UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 3

FEBRUARY 8, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1968
(PAGES 2603 TO 3952)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1968

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Thursday, February 8, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. E. McKinnon White, pastor, Washington Park Methodist Church, Providence, R.I., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, to whom we appeal for wisdom and truth, be with those who gather here in this place today. May we be disciplined to wait upon Thee for Thy spoken word and the word from our neighbor.

Let all be receptive to Thy sense of justice and courageous enough to act upon it when heard.

May the duties of government be kept clearly before all citizens of this Nation, both those who rule and those who are ruled. So let us decide and live that our resources will be for justice and truth among men in all nations. In Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 7, 1968, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for Fiscal Year 1967—the first full year of its existence.

The report offers abundant proof that the Endowment has made good use of its resources. With the advice and recommendations of the members of the National Council on the Arts, the Endowment has:

- —Opened new opportunities for creative writers, art students, and visual and performing artists;
- —Created three Laboratory Theatres—in Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Providence—for the presentation of professional theatre to secondary school students and the adult community;
- —Assisted 17 resident professional theatres across the Nation;
- —Initiated the first American Literary Anthology, representing the finest work appearing in literary magazines;
- —Helped major museums expand their audiences and provide more services to their communities;
- —Launched a program to enhance the environment of American cities with outstanding works of sculpture in outdoor public places;
- —Created a new program to aid American composers and symphony orchestras;
- —Stimulated the production and nationwide distribution of programs on the arts for educational television;
- —Rendered financial and technical assistance to agencies for the arts in 50 States, and District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico enabling them to implement 295 new or expanded arts projects.

Throughout Fiscal Year 1967, the National Endowment for the Arts worked closely with private foundations, organizations and individuals, seeking to increase appreciation and support of the arts in the United States.

Since the Endowment was created, Federal grants totaling $10.5 million have been made. These Federal grants have been supplemented by nearly $16 million in contributions from States and cities, and from private agencies and individuals—dramatic evidence of the widespread support which now exists for those whose talent and genius enrich the life of our country.

The National Endowment for the Arts has made great progress toward realizing the mandate given it by the Congress to improve the quality of American life.

I transmit with pride this report of the Endowment's first full year of activities and urge the Congress to act promptly to extend the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1968.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1155) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to change the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. FINO, and Mrs. DWYER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 947) authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF AGREEMENTS AND LEASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 937, H.R. 12603.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12603) to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word “of” strike out “1967’ ”, and insert “1968’ ”; on page 2, line 22, after the word “than” strike out “twenty” and insert “thirty”; on page 3, at the beginning of line 6, strike out “twenty” and insert “thirty”; in line 21, after the word “by” strike out “the Administrator” and insert “the Secretary, the Administrator”; after line 22 strike out:

> (7) the aggregate annual cost to the United States of all leases entered into under this title shall not exceed $3,000,000;

On page 4, at the beginning of line 1, change the number from “(8)” to “(7)”; in line 12, after the word “under” strike out “section 18 of”; and in line 16, after the word “before” strike out “January” and insert “April”; on page 5, after line 2, strike out:

> Sec. 105. (a) The District of Columbia shall not, during the term of any lease entered into by the United States pursuant to this title, include in the assessed valuation for tax purposes of the properties now owned by The Washington Terminal Company in the District of Columbia any increase in valuation by reason of the agreements, leases or improvements made pursuant to this title on behalf of the Federal Government.
>
> (b) In the case of any real property acquired or constructed by the Company in the District of Columbia, after the date of enactment of this Act, other than property leased to the United States under this title, including, but not limited to the new railroad passenger station to be constructed pursuant to section 102(a)(4) of this title, nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize or require any reduction or exemption from taxes applicable in the District of Columbia to such property.

At the beginning of line 20, change the section number from “106” to “105”; on page 6, at the beginning of line 7, change the section number from “107” to “106”; in line 16, after the word “with” strike out “section 18 of”; at the beginning of line 23, change the section number from “108” to “107”; on page 7, at the beginning of line 3, change the section number from “109” to “108”; in line 4, after the word “amended” strike out “by inserting ‘and directed’ immediately following ‘authorized’ and”; in line 9, after the word “of” strike out “1967;’ ” and insert “1968;’ ”; at the beginning of line 11, change the section number from “110” to “109”; after line 13 strike out:

> Sec. 111. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the alterations referred to in section 102(a)(1), and the parking facility referred to in section 102(a)(3), of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

On page 8, line 18, after the word “Institution”, strike out “the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities,”; in line 21, after the word “Arts” strike out “six” and insert “two”; and in the same line, after the word “Senate” strike out “three” and insert “one”; in line 23, after the word “and” strike out “six” and insert “two”; in line 24, after the word “Representatives” strike out “three” and insert “one”; in line 25, after the word “and” strike out “four” and insert “three”; on page 10, line 8, after the word “authorized” strike out “and directed”; and on page 11, after line 2, strike out:

> Title IV—Additional Visitor Facilities
>
> Sec. 401. The Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479; 40 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> “Sec. 18. (a) Whenever, under authority of section 107(a) of the National Visitor Facilities Act of 1967 the Secretary of the Interior determines that there is a need for the acquisition or construction of any facility for visitors to the Nation's Capital in addition to those specifically authorized by title I of such Act, or a need to alter any existing visitor facility, he shall recommend such action to the Administrator who shall transmit to Congress the prospectus of the proposed project including, but not limited to—
>
> “(1) a brief description of any building to be constructed, altered, or acquired;
>
> “(2) location of the project and an estimate of the maximum cost of the project;
>
> “(3) a statement of justification for the necessity and desirability of such facility.
>
> “(b) No appropriation shall be made to construct, alter, or acquire any additional visitor facility under this section if such construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by resolution to be adopted by the Committee on Public Works in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and such approval has not been rescinded as provided in subsection (c) of this section.
>
> “(c) In the case of any project for a visitor facility approved for construction, alteration, or acquisition by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section, if such an appropriation has not been made within one year after the date of such approval by either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives may rescind, by resolution, its approval of such project at any time thereafter before such appropriation has been made.
>
> “(d) To the extent applicable, all other provisions of this Act shall apply with respect to the construction, alteration, or acquisition of any visitor facility in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply in the case of construction, alteration, or acquisition of other public buildings under this Act.”

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 959), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEED

There are approximately 20 million Americans who visit the Nation's Capital each year, and it is anticipated that this number may reach 35 million by 1980. In addition to increasing numbers of Americans who are visiting the Nation's Capital, there are also increasing numbers of nationals of other countries who come to the Capital for both sightseeing and study purposes. At the present time there is no central location where these visitors may go to find a parking place for their cars, obtain assistance, receive information on the points of interest or historical significance, and to find the most convenient transportation to places of historical and cultural significance. As a rule they enter the city, drive searchingly along streets, impede the normal flow of traffic, and become thoroughly frustrated, having spent most of the day looking for a parking place, and having seen nothing of the many historical points of interest.

The urgent need for an appropriate National Visitor Center was stressed by the National Visitors Center Study Commission in its report of September 1967.

HEARINGS

On December 5 and December 14, 1967, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds conducted hearings on this legislation. It received testimony from Members of the Congress, heads of Federal agencies, and officials of many organizations and corporations concerned with transportation, parking, visitors' services, and the promotion of Washington, D.C., as a visitor and business center. All testimony favored the establishment of a national visitor center at Union Station.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The problems facing the average visitor to the Nation's Capital are overwhelming. Where does he start? Where does he park his car? Where does he obtain information on what there is to see and how he will get there?

In addition to being the Capital of the United States, Washington, D.C., has also become a world capital. Over the years there has been an ever-increasing number of visitors from all parts of the United States and from all parts of the world who come to the city for either business or pleasure. These visitors, whatever the purpose of their visit to Washington, are anxious to see this great Government in action and to visit the many historic sites in the area. In many cases this is their first visit to the Nation's Capital. Visitors come to enjoy a few hours or a few days in this historic city and in most cases have little knowledge of what to see or where to go. When they come to Washington to take in its treasures they find no central point nor organized program to provide them with information on the Nation's Capital.

Over the past few years, many proposals have been advanced to remedy this situation, but no plan has been effected to date which will make a visitor's stay in the city easier, and will enable him to get the most out of his trip. The time for action is now.

In 1960 more than 15 million people visited the Washington area. By 1970, 24 million visitors are expected, and in 1980 it is expected that the number will reach 35 million.

There has been repeated criticism that Washington is almost alone among the national capitals of the world in not having a program to assist visitors, students, and tourists. What is needed is an orientation center which becomes the visitor's first stop in Washington. Here he would receive overall information on the operations of the Government and the historical monuments and museums to be seen which would enable him to apportion his time to the greatest advantage. In addition to receiving information and directions at a central location he would also be provided with ample parking facilities, restaurants, rest areas, and visual and written aids.

The local community has long been aware of the need to assist visitors coming to Washington. Citizens, newspapers, and businessmen have expressed their concern and have contributed time and services to developing preliminary plans for aiding visitors.

The Congress has also recognized the need for adequate visitor facilities in the District of Columbia. In order to find out what could be done and how and where an appropriate visitor center might be developed, the Congress in November of 1966 passed Public Law 89–790, which created the National Visitors Center Study Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors.

The Commission was composed of 21 members, including the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Chairman of the Council on the Arts and Humanities, the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, six Members of the Senate, six Members of the House of Representatives, and three members appointed by the President.

In accordance with its mandate the Commission conducted a complete study of the problem, which included the holding of extensive meetings throughout the city and inspecting a number of proposed sites for a National Visitor Center.

In September of 1967 the Commission submitted its recommendations for legislation to the Congress. The Commission concluded that a National Visitor Center is urgently needed and that Union Station, with certain renovations and the addition of a parking facility constructed over the tracks, is the most suitable location for such a center and that the Center should be operated by the National Park Service which would provide therein a complete visitor orientation program. The primary recommendations of the National Visitors Center Study Commission are embodied in H.R. 12603.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It is the opinion of the committee that the establishment and operation of a Visitor Center at a central location in the District of Columbia is long overdue. The committee believes the legislation that it reports herein fully protects the interests of the U.S. Government in the establishment and operation of a National Visitor Center and provides the best possible method of establishing additional visitor facilities as needed through the creation of an advisory commission.

While the term of the basic lease may not exceed 30 years, it is desirable for the Secretary and the Administrator to include appropriate renewal options in the lease to assure continued use of the facilities beyond 30 years if necessary. It is pointed out that under this act there will be no expenditure of money by the United States until such time as the Visitor Center facilities are available for public use.

The committee expects that the Department of the Interior will operate the National Visitor Center in such a way that the income from parking and concessions will as nearly as possible offset the annual rental and operating costs. However, the committee directs that under no circumstances will the Secretary charge or authorize the charging of any admission or entrance fee or other charge for entrance to the Visitor Center or for the use of the public facilities therein, other than for parking.

The committee recommends that H.R. 12603, as amended, be enacted.

COSTS

Enactment of this legislation will necessitate the appropriation of funds to pay the annual rental and operating costs of the National Visitor Center and other costs which may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It is anticipated that it will take approximately 3 years to design and construct the required facilities and therefore appropriated funds will probably not be required before fiscal year 1971.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The bill clerk read the nomination of Frederick E. Batrus, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 22

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that, pursuant to a special order adopted by the Senate on January 24, 1901, the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d day of February 1968.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, February 8, 1968, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 13094) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PLANNED ACTIONS IN THE NASA FISCAL YEAR 1968 PROGRAM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautical and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on planned actions in the NASA fiscal year 1968 program for research and development (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND THE ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Federal Contributions Programs Equipment and Facilities for the quarter ending December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NROTC FLIGHT INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program for the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED SECURITY MEASURES FOR BANKS AND OTHER FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1968; to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON NASA EMPLOYEE PERSONAL PROPERTY CLAIMS SETTLED

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AUTHORITY FOR BUREAU OF PRISONS TO ASSIST STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IMPROVE THEIR CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of their correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Prohibition of Manufacture, Introduction or Advertisement for Sale of Motor Vehicle Master Keys in Interstate Commerce

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 208. A resolution to authorize the Committee on Finance to expend $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946;

S. Res. 210. A resolution authorizing additional funds for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections (Rept. No. 961);

S. Res. 212. A resolution to study certain aspects of national security and international operations (Rept. No. 962);

S. Res. 213. A resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting" (Rept. No. 963);

S. Res. 215. A resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a complete study of the problems of small and independent businesses (Rept. No. 964);

S. Res. 217. A resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "U.S. Foreign Aid in Action: A Case Study" (Rept. No. 965);

S. Res. 219. A resolution to authorize certain investigations by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Rept. No. 966);

S. Res. 222. A resolution to provide for the study of migratory labor (Rept. No. 967);

S. Res. 224. A resolution to study the Standing Rules of the Senate (Rept. No. 968);

S. Res. 225. A resolution to make a study of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services (Rept. No. 969);

S. Res. 226. A resolution to provide for a study of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States by the Committee on Foreign Relations (Rept. No. 970);

S. Res. 228. A resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (Rept. No. 971);

S. Res. 229. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 972);

S. Res. 230. A resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 973);

S. Res. 231. A resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings, part 2, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders" (Rept. No. 974);

S. Res. 232. A resolution to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 975);

S. Res. 234. A resolution to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebration (Rept. No. 976);

S. Res. 235. A resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments (Rept. No. 977);

S. Res. 239. A resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 978);

S. Res. 241. A resolution to examine and review the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights (Rept. No. 979);

S. Res. 242. A resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 980);

S. Res. 244. A resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 981);

S. Res. 246. A resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "The National Airport System" (Rept. No. 982); and

S. Res. 249. A resolution to print as a Senate document a report on "The Cost of Clean Water" (Rept. No. 983).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 218. A resolution to authorize funding of the Indian Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee (Rept. No. 985).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 206. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing and urban affairs, including urban mass transportation (Rept. No. 986);

S. Res. 207. A resolution to continue for one year the authority of the Committee on Finance to employ six additional clerical assistants (Rept. No. 987);

S. Res. 209. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor (Rept. No. 988);

S. Res. 211. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to foreign assistance operations by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 989);

S. Res. 214. A resolution to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government (Rept. No. 990);

S. Res. 216. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government (Rept. No. 991);

S. Res. 221. A resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 992);

S. Res. 223. A resolution to provide for the study of the problems of the aging (Rept. No. 993);

S. Res. 227. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government (Rept. No. 994);

S. Res. 233. A resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 995);

S. Res. 236. A resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 996);

S. Res. 237. A resolution to investigate criminal laws and procedures (Rept. No. 997);

S. Res. 238. A resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 998);

S. Res. 240. A resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 999);

S. Res. 243. A resolution to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 1000);

S. Res. 245. A resolution to make a full and complete study of the separation of powers under the Constitution (Rept. No. 1001);

S. Res. 248. A resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 1002);

S. Res. 250. A resolution to authorize certain additional studies by the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 1003); and

S. Res. 252. A resolution to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies (Rept. No. 1004).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 220. A resolution to provide additional professional and clerical staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 984).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 247. A resolution continuing the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress through December 31, 1968 (Rept. No. 1005).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2949. A bill providing for the addition of the Freeman School of the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. FONG):

S. 2950. A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction into interstate commerce of tryout keys or manipulation keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 2951. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2952. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2953. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize reimbursement for certain previously constructed treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as Lym Engineering Co.;

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Ann Maria Y. Uy; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2956. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, in order to make marketing orders applicable to apples produced in the State of

Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Soon-Hie Cho Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. HART) (by request):

S. 2958. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for oher purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2959. A bill to increase insurance of savings and loan accounts and bank deposits of public units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2960. A bill to provide for the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2961. A bill for the relief of Sezan Osoktay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2962. A bill for the relief of Mario Simoes Da Fonseca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2963. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws and certain other payments; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S.J. Res. 141. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 3d day of June of each year as Dr. Charles Richard Drew Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SCOTT):

S.J. Res. 142. A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 143. A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 144. A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. MOSS):

S.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to provide for a study and evaluation of scientific research in medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

GREETINGS AND COMMENDATIONS OF CONGRESS TO THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF TELEVISION ARTS AND SCIENCES

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 56

Whereas in 1947, the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences was founded in Hollywood, California; and

Whereas in 1957, the parent chapter in Hollywood invited New York City to form a chapter, join with it, and make up the "National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences"; and

Whereas since that time several additional chapters have joined the academy in cities located throughout the United States; and

Whereas the academy has a total membership of six thousand of television's most creative contributors, embracing leaders both of management and labor unions and guilds; and

Whereas the annual awarding of Emmys for achievement both locally and nationally is the best known activity of the academy; and

Whereas the academy is dedicated to the advancement of excellence in the television industry and provides many additional activities and services related to this end; and

Whereas during the year 1968, the academy is celebrating the twentieth anniversary of its founding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences its most cordial greetings and felicitations upon the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the academy, and expresses its highest commendations and appreciation for the many contributions made by the academy to the television medium and the American people during the past twenty years.

COMMENDATION OF MILTON BERLE

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 57

Whereas Milton Berle has achieved international fame as an entertainer, in a career that has spanned more than half a century; and

Whereas throughout his varied careers in show business, Milton Berle has given unstintingly of his time and talent to appear without pay at benefit performances of every description; and

Whereas Milton Berle has been honored by the title, "Mr. Television" for his career has paralleled the advances of the television industry to its present position of greatness as an entertainment medium; and

Whereas from his television debut through his familiar appearances on the "Texaco Star Theater" to the present, Milton Berle has brought laughter, happiness, and family entertainment to audiences of all ages in nearly every home in the Nation; and

Whereas the year 1968 marks the twentieth anniversary of his career in television; and

Whereas on February 10 of this year, the Hollywood chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences will be celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the Academy by honoring Milton Berle; and

Whereas it is fitting that appropriate recognition also be accorded to Milton Berle by all the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its cordial greetings to Milton Berle on the occasion of his twentieth year in television and its highest commendation for his two decades of contribution to the American people by way of the television medium.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO REDUCING THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT THROUGH USE OF AMERICAN SHIPS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself, Senator BARTLETT, and Senator BREWSTER, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reducing the balance-of-payments deficit by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships. In recent months there has been considerable discussion and concern about the dangers arising from our unfavorable balance of payments. The President has just recently proposed a comprehensive program designed to help alleviate this most serious situation.

With an ever-expanding trade horizon, the potential balance-of-payments advantages to be realized by utilization of American-flag carriers becomes increasingly clear. As you know, our American merchant marine is now carrying only 7 percent of our foreign water-borne trade, and surely there is a pressing need for substantial improvements in this area. However, as President Johnson has stated previously with respect to the American merchant marine:

> Even at its present level, it earns or conserves almost $1 billion of foreign exchange every year, making it a major factor in our balance of payments position.

While not all within or without Government have always viewed the importance of utilizing American-flag transportation facilities with the same degree of conviction that I hold on this matter, I believe that the present circumstances clarify the appropriateness of such a policy. Surely the Government as the largest user of transportation facilities can do much to encourage use of American-flag carriers, particularly through appropriate action by the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development, and the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 58

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the United States during the past several years has been suffering from an unfavorable balance of payments; and

Whereas despite efforts to control the outflow of capital the unfavorable balance has greatly increased; and

Whereas the continued heavy imbalance could seriously affect the stability of the dollar; and

Whereas the President has suggested a number of means, both legislative and voluntary, of diminishing the outflow of dollars; and

Whereas an important element in the unfavorable balance is the payment of ocean freights and passenger fares to foreign-flag carriers for shipping and transportation abroad; and

Whereas a large proportion of every dollar of ocean freight payments to United States cargo ships is retained in the United States; and

Whereas a large proportion of every dollar spent for travel aboard United States passenger ships is retained in the United States; and

Whereas American-flag ships are available to carry an increased portion of such commerce and passengers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships to the end that the balance-of-payments drain resulting from payments to ships of other countries be substantially reduced; and (2) that the Department of Commerce, Department of Transportation, and all other Government agencies should take all measures at their disposal to accomplish this objective.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, has just introduced into the Senate a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the reduction of our balance-of-payments deficit by encouraging shipping and travel on American-flag vessels.

I am proud to cosponsor this resolution.

Today the American merchant marine carries only 7.4 percent of this country's total foreign commerce. Even so, this small percentage contributes approximately $1 billion toward the betterment of the balance of payments.

Imagine the effect on the balance of payments if our ships carried a much greater proportion of our foreign trade.

It is, in fact, not difficult to see that if ships flying our own flag carried substantially more than 7.4 percent of our oceangoing foreign commerce, our balance of payments would improve radically.

Not long ago, Paul Hall, president of the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department, demonstrated that if the United States carried 34 percent of its total foreign commerce in American-flag vessels, we would have no balance-of-payments deficit at all.

Sadly, Mr. Hall's statement appears to have gone practically unnoticed.

As Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, has pointed out, our balance of payments stands to worsen steadily as we allow the condition of our merchant marine to deteriorate. Although now we have 935 ships less than 25 years old—the standard lifetime for a merchant ship—in 1972, we will have only 357. This means that the percentage of our trade carried in our own ships, small though it is now, will decline sharply in the next 4 or 5 years, and more and more American dollars will flow out of the country to finance transportation in foreign carriers.

It is not difficult to see the situation deteriorating to the point of utter hopelessness—unless we begin right now to beef up our merchant fleet. The legislative ingredients for a revitalized fleet are contained in S. 2650, the comprehensive maritime bill introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, Senator BARTLETT, and myself late last session. I certainly hope we shall see action on that measure in the near future.

The purpose of the resolution introduced today is to secure the recognition of Congress of the vital connection between our merchant fleet and the balance of payments, and thereby, to focus attention on the need to take action forthwith to improve the fleet.

It is not only the maritime industry of the Nation that will benefit, but, through a reduced deficit in the balance of payments, the Nation as a whole.

RESOLUTIONS

CHARLOTTE N. HORTON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 256); which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 256

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Charlotte N. Horton, widow of Ralph W. Horton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WILHELMINA SIMMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 257); which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 257

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Wilhelmina Simms, widow of Perry F. Simms, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADDITION OF FREEMAN SCHOOL TO THE HOMESTEAD NATIONAL MONUMENT OF AMERICA IN NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and myself, I sent to the desk a bill that provides for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument in the State of Nebraska. I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2949) providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That in order to further the interpretation and commemoration of the pioneer life of early settlers of the West, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds the following described lands and interests therein, on which is situated the old school building known as Freeman School:

Beginning at the southeast corner of the SE ¼ of Section 22, Township 4 North, Range 5 East, Sixth Principal Meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, thence running north on the east line of the said quarter section 297 feet, thence west 214.5 feet, thence south 297 feet, thence east 214.5 feet to the point of beginning.

The Secretary is further authorized, in order to protect the setting of the Freeman School, preserve an adequate visual relationship with the existing Homestead National Monument of America, and provide access to the school from the national monument, to acquire by any of the above methods such lands and interests therein, as he deems necessary within the areas in certain sections of Township 4 North, Range 5 East, Sixth Principal Meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, which are described as follows:

Section 22, beginning at a point 297 feet north of the southeast corner of the SE ¼ on the east line of the said quarter section, thence north along the east line of the said quarter section 103 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence south 400 feet to the south line of said quarter section, thence east along the south line of said quarter section 85.5 feet to the boundary of the Freeman School property, thence north along the boundary of the school property 297 feet, thence east along the boundary of the school property 214.5 feet to the point of beginning;

Section 23, the south 300 feet of the SW ¼ thereof;

Section 26, the north 300 feet of the NW ¼ NW ¼ thereof;

Section 27, beginning at the northeast corner of the NE ¼, thence along the east line of the said quarter section 300 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence north 300 feet to the north line of said quarter section, thence east along the north line of said quarter section 300 feet to the point of beginning; all containing about 31 acres.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of The Homestead National Monument of America, in accordance with the Act of March 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE INTERSTATE SALE AND ADVERTISING OF MANIPULATION AND TRYOUT KEYS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, why children misbehave is one of the major concerns of parents, law-enforcement officers, corrections personnel, and some legislators. Teenage and youthful misbehavior, when it is labeled "juvenile delinquency" by the courts, imposes on the community the additional burden of treatment and rehabilitation.

For several years the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has probed the causes of serious law abuses by children. We know to a large extent where they live. We know what kind of adults some of them grow up to be. But we know little of the motivation behind particular crimes. We do not know enough about the behavior patterns of those most likely to become juvenile delinquents. Even as we pursue some of these elusive questions, the subcommittee is focusing on more concrete, though partial, solutions in new legislation.

We already know, for example, that 89 percent of all automobile thefts are perpetrated by juveniles and young adults.

We know that most lifetime criminals stole cars in their early years.

We know that automobile theft is one of the Nation's most costly crimes against property. In 1966, the direct dollar loss was $165 million. Compare that to the $6 million stolen in 1965 in all the bank robberies in the country.

Of course, prevention of a large portion of auto theft is relatively simple. Car owners can lock their car doors and take the keys with them. This simple precaution, it is conceivable, would immediately reduce car theft by 40 percent, or 200,000 cars a year. Other thefts are more difficult to prevent since they are the conscious schemes of professional thieves or the result of unscrupulous entrepreneurs who exploit youth for commercial gain.

Since the beginning of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's study of the causes and patterns of juvenile auto theft, I have grown increasingly aware of the availability to minors of so-called automobile master keys, which are widely sold for opening locked doors and ignitions without the owner's keys.

According to the Security Standards Committee of the Associated Locksmiths, a master key is a single key which opens many locks which were designed with individual combinations of tumblers and individual opening keys.

But when the slick ads in the girlie magazines offer a ring of master keys to gullible youngsters with dreams of flipping open a borrowed car's door and turning on its ignition for a quick spin around the block or a trip to another State, they are using a technical term that can confuse those who would devise legislation which would outlaw these items. The problem keys are something other than real master keys.

The detailed instructions provided for a would-be young auto thief gives us a clue as to the real nature of these devices. In the package with the mail-order keys comes an instruction sheet on which step 3 directs the user to "Apply pressure to the right side and jiggle the key upward and downward."

Because the pseudo master keys are really "tryout keys" or "manipulation" or "jiggle keys," the locksmiths describe the use of these as simple variations on old-fashioned lock picking. There is presently no law forbidding the advertisement and sale of these jiggle keys whose sole purpose is the entry into locked cars and the operation of ignition systems.

Using direct mail advertising, one promoter claimed he had solicited key sales and orders for a device to unlock car doors from gasoline service stations, parking garages, car dealers, and other legitimate businesses related to the auto industry.

Ads are worded to appeal, however, not to the established service station but to youngsters and others with thrills and larceny in mind. "Strikes like a cobra," proclaimed one blurb sheet showing a car door opener which is accurately labeled a "burglar tool." The promoter also spent a considerable sum to entice an immature audience with ads in the girlie magazines. The come-ons do their job.

Our investigation revealed that youthful employees or frequenters of the auto businesses obtained the order blanks and used company names to order these tools for themselves.

In spite of the warning in the ads that no personal orders would be accepted—only company orders on letterheads with company checks, the flyers say—thousands of individuals who sent personal checks, money orders, or cash, on personal stationery have received the keys without question.

The subpenaed records of just one company showed that 20,000 sets of these keys were mailed in a 1-year period, at a price of $10 per set.

At least half of the legitimate key and door opener purchasers are skilled enough to use the expensive lock picks successfully. What percentage of the teenagers interested only in "borrowing a car for a date" and what percentage of the more sophisticated car thieves can effectively use these simple tools must be left to speculation at this point.

We know they buy keys. Police records tell us this. The key distributors' records tell us this. And, confiscated property records after arrests tell us this.

The subcommittee traced purchasers of these keys throughout the country.

In Chicago, 8 percent of the purchasers had police records. One mail order key buyer was particularly active: his record includes robbery, auto theft, possession of burglar tools, carrying concealed weapons, and vagrancy. Another had an arrest record for receiving stolen property.

In Detroit, 15 percent of the purchasers had run-ins with the law. One 14-year-old boy there was already busy stealing cars with other youngsters. Lured by a magazine ad which promised "high earning in your own business," he decided to amass his own set of tools and bought keys by mail specifically to use them for stealing cars. Until our inquiry, his parents were unaware that their son had purchased the keys, and when they questioned him, he admitted the inspiration and his plans.

Cases involving key purchases in other cities are likewise revealing.

In Miami, a service station owner was arrested on charges of receiving and concealing stolen properties, which included vehicles stolen out of State and sold by him in Florida. He was also arraigned on charges of stealing local cars.

The son of one key purchaser in Phoenix was arrested on charges of auto theft and altering the motor vehicle identification numbers. The boy was employed by his father in an automobile business.

There were 12 criminal records among the 72 mail-order key purchasers in Philadelphia. During 1965 and 1966 at 35 of the addresses of these purchasers, police reported to us there had been 17 auto thefts, 10 burglaries, three burglaries from vehicles, and five larcenies of auto accessories. One citizen in the City of Brotherly Love had a 26-year record of 23 arraignments which included larceny, auto theft, violation of towing laws, forgery, interstate transportation of stolen vehicles, and arson.

Other major cities in the subcommittee study were Los Angeles, Oakland, Washington, D.C., New York, Cleveland, and San Francisco.

In these 11 cities a total of 950 mail-order key buyers were either interviewed or checked for police records. Thirty-five percent or 333 of the 950 key buyers were actual or suspected auto thieves.

Mr. President, a substantial amount of the Nation's automobile theft loss might be easily and swiftly controlled by prohibiting the interstate commerce in manipulation and tryout keys, which at the moment are freely accessible to everyone.

Our investigation shows these devices are not needed by legitimate locksmiths and others in the automobile industry.

That is why I introduce this relatively simple piece of legislation which would proscribe the commerce in these items.

This bill would make it a felony to introduce into interstate commerce tryout or manipulation keys or to disseminate through the U.S. mails any advertisements for such burglar tools.

This bill can contribute substantially to reducing car theft, a crime which is the annual initiation into delinquency and perhaps a lifetime of crime for thousands of our country's youth.

I hope it will receive prompt and favorable consideration by both Houses of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2950) to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction into interstate commerce of tryout keys or manipulation keys, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTROL, REGULATION, AND MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators CHURCH and CANNON, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands.

The prime purpose of the bill endorsed by the Nevada Fish and Game Commission through its director, Mr. Frank Groves of Reno, Nev., is to resolve the continuing argument and controversy between the respective Fish and Game Commissions of the various States and Federal agencies as to who has jurisdiction on Federal lands over resident wildlife species.

I trust that Congress can move expeditiously to resolve this long continuing problem.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues from Nevada, Senators BIBLE and CANNON, in sponsoring this bill to declare and determine policy with respect to authority of the States to manage the fish and wildlife within their boundaries.

This bill should help resolve a problem which has been with us a good many years. It has been endorsed by the Idaho Fish and Game Department through its director, Mr. John R. Woodworth, who informs me it is also endorsed by the various State game departments and the National Governors' conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2951) to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. CHURCH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize reimbursement for certain previously constructed treatment works. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the past few years, the Congress and the administration have worked diligently to develop Federal programs for the control and elimination of pollution in U.S. waters. The citizens of this country now recognize the need for corrective action and most realize it will be costly. The Federal Government has promised to support local and State efforts with Federal money. But the pressure of national military commitments has caused Federal appropriations for many domestic programs to lag substantially behind the amounts authorized under existing law. Last year, for example, the amount authorized for treatment plants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was $450 million, but it was quite difficult to win approval of slightly more than $200 million. This year, the authorization for water treatment plants under the act is much greater—$700 million. Yet the appropriation will undoubtedly be nearly the same as last year. While Federal appropriations falter, pollution abatement needs continue to mount.

With the background knowledge that Federal funds are likely to be restricted for some indefinite time and with the presence in the act of an impending cutoff date—July 1, 1971—for future Federal appropriations to match qualifying local and State expenditures, local officials are presented with a clear warning to slow down or halt local sewerage expenditures. In the State of Washington, for example, where qualifying projects greatly exceed available allocations, local officials know that a continued accumulation of unmatched qualifying expenditures measured against a narrowing time for appropriations of matching Federal funds means less and less chance of ever getting the Federal funds which the original authorized levels indicated would be used to match local and State expenditures. This will almost certainly cause a wait-and-see approach on local sewer expenditures which will become increasingly severe as the 1971 deadline approaches. Even though national commitments should continue to prevent pollution abatement appropriations from reaching desired levels the Federal Government should at least maintain its ultimate intention to carry out the basic purpose of the Water Pollution Control Act. It can only do this by letting local officials know that present local expenditures will ultimately be matched by Federal expenditures.

In the bill I introduce herewith, I propose to accomplish the task of reassuring local officials by deleting from section 8(c) of the act any reference to an impending cutoff date for Federal matching funds.

This bill is also addressed to another problem which is of great concern to many of our larger cities. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit reimbursement of State and local funds used in lieu of Federal funds in construction of waste treatment works. For any project on which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966, and which proceeded without Federal assistance or with a lesser amount of Federal assistance than authorized by law, the State allotment may be used to reimburse State and local funds used in lieu of Federal funds to the extent that Federal assistance could have been authorized if adequate funds had been available.

Although the matter of retroactive Federal participation in cost of construction of waste treatment works had been considered on other occasions, no such provision was enacted previously. I believe that the inclusion of this feature in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is a significant action of the Congress in recognizing its responsibility toward such communities. However, I also believe that it is highly discriminatory to restrict retroactive Federal participation to those projects on which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966.

Prior to the 1966 amendments, the basic objective of the Federal construction grant program was to assist the smaller communities that generally have financing problems. This was all well and good. Those communities surely need Federal help. But the 1966 amendments were designed to assist all communities, including the large cities, to meet the water quality standards requirements of the Water Quality Act of 1965. I submit that Congress in 1966 changed the ground rules and, in effect, penalized those cities such as Seattle and St. Louis which had acted in good faith in previous years by financing pollution abatement facilities almost entirely with local funds.

This discrimination has resulted in sewer service charges in the cities which have used local money to resolve their pollution problems which are substantially higher than charges in federally assisted communities. Communities which have proceeded on their own to construct facilities without waiting for Federal aid, by reducing the effect of steadily increasing construction costs, have saved themselves and the Federal Government untold millions of dollars. At the same time, they have proven themselves to be good neighbors to other communities "downstream" by accepting the responsibility to clean up the wastes which they have created rather than pass them on to others. Their actions in doing so are highly commendable and should not result in their being denied the benefits which have been made available to other communities.

Another problem which results from the lack of retroactivity is best described with an example. The citizens of the Seattle metropolitan area have constructed or are constructing approximately $135 million worth of metropolitan sewerage facilities. Total Federal assistance on this work is less than 3 percent. This construction is being financed by long-term revenue borrowing of the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle. The Seattle area has grown rapidly in the past few years and additional construction is necessary to meet the additional pollution problems which this growth has produced. But the local taxpayers are already carrying a heavy burden. Every community which has recently constructed high-cost sewage projects without the benefit of substantial Federal aid finds its ability to finance additional projects severely limited by heavy charges for long-term debt incurred to build existing projects.

In this bill I have, therefore, proposed that the reimbursement feature of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act be applied to all projects which proceeded with construction after June 30, 1961. The proposed amendment will induce such communities to construct remaining badly needed sewage facilities by assuring these communities that ultimately the Federal Government will bear a fair proportionate share of projects which meet the requirements of the Federal act. This proposed amendment will also reduce the serious inequity caused by arbitrary previous matching limits which discriminated harshly against large cities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2953) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize reimbursement for certain previously constructed treatment works, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sixth and seventh sentences of section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are amended (1) by striking out "June 30, 1966" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961", and (2) by striking out "ending prior to July 1, 1971" and "prior to 1971," wherever appearing therein.

WHOLESOME FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS ACT OF 1968

Mr. HART. Mr. President, fish and fish products are major sources of food for Americans. The annual marketing of fish in this country amounts to more than 4 billion pounds

Fish are highly perishable and susceptible to contaminants. Yet anywhere from 2 to 14 days can elapse between the catch and processing. Consequently, fish can be hazardous to health.

But the Food and Drug Administration estimates that less than 1 percent of domestic fish products and 5 percent of the lots of imported fish are adequately inspected.

Obviously, something must be done to provide better protection for American consumers. Today I am pleased to join the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] in introducing the administration bill to cope with this problem.

Through this new legislation I hope that the Congress can insure that no unwholesome or adulterated fish product will be marketed in interstate commerce and that the sale of fish products will be promoted by insuring that a consumer will be able to purchase fish products of consistently good quality.

Representing as I do a Great Lakes State, the "health, or ill health, of the fishing industry," as I said last year, is also of major importance to me. I am interested in improving the economic position of that industry.

I believe that better sanitation and health protection measures will in fact be a great boon, not only to those who use fish products, but also to the entire, widely scattered industry—to big and small producers alike. Consumers who can rely on the quality of fish will demand more fish. Those who catch and process the fish will make bigger profits.

Too often we act to correct unsafe conditions only after something dramatic happens and receives wide press coverage. In 1963, you will recall, an outbreak of botulism resulted from consumption of fish. Several persons died. During one weekend of 1966, more than 300 cases of Salmonella poisoning were reported in New York. In the same year more than 250 cases of food poisoning in Buffalo were traced to imported shrimp.

These are grim but only fragmentary statistics. As convenience foods become an increasing part of our market, a greater variety of fish products will have the potential to cause illness.

Consumers Union, from tests conducted between 1961 and 1966, reported that anywhere from 46 to 98 percent of a variety of packaged fish products were of substandard quality. Disease and death resulting from poor quality fish products are therefore more than statistical possibilities.

My hope is that our combined efforts, based on my proposals of last year in S. 1472, the Fishery Products Protection Act of 1967, will produce legislation which will deal adequately with the current problems while causing a minimum amount of disruption to the fish processing industry.

In connection with this new bill which we are today introducing, I wish to comment that section 410(i) on "Importation of Fish and Fishery Products" concerns me very much. I doubt that it is feasible to require that conditions in the 116 countries from which we presently import fish meet U.S. standards within 2 years. I believe we will need to give further consideration to this provision, both in the interest of price to the U.S. consumer and in the interest of our trade relations with the countries involved, particularly the lesser developed nations.

Mr. President, I urge action in the 90th Congress to assure passage of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act to aid both the consumer and the important industry which catches, processes, and ships these products.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and a fact sheet on it, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and fact sheet will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2958) to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mr. Hart), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1968".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDING

Sec. 2. Fish and fishery products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. These foods are consumed throughout the Nation and the major portion of the supply moves in interstate commerce, some from foreign sources. It is essential that the health and welfare of consumers be protected by assuring that fish and fishery products distributed to them are of good quality, wholesome, not adulterated, and are properly marked, labeled, and packaged. Fish or fishery products which do not meet these standards depress markets for wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged fish and fishery products. Those articles that are unwholesome, adulterated, of poor quality, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged compete unfairly with articles that are of good quality, wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged, to the detriment of commercial fishermen, processors and consumers of fish and fishery products. It is hereby found that all fish and fishery products regulated under this Act are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce, and that Federal regulation and cooperation by the States and other jurisdictions as contemplated by this Act are appropriate to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce, to effectively regulate such commerce, and to protect the health and welfare of the consumer.

WHOLESOME FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 101. Section 201, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"(w) The term 'fish' means any aquatic animal, including amphibians, or part thereof capable of use as human food.

"(x) The term 'fishery products' means any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from any fish or portion thereof, except products which contain fish only in small proportions or historically have not been, in the judgment of the Secretary, considered by consumers as products of the commercial fishing industry, and which are exempted from definition as a fishery product by the Secretary under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that the fish or portions thereof contained therein are not adulterated and that such products are not represented as fishery products.

"(y) The term 'capable of use as human food' applies to any fish or part or product thereof, unless it is denatured or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to deter its use as human food, or unless it is naturally inedible by humans.

"(z) The terms 'process', 'processed', and 'processing' with respect to fish or fishery products, mean to harvest, handle, store, prepare, produce, manufacture, process, pack, transport, or hold such products.

"(aa) The term 'official mark' means the official inspection legend or any other symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to identify the status of any fish or fishery product under this Act.

"(bb) The term 'official inspection legend' means any symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary showing that an article is in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(cc) The term 'official inspection certificate' means any certificate prescribed by regulations of the Secretary for issuance by an inspector or other person performing official functions under this Act.

"(dd) The term 'official device' means any device prescribed or authorized by the Secretary for use in applying any official mark.

"(ee) The term 'vessel' means any water-craft of any description which is engaged primarily in the processing of fish for landing and human consumption in any State.

"(ff) the term 'continuous inspection' means the application of inspection by a full-time inspector, except in cases where geographic distribution of establishments makes it reasonable, from the standpoint of carrying out the purposes of this Act, for one inspector to inspect more than one establishment on a substantially continuous basis."

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 102. Section 301, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(r) Without authorization from the Secretary or contrary to regulations prescribed by him, casting, printing, lithographing, or otherwise making, simulating, using, or failing to use, altering, defacing, detaching, or destroying any form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate, or official device; possessing, without promptly notifying the Secretary thereof, any forged, counterfeited, simulated, or improperly altered form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate or official device; forging, counterfeiting, simulating, improperly altering any form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate, or official device; making any false statement in any shipper's or other certificate provided for in regulations; or falsely or misleadingly representing that any fish or fishery product has been inspected and passed or exempted from such inspection.

"(s) The processing of any fish or fishery products in any establishment or vessel preparing any such article in violation of the requirements of part B of chapter IV and regulations prescribed pursuant thereto.

"(t) The importation of fish and fishery products in violation of section 410(i).

"(u) The failure to maintain, or to afford access to, records as required by section 411 (b)."

ADULTERATION

SEC. 103. Section 402, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(f) If it is, or it bears or contains, any fish or fishery product, and it has been processed, stored, or handled in violation of section 410 or 411 or any regulations issued by the Secretary under such sections."

INSPECTION OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS, ESTABLISHMENTS, AND VESSELS

SEC. 104. Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended (1) by inserting "PART A—GENERAL" immediately below the chapter heading, and (2) by adding at the end of such chapter the following:

"PART B—FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS

"SUBPART 1—INSPECTION AND REGULATION OF PRODUCTS, ESTABLISHMENTS, AND VESSELS

"SEC. 410. (a) GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall, either directly or by contract, make, by experts in sanitation or other competent persons, such survey of as many establishments in the United States and vessels which process fish or fishery products for interstate commerce as he deems appropriate to inform himself concerning the operations and sanitary conditions thereof for the purpose of developing adequate standards of good manufacturing practices, including but not limited to sanitation and quality control, under which such establishments and vessels shall be maintained and operated. The Secretary shall thereafter prescribe, by regulations, issued within one year after funds are appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part, standards of sanitation and quality control for the processing of fish and fishery products which shall be applicable to persons covered by this part. Such regulations shall become effective upon the date specified in the order prescribing them, but in no event later than one year after the date on which such regulations have been issued, unless the Secretary finds that additional time, not in excess of one year, is necessary to place all or any part of such regulations into effect. On and after the effective date of such regulations no person shall process for interstate commerce fish or fishery products in any establishment under his control without complying with such regulations.

"(b) CERTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS AND VESSELS.—Thirty days after the effective date of such regulations, no person shall process for interstate commerce fish or fishery products in any establishment or vessel under his control unless there is in effect for such establishment or vessel a certificate of registration issued by the Secretary. The Secretary shall issue such a certificate upon application accompanied by such assurance as may be required by regulations that such establishment or vessel is and will be maintained in compliance with applicable standards. The Secretary may deny the certificate of registration if an adequate assurance of compliance is not presented, and the denial shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by section 412.

"(c) SUSPENSION AND REINSTATEMENT OF CERTIFICATES.—The certificate of registration of any establishment or vessel may be suspended, after opportunity for hearing, for failure to comply with the requirements of this subpart. The certificate may be immediately suspended by the Secretary (1) for failure to permit access for inspection or failure to comply with the lawful order for condemnation or detention or (2) where an inspection or investigation discloses violation of any provision of this chapter or any regulation issued thereunder which might result in imminent harm to consumers if processing were to continue prior to the correction of such violation. The holder of such suspended certificate may at any time apply for reinstatement, and the Secretary shall immediately grant such reinstatement if he finds that adequate measures have been taken to comply with the provisions of this chapter and the regulations. Suspension of a certificate and the denial of reinstatement shall be subject to the procedures provided by section 412, but a summary suspension shall remain in effect during the pendency of the administrative proceeding under that section. In the event of any judicial proceeding relating to such summary suspension before the proceeding under section 412 the only issue to be judicially determined shall be whether the Secretary had reasonable cause under the circumstances of the case to take summary action.

"(d) INSPECTION.—For the purpose of preventing the use in interstate commerce of fish or fishery products which are adulterated or misbranded, the Secretary shall cause to be made, by inspectors appointed by him for that purpose, a continuous inspection of each establishment where fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce. For the same purposes, the Secretary, at his discretion, may require that adequate inspections be made, by inspectors appointed for that purpose, of vessels processing fish or fishery products for interstate commerce. Any inspector appointed for the purposes of this title shall at any time have access to any establishment or vessel where fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce. Denial of access to such inspector shall be ground for suspension of the certificate of registration. The Secretary, when ever processing operations are being conducted, may, at his discretion, provide for the sampling, detention, and reinspection of fish or fishery products at each such establishment or vessel. Any fish or fishery products found to be adulterated shall be immediately condemned, segregated, and destroyed for food purposes by said establishment or vessel in the presence of an inspector. Failure to comply shall be ground for suspension of said certificate of registration: *Provided*, That any fish or fishery products which may by reprocessing be made not adulterated shall not be so condemned and destroyed if reprocessed under the supervision of an inspector and thereafter found to be not adulterated. The cost of inspection rendered under this section shall be borne by the United States, except that the cost of overtime and holiday pay performed in establishments subject to inspection at such rates as the Secretary may determine shall be borne by such establishments. Sums received by the Secretary in reimbursement for sums paid out by him for such premium pay work shall be available without fiscal year limitation to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) USE OF THE OFFICIAL MARK AND OFFICIAL INSPECTION LEGEND.—When fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce in an establishment holding an unsuspended certificate of registration and are placed or packed in any container or wrapper, the person processing such products shall, at the time they leave the establishment, cause a label to be attached thereon which shall bear or contain the official mark or official inspection legend.

"(f) LABELING AND PACKAGING.—If the Secretary has reason to believe that any labeling or packaging in use or proposed for use with respect to any article subject to this subpart is or would render such article misbranded, he may direct that such use be withheld, and the official mark or the official inspection legend not used, unless the labeling and packaging is modified in such manner as he may prescribe to comply fully with this Act. If the person using or proposing to use such labeling or packaging does not accept the determination of the Secretary, such person may request a hearing, but the use of such labeling or packaging shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by Section 412.

"(g) TRADE NAMES AND ESTABLISHED PACKAGES.—Established trade names or other labeling and packaging which are not false or misleading in any particular and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

"(h) STORAGE OR HANDLING REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may by regulation prescribe conditions under which fish or fishery products capable of use as human food shall be stored or otherwise handled by any person engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, or transporting, in or for interstate commerce, or importing, such articles, whenever the Secretary deems such action necessary to assure that such articles will not be adulterated, misbranded, or otherwise in violation of this Act when delivered to the consumer. Violation of any such regulation is prohibited, and fish and fishery products stored or handled in violation of such regulation shall be deemed adulterated under Section 402(f) of the Act. Such regulations shall not apply to the storage or handling of such articles at any retail store or other establishment in any State that would be subject to this section only because of purchases in interstate commerce, if the storage and handling of such articles at such establishment is regulated, under the laws of the State in which such establishment is located, in a manner which the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee provided for in Section 421(a) of this Act, determines is adequate to effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"(1) Importation of Fish and Fishery Products.—After the effective date of regulations issued under this subpart—

"(1) no fish or fishery products shall be imported into the United States if such articles are adulterated or misbranded or otherwise fail to comply with all the inspection, good manufacturing practice, and other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder applicable to such articles in commerce within the United States; *Provided*, That whenever it shall be determined by the Secretary, in the case of any foreign country, that the system of plant and vessel inspection of fish and fishery products is at least equal to all the inspection, good manufacturing practice, and other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder, and that reliance can be placed on certificates required by regulation of the Secretary as to compliance with the country's inspection, good manufacturing practice and other requirements, the Secretary may accept such certificates as compliance with the comparable requirements of this subpart; *Provided further*, That any fish or fishery products covered by such certificates shall be marked and labeled as required by regulations for such imported articles: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section shall apply to a person who purchases fish outside the United States for his own consumption except that the total amount of such fish shall not exceed fifty pounds.

"(2) The Secretary may prescribe, under section 801 of this Act, the terms and conditions of the destruction of all such articles which are imported contrary to this section, unless (1) they are exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor by the Secretary, or (2) in the case of articles which are not in compliance with this Act solely because of misbranding, such articles are brought into compliance with the Act under supervision of authorized representatives of the Secretary.

"(3) For the purpose of facilitating enforcement of this section and reducing the costs thereof, the importation of fish or fishery products into any port in the United States, except such as may be designated by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury as ports of entry for vessels or aircraft, is prohibited.

"*Administrative and auxiliary provisions*

"Sec. 411. (a) Withholding, Withdrawing and Reinstating Certificates.—The Secretary (for such period, or indefinitely, as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act) may withdraw a certificate of registration under section 410 or may suspend or withdraw such a certificate issued under that section, with respect to any establishment if he determines that the applicant or holder of such certificate is unfit to engage in any business requiring a certificate under that section because such person, or anyone responsibly connected with him, has been convicted, in any Federal or State court, within the previous ten years of (1) any felony, or more than one misdemeanor, based upon the acquiring, handling, or distributing of adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged food or fraud in connection with transactions in food; or (2) any felony involving fraud, bribery, extortion or any other act or circumstance indicating a lack of the integrity needed for the conduct of operations affecting the public health. This section shall not affect in any way other provisions of this Act for suspension of a certificate under section 410. For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be responsibly connected with the business if he was a partner, officer, director, holder or owner of 10 per centum or more of its voting stock, or employee in a managerial or executive capacity. Withholding, withdrawal, and refusal to reinstate a certificate under this section shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by section 412.

"(b) Maintenance and Retention of Records.—For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act, persons engaged in the business of processing fish or fishery products for human consumption in interstate commerce or holding such products after transportation in interstate commerce shall maintain accurate records showing to the extent that they are concerned therewith, the receipt, delivery, sale, movement, or disposition of fish or fishery products and shall, upon the request of the Secretary, permit him at reasonable times to have access to and to copy all such records. Any record required to be maintained by this section shall be maintained for two years after the transaction which is the subject of such record has taken place.

"(c) Administrative Detention of Fish or Fishery Products.—Whenever any fish or fishery product is found by any authorized representative of the Secretary upon any premises where it is held for purposes of, or during or after distribution in, interstate commerce or otherwise subject to this Act, and there is reason to believe that any such article is adulterated, or misbranded or otherwise in violation of the provisions of this Act or of any other Federal law, or that such article has been or is intended to be distributed in violation of any such provisions, such fish or fishery products, if not otherwise subject to condemnation under Section 410(d), may be detained by such representative for a period not to exceed 20 days pending action under Section 304 of this title or notification of any Federal, State, or other governmental authorities having jurisdiction over such article, and shall not be moved by any person from the place at which it is located when so detained until released by such representative. Such fish or fishery product shall be detained in a suitable manner to prevent decomposition and the costs thereof shall be borne by the owner thereof. All official marks may be required by such representative to be removed from such article before it is released unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the article is eligible to retain such marks.

"(e) Inspection Exemptions.—(1) The provisions of this subpart shall not apply to the processing by any person of fish of his own raising or harvesting, and the preparation by him and transportation in commerce of the fish or fishery products exclusively for use by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees, if such person does not engage in the business of buying or selling any fish or fishery products capable of use as human food.

"(2) The Secretary may, by regulation and under such conditions as to sanitary standards, practices, and procedures as he may prescribe, exempt from specific provisions of this subpart retail dealers with respect to fishery products sold directly to consumers in individual retail stores, if the only processing operations performed by such retail dealers are conducted on the premises where such sales to consumers are made. The Secretary may suspend or terminate any such exemption at any time with respect to any person, upon a finding that the conditions of exemption, prescribed by regulations, are not being met.

"(f) Processors of Industrial Fishery Products and Related Industries.—Inspection shall not be provided under this subpart of any establishment or vessel processing fish and fishery products which are not intended for use as human food, but such articles shall, prior to their offer for sale or transportation in interstate commerce, unless naturally inedible by humans, be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to deter their use for human food. No person shall buy, sell, transport, or offer for sale or transportation or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any fish or fishery products which are not intended for use as human food unless they are denatured or otherwise identified as required by the regulations of the Secretary or are naturally inedible by humans.

"*Opportunity for hearing and judicial review of denial, withholding, suspension or, withdrawal of certificates and withholding of approval of labeling or packaging*

"Sec. 412. (a) Opportunity for Hearing.—(1) Any person denied a certificate under section 410(b) or 411(a), or whose certificate has been suspended or who has been denied reinstatement under section 410(c), or who has been refused the official mark for proposed labeling or packaging under section 410(f), or from whom it is proposed to withdraw a certificate under section 411(a), may file objections thereto with the Secretary, specifying with particularity reasonable grounds for his objection, and request a hearing upon such objection. The Secretary shall afford an opportunity for a hearing on such objections, and shall expedite such hearing upon request. As soon as possible after the hearing, the Secretary shall act upon the objections.

"(2) Such order shall be based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at such hearing, and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions on which the Secretary's action was based.

"(3) The Secretary shall grant such interim relief from any order suspending or withdrawing a certificate as he finds justified upon considering the interests of the person holding the certificate and the necessity for protection of the public health and the interest of consumers.

"(b) Judicial Review.—(1) Any person adversely affected by the Secretary's action on his objections may obtain judicial review by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the Circuit in which he resides or has his principal place of business, within 60 days after the entry of the Secretary's order, a petition for judicial review.

"(2) A copy of the petition shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the Court to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall file in the Court the record of the proceeding. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record.

"(3) The judgment of the Court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order under this section shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code.

"SUBPART 2—FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION

"Sec. 421. (a) It is policy of the Congress to protect the consuming public from fish and fishery products that are adulterated, misbranded or otherwise in violation of this Act, and to assist in efforts by State and other Government agencies to accomplish this objective. In furtherance of this policy:

"(1) The Secretary is authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in developing and administering a State fish and fishery products inspection program in any State which has enacted a State fish and fishery products inspection law that imposes mandatory inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under subpart 1 of this part, and provisions of this Act related to such subpart, with respect to all or certain classes of persons engaged in the State in processing fish and fishery products for use as human food solely for distribution within such State.

"(2) Cooperation with State agencies under this section may include furnishing to the appropriate State agency (A) advisory assistance in planning and otherwise developing an adequate State program under the

State law, and (B) technical and laboratory assistance and training, including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment, and financial and other aid for administration of such program. Grants to any State under this section from Federal funds for any fiscal year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program in such State. Such cooperation and payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the State program in a manner which the Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate advisory committee appointed under paragraph (3), deems adequate to effectuate the purpose of this section.

"(3) The Secretary may appoint advisory committees consisting of such representatives of appropriate State agencies and representatives of consumers and industry as the Secretary and the State agencies may designate to consult with him concerning the State and Federal programs with respect to fish inspection and other matters within the scope of this part, including evaluating State programs for purposes of this part, and obtaining better coordination and more uniformity among the State programs and between the Federal and State programs and adequate protection of consumers.

"(b) The appropriate State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate under this subpart shall be a single agency in the State which is primarily responsible for the coordination of the State programs having objectives similar to those under this Act. When the State program includes performance of certain functions by a municipality or other subordinate governmental unit, such unit shall be deemed to be a part of the State agency for purposes of this section.

"Sec. 422. (a)(1) If the Secretary believes, by 30 days prior to the expiration of two years after the effective date of regulations promulgated under this Act, that a State has failed to develop or is not enforcing, with respect to all establishments within its jurisdiction at which fish or fishery products are processed for use as human food for distribution solely within the State, inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements at least equal to those imposed under subpart 1 of this part and other provisions of this Act related to such subpart, he shall promptly notify the Governor of the State of this fact. If the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Governor of the State, or representative selected by him, that such requirements have not been developed and activated, he shall promptly after the expiration of such two-year period designate such State as one in which the provisions of such subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act shall apply to operations and transactions wholly within such State: *Provided*, That if the Secretary determines that there is reason to believe that the State will activate such requirements within one additional year, he may delay such designation for that period, and he shall in that event not designate the State if he further determines at the end of that period that the State then has such requirements in effective operation.

"(2) The Secretary shall publish any such designation in the Federal Register and, upon the expiration of thirty days after such publication, the provisions of subpart 1 and other provisions of this Act related thereto shall apply to operations and transactions and to persons engaged therein in the State to the same extent and in the same manner as if such operations and transactions were conducted in or for interstate commerce.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subpart, if the Secretary determines, at any time prior to designation of a State under this section, that any establishment within a State is producing adulterated fish or fishery products for distribution within such State which would clearly endanger the public health, he shall, with a view to achievement of effective action under State or local law, notify the Governor of the State and the appropriate advisory committee provided under this subpart of such fact. If the State does not take action to prevent such endangering of the public health within a reasonable time after such notice, as determined by the Secretary in the light of the risk to public health, the Secretary may forthwith designate any such establishment as subject to the provisions of subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act, and thereupon the establishment and operator thereof shall be subject to such provisions as though engaged in interstate commerce until such time as the Secretary determines that such State has developed and will enforce requirements at least equal to those imposed under such provisions.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that any State designated under this section has developed and will enforce State fish inspection requirements at least equal to those imposed under subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act with respect to the operations and transactions within such State which are regulated under this subsection, he shall terminate the designation of such State under this section, but this shall not preclude the subsequent redesignation of the State at any time upon thirty days' notice to the Governor and publication of such notice in the Federal Register, and any State may be designated upon such notice and publication at any time after the period specified in this subsection, whether or not the State has theretofore been designated upon the Secretary determining that it is not effectively enforcing requirements at least equal to those imposed under such subpart and related provisions.

"(c) The Secretary shall promptly upon enactment of this subpart 2, and periodically thereafter but at least annually, review the requirements, including the enforcement thereof, of the States not designated under this section, with respect to the processing of fish or fishery production and inspection of such operations.

"State jurisdiction

"Sec. 423. Requirements within the scope of subpart 1 of part B of this chapter with respect to any establishment or vessel at which a certificate of registration is required under subpart 1 of this part, which are in addition to or different from those made under such subpart may not be imposed by any State, except that any such jurisdiction may impose recordkeeping and other requirements with respect to any such establishment. Marking, labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements in addition to, or different from, those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State with respect to articles processed at any establishment or vessel in accordance with the requirements under such subpart, but any State may, consistent with the requirements under this Act, exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Secretary over articles inspected under such subpart, for the purpose of preventing the distribution for human food purposes of any such articles which are adulterated or misbranded and are outside of such an establishment, or, in the case of imported articles which are not at such an establishment, after their entry into the United States. This Act shall not preclude any State from making requirement or taking other action, consistent with such subpart, with respect to any other matters not regulated thereunder.

Interdepartmental cooperation

"Sec. 424. (a) There shall be consultation between the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior prior to the issuance of standards under this Act applicable to fish or fishery products. There shall also be consultation between the Secretary and an appropriate advisory committee provided for in this Act, prior to the issuance of such standards under this Act, to avoid, insofar as feasible, inconsistency between Federal and State standards.

"(b) For the purpose of facilitating enforcement and reducing the costs thereof, the Secretary may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, law enforcement officers or other personnel and facilities of other Federal agencies to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary is also encouraged to enter into agreements or other arrangements, with or without reimbursement, with any State in carrying out the provisions of this Act, including enforcement."

OTHER LAWS

Sec. 105. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the amendments made by this Act shall not derogate from any authority conferred upon any Federal officer, employee, or agency by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to enactment of this Act, by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, by the Public Health Service Act, or by any other Act.

The fact sheet, presented by Mr. Hart, is as follows:

Fact Sheet: Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1968

BACKGROUND

Fish products, rich in protein, are a major source of food in America. Billions of pounds of fish are consumed each year. The Food and Drug Administration estimates that less than 1% of the volume of domestic fish products and less than 5% of the lots of imported fish receive adequate inspection, surveillance and compliance control.

Fish are highly perishable and susceptible to numerous contaminants, natural and toxic. Careless processing, storage, and shipping bring about contamination by Staphylocci, Salmonella, Shigella and other forms of food poisoning. The potential for danger is compounded by the fact that the lapse between the death of a food fish and the time it is processed ranges from 2 to as much as 14 days.

In 1963, inadequate safeguard in processing fish resulted in a major outbreak of botulism; nine persons died. During one weekend in 1966, about 400 cases of Salmonella poisoning were reported; the illness was directly attributable to smoked fish. In 1966, more than 250 cases of food poisoning were reported in Buffalo; imported shrimp was identified as the cause.

Efforts to achieve observance of adequate standards for the sanitary processing and quality control of pure fish are hampered by insufficient laboratory facilities and personnel for inspection and surveillance, and lack of comprehensive regulatory authority.

Almost 50% of the 4000 fishery shore processing establishments are not subject to Federal regulation because of the intrastate nature of their business. Very few of the nearly 80,000 commercial fishing boats are inspected for hygienic conditions of fish handling and storage. The Food and Drug Administration, limited by manpower, budget and inadequate authority, has been able to inspect only about one-third of those shore establishments subject to Federal regulation.

Most State programs are grossly inadequate. State inspections of fishery products are often incidental to inspection of other food products covered by State agencies. In addition, inconsistencies and variations among State programs make enforcement of uniform standards impossible.

Other Federal efforts to protect the consumer from unwholesome fish have proven less than satisfactory. Of the 4000 fishery shore establishments, only 40 participated in the Department of Interior's voluntary continuous inspection service.

Additional Federal standards are needed, both for Federal regulation of fish products in interstate commerce, and for State regulation of intrastate commerce.

PROPOSAL

The bill would impose the same kind of continuous inspection for fish and fishery products as will be applied to meat under the recently enacted Wholesome Meat Act.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would make a survey of fish processing establishments and vessels to accumulate information for the development of adequate standards of good manufacturing practices, including standards of sanitation and quality control. These regulations would be issued within one year after funds are appropriated, and would be made effective not later than one year thereafter, unless additional time is found necessary. After the regulations are issued, all establishments and vessels presenting assurance of compliance would be issued a certificate of registration.

Processing would be subject to continuous inspection, and vessels would be given adequate inspection. An official mark would be used on products subjected to continuous inspection. Any firm found in violation could have its certificate of registration suspended, in some instances summarily and in others after a hearing.

The Secretary is authorized to impose any needed regulation for the storage and handling of fish. Imported fish and fishery products would be subject to the same requirements as domestic product. Firms would be required to maintain records and to make them available for inspection.

Like the Wholesome Meat Act, this bill would encourage the development of an adequate state inspection service in intrastate commerce. Grants-in-aid would be offered to assist States in developing an inspection capability.

If after two years, the Secretary believes that a State has failed to develop, or is not enforcing, an appropriate inspection service at least equal to the Federal inspection service, he may make the Federal act applicable to locally processed products. In cases where local processing would clearly endanger the public health, the Secretary could within the two year period subject the establishment to the Federal requirements. After having imposed the Federal requirement, the responsibility would be returned to the State whence the Secretary finds a readiness to impose equal requirements.

INCREASED INSURANCE OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ACCOUNTS AND BANK DEPOSITS OF PUBLIC UNITS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase insurance of savings and loan accounts and bank deposits of public units. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the past it has been the practice of many public officials to invest substantial amounts of public funds in accounts with savings and loan associations. These accounts in savings and loan associations were opened under the assumption that the present $15,000 account insurance coverage available from the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation applied to each separate purpose fund placed by a single public official in one institution, even though that official placed several separate purpose funds in that same institution. For example, if a county treasurer placed in one insured savings and loan association a $15,000 county highway fund, a $15,000 county school fund, and a $15,000 county welfare fund, all in his official custody, he assumed that the total was insured up to $45,000.

Recently, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board issued new regulations to clarify the insurance coverage of accounts. These regulations were effective September 1, 1967 but coexist with the former insurance regulations until April 15, 1968. The revised regulations provide that money held by law in the custody of a single official of a public body are limited to an aggregate of $15,000 insurance if placed in savings accounts in a single savings and loan association regardless of the purpose for which the moneys are designated. In the example given above, this would mean only $15,000 of the investment by the county treasurer would be insured.

The situation has caused some public officials to take steps toward withdrawing public moneys from some savings and loan associations on or before April 15 in order to bring the amount maintained in savings accounts in a single institution within a level more consonant with the $15,000 maximum insurance coverage. It is quite probable that the result will be a net withdrawal of funds from the savings and loan system. This in turn would cause money for home and apartment construction and ownership transfer to become still tighter at a time when the supply of such money is already tight. The tendency would be to drive to still higher levels mortgage interest rates that are already high.

The Congress along with the administration should insure that no additional source of funds is lost to the savings and loan associations. Public unit funds are an important source of money supply for many of our savings and loan associations and it would appear that the public interest is best served by maintaining the availability of these moneys.

Enactment of the bill I am introducing will make any shifting of funds unnecessary because it will provide insurance coverage for all public unit funds in savings accounts in one savings and loan association, under regulatory power of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to safeguard the financial soundness of any single institution by limiting the total amount of public funds it may hold in savings accounts. The bill would likewise provide the same insurance coverage for public unit funds deposited in a single bank having deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

It should be noted that revised regulations have been issued by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that apply to FDIC-insured public unit deposits in a single bank the same rules as apply to FSLIC-insured public unit savings accounts in a savings and loan association.

The danger of a shifting of such bank deposits may not be as great as the danger of shifting of savings accounts in savings and loan associations, however, because many public unit deposits in banks are secured by collateral pledged by the bank for such deposits, usually for the excess of the deposit over FDIC insurance coverage. Savings and loan associations are not allowed to pledge collateral for public unit savings accounts, because of the theory that all holders of the same class of savings accounts must receive equal treatment and none can be preferred over others.

In the event of failure of a collateralized bank account, the collateral is credited to that account to the extent required to pay it out. This, therefore, decreases by the amount of the collateral so applied the bank assets left to reimburse FDIC for its payout of the proceeds of deposit insurance. But by use of collateral, the public unit deposit is fully safeguarded even though the deposit exceeds the insurance coverage applicable to the deposit.

Therefore, granting full insurance coverage to a collateralized deposit will make the collateral available to reimburse FDIC for insurance proceed payouts along with other assets of the bank. So FDIC's net insurance risk exposure remains substantially unchanged, when payouts are offset by reimbursement from assets.

Enactment of this bill will not result in overloading any demand on insurance reserves in either the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It will bring stability to the holding of public unit funds in both savings and loan associations and banks.

Since April 15 is close at hand, time is of the essence and, therefore, I urge the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to move expeditiously in its consideration of this proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2959) to increase insurance of savings and loan accounts and bank deposits of public units, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2959

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 401(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724(b)), is amended—

(1) by striking out ", for the purpose of determining the amount of the insured account,"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and the dollar limitations imposed by this Act shall not be applicable to any such insured member, but the corporation may by regulation limit the amounts of such funds that may be invested in insured institutions."

(b) The third sentence of section 3(m) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1813(m)), is amended—

(1) by striking out ", for the purpose of determining the amount of the insured deposits,"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and the dollar limitations imposed by this Act shall not be applicable to any such insured depositor."

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, a bill to provide for the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, together with a statement of purpose and need and a section-by-section analysis prepared by him, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2960) to provide for the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, statement, and section-by-section analysis, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1968.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To provide for the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of Commissioned Officers of the Environmental Science Services Administration, and for other purposes," and four copies of a statement of purpose and need and a section by section analysis.

This proposal is part of the Department of Commerce Legislative Program for the 90th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Simply stated, this proposal provides a basic charter for the establishment and operation of the Commissioned Officer Corps of the Environmental Science Services Administration.

The proposed legislation is based substantially on the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948, as amended, the basic charter of the Commissioned Officer Corps which, by virtue of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965, became the Commissioned Officer Corps of the Environmental Science Services Administration.

The Department of Commerce believes that this proposal will provide a significant increase in the effective utilization of the officer corps while at the same time enhancing the attractiveness of the corps as a career for professionally qualified officers.

Enactment of this proposal would cause little or no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,
Howard J. Samuels,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Enclosures.

Statement of Purpose and Need

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965 consolidated the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau to form the Environmental Science Services Administration. Subsequent action by the Secretary of Commerce added the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards to the new Administration.

In this message transmitting the Reorganization Plan to Congress, the President stated "Commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey will become commissioned officers of the Administration and may serve at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce throughout the Administration".

Pursuant to the new and expanded role of the commissioned officers in the Administration the Secretary of Commerce appointed an Advisory Committee of distinguished and knowledgeable citizens outside the Department of Commerce to review the function of the Commissioned Officer Corps within the Administration; the training and educational needs of the Corps; career planning for the Corps; and the relationship between civilian and commissioned personnel of the Administration.

After detailed study and lengthy discussion the Committee concluded that "a commissioned officer corps offers the best mechanism for increasing the effectiveness of (the Administration) in meeting certain of its worldwide responsiblities in the environmental sciences."

The Advisory Committee also concluded that existing legislation does not clearly define the establishment, responsibilities, duties, procedures, and benefits of the Commissioned Officer Corps, and it made specific recommendations for legislation therefor.

The Committee recommended that legislation be enacted which would be explicit with respect to authority for the operation of the Corps and yet broadly written to allow for administrative operating procedures to be established by the Secretary of Commerce.

The purpose of this Bill is to implement the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and to gather into one comprehensive Act all basic provisions of law that relate to the Commissioned Officer Corps of the Environmental Science Services Administration.

Recognizing the need to ensure orderly growth of the Corps while at the same time maintaining a desirable distribution of rank and experience, the Committee recommended, and this Bill implements such recommendation, that the existing limitation allowing original appointment of officers only up through the grade of lieutenant be revised to permit initial appointment in all grades through captain.

Taking into account the enlarged responsibilities, the projected high percentage of advanced degree holders, the overall professional competence of the Corps, and the need to provide a more attractive career development program in order to retain competent officers, the Committee recommended the existing restriction on the number of temporary promotions be removed. This recommendation has been implemented in this Bill by providing that officers serving in any permanent grade may be temporarily promoted one grade when such promotion is deemed necessary or desirable and in the best interest of the Administration.

The Committee recommended that a clearly defined procedure be established for the promotion, selection-out, and separation of officers, based on qualifications and merit. The recommendation has been incorporated in this Bill through the provision of specific sections covering promotions, separations, and retirements.

The Committee also recommended, and this Bill provides, a provision for transfer of officers between the Administration and the armed forces. In view of the worldwide responsibilities of the Administration, this Bill also authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to detail officers to foreign governments and international organizations when such detail is in the interest of the United States.

In consideration of the increased mission, responsibilities and educational requirements imposed on the Corps, and the need to provide a more attractive career development program in order to recruit and retain qualified officers, it was considered necessary by the Committee that a more adequate education and training program be established. This Bill contains provisions for such a program.

This Bill also includes provisions which would put officers of the Corps more nearly on a parity with officers of the armed forces with respect to certain rights and benefits, thereby implementing another recommendation of the Committee.

The Committee recommended that the wartime status of the Corps be clarified. This Bill established mechanisms whereby officers of the Corps can be effectively utilized in peacetime and wartime in behalf of the national defense.

The remaining provisions of this Bill are intended to implement the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and to provide general authority relating to the management and operation of the Corps.

Environmental Science Services Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 1968: Section-by-Section Analysis of the Bill

The list of Definitions as used in section 2 of the Bill shall apply throughout the sectional analysis. Where pertinent, parenthetical expressions, (new), (old), and (modified), are used to denote, respectively, whether sections of the bill are new authority, essentially unchanged old authority, or old authority that is changed a significant amount. The bill is based primarily on the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948, as amended.

Section 1: This section states the name of the Act. It corresponds to section 1 of the Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 297), as amended, which was cited as the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948. In the title of the present Act, "Commissioned Officer Corps" is used in place of "Commissioned Officers" in view of the many provisions within the Act that relate to the Corps as an entity.

Definitions

Section 2: This section (new) assimilates definitions of title 10, United States Code, ("Armed Forces") to this Act. Definitions listed in the section are intended to supplement or be substituted for the definitions in title 10.

Authorization for Corps

Section 3(a): This subsection (modified) establishes the Commissioned Officer Corps of ESSA and specifies that grades of officers within the Corps shall correspond to grades authorized commissioned officers of the Navy. Although the Commissioned Officers Corps dates back to the Act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87) specific authority for the Corps has been found only in annual appropriation acts.

(b) This subsection (new) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to establish the "authorized number" of commissioned officers on the active list in ESSA, thus permitting timely changing of the size of the Corps, within budgetary and fiscal limitations, to meet the varying requirements imposed by such changeable factors as completion of new ship construction, the resignation or retirement of officers, and the seasonal availability of officer candidates. Secretarial authority to establish the size of the Corps would provide optimum utilization of the Administration's manpower in the execution of its programs.

(c) This subsection (modified) establishes the distribution in permanent grades of officers on the active list, excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade, by authorizing the maximum number of officers, by percentage, holding each grade on a permanent basis from ensign through rear admiral. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853a(a).

For purposes of clarity only, percentages have been substituted for the ratios used in the past. An authorized percentage of rear admirals is established for the first time in this Act to provide an appropriate grade and compensation for positions of extraordinary responsibilities. In the past, statutory authority provided the officer corps two rear admiral positions in the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Those offices, abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965 which established ESSA, were equivalent to about one percent of the Corps strength; the new value of 0.25 percent of the Corps for rear admiral (upper half) and 0.50 percent for rear admiral (lower half) add up to 0.75 percent used by the armed forces. The percentage allotted rear admirals is compensated for by using "the remaining percent" in the grade of ensign.

(d) This subsection (old) prescribes the method of handling fractions when computing the number of officers authorized in each grade as prescribed in subsection 3(c). It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 853a(b).

(e) This subsection (old) provides that an officer shall not be reduced in grade or pay or separated due to computations prescribed in subsection 3(c). It is derived from and identical to authority contained in 33 USC 853a(c).

(f) This subsection (old) specifies that vacancies need not be filled and that vacancies may be considered to exist at lower grades in lieu of those authorized in subsection 3(c). It is derived from and identical to authority contained in 33 USC 853a(d).

(g) This subsection (old) authorizes the number of officers on active duty to be temporarily exceeded providing the average number on duty during the fiscal year shall not exceed the number prescribed by the Secretary. It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 853a(e).

Officer Personnel Board

Section 4: This section (modified) establishes an Officer Personnel Board to provide recommendations to the Secretary concerning promotions and other personnel actions relating to the Commissioned Officer Corps. It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 853r. Changes include the designation of the Board as "Officer Personnel Board" to distinguish it from other personnel boards which may be set up within the Administration; the requirement that Board members be in the "permanent grade of captain" on the active list; and the addition to the Board membership of "such other Administration officials as he deems desirable." The word "grade" is used instead of "rank" to be consistent with similar usage in title 10 and title 37, United States Code. "Commander" was changed to "captain" because it is not deemed appropriate for officers of the lower grade to be on a board which will make recommendations concerning officers senior to themselves.

In the past when the Corps was small and the number of officers in the headquarters area was limited, it was felt necessary to include commanders as a source of members of the Board. Henceforth, the size of the Corps will provide a sufficient number of experienced captains for the Board. In view of the expanded role of ESSA pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965, the phrase, "and such other Administration officials as he deems desirable," was added to provide the Secretary authority to appoint to the Board civilian members of the Administration whose administrative and professional backgrounds can effectively supplement the backgrounds of officer members.

APPOINTMENTS

Qualifications

Section 5: This section (modified) sets out the qualifications required for appointment to any grade. It adds a requirement concerning citizenship which was not included in the authority contained in 33 USC 854 from which this derives. It is similar to the qualifications required by the armed forces, and the language is deemed appropriate for any and all appointments, permanent or temporary, original or for promotion purposes.

Permanent appointment

Section 6: This section (old) establishes the procedure for making permanent appointments of officers. It covers permanent original appointments and permanent appointments for promotion. Permanent appointments are presently made in accordance with authority contained in 33 USC 853i(a), from which this derives.

Temporary appointments

Section 7(a): This subsection (old) establishes the procedure for making temporary appointments of officers. It covers temporary original appointments and temporary appointments in connection with temporary promotions. The expression "the President alone" has been changed to "the President" to eliminate the possible interpretation that he cannot delegate such authority to the Secretary. Temporary appointments are presently made in accordance with authority contained in 33 USC 853j–1, from which this derives.

(b) This subsection (new) is intended to positively assert the otherwise implied authority that an appointing officer can vacate any appointment that he is lawfully entitled to make. It is similar to statutory provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 14 USC 214(e); 10 USC 3447(c)).

(c) This subsection (new) is a savings clause intended to prevent injury to officers serving under temporary appointments. It is similar to statutory provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 14 USC 214(d); 10 USC 5596(f)).

Original appointment

Section 8(a): This subsection (modified) authorizes original appointments, whether permanent or temporary, to be made in all grades up to and including captain. It is an expansion of the authority contained in 33 USC 853t(a), which authorizes "original appointments" in the lowest three grades (not specified to be restricted to permanent appointments) and in 33 USC 853j–1(a) which authorizes "temporary appointment" in the grade of ensign. It is intended to encourage qualified, experienced personnel to join the Commissioned Officer Corps by insuring adequate status (higher grades) and starting pay.

(b) This subsection (modified) specifies that each newly appointed officer shall, on the basis of an evaluation of his qualifications, be placed on the lineal list in an appropriate position and credited with an appropriate number of years of service for the purpose of basic pay. The subsection derives from and is an expansion of authority contained in 33 USC 853t(b) and (c).

Although present authority specifies that placement on the lineal list shall be on the basis of qualifications, such placement is limited to the lowest three grades and basic pay is statutorily (33 USC 853t(c)) limited without due consideration of the qualifications of individual appointees. Thus, regardless of an individual's merit, he is limited to one and one-half year's credit for pay if he falls anywhere on the lineal list within the lieutenant (junior grade) zone and, similiarly, to three years' credit anywhere within the lieutenant zone.

To attract qualified, experienced officer candidates from scientific and engineering fields related to the functions of this Administration, it is desirable to have the statutory flexibility provided by this section. With such flexibility it will be possible to appoint each new officer to a position commensurate with his educational and professional background.

Date of appointment; oath of office

Section 9(a): This subsection (new) prescribes the effective date of original appointments of officers. The determination of such date is not now specifically covered by statute.

(b) This subsection (modified) prescribes the effective date of promotions. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 854a–2. The reference to pay and allowances contained therein is now considered unnecessary because such pay is covered in title 37, United States Code.

(c) This subsection (modified) provides that an officer who has served continuously in ESSA need not resubscribe to the oath unless the Secretary determines that a new oath is required in the public interest. The elimination of the requirement for a new oath each time an officer is promoted would, in fact, lessen administrative complexity and obviate any possibility of an officer not being eligible for pay and allowances for a particular grade because of some technical oversight in executing or failing to execute an administrative document. It is similar to 5 USC 2905 (a) and (b).

PROMOTION

Permanent promotion

Section 10: This section (modified) prescribes the manner in which permanent promotions shall be made. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853b. Changes have been made in wording to include promotion to all grades above ensign instead of above lieutenant (junior grade) so as not to impair or diminish the authority of the Officer Personnel Board, the Administration, the Secretary, or the President in regard to promotion from ensign to lieutenant (junior grade). The reference to "permanent grade" has been eliminated and the words "permanent appointment" have been used to conform with phraseology preferred by the Navy, (e.g., 10 USC 5780). Permanent promotions to the grade of rear admiral will be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 11(a): This subsection (modified) states that vacancies may be filled by permanent appointments, and that a vacancy existing at a higher grade may be filled by a permanent appointment at that grade or any lower grade. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853a(d) and it supplements section 3(f) of this Act. The words "may be filled" determine that it is not necessary to fill such vacancy.

(b) This subsection (old) authorizes the promotion of officers who have completed long terms of service and who are fully qualified for promotion except that vacancies are not available. It is derived from and identical in purpose to authority contained in 33 USC 853c, d and e(a). The subsection is similar in purpose to authority vested in the armed forces (e.g., 10 USC 3299(b)).

The language has been changed for the purpose of clarification and consistency. Promotion to captain is authorized at 28 years instead of 30 years, to be consistent with the seven-year intervals required for promotion to lower grades; and the promotion of ensigns has been changed from mandatory to permissive, subject to meeting qualification requirements for the next higher grade in the same fashion required for all promotions. Promotions under this subsection are discretionary.

This subsection provides an opportunity to promote fully qualified officers at certain fixed anniversary dates, dates which represent length of service greatly exceeding that at which officers would normally be promoted. Less than fully qualified officers would, under normal circumstances, be eliminated through selection-out procedures prior to these year points for having failed to be promoted after having been considered a number of times. This subsection confers no right to promotion, merely the opportunity when, because of economic or other circumstances the Corps is at full strength and no vacancies occur over extremely long periods.

This provision has little relevance at the present time because of career advancement and the shortage in the number of available officers. However, in other times in order to keep the proper balance in the various ranks or grades, it is appropriate to provide for an orderly career progression.

The subsection further states that such promotions shall fill vacancies if vacancies exist and that extra numbers in grade shall be created if vacancies do not exist, thus stating explicitly conditions that have been implied in the past.

Temporary promotions

Section 12(a): This subsection (new) prescribes that temporary promotions shall be made only by selection from officers holding permanent appointments in the next lower grade. By authorizing only a one-grade promotion, it prohibits indiscriminate, successive temporary promotions of an individual officer, and provides a more stable structure for the Corps. As in the case of permanent promotions (see section 10), promotions of officers up to and including captain shall be upon recommendation of the Officer Personnel Board, and promotion to flag rank shall be in accordance with recommendations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) This subsection (old) provides that a qualified ensign may be given a temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) whenever a vacancy exists in that or a higher grade. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853j–1(b).

(c) This subsection (modified) provides for the temporary promotion of any officer who is assigned duties of greater responsibility than would normally be expected of him at his permanent grade. The subsection is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853j–1(c). Wording changes have been made to let this subsection conform grammatically with the preceding subsection and to clarify the purpose and duration of such promotions.

The present statutory limitation (33 USC 853j–1(c)) of such temporary appointments to 1½ percent of the total Corps has been deleted as unnecessarily restrictive. At times it is necessary and advantageous to the Administration to assign officers with special capabilities to positions of unusual responsibility. This may be due to a peculiar match of officer and job, or it may be due to an insufficient number of officers in a grade to fill all the assignments necessary. In both cases, the officer is asked to perform at a level of responsibility that is higher and more demanding than is normally asked of officers of his permanent grade. In fairness to such officers and to the Administration as a whole, such assignment of officers should be compensated by temporary increases in grade. The number of such temporary appointments is not a function of the Corps' size; it is rather a function of Administration needs and, as such, should be controlled by management considerations that take into account the overall needs of the Administration's programs. (It is noted that in the Senate Hearings on P.L. 87–233 a Member of Congress suggested the 1½ percent limitation represented an unwarranted restriction.)

This subsection also provides for the temporary promotion of officers to the grade of rear admiral (lower half). It specifies that the number of temporary promotions to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) shall be limited to 0.25 percent of the authorized number of officers in the Corps, except that, in the Secretary's discretion, the number of temporary promotions to rear admiral may be augmented by substituting temporary promotions for the permanent promotions to rear admiral authorized under section 3(c) of this Act.

Temporary promotion to flag or general ranks is authorized in the armed forces: In the Navy temporary promotion to rear admiral is authorized for officers serving as Bureau Chiefs (10 USC 5133) and for certain other positions of responsibility (10 USC 5981). In the Air Force temporary promotion to general rank may be used to fill vancancies (10 USC 8442).

Length of service for promotion and precedence

Section 13: This section prescribes the manner in which length of service shall be determined for promotion and precedence.

(a) This subsection (modified) is identical to authority contained in 33 USC 853f with the exception that "whose position on the lineal list has been lowered by administrative action" has been substituted for "who has lost numbers," as more meaningful; the word "precedence" has been added to provide a statutory basis for determining the ranking of officers; and the phrasing of the subsection has been changed to emphasize its contents.

(b) This subsection (modified) is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 854a. The words "for officers appointed after June 30, 1922," are deleted as no longer necessary; the word "precedence" has been added for the purpose stated above in section (a); and provision has been made to count service credited under section 8(b).

Section 14(a): This subsection (new) prescribes the manner in which an officer's date of rank shall be determined.

(b) This subsection (modified) prescribes that precedence shall be in accordance with dates of rank. The ranking of ESSA officers among themselves has not been explicitly tied to their dates of rank in the past. The ranking of ESSA officers among military officers is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 856.

REVOCATION, SEPARATION, RETIREMENT

Revocation

Section 15: This section (modified) authorizes the revocation of an officer's commission during his first three years. It is comparable to authority contained in 33 USC 853e(b) and 853t(a). The revocation of a commission has been limited to the grades of ensign, lieutenant (junior grade), and lieutenant as these have been the only grades in which original appointments have been authorized. In this new Act original appointment is authorized in all grades, and, to be consistent the revocation authority must be extended to all grades. The section is similar to provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 3814).

Separation for failure of promotion

Section 16(a): This subsection provides for the removal from active duty, by discharge or retirement, of officers who have failed twice to be selected for promotion. It is patterned on 14 USC 282, 283(a), and 285 (Coast Guard). Existing law (33 USC 853g) provides for the selection out of undesirable officers, but it makes no attempt to distinguish between those merely unqualified to be promoted to more responsibility and those who, for dereliction of duty, immorality, security violations, or other reasons, should be removed from office for "cause." This section, which treats of the former, and section 17, which treats of the latter, are compatible with statutes pertaining to the armed forces.

(b) This subsection describes how discharge under subsection (a) is effected and how severance pay is computed. It is patterned on 14 USC 282(2), 283(a)(2), 286, and 287 (Coast Guard). See section 30(c) for creditable service.

(c) This subsection describes how retirement under subsection (a) if effected, and it provides for discharge with severance pay in lieu of retirement in the event the officer is not already eligible for retirement. It is patterned on 14 USC 286 and 287 (Coast Guard).

Separation for cause

Section 17 (a), (b), and (c): This section (new) is designed to permit separation of an officer from active duty for reasons other than failure to be promoted (sec. 16). This section is needed because the ESSA Commissioned Officer Corps is not subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, unless declared to be an armed force under sec. 34(b), and thus, the Secretary would not normally be authorized to exercise court-martial authority. This section would give the Secretary authority to remove an officer from active duty for cause. In the case of an officer so removed, the Secretary would be required either (a) to separate him from the service (whether or not eligible for retirement), or (b) if eligible for retirement, to authorize such retirement. In the case of officers whco are separated from the service, as distinguished from those who are retired, it would be within the discretion of the Secretary to authorize a lump sum severance payment equal to one-half the amount of that specified in sec. 16(b) but not to exceed one year's basic pay.

Subsection (c) of this section requires that this section shall be implemented only after fair and impartial hearing held in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may provide.

Retirement at own request

Section 18: This section (old) provides for voluntary retirement after 20 years of active service. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 853l and from authority applicable to the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 6323(a); 14 USC 291).

Retirement for age

Section 19: This section (modified) specifies the age at which officers shall be mandatorily retired. It differs from existing authority in that it specifies that the determination shall be in regard to each officer's permanent appointment grade.

(a) This subsection is derived from the authority contained in 33 USC 853 k(a), except that the proviso has been deleted as no longer necessary.

(b) This subsection is derived from the authority contained in 33 USC 853k(b).

Retirement in highest grade

Section 20: This section (modified) specifies that each officer shall be retired in the highest grade held by him while on active duty. It is similar to and is derived from the authority contained in 33 USC 853p. Modification includes the elimination of "heretofore or hereafter" and the original proviso as superfluous, and the changing of "rank" to "grade" to agree with nomenclature throughout this Act. "Uniformed services" was added to insure that service in any of the uniformed services would be properly credited. Wording was also changed for grammatical purposes, and a new proviso was added to place the same administrative restrictions on retiring from temporary appointments that apply to retiring from permanent appointments. (Administrative restrictions imposed by the Secretary include, for example, a requirement that voluntary retirement will not be authorized after permanent promotion to the grade of captain, except in hardship cases, for at least two years. Such restrictions are patterned after similar restrictions of the armed forces.) The section also covers promotions that occur under the recall authorized in section 21 of this Act (33 USC 853p(b)).

Recall to active duty

Section 21(a): This subsection (new) authorizes voluntary peacetime recall to active duty of officers who have retired. At the present time recall of ESSA officers is accomplished by virtue of the authority contained in 33 USC 864, which assimilates retirement of ESSA officers to laws pertaining to the retirement of Navy officers (unless otherwise provided for by statute). It is considered desirable to have explicit authority for recall. This subsection is similar to provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 6381; 14 USC 332).

(b) This subsection (new) authorizes involuntary recall of retired officers during periods of national emergency. It is similar to provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 6481; 14 USC 331).

(c) This subsection (new) is intended to make the recalling of officers possible without any detrimental effect on the stability of the Corps' size and composition.

Detail of officers

Section 22: This section (new) would permit the detailing of ESSA officers to foreign governments and international organizations. The activities of the Administration are worldwide in nature and international in scope. It would be a distinct advantage to the United States for officers to be authorized to cooperate with such governments and organizations whenever the interests of the United States are involved and the special capabilities of officers can be effectively utilized. The World Meteorological Organization; the nations of the Pacific Basin involved in the common problems of tsunami detection; the Inter-American Geodetic Survey; and the International Hydrographic Bureau represent some of the many billets where Administration officers could make valuable contributions.

Section 23: This section (new) permits the assignment of officers to public and private agencies of the United States. It is derived in part from the authority contained in 33 USC 883e. Administration officers represent a valuable Federal resource which should be shared with other organizations when it is in the national interest. The functions of the Administration include many disciplines in which state and local government and private organizations cannot hope to become competent because of the shortage of qualified persons or because of a lack of profit or other inducement. Operations such as nautical charting, seismic investigations, geodetic surveying, and natural hazard warnings represent some of the many areas of competence where detailing of officers could be mutually advantageous to the requesting agency and the Administration.

Section 24: This section (new) is intended to (1) protect the rights of officers while detailed and (2) to keep the Corps at its full strength while officers are on detail for extended periods. It also provides that upon the return of detailed officers to ESSA, at the discretion of the Secretary, the total number of officers on active duty may exceed the authorized number established by the Secretary in section 3(b). The excess would not be permanent; it would be reduced by normal attrition.

Transfer of officers

Sections 25, 26, and 27: These sections permit the voluntary permanent transfer of commissioned officers between the military departments and ESSA when it is advantageous to the Government.

The varying requirements of the military departments and the Administration with regard to officer qualifications and organization strength result in excesses and shortages of officers in various grades and various skills. It is a distinct advantage to the Government to be able to transfer officers between services to best utilize the total resource.

Transfer of officers between military departments is already authorized under 10 USC 716. This present legislation would increase the benefits to the Government by extending the total authority.

For the Administration "authorized strengths" means the authorized number of officers established by the Secretary under section 3(b).

Special instruction and training

Section 28: This section (new) is intended to provide the maximum benefit to the Administration through an education and training system authorizing attendance of officers at whatever school, institution, or facility is deemed best suited to provide the proper instruction.

Officers presently attend educational facilities under authority of 5 USC 4101, et seq., and the Administration is limited both as to the number of "employees" authorized to be in educational programs and the amount of training authorized for each "employee." (5 USC 4106, 4107)

The encouragement to outstanding officers that is inherent in a broader authority for training, especially advanced education, is recognized. The need of the Administration for a significant increase in the number of officers with advanced degrees in the environmental sciences is directly related to the increased scope of its missions and the effectiveness of its operations.

The uniformed services, except for this Administration, are specifically excluded from coverage under chapter 41, Training of title 5 of the United States Code. Section 47 of this Act complements this section by amending title 5 so that officers of this Administration will be treated like other members of the uniformed services for purposes of training.

Subsections (b) and (c) would provide instruction such as that offered by the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (10 USC 7045) not presently authorized by statute.

Active duty: Pay and active service credit

Section 29(a): This subsection (new) is intended to assimilate pay and allowances for officers of the Administration to pay and allowances of officers of the Navy in order to insure proper pay coverage at all times. The intent of title 37 is to insure equity and comparability in pay of all the uniformed services, as indicated in 37 USC 1001, and this section will safeguard ESSA officers in this respect.

(b) This subsection (modified) reiterates the crediting for basic pay purposes of all service as a deck officer and junior engineer and other service credited to the uniformed services under title 37 (37 USC 205), and adds to such credit all the credit for pay purposes awarded an officer on the basis of his personal qualifications at the time of his original appointment under section 8 of this Act.

Retirement: Pay and active service credit

Section 30(a): This subsection (old) is intended to assimilate retirement pay and benefits of officers of the Administration to retirement pay and benefits of officers of the Navy. It is derived from the authority contained in 33 USC 864.

(b) This subsection (old) specifies the method of computing retirement pay. It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 8530(a). Changes in wording include the deletion of the reference to subsection (b) of the original statute which was repealed previously. The method of computation is standard for the uniformed services.

(c) This subsection (modified) defines active service that is applicable to retirement, retirement pay, and severance pay. It is derived from authority contained in 33 USC 8530–1. Specific reference is made to severance pay in this paragraph; it was not covered under prior statute.

Uniform

Section 31(a): This subsection (new) authorizes the President to prescribe the uniform of the Administration. Officers presently wear the uniform formerly worn by officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(b), (c), and (d) These subsections provide for the proper protection of the uniform and authorize its wear under circumstances other than active duty. They are similar to provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 771, 772).

Awards and decorations

Section 32: This section (new) would authorize the President to prescribe the conditions under which ESSA officers could be given awards and decorations of the armed forces. Officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey had no statutory authority to wear campaign ribbons, decorations, and medals. In the past, officers transferred to military departments under the authority of 33 USC 855 generally wore awards that were authorized the unit to which transferred; officers otherwise assigned to and serving with military departments lacked authority to wear such awards. This section would provide a consistency in the wearing of ribbons, decorations, and medals which does not now exist.

Historically, awards of the various military services have differed to some extent, but the trend has been toward standardized awards for campaign ribbons and such other awards as are common to all services. It is deemed appropriate that ESSA officers serving under the same conditions and in the same areas should be entitled to wear the same decorations as the armed forces.

Rights and benefits

Section 33: This section is intended to place officers of this Administration on a parity with officers of the armed forces in regard to certain specific laws and regulations.

Over the years special rights and benefits have been awarded by statute to members of the armed forces to compensate them for specific losses or deprivations that result from their service. Such benefits are provided to solve specific problems that arise due to being in and conforming to the requirements of service. Many of those problems apply equally to officers of ESSA and it is deemed appropriate that relief from such problems also be extended to them.

(1) Laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—The proposed legislation essentially restates existing statute which assimilates Veterans' Administration laws to Coast and Geodetic Survey commissioned officers and extends continued coverage under the same laws to commissioned officers of ESSA.

Existing statute (PL 881—August 1, 1956; 70 Stat. 883; 33 USC 857) states, "Active service of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be deemed to be active military service for the purpose of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (except the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951) . . ."

The Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, excluded in the above statute, has been made obsolete by Servicemen's Group Life Insurance authorized by PL 89–214; 79 Stat. 880, which specifically includes commissioned officers of ESSA.

(2) Laws administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission—Coverage sought (49 USC 22, 317(b), 906(c) and 1005(c)) would authorize common carriers to provide reduced fares to ESSA officers on emergency leave, furlough, etc., as they do now for armed forces personnel. ESSA officers and armed forces officers travel under the same Joint Travel Regulations and accrue leave under 10 USC, chapter 40.

(3) The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended—

Commissioned officers of ESSA are directed by official orders to perform duties that require them to work and live in many different States during their careers. It is not unusual on mobile duty assignments for an officer, and his family, to live and work in several states during the same year. The problems encountered by such officers are identical to the problems encountered by transient armed forces personnel, problems that prompted the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. Examples of problems encountered include:

(A) Multiple liability for personal prop-

erty taxes, State and County income taxes, school taxes, and in some cases tuition charges for elementary and secondary schools.

(B) Invalidation of automobile licenses, housetrailer licenses and driver licenses (still unexpired in the State of issue) because of local residence laws. Sales taxes based on the current value of the vehicle are often paid many times as the vehicle is repeatedly registered in different States.

(C) Loss of individual rights ("second-class citizenship") due to lack of authority to claim a "home State." Individuals lose local and national voting rights, and pay "out-of-State" charges for college tuition for children and for licenses such as those required for hunting and fishing.

Coverage of the commissioned officers of the Administration by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would provide a just solution to such problems.

(D) Laws administered by and regulations of the Civil Service Commission—

Coverage would include 5 USC 2108, 3304, 3326, 3502, 5335, 5344, 5514, 5516, 5517, 5552, 6303, 6304, 8116, 8319, and 8706.

Cooperation with Armed Forces

Section 34: This section is intended to clarify the role of the ESSA Commissioned Officer Corps with respect to the armed forces, both in peacetime and in periods of national emergency. Subsections (a), (b), and (c) specify the manner in which the Corps or its officers may be utilized in direct furtherance of the national defense; subsection (d) specifies the manner in which the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Defense shall determine the actual supporting role of ESSA; subsection (e) specifies the conditions under which ESSA officers shall be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and subsection (f) specifies how appointments, promotions, retirements, and separations of officers shall be administered during periods of national emergency.

(a) This subsection (new) authorizes the Secretary to detail ESSA officers to the armed forces. It would allow ESSA officers in peacetime or wartime to serve with the armed forces as ESSA officers, just as a Navy officer might be assigned to an Army command to provide special assistance. The subsection is derived from 10 USC 719 which authorizes detailing of members of the armed forces to ESSA.

(b) This subsection (new) authorizes the President during national emergencies to make the Commissioned Officer Corps an armed force. The purpose of this subsection is to provide a meaningful and protective status to ESSA officers who are neither detailed nor transferred to the armed forces under subsection (a) or (c).

The designation of the entire Corps as an armed force would provide indisputable authority and protection to ESSA officers to serve where needed and to command and sail on ESSA's own ships (which are armed during wartime) while engaging in essential hydrographic and geodetic surveys. Equally important, it would provide a uniformity of treatment to all officers of the Corps, including those transferred to a military department and those remaining on duty in ESSA. The benefits to ESSA and to individual officers inherent in this section are significant as the disparities existing between transferred and nontransferred officers with regard to rights, privileges, and responsibilities, contribute to a severe morale problem and reduce the operational effectiveness of ESSA. The protection afforded by this subsection during wartime is most desirable in view of the fact that officers who are not detailed or transferred to a military department are, nevertheless, productively engaged in defense-oriented projects and may even on occasions be on duty in the same area as their detailed or transferred fellow officers and involved in the same kind of operations.

(c) This subsection (old) authorizes the President to transfer ESSA officers and equipment to the armed forces during national emergencies. It is essentially a restatement of PL 89–657 (33 USC 855). Officers transferred under this subsection are treated as officers of the department to which transferred for all practical purposes.

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) contain the provisos of the existing statute. In paragraph (3) reference to transferred officers having "proper military status" is deleted; it is now contained in subsection (e). Paragraph (4) is intended to protect the rights of the Secretary as well as officers transferred under this subsection. The officers are not permanently and irrevocably transferred, but as stated in paragraph (3) they shall "be subject to the laws, regulations and orders" of the department to which transferred. Since such laws, etc., of the military departments include the right to dismiss an officer, this section is necesasry. (See 10 USC 1161.)

(d) This subsection (old) provides that the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense shall mutually determine and prescribe the duties of ESSA in regard to supporting the national defense, both in peacetime and in wartime. It is a restatement of existing law (33 USC 858).

(e) This subsection (new) prescribes that ESSA officers, while detailed or transferred to the armed forces or while the Corps itself is an armed force, shall have proper military status and shall be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, under such jurisdictional arrangements as the Secretaries concerned prescribe. It conforms to and removes any ambiguity from Article 2 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 USC 802) which states, "members of the Environmental Science Services Administration . . . when assigned to and serving with the armed forces," shall be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

(f) This subsection in paragraph (1), (modified) authorizes the President during national emergencies to suspend laws relating to appointment, promotion, retirement, and separation of officers. It is an expansion of authority and is derived from 33 USC 853i(b). It is similar to provisions of the armed forces (e.g. 10 USC 3313; 14 USC 275).

Paragraph (2) (old) specifies that during periods of national emergency ESSA officers shall be subject to Navy laws regarding the temporary appointment and advancement of officers, with certain limitations which are listed in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C). The paragraph and its subparagraphs restate existing law (33 USC 854a–1).

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Transportation of deceased officer's effects

Section 35: This section (old) provides for the transportation of personal and household effects of commissioned officers who die while on active duty. It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 874(a).

Settlement of claims

Section 36: This section (modified) is intended to provide protection for officers of this Administration in claims against the United States to the same limit and in the same manner as provided for officers of the armed forces.

The Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 767) provided officers of the Administration the same protection provided officers of the armed forces. In 1965 this Act was amended by PL 89–185 (79 Stat. 789) to increase the limit of claims to $10,000. The amendment did not provide this same increased coverage to officers of the Administration.

This section will assimilate claims of officers of this Administration on a permanent basis, to officers of the armed forces.

Indebtedness to the United States

Section 37: This section (new) provides that an officer's pay may be withheld under title 5, United States Code, on account of indebtedness to the United States, only upon judgment of a court or upon a special order issued by the Secretary. This section would place officers of the Administration under the same protection offered officers of the military services (37 USC 1007(a)). The very nature of an officer's career requires him to move periodically to a new assignment. To require him at his own expense, to return to a former duty station to contest claims against his pay would impose a real and at times unjustifiable financial burden on the officer. For this reason the withholding is authorized if the indebtedness to the United States is admitted or shown by a judgment of a court, but not otherwise unless required by the Secretary.

Administration of oaths

Section 38(a): This subsection (modified) would authorize commanding officers and other officers designated by the Secretary to exercise powers of a notary public for specified purposes. It is intended to expand existing authority of commanding officers of ships and other designated officers with regard to oaths and notarial acts. Present authority permits such officers to administer oaths and perform notarial acts only outside the conterminous states and only in behalf of personnel of the Administration or in connection with functions of the Administration (33 USC 875).

Paragraph 1 would authorize those same officers to administer oaths and perform notarial acts for Administration functions anywhere. It is deemed appropriate that the Administration should be able to administer oaths and perform notarial acts in its own behalf without the inconvenience of searching for and providing payment to private notary publics. This is especially true for ships whose operations routinely take them to new and different ports and whose commanding officers would themselves be forced to delay ship's operations in order to have official papers notarized. With notary authority vested in commanding officers of ships it would, for example, be possible to execute ship's business while at sea and mail the completed papers by sending a small boat ashore at any convenient coastal hamlet.

Paragraph 2 provides authority for commanding officers and designated officers to administer oaths and perform notarial acts beyond the conterminous states for any purpose or person. This authority is desirable in many remote areas where Administration ships and field parties operate. In such areas indigenous personnel may otherwise be deprived of the services of a notary public.

Paragraph 3 provides authority to administer oaths and perform notarial acts under all circumstances during time of war or national emergency. During such a period, with disrupted communications and displaced persons and offices, it is imperative that such authority exists in order that the conduct of Government and private affairs be hindered as little as possible. Provisions of this section are similar to 14 USC 636.

(b) This subsection (old) specifies that officers performing notarial acts shall not be paid for such service. It further provides that the signature of the officer shall be prima facie evidence of his authority. It is derived from and essentially the same as authority contained in 33 USC 876.

Purchase of supplies, stores, uniforms

Section 39(a): This subsection (old) provides authority for commissioned officers and specified ship personnel to purchase from armed forces commissaries and quartermaster supply stores. It essentially restates existing authority (33 USC 868a).

(b) This subsection (new) authorizes purchase of supplies for messes, stores, uniforms, and related equipment of resale to members of the uniformed services and other persons, as authoried by the Secretary. At remote stations and on ships, where it is impracticable for each officer to sustain himself independently, it is advisable to provide quantities of items such as these for resale to personnel. Reimbursement from such sales to the appropriations charged is authorized.

Emergency assistance to others

Section 40: This section (old) authorizes the Secretary to furnish clothing, subsistence, and medical supplies for emergency use of distressed persons and shipwrecked persons. It further authorizes the Secretary to reimburse officers who have provided personal belongings to such persons. It is derived from and similar to authority contained in 33 USC 874(b). Its purpose is humanitarian.

Compensatory absence from duty

Section 41: This section (new) would authorize the Secretary to grant compensatory absence from duty, without charge to the normal leave credited them, to officers who must by the nature and location of their assignments serve for extended periods in isolation or in confinement with little or no opportunity for rest or relaxation.

Hiring of quarters for officers

Section 42: This section (new) would authorize the Secretary to lease and provide quarters for officers and civilian employees where other Government quarters (such as military B.O.Q.'s) are not available. Payments received from individuals quartered therein would reimburse the appropriation charged.

When major ships are being constructed, decommissioned, or are undergoing extensive repairs, it is sometimes necessary for officers to live ashore in the vicinity of the ship for extended periods. When individual housing is expensive or difficult to find, it would be at times a distinct advantage to the Administration to rent sizable quarters so that all the officers could be housed in one convenient location at a reduced rate.

At present, officers of the Administration are entitled to stay at military B.O.Q.'s, but only on a temporary, space available basis. This inadequate arrangement, especially when the B.O.Q. is at a considerable distance from the duty station of the officer, forces many officers to seek private quarters at considerable expense to themselves.

Procurement of officers

Section 43: This section (new) would authorize the Secretary to make expenditures as necessary in the recruiting of officers. It is similar to 14 USC 468.

Authority of Secretary

Section 44: This section (new) would provide general authority for the Secretary to prescribe regulations as necessary to implement the provisions of this Act or any other acts governing the administration of the Commissioned Officer Corps. In accordance with other assimilating provisions of this Act, this section requires that, when practicable, regulations prescribed by the Secretary shall be uniform with regulations of the armed forces.

Savings clause

Section 45: This section contains appropriate savings clauses.

Amendments

Section 46: This section (modified) would remove the existing restriction which limits to one the number of officers who can serve as heads of ESSA's principal components. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965, creating ESSA, stated in section 4(d), "at any one time, one principal constituent organizational entity of the Administration may, if the Secretary so elects, be headed by a commissioned officer of the Administration who shall be designated by the Secretary. . . ."

In order to appoint the most qualified individuals to such posts of responsibility, the positions should be open to all members of the Administration, just as they are open to persons outside the Administration.

Section 47: This section (new) is intended to eliminate all references to ESSA officers from chapter 41, "Training," of title 5, United States Code. (Title 5 referred to such officers as "Coast and Geodetic Survey" officers prior to enactment of PL 90-83 on September 11, 1967.)

The elimination of such references is necessary in view of the inclusion in this proposed legislation of section 28, "Special Instruction and Training," which is intended to provide training more suitable to the needs of the Administration. (See section 28 of the Section by Section Analysis.)

Section 48: This section (new) would amend title 18, United States Code, to provide the same protection against improper, unauthorized wearing of the uniform of the Administration as is presently provided for improper, unauthorized wearing of uniforms of the armed forces and the Public Health Service.

Section 49: This section (new), by amending title 37, United States Code, would authorize the payment of an allowance of $200 to newly appointed officers for the purchase of uniforms and accouterments.

Allowances presently paid such officers are in accordance with the "Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act" of September 1, 1954, as now set out in title 5, United States Code. This section would provide uniform allowances for officers in a manner comparable to that for the other uniformed services (armed forces and Public Health Service).

Section 50: This section would amend title 38, United States Code ("Veterans' Benefits"), to extend continued coverage of ESSA officers under various provisions of law relating to benefits for veterans. It is intended to supplement by specific provision the general assimilating provisions in section 33.

Section 51: Subsections (a) and (b) of this section amend the National Housing Act to provide coverage for ESSA's officers equal to coverage now provided the armed forces, with regard to mortgage insurance.

The "conditions of employment" of members of the armed forces and ESSA officers are identical with respect to their susceptibility to change of permanent station on short notice and on an involuntary basis. The circumstances under which members of the armed forces and ESSA officers buy and sell homes are identical. Therefore, since mortgage insurance is a part of the total pay package that is evaluated by the Executive Branch and by Congress in determining comparability between civilian and military pay, and since pay of ESSA officers is otherwise tied to the pay of the armed forces, it is appropriate that ESSA officers also be provided housing benefits applicable to the armed forces.

Subsection (a) amends section 222 of the National Housing Act to provide FHA mortgage insurance for ESSA officers in addition to armed forces servicemen and their families. (See 12 USC 1715m.)

Subsection (b) authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgages on residences which are not owner-occupied, where the owner has entered upon active duty after filing application for FHA insurance. (See 12 USC 1715g.) The amendment provided by this subsection would include ESSA service in addition to military service with regard to entering on active duty.

Section 52: This section lists statutes repealed by this Act:

Current sections of title 33, USC	*Section of ESSA Officers Corps Act*
851	3 (a), (b)
852	Abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2
852a	Abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2
852b	Abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2
853	Vested in Administrator
853a(a)	3(c)
853a(b)	3(d)
853a(c)	3(e)
853a(d)	3(f)
853a(e)	3(g)
853b	10
853c	11
853d	11
853e(a)	11b
853e(b)	15
853f	13
853g	16, 17
853h	16, 17
853i(a)	6
853i(b)	34(f)(1)
853j	5
853j-1(a)	Recess Appointment, 5 U.S.C. 5503
853j-1(b)	12(b)
853j-1(c)	12(c)
853k(a)	19(a)
853k(b)	19(b)
853l	18
853o(a)	30(b)
853o-1	30(c)
853p	20
853q	20
853r	4
853t(a)	5, 8(a), 15
853t(b)	8(b)
853t(c)(1)	8(b)
853t(c)(2)	8(b), 29(b)
854	5
854a	13(b)
854a-1	34(f)(2)
854a-2	9
855	34(c)
856	14, 29
857	33(1), 50
857a	In effect, unchanged
858	34(d)
864	30
868a	39(a)
873	In effect, unchanged
874(a)	35 (also 37 U.S.C. 406(f))
874(b)	40
875	38(a)
876	38(b)

REAPPOINTMENT AS CITIZEN REGENTS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three Senate joint resolutions to provide for reappointment as citizen regents of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of Dr. Crawford M. Greenewalt, Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, and Dr. William A. M. Burden.

I ask unanimous consent to have the attached biographical sketches for each of the regents printed in the body of the RECORD, along with the Senate joint resolution in each instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolutions and biographical sketches will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. FUL-

BRIGHT, and Mr. SCOTT), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 142

A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the terms of Doctor Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Wilmington, Delaware, on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The biographical sketch, presented by Mr. ANDERSON, is as follows:

CRAWFORD HALLOCK GREENWALT

Business executive; b. Cummington, Mass., August 16, 1902; s. Frank Lindsey and Mary Elizabeth (Hallock) G.; ed. William Penn Charter Sch.,- 1914–18, B.S. in Chem. Engineering, Mass. Inst. Tech., 1922; D. Sc. Univ. Delaware, 1940; D. Sc., Northeastern University, 1950; E. D. (hon.), Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst., 1952; LL.D., Columbia University, 1953; LL.D., Williams Coll., 1953; Sc.D., Boston U., 1953; D.C.S., NYU, 1954; D. Engineering, Poly. Inst. of Brooklyn, 1954; D. Sc., Phila. Coll. Pharmacy and Sci., 1955, Drexel Inst. Tech., 1961; LL.D., Kenyon Coll., 1958, Kansas State U., Temple University, 1960, U. Pa., 1961, Swarthmore Coll. 1961, Univ. Notre Dame, 1965, Bowdoin College 1965; L. H. D., Jefferson Med. Coll., 1960; m. Margaretta Lammot du Pont, June 4, 1926; children—Nancy Crawford Frederick, David, Crawford Hallock. With E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. since 1922, Asst. Dir. exptl. station, chem. dept., 1939, chem. dir. Grasselli chem. dept., 1942, tech. dir. explosives dept., 1943, asst dir. development dept., 1945; asst. gen. mgr. pigments dept. Sept. 1945; vice pres. June 1946–48, pres., 1948–62, chmn. bd. 1962— ; Director Equitable Trust Company, 1935–43, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Christiana Securities Co., Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., Boeing Co. Mem. bd. dirs. The Family Soc. Wilmington Music Sch., Winterthur Corp., Mass. Inst. Tech., Phila. Acad. Natural Scis., Phila. Orchestra Assn. New School of Music. Trustee Longwood Foundation, Am. Mus. Natural History, Carnegie Instn., Regent Smithsonian Instn. Recipient John Fritz Medal, Am. Inst. of Chem. Engrs., 1962. Mem. Am. Inst. Chem. Engrs., Am. Inst. Chemists, Soc. Chem. Industry, Am. Acad. Arts and Sciences, Nat. Acad. Scis., Am. Chem. Soc., A.A.A.S., Am Philos. Soc., Theta Chi, Tau Beta Pi. Clubs: Wilmington, Wilmington Country, du Pont Country; Royal Bermuda Yacht. Author: The Uncommon Man, 1959; Hummingbirds, 1960. Home: Greenville, Del. Office: Du Pont Bldg., Wilmington, Del. 19898.

S.J. RES. 143

A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, of Washington, District of Columbia, on April 6, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The biographical sketch, presented by Mr. ANDERSON, is as follows:

CARYL PARKER HASKINS

Educator, research scientist; b. Schenectady, N.Y., August 12, 1908; s. Caryl Davis and Frances Julia (Parker) H.; Ph. B., Yale, 1930; Ph. D., Harvard University, 1935; D.Sc., Tufts Coll., 1951, Union Coll., 1955, Northeastern U., 1955, Yale, 1958, Hamilton Coll., Cin., 1960, Boston Coll., 1960; LL.D., Wash- 1959; LL.D., Carnegie Inst. Tech., 1960, U. ington and Jefferson Coll., 1961; Sc.D., George Washington University, 1963; m. Edna Ferrell, July 12, 1940. Staff member, research laboratory, General Electric Company, Schenectady, New York, 1931–35; research associate Mass. Inst. Tech., 1935–45; pres., research dir. Haskins Labs., Inc., 1935–55, dir., 1955—; pres. Nat. Photocolor Corp. of N.Y.C., 1939–55, dir. 1939–56; research prof. Union Coll., Schenectady, 1937–55; pres. Carnegie Instn. of Washington, 1956—; mem. bd dirs. Schenectady Trust Co. Asst. liaison officer OSRD, 1941–42, senior liaison officer, 1942–43; exec. asst. to chmn. NDRC, 1943–44, dep. exec. officer, 1944–45; sci. adv. bd. Policy Council, Research and Development Board of Army and Navy, 1947–48; consultant Research and Development Bd., 1947–51, Sec. of Def., 1950–60, Sec. of State 1950—; mem. President's Science adv. com., 1955–58, cons. 1959—. Trustee Carnegie Institution, Washington, Pacific Sci. Center, Center Advanced Study Behavioral Scis., Asia Found., Carnegie Corp. of N.Y., Population Council, Rand Corp.; mem. bd. trustees of the Ednl. Testing Service, chmn. bd., 1960–61; regent Smithsonian Institution; trustee, mem. corp. Yale; trustee Marlboro Coll. Mem. corp. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. Awarded Certificate of Merit, (U.S.), 1948; King's Medal for Service in Cause Freedom (Gt. Britain), 1948. Served as lt., Res. Officers Assn., 1930–40. Fellow Am. Phys. Soc., A.A.A.S., Am. Acad. Arts and Sciences, Royal Entomol. Soc. (Gt. Britain), Entomol. Soc. Am., Am. Geog. Soc.; mem. Am. Acad. Pol. Sci., Royal Soc. Arts (Gt. Britain), Am. Chem. Soc., Faraday Soc., Am. U. Profs., Am. Soc. Zoologists, Genetics Soc. Am., Am. Soc. Naturalists, Council Fgn. Relations (dir.), Am. Inst. Physics, Am. Mus. Natural History, Am. Philos. Soc., Am. Polit. Sci. Assn., Am. Soc. International Law, Brit. Assn. Advancement Sci., Am. Inst. Biol. Scis., Am. Eugenics Society, Biophys. Soc., Soc. Protozoologists. Am. Soc. Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Soc. for Study of Evolution, English-Speaking Union, Lit. Soc., Japan Soc., Met. Mus. Art, Nat. Acad. Sci., N.Y. Acad. Scis., Soc. Am. Military Engineers, N.Y. Botanical Garden P.E.N., Pilgrims, Sigma Xi, Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Beta Kappa. Episcopalian. Clubs: St. Botolph, Somerset (Boston); Chemists, Bankers Century, Coffee House, Explorers (N.Y.C.); Mohawk (Schenectady); Metropolitan, Cosmos, University (Washington). Author: Of Ants and Men, 1939; The Amazon, 1943; Of Societies and Men, 1950; The Scientific Revolution and World Politics, 1964; contbr. to anthologies and tech. papers. Home: 1545 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Office: 1530 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

S.J. RES. 144

A joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Doctor William A. M. Burden as Citizens Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor William A. M. Burden, of New York, New York, on July 2, 1968, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory terms of six years.

The biographical sketch, presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

WILLIAM ARMISTEAD MOALE BURDEN

Financier, govt. ofcl.; b. N.Y.C., Apr. 8, 1906; s. William A. M. and Florence Vanderbilt (Twombly) B.; A.B. cum laude, Harvard, 1927; D.Sc. (hon.), Clarkson Coll. Tech., 1953; married Margaret Livingston Partridge, Feb. 16, 1931; children—William A. M. (dec.), Robert Livingston, Hamilton Twombly, Ordway Partridge. Analyst aviation securities Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., N.Y. City, 1928–32; charge of aviation research Scudder, Stevens & Clark, N.Y. City, 1932–39; v.p and dir. Nat. Aviation Corp., aviation investment trust, N.Y.C., 1939–41; v.p. Def. Supplies Corp. (subsidiary RFC), 1941–42; spl. aviation asst. sec. of Commerce, 1942–43; mem. NACA, 1942–47, asst. sec. of Commerce for air 1943–47; U.S. del. Civil Aviation Conf., 1944; chmn. U.S. delegation Interim assembly Provisional Internat. Civil Aviation Orgn., 1946; aviation cons. Smith Barney & Co., Inc., 1947–49; partner William A. M. Burden & Co., 1949- —; spl. asst. for research and development to Sec. of Air Force, 1950–52; mem. Nat. Aeros. and Space Council, 1958–59; U.S. Ambassador to Belgium, 1959–61; mem. U.S. Citizens Commission for NATO, 1961–62; dir. Allied Chem. Corp., Am. Metal Climax. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Mfrs. Hanover Trust Co. (hon.) Chmn. bd. Inst. for Def. Analyses; pres. Mus. Modern Art; gov. Soc. of N.Y. Hosp.; trustee Columbia U., Foreign Service Edn. Foundation, French Inst. in U.S. Regent Smithsonian Instn.; bd. dirs. Atlantic council U.S. Decorated Comdr. Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazil), 1958; Comdr.'s. Cross Order of Merit (Fed. Republic Germany), 1958; Grand Official El Sol del Peru (Peru), 1959; Comdr. French Legion of Honor, 1961; Comdr's. Cross Order of Merit (Italy), 1961; grand cordon Order of Leopold (Belgium), 1961; asso. comdr. (Bro.) Order of St. John, 1962. Member Council Fgn. Relations (dir.). Am. Inst. Aeros, and Astronautics, France-Am. Soc. (Pres.), Atlantic Inst. (dir.), Clubs: Somerset (Boston), The Brook, Racquet and Tennis, River, Links, Century (N.Y.C.); Metropolitan, Chevy Chase (Washington); Buck's and White's (London); Travelers (Paris). Author: The Struggle for Airways in Latin America, 1943. Address: 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON HEALTH SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at this time I would like to introduce Joint Resolution 145, on behalf of myself and Senator FRED HARRIS, of Oklahoma, and Senators BAYH, BYRD, of West Virginia, CLARK, HART, INOUYE, EDWARD KENNEDY, ROBERT KENNEDY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, NELSON, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH as cosponsors.

Mr. President, the current advances in health science and technology are bringing men more and more power in matters of life and death.

In California, man has created a kind of life. In South Africa, New York, and California, man has taken another step on the path of prolonging life through the substitution of vital organs. And some scientists are predicting that human intervention in genetic processes will one day make it possible to choose which parent a child will resemble.

Mr. President, these developments might be said to move men closer to God.

Heart transplant operations and genetic breakthroughs, have focused worldwide attention on the awesome implications of advances in medical and biological sciences.

These dramatic possibilites, and others perhaps unimagined as yet by most of us, hold great promise for the present and future of mankind. At the same time, they raise profound and complex questions of ethics, law, and public policy—what is life and what is death; who shall live and who shall die; how long shall life be preserved and how shall it be altered; who shall make which decisions; how shall society be prepared?

Questions like these are not new, Mr. President. Nor are present accomplishments isolated advances. Rather, as Barry Commoner has pointed out:

> We are today witnessing the inevitable impact of the tidal wave created by scientific revolution more than half a century old. It is simply too late to declare a moratorium on the progress of science . . . The real question is not *whether* we should use our new knowledge, but *how* to use it.

Or to put it another way—are we wise enough to be so smart?

It is imperative that we recognize the scientific significance of these advances. And it is also essential that we begin to deal with their social and ethical implications in as rational and public a fashion as possible. For there are public questions as well as personal ones to be considered.

The need for a Commission on Health Science and Society becomes clear, if one examines some of these questions and their obvious relationships to theology, ethics, law, and public policy.

I. WHAT IS LIFE AND WHAT IS DEATH?

Heart transplant operations cloud the distinction between life and death, based on the heartbeat. The artificial production of a viral core that can replicate itself raises the issue of what besides the ability to reproduce distinguishes life from nonlife.

These definitions and related considerations have implications for theology, ethics, and the law.

The Eichwald report, published by the National Academy of Sciences, asserts:

> Society seems to have accepted the notion that the welfare of the living is more important than the sanctity of the dead.

Pope Pius XII has stated:

> The removal of viable organs from the dead in the interests of science does not offend the mercy of the dead.

Other theologians, however, are said to think that "death" is not the necessary criterion, but that "inevitability" of death is sufficient justification for removal of organs from the living in order to prolong life for another.

II. WHO SHALL LIVE AND WHO SHALL DIE?

Over 400,000 persons died last year from coronary heart disease. Some could have been saved at least for a time by heart transplant operations. An estimated 7,700 persons died last year for lack of kidney transplant operations.

Theological and moral concerns are manifest in the decisionmaking process. The disparity between demand for transplants and supply of organs, personnel and facilities makes decisions about who shall give and who shall receive the most difficult kind of ethical and moral issue.

There is a new three-in-one "God" substitute at work in the decisionmaking processes with respect to transplant operations: the patient, the family, or next of kin, and the physician. In addition, one also must consider the role of the law and the society at large.

A. THE PHYSICIAN

Perhaps the heaviest weight of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the physician.

First, he must decide whether to attempt the operation at all. When is a heart transplant a justifiable risk?

During recent weeks the shades of opinion in the profession have ranged from caution to enthusiasm for the experiments conducted so far. But even when and if transplants become more common, the decisions will still be difficult.

The Hippocratic oath instructs the physician to do no harm. But developing medical techniques for prolonging life raises a complex question—no harm to the potential donor or no harm to the life of the potential recipient?

By the same token, religious principles may not provide complete guidance. "Thou shalt not kill" may be an ambiguous instruction.

William A. Nolen, M.D., of the Litchfield Clinic, Litchfield, Minn., wrote to me of some of the ethical problems he and other members of his profession face every day:

> I have been a participant in the weekly surgical conferences at Hennepin General Hospital in Minneapolis for the last six years. Time and time again problems arise related to tissue transplantation. Under what circumstances can we in good conscience declare an individual dead? Do we use an electroencephalogram, and electrocardiogram, or simple clinical signs to determine the absence of life? How should the relatives of the potential donor be approached? When can the donor be put in a heart-lung by-pass? I could go on indefinitely. The point is that confusion reigns even in a center where kidney transplants are frequent. Policies are established but on uncertain grounds.

Rabbi Bernard S. Raskas of St. Paul, Minn., points out another dimension of the ethical dilemmas. He points out that the one surviving human heart transplant patient is alive because he has the heart of a mulatto beating in his breast.

The country of South Africa, he reminds us, practices strict segregation of the races. While the national policy of the United States demands racial equality, de facto, if not de jure segregation makes relevant the questions Rabbi Raskas raises:

> Is it all right to have the heart of a Negro inside you, beating for you, giving you life, but not all right to have him live next door? . . . Is it perfectly permissible to use the kidneys of Negroes for one's welfare, but then to deny them the rights of employment, the opportunity to better their minds through education, and to reject their right for the pursuit of happiness?

I can only hope with Rabbi Raskas:

> Science may have brought to the fore a divine subtlety . . . that it is for us in the wake of transplanting a new heart to also acquire a new spirit of authentic religious equality in dealing with all of God's children.

B. PATIENT AND FAMILY

The basic principle guiding choice of donors and recipients is the consent of both parties.

Basic to the ethics and law in this area is the notion that consent be informed and that it be voluntary.

Discussions have continued for years about what constitutes informed and voluntary consent. The same kinds of questions are raised again by the transplant operations, but in a more dramatic context.

How well informed and how voluntary the consent is for patient and family depends not only on what they are told, but on how they are told. Which is more important—the contribution to medical science or letting a relative die naturally? Amid personal grief and stress, the family or patient may make judgments they later regret.

C. SOCIETY AT LARGE

How much is a man's life worth?

To ask questions about finance is to see the relationship between social decisions and life and death.

An estimated cost for transplanting a kidney is $5,000, plus followup care. The cost for hearts may be much more, yet $130 per year could give adequate, routine health care to poor Americans.

A public commitment of $1 billion could buy enough kidney and community dialysis centers to serve the 25,000 or more who will need them in the next decade. Or it could buy comprehensive ambulatory health care for more than 1,250,000 poor people.

This is a question of distributive justice. Obviously we need both kinds of health care services. But with limited resources and disagreements about the extent and direction of public commitments, the priorities we establish affect both the quantity of life—who lives and dies—and the quality—just how healthy people really can be.

And not only the priorities, but also the financing mechanisms are important. Shall organs be bought and sold like blood? Or shall they be procured through some public mechanism? Who shall pay for the operations?

To ask this question is to raise the issue brought up by Dr. Joseph T. English, Acting Director of Health Affairs for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The question is whether the poor shall have access:

> What is particularly unjust, it seems to me, is that so many of our research discoveries would not have been possible were it not for the fact that the poor have allowed us to perform our research experiments upon them. Doesn't it make sense that they then should be among the first to reap the benefits of this research—and that we have a moral obligation to see that this happens?

Should the "ability to pay" principle guide selection of recipients of heart and other organ transplants—selection of those who may have life?

And Dr. P. J. Peete, professor of surgery, Duke Medical Center, inquires:

> Where should the money be spent? . . . Should we spend as much time and money

> for the defective, the incurable, the unproductive as for the rehabilitated? Should we spend money for the mentally retarded when it is needed for the highly intelligent? Do the fit have more right to life than the unfit?

This, in turn, raises the question of how individual decisions are to be made, and by whom.

D. THE LAW

Legal issues emerge when one examines State statutes dealing with such subjects as donation of human tissues, property rights in dead bodies, and mutilation of corpses.

A distinction must be made between donation between the living, as is the case for kidney transplants, and donation from the dead to the living, as is the instance in heart transplants. The first situation presents fewer legal difficulties than the second.

If one relative donates a kidney to another living relative, the primary legal principle is "informed" and "voluntary" consent. While factors such as inadequate explanation and social pressure may be difficult to judge, they still are not as complex as are the issues raised by donation from dead to the living.

To begin with, what is "death"? As pointed out before, techniques which preserve the function of the heart when other body processes have ceased may make the present medical definition of death obsolete. Law does not provide guidance to the physician faced with the decision as to how long to maintain life artificially through use of a machine. Many writers have called for a redefinition of "death," perhaps based on cessation of brain function.

Thirty-eight States, including Minnesota, have tissue-donation statutes, giving individuals the right to donate tissues and organs for specific purposes. Five additional States have laws limited to donation of eyes.

Some of these laws require that organs may be donated only through wills, omitting the possibility of donation through other written instruments, cards, or perhaps oral deathbed donations. Some limit the places to which organs may be donated. The Minnesota law, one of the earliest, limits donation to wills, and fails to mention donation to tissue banks, for example.

Then there is the issue of immunity for physicians. Even if a person has donated organ or tissue through a will, there is a legal question as to whether the physician could be found guilty of mutilating the corpse if the relatives wanted the body whole for burial. Statutory statement of immunity might remedy this possible conflict, but most States, including Minnesota, do not have such a provision.

If an individual has not donated before death, other problems arise. Having property rights in the dead body, relatives might be asked to consent to removal of tissue or organs.

Often this right is not stated specifically in the statutes. It is not, for example, in Minnesota. But even if this right is stated, relatives may be under such strain at the time of death that they may be unwilling or emotionally unable to make such a decision.

In addition, time may prove a barrier. Present technology requires that many kinds of organs be removed almost immediately, within 30 to 60 minutes in some cases, for example. In this instance, unless the relative is present at bedside, consent may not be obtained in time to make the organ available for use in transplant operations.

Finally, there is the question of the role of the medical examiner. With the present gap between supply of organs and demand for operations, some have suggested enlarging the authority of the medical examiner to include the right to donate tissue or organs for medical research or transplantation as he is performing autopsies. This would require a change in laws which presently limit the authority of the medical examiner to determining cause of death in such cases as homicide, suicide, or in cases where an accident victim dies unattended by a physician.

The proposed Uniform Gift to Tissues Act, which recently received preliminary approval from the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law deals with many of these issues. If adopted, it would resolve many conflicts.

However, even it does not resolve all questions, some lawyers suggest that this law or another might well deal with the issue of payment mechanisms, and that this group or others might address the question of how international tissue donation is to be handled.

The dramatic events of recent months have focused attention on the implications of the transplant operations. But the same kinds of questions arise when considering the implications of genetic research, including the DNA—deoxyribonucleic acid—discoveries.

On a far distant horizon according to some scientists is the day when scientists will be able not only to predict whether a gene is likely to be present in human beings, but also to intervene directly in genetic processes. Some geneticists claim that work with frogs indicates that there is no reason why a man or woman could not turn out an exact genetic replica of himself instead of going through the process of fertilizing an egg and taking the chance on the outcome of the mating procedures.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg points out that through the technique of nuclear transplantation, children someday could be propagated who resemble one parent rather than a combination of the characteristics of the two. And it is said that the future implications of Dr. Kornberg's artificial production of a viral core may someday lead to vast improvements in the treatment of old-age diseases and malfunctions, including cancer and mental retardation.

The application of new knowledge of genetic chemistry to diagnosis of disease raises some questions. Who shall have access to these specialized diagnostic procedures? Those within reach of the highly sophisticated research centers? How quickly is this knowledge to be spread to the rest of the population?

Genetic intervention also raises moral and ethical issues of the most profound magnitude.

Geneticists, such as Dr. Lederberg, stress that they are not going to change the bodies of any existing people. But if this is a possibility for the future, we should be thankful that we have many years to think and plan. I am happy that I do not have to think about deciding which kinds of people would represent "perfecting the race" through genetic chemistry and which would not. It is somewhat comforting to think that perhaps the people who will have to make decisions like that would not have the clear memory of Nazi Germany on their minds, as I do.

While we continue to discuss the implications of sterilization of ghetto women, of LSD, of marihuana, and of abortions for thalidomide babies, we must begin to address the questions of mass eugenics that genetic chemistry raises for us now and will raise in the future. For example, should we spend the $10 billion Dr. Lederberg says it would take to translate genetic research into treatment as fast as science could proceed, or shall we spend it on nuclear weapons which have their own potentialities for genetic alteration?

III. HOW SHALL PUBLIC EDUCATION TAKE PLACE?

Several writers, including Dr. Irvine H. Page, have asked important questions about how public information should be handled on these scientific breakthroughs.

As Dr. Page puts it:

> The chief drawback to the newer procedure is that many wholly unsuccessful experiments are presented first as "miracles," a few days later as "maybe," and the following week, "the patient died but the experiment was a success."

How does this disillusionment affect the confidence of the public in the medical profession? Dr. Page maintains:

> Too early reporting leads to unhealthy competition among physicians and investigators, with too much emphasis on being "first."

The problem is how to put things in public perspective. The Washington Post carried an article recently about a speech given by Dr. Donald S. Frederickson, Director of the National Heart Institute, in which he pointed out how limited is the current value of heart transplants for treatment of heart disorders. But this article was on a back page, while the transplants themselves made daily front-page headlines.

How many people now expect the heart transplants are "the answer"? How many Americans will put tremendous and uncalled-for pressure on physicians and hospital administrators because of unrealistic expectations?

Education of the public including patients, physicians, legislators, and administrators, is an absolute necessity if they are to appreciate the true meaning of scientfic discoveries, and to make the best possible choices.

As a famous surgeon and researcher, Dr. Michael DeBakey, has pointed out:

> The moral, ethical, legal, and psychological implications of human cardiac transplantation will undoubtedly be much more far reaching than anticipated from present brief experience. The issues must be thoroughly analyzed, human values reconsidered, and satisfactory answers sought in the light of

> reason rather than in the heat of emotions. Cliches, irrelevancies, and capricious injunctions must not be allowed to thwart sane judgment.

Numerous groups and individuals and organizations are now at work on these problems. The Gottschalk report on chronic kidney disease was prepared for the use of the Bureau of the Budget. The National Institutes of Health has prepared guidelines for clinical investigators. The American Medical Association Journal has published numerous articles concerning medicine and society. In my own State, the Mayo Clinic has a committee considering some of the implications, and there are many, many more.

Taken together, these efforts represent a significant beginning. But something more is needed. The right information is not getting into the proper channels. Many issues remain undiscussed. And many American citizens, including Congress and the President, have yet to become involved and informed.

And I am not alone in this conviction.

I have written to more than 200 persons, including physicians, those engaged in public policy, and deans of schools of medicine, law, and theology and individuals all over the United States; I have discussed these matters abroad. In my letter, I asked whether there were social and ethical issues that deserved discussion. And I also asked what they thought of an idea I had to move this discussion forward—the creation of a Presidential Commission to consider these issues.

The response has been overwhelming and positive. I have used excerpts from some of these letters in the discussion so far. I intend to place all of them in the Record at a later date, along with an analysis.

Some receive any consideration of the social implications of medical research as an attempt to interfere with the magnificent progress in this field. I am thrilled by what modern medicine is producing and I recognize that medical research must be encouraged and protected if we are to continue to enjoy the fruits of this progress. I have joined the battle on several previous occasions to protect modern medical research and I will continue to do so in the future.

The purpose underlying the Commission's functions is not to interfere with medical research. Indeed it is to encourage it, but also to be sure that the moral and social implications of the products of such research are fully and responsibly considered and dealt with.

I agree with Dean Harold F. McNiece, of the School of Law, St. John's University, Brooklyn, N.Y.:

> We must develop ways and means of keeping the social and ethical sciences abreast . . . of the biological and chemical sciences . . . In brief, we must become more concerned with the why of scientific advance . . .

This resolution sets up a framework for discussion.

It provides for the establishment of a Commission to be composed of 15 members, appointed by the President from among representatives of medicine, law, physical and social science, theology, philosophy, ethics, health administration, and government. We would expect the best minds in the country to deal with the important issues, representing not only the academic community, but working scientists and laymen as well.

The Commission would undertake a comprehensive investigation and study of the legal, social, and ethical implications of health science research and development, including analysis and evaluation of the public and private national effort in this field, ascertaining public attitudes, and sifting out the implications for public policy implicit in these developments.

At the end of 1 year, the Commission would send to the President and the Congress a report, containing a statement of the findings of the Commission, together with recommendations for legislation and administrative action it deems advisable.

We would expect the Commission to make the widest possible use of materials already developed by governmental agencies, and private groups and individuals.

The Commission could establish contractual relationships with individuals and organizations, both public and private, to gather additional information they would need.

Since public involvement and education is of the essence, the Commission would be expected to go to the people through regional or local discussions at widely scattered points of the country.

The emphasis of the Commission would be on public policy. It would concern itself with setting goals, suggesting programs, recommending priorities, suggesting legislation, and formulating models for the evaluation of our national health science effort within the context of the needs of society as a whole. The Commission would recommend actions to promote a closer relationship between health science and society, in order that the goals and actions of the one reflect and influence the aims and conduct of the other.

Of course, some of the questions I raised at the outset can never have final answers. Some are purely philosophical, others have clear relationships to public policy. Some questions are more urgent than others. Some are already being adequately addressed by other groups and individuals.

While the potential scope of the Commission is enormous, its initial focus would need to be narrow, if the findings and recommendations were to be useful.

The process of hearings will serve to guide the Commission in setting priorities, and I look forward eagerly to this process. I believe we will be deeply grateful tomorrow that we have raised these questions today.

I agree with the admonition of Rabbi Raskas:

> Don't rush to answer these questions so fast—

He says—

> for they imply basic decisions to be made about the human race. They raise the ultimate questions of existence.

Like the rabbi, "rather than finding these dilemmas disturbing, I welcome them with my whole heart."

For, like the rabbi, I see hope in the work a commission could do not only implications for health research, but for society as well. Perhaps it is not too farfetched to dream as does Rabbi Raskas:

> Perhaps if mankind now sets its best brains to thinking about these things, then may it not be just possible that as a by-product we might find the solution to wars, poverty and prejudice. If we focus our entire thoughts on the highest reaches of man, may we not find that we all must cooperate so completely for man's welfare that the negating and destructive impulses in us will be effectively controlled and directed. We can do this if we set our hearts to the task . . .

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 145) to provide for a study and evaluation of scientific research in medicine in the United States, introduced by Mr. Mondale (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2928) for the relief of certain distressed aliens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2050) to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

AMENDMENT NO. 511

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 511, offered by Senator Lausche, for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], to S. 1042, the bill to provide for the general revision of the patent law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 15, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Edward J.

Schwartz, of California, to be U.S. district judge, Southern District of California, vice James M. Carter, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, myself, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

NOTICE OF CRIME AND DRUG HEARINGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Johnson's crime message was distinguished both for its inclusiveness and for its recognition of the juvenile as the major contributor to the Nation's overall crime problem.

It was a solid, and to the point statement of the crime problem and what must be done about it by this Congress.

I was pleased to see that President Johnson's recommendations, particularly in the area of juvenile crime, endorsed the investigations conducted by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee over the last 6 years in such areas as drug abuse, firearms controls, juvenile institutions, auto theft, and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

As chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I will continue to cooperate with the administration, in achieving its goals in delinquency and crime control, in processing its legislation and in probing further into the root causes of juvenile crime.

Public hearings on the abuse of narcotics, dangerous drugs, and LSD and the need for changes in Federal enforcement practices are our first order of business and public hearings of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee will begin on February 19, 1968.

The probe is a continuation of hearings begun in 1966 to find new tools to cope with a rise in marihuana use and a massive increase in the abuse of LSD and dangerous drugs.

Our field investigations suggest that tighter controls are needed along with more coordinated enforcement and extensive government rehabilitation for those victimized by our drug culture.

Scheduled to testify when public hearings reconvene at 10 a.m. in the caucus room on February 19 is Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

Previous subcommittee hearings examined in depth the problems connected with enforcement of the Dangerous Drug Control Amendments of 1965 and the establishment of an effective rehabilitation program backed by the Federal Government.

The subcommittee suggested to Dr. Goddard at that time that the runaway abuse of LSD by college students and "hippies" called for more severe controls over its manufacture and possession. It was agreed then that LSD was, and is, a nonpharmaceutical with no accepted medical use.

The Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Goddard said, charged with administering the then new Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, would like some time for experience in administering the new drug control amendments, and for further study of its position on LSD.

I am pleased to see that Dr. Goddard, with sufficient time to study the problem, apparently now agrees that new legislation is needed on LSD, and we are encouraged to see President Johnson place White House support directly behind the type of legislation the subcommittee suggested.

Other witnesses scheduled to testify at the forthcoming hearings are: February 20, 1968, Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics; February 21, 1968, Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General; Dr. Stanley F. Yoles, Assistant Surgeon General; Dr. Helen H. Nowlis, former director of the National Association of School Personnel Administrators' drug education project.

PROPOSED MASS CAMP-IN IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr President, in my previous discussion on the pending bill, H.R. 2516, I inserted in the Record articles with reference to the activities of Martin Luther King and his plan to march on Washington.

King yesterday set the goal for his mass camp-in in Washington. This is stated in the article apearing in the Washington Post today, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

King Keys His Tactics to Response by Hill

(Jean M. White and Robert C. Maynard)

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., yesterday set the goal for his mass camp-in in Washington as a "bill of economic and social rights" for the poor, including guaranteed jobs and guaranteed minimum income.

At the same time, the Negro leader pledged that his April poor people's campaign will begin as a peaceful and law-abiding demonstration and will "escalate to disruptive protest" only if Congress doesn't help the poor.

"Our aim is not to tie up the city of Washington," Dr. King emphasized. "Our protests will center on the Government, Congress, and not the city at large."

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference also hinted he may carry his crusade to the national political conventions in this election year "if things don't happen here" and Congress does not act.

He also talked about simultaneous demonstrations in 15 other cities and taking pickets into the home towns of Congressmen for protests before their homes and offices.

Dr. King held meetings with two different groups last night, the first with top SCLC and SNCC staff members—including Chairman H. Rap Brown—at the Pitts Motor Hotel, and the second at a rally in the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, 1630 Vermont Ave. NW., with about 1000 persons attending.

Dr. King said after the meeting with SNCC leaders that it was simply one of several he is holding "in a number of cities with a number of groups" to explain his spring campaign.

Brown, under a bond restriction to remain in the nine counties of the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York, shrugged his shoulders when asked if his presence in Washington might not arouse the ire of that court.

At the rally on Vermont Avenue, Dr. King was applauded and cheered throughout his 35-minute talk. A large minority of white persons attended.

Dr. King said it is long past time for America to get concerned over the Negroes' economic and social plight.

"Freedom is not something the oppressor will give to the oppressed," he said. "Freedom is something the oppressed must demand from the oppressor . . . We will come to Washington in April not to beg, but to demand justice and demand that they grant us what is truly ours."

Hosea Williams, one of Dr. King's aides, said, "We want to make it clear we are not building any coalitions."

Yesterday black power militant Stokely Carmichael, who met with Dr. King on Tuesday night along with 100 other Washington Negro civil rights activists, indicated that he will not overtly interfere or oppose the SCLC plans for "militant nonviolence."

Carmichael, commenting yesterday on his discussion with Dr. King, summed it up this way:

"I said we have to accept each other's ideology whether we disagree with it or not."

Carmichael added that "any black man who would blast Dr. King would be totally irresponsible."

But Carmichael, who is trying to pull together a Washington Negro coalition under the name of the Black United Front, added that it will be up to each organization in the Front to decide what its role will be in King's nonviolent campaign.

His individual role, he indicated, will be governed by what his Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee decides.

At a press conference yesterday, Dr. King was asked whether Carmichael and SNCC black power militants would agree to accept the "discipline of nonviolence" if they join the camp-in.

Dr. King said that he was certain Carmichael believes that people committed to nonviolence should be allowed to practice their philosophy.

The SCLC head called the press conference yesterday to unveil some of the specific legislative demands that his poor people's army will carry to Congress.

In answer to a reporter's question, he said a bill introduced by Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) comes "close to what we're talking about."

Conyers' "Full Opportunity Act," co-sponsored by nine other House members, calls for spending $30 billion a year for a massive attack on city slum problems. It would provide job training, a $2-an-hour minimum wage, housing, family allowances and aid to education.

As an "absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a full employment bill, some kind of guaranteed income, and housing legislation to provide at least 500,000 units a year for low-income families.

As to the tactics of his spring campaign, Dr. King said the first two weeks or so will be spent in peaceful protest "within the First Amendment" with the aim of educating the "Nation to its grave problems."

But Dr. King did not rule out—as a "last resort"—tying up traffic on the bridges of Washington.

"If it is necessary to tie up traffic, however inconvenient, the result is not as inconvenient as the conditions poor people live in," he said.

He also underlined the political leverage of his poor people's power and predicted that the presidential candidate "who responds to our program will get the Negro vote."

From then on, he said the tactics will depend on the response of Congress.

He said he didn't think building shantytowns—one tactic mentioned—was necessarily breaking the law since "people have built tent towns around Washington and not been driven out." He pointed out that "people own private property and private land," with the hint that the tents and shanties could go up on these without breaking the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote several paragraphs of the article:

> At the same time, the Negro leader pledged that his April poor people's campaign will begin as a peaceful and law-abiding demonstration and will "escalate to disruptive protest" only if Congress doesn't help the poor.
>
> "Our aim is not to tie up the city of Washington," Dr. King emphasized. "Our protests will center on the Government, Congress, and not the city at large."
>
> * * * * *
>
> "Freedom is not something the oppressor will give to the oppressed," he said. "Freedom is something the oppressed must demand from the oppressor . . . We will come to Washington in April not to beg, but to demand justice and demand that they grant us what is truly ours."
>
> * * * * *
>
> But Dr. King did not rule out—as a "last resort"—tying up traffic on the bridges of Washington."
>
> "If it is necessary to tie up traffic, however inconvenient, the result is not as inconvenient as the conditions poor people live in," he said.
>
> * * * * *
>
> He said he didn't think building shantytowns—one tactic mentioned—was necessarily breaking the law since "people have built tent towns around Washington and not been driven out." He pointed out that "people own private property and private land," with the hint that the tents and shanties could go up on these without breaking the law.

Mr. President, I believe it is high time that those in official positions in Washington publicly state the laws that would govern the proposed march on Washington, including the zoning laws prohibiting the erection of so-called shanties or tents on private property and the restrictions applying to the use of Federal property. It is inviting trouble to allow such plans to proceed without informing Dr. King of the laws that exist as well as letting him know that all necessary steps will be taken to prevent disruption of the daily working of the Government and the people of this metropolitan area. Action must be taken now to clearly advise Dr. King and others that they must comply with the existing rules, regulations and laws, and that such rules, regulations and laws will be enforced to the maximum degree.

Dr. King must be made to realize now that his threats against the "Government," meaning the President, and against "Congress," meaning the Members of the Senate and the House, will get him exactly nowhere, and that such threats ill become any American citizen, much less a citizen who is a minister of the Gospel.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY AND FROM MONDAY UNTIL NOON ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Monday morning next, for a pro forma meeting of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the pro forma meeting of the Senate on Monday next the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no business of any kind whatsoever will be transacted at the pro forma meeting of the Senate on Monday next.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STANDING COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING SENATE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all standing committees be authorized to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate on Tuesday, February 13, 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on foreign aid. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Peace will never be secure so long as:

- —Seven out of ten people on earth cannot read or write;
- —Tens of millions of people each day—most of them children—are maimed and stunted by malnutrition;
- —Diseases long conquered by science still ravage cities and villages around the world.

If most men can look forward to nothing more than a lifetime of backbreaking toil which only preserves their misery, violence will always beckon, freedom will ever be under siege.

It is only when peace offers hope for a better life that it attracts the hundreds of millions around the world who live in the shadow of despair.

Twenty years ago America resolved to lead the world against the destructive power of man's oldest enemies. We declared war on the hunger, the ignorance, the disease, and the hopelessness which breed violence in human affairs.

We knew then that the job would take many years. We knew then that many trials and many disappointments would test our will.

But we also knew that, in the long run, a single ray of hope—a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—can do more to build the peace and guard America from harm than guns and bombs.

This is the great truth upon which all our foreign aid programs are founded. It was valid in 1948 when we helped Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. It was valid in the early fifties when the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a ruined Western Europe into a showcase of freedom. It was valid in the sixties when we helped Taiwan and Iran and Israel take their places in the ranks of free nations able to defend their own independence and moving toward prosperity on their own.

The programs I propose today are as important and as essential to the security of this nation as our military defenses. Victory on the battlefield must be matched by victory in the peaceful struggles which shape men's minds.

In these fateful years, we must not falter. In these decisive times, we dare not fail.

NO RETREAT, NO WASTE

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1969 is designed to foster our fundamental American purpose: To help root out the causes of conflict and thus ensure our own security in a peaceful community of nations.

For Fiscal 1969, I propose:

- —*An economic aid appropriation of $2.5 billion.*
- —*A military grant aid appropriation of $420 million.*
- —*New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.*
- —*A five-year program to develop and manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on millions of children because of malnutrition in their early years.*
- —*That the United States join with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development-lending affiliate of the World Bank.* For every two dollars the United States contributes, other nations will contribute three dollars.
- —*That the Congress authorize a contribution to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.*

- —*Prompt appropriation of the annual contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.*
- —*A further authorization and appropriation of callable funds for the Inter-American Development Bank to stand behind the Bank's borrowing in private money markets.*

COMMON EFFORT FOR COMMON GOOD

I pledge to the Congress and to the people of America that these programs will be carried out with strict attention to the six basic principles of foreign aid administration we announced last year.

1. *Self-Help*

Self-help is the fundamental condition for all American aid. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment. We will help those—and only those—who help themselves. We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement.

2. *Multilateralism*

This year, 90 percent of our AID loans will be made as part of international arrangements in which donors and recipients alike carry their fair shares of the common burden.

America now ranks fifth among donor countries in terms of the share of its national product devoted to official foreign aid. Japan increased her aid by nearly 50 percent last year. Germany has increased her aid budget despite fiscal restraints which have curtailed domestic welfare programs. Great Britain is maintaining aid levels despite severe financial problems. With the signing of the International Grains Agreement, other wealthy nations will for the first time be obligated to contribute food and money to the world-wide war on hunger.

This year we must take another important step to sustain those international institutions which build the peace.

The International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate is almost without funds. Discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now underway. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealthy nations of the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The Administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support.

3. *Regionalism*

Last year I joined with the Latin American Presidents to renew, reaffirm and redirect the Alliance for Progress.

The nations of free Asia began a general survey of their joint transportation and education needs, while work proceeded on projects to bring power, water and the other tools of progress to all.

The African Development Bank, financed entirely by Africans, opened its doors and made its first loan.

The coming year will present three major opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts:

A. *The Inter-American Development Bank.*

This Bank stands at the center of the Alliance for Progress. Last year, the Congress authorized three annual contributions of $300 million each to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations. The second of these contributions should be appropriated this year.

The Ordinary Capital of the Bank, which comes mainly from sales of its bonds in the private market, must now be expanded. Since 1960, we have appropriated $612 million which is kept in the U.S. Treasury to guarantee these bonds. Not *one* dollar of this money has ever been spent, but this guarantee has enabled the bank to raise $612 million from private sources for worthy projects. We must extend this proud record. *I urge the Congress to authorize $412 million in callable funds, of which $206 million will be needed this year.*

B. *The Asian Development Bank.*

This Bank has asked the United States, Japan, and other donors to help establish Special Funds for projects of regional significance—in agriculture, education, transportation and other fields. Last October I requested that the Congress authorize a United States contribution of up to $200 million. This would be paid over a four year period—only if it were a minority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. *I urge that the Congress take prompt and favorable action on this request.*

C. *The African Development Bank.*

This Bank has also asked for our help to establish a small Special Fund for projects which cannot or should not be financed through the Bank's Ordinary Capital. *We must stand ready to provide our fair share, with full safeguards for our balance of payments.*

4. *Priority for Agriculture and Population Planning.*

Victory in the war on hunger is as important to every human being as any achievement in the history of mankind.

The report of 100 experts assembled last year by the President's Science Advisory Committee on the World Food Supply rings with grim clarity. Their message is clear: The world has entered a food-population crisis. Unless the rich and the poor nations join in a long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human affairs, this crisis will reach disastrous proportions by the mid-1980's.

That Report also reminded us that more food production is not enough. People must have the money to buy food. They must have jobs and homes and schools and rising incomes. Agricultural development must go hand-in-hand with general economic growth.

AID programs are designed *both* to stimulate general economic growth and to give first priority to agriculture. In India, for instance, about half of all AID-financed imports this year will consist of fertilizer and other agricultural supplies.

We have made a good start:

- —India is harvesting the largest grain crop in her history. Fertilizer use has doubled in the past two years. Last year five million acres were planted with new high yield wheat seeds. By 1970 this will increase to 32 million acres.
- —Brazil, with AID help, has developed a new grass which has already added 400,000 acres of new pastureland and increased her annual output of beef by 20,000 metric tons.
- —The Philippines is expecting a record rice crop this year which will eliminate the need to import rice.

In the year ahead, AID will increase its investment in agriculture to about $800 million—50 percent of its total development aid. In addition, I will shortly propose an extension of the Food for Freedom program to provide emergency food assistance to stave off disaster while hungry countries build their own food production.

We must also tap the vast storehouse of food in the oceans which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. I have directed the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Secretary of the Interior to launch a 5-year program to:

- —Perfect low-cost commercial processes for the production of Fish Protein Concentrate.
- —Develop new protein-rich products that will fit in a variety of local diets.
- —Encourage private investment in Fish Protein Concentrate production and marketing, as well as better fishing methods.
- —Use this new product in our Food for Freedom program to fortify the diets of children and nursing mothers.

But food is only one side of the equation. If populations continue to grow at the present rate, we are only postponing disaster not preventing it.

In 1961 only two developing countries had programs to reduce birth rates. In 1967 there were 26.

As late as 1963, this government was spending less than $2 million to help family planning efforts abroad. In 1968, we will commit $35 million and additional amounts of local currency will be committed. In 1969 we expect to do even more.

Family planning is a family matter. The United States will not undertake to tell any government or any parent how and to what extent population must be limited.

But neither we nor our friends in the developing world can ignore the stark fact that the success of development efforts depends upon the balance between population and food and other resources. No government can escape this truth. The United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

5. *Balance of Payments Protection.*

Our ability to pursue our responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. Economic aid now helps—not hurts—our balance of payments position.

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over $600 million. Last year it was down to $270 million. I have already directed that even this figure be reduced in 1968 to less than $170 million. More than $9 of every $10 AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans.

Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. Efficient Administration

Over the past few years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number of employees overseas in all civilian agencies. In addition, AID is further improving and streamlining its over-all operations.

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Foreign aid must be much more than government aid. Private enterprise has a critical role. Last year:

- —All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.
- —The International Executive Service Corps operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counseled local executives.
- —Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a private, U.S. non-profit organization.
- —More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.
- —Thirty-three American states supported development work in 14 Latin American countries under AID's Partners of the Alliance program.

All of these efforts will be sustained and expanded in the coming year. We are committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in and assistance to the developing countries. We shall remain so.

A YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY, A YEAR OF RISK, LATIN AMERICA

I propose appropriations of $625 million for the Alliance for Progress.

The American Presidents met at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

- —The Nations of Latin America have invested more than $115 billion, compared with $7.7 billion in American aid.
- —Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.
- —Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

A new course was charted for that partnership in the years ahead. At Punta del Este, the American nations agreed to move toward economic integration. They set new targets for improvements in agriculture, in health, and in education. They moved to bring the blessings of modern technology to all the citizens of our Hemisphere.

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have progressed to the point where they no longer require AID loans. More than two-thirds of our aid will be concentrated in Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Central America. Each has done much to deserve our help:

- —*Brazil* increased food production by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real economic growth of 5%. Inflation was cut from 40% in 1966 to 25% in 1967.
- —*Chile*, under President Frei's Revolution in Freedom, has launched a strong program of agricultural and land reforms, while maintaining an overall growth rate of about 5%.
- —*Colombia* has also averaged 5% growth while undertaking difficult financial and social reforms.
- —*Central America* leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. Trade among these countries has grown by 450% in the six years of the Alliance—from $30 million in 1961 to $172 million in 1967.

This peaceful Alliance holds the hopes of a Hemisphere. We have a clear responsibility to do our share. Our partners have an equally clear responsibility to do theirs. We must press forward together toward mutual security and economic development for all our people.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

I recommend $706 million for the Near East and South Asia.

Half the people we seek to help live in India, Pakistan and Turkey. The fate of freedom in the world rests heavily on the fortunes of these three countries.

Each is engaged in a powerful effort to fight poverty, to grow more and better food, and to control population. If they succeed, and in so doing prove the effectiveness of free institutions, the lesson will be heard and heeded around the world.

This is a year of special importance for all three countries.

INDIA

India has survived two successive years of the worst drought of this century. Even as she fought to save her people from starvation, she prepared for the day when the monsoon rains would return to normal. That day has come. India is now harvesting the greatest grain crop in her history. With this crop, India can begin a dramatic recovery which could lay the groundwork for sustained growth.

India must have the foreign exchange to take advantage of this year of opportunity. A farmer cannot use the miracle seed which would double or triple his yield unless he can get twice as much fertilizer as he used for the old seeds. A fertilizer distributor cannot sell that much more fertilizer unless it can be imported. An importer cannot buy it unless he can get foreign exchange from the Government. India will not have that foreign exchange unless the wealthy countries of the world are willing to lend it in sufficient quantities at reasonable terms.

This is the crux of the matter. If we and other wealthy countries can provide the loans, we have much to look forward to. If we cannot, history will rightly label us penny-wise and pound-foolish.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan, though also plagued by drought, has continued its excellent progress of the past few years. Her development budget has been increased. Her military budget has been reduced. Agricultural production is growing faster than population. Private investment has exceeded expectations.

Now the Government of Pakistan has undertaken further steps to reform its economic policies—to free up its economy and give more play to the market. These reforms are acts of wisdom and courage, but they require foreign exchange to back them up. Pakistan deserves our help.

TURKEY

Turkey's economic record is outstanding. Her gross national product has grown an average of six percent annually since 1962. Industrial output has grown nine percent per year. Food production is growing much faster than population growth.

Turkey's own savings now finance some 90 percent of her gross investment. Difficult problems remain, but we may now realistically look forward to the day—in the early 1970's—when Turkey will no longer require AID's help.

AFRICA

I recommend $179 million for Africa.

Just one year ago, I informed the Congress of a shift in emphasis in our aid policy for Africa. We moved promptly to put it into effect:

- —There will be 21 U.S. bilateral programs in Africa in Fiscal 1969, compared to 35 last year.
- —Most of our bilateral programs will be phased out in eleven more countries in the following year.
- —Expanded regional and international projects will meet the development needs of the countries where bilateral aid is ended.

The past year has provided further evidence that this support for regional economic institutions and projects is a sensible approach to Africa's problems. It expands markets. It encourages economies of scale. It gives meaningful evidence of our concern and interest in African development.

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 250 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of $480 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort in Vietnam. This effort will be intensified by the need to restore and reconstruct the cities and towns attacked in recent days.

Defense of Vietnam requires more than success on the battlefield. The people of Vietnam are building the economic and social base to preserve the independence we are helping them to defend.

Since 1965, when galloping inflation loomed and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the people of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in combat:

- —They have written a Constitution and established representative local and national governments through free elections, despite a concerted campaign of terror, assassination and intimidation.
- —Runaway inflation has been averted, and the foundation laid for a thriving economy, despite the enormous stresses of war.

But still the innocent victims of war

and terrorism must be cared for; persistent inflationary pressures must continue to be controlled; and the many problems faced by a new government under wartime conditions must be overcome. The framework for economic and social progress has been established. We must help the Vietnamese people to build the institutions needed to make it work.

In the coming year, we will:

—Improve our assistance to refugees and civilian casualties. The wages of aggression are always paid in the blood and misery of the innocent. Our determination to resist aggression must be matched by our compassion for its helpless victims.

—Intensify agricultural programs aimed at increasing rice production by 50% in the next four years.

—Concentrate our educational effort toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

—Stress, in our import programs, the key commodities needed for agricultural and industrial growth.

The rapid program expansion of the past two years—in dollars, people and diversity of activities—is ended. The emphasis in the coming year will be on concentration of resources on the most important current programs.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our ultimate success.

EAST ASIA

I recommend $277 million for East Asia.

For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and urgent business for the nations of East Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

But this year the larger portion of our aid to East Asian countries will be focused directly on the work of development. Asians know—as we do—that in the long run, economic, social and political development offer the best protection against subversion and attack. Despite communist pressure, they are getting on with the job. For example:

—For the last three years, the *Korean* economy has grown by a phenomenal 10 percent per year; domestic revenues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.9 percent in 1962 to 2.5 percent today, and a strong national population program is contributing to further reductions. We are now able to plan for orderly reduction of U.S. economic aid as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will be—maintained.

—*Indonesia* has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and rehabilitation and is moving toward development. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is overwhelmingly in our interest to provide it.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

I recommend $420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of nations on the perimeter of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of free world collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress.

Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have resisted large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons.

We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with this problem. In addition, we will explore other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through cash and credit sales. I will submit separate legislation to authorize necessary military sales and provide for credit terms where justified.

Our military assistance programs will provide only what is needed for legitimate defense and internal security needs. We will do no more. We can afford to do no less.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The internal peace and order of this steadfast ally is once again threatened from the North.

These threats summon Korea to strengthen further her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

We must help.

I propose that Congress appropriate immediately an additional $100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea.

This can be accomplished within the authorizing legislation already enacted.

With this additional help, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea can gain new strength through the acquisition of aircraft and anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft, ammunition, and other supplies.

AMERICA'S CHOICE

Foreign aid serves our national interest. It expresses our basic humanity. It may not always be popular, but it is right.

The peoples we seek to help are committed to change. This is an immutable fact of our time. The only questions are whether change will be peaceful or violent, whether it will liberate or enslave, whether it will build a community of free and prosperous nations or sentence the world to endless strife between rich and poor.

Foreign aid is the American answer to this question. It is a commitment to conscience as well as to country. It is a matter of national tradition as well as national security.

Last year some Americans forgot that tradition. My foreign aid request, already the smallest in history, was reduced by almost one-third.

The effects of that cut go much deeper than the fields which lie fallow, the factories not built, or the hospitals without modern equipment.

Our Ambassadors all over the developing world report the deep and searching questions they are being asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to fate the weak and the striving who are depending on her help?

This Congress can give a resounding answer to these questions by enacting the full amount I have requested. I do not propose this as a partisan measure. I propose it as an extension of the humane statesmanship of both parties for more than twenty years.

I said in my State of the Union address that it is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will. This is nowhere more true than in the developing countries where our help is a crucial margin between peaceful change and violent disaster.

I urge the Congress to meet this test.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1968.*

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few minutes to talk about a matter which I think is of great concern to the country, and should be of great concern to the President.

Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Relations took a course of action which later in the day was discussed on the floor of the Senate by the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. That action was to request the chairman of the committee to advise the President that it would like to have further consideration given to the advisability of having the Secretary of State appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations at public hearings with respect to foreign policy matters.

As the Senate knows, I have taken that position from the very beginning of the controversy that has developed between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Secretary of State. I hold to the point of view that the Committee on Foreign Relations, as a matter of constitutional right, has the authority to ask the Secretary of State—and have the request complied with—for a public discussion of foreign policy matters. It is unfortunate that this controversy has developed, and I am most desirous of joining in building a bridge between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the White House, for the Foreign Relations Committee and the White House should be the two ends of a bridge of communication, cooperation, and understanding.

While the final jurisdiction rests in the President of the United States as far as the course of action the executive branch of the Government wishes to follow in connection with this controversy, I think it should be resolved along the lines that the Committee on Foreign Relations respectfully suggested yesterday in its instructions to its chairman. It was felt that not only should a letter be sent, but that the President should be advised that the committee stands ready and willing to have the chairman of the committee, a subcommittee of the committee, or the full committee itself meet with the President at his convenience, at any time, to discuss with him, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, the urgent and perplexing problems that face the Republic in the field of foreign policy in these critical times.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I note that no other Senator seeks recognition. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be recognized for an additional 15 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MORSE**. In the committee yesterday, I made my plea for this approach, motivated only by a desire to cooperate with the President, to make available the expertise of the Committee on Foreign Relations as a legislative body, and as the legislative committee of the Senate in the foreign relations field, to advise and consent with him in whatever format he might decide in his wisdom and discretion would be beneficial to him. There is ample precedent.

Let me take the Senate, the President of the United States, and the country back to World War I, and to the relationship that developed between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the then great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. For during and after that war, too, Mr. President, there was not always unanimity of spirit between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the White House. It is well known that there were differences between President Wilson and the Committee on Foreign Relations. I direct the attention of the Senate to the proceedings of the Committee on Foreign Relations of August 14, 1919.

The committee met at 10:30 a.m. Those present were Senators Lodge, McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Swanson, Pomerene, Pittman, and Shields.

There was a discussion in the committee, as these minutes of the meeting will show. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the Committee on Foreign Relations of August 14, 1919, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 14, 1919.

The committee met at 10:30 a.m.

Present: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Swanson, Pomerene, Pittman, and Shields.

The chairman laid before the committee the following letter from Messrs. Johnson and Borah:

AUGUST 13, 1919.

Hon. H. C. LODGE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: We deem it absolutely essential, before the hearings be closed upon the German treaty now under consideration, that the following witnesses be called, and that the committee be informed, as they are not now informed, of the knowledge of these gentlemen:

1. Gen. Tasker Bliss, Mr. Henry White, Col. Edward M. House, as to the various circumstances connected with the treaty, and particularly concerning the League of Nations, the reparation clauses, and territorial dispositions, and with special reference to the Shantung award.

2. Professor Williams, of the University of California; Doctor Hornbeck, both of whom were experts in relation to oriental affairs and both of whom are familiar with the Japanese and Chinese claims.

3. Professor Young and any others who either resigned their positions as experts to the American commissioners or participating in the decisions made, protested against them.

4. Mr. William C. Bullitt, who was officially commissioned to visit European Russia and intrusted, as we have been told, with propositions of peace by the President to Russia.

5. Dr. John C. Ferguson.

6. Mr. Thos. F. Millard.

When Secretary of State Lansing was examined recently, he was asked concerning the engagements or commitments of the United States under the treaties now being completed with Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey. The Secretary answered in substance that he was wholly ignorant of the engagements to which the United States had been committed and that it would be impossible to determine until all the treaties were before us, in what our country would be involved in the future. We deem it essential, therefore, before any report be made upon the pending German treaty, that we have before us the treaty with Austria and those with Bulgaria and Turkey as well. You recall that Secretary Lansing said that the President insisted, even though we had not declared war upon Bulgaria and Turkey, that we should be a part of the ultimate settlements made with these countries. Our people, therefore, should not be committed piecemeal to a general European and Asiatic settlement and should know, before action is taken upon any treaty, the engagements to which we are committed under all.

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM W. JOHNSON.
WM. E. BORAH.

Mr. Borah moved that the committee subpœna Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Hon. Henry White, and Col. Edward M. House, American members of the Peace Commission.

The question being put, the roll was called, and the following voted in the affirmative: Messrs. Lodge, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Johnson, New, Moses (8).

Those voting in the negative were: Messrs. McCumber, Harding, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith, Pittman, Shields (9).

So the motion was not agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Johnson, it was agreed to subpoena Prof. E. T. Williams and Capt. S. K. Hornbeck, advisers to the American delegates at the peace conference on Far Eastern affairs; also Thomas F. Millard, adviser to the Chinese Peace Delegation, and Dr. John C. Ferguson, adviser to the President of China.

Mr. Johnson moved that W. M. Bullitt also be directed to appear before the committee in regard to Russian affairs in connection with the pending treaty.

The question was put, and the following voted in the affirmative: Messrs. Lodge, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses (9).

Those voting in the negative were: Messrs. McCumber, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith, and Pittman (7).

So the motion prevailed.

On motion of Mr. Fall, the chairman was directed to write to the President requesting that the committee be informed as to what action has been taken with reference to the disposition of the former German colonies referred to in articles 119 and 120 of the treaty of peace.

After discussion, the chairman was authorized to request the President to inform the committee if he would receive the members of the committee at such time and place as might be convenient to him in connection with the treaty of peace with Germany, the President to be informed that nothing said at the conference would be considered confidential.

At 1.40 p.m. the committee adjourned until August 15 at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, there was a considerable amount of discussion in that committee meeting, as this record will show, in regard to differences that existed within the committee in connection with some of the positions being taken by the President of the United States in connection with seeking a peace treaty with Germany.

I read a part of it:

> On motion of Mr. Fall, the chairman was directed to write to the President requesting that the committee be informed as to what action has been taken with reference to the disposition of the former German colonies referred to in articles 119 and 120 of the treaty of peace.
>
> After discussion, the chairman was authorized to request the President to inform the committee if he would receive the members of the committee at such time and place as might be convenient to him in connection with the treaty of peace with Germany, the President to be informed that nothing said at the conference would be considered confidential.
>
> At 1:40 p.m. the committee adjourned until August 15 at 10:30 a.m.

It is interesting to note that at that meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations on August 14, 1919, the committee took a course of action quite different from that taken by the present Foreign Relations Committee yesterday. In the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations of August 14, 1919, they asked for a conference with the President, but in their request for the conference, they made perfectly clear that it was not to be in executive session, but that that conference would be held with the understanding that nothing that took place in the conference would be confidential.

Mr. President, that is not the position of the Foreign Relations Committee in the present situation. All we seek to do is to have our chairman and whoever he wants to take with him discuss with the President this controversy that can boil up into a magnitude that is unwarranted, undesirable, and not in the interest of the relationships that ought to exist between the White House and the Senate of the United States. They should discuss with the President a resolution of this dispute as to whether the Secretary of State should appear before the Foreign Relations Committee in public hearings.

Everyone knows that there is not the slightest danger that the security of the Republic will be involved because of the separation of powers doctrine, because of the rules of privilege, and because the Foreign Relations Committee has demonstrated over and over again, without exception in my years of service in the Senate, that if there exists any question of violation of privilege, any question of violation of separation of powers, or any question involving in any way the security of the Republic, all the administration witness has to say—be he the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, a general or anyone else—is: "I request that that question be answered in executive session because it is a matter of privilege, or it involves a matter of security, or it would not be wise in the interest of our country to have the answer made known to potential enemies in the world."

That request has never been violated in all of my years in the Senate, and it would not be now. However, let me also say that under our Constitution the legislative branch of the Government has a great responsibility in the field of foreign policy under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

The Constitution vests great power in the Senate in the field of foreign policy. Without taking the time to read the sections of the Constitution involving advise and consent powers of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that article II, section 2 be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is to be noted that the Senate is empowered to advise and consent with the President in making all treaties. Further, advise and consent powers are granted to the Senate in the appoinment of ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls.

There being no objection, article II, section 2 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 2. (1) The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

(2) He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided, two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

(3) The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that article I, section 8 of the Constitution be printed at this point in my remarks. Here again, it is to be noted that section 8 provides that it is the Congress and only the Congress that has the power "To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water." This section, as will be noted, provides for other congressional jurisdiction over military affairs and incident thereto over foreign affairs such as "To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years." Also, "To provide and maintain a Navy." These are all great consent powers, including the language "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

There being no objection, article I, section 8, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 8. (1) The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

(2) To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

(3) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

(4) To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

(5) To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

(6) To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

(7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

(8) To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

(9) To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

(10) To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

(11) To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

(12) To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

(13) To provide and maintain a Navy;

(14) To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

(15) To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

(16) To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

(17) To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

(18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is so important that we try to build this bridge and that the President become an architect and builder with us, for what we are seeking is to have our chairman and whoever he wants to go with him sit down with the President and advise him as to what the situation is as it is developing in the Senate and in the Foreign Relations Committee. This ought not develop into a controversy between the Senate and the President. And I do not think that the American people should be put in a position in which increasing numbers of them are going to raise questions that they are raising now as to whether we will hold fast to the principle of full, public disclosure of the publics business, except for purely military defense security information.

That is why there should be a conference with the President, and not a conference in which nothing will be kept confidential, as did the Foreign Relations Committee on August 14, 1919.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the minutes of the Foreign Relations Committee of August 15, 1919.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 15, 1919.

The committee met at 10:30 a.m.

Present: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Brandegee, Fall, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, and Pittman.

The chairman laid before the committee a letter from the President in reply to the communication of the committee of the 14th instant, stating that he would be glad to receive the members of the committee at the White House on August 19 at 10 o'clock and discuss with them the provisions of the treaty of peace with Germany.

The committee resumed consideration of the treaty.

Mr. Fall moved to strike out, in article 34, the words "League of Nations" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "commission of the allied powers." After discussion action on the motion was deferred.

The chairman laid before the committee a communication from Prof. E. T. Williams, of the University of California, replying to a request of the committee that he appear and testify regarding the pending treaty and asking to be excused. The chairman was authorized to insist upon his presence and to have a subpena issued if necessary.

On motion of Mr. Johnson, the chairman was directed to summon for appearance Dr. John C. Ferguson, of Newton, Mass., adviser to the President of China, and Thomas F. Millard, a journalist and newspaper publisher in China, both at present in the United States.

On motion of Mr. Moses, the committee adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the committee met at 10:30 a.m. on the morning of August 15, 1919.

Present were Senators Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Brandegee, Fall, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, and Pittman.

In the course of the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee the following transpired:

The Chairman laid before the committee a letter from the President in reply to the communication of the committee of the 14th instant, stating that he would be glad to receive the members of the committee at the White House on August 19 at 10 o'clock and discuss with them the provisions of the Treasury of Peace With Germany.

The committee resumed consideration of the treaty.

Mr. President, I now turn to the record of the Foreign Relations Committee of August 19, 1919. I ask unanimous consent that those proceedings be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 19, 1919.

The committee met at the White House at 10 a.m., pursuant to the invitation of the President, and proceeded to the East Room, where a conference[1] was held regarding the pending treaty of peace with Germany.

Present: Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and the following members of the committee: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith, and Pittman.

The President made a formal statement to the committee in regard to the treaty, following which various questions relating to the treaty, and more particularly to the covenant of the League of Nations, were taken up for discussion, the President responding to questions propounded by individual members of the committee.

At 1:35 the conference adjourned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is what the minutes show:

The committee met at the White House at 10 a.m., pursuant to the invitation of the President, and proceeded to the East Room, where a conference[1] was held regarding the pending treaty of peace with Germany.

The footnote shows:

For a verbatim record of the conference with the President, see Senate Document 76 or Senate Document 106, 66th Congress, 1st Session.

The full proceedings with the President were printed as a Senate document.

Mr. President, I now turn to that document, the document of Tuesday, August 19, 1919. I ask unanimous consent that the entire document be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY
TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 1919.
UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

CONFERENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The committee met at the White House at 10 o'clock a.m., pursuant to the invitation of the President, and proceeded to the East Room, where the conference was held.

Present: Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and the following members of the committee: Senators Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, of California, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith, and Pittman.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the liberty of writing out a little statement in the hope that it might facilitate discussion by speaking directly on some points that I know have been points of controversy and upon which I thought an expression of opinion would not be unwelcome. I am absolutely glad that the committee should have responded in this way to my intimation that I would like to be of service to it. I welcome the opportunity for a frank and full interchange of views.

I hope, too, that this conference will serve to expedite your consideration of the treaty of peace. I beg that you will pardon and indulge me if I again urge that practically the whole task of bringing the country back to normal conditions of life and industry waits upon the decision of the Senate with regard to the terms of the peace.

I venture thus again to urge my advice that the action of the Senate with regard to the treaty be taken at the earliest practicable moment because the problems with which we are face to face in the readjustment of our national life are of the most pressing and critical character, will require for their proper solution the most intimate and disinterested cooperation of all parties and all interests, and can not be postponed without manifest peril to our people and to all the national advantages we hold most dear. May I mention a few of the matters which can not be handled with intelligence until the country knows the character of the peace it is to have? I do so only by a very few samples.

The copper mines of Montana, Arizona, and Alaska, for example, are being kept open and in operation only at a great cost and loss, in part upon borrowed money; the zinc mines of Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin are being operated at about one-half their capacity; the lead of Idaho, Illinois, and Missouri reaches only a portion of its former market; there is an immediate need for cotton belting, and also for lubricating oil, which cannot be met—all because the channels of trade are barred by war when there is no war. The same is true of raw cotton, of which the Central Empires alone formerly purchased nearly 4,000,000 bales. And these are only examples. There is hardly a single raw material, a single important foodstuff, a single class of manufactured goods which is not in the same case. Our full, normal profitable production waits on peace.

Our military plans of course wait upon it. We cannot intelligently or wisely decide how large a naval or military force we shall maintain or what our policy with regard to military training is to be until we have peace not only, but also until we know how peace is to be sustained, whether by the arms of single nations or by the concert of all the great peoples. And there is more than that difficulty involved. The vast surplus properties of the Army include not food and clothing merely, whose sale will affect normal production, but great manufacturing establishments also which should be restored to their former uses, great stores of machine tools, and all sorts of merchandise which must lie idle until peace and military policy are definitively determined. By the same token there can be no properly studied national budget until then.

The nations that ratify the treaty, such as Great Britan, Belgium, and France, will be in a position to lay their plans for controlling the markets of central Europe without competition from us if we do not presently act. We have no consular agents, no trade representatives there to look after our interests.

There are large areas of Europe whose future will lie uncertain and questionable until their people know the final settlements of peace and the forces which are to administer and sustain it. Without determinate markets our production can not proceed with intelligence or confidence. There can be no stabilization of wages because there can be no settled conditions of employment. There can be no easy or normal industrial credits because there can be no confident or permanent revival of business.

But I will not weary you with obvious examples. I will only venture to repeat that every element of normal life amongst us depends upon and awaits the ratification of the treaty of peace; and also that we can not afford to lose a single summer's day by not doing all that we can to mitigate the winter's suffering, which, unless we find means to prevent it, may prove disastrous to a large portion of the world, and may, at its worst, bring upon Europe conditions even more terrible than those wrought by the war itself.

Nothing, I am led to believe, stands in the way of the ratification of the treaty except certain doubts with regard to the meaning and implication of certain articles of the covenant of the league of nations; and I must frankly say that I am unable to understand why such doubts should be entertained. You will recall that when I had the pleasure of a conference with your committee and with the Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs at the White House in March last the questions now most frequently asked about the league of nations were all canvassed with a view to their immediate clarification. The covenant of the league was then in its first draft and subject to revision. It was pointed out that no express recognition was given to the Monroe doctrine; that it was not expressly provided that the league should have no authority to act or to express a judgment on matters of domestic policy; that the right to withdraw from the league was not expressly recognized; and that the constitutional right of the Congress to determine all questions of peace and war was not sufficiently safeguarded. On my return to Paris all these matters were taken up again by the commission on the league of nations and every suggestion of the United States was accepted.

The views of the United States with regard to the questions I have mentioned had, in fact, already been accepted by the commission and there was supposed to be nothing inconsistent with them in the draft of the covenant first adopted—the draft which was the subject of our discussion in March—but no objection was made to saying explicitly in the text what all had supposed to be implicit in it. There was absolutely no doubt as to the meaning of any one of the resulting provisions of the covenant in the minds of those who participated in drafting them, and I respectfully submit that there is nothing vague or doubtful in their wording.

The Monroe doctrine is expressly mentioned as an understanding which is in no way to be impaired or interfered with by anything contained in the covenant and the expression "regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine" was used, not because anyone of the conferees thought there was any comparable agreement anywhere else in existence or in contemplation, but only because it was thought best to avoid the appearance of dealing in such a document with the policy of a single nation. Absolutely nothing is concealed in the phrase.

With regard to domestic questions article 16 of the covenant expressly provides that, if in case of any dispute arising between members of the league the matter involved is claimed by one of the parties "and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement." The United States was by no means the only Government interested in the explicit adoption of this provision, and there is no doubt in the mind of any authoritative student of international law that such matters as immigration, tariffs, and naturalization are incontestably domestic questions with which no international body could deal without express authority to do so. No enumeration of domestic questions was undertaken because to undertake it, even by sample, would have involved the danger of seeming to exclude those not mentioned.

The right of any sovereign State to withdraw had been taken for granted, but no objection was made to making it explicit. Indeed, so soon as the views expressed at the White House conference were laid before the commission it was at once conceded that it was best not to leave the answer to so important a question to inference. No proposal was made to set up any tribunal to pass judgment upon the question whether a withdrawing nation had in fact fulfilled "all its international obligations and all its obligations under the covenant." It was recognized that that question must be left to be resolved by the conscience of the nation proposing to withdraw; and I must say that it did not seem to me worth while to propose that the article be made more explicit, because I knew that the United States would never itself propose to withdraw from the league if its conscience was not entirely clear as to the fulfillment of all its international obligations. It has never failed to fulfill them and never will.

Article 10 is in no respect of doubtful meaning when read in the light of the covenant as a whole. The council of the league can only "advise upon" the means by which the obligations of that great article are to be given effect to. Unless the United States is a party to the policy or action in question, her own affirmative vote in the council is necessary before any advice can be given, for a unanimous vote of the council is required. If she is a party, the trouble is hers anyhow. And the unanimous vote of the council is only advice in any case. Each Government is free to reject it if it pleases. Nothing could have been made more clear to the conference than the right of our Congress under our Constitution to exercise its independent judgment in all matters of peace and war. No attempt was made to question or limit that right. The United States will, indeed, undertake under article 10 to "respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league," and that engagement constitutes a very grave and solemn moral obligation. But it is a moral, not a legal, obligation, and leaves our Congress absolutely free to put its own interpretation upon it in all cases that call for action. It is binding in conscience only, not in law.

Article 10 seems to me to constitute the very backbone of the whole covenant. Without it the league would be hardly more than an influential debating society.

It has several times been suggested, in public debate and in private conference, that interpretations of the sense in which the United States accepts the engagements of the covenant should be embodied in the instrument of ratification. There can be no reasonable objection to such interpretations accompanyng the act of ratification provided they do not form a part of the formal ratification itself. Most of the interpretations which have been suggested to me embody what seems to me the plain meaning of the instrument itself. But if such interpretations should constitute a part of the formal resolution of ratification, long delays would be the inevitable consequence, inasmuch as all the many governments concerned would have to accept, in effect, the language of the Senate as the language of the treaty before ratification would be complete. The assent of the German Assembly at Weimar would have to be obtained, among the rest, and I must frankly say that I could only with the greatest reluctance approach that assembly for permission to read the treaty as we understand it and as those who framed it quite certainly understood it. If the United States were to qualify the document in any way, moreover, I am confident from what I know of the many conferences and debates which accompany the formulation of the treaty that our example would immediately be followed in many quarters, in some instances with very serious reservations, and that the meaning and operative force of the treaty would presently be clouded from one end of its clauses to the other.

Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I have been entirely unreserved and plain-spoken in speaking of the great matters we all have so much at heart. If excuse is needed, I trust that the critical situation of affairs may serve as my justification. The issues that manifestly hang upon the conclusions of the Senate with regard to peace and upon the time of its action are so grave and so clearly insusceptible of being thrust on one side or postponed that I have felt it necessary in the public interest to make this urgent plea, and to make it as simply and as unreservedly as possible.

I thought that the simplest way, Mr. Chairman, to cover the points that I knew to be points of interest?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned—and I think I represent perhaps the majority of the committee in that respect—we have no thought of entering upon argument as to interpretations or points of that character; but the committee is very desirous of getting information on certain points which seem not clear and on which they thought information would be of value to them in the consideration of the treaty which they, I think I may say for myself and others, desire to hasten in every possible way.

Your reference to the necessity of action leads me to ask one question. If we have to restore peace to the world it is necessary, I assume, that there should be treaties with Austria, Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria. Those treaties are all more or less connected with the treaty with Germany. The question I should like to ask is, what the prospect is of our receiving those treaties for action?

The PRESIDENT. I think it is very good, sir, and, so far as I can judge from the contents of the dispatches from my colleagues on the other side of the water, the chief delay is due to the uncertainty as to what is going to happen to this treaty. This treaty is the model for the others. I saw enough of the others before I left Paris to know that they are being framed upon the same set of principles and that the treaty with Germany is the model. I think that is the chief element of delay, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not regarded as essential to the consideration of this treaty?

The PRESIDENT. They are not regarded as such; no, sir; they follow this treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know about the other treaties, but the treaty with Poland, for example, has been completed?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, and signed; but it is dependent on this treaty. My thought was to submit it upon the action on this treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. I should like, if I may, to ask a question in regard to the plans submitted to the commission on the league of nations, if that is the right phrase.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were kind enough to send us the draft of the American plan. When we were here in February, if I understood you rightly—I may be incorrect but I understood you to say that there were other drafts or plans submitted by Great Britain, by France, and by Italy. Would it be possible for us to see those other tentative plans?

The PRESIDENT. I would have sent them to the committee with pleasure, Senator, if I had found that I had them. I took it for granted that I had them, but the papers that remain in my hands remain there in a haphazard way. I can tell you the character of the other drafts. The British draft was the only one, as I remember, that was in the form of a definite constitution of a league. The French and Italian drafts were in the form of a series of propositions laying down general rules and assuming that the commission, or whatever body made the final formulation, would build upon those principles if they were adopted. They were principles quite consistent with the final action.

I remember saying to the committee when I was here in March—I have forgotten the expression I used—something to the effect that the British draft had constituted the basis. I thought afterwards that that was misleading, and I am very glad to tell the committee just what I meant.

Some months before the conference assembled, a plan for the league of nations had been drawn up by a British committee, at the head of which was Mr. Phillimore—I believe that Mr. Phillimore who was known as an authority on international law. A copy of that document was sent to me, and I built upon that a redraft. I will not now say whether I thought it was better or not an improvement; but I built on that a draft which was quite different, inasmuch as it put definiteness where there had been what seemed indefiniteness in the Phillimore suggestion. Then, between that time and the time of the formation of the commission on the league of nations, I had the advantage of seeing a paper by Gen. Smuts, of South Africa, who seemed to me to have done some very clear thinking, particularly with regard to what was to be done with the pieces of the dismembered empires. After I got to Paris, therefore, I rewrote the document to which I have alluded, and you may have noticed that it consists of a series of articles and then supplementary agreements. It was in the supplementary agreements that I embodied the additional ideas that had come to me not only from Gen. Smuts' paper but from other discussions. That is the full story of how the plan which I sent to the committee was built up.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is obvious that the Gen. Smuts plan has been used. That appears on the face of the document.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there was a previous draft in addition to the one you have sent to us? You spoke of a redraft. The original draft was not submitted to the committee?

The PRESIDENT. No; that was privately, my own.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it before our commission?

The PRESIDENT. No; it was not before our commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The one that was sent to us was a redraft of that?

The PRESIDENT. Yes. I was reading some of the discussion before the committee, and some one, I think Senator Borah, if I remember correctly, quoted an early version of article 10.

Senator BORAH. That was Senator Johnson.

Senator JOHNSON of California. I took it from the Independent.

The PRESIDENT. I do not know how that was obtained, but that was part of the draft which preceded the draft which I sent to you.

Senator JOHNSON of California. It was first published by Mr. Hamilton Holt in the Independent; it was again subsequently published in the New Republic, and from one of those publications I read it when examining, I think, the Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT. I read it with the greatest interest, because I had forgotten it, to tell the truth, but I recognized it as soon as I read it.

Senator JOHNSON of California. It was the original plan?

The PRESIDENT. It was the original form of article 10; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I was about to ask in regard to article 10, as the essence of it appears in article 2 of the draft which you sent, whether that was in the British plan—the Smuts plan—or the other plans?

Of course if there are no drafts of these other plans, we can not get them.

The PRESIDENT. I am very sorry, Senator. I thought I had them, but I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, testified before us the other day that he had prepared a set of resolutions covering the points in the league, which was submitted to the American commission. You saw that draft?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. No specific action was taken upon it?

The PRESIDENT. Not in a formal way.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. President, I have no prepared set of questions, but there are one or two that I wish to ask, and will go to an entirely different subject in my next question. I desire to ask purely for information. Is it intended that the United States shall receive any part of the reparation fund which is in the hands of the reparation commission?

The PRESIDENT. I left that question open, Senator, because I did not feel that I had any final right to decide it. Upon the basis that was set up in the reparation clauses the portion that the United States would receive would be very small at best, and my own judgment was frequently expressed, not as a decision but as a judgment, that we should claim nothing under those general clauses. I did that because I coveted the moral advantage that that would give us in the counsels of the world.

Senator MCCUMBER. Did that mean we would claim nothing for the sinking of the *Lusitania?*

The PRESIDENT. Oh, no. That did not cover questions of that sort at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood that prewar claims were not covered by that reparation clause.

The PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked that question because I desired to know whether under the reparation commission there was anything expected to come to us.

The PRESIDENT. As I say, that remains to be decided.

The CHAIRMAN. By the commission?

The PRESIDENT. By the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Going now onto another question, as I understand the treaty the overseas possessions of Germany are all made over to the five principal allied and associated powers, who apparently, as far as the treaty goes, have power to make disposition of them, I suppose by way of mandate or otherwise. Among those overseas possessions are the Ladrone Islands, except Guam, the Carolines, and, I think, the Marshall Islands. Has there been any recommendation made by our naval authorities in regard to the importance of our having one island there, not for territorial purposes, but for naval purposes?

The PRESIDENT. There was a paper on that subject, Senator, which has been published. I only partially remember it. It was a paper laying out the general necessities of our naval policy in the Pacific, and the necessity of having some base for communication upon those islands was mentioned, just in what form I do not remember. But let me say this, there is a little island which I must admit I had not heard of before.

Senator WILLIAMS. The island of Yap?

The PRESIDENT. Yap. It is one of the bases and centers of cable and radio communication on the Pacific, and I made the point that the disposition, or rather the control of that island should be reserved for the general conference which is to be held in regard to the ownership and operation of the cables. That subject is mentioned and disposed of in this treaty and that general cable conference is to be held.

The CHAIRMAN. I had understood, or I had heard the report, that our General Board of the Navy Department and our Chief of Operations, had recommended that we should have a footing there, primarily in order to secure cable communications.

The PRESIDENT. I think you are right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That we were likely to be cut off from cable communication—that is, that the cables were likely to pass entirely into other hands—unless we had some station there, and it seemed to me a matter of such importance that I asked the question.

I wish to ask this further question: There was a secret treaty between England and Japan in regard to Shantung; and in the correspondence with the British ambassador at Tokyo, when announcing the acquiescence of Great Britain in Japan's having the German rights in Shantung, the British ambassador added:

"It is, of course, understood that we are to have the islands south of the Equator and Japan to have the islands north of the Equator."

If it should seem necessary for the safety of communication for this country that we should have a cable station there, would that secret treaty interfere with it?

The PRESIDENT. I think not, sir, in view of the stipulation that I made with regard to the question of construction by this cable convention. That note of the British ambassador was a part of the diplomatic correspondence covering that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. That was what I understood.

Senator MOSES. Was the stipulation that that should be reserved for the consideration of the cable conference a formally signed protocol?

The PRESIDENT. No; it was not a formally signed protocol, but we had a prolonged and interesting discussion on the subject, and nobody has any doubt as to what was agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked the question because it seemed to me a matter of great importance.

The PRESIDENT. As a matter of self-protection, it seemed on the face of it that the treaty would give the five principal allied and associated powers the authority to make such disposition as they saw fit of those islands, but I did not know whether the secret treaty would thwart that purpose. I have no further questions to ask, Mr. President.

Senator BORAH. Mr. President, if no one else desires to ask a question, I want, so far as I am individually concerned, to get a little clearer information with reference to the withdrawal clause in the league covenant. Who passes upon the question of the fullfilment of our international obligations, upon the question whether a nation has fulfilled its international obligations?

The PRESIDENT. Nobody.

Senator BORAH. Does the council have anything to say about it?

The PRESIDENT. Nothing whatever.

Senator BORAH. Then if a country should give notice of withdrawal it would be the sole judge of whether or not it had fulfilled its international obligations—its covenants—to the league?

The PRESIDENT. That is as I understand it. The only restraining influence would be the public opinion of the world.

Senator BORAH. Precisely; but if the United States should conceive that it had fulfilled its obligations, that question could not be referred to the council in any way, or the council could not be called into action.

The PRESIDENT. No.

Senator BORAH. Then, as I understand, when the notice is given, the right to withdraw is unconditional?

The PRESIDENT. Well, when the notice is given it is conditional on the faith of the conscience of the withdrawing nation at the close of the two-year period.

Senator BORAH. Precisely; but it is unconditional so far as the legal right or the moral right is concerned.

The PRESIDENT. That is my interpretation.

Senator BORAH. There is no moral obligation on the part of the United States to observe any suggestion made by the council?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, no.

Senator BORAH. With reference to withdrawing?

The PRESIDENT. There might be a moral obligation if that suggestion had weight, Senator, but there is no other obligation.

Senator BORAH. Any moral obligation which the United States would feel, would be one arising from its own sense of obligation?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, certainly.

Senator BORAH. And not by reason of any suggestion by the council?

The PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Senator BORAH. Then the idea which has prevailed in some quarters that the council would pass upon such obligation is an erroneous one, from your standpoint?

The PRESIDENT. Yes; entirely.

Senator BORAH. And as I understand, of course, you are expressing the view which was entertained by the commission which drew the league?

The PRESIDENT. I am confident that that was the view. That view was not formulated, you understand, but I am confident that that was the view.

Senator MCCUMBER. May I ask a question right here? Would there by any objection, then, to a reservation declaring that to be the understanding of the force of this section?

The PRESIDENT. Senator, as I indicated at the opening of our conference, this is my judgment about that: Only we can interpret a moral obligation. The legal obligation can be enforced by such machinery as there is to enforce it. We are therefore at liberty to interpret the sense in which we undertake a moral obligation. What I feel very earnestly is that it would be a mistake to embody that interpretation in the resolution of ratification, because then it would be necessary for other governments to act upon it.

Senator MCCUMBER. If they all recognized at the time that this was the understanding and the construction that should be given to that portion of the treaty, would it be necessary for them to act on it again?

The PRESIDENT. I think it would, Senator.

Senator MCCUMBER. Could they not accept it merely by acquiescence?

The PRESIDENT. My experience as a lawyer was not very long; but that experience would teach me that the language of a contract is always part of the debatable matter, and I can testify that in our discussions in the commission on the league of nations we did not discuss ideas half as much as we discussed phraseologies.

Senator McCumber. But suppose, Mr. President, we should make a declaration of that kind, which would be in entire accord with your view of the understanding of all the nations, and without further comment or action the nations should proceed to appoint their commissions, and to act under this treaty, would not that be a clear acquiescence in our construction?

The President. Oh, it might be, Senator, but we would not know for a good many months whether they were going to act in that sense or not. There would have to be either explicit acquiescent, or the elapsing of a long enough time for us to know whether they were implicitly acquiescing or not.

Senator McCumber. I should suppose that when the treaty was signed, under present world conditions, all nations would proceed to act immediately under it.

The President. In some matters; yes.

Senator Harding. Mr. President, assuming that your construction of the withdrawal clause is the understanding of the formulating commission, why is the language making the proviso for the fulfillment of covenants put into the article?

The President. Merely as an argument to the conscience of the nations. In other words, it is a notice served on them that their colleagues will expect that at the time they withdraw they will have fulfilled their obligations.

Senator Harding. The language hardly seems to make that implication, because it expressly says, "Provided it has fulfilled its obligations."

The President. Yes.

Senator Harding. If it were a matter for the nation itself to judge, that is rather a far-fetched provision, is it not?

The President. Well, you are illustrating my recent remark, Senator, that the phraseology is your difficulty, not the idea. The idea is undoubtedly what I have expressed.

Senator Pittman. Mr. President, Senator McCumber has drawn out that it is your impression that the allied and associated powers have the same opinion of the construction of these so-called indefinite articles that you have. Is that construction also known and held by Germany?

The President. I have no means of knowing.

Senator Pittman. Germany, then, has not expressed herself to the commission with regard to these mooted questions?

The President. No; we have no expression from Germany about the league, except the expression of her very strong desire to be admitted to it.

Senator Pittman. And is it your opinion that if the language of the treaty were changed in the resolution of ratification, the consent of Germany to the change would also be essential?

The President. Oh, undoubtedly.

The Chairman. Mr. President, in that connection—I did not mean to ask another question—I take it there is no question whatever, under international law and practice, that an amendment to the text of a treaty must be submitted to every signatory, and must receive either their assent or their dissent. I had supposed it had been the general diplomatic practice with regard to reservations—which apply only to the reserving power, and not to all the signatories, of course—that with regard to reservations it had been the general practice that silence was regarded as acceptance and acquiescence; that there was that distinction between a textual amendment, which changed the treaty for every signatory, and a reservation, which changed it only for the reserving power. In that I may be mistaken, however.

The President. There is some difference of opinion among the authorities, I am informed. I have not had time to look them up myself about that; but it is clear to me that in a treaty which involves so many signatories, a series of reservations—which would ensue, undoubtedly—would very much obscure our confident opinion as to how the treaty was going to work.

Senator Williams. Mr. President, suppose for example that we adopted a reservation, as the Senator from Massachusetts calls it, and that Germany did nothing about it at all, and afterwards contended that so far as that was concerned it was new matter, to which she was never a party: Could her position be justifiably disputed?

The President. No.

Senator Borah. Mr. President, with reference to article 10—you will observe that I am more interested in the league than any other feature of this discussion—in listening to the reading of your statement I got the impression that your view was that the first obligation of article 10, to wit—

"The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league"—

was simply a moral obligation.

The President. Yes, sir; inasmuch as there is no sanction in the treaty.

Senator Borah. But that would be a legal obligation so far as the United States was concerned if it should enter into it; would it not?

The President. I would not interpret it in that way, Senator, because there is involved the element of judgment as to whether the territorial integrity or existing political independence is invaded or impaired. In other words, it is an attitude of comradeship and protection among the members of the league, which in its very nature is moral and not legal.

Senator Borah. If, however, the actual fact of invasion were beyond dispute, then the legal obligation, it seems to me, would immediately arise. I am simply throwing this out in order to get a full expression of views. The legal obligation would immediately arise if the fact of actual invasion were undisputed?

The President. The legal obligation to apply the automatic punishments of the covenant, undoubtedly; but not the legal obligation to go to arms and actually to make war. Not the legal obligation. There might be a very strong moral obligation.

Senator McCumber. Just so that I may understand definitely what your view is on that subject, Mr. President, do I understand you to mean that while we have two different remedies, and possibly others, we would be the sole judge of the remedy we would apply, but the obligation would still rest upon us to apply some remedy to bring about the result?

The President. Yes. I can not quite accept the full wording that you used, sir. We would have complete freedom of choice as to the application of force.

Senator McCumber. Would we not have the same freedom of choice as to whether we would apply a commercial boycott? Are they not both under the same language, so that we would be bound by them in the same way?

The President. Only in regard to certain articles. The breach of certain articles of the covenant does bring on what I have designated as an automatic boycott, and in that we would have no choice.

Senator Knox. Mr. President, allow me to ask this question: Suppose that it is perfectly obvious and accepted that there is an external aggression against some power, and suppose it is perfectly obvious and accepted that it can not be repelled except by force of arms, would we be under any legal obligation to participate?

The President. No. sir; but we would be under an absolutely compelling moral obligation.

Senator Knox. But no legal obligation?

The President. Not as I contemplate it.

Senator Williams. Mr. President, each nation, if I understand it, is, of course, left to judge the applicability of the principles stated to the facts in the case, whether there is or is not external aggression?

The President. Yes.

Senator Williams. And if any country should conclude that there was not external aggression, but that France or some other country had started the trouble indirectly, we would have the same right, if I understand it, that Italy had to declare that her alliance with Germany and Austria was purely defensive, and that she did not see anything defensive in it; so when you come to judgment of the facts, outside of the international law involved, each nation must determine, if I understand, whether or not there has been external aggression?

The President. I think you are right, sir. Senator [addressing Senator Knox], you were about to ask something?

Senator Knox. I only wanted to tell you that I asked that question because I was a little confused by the language of your message transmitting the proposed Franco-American treaty to the Senate, in which you said, in substance, and, I think, practically in these terms, that this is only binding us to do immediately what we otherwise would have been bound to do under the league of nations?

The President. Yes.

Senator Knox. Perhaps I am mistaken with respect to its having been in that message. I am sure I am mistaken; it was not in that message; it was in the message that Mr. Tumulty gave out——

The Chairman. May 10.

Senator Knox. Yes.

The President. Yes.

Senator Knox. That it was merely binding us to do immediately, without waiting for any other power, that which we would otherwise have been bound to do under the terms of the league of nations.

The President. I did not use the word "bound," but "morally bound." Let me say that you are repeating what I said to the other representatives. I said, "Of course, it is understood we would have to be convinced that it was an unprovoked movement of aggression," and they at once acquiesced in that.

Senator McCumber. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who sincerely believe that under the construction of article 10, taken in connection with other clauses and other articles in the treaty, the council can suggest what we should do, and of course, while they admit the council can only advise and suggest, that it is nevertheless our moral duty to immediately obey the council, without exercising our own judgment as to whether we shall go to war or otherwise. Now, the public, the American people, a great proportion of them, have that same conviction, which is contrary to your view. Do you not think, therefore, that it would be well to have a reservation inserted in our resolution that shall so construe that section as to make it clear, not only to the American people but to the world, that Congress may use its own judgment as to what it will do, and that its failure to follow the judgment of the council will not be considered a breach of the agreement?

The President. We differ, Senator, only as to the form of action. I think it would be a very serious practical mistake to put it in the resolution of ratification; but I do hope that we are at liberty, contemporaneously with our acceptance of the treaty, to interpret our moral obligation under that article.

Senator Pittman. Mr. President, I understand that, under the former method, in your opinion, it would have to go back to Germany and the other countries; while under the latter method it would not be required to go back for ratification.

The President. Yes, sir; that is my judgment.

Senator Knox. Mr. President, is it not true that such matters are ordinarily covered by a mere exchange of notes between powers, stating that they understand in this or that sense, or do not so understand?

The President. Yes, sir; ordinarily.

Senator Knox. That would be a matter that would require very little time to consummate it, if these constructions have already been placed upon it in their conversations with you.

The President. But an exchange of notes is quite a different matter from having it embodied in the resolution of ratification.

Senator Knox. If we embody in our resolution of ratification a statement that we understand section 10 or section 16 or section something else in a particular sense, and this Government, through its foreign department, transmits the proposed form of ratification to the chancellors of the other nations that are concerned in this treaty, and if those interpretations are the same as you have agreed upon with them in your conversations, I do not see how we would need anything more than a mere reply to that effect.

The President. It would need confirmation.

Senator Knox. Yes; it would need confirmation in that sense.

The President. My judgment is that the embodying of that in the terms of the resolution of ratification would be acquiescence not only in the interpretation but in the very phraseology of the interpretation, because it would form a part of the contract.

Senator Knox. It might with us, because we have so much machinery for dealing with treaties, but in other countries where it is much more simple I should think it would not be.

The President. It is simple legally, Senator; but, for example, this treaty has been submitted to legislatures to which the Government was not, by law, obliged to submit it, and it is everywhere being treated as a legislative matter—I mean, so far as the ratification is concerned.

Senator Knox. You mean in countries where, under their constitutions, there are provisions that treaties ordinarily are not submitted to the legislative branch of the Government, this treaty is being so submitted?

The President. So I understand.

Senator Knox. Where there are two branches of the legislative department, an upper and a lower branch, do you know whether it is being submitted to both?

The President. I think not, sir. I am not certain about that; but my memory is it is not.

Senator Fall. Mr. President, the idea has struck me and I have entertained the view, since reading the treaty and the league, that Germany having signed the treaty but not being yet a member of the league, any reservations which we might make here would be met by Germany either joining the league or refusing to join the league. It would not be submitted to her at all now, because she is not a member of the league? You catch the point?

The President. Yes. I differ with you there, Senator. One of the reasons for putting the league in the treaty was that Germany was not going to be admitted to the league immediately, and we felt that it was very necessary that we should get her acknowledgment—acceptance—of the league as an international authority, partly because we were excluding her, so that she would thereafter have no ground for questioning such authority as the league might exercise under its covenant.

Senator Fall. Precisely.

The President. Therefore, I think it would be necessary for her to acquiesce in a league the powers of which were differently construed.

Senator Fall. Precisely; but her acquiescence would be by her accepting the invitation, when extended, either to join the league or not to join the league. In other words, upon ratification by three of the powers, a status of peace is established, and as to those three powers and Germany all the rules and regulations contained in the treaty of peace become operative. As to the other nations which have not ratified, the status of peace exists; that is, war has terminated. Now, that being the case, and Germany being out of the league—not having been invited to join the league—if in ratifying the treaty we ratify it with certain explanations or reservations, even in the ratifying resolution, when the time comes and Germany is invited to become a member of the league, or when she applies, under the admission clause of the league, for membership therein, if she enters she of course accepts our reservations. If she makes a qualified application, then it is for the league itself to consider whether she will be admitted?

The President. I do not follow your reasoning in the matter, Senator, because this is not merely a question of either membership or nonmembership. The covenant is a part of the treaty, it is a part of the treaty which she has signed, and we are not at liberty to change any part of that treaty without the acquiescence of the other contracting party.

Senator Fall. Well, Mr. President, of course it is not my purpose to enter into an argument, but we are here for information. There are provisions for the amendment of the articles. Germany is out of the league. Any amendment proposed by the other members of the league prior to her coming into the league would not be submitted to her, would it, she not being a member?

The President. I will admit that that point had not occurred to me. No, she would not.

Senator Fall. Then so far as we are concerned we could make a recommendation in the nature of an amendment.

Senator Pittman. She has already agreed by this treaty that she has signed that the members may amend it.

The President. Yes.

Senator Fall. Precisely, and we could come in with an amendment.

Senator Hitchcock. Did I undersatnd your first reply to Senator Fall to be that Germany under this treaty already had a relationship to the league by reason of its international character, and its participation in a number of questions that Germany was interested in?

The President. Yes.

Senator Hitchcock. So that it has a relationship to the league of nations even before the time that it may apply for membership.

The President. Yes.

Senator McCumber. Mr. President, you answered one question that I think possibly may need a little elucidation. If I remember rightly, in reference to reparation your statement was that the commission would have to decide whether the United States should claim her proportion of the reparation.

The President. That the commission would have to do it? No; we decide whether we claim it or not.

Senator McCumber. That is what I want to make clear. I think the question was asked if the commission was to decide that, and I thought your answer said yes. That is the reason I asked the question.

The President. The claim would have to come from us, of course.

Senator McCumber. It would have to be through an act of Congress, would it not?

The President. I would have to be instructed about that, Senator. I do not know.

Senator McCumber. Whatever right the United States would receive under the treaty for reparation or indemnity is one that runs to the United States, and therefore to divest ourselves of that right would require an act of Congress.

The President. To divest ourselves of it? I suppose so.

Senator Knox. In the question of the Japanese indemnity, that was done by a joint resolution.

Senator McCumber. I thought the President said it would have to be decided by the constituted authority.

Senator Knox. I did not understand that he said that.

Senator Swanson. I understand that the reparation is to be decided upon a representation made by the associated powers. It would seem that the President under that agreement with France, Great Britain, and other nations would have to submit it to the Senate for ratification, and the agreement would have to be reported.

Senator McCumber. In each case it would have the force of law.

Senator Swanson. If the Senate wanted to ratify it, it would take an act of Congress.

Senator Williams. This question of reparation does not in any way affect our rights to prewar indemnities?

The President. That is expressly stated.

Senator Williams. That is expressly stated. Now, then, one other question. Germany has signed this treaty with the covenant of the league in it, and she is subject to be dealt with as a nonmember under the treaty, and has very much fewer privileges than a member?

The President. Yes.

Senator New. Mr. President, may I ask a question there? What effort was made by the delegates there to prevent the proceedings of the reparations committee being required to be secret?

The President. I beg your pardon, Senator.

Senator New. What effort, if any, was made by the American delegates to prevent the proceedings of the reparation commission from being required to be secret, and did the American delegates protest that America be omitted from this commission on account of that thing?

The President. Nothing was said about it, that I remember.

Senator Borah. Mr. President, coming back for a moment to the subject from which we were diverted a moment ago, and coupling with article 10 article 11, in order that we may have the construction of the committee which framed the league as to both of those articles, as I understand it from your statement, the committee's view was that the obligations under articles 10 and 11, whatever they are, are moral obligations.

The President. Remind me of the eleventh. I do not remember that by number.

Senator Borah (reading):

"Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations."

What I am particularly anxious to know is whether or not the construction which was placed upon these two articles by the committee which framed the league was that it was a binding obligation from a legal standpoint, or merely a moral obligation.

The President. Senator, I tried to answer with regard to article 10.

Senator Borah. Yes; exactly.

The President. I would apply it equally with regard to article 11, though I ought to hasten to say that we did not formulate these interpretations. I can only speak from my confident impression, from the debates that accompanied the formulation of the covenant.

Senator Borah. Yes; I understand; and your construction of article 11 is the same as that of article 10?

The President. Yes.

Senator Borah. As to the question of legal obligation. That is all I desire to ask at present.

Senator Harding. Right there, Mr. President, if there is nothing more than a moral obligation on the part of any member of the league, what avail articles 10 and 11?

The President. Why, Senator, it is surprising that that question should be asked. If we undertake an obligation we are bound in the most solemn way to carry it out.

Senator Harding. If you believe there is nothing more to this than a moral obligation, any nation will assume a moral obligation on its own account. Is it a moral obligation? The point I am trying to get at is, Suppose something arises affecting the peace of the world, and the council takes steps as provided here to conserve or preserve, and announces its decision, and every nation in the league takes advantage of the construction that you place upon these articles and says, "Well, this is only a moral obligation, and we assume that the nation involved does not deserve our participation or protection," and the whole thing amounts to nothing but an expression of the league council.

The President. There is a national good conscience in such a matter. I should think that was one of the most serious things that could possibly happen. When I speak of a legal obligation, I mean one that specifically binds you to do a particular thing under certain sanctions. That is a legal obligation. Now a moral obligation is of course superior to a legal obligation, and, if I may say so, has a greater binding force; only there always remains in the moral obligation the right to exercise one's judgment as to whether it is indeed incumbent upon one in those circumstances to do that thing. In every moral obligation there is an element of judgment. In a legal obligation there is no element of judgment.

Senator Johnson of California. But, Mr. President, when a moral obligation is undoubted it will impel action more readily than a legal obligation.

The President. If it is undoubted, yes; but that involves the circumstances of the particular case, Senator.

Senator Johnson of California. Yes; necessarily.

Senator Harding. In answering Senator Knox a moment ago you spoke of a compelling moral obligation. Would you think that any less binding than a specific legal obligation?

The President. Not less binding, but operative in a different way because of the element of judgment.

Senator Harding. But not less likely to involve us in armed participation?

The President. In trifling matters, very much less likely.

Senator Harding. To clear my slow mind, let me take a specific case. Suppose the allotted territory which comes under the control of Italy should in some way be assailed from the Balkan States and the council of the league should immediately look upon that as a threat of war involving other nations and should say that the nations of the league should immediately contribute an armed force to stop that war or to bring the attacking nation to terms, would we be a perfidious people, if I may use that term, or would we violate our obligations, if we failed to participate in the defense of Italy?

The President. We would be our own judges as to whether we were obliged in those circumstances to act in that way or not.

Senator Hitchcock. In such a case the council would only act unanimously, and our representative on the council of course would have to concur in any advice given.

The President. Certainly; we would always in such case advise ourselves.

Senator Williams. But if in such case, Mr. President, we concluded that the case provided for and prescribed had arisen and that the extraneous attack existed and that it fell within the terms of the treaty, then we would be untrue if we did not keep our word?

The President. Certainly.

Senator Borah. In other words, then, that transfers the power to decide whether we should act from the Congress of the United States to one individual who sits on the council.

Senator Williams. No, it does not; it merely provides that when the council acts in accordance with the prescribed terms and we see that it has acted, then Congress will, as a matter of faith keeping, act itself; and, if Congress does not, Congress will do a dishonorable thing.

Senator Borah. Precisely so; so that the matter gets back to the point where one individual has bound Congress.

Senator Hitchcock. I hope my question to the President will not be interpreted in that way. My question to the President was whether the matter would even come before this country as the advice of the council until the American representative had concurred with the other eight members of the council. After he had concurred it would then be up to Congress to decide.

The President. You are quite right, Senator. And let me suggest that I find nothing was more clearly in the consciousness of the men who were discussing these very important matters than that most of the nations concerned had popular governments. They were all the time aware of the fact that it would depend upon the approving or disapproving state of opinion of their countries how their representatives in the council would vote in matters of this sort; and it is inconceivable to me that, unless the opinion of the United States, the moral and practical judgment of the people of the United States, approved, the representative of the United States on the council should vote any such advice as would lead us into war.

Senator Borah. Mr. President, does the special alliance treaty with France which has been submitted to us rest upon any other basis as to legal and moral obligation than that of article 10 and article 11 which you have just described?

The President. No, sir.

Senator Borah. That is also, as you understand it, simply our moral obligations which we enter into with France?

The President. Yes.

Senator Williams. All international obligations are moral ones.

Senator Pittman. There is one thing I do not understand about Senator Borah's question. He has stated that he gathers from what you said that it all rests with our representative on the council. Even if our representative on the council advises as a member of the council, and the council is unanimous, is it not then still up to Congress either to accept or reject that advice?

The President. Oh, yes; but I understood the Senator to mean that it would be dependent on our representative.

Senator Johnson of California. May I take the example that was just suggested concerning the Balkan States and a possible attack upon the new territories of Italy. Assuming that that is a case of external aggression by the Balkan States concerning the new territory that Italy has acquired by the peace treaty, upon us rests a compelling moral obligation to do our part in preventing that, does there not?

The President. Yes.

Senator Johnson of California. And that compelling moral obligation would require us to use such means as would seem appropriate, either economic or force? Is not that correct?

The President. Deemed appropriate by whom? That is really the point.

Senator Johnson of California. Of course, deemed appropriate for the purpose of preventing and frustrating the aggression.

The President. Deemed by us appropriate?

Senator Johnson of California. I assume of necessity it would have to be deemed by us to bind us as a compelling moral obligation to prevent the aggression in the case named.

The President. Yes.

Senator McCumber. Mr. President, I think, due to my own fault, I do not fully comprehend your distinction between a moral and a legal obligation in a treaty. If we enter into a treaty with France to defend her against aggression from Germany for any length of time, that is a legal obligation, is it not?

The President. Legal in the sense that a treaty is of binding force; yes.

Senator McCumber. Yes; that is what I meant. It is as legal as any treaty could be made legal, and there is also a moral obligation to keep that treaty, is there not?

The President. Yes, sir. I happened to hear Senator Knox say what I am glad to adopt. It is a legal obligation with a moral sanction.

Senator Borah. That is true generally, is it not?

The President. Yes, Senator; but I have already defined in what special sense I use the word "legal."

Senator McCumber. To my mind those two articles are legal obligations to be carried out by the moral conscience of the American people if the conditions justify it.

The President. You see we are speaking of two different fields, and therefore the language does not fit. In international law the word "legal" does not mean the same as in national law, and the word hardly applies.

Senator Borah. I wish to ask some questions in regard to the secret treaties. I do not feel as free about those matters as I do about the league, because there are certain things that I recognize may not be entirely open for public consideration; but, nevertheless, in so far as we can, I should like to know when the first knowledge came to this Government with reference to the secret treaties between Japan, Great Britain, Italy, and France concerning the German possessions in Shantung.

The President. I thought that Secretary Lansing had looked that up and told you. I can only reply from my own knowledge, and my own knowledge came after I reached Paris.

Senator Borah. We did get a reply from Mr. Lansing to the same effect so far as he was concerned. When did the secret treaties between Great Britain, France, and the other nations of Europe with reference to certain adjustments in Europe first come to your knowledge? Was that after you had reached Paris also?

The President. Yes; the whole series of understandings were disclosed to me for the first time then.

Senator Borah. Then we had no knowledge of these secret treaties, so far as our Government was concerned, until you reached Paris?

The President. Not unless there was information at the State Department of which I knew nothing.

Senator Borah. Do you know when the secret treaties between Japan, Great Britain, and other countries were first made made known to China?

The President. No, sir; I do not. I remember a meeting of what was popularly called the council of ten, after our reaching Paris, in which it was first suggested that all these understandings should be laid upon the table of the conference. That was some time after we reached there, and I do not know whether that was China's first knowledge of these matters or not.

Senator BORAH. Would it be proper for me to ask if Great Britain and France insisted upon maintaining these secret treaties at the peace conference as they were made?

The PRESIDENT. I think it is proper for me to answer that question, sir. I will put it in this way: They felt they could not recede from them, that is to say, that they were bound by them, but when they involved general interests such as they realized were involved, they were quite willing, and indeed I think desirous, that they should be reconsidered with the consent of the other parties. I mean with the consent so far as they were concerned, of the other parties.

Senator MOSES. Were all those treaties then produced, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, yes.

Senator MOSES. Did that include the secret arrangement with reference to Avlona?

The PRESIDENT. I do not recall that agreement, Senator. You mean with regard to Italy having Avlona?

Senator MOSES. Yes.

The PRESIDENT. If it did, I did not see it. I heard of it, but I can not say confidently that the terms were laid before us.

Senator MOSES. I recall in some statements you made in connection with Fiume that you referred to Italy receiving Avlona under some agreement previously arrived at, and in that statement you held that to be part compensation at least for any loss she might sustain in not having Fiume.

The PRESIDENT. I was referring to what I understood to be the agreement. I am simply now answering your question that I did not see that agreement in written terms.

Senator MOSES. Then, they were not produced in textual form?

The PRESIDENT. I do not know; they may have been and I may not have picked them up in the great mass of papers before me.

Senator MOSES. The purpose of my inquiry was to ascertain whether there was laid before the council of ten any textual agreements which transferred parts of the territory of one independent nation to another.

The PRESIDENT. Only those that have been spoken of.

Senator MOSES. That is to say, Shantung and Avlona?

The PRESIDENT. I say only those that we have had under general discussion. I can not enumerate them, but there are none that have not been produced so far as I know. That answers the question.

Senator MCCUMBER. The secret treaties to which you refer are those treaties which were made from time to time as the exigiencies of the war required during the period of the war?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator MCCUMBER. And not treaties that were made prior to the war?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to ask you a question in order to see if the facts are clear in my own mind. As I understand the situation—and I should like to have you correct me if I am wrong—France and Great Britain both have stated that they were bound by certain treaties with Japan and they were perfectly willing, with Japan's consent, to reconsider those treaties, but that they were themselves bound if the other party to the treaty did not consent to reconsider. Is that about it?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is what I thought. Bound in honor is the only way a nation is bound in international affairs.

Senator SWANSON. Can you tell us, or would it be proper to do so, of your understanding with Japan as to the return of Shantung? That is a question which has been very much discussed.

The PRESIDENT. I have published the wording of the understanding, Senator. I can not be confident that I quote it literally, but I know that I quote it in substance. It was that Japan should return to China in full sovereignty the old Province of Shantung so far as Germany had had any claims upon it, preserving to herself the right to establish a residential district at Tsingtao, which is the town of Kiaochow Bay; that with regard to the railways and mines she should retain only the rights of an economic concession there, with the right, however, to maintain a special body of police on the railway, the personnel of which should be Chinese under Japanese instructors nominated by the managers of the company and appointed by the Chinese Government. I think that is the whole of it.

Senator POMERENE. That is, that the instructors should be confirmed by the Chinese Government?

The PRESIDENT. No; not exactly that. The language, as I remember it, was that they should be nominated by the managers of the railway company, and appointed by the Chinese Government.

Senator BORAH. Was that understanding oral?

Senator WILLIAMS. This rather curious question presents itself to my mind: As I understand, Japan has retained sovereignty for the 99 years of the lease only at Kiaochow, and 5 kilometers, or some such distance, back from the bay.

The PRESIDENT. She has not retained sovereignty over anything.

Senator WILLIAMS. She has not?

The PRESIDENT. I mean, she has promised not to.

Senator WILLIAMS. During the period of the lease?

The PRESIDENT. No; she has promised not to retain sovereignty at all. Senator Borah asked whether this understanding was oral or otherwise. I do not like to describe the operation exactly if it is not perfectly discreet, but as a matter of fact this was technically oral, but literally written and formulated, and the formulation agreed upon.

Senator JOHNSON of California. When, Mr. President, is the return to be made?

The PRESIDENT. That was left undecided, Senator, but we were assured at the time that it would be as soon as possible.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Did not the Japanese decline to fix any date?

The PRESIDENT. They did at that time, yes; but I think it is fair to them to say not in the spirit of those who wished it be within their choice, but simply that they could not at that time say when it would be.

Senator JOHNSON of California. The economic privileges that they would retain would give them a fair mastery over the province, would they not, or at least the Chinese think so? Let me put it in that fashion, please.

The PRESIDENT. I believe they do, Senator. I do not feel qualified to judge. I should say that that was an exaggerated view.

Senator JOHNSON of California. But the Chinese feel that way about it, and have so expressed themselves?

The PRESIDENT. They have so expressed themselves.

Senator KNOX. Mr. President, the economic privileges that they originally acquired in Korea, and subsequently in inner and outer Mongolia, and in northern and southern Manchuria, have almost developed into a complete sovereignty over those countries, have they not?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, Senator; in the absence of a league of nations they have.

Senator KNOX. You think the league of nations would have prevented that, do you?

The PRESIDENT. I am confident it would.

Senator NEW. Mr. President, does not this indefinite promise of Japan's suggest the somewhat analogous case of England's occupation of Malta? She has occupied Malta for something like a century, I believe, under a very similar promise.

The PRESIDENT. Well, Senator, I hope you will pardon me if I do not answer that question.

Senator FALL. Mr. President, speaking of the duty of defense in reference to sovereignty, and aggression with reference to sovereignty, in construing these different articles of the league, I have been curious to know who will defend the mandate territories or colonies if there should be external aggression.

The PRESIDENT. Primarily, the mandatory power.

Senator FALL. The mandatory power would have that character of sovereignty over the possession which would compel it as a duty to defend the mandate province?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator FALL. Then a qualified sovereignty would in that instance at any rate, compel the mandatory of the league first to defend the colony?

The PRESIDENT. I should put it this way, Senator: We had in mind throughout the whole discussion of the mandate idea the analogy of trustees. The States taking those under mandates would be in the nature of trustees, and of course it is part of the trustee's duty to preserve intact the trust estate.

Senator FALL. But out of the funds of the trust estate?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, yes.

Senator FALL. Mr. President, I will not pursue that line at this time. I will say very frankly that I have prepared some questions which I wanted, for my own purposes, to put down in writing, and I had expected to ask them in sequence of you after the other Senators had concluded. It will, however, evidently take quite a long while if we pursue the line which we are now pursuing, and particularly if the Senators themselves argue their own interpretations of the different clauses in the treaty.

Senator MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to get as definite an understanding as I can, at least, of how these promises of Japan to return Shantung are evidenced to-day. In what form do they appear?

The PRESIDENT. They are evidenced in a procès-verbal of the so-called council of four—the name that we ourselves used was very much more pretentious; we called ourselves the council of the principal allied and associated powers—but the four who used to confer, or rather the five, because Japan was there of course at that time.

Senator MCCUMBER. The principal points were taken down in writing and read over and compared and preserved, were they?

The PRESIDENT. Not read over and compared, but preserved. The process each day was this, Senator: The matters discussed were summarized, and the conclusions reached were recorded in a procès-verbal, copies of which were distributed within 24 hours; and of course it was open to any one of the conferees to correct anything they might contain. Only in that sense were they corrected.

Senator MCCUMBER. Where are those records kept now?

The PRESIDENT. They are in Paris, sir.

Senator MCCUMBER. Is there any objection to their being produced for the committee?

The PRESIDENT. I think there is a very serious objection, Senator. The reason we constituted that very small conference was so that we could speak with the utmost absence of restraint, and I think it would be a mistake to make use of those discussions outside. I do not remember any blazing indiscretion of my own, but there may be some.

Senator MCCUMBER. In those conversations it was fully understood that Japan was to return Shantung as soon as possible?

The President. Yes, sir.

Senator McCumber. Was there anything stated as to what was meant by "as soon as possible"—that is, to place it within any definite period at all?

The President. No, sir; no. We relied on Japan's good faith in fulfilling that promise.

Senator McCumber. Was there anything outside? If I go too far in my questions you can signify it, Mr. President.

The President. How do you mean outside, Senator?

Senator McCumber. Was there anything said by Japan as to anything that she would want to do before she turned the territory over to China?

The President. No; nothing was mentioned.

Senator McCumber. Then "as soon as possible" would naturally mean, would it not, as soon as the treaty has been signed under which she accepts the transfer from Germany?

The President. Well, I should say that it would mean that the process should begin then. Of course there would be many practical considerations of which I know nothing that might prolong the process.

Senator McCumber. And all that Japan reserves is the same that other great nations have reserved—certain concessions?

The President. A residential concession and economic concessions; yes, sir.

Senator McCumber. The same as Great Britain and France and other countries have retained there?

The President. Yes; and I ought to say that the representatives of Japan showed every evidence of wishing to put the matter upon just the same basis that the dealings of other nations with China have rested upon for some time.

Senator McCumber. The whole purpose of my question, Mr. President, is to satisfy my mind, if I can, that Japan will in good faith carry out her agreement.

The President. I have every confidence that she will, sir.

Senator Pomerene. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to ask a question or two along that same line. If this treaty should fail of ratification, then would not the opportunity be open to Japan to treat the Shantung question just as she has treated the Manchurian situation?

The President. I think so; yes.

Senator Pomerene. So that if the treaty should fail of ratification, China, so far as Shantung is concerned, would be practically at the mercy of Japan; whereas if the treaty is ratified, then at least she will have the benefit of the moral assistance of all the other signatory powers to the treaty to aid in the protection of Chinese rights?

The President. Senator, I conceive one of the chief benefits of the whole arrangement that centers in the league of nations to be just what you have indicated—that it brings to bear the opinion of the world and the controlling action of the world on all relationships of that hazardous sort, particularly those relationships which involve the rights of the weaker nations. After all, the wars that are likely to come are most likely to come by aggression against the weaker nations. Without the league of nations they have no buttress or protection. With it, they have the united protection of the world; and inasmuch as it is the universal opinion that the great tragedy through which we have just passed never would have occurred if the Central Powers had dreamed that a number of nations would be combined against them, so I have the utmost confidence that this notice beforehand that the strong nations of the world will in every case be united will make war extremely unlikely.

Senator Moses. Mr. President, are these procès verbaux to be deposited anywhere as a matter of public record?

The President. That had not been decided, Senator. Of course, if they were deposited as a matter of public record, there would be certain very great disadvantages.

Senator Moses. Are they to be deposited with the secretariat of the league of nations?

The President. No, sir.

Senator Moses. Without some such depository, how otherwise would this engagement of Japan, as embodied in the procès verbal, be brought forward for enforcement?

The President. There would be as many copies of the procès verbal as there were members of the conference in existence much longer than the time within which we shall learn whether Japan will fulfill her obligations or not.

Senator Moses. You mean in the private papers of the personnel of the council of four?

The President. I would not call them private papers. I have a copy, Senator. I regard them as a public trust, not private papers, and I can assure you that they will not be destroyed.

Senator Moses. Suppose that each member of the council of four had passed out of office, out of any position of power, at a time when it became evident that Japan was not keeping the engagement as it was embodied in the procès-verbal on the day when this record was made, in what manner would you expect that engagement to be brought forward for enforcement?

The President. I should deem it my duty—I can not speak for the others—to leave those papers where they could be made accessible.

Senator Pomerene. Mr. President, I have another question or two on the Shantung proposition that I should like to ask, if I may.

Assuming for the sake of the argument that there were to be some undue delay on the part of Japan in turning back to China her rights in Shantung, and that China were to make complaint to the council provided for in the league of nations, have you any doubt but that it would be taken up promptly by all the members of that council for their consideration and determination?

The President. No, sir; I have not any doubt of it.

Senator Pomerene. Another question: On yesterday Dr. Millard was before the committee, and he made the statement that there were twenty regional understandings similar to the Monroe doctrine. I desire to say, however, that in answer to a question——

The President. Did he name any of them?

Senator Pomerene. I asked him some questions afterwards, and in explanation he qualified that statement by saying that these were written agreements somewhat akin to the Lansing-Ishii agreement, so-called, and as to these with relation to China a part of them were as between Japan and China, and a part as between Great Britain and China; and he instanced the secret agreement with Japan respecting Shantung. What I desired to ask was this: Did any information come to the commission indicating that there were any regional understandings similar to the Monroe doctrine?

The President. None, whatever. The only agreements that I can imagine he was referring to are contained in the exchanges of notes which occurred between the Japanese and Chinese Governments in 1915 and 1918 with regard to the method and conditions of the return of Shantung Province to China.

Senator Hitchcock. Mr. President, I think it should be said also that later on in his testimony, either in answer to a question by Senator Pomerene, or perhaps in response to a question by Senator Swanson, while the witness, Dr. Millard, stated that he deemed them regional understandings—those that he had in mind—he said very emphatically that they were totally unlike the Monroe doctrine, and would not come under that category.

The President. And in his sense every treaty that concerns territory anywhere affects a region, and is a regional understanding; but that is a very broad and vague meaning to attach to the word.

Senator Johnson of California. Mr. President, I am quite hesitant about asking certain questions which I wish to ask. I apologize in advance for asking them, and I trust you will stop me at once if they are questions which you deem inappropriate, or that ought not to be asked.

The President. Thank you.

Senator Johnson of California. First, we have pending now treaties of peace with Austria, with Hungary, with Bulgaria, and with the Ottoman Empire, all of which involve tremendous new territorial adjustments; and under those new territorial adjustments we will have our obligations, moral or otherwise, under the league of nations, of course. The new territorial adjustments about to be determined upon in these various treaties are really greater in extent, or quite as important, at least, as those that are provided for by the German treaty; are they not?

The President. I should say so; yes.

Senator Johnson of California. They will deal not only with the creation of the boundaries of new nations, but possibly with the subject of mandatories, too?

The President. Well, the treaties will not themselves deal with the mandatories. That is a matter that will be decided by the league.

Senator Johnson of California. Oh, yes.

The President. But the treaties will no doubt create certain territories which fall under the trusteeship which will lead to mandatories.

Senator Johnson of California. So that there is a very important—in fact, the most important—part of the territorial world settlement yet to be made?

The President. Well, in extent, yes, Senator; so far as the amount of territory covered is concerned, yes.

Senator Johnson of California. Not only in extent, but in their character, and in the numbers of peoples involved, too, Mr. President. Is not that accurate?

The President. Well, you may be right, Senator; I do not know.

Senator Johnson of California. I think you answered to Senator Borah the question I am about to ask, so pardon me if it is repetitive. It is this: Was the United States Government officially informed, at any time between the rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany and the signing of the armistice, of agreements made by the allied Governments in regard to the settlement of the war?

The President. No; not so far as I know.

Senator Johnson of California. So far as you are aware, was it unofficially informed during that period?

The President. I would be more clear in my answer, Senator, if I knew just what you were referring to.

Senator Johnson of California. I am referring to the so-called secret treaties which disposed of territory among the belligerents.

The President. You mean like the treaty of London?

Senator Johnson of California. Yes; like the London pact.

The President. No; no, sir.

Senator Johnson of California. Could you state whether or not any official investigation was made by our Government to ascertain whether or not there were any such treaties of territorial disposition?

The President. There was no such investigation.

Senator Johnson of California. These specific treaties, then—the treaty of London, on the basis of which Italy entered the war; the agreement with Roumania, in August, 1916; the various agreements in respect to Asia Minor, and the agreements consummated in the winter of 1917 between France and Russia relative to the frontiers of Germany, and particularly in relation to the

Saar Valley and the left bank of the Rhine—none of these did we (and when I say "we" I mean you, Mr. President) have any knowledge of prior to the conference at Paris?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir. I can confidently answer that "No", in regard to myself.

Senator McCUMBER. Senator Johnson, may I ask the President right here whether or not after we entered into the war any treaties were made between any of our cobelligerents that were not given to us.

The PRESIDENT. No sir; I do not know of any.

Senator McCUMBER. Then the secret treaties that you have reference to were made prior to the time we entered into the war?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator McCUMBER. After that, our cobelligerents withheld nothing from us; did they?

The PRESIDENT. They entered into no agreements.

Senator BORAH. Well, you asked, Senator, if they withheld anything from us. They withheld all that they had had previously?

The PRESIDENT. No, no; but he means, Did they withhold any agreement that they made after we entered the war?

Senator McCUMBER. That is just what I meant.

Senator JOHNSON of California. We do not know of any engagements which have been made subsequent to our entering into the war?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Those that I have referred to—and I say this, Senator, so that you will have no error in respect to it—I referred wholly, I think, to the treaties that were prior to our entry into the war.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Were you familiar, Mr. President, please, with any agreements that were made by the allied Governments with the Czecho-Slovak National Council, the Polish National Council, and the Yugo-Slav National Committee?

The PRESIDENT. I was aware of arrangements similar to those that we had ourselves made recognizing those national committees as provisional representatives of the people.

Senator JOHNSON of California. But merely as recognizing governments, and that these committees represented the peoples of the various countries?

The PRESIDENT. Yes; and the recognition was purely informal. It was not an international recognition, but an agreement to deal with them as representatives.

Senator JOHNSON of California. When our Government through you, Mr. President, in January, 1918, made the 14 points as the basis for peace, were those points made with the knowledge of the existence of the secret agreements?

The PRESIDENT. No; oh, no.

Senator JOHNSON of California. It was not intended then, by the expression of these 14 points, to supplant the aims contained in the secret treaties?

The PRESIDENT. Since I knew nothing of them, necessarily not.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes; quite so. Do you know, Mr. President, or is it permissible for us to be told, whether France has special military agreements with Poland and Czecho-Slovakia?

The PRESIDENT. I know of none, sir.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Did China enter the war upon our advice—the advice of the United States?

The PRESIDENT. I cannot tell, sir. We advised her to enter, and she soon after did. She had sought our advice. Whether that was the persuasive advice or not, I do not know.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Do you recall, Mr. President, that preceding that advice we had asked China, as one of the neutral nations, to sever diplomatic relations with Germany?

The PRESIDENT. Whether we had asked her?

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. I do not recall, Senator. I am sure Mr. Lansing can tell, though, from the records of the department.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Do you know, Mr. President, whether or not our Government stated to China that if China would enter the war we would protect her interests at the peace conference?

The PRESIDENT. We made no promises.

Senator JOHNSON of California. No representations of that sort?

The PRESIDENT. No. She knew that we would as well as we could. She had every reason to know that.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Pardon me a further question: You did make the attempt to do it, too; did you not?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, indeed I did; very seriously.

Senator JOHNSON of California. And the decision ultimately reached at the peace conference was a disappointment to you?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir; I may frankly say that it was.

Senator JOHNSON of California. You would have preferred, as I think most of us would, that there had been a different conclusion of the Shantung provision, or the Shantung difficulty or controversy, at the Paris peace conference?

The PRESIDENT. Yes; I frankly intimated that.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Did it require the unanimous consent of the members of the peace conference to reach a decision like the Shantung decision?

The PRESIDENT. Every decision; yes, sir.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Do you recall, Mr. President, prior to the decision on the territorial question of Shantung, or of German rights in Shantung, the racial equality question coming before the peace conference?

The PRESIDENT. I remember that at one of the sessions called plenary sessions a resolution regarding that matter was introduced by the Japanese representatives, but rather as an expression of opinion or hope, and it was not pressed for action.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the press at that time stated that it had gone to a vote—and I trust some one will correct me if I am in error—and that the vote was 11 to 6 upon the proposition. The dispatches at that time were to that effect.

The PRESIDENT. I was misled, Senator. You are referring to the commission on a league of nations?

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes.

The PRESIDENT. There was a vote there. There never was a vote on any subject in the peace conference.

Senator JOHNSON of California. I confounded the two.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator JOHNSON of California. May I ask, if permissible, how the representatives of the United States voted upon that particular proposition?

The PRESIDENT. Senator, I think it is very natural you should ask that. I am not sure that I am at liberty to answer, because that touches the intimacy of a great many controversies that occurred in that conference, and I think it is best, in the interest of international good understanding, that I should not answer.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Do you know, Mr. President, whether or not the American Commission at Paris urged that a definite sum of reparation be fixed in the treaty?

The PRESIDENT. It did.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Will you state, if appropriate, why that view did not prevail?

The PRESIDENT. No, Senator, I can not; and yet I dislike to decline, because it may create a misapprehension on your part. Let me see if I can explain it, without indiscretion: I would be very glad, gentlemen, to tell you all about it, if you will leave it out of the notes. May I do that?—because I do not wish to leave any wrong impression on your minds. The explanation is perfectly simple.

Senator BRANDEGEE. What is the question, please?

The PRESIDENT. The question is, Why was the policy urged by the United States, that we fix a definite sum of reparation in the treaty, not adopted?

Senator BORAH. I would be content to have it left out of the notes upon your request; but I am afraid it would still get to the public, and that would put us in an embarrassing position.

The PRESIDENT. It is not an explanation discreditable to anybody, but it is an international secret. I am quite at liberty to say that the United States financial representatives—who, by the way, made an admirable impression upon everybody over there—did advocate the fixing of a definite sum for reparation.

Senator FALL. Mr. President, may I ask, to clear up a difficulty in my own mind, whether you regard the answering of these questions as an indiscretion because of the fact that there are other negotiations pending which might be affected?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, no, sir; simply because they affect the internal political affairs of other countries.

Senator FALL. Then, in your judgment, these matters should never be given publicity?

The PRESIDENT. Matters of this sort.

Senator FALL. I say, matters of this sort that have been referred to, should, in your judgment, never be given publicity; and it is not because of pending or other negotiations?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, no; I think they should not be given publicity.

Senator JOHNSON of California. I thank you very much, Mr. President. That is all I desire to ask.

The PRESIDENT. You have been very considerate in putting your questions.

Senator FALL. Mr. President, as I suggested, I have prepared several written questions, for the purpose of concentrating my own ideas, and several of them, I may say, are somewhat in sequence, and I feel that if we are going to hold hearings all day—that is, if we are all going to have the time and do not get into arguments among ourselves—possibly it might be just to you to submit these questions, as I have prepared them, to you first, and allow you to look them over before I pursue the line of inquiry. However, that is, of course, entirely with you. They do not all refer directly to provisions of the treaty nor to the construction of the treaty, but to other matters relating to the treaty.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Before you do that, Senator, with the President's permission may I ask one or two more questions concerning Shantung which I omitted or forgot?

The PRESIDENT. Certainly, Senator.

Senator JOHNSON of California. First, did Japan decline to sign the award as made or provided in the peace treaty?

The PRESIDENT. Her representatives informed us, Senator, that they were instructed not to sign in that event.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Was the determination finally reached a balancing of the difficulties or the disadvantages that might arise because of the balancing of those advantages or disadvantages?

The PRESIDENT. I do not know that I could answer that either "yes" or "no," Senator. It was a matter of many conversations and of many arguments and persuasions.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Was the decision reached—if you will pardon the perfectly blunt question—because Japan declined to sign unless that decision was reached in that way?

The PRESIDENT. No; I do not think it would be true to say "yes" to that question. It was reached because we thought it was the best that could be got, in view of the definite engagements of Great Britain and France, and the necessity of a unanimous decision, which we held to be necessary in every case we have decided.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Great Britain and France adhered to their original engagements, did they not?

The PRESIDENT. They said that they did not feel at liberty to disregard them.

Senator JOHNSON of California. And you, Mr. President, were the one who was endeavoring to determine—I gather this from the news dispatches—the question upon its merits and its justice.

The PRESIDENT. Our Government was the only Government free under the circumstances; yes.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir. Do you mind stating, or would you prefer not, what it was that caused you ultimately to accede to the decision that was demanded by Japan?

The PRESIDENT. Only the conclusion that I thought that it was the best that could be got under the circumstances.

Senator BRANDEGEE. May I interpolate there without disturbing you, Senator Johnson?

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. In Part 6 of the hearings before our committee, on page 182, Senator Johnson of California questioned Secretary Lansing. [Reading:]

"Senator JOHNSON of California. Was the Shantung decision made in order to have the Japanese signatures to the league of nations?

"Secretary LANSING. That I can not say.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. In your opinion was it?

"Secretary LANSING. I would not want to say that, because I really have not the facts on which to form an opinion along that line.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. Would the Japanese signatures to the league of nations have been obtained if you had not made the Shantung agreement?

"Secretary LANSING. I think so.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. You do?

"Secretary LANSING. I think so.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. So that even though Shantung had not been delivered to Japan, the league of nations would not have been injured?

"Secretary LANSING. I do not think so.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. And you would have had the same signatories that you have now?

"Secretary LANSING. Yes; one more, China.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. One more, China. So that the result of the Shantung decision was simply to lose China's signature rather than to gain Japan's?

"Secretary LANSING. That is my personal view, but I may be wrong about it.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. Why did you yield on a question on which you thought you ought not to yield and that you thought was a principle?

"Secretary LANSING. Because naturally we were subject to the direction of the President of the United States.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. And it was solely because you felt that you were subject to the decision of the President of the United States that you yielded?

"Secretary LANSING. Yes.

"Senator JOHNSON of California. The decision is his?

"Secretary LANSING. Necessarily."

Now, I wondered whether Secretary Lansing was well informed about this question or not?

The PRESIDENT. Well, my conclusion is different from his, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. You could not have got the signature of Japan if you had not given Shantung to Japan?

The PRESIDENT. That is my judgment.

Senator BRANDEGEE. You say you were notified to that effect?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator SWANSON. As I understand, you were notified that they had instructions not to sign unless this was included.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BORAH. And was it your judgment that after the treaty had been ratified, China's rights would be protected and Japan would surrender to China what she said she would?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator SWANSON. As I understand it, you consider this verbal agreement effective as relating to Shantung and you understood that this conveyance would be followed by a conveyance to China.

The PRESIDENT. Not to supersede it, but the action by Japan is to follow.

Senator JOHNSON of California. I beg your pardon, what was your question?

Senator SWANSON. The conveyance or retransfer of the German possessions in Shantung is to be followed by Japan's conveyance of this back to China, according to this agreement. One is as effective as the other.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes; but, Mr. President, you would have much preferred to have a different disposition, notwithstanding the promise of Japan in the treaty, would you not?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator Fall, would this be a practical suggestion? I have no objection to sitting here all day. Indeed, I have taken the liberty of having lunch prepared, if the gentlemen of the committee would be kind enough to join me. But since your questions are written, perhaps you might leave them with me and let me give such answers as I feel I can.

Senator FALL. Precisely, Mr. President. I can say to you, sir, that I prepared the questions with some care for the purpose of informing myself, and I think that it might not be entirely fair to you to answer offhand a series of questions, when I have the theory in mind along which I am propounding the questions—that is, one may lead to another—and I think it would be only fair to you that you might have the questions so you can read them and follow it.

The PRESIDENT. Will you state the theory at the top [laughter]?

Senator FALL. There are two or three theories. The first question that I would like to ask is, "In your judgment have you not the authority by proclamation to declare in words that peace exists, and thus restore the status of peace between the Government and the people of this country and those with whom we declared war?" If you choose, I will read the following question.

The PRESIDENT. That sets the key to them, I suppose.

Senator FALL. To several of them. Then there are others along other lines, one of which leads to another.

The PRESIDENT. I would be happy to answer them as far as I can.

Senator FALL. That can be done later or now, just as you please.

Senator WILLIAMS. Suppose we take a recess.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether there are any more questions.

The PRESIDENT. I had thought that I would send you in the replies.

Senator FALL. That would certainly be satisfactory to me. You would have no objection to the same publicity that is being given now?

The PRESIDENT. No.

Senator FALL. There are two or three different lines of questions.

Senator MCCUMBER. You would probably get more clear information if you take that method.

Senator FALL. I think so. They are not in any sense, Mr. President, prepared as catch questions, otherwise I would not submit them to you. If you were on the stand, and I were cross-examining you as a witness, I would prefer not to let you see the whole series of questions. But I think that is fair, and so far as I am concerned if it is satisfactory to you it would be more satisfactory to me.

Senator BRANDEGEE. In reply to Senator Lodge's inquiry I jotted down a few questions at random with the idea of asking some if they had not been touched upon by other members of the committee. I have some that I would like to ask, but I want to conform to the convenience of the President and the committee as to when it shall be done. I do not mean to delay you on your luncheon hour or anything of that kind.

The PRESIDENT. The luncheon hour is 1 o'clock, and I was in hopes that you gentlemen would remain for lunch.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I do not want to absorb the remaining time if other Senators want to go on now. I am perfectly willing to wait until they are finished.

Senator HARDING. I would like to hear your questions.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I am not sure what questions I will ask except I made some notes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would rather come back tomorrow morning at half past 10.

Senator HITCHCOCK. We have an engagement tomorrow morning for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we must have some consideration for the President's time.

Senator HARDING. I just want to reserve one question.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Do you not want to ask it now?

The CHAIRMAN. We have until 1 o'clock.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I have here the President's statement which he read to us when we met here this morning, and in it he states:

"Nothing, I am led to believe, stands in the way of the ratification of the treaty except certain doubts with regard to the meaning and implication of certain articles of the covenant of the league of nations; and I must frankly say that I am unable to understand why such doubts should be entertained."

Now, I do not believe the President is correctly informed as to the situation if he believes that. There are things in the treaty itself which militate against the ratification, in my opinion, of the treaty without amendment. Did you have in mind, Mr. President, when you read that to us, the Shantung provision of the treaty?

The PRESIDENT. I certainly had that in mind, Senator, but I did not understand that that stood in the way of ratification. I am, of course, acting only upon such information as I have received.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I understand—and that is the reason of taking the liberty of suggesting to you that you may not be well informed in this respect. Of course there is opposition by a great many Senators to the entire covenant of the league of nations, which I have no doubt you know, that is, article 1 of the treaty of Versailles. Then there is opposition to the various parts of the covenants of the league and not to the whole league, by other Senators. Then there is a great opposition, fundamental and sincere, to the Shantung provision, which is in the body of the treaty itself, and which can only be cured by an amendment. As I understand it, no reservation that we could make in the resolution of ratification would be effective to strike out the Shantung provision. It must be cured, if it is cured, by a straight out-and-out amendment, striking that from the treaty. That, of course, would necessitate the resubmission of the treaty to the signatories who have already signed it.

Now, you state later on that every suggestion of the United States was accepted, that is after you went back, after you had your conference with us last March, and having obtained our views as to the necessity for certain changes in the first draft of the covenant, you state [reading]:

"The view of the United States with regard to the questions I have mentioned had, in fact, already been accepted by the commission and there was supposed to be nothing inconsistent with them in the draft of the covenant first adopted."

And omitting a few lines which do not apply to that you say [reading]:

"There was absolutely no doubt as to the meaning of any one of the resulting provisions of the covenant in the minds of those who participated in drafting them, and I respectfully submit that there is nothing vague or doubtful in their wording."

Of course that is your opinion, if I may say so.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. But you are familiar with the statements, I have no doubt, that ex-Senator Root, Justice Hughes, Mr. Taft, and other able lawyers of the country have made with respect to the necessity for reservations if we are to ratify the treaty, are you not?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. That is, you admit that there are grave doubts among the ablest lawyers of the country as to the necessity for reservations or the alternative between reservations and ratifying the whole treaty, as it is expressed in the vernacular, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

The PRESIDENT. I admit that there are those difficulties in a great many minds.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Now, of course, it is true, is it not, that if difficulties arise as to the construction of any provision of the treaty after we have passed from the scene, what we thought the provisions of the treaty or of the covenant meant, will not be very powerful in the construction that may be placed upon it by those who then have to determine what it means, will it?

The PRESIDENT. The vote of the United States will be essential.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I do not mean that. The fact that you think now that everything in the treaty is plain and that there is no doubt about the meaning of any provisions, and the fact that I think there is grave doubt about many of the provisions, will not seriously affect the opinion of the council or of the arbitrator that finally passes upon the true meaning of the treaty when dispute arises.

The PRESIDENT. No, Senator; but the plain wording of the treaty will have a great deal to do, and the meaning of the wording is plain.

Senator BRANDEGEE. That is simply another way of stating, is it not, that you are clear in your opinion that the provisions of the treaty are plain? But I am suggesting that there will be a dispute between nations as to what the treaty means after we have passed from the scene.

The PRESIDENT. No, sir; it is a question of being confident of what language means, not confident of an opinion.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I mean, we derive our opinions as to the meanings of the treaty from the language of the treaty, do we not?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Now they would derive their construction of what the treaty means from the language of it, we not being there?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. So that what we think about it now will not be determinative in an international court or before an arbitrator 20 years hence in case of a dispute between two nations as to the meaning of the treaty?

The PRESIDENT. Certainly not, but the language will.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Of course they will have the language before them, but the language which determines it is now in dispute between you and certain lawyers of the country and certain Senators as to its meaning. Now what provision is there in the treaty for the determination of a dispute as to the interpretation of a clause of the treaty if such dispute arises?

The PRESIDENT. The covenant states that there are certain questions which are acknowledged as being especially suitable for submission to arbitration. One of those is the meaning of the treaty.

Senator BRANDEGEE. What does the treaty provide about that?

The PRESIDENT. You have it there, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Yes, sir; I wondered if you remembered it.

The PRESIDENT. I think I do so, but you have the language.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Yes. Article 12 of the league provides [reading]:

"The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the council."

That is, if there is a dispute, as I construe this, between members of the league as to the meaning of the covenant or any article thereof, it shall be referred to the arbitrators.

The PRESIDENT. Only if the parties agree.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Or to the council?

The PRESIDENT. Or to the council; yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. That is, the council is to determine the meaning of the covenant?

The PRESIDENT. No, Senator; I beg your pardon. There are two processes. If the parties agree to submit to arbitration, of course it is submitted to arbitration, and the decision is final. If they think it is a question that they are not willing to submit to arbitration, then they must submit it to the council for an expression of opinion and a recommendation, but that opinion and recommendation do not bind.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Is there any possible way authoritatively of determining without war what the treaty means?

The PRESIDENT. That is true of every treaty, Senator. If you re-express it in the language of the Senators to whom you refer and there is a dispute about the meaning of that, the same would apply. You can not use any language, I assume, which could not possibly give rise to some sort of dispute.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I assume that if it provided that if there should arise between the members of the league any dispute in relation to the construction of any article of the covenant of the league of nations, such dispute should be referred to an arbitrator, and the members would agree to be bound by its decision; that would be an agreement for an authoritative determination of what the treaty meant.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Now, as it is they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and so forth. Now, you say that the opinion of the council to which the dispute has been submitted is only advisory?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Then suppose one party to the dispute against whom the council decides declines to abide by it?

The PRESIDENT. Then there is war, but not within three months of the opinion of the council.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Under article 10 the members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. That is a contract between the signatories. We say: "We undertake to preserve the territorial integrity of the members against external aggression," which means that we contract to do it, does it not?

The PRESIDENT. We engage to do it.

Senator BRANDEGEE. It means an international contract, does it not, a compact, an agreement?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Whether that is a moral or legal obligation, it is an obligation?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Of course, it is a moral duty to keep a promise, and this is an international promise; so that the distinction between a moral obligation and a legal one seems to me to be not of great importance, because we are obligated in any event.

The PRESIDENT. Pardon me; I think it is of the greatest importance, because the element of judgment enters into it as it does not in the other.

Senator BRANDEGEE. You mean the judgment as to whether or not it is a moral obligation?

The PRESIDENT. No. For example, a question is submitted to arbitration and it is agreed that the decision shall be final. The judgment of one of the parties to the controversy may be that the decision is a very bad one, but it has to accept it; the element of judgment is excluded altogether; but, with regard to the method of fulfilling the obligations of a covenant like that under considertaion there is freedom of judgment on the part of the individual members of the league. It seems to me that makes a very considerable difference.

Senator HARDING. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt right there?

Senator BRANDEGEE. I will.

Senator HARDING. I dislike to interrupt the Senator.

Senator BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Senator HARDING. The President expressed a while ago surprise that I raised a question as to the value of this compact because of the moral obligation feature. Let me promise by the statement that I look upon a moral obligation as that which the conscience of the contracting party impels. The conscience of any nation in Europe, for example, may be warped by its prejudices, racial, geographical, and otherwise. If that be true and any nation may put aside or exercise its judgment as to the moral obligation in accepting any recommendation of the league, really what do we get out of this international compact in the enforcement of any decree?

The PRESIDENT. We get the centering upon it generally of the definite opinion of the world, expressed through the authoritative organs of the responsible governments.

Senator HARDING. Another question: That is surrendering the suggestion of a moral obligation for this Republic to the prejudices or necessities of the nations of the Old World, is it not?

The PRESIDENT. I do not understand that we make such a surrender.

Senator HARDING. Would you not understand a decree by the council to be a suggestion of this moral obligation?

The PRESIDENT. Certainly I would, but we would have to concur in that before it had any force of any kind.

Senator HARDING. Would it not be quite as moral for this Republic itself to determine its moral obligations?

The PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly, Senator; but in the meantime the world would not have the knowledge before it that there will be concerted action by all the responsible governments of the world in the protection of the peace of the world. The minute you do away with that assurance to the world you have reached the situation which produced the German war.

Senator HARDING. What becomes of our standing among nations if the council fixes a moral obligation upon us and we reject the judgment of the council as to the moral obligation?

The President. Pardon me if I remind you that we always have to concur in that.

Senator Harding. Precisely; but the council state what constitutes the moral obligation, if we agree; but if we do not agree, then, in the eyes of the world we have rejected its judgment as to a moral obligation.

The President. Certainly; and I hold that we are at liberty to do that, if our moral judgment honestly differs from the moral judgment of the world.

Senator Harding. Then, let us go back to the original inquiry. What permanent value is there, then, to this compact?

The President. The greatest permanent value, Senator, is the point that I have raised. We are assuming that the United States will not concur in the general moral judgment of the world. In my opinion, she generally will. If it had been known that this war was coming on, her moral judgment would have concurred with that of the other Governments of the world, with that of the other peoples of the world; and if Germany had known that there was a possibility of that sort of concurrence, she never would have dared to do what she did. Without such notice served on the powers that may wish to repeat the folly that Germany commenced, there is no assurance to the world that there will be peace even for a generation, whereas if they know beforehand that there will be that concert of judgment, there is the most tremendous guaranty.

Senator Harding. But, Mr. President, nobody expressed for us our moral obligation to enter into this war. That was our own expression, was it not?

The President. Certainly; it was our concurrence in the judgment of the world.

Senator Harding. One of the points I am getting at, if I can make it clear, is the necessity of a written compact for this Republic to fulfill its moral obligations to civilization.

The President. Senator, this Republic, if I interpret it rightly, does not need a suggestion from any quarter to fulfill its moral obligations.

Senator Harding. I quite agree with that.

The President. But it steadies the whole world by its promise beforehand that it will stand with other nations of similar judgment to maintain right in the world.

Senator Fall. Mr. President, then if the commissioner of the United States on the council were to join with the other members of the council in fixing a moral obligation upon the United States, and the Congress and the President, acting as part of the legislative branch of the Government, were to reject that judgment, would it not have a very disastrous effect upon the league, throw the world into chaos, and undo all that has been done?

The President. It might; but you are assuming a case——

Senator Fall. Certainly; we have to assume cases.

The President. Where we would have to assume that responsibility, because, being part of the Government, we would in every case really express the judgment of the American people, and if the unhappy time should ever come when that judgment is against the judgment of the rest of the world we would have to express it.

Senator Fall. Certainly. Mr. President, I am possibly looking, as Bacon said, at a distance.

Senator McCumber. Would our moral conviction of the unrighteousness of the German war have brought us into this war if Germany had not committed any acts against us, without the league of nations, as, of course, we had no league of nations at that time?

The President. I hope it would eventually, Senator, as things developed.

Senator McCumber. Do you think if Germany had committed no act of war or no act of injustice against our citizens that we would have gotten into this war?

The President. I do think so.

Senator McCumber. You think we would have gotten in anyway?

The President. I do.

Senator Brandegee. If I may be allowed to resume, for I kept still all morning——

Senator Fall. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I am going to ask the President to excuse me, as I have an engagement.

The President. I am sorry, Senator, that you are obliged to leave.

Senator Fall. I regret, sir, that I have an engagement with my wife, who is not in very good health.

Senator Brandegee. Now, if I may proceed without interruption, which breaks the continuity of my thought and uses a great deal of time, I will be through in a very few minutes. As I understand the President, his construction of article 10 is that if the council considers the question of external aggression upon a member of the league, we having signed this treaty with article 10 in it, in which we undertake to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity of all members of the league, can then say, it is a moral question into which the element of judgment enters and we, considering our judgment binding at the time, do not care to agree to the recommendation of the council. If every member of the league is at liberty to take that view of its moral and legal obligations under article 10, and declines to do what the council recommends, and if it is known in advance that that is the construction placed upon article 10 by those who framed it, it does not seem to me—and this is merely my opinion—that the terror to wrongdoers by what is hoped to be the united, concerted action of the members of the league in the concentration of its powers to suppress the wrongdoer will have the effect that the President thinks it will. In other words, I do not think that Germany would have refrained from war if she had known that article 10 was in existence.

Article 10 says:

"In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

There is no doubt that that is an obligation in a contract, and I know of but one way to perform an obligation that you have contracted to perform, and that is to perform it. I do not think that it admits of any qualifications after you sign the treaty. I want to call attention also to the fact that the external aggression which we undertake, if we sign this treaty, to repel or guarantee against is not stated in the treaty at all to be an unwarranted aggression. I wish to ask the President, if the league were in existence and Hungary and Roumania were members of it, and Roumania were in the position she now is, having raided the territorial integrity of Hungary and marched through its capital and occupied it, and the council, as its duty would be under the covenant, considered what was best to be done and advised us to send immediately to cooperate with them 100,000 men, whether we would be at liberty to discuss whether we were morally bound by article 10 of the covenant and decline to send the men, and, if we were, could we do it without risking being called an "international slacker" by the other members of the league?

The President. Senator, since you have made the case a concrete one I am afraid I ought not to answer it, because it involves a judgment as between Roumania and Hungary.

Senator Brandegee. I withdraw the names of the two countries, and assume the circumstances.

The President. Let me say that I take it for granted that in practically every case the United States would respond; but that does not seem to be the question. I quite agree with you that a moral obligation is to be fulfilled, and I am confident that our Nation will fulfill it, but that does not remove from each individual case the element of judgment which we are free to exercise in two stages: We are, first, free to exercise it in the vote of our representative on the council, who will of course act under instructions from the home Government; and, in the second place, we are to exercise it when the President, acting upon the action of the council, makes his recommendation to Congress. Then, Congress is to exercise its judgment as to whether or not the instructions of the Executive to our member of the council were well founded, and whether the case is one of distinct moral obligation.

Senator Brandegee. Suppose that each member of the council, as you say, acting under instructions from its home Government, including our representative on the council, should think, for instance, that Roumania was entirely right in some invasion of Hungary, and public sentiment was that way, but that our Government instructed our representative to vote with the foreign members of the council to support Hungary—suppose the public sentiment of the other members and of the people of this country were in favor of Roumania, what sort of a position would we be in to fulfill our guaranty?

The President. In order to answer that question I must go a little bit afield. In the first place, I understand that article to mean that no nation is at liberty to invade the territorial integrity of another. That does not mean to invade for purposes of warfare, but to impair the territorial integrity of another nation. Its territorial integrity is not destroyed by armed intervention; it is destroyed by the retention of territory, by taking territory away from it; that impairs its territorial integrity. I understand the covenant to mean that that is in no case permissible by the action of a single nation against another; that there is only one permissible method and that is, if territorial arrangements are unsatisfactory, that they should be brought to the attention of the world through the league and that then the league should exercise such rights as it may be able to exercise for a readjustment of boundaries.

I believe that territorial aggression, in the sense of territorial capture, is, by the wording of the act, made illegitimate.

Senator Brandegee. The words are not "territorial aggression," but "external aggression."

The President. But it says the preservation of its territorial integrity against external aggression.

Senator Brandegee. Suppose the external aggressor, having gotten within the territory of the aggressee, stays there?

The President. Then that impairs the territorial integrity.

Senator Brandegee. Certainly; and then on a call by the council for us to perform our international contract under article 10, if Congress does not favor performing it, you think we would not be subject to criticism by the other members of the league?

The President. Oh, we might be subject to criticism; but I think Congress would be at liberty to form its own judgment as to the circumstances.

Senator Brandegee. I agree with you entirely, and under our Constitution Congress would have to do so.

The President. Yes; that is understood by all.

Senator Brandegee. Of course; but I am assuming if the council should advise us to do a certain thing, and Congress refused to do it—and if every nation's representative assembly can do the same thing, it seems to me like a rope of sand and not an effective tribunal which would result in promoting peace.

The President. The reason I do not agree with you, Senator, is that I do not think such a refusal would likely often occur. I believe it would be only upon the gravest grounds—and in case Congress is right, I am indifferent to foreign criticism.

Senator Brandegee. Of course, we would always think we were right, I assume. Now, I wish to call your attention to article 15. I do this simply because you think all these provisions are clear, and I want to say in that connection that we had Mr. Miller, who described himself as the technical expert or adviser to the American Peace Commission, especially, I think, on questions of international law.

The President. The league of nations.

Senator Brandegee. We had him before our committee, and he answered this question, that I am about to ask, in three different ways, and we could not, of course, get much information from him; and he promised to take it under advisement and to give us his considered opinion, but he has not done so. Now, article 15, in the last two paragraphs provides:

"The council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the council.

"In any case referred to the assembly, all the provisions of this article and of article 12 relating to the action and powers of the council shall apply to the action and powers of the assembly, provided that a report made by the assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the league represented on the council and of a majority of the other members of the league, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute."

Now, in the first place, it says "represented on the council and of a majority of the other members of the league." Does that mean that the various members of the league have got to act upon that as separate Governments, or does it mean the representatives of the other members of the league?

The President. I do not quite understand that question.

Senator Brandegee. It says:

"A report made by the assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the league represented on the council and of a majority of the other members of the league."

Does that mean there "and a majority of the other representatives of members of the league in the assembly"?

The President. Yes; I assume so.

Senator Brandegee. But it does not say so. It leaves it as though the members of the league could act independently of their representatives and the assembly.

The President. Oh, no.

Senator Brandegee. I assume it means what you say.

The President. Yes; I assume that.

Senator Brandegee. Very well. Now, the question: Supposing there were a dispute between the United States and that portion of the British Empire known as the United Kingdom—England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales—as to some right of one of our ships to enter an English port, for instance, and that dispute should come before the council, and, upon the request of Great Britain, it should be removed to the assembly. The article I have just read provides for a report concurred in "exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute."

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. Now, all the self-governing colonies of England, or at least five of them, have a vote in the assembly, and the British Empire also has a vote. I assume in the case of the dispute which I have supposed, of course, the United States would be excluded from voting, as being a party to the dispute; and I assume the British Empire would be excluded, but I am not sure.

The President. Yes, sir; that is what I assume.

Senator Brandegee. Do you assume also that Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and India would be excluded?

The President. They are parts of the British Empire.

Senator Brandegee. They are parts of the British Empire, but are they parties to the dispute which I have supposed to have arisen between us and England?

The President. I admit, Senator, that that is a complicated question; but my judgment about it is quite clear. I think I can give one instead of three answers.

Senator Brandegee. Yes.

The President. Disputes can arise only through the Governments which have international representation. In other words, diplomatically speaking, there is only one "British Empire." The parts of it are but pieces of the whole. The dispute, therefore, in the case you have supposed, would be between the United States as a diplomatic unit and the British Empire as a diplomatic unit. That is the only ground upon which the two nations could deal with one another, whether by way of dispute or agreement. Therefore, I have assumed, and confidently assumed, that the representatives of all parts of the British Empire would be excluded.

Senator Brandegee. I should think that would be only fair, and I would assume that; but Mr. Miller answered that question by saying, first, that he was in doubt; secondly, that the self-governing colonies of Great Britain or of the British Empire would not be excluded, because they were not parties to the dispute; and then, third, that they would be excluded because they were parts of the British Empire; and if the legal adviser of the commission was that much confused, I feel that I need not apologize for being confused myself.

The President. No; but the commission was not confused.

Senator Knox. May I say this: I was not present at the meeting when Mr. Miller testified. The fact is that while it is technically true, as the President says, that the British self-governing colonies deal diplomatically through the British foreign office, it is only true in a most technical sense. They are absolutely autonomous, even in their diplomatic dealings, as to matters that affect them. For instance, I remember when the Canadian reciprocity agreement was negotiated in 1911 the delegates sent to negotiate the agreement were from Canada. Great Britain did not appear at the hearings or conferences at all, and in every sense Canada was just as autonomous in conducting her international negotiations as she would have been if she had been an absolutely independent Government.

The President. Yes; but this, you see, Senator, is a combination of definite Governments that have definite international relations with each other.

Senator Knox. But the fact that you give representation to Canada and Australia and New Zealand and other autonomous self-governing British colonies rather contradicts the idea, does it not, that they are one Government?

The President. I think not, sir; because in making up the constitution of the council it was provided, to speak with technical accuracy, that the five principal allied or associated Governments should each have one representative in the league; and in the opening paragraph of the treaty itself those powers are enumerated, and among others is the British Empire. "The Empire of Great Britain," I think, is the technical term. Therefore their unity is established by their representation in the council.

Senator Brandegee. Mr President, I read from the treaty——

The Chairman. I was going to ask, if I may, what function do these five Dominions of the British Empire have in the assembly?

The President. None, except the general powers of the assembly itself.

The Chairman. They have votes in the assembly?

The President. They have votes, but in a matter involving the British Empire, they would have but one vote among them.

The Chairman. But on all other matters, they would each have one vote?

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. I want to call the President's attention to the first page of the treaty with Germany, which says, after the preamble setting forth the desirability of the condition existing being replaced by a just and durable peace, "For this purpose, the high contracting parties represented as follows," and then it names them, and in the list is "His Majesty, the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, by his duly accredited officials, and the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of South Africa, the Dominion of New Zealand," etc. Now, they are "high contracting parties"?

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. And if one of those high contracting parties has a dispute with another of the high contracting parties, by what inference are other high contracting parties made parties to the dispute?

The President. I think by the inference that I thought I established, sir——

Senator Brandegee. But, if you will allow me to say so, it does not say that these parties, the self-governing British colonies, shall be excluded from participating in the deliberations because they may have some interest in the controversy.

The President. No.

Senator Brandegee. They must be parties to the dispute. Now, if we have a dispute with England about the right of an American ship to enter an English port, how can it be said that New Zealand or Australia is a party to that dispute?

The President. Because, Senator, in case of the worst coming to the worst, and war ensuing, we would be at war with all of them.

Senator Brandegee. It may be that a blunder has been made in creating such a situation. It would not be determinative, in my opinion.

Now, on page 7 of the print that I have, which is Senate Document No. 49, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, the last thing in the treaty is this statement:

"From the coming into force of the present treaty the state of war will terminate. From that moment and subject to the provisions of this treaty, official relations with Germany, and with any of the German States, will be resumed by the allied and associated powers."

The treaty itself provides that when Germany and three of the allied and associated powers have ratified the treaty it has come into force.

The President. As between those parties.

Senator Brandegee. It does not say so.

The President. I beg your pardon, I think it does.

Senator Brandegee. Here it is, Mr. President. [Handing pamphlet to the President.] I have read it, and there is no such language in it that I can discover.

The President. No; not the part that you read; I did not mean that; but in the part where the provision is referred to about ratification by Germany and three of the principal allied and associated powers.

Senator Brandegee. I have read that with some care, and I have not seen it.

Senator Knox. The language to which the President refers is the concluding paragraph of the treaty, and it provides that when the process of ratification shall have been completed by Germany and any three powers, the treaty shall come into force.

The President. As between them.

Senator Knox. No; I beg your pardon, Mr. President. In a subsequent clause dealing with what I think is an entirely different matter—that is, the adjustments as between the nations, not adjustments as between the allied and associated powers and Germany—it comes into force whenever the ratifications are made; but if you will take the body of the treaty you will find that everything that Germany is to do is to be done within a certain number of days after the ratification has been made; and a certain number of months afterwards she is to demobilize, give up her ships, and do all things that will make her practically a noncombatant, within a number of days after ratification by three of the powers; so she is either at peace with the world, or she is only partially at peace with the world; and as the requirements of the treaty are specific that she is to go out of the war business altogether, there is a conclusive inference in my mind that she is at peace with the world when those three ratifications have been made.

The President. I can not agree with you there. You see, the theory is this: That when three of the principal allied and associated powers ratify this treaty, Germany having ratified it, then the treaty is in force; that is to say, she has then engaged to do the things provided in the treaty, and her engagement is with those three powers, among the rest, and she must then proceed to do what she has promised; but it does not establish peace between her and other countries.

Senator Knox. I think that language shows that it establishes peace and provides for a resumption of diplomatic and all other relations with Germany. I intend, within a short time, to try to make my views upon that clear.

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. I went into that question rather thoroughly—"from the coming into force of the present treaty the state of war will terminate." Then it says, "From that moment, and subject to the provisions of this treaty, official relations with Germany and with any of the German States will be resumed by the allied and associated powers," which I assume means all of them.

Now, to revert to another point, Mr. President, have you any knowledge—and I ask all these questions, of course, subject to your determination as to whether it is proper for you to answer them, or to make any statement about them——

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. Are the Austrian, Bulgarian, and Turkish treaties, which I assume are in process of being made——

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee (continuing). Intertwined with the covenant of the league of nations as is the treaty with Germany?

The President. The covenant of the league constitutes a part of each of those treaties.

Senator Brandegee. Would you feel at liberty to state what percentage of progress they have made up to the present time, or how nearly completed they are?

The President. I think they are all practically completed, Senator, with the exception of some debatable questions of territorial boundaries.

Senator Brandegee. Inasmuch as our Constitution provides that treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present, do you think that it is constitutional for us to approve the Franco-American treaty which provides that before it goes into operation—or substantially, I would say, before it goes into operation—it must secure the approval of the council of the league of nations?

The President. Why, yes; we can consent. We have the sovereign right to consent to any process that we choose, surely.

Senator Brandegee. We have the right to consent, but of course the Senate has the constitutional right to ratify the treaty, negotiated and presented by the Executive; but my point is, have we a right to provide that in addition to the constitutional requirements for the making of a valid treaty there shall also be required the consent of the council of the league of nations, which the Constitution was not aware of?

The President. If that is a part of the treaty; yes, I think we have.

Senator Brandegee. But you do not think that the treaty can in any way amend the Constitution or the constitutional requirements for executing a treaty.

The President. No.

Senator Brandegee. Then by what process of ratiocination do you assume that the treaty can compel the consent of the council before this covenant is approved?

The President. Suppose you would determine that when any group of nations adopted a treaty then we could adopt the treaty that contained certain provisions that we wished to put in, and to make the operation of the treaty contingent upon its acceptance by the other nations in the group. It seems to me that that is an entirely analogous case. In other words I am assuming that we adopt the treaty with Germany. In that case we will be members of the league. We are in effect saying that we have become members of the league. If the council of the league accepts this we agree to put it in force. It is a means of being consistent with the thing that we have already done in becoming a member of the league.

Senator Brandegee. I get your viewpoint about that. Now, do you think it is wise for us to adopt the Franco-American treaty which in substance provides that we can not denounce it until the council of the league of nations gives us permission to do so or agrees to denounce it.

The President. I do, Senator. I have a very strong feeling with regard to our historical relations with France, and also a very keen appreciation of her own sense of danger, and I think it would be one of the handsomest acts of history to enter into that.

Senator Brandegee. I feel just as cordially toward her heroic conduct as anybody can. But that was not the question. The question was whether it was wise to so tie ourselves to any foreign nation as that we never could repudiate—I will not use the word "repudiate"—can never cancel our treaties without due notice, without the consent of a body not yet created.

The President. Of course I am assuming that body will be created before we adopt the Franco-American treaty, and in that case that provision that you are alluding to is only a completion of the idea of the treaty, namely, as I have been quoted as saying, this is an agreement on our part to anticipate the advice of the council of the league, as we shall take such and such measures to defend France. Inasmuch as we are anticipating that, we are assuming the action of the league, and therefore it is with the league and its action that the whole matter is bound up, and I think that the provision you allude to, therefore, is consistent and almost logically necessary.

Senator Brandegee. Well, now, inasmuch as you have stated in your message—and I have of course agreed to it and have no doubt that it is true—that the Franco-American treaty is only designed for temporary purposes, the defense of France until the league says that it is competent to do it, or words to that effect——

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. Would it not be the part of prudence for us to include in the Franco-American treaty, if it should be ratified, a provision that it shall have some time limit put upon it, that it shall exist for not more than 10 years, say. I assume if the league is ever going to be effective to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of its various members, it will be in the course of 10 years, and there is no objection to having some time limit on the treaty.

The President. Only a psychological objection, the sentiment between the two countries.

Senator Brandegee. The other alternative is to guarantee it forever or until the council of the league loosens us from it, is it not?

The President. Yes; when the council of the league will exist, among other uses should be that the whole international influence that could be brought to bear for the management of all these things will be present there to bring about this rearrangement.

Senator Brandegee. Yes; I understand that. But the fact that we have a vote to loose ourselves does not help us, as unanimous action is required by nine gentlemen, any one of whom can prevent us.

The President. No, Senator; but the diplomatic relations of the different countries in that council will be such, if I may judge, that those things may be accomplished.

Senator Brandegee. That is an optimistic view to take, if you will pardon my opinion about it.

The President. Perhaps it is.

Senator Brandegee. I want to call your attention to the fact that this era of good feeling which exists between the allied and associated powers after their common experience and suffering in this great war may not always exist, in view of future commercial contests and separate interests of different nationalities which may occur in the future, and what some of us feel is that we ought to be careful in making these definite international engagements, which we are wisely determined to carry out in good faith if we should make them, and we feel that now is the time to understand exactly the obligations we are to be held to before we affix our signature, and I have no doubt that you agree to that.

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. I want to ask you a word or two about this so-called American draft. The American draft of the league which was sent to us in response to Senate resolution was the draft which was submitted by the American commission to the conference abroad?

The President. No.

Senator Brandegee. It was the draft which was submitted by you as the head of the American commission to the American commission. Is that correct?

The President. Why, Senator, it was done as all other things of this sort were done over there. We circulated the draft among the representatives of the 14 States who were represented in the general league of nations, and they had 10 days or more to examine it. I also submitted it to my colleagues, not for any formal discussion but in order to have their opinion if they chose to express it. Then when the commission got down to its real work they appointed a committee.

Senator Brandegee. Of the commission?

The President. No; of two officers of the commission. Well, they did form a committee, but that committee employed the services of two technical advisers. Mr. Miller was one of them and Mr. Hurst—not the Mr. Hurst that Mr. Miller mentioned.

Senator Brandegee. He gave his initials as C.J.B.

The President. I have forgotten the initials.

Senator Brandegee. He said he was an employee of the British State Department.

The President. Yes; he is a very able man. He was on the general drafting committee of the treaty, and Mr. Miller took the various documents that we have been reading and discussing and made a combined draft and it was that combined draft which was the subject of formal discussion and amendment and addition by the committee.

Senator Brandegee. And that was the combined draft, the one that you sent to us the other day?

The President. No; Secretary Lansing was asked for it.

The Chairman. It was a composite draft. It came in yesterday.

Senator Brandegee. I beg your pardon, I did not know about it. Was there any draft, no matter how incomplete, any skeleton draft or enumeration or substance for a draft for the so-called American plan for the covenant of the league of nations which you took with you from this country or was prepared over there by you?

The President. Only the one that I referred to earlier in this conference, Senator, when I had taken the Phillimore report as more or less of a basis of my work.

Senator Brandegee. That was the only thing that you had in the nature of a skeleton draft when you left the country?

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. Did the Phillimore draft or report, whatever the proper term may be, contain anything like what is now article 10 of the covenant of the league?

The President. I do not remember.

Senator Brandegee. You do not remember whether there was anything like that in that?

The President. Let me say this in regard to article 10. I believe this to be part of the history of it. It is so far as I am concerned. Early in my administration, as I think many of the members know, I tried to get the American States, the States of Central and South America, to join with us in an arrangement in which a phrase like this constituted the kernel, that we guaranteed to each other territorial integrity and political independence. "Under a republican form of government" was added in that case. But that is another matter. As I represented to them at that time, it was a desire on my part at any rate to show the way to them of keeping things steady and preventing the kind of aggression they have had.

The Chairman. That was the subject of the Niagara conference?

Senator Brandegee. The A. B. C. powers.

The President. I do not think it was discussed there, Senator. We discussed it diplomatically.

The Chairman. It was taken up at that time?

The President. It was taken up at that time.

Senator Brandegee. Who was the author of article 10?

The President. I suppose I was as much as anybody.

Senator Brandegee. And you recommend it to your fellow American commissioners?

The President. Yes.

Senator Brandegee. How many Americans were on the commission which framed the covenant for the leage of nations?

The President. Two—Col. House and myself.

Senator Brandegee. The total membership was what? Fifteen, was it not?

The President. Fourteen nations, and five principal nations had two members, which would make 19, would it not? Yes, 19 members.

Senator Brandegee. Did they have the unit rule, so to speak, casting one vote for each member?

The President. In only one or two instances did we vote at all. I presided and the final form was this, "If there are no objections we will regard that as accepted."

Senator Brandegee. As we say in the Senate, "without objection it is agreed to."

The President. Yes; and that is the way the whole thing was agreed to.

Senator Brandegee. Did these commissions to which the plenary conference delegated certain subjects to prepare reports upon have any coordination with each other? Did each commission know what the other commissions were doing?

The President. No; the subjects were too unlike.

Senator Brandegee. Was there any debate on the completed draft of the covenant of the league of nations when it was submitted to the plenary council just before you came over in March?

The President. Yes; there were speeches.

Senator Brandegee. I do not call those debates. I read that there were no debates as to what each particular government demanded.

The President. No; because there were so many of those represented, and they had all been canvassed in the process of formulation.

Senator Brandegee. You replied to a resolution of the Senate requesting a copy of a letter of Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, which was also signed by Secretary Lansing——

The President. And Mr. White.

Senator Brandegee. And Mr. White—you stated, if I recollect, in substance, that you would be glad to furnish us with a copy of it but for the fact that Gen. Bliss had mentioned the names of certain Governments and you thought it was a matter of delicacy not to make it public. Would it not be possible to furnish us with the general drift of the arguments, leaving out the names of the Governments, etc.?

The President. There was not any argument. He said flatly that it was unjust. It was not a reason.

Senator Brandegee. It was an opinion.

The President. An opinion.

Senator Brandegee. A conclusion.

Senator Johnson of California. With that, you agreed, Mr. President, did you not?

The President. Senator, I do not think I ought to say any more than I have said.

Senator Brandegee. I do not think I care to ask anything more.

Senator Hitchcock. Will you permit me to read into the record these two paragraphs from the conclusion of the treaty and ask whether they are what you refer to when you express the opinion that the treaty would go into effect when Germany and three of the contracting parties had signed it, and only as to them?

The Chairman. That is explicitly stated.

Senator Hitchcock. I thought it was left in some doubt. I would like to read them into the record [reading]:

"A first procès-verbal of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up as soon as the treaty has been ratified by Germany on the one hand, and by three of the principal allied and associated powers on the other hand.

"From the date of this first procès-verbal the treaty will come into force between the high contracting parties who have ratified it. For the determination of all periods of time provided for in the present treaty this date will be the date of the coming into force of the treaty."

I just wanted to make it clear that the treaty is not in effect except as to those that have ratified it.

The President. I could not put my hand on it, but I was sure.

Senator McCumber. Mr. President, just one question on this French treaty. If we should adopt this present treaty with the league of nations and with section 10 in it, which brings all of the great nations of the league to the protection of France, if war should be made against her by Germany, what necessity is there for any other special treaty with France?

The President. To meet the possibility of delay in action on the part of the council of the league.

Senator McCumber. But the agreement of section 10 comes into effect, does it not, the moment we adopt the treaty?

The President. Yes; but the council has to act and formulate its advice, and then the several Governments have to act and form their judgment upon that advice.

Senator McCumber. Do you not think under the present situation that that could be done as quickly as Germany could get ready for a second war on France?

The President. Oh, as quickly as she could get ready, yes; but not as quickly as she could act after she got ready.

Senator Brandegee. Mr. President, the situation is this: If Germany has surrendered her navy, demobilized her army, and been shorn of large portions of her territory; if we have no demand for reparation or indemnity against her; if, as you stated in your addresses to the Congress, the war is over; if there is no fighting going on; if Germany has signed the peace treaty, and you have signed the peace treaty; if, in fact, there is a condition of peace, and only the joint resolution of Congress that a state of war existed a year ago—if that is all so, is there no way by which the condition of peace which actually exists can be made legally effective except by the adoption of the proposed treaty?

The President. Senator, I would say that there is no way which we ought to be willing to adopt which separates us, in dealing with Germany, from those with whom we were associated during the war.

Senator Brandegee. Why?

The President. Because I think that is a moral union which we are not at liberty to break.

Senator Brandegee. If we have rescued our fellow belligerents from the German peril voluntarily and without any charge, and if we prefer not to have any entanglements or connections with European powers, but to pursue our course as we did before the war, where is the moral obligation to merge ourselves with Europe forever?

Mr. President. I do not construe it as merging ourselves, but I do think we are under the plainest moral obligation to join with our associates in imposing certain conditions of peace on Germany.

Senator Brandegee. Even if we ratify the German so-called peace treaty, with or without the Shantung provision in it, and strike out article 1 of the peace treaty, the covenant of the league of nations, we still join with those with whom we have cooperated in establishing peace with Germany, do we not, and are at liberty to trade with her?

The President. An unworkable peace, because the league is necessary to the working of it.

Senator Brandegee. Well, suppose they have a league, and we ratify the treaty with the reservation that we are not bound by article 1, which is the covenant of the league—then they have a league of nations covenant.

The President. Yes, and we are tied into every other part of the treaty by reason of the fact that we are supposed to be members of the league of nations.

Senator Brandegee. Suppose we also adopt the 21 amendments that Senator Fall has pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations, striking us out of these commissions to which we are tied, and just cutting the Gordian knot which ties us to the covenant: We establish peace with Germany just the same, I fancy. The other powers could accept our amendments to the treaty or not, as they chose. In either case Germany would be at peace, and they would be in the league, and we would be out of it. We could have peace, and resume all our business in relation to copper mines and zinc mines, etc., and we could export to Germany, and reestablish the consular service; could we not?

The President. We could, sir; but I hope the people of the United States will never consent to do it.

Senator Brandegee. There is no way by which the people can vote on it.

The Chairman. Are we not trading with Germany now, as a matter of fact?

The President. Not so far as I know, sir.

The Chairman. Licenses certainly have been issued. It is advertised in all the New York papers.

The President. We removed the restrictions that were formerly placed upon shipments to neutral countries which we thought were going through to Germany.

The Chairman. Yes; I see them advertised broadly in the New York papers.

Senator Johnson of California. Mr. President, does the moral obligation to which you have alluded compel us to maintain American troops in Europe?

The President. Which moral obligation, Senator?

Senator Johnson of California. You referred to the moral obligation resting upon us to carry out the peace terms and the like in conjunction with our associates, and felt that it would be, as I understood you, a breaking, a denial of that moral obligation to make a separate peace or to act by ourselves.

Mr. President. Yes.

Senator Johnson of California. Does that obligation go to the extent of compelling us to maintain American troops in Europe?

The President. Such small bodies as are necessary to the carrying out of the treaty, I think; yes.

Senator Johnson of Californis. And will those troops have to be maintained under the various treaties of peace until the ultimate consummation of the terms of those treaties?

The President. Yes, Senator; but that is not long. In no case, as I remember, does that exceed 18 months.

Senator Johnson of California. I was rather under the impression that the occupation of Germany was to be for 15 years.

The President. Oh, I beg your pardon.

The Chairman. Along the Rhine.

The President. Along the Rhine; yes. I was thinking of Upper Silesia, and the other places where plebiscites are created, or to be carried out. It is the understanding with the other Governments that we are to retain only enough troops there to keep our flag there.

Senator Johnson of California. The idea in my mind was this: Will we be maintaining American troops upon the Rhine for the next 15 years?

The President. That is entirely within our choice, Senator; but I suppose we will.

Senator Johnson of California. Do you know, Mr. President, whether or not we have American troops in Budapest at present?

The President. We have not. There are some American officers there, Senator, sent with a military commission, but no American troops.

Senator Johnson of California. Returning, if you do not mind, Mr. President, to one last question about Shantung, do you recall the American experts reporting that the Japanese promise, the verbal promise, which has been referred to, to return Shantung, meant in reality the returning of the shell but retaining the kernel of the nut?

The President. I remember their saying that; yes, sir.

Senator Johnson of California. That is all.

The President. But I do not agree with them.

Senator New. Mr. President, if no one else has any questions to ask, I have a few.

The President. Proceed, Senator, if you will.

Senator New. These questions, Mr. President, are more or less general and haphazard, referring to no particular feature of the treaty, but to all of them.

First, was it the policy of the American delegates to avoid participation by the United States in strictly European questions and their settlement; and, if so, what were the matters in which America refused to participate, or endeavored to avoid participation?

The President. I could not give you a list in answer to the last part of your question, sir; but it certainly was our endeavor to keep free from European affairs.

Senator New. What did the American delegates say or do to secure nonparticipation by the United States in the cessions of Danzig, Memel, and in the various boundary commissions, reparations commissions, and other agencies set up in the treaty for the disposition of questions in which America has no national interest?

The President. I did not get that, Senator, it is so long.

Senator New. I will divide it. What did the American delegates say or do to secure nonparticipation by the United States in the cessions of Danzig and Memel?

The President. Why, Senator, the process of the whole peace was this: Each nation had associated with it certain expert advisers, college professors and bankers and men who were familiar with ethnical and geographical and financial and business questions. Each question was referred to a joint commission consisting of the specialists in that field representing the principal allied and associated powers. They made a report to this smaller council, and in every instance the American representatives were under instructions to keep out of actual participation in these processes so far as it was honorably possible to do so.

Senator New. The second half of the question is this: What did the American delegates do to secure nonparticipation by the United States in the reparations commission?

The President. Why, we were disinclined to join in that, but yielded to the urgent request of the other nations that we should, because they wanted our advice and counsel.

Senator New. What agreement, written or verbal, has been entered into by the American delegates touching the assignment to various States of mandatories under the provisions of article 22?

The President. None whatever.

Senator New. If it be understood that Great Britain or her dominions will act as mandatories of the territory in Africa lately held by Germany, what advantage of a practical nature is expected to accrue, and whom will it benefit, from subjecting the British or dominion administration to the mandatories of such nations as Liberia, Italy, or any others?

The President. Mandatories of Liberia?

Senator New. Yes.

The President. I do not understand, Senator. The whole system of mandates is intended for the development and protection of the territories to which they apply—that is to say, to protect their inhabitants, to assist their development under the operation of the opinion of the world, and to lead to their ultimate independent existence.

Senator New. Mr. President, it seems that there is more than a suspicion; there is a general conviction in the world, I think, that Germany is promoting the dissemination of Bolshevist propaganda in the countries of the Allies, including the United States. That being the case, I am prompted to ask what provision in the treaty obligates Germany to prohibit Bolshevik propaganda from German sources in the United States and allied countries?

The President. None.

Senator New. No provision? Was any proposal considered by the peace conference directed toward securing the names of German propaganda agents in the United States and the allied countries, or to obtain the records of the disbursements made in support of Bolshevik or other propaganda intended to weaken or disrupt the United States?

The President. We made every effort to trace everything that we got rumor of, Senator; and traced everything that we could; but no provisions were feasible in the treaty itself touching that.

Senator New. Did not France yield under pressure at least partly exerted by the American delegates to abandon certain guaranties of the security of her German frontiers which she had been advised by Marshal Foch were indispensable; and is not the present frontier, in French military opinion, less secure than the one which France was induced to abandon?

The President. Senator, do you think I ought to redebate here the fundamental questions that we debated at Paris? I think that would be a mistake, sir.

Senator Johnson of California. Mr. President, it is on that very theory that I refrained from asking many of those things, the thoughts of which crowd one's mind, and which one would like to ask.

The President. Of course. You see, you are going into the method by which the treaty was negotiated. Now, with all respect, sir, I think that is a territory that we ought not to enter.

Senator New. Of course, if there is any reason why it should not be answered, I will withdraw it. Is there objection to answering this, Mr. President: What was France's solution proposed for administration of the Saar Basin?

The President. I do not think I ought to answer those questions, Senator, because of course they affect the policy and urgency of other Governments. I am not at liberty to go into that.

Senator New. Mr. President, would our position in the War of 1812 and the Spanish-American War have been secure under the league covenant?

The President. Oh, Senator, you can judge of that as well as I could. I have tried to be a historical student, but I could not quite get the league back into those days clearly enough in my mind to form a judgment.

Senator New. What would have been the procedure under the covenant in those two cases, in your opinion?

The President. Why, Senator, I could figure that out if you gave me half a day, because I would have to refresh my mind as to the circumstances that brought on the wars; but that has not been regarded as a profitable historical exercise—hypothetically to reconstruct history.

Senator New. Well, I do not want to press for answers, then.

Senator Moses. Mr. President, under the terms of the treaty, Germany cedes to the principal allied and associated powers all of her overseas possessions?

The President. Yes.

Senator Moss. We thereby, as I view it, become possessed in fee of an undivided fifth part of those possessions.

The President. Only as one of five trustees, Senator. There is no thought in any mind of sovereignty.

Senator Moses. Such possession as we acquire by means of that cession would have to be disposed of by congressional action.

The President. I have not thought about that at all.

Senator Moses. You have no plan to suggest or recommendation to make to Congress?

The President. Not yet, sir; I am waiting until the treaty is disposed of.

The Chairman. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere in any way, but the conference has now lasted about three hours

> and a half, and it is half an hour after the lunch hour.
>
> The PRESIDENT. Will not you gentlemen take luncheon with me? It will be very delightful.
>
> (Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m., the conference adjourned.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall read the first part of the document into the RECORD. It is a Senate document consisting of a report of the conference between members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the President of the United States in the White House on Tuesday, August 19, 1919.

The document opens with this sentence:

> The committee met at the White House at 10 o'clock a.m., pursuant to the invitation of the President, and proceeded to the East Room, where the conference was held.
>
> Present: Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and the following members of the committee: Senators Lodge (chairman), McCumber, Borah, Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson of California, New, Moses, Hitchcock, Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith, and Pittman.

The next item is a statement of the President. It reads:

Statement of the President

> The PRESIDENT. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the liberty of writing out a little statement in the hope that it might facilitate discussion by speaking directly on some points that I know have been points of controversy and upon which I thought an expression of opinion would not be unwelcome. I am absolutely glad that the committee should have responded in this way to my intimation that I would like to be of service to it. I welcome the opportunity for a frank and full interchange of views.
>
> I hope, too, that this conference will serve to expedite your consideration of the treaty of peace. I beg that you will pardon and indulge me if I again urge that practically the whole task of bringing the country back to normal conditions of life and industry waits upon the decision of the Senate with regard to the terms of the peace.
>
> I venture thus again to urge my advice that the action of the Senate with regard to the treaty be taken at the earliest practicable moment because the problems with which we are face to face in the readjustment of our national life are of the most pressing and critical character, will require for their proper solution the most intimate and disinterested cooperation of all parties and all interests, and can not be postponed without manifest peril to our people and to all the national advantages we hold most dear.

There follows the President's statement the colloquy that was had between the President and members of the committee. It is a fascinating chapter of American history, and, Mr. President, it is an example of the application of the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

Mr. President, it was a case in which a great American President, a great political scientist, a great American historian, recognized the importance of the President of the United States in an hour of great crisis sitting down with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States in keeping with the meaning of the advise-and-consent clause and reason together with them.

Mr. President, no one is more proud of the position of the President of the United States than I when he so frequently quotes from the Bible itself pointing out the importance of men sitting down and reasoning together.

I say most respectfully, as I plead with my President from the floor of the Senate today, that I believe the hour has come, as it came on August 19, 1919, for the President of the United States to demonstrate to the country and to the world that he, too, is just as anxious as the Committee on Foreign Relations to sit down and reason together in regard to the great problems that face the Republic in the field of foreign policy—not for agreement, if in fact there should not be agreement, in the judgment of the President of the United States, in carrying out his responsibilities as President under the Constitution and as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. But if we are going to make the constitutional system work, we must apply its conditions, its terms, and its articles in accordance with the meaning of the Fathers of our Constitution. That is why I make this plea.

It would be salutary and reassuring to the people of this country if the letter that is sent to the President received a response similar to that which Woodrow Wilson gave to the Committee on Foreign Relations on August 15, 1919, when he invited the committee, in accordance with its letter of August 14, assuring him that they would be glad to meet with him.

I believe that the people of this country are entitled to know that a bridge has been built between the Senate of the United States, through its Committee on Foreign Relations, and the White House. the letter that was voted yesterday to be sent to the President, may I say, is the first span in that structure. I hope now that the White House, at the other end of the situs of the bridge, will put in place its span, reaching to the Capitol, for I believe it is in the national interest. I believe it is in the interest of the President and in the interest of the Senate.

I hope the President will respond favorably to the letter that the Committee on Foreign Relations has instructed its chairman to send to him. In addition I would hope that the President would meet with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or with a subcommittee that the chairman might wish to bring with him to the White House or with the full committee for a discussion of the matter of the Secretary of State testifying at public hearings and any such other matters in the field of foreign policy that the President might be willing to discuss with the Foreign Relations Committee.

SUPPORT OF U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the beginning I have questioned the wisdom of becoming involved in a ground war in Asia; yet, once our Government committed troops, I have given full support to these troops.

But the question I pose today is whether our Government is giving full support to our troops.

Mr. President, the series of coordinated Vietcong attacks against American bases throughout Vietnam, the overrunning of a U.S. Special Forces camp by a North Vietnamese tank company, the massing of a North Vietnamese division south of Da Nang, and the menacing buildup of North Vietnamese forces around Khesanh bring new urgency to the question of shutting off supplies going to the enemy through the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong.

Whatever questions may be raised about these events—and I submit that there are many—there can be no question that attacks on the scale we have witnessed would not have been possible without the uninterrupted flow of supplies which daily—yes, daily—are allowed to reach North Vietnam through Haiphong.

Many of the rockets, mortars, and artillery shells that are exploding at this minute on our base at Khesanh and at other U.S. bases in Vietnam were undoubtedly brought through that port.

The tanks used for the first time by the North Vietnamese in attacking a U.S. Special Forces base Tuesday operated on fuel brought in through Haiphong.

There is also evidence the Russians are beginning to supply North Vietnam with surface-to-surface missiles. It is highly probable that these missiles—the same kind of missiles used by the Egyptians to sink the Israeli destroyer *Eilat*—are being brought in through Haiphong just as were the surface-to-air missiles that are being used in large quantities against our aircraft.

Mr. President, the American people have a right to know that the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all have formally recommended to the President that we shut off supplies going to the enemy through Haiphong. That recommendation was made months ago and is still the considered judgment of these military leaders.

Can the President continue to justify his complete disregard of the recommendation of his top military advisers in so fundamental a military matter as shutting off supplies to the enemy?

I raise this question, too:

Even if the President could justify his failure to act in the past, can he now justify his refusal to listen to our top military leaders after the events of the past 10 days?

Can he refuse to listen with U.S. casualties exceeding 100,000 in the space of 2 years—35,000 in 1966 and 71,000 in 1967?

Can he refuse to listen when casualty figures made public today show that the United States has suffered 9,939 casualties during the first 5 weeks of 1968, when U.S. military bases throughout South Vietnam are coming under heavy attack, and when our men at Khesanh and Da Nang are facing 42,000 of the toughest, best trained, and best equipped North Vietnamese regulars?

Mr. President, can this Government any longer refuse to give this basic support to the more than one-half million men we have committed to the fighting in Vietnam?

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

CHANGES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued today by Mayor Walter E. Washington, dealing with the public safety and police issues that prevail in the District of Columbia at this time. The opening statement reads:

> I highly approve of the accompanying joint statement by Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

I also ask unanimous consent that the news release, which is the accompanying statement referred to by Mayor Washington, be printed in the RECORD immediately following the statement by Mayor Washington.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR WALTER E. WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 8, 1968

I highly approve of the accompanying joint statement by Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

I am delighted they have pledged a team effort to serve the city and fight the menace of crime in our community.

Unity is all important in the Police Department's job of combatting the District's appalling crime rate.

The citizens can be reassured that the job of protecting the community is in the hands of a strengthened police department, which now has the combined experience of Public Safety Director Murphy, Chief Layton and Assistant Chief Jerry V. Wilson, in his new role as head of Field Operations.

Our top law enforcement officials are together in their resolve to fight the common enemy—crime in our city.

NEWS RELEASE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FEBRUARY 8, 1968

The following statement was released jointly today, by Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

The assignment of Jerry V. Wilson as Assistant Chief for Field Operations in no manner diminishes the authority and functions of the Chief of Police, John B. Layton. Chief Layton continues as the operating head of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Assistant Chief of Police Howard V. Covell continues in the number two position in the Department, Executive Officer.

Assistant Chief Wilson has filled one of the four Assistant Chief positions and will be responsible for one of the four major functions of the Department.

The Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, is responsible for policy formulation and program development in the Police Department, as well as in the Fire Department and Office of Civil Defense, the three agencies which come under his control. The creation of the position of Director of Public Safety has strengthened and facilitated police operations by placing a representative of the Department in the Mayor's Office to speak for it on important policy questions, such as budget requests, manpower and equipment needs, salary and working conditions and other matters.

Director Murphy stated: "I repeat what I have said publicly many times since my appointment. I would not have accepted this position if I did not consider Chief Layton an able, experienced and dedicated police chief. He has been of great assistance in familiarizing me with the operations of the Police Department. We have worked closely and harmoniously in planning the efforts of the Department for the future. I look forward to a continuing fruitful working relationship, and appreciate Chief Layton's pledge of loyal support in our attempt to make this fine police department ever better."

Chief Layton stated:

"I have long had great pride in the Metropolitan Police Department and the accomplishments of its members over the years. I am proud to be its Chief.

"In these times of great change I have looked forward with confidence to what I think can be greater accomplishments for our city under Mayor Washington and Deputy Mayor Fletcher as they move to reorganize and revitalize our City Government.

"In this connection, my role as operating head of the Department was made clear by Mayor Washington on the appointment of Mr. Murphy as Public Safety Director and has been reaffirmed by both Mr. Murphy and the Mayor's Office.

"I pledge to the Mayor, his Deputy, Director of Public Safety and the citizens of this community my best efforts to make this excellent Department an even better one."

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, by Carl Bernstein, captioned "Police Shift Points to Mayor's Rule."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE SHIFT POINTS TO MAYOR'S RULE

(By Carl Bernstein)

The city government appears to have decided that the Metropolitan Police Department should be a tightly controlled agency of the District Building.

Under its last two chiefs, the Police Department has operated as an almost autonomous adjunct of the city government.

During the past week, however, Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy has made it clear that he intends to make the Department a working part of the administration of Mayor Walter E. Washington.

Under both Chief John B. Layton and his predecessor, Robert V. Murray, it has not been uncommon to find the chiefs spending much of their time on Capitol Hill.

Similarly, attempts by the old District Commissioners to exercise control over the Police Department foundered to the point of near hopelessness.

When Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, for example, asked Chief Layton to include the word "boy" on a list of "trigger words" not to be used by police, Layton refused.

Layton told the head of the city government that he would not make the change unless he received a direct, written order. Tobriner never issued the order.

When the Supreme Court established the Mallory Rule limiting the time between arrest and arraignment of a suspect, Chief Murray immediately informed Congress the Court's decision would all but wreck police work here.

Never did the chief approach the Commissioners to devise ways of working within the rule's limitations.

There have been numerous occasions when the city's chief of police has testified on Capitol Hill in favor of crime legislation that his superiors at the District Building have opposed.

As for the internal workings of the police department, they have been within the exclusive purview of the chief of police, save for the pro-forma signing of departmental promotions by the Commissioners.

There has been no single instance in recent years in which the District Building has exercised the same kind of control over the Department's machinery as Public Safety Director Murphy demonstrated in the past week.

Thus, the significance of the appointment of Assistant Chief Jerry V. Wilson "to run the day-to-day operations" of police here is not just that Chief John B. Layton will be bypassed in much of the decision-making and implementing in the Department.

The real importance of the move is that Wilson will report directly to the new Director of Public Safety, not the Chief of Police, in Murphy's role as a key aide to Mayor Washington.

Similarly, when Murphy took Layton to task for failing to inform him of a drinking and shooting incident involving four policemen, Murphy was asserting his role as an authority to be reckoned with outside the uniformed Police Department.

This new approach by Murphy, not surprisingly, has brought some criticism from individual policemen, the Police Wives Association and Capitol Hill.

"I would like to remind the new Director of Public Safety," Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.) said yesterday, "that crime is our major problem, not the Metropolitan Police Department . . . I don't know who is pulling the strings that make him (Murphy) jump, but I think it is a legitimate point of inquiry for the Congress to undertake."

Obviously, Broyhill is not accustomed to seeing the city government assert itself in matters previously reserved for the consideration of the Police Department and the House District Committee, of which he is a member.

Asked to explain Murphy's statements asserting that he intends to make most of the major police policy decisions, Deputy Mayor Thomas W. Fletcher yesterday offered a good description of the new relationship between the District Building and the Police Department.

"Patrick V. Murphy represents Walter E. Washington. As the Mayor's representative, Murphy is the guy who makes the policy for the Police Department. Actually, the Mayor and Murphy are doing what the Commissioners' responsibility was before."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been in consultation today with District of Columbia officials, and I desire the RECORD to show that, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee which has jurisdiction over the police, I completely support the position taken by Mayor Washington and the position taken by Mr. Murphy, the Director of Public Safety in the District of Columbia.

I support the position of the Mayor that the Police Department must become an integral part of the District of Columbia government, accountable to the Mayor. The Department must follow the policy of the Mayor and the City Council to the letter.

There must be civilian control and supervision, and that change must take place at the organizational level of the Police Department.

I want to make perfectly clear that I support the view that the Department must be reorganized with some changes and transfers in personnel so that it can better cope with the serious crime problem. Too many police officials conduct themselves in their official duties as though the Department were maintained for their convenience. It must be made clear to them that the Department was established to enforce the laws of the city and their job as police officials is to see that this is done fairly and impartially.

There is a serious deficiency of good supervision of men in the Metropolitan Police Department from the level of private through the level of Deputy Chief. In my judgment, it must be brought under control by the Director of Safety, Mr. Murphy, and by Mayor Washington.

Mr. President, the program of reform which is being announced by the Mayor, as you will see by the material I have already submitted for the RECORD, has the complete support of the Deputy Mayor, Mr. Fletcher, the complete support of the Director of Public Safety, Mr. Murphy. In my judgment it augurs well for the improvement of law enforcement in the District of Columbia and for meeting on a much better basis of efficiency the crime crisis that exists in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, when I say those things, I want also to pay my respects to the Chief of Police, Chief Layton, for I think he understands what we all should understand: If you are going to have this kind of efficient centralization of administration, then, of course, his office and all other offices in the Police Department must be coordinated under the central direction and control that the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, and the Public Safety Director have made perfectly clear is their intention as far as administration policy is concerned.

I note already in the press that there is being stirred up some allegations of controversy between the present administration of the Police Department and the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and the Director of Public Safety. I wish to advise the Senate that I looked into this matter this morning as the chairman of the subcommittee and it just is not the case.

The Chief of Police, Mr. Layton, as those of us who know him would expect him to do because he is a dedicated public servant, has made very clear that he is accepting completely the change in organization and will cooperate fully.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the Mayor, Mr. Washington, the Deputy Mayor, Mr. Fletcher, the Director of Public Safety, Mr. Murphy, and the Chief of Police, Mr. Layton, have my complete cooperation in carrying out the announced administrative reforms by the Mayor, Mr. Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EFFECT OF SUPREME COURT'S KATZ AGAINST UNITED STATES DECISION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a great deal has been said about Senate bill 2050—the Electronic Surveillance Act of 1967—since its introduction on August 8, 1967.

One of the most recurrent themes in the debate that has taken place over this bill has been the question of its constitutionality. Coming shortly after the Supreme Court decision of Berger against New York, S. 2050 was written to take into account the legal precedents established in that particular case. It was G. Robert Blakey, professor of law at Notre Dame University, who asserted quite early that the Supreme Court gave, in Berger, an open invitation to the legislative branch to legalize wiretapping under certain strictly regulated procedures.

Since that time, a number of competent and prestigious individuals have endorsed this proposed legislation as necessary and constitutional. Three organizations, the National Judicial Conference, consisting of ranking Federal judges across the country; the Association of Federal Investigators, representing 1,000 Federal career employees active in law enforcement; and the National Association of Attorneys General, in recent statements supported such legislation.

Yet its constitutional validity was still very much in question when the case of Katz against the United States came before the Supreme Court on December 18, 1967. It was this case which did away with the constitutional questions regarding the concept of electronic surveillance. In the words of Fred P. Graham, in an article in the New York Times entitled "New Tack in Bugging":

> Yesterday's opinion by Justice Potter Stewart was practically an invitation for the lawmakers to enact these (wiretapping) laws because it erased many of these constitutional doubts.

The wiretap involved in the case of Charles Katz, a Los Angeles gambler convicted of transmitting wagering information by telephone from Los Angeles to Miami and Boston, was conducted in a carefully circumscribed manner. The Federal agents did not begin electronic surveillance until they were given probable cause that the telephone was being used to violate a Federal law. Further, the surveillance was confined to the "brief periods during which he—Katz—used the telephone booth." Only his conversations were tapped.

In commenting on the conduct of the Government in this case, Mr. Justice Stewart pointed out:

> It is clear that this surveillance was so narrowly circumscribed that a duly authorized magistrate, properly notified of the need for such investigation, specifically informed of the basis on which it was to proceed, and clearly appraised on the precise intrusion it would entail, could *constitutionally* have authorized, with appropriate safeguards, the very limited search and seizure that the Government asserts in fact took place.

Mr. President, this decision represents a tremendous breakthrough insofar as Senate bill 2050 is concerned. I feel that the Supreme Court has, in this case, set down the framework for constitutional use of electronic surveillance devices. The legislation that has been proposed fits well into the framework set down by the Court.

It is my wish, Mr. President, that in light of the tremendous threat that organized crime poses both to our system of government and to our Nation's poor, on whom such crime preys, that we may act expeditiously in passing this legislation, now that the constitutional roadblocks have been removed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times by Mr. Graham and the Supreme Court decision in the case of Katz against the United States be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 20, 1967]

NEW TACK IN BUGGING—SUPREME COURT'S RULING MAY PRODUCE STATE LAWS ALLOWING EAVESDROPPING

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, December 19.—Opponents of electronic eavesdropping by the police won a battle in the Supreme Court but lost a major campaign of the war. As a result of the decision, in which the Court struck down a $300 fine imposed on a Los Angeles gambler who placed his bets from a bugged telephone booth, several state and perhaps the Federal Government could be encouraged to pass new laws to permit eavesdropping by the police.

Although the Court announced new limitations yesterday on electronic surveillance, it took the occasion to make it clear that bugging by the police could be a constitutional way of gathering evidence if the officers first obtained a warrant from a judge.

Study commissions in New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island have been working on proposed laws to establish procedures for court-approved police eavesdropping. A similar bill has been approved by a Senate subcommittee. But the outlook for these moves had been in doubt because many lawyers had thought the Supreme Court would declare them unconstitutional.

WAY OPENED FOR CHANGE

Yesterday's opinion by Justice Potter Stewart was practically an invitation for the lawmakers to enact these laws because it erased many of these constitutional doubts.

The Court held that Charles Katz, the gambler, had been illegally convicted because Federal agents had obtained evidence illegally when they overheard his remarks in the telephone booth.

This narrow holding was a point for those who oppose police eavesdropping, because it declared that the Constitution's ban on police surveillance forbids eavesdropping in semipublic places. The new ban applies even when the officers use such modern devices as directional microphones that allow them to pick up conversations without breaking into private premises to plant hidden microphones.

Last June, in the landmark Berger v. New York decision, the Court announced that the Fourth Amendment's ban on "unreasonable searches and seizures" by the police applied to eavesdropping. It held that the use of electronic devices amounts to a "seizure" of the words.

ISSUE LEFT UNDECIDED

But since traditional police searches always require the physical entry by officers into private premises, the Berger ruling left undecided the question of whether the Fourth Amendment also forbids the use of evidence obtained with the new devices that pick up conversations on distant park benches or through solid walls.

Justice Stewart's answer had been expected by most lawyers—that the fourth amendment "protects people, not places" when it asserts the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

The Justice's remark meant that no matter where a person might be his private remarks are protected by the Constitution from unreasonable police eavesdropping.

NEW YORK PREPARING BILL

But in New York, the Law Revision Commission under Richard J. Bartlett has drafted a bill that Governor Rockefeller is expected to recommend to the Legislature next month. It is designed to permit police eavesdropping that would stand up in court.

The bill would require that the police show probable cause that a crime is being committed, and that all other means of obtaining evidence had been tried before permission to bug was asked. It would permit eavesdropping for limited periods if a judge approved. After that, the subject would be notified that he had been bugged.

This type of legislation is expected to gain the endorsement soon of the American Bar Association's special Committee on Minimum Standards for Criminal Justice, and also of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

The most significant barrier to the enactment of such laws has been the opposition of the Johnson Administration, which insists they are an unnecessary harbinger of "Big Brother" government.

But now that the Supreme Court has lowered the constitutional barriers and the statute drafters are saying they have developed laws that will protect the innocent from governmental snooping, the pressure will be on the Johnson Administration to soften its stand against court-approved eavesdropping by Federal agents.

Then Justice Stewart added a statement that surprised most lawyers. In the Katz situation, he said, the bugging of the telephone booth would have been "reasonable," and the evidence admissible, if the agents had first obtained a "search" warrant from a judge.

When the Supreme Court struck down in the Berger case New York's permissive law on police eavesdropping the tone of the opinion by Justice Tom C. Clark had been so hostile to eavesdropping that many observers took it as the Supreme Court's way of saying that no law would be upheld if it authorized eavesdropping, even with prior judicial approval.

MORE LAWS EXPECTED

Now that the Supreme Court has clearly said that the police can constitutionally use electronic listening devices against suspected lawbreakers, public support can be expected to develop for the enactment of laws authorizing court-supervised bugging.

Yesterday's decision did not specify what procedures must be used for obtaining these warrants, leaving this to the ingenuity of the state legislatures and possibly Congress.

Without legislation, it is doubtful that judges in any jurisdiction could issue an eavesdropping warrant that would be accepted by the Supreme Court.

The Federal rules of criminal procedure, for instance, require that any warrant describe the "property" to be seized. It defines property as "documents, books, papers, and any other tangible objects."

Similarly, the law in most states is designed to permit search warrants only for the seizure of physical evidence. These laws will have to be amended before the police can use the constitutional eavesdropping described by the Supreme Court yesterday.

Supreme Court of the United States, No. 35.—October Term, 1967, Charles Katz, Petitioner, *v.* United States, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

[December 18, 1967.]

Mr. Justice Stewart delivered the opinion of the Court.

The petitioner was convicted in the District Court for the Southern District of California under an eight-count indictment charging him with transmitting wagering information by telephone from Los Angeles to Miami and Boston, in violation of a federal statute.[1] At trial the Government was permitted, over the petitioner's objection, to introduce evidence of the petitioner's end of telephone conversations, overheard by FBI agents who had attached an electronic listening and recording device to the outside of the public telephone booth from which he had placed his calls. In affirming his conviction, the Court of Appeals rejected the contention that the recordings had been obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment, because "[t]here was no physical entrance into the area occupied by [the petitioner]."[2] We granted certiorari in order to consider the constitutional questions thus presented.[3]

The petitioner has phrased those questions as follows:

"A. Whether a public telephone booth is a constitutionally protected area so that evidence obtained by attaching an electronic listening recording device to the top of such a booth is obtained in violation of the right to privacy of the user of the booth.

"B. Whether physical penetration of a constitutionally protected area is necessary before a search and seizure can be said to be violative of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution."

We decline to adopt this formulation of the issues. In the first place, the correct solution of Fourth Amendment problems is not necessarily promoted by incantation of the phrase "constitutionally protected area." Secondly, the Fourth Amendment cannot be translated into a general constitutional "right to privacy." That Amendment protects individual privacy against certain kinds of governmental intrusion, but its protections go further, and often have nothing to do with privacy at all[4] Other provisions of the Constitution protect personal privacy from other forms of governmental invasion.[5] But the protection of a person's *general* right to privacy—his right to be let alone by other people[6]—is, like the protection of his property and of his very life, left largely to the law of the individual states.[7]

Because of the misleading way the issues have been formulated, the parties have attached great significance to the characterization of the telephone booth from which the petitioner placed his calls. The petitioner has strenuously argued that the booth was a "constitutionally protected area." The Government has maintained with equal vigor that it was not.[8] But this effort to decide whether or not a given "area," viewed in the abstract, is "constitutionally protected" deflects attention from the problem presented by this case.[9] *For the Fourth Amendment*

---

[1] 18 U.S.C. § 1084. That statute provides in pertinent part:

"(a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information for use in news reporting of sporting events or contests, or for the transmission of information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on a sporting event or contest from a State where betting on that sporting event or contest is legal into a State in which such betting is legal."

[2] 369 F. 2d 130, 134.

[3] 386 U.S. 954. The petition for certiorari also challenged the validity of a warrant authorizing the search of the petitioner's premises. In light of our disposition of this case, we do not reach that issue.

We find no merit in the petitioner's further suggestion that his indictment must be dismissed. After his conviction was affirmed by the Court of Appeals, he testified before a federal grand jury concerning the charges involved here. Because he was compelled to testify pursuant to a grant of immunity, 47 U.S.C. § 409 (*l*), it is clear that the fruit of his testimony cannot be used against him in any future trial. But the petitioner asks for more. He contends that his conviction must be vacated and the charges against him dismissed lest he be "subjected to [a] penalty . . . on account of [a] . . . matter . . . concerning which he [was] compelled . . . to testify . . ." 47 U.S.C. § 409 (*l*). *Frank* v. *United States,* 347 F. 2d 486. We disagree. In relevant part, § 409 (*l*) substantially repeats the language of the Compulsory Testimony Act of 1893, 27 Stat. 443, 444, 49 U.S.C. § 46, which was Congress' response to this Court's statement that an immunity statute can supplant the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination only if it affords adequate protection from future prosecution or conviction. *Counselman* v. *Hitchcock,* 142 U.S. 547, 585–586. The statutory provision here involved was designed to provide such protection, see *Brown* v. *United States,* 359 U.S. 41, 45–46, not to confer immunity from punishment pursuant to a *prior* prosecution and adjudication of guilt. Cf. *Reina* v. *United States,* 364 U.S. 507, 513–514.

[4] "The average man would very likely not have his feelings soothed any more by having his property seized openly than by having it seized privately and by stealth. . . . And a person can be just as much, if not more, irriated, annoyed and injured by an unceremonious public arrest by a policeman as he is by a seizure in the privacy of his office or home." *Griswold* v. *Connecticut,* 381 U.S. 479, 509 (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black).

[5] The First Amendment, for example, imposes limitations upon governmental abridgment of "freedom to associate and privacy in one's associations." *NAACP* v. *Alabama,* 357 U.S. 449, 462. The Third Amendment's prohibition against the unconsented peacetime quartering of soldiers protects another aspect of privacy from governmental intrusion. To some extent, the Fifth Amendment too "reflects the Constitution's concern for . . . '. . . the right of each individual "to a private enclave where he may lead a private life." ' " *Tehan* v. *Shott,* 382 U.S. 406, 416. Virtually every governmental action interferes with personal privacy to some degree. The question in each case is whether that interference violates a command of the United States Constitution.

[6] See Warren and Brandeis, "The Right to Privacy," 4 Harv. L. Rev. 193 (1890).

[7] See, *e.g., Time, Inc.* v. *Hill,* 385 U.S. 374. Cf. *Breard* v. *Alexandria,* 341 U.S. 622; *Kovacs* v. *Cooper,* 336 U.S. 77.

[8] In support of their respective claims, the parties have compiled competing lists of "protected areas" for our consideration. It appears to be common ground that a private home is such an area, *Weeks* v. *United States,* 232 U.S. 383, but that an open field is not. *Hester* v. *United States,* 265 U.S. 57. Defending the inclusion of a telephone booth in his list the petitioner cites *United States* v. *Stone,* 232 F. Supp. 396, and *United States* v. *Madison,* 32 L. W. 2243 (D.C. Ct. Gen. Sess.). Urging that the telephone booth should be excluded, the Government finds support in *United States* v. *Borgese,* 235 F. Supp. 286.

[9] It is true that this Court has occasionally described its conclusions in terms of "con-

protects people, not places. What a person knowingly exposes to the public even in his own home or office, is not a subject of Fourth Amendment protection. See *Lewis* v. *United States*, 385 U.S. 206, 210; *United States* v. *Lee*, 274 U.S. 559, 563. But what he seeks to preserve as private, even in an area accessible to the public, may be constitutionally protected. See *Rios* v. *United States*, 364 U.S. 253; *Ex parte Jackson*, 96 U.S. 727, 733.

The Government stresses the fact that the telephone booth from which the petitioner made his calls was constructed partly of glass, so that he was as visible after he entered it as he would have been if he had remained outside. But what he sought to exclude when he entered the booth was not the intruding eye—it was the uninvited ear. He did not shed his right to do so simply because he made his calls from a place where he might be seen. No less than an individual in a business office,[10] in a friend's apartment,[11] or in a taxicab,[12] a person in a telephone booth may rely upon the protection of the Fourth Amendment. One who occupies it, shuts the door behind him, and pays the toll that permits him to place a call, is surely entitled to assume that the words he utters into the mouthpiece will not be broadcast to the world. To read the Constitution more narrowly is to ignore the vital role that the public telephone has come to play in private communication.

The Government contends, however, that the activities of its agents in this case should not be tested by Fourth Amendment requirements, for the surveillance technique they employed involved no physical penetration of the telephone booth from which the petitioner placed his calls. It is true that the absence of such penetration was at one time thought to foreclose further Fourth Amendment inquiry, *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 457, 464, 466; *Goldman* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 129, 134–136, for that Amendment was thought to limit only searches and seizures of tangible property.[13] But "[t]he premise that property interests control the right of the Government to search and seize has been discredited." *Warden* v. *Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294, 304. Thus, although a closely divided Court supposed in *Olmstead* that surveillance without any trespass and without the seizure of any material object fell outside the ambit of the Constitution, we have since departed from the narrow view on which that decision rested. Indeed, we have expressly held that the Fourth Amendment governs not only the seizure of tangible items, but extends as well to the recording of oral statements, overheard without any "technical trespass under . . . local property law." *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505, 511. Once this much is acknowledged, and once it is recognized that the Fourth Amendment protects people—and not simply "areas"—against unreasonable searches and seizures, it becomes clear that the reach of that Amendment cannot turn upon the presence or absence of a physical intrusion into any given enclosure.

We conclude that the underpinnings of *Olmstead* and *Goldman* have been so eroded by our subsequent decisions that the "trespass" doctrine there enunciated can no longer be regarded as controlling. The Government's activities in electronically listening to and recording the petitioner's words violated the privacy upon which he justifiably relied while using the telephone booth and thus constituted a "search and seizure" within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. The fact that the electronic device employed to achieve that end did not happen to penetrate the wall of the booth can have no constitutional significance.

The question remaining for decision, then, is whether the search and seizure conducted in this case complied with constitutional standards. In that regard, the Government's position is that its agents acted in an entirely defensible manner: (1) They did not begin their electronic surveillance until investigation of the petitioner's activities had established a strong probability that he was using the telephone in question to transmit gambling information to persons in other States, in violation of federal law. Moreover (2) the surveillance was limited, both in scope and in duration, to the specific purpose of establishing the contents of the petitioner's unlawful telephonic communications. (3) The agents confined their surveillance to the brief periods during which he used the telephone booth,[14] and (4) they took great care to overhear only the conversations of the petitioner himself.[15]

Accepting this account of the Government's actions as accurate, it is clear that this surveillance was so narrowly circumscribed that a duly authorized magistrate, (a) properly notified of the need for such investigation, (b) specifically informed of the basis on which it was to proceed, and (c) clearly apprised of the precise intrusion it would entail, could constitutionally have authorized, with appropriate safeguards, the very limited search and seizure that the Government asserts in fact took place. Only last Term we sustained the validity of such an authorization, holding that, under sufficiently "precise and discriminate circumstances," a federal court may empower government agents to employ a concealed electronic device "for the narrow and particularized purpose of ascertaining the truth of the . . . allegations" of a "detailed factual affidavit alleging the commission of a specific criminal offense." *Osborn* v. *United States*, 385 U.S. 323, 329–330. Discussing that holding, the Court in *Berger* v. *New York*, 388 U.S. 41, said that "the order authorizing the use of the electronic device" in *Osborn* "afforded similar protections to those . . . of conventional warrants authorizing the seizure of tangible evidence." Through those protections, "no greater invasion of privacy was permitted than was necessary under the circumstances." *Id.*, at 57.[16] Here, too a similar judicial order could have accommodated "the legitimate needs of law enforcement"[17] by authorizing the carefully limited use of electronic surveillance.

The Government urges that, because its agents relied upon the decisions in *Olmstead* and *Goldman*, and because they did no more here than they might properly have done with prior judicial sanction, we should retroactively validate their conduct. That we cannot do. It is apparent that the agents in this case acted with restraint. Yet the inescapable fact is that this restraint was imposed by the agents themselves, not by a judicial officer. (1) They were not required, before commencing the search, to present their estimate of probable cause for detached scrutiny by a neutral magistrate. (2) They were not compelled, during the conduct of the search itself, to observe precise limits established in advance by a specific court order. (3) Nor were they directed, after the search had been completed, to notify the authorizing magistrate in detail of all that had been seized. In the absence of such safeguards, this Court has never sustained a search upon the sole ground that officers reasonably expected to find evidence of a particular crime and voluntarily confined their activities to the least intrusive means consistent with that end. Searches conducted without warrants have been held unlawful "notwithstanding facts unquestionably showing probable cause," *Agnello* v. *United States*, 269 U.S. 20, 33, for the Constitution requires "that the deliberate, impartial judgment of a judicial officer . . . be interposed between the citizen and the police . . ." *Wong Sun* v. *United States*, 371 U.S. 471, 481–482. "Over and again this Court has emphasized that the mandate of the [Fourth] Amendment requires adherence to judicial processes," *United States* v.

---

stitutionally protected areas," see, *e.g.*, *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505, 510, 512; *Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427, 438–439; *Berger* v. *New York*, 388 U.S. 41, 57, 59, but we have never suggested that this concept can serve as a talismanic solution to every Fourth Amendment problem.

[10] *Silverthorne Lumber Co.* v. *United States*, 251 U.S. 385.

[11] *Jones* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 257.

[12] *Rios* v. *United States*, 364 U.S. 253.

[13] See *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 464–466. We do not deal in this case with the law of detention or arrest under the Fourth Amendment.

[14] Based upon their previous visual observations of the petitioner, the agents correctly predicted that he would use the telephone booth for several minutes at approximately the same time each morning. The petitioner was subjected to electronic surveillance only during this predetermined period. Six recordings, averaging some three minutes each, were obtained and admitted in evidence. They preserved the petitioner's end of conversations concerning the placing of bets and the receipt of wagering information.

[15] On the single occasion when the statements of another person were inadvertently intercepted, the agents refrained from listening to them.

[16] Although the protections afforded the petitioner in *Osborn* were "*similar* . . . to those . . . of conventional warrants," they were not identical. A conventional warrant ordinarily serves to notify the suspect of an intended search. But if Osborn had been told in advance that federal officers intended to record his conversations, the point of making such recordings would obviously have been lost; the evidence in question could not have been obtained. In omitting any requirement of advance notice, the federal court that authorized electronic surveillance in *Osborn* simply recognized, as has this Court, that officers need not announce their purpose before conducting an otherwise authorized search if such an announcement would provoke the escape of the suspect or the destruction of critical evidence. See *Ker* v. *California*, 374 U.S. 23, 37–41.

Although some have thought that this "exception to the notice requirement where exigent circumstances are present," *id.*, at 39, should be deemed inapplicable where police enter a home before its occupants are aware that officers are present, *id.*, at 55–58 (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan), the reasons for such a limitation have no bearing here. However, true it may be that "[i]nnocent citizens should not suffer the shock, fright or embarrassment attendant upon an unannounced police intrusion," *id.*, at 57, and that "the requirement of awareness . . . serves to minimize the hazards of the officers' dangerous calling," *id.*, at 57–58, these considerations are not relevant to the problems presented by judicially authorized electronic surveillance.

Nor do the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure impose an inflexible requirement of prior notice. Rule 41(d) does require federal officers to serve upon the person searched a copy of the warrant and a receipt describing the material obtained, but it does not invariably require that this be done before the search takes place. *Nordelli* v. *United States*, 24 F. 2d 665, 666–667.

Thus the fact that the petitioner in *Osborn* was unaware that his words were being electronically transcribed did not prevent this Court from sustaining his conviction, and did not prevent the Court in *Berger* from reaching the conclusion that the use of the recording device sanctioned in *Osborn* was entirely lawful. 388 U.S. 41, 57.

[17] *Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427, 464 (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan).

Jeffers, 342 U.S. 48, 51, and that searches conducted outside the judicial process, without prior approval by judge or magistrate are *per se* unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment [18]—subject only to a few specifically established and well-delineated exceptions.[19]

It is difficult to imagine how any of those exceptions could ever apply to the sort of search and seizure involved in this case. Even electronic surveillance substantially contemporaneous with an individual's arrest could hardly be deemed an "incident" of that arrest.[20] Nor could the use of electronic surveillance without prior authorization be justified on grounds of "hot pursuit." [21] And of course, the very nature of electronic surveillance precludes its use pursuant to the suspect's consent.[22]

The Government does not question these basic principles. Rather, it urges the creation of a new exception to cover this case.[23] It argues that surveillance of a telephone booth should be exempted from the usual requirement of advance authorization by a magistrate upon a showing of probable cause. We cannot agree. Omission of such authorization "bypasses the safeguards provided by an objective predetermination of probable cause, and substitutes instead the far less reliable procedure of an after-the-event justification for the . . . search, too likely to be subtly influenced by the familiar shortcomings of hindsight judgment." *Beck* v. *Ohio,* 379 U.S. 89, 96.

And bypassing a neutral predetermination of the *scope* of a search leaves individuals secure from Fourth Amendment violations "only in the discretion of the police." *Id.,* at 97.

These considerations do not vanish when the search in question is transferred from the setting of a home, an office, or a hotel room, to that of a telephone booth. Wherever a man may be, he is entitled to know that he will remain free from unreasonable searches and seizures. The government agents here ignored "the procedure of antecedent justification . . . that is central to the Fourth Amendment," [24] a procedure that we hold to be a constitutional precondition of the kind of electronic surveillance involved in this case. Because the surveillance here failed to meet that condition, and because it led to the petitioner's conviction, the judgment must be reversed.

It is so ordered.

Mr. Justice Marshall took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Supreme Court of the United States, No. 35—October Term, 1967, Charles Katz, Petitioner, *v.* United States, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

[December 18, 1967.]

Mr. Justice Douglas, with whom Mr. Justice Brennan joins, concurring.

While I join the opinion of the Court, I feel compelled to reply to the separate concurring opinion of my Brother White, which I view as a wholly unwarranted green light for the Executive Branch to resort to electronic eavesdropping without a warrant in cases which the Executive Branch itself labels "national security" matters.

Neither the President nor the Attorney General is a magistrate. In matters where they believe national security may be involved they are not detached, disinterested, and neutral as a court or magistrate must be. Under the separation of powers created by the Constitution, the Executive Branch is not supposed to be neutral and disinterested. Rather it should vigorously investigate and prevent breaches of national security and prosecute those who violate the pertinent federal laws. The President and Attorney General are properly interested parties, cast in the role of adversary, in national security cases. They may even be the intended victims of subversive action. Since spies and saboteurs are as entitled to the protection of the Fourth Amendment as suspected gamblers like petitioner, I cannot agree that where spies and saboteurs are involved adequate protection of Fourth Amendment rights is assured when the President and Attorney General assume both the position of adversary-and-prosecutor and disinterested, neutral magistrate.

There is, so far as I understand constitutional history, no distinction under the Fourth Amendment between types of crimes. Article III, § 3, gives "treason" a very narrow definition and puts restrictions on its proof. But the Fourth Amendment draws no lines between various substantive offenses. The arrests in cases of "hot pursuit," the arrests on visible or other evidence of probable cause cut across the boards and are not peculiar to any kind of crime.

I would respect the present lines of distinction and not improvise because a particular crime seems particularly heinous. When the Framers took that step, as they did with treason, the worst crime of all, they made their purpose manifest.

Supreme Court of the United States, No. 35—October Term, 1967, Charles Katz, Petitioner, *v.* United States, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

[December 18, 1967.]

Mr. Justice Harlan, concurring.

I join the opinion of the Court, which I read to hold only (a) that an enclosed telephone booth is an area where, like a home, *Weeks* v. *United States,* 232 U.S. 383, and unlike a field, *Hester* v. *United States,* 265 U.S. 57, a person has a constitutionally protected reasonable expectation of privacy; (b) that electronic as well as physical intrusion into a place that is in this sense private may constitute a violation of the Fourth Amendment; and (c) that the invasion of a constitutionally protected area by federal authorities is, as the Court has long held, presumptively unreasonable in the absence of a search warrant.

As the Court's opinion states, "The Fourth Amendment protects people, not places." The question, however, is what protection it affords to those people. Generally, as here, the answer to that question requires reference to a "place." My understanding of the rule that has emerged from prior decisions is that there is a twofold requirement, first that a person have exhibited an actual (subjective) expectation of privacy and, second, that the expectation be one that society is prepared to recognize as "reasonable." Thus a man's home is, for most purposes, a place where he expects privacy, but objects, activities, or statements that he exposes to the "plain view" of outsiders are not "protected" because no intention to keep them to himself has been exhibited. On the other hand, conversations in the open would not be protected against being overheard, for the expectation of privacy under the circumstances would be unreasonable. Cf. *Hester* v. *United States, supra.*

The critical fact in this case is that "[o]ne who occupies it, [a telephone booth] shuts the door behind him, and pays the toll that permits him to place a call, is surely entitled to assume" that his conversation is not being intercepted. *Ante,* p. 5. The point is not that the booth is "accessible to the public" at other times, *ante,* p. 5, but that it is temporarily private place whose momentary occupants' expectations of freedom from intrusion are recognized as reasonable. Cf. *Rios* v. *United States,* 364 U.S. 253.

In *Silverman* v. *United States,* 365 U.S. 505, we held that eavesdropping accomplished by means of an electronic device that penetrated the premises occupied by petitioner was a violation of the Fourth Amendment. That case established that interception of conversations reasonably intended to be private could constitute a "search and seizure," and that the examination or taking of physical property was not required. This view of the Fourth Amendment was followed in *Wong Sun* v. *United States,* 371 U.S. 471, at 485, and *Berger* v. *New York,* 388 U.S. 41, at 51. Also compare *Osborn* v. *United States,* 385 U.S. 323, at 327. In *Silverman* we found unnecessary to re-examine *Goldman* v. *United States,* 316 U.S. 129, which had held that electronic surveillance accomplished without the physical penetration of petitioner's premises by a tangible object did not violate the Fourth Amendment. This case requires us to reconsider *Goldman,* and I agree that it should now be overruled.* Its limitation on Fourth Amendment protection is, in the present day, bad physics as well as bad law, for reasonable expectations of privacy may be defeated by electronic as well as physical invasion.

Finally, I do not read the Court's opinion to declare that no interception of a conversation one-half of which occurs in a public telephone booth can be reasonable in the absence of a warrant. As elsewhere under the Fourth Amendment, warrants are the general rule, to which the legitimate needs of law enforcement may demand specific exceptions. It will be time enough to consider any such exceptions when an appropriate occasion presents itself, and I agree with the Court that this is not one.

---

[18] See, *e.g., Jones* v. *United States,* 357 U.S. 493, 497–499; *Rios* v. *United States,* 364 U.S. 253, 261; *Chapman* v. *United States,* 365 U.S. 610, 613–615; *Stoner* v. *California,* 376 U.S. 483, 486–487.

[19] See, *e.g., Carroll* v. *United States,* 267 U.S. 132, 153, 156; *McDonald* v. *United States,* 335 U.S. 451, 454–456; *Brinegar* v. *United States,* 338 U.S. 160, 174–177; *Cooper* v. *California,* 386 U.S. 58; *Warden* v. *Hayden,* 387 U.S. 294, 298–300.

[20] In *Agnello* v. *United States,* 269 U.S. 20, 30, the Court stated: "The right without a search warrant contemporaneously to search persons lawfully arrested while committing crime and to search the place where the arrest is made in order to find and seize things connected with the crime as its fruits or as the means by which it was committed, as well as weapons and other things to effect an escape from custody, is not to be doubted."

Whatever one's view of "the long-standing practice of searching for other proofs of guilt within the control of the accused found upon arrest," *United States* v. *Rabinowitz,* 339 U.S. 56, 61; cf. *id.,* at 71–79 (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter), the concept of an "incidental" search cannot readily be extended to include surreptitious surveillance of an individual either immediately before, or immediately after, his arrest.

[21] Although "[t]he Fourth Amendment does not require police officers to delay in the course of an investigation if to do so would gravely endanger their lives or the lives of others," *Warden* v. *Hayden,* 387 U.S. 294, 298–299, there seems little likelihood that electronic surveillance would be a realistic possibility in a situation so fraught with urgency.

[22] A search to which an individual consents meets Fourth Amendment requirements, *Zap* v. *United States,* 328 U.S. 624, but of course "the usefulness of electronic surveillance depends on lack of notice to the suspect." *Lopez* v. *United States,* 373 U.S. 427, 463 (dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan).

[23] Whether safeguards other than prior authorization by a magistrate would satisfy the Fourth Amendment in a situation involving the national security is a question not presented by this case.

[24] See *Osborn* v. *United States,* 385 U.S. 323, 330.

*I also think that the course of development evinced by *Silverman supra, Wong Sun, supra, Berger, supra,* and today's decision must be recognized to overrule *Olmstead* v. *United States,* 277 U.S. 438, which essentially rested on the ground that conversations were not subject to the protection of the Fourth Amendment.

Supreme Court of the United States, No. 35—October Term, 1967, Charles Katz, Petitioner *v.* United States, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

[December 18, 1967.]

Mr. Justice White, concurring.

I agree that the official surveillance of petitioner's telephone conversations in a public booth must be subjected to the test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment and that on the record now before us the particular surveillance undertaken was unreasonable absent a warrant properly authorizing it. This application of the Fourth Amendment need not interfere with legitimate needs of law enforcement.**

In joining the Court's opinion, I note the Court's acknowledgement that there are circumstances in which it is reasonable to search without a warrant. In this connection, in footnote 23 the Court points out that today's decision does not reach national security cases. Wiretapping to protect the security of the Nation has been authorized by successive Presidents. The present Administration would apparently save national security cases from restrictions against wiretapping. See *Berger* v. *New York*, 388 U.S. 41, 112–118 (1967) (White, J., dissenting). We should not require the warrant procedure and the magistrate's judgment if the President of the United States or his chief legal officer, the Attorney General, has considered the requirements of national security and authorized electronic surveillance as reasonable.

Supreme Court of the United States, No. 35—October Term, 1967, Charles Katz, Petitioner *v.* United States, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

[December 18, 1967]

Mr. Justice Black, dissenting.

If I could agree with the Court that eavesdropping carried on by electronic means (equivalent to wiretapping) constitutes a "search" or "seizure," I would be happy to join the Court's opinion. For on that premise my Brother Stewart sets out methods in accord with the Fourth Amendment to guide States in the enactment and enforcement of laws passed to regulate wiretapping by government. In this respect today's opinion differs sharply from *Berger* v. *New York*, 388 U. S. 41, decided last Term, which held void on its face a New York statute authorizing wiretapping on warrants issued by magistrates on showings of probable causes. The *Berger* case also set up what appeared to be insuperable obstacles to the valid passage of such wiretapping laws by States. The Court's opinion in this case, however, removes the doubts about state power in this field and abates to a large extent the confusion and near paralyzing effect of the *Berger* holding. Notwithstanding these good efforts of the Court, I am still unable to agree with its interpretation of the Fourth Amendment.

My basic objection is twofold: (1) I do not believe that the words of the Amendment will bear the meaning given them by today's decision, and (2) I do not believe that it is the proper role of this Court to rewrite the Amendment in order "to bring it into harmony with the times" and thus reach a result that many people believe to be desirable.

While I realize that an argument based on the meaning of words lacks the scope, and no doubt the appeal, of broad policy discussions and philosophical discourses on such nebulous subjects as privacy, for me the language of the Amendment is the crucial place to look in construing a written document such as our Constitution. The Fourth Amendment says that

> "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

The first clause protects "persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures. . . ." These words connote the idea of tangible things with size, form, and weight, things capable of being searched, seized, or both. The second clause of the Amendment still further establishes its Framers' purpose to limit its protection to tangible things by providing that no warrants shall issue but those "particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized." A conversation overheard by eavesdropping whether by plain snooping or wiretapping, is not tangible and, under the normally accepted meanings of the words, can neither be searched nor seized. In addition the language of the second clause indicates that the Amendment refers to something not only tangible so it can be seized but to something already in existence so it can be described. Yet the Court's interpretation would have the Amendment apply to overhearing future conversations which by their very nature are nonexistent until they take place. How can one "describe" a future conversation, and if not, how can a magistrate issue a warrant to eavesdrop one in the future? It is argued that information showing what is expected to be said is sufficient to limit the boundaries of what later can be admitted into evidence; but does such general information really meet the specific language of the Amendment which says "particularly describing"? Rather than using language in a completely artificial way, I must conclude that the Fourth Amendment simply does not apply to eavesdropping.

Tapping telephone wires, of course, was an unknown possibility at the time the Fourth Amendment was adopted. But eavesdropping (and wiretapping is nothing more than eavesdropping by telephone) was, as even the majority opinion in *Berger, supra*, recognized, "an ancient practice which at common law was condemned as a nuisance. 4 Blackstone, Commentaries 168. In those days the eavesdropper listened by naked ear under the eaves of houses or their windows, or beyond their walls seeking out private discourse." 388 U.S., at 45. There can be no doubt that the Framers were aware of this practice, and if they had desired to outlaw or restrict the use of evidence obtained by eavesdropping, I believe that they would have used the appropriate language to do so in the Fourth Amendment. They certainly would not have left such a task to the ingenuity of language-stretching judges. No one, it seems to me, can read the debates on the Bill of Rights without reaching the conclusion that its Framers and critics well knew the meaning of the words they used, what they would be understood to mean by others, their scope and their limitations. Under these circumstances it strikes me as a charge against their scholarship, their commonsense and their candor to give to the Fourth Amendment's language the eavesdropping meaning the Court imputes to it today.

I do not deny that commonsense requires and that this Court often has said that the Bill of Rights' safeguards should be given a liberal construction. This principle, however, does not justify construing the search and seizure amendment as applying to eavesdropping or the "seizure" of conversations. The Fourth Amendment was aimed directly at the abhorred practice of breaking in, ransacking and searching homes and other buildings and seizing peoples' personal belongings without warrants issued by magistrates. The Amendment deserves, and this Court has given it, a liberal construction in order to protect against warrantless searches of buildings and seizures of tangible personal effects. But until today this Court has refused to say that eavesdropping comes within the ambit of Fourth Amendment restrictions. See, *e.g.*, *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U.S. 438 (1928), and *Goldman* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 129 (1942).

So far I have attempted to state why I think the words of the Fourth Amendment prevent its application to eavesdropping. It is important now to show that this has been the traditional view of the Amendment's scope since its adoption and that the Court's decision in this case, along with its amorphous holding in *Berger* last Term, marks the first real departure from that view.

The first case to reach this Court which actually involved a clear-cut test of the Fourth Amendment's applicability to eavesdropping through a wiretap was, of course, *Olmstead, supra*. In holding that the interception of private telephone conversations by means of wiretapping was not a violation of the Fourth Amendment, this Court, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Taft, examined the languge of the Amendment and found, just as I do now, that the words could not be stretched to encompass overheard conversations:

> "The Amendment itself shows that the search is to be of material things—the person, the house, his papers or his effects. The description of the warrant necessary to make the proceeding lawful, is that it must specify the place to be searched and the person or *things* to be seized. . . . Justice Bradley in the *Boyd* case [*Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U.S. 616] and Justice Clark in the *Gouled* case [*Gouled* v. *United States*, 255 U.S. 298] said that the Fifth Amendment and the Fourth Amendment were to be liberally construed to effect the purpose of the framers of the Constitution in the interest of liberty. But that can not justify enlargement of the language employed beyond the possible practical meaning of houses, persons, papers, and effects, or so to apply the words search and seizure as to forbid hearing or sight." 277 U.S., at 464–465.

**In previous cases, which are undisturbed by today's decision, the Court has upheld, as reasonable under the Fourth Amendment, admission to trial of evidence obtained (1) by an undercover police agent to whom a defendant speaks without knowledge that he is in the employ of the police, *Hoffa* v. *United States*, 385 U.S. 293 (1966); (2) by a recording device hidden on the person of such an informant, *Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427 (1963); *Osborn* v. *United States*, 385 U.S. 323 (1966); and (3) by a policeman listening to the secret micro-wave transmissions of an agent conversing with the defendant in another location, *On Lee* v. *United States*, 343 U.S. 747 (1952). When one man speaks to another he takes all the risks ordinarily inherent in so doing, including the risk that the man to whom he speaks will make public what he has heard. The Fourth Amendment does not protect against unreliable (or law-abiding) associates. *Hoffa* v. *United States, supra*. It is but a logical and reasonable extension of this principle that a man take the risk that his hearer, free to memorize what he hears for later verbatim repetitions, is instead recording it or transmitting it to another. The present case deals with an entirely different situation, for as the Court emphasizes the petitioner "sought to exclude . . . the uninvited ear," and spoke under circumstances in which a reasonable person would assume that uninvited ears were not listening.

Goldman v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 129, is an even clearer example of this Court's traditional refusal to consider eavesdropping as being covered by the Fourth Amendment. There federal agents used a detectaphone, which was placed on the wall of an adjoining room, to listen to the conversation of a defendant carried on in his private office and intended to be confined within the four walls of the room. This Court, referring to *Olmstead*, found no Fourth Amendment violation.

It should be noted that the Court in *Olmstead* based its decision squarely on the fact that wiretapping or eavesdropping does not violate the Fourth Amendment. As shown, *supra*, in the cited quotation from the case, the Court went to great pains to examine the actual language of the Amendment and found that the words used simply could not be stretched to cover eavesdropping. That there was no trespass was not the determinative factor, and indeed the Court in citing *Hester* v. *United States*, 265 U.S. 57, indicated that even where there was a trespass the Fourth Amendment does not automatically apply to evidence obtained by "hearing or sight." The *Olmstead* majority characterized *Hester* as holding "that the testimony of two officers of the law who trespassed on the defendant's land, concealed themselves one hundred yards away from his house and saw him come out and hand a bottle of whiskey to another, was not inadmissible. While there was a trespass, there was no search of person, house, papers or effects." 277 U.S. at 465. Thus the clear holding of the *Olmstead* and *Goldman* cases, undiluted by any question of trespass, is that eavesdropping, in both its original and modern forms, is not violative of the Fourth Amendment.

While my reading of the *Olmstead* and *Goldman* cases convinces me that they were decided on the basis of the inapplicability of the wording of the Fourth Amendment to eavesdropping, and not on any trespass basis, this is not to say that unauthorized intrusion has not played an important role in search and seizure cases. This Court has adopted an exclusionary rule to bar evidence obtained by means of such intrusions. As I made clear in my dissenting opinion in *Berger* v. *New York*, 388 U.S. 41, 76, I continue to believe that this exclusionary rule formulated in *Weeks* v. *United States*, 232 U.S. 383, rests on the "supervisory power" of this Court over other federal courts and is not rooted in the Fourth Amendment. See *Wolf* v. *Colorado*, concurring opinion, 338 U.S. 39, 40. See also *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, concurring opinion, 367 U.S. 661–666. This rule has caused the Court to refuse to accept evidence where there has been such an intrusion regardless of whether there has been a search or seizure in violation of the Fourth Amendment. As this Court said in *Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427, 438–439, "The Court has in the past sustained instances of 'electronic eavesdropping' against constitutional challenge, when devices have been used to enable government agents to overhear conversations which would have been beyond the reach of the human ear [citing *Olmstead* and *Goldman*]. It has been insisted only that the electronic device not be planted by an unlawful physical invasion of a constitutionally protected area. *Silverman* v. *United States*."

To support its new interpretation of the Fourth Amendment, which in effect amounts to a rewriting of the language, the Court's opinion concludes that "the underpinnings of *Olmstead* and *Goldman* have been . . . eroded by our subsequent decisions. . . ." But the only cases cited as accomplishing this "eroding" are *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505, and *Warden* v. *Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294. Neither of these cases "eroded" *Olmstead* or *Goldman*. *Silverman* is an interesting choice since there the Court expressly refused to re-examine the rationale of *Olmstead* or *Goldman* although such a reexamination was strenuously urged upon the Court by the petitioner's counsel. Also it is significant that in *Silverman*, as the Court described it, "the eavesdropping was accomplished by means of an unauthorized physical penetration into the premises occupied by the petitioners," thus calling into play the supervisory exclusionary rule of evidence. As I have pointed out above, where there is an unauthorized intrusion, this Court has rejected admission of evidence obtained regardless of whether there has been an unconstitutional search and seizure. The majority's decision here relies heavily on the statement in the opinion that the Court "need not pause to consider whether or not there was a technical trespass under the local property law relating to party walls." Yet this statement should not becloud the fact that time and again the opinion emphasizes that there has been an unauthorized intrusion: "For a fair reading of the record in this case shows that the eavesdropping was accomplished by means of an *unauthorized physical penetration* into the premises occupied by the petitioners." (P. 509, emphasis added.) "Eavesdropping accomplished by means of such a *physical instrusion* is beyond the pale of even those decisions . . . ." (Pp. 509, 510, emphasis added.) "Here . . . the officers overheard the petitioners' conversations only by *usurping* part of the petitioners' house or office . . . ." (P. 511, emphasis added.) "[D]ecision here . . . is based upon the reality of an *actual intrusion* . . . ." (P. 512, emphasis added.) "We find no occasion to re-examine *Goldman* here, but we decline to go beyond it, *by even a fraction of an inch*." (P. 512, emphasis added.) As if this were not enough, Justices Clark and Whittaker concurred with the following statement: "In view of the determination by the majority that the *unauthorized physical penetration* into petitioners' premises constituted sufficient trespass to remove the case from the coverage of earlier decisions, we feel obliged to join in the Court's opinion." (P. 513, emphasis added.) As I made clear in my dissent in *Berger*, the Court in *Silverman* held the evidence should be excluded by virtue of the exclusionary rule and "I would not have agreed with the Court's opinion in *Silverman* . . . had I thought that the result depended on finding a violation of the Fourth Amendment . . . ." 388 U.S., at 79–80. In light of this and the fact that the Court expressly refused to reexamine *Olmstead* and *Goldman*, I cannot read *Silverman* as overturning the interpretation stated very plainly in *Olmstead* and followed in *Goldman* that eavesdropping is not covered by the Fourth Amendment.

The other "eroding" case cited in the Court's opinion is *Warden* v. *Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294. It appears that this case is cited for the proposition that the Fourth Amendment applies to "intangibles," such as conversation, and the following ambiguous statement is quoted from the opinion: "The premise that property interests control the right of the government to search and seize has been discredited." 387 U.S., at 304. But far from being concerned with eavesdropping, *Warden* v. *Hayden* upholds the seizure of *clothes*, certainly tangibles by any definition. The discussion of property interests was involved only with the common-law rule that the right to seize property depended upon proof of a superior property interest.

Thus, I think that although the Court attempts to convey the impression that for some reason today *Olmstead* and *Goldman* are no longer good law, it must face up to the fact that these cases have never been overruled or even "eroded." It is the Court's opinions in this case and *Berger* which for the first time since 1790, when the Fourth Amendment was adopted, have declared that eavesdropping is subject to Fourth Amendment restrictions and that conversations can be "seized."[*] I must align myself with all those judges who up to this year have never been able to impute such a meaning to the words of the Amendment.

Since I see no way in which the words of the Fourth Amendment can be construed to apply to eavesdropping, that closes the matter for me. In interpreting the Bill of Rights, I willingly go as far as a liberal construction of the language takes me, but I simply cannot in good conscience give a meaning to words which they have never before been thought to have and which they certainly do not have in common ordinary usage. I will not distort the words of the Amendment in order to "keep the Constitution up to date" or "to bring it into harmony with the times." It was never meant for this Court to have such power, which in effect would make us a continuously functioning constitutional convention.

With this decision the Court has completed, I hope, its rewriting of the Fourth Amendment, which started only recently when the Court began referring incessantly to the Fourth Amendment not so much as a law against *unreasonable* searches and seizures as one to protect an individual's privacy. By clever word juggling the Court finds it plausible to argue that language aimed specifically at searches and seizures of things that can be searched and seized may, to protect privacy, be applied to eavesdropped evidence of conversations that can neither be searched nor seized. Few things happen to an individual that do not affect his privacy in one way or another. Thus, by arbitrarily substituting the Court's language, designed to protect privacy, for the Constitution's language, designed to protect against unreasonable searches and seizures, the Court has made the Fourth Amendment its vehicle for holding all laws violative of the Constitution which offend the Court's broadest concept of privacy. As I said in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, "The Court talks about a constitutional 'right of privacy' as though there is some constitutional provision or provisions forbidding any law ever to be passed which might abridge the 'privacy' of individuals. But there is not." (Dissenting opinion, p. 508.) I made clear in that dissent my fear of the dangers involved when this Court uses the "broad, abstract and ambiguous concept" of "privacy" as a "comprehensive substitute for the Fourth Amend-

---

[*] The first paragraph of my Brother HARLAN's concurring opinion is susceptible to the interpretation, although probably not intended, that this Court "has long held" eavesdropping to be a violation of the Fourth Amendment and therefore "presumptively unreasonable in the absence of a search warrant." There is no reference to any long line of cases, but simply a cite to *Silverman*, and several cases following it, to establish this historical proposition. In the first place, as I have indicated in this opinion, I do not read *Silverman* as holding any such thing; and in the second place, *Silverman* was decided in 1961. Thus, whatever it held, it cannot be said it "has [been] long held." I think my Brother HARLAN recognizes this later in his opinion when he admits that the Court must now overrule *Olmstead* and *Goldman*. In having to overrule these cases in order to establish the holding the Court adopts today, it becomes clear that the Court is promulgating new doctrine instead of merely following what it "has long held." This is emphasized by my Brother HARLAN's claim that it is "bad physics" to adhere to *Goldman*. Such an assertion simply illustrates the propensity of some members of the Court to rely on their limited understanding of modern scientific subjects in order to fit the Constitution to the times and give its language a meaning that it will not tolerate.

> ment's guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures." (See generally dissenting opinion, pp. 507-527.)
>
> The Fourth Amendment protects privacy only to the extent that it prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures of "persons, houses, papers and effects." No general right is created by the Amendment so as to give this Court the unlimited power to hold unconstitutional everything which affects privacy. Certainly the Framers, well acquainted as they were with the excesses of governmental power, did not intend to grant this Court such omnipotent lawmaking authority as that. The history of governments proves that it is dangerous to freedom to repose such powers in courts.
>
> For these reasons I respectfully dissent.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. **HANSEN**. I yield.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Did the Supreme Court rule that under certain circumscribed circumstances the right to tap wires was valid?

Mr. **HANSEN**. It is my interpretation of this decision that impliedly the Supreme Court made that assertion.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. That is, it said that if you keep the tapping within narrow bounds, it will conform to the provisions of the Constitution?

Mr. **HANSEN**. That is my interpretation of the thrust of this opinion.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

I wish to point out that under the Constitution of the United States, while the right of a man in his home to be free from invasion by Government has been declared to be sacred, nevertheless, it is possible, under circumscribed conditions, to obtain a right of search warrant from the Government.

I would like to hear the comments of the Senator on that point.

Mr. **HANSEN**. That is clearly my interpretation of the thrust of the case. Here is demonstrated a set of circumstances where the Government anticipated in advance precisely what it wanted to do, and the times that it proposed to make the wiretap under a certain set of circumstances and conditions. It is my understanding that the Supreme Court is indicating it would fit perfectly within the framework of the Constitution for a judge to grant permission to a governmental agency to make a wiretap under that sort of circumstances.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. I thank the Chair. We have all heard the slogan "a man's home is his castle." We all subscribe to the principle that it shall not be invaded by anyone, that the Government shall not have the right to enter it, that a man's home is his domain, and he shall live inviolate in it.

Yet, the writers of the Constitution declared that under certain circumstances, when proof is offered indicating to a court the probable existence of wrong, the court can authorize the issuance of a search warrant. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. **HANSEN**. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his perceptive comments on this subject which is so important to everyone in this country. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. It is argued that wiretapping shall be absolutely prohibited, that no right shall be vested in anyone to wiretap. I am against wiretapping to the maximum degree except when it is considered from the standpoint of what the writers of the Constitution declared constitutes the ability of the Government to act with search warrants. I think that the principle declared in the right of search is the same principle which should be made applicable with respect to wiretapping. If and when duly constituted public officials go before a court of justice and submit proof indicating that their actions will be limited, and that there is probable cause for the making of the investigation, the court may grant that authority. Is that what the experience of the Senator from Wyoming has been?

Mr. **HANSEN**. That is precisely my understanding of the thrust of the decision.

Again I thank the Senator from Ohio. He has made a valuable contribution to the understanding all Senators should have of this most important landmark decision, in my mind, and for having clarified it as well as he has.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. In my opinion, the No. 1 problem confronting the people of this country today is our involvement in Vietnam. No 2, is the maintenance of law and order.

When law and order is not maintained, there is anarchy. With anarchy there is no government at all.

In my opinion, I believe that we are pretty close to that point where we have no government at all because of the inclination to protect the criminal and forget completely about the innocent victims—the law-abiding citizens of the country.

I want the fullest protection accorded to every citizen in the enjoyment of his rights. I do not want an invasion of his home. I do not want the wiretapping of his telephone, or otherwise. But, when we conform in a limited degree to what the writers of the Constitution said shall be the right to issue search warrants, I subscribe to what is proposed to be done.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, is it his bill that he is speaking on now?

Mr. **HANSEN**. No, but I am a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. I join the Senator from Wyoming in asking that support be given to the bill.

CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. **HANSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes in the morning hour.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **HANSEN**. Mr. President, the critical events of the past 2 weeks in South Vietnam have forced our people to think anew about the complex and murky situation in Southeast Asia. But one thing has emerged very clearly from these events: The President and his spokesmen have not leveled with the American people in the past about Vietnam. They have not leveled with the people during the present crisis. In fact, one wonders whether they have leveled with themselves.

We have heard for some months glowing reports of the progress being made by the Allied forces in South Vietnam. We were—so the administration told us—gaining the upper hand militarily, and several notes of restrained optimism were sounded about the "other war."

Well, Mr. President, we now see that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese were wholly capable of a massive, well-planned, and highly coordinated offensive throughout the country. Certainly, their losses have been heavy; but some of our military commanders are now saying that the enemy could launch another equally heavy offensive soon. I would not say that fighting bloody battles all over South Vietnam, at places and times of the enemy's choosing, and losing control of major cities, could be called "winning" in a military sense.

But what about the political war—the war for the loyalty of the South Vietnamese people? Phrases gleaned almost at random from our own press sum up the situation. Newsweek reports "an incalculable psychological setback." The Christian Science Monitor headlines: "Hardly a Hamlet Feels Safe."

The South Vietnamese and American forces, Mr. President, have not been able to provide security for the civilian population. In fact, they have been forced—as the Vietcong surely planned—to exact a heavy toll of civilian lives and property. And there is little evidence that the South Vietnamese Government can care for the wounded, the displaced, the bereaved.

What have the President and his spokesmen claimed? A great Allied victory. All this fuss, we are told, is caused by a few bandits and saboteurs. A few days ago, this was described as the "death rattle" of the Vietcong. That was before General Westmoreland and others warned that the Vietcong had by no means committed all their forces.

In its efforts to minimize these events, the administration has shown a glaring lack of candor. The American people, Mr. President, want the truth. They do not want bland reassurances which fly in the face of facts—the facts which have been so graphically brought home these past few days by all the news media. And they want leadership which will face the facts as well. As the Rocky Mountain News put it Monday:

> With the next Presidential election just nine months away, President Johnson could be expected to put a rosy explanation on the week-long Communist offensive.
>
> But even allowing for politics, the President's analysis of the Communist attacks as a "complete failure" from a military standpoint constitutes either a grave misreading of the facts or an insufficient regard for the level of frankness required by the American people at this moment.

Minimizing the serious political, psychological, and military setbacks in Vietnam may seem politically expedient, but it serves neither sound policy nor the real demands of the American people.

Mr. President, to demonstrate what I believe is the real and widespread rejection of the administration's unwillingness to face up to reality, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a number of penetrating, concerned articles and editorials from a cross section of our Nation's press. The editorials are from the Los Angeles Times, the Washington Daily News, the Rocky Mountain News, and the Baltimore Sun. I also include two articles from the Christian Science Monitor: "Hardly a Hamlet Feels Safe" and "Time for Churchillian Candor?" I strongly urge my colleagues to read these carefully, for they herald an informed public, far more willing to face hard truths than is a self-serving administration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 5, 1968]

The President "Explains"

With the next Presidential election just nine months away, President Johnson could be expected to put a rosy explanation on the week-long Communist offensive.

But even allowing for politics, the President's analysis of the Communist attack as a "complete failure" from a military standpoint constitute either a grave misreading of the facts or an insufficient regard for the level of frankness required by the American people at this moment.

The President duly cited Allied casualties at his news conference Friday, then emphasized that only 15 U.S. planes and 23 helicopters were destroyed—giving it the silver-lining twist that this was "a very small proportion" of our total.

While many thousands of civilians buried their dead or lay wounded in hospitals—if indeed they could get coffins or a hospital bed—and while fighting continued in Saigon and three provincial capitals, LBJ spoke of the "disruption of public services" the attackers had caused—the kind of thing, he said, "a few bandits" can do in any city.

The President said he had known "for several months" the Communists planned a major offensive—then failed to explain how, if so, thousands of Communist troops could penetrate the heart of half the nation's 44 provincial capitals plus lesser towns, and storm scores of bases and the American Embassy itself.

Mr. Johnson also took satisfaction that the Communists found little popular support for their offensive—though battalion after battalion entered "secure" cities without a single reported instance of townspeople showing sufficient devotion to the government to sound a warning to sieve-like security troops deployed to provide protection.

It does no good if generals, ambassadors, cabinet officials or the President himself ignores the seriousness of what the Communists have done—and adds this to the months of underestimating the costs and casualties of the war.

Let's face it. In suicide attacks, rampant terrorism and sustained attacks in force, the Communists have accomplished these results: Dealt damaging blows to many Allied positions throughout the country, proved even urban strongpoints are no more secure than admittedly vulnerable lesser towns and villages, reduced civilians' faith in their government's ability to protect them, caused redeployment of Allied forces to handle the offensive (thus weakening security in pacification areas), strengthened the morale of their own forces, supporters and the North Vietnamese behind them, and upped their price in negotiations, if they occur.

President Johnson said the Communists lost more than 10,000 killed last week. The figure is bound to be greeted with skepticism, but even if it is accurate, the cost by standard Communist measurement was well worth the sacrifice. Their gains—military, political, psychological—are major.

The President ended his explanation by saying he didn't want to seem unduly optimistic or give false assurances. He wound up doing both.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 5, 1968]

Unconvincing

President Johnson may have convinced himself the Viet Cong suffered a staggering military defeat in their current offensive. But it is highly doubtful he can convince the American people or the South Vietnamese people or Ho Chi Minh.

We hope the President really knows something seriously went wrong in South Vietnam and that his what?-me-worry? interpretation is only public relations or politics. But we have only his public words and the fact he dispatched his top two lieutenants into the breach Sunday to cover up the gaping hole now blown in the Administration's rosy picture of our "steady progress" in Vietnam.

The performance of Secretary of State Rusk and Defense Secretary McNamara (on NBC's "Meet the Press") was unconvincing. They fired in all directions. They maximized the Viet Cong's casualties, rejoiced that the communists had failed to hold a single city, thought South Vietnamese were "revolted" by the attacks, and upheld the President's willingness to negotiate.

As was bound to happen, the two Secretaries' cheery picture didn't square with all the realities. Our Marines were at the moment taking casualties in the streets of Hue, new U.S. troops were committed to the battle in Saigon, major sections of two dozen cities lay in ruins and the toll of civilian dead and wounded mounted into the thousands.

The point is the Viet Cong don't have to hold a single city. If they can pull an attack like this one once every two years, will the U.S. have succeeded in Vietnam? Will our troops be able to come home?

And what makes the Administration feel civilians will be "revolted" by the Viet Cong? The communists have been blowing up people for years; the Vietnamese Government has not been able to defend them and now there is massive proof of it.

The President's two spokesmen were unconvincing because they made an unconvincing case.

We would have preferred to hear from the President, or his spokesmen, something more on this order:

"We were getting cocky and we got socked for it. We were dreaming about negotiations and forgot there's a war on. We're not going to underestimtae the enemy again. No more holidays. No more truces. We're going to tighten our defenses. We are going to examine whether we have enough men and whether they are in the right places and doing the right jobs. We are going to do the same thing regarding the South Vietnamese. In short, we are going to stop treating this as a part-time, easy war."

That, we would be encouraged by.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 1, 1968]

Political Warfare in Vietnam

"The enemy's well-laid plans went afoul," said Gen. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, of the Viet Cong suicide raid on the American embassy in Saigon. That, to say the least, is putting an unmerited interpretation on a sorry matter.

The fact is that the Communists, in their attacks in Saigon and elsewhere, scored a considerable propaganda coup, which is what they sought. They are exploiting their terrorist coups with what appear to be sustained attacks throughout the country.

The Communists have demonstrated again an ability to penetrate supposedly secure or well-protected civilian and military areas. They have shown a skill at coordination in their attacks which only the most careful planning could have achieved. Despite heavy casualties in this week's efforts, they have once more made clear their willingness to sacrifice men for political gain.

These attacks were not unexpected in the larger sense. That is, having been mounted often enough in the past, such raids can be regarded as an essential part of the Communist war plan. Tactically, however, these latest attacks do appear to have caught allied forces off-guard in a number of areas. Similar raids are almost certain in the future.

Militarily, it remains to be seen just how great have been the Communist gains. But the military phase of operations is only one part of the Communist strategy.

Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh and Gen. Giap, North Vietnam's defense minister, have all made clear in their writings the importance they attach to the political-propaganda side of what Giap calls "people's war." Demoralization of the populace, attempts to demonstrate the military ineptitude of the national government, and, first in France during the Indochina war and now in the United States, efforts to encourage defeatism, all are prime considerations in the Asian Communist handbook of war.

The Viet Cong penetration of the American Embassy compound, following the North Korean seizure of the USS Pueblo, is undeniably a further embarrassment for the United States. But what the Communists have done in Vietnam this week is hardly conclusive in terms of affecting the long range course of the conflict.

In their limited forays they have driven home again several points we should have absorbed by now. Namely, that the Vietnam war has no real front; that terrorists are easily able to blend into the loyal population; that difficult terrain gives the enemy an advantage against fixed positions; that Communist political efforts, aimed at eroding allied confidence, must always be expected.

Understanding these points should give a clearer perspective on the war—and on the seeming dubiety of some of the optmistic statements of Gen. Westmoreland and others. This week's incidents are a paragraph in the grim history of the war, a volume that, unfortunately, still appears far from conclusion.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 6, 1968]

Vietnamese Abacus

Consider, for example, the figures on casualties. As we write, the latest count of enemy dead in South Vietnam in recent days is 14,997: a new and larger figure will undoubtedly have been issued in the brief time that must elapse before this gets into print. South Vietnamese losses are put at 1,164 killed; American at 367. (The South Vietnamese figures are military. No one guesses at the toll in civilian dead.)

Among those who have used the military casualty counts as an argument for the point of view that the enemy, with losses many times the higher, has fallen far short of success in his latest tactic have been President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk and General Westmoreland. Yet these men must have known—as the public even now is but dimly aware—that these figures on enemy dead are even more uncertain than is ordinarily the case.

Besides the obvious fact that at a time of great confusion and peril there are tasks more important than trying to count enemy casualties, there is the additional fact that the figures brought forward as accurate by American officials are compiled largely by the South Vietnamese, and that in taking these figures as our own, right now, we have departed from ordinary routine practice.

A degree of correction has been provided by Brig. Gen. Philip B. Davidson, Jr., chief of intelligence in the American command in Vietnam, who after describing the enemy's losses as "enormous," which undoubtedly they are, adds "by all counts available to us."

The matter of casualties is an example only—an example of the sort of highly questionable material, and dubious judgments in the midst of a fluid and turbulent situation, that has been put forth recently from high places. For whose benefit? The enemy's? But he must know what his losses are, and his remaining capabilities. The rest of the world? The rest of the world, already skeptical of our readings, is made more skeptical. The American public? Perhaps.

General Davidson says further that the enemy "has not expended his full capacity" and could mount an even more powerful offensive "at almost any time." This may or may not turn out to be so. In any case, it is a considerable way from the President's earlier declaration that the enemy's wave of attacks had "failed completely," from Secretary Rusk's statement that the enemy was "not permitted to succeed" and from General Westmoreland's comment last week that he had reports to suggest that the enemy was "running out of steam."

The public, which would like to get the picture as it is, the favorable and the unfavorable together, would appreciate from its high officials a closer regard for accuracy, and a firmer restraint on off-the-cuff optimism.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1968]

SOUTH VIETNAM SHAKEN—HARDLY A HAMLET FEELS SAFE

(By Beverly Deepe)

SAIGON.—Even with a half-million troops, a 13-year presence, and a $66 million-a-day war expenditure, the United States now has seen it sensationally demonstrated that hardly a city or hamlet in South Vietnam feels secure.

And an American Embassy spokesman has admitted it. American generals believe the Communists could launch a repeat performance—and expect them to at any time.

Even without a second blitz in the next several weeks, the military situation in Saigon and its suburbs is increasingly serious. After one week of fighting, organized Communist units are still hitting police stations, warehouses, and bridges in the city limits, and the longer significant military contact continues, the more demoralized the Saigon population becomes.

AGENTS LEFT BEHIND

More significant, however, reliable sources report that the Viet Cong have won the support of individual Saigonese who have joined in alliance with them as "forces for a just cause." These would presumably mean the colonies of hooligans, "cowboys," draft dodgers, and criminals evading the law who inhabit the labyrinths of slum alleys of the city. In short, the Viet Cong has stepped up its recruitment of military supporters in Saigon.

And even more serious for the South Vietnamese Government, the Communists are known to be leaving behind scores of propaganda cadres and political agents to further arouse the emotions of the Saigon citizenry during this electric and bitter period.

Government outposts surrounding the capital are being overrun and uprooted. All roads leading out of the city are either barricaded or cut by the Communists.

Saigon is an island.

During the past week, the Communist blitz, in one synchronized swoop, was launched into Saigon against the most prestigious chunks of real estate in the republic. The dazzling white American Embassy, dedicated a few months ago, was rocketed and assaulted by enough Communists to require helicoptering in of a platoon of the elite United States 101st Airborne Division.

Tansonhut, just about the world's busiest and best-defended airport, was nearly captured—and with it the brand-new multimillion-dollar American military command, often called "Pentagon East." The Vietnamese high command was infiltrated by Communists wearing government soldiers' fatigues.

The well-armed assaulting forces nearly captured some of the wives of Vietnamese generals living there, and the compound was saved only by repeated daisy chains of American helicopter rocket attacks.

The modernistic Vietnamese presidential palace, dedicated only three months ago, would have been pulverized if the Communist driver of a truckload of explosives had not been shot by a passing police vehicle.

Transposing this into an American setting, it would be roughly equivalent to an enemy force's failing by a hair to blow up the White House in Washington, with government forces saving the Pentagon only by rushing in elite forces, rocketing nearby residential areas with their own friendly aircraft, and fighting bitterly at the military airport outside the city for days.

U.S. PARALLEL?

The latest comparable event in American history might be considered as the War of 1812, when the British forces razed portions of the capital city and some government buildings.

A half-dozen sections of the capital would be razed either from enemy attacks or from the overreaction of rocketing with friendly air power. The suburbs would periodically be in enemy hands.

If the cross-country blitz had been launched within the United States, the countryside would look something like this: In the old cultural center of Boston, comparable with Hue in Vietnam, enemy regiments would have controlled the heart of the city for several days. An enemy flag would have flown atop the old State House. As the National Guard and allies swarmed in to retrieve control, portions of the city, including historical buildings, would have been bombed and burned.

A Harvard professor would have sided with the enemy forces to set up yet another front organization for "democracy, nationalism, and peace." Students would have joined the enemy in "liberating" the city.

In the nation's second largest city of Chicago (Cantho in the delta vies with Da Nang for second place), the enemy forces would have seized control of the airport and radio station, and all of the state's national guard would have been unable to bring the state under control for days. Propaganda sessions would have been held in the Loop. Eleven of the 15 most prominent state capitals in the wheat bowl surrounding Chicago would have come under enemy bombardment or else enemy assault, siege, or several days' rule.

All airports in the area, including the Strategic Air Command base in Omaha, would have been immobilized by bombardment or sniper siege. All major roads and railroads between state capitals would have been cut. Several of the state capitals would have been devastated by flames, shot, and shell and would lie in ruins after days of frantic fighting.

Portions of all of the three most significant border cities, such as Seattle, Portland, Ore., and Oakland, Calif. (Pleiku, Banmethuot, and Kontum in the central highlands) would be considerably destroyed after as many as five days of fighting. In some areas the whole population would have become refugees.

In the famous resort city of Colorado Springs (Dalat), the enemy would have emerged from within the city, held the central market place and resort hotels, bus station, and airport terminal, shot the state police commissioner and two of his staff while they were eating soup in a restaurant, and executed the governor in his home. Provisional companies of Air Force Academy cadets would have been formed to salvage the situation.

In the countryside, many county seats would also have been assaulted, overrun, and held for hours. The isolated outposts of national guardsmen in Topeka, Kan. would be thinking, "If the enemy can assault the Pentagon, he can certainly overrun these sandbags surrounding me whenever he wants."

The momentous impact of the Communist blitz into Vietnamese cities and towns, and its continued but synchronized general offensive nationwide, has these crucial military effects:

1. In glaring and sensational terms, it has raised the specific question of the effectiveness of Gen. William C. Westmoreland's "forward strategy."

2. In subdued, more nebulous terms, it has raised the issue of how the war in Vietnam is being waged.

3. It has graphically etched for the whole world to see the effectiveness of Communist revolutionary warfare concepts frustrating, if not momentarily defeating, the conventional might of the most powerful nation in history.

DEBATE GOES ON

While the outside world is debating whether General Westmoreland's command had accurate and timely enough intelligence information about the attacks, whether he misjudged the tempo, intensity, and vast panorama of the Communist offensive, the heart of the debate here is whether the military command has ever understood the nature of the entire conflict.

Pockets of this criticism have existed in the American community here since the arrival of United States combat troops in 1965. These critics have consistently maintained a pessimistic view of the situation because they were much more in step with the reactions of wide cross-sections of the Vietnamese population.

These critics were almost always hooted down. Some left Vietnam in frustration.

Some of these Americans spoke Vietnamese, or had lived in Vietnam for some time. Some were members of the official or quasi-official establishments here, but their voices in the wilderness were never amalgamated into one office or agency enough to influence the official bureaucratic institution.

CRITICISM ASSESSED

Criticism of the official decisions here has never taken the form of the hawk vs. dove debate in the United States. Most officials and their critics agree that an American defeat in Vietnam, on the battlefield, or at the conference table, before China has developed its nuclear umbrella, would tend to catapult Asia into the Communist order.

Hence, all were hawks in this sense. Even the critics were politico-hawks, while the military command here was conventional power hawks. All agreed any solution to the problems of South Vietnam necessitates American military power, but the critics maintained military power alone could not solve them.

Their specific criticism has consistently been directed at General Westmoreland "forward strategy," and the Communist blitz has climaxed this verbal opposition. The criticism was that positioning American troops in the forward or border areas was ineffective, if not disasterous.

First, American battalions were fighting simply the Communist main-force units rather than the whole spectrum of Communist military organization—guerrillas, regional forces, and main forces.

Second, the Vietnamese Army was ineffective in "securing" the rear of the American operational bases. This ineffectiveness resulted not only from lack of military discipline, but also from the rampant corruption of the Vietnamese officers and units.

POPULATION HARASSED

Hence, while American troops had taken the offensive in the jungles to secure the rear, the Vietnamese troops presumably holding off the regional and local guerrilla irritated the Vietnamese urban population to shakedowns, bribery, embezzlement, nepotism, and kickbacks from bars and brothels which mushroomed on such a large scale to seem immoral and un-Vietnamese to the townspeoples.

The Communist blitz has thus in a conventional sense outflanked the American troops along the borders with a lightning, and gigantic maneuver—a sweep into the unsecure centers in the rear. The Communist strategy was to disperse forces all over the countryside and the towns, in groupings small enough to squeeze easily through the massive concentrations of American forces.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1968]

Time for Churchillian Candor?

(By John Hughes)

Hong Kong.—"This," said an American friend appraising the Vietnam crisis, "is America's Dunkirk."

The remark reflects a feeling, widespread among Americans in Asia, that for the United States the Vietnam war has reached its most serious and grievous low point..

This is not to suggest that American forces are about to be thrown out of South Vietnam, as were Allied forces out of France early in World War II.

But there is a conviction that the war has reached a decisive point where the United States must either steel itself for long and costly sacrifice, or let its presence fade away in Southeast Asia and concede victory and territory to the Communist enemy.

As many Americans, both official and nonofficial, see it, the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese have changed the character of the war with their current massive offensive.

Many Americans reacted with sardonic disbelief to President Johnson's reported remark that the Viet Cong offensive had proved both a military and psychological failure. The apparent new frankness of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in a weekend press conference has done something to balance the situation.

But many people engaged in the implementation of American policy in Asia believe the posture in Washington should now be one of Churchillian backs-to-the-wall candor rather than automatic dismissal of Communist achievements.

PICTURE INCOMPLETE

The picture in South Vietnam is, of course, still far from complete. Even as the bitterest fighting in the country's history entered its second week, Communist troops poised above the threatened Marine base of Khe Sanh let loose Monday with an artillery barrage and ground attack which could herald the predicted main assault.

But even as it stands now, the Communist offensive is conceded by many Americans here on the ground in Asia to have won major gains for the enemy, and to have set back seriously the over-all allied campaign.

Outside topmost American military circles there is widespread skepticism of the official American estimate of Viet Cong casualties. Says one American close to the war: "How did we get the figure? By body count? Our guys were so busy keeping alive they didn't know who got killed on the other side."

Experts believe the most serious consequence of the Viet Cong offensive will be the psychological effect on the populace of South Vietnam. It may be argued that once the current Viet Cong campaign has petered out, it will be many months before the Communists could prepare and launch such a series of attacks.

But to a simple Vietnamese who has just lived, say, through a week of Viet Cong occupation in a district capital, the possibility of the Viet Cong returning may understandably loom larger than government assurances to the contrary.

The Viet Cong will have told him they are the winning side and will be back. They may have warned him against supporting the Saigon government, and particularly the Americans. He isn't sure just whether they will be back, or when. But he does want to stay alive.

Against this display of Viet Cong effectiveness, the Saigon government has produced a record of minuscule achievement. The administration of President Nguyen Van Thieu and Vice-President Nguyen Cao Ky has not proved a rallying point or an inspiration for Vietnamese non-Communists.

And now, against this background, the Viet Cong have penetrated so deeply into Saigon as to prevent the President landing by helicopter on his own palace in the heart of the city.

For a government which seeks to galvanize a tired people against ruthless Communist terrorism, this must be a low point of despair.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 6, 1968]

Whitewash Test

In his attempt to portray the spectacular Viet Cong offensive as a "complete failure" militarily, President Johnson has chided "some unknowing people" and "Monday morning quarterbacks" for blowing up the attacks all out of proportion.

The continuing battle for Hue, the continuing fighting in Saigon, the havoc wreaked thruout the country are enough to refute the President's "all's-well" report. But, be that as it may, here's a sporting proposition:

Would the President call in the press and read the speech made by Gen. Westmoreland last Nov. 21 in Washington, while home on the President's orders and a guest at the White House?

He would have to say, among other things: "It is significant that the enemy has not won a major battle in more than a year. In general, he can fight his large forces only at the edges of his sanctuaries . . . His guerilla force is declining at a steady rate. Morale problems are developing within his ranks."

The President would also have to repeat that during "Phase Two" of the war strategy, ending in 1967, we "discovered and thwarted the enemy's battle plans before they could be executed . . . drove the enemy divisions back to sanctuary or into hiding . . . entered enemy base areas and destroyed his supplies . . . trained, expanded and improved the quality of the Vietnamese armed forces . . ."

The General's report is not unique in its optimism. It is in the same vein as Defense Secretary McNamara and General Maxwell Taylor's 1963 judgment ("the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of . . . training personnel").

The trouble with these statements is not the "unknowing people" or "Monday morning quarterbacks" but the hards facts of the war that the Administration glosses over habitually.

The disappointing thing about the White House whitewash of the current fiasco is it indicates the Administration has not learned its lesson. To us the lesson is clear: Stop underestimating the Viet Cong. Stop overestimating the South Vietnamese allies.

But if the Administration doesn't know something went wrong, how can it draw any lesson?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, no thoughtful American citizen minimizes the seriousness of our position. It is precarious but the alternatives are equally dangerous.

We will not deceive the enemy by deceiving ourselves.

Let us have the facts. Armed with the full truth, Americans can and will make the tough, painful decisions that the situation requires.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM THE PERIOD OF FEBRUARY 11 THROUGH 17, 1968, AS "LULAC WEEK"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 947, authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week," which was read twice by its title.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this joint resolution was introduced in the House by Representative Richard White on December 4, 1967, and in the same month by me in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 128, the full resolution. The version that passed the House was partial and restricted, having only the enacting clause, without the whereases and the recitations.

I shall ask that the version as passed by the House be passed here, but I want to point out some of the whereases as originally introduced. Those clauses point out that the League of United Latin American Citizens, better known as LULAC, a nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical civic organization, is now observing its 39th anniversary.

This organization was formed in my State, largely under the leadership of World War I veterans, to better the lot of the Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest. It has now spread over the country. The organization covers 19 States, from New Jersey and New York on the east to California on the west; from Texas in the southwest to Michigan and Illinois in the north. It is a patriotic group that is working to teach English to young Spanish-speaking Americans to enable them to fully enter our culture. The group provides improvement in the educational opportunities for young

Americans of Spanish-speaking background, and promotes the highest standards of true patriotism among its members while preserving the dignity of their Latin American heritage.

It is a truly patriotic organization operating in the best interests of this country.

There are many such organizations, but LULAC was the first Latin American organization composed of citizens of Latin American background. The organization has a proud record. It has trained thousands and thousands of young Americans in my State to read and write English in cases where they had dropped out of school or had not gone into school.

Mr. President, I could enumerate many accomplishments of LULAC, but in the interest of saving the time of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 947 as originally introduced by Representative WHITE, of El Paso, Tex., and Senate Joint Resolution 128 as originally introduced by me.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.J. RES. 947

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week"

Whereas the League of United Latin American Citizens, better known as LULAC, a nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical civic organization, in this year 1968 is observing its thirty-ninth anniversary; and

Whereas each year the week which includes February 17, the anniversary of LULAC's organization, is observed as LULAC week as provided by the league constitution; and

Whereas LULAC has achieved a proud record in training new Americans for citizenship, in improving the educational opportunities for young Americans of Spanish-speaking background, and in promoting the highest standards of true patriotism among its members, while preserving the native charm of their Latin American heritage; and

Whereas this dedicated organization has consistently identified itself with worthy civic projects in the communities where LULAC councils exist; and

Whereas LULAC councils presently exist in nineteen States of the Union from New York and New Jersey to California and from Michigan to Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week," and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

S.J. RES. 128

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week"

Whereas the League of United Latin American Citizens, better known as LULAC, a nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical civic organization, in this year 1968 is observing its thirty-ninth anniversary; and

Whereas each year the week which includes February 17, the anniversary of LULAC's organization, is observed as LULAC Week as provided by the league constitution; and

Whereas LULAC has achieved a proud record in training new Americans for citizenship, in improving the educational opportunities for young Americans of Spanish-speaking background, and in promoting the highest standards of true patriotism among its members, while preserving their Latin American heritage; and

Whereas this dedicated organization has consistently identified itself with worthy civic projects in the communities where LULAC Councils exist; and

Whereas LULAC Councils presently exist in nineteen States of the Union from New York and New Jersey to California and from Michigan to Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week," and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 947) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE STRIKE OF THE SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was shocked to learn late Tuesday afternoon, February 6, that the operating trainmen and other employees of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, without notice, had gone on strike.

I placed in the RECORD at that time four telegrams advising of the cruel imposition which has been caused by having a strike on this important railroad at the very time when our perishable commodities, both citrus and vegetables, are moving at their greatest volume.

I further advised the Senate that I had called the White House and that the Florida delegation as a whole was requesting the President to take immediate action in appointing a factfinding board and assisting in getting the line running again.

Mr. President, I have not yet heard of any steps being taken to get the railroad running again. I understand that the matter has been referred to Secretary Wirtz for his recommendations, and to my knowledge such recommendations have not been made to the White House.

Mr. President, I have stated before that this strike is causing serious disruption of the economy of our State of Florida and unless immediate action is taken to get the railroads operating again, losses of perishables will run into the millions.

Mr. President, I have received 16 additional telegrams with reference to this most serious situation, and I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to read all of these telegrams, but I do think it is important for the purpose of showing the diversified industries that are affected by the strike to state for the record the industries which I have received the telegrams from. One is from Mr. Harold Colee, executive vice president of the Florida Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla., pointing out that not only are the fruit and vegetable growers greatly affected, but the elimination of passenger service affects over 5,000 tourists per day and that the phosphate industry and sugar industry, having large payrolls, are greatly affected.

Another is from Mr. Ed H. Price, Jr., executive vice president, Tropicana Products Inc., Bradenton, Fla., advising that their operation is placed in serious jeopardy. They are the largest shipper of chilled orange juice—purchasing some 10 million boxes of oranges and grapefruit a year.

Not only they, but several thousand employees and several hundred growers who sell their food to them are seriously affected by this stoppage.

A third is from Mr. Robert W. Rutledge, executive vice president, Florida Citrus Mutual, stating that this strike could affect the shipment of some 2,000 carloads of citrus each week.

Mr. Rutledge speaks for our largest citrus organization, with something like 15,000 members.

Also, among these telegrams are those from LP gas distributors having over 500,000 customers throughout Florida, exporters of fruits and vegetables, and the fertilizer interests.

In addition, I have received a call from Mr. Harry T. Vaughn, president of the United States Sugar Corp., which is the largest producer of sugar in the State, and I believe in the mainland part of our Nation. He has advised that the warehouses are full and are unable to ship to the refinery in Savannah, and if the strike continues, the sugar industry will be terribly hurt. This will be a terrible tragedy and will greatly affect the thousands of workers on local payrolls, as well as the offshore canecutters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I have 3 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am advised that between 8,000 and 9,000 canecutters from Jamaica are in our State. To see them idle and still drawing pay from the producers is a rather tragic situation, when they are not able to work.

Mr. President, from these telegrams and those which I previously placed in the record, there is clearly pointed up the absolute necessity for immediate action by the President to avoid irreparable damage to the State of Florida.

Mr. President, I am placing these telegrams in the RECORD, but I want to read the names of those from whom they come and industries they represent.

The first is from Mr. Harold Colee, executive vice president of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, representing industry in our State.

The second is from Mr. Robert W. Rutledge, executive vice president of the Florida Citrus Mutual, representing the largest citrus organization in my State.

The third is from Ed H. Price, Jr., executive vice president of Tropicana

Products, Inc. They ship entirely by this particular railroad and entirely by piggyback shipments in glass bottles, incidentally, that they make right in their own quarters, because they have a bottle factory as a part of their very large industry.

The next is from David M. Earle, general sales manager of A. Duda & Sons Cooperative Association, Oviedo, Fla. The Duda family is from Czechoslovakia. The senior member of this family now living has been named the outstanding grower and planter of the State of Florida. They are building a very large export industry. They tell in their wire about a ship which is standing by in New York, waiting for the many carloads of their produce that are required to fill it to take our produce abroad, which would help relieve our balance-of-payments situation.

Next is a telegram from Walter R. Lee, Jr., of Gainesville, Fla., who tells us that the supply of LP gas is quite limited and will be exhausted in a few days and that the only source of their supply is by this particular railroad, through tank cars which come periodically to them.

Next is a telegram from George L. Stuart, of Orlando, Fla., president of a very large concern dealing in fruits and vegetables.

Next is a telegram from B. L. Robertson, traffic manager of the Jno H. Swisher and Son, Inc., which is the largest cigar factory in Jacksonville, which wire speaks for itself.

The next is from M. V. Davis, president of the Greater Mulberry Chamber of Commerce, which is concerned with the phosphate industry. Mulberry is only about 8 miles from my hometown, and is the very heart of the phosphate industry, which moves its rock by trainloads each day to the Port of Tampa, where, right now, I am advised in another wire, two ships are waiting to be loaded and rolling up deferring costs.

The next is from Mr. R. T. Moore, vice president of manufacturing, Dolly Madison Industries, Inc., of Huntingburg, Ind. I am not acquainted with the nature of that business, but he states it is nationwide.

The next is from Mr. Alfred M. Dye, vice president, Everglades Fertilizer Co., Fort Lauderdale, Fla., this being the time of year when they must get in their materials and must ship out their fertilizer to the truckers and fruit people, and this being the season when citrus is fertilized.

The next is from E. A. Swindle, vice president and manager, Southeastern Propane Gas Co., Miami Springs, Fla. That, too, has to do with the LP gas industry.

The next is from the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce, from the county where Tropicana, which I have already mentioned, is located.

The next is from Marshall DeSear, president, Committee of One Hundred, Bradenton, Fla., from that same community, Mr. President, which is so badly hurt already, and, along with it, the hundreds of growers who ship their citrus crops to that very large industry for processing into juice.

The next is from Mr. W. Howard Frankland, of the Pioneer Tire Co., of Tampa, Fla., a very distinguished citizen of Tampa, formerly a member of our road department, and also formerly a member of the Port Authority of Tampa, quite conversant with the serious problems involved there.

The next is from the Lykes Industries, speaking not only for their heavy shipments—and they are the largest owner of ships in all of our Nation, Mr. President, who ship under the American flag—and from Mr. J. B. Hawkins, who is the head of their meat-packing business, the largest that we have in our State, which is greatly affected by this strike.

The next is from Florida Pacific Lumber, Inc., at Miami, and it speaks for itself.

The last telegram I have here is from Albert Ernest, Jr., president, Allied Timber Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. President, the results of a deliberate blow like this, aimed at thousands of people and their income, including many thousands of workmen who work for wages, are just unspeakable. I cannot see how any group of working people who have any interest in the folks they serve and any interest in preserving the good will of the public could do a thing like this, particularly without notice and without giving anybody a chance to protect himself.

Mr. President, this matter is right square in the lap of the President of the United States. This is the third day I have been in touch with the White House. I do hope that we shall have early action, within the next few hours, to avert the terrible damage, danger, and injury that threatens our State and other parts of the Nation as well. Understandably, Mr. President, I have spoken particularly about what I know most about, which is the industries of the State of Florida.

EXHIBIT 1

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
February 7, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Seaboard Coast Line Railroad serving about 90 percent of our peninsular State is experiencing work stoppage which has necessitated complete elimination of its passenger service at the height of the Florida tourist season affecting in excess of 5,000 passengers per day. Furthermore, the fruit and vegetable growers are in the midst of their primary shipping season and the loss will be tremendous to the growers and will deprive large segments of the country of essential food products. Florida produces 80 percent of all phosphate consumed in the United States most of which originates on this railroad and is so essential to the plant food industry of America particularly as the planting season is approaching. The operation of our sugar industry multiplied by many hundred other industries so dependent upon this rail service is suffering and many will be forced to close completely. There are a number of national defense industries in the State which are wholly or partially dependent upon railroad transportation. The only available relief is to have the National Mediation Board certify to the President that a national emergency exists and request the appointment of an emergency board to consider the problem which will automatically result in a resumption of railroad operations during the period of consideration. You are urgently requested to use your good office to insure the appointment of a board at the earliest possible moment.

HAROLD COLEE,
Executive Vice President, Florida State Chamber of Commerce.

LAKELAND, FLA., *February 7, 1968.*

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Seaboard Coastline Railroad strike, if it continues and spreads, could seriously disrupt fresh citrus shipments from Florida. This is peak period of citrus shipments with nearly 2,000 carloads moving out of Florida each week. Other methods of transportation not sufficient to give relief if strike continues for any length of time. On behalf of Citrus Growers of Florida, urgently request any appropriate action you deem necessary in this emergency.

ROBERT W. RUTLEDGE,
Executive Vice President, Florida Citrus Mutual.

BRADENTON, FLA.,
February 7, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The totally unexpected walkout of railroad personnel places our operation in serious jeopardy. We ship from the largest piggyback terminal in the United States and we are the largest processors and shippers of chilled citrus juices in disposable glass bottles and cartons in the United States. We expect to purchase 10 million boxes of oranges and grapefruit this year and Florida's growers are dependent upon our ability to market this fruit throughout the United States if they are to survive. This unwarranted walkout can be a shocking and destructive thing for our own business and for all of the citrus industry. We urge you to again contact the President and to use every power at your command to settle this dispute at the earliest possible moment.

TROPICANA PRODUCTS, INC.,
ANTHONY T. ROSSI,
President.
ED H. PRICE, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

OVIEDO, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: Bringing U.S. dollars back to USA upset by Seaboard Coastline railstrike.

Exporting to Europe helps conserve our dollars. We are interested in both keeping our dollars in USA and in expanding our business through export.

Last year we began experimenting on a very limited scale with export. We sent out approximately six loads of produce during last season. This year we have expanded this and are looking forward to next year with many times what we are presently doing.

May we cite what our present situation is: For shipment from New York on Feb. 16 we have scheduled seven carloads of fresh vegetables bound for Europe. We sell on a CIF basis, which means a total value of approximately $38,000 for one week's shipment. This means that much money returning to our country.

What is our problem?

In order to get this business, we must receive refrigerated containers from NY in time for us to load and return them to NY via railcar to meet and be loaded on deck ship.

Seven containers left NY Feb. 6 to our shipping point. We must get these loaded and returned to New York by 8 a.m., February 16, in order that they may be loaded aboard ship for Europe. One day delay by the railroad due to the present strike against Seaboard Coastline, either in receiving containers or shipment, could stop us from making this shipment to Europe.

We therefore request your urgent support of immediate action to settle this strike against Seaboard Coastline.

Greetings,

DAVID M. EARLE,
General Sales Manager, A. Dudd & Sons Cooperative Association.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
February 6, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge immediate Federal action to end railroad strike by Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Endangering LP gas deliveries to over 3,000 of our customers and over 500,000 customers throughout Florida. All of our product comes by rail.

Present supplies will not last over six days without further deliveries.

FUILGAS, INC.,
WALTER R. LEE, Jr.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
February 6, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: This railroad strike will play havoc with our operation. It comes at an extremely bad time and our business will be severely penalized. Coming as it does on the top of the ridiculously high LCL and LTL freight rates which have recently been put into effect it seems to us a woeful disregard of the public interests and of the well-being of their customers by both labor and management. Please bring all the pressure you can on Mr. Wirtz and on Mr. Gamser, Chairman of the National Mediation Board to see that this is settled at the earliest possible time.

GEORGE L. STUART,
President, George Stuart, Inc.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please work toward an emergency arbitration board to settle the current rail strike as it is presenting a great problem for us and other shippers in this area. Thanks for your cooperation.

B. L. ROBERTSON,
Traffic Manager, Jno H. Swisher & Son, Inc.

MULBERRY, FLA.,
February 7, 1968.

Subject: SCLRR strike.
Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.:

The Greater Mulberry Chamber of Commerce urges your immediate attention to the Seaboard Coastline rail traffic effected by union-management dispute. We strongly encourage some means be implemented by your office to assure transportation by SCL for public benefit.

M. V. DAVIS,
President, Greater Mulberry Chamber of Commerce.

HUNTINGBURG, IND.,
February 7, 1968.

SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding railroad strikes prevailing in our several plant areas served by these railroads, Missouri Pacific, Texas Pacific and Seaboard Coastline.

We urge that you take immediate action to restore service in order that manufacturing operations requiring arrival of raw materials and shipment of finished goods via railroad can be continued.

R. T. MOORE,
Vice President, Manufacturing, Dolly Madison Industries, Inc.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
February 7, 1968.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As you know, Florida vegetable production at peak season—rail strike curtailed movement of plant food material necessary for vegetable production as well as produce shipment. Proceeds of which vital to Florida economy. Please do everything possible to restore regular freight service immediately.

ALFRED M. DYE,
Vice President, Everglades Fertilizer.

MIAMI SPRINGS, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your diligence toward the settlement of the railroad difficulties is being watched with considerable interest by the LP Gas Dealers in Florida, we would estimate 100,000 of our customers alone would be without cooking and heating facilities in Florida by Friday unless rail deliveries become normal immediately.

E. A. SWINDLE,
Vice President and Manager, Southeastern Propane Gas Co.

BRADENTON, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative for the health, welfare, economy of Manatee County and the State of Florida that immediate action be taken to settle rail strike.

MARSHALL DESEAR,
President, Committee of One Hundred.

BRADENTON, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.:

The Manatee County Chamber of Commerce urgently asks for immediate emergency action by President Johnson to settle the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad strike. Our agricultural-citrus season is at its peak point of performance. Any single additional day's delay costs this county's economy millions of lost forever dollars. We urgently ask for immediate action.

MANATEE COUNTY CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,
C. A. STILL,
Executive Vice President.

PLANT CITY, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Seaboard coastline strike beginning to hurt unless administration acts it will seriously hurt many industries.

LYKES BROS., INC.,
J. B. HAWKINS.

TAMPA, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is inconceivable that the Government would allow an issue already once decided by Congress to tie up practically all railroad service rendered by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. You are urgently requested to take such action as necessary to stop this ridiculous and paralyzing blow both for the delivery of ammunitions to Viet Nam and the entire area serviced by this line.

PIONEER TIRE CO.,
W. HOWARD FRANKLAND.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urge your immediate help toward settlement of railroad strike crippling Florida and Southeastern area.

FLORIDA PACIFIC LUMBER, INC.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent action is needed in the establishment of emergency board to deal with rail crisis in Southeast. Our business effecting directly the employment of 300 people in North Florida and South Georgia is being perilized by the SCL strike. Thank you.

ALBERT ERNEST, Jr.,
President, Allied Timber Co., Inc.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Gladly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has spoken about the strike on the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, called without notice, at a time when harvesting the crops and selling the products of Florida in the market is a vitally important matter, is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct, and when thousands of tourists who do not care to fly are using the railroads to go to our State at this particular time of the year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And this strike has been declared with the notice of a purpose to stop the means of transportation, which it has done, in this season of the year when Florida must sustain its economy through the influx of tourists; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join substantially in what the Senator from Florida has said, but I wish to go a few words beyond his statement.

At present we have in existence, first, a strike of the garbage collectors of New York City; second, a strike of the schoolteachers in Montgomery County, Md.; third, the railroad strike on the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad in the southeastern part of the country; and fourth, the copper strike, which has now continued for more than 6 months.

Two of those strikes are against governments, the one of the garbage collectors in New York and that of the schoolteachers in Montgomery County, Md. I think the time has come when citizens of the United States must begin pondering the question: How far can we countenance strikes against the government?

Government officials are limited as to the amounts of money they can spend.

They are limited by barriers fixed by the legislatures. Yet strikes are interposed, making demands which may be far in excess of what the legislators are willing to countenance.

Involved in the garbage strike in New York is a health menace. I have listened on the radio and read in the newspapers about garbage accumulating and rats running wild, with apparently no capability of removing the menace to health.

No remedy seems to be available. Mayor Lindsay has spoken about calling out the National Guard. What a strange paradox: On the one hand, a strike against the government; on the other hand, a calling out of the National Guard to remedy the wrongs done by the strike. I cannot reconcile those two courses of action because the Government of the United States countenances the strike and then calls out the National Guard to break the strike.

In the copper industry, a strike has been in progress for more than 7 months. No action has been taken by the Government. Jungle warfare is in effect. The mightiest of the two shall prevail, whether it be the copper industry or the leaders of the copper unions. No thought is given to justice. Which of the two is the more powerful? is the only factor considered. The vast industry of Ohio is seriously affected by what is happening. But nothing is done by Government to solve the problem.

I have now discussed the garbage strike, the copper strike, the railroad strike, the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad strike, and the strike of the schoolteachers. My query is: When will we begin to consider the interests of the general public? Strikes are declared, I say to the Senator from Florida, at a time when they will have the most potent effect upon the economy of a specific community. Florida, for its sustenance, is required to render service to tourists. A railroad strike has been declared. Why at this time? The answer is that it will cause the greatest damage to the industry of Florida.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to comment on this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was tapping my foot all the time the Senator from Ohio was speaking. I have introduced bills in the Senate for many years, affecting one or the other of these fields: aviation strikes, strikes in local public utilities—such as the electric power industry—and the like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that we may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I supported actively the effort we made last year, when certain railroads were actually on strike, to get the men back to work by what I regarded, as I indicated, a form of compulsory arbitration. I have always felt that we must do something to protect the general public, whether on the local scale or on the national scale, against strikes—and stoppages, too, if the stoppage is by industry itself—because strikes and stoppages are hurtful to the economy and the welfare of the people. I have not been able to get hearings before the committee. I have not been able to get those bills moving. I have asked repeatedly that hearings be held.

With great pleasure I heard the President announce several years ago that he was planning to send to Congress proposed legislation that would effectively deal with this problem. I have not seen it. I only say that I hope the President will remember—and I hope we all remember—how a very humble little man in Boston elevated himself, first to the Vice-Presidency, and then to the Presidency, by having enough intestinal fortitude to stand up against policemen and firemen who were striking. The same principle is involved when employees of essential public utilities which serve the people go on strike or when the companies shut down the service.

I hope the Senate will get around to the business of passing and sending to the President some effective legislation to deal with this subject. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, time and time again he has announced on the floor of the Senate his willingness to go just as far as is necessary to provide full protection for the public. He states that again. He is sorry that he is not a member of the particular committee concerned; but he says again that we must have action along this line.

If the President does not take action to end the railroad strike, I think his own reputation will suffer badly, because firmness, in an approach that will protect the general public, is needed to get the railroads running again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida for reminding us—and I must say that practically everyone has forgotten it—that the President, about 1 year ago, said that he would send to Congress a program which would deal with this problem. He has not done so and I regret it very much.

I turn now to what I think is both a tragedy and a comedy. The court in Montgomery County has issued a preliminary injunction. It has not been able to obtain service upon the heads of the schoolteachers' union. The court has said that the strike is unlawful; but no service has been issued by the sheriff on the heads of the schoolteachers' union of Montgomery County.

Over the radio this morning, as I was coming downtown, I heard a leader of the schoolteachers' union say, "So long as they don't serve us, the picketing will go on." First, why has not the sheriff served them? I pause deliberately. Why has not the sheriff served them?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. They have not been served because they have gone across the Potomac River, into a motel on the Virginia side of the line, a place where I am sure they are not getting any sympathy from the people who live there, because I know the attitude of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia. But they are beyond reach of the Montgomery County sheriff.

I have wondered why the State's attorney did not make this a class case, so that the sheriff could send his deputies to serve the pickets on the line, and not allow himself to be thwarted in this ridiculous way, as the Senator from Ohio has referred to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is why I say that the activity is a comedy. It is contempt for the dignity of our democratic process. The judge and the sheriff, loyal to their responsibilities, should have removed promptly this insult to the dignity of the government. Yet brazenly on television they say: "So long as you do not serve us with process, we will continue the picketing."

It is my recollection from the teaching of the law of equity, which I taught for 6 years, that there is an established principle that those who are apprised of an order issued by the court, whether or not they have been served, become subject to the punitive processes of the court. I do not want to speak with positiveness on that subject, but that is my recollection.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yeld.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am not authorized by the White House to speak about the railroad strike. I have had no communication with the White House about it. However, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I do have some information on the matter.

I think that the Senator is greatly mistaken when he states that the railroadmen went out on strike because it is the heart of the harvest and tourist seasons and they wanted to hurt Florida or anybody else.

The railroads refused to negotiate with the working brotherhoods. The railroads said, "We are cutting your crews by one brakeman each and are firing those brakemen tomorrow." They summarily, and without notice, fired one brakeman from each train.

Thirty-four of the railroads in the United States had signed an agreement with the working brotherhoods that they did not need to fire them, and they did not fire them. However, certain railroads arbitrarily fired brakemen, despite the fact that the working brotherhoods pleaded with them to sit down and negotiate. The railroads refused. The brotherhoods had no other recourse then but to strike the Missouri Pacific and the Atlantic Coastline Division of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. I know that other people in the world refuse to negotiate. However, those railroads would not negotiate. They fired the brakemen.

The unions were threatened with losing the right that they had litigated in the court, after formal order, and had won in the circuit court of appeals.

The U.S. Supreme Court refused certiorari.

Certain railroads, 33 of the biggest or basic railroads in the eastern and northeastern parts of the United States and one in the West signed an agreement that they needed the brakeman on the train and would not fire him. The other railroads that were struck did fire them and refused to negotiate.

It is a great injustice to American workingmen to say that they pulled a strike to hurt Florida or business. Furthermore, President Luna of the Trainmen has given orders and union crews are standing ready to move any defense material.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, that was not said by the Senator from Florida, nor by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The situation caused losses in our State, also. I know something about the strike.

I think the railroads ought to sit down and talk with the men about the situation. The Associated Press has just reported that Federal District Court Judge Robert Van Pelt, in Lincoln, Nebr., has just announced he is temporarily restraining the Union Pacific Railroad from reducing the size of its work crews until good-faith bargaining takes place. Under the court's order the Union Pacific's cutback of work crew size, which the Union Pacific ordered into effect on Tuesday, is temporarily set aside. If the railroads would bargain before changing the crew size there would be no strikes. It is the precipitous action of the railroads themselves that have caused the problems the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] have referred to. I would reiterate that I do not know the situation in the White House on this matter. I do know that the matter is being given careful consideration, but I have not talked about it with the White House.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What does the Senator say about the 6-month strike in the copper industry? In carrying out its objectives the unions, of course, choose the most effective time to strike. I can understand that.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have no information about the details of the copper strike, or of any other strike. The President's special Board chaired by Professor Taylor who is ably assisted by Monsignor Higgins and George Ready, is mediating that dispute. I would not attempt to comment on that work stoppage while they are working to get the parties together. I have referred only to the railroad dispute.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram received from Vance M. Watson, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Florida, in support of the President's message and proposals in behalf of our veterans be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

I want to assure Commander Watson that I am in full accord with his views in support of President Johnson's proposals.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCALA, FLA., *February 7, 1968.*

Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Your outstanding work for veterans and America's servicemen over the years is deeply appreciated. I know that you join with me in approval of President Johnson's message to the Congress, January 30, 1968 outlining the needs in this area. Please be assured of the approval of this message by the Department of Florida, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the fact that you will receive our complete support in your efforts toward this aim.

VANCE M. WATSON,
Department of Florida, Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

TIME TO BE STALWART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a well-thought-out column by William H. Stringer entitled "Time To Be Stalwart," carried in the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1968, be incorporated in the RECORD. I commend its reading to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO BE STALWART

(By William H. Stringer)

It is time to think about upholding the hands of government. This is a moment for Americans to stifle, not criticism nor dissent, but that violent, discouraged, and anarchic thinking which disrupts government and adds to Washington's already grievous burdens.

Add the North Vietnamese build-up around Khe Sahn to the Viet Cong's attack within South Vietnam's cities and you could have the war's most crucial engagement. The aim: to bring the United States and its Allies into peace talks in a starkly unfavorable position, so that the unavoidable result would be a coalition government essentially under Viet Cong control, and finally, an American pull-out.

Perhaps this is the feasible result. It would be a disguised defeat. Perhaps it would leave behind an eventually united Vietnam that, Titolike, would someday repulse the advances of Peking. Each to his opinion.

The point is, neither the scars of war nor the peace proffers are reason for carrying placards denouncing, with obscenities, the President of the United States. Or for encouraging widespread law violation, or the disruption of other people's rights to free speech. That is anarchy and nihilism. We are not that kind of people.

Our government represents our compact with society, whether it's headed by Johnson or Rockefeller or McCarthy or Eisenhower.

The mammoth power that is the United States cannot be exercised in jerks and starts, according to whoever can amass the noisiest protest march against the Pentagon. The Constitution didn't set things up that way.

It is this responsible setup which has enabled the United States to stand tall in the modern world. It is orderly government which mobilizes a nation to halt aggression at Berlin, to distribute grain to hungry peoples under PL 480, to be on the way to a moon landing, to work for détente with Moscow, to give life and treasure, if need be, in honoring far-off commitments. And, of course, to tackle (and win) the great battle of rehabilitating the inner core of American cities with their struggling, long-denied minorities.

There are young dissenters, brought up on permissiveness and now flouting government authority, who would, if they could, destroy the middle class and industrial capitalism. There are bizarre thinkers who make fun of the late President Kennedy's famous injunction to ask not what the country can do for you but what you can do for your country, and who label the Peace Corps a dropout device.

These are minority voices.

But there is an over-abundance of complaining and carping and caterwauling from the pseudointellectual establishment. Nor is there any need that a forthright, vigorous nation should accept into its thinking the debilitating doctrines of either Asian mysticism or homegrown pacifism.

The Asian aim, to extinguish individuality by absorption into a sea of bliss, would substitute contemplation for demonstration. The pacifist outlook, regarding war as totally evil, could not have stood up to Hitler's Nazism, and in America's own Civil War would never have brought the splendidly couraged South back into the Union.

The Civil War had its draft riots and poison-pen editors. Today the news media are summoned to avoid panicky assessments, to omit the pinpricks and the deprecatory and the despairing phrase.

The Viet Cong assault against the cities may be a last-gasp attempt. Or it may show that the United States has built a mere hollow shell of government in South Vietnam—bricks without straw.

Certainly this time of crucial decisions is a time to uphold the government—President and Congress—with our prayers. Yes, to see that no mist of false doctrine or sleazy upbringing can upset the constitutional order which gives thrust and purpose to our country. And to remind ourselves and affirm that our leaders have the utilization of ever-present intelligence and wisdom from on high, that they indeed can perceive and follow the "path which no fowl knoweth." (Job 28.)

THE MULTILATERAL TREND

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have read with interest the President's foreign aid message to Congress today.

As we all know, there is now a desirable trend toward multilateralism in foreign aid, and I was gratified to note the emphasis that the President put upon that in his lifting of the fundamental principles of our foreign assistance program. The plan to make 90 percent of our loans on one multilateral basis or another is wise and proper, and the President's statement of the needs of the International Development Association—the World Bank's "soft loan window"— commends itself to our serious consideration.

Those who use terms like "foreign aid giveaway" and who carp at our assistance to less-developed nations should instruct themselves on how many multilateral institutions and arrangements these are. There is the Development Assistance Committee, headquartered in Paris and composed of members from 15 nations and the European Economic Community. It is the major international mechanism for coordination of free world assistance. There are the World Bank's consortia for India and Pakistan, and other such consortia for other countries, composed of as many as 16 donor countries and institutions. There are consultative groups established by the World Bank and others for the pooling and coordination of assistance to particular countries, such as Nigeria, Colombia, Thailand, Peru, and Korea.

There are other coordination arrangements, such as the Colombo plan for South and Southeast Asia and the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

We have helped develop and have strongly supported such multilateralism, and some of our partners in these enterprises are devoting larger shares of their national product to foreign aid than we are.

THE NATION FACES REALITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Time To Push, Not Merely Prod," published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1968; and an equally excellent article entitled "Facing Reality," written by Alan L. Otten, and published in the Wall Street Journal of today, February 8, 1968.

There is much food for thought in the editorial and the article. I urge Senators to give them their consideration.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1968]

TIME TO PUSH, NOT MERELY PROD

It would be tragic if the United States had not learned a worldwide lesson from its long, painful, and presently uncertain labors in South Vietnam. This is the crystal-clear fact that it is impossible to foster or maintain popular democracy anywhere unless local leadership is sincerely dedicated to the welfare of the country and the individual.

As outgoing Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara underlined in his farewell report to Congress, America cannot achieve its goals in Vietnam unless the Saigon government establishes its authority over its territory. And Saigon can do this only through radical reform. It has little hope of winning a popularity contest against the Viet Cong unless it proves its determination to give honest, conscientious government, root out privilege and exploitation, severely punish graft and corruption, and, in short, represent popular rather than restricted interests.

What is true in war-seething Vietnam is equally true at other potential blow-up points. Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bolivia, Latin America are dotted with tindery areas merely awaiting the right combination of moment, leadership and popular desperation. Cuba should have shown clearly enough where such conditions can lead.

There may at the moment be fewer such areas in Africa and Asia (on these two continents governments more responsive to the popular will have come into being) but there are still spots where deep dissatisfaction gnaws and where there is a broad gap between the governed and the governors. Even Europe, where the present governments of Greece, Portugal, and Spain were neither popularly elected nor popularly chosen, is not safe from this alienation between those on top and those below.

Although the situation is more desperate in Vietnam than elsewhere, nonetheless there are forces in other parts of the world that would tend to produce other Vietnams. They exist wherever, in this day of rising expectations, the people have come to feel profoundly that their government is against them rather than for them. Wherever there are peasants toiling for others at a few pence a day, wherever there is cruel and glaring contrast between the handful of rich and the throngs of poor, wherever elections bring no real change in the situation, strong and constructive action is urgently needed to prevent the development of other Vietnams.

For the two decades since the end of World War II the United States has generally been content to prod gently in the hope of inducing reform in governments it helps. By 1968, and with the lesson of South Vietnam before us, has not the time come for America to push, and push hard, rather than merely prod?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1968]

FACING REALITY

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—The most interesting thing thus far about the popular American reaction to the Pueblo affair is the lack of it.

Officials and ordinary citizens alike have been comparatively calm and restrained in their response, which suggests that perhaps the United States, after decades of almost adolescent confidence in its infinite ability to shape and reshape conditions at home and abroad, is beginning to comprehend the confines of power. This long-delayed maturing results, at least in part, from the nation's Vietnam involvement; it is an unexpected but valuable byproduct of the war.

We have heard, to be sure, a few hawks' cries for the military to rush in and show those gooks a thing or two, a few wistful recollections of the North African bandit caving in and releasing the Greek-American merchant when good old Teddy Roosevelt laid down his famous ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

But the general attitude of top Johnson men, influential Senators and Congressmen, editorial writers and men on the street has been remarkably relaxed. The feeling seems to be that the Government should certainly do all it can to get the men back (there appears little anxiety over the ship) but that it should be extremely cautious about any steps that might lead to broad military action.

Administration leaders have been pleasantly surprised, for instance, at the comparative composure on Capitol Hill. One State Department official tells of having to brief a Congressman whose mimeograph machine had initially bellowed belligerently for action. The official outlined what the Administration was doing through diplomatic channels, then waited for the angry blast about panty-waist diplomacy. "Well," said the firebrand meekly, "I guess that's about all anyone could expect you to do right now, isn't it." The official assumes this means that the back-home pressure to "do something" had been considerably less than the lawmaker had originally expected.

Admittedly, one element of this new maturity is a certain sophisticated cynicism. In the U-2 affair and the Bay of Pigs, the American involvement eventually was shown to be less than saintly; the same might be true of the Pueblo, people were saying, especially after Secretaries McNamara and Rusk on TV Sunday acknowledged at least the possibility that at some time the spy ship might have been inside North Korea's 12-mile limit. The whole spy craze in books and movies and TV entertainment causes heads to nod wisely at the Pueblo news: This is a dirty business, those who work at it are likely to get caught and get hurt, and it's all in the game. To many Americans it seems more sensible to take the losses quietly than to risk more chips on a poor hand.

But certainly there is an additional factor working in the Pueblo affair that was not present in earlier incidents: A reluctant recognition that the U.S. does not have limitless military or financial resources, and thus should not expose itself to another long, messy war for anything less than a very clear threat to its self-interest.

The U.S. response to the Arab-Israeli war last spring was remarkably similar. Even the shrillest Vietnam hawks cautioned against rushing into another major battleground, and the nation squirmed uneasily as its conscience urged it to help Israel and its common sense warned it to stay the hell out. A nationwide sigh of relief went up when the Israeli army and air force ended the war before the U.S. had to decide between the promptings of conscience and the counsel of good sense.

It seems highly likely, too, that similar restraint will be the response to future foreign flare-ups. For the Vietnam war has driven home—rubbed the national nose in, if you will—the lesson of the limitations of American power. The nation is coming to realize, as decades earlier Britain and France had to realize, that massive military might, technological superiority and even good intentions aren't always enough to shape events. Particularly the U.S. is learning that there are many situations where nuclear power is too awful to contemplate and conventional power inadequate, and that in such situations discretion is definitely the preferred course.

It is a difficult lesson for a people inherently optimistic and self-confident. Americans have long believed there was almost nothing they couldn't do once they set their minds to it—and, somehow, things got worked out that way until recently. Didn't the U.S. win World War I and World War II, rebuild Western Europe, halt the Communists in Korea? Now, with realistic resignation, the Republic is adjusting to the fact that events don't always march to the American tune.

It still comes as a considerable shock to a nation used to flexing its financial muscle to be told that gold supplies are dwindling dangerously, that the dollar is in trouble, that its citizens may have to accept strict limits on where they can invest and—for the first time—stiff taxes when they travel abroad. Perhaps the Administration's proposals are examples of overkill, and will ultimately be trimmed down or even in part rejected. But whatever curbs finally emerge, and even the debate about them, will force Americans to face reality.

In the domestic field the awakening is proving equally rude. Even those Americans who have had doubts about the nation's power to remake the world have always happily assumed they could pretty well do as they wanted to remake their own country. Good will, hard work and money could overcome the race problem, save the cities, give jobs to practically everyone and so forth. Indeed the President quite properly and accurately recites strings of statistics of advances in employment, housing, education, health. Yet the problems seem to have grown even faster; the list of unmet needs stretches ever longer and race relations grow more bitter.

Perhaps the awakening was bound to come sooner or later, as it came to the British and French and other once high-riding empires. Certainly, though, Vietnam has been a catalyst to speed the American awakening, dramatically underscoring the difficulties of winning wars in faraway lands, the limits of financial resources, the problems of mobilizing national will. And if, as a result of Vietnam, the awakening has come a little sooner and perhaps even a little less rudely than it might otherwise have come, then perhaps that is a perverse plus for the war—one not usually included on the Administration's Vietnam balance sheet.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS TIMELY MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the President's message on crime, which was sent to the Senate yesterday, accurately reflects this Nation's concern about the continued rise in crime. The dramatic figures are well known: since 1960, violent crimes have increased 72 percent and crimes against property have risen 90 percent; crime last year cost

$4 billion in lost property and thousands of persons were killed or injured.

But a less publicized cost of crime is the toll it takes on the quality of every citizen's life. A recent Presidential Crime Commission survey in cities showed: nearly one-half of the citizens stayed inside their houses at night for fear of crime; one-third will not speak to strangers for fear of crime; nearly one-quarter drive rather than walk for fear of crime; and one-fifth want to move to another neighborhood for fear of crime.

COMPENSATION TO INNOCENT VICTIMS

For some people, crime is more than a lessening of the quality of life. Many thousands are the innocent victims of violent crimes. They suffer painful injury, loss of money, medical expenses, and lost wages through missed days of work. After a crime we spend money feeding, clothing, housing, and protecting the rights of the accused criminal, but we forget the victim. As Mr. Justice Goldberg once said:

> The victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the "protection" of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole.

My bill, S. 646, is needed to assure a humane approach as we consider the full impact of crimes on our society.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

I agree with George Washington that—

> The due administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government.

The President wisely calls on our local agencies who are the basis for law enforcement, to reexamine their own procedures to see that their ordinances and laws are "fair, firm, effective, and adapted to the criminal justice problems of the 20th century."

Mayors and Governors must scrutinize their judicial systems, for the court is at the heart of justice. Its rules and procedures govern the police. Its process seeks the truth. Its determinations affect individual life, liberty, and personal property. And its sentence frames the work of the correctional system.

They must also dig out the low-visibility problems such as bail bond malpractices that price our system of justice out of the range of many and render them more likely to be convicted simply because they are poor. Without any single intentional act, the administration of an insensitive or outmoded or discriminatory system can brutally crush out of a person any respect for the rule of law.

SAFE STREETS AND CRIME CONTROL

As a cosponsor of the original Senate measure by which we would provide local authorities with needed assistance, I join with the President in calling for the speedy passage of his bill as proposed last year.

The average policeman today receives $5,300 a year. That means he must often moonlight to support his family. We need better paid, better trained, better equipped local police. An important way we can support our local police is to make available assistance for education and training because, as the President's message made clear:

> Law enforcement means more than putting on a uniform. It means learning about the Constitution, about our laws, about weaponry, about people.

Action on this proposal has been delayed because of several controversial amendments being considered in the Senate subcommittees. One of these would reverse the constitutionally based rule of the Supreme Court on confessions. Another would drastically limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in habeas corpus cases. Another would authorize wiretapping and bugging under judicial supervision.

I oppose these additions as does the administration. We want a just society, and a safe one. It is not necessary to trade freedom for security; we can have both.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The most disturbing single aspect of the Nation's crime problem is the deep and growing involvement of young people. Half of all crimes against property are committed by minors. Fifteen-year-olds are arrested most often of all ages. Forty-eight percent of our young offenders will commit second and third offenses.

The greatest hope for reducing crime is to stem the increase in youth crime. The President proposes a new approach in developing a greater range of alternatives to jail. The financial cost of detention is high—$144 million was spent in 1965, by State and local communities, to confine 48,500 teenagers. But a worse cost is the effect our correctional institutions may have on the future of a youthful offender. HEW Secretary John W. Gardner said:

> The mere involvement of an individual with the juvenile justice system increases the chances that he will return to that system.

The establishment of special youth agencies in local communities to develop half-way houses and other alternatives to jail could restore to our Nation the youthful resource that is now being lost to crime.

DRUGS

The growing use of narcotics and dangerous drugs must be curbed by a concentrated drive at the Federal level. Present Federal laws are inadequate both in their approach and in the responsibility for their enforcement. The President suggests a new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs under the Justice Department to increase our efforts and our efficiency.

This problem affects our Nation's health as well as our self-respect. The improper use and illegal trafficking in barbiturates, pep pills, amphetamines, hallucinogens, and drugs must be fully investigated, exposed, and controlled.

TOTAL ATTACK ON CRIME

To be effective, our attack on crime must be total. We must not concentrate solely on the highly publicized crime in the streets for there are other types of crime that strike even deeper blows at a society so delicately balanced on respect for law and order. For example, consumer abuses so ingenious that legislation does not adequately prevent them, and consequently their fraudulent contracts will be upheld in court, cause a disrespect for law.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders is learning that disillusion and alienation with the rule of law is a direct contributing factor to ignoring laws. We must attack all crime to show that the law can work for the poor as well as the rich, and that using the law provides the best solution to one's problem.

I congratulate the President on his crime message and support the many measures he has outlined. He has vested much new authority in Attorney General Ramsey Clark, whom he called "Mr. Big" in his plans for attacking crime, and I wholeheartedly support the President's judgment that General Clark can provide the leadership we need in a renewed attack on crime.

THE EXPERIENCE OF SENATOR PERCY IN VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was a good deal of discussion when my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], went to Vietnam recently and came, in a sense, under shell fire.

I thought it would be well if the whole story were properly told and suggested that perhaps he should set it down on paper so that I could insert it in the Record.

Thus, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks he has advanced to me be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Your Senator Reports

(By Charles H. Percy, U.S. Senator)

It's great to be back home! Although it is interesting to travel, and important for a legislator to have first-hand knowledge of the situations on which he must vote, I am very happy to be in the United States again.

Much of the mail waiting for me dealt with the attack we encountered at Dak Son. Loraine and I especially appreciated the hundreds of messages evidencing concern for our safety.

Overseas I learned a great deal I could not learn at home, and Loraine—with her great sensitivity to social problems—contributed to my understanding. Her conversations in Vietnam with hospitalized American soldiers and South Vietnamese civilians, with social workers, doctors, teachers and young people brought a new dimension to my own investigations of the political, economic, and military problems of that unhappy country.

U.S. Ambassador Bunker, who personally approved Mrs. Percy's going to Vietnam, must have known how much a woman can add to such a study trip. So did President Johnson when he invited a group of American women to tour Vietnam to see our activities there just before we arrived.

For this reason, we had no anxiety as we flew to Dak Son, which was a deserted village in an unpopulated area to study first hand the Viet Cong atrocity there and our handling of the refugees. Our helicopter pilot radioed for military clearance to land and the clearance was given. Arrangements for the plane had been made by the American Embassy and we were accompanied by a refugee official working under military authority who was assigned to us by American officials in Saigon.

Being at Dak Son when the firing began was unfortunate for us, but no one was hurt and the attackers apparently fled after the brief assault, so it was perfectly safe when the helicopters came in to rescue us. No rescue helicopter was shot at, and we were soon at the American military base a few kilometers away where Mrs. Percy was waiting for us.

To our great surprise, Mrs. Percy was very calm. She had already made friends with a nurse and a number of children being cared for there.

Although I could have done without the experience of Dak Son, it turned out to be worthwhile, for, from that moment on, I was able to understand the courage and perseverance and anxieties of our fighting men much better than before. Somehow, having experienced an attack myself, my communication with our men in Vietnam became much closer and they were more frank with me, considering me as one of them. A group of Illinois military men stationed in Bangkok later presented me, in good humor, with a Vietnam campaign medal!

Some of my conclusions resulting from the additional information I obtained on this trip have already been reported on "Meet The Press". In articles and statements on the floor of the Senate, and in Illinois, in the weeks ahead, I shall say more. But let me just say this now: I realize more clearly than ever that we are in a strong military position in Vietnam and therefore should have no fear of negotiating. And so long as the fighting continues, we must see to it that our men, and those of our allies, are provided with the best weapons to enhance their safety and effectiveness.

I am more firm than ever in my conviction that we cannot win this war *for* the South Vietnamese. We can help, but ultimate victory—military, economic, political and social, must be won by them.

THE VIETCONG HAS FAILED IN ITS BASIC OBJECTIVES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the murderous attacks by North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces against the civilian population in the South Vietnamese cities have been described by some people as major psychological and military victories for the Communists. It cannot be denied that these coordinated attacks have impressed the Vietnamese people with their rather considerable military capabilities. An analysis of the events of the past week, however, indicates very clearly that the past week has been far from a victory for the Communist leaders.

These leaders had quite obviously believed that the attacks in the cities by the so-called liberation forces would evoke wide-scale support from the civilian population. They were probably also convinced that their surprise attacks during the Tet truce period would allow them to destroy complete military units and to bring about wide-scale desertions among the South Vietnamese defending forces. Neither of these predictions were realized.

The people of the South Vietnamese cities just did not receive the Communists with open arms. Except for the Communist cadre in the cities, the Vietcong received almost no civilian support during their attacks. And at the same time, despite temporary military setbacks, the defenses of the Allied military forces, were quickly organized in most places and offensive operations against the Communists soon undertaken.

I think that the events of the past week have destroyed the myth that the South Vietnamese army cannot and does not fight. I think we have all seen numerous news reports on TV from Vietnam in which the South Vietnamese soldiers showed not only a willingness to fight but also were quite obviously doing a commendable job of it, at times against heavy odds. I think we should recall that the attacks were started during the Tet truce period, when many soldiers were at home visiting their relatives and honoring their ancestors. The ability of the South Vietnamese to react quickly to the often devastating attacks reflects extremely well on the leaders of the South Vietnamese army, police, and other defense forces who are often brunt of much misguided and uninformed criticism.

It is believed that another of the purposes of the Communist attack was to weaken the South Vietnamese and the American forces around the Khe Sanh area where a major enemy offensive is building up. This quite obviously was another setback for their plans. Their offensive against the cities was stopped without any effect on our force level and overall strength at Khe Sanh.

The Communists also paid a ghastly toll for their offensive during the past week. Over 21,000 Communists have already been killed and the number is rising each day as the remaining pockets of terrorists are being cleared out in several cities. Several thousand other Communists have also been captured. I think it is also safe to say that many of these Communist dead or captured were political and organization cadre whose loss will cause serious difficulties. To say the Communists still have sufficient forces to continue their attacks can not overshadow the fact that they have experienced serious personnel losses. This can not help having some detrimental effects on their morale in the future.

The events of the past week have shown that the South Vietnamese people and fighting forces backed up by United States and their other allies, are not willing to succumb to Communist aggression. I would hope, Mr. President, that we Americans can, despite the difficulties of the moment, continue to support this brave will to resist Communist aggression and domination.

THE FUTURE OF THE OCEAN—A RULE OF ORDER OR A RULE OF FORCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, late in the last session the Committee on Commerce favorably reported to the Senate S. 2269, a bill to provide some additional needed compensation for American tuna and shrimp fishermen. These are American citizens who have been harassed, pursued, and seized in the eastern Pacific Ocean for more years than I care to remember. The hearing record on that measure is heavily laddened with those "terms and expressions" which today—after the seizure of the *Pueblo*—are becoming a part of the common vernacular.

These American tuna and shrimp vessels are in peaceful pursuit of ocean harvest. You may call their individual seizures "incidents," but to the men aboard and the wives and families concerned, those days and weeks when communication was illegally and forcibly cut off, the individual fear and concern was not one heartbeat less than those of any family whose loved ones served abroad on vessels held in foreign ports, be they private or Government owned.

In these eastern Pacific Ocean seizures—and I would not omit those which have confronted the large and important shrimp fleets of this country—there has been no question or dispute as to position. Yet the distances from baselines off Latin America have been doubled, and more, the lines claimed generally by the Communist nations. We have not quibbled about 9 miles, or perhaps 12, or even 16. Our debates have been in waters far beyond—waters which this world has historically recognized as international, even before the documentation by Hugo Grotius, in 1609, on behalf of the Dutch East India Company. These became what is now widely referred to as the "cannon shot rule," and that doctrine of freedom has grown down through the centuries. It weathered the attacks in 1635 by the British jurist, John Selden. It has remained so even in this modern world.

In 1793 the 3-mile limit for territorial jurisdiction was formally adopted by Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. It allowed William Seward in that same office in 1862 to write:

> This Government adheres to . . . the principle that the maritime jurisdiction of any nation covers a full marine league from its coast.

My purpose today, however, is not to debate the wisdom of the "cannonball" philosophy, nor even to justify the present United States position that the territorial sea of a nation should not extend beyond 3 miles. Certainly, in the annually repetitive cases of our fishermen this question is academic. We seemed ready to accept the claims of some nations to 12 miles of territory, although we claim only 3. Off Latin America our fishermen have been advised by their representatives to respect the broader limit, but only in relation to fisheries for these American-flag vessels have no other reason for being present in the eastern Pacific Ocean.

Mr. President, I have not been passive over the years in regard to the illegal seizures of our American fishing vessels on what this world calls the high seas. Nor have I been tolerant of the accompanying indignity of these fishing vessel seizures. Are not these fishermen American citizens?

Are not they defending this presently popular concept of the "freedom of the seas?"

Freedom is like a lot of things which we Americans take for granted—too much so, perhaps. But freedom must be used to establish validity just as new laws must be tested in our courts.

Who has better defended this concept of freedom of the seas than our fishermen?

If the premise of rightful use has any

meaning toward world order, let those who have given more in monetary loss, fear for life, or family concern than America's fishermen come forward.

I would plead their case and praise their sacrifice in no less degree.

You may then recall November 1954, when five whaling ships of Panamanian registry were seized offshore by Peru. Two were 126 miles off the coast; two others were attacked with bombs and machinegun fire from Peruvian aircraft and surface units about 300 miles offshore.

The factory ship in that situation—or incident if you prefer—was attacked by Peruvian aircraft 364 miles off the coast.

The masters of those vessels were tried—under Peruvian law—in the court of the port officer of Paita and the ships impounded.

The fine was $3 million.

No tuna or shrimp vessel flying the American flag has been penalized in that degree—not individually.

But in the past 8 years 111 U.S.-flag fishing vessels have been wrongfully and illegally seized in international waters by Latin American countries. The record of shrimp vessel abuse would swell the total considerably. We are not talking about hundreds of dollars individually in relation to our American fishermen's sacrifices in maintaining this doctrine of freedom of the seas by use. Collectively, the amount is substantial.

I suppose whenever I feel the need to share my views on this subject that I must go back to the incident in 1955. The man wounded off Ecuador near Santa Clara Island on March 27 of that year came from my own State. His name was "Billy" Peck, and Ecuadorean gunfire brought wounds which he carries today and suffering which he must bear for the rest of his life. Despite the strong protest of this Nation, the ship upon which he served, the *Arctic Maid,* was fined more than $49,000, and this Nation has never properly compensated this man who was forced to accept that risk upon mere passage through our territorial sea onto the waters which we call international.

I am not going to burden the RECORD today with fishing vessel seizures or affidavits. Our committee hearing records and files are available to any who might wish to raise questions.

But, Mr. President, let me cite an incident—and there were 27 tuna and shrimp vessel seizures off Latin America in 1967.

On October 19, 1967, the captain of an American tuna clipper, out of San Diego, Calif., ordered the engines of his vessel shut down at 7 p.m. He further ordered that watches be continued to observe the vessel's drift. The navigator was instructed to take a night position that he might calculate movement for proper location the following morning.

The captain of that vessel was 70 miles offshore in the eastern Pacific. There were nine other U.S. tuna vessels drifting that night in the vicinity, should there be doubt or question as to the affidavit which he made in San Diego at a later date.

A crewman awakened him at 5 a.m. the following morning to advise that there were blinking lights visible from a vessel. The captain went immediately to the bridge, listened to the U.S. Coast Guard distress frequency 2182 kilocycles.

There were no calls.

He then heard pistol fire from the approaching vessel. He returned to his radio and asked for explanation. The response was in Spanish—it was that he lower his skiff and proceed to the adjacent vessel with his ship's papers. The American fishing captain talked further by radio.

The first question asked by the Latin American captain was whether or not he had a fishing permit. He replied he did not, that he was outside the 12-mile limit.

It seems important here to note that although this American tuna boat captain, whose vessel was not fishing, still respected the 12-mile limit questions, although the United States does not recognize more than 3 miles as a legal territorial sea.

Mr. President, allow me to quote from his statement:

> I have pilot house control, so I started the vessel slow ahead into the swell. There were heavy swells and the sea was very rough. As is normal in such sea conditions in order to lower the power boat or skiff, the main engine on the vessel has to be in position "ahead" and the vessel traveling so as to permit the skiff to be launched from the stern with safety to the men and the vessel.
>
> As I was starting slow ahead, my vessel was hit by a series of machine-gun firing, the . . . warship . . . was on our portside—port quarter, less than 100 feet away.
>
> I then got on the radio, 2182 frequency, and asked them to stop firing, my engines were stopped. The machine-gun firing was still continuing. Then an English speaking person got on the radio and told me not to move my vessel any more, that a small boat would come to our vessel with a boarding party.
>
> While I waited for the boarding party, I talked on the radio to August Felando, General Manager of the American Tunaboat Association, and explained the incident. I also gave him the position of the vessel at the time, as was provided me by the navigator. The last position was 03 degrees 15 minutes South, 81 degrees 39 minutes West, about 70 miles offshore.
>
> As I was talking to Mr. Felando . . . four sailors and one officer (came on the bridge). All were armed; three sailors directed machineguns, one sailor had a pistol, and the officer also had a pistol.
>
> The officer then shut off my radio and touched his pistol, while I was talking to Mr. Felando. I told the officer, "What's going on here, we are further than 12 miles out." I then noticed that all of the sailors held their machineguns in a position to fire if ordered.
>
> The officer told me the limits were 200 miles. He looked at our charts and asked about our overnight's position. We had no drift information for him or an early morning position. We showed him that our position was estimated as 03 degrees, 15 minutes South, 81 degrees, 39 minutes west. He then agreed, and we all signed the navigation chart.
>
> The officer took our Ship's Log, and this document was never returned to our vessel. The officer then ordered us to follow the (warship) and said that we would head to (port). The officer and sailors remained aboard and observed our actions.

There is more, but I have purposely deleted sections so that this man and his vessel be not further singled for illegal harassment on the basis of the statement I make today. I can say, however, that this vessel was finally released after paying a fine of $16,000.

I will not now mention the name of that country either, for no useful purpose would be served in citing an instance from so many made available to our committee.

This incident is not mentioned for the amount of the fine—the records will show that they have been much larger. Neither would I point to the harassment as more excessive than in the other instances regularly presented in affidavit form to our committee. Indeed, 70 miles offshore is not a record for seizure by those Latin American nations who, in my judgment, demonstrate not only irresponsibility, but contribute to the breakdown of the "freedom of the seas" which these fishermen are attempting to protect in peaceful pursuit in those waters which this world calls international.

Fortunately, a year ago when the San Diego-owned and based fishing vessel *Ronnie S* was seized off Ecuador, no shots were fired. But the "high seas" boarding men were armed—only with .45-caliber pistols in this case.

But, Mr. President, there has been bloodshed. There are American fishermen carrying the mark and even the metal of gunfire from these critical situations which have existed off Latin America, and been regularly documented before our committee.

The fishermen seized illegally in the international waters of the eastern Pacific Ocean have been forced to sign untrue statements. Unlike the captain of the vessel, whose sworn affidavit was earlier included in the RECORD, they have also been under duress to sign ships logs which designated chart positions they knew were not true.

In some cases officers of these South American countries have sealed radios that the men aboard might not even give assurance to wives and families in America that they were alive or safe.

Last February an Ecuadorean warship seized the San Diego *Ronnie S,* as I mentioned earlier, and that seizure was accomplished 25 miles off that nation's coast. The Ecuadorean officer in command agreed as to position, let there be no question on that.

The warship, however, which seized the *Ronnie S* and crew was the *Guayaquil* No. LC72, and that vessel is no less familiar to the records of this committee than to the fishermen who ship aboard vessels out of the west coast of the United States in search of yellowfin tuna on the high seas.

The *Guayaquil* No. LC72 was one of five former U.S. warships given to Ecuador under the military assistance program. This was not a surplus vessel; she touched water for the first time at her launching in our own State of Wisconsin in 1966.

In the past 7 years more than 50 percent of the entire fleet of U.S. owned and based tuna flag vessels have been involved in harassment or seizure on the high seas.

Our fishermen have been wounded by gunfire;

Imprisoned for as long as 10 months;

Our vessels have been forcibly detained for more than a month.

Mr. President, I am proud that this Congress saw fit late in the last session to adopt Public Law 90–244. At least now the provision of military vessels to those Latin American nations who use them to harass or seize American fishing vessels and citizens on the high seas will be terminated.

It is an assertion of this Nation's sovereign right, long overdue. But it is not enough.

Let us not forget that this country presently recognizes only 3 miles as the territorial sea, although we now have adopted an additional 9 miles contiguous zone exclusively for fishery jurisdiction.

That 200-mile claim of world ocean is not for fisheries alone, but as a territorial sea in the case of many Latin American countries.

Mr. President, the fishermen who harvest the resources off my State—and indeed off most of the ocean-bordering States of this Nation—are now faced with Government-subsidized, massive, competitive assaults on our rich adjacent fishery resources.

The fishermen of my State would like to claim 200 miles of jurisdiction.

I am equally certain that our Navy would wish to inspect the sophisticated electronic equipment aboard some of the Soviet trawlers just outside our new 9-mile fishery zone. Particularly, when their course appears to be more concerned with the monitoring of our military exercises than in search of fish at the bottom of the sea.

But we are a responsible member of the world community of nations, and it seems to me that the time has come for us to begin insisting that others live up to an equal role if we are to maintain peace.

I well recognize, Mr. President, that it is not popular to draw attack to the illegal actions of such essentially friendly nations as Chile, Ecuador, and Peru.

But the record is undeniably present, and the responsibility of the Senate Commerce Committee would be unfilled if these words were unsaid.

Freedom of the seas is not as simple as it was in 1609 when Grotius made his case for the doctrine. And I would be first to cite that with freedom comes responsibility. The ocean resources are not limitless; there are no more virgin frontiers in fisheries.

But, Mr. President, the case of the tuna and shrimp fishermen who proudly fly the American flag on the high seas are not capturing some wealth which might otherwise be harvested by these Latin American nations. For those countries who make exorbitant claims in defiance of international law and conflict in our goal to world order are not harvesting these species.

In other words, these fish would die, unharvested, a waste to a hungry world whose larder is less than filled. Were there a question of conservation, I would rise in protest as I have on behalf of the west coast fishermen; indeed for those who stand in wait for the returning salmon in the North Pacific and return with an empty hold as the interception has taken place on these same high seas we speak of.

I came here today to discuss the merits of S. 2269. It is my wish to discuss some of the "precedent" and "preference" arguments which have arisen in the Senate on this issue.

I would assume that those who would speak of expanding "preference" are concerned with the treatment which this Nation accorded to the distant water American fishing fleets in 1954. But may I emphasize—there is no expansion of the principle of reimbursement in S. 2269. The same circumstances which gave validity to the action of this Nation at that time exist today. I dislike the word subsidization, but for those who would use it, let us say only that the "precedent" for the justifiable action on the part of the U.S. Government was properly set at that time—14 years ago.

I appreciate and well understand the magnitude of our diplomatic and economic assistance efforts in Latin America and the reasons for them. But I cannot forgive the injustice to these American citizens; and if there be a choice of preference let it be to the American fishermen.

There are those who might object on the basis that some other American is not treated equally in his lawful operation outside the continental United States or its territorial sea.

Let me say only this.

When an American individual or business establishes an operation on foreign soil, he does so in full knowledge that he may be subject to the laws which govern that land, and although I would defend his rights as an American citizen, his investment is a calculated risk in an uncertain world.

But, Mr. President, when a ship sets sail for the international waters—the world oceans—his thought goes not to any nation, nor his concern to any national law. For he hopes and seeks that freedom of the seas which this Nation should be prepared to defend in every case, for there are few areas which have more historical or basic substance.

Let us not then draw unfair analogy as to restitution of loss to an American who operates on foreign soil;

Let us not fail in a duty to a citizen who seeks his living in that area of inner space which we can still call international;

Let us not abdicate our leadership position toward world order, nor our recorded responsibility toward international law;

Let us not turn our back on the American insult—long prevalent in the eastern Pacific.

Mr. President, there was bitterness within the American fishing community on the issue of the 9-mile fishery zone adopted during the 89th Congress. The fishermen in my State—as well as those in Oregon, Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and many others—pleaded for a 200-mile limit or a Continental Shelf philosophy. They asked for that same kind of broad jurisdiction claimed by South Americans.

But they did not want conquest; they did not seek taxes for local government to be paid by those offshore; they sought only the protection, conservation, and retention of our rich adjacent fishery resources.

But again, the fishermen of my State—and indeed in the fishing ports throughout this Nation—stand firmly beside the America tuna and shrimp fishermen. For all must retain the freedom of opportunity to seek an honest living from the resources of the adjacent or high seas.

Are these fishermen entitled to less right, though their advice and counsel as to the legality of their operation comes from the U.S. Government, than any other American citizen?

Mr. President, hundreds of American fishermen have been held incommunicado aboard their ships in the harbors of South America; they have been under armed guard, treated as criminals; they have remained in jails under charges which our Government continued to proclaim as illegal.

Their plight has been a violation of every American concept of justice. It has been a continuing national disgrace.

S. 2269 is not a perfect legislative proposal. I suppose no law can serve all purposes without conflict.

The record must show that this Nation has provided—through the Alliance for Progress program—over half a billion dollars in assistance from 1961 to 1966 to the citizens of only three South American countries: Ecuador, Panama, and Peru.

I must agree with the objections raised to S. 2269 in the failure of this Government to meet its responsibility as outlined in 1954 to recover taxpayer funds.

Our fishermen and merchant seamen must not be some kind of second-class citizens upon departure from an American port.

His rights must be protected. He is not investing on foreign soil; he is using historic internationally free and public highways, on a portion of this earth far greater than the populated land mass—the world ocean.

These seizures of our fishermen, particularly off Latin America, have continued far too long.

The United States has—and it was so testified before Senator BARTLETT's subcommittee in this Congress—lodged the strongest of protest over the years at illegal fines assessed against our fishermen.

But, Mr. President, the record shows not one penny returned by those who have violated the lawful order of the world oceans in these seizures. And yet that same record clearly shows the millions which we have sent for various kinds of aid to them.

It is difficult for me, Mr. President, to advocate the removal of a single spoonful of protein from the mouth of a hungry citizen in these offending countries. We have not yet done so.

But this is a realistic world.

We must look at some balance here. If the deduction of such foreign aid and assistance will assist to bring some better order to the world ocean;

If such deduction will prevent the loss of untold thousands of man-hours in ocean harvest of food for the hungry;

Then, Mr. President, I am prepared to alter my views.

I am prepared to accept amendment to S. 2269, that these needs of ocean harvest and rational freedom be met; that the future of the oceans, Mr. President, be guided by a rule of order, not a rule of irrational force.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Nation is accustomed to viewing with a special significance the comments of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] on Vietnam. His remarks earlier today at the book and author luncheon in Chicago amply justify those expectations. This is a powerful speech—eloquent, cogent, incisive. Although I am confident that this is a speech of such great moment that it will undoubtedly be reported in detail in tomorrow's press, nevertheless I believe that it should be printed in full in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of Congress and their staffs and all other readers of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that this may be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, BOOK AND AUTHOR LUNCHEON, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 8, 1968

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated anew the truth of Lord Halifax's dictum that although hope "is very good company by the way . . . (it) is generally a wrong guide."

Our enemy, savagely striking at will across all of South Vietnam, has finally shattered the mask of official illusion with which we have concealed our true circumstances, even from ourselves. But a short time ago we were serene in our reports and predictions of progress. In April, our commanding general told us that "the South Vietnamese are fighting now better than ever before . . . their record in combat . . . reveals an exceptional performance." In August, another general told us that "the really big battles of the Vietnam war are over . . . the enemy has been so badly pummeled he'll never give us trouble again." In December, we were told that we were winning "battle after battle", that "the secure proportion of the population has grown from about 45 percent to 65 percent and in the contested areas the tide continues to run with us."

Those dreams are gone. The Vietcong will probably withdraw from the cities, as they were forced to withdraw from the American Embassy. Thousands of them will be dead. But they will, nevertheless, have demonstrated that no part or person of South Vietnam, is secure from their attacks: neither district capitals nor American bases, neither the peasant in his rice paddy nor the commanding general of our own great forces.

No one can predict the exact shape or outcome of the battles now in progress, in Saigon or at Khesahn. Let us pray that we will succeed at the lowest possible cost to our young men. But whatever their outcome, the events of the last two weeks have taught us something. For the sake of those young Americans who are fighting today, if for no other reason, the time has come to take a new look at the war in Vietnam; not by cursing the past but by using it to illuminate the future. And the first and necessary step is to face the facts. It is to seek out the austere and painful reality of Vietnam, freed from wishful thinking, false hopes and sentimental dreams. It is to rid ourselves of the "good company" of those illusions which have lured us into the deepening swamp of Vietnam. "If you would guide by the light of reason," said Holmes, "you must let your mind be bold." We will find no guide to the future in Vietnam unless we are bold enough to confront the grim anguish, the reality, of that battlefield which was once a nation called South Vietnam, stripped of deceptive illusions. It is time for the truth.

We must, first of all, rid ourselves of the illusion that the events of the past two weeks represent some sort of victory. That is not so.

It is said the Vietcong will not be able to hold the cities. This is probably true. But they have demonstrated despite all our reports of progress, of government strength and enemy weakness, that half a million American soldiers with 700,000 Vietnamese allies, with total command of the air, total command of the sea, backed by huge resources and the most modern weapons, are unable to secure even a single city from the attacks of an enemy whose total strength is about 250,000. It is as if James Madison were able to claim a great victory in 1812 because the British only burned Washington instead of annexing it to the British Empire.

We are told that the enemy suffered terrible losses; and there is no doubt he did. They cannot, however, be as devastating as the figures appear. The Secretary of Defense has told us that "during all of 1967 the Communists lost about 165,000 effectives," yet enemy main force strength "has been maintained at a relatively constant level of about 110,000–115,000 during the past year." Thus it would seem that no matter how many Vietcong and North Vietnamese we claim to kill, through some miraculous effort of will, enemy strength remains the same. Now our intelligence chief tells us that of 60,000 men thrown into the attacks on the cities, 20,000 have been killed. If only two men have been seriously wounded for everyone dead—a very conservative estimate—the entire enemy force has been put out of action. Who, then, is doing the fighting?

Again it is claimed that the Communists expected a large-scale popular uprising which did not occur. How ironic it is that we should claim a victory because a people whom we have given sixteen thousand lives, billions of dollars and almost a decade to defend, did not rise in arms against us. More disillusioning and painful is the fact the population did not rise to defend its freedom against the Vietcong. Thousands of men and arms were infiltrated into populated urban areas over a period of days, if not of weeks. Yet few, if any, citizens rushed to inform their protectors of this massive infiltration. At best they simply shut their doors to concern, waiting for others to resolve the issue. Did we know the attack was coming? If so, why did we not strike first, and where were the forces needed for effective defense?

For years we have been told that the measure of our success and progress in Vietnam was increasing security and control for the population. Now we have seen that none of the population is secure and no area is under sure control. Four years ago when we only had about 30,000 troops in Vietnam, the Vietcong were unable to amount the assaults on cities they have now conducted against our enormous forces. At one time a suggestion that we protect enclaves was derided. Now there are no protected enclaves.

This has not happened because our men are not brave or effective, because they are. It is because we have misconceived the nature of the war: it is because we have sought to resolve by military might a conflict whose issue depends upon the will and conviction of the South Vietnamese people. It is like sending a lion to halt an epidemic of jungle rot.

This misconception rests on a second illusion—the illusion that we can win a war which the South Vietnamese cannot win for themselves.

Two Presidents and countless officials have told us for seven years that although we can help the South Vietnamese, it is their war and they must win it; as Secretary of Defense McNamara told us last month, "We cannot provide the South Vietnamese with the will to survive as an independent nation . . . or with the ability and self-discipline a people must have to govern themselves. These qualities and attributes are essential contributions to the struggle only the South Vietnamese can supply". Yet this wise and certain counsel has gradually become an empty slogan, as mounting frustration has led us to transform the war into an American military effort.

The South Vietnamese Senate, with only one dissenting vote, refuses to draft 18 and 19 year old South Vietnamese, with a member of the Assembly asking "why should Vietnamese boys be sent to die for Americans."—While 19 year old American boys fight to maintain this Senate and Assembly in Saigon. Every detached observer has testified to the enormous corruption which pervades every level of South Vietnamese official life. Hundreds of millions of dollars are stolen by private individuals and government officials while the American people are being asked to pay higher taxes to finance our assistance effort. Despite continual promises the Saigon regime refuses to act against corruption. Late last year, after all our pressure for reform, two high army officers were finally dismissed for "criminal" corruption. Last month, these same two officers were given new and powerful commands. In the meantime, incorruptible officers resign out of frustration and defeat.

Perhaps, we could live with corruption and inefficiency by themselves. However the consequence is not simply the loss of money or of popular confidence; it is the loss of American lives. For government corruption is the source of the enemy's strength. It is, more than anything else, the reason why the greatest power on earth cannot defeat a tiny and primitive foe.

You cannot expect people to risk their lives and endure hardship unless they have a stake in their own society. They must have a clear sense of identification with their own government, a belief they are participating in a cause worth fighting for. Political and economic reform are not simply idealistic slogans or noble goals to be postponed until the fighting is over. They are the principal weapons of battle. People will not fight to line the pockets of generals or swell the bank accounts of the wealthy. They are far more likely to close their eyes and shut their doors in the face of their government—even as they did last week.

More than any election, more than any proud boasts, that single fact reveals the truth. We have an ally in name only. We support a government without supporters. Without the efforts of American arms that government would not last a day.

The third illusion is that the unswerving pursuit of military victory, whatever its cost, is in the interest of either ourselves or the people of Vietnam. For the people of Vietnam, the last three years have meant little but horror. Their tiny land has been devastated by a weight of bombs and shells greater than Nazi Germany knew in the Second World War. We have dropped twelve tons of bombs for every square mile in North and South Vietnam. Whole provinces have been substantially destroyed. More than two million South Vietnamese are now homeless refugees. Imagine the impact in our own country if an equivalent number—over 25 million Americans—were wandering homeless or interned in refugee camps, and millions more refugees were being created as New York and Chicago, Washington and Boston, were being destroyed by a war raging in their streets. Whatever the outcome of these battles, it is the people we seek to defend who are the greatest losers.

Nor does it serve the interests of America to fight this war as if moral standards could be subordinated to immediate necessities. Last week, a Vietcong suspect was turned over to the Chief of the Vietnamese Security

Services, who executed him on the spot—a flat violation of the Geneva Convention on the Rules of War. Of course, the enemy is brutal and cruel, and has done the same thing many times. But we are not fighting the Communists in order to become more like them—we fight to preserve our differences. Moreover, such actions—like the widespread use of artillery and air power in the centers of cities—may hurt us far more in the long run than it helps today. The photograph of the execution was on front pages all around the world—leading our best and oldest friends to ask, more in sorrow than in anger, what has happened to America?

The fourth illusion is that the American national interest is identical with—or should be subordinated to—the selfish interest of an incompetent military regime. We are told, of course, that the battle for South Vietnam is in reality a struggle for 250 million Asians—the beginning of a Great Society for all of Asia. But this is pretension. We can and should offer reasonable assistance to Asia; but we cannot build a Great Society there if we cannot build one in our own country. We cannot speak extravagantly of a struggle for 250 million Asians, when a struggle for 15 million in one Asian country so strains our forces, that another Asian country, a fourth-rate power which we have already once defeated in battle, dares to seize an American ship and hold and humiliate her crew.

And we are told that the war in Vietnam will settle the future course of Asia. But that is a prayerful wish based on unsound hope, meant only to justify the enormous sacrifices we have already made. The truth is that Communism triumphed in China twenty years ago, and was extended to Tibet. It lost in Malaya and the Philippines, met disaster in Indonesia, and was fought to a standstill in Korea. It has struggled against governments in Burma for twenty years without success, and it may struggle in Thailand for many more. The outcome in each country depends and will depend on the intrinsic strength of the government, the particular circumstances of the country, and the particular character of the insurgent movement. The truth is that the war in Vietnam does not promise the end of all threats to Asia and ultimately to the United States; rather, if we proceed on our present course, it promises only years and decades of further draining conflict on the mainland of Asia—conflict which, as our finest military leaders have always warned, could lead us only to national tragedy.

There is an American interest in South Vietnam. We have an interest in maintaining the strength of our commitments—and surely we have demonstrated that. With all the lives and resources we have poured into Vietnam, is there anyone to argue that a government with any support from its people, with any competence to rule, with any determination to defend itself, would not long ago have been victorious over any insurgent movement, however assisted from outside its borders?

And we have another, more immediate interest: to protect the lives of our gallant young men, and to conserve American resources. But we do not have an interest in the survival of a privileged class, growing ever more wealthy from the corruption of war, which after all our sacrifices on their behalf, can ask why Vietnamese boys should die for Americans.

The fifth illusion is that this war can be settled in our own way and in our own time on our own terms. Such a settlement is the privilege of the triumphant; of those who crush their enemies in battle or wear away their will to fight.

We have not done this, nor is there any prospect we will achieve such a victory.

For twenty years, first the French and then the United States, have been predicting victory in Vietnam. In 1961 and in 1962, as well as 1966 and 1967, we have been told that "the tide is turning"; "there is 'light at the end of the tunnel' ", "we can soon bring home the troops—victory is near—, the enemy is tiring." Once, in 1962, I participated in such predictions myself. But for twenty years we have been wrong. The history of conflict among nations does not record another such lengthy and consistent chronicle of error. It is time to discard so proven a fallacy and face the reality that a military victory is not in sight, and that it probably will never come.

Unable to defeat our enemy or break his will—at least without a huge, long, and ever more costly effort—we must actively seek a peaceful settlement. We can no longer harden our terms everywhere Hanoi indicates it may be prepared to negotiate; and we must be willing to foresee a settlement which will give the Vietcong a chance to participate in the political life of the country. Not because we want them to, but because that is the only way in which this struggle can be settled. No one knows if negotiations will bring a peaceful settlement, but we do know there will be no peaceful settlement without negotiations. Nor can we have these negotiations just on our own terms. We may have to make concessions and take risks, and surely we will have to negotiate directly with the NLF as well as Hanoi. Surely it is only another illusion that still denies this basic necessity. What we must not do is confuse the prestige staked on a particular policy with the interest of the United States; nor should we be unwilling to take risks for peace when we are willing to risk so many lives in war.

A year ago, when our adversary offered negotiations if only we would halt the bombing of the North, we replied with a demand for his virtual surrender. Officials at the highest level of our government felt that we were on the edge of a military victory and negotiations, except on our terms, were not necessary. Now, a year too late, we have set fewer conditions for a bombing halt, conditions which clearly would have been more acceptable then. And the intervening year, for all its terrible costs, the deaths of thousands of Americans and South Vietnamese, has not improved our position in the least. When the chance for negotiations comes again, let us not postpone for another year the recognition of what is really possible and necessary to a peaceful settlement.

These are some of the illusions which must be discarded if the events of last week are to prove not simply a tragedy, but a lesson: a lesson which carries with it some basic truths.

First, that a total military victory is not within sight or around the corner; that, in fact, it is probably beyond our grasp; and that the effort to win such a victory will only result in the further slaughter of thousands of innocent and helpless people—a slaughter which will forever rest on our national conscience.

Second, that the pursuit of such a victory is not necessary to our national interest and is even damaging that interest.

Third, that the progress we have claimed toward increasing our control over the country and the security of the population is largely illusory.

Fourth, that the central battle in this war cannot be measured by body counts or bomb damage, but by the extent to which the people of South Vietnam act on a sense of common purpose and hope with those that govern them.

Fifth, that the current regime in Saigon is unwilling or incapable of being an effective ally in the war against the Communists.

Sixth, that a political compromise is not just the best path to peace, but the only path, and we must show as much willingness to risk some of our prestige for peace as to risk the lives of young men in war.

Seventh, that the escalation policy in Vietnam, far from strengthening and consolidating international resistance to aggression, is injuring our country through the world, reducing the faith of other peoples in our wisdom and purpose and weakening the world's resolve to stand together for freedom and peace.

Eighth, that the best way to save our most precious stake in Vietnam—the lives of our soldiers—is to stop the enlargement of the war, and that the best way to end casualties is to end the war.

Ninth, that our nation must be told the truth about this war, in all its terrible reality, both because it is right—and because only in this way can any administration rally the public confidence and unity for the shadowed days which lie ahead.

No war has ever demanded more bravery from our people and our government—not just bravery under fire or the bravery to make sacrifices—but the bravery to discard the comfort of illusion—to do away with false hopes and alluring promises. Reality is grim and painful. But it is only a remote echo of the anguish toward which a policy founded on illusion is surely taking us. This is a great nation and a strong people. Any who seek to comfort rather than speak plainly, reassure rather than instruct, promise satisfaction rather than reveal frustration—they deny that greatness and drain that strength. For today as it was in the beginning, it is the truth that makes us free.

PROPOSAL OF AN AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE INVESTIGATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, perhaps the most important item in President Johnson's consumer message was his proposal to have the Secretary of Transportation conduct a comprehensive study of the automobile insurance system.

I commend the President for this courageous proposal. His call for this badly needed investigation can only be received by the drivers of the Nation with heavy applause and sighs of great relief.

I began a study into the serious problems present in automobile insurance more than 2 years ago. As a member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I held hearings and conducted extensive followup investigations.

What we discovered was nothing less than astonishing.

We discovered that high-risk automobile insurance companies were failing at a startling rate.

We discovered that from 1960 to 1966 73 companies out of 350 engaged in this kind of business collapsed financially, leaving well over a million persons without insurance.

This investigation uncovered an insolvency problem of such magnitude that it may rank as one of the greatest insolvency crises in the history of the insurance industry.

It was hard at first for me to believe that as many as 73 companies had actually failed out of a group so limited in size, but it soon became obvious that a major legislative effort had to be undertaken.

Thus on October 18, 1966, I introduced a bill in the Senate to establish an insurance guaranty corporation, and at the beginning of this Congress, I reintroduced the bill.

The purpose of this bill, which was introduced only after a great deal of study, was to establish a Federal corporation to compensate policyholders and accident victims in cases where auto insurance companies became insolvent. This corporation would protect the public much as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation protect individuals with deposits and savings accounts.

I am hopeful that this extremely important legislation will be acted upon in this session.

But I am truly gratified that the President has now called for an even broader investigation of the automobile insurance industry.

It is an investigation that is vitally necessary.

In the last 3 years of the period we investigated, the high-risk insolvency problem became even worse. In 1964, 1965, and 1966, 44 high-risk auto insurance companies failed.

Since there are approximately 350 companies doing this type of business throughout the country, it statistically follows that 12.6 percent of these companies toppled in this 3-year period alone. That averages out to an annual failure rate of 4.19 percent.

Too few people are able to appreciate the real seriousness of that high a failure rate. It is a rate of staggering implications.

Businesses in general are currently failing at the rate of approximately six-tenths of 1 percent every year. The public's interest in the continued prosperity of an ordinary business is relatively small when considered in relation to its interest in banking or insurance institutions, for the latter are entrusted with the public's funds.

The logical conclusion, then, is that the high-risk insurance failure rate should be far lower than the general business failure rate. But the shocking fact is that it is much higher—about seven times higher.

To further illustrate the incredible seriousness of this failure rate, let us consider the case of the banks.

In 1964 and 1965 14 of the Nation's 14,281 banks permanently collapsed, creating an approximate annual failure rate of one-twentieth of 1 percent. The failure rate of any segment of the insurance business should at least be on the same level as the banking failure rate.

But involved and complex calculations are not required to see that the high-risk insurance failure rate is not even close to the banking rate. Astonishingly, it is 84 times higher.

This situation has gone far beyond the level of what is tolerable. It is outrageous and should be a source of anxious concern for every responsible insurance man in the country.

The injustices which stem from so many insurance company failures are many and gravely heavy in their impact upon our society.

In enacting the McCarran-Ferguson Act, Congress placed the regulation of insurance in the hands of the States. However, it was only a conditional delegation of authority to be reconsidered—as the legislative history of the act points out—if the States should demonstrate an inability to properly serve the public interest.

But have the States been adequately regulating the business of insurance? Have they been properly serving the public interest?

This rash of high-risk insolvencies and the inability of the States to cope with such a problem have illustrated the underlying weakness of insurance regulation by many of our States.

State insurance regulation for a long time gave the impression of reasonable control. This appearance continued as long as the regulated companies generally were sound and not seriously in need of close scrutiny.

But then one day, not too long ago, along came a type of insurance business which quickly demonstrated that it bore careful watching, and this, as we now can clearly see, was the nemesis of many of our States' insurance departments.

This development was hardly surprising to those who realized that these insurance departments generally fail to maintain examiners sufficient in number and ability to carefully and continually analyze the financial standing of all the insurance companies under their jurisdiction.

Nor was it surprising to those who knew that the State legislatures appropriate for the operation of their insurance departments usually less than 4 percent of the premium taxes and fees collected from insurance companies.

The proven inability of so many States to competently contend with this critical insolvency problem is a deeply disturbing matter.

Thousands of American citizens every year find it necessary to turn to high-risk companies in order to obtain automobile insurance protection. The automobile long ago ceased to be a luxury and became instead an established and necessary ingredient of our American way of life.

Just as necessary as the automobile itself is the acquisition of adequate insurance coverage for that automobile. Yet, the major automobile insurance companies are every day tightening their standards of risk evaluation and acceptability.

Consequently, thousands of people are in the unhappy position of desperately needing automobile insurance and having no regular company willing to sell to them. Too often no choice remains open to them other than the high-risk insurance company.

The possibility that any one of us may become a member of this unfortunate group is not remote. Senior citizens who have had the misfortune of meeting with an accident are receiving cancellation notices every day, regardless of how many years they have poured premiums into their company's pocket.

And once an individual has been canceled, rejected, or not renewed, it is simply an exercise in futility to apply to any other company in the regular market.

Fidelity and a sense of duty to long-term policyholders is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.

Some of these insurance company practices are partially attributable to the squeeze in which companies find themselves caught between the rapidly rising cost of accidents and closely regulated rates. But this is all the more reason for a truly comprehensive study of our limping automobile insurance system.

But once individuals are driven from the regular insurance market to the high-risk companies, they no longer can regard the possibility that their underwriter may collapse as an entirely far-fetched and unreal consideration.

They must face the fact that over a 2-year period their odds are almost 1 in 10 of having a worthless piece of paper for an insurance policy.

They must face the fact they can never have peace of mind knowing that an injured person's wounds and suffering may go uncompensated.

They must face the fact that their families can never be secure by their fireside knowing that the insurance company standing between any judgment and their home may become insolvent.

The growing distrust of high-risk insurance companies does little to further the insurance industry's hard-earned and well-deserved image of strength and dependability. But the industry cannot go on dismissing the high-risk insolvency problems as a minor matter.

The time has come to face up squarely to the seriousness of the problem that is before us.

It is my hope that the President's proposed investigation by the Department of Transportation will help us to do just that.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President during the adjournment between the sessions of the 90th Congress, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] addressed the Young Democrats at the University of Texas. He spoke on his bill, S. 1779, of which I am a cosponsor, to establish an international health, education, and labor program.

The need is now greater than ever before for programs of cultural relations to promote international understanding and develop free institutions in new nations. Such programs are in our national interest for we do have an interest in a stable and socially progressive world.

But activity in cultural relations has been cut drastically. The programs of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs have been given a low priority and trimmed to the point that its director recently resigned. We have been told that CIA assistance to activity in this area has stopped, and reports in the Washington Post and the New York Times indicate that the President's special commission appointed to study this problem has reached no conclusion.

Consequently, we have added reason to give our attention to proposals such as the one outlined in this address. Reminding us of President Kennedy's belief that "the responsibility for peace is the responsibility of our entire society," Senator YARBOROUGH suggests to these young students how they can play their part in working for peace by attacking problems of hunger, disease, and ignorance.

I commend the address to my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

(Remarks of RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, to University of Texas Young Democrats on January 10, 1968)

The role of the university community is often conceived as one of pursuit of knowledge. But this is not an easy, or relaxed, or sterile task. The university must accept its full responsibility to understand, to exchange ideas, and to promote change along the lines of the ideas it has fostered. Each individual must aid in that process.

Your group of Young Democrats has shown its willingness to accept the responsibility to be informed about its environment, and more important, to promote progressive change in your city's, and state's, and nation's conduct of its affairs. But what role do you have internationally? A student in any university today is a student of the world, for there is no place in the world that is not of concern to all of us.

I want to make it possible for young persons like you, in organizations like yours, to play a larger role in the conduct of our international relations. Utilizing the initiative and resources of the individual citizen in the private sector to develop the cultural relations dimension of our foreign policy is in our national interest. And it would fill an international need.

You here represent a generation of young Americans who have developed a resource that is the scarcest in the world—human skills. And it is a resource that we should be proudest to export. We will never face a balance-of-payments problem in human resources development because every investment will bring us as much profit as it does to the rest of the world.

What skills do you have? The greatest problem facing the world today is increasing hunger. Every 8.6 seconds a person, usually a small child, dies of malnutrition in an underdeveloped country. That is 10,000 persons each day. While we work through family planning to relieve the overpopulation crisis, we must work on the hunger problems of those already born. More than one-half of the world's population is hungry—and in India over 50 million children will die of malnutrition in the next ten years. Some of you are from rural areas. In a few weeks during a vacation you could teach a farmer in India how to raise chickens, or how to use modern techniques and implements for an increased yield. And the world would benefit.

Some of you probably spent last summer volunteering in medical projects—teaching basic hygiene, or giving inoculations, or explaining simple preventive medicine to persons who had been passed as medicine was taking its giant steps. Some of you are premeds. You have a skill. In some countries in Latin America, 4 out of 10 children die by their first birthday. Persons like you could train assistants in other countries in a few weeks so they can practice hygiene all year long.

Many of you take part in tutoring programs in this community. In our advanced society you are trying to help disadvantaged persons catch up. But in many countries over 80% of the citizens cannot read or write. In a world of suspicion and hostility, ignorance is a worse threat to the peace than any international movement. Your generation has developed new techniques to motivate and teach both young and old to learn to read and write.

Your skills can strike out at the hunger and disease and ignorance that are major causes of unrest in an unstable world. Individual citizens must do what they can to aid. This is not just a job for professionals. When President Kennedy signed the order establishing the Peace Corps, he said: "Universities, voluntary agençies, labor unions and industry will be asked to share in this effort, making it clear that the responsibility for peace is the responsibility of our entire society."

At present it is not so easy for these components of the private sector to play a role in international affairs. Let me illustrate some of the problems. Two years ago, the major youth organization in India, many members of which are also young members of Parliament, asked the Young Democrats if they would send over a delegation for a few weeks. For various reasons, such a delegation was delayed, and as leadership in the organization changed hands, the request was almost forgotten.

The request was renewed to several organizations the next year because members of the Indian youth organization who were running for election wanted their American counterparts to stump the country with them. A large campaign issue involved relations with the United States. And a major need was to find ways to reach the electorate in a country where there was little means of communication and mass illiteracy.

The United States Youth Council in New York accepted the invitation and joined with the YD's and the bi-partisan American Council of Young Political Leaders to sponsor a delegation. It took six months to secure money and even then one organization had to donate some administrative funds. The leadership of three groups had to devote full time to administrative details as prospective participants were interviewed and selected, up-to-date information on India was sent to them, and everything from passports to inoculations were taken care of.

The several week trip was a success. Young Americans met young Indian candidates and answered questions about our country in villages where no one could remember ever seeing a westerner before. The delegation addressed several university audiences, and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi requested them to give their impressions to her at the end of the trip.

Many new friendships were begun as contacts were made. Much practical information was requested—on new agricultural techniques, literacy instruction, basic health manuals, and activities of American youth organizations. But I have been informed that contacts have dropped off and information was not gathered, as individual participants returned to their activities.

This example of a bilateral exchange delegation is only one illustration of the many things that private citizens can do in foreign affairs, but it should point out many problems facing private organizations. I have introduced a bill to meet many of these problems—problems of meeting requests from other countries, of securing funds, maintaining contacts with other American organizations, selecting participants from around the country, keeping up-to-date information on relevant groups in developing countries, maintaining contacts when participants return, and making sure promised information is sent and new information is automatically exchanged.

We could accomplish this by establishing a foundation of private citizens skilled in cultural relations to administer a quasi-public corporation supported by the government. A central foundation, with a growing repository of information and contacts, would not diminish the contribution any individual or organization could make; nor would it impose any controls. It would merely stimulate the private sector to realize its full potential in international relations.

I am proud that students realize the need for increasing this private effort. When the eight-year-old University of Texas-Chile exchange was recently cancelled because some members of the University administration felt the communist competition in Chile was getting too tough, the students insisted on the continuation of the program, and won. The need to cooperate in constructive ventures with people in developing areas has never been greater. As Sargent Shriver has observed: "There is a world election now underway on every continent. The 'voting' takes place outside the election booths. The 'returns' are measured in terms of people fed, jobs found, schools built, children educated, bodies cured, and economies growing."

We have a responsibility not only to help, but also to reaffirm our own fundamental commitment to a just and free society. We must determine whether we will meet the challenge. And we will be judged by the weapons we choose to employ in dealing with the rest of the world. I think we shall be judged harshly if we do not promote to the fullest our strongest weapon for peace and justice; the cultural aspect of our foreign policy which reflects those features that have made America unparalleled in history.

THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE CONTINUE TO STAND FAST

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, one of the major targets of the Vietnamese Communist leaders when they sent their troops on a rampage of terror last week was, obviously, the ordinary people of South Vietnam.

Through their swift and murderous attacks, they hoped to shock the mass of South Vietnam's population into believing that they were militarily invincible—that they would be the ultimate victors. They expected the populace to rise up and join them in their attempt to bring down the legitimate government, and to turn on the South Vietnamese armed forces and our own fighting men.

The people of South Vietnam were indeed shocked and confused by the attacks. But they angrily rejected the Communist attempts to arouse them into a general uprising. It was the ordinary people of South Vietnam who bore the brunt of battle. Thousands of them—men, women, and children—were killed or wounded, tens of thousands were made homeless, all as a result of the Communist actions.

And there was the added factor of indignation that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese troops violated their own announced truce—that they used the Tet holiday as a cover to bring death and destruction when there should have been gaiety and feasting.

It is impossible to foresee how long the normal lives of the urban people of South Vietnam will be disrupted. But one thing is certain: the Communists will come to realize that they blundered—that they succeeded only in turning the bulk of the people against them.

Mr. President the innocent people of South Vietnam were not the only targets of the Communists. The people of the United States also figured prominently in the minds of the men who planned and executed the sudden, murderous attacks.

They hoped that their dramatic assaults on our Embassy and other American installations would stun the American people—would anger or dishearten us and cause widespread demand that we bring the war to an end—even if it meant abandoning our commitment to South Vietnam.

But just as the Communist leaders failed in their attempt to sway or intimidate the people of South Vietnam, so too have they failed to influence the bulk of the people of this Nation.

I believe that the majority of the American people now recognize the utter ruthlessness of the Communists; I believe that they realize that we as a nation must remain calm and must—more than ever before—support our fighting men in Vietnam—those men who gave such a superb accounting of themselves in the greatest crisis of the war.

Mr. President, I am confident that when the history of these days is written, it will show that the Communists committed a decisive error—that they failed in their objective to make a dramatic impact on the people of South Vietnam and the American public. History will show that instead they succeeded only in stiffening the resolve of both peoples to see the struggle through to an honorable end.

VIETCONG OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong, now launched on their "go for broke" offensive in Southeast Asia, do not have much of a record for lasting military successes. Still, they are sure, a political solution to the war can be forced, and in that solution they see the opportunity for eventually achieving a political victory—control over the Government of South Vietnam.

This strategy, Mr. President, as all our intelligence would indicate, is predicated on the belief that Americans are deadlocked and that there is a growing feeling in this country that we should get out of Vietnam. It is that feeling on which our enemy banks. In a column printed in Wednesday's Evening Star, Richard Wilson observes that the calculations of North Vietnam's military chief, General Giap, may not prove wrong if, "at this very critical time, the voices of despair prevail."

As President Johnson said to us in his state of the Union address, and again in closing his message to us today:

> It is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will.

Mr. President, our will must be firm to resist the temptation to surrender politically what General Giap and his forces cannot wrest by military action. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilson's column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hanoi Sure It Can Force a Political Solution

(By Richard Wilson)

A Viet Cong pedagogy school teacher sat scribbling in his diary last fall the doubts which plagued him about the indoctrination of his superiors on Uncle Ho's order for the coming general offensive and uprising.

Propaganda discourse in the Communist forces is endless. It goes on night and day in barracks, bivouac and jungle. The Viet Cong teacher's superiors named Dong and Minh had returned from attending a military reorientation course to the school located along the coast in Quang Ngai province with the latest word on how a "blitzkrieg" offensive ordered by North Vietnam President Ho Chi Minh would soon end the war. "We gain," wrote the Viet Cong schoolteacher in his diary, "but are not victorious and the U.S. forces lose but are not defeated.

The schoolteacher remained skeptical. He told his diary that he did not believe the United States is at all a "paper tiger" as Mao Tse-tung said, and suspected that once more the Viet Cong leaders had miscalculated as in 1950 and in 1964.

This schoolteacher's diary is one of many thousands of Communist documents and papers which have fallen into the hands of American intelligence. Many hundreds of these documents reveal a general pattern of indoctrination for the general uprising and offensive which is now taking place.

It is as if all were preordained. The uprising and general offensive would achieve a decisive victory in the winter-spring offensive. One political cadre was informed its members could expect to return to their homes on August 5, 1968, or possibly earlier. The basis for the preordination was simple. The United States is losing the war. President Johnson is confused and demoralized. Defense Secretary McNamara had ordered an end to the bombings.

Americans are deadlocked and unable to find a solution for the war. An offensive and uprising would finish them off and President Johnson would sue for negotiations to create a coalition government which the Viet Cong would control.

A caution was entered by a Viet Cong political officer of a mortar company of the 22nd Regiment, 3rd North Vietnam Army Division: "Tell our brothers not to say that this order comes from the party and Uncle (Ho Chi Minh) but to say that it comes from the Liberation Front." It would not do to supply documentary proof that Ho Chi Minh was issuing orders to the Viet Cong. No, indeed. The Viet Cong is supposed to be an indigenous revolutionary political party fighting a civil war, and accepting help but not orders from Hanoi.

From Hanoi, nevertheless, the orders came from Uncle Ho and the strategy to carry them out bore the indelible mark of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, North Vietnamese defense minister and victor over the French in the battle of Dien Bien Phu.

The whole pattern of the many thousands of captured documents is too convincing to be ignored. The repeatedly stated objective is political. The theme is often repeated that military victory may not be complete. Nor, in its initial stages, may the political victory be realized fully. A new president of South Vietnam may not, in the first instance, come from the revolutionary forces, but the core elements of the government will be from those forces.

All the vast mass of this intelligence material points toward the conclusion that the war, so far as North Vietnam is concerned, is being brought to decisive finality as a major political maneuver, related to the American presidential election.

Thus far General Giap cannot claim too many victories. He has lost the big unit engagements. His early attack on the base of Con Thien did not achieve its objective. Attacks at Loc Ninh and Dak To were failures. Now the countrywide assault on the cities has cost General Giap 15,000 to 20,000 men without achieving any stated objectives except, for the time being, the citadel at Hue and an uncomfortable amount of civilian dislocation in Saigon and elsewhere.

It is on the political front where General Giap's progress is the most ominous, not solely in Vietnam, but in the United States. This series of attacks is interpreted among those who oppose the war as an illustration that we can never expect to control South Vietnam, either through our own forces or those of the South Vietnamese. That being the case we had better begin to get out, it is argued.

If this delayed reaction to President Johnson's claim that the cities' attack was a complete failure continues, General Giap will have won a greater victory than he is likely to win in the coming engagement at Khe Sanh. Giap may know more about us than we know about ourselves, or as one Viet Cong wrote in his notebook, "No one understands the Americans better than we do."

Their calculations may not prove to be wrong if, at this very critical time the voices of despair prevail.

MODEL CITIES—A TOP PRIORITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most impressive accomplishments of the 89th Congress was the enactment of the model cities program. This program now has been funded and the Department of Housing and Urban Development has selected 63 cities for initial participation in the program. It is my hope that this program will be the keystone of all of our future urban efforts.

Model cities is a change from our present policy of aiding specific projects; instead, it permits the community to identify the needs of one of its low income neighborhoods and then develop a concerted set of programs to solve these problems. Thus, the community must examine and determine the total needs of the neighborhood and its citizens, it must set priorities for action, and it must plan a comprehensive attack on the ills of the neighborhood. If carried out properly, this approach will avoid the haphazard method of responding to immediate problems that have been manifest in many of our communities.

In addition, the program provides funds which can be used by the city to implement locally conceived programs where there is no appropriate Federal program available. Thus, there is an opportunity to demonstrate new approaches to solve the problems of poverty, hard-core unemployment, inadequate housing, substandard education, and the rest of the conditions associated with our deteriorating neighborhoods and slums. This means that our cities will have the money to become true incubators of new ideas and programs. Finally, the model cities program requires a high degree of citizen participation. This means that the neighborhood residents will plan what is to occur within the neighborhood as opposed to reading about it in a newspaper. Thus, the priorities for the neighborhood will be established by its residents and not by bureaucrats who live in some other section of the city.

Recently, I was in Minnesota and toured the Duluth model city neighborhood and talked with officials there. I was amazed with the enthusiasm and commitment of these officials. The selection of Duluth as a model city has made a difference to the community. Duluth is completely dedicated to making the model city effort a success. The same is true in Minneapolis, the other model city in Minnesota, and I assume that the same as true in every one of the other 61 model cities in this country.

Unfortunately, there were misgivings about the model city program in the 90th Congress. Initially, the President requested $662 million for the program which would have allowed the Government to commit itself to full funding of community projects. However, the mood of Congress was one of caution last year and the final figure approved was only $312 million. This was a disappointment to those of us who are champions of this new approach.

However, the President has asked for the full authorization of $1 billion this year. This full amount needs to be appropriated if we are to insure the success of this program and demonstrate the validity of this new approach. If we delay, if we are hesitant, if we retreat from our commitment, then the communities and the neighborhood residents will lose the enthusiasm and the drive they now have. If we fail to meet our responsibilities along these lines, we are threatening the program, threatening innovations, and moving nowhere in our attempt to cope with the urban crisis. I congratulate the President for his wise decision to establish priorities in his budget message in giving top consideration to the model cities program. I hope the Congress will follow the President's example as it tries to establish priorities and give full funding to this valuable program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the President's budget dealing with the model city program be placed in the RECORD. This message points out that the model city program is already operating in 63 cities and involves 3.7 million people. Further, approximately 70 more cities will be added this year.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Model Cities.—Sixty-three cities have launched detailed planning of their programs to upgrade the physical and social fabric of large blighted areas. These plans will demonstrate that the interrelated problems facing the people of our cities can be attacked, molding into a unified program the many diverse efforts to improve such services as education, skill training and employment, health, welfare, recreation, and physical development. Some of these plans are expected to be completed late in 1968, and the remainder in early 1969. The first 63 cities will then begin their action programs with the aid of supplementary grants to help cover costs not met by other Federal aids. These action programs will help rejuvenate 65 blighted areas containing 3.7 million people.

Approximately 70 more cities are expected to start preliminary planning for model cities programs in late spring, 1968; some will be able to start their action programs before the end of 1969.

The budget provides new obligational authority of $500 million for supplementary grants, which together with $200 million appropriated in 1968 will allow grant commitments of $700 million over the 2-year period. In addition, $500 million will be available from the urban renewal program. Total expenditures in model cities in 1969 are expected to reach $250 million, compared to only $25 million in 1968.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 3 years ago, Congress enacted the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. At that time, there was much discussion on the feasibility of such a program. There was a fear of Federal control and also a deep concern that such Federal involvement in the arts would bring about a dilution in the quality.

The New York Times of February 6, 1968, contains an editorial about the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. It speaks of the successful operation of the National Endowment for the Arts. Those who feared Government control have seen their fears come to naught.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Public, as opposed to private, subsidy of the arts is something new in this country, or at least overt subsidy is. For some considerable time the arts have enjoyed foundation support, itself an oblique public subsidy, and patrons of the arts have for long enjoyed certain tax concessions that in themselves represented an indirect contribution to the arts from the economy's public sector.

When in 1965 the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities was founded, its birth was accompanied by a great deal of goodwill, but also a certain healthy skepticism. This, after all, was not the American way of financing the arts, and this new Government body had to prove itself in a number of areas. First, was it efficient? Did it know where to pass the buck where it was most needed? Second, was it impartial? In Europe, the concept of a nonpolitical but government-financed agency is more easily accepted than in the United States.

The foundation has set a record of which it can be proud. Born part of despair and disbelief, it has established for itself in the world of the arts a reputation not only for fair dealing but also for perceptiveness. The foundation also has proved itself extremely flexible in its operations, recognizing that arts subsidies in the United States cannot be slavishly based on European models, but must meet American needs.

After three years of trial the foundation is awaiting House debate on renewal of its life for the next two years. The United States now gives less Government support to the arts than any other civilized country in the Western world. In view of the need to restrict spending in every sector, should Congress cut back? It is not without relevance that devaluated Britain, in her hour of greatest financial stringency, has just promised not less, but more, for the arts.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S WAR ON CRIME

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President's crime proposals deserve thoughtful consideration and early action by Congress.

The Safe Streets Act proposed by the President in the last session, and reemphasized in his current message on crime, would improve police training, upgrade the qualifications of police officers, provide better and more modern equipment to fight crime with the best scientific and technological techniques available.

The proposed Federal firearms legislation would help keep guns out of the hands of criminals and other irresponsible people. It would regulate the interstate flow of guns so that the States could effectively control the sale and possession of guns within their own borders.

The President has also proposed a frontal attack on organized crime in the United States. The Department of Justice is coordinating the use of task forces to go into cities where organized criminal syndicates are operating, to conduct investigations and initiate prosecutions.

Clearly the time has come to stand up and take effective action against crime. I hope Congress will act promptly to back up the President on these proposals. I fully support the President on each of them.

NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT CLAIMS ARE UNTRUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there is much talk, loose talk, about an American credibility gap with regard to the war in Vietnam. But if there is such a gap in our own Government, it is certainly true that the chasm which divides the propaganda of our adversary from the truth is much wider, much deeper.

The lead editorial in Wednesday's Evening Star makes this point, and makes it well. It shows how the NLF's claims for its Tet offensive already are proven untrue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VC CREDIBILITY

The gamut of reaction to the Viet Cong's Tet offensive on the free side of the ideological fence has ranged from the administration's assurance that all is well to the critics' assertion that all has been lost. It is interesting—and somewhat comforting—to note that the National Liberation Front is having some difficulty itself coming up with a consistent assessment of just what the "go-for-broke" push of the past week accomplished.

Dang Quang Minh, who represents the NLF in Moscow, has no doubts—or so it would seem. He told a news conference that the offensive was an unqualified success; that the South Vietnamese army is "paralyzed and falling apart;" that thousands of Russians and Americans are volunteering to join the Communist cause, but are no longer needed. The battle, he indicated, is as good as over, and the complete overthrow of the Saigon government is in sight.

Unfortunately for Dang, the Viet Cong back home were digging a credibility gap for him even as he spoke. While he was entertaining the press in Moscow with his announcement that no outside help was needed, the Viet Cong through Hanoi radio were broadcasting urgent appeals to the South Vietnamese to stage armed uprisings against their government. These appeals—which, it seems, fell on unreceptive ears—hardly square with Dang's display of his "No Help Wanted" sign.

We strongly suspect that, when the dust has finally settled and the picture is clarified, the final assessment will wind up considerably closer to the administration's claims than to the NLF's. The Viet Cong have scored some startling, even shocking, successes, and there may be more to come.

But when the offensive is over, chances are

> that a Saigon government will still exist, the American forces will still be present, and that no major city or provincial capital will be in Viet Cong hands. The enemy will be be back where they started—and will have paid a fearful price for a fleeting and highly qualified triumph.

THE CORNER DRUGSTORE AND THE CREDIBILITY GAP

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, we are told there is a season for everything—"a time to keep silence and a time to speak."

One is reminded of this as a result of the bureaucratic musings which were attributed not long ago to Dr. James L. Goddard, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

According to newspaper reports, Dr. Goddard undertook rather casually to consign to oblivion one of our cherished institutions, and was quoted as saying:

> The corner drugstore should be closed down.

Mr. President, I believe that the Nation's 53,000 retail drugstores, which are patronized daily by an estimated 15 million Americans, deserve a little more consideration than that. The corner drugstore has been a part of the American scene for quite a little while.

In many small towns and villages across the country, the drugstore dispenses more than drugs and vitamins. It is a common meeting place, often the social center and sometimes a political forum.

So, it is not surprising that quite a few Americans have taken strong exception to Dr. Goddard's remarks. They have made their feelings known, and their resentment has been registered in high places here in Washington.

It is not exactly surprising either that some of Dr. Goddard's superiors, and Dr. Goddard himself, quickly decided that such remarks were not in good season—especially in a presidential election year.

Indeed, the frantic "backing and filling" which followed on the heels of Dr. Goddard's statement provides an interesting illustration of why the administration has a credibility gap, and how it has been widened by a new excavation.

Last December, Dr. Goddard spoke before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in New York City. He also met informally with the press, and according to the New York Times of December 31:

> Dr. Goddard . . . urged the dispensing of more drugs by more people who were expert in the effects of pharmaceuticals.
>
> I would say that the corner drugstore should be closed down, although I know that is a radical statement, he said.
>
> He advocated, instead, that drugs be dispensed in medical centers and even in doctors' offices.

In the Washington Evening Star of December 30, William Hines, one of the most respected science writers in the country, wrote:

> The topic of Goddard's prepared speech to the AAAS was "Safety and Efficacy in the Environment," but in his talk with reporters he went far beyond the language and scope of his text.
>
> Among his impromptu remarks was a statement "the corner drugstore should be closed down." He amplified this by saying that much of the dispensing of medicines should, and in the future probably will, be done in the doctor's office.

Thereafter, on January 3, 1968, the National Association of Retail Druggists issued a special bulletin calling for the resignation of Dr. Goddard.

The next day, Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, talked by telephone with Wilbur B. Simmons, executive secretary of the druggist association. Mr. Cohen followed up this conversation with a telegram to Mr. Simmons which read in part:

> This will confirm my telephone conversation with you in which I stated unequivocally that neither the Department nor the Food and Drug Administration favor or endorse any proposal for closing down drugstores now or in the future.

But what of the views of Dr. Goddard himself? My office undertook to explore this matter with Dr. Goddard. On January 15, we received from Mr. Paul A. Pumpian, Director of FDA's Office of Legislative and Governmental Services, written communication containing this statement:

> Dr. Goddard does not favor or endorse any proposal for closing down neighborhood pharmacies.

Mr. President, what this comes down to is one of the most abrupt 180-degree turns in political navigation. But such turnabouts—such verbal gymnastics—have become, unfortunately, a familiar trademark of the Johnson administration.

I would like to focus upon another quote from Dr. Goddard's address in New York. He said:

> I am not a participating pharmacist, nor have I actively practiced medicine—treated patients—in many years. And I will not pretend to match pharmacological expertise with those speakers who have come before and who will come later. . . . I am here today not to match data with my colleagues, but rather to match ideas and concepts and concerns. And if they outwit me, I would be delighted.

In view of the outcries over his remarks, it appears that Dr. Goddard may have succeeded in outwitting himself.

No Member of this body is more familiar with the role of the neighborhood drugstore in American life than the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States. Mr. HUMPHREY grew up in South Dakota in a family drugstore business and became a graduate pharmacist.

Like the Vice President, I am an old drugstore clerk myself. Before attending college, I worked many years in a small pharmacy, as many others have done.

I might add that Miss Michigan of a few years ago, the former Nancy Ann Fleming, worked after school hours in a corner drugstore in Montague—population 2,366—before going on to Atlantic City where she was crowned Miss America in 1960.

Our corner drugstores and our independent druggists need no defense from me or from anyone else. Over the years they have demonstrated they are able to take care of themselves. But it may be somewhat reassuring for them, and for all of us, that—based on the latest official statements—the corner drugstore is not marked for extinction, at least for the time being.

NATION'S GREATEST DOMESTIC PROBLEM—CRIME

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, President Johnson has announced an impressive program to meet the nation's greatest domestic problem—crime. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I shall be actively involved in the consideration of the legislation he has proposed.

I am particularly pleased that the President's message stresses the need for Federal assistance for the education and training of local law enforcement personnel and for the development of modern communications and crime fighting equipment for all law enforcement agencies. These proposals incorporate the essential features of S. 824, the Local Law Officer's Education and Equipment Act, which I introduced for myself and 13 other Senators last February. In his message today, the President has specifically called for a program of fellowships, student loans and tuition aid for State and local law enforcement officers, the key provision of S. 824.

I applaud also the President's recommendation for strengthening our gambling control laws. Such legislation is particularly important today to fill gaps in present law established under the recent Supreme Court decisions in the Marchetti and Grosso cases.

The President also places proper emphasis on legislation to rehabilitate alcoholics. Last May I introduced S. 1740 to create a model program for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia.

Finally, I wish to emphasize, as the President did, that we cannot control crime without controlling the random and wanton distribution of guns. I will continue to give fullest support to pending gun control legislation.

LABOR DISPUTES—THE PUBLIC CONTINUES TO SUFFER

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in 1966 a Brooklyn shoemaker expressed the feeling of frustration and anger shared by so many of our fellow countrymen when he said, "Whenever we have a strike, it seems like neither side wins, and the public always comes out of it the worst of all." This was neither the first nor the last time that such sentiments have been voiced by the public, over our present system of dealing with labor-management disputes.

We have barely begun the New Year and already our cities, industries, and transportation facilities have been plagued by strikes.

New York City has, since January 1, suffered a cab strike, and a walkout by parking lot employees, both of which wreaked havoc on transportation and caused hardship and loss of income in every segment of the public.

Presently, the people of New York are faced with a strike by the city's sanitation workers. The union has defied a back-to-work order by the State Supreme Court and is continuing the strike as 10,000 tons of garbage pile up daily on city streets.

A strike such as this, which affects a vital municipal service, not only causes inconvenience but represents a hazard to the general health and welfare of the city's inhabitants.

These strikes by municipal employees have become more frequent and of longer duration in the past several years. When they involve firemen, sanitation workers, or nurses and doctors at public hospitals, they represent a clear danger to public safety, health, and welfare.

In the field of education, strikes by teachers and other school system employees are becoming more commonplace. The current teachers strike in Montgomery County, Md., presents a good example of the lack of solutions to these problems. With a court injunction hanging over them, the striking teachers have rejected wage and benefit offers and are continuing the walkout.

These strikes are, of course, local in scope and must be settled through local action. I mention them only in passing to point out that the shoemaker from Brooklyn was, and still is, correct in his statement that in a strike the big loser is the public.

These examples of local strikes bring home the realities of just how much the public does suffer in a labor dispute. On a small scale the hardship, suffering, and danger to general welfare is more easily seen. On the national level, however, a protracted labor dispute is far more damaging, costly, and dangerous to the country as a whole, although not always as immediately evident.

For example, there has been a work stoppage in the copper industry since July 15 of last year. During this period the country has suffered a loss of $60 million in Federal taxes and a balance-of-payments loss of $280 million.

This resulted from an increase of copper imports of $180 million and a decline in copper exports of $100 million. This strike comes at a time when we are trying desperately to correct the balance-of-payments deficit.

Meanwhile, General Motors, recovering from recent foundry strikes that idled 134,000 workers, is reportedly facing another walkout at four plants in Flint, Mich. A work stoppage in a major industry such as this could severely damage the war effort in Vietnam.

In yet another area, the United Mine Workers have halted production at several soft coal mines in Pennsylvania and Ohio in a recent attempt to unionize these mines.

And now, most recently, we are faced with another railroad strike, affecting not only my State, but large areas of the Nation.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has shut down the 12-State Missouri Pacific and its subsidiary Texas & Pacific. Also involved is the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad.

The Missouri Pacific covers the entire Midwest from Chicago south to the Gulf of Mexico, while the Seaboard Coast Line the entire east coast area from Miami to New York City.

A prolonged strike of the Seaboard line will have disastrous effects on the citrus industry as well as the tourist trade in my own State of Florida.

But of even greater concern is the fact that these rail lines are an important link in the lines of supply to our forces in Vietnam. One late or missed shipment of munitions or materials to our troops in Vietnam could have tragic consequences for our fighting men.

The dispute between the union and the struck railroads centers on an old issue which many of us had hoped was settled—the size of train crews.

The dispute over so-called featherbedding has a long history, beginning in 1959, when several major railroads announced that they were eliminating certain jobs. Presidential action, commissions, arbitration, 11th-hour legislation, and court battles followed.

Since then, however, an appellate court order has freed the union to bargain with eight railroads individually, based on the fact that they have followed all of the steps required by the Railway Labor Act in their continuing dispute.

However, the very fact that this single dispute has continued to plaque our Nation's rail industry for nearly 10 years points out the inadequacy of the Railway Labor Act of 1926 and the antiquity of our strike-settling machinery in general.

In the early days of labor, the strike was a necessary and effective weapon to counter the strength of big business and industry.

A refusal to work was the only way a union could bring economic pressure to bear on the employer. The employer could, of course, assert his right to close up shop, lock his workers out, or simply dismiss them for union activity.

We have come a long way since those early days. Governmental action has strengthend the unions to a point where they are now able to bargain on an equal footing with giant corporations.

Thus we increasingly find the giants of labor and industry locked like titans in battles which hurt only the bystanders.

When we were primarily an agrarian society, the town meeting type of democracy sufficed in settling most labor disputes.

But in today's economic and social complexity, we can no longer tolerate such dislocations.

The time has come to try a new balance between public and private rights. There is abundant evidence that work stoppage in the Nation's transportation industries, defense plants, and other industries affecting the public, cause irreparable damage and endanger the safety of the country as a whole.

The impact of these strikes on the general public has been one of severe economic loss, impairment of health and safety and a great deal of inconvenience.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that I introduced on January 11, 1967, S. 176, a bill to create a five-man U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations. This court would have jurisdiction in labor management stalemates adversely affecting the national interest. It would provide the machinery through which binding settlements could be achieved in the most difficult of deadlocks.

We pride ourselves as being a nation of vision and yet we labor under an antiquated system of dealing with labor disputes while countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Australia devise systems which make them virtually strikeless nations.

We pride ourselves on being a nation of progress, and yet we continue to suffer the recurring cycle of strikes which utterly disrupt us and hurt us in many ways.

We pride ourselves as being a nation of laws, and yet we have not applied the measured hand of the judiciary to the problem of strikes.

Mr. President, the time has come to end our inadequate response to a problem of growing importance.

If we are ever to find a means of equitably resolving these disputes, it is through our courts.

I humbly suggest that we should lose no more time and sit down to devise a workable U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations to resolve our labor disputes as we resolve most other disagreements, through the courts.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. DONALD R. LONG, A DISTINGUISHED OHIOAN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today the U.S. Government conferred posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Sgt. Donald R. Long, of Columbus, Ohio.

Sgt. Donald R. Long was a Negro boy, born in Lawrence County, Ohio. He was originally a draftee. However, after his service as a draftee was completed, he reenlisted.

Sgt. Donald R. Long gave his life to save eight comrades by throwing himself bodily on a live grenade in Vietnam.

I was present at the U.S. Government ceremony conferring posthumously this highest national honor upon Sgt. Donald R. Long.

Also present at the ceremony were eight brothers and sisters of Sergeant Long, together with their children. There were at least 40 members of Sergeant Long's family present at the services bestowing posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor upon this heroic young Ohioan.

Ohio is proud of Donald R. Long. He exemplified in his military service the kind of courage and heroism that we wish all of us possessed. That, however, is not the good fortune of very many. It only comes to a few. It came to Donald R. Long.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the citation under which the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest honor that can be awarded by the U.S. Government to a military man, was given to this distinguished son of Ohio.

There being no objection, the citation

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of the Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to Sergeant Donald R. Long, United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On June 30, 1966, Troops B and C, 1st Squadron, 4th Cavalary, while conducting a reconnaissance mission along a road in the Republic of Vietnam, were suddenly attacked by a Viet Cong regiment, supported by mortars, recoilless rifles and machine guns, from concealed positions astride the road. Sergeant Long abandoned the relative safety of his armored personnel carrier and braved a withering hail of enemy fire to carry wounded men to evacuation helicopters. As the Platoon fought its way forward to resupply advanced elements, Sergeant Long repeatedly exposed himself to enemy fire at point blank range to provide the needed supplies. While assaulting the Viet Cong positions, Sergeant Long inspired his comrades by fearlessly standing unprotected to repel the enemy with rifle fire and grenades as they attempted to mount his carrier. When the enemy threatened to overrun a disabled carrier nearby, Sergeant Long again disregarded his own safety to help the severely wounded crew to safety. As he was handing arms to the less seriously wounded and reorganizing them to press the attack, an enemy grenade was hurled onto the carrier deck. Immediately recognizing the imminent danger, he instinctively shouted a warning to the crew and pushed to safety one man who had not heard his warning over the roar of battle. Realizing that these actions would not fully protect the exposed crewmen from the deadly explosion, he threw himself over the grenade to absorb the blast and thereby saved the lives of eight of his comrades at the expense of his own life. Throughout the battle, Sergeant Long's extraordinary heroism, courage and supreme devotion to his men were in the finest traditions of the military service, and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as many Senators know, a dispute between the Missouri Pacific Railroad and some of its employees has resulted in an interruption of service by the Missouri Pacific. This interruption threatens to cause substantial damage to the economy of my State. I have asked the Chairman of the National Mediation Board for assurance that every effort is being made to settle this dispute so that railway service may be resumed without delay. I understand that this problem has been called to the attention of the President, and I know that he will want to take whatever action may be appropriate to enable the resumption of railway service.

Mr. President, in order that the gravity of this situation may be known to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD telegrams which I have received from the Governor of Arkansas and businessmen from my State. I also ask consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article by Douglas Watson, published in the Washington Post this morning, and an article published in the Arkansas Gazette of Tuesday, February 6.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 6, 1968.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A continued strike and interruption of service on the Missouri Pacific Railroad will result in a devastating impact upon the economy of Arkansas. As Governor of Arkansas I urge you to appoint an emergency board in an effort to compose the differences between the striking employees and the railroad management as contemplated the procedures established under the Railway Labor Act. It is in the public interest that you take this action as quickly as possible in order that railroad service affecting the health and economic welfare of the people of Arkansas may be restored. Original message sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of Arkansas.

GUION, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Our shipments to glass manufacturers and foundries are wholly dependent on service by Missouri Pacific Railroad. Please exert all possible efforts to achieve immediate resumption of service.

MERTIE A. HARRIS,
President, Silica Products Co., Inc.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK.,
Feb. 6, 1968.

Senator JOHN WM. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The strike by the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen against the Missouri Pacific Railroad threatens to do substantial economic harm to the large number of communities which it serves in Arkansas and to the many industries which that railroad serves exclusively. We feel the Missouri Pacific's position in resisting labor's attempt to saddle them with more surplus jobs is sound; but in an effort to resolve this issue as quickly as possible would appreciate your assistance toward the establishment of an emergency board which probably would have to be advised by President L. B. Johnson to arbitrate the issue.

PETER D. JOERS,
Chairman of Board, Dierks Forests Inc.

EL DORADO, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Rail strike preventing movement of 400,000 gallons of motor oil this month against government contracts. Urgently request your help in restoring service as soon as possible.

PAUL MCHENRY,
Vice President, Macmillan Ring Free Oil Co., Inc.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We operate a feed mill manufacturing livestock feeds for farmers in Arkansas and Louisiana. Last month we handled 500 carloads by rail and will be unable to continue operations if the Missouri Pacific strike continues.

Any assistance you can give toward getting the Missouri Pacific in operation will be appreciated.

A. M. FELAND III,
Southern Farmers Association.

GURDON, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We urge that you do all within your power to end the railroad strike as the economy of this community is greatly affected. Our labor force here depends on our local manufacturers which are: ARK-LA Chemical Corp., Gurdon Plywood Plant, Gurdon Lumber Co., J. A. Barringer & Sons, A & A Manufacturing Co., Frizzell Bros. Lumber Co., which are preparing to lay off men due to the strike.

H. C. NIEHUSS,
President, Gurdon Chamber of Commerce.

WARREN, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Missouri Pacific Railroad strike which began Tuesday a.m., February 6, 1968, without notice will force shut down of our Hardwood Saw Mill, Friday, February 9th, causing immediate loss of earnings to 50 people and shut down of our Ozan Saw Mill, Prescott, Ark., causing immediate loss of earnings to 100 more. Further curtailments affecting balance of our 1,450 Arkansas employees are imminent unless vital rail service is resumed. We would appreciate any assistance your office might give to resolve this difficult situation.

R. V. WARNER,
General Manager, Potlatch Forests.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 7, 1968.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request your help and influence in bringing the strike of the Missouri Pacific Railroad to an immediate end. Impossible to provide feed for poultry and livestock without rail service.

MOUNTAIRE POULTRY CO., INC.,
G. TED CAMERON, *President.*

EL DORADO, ARK.,
February 6, 1968.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Washington, D.C.:

Strike of Missouri Pacific and other railroads at a time when in-plant inventories are full has already necessitated a cut-back in production at our El Dorado, Arkansas plant. Unless Missouri Pacific operations are resumed immediately, shutdowns of some facilities and lay-offs are imminent.

Concentrated nitric acid shipments for the war effort are not able to be made.

Urgently request Federal Government intervention to restore railroad operation.

J. C. LANDES, Jr.,
Plant Manager, Monsanto Co.

MORRILTON, ARK.,
February 6, 1968.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Missouri Pacific RR cannot serve us because of strike. Will appreciate your help through National Mediation Board or other means you may employ.

ALLAN STALLINGS,
Stallings Bros.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 6, 1968.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

MoPac Railroad strike brings our business to a complete standstill. Please do everything can to effect settlement of this strike immediately.

THIBAULT MILLING CO.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator WM. J. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Will appreciate your help in bringing trainmen strike to end. Our Little Rock plant served by MOP RR is greatly hampered by no car supply and service.

G. W. TURNIPSEED.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Sen. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The poultry industry in Arkansas in real danger because of rail stoppage of Missouri Pacific Railroad. Grain supply will be critical by end of week. Must have rail service to major production areas or face real danger of mass mortality of hens, broilers, and turkeys. Any assistance that you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

LEX KILLEBREW,
Executive Secretary, Arkansas Poultry Federation.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Due to our location on their line current strike on Missouri Pacific RR very seriously curtailing receipt necessary inbound raw materials and outbound finished products continuance bound to cause serious loss of business urgently request your assistance where possible.

W. R. WRAPE, 2d,
President, W. R. Wrape Stave Co., Inc.

STUTTGART, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our rice mills and soybean processing plants face immediate shutdown result Missouri Pacific strike. Urge emergency action GE taken to settle strike. Matter extremely serious. Have excess 300 carloads traffic per week must ship Mopac. Prolonged strike will have serious effect on Arkansas farm income.

ARK. RICE GROWERS COOP ASSN. AND
ARKANSAS GRAIN CORP.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram has been sent to President Johnson. "Poultry and livestock industry in Arkansas entering into a critical feed shortage situation due to strike of Missouri Pacific RR. Respectfully request your assistance in bringing this strike to an end."

MOUNTAIRE POULTRY CO., INC.,
G. TED CAMERON, *President.*

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 9, 1968.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

MOPAC strike is killing us, can you help?

J. H. HAMLEN & SON, INC.

FORT SMITH, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Our plants are completely surrounded by the Mo. Pacific R.R. and their continual strikes have caused us a lot of expense. If this wild-car strike continues 3 or 4 days, we will be forced to shut our plants down. Isn't there something that can be done to prevent these situations?

JAMES A. WARD III,
Ward Furniture Manufacturing Co.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge that you take action to settle dispute between Brotherhood of Railroad.

Trainmen and Missouri Pacific Railroad in order to restore service. We have three large plants in Arkansas curtailed. Request you use the Railroad Labor Act machinery to try to settle the dispute so that these plants can operate while settlement is made. Unemployment is spreading in Arkansas due to this strike and if the strike is not ended complete shutdown will be required in many manufacturing plants.

W. R. STEPHENS,
President and Chairman of the Board, Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.

FORT SMITH, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

WM. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do everything possible to end Missouri Pacific Railroad wildcat strike. Since Congress has not acted on S.B. S751 we cannot ship by truck, now we cannot ship by rail. Our situation is desperate.

DON H. FLANDERS,
President, Flanders Manufacturing Co.

MENA, ARK.,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The poultry industry in Arkansas is in real danger because of rail stoppage of Missouri Pacific Railroad. Grain supply will be critical by the end of week. Must have rail service to major production areas or face real danger of mass mortality of hens, broilers and turkeys. Any assistance you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

CLIFT C. LANE,
Lane Poultry, Grannis, Ark.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1968]

TRAINMEN'S WALKOUT CRIPPLES SEABOARD'S SERVICE HERE

(By Douglas Watson)

A strike by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has halted all Seaboard Coast Line passenger trains running to and from Washington and has cut that railroad's freight traffic here by about a third.

The walkout, which began Tuesday, has similarly affected Seaboard's operations throughout the Southeastern states and brought pleas by the Florida and South Carolina congressional delegations that President Johnson appoint an emergency fact-finding board, thereby stopping the strike for at least 30 days.

Canceled here are Seaboard's nine southbound passenger trains that daily leave here with from 1000 to 1500 passengers, as well as ten northbound trains that arrive here daily.

Seaboard and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad normally operate from four to six freight trains daily to and from the Potomac Yards in Alexandria. Yesterday, there were only three such freight trains in either direction.

The trainmen also are striking the 12-state Missouri Pacific Railroad and its subsidiary, the Texas & Pacific. Similar strikes could spread to five other railroads, including two serving Washington—the Southern Railway and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad.

The dispute between the union and the struck railroads centers on the size of train crews. Generally, the trainmen are demanding a minimum non-engine crew of three men, a conductor and two brakemen, for all trains. The railroads have moved to reduce the crews, in most cases, to two.

The dispute has a long history beginning in 1959 when many railroads announced they were eliminating certain jobs. Presidential commissions, congressional legislation, arbitration and an escalating court battle followed.

On Jan. 15 the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the decision by an appellate court that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen could negotiate with individual railroads rather than having to bargain on a nationwide basis.

This freed the union to strike eight railroads, since bargaining with them has proceeded through all the steps required by the Railway Labor Act. The struck Seaboard, Missouri Pacific and Texas & Pacific lines had earlier ordered crew reductions.

Southern Railway and Union Pacific also have announced crew reductions and the C & O, Boston & Maine, and the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio are expected to follow.

In an effort to avoid Federal intervention, the union is not expected to strike all these railroads.

Problems for shippers, particularly citrus growers, are likely to worsen considerably if the Seaboard strike is a prolonged one.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Feb. 6, 1968]

MOPAC LINES HIT BY STRIKE: BROTHERHOOD SAYS SAFETY A FACTOR

ST. LOUIS.—The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen struck the Missouri Pacific Lines at 10:30 p.m. Monday, claiming that the railroad had refused to negotiate over safety factors involved in crew sizes.

A union spokesman said more than 2,500 men would be off the jobs. The railroad denied union allegations that it had refused to negotiate and said that the strike was an attempt to return to featherbedding.

The railroad said it would attempt to operate its freight service with supervisory personnel but would not operate passenger trains.

At Little Rock, two pickets were in front of Union Station. The freight yard at North Little Rock was being picketed. A train from St. Louis en route to San Antonio with 114 passengers was stopped at Little Rock. Twenty-seven passengers got off at Little Rock. The railroad arranged for the others to travel by bus. A train due at Little Rock at 1:50 a.m. today en route to St. Louis was to have been stopped here, the railroad said.

The union said that the strike would extend to the line's subsidiary, the Texas and Pacific.

The union issued this statement: "This strike by the Railroad Trainmen is an effort to convince the Missouri Pacific to provide the minimum number of workmen in yards and road crews necessary to perform the work with safety and without undue hardship. Basically we seek a minimum of a foreman or conductor and two helpers. The railroad seeks to impose its own desires on reducing the number of men and crew below the standard levels. It has long been recognized that the work of brakemen and switchmen is an extra hazardous occupation and we all know all too well that many of our men have been killed and maimed in the course of this work."

SHORTAGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE GRADUATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. T. A. Burtis, the immediate past president of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, made a very provocative address at the recent annual meeting of the institute concerning the shortage of engineering and technical college graduates in the United States. Much is heard about the brain drain of scientific and technical personnel from the countries of Western Europe to the United States. As Mr. Burtis points out, the influx of foreign scientific and technical personnel falls far short of meeting the requirements of American industry for trained personnel. The total number of immigrants plus the total number of graduates from our engineering and technical institutes does not come close to fulfilling the approximately 75,000 job openings which are created each year. This is a serious problem which must be met if this Nation is to retain its present rate of economic growth and I therefore commend Mr. Burtis' address to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Burtis' address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY T. A. BURTIS TO AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERS ON SHORTAGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE GRADUATES IN UNITED STATES

If you were a young engineer with a brand new B.S. degree and could choose between a job near home which promised great security but little challenge or responsibility, and one far away with more risk but more compensation and challenge, which would you take?

Suppose you were a practicing engineer with a few years' experience, and you were offered three times the pay to work in a new field of technology—would you take it?

Or put yourself in the position of a new Ph.D. who could have a routine job close to home, or join an advanced research institution far away—what would you do?

THE DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE

In the last 10 or 15 years thousands of men faced with these decisions have made the choice which any self-respecting professional would make. This, then, is the "brain drain." For these thousands of scientists, engineers, and physicians have been foreign nationals who have chosen to come to the United States. Their migration has caused a storm abroad and now engages the concerned attention of our own government, as well as those of other Western countries. Ordinarily, the migration of a few thousand people would cause no great alarm, but since this now becomes part of what popular jargon calls the technological gap, warning signals begin flashing all over the world.

Understanding the size, the shape or the impact of this migration is no easy task—not for lack of data or opinion but because of the volume and inconsistency of both. The best documentation seems to be that supplied by the National Science Foundation, which from the period of '57 through '64 kept track of the immigration of engineers, natural scientists, and social scientists to the United States. The social scientists, principally economists, make up a very small portion of the total—generally less than 5%. The NSF data indicate that the influx of foreign engineers and natural scientists declined from a high of about 6,000 in 1957 to about 4,200 in '61, then rose again to about 5,900 in 1963 and again declined to an estimated level in 1966 of 5,400. In the middle years of 1962 through '64, a total of 16,000 are estimated to have emigrated to the United States—a little over half of these from Europe, with the United Kingdom (3,200) being the greatest contributor.

Since 1960 there seems to have been a smaller proportion of engineers entering this country but more natural scientists, and there is a slow pick-up in the number of social scientists. If these numbers are reliable, there is a slow decrease in the number of foreign-born professionals entering this country, but no radical change is to be expected. Directly to the contrary, however, another government agency reports that in 1966 the immigration of "professional, technical, and kindred" people amounted to 30,000, out of a total immigration to this country of 323,000. No definition of "kindred" is supplied. They further report that this is an increase of 58% over 10 years ago. The House Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee published data which said that the influx of foreign scientists increased 77% in 1966 over '56 and 32% in '66 over '65.

WHY DO THEY LEAVE?

Perhaps of more import to us than the precision of the numbers is an understanding of what causes people to leave their countries to come here. On this there is fairly widespread agreement—that the principal lures are higher pay, better conditions of work, better social standings. But most important of all (according to a survey of English immigrants made by Professor Wilson of the University of Pittsburgh), are the greater professional opportunities. There is much evidence to support the validity of this conclusion. A prominent Indian biochemist now in this country has expressed his desire to return to his homeland, but remains, simply because there is no opportunity for him to carry on research in his country. My own limited experience leads me to believe that the lure of higher pay is much exaggerated and that the real reason for the departure of these men from their homes lies in the social and industrial attitudes there prevailing.

About 10 years ago, while sitting around a table having coffee with a dozen senior students at one of the great British universities, I was astonished to hear more than half of them say that they proposed to emigrate when their studies were finished. Not one said he was looking for more money; the overriding reason they all advanced (these were not all scientists by any means) was the fact that they could see no possibility of their having any important impact on the conduct of business or public affairs in their country for at least another 30 years. They simply were not prepared to wait that long and sought opportunities in other parts of the world, not necessarily the United States, where they could feel that their work would have some measurable meaning.

Whatever the causes, the meaning, or the impact, the whole issue of the "brain drain" and the technological gap is receiving widespread attention. In our own government there is an interagency committee headed by Dr. D. F. Hornig which includes representatives of State; Defense, Commerce, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Authority, and the Council of Economic Advisors who are studying the problem. A parallel study is being undertaken by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris. A number of political figures abroad have proposed various remedies. Among them a Technological Marshall Plan, a gift of U.S. science and technology; and unfortunately, recently repressive measures have been advocated.

THE HOME-GROWN DRAIN

My intent is not to add one more commentary to this international dispute. It is rather to point out another area that needs equal attention—and that is our own home-grown "brain drain." Between 1961 and 1965 the total number of bachelor's degrees granted to male graduates in the United States increased from 256,000 to 320,000, a compounded growth rate of 4.4%. Within the same period the number of bachelor's degrees in engineering increased only from 35,700 to 36,600—a growth rate to all intents and purposes of 0. The physical sciences fared somewhat better, with a growth rate of 2.8%; but this is still well below the rate for the college population as a whole. Surprisingly, education, which one would expect to have shown a healthy rate of growth, achieved only a 1.7% increase each year—only a little over a third the average. Where, then, has the new college generation turned? The answer is clear—to the humanities and social sciences.

In the same 1961–65 period, the number of social science degrees increased from 38,000 to 58,000, a compounded growth rate of 8.6%, nearly twice that of the college population as a whole. In terms of absolute numbers, the degrees granted in these areas account for something over a third of the total increase in the last five years. Here I think is an internal "brain drain" that merits some portion of the attention being given to that on the international scene. This is not to say that we do no need more bright and capable economists or political scientists or sociologists. To the contrary, the state of the world today would indicate that we need as much talent in these areas as we can find. On the other hand, however, if the technological and scientific strength of the United States is so great as to cause concern abroad, if it is so important that our own government relies on this capability for the solution of problems in space, defense, transportation, environmental control, and other public problems, if industry is relying on science and engineering for future growth, some steps must be taken to see that the talent necessary to meet these objectives becomes available. That it is not today is clearly evident. One need only look at the job opportunity ads in any of the journals, including our own. The accepted estimate is that as against the 75,000 job openings for engineers which appear every year, there is available in this country only a total addition of 45,000 trained men.

WHAT ARE THE REASONS?

We have figures to tell us problems, but we lack understanding of causes and thus we lack solutions. Why does engineering and science in the U.S. attract the skilled men from abroad, but not our own young brains. Can the reason be economic? Apparently not, because all of the figures available to us today show that engineers and scientists are paid well above the average of the general population and generally have the advantage of all the advanced programs in fringe benefits. Even more indicative of this is the fact that the medical profession, traditionally one of the best compensated in this country, is having increasing difficulty in attracting students to the medical schools.

Is it possible that lack of opportunity is preventing the bright young high school students from choosing science and engineering? This also seems hardly believable. The resources we devote to research and development are increasing at almost an exponential rate, and these depend almost entirely on technically trained people. One need only look at the rate of capital formation in this country, at the growth of the technically-oriented industry, and at the burgeoning technically-based institutions to understand that opportunities abound.

Can it be that science and engineering in the universities are just too difficult, too demanding of application, of discipline, of high individual performance to the young people? Hopefully not, because if this were the case it would be a great tragedy. As John Gardner wrote in his book *Excellence*, "When an institution, organization or nation loses its capacity to evoke high individual performance, its great days are over."

Or could it be that the challenge and the opportunities for personal growth and personal contribution through science and engineering are either absent or misunderstood? The latter I think is likely to be the case.

HOW SERVICE CAN BE RENDERED

It has become a platitude to say that young people today are impressed with the need to serve their neighbors, their community, and humanity itself, and hopefully this idealism is not strictly confined to the college generation. But is there really an understanding of how this service can be rendered? One must note that nursing, one of the most selfless of professions, is in desperate straits for new recruits.

Is it true, for example, that the government agency which distributes new seeds to the farmers of a developing country better serves humanity than the chemical company which through its research provides the pesticides that will insure that a crop is reaped from this seed? Does the diplomat who negotiates a tariff treaty make a greater contribution than the men who design and build the vessels in which international trade flows? I know it is almost like being against motherhood to offer any criticism of the Peace Corps, but does the Peace Corpsman who teaches an Asian peasant to use an iron plough do more for humanity than the engineers who in the last few years have halved the cost of agricultural nitrogen fertilizer? When the injection of an antibiotic saves a life, does all the virtue reside with the hand on the syringe, and none with the engineers who ran the fermentation plant? And can the teacher who saves a child from illiteracy have any confidence in his contribution unless someone produces the machinery, the paper, even something as prosaic as the ink and the distribution system to bring the written word to the literature child?

One could ask an endless list of such rhetorical questions and I think would have to conclude that both kinds of contributions are not only valuable but indispensable. Somehow, however, our values are skewed and only half the story is being told.

THE TIME IS NOW

Now is the time to start giving serious attention to our own "brain drain," the diversion from engineering and science of the talent we will sorely need in the future to maintain the growth of our economy and insure its security. When the Interagency Committee comes to some conclusion about the international "brain drain," perhaps it will turn its attention to the pressing matter of securing future scientists and engineers from our own plentiful resources. Perhaps industry in the face of the shortage of engineers will respond not only by bidding fiercely for the available talent, but also by carrying to the high schools the message of its needs, its challenges and opportunities. Let government agencies and our academic institutions turn some of their zeal to promoting a wider understanding of tho physical and economic realities of the modern world, so that the challenges and opportunities of science and engineering are known to our most able youngsters. And we who are already engineers must individually and collectively make known our own pride in and dedication to this honorable profession.

Quoting once more from John Gardner, I suggest that we take these words to heart . . . "No society can reach heights of greatness unless in all fields critical to its growth and creativity there is an ample supply of dedicated men and women. Whether any particular field will have enough such men and women depends partly on morale within the field itself and partly on how highly the society as a whole values dedication. If the society understands, expects and honors dedication, the incidence will be high, but if it assumes that dedicated men are exceedingly rare and probably a little foolish, then the incidence will be low."

Let us not permit society to come to this disastrous conclusion. *The foregoing was the Presidential Address presented at the AIChE 1967 Annual Meeting, New York, N.Y.*

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR HARLAN CLEVELAND BEFORE NATO GROUP

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Chairman of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference Standing Committee of Educational Cultural Affairs and Information, I am happy to invite the attention of Congress and the country to Ambassador Harlan Cleveland's presentation to one of our committee sessions in Brussels last November during the annual Conference of NATO Parliamentarians.

Ambassador Cleveland discusses some of the evolving programs on which our NATO committee has been working for several years, one of which is nearing realization when we hope to hold during the summer of 1969 at the College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium, the world's first training conference for civil servants and middle-level administrators recruited from free world countries and dedicated to helping them improve the functioning of the machinery of freedom in aiding self-determination to succeed. We expect to include a few governmental representatives from the underdeveloped countries in this training seminar along with those from most of the NATO countries in the hope all will benefit from the experience of others and that improved procedures may be evolved for providing greater stability and survival value to the art of self-government as practiced in the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS MADE BY THE HONORABLE HARLAN CLEVELAND, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO NATO, AT THE MEETING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND INFORMATION, HELD IN BRUSSELS ON THE 21ST OF NOVEMBER, 1967

In our societies of the Atlantic Community the present generation has created a whole new environment for the public administrator. It is the kind of environment for which our educational systems do not yet prepare young men and women. Our present systems are primarily pointed toward the development of effective specialists—and indeed, the way to get ahead in all of our countries for the first ten, fifteen or twenty years of a career is to be an effective specialist—yet the capacity to pull these specialists together to make something happen is neglected in the process. It is a notably difficult task to teach a youngster how to pull people together to make something happen. I tried this myself at the Maxwell School at Syracuse, and I found it extremely hard to explain what responsibility is to a person who has never had any.

It seems especially appropriate that the North Atlantic Assembly's Committee on Education, Cultural Affairs, and Information has begun to address this problem under the chairmanship of a man who has personally sponsored so much of the United States Government's enormous work in the field of international academic exchange: Senator Karl E. Mundt. The primary bottleneck in the development of industrial societies continues to be the lack of adequate managerial training. In fact, one can almost define economic and social development as the growing capacity to administer and co-ordinate human activity. For this reason, the work of Senator Mundt's committee in suggesting the idea of a NATO-connected institution organized specifically for that kind of training carriers particular relevance and importance now.

What we are considering here is education in middle life—education, if you will, for the conversion of specialists into general managers. The environment in which this new function is performed is an environment of unimaginable complexity, with many machines, with many computers, with a multitude of systems—and with nobody really in charge any more. All kinds of administrations now begin to resemble those of an academic faculty or a hospital or a scientific laboratory, even in cases where administration has been traditionally regarded as very vertical, like military establishments or family business. With no one completely in charge and everyone partly in charge, most of the relationships become horizontal. Orders are no longer given; everything is done by suggestion or by persuasion of people who do not work for you and for whom you do not work. When we take this factor—what one might call the increasing horizontality of administration—and combine it with two others, we develop a picture of the training programs now required.

One of these two factors is the blurring of the line between what is public and what is private. So much of our industry now works with and for the Government that some of the words about private business do not quite apply any more. But by the same token, in an enormous Government like ours, the individual component agencies are in some sense also practicing a kind of free enterprise, making most of their own decisions, justifying their own programs, handling their own public relations—and thus acting somewhat the way a private organization was supposed to act a generation ago.

Secondly, there is the blurred line between what is domestic and what is foreign. I find it increasingly hard to tell, with respect to any particular activity, whether we are dealing with international relations or domestic policy—a notion dramatically indicated, for example, by the domestic economic crisis in Britain and its international repercussions beginning last November.

The problem, therefore, is to develop people who are not primarily specialists but who have the breadth and vision and reach and imagination to handle the executive tasks of our time which are broadening so fast that it is hard for those of us who went to school in one generation even to imagine the new problems. I am struck, for example, by the enormous change that is just about to occur in the way all governments look at the weather. For it will soon be possible to look at the weather the way the Lord has presumably been looking at it all along, that is, as a single envelope around the earth. It is a big envelope; and with communications satellites, picture-taking satellites, and fast computers at our disposal, for the first time in this generation we will be able to mount a world weather watch.

That is just one small example of the kinds of breadth we must build into our "middle management": not merely training in particular posts but the ability to handle large substantive programs and the confidence to tackle unprecedented problems with an optimism unwarranted by the gloomy specialist advice which a "generalist" will always be getting around him. I believe that what some call the technological gap is perhaps traceable to the fact that in the United States, thanks to our large-scale operations in defense and other enterprises, we do find a great number of people who have had the experience of solving an impossible problem in a group with other people. The so-called Atlantic gap, in other words, is the numerical difference between people in North America and Europe who are routinely accustomed to doing the impossible.

By and large, none of our educational systems has professionally tackled this problem. Consequently, an international effort in the form of an experimental training program for people in middle life who are graduating from being specialists to being general executives would be an immensely important thing. Any organization that is going to regard itself as lively, and be regarded as lively, might well consider such an approach.

In this connection the Mundt Committee has come up with two nourishing suggestions. One of these favors the idea of establishing managerial internships. I have long held the conviction that the way to learn about the general management of society's functions is not so much to study them theoretically but to become immersed with considerable responsibility in some one program. In a sense, the particular subject does not matter. It is like training people to go overseas. The important thing is that they get deeply enough immersed in one foreign culture so that they can then know how to make themselves at home in any foreign culture. Thus, the Committee's idea of selecting private people in middle life who seem to have the capacity for taking on general responsibility, giving them some form of paid leave, and putting them on a specific work project, is in my opinion very sound.

One caveat: I would not agree with the idea that it is impossible to have internships in sensitive subjects like foreign affairs and defense. We experimented with this at Syracuse, placing American students inside the finance ministries, foreign affairs ministries, and interior ministries of other governments, and we made it work. Experience of this kind might be considered as a possible guide toward developing international internships even in the most sensitive sorts of subjects, because it is precisely the "sensitive" subjects which most require the kind of talent we want to develop.

The second proposal put forward by Senator Mundt's Committee calls for an international administration training center. This too would be a first. There are, to be sure, a number of national administration centers all over the world for training of middle management public servants. I participated with Sir Noel Hall of the Henley Administrative Staff College in helping to set up the Pakistani Government's institute at Lahore. But while there may be a lot of experience at the national level, the notion of developing a training center under international sponsorship is both new and constructive.

In conclusion, then, I would stress four ideas. First, in any international training program let us emphasize the conversion of specialists to general executives, and along with such conversion the importance of training in the new tools of administration, notably computers and their use. Secondly, let us emphasize the usefulness of a growing body of public administration case histories, much of it so different from the variety we now find, for example, at the Harvard Business School. Thirdly, let us aim at combining our training programs with some form of at least short-term internships in fields wholly separate from those where the specialists have grown up; from such a process these specialists could see how other specialists look at their work and could then generalize from that experience. Finally, let us emphasize the importance of attaching such a training center to a teaching organization which already exists *sur place*. The College of Europe in Bruges—with which I hope to become better acquainted during my stay in Belgium—may very well be such an organization. It already has some academic tradition and it believes that teaching people is important. Characteristics of this kind are indispensable in making sure that a training center does not become just another research house in the field of public administration or, even worse, an isolated institution set up *in vacuuo*.

FIRST INTERVENTION

I confess myself to be about seven years out of date in the professional field since tilling other soil, so I do not know the other two you mention. I think the Henley model is probably not a close model of what is involved here. For one thing, it is pointed at private business and only partly at public servants. The latter are in the minority, or at least were when I visited Henley about ten years ago.

Here I think the target should be primarily the management of public functions, which is a growing proportion of all the management jobs to be performed; and I think that requires, and has tended to produce, a different kind of teaching material in national training organizations. The difference is, I believe, one of greater complexity, involving the whole dimension of public ethics and the public interest.

SECOND INTERVENTION

I would, Mr. Chairman. It seems to be impossible to keep the supply of general managers in line with the growing demand for them. The reason for this, I believe, is that as the development process proceeds, the higher rate of industrialization seems to produce a disproportionate increase in the requirement for leaders. And as things get more complex and it becomes impossible for any one person to understand most of the specialties which flow into what he is supposed to be responsible for, other people are freed to be leaders. The result is a kind of horizontal society where, in the case of the United States, we find major jobs of leadership collectively exercised by a couple of million people.

This is a completely different dimension of training from the one we based our needs upon two generations ago. In fact, I would go even further than the United Nations Handbook. I would say that the more successful a nation's development and industrialization process becomes, and the faster its rate of economic growth, the worse is its problem in the field of leadership cultivation. Denmark's problem, for example, would be far worse in this respect than that of the Congo—an observation quite contrary to the normal way of looking at such problems among people who think about development.

THIRD INTERVENTION

My own opinion is that the subject you are now discussing is at least as important as the advanced work in electronics, or air defense, or anything else. We have several special institutions already in the NATO structure which have grown out of the Defense and Science programs. Those which have grown out of the Science program—notably the Von Karmen Institute—are not very closely connected with the day-to-day work of NATO. They have been "spun off" in effect by NATO but are partly supported by the NATO budget from year to year in the field of advanced scientific work and in fields that happen to be important to Mr. Von Karmen, who was a very influential member of the Science Committee. I see no reason why it would not be possible to "spin off" an activity in this field in somewhat the same way, provided it passes some of the tests we have been discussing this morning and it is attached to a reputable institution. If the Governments were prepared to support it by sending people, then I think you would probably need some essential nest-egg money. But the amount of that money, in terms of the totals that we deal with in the NATO appropriation each year would certainly be very hard to find; and this would be the smallest line in that budget.

DEEPER, EVER DEEPER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an interesting column by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post on February 4. The column is entitled "Deeper, Ever Deeper."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Deeper, Ever Deeper: Soldiers Now in Vietnam Were Babies When U.S. Involvement Began

(By Drew Pearson)

The United States has been involved in war in Vietnam directly or indirectly for 18 years—so long that most Americans have forgotten just how we got mixed up in it. The men now being drafted were babies when we first began to pour money into Vietnam.

In 1950, when Harry Truman was President, we began financing the French army in its battle against Ho Chi Minh in Indo-China. By November, 1952, the United States had paid one third of the war bill in Indo-China, sent 200 shiploads of materiel, 222 warplanes, 235 naval vessels, 775 combat vehicles and 1300 trucks.

By 1953, as President Eisenhower assumed office, our financial support to the French was running between $350 million and $400 million a year.

The Russians were sore. They continue to be sore today. Said Foreign Minister Andrei Vyshinsky in 1953: "These illegal, flagrantly illegal acts must stop."

But believe it or not, on Oct. 6, 1953, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles described American support for Indo-China as his "brightest achievement of the year."

The next month the siege of the big French fortress Dienbienphu began and there was grave danger of its falling to Ho Chi Minh. As a result, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, demanded that the United States intervene directly.

Gen. Eisenhower poured cold water on the idea. On Feb. 10, 1954, he said: "I say that I cannot conceive of a greater tragedy for America than to get heavily involved now in an all-out war in any of those regions particularly with large units.

John Foster Dulles didn't like Ike's position. He felt it was necessary for us to get involved. So did another man, later to become President—Sen. John F. Kennedy.

"It is important," Sen. Kennedy said, "that the Senate and the American people demonstrate their endorsement of Mr. Dulles's objectives, despite the difficulty in ascertaining the full significance of key phrases . . . If necessary the United States will take the ultimate step . . . It is war."

Maj. Gen. John W. O'Daniel was rushed to Indo-China to train Vietnamese troops but found French officers uncooperative. One of the most strenuous objectors was Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

Foreseeing the fall of Dienbienphu and the rout of the French, Dulles on March 29 announced a plan for a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization or SEATO. This was the beginning of the commitment about which Lyndon Johnson has complained as committing him to defend Southeast Asia.

Dulles called a secret meeting of congressional leaders April 3, including Sen. Johnson, and requested a joint resolution giving President Eisenhower power to use American armed forces in Indo-China. Sen. Johnson objected. He argued that Dulles must seek and get the support of our allies before Congress would okay any plan to commit American troops. Other congressional leaders agreed.

On April 21, 1954, Vice President Nixon, talking to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said: "The United States as leader of the free world cannot afford further retreat in Asia. It is hoped that the United States can afford direct involvement in Indo-China. But if there is no other recourse, the Administration will have to face up to it and send troops."

The speech was off the record, but the London Telegraph leaked it. It ricocheted back across the Atlantic. Public reaction was devastating. President Eisenhower pulled the rug out from under his Vice President and made it clear that no troops would be sent to Indo-China.

In May the French surrendered Dienbienphu. In August there was a total ceasefire. The French were defeated, but the Geneva Treaty of 1954, engineered by the British and Russians, saved face for them. It provided for the split-up of Indo-China into four independent countries with a vote between North and South Vietnam two years later to see whether they should unite.

President Eisenhower took a rosy view of the setback. He announced Oct. 20 that the United States would develop and maintain in South Vietnam "a strong viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

The United States by 1954 had spent $4 billion supporting the French army, all of it having gone down the drain.

At Christmas time in 1954, Cardinal Spellman of New York visited Saigon and presented a check for $100,000 from Catholic Welfare to Catholic refugees fleeing from the North. He returned to persuade President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon to step up U.S. aid.

Meanwhile, Cardinal Spellman and Joseph P. Kennedy, father of the Senator from Massachusetts, had organized "the American Friends of Vietnam" and were mobilizing American public opinion behind President Diem, who had been educated at Maryknoll, the Catholic seminary outside of New York City.

President Eisenhower had sent one thousand American military "advisers" to train the South Vietnamese army. In the fall of 1961, President Kennedy increased this to about 15,000 men, with an expenditure of $1.5 million a day. We have been escalating ever since. American armed forces in South Vietnam now total something over half a million men, our expenditure running to a minimum of half a billion dollars a week.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRIME MESSAGE

Mr. **HART**. Mr. President, yesterday President Johnson sent to Congress a far-reaching anticrime message. In this comprehensive message the President proposed a number of significant and badly needed measures.

At this time I would like to briefly comment on the major elements of the President's crime message. In his message the President urged prompt passage of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, and proposed doubling the first year appropriation for the act. I agree with President Johnson that prompt passage of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act is a must. Such prompt passage will go a long way toward giving local and State law enforcement and criminal justice units a much-needed shot in the arm.

The President also proposed a Federal antiriot law. On the basis of last summer's Judiciary Committee hearings on H.R. 421, the House-passed antiriot bill, I am not yet convinced State law in this area is inadequate and that there is any need for such Federal legislation. Further, there are serious first amendment questions that arise when one attempts to draft an antiriot bill.

In his crime message the President also strongly endorsed the administration's Right of Privacy Act, S. 928, stating:

> We must protect the American people against a new threat to one of our oldest and most precious rights—the right of personal privacy.
>
> The principle that a man's home is his castle is under new attack. For centuries the law of trespass protected a man's lands and his home. But in this age of advanced technology, thick walls and locked doors cannot guard our privacy or safeguard our personal freedom. Today we need a strong law—suited to modern conditions—protect us from those who would trespass upon our conversations.
>
> Last year I recommended to the Congress the Right of Privacy Act. I urge the Congress to enact this legislation this year.

Mr. President, this firm endorsement of S. 928 which prohibits all wiretapping except where national security is at stake, should put an end to the groundless rumors heard around Washington that the White House was willing to accept a court-order wiretap authorization statute in return for passage of its Safe Streets Act. I commend the President and also the Attorney General for their strong public stand on invasions of privacy.

The President is also to be commended for proposing in his crime message measures: To give Federal leadership and assistance, to promote the special handling of juvenile delinquents and alcoholics, to facilitate attacks against organized crime, to improve the communications and weapons available to law enforcement agencies, to tighten the protection of banks against robbers, and to improve the Federal correction system.

Mr. President, this discussion of the President's crime message is an appropriate time to insert in the RECORD two articles commending our chief law-enforcement officer, our outstanding Attorney General, Hon. Ramsey Clark.

Mr. President at this time I ask unanimous consent to insert an article from the Orlando Sentinel and a letter to the editor of the Boston Globe. I believe the last sentence of the letter to the Boston Globe sums up the feelings of many Americans—

> In government, law enforcement and private life: . . . "Ramsey Clark will go down in history as one of the greatest Attorneys General."

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Jan. 14, 1968]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEPS UP CRIMINAL ACTIONS

WASHINGTON.—The Justice Department recorded sharp increases during 1967 in criminal actions against Cosa Nostra gangsters, users of hallucinogenic drugs, and draft violators, Atty. Gen. W. Ramsey Clark reported Saturday.

Clark said the department filed 33,158 criminal cases during the year, the highest number for any year in the last decade. It achieved an over-all conviction rate of 74 per cent, up slightly from 1966.

Government action against violators of the Selective Service Act reached an all-time high, with 952 convictions, up 78 per cent from 536 in 1966 and up 250 per cent from 272 in 1965.

In addition, 1,648 draft-law prosecutions were begun during 1967, up 62 per cent from 1,015 during the previous year and up 226 per cent from 506 in 1965.

Prosecutions under legislation controlling drug abuse aimed at hallucinogenic drugs such as LSD were up from 55 in 1966 to 260 in 1967. About 619 million pills or doses of dangerous drugs valued at $127 million were seized.

Organized crime suffered severe setbacks during 1967, Clark said.

Of 183 known members of Cosa Nostra indicted or convicted during the last 12 years, 55 were the subject of court action by the Justice Department during 1967. They included three "bosses" or heads of Mafia "families," two "underbosses," one "consigliere" or counselor, and 10 "capo regime."

In addition, the department uncovered "skimming" of gambling profits from two large Las Vegas, Nev., hotels, and prosecuted a heroin smuggler reputed to be Cosa Nostra's chief narcotics agent.

Clark said the Justice Department expended a record $7.1 million to state and local law enforcement agencies during 1967 for 188 projects in law enforcement and criminal justice.

The nation's prison population increased during the year, from 19,277 a year earlier to 19,637. Clark said a factor was longer sentences for Selective Service violators, a 1967 average of 32.1 months compared with 25.4 months in 1966.

Among other 1967 department achievements cited by Clark were:

—Convictions in the case of three civil rights workers who were murdered in Mississippi.

—A landmark decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in New Orleans speeding desegregation of public schools in the South.

—Filing of a record number of suits—43—alleging racial discrimination in public accommodations.

—The first federal suit in the North alleging violation of the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act.

—The largest number of antitrust price-fixing cases filed in five years—37.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Nov. 11, 1967]

PRAISE FOR RAMSEY CLARK

As President of the International Association of Police Professors, I would like to take strong exception to Jack Anderson's article in Parade Magazine in the Sunday, Nov. 5, Globe.

Contrary to Mr. Anderson's rather limited research, Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark is not only respected by the police community generally, he is providing the very necessary leadership as chief law enforcement officer of this nation in striving to strike a just balance between the rights of the individual and the rights of society as a whole . . .

As a member of the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel of the United States Department of Justice, I have talked with Mr. Clark at length . . . I find him very open to suggestions and extremely conversant and knowledgeable relative to the problems of the police. There are few people in this country who understand the difficulties confronting law enforcement as well as does our present Attorney General.

What too few people realize, I think, is that the Congress has seen fit not to endorse the President's Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, and that the problem of what to do about crime has become a political issue which takes away from the Attorney General the machinery through which the innovative and progressive programs aimed at professionalizing law enforcement can be achieved. The lethargy on the part of Congress to pass meaningful anticrime legislation is unfortunate and, through no fault of his, reflects unfairly on the Attorney General.

One of the problems facing police administrators today is that many of them lack the kind of progressive leadership qualities that Ramsey Clark possesses and which are so necessary if law enforcement is ever to be professionalized and dragged screaming into the twentieth century.

In my opinion, Ramsey Clark will go down in history as one of the greatest Attorneys General.

ROBERT SHEEHAN,
Acting Dean, College of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University, Boston.

MARTIN LUTHER KING'S PLANS FOR DEMONSTRATION IN NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a news story which appeared in the Washington Star on February 3, entitled "King Pledges Shantytown at D.C. Festival."

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING PLEDGES SHANTYTOWN AT D.C. FESTIVAL

ATLANTA, GA. (AP)—Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. says he will take his squatter army of the nation's poor to Washington this April and build a settlement of tumbledown shanties among the cherry blossoms to point up the plight of the needy.

The shanties—to "house the troops of hopeless and embittered poor"—are a part of King's strategy for the massive demonstration of militant nonviolence in his Poor People's Campaign. He plans a cadre of about 3,000 trained volunteers to lead the demonstrations.

King said he has few illusions about persuading Congress to action, but hopes to appeal to the conscience of the nation.

"We plan on doing this by sending thousands of poor people—poor children in particular, who've not had adequate care—to all the hospitals around Washington and have them stay there until they get medical attention," he said.

At a White House news conference yesterday, President Johnson was asked whether he would try to talk civil rights leaders out of the April march.

Johnson didn't answer directly, but said he would hope that energies could be directed in a more productive manner. He said he thought it might be more helpful to present views to Congress and added "we'll do all we can to work with all groups, see that their views are heard, considered and acted upon."

King's planned protest was one of several topics discussed in Washington last night at a two-hour closed meeting by a group of top local civil rights leaders.

The group, invited to meet by Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League, also discussed Stokely Carmichael's newly-organized Black United Front, crime and unemployment in Washington.

Tucker would not comment on results of the meeting and participants referred questions back to him.

THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I sent a letter to Secretary Rusk and a letter to Secretary McNamara in which I ask for answers to certain questions involving the *Pueblo* incident. I ask unanimous consent that copies of the letter be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1968.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the fact that Seaman First Class Duane Hodges, a member of the Pueblo crew, lost his life in the Pueblo incident, I am receiving many requests from Oregon newspapers and Oregon constituents to try to obtain an answer to the following questions from both you and Secretary Rusk.

Before I list the questions, I want to make very clear to you that I am not seeking any information which, at this time, you or Secretary Rusk think should not be disclosed for security reasons. I think you are well aware of my consistent defense during my years in the Senate of the separation of powers doctrine and the right of the Executive Branch of Government not to publicly disclose any information at a time of crisis that could possibly be of assistance to the enemy. If any of my questions, in any way, would handicap our Government in its negotiations in Panmunjom, then, of course, I would not want the information disclosed.

If, in the opinion of you and the Secretary of State, any of the information can be disclosed on a confidential basis to me, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, or to the Committee as a whole, you may be sure that its secret nature will be protected. However, I would rather not have the information if it involves top secrecy matters at this present time.

On the other hand, I thought I owed it to you and the Secretary of State to call your attention to the fact that there is a public demand in my State for such information, and I think it exists elsewhere in the country because of the growing feeling that the country does not know just what happened in the Pueblo incident in relation to the specific questions that I now list:

1. Was the ship fired upon? If it was, is that the explanation for the injuries?

2. If the ship was not fired upon, what do you know, by way of explanation, of the injuries?

3. Do we have any firm information as to whether the ship was ever in national waters?

4. What commitments, if any, have we made in the negotiations with the North Koreans?

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

FEBRUARY 8, 1968.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the fact that Seaman First Class Duane Hodges, a member of the Pueblo crew, lost his life in the Pueblo incident, I am receiving many requests from Oregon newspapers and Oregon constituents to try to obtain an answer to the following questions from both you and Secretary McNamara.

Before I list the questions, I want to make very clear to you that I am not seeking any information which, at this time, you or Secretary McNamara think should not be disclosed for security reasons. I think you are well aware of my consistent defense during my years in the Senate of the separation of powers doctrine and the right of the Executive Branch of Government not to publicly disclose any information at a time of crisis that could possibly be of assistance to the enemy. If any of my questions, in any way, would handicap our Government in its negotiations in Panmunjom, then, of course, I would not want the information disclosed.

If, in the opinion of you and the Secretary of Defense, any of the information can be disclosed on a confidential basis to me, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, or to the Committee as a whole, you may be sure that its secret nature will be protected. However, I would rather not have the information if it involves top secrecy matters at this present time.

On the other hand, I thought I owed it to you and the Secretary of Defense to call your attention to the fact that there is a public demand in my State for such information, and I think it exists elsewhere in the country because of the growing feeling that the country does not know just what happened in the Pueblo incident in relation to the specific questions that I now list:

1. Was the ship fired upon? If it was, is that the explanation for the injuries?

2. If the ship was not fired upon, what do you know, by way of explanation, of the injuries?

3. Do we have any firm information as to whether the ship was ever in national waters?

4. What commitments, if any, have we made in the negotiations with the North Koreans?

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

TROUBLES IN NEW YORK SCHOOLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times of February 3, 1968. One is entitled "Bedlam at Junior High School 258," and the other is entitled "Teacher Quits at 201." Both stories are under the general heading "Hundreds of Pupils Rampage in Protest at Brooklyn School." I also ask unanimous consent to insert a followup story which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "Violence in Intermediate School 201 Spurs Transfers."

There being no objection, the news articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1968]

HUNDREDS OF PUPILS RAMPAGE IN PROTEST AT BROOKLYN SCHOOL

BEDLAM AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 258

Hundreds of eighth grade pupils—surging through corridors, trading blows, barging into classes, shouting, jeering and turning in a false fire alarm—created havoc yesterday in a Bedford-Stuyvesant junior high school after demonstrating to win better food, more freedom and more dances.

Only when half a dozen policemen were rushed to the school was order restored and the children herded back to their classrooms, where there was no further instruction for the day.

Assistant Superintendent Henrietta B. Purcell, who was summoned to Junior High School 258, at Marcy Avenue and Macon Street, said a complete investigation of the disorder would be made by the Board of Education.

She said there was indications that the outbreak in the school, where more than 95 per cent of the 1,480 pupils are Negro or Puerto Rican, had been planned and the youngsters incited—"although I have no positive information now."

In a prelude to the mass disruption, 60 of the pupils gathered at 8:30 A.M. outside the school, shouting slogans and holding aloft placards with crayon scrawls listing their demands.

"We want McCassey Out," said one sign, in a reference to Miss Mary A. McCassey, who is white and has been the principal of the school for the last 18 months.

"We want Good Teachers Kept," said another sign in an apparent reference to the dismissal on Jan. 22 of George Fuccillo, who was popular with the youngsters, even though he allegedly struck one.

By 10:30, the crowd had swelled to a hundred—most of them eighth graders. Mrs. Joy Berry, executive assistant principal, persuaded the youngsters to enter the school to present their demands to Miss McCassey.

The demonstrators were led to the cafeteria, but they were joined by about 600 eighth-grade pupils who had been attending classes until they were disrupted.

With the throng overflowing the cafeteria, the pupils were taken to the auditorium, where Miss McCassey expressed her willingness to discuss the demands with class representatives if the pupils would return to their classrooms.

Without dissenting, the children were dismissed, but disorder erupted as they surged into the corridors.

Bedlam starts

Racing up and down hallways and stairways, breaking into classrooms, shoving, pushing, shouting down appeals and instructions from teachers who were jostled by their charges, the pupils roamed heedlessly and at will.

"Return to your class," shouted a teacher.

"What class?" retorted a youngster.

Fights among pupils flared, and on the third floor lights were switched off. In the midst of the turmoil, a fire alarm rang, but in an instant, loudspeakers were telling the pupils to ignore it.

Teachers said that during the past week 11 false fire alarms had been turned in and that three fires had been discovered in wastebaskets.

In a hallway, Miss McCassey was trying to calm the pupils. Most ignored her. But one girl came running to her, complaining that she had been "shoved" by a teacher. Miss McCassey took the girl in her arms and promised to look into the matter.

From the pupils, Miss McCassey heard reports of fights in classrooms to which she dispatched teachers. None of the scuffles was serious, but the constant shuttling of teachers on peacemaking missions seemed to heighten the air of disorder.

The one policeman normally assigned to the school—Patrolman Cecil Greenidge—hurried from one trouble spot to another, but could not restore calm.

Only at noon, when six patrolmen commanded by Capt. Norman Weiner came on the scene and fanned out through the building was relative peace attained. Only eighth-grade classes had been involved.

Promises made

With the students again in their classrooms, Miss McCassey visited them, offering to meet some of their demands after agreeing that the food was not up to par. She promised a cleaner cafeteria, French fried potatoes—instead of the usual potatoes boiled in their jackets, and more dances.

She also said the cafeteria would be provided with fresh vegetables and with pretzels, potato chips and candy that the pupils could purchase "instead of sneaking out to buy them."

As for release from school during lunch time, she said she would meet with their mothers, the teachers, the police and others involved to determine whether such a move would be feasible.

At a later meeting with about 75 student representatives, Miss McCassey repeated the promises, agreed that everything was not perfect and asked the pupils to tell her what was good about the school.

There was an embarrassing silence until one pupil cried, "Nothing!" The others laughed.

Teachers, who refused to be quoted, insisted there was too much permissiveness in the school and too little communication with the principal and her staff.

One pupil, who wanted the principal ousted, gave this explanation. "She doesn't keep promises. She promised us better food long ago and we still get slop."

TEACHER QUITS AT 201

(By Leonard Buder)

A new teacher turned down his assignment to Intermediate School 201 as the result of an allegedly antiwhite play presented in the school auditorium Thursday by LeRoi Jones, the militant Negro writer.

Three other teachers reportedly "walked out in disgust" during the performance but did not quit and were at work yesterday.

The new teacher, after working one day—Thursday—at the East Harlem school, went to district headquarters and said: "Please take me out of there." The teacher was reassigned.

Martin W. Frey, the district superintendent, said yesterday that he had learned about the play after it had taken place and was looking into the situation. "I heard today that LeRoi Jones had been here," he said. "I don't know who invited him or who organized the assembly program."

Mr. Frey had been asked on Thursday to personally take charge of the troubled East Harlem school by Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, the Superintendent of Schools. The assembly program took place while Mr. Frey was attending a meeting at Board of Education headquarters in Brooklyn.

According to the account of the play given to the district office by the teacher who asked for reassignment, a major character posed questions that were answered by a chorus. The questions and responses supposedly went like this:

> "Who murdered the black man?"
> "Whitey, whitey."
> "Who should we lynch?"
> "Whitey, whitey."

The teacher said that a Negro pupil sitting nearby told him, "We're talking about you, but we'll let you live."

EDUCATION STRESSED

But Herman B. Ferguson, a special adviser to the I.S. 201 "governing board," said he did not recall hearing these lines. He said the presentation was intended as "another educational experience for the children" and to give them exposure to professional theater.

"There was nothing racial as far as I was concerned," Mr. Ferguson said. "It had a historical flavor."

Mr. Ferguson, a licensed assistant principal, was suspended from his post in a Queens school last fall after being indicted for participating in an alleged Revolutionary Action Movement plot to murder moderate civil rights leaders. Mr. Ferguson has denied the charges, and has not yet come to trial.

Mr. Jones could not be reached for comment yesterday. The 34-year-old poet and playwright is free in bail awaiting a hearing on his appeal from a weapons conviction.

He had been sentenced last month to two and a half to three years in the New Jersey State Penitentiary and fined $1,000 for having two loaded revolvers in his car in Newark during last July's riots.

The I.S. 201 governing board was established as part of an experiment to test community control of local schools.

201 BESET BY TROUBLE

The governing board, which now has "semiofficial status," according to the Board of Education, has not yet been given full operating control over the intermediate school and five nearby elementary schools in the project.

The 18-month-old I.S. 201, at 127th Street and Madison Avenue, has been plagued from the first by problems of leadership, teacher turnover and pupil behavior. Earlier this week a teacher described it as "a jungle."

When the new term began on Thursday, the school had no licensed supervisor in charge, Superintendent Donovan asked Mr. Frey to take charge until a permanent principal is appointed. The governing board has named its own principal, but the selection has not been recognized by the Board of Education.

A telephone call to I.S. 201 yesterday afternoon asking for "the principal of the school" caused a flustered response. After some hesitation and apparent consultation with others in the office, the woman who answered the call asked the caller: "Can you call back Monday?"

VIOLENCE IN I.S. 201 SPURS TRANSFERS—PARENTS CITE FEAR FOR SAFETY OF PUPILS AS MOTIVE FOR SEEKING NEW SCHOOLS

(By Leonard Buder)

An exodus of pupils who say they have been assaulted, harassed or robbed by their classmates has developed at Intermediate School 201 in East Harlem.

Sixteen youngsters have been granted transfers in the last three days after their parents voiced concern over the children's safety at the school, which the Board of Education had intended to be "one of the best in the nation."

In all, 40 of the school's 1,100 pupils have been transferred to other schools at their parents' request since last October. But the transfers had begun to level off until a flurry of requests were made in recent weeks.

Martin W. Frey, the district superintendent who has been personally overseeing I.S. 201 since the new school term began last Thursday, said that the number of special transfers from the school was "about four times the normal rate."

Although the majority of the school's pupils are Negroes, 30 of the 40 who have been transferred are Puerto Ricans.

However, Mr. Frey said that he had "no personal evidence" of any friction along ethnic lines between Negro and Puerto Rican pupils.

SENT TO 4 SCHOOLS

Although not all the requests from parents for transfers have been granted, enough have been approved to result in a stream of letters from Mr. Frey's office to principals of other schools, saying:

"Please accept the following children as transfers from I.S. 201. These children have been assaulted and the parents fear for their safety."

The pupils have been sent to I.S. 177 and Public Schools 80, 96 and 155.

Wracked by controversy

I.S. 201, at 127th Street and Madison Avenue, has been wracked by controversy and troubles since it opened in September, 1966.

The school is the hub of a planned decentralization project involving four nearby elementary schools, that is intended to test community control of local school operations.

A governing board of parent, community and school representatives has been established, but has not been given control of the five schools by the city Board of Education. However, it is being consulted on school matters.

Mr. Frey would not discuss conditions at I.S. 201 yesterday. He also said that newsmen would not be permitted to inspect the school until matters have "steadied."

A New York Times reporter who visited the school 10 days ago found near-bedlam in the building. Pupils were observed pushing and fighting during class-changes and roaming the corridors when classes were in session. One teacher brandished a yardstick to maintain order.

Mr. Frey said yesterday that five of the 80 teaching positions were vacant, as were two positions of assistant principal. Mr. Frey took over personal supervision of the school when the acting principal and two licensed assistant principals went on leave. This had left the school without licensed supervisor.

The district superintendent said that seven persons who are on the eligibility list for appointment as junior high school principals had applied to head I.S. 201. He said that their names were being referred to the governing board. Berlin L. Kelly, chief consultant to the governing board, said later that these candidates would be given interviews.

However, the governing board had announced last week the selection of Ronald Evans, an experienced city teacher, as the new principal of I.S. 201. Mr. Evans is not on the eligibility list. Mr. Kelly said yesterday that the governing board was working with city school authorities "on procedures" for the appointment of a principal.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill—H.R. 2516—to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be recognized for an additional 15 minutes beyond the time allowed under the order of yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota may yield to other Senators and that they may speak out of order, notwithstanding rule VIII, without his losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy, and I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

SENATOR ERVIN'S BRIEF AS "FRIEND OF THE COURT" IN FLAST AGAINST GARDNER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 29, 1967, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] who is chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, filed with the Supreme Court a friend-of-the-court brief in the case of Flast against Gardner. The petitioners in this case have asked the Supreme Court to permit individual citizens and taxpayers to challenge Federal aid to church-related institutions on the ground that it violates the first amendment prohibition against establishment of religion.

For years the Court has refused to hear cases of this nature, saying that individuals cannot show any monetary injury from the alleged violation of the first amendment. In my opinion, this rationale is unjust and deprives individuals of the right to vindicate guarantees conferred by the first amendment. As Senator Ervin put it:

> The citizens' interest in maintaining the "wall of separation" between church and state is great and compelling and is certainly sufficient reason to be allowed to sue.

History has taught us that freedom is in peril when the church meddles in the affairs of state and the state attempts to influence the spiritual affairs of men in a free society.

Twice Senator Ervin has been successful in gaining Senate passage of a judicial review measure, S. 3, which would allow individuals to challenge the constitutionality of Federal aid to church-related institutions. The most recent passage of S. 3 was by a unanimous Senate vote on April 11, 1967, by a vote of 71 to 0. A judicial review amendment was attached to the Senate version of the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments Act providing for judicial review of first amendment questions arising under Federal aid programs in education. Nevertheless, the House-Senate conferees deleted that amendment. I, like Senator Ervin, deeply regret this action.

The House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee No. 3, however, has agreed to hold hearings on the Ervin measure on March 6. I sincerely hope the House Judiciary Committee will report S. 3 in the immediate future, and thereby make the first amendment protection against establishment of religion a reality for all Americans.

Flast against Gardner is an extremely important case for the principle of freedom of religion, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that Senator Ervin's excellent brief in the case be printed at this point in the Record. In view of the fact that the Senate has unanimously passed the measure on this subject, as I have mentioned, I believe that this brief will be of interest to all Senators.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1967, No. 416]

Florence Flast, Albert Shanker, Helen D. Hankin, Frank Abrams, C. Irving Dwork, Florine Levin and Helen L. Buttenwieser, Appellants *v.* John W. Gardner, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States, and Harold Howe 2d, as Commissioner of Education of the United States, Appellees

(On appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York: brief of Americans for Public Schools, and Baptist General Association of Virginia)

INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE

The Baptist General Association of Virginia is an association of approximately 1,450 Baptist churches in the State of Virginia whose congregations number over 500,000 members. The Baptists of Virginia have long been concerned with the constitutional issue of the separation of church and state. They were instrumental in securing the enactment in 1786 of Virginia's Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, which this Court has recognized as the progenitor of the religious clauses of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. At present, the Baptists of Virginia operate four colleges and three secondary schools, creating a vital interest in the question of whether taxpayer monies can be used to support sectarian schools under the First Amendment.

The Americans for Public Schools are concerned that federal aid to sectarian schools deprives the public schools of America of urgently needed funds. They have dedicated themselves to the preservation and strengthening of public education. One of the major responsibilities of government is to provide excellent, free education for its citizens. This responsibility cannot be met if public funds are diverted to privately operated schools and the public schools must compete for the limited resources available.

Permission is granted by both parties for the filing of this brief.

STATUTE INVOLVED

The statutory provisions involved in this suit are Titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 874, Eighty-First Congress).

THE QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

This appeal presents the following question: Do citizens and taxpayers of the United States have standing to challenge in the Federal courts an expenditure of Federal funds on the ground that such expenditure is in violation of the Establishment and Free Exercise provisions of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This action was brought by a group of individuals, citizens and taxpayers of the United States and residents of the City and State of New York, challenging the constitutionality under the First Amendment of certain expenditures made by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The complaint alleges that these expenditures, purportedly made pursuant to the authority of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, were made to finance the furnishing of instruction and the providing of instructional materials for use in religious and sectarian schools. The plaintiffs requested judgment declaring these expenditures to be unconstitutional and enjoining further expenditures for these purposes. No request was made for judgment requiring restitution for funds already expended or which will have been expended before issuance of the injunction sought in the action.

The District Court dismissed the complaint on the ground that the action was controlled by the principles laid down in the case of *Frothingham* v. *Mellon,* 262 U.S. 447 (1923), that under these principles the plaintiffs had no standing to bring the action, that there was no justifiable controversy, and that the court therefore lacked jurisdiction of the subject matter. The court rejected the plaintiffs' contentions that *Frothingham* was not based upon absence of constitutional jurisdiction but upon judicial policy and that the policy considerations which required dismissal in *Frothingham* were inapplicable to a suit based upon the First Amendment. Although conceding that *Frothingham* has been the subject of criticism, the court held that since it had never been overruled or limited by this Court, the court below could not or would not overrule it on its own motion.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In spite of the interest that they as citizens have in maintaining the absolute "wall of separation" (*Reynolds* v. *United States,* 98 U.S. 145, 164 (1878)), it is alleged that plaintiffs in this case have not demonstrated that they possess the requisite standing necessary to bring the present suit. For this proposition, appellees rely upon the case of

Frothingham v. *Mellon,* 262 U.S. 447 (1923). In that case, a federal taxpayer sought to enjoin administration of the Maternity Act of 1921, which provided for the appropriation of federal funds to combat maternal and infant mortality, on the basis that by enacting the statute Congress had exceeded its delegated powers and usurped powers reserved to the states by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. The plaintiff contended that the effect of the appropriation would be "to increase the burden of future taxation and thereby take her property without due process of law." *Id.* at 486. The Supreme Court held in that case that the taxpayer could not maintain the suit, stating in part as follows:

"The interest of a taxpayer of a municipality in the application of its moneys is direct and immediate and the remedy by injunction to prevent their misuse is not inappropriate. . . . But the relation of a taxpayer of the United States to the Federal Government is very different. His interest in the moneys of the Treasury—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and indeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, or any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating and uncertain, that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity. . . .

"We have no power *per se* to review and annul acts of Congress on the ground that they are unconstitutional . . . . That question may be considered only when the justification for some direct injury suffered or threatened, presenting a justiciable issue, is made to rest upon such an act. Then the power exercised is that of ascertaining and declaring the law applicable to the controversy. It amounts to little more than the negative power to disregard an unconstitutional enactment, which otherwise would stand in the way of the enforcement of a legal right. The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally. . . . *Id.* at 486–488."

We submit that the *Frothingham* case is not dispositive of the issue of standing in this case for several reasons: (1) It does not govern cases alleging encroachments upon First Amendment freedoms, especially cases bottomed on the Establishment Clause; (2) if governing, plaintiffs satisfy the standards set forth in that case; and (3) even if they fail to satisfy these tests, there are important reasons requiring that the Court nonetheless confer standing in this case.

ARGUMENT

I. The nature of the injury caused by infringement of the rights of citizens under the establishment clause is sufficient to confer standing

The First Amendment provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ." As its preeminent location in the Bill of Rights indicates, and as this Court has repeatedly held, all of "the great liberties insured by the First Article" occupy "a preferred position in our basic scheme." *Prince* v. *Massachusetts,* 321 U.S. 158, 164 (1944). Mr. Justice Jackson explained that "this freedom was first in the Bill of Rights because it was first in the forefathers' minds; it was set forth in absolute terms, and its strength is its rigidity." *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* 330 U.S. 1, 26 (1947) (Jackson, J., dissenting), quoted with approval in *Abington School District* v. *Schempp,* 374 U.S. 203, 216 (1963).

This Court has repeatedly declared that the provisions of the First Amendment, and in particular those of the Establishment Clause, are absolute and without qualification. In *Everson, supra* at 15–16, the Court said: "The 'establishment of religion' clause means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. . . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and *vice versa.* . . ." Accord: *Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education,* 333 U.S. 203, 210–211 (1948); *McGowan* v. *Maryland,* 366 U.S. 420, 442–443 (1961); *Torcaso* v. *Watkins,* 367 U.S. 488, 492–493 (1961); *Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra* at 216–217. Furthermore, this Court has explained that "[t]he Establishment Clause, unlike the Free Exercise Clause, does not depend upon any showing of direct governmental compulsion and is violated by the enactment of laws which establish an official religion whether those laws operate directly to coerce non-observing individuals or not. . . . When the power, prestige and financial support of government is placed behind a particular religious belief, the indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform to the prevailing officially approved religion is plain." *Engel* v. *Vitale,* 370 U.S. 421, 430–431 (1962); *Accord: Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra* at 221. Thus, "the effect of the religious freedom Amendment to our Constitution was to take every form of propagation of religion out of the realm of things which could directly or indirectly be made public business and thereby be supported in whole or in part at taxpayers' expense." *Everson, supra* at 26 (Jackson, J., dissenting), quoted with approval in *Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra* at 216. "Further, it is no defense to urge that the religious practices here may be relatively minor encroachments on the First Amendment. The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent, and, in the words of Madison, 'it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties.' Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, quoted in *Everson, supra* at 65." *Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra* at 225.

These excerpts show the Court's appreciation of the fact that every breach in the "wall of separation" dividing Church and State, however indirect or quantitatively small, is nonetheless a dangerous encroachment on the fundamental and important individual freedoms sought to be protected by the First Amendment. The Establishment Clause was adopted as a means of protecting the citizen from the dangers which, as history convinced the authors and has confirmed since, inevitably flow from an alliance of the two. Although the enforced separation also protects both parties from the consequences of mutual involvement in each others affairs, these benefits are only incidental. The primary purpose of the Establishment Clause is to protect the individual, in whose name these associations are inevitably made. The injury done by encroachment upon the principle is, therefore, to every citizen and to all citizens. It is a diminution of the citizen's freedom, and appropriate reason for him to seek redress in this Court.

The nature of the rights protected by the Establishment Clause is such that the injury caused the citizen by their erosion cannot be comprehended in monetary terms. As Judge Frankel pointed out below, the injury is no less real because it "is not merely, or mainly, economic loss. And the roles in which plaintiffs allege injury are not simply their roles as taxpayers. When the Founders proscribed laws 'respecting an establishment of religion', their aim, as Madison described it, was to make it impossible 'to force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one [church] establishment * * *' Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, quoted in *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* 330 U.S. 1, 63–66 (1947) (Appendix to dissent of Rutledge, J.). It is banal but relevant to say that the concern was not over the three pence. The concern was with a specially cherished form of spiritual and intellectual freedom. . . ." *Flast* v. *Gardner,* 267 F. Supp. 351, 355 (S.D.N.Y., 1967).

Thus, as Judge Frankel suggested, an economic analysis of the plaintiff's interest is inappropriate in a case of this kind. *Ibid.* The proper analysis must comprehend the nature of the rights confirmed by the Establishment Clause, and the identity of the party upon whom these rights are conferred. When, through the action of government, these rights are diminished, the citizen is injured, and must be able to seek redress for that injury in court. The plaintiffs in this case, as citizens, contend that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act infringes the rights conferred upon them by the First Amendment. Their status as injured citizens, and nothing else, gives them the requisite interest to maintain their suit.

This Court stated the test of standing in *Baker* v. *Carr,* 369 U.S. 186 (1962) as follows: "Have the appellants alleged such a personal stake in the outcome of the controversy as to assure that concrete adverseness which sharpens the presentation of issues upon which the Court so largely depends for illumination of difficult questions?" *Id.* at 204. In that case, appellants were challenging the validity of a Tennessee statute apportioning the members of that State's General Assembly on the grounds that it debased their votes and thereby denied them equal protection of the laws. The Court declared that plaintiffs were asserting " 'a plain, direct and adequate interest in maintaining the effectiveness of their votes' . . . not merely a claim of 'the right, possessed by every citizen, to require that the government be administered according to law. . . .' 'The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury.' " *Id.* at 208.

The plaintiffs in this case have clearly suffered an injury if their rights under the First Amendment have been encroached upon, regardless of their status as taxpayers. And that injury is surely one which they have a "plain, direct and adequate interest" in preventing (*Baker* v. *Carr, supra*), if only because "it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties." *Everson, supra* at 65. In neither case can the injury be measured in any quantitative fashion, financial or otherwise. The injury in both cases is personal to plaintiffs as citizens and is measured properly only by the quality of the wrong they have suffered.

The fact that they share this injury in common with other citizens should not bar their suit. As Professor Jaffe has pointed out, "it begins to be paradoxical to argue that because an allegedly unconstitutional law affects all the citizenry rather than only someone here and there, the Court is without jurisdiction." Jaffe "Standing in Public Actions," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1265, 310 (1961). Here, as in *Baker* v. *Carr* where plaintiffs also suffered an injury in common with everyone else affected by the statute, plaintiffs should be held to have sufficient standing to protect their constitutional rights regardless of their monetary stake in the outcome of the suit, and regardless of the fact that the wrong was also done to other citizens. To rule otherwise is to declare that this Court will only consider petty infringements of the First Amendment affecting small groups of persons, but will not consider a general attack affecting all citizens. Indeed, it is to say that the Court is powerless to interpose itself against a grand alliance of Church and State to the detriment of all, and is reduced merely to the role of obstrucing joint ventures of limited purpose and narrow impact.

The case of *Engel* v. *Vitale, supra,* furnishes further support for the view that standing should not depend on financial injury in a case of this kind. In that case, parents of school children challenged a New York law directing a school principal to have a 22 word prayer read aloud in class as an encroachment upon the Establishment Clause. Students who wished to do so could remain silent or be excused during the recitation. The Court recognized that there was no "direct government compulsion" shown, but held that "[t]he Establishment Clause . . . is violated by the enactment of laws which establish an official religion whether those laws operate directly to coerce non-observing individuals or not." 370 U.S. at 430. As Professor Sutherland has noted, "the Court's opinion seems to find that the available permission for the child to withdraw, or not to take part in the exercise, has shielded the child from cognizable hardship. Has the parent, despite this, suffered some justifiable wrong *qua* parent? How is the parent any more wronged than his childless but religiously strong-minded neighbor across the street?" Sutherland, "Establishment According to Engel," 76 Harv. L. Rev. 25, 42 (1962). Yet the Court did not question the parents' standing to sue in that case. See also *Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra* at 224, n.9; *Zorach* v. *Clauson,* 343 U.S. 306 (1952); *Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education,* 333 U.S. 203 (1948).

The injury suffered by reason of a breach of the Establishment Clause is necessarily indirect, and somewhat indefinable, as was that of the parent in *Engel, supra.* But the interest of the citizen surely is no more indirect or immeasurable than that of the parent. Thus, we submit that Mr. Justice Brennan was partially correct when he stated that ". . . it might seem illogical to confer standing upon a parent who . . . suffers no financial injury, by reason of being a parent, different from that of an ordinary taxpayer, whose standing may be open to question. . . ." *Abington School District* v. *Schempp, supra,* at 267, n. 30 (Brennan, J., concurring). However, the illogic is not in the conferral of standing upon the parent but in the fact that there should be any doubt about a citizen's or taxpayer's standing. The citizen's interest in maintaining the "wall of separation" between Church and State is equally great and equally compelling. The answer to the paradox described by Justice Brennan and Professor Sutherland is that the parent in *Engel* suffered no injury under the Establishment Clause different from his religiously strong-minded neighbor. The plaintiff in *Engel* had standing as a citizen who was coincidentally also a parent.

II. If the test of economic interest laid down by Frothingham governs this case, then plaintiffs have standing as Federal taxpayers

A. Frothingham Did Not Hold That a Suit by a Federal Taxpayer Could Never Rise to the Level of a Case or Controversy

Several aspects of the Court's decision in the case of *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* compel the conclusion that the Court did not hold that there is a constitutional barrier to the maintenance of a suit by a Federal taxpayer. The first, and most obvious, is that the Court did not say that there was such a barrier, whereas in the companion case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon,* the Court specifically stated that "the complaint of the plaintiff State . . . is political and not judicial in character, and therefore is not a matter which admits of the exercise of the judicial power". 262 U.S. at 483.

The Court in *Frothingham* spelled out several other reasons for its decisions, all of which indicate that the decision was an exercise of the Court's discretion, and not of obligation under the Constitution. It pointed out that the plaintiff shared her interest in common with millions of other taxpayers, that her particular interest was "comparatively minute and indeterminable," and that the effect on future taxation or payment out of the funds was "remote, fluctuating and uncertain". *Id.* at 487. Thus, the Court's holding that "no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity" (*ibid.*) is no more than a statement of the familiar principle that a plaintiff, when appealing to the Court's traditionally discretionary equitable powers, must show irreparable harm which can not be remedied by resort to a court of law. Mrs. Frothingham did not show such harm.

It should also be observed that Mrs. Frothingham's claim that her property was taken in violation of the Fifth Amendment was based upon an alleged abuse of the federal principle expressed in the Tenth Amendment. The gravamen of her action being a violation of the division of powers between the States and the Federal Government, it was proper for the Court to regard her litigable interest in this matter as deficient. Questions such as these not being justiciable (*Mellon*), the slight economic burden she suffered was inadequate to move the Court into the political arena.

Such restraint is required when political objections to social legislation are recast in legal terms and the controversy is taken to the courts for resolution. But judicial reluctance to hear the claim of a federal taxpayer is misplaced when it is employed to reject a petition alleging the improper use of one's tax monies for the aid of religion. Indeed, it may be more than merely misplaced. The constitutional history of the First Amendment shows the concern of Madison and Jefferson over the use of the taxing power for the benefit of religion. This history strongly suggests that the Court is constitutionally obligated to hear this taxpayer's complaint.

That *Frothingham* at most expresses a policy of judicial restraint is reinforced by the Court's assertion of jurisdiction in *Everson, supra.* For, as this Court pointed out in *Doremus* v. *Board of Education,* 342 U.S. 429 (1952), citing *Frothingham,* "what the Court said of a federal statute [is] equally true when a state Act is assailed. . . . [B]ecause our jurisdiction is cast in terms of 'case or controversy', we cannot accept as a basis for review, nor as the basis for conclusive disposition of an issue of federal law without review, any procedure which does not constitute such". *Id.* at 434. Having adopted the same test for state as well as federal cases, the Court's failure to question Everson's standing can only mean that *Frothingham* is no constitutional barrier to state taxpayers seeking to challenge expenditures violative of the First Amendment. The fact that Everson paid his taxes to the district and not to the federal treasury is not a difference sufficient to rise to the dignity of a constitutional distinction. At most, the issue is whether plaintiffs, as federal taxpayers, have shown an interest in their case at least as strong as Everson did in his—one that warrants asking the Court to exercise its equitable powers.

B. Plaintiffs Show Sufficient Interest in This Case To Satisfy the Frothingham Test

In *Doremus* v. *Board of Education, supra,* plaintiff taxpayers, challenging Bible reading in the public schools, did not allege any precuniary interest in order to maintain standing. The Court held that he did not have standing. The Court stated, however, that "Everson showed a measurable appropriation or disbursement of . . . funds". *Doremus* v. *Board of Education, supra* at 434. Everson's monetary injury was an indeterminable part of the $357.74 expended for transporting children to parochial school. The personal expense to Everson was therefore undetermined and negligible. In this case also, plaintiff taxpayers are alleging a "measurable appropriation or disbursement of . . . funds". Plaintiffs' injury is an indeterminate part of the billions of dollars expended and to be expended under the challenged program. While the dollar amount going to church-related recipients may not yet be determined, it certainly is not negligible. And the personal cost to plaintiffs may not, in the long haul, be negligible either.

It would be arbitrary to permit Everson to sue as a district taxpayer under the facts of that case, and yet reject plaintiffs' standing here merely because they are federal rather than state taxpayers. *Frothingham* attempted to draw such a distinction, stating that "the interest of a taxpayer of a municipality in the application of its money is direct and immediate and the remedy by injunction to prevent their misuse is not inappropriate" because of "the peculiar relation of the corporate taxpayer to the corporation". The distinction, if ever valid, no longer is in today's complicated society. What the Court then said about federal taxpayers is now equally true of state and local taxpayers. The relationship of a taxpayer to his state or city government no longer has "some resemblance to that subsisting between stockholder and private corporation" (*Frothingham, supra* at 486). Rather, state and local taxpayers today also have an "interest in the moneys of the [state and local treasuries]—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—[which] is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and indeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds . . . [is] remote, fluctuating and uncertain . . ." (*ibid.*). Furthermore, as Professor Davis pointed out in testimony before The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee (Hearings on S. 2097, 89th Cong. 2d Sess., p. 493):

"The Court [in *Frothingham*] said that the effect of a Federal expenditure on a Federal Taxpayer was 'comparatively minute and indeterminable.' That was true as of 1923. But it is not true as of 1966. Taxes that almost any corporation pays to the Federal Government are no longer "comparativly minute" as against taxes the same corporation pays to municipalities. . . . The tax facts on which the *Frothingham* opinion was based have now turned right around backwards. . . . Because the rule of the Supreme Court since 1879 has been and still is that a municipal taxpayer has standing, and because that rule is clearly sound, a Federal taxpayer should now a *fortiori* have standing."

Thus, viewed in terms of the tests laid down by *Frothingham*, and as applied in prior cases, these plaintiffs as federal taxpayers stand in no worse light than have other litigants who have relied upon their contributions to local treasuries as the measure of their claim to maintain their case. Accordingly, they meet the criteria governing standing which were outlined in *Frothingham* and should be heard here.

III. The magnitude of the issue presented in the suit is sufficient to confer standing on the plaintiffs even if they fail to meet the Frothingham test

The issue presented by this case is precisely that which it is the function of the Court to decide. The controversy is mature, the parties are antagonistic, the question is justiciable in the ordinary sense, and the relief prayed for does not threaten to involve the Court in duties alien to its processes. Cf. *Baker* v. *Carr, supra.* No judicial doctrine of abstention or constitutional principle governing litigation is involved other than the question of standing.

As noted by Justice Brennan, "the concept of standing is necessarily a flexible one" (*Abington School District* v. *Schempp,* 374 U.S. at 267, n. 30 (Brennan, J., concurring)). Where, as here, plaintiffs have "very real grievances . . . which cannot be resolved short of constitutional adjudication" (*ibid.*), this Court should confer standing whether or not the plaintiffs meet the conventional tests. They present "weighty countervailing policies here to cause an exception to our general principles". *McGowan* v. *Maryland,* 366 U.S. 420, 430 (1961). See also *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister,* 380 U.S. 479, 486 (1965). In *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters,* 268 U.S. 510 (1925), the Court held that a private corporation devoted to secular and religious education had standing to challenge the constitutionality of the Oregon Compulsory Education Act which required that parents send their children to public elementary schools. The Court readily conceded that the corporation could not claim for itself "the liberty which the 14th Amendment guarantees." *Id.* at 535. However, it went on to note that the corporation's business and property were "threatened with destruction through the unwarranted compulsion which [Oregon was] exercising over prospective patrons of their schools", and that "this Court has gone very far to protect against loss threatened by such actions." The Court accepted jurisdiction over the case despite the alleged defect in the plaintiffs' standing.

The Court in *Pierce* was moved to accept the suit, not so much because the claim of injury was so importunate, but rather because the financial injury that was threatened stemmed from a clear violation of the Free Exercise Clause. So blatant was the violation that the Court waived its ordinary rules and, in effect, permitted the Society standing *in loco parentis* of the children, whose right to pursue a religious education was infringed. The interest of the plaintiffs in this case is more important than the corporate health of the Society, and certainly more direct. The Court should go just as far to protect this interest even if, as it did in *Pierce,* it must ignore *some of the technical* requirements of standing in order to do so.

The magnitude of the issues raised in this suit completely overshadows the technical rules of standing set forth in *Frothingham.* The principle expressed in the Establishment Clause, and as restated by this Court in every pertinent case, is of the first order of importance. The historical events which led to the incorporation of this principle in the Constitution demonstrate the danger posed by the association of government in church affairs, and of the church in government. The experience of the past demonstrates the possible results when governmental power is exerted to tax citizens for the benefit of religion. The modern experience of other societies, and suggestions now being raised in our own, illustrate the threat to public education which may result from mutual involvement unchecked by judicial review. The spectre raised by this Court, that "[t]he breach of neutralism that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent", will be all too real if the Court decides against these plaintiffs.

The Court should recognize the possible consequences of a decision which denies standing to citizen-taxpayers to challenge federal appropriations deemed to contravene the Establishment Clause. There are no other potential litigants who may raise this issue adequately before the Court. While nimble imagination may devise a set of circumstances in which a public institution, denied what it considers its full share, might complain that a church-related school received federal funds in violation of the First Amendment, or one in which a public official defends his refusal to carry out the dictates of the statute on the grounds that to do so would be unconstitutional, as a practical matter these speculations are not likely to be realized. As citizens and taxpayers, these plaintiffs are probably the only type of litigants who can present this type of controversy before the Court and, because they present the constitutional controversy in its clearest and sharpest guise, they are the best possible litigants that may be expected.

Finally, it should be recognized that the result of holding that this class of plaintiffs has no standing would be to reduce the Establishment Clause to a minor rule of law governing errant States. The Clause henceforth would have vitality only against State legislatures, although it is applied to them indirectly through the 14th Amendment, and then only since 1940. The principle would no longer serve as an effective restraint upon Congress, despite the words of the provision and its original intent. On religion and the First Amendment, the law of the land would be less majestic than ironic.

In short, because the consequences of failing to permit this type of plaintiff to maintain this suit are so inimical to the constitutional principle involved, the situation warrants the conferring of standing as an extraordinary grant. This the Court has done before, even at the expense of weightier obstacles than those presented by *Frothingham.* E.g., compare *Baker* v. *Carr, supra,* with *Colegrove* v. *Green,* 328 U.S. 549 (1946).

The history of congressional stalemate on legislation authorizing judicial review highlights the need for Court action. For the past five years the Senate has overwhelmingly approved legislation to overrule the *Frothingham* case as respects First Amendment suits. These attempts, reflecting Senate conviction that the case expresses merely a doctrine of restraint which is inappropriate in the area of the First Amendment, have consistently come to naught because of resistance by the House of Representatives. The most recent example occurred on December 1, 1967, when a judicial provision was added on the Senate floor to the 1967 Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (Title VIII, H.R. 7819, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 25, p. 34685.) The provision was deleted in conference at the insistence of the House. A similar amendment was deleted in 1963 from the Higher Education Facilities Act, and in 1966 and 1967, the House also refused to consider Senate-passed judicial review legislation.

The inability of Congress to overrule the *Frothingham* precedent means that, as a practical matter, the only foreseeable opportunity for judicial consideration of the First Amendment questions in federal aid to church-related schools lies before the Court in this case. The legislative action was initiated because of the previous reluctance of this Court to reverse or clarify its own rule of decision. The failure to enact repealing legislation means that the obligation once again is placed solely on this Court.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, and for the reasons submitted by appellants, the Court should reverse the decision of the court below and remand the case for trial on the merits.

Respectfully submitted.

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Attorney for Amici.

DECEMBER 1967.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota and to my colleague from West Virginia, the acting majority leader, for giving Senators, including myself, the opportunity to speak out of order prior to what I know shall be the meaningful remarks of our colleague who has joined in this arrangement.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR RANDOLPH AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was with genuine regret that I decided to leave my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This was a difficult decision for me, because I was challenged by this type of legislative activity. But, after earnest consideration, I determined this was necessary due to exacting duties as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and two of its subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development. It is not my desire to continue in the role of chairman in name or partially in name.

It has been a privilege to chair this subcommittee for approximately 19 months, from late June 1966 to February of this year. The activities of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee aided the formulation of legislation beneficial to more than 26 million living veterans and their families. They compose nearly 46 percent of the population of our country.

I wish to express my personal and official appreciation for the guidance and the counsel of our beloved chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator LISTER HILL. He gave me very real assistance.

During this period of 19 months, I was given the opportunity, and shared the responsibility with the members of the subcommittee, of reporting legislation to this Chamber, which has been enacted into law. These measures are of benefit to our veterans. They and their families, I remind my colleagues, constitute nearly 46 percent of the population of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the legislative proposals which were handled in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the period from June 29, 1966, to the present, under my chairmanship.

There being no objection, the legislative proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FROM JUNE 29, 1966, TO FEBRUARY 1968

During 1966:

H.R. 16330—To provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans and for other purposes. Became law September 30, 1966. Public Law 89–612.

H.R. 7850—To amend Sec. 1822(a) of title 38, U.S. Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases. Became law October 4, 1966. Public Law 89–623.

H.R. 11927—To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under veterans' loan programs. Became law October 4, 1966. Public Law 89–625.

H.R. 12664—To retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon veterans hospital reservation. Became law October 4, 1966. Public Law 89–626.

H.R. 13012—To provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Mississippi. Became law October 4, 1966. Public Law 89–629.

H.R. 16367—To extend the benefits of war orphans educational assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines, Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during W.W. II and for other purposes. Became law September 30, 1966. Public Law 89–613.

H.R. 11631—To amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel. Became law November 7, 1966.

During 1967:

H.R. 399—To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y. Became law June 7, 1967. Public Law 90–25.

H.R. 2730—Authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Temple Junior College, Temple, Tex. Became law December 14, 1967. Public Law 90–197.

H.R. 4717—To authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn. Became law June 28, 1967. Public Law 90–32 (Senate companion bill S. 619).

S. 16—To amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes.

(Not referred to the committee but amended with provisions of S. 9 and S. 1942 by Senate floor action.) Became law August 31, 1967. Public Law 90–77.

S. 9—To authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes. (See S. 16.)

S. 1742—To amend chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, in order to extend until July 25, 1970, the termination date for home, farm, and business loans under such chapter in the case of veterans of World War II. (See S. 16.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. In recent years, Mr. President, we have made significant progress in affording our veterans the assistance and benefits they deserve. I stated in this Chamber on the day that the President submitted his message on veterans benefits, that, even with these accomplishments, there is much to be done to meet the needs of our veterans, whose dedicated service has contributed greatly to the freedoms we enjoy today.

I expressed the hope that the Congress will act with dispatch on all phases of the President's proposed programs. Although I will not be chairing the Veterans' Subcommittee when consideration begins on the new legislative proposals, I will be an active participant through my continuing membership on the subcommittee.

It will be my purpose to work closely with our new chairman, the capable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. He has been a valued member of the subcommittee and he will provide important leadership in vital work ahead.

Mr. President, I say very earnestly that I have enjoyed this work. It has been a rewarding experience to serve with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I assumed the chairmanship which he left to become chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor. It has been a privilege also to serve on the subcommittee with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The three splendid and diligent members of the minority who serve on our subcommittee are the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

I deeply appreciate the cooperation and the understanding of these men as we have worked together to formulate the legislation that has come from our subcommittee, to the full committee, then to the floor of the Senate for debate and decision, and ultimately for passage into law.

Additionally, I recognize the effective assistance of our staff, William Stover, the associate counsel, and Helen Kettendorf, the secretary for the subcommittee. They have exercised a vital role in our efforts.

Mr. President, many organizations, government agencies at all levels, and individuals contribute in the formulation of legislative proposals. I am grateful for the constructive efforts of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, William J. Driver, and his staff, and the many veterans organizations and educational associations. They have represented well the interests of our veterans.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand, of course, the compelling reasons which bring about the retirement of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I wish to take this opportunity to thank and to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for the fine and wonderful cooperation he has given to me.

I heartily commend and congratulate him on the great work and outstanding contributions he has made as the chairman of this subcommittee. He labored, he worked, and he was dedicated in the cause of our Government and in the cause of those men who offered their lives for the safety and preservation of our country and its freedom. Surely no man could have been more diligent, more indefatigable, or more consecrated in his work as the chairman of the committee than was the distinguished and outstanding Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator. I am very grateful.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has compiled an enviable record in the 19 months he has served as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. He has seen the enactment of 13 bills into law, an average of nearly a bill a month. The chairman of a full committee would be proud of a record such as that; many times a chairman would be glad to see just one of his bills passed in a year.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs was able to achieve this accomplishment because of his congeniality, his consideration of all of his fellow Senators, and his ability to work with every Senator on either side of the aisle.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I had served as chairman of that committee for a period of 7 years. At the end of my chairmanship I did not leave the committee. I stayed on the committee with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, just as he is going to remain on the committee now. It is a tribute to the leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and his concern for the 26 million veterans of this Nation that despite his heavy burden in connection with Committee on Public Works he served for a year and a half, during which the subcommittee passed very crucial legislation to aid veterans.

When I left the chairmanship of the committee in 1966 the veterans organizations of this country were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the new chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. The reason for that enthusiasm was that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia over a long course of years had exhibited his concern for the returning servicemen of this Nation during the long years of fighting for the cold war GI bill, which was finally passed in 1966 after 8 years. We always had the support of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, just as we had the support and leadership of the illustrious Senator who is the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Without his leadership, his constant guidance, and encouragement, the cold war GI bill would not have become law.

In that bill the allowances for veterans were amended and made more realistic. There was added on-the-job, farm, and flight training, as well as opportunity for completion of high school training, which had not been included in any former GI bill, even during the Korean conflict.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for placing me in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in 1958, and for making it possible for me to stay there after other duties required that I give up the chairmanship.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia did not have to give up the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on

Veterans' Affairs because of his chairmanship of another committee. He gives it up voluntarily, out of a sense of devotion and care for veterans. He has stated that his duties in connection with the Committee on Public Works, which includes the entire highway system, have become so heavy that he cannot devote enough time to see that the veterans receive the care they need. This willingness to sacrifice is typical of the dedication and devotion of the Senator from West Virginia.

This kind of dedication is needed all over the country. I am glad that he is staying on the committee.

I think it is a great credit to the Senator that with all of his actions and all of his great accomplishments, he is now retiring to let someone else continue his efforts.

It is not the words we say here, but what the Senator has done in his 19 months of service to our veterans and their families that counts. We also know that he has done it for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Once more I congratulate the Senator for his great leadership and his manifold accomplishments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the generous remarks of the Senator from Texas. He has been a leader in the work to aid our veterans.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me before he concludes his remarks?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I want to add my commendation to those which have already been expressed by my colleagues concerning the truly exemplary work which my senior colleague has performed as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

I can appreciate, as other Senators can appreciate, his reasons for relinquishing this honor and this very important post. He has adequately explained those reasons.

Let me say that in my observation of his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been impressed by the fact that he has, at all times, been diligent in his efforts to serve the good interests of American veterans and their families. Not only has he been diligent, but he has also been effective.

He is today stating in this Chamber his decision to relinquish the chairmanship but I am sure that this does not mean that his interest in, and his services to, our veterans and their families will wane. We all know that his good work in behalf of veterans will continue.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague. Not only the veterans of America but also my colleagues who are similarly interested in veterans, owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gracious comments of my colleague from West Virginia.

I sense that there is a continuing commitment among all Members of this body to the veterans and their families, who form, as I have indicated, more than 40 percent of our population. There is still much to be done.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to join other Senators in expressing my profound appreciation for the magnificent work performed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is so characteristic of his contributions not only in this field but also in all those in which his wide interests require him to be active.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale] for his kind remarks.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Subcommittee, I wish to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] for the splendid cooperation he has always given the minority members of the subcommittee. Under his leadership, the subcommittee has continued its bipartisan approach to veterans legislation. Any disagreements—and there have been very few—have not been partisan; we have all worked under his leadership with one purpose in mind—to benefit our Nation's 26 million veterans.

I know that he is leaving this position reluctantly, but I assure him that I am looking forward to continuing our working relationship on both the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is an effective member of our subcommittee, as I indicated earlier. I am grateful for his cooperation.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senate has been involved for some days in a discussion of what I regard as perhaps the most important issue to face Congress this session; namely, the question of whether we will decide once and for all to prohibit deeply imbedded patterns of segregated living in America, by enacting a meaningful law against widely practiced efforts to restrict housing to minorities through the discriminatory sale of rentals on housing.

To me, the issue is basically a simple one. It comes down to the matter of right and wrong, to the question of whether a person, otherwise able to purchase a home, otherwise wholly suitable for homeownership and for residence within a community shall, nevertheless, be denied the opportunity to purchase a home, or to rent quarters, solely because of his color.

Mr. President, it is a tragedy that in America today the answer is that he may not purchase such a home, or rent such dwellings, in a vast majority of instances throughout the country.

The consequences that flow from this outrageous discriminatory practice have been developed at great length by many speakers in this Chamber since the pending amendment was introduced.

One of the standard arguments against fair housing is the theory—a false one—that if a Negro family moves into an all-white community, the real estate values will fall.

This is one of the oldest myths—and that is what it is—raised repeatedly by those who oppose decency in the sale and rental of housing throughout the Nation.

A significant study was made by Dr. Luigi Laurenti. It is entitled "An Economic Analysis of Property Values and Race." It was analyzed in an article in Land Economics, written by Mr. Anthony Downs, of the University of Chicago. The study has many different aspects which I shall insert in the Record and not repeat here but it states this in conclusion:

> The study's major conclusion can be stated as follows; when nonwhites enter a previously all-white neighborhood consisting primarily of single-family residences, and no other changes in neighborhood character occur, then prices of residential property in the area will probably not decline and may very well rise in comparison with prices in similar neighborhoods that have remained all white. In other words, nonwhite entry alone—as distinguished from such changes in physical use as increased density—rarely causes residential property to fall in price, and quite often causes it to rise.

Mr. President, this study, which goes on for several pages, explodes the myth that entry of nonwhites into an all-white community diminishes real estate values.

I ask unanimous consent to have the study printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Reprinted from Land Economics (University of Wisconsin) vol. 36, No. 2, May 1960]

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF PROPERTY VALUES AND RACE (LAURENTI)

Do property-prices fall when nonwhites move into a neighborhood? Probably no other question concerning real estate has created so much controversy or played such an important a role in determining the ethnic ecology of our cities. Yet objective evidence about the answer has been so scarce that the controversy has consisted mostly of hearsay, opinions, and prejudicies rather than facts. But now The Commission on Race and Housing has sponsored a study in which a mass of data has been gathered and analyzed by Luigi Laurenti and set forth in a new book entitled, *Property Values and Race.*[1] Because this study is the most comprehensive, thorough, and scientific analysis ever made concerning the impact of race upon sales prices of property, it deserves careful evaluation by appraisers, brokers, and everyone else concerned with real estate.

The study's major conclusion can be stated as follows: when nonwhites enter a previously all-white neighborhood consisting primarily of single-family residences, and no other changes in neighborhood character occur, then prices of residential property in the area will probably not decline and may very well rise in comparison with prices in similar neighborhoods that have remained all-white.[2] In other words, nonwhite entry alone—as distinguished from such changes in physical use as increased density—rarely causes residential property to fall in price, and quite often causes it to rise.

---

[1] Luigi Laurenti, *Property Values and Race* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), xix plus 256 p., $6.00. Although Laurenti uses the term *value* as equivalent to *price* I have retained the traditional distinction in this review article. Therefore, since his study concerns sales *prices* of properties I use the term *price* in many places where he refers to *value*.

This conclusion is so directly opposite to traditional opinions that it deserves extremely careful analysis. Therefore we shall examine at some length the methods used to derive this result in order to discover whether they are truly valid. Then we shall discuss the study's limitations and its implications for all cities.

The Methodology. Although the subtitle of Laurenti's work is, "Studies in Seven Cities," its real meat is an analysis of neighborhoods in San Francisco, Oakland, and Philadelphia. In order to isolate the influence of nonwhite entry upon prices of property, he chose twenty neighborhoods in which entry had occurred at some time during the past fifteen years and compared price movements in each one with price movements in one or more similar neighborhoods which had remained all white. Nineteen such "control" neighborhoods were uesd, but some were compared with more than one "test" neighborhood. Thus a total of thirty-four comparisons was made. In each one the two areas being compared were similar in size, reputation, type and price of homes, and character of residents; hence the only major difference between them was the entry of nonwhites into the "test" neighborhood.

For each area Laurenti obtained the sales prices of as many transactions as possible for the six-year period from mid-1949 to mid-1955. In San Francisco and Oakland these prices were procured from multiple-listing services; in Philadelphia they were provided by real estate directories. Over 9,700 sales prices were analyzed—a total comprising about 40 percent of all sales during the six-year study period in the areas considered.

Two methods of comparison between prices in the paired neighborhoods were employed. Where properties in both areas had very similar prices and price ranges within each area were not large, average sales prices for each quarter were compared directly. When these conditions did not apply, quarterly comparisons were made of the average ratio of prices to 1950 assessed values. In either case the end result was a series of quarterly averages for each neighborhood, which was then graphed and analyzed numerically.

The most significant results of this analysis are derived from the ratio of test-area prices to control-area prices, which was computed both before and after nonwhite entry into each test area. Changes in this ratio serve as indicators of the effect of nonwhite entry on property prices. For example, assume that two areas are being compared: Area T (the test area), into which nonwhites entered in 1951, and Area C (the control area), which is still 100 percent white. Sale prices in Area T for the pre-entry period (from the beginning of the study in 1949 until entry in 1951) averaged $8,000, whereas sales prices in Area C during the same period averaged $10,000. Thus the pre-entry ratio of test prices to control prices is .80. But for the four quarters immediately preceding the end of the study, prices averaged $9,900 in Area T and $11,000 in Area C—a ratio of .90. Thus the ratio rose .10 over the period, which is equal to 12.5 percent of its original level (.80). It is this percentage change in the test-price/control-price ratio (12.5 percent in the example) which is used to indicate the impact of nonwhite entry on prices. Whenever the ratio rises or falls by 5 percent or less after nonwhite entry the impact is considered insignificant. If the ratio increases by more than 5 percent, the relative gain of test prices over control prices implies that nonwhite entry increased property prices. If the ratio falls by more than 5 percent, the relative loss of test prices compared to control prices implies that nonwhite entry decreased property prices. This methodological description may seem unduly detailed but such detail is necessary for a full understanding of Laurenti's results.[3]

However, before we examine those results, one significant limitation of the study should be mentioned. Almost all of the neighborhoods selected consisted primarily of single-family residences occupied solely by their owners. This was true both before and after nonwhite entry. Furthermore, most of the test neighborhoods were not contiguous to other areas of nonwhite population. Some were as far as two miles from the nearest nonwhite resident when entry first occurred. These characteristics make the test neighborhoods quite different from areas of racial transition in cities such as Chicago and New York, where nonwhite entry usually occurs on the periphery of neighborhoods already heavily nonwhite, and often involves significant increases in population density. Thus the conclusions derived from Laurenti's study cannot be directly applied to transition in all other cities—a fact he himself recognizes.

Nevertheless, granted this limitation—the import of which we will discuss later—it is hard to imagine a better-designed or more scientifically-conducted study than *Property Values and Race*. A great many neighborhoods are considered, control comparisons are made throughout, the sample studied includes almost half of all the sales that occurred during the test period, and the analysis is thorough and objective. Even the effects upon prices of differences in financing between white and nonwhite buyers are proved to be irrelevant by a careful subsidiary study. In my opinion, the methodology is so well constructed and well applied that the conclusions cannot be challenged as resulting from either insufficient data or misinterpretation of evidence.

The Results. As noted above, the study's most significant results consist of changes in the ratio of test-area prices to control-area prices for each paired comparison over the period of nonwhite entry. These changes, which reflect gains and losses of test-area prices relative to control-area prices, are summarized (for all neighborhoods) in the following table:

City	Number of comparisons	Comparisons with no significant change in price ratio	Comparisons which show relative gain for test-area prices	Comparisons which show relative loss for test-area prices
San Francisco	14	7	4	3
Oakland	17	5	10	2
Philadelphia	3	1	2	0
Total	34	13	16	5
Total percent	100	38.3	47	14.7

This table indicates that *in almost half of the price-comparisons made, prices in the racially-mixed neighborhood increased significantly, relative to those in the all-white neighborhood*. Positive changes in the test-price/control-price ratio ranged from 5.1 percent to 26.3 percent and averaged 11.7 percent. In 38.3 percent of the comparisons, no significant change in the ratio was observed. *Thus in only one out of seven cases was nonwhite entry followed by a significant decline in test-area prices relative to control-area prices*. These declines ranged from 5.1 percent to 9.1 percent and averaged 6.7 percent.

It is true that erratic price-movements in many areas caused enormous short-run variations in the key ratio. Test prices sometimes zoomed far above control prices or vice versa during one quarter, only to plunge far below shortly thereafter. Thus it might be argued that comparing the ratio before and after entry is an arbitrary process with results dependent upon what moment after entry is selected for matching with the pre-entry period. However, Laurenti based his post-entry comparison upon a four-quarter period precisely to avoid biases caused by very short-run fluctuations. Furthermore, the analysis was cut off at the same moment (mid-1955) in all areas; therefore random influences on prices should cancel out over all 34 comparisons, leaving a basic pattern embodying the effects of nonwhite entry.[4] These effects contradict the prevailing opinions of most citizens to a startling degree. Specifically, Laurenti's results imply the following conclusions:

(1) There is no single invariable effect of nonwhite entry upon prices of property. Therefore it is completely false to say that nonwhite entry always causes residential property to decline in price.

(2) Nonwhite entry caused property values to rise much more often than it caused them to fall. Sales prices in test areas increased relative to those in control areas 3.5 times as often as they decreased. Furthermore, the degree of increase was significantly larger than the degree of decrease.[5]

(3) Whether prices of property in transition areas will increase or decrease relative to those in all-white areas does not depend upon the magnitude of the nonwhite influx. When the study ended, the population in Laurenti's test neighborhoods ranged from 3 percent to 75 percent nonwhite but there was no apparent correlation between the percentage of nonwhites and changes in property prices.

Why Prices Did Not Fall. Since the purpose of Laurenti's study is simply to present the facts, he does not attempt to explain in detail why his results are so different from prevailing beliefs. However, the evidence he amasses points to certain basic causes of this discrepancy, which we shall try to illuminate.

Two arguments are usually advanced to uphold the belief that nonwhite entry depresses property prices. The first states that such entry converts neighborhoods from low-density and high-quality maintenance to high-density and low-quality maintenance, resulting in rapid physical deterioration and a depreciation of even those homes that have been well maintained. However, this argument was completely inapplicable to the neighborhoods in Laurenti's study. In these areas the entering nonwhites kept up or improved the standards of density and maintenance that their white predecessors had exhibited. As noted previously, these neighborhoods consisted mainly of single-family residences.

---

[2] In the areas studied by Laurenti, 95 percent to 100 percent of the nonwhites were Negroes and almost all the whites were Caucasians.

[3] These percentages differ slightly from those given by Laurenti on page 51 because I believe his figures are in error. His error understates the upward influence of nonwhite entry on prices.

[4] One significant bias could result from the fact that Laurenti's study took place during a period of general housing shortage. Because this shortage has ended since the conclusion of his study his results need some qualification before their present applicability can be judged. This problem is discussed at length in a later section of this review.

[5] The average increase of 11.7 percent cannot be compared directly with the average decrease of 6.7 percent because the time periods involved in the individual comparisons making up both averages vary from one to six years. However, the magnitude of the difference between these two averages can be taken as a general indicator that gains in price were relatively larger than losses in price.

The second argument declares that nonwhite entry reduces prices because of panic selling. According to this view, as soon as a non-white buys a home in an all-white neighborhood many white owners become frightened and try to sell their homes immediately. This floods the market and causes a sharp fall in prices. Contrary to this view, Laurenti's graphs reveal no consistent pattern of either relative or absolute price declines immediately after nonwhite entry. This is true even though entry was completely unexpected in many areas. There were a few instances in which such panic occurred but even in these cases test-area prices usually regained their relative position shortly, and sometimes climbed even higher than control-area prices in the long run. But in most areas, there was no panic whatsoever; therefore this argument was also completely inapplicable.

One reason why so few white owners panicked was undoubtedly the widespread awareness that nonwhite entry would not lead to high density and lower maintenance standards. Thus the absence of the first factor usually cited as a cause of declining prices partially explains why the second factor also failed to appear.

The foregoing analysis shows clearly why property prices did not react to nonwhite entry in the way most people in the real estate profession expect them to react. Neither of the price-depreciating factors usually associated with nonwhite entry was present in the majority of test areas studied. Thus it is incorrect for anyone to argue that nonwhite entry *always* leads to either high-density use or panic selling or both. These outcomes *may* result but they are not inevitable consequences of nonwhite entry. Laurenti's study proves conclusively that no simple generalizations about the effects of nonwhite entry upon prices are valid; hence such effects can be predicted only after a careful analysis of the factors operative in each specific area of entry.

The Market Shift and Its Effect. One important aspect of such specific analysis is the degree to which nonwhite entry causes the market for future sales to shift from white to nonwhite buyers. Because of prevailing attitudes toward race the market for housing does not consist of a single set of available properties on the supply side and single set of buyers on the demand side. Instead, both supply and demand are divided into white and nonwhite segments. Nonwhite buyers either exclude themselves from access to the white housing supply because they do not want to live among whites, or they are involuntarily excluded by tacit collusion among realtors and sellers and by fear of violence. On the other hand, whites typically exclude themselves from access to the nonwhite housing supply because they do not wish to live in nonwhite areas. But as the nonwhite urban population grows it must be housed somehow—either by new construction on vacant land or by the shifting of extent housing from white to nonwhite use. Since most vacant land exists only in all-white areas, new housing has been built mostly within the white segment of the market, except for public housing which is usually built on land cleared for this purpose. Therefore most additions to the supply of nonwhite housing have come about through shifts of "used" housing from the white segment of the market to the nonwhite segment.

Such a shift usually starts to occur soon after nonwhites first enter an all-white area. In the areas Laurenti studied white residents rarely left *en masse* when nonwhites started moving into an all-white area; thus there was no sudden increase in the supply of homes offered for sale by whites. However, there was almost always a decrease—sometimes a sharp one—in the demand for housing by whites seeking to move into the area. This fall in white demand was invariably accompanied by the appearance of nonwhite demand for housing in the area. Once the racial "barrier" had been penetrated, nonwhites no longer felt excluded from this portion of the white housing supply and began offering to buy houses there. In fact, such transition areas were considered especially desirable by many nonwhites because they offered both decent housing and escape from nonwhite ghettos.

It is apparent from this analysis that the impact of nonwhite entry upon prices depends upon two factors: (1) the degree to which such a shift from white to nonwhite market segments takes place, and (2) differences between white and nonwhite demand for housing of a given type. The first factor simply determines the degree to which the second factor becomes operative: the more an area is shifted from one market to the other, the greater will be the effects of whatever differences exist between these markets.

Two factors in the nonwhite segment of the housing market distinguish it from the white segment: an artificial restriction of supply and a lower-centered distribution of income among buyers. The very existence of market segments creates an artificial restriction of supply for nonwhites: they cannot satisfy their demand for housing anywhere it is available, but must confine their search to areas already penetrated by nonwhites (except for the rare individuals who "pioneer" initial entry into all-white areas). This fact creates pent-up housing demand all across the nonwhite income distribution. In those sections of the distribution where the greatest number of non-whites are clustered, the backlog of demand is greatest. Since very low incomes are most numerous, demand for low income housing is very high —in fact, it creates a great pressure to convert decent housing into small units accessible to low-income consumers. Thus the artificial restriction of supply in the nonwhite market is partially responsible for the tendency of transition to cause increases in density which eventually result in physical deterioration of property.

But there is also a high demand among nonwhites for decent low-density housing accessible to middle-income consumers. An increasing number of nonwhites are skilled workers, businessmen, and professionals capable of purchasing moderate-priced homes and just as eager as whites to maintain decent housing standards. Their total number is much smaller than the number of whites who can afford the same level of housing but, because the supply of such housing available to nonwhites is so small, the intensity of demand among nonwhites is much greater. Thus when a given area of middle-price housing shifts from the white segment of the market to the nonwhite segment, the intensity of demand for it is likely to increase. This tends to raise prices relative to similar housing still in the white market segment.

On the other hand, the intensity of demand for high-priced housing is likely to be less among nonwhites than among whites. In this case the effect of restricted supply for nonwhites is outweighed by the effect of their lower incomes. So few nonwhites can afford high-priced housing that, when an area of such housing shifts from the white to the nonwhite market segment, its value is likely to decline in comparison with similar housing still in the white segment. This is exactly what happened in the one high-priced neighborhood studied by Laurenti.

The Effects of a General Housing Surplus. Thus the effect of nonwhite entry upon prices in a specific area can be predicted by analyzing two basic aspects of the ensuing change in the area's "market location:" the degree to which the area shifts from the white market to the nonwhite market, and the differences between these two markets at the relevant price-level. Both of these aspects are markedly influenced by the relation between supply and demand in the housing market as a whole.

Although the supply of housing in the United States has grown rapidly since 1945, not until 1958 did it catch up with the demand generated by the backlog from World War II and the large number of families formed during the postwar period. Thus from 1945 to 1958—the period in which Laurenti conducted his study—there was a relative shortage of housing. But during the past two years, a surplus of supply has caused the housing market to become relatively "soft." This shift from shortage to surplus will affect nonwhite impact upon property values in two ways.

First, because the surplus of supply is mainly in the white segment of the market the intensity of demand for housing among whites will decline in all neighborhoods. But demand among nonwhites for housing available to them will remain relatively high because of the artificial restriction of supply explained above. Thus for white sellers in any low- or middle-income neighborhood, the relative attractiveness of selling to nonwhites will increase. If financing is available to nonwhites, they will be willing and able to offer more for desirable property than whites will if it is not in the high-price range. As a result, nonwhite entry should occur in more predominantly single-family neighborhoods not adjacent to ghettos than it has in the past.

The second effect will take place once nonwhite entry occurs. Since whites looking for homes have more alternatives than they had in the period of shortage, and since most whites do not wish to live in transition neighborhoods, fewer will offer to buy homes in such neighborhoods. Once a nonwhite citizen enters a previously all-white area, the "normal turnover" demand among whites for homes in that area will fall off much faster than it did in periods of shortage. Whites living in the neighborhood who wish to move will find few white buyers who can match the prices that nonwhite buyers will be offering; therefore they are more likely to sell to nonwhites. In other words, the "soft" condition of the white housing market will cause any area where nonwhite entry has occurred to shift into the nonwhite market faster than it would have under conditions of shortage. This is precisely what happened in one of the Oakland neighborhoods which Laurenti studied, where white demand had already sagged before nonwhites entered and reversed the falling trend of values.

Essentially, a surplus in the white housing market increases the difference between the intensity of demand found in the white market and that found in the nonwhite market. Because nonwhites are denied access to most of the housing supply the intensity of their demand is not immediately affected by additions to supply made in the white sector. This changes the "terms of trade" in favor of nonwhites and should result in wider entry of nonwhites into all-white areas and faster transition of those areas to high levels of nonwhite occupancy once entry has occurred. However, these tendencies could be largely offset by a decline in the rate at which nonwhites migrate into Northern and Western urban areas. If this rate subsides, as it shows signs of doing, then the intensity of demand in the nonwhite market may decline also.[6] This would tend to make the white and nonwhite markets more alike, since a fall in demand in the latter would have the same effect as the increase in supply in the former. In any case, Laurenti's study has proved that the effect of nonwhite entry upon prices can be determined only by specific analyses of supply and demand, rather than by shibboleths about the inevitable relations between race and property prices.

---

[6] Very few accurate data are available on the rate of migration of nonwhites into Northern and Western cities. However, Real Estate Research Corporation makes annual surveys in Chicago to determine the number of blocks which have more than 25 percent

The Other Cities Studied. Analysis of Laurenti's findings concerning San Francisco, Oakland, and Philadelphia occupies 92 percent of *Property Values and Race*. The other 8 percent consist of brief resumes of studies made in Chicago, Kansas City, Detroit, and Portland by five other authors. These studies were not part of the project established by the Commission on Race and Housing, but are germane to the general topic even though completely unrelated to each other in method, scope, and times covered. Their conclusions generally support Laurenti's own analysis with one interesting exception. In Portland, Oregon, studies were made of five neighborhoods into which a single Negro family moved, not followed by other non-whites. So few sales were analyzed that the results are dubious but certain outcomes are of interest. First, in none of the areas was there panic-selling by whites. Second, in three out of the four areas where there were enough data for analysis, prices did not fall absolutely but did decline relative to those in comparable all-white areas. These results tend to confirm our preceding analysis of the relevant factors in forecasting what prices will do after nonwhite entry. Evidently the appearance of one Negro family shifted the neighborhood *out* of the white market but not far enough *into* the nonwhite market to hold prices stable relative to similar all-white areas.

Limitations of the Study's Application. Although Laurenti's conclusions cannot, in my opinion, be strongly challenged on methodological grounds, this does not mean they will be universally accepted. In fact, a basic objection is sure to be raised against applying these conclusions to cities other than the ones he studied. This objection states that, since every city is unique, conclusions derived from San Francisco, Oakland, and Philadelphia are not necessarily applicable elsewhere. Such a view is most likely to be encountered in the form of remarks like, "it may be true on the West Coast, but in *my* city, when nonwhites move in, property prices fall." How valid is this criticism? Its validity depends upon two factors: (1) whether nonwhite entry in any given city occurs under conditions significantly different from those studied by Laurenti, and (2) if so, whether it can be proved that the differences involved mean nonwhite entry will always cause property prices to fall.

The first factor is certainly operative in a great many cities. In Chicago, for example, nonwhite expansion nearly always occurs on the edge of a giant ghetto and usually (though not invariably) involves increases in density and decreases in income and occupational-status levels in the transition neighborhoods. None of these conditions were extant in the neighborhoods Laurenti studied. The same differences in accompanying conditions exist in New York, Detroit, Milwaukee, Newark, and many other cities with significant nonwhite minorities. In fact, these particular differences are really the only relevant grounds for arguing that the conclusions Laurenti derived in three cities are not applicable to all others. The question then becomes: does the fact that these particular conditions have usually coincided with nonwhite entry in certain cities mean that such entry must lead to declining property prices in those cities?

Surprisingly enough, the answer can be derived from Laurenti's study even though he did not base his conclusions on neighborhoods where the above conditions existed. His methodology is designed to isolate the effects of racial change upon property prices from the effects of all other causal factors. Where racial transition is accompanied by increased density or lower levels of income and occupational status the effects of these factors upon property prices cannot be analytically separated from the effect of race *per se*. This intermingling of effects may lead people to "blame" racial change for results actually caused by other factors. For example, in some cities racial transition is usually accompanied by conversion of old single-family dwellings to multi-family occupancy. This causes a rise in population density and rapid physical deterioration of the converted properties. The whole neighborhood becomes downgraded and even well-maintained homes still used by only one family decline in price. Such declines are frequently attributed to racial change; whereas they are really caused by the higher density and lower economic status of the incoming population.

To escape the analytical difficulties inherent in such multiple causation, Laurenti studied only neighborhoods where racial change was not accompanied by increases in density or declines in maintenance standards. He therefore omitted neighborhoods on the periphery of nonwhite ghettos and instead selected those into which nonwhites had "leapfrogged" over sizeable distances from the nearest previous nonwhite residences. But in many American cities such "leapfrogging" is very rare; almost all nonwhite expansion occurs on the borders of large ghettos. Therefore in such cities realtors and homeowners can argue that Laurenti's conclusions simply do not apply since racial change is almost always associated with higher density and lower maintenance standards. Under these conditions, nonwhite entry seems to lead directly to neighborhood deterioration, with its ensuing declines in property prices.

Although this argument contains an important kernel of truth, it is still essentially false. The kernel of truth is that racial change is indeed bound up with other changes in many cities, for a variety of reasons. But one of the most significant of these reasons is the belief that nonwhite entry *always* leads to falling prices—a belief which Laurenti's study decisively disproves. When this erroneous belief is accepted by white homeowners, they strongly oppose entry of nonwhites into all-white areas of decent housing because they fear falling prices. Such opposition keeps nonwhites bottled up in ghettos and makes the density in them so high that whenever a new border area opens up for nonwhite settlement it is flooded with residents far beyond its capacity to house decently. This process tends to confirm the original (but erroneous) belief that nonwhite entry is invariably accompanied by rising density and falling values. A vicious circle is created, founded on what Robert Merton has labeled a "self-fulfilling prophecy:" "A *false* definition of a situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true."[7] If "leapfrogging" by middle- and upper-income nonwhites into decent all-white neighborhoods were permitted in all cities (as it has been in San Francisco and Oakland) then at least some instances of nonwhite entry without higher density or falling maintenance would occur everywhere. Such universal evidence would destroy the belief that nonwhite entry *inevitably* means deteriorating neighborhoods. But at present this belief remains unchallenged in many cities because its continued existence blocks the creation of situations which would disprove it.[8]

CONCLUSION

The great contribution of Laurenti's study is its irrefutable proof that this belief is false. By isolating racial change from the other factors which are so closely connected with it in many cities he proves that it alone need not lead to falling prices. True, such isolation prevents his conclusions from being directly applicable to many American cities. But at the same time it lays the foundation for helping those cities break out of the vicious circle caused by erroneous beliefs about race and property prices.

In itself, Laurenti's study does not automatically destroy all connection between racial transition and factors like high density or low maintenance. If we wish to discover just why these conditions often accompany racial transition and what steps can be made to disengage them from it then the whole transition process must be studied with the same intensity and objectivity which Laurenti has brought to bear upon one part of it. No doubt in some cities such a disengagement will prove a difficult task requiring immense efforts. But insofar as the connection between nonwhite entry and declining property prices is perpetuated by the belief that such a connection is inevitable, Laurenti's proof that this belief is false definitely furthers better housing and racial equality.

---

nonwhite occupancy. Yearly changes in this total provide a crude measure of changes in the overall rate of growth of the nonwhite population. Such growth is caused by both natural increase and net immigration but the former should provide either constant or increasing annual population increments. Hence any decline in growth rates can be attributed to declines in net immigration. The number of blocks per week converted from less than 25 percent nonwhite occupancy to more than 25 percent nonwhite occupancy for various periods from 1950 to 1959 is as follows:

Average number blocks changed per week

Period covered	
April 1950 (census)—October 1952	2.96
October 1952–October 1953	2.85
October 1953–April 1955	2.15
April 1955–April 1956	2.35
April 1956–July 1957	3.78
July 1957–August 1958	2.59
August 1958–July 1959	1.94

These figures indicate a significant decline in the rate of nonwhite expansion from its peak in 1956–1957.

[7] Robert K. Merton, "The Self-fulfilling Prophecy," *Antioch Review*, Summer 1946, p. 208.

[8] Such a "self-fulfilling prophecy" recently occurred in Deerfield, Illinois. When a builder revealed his plans to sell some new homes to Negroes, local residents caused a furor, stating that they feared falling property prices. This furor was so great that two other builders who had been planning to construct all-white housing withdrew from the area, thereby causing land prices to fall. They did not depart because they feared the entry of Negroes (none have yet entered and perhaps none will) but because the reaction of the community, and especially of the city building department, created what they believed was an unfavorable climate for any builder. Thus it was the uproar about falling prices that turned demand away from the area and caused prices to fall—not the appearance (or potential appearance) of Negroes. Yet the results will undoubtedly be cited as confirmation of the original fear that Negro entry would cause prices to fall—even though not one Negro has entered the area.

Because his work is not yet widely known and because prevalent attitudes regarding race and housing are reinforced by noneconomic prejudices, Laurenti's study will probably take years to have significant impact. But for informed members of the real estate profession it is of immediate importance. From now on, predicting the effects of nonwhite entry upon residential prices must be considered a matter of analyzing the relevant markets involved in each specific area rather than applying any invariant rules about the effects of race. Furthermore, Laurenti's evidence that nonwhite entry does not depress prices shifts the burden of proof onto those who claim the opposite. For these reasons, in my opinion, the Fund for the Republic certainly received an excellent return from its investment in *Property Values and Race.*

ANTHONY DOWNS.

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, another argument which has been made in favor of the pending amendment is that real estate values in the ghetto are exorbitantly high, that the artificial crowding of Americans because of color into the slum and ghetto areas of the rotting cores of American cities has resulted in exorbitantly high rents, and exorbitant costs for the purchasing of housing. I do not believe there is any doubt about that thesis. Many have written about it.

One example of the overwhelming evidence is a recent statement issued by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, based on a study made of the classified ads published in the Washington Post on a single day, September 17, 1967.

The study concludes, on the basis of these ads, and further study:

> . . . that rents in the slums are not cheap. And that if suburban units were open to them, quite a few nonwhite families could get more, better, and newer housing for their money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the study to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENTS IN SLUMS AND SUBURBS

(NOTE.—A brief comparison of rentals for units in the inner city of Washington, D.C., and rentals for apartments in the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia.)

Attached are data sheets on 16 inner city units compiled from the records of the Washington Housing and Planning Association and the housing office of the United Planning Organization. Although this is a random sample, it is a valid one of the kind of housing available to slum dwellers in the Nation's Capital.

Several of these units were selected by the Leadership Conference and compared with ads for units of comparable size and price being offered in the suburbs. All of the ads were taken from the classified columns of *The Washington Post* for Sunday, September 17.

The Conference is aware of how inexact such a comparison is. The Conference does not have studies of the units advertised to determine how accurate their glowing descriptions are. The comparison also does not take into account such a variable as family size in relation to the size of a housing unit. Nevertheless, the Conference believes the essential impression the comparison gives is correct: that rents in the slums are not cheap. And that if suburban units were open to them, quite a few non-white families could get more, better and newer housing for their money.

PROBLEMS WITH WHICH UPO HOUSING OFFICE HAS HAD CONTACT DURING PAST 2 WEEKS

Address	Rent and utilities	Number of bedrooms	Number of occupants	Comments
1. Georgia Ave and Morton St	$85.00	2	5	Ceiling leaks; electrical shorted; broken plaster.
2. Morton St. NW	80.00	1½ rooms in each unit		46 violations in 4-unit building; plaster never put in.
3. Hiatt Pl	95.00	2	7	95 violations (21 violations on 2d floor, which is the 2-bedroom unit renting at $95 per month).
4. Holmead Pl. NW	102.00	1		
5. Hill Top Apartments, Eastern Ave. NE	137.50	2		One of better management firms; property in fair shape although facilities are lacking.

INFORMATION FROM THE CASE RECORDS OF WASHINGTON PLANNING & HOUSING ASSOCIATION

Address	Rent and utilities	Number of bedrooms	Children	Comments
6. W St. SE	$108 per month		6	Leaking in basement; doors off hinges (landlord re fuses to fix).
7. Florida Ave. NW	$70 per month	1 room in family house	4	
8. Harvard St. NW	$76 per month	1 bedroom, shared kitchen and bath	6	Rats; roaches; leaking ceiling.
9. Monroe St. NW	$90 per month (uti'ities were to be included; gas and electric cut off).	1 bedroom	3	Toilet doesn't work; roaches.
10. Harvard St. NW	$120 per month	2 bedrooms	4	Insanitary; unsafe; furnace located in hall.
11. 8th St. NW	$20 per week	1 bedroom	3	No heat; falling plaster; no trash cans.
12. 8th St. NW	$75 per month; utilities $40	2 bedrooms	7	Poor plumbing and cracked plaster.
13. 8th St. NW	$100 per month	5 rooms	6	Rat holes; broken water heater; plumbing needs repair; windows in poor condition.
14. 2d St. NE	$82.50 per month	2 rooms (kitchen and bath)	3	
15. Girard St. NW	$114 per month	1 room with bath on 3d floor; shares kitchen downstairs.	5	
16. Central Ave. NE	$134 per month; utilities, $52	3 bedrooms	8	
17. 12th Pl. NW	$105 per month and utilities	2 bedrooms	4	Wiring is so bad they have no electricity.
18. 12th Pl. NW	$92.50 per month	do	7	Falling plaster; draft from fireplace.

IN THE DISTRICT

Description	Address	Rent	Comment
1. 2-bedroom apartment.	Georgia Ave. and Morton St.	$85	Ceiling leaks, electrical shorted, broken plaster.
2. 2-bedroom apartment.	Hiatt Pl	95	95 violations (21 violations on 2d floor where $95 unit is located).
3. 1½-room unit	Morton St. NW	80	46 violations in 4-unit building. Plaster never put in.

SOME SUBURBAN EQUIVALENTS

1. Bladensburg, Md., 1-bedroom apartment, $89.50. Shopping and transportation at your door. Minutes from center of District of Columbia.
2. Bolling-Eastover, large modern apartment project, 1–2 bedrooms, school, bus, shops, $83.50 up.
3. Andrews area, 1 bedroom, $79.50; 2 bedrooms $95. All utilities included; completely redecorated; immediate occupancy.
4. District Heights, Md., $79.75. 1-bedroom apartment, all utilities included; free olympic pool.
5. Andrews, 1–2 bedroom apartment, $79.50. Includes electricity, water, heat, gas at no extra.
6. Greenbelt, 1-bedroom apartments off Washington Parkway, from $77.50.
7. Queenstown, beautiful new olympic-size swimming pool open; wired for air conditioning; walk-in closets; extra large rooms. 1-bedroom apartment, $84.50; 2-bedroom apartment, $89.50. All utilities included.
8. Hyattsville, Md., 1-bedroom apartment, $83.50; 2-bedroom apartment, $91.50. Includes utilities and 11-ft. refrigerator; wired for air conditioning, also furnished apartments. Direct bus service downtown shopping center—picnic groves.

IN THE DISTRICT

Description	Address	Rent	Comment
1. 2 bedrooms	Hill Top Apartments, Eastern Ave. NE.	$137.50	One of the better management firms; property in fair shape although facilities are lacking.
2. 2 bedrooms	Harvard St. NW	120.00	Insanitary, unsafe; furnace located in hall.
3. 1 room and bath on 3d floor, shares kitchen downstairs.	Girard St. NW	114.00	

SOME SUBURBAN EQUIVALENTS

1. Brentwood, Md., 2 bedrooms, $119.50; air conditioned, includes all utilities except electric. Convenient to schools, shops, and public transportation.
2. We have a professionally staffed nursery school right on the premises for the kids and they don't even have to cross the street to walk to school. Our apartments have plenty of "growing" space, dishwashers, individually controlled air conditioning and heating. 2-bedroom apartment, $137.50, all utilities included.
3. Hillcrest Heights, Md., apartment, first floor, living room-dining room combined; 2 bedrooms and bath with recreation room. $112.50 plus utilities.
4. College Park, Riverdale. 2-bedroom apartment, $104. 50.
5. Coral Hills, 2-bedroom apartment $104 50; 3 bedrooms $120.50.
6. Falls Church, Va., 2-bedroom apartment $137.50, all utilities included. Patios and balconies, quality construction providing maximum soundproofing, close to schools, shopping, churches, public transportation, security patrolled, air conditioned, swimming pools.

7. Marlboro Pike, Hillside, Md., 1 bedroom and den, from $123.50; 2 bedrooms, from $133.50; all utilities included; furnished apartments available; air conditioned, swimming pool, adjacent public transportation and shops.
8. Alexandria, Va., air conditioned, yard space for barbecues, first floor powder room; 2 bedrooms, $117.50; plus utilities, individually controlled air conditioning; supersize kitchen with space for washer and dryer (rent ours or use your own). Large, double door, automatic defrost refrigerator with frozen food section. Loads of closets and storage space.
9. Hillside, Md., 2-bedroom apartment $125; air conditioned, swimming pool, free drapes, all utilities included, GE dishwasher available.
10. Riverdale, Bladensburg; 2 bedrooms, near schools, bus. $104.50 including utilities.
11. District Heights, Md.; 2-bedroom apartment $120; 2-bedroom townhouse, from $132. Square dancing, bowling teams, Teen Club, Saturday movies for kids, community lounge, swimming pool. 24-hour maintenance service, air conditioned, security guard.
12. Seat Pleasant; 2 bedrooms, all utilities included, $125.
13. Silver Spring; 2-bedroom vacancy in quiet, wellkept building overlooking Sligo Creek Park, $117.50 per month.
14. Silver Spring; off East-West Highway. 2 bedrooms, from $132.50, including all utilities, individual temperature controls, swimming pools.
15. Silver Spring; 2 bedrooms $119.50, including all utilities.
16. 2-bedroom apartments, $130, plus utilities. Conveniently located in Silver Spring, these air conditioned apartments are near Walter Reed, NIH, Wheaton, and local shopping centers. Swimming pool available.
17. Andrews AFB-Census Bureau; swimming pool, air conditioned, balcony; 2 bedrooms, $117.50.
18. Oxon Hill, Md.; air conditioned, 1 and 2 bedrooms (some with den) from $111.50, all utilities included.
19. Riverdale; air conditioned elevator apartment building. All utilities included. 2-bedroom apartment, $125 per month. See Resident Manager, apartment 110.
20. Riverdale, Md.; fully air conditioned, swimming pool, cross ventilation; 2 bedrooms from $129.50

IN THE DISTRICT

Description	Address	Rent
1. 3 bedrooms	Central Ave. NE	$134 per month; utilities, $52; total, $189 per month.

SOME SUBURBAN EQUIVALENTS

1. On Suitland Road opposite Census. Newest in colonial style and old-fashioned spaciousness, exposed brick dining room and kitchen walls, beamed ceilings, 1½ ceramic tiled baths, extra large closets, frigidaire, custom kitchens, private balconies or terraces, traverse rods, gas air conditioning, 5 minutes from the Beltway, swimming pool. 1-bedroom apartments, $125 including all utilities.
2. Complete family community. Large swimming and wading pool, fully equipped playgrounds, air-conditioned apartments with large color coordinated kitchen with eating space; outside windows, disposals, broom and storage closets, large linen closets. Walk to Suitland Shopping Center. Express and local bus at entrance. Children can walk to all schools. Supervised day nursery on premises. Security guard. 1-bedroom apartments $116.50; 2-bedroom apartments, $134.50; 2 bedrooms, den apartments, $151.50. All utilities included.
3. Andrews Air Force Base area. Swimming pool, individual control air conditioning. Bus stop on premises with local and express service to downtown, convenient to schools and shopping. Patio or balcony in every apartment, window in kitchen; entrance foyer, huge closets, small pet building. 1-bedroom, $109.50; bedroom with den, $119.50; 2 bedrooms, $127.50; 3 bedrooms, $154.50. All utilities included.
4. Family-size 2- and 3-bedroom air-conditioned apartments. All have extra-large walk-in closets and paneled living room available. Color coordinated kitchens, with breakfast bars; double load washer and dryer in each building, swimming and wading pool; tennis and basketball court, fully equipped playground. Express bus to District of Columbia, Eastover Shopping Center nearby, pet building available. 1-bedroom apartment $116.50; 1-bedroom, den apartment, $135.50; 2-bedrooms apartment, $129.50; 2 bedrooms, den apartment, $149.50. All utilities included.

IN THE DISTRICT

Description	Address	Rent	Comment
1. 2-bedroom apartment.	12th Pl. NW	$105 per month plus utilities.	Wiring is so bad they have no electricity.

SOME SUBURBAN EQUIVALENTS

1. Alexandria; 1 bedroom apt., $79.50 to $95; 2 bedroom apt., $105; newly decorated, clean and ready for inspection, convenient to shopping and transportation, offstreet parking, drying facilities.
2. Alexandria; spacious 1- and 2-bedroom apartments from $92.50 on beautifully landscaped acreage and only 10 minutes—really minutes—from downtown Washington, only 5 minutes to Beltway, Pentagon, or National Airport. Presidential Gardens offers you newly renovated apartments, private balconies, redecorating freedom, large closets, secretarial switchboard, free parking, laundry in each building and convenient shopping facilities and bus service.
3. Falls Church, Va.; 1-bedroom apartment, $88 to $90; 2-bedroom apartments, $108 to $110; including all utilities except electricity. Short-term lease available. Use your own washing machine in apartments. A few furnished apartments available. Shopping center and schools on site.
4. Your choice of 11 floor plans from $107. School bus inside community. Nursery on premises. Two large pools, and wading pool, parklike setting with picnic areas, barbeques, and fully equipped playgrounds. Express bus at front door to downtown District of Columbia and Marlow Heights Shopping Center. Building is available for people with small pets. 1-bedroom apartments, $107, all utilities included.
5. Arlington; 1-bedroom apartment, $96.50; 2-bedroom apartment, $108.50; all utilities included.
6. Arlington, south; large garden apartments, 10 minutes to Pentagon, Navy Annex and the District of Columbia; bus at door. Off-street parking. 1-bedroom apartment, $100; 2-bedroom apartment, $112; all utilities included.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on February 1, 1968, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights sent letters to every Member of this body enclosing the resolutions unanimously adopted by them relating to the matter which is now before us.

A part of that statement reads as follows:

> The bill the Senate is now debating, the civil rights protection act, would do much to protect citizens from violence in the exercise of such elementary rights as serving on juries, going to school, getting a job, using public transportation, visiting a restaurant or movie or enjoying the parks or other facilities paid for with their taxes. It would protect those working to help people achieve and exercise the rights to which they are constitutionally entitled.

This is a point to which I wish to make strong reference:

> But this bill alone will not advance us very far toward full equality. It does not address itself to two glaring injustices—the denial of equal access to housing and jobs. If the Fair Housing Act and the bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission now before the Congress are added to the civil rights protection bill, we would then have legislation that would at least offer hope that Congress means to continue the work it began in 1964 and 1965 of correcting injustices through law.

This is further evidence that those closest to this problem regard the fair housing issue of fundamental and substantial significance in the solution of social problems in our country today.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I previously referred, the statement adopted by the board, and its resolution on fair housing, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR: At its annual meeting last Tuesday night, the National Board of the Leadership Conference unanimously adopted a statement calling for a single civil rights bill in 1968, one that contains the civil rights protection act now before the Senate, and as amendments to that, the national fair housing act (S. 1358) and the bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (S. 1308). We enclose a copy of the Board's statement.

We also enclose two documents that show the growing support for open housing legislation. One is a resolution adopted on January 18 by 350 civic leaders from 17 states, at an Action Conference on Housing sponsored by the Urban Coalition. These leaders, including many members of the business community, gave specific support to S. 1358.

The other item gives the results of a recent Harris poll which found that among the reasons for the current loss of confidence in this Congress is its failure to pass a fair housing law.

We bring these matters to your attention because we feel, together, they are evidence of a broad sentiment in this country to continue civil rights progress through legislative means.

We respectfully urge your support of programs endorsed by the 115 national organizations in the Leadership Conference and by a large cross-section of the American people.

Sincerely yours,
ARNOLD ARONSON,
Secretary.

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL BOARD MEETING OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, JANUARY 30, 1968

At this time of racial and social crisis, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, on the occasion of its annual board meeting, reaffirms its conviction that solutions to our nation's domestic problems can and must be achieved through peaceful, democratic means and within the American political system.

It is a reaffirmation made with a sense of burning urgency. For unless this Congress and this Administration act quickly, our reaffirmation may become empty rhetoric.

The bill the Senate is now debating, the civil rights protection act, would do much to protect citizens from violence in the exercise of such elementary rights as serving on juries, going to school, getting a job, using public transportation, visiting a restaurant or movie or enjoying the parks or other facilities paid for with their taxes. It would protect those working to help people achieve and exercise the rights to which they are constitutionally entitled.

But this bill alone will not advance us very far toward full equality. It does not address itself to two glaring injustices—the denial of equal access to housing and jobs. If the Fair Housing Act and the bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission now before the Congress are added to the civil rights protection bill, we would then have legislation that would at least offer hope that Congress means to continue the work it began in 1964 and 1965 of correcting injustices through law.

We therefore call upon the Senate to combine the three bills into a single measure and to keep the Civil Rights Act of 1968 the pending business of the Senate until the filibuster is broken and this broader bill is passed. We call upon the President to exert the utmost influence in support of this course of action.

We deplore current efforts that tend to compromise the civil rights protection bill rather than strengthen it. The debilitating compromises being circulated are unnecessary and unacceptable retreats from the Fourteenth Amendment. We urge the shelving of these proposed compromises and the return to the civil rights offensive through the passage of the fair housing and equal employment amendments.

Because we believe that civil rights require not only the establishment and enforcement of rights in law, but also the realization of social and economic conditions in which alone the fulfillment of these rights is possible, we reaffirm our support of a legislative program that will guarantee decent jobs to all who are able to work, adequate housing, full education and a living income to all citizens mired in poverty.

We support the President in his call to private industry to help find 500,000 jobs for the hard-core unemployed. But it is a task that cannot be left to private industry alone. We urge enactment of legislation already before this Congress that would oblige the government to act as employer of last resort by channeling workers into needed public service jobs.

We also support the President's call for "a 10-year campaign to build six million new decent housing units for low and middle-income families."

The announced cuts in anti-poverty programs underscore the need for this Congress to provide adequate funds for the welfare and education programs it has already authorized. We know too well the disillusionment created when a program of promise is held out to desperate people and then withdrawn. We call on this session to vote sufficient funds to enable threatened programs to continue.

The first session of the 90th Congress committed a crime against the poor when it adopted welfare provisions that force mothers to take jobs, often wretched ones, or lose their benefits, and that put severe limits on aid to children in fatherless homes.

We therefore call upon this session to repeal these provisions and upon the President and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to see that defenseless people do not suffer.

The goals we set forth tonight are modest, minimal and necessary. We shall do all in our power to fulfill them in 1968. We cannot and must not falter in our drive toward full equality.

Urban Coalition

(By the National Action Conference on Expanding Equal Housing Opportunities, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., January 18, 1968)

CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Fair housing legislation

It is hereby resolved that this conference on equal opportunity in housing recommend its support in behalf of the Fair Housing Act of 1967, S. 1358 now pending in the Congress. Be it further resolved that the Steering Committee of the Urban Coalition be hereby urged to reaffirm its previously adopted support of this pending legislation.

It is hereby resolved that this conference be recorded as supporting the adoption of state and local fair housing legislation. Such laws should be comprehensive in coverage and provide for meaningful and effective enforcement.

This conference hereby recommends the support by national and local groups of the position of the plaintiff in Jones versus Mayer, the case now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court. Such support should be in the form of briefs *amicus*.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we have not had an opportunity as yet in this discussion to develop at adequate length the constitutional questions concerning the fair housing proposal. I understand the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who is one of the chief sponsors of the measure now pending before us, will develop that matter to some extent; but I would like to include, in addition, at this point in my remarks, a summary of the constitutional issues as I see them and the arguments which I think, beyond all doubt, explode any question that could be raised about the constitutionality of fair housing.

As I stated yesterday, the Attorney General of the United States, a distinguished panel of deans of leading law schools throughout the country, and other documents I think once and for all establish that, while there may be some problems in connection with the issue, one of those problems is not the constitutional one.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks an analysis of the constitutional basis justifying the amendment now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Constitutionality

Information submitted by the Department of Justice last year, and the evidence gathered by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress has clearly established the constitutional bases for this legislation.

To support jurisdiction under the Commerce Clause, it was shown that housing contributed, in 1965, more than $27 billion of new investment to the economy.[1] A large portion of housing construction materials are shipped in interstate commerce. Forty-one million tons of lumber and finished wood stock were shipped in the United States in 1963. Forty-three percent of this material was shipped 500 miles or more.[2] Millions of tons of brick, millwork, wood products, furniture, glass and other housing materials are shipped in interstate commerce every year.

Much of the financing of housing crosses state lines. In 1960, 2.4 million out of a total of 14.5 million one-family occupant-owned dwellings subject to mortgage were located in a State other than that of the mortgage lender.[3] Almost 40 per cent of all the non-farm mortgages on property located in California, for example, were given to secure loans, the funds for which came from outside the State.[4]

Each year, one family out of every 30 in the population moves its place of residence to a different State.[5]

Discrimination in housing affects this interstate commerce in several ways. The confinement of Negroes and other minority groups to older homes[6] in ghettoes restricts the number of new homes which are built and consequently reduces the amount of building materials and residential financing which moves across state lines. Negroes, especially those in the professions or in business, are less likely to change their place of residence to another state when housing discrimination would force them to move their families into ghettoes;[7] the result is both to reduce the interstate movement of individuals and to hinder the efficient allocation of labor among the interstate components of the economy.

Congress has ample power, under the Commerce Clause, to protect interstate commerce from adverse effects such as these. *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294; *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 189, 192. That power is not restricted to goods or persons in transit. It extends to all activities which affect interstate commerce—even if the goods or persons engaged in their production are not, or may never be, traveling in commerce. *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 302; *Labor Board* v. *Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.*, 301 U.S. 241, 257. The power exists even when the effects upon which it is based are minor, or when taken individually, might be regarded as insignificant. *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111, 125; *Mabee* v. *White Plains Publishing Co.*, 327 U.S. 178. And it does not matter that when Congress exercises its power under the Commerce Clause, its motives are not solely to protect commerce. We can as validly act for moral reasons. *Heart of Atlanta Motel* v. *United States*, 379 U.S. 241, 257.

* * * * *

Our power to act under the Fourteenth Amendment is equally clear. It derives from Section 5 of that Amendment, which states:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

A recent example of Congressional action pursuant to this clause is found in Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, conferring voting rights on certain citizens unable to read or understand English. (42 U.S.C. 1973(e)). In upholding Section 4(e) as a valid exercise of Congressional power, the Supreme Court said, in *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan*, 384 U.S. 641, 652–56, that Congress not only could legislate to nullify or forbid State action which it considers invidiously discriminatory, but could legislate as well to remove obstacles in the way of persons seeking the equal benefits of government.

Legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing on account of race, color, religion or national origin would be sustainable on this basis. Discrimination in housing forces its victims to live in segregated areas—ghettos—and the benefits of government are less available in such areas. Children raised in ghettos are more likely to go to inferior public schools.[8] Their parents are more likely to lack adequate public transportation facilities to commute to and from work, and so will miss employment opportunities.[9] Local building and housing codes are often not effectively enforced in ghettos.[10] Federal subsidies for private housing bypass the ghettos and go instead to the predominantly white suburbs.[11] Freeways are typically routed through ghettos, disrupting neighborhoods and displacing families, because land is cheaper and the inhabitants less able to organize politically to oppose them.[12]

---

[1] *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1966, Table 454, p. 322.

[2] *1963 Census of Transportation, Commodity Transportation Survey, Shipper Series, Lumber and Wood Products, Except Furniture* (*Group II*), *Preliminary Report*, Table 5, p. 7.

[3] *1960 Census of Housing, Volume V., Part I, Residential Finance—Homeowner Properties.*

[4] Leo Grebler, "California's Dependence on Capital Imports for Mortgage Investment," *California Management Review*, Spring 1963, Vol. V, No. 3, page 47, at 48–49.

[5] United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Americans at Mid-Decade*, Series P–23, No. 16, January 1966, pp. 4–7, 17–18.

[6] See Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* 349–50.

[7] See *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 300. The armed forces also encounter difficulties from off-base segregation in transferring servicemen from one state to another. President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, Initial Report, Equality of Treatment and Opportunity of Negro Military Personnel Stationed within the United States, 47 (1963).

[8] *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, Vol. 1 and 2, Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., 1967.

[9] "White House Aiding Urban Transit Programs to Make It Easier for Poor to Get to Jobs" by Robert B. Semple, Jr., *New York Times*, March 20, 1967, p. 17.

[10] *Law and Poverty 1965* by Patricia M. Wald, National Conference on Law and Poverty, Washington, D.C., June, 1965, pp. 12–20.

[11] *Housing*, Report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Vol. 4, Washington, D.C., 1961;

Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Vol. 1, Report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., 1967, pp. 20–25.

Most significantly of all, law enforcement is least effective in the ghetto, although it is there it is needed the most.[13]

There is an additional basis under the Fourteenth Amendment to support fair housing legislation. Section 5 of the Amendment authorizes Congress to *enforce* the Amendment's provision—one of which is the Equal Protection Clause. Enforcement, in the legal sense, traditionally includes both the prevention of violations and the punishment[14] and correction of the effects[15] of past violations. It follows that if the States in the past denied to persons within their jurisdictions the equal protection of laws, and if the effects of their denials are still present, Congress possesses the power to correct those effects. Similarly, the Fifth Amendment, which has been interpreted as imposing equal protection obligations on the Federal Government, *Bolling* v. *Sharp,* 347 U.S. 497 (1954) grants Congress the power to correct the enduring effects of past denials of equal protection by the Federal Government.

Such denials, state and Federal, were in fact numerous, and their effects in housing are still present. The States and their local subdivisions enacted zoning laws denying Negroes and other minorities the right to live in white neighborhoods until the Supreme Court put a stop to the practice in 1917. *Buchanan* v. *Warley,* 245 U.S. 60. Local ordinances with the same effect, although operating more deviously in an attempt to avoid the Court's prohibition, were still being enacted and struck down by the courts as late as 1930. *Harmon* v. *Tyler,* 273 U.S. 668; *City of Richmond* v. *Deans,* 281 U.S. 704 (1930). During these years there also came into use privately drawn racially restrictive covenants in deeds, which "ran with the land" and bound successive owners irrespective of their personal inclinations. Such covenants quickly became the major weapon for keeping minorities out of good housing,[16] and they were fully honored by State and lower Federal courts (See 3 A.L.R. 2d 466, 474 77 (1949) until the Supreme Court ruled in 1948 that they could not constitutionally be enforced. *Shelley* v. *Kraemer,* 334 U.S. 1; *Hurd* v. *Hodge,* 334 U.S. 24; *Barrows* v. *Jackson,* 346 U.S. 249.

And the problem of government-practiced discrimination in housing is not entirely one of the past. The Supreme Court, in affirming the California Supreme Court's decision invalidating "Proposition 14," stated, on May 29, 1967, that the state's constitutional amendment adopted under Proposition 14 "was intended to authorize, and does authorize, racial discrimination in the housing market. The right to discriminate is now one of the basic policies of the State." *Reitman* v. *Mulkey,* (slip opinion) No. 483, at 11.

This "state action" was struck down by the Court, but it illustrates the point that it is not only state action of long ago that has barred the way to equal opportunity in housing.

Throughout this period and even somewhat after the Supreme Court's historic ruling in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer,* the Federal Housing Administration actively encouraged the use of racially restrictive covenants, in most cases flatly refusing to grant its mortgage insurance or guarantees unless such covenants were included in the deeds concerned.[17] FHA went so far as to recommend language for a model restrictive covenant to be used in deeds for mortgage property insured by the agency.

At the same time, the Federal and State governments were cooperating to enforce segregation in public housing. Lower federal courts approved such efforts as late as 1941,[18] and although courts more recently have, when they had the opportunity, invalidated them, efforts to keep public housing segregated were continuing in the North until at least 1955 (See *Detroit Housing Commission* v. *Lewis,* 226 F. 2d 180) and in Kentucky, Missouri and Tennessee until at least 1961.[19]

These efforts to place Negroes in separate neighborhoods were especially successful because they occurred during the period of the greatest Negro migration out of the South into Northern cities. Whereas only 10 per cent of the Nation's Negroes lived outside the South in 1910, 40 per cent did so by 1960.[20]

Throughout these years, the Federal and state governments were also active in promoting segregation in areas other than housing, such as schools and the armed forces. That activity also contributed to housing segregation, because it educated the white public to the myth that any kind of close association with Negroes was debasing and to be avoided.[21]

It thus seems only fair, and is constitutional, that Congress should now pass a fair housing act to undo the effects of these past State and Federal unconstitutionally discriminatory actions.

* * * * *

It is no objection to its validity that a Federal Fair Housing Act would prohibit private acts of discrimination as well as discrimination practiced by government. The supposed objection arises from a false analogy between judicial enforcement and congressional enforcement of the Equal Protection Clause. The power of a court to enforce the Equal Protection Clause arises directly from its language, which speaks only of what States are forbidden to do. Hence, courts enforcing the clause can only forbid action by States or their local subdivisions. But the power of Congress to *enforce* the Clause arises from Section 5 of the Amendment. Section 5 grants a legislative power, and legislative powers are exercisable in accordance with the Necessary and Proper Clause. *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan,* 384 U.S. 641, 648–51; *United States* v. *Guest,* 383 U.S. 745, 762, 782–84. Under that Clause (Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution) Congress has the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all . . . Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, . . ."

The scope of the Necessary and Proper Clause has been settled at least since Chief Justice Marshall formulated it in 1819 in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland:*[22]

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

The purpose, or "end" of the fair housing law is to remove the walls of discrimination which enclose minority groups in ghettoes, so that they may live wherever their means permit and be better able to secure the equal benefits of government and other rewards of life. Prohibiting private as well as government acts of discrimination in housing is undoubtedly a "means which [is] appropriate" and "plainly adapted to that end."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included following the submission on the constitutionality of the pending proposal an additional document entitled "Memorandum of Law on the Constitutionality of Federal Fair Housing Legislation," prepared by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, under the chairmanship of one of America's great lawyers, Mr. Sol Rabkin, and a distinguished committee of top lawyers and other experts who have contributed to this remarkable summary of the law surrounding this issue, which study concludes that there is absolutely no doubt of the constitutionality of this proposal.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF LAW ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING LEGISLATION

This Memorandum discusses the constitutional basis for federal legislation against discrimination in housing. The proposed federal fair housing legislation contains a sweeping ban on discrimination, based on race, religion or national origin, in the sale, rental and financing of all housing. This Memorandum deals with the fundamental question—whether Congress has power, under the Constitution, to adopt any legislation designed to curb bias in the general housing market.

Three points are made in the following pages: (1) Congress has power under the Commerce Clause to prohibit discrimination in housing; (2) Congress has such power also under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment; and (3) Congress is not barred from taking such action by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

INTRODUCTION

This pamphlet is a Memorandum of Law setting forth the constitutional authority of Congress to enact federal fair housing legislation directed against discrimination in private housing. It was originally prepared in 1966 in response to a request by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee which asked for the views of the National Committee Against Discrimination In Housing on the fair housing section of the proposed, now dead, Civil Rights Act of 1966. We are grateful to Sol Rabkin of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Joseph B. Robison of the American Jewish Congress and Rhonda Goodkin of the American Jewish Committee who prepared it. The Memorandum is presented here, with minor revisions, in the belief that the American public must be fully informed about the constitutionality of federal fair housing legislation if the country is to preserve its democratic heritage and avoid further chaos and bloodshed in its urban centers and the denial of equality implicit in the maintenance of racial ghettos in those centers.

---

[12] *Dark Ghetto* by Kenneth B. Clark, Harper and Roe, New York, 1965, pp. 154–182.

[13] *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society,* Report by the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967, pp. 60–63.

Dark Ghetto by Kenneth B. Clark, Harper and Roe, New York, 1967, pp. 81–97.

Manchild in the Promised Land by Claude Brown, McMillian Co., New York, 1965, pp. 30–32, 160–180.

[14] See e.g., 18 U.S.C. 241–43.

[15] See, *e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. 1983–85.

[16] Gunnar Mydal, *An American Dilemma* 349–50, 662–27 (1944).

[17] See *U.S.F.H.A., Underwriting Manual* (1938), paragraphs 980 (3)g, 935, 937 and 951. These provisions stayed in effect until 1947, see *U.S.F.H.A., Underwriting Manual* (1947), Preface, p. VI. Even thereafter FHA continued to deny mortgage insurance or guarantees if the neighborhood was or threatened to become integrated, see Abrams, *Forbidden Neighbors* 233 (1955), and Weaver, *The Negro Ghetto* 71–73 (1948).

[18] See *Favors* v. *Randall,* 40 F. Supp. 743 (E.D. Pa. 1941).

[19] The United States Commission on Civil Rights, *The Fifty States Report* 173, 329, 591 (1961).

[20] McEntire, *Residence and Race* 9–11 (1960); *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1966,* Table 26, p. 27.

[21] McEntire, *Residence and Race* 87 (1960).

[22] 4 Wheat. 316 (1819).

Contrary to the views of the organized real estate industry, Congress announced its power to legislate against discrimination in private housing one hundred and one years ago, when it enacted the Nation's first Civil Rights Act. The 1866 Act was intended to implement the Thirteenth Amendment guarantee against human slavery and all previously existing incidents of slavery. Pre-eminent among these incidents of slavery following the close of the Civil War was the failure of Southern legal systems to establish the freed man's rights to purchase and lease real and personal property despite widespread limitations on that right. Clearly these restrictions would have helped restore the *status quo ante bellum* by limiting the freed Negroes to the role of propertyless peasants. To prevent subversion of the Thirteenth Amendment's purpose, the 1866 Civil Rights Act provided: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property." This section of the Act was reenacted as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1870 and is today Section 1982 of Title 42 of the United States Code. And that legislation as well as current proposals to adopt such legislation with specific provisions for federal enforcement of that right is clearly constitutional.

In the view of the sponsors of this pamphlet such legislation must be brought into play in the critical campaign to eliminate discrimination and segregation from American life, to break down the walls of our spreading racial ghettos. Since the issue of the need for effective federal fair housing legislation will not disappear until Negroes and other minority groups are able to purchase the best housing they can afford on the open market without discrimination, it is likely that proposals will be introduced, in this and in future Congresses, that seek to establish the kind of formal administrative enforcement mechanisms absent from the 1866 statute. The purpose of this pamphlet is to show that the power of Congress to enact such legislation can no longer be doubted.

Anti-discrimination legislation is essential in combating practices of discrimination emanating from racial prejudices, but the enactment of such legislation will not discharge the Federal government from its responsibility for administering these laws affirmatively and effectively to bring about genuine open occupancy. The fact is the Federal government has been unduly hesitant in enforcing existing laws and regulations against housing discrimination. President Kennedy's Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing, Executive Order 11063, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, prohibiting the expenditure of Federal funds to advance segregation, constitute potentially useful weapons against bigotry and ignorance on the part of state and local officials. Yet these weapons go unused because the Executive Branch has been too slow to use these weapons with resolution to eliminate segregation in the housing market.

The crisis in the racial ghettos is so explosive and so urgent that further delay cannot be tolerated. Action must be taken on every front to prevent the spread of racial ghettos and of exclusive white suburbs. As we embark upon major ghetto rehabilitation programs, of which Model Cities program is the focal point, major efforts to break down the walls of exclusion and discrimination that hem in our racial ghettos must be carried out if these new programs are not to serve only to indurate existing racial and social patterns of housing segregation in our metropolitan areas.

President Johnson has said, "The ghettos of our major cities, North and South, East and West, represent fully as severe a denial of freedom and the fruits of American citizenship as more obvious injustices. So long as the color of a man's skin determines his choice of housing, no amount of physical rebuilding of our cities will free the men and women living there."

Let us all move forward speedily toward the elimination of these injustices.

EDWARD RUTLEDGE.
JACK E. WOOD, Jr.

The contents of this pamphlet have been approved by the Legal Committee of the National Committee Against Discrimination who are listed below:

Chairman: Mr. Sol Rabkin, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Mrs. Shirley Adelson Siegel, Housing and Development Admn.

Mr. Charles Abrams.

Professor Curtis J. Berger.

Berl I. Bernhard, Vernier, Liipfert & Bernhard.

Mr. Robert L. Carter, General Counsel, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Adrian DeWind, Paul Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison.

Mr. Jefferson B. Fordham, Dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Mr. Jack Greenberg, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

Professor Robert Harris.

Professor Harold W. Horowitz.

Mr. Edwin J. Lukas, The American Jewish Committee.

Mr. Carl Rachlin, Scholarship, Education and Defense Fund for Racial Equality.

Mr. Joseph B. Robison, American Jewish Congress.

Mr. Melvin L. Wulf, American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. John Denton, University of California Extension.

The memorandum has also been submitted to a group of legal scholars concerned with the problem it discusses. Set out below is a list of these scholars who have indicated their agreement with the views espoused herein.

Nathaniel S. Colley, Colley and McGhee, 1617—10th Street, Sacramento, California.

Vern Countryman, Law School of Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Mass.

Norman Dorsen, Arthur Garfield Hays Civil Liberties Program, New York University School of Law, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10003.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean, Boston College Law School.

Harold C. Havighurst, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20001.

Thomas P. Lewis, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Bruce A. Miller, Zwerdling, Miller, Klimist & Maurer, Attorneys at Law, 3426 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

Fred Okrand, Wirin, Rissman, Okrand & Posner, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

John de L. Pemberton, Jr., American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.

William J. Pierce, Legislative Research Center, The University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

Daniel H. Pollitt, The University of North Carolina School of Law, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Arnold M. Rose, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Theodore Sachs, Rothe, Marston, Mazey, Sachs & O'Connell, Attorneys and Counselors at Law, 3610 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

Terrance Sandalow, The University of Michigan Law School, Legal Research Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

I. CONGRESS HAS POWER UNDER THE COMMERCE CLAUSE TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

Decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the last 30 or 40 years have made it clear that Congress has, under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, broad, even plenary, power. Thus in *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942) the Court held that the mere fact that a particular farmer's contribution to the demand for wheat was trivial in itself was not enough to remove him from the scope of federal regulations where his contribution, when taken together with that of many others similarly situated, was far from trivial. The extent of Congressional power in this field has been summed up recently by the Supreme Court in *Katzenbach v. McClung*, 379 U.S. 294 (1964) in which the Court said at page 305, "The power of Congress in this field is broad and sweeping; where it keeps within its sphere and violates no express constitutional limitation it has been the rule of this Court, going back almost to the founding days of the Republic, not to interfere."

In exercising its power under the Commerce Clause, Congress is not limited to the promotion of commerce or even the mere avoidance of interference with commerce. Thus, the Court said in *Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States*, 379 U.S. 241 (1964) 257, "That Congress was legislating against moral wrongs in many of these areas rendered its enactment no less valid."

It is also well settled that the power of Congress under the Commerce Clause extends to activities which are ordinarily considered local and which seem to have at most a very slight impact on interstate commerce. In *Wickard* v. *Filburn, supra*, the Congressional authority was upheld to adopt legislation under the Commerce Clause even when that legislation was applied to a farmer who had sown only 23 acres of wheat and whose impact on interstate commerce was therefore minute. The Supreme Court took cognizance of the fact that his contribution, when coupled with that of large numbers of others similarly situated, did have substantial impact on interstate commerce. The same reasoning applies equally to individual home owners in a community all of whom refuse to sell to Negroes and thus, collectively, affect the rights of the millions of Negroes in this country to employment, to move in interstate commerce, and to find a place to live.

Although much is made of the local nature of housing, the fact is that the national housing market is a major segment of our economy and its operations involve broad and multitudinous aspects of interstate commerce. There is no need to spell out in detail the interstate aspects of the home finance industry. Home mortgage lending today is largely affected with interstate lending by finance institutions. As far back as 1952 a study undertaken by the Division of Research Statistics of the Federal Reserve System found:

"The data nevertheless suggest that an appreciable part of the funds for financing real estate in the Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Dallas districts comes from the financial districts such as Boston and New York, and from Chicago and San Francisco . . . the movement of funds from one part of the country to another has been encouraged by investors seeking outlets for large amounts of funds. Both institutional and non-institutional registrants participate in this movement of funds. Insurance companies and other institutional lenders hold large amounts of loans on real estate located at a distance and in many instances, have them serviced by non-institutional lenders close to the properties." (Real Estate Loans of Registrants under Regulation X, 38 Fed. Res. Bull. 620 (1952), 620, 627, 621.)

In *U.S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association,* 322 U.S. 533 (1944) the court rejected the argument that the individual financial transactions under consideration were intrastate only. The court said at p. 537, "True, many of the activities . . . which constituted this chain of events (the insurance contract, negotiations, payments, communications, etc.) might . . . be regarded as wholly local." But it went on to find that all these transactions "constituted a single continuous chain of events, many of which were multi-state in character . . ."

When discrimination in housing imposes on our cities and suburbs a pattern of racial ghettoization, this pattern necessarily affects adversely the interstate movement of mortgage funds. Certainly, Congress may, under its plenary power under the Commerce Clause, enact legislation directed against removing these hindrances and restrictions.

Nor can it be question that racial discrimination in housing has a substantial impact on the aspect of interstate commerce involving the movement of individuals from one state to another. There can be no doubt that if Negroes were free to buy housing they could afford in any city to which they migrated, their movements in interstate commerce to accept better jobs, to find jobs allowing them to avail themselves of their highest skills would be vastly increased.

There is a long line of decisions upholding the Congressional power under the Commerce Clause to remove such clogs on the interstate movement of individuals, *Katzenbach v. McClung,* 379 U.S. 294 (1964) is one example. The Supreme Court's decision in *Heart of Atlanta Motel Inc. v. U.S., supra,* involving motel discrimination based on race, is another example. *Boynton v. Virginia* 364 U.S. 454 involving discrimination in an interstate bus terminal is another. It is clear that in dealing with these problems Congress is free to exercise its discretion and may use means which affect persons moving only in intrastate commerce rather than interstate commerce. *United States v. Darby,* 312 U.S. 100, where the court said at p. 115: "The motive and purpose of a regulation of interstate commerce are matters for the legislative judgment upon the exercise of which the Constitution places no restriction and over which the courts are given no control." The Court also pointed out that Congress may, in dealing with the problem, "choose the means reasonably adapted to the attainment of the committed end, even though they involve control of intrastate activities." At p. 121.

The reasoning of *Katzenbach v. McClung* applies also to the movement of building materials and home furnishings through the channels of interstate commerce in connection with the construction, sale, lease and furnishing of dwellings. It is clear that the materials used for building and furnishing homes and for their repair and rehabilitation and the labor used in connection with such construction, repair and rehabilitation flow to a large extent in the channels of interstate commerce. In *NLRB v. Denver Building and Construction Trades Council,* 341 U.S. 675 (1951) the court held that the NLRB had jurisdiction under the Commerce Clause over a dispute in the building trades because the disagreement might have prevented building materials from crossing state lines. In *United States v. Employing Plasterers' Association of Chicago,* 347 U.S. 186 (1954) the court upheld a complaint alleging a conspiracy to suppress competition among Chicago plastering contractors charged to be affecting the flow of plastering material into Illinois as stating an appropriate cause of action within the federal jurisdiction. The courts have held that interstate commerce is burdened by the activities of janitors in a building where some of those having offices in the building were engaged in interstate work, *NLRB v. Tri-State Casualty Insurance Company,* 188 F. 2nd 50, by the labor practices of a newspaper with an out-of-state circulation of about one-half of one per cent, *Mabee v. White Plains Publishing Company,* 327 U.S. 178, and by the price of milk which is produced and sold intrastate but which competes with milk shipped from outside the state, *United States v. Wrightwood Dairy Company,* 315 U.S. 110 (1942).

It is submitted that the disturbances which occurred in the racial ghettos of New York, Rochester and Watts which, it is conceded, arose in part, at least, out of the pattern of racial segregation in housing in effect in those areas, have similar adverse impact on the channels of interstate commerce. If some of those adversely affected by such housing segregation believe that resort to violence and to attacks on local business as well as interstate business may be necessary if their wrongs are to be righted, Congress may properly deal with such housing segregation under the Commerce Clause in view of the adverse effect this clearly has on interstate commerce.

Hence the Commerce Clause of the Constitution encompasses a constitutional power in Congress to adopt legislation directed against discrimination in housing.

II. CONGRESS HAS POWER TO DEAL WITH HOUSING DISCRIMINATION UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Congress can enact legislation against discrimination in housing as an exercise of its power under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment which provides:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

This Section, properly viewed, is a broad delegation to Congress of power to achieve the basic purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment—to end inequality and the indicia of slavery.

This view of the Amendment can be rejected only if Section 5 is interpreted narrowly as empowering Congress to do no more than police and enforce the provisions of the preceding sections. We recognize that that is the teaching of the Supreme Court's decision of 1883 in the *Civil Rights Cases,* 109 U.S. 3. We submit, however, that the restraints of that decision should no longer be looked upon as binding.

A. The civil rights cases were wrongly decided

There is a wealth of authority that the Supreme Court of 1883, in its decision in the *Civil Rights Cases,* departed completely from the plain intent of the Amendment as proposed by Congress and approved by the states. See, for example, the authorities cited in Justice Goldberg's concurring opinion in *Bell* v. *Maryland,* 378 U.S. 226, 289–305 (1964). Most striking is the fact that, in 1875, only a few years after the Amendment was approved, Congress enacted a statute broadly prohibiting discrimination in places of public accommodation (18 Stat. 335), quite plainly demonstrating thereby its understanding that it had the power thus to reach practices by private parties that prevent attainment of equality in fact. The Court's subsequent decision that Congress did not have that power was thus inconsistent with the views of those in the best position to know what they had intended only a few years earlier.

Only 25 years after the decision in the *Civil Rights Cases* was handed down, its reasoning was closely analyzed and rejected by a person entirely sympathetic to the result it reached. H. E. Flack, *The Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1908). Flack examined in detail the legislative history of the Amendment, including the debates in Congress and newspaper reports concerning the debates in the various ratifying states. He also examined the debates on the civil rights laws adopted during the Reconstruction Period. A few of the highlights of the book may be given here.

Describing the history of the Fourteenth Amendment, Flack says that one of its most active proponents told the House that Congress should have the power to declare what rights should be secured to all citizens. It was immediately after his speech that the House approved the Amendment (pp. 80–81). Flack comments (at pp. 81–2):

"It does seem proper to say that Congress would be authorized to pass any law which it might declare 'appropriate and necessary' to ensure to citizens their Privileges and Immunities, *together with the power to declare what were those Privileges and Immunities."* (Emphasis supplied)

Flack also says that the framers of the Amendment intended to make a great change in the Federal Government and that "Their failure to do this is due to the strained construction put upon their work by the Supreme Court." (p. 69)

A bill prohibiting discrimination in places of public accommodation was introduced in the Congress in 1873 (pp. 260–1). One of its supporters, Congressman Lawrence, who was a member of Congress when the Fourteenth Amendment was approved, expressed the view as to the first section of the Amendment that, "The object of this provision is to make all men equal by the law. If a State permits inequality in rights to be created or meted out by citizens or corporations enjoying its protection, it denies the equal protection of the laws." He also said: "What the State permits by its sanction, having the power to prohibit, it does in effect itself." (p. 262).

Flack concluded his book as follows (p. 277):

"However futile was the effort by Congress to give vitality to the Amendment as interpreted by itself and by those who had most to do with its drafting and adoption, the fact remains that nearly all the evidence goes to sustain the position of Congress as far as the question of power and authority is concerned. The evidence shows that according to the purpose and intention of the Amendment as declared in the debates in Congress and in the several state legislatures and in other ways, Congress had the constitutional power to enact direct legislation to secure the rights of citizens against violations by individuals as well as by the states."

Legislation against discrimination in housing by Congress is designed to deal with the fact that state law all too frequently "permits inequality in rights to be created or meted out by citizens or corporations . . ." It is an exercise of the power which the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment intended to confer on Congress—to declare the rights, privileges and immunities created by the Amendment. As such, it is clearly constitutional.

B. The authority of the Civil Rights cases has been destroyed

The *Civil Rights Cases* and *Plessy* v. *Ferguson,* 163 U.S. 537 (1896), were the principal decisions in the series of cases in which the Supreme Court largely frustrated the equalitarian aspects of the Fourteenth Amendment. In both, the first Justice Harlan dissented. His dissent in the *Plessy* case is now the law of the land as a result of the series of Supreme Court decisions destroying the "Separate but Equal" doctrine (beginning with *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education,* 347 U.S. 483 (1954). It can be only a matter of time before Justice Harlan's dissent in the *Civil Rights Cases* similarly becomes the law of the land. In fact, this may already have taken place by virtue of the Supreme Court's decision this year in *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan,* 379 U.S. 294, 34 U.S.L.W. 4483, decided June 13, 1966.

The Court in that case upheld the validity of Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act of

1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973b(e). That Section provides that no person who has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the language of instruction was other than English shall be denied the right to vote in any election because of his inability to read and write English. It was enacted, as the statute recites in sub-paragraph (1), in order to "secure the rights under the Fourteenth Amendment of persons educated in American flag schools. . . ."

The provision was challenged on the ground that (1) the Fourteenth Amendment did not by itself, under the Equal Protection Clause of Section 1, bar states from adopting English literacy tests for voting and (2) Congress had no power to create rights not already in existence by reason of the Equal Protection Clause. The Supreme Court specificially accepted the validity of the first of these two points. (Indeed, the Court refused to decide the issue in a companion case which squarely raised the point. *Cardona* v. *Power,* U.S. 34 U.S.L.W. 4488, decided the same day). Assuming that the Equal Protection Clause does not of itself prohibit an English literacy test, the Court, voting 7 to 2, ruled that Congress has power to find and declare that equal protection is denied by use of the test. It specifically said:

"We hold that, in the application challenged in this case, Section 4(e) is a proper exercise of the powers *granted to Congress by Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment* . . ." (Emphasis supplied)

Referring to the argument of the Attorney General of New York that Section 4(e) could not be sustained under Section 5 of the Amendment "unless the judiciary decides—even with the guidance of a Congressional judgment—that the application of the English literacy requirement prohibited by Section 4(e) is forbidden by the Equal Protection Clause itself," the Court said shortly, "We disagree." It went on:

"Correctively viewed, *Section 5 is a positive grant of legislative power* authorizing Congress to exercise its discretion in determining whether and what legislation is needed to secure the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment." (Emphasis added.)

Turning to the question whether the challenged statute was an appropriate exercise of that power, the Court said:

"Section 4(e) may be readily seen as 'plainly adapted' to furthering these aims of the Equal Protection Clause. The practical effect of Section 4(e) is to prohibit New York from denying the right to vote to large segments of its Puerto Rican community. Congress has thus prohibited the State from denying to that community the right that 'is preservative of all rights.' . . . It is not for us to review the Congressional resolution of these factors. It is enough that we be able to perceive a basis upon which the Congress might resolve the conflict as it did. There plainly was such a basis to support Section 4(e) in the application in question in this case. Any contrary conclusion would require us to be blind to the realities familiar to the legislators."

There can be little doubt that this decision substantially undermines the 83-year-old authority of the *Civil Rights Cases* (even thought neither the Court nor the dissenting Justices referred to it). In 1883, the Court held that Section 5 gives Congress no substantive power to declare what is and what is not a denial of equal protection. Now, the Court has held that Congress has just that power. Congress should have no hesitation about using it, particularly in view of the strong evidence that the Court's present ruling merely restores the original understanding of what Section 5 was supposed to do.

The enactment of federal fair-housing legislation would be an exercise of Congress' power under Section 5 fully as justifiable as Section 4(e). Congress has heard extensive evidence on the extent and harmful effects of housing bias—that it is a nationwide phenomenon dominating the housing market and compelling one-tenth of our people to *de facto apartheid*, with all its accompanying evils. You do not have a Watts riot without a Watts.

In the *Morgan* decision, the Supreme Court stressed that voting is a basic right because it is "preservative of all rights." But the same Court noted 45 years ago that, in the words of Justice Holmes, "housing is a necessary of life." *Block v. Hirsch*, 256 U.S. 135, 156 (1921). This is one of the "realities familiar to the legislators" to which the Supreme Court would not be "blind."

There is, therefore, ample basis for Congressional action dealing firmly with housing discrimination—an evil that corrodes, distorts and frustrates all efforts to give reality to the American promise of equality.

III. FAIR HOUSING LEGISLATION IS NOT A DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS

The opponents of federal and state fair housing laws have consistently used the term "forced housing" to describe such proposals. They have talked much about how such laws involve an unconstitutional interference with the rights of private property owners to sell to whom they please. Where reference has been made to constitutional inhibitions against such proposals, it has been in terms of violation of the "due process" clause of either the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments.

An examination of the authorities reveals that quite the opposite is the case. As was stated by the Supreme Court in *Nebbia* v. *New York*, 291 U.S. 520, 523 (1934), where the power of New York State to regulate milk prices was upheld, "Under our form of government the use of property and the making of contracts are normally matters of private and not public concern. . . . But neither property rights nor contract rights are absolute; for government cannot exist if the citizen may at will use his property to the detriment of his fellows, or exercise his freedom of contract to work them harm. . . ."

Insofar as respects the legitimate sphere for governmental action, at page 525 the Court goes on to say that the requirement is merely that ". . . the end shall be accomplished by methods consistent with due process. And the guaranty of due process, as has often been held, demands only that the law shall not be unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious, and that the means selected shall have a real and substantial relation to the object sought to be attained."

The scope and limitations of Congressional power under due process requirements were recently demonstrated in *Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc.* v. *U.S., supra* where the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was upheld. The Court there disposed of the contention of a private motel owner that by denying to him the right to choose his customers on the basis of race, the Act had deprived him of liberty and property without due process of law. Applying the same standard to federal legislation as it had in *Nebbia, supra*, i.e., that there was a rational basis for its action, and that the means chosen were reasonable and appropriate, the Court said, at p. 258, that, if such were the case, ". . . appellant has no 'right' to select its guests as it sees fit, free from government regulation."

As respects the field of housing, there can no longer be any doubt that discrimination in housing exerts a pernicious effect on society in general and on large segments of it in particular. As is abundantly documented, its existence is the well-spring of many of the social ills that afflict this Nation today. If not brought to an end, it promises to continue patterns of housing segregation with resultant adverse effects such as intergroup tension, increased mortality, unhealthful living conditions, and a variety of evils threatening the health, safety, and welfare of this Nation and disrupting its patterns of commerce. There can be no doubt that the eradication of such evils is a legitimate exercise of Congressional power, in accordance with *Nebbia*, and *Heart of Atlanta Motel, supra*.

The validity of state anti-discrimination statutes limiting property rights other than those in real property is well established. Thus, laws prohibiting discrimination in employment and accommodations at the state and local levels of government, upheld as valid exercises of the police power, are now commonplace. See *Railway Mail Ass'n.* v. *Corsi*, 326 U.S. 88 (1945), *Bob Lo Excursion Co.* v. *People of the State of Michigan*, 333 U.S. 28 (1945).

Rather than being inviolable, as is so often claimed by their champions, the rights of owners of private property reflect at any given moment of time a decision by society as to how the competing interests of various individuals are to be balanced. See Bentham, *Limits of Jurisprudence Refined* 84 (Everett ed. 1945) as quoted in Powell, "Property Rights and Civil Rights," 15 Hastings Law Journal 135 (1963). In the case of legislation prohibiting discrimination in broad categories of housing, many of the states have already acted to lessen or eradicate the evil sought to be eliminated by the proposed legislation. See "State Statutes, and Local Ordinances Prohibiting Discrimination in Housing and Urban Renewal Operations," December 1961, Housing and Home Finance Agency, *Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination v. Colangelo*, 344 Mass. 387 (1962), *N.Y. State Commission Against Discrimination v. Pelham Hall Apts.*, 10 Misc. 2d 334, 170 NYS 2d 750 (1958); and see *Mulkey v. Reitman*, 64 Cal. 24 529 (1966) where the California Supreme Court has recently struck down an amendment to the California State Constitution which authorized the practice of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing by private persons as violative of the federal Constitution, thereby reinstating California's fair housing law. This decision was recently affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, —U.S.—; 87 Sup. Ct. 1627 (1967). See also, Robison, J. B. "Housing—The Northern Civil Rights Frontier" 13 West. Reserve L.R. 1 (1961) and Saks and Rabkin, "Racial And Religious Discrimination in Housing: A Report of Legal Progress" 45 Iowa L.R. 488 (1960).

Opponents of fair housing legislation argue that the rights of private property, particularly real property, are in some manner superior to other rights. This is not the case. See, Powell, Richard R. B., "Property Rights and Civil Rights," *supra*. When there exists a conflict between the interests of the state and of private property, the power of the state when reasonably exercised is supreme. *West Coast Hotel* v. *Parrish,* 300 U.S. 379 (1937). This is no less true in the case of housing than in the other instances cited, *supra*.

Particularly as respects the use and enjoyment of real property, there are innumerable examples wherein the rights of private property have yielded to the superior interest of the state. Dividing the powers of property into their two main headings, (one) the power to dispose of what is owned, i.e., alienability, and (two) the power to use the land in question, one finds in the first instance restraints of the following order: laws on unlawful restraints on alienation; the general law against illegal or anti-social dispositions; the strict formalities attendant upon lawful execution of deeds; and the various rules respecting alienability, such as the Rule Against Perpetuities.

As respects restraints on the use of private property, one finds a huge array of laws, both state and local. Thus, we find laws respecting easements; zoning; riparian rights; the height of buildings; nuisances; emergency rent regulations; the sanitary conditions of places of habitation. The list could be lengthened but the point is clear: there is not now nor has there been in the past a free, unfettered, wholly "private" use of private real property without regard to the effect of the use on one's neighbors and society in general. The rights in real property, just as other property rights, are subject to the regulation of the state in the exercise of its police power to legislate for the general welfare of all its citizens.

The argument that rights in real property are in some manner exempt from the exercise of the police power was answered by the Supreme Court in *Levy Leasing Ltd. v. Siegel*, 258 U.S. 242 at p. 247 (1922), a case dealing with emergency rent legislation in New York State, with the statement that, ". . . this court has held that there is no such inherent difference in property in land, from that in tangible and intangible personal property, as exempts it from the operation of the police power in appropriate cases . . ."

From the review of the state law restricting in various manners the use and enjoyment by owners of real property, it would appear clear that the test of *Nebbia, supra*, as respects due process requirements is just as valid in the field of real property as in any other legitimate area of regulation on behalf of the greater interests of the state.

Insofar as the argument that "due process" bars laws against housing discrimination is concerned, it might be well to recall the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Railway Mail Ass'n* v. *Corsi, supra*, at p. 98 where a New York State statute prohibiting discrimination by unions was held constitutional He noted that if the state chose to put its power behind the wishes of those persons who would put an end to racial and religious discrimination, the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment could not be raised against the assertion of that power, saying:

"To use the Fourteenth Amendment as a sword against such State power would stultify that Amendment. Certainly the insistence by individuals on their private prejudices as to race, color or creed, in relations like those now before us, ought not to have a higher constitutional sanction than the determination of a State to extend the area of nondiscrimination beyond that which the Constitution itself exacts."

The logic of that argument applies with no less binding force upon the legislation herein contemplated by the federal government.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted on the basis of the foregoing that Congress is clearly empowered under the Commerce Clause and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to enact legislation directed against discrimination in all aspects of housing.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to remind the distinguished Senator that we had a Supreme Court test case in Illinois of the constitutionality of the local ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago. The Supreme Court of Illinois upheld the constitutionality of local ordinances. We now have in Illinois the legislative question as to whether or not a State law can be adopted.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota—who comes from a State which has been enlightened enough to adopt State legislation for fair housing—whether or not the law has been tested in Minnesota?

Mr. MONDALE. We have had State court procedures in connection with housing and in every case I know of, plus the opinion of the Attorney General, it has been unanimously held that our State fair housing law is a constitutional enactment. I doubt that there is any serious constitutional issue surrounding the enactment of our law whatsoever.

I think the same is manifestly true with respect to the power of the Federal Government, through the reach of the 14th amendment and the commerce clause, to have the power it must have to prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

I think we might expect, however, to be confronted with this issue, because every time the U.S. Senate has tried to adopt a long overdue civil rights measure, whether it was public accommodations or voting rights or the other civil rights measures that have been passed by this body in the last 10 years, on all occasions we have been greeted with the argument that it was utterly unconstitutional. And in every case the Supreme Court has in fact held it to be constitutional. I expect to hear that again, but I think it is a strawman. I think there is no doubt about the constitutionality of this measure.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I asked the Attorney General of the United States, in our hearings before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee whether or not the Republican-sponsored—I am happy to say—open-occupancy legislation which was adopted by the House and which a majority of Illinois Republican Representatives, as well as an overwhelming majority of Democratic members from Illinois, supported, was constitutional, in his judgment.

I would like permission, and ask unanimous consent, to include in the RECORD the reply the Attorney General gave, in which he unequivocally said that in his judgment the House-passed measure was a constitutional bill.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Attorney General CLARK. Yes, that was constitutional, Senator Percy, in our judgment. That was not the bill that the administration had sent forward. It had amendments in the area of extent of coverage.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his most significant contribution.

Mr. President, I am delighted to yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we now have before us what is probably properly called one of the three major remaining pieces of legislation to meet the present exigencies of the crisis of the cities—a crisis which, in my judgment, is equal to the crisis which we face in Vietnam. Much too little attention has been focused upon this particular measure dealing with discrimination in housing, and much too little attention given to its importance in the minds of those who feel that, for a century, they have been a depressed and discriminated-against element of the American community.

Mr. President, housing to Americans who are discriminated against—chiefly Negroes, though there are also others—is a vital issue: more important than jobs, and even more important than equal treatment under the law. It is the issue of personal dignity and of basic incentive; for the greatest incentive known to man is a good home in a good neighborhood, with decent surroundings, such as most of us have in our country. It is a fundamental element of dignity that a man may enjoy such a home without hindrance, as expressed in the often quoted but still very true phrase that "his home is his castle."

This is felt most keenly by the man whose eyes meet, upon waking every morning and looking about him, nothing but depressing dirt, rats, and generally desultory housing and community conditions, ranging from the very worst to the mediocre. This, I know from my knowledge of such communities, represents a monumental contribution to those social tensions which have brought us to the crisis toward which this measure is addressed.

The other two unmet aspects of this issue of great importance, Mr. President, are, first, Senator HART's bill dealing with the protection which the law affords to those who seek to assert their civil rights, and to those who obey their convictions and aid others who would assert those rights; and, second, a measure which would seek to provide assurances that the same kinds of discrimination and segregation will not be used to deny men the job opportunities and job training which their talents and initiative deserve. That is the trilogy of legislation which remains to be enacted, and should be enacted in this very session of Congress, in this field.

Mr. President, these unmet needs are the prime contributors to the basic causes which put the Nation in such internal peril in the summer of 1967, and which, without being Cassandras, we must take account of in 1968, knowing that not enough time has elapsed for the major programs we have already enacted even to bite into the problems to which they were addressed, and that therefore we still face, as we did in 1967 and we may hereafter for a time, the highly flammable situation which erupted in more than 70 cities in 1967.

I wish to summarize, at this point, the arguments for a bill against discrimination in housing, bearing in mind, Mr. President, that we must make it as comprehensive as possible. Indeed, it really should have, in conscience, no exceptions; but, practicably, there are some exceptions in the measure which is before us, to take account of the necessity for adjusting the ideal to the practical, which mainly relate to the problem of owner-occupied dwellings with not more than three families in addition to the owner-occupant—the so-called Mrs. Murphy's boarding house problem of boarding houses and other similar accommodations, which are considered so highly personal in character as to make it desirable that they should not, at least at this time, come under the law.

The summary of the arguments for nondiscrimination in housing and for the enactment of this amendment is as follows:

First, that it involves the basic issue which I have just mentioned of personal dignity and of incentive to make something more of one's life than slum and ghetto opportunities normally allow.

Second, that history has shown that the arguments made against it—(1) that it tends to depreciate values in communities, (2) that it represents a formidable enforcement problem, with a plethora of cases, and (3) that it will tend to diminish the incentive to build, on the part of builders—are based on fears which are unfounded, and that the facts completely disprove them. We have by now had very considerable experience in this field on the State and local levels, because there are today some 94 laws and ordinances which have been enacted since the very early ones going back to 1958. This gives a long experience in this field and therefore confirms the fact that these fears are not well taken.

Mr. President, the statute which we seek to have enacted into law is completely constitutional both in the principle which it utilizes from the Constitution—that is, its being based on the commerce clause and the 14th amendment—and because it has been sustained by the cases which have developed since the original concept of nondiscrimination in housing began to be implemented in law.

The Executive order now on the books, issued by the late President Kennedy, laudable as it is, is completely inadequate and fails to reach the overwhelming percentage of housing. While it is a move in the right direction, it cannot hope to have the sweeping effect which is absolutely essential to the national order and stability.

Mr. President, as I see it, that represents the summary of the arguments for the pending amendment. I should like now to develop that, if I may, in some detail.

First, on the issue of dignity and incentive, it is very instructive to read a typical paragraph from an authoritative book written very recently, 1965, which sums up this argument in a very effective way.

The title of the book is "The City Is the Frontier." It was written by Charles Abrams, an outstanding housing expert, and it was published by Harper & Rowe in 1965. The paragraph reads:

> The housing available to Negroes is inferior in quality compared to the housing of whites; both the housing and neighborhoods in which he lives show signs of greater deterioration; there are fewer amenities; mortgages are more difficult to obtain; there is little or no private investment in new buildings for Negroes; tax arrears are higher in their neighborhoods and public interest in maintenance is lower; real estate values are lower in relation to net income; overcrowding is more intense; schools, hospitals, and recreation are inferior; and the Negro usually gets less housing per dollar he pays.

The facts bear this out. Forty-four percent of all nonwhite occupied units were substandard according to the 1960 census. That compares with 13 percent—or three times more than the white occupied units which were substandard—and 155,000 nonwhite families in 1960, and the situation has become worse since then, had to share single dwelling units with other families. That is more than twice the number of white families who found themselves in similar circumstances.

The whole problem has become a crisis in the cities because it has been so aggravated in the cities. The in-migration of nonwhite population into the central cities as a result of the out-migration—largely from Southern States of the country—of nonwhite population in the 10-year period from 1950 to 1960 increased more than 60 percent, from roughly 6 to 10 million, and at the same time the white population in the central cities was increasing at a rate of only 13 percent, from 42 to 47 million.

Mr. President, this enormous influx to which I have referred must be juxtaposed to the fact that only 3.7 million housing units were added in that same 10-year period. These figures, as I say, are based upon the Census of 1960, the last census which we have.

Mr. President, I have another set of figures that were developed by Karl Taeuber, the University of Wisconsin sociologist. He refers to this as the segregation index of racial residential dissimilarity in 207 cities across the country, including the largest and most economically significant cities in our country.

This index stood at 86 percent in 1960. That means that 86 percent of the urban Negro population would have to move to all-white or integrated slums in largely all-white neighborhoods if the segregation index was to be zero, if Negroes were to be distributed as whites are on a random basis throughout the city.

The figures go so high that in cities, for example, in the State of Florida, there is nearly 100 percent racial residential segregation.

A good deal has been made about the charge that property values in areas which are desegregated and have admitted Negroes on an equal level with whites will decrease. This has been applicable to suburban areas in which the white people in the main are homeowners.

I point out first how the shoe pinches.

One study, which is in my judgment the most revealing study—and this study was made very recently, within the last 3 years—illustrates in 17 metropolitan areas that as the white population pushed out into the suburbs, the Negro, notwithstanding the fact that his income rose to the point that he, too, could go to the suburbs, was nonetheless restricted to core cities, and largely in its slums and ghettos.

This study showed that in these 17 metropolitan areas, if Negroes had been permitted the same freedom of purchase as white families in respect to suburban dwellings, they would have bought about 45,000 more units of homes than they actually did, compared with their white neighbors.

On the basis of this investigation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency itself concluded that—

> While the study cites a number of related factors inhibiting home ownership among non-whites, it points particularly to racial restrictions as an important deterrent to the availability of new housing for this group.

So, not only have we had an enormous influx into our central cities of members of the minority population, but we have also then bottled them up in the inner-core cities with all of its resultant contribution to the crowding and increasing difficulties which exist in the slums and ghettos, because they have been unable, as has the white population, to escape to the suburbs.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that it is claimed that values will be affected when a neighborhood becomes desegregated. I quote in this respect from a study made by a California sociologist. This study was published by the University of California Press.

It states that a study of 10,000 real estate sales over a 12-year period in seven cities contradicts directly the idea that property values have inevitably declined when Negroes move into a formerly all-white area.

Bear in mind that the block-busting technique, so-called, which consists of many of these rumors being spread throughout a neighborhood to cause a decline in values, is a technique by which real estate agents without conscience spread the rumor of Negro occupancy or purchase of homes in the community in order to bring the prices down. Then, they buy up homes cheaply, and when the prices do not break, and invariably they do not, they resell the homes at a very considerable profit.

Indeed, this study that I have referred to found that 41 percent of the homes in interracial neighborhoods did not go down in price at all; 44 percent, an even higher percentage, increased in price anywhere up to 25 percent; and only 15 percent dropped off in price, thus indicating no appreciable change in the pattern between normal value ratios and invalidating the argument that values decline.

Then it was very revealing to have a national survey published by Look magazine in 1966. They found that more than 80 percent of the American people in all sections of the country would not abandon their blocks, even if a Negro family moved next door. In commenting on this poll, Look said:

> This unexpected response to the Negro as a neighbor does not mean that Negroes will receive a warm welcome from white real estate dealers. It does suggest, however, that many Americans are willing to accept, in theory, an idea that seemed unthinkable to most of them a few years ago.

I might say, Mr. President, as a political aphorism, that though in some instances we have seen resentment and unhappiness when a community became desegregated in the manner I have described, as a practical matter, when people's consciences assert themselves in the broad areas of the country which do not experience segregation as a civil order or social system, they invariably vote their consciences rather than their intermediate or temporary resentments.

Another argument which has been made—mainly by builders—in States and in local communities where laws against discrimination in housing were passed, was that it would affect very seriously the incentive to build. But in 1963, the first year after the Executive order issued by President Kennedy took effect relating to nondiscrimiation in housing, nonfarm housing starts totaled 1,613,000—140,000 over the preceding year. In 1964 and 1965 we had somewhat declining starts, but that was not precipated and was attributed by all observers to economic factors, higher interest rates, labor costs, and so forth. Also, none of the Federal programs to which the Executive order was directly related—to wit, the direct FHA guarantee and the direct VA guarantee—shrunk in size, either in terms of expenditure of funds and effort or in terms of demand from them by States and localities, notwithstanding the very sharp limitation involved in the Federal order to which I have referred.

The other argument made is that laws of this character represent a great enforcement problem. New York State, my own State, has probably the most advanced among these laws. Indeed, in New York, the law excepts only an owner-occupied two-family dwelling and the rental of rooms in a dwelling occupied by the owner. The New York City ordinance has no exception whatever.

Let us take a look at a recent report on the enforcement situation in New York. Last year, 632 complaints charging discrimination were filed with the New York State Commission for Human Rights. All but 40 of these were from Negroes, indicating what I said before, that that is where the issue exists. In 281—well over one-third of these cases—probable discrimination was found, and in 174 of these cases, the complainants either obtained housing or refused the housing that was offered to them.

It is estimated that dwellings in New York, roughly 10 percent of the national total, aggregate some 6 million. I respectfully submit that this is an extremely small proportion of cases. This indicates that all the fears about the size of enforcement problem are entirely unwarranted, as experience has demonstrated, not only in the field of housing but also in the sensitive field of employment. I was attorney general of my State and had a great deal to do with the administration of our FEPC, the fair employment statute which has been on the books for more than 25 years. The number of cases which produced complaints which were finally found to be sustainable, which went to court, were roughly in the same order of magnitude as the experience in the housing field to which I have just referred.

This illustrates that the effort to raise a scare about the inundation of enforcement problems which will result from a measure against housing discrimination does not stand up in the face of the facts as these things develop.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to speak about the constitutionality of this type of measure. My colleague, Senator HART, with whom I have the honor to be associated in the handling of this bill, will, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as the author of the measure before us, analyze for us, I would hope, in due time, and in rather complete detail, the constitutional issue. However, as a former member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as a lawyer, myself, of rather considerable experience, and as a former attorney generate of my State, I feel that I, too, would like to address myself to this issue.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Michigan would appreciate very much having the Senator from New York discuss the constitutionality.

The credentials of the Senator from New York to discuss a subject such as this did not develop just the day he became a member of the Judiciary Committee. His credentials did not diminish the day he left that committee. His background is such that all of us should welcome the opportunity to have the benefit of his sound judgment.

He and I happen to share the same point of view—namely, that it is clearly constitutional; but, spoken against his background, I believe there are some who might, if they do entertain doubts, have them resolved. So I will be delighted if the Senator from New York will discuss this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, of all the areas in which there could have been argument with respect to constitutionality, housing struck me as being the most soundly based. It has many of the attributes with respect to Federal jurisdiction which deal with interstate commerce, and it certainly meets squarely the doctrines of the 14th amendment with respect to equal protection under the law.

Since time immemorial, to borrow a phrase from England's jurisprudence, real property has been the darling of the law. It has been the one classic area in which protection has been granted. Indeed, the protections to real property—its ownership and enjoyment—preceded the concept of the legal protection of human rights to which a great body of development in English law and in American law was necessary before it flowered into the 10 amendments of the U.S. Constitution and the historic implementation of those amendments by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Originally and basically, the concept of the protection at law of the ownership and enjoyment of real property was basic to orderly societies and grew up in the law as its prime incentive and reason for being. It seems to me that that alone vouches for the constitutionality, and that for this reason the U.S. Constitution, under the 14th amendment, seeks to preserve the equal application of the law to the individual in every State, and has construed that to mean that where the State has legal power over the individual or over what the individual is to enjoy, that legal power must be exercised in an equitable way; and that parties who interfere with that process may be reached by the law under the 14th amendment, and particularly section 5 thereof, which permits of legislation to implement the guarantees of the 14th amendment itself.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Congress would have a right, having found there is an unequal enjoyment of those rights, which are the very dearest protection of the law in respect of the enjoyment of real property, to make reasonable regulations with respect to that enjoyment in the interest of the individual citizen.

I really think that concept is basic in the law. Long before the long series of what are called more liberal interpretations to allow of civil rights, which date from the so-called Brown case which dealt with discrimination in education in 1954, back in 1917 we had cases under the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which affirmed the right to nondiscrimination in respect of housing.

Of course, this takes us right up to today when, in the most eloquent way in the case of Atlanta Motel against United States, which dealt with the public accommodations title of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it became very clear that the kind of statute which we are considering was soundly based in the Constitution.

Mr. President, in addition, it is very clear, too, from the history of events since 1917 that the people at large recognize that discrimination in housing was contrary to the guarantees of the 14th amendment because there was an entire series of actions which were designed to get around that prohibition; namely, the restrictive covenants.

The restrictive covenants, of course, were covenants between people who lived in the same area agreeing that they would not sell their homes to a given minority. In most cases they involved the Negro minority, although religious minorities were often covered.

The idea persisted that such a contract between private persons, was beyond purview of law. It was not until

Shelly against Cramer, the case in the 1950's in which the court struck down the doctrine that the so-called restrictive covenants ended.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with this history before us the question is a very well settled one. Indeed, as I said, it is much more settled than are the other aspects of constitutionality of civil rights matters.

Certainly as strong as the 14th amendment basis of the constitutionality of this legislation is the commerce clause. It is well known that that provision operates in two ways. First, there is involved transportation invariably of materials and substances such as lumber and other products, which go into a home and which move across interstate lines; and second, and equally important, is that the movement of persons from place to place and State to State, and the mobility of our population is very heavily guided or interfered with by the availability of housing. Therefore, there is a direct relationship, between commerce and housing discrimination.

I am sure that many people have read the advertisements in the New York newspapers or the Washington newspapers on any Sunday which try to attract draftsmen or scientists from several areas such as New York or Washington, to Huntsville, Ala., or some city in the South, offering as an inducement fine homes and living conditions which are very much more agreeable than in other parts of the country. In instances where that is true, it is a powerful magnet to draw the population from one part of the country to another part of the country.

It may also be a matter of some interest to recall a struggle we had in the Senate last year when the U.S. Government, through the Atomic Energy Commission, proposed to locate an accelerator, a great scientific experimental instrument, in Weston, Ill., a State without a nondiscrimination housing statute. We fought it, it will be remembered, very strongly, on the ground that this was improper as it would tend to inhibit the employment of those people who could find a place to live in this scientific complex which was being authorized by Congress.

Our theory was directly premised upon the commerce clause and it points out as a practical matter that this does operate in terms of drawing or impelling possible employees.

Mr. President, I shall conclude this argument with respect to the propriety and constitutionality of this statute with a reference to the very admirable initiative of President Kennedy in issuing the first Executive order seeking to deal with this problem and with pointing out the limitations of that order as bearing upon why we need legislation now.

It will be recalled that President Kennedy's Executive Order 11063 dealt, as I said a moment ago, with FHA and VA guaranteed loans. Then, in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 we dealt with housing through title VI of that act. There were other areas of regulation where there was a direct contribution by the Federal Government in connection with the establishment and creation of housing.

Mr. President, it must be recognized how sharp are the limitations which are involved in the Executive order to which I have referred. A relatively small proportion of all housing is now constructed with FHA or VA guarantees. The same is true in other fields, including urban renewal, which I described. The aggregate estimate of the housing affected by the Executive order is about 20 percent, leaving the enormous area of four-fifths of all housing which could be reached and would be reached, by the amendment which is before us, completely unaffected.

Mr. President, in addition, there is grave argument about the lack of implementation of the Executive order. Sanctions may be employed if the Executive order is departmental in character and about the worst that can be done is to blacklist those who are persistent violators from getting other help or aid from FHA or VA.

However, with the construction of homes being heavily financed by means other than FHA and VA guaranteed loans, and with the normal reluctance of these Government agencies, and the slow processes, and finally to get to any case where anybody is put on any such blacklist, it has been useful but very, very far from determinative even in the area in which it reaches—to wit, about 20 percent of all housing.

Thus, for all the reasons I have described, and particularly because it relates so directly and, indeed, so poignantly to the dignity of the individual who is affected by the denial of housing opportunity and the right to live where he and his family choose to live, that fair housing legislation is needed.

The additional factor in housing is that not only is the individual purchaser or renter generally the head of a family, the father or the husband, not only is his individual dignity affected, but when we deal with housing we also deal with it in the view and presence of the man's whole family, to whom he becomes nothing, as well as the whole community in which he either lives or to which he chooses to move.

Thus, Mr. President, it is understandable in terms of the negative, of a deep hurt and affront to the dignity of the individual; and in terms of the positive, in robbing him of many of the incentives to progress economically, because the great reward is a fine home, but when he makes the grade economically, his initiative and incentive are deadened by the fact that complete unreason takes over, and no matter how decent a human being he is, no matter how successful, he still cannot have his heart's desire; namely, a home, which has been his dream and which has driven him forward in the years in which he has worked so hard to obtain a better economic state, greater skill, and greater competence in the economic or professional field.

It is for these reasons that we have felt it our duty to press the matter. Like so many other great, modern reforms, it has a tremendous base in the cities and the States from which we can now build the base of experience, the base of acceptance. These laws exist in 21 States, and the fact that in some States like Illinois with enormous populations and with a minority of Negroes thus discriminated against they have not chosen to act, is all the more reason why we should act.

We have the 14th amendment and civil rights legislation to deal with situations in which State responsibility has not been coupled with the action required. In order to bear that responsibility fairly, not only to the people of that State who are also citizens of the United States, but also to the people of the whole Nation which must, if there is disorder and difficulty in that State, suffer for it. We should act now.

For all those reasons, we have put this matter forward with deep conviction as to its timeliness and as to its being the right, the urgent, and the necessary thing to do, to make a contribution to resolve the crisis in the cities, which is lawful and constitutional, and which has the broad base which I have described in 21 States and many of their municipalities, constantly growing in number, to justify our acting at this time.

I hope very much that we will have the understanding and the statesmanship to adopt this amendment and incorporate it in the bill, and that we who support it will have the skill, the patience, and the persistence to deal with the procedural hurdles which we know so well in this Chamber and which will, at long last, bring this promise into law.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] wishes to address the Senate at this time and I shall be very happy if he will do so now.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, on an occasion when the principal author of the amendment, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] is on the floor, I shall engage in colloquy with him to establish the basis for the statement I now make in summary.

As the Senator in charge of the bill reported from the committee, the question has been put to me: What is my attitude with respect to adopting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota?

For reasons which I shall develop in colloquy with him, I fully support offering the amendment at this time, and I hope very much that the Senate will adopt it.

Last year, in the Committee on the Judiciary, this same amendment, or this amendment substantially in the form now being offered, was offered as an amendment to the bill which the committee had reported. At that time, we tabled by, I think, the unanimous action of the committee, the proposal to add the amendment to the bill.

Why did we do that on that occasion, and now urge that it be added here?

Simply because last year we felt that if the bill could be reported clean from the committee, there remained time in the session last year to act favorably on the worker protection bill, and that in the intervening months the Committee on Banking and Currency could act favorably on the housing bill.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], in charge of the hearings on the housing bill in the Committee on Banking and Currency, advised the Senate that this is the time and perhaps the first and last time that we will have the opportunity to act on housing.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I support enthusiastically the addition of the fair housing amendment to the committee bill.

Now a little as to the background, and this is one man's impression:

The historians charged with writing the story of this Congress and the previous one will—I think—have a special interest in our discussions and debates on the issue of fair housing.

And I suspect they will devote a great deal of time to figuring out exactly why it took us so long. A fair housing law, in my opinion, is inevitable. It is the sort of basically moral issue that the Nation almost always responds to favorably.

Unhappily, it has not yet matched moral benefit with political benefit to the point where it has been embraced by a two-thirds majority of this body.

That time will come but the long-term interest of the Nation suffers in the meantime—suffers so greatly that I am hopeful the bill will be passed soon, tomorrow, although I would not advise any friend to bet hard cash on that possibility.

I have stood on this floor and made the case for fair housing on a number of occasions. In 1966, I was floor manager of the omnibus bill that carried fair housing as its main feature, and its lightning rod.

I speak to this point—

The defeat of that bill, even though its advocates numbered a majority of this body, can hardly be regarded as a tribute to my eloquence.

But let us remember that in 1966 a majority of this body did seek to apply cloture to permit the Senate to vote on that housing bill.

As to the matter of eloquence on my part, I think that I am a poor spokesman for the bill. I am not a Negro. I do not have a bit of trouble getting a home for my family anywhere I wish. I have never been turned away with lame excuses or evasive explanations which hide nothing.

The best spokesman for this bill would be a Negro father who had worked hard all his life, saved diligently, had gone out and then had come back that night, and had to explain to his children why he had not been able to get the house. Put yourself in the shoes of that father, or put your children in his children's shoes. That is the kind of witness we should have here urging favorable action on open housing.

If one wants to think a little beyond that, think of the reaction on those children and their reaction to our society. And if one does not like the way they react, do not blame Rap Brown.

It does not mean those of us here are not conscious of the ghetto and the problems which are posed not only for those inhabitants but for our Nation. The life of any family is going to be shaped or warped by the neighborhood in which it lives. When a man picks a home, he picks the schools his children are going to attend.

When a man picks a home, he has selected—whether or not he knows it—the range of job opportunities that are going to be open to him.

When a man picks a home, he has very often chosen the prices his wife will pay for meat and vegetables, and he has picked the companions that will influence the attitude of his children and his family and himself.

We know that jobs for the unskilled are declining steadily in the central cities. The new construction, the new industrial plants, the new shopping centers are all out in the suburbs, and public transportation from the cores of the cities to the suburbs is a little tough. We are talking about families who are not wondering where to leave the second car; they do not have the first.

We know that the neighborhood markets within walking range of the ghetto apartments are not known as cut rate grocers, although that is what the signs outside may proclaim.

This problem of where a family lives, where it is allowed to live, is inextricably bound up with better education, better jobs, economic motivation, and good living conditions.

I think what surprises me most about the problem of fair housing legislation is not that some people should oppose it, but that so many people are completely indifferent to it and could not care less.

Let us turn our minds back a little to fairly recent events. In 1964 we had a civil rights bill that contained a controversial public accommodations section. It was filibustered. The filibuster was beaten.

Let us look at the ingredients that went into those two victories and compare them with the ingredients present in the fall of 1966, when the bill went down to defeat in this Chamber.

In 1964, that inspiring, gently overwhelming rights march on the city of Washington was fresh in the minds of all. The lobbies and corridors were crowded with civil rights delegations and clergymen. The clergymen were an especially potent force. The patient determination of nonviolent demonstrators in the South was winning sincere sympathy in the North, where the rights demonstrators were seeking had long been taken for granted.

Civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King were winning new respect and admiration every day for developing and standing on an issue whose morality was becoming increasingly evident to the Nation.

And Bull Connor's police dogs—and let us not forget them—were snarling into every home that owned a television set. And now 1965. We passed a bill then. Again, the Nation's conscience was being stirred by delegations of clergymen. Again Northern whites felt great sympathy for Negroes trying to win a basic right long accorded everyone in the other regions of the Nation.

And Selma, Ala., with network television cameras on its street corners, showed the Nation what was happening to a gallant band of people petitioning for Negro suffrage.

These were the ingredients that produced a two-thirds vote in the Senate for cloture. That was the atmosphere. That was the setting.

Now let us look at the factors that were operating in 1966, when we mustered a majority of the Senate's votes, but fell far short of the needed two-thirds to permit us to take action.

Well, by the fall of 1966 the march on Washington was a dim memory, no longer a really important asset.

The delegations around the Capitol in support were thin and occasional, especially unspectacular in comparison with the throngs of the previous year.

The clergymen who provided a massive reminder of moral responsibility in 1965 no longer packed the corridors of the Capitol.

All of these were still plus factors, but had diminished in influence.

Now, let us analyze the minus factors as of the fall of 1966.

First, opposition from whites outside the South: In 1964 and 1965 this white opposition from outside the South was limited largely to hard core bigots, principally because the bills meant no really substantial change in policy in the States of the North and the West. They were, if not enthusiastic, mildly indifferent to earlier civil rights arguments and debate and petitions because they thought we were talking about somebody down South. All of a sudden they heard we were talking about their own neighborhoods, and who would move next door. So they sounded off in 1966, as they sound off now.

This time many Northern whites feel personally threatened. Many were certain, however mistakenly, that a housing bill would deteriorate their own property values.

That was one of the minuses in 1966, in the fall.

Second, the dramatic event, the thing that so often is important in the legislative process, as evidenced by Selma, Birmingham, Greenwood, and Oxford, this time was not working in favor of the bill, because the dramatic events that captured the headlines and television screens in 1966 were riots that continued and intensified in the summer of 1967, riots by Negroes imprisoned in big city ghettos—not in the South; in the North and in the West.

So this time the dramatic events seemed to portray the Negro as the aggressor, not the victim. There were not too many citizens thoughtful enough to examine just what justification slum Negroes might have for despair and anger.

For example, they had never had to come home and tell their children that they had saved money all their lives and had tried to buy a decent home, but they could not, because they could not pass the color test.

There was even a punitive spirit or mood in the air. I saw it in my mail, and I know that my fellow Senators have seen it.

One typical correspondent wrote me:

> Sure, I am for equal opportunity but why reward rioters with a new bill?

Here we come up against the same old illogic: Because some Negroes were wrong or irresponsible, all Negroes became unworthy.

Illogical? Of course it is illogical. We do not want it applied to us, as whites; I submit we ought not to apply it to anybody else. We want others' judgment of us to be made on the basis of each of us as an individual, good or bad—not while we get out of a car parked 50 feet away, where, if it is daylight, and if we are Negroes, a good many automatic judgments are made against us, based not on our talents, our temperament, our decency, our ambitions, or our sacrifices, but on our color. Sometimes others judge us, when they see our name in print, by the way we spell it; and, even yet, sometimes we are judged by where we go to church.

That is the kind of illogical judgment that hindered, to some extent, favorable action by the Senate on the bill of 1966, and the kind of judgment that confronts us now.

The cold fact is that the decisions of a nation often are based more on its emotional temperature than on its collective reasoning power. Sad, but true.

The forces working against civil rights in 1966 were inflated, and the forces working for it were diminished. It is as simple as that.

Politically, in so many ways, it becomes even more attractive to talk about building up the ghetto rather than concentrating on phasing it out. Build it up: Improve the housing, improve the schools, get the garbage out of the alleys, bring in jobs. Who wishes to quarrel with that? I do not. Who could? It is bound to have a tremendous and immediate appeal to the man who is trying to build a better life for his family, and who is worried right now—this very hour—about the foul-smelling airshaft and the gangs down on the corner.

But let us never get ourselves into the position of thinking that that is a full solution. I do not wish to deny anyone a chance to live in an improved ghetto. But at the same time, I do not wish to deny anyone a chance to get out of the ghetto, to buy a home of his own choosing, for whatever price he can afford to pay.

Of course, we should improve immediate living conditions where we can; but the Nation needs not just better housing it needs fairer housing, too.

I implore this Congress not to respond to the assumption prevalent in many parts of the white community that because some Negroes riot, all Negroes should be denied; that because some Negroes are wrong or irresponsible, all Negroes are unworthy. Let us discipline ourselves against such persuasions.

The true irony comes in when we consider just whom we would be punishing by the defeat of the fair housing amendment. Who would it be? Is it the small minority of Negroes who rioted?

No. They are not very likely to be shopping for homes in the suburbs, even if they had the chance. The persons most directly damaged would be the responsible middle-class Negroes, with savings and steady jobs—those who do not see violence as the road to self-improvement, and who would be appalled by the suggestion. Those who would be punished most by the defeat of this amendment are the very ones who have heeded the stock lecture that every generation of Americans has been given: "Work hard, save your money, and you can improve the circumstances of your children by getting into a better neighborhood."

That is what this bill seeks to enable them to do.

If fair housing is once again drowned by extended debate, I am convinced that 10 years from now, or even 5, historians will conclude that our action was not a wise one.

I hope in the next few days we will demonstrate that we are prepared to speak for the people of this country in behalf of the proposition that nobody has to run a litmus test of religion or race when he goes out to buy a home. That is what this amendment is all about. The time should long since have passed when there should be any difficulty in adopting it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I would like to enter into a dialog with him on his statement.

First, I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan on what I think has been one of the most effective statements on the fair housing amendment, not only during the course of this debate, but also during the course of the debates we had on the question of housing in the 89th Congress.

The Senator from Michigan serves as a member of the Judiciary Committee, as do I. We were both cosponsors of the 1966 civil rights bill and the 1967 bill, both of which included titles on housing. So we are both well aware of the course this subject has run in the Congress.

One of the things we are confronted with—and I would be interested in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan—is the fact that this is a subject on which we have had a great many hours of hearings in both Houses of Congress in both the 89th and 90th Congresses. We also had a great deal of debate on this matter in both Houses during the course of the 89th Congress, when the matter came to the floor.

Does the Senator from Michigan not agree with me that it is about time that we have action on this legislation, and that the Members of the Senate be given an opportunity to express themselves on a matter which is of such tremendous urgency and importance for the American people?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, first I am grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for his kind preliminary remarks.

Certainly, I could not agree more fully with the Senator from Massachusetts that this is a subject, the nature of which, and even the details of which, are broadly understood. Records have been made on both sides, House and Senate.

We are familiar with the favorable actions that have been had in many States and with the large number of municipalities that have been adopting fair housing ordinances.

The clock of history reads 1968, and time seems to run a little faster these days than it did 100 years ago.

We do not legislate because of pressure, but we ought to recognize the existence of pressure and act prudently in the recognition of time.

For all of these reasons, I know that the Senator from Massachusetts is right. This is the time for action, and I hope that we have favorable action, on open housing legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, is the Senator from Michigan not impressed by the fact that when this matter came before the Committee on the Judiciary in the last Congress, a majority, 10 out of the 16 members, of that committee agreed on a report on the open housing proposal?

We have seen in this Congress that a majority of the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee have endorsed this proposal. And I think the Senator would agree with me that it is certainly evident that a majority of the Members of this body have at one time or another indicated general support for this proposal.

I would think that this would certainly be an additional, compelling reason why the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on this legislation. When we have the committees that have considered the legislation most closely and carefully expressing themselves at one time or another as being in favor of such legislation, and when a majority of the Senate has indicated its desire for a bill, it certainly appears to me that we are really failing to meet our responsibilities by failing to have at least some vote in the Senate on the merits of this issue.

Mr. HART. It is very helpful that the Senator from Massachusetts has reminded us of that fact. Frankly, I had completely forgotten that 10 of the 16 members of the Judiciary Committee in the fall of 1966 recommended favorable action on open housing. That fact ought to be most persuasive now, coupled with the motion that is now pending, and the recommendation by a majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency which committee has held full hearings and concluded those hearings on the open housing section.

The accumulated effect of these two recommendations, I would hope, would persuade us to act favorably.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, certainly from a procedural point of view, full hearings and debate having been held, there really is very little reason to justify a continued delay in this matter. I think it is apparent from the remarks of the Senator from Michigan that what we really need is a sense of urgency.

As I listened to the very carefully prepared statement of the Senator from Michigan, I wondered whether the Senator from Michigan has as much trouble as I do in understanding the reason for this delay, particularly at a time like the present one when we have seen so many American lives lost in Vietnam, many of which were lives of men whose skin was of a different color.

How can we possibly justify to the American people any further acquiescence in a practice which would deny to these returning veterans—and many of our boys, of course, will not return—an opportunity to purchase a home in a particular area in the United States because of the color of their skin.

I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan would not agree with me that the overwhelming majority of American people will, in a clear and demanding voice, expect to provide for those returning veterans, not merely because they have served with such gallantry, effectiveness, and heroism, but also because we as a nation have once again been reminded that these individuals are Americans in every sense; that they are fighting for American rights as well as for the interests of the South Vietnamese; and that especially when they are meeting the most demanding obligations of citizenship, they certainly should not be denied the opportunity to seek out a place to live and rent or purchase a home, just because the color of their skin is different.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts has identified the most dramatic, appealing, and persuasive of all situations that should encourage us to act favorably on the bill.

I mentioned the Negro father who, after a lifetime of hard work, had saved enough to go out and get a home in a better neighborhood. He came back that night and explained to his children that he could not do it. I do not know how one explains to his children, in a situation such as that, why he was not able to do it.

That seems to me to be a pretty tough situation for anyone to confront and to say, "I am still against open housing." But when the man has been put into a uniform, and perhaps he returns with a Purple Heart on his blouse, and he cannot buy a home, I say it is very tough to vote against open housing with that man in the room with us.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan would not agree with me that when Congress can act expeditiously in sending 500,000 Americans to South Vietnam, the question cannot appropriately be asked as to why we are so dilatory in responding to many of those Americans whom we were so quick to send to Vietnam, by giving them the basic and fundamental right to obtain housing—the opportunity to buy a house where they desire, regardless of the color of their skin.

I am sure, as I believe the Senator from Michigan must be, that this question will be asked by Americans all over the country. If we can act so quickly and massively in one area, why can we not act similarly in another, particularly after, as the Senator from Michigan pointed out earlier this afternoon, we have twice gone through the consideration of this matter by the relevant committees—the Committee on Banking and Currency in the 90th Congress and the Committee on the Judiciary in the 89th? The matter has been debated on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House. I wonder what possible answer we can give to the American people when they ask that question of us.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts suggests a possibility that may offer additional encouragement to those of us who would like to see favorable action on the bill. Perhaps the picture he draws so effectively will strike the consciences of a great many people who at this moment in this country seem relatively indifferent to this debate.

I have been visited in the last few days by groups of ministers and laymen concerned about Vietnam. For understandable reasons, they are concerned, and they have some very firm opinions about how we should conduct ourselves in Vietnam.

The Nation has some problems that will be with us after Vietnam, and what we are talking about is one of them. I hope that those groups will add to their agenda of items of concern the matter we are debating, and that the next time they come to Washington they will spend a little time in support of this effort. In the long run, this matter may have more to do with our survival as a free people than what happens in Vietnam. That statement may strike those concerned about Vietnam as very harsh, but it may be true.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. In the course of this discussion and his statement, he has focused on dramatic and urgent reasons why we need action on this measure. In the course of his commentary earlier, he pointed out the history of the development of support for various pieces of civil rights legislation.

I believe all of us are realistic enough to know that, under many sets of circumstances, unless we have an opportunity to highlight this legislation and its relevance to current problems, all too often indifference and apathy carry us to the point where we fail to get action.

I believe that all Americans who have watched the television sets in the last 10 days or 2 weeks—really, for the last 3 years, but more dramatically in that period of time—and have seen the many American soldiers of all races who have been killed or wounded, want to express the support for those men which all of us feel. And they may ask the very question which the Senator from Michigan and others have been asking for a long time: Why can we not provide for all those individuals, who are representing this country who are giving their lives in its interest, and of whom we are all proud, the same opportunities for the purchase and rental of housing? Why can we not act to prohibit and proscribe the discrimination against these individuals because of the color of their skin? That is what this measure would do.

I believe that the American people are going to demand from us accountability for our actions and for the lack of expeditious action by the Senate on this measure.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE COPPER STRIKE AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, much has been heard recently about the balance-of-payments problem. Considerable emphasis has been placed on the idea of increased taxes, tax on travel, "buy America," and other devices designed to offset our current imbalance-of-payments difficulties.

One aspect of the problem has gone relatively unnoticed. That is the adverse effect of the copper strike which has been going on for nearly 7 months. At my request, the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service has prepared an interesting comment concerning this aspect of the problem. Mr. Vladimer N. Pregelj researched this matter, and has provided me with enlightening statistics.

In essence, he points out that some sources estimate that presently copper is already being imported at a rate of over $100 million a month. He goes on to state that if the copper strike continues, and if the industry stockpiles which are being steadily depleted are completely exhausted, the copper trade situation could feasibly contribute to the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments at a projected annual rate of $1 billion and upward. It is obvious that this Nation simply cannot afford such a deficit, particularly since it involves only one segment of our economy, though a vitally important one.

It is my earnest hope that the factfinding commission appointed by the President—composed of Professor Taylor, Monsignor Higgins, and Mr. Reedy—will soon be able to mediate this devastating strike which has so severely affected the Western States of this Nation and, as shown by the Pregelj article, has the potential for damaging the fiscal stature of the Nation as a whole.

I point out further than in addition to the producing areas in the Rocky Mountain West, States in the Middle West and, most especially, the Connecticut Valley, New Jersey, and the Baltimore area, have copper fabricating plants which are likewise being affected by the impasse—and "impasse" is the only way to characterize the status of the strike at the present time insofar as the companies and the union are concerned.

So I would hope that this Factfinding Commission in its meetings this week after having met with the companies and the union last week, will be able to come up with a solution. I hardly need to mention again that the situation has affected my State of Montana drastically, indeed, it has created a problem unparalleled in the history of Montana, and, I reiterate, unparalleled in the history of the copper industry as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the study to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD, together with two recent articles dealing with the same topic, one entitled "Copper Strike: Imports Harm Payments Balance—Wirtz Hints U.S. Intervention," written by Ed Townsend and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 12, 1968, and the other entitled "A Strike That Adds to the Dollar's Troubles," published in U.S. News & World Report of January 15, 1968; and a copy of the latest copper export control regulations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

Effect of the Copper Strike on the Balance of Payments

(By Vladimir N. Pregelj, analyst in international trade and finance, Economics Division, Legislative Reference Service, The Library of Congress)

The copper strike is now in its seventh month. While it has not yet resulted in critical copper shortages, it has had a significant impact on the United States balance of payments. It must be mentioned, however, that the effect of the strike on the U.S. copper industry is not the only, although it is presently undoubtedly the strongest, factor in the adverse balance of copper trade.

Domestically produced copper was declared in short supply as early as November 1965, and short-supply controls on its exports have been in effect ever since. Under these controls, applied in the form of export quotas, the exports of copper (measured in copper content) and its alloys (excluding brass) fell from a monthly average of 33,000 tons in 1965 to just under 30.000 tons in 1966 and under 29,000 tons in the first half of 1967. Despite the drop in quantity, the value of copper exports was on a slow upward trend throughout this period. Monthly average value of exports of copper stood at $27 million in 1965, and increased to $28 million in 1966, and $28.5 million in the first half of 1967.

Imports during this pre-strike period increased from about 43,000 tons a month in 1965 to almost 60,000 tons a month in 1966, this increase being due exclusively to a tremendous jump in imports during the second half of the year (85,000 tons a month), probably caused in part by the desire to build up stocks as a hedge against the possibility of a strike. During the first half of 1967, the monthly average stood at 55,000 tons. The value of copper imports averaged about $30 million a month in 1965, remained at the same level during the first half of 1966, and jumped to $73 million during the second half of 1966, resulting in a $51 million monthly average for 1966. During the first half of 1967, monthly imports of copper averaged $46 million.

Thus, the monthly average balance of copper trade was an unfavorable balance of about $3 million in 1965 and a favorable balance of about $3 million during the first half of 1966. During the second half of 1966, it again became strongly unfavorable ($50 million), thus reducing the monthly average balance figure for the entire year of 1966 to minus $23 million. During the first half of 1967, the average monthly balance stood at about minus $18 million.

It should be noted that there exists a discrepancy between the above data for the first half of 1967 and those given for the same period in the table supplied to your office by the Copper Division, EDSA. While this discrepancy is statistically significant, it is probably due to the exclusion of certain copper alloys (brass) or products from our figures and it does not, on the whole, change the overall picture.

Compared to the above cited pre-strike figures, import and export data for the period following the inception of the strike, as compiled by the Copper Division, BDSA, clearly indicate a distinct turn for the worse. Imports of copper increased from a monthly average of, roughly, $50 million during 1966 and the first half of 1967 to $60 million and have shown a marked tendency to grow from month to month. Copper exports, on the other hand, dropped from their almost traditional level of slightly under $30 million per month to about $20 million. The unfavorable balance of trade was thus increased by some $20 million a month to $40 million, or about double the levels of 1966 and the first half of 1967.

The situation is likely to worsen even further. Thus far, a part of the current requirements of copper users has been satisfied from the industry's stockpiles. These are being steadily depleted, and for many users it may only be a matter of time until they are completely exhausted. As a consequence, not only the demand for foreign copper, but also—in view of the increased demand—the price of foreign copper will increase, and the total outflow of dollars for copper imports will rise. In fact, some sources estimate that presently copper is already being imported at a rate of over $100 million a month. In such a case, the present copper trade situation would then contribute to the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments at an annual rate of $1 billion and upward.

Two recent articles dealing with the same topic and a copy of the latest copper export control regulation are inclosed for your information.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 12, 1968]

Copper Strike: Imports Harm Payments Balance—Wirtz Hints U.S. Intervention

(By Ed Townsend)

NEW YORK.—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has just suggested that the Johnson administration may find it necessary to intervene in the six-month copper strike. There is no national emergency; critical copper shortages have failed to develop because of the availability of copper supplies overseas.

But, Secretary Wirtz said, greatly increased purchases of copper abroad are having an adverse effect on the nation's balance-of-payments position at a critical time for the American dollar.

One electrical manufacturer, a major copper customer, is reported buying about $25,000 worth of copper in foreign markets each week. Its purchases overseas during the strike that began July 15 are near a $750,000 level. And it is only one customer of the copper industry.

A few days ago, James Boyd, president of Copper Range Company, estimated that purchases overseas to fill the losses of supplies mined and refined in this country have caused a balance-of-payments decline of $181 million in the past three months alone. Other top industry sources say the dollar outflow for copper now is about $20 million a week, a rate of more than $1 billion annually, exclusive of payments for fabricated copper and brass products.

PRICES HIGHER, TOO

This is a critical drain at a time when the administration is taking steps to plug dollar leaks, and the economic effects are aggravated by the fact that purchases abroad are at higher prices—adding to inflationary pressures on prices to United States consumers.

Under the circumstances, official Washington is becoming more impatient with the lack of progress in bargaining between major copper companies and the United Steelworkers of America (USW). Although administration spokesmen officially still stick to a position that there are "no present plans to do anything," this could change very quickly.

Secretary Wirtz left little doubt of that when he commented that the strike by the Steelworkers and 25 other unions has lasted "an intolerable length of time." He deplored the lack of signs of significant progress. Perhaps it's time to acknowledge the "failure" of collective bargaining in the copper industry, he said.

TAFT-HARTLEY QUESTION

Asked whether that might be interpreted to mean that the government is ready to use the Taft-Hartley Act or other measures to end the strike, Mr. Wirtz conceded, "I don't know." He added, "We are going to have to review our position."

Part of the reluctance to intervene is political: The Johnson administration—and the Democrats—must have organized labor's support in the 1968 election. Not only the copper unions but all of labor would react strongly against any government move that might be construed as strikebreaking.

But part is legal: If it wanted to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to get an injunction to end the strike in copper states, the administration would have to demonstrate a national emergency. That would be controversially hard to justify.

Other than Taft-Hartley, its only recourses would seem to be persuasion (and persuasion hasn't worked yet in the industry) or some extralegal form of fact finding.

The strike began routinely last July 15, when USW and a number of smaller unions struck the industry's "big four"—Kennecott, Phelps-Dodge, Anaconda, and American Smelting & Refining—and four smaller firms. Since then the strike has spread so that it has shut off more than 90 percent of the country's domestic copper production, along with half of its lead and zinc output.

Orders to customers of the struck companies have been filled from stockpiles, built up in anticipation of a labor showdown this year, or from supplies imported from abroad and sold at premium prices.

A CUSTOMER'S VIEW

The government's defense-production needs have been met on schedule, and will continue to be: no emergency is in the offing.

Electrical manufacturers and others who need copper for private production so far have managed to get enough of it—or have turned to substitutes. Some now say the pinch-off of domestic copper is beginning to hurt more and insist they can't go on "indefinitely" without the reopening of the domestic mines and mills.

Within the next few weeks, they say, pressures will be brought to bear on copper companies to negotiate settlements. But one management spokesman of a copper-using firm said his company would be "most reluctant" to do this: "We are 100 percent behind the copper producers," he said, "and we feel as they do that this is a hard test of the right of union leaders to take bargaining into their own hands, squeezing out the rank and file who are hurt by a strike."

The statement by an outsider, involved as a copper customer, is significant. It indicates why the strike is dragging on.

Both sides say they stand ready to negotiate at any time on a "realistic" basis. The trouble is, they can't agree on what is realistic.

Instead of the usual issues—wages, hours, and working conditions—the crux of the copper dispute is a major difference of opinion over the whole pattern of bargaining.

Employers contend that the unions are trying to establish industrywide bargaining by winning, initially, company contracts with a common expiration time. And they strongly object to union demands for wage uniformity instead of rates set, according to local conditions, in plant-in-plant contracts. Whoever wins will have a future bargaining edge.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 15, 1968]

A STRIKE THAT ADDS TO THE DOLLAR'S TROUBLES

A strike that seemingly has no end is bringing surprising results—it is weakening the dollar.

Floods of dollars are going abroad for copper that cannot be bought at home. Reason: U.S. mines are paralyzed by a strike that already is six months old.

At a time when President Johnson is moving to strengthen the dollar by keeping more dollars at home, the prolonged strike in copper is increasing the outflow of dollars to foreign lands.

The reason: American consumers of copper are stepping up imports to offset the loss of production in this country.

The effect: a weakening of the dollar by increasing the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

As a result, pressure is beginning to mount in Washington to end the walkout, now six months old.

Effects of the copper strike can be seen in the following facts:

Copper-consuming industries are spending an estimated 12 million dollars a week—an annual rate of 600 million—on imported copper.

Refined copper is entering the U.S. at a rate of about 14,000 tons a week, compared with 4,000 tons before the strike began on July 15.

To maintain their supplies of the metal, some users are having to pay sharply higher prices for copper brought in from abroad.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION?

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz suggested on January 3 that the Administration soon may intervene in some way to end the shutdown.

Mr. Wirtz said the strike "has gone on an intolerable length of time." He added: "Obviously, it is the kind of case that has a relevancy to the considerations the President is talking about in his dollar-balance statement."

The Government up to know has refrained from seeking an 80-day injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act. Such an order could end the strike temporarily but might not prevent resumption of the walkout after 80 days.

Most of the country's copper industry has been shut down since July 15 by the walkout of some 60,000 workers belonging to more than 20 unions. Production is down to about 3 per cent of normal, but the Commerce Department said it has no reports of serious shortages.

One reason, in addition to imports, is the huge stockpiles built up by users as a hedge against the strike.

Imports in November alone totaled 62,000 tons, an official of the Commerce Department said. About one third is coming from Canada, at 51 cents a pound, with the rest being brought from Europe at 61 to 62 cents.

The domestic price has remained at the prestrike level of 38 cents a pound, officials said, although only 3 per cent of the industry is operating.

In addition to supplies from abroad and the industrial stockpiles, there is a Government defense stockpile of 259,000 tons, far below the stated goal of 775,000 tons.

GOVERNMENT STOCK NOT AVAILABLE

A Commerce Department official said the Government does not plan to release copper from its defense stockpile, because it wishes to avoid union complaints of "strikebreaking."

Size of the industrial inventories before the strike was indicated by a Commerce Department preview of 1968, made public January 8.

The report said that by the end of June, 1967, mill inventories of finished copper products were 26 per cent larger than in December, 1966, and 64 per cent above September, 1966, levels. It added:

"Brass-mill shapes and wire-mill shapes held by manufacturers, electric-power utilities, and wholesale distributors increased 24 per cent from the end of September, 1966, to the end of June, 1967."

The auto industry was among those that prepared for the strike by building stockpiles. Auto companies use about 9 per cent of the copper consumed in this country.

AUTOMAKERS WORRIED

The auto industry now is becoming increasingly apprehensive over the shutdown, but so far the plants have maintained normal production and expect to do so for at least another month or two.

A General Motors spokesman said GM's position is "difficult," but there is "no pinch yet and probably won't be before the end of the month." Ford Motor Company said it built an inventory of 60 to 90 days above normal usage prior to the strike, using foreign sources in part. Chrysler Corporation reported that it is feeling no immediate pinch.

Another big user of copper, Westinghouse Electric, reported it is well supplied now, but is paying higher prices for the metal imported from Canada and Europe. "We figure," a spokesman remarked, "that we can get through February with only spot shortages."

Still another manufacturer said copper was being obtained by "paying exorbitant prices—as much as 68 per cent above the normal market price."

Thus, copper users are being forced to increase their manufacturing costs in order to stay in production. They are not the only ones complaining about the length of the strike. Officials of Western copper States for months have been seeking an end to the shutdown.

Why has the walkout in this industry lasted so long? What issues are so important to both sides as to deadlock the dispute since mid-July?

The companies accuse the unions of ganging upon the employers—through a new strategy of "co-ordinated bargaining." That is, officials of various unions having contracts with an employer act in concert on demands and strategy.

The industry also contends that the unions are trying to force industry-wide bargaining on the companies.

Employers contend that wages should be pegged to those being paid by industries in the area, while the unions want uniform rates across the country.

From the union side comes the argument that most other employers have granted company-wide contracts to unions. The labor groups, led by the Steelworkers, contend that unions have a right to co-operate in negotiations.

THE WAGE DISPUTE

Wages and "fringes" also are in dispute. The union coalition demanded pay raises of about $1 an hour over three years. The first offer from the companies ran about 52 cents an hour. Recently Phelps Dodge raised its offer to 64 cents an hour.

Phelps Dodge was the only major firm actively bargaining as the new year began. Federal mediators hoped to break the negotiating deadlock and find a solution to this strange strike.

[From Current Export Bulletin 962, Supplement to the Comprehensive Export Schedule, Jan. 22, 1968]

EXPORTS OF COPPER, JANUARY TO JUNE 1968—SECTIONS 373.20 (a)(2) AND (b)(2), AND SUPPLEMENT NO. 1 TO PART 373

PURPOSE AND EFFECT

Short supply controls over the export of copper and copper products from the United States will be continued during the six-month period January–June 1968.

During this period, the Office of Export Control will consider applications for licenses against the established export licensing quotas set forth below. This continues the level of control that has been in effect since January 1966.

The quotas established are as follows:

Commodity: (a) Copper scrap, as follows: Copper metalliferous ash and residues (Export Control Commodity No. 28401); copper or copper-base alloy waste and scrap, including copper alloy waste and scrap of less than 40 percent copper content where the copper is the component of chief weight (Export Control Commodity No. 28402);

Nickel waste and scrap containing 50 percent or more copper irrespective of nickel content (Export Control Commodity No. 28403).

(*Quota:* 16,500 copper content short tons.)

(b) Refined copper of domestic origin including remelted, in cathodes, billets, ingots (except copper-base alloy ingots), wire bars, and other crude forms (Export Control Commodity No. 68212).[1]

(*Quota:* 25,000 copper content short tons.)

(c) Copper-base alloy ingots composed essentially of copper with one or more other metals, for example: berryllium copper ingots, devarda alloy ingots, guinea alloy ingots, ounce metal ingots, etc. (Export Control Commodity No. 68212).

(*Quota:* 1,000 copper content short tons.)

(d) Semi-fabricated copper products and master alloys of copper, as follows:[2]

(*Quota:* 9,000 copper content short tons.)

Export control commodity No.	Commodity description
No,	
51470	Master alloys of copper containing 8 percent or more phosphor.
68213	Master alloys of copper.
68221	Bars, rods, angles, shapes, sections, and wire of copper or copper-base alloy.
68222	Plates, sheets, and strips of copper or copper-base alloy.
68223	Copper foil.
68223	Paper-backed copper foil.
68224	Copper or copper alloy powders and flakes.
68225	Tubes, pipes, and blanks therefor, and hollow bars of copper or copper-base alloy.
69892	Copper and copper-base alloy castings and forgings.
72310	Wire and cable coated with, or insulated with, fluorocarbon polymers or copolymers.
72310	Coaxial-type communications cable as follows: (a) Containing fluorocarbon polymers or copolymers, (b) using a mineral insulator dielectric, (c) using a dielectric aired by disks, beads, spiral, screw, or any other means, (d) designed for pressurization or use with a gas dielectric, or (e) intended for submarine laying.
72310	Other coaxial cable.
72310	Communications cable containing more than 1 pair of conductors of which any 1 of the conductors, single or stranded, has a diameter exceeding 0.9 mm. (0.035 in.), as follows: (a) Cable in which the nominal mutual capacitance of paired circuits is less than 53 nanofarads/mile (33 nanofarads/kilometer, except conventional paper and air dielectric types, (b) submarine cable, or (c) cable containing fluorocarbon polymers or copolymers.
72310	Other communications cable containing more than 1 pair of conductors and containing any conductor, single or stranded, exceeding 0.9 mm. in diameter.
72310	Other copper or copper-base alloy insulated wir and cable.

---

[1] Shipments of refined copper produced from foreign-origin copper raw materials, and refined copper produced from material which was declared as an offset against an equivalent quantity of foreign-origin copper raw materials entered into the United States under a recent U.S. Customs Import Entry, may be licensed for export without a charge against the quota (see paragraph 373.43 (b)(2)).

[2] Shipments of semi-fabricated copper products and master alloys of copper under United States military contracts or under contracts financed by the Agency for International Development will be licensed without a charge against the quota.

Licensing under past participation in exports licensing method

The quotas set forth above for copper-base scrap, refined copper, and copper-base alloy ingots will be licensed in accordance with the Past Participation in Exports licensing method described in § 373.8 of the Comprehensive Export Schedule, except as otherwise indicated in the footnote to the quota announcement in this Bulletin.

Of the total quota of 9,000 copper content short tons established for semi-fabricated copper products and master alloys of copper, 65% (or 5,850 copper content short tons) will be allocated in accordance with the Past Participation in Exports licensing method. The remaining portion of the quota, 35% (or 3,150 copper content short tons) will be reserved to meet essential export requirements that cannot be satisfied under the Past Participation in Exports licensing method.

Quantities allocated for licensing to each exporter under the Past Participation in Exports licensing method will be the same during the January–June 1968 six month period as it was during the period of July through December 1967.

Time schedules for submitting applications

An exporter of any commodities for which a quota has been established, except for semi-fabricated copper products and master alloys of copper, who qualifies as a "historical exporter" under the Past Participation in Exports licensing method shall submit his applications no later than May 31, 1968. An exporter of these quota commodities who does *not* qualify as a "historical exporter" shall submit his applications no later than February 16, 1968.

The submission of applications for licenses to export semi-fabricated copper products and master alloys of copper is not subject to time schedules. Applications for these products may be submitted at any time.

Accumulated inventories

1. Copper ores, concentrates, matte, blister copper and other unrefined copper: Previously, where an exporter intended to export these commodities for refining overseas without return of the refined copper to the United States, the Office of Export Control granted licenses for 80% of the exporter's available quantity of his July 1–November 15, 1967 production, and required the exporter to retain the remaining 20% in his accumulated inventory. The Office of Export Control will now consider applications to export this accumulated inventory, even though the exporter does not intend to return the refined copper to the United States.

2. Copper and copper-base alloy waste and certain nickel scrap: The provisions of paragraph 373.20(b)(2)(ii) remain in effect limiting consideration for approval to export these commodities to eighty percent of an applicant's inventory and receipts where the export will not result in the import of refined copper into the United States for consumption.

Applicability of other provisions

Exporters are reminded that all other special copper provisions continue in effect. These provisions are set forth in §§ 373.20 and 373.43 of the Export Regulations. It should be noted in particular that applications for licenses to export copper ores, concentrates, matte, blister copper and other unrefined copper generally are denied. However, applications for licenses to export these commodities as well as copper and copper-base alloy waste and certain nickel scrap that cannot be processed commercially in the United States will continue to be considered for licensing without a charge against the export quota. In connection with the exception to the general policy of denial for copper ores, concentrates, matte, blister copper and other unrefined copper, the Export Regulations formerly described these commodities as not commercially processable because of "contamination or for any other reason." They are now identified as not commercially processable for "technological or economic reasons."

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACTION: JANUARY 22, 1968

Accordingly, the Export Regulations are amended in the following respects:

1. Supplement No. 1 to Part 373 is amended as set forth above under Time Schedules for Submitting Applications.

2. The first sentence of paragraph 373.20(a)(2)(i) is amended to read as follows:

(i) Shipments not commercially processable in the United States.

Consideration will be given to approval of applications covering the proposed export of commodities described in paragraph (1) above, which because of technological or economic reasons, cannot be processed commercially in the United States.

3. Paragraph 373.20(a)(2)(ii) is amended to read as follows:

(ii) Shipments for which processing facilities are not available due to strike conditions.

Consideration will be given to approval of applications received from, or on behalf of, copper producers covering the proposed export to Country Groups T and V of commodities described in paragraph (1) above, that cannot be processed commercially in the United States due to the nonavailability of processing facilities caused by strike conditions in the domestic copper industry. Such applications shall include the following certification:

"I (We) certify that due to strike conditions there are no domestic facilities available for processing the commodities described on this application."

4. The second paragraph of 373.20(b)(2)(ii) is amended editorially to set forth in full, rather than by cross reference, the certification required by that paragraph. As amended, the second paragraph reads as follows:

Where an application covers commodities to be exported under the provisions of this paragraph 373.20(b)(2)(ii) that will be smelted and the resulting refined copper, or an equivalent quantity thereof, will be imported into the United States for consumption, it shall also contain the following certification:

"I (We) certify that there are no domestic facilities available for processing the commodities described on this application. The refined copper produced from these commodities, less the customary charges made by the foreign refinery, or an equivalent amount of refined copper will be imported into the United States for consumption."

Such applications may be for one hundred percent of the stocks of the commodities held by the applicant. However, the refined copper resulting from the export of copper bearing scrap commodities must be imported into the United States no later than 120 days after the scrap export to which it is related.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the purpose of information, when did the President appoint the factfinding commission?

Mr. MANSFIELD. About 2 weeks ago. And they met 4 days last week, on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

They met with Phelps-Dodge and the Steelworkers Union on Tuesday; on Wednesday, with Kennecott and the Steelworkers Union; on Thursday, with Anaconda and the Steelworkers Union; and on Friday, with American Smelting & Refining, ASR, and the Steelworkers Union.

On the basis of those hearings, this week they decided to go into private conference, and they are considering ways and means by which this matter may possibly be settled.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the opinion of the Senator from Montana that the factfinding commission appointed by the President should strive objectively and impartially to consider the facts and then reach a judgment that will best serve the general interests of the whole economy of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. And I might say that he has some copper fabricating plants in his State which are affected by the strike.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Montana was not on the floor today when I pointed out that Ohio is being seriously and prejudicially affected by the strike that is going on, and that the Ohio economy wants something done immediately and quickly to settle the dispute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator made a good statement. I am sorry that I was not here to hear it. However, I point out that, in contrast to the fabricating plant areas, in cities like Butte and Anaconda, there are no other industries to fall back on, and these are one-commodity towns. As a matter of fact, so is East Helena, which has the ASR located there. They have the State capital 5 miles away, and perhaps some people can find jobs there. However, as far as Butte and Anaconda are concerned, they are in the dumps. There is no other place there to find employment, and the situation is serious and calls for attention right now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, that would mean that both sides must recognize the serious impact upon the economy and the ability of people living in those areas to sustain themselves. If an agreement is not reached, they will be unable to do so. An agreement should be reached by the parties.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. I am only sorry that up to this time there has been no real, free collective bargaining. What has happened is that the unions and the companies have been at arms' length.

What should be done is that they ought to get them around the table and work them on a 24-hour, round-the-clock basis until a settlement is reached.

The livelihood of too many people is being hurt gravely by this strike, and the losses which they have suffered will never be regained.

FRENCH INDEBTEDNESS TO THE UNITED STATES—A DEBT OF HONOR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on February 5, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], made a statement concerning the French World War I indebtedness to the United States. In effect, the statement gave the impression that the United States should not press for a settlement of its claims outstanding on the

Government of France. I dispute that statement, and I should like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

First, it is agreed that the French have been punctual in paying back the loans we made them after World War II. Indeed, as the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out, France has prepaid many of its obligations incurred after World War II. No one disputes this.

With regard to the World War I indebtedness, however, the French are in default on $5.1 billion and have not paid a penny of principal or interest since 1932.

Britain and other countries owe us another $10.4 billion from World War I which has also been in default since 1932.

The basic question is, however, are these still valid claims? The answer is "Yes." The French Government has not contested the validity of its World War I debt to the United States. It has insisted that there is a direct connection between French payment of this debt and of reparation payments by Germany to France. The U.S. Government to this day, however, has maintained that there is no connection between German reparations and the debts of allied nations to the United States. If someone owes me $100 he cannot claim forgiveness simply because someone else owes him $200. That is a simple legal principle. It is also clear that a creditor has the legal right to demand payment of a note from one debtor, while agreeing to extend further credit to another debtor.

Furthermore, it is a well-accepted principle that if two people owe each other money and one calls for payment from the other, the second person has a right to cancel one debt against the other.

Moreover, Mr. President, there is another factor which is relevant in this issue; that is, that the Government of France has not hesitated to buy every dollar's worth of gold they can get from the U.S. Treasury's dwindling stock. Since 1958, the French have purchased $3.6 billion of our gold, not including whatever they bought in the last quarter of 1967 when we lost over $1 billion.

In other words, France is making a run on our gold while she owes us $5.1 billion. We have a perfect right to say, "Before we give you any more gold, we will first give you credit against some of the $5.1 billion you owe us. After you have brought us $5.1 billion, we will then proceed to pay you in gold, as in the past. But your note is in arrears. It is past due. When you bring the dollars in, we will apply them against the $5.1 billion. After that, we will be glad to sell you more gold."

We have a perfect right to do that, Mr. President, just as a bank has a right to look at the fact that one has money in its bank. If a person has a note that is past due, they simply credit the note against the bank account. I have seen banks do that. At times it has taken businessmen by surprise to have that happen, but the bank has a right to do that and they sometimes proceed to do it.

The French raid on our gold stock has given rise to enormous private speculation in gold to the extent that since 1965, more than the entire world's gold production has gone to private hands, and there has been a decline in official holdings of gold by the world's monetary institutions.

This is not an action of a friendly, creditor country. This is an action of rebuff to the United States from the nation on whose soil American soldiers have spilled a lot of blood. Blood to preserve the "glory" of France. But we do not claim these debts as blood debts. We do not want to return to the situation which existed during most of the 19th century wars between Germany and France in which the victor bled the financial sources of the vanquished. Nor do we want to return to the atmosphere which existed after the Treaty of Versailles where allied countries demanded a blood debt from Germany, far beyond her capacity to pay. That treaty was used so effectively by a paperhanger to lead a frustrated nation into triggering off World War II. Yes, Adolf Hitler, waving the Treaty of Versailles, aroused the indignation of the German people to the point of insanity.

What we are saying is that first of all, we have legal claims on France and other countries which are beyond dispute, and second, we can and should press those claims on any country we want to, while extending terms to others.

Why should we be nailed to the cross of gold by any country which owes us $5 billion? Asserting our legal rights would not be an act of vengeance; this is a debt of honor incurred by an ally.

I think we saw something of the reward France got after the vengeance they exerted in demanding reparations beyond the ability of Germany to pay. They got themselves defeated in another war, which was part of their vengeance, which this Nation did not advocate.

Why do we owe them something after we won for them the war they lost? Imagine that, Mr. President. France owes us $5 billion. France goes to war with Germany. Germany defeats France and captures the whole place, including the North African holdings. Having taken the entire matter over, the United States sends its soldiers in, liberates France and defeats Germany, with a handful of Frenchmen who left to come to our side.

The quality of their troops was not up to ours and that is one of the reasons that De Gaulle despises us, because we would not trust his troops to go in ahead of ours. Our troops performed so much better than his that he would not even recognize D-day. They did not go ashore on D-day to do their job to liberate France. He recognizes the southern French invasion, of which I was a part, as the day when the liberation of France began because there were French troops there. However, they were not the first troops who went in there either.

Mr. President, my point is that after we liberated France, for De Gaulle to come in here, or for anyone to contend they no longer owe us the $5 billion is inconceivable.

Mr. President, how much money do you think they would have gotten out of Germany if we had not liberated them to begin with? If they think we owe them a debt—I wonder whether people can be in their right mind to assert such a claim.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have not heard the thought expressed heretofore that has just been uttered by the Senator from Louisiana. I have had many letters from constituents in Ohio asking that we demand the French Government to pay the United States the debt which it owed to us as a consequence of World War II. The argument has been made that if we demand of France the payment of its debt to the United States, France will demand of Germany reparations equal to what we expect France to pay to us.

The Senator from Louisiana raises a most interesting point. He states that France was beaten, that it quit in battle.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They surrendered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was gone. We stepped in to save France. France now says that it was victorious over Germany—not France, because the French people do not say it; De Gaulle says it. De Gaulle says, "I was victorious over Germany and, therefore, I have a right to demand of Germany reparations equal to the debt which we incurred to the United States." It is plain balderdash, it is unsound, and it should not be listened to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With reference to what the Senator said, some Frenchmen would like to contend that it was more or less inferred that France would not demand reparations from Germany if the United States would not ask to be paid the $5 billion.

With reference to that, I would say, "Where does it say that in the contract?"

France has defaulted on $5 billion. If some American official claims he had authority to forgive that $5 billion, I want to know who, and when, and I want to see the contract.

I know enough about law to know that these people owe us $5 billion—perhaps it is even larger——

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is $7 billion, I believe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It may very well be larger, but my computation indicates $5.1 billion is in default out of a total debt of $6.9 billion. In any event, that is a large sum of money and it was never forgiven.

There is no showing that the United States agreed to forgive that debt on any basis whatever. What it amounts to is that the United States was extremely generous to a country which we had befriended in this century as no other country ever befriended it. Despite our generosity that country now is actually assaulting the stability of the American dollar to the greatest extent possible.

Not as a matter of vengeance, or of hate, or of anything else, we are simply saying to France, "We are running short on gold. If it is all the same to you, old friend, it is about time you started paying us that $5 billion."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator recommending that we demand payment of the debt?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. In fact, I would recommend that we go further than that and make the suggestion that the next time France comes over here with dollars to turn into gold, we say to her, "Would you mind turning in your dollars, and we will credit that amount to the debt you owe us. You owe us $5 billion. We will give you credit for the $100 million, let us say, or the $200 million, you are bringing in, and apply it on the $5 billion debt. We are so happy that at last you are able to pay your honest debts."

Mr. President, to get the figures straight, let me state also that the original debt of France was $7,336 million, and that that has been gradually reduced down to $5,077 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Without interest?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that includes interest.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It does? Well, I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am referring to the figures that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, put out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would not accept those figures as being accurate. [Laughter.] I think it is $7 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, so far as I am concerned, I am willing, for the sake of argument, to accept the figure, but I differ 100 percent with the conclusion.

His conclusion is that they do not owe us the $5 billion. My conclusion is that they do owe us the $5 billion. It has never been forgiven. It has not been paid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1931, France said it could not meet its interest obligations, and our Government waived the payments. Since that time, the Government of the United States has carried on its books from year to year the amount owed on the principal and the accumulated interest that was developed on the basis of the debt. Our Government has indicated, by its books, that it never released France from the debt.

In 1931, France did not claim that we said to her, "If you will release Germany from the payment of reparations, we will release you, France, from the payment of the debt." It was never agreed upon.

Now then, the truth is that there are probably 10 or 12 other nations who owe us money. England owes us more than France, but England has not been so ferocious in its purpose to destroy the United States as De Gaulle has been.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, Mr. President, the Senator states the situation as I understand it. So far as this country is concerned, as between two people who owe me money, say, as an American banker—I do not know about two creditor nations—but I could look up one of them and say, "Look, old boy, you are doing pretty well. You are prosperous now. You have lots of money. You are showing a nice, big profit for this year. You are doing very well, indeed. How about paying some money on that note you owe me? You do owe it. It is past due."

I could look at another debtor over here and say, "Gee, it is tough, old boy. I see that you lost money again this year. I will tell you what I will do—as I have done for all you fellows—I will give you a while longer to pay." If he cannot pay me and he goes broke, I guess that I will lose my money.

But if he strikes it rich and is doing well, and is showing a profit, there is no reason why he should not come around and make a payment on his note. That is what regular bankers would do, I would think.

We cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip, but when De Gaulle comes over here wanting to destroy the value of the American dollar, it seems to me that we ought to say, "Look, old boy, if it is all the same with you, we are not going to give you any gold, but we will credit you with whatever money you have brought with you against the $5 billion debt which you owe us." That is what bankers would do. Why we do not do that, is more than I can understand.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that so far as the other countries are concerned who owe us $10 billion, I see no particular reason that we should take the view that that money is forgiven. We did not forgive it. They said they could not pay it, and when they said they could not pay it, we said, the countries being in the bad situation that they were, "We will go along with you and give you more time."

The Senator knows that, in years gone by, nations have been known to commit acts of war against another country which would not pay its debts. They would blockade the harbor, shoot the place up, or capture one of their cities and hold the place as hostage until they did pay up.

Of course, we do not propose to do anything like that. What we say is, "Here is the honest debt you owe us. You have our dollars. You admit you owe us that debt. When you come to give us the dollars for gold, we will give you credit against your note instead."

Mr. President, why we should bankrupt our country before we call upon those who would bankrupt us to pay up their debts to us, I cannot understand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would want to be most lenient with France, to the utmost of what leniency means. We helped France in World War I. In World War II we saved her. De Gaulle is wholly unconscious of the sacrifices that the U.S. Government and its people made for France. He is not only unconscious of those sacrifices, but he is now deliberately trying to throw us into a monetary and fiscal catastrophe. He is deliberately sending credits in, asking for payments in gold, and not wanting to take our paper dollars. He is—I regret to say it—an enemy of the United States.

Now, then, how long can we tolerate De Gaulle's challenge and his enmity, without saying to him, "You demand payment of your credits in gold. Why don't you pay your debt to the United States"?

I have reserved my judgment on this matter, but I think the time has come when something along the lines of what the Senator from Louisiana has said must be done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say the State of Louisiana, as the Senator knows, was at one time a French territory. The people in south Louisiana are predominately of French ancestry, and extremely proud of it. If one wants to bring the house down in front of any audience in south Louisiana, the people of which, as I have said, are predominately of French ancestry, about all he has to do in the course of his speech is say, "I think it is about time Charles de Gaulle paid us the debt that he honestly owes us." There are people down there who are proud to be of French ancestry, who are proud of the glory of France. But, thinking of the situation, here is something they believe he owes us, and before we empty Fort Knox of any advantage we may have there, it might be well to ask them to pay off this debt.

I personally do not feel we should ask the French to pay this debt on the basis that we are angered or upset about the way Charles de Gaulle has acted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think we should.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not think it ought to be on that basis. We should simply say, "We are of the honest opinion that you are able to pay your debts. We gave you billions of dollars after World War II to help rebuild. We are not asking anything for that. We did not expect anything for that then. We do not now. Nor do we expect anything for the fact that we helped liberate you. We did not ask anything then. We do not now. That was not in the contract.

"But here is something you can afford to do. You can afford to pay off this debt better, frankly, than we can afford to pay you $5 billion. So we think you should start paying off those notes that are past due."

Mr. President, it may be that in days to come England may be in good shape. I certainly hope that that nation, whose Prime Minister is in the city, and perhaps in the Capitol at this very moment, may get his house in order, so that Britain may pay some of the money she owes us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot help but express my great admiration for the people of Finland. Finland, in the face of most serious adversities, paid not only the principal but the interest on her debt. De Gaulle, whom I admired 5 years ago as being a great leader who was to stabilize France, for some reasons has proceeded on a course to destroy England and the United States. Why?

The Senator from Louisiana answered that a little while ago when he talked about his disappointment that he was not in some way included in the movement that brought the victory to the allied forces of the United States.

May I hear the Senator's view on that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not know—it is beyond my power to describe the exact reason—why Charles de Gaulle feels toward the United States as he does. I would certainly hope he does not feel that way toward the Senator from Louisiana. I am partly of French ancestry, myself. My middle name is Billiu; it refers to my maternal grandmother. I am very proud to be partly French by ancestry.

I proudly volunteered to take part in the first LCT landing onto French soil in southern France. May I say that I was extremely lucky that day, because the small boat just ahead of me blew up into a thousand pieces.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was that in World War II?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. World War II. The man who occupied the majority leader's seat until just a few minutes ago [Mr. HART], was shot down on the Normandy beaches shortly before that. We asked no particular favors for it one way or the other. Those of us who proudly went to France's aid did so under the order of our Commander in Chief, it is true. But some of us volunteered to accept particularly hazardous assignments. In doing that, we find difficulty in understanding Charles de Gaulle's attitude toward us. He would have to explain it himself; for the life of me, I cannot explain it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thought the Senator from Louisiana made some explanation of why De Gaulle is following a course which seemingly would be destructive of our country and was also doing the same thing with respect to Great Britain. Why?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have had persons point out to me that there have been a great number of situations in which Charles de Gaulle has adopted a policy which was parallel with what the Communists wanted. Whether that was done with a view of attracting certain leftwing voters to vote for his party, I would not know, but apparently he must feel it is popular with some sources, or else he must find some less worthy reason to take the attitude he takes toward the United States and our citizens.

I find it somewhat difficult to buy his protestations that he greatly fears that the mammoth American capitalistic system might gobble up and swallow up all of Europe.

My impression is that if he had been anywhere nearly so good a friend to us as the United States has been to France in this century, and as France has been to the United States in prior centuries——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree. I do not believe that De Gaulle represents the thinking of the French people. The people of the United States are deeply friendly to the people of France. My belief is that the people of France are deeply friendly to the people of the United States. De Gaulle does not truly represent the honest judgment of the French people. They are good. They know that we went to their aid in two World Wars. They know that we have helped them.

De Gaulle, I must finally say, in spite of his bigness and grandness, is showing all of the weaknesses of a little man who allows rebuffs and disappointments to dominate his judgment.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for allowing me to participate with him in this discussion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I very much appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has said. I believe his remarks accurately reflect what a great number of Americans are thinking about this matter.

If someone had befriended me to the extent that this Nation has befriended France in this century—in a way which ordinarily would evoke gratitude, friendship, love, and affection—I would not be at all dismayed if anyone in that country were willing to invest some of its money in my country.

If anyone in France has any money to invest in Louisiana, I think, so far as I am concerned, that we would be delighted to have him do so. If he thinks he knows how to run an industry, we might even lend him some money to help him begin operations, or find some people who would coinvest with him, if it appeared that he knew what he was doing. We can use more business acumen in helping to build the commerce of Louisiana. We would be extremely pleased to have him do so.

We would not hold it against Frenchmen or against France that De Gaulle does not indicate any great love for this country. We would be happy to welcome Frenchmen with open arms and to assist them in any way we reasonably can. They would not suffer from any prejudice by virtue of the fact that they are not citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, I repeat: Why should we be nailed to the cross of gold by any country which owes us $5 billion? Asserting our legal rights would not be an act of vengeance; this is a debt of honor incurred by an ally. We are a creditor-country to France from World War I, and we have been a very lenient creditor-country.

They have not paid us a penny since 1932 on those debts. But the French are demanding gold for every U.S. dollar they can get their hands on, and we simply can no longer turn the other cheek. We have to assert our legal rights. At this time we have a critical balance-of-payments problem, due in large measure to our commitments abroad to defend Europe and the former colonies of Europe—especially the vacuum left by the French in Indochina, now known as Vietnam. This problem would be greatly alleviated if we received payment on the debts other countries owe us.

Mr. President, the United States is now embarking on a very restrictive program to preserve its dwindling gold stock. We have an embargo on American corporations sending capital to continental Western Europe. The administration is proposing a stiff tax on tourists who want to spend their savings outside the Western Hemisphere. Our banks are prohibited from making loans beyond a certain point. If we are willing to restrict the freedoms of American individuals, banks and corporations to protect our gold stock, should we not also be willing to assert our legal claim against countries to which we have loaned billions of dollars?

I would hope that our financial officers would be hardheaded enough to press our legal claims against other countries. In fact, I would suggest that when the debtor countries come over here to raid our gold stock, we should accept their dollars and give them a credit for payment of those debts, and not until the debt is paid should they be entitled to purchase gold from us.

Again, we want to repeat, this is not a claim based on a blood debt; it is a claim of honor. Let us not have to repeat those immortal words of Winston Churchill to the effect that the "biggest cross I have had to bear was the cross of Lorraine." Winston Churchill has now passed from the scene but his former cross is now weighing heavily on the financial shoulders of the United States of America.

CONSPIRACY TO FIX DRUG PRICES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I direct attention to the fact that once in a while a person can, I believe with propriety, say either "I was right" or "I told you so."

Two years ago, I documented for the Senate, in page after page, the extent and depth of the swamp in which a number of American drug companies wallowed, fixing prices and rigging bids on foreign sales of antibiotics, including tetracycline. Senators will recall the case where the companies actually rolled dice to see who would take a particular bid, all their prices being identical.

And, after that kind of behavior, those of us who criticize high drug prices are labeled as opponents of "free enterprise"! Mr. President, I have always thought I was for free enterprise, as I understand it. But what is "free" about fixed prices? What is "enterprising" about an illegal conspiracy?

The drug companies which were convicted in December 1967, had been originally indicted in 1961. The case then languished in the Department of Justice, to my great dismay. In 1965, however, I learned that there was an effort afoot at various levels of the administration to persuade the Justice Department not to prosecute this lawsuit, and to permit a nolo contendere plea to be entered and some kind of compromise to be made. I corresponded with the Department of Justice, urging that the tetracycline case be acted upon, and then the wheels finally began to turn in the Antitrust Division. In December 1965, I was advised that Justice would prosecute.

This past December, a Federal jury convicted three drug companies—three of the biggest—of conspiring to fix the price of tetracycline—a widely used antibiotic. Those companies, American Cyanamid, Pfizer, and Bristol-Myers, as well as two others, Squibb and Upjohn who were listed as coconspirators, faced civil suits potentially totaling hundreds of millions of dollars.

This conviction comes as no surprise to me, nor, I suspect to most Senators, although it may have come as a surprise to some.

I recall that when I made my speech referring to this conspiracy, the drug companies, through their highly paid lobby and their press connections, poopooed the idea, said that this was warmed-over biscuits, that I did not know what I was talking about, and so on.

I think the record now shows who knew what he was talking about. The companies have been convicted by a jury of criminal conspiracy and may owe the Government, as well as their other victims, a lot of money.

For years now, a number of us have repeatedly contended and demonstrated that there was absolutely no sensible rhyme or reason to the fantastic prices charged for many of the drugs sold to the American people. In too many instances, the obvious policy of the drug manufacturers was to simply, bluntly, and cruelly "charge what the traffic would bear." Mr. President, it is apparent to me that the "traffic" will bear it no longer.

It is not only this conviction in Federal Court which demonstrates that the American people and their representatives are fed up with this baldest form of exploitation of the sick and the poor. Just a few months ago, the Senate passed—may I say by a very close margin; I am happy to see present in the Chamber the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who helped in this very close fight—an amendment I had offered which sought to at least protect the Government from being repeatedly victimized by extraordinarily high and what appeared to be artificially high drug prices. We were able to retain a portion of this amendment in conference—I am hopeful that, ultimately, we will be able to gain acceptance of the entire provision.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that, now that Chas. Pfizer & Co. has been convicted of conspiracy along with other companies—they arranged for a public opinion poll, to see what the public thinks of them, as well as of other drug companies.

This is what Pfizer has provided the court in support of its appeal from the conviction—Pfizer provided the court with a public opinion poll, taken at its own expense, to see what the American people think of drug companies compared with other industries. It was designed to measure the feeling in the community in which prospective jurors resided.

Why would they want to know that? Well, their argument is that they should not be tried in that community, because they would have difficulty obtaining a fair jury, that prospective jurors would be prejudiced against them.

So, they took this poll in this area. Where was the area? It was in New York City and a suburban county. That is a pretty big place in which to take a poll. A lot of people live there. They asked: "Do you think prices are unreasonably high?"

Mr. President, the poll indicated that 75 percent of those interviewed stated that they felt that the prices of prescription drugs were unreasonably high.

I read the last few paragraphs:

> In all, 97 per cent of those responding were critical of the industry in at least one of the categories.
>
> Of those who assumed a $10 retail price for a drug, the largest share—33 per cent—guessed the manufacturing cost at $3.

That means that 33 percent of the people who were polled guessed that if one is paying $10 for a drug, the manufacturing cost is $3.

Mr. President, may I say that those of us who studied this matter know that the cost to the manufacturer might very well be less than $1 if one pays $10 at retail.

The poll revealed that—

> Of those who were asked to believe that $3 was in fact the manufacturing cost, 86 per cent thought a retail price of $10 "excessively high."
>
> Voters were consistently more critical of the drug industry than non voters. Men voters were especially critical.
>
> "In fact," Roper told Pfizer, "male voters surpassed Ivory Soap's 99-44/100 per cent with a full 100 per cent citing the drug industry negatively on one or more of . . . six questions. In our experience, it is rare indeed to find 100 per cent of any group agreeing on anything."

When they asked all of the group who thought drug prices unreasonably high, who thought manufacturers do not have sufficient concern about holding down or reducing prices, who thought manufacturers make unreasonably high profits, and who thought drug manufacturers frequently have an understanding to fix prices at a high level—meaning a conspiracy—in all of those categories from Pfizer's own poll, taken by Roper, at Pfizer's instigation, the results showed that, with respect to the male voters, 100 percent of them were critical of the drug industry on one or more of these points.

I think that, to some extent, this explains why Mr. George Squibb, a third generation member of a family long associated with drug manufacture, had the courage to speak out against certain policies of the drug industry. He testified that if the industry did not clean up its own house, it was going to face action by Congress that would be less satisfactory than would be the case if the industry voluntarily cleaned up some of the mischief in its house.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that a number of cities and States have already filed treble damage suits against these companies and that more are expected to file suits.

Texas, Florida, Wisconsin, and West Virginia are among the States which are acting to protect their interests and recover excess charges. I am hopeful that my State of Louisiana will also seek redress.

In addition, if these States were bilked, there is a good chance that the Federal Government was also taken for a ride. I would certainly like to find out. If the Federal Government has been taken for a ride, then we should prosecute a claim for damages on behalf of the taxpayers of this country.

In the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation designed to prohibit the deduction as a normal business expense of the punitive portion, two-thirds of the damages awarded following a criminal conviction for the violation of the antitrust laws.

It is inconceivable to me that illegal business conduct of this nature should be recognized as "ordinary and necessary expense." Public policy simply cannot be twisted into that crippled a posture. How can we ask the millions of taxpayers of this country to pick up half of the tab for the penalty imposed upon someone else.

The legislation I now propose basically says that the purpose of treble damages is to deter illegal conduct and that a party guilty of such conduct must suffer an economic loss. This bill is essentially the same as S. 3650 of the 89th Congress. I think it is time we acted to take the tax favoritism out of this sort of price fixing.

I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2963) relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws and certain other payments, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield, but first may I point out that the distinguished Senator from Michigan introduced a bill which, although not quite identical with mine, seeks to correct the same loophole in the law under which innocent taxpayers are required to pick up 50 percent of the tab for the unlawful conduct of those who have victimized and exploited the American people.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Louisiana introduced the bill. It is very kind of the Senator to make the comment that he has made on the bill which I introduced.

As a matter of fact, several years ago a bill looking to this end—namely, to prevent the deduction of such sums by corporations convicted of violating the antitrust laws by virtue of allowing them to claim the deduction as a business expense was introduced by me. A companion bill was introduced in the House by Representative CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The Senate Antitrust Subcommittee held hearings for several days on the bill I introduced. Following that, we reexamined the matter and introduced a second, refined bill on the subject matter.

The staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee was then instructed to see if, together with the staff of the majority whip in his role as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, we could not develop an approach that would respond effectively to the problem and prevent the Government, in effect, from paying for the cost of the illegal conduct.

I would hope that, with the introduction of this bill by the Senator from Louisiana, and the pendency of my bill and the hearings record made in the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, that Congress in this session will be able to do what is right and certainly—whatever the proper composition of the statutory language is—correct an obvious and gross inequity in the tax structure—namely, the provision of taxpayers' money to reimburse for criminal fines. It does not happen when one runs a traffic light, and it should not happen when one runs the antitrust light.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

I had indicated that I was going to seek to move a measure along this line after the big electrical contractors were convicted of conspiracy and were given a favorable ruling by the executive branch of Government.

It seems to me that there is no basis and no excuse whatever for the Treasury Department or those who were consulted about it, to give these people a ruling that they could deduct, as a necessary and ordinary business expense, the treble damages they paid for violating the criminal law of the country. To me, it was utterly fantastic that there would be such a ruling. It would almost be the same as saying that a criminal who had stolen from the public could be required to give back what he stole but could then deduct the cost of his fine.

But once the horse was out of the barn, it was generally agreed by Senators and Representatives, especially those who were the senior members of the committees, not to make an effort to attempt to collect retroactively what the Government lost because of letting these people get away with this deduction. It was felt that this was done and that was the end of it. We would just let it go at that. It was wrong, but it was too late to correct it. I regret that we did not push immediately at that time to correct that improper ruling.

Now the drug companies will undoubtedly contend that they should have the benefit of the same ruling after their conviction. In my judgment, the fact that you have to pay treble damages and cannot deduct it as a business expense should be part of the deterrent that would cause one not to commit a crime such as this.

Mr. President, I have indicated how high some of those drug costs are. I made reference to tetracycline, which sells under the name of Achromycin and other names. It is interesting to note that patients at one time were paying 50 cents a pill for tetracycline, as a result of the conspiracy to which I have made reference, when it was estimated that the maximum cost to the manufacturers was 1.5 cents per pill. So now, when citizens guess that they are paying approximately three times the manufacturer's cost, it is interesting to note that with regard to the wonder drug tetracycline, they were badly in error—if they had that pill in mind—because they were paying approximately 30 times the cost of the company to manufacture it.

Mr. President, I do not blame the pharmacists in this matter. I am happy to say that representatives of the 45,000 pharmacists who are members of the American Pharmaceutical Association have come before our committee and urged us to pass effective legislation to help them protect the public by helping them to do business in a way that would permit them to make a decent profit, and at the same time protect the public against the exorbitant prices they have been charged as a result of conspiracies and as a result of other much criticized practices in the drug industry designed to extort from the public a much greater price than is justifiable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Ninety-seven Percent Critical of Drug Industry" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 4, 1968]

NINETY-SEVEN PERCENT CRITICAL OF DRUG INDUSTRY

(By Morton Mintz)

A poll taken for a drug manufacturer shows that 97 per cent of the persons sampled in the New York City area were critical of the profits and pricing practices of the pharmaceutical industry.

"I cannot recall any study we have done where an industry has been criticized by such a vast proportion of the population," said Burns W. Roper, president of Roper Research Associates, Inc., a polling firm founded 34 years ago by his father, Elmo Roper.

"On what we would regard as the most critical or damning question—the matter of fixing prices at artificially high levels—42 per cent or close to half (of the persons interviewed) cited the prescription drug industry.

"This was over twice as many as cited the next most frequently named industry (gasoline). The other industries used for comparison were beer, frozen foods and soap."

GUILTY VERDICT

Roper made the statements in a letter to Frank A. Duckworth, associate general counsel of Chas. Pfizer Co., Inc., and in an affidavit.

Last Dec. 29, a guilty verdict was returned in Federal court in Manhattan against Pfizer, the American Cynamid Co. and the Bristol-Myers Co. on criminal antitrust charges—conspiring to fix prices of "wonder" antibiotics, conspiring to monopolize the market and achieving a monopoly.

A few days ago, Pfizer filed the Roper papers in court in support of a contention that the jury had been biased.

In the affidavit, Roper said the poll was undertaken "to determine the extent, if any," to which residents of the district from which the Court chooses juries "believe the 'excessively high' and 'are otherwise prejudiced . . .' "

ATTACHED TO AFFIDAVIT

Roper's letter, which was attached to the affidavit, told Duckworth that the poll results are related "directly to your contention of bias in the jury.

"We would find it difficult to believe that a sample of the 12 jurors would contain no one who held . . . negative-about-the-drug-industry views unless they had been eliminated through screening questions," Roper said. The jurors were selected from a panel of more than 160 persons.

The poll was made Jan. 11 through 16 in representative areas of New York City and Westchester County. Interviewers were instructed "not to reveal . . . any particular interest in prescription drugs." There were 516 persons in the sample. All but 13 answered one or more questions about drug prices and profits.

Of 278 respondents who asserted knowledge of congressional or other Government drug-price investigations, 166—60 per cent—said there were "just causes" for such inquiries. Only 19 per cent considered the causes "politically inspired."

OTHER POLL HIGHLIGHTS

Other poll highlights cited in the Roper affidavit:

75 per cent of the respondents believe drug prices are "unreasonably high," 54 per cent felt the industry was insufficiently concerned about holding them down or reducing them and 58 per cent termed drug makers' profits "excessive."

42 per cent assumed drug makers "frequently have an understanding to fix prices at a high level."

In all, 97 per cent of those responding were critical of the industry in at least one of the categories.

Of those who assumed a $10 retail price for a drug, the largest share—33 per cent—guessed the manufacturing cost at $3.

Of those who were asked to believe that $3 was in fact the manufacturing cost, 86 per cent thought a retail price of $10 "excessively high."

Voters were consistently more critical of the drug industry than nonvoters. Men voters were especially critical.

"In fact," Roper told Pfizer, male voters surpassed Ivory Soap's 99–44/100 per cent with a full 100 percent citing the drug industry negatively on one or more of . . . six questions. In our experience, it is rare indeed to find 100 per cent of any group agreeing on anything."

OPINIONS ON PRICING PRACTICES

The questions below were "designed to measure the feeling in the community" in which the trial jurors reside. In connection with the listed product groups, each person interviewed was asked if he thought that in any:

[In percent]

Product group	Prices are "unreasonably high?"	Makers do not have "sufficient concern about holding down or reducing prices?"	Manufacturers make "unreasonably high or excessive profits?"	Makers "frequently have an understanding to fix prices at a high level?"
Gasoline	29	18	19	20
Prescription drugs	75	54	58	42
Frozen foods	43	24	20	17
Soap	29	18	18	13
Beer	21	12	15	11
None	6	10	6	8
Don't know	6	22	20	32
No answer	1	3	4	7

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments Nos. 518, 519, and 520, which were submitted by me on January 31, be considered as having been read, to comply with the provisions of rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the so-called fair housing amendment now before the Senate purports to protect the right of every person to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national original in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use and occupancy of housing in the United States. The proponents have sought to constitutionally justify this provision under the 14th amendment to the Constitution and the commerce clause.

The first concept to be kept in mind throughout any discussion of this title is that the subject sought to be regulated and the matter upon which it is proposed to legislate in this amendment is the private dealings between individuals. This amendment does not even purport to have application to any State involvement or involvement by any official person, or body, of the State. The right to hold and enjoy property is a personal right which attaches to each and every individual in this country under the laws and traditions established by the laws. Property itself has no rights. There is no contest here between what could be termed "property rights" on the one hand versus "personal rights" on the other. We are dealing only with personal rights and, in this specific case, with the personal right to hold, use, and enjoy property.

In the case of the *U.S.* v. *Dickinson*, 331 U.S. 745 (1947), the Supreme Court held that property is "taken" within the meaning of the Constitution "when inroads are made upon the owners' use of it to an extent that, as between private parties, a servitude has been acquired either by an agreement or in course of time." The rights which a person has in the use and enjoyment of his property include a free and unfettered decision as to whom he will rent, if he decides to rent, and to whom he will sell, should he decide to sell. This is purely a personal decision on his part and, as we shall see, there is no legally enforceable way his neighbors or any other individuals can influence his decision in any unconstitutional manner.

The most celebrated case in this field, and certainly the landmark case, is *Shelley* v. *Kramer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948). In this case, the judicial power of the State was called into play to enforce restrictive covenants between private adjoining landowners which discriminated against prospective purchasers on account of their race. The Supreme Court of the United States held that restrictive covenants, although they were purely private agreements, could not be enforced in the courts since an attempt to do so would involve State action. Speaking for the Court, Chief Justice Vinson said:

> These are not cases, as has been suggested, in which the States have merely abstained from action, leaving private individuals free to impose such restrictions as they see fit. Rather, these are cases in which the States have made available to such individuals the full coercive power of the Government to deny to petitioners, on the grounds of race or color the enjoyment of property rights in premises which petitioners are willing and financially able to acquire and which the grantors are willing to sell.

The proponents of this amendment have relied very heavily upon this case to substantiate a claim of constitutionality of this amendment. This case should give them no solace, for it is clear from even a casual reading of it that the object of the 14th amendment is State action, and what is sought to be controlled by this legislation is purely private action.

The Supreme Court has consistently held, beginning with the civil rights cases in 1883 and down to the present time, that the 14th amendment is directed only toward State action and does not apply to acts of individuals in their individual capacity. In 1883 in the civil rights cases, the Supreme Court said:

> That Congress' power under Section 5 (of the Fourteenth Amendment) is confined to the adoption of "appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of . . . prohibited State law and State acts, and thus to render them effectively null, void, and innocuous."

In 1948, in Shelley against Kramer, the Court said:

> The principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the State. That Amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful.

As recently as March 28, 1966, the Supreme Court, in United States against Guest, said:

> It is a commonplace that rights under the Equal Protection Clause itself arise only where there has been involvement of the State or of one acting under the color of its authority. The Equal Protection Clause "does not . . . add any thing to the rights which one citizen has under the Constitution against another." *U.S.* v. *Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542, 554–555.

As Mr. Justice Douglas more recently put it:

> The Fourteenth Amendment protects the individual against State action, not against wrongs done by individuals (citations omitted). This has been the view of the Court from the beginning. *It remains the Court's view today* (citations omitted).

Since it is obvious that this amendment is aimed at only private action and does not purport to be concerned with State action, it is not appropriate legislation or constitutional legislation under the 14th amendment.

The commerce clause of the Constitution is also cited as constitutional authority for this proposal. The commerce clause of the Constitution reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

Admittedly, the commerce clause has been cited as authority for far-reaching legislative enactments in recent years. If it does indeed authorize Congress to regulate private action dealing with the sale or rental of real property situated wholly within the borders of one State, then there is no field of endeavor which Congress cannot control under the authority granted in this clause. There is no question in my mind but that such an elastic view exceeds the power intended to be granted Congress by the framers of the Constitution. Had they intended otherwise, the framers of the Constitution certainly would not have gone to the time and trouble of delineating certain specific grants of power to Congress. This would have been completely unnecessary because such an all-encompassing interpretation of the Commerce Clause would have obviated the necessity for any other grants of power. I cannot ascribe to the framers of the Constitution a willful intent to make a futile gesture to limit Congress power by specifically authorizing fields of legislation while granting such pervasive power in one single clause.

I am frank to admit that I do not know how the Supreme Court, as it is today composed, would rule on this issue. I do know, however, that it is the duty and the obligation of each Member of Congress, according to the oath he took upon assuming his duties in Congress, to weigh each piece of legislation presented to him on the scales of the Constitution. If he finds a lack of authority under the Constitution, he must vote against that proposal.

Under no theory of either the commerce clause or the 14th amendment do I find constitutional authority to deprive any individual of his basic, inherent right to hold, use, and enjoy private property.

Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate should be tabled or it should be rejected. I hope the Senate will study this matter carefully and not approve this amendment because such approval would be in violation of the Constitution and would violate the rights of individuals holding property in this country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 225(b), Public Law 90–206, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Edward H. Foley, of the District of Columbia, and Mr. William S. Spoelhof, of Michigan, as members from private life of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 5) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. FINO, and Mrs. DWYER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 947) authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LUAC Week," and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRIME MESSAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I have been increasingly alarmed by the rising tide of crime in our country. No person can spend any time at all in our cities without being aware of the menace on the streets.

It is for this reason that I find great merit in most of the proposals that the President has sent to Congress, not only to combat existing crime, but also to reach deeply into the source of criminal activity and prevent its growth.

I am encouraged by much of the President's message, for I feel that it represents a workable effort to provide better police protection.

The President has said:

> The Federal Government must never assume the role of the Nation's policeman.

He then offers the major tool needed to combat open criminal activity, Federal assistance to local law-enforcement agencies to strengthen them to meet their own problems. Law enforcement begins with the cop on the beat; whether he be a patrolman walking the hot summer pavement of Detroit or a weather-burned deputy sheriff patrolling the backroads of a rural area. In many instances, law enforcement is no better than this man, and the more qualified and trained he is, the greater the degree of crime prevention.

He asserts great influence on those he contacts daily and it is here that we can make progress in educating young Americans to respect the law and the man who enforces it.

I applaud and support the President's proposal to combat juvenile delinquency.

I will give my full support to the President's recommendations to strengthen our narcotics and drug laws, especially legislation to outlaw the manufacture, sale, or distribution of LSD or other hallucinogenic substances.

All of this I find encouraging. But I would be remiss, Mr. President, if I did not take exception to one part of the President's message.

It deals with the demand for enactment of Federal firearms controls. I have consistently opposed such blanket regulations designed to solve big city problems at the expense of the rural areas. I have said before that this is a matter of concern for each of the several States—not a matter for uniform Federal control.

With this exception, Mr. President, I find the President's message on crime a commendable effort to meet a growing national crisis.

KGB IS AID TO HARASS UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "KGB Is Said To Harass Ukrainian Intellectuals" which was published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KGB IS SAID TO HARASS UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS

LONDON, February 7.—An account of security-police harassment of Ukrainian intellectuals and of the harsh conditions in labor camps to which some have been sent was published today in The Times of London.

The description of the activities of the security police, the K.G.B., came from Vyacheslav Chornovil, a 30-year-old television journalist. He was sentenced last November by a Lvov regional court to 18 months in a labor camp.

The article says the letter was published in Ukrainian in Canada and reached the newspaper from there. It had been sent to Pyotr Y. Shelest, First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist party, in June, 1966. It was for distributing copies of this letter than Mr. Chornovil was imprisoned.

"The men mentioned in it are, like the author, imprisoned," according to The Times. "They have been sent to the freezing labor camps of the Mordvinian Republic, along with Sinyavsky, Daniel, Gerald Brooke—and probably Yuri Galanskov and Aleksandr Ginzburg, whose punishment was pronounced last month."

The Times article said Mr. Chornovil was educated at Lvov University, had been an official of the Young Communist League and worked for Lvov television and a league newspaper.

REFUSED TO TESTIFY

He refused to testify for the prosecution at a secret trial of Mykhaylo Osadchy, a lecturer at Lvov University, who in April, 1966, was sentenced to two years in a camp under severe discipline. Mr. Osadchy was one of several Ukrainian intellectuals who were secretly tried in 1966.

Mr. Chornovil had been moved to make his protest after seeing K.G.B. methods against witnesses and accused—methods characterized by the Times report as "interrogations without sleep, electronic eavesdropping, threats, blackmail, humiliation and, where necessary, force."

Mr. Chornovil's letter said:

"Reliance is placed on the hope of breaking the will of the arrested person and forcing him to recite a memorized part at this trial.

"The longer a man sits behind bars, the longer the only individual with whom he can speak is the K.G.B. investigation officer, with his monotonous ditty about the terrible crime and the need to repent; the longer the prison door lock keeps banging closed while the vigilant guard keeps looking into the spy hole, the greater the guarantee that a human will turn into clay from which it is possible to mold whatever one desires."

Mr. Choronvil described K.G.B. bugging apparatus in a building on Khreschatyk Street, Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, and the agency's methods of carrying out unauthorized searches.

"LIKE A PRISONER OF WAR"

"The protectors of state security arrive in your flat," he wrote. "Like a prisoner of war you stand with your hands in the air, waiting until your 'friend, comrade and brother' feels your pockets. Sometimes, to terrify your wife or neighbors, he will propose that you 'produce your weapons.' Then you are shown the warrant, which is for confiscation of anti-Soviet documents duplicated by you."

The letter described how friends protested at the trial in March 1966, of Yaraslav Hevrych, a Kiev student. Militiamen and plainclothes men threw them out of the courtroom, the Times article added.

The date of sentence was changed but the friends found out. To prevent a demonstration, the article continued, the court was packed with stooges, "marching almost in ceremonial step into the court building." It said that after the trial people broke through a police cordon and shouted questions at the chairman of the regional court.

According to Mr. Chornovil, the same judge presided over a later trial when only three persons were admitted to the court for the sentencing of a group of Kiev scientific workers. Two spectators, women poets, threw flowers to the prisoners after they had been sentenced to three years each, the article said.

In a Lvov trial, Mr. Chornovil continued, friends of the accused covered a police wagon with flowers and shouted "glory" to the sentenced men.

The Times article also contained excerpts from two letters written by inmates of Mordvinian labor camps.

One was written by Ivan O. Kandyba, a lawyer and former Communist party member and official propagandist, who was sentenced in 1961 for Ukrainian nationalist activities. It was written late in 1966 in an appeal to world opinion against his conviction. Describing conditions in his camp at Yavas, he wrote:

"The great majority of the prisoners are on semi-starvation rations. Theoretically we are to receive 2,300–2,400 calories daily, but we are lucky if we get 1,500 because the products are of low quality, especially in spring and summer before the new crop. The herring is rotten and smelly. The dried potatoes, macaroni, barley and meat are infected with worms.

"We are forced to fulfill our work quota 100 per cent. At the type of jobs we do we use up 3,500 to 4,000 calories. Try to survive on that if you can!"

The other letter, from an anonymous prisoner in the Yavas complex of camps, takes up the tale. Written in January, 1967, from Ozernoe, a village near Yavas, it said:

"There are 276 male political prisoners in Camp 17A. Among theme is the writer Yuli Daniel.

"Most of the male prisoners are invalids. They have only two crowded, cold and badly ventilated huts. Prisoners never even receive a full portion of their small rations of food. Even a healthy person cannot eat the sour, half-baked bread. Medical aid is virtually nonexistent. On Jan. 7, the prisoner Mykhaylo Soroka, who has spent 31 years in Polish and Soviet prisons, fell seriously ill with coronary thrombosis.

"Medical help was essential. But a medical assistant arrived only four days late. On the seventh day after his attack Soroka was taken to the medical station. Up to this time he stayed in a hut, looked after by a medically trained prisoner without drugs or instruments.

"The so-called hospital contained only seven beds to accommodate 225 invalids, most of them seriously ill and quite old. There are no drugs and the prisoners are not allowed to receive any from their families—not even vitamins.

"Often doctors at the central hospital sent back prisoners in whom cancer had been diagnosed—they had every right to release them. Only the prisoners' death and autopsy confirmed the initial diagnosis.

"In Camp No. 11, the prisoner Ivan Maksym applied several times for medical aid to the surgeon, but he was called a malingerer. He died as a result."

The letter said that when Mr. Daniel "complained about the shocking attitude" toward the sick, "the medical inspector said it was irrelevant—the sick man had not died during the time when he had lacked medical aid—and he tried to make Daniel acknowledge that everything was in order in the camp." Mr. Daniel refused, the letter said.

FIRST PUBLICATION IN MUNICH

According to a spokesman for Prolog Associates, a Ukrainian organization at 875 West End Avenue, the Chornovil letter was first published last October in a Ukrainian-language magazine, Suchasnist (Contemporary Times), in Munich.

The letter subsequently was published in a Ukrainian weekly newspaper, Novyi Shlakh, in Winnipeg on Jan. 6.

KING KEYS HIS TACTICS TO RESPONSE BY HILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "King Keys His Tactics to Response by Hill," written by Jean M. White and Robert C. Maynard, which was published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING KEYS HIS TACTICS TO RESPONSE BY HILL

(By Jean M. White and Robert C. Maynard)

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., yesterday set the goal for his mass camp-in in Washington as a "bill of economic and social rights" for the poor, including guaranteed jobs and guaranteed minimum income.

At the same time, the Negro leader pledged that his April poor people's campaign will begin as a peaceful and law-abiding demonstration and will "escalate to disruptive protest" only if Congress doesn't help the poor.

"Our aim is not to tie up the city of Washington," Dr. King emphasized. "Our protests will center on the Government, Congress, and not the city at large."

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference also hinted he may carry his crusade to the national political conventions in this election year "if things don't happen here" and Congress does not act.

He also talked about simultaneous demonstrations in 15 other cities and taking pickets into the home towns of Congressmen for protests before their homes and offices.

Dr. King held meetings with two different groups last night, the first with top SCLC and SNCC staff members—including Chairman H. Rap Brown—at the Pitts Motor Hotel, and the second at a rally in the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, 1630 Vermont ave. nw., with about 1000 persons attending.

Dr. King said after the meeting with SNCC leaders that it was simply one of several he is holding "in a number of cities with a number of groups" to explain his spring campaign.

Brown, under a bond restriction to remain in the nine counties of the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York, shrugged his shoulders when asked if his presence in Washington might not arouse the ire of that court.

At the rally on Vermont Avenue, Dr. King was applauded and cheered throughout his 35-minute talk. A large minority of white persons attended.

Dr. King said it is long past time for America to get concerned over the Negroes' economic and social plight.

"Freedom is not something the oppressor will give to the oppressed," he said. "Freedom is something the oppressed must demand from the oppressor . . . We will come to Washington in April not to beg, but to demand justice and demand that they grant us what is truly ours."

Hosea Williams, one of Dr. King's aides, said, "We want to make it clear we are not building any coalitions."

Yesterday black power militant Stokely Carmichael, who met with Dr. King on Tuesday night along with 100 other Washington Negro civil rights activists, indicated that he will not overtly interfere or oppose the SCLC plans for "militant nonviolence."

Carmichael, commenting yesterday on his discussion with Dr. King, summed it up this way:

"I said we have to accept each other's ideology whether we disagree with it or not."

Carmichael added that "any black man who would blast Dr. King would be totally irresponsible."

But Carmichael, who is trying to pull together a Washington Negro coalition under the name of the Black United Front, added that it will be up to each organization in the Front to decide what its role will be in King's nonviolent campaign.

His individual role, he indicated, will be governed by what his Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee decides.

At a press conference yesterday, Dr. King was asked whether Carmichael and SNCC black power militants would agree to accept the "discipline of nonviolence" if they join the camp-in.

Dr. King said that he was certain Carmichael believes that people committed to nonviolence should be allowed to practice their philosophy.

The SCLC head called the press conference yesterday to unveil some of the specific legislative demands that his poor people's army will carry to Congress.

In answer to a reporter's question, he said a bill introduced by Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) comes "close to what we're talking about."

Conyer's "Full Opportunity Act," co-sponsored by nine other House members, calls for spending $30 billion a year for a massive attack on city slum problems. It would provide job training, a $2-an-hour minimum wage, housing, family allowances and aid to education.

As an "absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a full employment bill, some kind of guaranteed income, and housing legislation to provide at least 500,000 units a year for low-income families.

As to the tactics of his spring campaign, Dr. King said the first two weeks or so will be spent in peaceful protest "within the First Amendment" with the aim of educating the "Nation to its grave problems."

But Dr. King did not rule out—as a "last resort"—tying up traffic on the bridges of Washington.

"If it is necessary to tie up traffic, however inconvenient, the result is not as inconvenient as the conditions poor people live in," he said.

He also underlined the political leverage of his poor people's power and predicted that the presidential candidate "who responds to our program will get the Negro vote."

From then on, he said the tactics will depend on the response of Congress.

He said he didn't think building shantytowns—one tactic mentioned—was necessarily breaking the law since "people have built tent towns around Washington and not been driven out." He pointed out that "people own private property and private land," with the hint that the tents and shanties could go up on these without breaking the law.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1968, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1968:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick E. Batrus, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 8, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.—11 Corinthians 13: 11.

Eternal Father, strong to save and eager to help, who art always speaking to man and revealing Thy way to him, speak Thou to us this moment and make known Thy will as we pray that Thy spirit may live in our hearts.

Make us great in our devotion to truth, gallant in our desire for honor, gentle in our dedication to good will, and genuine in our decision to seek peace and to pursue it until we possess it.

Bless these leaders of our Nation that they may walk with Thee as they make decisions looking forward to a better day. Strengthen our people that with genuine faith, humble spirit, and patriotic fervor they may find themselves by doing Thy will, and by living together in peace, usher in a new day of peace for our world. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 5) entitled "An act to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2511. An act to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes.

NATIONWIDE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much these days concerning the crime which is running rampant in this Nation of ours. We hear it from the press, from the radio and TV media. We heard it in the President's message.

We see bills concerning the subject of crime pending before the Congress.

I believe the simple idea which I have advanced—that is, the use of a uniform nationwide telephone number for reporting emergencies such as crime and fire—is one which will make a meaningful contribution toward helping combat this problem.

Today I am pleased to announce that my hometown of Huntington, Ind., has decided to use the telephone number 911 as its emergency telephone number. This means that Huntington, Ind., will be the first city in the Nation to adopt 911 as its emergency number. The city of New York is also contemplating this. The city of Gary, Ind., is considering the use of this number as its emergency number. I hope that this will be the start of the adoption of this number throughout the rest of the Nation as the emergency number for the purpose of reporting fire, crime, and other emergencies.

ALTERNATIVE TO THE TRAVAL TAX

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is my present intention not to vote for any travel tax. When I oppose a measure I usually have a reason and an alternative. I would suggest that one of the ways to save some dollar outflow would be for the Secretary of State and the heads of all the other departments of Government who have people overseas and who transport their cars back and forth to issue a directive that from now on no cars will either be transported overseas or back from overseas unless they are American automobiles. This will save in the next year, it is estimated, about $200 million, which is a big chunk of the $500 million that the President says he wants to save. I think it will do nobody any harm.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION FOR VICTIMS OF THE EARTHQUAKE IN SICILY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the great suffering and hardship caused to more than 40,000 Sicilians by the earthquake disaster last month, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, Committee on the Judiciary, will hold a hearing Wednesday, February 21, at 10 a.m. in room 2141, Rayburn Building, on bills which have been introduced to permit the immediate admission into the United States of victims of this catastrophe.

It is my intention to expedite consideration of legislation by holding hearings to 1 day only, and to silent testimony only from those most vitally involved in this crisis.

Our Government moved quickly to the aid of those uprooted, as have the voluntary agencies, many organizations, and private individuals.

More than 45 of my colleagues have joined me in voicing their concern through the introduction of bills. Many Italian societies and organizations have also voiced concern. Many thousands of people in Sicily are without homes, or livelihood, even without their land. Their plight is our plight, and our tradition of offering a haven to the distressed and suffering, to the victims and refugees from disaster or tyranny, calls for expeditious action on our part.

A CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. PETTIS. It is a stirring tribute to the patriotism of my colleagues to see their names as volunteers in the new Congressional Wing of the Civil Air Patrol—an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force.

These forwardlooking, responsible Members of this House see the opportunities for aiding the development of tomorrow's leaders, our 45,000 cadets. The CAP inspires young men and women, and as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Col. LESTER WOLFF, commander, said this morning:

> The CAP is an answer to crime on the streets and many other problems facing our Nation.

The CAP also gives all of us an extra opportunity to serve our country as search and rescue pilots, instructors in a variety of activities important to our Nation's well-being and in the development of aerospace aviation.

We urge our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to enroll with us, in an opportunity for service that is inspiring and extremely valuable to our Nation. Please see Col. LESTER WOLFF or me, and give us an opportunity to explain fully the activities of the CAP.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Colonel WOLFF, in advising you that the Civil Air Patrol has now formed a congressional squadron and ask that those of you who might have an interest, whether you be pilots or simply nonflying enthusiasts of aviation, consider joining this squadron.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol, as many of the Members of the House I am sure are aware, has a threefold mission: Search and rescue; the advancement of education in aerospace; and the Cadet Corps which is made up of the young people who are interested in aviation.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally indebted to the Civil Air Patrol for their rescue of me in 1964 when I was forced down in the mountains of Arizona and was located after some 36 hours by the Arizona squadron of the Civil Air Patrol.

I can tell the Members of the House that there may be feelings of emotion which one will recall throughout one's life, but I can only assure you that there is nothing quite as significant in one's life under these circumstances as the arrival of the Civil Air Patrol, when one is in such a situation as I was.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members of the Congress consider joining the squadron to which reference has been made and that the Members urge the members of their staffs to also join.

SHOCKING STATEMENTS OF YURI MASHIN

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked but not too surprised to read the statements of Yuri Mashin, president of the Central Committee on Soviet Sports Federations, made at a recent press conference in Grenoble, France, site of the 1968 Winter Olympics. Mashin, as head of the Soviet delegation of the Olympics, called a press conference Monday for the purpose of denouncing so-called "American aggression" in Vietnam. Speaking before 100 press reporters from around the world, Mashin stated:

> The Soviet sportsmen are profoundly disgusted by the American aggression in Vietnam.

To say the least, such wildly inflammatory pronouncements are hardly conducive to the spirit of international friendship—not to mention sportsmanship—which the Olympic games are intended to foster. Indeed, coming from the representative of a totalitarian state which has for over 20 years enslaved all of Eastern Europe, and which finds the Berlin Wall a necessary adjunct of foreign policy, Mr. Mashin's self-righteous statements describing "peace, friendship, and mutual understanding between peoples" as the "cornerstone" of Soviet foreign policy sound hollow and ludicrous.

The Russian Government's use of the Olympic games as a platform for fomenting international discord recalls a similar attempt by another totalitarian regime at the 1936 Olympics in Berlin, Germany.

I am sure that no one has to remind Mr. Mashin of the outcome of those games nor of the far less peaceful and tragic competition that followed. Let the Soviet sportsmen speak for themselves through their athletic prowess in open competition rather than by the meaningless rhetoric of their delegation head. It seems to me that Mr. Mashin's energies might be better spent developing a figure skater of Miss Peggy Fleming's caliber instead of expounding on subjects about which he obviously has little knowledge or understanding.

Mr. Mashin's statements should be roundly denounced.

PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER MESSAGE PROPOSES BOAT SAFETY ACT FOR SAFE RECREATION

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the President's consumer message properly notes the Nation's concern over the growing incidence of injuries and fatalities occurring to boatowners and users. It proposes remedies.

Eight million boats are being operated on our inland waterways—with a 5-percent increase expected in their number this year.

While Americans are increasingly taking to the water, far too many are finding unexpected tragedy. Last year alone saw 1,400 boaters killed.

I hope President Johnson's Recreational Safety Act of 1968 will provide needed protection for the boating public.

It will help States establish and improve their boat safety programs to include removal of hazardous debris, boat operator education, safety patrols, and boat inspections. Also, the Secretary of Transportation will be empowered to establish and enforce safety standards for boat design and equipment.

By beginning a comprehensive water safety program today we can avoid an epic accident toll such as we find on our Nation's highways. Early action is needed now—before the problem becomes much more difficult to control tomorrow.

Safe recreation for all boaters and their families must be our goal in 1968.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's crime message. The escalation of the crime rate in recent years is indicative of the necessity for early enactment of Federal programs which can reverse this trend. Due to the sophisticated and extensive nature of many criminal activities, local law enforcement agencies are unable to cope with this problem. The lack of resources, facilities, techniques, and training of local law enforcement agencies requires the immediate attention of the Federal Government. Consequently, I am particularly gratified by the President's emphasis upon grants to State and local governments to meet the existing deficiencies.

The States are waging a valiant but unsuccessful war to reduce the crime rate. The President is not proposing a national police force or the merger of local law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement will remain the responsibility of State and local governments. However, effective assault on the national problem requires the assistance of the Federal Government. Our streets must be safe for the vast majority of Americans who are decent, law-abiding citizens. Criminal conduct cannot be excused or justified.

The President's proposals are timely and appropriate. I ask my colleagues in the Congress to give them prompt and serious consideration.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to applaud the President's timely crime message. The message clearly and forthrightly describes the continuing menace of crime, and the energetic and vigorous efforts now being undertaken by many departments and agencies of the Federal Government to stem this rising tide of lawlessness. The "Strike Force" units created within the Department of Justice are a case in point. This utilization of the skills and personnel of many related Federal Government agencies has been especially effective in fighting the hidden, yet malignant, disease plaguing our society in the form of organized crime.

To continue the struggle against this often invisible menace, it is necessary to penetrate a wall of silence which often repels the efforts of law enforcement officials to obtain witnesses in organized crime cases. This is especially true in cases of corruption of Government officials. To break through this wall of silence and to compel the giving of testimony regarding activities linked closely with organized crime, the President has wisely called for an extension of special immunity provisions to four laws invoked in the prosecution of organized crime—that is, statutes relating to travel in racketeering enterprises, bankruptcy frauds, bribery, graft, conflict of interest, and the obstruction of justice. The Senate passed this legislation in the first session. I hope that the House will now move expeditiously toward its consideration.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for the week beginning February 19, that is, following next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as previously announced, when we adjourn on the completion of business of this week, we will go over until Monday and thence over to Thursday and thence over until Monday again, with no legislative program scheduled for next week pursuant to the agreement that we made earlier last week.

The program for the week of February 19 is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

As of today we have two suspensions. Of course, the Speaker of the House has authority to add suspensions. This announcement is tentative because we will meet on Monday and Thursday next week. If suspensions are added we will try to give notice in the RECORD. We will also try to give notice of any other additions to the legislative program.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

On Tuesday we also have scheduled H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890. This is subject to a rule being granted.

S. 989, Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968; also subject to a rule being granted.

Pursuant to the usual tradition and custom of the House, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Thursday, February 22.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

As I have advised, there may well be additions to or changes in the program.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON FEBRUARY 14, AND FEBRUARY 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next and the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRITISH SUPPLIES FOR THE VIETCONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] called attention to the fact that the perfidious British are still running their flagships into Hanoi with supplies for the Vietcong, the Communists of North Vietnam, and thus collecting their blood money. The gentleman from Michigan said that he is sending a telegram to the President of the United States to use his influence upon Prime Minister Wilson, who is now in this country, to put a stop to this business. I hope the gentleman from Michigan does not hold his breath until Lyndon Johnson answers his telegram in the affirmative.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio if I have the time.

Mr. HAYS. If the British are bringing their ships into Hanoi, as the gentleman said, they are not only perfidious but also magicians.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the port of Haiphong, and the gentleman well knows it. He is one of those who stood on the floor of the House last year, and with tears coming from every pore, insisted that if my amendment to the foreign aid bill was adopted to stop all trade with those supplying North Vietnam, we would lose a contract to sell——

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman yielded to me; I had not finished.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Iowa has 10 seconds of his 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman bled at every pore because, he said, we would lose a contract to sell some $700 million worth of F–111 military planes to the British. The British took pretty good care of the situation, and the gentleman from Ohio well knows it, by simply repudiating the agreement to buy the planes, and left us holding the bag while they, the British, go blithely on their devious ways continuing to bilk the United States and helping supply those who are killing Americans.

THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think many of us in this House were highly pleased yesterday to hear presented to the Congress a series of far-reaching Presidential recommendations for the conduct of an aggressive war against crime on the streets and in the communities of the country. I hope that we can proceed without further delay in the committees that have jurisdiction over the various measures to consider these proposals that have been advanced by the President and to advance them expeditiously. An annual cost of $4 billion in property loss alone through the ravages of crime is cause enough for expeditious action. When we add to it the impact upon human lives of the mounting cost of crime in the United States, I certainly believe all of us have reason to agree that this should be a top-priority field for legislative action.

I believe this is a matter that should be nonpartisan in character and I hope our Republican friends will not permit partisan politics in an election year to block or delay needed legislation.

As one of those who sponsored a bill to make it a felony to cross a State line with intent to incite a riot and thereafter participate in such disturbance, I was highly pleased to see the President put his personal stamp of approval on this particular proposal. I hope there will be no further delay over in the other body in enacting this measure into law and making it a part of our arsenal against crime.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House considered and passed a bill extending the life of the Export-Import Bank.

I was present for the debate, participated in the teller and voice votes, and voted against the motion to recommit the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor at the time the measure was up for final passage. Had I been present on the floor, I would have cast my vote with the other 375 Members of the House who voted for passage.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who accused me of having tears running from every pore, that I do not cry very easily. In fact, I do not ever remember crying on this floor except a couple of times when I cried about the misinformation in a couple of speeches that the gentleman from Iowa made.

A PROGRAM FOR NARCOTIC ADDICTS AND ALCOHOLICS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for his program for the prevention, treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts and alcoholics.

I rise to support the inclusion of programs for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and alcoholism in the Community Mental Health Centers program. Treatment services for addicts and alcoholics must be provided by the same types of personnel who are staffing our community mental health centers. There are already more than 250 such facilities in operation or now developing throughout our Nation.

Not only do these centers incorporate a broad range of direct treatment services, they also have another very important element of service—a service especially important to programs for narcotic addiction and alcoholism—and that is consultation and education for other community helping agencies.

This service is important because it permits the centers to move toward prevention and the nature and magnitude of addiction and alcoholism makes prevention especially important. The consultation and education staff of the community mental health centers are admirably qualified to work with police, probationers, health departments, and other community-helping agencies on preventive programs.

I urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to this legislation.

THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it was good to hear the comments of my colleague from Oklahoma in speaking about the President's message against crime.

I, too, am pleased that the President has sent a message against crime to the Congress. I also want to say, for the record, that a number of us have been engaged in the war against crime for a long, long time.

Within the next day or two I shall have something to say of the battles we have won in that war and of the legislation that we, in the House, have introduced, where it now rests, and the reasons therefore, I hope much of that legislation will soon become law.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF CRIME

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's program for the prevention and control of crime should be enacted promptly by the Congress. The crime program includes safe streets, immunity, drug abuse, and firearms control. It would provide a comprehensive and effective means of staging a combined Federal-State attack on crime.

Unquestionably adequate Federal gun control laws are necessary in order to permit the States to control these tools of the criminal. The present indiscriminate mail-order sale of handguns and other lethal weapons permit them to be acquired easily by anyone including criminals, juveniles, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, and others whose possession of such weapons is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States.

The lack of adequate Federal controls over the traffic in firearms prevents effective action by the States to control such traffic within their own borders. It is a common practice for a resident of a State having strict controls over firearms to go to an adjoining State having little or no controls, purchase whatever weapons he desires, and thus effectively evade the laws of the State of his residence. The administration's gun legislation would provide the necessary Federal controls over interstate traffic in firearms so that the States could exercise such controls as the people of the State feel are necessary.

TATE, OF PHILADELPHIA, PROPOSES URBAN COALITION TO AVOID "HOT SUMMER"

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mayor H. J. Tate, of Philadelphia, has been actively fighting the conditions of poverty during his career of public service. Philadelphia has been a front-runner among cities in efforts to improve the living and working conditions of its residents. Much has been undertaken and accomplished in the great city of Philadelphia since James Tate entered the office of mayor in January 1964.

Yesterday the mayor announced another step in the efforts to solve the problems of poverty. He announced plans for the creation of an Urban Coalition for Philadelphia to bring business, education, religion, and civil rights into the fight against poverty. He said:

> A partnership between government and the private sector is essential if we are to achieve the most rapid solution to our problems.

Accordingly, the mayor has invited 225 such leaders to a 2-day conference on the coalition for February 15 and 16. It is proposed that a steering committee will be formed at this meeting to lead the private sector of the Philadelphia community in a new commitment to help in the solution of pressing urban problems. The mayor estimated it would cost $100,000 in private funds for the work of the urban coalition with the city of Philadelphia providing the staff.

This proposal will unite the efforts of the private sector of the Philadelphia community, which in a number of instances has illustrated its concern with urban problems. Such a course, followed by government and the private community and supported by the citizenry, can greatly alleviate conditions which might contribute to a "hot summer."

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 225(b), Public Law 90–206, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries the following members from private life: Edward H. Foley, of the District of Columbia; William S. Spoelhof, of Michigan.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential messages are enlightening to all of us. I believe that a quorum of the Members should be present here to dispose of these messages.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Abbitt
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Bolling
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Devine
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Everett
Foley
Ford, William D.
Gettys
Green, Oreg.
Gude
Gurney
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kluczynski
Mathias, Calif.
Moss
Nichols
Patman
Pollock
Pucinski
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Schweiker
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Zwach

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Peace will never be secure so long as:

—Seven out of ten people on earth cannot read or write;

—Tens of millions of people each day—most of them children—are maimed and stunted by malnutrition.

—Diseases long conquered by science still ravage cities and villages around the world.

If most men can look forward to nothing more than a lifetime of backbreaking toil which only preserves their misery, violence will always beckon, freedom will ever be under seige.

It is only when peace offers hope for a better life that it attracts the hundreds of millions around the world who live in the shadow of despair.

Twenty years ago America resolved to lead the world against the destructive power of man's oldest enemies. We declared war on the hunger, the ignorance, the disease, and the hopelessness which breed violence in human affairs.

We knew then that the job would take many years. We knew then that many trials and many disappointments would test our will.

But we also knew that, in the long run, a single ray of hope—a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—can do more to build the peace and guard America from harm than guns and bombs.

This is the great truth upon which all our foreign aid programs are founded. It was valid in 1948 when we helped Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. It was valid in the early fifties when the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a ruined Western Europe into a showcase of freedom. It was valid in the sixties when we helped Taiwan and Iran and Israel take their places in the ranks of free nations able to defend their own independence and moving toward prosperity on their own.

The programs I propose today are as important and as essential to the security of this nation as our military defenses. Victory on the battlefield must be matched by victory in the peaceful struggles which shape men's minds.

In these fateful years, we must not falter. In these decisive times, we dare not fail.

NO RETREAT, NO WASTE

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1969 is designed to foster our fundamental American purpose: To help root out the causes of conflict and thus ensure our own security in a peaceful community of nations.

For Fiscal 1969, I propose:

—An economic aid appropriation of $2.5 billion.

—A military grant aid appropriation of $420 million.

—New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.

—A five-year program to develop and

manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on millions of children because of malnutrition in their early years.

—*That the United States join with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development-lending affiliate of the World Bank.* For every two dollars the United States contributes, other nations will contribute three dollars.

—*That the Congress authorize a contribution to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.*

—*Prompt appropriation of the annual contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.*

—*A further authorization and appropriation of callable funds for the Inter-American Development Bank to stand behind the Bank's borrowing in private money markets.*

COMMON EFFORT FOR COMMON GOOD

I pledge to the Congress and to the people of America that these programs will be carried out with strict attention to the six basic principles of foreign aid administration we announced last year.

1. *Self-Help.*

Self-help is the fundamental condition for all American aid. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment. We will help those—and only those—who help themselves. We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement.

2. *Multilateralism.*

This year, 90 percent of our AID loans will be made as part of international arrangements in which donors and recipients alike carry their fair shares of the common burden.

America now ranks fifth among donor countries in terms of the share of its national product devoted to official foreign aid. Japan increased her aid by nearly 50 percent last year. Germany has increased her aid budget despite fiscal restraints which have curtailed domestic welfare programs. Great Britain is maintaining aid levels despite severe financial problems. With the signing of the International Grains Agreement, other wealthy nations will for the first time be obligated to contribute food and money to the world-wide war on hunger.

This year we must take another important step to sustain those international institutions which build the peace.

The International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate is almost without funds. Discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now underway. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealthy nations of the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support.

3. *Regionalism.*

Last year I joined with the Latin American Presidents to renew, reaffirm and redirect the Alliance for Progress.

The nations of free Asia began a general survey of their joint transportation and education needs, while work proceeded on projects to bring power, water and the other tools of progress to all.

The African Development Bank, financed entirely by Africans, opened its doors and made its first loan.

The coming year will present three major opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts:

A. *The Inter-American Development Bank.*

This Bank stands at the center of the Alliance for Progress. Last year, the Congress authorized three annual contributions of $300 million each to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations. The second of these contributions should be appropriated this year.

The Ordinary Capital of the Bank, which comes mainly from sales of its bonds in the private market, must now be expanded. Since 1960, we have appropriated $612 million which is kept in the U.S. Treasury to guarantee these bonds. Not *one* dollar of this money has ever been spent, but this guarantee has enabled the bank to raise $612 million from private sources for worthy projects. We must extend this proud record. *I urge the Congress to authorize $412 million in callable funds, of which $206 million will be needed this year.*

B. *The Asian Development Bank.*

This Bank has asked the United States, Japan, and other donors to help establish Special Funds for projects of regional significance—in agriculture, education, transportation and other fields. Last October I requested that the Congress authorize a United States contribution of up to $200 million. This would be paid over a four year period—only if it were a minority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. *I urge that the Congress take prompt and favorable action on this request.*

C. *The African Development Bank.*

This Bank has also asked for our help to establish a small Special Fund for projects which cannot or should not be financed through the Bank's Ordinary Capital. *We must stand ready to provide our fair share, with full safeguards for our balance of payments.*

4. *Priority for Agriculture and Population Planning.*

Victory in the war on hunger is as important to every human being as any achievement in the history of mankind.

The report of 100 experts assembled last year by the President's Science Advisory Committee on the World Food Supply rings with grim clarity. Their message is clear: The world has entered a food-population crisis. Unless the rich and the poor nations join in a long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human affairs, this crisis will reach disastrous proportions by the mid-1980's.

That Report also reminded us that more food production is not enough. People must have the money to buy food. They must have jobs and homes and schools and rising incomes. Agricultural development must go hand-in-hand with general economic growth.

AID programs are designed *both* to stimulate general economic growth and to give first priority to agriculture. In India, for instance, about half of all AID-financed imports this year will consist of fertilizer and other agricultural supplies.

We have made a good start:

—India is harvesting the largest grain crop in her history. Fertilizer use has doubled in the past two years. Last year five million acres were planted with new high yield wheat seeds. By 1970 this will increase to 32 million acres.

—Brazil, with AID help, has developed a new grass which has already added 400,000 acres of new pastureland and increased her annual output of beef by 20,000 metric tons.

—The Philippines is expecting a record rice crop this year which will eliminate the need to import rice.

In the year ahead, AID will increase its investment in agriculture to about $800 million—50 percent of its total development aid. In addition, I will shortly propose an extension of the Food for Freedom program to provide emergency food assistance to stave off disaster while hungry countries build their own food production.

We must also tap the vast storehouse of food in the oceans which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. I have directed the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Secretary of the Interior to launch a 5-year program to:

—Perfect low-cost commercial processes for the production of Fish Protein Concentrate.

—Develop new protein-rich products that will fit in a variety of local diets.

—Encourage private investment in Fish Protein Concentrate production and marketing, as well as better fishing methods.

—Use this new product in our Food for Freedom program to fortify the diets of children and nursing mothers.

But food is only one side of the equation. If populations continue to grow at the present rate, we are only postponing disaster not preventing it.

In 1961 only two developing countries had programs to reduce birth rates. In 1967 there were 26.

As late as 1963, this government was spending less than $2 million to help family planning efforts abroad. In 1968, we will commit $35 million and additional amounts of local currency will be committed. In 1969 we expect to do even more.

Family planning is a family matter. The United States will not undertake to tell any government or any parent how and to what extent population must be limited.

But neither we nor our friends in the developing world can ignore the stark fact that the success of development efforts depends upon the balance between population and food and other resources. No government can escape this truth. The

United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

5. *Balance of Payments Protection.*

Our ability to pursue our responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. Economic aid now helps—not hurts—our balance of payments position.

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over $600 million. Last year it was down to $270 million. I have already directed that even this figure be reduced in 1968 to less than $170 million. More than nine dollars of every ten dollars AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans.

Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. *Efficient Administration.*

Over the past few years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number of employees overseas in all civilian agencies. In addition, AID is further improving and streamlining its over-all operations.

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Foreign aid must be much more than government aid. Private enterprise has a critical role. Last year:

- —All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.
- —The International Executive Service Corps operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counseled local executives.
- —Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a private U.S. non-profit organization.
- —More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.
- —Thirty-three American states supported development work in 14 Latin American countries under AID's Partners of the Alliance program.

All of these efforts will be sustained and expanded in the coming year. We are committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in an assistance to the developing countries. We shall remain so.

A YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY, A YEAR OF RISK

LATIN AMERICA

I propose appropriations of $625 million for the Alliance for Progress.

The American Presidents met at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

- —The Nations of Latin America have invested more than $115 billion, compared with $7.7 billion in American aid.
- —Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.
- —Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

A new course was charted for that partnership in the years ahead. At Punta del Este, the American nations agreed to move toward economic integration. They set new targets for improvements in agriculture, in health, and in education. They moved to bring the blessings of modern technology to all the citizens of our Hemisphere.

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have progressed to the point where they no longer require AID loans. More than two-thirds of our aid will be concentrated in Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Central America. Each has done much to deserve our help:

- —*Brazil* increased food production by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real economic growth of 5%. Inflation was cut from 40% in 1966 to 25% in 1967.
- —*Chile*, under President Frei's Revolution in Freedom, has launched a strong program of agricultural and land reforms, while maintaining an overall growth rate of about 5%.
- —*Colombia* has also averaged 5% growth while undertaking difficult financial and social reforms.
- —*Central America* leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. Trade among these countries has grown by 450% in the six years of the Alliance—from $30 million in 1961 to $172 million in 1967.

This peaceful Alliance holds the hopes of a Hemisphere. We have a clear responsibility to do our share. Our partners have an equally clear responsibility to theirs. We must press forward together toward mutual security and economic development for all our people.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

I recommend $706 million for the Near East and South Asia.

Half the people we seek to help live in India, Pakistan and Turkey. The fate of freedom in the world rests heavily on the fortunes of these three countries.

Each is engaged in a powerful effort to fight poverty, to grow more and better food, and to control population. If they succeed, and in so doing prove the effectiveness of free institutions, the lesson will be heard and heeded around the world.

This is a year of special importance for all three countries.

INDIA

India has survived two successive years of the worst drought of this century. Even as she fought to save her people from starvation, she prepared for the day when the monsoon rains would return to normal. That day has come. India is now harvesting the greatest grain crop in her history. With this crop, India can begin a dramatic recovery which could lay the groundwork for sustained growth.

India must have the foreign exchange to take advantage of this year of opportunity. A farmer cannot use the miracle seed which would double or triple his yield unless he can get twice as much fertilizer as he used for the old seeds. A fertilizer distributor cannot sell that much more fertilizer unless it can be imported. An importer cannot buy it unless he can get foreign exchange from the Government. India will not have that foreign exchange unless the wealthy countries of the world are willing to lend it in sufficient quantities at reasonable terms.

This is the crux of the matter. If we and other wealthy countries can provide the loans, we have much to look forward to. If we cannot, history will rightly label us penny-wise and pound-foolish.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan, though also plagued by drought, has continued its excellent progress of the past few years. Her development budget has been increased. Her military budget has been reduced. Agricultural production is growing faster than population. Private investment has exceeded expectations.

Now the Government of Pakistan has undertaken further steps to reform its economic policies—to free up its economy and give more play to the market. These reforms are acts of wisdom and courage, but they require foreign exchange to back them up. Pakistan deserves our help.

TURKEY

Turkey's economic record is outstanding. Her gross national product has grown an average of six percent annually since 1962. Industrial output has grown 9 percent per year. Food production is growing much faster than population growth.

Turkey's own savings now finance some 90 percent of her gross investment. Difficult problems remain, but we may now realistically look forward to the day—in the early 1970's—when Turkey will no longer require AID's help.

AFRICA

I recommend $179 million for Africa.

Just 1 year ago, I informed the Congress of a shift in emphasis in our aid policy for Africa. We moved promptly to put it into effect:

- —There will be 21 U.S. bilateral programs in Africa in Fiscal 1969, compared to 35 last year.
- —Most of our bilateral programs will be phased out in eleven more countries in the following year.
- —Expanded regional and international projects will meet the development needs of the countries where bilateral aid is ended.

The past year has provided further evidence that this support for regional economic institutions and projects is a sensible approach to Africa's problems. It expands markets. It encourages economies of scale. It gives meaningful evidence of our concern and interest in African development.

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 250 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of $480 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort in Vietnam. This effort will be intensified by the need to restore and reconstruct the cities and towns attacked in recent days.

Defense of Vietnam requires more than success on the battlefield. The people of Vietnam are building the economic and social base to preserve the independence we are helping them to defend.

Since 1965, when galloping inflation loomed and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the people of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in combat:

—They have written a Constitution and established representative local and national governments through free elections, despite a concerted campaign of terror, assassination and intimidation.

—Runaway inflation has been averted, and the foundation laid for a thriving economy, despite the enormous stresses of war.

But still the innocent victims of war and terrorism must be cared for; persistent inflationary pressures must continue to be controlled; and the many problems faced by a new government under wartime conditions must be overcome. The framework for economic and social progress has been established. We must help the Vietnamese people to build the institutions needed to make it work.

In the coming year, we will:

—Improve our assistance to refugees and civilian casualties. The wages of aggression are always paid in the blood and misery of the innocent. Our determination to resist aggression must be matched by our compassion for its helpless victims.

—Intensify agricultural programs aimed at increasing rice production by 50% in the next four years.

—Concentrate our educational effort toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

—Stress, in our import programs, the key commodities needed for agricultural and industrial growth.

The rapid program expansion of the past two years—in dollars, people and diversity of activities—is ended. The emphasis in the coming year will be on concentration of resources on the most important current programs.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our ultimate success.

EAST ASIA

I recommend $277 million for East Asia.

For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and urgent business for the nations of East Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

But this year the larger portion of our aid to East Asian countries will be focused directly on the work of development. Asians know—as we do—that in the long run, economic, social and political development offer the best protection against subversion and attack. Despite communist pressure, they are getting on with the job. For example:

—For the last three years, the *Korean* economy has grown by a phenomenal 10 percent per year; domestic revenues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.9 percent in 1962 to 2.5 percent today, and a strong national population program is contributing to further reductions. We are now able to plan for orderly reduction of U.S. economic aid as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will be—maintained.

—*Indonesia* has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and rehabilitation and is moving toward development. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is overwhelmingly in our interest to provide it.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

I recommend $420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of nations on the perimeter of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of Free World collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress.

Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have resisted large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons.

We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with this problem. In addition, we will explore other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through cash and credit sales. I will submit separate legislation to authorize necessary military sales and provide for credit terms where justified.

Our military assistance programs will provide only what is needed for legitimate defense and internal security needs. We will do no more. We can afford to do no less.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The internal peace and order of this steadfast ally is once again threatened from the North.

These threats summon Korea to strengthen further her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

We must help.

I propose that Congress appropriate immediately an additional $100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea.

This can be accomplished within the authorizing legislation already enacted.

With this additional help, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea can gain new strength through the acquisition of aircraft and anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft, ammunition and other supplies.

AMERICA'S CHOICE

Foreign aid serves our national interest. It expresses our basic humanity. It may not always be popular, but it is right.

The peoples we seek to help are committed to change. This is an immutable fact of our time. The only questions are whether change will be peaceful or violent, whether it will liberate or enslave, whether it will build a community of free and prosperous nations or sentence the world to endless strife between rich and poor.

Foreign aid is the American answer to this question. It is a commitment to conscience as well as to country. It is a matter of national tradition as well as national security.

Last year some Americans forgot that tradition. My foreign aid request, already the smallest in history, was reduced by almost one-third.

The effects of that cut go much deeper than the fields which lie fallow, the factories not built, or the hospitals without modern equipment.

Our Ambassadors all over the developing world report the deep and searching questions they are being asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to fate the weak and the striving who are depending on her help?

This Congress can give a resounding answer to these questions by enacting the full amount I have requested. I do not propose this as a partisan measure. I propose it as an extension of the humane statesmanship of both parties for more than twenty years.

I said in my State of the Union address that it is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will. This is nowhere more true than in the developing countries where our help is a crucial margin between peaceful change and violent disaster.

I urge the Congress to meet this test.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1968.*

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to Congress his proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1969.

It is a modest program requesting $2½ billion for foreign economic assistance and $400 million of military assistance.

As the richest nation in the world, it represents the minimum that we can do in cooperation with the developed free world powers to fight the conditions of poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and disease upon which communism breeds in the less developed world.

The AID request together with other foreign aid activities such as Public Law 480 food aid, our contributions to multilateral institutions such as IDA, IDB, and the Asian Bank, and our funding of the Peace Corps, represents about 0.5 percent of the U.S. gross national product.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the obvious frugality of this effort is more than proved by the fact that it represents only one-quarter of the contribution of our gross national product as was devoted to this same field of activity by the United States in 1949.

The following analysis of the President's foreign aid program points out that it is a thrifty and cautious proposal:

AID PROPOSED PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969 (FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968)

I. SIZE OF PROGRAM

$2.9 billion is requested for economic and military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act:

A.I.D.—$2.5 billion.

Military Assistance—$0.4 billion.

The appropriation requested for A.I.D. together with other available funds will finance a program of $2.7 billion (see attached table).

The $2.5 billion requested for A.I.D. is about $130 million less than the President requested for FY 1968. The Congress appropriated $1.9 billion for FY 1968.

The A.I.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid, contributions to multilateral institutions (IDA, IDB and the Asian Bank), and Peace Corps, represents about 0.5% of U.S. GNP—only half as much as the target of 1% of GNP set by the UN and OECD. In 1949 the United States put 2% of its GNP into foreign economic aid.

II. CONCENTRATION

Countries: The FY 1969 proposed A.I.D. program is heavily concentrated in key countries—15 countries will receive nearly 90% of all country program funds: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Peru, Tunisia, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam.

Nine of these will get about 85% of development loan country programs: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Korea, Indonesia.

Four will get 95% of Supporting Assistance country programs: Vietnam, Korea, Laos and Thailand.

Agriculture: About $800 billion of A.I.D. funds will be used in FY 1969 for agricultural development and increasing food production.

III. REDUCED COST TO U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Ninety-two percent of A.I.D. funds in FY 1969 will be spent on purchases of U.S. goods and services. In 1963 the dollar outflow resulting from A.I.D. operations was over $600 million. In 1967 this dropped to about $270 million. In 1968 it will be reduced to less than $170 million. Repayments of over $200 million on outstanding aid loans will more than offset this outflow.

Ending foreign aid would not, therefore, significantly improve the U.S. balance of payments. But it would adversely affect the U.S. industries, workers and farmers who are manufacturing, producing and exporting aid-financed goods.

IV. OTHERS SHARE THE BURDEN

United States leadership in the aid field has declined. We are now only *fifth* among DAC donors in share of national income devoted to official aid: *eighth*, when private investment in Less Developed Countries is included.

Despite fiscal and other economic problems, a number of other countries—Japan, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany—are increasing their aid programs. Britain is maintaining its aid budget levels.

V. SPECIAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR KOREA

A special supplementary appropriation of $100 million will be requested in FY 1968 for additional military aid to Korea, to supply aircraft, anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft and other supplies. This appropriation request will be made under the existing FY 1968 military assistance authorization.

FISCAL YEAR 1969 APPROPRIATION REQUEST AND PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

[In millions of dollars]

Assistance category	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation request	Fiscal year 1969 proposed program [1]
Economic assistance:		
Development loans	765.0	850.3
Technical assistance	235.0	253.0
Alliance for Progress	625.0	685.2
Development loans	515.0	567.2
Technical assistance	110.0	118.0
Supporting assistance	595.0	629.5
Contingency fund	45.0	50.0
Contributions to international organizations	154.3	154.3
American schools and hospitals abroad	15.1	15.1
Surveys of investment opportunities	1.5	2.0
Administrative expenses:		
AID	58.8	61.4
State	3.9	3.9
Total economic assistance	2,498.5	2,704.6
Military assistance [2]	420.0	503.5
Total	2,918.5	3,208.1

[1] The fiscal year 1969 proposed program is the total amount of funds that would be available to carry out programs under the Foreign Assistance Act. The proposed program consists of the new appropriations requested and additional funds available for use in fiscal year 1969 such as repayments on prior loans, reimbursements, and uncommitted or deobligated funds from prior years.

[2] Excludes appropriations of $120,000,000 to be requested in a separate military sales act.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the President's message on foreign aid that current restraints on private investment in other countries does not extend to the poor nations carrying on the fight against hunger, ignorance, and disease. The message stresses that the United States is committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in the assistance to the developing countries.

One of the first things we have discovered about economic progress is that the countries developing most rapidly are those in which the creative forces of private enterprise are allowed full play.

Encouragement of private enterprise has two facets. It takes the form of encouraging American private industry, nonprofit organizations, universities, and State and local governments to participate as widely as possible in overseas development. It also takes the form of conducting programs directly aimed at strengthening private enterprise already doing business in developing countries.

So-called program loans finance a wide range of development commodities purchased in the United States and ultimately distributed overseas through private channels. Our technical assistance, meaning AID-financed American advisers who themselves are often drawn from private enterprise, encourages private sector growth overseas. Private American organizations also play a prominent role in helping the poor countries benefit from American experience with cooperative endeavors—credit unions, cooperatives for marketing or farm credit, rural electric cooperatives, and savings and loan institutions.

The President, in his message, takes note of the critical role of private enterprise in all this work. Private enterprise and public governments—working in partnership—can together best help the people of the poor nations realize their hopes for a better life in freedom. Which, after all, describes the only kind of world in which American business can long prosper.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 message on foreign aid, received from the President today, pointedly makes clear that world peace can never be attained while millions upon millions of our fellow human beings live in disease and squalor, ignorance, and despair.

Chief Justice Holmes once said that taxes are the price we pay for civilization. The same could be said, I believe, of foreign aid.

If, as the President notes, men can foresee only lives of torment and backbreaking toil, our world will wallow in senseless barbarism. Civilization may well recede—as has happened before in world history.

The cost of foreign aid to our Nation—in the recommendation of the President—would be $2.5 billion. It is the smallest amount ever requested since the initiation of the program in 1948.

If the President's full request is granted, it would still be the smallest percentage of our Nation's gross national product ever expended in foreign aid.

Surely, this is a small amount to promote peace and security.

Then too, in terms of world population, it would be the smallest amount ever allocated on a per capita basis of the needy abroad.

If past history is any indication, the final authorization figure recommended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be even lower than the President's request.

And yet we may expect that when the bill reaches the floor of the House, Members of Congress—many of whom have been voting against foreign aid for years—will vote against it once again.

It is to those Members that today I urge a close and careful reading of the President's message on foreign aid, and equally careful study of the line-item presentation book when it is made available to all Members.

It is my hope that they will restudy their position not only in the light of the great needs of our fellow men all over the world but more importantly from the standpoint of our own national interest and security.

The Bible tells us of the rich man, Dives, who threw the scraps from his table to his dogs, while the beggar Lazarus, starved outside.

Not one of us here, I know, would turn our generous hand away from the sight of Lazarus.

Yet outside these warm and comfortable halls, across the seas which surround our bountiful land, there are millions like Lazarus who need our help. Can we—the richest nation in the entire history of the world—turn away from them?

Let us not be mistaken. As we sow in this world, so shall we reap.

It behooves all of us, therefore, to search our consciences, on both sides of the aisle, and to give the President's foreign aid request a fair hearing.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to single out two items in the President's foreign aid message for additional comment.

First, the President wisely has proposed a 5-year program for the research and manufacture of fish protein additives in an effort to help combat the brain damage which scientists now know is caused by malnutrition in small children.

This program would complement present efforts to raise the nutrition level of children through the use of fortified foods. The most widely used of these is CSM, a mix of corn, soybeans, and milk with vitamin that already may well have saved thousands of starving children in India and elsewhere from dulled minds.

Is there any cause more worthy of our attention and concern? Dare we ignore the irreparable damage which a lack of protein during the formative years can cause?

Of course, we cannot. That is why the President's forward-looking proposal to extract life-giving protein from fish deserves our commendation.

Second, I want to comment on the request for $200 million for the new special fund of the Asian Development Bank.

Since its inception, I have closely observed the operation of this international financial institution. It holds great hope for mutual cooperation among the countries of Asia toward the economic and social progress of the region.

The $200 million requested would provide long-term, low-interest loans to member countries for agriculture, transportation, communication, and other vital projects of regional significance.

The funds would be given to the Bank over a 4-year period and only on the condition that the U.S. contribution to the fund be a minority one. Further, the funds would have to be used in a manner not injurious to our balance of payments.

The plain facts are, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot spend billions on war and destruction in Asia and not be willing, at the same time, to spend even a fraction of those amounts on projects designed to build and further the cause of peaceful development in that area.

As President Johnson has said, we know that the hope of progress does more to build the peace and security of the world than guns and bombs.

The foreign aid message read here today contains great potential for worldwide progress. Let us all give it the attention it deserves—and let our consciences be our guides.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it may often seem to us that the nations of the world are growing apart from one another. Nationalism, lack of contact, lack of experience, lack of imagination, lack of mutual confidence, often stand in the way of cooperation.

Yet, among the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America we can see solid progress toward regional cooperation, bolstered by U.S. economic assistance.

I welcome what the President calls in his message on foreign aid "opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts." For, as he has said previously, resources know no national boundaries. Rivers flow through many countries, transportation and communications networks serve different peoples, sources of electric power must be shared by neighbors.

In addition to other organizations of Asian or Southeast Asian nations, the Asian Development Bank shows great promise as a force for regional cooperation. As the message points out, work is proceeding on regional power and water projects. Based on a survey of transportation and education needs, the Bank has asked for contributions for a special fund for joint development projects of regional significance in these fields as well as others. Another regional effort in the area is the development of the lower Mekong River, which flows through Thailand, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia.

The Inter-American Development Bank, a kingpin of the Alliance for Progress, requires expansion of its capital and additional guarantee funds.

In Africa, regional economic cooperation is increasingly centered in the African Development Bank, which has opened its doors and, financed entirely by Africans, has made its first loan.

With reduced bilateral U.S. programs for the African nations, I urge the Congress to support the President's call for assistance to the African Bank in financing special projects.

We must grasp every opportunity to encourage these promising advances in regional cooperation.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the President's latest foreign aid message emphatically reminds us that economic assistance is by no means a no-obligation gift for developing nations.

It is provided only to those countries willing to help themselves and prepared to demonstrate that they are able to do so. Advocates of foreign aid wholeheartedly support President Johnson's statement that—

> We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment.

Let me add that this self-help requirement is one that the Agency for International Development will continue to enforce as stringently in the future as it has done in the past.

There is proof in the fact that developing countries invest an average of $8 for every dollar received in U.S. aid. Some contribute even more.

Colombia, for example, invested $980 million in fiscal 1966 on development operations. This amounted to 16 percent of its gross national product. Compare Colombia's share to the $87 million provided to it by AID and you see that it contributed 11 times as much to its welfare as did the United States. India is another example. That same year it spent $7.3 billion on development projects—about 24 times the $310 million provided by AID.

Whether or not a country receives any assistance at all often hinges on its completing a necessary project on its own. Afghanistan, for instance, had to create a highway maintenance department before we would provide it a $7.7 million highway loan. A loan to the Bolivian Mining Bank was held up until that country completed reforms in mining policies.

The history of this country's aid program is filled with similar examples. Each one is further proof of the soundness of AID's major operating principle, so well stated by the President:

> We will help those—and only those—who help themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years Congress has accepted the foreign aid programs of both Republican and Democratic administrations as essential to our free world leadership. Again President Johnson has reminded us that this is it.

I am particularly struck by the importance of the President's recognition of the need to move forward in our commitments to regional economic development projects to support those international institutions which he says "build the peace."

The growth of common markets and regional associations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are a major force for world peace.

The President has presented us with what he calls "three major opportunities" to add new momentum to this regional development.

First, we must appropriate the President's request of $206 million as a contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. As the President says this institution is at the very center of the Alliance for Progress.

Second, we must authorize a contribution of $200 million as our share to the Asian Development Bank. The nations of free Asia will need full fiscal support for a variety of economic projects that will mean a better life for all in that area of the world.

Third, we should provide a modest share of the funds needed by the African

Development Bank to begin its very important work in that great continent.

The notion that individual countries have a real stake in mutual development of resources commonly held with others is not new, of course. But active pursuit of effective regional arrangements of a formal character has only recently emerged as a firm policy of American aid officials. It is something to be energetically encouraged by this Congress, for national rivalry no less than of poverty and ignorance is a classical cause of violence that benefits no one.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's admonition that this Government will continue to insist that self-help be a fundamental condition for all American assistance has been well put.

The record speaks for itself. Most of our aid recipients have been moving toward their economic goals with leadership, energy, and determination. In fact, most countries now contribute an average of $8 for every dollar received from our aid program.

Outstanding examples of how self-help pays off can be cited in the cases of Iran and the Republic of China—Taiwan—countries have graduated from the aid program and are now on their own. The Republic of Korea is in the midst of a tremendous economic expansion which can be traced largely to its self-help measures.

In these countries private investment, both domestic and foreign, has been and is still being encouraged. They have upgraded their agricultural, health, and educational institutions. Tax collection has been improved and land tenure arrangements are being changed for the better.

In India, Pakistan, and Turkey, our aid is merely an adjunct to their own intensive self-help programs.

Self-help calls for leadership, energy, and determination on the part of country leaders. In Tunisia we can point to tremendous growth in agriculture, where this country has become an exporter of foodstuffs rather than an importer.

When the President speaks of America helping those and only those who help themselves, I am certain that he has in back of his mind these examples. While AID must be tailored to countries' needs, so must their own self-help efforts if they are to move away from their less-developed status.

Mr. Speaker, I recently completed a 5-week factfinding mission which took me through nine countries in Southeast Asia. This trip reaffirmed my belief that this is the best possible way we can help lesser developed countries. And, at the same time, we are helping ourselves. For by showing these countries the path to social and economic stability, we are enabling them to afford to help us, as well. Thailand's support of our effort in Vietnam is a case in point.

I have long been a stanch supporter of foreign aid and I shall continue to be one, for I firmly believe that there is no greater gift that we can give to lesser developed countries than the wherewithal to help themselves.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am vitally interested in the war on hunger aspects of our foreign aid program. It is not just idle supposing that we will be faced with the prospect of a world food shortage unless all the nations of the world cooperate in an extensive effort to meet the food needs of tomorrow. Already, over one-half of the world is hungry, and the population explosion is adding to the hungry half of the world each day.

The problem is of such proportions that it can no longer be solved by sharing the surplus of productive nations with countries unable to feed themselves. It must be attacked through programs of agricultural development, research in the field of nutrition, and emphasis on family planning.

Last year, President Johnson made agriculture a primary concern of our foreign aid program, and I am happy to see that his foreign aid message this year again stresses the importance of bringing world food production and population growth into balance.

The President has directed the Agency for International Development to increase its investment in agriculture and has proposed a 3-year extension of the food-for-freedom program.

Also, in light of recent evidence that malnutrition in the early years can severely limit mental, as well as physical capacities, he has called for a 5-year program for the research and manufacture of protein additives from fish to fortify the food consumed in the developing countries.

I am in full accord with these proposals, because I believe there is no greater threat to world stability than that of widespread hunger. We have the resources and know-how to avert this threat, and we must employ them now before the war on hunger becomes, not a foreign aid program, but one of self-preservation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the strength and good sense which is evident in the President's message, "To Build the Peace," which was submitted to the Congress today.

Often I am asked by the voters of my district: "What are the basic principles of our foreign aid program?" Our critics at home and abroad have claimed that we have no foreign aid policy worth the name. I would invite them to study the eloquent statement which President Johnson made today on the subject of foreign aid.

Our President made clear that in the field of foreign aid our policy must be based on principles, not on expediency, He outlined six basic principles which I believe merit our close attention and support.

Events of recent weeks show that America must be flexible in our relations with other nations. Flexibility demands that other countries understand our commitments and recognize that our policy in one part of the globe is consistent with our commitments in all parts of the globe. In this respect, our foreign aid program cannot be based on the shifting sands and shallow waters of momentary impulse.

When we talk of needed flexibility in foreign aid we mean the ability to react to change as it occurs. Yet flexibility must also be based on a clear understanding and delineation of our own goals. Today the President spoke of these goals—he outlined six important ones for American foreign aid: self-help, multilateralism, regionalism, priority for agriculture and population planning, protection of a favorable balance of payments, and efficient administration of the aid program. These goals are also the principles of our foreign aid effort.

By directing our attention to such principles, and by developing specific legislative programs to give life to these principles, we will achieve the kind of commitment to flexibility which characterizes our foreign policy at its best. I think that this is an important message and a good one.

I have consistently supported our foreign aid program, as I believe that it has done much to stimulate and develop stronger economies in many nations. In turn, their strength contributes to our economic well-being through trade and their ability to resist Communist aggression or subversion.

Some countries, however, have turned their backs on us, and have formed or joined alliances contrary to our interests. In those specific cases I have favored cessation of financial or military assistance.

In many non-Communist nations there are acute shortages of food and other vital commodities which endanger the lives of their people as well as the political stability and security of their nation.

Our shipments of surplus grain to the starving millions in India certainly, from a humanitarian standpoint, should not be cut off simply because we disagree with some specific action of the Indian Government this month, or next month.

I am in favor of our present policy of annual examination of our foreign aid commitments, particularly our military assistance commitments. In a few instances these arms have been diverted from maintenance of national security to aggressive use against neighboring countries.

While it is difficult to see the importance of foreign aid at a time when there are so many needs at home, we should keep in mind the fact that more than 80 percent of appropriated foreign aid dollars are spent right here in the United States for the products of our factories and fields. It is true that our foreign aid program has done much to give this Nation the acknowledged leadership of the free world. All of us as Americans can be proud of this position of leadership.

The rebuilding of Europe after the Second World War is a good example of the success of our foreign aid program. It stopped the spread of communism and provided markets for American goods. The nations of Western Europe have remained strong allies against the threat of Soviet expansion. Only France has taken a position apparently based on extreme nationalistic pride, rather than gratitude for our past assistance. However, none of us doubt the anti-Communist position of the present French Government.

I will continue to review carefully our foreign aid commitments. Our foreign policy must be flexible and must adjust itself to changing relations among nations—both friendly and unfriendly.

Our foreign policy should be conducted first and foremost in our own interest. I do not believe that it would contribute to our own national security or position of leadership if we cut off foreign aid completely at this time. We do live in a dangerous world, and world problems inevitably affect for better or worse our destiny as a free nation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, every taxpayer wants to feel that foreign aid tax dollars are spent wisely. We all want to know that our money spent for foreign aid is going where its effects will be felt.

President Johnson has just delivered his foreign aid message for 1968 in which he assures us that he will insist on six basic principles of foreign aid administration to insure an efficient and effective aid program:

First, self-help: This is the overriding principle of foreign aid. U.S. assistance will supplement development programs, but the major effort must come from the countries themselves.

Second, multilateralism: Every advanced nation must share the burden and coordinate assistance efforts.

Third, regionalism: Neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources.

Fourth, priority for agriculture, health, and education: The critical areas of want must be relieved in order to achieve development.

Fifth, balance of payments: We cannot help others grow unless the American dollar is stable. AID operations will be a positive contribution to the balance of payments.

Sixth, efficient administration: Every American citizen is entitled to know that his tax dollar is spent wisely.

Foreign aid is a vital investment in the security of the United States, and I believe these six principles will adequately protect that investment.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, one recent trend that has improved the effectiveness of our foreign aid program is the growing proportion of assistance being distributed through institutions and mechanisms supported by many nations besides the United States. We should be delighted that this multilateral approach is still an article of faith with the President and his aid planners.

For a long time, we have believed in cooperation with other free world nations that help the less developed countries, whether through contributions to international development institutions or through close coordination of our own AID program with those of other aid-giving countries. We have also believed in promoting cooperation among the less developed nations themselves to further their common development.

There are examples of how effectively this is working all over the globe. In East Asia, we have supported the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong Basin program. The Mekong River flows through many countries of Southeast Asia, and for more than 10 years we have acted in concert with others to control its floods, irrigate surrounding land and improve navigation. In Africa, as much of our aid as possible is going to 10 nations where development prospects are best in cooperation with other aid donors and under leadership of international organizations. In Latin America, the whole of our AID program rests on the actively multilateral foundation of the Alliance for Progress.

It is not always possible to establish multilateral institutions as the channel for our aid because to succeed they must have the meaningful cooperation of other aid giving nations—and some are reluctant to cooperate. But it is nonetheless gratifying to see the steady progress being made in this field.

Now the President has called upon us to consider joining with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development lending branch of the World Bank; to enlarge the resources of the Asian Development Bank for agriculture, transportation, and other vital projects; to continue our support of the Inter-American Development Bank; and to make a modest contribution to a new Special Fund of the African Development Bank.

The President's message notes that in 1968, 80 percent of our AID loans were made as part of international arrangements through which all carry their fair shares of the common burden.

I, for one, will continue to support this respect for and use of international institutions which, in the President's words, "build the peace."

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in his aid message, the President has rightly emphasized that no economic and social development effort can succeed unless population is brought into balance with food and other resources.

It has become obvious that the rapid increase in population—now averaging 2 percent a year worldwide—is dragging at the heels of hard-won progress, not only in food production, but also in housing, education, employment and stability. Hardest hit by the ever-growing number of mouths to feed are the less developed areas of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where two thirds of humanity lives.

Therefore it is most gratifying to me to know that along with food production the highest priority has been given to encouragement, support and strengthening of voluntary family planning programs in the developing countries.

AID has in various ways been supporting population studies and voluntary family planning programs in some 30 countries, and is expected to obligate $35 million for this work during this fiscal year, and even more next year.

But we must keep in mind that efforts to reduce the population explosion, though urgently needed, must be treated delicately. The family planning programs we assist must be host nation programs—not our programs. Furthermore, we should assist only when the developing country, having decided on the types of programs appropriate to its requirements, allows individuals freedom of choice to participate or not, as well as a choice of means.

For these reasons, I would urge the Congress not to try to dictate the amount of money to be spent on population programs overseas, or otherwise to legislate specific means in this area. For it is plain that AID efforts on population growth problems are increasingly effective and are meeting requirements of developing countries as these countries themselves recognize their needs.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the President has set before us a bare-bones request for $706 million for Agency for International Development programs in the key nations of the Near East and South Asia. India, Pakistan, Turkey, and their neighbors are determined to move ahead. We must remain determined to assist them.

We may point to real achievements. For example, because of the AID program and the self-help that AID encourages, Iran no longer needs our help and the AID program there ended November 30, 1967. In addition, the people at the Agency for International Development and their Turkish beneficiaries see a time in the early 1970's when Turkey, too, will be economically self-maintaining and off the AID rolls.

Nations and their leaders press forward. Farmers on the edge of survival have begun to leave their old ways and embrace the technological advances introduced with our help. Pakistan has fought off the ill effects of drought and India is lifting herself out of the recession of the last few years.

But these accomplishments can reverse themselves, and quickly. Indian agriculture, for example, is still the puppet of undependable rain. Therefore, because we are men of conscience and because we are Americans concerned with the fate of the planet we share, we must act favorably upon the President's request to us today. The nations of the Near East and South Asia, the nations of the other regions of the underdeveloped world, the good people we represent all are watching us.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in the RECORD immediately following the President's message, "To Build the Peace."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

REPORT FOR FISCAL 1967 OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for Fiscal Year 1967—the first full year of its existence.

The report offers abundant proof that the Endowment has made good use of its resources. With the advice and recommendations of the members of the National Council on the Arts, the Endowment has:

- —Opened new opportunities for creative writers, art students, and visual and performing artists;
- —Created three Laboratory Theatres—in Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Providence—for the presentation of professional theatre to secondary school students and the adult community;
- —Assisted 17 resident professional theatres across the Nation;
- —Initiated the first American Literary Anthology, representing the finest work appearing in literary magazines;
- —Helped major museums expand their audiences and provide more services to their communities;
- —Launched a program to enhance the environment of American cities with outstanding works of sculpture in outdoor public places;
- —Created a new program to aid American composers and symphony orchestras;
- —Stimulated the production and nationwide distribution of programs on the arts for educational television;
- —Rendered financial and technical assistance to agencies for the arts in 50 States, and District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico enabling them to implement 295 new or expanded arts projects.

Throughout Fiscal Year 1967, the National Endowment for the Arts worked closely with private foundations, organizations and individuals, seeking to increase appreciation and support of the arts in the United States.

Since the Endowment was created, Federal grants totaling $10.5 million have been made. These Federal grants have been supplemented by nearly $16 million in contributions from States and cities, and from private agencies and individuals—dramatic evidence of the widespread support which now exists for those whose talent and genius enrich the life of our country.

The National Endowment for the Arts has made great progress toward realizing the mandate given it by the Congress to improve the quality of American life.

I transmit with pride this report of the Endowment's first full year of activities and urge the Congress to act promptly to extend the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1968.*

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred to by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11284, THE FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 926 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 926

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11284) to amend the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 11284, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1124 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11284 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 926 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 11284, a bill to authorize a fire research and safety program. The resolution further provides that, after passage of H.R. 11284, it shall be in order to take S. 1124 from the Speaker's table, move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11284 as passed.

The purpose of H.R. 11284 is to provide a national fire research and safety program and to create a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control in order that more effective measures may be taken against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property resulting from uncontrolled fire.

In 1965, some 12,000 lives and $1.75 billion were lost to fire. Our per capita death rate through fire was about four times as great as that of the United Kingdom and—hear this—over six times as great as that of Japan, the so-called "land of paperhouses."

H.R. 11284, the passage of which was requested by the President in his state of the Union message, will set up a comprehensive fire research and safety program within the Department of Commerce to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards. The bill will allow the Bureau to undertake new areas of responsibility which are not being covered adequately by any private or governmental organization at the present time.

The bill under consideration provides that the National Bureau of Standards will work in-house and by contract or grants, on a number of important existing research projects which should have been started long ago. These projects have been sadly neglected because of insufficient funds and the limited authorization provided in the original Organic Act.

Passage of this bill would mean that research can and will be conducted for a better understanding of the nature and causes of fires.

Another research project would have as its goal the improvement of firefighting equipment. In this age of technological advancement, it is known that much of our firefighting equipment is operationally inadequate. Also included would be developmental studies by firemen into improving environmental protection and communication systems, and research to find safe ways of identifying the actual location of a fire.

The National Bureau of Standards has demonstrated its ability to correlate, evaluate, and disseminate data expeditiously. For this reason, it can be expected to provide an efficient and comprehensive method of acquiring fire data from local, State, and Federal sources.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of Commerce will establish a fire research and safety center to carry out the purposes enumerated in the bill, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

One new activity authorized by H.R. 11284 is the demonstration projects on fire prevention and control. It would permit ideas to be tried in actual use. The ideas could come from the fire services, from industry and others in addition to those suggested by the results of the National Bureau of Standards fire research.

H.R. 11284 will establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. This Commission will undertake a thorough study and investigation for the purpose of reducing the destruction of life and property caused by fire in our cities, suburbs, and communities.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Bureau will undertake or support programs in research, training and information services where clear problems already exist for the use of State and local governments, fire departments, and other organizations interested in fire protection. At the same time, the Commission will determine whether or not additional problems exist that warrant attention at a national level such as fire department personnel problems, the need for standardization of equipment, the adequacy of building codes and construction methods, and the consideration of fire protection in urban planning.

Mr. Speaker, the discovery of fire by primitive man marked the crucial beginning of his civilization, and yet fire, by its very nature, portends his very end when unharnessed and uncontrolled. The adoption of House Resolution 926 will be a step toward a better harness and a more effective control of fire, to make it a true servant of man in his constant quest for a better life in a greater society.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman referred to fire loss figures for the past year; is that correct?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. For the year 1965 the figure is $1.75 billion.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 926, as the gentleman from Hawaii has explained, is an open rule providing for 1 hour of debate for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11284, a bill to set up a fire research program within the Department of Commerce to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards.

According to the report, the primary purposes of this bill are as follows:

The investigations of fires as to their causes; frequency of occurrence, and severity of losses;

Research into causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention and control;

Public education on fire hazards and safety;

Fire information reference service; and

Education and training programs for professional firefighters.

In addition to this, it also proposes that grants be established for colleges and universities that will agree to promote causes in the field of firefighting and in the science of fire.

This part of the program could have more properly been presented to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House rather than to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. But, nevertheless, that is what the bill purports to do under its present provision.

The Bureau of Standards, as I have stated, would be authorized to carry out this program. Their appropriation—and mark this—their appropriation has been averaging $200,000 a year.

This bill authorizes to be appropriated $10 million, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 50 times in the amount of money appropriated to the National Bureau of Standards this year.

In addition, a second portion of the bill will set up a National Commission on Fire Prevention composed of 20 members, $100-a-day specialists and, according to the Department of Commerce, the estimated cost of this Commission for the next 2 years is $665,000.

This is nothing new. We have fire research going on not only in the Federal Government but also in private industry. Again, according to the report, nine different departments of the Federal Government last year received funds in a total of about $11 million to conduct research in the area of fire.

Let me read to you the departments of the Federal Government that so participated: The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Office of Civil Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, the National Bureau of Standards. The report shows that nine different departments in the Federal Government received approximately $11 million last year in the same area for which we would set up a new program in the National Bureau of Standards to the tune of $10 million.

What has been going on in private industry? We have millions of dollars being spent by private industry in this very same field, and being spent effectively. Your fire equipment companies are constantly striving to improve the efficiency of their equipment with which to put out fires and to control fires, and they are spending large sums in the area of research. Building material companies—and they are referred to in the report—are spending huge sums of money to develop and research fireproof building materials.

I happen to know something about this at firsthand because I am in the retail lumber business and have been all of my life. I have attended some demonstrations put on by the building material companies. I refer particularly to the Johns-Manville Co. I was at their plant in Waukegan, Ill. Johns-Manville have developed many fine products that are fireproof. They constructed a little building utilizing these new products that they had developed. They purposely set it on fire. No fire department was called and no water was used. They let it burn. In a short time it burned itself out. But the entire building was not destroyed because the fireproof materials that J-M had developed stopped the spread of the fire.

Many other companies in the building material industry—Ruberoid, United States Gypsum, Philip Carey, and many, many others—are constantly working in this field, in private enterprise, using their own funds, their own money, to develop fireproof materials. Also working in that field are trade associations, commercial laboratories, nonprofit organizations, universities, and last, but not least, the insurance companies.

Who has a greater stake in the prevention of fire than do fire insurance companies? They are the ones who have to pay out cold hard cash for losses from fire. They are spending probably more money for fire research than any other single industry in the United States today. Yes; we are spending millions of dollars in this field both in the Federal Government and private industry. I think this sort of legislation at this time should be postponed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious fiscal situation in which this country finds itself today, I feel this program should be deferred. The Congress, last year, took action forcing cuts in the nondefense area of spending.

We are facing a $20 billion deficit in the current fiscal year. We are also faced with a demand from President Johnson for a 10-percent increase in income taxes. In the budget message of the President received last week, he predicted another sizable deficit for fiscal year 1969.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to curtail expenditures, and this bill provides an excellent opportunity for a start in the right direction in the second session of the 90th Congress.

Let me quote to you the words of the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], from remarks given on the floor of the House recently:

> In all but the imperative necessities, we ought to close our eyes to each and every increase requested over the present level.
>
> We ought to show minus signs all up and down the line. Hold the line at the present level—make do with what we have. Reject the unnecessary. Defer the desirable. Minimize the essential. All it takes is good old-fashioned will—and a majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity in the second session of this Congress for the House to announce to the country in no uncertain terms that we mean what we say when we talk about reductions in Federal expenditures. The bill before us is a new program. I urge the Members to follow the admonition of the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and defer action on new spending programs and on increased expenditures. Today—not tomorrow—is the time to get on the right road.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I note from the report filed with this legislation, that one of the purposes of the bill is as follows:

> This bill will allow the Bureau to undertake new areas of responsibility which are not being covered adequately by any private or governmental organization at the present time.

Can the gentleman tell us what, if any, new areas of responsibility he knows are indicated for investigation?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no areas to be covered by this legislation that are not already being covered either by the nine Federal programs we have in nine different departments of the Federal Government or by private industry.

Mr. CAHILL. So it is the gentleman's observation, then, that the Commission would really be an organization to compile information that is already available?

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman speaking about the Commission of 20 members to be appointed by the President?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. This Commission would make a study of this entire matter and report back within 2 years' time, and then it would be dissolved 30 days after that. I cannot see where it will come up with any new information than what the Federal Government and private industry are already providing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

As the gentleman from Nebraska has pointed out, this is a new program we are entering into, with a tight fiscal situation.

I should like to give a little history and background which makes me feel more inclined to oppose the rule.

In the 1964 budget we had an item, in the Buerau of Standards, known as the Holloman plan for fire research, which was identically the same plan. The so-called Holloman plan was the fire research plan.

I am sorry I do not have them with me on the floor, but I can produce a file of letters, many of them opposing the Holloman plan, from fire departments, insurance companies, research laboratories and colleges—opposing the plan because it was overlapping, because dual work was being done, and because it was not feasible.

That was a million-dollar plan.

So, in the judgment of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce, we did not appropriate the money, and it was not put in the bill on the floor of the House, and the plan was dropped. It was not necessary.

Now, what has happened? They come along now with a plan not for $1 million but, as I understand it, for $10 million. In order to get support for this plan there are some grants here provided, grants to colleges and grants to fire departments. And some of the same people who opposed the spending of a million dollars, because it duplicated the work they were doing and they said it was not necessary, now, since there is an opportunity to reach out and get their hands in the Federal Treasury with grants, have changed some of their opinions.

I suggest that if a million-dollar program was not good there is certainly no reason why we should embark today on a $10 million program, an entirely new program.

Many of us have said time and time again there should be no new programs started during this period of time.

Certainly this one looks real bad to me, when $1 million was too much in 1964, but because of the support they can get for grants, for handouts, they are beginning to get some support for $10 million.

I say to the Members, you and I both know that once we adopt this approach, once we start it—it may be cut to $2.5 million today, or it may be cut to $5 million—believe you me, once we start a program of this kind, I can see it going up and up and up to where the $10 million program will eventually be a $100 million program.

I urge my colleagues that this is a good time to serve notice on the country that we are not going to start new programs, that we are going to try to do something about this budget, today. A good time to do it is by not adopting this rule.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, a bill amending the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards, to authorize a fire research and safety program, and to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

In my view, this legislation is long overdue. There are many groups throughout the country, large and small, public and private, local and national, which have been trying for years to cope with various aspects of the fire problem in this Nation. The National Bureau of Standards' efforts, for example, go back more than 60 years. Nevertheless, the per capita loss rate, whether measured in lives, injuries, or property damage, continues to go up. In 1965, fire damage totaled $1.75 billion, and over 12,000 people lost their lives. We face a national problem which requires a national solution. The Fire Research and Safety Act is the implementing of the policy for a national solution.

The basic premise of this legislation is that we are not starting from scratch with a vast and unlimited bureaucratic mechanism. The clear intent of H.R. 11284 is to strengthen and support existing programs in the field of fire research and safety. This objective will be accomplished by grants to State and local governments, and other public and nonprofit organizations, and support for in-house activities of the National Bureau of Standards.

The bill would authorize information gathering and laboratory research on the causes, frequency, and severity of fires, as well as new methods for fire prevention and control. The public would be taught about safety techniques and fire hazards. Fireman would benefit from improved training courses and materials. Information services would give out the latest knowledge on fire research and safety. Model projects demonstrating new and improved fire services and new methods for fighting fires would be authorized.

To provide a broad, long-term view of the problem and potential solutions, the Commission would make a comprehensive study of all aspects of the problem.

At the present time, 70 percent of the people in America live on 1 percent of the land. This rapidly increasing trend toward urbanization could greatly increase hazards in the future. Fire and explosion constitute these hazards. The fire research and safety bill is a sound response to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill.

Might I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario], several questions?

On page 11, line 20, there is a provision that—

> Any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing . . .

My objection to that language is over the fact that an individual member has a right to hold hearings. Why do we not just limit it to the subcommittee?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is a matter we discussed during the subcommittee hearings and in the presentation before the full committee. This is a simple procedural matter which is contained in most committees of this kind. They can set up their organization in order to function in the most efficient way with the least amount of problems. For that reason they are allowed to work. So we do not wish to put any hindering language on them in the legislation but allow them to set up their own rules and regulations with the greatest latitude possible. It may be necessary for them from time to time to send members on an individual basis to other places and this is the cheapest and most efficient way to do it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does that word "member" include the advisory members, which are the two Senators and the two Members of the House?

Mr. DADDARIO. I would say in answer to that it only includes the members. It makes clear that the Members of the House and the Senate are advisory members and could not act in that capacity. This discussion is helpful in that respect, to make that sufficiently clear.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Bow, that this is the time for fiscal responsibility and for economy. On page 7, from lines 1 to 7, we see the authorization of appropriations. It is clear that the $10 million is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. If we look at that amount, you can see there are just the months of February, March, April, May, and June remaining. This is $10 million to be spent over a period of 5 months. This would be a pretty high rate of expenditure for a new program, would it not? Could they spend it in that time?

Mr. DADDARIO. May I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this particular question up. As the gentleman will recall, in our deliberations in the committee, our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush], submitted an amendment to this effect in the full committee so that it would be cut down to a 2-year program. There will be an amendment applying to this so that it will adhere to Mr. Roudebush's amendment. This will be a 2-year program and will be terminated at that time unless Congress determines that it be supported further. As presently written and unless changed during the course of this, it will be $10 million for 1 year and general authorization for 1 additional year.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then, there would be a change, in line with the gentleman's statement, in the succeeding fiscal year, 1969. It is now indefinite under the terms of the bill that such sums as may be necessary for the following fiscal year will be spent. That is an indefinite authorization. Would this be made definite in that case?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes. It will definitely be demonstrated here that this will be a 2-year program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. On page 12 you will notice in subsection (c) that there is the waiving of title 5 of the

United States Code governing appointments in the civil service with regard to the employees of the Commission That is to be set up under title 2.

Likewise, under line 10, there is an exception made to the provisions of chapter 51, subchapter 3 of chapter 53, which grants an exception from the rules made for the general classification service pay raise. Why is that?

Mr. **DADDARIO**. Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the reason for this is that this being a 2-year program and because we wish it to get underway as quickly as possible——

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **ALBERT**). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. **MATSUNAGA**. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 additional minute.

Mr. **DADDARIO**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. I yield further to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. **DADDARIO**. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the work of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessarily on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation to them. It would represent a much cleaner operation to follow this procedure in order to avoid these handicaps; that is, to give the Commission the authority to act promptly in the employment of these people when the work of this Commission begins.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. I agree, I would like to point out, however, that the language which appears on page 12 of the report of the committee states the following:

> The committee believes that by adding a Commission to this bill it will tie the fire legislation into one package instead of two fragments going off in different directions.

When the Commission is being established under civil service, why not have a Commission as well tied into the operations and rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. **MATSUNAGA**. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 21, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—332

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—21

Berry
Bow
Burke, Fla.
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Denney
Dickinson
Eshleman
Hall
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
Martin
Minshall
Mize
Reid, Ill.
Schadeberg
Stuckey
Thompson, Ga.
Watson
Whitten

NOT VOTING—78

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Biester
Boggs
Bolling
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Devine
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Everett
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Gettys
Gray
Gude
Gurney
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
Latta
McCloskey
McDade
Madden
Mathias, Calif.
Michel
Moss
Nedzi
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Pepper
Pollock
Pool
Pucinski
Railsback
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Riegle
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Zwach

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McDade.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Devine with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota with Mr. Biester.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUTH IN LENDING ACT OF 1967

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 5) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOORHEAD, WIDNALL, FINO, and Mrs. DWYER.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 thru 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week".

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 25, ESTUARINE AREAS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 1058 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1058

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1058 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 25, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources. The rule further provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

The purpose of H.R. 25 is to provide a means for protecting and conserving our Nation's estuarine areas and the waters of the Great Lakes.

The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries, including coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, seaward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes.

With respect to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., which were studied in 1961 and 1965, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into an agreement with the State of New York, or any political subdivision or agency thereof, for the permanent management, development, and administration of such areas.

The Secretary would also be authorized and directed to study publicly owned areas in other States with a view toward recommending the desirability of authorizing the Secretary to enter into similar agreements for the administration, management, and development of those areas.

The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress, not later than January 30, 1970, a report of the study conducted, together with any legislative recommendations.

No lands could be acquired unless authorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

The study is authorized over a 2-year period; $750,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1969 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970. There is no direct authorization for the project to be undertaken on Long Island, N.Y. The estimated additional cost to the Federal Government for the Long Island project is $510,500 over a 5-year period, assuming maximum Federal participation will be 50 percent of total costs.

The Nation's estuarine areas are rapidly being destroyed in many areas by pollution. The study and inventory authorized by H.R. 25 would be the basis for determining appropriate means of preserving or restoring these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] made a very excellent statement before the Committee on Rules outlining the purport and intent of this particular legislation. This legislation certainly seems to be in the best interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1058 in order that H.R. 25 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has stated, House Resolution 1058 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 25, making the committee substitute in order as an original bill.

H.R. 25 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a 2-year study and inventory of our estuaries and the waters of the Great Lakes and report its recommendations to the President and the Congress by January 30, 1970. The bill further provides for the Secretary, together with the State of New York or any of its subdivisions, to enter into an agreement for the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island, N.Y. The costs are to be equitably apportioned.

The study is authorized over a 2-year period; $750,000 in fiscal 1969 and $250,000 in 1970.

Estuarine areas are coastal lands where salt and fresh water meet. The pressures of our expanding industrial Nation are rapidly polluting and destroying many of these, and the results can be serious. About two-thirds of the seafood consumed depends in a major degree on estuarine areas for their existence in American waters.

There is no direct authorization for the projected agreement between the Interior Department and the State of New York concerning the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island. The bill requires an "equitable" division of costs. The committee report estimates that over a 5-year period, assuming a 50–50 split in total costs, the Federal Government's share would be $510,500.

Departmental views are favorable to the bill as reported, and there are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rule be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] have any further requests for time?

Mr. QUILLEN. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11284) to amend the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11284, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] have control of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the fire research and safety bill which is now before you is that bill which the President referred to in his consumer message to Congress a year ago, and which he again requested the House to pass his state of the Union message just this past month.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important for us first of all to turn our eyes back to the decade from 1955 to 1965, when in that 10-year period, total property losses were reported to be $16.7 billion, and it was reported that more than 115,000 people died as a result of fires.

Based on the loss of life and the property damage in the past, and considering our growing population, it is estimated that each year the loss of life will be over 12,000 people and the loss in property damages, will be something in the order of $2 billion a year, or better.

Mr. Chairman, I cite these statistics because I believe that it does fit into the context of the remarks made by the President regarding this matter a year ago, when he described our fire losses as "shameful." This is particularly so when we consider that the per capita death rate in the United States from fires was four times as high in 1965 as the rate in Great Britain, six times as high as the rate in Japan, and twice as high as the rate in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose and aim of this legislation is that we might, in fact, develop a capability to know more about the causes of this destruction and then to put that particular knowledge to use. While we have a national fire problem, we offer here hope that we may be able to find a solution for that problem.

Title I of the bill before you authorizes a comprehensive fire research and safety program within the National Bureau of Standards, which for the last 60 years has been doing some research work on materials and the causes of fire. The people who are doing that work now will be the corps around which the work will be performed in the future.

Title II creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention Control which will develop knowledge and recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem. Title II was offered as a separate bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT]. It fitted properly within the legislation that we were contemplating in committee and was incorporated both in the House bill and the Senate bill.

An important aspect of the commission's work is that it will allow the people who are most concerned with the causes and nature of fires—people who represent the building material industry, people who build firefighting apparatus, local firefighters and the like—they would be the groups from which we would seek to get the members on this particular Commission.

There was also offered in committee by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER], the provision providing for congressional representation and that is included in the legislation.

Title I of the bill which refers to the fire research and safety program will be performed by the National Bureau of Standards. It would look into and investigate the causes, frequency, and severity of fires. It would research into the causes of major fires and on better ways to prevent and control fires; education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques; and education and training of those who fight fires. It would disseminate information on fire prevention and control, and would support demonstration projects. The demonstration projects are particularly important because they will encourage and make possible the testing of new ideas in actual use.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation will in fact turn us in the direction of coming up with solutions to some of these particular problems.

I note that during the course of debate on the rule, it was said that we are performing some $11 million worth of fire research work in certain agencies of Government. This is true, and we included that information in our report because we felt it was of particular importance to call to the attention of the Members. We are spending moneys in other places for fire research. But the important point which was not stated in the course of that debate was that in each of these instances, the fire research activity is mission oriented—that is, as to airplane fires, ship fires, forest fires and so on—to the peculiar type of activity which is encompassed in the mission objective of the agencies within which these expenditures are taking place.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11284, the fire research and safety bill, represents one of the consumer protection bills that President Johnson requested in his message to Congress on February 16, 1967. In his message, President Johnson described our fire losses as "shameful," and the facts clearly support this assessment of the situation.

In 1965, more than 12,000 people lost their lives due to fire, and property losses totaled $1.75 billion. In 1966, property losses rose to $1.86 billion. Looking at the last 10 years, the total property losses reported were $16.7 billion and more than 115,000 people died as a result of fires.

Mr. Chairman, I believe these statistics take on more significance when translated to a per capita basis, and compared with figures for other industrialized countries like ourselves. The per capita death rate from fires in America for 1965 was four times as high as the rate in Great Britain. Our rate was six times as great as Japan's and twice as high as Canada's.

To find out if we are making progress, we need only look at the per capita death rate from fire, the per capita number of fires, and the per capita property losses. We have had no success in reducing the death rate from fires. The number of fires has gone up, and property damage also has risen. This lack of progress must be viewed against the efforts of many public and private groups throughout the country, going back in some cases for decades, efforts aimed at solving one aspect or another of the fire problem. These groups are to be commended for their work. At the same time, we must recognize that a major task lies before us.

The destruction caused by fires is a problem in every section of this country, in cities and in rural areas, a threat to rich and poor alike, and a hazard in almost every area of modern life. Many people assume that the problem is under control, and that there are organizations and institutions addressing themselves effectively to the problem.

I believe the facts clearly show, however, that the situation is not well in hand. If we proceed on the assumption that we can turn our attention away from the problem of fires, we do so at the risk of great peril to the lives and to the property of our citizens. We have a national fire problem, and the time has come to seek a national solution.

Mr. Chairman, during May and June of this year the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development held hearings on the administration's fire research and safety bill. At the same time, the subcommittee also considered House Joint Resolution 498, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. Fourteen witnesses testified at the hearings, and 18 additional statements were received for the record. Virtually all of the witnesses were in agreement that considerable work must be done to reverse our losses due to fire, and that the proposed legislation is a realistic method of accomplishing this objective.

The two primary conclusions which emerged from the hearings were that we need to know more, and we need to put that new knowledge to work. I believe H.R. 11284 seeks to meet these two needs.

Title I of H.R. 11284 authorizes a comprehensive fire research and safety program, within the Department of Commerce, and administered by the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau has been engaged in fire research and safety work for more than 60 years, and its experienced research staff will make up the core of professionals necessary to perform the functions under this bill. Title II of the bill creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which will develop the knowledge and recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem.

The fire research and safety program authorized under title I contains several elements:

First, investigation of the causes, frequency, and severity of fires;

Second, research on the causes and nature of fires, and on better ways to prevent and control fires;

Third, education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques;

Fourth, education and training for those who must fight fires;

Fifth, information disseminating services on fire prevention and control; and

Sixth, support for demonstration projects in fire prevention and control.

The demonstration projects program will encourage and make possible the testing of new ideas in actual use. Improved methods and techniques will come from many sources, and will be tried out under real conditions.

Some of the activities authorized by this bill will be carried out within the National Bureau of Standards, but the greatest proportion will be carried out by grants and contracts with other public and private organizations. The Bureau expects to build upon existing resources, and to support those organizations which have demonstrated a competence and which have for many years played key roles in the Nation's efforts to meet the fire problem. I also would like to point out that the research contemplated in this bill is research aimed at meeting the real needs of the Nation's cities, the firefighters in the country, and the building and construction industry, as well as the needs of those whose job it is to understand the fundamental nature of fires.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control authorized under title II will make a thorough study of the national fire problem and will make recommendations for future action. The Commission will have a broad mandate, including:

First, a study of how fires can be prevented through technological advances, better construction techniques, and improved inspection procedures;

Second, the standardization of fire equipment;

Third, an analysis of administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments; and

Fourth, an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities for fire prevention.

The Commission will be composed of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and 18 members appointed by the President. The appointed members of the Commission will represent Federal, State, and local governments, and the many organizations and industries which have a responsibility or interest in some facet of the fire problem. In addition, the Commission would have four advisory members, two of which would be appointed from the House of Representatives and two from the Senate.

Within 2 years after its establishment, the Commission will report its finding and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission is an important element of this bill because it will bring together the people most concerned—people representing State and local governments, the building industry, insurance companies, equipment manufacturers—for a long term look at the whole fire question. Matters such as building codes, construction techniques, and equipment requirements are essentially local responsibilities which cannot, and should not, be dictated by the Federal Government. Yet, it is in these areas that we may be able to make some of our greatest advances in reducing the hazards of fire.

As originally written, Mr. Chairman, the administration's fire research bill would have authorized a 5-year program estimated to cost $10 million a year. In its deliberation on the bill, the Science and Astronautics Committee reduced the program from a 5-year to a 2-year program on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago President Johnson in his state of the Union message specifically requested that the House pass the fire safety bill. The bill has the support of almost all of the organizations concerned with fire research and safety, and I believe its enactment is necessary if we are to reduce the destructive effects of fire in this country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that the support for this bill has been virtually unanimous.

The fire chiefs, the firefighters, and fire marshals throughout the United States are solidly in favor of this legislation and have so testified before our committee. The fire equipment manufacturers are strongly in support of the bill and have so testified. The insurance companies and the underwriters are equally in favor of the legislation and have so testified. Those already in the fire research field such as the Fire Research Advisory Division of the National Reseach Council, as well as the few educators who conduct fire protection curricula at the university level, are unanimous in recommending passage of this legislation.

The only organization which has expressed a reservation on this legislation is the National Fire Protection Association, a trade organization whose principal function is the dissemination of information conducive to fire safety. A representative of this organization testified before our committee and, while expressing dissatisfaction with title I of the bill, indicated that if the bill contained title II—which it now does—this would largely overcome the objections of the AFPA. The association has since sent letters to every Member of Congress putting its views on record in opposition, which appears to me to be somewhat inconsistent with the testimony provided to us and to the Senate committee.

Regardless of this latter situation, however, I believe it is pertinent to point out that the AFPA is not itself a research organization nor is there any conclusive evidence that it supports any educational efforts insofar as training or academic preparation in the country is concerned. I do not, therefore, consider that the stand of the AFPA should be given more than the usual weight of an interested trade group.

I urge, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that all Members support the bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I would just like to commend the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, for his leadership on this legislation and commend him for the remarks he has made. In the past year I had the privilege of being chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which was investigating the tragic fire that took place at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas in connection with a special atmospheric demonstration being carried on out there in an oxygen atmosphere. That fire took the lives of two Air Force men, one of whom was from my own district.

I know that the gentleman from Connecticut, as a member of the great Committee on Science and Astronautics, has also been following closely the tragic fire that claimed the lives of three astronauts. We found in our investigation, and I am sure the gentleman found in his, that actually when it comes to detailed research into questions of the flammability of fabrics, the generation of flash fires generally, and things of that kind that had a bearing on those two tragedies, our country was sadly unprepared.

We found evidence, for example, that there had been requests made for this kind of research within the Air Force. Had such research been undertaken, it might well have alerted us beforehand to certain situations that could then have been prevented and might perhaps have saved those 5 lives.

Perhaps these two tragedies, tragic as they were, have alerted us now to the need for detailed research in this field, the very kind of research which, as I understand it, will be undertaken under the gentleman's legislation. The results of this research can then be made available not only to agencies of the Government most directly concerned, but also to local fire coordinators, and fire agencies in local communities, so that all of them may benefit by knowing more of the properties of fabrics in fire situations, the behavior of fire-resistant materials, the nature of flammability itself, and so on.

For that reason this legislation is extremely important to the whole country, and I do want to concur with what the gentleman has said and lend my wholehearted support to this legislation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has made some remarks which are extremely important to the debate we are having. I would like to make one comment in regard to it. The incidents which the gentleman from New York refers us to show that when we deal with materials, and we have information in separate bits and pieces on them, we really have no idea about how they would work in a fire situation together and in larger volume than in the research stage.

One of the things we are trying to do here is to incorporate that kind of capability into the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think he is absolutely correct. We did do some research, as the gentleman knows, but it was never really pulled together and extrapolated in the way in which the gentleman suggests. So I think this is very important legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the chairman of the committee the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks. I would like to cite as an example of what we are trying to do that for years fires at sea were generally fought by trying to isolate the compartment in which the fire was located and then turning super-heated steam into it. Research has shown that this is the thing you do not do, possibly because that steam contains quantities of gaseous oxygen that help to stimulate the fire. And yet that was the accepted way of fighting fire for many years. Today they either use foam or fog or hermetically seal it, if that is possible, and let the fire burn the oxygen out.

There is a great deal we must learn in this field. Having learned it, we must propagate it and get it out into the firefighting establishments throughout the country.

I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman who headed the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], and all members of the committee for having done an outstanding job in this bit of research.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish, too, to rise and compliment the chairman of this most active and successful subcommittee of the House, and to say that when the gentleman from New York referred to the fire at Brooks Air Force Base, he was touching on a base which is in my district and was pointing to an area of need. More importantly, the creation, as a result of the passage of this bill, of a centralized research center will be one of the biggest contributions that can be made in a greatly needed area.

I know, speaking for an area such as the city of San Antonio, I speak for, and perhaps represent and symbolize the needs of others, similarly situated, where the basic services offered by the municipality in police and fire protection are strained. In fact, the municipalities are strained just to administer the payment of salaries and the like. Therefore, they have had no moneys for research in this desperately needed area.

Therefore, I compliment the chairman of this subcommittee and all his colleagues for bringing this bill up for consideration of the House.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for his pioneering work on this subject. I am particularly interested in the matter of fire and explosion prevention, and it was one of my prime legislative goals when I was in my State legislature. Therefore, I was deeply concerned when a high officer of the Coast Guard warned recently that our Houston ship channel is like a great wick which could set aflame the entire industrial area in my district through which the channel runs.

The Houston ship channel has had its share of disaster. It was in 1947 that Texas City was rocked by a chain of explosions set off by an explosion on the French ship *Grandchamp*, which was loading ammonium nitrate; 576 persons were killed, 4,000 injured, and $67 million of property damage occurred. At the time, the handling of ammonium nitrate was not considered dangerous nor the substance particularly flammable.

Then on November 8, 1959, when a tug ignited oil floating on the surface of the channel, flames hit the tanker *Amoco Virginia*, causing an explosion on that vessel. Seven men died, including a fireman fighting the fire, and $3½ million worth of property damage resulted.

More recently, on January 16, 1968, the Liberian freighter *Christiane* collided with a string of barges pushed by a tug. The lead barge had contained gasoline and there remained an explosive mixture of gasoline vapor which exploded. Debris fell on another gasoline barge in the train and set it afire. Fortunately, no one was killed.

I feel that this bill is well suited to develop means of lessening the hazard of fire and explosion in such areas. These hazards in a concentrated industrial complex present problems that are sometimes beyond the competency of a single industry's fire and safety program. They are frequently far beyond the competency of local governmental subdivisions. Therefore, a Federal program of this type is called for.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Connecticut and all the members on the subcommittee on both sides for bringing forth this legislation which is opportune and timely. I think it represents a great step forward in terms of the security of all our people.

The acknowledged move toward urbanization, which has been the characteristic of the middle of the 20th century, has in a sense made more dangerous and more perilous many conditions of life for persons who live in the cities.

I think it is fair to state that even though today it is something of a storybook tale, we refer back to the Chicago fire and how the city was devastated when Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over the lantern. In truth, we are still using many of the firefighting techniques used in that fire, for the very reason pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, that we have not improved on our techniques. Actually, some of the buildings standing at the time of the Chicago fire are still standing in the city of New York and are not improved in construction or fire retardation. As a result, in recent years and months, more than a dozen firemen lost their lives in one fire, one holocaust in this great, supposedly modern city. In only the last 2 weeks we have had the greatest loss in 20 years of lives in a fire in a residence in New York City, where a family was living in slum conditions, and they lost their lives in a fire.

We can do better than this, and we can bring the best minds we can find, in and out of government, to bear on this, to see how we can avoid this dreadful loss of life among inhabitants through fires in our great cities.

This bill is so well supported—by the United Firemen's Association, by Mr. Robert Lowery, the fire commissioner of New York City, by the International Association of Fire Fighters, and the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and by others who indicate themselves in support of this bill and indicate this is a crying need to save lives.

I commend the gentleman for his work on this bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has skillfully pointed out the problems in the cities. I would like, because of this emphasis and because of the debate on the rule by the gentleman from Nebraska, to point out that in Nebraska in 1966, there were 62 people killed as a result of fires, and a fire loss of $10,298,000, at a cost of over $7 per person. This is, therefore, a problem limited by no means to the big cities. It involves every State in the Union.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, should like to commend my subcommittee chairman for the work which has been done on this particular legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 11248, the fire research and safety bill designed to establish a national fire research and safety program.

Legislation along these lines has been recommended by the President as a part of his 1967 consumer protection message and in his 1968 state of the Union address.

The need for the comprehensive research and investigation into the causes of fires as well as methods of fire prevention and control is attested to by the fact that nationwide we seem unable to diminish the costs and the damages of fire. Yet we are the leading nation in the world in advanced technology. Obviously this has not been applied to the problem of fire, nor do we know how to do so at this time. For this reason the fire research and safety bill is important; is necessary for the better protection of the American people.

The National Fire Protection Association reports that in 1966 there was a 24-percent increase over 1965 in fires in the United States and Canada killing three or more persons; and that the number of fires causing $250,000 or more property damage increased 12 percent. These must be approximations, yet they indicate that we are not making progress in combating this national problem. There were 91 fires in the United States in 1966 that cost $750,000 or more in property damage. We cannot, then, not afford to provide for better education programs on fire and safety for the public, and for firefighters, as also provided by this legislation; nor can we hesitate to create the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control that this act would establish to undertake a complete study of methods of reducing destruction of life and property by fire.

Mr. Chairman, for the second year the Federal Fire Council has issued a condensed report on Federal fire experience, on the loss to the Federal Government of property and lives, by fire. They report a fiscal year 1966 fire loss of $235 million, 323 deaths, and 1,452 injuries. This includes the loss experience of 58 Federal departments and agencies, controlling approximately 99.9 percent of the total Federal property valuation of over $347 billion.

The conclusion of the Council is that:

> The continuing toll of lives and property losses due to unwanted fire definitely points out the need for all Federal agencies to review and evaluate their own programs for desired improvements.

I think that same conclusion relevant not only to Federal property and lives, but also to the lives and property of all the American people. We must reexamine our methods of firefighting, fire prevention, and control; we must analyze and research the causes and nature of fires; we must demonstrate more effective materials for resisting fires. We must do these things and many more, and I believe the legislation before us will help to accomplish just these informational needs. Without this we cannot improve; we cannot diminish the cost and the tragedies associated with fire. This is a national waste, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot afford.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967.

This measure represents a conviction that a major national effort is required to reduce the present shameful loss of life and property resulting from fires.

The legislation before us would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program to gather detailed fire data, conduct intensive fire research, educate and train in fire protection and safety, and support demonstrations of improved and experimental fire protection and safety and establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Unfortunately there is no comprehensive fire research and safety program in the United States today. Fire prevention and firefighting is conducted at the local level. Standards in training of personnel, lack of up-to-date information, equipment and expertise vary to such an extent from one area to another that advances in research are difficult to communicate throughout all communities in the country.

Even more unfortunate than the lack of the means to deal with the problem is the general apathy and attitude of the average citizen toward the staggering loss of life and property.

The Wingspread Conference on Fire Service Administration Education and Research which was held in Memphis last March noted this lack of concern stating:

> Society in general in the United States seems to establish tolerable fire loss limits which we are willing to accept.

The hearings on H.R. 11284 clearly demonstrated the inadequacy of present efforts to protect the American public from the ravages of fire. The best estimates available indicate that in 1967, fire in the United States caused 12,200 deaths and property damage amounting to $2.07 billion—or about $9 for every man, woman, and child. Particularly disturbing is the evidence that among the major nations of the world, the United States has the highest per capita death rate from fires; twice that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and, remarkably, six and one-half times that of Japan.

While our much higher per capita death rate may reflect the hazards that accompany our higher standard of living, this merely indicates that we must put forth far greater safety efforts as our living standards rise, if we are to eliminate excessive loss of life due to fire.

There are a number of public and private institutions that are active in the field of fire safety. The International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fire Protection Association, and others have endeavored to combat the problem. Without their efforts, the situation today would no doubt be far worse than it is. Working with such limited resources, however, it has been impossible to establish a national fire safety program and the training of personnel is still inadequate. Only two universities in the country offer substantial programs in fire prevention and administration.

Aside from amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards, H.R. 11284 proposes the establishment of a commission to study in depth the many aspects of this great problem and to make recommendations for sensible, well-balanced action. The Commission is to be appointed by the President and is to be composed of outstanding members drawn from the groups who are in the midst of this problem and who can provide firsthand and expert service.

As was pointed out in the committee report, accidental death, injury, and loss of property caused by fire in the United States today is second only to the damage and injuries caused by automobile accidents.

Only last week in my district in Brooklyn a mother and her 4-year-old son perished in a fire in their third-floor apartment. Fireman Robert Surrey was critically injured by burns and smoke inhalation and three other firemen sustained lesser injuries. I was glad to learn that Fireman Surrey's recovery, which had appeared doubtful, now seems assured.

By the year 2000 the number of buildings in our cities will have doubled and with this expansion will come an intensification of the fire problem unless we act now to protect our present and future investment, and the life and security of inhabitants and firefighters.

In my opinion, the problem of fire safety is a perfect example of one which can best be resolved through the cooperative efforts of public and private organizations, and through a working partnership of governments at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

In conclusion I wish to acknowledge the help and support for this legislation which we have received from fire organization leaders all over the country.

From New York City in particular, Fire Chief John O'Hagen and Gerald Ryan, president of the Uniform Firemen Association, and John Carhin, on behalf of the fire officers group, have been most helpful.

As good firemen they have been mindful of the fire tragedies of the past which have caused severe casualties and loss of life.

In one holocaust, traceable to faulty drafting and enforcement of building codes, 12 firemen were killed.

With the passage of this bill I hope we can begin to move to prevent the recurrence of such losses.

I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this legislation. I believe it is desirable. But I believe we must look at the National Bureau of Standards and what they do, because in my opinion they are completely squandering a lot of the taxpayer's money in many of their other endeavors.

In the fiscal year 1967 hearings of the Appropriation Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce, I asked Dr. Astin, who is the head of that organization, some questions. He said that they conduct research for several hundred blue chip companies. When I asked him what he meant by that, he said they were the leading steel companies, petroleum companies, most of the chemical manufacturing companies, and General Motors. He later said they do research for private power companies, for RCA, and for the apparel industry.

I can understand subsidies being given to marginal people, but this is an agency of the U.S. Government which does research that should be done by the private companies.

I asked Dr. Astin this question:

> If this is the case and you are dealing with blue chip industry, why should not this be paid for by their share holders rather than the taxpayers of the United States?

Dr. Astin's answer was:

> This is a good question, sir.

I do not know that this agency gets a lot of scrutiny, but I do know it gets a lot of money. Any private industry can come in and have research done for it. The roofing industry gets considerable research done. The glass industry gets considerable research done.

I would like to point out that there is no way the National Bureau of Standards, if it comes up with safer products can obligate the companies for which it does research to utilize such products.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I should like first to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for the excellent work he has done in coordinating this effort, and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], for his very effective leadership, and to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], for the excellent effort he has made throughout the space program and his leadership in helping to shape this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act.

This bill would give to the American people a degree of protection against the threat of fire which they do not now enjoy.

You will note that it provides for a 2-year authorization which would probably total $20 million.

In view of our Nation's critical economic posture, it is my intention at the appropriate time to offer an amendment to reduce the authorization by 75 percent—to $5 million for the 2 years.

This figure is well within the bounds of the President's budget.

I want to stress, however, that my amendment will reflect only a necessary concern for economy and should in no way be interpreted as a lack of confidence in the merits of the legislation.

Annual cost of direct fire losses in our country exceeds $9 per man, woman, and child.

We are talking about spending approximately 2½ cents per person to reduce that amount—a most attractive cost-benefit ratio.

Statistics over the last 20 years show a mathematical relationship between gross national product and fire losses.

As the gross national product increases by a hundred billion dollars, fire losses increase by $230 million.

If with this legislation we can just keep the current $1.8 billion loss rate constant over the next 10 years, we would save $5 billion in direct losses alone and as much as $15 or $20 billion including indirect losses.

Our Nation's fire death rate is more than twice as great as that of Canada—and four times that of England.

Yet in terms of percentage of GNP, the total U.S. Government budget for fire research, including forest fires, civil defense, and military applications, is only about half as great as that of a single laboratory in England.

Throughout the testimony on this legislation, two words emerged again and again: "coordination" and "standardization."

Efforts in the private sector, while in many cases very worthy, are also scattered, tending to concentrate in the direction of their immediate economic interests.

Attempts even to obtain a uniform system of reporting fires have failed.

There is no central clearinghouse where information learned by one organization is made available to others facing the same problems.

Even in light of increased awareness of the crisis of urban congestion, there is no program within the Federal Government that deals with fires in the cities.

What is learned by the Department of Defense, what is learned by fighting forest fires can and must be coordinated to combat the destruction of lives and property in our urban areas.

Accidental death, injury, and loss of property caused by fire in the United States today is second only to the damage caused by automobile accidents.

This is a crisis of national import.

And it must be dealt with by serious national effort.

The Fire Research and Safety Act would build upon existing resources.

Efforts already underway in the private sector would not be duplicated. Rather, the Government would utilize private knowledge, coordinate research and fill in gaps which become evident.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a haphazard response to an emotional appeal. It is a reasonable, well-thought-out piece of legislation designed to meet a critical national problem—a problem which cannot be solved by the uncoordinated, scattered efforts of groups at different levels working independently of one another.

The dangers of fire are clear and present.

The attack on fires outlined in this bill can be effective.

What is required is that we accept our responsibility to legislate when the need for action is as clear as it is in the matter before us now.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California upon his very excellent statement. Further, I wish to compliment him for his study and the magnificent job which the gentleman has performed during the consideration of this question.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great benefits gained by any particular Member as the result of service in the House of Representatives is to find individuals who take upon themselves these responsibilities, such as the distinguished gentleman from California has done.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], upon his leadership and his contributions to this most necessary field of endeavor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What happens at the end of the 2 years to all the wonderful research that is to be carried on? What happens to the end product of this research at the end of the 2 years?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will note, there are two titles contained within the provisions of this bill. One of the requirements, title II, is the setting up of a commission to perform a broad-gage study of the Nation's problems with reference to fires. That Commission at the end of 2 years, will complete and terminate its function, after it has made a report to the Congress of the United States.

Title I involves research to be made by the National Bureau of Standards, which effort will continue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, there is to be established a center; is that right, after the life of the Commission expires?

Mr. BELL. The life of the Commission will continue for 2 years, and then that life ends. The National Bureau of Standards, which under this legislation will do fire research, will continue the program of research in the fire area.

The part of this legislation dealing with the Commission involves a separate title—title II—and is not connected with the center. The center would operate under title I of this legislation. The National Bureau of Standards would direct its research.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The center is established under the aegis of the Bureau of Standards, separate and apart from the Commission, is it not?

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, certain present employees of the Bureau of Standards will be used at that particular center, and a number of them will continue to perform their normal duties. Likewise, there will be other employees hired.

I believe that H.R. 11284 can be materially improved. This can be done by requiring in section 204, paragraph (c), the employment of civil service personnel by the Commission. I further would recommend an even more austere approach over the next 2 years of the Commission operations. However, for the present I will withhold any criticism on my part until a later time when the Commission has been functioning over a reasonable period.

Mr. BELL. The Commission, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, however, is a separate project that has no connection with the center. In other words, a report is made by the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States and the Commission——

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, then 30 days after that report is made on the part of the Commission, it goes out of existence?

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 11284 and wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California upon his very fine statement.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we cannot measure this type of legislation against the question of dollars and cents.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of Philadelphia we have the finest fire department in the United States of America. This fire department has been given an award as being one of the finest fire departments in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the fire commissioner, Mr. Carey, has won the national award, which award was also won in 1966.

I would like to say again, Mr. Chairman, that one cannot measure the loss of lives and property involved in fires on the basis of dollars and cents. I say this, because we had over 4,000 homes destroyed by fires. This is to be taken into consideration alongside the fact of the efficiency of the fire department of the city of Philadelphia. Yet, 98 lives were lost and there was a total of $6 million damage as a result of these fires.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is to be commended for its work on this legislation which is vitally needed to advance our knowledge of how to cope with the danger and destruction of fires. Every day disastrous fires strike our homes, offices, factories, and stores, exacting a staggering toll in property loss and much more importantly thousands of lives every year.

This bill is a key part of the drive in this Congress to provide consumer protection in a number of fields. The testimony on this bill indicates that in spite of America's technological and scientific leadership, there has been all too little research into the causes and nature of fire hazards and the best ways to guard against them. Certainly a nation which is on the verge of putting a man on the moon cannot be complacent about daily headlines of deadly fires in slum housing, homes for the aging, public places such as restaurants, or brush fires that destroy entire subdivisions. The intensified study that will result from this legislation will serve to help protect all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased that the bill includes as title II, the resolution which I introduced last year to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. I am also pleased to see that this provision is incorporated in the Senate-passed companion bill, S. 1124. This Commission, to be made up of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Commerce, and 18 other members to be appointed by the President, will study problems and proposals in this field and pave the way for future intensive research. When our Subcommittee on Housing held hearings on this resolution last year, I was impressed with the widespread public support and particularly with the intense interest and support of Members of the Congress. Each of us knows the tragedy of fire in his own district and each of us feels sympathy for disasters which strike elsewhere.

We were frankly appalled in that hearing at the statistics on fire loss in the United States every year. I will not repeat the figures here, which are now available to us from the excellent report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the statements on the floor by the able member of that committee. However, I want to mention one statement made to us by William D. Buck, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL–CIO. In addition to the sad statistics on the overall havoc wrought by fire, he called our attention to the frightening figures on injuries and death suffered by our gallant firefighters who day and night stand ready to answer the call of duty to protect us from fire. We owe it to these brave men as well as to the public at large to see to it that no effort is spared to make fire prevention as effective as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass the House unanimously and I urge all of my colleagues to give it the support which it so richly deserves.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] describe to you the intent of H.R. 11284. He has told you how much each year conflagrations in this country cost the American people. He has described to you what to me is the obvious need to apply our resources in science and technology in order to reduce to the lowest possible minimum these losses.

Gentlemen, this is a sensible, and what is more important, practical piece of legislation. It involves a relatively small amount of money. The bill does not in any way call for the establishment of a potentially huge Government organization. It intends to utilize the already existing scientific and technological capabilities of the National Bureau of Standards. Its intention is to organize the talents and personnel available right now to determine the most efficient solutions to the causes of all fires and the best methods to extinguish them.

Perhaps some of the Members present today are asking themselves what is so mysterious about the causes of fire and what we do not know right now about putting them out. After all, there are thousands of experienced firefighters in our country. Certainly, the insurance underwriters have been most active in determining fire hazards and in producing methods to avoid them.

Let me remind the House that we are experiencing in this Nation a burgeoning population growth. We are moving toward new methods of construction and new approaches to urban planning. There is a continuous movement of people from the rural areas into urban areas.

All these changes and growth by their own nature create new social hazards of a wide variety. A most important one, of course, is the question of fire prevention. And that is the key word, "prevention." This is the area where our enormous resources in science and technology can be utilized to produce great benefits in the prevention of property and most importantly, lives.

I think in H.R. 11284 is an excellent example of progressive action that can be taken by the House to overcome a serious situation that yearly threatens the welfare of thousands of Americans.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER].

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment very briefly in support of this bill, and perhaps emphasize one or two points which, it seems to me, have not been as clear as they might be.

The first point is that the bill does not set up an entirely new organization to do fire research. It merely expands a nucleus within the Bureau of Standards which already is engaged in this activity to some degree. This bill will permit the Bureau to engage in types of fundamental research which it is not presently doing, as well as permit the Bureau to contract for research into fire problems. It is anticipated that most of the money earmarked for research will be contracted outside the Bureau.

The second point I would like to emphasize is that we do not, in contrast to some allegations, always know the cause of fire or the nature of fire once started. It is a matter of record, for example, that the 1966 fire statistics as carried in Fire Journal show that the largest dollar loss of 16 causes of fires in the United States are "unknown or undetermined." More than one-third of the losses sustained through fires are in this category—35 percent to be exact—in 1966, 90,000 fires costing $536,000,000 in damages. Moreover, it is common knowledge that some of the causes of fires listed in the statistics, such as "electrical" or "flames and sparks" or "fireworks" do not always tell the complete story. Finally, it is quite clear from the testimony given to our committee that much is yet to be learned about handling and controlling fires.

The equipment we use today has been much improved in the past decades, but our methods are still essentially the same. We have, in fact, learned that some things that we have been doing, some things that we have considered the best way of handling fires have turned out, after a bit of research, to be quite wrong; in some cases they have even been aggravating factors—using superheated steam in closed spaces is an example.

The third and final point I wish to emphasize is that titles I and II of this bill are actually supplementary. They are not overlapping activities. Title I provides for an attack upon immediate problems which we have already identified. Title II, which sets up a study commission for a limited time, is designed not only to identify long range and future needs in the matter of fire research, but to develop recommendations concerning other phases of the overall problems, such as improving equipment, analyzing administrative difficulties affecting fire departments, and assessing the administrative handling of fire prevention by local, State, and Federal Governments.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Hunt].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise not actually in opposition to H.R. 11284, but rather to ask the House to reflect upon the real need for this legislation.

I keep asking myself, and I think everyone here should ask himself the same question; do we really need this legislation which involves an expenditure of $10 million for this activity?

Now, I realize that in the judgment of some Members, who might make a comparison to some of the budgets and figures we will be considering on the floor in the upcoming weeks and months ahead, $10 million is a comparatively small sum. I cannot bring myself to view $10 million as insignificant.

We are talking about investing $10 million to create a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control to work within the National Bureau of Standards.

First, I do not think there is any mystery connected with how fires start, what causes them and how to put them out. Every city and town, every professional and volunteer fire department has undoubtedly a considerable amount of experience with regard to the nature of fires and how they are initiated.

There are in the United States today many, many programs of research into conflagrations, both large and small, and into the development of new technologies to bring them more quickly under control.

Many Federal agencies are conducting right now a wide variety of research programs into the prevention and control of fires. The Department of Defense is spending $1,745,000; armed services, $2,105,000; Department of Agriculture, $3,358,000; Atomic Energy Commission, $100,000; the Commerce Department, $265,000; Health, Education, and Welfare Department, $388,000; the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $100,000; Interior Department, $660,000; National Aeronautics and Space Administration, about $1,000,000; National Science Foundation, $227,000; and the Transportation Department, $1,211,000. The moneys involved here total more than $11 million, and in terms of research of this nature, that is a significant total.

Now again I say, do we really need this legislation? Do we really want to set up a new organization which, although it is presently planned to place it under the aegis of the National Bureau of Standards, could eventually develop, as all such inevitably do, into a whole new governmental agency.

Every Member is aware of the extremely difficult budgetary burden this country will bear for the coming fiscal year. We all know of the austerity that has been forced upon many Government departments allegedly because of the costs of Vietnam.

One of my main concerns is that the American people are not further burdened by a multitude of relatively minor authorizations and appropriations which would eventually total an enormous amount of money. This bill incorporates one of those minor authorizations.

I believe that the same result proposed by this bill could be achieved with little or no expenditures of moneys by the administration through the proper organization of resources already available within the Federal Government. It appears to me to be a matter of establishing the proper organizational setup which would result in the centralization of knowledge gained from Federal fire research programs already in existence. This, in turn, would make it possible for State and local governments to take advantage of this knowledge.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask, do we really need this legislation? We should, when the time comes to vote on H.R. 11284, have thoroughly resolved the answer to that question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been very much interested this afternoon in some of the arguments being advanced for the passage of this bill.

The Apollo disaster was conjured up as one of the reasons apparently as to why the legislation should be enacted.

I think anyone conversant with even a few of the facts of life should have known that nylon is a flammable material—long before the Apollo disaster occurred; and that the use of 100 percent of oxygen in a capsule of that size, in combination with nylon, created a highly dangerous situation.

Reference was made to the Houston ship channel as being a torch. Well, as long as gasoline and oil is dumped into the Houston ship channel, it will be something of a torch and the passage of this bill will not make any difference.

Then the Texas City disaster has been referred to. If memory serves me correctly, and this was a long time ago, this involved the mishandling of nitrate or some other explosive and flammable product.

I doubt very much that the passage of this bill, with the creation of another 18-member Commission in the Government, to be financed by our already overburdened taxpayers of this country, is going to solve many of the problems that have been mentioned here this afternoon.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his remarks.

This was one of the reasons, as expressed by the gentleman from Iowa, that I thought it would be more feasible to incorporate the various agencies that we have now and use some of the money that we spend, that is allocated to them, rather than to set up a new agency for the same purpose.

It is my hope, ladies and gentlemen, that you will examine this thoroughly before you cast your vote.

There is a need for a channelization. There is a need for consolidation. But I question whether or not this is the proper organizational way to do it.

The $20 million figure is entirely too much for this project. I have recommended to the House Members that it should be reduced by at least $15 million for the 2-year life of the Commission. I am hopeful the Members will support my views.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Eckhardt].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa mentioned my district, and the cause of the fire, the imagined cause of the fire, in the Texas City disaster.

I happen to know about that incident very well because at the time I prepared a bill for the Texas Legislature to try to meet that cause. The cause of the disastrous holocaust in Texas City was the storage of certain chemicals within the hold of a foreign ship in port, which stood by like a fuse which blew up that city.

It is true that nothing likely could have been done at that time to prevent the fire because the fire was caused by the storage of chemicals in a ship. But it is also true that research of the type that this bill calls for might well have devised means by which ships containing such admixtures and such combinations of chemicals would not have been permitted to remain at a position close enough to the explosive industries in the area to cause that sort of holocaust.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is an excellent example pointing up the need for the type of research that this bill calls for.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Lukens].

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise in support of the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from California to H.R. 11284. I am of the firm belief that this Nation has to do basic research and development in the area of fire research and safety. Although I think much argument can be made for the point that we cannot avoid many of the fires that occur every day through human negligence and ordinary carelessness, there are many technical situations which have never been investigated let alone looked into. I think this is the time to move. What we are asking is a nominal amount. I appreciate the opportunity to support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] to H.R. 11284. I believe that $2.5 million for 2 years is a nominal amount, one which will allow us to move forward in this direction.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, while not opposing in principle the worthiness of the Fire Research and Safety Act, I will vote in opposition to it as a measure low on the priority list of necessary legislation and spending at this time.

In my report to the people of my district at the close of the first session of the 90th Congress I told them I thought it was my responsibility to examine closely any new legislation proposed in the second session from the standpoint of urgency against the pressing fiscal needs in Vietnam and in other areas of Federal spending.

I have made that judgment in this instance, voting against what is undoubtedly a worthy objective but one in which the taxpayers will be saved the sum of $5 million at a time when, despite the massive size of the Federal budget, every dollar counts.

Just as we do in our own households, we have to take into account our ability to pay for all the wonderful things we find pleasure and usefulness in using in our daily lives. We delay our purchases in many instances, putting aside our desires for another day or another season when we will be able to better afford those things we seek.

So it must be with our Federal Government and so it was in my deciding to vote against the Fire Research and Safety Act. In my opinion there are many such programs which can be kept on the back burner until the burden of the war in Vietnam is no longer pressing us and until such a time that our fiscal house is in order. I felt in this instance, too, that the vast resources of the fire insurance underwriting industry is well able to assist our worthy firefighting departments in the Nation and that in view of our circumstances of the moment we could get along for now without creating another Federal agency or bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act, will strengthen Federal participation in fire research and safety problems, especially for our cities and suburbs.

The establishment of a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, as provided in the bill, will meet a long-existing need.

In my State of California where forest fire problems tend to merge with urban and community fire problems in fire emergency situations, the need is especially great.

The Bel Air and Malibu fires in southern California and the Napa fire in northern California are dramatic examples.

Basic authorities and sound programs of protection and research for forest areas have existed for many years.

I am proud of the role I have been able to play in the strengthening of these activities.

While additional research and protection financing is needed, I am satisfied that the basic structures and arrangements are sound.

The fire research activities of the Forest Service are developing the new technologies so badly needed in California where climate, terrain, and vegetation combine to create a terrifying potential for holocausts.

The fire protection capability of the Federal land-managing agencies has been strengthened.

The depth of suppression strength within the Forest Service, for example, was amply demonstrated in the recent Idaho forest fire emergency.

I understand that in 2 or 3 days' time the equivalent of an army division of firefighters was mobilized from throughout the Nation.

The State forester of California, Francis Raymond, is doing a magnificent job through his organization in providing fire protection to privately owned forest lands and many of the small communities in my district.

This effort is supported by the Federal funds and technical assistance that have been available for over 40 years under the Clarke-McNary Act.

This program is one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State partnership in a critically important endeavor.

While stronger support is needed, and forest fire problems in California not yet solved, there is no comparison between today's situation and that of 20 years ago.

In several counties in California the county and city fire services are responsible for wildland fire suppression as an integral part of their structural fire operations.

Opportunities which H.R. 11284 will present to determine needs and direction and ultimately increased fire protection capability for these organizations will be of great importance.

It is my understanding that this bill will further the liaison established between on-going wildland firefighting organizations and urban and suburban fire suppression activities.

I understand also that some of the gaps in information and in fire suppression technology will be filled by this legislation. I urge its passage.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the bill under consideration today. This bill is designed to authorize a fire research and safety program under the direction of the National Bureau of Standards, and to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Fire is indeed a grave national problem. In 1966 fire claimed the lives of 12,000 men, women, and children. The direct material loss of property exceed $1.8 billion. These statistics become even more alarming when we realize that the annual loss by fire amounts to approximately $9 per person in the United States. The total loss to our national picture is, of course, beyond calculation.

The fire research and safety program would provide the strengthening, expansion and voluntary coordination of the already significant efforts of the many private organizations and individuals as well as the local, State, and Federal organizations active and competent in the field. The provision of Federal funds, through contracts and grants, will assist these groups to establish a broader financial base and, thereby, to increase their effectiveness and extend the scope of their activities in behalf of public safety. The participation of the Federal Government is expected not only to widen the technical and financial base, but to increase public awareness of the seriousness of the problem.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control would study all aspects of the national fire problem. It would report to the President and the Congress in 18 months on proposed legislation and other appropriate measures to establish the scope and course of a national fire research and safety program beyond the first 2 years. Its interim and final reports will be most important in shaping a long range program and thereby advancing national fire safety.

To justify the need for H.R. 11284, we need only recall such recent tragedies as the Penthouse Restaurant in Montgomery, Ala., and the Chicago Convention Center fire, and the resulting loss of lives and property. In light of these recollections, I am confident that my esteemed colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967".

TITLE I—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program is needed in this country to provide more effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable and necessary for the Federal Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended, to provide a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research program; fire safety education and training programs; and demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 102. The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271–278e), is further amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to—

"(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants—

"(1) investigations of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity; and other pertinent factors;

"(2) research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"(3) educational programs to—

"(A) inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques, and

"(B) encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"(4) fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"(5) educational and training programs to improve, among other things—

"(A) the efficiency, operation, and organization of fire services, and

"(B) the capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"(6) projects demonstrating—

"(A) improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage,

"(B) application of fire safety principles in construction, or

"(C) improvement of the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

"(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"(1) fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"(2) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of this Act—

"(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions. Such a grant may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of the project for which the grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purpose for which the grant is sought. For the purposes of this section, 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and 'public agencies' includes combinations or groups of States or local governments.

"(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments and agencies for the performance of any such functions, and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 16 of this Act with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers.

"(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529).

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to carry out such functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such functions or this section, including rules and regulations which—

"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 16."

NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sec. 103. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this title, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following four fiscal years, and such appropriations are authorized to be made without fiscal year limitations.

TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of the loss of life and property from fire is a matter of grave national concern; that this problem is particularly acute in the Nation's urban and suburban areas where an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that as population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond purely local capabilities; and that there is a clear and present need to explore and develop more effective fire control and fire prevention measures throughout the country in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish a commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the destruction of life and property caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 202. (a) There is hereby established the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed as members (1) shall be eminently well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission, and (2) shall be selected so as to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, laboratories, trade associations, and other interested institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

(1) two Members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

(2) two Members of the Senate who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

The advisory members of the Commission shall not participate, except in an advisory capacity, in the formulation of the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission or in its advisory membership shall not affect the powers of the Commission, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country in addition to the steps taken under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act). Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

(1) a consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques, and improved inspection procedures;

(2) an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted housing and in the redevelopment of the Nation's cities and communities;

(3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

(4) an evaluation of present and future needs (including long-term needs) of training and education for fire-service personnel;

(5) a consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and suggestions for the standardization and improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires;

(6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

(7) an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

(b) In carrying out its duties under this section the Commission shall consider the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act), and consult regularly with the Secretary in order to coordinate the work of the Commission and the functions carried out under such sections 16 and 17.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the Commission has been duly organized.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 204. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including an independent agency, is authorized to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as it authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Sec. 205. (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 202(b), who is a Member of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 203(c).

Mr. DADDARIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, strike out lines 5 through 7, and insert the following: "for the following fiscal year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: On page 7, strike out lines 2 through 7 and insert the following:

"SEC. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purposes of this Act, $5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1970."

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is self-explanatory. As reported to this house, H.R. 11284 would authorize $10 million for the first fiscal year and such sums as may be required for the following year.

The National Bureau of Standards has estimated that its requirement for the second year would also be $10 million.

My amendment would reduce this $20 million total for the 2 years by 75 percent to $5 million—$2½ million for the first year and $2½ million for the second—a figure well below that proposed in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I support the programs and goals outlined by the Fire Research and Safety Act.

But fiscal responsibility forces us to economize wherever and whenever possible.

There is overwhelming evidence to support the contention that the United States has been lax in providing funds for fire research and safety and that the price we have paid for this laxness—both in loss of life and in property damage—has far exceeded the cost of effective research.

It is appropriate that we start now to make up for lost time.

Open areas in Los Angeles, particularly in the district of Los Angeles which I represent, are ravaged each year by fires which might be prevented or minimized.

I believe this legislation in substance constitutes a good investment which will quickly begin paying for itself—not just where I live but everywhere in the Nation.

And I believe this act is more apt to develop into a rewarding program of the Federal Government if we move in an orderly, efficient fashion.

It is my belief that the figure provided by my amendment would enable us to implement this program while recognizing the demands of a limited budget, and I urge its acceptance by my colleagues.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, taking into consideration what the gentleman from California has said about his amendment, I will accept it. I have no opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: on page 4, line 25, strike out "the grant" and insert "such grant".

Mr. PELLY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, did we vote on the Bell amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Bell amendment was adopted, after having been accepted by the acting chairman of the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I heard the chairman accept it, but I did not hear anybody on our side, and I did not know there had been a vote. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. HUNT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the Bell amendment, accepted by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], cuts the figure from $10 million per annum to $2.5 million per annum?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. HUNT. There was a $20 million total for 2 years, which is now, by the amendment, reduced to a $5 million figure.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair, but the gentleman from California is here and might state it.

Mr. BELL. That is correct. The amendment provided for a cut down to a total of $5 million.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification. At least we saved $15 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reread?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: On page 1, line 4, strike out "1967" and insert "1968".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last year in his consumer message, President Johnson drew attention to the frightening loss in lives, injuries, and property that is suffered in this country each year by fires. He said then, "We can do better, and we must."

I introduced at that time on behalf of the administration the bill which we have before us today, the Fire Research and Safety Act.

The committee hearings on this bill revealed that the problem of fires is, indeed, a national problem. Furthermore, it is a greater problem in the United States than it is in other industrialized nations. Our per capita death rate from fires, our per capita number of fires, and our per capita property damage from fires are not only higher than comparable countries, but the tragic figures are still going up, in spite of the best efforts of many private and public groups working for solutions to the problem.

The Fire Research and Safety Act has several important features. Study and research on the nature and causes of fires will be conducted. The public will be educated on fire hazards and safety techniques. Firefighters will receive training. Information services will give out the latest information and data on fire safety, and model projects will be conducted to demonstrate new methods of controlling the spread of fires. These goals will be achieved, in part, by a program of grants made to State and local governments, and to other public and nonprofit institutions.

There also will be established a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which will take a searching look at the entire problem of fires in the United States, and what we need do to keep ahead of the danger.

The bill reflects the views of many groups who are responsible for various aspects of fire prevention and control. Its enactment will demonstrate that the Government is responsive to the needs of all the people, and I urge all Members to give thoughtful consideration to this important item of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut to give us an explanation of section 204, to be found on page 11 of the bill, which states that "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof."

Why the administering of oaths in hearings pertaining to this subject? In what fields is it proposed to hold hearings that require administering of an oath?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's question goes just to the nature of the way a commission should operate. This is not unusual, as I understand it. A commission investigating causes and natures of fires should have the authority to have its witnesses testify under oath, so that proper testimony may be taken. This is not an unusual inclusion in legislation of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed to go into insurance rates with this Commission?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would not understand that would be in the nature of this investigation. I would say that the insurance industry, as it testified before our committee by representatives, indicated its support, not only for the legislation, but for this Commission and the contents and the terminology that is presently before us.

Mr. GROSS. This was a part of the bill at that time. Is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, it was.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 12, strike out lines 6 through 17.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can be talked out of this amendment, if the gentleman from Connecticut will give me his attention, but it seems to me this is a wide-open invitation to empire building by the proposed Commission. I am surprised to see a bill brought in providing for unlimited employment by a commission and an unlimited ability to fix the salaries of such employees.

Is that the intention of the committee?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is certainly not our intention to provide any opportunity for empire building.

The report indicates that the number of employees who would be hired by the Commission would be 11. That is an absolute ceiling.

Our reason for having this language, as I indicated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania earlier, is so that they would not be encumbered in the first instance by adhering to civil service requirements in order to hire these 11 people. They would not then be on the civil service roster after the 2 years of Commission's activity has expired.

We believe this to be a simple part of our legislation, and it makes it a much cleaner operation than it would be if the language was not there.

Mr. GROSS. This is the reason why I took the floor. Perhaps I should have asked the gentleman to explain this provision of the bill before offering the amendment.

I understand the temporary nature, or at least the hoped-for temporary nature of this Commission. I agree with the gentleman it would be unwise to put a number of permanent employees on the payroll when it is possible, with the oversight of the committee, to hold down the employment, to hold down the number of supergrades and so on and so forth, of high priced personnel, and to keep them on a temporary basis and therefore be able to dispense with them at the end of 2 years.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. DADDARIO. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa has brought up this particular point. It has been our intent to do so.

I believe what has been said here is reaffirmation of that. There will not be more than 11 people. They would not be put on the civil service roster after 2 years pass. They are exempt in this particular instance so that they may be hired in an efficient manner, and so that the Commission can get about its work quickly in order to get the job done in 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the assurance of the gentleman that the committee will give real oversight to this matter of employment, because this is wide open, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11284) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 926, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 78, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—269

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Cohelan
Collier
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyl
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Roth
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schwengel
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Watson
Whalen
White

Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—78

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Berry
Bevill
Bow
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Denney
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Flynt
Goodling
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Harrison
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
McClure
McEwen
Mahon
Martin
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Nelsen
Poage
Pryor
Quillen
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Walker
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Willis
Winn

NOT VOTING—84

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Battin
Biester
Bolling
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H
Cleveland
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Devine
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Everett
Findley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Gettys
Goodell
Gray
Gude
Gurney
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
Latta
McCloskey
McDade
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mathias, Calif.
Michel
Moss
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pepper
Pollock
Pool
Pucinski
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Riegle
Rivers
Rooney, N.Y
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Steiger, Wis.
Ullman
Utt
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Abbott with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Schweiker.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Don H. Clausen with Mr. Biester.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Rienecke.

Mr. Rumsfeld with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Stieger with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Diggs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 926, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 1124.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. DADDARIO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1124 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11284 as passed, as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968'.

"TITLE I—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 101. The Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program is needed in this country to provide more effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable and necessary for the Federal Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended to provide a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research program; fire safety education and training programs; and demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

"AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 102. The Act entitled 'An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards', approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278e), is further amended by adding the following sections:

"'SEC. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to—

"'(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants—

"'(1) investigations of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity, and other pertinent factors;

"'(2) research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"'(3) educational programs to—

"'(A) inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques, and

"'(B) encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"'(4) fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"'(5) educational and training programs to improve, among other things—

"'(A) the efficiency, operation, and organization of fire services, and

"'(B) the capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"'(6) projects demonstrating—

"'(A) improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage,

"'(B) application of fire safety principles in construction, or

"'(C) improvement of the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

"'(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"'(1) fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"'(2) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"'SEC. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of this Act—

"'(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions. Such a grant may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of the project for which such grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purpose for which the grant is sought. For the purposes of this section, "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and "public agencies" includes combinations or groups of States or local governments.

"'(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments and agencies for the performance of any such functions and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 16 of this Act with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers.

"'(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529).

"'(d) The Secretary is authorized to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to carry out such functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"'(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such functions or this section, including rules and regulations which—

" '(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

" '(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 160.'

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 103. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purposes of this Act, $5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1970.

"TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of the loss of life and property from fire is a matter of grave national concern; that this problem is particularly acute in the Nation's urban and suburban areas where an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that as population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond purely local capabilities; and that there is a clear and present need to explore and develop more effective fire control and fire prevention measures throughout the country in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish a commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the destruction of life and property caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby established the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed as members (1) shall be eminently well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission, and (2) shall be selected so as to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal, State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, laboratories, trade associations, and other interested institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

"(b) The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

"(1) two Members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

"(2) two Members of the Senate who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

The advisory members of the Commission shall not participate, except in an advisory capacity, in the formulation of the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission or in its advisory membership shall not affect the powers of the Commission, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country in addition to the steps taken under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act). Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

"(1) a consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques, and improved inspection procedures;

"(2) an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted housing and in the redevelopment of the Nation's cities and communities;

"(3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

"(4) an evaluation of present and future needs (including long-term needs) of training and education for fire-service personnel;

"(5) a consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and suggestions for the standardization and improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires;

"(6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

"(7) an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

"(b) In carrying out its duties under this section the Commission shall consider the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act), and consult regularly with the Secretary in order to coordinate the work of the Commission and the functions carried out under such sections 16 and 17.

"(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the Commission has been duly organized.

"POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 204. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommitee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including an independent agency, is authorized to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

"(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

"SEC. 205 (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 202(b), who is a Member of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 203(c)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11284) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REMARKS IN PERMANENT RECORD

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks which appear on page E571 in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 6, pertaining to my visit to Nicaragua, be printed in the permanent RECORD of that date following the last special order of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ESTUARINE AREAS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 25, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 25 is to provide a means for protecting and conserving our Nation's estuarine areas and the waters of the Great Lakes.

These areas are rich in a variety of natural resources including habitat and feeding areas for wildlife, spawning areas for fish and shellfish, and are also valuable for sport and commercial fishing, outdoor recreation and scenic beauty. These valuable areas are rapidly being damaged or destroyed and consequently are in dire need of protection.

Mr. Chairman, although many of the Members were present when legislation on this subject was considered under suspension of the rules in the 89th Congress, I think it might be appropriate to briefly review the background of this legislation.

H.R. 25 dates back to September 23, 1965, when the gentleman from New York, Congressman TENZER, introduced legislation—limited in scope—which would provide for the protection and administration of the estuarine-wetland area of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y.

Subsequently, I and several other Members of the Congress introduced legislation—broader in scope—which would establish a nationwide system of protecting our estuarine areas.

As many of you will recall, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported my bill, H.R. 13477, which blended the best features of all of these bills. However, it failed to pass under suspension of the rules of the 89th Congress by three votes.

In January of this past year I again introduced legislation on this subject—H.R. 25, which is now before you for consideration.

H.R. 25 as introduced, was considerably broader in scope than the previous bills and contained several provisions which proved to be quite controversial.

As a result of the lengthy hearings and discussions which ensued, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries deemed it desirable to strip from the bill those controversial provisions and report a bill which would still provide the best possible means for protecting our Nation's estuarine areas and estuarine resources.

Briefly explained, section 1 of the bill contains congressional findings that the estuarine areas of the Nation are rich in a variety of natural, commercial, and other resources; that consideration should be given to the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that maintains a balance between the national need for protection in the interest of conservation and the need to develop these estuaries to further the Nation's growth and development.

Section 2 of the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior—in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies—to conduct a study and inventory of our Nation's estuaries, including the land and waters of the Great Lakes.

For the purpose of the study, the Secretary would be required to consider, among other matters, first, their wildlife and recreational potential, and fisheries values; second, their importance to navigation and flood control; and third, the value of such areas for urban, commercial, and industrial developments.

The Secretary of the Interior would be required to carry out this study in conjunction with the estuarine pollution study authorized under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as well as other applicable studies in those areas.

In studying such areas, the Secretary would be required to give consideration to whether any land or water area within an estuary and the Great Lakes should be acquired by the Federal Government or by a State or local government, or whether such areas could be adequately protected and preserved through local, State, or Federal laws without Federal acquisition or administration.

Further, this section would require the Secretary of the Interior, no later than January 30, 1970, to submit to the Congress through the President his report and legislative recommendations, including recommendations on the desirability of establishing a system of estuarine areas and the designation of any area which he thinks should be acquired by the Federal Government. However, no land could be acquired until authorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

To carry out the study and inventory, there would be authorized to be appropriated $750,000 for fiscal year 1969 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Secretary—based on studies conducted by him in cooperation with the New York State Department of Conservation—which were studied in 1961 and 1965—to enter into an agreement for the permanent management, administration, and development with the owners of certain lands and waters on Long Island, N.Y. The cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas would be shared on an equitable basis between the Secretary and the public owners.

As another method of conserving estuarine areas, this section would authorize the Secretary to also study the desirability of authorizing the Secretary to enter into similar agreements with public owners of areas in other States.

Section 4 of the bill would require all Federal agencies, in planning uses of water and land resources, to give consideration to the importance of the natural resources of such areas for commercial and industrial development, and all project plans and reports submitted to the Congress shall contain a discussion and recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior on the effects of the projects on estuaries and other resources.

Section 5 of the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the States and their local subdivisions to consider, in their comprehensive plans for Federal assistance under programs administered by the Department of the Interior, the needs and opportunities for protecting and restoring estuaries in accordance with the purposes of this act. Such programs are the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, and the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act.

Section 6 would make it clear that this bill would not affect the authority of any Federal agency to carry out Federal projects within an estuary heretofore or hereafter authorized.

Mr. Chairman, all of the testimony at the hearings was strongly in favor of the legislation and the bill, as reported, would receive the approval of all departments reporting on the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, your committee was unanimous in reporting H.R. 25 to the House and I urge its prompt passage.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, we are again dealing with the question of the conservation and preservation of our estuarine areas. A bill very similar to H.R. 25 before the Committee today came before the House in the 89th Congress.

There were several things about that bill which concerned me a great deal. In the first place, I believe the State and local governments in whose subdivisions the estuarine areas lie should have a strong voice and a definite priority as to their management, conservation, and preservation. In the bill that came before the House near the end of the 89th Congress, I did not think the States were adequately protected and, therefore, I objected to the legislation offered.

The present bill which is being offered today, in my opinion, is a far better bill. It has my enthusiastic support. This legislation reflects a great deal of work and effort by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]; and by other members of the committee, as well as Members not on the committee, but who have a particular interest in the destiny of our wetlands and estuaries. The gentlemen from New York [Mr. WYDLER and Mr. TENZER] and many others contributed a great deal toward the elimination of the objections which many people had to the legislation offered over a year and a half ago.

The amendment which will be offered to section 3 completely protects the States and local communities from any arbitrary action by any Federal agency. It also guarantees to the State involved the power of decision over any proposed agreements dealing with the management and responsibility for the conservation practices needed to preserve our wetlands and estuarine areas.

The preservation of our estuarine areas is, as far as I am concerned, without controversy. The marshes, the wetlands, and those transitional areas where the fresh water of our rivers runs into the sea water of our tidal estuaries are a most vital part of our environment.

The Chesapeake Bay is, perhaps, the noblest of all our estuaries because of its great size and the blend of salt water from the sea and fresh water from the land. The Chesapeake is, in itself, an environment almost perfectly formulated for a dynamic ecology. It contains, the spawning ground for the shad, for the herring, for the striped bass, and many other species. It contains the entire migratory cycle of the blue crab. It is a fantastic producer of oysters and clams. But more than this, the marshes of its shores, the grasses of its shallows, and the protection of its coves provides for migratory waterfowl an almost perfect habitat.

As we crowd its shores with works of civilization, as we dredge its bottoms with new channels, as we span its surface with bridges, as we reshape its shores to suit the needs of industry or the houses of men—each time, we invade the natural environment and upset the balance of its vast ecology. Preserving the wetlands and the estuarine areas is but a facet in the program we must develop in the management of this great basin if we are to preserve it as a great natural resource.

I mention the Chesapeake because of its importance to me, to Maryland and Virginia, to the great cities near it, and finally, to the Nation. But the Chesapeake is only an example. This Nation is blessed with magnificent estuaries: Puget Sound, Long Island Sound, Pamlico and Albemarle, the vast bayou country, the Everglades, Great South Bay, Buzzards Bay, the long coastal waterway of the east coast and gulf coast. In addition to this, we are blessed with the Great Lakes system, its connections and its tributaries. The Chesapeake is but an example.

If man is to survive, and if civilization is to achieve a higher order, the relationship between man and nature must be perfected. If we are to reach for greatness, we must deal not only with our public works, our highways, our transportation, our adventures into space, the physical facilities which house our enterprise—but also with our natural environment. If we fail to develop compatibly with nature, if we fail to conserve and protect the opportunity for wildlife to share this earth with us, if we fail to ensure the integrity of the shorelines of our waterways, if we allow the cleanliness and purity of our great natural environment to become soiled and contaminated by human waste, then we, in the end, as children of God and creatures of nature, will not and can not survive. Were we to describe the price we have paid to develop our industrial society, to bring about the enjoyment of our materialism, we could well say the price has been paid through the loss of the integrity of our natural environment.

Here in the middle of the 20th century, at a time when we are venturing away from this planet into the mystery of space, we are faced with the fundamental question of our environment and the posture of mankind within the total ecological concept. This bill, though a meager thrust toward the conservation and preservation of areas of biological importance, is timely. It gives recognition to the estuarine areas. It devises means for their preservation and conservation.

The language and spirit of this legislation is designed to bring Federal and State conservation efforts into closer relationship. The purpose here is not to acquire, take over, condemn, or federalize the estuarine areas. The purpose is to study; the purpose is to consult with the States; the purpose is to develop an understanding of the potential of our estuarine areas, to understand their ecology, their contribution to navigation, their opportunities for recreation, and their value as a resource. The purpose is to define them and work out the best plan for their management, preservation, and conservation.

It will be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior, and, I hope, the oversight of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to see that this program to preserve our estuarine areas does not overlap or conflict with other Federal land management systems or State programs of a parallel nature. This legislation, in itself, is a new adventure in conservation. The success of our efforts here will be a measure of how well this program is integrated into other conservation efforts carried out by State, Federal, and private interests.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill which holds great hope for the preservation and conservation of a part of our environment essential to many aspects of marine life and extremely important in the total ecology, including man.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer any questions that any of the Members might have concerning the bill, which I believe was well explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORTON. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Under the definition of terms in this bill, what is an estuary?

Mr. MORTON. An estuary is a body of water, or an area, where the fresh water of the tributaries and the fresh waters of the runoffs meet the tidal waters, or salt waters of the sea.

Estuarine areas are defined in the report, and perhaps a definition which promotes better understanding would be to cite some examples.

The large estuarine areas, of course, are areas such as Puget Sound and the Chesapeake Bay. The wet lands in these areas are an integral part of them, and the wet lands are those lands which are subject to flooding by normal tides.

Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman yield right there for a question of clarification?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Webster and other authorities also list as estuarine areas the outflow from springs composed only of fresh water. Are those intended to be included in this legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. If the Great Lakes are included, does the gentleman include only those areas where there is this commingling of salt water and fresh water?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman will permit, in the committee report in the 90th Congress, it states as follows:

> Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water.

And then it goes on to say:

> A meandering river flows to the sea and terminates in an estuary. At this point, the river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores interact resulting in the depositing of river sediments and sediments washed up by the sea in the estuary.

That is the definition used by the committee, as supplied by the Department of the Interior.

If the gentleman will yield still further, this definition was expanded only by the addition of language making possible the extension of the provisions of this legislation to the Great Lakes.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORTON. Let me say this to the gentleman before I yield for another question: that the thrust of the bill before us is aimed at the wetlands, or the areas which make up our shoreline that are of extreme biological importance because they house the life-giving elements of many of our very small shellfish, and fish of other species which are vital to the total cycle of a tidal ecology, and are such large bodies of water as Long Island Sound, Great South Bay, the Albermarle and Pimlico Sounds of North Carolina, Chesapeake Bay—these are some of the areas.

I would add further that one can concern himself about the technical definition of the words such as "estuarine areas."

But what we are concerned about is that vital boundary between fresh and salt water in our coastal areas and that vital boundary between the shore and deeper waters of our fresh-water masses, such as the Great Lakes.

Mr. KYL. Now so that we may absolutely be specific about this, I will ask the gentleman these two questions.

Am I right in assuming that those areas which by their dictionary definition are caused by the flow of large springs are not to be considered as eligible under this bill; is that correct?

Mr. MORTON. I do not believe I am qualified to answer that because I am not sure what areas you have in mind.

Mr. KYL. Well, that is exactly why I ask the question.

Mr. MORTON. If these springs would exist, for example, in the shores of the Chesapeake Bay or the shores of the Great Lakes areas, I think they would qualify.

Mr. KYL. But only under those circumstances?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, but only under those circumstances.

Mr. KYL. Then am I right in assuming that under the Great Lakes portion of this legislation, any place where a river, fresh water, flows into a lake of fresh water, it is eligible for consideration as an estuarine area?

Mr. MORTON. I do not believe that under the terms of this legislation it would be in every instance.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. If I may read from page 29 of the report, I think this subject is covered.

The report reads as follows:

> H.R. 25 and the companion bills are not concerned with the open ocean, nor with the fresh water stretches of streams that go down to meet it. Rather, it deals with the areas in between that are under the direct influence of the salty sea and its tides. Hence, we are talking about the kinds of places that have such common names as bays, coasts, sounds, harbors, lagoons, tidal marshes, inshore waters and channels.

That is from the testimony of Dr. Stanley A. Cain as a witness before the committee.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell me what areas in the Great Lakes are to be considered as potentially estuarian areas for conservation under this act?

Mr. MORTON. I think the study itself has to determine that. That is what we are trying to determine—exactly what areas.

Mr. KYL. Are you talking about Lake Michigan and Lake Superior?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my district will be a beneficiary of the research and study—and hopefully the conclusions that will be reached by the commission which is established by this bill to look into the relationship of the estuarine areas to the wild life and to the fish that spawn within these areas and which eventually find their way to the marketplace and on to the tables throughout our country.

It is very important that this relationship be understood.

Thanks to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the witnesses who appeared before us, the rights of the States and the subdivisions thereof have been respected.

The legislation calls for a most thoughtful study and before actual moneys can be spent to implement the recommendations of the study, the report must come back to the Congress for action.

In my view, this legislation can be very helpful not only to the coastal areas and the Great Lakes that are specifically included but to the public which must have the benefits which flow from these great natural resources which are necessary to sustain us and provide the protein that is so necessary in our diets.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to answer the question raised a moment ago by the gentleman from Iowa as to what parts of the Great Lakes were included in this legislation. I am able to answer him a little more fully at this time. I refer to the table and summary on page 30 of the hearings, where there is included a footnote under "Michigan":

> In Great Lakes only shoals (areas less than 6 feet deep) were considered as estuaries.

I think that is the best I can do in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question on an unrelated subject?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Does this bill in and of itself authorize the acquisition of any lands by the Federal Government?

Mr. PELLY. My understanding is there will be no authority to acquire any lands under this bill.

Mr. KYL. Is there any obligation in the bill which calls on the Federal Government to build, maintain or administer any of these areas, in the language of the bill itself?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who is the author of the bill. I think he can give you a better answer than I could.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman. First, if the gentleman will refer to page 18, he will find that no interest in land may be acquired by the Federal Government under the bill until such time as a study is completed and until after specific authorization by Congress.

The bill authorizes only a study, and it would authorize, upon completion of the study, that the Federal Government could—except for the Long Island Wetlands area—subject to appropriations and after action by the Congress, enter into agreements by and between the Federal Government and the local units of government which happen to have lands now in public ownership for inclusion of all or such portions of those areas as the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the President and the local unit of government or State—with the concurrence of the government—would deem appropriate.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman look at page 18, lines 1 and 2:

> No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by subsequent Act of Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I would like to revert to the question raised earlier by the gentleman from Iowa and again raised by the distinguished and respected gentleman from Washington. I am not quite clear on how the Great Lakes got into this estuarine bill. I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am a strong supporter of the objectives of the bill, the need for the study, the need for proper management of these estuarine wetlands, and the need for participation by Federal, State, and local interests in a joint effort. But for the record, and also for my own information, after reading all the definitions of "estuary," I found the following definition in the Random House Dictionary, 1967 edition:

> Estuary. 1. That part of the mouth or lower course of a river in which the river's current meets the sea's tide. 2. An arm or inlet of the sea and the lower end of a river.

The gentleman from Michigan, the author of the bill, read the definition in the committee's report. It appears at the bottom of page 5:

> Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water, et cetera.

I would like to have the question with reference to the Great Lakes clarified by an extension or revision in the RECORD, because on page 18 it states:

> No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by subsequent Act of Congress.

Mr. PELLY. The study, if I might suggest, will develop as to where the estuarine areas are. I cannot myself tell you why the Great Lakes were included other than the fact that there are certain important resources, fishery resources in, as I understand, the shoals of the Great Lakes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? Perhaps we could ask the author of the pending bill, the gentleman from Michigan, to explain why the Great Lakes were included as an estuary.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to transgress too much on the time of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have promised to yield time, and perhaps the gentleman can get some time from his side of the aisle and answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, in the very first line after the introduction of the bill itself, it says:

> In the House of Representatives, January 10, 1967, Mr. DINGELL introduced the following bill.

There is the answer as to how the Great Lakes got in.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, we will let Mr DINGELL on his own time explain it.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, it says further, on page 16, in section 2:

> The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation and in cooperation with the States—

And so on—

> shall conduct directly or by contract a study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries, in-

> cluding without limitation coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, seaward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes.

So it was the intent of the committee, as I hope it is the intent of this Congress, that for purposes of this bill the Great Lakes should be included.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a short question to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to demonstrate to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Massachusetts they are not the only ones who have a concern. In the report from the Corps of Engineers we find this language:

> We believe that all references in the draft bill to waters of the Great Lakes should be deleted. These waters have problems, but they differ greatly from the esthetic, recreational, and fish and wildlife problems with which the bill is designed to deal.

I support this idea of conservation, but I believe by putting the Great Lakes in we will diminish the money and activity which will be necessary in the coastal areas.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a short answer.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the objection of the Corps of Engineers, to which our good friend from Iowa alludes, deals with the bill as originally drafted, before it was amended by the committee. At that point the corps had some very real objections, because the bill as drawn then set up the dual permit system. That is no longer in the bill. There is no provision for dealing with permits at all. So the bill is entirely outside the area of the Army Corps of Engineers to deal with these permits.

I had a meeting with the Corps of Engineers and others, and, subject to one very small amendment which I will offer later, the objections of the Corps of Engineers have been removed.

With regard to how the Great Lakes got in there, the gentleman from Massachusetts hit the nail on the head. The conservation departments of the Great Lakes States requested they be included under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Michigan said the gentleman from Massachusetts has hit the nail on the head, I will yield to him briefly.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, the greater part of the money contained in this bill will in my view go to correlate studies already in existence. Estuary studies have been made until, as we say in Massachusetts, the cows come home. Somebody has to take them and correlate all that information. A large part of this money, this million dollars, will go to that end, not to original research. Certainly there will be sufficient funds in my view in this bill to help with the fresh water problem as it relates to the Great Lakes. I would hope no inland Congressman would object to translation of the studies, as they come from the Great Lakes, to other areas in the inland States.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take this conversation away from the Great Lakes for a few moments, because its main trust is what was generally known as estuarine areas of the Nation, which are along the seacoast.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, which is essentially a study bill of the estuarine areas. A year ago I made the same statement, that I was in support of the legislation, before the committee which was then holding hearings on the bill.

Last December a bill was reported out of the committee at the last minute with a serious and important change in section 3 of the bill. Everything I say here today shall relate to section 3 of the bill, which is the section which has been in dispute.

That section, as changed at the last minute and reported out by the committee, was going to affect only New York State and, in fact, only certain limited wetlands areas in the towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay, both of which towns I have the pleasure of representing here in the Congress.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], requested me to talk to the people of New York State and the towns, to get their reaction to the proposed change. I did that. They objected.

I asked the leadership on both sides of the aisle to withdraw the bill from what was then an attempt to have it passed under a suspension of the rules, until the disagreements could be worked out. The leadership complied. The bill was withdrawn.

I then arranged for a meeting to which all of the interested parties could come to discuss differences in the bill. This meeting was held.

What were these objections which had to be met?

First of all, the new revised section 3, which at that time was proposed by the subcommittee, was so narrowly drawn that the State of New York and indeed the towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay felt they were being singled out and made to look like the targets of the legislation. In our meeting we agreed that this would be changed, and neither the State of New York nor the towns of Hempstead or Oyster Bay are any longer mentioned in the legislation, and whatever provisions there are are nationwide.

Of course the towns did not want to be singled out because they consider that they have the very best conservation agreements in the United States of America for the protection of wet lands. They have town-State agreements now in existence, and they seriously question whether they need any improvements of them.

Second, the bill as then proposed would have required the use of old surveys as the basis for wetlands agreements. This would have limited the scope and the area of the wetlands agreements. The State did not want this. The towns did not want this. They wanted new studies which would allow the inclusion of new areas and proper agreements to protect unprotected areas of our wet lands.

It was also possible—and this was a most serious thing, because it would have affected everyone—under the legislation as then proposed to bypass the State, and for the Federal Government to make agreements directly with localities within the State without the State's concurrence.

All these objections were met by the chairman of the committee in this meeting, and I want to congratulate him on the attitude he took, because through his efforts a full agreement has been reached.

I want to direct certain questions, if I may, to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I should like to have his attention.

Mr. DINGELL. I shall be pleased to respond.

Mr. WYDLER. The difficulty I now have with the legislation is this: We have before us the report of the committee on the bill, which is wrong, because the bill is now going to be changed, yet people reading the legislative history on the bill may refer to this report and will come to improper conclusions about what it means.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is entirely correct. The report does differ somewhat from the language.

Mr. WYDLER. I should like to point out to the chairman of the committee the language on page 3, the last paragraph, which I do not believe has any application whatsoever to the legislation as will be passed here today. Also the second paragraph on page 5 of the report and the third and fourth paragraphs on page 7 of the report, all of which deal with the specific prior reports made in the area of the Nation and of New York State, none of which are mentioned now in the legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell my good friend that at the appropriate time we are going to offer an amendment which I believe will meet the objections of my good friend from New York and which will also set the matter straight. With respect to the language contained in the report, that language naturally related to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to get these things on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to get four questions answered for the record, if I may, by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The first question is: Is it a fact that under the legislation as will be finally passed here today any State in the Nation will have to be a party to any agreement within that State under this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, it would have to be a party to those agreements between the Federal Government and the local units of government for management of estuaries which will be completed previous to the completion of the whole study as referred to in the bill. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WYDLER. Second, before any agreements are entered into in the Long

Island area or, for that matter, in any area of the United States will new studies have to be conducted and completed?

Mr. DINGELL. No. The overall study does not have to be completed before agreements can be entered into. Under the amendment that will be offered, that does not have to be done. However, before lands can be acquired or an interest in lands may be acquired by the Federal Government, the study must have to be completed and the Congress must act to approve affirmatively such acquisitions of land.

Mr. WYDLER. What I am asking the gentleman is this, for example: If the Federal Government were to try to enter into an agreement with a locality in Long Island, for example, before they did it they would have to complete a new study, would they not, whether it is a complete study or a partial one?

Mr. DINGELL. I understand what the gentleman is saying. Yes. The area in question must be studied and, in the case of the Long Island waterway, to which I am sure the gentleman is alluding, the study would have to be updated, and at the appropriate time I will introduce a letter dealing with this point from the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. Finally, the question which was raised by the State, as the gentleman will remember, at the conference we held, which is, will any partial study of any sector or will the Secretary of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies?

Mr. DINGELL. Under the language of the amendment which will be offered, the action of the Secretary with regard to entering into agreements for the management of areas between the Department of the Interior and local units of government or the States must take into consideration very clearly the language of subsections 2(a) and 2(b) of the bill and insofar as possible to consult and cooperate with the States and also with the Secretary of the Army and other Federal agencies so as fully to consider the views of the States and the local units of government and other affected Government agencies.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman for that statement. I also wish to thank the gentlemen from New York [Mr. Tenzer and Mr. Grover], who demonstrated such a great interest in the bill. I would also like to put on the record today that we have all agreed, we being the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Dingell, myself, Congressman Tenzer, and Congressman Grover, that we will in fact send a proper letter to the Department of the Interior, insofar as we are talking about the Long Island area, requesting them to make any study that they make in the area an areawide study of all the wetlands of both the north and south shores of Long Island.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is fully correct in that last statement and, as he will recall, I sent in all of the correspondence received by me throughout the years, including some concerning the specific questions that the gentleman just raised. I have no objection to them being placed in the Record at the appropriate time.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding this time to me.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 25. In particular I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] and the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. Wydler, Grover, and Tenzer] for their initiative on this vital conservation measure.

This bill enjoys the support of Governor Rockefeller and the New York State Conservation Commissioner, Stewart Kilbourne. It is my hope that it will have the strongest bipartisan backing.

The bill before us, considerably reduced in scope from the original version, would authorize a 2-year study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries and waters of the Great Lakes by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States and other Federal agencies. The study and report, to be submitted to the Congress, must be completed no later than January 30, 1970, at a cost not to exceed $750,000 for fiscal year 1969 and $350,000 for fiscal year 1970. In addition, with respect to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., which were studied by the Secretary in conjunction with the State of New York in 1961 and 1965, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into an agreement with New York or any political subdivision thereof for the permanent management, development, and administration of such areas.

Throughout the Nation, estuarine areas have both conservation and economic value. Estuaries, as marginal sea and land areas, are the environment for many natural resources, including large populations of wildfowl, such as ducks, geese, swans, rail, and snipe. Many of our most valued commercial species of fish spend at least a portion of their lives in estuarine areas, including prawns, menhaden, bluefish, oysters, soft clams, blue crabs, and diamondback terrapins. It is estimated that, in 1960, estuarine-dependent seafood resources supported about 90,000 commercial fishermen at the rate of about 2.8 billion pounds.

Specifically, in terms of the Long Island wetlands, the area comprises extensive marshes and bays some 15 miles long and 3½ miles wide, including Hempstead and South Oyster Bays. The commercial and recreational value of the finfish, shellfish, waterfowl, and shorebirds that inhabit this area is enormous and the demand for these resources is increasing. A report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that some 29 percent of the Long Island wetlands have been destroyed between 1954 and 1964, and an accelerated rate of wetlands destruction will continue unless a positive program of acquisition and management is undertaken.

This legislation would make possible such a program. When a political subdivision other than a State desires to enter into a management agreement with the Department of the Interior, such agreement must have the approval of the Governor.

If we are to save more of the valuable estuarine areas of the United States, a much larger undertaking is clearly required. This legislation is but a first small step—yet, if we postpone even this minimal beginning any longer, the opportunity to preserve these resources may well pass us by.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleague from Michigan in urging passage of H.R. 25—the so-called estuarine area bill—with the amendment to be offered by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

As has been previously stated, the principal thrust of this legislation is to authorize and to direct the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, to study and to inventory the Nation's estuaries including the Great Lakes area. This study would have to be submitted to the Congress by the President not later than January 30, 1970, together with appropriate legislative recommendations. Significantly, this legislation provides an express prohibition against the acquisition of lands within any subsequently designated estuarine area "until authorized by subsequent act of Congress."

Whereas the bill, H.R. 25, as reported by our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into only an agreement pertaining to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., studied in 1961 and 1965, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan would so amend section 3 of the bill as to expand this somewhat restrictive authority. It would furnish the Secretary of the Interior permissive authority to enter into an agreement for the management, administration, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas following the completion of a study of such areas and subject to the approval of the President of the agreement.

Most importantly, however, no agreement could be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with any political subdivision of a State without it first being approved by the Governor of the respective State. The cost resulting from such agreements would be shared in an equitable manner by the Federal Government and the respective State or political subdivision thereof, subject to the availability of appropriations, and State hunting and fishing laws shall be applicable to those areas covered in the agreement. It is my understanding that with this amendment the bill, H.R. 25, satisfactorily disposes of concerns previously expressed by several Members of the House.

As originally introduced, H.R. 25 did

contain several provisions found to be objectionable to various interested parties. However, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has taken exceedingly great pains to provide all parties every opportunity to make their views known. Every possible consideration was afforded so as to hammer out legislation acceptable to all interests. Quite frankly, I hope that in so doing we will not fall prey to the fate so aptly described in one of Aesop's Fables, and I quote:

> Please all, and you will please none.

Mr. Chairman, fish resources are the eocnomic mainstay of hundreds of our coastal communities and the key to prosperity for many seaside resorts where sport fishing supports the local economy. These same resources provide recreation for hundreds of thousands of our citizens. What H.R. 25 accomplishes is to sound the alarm that these valuable resources are in danger of depletion because of burgeoning community and industrial development, expanding into estuarine areas which are the principal habitat for a large portion of our fish resources.

There exists, therefore, a need for balancing the interest between community/industiral development and the preservation of the habitats of fish. This legislation constitutes an initial step toward bringing these interests into balance. As noted in an editorial appearing in the Marine Digest of January 27 on the preservation of estuarine resources, and I quote:

> On a citizen level, we feel it makes a lot of sense for men to participate in both conservation and industrial growth activities. Candidly, neither side, because of the motions involved, can be trusted to have just their own way. A compatability must and can be achieved.

The bill, H.R. 25, constitutes the initial vehicle to achieve this necessary compatability and I therefore strongly urge the House to pass this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our distinguished friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], the chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, such time as he may consume.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, it would be a great tragedy if the United States, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, should permit the loss of one of its most valuable natural resources—the estuarine, or wetland areas.

H.R. 25 is designed to make certain this loss never happens. The bill would do no more than authorize a 2-year study of the wetlands of the Nation—including our Great Lakes area. I join my colleagues in strongly endorsing this legislation.

America's wetlands are the natural habitat and breeding grounds for countless varieties of plant, marine, and bird life, and they form an important link in the delicate balance of nature. For example, oysters, clams, and blue crabs—all of which constitute an important seafood industry in my own Chesapeake Bay area of Maryland—spend their juvenile stages in the protected waters of the estuarine zone.

Once these wetlands are destroyed, they are gone forever.

I am, of course, just as acutely aware of the importance of these areas to our industrial interests. I know the wetland areas are valuable sites for future industrial expansion.

The interests of the naturalist and the industrialist often conflict, and that is another reason why this bill is important. It does not threaten either interests. What it will do is initiate a study that will enable us to find an intelligent and equitable solution to this important problem.

Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt passage of H.R. 25.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Tenzer] who originated the fight to preserve our estuaries.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell], for yielding this time to me.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes, because I shall not undertake to repeat that which has already been said, but shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, however, I should like to address myself to one matter related to this bill which in my opinion is of extreme importance but which up to this point has not been touched upon by some who have spoken in support thereof.

Mr. Chairman, this is really a measure of economy for future Congresses to act upon in connection with the provisions as contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, until today, hopefully, if this legislation is passed, the Federal Government was not allowed to use its expertise for the improvement or development of any of our natural lands, without acquiring those lands by either condemnation or purchase.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 25 includes this new concept which has been brought into being in which I was proud to have included in my first bills introduced in the 89th Congress and that philosophy is based upon the fact that where the land is already in public ownership, already owned by the people of a State or a political subdivision thereof, it should not be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire such land either by condemnation or purchase for the purpose of seeking the expertise of the Federal Government in the management and preservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 25 and I urge its unanimous approval.

Mr. Chairman, aside from all the other worthy reasons which have been expressed here today in support of this legislation, it is my opinion that the concept of our requiring Federal ownership or protection with reference to these lands is a concern and concept which deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House this afternoon is a credit to our distinguished colleague [Mr. Dingell] and to the other members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on both sides of the aisle. The members of this committee have approached the subject of preserving our natural resources—our valuable estuaries and coastal wetlands—with unusual dedication.

Unfortunately, prior attempts to bring this bill to the House floor with bipartisan support failed due to a lack of communication, understanding, and a lack of willingness on the part of some local politicians on Long Island to work together. On three prior occasions bipartisan support was given and then at the last possible moment withdrawn by certain officials of the New York State Conservation Department and of the town of Hempstead.

Finally on January 31, 1968, a meeting was held in the office of Subcommittee Chairman Dingell and with the cooperation of our distinguished colleague [Mr. Morton] of Maryland, and my colleagues from Long Island, agreement was finally reached on the language of section 3 which Mr. Dingell has offered today by way of amendment. State and local officials present at the meeting in Mr. Dingell's office pledged their support of H.R. 25 as amended and the road is now cleared for final passage of this important measure.

The purpose of H.R. 25 which I have cosponsored with Chairman Dingell is to preserve the valuable estuaries and coastal wetlands of our Nation which have been all too fast disappearing and being under foundations of concrete preserved under concrete rather than for future generations of Americans. To achieve this objective, H.R. 25 provides for a nationwide inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries with particular emphasis on recommendations for protecting and preserving these valuable natural resources in perpetuity.

In the 89th Congress on September 23, 1965. I introduced H.R. 11236, a bill to preserve 16,000 acres of valuable wetlands located on the south shore of Long Island. In that bill I proposed a new concept for the preservation of natural resources already in public ownership—a concept which has remained intact in H.R. 25. This concept is simply that when lands are in public ownership—State or local government ownership—the bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior to enter into voluntary cooperative Federal, State, and local management agreements by negotiation, to preserve these resources rather than requiring the Federal Government to acquire the lands by condemnation or purchase as is presently required.

Under H.R. 25 and under the terms of such an agreement title to the wetlands or estuarine area involved, remains with the State and/or local government. As an example the 16,000 acres of Long Island's south shore wetlands have been estimated to be worth approximately $25 to $30 million. Why should the Treasury of the Federal Government be required to transfer huge sums of money to acquire lands already owned by State or local governments? In lieu of acquisition by purchase or proceeding by condemnation, H.R. 25 would authorize cooperative management agreements, under which Federal, State, and local governments would work together to preserve our natural resources while equitably sharing the costs of maintaining, improving, and managing such resources.

Under the proposed amendment to H.R. 25, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and supported by New York State and local officials, the Secretary is authorized to negotiate agreements with States and with local political subdivisions with the approval of the State after completion of the inventory and a study of the area involved has been made.

At the conclusion of the nationwide study the Secretary of the Interior is required to report to the Congress on the results of the study and his recommendations for preserving valuable areas of estuaries and wetlands throughout the United States.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has made an outstanding contribution to conservation by reporting H.R. 25 favorably and by providing this new vehicle for protecting our natural resources.

Throughout the history of the estuarine protection bill many organizations, a number of States and political subdivisions have testified in favor of the legislation. Many individuals have testified at the public hearings and written letters expressing their support for this measure.

The amendments which have been incorporated in H.R. 25 have met the objections raised by certain States.

Among the States whose recommendations have been adopted are California, New Jersey, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Washington, Oregon, Florida, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Idaho. The bill also has the full support of the Mid-West Fish and Game Commissioners Association, which include representatives from the States of Michigan, Kansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Maryland, Iowa, Colorado, North Dakota, Minnesota and Illinois.

It is important to note that the provisions of section 3 of H.R. 25 relating to cooperative management agreements are completely voluntary. There is no coercion, no Federal control, and no obligation imposed upon any State or political subdivision to enter into such agreements. The terms of the management agreements may vary from area to area and they are to be negotiated at arm's length by the State or political units involved and Secretary of the Interior.

During the committee hearings in the 89th and 90th Congresses I testified and I have made speeches on the House floor stressing the importance of Long Island's wetlands. I have pointed out that when I moved to Long Island's south shore in 1936 there were 30,000 acres of valuable wetlands but now only 16,000 remain. This bill provides a new way to preserve the remaining wetlands on Long Island and other such valuable resources throughout the Nation.

More and more of our local communities are now realizing the importance of preserving open space and recreational areas. They are recognizing the urgency of providing for expert planning and maintenance of their remaining natural resources. Efforts are now being made in communities and States across the Nation to accomplish this and I believe the Federal Government should assist—both financially and by making available Federal expertise—to work with the States and localities before it is too late.

After this legislation is enacted, the complex of Long Island wetlands in Nassau and Suffolk Counties may become one of the first areas in which a study and inventory is completed. Prior studies in 1961 and 1965 of the Long Island wetlands are referred to in the committee report on H.R. 25 and have called these the most important spawning grounds for fish and waterfowl on the North Atlantic coast.

Other areas will be studied and the voice of the people in each area who want their resources protected and preserved will be heard. If their voice is not heard, what legacy will they leave to their children, other than a filled in bay—a polluted stream—and natural resources preserved under concrete.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has reported H.R. 25 unanimously. Its distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL has been a magnificent and articulate spokesmen for those who are concerned about preservation of our remaining natural resources. I am pleased to have become his ally. I am proud to have originally sponsored legislation in 1965 to protect Long Island's wet lands and extremely gratified that Chairman DINGELL has with great foresight broadened the battle to preserve the Nation's wet lands.

I urge my colleagues to give to the people the protection they need and deserve. The concept of cooperative management agreements between Federal, State, and local governments—rather than condemnation or Federal acquisition—is one worthy of our attention. We should not spend Federal funds to purchase lands for protection which are already in public ownership. We should survey and inventory our resources and encourage Federal, State, and local agreements to preserve them. That is what H.R. 25 authorizes. That is what you are being asked to support today

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD at this point a number of recent newspaper editorials giving expression to the widespread support of the purposes and intent of H.R. 25:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 15, 1967]

THE LAST WORD

The bays, estuaries and coastal wetlands where the fresh waters of a river meet the tides of the sea were once crucial in the evolution of man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the nation's commercially valuable finfish and shellfish spawn. Here are found oysters, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here water birds live and migratory birds rest on their journeys.

Human beings, forgetful of their own past and heedless of the welfare of other species, think of swamps and marshes as wastelands. They mistakenly believe that oceans and rivers can absorb an infinite amount of abuse. So it is that they pollute the waters and destroy estuaries and adjoining wetlands by dredging and filling.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is now considering a bill by Representative Dingell of Michigan to authorize an inventory of the nation's estuarine areas by the Interior Department.

Originally, his bill was more ambitious. It included a requirement that those seeking to dredge or fill would have to obtain a permit from the Secretary of the Interior. But the sand and gravel companies, the real estate developers and the Rivers and Harbors Congress mounted a successful lobbying campaign to insure that their perennial ally, the Army Corps of Engineers, will retain the final power of decision.

Despite this drastic downward revision in subcommittee, the bill is still of some value. It authorizes the first comprehensive study of estuaries. Where wetlands are already under local public control, as in parts of the southern coast of Long Island, a provision sponsored by Representative Tenzer of New York would enable the Secretary of the Interior to provide Federal administration if the localities agreed. Federal supervision is the most effective barrier against pressures by developers on village and town officials.

As the public comes to understand better the unique value of estuaries and coastal wetlands, the time draws nearer when long-term ecology rather than short-term economic interests have the last word on this significant part of man's environment.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Dec. 6, 1967]

BOGGED DOWN

The struggle to preserve Long Island's Wetlands has bogged down in a morass of politics and jurisdictional jealousies.

The bill, introduced by Rep. Herbert Tenzer, the Lawrence Democrat, provides for voluntary federal-local agreements for the preservation of the wetlands, so vital to the balance of nature in marine life and so tempting for real estate developers.

When introduced last March, it had wide by-partisan backing. But a potent Republican minority forced the House on Monday to postpone action.

Leading the opposition was Rep. John Wydler, the Garden City Republican. An early supporter of the bill, he now holds—along with the State Conservation Department and Hempstead Town's Republican Supervisor Ralph G. Caso, whose town contains most of the contested areas—that existing state-local agreements are adequate.

Herein lies the nub of the dispute. Mr. Caso, while he says he recognizes the conservation imperatives, consistently refuses to enter into any agreement that will hold the Wetlands forever in a public conservation trust. He would like to keep the town's options open for future consideration. But it has been the exercise of local options that caused the disappearance of thousands of precious, irreplaceable acres.

Both Reps. Tenzer and Wydler have expressed willingness to confer and try to resolve their differences. That's a good idea—and maybe a bill guaranteeing full protection for this public treasure can get on the House floor and be passed into law after the new year.

[From Newsday, Jan. 16, 1968]

WETLANDS BILL: PRESERVING OUR RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In a recent letter to the editor (Jan. 3), Hempstead Presiding Supervisor Ralph G. Caso defended his opposition to my wetlands preservation bill by stating: "We want the same study other tidal areas will receive." The Town of Hempstead position is difficult to understand in light of these facts. In 1958 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the New York State Conservation Department undertook a joint study of 16,000 acres of South Shore wetlands. In 1961 a final report was published calling these wetlands "the most valuable waterfowl area in the North Atlantic States." Recommendations for preservation of the remaining wetlands were also issued.

In 1965, this study was updated. In September of that same year, I introduced legislation authorizing cooperative management agreements between the federal, state, and local government for the permanent preservation of the wetlands. Approximately 14,000 acres of wetlands had been destroyed during the previous 20 years, and my bill was designed to protect the remaining acreage.

The bill was subsequently broadened to include a study of the nation's wetlands. Since L.I.'s wetlands had already been studied over the past seven years—the only such study completed in the U.S.—the legislation included authorization for cooperative agreements covering these wetlands. At congressional hearings, Department of Interior officials stated that prior to any such agreement the L.I. studies would be updated again. It was estimated this would take from two to five months.

After all this, and after publicly supporting the wetlands bill, Mr. Caso—on the eve of House consideration of the legislation—withdrew his support and, together with Rep. John Wydler (R-Garden City) and officials of the State Conservation Department, asked for a delay in House action. The excuse that Hempstead wants additional studies is a "phony."

The bill is completely voluntary, merely authorizing negotiations between the town, the state and the Interior Department. Apparently for political reasons alone, the town has placed every obstacle in the way of congressional action on this legislation. Instead of discussing this bill with its sponsors, the town has conducted an exchange of views through the press.

The town wants to restrict this legislation to a study because it knows that public opinion may force a permanent agreement for preservation of the wetlands. This concept of voluntary cooperative agreements is a new approach to the preservation of natural resources. It would save billions of dollars now spent for purchase of condemnation of land already in public ownership. If these resources belong to the people, they should be preserved without the need for purchase or condemnation.

Mr. Caso also refers to the state-town agreement and the broad conservation program of the town. The state-town agreement is not permanent, and the fact is that until my bill was introduced in 1965 there had been no effort at all to preserve the wetlands though state agreements. If the town is really interested in preserving its resources, why does it fear the federal government becoming a third party to preservation agreements, leaving title with the town and providing federal funds to relieve some of the tax burden which results from a town conservation budget nearing $300,000 a year? And even if this town administration is conservation-minded, what protection do we have from a future town government that wants to permit additional commercial or private housing development on the wetlands?

Another attempt to bring this legislation to the House floor will be made early in this session of Congress, and I hope that the town will recognize the need for this bill and will comply with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of the South Shore by supporting the legislation.

[From the Nassau (N.Y.) Herald, Jan. 18, 1968]

DEAR MRS. SPANIERMAN: Our Town of Hempstead has been instrumental in blocking passage of the Federal Wetlands Bill, which has national importance—besides affecting us here locally.

Although our town now has its own conservation program in conjunction with the state (finally after years of wetlands destruction) the program could evaporate easily, as times change and strong pressures grow to make use of the wetlands in some form other than their natural state. The town-state program is merely a mutual agreement, with no lasting legal protection, and can be cancelled by town board vote and state at any time. It is easy to foresee both the town and state wanting to put a super road through the wetlands 10 or 15 years from now; or golf courses, etc. This is why federal involvement is so important—to make future encroachment of the wetlands more difficult. The federal involvement in the bill is not ownership or control, but merely a voluntary agreement for studies, management advice, financial assistance, etc. Our town helped torpedo the bill at the last moment (in order to weaken it) under the guise that local control is better than federal—but the entire federal proposal is voluntary! We need federal involvement as watchdog help, if for nothing else—our town history proves this.

There are some important meetings to resolve the problem coming up soon in Washington, when congress reconvenes in late January.

Write this week to: Presiding Supervisor Ralph Caso, Town of Hempstead, Mineola, New York. Send copy to: Cong. Herbert Tenzer, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Say: Don't obstruct passage of the federal wetlands bill! Don't water it down.

Mr. Chairman, the following is a partial list of those supporting H.R. 25:

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Defenders of Wildlife.
National Audubon Society.
North American Wildlife Foundation.
National Wildlife Foundation.
Sierra Club.
The Wilderness Society.
The Izaak Walton League.
Wildlife Management Institute.
Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council.
Conservation Planners, Inc.
League of Women Voters.
Garden Clubs of America.
Federated Garden Clubs of New York State.
Nassau County Planning Commission.
Long Island School Boards and PTAs.
Long Island Fisherman Association.
Long Island League of Salt Water Sportsmen.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters from constituents expressing support for this legislation. I am pleased to call these to the attention of my colleagues—and include them in the RECORD at this point:

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE,
Mineola, N.Y., January 19, 1968.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: I hope that we will see in this session of the Congress long overdue action in support of your dedicated efforts to save Nassau's priceless wetlands.

The time for action is now. Fourteen thousand acres have already been lost to the dredger and developer. "Studies" of this critical situation, which has been studied thoroughly for many years, would only serve as a stalling tactic to enrich the few and deprive the many of a vital part of our natural heritage.

Leading conservationists rightly question the value of the wetlands agreement between New York State and the Town of Hempstead since it can be abrogated.

Your efforts to provide permanent protection for the wetlands would have succeeded in the last session of Congress but for the last-minute turnabout by Representative Wydler at the urging of the Presiding Supervisor of the Town of Hempstead.

They apparently do not understand that vast economic and sports interests involving fish and wildlife are dependent upon our wetlands' central role in migration.

The Town of Hempstead's participation in permanent protection of the wetlands is not mandatory under the terms of your bill. Yet one would hope that its officials would feel some responsibility to areas on Long Island and throughout America where your legislation would help prevent what has happened in Hempstead.

It is scandalous that a small group of men wielding political power in one small area of the East coast should jeopardize America's wetlands.

Fortunately for Nassau County residents, the County has acquired 175 acres of wetlands for the Cow Meadow Natural History Preserve from which our people can learn the use and values of the wetlands.

Without passage of your bill, however, Cow Meadow could become a lone memorial to one of our greatest natural resources.

I commend your challenging the Congress with this major opportunity to serve the future of our nation, and I urge all the people of Nassau to support your far-seeing efforts to save the wetlands in Nassau and throughout America.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE H. NICKERSON.

LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION,
Lawrence, Long Island, N.Y.,
January 17, 1968.

RESOLUTION

To: 1. Hon. Ralph G. Caso. 2. Conservation Commissioner J. Stewart Kilburne.

Copies to: Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Hon. Herbert Tenzer, L.I. Press, Newsday, S.S. Record.

Re: Federal Wetlands Bill.

This is to inform you that at a regular meeting of the Board of Gov. of the Lawrence Association, it was resolved to advise you:

1. That we are completely familiar with the events surrounding the failure of the Federal Wetlands Bill to be voted on during the last congressional session ending December 1967.

2. That the Lawrence Association reaffirms its support for this legislation and urges you to change your position and do what you can immediately to help pass this bill without further delay, obstruction, or weakening changes.

This is a bill of national importance, and being completely voluntary it is inconceivable that local politics should act as a hindrance any longer.

M. A. BENDES,
President.

FEDERATION OF NEW YORK STATE
BIRD CLUBS, INC.,
Freeport, N.Y., December 2, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: For whatever help it can be, the Federation of New York State Bird Clubs, Inc., continues to stand firmly behind HR 25.

I would like to report in my newsletter to the clubs in the state the votes of the New York State congressmen. If possible, I would appreciate a copy of the day's Congressional Record (since it will probably also carry the debate).

Also, I would appreciate a copy of the bill. Thank you and Good Luck!

Best regards,
MAXWELL C. WHEAT, Jr.,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the chairman of the

full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation; the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]; the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER]; the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], and others for bringing to the floor of the House this important legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself this time during which I wish to pay tribute before I yield to my next colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word of praise to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], who has worked so long and hard on this bill, and to say a word of praise to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER], who has been of valuable assistance in the development of the provisions thereof; also, a good word in behalf of our good friend, the distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], who has worked so long and hard upon this legislation; as well as my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH]; and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], who have helped iron out the many difficulties with which we were faced in drawing up this legislation.

And, of course, the distinguished member of the subcommittee [Mr. PELLY] without whose help on this legislation, and much else, we would not have been able to bring the legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield 1 minute of this time to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain that the record indicates that there is already a great deal of work that has been done, and that the integrity of those studies is subject to the review of the State governments and local municipalities involved and, pending their approval or disapproval of those studies, they could or could not be recognized in the development of the overall report.

The same situation would obtain also with reference to the Federal studies. I know that there have been many studies made of many estuarine areas throughout the country, and I for one am certain that these studies can provide a sufficient basis for action in some areas.

On the other hand, changes in the ecology of other areas would require updating of any studies that have been made. The record as it stands now seems to be somewhat in conflict on this subject, and I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee will clear this up.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that I believe that there are, as the gentleman has already said, a large number of such studies in existence. It is expected that these studies will be used in all cases as a starting point.

Indeed, one such study now going on involves a study of the estuarine areas insofar as pollution is concerned. It is expected by the committee that these matters will be considered and will be meshed together with the identification of the estuarine areas to be preserved, and it is expected that by reason of those studies we will be able to accomplish substantial economies in terms of identifying estuarine areas, and in determining in what way they should be preserved.

Further than that, it is also the intent of the committee that, insofar as possible, we should engage—or the Federal Government should consult first with the States and with the other local units of the local governments in terms of identification of the areas to be studied, and the identification of the manner in which the areas should be studied.

Subsections 2(a) and 2(b) specifically indicate that whatever studies may be engaged in by the Federal Government will be engaged in with cooperation of and in consultation with the State and other local units of government.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time first to compliment the gentleman from Michigan who, once again, has demonstrated to us all his legislative skill in bringing a difficult subject to the floor. I understand further that the gentleman has prepared and is intending to offer an amendment which will change the bill, if adopted, to provide that Presidential approval for designation of estuarine areas will be necessary, in addition to these preliminary studies and agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and the States.

Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct, but only insofar as where the management agreements will be enacted. It is the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan that such language is not needed, because in any event the Department of the Interior will not engage in any agreements without the full approval of the President of the United States.

However, this language is included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

However, Mr. Chairman, the language was included insofar as the section which will be offered at a later time dealing with the approval of—or, rather, dealing with the agreements by the Department of the Interior with all units of government for management of the estuarine areas and wet lands which will be permitted in the bill previous to the time that the studies authorized by the bill are completed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand further that the bill in its final form provides assurances that the Secretary of the Interior will consult with the Department of the Army, or other interested Federal agencies on their position with regard to designation of estuarine areas.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. It is expected that the Secretary will engage in broad consultation with other Federal agencies and also with local and State units of government.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have one further question, if I may.

Under the definition of estuarine areas and estuaries, is it conceivable that the flow of a salt spring into a river, which is an occurrence which we find every once in a while in the State which I represent, could create a situation in which you define that river as an estuarine area and place it under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell the gentleman—emphatically "No."

The requirement here is, in the case of estuarine area, with the exception of the Great Lakes, that they be generally tidal in nature.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So you are not aiming at rivers which flow through States and which do not within those States, enter a body of salt water; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. The language is very clearly defined in the bill as to what constitutes an estuary and I will read it now. It reads as follows:

> Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water. A meandering river flows to the sea and terminates in an estuary. At this point, the river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores interact resulting in the depositing of river sediments and sediments washed up by the sea in the estuary. It is a holding place for nutrients and, in some cases, for pollutants.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. GROVER. I have said before that I am in enthusiastic support of this bill and I just want to make it a matter of record that indeed I am.

For those of us who have not really been close to the work which has been done on the estuarine bill in the last few years, and for those of you who live in the rockribbed part of our country and who do not get out to the great Atlantic coast beaches—and of course that is not to say that they do not have fine beaches on the west coast—I want to say that this is really landmark legislation, and is going to incorporate a great deal of the wetland areas along our coast and the Pacific coast.

I am happy to support my friend, the chairman, and the other gentlemen who have worked on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity in yielding time. There is pressure on all of us to get this bill on the way.

H.R. 25 as originally reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was acceptable legislation insofar as I am concerned. It was arrived at after long and intensive discussions and after many agreements and compromises between all interested parties.

This bill, as such, is far reaching in its scope. It affects many segments of our Nation's industries. The bill is wide in its scope. Under the definition of "estuary," in fact, it covers a much larger area than estuaries. It includes the land adjoining the Great Lakes and all of our coastal waters.

This is important legislation that should be carefully considered by the Congress, not only at this time, but at a later period. That was the original intent of H.R. 25 as it was reported from committee.

The key sections of that bill, sections 2 and 3, in both cases authorize the Secretary of the Interior—and I emphasize this point—authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study both the actual question of acquisition of estuarine lands and also the overall problem of managing these lands. In both cases the Secretary was to report back to the Congress for further consideration of the proper committees and the Congress itself.

I am now advised that the gentleman from Michigan is prepared to offer an amendment to section 3 of H.R. 25 which would, in essence, eliminate one-half of what was intended by the committee in its original action. His amendment, as he presents it, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with the State or any subdivision thereof for the administration, management, and development of either State or locally owned estuarine areas. It would permit the Secretary to do this without any further authorization from the Congress. All that would be required for him to carry out this provision would be the necessary funds which he would obtain from the Appropriations Committees, but the committees that have the basic jurisdiction in this matter would, in essence, be bypassed, and the Secretary would indeed have a free hand in the matter. This is the point I wish to raise to this body.

What we will be doing here if we approve the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Michigan is, on the one hand, to require the Secretary to study the question of acquisition of estuary areas, and, on the other hand, reverse ourselves by saying, "Go ahead, Mr. Secretary, and enter into agreements to manage these lands," which, in essence, is really the same thing as acquisition, and it would permit him to do this without any further congressional approval. I believe this is wrong. Too many parties have an interest in this matter. They should be given their proper day in the Congress to be heard at hearings.

I am, therefore, in opposition to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I suggest that the bill as reported was an acceptable bill, as I have stated previously, arrived at after many discussions and negotiations. I see no need or reason for the gentleman's amendment.

I would like to ask a question pertaining to the gentleman's proposed amendment, to save time under the 5-minute rule, and perhaps it would be more opportune at this point.

May I ask the gentleman again, for my recollection and for the record—am I correct that section 2 of H.R. 25, as passed unanimously by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and which bill is now before us, provides: "the Secretary to enter into agreements such as the one authorized by subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas located in other States as another method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas."

The Secretary could not enter into such contractual agreement or arrangements but could only recommend them to the Congress and then wait for an authorization by a committee of the Congress; is that correct? That is in the language in the bill before us.

Mr. DINGELL. That is the language of the bill at this moment. But it is the intention of the committee to offer language at the earliest possible time under the 5-minute rule, at least it is the intention of the gentlemen from Michigan, to offer language at the earliest possible time affording permission to the Secretary to enter into these management agreements appropriating necessary funds where the study has been completed in consultation with the several States and the affected agencies and also subject to approval in the case of a State by the Governor and in the case of the Federal Government by the President—which essentially needs the review of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BLATNIK. He would eliminate then the necessity of the recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior and this proposition going back to the proper committee of the Congress going back for authorization?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. That is what the amendment will do.

Mr. BLATNIK. Is there any reason for bypassing or eliminating the committee of the Congress?

Mr. DINGELL. It is not felt that this was necessary. It was felt that it would occur after such careful safeguards and subject to such careful review of the committee that has jurisdiction over this matter, that is, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that such a requirement would not be necessary.

Mr. BLATNIK. The reason I raised that point is—and I am trying to limit myself to the procedural situation and not to the substantive principle involved here which I support—and I do support the bill and I support the intent of the amendment—but let me give you an example of what I think will probably happen or could happen and which causes me some concern. Let us take a given estuarine area. Its proper management may permit many varied uses. One may be channel improvement. If so, it would come before my Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee. Another aspect may require downstream augmentation or flow control.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. We have no expectation that any of these agreements will involve that. The agreements are simply with regard to improvements by the Federal Government of the area after the study. We are not discussing any question of flow, channel improvement, stream improvement, dams, flow increase, or flow augmentation. These are simply questions of managing wet lands, to preserve them from encroachment, and to keep up the fish and wildlife.

Mr. BLATNIK. I understand the gentleman. Let us take the intracoastal canals, the Atlantic Intracoastal Canal, and the Gulf Intracoastal Canal. You have there navigation and marshlands. They are all related. There is the question of flood control and augmentation during dry seasons, for it would be necessary to keep the wet lands wet in the dry seasons. There is a navigation aspect, a beach erosion control aspect, and the flow control aspect. Those three purposes would require authorization of a committee of Congress and an act of Congress. We have had no problem with those questions, no delays, no difficulties at all.

On the other hand, we would now abrogate certain of our authority to the Secretary of the Interior, who could deal directly with towns, municipalities, counties subject to the approval of the Governor or a State to enter into agreements, without any regard or any consideration to established policies and programs already authorized and approved and appropriated for by the Congress itself. You have a sort of dual operation, and yet unrelated. This causes me great concern. It can be a problem. I am sure the gentleman is absolutely sincere in his intentions that it shall not be a problem. But I am sincerely concerned that there could well be a needless type of dual and separate operation. That was not the intent of the Congress to create.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions on this bill.

In my own State of Texas, the historic situation has been that a shell dredging company holding a permit from the State of Texas need only apply and satisfy all requirements for Department of Army permits. The powers of the Corps of Engineers in matters of this type are purely regulatory, not proprietary. The dredged lands are owned by the State—but certain features relating to navigable waterways are subject to Federal supervision. Hence, up to a few years ago, the extent of Federal concern was merely that the dredging did not impair navigation.

More recently, laws—good laws—have been enacted dealing in various degrees with protection of fish, wildlife, and water pollution in these areas. These laws have been administered through the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Interior.

It is a general premise of these laws that the extent of Federal interest is to study the problems of pollution and wildlife in these areas, and to assist States in programs they create to protect these interests.

The memorandum of understanding, mentioned in the committee report on H.R. 25, is made between the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the

Interior. In essence, it adds another layer of administration an individual must pass through before securing final permission to commence a commercial dredging operation. In general, the goal sought is a good one. There are many problems in coordinating the interests of the State, and of the various Federal agencies, and the approach of the memorandum is not an unreasonable one.

I am somewhat concerned, however, that this memorandum may establish a precedent that agencies may join together to agree to procedures outside the scope of enabling legislation and which might conflict with State laws.

To my way of thinking, another crucial problem is that pyramiding administration in this manner might result in unreasonable delay or expense to the individual who must wade through it.

The memorandum, in most cases, indicates that the Army will continue to have the final word in whether to approve a dredging operation which has been approved by the State. The individual need make only one "Federal stop" and the Army is merely charged with the additional function of soliciting opinions from Interior as to the impact of the specific proposal on fish, wildlife, and water pollution. In most cases, the additional legwork would be performed by the Federal agencies. This is as it should be.

Still a recent case has come to my attention where the demands placed on the individual applicant seem somewhat questionable.

In a case handled through the district engineer of Houston, the applicant, as he had done for years, made application to the Army for certain dredging operations. The Army, after consulting with Interior, found that no navigation problems existed, but felt that pollution might be a problem.

Accordingly, as a condition to approval of the permit, the Army required, among other things:

> 6. A survey shall be conducted in the Galveston Estuary by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, or other appropriate agencies to map each major oyster reef and determine its area, condition, and value. The cost of this work, not to exceed $100,000, shall be funded by the applicants.
>
> 7. A twelve-month study shall be conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to assess further the problems of siltation from shell dredging for the purposes of improving operational procedures and developing general guidelines to reduce or eliminate damage to oyster reefs. The cost of this work, not to exceed $70,000, shall be funded by the applicants.
>
> 8. The applicants shall cooperate and assist in the study to assess siltation and in other ways as may be necessary.

If this is the type of procedure consistently expected to be followed under the memorandum of understanding, then I say we should demand a thorough congressional investigation of what exactly is authorized in the memorandum, and whether it is within the purview of existing legislation.

I would like to pursue some of the questions asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] with reference to the memorandum of understanding which apparently was entered into between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior. My question specifically is this: In cases of a dredging operation in an estuary, who would make the decision as to whether that would be controlled or managed by a certain department?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to my good friend that that question is really not before us, because that agreement which has been executed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior with regard to dredging applies to navigable waters.

Mr. PICKLE. Let me say to the gentleman that previously and historically the Federal interest has been concerned when the act of dredging affected navigation. Now they have come in and said that the Federal Government, through the Department of the Interior, must concern itself with that which pertains to pollution. Do you have the memorandum of understanding? I want to know what that does with respect to the rights of the States and the rights of the individuals who are doing the dredging.

Mr. DINGELL. I would have to tell my good friend that the full memorandum of that understanding appears in the report on page 34 and following. It was the thought of the committee when we took out the dual permit section previously in the measure, we did so not necessarily by reason of the memorandum of understanding.

Mr. PICKLE. I understand that the dual permit provision has been eliminated. You just made one Federal step, so to speak. Still who would make a decision about the control of a particular estuary?

Mr. DINGELL. In connection with dredging and filling permits, the Corps of Engineers would still do so, subject to the provisions of the memorandum of understanding and the authority of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PICKLE. If my State of Texas were granted a permit for a dredging operation, could the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Army, either one, prevent the dredging operation if they thought it had something, even though it were State waters?

Mr. DINGELL. No. I would say to my good friend, if it is under the navigation waters, under the Flood Control Act of 1899, under which these permits are issued, anyone who is going to dredge or fill must have a permit from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. PICKLE. Even though they will not interfere with navigation?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. They have to have a permit because it is considered as affecting navigation. If they fail to do that, they may find themselves in jail.

Mr. PICKLE. There is a great controversy on that brewing in Texas, and it has not been settled by the States or parties involved, but I do not want the Federal Government coming in and preempting what they may have worked out on a State level.

Mr. DINGELL. That question was worked out in the Flood Control Act of 1899. That question was not considered by the committee on which I served.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman from Texas is a very valid one—that is the reason I raised it earlier—when we allow several service functions to come before the committees of Congress which are directly involved with the immediate area. They have definite effects. There can be too much water or too little, or too fast a turnover, and people can or cannot dredge. That is why I question the wisdom of eliminating the section in the bill now, that the Congress should authorize these wetland agreements so they do protect the rights by law, whether it be of States or Federal agencies. Congress has already considered that.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that we are limited in time, and I will have additional remarks under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 25 is before us today. Measures to conserve the Nation's wet lands and estuary areas are long overdue. We are finally beginning to appreciate the stresses upon natural resources caused by industrial, commercial, and population growth. The Congress is at last coming to grips with the need to preserve our wet lands and estuary areas, which are so important to the preservation of life cycles of all kinds of wildlife and to the conservation of natural recreation areas. I introduced legislation in both the 89th and 90th Congress to accomplish this objective.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for his leadership in bringing this bill, which I originally cosponsored, to the floor. Our colleague from New York [Mr. TENZER] deserves special credit for his efforts in connection with the Long Island wetlands area.

A 1964 survey on the Long Island wet lands revealed that 33 percent of the total wetlands area had been lost in the previous 10 years to spoliation from pollution, dredging, or erosion. Nearly 7,000 acres had been lost since 1959 alone. The need for prompt action to conserve what remains of this precious natural resource is apparent, and New Yorkers should be grateful to Congressman TENZER for his leadership in the fight to halt the steady destruction of the Long Island wet lands.

I regret that the legislation as originally introduced has been weakened.

Section 12 of the original legislation would have required the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not dredging would impair the natural values of any estuary before granting a dredging permit. Instead reliance is to be placed on an administrative arrangement, a memorandum of understanding, lacking firm congressional mandate, for consultation between the Departments of the Army and Interior prior to the authorization of any dredging. Hopefully, the original intent will be effectively carried out in practice, but there is no question that legislative authority would have been preferable.

A second provision which can only weaken the intent of the legislation is section 2(a)3, providing that, in carrying out the inventory of the Nation's estuarine areas, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider—as well as their ecological, esthetic, and navigational values—their value for commercial and industrial development. It is careless commercial and industrial exploitation that has necessitated protective legislation. Requiring the Secretary of the Interior to keep in mind further commercial exploitation in his study hardly furthers the purposes of this legislation.

H.R. 25, as reported from committee, restricts the authority of the Secretary to enter into agreement for the management of wetlands to certain publicly owned lands in the State of New York. The problem is nationwide. I am hopeful that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to extend this authority will be adopted. It is also unfortunate that the question of actual acquisition of wet lands by the Secretary has been deferred for further study.

Nevertheless, this legislation is another necessary step toward the proper management of the Nation's natural resources. The health of our river and coastal regions cannot be regained once these areas have been eroded and contaminated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of recording my support for H.R. 25, a bill which would authorize studies to provide inventory information and to outline the means for establishing a nationwide system of protected estuarine areas.

Further, H.R. 25 would raise the estuary, as a land form, to the status of mountain wilderness, wild rivers, the seashore, and other areas already protected under existing conservation legislation.

The rapid influx of population along our national shoreline has posed a clear threat to the preservation and management of coastal natural areas. Seventy-five percent of our population now live in States bordering the seaside and Great Lakes. Considering the substantial additional population and industrialization of shore areas predicted for the next twenty years, any delay in enacting this legislation will endanger countless brackish sounds, bays and tidal streams along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and the marshes of the Great Lakes.

No effective nationwide controls have so far been applied against filling and dredging operations which are continually encroaching on estuaries. Such operations are carried on by many local developers for a number of reasons. Often a marsh is the easiest and cheapest place to deposit the spoil from minor dredging or other earthmoving work. Frequently coastal land values have soared, and estuaries have justifiably been turned into prime residential and industial sites. Many speculators, however, have been buying up relatively cheap marshlands, and needlessly filling them over a period of years. There is anticipation of future bidders, but little expectation of immediate profit.

Left as they are and protected from pollution, estuaries are highly productive of plant and animal life. Many of the commercial and sports fish spend part or all of their lives in these waters. In my State of Florida alone, the value of this fish life to the vacation industry is enormous.

It seems to me that the protection of a reasonable number and distribution of estuaries along our entire coastline is sound planning both from the economic standpoint and the conservation objective of maintaining a variety of nature to promote a balance between man and other living things.

I hope and am confident that the House will enact into law this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The committee substitute amendment is as follows:

H.R. 25

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress finds and declares that many estuaries in the United States are rich in a variety of natural, commercial, and other resources, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and the need to develop these estuaries to further the growth and development of the Nation. In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the estuaries of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public, it is declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the responsibilities of the States in protecting, conserving, and restoring the estuaries in the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, shall conduct directly or by contract a study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries, including without limitation coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, seaward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes. For the purpose of this study, the Secretary shall consider, among other matters, (1) their wildlife and recreational potential, their ecology, their value to the marine, anadromous, and shell fisheries and their esthetic value, (2) their importance to navigation, their value for flood, hurricane and erosion control, their mineral value, and the value of submerged lands underlying the waters of the estuaries, and (3) the value of such areas for more intensive development for economic use as part of urban developments and for commercial and industrial developments. This study and inventory shall be carried out in conjunction with the comprehensive estuarine pollution study authorized by section 5(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and other applicable studies.

(b) The study shall focus attention on whether any land or water area within an estuary and the Great Lakes should be acquired or administered by the Secretary or by a State or local subdivision thereof, or whether such land or water area may be protected adequately through local, State, or Federal laws or other methods without Federal land acquisition or administration.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall, not later than January 30, 1970, submit to the Congress through the President a report of the study conducted pursuant to this section, together with any legislative recommendations, including recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing a nationwide system of estuarine areas, the terms, conditions, and authorities to govern such system, and the designation and acquisition of any specific estuarine areas of national significance which he believes should be acquired by the United States. No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by subsequent Act of Congress. Recommendations made by the Secretary for the acquisition of any estuarine area shall be developed in consultation with the States, municipalities, and other interested Federal agencies. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the interested States, municipalities, and other Federal agencies and river basin commissions may submit within sixty days after having been notified of the proposed recommendations, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal programs in the basin wherein such area is located, (3) in the absence of such a plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial users of the resources of the proposed estuarine area, and (4) a discussion of the major economic, social, and ecological trends occurring in such area.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $750,000 for fiscal year 1969 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970 to carry out the provisions of this section. Such sums shall be available until expended.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, based on studies conducted by the Secretary in cooperation with the New York State Department of Conservation and reported in 1961 and 1965, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with the State of New York or any political subdivision or agency thereof for the permanent management, administration, and development of the estuarine lands and waters which are generally depicted on a boundary map dated September 15, 1965, of the proposed Long Island wetlands area on file in the offices of the Department of the Interior and which are owned or will be acquired by the State of New York or by any political subdivision or agency thereof. Such agreement shall, among other things, provide that the State of New York or the political subdivisions or agencies thereof and the Secretary of the Interior shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such estuarine areas, and such development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements, and such agreement shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. State hunting and fishing laws and regulations shall be applicable to such areas to the extent they are now or hereafter applicable.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, in conducting the study authorized by section 2 of this Act, shall, in consultation with the interested States, also study, with funds authorized by that section, the desirability and feasibility of authorizing the Secretary to enter into agreements such as the one authorized by subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas located in other States as another method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas. The Secretary shall make recommendations thereon in the report authorized by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. In planning for the use or development of water and land resources, all Federal agencies shall give consideration to estuaries and their natural resources, and their importance for commercial and industrial developments, and all project plans and reports affecting such estuaries and resources submitted to the Congress shall contain a discussion by the Secretary of the Interior of such estuaries and such resources and the effects of the project on them and his recommendations thereon. The Secretary of the Interior shall make his recommendations within ninety days after receipt of such plans and reports.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall encourage States and local subdivisions thereof to consider, in their comprehensive planning and proposals for financial assistance under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (50 Stat. 917), as amended (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (64 Stat. 430), as amended (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 197), and the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), the needs and opportunities for protecting and restoring estuaries in accordance with the purposes of this Act. In approving grants made pursuant to said laws for the acquisition of all or part of an estuarine area by a State, the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as he deems desirable to insure the permanent protection of such areas, including a provision that the lands or interests therein shall not be disposed of by sale, lease, donations, or exchange without the prior approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of any Federal agency to carry out any Federal project heretofore or hereafter authorized within an estuary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Strike out line 25 on page 18 and line 1 on page 19 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 20 and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. After the completion of the general study authorized by section 2 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with any State or with a political subdivision or agency thereof (if the agreement with such subdivision or agency is first approved by the Governor of the State involved or by a State agency designated for that purpose) for the permanent management, development, and administration of any area, land, or interests therein within an estuary and adjacent lands which are owned or thereafter acquired by a State or by any political subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That, with the approval of the Governor of the State involved or of a State agency designated for that purpose, the Secretary may also enter into such an agreement for any particular area whenever the segment of the general study applicable to that area is completed subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of this Act. Such agreement shall, among other things, provide that the State or a political subdivision or agency thereof and the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas, and such development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements, and such agreement shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. State hunting and fishing laws and regulations shall be applicable to such areas to the extent they are now or hereafter applicable."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues will recall, we have been discussing for some while the provisions of this amendment, which generally has been explained already. The functions of the amendment are simple. They are to assure that previous to the time that the whole overall study has been completed, the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with any State or with a political subdivision or agency thereof—if the agreement with such subdivision or agency is first approved by the Governor of the State involved or by a State agency designated for that purpose—for the permanent management, development, and administration of any area, land, or interests therein within an estuary and adjacent lands which are owned or thereafter acquired by a State or by any political subdivision thereof.

Provided, that with the approval of the Governor of a State the Secretary may also enter into an agreement for the area, where the general overall study has been completed, which is authorized by other sections of the bill.

Such agreement may provide also that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas, and that the development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements.

But the agreement is subject to action by the Congress in terms of appropriating such funds as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the agreement.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. I make this observation to the subcommittee chairman. I note that we say the improvements may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads and so forth.

I believe the thrust of the New York State Wetlands Acts on this subject is to encourage the preservation of these ecological systems in their native habitat.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The proposed amendment is merely general language usually found in provisions of this kind, which authorizes him to do only that amount of construction absolutely necessary for the successful administration and the preparation of the area. It is not our intention to authorize the Secretary to go into big land development projects or big alterations of these wet lands. It is the intention of the committee that the wetlands remain as wild and in as near a natural state as possible.

Mr. GROVER. I am glad the chairman has made that statement. I know the wet lands with which I am familiar could best be managed left alone. Of course, we must have administration and we must spend money to keep them forever wild. They lend themselves best to the perpetuation of the ecological cycle that way, and the wild life flyways. I refer in great part to the upper east coast and mid-Atlantic areas.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. This is the matter discussed between the gentleman and me, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER]; that it was the intention by this amendment to permit a broader agreement than just, let us say, in one political subdivision; to permit a unitary management of a number of subdivisions.

Mr. GROVER. I can appreciate that. There could be a variety of developments in various parts of the country. I wanted to make the point that the initial philosophy and the thrust was to keep the wetlands and estuary areas forever wild.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are indulging here in a unique legislative procedure.

Bills concerning this subject have been pending for a long time. They have had thorough discussion in the committee.

The bill presented to us today was recommended unanimously by the committee.

If this amendment was such a good amendment, I cannot understand why it was not included in the bill before it reached the floor.

I think through adopting this amendment we would open a great number of serious problems. There is no estimate of cost and there cannot possibly be an estimate of cost included with this amendment. In this bill we do authorize money for a study, because the Interior Department does not have the money now to make this study unless we give them an additional amount. The budget of the Interior Department is tight already. To authorize in any fashion additional spending by the Interior Department without further appropriation by this House or the Congress could definitely impede projects and administration which are already authorized by the Congress.

I do not think we should give precedence over congressional authorizations to very vague unauthorized expenditures which are proposed in this amendment. I know that there will be administrative problems arising among various Federal agencies and departments and between the Federal Government and the States and local political subdivisions. We are not talking here about small unauthorized expenditures, but we are talking about "a permanent"—and note that word permanent—"management, development, and administration of any area, land or interests therein." That covers a heap of spending any way you look at it.

Mr. Chairman, I think that logic demands we reject this amendment and adopt the bill that the committee reported to the floor.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier in the general debate, I had serious doubts about some aspects of the amendment, although not of the intentions of the gentleman from Michigan, whatsoever or his unquestioned knowledge in this very important field. I still have these doubts. I am just reluctant about going along. Perhaps I shall go along, but I want to make it clear that I do question the advisability or the good judgment of striking from the bill which has had committee review and authorization, of striking language that would do away with congressional review of any proposed contractual agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and the States and local political agencies. In most other operations dealing with these same bodies of water we do need congressional authorization and review. I am reassured by section 4 of the bill, and I would like to ask the gentleman if my understanding is correct that in section 4 of the bill other Federal agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Departments of Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Coast Guard, and others would be required to give consideration to these projects? Their views would be sought, would they not?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. In the first place, I would like to remind my good friend from Minnesota that the only thing the Federal Government will be able to do under this amendment is enter into agreements for management with State and local subdivisions of government. Under the language of the amendment, they must consult and coordinate endeavors, first of all, with State and local units of government. Second, they must consult and coordinate very carefully with other Federal units of Government such as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies of that sort. They must also consult with the Department of Agriculture and all of the others to make sure that the administration is done in the best possible way and that the views of all the Federal agencies are considered.

Mr. BLATNIK. That gives me much more reassurance, because the committees will have access to the recommendations of their respective agencies, which in our case would be the Corps of Engineers. Second, may I ask the chairman am I correct that under your amendment any estuary area in which a study has been completed would be immediately eligible for this process of contractual agreement between the local governmental subdivision, with the approval of the Governor, and the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President? Is that right?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct, but only in those wet lands where two things have happened; namely, one, where the study has been completed. There is only one such area in this country and that is the Long Island wet lands which have been referred to previously. However, in the case of the Long Island wet lands, it is the expectation of the subcommittee and the committee that that study will have to be updated, again consulting with the State and local subdivisions. In addition to this, I must say to my good friend from Minnesota that it is the expectation of myself at least that there is only one area in the country where this kind of an agreement will be able to be entered into before the completion of the study, which will be in 2 years. This is in the so-called Long Island wetlands area. There we have a total cost estimated figure for 5 years, of $510,500 or a cost average of about $100,000 a year to manage the area.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, with these assurances there will be, obviously, very few of these areas that will come up for any agreement within the 2-year period of time involved before the full study and comprehensive report and all recommendations are submitted by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, with these assurances and with all of my reservations, it is my opinion that the question with which we are confronted today is the question of improving our safeguards of the jurisdiction of the authorization committees of the Congress and our interest in some of these areas.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I too have doubts about this particular amendment that is being offered, because it is rather broad. In fact, I think we are getting into the field of creating joint park and recreational areas without the specific approval of the Congress, and this should only be after the debate upon the general study authorized by the particular section of the bill involved.

It is my further opinion that we ought to wait until the study is completed.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has done a good job. This study is aimed at the solution of the problem. It is needed, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan for bringing it up to date and to encourage more local participation in recreational areas in the field of our fish and wildlife.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has been a fighter in that field and I wish to commend him for it.

However, it is my opinion that we ought to await this report. It is due in 1970. It is my further opinion that then we can be more specific and that the Congress should maintain control of these specific developments under the terms and the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, all we need is an agreement on the part of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the President of the United States, and the local and State governments as to the specific meaning of national parks and State national estuaries. As I read and construe this legislation, there is no limit thereon. It just says, in effect, "subject to the availability of appropriations" that the Department of the Interior could just go in and operate under its regular procedures of operations, without any designation of whether or not they are creating such an area.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the very able gentleman who has pioneered in this field, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], if he can assure me of the fact as to the intent as contained in this clause of the report which appears, beginning on page 34, to the general effect that there is no intent to give any legality to such law?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the bill here now under consideration does not mention the law to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is the assumption, at least by myself—and I am not authorized to speak for any other than the 16th District of Michigan, that the particular amendment is legal and valid and fair in all respects. Therefore, I have no reason to believe otherwise. However, there are certain aspects of the problem that I have never studied, and I have reference specifically to the statute involved to which reference is made where there is no longer a requirement by reason of the understanding achieved by the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Again, that is not answering my question. It is not the intent to confer by this language to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army any powers that they have not heretofore been authorized by law?

Mr. DINGELL. There is no language in the bill which would authorize the two Departments to enter into memorandums of understanding with regard to that. The gentleman is correct in that particular.

Mr. CASEY. And it is not the express intent of the Congress to confer any additional powers on either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army other than those powers that they have had heretofore?

Mr. DINGELL. Except insofar as they are conferred by the language of the bill. But I will point out to the gentleman, as he has indicated, that there is no conferral by this legislation on the two Departments to enter into agreements.

Mr. CASEY. As the gentleman knows, I did not care for the bill as it was originally introduced, and I believe the gentleman should be commended for taking the steps that he has, and in moving carefully with this study; other than the broad powers that are proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman I believe the gentleman has an excellent bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say further to my good friend that there will be very few areas set aside, and each must be identified specifically before any agreement can be entered into, and in each instance the budgetary authority must be achieved with that agreement.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several other questions of the author of the bill.

In the first place, I would like to know whether the assurances that are contained on page 3 of the report still hold, if this bill is adopted in the amended form that is proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, and that is the assurance that is contained in the last sentence of the second paragraph of the "purpose of the bill" where it says:

> However, no lands could be acquired unless authorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. That is still correct, I will tell my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So that if there is to be any land acquired to which the Federal Government makes a contribution for the land acquisition, an act of Congress would be required in that instance?

Mr. DINGELL. In each instance before the Federal Government acquires an interest in the lands there must be action by the Congress, and that cannot take place until the time that the study has been completed under the requirements of the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do this for the purpose of asking a question of clarification on this point by the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman would not be proposing that the Secretary of the Interior under existing law that now permits States to use money from the land and water conservation fund, can acquire lands owned by the State, and they then turn around and enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the management of those wetlands? This would not permit lands owned by the States to be purchased with Federal moneys by the States, and then be managed more or less according to the criterias and procedural requirements set forth by the Federal Department of the Interior; is that possible?

Mr. DINGELL. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that in the consideration of this legislation the committee did not go into the question of whether States could go into the land and water acquisition funds. This legislation does not, I will say to my friend from Minnesota, in any way change the authority of the States under the land and water conservation fund.

I would assume—and it would be my private expectation—that unless the language of the land and water conservation fund very clearly permits this kind of activity, that the Secretary would not allow something such as that to be done. But he does not generally allow this matching of Federal funds with Federal funds, which is essentially what would take place there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman comment further upon the language in the amendment which has been offered that says that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas?

It is my understanding that the gentleman has the opinion—or has given as his opinion—that this would not in any case exceed 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. No, I have not made that statement. It was my general expectation in the light of earlier language that was included in the bill that the allocation would be generally on the basis of a 50–50 sharing by and between the Federal Government, the States, and local units of government.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. But it was also my expectation that there were certain circumstances where it would be necessary to deviate from that—for example, where you have an area that is notoriously poor and totally incapable of engaging in this kind of management agreement. Then conceivably the figures might necessarily be jiggered to accommodate the peculiar economic circumstances that might exist there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the gentleman talking of a State where the resources are limited or is he talking of a locality?

Mr. DINGELL. There are States and local units of government. Remember, this authorizes an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and either local units of government or the States and conceivably in those instances you could find a local unit of government that simply does not have the means to manage that or to enter into this 50–50 managing program by and between it and the Secretary of the Interior. In that event the language included would permit the Secretary of the Interior to engage in an agreement which might have a different balance and conceivably where it might go as high as to a 90–10 agreement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When the gentleman speaks of "equitable manner" he does not have any real yardstick that he applies—it is a variable proposition.

Mr. DINGELL. It is expected that it will be 50 percent in most instances.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of the words "shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing" and so forth would have upon the development of any State estuarine area which a State might contemplate developing on its own. Knowing now that this law is in existence would not a State consider delaying action in the hope that it could enter into a contract with the Federal agencies involved, because the local people or the State might hope that the Federal Government would pay a portion of the cost of administering this program, whatever it is.

Mr. DINGELL. Conceivably a State could choose to enter into an agreement because it might be desirable, on an economic basis. But you ought to remember that that would only be with regard to lands ownd by the States.

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. In the instance where they are owned by a political subdivision, of course, the judgment would have to be made by the political subdivision and not the State. I do not know the particular circumstances—the question with regard to management differs very greatly in each State and the economic desirability again differs very greatly from State to State.

There are occasionally States which under no circumstances would enter into an agreement.

You want to remember that there are many, many checks and balances in the language of this amendment. The President has to agree. The other Federal agencies have to agree. The Bureau of the Budget has to agree. The Department of the Interior and the local subdivision of the State must enter into a fair and open and arm's-length agreement.

Again, of course, in the instance where it is a local subdivision of the government entering into an agreement, the concurrence of the State must be had before the agreement can be finally consummated.

Mr. KEITH. It would appear to me it could have a beneficial effect in some instances and an adverse effect in others.

The local interest could argue that they should let the Federal Government do this. They would try to get the Federal Government to help and failing that they might get nowhere—might just waste time in hoping and in negotiating. If they do enter into a contract, then they have to wait until the money is appropriated, because it is already authorized under the terms of this act. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. This authorizes an agreement subject to an appropriation. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEITH. It seems to me that all of this is a good argument for tax sharing.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point two letters which will serve to supplement legislative history and also assist in the carrying out of the legislation.

The letters follow:

FEBRUARY 5, 1968.

Hon. STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR STAN: I am hopeful that my bill, H.R. 25, to preserve and protect the wetlands across the United States of America will shortly be passed by both the House and the Senate and enacted into law.

In its present form, the legislation will probably call for a nation-wide study of the estuarine areas and allow partial studies of certain selected areas.

It appears that one of the areas selected for early and partial study will be the area of Long Island. Previously, certain surveys have been made of wetlands on Long Island located in the Towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay. It appears to me and to all the Congressmen involved in the area that any partial study of the Long Island area should be made of all the wetlands in the Long Island area. That is to say, all the wetlands located off the shoreline of the counties of Nassau and Suffolk on both the south and north shores. They are ecologically one unit and such a study will be much more valuable in drawing recommendations and conclusions in preservation of the wetlands for future generations.

I would be most pleased to hear from you regarding this recommendation and, of course, would be most pleased if you were to concur in it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1968.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In response to your telephone request of January 31, I am pleased to furnish you with a copy of the report on Preservation of Hempstead and South Oyster Bay Wetlands of September 1961 and its supplement of June 1965. You will note that the original report was prepared jointly by the New York State Department of Conservation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The supplement was prepared by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in consultation with biologists of the New York State Department of Conservation.

The Hempstead-South Oyster Bay study was an early ground-breaking venture in the conservation field and we visualize a demand for similar endeavors. We shall be pleased to conduct similar studies in other areas of Long Island as appropriate and if agreeable to State and local governments. Such studies, of course, would depend on appropriations for this purpose.

It has been my observation that conservation of our country's estuarine resources cannot be satisfactorily accomplished by Federal, State or local governments working unilaterally. It has always been our policy to cooperate closely with the State and local agencies in this regard, and you may be assured this policy will be continued in our consideration of estuarine problems of Long Island and other parts of the Nation.

Please be assured that our Department would not execute any agreements for administration and development of an estuarine area owned by non-Federal public agencies under the terms of H.R. 25 unless it is concurred in by the State. Actually, we believe an agreement with local political subdivisions should only be exericsed where the State is a party to it.

Your continued interest in estuarine preservation and other matters of concern to conservationists is most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1058, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if there is a clarification or revision in the schedule which was previously announced.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the minority leader calling this matter to the attention of the House, because we would like to reverse the bills that we have scheduled for Tuesday, February 20 and the balance of the week. We shall schedule for action first the bill H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, to come ahead of H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, provided a rule is granted on Monday on H.R. 14743. Otherwise, the program is as announced, unless there are future changes.

The complete revised program is as follows: for the week of February 12, 1968, there is no legislative business; for the week of February 19, 1968, we will have on Monday, the Consent Calendar; two suspensions.

H.R. 14934, reduction of ratio of career substitute employees to regular employees in Postal Field Service; and

H.R. 14935, regulation of mailing of master keys for motor vehicles.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, Private Calendar.

H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation, of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965—open rule, 2 hours of debate; and

S. 989, jury selection and Service Act of 1968, subject to a rule being granted.

George Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Thursday, February 22.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM TODAY TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12; THEN TO FEBRUARY 15; AND THEN TO FEBRUARY 19

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 12; that when it adjourns on that day, that it adjourn to meet on Thursday, February 15; and that when it adjourns on that day that it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 19.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on crime in America focused attention on a number of new proposals, and others left pending at the end of the first session of the Congress, which must be enacted before the 90th Congress adjourns, if we are to do our part to reverse the rising tide of crime across the Nation. Certain measures taken in the first session must be followed up, as the President has reminded the Congress. Last year, both bodies passed legislation to make it a crime to obstruct criminal investigations by forcible interference with a witness, or potential witness, before criminal proceedings have been initiated. That law, Public Law 90–123, will be of material assistance to law-enforcement officers in breaking the barrier of silence that often hampers an organized crime investigation.

Companion legislation which would enable the Government to obtain witnesses for criminal prosecutions by extending witness immunity provisions to four statutes frequently utilized in prosecuting members of the underworld was passed by the Senate and is now pending in the House. I am speaking of legislation which would permit the compulsion of testimony through grants of immunity in cases involving travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises, obstruction of justice, bankruptcy frauds, and bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest. The importance of these statutes to organized crime prosecutions was emphasized in the recent report of FBI Director John Edgar Hoover for the fiscal year 1967. Mr. Hoover reports that under Federal law barring interstate transportation in aid of racketeering, the FBI obtained 97 convictions. These are part of a total of 197 convictions resulting from FBI investigations of violations pertaining to all racketeering activities.

Also, during fiscal year 1967, FBI investigations of bribery and conflict of interest violations resulted in 17 convictions, growing out of investigations into the conduct of government employees in the administration of their public responsibilities.

FBI investigations under the National Bankruptcy Act resulted in 48 convictions. Investigations in bankruptcy cases in recent years have turned up numerous planned bankruptcies engineered by the criminal underworld in violation of the statute. Although these statistics indicate a concerted assault on organized crime activities, clearly prosecutions would be facilitated and convictions of major crime leaders could be obtained by the enactment of immunity legislations which would compel the underlings of the criminal syndicates to testify against the top leaders of the syndicates. I urge the House to enact such legislation without further delay.

PERSONAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has for some time now been engaged in an apparent campaign to carry traditional American guarantees of personal rights and freedoms to their most extreme, illogical, and ridiculous conclusions. The Court forgets that it must also protect the Nation as well as the individual, for without the national structure the rights of the individual would soon perish.

It is basic to national sovereignty, I think, for the Nation to be able to protect itself from actual and potential harm. Yet the Court hands down a decision in the Robel case which would prevent the United States from prohibiting the employment of subversives in defense plants.

This, in my view, is sheer folly, and I am consequently lending my support to efforts in the House to pass a bill amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which would serve to reverse the effects of the Court's Robel decision.

The people of America have long remonstrated with the Court against these hasty and dangerous decisions, but to no avail. It is therefore left to the Congress to take action to redeem the integrity of the U.S. Government and to prevent the obvious damage these decisions threaten to loose upon us.

I am cosponsoring legislation which will authorize the Government to bar from employment in defense facilities individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion. The bill provides for designation of defense plants, investigations into the backgrounds of employees to determine the possibility of subversiveness, and the injunctive process to prevent employers from hiring subversives.

This is apparently an attempt to reverse the Court's ruling in the Robel case, and it is sad that this bill is necessary. But when it becomes evident that the Supreme Court has no taste for the defense of the Nation, we should not allow the same to be charged against the Congress.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress will celebrate its seventh anniversary in 1968. It continues to be one of the most successful of our foreign aid programs. The Latin American nations have responded readily to the idea of self-help which is the cornerstone of our aid program, and their determination to help themselves is evident in their actions and their progress.

The United States contributes to the Alliance by providing capital and technical assistance through a number of organizations, including the Agency for International Development, the Export-Import Bank, the social progress trust funds, and the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Peace Corps, and food for peace—Public Law 480. This assistance supplements, but does not substitute for, the efforts of the people of Latin America to become self-reliant. The will, the leadership, the labor, and most of the money come from the countries themselves.

The Department of State, with contributions from other members of the multilateral Inter-Agency Alliance Information Committee, has recently prepared the yearend review of the Alliance for Progress which reports on this program's activities during 1967. I would like to include a brief summary of this review in the RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues:

U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

AID loan and grant disbursements to Alliance countries for the year ending June 30, 1967, amounted to $563 million, a new high in the annual volume of such assistance.

During calendar year 1967 the authorization rate of development and program loans totaled about $460 million, against $500 million in 1966 and $300 million in 1965.

Summary figures, subject to adjustment, for all U.S. economic aid to Latin America over the past six fiscal years—1962 through 1967—amount to $7,021 million. This includes AID loans and grants, Food for Freedom, the Social Progress Trust Fund, and the Export-Import Bank programs in Latin America. Likewise it takes in contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank, the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Highway.

LATIN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE GAINS IN 1967

1967 closed with an encouraging announcement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture which maintains the Latin American Agricultural Production Index.[*]

The 1967 Index, said the USDA, was UP—substantially UP over 1966 when drought added to the woes of large farmland areas in Latin America. The estimated 1967 gains are over and above Latin America's 2.9 percent annual population growth rate.

LATIN AMERICAN COOPERATIVES FLOURISH

US-AID missions are likewise continuing their assistance in the organization and management of credit unions, cooperative banks, rural electric cooperatives, insurance, farm supply and production and consumer cooperatives. Training activities were also expanded.

More than 200 new credit unions were established in 1967, bringing the total to about 2,400 with a membership of 600,000 in 12 countries and total savings of about $44 million at year-end. During 1967 these credit unions disbursed about $16 million in small loans, to reach a new total of $51 million in interest-bearing loans for farm supplies, education, health and consumer requirements.

More than 30 rural electric cooperatives have been organized in twelve Latin American countries. AID's loan assistance of about $15 million, plus $9.4 million in local contributions have financed rural electric cooperative operations in Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Peru. More than 25 pilot cooperatives now serving more than 40,000 families are in various stages of completion or operation.

---

[*] For comparison purposes, agricultural production in the years 1957–1959 is equivalent to 100 in the Index ratings.

More than 140 Latin Americans have received specialized technical and management training in rural electric cooperative operations.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CREDITS AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

In 1967 the Export-Import Bank authorizations for long and medium-term loans, medium-term guaranties and insurance, and short-term insurance for exports to Alliance countries totaled $849.1 million for the year ending June 30. This 70 percent increase over the previous year was an all-time record besides. Every dollar of this credit assistance was earmarked for goods and services needed to further the Alliance for Progress.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE—THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AT THE GRASSROOTS LEVEL

Private citizens inbued with the "development spirit" fostered by the Alliance for Progress expanded their scope of operations in 1967 to include 34 areas in 14 Latin American countries and 34 States in the United States.

Now about four years old, the Partners program embraces citizens of the Hemisphere who want to take an active part in furthering the goals of the Alliance.

Since its inception the Partners program has generated a flow of more than eight million dollars in material and technical assistance to Latin America from the private sector of the United States. Activities include an exchange of teachers and students through scholarships and in-service training programs; business and industry programs including technical and commercial relationships; projects to promote food production and to strength democratic institutions.

During 1967 five investment conferences sponsored by Partners committees have resulted in joint business ventures. In November a Partners' investment conference in Washington brought together about 50 Brazilian businessmen and 75 prospective U.S. investors.

In 1967 the stateside Partners committees founded the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance with Edward S. Marcus, of Dallas, as president. This association is a clearinghouse for voluntary activities in Latin America; and it provides facilities through which investment opportunities are channeled to prospective investors.

PEACE CORPS EXPANDS IN LATIN AMERICA

The Peace Corps expanded its programs in Latin America during 1967. More than 4,300 Volunteers served in 19 nations, representing about one-third of the world-wide total. This was an increase of 800 over 1966.

ENGINEERING GIVES LATIN AMERICA A NEW FACE

Highway development

Through 1967 AID and its predecessor agencies had made road construction and improvement loans amounting to some $370 million. About $275 million of this sum helped to finance 5,000 miles of road construction. During the year about 500 miles of new Alliance roads principally financed by AID were completed.

Airports

Chile's new international airport at Santiago, now serving 19 airlines, was completed late in 1967. Jet service has been inaugurated with Miami, Florida. Another modern airport under construction at Concepcion, Chile, will be operational in 1968.

Additional facilities are being added to the high-altitude jet airport at El Alto, on the outskirts of La Paz, Bolivia, developed with loan assistance from AID.

Water and sewerage

Improvements and extensions to Panama City's 30-million gallon-per-day water distribution and sewerage systems were completed in 1967. Further extensions will get underway early in 1968.

Extensions and improvements to Lima, Peru's water supply and sewerage systems were almost completed.

School building

Among the AID-assisted school building projects in 1967:

In Panama 30 new primary schools were completed and an additional 53 primary schools are under construction.

A 40-school construction program in Chile was completed in 1967.

El Salvador's primary school construction program, involving 1,600 classrooms for 64,000 children, was also completed.

In Mexico, the University of Guadalajara is developing a new campus.

Under a project loan to Honduras, 20 secondary schools with 358 classrooms will be constructed and equipped.

TRENDS IN HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Congress in 1967 indicated its continuing support of Latin American housing and urban development by approving two substantive measures:

It amended the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, adding "home ownership and decent housing" to the three previous AID priorities—health, education and agriculture—and expressly included slum clearance, urban development and cooperatives among the purposes of capital assistance.

Next it added $50 million to the investment guaranties authorized for Latin American housing, bringing the total Congressional authorization to $500 million. A total of 47 Alliance projects comprising 42,750 dwelling units valued at $224.4 million have been authorized to date under this program. Contracts have been signed for 26 of these projects with 24,050 dwelling units, for a total cost of $144.6 million.

Counting local currency housing and urban development loans, Inter-American Development Bank loans of $275 million (of which $260 million were funded by the U.S.) and the investment guarantee authorization level of $500 million, the U.S. has allocated or committed more than one billion dollars to Latin American housing during the last six years.

GUARANTIES SPUR PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Through the first nine months of 1967 more than $233 million worth of private U.S. investments in Latin American countries was covered under AID's Specific Risk Insurance Program, compared to $123.3 million insured during the entire calendar year of 1966 for Latin America.

During the nine-month period forty U.S. companies received AID guaranties covering 39 projects in 14 Latin American countries. The total value of these guaranties was $515 million, compared to $320 million for all of 1966. Thirteen of the 40 projects involved investments in food or agriculture valued at $64 million; these investments are protected by $140 million worth of AID insurance under the three coverages offered in the political risk insurance program. Other projects included such diverse enterprises as banking, petrochemicals, mining, aluminum fabricating, pharmaceuticals and business machines, to name a few.

Investment surveys

AID's Investment Survey Program encourages U.S. investors to study the feasibility of business projects in less developed countries. During the first nine months of 1967 AID concluded agreements with 28 companies for carrying out pre-investment surveys in Latin American countries.

WAGING WAR ON HUNGER IN LATIN AMERICA

The President delegated responsibility for implementing the War on Hunger to the Agency for International Development. In 1967, AID consolidated all activities in food, health, nutrition, food-from-the-sea, population planning and voluntary relief services in the Office of the War on Hunger. At the same time, AID's Office of Private Resources was charged with the responsibility of enlisting private industry's active participation.

During 1967 more than six million Latin American school children received nutritious meals through U.S. Food for Freedom feeding programs. Another 1.1 million pre-school children and mothers also benefited.

During 1967 four U.S. industrial firms under AID service contracts undertook high-protein food studies in Latin America for the purpose of overcoming the critical protein shortage and developing marketing techniques for protein-rich food supplements.

Other developments:

15 nationwide nutrition surveys were conducted in Latin America by the Office of Informational Research of the U.S. Public Health Service, in collaboration with the Pan American Health Organization and the Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

On another front, AID Administrator William S. Gaud underscored his view that U.S. assistance to family planning and food production programs would share the highest functional planning priority in AID.

AID also announced that assistance would be given to local government population programs only upon the request of central governments and to non-governmental programs only with the prior consent of central governments.

AID has assigned a specialist in each country mission to follow developments in the population field and assist local government programs, on request.

Financing under AID program assistance loans is now available for contraceptives and other necessary devices.

In 1967 commodities valued at more than $110 million were channeled through Food for Freedom programs in Latin America. About 45 percent of this amount supported programs co-sponsored by U.S. voluntary agencies, involving some 12 million recipients.

CONGRESS, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1967, the National Educational Television Network, in association with the Eastern Educational Network, aired a wrap-up of the first session of the 90th Congress. The program was entitled "Congress, 1968" and featured the following distinguished guests: Senators THRUSTON B. MORTON and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and Representatives MELVIN R. LAIRD and HALE BOGGS; Dr. Alfred de Grazia of New York University, and Dr. Robert L. Peabody of Johns Hopkins University, political scientists; Congressional Quarterly Reporters N. Prentice Bowsher, Joseph Foote, William B. Dickinson, Jr., and Neal R. Peirce, together with NET Correspondents Paul Niven and Dick McCutchen.

Discussion centered around four main topics: Vietnam and foreign policy, problems of the American cities, taxes, and congressional ethics and reform.

The transcript of the hour-and-a-half program is understandably somewhat

long, but in view of the expertise of the assembled commentators and the significance of the subject matter to all of us, I would like to place the entire text in the Congressional Record.

Congress, 1968

This broadcast of the National Educational Television Network in association with the Eastern Educational Network was aired at 9:40 P.M. E.S.T. on December 15, 1967. The program was an analysis of the 1st session of the 90th Congress.

PARTICIPANTS

From The Congress: Senator Thruston B. Morton, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Representative Melvin R. Laird, Representative Hale Boggs.

Outside Experts: Dr. Alfred de Grazia, New York University; Dr. Robert L. Peabody, Johns Hopkins University.

NET Correspondents: Paul Niven, and Dick McCutchen.

Congressional Quarterly Reporters: N. Prentice Bowsher, Joseph Foote, William B. Dickinson, Jr., Neal R. Peirce.

Announcer. At 6:36 this evening the House of Representatives adjourned. The Senate followed suit fourteen minutes later. The 1st Session of the 90th Congress had come to an end. For the next 80 minutes, a report on that Congress, as seen by some of its leading members and outside experts.

In color, the National Educational Television Network presents "Congress '68." In the studios of WETA, in Washington, Dick McCutchen.

Mr. McCutchen. Good evening. Tonight we'll take a look at the record of the 90th Congress and analyze that record in the light of the needs of the nation.

To take part in this program we have invited observers and critics of the Congress as well as four of its distinguished members. In Room S–207 of the Capitol, from the Senate, Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, former Chairman of the Republican National Committee and the Republican Campaign Committee; and Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, current Chairman of the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee.

From the House of Representatives, Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, Democratic Whip of the House, and Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin, Chairman of the House Republican Conference.

From the studios of WNDT in New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia, Director of the Center for Applied Research of New York University and Editor of Congress, the First Branch of Government.

Speaking from Washington will be Professor Robert L. Peabody, Associate Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University, and Associate Director of the American Political Science Association Study of Congress.

Here in the studio to provide an account of this congressional session are four staff members of the independent Washington research organization Congressional Quarterly: reporting on Vietnam and foreign policy, Prentice Bowsher; on the cities, Joseph Foote; on taxes, William B. Dickinson, Jr.; on congressional ethics and reform, Neal R. Peirce.

Now an up to the minute report on what happened in Congress today, on the mechanics of that annual last minute rush. For that report we switch to NET Washington Correspondent Paul Niven at the Capitol.

Mr. Niven. Congress more or less shattered precedence today by adjourning about when it expected to, with none of the last minute hassles which often add unexpected hours or even days to a session. It gave final passage to and sent to the White House four major bills: Social Security changes; $9.1 billion for school aid, an authorization; $2.3 billion for foreign aid, a record low; and just under $1.8 billion for the war on poverty, enough for most existing poverty programs but none for new ones.

The legislators also agreed to come back on January 15, giving themselves a rare full month in which to vacation or to mend fences back home.

The House of Representatives let out a whoop of joy when Majority Leader Carl Albert made the final motion. In the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, a Vietnam dove, put in a plug for peace in 1968; and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen put in a plug for his television program tonight, urging his colleagues to rush home and see it.

Oregon Democrat Wayne Morse tut-tutted the Senate for quitting on Friday afternoon so as to get home for the week-end and served notice that he would object next year. But then even Morse had come to the Christmas spirit and said everybody should go away with a prayer on his lips.

Well, all of this at 6:36 in the House and 6:50 in the Senate; fifteen minutes later the place was deserted. Not a Senator in sight, the restaurant closed and thousands of people who have toiled in this building for the last eleven months are now on their way home, some to Georgetown, some to Hawaii, and Alaska.

Mr. McCutchen. Before we list the important bills in the sessions we're going to try to describe the process by which a bill becomes law. Some members of the Congress have said that it takes them as long as five or six years to understand this process fully. We are going to try to do it in a couple of minutes.

Here are the essentials: Action on a bill may in most cases be initiated in either house, but let us suppose our lawmaker is a Senator. First, after sounding out other legislators to test their mood and line up support, the Senator draws up a bill and takes it to the Senate where the legislative metamorphosis begins. The bill is recorded by title, categorized by content and sent to the appropriate committee for a closer look. Here the merits of the measure are debated, hearings held, its possibilities of enactment weighed, changes made, either to improve the bill or to gain votes for it.

Now, returned to the Senate, it is read, debated and amended by members of the entire assembly and voted. If a majority of Senators are against it the bill dies there, but should the majority approve it is declared passed and sent to the House where essentially the same process is repeated. If the House changes the bill before passing it, it then goes to a joint conference committee made up of key committee members from both houses where the differences are resolved. The resulting compromise measure must then be passed again by both houses.

A bill which survives this long and rigorous procedure—and many fall by the wayside—is sent to the President. If he approves he signs it into law; if not, Congress can override his veto and pass it, if two-thirds of its members vote in favor of adoption. So much for the legislative process as such.

Now for the actual legislation which has survived that process in 1967. As of mid-afternoon today, the President has signed 202 bills, most of them, as for any Congress, were of limited significance, some of them indeed important only to one or two individuals. Even among major bills we're going to have to be selective and we've divided the measures we will consider among four board categories: Vietnam, the cities, taxes, and congressional ethics and reform.

In foreign policy the Constitution places primary responsibility in the Executive Branch. The extent of a Congress' role has been the subject of debate throughout 1967, especially among dissident Senators, including Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

But there is no doubt that the Congress does have a role in foreign policy. For one thing, it has the power of the purse. A President could not fight a war without soldiers and weapons, and without congressional authorization and appropriation he could neither pay the men nor buy the arms. The lawmakers have other more subtle ways of influencing foreign policy, too.

This year on the Hill, as at the White House, Vietnam has over-shadowed the whole field of foreign policy, and beyond that has greatly influenced federal policy in the domestic field.

For a review of legislative action on Vietnam and foreign policy, here is Prentice Bowsher.

Mr. Bowsher. Thank you, Dick.

There is no question about it, that the issue of Vietnam was a big issue in Congress this session. But it is important to remember that Congress dealt with Vietnam a lot more through committee hearings and through floor debate than it did through legislation as such.

In terms of legislation there really were two big Vietnam issues, and these were money—$32 billion of it. It came in two appropriations bills, one for $12 billion early in the session and another that included $20 billion for Vietnam, this was the fiscal '68 defense appropriation bill. The total for this bill was something like $70 billion; of that, $20 billion was for Vietnam.

Debate in Congress on Vietnam surrounded these bills, it surrounded other bills. It surrounded new casualty totals, new troop commitments to Vietnam, new bombing targets in Vietnam, and almost any time a Senator or Congressman had a new idea that he wanted to express.

Let's take a look at this legislation. First, the symbols here. We've put an "X" for bills that have cleared the congressional process you saw described. We put a "plus", as you see here, if the administration favored the bill. We put a "minus", as you see here, if the administration opposed the bill. And we put a "zero", as you see here, if the administration took no position on the measure.

All right. The top two, those are the appropriation bills, $20 billion in this one for Vietnam, $12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI's fighting in Vietnam. Poats' appointment, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American aid program in Vietnam. Poats was a foreign aid official, he was up for a new appointment. Congress—the Senate, rather, came within one vote of defeating the nomination. It ultimately was confirmed.

National commitments, this was Fulbright's resolution, just recently reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it's important. It raised broad constitutional questions; didn't get full consideration by the Senate this session; might next session.

U.N. action—everybody liked it. This was Mike Mansfield's resolution. But there is little doubt that the U.N. Security Council really could take much substantive action on the Vietnam war.

The next three, really minor measures; as you can see, they didn't get far.

Foreign aid, Congress cleared it this afternoon. There was an unspecified amount of money in that bill for Vietnam. Draft law revisions, the question here was educational deferment. Negroes, supposedly, according to critics, could not get them; more affluent youngsters, mainly whites, could get them. This was a problem here and, as you can see, Congress did pass it and the administration favored it.

Mr. McCutchen. Prentice, getting back to that first item, this is the third year in a row that the administration sought additional funds for Vietnam. What is the outlook for another request for even more money next year?

Mr. Bowsher. I'd have to say the outlook is pretty good, Dick. President Johnson, in his tax surcharge message back in August, said that Vietnam money requirements had gone up something like $4 billion beyond what had been estimated. So there is the need for the supplemental next year.

In addition, Chairman George Mahon of the House Appropriations Committee has said that it is correct that additional funds will be needed, and that is the man who should know.

Thank you.

Mr. McCutchen. If the subject of Vietnam overshadowed all other foreign policy problems this year, the subject of the cities towered over the domestic field. Even before the summer the Nation was increasingly preoccupied with the problem of the big increasingly ghetto-ized metropolitan centers. Then came Newark, Detroit and other explosions.

The fact of the crisis was clear, but there were different diagnoses and different prescriptions.

Joseph Foote.

Mr. Foote. Yes, Dick, the seriousness of the riots this summer, I think, impressed upon everyone, including a good many Congressmen, just perhaps what was going on in the American cities. And yet no comprehensive scheme for dealing with either the riots, with urban problems, with air pollution, transportation, any of the problems emerged.

The President has several programs, however, and let's discuss a little bit how they fared.

The model cities program was one directed at coordinating efforts to strike at social ills, at the physical blight of urban areas. Now the President asked for $662 million for that; he got $312 million.

The rent supplements was another program of this nature. It was designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only a quarter of his funds on that.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his final bill today with $1.7 billion. The rat control was one of the surprises of the year. The House, on July 20, laughed the bill off the floor, literally; but came back two months later, quietly, to reinstate the $40 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be substantially bigger next year. I don't know what the President will propose. Perhaps we could talk about that in a moment. The President this year did propose a $50 million program to help communities update their law enforcement; the bill went down to defeat, that is, by the Senate.

Let's take a look at the scoreboard for just a moment. Model cities and rent supplements both went through but with the President getting about half a load.

The poverty program did well, $1.7 billion. Rat control has yet to be funded, perhaps next year.

Food stamps, extension of an existing program.

Air pollution, a rather weakened bill went through this year.

Anti-crime didn't amount to anything this year.

Anti-riot was passed by the House. This was the bill that was aimed at people who crossed state lines and tried to incite to riot. It died in the Senate.

Civil rights simply didn't get off the ground this year.

Teacher Corps, one of the President's pets; it was finally funded this year and it will be interesting to see what the results of that program are.

Elementary education, a big bill, cleared late this afternoon, one of the last bills to go out this session.

Truth-in-lending, one of the consumer bills, was not passed this year. Meat inspection was; flammable fabrics was. Consumer bills will probably be big next year.

Finally, last but not least, the Public Broadcasting Act, which we considered a genuine landmark piece of legislation, particularly important to bring non-commercial television to many of the major cities of the country.

Mr. McCutchen. You said that crime was a big issue this year and is going to be substantially bigger next year. What is the outlook for action there?

Mr. Foote. Well, I think that both parties will be pushing this. It is an election year and perhaps not the best year to pass crime legislation in, in an emotional atmosphere, but I think the President is going to go after this in a big way. He is going to try to take that issue away from the Republicans, so both parties will be pushing crime legislation next year. I am quite sure, Dick.

Mr. McCutchen. Thank you.

An expensive array of Great Society programs, plus an expensive war, plus a balance of payments problem gave President Johnson a year-long fiscal headache in 1967. The Congress was not very sympathetic.

William B. Dickinson, Jr.

Mr. Dickinson. Dick, the Constitution says that Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. In the year when its power to shape foreign policy was at low ebb, the Congress seemed to jealously guard its constitutional rights in the fiscal field.

Twice this year a Democratic-controlled Congress turned down a Democratic President in his request for a 10 per cent surtax on personal and croporate income. The reject has come against the best advice of both government and private economists. They say that higher taxes are essential to stem inflation, protect the dollar, hold down interest rates, limit budget deficits, and, last but not least, pay for the war in Vietnam.

If lack of action on taxes brings the economy to a bad end, there will be plenty of blame to spread around. President Johnson himself is faulted. His critics say that he failed to ask for a tax increase early enough in 1967 and then that he failed to push hard enough for its passage. It was not until August 3rd that President Johnson actually sent his special message on taxes to Capitol Hill. Any sense of urgency in the message seemed to be lost on the Congress.

The tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee held a month of hearings and then put the whole business aside. Prospects for action revived in November when Britain devalued the pound sterling. Cabinet officials hurried to Capitol Hill with specific promises of spending cuts and with a second anxious plea for passage of an anti-inflationary tax increase.

Meanwhile, at the White House, President Johnson warned publicly of a budget deficit that might reach $30 billion, even $35 billion. Where he got this figure remains somewhat of a mystery. Under close questioning on Capitol Hill, administration officials conceded that the actual budget deficit for this fiscal year would be no more than $22 billion. That would still be a record deficit since the end of World War II but far below the President's estimate.

Apparently the red ink possibilities don't terrify members of the Congress. Chairman Wilbur Mills clearly spoke for most of them when he turned down the idea of higher taxes in 1967. Today, however, only this afternoon Mr. Mills announced that the House Ways and Means Committee would reconsider the tax bill on January 22. His decision was apparently prompted by the run on the dollar through the gold purchases on the London and Paris gold bullion exchanges.

In other words, the tax debate must be regarded for 1967 as President Johnson's greatest legislative failure of the year. Congress simply didn't fear inflation or big budget deficits as much as it feared the wrath of tax-weary voters back home.

Let's take a quick look at some of the other legislation in the tax field.

This morning the Senate managed to complete action on the Social Security bill. This will provide across-the-board 13 per cent increases for 22 million Americans beginning in March, with the March check on March 3rd. The cost—$3.5 billion. The bill contains controversial new restrictions on welfare payments to families with dependent children, and these will provide fuel for further debate in 1968.

The other thing I might mention is an investment tax credit, actually a tax cut for business; and the debt limit which was raised to a permanent limit of $358 billion.

Mr. McCutchen. Bill, thank you very much.

One subject that looms larger in every session loomed larger than ever this year, the question of congressional ethics. There were several triggers this year in the form of specific irregularities on the part of specific members. But, as usual, there was more talk than action. Both houses pondered codes of ethics but neither House adopted one.

In the related fields of campaign finance and legislative reorganization, the Senate acted but the House did not.

Neal Peirce.

Mr. Peirce. The nationally publicized cases of Thomas Dodd and Adam Clayton Powell this past year forced Congress to delve into a subject that it likes to keep behind closed doors, the ethics of its own members. The House voted last winter to exclude Adam Clayton Powell from the 90th Congress after investigations disclosed that he had misused House funds, House committee funds, falsified travel accounts and had apparently cashed his estranged wife's Congressional paychecks. Powell is still trying to get a court order to regain his seat. As for Thomas Dodd, the Senator from Connecticut, he was censured by his colleagues for using some $16,000 out of proceeds from testimonial dinners which were purportedly for political purposes for his own personal use instead. Congressional ethics got a further airing this year when the Senate Ethics Committee felt obliged to investigate press allegations that Missouri Senator Edward Long had used his position in the Senate to aid James Hoffa, the imprisoned boss of the Teamsters Union and also shared legal fees with one of the lawyers for the Teamsters Union. Long was exonerated of wrong doing by the Senate Ethics Committee in October, but Life Magazine then charged a whitewash and Senator Stennis agreed to reopen the case.

Finally, one might note that early this year Bobby Baker, who had a few years ago been the secretary of the Senate Majority in the Senate was convicted in Federal Court on seven counts of income tax evasion, theft and conspiracy to defraud the Federal Government.

Mr. McCutchen. Well, you certainly would think so, Dick, that is the climate we expect to get out of this but certainly the events of this past year pointed up the lack of any kind of clear guidelines now for Congressmen or members of Congress to give them some idea of what they should and should not do in regard to outside income, gifts, honorary and campaign contributions and the like, but Congress did not seem to be in any kind of a hurry to set guidelines for the future. In the House, for instance, an ethics committee was set up by unanimous vote last spring, but it has very severely restricted powers. It's packed with old timers with pretty much a don't rock the boat philosophy and we don't expect too much out of that group.

In the Senate, Senator Stennis' Ethics Committee promises to have a code of ethics up quite early next year and there is a good possibility according to Senator Stennis that there may be a code of financial disclosure for members of Congress in that measure when it comes to the floor and this could be an important breakthrough because many experts believe that unless there is some kind of across-the-board disclosure of outside income and activity by members of Congress, this ethics problem will always be a very troublesome one. In September, as a matter of fact, there was a vote in the Senate in which disclosure only came four votes short of passage indicating that the idea which used to be rejected out of hand may have a chance in the future. Also in September, the Senate did pass a comprehensive campaign spending reform law, the most far-reaching measure of its kind ever to reach or ever to be approved by one of the chambers of Congress. This bill would tighten up the archaic and loophole ridden provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act to require complete spending reports of all the candidates for President and for Congress. But a similar bill, one even stronger, has been stalled in the House Administration, full House Administration Committee since last summer and we don't see too much hope for its passage, at least no very good hopes right now.

Finally, we should note that the Senate last year passed early in 1967 the Legislative Reorganization Act, the first in 20 years, to tighten up committee procedures and also to tighten up the woefull inadequate lobby registration laws, but that bill got snarled up in the House Rules Committee where it still is.

Mr. McCutchen. Neal, thank you and gentlemen, thank you all for those reports on what Congress did and failed to do in 1967.

Let's switch now to our four guests from the Congress with Paul Niven at the Capitol.

Mr. Niven. Senators Morton and Muskie, Congressmen Boggs and Laird, I would like to ask each of you in turn to give your personal verdicts on the work of the Congress in 1967 in relation, I suppose, to the needs of the Country in 1967.

Senator Muskie, will you begin?

Senator Muskie. Paul, after the rundown we have just heard, I think anything any of us could add would be superfluous. I suppose you want now from us the partisan rhetoric. We did or we didn't. I think that it is fair to say from my point of view that it has been a Congress of solid accomplishment. A lot of things we didn't do, a lot of things we should have done that we didn't do, but I think that the achievements are real and meaningful.

Let's take the last day of the session today. We completed action on the biggest social security bill in the history of the country. We sent the President a poverty bill which at some points in this session looked to be on its deathbed and finally sent him a bill that was a continuation at the present level of spending.

In addition, we finally passed a foreign aid bill considerably reduced from the President's request but nevertheless a continuation, and I think the reduction is simply in the context of reducing congressional support for this program over a period of years. So I think there has been an effort on the part of this Congress to come to grips with the problems but its ability to do so I think has been compromised, some very real political realities.

There is the political reality that in 1966 in the House over 40 additional Republicans were elected. This was a reduction in the strength of the President's party and it made itself felt. And interestingly enough, the impact of this increased Republican representation in the House seems to have been on the conservative side.

On the Senate side there were additions on the Republican side of young senators who seemed to give the Republican side of the aisle a more moderate look than it had had before, and both of these injections of new blood from the Republican side I think are reflected in the voting records in this Congress. The result is that there were two strong pressures in this Congress as I see it, one from the conservative side, the pressure to reduce spending, reduce new programs, including those that the other side regarded as essential from the point of view of the cities and so many domestic problems and then on the more liberal side, the pressure for more effective action in dealing with the problems of the cities and in dealing with racial unrest and so on. And as a result of these two pressures, we got something down the middle between the two.

Mr. Niven. Your colleague, Senator Kennedy of New York, said tonight that the Congress, the Executive nor the Legislative Branch had done what needed to be done this year. That is what he said in effect. I gather you don't agree with that.

Senator Muskie. I expect you get that point of view from the conservative side represented by people like Congressman Laird, too, that we didn't do what we should have done, as well as from the liberal side represented by Senator Kennedy. I think from each of these points of view the Congress didn't do what it should have done, so the result is we did something down the middle that did a little for the city but not what should have been done, that did a little to reduce spending from Congressman Laird's point of view, but not what should have been done, that did a little in the tax field but not what should have been done, and I think this is the product of the strong pressures, each of them I think a little stronger than normal.

Mr. Niven. Senator Morton?

Senator Morton. First, let me say that I am years older than any of my colleagues who are appearing on this program but am junior to my friend, Congressman Boggs, in service in the Congress. This to me has been the most frustrating year from a personal standpoint that I have ever had in the Congress of the United States and I speak not as a partisan Republican. I am a pragmatic politician. I have held extracurricular jobs in my party, but I speak personally.

First, I think that the breakdown of communications between the Administration and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a tragedy.

Mr. Niven. Whom do you blame?

Senator Cooper. I don't know whom to blame, but the breakdown is there. It is specific and it is there. And under our Constitution the Senate has a greater role in the conduct of foreign affairs than does the House. I will admit that our role in the Senate is somewhat negative. It is the veto power. But this disturbs me as a citizen and as a grandparent.

Second, I think that we didn't face up quickly enough to the terrible situation that developed last summer, and I hope it never, develops again, but I am afraid it will in connection with the so-called riots, the civil unrest, and so forth. We must find a way to accomplish law and order.

Now, the President set up a commission of fine people, no question about that. We all know as members of Congress the long-range causes and the long-range solutions to this problem. But we have got to have sort of a fire brigade.

Now, I ask that we take—put in transferability—take 10 percent of that which we have already allocated to the cities so it doesn't have to go through Congress, give the President transferability so that he can set up a fire brigade.

Senator Kennedy came along with a similar idea. Nothing was done about it. Here we are going into another year, another long hot summer, complicated by a presidential election, which may indeed make it even more complicated.

But I say frankly this has been a frustrating session. When I came—when we came here in January and I heard my majority leader, who is one of the greatest guys I have ever known, Mike Mansfield, get up and say, "Now we are going to review these welfare programs objectively, these things that we hurried through the 89th Congress," I had great hope. I thought we were going to do that. And then we end up with a committee, Subcommittee of the Labor Committee, headed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and we whitewashed all of them.

I, for instance, was very much against the Head Start program in its inception. I have changed my mind. I think it is a good program. In most places it is a good program. And I think we ought to examine and analyze all these programs. I think we are encouraging the breakup of the family. We are encouraging people not to go to work. I think we have got to objectively—I don't care whether they are Republicans or Democrats, objectively go to work on these things and I hoped we were going to do it.

So for me this has been a frustrating year.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Boggs, have you found this session as frustrating as Senator Morton has?

Representative Boggs. No. As a matter of fact, my mood is quite different from that of Senator Morton's. I feel very gratified this evening. We have just adjourned Congress. What we have done from my point of view is a miracle, remarkable. We lost 47 Democrats in the House, all of whom were supporting programs such as the ones that Senator Morton said we should do, and we had to operate without those 47, and sometimes it was very difficult.

I listened to these high level men giving these analyses. They didn't even mention the fact that we had to pass the debt ceiling three times and on each occasion we didn't get a single Republican vote. So that we had to get votes for the very basic thing of maintaining the integrity of the government of the United States from some members who had never voted for it before. In all of these programs I think we have done a great deal. I disagree with the remark that you attributed to Senator Kennedy.

I think that if you look at what we have done in education, in the poverty program, in social security, in health, the session will go down as one of the really constructive sessions of Congress. And none of these things come easy. Congress by its very nature is controversial and you only move after you have great controversy. But, if anyone had said just six weeks ago that tonight we would have a viable poverty program, preserved and administered as a separate agency of the government, wherein the poverty people, the poor people are actually participating, they would have said, well, that was impossible. As a matter of fact, one of my dear friends on the Republican side, Congressman Goodell, started the debate on the subject by saying the bill was one dedicated to bosses and boll weevils. By bosses he meant the people who are elected to run our towns and cities, the municipal officials of our country, and by boll weevils it ultimately got down to defining boll weevils as southern members of Congress which some of us didn't exactly appreciate. But in any event, despite all the controversy, and I am not intimating for one moment that we didn't have bipartisan support on many of these programs, but despite all of that, despite the atmosphere that is created by Vietnam, despite the partisan atmosphere that always develops prior to a presidential election, I think anyone who looks at this session objectively will come to the conclusion that it has been a constructive session of Congress.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Boggs, you clearly feel that it was much more constructive than Senator Muskie or Senator Morton do.

Representative Boggs. Let me say this to you. I am one of the fellows who has to get votes. It is my job as the Democratic whip to put these votes together.

Mr. Niven. You see now—excuse me.

Representative Boggs. I think what we have done is quite remarkable really, and I can understand the frustration Senator Morton expressed because there are frustrations all over the country. But I don't see why the frustrations should be attributed to Congress. The frustrations come from Vietnam. They come from the great migrations into our cities, from elsewhere, of poor people. They come from a change in the population pattern in our country and all these problems that we have. I think that Congress has tried to face up to them and with the resources that we have at our command, while we are fighting a war, I think it has responded very adequately.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Laird, do you share Congressman Boggs' verdict?

Representative Laird. No, I don't. I would have to say that this Democratic controlled Congress with its better than two to one majority in the United States Senate, its three to two majority in the House of Representatives, will have to go down as a deficit Congress because it has made possible the highest deficit that this country has ever experienced at any time since World War II. And this deficit is going to have its effect upon the cost of living, the tax of inflation is going to be levied upon all our people. The housewife in the home, the worker in the factory, the farmer in the field is going to feel the effects of deficit financing to the extent that we have embarked upon in this first session of the 90th Congress. We have had no new ideas coming from the Executive Branch of the government. True, the poverty program was reenacted. Twelve new grant in aid programs were asked for by the President.

Grant-in-aid programs using the old model of the 1932's. Instead of moving into a new model of the 1970's and beyond, and the Republicans with our 47 new members still in the Minority made an allout effort to institute tax credits for human investment, for training, tax credits for state and local taxes paid, revenue sharing so that when the war is over in Vietnam, we would have a new approach to these problems of our cities and our states. We in the Republican party believe that we have problem solvers in our cities and in our states and we believe that the creativity of each individual can be brought to its fullest effect by returning the resources to the local communities instead of setting up this project by project grant application basis that was suggested again in this session by President Johnson.

No, I think this Congress will be deficit in many ways. The fact that it didn't institute any new approaches to the problems of our cities, to the problems that our states face, and also because we are going to have this tremendous deficit of from 23 to 25 billion dollars this year and a possible deficit of some 40 billion dollars in fiscal year 1969, the next fiscal year.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Gentlemen. It is clear that we have four rather distinct viewpoints on the work of the first session of the 90th Congress.

Our discussion will be joined at this point by two outside political scientists who will question the four of you from afar. First, speaking from a studio in Washington, Professor Robert Peabody of Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. Peabody. Well, Paul, I guess the first question I would have would be something like this. Congress has just adjourned. We have seen a wrap-up by four experts from Congressional Quarterly; four of the most able and distinguished members of Congress have given us four quite distinct views of what the record of the 90th Congress, 1st Session, was all about.

I had an unusual opportunity to watch the 1st Session of the 89th Congress, 1965, at firsthand. Democrats called that one a great Congress. It certainly passed a large number of very important pieces of legislation. Now the 90th Congress, 1967, has been completed. I guess the question that I am left with is something like this: How do you evaluate the output of a Congress? Is it in terms of the numbers of bills passed? Clearly not. Is it the kind of bill that is passed, what it does for certain kinds of people? Well, that is probably more important. I happen to have heard the Senate minority leader Dirksen and the House minority leader Gerald Ford of Michigan a little earlier this evening, and they were talking about how constructive the 90th Congress, 1st Session, was, only they seemed to disagree with President Johnson in his speech down in Miami last Monday where he said Congress was no good because of the status quo Republican attitude. Dirksen and Ford, on the other hand, seem to be arguing that this Congress was a good, constructive Congress precisely because they had 47 more Republicans in the House and four more Senators than they had before.

So before the program is over, I guess what I would like to know is how do you evaluate the output of a Congress? How do you determine whether it is truly representative of the needs of the American public? And so far I guess I am still up in the air.

Mr. Niven. Thanks, Professor Peabody. We will get to some of those questions in a few minutes. First, however, an analysis from your colleague on this program, speaking from New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia of New York University.

Mr. de Grazia. I guess Professor Peabody and myself are thinking along the same lines. I meant to make several comments about methods of evaluating the work of Congress, not only for this past year but in terms of the past and of the future, because I think when you evaluate Congress, you have to have some kind of historical standard.

This Congress, it seems to me, has been fairly typical. Perhaps the disposition of many of the congressmen because of the Vietnamese war and the situation in the cities has been a little meaner, but the output has not been more or less radical or conservative, I would say, than a typical Congress.

I don't want to comment on the performance of the two parties. I would leave that pretty much up to the experts who are bored already and who have preceded me.

I think that one might find good and bad bills have been passed and I might also mention that a lot of bad legislation has been screened out. Some of it has—some good legislation has gone out as well. The tax proposal probably must be passed. Regrettably, as Congressman Laird has said, there are many reasons for regretting that the country should have come to this point. On the other hand, there is a lot of work that the Congress has done that is not reflected in its bills that we have been scoring here. There has been this every day scrutiny of agencies going on, a half a thousand very active people, experts in their own rights, going about examining the work of the bureaucracy. There has been a lot of financial watchdogging. There have been inspection trips of all kinds. Congressmen have been found all over the world. These so-called junkets are actually for the most part very useful practices and should be encouraged because we want to know and the people in the field around the world want to know that the Congress as well as the Executive Branch and Department of Defense is watching.

Mr. Niven. In this program please stay in place.

Mr. de Grazia. Then the Congress has had a number of most interesting hearings and these, too, add up to a very busy period of time, for the most part highly constructive for which the Congress has to be commended.

If Congress is a little bit like the husband who is not able to bring his wife a fur coat for Christmas time, at least it is also like the husband who has done a good job most of the year.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Dr. de Grazia.

Gentlemen, we are now going to have a free for all discussion. All mikes will be open at all times. Questions will be directed to you as individuals but any of the four may comment on the answers of another. May we have a question first, from Professor Peabody?

Professor Peabody. Do you want to start off with Vietnam, Paul? Would that make sense?

Mr. Niven. Yes, please.

Professor Peabody. Then, I would like to ask Senator Muskie and Morton, given the fact that the President clearly has initiative in the area of foreign policy and rightly so, he is one man, he can act quicker than Congress can to emergencies and crises, do you believe Congress has done a good job, has done all it could do to inform the American public as to the reasons why we are in Vietnam and to clarify or make more sense out of what we are trying to accomplish there?

Senator Muskie. I suspect, speaking for myself, that every member of the Senate feels that he has in his own way done what he can to enlighten his constituents as to the issues involved in Vietnam, but the total effect of 100 Senators with a 100 different views is not likely to be especially enlightening. Really, on a subject such as Vietnam, as the analysis of what the Congress has done in this field earlier in the program indicated, takes place in committee hearings, takes place in floor debate, takes place I suppose in votes on defense appropriations bills, but we can not speak as one voice on Vietnam, and we are usually separated into two groups, the hawks and the doves, and sometimes a third group variously called owls or eagles is introduced. I don't think any of these labels is one sufficiently accurate to encompass more than a handful of Senators. I think there are probably a 100 views on all aspects of the Vietnam policy. Basically, of course, we have to decide whether or not to support the President's policy or not. The basic question which was asked of me was has there been a contribution from the Senate to an understanding by the American people of why we are in Vietnam. My answer is I suspect that each of us has done his best to answer that question, but I am not sure that all of our constituents are satisfied they have had a sufficient answer.

Mr. Niven. I know these labels sometimes are resented but whatever Senator Morton was at the beginning of the year on Vietnam, he is something else now. You have changed your view, haven't you, Senator Morton?

Senator Morton. I have changed my view merely because I think what we are doing and more of the same isn't going to accomplish our mission there. I think that we failed to recognize that we are engaged in two wars. There is the question of aggression. There is our moral obligation. I am not talking about the morality of it. I have never questioned that. I am talking about the reality of it. I think that when we get into South Vietnam with the civil disturbance there we are just opening up Pandora's box. If we are going to try to stop every civil disturbance all over the world, whether we say it is inspired by communists or not, I just think we are going far beyond our means even though we are the most wealthy and the most powerful country in the world. I think we get into a hopeless dilemma and I am afraid we are getting on that wicket in Vietnam and I must say that the constant talk of victory, victory, victory that we hear from the administration and from the military commanders in Vietnam, well, from my own state the 101 Airborne just went over there and they are the greatest outfit in the world, I think, the greatest fighting men in the world, and every Republican, every Republican in the House and Senate has supported the troops in Vietnam and we will continue to do so. Those lads aren't there because of any policy decision. I hope the Democratic Party can achieve that same sort of unity in support of these gallant men, but I must say that I think that it is time for some of us to question the policy which I don't think is going to in any way solve the problem that exists there.

Professor Peabody. Can I break in here, Paul?

Senator Morton. Yes, sir.

Professor Peabody. I just would like to kind of question that last statement about the unity of the Republican Party. It does not seem to me that they are any more unified than the Democrats.

Senator Morton. No, we are not. No. I didn't mean to imply that.

Professor Peabody. Right.

Senator Morton. We are not. I grant you that. We have differences as to Vietnam in our party as indeed do the Democrats. My point was that when it comes to appropriations for those boys who are fighting so well in Vietnam, I have yet to see a Republican who didn't vote for them.

Mr. Niven. Professor de Grazia, do you question——

Professor Peabody. It's a problem, though, that I——

Professor de Grazia. No question about——

Mr. Niven. Excuse me just a moment——

Representative Laird. The Vietnam situation, I think this is one of the areas where the whole question of Congressional oversight can be brought into focus. I don't believe that we in the Congress have done the job of oversight as far as the war is concerned that we should do. I take the question of financing the war. At the present time serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee I know that we are using O&M, operation and maintenance money for the third and fourth quarter. We are borrowing against the third and fourth quarter of fiscal 1968 to finance the second quarter of this fiscal year. We are operating on a deficiency basis in the Department of Defense to finance this war. I think the American people have the right to know what the war is costing. The President continues to talk about $23 billion. Those of us on the Defense Appropriations Committee know the war is costing closer to $30 billion. And I think here is a responsibility that the Congress has under our Constitution to do a better job of oversight, a better job of informing people as to what these costs are. Earlier in the program you talked about the two votes we had on the one supplemental, some $13 billion. There wasn't much anybody could do but vote for that supplemental because the Executive Branch had already obligated the funds.

Mr. de Grazia. Well, don't you think, Congressman Laird and Senator Morton, it is about time for the Congress to draw a line, maybe set a date after which the Congress will take rather decisive action with respect to the Vietnamese war? I mean by that either introduce a kind of resolution that would bring us into a state of hostilities on terms that Congress might define with objectives that the Congress might define.

I think the matter has gone along too far. Perhaps the Republican Party should introduce such legislation.

Representative Boggs. I think the gentleman should be more specific. What does he mean? He wants Congress to take over the war?

Mr. de Grazia. Commander in Chief.

Senator Morton. I don't agree with what he is doing, but I still don't see how the 537 of us up here on Capitol Hill——

Representative Boggs. You really would have pandemonium if you followed that suggestion.

Representative Laird. I am sure that must be what he is talking about, though, must be throwing out the idea that Senator Fulbright and we have several over on both sides of the aisle in the House that introduced a similar resolution so that we will have open debate on this particular question.

I think we have had very few opportunities in the House. I think you have had more opportunities in the Senate, but in the House there is a frustration on part of many Members, and I think some 70 Members now have introduced a resolution along that line. Whether that kind of a debate would be helpful or not I really can't say.

Senator Muskie. I must say I am not under the impression that there has been an insufficiency of debate in the Congress on Vietnam.

Senator Morton. Certainly not in the Senate.

Senator Muskie. Not in the Senate. I don't think in the House. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that each of us has an obligation here and a responsibility here that we don't always respond to. Sure, all of us can raise questions as to how we happened to get there in the first place. All of us can ask questions, and legitimate ones, about whether or not we are hitting the proper targets, all of the targets we ought to be hitting.

It is proper to consider the question of whether or not a cessation of the bombing in the north would expedite or slow down progress towards a settlement of the war, but at some point we have learned the lesson in 180 years that after you ask all the questions, after you debate the alternatives and the options, you exercise a little self-restraint and a little steadfastness to support your policy.

Mr. de Grazia. You mean it is improper for the Congress ever to raise the question about the top command of a war?

Senator Muskie. It seems to me I spent about three minutes saying first that it was proper to do this, so I think your question is hardly proper. I have said it is proper to raise all these questions. It is proper to do it from time to time, but at some point, as we have in previous wars—and this is the point that apparently you refuse to cross—that at some point we ought to exercise not restraint imposed——

Mr. Peabody. Let me make——

Senator Muskie. Don't break in on me yet—not restraint imposed by someone else. Restraint imposed by ourselves in the light of the importance of steadfastness behind our policy.

Mr. Peabody. Sir, let me break in here. I am sorry, I probably picked a controversial subject like Vietnam to open this one with. Let's go to a less controversial one.

Representative Laird. I think Vietnam is a good thing to talk about in connection with this Congress because it is the overriding thing.

Mr. Peabody. But we could stay here with Vietnam for another half-hour.

Representative Laird. But it does affect so many things. It has to do with our whole spending program and everything about this—I can understand why it would be brought up.

Mr. Niven. One more minute from each of you.

Representative Boggs. I think it has to do with opposition in the world as well as our spending policies. Somebody should mention that. But go ahead, Professor. He was about to ask a new question.

Mr. Niven. I think we ought to move on to domestic problems and especially the problems of the cities.

Representative Boggs. What is the question? Go ahead, Professor.

Mr. Peabody. This one is on tax policy. You are a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very important member of that committee.

Representative Boggs. Thank you.

Mr. Peabody. How come it is when the Administration, the President, the House leadership right down the line, wants a tax bill it can't get out of the Ways and Means Committee?

Representative Boggs. Well, I would suggest that you direct that question to Congressman Mills, the chairman of the committee. He would be better able to answer the question than I can. I can only speak for myself and say to you that any time that I am given an opportunity to vote for a tax bill I shall do so because I think that what is happening now is that the burden is being felt unequally. The idea that the American people get off by not having a tax bill, particularly one as modest as this one, is one that doesn't bear inspection.

Congressman Laird talked about inflation and said no inflationary trend is in the economy. And if they continue they could be much more devastating than a 10 percent surcharge. In addition to that——

Mr. Peabody. I wonder——

Representative Boggs. Excuse me. Let me go ahead.

In addition to that, certain sectors of the economy are bearing a tremendous burden. The interest rates have gotten very high, and this means the housing industry, the building and loan associations, the small savings associations and so forth, building suppliers, and so on, are bearing a much greater burden than other sectors of the economy.

So that I think that come January, when we look again, and I think that Congressman Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the war in Vietnam is costing closer to $30 billion than $23 billion, and that we are going to have to have a tax bill. And the idea that we won't have one is something that I reject. I have never made any bones about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congress Mills, and me. All the rest of them have enjoyed that fine luxury of just voting against taxes but every now and then you have to vote for them. We had to vote for them in Korea, we had to vote for them in World War II, and we are going to have to vote for them now.

Representative Laird. Already, I would just like to say I told the President he would get eight of the 15 Democrats to vote for that tax bill.

Representative Boggs. I remember that statement. I applauded you for it.

Representative Laird. But I was sure there would be enough Republicans in the minority that would get——

Representative Boggs. I think that is true.

Representative Laird. The Democratic majority that wouldn't give the votes to report out the President's bill, isn't that correct?

Representative Boggs. Well——

Senator Morton. As a member of the Finance Committee, I can only say when the President comes out and tells us in February it is an $8 billion deficit and in October it is $35 billion, it makes it very difficult to approach this thing objectively.

Now, I agree with my friend, Congressman Boggs. I think that, especially in the light of what has happened to the pound, the secondary reserve currency as we call it, that we are going to have to do something to put confidence back in the dollar and I am afraid that we are not doing it, and I hope we will take action in January, but it is very difficult in view of the apparent switches that are going on by the leader of your party.

Representative Boggs. Let me recall a little history here, Senator. I was on the committee and you were a member of the House back in the beginning of the war in Korea.

Senator Morton. Yes.

Representative Boggs. And we had instituted a tax bill in the House and as you know, under the Constitution the House has that prerogative, and it was a tax reduction bill. We had taken a look at the World War II tax schedule and the House had actually passed a tax reduction bill, both in individual income taxes, corporate taxes, and excise taxes. Between the time that the House passed the bill and the time that the Senate Finance Committee, your committee, acted on it, Korea came, June 1950.

Senator Morton. And that changed the whole picture.

Representative Boggs. Right, and by the time the bill got back to the House it was a tax increase, rather than a tax decrease and it—compared to what is proposed here, it was unbelievable. It upped the rates tremendously. It imposed an excess profits tax. It increased all the excises and also compared to the gross national product, the take, so to speak, the amount of money you take out of the economy, was tremendously more than is proposed in this tax bill.

Mr. Niven. Gentlemen, I would like to pose a question which is really more about the mores that prevail in this building than it is about taxes. Why is it that when the President of the U.S. with 30-odd million votes behind him, wants a tax increase he has to approach more or less as a petitioner a Congressman from Arkansas who is elected by 200,000 people perhaps? What is the source of Congressman Mills' great power? Is it the seniority system? Is it that——

Representative Laird. No one has power in the Congress unless he has votes on the committee backing him up and Congressman Mills had a vast majority of the members of his party supporting him.

Mr. Niven. Does that mean a majority of the members of the House supporting him, do you think?

Representative Laird. I think it developed into a position here quite frankly that the minority party is the Republican Party and it shouldn't be our responsibility to pass the President's tax bill.

Now, all we asked was that a majority of the 15 members on the Ways and Means Committee vote out a tax bill.

Senator Morton. 15 Democrats.

Representative Laird. 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Now, Congressman Mills has his power because he is supported by members of the committee.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Boggs?

Representative Boggs. Well, you know, I am always reluctant to try to delve into the mind of another man, and——

Mr. Niven. Does Congressman Mills represent the mood of the House on taxes?

Representative Boggs. Congressman Mills is one of the ablest members of the Congress. I would say to you that in my judgment that if Congressman Mills in January takes another look and reports—if the committee reports a bill, that the House would pass it. These things don't happen overnight. Do you know it took us two years to pass a tax reduction bill? People were complaining about that. They said my goodness alive. What is wrong with you fellows? And it took us a long time to pass a tax investment credit which was a terrific help to business in our country. These matters don't happen overnight. Your journalists in both electronics and the press generally, you like to keep these controversies going. You like to say, well, Mr. Mills is fighting the President. As far as I am concerned, if there was any fight it is over with now. We are looking to the second session of the Congress.

Representative Laird. Well, Hale, isn't it true, sometimes these political scientists fail to realize the simple mathematics of this thing. It is a question of votes and you are more familiar with that than anybody else, being the Democratic Whip.

Professor Peabody. I would say you are both pretty good vote counters.

Mr. Niven. Professor de Grazia, did you have a question?

Professor de Grazia. I was listening to some lessons in political science. But I did have a question of Congressman Boggs. If he is so concerned about inflationary tendencies I wonder why he was so enthusiastic about raising the debt twice in the last year.

Representative Boggs. Well, certainly enthusiastic is a word that doesn't fit the situation. I face the fact that unless we raise the debt ceiling the credit of the government of the U.S. would be nil and any person who would take a contrary point of view to me is ridiculous. We voted as Democrats eight times, a clear majority of the Democratic Party to raise the debt ceiling under President Eisenhower because we thought it was responsible government. The question of raising the debt ceiling was something that came after the fact. This is a result of what Congress had done previously, not what it was doing that minute, and the notion that you would cut down expenditures by not raising the debt ceiling and not paying off the obligations of the government of the U.S. is just something that I can't buy and I don't believe you do either.

Mr. Niven. Gentlemen, let's turn now to the urban problems on which a great deal of this money has been spent in 1967. Professor Peabody, have you a question?

Professor Peabody. Yes, I do.

The question is something like this, I guess. Is Congress doing all that it could do to solve the problems of the cities? Here I am talking about the—we had an anti-poverty bill passed. Some people liked it. Some people thought it had a lot of problems to it. We have done something about riot controls. We had a lot of fun and some grief and a lot of party maneuvering on the rat bill so-called. What is being done looking ahead now to what could be a very hot and very unfortunate kind of summer next year, particularly since it is just before Presidential election?

Mr. Niven. Professor, Congressman Laird reacted a little violently to your assertions about party maneuvering on the rat bill.

Professor Peabody. All right.

Mr. Niven. Let's direct your questions to him.

Representative Laird. I don't know of any party maneuvering on the rat bill. I know the majority of my party, minority party, which doesn't have the votes in the Congress, were against putting it over in the housing administration and, but we did favor it and I voted for putting in the Public Health Service because we already had an existing program.

Professor Peabody. As I recall, you were in a distinct minority in that position.

Representative Laird. Well, I might have been in the minority but we put together a coalition that became the majority on that issue and it is now in the Public Health Service. The only thing about it is that the President handed out all those pens last week when the bill was signed to everyone but he failed to ask for a single dollar to fund the program. And I think that should be pointed out, that it is nice to make these fancy speeches about the progams and what has been accomplished, but it also takes an appropriation. It takes a request through the Bureau of the Budget and there has been none forthcoming on that issue.

Professor Peabody. I think I would like to say——

Representative Boggs. Just for the record, you know, I greatly admire Congressman Laird. I consider him one of the really attractive members of the House, certainly one of the ablest. But he will admit that on the first go-around that his party was not quite so enthusiastic as particular for that bill. That is an understatment really.

Representative Laird. But they were against setting up a new categorical aid program and it is——

Representative Boggs. Sorry, Mel, I won't——

Representative Laird. When we already had an existing program in the Public Health Service in HEW. We wanted to use——

Representative Boggs. You know, it reminds me of some fellow who said you Republicans are never for anything the first time.

Representative Laird. Well, we are not for the categorical aid approach on any of these programs today.

Mr. de Grazia. Senator Morton—I would like to ask a question of Senator Morton. He did mention that there was no agonizing reappraisal of the poverty program.

Senator Morton. No.

Mr. de Grazia. And I wonder whether the Congress actually has the machinery for making such an appraisal.

Senator Morton. Yes, I think Congress definitely has.

Mr. de Grazia. I would like to hear your opinion.

Senator Morton. I think the speech made by my leader, Senator Mansfield, the leader of the Senate, indicated that last winter when we came back to the 1st Session, beginning of this long session, and frankly I had high hopes—I personally think that our whole welfare programs, all of them, need reexamination. I don't say that we can do the job any cheaper. It may cost us more. But I say we have to instill in people a desire, a will, to create, a will to produce, to instill in them desire to be productive members of society. Many of us had very serious misgivings about the social security bill, the welfare features of it, which we passed only today in the Senate, but we of course had—there was little choice. I mean 24 million people were going to benefit and 800,000 were going to be perhaps hurt, and, as a pragmatic politician I knew what we were up against and this was brought out clearly in the debate, and I hope that we will be able to do something about it.

But frankly I think that we are looking at this thing, we are going at this thing in the wrong way, and I hope that the next Congress, whether they are—next session of this Congress or the next Congress, whether there are more Democrats or Republicans is not so important, but if we get this thing back on the track, I think we will have rendered a great service to the people of this country as members of Congress.

Senator Muskie. I would like to make a comment.

Representative Boggs. I would like to make one, too, when you get through.

Senator Muskie. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to Congressman Laird from time to time and Senator Morton just now making an argument that is all too familiar around here, that the purpose we seek to serve, the particular piece of legislation is worthwhile but this isn't the right way to do it and until we find the right way to do it we are not going to get support.

Mr. de Grazio. Yet they don't come up with the means for finding the right way, is that right, Senator?

Senator Muskie. Well, they offer suggestion from time to time, but then, as Congressman Laird distinctly said tonight, not being in the majority, he disclaims responsibility for getting the votes necessary to get action. Now, I am all for responsible action and I am all for getting the best idea that we can, but when you deal with problems as urgent as the problems of our cities you have got finally to come to grips with the best idea that the majority can agree to and go forward with it.

Now, there are a number of programs that have been developed in the last two years. Congressman Laird asked for new ideas. The Model Cities Program is new, as new as last year. The Rent Supplemental Program is new.

Representative Boggs. The poverty program is a new program.

Senator Muskie. Poverty program is a new program. It isn't exactly as he would tailor it, but I say to him, with all urgency, and I say to the country with all urgency, that these are the programs at hand. And they are addressed at the very critical urban problems with which we must deal, so why not let us try them?

Representative Boggs. Let's go on a little further there, Senator. The Education bill which we passed today, which we finalized today, is secondary and elementary education for all practical purposes is a new program. For the first time we passed this program just a couple of years ago. Today we experimented with it for two years with almost $10 billion authorization. Now, most of this money will be spent in the cities. They talk about urban programs. When you take education, health, poverty and social security, you have an enormous contribution, and housing.

Senator Muskie. And pollution.

Representative Boggs. And pollution—to the problems of the cities—I want to go on one thing, the Social Security thing.

Representative Laird. Then I would like to break in.

Representative Boggs. I served on the committee that wrote the Social Security bill, and I served on the conference that ironed out the differences between the House and Senate and, as a matter of fact, Senator, we did write in a work program, a training program which it was anticipated—under which it is anticipated that 750,000 people now on welfare will be trained for gainful employment within the next two years.

Senator Morton. Mothers of one or two-year-old children.

Professor Peabody. Can I break in here a minute?

Representative Laird. I would like to rebut sometimes these four categorical aid programs that were brought up because we have a better way.

Mr. Niven. Professor Peabody tries to set you up for that.

Professor Peabody. Just wait a minute.

Representative Boggs. Pretty hard when professors and politicians are on the same program.

Professor Peabody. Equal time.

The question I have is this. It seems to me Republicans have come up and now let's say it is hard to say who has come up with the idea, but the notice simply is one of tax sharing.

Now, I think it is fair to say that Walter Heller has a plan, Joe Pechman at Brookings has a plan, but if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Laird is the first Congressman to introduce a bill calling for some form of block grants, and I wondered if you might want to explain that approach as an alternative to some of the programs that the Democrats have been proposing.

Mr. Laird. I appreciate that question very much because that really is the alternative. That is a better way to do things than the way of the categorical aid approach.

Senator Muskie mentioned several of the programs that were first enacted in the 89th Congress, four of them, to be exact. These programs aren't of a massive nature.

Take, for instance, the water pollution, sewer construction aid program, another categorical aid program that was set up. You know, we have $160 million authorized and appropriated in that program. Over in HUD right now there is $5,100,000,000 worth of applications. They are holding up sewer construction all over the United States——

Senator Muskie. May I say that we authorized $6 million and the House would not increase the Senate appropriation.

Mr. Laird. The President's budget——

Senator Muskie. By $23 million. I know, but we gave you a chance to go above it.

Mr. Laird. It is $160 million and the President asked for that. There is $5 billion——

Senator Muskie. $203 million.

Mr. Laird. We gave every penny that the President asked for.

Senator Muskie. Which was $203 million.

Mr. Laird. Every penny——

Senator Muskie. We gave you a chance to go up another twenty-three and you didn't. So why should you complain about the authorization?

Mr. Laird. I am just telling you—the President—take 223——

Senator Muskie. But you have indicated this was a Congressional idea.

Mr. Laird. Right.

Mr. Niven. Gentlemen, this argument could go on all night.

Mr. Laird. $5 billion worth of applications——

Mr. Peabody. A good example of what happens in Congress all the time.

Mr. Laird. The trouble here is——

Mr. Peabody. This is fascinating——

Mr. Laird. That is why we need another approach of a massive nature.

Mr. Niven. I would like to listen to——

Mr. Laird. The problems of our city.

Mr. Niven. We are in our last five minutes and I would like to move along to a last subject which is one that you don't always like but which did get a great deal of attention early in the session especially, and that is the question of Congressional ethics.

Mr. Peabody. Can I start that one out with a quote?

Mr. Niven. Yes, sir.

Mr. Peabody. I will have to rework it a little bit because it is not directly Congressional ethics but it is really Congressional reorganization. It is the problem of the image of Congress. I mean you are all dearly loved in your districts but collectively Congress is kind of a whipping boy. It is, you know, mistreated in the New York Times and the Washington Post and most journalists don't seem to understand. They understand the Senate, Paul Niven particularly, but not too many of them seem to understand what goes on in the House.

Let me just read this quote:

"It is reported an agreement has been entered into by the leaders of the United States House of Representatives to have the votes of the House recorded by an electrical apparatus beginning with the opening of the next session. The device which will probably cost $20,000 to install is intended to simplify and shorten the roll call."

This is John Matthews, the News and Note section of the American Political Science Review, August, 1914.

Mr. Niven. What is your question, is that a good idea?

Mr. Peabody. No. My question is how come you don't—how come you are not dealing with these problems of Congressional ethics? How come you are not introducing electronic data processing techniques? How come you are not coming into the 20th Century more than you are?

Senator Morton would like to tackle that one.

Senator Morton. Well, I would like to comment on that.

I don't see how a computer or a vote machine is going to change ethics.

Now, you are smarter than I am but I don't see how that has anything to do with ethics, frankly.

I think we have got to do something about ethics. I think we ought to do something and I think that we ought to have a code of ethics, but putting in a vote machine doesn't change it. They still steal as many votes in Chittling Switch, Kentucky, with a voting machine as they used to with the ballot box.

Mr. Niven. Senator, aren't there occasions when all of you would have preferred for one good or another political reason to avoid being counted on an issue?

Mr. Boggs. No.

Senator Morton. No, no. We get there but we are in committee meetings, we are all over the Hill, we are downtown seeing somebody, doing something for a constituent, I mean, this thing of putting voting machines in the House.

Mr. de Grazia. I don't think that is very important, really. Certainly not much of an ethical question.

Senator Morton. I think a full disclosure of our income.

Mr. Niven. But you came out for it the first time this year. You changed your position.

Senator Morton. Oh, no. I came out—I published—I put it in the Louisville papers, what I was worth, what I got, what my income was.

Mr. Niven. Didn't you for the first time this year come out for a bill for compulsory disclosure by all?

Senator Morton. No. I came out for that several years ago.

Mr. Niven. Why hasn't it happened?

Mr. Laird. I think it is about to happen. The Ethics Committee of the House has a recommendation that is about ready to come out. We set this committee up this year and I think they are very close to some kind—

Mr. Boggs. I do, too. Again, let me, somebody said, be the devil's advocate. I don't think there is an opposition in the House to a code of ethics. I am sure these gentlemen can speak for the Senate.

Senator Muskie. I am sure it is about to come.

Senator Morton. Well, the thing is, the thing rubs off on all of us. You have got 537 people up here and you get a sour apple in the barrel—

Mr. Boggs. Right.

Senator Morton. And it rubs off on every one of us.

Mr. Boggs. Right.

Senator Morton. And I think the gentleman who asked the question is right. I think we are in ill repute about it and I think the Congress ought to do something about it.

Mr. Laird. And perhaps the Congress should move more rapidly on it. But I think we are about ready in the House. I think the Election Reform bill may get out of the House early in the next session.

Mr. Boggs. I think Mel Laird made a very significant statement. A lot of people—one of the professors mentioned the tedious committee work that goes on. Most of the work necessary to draft a code of ethics and do it properly has already been done and we should be ready to act early in the second session of this Congress.

Mr. Niven. Gentlemen, thank you very much. I think whatever one may think of the results of the first session of the 90th Congress, anyone who has been here at all knows that all of you have worked very hard. It remains only to issue bon voyage as you go home, Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. Thank you so much for joining us.

Now back to Dick McCutchen.

Mr. McCutchen. For the last 80 minutes you have seen a report on the first session of the 90th Congress as seen by some of its leading members and outside experts. That session came to an end shortly before 7 o'clock this evening. The Congress will reconvene in one month on January 15.

Our thanks to, in Washington, Professor Robert Peabody of Johns-Hopkins University. In New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia of New York University.

On Capitol Hill, Senators Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky and Edmund Muskie of Maine. And Congressman Hale Boggs of Louisiana and Melvin Laird of Wisconsin.

Reporting on the legislative record of the Congress from the staff of Congressional Quarterly, Prentice Bowsher on Vietnam, Joseph Foote on Cities, William Dickenson on Taxes, and Neal Peirce on Congressional Ethics.

This is Dick McCutchen for National Educational Television.

FREE-WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAMESE PORTS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in remarks in the RECORD on January 15, 1968, during 1967 there were 78 free-world ships arriving in North Vietnamese ports. Sixty-seven of these ships flew the British flag. Just this morning, I was informed by the Department of Defense that during January 1968 there were 10 free-world flag ships arriving in North Vietnam and that nine of these flew the British flag.

Time and time again, I have pointed out these incredible and intolerable facts only to be advised just as many times by the administration that this trade wasn't a matter of great concern and that the British Government had indicated it could do nothing under its present laws about the movements of these vessels under its registry.

Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to everyone, in view of the enemy's concentration of forces in the Khe Sanh area at this very moment, that the North Vietnamese are fighting an all-out war—they mean business. Any supplies that they need badly enough to pay the freight and to charter free-world vessels must be of significant importance to them. In addition, I am advised that free-world vessels have, in fact, delivered strategic goods to North Vietnam. It matters not at all whether these goods were of Communist or of free-world origin. The point is that free-world ships are being used to help relieve the strains and pressures of other transportation facilities available to the North Vietnamese. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned about the lack of action by the administration in this matter.

Because I believe the presence of the Prime Minister of Great Britain in our country at this time offers an excellent opportunity to discuss this matter with our British friends, I have sent a telegram to the President this morning expressing my hope that he will use the occasion to seek more cooperative action from the Prime Minister with respect to this disturbing situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my telegram to the President, as well as a chart relating to free world shipping to North Vietnam during the month of January 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The telegram and chart referred to follow:

FEBRUARY 8, 1968.

THE PREISDENT, UNITFD STATES OF AMERICA,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

May I express the hope, Mr. President, that during your current discussions with Prime Minister Wilson you may have occasion to remind the Prime Minister that 67 of the 78 free world flag vessels that carried cargoes to North Vietnam this past year were flying the British flag and that you will enlist his earnest support and cooperation in an effort to reduce and eliminate this source of supply that is helping the enemy to continue its aggressive action against the defenders of freedom in South Vietnam. The fact that this trade is increasing rather than decreasing, Mr. President, is most alarming as evidenced by the information just made available to me today by the Department of Defense indicating that 9 of the 10 free world flag ships arriving in North Vietnam this past month were flying the British flag. When related to events recently transpiring in both South Vietnam and Korea it appears to me that the time has come to urge the British with greater force to stop renting their flag in support of Communism.

Most respectfully yours,
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Member of Congress.

FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1968

	Month	No.	Deadweight tonnage
British	January	9	65,650
Cyprus	do	1	3,100
Total		10	68,750

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR MEMORABILIA AT SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House that the uniform worn by my good friend and comrade, the late Michael J. Budinger, in the battle in Manila Bay 70 years ago is now on display at the Smithsonian Institute, as related in the following news article from the Chicago American of June 1, 1967:

MEMORABILIA AT SMITHSONIAN: SPANISH AMERICAN VET HONORED

(By Robert Glass)

Michael J. Budinger, a Spanish-American war hero, wore his medals and uniforms each year at Memorial day parades until his death in 1965 at 89.

Now they will be permanently displayed in the armed forces history collection in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington as the result of a letter his widow wrote.

Mrs. Garoline Budinger, 80, of 2033 Hutchinson st., said she wrote the Smithsonian last month to ask whether they wanted the items.

MUSEUM WANTS ITEMS

She soon received a reply from M. L. Peterson, chairman of the institution's armed forces history department, that read:

"We believe your husband's uniform along with the other memorabilia will make a lasting gift for the Smithsonian Institution. We do not have many uniforms from that period."

COPY OF SHIP'S LOG

Among the items are a copy of the ship's log from the U.S.S. Baltimore, on which Budinger served as a gunner's mate, and a medal forged from a cannon on the ship.

Another medal Budinger received was a Purple Heart for being the most seriously wounded seaman at the Manila bay battle during the war.

He was critically hurt when a shell from Spanish shore batteries struck the Baltimore, blowing up a box of ammunition.

CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ INTRODUCES CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships to the end that the balance-of-payments drain resulting from payments to ships of other countries be substantially reduced—and that the Department of Commerce, the Department of Transportation, and all other Government agencies should take all measures at their disposal to accomplish this objective.

In this, and an identical resolution, I am joined by all other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and 9 other cosponsors.

During the past several years, the United States has been suffering from an unfavorable balance of payments.

Efforts have been made to control this outflow of American capital—yet the unfavorable balance continues to increase—and could seriously affect the stability of the dollar.

Because of this dangerous situation—the President has suggested a number of means—both legislative and voluntary—for diminishing the flow of dollars abroad—and thus materially reverse the present trend.

All Americans should be concerned about our worsening balance-of-payments situation and seek to find ways and means of correcting it.

In this vein, on January 19, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce pointing out that an important factor in the outflow of American dollars since World War II has been the foreign construction of large numbers of merchant ships for the account of U.S. companies and their affiliates operating vessels under foreign flags.

In fact, almost twice as many large oceangoing vessels have been built abroad for U.S., and U.S.-affiliated, interests in the period up to April 1, 1967—at an estimated foreign cost of nearly $6 billion.

The purpose of my letter was to call this fact to the Secretary's attention in connection with his responsibilities for seeking ways of retaining dollars at home.

Just as construction of ships in foreign shipyards for American account cause a drain on our gold position—so does the employment of foreign-flag ships for the transportation of goods and passengers.

Yet, somehow it seems that the extent to which the net foreign trade earning of U.S. ship operators favorably affect our balance of payments is not generally recognized.

But consider this—even though our aging and declining American-flag merchant marine is only carrying about 7 percent of our total foreign waterborne commerce—it nevertheless is currently producing net foreign trade revenues of somewhere around $1 billion per year.

Even in its present condition, the services of American-flag ships are among our largest single category of exports.

Informed persons in the American shipping industry have estimated that, if U.S. ships moved from 34 to 50 percent of its total foreign commerce, there would be no balance-of-payments deficit whatsoever, and nothing else would have to be done to preserve this Nation's gold.

This is a major factor in the determined efforts that I—members of the Merchant Marine Committee—and other Members of Congress—have been making in recent years to attempt to revitalize one of the most vital elements of the American security and economy—the American merchant marine.

The concurrent resolution we are introducing today is intended to emphasize that a nation's shipping services is an export commodity—and thus American patronage of American ships for travel and the transportation of goods can make a significant contribution to the reduction of our balance-of-payments deficit.

The American merchant marine we have today is not capable of carrying enough goods and people to eliminate the balance-of-payments problem singlehanded.

To do that we must rebuild and expand our operating fleet.

But if all who travel or ship will bear in mind the contribution they can make in the national welfare by patronizing ships flying the U.S. flag to the fullest extent possible, I believe major improvements in this serious problem affecting our national economy will be felt immediately.

I hope that early action can be taken on this concurrent resolution and that, when it is reported to the floor, it will have overwhelming support from the Congress.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should cast his vote for this vitally important resolution. Its request to patronize American passenger and cargo vessels makes more sense than taxing Americans on what they spend overseas or putting a 5-percent tax on their ship tickets.

This is a painless way for the administration to help solve its balance-of-payments problems. The American merchant marine already contributes nearly $1 billion a year toward a more favorable payments position. Yet, the foreigners carry all but a fraction of our international commerce. Think of how the $3.5 billion payments deficit would start to dissolve if more U.S. foreign traders used American bottoms. The 7-percent trade carried by all our ships is peanuts. Think of how the payments scale would begin to balance if we tripled or quadrupled that carriage figure. American ships should be carrying at least 50 percent of our import-export trade today to keep in step with the fleets of other nations.

The 100-percent subsidized Russian merchant fleet is being used to preserve its nation's rubles to protect the Soviet's balance of payments. Many foreign countries have favorable balance of payments through a big assist by their merchant marines which carry a sizable percentage of their waterborne commerce and contribute large amounts of foreign exchange to a favorable payments situation.

American passenger and freight ships are among the world's best. What better ship could an American travel on than, say, the SS *United States*, the safest, fastest, and one of the most luxurious liners afloat? To aid our balance-of-payments dilemma, Americans should patronize our passenger ships that visit resort cities around the globe. America has the world's largest container ship operation and a number of its freighters are among the fastest and best constructed. They employ only the most advanced cargo handling techniques. I, therefore, urge the traveling American public and U.S. exporters and importers to significantly increase their utilization of American ships. Their conference rates are generally comparable with ships of foreign nations.

This timely resolution asks that this be done. Let us act on this resolution quickly.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, over a long period of time now, many of us have been greatly concerned about the balance-of-payment deficit and candidly the present status of that most crucial problem gives rise to even more concern day by day.

Only trained expert economists have the knowledge and understanding to analyze this problem in its entirety and make appropriate recommendations.

The questions related to our payments balance and gold supply are probably the most complex economic and budgetary problems that we have before us today.

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, professor of international trade and Prof. Thomas D. Willett, assistant professor of economics, both of Harvard, recently pointed out that current proposals and efforts to solve the international payments problem cannot succeed until the Federal budget deficit is reduced.

Both these distinguished gentlemen, who are experts in their fields, have said, in effect, what some of us have said here, and I quote:

> If the financial house is not put in order by cutting down excessive monetary growth and restoring better balance to the federal budget, devaluation of the dollar will become unavoidable, either open or disguised in a multitude of controls and restrictions on international trade payments.

These experts in their analysis recently released by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research made very pointed comments concerning past and present balance-of-payments control programs.

They expressed the view that, since 1959, U.S. balance of payments were "largely a combination of short emphasis on long-term solutions." These policies were in effect calculated to buy time and fundamental corrections have not been made, they observed.

They believe that "higher taxes could not be avoided now, even if Government expenditures were cut to the maximum extent politically feasible."

They are also of the opinion that it is no longer possible to provide guns and butter at the rate of which expenditures for both have been rising, and that checking inflation is the keystone to any effective balance-of-payments program and it is missing from our present Government program.

The two experts also disapproved restrictions on foreign investment and travel which they view as a step toward full-fledged control.

As these learned gentlemen suggest, the benefits from restricting direct foreign investment can only be temporary, no matter how long the controls are maintained.

Since the investment controls fall unevenly on different nations, the countries hardest hit are bound to retaliate by reducing imports of American products.

The plan divides foreign investment trade into three categories: advanced, less developed and underdeveloped nations.

The experts also evidently believe certain proposed restrictions on travel would not be helpful and in this opinion many people agree. On the whole, the informed statement of these highly trained, knowledgeable economists impressed one with the need for very careful, penetrating scrutiny of the many-sided facets of the international balance-of-payments deficit, our extremely difficult budgetary situation and the impact of higher taxes, as well as the need for checking dangerous inflation.

We should bear in mind, however, that it is also of great moment at this time to make very sure that efforts we make in combating inflation do not result, as they sometimes have in the past, in releasing deflationary forces in the economy.

I hope and urge that our great Ways and Means Committee, as well as the executive department and its experts give these questions profound study, mature deliberation and continuous consideration in the hope that the right answers will be found before long.

PROBLEMS FOR TRAVELERS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of February 6 entitled "Problems for Travelers," the Cleveland Press points out that the paperwork and confusion involved in the administration's travel tax proposals are more likely to deter overseas travel than the taxes themselves.

The Press recommends that instead of firing off paper wads of this type, the administration should tackle the problem head on: by slashing its own spending abroad, by rigidly restricting official travel, and most of all by balancing the Government budget—which is the key to the whole situation. These are excellent suggestions.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading the entire editorial, I ask that it be included as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

PROBLEMS FOR TRAVELERS

President Johnson wants to reduce the "intolerable" drain of U.S. dollars to countries outside the western hemisphere.

To this end, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler proposes to levy a 5% tax on all plane and ship travel outside the U.S.—identical to the present tax on domestic travel. He proposes a tax ranging from 15% to 30% on travel expenses outside the Western Hemisphere and a tax on purchases.

He proposes to reduce the duty-free limit on foreign purchases from $100 to $10 and to cut the duty exemption on gifts sent home from $10 to $1.

All this begins to get mighty complex, and the paperwork and confusion involved in these proposals are more likely to deter overseas travel than the taxes themselves.

For instance, a tourist to Europe would pay no tax on the first $7 a day he spends, he would pay a 15% tax on the next $8 a day he spends and a 30% tax on all over $15 a day.

Moreover, the expenditures tax, so-called, is enormously complicated by exemptions, ifs and ands and buts. For instance, businessmen, students, teachers or professors on sabbaticals would be exempt if they stay abroad more than 120 days and are engaged full-time in business, studies or research.

All this stamps the proposal as unworkable—even with any army of agents to enforce it, an army which surely would eat up the yield of the taxes. And if it isn't enforceable, it hardly can be expected to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by any worthwhile amount. No such problem ever was licked with red tape.

Instead of firing off paper wads of this type, the Administration ought to be tackling the problem head on: by slashing its own spending abroad, by rigidly restricting official travel—and most of all by balancing the government budget, which is the key to the whole situation.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his February 7, 1968 message to the Congress, "To Insure the Public Safety," presented a program to make conditions of life for our law-abiding citizens safer. In calling for action against crime and criminals in our society the President stated:

> Speeches and strong words and good intentions will not solve our Nation's crime problem. . . . Only action will be effective to control crime in the cities and states of our country: action at the local level, action at the state level and action by the Congress of the United States.

We in the Congress must heed this call and the cry of our citizens to action in the national interest by enacting an effective anticrime program. I wish to express my past and continued support in urging the swift enactment of a number of the President's proposals which I have sponsored such as a Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, a State Firearms Control Assistance Act, and a bill to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons.

I am sure we all agree that crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by State and local governments. However, lawlessness is a national phenomenon and national assistance is needed to support and encourage greater effort by State and local governments to find new answers to the threats presented. Therefore, early in the first session of the 90th Congress I introduced a safe streets and crime control bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, encourage coordinated law enforement and criminal justice at all levels of government, and on August 8, 1967, the House passed the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, an amended version. As of today, no action has been taken in the other body.

The need for strong Federal controls over interstate sales of firearms has been established. Records of deaths from illegally possessed firearms, many purchased by mail order, are almost daily news. Local laws, although useful, have proved ineffective. The President's crime program includes enactment of Federal gun control legislation.

During the first session of the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 11616, "to provide for the control of the interstate traffic in firearms," to be cited as the State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967, which if enacted would place controls on the business of buying, selling, and transporting handguns and other firearms in interstate and foreign commerce. The legislation would require gun dealers to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Treasury and to conduct their firearms business in a prescribed manner. H.R. 11616 would: Stop the interstate mail-order sale of firearms; limit sales of all weapons, except for rifles and shotguns, to persons living in the State where the sale is made; and establish a national minimum age for the legal purchase of weapons. The bill would not curtail or interfere with the right of the individual to acquire or possess handguns, rifles, or shotguns for the purposes of sport, hunting, or self-defense. It would not require individuals to register or to acquire a permit for their handguns, rifles, or shotguns; nor would it prohibit sportsmen from carrying their shotguns and rifles across State lines. However, such legislation would make it more difficult for criminals to obtain guns and to commit crimes of violence.

No final action has been taken in either body on this important legislation. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before how many more cracks of rifles, shotguns and even automatic weapons in the wrong hands, leading to death in our Nation's streets, must we witness before the Congress acts?

Mr. Speaker, in this same message the President placed special emphasis on the increasing problem of the availability and the use of narcotics and drugs, when he stated that—

> In no area of law enforcement is there a greater need for a concentrated drive than in dealing with the growing problem of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

I believe that there is a widespread, growing national concern about the use of LSD—Lysergic Acid Diethylamide—and other hallucinogenic drugs. I intend to focus special attention on this entire problem during the months ahead. However, last session in line with my concern and the growing cases of human tragedies reported where LSD has been used, I introduced H.R. 14299, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons. Current Federal law does not make it illegal for individuals to possess LSD for their personal consumption. Therefore, by enactment of this legislation it will clearly establish that the illegal presence of LSD and other dangerous hallucinogenic drugs is firmly condemned when used for non-medical purposes. I urge speedy action on this measure.

I wish to commend the President for all his recommendations in the field of public safety and I intend to review with great care his numerous additional recommendations in this field.

GREEN AMENDMENTS TO THE POVERTY ACT

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have an article that appeared in the February 5, 1968, issue of the Washington Evening Star, an account by Mr. Robert Walters, Star staff writer, about the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity to draft guidelines to put into effect the so-called Green amendments to the recent new authorization of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This article suggests that the Green amendments to the authorization were designed to appease southerners and that the motive of the southerners seeking to amend the bill through the Green amendment was to provide a basis to block the implementation of the community action program and assistance being provided to our impoverished citizens.

This is just not true. I was one of several southerners working to have the bill drafted and presented to the House in a fashion that would make it stronger and provide greater assurance that the assistance intended by Congress would go to the needed areas and have the local supervision that would give more hope for the desired results.

The charge is made that the southerners wanted the bill put under the control of courthouse politicians, so that the Federal effort would be negated. This is an affront to the intelligence of all of us who sought to work up a better bill and, moreover, is an insult to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon who, after long study of the proposal to place elected public officials on these boards, decided as we did that this was a good move. If she had not felt this way, I am absolutely certain that she would have refused to have supported the amendment and, in my judgment, would refuse to support any amendment that was not designed to strengthen the bill.

Our elected public officials are concerned about the conditions in their cities and counties. They know as well as and better than most other people the problems that pertain to their respective cities and counties. They are honorable people; they are compassionate people; and they welcome the opportunity to have the legal weapons available to them to meet some of the problems confronting them in their official capacities.

Let us stop this business of always doubting the motive of one who comes from a particular section of the country. It is time we recognize that the ills we are seeking to treat with the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act afflict all sections of America and that it is the responsibility of all Americans from every section to join hands and do what can be done to eliminate the causes of these troubles.

CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS' OUTSTANDING NEWSLETTER ON THE URBAN CRISIS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter put out by our distinguished colleague from Washington [LLOYD MEEDS] came to my attention just this morning. I believe this newsletter eloquently addresses itself to much of the concern about the long, hot summer that may be impending. I believe that this Member of Congress, who represents a district that has few or no Negro constituents, has made one of the best statements that I have read, not one containing all of the solutions, but yet one that admirably demonstrates concern that this problem should be aired in his district.

The gentleman has done a splendid job. The newsletter concisely outlines some of the important facts about life in urban America that must be understood by all Americans. In order that all Members of the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may have the opportunity of reading this excellent newsletter which is so pertinent at a time of urban crisis.

The newsletter follows:

ISSUE: RIOTS

How will you react to the riots next summer?

The Los Angeles police are experimenting with a twenty-ton armored personnel carrier. With room for twenty fully equipped men, it boasts 30 calibre machine gun, tear gas launchers, chemical fire extinguishers and a siren so loud its wail can stun rioters.

Force is one answer to controlling riots. Unfortunately, for some people it is the complete answer. I can't agree.

I would like to discuss, frankly, some of my thoughts about this tough and controversial problem of riots and their causes. I hope you will think about it, too, and let me know your views in "Exchange."

Cities all across the land are "gearing up". Special riot training is being given to the police. New mob control techniques are being developed. New devices are being marketed to help police quiet crowds, quell violence and prevent fire and death.

Police forces are also making a greater effort than ever before to improve strained police-community relations in the slum areas. Citizens' committees are striving hard to create more recreational areas and summer employment for young people.

All of these things are essential if we are to stop riots. And stop them we must. There is no excuse in this democratic nation for violence and lawlessness. Nothing can be accomplished with anarchy. "Black power" demagogues and "white power" rabble-rousers can only inflame passions at the expense of cool-headed and creative action. Genuine social injustices will not be corrected by the raging of a mindless mob. Where violence occurs, it must put down justly, but quickly.

But it is not enough just to make a pledge to law and order. We cannot turn away to other matters and pretend to have achieved peace and stability. The techniques discussed so far deal only with ways to control riots.

We also need effective ways to prevent riots. The best way to do that is to first know what causes people to storm through streets—burning, looting and killing.

A man with a good job, a promising future and a livable home does not riot. He shares the "American Dream." He knows, just as you and I do, that with hard work, drive, and a little luck he can attain any kind of life he wants for himself and his family.

The people who surged into the streets of the ghettos in cities across the United States last summer do not share that "American Dream". They do not believe that hard work and the desire to succeed will really get them anywhere. We must recognize that basic truth if we are ever to understand the bitter disillusionment that stalks the slums of our great cities.

Why is the "American Dream" a farce to so many of the poor?

Newsweek recently suggested that "the cold fact is that the Negro in America is not really in America." These people who are virtually imprisoned in the slums share neither our prosperity nor our self-confidence.

Elliot Liebow says in his book, Tally's Corner, that:

> The bus boy or dishwasher who works hard becomes, simply, a hard working bus boy or dishwasher. Neither hard work nor perseverance can conceivably carry the janitor to a sit down job in the office building he cleans up. The man does not have a reasonable expectation that, however bad it is, his job will lead to better things.

Raised in poverty, few of the Negro poor can break free of its shackles. Good men who are willing to work and who want to escape destitution are defeated and slowly broken down by the persistent cruelties of this "other America".

"Motivation". "Drive". "Initiative".

These are important and meaningful words for you and me. They tend only to mock the poor. Inferior education (and too little of that), fatherless homes and the rotting environment of the slums bring a boy through his formative years to adulthood without skills, without the ability to hold a good job, and without any hope of succeeding in our increasingly technical society. What can motivation, drive and initiative mean to him? His is hardly the kind of situation that would motivate you or me.

One vital difference, then, is that we have hope of success, and he does not.

Another difference is that we are accepted by our fellow men for what we are, as individuals. Other people don't prejudge us by the color of our skin before we have a chance to demonstrate our abilities.

That isn't true for our fellow American citizens who are Negro.

So the poverty-stricken Negro has two strikes against him when he comes up to bat. It shouldn't be surprising that he rarely gets to first base.

We must understand these basic difference if we are ever to find an effective way to get the jobless poor off the seats of their pants and into productive roles in society.

What, then, should we do?

Broadly speaking, we should assure truly equal opportunity for the Negro.

Despite the fact that this country has pledged equal educational opportunity for everyone, it is a hollow promise to most Negroes in the core cities. Until last summer, the school board of Washington, D.C. spent $100 more per pupil in predominately white schools than in predominately Negro schools. This example reflects a national pattern which results in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

John Conyers, a Negro Congressman from Detroit, told me, "You attend a graduation ceremony and you know damn well that some of those kids couldn't read the face of their diploma if their lives depended on it."

Inequality of opportunity hits the Negro child early and dogs him for a lifetime. His very home is a reminder of this inequality. Over 30% of the Negro families in this country live in substandard housing . . . sweaty, rat-infested, dilapidated tenements. Landlords frequently refuse to meet even minimal building and sanitation standards and evict any tenant who dares to complain.

Whose responsibility is it to see that these conditions are improved?

I believe that the burden rests on the poor and affluent alike. If God helps those who help themselves, then we should do no less. The people of the ghettos must be willing to try again . . . to seize the new opportunities . . . to help themselves. For our part, we must assure genuine equality of opportunity, particularly in jobs, housing and education.

Now, how do we go about it?

JOBS

The number one priority is jobs. A Community of breadwinners earning decent wages is not a community likely to explode. For the poor, a good job can be the cornerstone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those people with some marketable skills, jobs must be found.

For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow and some new approaches developed and implemented.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training too. It needs to be enlarged.

On-the-job-training.—This is one of the most successful of all the manpower programs I have studied as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. With participation by private business and industry, people are trained for a job while actually working at it. This training generally leads to positions that offer salary increases and promotions.

Vast expansion of this program is necessary, and private enterprise must be encouraged to participate in a massive way. Tax credits and other incentives may be necessary to stimulate greater business involvement.

Eliminate racial barriers.—If a man can't work because of his race, regardless of how well qualified he may be, all the rest I have discussed is pointless. Employers and unions are increasingly dropping racial barriers, but there are still problems with some whose words are not matched by deeds.

HOUSING

The core cities and ghettos of this nation are clogged with smoke, soot, garbage and raw sewage. They are perfect breeding grounds for rats, riots and crime. Cold in winter, hot in summer and unbearable year 'round, the crowded tenements are shameful reminders of the "other America".

Massive rebuilding programs must be undertaken to replace, repair or rehabilitate great rotting sections of our cities.

Model cities.—Offers federal financial assistance to city governments for planning and implementing local programs to improve housing, parks, shopping centers, community facilities, schools, transportation—all aspects of community life in the central city. It needs more adequate funding.

Rent supplements.—Make it possible for private enterprise to provide housing for low-income families whose earnings are enough to make them ineligible for public housing. This gets around an old problem whereby people are penalized for working because their income may be high enough to force their eviction from public housing but too low for them to rent adequate private housing. This new approach offers a stepping stone from dependence to independence and should be amplified.

A home ownership program.—That would make eventual home ownership available to the poor is needed. Just pride of ownership alone could do much to prevent slums from recurring.

Urban renewal.—In cities must be rechanneled to help solve tenement area problems. Too often it has been used to replace low-rent slums with high-rent apartments, leaving low-income families no choice but to move on to other slums.

Involving the poor in renovation projects.—Should be carried out, because such an approach meets a cross-section of ghetto problems. It could provide productive employment while renovating slums. With ghetto residents actually participating in the planning and building; community pride, dignity and a sense of accomplishment could be developed. This in turn would help insure continued community interest in maintaining clean, livable, pleasant neighborhoods.

EDUCATION

Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who will need the Job Corps, Manpower Training or some other remedial program. He is one person less who will occupy the welfare rolls. It's really a matter of educating these children properly the first time, so we don't have to go back and patch them up later.

Because ignorance is so much a part of the problem of the very poor, quality education is a vital part of the solution.

Quality schools.—First we have to assure that schools in the poor sections of cities have truly adequate buildings, good faculties, enough materials—in short, they must be as good as what we expect for our own children.

Compensatory education.—Special programs such as Head Start, remedial work, guidance and counseling must be especially tailored to the specific needs of the children they serve. Much greater emphasis needs to be placed on this.

Teacher Corps.—A promising program that puts dedicated teaching teams into ghetto schools to supplement both faculty and program, has been badly mauled by Congress. But it needs to be augmented and fully funded.

Vocational education.—Today millions of young people drop out of school because they are not primarily interested in academic studies. Vocational education should be more readily available as a supplement for those who wish to develop their potential in this direction.

I will soon introduce in Congress legislation that completely revamps and strengthens the federal contribution to our state and local vocational education programs. I foresee an intensive approach to develop the whole man and to tailor training and skills to local job market needs.

These remedies and others that may be required will not be cheap or easy. They will require a minimum of 4 billion dollars the first year, and more in subsequent years until the blight of our cities and the despair of ghetto life are eliminated.

Can we afford it?

First of all, it is wrong to assume that if we don't spend the money to correct the situation, it will cost us nothing. Riots, welfare, crime and urban rot all cost billions too.

Secondly, did you know that as a nation we spend nearly $4 billion each year on cosmetics? We spend $17½ billion each year on tobacco and liquor. Certainly, then, we can afford to invest a fraction of that amount to make America a better place to live for all our citizens.

One other point, and probably the most important: We often hear people say, "The Negro must prove himself. He must be willing to assume his place in our society with all its responsibilities. The Negro must pull himself up by his bootstraps."

I don't disagree with that, but have to point out that he can't pull himself up by his own bootstraps if our society insists that he remain barefoot. He can't prove himself if he doesn't have the means. He can't gain self respect if, as a society, we remind him in a thousand humiliating ways each day that we don't think he is quite as good as the rest of us.

This adds up to a chilling and shameful fact: We talk a good game about "brotherhood of man" and each individual's "equality before the law and in the sight of God." But too often, it is just talk.

Assuring equality of opportunity in jobs, in housing and in education is just the first step of a longer journey. Our goal is the decent treatment of every American citizen as a person, as an individual possessing strengths and talents that can enrich our society. That goal cannot be achieved until—when you and I say "equal", we really mean it.

What do you think?

THE FAILING JUDICIAL IMAGE AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEDZI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was more than 2 years ago that I first called to the attention of the House the shocking story of a bitter feud among three Federal judges in Oklahoma City, Okla.

Shortly thereafter, I introduced a resolution in the House calling for a special investigation of the situation. No action was taken on the resolution for the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, appointed a special subcommittee for the ostensible purpose of making such an investigation.

For the benefit of new Members and to refresh the memories of older Members, I pointed out that there was then and had been for nearly 4 years—ignored and gathering dust in the files of the U.S. Supreme Court—an official transcript of the allegations in this sordid case.

The transcript is the verbatim statement of Federal Judge Stephen S. Chandler in which he accused Federal Judges Alfred P. Murrah and Luther Bohanon of persecution and worse.

Chandler's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 25, 1962, after Chandler had been disqualified by the Judicial Council from presiding in a bankruptcy proceeding.

Chandler asserts in his testimony that Federal Judge Murrah, now the chief judge of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, sometimes cursed him and once tried to get him to alter his estimate of property values; that his telephone was tapped and he was afraid of being poisoned.

He accused Federal Judge Bohanon of spying on him, circulating rumors about him, and soliciting a bribe. Chandler said that in 1942, Bohanon, then an attorney, offered to get him—Chandler—appointed as a Federal judge for $25.000. It was on January 30, 1962, said Judge Chandler, that Bohanon's attitude toward him changed from warm friendship to bitter hatred.

In the case in which he fixed the value of certain property, Judge Chandler testified that Judge Murrah called him into his chambers and said:

> Now you have got to change that . . . You are going to delay our building here.

Chandler said he replied that his appraisal was correct, and he refused to change it whereupon, said Chandler:

> He (Murrah) jumped up and said "You (so-and-so) yellow son of a (so-and-so). I have worked for seven years on this building and here you do that and we don't get it."

Chandler testified that on another occasion Murrah asked him to set aside an order in a jury case. He refused, and Murrah then said, according to Chandler:

> Well every other judge of the circuit does what I tell them to. I don't know what the —— is wrong with you that you won't.

It was the judges of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting as the Judicial Council, that disqualified Chandler from further jurisdiction in the bankruptcy case, and on December 13, 1965, stripped him of all judicial power and authority, leaving him only his title and $30,000 a year salary.

For all practical purposes this amounted to impeachment—an action which, under the Constitution of the United States, is vested in Congress.

Subsequently, in February 1966, because of protests both in and out of Congress, the same Judicial Council screened and restored to Judge Chandler some 160 of the cases previously taken from him. This simply emphasized and compounded the deliberate and ruthless assumption of power implicit in the original action.

In the meantime, Judge Chandler filed an action in the U.S. Supreme Court challenging the authority of the Judicial Council to strip him of his power and authority.

Through the remaining months of 1966 that followed the establishments of the special three-man investigating subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JACK BROOKS] no decisive action was forthcoming.

Then in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 113, part 1, page 49, Mr. BROOKS inserted what I presume to be something in the nature of a report on the case involving Federal Judges Chandler, Murrah, and Bohanon. In these remarks, Mr. BROOKS said, and I quote him in part:

> The problems before the subcommittee were brought to the floor of Congress as a result of an action filed with the U.S. Supreme Court, Chandler v. Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit of the United States, miscellaneous No. 34, and certain charges made during a hearing before the 10th Circuit Judicial Council.
>
> The two main problems before the subcommittee can be stated generally as follows:
>
> First. Whether the 10th Circuit Judicial Council has been granted legal authority to strip a Federal district court judge of his judicial powers, or whether that power was usurped by the said judicial council; and
>
> Second. Whether any of the said judges have so conducted himself that he has committed an impeachable offense.
>
> The seriousness of these issues requires that they be treated with the strictest solemnity.

No one can criticize the objective of the subcommittee, but Mr. BROOKS went on to say that "The core of the issue is still pending before the U.S. Supreme Court in the Chandler against Judicial Council case."

He said:

> The subcommittee hesitates to publicly act on this issue until the Supreme Court has reached a decision in said case.

Apparently to buttress the case for procrastination by deferring to the Supreme Court, Mr. BROOKS quotes the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, as follows:

> Until the Supreme Court acts (on Chandler v. Judicial Council) I do not think it would be meet or proper for the Committee on the Judiciary to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1967, after reading Mr. BROOKS' remarks of January 10, 1967, and for the first time fully realizing the stranglehold the U.S. Supreme Court had on the Judiciary Committee and its subcommittee structure, I wrote the following letter:

> The CHIEF JUSTICE,
> *The Supreme Court,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: The Honorable Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, informs me that there is pending before the United States Supreme Court the case of Chandler versus Judicial Council.
>
> Please provide me with answers to the following questions:
>
> 1. When was the case of Chandler versus Judicial Council filed with the Supreme Court?
>
> 2. When is it anticipated the Supreme Court will make a determination in this case?
>
> An early reply to this inquiry will be appreciated.
>
> Sincerely,

More than a month later, on February 23, 1967, and from the marble temple some four blocks away, came an "early reply" consisting of two paragraphs. It reads as follows:

> Hon. H. R. GROSS,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: Sometime ago you wrote me concerning the case of *Chandler* v. *Judicial Council of the Tenth Circuit*, and asked certain questions concerning it.
>
> This case was filed in the Supreme Court on January 6, 1966, but since that time the posture of the case and the issues involved have changed materially. It is, therefore, not possible for me to advise you when a determination of it will be made, but you may be sure that it will receive appropriate consideration by the Court.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> EARL WARREN.

How wonderfully enchanting and responsive are such phrases as "the posture of the case," and "it will receive appropriate consideration by the Court."

Bear in mind that for 2 long and weary years a Federal Judge has sought to ascertain the legality of an action by which his authority was trampled underfoot and he was personally demeaned. It makes no difference whether it is a Judge Chandler, a Judge Smith, or a Judge Jones—there is here involved the integrity of the entire Federal court system and those who occupy its benches.

The Supreme Court ought to have expedited its decision instead of procrastinating and perhaps if the Chief Justice would stop gallivanting around the world, in season and out, and at taxpayer expense, he would find time to conduct the business of the Court.

Bear in mind, too, that in this case there are grave allegations of misconduct and corruption involving a multiplicity of Federal judges—allegations that certainly shake the trust and respect of citizens in the courts and justice in this land.

Is there a studied, deliberate, and diabolical hope that this case will wear itself out and quietly pass into the limbo of things forgotten?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said on the floor of this House on February 21, 1966—I have never met any of the principals involved in this situation. I have no personal knowledge of the character or qualifications of these jurists.

I do know that when a Federal district judge sits before a tribunal of four Federal circuit judges and makes the charges which I have qouted, as well as others—and for almost 6 years little or nothing is done to prove or disprove those charges—that it is a travesty in the name of the courts and justice in this country.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yielding. I certainly appreciate him bringing this sad state of our judiciary in general, back to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I regret, I say to my friend from Missouri, that it is necessary to feel that one has to do this in order to get action somewhere, first of all in the Supreme Court and, if the Supreme Court fails to act, then not much more time should be given the House Committee on the Judiciary to act.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, that is the very point I wanted to make in confirming and complementing his argument and presentation to the people this evening. I just recently, for example, pointed out something which goes even further than the question of malfeasance of one judge, in that it subverts two very basic principles on which this Nation is founded, No. 1, the public trust and, No. 2, the principle of the separation of the powers.

As the gentleman from Iowa will recall, on February 1, I inserted an article on page 1862 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the 1-minute rule, entitled "Judge-Politicians Meet in Private on Remapping Plan." This refers to the Federal judge in the western district of Missouri who arranged for and did meet with the Governor of that State and the legislators who are charged in this special session of their general assembly, with the remapping of the congressional districts therein; after a so-called three-judge court had ruled the action in 1967 of the State legislature to be not in conformance with the high tribunal's findings based on the "one-man, one-vote" rule.

Then I inserted a further article entitled "Reprimand Judge Oliver" on page 2021 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5. Yesterday I inserted an article which was entitled "Political Thicket" on page 2463. I cite these and filed them for the RECORD simply to point out the two things and that the gentleman has brought out here, namely, that the Supreme Court must act in these cases because of the arbitrariness of a so-called three-man court which has ruled this to be not in conformity or within necessary percentages, in spite of the instructions of this House. There is no question about the precedents or the Constitution, all of which can be cited, about the separation of the powers or the equal and coequal branches of Government. There is no question about the authority of the State legislature to redraw the congressional district lines, and there is no question about rule XI of our own House of Representatives which says:

> All proposed legislation, messages, petitions memorials, and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees respectively—(12) the Committee on the Judiciary, subheading f, Federal courts and judges.

Quite outside of the question of malfeasance and quite outside of the question of impeachment—and no one asks that as yet it is paradoxical the western Missouri judiciary acts so capriciously and arbitrarily on the one hand, yet avers it will respect the congressional legislation precluding elections at large in the 91st and 92d Congress.

In a letter dated February 6 to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House I asked that an investigation be made into this one Judge Oliver's conduct and his ex parte communication, if you please—and without a legal mind, I do know he did intervene before the fact, because this three-judge court must indeed rule on action of the Missouri Legislature or redraw the lines itself, one or the other, and indeed the latter if the special session of the Missouri General Assembly does not act in time for filing or under a stay which the one dissenting judge on the three-judge court has since written.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other principles which we could cite and there is considerable background therefor. But what has evolved here is the lowest kind of intervention for the purposes of political patronage. for gerrymandering, and for redistricting all districts that were within 5 percent of the mean national norm in the first place; that is, the 1967 legislative action. It had been put in State legislation and signed into law by the Governor, and the people were satisfied and the candidates were filing, when this upset came along in order to accommodate, maybe, two or three different districts or persons.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would recall to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and ask if the gentleman does not recall the discussion and colloquy, on the occasion when the Congress increased the number of Federal judges, about gerrymandering, political heirs, and patronage—and I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 5, page 6288 thereof, and thereafter, wherein such remarks were made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who now seems loathe to act, who seems loathe to go into the question at hand, who seems loathe to go into the surveillance of these Federal judges, and who apparently hesitates to take jurisdiction over the highest tribunal and to recall for interview and investigation these judges who were appointed when or subsequent to the time we increased that number by 83 new judgeships—and subsequently an additional 45—when it was stated:

> Of course, there are some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who do not relish the creation of such a number of judges to be appointed by a Democratic President. Similarly, during the past two Congresses, we Democrats, then in power in the Legislative branch, did not like creating judgeships to be filled by a Republican President.
>
> On one occasion I said, rather facetiously:—meaning the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—we Democrats do not like putting Democratic eggs under a Republican hen for the Republican hen to hatch Democratic eggs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not bother the Members of the House at this late hour of the day with other citations. However, I would call attention to the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association, which says in noting the procedures under which our system of jurisprudence is to operate—and which some of us who are not lawyers but who undertake to understand the law and who are disposed to observe it, one will note in article 5 under the heading of "Essential Conduct":

> A judge should be temperate, attentive, patient, impersonal, and since he is to administer the law and apply it to the facts, he should be studious of the principles of the law and diligent in endeavoring to ascertain the facts.

I cite article 17 under the heading of "Ex Parte Communications":

> A judge should not permit private interviews, arguments or communications designed to influence his judicial action, where interests to be affected thereby are not represented before him, except in cases where provision is made by law for ex parte application.

Then, Mr. Speaker, under the heading of "Partisan Politics" we find the following:

> While entitled to entertain his personal views of political questions, and while not required to surrender his rights or opinions as a citizen, it is inevitable that suspicion of being warped by political bias will attach to a judge who becomes the active promoter of the interests of one political party against another. He should avoid making political speeches, making or soliciting payment of assessments or contributions to party funds, the public endorsement of candidates for political office and participation in party conventions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] if in view of all of these admonitions and in view of all the matters which have transpired, and further including article 34 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics which reads—"A Summary of Judicial Obligation":

> In every particular his conduct should be above reproach. He should be conscientious, studious, thorough, courteous, patient, just, impartial, fearless of public clamor, regardless of public praise, and indifferent to private political or partisan influences; he should administer justice according to law and deal with his appointments as a public trust; he should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of his judicial duties, nor should he administer the office for the purpose of advancing his personal ambitions or increasing his popularity.

Again I ask the gentleman does he not agree with me that the basic principles of public trust have been violated by not only the committee which fails to act, but by one which is charged with the jurisdiction thereof in the face of this onslaught against the legislative process and branch that we know to be a coequal branch of the Government. In fact, we are asked to give direction and, perhaps, in many cases find and establish the principles of the separation of powers, but beyond all of the urgency of the juridical image which we have been told from childhood at home we should respect, and the lack of surveillance in the review of duly constituted authority, it is my opinion that a very sorry state of affairs has developed in view of all of the foregoing. I think the U.S. citizens are fed up with it and blame political buffoonery for failure of our courts to backup our constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for bringing up this timely and erstwhile matter. Some day we should go into methods of appointment and tenure of our judiciary. Its outdoing itself in proving it needs a general overhaul.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I believe his statement about failing juridical image was probably the most important that he has made, and that is the growing lack of respect for the courts of this country, a thing that we badly need. The case that I have spoken of is one, but it seems to me a very sad and sordid case, but only one of a half dozen others that cry for attention in this country, cases that involve the Federal judiciary.

Mr. HALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman, if he would yield further, but I want to make it crystal clear and reunderline the fact that we are defaming certain underlying, eternal, and basic principles; and then we set idly by and do nothing about them, we are almost coequally guilty. Is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

GEN. JOHN LEONARD HINES A LIVING ARMY LEGEND

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. NEDZI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, although confined to Walter Reed Army Medical Center and 99 years old, former Army Chief of Staff and combat hero in two wars, Gen. John L. Hines, still takes an interest in today's soldiers. He is the oldest living graduate of West Point.

When his former aide and frequent visitor Gen. Charles L. Bolte, retired, told him recently that the Army was now entitled to the same ration allowances as the Navy, Hines said, "Ah, they've finally made it."

Vietnam occupies a special spot in General Hines' heart because his old outfits, the 1st Division's 1st Brigade and 16th Infantry, and the 4th Infantry Division, are involved in what some call a new kind of war. He commanded the regiment, the brigade, and the 4th Division in World War I, a half century ago.

Since his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy in 1891, he has seen many changes in the Army—from Indian fighting on the western plains to jungle war in Cuba and the Philippines and later to the bloody battles for trenches in France. Just before America entered World War I, he took part as adjutant general and chief of staff of the punitive expedition into Mexico with Gen. John J. Pershing.

When the United States entered the war, he went to France, May 28, 1917, as a lieutenant colonel and the assistant adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Force. Like Eisenhower, a quarter of a century later, promotions followed in rapid order. Hines became colonel, brigadier general, and then major general during the war. He won the Distinguished Service Cross for his part in the Battle of Soissons in the summer of 1918 as well as the Distinguished Service Medal and several foreign decorations. The citation to his DSC reads in part:

> At a critical time during the battle southwest of Soissons, when liaison had been broken between the 16th Infantry and the 26th Infantry, and repeated efforts to reestablish it had failed, General Hines, then in command of the 1st Infantry Brigade, personally went through terrific artillery fire to the front lines of the 16th Infantry, located its left flank, and walking in front of the lines, encouraged the troops by his example of fearlessness and disregard of danger. He then succeeded in finding the right forward elements of the 26th Infantry, and directed the linking up of the two regiments, thereby enabling the operations to be pushed forward successfully.

Pershing said he was "No. 1 on the list of general officers known to me."

After the war, he held various command assignments until 1922 when he was deputy chief of staff to Pershing. In 1924, he was selected to be the Army's Chief of Staff by President Calvin Coolidge. Hines took the job, but he did not like it. He did not care for the paper work, desk duty, making speeches and writing memos, all an indispensable part of Washington duty. Two years later he left to command IX Corps and in 1930 he succeeded Gen. Douglas MacArthur in command of the Philippine Department. In 1932 he retired from active service at the age of 64. Hines then traveled extensively and later settled in Washington, D.C. Like many old soldiers, he missed the Army and when World War II came along, he applied for active duty. He was turned down. The Army had nothing against him—it was just that he was 73 years of age at the time.

Early in his military career, General Hines gained the reputation for sagacity, tact, and dependability which made him ever an outstanding leader. Of fine soldierly appearance and bearing, standing well over 6 feet, his presence alone inspired men to follow him, on and off the battlefield. Never unduly demonstrative and wholly devoid of flamboyance or loquacity, his calm forthrightness and effective consideration for those about him evidenced one of his favorite maxims that loyalty works both ways—up and down. The Army and the Nation are the better for his having served them.

I submit a factsheet on this grand old soldier, prepared by the Department of the Army:

JOHN LEONARD HINES

The battlefield test of the AEF in World War I came in the final months of that war, from the German Spring Offensives in 1918 until the Armistice in November. In those few months, short in time and in comparison to the years of war but unending in the continued furious pressure of battle, one regimental commander—of the 16th Infantry in the 1st Division, rose, continuously, to the further battle command of brigade, division, and corps. After the War, General Pershing wrote of him—by now Major General John L. Hines—"He is able, efficient, conscientious, and loyal, all to a superlative degree. Commanded in battle from regiment to corps in World War and won outstanding distinction in every position. An exceptionally fine officer in every respect. No limit to any command whatever or Chief of Staff. One of the fine developments of the war. A natural leader, capable in all respects. No 1 on list of general officers known to me."

In 1924 General Hines succeeded General Pershing, on his recommendations, as Chief of Staff of the Army, having served as his Deputy Chief of Staff for the preceding two years. Separated by eight years in age and five years as cadets, one a cavalry officer and the other an infantryman, these two, in the last ten years of service together, formed an enduring relationship of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.

Being retired statutorily, for age, in 1932, after 44 years of active duty, including service in the War with Spain, the Cuban Pacification, the Philippine Insurrection, the Punitive Expedition into Mexico, and World War I, and placed on the retired list of the Army in 1940 as full general by special Act of Congress, General Hines continued to enjoy the long years of retirement with his family, friends, and associates in and out of the military forces.

John Leonard Hines was born in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, on May 21, 1868. His father, Edward Hines, son of a farmer in Ballyvaghan, County Clare, Ireland, and his mother, Mary Frances Leonard, from County Galway, emigrated—he to Richmond, Va., and she to Baltimore, Md., about 1852—on the same ship but as yet unknown to each other. It was on a post-Civil War visit to Baltimore that Edward met Mary Frances and married her. Of their seven children, three lived to maturity—John, his sister Mary Ellen, and his younger brother, William.

Schooling in the West Virginia mountain country in the post-mid nineteenth century was not an easy matter, and most of John Hines early education was gained in the typical one-room school. Fortunately, the schoolmaster saw promise in him and coached him privately, until, in 1875, he was sent for a brief period to a small private school near Concord, W. Va. Returning to White Sulphur Springs, and eager to find a road to progress, he learned from the newspaper about a competitive examination for entrance into the United States Military Academy. Coached again by another interested teacher, he won the appointment to West Point and was ordered to report in 1887.

At the Military Academy Cadet Hines had a hard time making passing grades. He had to devote all of his time to his studies, and attended few if any "hops" or other social entertainments. He stayed at West Point, almost uninterruptedly, through all his cadet years partly to continue his intensive studies and partly because there were few family funds to allow the luxury of return trips to West Virginia. During the entire four years, seldom did anyone come to the academy to see him. Companionship came from his classmates, and from the contemporarily small classes characterizing the period came the knowledge of each other which marked the subsequent years of Army service. In his first year he gained the nickname of "Birdie", because one of his classmates, seeing him crossing the Plain with his distinctive springy walk remarked that he looked like a bird hopping along. During his cadet years his disciplinary record was high, showing then true qualities of a soldier, so well proven in the years to come, by the acid test of war. He took great interest in athletics and was one of the mainstays of one of Army's first great football teams.

Graduating in the Class of 1891, he was commissioned 2d Lieutenant and assigned to the 2d Infantry at Fort Omaha, Nebraska. He served there and at Fort Harrison, Montana, until the Spring of 1898, when the regiment proceeded via Tampa to land at Cienfuegos and take part in the Santiago Campaign. He served with his regiment throughout the campaign, at the battle of San Juan Hill, and was later cited in War Department orders for gallantry in action there.

During a brief return to the United States, Lieutenant Hines, on December 19, 1898, in Columbus, Ohio, married Harriet Schofield (Elita) Wherry, one of the daughters of Colonel (later Brig. Gen.) William M. Wherry, a Civil War Veteran and holder of the Medal of Honor, who had been his commanding officer. Two children were born of this marriage, Alice Grammar in 1900, and John Leonard, Jr., in 1905.

Returning to serve another year in Cuba, Lieutenant Hines resumed the early gaining of the practical experience in finance, supply, and administration begun in his post-graduation years, which—as did in fact his experiences under fire and in command—did much in the years to come to round out his high qualities for command and staff. In the after years of reminiscence General Hines was wont to recall that as a junior officer in the isolated doldrums of peacetime post life he found that there were always tasks, aside from troop duty and drill, which, though often assigned, could still otherwise be undertaken by the willing young officer and much of future use be thereby learned, tasks which most officers, after a time preferred to avoid.

Again after only a few brief months in the United States, during which he was promoted and assigned to the 23d Infantry, Captain Hines proceeded, with a detachment of recruits, to station with his regiment on the island of Marinduque in the Philippines. On scouting duty at Boac, in skirmishes with the insurrectos at Nalabut and Yba, he was commended by the island commander. After transfer to Jolo and return home for duty as regimental and post quartermaster at Plattsburg Barracks, he again proceeded to the Philippines for similar duties at Malabang, Mindanao. Here again he took the field, this time against hostile Moros.

The subsequent years, until 1916, found Captain Hines on various state—side assignments, principally quartermaster, as also at Nagasaki, Japan, and again in the Philippines—this time with the 19th Infantry. After his fifth return to the United States and promotion to major and battalion command in the 6th Infantry, he soon began a series of assignments in the then important position of adjutant and adjutant general, finally as such with General Pershing's Punitive Expedition against Pancho Villa.

It was from this initial closer relationship that came the inclusion of Lieutenant Colonel Hines in the first group of officers selected by General Pershing to begin the staff of what became GHQ—the headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces. A five months period of this service, during which he was promoted again, was ended in October, 1917, by his assignment to command the 16th Infantry in the 1st Division, then in training in northeastern France. It was here, during the severe conditions of winter, including tours of trench duty, that Colonel Hines, faced with the common problems of developing competent officers, devised a system of training staff supervision which later proved its worth in battle. Although under fire at times during the so-called quiet training period, the troops began their offensive battle experience with the move to the Montdidier area, north of Paris, to aid in stemming the rising tide of the German offensive.

There ensued, for the 1st Division, the fierce actions in the Cantigny-Montdidier area, a prelude to its drive against the hinge of the German salient south of Soissons. Promoted during the first week of May, and assigned to command the 1st Brigade, General Hines' dynamic and effective leadership in battle was such as to elicit later from his division commander, Major General Summerall, the comment: "He is the highest type of man and soldier, and I believe that in war or in peace there is no task too great for him to perform with credit to himself and to the country. He commanded the 1st Infantry Brigade during the battle of Soissons and the occupation of the Saizerais sector. He was distinguished by his masterful leadership, his unswerving loyalty, his indomitable courage, his wonderful endurance, and his skill as a tactician. The success of the 1st Division in the desperate fighting at Soissons is due in great measure to the qualities General Hines displayed in the operations."

After the successful Aisne-Marne counteroffensive, General Hines was promoted to major general and assigned to command the 4th Division, which had also participated in that battle, and was re-assembling in northeastern France in preparation for the American Army attack on the St. Mihiel salient. In a matter of just a few days, General Hines drew together the elements of his division, moved it into line on the northwest hinge of the offensive, and shortly after the success of the comparatively brief battle, moved it westward across the Meuse and into line for the great Meuse-Argonne Offensive. Again the evidence of his outstanding battle leadership, in the rapid initial advance of the division, came to the fore and resulted in less than three weeks in his elevation to the command of the Third Corps. In the continuing action he directed the corps in a successful crossing of the strongly held Meuse river line, one of the most difficult operations in war and in this case one made doubly difficult by lack of space for maneuver.

General Hines continued in command of the Third Corps after the Armistice, during the march into Germany, and the occupation of the Rhine bridgehead. Upon the dissolution of the AEF General Hines returned briefly to GHQ until his return to the United States in early September, 1919. There followed for him a series of divisional commands with the dwindling forces of the early post-war years, culminating in the command of the Eighth Corps Area. Then, in 1922, General Pershing called him to Washington as his deputy, and as his successor as Chief of Staff two years later. His selection to these highest Army assignments and approval therefor by his civilian superiors was influenced in large measure by his characteristic ability of going always straight to the heart of any problem and producing a swift, clear-cut, and workable solution. Here, again, his earlier practical administrative experience in the junior and field grades served him well, in finance, supply, and personnel, especially in view of the then growing curtailments in troop strengths and military budgets, and the necessity of closing or disposing of posts and other installations no longer needed or supportable.

The years in Washington were not spent in the type of service or milieu nearest to General Hines' desired way of life. Basically a field soldier, a troop commander, an outdoor soldier who liked best to be on horseback with troops training in the field—but who could gallop on the dance floor at a post hop as well as on a horse—he was less happy at a desk in an assignment with inescapable political overtones at the seat of government. So, when his years on the War Department came to a close, he went to command the corps area farthest from Washington, in San Francisco, and then, for his final year of active service, to a scene of his earlier years, the Philippines. Much of his initial years in retirement was spent in his boyhood home of White Sulphur Springs.

CONCERNING AN EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OF FAYETTE COUNTY, GA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 7, 1968, an occurrence took place, the substance of which I consider of sufficient gravity to inform the House of Representatives. In order to present this information in chronological order, it is necessary that we review some letters by dates, addresses, and signatures, and other letters in their entirety, which make up an exchange of correspondence between the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the board of education and the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

This series of letters which constitutes the exchange of correspondence began on or about December 7–8, 1967, when on December 7, 1967, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin of the Office for Civil Rights addressed a letter to the superintendent of schools, Fayette County, Ga.

On or about December 8, 1967, Mr. Lloyd R. Henderson of the same Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed another letter on the same subject matter to Mr. A. Eugene Bowers, the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

On December 29, 1967, Mr. A. Eugene Bowers addressed a letter to Mrs. Ruby Martin outlining apparent conflicts between the two letters written on successive days by Mrs. Martin and by Mr. Henderson. This letter from Mr. Bowers to Mrs. Martin asked for a clarification of an apparent conflict in the substance of two letters.

As near as I can tell there was no reply or response from any source to Mr. Bowers' letter dated December 29, 1967.

On January 26, 1968, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin addressed a letter to Mr. Bowers stating that in her opinion an impasse had been reached and that it would be necessary to issue a notice of deferral which would have the effect of deferring all funds for new programs and activities for the Fayette County school system.

Upon receipt of the letter of January 26, 1968, Mr. Bowers on January 29, 1968, again wrote to Mrs. Martin telling her that the purpose of his earlier letter was solely to request a clarification and that an effort would be made to comply with such letter upon receipt of the clarification.

On January 30, 1968, Mr. Bowers called me in my office in the House Office Building and told me what had taken place. He told me that the next regular meeting of the Board of Education of Fayette County would be on February 6, 1968, and that he would like for me to submit an urgent request for a delay or extension in the issuance of the notice of deferral until February 15 in order that the board could approve or reject a plan which he would submit to the board and which he felt confident that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and specifically the Office for Civil Rights would accept.

On that same date, January 30, 1968, my office called Mrs. Ruby G. Martin to request this extension until February 15, 1968. Mrs. Martin was not in her office on the 30th and we left word requesting that she call back. On January 31, 1968, she did call back; the message from Mr. Bowers was transmitted to her and she replied that she would be glad to grant an extension until February 15. Whereupon I asked her to notify Mr. Bowers immediately, and she did. The letter from Mr. Bowers to Mrs. Martin, dated January 31, 1968, and Mrs. Martin's reply dated February 2, 1968, are as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1968.

MRS. RUBY G. MARTIN,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MARTIN: This letter is to make further request for delaying any further action on your part until we can prepare and recommend a plan designed to accomplish the purposes of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to the Fayette County Board of Education on Tuesday night, February 6, 1968. If the Board approves the plan we will forward same to you by February 15, 1968.

We hereby request delay in any further action by your office until February 15, at which time you would have the opportunity to review the plan submitted for your consideration.

Sincerely,
A. EUGENE BOWERS,
Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.

FEBRUARY 2, 1968.

MR. A. EUGENE BOWERS,
Superintendent,
Fayette County Public Schools,
Fayetteville, Ga.

DEAR MR. BOWERS: Your letter of January 31, requesting a delay until February 15, of enforcement action against the Fayette County School System has been received.

Your request is granted, and we look forward to hearing from you by that date. If we can be of assistance to you and your board, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,
MRS. RUBY G. MARTIN,
Director, Operations Division,
Office for Civil Rights.

On January 31, 1968, Mr. Bowers sent me a copy of this letter—same date—to Mrs. Martin attached to an original letter—January 31, 1968—addressed to me, as follows:

> FAYETTE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
> *Fayetteville, Ga., January 31, 1968.*
> Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT,
> *U.S. House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. FLYNT: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter of this date to Mrs. Ruby Martin. You will also find a copy of a letter from Lloyd Henderson dated December 8, 1967 and a copy of a letter from Ruby Martin dated December 7, 1967.
>
> As you know from copies of previous correspondence, this is not the first time officials of H.E.W. have sent conflicting statements to us. The plan which Ruby Martin recommended would not be feasible inasmuch as facilities would not permit implementation of her plan. Space simply would not permit implementation of her suggested plan.
>
> We sincerely appreciate everything you are doing in our behalf. We will keep you informed on activity between the Fayette County School System and the bureaucratic Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "a part of the great society."
>
> We appreciate very much your getting a delay in action by the Office for Civil Rights to bring about an immediate hearing until February 15. This will give us time to get approval for evening classes in Business Education for the remainder of this school term and also time to get approval for additional NDEA projects in the amount of $12,000 and for additional allocations in Title I funds for this term of approximately $5,000.
>
> Sincerely,
> A. EUGENE BOWERS,
> *Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.*

I especially call attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Bowers' letter to me dated January 31, 1968:

> We appreciate very much your getting a delay in action by the Office for Civil Rights to bring about an immediate hearing until February 15. This will give us time to get approval for evening classes in Business Education for the remainder of this school term and also time to get approval for additional NDEA Projects in the amount of $12,000 and for additional allocation in Title I funds for this term of approximately $5,000.

Mr. Bowers told me over the telephone that he planned to begin the evening class in business education on February 5, 1968—open to members of both races—in order to demonstrate his efforts at and accomplishment of integration of classes prior to February 15, 1968. This is evidence of good faith.

He also planned to use the additional NDEA projects to encourage transfers of students and faculty to participate in these new classes to be funded by NDEA funds. I have no information of the purpose for which the additional $5,000 in title I would be used.

The application on file for the funds for evening classes in business education states the urgency of beginning classes by February 5, 1968, in order to give a full semester credit for these courses to students in both high schools in Fayette County.

Mr. Bowers sent me a copy of his letter to Mrs. Martin and I assume he sent her a copy of his letter to me since both were written and mailed at the same time.

I received both letters on February 1, 1968, and I assume Mrs. Martin received both letters on the same date.

Mr. F. Peter Libassi and I discussed this in my office on yesterday, February 7, 1968, for approximately 2 hours.

Upon my arrival in my office on yesterday, February 7, 1968, my office received a telephone call from Mrs. Ruby G. Martin of the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stating that a telegram was being sent to Mr. Bowers, or had already been sent to Mr. Bowers, telling him that the extension or delay until February 15, 1968, has been revoked. We asked Mrs. Martin why the extension or delay was revoked in such a peremptory manner. Her reply was that HEW has revoked the delay heretofore granted based upon "concrete" evidence which they had received that the Fayette County Board of Education was not acting in good faith when the request for the delay was made.

The telegram dated February 6, 1968, to Mr. Bowers reads as follows:

> Information has reached our office which indicated that your request for a delay until 15 February 1968 in initiation of Title VI enforcement action by this Department was not made in good faith.
>
> Therefore, we have asked our general counsel to initiate enforcement action against Fayette County School System immediately. In addition final approval of any application filed with the Department for Federal funds for new programs and activities is hereby ordered deferred.
>
> Your state education agency is also being notified that commitment of Federal financial assistance for all new activities are likewise to be deferred.
>
> Detailed letter to follow.
>
> (Signed) F. PETER LIBASSI.

Immediately following the conversation with Mrs. Martin, we called Superintendent Bowers and told him the contents of the telephone conversation with Mrs. Martin. He replied, "Yes, I have already received that telegram." Among other things, the fact that Mr. Bowers had already received that telegram indicated without question that the telegram from Mr. Libassi had been dispatched to Mr. Bowers prior to the time that Mrs. Martin called my office to advise of the action of revocation which the Office had taken.

Mr. Bowers tells me that the facts are, that on Tuesday night, February 6, 1968, the Fayette County Board of Education met and approved the recommendation of Mr. Bowers, the superintendent of schools, for the further integration of students and faculty in three of the Fayette County schools and included a plan for the orderly integration of the remaining schools in Fayette County.

I immediately requested a personal conference with Mr. F. Peter Libassi, Director of the Office of Compliance, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and he agreed to come to my office at approximately 2:45 p.m. the same date. Mr. Libassi did in fact come to my office at approximately 2:45 p.m. this same date, and stated, that while he ratified the decision, the decision had not in reality been made by him. He stated that Mrs. Martin made the determination and asked him to ratify it, which he did. He was asked by me what evidence he had to support his conclusion that the Fayette County Board of Education and the Fayette County school superintendent had not acted in good faith. He refused to state what this evidence was. He not only refused to state what the evidence was, he refused to state the source either by individual or by category of such information upon which he had relied.

He told me that he had been told by another person, who had been told by still another unidentified person, that the Fayette County Board of Education had acted in bad faith. This is hearsay and rumor in either the third or fourth degree. It is not factual and it is not evidence.

Upon this third- or fourth-hand report of rumor and hearsay evidence, he deliberately revoked an extension which he had previously granted in writing. Relying upon this written extension of time, the school superintendent and the Board of Education of Fayette County formulated a plan which by any reasonable and objective evaluation complied with all rules, regulations, guidelines, and laws under which the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is administered.

This unprovoked and unjustified action which was taken by Mr. Libassi impugns the character and integrity of Superintendent Bowers, each member of the board of education and, through them, the character and integrity of that county.

His action has nothing to do with the adequacy of the action taken by the board of education on February 6, 1968. It demonstrates his own bad faith and his own incredibility. He revoked his own previous action without either evidence or facts and solely on a conclusion.

The action taken by Mr. Libassi is unworthy of a Federal employee or official.

I call upon him to reinstate his and Mrs. Martin's letter of February 2, 1968, and to extend his apology to Mr. Bowers and the Fayette County Board of Education. In the absence of such reinstatement and apology, I call upon the President of the United States to order the immediate dismissal of Mr. F. Peter Libassi and Mrs. Ruby G. Martin.

JOHN CARDINAL KROL WILL BE GIVEN 1968 NATIONAL HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD BY THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, in Cleveland, a great American, an outstanding clergyman, John Cardinal Krol, will be signally honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in recognition of the devotion of this distinguished churchman to the plight of the underprivileged. A man of high and noble purpose, he has acquainted himself with the problems of those living in abject poverty and has dedicated his life to the cause of humanity. The character of this eminent man is reflected, in some measure, by an article which appeared in the February 4 edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, titled "A Busy Day With Cardinal Krol," which I include, under leave granted:

A BUSY DAY WITH CARDINAL KROL

(By Thomas J. Monahan)

By choice he is a man of God. By circumstance, he is a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Wrapped up in the six-foot frame of John Cardinal Krol, Cleveland's contribution to Philadelphia, is the determination of a man who wants first to do what is right for his church, even at the price of popularity.

"I want to be popular, but I can't shirk my responsibility," the 57-year-old cardinal told me recently during a day I spent with him on his appointed rounds in his adopted city.

The former Cleveland priest and auxiliary bishop believes not all he does for the 1.3 million members of his archdiocese will make him popular. Nothing a leader does meets with unanimous consent and Cardinal Krol is an astute observer of the ways of his church and the world.

He is a man who would rather make quiet history than noisy headlines for his church.

He is revered by those around him and has made countless friends in his 30 years as a priest. His opponents respect him in the arena of the church.

Cardinal Krol is a man of concern and he manifests it in an easy and natural way. He has endeavored to obtain better immigration laws, to provide better understanding between the races and to make a better church for himself and the half billion other Roman Catholics in the world.

Because of this concern, the National Conference of Christians and Jews will honor the cardinal next Sunday night with its 1968 National Human Relations Award for "his leadership in the Ecumenical movement both nationally and internationally; his efforts in carrying out the directives of Vatican Council II; his work in bettering race relations in America; his labors on behalf of nationality groups, his missionary endeavors among American Indians and Negroes and his shining example of one who believes in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man."

But the scroll and the gold medallion he will receive from NCCJ president Sterling W. Brown at Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland will not signal an end to the efforts of this man of God.

The NCCJ honor is but another thread in the fiber of character that has typified Cardinal Krol. The weaving of that fabric began the day he was born, Oct. 26, 1910. The final product was the making of a cardinal.

He is the fourth of eight children of the late John and Anna Pietruszka Krol who came here from Poland in 1901. His father was a machinist.

He attended St. Hyacinth Parish School on the city's southeast side and graduated from Cathedral Latin School in 1927. In Latin's 1927 yearbook there is this tribute:

"The pleasure one feels in the consciousness of having performed his duty is the reward one receives for all his pain. John must certainly feel this most delectable sensation. He does his duty, never swerves from it; his conscience tells him he is right and he leaves the consequences to God."

While in school, John Krol followed his father's advice: "Watch anyone at work and you can learn to do the job yourself."

When he was 15, a classmate got a paperhanging job and asked Krol if he could do the job with him. He did and there were no complaints.

His working versatility ranged from haircutting through plumbing, masonry work, carpentry and gardening. After high school he worked as a meat cutter for a chain store.

At 18 he was named manager of one of the stores. When the chain decided to bond its managers, young Krol, who was below the bonding age, resigned not only from the store but from a way of life. He chose instead to make an alliance with God.

The future cardinal's mother, whenever her household chores permitted, used to attend mass during the week and this deep religious commitment was passed on to her son.

When she died in 1946, John Krol was already on the rise—a monsignor and vice chancellor of the Cleveland Catholic Diocese.

When he entered the seminary he carried with him the nickname of "Rex" which means king—as does Krol in Polish. He uses the word "rex" in his episcopal seal: *Deus Rex Meus* (God is my king).

Following his ordination in 1937, John Krol studied canon law—church law—in Rome and Catholic University, Washington, D.C., where he received his doctorate.

It was partly through canon law that he came to the attention of an apostolic delegate to the United States, Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, now the Vatican's secretary of state and himself a cardinal.

While driving the late Archbishop Edward F. Hoban and then-Archbishop Cicognani to Cleveland from Cincinnati some 20 years ago, the then Monsignor Krol was asked by Archbishop Hoban to solve a problem in canon law. His evaluation brought him more problems for solutions and cemented a friendship that had begun on a teacher-to-pupil plain some 10 years earlier when John Krol was a canon law student in Rome.

In 1951 John Krol was named chancellor of the diocese here by Archbishop Hoban. Two years later he became auxiliary bishop to Archbishop Hoban. Seven years ago he was named archbishop of Philadelphia.

His administrative abilities are unquestioned in ecclesiastical circles.

Since arriving on the banks of the Schuylkill River on March 22, 1961, to become the 10th archbishop of the Philadelphia Catholic Archdiocese, he has been a busy man indeed. Sometimes his working day is 20 hours—and younger priests marvel.

James McCaffrey, who has been chauffeuring cardinals in Philadelphia for 26 years, said in what this visitor assumed to be a distinct Philadelphia dialect: "There is no comparison between the previous two cardinals and his eminence. He doesn't let any grass grow under his feet."

Around Philadelphia they call him "Your eminence" but he still answers to monsignor or bishop whenever a friend forgets.

Cardinal Krol puts in a seven-day week. He occasionally finds time for a round of golf—he shoots in the low 80s or high 70s—and out-of-town speaking engagements often mean a break in his schedule.

His day usually begins about 6:30 a.m. An hour later he offers mass in his private chapel for his house staff. After breakfast he opens his mail and takes care of appointments before leaving for his chancery office.

He sometimes drives to the chancery, a 120-year-old home at 228 N. 18th Street, next door to SS. Peter and Paul Cathedral in downtown Philadelphia. Once in a while he chauffeurs one of his aides to the office.

He uses his own key to open the front door. Most of the offices of the archdiocese are scattered throughout the downtown area because of the lack of a central office building.

The cardinal's private office is in one of the high-ceiling rooms in the house. He reads his own mail and dictates replies before setting out for a round of meetings. He remarked:

"I wish I could spare the time for slow travel. It's always meetings, meetings, meetings. But they are a necessary part of life."

Cardinal Krol thrives on those meetings. It gives him a chance to meet more people and to explain his church to them.

Shortly before suppertime, Cardinal Krol will drive the nine miles to his home at 5700 City Avenue in northwest Philadelphia. Any time left before dinner is eaten up by opening more mail. Occasionally he has a guest.

Two of his aides, Msgr. James F. Connolly, his secretary, and Msgr. Philip J. Dowling, executive secretary of the cardinal's Commission on Human Relations, usually dine with him.

After dinner the cardinal visits his chapel for a few moments of silent prayer and then on his way to his room, he stops off in a nearby parlor and plays on the piano. He is an accomplished pianist.

The cardinal occupies only two of the nearly 40 rooms in the home. His second floor suite consists of a combination office-sitting room and bedroom. The remainder of the house is used by his aides and a house staff. There are several guest suites and three small chapels for visitors.

In his room after supper he will work on matters he couldn't clear up during the day. Chauffeur McCaffrey said he often sees the cardinal's lights on well after 1 a.m.

What sort of a man is he?

Two years after coming to Philadelphia two firemen died while fighting a fire in one of the parochial schools. Then-Archbishop Krol immediately went to the homes of the widows and gave them each checks for $5,000.

Another time a priest remarked at a dinner meeting that he was going to buy a car.

"A two-door, your eminence."

"How about your mother? She's still crippled with arthritis, isn't she?"

"But that's all I can afford."

"Nonsense," said the cardinal, "You can afford more when it comes to your mother."

The priest bought the four-door.

Last Dec. 27 Cardinal Krol met with 260 of his 319 pastors to discuss financing the diocese and to plan several major construction projects including a new chancery building and a new seminary.

He held a dinner for the priests and then presented two plans for financing to them.

Afterward one of the pastors said, "I've never heard of such a thing—a cardinal asking me how I want to finance a diocesan program."

That choice won't be made by the pastors, a spokesman for the cardinal said later. Letters have been sent to the cardinal from the pastors telling him they will accept any plan he wants to put into effect. And they suggested that Cardinal Krol went overboard in giving them an opportunity to express their opinions.

"He did it the hard way," one pastor said. "He didn't have to get up in front of us and ask us. He could have sent a letter out and told us and we would have accepted his decision."

His rapport with his pastors is growing steadily. He has traveled over most of the five-county archdiocese and met most of them.

Cardinal Krol operates a school system that has been expanded by some $27 million in new building in the past five years. It yearly educates some 60,000 students, tuition free. Pastors pay $150 for each student.

The cardinal is proud of the system and is refusing to yield to some pressure to limit it.

The far-reaching consequences of Vatican Council II are still being felt in all areas of church life. Shaping those programs that have changed Catholic life in the past five years was one of the tasks of Cardinal Krol.

Other American bishops point to him as the single force behind the smooth running of the worldwide meetings of bishops. He used his administrative talents to their fullest while in Rome during the four council sessions and in the preparatory sessions.

He was the only American prelate to serve in the preparatory stages of the Council after Pope John XXIII called it.

When it opened, he was one of its five undersecretaries. When it closed Pope Paul VI named him to the committee to implement the decrees throughout the world.

Last June 26, Pope Paul named him a cardinal.

With the rank came the obligation of electing a successor to Pope Paul and helping administer the worldwide church. But worldwide obligations are familiar to him because of the Council contacts, especially among the other religions.

One of his closest friends is Methodist Bishop Fred Pierce Corson of Philadelphia. They were constant companions on the flights to Rome when Cardinal Krol was busy with Council matters.

"From our first contact," Cardinal Krol said, "we had a charitable understanding. We always find ourselves taking pretty nearly the same viewpoint on civic and community affairs. And we don't give the ecumenical movement a wan smile and pretend there are no differences. We know there are differences, but we know that we are instruments in the hands of God and we approach those differences with honesty and sincerity."

Bishop Corson said in Rome last summer of Cardinal Krol: "He and I think like each other, and that's not always true of people you work with, even among churchmen."

Besides ecumenical relations, which the cardinal urges every parish to take part in, he has an active Human Relations Committee that was recently expanded from 11 to 17 members, including laymen.

He sees race relations as a tension that will be around for a long time, but the constant pressure of teaching, he feels, will ease it eventually.

He sees communication between individuals and parishes as an important phase of race relations. Some 1,500 high school students quietly formed a Community Service Corps to work in the inner city area schools with young pupils on a one-to-one basis.

Despite some internal problems in his seminary last year, the seminarians are getting involved in human relations work. On their days off they help supervise the Community Service Corps volunteers and visit homes of the inner city residents.

In opening his schools to youngsters of all faiths, the cardinal made only one major stipulation: the youngsters must obey the rules of the schools. He told his priests, nuns and lay teachers not to talk about baptism until the parents ask for it.

Working quietly, his Human Relations Commission helped pass a fair housing ordinance for Philadelphia and a state law.

There are only two topics that Cardinal Krol will not discuss either privately or publicly and they are birth control and celibacy.

His aides say he is obeying Pope Paul who asked his bishops to remain silent on both issues, especially the birth control question, until a decision is made by him.

He feels that the church is moving ahead, despite what some critics say. He urges the liturgical reforms allowed by Rome.

As a canon law expert he hopes the church law will be overhauled and disclosed that he spoke at the recent Synod of Bishops in Rome and asked that such a move be made. He proposed that the new church law be restyled to fit into three categories: constitutional, pertaining to church dogma and thus never needing updating; common law, a section that would need little revision, and particular law, that could be updated at will.

His impressions of Pope Paul were gained first-hand. "I think he is a tremendous strategist. He makes certain, firm, definite progress. And the progress he makes is the progress that holds."

Asked if there will ever be a need for another Vatican Council, the cardinal said: "I would venture to say, with absolutely no claim to prophecy, that while the ecumenical council was a tremendous blessing, the Synod of Bishops will bring into the Vatican the blessings of the Council almost on a regular basis, so that the Vatican will be alert and aware of the needs and problems of the church throughout the entire world. And consequently can adjust its directives and legislation to meet these needs."

He doubts whether people can rightfully call the Vietnam war immoral, because they lack all the facts. "I wouldn't even claim to know all the facts that are involved although I have been to briefings with Secretary of State Rusk and have direct information from Vietnam through a priest who ran the Catholic Relief Services there for 17 years.

"You demonstrate for a purpose to achieve a purpose. But demonstrations should bring you to the negotiations table."

He has grave reservations about nuns and priests demonstrating for the sake of civil rights. He believes priests should preach the Gospel of Christ to reemphasize the twin commandments of love. "That is as it should be."

Regarding the roles of the secular and Catholic press: "Both have similar roles, to tell the truth, the whole truth. You have a tendency today with some journalists of selective reporting. They will report only what appeals to them.

"And there is a false impression given to the reader that the viewpoint of a theologian is the viewpoint of the Vatican Council."

He holds that the laity has a right to administer the church in every area outside of the priesthood itself—"the sacred rites, rituals and sacraments."

THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT OF 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the Pension and Employee Benefit Act of 1968.

This legislation, similar to that introduced in the other body by the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, is designed to deal with the major problems and defects in our private pension plan system. The seven-point thrust of the program would do the following:

First, establish minimum vesting standards for pension plans to assure that an employee who works under a pension plan for many years does not have to forfeit his pension rights because of some "small print" in the contract;

Second, establish minimum funding standards to assure that pension funds will be operated on a sound and solvent basis, enabling the fund to deliver the benefits which it has promised;

Third, establish a program of reinsurance of pension funds so that retirees would be insured against loss of benefits when an employer goes out of business before the plan could be fully funded;

Fourth, establish a special voluntary portability fund, providing a central clearinghouse of pension credits for persons transferring from one employer to another;

Fifth, establish minimum standards of conduct, restrictions on conflicts of interest and other ethical criteria to be followed in the administration of pension and other plans providing benefits for employees, to make impossible the kind of diversion of funds disclosed in congressional investigations;

Sixth, establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the requirements of this bill, subject to judicial review; and

Seventh, consolidate in the Commission most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, unions, insurance companies and banks of the necessity of dealing with many Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that with almost $100 billion invested in private pension plans and with almost no Federal regulation or minimum standards concerning their operations, this legislation is vitally necessary.

Millions of working people in this country have invested their labor during their productive years in the hope they will receive enough compensation in their later years to insure that they will continue to have justly comfortable existence. This investment by various single wage earners is multiplied manifold and reinvested, through the pension plans, in the growth of our Nation. Both of these extremely important investments, the individual and the national, must be protected in a comprehensive manner, and, I feel that this bill is the answer to that end. Further we must assure that employees do not lose a dime of their retirement benefits because of a shift in jobs.

Three years ago, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds issued a report in which it was recommended that every pension plan be required to "provide some reasonable measure of vesting for the protection of employees"; that minimum funding standards be established because "inadequate funding of private pension plans under present standards places an unwarranted financial risk on employees during their retirement years"; that "the possibility of developing an institution arrangement for transferring and accumulating private pension credits deserves serious study"; and that, although funding provides some measure of protection for retirees, it "may not protect plan participants from losing at least some of their equity in the event of a plan's termination," and, to meet the latter problem, the idea of reinsurance "is worthy of serious study."

That was 3 years ago and until the gentleman from New York, senior Senator JACOB JAVITS, introduced similar legislation no one had taken steps to implement a comprehensive plan based on these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this body will give prompt consideration and action to this vitally needed piece of legislation. The time has come to relieve some of the burden now placed squarely on employers, unions, insurance companies, and banks in dealing with a multiplicity of Federal agencies and assure that uniform and adequate safeguards are erected to protect the investment all workers have made during their productive years.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House

Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], made some excellent observations concerning the President's crime message and the recommendations contained therein. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has been informed of the special order taken by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] and he does know the sentiments that will be expressed in general by Members of the committee and Members of the Republican task force. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], who has had great experience in the field, is coauthor of a number of the Republican bills which will be discussed. His leadership has contributed greatly to the overall Republican effort in this field.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that—

> Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes or shops.
>
> Property valued at almost $4 billion is lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeers—money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.
>
> For decades our system of criminal justice has been neglected.
>
> For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force.

Republicans ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now?

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our No. 1 domestic problem. The fact and fear of crime stalks our Nation. Since 1960 the reported rate of crime has increased over 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Republicans believe that the administration must account to the Nation for these figures. All levels of government—local, State, and National—share responsibility for the safety of our Nation.

Control and prevention of crime is not solely a responsibility of government. In the first and last analysis it is the responsibility of every American. Crime cannot and will not be controlled without the support and assistance of all responsible citizens. Americans need effective and sustained leadership to mobilize and properly channel their concern into constructive effort. The greatest failure of the Johnson administration is its failure to provide Americans with this much needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Republicans welcome the President's pledge to fight crime. But we express both disappointment and concern over inadequacies of the President's proposed program. The President has failed to fully recognize the problems of crime in America and effectively respond to the challenge. His proposed program is much like a prize fighter with dazzling foot work, but no punch.

I am concerned that an analysis will show that the President has given the Nation a political document and not a much needed plan for national action.

Crime must be brought under control and substantially reduced. The Republican Party is committed to solving this problem which each year grows as a deepening crisis. While the Johnson administration slept, Republicans have developed and introduced specific legislative proposals designed to control and prevent crime and lawlessness. I believe these Republican proposals offer great promise for alleviating the problems of crime.

Indeed, the fact that the President has recommended the enactment of two proposals which were developed, drafted, introduced, and overwhelmingly supported by House Republicans—the Cramer antiriot bill and the Railsback appeals bill—is but a sampling of the commitment and ability within our party to solve this problem of crime.

Others from our side of the aisle will discuss other instances where Republican leadership has substantially improved administration anticrime legislation in this and previous Congresses.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Recognizing the hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall be as brief as the subject will permit.

I believe it is fair to say that insofar as the President's crime message delivered to the Congress yesterday is an indication that he not only is concerned about but also that he finally means to do something about the problem of crime in this country, all Republicans will welcome the message.

Until now I think it is further fair to say that the administration has been content to rely principally upon oration and outrage. The legislative measures that have been proposed have been until now too few, too narrow, and too slow in coming. It is apparent that there has been some change in the climate now and with it hopefully a recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge. I suggest that it is too early to attempt to make a definitive analysis of the President's proposal. We do not attempt to assume either a negative posture or positive posture with respect to the specific proposals itemized by the President. What we do mean to make plain now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce the priority treatment of crime measures which is so urgently needed in the Congress this year. This is all to the good. Whatever the motives behind the President's new posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By embracing some Republican ideas he has at the very least laid a predicate for a meaningful dialog on an issue that troubles every thoughtful American regardless of party.

Those who heard the President's message and who had an opportunity to read it since recognize, I think, its distinct Republican flavor. It contained much of Republican origination and Republican orientation. Of the 22 proposals specifically explained by the President, four have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President called upon the Congress to enact is legislation previously endorsed by the Republican task force on crime. I might add it was urgently proposed by the President's own Crime Commission several months ago.

Second, as has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the House last year making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Railsback].

Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President in his message adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most conspicuously, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer]. That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation of the antiriot bill is something of a new approach insofar as the administration is concerned, I think it is well to remember that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the course of that debate, made it plain at that time that the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the antiriot bill. In order, Mr. Speaker, that this may be made crystal clear, I would like to quote from the Congressional Record for July 19, 1967, at pages 19362–19363, a portion of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler]. He stated in part as follows:

> The distinguished Attorney General on "Meet The Press" last Sunday said he was opposed to this bill . . . And in the conversation that I had with the Attorney General in my office yesterday he repeated to me that he was opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, "yesterday" would have been July 18. July 18 was 4 days after the first outbreak of the Newark riots and, now, some several months later, for the first time the President is recommending the adoption of antiriot legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, while I was not serving in the Congress of the United States at the time of the original hearings which were held on the antiriot proposal of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that were held at that time, and out of which this bill grew, relating to the interstate activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations of that type, which were repeated over and over again by the various witnesses who appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. POFF. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the startling thing is that the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such application.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for just a moment, while I say it might be premature to make an analysis of certain proposals in the President's message, it would be appropriate to take note of some of the omissions in the President's message.

Last year the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endorsed other bills in the general law enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the task force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEDZI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The excerpts referred to follow:

I. ORGANIZED CRIME

1. *Electronic surveillance*—a bill which outlaws all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping except by law enforcement officials under Court approval and continuing Court supervision during national security investigations and investigations of certain organized crime type cases. The Task Force believes that enactment of this legislation would be the single most important step in combatting organized crime. The McCulloch-Ford bill (H.R. 13275, October 3, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force, follows the blue-print for such legislation fashioned by the Supreme Court in the *Berger* case.

2. *Witness immunity*—a bill to expand the power of the Government to compel the testimony of hostile witnesses by granting them immunity from prosecution when they plead the Fifth Amendment during the investigation and during the trial of certain organized crime cases. Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act (H.R. 11267, June 29, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force contains this provision.

3. *Loan-sharking*—a bill (H.R. 14373, December 11, 1967) which would make it a federal crime to lend money at rates of interest prohibited by State law whenever such a loan interferes with or affects interstate commerce or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collection cross state lines. In addition to the Chairman and members of the Task Force, this bill is sponsored by the Minority leader, the ranking Minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the ranking Minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. *Obstruction of investigation*—a bill which would make it a federal crime to interfere with or obstruct investigations by federal agents by the intimidation of potential witnesses. Legislation of this nature was passed by the Congress and enacted into law during the First Session. It was first proposed by Rep. William Cramer (R.-Fla.), a Task Force member, in 1960, and is contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

5. *False statements*—a bill which makes the rules of evidence in perjury prosecutions less rigid and more realistic. This is contained in Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act and was recommended by the Katzenbach Crime Commission.

6. *Profits from Criminal activities*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has been earned from illegal racket activities in legitimate businesses. This is the Criminal Activites Profits Act (H.R. 11268, June 29, 1967) co-sponsored by the Task Force.

7. *Funds unreported for tax purposes*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has not been reported for income tax purposes in legitimate business. This is H.R. 11266, co-sponsored by the Task Force, and principally aimed at organized crime.

8. *Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime*—a bill creating a permanent bi-partisan Committee of both Houses of Congress to investigate organized crime and report its extent, impact and effect to the American public. This is H.R. 6054, first proposed by Rep. Cramer.

II. INVESTIGATIONS AND PRETRIAL PROCEDURES

1. *Motions to suppress*—a bill creating in the Government a limited right to appeal to a higher Court the granting of a defendant's motion to suppress confessions and other evidence. H.R. 8654, proposed by Rep. Thomas Railsback (R.-Ill.), a member of the Task Force, is such a bill and such a provision is contained in Title I of the Task Force sponsored Criminal Procedures Revision Act. The bill has passed the House.

2. *Searches incident to arrests*—a bill to codify, and make less confusing, the existing law of search and seizure where lawful arrests are involved. Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act contains a provision to this effect.

3. *Searches pursuant to warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants for property which constitutes evidence of the offense in connection with which the warrant is issued. This is in conformity with a recent Supreme Court decision (*Warden* v. *Hayden*). It is the subject of H.R. 8653, proposed by Rep. Railsback, and contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

4. *Execution of search warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants authorizing the officer executing it to enter the place to be searched without announcing his identity and purpose where the Judge or Commissioner has determined that physical evidence sought is likely to be destroyed or when danger to the officer exists. This is one of the provisions of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act, patterned after H.R. 8652, sponsored by Rep. Railsback.

III. THE POLICE

1. *Survivorship and disability benefits*—a proposal to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local police and non-federal law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while assisting federal officers in the apprehension of, for example, bank robbers, kidnappers and AWOL military personnel. The Survivorship Program originally proposed was broadened to include a disability program in a bill introduced by Chairman Poff and endorsed by the Task Force. This legislation passed the House this year.

IV. THE COURTS

1. *Bail reform*—a proposal to re-examine and amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to allow the Courts more discretion in granting or denying release on personal recognizance to defendants who are found to be a danger to the community or in revoking the release of those who have committed other crimes after release.

2. *Federal Magistrates*—a bill to abolish the present U.S. Commissioner system and to replace it with a lower-tier of judicial officers, U.S. Magistrates, who are empowered to handle minor trials and otherwise perform routine Court functions that presently occupy the time of Federal judges that ought to be devoted to more serious matters. S. 945, proposed by Senator Tydings (D.-Md.) and Scott (R.-Pa.) is such a bill.

V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1. *The District Anti-Crime bill*—an omnibus anti-crime bill dealing with special law enforcement proposals for the District of Columbia. H.R. 10783 passed the House on June 26, 1967, by a vote of 355 to 14.

2. *Appropriations and personnel*—proposals to increase the authorized strength of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Bail Agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of defendants released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every echelon of Government and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address include the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the President and his advisers will want to examine this list of bills and hopefully give bipartisan support to those which they consider meritorious.

Further omissions in the President's message, I believe, should be underscored. First of all I was disappointed to learn that the President did not take the opportunity to endorse the legislation which passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was known as the safe streets bill; finally under amendment in committee it became known as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. The President did recommend again the passage of the safe streets bill, but seemed anxious to insist that the bill which is passed by the Congress be the bill which he proposed to the Congress.

The Republican amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], we believe, made a significant improvement in the legislation, and we trust that the president will see fit to lend his endorsement and pronounce his endorsement in the other body.

At that point I believe parenthetically it should be said that we Republicans agree with the President when he makes the point that essentially law enforcement is a responsibility of State and local governments. And we do agree, because we share the concern of all thoughtful people that too much concentration of too much power at the Federal level of government tends toward the development of a national police state, and all patriotic Americans abhor that possibility. It was because we have such fears that the Cahill amendment was attached to the safe streets bill.

The orginial safe streets bill, the Members will recall, vested complete authority in the Attorney General of the United States to administer the funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress under this legislation, and to allocate money among the several States, or communities in the States, as he in his sole discretion saw fit.

The Cahill amendment, on the other hand, conceived with a block-grant approach, returned primary control of the funds and operation of the program to the State and local authorities where it belonged.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to and endorse the most excellent summary made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, regarding the law enfrocement and criminal justice assistance act passed by the House of Representatives in August of last year. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in deploring the fact that this excellent legislation, commended by the National Association of Attorneys General, by virtually all agencies concerned with law enforcement and criminal justice, this excellent House bill, has languished without effective action in the U.S. Senate.

One further point I deem it most important to make here: I regret that the President in his crime message has charted a course of retreat in support for local and State law enforcement, and criminal justice instrumentalities.

The President a year ago in February of 1967 indicated in his crime message to the Congress of that date that—

> Our best estimate is that the federal investment under this act—

The Crime Control Act—

> in its second year would be approximately $300 million.

Then Attorney General Ramsey Clark, in testimony on March 15 of 1967, before the House Committee on the Judiciary, said:

> For fiscal year 1969 $300 million will be asked to commence a sweeping action program.

It was with great disappointment that I found the President in his state of the Union message and again in his crime message retreating from $300 million to $100 million in his recommended support of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act for its second year; namely, fiscal year 1969.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his most meaningful contribution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me say most emphatically that certainly the country is the beneficiary because the Republican task force on crime is headed by the gentleman from Virginia. I, and my colleagues, are grateful for his many contributions and his leadership.

I also would like to add, I am now reliably informed that 49 of the 50 Governors have endorsed the House version of the anticrime bill that was passed in 1967. This is the legislation which grew out of the Cahill amendments to the committee bill. This endorsement by 49 out of our 50 Governors should insure the support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. POFF. The gentleman has anticipated my speech and put it infinitely more eloquently than I could.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I would like to give credit at this time to some of the very able supporters of the efforts and leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], specifically to Republican Congressman BIESTER of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY], who were the prime architects in supporting the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] in developing and gaining wide support from Republicans and Democrats alike for the excellent Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1967.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—or, if you want to call it, the safe streets bill. I think there may be a lack of understanding as to the impact of this bill.

The impact of this bill, as I understand it, is one of funds—the funds that go to the training of law enforcement officers; how those funds are distributed, and how they can be most effective.

I certainly share the gentleman's assessment of the Cahill amendment and the direction that we hope any final legislation will take.

I think there is in the minds of the public a concept that there is something over and beyond mere assistance in the financing of police training and other law enforcement activities and research. I think we should point out that the very guts of the bill is what we are talking about here.

This is the impact of the bill. There is no special activity or special magic that the Federal Government brings to this situation.

Mr. POFF. I am glad the gentleman has brought out that point. All those who are knowledgeable in the field agree, and this includes the President's own crime commission, that the chief need is improved training and better and more police officers at the State and local levels. This is exactly the target of this legislation.

Continuing now, if I may briefly, Mr. Speaker, to comment upon the more conspicuous omissions in the President's crime message, a similar amendment to that just discussed was offered to the Juvenile Delinquency Act adopted in the House last year and again that amendment was of Republican origin.

I hope that the President did not mean, be anything that he said in his message, to disavow or reject that amendment to that legislation.

Another measure that the President did not mention is the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote by the House only last week while the House was debating the truth-in-lending bill.

That amendment, as you will recall, was aimed at organized crime involvement in the nefarious practice of loan sharking.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to mention this amendment was intended to indicate his support of that amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that it was through the efforts of the gentleman in the well that the amendment which make loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill. I think that this was an activity for the great benefit of the United States, that the gentleman in the well perfected this amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime, and secured its attachment to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am interested to note that the President in his message said:

> Organized crime is big business in America.

I think this is something that Republicans in this House and the Republican task force on crime have been saying loudly and clearly for some time. He went on to say that—

> Its sinister effect pervades too many corners of America today—through gambling, loan sharking, corruption, extortion, and large movement of narcotics.

I am hopeful also, with the gentleman in the well, that the President's omission to say anything about specific legislation in regard to loan sharking indicates that he will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

May I reciprocate by saying how fortunate the task force is to have a member with the distinguished background that he has enjoyed at the bar and on the bench.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some consternation on the faces of those who remain as I walked in with these eggs. I want to assure you I am not planning to pelt anyone with them. I would like, rather, to pass out some bouquets to the chairman of our crime task force, who has been tirelessly and thoughtfully exploring the scope of this issue, which is so important to the American people.

This task force has been working hard for a long time, and I am proud to have been a member of it. I think it will continue to work hard for some time to come. While this is not a partisan issue, it is an issue of the people—really the people's greatest issue. It certainly is the kind of issue that should have the attention of us all, regardless of party, regardless of our particular concerns in this field.

I think we all welcomed the President's message this week. We welcomed the assessment of this very shrewd politician that this is a major issue. We welcomed an indication that he was putting the prestige of his office behind a leadership posture which would be more constructive in the reduction of this issue and the reduction of the terrible concerns of the American people for the safety of the streets.

I was pleased to note the President's comments about the so-called safe streets bill and his hope that the Congress would address itself to a resolution of the impasse which resulted from the Senate's unwillingness to accept the House version, at least as it appears to the present time. I know that with the weight of the President behind a resolution of this impasse, we are going to make some progress, progress that is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President's message and his great emphasis on the fact that the Attorney General is the man to call if one is concerned about crime indicates also that we will find a new vigor in the expressed attitudes of the Attorney General toward the problems of organized crime, particularly in the wiretapping area. Many of us have been concerned about where we were headed there. Certainly, organized crime is one very legitimate concern of the Federal Government.

It involves a network, a countrywide network, and one which is interstate commerce of the most nefarious sort.

We look forward to some new approaches, to some new vigor in the fight against organized crime, if the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this battle cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by all sides of our political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best thought to continuing the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the speaker in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his diligence, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I know all on the task force agree with me when I say that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on what the gentleman from New York has just said, and agree with him that crime and riots are not a partisan issue, but the responsibility of all the Members of Congress—my responsibility—and the responsibility of the people of this great country.

Also, I join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Virginia, on his vast knowledge of legislation pertaining to crimes and riots. I certainly agree with the gentleman we need stronger legislation in this field.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend—and I use the word "friend" carefully. I count him truly as a friend, and I only hope I can deserve the tribute he just paid me.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi would be welcome on the Republican task force on crime. He has only to make one modest change.

Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the character of the gentleman's contributions to the fight against crime.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today a clergyman from St. Paul, Minn., visited me in my office. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who has made a commitment to do more in the contest against the growing incidents of juvenile delinquency both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commended me on my appearance a week ago Friday night at Macalester College in St. Paul as the final banquet speaker at a meeting of clergy and laymen concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's crime message of yesterday. He sat in my office while I was on a long distance telephone call, and read from the message, and later quoted to me the following words of the President of the United States:

> I propose the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

This clergyman said to me: "Congressman, do you think it will pass?" I said: "It already has passed the House of Representatives, in September of last year. To be sure the House in its wisdom rewrote the bill recommended by the administration. It tailored the bill to the Republican philosophy of the proper role for the Federal Government in the fight against juvenile delinquency, and it passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority." The clergyman look at me and said: "I find no reference to that fact in the President's message. Could you tell me why?" I said: "Sir, you have not addressed your question to the right party. I cannot look into the mind of another man."

I said: "I will make available to you the full text of the bill as passed by the House in September of last year, the bill which will make a meaningful contribution to the fight against juvenile delinquency, which will do so in a proper and most humanitarian way. I will also send you a copy of the debate in the House of Representatives, so that you may understand the reasons for the rejection by the House of Representatives of the administration recommendations and the adoption of those put forward under the leadership of individual Republican Congressmen serving in the House."

He said: "I hope you will. Is it not too bad that you do not have a voice equal to that of the occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, so that the entire country would understand that excellent progress legislatively in the Congress has already been made on this problem of juvenile delinquency prevention?"

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, attention can eventually be drawn to the impasse which exists in the U.S. Senate, and whatever reasons there may be for the delay, that those reasons will disappear, and inaction will end and action will take place in our other Chamber across the other side of this building.

All Americans deeply concerned about the growing rise of crime and juvenile delinquency should indeed be demanding that our sister Chamber take the same sort of constructive action which was taken here in the House of Representatives last August and last September.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Before I conclude I should like to say that the thing in the President's message which disappointed me most was his insistence once again upon the wiretap bill which he first proposed. As the Members of this body will recall, the President would permit wiretaps for the gathering of evidence only in national security cases, and he would decide or allow the appropriate authorities of the Executive establishment to decide when the national security was involved and what constituted national security cases.

The legislation which the task force has endorsed, which has been introduced in this body and in the other body, would permit wiretapping only in those cases where the law-enforcement officer was able to convince an appropriate judge that the evidence could not be acquired by other techniques, to convince the judge that a crime had been committed or was being committed, to convince the judge that a court order was necessary to acquire evidence of a crime specifically named in the legislation.

Legislation of this kind has received almost universal endorsement. The concept enjoys the approval of the three previous Attorneys General, of the Judicial Conference of the United States, of the majority of the President's own Crime Commission, and of every national law enforcement association in the United States which has pronounced upon the subject.

The Attorney General of the United States today stands almost alone in his opposition to that legislation.

The urgency of that legislation is greater today than it was before Monday of last week. On that day the Supreme Court rendered two decisions which jointly had the effect of nullifying the utility of the gambling tax statutes under which so many of the organized criminals of this country have been brought to the bar of justice. Now that law enforcement officers are stripped of that means of assembling evidence it is all the more important that this carefully devised legislation be considered promptly and favorably by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to hope that the President will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to receive on his desk a bill which will incorporate as one of its essential features the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford], and a number of other Members on this side of the aisle. If such legislation is a part of the bill before the President, I believe he will see fit to sign it. I cannot believe that the President could bring himself in the present state of things to veto such legislation. With that thought in mind, I trust that our committees in both the House and the other body will move promptly.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I must agree with the gentleman that I could not see the President bring himself to veto that kind of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

> Public order is the first business of Government.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we welcome President's Johnson's support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statements of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we urge its easily enactment.

The statements referred to follow:

House Republican Policy Committee Statement on the Antiriot Legislation, H.R. 421, July 12, 1967

The House Republican Policy Committee urges the prompt enactment of H.R. 421. This Republican sponsored legislation (the Cramer bill) would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in or using the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot.

Last year in response to a growing public demand for assistance in maintaining law and order in the streets and urban centers of our land, Republican antiriot legislation was adopted in the House of Representatives, as an amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, by a vote of 389 to 25. That legislation was permitted to die in the Senate. Now, as a result of continuing pressure and leadership by Republican Members, this vital legislation is being brought to the House Floor as an independent measure.

The proposed legislation represents the legitimate exercise of Federal criminal power under authority based on the commerce clause of the Constitution. Historically, certain types of conduct have been prohibited by Federal Statute when the facilities of interstate commerce are used. For example, there is the Mann Act, the prohibition against the interstate transportation of strike breakers, the Federal Kidnapping statute and the Anti-Racketeering Act.

H.R. 421 is not intended to and does not limit the right of dissent and peaceful demonstration. Legitimate activities by those who travel in interstate commerce to participate in public gatherings or other lawful demonstrations are not affected. However, those persons who use facilities in interstate commerce, or who travel from one State to another or from a foreign country to a State, in order to incite or attempt to incite riots, violence, looting, vandalism, arson, bombing, and physical assaults would be subject to prosecution.

This bill would supplement, not supersede local law enforcement. Certainly the most effective means of riot control rests with the State and local police. However, by assuring Federal jurisdiction over "out-of-State" inciters, State and local authorities will be substantially assisted in keeping the peace and protecting the public safety.

H.R. 421 would provide a new and effective law-enforcement weapon in riot situations like those that have occurred in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, Boston, Buffalo, and Waterloo. Many of the summertime riots have been traced to troublemakers who travel about this Nation inciting riots. It is imperative that we rid interstate commerce of these agitators and riot-mongers. The law-abiding citizens in the area where the riots occur may suffer grievous personal injury and untold property damage unless this additional protection is afforded them.

House Republican Policy Committee Statement on the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, H.R. 5037, August 2, 1967

The events of recent weeks have starkly dramatized the crisis in law enforcement in this country. The very ability of government to maintain law and order and to provide personal safety has been challenged. Local law enforcement, criminal justice, techniques of correction and rehabilitation must be updated and improved.

H.R. 5037, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, properly amended, could be an important step in the establishment of a federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies. Unfortunately, the Administration bill that was originally submitted contained the standard Great Society formula. It stifled local initiative and direction and placed maximum federal control in the hands of the Attorney General. In an effort to improve the bill, the Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee obtained a number of amendments. For example:

(a) An appropriate judicial review is provided in cases where the Attorney General cuts off funds.

(b) Congressional oversight on the operation of the data bank has been established.

(c) The open-end authorization was eliminated, thereby insuring essential legislative review of this Act.

(d) The direct Federal payment of regular police salaries has been banned.

The present emergency demands that meaningful and appropriate Federal assistance be given to state and local law enforcement agencies. However, this crisis must not be used as a vehicle to place Federal control over state and local police administration and to lay the foundation for a centralized Federal police force. Therefore, additional and essential safeguards on the broad powers of the Federal Administrator should be adopted.

Law enforcement and criminal justice administration are primarily local responsibilities. Crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by state and local governments. Even the Attorney General has stated, "We would hope to have all the States really working for a fully comprehensive plan for the State." Any provision or measure that would upset or reverse this historic concept must be avoided. The recent riots have reemphasized the basic fact that the State and its designated agencies must have the primary responsibility for coordinating the law enforcement effort within a state. Certainly, experience under the "poverty" program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate Federal activities with state activities creates serious financial and administrative problems.

In a letter dated June 8, 1967, the National Governors' Conference noted that "the state holds the primary responsibility for establishing the coordinating machinery needed for intergovernmental assistance programs." It was then suggested that H.R. 5037 be amended so that where a state has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid to local law enforcement activities, the Attorney General shall make all grants to the state agency designated by the Governor to administer such plan. On July 18, 1967, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller also urged the adoption of an amendment that would "assure that the State can effectively coordinate application for assistance." Governor Rockefeller pointed out, "If comprehensive crime control envisioned by H.R. 5037 is to be effective, it is essential that the legislation recognize the primary role of the State, especially in developing a statewide comprehensive plan."

We support an amendment of this type. We believe it will provide essential state coordination and eliminate the Federal Government's power to dominate and control local law enforcement. We reject the Democratic Majority's contention that ". . . the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in promulgating regulations and in administering the authorized programs to determine the population size that would be most appropriate for participation in the light of all considerations relevant to the particular programs."

We believe that an appropriate allocation formula should be adopted. In the present bill, the only limitation on the Attorney General's discretion to distribute funds, is the prohibition "that not more than 15 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be used within any one State."

Certainly, there must be a statutory assurance that there will be a meaningful amount of funds available for every State.

We believe that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which in turn would be authorized to establish regional training institutes. In order to have a real impact on our law enforcement problems, the education and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel and research must be emphasized. Improved training of local and state law enforcement personnel in riot prevention, riot suppression and riot control is needed. New techniques for combating organized crime must be developed. These objectives can be accomplished through an Institute similar to the National Institute of Health or the National Academy of Science. Moreover, the improved methods for crime detection, prevention, prosecution, and rehabilitation can be developed and taught in this manner without the danger of dominant by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I stood before this House, I praised certain portions of the President's message on crime. Indeed, I do find much to commend in the President's recommendations, particularly those regarding a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. If created, it could conduct research into the application of advanced scientific and technological devices for improving law enforcement, as well as for improving police training and education at Federal, State, and local levels. However, at the risk of sounding self-laudatory, I wish to remind the President—and the public—that such proposals were first put forward by Members of this House and were embodied in the substitute amendment which I offered to title III of the omnibus anticrime bill.

In fact, when one examines the President's 22 proposals to "insure public safety," one finds that they consist almost entirely of recommendations previously made by Republican Members, or are a rehash of the administration's past proposals. Careful scrutiny of the President's February 7 message reveals his concurrence with Republican thinking on the crime problem. For example:

The President urges the prompt passage of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act—formerly heralded by the misnomer "Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967." I agree that final action should be taken on this bill—a measure which was considerably improved by a series of Republican-offered amendments passed by this House last August.

The President asks for a "major assistance program" for the purposes of educating and training the Nation's law-enforcement personnel, as well as the initiation of a comprehensive research program to be conducted through a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice—virtually the sum and substance of my amendment to title III of the anticrime bill.

The President seeks a $100 million authorization for the crime bill—an amendment offered by my Republican colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] would have provided an increased authorization.

The President desires controls on the hallucinatory drug, LSD—a measure first suggested by my Republican colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The President also asks for riot control legislation—legislation which my Republican colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and many other Republican Members, including myself, have been urging for years.

The President wants to make it a Federal crime "to engage in gambling as a substantial business affecting interstate commerce." I refer him to the legislation first sponsored by my Republican colleague from Virginia [Mr. POFF]—and others—which would accomplish precisely this purpose.

The President wants legislation to permit the Federal Government to appeal pretrial orders granting motions to suppress evidence. I suggest that he examine a bill first introduced last session by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK].

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, many proposals made in the President's crime message reveal a decidedly Republican attitude on the subject of crime.

If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republicans modestly accept the role of pacemakers for the present administration. But we are not "beguiled" nor will the American public be deceived.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that in this election year of 1968 the President has suddenly awakened to a national crisis in crime.

He is eager to share the blame for this disgraceful crisis.

He implores that it not be made a partisan issue in the forthcoming election.

His wish is understandable! But the escalation of crime in this country is an issue.

Not because anyone makes it an issue. But because the senseless, spiraling, rise of crime in this land has struck fear and frustration into the hearts of the good men and women of this Nation.

It is an issue because the present administration has failed to comprehend and cope with it.

It is an issue and a culpability the administration cannot escape or share.

The people of this county know who was manning the watch when the ship of state ran aground on this rocky shoal.

The President's election year message is a sorry excuse for the dangerous course he has been setting throughout his administration. Every statistic is an indictment of his public stewardship—every line a confession of his failures to preserve to the people even the basic freedom—freedom from the fear of criminal tyranny in the streets of our cities and the homes of our land.

Crime is an issue in 1968, because the President did not make it an issue of his concern in 1967, or 1966, or 1965, or 1964—when all America was crying out for some protection for the honorable and decent citizens against the violent and corrupt criminals who seemed to enjoy unbelievable favor in the administration of justice during these years.

The folly of this foolishness has come home. The day of reckoning is here. That is why crime is an issue, and the President cannot escape it, or wish it away.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks today following the colloquy following my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION REFUSES TO TELL AMERICAN PEOPLE TRUTH ABOUT "PUEBLO," BECAUSE—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, does the administration not trust the American people enough to tell them what really happened in the *Pueblo* incident? Why does the administration not release the information the Communists almost certainly have: the full texts of the messages between the *Pueblo* and higher U.S. authority? A very small part of *Pueblo*'s transmissions, just a few words, have been made public, but there has been no information of any kind as to what the *Pueblo* was told to do, or not to do.

There were 2½ hours between the time the *Pueblo* was first stopped until it went off the air; 1½ hours from the time North Korean ships moved in until it quit transmitting; 45 minutes from the time of North Korean boarding until it went silent; 20 minutes from time of North Korean orders to go to Wonsan until the last message was sent.

What did the *Pueblo* tell Washington, and what went back in return?

The administration's statements and actions to date have gone from hard-line to soft-line to contradiction to the truly incredible recommendation that we admit we were wrong whether we were or not. The net result is confusion:

Hard line: a carrier task force to the Sea of Japan; fighter squadrons to South Korea; reserve callup.

Soft line: a Presidential reminder at a news conference that it took 7 months to get the crew of an RB-47 reconnaissance plane back from the Soviet Union.

Contradiction: Ambassador Goldberg told the U.N., without qualification, that the *Pueblo* was never in North Korean waters. The Secretary of Defense says we cannot be absolutely sure of this.

Plead guilty, regardless: the Senate Democratic majority leader suggested we admit the ship was in North Korean waters, whether it was or not, if this would get it back.

Espionage may be an unpleasant fact of the cold war, but it is a very real and necessary operation and I am certain the American people know and understand this. We have other so-called spy ships and the Soviet Union has around 40.

The Soviet ships lurk outside U.S. Polaris submarine bases at Guam, at Rota, Spain, at Holy Loch, in Scotland, and, where I have seen them myself, at Charleston, S.C. They wait off the Florida coast and monitor space flights from Cape Kennedy; they circle Kwajalein Atoll, in the South Pacific, where we test antiballistic missiles. They shadow our fleet in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic, and one now follows our naval forces in the Sea of Japan, off North Korea.

We consider 3 miles the limit for our territorial waters. According to the State Department, Soviet ships have come inside our limit on three occasions. Each time we have followed normal international practice in informing them they are trespassing, escorting them outside the limit, and protesting to Moscow.

Some countries, such as North Korea, consider 12 miles the limit. I have introduced legislation that would have 12 miles apply off our own shores to ships of all countries that claim 12 miles off their coasts.

The Soviet Union and North Korea are certainly working together now to make the whole incident as humiliating and difficult for the United States as they possibly can. We may be certain, too, that whatever intelligence data was taken from the *Pueblo* by North Korea was in Moscow in a very short time. In spite of this, we still are so naive as to seek Soviet help to get the ship and the men back. This is like asking the Mafia to handle an anticrime crusade.

Release of the messages would not tell the Communists anything they do not know. They monitor our broadcasts, too.

But release might tell the American people more about our lack of military preparedness and foresight than the administration cares for them to learn.

It might show we learned nothing from the attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty*, another electronic intelligence ship, in the Middle East last year.

The messages might show there were not enough planes available in South Korea to help handle such incidents.

The messages might show there were not enough ships available to provide some sort of naval backup and protection.

Secretary of Defense McNamara said that to have protected the ship would have been a provocative act. This is nonsense. We are quick to worry about provoking someone else, but if someone provokes us we try to excuse it, explain it away, cover it up, and temporize, giving the appearance of weakness and indecision.

"Speech is silver," says the old proverb, "but silence is golden." In this case, silence is also deceptive, evasive, and another attempt by the administration to bury a series of errors that added up to a gross tactical blunder.

THE PRESIDENT CALLS FOR LEGISLATION TO REDUCE BANK CRIMES

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 when the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations was reestablished, one of the most serious crime problems facing the Nation was the continuing rise in crimes against banking institutions. Embezzlements committed within banks had, for years, been increasing both in the number of offenses and in the amounts stolen from banks and savings and loan associations, and those institutions were increasingly being subjected to robberies and burglaries.

It is an obligation of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee to evaluate the efficiency and economy with which agencies under its jurisdiction conduct their operations. All of the Federal banking supervisory agencies are within the subcommittee's oversight jurisdiction. As chairman of the subcommittee, I therefore directed that a study be made of the operations of the supervisory agencies, as they related to the bank crime problems. That study resulted in a report, entitled "Crimes Against Banking Institutions"—House report 1147, 88th Congress, second session. That report contained the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to combat the rise in crimes against banking institutions it is recommended:

1. That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, hereafter called supervisory agencies, each establish by rules or regulations specific guidelines for the prevention of external and internal crimes against banking institutions under their supervision, consistent with the requirements of the several kinds and sizes of such institutions, and the public interest.

2. That in establishing such guidelines the supervisory agencies give consideration to incorporating therein, as requirements, adequate audit, compulsory vacations, direct verification, decoy money, and other widely accepted measures referred to in this report.

3. That the examiners employed by the supervisory agencies be given such training in the methods of prevention of external and internal crimes as will enable them to ascertain and advise on any security deficiencies in the institutions they examine; and that to assist in the examination for security against external crimes the examination report forms call for detailed information in that regard, similar to the American Bankers Association's bank inspection form referred to in this report.

4. That the supervisory agencies consider making it a requirement on the institutions they supervise that fingerprints of prospective officers, directors and employees of such institutions be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for criminal record checks.

5. That the supervisory agencies establish an interagency committee for the purposes of making a coordinated effort to lessen bank crimes through the collection and analysis of bank crime statistics and the study and development of means of combating such crimes; and to assist banking institutions toward greater security against such crimes by undertaking such research projects as may be deemed advisable, including the requirements, from the security standpoint, of a model institution, and the testing and evaluating of security means and devices.

6. That the adequacy of the institution's crime prevention facilities and procedures be considered whenever a supervisory agency must act upon its application for charter, deposit insurance, branch offices, or any other application requiring agency approval.

7. That the supervisory agencies impress on the directors of the institutions they supervise the collective and individual responsibilities of directors for the adequate security of their institutions against losses from crimes.

8. That consideration be given to legislation which would permit the supervisory agencies to approve or disapprove major changes in management arising from changes in control or ownership of institutions they supervise, and to exclude underworld elements from becoming directors, officers, or employees of banking institutions.

Over the intervening years, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have sought to have the above recommendations carried out by the bank supervisory agencies. In many respects the results have been excellent.

For example, the supervisory agencies have inaugurated procedures requiring their examiners to check on the kinds of security features banking institutions have provided to guard against robberies and burglaries. The agencies attempt to persuade banks and savings and loan associations to submit the fingerprints of prospective officers, directors, and employees to the FBI to be checked for any criminal records. Also, legislation has been adopted which requires that the supervisory agencies be notified of any changes in control and ownership of the institutions they supervise, thus arming them with some means of excluding underworld elements from taking over the institutions.

The agencies also have increased the instruction given their examiners on the perils of bank crimes, and have sought through instruction and moral persuasion to convince banks and bankers to better protect their institutions against crimes. However, they have not done enough—the easy test of that fact is that it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper on any day without reading a story about a current bank robbery. External crimes against banks have continued to increase, and they increased particularly sharply in the past year.

In 1966 these crimes against financial institutions protected by the Federal bank robbery statute reached an alltime high of 1,871. Figures recently made available by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that the total reached 2,551 in 1967—reflecting approximately a 30-percent increase.

The dollar amounts stolen from victimized banks are staggering. Data compiled by the American Bankers Association show that losses to federally insured banks, alone, resulting from robberies committed from January through June 1967, totaled $3.3 million, compared with $1.3 million in the same 6-month period of 1966. Additional large losses were suffered due to burglaries or larcenies. These statistics do not reflect the cost of investigating these crimes by law enforcement agencies.

As our report pointed out, of even greater concern than the dollar losses, is the peril to human lives that armed bank robberies represent. Bank officers and employees, customers, and police officers have been victims of the violence that is inherent in every bank robbery.

The FBI reports that banks are attractive targets for criminals not only because they are repositories for large sums of money, but also because security and protective methods are grossly inadequate in many banks. Some financial institutions are lagging behind retail stores and other business establishments in the protection they afford against robberies, burglaries, and larcenies. By and large, banking institutions have not taken full advantage of the safeguards which modern technology has placed at their disposal—such as hidden cameras, closed circuit television, microphones, and silent alarms. Some even refuse to use marked or "decoy" money, which would aid in the apprehension and conviction of bank robbers.

Federal supervisory agencies, in general, have issued no regulations requiring even basic security measures for the prevention of external crimes against financial institutions, and there have been indications that some doubt they have authority to do so.

The time has come when the Federal Government must assume responsibilities in this direction, and the President has clearly so indicated in his crime message. I therefore favor legislation which would authorize and require agencies vested with control of federally insured banks and savings and loan associations to develop and prescribe standards for the installation of such safety devices as are necessary to discourage robberies, burglaries and larcenies, and to assist in the apprehension of the criminals who commit these crimes.

I urge my colleagues to support these recommendations of the President.

THE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare convened the New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement Conference under the Clean Air Act of 1963. The first phase of the Conference considered primarily sulfur dioxide pollution and made specific recommendations for abatement, which were issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner.

The second session of the Conference started on January 30, 1968, to examine how the recommendations had been carried out, to consider particulate pollution and to make further recommendations.

I testified on January 30, 1968, about the continuing menace of air pollution in the New York metropolitan area and particularly about the failures of the New York City administration in air pollution control and abatement. As I did in January, 1967, I made specific proposals for action to be taken by the Conference in order to achieve clean air.

Although size and air pollution do not necessarily coincide, New York City has the most polluted air of any major city in the Nation. It is also the largest city.

We have both the resources and technologies to insure clean and healthy air now in all our cities. Our failures are simply failures of will and administration.

Unfortunately, the New York City administration has been providing the worst administration of air pollution control efforts of any major city in America.

Although faced with almost certain air pollution disasters, the city administration has failed to establish an essential emergency plan to ward off such disasters when they come.

For more than a year, the city administration has failed to use available Federal funds for air pollution control. The Federal Government has had to extend the grant.

The administration is the city's worst polluter by far. It is also the city's worst violator of the air pollution law and its worst scofflaw. It is scoffing at State law, which requires low-sulfur fuels. It scoffed at a new city law prohibiting open burning. It is scoffing at its own laws governing municipal and apartment house incinerators. It has encouraged landlords to scoff at the laws.

The New York City administration has confirmed the facts of my testimony before the Conference about its failures.

A new city law, local law 14, had required upgrading of incinerators in large apartment buildings by May 20, 1967. In testimony before the Conference on February 1, 1968, the New York City commissioner of air pollution control, Austin N. Heller, confirmed that the administration's own ruling that buildings constructed before 1951 would not have to upgrade incinerators "was the final 'coup de grace'" to the law.

Although city law required an end to open burning by May 20, 1967, Commissioner Heller confirmed that open burning had been permitted "until November of this past year."

Although municipal incinerators violate the present code, and city law requires upgrading of all municipal incinerators by mid-1969, the commissioner confirmed that—

> It now appears unlikely that all the municipal incinerator furnaces will be able to comply with this deadline.

Although the law required upgrading of incinerators in some 9,000 large apartment houses over seven stories by May 20, 1967, the commisioner admitted in his testimony that less than 2 percent or some "150 upgraded on-site incinerators have received certificates of operation since the effective date of the law."

RECOMMENDATIONS

I asked the Conference to make part of the public record a list of the major particulate polluters in the area. On February 1, 1968, the Conference released a list of 144 point sources emitting more than 100 tons per year of particulate matter.

The point source report reveals that New York City's municipal incinerators produce 17,223 tons per year of particulate matter. On the basis of a 6-day week this is 53.6 tons per day. The figure used in my testimony, which was obtained from the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, was 13,000 tons per year. So the situation is considerably worse than the city's own estimate.

I asked the Conference to require that New York City—

Immediately develop a workable automatic emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster;

Comply immediately with the 1967 Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels;

Set requirements that those who burn coal and fuel oil use fuel which generates less particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment;

Enforce the ban on open burning;

Immediately enforce upgrading or shutting down of all private incinerators along with necessary steps to handle the additional refuse;

Upgrade the municipal incinerators and install precipitators or bag filters; submit monthly reports and comply by a deadline of no more than the end of the year; and

Immediately make actual use of granted Federal funds.

I urged the Conference to require New Jersey to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal.

I pointed out that the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effect.

I called upon the Conference to make specific recommendations to deal with the dangerous problem of particles which are smaller than 5 microns.

I urged the Conference to prepare a comprehensive emergency action plan for the entire New York-New Jersey 17-county area, to be implemented by phase as the level of pollutants rises.

Finally, I asked that the Conference remain in continuing session and that regular reports be submitted to the presiding officer. If air pollution is to be significantly reduced, then the Conference's continuing jurisdiction is required.

I include at this point in the RECORD my testimony on January 30, 1968, before the second session of the New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement Conference:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN BEFORE THE SECOND SESSION, NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONFERENCE AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY ALUMNI HALL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 30, 1968

This Second Session of the Interstate Air Pollution Abatement Conference is investigating particulate pollution which endangers the health and welfare of persons in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area.

But this session also has another stated purpose, to evaluate just what action has been taken since the first session one year ago to control sulfur dioxide pollution.

When I testified at the first session in January 1967, I pointed out that the problem of air pollution is well known to all. We know its costs and its damage to health and property. We have the power, the funds and the technologies to stop pollution.

"The need today," I pointed out then, "is not primarily for more discussions, new technologies or even new laws. The need today is for action."

This Conference made recommendations that forced action.

New York State has complied generally with the recommendations. New Jersey has followed some of the recommendations. The Consolidated Edison Company has taken major steps.

But New York City, despite its highly publicized promises, has acted not for strict controls to benefit the citizens it represents but for looser controls to accommodate influential interests and the real estate operators.

Today I am testifying more in sorrow than in anger.

I am testifying to New York City's ineptitude, broken promises, and shocking failures.

Over the last year, the City Administration has given a demonstration of the worst administration of air pollution control efforts of any major city in America.

Although theoretically all in the same Administration, the City's Mayor, Air Pollution Control Commissioner, and Sanitation Commissioner apparently never coordinate policy.

The Administration has promised speed and engendered delay. It has told different stories to different audiences. It has calmly broken its own promises.

For a year the City Administration has called for more Federal aid for air pollution control, while not even using the funds the Federal government had already provided.

For more than eight months, the Administration has played a comedy over enforcing the law governing apartment building incinerators.

Despite proclamations, it has not upgraded its own Housing Authority incinerators.

Despite plans and promises, it has taken no rapid action to upgrade municipal incinerators. They are all operating in violation of the law.

Although faced with almost certain air pollution disasters that may kill hundreds or thousands, the City Administration has failed to establish an adequate essential emergency plan to prevent such disasters.

The Administration is the City's worst polluter. It is also the City's worst lawbreaker and its worst scofflaw. It is scoffing at its own laws governing incinerators. It is encouraging and in fact advising landlords to scoff at the laws. It is undermining State Law, specifically Rule 200.

I am testifying in the hope that this Conference will make recommendations, requiring the New York City Administration to obey its own laws, to enforce its own rules, to use Federal funds it already has and to act to end air pollution not in ten years, but now.

I am also asking this Conference to require compliance with the recommendations it made last January.

THE DIRTIEST AIR

New York City has the most polluted air in the nation. We pump more poison and pollution per square mile into our air than any other major city, some 9,000 tons a day.

New York City's air is not the dirtiest simply because the city is the largest. San Francisco, for instance, ranks seventh in the nation in population but it ranks 35th in terms of pollution. Wilmington, Delaware, ranks 55th in population but 15th in terms of pollution. Jersey City is almost as bad, 45th in population but 17th in terms of pollution.

Primarily, New York City has the dirtiest air in America because the City Administrations, past and present, have not taken the actions or enforced the laws that would ensure clean air.

THREAT TO HEALTH

As almost every expert now agrees, air pollution damages our health. It helps kill many of us slowly and some of us rapidly. Dr. John T. Middleton, Director of the Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control, has stated publicly that in New York City and other large urban areas, "the public health and welfare are threatened by air pollution."

Dr. Norton Nelson, Director of the Institute of Industrial Medicine of the New York University Medical Center, has pointed out, "Air pollution in its effects on health . . . acts primarily through the exacerbation of existing diseases."

With rapidly increasing air pollution, respiratory diseases have been growing at an appalling rate. Studies have shown that air pollution contributes to bronchitis and emphysema, in which lung tissue is progressively destroyed. These diseases have been causing twice as many deaths every five years. To put it another way, in New York City since 1960 the death rates of emphysema have increased 100 per cent.

Air pollution also may contribute to lung cancer, which now takes 50,000 lives a year. One study by a doctor at Albert Einstein Medical College has found that the death rate from lung cancer among men living on the north shore of Staten Island, where air pollution has been rampant, is more than 30 per cent greater than for men living on the south shore, where the air is relatively clean.

Air pollution sometimes kills quickly.

We are all familiar with the historic air pollution disasters—the Meuse River Valley of Belgium in 1930; London's killer smog of 1952, which killed thousands, the Donora, Pennsylvania disaster of 1948; and disasters in New York City in 1953, 1963, and 1966, which killed hundreds.

As I have warned many times in the past, in New York City we face atmospheric inversions that will concentrate the slowly murderous effects of air pollution into a few hours or days, and murder hundreds or even thousands.

DAMAGE TO PROPERTY

As well as injuring our health, air pollution costs us billions of dollars every year in property damage. One estimate puts the cost at $65 per person or from $11 to $12 billion dollars a year. Yet for around $3 billion dollars a year we could erase the outrage, according to *Fortune* Magazine.

In the 17-county New York and New Jersey area, we are paying $3 billion dollars a year for pollution damage.

New York City itself estimates each person in Manhattan spends about $350 extra per year because of air pollution. According to the City, polluted air is costing the family in Manhattan $850 a year, a family in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens $720 and the family in Staten Island $560 a year.

In air pollution we are now paying many times more for the dirty air we don't want than we would have to pay for the clean air we do want.

The New York City Administration has formally and publicly made the following declaration to all of us. I quote to you from a pamphlet, "What Does Air Pollution Cost You," above the names of the Mayor and the Commissioner of Air Pollution Control:

"It's your job, as a consumer and a taxpayer, to build a market for air pollution control—to demand clean air. And to tell all those heel-dragging polluters who tell you there's a price tag on clean air, 'I know, but it's cheaper than dirty air.'"

As you know, the major heel-dragging polluters who put a price tag on clean air are the members of the New York City Administration. In their own words, they must be told there is no excuse. Clean air is cheaper.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

On January 19, 1967, the first session of this Conference, as provided by law, made seven major recommendations.

Recommendations V, VI and VII related to industrial emission of sulfur oxide compounds, emission of carbon monoxide and emissions from Abex Corporation, Mahwah, N.J.

These recommendations have been generally followed.

The major Conference recommendations called for a regional air pollution control agency and action to cut the sulfur dioxide pollution that threatens all of us. Sulfurous air pollution needs no description. It is the traditional air pollution depicted in Hell.

Recommendation I called for an interstate agency with legal authority to control pollution on a regional basis. New York and New Jersey have passed the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact, now subject to act of Congress.

The Conference found that our air is continuously more polluted by sulfur dioxide than the standard recommended by the Public Health Service.

Sulfur-rich fuels are the source of sulfur dioxide pollution. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic, industrial and commercial plants for heat and other purposes.

Through power-plant use, sulfur-rich fuels contribute 40 per cent of the present sulfur dioxide pollution. Through domestic, commercial and industrial burning, they contribute another 50 per cent.

Recommendation III would ensure future use of low-sulfur fuel. The conference recommended that all approved new power generating facilities must have an assured 20-year supply of low sulfur fuel or must demonstrate effective control means.

Last year, on September 29, 1967, the New York State Air Pollution Control Board adopted Rule 200, which carries out this and other recommendations. (Rule 200 prohibits any new power generating facilities designed for fuel having a sulfur content of more than one per cent by weight after October 1, 1968, in Bronx, Kings and New York Counties and in the remainder of the New York City metropolitan area after October 1, 1969.)

Consolidated Edison is building a new facility on Staten Island. The company reports that the new plant will use low sulfur fuel and will include the latest air pollution control equipment.

Recommendations II and IV deal with existing polluters. The recommendations require use of low-sulfur fuel by October 1, 1969. (The recommendations require that fuel used by power plants should not contain more than one per cent sulfur by weight; oil used for heating or other domestic, commercial or industrial purposes should not contain more than 0.3 per cent sulfur by weight; coal used for heating or other domestic, commercial or industrial purposes should not contain more than 0.2 per cent sulfur by weight.)

On January 12, 1968, the New Jersey Commissioner of Health promulgated regulations requiring low sulfur fuel oils. (These regulations, Chapter X, limit sulfur content by May 1, 1968, to 0.3 per cent in distillate oil, 0.7 per cent in Number Four oil and 0.5 per cent in residual oil. By October 1, 1971, they require 0.2 per cent in distillate oil, 0.3 per cent in Number Four oil, and 0.3 per cent in residual oil.)

Unfortunately, New Jersey's regulations do not cover the sulfur content of coal, which is a major power plant fuel and continues to make contribution to both sulfur dioxide and particulate pollution. There is no excuse for this failure.

RULE 200

With Rule 200, New York State moved to comply with all the power-plant fuel recommendations. (Rule 200 limits power plant fuel to 1.0 per cent sulfur content in the Bronx, Kings and New York Counties by October 1, 1968, a year earlier than the Conference recommendations; and in other New York metropolitan counties by October 1, 1969.)

Rule 200 also carries out the Conference recommendation on low-sulfur fuel for heating and other domestic and commercial purposes. (Rule 200 prohibits use of fuel containing more than 0.2 pounds of sulfur per million BTU gross heat content (0.34 percent sulfur by weight) in stationary installations by October 1, 1969, except for power plants.)

Consolidated Edison Company has de-

clared its intention to "cooperate with Federal, State and local officials in every way to attain the goal of clean air for New York." Chairman Charles F. Luce formally supported Rule 200.

By last December, Con Edison had switched to fuel oil of one per cent sulfur. By April, 1968, its coal is expected to meet the one per cent standard.

As a past critic of Con Edison's failures in air pollution control, it is a pleasure to commend Chairman Luce and the Company for its progress. Con Edison's actions alone prove the soundness of the Conference approach.

However, in the fight against sulfur dioxide pollution, the New York City Administration has taken its stand with the polluters and against clean air.

Neither New York City's Local Law 14 nor proposed additions to the law comply with Conference recommendations or with New York State Rule 200. The City law would permit use of more sulfur-rich fuels for longer times.

(Under Local Law 14, coal and residual oil is limited to 2.2 per cent sulfur. On May 20, 1969, it would be limited to 2 per cent and on May 20, 1971, to 1 per cent. Under the proposed amendment to Local Law 14, Number 2 oil would be limited to 1 per cent and Number 4 oil to 1.75 per cent sulfur. On May 20, 1969, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1.6 per cent, and on May 20, 1971, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1 per cent.)

Studies have shown that the worst recorded concentrations of sulfur dioxide are in the heart of Manhattan, around the 121st Street air pollution sampling station. At the first session of this Conference, William H. Megonnell of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that an 83 per cent reduction of sulfur dioxide pollution would be needed to meet the maximum permissible standards around the 121st Street station.

In its summary report of the first session, this Conference stated that to bring air quality up to minimum standards for sulfur dioxide would "require an overall reduction in emissions of slightly more than 80 percent."

When the New York State Air Pollution Control Board held hearings on Rule 200, the New York City Administration opposed Rule 200's limitations on sulfur-rich fuels. The Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, Austin Heller, testified against the rule and pleaded for the continued use of more sulfur-rich fuels.

Commissioner Heller has made clear the City Administration's objective—not cleaner air but lower costs for polluting landlords and lower costs for our largest polluter, New York City.

At the Rule 200 hearing he said, "An 80 per cent reduction may not be necessary to achieve our air quality objective."

He said, and these are his words, "It is incumbent upon us to examine the economic impact of the proposed rule and suggest modifications."

Commissioner Heller pleaded for a system of interruptible gas and Number 2 fuel oil, which experts have stated would not necessarily meet the standards. He has said that, if the regulations were relaxed and this system were used, "It would be far less expensive for us."

Presumably by "us" he meant the real estate lobby and the City Administration's own heat and power plants.

On the one hand, the City Administration says cost is not a factor. Clean air is cheaper. On the other hand, it pleads for less effective and less expensive methods.

As I said at the time of the Rule 200 hearings, the Administration has given a shocking defense of go slow abatement and continued air pollution.

NO WORKABLE EMERGENCY PLAN

With present levels of sulfur dioxide, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate pollution, New York City still faces the constant threat of an atmospheric inversion, holding down the poisons to create a pollution disaster.

The Public Health Service has warned of such episodes. In its Phase II report for this Conference, the Public Health Service warns:

"Based on past records, the New York metropolitan area will average two such episodes per year. In one-half of the years an episode will occur in September or October and one-third of the episodes will persist six days or more. The longer episodes are most likely to occur in the fall."

In a recent letter to me, Dr. John T. Middleton, Director of the Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control, wrote:

"We share your great concern of the possibility—indeed, the probability—of another air pollution episode in the New York-New Jersey area."

In testimony before this Conference last year I noted that New York City had suffered an inversion which brought a near disaster during Thanksgiving, 1966. I pointed out that New York City received a warning of the inversion build up on Wednesday, November 23rd, at 12:07 P.M., but did not issue an official alert until Friday, November 25th, at 1:15 P.M.

I called for the immediate establishment of an adequate air monitoring network to provide an automatic warning system. Further, I noted, "This system must involve a mandatory shutdown of major pollution sources."

As an inversion occurs, and pollution builds up, such an emergency action plan would provide for the automatic shutdown of selected sources of pollution, thus preventing the killing disaster.

The Federal Weather Bureau warns localities of inversions and the threat of air pollution disasters. New York City has publicized a network of air monitoring stations to report on rising pollution.

But it is obviously only part of the problem to know when the disaster is coming. It is also necessary to be prepared to do something about it.

Under the Clean Air Act of 1967, in the case of an approaching air pollution disaster, the Federal government can ask the Attorney General to seek an injunction to stop polluters. But such action obviously would take too much time to be effective in the rapid pollution buildup of most disasters.

Dr. Middleton testified recently before the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of which I am a member. He pointed out that Los Angeles has a workable warning system and action plan.

What about New York?

We know we are going to have some future air pollution disaster in New York. It may threaten the lives of hundreds or thousands. We will be warned of its approach. Yet New York City has failed to come up with a workable emergency plan that would stave off the disaster—no workable plan to stop polluters before pollution reaches the danger and death-dealing levels.

This is worse than shocking. This is criminal.

For the sake of the health and life of the citizens of New York City, this Conference must require that the metropolitan area, and particularly New York City, immediately develop a workable automatic emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

* * * * *

New York State has moved to comply with Conference recommendations; New Jersey has made a start. However, the New York City Administration has opposed adequate regulation, failed in enforcement and failed to prepare for predicted pollution disasters.

PART II—PARTICULATE POLLUTION

Danger to health and property

This session of the Conference is investigating particulate pollution.

In its threat to health, particulate matter is critical, not just by itself, but as the carrier of damaging and deadly pollutants.

At last year's conference, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, Assistant Surgeon General, Director, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that the greatest danger from SO2 is that it oxidizes rapidly to S03, which combines with moisture to form sulfuric acid mist. The membranes and tissues of the respiratory tract and the lungs would supply this moisture if SO2, adsorbed on particulates, is breathed in and carried deep into the respiratory system. While the larger particles tend to be caught in the upper respiratory tract and many are expelled, smaller particles—those less than 5 microns in diameter (approximately 56% or 136,000 tons per year)—remain airborne indefinitely; they are small enough to be inspired deep into the human respiratory system.

Fine particulates accompany coarse emissions (such as from coal burning, incineration and some industrial processes) but also emanate from the burning of natural gas, fuel oil and vehicular fuels. Even when particulates are stringently controlled, those particles which do escape collection are smaller than 5 microns. A solution must be found for this danger to human health. I urge the Conference to make specific recommendations to deal with this problem.

Greatest densities of all types of particulate pollution are found in highly populated business and residential districts of Manhattan. Values in Manhattan range from 3.7 tons per square mile on a minimum heating day to 6.4 tons per square mile on a maximum heating day. Manhattan emission densities are more than three times greater than those of Hudson County, the next most contaminated area.

Six of the square-mile zones in New York City have emission densities exceeding 10 tons per day. On a maximum heating day in New York City, particulate emissions have reached a level of 479.4 tons. These figures reflect the greater quantities of refuse incinerated and the heavier concentration of power plants in New York City.

Manhattan is also a center of heavy densities of settleable particulates (concentrations greater than 35 tons per square mile per month) and suspended particulates (The 121st Street station rates a measurement of "heavy soiling.") Thus, where the largest number of people work and live, the highest concentrations of particulate pollution are found—where they can hurt human beings the most.

In the book, "Air Conservation," The American Association for the Advancement of Science notes that small particles may carry various damaging materials, including free radicals and gases. These pollutant particles can induce mutagenic effects similar to those caused by radiation. Thus, the synergistic combination of particulates with other pollutants, particularly the SO2 which we have in abundance in our ambient air, could be a serious danger to health. Insults to some portion of the respiratory tract by pollutants may alter the receptivity to infection or may permit infection to progress to overt disease. This is the part scientists and medical experts are beginning to assign to pollutants in the increase of respiratory ailments.

Another work, "Waste Management and Control," notes that "sensitivity to effects of sulfur dioxides is markedly increased by certain otherwise harmless aerosol particles."

In damage to property, particulate matter is a major offender. As noted, we are spending something like $11 billion per year in the nation, including $3 billion a year in the

17-county metropolitan area, for air pollution damage. Much of this expenditure is for the removal of settled particles from buildings (commercial and residential), clothing, household effects and other surfaces.

Major sources

The polluters are now pouring a total of about 240,000 tons of particulate matter into the air over the 17-county area. This is about 9000 tons more than the amount cited in the Phase II Particulate Matter report. This increase is attributable mainly to the New York City municipal incinerators and to rock crushing operations.

Fuel oil and chiefly coal, burned primarily by power plants and residential heating units, contribute 56 percent of the total. Refuse burning contributes about 19 per cent. Motor vehicles contribute 14 per cent, industrial processes 10 per cent, and aircraft and shipping less than one per cent.

The major particulate polluters are those who burn fuel oil, coal and refuse. They generate three-fourths of all particulate pollution.

New York City installations are a major source of particulates. New York City operates many heating units as well as some 2,666 Housing Authority incinerators and 11 huge municipal incinerators.

Last January I asked this Conference to list major producers of sulfur dioxide pollution. The Conference released a list showing who is poisoning us and how much.

I understand the Public Health Service has pinpointed some 137 major sources of particulate pollution, each of which generates more than 100 tons per year.

These sources include 26 steam-electric power plants, 73 industrial sites (fuel, process, and incineration combined), 31 municipal incinerators, and 7 miscellaneous coal-burning operations.

These 137 point sources contribute 43 per cent, or 98,500 tons per year, of the particulate emissions in the area. Industrial point sources generate 38,300 tons of particulate per year, or 17 percent of the area total. Power plant point sources contribute 17 percent of the total particulate (39,000 tons), and the 31 point source municipal incinerators emit 19,000 tons of particulate, or 8.2 percent of the total.

I ask that this Conference make public a list of the 137 point sources of particulate pollution so citizens will know who is dumping how much particulate on them. This information should be made part of the record of this conference.

Stationary combustion of fuels and refuse burning are the two major producers of particulate pollution.

In stationary combustion, coal is the major problem. It supplies about 15 per cent of our heat but more than twice as much of our particles. Coal burning contributes about 34 percent of the particulate pollution. Fuel oil contributes something like 21 per cent of the particulate matter; natural gas less than 2 percent.

In stationary combustion, power plants are a major source.

Some local power companies have taken steps to reduce particulate emission from coal firing.

As well as moving toward low-sulfur fuel, Consolidated Edison Company is moving toward low-particulate fuel, from coal to oil and from oil to gas. It has received an increased permanent allocation of natural gas from the Federal Power Commission. It will start this spring to convert three plants in Manhattan, one in the Bronx and two in Brooklyn, from coal to oil.

In another demonstration of what can be done, Con Edison installed last April an electrostatic precipitator said to be 99% effective at the new Ravenswood Plant.

In stationary combustion, however, the largest source is not power plants but the burning of coal and fuel oil for residential heating. This burning contributes 22.5 percent of the total particulates generated in New York City.

Thus in terms of fuel and stationary combustion, present requirements for cleaner, low-sulfur fuel are a step in the right direction.

This Conference must also recommend requirements that those who burn coal and fuel oil use fuel which generates less particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment. These requirements must cover both power plants and heating units.

Incineration

In New York City, incineration continues to be one of the major sources of particulates. In the City's central area, more refuse is burned and incinerators pour out more particulates per square mile than anywhere else in the nation.

Residential, industrial and commercial incinerators are major offenders. There are more than 12,000 apartment house, flue-fed incinerators, each discharging more than a ton of particulate air pollution each year.

Few of the apartment house incinerators and none of the municipal incinerators are meeting the City's own emission standards.

At the present time, with the full knowledge of the Administration, almost every incinerator in New York City is violating the law.

Not only is the Administration not enforcing its own law, it is itself violating the law and in some instances even encouraging landlords to violate the law.

In 1966 New York City passed Local Law 14 requiring all private incinerators in buildings over six stories to be upgraded by May 20, 1967, and in other buildings by May 20, 1968.

Upgrading of the incinerators would require two types of proven, available equipment—a combustion chamber to raise burning temperatures to at least 1,400 degrees for minimal efficient burning and a scrubber to trap solids and particles before they pour into the atmosphere.

Commissioner Heller estimated the average cost of the upgrading would be $7,000 per incinerator.

The Administration has gone through a series of contradictory statements, retractions, and inter-Administration arguments.

Housing authority incinerators

On April 25, 1967, Commissioner Heller proclaimed in the New York *Times* that the City's Housing Authority, "has taken all the necessary steps to meet" the deadline for upgrading 1,169 of its 2,666 incinerators by May 20, 1967.

On May 21, 1967, Commissioner Heller made a publicity tour of the Authority's Robert Fulton Houses, which had been using upgraded incinerators for three years.

Then apparently the Housing Authority had some second thoughts—unpublicized. Although the City had estimated it would cost $7,000 to upgrade each incinerator, the Housing Authority now claimed it would cost $19,000 per incinerator or a total of $23 million.

As of yesterday, the New York City Housing Authority reported that it had completed work on combustion devices for less than ⅓ (or only 305) of the 1,169 incinerators. It has contracted for, and begun work on, less than one third (or 343) scrubbers. Thus, the Housing Authority incinerators continue in violation of the Air Pollution Code and Local Law 14 although the deadline was May 20, 1967. Apparently, it has done nothing about the 1,497 incinerators that must be upgraded by May 20, 1968.

Apartment house incinerators

Now I ask you to listen to the story of New York City's upgrading of apartment house incinerators.

On April 25, 1967, Commissioner Heller publicly warned landlords that he intended to close incinerators in apartment houses that failed to meet standards effective May 20, 1967. According to the *New York Times*, the Commissioner proclaimed:

"I am very unsympathetic to the seeming lack of responsibility of those who have both the financial ability and all the information they need to meet this deadline."

And he added, "The owner of every incinerator which does not have a valid certificate of operation will be served a notice that within five days the incinerator will be sealed."

But on May 20th, when the law went into effect, the Administration jumped several different ways, all at the same time.

Up until 1951 some apartments constructed in New York City were built with incinerators and some without incinerators. In 1951 the City passed a law requiring new apartment houses to be built with incinerators. This fact gave the Administration its loophole.

When the new law took effect, Commissioner Heller ruled that owners of large buildings built with incinerators before 1951 would not necessarily have to abide by the law. They could choose whether to upgrade their incinerators or to shut them down.

As he explained later, this was—and I quote the *New York Times* of August 5, 1967—"to make them even with pre-1951 owners who had selected garbage removal in the first place."

But on May 21, after the law went into effect, Commissioner Heller permitted them to violate the law, apparently because no one had considered the fact that closing incinerators would mean more garbage on the street and more work for the Sanitation Department.

At the same time, however, the Commissioner said 75 inspectors would check more modern buildings. If they had not upgraded within five days, inspectors would seal incinerators. Landlords would be fined $25 and billed for additional garbage collection.

But apparently the Air Pollution Control Commissioner had not talked to the Sanitation Commissioner, who said he was not sure the City could charge for the collection or could handle the added garbage.

In July the Mayor signed a new housing Code which did not require that incinerators be installed in apartment houses. Theoretically, that Code was to take effect after all incinerators had been upgraded.

The Corporation Counsel, a member of the same Administration as the Air Pollution Control and Sanitation Commissioners, promptly ruled that because of the new Code no one could be required to upgrade.

Then the Sanitation Department jumped in and pointed out that, if all incinerators were shut down, it could not possibly handle the garbage increase.

By September, Commissioner Heller had forgotten the old May 20 deadline. Now he promised a three-year program to give landlords the option of upgrading their incinerators, installing compaction equipment or discontinuing use of incinerators.

The Sanitation Commissioner pointed out that all this was predicated on his getting 800 new collection trucks to haul away the extra garbage. In late October, contracts were announced for $11.6 million for 800 new trucks.

Both the City Administration and others have introduced amendments to Local Law 14 on incinerators. The Administration proposes three alternatives: upgrade, install a compactor or shut down. Councilman Robert Low introduced an amendment which would require all landlords by May 20, 1968, to either upgrade their incinerators or install compacting systems. Neither of the amendments has been passed. It is eight months since the May 20 deadline when all incinerators had to be upgraded.

Open burning

In a similar vein, the City Administration has taken steps to cut down on open burning. Local Law 14 prohibited open burning after May 20, 1967. But the Administration scoffed at the law and permitted open burning of timbers from pier and other projects.

Staten Island threatened to sue to enforce the law. Commissioner Heller halted the burning. Timbers piled up. In August, the Administration allowed burning, again in violation of the law, but further away from those who might sue.

* * * * *

This Conference must require the City Administration immediately to enforce the ban on burning, and immediately enforce upgrading or shutting down of private incinerators along with necessary steps to handle the additional refuse.

Municipal incinerators

But whether apartment incinerators are upgraded or closed, the City Administration remains the major lawbreaker and scofflaw in the City in its operation of municipal incinerators.

The 11 municipal incinerators, which are operating in violation of the Code, pour out about 40 tons a day of particulate matter for a whopping total of some 13,000 tons a year.

There is no need for this. Proven devices for control of particulate emissions include electrostatic precipitators and bag filters. Precipitators were invented in 1912, have proven themselves, have been used extensively in Europe on large municipal refuse-burning steam and power plants. Fiber glass bag filters have also proven themselves in industrial and other installations. Both devices have demonstrated efficiencies of more than 95 percent.

In 1965 spokesmen for the present Administration pledged immediate action to bring municipal incinerators within the law. On June 23, 1965, John V. Lindsay, Candidate for Mayor, said, "The City should put its own house in order."

Early in 1966, Mayor Lindsay set up his own Task Force on Air Pollution in the City of New York. That Task Force found, and I quote:

"The City is a gross violator of its own laws against air pollution . . . The City cannot expect to be taken seriously in its efforts to combat pollution unless it acts vigorously and promptly to reduce the film, smoke and poisons produced by the incinerators in its own waste disposal plants."

The Task Force reported the City must, "First, install effective air-pollution equipment on its incinerators or it must find other methods of disposing of garbage and waste."

Yet the City Administration has failed to act, has delayed and dawdled rather than forged ahead on upgrading municipal incinerators.

On January 4, 1967, in testimony before this Conference, Mayor Lindsay said:

"We are moving toward a major reduction of the fly-ash produced by our 11 municipally-operated incinerators with a pilot project under which we will get electrostatic precipitators for minimizing smoke and soot. The project is being financed with a $218,000 grant from the Public Health Service, the first such award to any city for a demonstration project of this nature . . . We hope to obtain conclusive reports on the merits of the devices by the end of this year."

But after many well publicized promises, the City Administration failed to produce. The Administration, which had the money, was not even able to spend it in one whole year. The Administration literally wasted all of 1967.

On October 26, 1966, the City had asked for a demonstration grant to evaluate control systems for municipal incinerators. On January 1, 1967, the Federal government had granted the full amount requested, $218,400 in Federal funds to be matched by $72,900 of city funds. Under the grant the first year funds were to be spent by December 31, 1967. The Federal government scheduled a second year of support for $149,750.

Leisurely, the Administration went out looking for a contractor, hired Arthur D. Little Company, then apparently found Little was not licensed in New York City, hooked up with another engineering firm which was licensed, and the whole year was gone.

On December 26, 1967, the City Administration has spent not one cent of the funds, and it requested an extension of the project so it would begin not in 1967 but in 1968, one year late. The Federal government agreed.

There is no excuse for such delay. Surely there is no excuse for failing to spend the money you have to do the job you say you want to do.

On January 5, 1967, Air Pollution Control Commissioner Heller testified before this Conference:

"The City's eleven large municipal incinerators, none of which can presently meet the requirements of the new regulations, will be improved drastically, and the emission from them will be reduced by at least 90 per cent."

Commissioner Heller added:

"The municipal incinerators must be upgraded by mid-1969, by law, but actually, progress will be faster. Thanks partly to a Federal grant, a pilot model will be in operation at one city incinerator within six months. The information to be derived from this pilot study will provide a firm basis for the selection of an efficient and economical device to control all particulate emissions for the city-owned incinerators."

All this would be funny if it were not so sad.

On June 29, 1967, the City Administration announced with considerable fanfare that it was, "moving to install electrostatic precipitators on two Sanitation Department incinerators in Brooklyn as part of the City's continuing war on air pollution."

The City said it was asking capital funds for precipitators at the South Shore and the Southwest Brooklyn Plant. It estimated that the two installations would take six to eight months. Give or take a month or two for what the Administration called, "formal approval by the Board of Estimate at its July 27th meeting."

Six months have gone by.

What happened to the precipitators?

In 1965, discussing the East 73rd Street Plant, the Department of Sanitation said it planned a test installation of a new type of multi-cone centrifugal separator for one furnace . . . "for completion in late 1966." But it did not get started in 1966.

On February 20, 1967, the Department announced with much fanfare that it had, "moved to install the Department's first scrubber device in its East 73rd Street burner."

But last week I visited the plant. Nothing has happened at the East 73rd Street plant.

Four of the City's 11 incinerators were built before 1938 and are obsolete by any standard. In 1965, two of the plants, Zerega Avenue, Bronx, and Flushing, Queens, were scheduled for abandonment when the new South Bronx Plant was completed.

In 1965 the Sanitation Department reported the South Bronx Plant was scheduled for completion in 1969. The Sanitation Department now reports—three years later, and one year before scheduled completion—that it will be at least two or three years before anyone breaks ground on the South Bronx Plant.

What happened?

* * * * *

The New York City Administration has administered a disaster in air pollution abatement and control.

With this kind of a record it is essential that this Conference require New York City to upgrade the municipal incinerators and install precipitators or bag filters. This Conference must require monthly reports and set a deadline of no later than the end of this year.

As the City Administration has proclaimed, cost is not a problem. For the citizen, clean air is cheaper. It will save hundreds of lives. It will cost less than dirty air.

CONCLUSION

I ask this Conference to require immediate action by the New York City Administration, including the actual use of granted Federal funds; immediate initiation of a workable plan of action for emergencies; upgrading or closing of apartment and municipal incinerators; and immediate compliance with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels.

In addition, the Conference should require New Jersey to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal. Moreover, the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effect.

The Conference should prepare a comprehensive emergency action plan for the entire New York-New Jersey 17-county area, to be implemented by phases as the level of pollutants rises.

Finally, the Conference should remain in continuing session, and regular reports should be submitted to the presiding officer. The Conference proved during the past year that it is a crucial vehicle for air pollution abatement in the New York-New Jersey inter-state area. If air pollution is to be significantly reduced, then the Conference's continuing jurisdiction is required.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1968, Robert T. Walsh, project director of New York-New Jersey Abatement Activity, noted:

In the more densely populated portions of New York City, more refuse is burned and more incinerator-related air contaminants released per square mile than in any other urban area of the country.

Mr. Walsh also confirmed that none of New York City's municipal incinerators "are yet equipped with high efficiency control devices."

I include at this point in the RECORD his testimony:

PARTICULATES EMISSIONS INVENTORY

(By Robert T. Walsh)

My name is Robert T. Walsh. I am a chemical engineer. My position with the Public Health Service is Project Director of the New York-New Jersey Abatement Activity. I will discuss the particulate emissions inventory.

During our recent study, sources of particulate matter air pollution in the 17 counties were located and quantified using the best available information. Personnel of state and local agencies as well as the Public Health Service participated in the investigation. Much of the information was supplied by industrial and commercial establishments and by governmental agencies.

The particulate emissions inventory is included on pages 45 through 70 of the Phase II Report. Except for small increases in emissions from municipal incinerators and industrial processes, the figures which will follow are the same as those listed in the report. Inasmuch as many of you already have reviewed these data, I will confine this discussion to areas of greater significance.

For one interested in air pollution, it is enlightening to fly over the study area in a helicopter or light aircraft. On a clear day you can't see as far as you'd like but what you can see is a lot of visible particulate matter billowing from boilers, incinerators, industrial processes, ships, jet aircraft and even a few open fires. These visible particulates include some smoke and soot from the incomplete combustion of fuels and solid wastes. Nevertheless, a major fraction is not combustible—coal ash, metallic foundry fume, rock dust, sulfuric acid mist and petroleum catalyst dust to name a few. This point is shown by the inventory and confirmed by aerial observations. Black smoke—indicating carbonaceous particulates—is overshadowed by more prevalent plumes of white, blue, brown, and grey particulate pollution.

Our engineers observed upwards of 150 sources of heavy visible pollution on routine surveillance flights over the 17 counties. They couldn't begin to count the sources of lesser visible particulate pollution.

But aerial reconnaissance doesn't provide finite numbers. In order to quantify particulate emissions you have to contact a large number of sources directly. For the multitudinous small sources, estimates have to be based on the best available information.

The survey showed that approximately 240,000 tons of particulate air contaminants are discharged to the atmosphere of the study area annually with 56% attributable to the eight New York counties.

Minor adjustments have been made to the particulate inventory based on information received after the report was printed. Total particulate releases were increased from 230,000 to about 240,000 tons per year. These principally resulted from the upward adjustment of emissions from New York City municipal incinerators and rock crushing operations. The changes have been incorporated into an updated Table 22 of the report. Copies of the revised table are available to interested parties.

Coal and fuel oil are not the all pervading sources of particulate that they are of sulfur dioxide. Stationary combustion fuels account for 56% of the total particulate while motor vehicles contributes 14%, refuse burning 19%, industrial processes 10% and aircraft and shipping less than one percent.

We have tabulated emissions in three general areas—the nine New Jersey counties, the five boroughs of New York City and the three outer New York counties, Rockland, Nassau, and Westchester. In this bar graph we show the four major sources of particulate emissions in these areas. It can be seen that stationary fuel combustion is the largest source of particulate pollution in each area, although not so much in the outer New York counties as in New Jersey and New York City. We also note that industrial processes are significant sources in New Jersey and in the outer counties but relatively minor contributors in New York City. The burning of solid wastes generates considerably more particulate in New York than in New Jersey. Some 47,000 tons of particulate are generated in the eight New York counties annually by the burning of refuse, approximately 8 times more than in New Jersey.

Of the particulate traceable to stationary combustion fuel, coal is the major culprit. This chart shows that 34% of the areas particulate is generated by coal burning, 21% by fuel oil and a mere 1.5% by natural gas, the cleanest fuel. The combusion of coal generates much more particulate per unit of heat than does the combustion of fuel oil or natural gas. Coal, in fact, supplies only 15% of the area heat requirement, less than natural gas, far less than fuel oil. On an equivalent heat basis, for the medium and small user, coal burning discharges 20 times more particulate than fuel oil and 80 times more than natural gas. At steam electric power plants, particulates from coal burning are stringently controlled but still exceed those of oil and gas.

About three-fourths of the anthracite coal is burned for space heating. A smaller although significant portion is burned by a few large industrial establishments located in New Jersey. Anthracite coal deservedly has a reputation for being cleaner than bituminous coal. Unfortunately, most anthracite cial is burned in boilers which are not equipped with any control whatsoever. On the average, only five percent of the particulate generated by anthracite burning is collected in air pollution control equipment. As a result, anthracite is credited with about 12% of the area's particulate emissions, about half of the quantity attributed to bituminous coal.

Most of the bituminous is burned in steam electric power plants. As compared to many areas of the country, local steam-electric generators are relatively well controlled, averaging about 95% collection efficiency. Nevertheless, even with the highest efficiency collection systems, utility boilers discharge some five times more particulate when burning coal than oil, and 20 times more particulate when burning coal than gas. During periods of equipment malfunction and during soot blowing, considerably greater quantities of coal ash are exhausted.

Recently, major steps were taken by some local power companies to reduce particulate emissions from coal firing. As we will discuss later in the Conference, there was a resultant decrease in air contaminants from power plants during 1967 which is not reflected in the 1966 inventory.

Most of the bituminous coal not consumed at power plants is burned in industrial boilers in New Jersey and Rockland and Westchester counties. Several of these boilers are equipped with intermediate range dust collection equipment. However, many are completely uncontrolled, such that the average collection efficiency is well below that of power generating stations. Industrial boilers discharge about five times more particulate per ton of coal than do power plants.

Emissions from properly functioning fuel oil burners are some four times greater than natural gas. Fuel oil burning is responsible for about 50,000 tons per year of particulate matter, 21% of the area total. These totals were calculated on the assumption that the fuel oil burners are operated at reasonable efficiency with average quantities of unburned materials discharged in the flue gases. If you happened to live or work near a poorly operated oil burning installation, you might take exception to our average emission factor.

Industrial processes account for approximately 10% of the particulate matter discharged in the study area. The largest portions emanate from New Jersey, where processes account for over 15% of the particulate, and from Westchester and Rockland Counties. There are wide variations in the degree of control employed at these industries. Some have high efficiency baghouses, electrical precipitators and scrubbers to provide better than 99% collection. There are others where control equipment is either inadequate or nonexistent. Most of the industrial sources are located close to major waterways—the Hudson River, Arthur Kill, Newark Bay, and the Raritan River. In these areas industrial processes represent a much greater particulate threat than in outlying rural areas.

As I noted earlier, the burning of solid wastes is responsible for over 47,000 tons per year of particulate, about 19% of the study area total, In the more densely populated portions of New York City, more refuse is burned and more incinerator-related air contaminants released per square mile than in any other urban area of the country.

The next bar graph shows that approximately 38% of the area's refuse is burned with the remaining 62% handled by landfill. In New Jersey landfill operations handle 87% of the solid wastes, in New York only about 50%. It follows that refuse burning is a much greater particulate source in New York than in most portions of New Jersey.

Two-thirds of the solid wastes burned are incinerated in municipal incinerators. The rest is burned by industrial, commercial, governmental, and residential sources, much of it in apartment house flue-fed incinerators in New York City. Very few incinerators are sufficiently well-designed that they meet stringent emission standards such as those established by the City of New York.

In the next slide we see a municipal incinerator in operation. The particular unit is of better design than many in the area. Particulate emissions are notably less than from flue-fed units but still well in excess of the New York City standard. [None of these incinerators are yet equipped with high efficiency control devices.]

The view shown here is familiar to many—the stack of a flue-fed apartment house incinerator. Most of the existing 12,000 or more incinerators are located in the four more populous boroughs of New York City but they are becoming common in suburban areas. Such units were not designed with any consideration for air pollution control. The average uncontrolled flue-fed incinerator discharges about 25 pounds of particulate per ton of refuse, over six times the limit established by the City of New York. On an annual basis this totals more than one ton of particulate air pollution from each incinerator.

The 240,000 ton annual particulate emissions in the study area are attributed to a few large sources and to a great number of small sources. The fraction contributed by large or small operations depends on one's choice of limits. For our purposes a large or "point" source is defined as a site from which more than 100 tons of particulate per year are discharged to the atmosphere.

On this basis, 144 point sources were found in the 17 counties. These include 26 steam-electric power stations, 32 municipal incinerators, 77 industrial and related sites and 9 miscellaneous coal-fired boiler operations. Many of the industrial sites were point sources only because they burned coal. Using this arbitrary level—100 tons per year—we can ascribe about 50 percent of the area's particulate air pollution to point sources.

In this map, we see that point sources are generally distributed close to large population concentrations in New York City, Newark, and Hudson County. Also, we can see a clustering along major waterways; the Hudson, Raritan and East Rivers, Newark Bay, and the Arthur Kill. Many of the isolated point sources in New York State are municipal incinerators. In outlying areas of New Jersey, the sources tend to be industrial processes and coal burning boilers.

For purposes of the emissions inventory, the area was divided into 607 zones based on census tract boundaries and other grid systems. Aggregate emissions of point sources and area sources were calculated for each of the 607 zones in the 17 county area. Totals for each zone are listed in Appendix D of the report in terms of tons of particulate per square mile for an average calendar day in 1966. These zone emission densities were plotted on the map shown in this next slide. As was the pattern with sulfur dioxide, the core areas in and around New York City, Newark, and Jersey City had the greater densities. Additional heavy pollution areas are noted near major waterways. The red areas on the map represent emission densities greater than two tons per day/per square mile. Many zones in heavily polluted areas are well in excess of this figure; six zones in New York City have densities exceeding 10 tons per square mile per day. The average in Manhattan is almost 5 tons as compared to rural areas where densities are less than 0.10 ton per square mile per day.

It must be emphasized that the latter figures describe an average calendar day. On a winter day when maximum space heating is required, almost twice the average quantity of particulate is dumped into our atmosphere.

All particulate matter pollution is not the same either in its effect on humans or in its ability to remain airborne. For this reason, estimates were made as to particle size ranges of pollutants from different sources. We find that less than 20% of the area's particulate is greater than 44 microns in mean diameter. The rest is smaller than 44 microns, in the range generally termed "suspended." Much of the latter eventually settles to the ground but its settling velocity is quite low. Of greater significance is the approximately 56% or 136,000 tons per year which is less than 5 microns in diameter. Besides their tendency to remain airborne for long periods of time, such particles are sufficiently small that they can be inspired into the human respiratory system.

There are no significant differences in particle size distribution of emissions between overall New York and New Jersey areas; however, there is a marked contrast in sources. About 70% of the coarse pollutants generated in New Jersey are due to coal burning. In New York, a comparable quantity of coarse particles is generated by refuse incineration. Richmond County (Staten Island) exhibits the lowest fraction of coarse and the greatest fraction of fines (71%) because of the sparsity of incineration and uncontrolled coal burning.

In summary, an inventory of particulate pollution emissions has been completed and major sources of such pollution have been located. Levels of emissions were found to be much greater in heavily populated areas than in more distant suburbs. A great deal of the particulate total is in finely divided form capable of remaining airborne for extended periods and capable of concentrating in the atmosphere during adverse weather conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the particulate emission inventory complied by the Public Health Service listing 144 point sources emitting more than 100 tons of particulate matter air pollution per year. I believe the public has a right to know who is poisoning the air.

The material follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1968.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT ACTIVITY POINT SOURCES EMITTING MORE THAN 100 TONS/YEAR OF PARTICULATE MATTER—1966 ESTIMATE

The 144 point sources tabulated in the attached listing have been estimated to emit at least 100 tons of particulate matter air pollution per year. They are situated throughout the 17 county area encompassed by the air pollution abatement activity. Together they discharge over 119,000 tons of particulate annually.

At these sources, particulates are generated by the combustion of fuels, industrial processes, and the burning of solid wastes. The listing was developed from information supplied directly by the sources, and from nonconfidential files of the co-operating agencies. Whenever specific emission data were not available, particulate releases were estimated with the use of generalized emission factors. A number of the sources have some measure of control, indicating an awareness of the air pollution problem and a knowledge of techniques for reducing emissions.

All sources within this area which released 100 tons of particulate matter annually may not be included; however, to the best of our knowledge this is a complete tabulation.

Some of the sources have informed us of operational changes which have reduced emissions materially below 1966 levels. Wherever such information was available, the list has been annotated.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)

BERGEN COUNTY (7)	
Abex Corp., Mahwah	385
Allied Chemical Corp., Edgewater	373
Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wood-Ridge	214
Garden State Paper Co., Inc., Garfield	744
Hills Brothers Coffee, Inc., Edgewater	112
Incinerator, Hackensack	174
Public Service Electric. & Gas Co., Bergen plant	3,468
Bergen County total	5,470
ESSEX COUNTY (6)	
Essex Chemical Co., Newark	125
Essex County Overbrook Hospital	125
Houdaille Construction Materials, Montclair Heights	119
Ironbound Incinerator Corp., Newark	312
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Essex plant	1,036
Universal Grain Co., Newark	108
Essex County total	1,825
HUDSON COUNTY (19)	
American Can Co., Jersey City	352
Campbell Foundry, Harrison	231
Central Railroad Co., Jersey City service plant [1]	421
Central Railroad Co., Pier 18	703
Colgate-Palmolive Co., Jersey City	354
Corps of Engineers, vicinity of Statue of Liberty	130
Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, Jersey City	854
Humble Oil & Refining Co., Bayonne	365
Incinerator, Jersey City	660
Kearny Smelting & Refining Co., Kearny [2]	165
Koppers Co., Kearny	630
Maxwell House, Division of General Foods Co., Hoboken	448
Metro Glass, Jersey City	165
Monsanto Co., Kearny	141
Owens-Illinois, Inc., North Bergen	220
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Hudson plant	1,164
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Kearny plant	1,954
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Marion plant	129
Worthington Corp., Harrison	743
Hudson County total	9,829
MIDDLESEX COUNTY (19)	
American Smelting & Refining Co., Perth Amboy	1,134
Chevron Oil Co., Perth Amboy	1,087
FMC Corp., Carteret	127
Hercules, Inc., Parlin	1,204
Hess Oil & Chemical Corp., Port Reading	545 545
Incinerator, Perth Amboy	189
International Smelting & Refining Co., Perth Amboy	630
Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Sayreville plant	4,219
Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Werner plant	349
Johnson & Johnson Co., North Brunswick	104
Metro Glass, Carteret	100
National Lead Co., Perth Amboy	219
National Lead Co., Sayreville	2,423
Port Reading Terminal, Port Reading	328
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Sewaren plant	3,671
Seaboard Coal Dock Co., South Amboy	739
Union Carbide Corp., Bound Brook	1,210
U.S. Gypsum Co., South Plainfield	372
U.S. Metals Refining Co., Carteret	808
Middlesex County total	19,458
MONMOUTH COUNTY (2)	
Incinerator, Red Bank	100
Nestles Co., Freehold	319
Monmouth County total	419
MORRIS COUNTY (4)	
Amerace Corp., Butler	281
Drew Chemical Corp., Boonton [3]	580
Hercules Inc., Kenvil	531
Picatinny Arsenal, Dover	6,795
Whippany Paper Board Company, Whippany	199
Morris County total	8,386
PASSAIC COUNTY (3)	
Laytham Foundry, Inc., Paterson	175
Manhattan Rubber Co., Passaic	1,090
Uniroyal, Passaic	962
Passaic County total	2,227
SOMERSET COUNTY (6)	
American Cyanamid Co., Bound Brook	870
Fanwood Crushed Stone & Uniset Asphalt Sales, Watchung	441
Houdaille Construction Materials, Inc., Bound Brook	1,059
Johns-Manville Products Corp., Manville	779
Ruberoid Co., Bound Brook	762
Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lyons	238
Somerset County total	4,149
UNION COUNTY (8)	
American Cyanamid Co., Linden	743
Cities Service Oil Refinery, Linden [4]	125
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Linden	271
General Aniline and Film Corp., Linden	147
Humble Oil and Refining Co., Linden	1,440
Philadelphia Quartz Co., Rahway	407
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Linden plant	1,028
U.S. Gypsum Co., Clark	306
Union County total	4,467
BRONX COUNTY (3)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Hell Gate Station	644
Incinerator, Zerega Avenue	1,449
National Gypsum Co	147
Bronx County total	2,240
KINGS COUNTY (BROOKLYN) (8)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Hudson Avenue	1,956
Consolidated Edison Co., Kent Avenue	718
Incinerator, Greenpoint	1,839
Incinerator, Hamilton Avenue	1,875
Incinerator, South Shore	1,638
Incinerator, Southwest Brooklyn	1,839
Kings County Hospital	467
Taylor & Co	109
Kings County total	10,441
RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)	
Burn-It Co. (offshore burning)	390
Consolidated Edison Co., Arthur Kill plant	948

[1] Ceased operation in May 1967.

[2] Control equipment installed during 1967 will reduce emissions below 100 tons per year.

[3] Ceased coal burning during 1967, 1968 emissions will be below 100 tons per year.

[4] Ceased operations in November 1966.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)—Continued

RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)—con.	
Nassau Smelting & Refining Co	110
Sea View Hospital	651
U.S. Gypsum Co	684
Richmond County total	2, 783
NEW YORK COUNTY (MANHATTAN) (12)	
Bellevue Hospital	628
Consolidated Edison Co., 59th Street plant	1, 051
Consolidated Edison Co., 74th Street plant	1, 105
Consolidated Edison Co., East River plant	3, 211
Consolidated Edison Co., Kips Bay plant	435
Consolidated Edison Co., Sherman Creek plant	1, 106
Consolidated Edison Co., Waterside plant	2, 771
Incinerator, East 73d Street	1, 239
Incinerator, Gansevort Street	1, 686
Incinerator, West 56th Street	1, 578
Incinerator, West 215th Street	1, 629
New York City asphalt batch plant	214
New York County total	16, 653
QUEENS COUNTY (6)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Astoria	3, 986
Consolidated Edison Co., Ravenswood	1, 881
Incinerator, Betts Avenue	1, 542
Incinerator, Flushing	909
Long Island Lighting Co., Far Rockaway	151
Phelps-Dodge Refining Corp	140
Queens County total	8, 609
NASSAU COUNTY (14)	
Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage [5]	868
Incinerator, city of Glen Cove	146
Incinerator, city of Long Beach	165
Incinerator, Garden City	117
Incinerator, Merrick	960
Incinerator, New Hyde Park	360
Incinerator, Oceanside	750
Incinerator, Sanitary District No. 1	345
Incinerator, town of Oyster Bay, plant No. 1	800
Incinerator, village of Freeport	237
Incinerator, village of Hempstead	131
Incinerator, village of Valley Stream	112
Long Island Lighting Co., Barrett	1, 220
Long Island Lighting Co., Glenwood	304
Nassau County total	6,515
ROCKLAND COUNTY (9)	
Incinerator, town of Ramapo	144
Lederle Laboratories, Pearl River	537
Letchworth Village, Haverstraw	208
New York Trap Rock Corp., West Nyack	185
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., Lovett Plant	3, 548
Orangeburg Manufacturing Co., Orangeburg	371
Rock Industries, Haverstraw	1, 446
Rock Industries, Tomkins Cove	1, 933
Rockland Material Corp., Suffern	669
U.S. Gypsum Co., Stony Point [6]	225
Rockland County total	9, 266
WESTCHESTER COUNTY (12)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Indian Point	103
FDR Veterans Administration Hospital, Montrose	129
Incinerator, city of White Plains	238
Incinerator, Mount Vernon	150
Incinerator, New Rochelle	385
Incinerator, village of Port Chester [7]	150
Incinerator, Yonkers	549
Otis Elevator Co., Yonkers	715
Refined Syrups and Sugars, Inc., Yonkers	2, 520
Sing Sing Prison, Ossining	205
Standards Brands, Inc., Peekskill	883
Westchester County total	6, 027

[5] Fuel change will reduce 1968 emissions below 100 T/Yr

[6] Emissions total being reviewed.

[7] Ceased operations during July 1967.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to visit with a colleague from the State of Michigan Congressman MARVIN L. ESCH. We were comparing notes as to the citizen reaction concerning the *Pueblo* incident and recent developments in Vietnam as we both have been in our districts recently.

At that time, Congressman ESCH told me of a special letter he sent to the President yesterday. In reading over a copy of that communication, I felt that other Members would appreciate the opportunity to see it too. I am certain that we will hold even greater interest in the reply that Congressman ESCH receives in response to his 14 key questions on what he has called "a crisis of confidence in the administration's handling of foreign policy."

Congressman ESCH's complete letter to the President follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to you today as a concerned citizen and as a Congressman—concerned over the crisis of confidence so evident in our nation today. Mr. President, the communications from the people of my District, and indeed throughout the country, reflect the doubt and the concern of a people who are willing to believe, yet do not know what to believe. Certainly this country is willing to support their Chief Executive in a time of grave international conflict, yet the people are losing faith and confidence in the face of great differences between what is said and what appears to be happening.

It is in this context that I write, urging you to give an immediate and fully reply to the questions below. These questions reflect conflicting testimony and statements by members of the Defense and State Departments and White House officials. They arise not only out of the seizure of the Pueblo, but also from the greatly increased activity and strength of the widespread enemy attacks in South Vietnam. To this date, neither the public utterances by you or these two departments have provided satisfactory information. Moreover, the private briefing which was afforded to Members of the House by the Department of State on January 31 was a sham.

Although many inquiries have been answered in a piecemeal fashion, during the past few days, I firmly believe that clearly-delineated and well-supported replies to inquiries, such as these I make, are demanded if your Administration can hope to overcome the crisis of confidence rampant in our land today.

Recognizing the limitations of military security, I request that you make public your replies, wherever possible, and where not possible that you present your answers to Members of the appropriate committees in the Congress.

1. Was the Pueblo in international waters when she was seized? Had she previously intruded in North Korean Territorial waters? There was direct conflict in the U.S. position between the first statement by Ambassador Goldberg before the United Nations that we had "never" intruded on Korean territorial waters and the subsequent doubts raised by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara on February 4. If there was serious doubt, as reflected in the Rusk-McNamara statement on February 4, why did we take a categorical stand before the United Nations indicating otherwise? Does this not lessen our stature among other nations and reduce our ability to deal with them on a basis of mutual trust?

2. It has been reported that there were a number of clear warnings that action of this type might be taken by the North Koreans. In light of this, what action was taken to prevent this incident? Were contingency plans made to handle a renewal of hostilities in Korea?

3. There have been seemingly contradictory statements by Ambassador Goldberg and Secretary Rusk regarding the nature and frequency of communications between the Pueblo and American sources before and during the capture. What was the exact nature of those communications from the first approach of the North Korean patrol boats until the docking at Wonsan Harbor?

4. It has also been charged that high government officials with decision making power were not informed of the crisis until the capture was a fait d' accompli. What provisions are made for delegation of authority to protect our forces, or to assure that decision making officials are promptly informed?

5. There has been considerable concern regarding the valuable monitoring and top secret equipment aboard this vessel. Were provisions made to destroy sensitive equipment? Have any efforts been made to prevent the North Korean government from conducting salvaging operations at the site of the seizure or have we attempted to salvage the equipment ourselves—both to protect the secrets it may contain and to prove the location of the seizure?

6. Is there any definite evidence to connect the Pueblo incident with the greatly stepped up Vietcong activity and attacks? Was this an effort on the part of the Communists to divert our attention and to sap our strength in Vietnam?

7. Is there any information which leads to the supposition that further Communist aggression and incidents are to be expected in other SEATO nations?

8. Do you envision any changes in policy regarding the protection and armaments and deployment of other intelligence ships?

There are also serious questions regarding the stepped up Communist activity in South Vietnam, the Viet-Cong capture of a number of provincial capitals, and the apparent failure of the Thieu government to maintain the stability of South Vietnam.

9. To what degree does the current crisis in South Vietnam reflect the lack of political and military stability? How could our previous assessments, including your optimistic account in your State of the Union address, be so inaccurate?

10. Why do discrepancies in casualty figures continue to exist? What assurances do we have that the number of "enemy" killed does not include South Vietnamese civilians? Are we to believe Defense Department spokes-

men in Vietnam who have consistently maintained that the casualty figures were actual body counts or Mr. McNamara's admission that they are only our best estimates under battle conditions?

11. Has there been a direct effort to minimize the civilian casualties during the past several days? What action is being taken to relieve the suffering and hardships of South Vietnamese and restore the confidence of the people in the ability of the government to defend them?

12. The summary trial and execution of a non-uniformed Vietnamese shown on American television last week is appalling to the American conscience. In what way are we working with the South Vietnamese government to demand that the Geneva Convention articles regarding prisoners of war be observed? I fully recognize that there are atrocities perpetuated upon American military personnel and Vietnamese civilians by the enemy, but do not believe that this gives us the license to commit or condone willful atrocities of our own or of the South Vietnamese.

13. Reports of widespread corruption, extensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the government to heed the need for social reform are commonplace and have not been contradicted. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government to commit its own troops to battle and the extensive practice of South Vietnamese young men avoiding military duty by bribing their way out. These problems have grown worse, not better, through the four years of the war. What, if any, action has the South Vietnamese government taken to correct these deplorable situations?

14. Are we, or are we not, continuing private negotiations with North Vietnam regarding possible settlement of the Vietnam conflict? The statement by the Secretary of State on February 4 implies that we have broken off all diplomatic contact with the North. Is this a correct assumption?

Mr. President, while 500,000 American young men serve their country in the cause of freedom in Vietnam, the events of recent days raise serious questions as to the reasons for which they serve. If the cause for which they are fighting has not brought about the beginnings of a stable and free Vietnam—free from corruption, free from fear, and free from authoritarian executions—they surely serve in vain. If the South Vietnamese do not have the will to survive as an independent nation, surely our defense of that independence is in vain. If our government cannot be forthright and honest in its communications to the world and to its people, then surely our troops serve in vain.

Such a crisis demands an answer. I await your reply.

Respectfully,

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted to the Congress his proposals for Federal expenditures for the coming year. As has been the case in the past few years, the proposed expenditures for the national defense and for the war in Vietnam constitute the largest single category. Forty-three cents out of every dollar proposed to be spent in the coming fiscal year will be devoted to national defense and the war in Vietnam. Spending requests for the nondefense or domestic portion of the budget also show an increase. The various subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee will soon be engaged in intensive review of these requests.

The principal concern of the Congress throughout 1967 was with the budget, or more accurately, with the nondefense or domestic portion of that budget. It had seemed quite evident during 1967 that the Congress would be giving no serious consideration to the President's request for additional revenue. The President wanted a 10-percent surcharge; that is, an additional 10 percent of the income tax liability of most of the individual and corporate taxpayers in the country. Roughly, the President was asking for an average additional tax of 1 penny on every dollar of income.

Tax increases at any level of government never muster overwhelming and enthusiastic support. At one time, we were told that this additional tax of 1 penny on every dollar of income was very necessary because of the increased costs of the war in Vietnam. At another time it was suggested that the additional revenue would substantially reduce inflationary pressures and curb the increase in the cost of living.

I regret that I was not a Member of Congress in 1964 when final action was taken on the Tax Reform and Reduction Act. The tax liability of individuals was reduced by $6.1 billion in 1964 and $9.1 billion in 1965. Rate reductions and reforms combined to cut tax liabilities by an average of 19.4 percent in 1965. That economic growth which the tax reduction program stimulated continues even today, and it is expected that this prosperity alone, with no increases in tax rates, will produce an additional $11 billion in Federal revenues.

As the Congress prepares for another extensive battle of the budget, it is important to realize what Congress accomplished with regard to the budget for the current fiscal year, 1968.

Congress reduced appropriations for the current fiscal year below appropriations made by Congress for the previous fiscal year, 1967, by almost $1.3 billion.

It is important to remember that there is a difference between what the Congress appropriates for a given fiscal year and what the administration actually spends during that year. Appropriations made in 1 fiscal year may well end up being spent in succeeding years. In regular appropriation bills for this fiscal year, Congress reduced appropriations below the President's budget by $5.8 billion. Also Congress enacted a special reduction in fiscal 1968 budgeted obligations designed to assure reductions of not less than $9 billion, including proposed expenditures involved in the cut of $5.8 billion. The net effect of all this was a reduction of not less than $4.1 billion in proposed expenditures for the current fiscal year.

It must, of necessity, follow that reductions and postponements in Federal expenditures find their way to the local level. When we respond to the sentiment to reduce spending, we must also view the specific impact of such a decision.

In my district, the Onondaga County Division of Traffic Safety had been anticipating a Federal matching grant from the Department of Transportation in the amount of $81,000 for a program to promote traffic safety. The amount that will be received will be closer to $13,000.

Local educational agencies will have to adjust and scale down programs which they expected to implement as a result of the Federal financial assistance promised in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Communities and States will be required to slow down their efforts to construct improved wastewater treatment plants because Congress and the administration did not make good on the promise of financial assistance provided for in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

All of us here are aware of the national and local implications of sizable reductions in the Federal budget. Congress, in its wisdom, left to the administration and the various Federal agencies the responsibility of dividing up the major portion of the expenditure reductions for the current fiscal year. It would seem to me that the Congress, since it enacts into law all of the Federal programs which need funds to be effective, ought to make the specific judgments about which programs are to be funded and which are to be reduced, postponed, or perhaps even eliminated.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has suggested that Congress create a Government Program Evaluation Commission. I support this idea, and I have cosponsored legislation to bring such a commission into the great problem which is facing the Congress.

Our gigantic military budget continues to grow. An additional $3.3 billion is being requested for the coming fiscal year. I think that we realize that there is no concrete indication that this situation is going to change in the near future. Congress must face up to the responsibility to develop effective, intelligent, and extensive guidelines for expenditure control. I think that the work of a Government Program Evaluation Commission would be invaluable in this effort. There are literally thousands of Federal activities and programs, and the Congress has need for the best thinking it can find to develop an intelligent system of priorities to phase out nonessential programs, to stretch out or postpone spending on less essential programs, and to move vigorously on those domestic activities which continue to be of the utmost importance.

Unquestionably, there will be congressional cuts in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year. The Congress, hopefully, will make greater use of the pruning knife and forsake the irresponsible use of the meat ax in its approach to the budget. Proposed expenditures will be closely examined, and efforts will be made to find the best areas for reduction and postponement.

CIVIC DINNER IN TAMPA HONORS SAM GIBBONS FOR WORK IN EDUCATIONAL FIELD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 1, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], was honored at a civic dinner in Tampa. The House, of course, knows that the gentleman is one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Education and Labor and has played an important part in the enactment of many of the landmark education bills of the past several years. It is a natural sequence of his prominence in this field, and his close association with leaders in education, that the Honorable John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made the major address at the dinner in honor of our colleague, Mr. GIBBONS.

I believe the House will be interested in the Secretary's remarks on this occasion and I include the text thereof:

Remarks by John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

It is a privilege for me to have a part in this dinner honoring my good friend, Sam Gibbons.

This is a time in our national history when we stand in need of the ablest, most responsible leaders we can find.

Sam Gibbons is just such a leader. I have seen him in action. I have seen him at work on the great legislative tasks and achievements that have made the last few years so memorable. He has won the respect and affection of his fellow Members of Congress and of the Executive Branch.

So when you invited me to participate in this tribute, I was proud to do so.

Sometimes I think we haven't taken to heart all the implications of self-government. When we were children we learned from our storybooks that a kingdom suffered when it came under the hand of a bad king. If he ignored the country's problems or was cruel or lazy or corrupt, the consequences were inevitably bad.

In free societies we don't have kings. We have government by people. But the consequences of bad governing are unchanged. If the American people refuse to face the problems of the nation, or if they believe that hatred and anger will solve those problems, or if they lack strength and courage under stress, then they will govern badly. And the nation will suffer.

Our Founding Fathers concluded that the best form of self-government is a representative government, and that is what we have. So the first and most crucial way that the people must exhibit wisdom is in selecting their representatives.

In sending Sam Gibbons to Congress you have chosen well. And I do not say that in a partisan spirit. As many of you know, I am a completely non-political person.

Now if you are to be good rulers of this self-governing society, you will have to do more than choose able leaders. You yourselves must face honestly the critical problems confronting the nation today.

My present job has given me a close-up view of the domestic issues facing this Nation. I'd like to talk to you about those issues, and about some of the things we're doing, in and out of government, to cope with them.

The domestic problems which concern the Federal Government today are of direct interest to you as individuals. How can we provide decent schooling for our children? How can we increase the supply and competence of teachers? When your sons and daughters are ready for college, will there be a place for them? Will there be jobs for those who want to work? Will there be peace or violence in our communities?

It doesn't require the instincts of a reformer or the eye of a muckraker to detect social evils in this land today. All it requires is the ability to follow the newspapers, to scan the data on infant mortality among the poor, to read the crime statistics, to see the many signs of urban disintegration, to observe the bitterness of racial conflict, to sense the mood of the people.

Despite such dramatic evidence, those problems have an unreal quality for the comfortable American who lives on a pleasant street in a pleasant suburb. It's easy for him to believe that the problems are someone else's, not his.

But we cannot have communities that are half sound and half unsound. Social decay and unrest cannot be sealed off. They inevitably affect the whole community and the whole nation. It won't be a decent society for any of us until it is for all of us.

In short, the first step for every citizen is to acknowledge that the problems are real and of direct concern to him. The second step is to recognize that the problems are exceedingly complex. Anyone who tells you that there are obvious, easy solutions is telling you lies. There are no simple answers. There are no easy victories.

Having admitted that the problems are real, having recognized that they are complex, we must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cynicism or self-pity on the part of any of us. They will yield only to unceasing effort by people who have the stability and steadiness of purpose to tackle our toughest social problems calmly and constructively.

Millions of Americans are engaged in that work today—and the man we are honoring tonight is prominent among those who are so engaged. The din of controversy has all but obscured the constructive efforts of such people, and I want to say a word about those efforts.

My job has enabled me to see a side of our national life that gives one hope for the future. For 2½ years I have spent my days with people in and out of government who are concerned with education, health, social services, rehabilitation of the handicapped, care of the mentally ill, education of gifted children, the problems of the cities and so on. The people I have seen in my travels around the country are teachers, social workers, nurses, doctors, businessmen who serve on school boards, housewives who volunteer in their local hospitals, college students who tutor slum children, and others.

In field after field, in health, in education, in rehabilitation, I have found people working with great energy on programs that weren't even in existence a half dozen years ago.

This is partly explainable in terms of a great increase in resources. Federal expenditures for education and for health have both tripled in the brief period that President Johnson has been in office. The great programs enacted into law by Sam Gibbons and his fellow Members of Congress have had a profound impact.

But the new burst of activity is more than a response to increased resources. It reflects, I believe, an extraordinary rise in our concern for these fields, and a remarkable increase in our commitment to certain goals.

The idea of the worth and dignity of the individual is thousands of years old. But embedding that idea in social and political institutions has been a painfully slow process. It is still slow.

Our own history is instructive. No nation had ever before expressed so clear a concern for individual freedom and fulfillment as was expressed in our founding documents.

Yet is was not until 1865 that we freed the slaves. It was not until the early years of this century that we outlawed child labor. It was not until 1920 that women were allowed to vote. It was not until 1954 that the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in the schools. And degrading poverty and discrimination still exist in this free and prosperous land.

No one can say that we moved with impetuous haste to make real our commitment to individual dignity. But we have moved. The social programs launched in the past several years are a new chapter in that long history. The most dramatic feature of this recent chapter is the breadth and penetration of the efforts that are being undertaken.

Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was the culmination of years of controversy over the question of Federal aid to education. And it was only one item a flood of legislation launching programs in every aspect of education.

In the past half dozen years economists have shown that funds expended on education are to be thought of as an investment rather than as consumption. They have shown that the release of human potential is good strategy for a nation that seeks to assure its continued dynamism and forward thrust. For a modern society, wholly dependent on human skill and creativeness for its vitality and productivity, education at every level and in every form is essential.

In other words helping people to improve themselves not only serves our deepest convictions as Americans, it makes this a more vital society.

We have seen an awakening of the national conscience with respect to education of disadvantaged children. For the first time there is widely shared understanding that inadequate early education often condemns the youngster to a life of hopelessness and perpetuates the culture of poverty.

But concern for the economically disadvantaged is only a facet of our larger concern. We're learning new ways of coping with all of the varied circumstances in which human potentialities are blighted.

Let me give you a simple example. In the past half dozen years we have seen a revolution in our treatment of handicapped children. And I'll wager that very few of you are at all familiar with those developments.

We value equality of opportunity. What kind of equality of opportunity can there possibly be for a child who is born blind, or mentally retarded, or crippled? Yet until very recently, neglect is the only word I can find to describe our dealings with such children. There were good people working on these problems, to be sure, but we didn't give them the resources to do the job.

Now the resources have been made available. Research can be done, clinics built, teachers trained. It's hard to visualize what this can mean in human terms.

Some time ago, a boy who lives not far from where I live in Washington was injured in an accident and had to have his leg amputated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artificial limb. The doctor walked 15 feet down the room and said "Now walk to me!" The boy hesitated and then came forward. With each step he gained new confidence. As he reached the doctor he got a pat on the head and then a nudge "Now, run!" And the boy ran the length of the room.

Not too many years ago that boy would have had to hobble around on a crutch with an empty trouser leg until he was grown. We just didn't make artificial limbs for children.

Now with the help of HEW grants there is a chain of child amputee centers across the country.

I could give you many similar examples involving blind children, deaf children, children born with brain damage, and so on. We are working on prevention of such conditions; we are working on improved methods of treatment; we are working on rehabilitation. As a result, youngsters who might have been condemned to lives of uselessness and dependence are becoming self-sufficient citizens.

This is one of the great American tasks—to save every child who can be saved, to help every child who can be helped, to heal the sick, to lift the fallen.

The avenues of individual fulfillment should be open to everyone. No one should be shut out from the life of the society.

It is an ideal to which we have often been grievously unfaithful.

In the past several years the nation has made a major effort to correct that infidelity. The effort has produced fierce controversy, as such efforts must. The gains achieved have been modest, and painfully fought for. We have a long way to go. Yet in the long history of the nation only the brief period 1933–1937 presents anything comparable in scope and seriousness to the contemporary effort.

Now let me say a word about the past and the future.

I was reminiscing with friends recently about my boyhood in California some 45 years ago.

It seems like another world. Was it really a less complicated world, or does it only appear so in the golden light of memory? In retrospect, it does seem to have been a safer, simpler, more orderly and humane existence. But then I call to mind that there were problems in those days too. I'm not thinking of the elderly neighbor of ours who said over and over that he didn't know what the world was coming to with things like flying machines and jazz music and skirts that showed women's ankles and all the young people running around in tin lizzies. I am thinking, rather, of the fact that a baby born in 1912—the year I was born—had an average life expectancy of 50 years. (I'm living on borrowed time.) A baby born today has an average life expectancy of more than 70 years. In 1915 out of every 1,000 live births, 100 infants did not survive their first birthday, as against 23 today. TB caused 117 deaths per 100,000 as against four per 100,000 today. The mentally ill were outcasts. Child labor was widespread. Old age and poverty were almost synonymous. Industrial accidents caused a rate of injury and death that would shock any modern corporate executive.

So we mustn't be misled by memories of a golden yesterday.

Each generation has its own problems. We had no right or reason to expect that our generation would be uniquely free of them. And in fact we have our full share—and then some.

But we can cope with them—if we are sufficiently honest to face up to them, if we can deny ourselves the joys of hating one another, and if we have the stamina and steadiness to hold to our deepest purposes through times of confusion and controversy.

President Johnson has said, ". . . A nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve, but what they achieve."

What do we want to achieve? Let me close this talk with a few brief words on that subject. I believe that large numbers of Americans have in recent years come to some kind of decision as to the sort of society that they really want.

We found ourselves coming into a period of unprecedented prosperity, and we decided that prosperity wasn't enough. We found ourselves in a period of extraordinary technical achievements, and we decided that technical proficiency wasn't enough.

We decided that what we really wanted was a society designed for people.

—a society in which every young person could fulfill the promise that was in him;

—a society in which every person, old or young, could live his life with some measure of dignity;

—a society in which poverty, disease and ignorance tyrannize no longer;

—a society of opportunity and fulfillment. Every individual is of value.

That defines the purpose of our efforts. That's the purpose of all our trials and errors, and seeking and finding. It's to enhance the individual human being. That's easy to lose sight of, especially when we're talking of huge government programs, but *their* only legitimate purpose is to create the conditions in which individual lives may be lived humanely.

We should never forget the central purpose of laws and government in a free society—that is to make the world manageable so that the individual human being may have the maximum amount of freedom to grow and develop, to choose and to be what he has in him to be. That's the star by which we should set our course. That's what our Nation is about.

CONTROVERSY IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently a good deal of press was given to what appeared to be a controversy within the Police Department of the District of Columbia. This has disturbed many Members of Congress. It is of grave concern to all of us, and we feel that our Federal City law-enforcement officials should be of best and in all cases harmony should prevail in order that the Federal interests be properly protected.

I received a copy of a statement by Commissioner Walter Washington and a copy of a news release by Director of Public Safety Patrick Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton. I wish to insert these in the Record for the information of my colleagues.

Statement by Mayor Walter E. Washington

I highly approve of the accompanying joint statement by Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

I am delighted they have pledged a team effort to serve the city and fight the menace of crime in our community.

Unity is all important in the Police Department's job of combatting the District's appalling crime rate.

The citizens can be reassured that the job of protecting the community is in the hands of a strengthened police department, which now has the combined experience of Public Safety Director Murphy, Chief Layton and Assistant Chief Jerry V. Wilson, in his new role as head of Field Operations.

Our top law enforcement officials are together in their resolve to fight the common enemy—crime in our city.

News Release of the Government of the District of Columbia, February 8, 1968

The following statement was released jointly today, by Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

The assignment of Jerry V. Wilson as Assistant Chief for Field Operations in no manner diminishes the authority and functions of the Chief of Police, John B. Layton. Chief Layton continues as the operating head of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Assistant Chief of Police Howard V. Covell continues in the number two position in the Department, Executive Officer.

Assistant Chief Wilson has filled one of the four Assistant Chief positions and will be responsible for one of the four major functions of the Department.

The Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, is responsible for policy formulation and program development in the Police Department, as well as in the Fire Department and Office of Civil Defense, the three agencies which come under his control. The creation of the position of Director of Public Safety has strengthened and facilitated police operations by placing a representative of the Department in the Mayor's Office to speak for it on important policy questions, such as budget requests, manpower and equipment needs, salary and working conditions and other matters.

Director Murphy stated: "I repeat what I have said publicly many times since my appointment. I would not have accepted this position if I did not consider Chief Layton an able, experienced and dedicated police chief. He has been of great assistance in familiarizing me with the operations of the Police Department. We have worked closely and harmoniously in planning the efforts of the Department for the future. I look forward to a continuing fruitful working relationship, and appreciate Chief Layton's pledge of loyal support in our attempt to make this fine police department ever better."

Chief Layton stated:

"I have long had great pride in the Metropolitan Police Department and the accomplishments of its members over the years. I am proud to be its Chief.

"In these times of great change I have looked forward with confidence to what I think can be greater accomplishments for our city under Mayor Washington and Deputy Mayor Fletcher as they move to reorganize and revitalize our City Government.

"In this connection, my role as operating head of the Department was made clear by Mayor Washington on the appointment of Mr. Murphy as Public Safety Director and has been reaffirmed by both Mr. Murphy and the Mayor's Office.

"I pledge to the Mayor, his Deputy, Director of Public Safety and the citizens of this community my best efforts to make this excellent Department an even better one."

REVIEW OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day in Wheeling, W. Va., President W. A. Boyle of the United Mine Workers of America made an important and challenging speech in which he said:

> The government-subsidized atomic power industry is a threat to the public safety and the health of all Americans. It should be stopped.

In the course of this address, which was inserted in the Congressional Record on September 14, 1967, by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Byrd, President Boyle called attention to "the unnecessary building of dangerous, poisonous, radioactive civilian atomic powerplants."

Mr. Speaker, along with some 25 other Members, I have joined the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] in introducing a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 889, to create a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the Government's civilian nuclear program. I have recently read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that as of the first of this year there were 15 operating nuclear powerplants in the United States, 21 others under construction, firm orders placed for an additional 40, plus 12 more in the planning stage. In the light of these figures there is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for an early review of this program as provided in the joint resolution.

EXCISE TAX ON ELECTRIC ENERGY PRODUCED WITH NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on page 81 of England's white paper entitled "Fuel Policy" published last November is this paragraph:

> As regards the Atomic Energy Authority's research and development expenditure, the royalty at the rate of 0.14d. per kwh to be paid by the generating Boards to the Atomic Energy Authority on AGR's in the second nuclear power programme has rested primarily on the assumption that they will show a cost advantage over alternative methods of generation. This royalty will not recover all the past costs of the development of the Magnox and AGR systems, but it is expected to cover amply all forward avoidable costs likely to be incurred by the Atomic Energy Authority in further development work for the second nuclear power programme.

Based on this unique plan to recoup a portion of Federal expenditures that have been channeled into the development of nuclear reactors, and mindful of the enormous Government investment that will be required if the Atomic Energy Commission's projected breeder reactor program is to be carried out, yesterday I introduced legislation to provide for an excise tax on electric energy produced in this country's nuclear powerplants.

The tax rate of 0.14 mill per kilowatt hour in my proposal is identical to that imposed in England at the devalued pound equivalent of $2.40. My colleagues will be interested to note that if the amount of atom-produced electricity follows predictions of the AEC, Government revenue from this assessment would amount to $147 million in 1980 although the cost to the average householder using power from nuclear reactors would be less than 75 cents a year.

Actually, with the Federal Government subsidizing a high percentage of the limited liability insurance coverage on atomic plants, the utility companies themselves should absorb the tax at no additional charge whatsoever to homeowners.

By contributing less than one and one-half tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour on electric power that comes from atom plants, the private utilities enjoying the consequences of research subsidized by the Federal Government will still be far in arrears with the advent of the 21st century, particularly if an additional $2 billion is to be taken from the U.S. Treasury for development of a breeder reactor as envisioned by the AEC. Nevertheless the British tax plan is a step in the right direction and should be welcome here in an era of dangerously unbalanced budgets.

H.R. 15199 reads as follows:

H.R. 15199

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an excise tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"SEC. 4103. Tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants. There is hereby imposed upon electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants and sold by the producer thereof for domestic or commercial consumption a tax equivalent to 0.14 mills per kilowatt hour, to be paid by the producer under such rules and regulations as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe."

REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 90th Congress which has recently concluded has gone a long way toward reviving the classic principle of American Government—namely, that the President proposes and the Congress disposes.

As a Republican Member of Congress, I would like to talk to you today about this first session of the 90th Congress, as I viewed it and give you my assessment of it.

First, let me note that during the preceding Congress, the 89th, when the President had massive majorities from his party in both the Senate and the House, many lawmakers on Capitol Hill rightly, I believe, developed the label of "rubberstamps." The President could practically snap his fingers and his party members in both Houses of Congress would jump.

This year, following the 1966 elections some balance has been restored in the House of Representatives and the situation is changed. Congress, in short got back into the act. And, even though still outnumbered three to two, I believe that the Republicans in the Congress helped write a constructive record of legislation.

On the one hand, the minority Republican Party, with the help of some southern Democrat House Members fought all year for fiscal sanity in Government—trying to head off the disastrous effects of inflation which massive Federal spending and huge red-ink deficits bring on. Although we were not entirely successful, we did manage to save taxpayers some $5.9 billion this year.

These cuts in President Johnson's requests amounted to $2.5 billion in military appropriations and $3.4 billion in nonmilitary spending.

The record of House votes in this past session points up just who were the so-called "big spenders" in Congress and who were not. For instance, on 23 key votes, an average of 85 percent of Republicans in the House voted for cuts in spending while the majority of Democratic House Members voted against cuts. In fact, Democratic voting for economy averaged only 17 percent.

But even though it is important to halt bad legislation, it is also necessary to support good legislation. I believe my record in this regard has been a constructive one.

Perhaps one of the most important of things accomplished is this: The majority of the Republican Members of Congress, I believe, let the country know, beyond any shadow of a doubt, where we stand on the important issues that face America today. And our actions have shown that we mean what we say, that between the minority party and the people there is no credibility gap.

We have given our unhesitating support to every requirement and need of fighting forces in Southeast Asia and our Armed Forces elsewhere in the world.

We have battled for legislation to make our streets and homes safe again.

The continuing transfer of governmental authority, responsibility, and control from Washington to the States and individual communities is another of our chief objectives, as is the reorganization and reform of Congress so that it may better and more swiftly serve the needs of the American people.

We have also fought for campaign reforms to assure clean and orderly elections for 1968.

I have tried to outline our main objectives and our accomplishments. But some of our failures may have been as important to the country as our successes. For, although on occasion we may have been voted down, we have pointed the way. We have shown what our party stands for and what we believe should and must be done.

In many respects, this year has been a year of education for the American people. I believe the lessons we have tried to teach are important ones and that coming events will prove them accurate and true.

THE STATUS OF THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House to a problem which, before too long, will be before us again, as it has been for many years in the past. The object of that attention is the foreign aid program. Like many other interested citizens, both in the Congress and in the public at large, I have become increasingly concerned about the present status and future prospects of the whole foreign aid project. As we all know, last year the foreign aid appropriation passed the House by a very small margin—eight votes if I recall correctly. It is not difficult to discern from these figures that the future of the foreign aid program is doubtful at best.

I have given a good deal of thought as to what factors are contributing to this deterioration of support for the program. And I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is at least twofold. First, and most important, the focus of the aid program has not changed sufficiently as the nature of the problems to which it is directed has changed. The focus of the highly successful Marshall plan was economic recovery. The focus of the program in the early 1950's was military and economic. Today, the program's emphasis is primarily economic, and to a lesser extent military. But, Mr. Speaker, these elements may be—I believe that they are—losing their relevance in the 1960's as we are confronted with different and rapidly changing problems throughout the developing world.

Second, while I know that the polls tell us from time to time that the majority of the American people support foreign aid, I am not convinced that this is true. Whatever popular support there is, it is soggy to say the least, and limited to the few groups that have made it their business to be concerned. If the program is to be continued—and I am convinced that it must be—its popular base must be extended and solidified. If we are to accomplish this it is imperative that we make clear to the American people just what it is that this program is supposed to accomplish—what it is realistic for us to expect can be accomplished through the aid program.

But, Mr. Speaker, how can we explain to the American people something that we apparently do not understand ourselves? The goals of foreign aid as they are presented to us are nebulous at best, and contradictory at worst. It is not enough to say that our aim is to combat world communism; to win and maintain friends for the United States and for democracy; or to help relieve some of the world's miseries. What is needed now is a major rethinking about the whole aid effort.

The situation which confronts us in the developing world is vastly different from that which existed in Europe at the end of World War II. The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are not in the same position as were the recipients of Marshall plan aid, and consequently, they cannot be treated in the same way. In many of them, there is a serious lack of development in the human infrastructure. The level of development of political life, education, industry, and commerce is in its early stages. In countries with a lack of political maturity, the process of economic development has been and will be impeded unless new approaches are made. This does not mean that we should abandon foreign aid; to the contrary, it means that we must address ourselves to new dimensions of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, with these objectives in mind I am introducing today a concurrent resolution identical to that which was submitted by the scholarly gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] in the other body, on January 25, 1968. The resolution would authorize the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Aid, to consist of seven Members of the House and seven Senators. Membership from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be limited to four each so that the joint committee can have a balance between specialized knowledge of existing foreign aid programs and fresh insight concerning their future shape and direction.

The main purpose of the joint committee would be to undertake a thorough and comprehensive study and reevaluation of foreign aid with a view toward developing such recommendations for reshaping foreign aid as it deems appropriate. The committee would be directed to consider such basic and important factors as: the nature and objectives of foreign aid and their relation to vital U.S. interests; the organizational and operational relationships among the U.S. Government agencies and other organizations—private and international—which are in the business of dispensing foreign aid; and, ways and means by which existing foreign aid programs might be improved to insure their efficient, economical, and effective administration and operation.

The joint committee would submit an interim report of its findings as soon as practicable and a final report with its recommendations no later than the end of this year. The committee's study should in no way interfere with the ongoing activities of the Agency for International Development. Further, the committee would disband upon completion of its assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is an urgent need for a critical reconsideration of the aid program and I think that it is absolutely necessary that interested and knowledgeable Members of Congress, as representatives of the people, participate in such a creative review of foreign aid. There is no question in my mind that such a reexamination is imperative. Meaningful development assistance is a long range affair and unless we address ourselves now to a thorough evaluation of the problems involved in such a program, we will find ourselves lacking in both direction and support for this much needed effort.

VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the President's message relating to veterans' and servicemen's benefits reflects the logic and necessity of our expanding existing programs and resolving inequities in the GI bill.

There is no question that we should do all we can for our fighting men. It is imperative that we consider raising the long outdated ceilings on servicemen's insurance and home loan mortgages at the earliest possible time.

The programs for education, employment, and rehabilitation will greatly expedite the veteran's reintegration into civilian life as well as benefit the society as a whole. Such programs reflect not only the need for meaningful, rewarding work for our young adults, but also consider the favorable impact of such training on the intricate social and economic problems existing in our country today.

The continuation and expansion of programs initiated under the administration's directives to give veterans a full appraisal of their benefits through readily available counseling and guidance services will insure that the purpose of these benefits is served.

I urge full and careful consideration of each of these points with a view toward assisting and providing incentive to those who have given such service to their country.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last year the Senate passed by a vote of 79 to 5 in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. This legislation has run into considerable difficulty in the House. It was referred to the House Rules Committee on March 9, 1967. After some hearings were held, the bill received no action whatever for the ensuing 10 months. The bill is still there and the outlook is not reassuring. Along with several of my colleagues here in the House, I am very disappointed that the Democratic leadership does not seem to be enthusiastic about bringing this legislation to the floor of the House for our consideration and subsequent action.

There is a critical need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker. It is no secret that the esteem in which the Congress is held by the American people at large is mighty low. How can we expect to do a job for the people of this country if we do not have their respect and confidence? The passage of this legislation, and the institutionalization of the reforms which it would enact, will go a long way toward the rebuilding of that respect and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I submit here an informed comparison of sections 103 and 104 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, S. 355, and other similar bills. This

material contains a careful explanation of what is involved in the relevant sections of the bill and I think it merits our careful attention.

SECTION 103(A)"A". PUBLIC NOTICE OF HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires each standing committee (except Appropriations) to give public notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing at least 1 week before the hearing begins unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date.

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3—Same provision as S. 355.

Original language of bill provided for two weeks, as per recommendation of Final Report (page 11): "9. Each committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of hearings at least 2 weeks in advance of the commencement of the hearings unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearings at an earlier date."

Time was reduced to 1 week by adoption of Senate Amendment No. 53—See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, page 3224.

SECTION 103(A)"B". OPEN HEARINGS; BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires committee hearings (except Appropriations) to be open to the public unless the committee determines that the testimony to be taken may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely upon the character or reputation of any individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation. Provides that open hearings may be broadcast and telecast under such rules as the committee may adopt.

Bolling—Deletes provision for broadcasting and telecasting. (New subsection "a" in Bolling bill.) Reid—Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3—re Open Hearings, adds to exceptions provided in S. 355 the wording "or except when the committee determines that, *for any other urgent reason*, such hearings should not be open to the public." re Broadcasting, there is some convoluted language here to the effect that if a hearing is open, such hearing (of a House committee) may be broadcast and telecast if the House, in advance of such broadcast, has approved such broadcast by the adoption of a resolution granting such approval, after the committee, by record vote of a majority of the members of the committee, have adopted a rule to permit such approval of such broadcasts, provided that the hearing is to be broadcast as a public service, without commercial sponsorship, and further provided that no objection by a witness is made to the broadcasting of his own testimony.

Original bill language conformed to the following recommendations of the Final Report (page 10): "5. Hearings shall be open to the public except when a majority of the committee determines that testimony may either bear on national security matters or tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or others. 6. Hearings may be televised and broadcast at the option of the chairman with the approval of a majority of the committee under such rules as the committee may impose to insure fair treatment to all concerned."

See Senate Amendments No. 59, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, page 3224, and No. 73, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, pages 3400–3401.

(Note: No rule of the House prohibits telecasting and broadcasting of committee hearings, meetings, or of proceedings on the floor. It is a matter of the Speaker's interpretation.)

SECTION 103(A) "C", STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES

S. 355—Requires a witness to submit a written statement of his proposed testimony 1 day in advance of his appearance before the committee unless chairman and ranking minority member determine that there is good cause for not complying with the requirement. If so requested by committee, staff shall prepare digest of such statements for use by committee members.

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Deletes provision for staff digest of statements.

Print No. 3—Adds following language to subsection "a": "Each such standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their arguments." Deletes provision for staff digest of statements.

Original language of bill conformed to recommendation of Final Report (p. 11), as follows: "11. Each committee shall require all witnesses appearing before it to file, at least 2 days before their appearance, written statements of their proposed testimony unless the committee finds good cause for the failure to file such a statement. The staff shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members."

See Senate Amendment No. 54, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, pages 3224–3225.

SEC. 103(A)"D". SUMMARIES OF DAILY TESTIMONY

S. 355—Provides that upon conclusion of a day's hearing, if so requested by committee, staff shall prepare summary of that day's testimony for use by committee members. (Summaries may be printed in committee hearings on approval of chairman and ranking minority member.)

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Provision deleted. Print No. 3—Provision deleted.

Original bill language conformed to mandatory language of Final Report recommendation (page 11), as follows: "13. Daily summaries of testimony shall be prepared by the staff of the committee for the use of members and, after approval by the chairman and ranking minority member, printed as a part of the committee hearings."

See Senate Amendment No. 55, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, pages 3225–3226, and Fulbright Amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4, pages 5373–5376.

SECTION 103(A)"E". MINORITY RIGHT TO CALL WITNESSES

S. 355—Provides minority right to have chairman call witnesses selected by minority during at least one day of hearings if majority of minority members so request.

Bolling—Essentially same as S. 355; request must include ranking minority member. Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3—Provision deleted.

See Final Report page 11: "12. In the event hearings have been called by a committee, the minority shall be entitled on request to call witnesses of its choice during at least 1 day of the hearings." Original bill language contained the word "on" instead of "during," which was restored by Senate Amendment No. 74—See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 2, page 2841.

SECTION 103(a) "f" AND "g", POINTS OF ORDER ON HEARING PROCEDURE; EXEMPTION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

S. 355—Subsection "f" provides that no point of order shall lie against a measure reported in conformity with requirements of the new section, subsection "g" provides that the requirements of the new section shall not apply to the two Committees on Appropriations.

Bolling—Same. Reid—Same. Print No. 3—Deletes point of order; retains Appropriations waiver.

Subsection "f" added by Senate Amendment No. 36, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 2, page 1718. For Subsection "g", see Hayden Amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 5, pages 5642–5643.

SECTION 104. COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION

S. 355—Under rules of both houses, no standing committee of either house may sit, without special leave, while its house is in session. Both Appropriations Committees are exempted from this prohibition, as are the House Committees on Government Operations, Rules, and Un-American Activities (see Rule XII, para 30). S. 355 amends present procedure to provide that standing committees *of the House* may *conduct hearings* while the House is in session if prior consent therefor has been obtained from the Speaker and Minority Leader. (Same exemptions as above.) Standing committees *of the Senate*, except Appropriations, may sit for *any purpose* while the Senate is in session by obtaining consent from the majority and minority leaders.

Bolling—No change in language for Senate. In the House, committees would have to obtain prior consent of Speaker and Minority Leader only if the House was in session "in other than a situation of general debate," meaning consideration of amendments and voting. Reid—No provision. Print No. 3—Same language as S. 355 except that in the House, committees would have to obtain the prior consent *only* of the Speaker.

See Final Report page 13: "16. Committees shall be permitted to conduct hearings during floor sessions by obtaining consent of the majority and minority leaders or their representatives."

Sec. 104 was amended on Feb. 1 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 2, pp. 2247–2248) and Feb. 7 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 2, pp. 2830–2836); both amendments affected only Senate.

FIVE CONGRESSMEN CALL FOR END TO "DRAFT CONFUSION" FOR NONDEFERRED JUNIOR COLLEGE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; Congressman GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas; Congressman ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont; Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, of Ohio; and myself, I call upon the administration to end the unnecessary delay in providing draft classifications for students in junior colleges and graduate schools.

There are hundreds of thousands of students who are waiting for the President to take some specific action to end the confusion surrounding deferments for next year. The Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, for example, has suggested that at the end of this academic year, some 274,000 men will become eligible for the draft by graduating from college, finishing a master's degree or completing the first year of graduate school. This excludes, she notes, some 421,000 students who are over age, veterans, or who will be deferred for other reasons or who will volunteer.

The complications resulting from the administration's failure to take action does not stop there. The universities are also in the difficult position of having to plan staffs, budgets, curriculums, and housing for a student body which may consist of no more than women, veterans, those over 26, and those physically unacceptable to the military. There have been repeated attempts by private institutions and some collegiate associations to prod the administration into action.

Under the law which took effect last July, the National Security Council is to send a list to the Selective Service System recommending that deferments be granted for certain critical skills and essential occupations—the classifications under which all students who are not in high school or working toward a baccalaureate degree must come if they are to be deferred. The National Security Council has not yet done this, even though the law has been in effect for 8 months.

Much of the criticism of the draft law has centered on the "uncertainty factor" facing every young man until he is 26. Supposedly, the law passed last year was an improvement on the old system, giving the President more concrete guidelines for deferments of students. Yet the President has only increased the confusion over student deferments by failing to promulgate guidelines for new II–A critical skills, deferments.

Furthermore, we hope the President will take full advantage of the new section in the law providing him with the ability to recommend uniform criteria across the Nation for administration of this and other deferment practices. Last July, we filed the Draft Reform Act of 1967 calling for mandatory uniform standards so that all local boards would follow identical classification and deferment policies. This legislation followed an intense study of the draft by my four colleagues and myself. We have since published that study in a book entitled "How To End the Draft."

PROMOTING TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the dangers of a new wave of isolationism may be increasing in this country, the last thing that Americans need is reduced contacts with people from other nations. The tensions and hostilities of modern international life call for more foreign travel, not less.

At the same time, however, the large U.S. payments deficit caused by foreign travel may compromise our international economic position. Because there were many more U.S. citizens abroad last year than there were foreign visitors to the United States, tourism represented a net loss of about $2 billion in our world trade accounts.

It is important for many reasons that this deficit, which has existed for years, be reduced or eliminated.

But restrictive measures that would discourage Americans from traveling abroad could create more problems than they solve. In addition to fostering international misunderstanding and infringing upon our basic rights as citizens of a free country, such measures might invite retaliatory action by other nations which depend on tourism from the United States for a substantial part of their income. The net result could be an even larger payments deficit than we now have.

In the hope of avoiding the necessity for restrictive legislation, I am introducing today a bill that would accomplish the same results by encouraging more Europeans and other foreign nationals to visit the United States.

It has been officially estimated that four times as many foreigners as actually visit our country have incomes which would permit them to do so. But it is not surprising that they fail to do so—and that most of the traffic is in the other direction—in view of our miserly expenditures in the past to publicize our tourist attractions abroad and to provide necessary facilities for foreign travelers in the United States.

Visitors to this country find neither the multilingual tourist services, such as information and guided tours, nor the decent lodging, food and transportation at moderate costs that are easily available in almost every other major tourist area in the world.

As for publicizing the many attractions which we do offer, U.S. expenditures for travel promotion are about equal to those of Canada or Ireland and less than those of France, Great Britain, or Mexico. The U.S. Travel Service, created in 1961, has operated on pitifully inadequate budgets of about $3 million a year.

The bill I am introducing, which has been introduced in the other body by a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, would increase the USTS budget to $15 million, including $10 million to promote foreign travel to this country and $5 million to inaugurate a domestic travel program. It would give new responsibilities to the USTS in such areas as developing a national travel policy, coordinating the present tourism activities of various Federal agencies, and encouraging the improvement of domestic travel and tourist facilities.

It also provides $2.5 million for a much-needed inventory of U.S. tourist resources to be carried out by a newly established National Tourism Resources Commission.

My new bill complements another proposal—H.R. 14779—which I cosponsored last month to attract European visitors to the United States by means of "travel incentive stamps."

Mr. Speaker, these proposals offer a constructive alternative to current talk about resrticting travel by Americans outside the Western Hemisphere.

The New York Times noted in an editorial Wednesday that—

> The Administration would be wise to place far greater emphasis than it has yet done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually untapped source of dollars, embodying the positive principle of encouragement to travel instead of the negative approach thus far adopted.

The full text of my bill and the New York Times editorial follow:

H.R. 15235

A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121–2126) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purposes of this Act).

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.";

(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by

inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1968".

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1968]

TOURIST TAX

The Administration's program for reducing the $2 billion drain generated by American tourists may have been devised with the best of intentions, to interfere as little as possible with the traditional freedom of travel, to avoid penalizing students and teachers and yet to cut down on the excessive outlays of those who have plenty of money to spend and have been spending it freely abroad. But despite some good features, this ingenious and complicated proposal seems so full of holes that it looks more like something hastily devised to help get the White House off the balance-of-payments hook than as legislation it seriously expects Congress to adopt.

The 5 percent excise tax on all airline fares and a similar tax on all ship tickets outside the Western Hemisphere, as well as a lowering of the duty-free allowance to a nominal $10, are reasonable and practical proposals. But the more important part of the plan, that imposing temporary taxes on spending abroad, appears to be neither reasonable nor practical.

While it certainly has its faults, the American tax system has proved more successful than most because of the excellent record of voluntary compliance of taxpayers. The proposed new tourist taxes would make a mockery out of the established principle of voluntary compliance. If Americans are to be asked to estimate their travel expenses and are subject to spot checks to determine just how much money they are taking with them, they will inevitably fall into the kind of evasive practices that have become almost normal in some other countries. Such a result could thoroughly undermine taxpayer morale and morality.

The Administration's proposal would be expensive and ineffective as well; it would almost surely result in retaliation by other countries. There is also the danger that Americans would be tempted to place funds abroad, adding to the outflow instead of reducing it.

While the 5 percent transportation tax and the lowering of the duty-free limit are worth adopting, the Administration would be wise to place far greater emphasis than it has yet done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually untapped source of dollars, embodying the positive principle of encouragement to travel instead of the negative approach thus far adopted.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks today, I am including title II, part 3 of the comparative analysis of congressional reform bills that has been prepared by the Republican task force on congressional reform.

In my judgment, this study of the specific provisions of relevant bills is of great value to all of us who are deeply concerned about the need to institute a number of urgent reforms in the operation of the Congress.

It would be my hope that the Rules Committee will take action in the near future to report out a reform bill that is essential to the efficient working of this body. Our failure to adopt meaningful reforms year after year does little to enhance the confidence of the American people in the Congress.

The material referred to follows:

TITLE II: PART 3—THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Sec. 231. Committee hearings.
Sec. 232. Budget review.
Sec. 233. Committee action.
Sec. 234. Passage of bills.
Sec. 235. Rollcall vote required on measures changing compensation of Members of Congress.

SECTION 231(A). APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS TO BE OPEN

S. 355. Provides for open hearings of both Appropriations committees unless committee determines that testimony to be taken may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely upon the character or reputation of any individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation.

Hearings may be broadcast by radio or TV under rules adopted by the committee (either house).

Bolling: No provision.
Reid: Same as S. 355.
Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

(NOTE.—See Final Report page 32: "7. Appropriations hearings shall be open except where the committee determines that an executive session is necessary because national security matters will be involved in the testimony to be given at a particular hearing." A technical amendment was adopted by the Senate to conform language affecting Appropriations committees with language applying to other committees—see Section 103(a)"b".)

SECTION 231(b–f), HEARINGS ON THE BUDGET AS A WHOLE

S. 355: Requires both Appropriations Committees to hold public hearings on the budget within 30 days after its transmittal. These hearings are to examine particularly (1) the basic recommendations and budgetary policies of the President in the presentation of the budget, and (2) the fiscal, financial, and economic assumptions used as bases in arriving at total estimated expenditures and receipts.

Committees are required to receive testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of BOB, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. (Hearings may be joint.)

Each Member of the House and Senate is to be furnished with a copy of the printed transcript of these hearings.

Subsection (f) repeals '46 Act relating to the legislative budget.

Bolling: No provision.
Reid: Same as S. 355.
Print No. 3: Same as S. 355.

(NOTE.—Section not amended by the Senate. See Final Report page 31: (5) Within 30 days after the submission of the executive budget, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers shall appear before the Appropriations Committee of each house to give testimony and answer questions as to overall budgetary considerations, assumptions in arriving at revenue and expenditure totals, and such other information as will be of assistance to the committee in acting on the budget requests. This testimony shall be printed immediately following their appearance. At the option of the Appropriations Committees, this appearance may be made before a joint hearing of the committees. (4) Section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 providing for a legislative budget shall be repealed.)

SECTION 232. BUDGET REVIEW OF MULTIAGENCY PROGRAMS

S. 355: Directs Appropriations Committees, or a duly authorized subcommittee of each, to review the budget for each fiscal year for the specific purpose of examining and reviewing multiagency programs; that is, those programs for which estimated expenditures or proposed appropriations contained in the budget are to be made by, or under the control of, two or more Federal agencies.

Bolling: Same. (Sec. 221 of Bolling bill.)
Reid: Same.
Print No. 3: Requires the full committees to make "selective examination and review."

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 32: "6. The Appropriations Committees shall examine multiagency programs through review by the full committees or designated subcommittees.")

SECTION 233—PROXY VOTING—COMMITTEE REPORTS

S. 355: Subsection (a) makes applicable to the Appropriations Committees of both houses the same proxy voting language as that to apply to other committees—see Section 102(d).

Subsection (b) requires the committee report accompanying each appropriation bill (in both houses) to include an analysis of the major factors taken into consideration by the committee in reporting the bill and recommending the appropriations contained therein. The report must also state the consideration given to cost effectiveness analyses or studies relating to programs for which funds are carried in the bill which have been furnished to or made by legislative committees.

Subsection (c) requires that reports accompanying supplemental or deficiency appropriation bills include an explanation of the nature of the request for each supplemental or deficiency appropriation and the reason such request was not made or could not have been made for inclusion in the regular appropriations bill for the fiscal year, or could not be withheld for inclusion in the regular appropriation bill for the following fiscal year.

Bolling: No provision. (See new Section 222 of Bolling.)

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

(NOTE.—See Final Report page 33: "8. The Appropriations Committees shall consider any analysis or study of cost and/or program effectiveness conducted by other Senate or House committees or the executive branch. All reports shall make reference to such studies . . .

("10. Committee reports on supplemental and deficiency appropriations bills shall include a comprehensive explanation of why the request is of an emergency nature and could not have been made in the current or the next regular appropriations bill. Fiscal responsibility is best exercised by the regular process of appropriating through annual bills. Programs should not be continuously funded through deficiency and supplementary bills in the absence of a compelling necessity to do so."

(Subsection (a) was amended by the Senate to make the proxy voting language applicable to the Appropriations committees the same as that to apply to other committees. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 4, p. 5385.)

Ex-officio membership on House Appropriations subcommittees

New Section 222 of the Bolling bill provides that the ranking majority and minority member of each standing legislative committee of the House shall be ex-officio members of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee which fund programs under the jurisdiction of standing legislative committees on which these two members sit.

SECTION 234. ROLLCALL VOTE ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

S. 355: Requires yea-and-nay vote on final passage of an appropriation bill in both House and Senate. (Requirement does not apply to the adoption of conference reports on appropriation bills.)

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3: Requires yea-and-nay on final passage of any "*general* appropriation measure."

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report, page 33: "9. There shall be a yea-and-nay vote on final floor passage of all appropriations bills in each house. Such a vote shall not be required on conference reports.")

SECTION 235. ROLLCALL VOTES ON COMPENSATION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

S. 355: Requires that any measure containing a pay raise for Members of Congress must be considered separately and approved by a roll call vote.

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355. (Sec. 236 of Reid bill.)

Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

(NOTE.—This provision was added by Senate Amendment No. 88, by Mr. Byrd of Virginia, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 3, pp. 4125–4127, accepted by voice vote.)

New provision—Reid bill

New Sec. 235 of Reid bill provides for the establishment of a joint committee to make a study of "means of (1) giving recipients of Federal educational assistance programs assurance as to the amount of funds they will receive in a fiscal year under such programs far enough in advance of the beginning of such year to permit them effectively to plan their participation in such programs for such year, and (2) providing the funds for such programs for a fiscal year early enough in the fiscal year to permit the recipients to use the funds effectively and economically during the year."

The joint committee is to report no later than 3 months after its approval and to go out of business on submission of the report.

MAKING 18 YEARS THE ELIGIBLE VOTING AGE FOR FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

As you know, this subject has been before Congress for many years, but for a number of reasons, no positive results have been forthcoming.

Most of the arguments for and against this proposal are well known to all of our colleagues. I shall not go into these longstanding opinions in depth. Instead, I will address myself to the logic, wisdom, and the practicality of the matter as I see it.

The 18-year-old citizen today is better educated and better equipped intellectually to exercise the suffrage than was his counterpart of 20 and 30 years ago. In our schools today, the student is becoming more aware and more interested in government and political activity than was his parent at the same level of education. It is the opinion of many that at age 18 the citizen student may be more apt to place the national interest above parochial and special interests. I agree with this observation.

There are a number of other reasons that can only lead one to conclude that our 18-year-olds should be given the right to vote. The age group of 18 to 21 carries the main burden of fighting our wars and maintaining the defense and security of our Nation. They stand responsible for the welfare of the families they bring into the world and for whom we allow the legal right to enter into binding written contracts such as wills, leases, insurance, and real estate agreements.

This group also stands responsible for their actions in our adult courts of law and for the lives of other citizens who travel on our streets and highways, for we allow 18-year-olds the privilege to operate motor vehicles. The 18-year-old can enter our civil service and pay substantial taxes to the Federal Government—but he lacks a voice and a vote in deciding who shall be the policymakers of the Government for whom he works and supports.

In short, we have offered the 18-year-old citizen our assistance, our good wishes, our advice and admonitions, the right to fight and die for their country in battles chosen by their elders, the right to make certain decisions provided they do not conflict with their elders' wishes—all these and more have been given freely, but we except them from the right to vote.

I am convinced that we in the Congress must make a sincere effort to bridge the wisdom and experience of age and the vitality and enthusiasm of youth. It is my conviction that by giving 18-year-olds the right to vote, we will begin to close the "generation gap" we hear so much about today.

The early participation of our younger citizen in voting will do two things. It will broaden the base of our democratic Government by balancing the older voter who is more inclined to be satisfied with the status quo and it will help to bring about an electorate that is better informed and truly interested in the effectiveness and capability of its public servants.

President Kennedy once said and I quote, "The future promise of any nation can be directly measured by the present prospects of its youth. This nation is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities." Professor Clinton Rossiter in "Goals for Americans," writes:

> The American future rests rather on the quality of our votes—and of our participation of every kind—than it does on the quantity. What America needs is not more voters, but more good voters, men and women who are informed, understanding and responsible.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to heed the advice of these two prominent Americans—to have faith in our young who will soon bear the burdens we now share and to involve them at a time when they are enthusiastic and interested in government and politics.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a copy of the joint resolution I have introduced today, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1078

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained eighteen years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each

House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States who have attained the age of eighteen years to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of age.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

HIGHER FHA RATES WILL COST HOMEBUYERS HEAVILY AND REDUCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, there has been much talk about placing higher interest rates on American homebuyers.

Much of this talk has come from well-meaning persons who are seeking answers that will revive the Nation's homebuilding industry and give millions of Americans the opportunity to own and live in decent homes.

All of these proposals are aimed in one direction—to increase the flow of funds into home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. This is the big need. There is no disagreement about this.

At first glance, Mr. Speaker, the theory that higher interest rates would accomplish this objective seems reasonable to many. It has been seized on as the panacea, as the only answer. Somehow in the desperation to find an answer to our homebuilding woes, high interest rates have been glorified.

Mr. Speaker, the answers to the decline of home construction are not simple, so quick, and so pat. And thank goodness, all of them are not so expensive.

Mr. Speaker, high interest rates on FHA mortgages would be one of the most tragic and misguided steps that could be taken under the current circumstances. Higher interest rates on FHA mortgages are not the answer.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is not one shred of economic, social, or political evidence to support the idea that high FHA interest rates will solve our homebuilding problems. The contrary is true. High interest rates, if the Congress is foolish enough to grant them, will have the opposite effect. Over the long haul, these higher interest rates would be destructive to the homebuilding industry and the homebuying public.

The proposals that have been publicized call for the Congress to give up its traditional and longstanding control over interest rates on Government-insured housing programs. In the place of this statutory control, the Congress would give the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development full discretionary power to set interest rates at whatever level he deems necessary on FHA programs.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals would, overnight, raise the cost of housing at least 11 percent. For the average homebuyer, the increased cost over the life of a 30-year mortgage would be between $4,500 and $5,000. Later I will detail all of the additional costs that would be imposed on the homebuyer under these increased interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those who are promoting this idea to slow down, to stop and look just where this will lead us. The facts just will not bear out their contentions that higher interest rates on FHA mortgages are the answer.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the fallacies one by one.

Can housing mortgages be competitive in the money market?

The mainstay of the argument for higher FHA interest rates hangs on the theory that higher rates will increase the flow of funds. In short, these theorists are promoting the idea that housing mortgage paper can somehow be made competitive. Mr. Speaker, all experience indicates that housing paper is the orphan child of the money markets. Invariably, in periods of high interest rates and tight money, it is the housing market which suffers first and the most.

During these periods, interest rates on conventional mortgages rise substantially but the flow of funds continues to drop. In 1966, interest rates on conventional mortgages rose to record highs, but housing starts declined by at least 500,000 units.

If high interest rates do not make conventional mortgages competitive in times of tight money, then why would high interest rates make FHA mortgages competitive?

A study of past changes in the FHA interest rates shows conclusively that the flow of funds has often actually decreased following an increase in the interest rate. A study printed in hearings dated June 12, 1967, by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee states on page 47:

> The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market indicates that higher rates may be ineffective at least as often as they are effective in attracting either a larger total of funds or a larger share of the funds available to all borrowers.

The most recent experiences of HUD bear out this contention. Three times in 1966 FHA raised its interest rates, finally reaching the statutory limit of 6 percent.

The result of these three increases in interest rates was a drop in the total units insured by FHA from 593,000 in 1965 to 470,000 units in 1966—a 20-percent decline. FHA's programs for low and moderate income housing suffered the most, dropping 27 percent despite the interest rate increases.

HUD, itself, concluded in a news release, dated March 9, 1967:

> Shortage of mortgage money, higher interest rates, and rising prices during 1966 bore more heavily on those of lower income than on those better able to pay for homes, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development reported today.

In short, HUD's experiment with high interest rates in 1966 brought only higher costs, not an increase in housing funds. There is no evidence to suggest that a new round of FHA interest rate increases would bring any different results in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, all of this points to the fact that housing mortgage paper is in a special category in our economy. As we consider any changes in the FHA interest rates, we must consider this overriding fact.

For example, it must be remembered that housing paper is usually long term. A million-dollar bundle of housing paper involves many owners and many separate pieces of paper. It is obvious that the lender would rather pick up a single commercial note of $1 million than 50 or 60 moderate-income mortgages. The time, trouble, and cost of handling the housing paper is obviously greater. So, given equal or near equal interest rates, the lender will often turn to the commercial paper or municipal bonds or Treasury bills in preference to housing mortgages.

Also, many lenders are reluctant, particularly in times of tight money, to tie up funds in long-term mortgages. In such cases it is quite possible participation certificates, Treasury notes, or other prime paper, bearing a shorter maturity date, could outbid 20-year housing mortgages even in the interest rate on the mortgage paper was slightly higher.

So, the question arises again and again: To what extent can high interest rates make housing mortgages, FHA or otherwise, competitive? Mr. Speaker, just how high would we have to go to be competitive in this market?

The special nature of the housing market has been recognized for decades by the Federal Government. The existence of the Federal Home Loan Bank and the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—are the result of specific policies based on the theory that a special stimulant was needed in the housing mortgage field.

The existence of both agencies is evidence that housing mortgage paper is not and cannot be fully competitive in the money market.

Yet now, we have proposals based on an announced goal of making FHA mortgages competitive with all other borrowers in the economy. This is a goal that can be reached only at excessively high costs and with the loss of housing units, particularly low and moderate income units.

Like Fannie Mae and FHLLB, the establishment of FHA was designed to insulate at least part of the home mortgage market from the vagaries of the money markets and to hold down costs to the home buyer. If FHA now converts itself into a vehicle for higher interest rates, and higher housing costs, then its original purpose will have been seriously distorted, if not totally destroyed.

FHA INCREASE WOULD TRIGGER GENERAL INCREASE IN ALL GOVERNMENT INTEREST RATES

Mr. Speaker, under the current proposals, the FHA rate would probably be moved to at least 7 percent.

This would place this type of paper, insured by the Federal Government, substantially above yields for Treasury notes, participation certificates and like securities.

As a result, interest rates on Treasury notes and PC's would skyrocket overnight to compete with the new 7-percent rate FHA paper backed by the Government insurance. We would experience a quick leapfrogging of all Government rates, thus costing the taxpayers billions of dollars in added costs on Treasury borrowings.

After the Treasury notes and PC's have jumped, the FHA paper would again find itself in a disadvantageous competitive position. Once again, the lenders and the homebuilders would seek a new increase in the FHA rate.

The cycle would continue until the FHA had priced millions of homeowners out of the market.

In addition to forcing up Treasury rates, an increase in the rate on insured FHA mortgages would undoubtedly trigger massive upward surges in rates on municipal bonds and similar securities. Conventional mortgages likewise would keep pace in front of the FHA rate.

POINTS AND DISCOUNTS

In proposing an increase in the FHA rate, many have argued that this would reduce the number of points or discounts that the seller now pays on 6-percent FHA mortgages. However, Mr. Speaker, I have heard no contention that these points would be eliminated by an increase in interest rates. There have only been contentions that the points would be reduced, possibly to 3 or 4.

In short, it is obvious that we would have FHA mortgages of 7 percent, with points.

In none of these proposals is there a plan to control points either by statute or administration action.

While points have gone down in the past, they have always reappeared in periods of tight money. Judged by past experience, it seems likely that points would creep back to the highest levels whatever the interest rates.

In other words, there may be a slight reduction in points as soon as the interest rate is raised to 7 percent. If general tight money conditions continued, points would go right back up to the same level that exists now with 6 percent FHA mortgages.

The long-range picture is: 7-percent FHA mortgages with maximum points.

INCREASED COST TO THE HOMEBUYER

Without question, the plan to increase the FHA interest rate will mean a massive increase in costs to the homebuyer. Interest costs are by far the largest item of cost in a house. They far outstrip the total of all other costs including land, material, and labor.

As I mentioned earlier, the removal of the FHA ceiling would mean an immediate increase of at least 11 percent in the cost of a house.

Quite frankly, millions of American workers cannot afford an 11-percent increase in the cost of housing. An increase in the FHA rate will topple these Americans back into substandard and overcrowded housing. Others will forego proper food, education, health care and recreational opportunities to meet the 11-percent increase in housing costs. Even substantial middle class families would be hurt badly by such an increase.

Let us compare the cost of a house at 6 percent and at 7 percent interest:

Under current 6-percent ceiling, a $20,000 home purchased on a 30-year mortgage would actually cost the buyer $43,171.20—$23,171.20 interest.

Under the proposed 7-percent FHA rate, a $20,000 home purchased on a 30-year mortgage would actually cost the buyer $47,845.20—$27,845.20 interest.

Removal of the ceiling would cost the home buyer $4,674 additional, a 17-percent increase in the interest charges.

Faced with the prospect that low and moderate income families could not meet the added interest charges, builders would be inclined to construct more expensive homes. Thus, the shortage of low and moderate income housing would grow rapidly. This woud be contradictory to President Johnson's state of the Union message which called for a sharp increase in the construction of this type of housing.

We must face the fact that, overall, a general increase in interest rates would undoubtedly mean a loss in housing starts. For example, Federal Reserve Board Governor Sherman Maisel, in a speech September 7, 1967, estimated that a 1-percent increase in interest rates causes a loss of 120,000 housing units at an annual rate.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVE TO RAISE STATE USURY LAWS

Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the fact that an increase in the FHA interest rate would, in effect, be a mandate to the States to raise usury limits. It appears that States with 6-percent usury statutes would be forced to raise the limit immediately or be left out of FHA programs.

Nine States with 26 percent of the Nation's population now have 6-percent usury limits. A 10th State, North Carolina, has just raised its rates to 6½ percent. States with 6-percent limit are: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Six other States have usury limits set at 7 percent and 12 others at 8 percent.

States with 6-, 6½-, and 7-percent usury statutes would probably be forced to seek an increase through legislative action. Some States would be forced to call special sessions to deal with the situation forced on them by an increase in the FHA rate.

Unfortunately, Congressional action to remove the FHA ceiling would be interpreted as nothing less than a directive to these States to raise their usury limits. It would mark the first time that the Federal Government had forced up usury rates. This would be a sad followup to the recently passed truth-in-lending bill.

In addition, it is my understanding that in some areas, existing mortgages have escalator clauses tied to the usury statutes. In other words, if the usury limit is raised, then the lender has the option of raising rates on existing mortgages.

Therefore, an increase in the FHA rate could mean a sharp increase in the cost of existing mortgages. This would be a hardship on older citizens and others who have adjusted their fixed incomes to the maximum extent possible to meet mortgage costs.

Undoubtedly, an increase in the FHA rate would put pressure on special assistance programs, including housing for the elderly, military housing, cooperative housing, various urban renewal programs. It is possible that higher interest rates would actually wipe out some of these programs—programs that are in the greatest need and the shortest supply.

Mr. Speaker, there are many alternatives to the removal of the FHA mortgage rate. In coming days, I shall discuss these in greater detail. However, I do want to call attention to Public Law 89-597 which gives the Federal Reserve System's Open Market Committee full authority to purchase housing paper from the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board system. This legislation was enacted in the second session of the 89th Congress and renewed in the first session of the 90th Congress. This is legislation which has been fully supported by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and all affected Federal agencies. I know of no opposition.

Yet, the Federal Reserve System has failed to carry out this provision in any meaningful fashion. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Federal Reserve System should carry out this congressional mandate fully before the Congress is asked to raise interest rates on consumers.

This is a mandate for the Federal Reserve System to support the housing market, and this, it has not done, in defiance of a law that has twice passed the Congress and twice been signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have this remedy and we should use it before we say to the American homebuyer—"Pay more interest."

Also, Mr. Speaker, we should look at all costs involved in a home mortgage. We should also look at the points, the discounts, the closing charges. If we are talking about raising the cost to the consumer on the interest rate side, then perhaps we should consider adequate protection on other costs involved in the mortgage.

At a minimum, the Congress must know what these costs are before it acts on the interest rate question. We cannot leave the consumer—the homebuyer—unprotected on all sides in the purchase of a house. If some people want higher interest rates, perhaps they will have to give up some other charge which they impose on the homebuyer and the homeseller.

LOOKING BACK AT TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of about a week since the House considered H.R. 11601, popularly described as the truth-in-lending bill. I take this opportunity to look back with some comments which I feel should be made before consideration by the House-Senate conferees.

The first thing is to compliment my fellow Missourian, the gentlewoman from St. Louis, LEONOR SULLIVAN, for her leadership as floor manager of this measure. It was her determination that resulted in the passage of a bill with the meaningful content necessary to afford the greatest protection to the greatest number of consumers. Her work was the sparkplug in the drive that won for the consumers of this country their big victory last week. It was so very interesting to observe that most of those who spoke against the bill and particularly against the amendments to strengthen the bill, once the roll was called, in spite of their negative arguments, could not afford to be recorded as being against either the bill or the strengthening amendments so important to those who must borrow and those who. have to pay for their purchases in installments.

In any comment upon a truth-in-lending bill, we must never forget that the man who started it all was Paul Douglas, then Senator from Illinois, over 8 years ago. He introduced the first bill in the Senate and continued his efforts until he was defeated in 1966. One week ago his pioneering bore fruit as the gentlelady from Missouri so ably steered the bill to its passage by the unexpected and unanticipated final vote of 382 to 4. When the bill finally clears the conference committee and becomes law, it is hoped it will be called the Douglas-Sullivan Act.

February 1 was a bad day in the House for the loan sharks. They have been called names in the privacy of their loan offices which are unprintable. They have even been sworn at in public. But they have never suffered such a harsh blow as their defeat of 1 week ago.

Before we are too hasty to pass judgment upon all those who grant credit and to whom the provisions of this bill apply, we must be careful to note we have not suggested that all creditors or grantors of credit are as a class untruthful. But it cannot be denied that some creditors have abused the loan process and have engaged in practices which make this legislation not only desirable, but necessary.

As I look around the Fourth Missouri Congressional District, I am proud to be able to report that the great majority of banks, lending institutions, and other extenders of credit are ethical and honorable and that "truth in lending" and other similar consumer legislation has not been necessitated by their fair business practices. Notwithstanding, the good people I represent were entitled to and I enthusiastically supported the legislation which will protect them from some questionable credit practices by a few unscrupulous places of business and some few loan offices that do prey upon the consumer or the borrower.

I became persuaded quite some time ago that the consumer all across our country needed the kind of protection this bill will afford from the unscrupulous practices of a few operators in the credit field.

We now have enactments on the statute books which call for the labeling of textiles, furs, and several other items. In our present economy which depends so heavily upon credit for its prosperity and the maintenance of our high standard of living, it is essential that the labeling of credit terms must also be truthful.

In consideration of specific provisions I think we can all be grateful for the strong provisions contained in the consumer credit protection bill which relate to the advertising of credit terms. Many of the hardships which have been experienced by consumers all over our land have started out with what could be called advertising bait. Misleading advertising has stated credit terms in indefinite and even evasive language. I am certain that when this bill becomes effective, those merchants who in the past may have thought it was all right to advertise credit terms in connection with the merchandise to which their terms apply will find they have been denied the latitude to state half-truths and even worse, untruths, as they try to seek the patronage of credit customers.

Who among us has not seen the misleading advertisements about "4-percent financing" on new cars which can be only a half-truth because of the additional and concealed charges which are never stated in the advertising. Such a practice will now be a violation of law.

It was encouraging to see the bill strengthened by the provision that requires the statement of total finance charges in terms of dollars and cents in the case of revolving credit accounts. It is also beneficial that the requirements for mortgage lending be more specific with respect to advising borrowers just how much their loans will cost.

I would be remiss if I were to neglect to observe that there were, however, some amendments which, while desirable in practice, may be legally questionable if and when put to the test of constitutionality. Garnishment of wages has long been a necessary device to protect legitimate business from deadbeats. Yet in many places these laws have been used so promiscuously by the unscrupulous and predatory type of credit operator as to strongly suggest the tightening up of these statutes. I voted in support of the committee amendment to exempt the first $30 from a worker's wages and to limit the remainder over $30 to 10 percent of the total wages due. But in supporting this provision I realized that this amendment, while granting needed protection to certain wage earners, could and perhaps would in many instances deny State courts the power to enforce their own garnishment laws.

In our own State of Missouri, the new Federal provision would affect our State statutes but very little. There would be no substantial change. Again I would be unobserving and careless if I were to omit to point out it is quite open to question and challenge whether Congress has the right to legislate in this area. A rather fuzzy justification for Federal legislation is advanced when it is said this legislation is simply an extenson of present Federal legislation in the field of bankruptcy.

The justification for Congress to legislate with respect to the garnishment of wages is placed under the commerce clause as reliance for constitutional authority to legislate on the subject of wage garnishment. But yet I cannot be completely satisfied that wage garnishment has the same kind of interstate characteristics that apply to most bankruptcy proceedings. I am not sure the commerce clause gives Congress the right to legislate in the field in which State law does apply with such a great variety of applications.

For instance, Texas has a statute that specifically prohibits the garnishment of wages Dozens of States have varying degrees of exemptions. At the extreme other end is Mississippi, which I understand provides no exemptions. In other words, Mississippi has no limits as to the amount that may be garnished from a worker's wages. Repeating, I voted for the garnishment provisions in principle, but must entertain serious doubts whether it can stand up under a well prepared challenge in court.

One omission which in my opinion should have been made a part of the bill to provide complete protection for consumers in their credit transactions cannot be found in the bill. I refer to the frequent practice of so-called balloon payments encountered at the end of some installment credit contracts. This is a devise which enables the seller of large ticket merchandise such as major appliances, a suite of furniture, or an automobile to offer a consumer the product for a nominal downpayment plus reasonable and even modest installment payments over a considerable period of time; for example, from 24 to 36 months.

Far too frequently the consumer makes his downpayment and is regular for each of the remaining 23 or 35 payments only to be jarred or shocked by the discovery that the 24th or 36th is much higher than the others.

In recent years this practice has been extended beyond automobiles even into the field of real estate. Far too frequently the time-payment purchaser who has been faithful with all of the monthly payments of $50 or $100 suddenly finds that the last payment is $500 or $1,000. It may well be that the Federal Reserve Board through regulation for enforcing this new act can handle such balloon payments administratively or through appropriate interpretation of our new act.

If this does not prove workable or possible, then I strongly favor the reopening of this subject in order that there may be written into law such a prohibition against the use of balloon payments unless the consumer fully understands there is a balloon payment. I would propose that such balloon payments be prohibited unless the consumer is advised separately in writing that he will be expected to make a greatly enlarged payment at the end of his time contract.

The amendment which sets a Federal definition for the crime of usury was in my opinion a commendable effort. There are many practices in the field of credit operations which are less than acceptable. Some are much worse than others. Usury has always been an evil practice. It has been so vicious that history has coined a description for the usurious lender. That description is "loan shark." Unfortunately there will always be those borrowers who are so desperate that unless there is a strong legal prohibition, they will pay exorbitant interest rates of almost any amount in order to receive a loan. Most of our States—all but eight or nine—have their own State statutes to define usury and to prohibit interest rates in excess of their definitions. The important point is that some of the States seem unwilling to enforce these laws to protect the desperate borrower. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] by his amendment places the law-enforcement facilities of the Federal Government at the disposal of the States to enforce their own laws against usury. This so-called "loan shark" amendment will make it a Federal crime with severe penalties to charge interest rates exceeding the maximum allowed under State law in the 43 States which have usury laws. Again, I support this effort in principle, although it is my belief that if there is a court contest it may be successfully challenged as to its constitutionality.

It was interesting to observe during the debate that at each stage of the discussion, opposition to the strengthening provisions seemed to fizzle out or sort of dissolve without a very strong or sustained fight by the opponents. At one stage the opponents of this legislation argued that providing borrowers with information as to how much they are asked to pay for credit would compel merchants and retailers in particular to make onerous and burdensome numerical calculations. They allowed that this would be an unreasonable or expensive burden that would lead to a great expense that would have to be absorbed by the business community.

It was even suggested at one time that this would be so burdensome as to materially reduce the profit that could be made from a sale. I felt then and I remain of the opinion that in this computer-oriented age it is possible to turn out interest tables that turn out virtually every set of credit arrangements, at very lost cost. The argument presented in the face of such new computer techniques was not very convincing.

Just a brief comment on the issue of the amendment which would exempt the revolving retail store charge accounts and also the amendment which would exempt transactions for which the interest charge is less than $10. I supported the effort to eliminate both these exemptions upon the premise that if we are to label this Consumer Protection Act honestly as a "Truth in Lending Act," then it should cover all such credit transactions and truthfully tell the borrower or purchaser the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

If we could sum up in a few words the object of this bill it would be to say its mission is to provide consumers with relative information. If a man borrows $550 from a loan company and has to repay $50 a month for 12 months, the true rate of interest should come out to a figure of about 17 percent. The important point is that these rates should become a matter of information communicated by the lender to the borrower so that he may know how much he is asked to pay for credit and thereby have an opportunity to compare the terms offered by competing retailers. Whether it is a loan of money or credit extended by stores for an installment purchase, the principle is the same.

It seems to me as I look back we should not confuse what we have done as imposing a limit on the rate of interest that may be charged. Historically, some of the attempts to prohibit "usury" seem to have failed. In my opinion, Congress should not repeat its mistakes and attempt to enforce interest ceilings on Treasury bonds or insured mortgages. But to require that the borrower be given information about the true interest charges is quite another matter.

Yes, last week we made quite a stride forward in providing truth in credit transaction. Even now it is hoped no Member of Congress or his constituents will be naive enough to believe that all efforts at evasion will stop. We cannot let ourselves believe we have eliminated all of those who will try to invent clever means to circumvent the provisions of this act.

As one wag who was seeking to be funny observed a few days ago, "now that we have truth in lending, maybe Congress should next turn its attention to the task of finding some way to establish and then enforce truth in borrowing." Returning to the serious side, the bill we passed last week was a great triumph for the consumer. As we compliment the floor manager, Mrs. Sullivan of Missouri, we should not forget former Senator Douglas who launched the campaign several years ago to arouse the public to the misleading nature of most credit and interest charges.

Let us all hope that the conference committee when it seeks to work out the differences between the weaker truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate last year and the much stronger bill passed by the House this year, will accept the House version rather than that of the Senate which would allow revolving credit charge accounts to continue to advertise the low and misleading monthly interest rate and which would also exempt credit charges of $10 or less, to exclude all purchases under $100. The Senate bill would not deal with the garnishment problem or carry a so-called loan shark amendment. The stronger House version is superior to the Senate bill and our conferees should stand fast for the House passed version of the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I had the distinct pleasure of joining with three of my colleagues—the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith]—in introducing H.R. 15146, designed to remedy the deficiencies in our present national system of poultry inspection. This is the bill referred to by the President in his consumer message to this session of Congress, and I can think of no three gentlemen who have attempted to do more to aid the American consumer than those cosponsoring this legislation with me.

This legislation represents an effort to achieve the first major overhaul of the Poultry Products Inspection Act since its passage in August of 1957. It includes, in addition to other provisions, amendments to:

Provide for Federal technical, laboratory, and financial assistance to States setting up poultry inspection systems. If the State does not take steps to set up a poultry inspection program within a maximum of 2 years, the Federal Government would provide inspection in that State.

Give USDA additional authority and control over marketing channels through which unwholesome poultry could reach the consumer.

Make additional changes to aid administration of the law and strengthen the protection it gives the public against unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged poultry and poultry products.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is not just merely "evident." It demands our attention and our speedy consideration of the legislation just introduced.

Approximately 87 percent of U.S. poultry slaughter is inspected by USDA under the Poultry Products Inspection Act administered by C. & M.S. This represents approximately 10.9 billion pounds of poultry which were federally inspected in calendar year 1966, in about 900 poultry slaughtering and processing plants.

The remaining 13 percent—or 1.6 billion pounds—of the Nation's poultry supply not slaughtered and processed in federally inspected plants is subject to State and/or local inspection or sanitation requirements ranging from full-time mandatory inspection to spot checks of plants and facilities under provisions of State or local food and health laws.

The following States have a mandatory law requiring inspection of poultry before and after slaughter: California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

The following States provide for poultry inspection on a voluntary basis: Kansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

The remaining 33 States depend entirely on food and health laws and have no poultry inspection laws, as such.

And what is the situation with regard to intrastate poultry inspection?

Yesterday, the Department of Agriculture released findings of a survey of 97 nonfederally inspected plants, made to determine the adequacy of plant and facility sanitation.

The survey results indicate that of the 97 plants checked, only 37 of the plants were basically in compliance with sanitation requirements of Federal inspection. In the language of the release, 34 of the plants would need "major" improvements, and 26 others required "moderate" changes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that one of the leading organizations in the poultry industry, the National Broiler Council, already has announced its support of my bill. I think that this group should be commended for its position and for its announced desire to obtain speedy and favorable consideration of poultry inspection legislation. I have received indications that other organizations in the poultry field are also favorably inclined toward the measure I have introduced. The support of the National Broiler Council for H.R. 15146 is indicative of the need one major industry source sees to bring under Federal inspection legislation all poultry, most of which is already subject to rigid inspection.

I am very pleased to be associated with my cosponsors, who were active in pursuing the interests of the American consumer by their yeoman efforts in obtaining passage of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, signed recently into law by the President.

I believe that there now exists the opportunity to make this Congress truly deserve the reputation of being a body that watches out for the American consumer. H.R. 15146 represents the kind of legislation that will achieve this goal, and I hope that my colleagues will join with me in pushing for early passage of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND ALCOHOLISM

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Johnson for his great wisdom in sending us legislation for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and alcoholism.

In 1968, alcoholism remains one of the most neglected health problems in America. The need for prompt action to encourage communities to establish comprehensive prevention and treatment facilities for alcoholics increases with the growing recognition that alcoholism is a disease to be treated in the community like other diseases.

The community mental health centers program has pioneered a concept of comprehensive community care; the Community Mental Health Centers Act provides a model for the administration of care to the alcoholic. This measure was handled by my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This program, which has coordinated mental health personnel, general hospitals, health and welfare agencies, and voluntary organizations, is the logical place for the development of comprehensive prevention and treatment programs for the alcoholic.

I support the proposed amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. They will enable us to achieve maximum effectiveness in meeting the needs of alcoholics and narcotic addicts. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS: THE TRANSPORTATION TOURNIQUET

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, today I join the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and several other colleagues from both sides of the aisle in introducing a concurrent resolution seeking an expression of the sense of Congress with respect to reducing our chronic balance-of-payments deficit. What I and the other cosponsors of this resolution propose is that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to ship and to travel on American ships, and that all Government agencies should take appropriate measures at their disposal to accomplish this objective.

I earlier recognized the potential role which American shipping could play in remedying our balance-of-payments problem, and on February 18, 1965, during the 89th Congress, I introduced a similar resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 310—which was substantially the same as the one being introduced today. Unfortunately, there was no action taken upon my earlier resolution during the last Congress. The problem of our unfavorable balance of payments, however, still remains with us, and the resolution being introduced today represents one area in which this situation potentially can be improved without having an unfavorable impact on our economy generally such as may result from certain legislative and voluntary means which have been advanced by the President. I therefore am extremely pleased to lend my support as a cosponsor of the resolution which is to be introduced today.

All too often, the potential role to be played by American shipping in our national economy is overlooked. The fact remains, however, that ocean freight presently is a significant negative factor in our balance of payments. This very point was underscored 3 years ago in a 1965 analysis by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, which noted in part that:

> As U.S. trade continues to grow in total amount, failure of the country's merchant fleet to expand significantly the volume it carries could balloon the net deficit on the shipping account into a massive factor of imbalance.

This conclusion is as appropriate today as when it was first made in view of the continuing and perilous decline of the American merchant marine.

Indicative of the role which can be played by American shipping, it has been estimated by some that of every dollar spent for ocean freight payments on American cargo ships and on travel aboard American passenger ships 80 cents and 90 cents, respectively, of that dollar is retained in the United States.

A further indication of the contribution which can be made by American transportation generally and shipping in particular to our balance-of-payments problem is to be found in one of several essays prepared by personnel of the Department of Defense and published 2 years ago by the Traffic Service Corp. This essay entitled "Gold Flow: The Transportation Tourniquet" contains the following statement which is particularly pertinent to the sense which we are attempting to express in the resolution being introduced today, and I quote:

> True, the U.S. is bleeding gold. But transportation . . . can play the dual role of monetary medic. For transportation can apply the tourniquet and furnish the plasma.

This, then, is what I and the other cosponsors of this resolution seek to accomplish. Hopefully, as a result of its subsequent approval by the House, it will serve to supply not only a tourniquet but the necessary plasma to overcome our persistent balance-of-payments deficit.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad commentaries on the first session of the 90th Congress is the lapsing of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and the failure of the House to act on the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 (S. 355). This bill, recommended by the joint committee and passed by the Senate, offered an opportunity for fulfilling the longstanding needs of this House for improved practices and procedures.

The various forces which have stalled S. 355 in the House Rules Committee should assume their full responsibility for this unfortunate development. At the very least, the House should have an opportunity to consider the Senate-passed bill and to discuss its various provisions in order to arrive at an acceptable version.

Working through the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Staffing, chaired by my friend and colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], members of the task force are attempting to revive an interest in congressional reform. As a part of this effort, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a legislative summary comparing certain sections of title II of S. 355 with the provisions of other congressional reform bills also pending before the Rules Committee. I note with interest that some of the sections follow closely a few of the recommendations which I made in the task force-authorized book, "We propose: A Modern Congress"—McGraw-Hill, 1966. These recommendations related particularly to enhancing the role of the GAO in the congressional budget process and to the "price tagging" of authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following in the RECORD:

TITLE II

PART 4—UTILIZATION OF REPORTS OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Sec. 241. Assistance to committees.
Sec. 242. Reports to committees.
Sec. 243. Agency reports.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Sec. 251. Cost estimates.
Sec. 252. Appropriations on annual basis.
Sec. 253. Committee jurisdiction.

Sec. 241. GAO assistance to committees

S. 355. Directs Comptroller General, at the request on any committee or joint committee, to designate employees of GAO to explain to and discuss with the committee or its staff any report made by the GAO which would assist the committee in its consideration of proposed legislation (including requests for appropriations) or its review of any program within its jurisdiction or of the activities of any Federal agency within its jurisdiction.

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Essentially same as S. 355. (The obligation to explain and discuss GAO reports with committees is placed directly on the Comptroller General on the theory that his authority to delegate this responsibility is implied.)

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11.(a). GAO representatives shall be available to meet with the Appropriations Committees and legislative committees to discuss their reports as they may affect agency budget justifications or proposed legislation."

Sec. 242. GAO reports to committees

S. 355. Directs Comptroller General to deliver copies of GAO reports to Congress to the Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations and "any other committee . . . which has jurisdiction over any program or part thereof, or any Federal agency, which is the subject of such report."

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. Some as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Requires CG to deliver copies of GAO reports to the Appropriations and Government Operations Committees and to such other committees as may request specific reports.

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11(b) GAO reports made to Congress shall be delivered as a matter of course to the Government Operations Committees, the Appropriations Committees, and the affected legislative committees. The review of these reports shall be a function of the committee's review specialist."

Sec. 243. Agency statements on GAO reports

S. 355. Requires that whenever the GAO has made a report which contains recommendations to the head of any Federal agency, the agency shall, in connection with the first request for appropriations for the agency submitted to the Congress more than 60 days after the date of such report, submit a written statement to the Appropriations Committees of both houses of the action taken by the agency with respect to the recommendations.

Bolling. Adds that copies of reports also go to Government Operations Committees. (Sec. 231 of Bolling bill.)

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Strikes provision.

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11(c). Agency justifications shall include reports on action taken pursuant to GAO reports."

Sec. 251. Cost estimates by legislative committees

S. 355. Requires the report accompanying each bill or joint resolution reported by any committee which has legislative jurisdiction to contain—

(1) estimates, made by the committee, of the cost of carrying out the bill or joint resolution for the then current and for the next 5 fiscal years (or the duration of the proposed legislation, if less than 5 years), and a comparison of these cost estimates with any cost estimates made by any executive agency, or

*(2) a statement of the reasons why the furnishing of such information is impracticable.

*In the case of a measure affecting revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the gain or less in revenues for a period of 1 year.

If the report accompanying a bill or joint resolution does not comply with these requirements, a point of order may be made against it.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 241 of Bolling bill.)

Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

NOTE.—See Final Report page 35: "12(a) . . . Committee reports on all new legislation shall include a projection of costs for the next 5 years or for the authorized duration of the program if it is less than 5 years. The estimates shall include a comparison of the committee's cost estimate with that of the executive branch. Final consideration of new legislation shall be subject to a point of order in the absence of this projection."

Section 251 was twice amended by the Senate, adding the language of paragraphs starred above. see Congressional Record of Feb. 15, Amendments No. 79, pp. 2004–06, and No. 62, pp. 2006–08 respectively.

Sections 252 & 253. Annual appropriations; grant-in-aid programs; miscellaneous

S. 355. Sec. 252 directs each committee or joint committee which has legislative jurisdiction, when recommending enactment of legislation,

(1) to *endeavor to insure* that all continuing Government programs, and all continuing activities of Federal agencies, are appropriated for annually; (subsection a)

(2) to review, from time to time, any program under its jurisdiction which is not appropriated for annually to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually; (subsection b)

(3) to make a complete review periodically of grant-in-aid programs. (subsection c)

Section 253 defines legislative jurisdiction.

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Modifies all subsections of Sec. 252 to emphasize that the requirements are optional with the committees; other provisions same as S. 355.

NOTE.—Sections not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 35: "12 . . . (b) Each legislative committee shall survey fixed obligation programs under its jurisdiction to determine which programs could be modified to provide for annual appropriations review by line item." (See paragraph 2 above; subsection b.)

"(c) Each legislative committee shall initiate a program for systematic review of grant-in-aid programs under its jurisdiction." (See paragraph 3 above; subsection c.)

"(d) Legislative committees should authorize programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriations review." (See paragraph 1 above; subsection a.)

INEQUITY IN INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to correct an inequity in the Internal Revenue Code. At the present time any person who has had the misfortune of having their home damaged or destroyed by fire, tornado, hurricane, or other means, and who must temporarily find another residence while his home is being repaired must declare any insurance payments covering the additional living expenses required by this situation as taxable income.

It is obvious that these insurance payments for living expenses which are higher than normal due to circumstances completely beyond the taxpayer's control are unfairly determined as taxable income because of an unintended loophole in our tax code. After referring several such cases to the Internal Revenue Service for comment, I have received sympathetic responses which admit that this situation is unfair. However, as the law is now written, the IRS can do nothing but enforce this inequity.

Much of the Fourth District of Kansas lies in the so-called "tornado alley," which has led to many cases wherein homeowners have been burdened with the loss of their homes, only to have that loss compounded by the necessity of paying income taxes on their additional living expenses insurance payments. My bill will exclude from taxable income any insurance reimbursement for living expenses incurred in connection with a casualty loss. Such legislation is overdue, and I would hope that the Ways and Means Committee will find the time during this busy year to hold hearings on this proposal and report it favorably to the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATHIAS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 7 and 8, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 6, 7, and 8, on account of influenza.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERLENBORN) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Albert in two instances in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. Dulski in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pettis to extend his remarks in the Record after those of Mr. Wolff on the Civil Air Patrol.

Mr. Carey to follow the remarks of Mr. Daddario.

Mr. Randall in two instances.

Mr. Pettis immediately following Mr. Bell on H.R. 11284.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Erlenborn) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Ashbrook in two instances.
Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Pelly in two instances.
Mr. Hunt in two instances.
Mr. Adair.
Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Brock in three instances.
Mr. Miller of Ohio.
Mr. Bray in two instances.
Mr. Collier in two instances.
Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Berry.
Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Dole.
Mr. Kupferman in five instances.
Mr. McClory in two instances.
Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Bob Wilson in three instances.
Mr. Morton.
Mr. Mathias of Maryland in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Montgomery) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.
Mr. Irwin in two instances.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Willis.
Mr. Taylor in two instances.
Mr. Daniels in three instances.
Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Adams in two instances.
Mr. Gallagher in four instances.
Mr. Selden in two instances.
Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan in two instances.
Mr. Tunney in two instances.
Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Corman.
Mr. Dingell in five instances.
Mr. Celler in two instances.
Mr. Giaimo.
Mr. Hardy in two instances.
Mr. Farbstein in eight instances.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Bolling.
Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Cohelan in two instances.
Mr. Flood in two instances.
Mr. Feighan in five instances.
Mr. Ryan in three instances.
Mr. Whitener.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. Baring.
Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Friedel.
Mr. Ashley in two instances.
Mr. Addabbo in four instances.
Mr. Pickle.
Mr. St. Onge in two instances.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Rarick in four instances.
Mr. Henderson in two instances.
Mr. Young.
Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Holland in two instances.
Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Hagan in three instances.
Mr. Tiernan.
Mr. Wolff.
Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Resnick.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following titles was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2511. An act to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13094. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1485. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International, Educational, and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Advisory Commission pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 252); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1486. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of the Panama Canal Company, fiscal years 1967 and 1966 (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on Government operations and ordered to be printed.

1487. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspections programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1488. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1489. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the ROTC flight instruction program for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 2110(b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to grant a special 30-day period of leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1491. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1492. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1493. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the highlights and recommendations from the general report of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1968, entitled "Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work (Publication 1)," pursuant to the provisions of section 12(d) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1494. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in procurement of petroleum products for use by Navy contractors, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1495. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1496. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Alcoholic and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968"; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–148; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) or other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except on a valid prescription; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1500. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 241(e), title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. A letter from the national corporation agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting the financial statement of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., for the period August 1, 1966, to July 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–224; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of their correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 254); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1505. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report setting forth all the judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 791(c) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 14401. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2191. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade; with amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2192. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Ocean Delight* in the coastwise trade; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15215. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15216. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of their correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15217. A bill to permit the release of certain veterans from liability to the United States arising out of loans made, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 15218. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15219. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1949, for service-connected disabilities of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 15220. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 15221. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 15222. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service assigned to Government quarters providing he is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 15223. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15224. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15225. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15226. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fossil Butte National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15227. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 15228. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries, to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 15229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the employment in defense facilities of individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 15230. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15231. A bill to authorize the Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College to award the degree of master of military art and science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15232. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15233. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 15234. A bill to direct the Council of the District of Columbia to prescribe regulations to control radiation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15235. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 15236. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 15237. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 15238. A bill providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15239. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain insurable war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15240. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15241. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15242. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15243. A bill to amend section 226 of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the hospital insurance benefits program for retired policemen and firemen who have attained the age 65 but do not otherwise qualify for such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15244. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15245. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 15246. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 15247. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 15248. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 15249. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the commission of a felony in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15250. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15252. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the elimination of political influence in the appointment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15253. A bill to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from national forests located within such States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 15254. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the effective date of reduction or discontinuance of pension by reason of the death of a dependent shall be the last day of the calendar year in which the death occurred; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15255. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the amount of the proceeds of mortgage insurance paid to the insured or his beneficiary equal to the indebtedness against the property insured shall be excluded from determinations of annual income for pension or dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15256. A bill to amend 38 U.S.C. 111(a) to increase the rate of reimbursement of travel authorized Veterans' Administration beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15257. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that amounts inherited from bank accounts jointly or separately owned shall not count as income for death or disability pension or for dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15258. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased dependency and indemnity compensation to widows in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 15259. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased pensions, disability compensation rates, to liberalize income limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15260. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 15261. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15262. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Negro History and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 15263. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15265. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 15266. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to encourage persons who are primarily committed to broadcasting and who have established interests in particular market areas to acquire station licenses and permits, to protect the public domain by insuring that such licenses and permits will be granted to persons pledged to carry out their fiduciary responsibilities to the public and serve its best interest, and to prevent this free privilege from being abused by persons engaged in spectrum profiteering; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.R. 15267. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 15268. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1969 National Jamboree, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDLER (for himself and Mr. GROVER):

H.R. 15269. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building in Nassau County, N.Y., and for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RESNICK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15270. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Jackson, Miss., as the Medgar Evers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 15271. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15272. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the employment in defense facilities of individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 15273. A bill to insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 15274. A bill to amend section 101(a)(27)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 15275. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 15276. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15277. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and related acts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 15278. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 15279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts received for additional living expenses arising out of a casualty loss to the residence of the taxpayer and paid pursuant to a policy insuring such residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. Horton, Mr. O'Konski, and Mr. Mathias of Maryland):

H.R. 15280. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15281. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 1073. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.J. Res. 1074. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 1075. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 1076. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 1077. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution proposing and amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the ways in which commercial broadcasters can be required to provide financial support to nonprofit public educational broadcasters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.J. Res. 1080. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself and Mr. Gettys):

H.J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution providing, until October 1, 1969, for flexible interest rates for mortgage insurance programs and continuing certain low-rent housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. Bray, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Edwards of Louisiana, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Baring, Mr. Stubblefield, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Ottinger, Mrs. Bolton, Mr. Duncan, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Rarick, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Bevill):

H.J. Res. 1082. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Randall, Mr. Michel, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Wylie, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Quie):

H.J. Res. 1083. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 636. Conurrent resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to reexamine the objectives and nature of the foreign assistance programs and the relationship of such programs to vital U.S. interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 638. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Con. Res. 639. Concurrent resolution to require the collection of the French World War I debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. Mailliard, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Clark, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Grover, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Morton, Mr. Lennon, Mr. Keith, Mr. Downing, Mr. Edwards of Alabama, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Stubblefield, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Roth, Mr. St. Onge, and Mr. Dellenback):

H. Con. Res. 640. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reducing the balance-of-payments deficit by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Karth, Mr. Ruppe, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Button, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Galifianakis, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Machen, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Gude, and Mr. Blanton):

H. Con. Res. 641. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reducing the balance-of-payments deficit by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to participation by the States and local political subdivisions in the celebration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Con. Res. 643. Concurrent resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Commitee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H. Res. 1060. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Conventions on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 1061. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Convention on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COWGER:

H. Res. 1062. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15282. A bill for the relief of Rosario Panepinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15283. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15284. A bill for the relief of Marie-Rose Wilfride Beauzile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15285. A bill for the relief of Carmela and Salvatore Levante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 15286. A bill for the relief of Domenica Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15287. A bill for the relief of Stefano Inzalaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15288. A bill for the relief of Ciro Guastella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 15289. A bill for the relief of Antonio Corapi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15290. A bill for the relief of Bian-Djoen Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15291. A bill for the relief of Walter V. Biagiolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 15292. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Calamba Sy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 15293. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ardito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15294. A bill for the relief of Habibollah Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 15295. A bill for the relief of Michael Gregory Grammatopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15296. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Stavrakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15297. A bill for the relief of Mr. Milton Stamatakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15298. A bill for the relief of Mr. Polecarpio DeCarolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 15299. A bill for the relief of Casimiro Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 1063. Resolution for the relief of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Johnson's Burdens

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, these have proven to be a difficult few weeks for President Johnson and the Nation.

We can only imagine the pressures of the weighty decisions that are confronting our President. He has not complained. Crisis and tough decisions are part and parcel of the office.

But as reporter Garnett D. Horner of the Washington Evening Star pointed out recently, the difficulties of the President's job are being complicated by those—who innocently, in most cases—are "promoting the Communist propaganda line."

I am referring, of course, to the stories, articles, and editorials in our press suggesting that the United States has suffered humiliation and defeat at the hands of the North Vietnamese in the recent terrorist raids on Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities.

We know that the Communists have lost 20,000 men in these raids. We know, too, that their hope of sparking widespread defections among the South Vietnamese have failed miserably.

As Mr. Horner writes:

> He (the President) might ask: "Isn't it a defeat for the enemy when they lose on the order of 20,000 men to our 400? What would it be if it was the other way around? What if the American Embassy was in their hands?"

There have been other complicating reports, too. We have seen dispatches giving unverified reports that the North Koreans have agreed to release the *Pueblo*'s crew in exchange for an American apology. Yet, there is no such agreement.

We have read that the South Koreans might pull out 50,000 troops from Vietnam in retaliation against American bilateral negotiations with North Vietnam.

The President, as Mr. Horner notes, is well aware that a prime Communist objective is to divide the allies in South Vietnam and send the Korean troops home.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the American people have the right to expect the best performance from their President during times of grave international crises. I think we can say with assurance that President Johnson has not let them down.

Yet, I think our people also have the right to expect the best possible performance from the news media. This means careful and responsible coverage of dangerous and delicate situations.

I think the record will clearly show that we have not quite enjoyed such wise and mature news coverage during these difficult days.

The article by Garnett D. Horner, entitled "Trying Times for Johnson," follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 6, 1968]

TRYING TIMES FOR JOHNSON

(By Garnett D. Horner)

Life is trying for President Johnson these days.

He has no reason to complain about having to deal with such crises as the massive Communist offensive in Vietnam and the North Korean seizure of the USS Pueblo. That's part of his job.

But it can only be frustrating for him to see his job complicated by fellow countrymen who, from his point of view, might be giving comfort to the enemy—innocently, in most cases—by promoting the Communist propaganda line. He must feel something like a man trying to swim upstream in choppy waters with lead weights around his legs and arms.

STRESS ON UNCERTAINTY

Knowing that one of the Communist objectives in their coordinated attacks on South Vietnamese cities and the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was a psychological and propaganda victory, Johnson must have trouble keeping his temper when he hears Americans of some standing, or reads newspaper stories and editorials, suggesting that the U.S. side suffered a defeat in the raids.

He might ask: "Isn't it a defeat for the enemy when they lose on the order of 20,000 men to our 400? What would it be if it was the other way around? What if the American Embassy was in their hands?"

When critics emphasize that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk are uncertain whether the Pueblo intruded into North Korean territorial waters, the President must feel especially frustrated.

Of course, that is legitimate news and Johnson would not blame anyone for reporting it. The galling part is to emphasize the uncertainty while subordinating the fact that McNamara said he is sure from clear evidence that the Pueblo was in international waters when seized, there is no indication it strayed too close to North Korea during preceeding days of radio silence, and he doesn't believe it did.

It is as if someone asked the President if one of his trusted aides ever robbed a bank, and he said the aide never had while he knew him, he didn't believe he ever had, but of course he couldn't be absolutely positive what the aide did before he knew him until he checked all the records—and a headline reported "President Uncertain Whether Aide Robbed Bank."

FALSE HOPES FED

Adding to the President's troubles is the prominence given unverified reports that the North Koreans have agreed to release the Pueblo's crew in exchange for an admission that the Pueblo violated territorial waters, and an apology—when there is no agreement. He might well feel that his effort to guard against raising false or premature hopes is endangered.

To see a television news program playing up reports that South Korea might pull some or all of her nearly 50,000 troops out of South Vietnam to meet the threat of renewed North Korean aggression, in the absence of fresh U.S. support, must sorely tempt the President to blow his stack.

His intelligence reports indicate that a prime objective of North Korean and other Communist leaders is to divide the allies in South Vietnam and divert the South Korean troops there homeward.

While he could not rule out forever the possibility of South Korea withdrawing some of its forces from South Vietnam without risking new credibility gap charges, he feels sure such a move is not likely and knows it is not under active consideration now. So reports to the contrary could only escalate his frustration.

Unquestionably it is particularly irksome to a man of Johnson's "can-do" disposition to be able to do little or nothing about statements and reports that seem to play into the hands of the enemy.

But he recognizes that free speech and a free press are mainstays of the American system. About all he can do is hope that people quoted in the news, and the news media themselves, will always keep in mind the national interest and their responsibility to it.

New Concepts and New Tasks Ahead as Efforts Continue in Water Resource Development

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in addressing the Mississippi Valley Association at a convention banquet session in the Chase-Park Plaza Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., February 5, 1968, I stressed my belief that few programs are more essential to the economic and social well-being of our people than that of our comprehensive water resources development.

Another area of vital importance for the extension of water resources planning which I emphasized was the view that we should use our refined techniques of economic evaluation to identify regions of the country which, with water resources development, could support large population increases. In almost every major urban area we observe the continued increase in crime and juvenile delinquency, in civil disorders, and a general degradation of the quality of life, and in congestion and environmental pollution. It is also a fact that few of our cities today offer a foundation for a good life, much less the basis for a great society.

Yet the march from rural areas to the cities continues at a rate of about a half-million to 600,000 a year. And current population projections indicate that by the end of this century, unless the trend is reversed, there will be an additional 100 million people occupying the urban spaces now occupied by 140 million persons. We now have the social, economic, and technological tools to disperse our population and to resist the inertia which continues to crowd more and more people into less and less space. I believe that water resources planners should lead in this effort and thereby stimulate a new surge of social and economic development in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 5, 1968

NEW CONCEPTS AND NEW TASKS FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

It is a pleasure to be with you in the Gateway City, in a city and in a region where so much of American history has been forged. The Mississippi River is deeply interwoven with the economic, social and cultural fabric of American life. It is appropriate that we give thought at our meeting to the new concepts, the new uses and new tasks for water resources development in the United States during the last third of the 20th Century.

The Congressional delegation from Missouri, led by my very good friend and your senior Senator, Stuart Symington, has always been in the forefront of support for the development of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. And had Stu Symington, a former member of our Public Works Committee, remained on the Committee, I would probably not now be addressing you—because he would now be the Chairman. I cannot wholly disapprove of his having left the Committee for another assignment. But this departure did not decrease his commitment to the development of public works in the national interest. Both he and Senator Ed Long, are diligent supporters of our national and regional water resources development programs.

Few programs are more essential to the economic and social well-being of our people than that of our comprehensive water resources development.

In 1808 Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under President Thomas Jefferson, submitted his historic report on Federal participation in an extensive public works program to develop inexpensive water transportation and post-road construction, in order to (quote) ". . . facilitate commercial and personal intercourse."

Secretary Gallatin enunciated for the first time the policy of our young Republic regarding water resources development by declaring ". . . no other single operation, within the power of government, can more effectually tend to strengthen and perpetuate that union which secures external independence, domestic peace, and individual liberty."

Approximately sixteen years later—and following the landmark decision by Chief Justice Marshall which upheld the power of the Congress to undertake navigation improvements (quote) ". . . within the limits of every State in the Union . . ."—a Federal program for waterway improvement was initiated with the removal of snags and sandbars from the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Throughout the 19th Century, the Federal effort was devoted almost exclusively to the improvement of navigational facilities, although flood control became a consideration with the formation of the Mississippi River Commission in 1879, and was extended with the establishment of the California Debris Commission in 1893. The concept of water resources development continued to broaden through the turn of the century, particularly in 1906, when the Inland Waterway Commission declared the need for comprehensive plans which ". . . should consider and include all the uses to which streams may be put."

In transmitting the report to the Congress, President Theodore Roosevelt emphasized (quote): "The National Government must play the leading part in securing the largest possible use of our waterways; other agencies can assist and should assist, but the work is essentially national in its scope." This concept has guided our water resources policy, and it has enabled us, to date, to meet the demands of a constantly expanding industrial technology and a growing population. In meeting these demands, many of our public works programs have succeeded far beyond our expectations.

Water has become so important to industry that it is now regarded as an indispensable raw material, for processing purposes as well as for the transportation of its products. Cities along the river are rapidly providing port and terminal facilities to handle the expanding river commerce. The Mississippi River and its tributaries and connecting waterways have had a definite and major influence on the economic growth and well-being of the mid-continent Valley area. Basic industries have poured billions of dollars into the area since World War II, drawing subsidiary industries not only to the river's banks but to the surrounding countryside. States bordering the lower Mississippi River are changing from an agricultural to an industrial economy.

The Upper Mississippi from Minneapolis to St. Louis, which was improved in the expectation of 9 million tons of traffic, now is carrying almost 40 million. From 1952 to 1962, 218 new plants came in at the waterside—34 chemical plants, 57 warehouses and terminals, metal working plants and others.

The Intercoastal Waterway is another example. It rims the Gulf of Mexico from Florida to Texas. When it was authorized, people were thinking it terms of perhaps an ultimate 5 million tons of commerce. It was carrying more than when it was finished, and now its commerce is approximately 70 million tons.

In the decade 1952 to 1962, 170 plants were built at the waterside—50 chemical plants, 32 petroleum plants and refineries, 9 iron and steel mills, 8 aluminum plants; sulfur plants, power plants, shipyards, carbon plants, coking plants, a sugar refinery, and many others.

The canalization of the Ohio River offers a dramatic illustration of the contribution of waterway development to economic and industrial growth. When the original system was completed in 1922, the river was carrying 6 million tons of cargo annually. By 1929 traffic had increased to 24 million tons. Although the system was expected to meet foreseeable requirements, the impetus given to commercial and industrial expansion in the Ohio Valley was so great that in less than 20 years it became apparent that a modernization program would be necessary. At that time traffic was in excess of 34 million tons, and modern tows had to be broken in order to pass through each of the 46 locks.

By 1955, when construction was started on the first of the new and larger replacement structures, traffic had risen to 71 million tons. And by 1963, with only 3 of the 17 proposed new locks in operation, annual tonnage had increased to more than 88 million. Of even greater significance, however, is the fact that since World War II, more than $21 billion worth of new industrial development has taken place in the counties along the Ohio River and its navigable tributaries.

A success story of similar proportions has emerged in the Pacific Northwest—the great region which Daniel Webster once referred to as ". . . this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs . . ." The multi-purpose development of the Columbia River providing abundant cheap electric power, has, within the past 25 years, transformed much of the Pacific Northwest from a region largely dependent on farming, mining, lumber and fishing, into a major center for the production of aluminum and aircraft.

Thus we see the reciprocal interaction between new technologies, new social and economic needs and new uses for stream development. In the past, our national interest in water resources was concentrated on navigation, irrigation, winning the West and lessening the impact of natural disasters. Today, our concern is widening—to include the effort to provide a greater share of the national growth for the lesser developed regions, to assure the protection and enhancement of the quality of our physical environment, and to provide opportunity for our citizens to enjoy the physical and spiritual enjoyment of the natural environment.

Largely the mission for developing our water resources is the Corps of Engineers. The Corps can take justifiable pride in its accomplishments, which include a record of having completed some 3000 projects, with approximately 300 now under construction. The overall program represents a capital investment in excess of $17 billion. I emphasize that these are investments, not expenditures, and they are translated into benefit productions in a variety of forms. For example: flood control projects have saved over $14 billion in flood losses; one-sixth of the Nation's intercity freight traffic is carried on Corps-built waterways; projects constructed by the Corps generate over 20 percent of the hydropower of the United States; the multipurpose reservoirs constructed under this program supplement the water supplies of more than 2 million people, and accommodate some 200 million recreation visitations per year. I know that Lt. General William F. Cassidy would agree that much more remains to be done if our water resources development program is going to keep pace with the population and economic growth of our country.

Our methods of water resources planning and economic evaluation should meet several general objectives. They should generate and evaluate the widest possible range of alternatives for consideration by the public and their elected representatives. For example, in order to maintain the water quality of a given stream in the face of industrial expansion, we must examine the options of stream augmentation, construction of waste treatment facilities, requirement of in-process changes, or a combination of these—as well as a consideration of other values which might be of such weight that industrial expansion should be curtailed. And whatever the choice, we must determine how the costs should be allocated for the non-direct user benefits.

Our planning and evaluation processes should appraise the values that all segments of society place on specific uses, abuses, enjoyment or appreciation of water resources.

The appraisal of values must include an attempt to ascertain how values develop or deteriorate with the passage of time, either because corrective action is too slow and alternatives are lost, or because action is so hasty that future options are foreclosed.

These are some of the general objectives that are being met by the water resources planning which was authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This law was a fundamental step forward for the Congress, not only in the development of our general economic policy, but also specifically with regard to water resources planning. The Water Resources Survey is the first major attempt to analyze the developmental role which water resources planning may perform in stimulating a regional economy and in the achievement of sustained regional growth. And I commend Colonel John C. H. Lee, Jr., Director of the Office of Appalachian Studies, and his staff for their constructive approach. The knowledge and expertise developed in the past two years in the Region can be applied to the other economic development regions.

The benefit analysis method developed under the Appalachian Act departs from traditional methods in several important respects: (1) it proposes to trace the benefit flow beyond the initial users in order to assess the impact of public investments on the regional and the national economy; (2) it provides for two separate accounts, regional and national, in which the estimate benefits; (3) it distinguishes between user and expansion benefits; (4) it provides for the apportionment of benefits among development programs where economic expansion is the result of combined development efforts, such as water resources, vocation education facilities and improvement of health facilities; and (5) it suggests methods for comparative weighting of regional and national benefits where a single benefit cost ration is desired.

The Committee on Public Works this year will consider the first of the projects to be developed under this new method of benefit analysis, and I am hopeful that as other regional economic development programs become formulated, this method can be applied to water resources development in those areas also.

Our Committee will give consideration this year to the need for changing and enlarging our method of studying deepwater port requirements, particularly in light of technological trends in container shipping and supertankers. We need to plan for both short and long range development of navigation requirements on a regional basis.

Similarly, we need to develop well-defined framework plans in the area of municipal and industrial water supplies on a regional basis. The Congress recognized this need for the Northeast after the protracted dry spell of the early 1960's when we authorized the Corps of Engineers in 1965 to make a comprehensive study of water supply requirements for that area. Such studies for other regions should not wait until the crisis is on us.

We must look closely at the problems of stream flow regulation and basin transfer of water. I am, of course, aware that the issue of stream diversion is a much debated topic in the Mississippi River Valley. I would hope that the issue would be debated on economic and technological grounds rather than in ideological or emotional terms. For our primary consideration should be to put the water where it will do the most good for the greatest number, within terms of the regional as well as the national perspectives.

Another area of vital importance for the extension of water resources planning would be to use our refined techniques of economic evaluation to identify those regions of the country which, with water resources development, could support large population increases. In almost every major urban area, we observe the continued increase in crime and juvenile delinquency, in civil disorders and a general degradation of the quality of life, and in congestion and environmental pollution. Few of our cities today offer a foundation for a good life, much less the basis for a Great Society.

Yet, the march from rural areas to the cities continues at a rate of about 500,000 to 600,000 a year. And current population projections indicate that by the end of this century, unless the trend is reversed, there will be an additional 100 million people occupying the urban spaces now occupied by 140 million. We now have the social, economic and technological tools to disperse our population and to resist the inertia which continues to crowd more and more people into less and less space. I believe that water resources planners should lead in this effort and thereby stimulate a new surge of social and economic development in America.

The world will not stand still for us now any more than it would on that terrible morning 27 years ago, when America found itself thrust into violent world conflict. Then, as now, whether we speak of military or civilian problems, we can agree with Abraham Lincoln that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

Project Vietnam

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during this month of February, a great number of special observances will occur. "Brotherhood Week," "Human Relations Week," "American History Month," and other such engrossing occasions are suggested in pulpit and press to remind us that "no man is an island unto himself."

It is with pride that I call to your attention a recent illustrated article in the Postmasters Gazette entitled "Project Vietnam." This is the story of the people of Antioch, Ill., a town in the 12th Illinois Congressional District. And this is the story of brotherhood, the best in human relations and the stuff of which American history is made—circa 1968. Not for a day, or a special month, but day in—day out—Project Vietnam goes on because it is the year around way the people of Antioch say "We love you!" to our fighting men in Vietnam.

The article follows:

PACKAGES AND LETTERS BRIGHTEN LIVES OF GI'S: ANTIOCH (ILL.) POST OFFICE COMMENDED FOR "PROJECT VIETNAM"

Antioch, Ill., is proud of its PM, its post office employees and the U.S. Armed Forces. The feeling stems from a mission of goodwill which began about Christmas, 1966, when mothers of Vietnam servicemen mailed their holiday packages. In conversation with mothers, personnel of the Antioch Post Office learned of the distasteful water soldiers were drinking because of the added chemicals needed to purify it. Mothers sent packages of *Kool-aid* with other gifts to make the water more palatable.

The idea attracted Antioch postal employees with a desire to assist in this mission. Acting PM Joe Wolf cleared the matter with Chicago Reg. Dir. Donald L. Swanson, and *Project Vietnam* became a reality at no expense to the POD. *Kool-aid* purchased by postal employees at wholesale prices was packed and addressed to the servicemen. Postage was paid at the "SAM" rates by postal employees at first and later by Antioch citizens. Since then other items have been sent such as powdered soups, combs, multi-purpose knives, tea bags, ball point pens, chewing gum, candy, paper-back books, playing cards, and other gifts. Outside donations and gifts have been pouring in since the project was started.

In the following 10-month period of *Project Vietnam*, numerous awards and citations have been given to Antioch postal employees, including a *Superior Accomplishment Award* from the POD, another from the American Legion and one from the U.S. Air Force.

Many letters lauding their efforts in support of the servicemen have been received from the GIs themselves, the Red Cross, and the 67th and 85th Evacuation Hospitals. Scores of newspaper articles and editorials praised the combined cooperation of all Antioch citizens within the town's delivery limits (16,000 people).

With the *Superior Accomplishment Award,* Reg. Dir. Swanson wrote PM Wolf, "I know that PMG Lawrence F. O'Brien would join me in thanking all of you for what you have done. We are proud of your success."

Servicemen in Vietnam from Antioch average about 50 on a continuing basis. More than 2,000 individual packages have been mailed since the project began.

Typical of the appreciative response from the military personnel, GI Ray Nordling wrote:

"I'd like to express my thanks for the packages I have rceived in Vietnam," he said. "They contained many wonderful and enjoyable items, but more than the contents of the packages is the thought and support of the people back home that does me so much good.

"Knowing that there are some people who do care makes being there much more meaningful and bearable.

"It makes me very proud to be from a community such as Antioch where there are so many fine people who are willing to go out of their way to make our lives a little happier," Nordling concluded.

Capt. Anton J. Jirka, battalion surgeon with the 101st Airborne, stopped at the Antioch PO to thank PM Wolf and his staff for the packages he had received. "I think *Project Vietnam* is great," he said. "The packages mean a great deal more to the boys, coming from the people of their hometown. It makes them feel good and proud of Antioch.

"Soup really goes over big there," the captain said. "You cannot get that there. You know, food hits the spot when you must stay awake all night."

Project Vietnam has generated much goodwill. As a result, the number of local complaints against the war has been considerably reduced in Antioch.

The PO bulletin board in the lobby displays pictures of GIs from within the Antioch mail delivery area who are serving in Vietnam. The scrapbook on the lobby desk presents a touching story of the community's men in service and the care shown for them by their hometown.

Special envelopes depicting the town's patriotism and support of their servicemen are available for Antioch citizens. The envelopes carry a two-color picture of three soldiers reading their mail. Beneath the picture is the caption *Antioch Is Proud of The United States Armed Forces.*

The Rising Crime Rate

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many steps need to be taken to deal adequately with the Nation's rising crime rate—one of the most important being the strict, impartial enforcement of our present laws. I am in favor of passing a crime control bill which will, in fact, give local law-enforcement officials much needed assistance; I am in favor of an antiriot bill and I am in favor of an all-out war on organized crime. But, just passing another law does not automatically eliminate the problem.

Mr. President, the rising crime rate has grown into a gigantic problem during the past 4 years and the big reasons are lack of effective leadership and lack of decisive law enforcement. We have sufficient laws under which to prosecute members of our society who feel they are above the law such as Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown, but the Justice Department refuses to prosecute them.

A hundred laws will not ease the domestic tension unless they are enforced, and enforced without regard for race, color or political repercussion. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the City Council of the Isle of Palms, S.C., which urges the Justice Department to see that justice is done regarding the flagrant violations of our law by Stokely Carmichael. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ISLE OF PALMS, S.C.

Whereas, by Federal Statute, the crime of treason is defined as giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States anywhere in the world, and

Whereas, the United States is at war, whether declared or undeclared, with the enemy, North Viet Nam, and

Whereas, over sixteen thousand (16,000) loyal Americans have died in the Viet Nam War, and

Whereas, one Stokely Carmichael while recently visiting Cuba and North Viet Nam, countries off-limits for travel by U.S. Citizens, did express while in Hanoi, "warm support for the struggle against the common enemy", meaning the United States, and on numerous other occasions, all of which is documented by competent evidence, has encouraged insurrection and rebellion within this country, and

Whereas, the City Council of the Isle of Palms, South Carolina believes that such conduct is disgraceful and illegal and that prompt and adequate legal action should be taken by the Justice Department against Carmichael and anyone else giving such aid and comfort to the enemies of our Nation.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City Council of the Isle of Palms, South Carolina urges the President of the United States, the Unted States Senators from South Carolina, and the Congressman from the First Congressional District, to exercise their influence with the Justice Department to forthwith take whatever legal action available against the said Stokely Carmichael and any others displaying such un-patriotic action against the interest of the citizens of the United States and the foreign policies of our government. And

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senators Strom Thurmond, Ernest F. Hollings and Congressman L. Mendel Rivers.

Unanimously adopted at a regular Council Meeting on January 10, 1968.

JOSEPH H. HAMER,
Mayor.

American Conduct in South Vietnam

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter sent by Rev. John L. Matovich, pastor of SS. Andrew and Benedict Church at 2430 South Beatrice, Detroit, Mich.

This fine letter directed to the question of American conduct in South Vietnam merits careful reading by all interested and patriotic Americans:

SS. ANDREW AND BENEDICT CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., February 1, 1968.

Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, Detroit, Mich.

BRETHREN: I am an American and therefore believe in Civil Obedience.

I am a Catholic, and believe in backing my Country to the hilt and to the end.

Disagreement with the present policies of our harassed Government just gives comfort and aid to the enemy which schemes, by any means whatsoever, to create confusion here and abroad.

This is a war against an enemy that is trying to destroy us, and, I pity those who cannot see into this intrigue.

I cannot agree with those who are hiding behind the cloak of their conscience, and those aiding them. Conscience is something personal and not something to be exploited as in this case. Our Government certainly recognizes true conscientious objectors, but you are attempting to inject a diseased needle into the minds of all our American Youths.

When I was in Czecho-Slovakia a few years ago, the first question I was confronted with was; "What is your opinion on Viet-Nam?" When I told them we had a commitment there and would adhere to it, I became a "Persona non-grata."

I back our President, the Justice Department, the Department of State and General Hershey 100%, and I'm urging my people to do the same. Incidentally, 98% concur with me. It's this 2% of un-American population that is responsible for the war being prolonged, our boys dying, and, creating hope of internal confusion in the minds of the enemy.

Your caption should read; "Clergy and Laymen Concerned *for* the United States and Viet-Nam.

No, thanks, we do not care to be identified or to support your so-called; "Washington Mobilization of Clergy and Laymen on Feb. 5 and 6 or ever, and we shall fight tooth and nail to support our country as true Americans in this hour of need.

Hip, hip, hurrah for America. The land of freedom and opportunity!

Respectfully yours
Rev. JOHN L. MATOVICH,
Pastor.

FBI Police Training Courses

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there is a great deal of interest in North Dakota in the police training course conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Recently a course was conducted at Rolla, N. Dak. It was attended by law-enforcement officials from a wide area.

One of the ablest newspaper editors in North Dakota, Mr. Lester J. Dewing, of the Turtle Mountain Star, wrote an excellent editorial on this meeting. I believe it merits insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the views he expresses will be of interest to Members of Congress as well as people all over the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNTAINS AND MOLEHILLS

(By Lester J. Dewing)

I have just returned from a two-hour session of peace officers' training school and my most sincere conviction arising from my observations is that this newspapering business is the place for me. Brother, I would gladly move to Lower Slobovia and comb the ice crystals off wolves, or work in the salt mines of Siberia before being forced to take a job as a law officer. Until I attended the school, I thought that the most dangerous element of police work was apprehending a criminal, but I have changed my mind. I believe those badge wearers are in much more danger of being "shot down" by the technicalities of the law in pursuing their duties than by any Jessie James or John Dillinger!

It's just too bad that every John Q. Citizen can't go into one of these peace officers' training schools and observe just for a few hours like I did. This school went on for three solid days, and I picked up enough information and instructions in the two hours I was there to fill a bushel basket full of brains my size. Admittedly, my brain size might be smaller than most, but by gosh, any of those peace officers at the school who retain half of what they hear will have to be gifted with brains like Solomon. When I was at the school, a special FBI agent, George Burton from Minneapolis, was shoveling out information and answers to technical questions faster than a steam shovel could fill up a tea cup. I'll tell you by the time I left that place, I had come to the conclusion that this man Burton is a genius or has a photographic mind or both. You would be amazed at the questions officers threw at him arising from the many and varied situations they run into, and he fielded every one of them perfectly, giving his opinion and citing the court decisions upon which he based that opinion. I was sitting there in a state of shock staring at this man and his phenomenal demonstration until he finally did admit that it is his job to keep up to date on all court decisions which affect law enforcement so he can instruct at such schools.

Now, picture this if you will. Here is a man who has been educated for years, received a law degree in 1935, and has had umpteen years of experience in the law enforcement field. Yet, he comes out flatly and states that he must study and work full time every hour of every day, and at times into the night, to just keep completely posted on the various aspects, procedures and technicalities of law enforcement as laid down by the courts of our land. And yet, we ordinary citizens complain and harp because our peace officers do not "know beans about anything" and we claim that we could do a better job than they do. Well, just try it, buster, that's all. . . . I'll guarantee you that after one hitch as a peace officer, you'll find out you didn't know anything about the law.

Yet, we expect these men who we place in the position of peace officers, and pay very low wages usually, to know everything about law enforcement, which one well-educated and well-trained man spends full time learning, and still carry out their 24-hour-a-day duties. Many of our law officers have had little formal education, certainly nothing like a law degree, and they gain most of their knowledge from the school of hard knocks. Now, experience is a sure way of learning something, and learning it well, but it can be very painful, too, especially in such an important area as law enforcement. I am sure they would not like to have to face the facts that assorted number of criminals are roving the streets because of mistakes they made while learning by experience, or reverse, that some poor soul has been put in jail for five or 10 years for a crime he did not commit in order that an officer can get a lesson by experience.

Now, these fellas who are our law enforcement officers are just ordinary guys like you and I. Sure, there may be a rotten apple in the barrel on a rare occasion, but as a rule peace officers are no more anxious to see a guilty man go free, or an innocent man convicted than any of us. Yet, they know and must live every day with the fact that one small act by them which does not meet all requirements and technicalities of the law as interpreted by countless judges across our land will do just that—free a guilty man or convict an innocent one. Who can they turn to, these minions of the law? Well, the state's attorneys of course, and they are lawyers so they should know how to interpret all the technicalities of the law. Just wait a darn minute now. Do you mean to tell me that a state's attorney sitting in Bottineau, Rugby, Cando or Rolla is supposed to be able to keep completely versed and up-to-date on all the variations of the law as represented by decisions handed down day-by-day in the U.S. Supreme Court and other federal and state courts? Well, if that's what you want from your state's attorneys, voters, you better start paying more taxes to provide salaries for two or three assistant state's attorneys. Because, if he is going to have in his office and at his fingertips, the information to provide the proper answer for every situation law enforcement officials bump up against, it is going to take that many, or one guy like FBI Agent George Burton working full time. I rather doubt if Mr. Burton's services would be available to each individual state's attorney in North Dakota, but if you are in doubt, you might write J. Edgar Hoover in Washington, D.C., and ask.

To make law enforcement work even tougher these days, the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts seem to infer by their decisions that it is the police officer who is at fault when he brings a man into court, at least until he can prove that he is right. The old rule of thumb, which still applies and is an excellent one, is that every man is innocent until proven guilty. But, it does not follow that the courts should need to, lean over so far backward in protecting human and individual rights that they automatically assume that the police officer is always wrong and up to no good. Yet, that is the way it sounds from the U.S. Supreme Court decisions these days. The classic case I always think of in this respect is the one reported in the daily newspapers a few months ago.

It seems a police officer in Philadelphia had arrested a man for having narcotics on his person. The officer was to appear in a city court as the complaining witness. The night before his court appearance, the officer was on duty until 1 a.m. and then went to the funeral home to view the body of his grandmother who had died the previous day. He was required to report in court at 7 a.m. the next day, so he rushed home from the funeral parlor to grab a few hours of sleep. He reported in court at promptly 7 a.m. that morning and sat down to wait the calling of the case in which he was involved. Well, as courts sometimes do, time passed and passed and still his case wasn't called. He dared not leave the courtroom so he sat through the forenoon, and until mid-afternoon. The court room was hot and crowded, and he became drowsy just sitting, as will most of us after only a few hours of sleep the night before. Well, the judge spotted him relaxing with his legs stretched out and yawning occasionally. So, the judge ordered this officer dressed in uniform to be brought before the bench by the court bailiffs, and charged the police officer with contempt of court. He refused to hear any explanation from the officer, and found him guilty of that charge. To add irony to insult, when the narcotics case finally did come up, the man the officer had arrested and charged was found not guilty by the judge and the case dismissed. Net result: one man, who a law-abiding officer doing his duty felt was a narcotics dealer, getting off scot free, and a police officer with a conviction for contempt of court on his record!

Don't get the idea that this type of thing is condoned by all judges or that court policy is intended to put law officers and state's attorneys in a jackpot all the time. Actually, it is a trend of the times which has seen such a drastic switch to protection of the rights of the individual that it has been overdone to the detriment of society as a whole. However, some judges recognize the problem and talk about it. For instance, Federal District Judge Marovitz in Illinois says, "The police must feel defeat when constantly bombarded with cries of police brutality, knowing that in most instances this is but a pre-planned phrase glibly invoked by self-serving individuals to arouse undeserved sympathy". And Chief Judge Foley of the U.S. Court in New York said, "We may strangle law enforcement and court function if in these cases distinctions become too finespun and unreal. We can quibble forever as to when the arrest took place; at the stopping of the car, or the stepping out of the car at the command of the detectives, or after the brown paper bag was found on the floor of the automobile."

Finally, as a result of my visit to the police training school, I firmly believe that these schools are most important. In fact, if our law officers are to continue to give us the kind of protection all society needs, they are as essential to the lawman as the belt to hold up his trousers. No doubt, some taxpayers say, what a waste of money for these other counties to send their officers to Rolla for a police school. To that I reply, as a taxpayer, that I just wish all my tax dollars could be "wasted" so usefully. The police school here was for six counties, and there was some talk of staging one in the area at regular intervals. I assume they meant at least one a year. Since I was in a group where my opinion would not count for much, I had nothing to say, but I will say right now that I am all for holding these schools at least once a year. I have never seen such an attentive bunch of "students" in all my life as these lawmen were at the school here, and I am sure they were learning much from it. If they retain even one-tenth of what they have learned, their value to the communities they represent will increase greatly, and the school will have been a rousing success. If they retain more than one-tenth of what they gleaned from the huge mass of information and education given to them, I would have to say they are more than law officers . . . they are intellectual geniuses!

Nixon Support Gathering

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. **BROCK**. Mr. Speaker, recent months have witnessed a growing wave of sentiment in favor of former Vice President Richard Nixon for the Republican presidential nomination. His February 1 announcement that he will actively seek the nomination has met with enthusiastic acclaim.

Two recent editorials, appearing in different parts of the country, reflect Mr. Nixon's widespread appeal.

The first of them appeared in the Chattanooga News-Free Press of January 13; the second in the December 31 issue of the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch. Because of their interest, I include them in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Jan. 13, 1968]

THEY SUPPORT NIXON

Of course Richard Nixon is going to announce his candidacy for President.

There's no question about it. He's been running for months—or even years. He is not one of the reluctant candidates. He has not said, like Govs. Ronald Reagan and Nelson Rockefeller, that he isn't running. He is. He will say so specifically perhaps within a very short time.

That doesn't mean, however, that the action taken by Tennessee Republican Reps. Bill Brock, Jimmy Quillen and Dan Kuykendall didn't mean anything. It meant a lot.

These three Tennesseans joined 33 other members of Congress in public urging of former Vice President Nixon to make an immediate announcement that he is seeking the Republican nomination for President of the United States.

"The coming campaign is so critical for our country that a forthright and vigorous Republican effort must begin now," the pro-Nixon GOP congressman said.

They are quite correct. And Mr. Nixon is the strongest, most conservative Republican who has indicated a desire to run, thus far. The support coming from the Tennessee congressmen and others is part of the political effort to focus attention upon Mr. Nixon's candidacy and to give it impetus.

Gov. George Romney of Michigan virtually killed himself off as a presidential contender before publicly getting into the race. He has shown he simply is not a big enough man to be President, and has failed to attract a wide public following. He is going to attempt to reverse this by running in primaries. If he takes a substantial beating there, as expected, he's through. With Rockefeller and Reagan declaring themselves out, and with nobody else rising to the top, Mr. Nixon is by far the frontrunner, though he does not have the Republican nomination sewed up. As Romney falters, there will be strong efforts to get Rockefeller to take his place as the liberal standard-bearer in the GOP. If Nixon should waver, there would be a Reagan demand.

Most of the regulars who will have influence on the decision at the August Republican National Convention seem to be lining up behind Mr. Nixon. The Brock-Quillen-Kuykendall move is a part of that drive. It indicates where the Tennessee delegation majority will be when the chips are down.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Dec. 31, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE BOW DECLARES FOR NIXON

Ohio's most influential congressman, Rep. Frank T. Bow of Canton, places himself openly in the presidential campaign camp of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Bow is the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, a spot that gives him a great deal of power despite his minority status.

So sold on Nixon is Bow that he has decided not to seek election in the May 7 primary as a delegate to the GOP National Convention Aug. 6 at Miami Beach.

Bow explained that he had been a delegate to previous conventions. This time, he said, he wants more freedom at the convention to work for Nixon. Delegates must stay close to their seats on the convention floor, Bow said.

Despite his devotion to Nixon, Bow has no plans to buck the Ohio Republican committee's decision to have all convention delegates from the state support Governor Rhodes as a "favorite son."

Bow said he will back Rhodes. But once Rhodes has made whatever moves he intends toward the nomination for president or vice president, Bow said he will shift his support to Nixon.

The Staggering Budget Total

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been deeply disturbed by the President's budget request of $186 billion for running the Federal Government during fiscal 1969. This is reflected by the editorial which recently appeared in the Fort Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel.

I believe that this editorial comment is typical of the public's reaction to the President's continued spending policies at a time when we are engaged in a very difficult and costly military conflict in Vietnam.

It seems to me that others should be afforded the opportunity of reading this editorial, which follows:

THE STAGGERING BUDGET TOTAL

In a situation where the National Administration is irrevocably committed to the concept of bigger and bigger government, budgetary economy must be measured not in a reduction in the annual budget, but in a reduction in the annual growth of the budget.

Thus we have President Johnson, in his budget message to Congress, making some left-handed responses to the long battle of House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills for governmental economies and a re-establishment of governmental fiscal "priorities."

"The Great Society," under the budget outlined by the President Monday, will not grow as rapidly in 1969 as it is growing in 1968. How much it will be slowed is a matter for conjecture.

However, one can get some idea of just how far the Administration has gone in realigning its military and civilian "priorities" by comparing the increase in the budget for the Vietnam war ($1.3 billion, or 5 per cent) to the great cutback in appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—economies to which the resignation of HEW Secretary John W. Gardner was last week attributed.

Major Health, Education, and Welfare programs, last year allotted $19.1 billion, will receive just $1.7 billion more under the new budget—an increase of 9 per cent, or nearly twice the defense increase, percentage-wise.

Where are the much-discussed "economies" in HEW? Well, they seem to focus on the fact that the 1968 HEW increase was $3.9 billion, or something like 25 per cent.

From this, it could be inferred that the Great Society plans, in this election year, will proceed at canter, not a gallop, and that the revised priorities of the Johnson Administration still stress advancement of its social programs over defense or, to put it another way, "butter over guns." The stress is only a little less emphatic than it was for the current year.

The new "all-inclusive" budget described by the President in his message already has been heralded as more complete and forthright than any used in the past, since it includes items which have heretofore been classed as "trust" accounts, such as Social Security taxes, which previously were excluded. We already have found in the new budget form a more honest presentation of the Government's fiscal problems. However, it must also be recognized that it makes comparisons with the past very difficult, if not impossible. It continues the Administration's faculty for revision of the ground rules of budgetmaking, and only when it has been in use for two or more successive years will it begin to reflect an accurate picture of governmental economies and excesses.

In the meantime, the new budget total of $186.1 billion gives us a figure to stagger the taxpayer, both in his imagination and in his pocketbook.

The State of L. B. J.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, after visiting in South Carolina following the state of the Union address, I had the opportunity to speak with a number of my constituents concerning the proposals of the President and the decisions facing the Congress during 1968.

The views of my constituents have been well summarized in an editorial entitled "The State of L. B. J.," which appeared in the Friday, January 19, 1968, issue of the State newspaper, which is published in Columbia, S.C.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF L. B. J.

Within a space of two days, the world has seen two of its top-ranked statesmen, Harold Wilson and Lyndon B. Johnson, stand up and admit, explicitly or tacitly, failure of socialist programs they have espoused.

Britain's Wilson was the more candid of the two, as indeed he had to be. His nation's economic situation is much more critical, much more immediate. He grabbed headlines by hauling down the Union Jack east of Suez and ending Britain's role as a world military force.

But he got boos from his own Labor Party backbenchers for his domestic retreats—cuts in housing, education, welfare, road construction, civil defense (which saved Britain in World War II). He called for installment curbs and higher taxes and even wants Britons to pay 30 cents apiece for drug prescriptions. So British medicine becomes a bit less socialized.

Now it is not altogether fair to compare Britain's economic woes with America's. The resources here are too much greater. But overindulgence abroad and inflationary spending at home have put both nations on the sick list.

President Johnson's State of the Nation speech was not an open-handed admission of failure. Indeed, he seemed to be calling for a ride further down the road he recommended in previous addresses. But in tone and in emphasis and in what was left unsaid, he signaled changes of direction needed to cope with problems that his old policies have created or failed to solve.

On Vietnam, he was firm on America's commitment and pragmatic about negotiations. The first order of business in talks, he said, must be complete cessation of all hostilities. Months earlier, he had laid the basis for such talk by starting to heed the advice of military professionals rather than civilian advisers.

On the home front, one of his major proposals was a 25 percent increase in manpower training funds to put 500,000 hardcore unemployed to work in private business in the next three years. The upgraded role of private business represents a shift a virtual acceptance of Republican suggestions.

On Wednesday night, the President declared, "The American people have had enough of rising crime and violence." Although in 1966 he vetoed a strong crime bill for the District of Columbia, now he wants an enlarged Safe Streets law, a stronger drug act to control LSD and other such drugs, 100 new assistant district attorneys to prosecute criminal cases, 100 additional FBI agents, and a strong gun control law.

It is interesting and perhaps significant that he received his most enthusiastic applause from the Democrat-controlled Congress when he mentioned the war on crime.

In 1965, Johnson chanted "We shall overcome" to the Congress and later urged that the masses be aroused and be told that "their hour has arrived and their day is here." The masses got the word but not all of the action they wanted. So they took to the streets and they killed and destroyed in a terrible two summers of rioting.

Now, LBJ calls for "civil order founded on justice" and he announces to "preachers of violence" that the federal government will aid local authorities to resist them firmly and decisively. Since he had sowed the seed and reaped a harvest he didn't want, he had to change his tune to "We Shall Overcome The Rioters."

On the monetary front, the President bowed to demands for a budget that more accurately reflects the total picture, but it is not as tight as he would have us believe and it is predicated on passage of a 10 per cent surtax. He called on business and labor to act responsibly but made no suggestions for legal restraints. He wants to free gold from currency backing requirements. He wants to restrict foreign travel.

Some of these are difficult steps for an old easy-money advocate who has seen interest rates zoom, who put in a tax cut earlier and who finds deficits and an embattled dollar everywhere he looks.

Lyndon Johnson did not eat as much crow as Harold Wilson. But some day he might have to consume an even bigger helping.

No Trade Is Good Trade That Isn't Fair Trade—Domestic or Foreign

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during these days of devoted, and sometimes heartless practice of the old "dog eat dog" philosophy, it is refreshing to find that on the American scene there is at least one unquivering and unafraid forthright voice that keeps preaching the benefits of fair and equitable trade procedures and practices in the marketplace.

I have listened to Ed Wimmer and read his column as often as it comes my way, and I have never known him to deviate from the main and the principal theme of playing the market game in a way that guarantees a fair wage, a reasonable profit and a quality product. Ed Wimmer, like many of the rest of us in a smaller or greater degree, has felt the cold stare and sharp tongue of the vast numbers of our fellow Americans, who from deep convictions, or blind stubbornness or a pitiful ignorance—or perhaps all three combined—have refused to acknowledge a simple and verifiable fact; the American people will prosper only so long as they are willing to pay for a product the price demanded for producing it.

Price cutting can only be achieved by reducing quality, paying lower wages or exploitation of the worker at the production line. Once prices for the product have been reduced by such methods the next step is to cut out the normal business channels for doing business and operating through short changing, nonservicing, false advertising retail outfits. In the end, this kind of operation reduces all quality, acts as a deterrent to reasonable wage payments and curtails industrial expansion.

This is true and absolute, since the economic laws of an industrial economy are based upon three equal factors and they are: production, distribution, and consumption. Not one of these three can stand alone and an injury to one eventually becomes an injury to all; serious in some cases and fatal in others.

A demoralized price structure in the marketplace opens the door for cutthroat low-waged products, flooding of the American marketplace by foreign-produced products. This is so true today that the doctrinaire freetraders in our Government are scampering from pillar to post trying to bolster our crumbling trade policies.

We are offered a program encompassing such products of great mental exercise, such as a tax on tourism, which will only hit the once-in-a-lifetime traveler who has saved for years to make a trip back to the old country, by taxing all over $7 a day spent in foreign travel. All this does is add a tax to the limited travel funds of the ordinary citizens. It will not and it cannot affect the travels of the jet crowd, or the pleasure-seeking American businessman with investments overseas, because the habitual traveler will disguise his spending by parading as the guest of foreign friends. The business traveler will charge it off to his travel expense account. I predict if such a tax is passed it will fall flat on its unworthy face, unless taxes are assessed arbitrarily on the basis of income bracket of the traveler and includes Government and congressional members.

The second proposal places a tax on all imports regardless if they are needed for our economy or if it is a surplus commodity in our market, and then further proposes to take these tax revenues and pay them out to the exporting crowd, many of whom are already subsidized by the American workman and the stay-at-home businessman.

This proposal can be likened to trying to kill one deer in a herd with a shotgun filled with scattershot and wounding the doe and the fawn, although the target happened to be the buck; a rifle would be a better weapon. In the matter of surcharges, customs, or outright border taxes on imports we can better justify equalizing charges against surplus cheap imports, or competitive steel, glass, textiles, mushrooms, and so forth.

Those of us like Ed Wimmer who have been labeled protectionists would not dare, even in our most protective moments, advanced an across-the-board trade tariff regardless of the need or the economic impact of the tax. These measures, in my opinion, will be about as effective as trying to inflict a mortal wound on an elephant with a blunt safety pin.

While the following remarks, made by Mr. Wimmer, deal more directly with the problem of fair trade within the U.S. marketplace, there is no fundamental difference between domestic and foreign trade when it comes to price structure, quality of goods, taxes, and so forth. I, therefore, include a radio address and column by Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America, Inc., and public relations director of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., as part of my remarks:

[Radio address and column by Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America, Inc., and public relations director of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.]

Appeasement Via Destruction of U.S. Industry—Jobs: No Way To Sound Trade

If you were an employee, distributor, stockholder, official or supplier of an efficient, progressive and highly reputable American tile maker, and if the Federal Government subsidized a competitor enough to put your company out of business, what would you say?

If you were a tax collector, Chamber of Commerce, Community Chest or Red Cross worker and you saw this happen to a company that was one of the mainstays of your community, state and nation, and you read about the layoffs and discontinuation of this enterprise, would it disturb you? Cause you to ask questions?

Suppose you were 50 years old and you worked in a textile mill, and you had read of 1,100 mills that closed in one year due to government subsidized competitors, and you knew that few if any corporations would hire workers over 50, what would you say about a government that did such a thing?

If you were a stockholder or worker of a glass manufacturer as efficient as any competitor, but ready to close down several modern plants due to government subsidized competition from abroad, would you write your Congressman?

Our government subsidized billions of dollars worth of plants for foreign countries now making steel, textiles, shoes, toys—almost everything, and then permitted these low wage, low taxed, American subsidized competitors, to wipe out your factories, your farms and your jobs.

To make matters worse, the foreign governments favoring our demise as a strong competitor, are openly supported by U.S. corporate officials, those who have subsidiaries abroad making goods under the same low wage—low tax conditions. A leader among this group is IBM's Arthur K. Watson who recently warned—that "excessive American corporate control in Europe is creating violent hatreds," and breeding monopolies foreigners hope will be big enough to compete with our monopolies. IBM sells 9 out of 10 computers sold in the world. Seven hundred of the biggest U.S. firms have subsidiaries abroad, and they want to produce abroad for American markets, and they want subsidies via tariffs so they can undersell their own home plants.

Mr. Watson says he is "baffled" by the "wave of protection" now building up in Congress—which our organization has backed to the hilt. We don't believe American taxpaying businesses and American jobs should be expendable to keep any government happy, and at the risk of making us a dependent nation for vital needs.

Our tile, textiles, shoes, rugs, glass, gloves, steel, bicycle companies—every kind of company you can think of—pays workers more in fringe benefits than importers pay in total wages. The taxes on our goods are more than production costs abroad, and keep in mind, that no country is going to buy our high priced exports once they can meet their needs at home.

In my travels I talked to Japanese, Norwegian, English and other foreign manufacturers about this problem. They emphatically said they could compete on a "fair market under tariff protection or fair trade laws that promote quality and fair competition." What is so bewildering is the failure of businessmen to help get these facts to the public.

Fair Trade in the United States

No speaker in America, I am sure, has quoted the Wall Street Journal more often than I, or with more respect, and I have felt very much the same about Barron's Weekly. There is one subject over which we have been in complete disagreement, however, and that is on the subject of Fair Trade legislation permitting a name brand manufacturer to establish a price on his product below which no seller may go without permission of the manufacturer, or in special cases where excess or outdated merchandise must be moved.

The whole idea behind Fair Trade legislation (and the proposed Quality Stabilization Bill now buried in Congressional committees by discounter opposition), is to give a maker of a quality product sold in free competition with like products, the simple right to prevent a price cutter from using reputable, name brand merchandise as a decoy for the purpose of selling highly profitable unknown merchandise—the result of which is the destruction of the legitimate retailer and distributor.

Can you imagine, for example, what would happen to local Hart Schaffner & Marx dealers, and the reputation of this old line company, if a price cutter could offer H.S.&M. suits either at or below cost? . . . Is it difficult to understand that in a few months or years the dealerships would be terminated and the quality go down as it always has when price cutting cuts deep enough?

Both the Wall Street Journal and Barron's Weekly are uncompromisingly opposed to the maintenance of price levels that insure workers, owners, distributors and producers a fair return, but in their own case, both the Journal and Barron's Weekly are sold at a price stipulated by the publisher of each; and they control their advertising rates.

On January 2, the distributors and the newsstand buyers were notified that the Journal would be increased from "10 to 15 cents" and Barron's Weekly from "35 to 50 cents" which in the case of the Journal, is a raise of $12 annually for the daily newsstand purchaser. (In my opinion, 15 cents is not an unfair price for the Journal considering what it dishes up for its readers. This is not my gripe.)

What I cannot understand is how these two price protected publishers can make one vicious attack after another on anyone seeking passage or enforcement of fair trade legislation, when its advocates include big names like Sunbeam, General Electric, Westinghouse, Bulova, Hamilton Watch and thousands of other companies that are subscribers of both the Journal and Barron's; and when none of these companies need price protection at the maker level.

Furthermore, there are more than 170 leading associations that have fought for passage of price maintenance legislation, which a V.P. of the AFL called a "charter of free enterprise." He also said that the day will come when "cutthroat competition will be considered the practice of criminals."

As a contrast, the Champion Spark Plug Company brought five suits against sellers who were using the Champion name to pull customers away from legitimate dealers. Champion won all five cases. At a cost of nearly $1 million, the small Schwinn Bicycle Co. carried on a long court battle to protect its dealers against the unfair merchandising of its fine product. The final round was won in the U.S. Supreme Court, but at what a price just to keep a good name and a costly built distribution system from being dragged through the gutter.

Why? Why should a company like Shulton, for example, be forced to go to court in Ohio and other states, to keep its Old Spice brand out of the bait columns? Why shouldn't a company like Motorola, that advertises:

"Motorola is for the independent retailer because without the independent retailer, there would be no Motorola," be given the right to protect its dealers from price cutters using Motorola products as baits?

A few years ago I walked into a convention hall in San Diego and found a big rainbow sign over a display. It read: "Independence with independents."

The sign was Motorola's. But what was wrong? The convictions of this fine company were not taken to the public.

Consider the statement of the general counsel for Esso Standard Oil Co., Mr. R. E. Keresey (and, believe me, you can trust your ears and eyes), taken from testimony before a Congressional committee. He said:

"For the few dollars the consumer saves during a price war, we may have lost an independent businessman. If so, we have lost the productivity of his invested capital and we have lost a member of the business community. We have lost him not because he is a poor businessman or inefficient. We have lost him because in the mad scramble of a price war, he has been priced out of business."

Why wouldn't such a defense of the profit system carry weight with American lovers of fair play? Did Esso really believe what its general counsel was saying, and if so, wouldn't it be good public relations to tell it to the public?

Paul Fisher of the Fisher Pen Co. has spent thousands of dollars promoting fair trade. . . . Champion announces unhesitantly it will fight to keep its good name and protect its dealers wherever protection is lawful, but look at the number of drug manufacturers who dropped fair trade, double-crossed their small dealers, went berserk in the merger field, and are now neck deep in investigations; yet, they could have made millions without merging. They could have continued to concentrate on research and protection of the public and their smaller suppliers. Instead, they let their industry fall into the hands of men stricken with the disease of mergeritis and volume, and now they're paying for this folly.

In Gulliver's Travels, Jonathan Swift wrote:

"Honesty has no defense against superior cunning, and since it is necessary that there should be a perpetual intercourse of buying and selling and dealing with honesty, where fraud is permitted and connived at or hath no law to punish it, the honest dealer is always undone and the knave gets the advantages."

Doesn't this have a reasonable sound? Don't you believe the young man starting out in an appliance store, drug or hardware business, should have his chance to compete for customers under the same ground rules that prevailed on the football field or the baseball diamond? In hockey or basketball? Are rules of fair play all right in sports but all wrong in business? Was an advertising agency official talking sense when he said that in a few more years—only the predators will remain?

Vice President Humphrey told Business Week that his drug store was the "only one left out of five in his home town." "The discounters got the other four," he said, and indicated his might be next. When the Vice President was a Senator, he fought constantly for the principles underlying fair trade laws and the Quality Stabilization Bill. Other Senators like Morton of Kentucky, Proxmire of Wisconsin, Lausche of Ohio, the late Senator Robert Taft, and some 50 other Senators voted for fair trade laws which were killed in the courts by discounters who found a technical weakness in the law. To offset this defeat by eliminating the technicality, a House committee approved the Quality Stabilization Bill by a 32 to one vote in 1966, but it was tabled by a half attended Senate committee meeting by a one-vote margin.

Senator Morton castigated the discounters for their admission that they had killed the bill at a cost of millions of dollars—but what really killed it was the lethargy of too many of its friends.

This commentator was in the first fair trade fight in California in 1931, the second year of the depression. There was no such thing as price stability at that time, and chaos reigned in the market place. The National Association of Retail Druggists took up the fair trade fight at this time. John Anderson, president of the Anderson Manufacturing Company (inventor of the wrap-around windshield wiper (ANCO), was still battling for the Quality Stabilization Bill at 92 when he passed away. This man attained great stature among businessmen by spending untold sums to back up his dealers and his convictions, and ANCO was never marketed as a bait.

My friends, I ask you, what has happened to us that we glory in trying to beat someone out of a profit, or buy something we know is a decoy—a bait—destroying opportunities for our young and closing the doors to free enterprise forever? Just what does it take to teach us that all this "something for nothing" which labor demands in its contracts, the "something for nothing" appeals of the market place, and all the "something for nothing" supposedly handed down by the government, is nothing for something and on the grandest scale in history?

In coming weeks I will return to this subject, but for now I ask only that you figure out in your own minds just what kind of country you want for yourself and your boys and girls, and ask yourself why so many students are growing more and more antagonistic to the business world—for what it is offering in Human values.

I leave you with this thought: Buy independent—your dollar is more powerful than your ballot.

Article on the Greenbrier Commended by Randolph

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I recently read an excellent article by Leavitt F. Morris, in the Christian Science Monitor, on the Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

This magnificent hotel is visited and enjoyed annually by many of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to include the article, "How a Resort Hotel Can Keep Growing—In Good Taste," from the January 30, 1968, issue of the Christian Science Monitor in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A RESORT HOTEL CAN KEEP GROWING—IN GOOD TASTE

(By Leavitt F. Morris)

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA.—The Greenbrier here, set majestically in an estate of nearly 7,000 acres, is the one vacation resort that I have visited which can entertain guests and convention groups simultaneously without one getting in the way of the other.

This indeed is a happy achievement and one I would not believe possible unless I had seen it myself.

And now I have. During our visit I had to be told that a large group of stockholders from the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was meeting here, so casually and easily did these people integrate with the regular guests.

How does The Greenbrier accomplish this most difficult task? Its size, of course, enables management to feed convention groups apart from the regular guests. Meeting rooms are situated far away from the guest lounges.

But there is another factor which I feel helps to make the conventioneer inconspicuous at The Greenbrier. The hotel's exquisite taste in décor gives it such a richness in atmosphere that convention people tread softly, keep voices down, and move about with almost awesome respect for what has to be recognized as one of the great resort hotels in the United States. Management told me that it experiences little, if any, rowdyism among convention people.

One only need travel the long hallways, step into the many lounges, and private rooms to note the meticulous housekeeping job that is done here. The fussiest housekeeper would have to do a lot of searching to find any fault in the way this hotel is kept. All of the fabrics on the chairs, the drapes, and the carpets look freshly cleaned or new. It is no easy housekeeping task at The Greenbrier. For example, about 40 miles of carpeting has to be vacuumed each day when the hotel is at its capacity of 1,140 guests.

Seventy five percent of those who check in at The Greenbrier throughout a year are members of convention groups. Without them the hotel could not open its doors, so great would be the costs to operate. Because of these convention people rates at The Greenbrier for vacation guests can be held to the minimum of $30 a day. This rate includes three meals and a pleasant afternoon tea hour.

In the very early years of this resort much emphasis was put on the waters for curative purpose. Today, however, emphasis has shifted to the scores of outdoor activities made available to guests.

There are three challenging 18-hole golf courses which Mr. Golf—Sam Snead—has made famous as he is the summer professional. There is a fine stable of horses for those who want to ride over all or part of the 200 miles of scenic bridle trails. Five Har-Tru tennis courts, two heated pools, a modern Gun Club on Kate's Mountain, shuffleboard, archery, horseshoes, putting greens, driving range, plus bowling lanes are among the other sports activities at the visitor's fingertips.

From Nov. 20 to March 31 The Greenbrier offers very attractive special package rates which include gratuities, free golf and tennis, and many other activities for which there is a fee in the busy season.

While golf cannot be guaranteed during the winter months, tennis can. The snow can be removed easily from the courts and play resumed. Usually the climate is temperate at the 1,925-foot elevation at which the resort is located.

There are pleasant walks for guests and a stroll through the landscaped grounds will reveal, in the flowering season, bright beds of tulips and scores of other blooms. The hotel sponsors nature and garden walks Monday through Friday during the summer. The garden tour, conducted by the resident naturalist, deals with features of design and ornamental plantings of the hotel.

A stroll along Alabama Row will bring you to the Presidents' Cottage Museum. Built in the early 1800's by Stephen Henderson, a sugar planter from New Orleans, it has housed such heads of the United States as Martin Van Buren, John Tyler, Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, and James Buchanan. In all, some 17 presidents of the United States, including Dwight D. Eisenhower, have visited White Sulphur Springs.

The Presidents' Cottage Museum, which I was unable to see, is open to visitors. In addition to the bedrooms furnished with many antiques, some originals used in the days the cottage flourished as a guest house for presidents, is the Display Room. Here are old photographs and other items of interest dealing with White Sulphur Springs.

The Greenbrier and its large acreage is owned by the Chespeake & Ohio Railroad. Managed by the competent and affable E. Truman Wright, who started his hotel experience at the Waldorf Astoria, the hotel now turns over a handsome profit to its stockholders.

A project in which Mr. Wright is now involved is the building of a new golf and tennis club house to replace the old one. The new structure will provide additional banquet facilities and a gourmet dining room on the third floor where late diners can be served. After 10 p.m. all meals will be on an a la carte basis. Guests staying at the hotel wishing to eat at the gourmet dining room up to 10 p.m. will be given a credit of $6 toward their meal.

So The Greenbrier keeps on growing. But always in good taste. For The Greenbrier is a hotel of grandeur but managing to embrace simplicity; it is a hotel exemplifying lavishness but never excessively; it is a hotel providing maximum modern comfort in surroundings maintained much as they were in the early 1800's.

The hotel's slogan, I think, sums up The Greenbrier about as succinctly as any I can think of:

"The resort that is a way of life."

Congress Views the Application of the Systems Approach to Public Problems

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, our colleagues from Massachusetts, the Honorable F. Bradford Morse, addressed the American Institute of Architects and the Consulting Engineers Council on the progress being made in the application of the systems approach to public problems. Mr. Morse has touched on an impressive number of examples of progress being made in the field of public problem solving. As he has pointed out, the expanded use and further possibilities of modern management techniques are more and more beginning to be understood and appreciated by Members of the Congress, executive branch departments, and administrators of government at all levels, as well.

Mr. Morse has noted that the world of automatic data processing has not always been easy to comprehend nor have many people cared to take the time and effort to delve into it. Now, however, legislators, administrators, and their staffs are familiarizing themselves with these new concepts.

Every effort should be made to continue this process and this progress. For this reason, Mr. Morse's speech merits our close attention and thoughtful consideration:

CONGRESS VIEWS THE APPLICATION OF THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO PUBLIC PROBLEMS

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Institute of Architectects and the Consulting Engineers Council, honored guests:

It was with genuine pleasure that I accepted your invitation to participate in this Joint Legislative Affairs Conference. The importance of a gathering of this type scarcely can be overstated, for it is increasingly imperative that responsible individuals in both the public and private sectors work together in coping with the problems of our age. My concern, as a Federal legislator, stems from conditions which are evident to any perceptive witness.

Our heritage as a nation has been one of virtually unlimited resources and a plenitude of the good things in life. It has become apparent during the past few decades, however, that the demands of a mounting population and the inroads caused by technological consumption of many resources would force us to reassess our way of life. A new set of problems has emerged: air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, the chaos of choked transportation systems, the multiplicity of problems involved in urban expansion and renewal, and many others.

The problems have been identified but unfortunately the solutions have been slow in forthcoming. The nation has marshalled impressive forces to accomplish the penetration of space and the development of nuclear energy, but for the most part the non-space, non-defense dilemmas have received less than a minimal allocation of resources to deal with them. I have believed for some time that ours has been a haphazard, piecemeal approach that depends far too much on good luck. The environmental problems facing this nation are very real . . . they are not going to disappear in and of themselves. The Federal government, the States, the local communities must bring intelligent, rational action and must work hard to bring about the restoration of healthful living conditions.

Not only must the public element be aroused and its powerful resources focussed on the critical problems of this generation, but the private elements also must shoulder their portion of the burden. The universities, the foundations, the industrial and commercial institutions—all are essential to the maintenance of the strength and viability of the nation.

While technology has created new problems, it also has provided our civilization with a fantastic array of innovative products, tools, services, and techniques. I often stand in awe of the strides made in the years since the Second World War. Atomic energy now is broken to peaceful uses; time- and labor-saving devices combined with improved management techniques have resulted in the more effective utilization of human effort; the electronic computer with its capability to store, correlate, and retrieve data at incredible speeds has become an integral part of our lives.

This morning, I am going to emphasize the role of the systems approach in our everyday life, and comment upon some of the alternatives which have been proposed by thinking men who now realize that traditional solutions no longer can suffice. We are on the threshold of an entirely new approach to the solution of these public problems. Long-standing relationships between government and business will, of necessity, have to be altered. Our best creative effort will have to be exerted through the evolution, testing, and full utilization of more forceful, imaginative techniques and devices.

In this audience there is a proven capacity to contribute to the welfare of our nation. We have labored to ensure national security. We must now join forces to create a capability that can bring about an ever-increasing standard of living for all citizens. Technology has had an immeasurable impact on our institutions, laws, and mores. I shall attempt to identify some of the ways in which systems technology can be applied to the problems of today. Your reaction and commentary will be useful in denoting where we shall go from here.

LEGISLATING A SYSTEMS APPROACH IN HELPING TO SOLVE PUBLIC PROBLEMS

The Congress of the United States is comprised of men and women who have been sufficiently concerned about how our nation is to survive that they have sought public office with all of its challenges and penalties. The average constituency of today for a member of Congress is roughly 450,000 persons. The Federal legislator must be responsive to the ideas, needs, and complaints of each constituent, and also to the needs of our people as a nation. Little wonder, then, that as the new series of problems—foul air, clogged waterways, mountainous deposits of refuse, jammed highways and byways, and all the rest—began to impinge on the lives of our citizens that an outcry was forthcoming that has crescendoed with each passing year. "Grass roots" needs never are ignored for long, and Congress began to look for new approaches to correct the threatening conditions.

Commencing with the 89th Congress, a series of legislative measures were introduced that were designed to confront and overcome the problems of the type earlier discussed. I have long had a deep concern regarding the lack of funding for research and development in these public problem areas. In Fiscal Year 1968, only 14% of all Federal R & D funds will be earmarked for developmental activity in the realm outside Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA activities.

The expenditure of these limited funds by diverse civil agencies must be conducted with maximum management skill, and the improvement of this management capability demands attention! Management science has been much talked about during the last two decades, and the aerospace industry has utilized it to the fullest. Unfortunately, few groups responsible for dealing with the "soft" problems of society have progressed toward the better utilization of management tools and techniques.

As the criticality of our situation became more and more glaring, I introduced legislation (H.R. 20) calling for the establishment of a National Commission on Public Management. Stress was placed upon having a working commission which would be comprised of representatives of industry, labor, government, and the academic world. Its charter would feature two major objectives:

(1) to collect and analyze information about the application of systems techniques to non-defense, non-space public problems, and

(2) to develop programs which would use these techniques to solve specific problems.

In addition, the National Commission would be given the responsibility for considering appropriate financial arrangements for the use of private management skills and experience.

Support for the concept has been forthcoming from many quarters. Recognition that we as a nation must better apply the advanced technology which we now possess was admirably captured in a recent statement by Dr. Simon Ramo, an eminent scientist and captain of industry:

One of our biggest challenges today is not so much the development of new technology but rather the utilization of what we have for the betterment of mankind. For the past few years, we have been watching our cities decay, our transportation systems choke with too-heavy traffic, our school and hospital facilities grow less and less adequate, and our water and air become more and more polluted.

In underscoring the need to delineate the ways in which systems technology could be applied to the spectrum of public problems, the National Commission has seemed logical to leaders in Congress and the private sector. More than 50 members of the house of Representatives joined me in sponsoring this concept, while in the Senate leadership was provided by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, backed by nearly 15 members of that chamber.

Another approach to the same general problem area has been developed by Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. He has concentrated upon the need to employ systems analysis and systems engineering in collaboration with plans to selectively allocate the nation's scientific and engineering manpower to the tasks facing us. Grants-in-aid to states or contracts with university groups are provided for in his bill. Both Senator Scott and I fully agree with Senator Nelson's statement that:

> Nothing short of a massive effort by industry and government at every level will solve this problem. This can be done only after a total analysis of the problem and development of an overall program of action.

It should be noted that this is not a partisan matter. An effort now is underway to combine the two approaches, which in some ways are complementary, so that the best elements of my proposal and the Nelson grants-in-aid strategy are retained.

Among the members and committees of Congress, there has developed a cognizance that understanding of the so-called "systems approach" required special orientation and education. The terminology itself often seemed unclear. What was meant by operations analysis and research, simulation and modeling, or systems management and planning? Esoteric phrases such as "symbolic logic" or "queueing theory" posed even greater mental impediments. The world of automatic data processing—the subject of countless articles in the popular press and professional journals—was not always easy to comprehend. Gradually, politicians and their staffs are striving to understand the new jargon to understand the system approach.

Quite recently I attended an excellent informal seminar sponsored by The Brookings Institution at which 19 members of the House, from both parties, discussed candidly their need for better information, and how systems techniques and automatic data processing might help them in their day-to-day office functioning and in their role as national legislators.

Among the Congressional groups scrutinizing the possible application of systems technology to public problems has been the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. In a report entitled "Environmental pollution—a challenge to science and technology" the Subcommittee urged that:

> To place pollution abatement on a comparable basis with other national technology programs, systems analysis and management capability should be established within the Federal Government.

Another perspective of the problem has been reflected in the deliberations of the House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs, and its criticism of low levels of funding for such vital program areas as sewage treatment, pollution control, urban complex planning (including housing, schools, parks and recreation), and transportation network design.

So numerous are the activities throughout the country wherein automatic data processing and systems analysis are in use that Senator Edward Kennedy has come forward with a recommendation for a study and investigation of information service systems for states and localities. Here again, the size and complexity of our nation make the problem difficult. A simple exchange of problems solved, mistakes made, and lessons learned is a matter of enormous difficulty.

We know, for example, that a great many states and metropolitan governments are utilizing systems analysis in such diverse application areas as procurement activity, welfare and anti-poverty and planning and policy determination. Of the 25 states and 19 metropolitan governments replying to a recent questionnaire, 77% indicated activity in management and related activities; 60% in services and transportation; 57%, social and economic development; 51%, utilization of resources (such as parks); and 40%, legal and regulatory activities. Funds expended for these programs and projects during 1966 totalled an estimated $22,500,000 for both in-house and external systems activities.

As Federal legislators face the plethora of activities being undertaken at the Federal, regional, state, and local levels, it quickly becomes apparent that assessment criteria and procedures are an absolute "must" if order is to emerge out of relative chaos. One step to bring this about has been the introduction of a bill by Representative Charles E. Goodell calling for the establishment of an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation and a Joint Committee of Congress on Program Analysis and Evaluation. In urging that "objective, scientific, and empirical analysis" be used in assessing all Federal programs, the sponsors are pointing up the requirement for strong controls in order to optimize the results to be derived from those programs which have been chosen for funding.

THE IMPACT OF THE PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING SYSTEM

While Representative Goodell and his colleagues have placed emphasis on improving evaluation and measurement mechanisms, there has been a major force in motion throughout the Federal community for several years that is called "PPBS," standing for the "Planning-Programing-Budgeting System." Initiated by Charles J. Hitch, former Comptroller of the Department of Defense, this system features the adaptation of systematic quantitative analytical techniques developed in industry and studied by the Rand Corp., on defense activities. A great many of the DOD programs and projects could be approached logically through the use of highly structured analyses and econometric procedures. In order that we all have a common frame of reference, let me run through the four salient characteristics of PPBS:

(1) Focus is placed on the basic objectives of the Federal government and establishing a relationship between these objectives and all program activities;

(2) The impact of program development and funding for several years into the future is identified;

(3) *All* costs germane to the given program are noted; and

(4) Alternative courses of action are delineated and analyzed.

It should be noted that PPBS was not placed in operation without some opposition, but as results proved the value of the precisely developed techniques and procedures, wider acceptance was forthcoming. Late in 1965, a directive signed by President Johnson was sent to all Executive Branch elements, notifying them that PPBS would be used in the preparation of all program and financial plans. The incorporation of PPBS now is in progress and a great deal is being learned about the differences between some of the planning needs in more subjective areas and the often more readily quantifiable programs of DOD.

The possible effect of PPBS on the authorization-appropriation cycle of the Congress is not yet known. Several Congressional committees have begun to examine the impact of PPBS on individual agencies. The Senate Special Subcommittee on Scientific Manpower Utilization was the first group to consider the lessons being learned in departmental use of PPBS; commentary from officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare aided Congressmen in understanding some of the problems being encountered by civil agencies.

Recognition of the growing impact of PPBS was present in the 1967 report, "Federal Research and Development Programs: the Decisionmaking Process," prepared by the Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs of the House Committee on Government Operations. The report noted that the defense, space, and atomic energy programs have drawn heavily on the new systems techniques, and that while mathematical models and computers often have been utilized, such tools have limited utility. Parenthetically, the Executive Branch of the Federal government has an inventory of nearly 3,000 computing devices and spends approximately 1.2 billion dollars annually on procurement, rental and operating expenses.

Another Congressional element active in examining the role of PPBS has been the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. Here, the emphasis has been placed on considering the role of the budgetary process in helping plan and control the national security policy. The testimony of such qualified advisors as Charles L. Schultze, the retiring Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Dr. Alain C. Enthoven, DOD Assistant Secretary for Systems Analysis, has proven to be invaluable to the Congressional observers.

The most recent series of hearings on the subject of PPBS were held by the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. Published as "The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System: Progress and Potentials," this legislative group, through its spokesman Senator William E. Proxmire of Wisconsin, went on record as saying:

> Certainly at a time when approximately 30 percent of our national income flows through the public sector, it is of the utmost importance that our policymakers be armed with the best possible tools for evaluating the effectiveness of our public programs and expenditures.

Not only have Congressional committees sought to hear the experience of the military and civilian agencies within the Federal government, but witnesses from state and city jurisdictions have been invited to testify. Included have been officials from the states of New York, Wisconsin, and Vermont. Also, there has been useful information provided by representatives of not-for-profit foundations, universities, and business institutions.

The members of the Congress are commencing to realize that a cleverly derived mixture of technological and political solutions is going to be needed to overcome the problems of our age and the means by which government strives to overcome them. I would agree with Professor Harold P. Green of the George Washington University when he states:

> "At the present time, national policy decisions with respect to go or no-go on technological programs are made on the basis of judgments only as to feasibility, cost, priorities, and budgetary considerations. What is required in my view is that judgments on legal, economic, and social aspects be integrated into the decision-making process."

EXAMPLES OF AGENCY PROJECTS INVOLVING SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY

Over the past several years, there have been significant numbers of systems contracts awarded by Federal departments and agencies to private sector groups. Many agencies have been in a quandary as to what extent internal staffing should be developed in lieu of going "outside" for consulting support. In many instances, abortive efforts have been made to conduct inhouse systems analysis without properly qualified personnel. The usual result was eventual reliance upon outside assistance in requirements analysis, systems designs, personnel training, and equipment selection.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been heavily involved in using systems analysis. Robert A. Levine, chief of the OEO Office of Research, Plans, Programs, and

Evaluation compared the problems of this civil agency with DOD:

(1) Welfare is easier to define than national security. That is, we know what we mean and can measure what we mean in terms of improvement of people as defined by income and other variables. Deterrence is much more difficult to measure.

(2) We had a lot of data to begin with—more than defense. Good economic data have been gathered and tabulated in this country for 30 years or more, and for the 20 years since the Employment Act of 1946 created the President's Council of Economic Advisors, the data have been quite good. Unfortunately, as most users will testify, these data are almost always out of phase with operational needs. There are problems such as the need for series on time and geographical bases different from the bases on which the data are gathered.

(3) Unlike the Defense Department, we play a game against nature which makes our task considerably easier. We do not have to contend with a malevolent enemy.

As OEO utilized the expertise of university and "think type" corporations, it was able to examine many areas which had been the subject of conjecture for many years. Among the study efforts funded by OEO were:

(1) Study of organization and measurement of urban poverty;

(2) Study of employment possibilities for sub-professional workers;

(3) Study of how poor youth view their problem;

(4) Study on analyzing alternative hypothetical urban community action programs; and

(5) Study of the effectiveness of Project Head Start in performing its manifest function.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also has relied upon systems technology as applied by private sector contractors. In a study recently completed by Consultech, Inc. for the HUD Fort Worth office, a comprehensive work processing system that would significantly increase the effectiveness of renewal operations was proposed.

The safety of aircraft activities over our cities has necessitated the rapid updating of pilots' aids, and this requirement resulted in an operations research study of the preparation of aeronautical charts by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Many of you assembled here are aware of the numerous contracts which have been let by the Federal government as it has studied the development of transportation and communications systems within the Northeast Corridor. The list is almost endless, and its ever-increasing length is mute evidence of the reliance placed by our nation's leadership in the usefulness and promise of systems technology.

IN CONCLUSION

We live in an age where change is the *modus vivendi*. Achievement succeeds achievement, and mankind can scarcely draw another breath before being confronted with yet another pressure. The job we perform, the pattern of life in the home, recreation, travel—every facet of our existence is in a state of flux.

What is the answer to this unprecedented condition? The new trends are not necessarily destroying what we used to call "the good old days." America is living in an affluence never before known on this planet. My appeal to you is this: let us work together as never before, keeping an open mind and grasping every opportunity that will help assure the preservation of our cherished heritage while offering the maximum opportunity for the better life. The greatness which America can attain is unlimited. To reach this pinnacle we must work harder and more intelligently than ever before. Perhaps of greatest importance is the willingness to use every resource—human, material, financial, and moral—that the nation possesses. With such a concerned effort, the achievement of our goals will never be in doubt. Thank you.

Escalation in Space

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most thought-provoking editorials on our involvement in Vietnam has been written by John Chamberlain and appeared in the Saturday, January 27, 1968, issue of the News and Courier at Charleston, S.C.

This article, entitled "Escalation in Space," draws some analogies between the Vietnam war and other conflicts in which this country has been engaged.

Mr. Chamberlain makes the point that in the past the leadership in this country has the vision to see what was necessary to achieve a military victory. Such is not the case as it applies to Vietnam, and the author concludes that until this military reality is accepted, the policy of gradual escalation will only lead to years and perhaps decades of useless American deaths in this faraway land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 27, 1968]

ESCALATION IN SPACE

(By John Chamberlain)

If nothing positive comes out of the recent "peace" disputation over the semantic difference between "could" and "will" as used in various North Vietnamese offers to "talk" after cessation of the bombing, the pressure on President Johnson to step up the war will be close to irresistible. Already, in Washington, attention is centering on what must happen when the weather changes in Southeast Asia. The idea of "hot pursuit" of the enemy into Laos is in the air.

Well, the U.S. people might as well face it: there is a geographical imperative to every war, and the imperative cannot be dodged forever.

War, between gritty and determined opponents, swings eventually on supply, and supply moves over well-recognized highways. It follows that the nation which can sever its opponent's supply lines will end up by dictating, or at least making a favorable settlement, at the peace table.

In the Civil War, President Lincoln discovered the geographical imperative only after an unsatisfactory period of futile pounding at Gen. Robert E. Lee's front in Virginia.

After Gen. George McClellan's dispiriting stand-off along the Potomac, Generals Grant and Sherman broke the struggle wide open by shearing the Confederacy in two along the line of the Mississippi and cutting in through Georgia and the Carolinas to roll up Lee's rear.

Meanwhile, the Union navy blockaded Charleston, Mobile, and New Orleans, risking trouble with Great Britain. But, because Britain needed America's wheat, the blockade never turned the battle into an international war.

All this is obvious stuff from the books. And it is just as obvious that the penalty of refusing to exploit the geographical imperative is a bloody dragged-out mess, an escalation in time that is more brutal than any conceivable escalation in space.

In World War I, the Western Front in France became a meat-grinder operation, with the appalling casualties of the Somme and Verdun, simply because Winston Churchill's attempt to link up with Russia in Germany's rear failed at Gallipoli. (The irony of this became apparent after the war, when it was discovered that the Allies had called off the Gallipoli campaign when the Turkish forts were running out of ammunition.)

In World War II, Gen. Douglas MacArthur exploited the geographical imperative by continuously getting behind the Japanese forward positions on the southwestern Pacific flank while the U.S. Navy attacked frontally in the north.

The Pacific War came to an effective end when Japan's oil route to the Indies was severed at the line of the Philippines; there was never any need to consider invading Japan, or to use the atomic bomb in Hiroshima.

The geographical fact of the Vietnamese War is that it is being fought in a peninsula, which could be closed off laterally.

But, absurdly, only the North Vietnamese are privileged to make flanking moves in the space involved.

The twin geographical keys to the war are the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and the ocean approaches to Haiphong and other North Vietnamese ports.

In Civil War terms, the Ho Chi Minh trail is the Mississippi; Haiphong is Charleston or Mobile.

But our Gen. Westmoreland is not permitted to act like Grant or Sherman, and nobody is allowed to mention Adm. Farragut. We are fighting the war as Lincoln would have fought the Civil War if he had resolved to do no more than invade Kentucky.

Gen. Thomas Lane says we could put a million men into South Vietnam and still get nothing better than a long and bloody stalemate if we aren't allowed to touch the Ho Chi Minh trail. There is the danger, of course, that Red China and Russia might react in an incalculable manner if we really tried to win.

Lincoln faced the same unknown when he gave the order to keep British ships from moving into Confederate ports. But Lincoln had that northern wheat to use as a diplomatic weapon. Similarly, the U.S. has Chiang Kai-shek's army of 600,000 men on Red China's flank.

There may be good political arguments bound up with atomic fears for not attempting to sever the supply arteries of the Viet Cong.

But if the Ho Chi Minh trail and Haiphong are to be forever sacrosanct, then Sen. Eugene McCarthy is obviously right: we should try to wind up the struggle with the best deal we can make.

If escalation of the war in space cannot be accepted with a view to winning it, escalation in time will only lead to years—and perhaps decades—of useless American deaths.

The Reserves Were Spared McNamara Boobery

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Congress is berated by its critics when it does not completely acquiesce in the demands it

receives from the executive branch. However, with the passage of time, these congressional critics are given the advantage of hindsight and then discover the wisdom demonstrated by the Congress in rejecting these ill-considered proposals by the executive branch.

The Members of this body are quite aware of the determination of the Committee on Armed Services to discharge its constitutional responsibilities in respect to the readiness of our Armed Forces. It therefore received the overwhelming support of Congress in rejecting the ill-conceived and abortive effort of the Department of Defense to destroy our Army Reserve and National Guard capability.

The Congress in passing H.R. 2, now Public Law 90–168, the Reserve bill of rights, left no doubt as to its complete disapproval of the Department of Defense's plans to emasculate our Reserve strength.

It therefore may be of considerable interest to the members of this body that a recent issue of the Nashville Banner carried an excellent editorial commending the Congress on its actions in respect to our Reserve Forces.

The editorial, which appeared in the Nashville Banner on January 29, 1968, was called to my attention by my good friend and colleague from the Fourth District of Tennessee, JOE L. EVINS.

I therefore include in the RECORD at this point, the full text of this editorial entitled "Thanks to Lawmakers, the Reserves Were Spared McNamara Boobery".

THANKS TO LAWMAKERS, THE RESERVES WERE SPARED MCNAMARA BOOBERY

In the sudden crisis begotten of North Korea's seizure of a U.S. ship and its crew of 83, President Johnson (and the Pentagon) found it militarily advisable to call up manpower and equipment strength from the Air Force and Navy reserves. It also was hinted that Army reservists may face the same swift induction.

The wonder is not that this occurred; but, as a disconcerting thought, what there would have been available for callup had Robert S. McNamara had his way in his long and insistent campaign as Defense Secretary to merge the Reserves with the National Guard—including cutbacks for both—and to strictly limit the equipment available for them.

That is a matter of record, as is his obvious belief that nuclear weaponry as a war-deterrent disposed of the necessity for preparedness to wage conventional warfare. Nevertheless, he has bitterly opposed—and for years blocked—deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system strongly advocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; consenting reluctantly last year to a start on Nike-X installations.

Thus his seven-year tenure of the top defense seat was marked by computerized reckoning to fit his own theories, in salient particulars challenging the reasoned judgment of competent military advisers. And for that fact, in terms of insecurity by inadequate preparedness, the nation has paid a high price. The same Whiz Kid analyses, whenever they interfered with tactical and strategic decisions, have contributed to lengthening the war in Vietnam.

The Banner published Saturday a recitation of that record as compiled and verified by the House Armed Services Committee—the study supplied by Rep. F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana Democrat and veteran member of that body. As stated, "the authority for the Reserve callup came under legislation enacted by Congress, which McNamara didn't want." Further, the Sec-Def and his aides were "determined they were not going to call up the Reserves for the Vietnam war, so the Army Reserve and National Guard have suffered tragically from lack of equipment." To correction of that, the Reserve Bill of Rights was enacted last year, ordering that they be properly equipped.

But for congressional action, there would have been no blocking of the McNamara drive to merge the Reserves with the Guard—a scheme announced in December, 1966, and which, as Hébert warned at the time, could leave the Army too weak "to satisfy general mobilization requirements in a major conventional war."

The oddity of the total situation is that while McNamara enunciated polities of reliance on nuclear power as a war-deterrent—in other words that logically no such conflict could occur because of its horrendous mutual destructiveness—simultaneously he was obsessed with policies that actually encumbered and weakened the capacity to wage conventional war; the type in which we are engaged in Vietnam, and toward which we could be stumbling in the Korean affair.

It is thanks to Congress, not McNamara, that a measure of preparedness, respecting Reserves, remained for the callups noted or pending. In the $70 billion defense money bill for fiscal 1968, the lawmakers required that the Army National Guard have a paid drill strength of 400,000 and the Army Reserve 260,000; and insisted that the Reserve include three combat brigades totalling 41,000.

Mr. McNamara was beyond his depth in the responsibilities assigned in the Kennedy administration and prolonged to such extent in the Johnson administration, and the nation has paid a high price for his boobery.

In those initial years of his misfit incumbency, he was party to the security default—purblindness and reckless naivete—which permitted the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba before even acknowledging its occurrence, much less acting to challenge it in the confrontation that finally came on overwhelming congressional and public demand. But for that prompting on the part of men who knew the score, inaction by amateurism at the helm, obsessed with appeasement policy, could have brought disaster both national and hemispheric.

The McNamara exodus, with Clark Clifford as replacement, cannot fail to make for improvement.

The nation has learned the hard way that once a war is joined—or its gathering clouds threaten—there is no substitute for victory. It also has learned that to that end there is no substitute for preparedness, and willingness to use it for national and free world security.

Something for Everybody but the Taxpayer

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial on President Johnson's recent state of the Union message reflects the views of a vast majority of people in this country. It is written by Donald Cammack, editor and publisher of the Times-Herald in Buffalo, S. Dak. Entitled "Something for Everybody but the Taxpayer," I include it in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

SOMETHING FOR EVERYBODY BUT THE TAXPAYER

President Johnson's State of the Union message last week contained little of assurance for the overburdened taxpayer, although he singled out most of the segments of the American economy for assurances that the Administration had something in the works to improve their condition.

Little hope for an early settlement of the Vietnam war was held out. Most of the nation will back President Johnson when he calls for assurance of reciprocal action on the part of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong as a condition for cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, and assures the enemy that the United States stands ready and anxious to pursue any avenue toward negotiation, providing there is some assurance that talks might be fruitful.

Most folks, in this area of the country at least, do not see eye to eye with the President's demands for a tax increase as a necessary means to curb inflation. It is our opinion that unless domestic spending can be cut sincerely and seriously, further taxes will only hasten the downward slide of the economy of the agricultural areas of the nation, and will cause further overburdening of the small business segment of the economy, which has been having hard sledding as it is. Planned increases in federal programs at the same time the administration is calling for a further belt tightening by the private economy leaves doubt as to the sincerity of any talk about federal economy moves.

The big problems of Vietnam, crime, poverty, civil disobedience and lack of respect for America abroad will not be solved by taxing the industrious among us and giving their substance to the less industrious at home and abroad in the form of increased relief payments, grants-in-aid, etc., and in the form of reduced tariffs to encourage greater imports of products in direct competition with the production of our heavily-taxed American farmers and producers of other goods.

To be sure, if federal spending continues to increase, increased taxes will be the inevitable result. Therefore, many of the nation's Congressmen and a growing percentage of the populace are beginning to demand a cut in domestic spending instead of a tax increase, as a curb on inflation. As long as defense budgets must remain at their present high point or increase, in order to insure the security of the nation, the federal government must show an inclination to hold back on nonessential spending before the man in the street in this part of the country will favor a tax increase.

"Kiki" Cuyler Named to Baseball's Hall of Fame

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago this month I called attention of the House to the desire of many of us in Michigan to have "Kiki" Cuyler named to baseball's Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y.

"Kiki," whose home was in Harrisville, Mich., in my congressional district, will be remembered by many of you as one of baseball's outstanding players during his era.

I am pleased to announce today that Mr. Cuyler has appropriately, though belatedly, been selected for the national pastime's Hall of Fame. In 1964 he was selected for Michigan's Hall of Fame. Both of these honors, of course, are made posthumously because Mr. Cuyler passed away in 1950.

Mr. Merrill Weber, publisher of the Alcona County Herald and veteran campaigner for Kiki's recognition, announced the long overdue honor of Mr. Cuyler's outstanding baseball record in a recent edition of his paper with the following news story:

> "KIKI" CUYLER NAMED TO BASEBALL'S HALL OF FAME
>
> Many Alcona County residents as well as baseball fans across the country were thrilled with the announcement Sunday that the late Hazen "Kiki" Cuyler had been voted to baseball's Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y.
>
> Cuyler, a native of Sturgeon Point and a lifelong resident of Harrisville, starred for 18 years for four National League teams and was third base coach for the American League's Boston Red Sox when he passed away in February, 1950, following a heart attack suffered while ice fishing at a lake near Glennie.
>
> The Hall of Famer's greatest athletic feats were performed while a member of the Pittsburgh Pirates and the Chicago Cubs. His speed, daring and batting prowess earned for him the name of "the right handed Ty Cobb." He compiled a life-time batting average of .321 and year after year was among National League leaders in stolen bases.
>
> Kiki started his baseball career on the sandlots of this county where he drew the attention of scouts who signed him to a contract with Bay City in the old Michigan-Ontario (Mint) League. He went from there directly to the major leagues with Pittsburgh.
>
> After starring in the Pennsylvania city where, among other outstanding feats, he won the 1925 World Series from Washington with a clutch ninth inning double off the immortal Walter Johnson, Kiki was traded to the Chicago Cubs where he reached the peak of his playing career.
>
> After ending his playing days, Cuyler managed at Chattanooga and Atlanta in the southern association and then went with Boston as a coach.
>
> Cuyler's widow, Mrs. Bertha Cuyler, still resides in Harrisville as do his daughter, Mrs. Ted Kruttln, and a son, Harold.
>
> To report that members of the family were thrilled at the news of Kiki's selection would be an understatement. Mrs. Cuyler says she has received numerous telephone calls from many of Kiki's old baseball friends from all over the country, conveying not only their congratulations but pleasure over the event.
>
> Members of the family, including five of Kiki's grandchildren, plan to attend installation ceremonies this summer at the Hall of Fame. Only one of the family who will be unable to make the trip to Cooperstown will undoubtedly be Harold "Butch" Cuyler who is presently serving with the army in Vietnam. Butch is the third consecutive generation of the Cuyler family to serve in the armed forces.

Proposed Travel Tax

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, once again Mr. Average American Taxpayer is being given a "snow job." The latest is the proposed travel tax overseas.

The administration is going to ask Congress to impose a temporary—and where has the American taxpayer heard that word before—impose a temporary 15-percent to 30-percent tax on spending in excess of $7 a day on Americans traveling outside the Western Hemisphere.

By this tax, the administration figures to slice about $500 million a year from our balance-of-payments deficit. Well and good. But what is it going to cost?

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, in his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee the other day, said:

> Implementation of the above measures—

And he is referring to all phases of the travel tax proposal—

> Implementation of the above measures will entail increased administrative costs for the Customs Service and the Internal Revenue Service; and also for the Post Office Department to the extent its expenses in collecting the duty on parcels arriving by mail cannot be covered by postal handling charges because of the ceiling set under the Universal Postal Union Convention. Their ability to execute these measures is dependent upon the establishment of an adequate mechanism for reimbursement of these costs to the agencies involved.

Mr. Speaker, whenever the administration talks about increased administrative costs, you just know this is going to cost Mr. Average American Taxpayer a bundle.

According to an Associated Press story, the Customs Service would need an additional 535 employees to handle the increased workload resulting from the administration's proposals and to tighten collection of duties. The Associated Press went on to say there is no estimate of the Internal Revenue Service's personnel needs.

For something that is supposed to be temporary, it seems that we will be going to quite a lot of expense, which naturally wipes out the so-called $500 million we are supposed to save.

In his rather lengthy statement presented to the House Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Fowler—when he wasn't weaving in the necessity of the need for a surcharge tax—came up with some rather conflicting statements along with amazing statistics.

On one hand, the Secretary points out that—

> Travel enhances international understanding and the free interchange of people is a basic tenet of democratic life and an ingredient of an expanding free world.

On the other hand, he points out that this "free interchange" is going to cost the American traveler money in taxation if he even dares to travel.

Still representing the views of the administration, Secretary Fowler points out that—

> The ideal program would be one which achieved the balance-of-payments savings with a minimum of trip cancellations.

Which more or less leaves one the feeling that Mr. Average American Taxpayer, and his insatiable desire to travel, is the cause for our payments deficit—not the Government.

Which brings me to the amazing statistics quoted by Secretary Fowler. In his statement, the Secretary said:

> The average length of stay is 33 days. The average daily expenditures are $16.73 per person. However, averages are misleading.

Misleading is hardly the word for it. If $16.73 is the "average daily expenditure," I hope Secretary Fowler will let me in on the secret of how this can be accomplished. The Secretary goes on to say:

> When the length of stay is analyzed by family income, we find that the lowest income travelers by far stay the longest, 51 days for those with under $5,000 income. It is 26 days for those with over $20,000 income.

Now there's something wrong here. If our poverty-level income is deemed to be $3,000, pray tell, how does a person in the $5,000 and under income bracket, after paying his taxes, have anything left over to make a European trip. And, I might add, get by on spending an average of $9.63 a day. A rather incredible set of figures, I must say. Likewise incredible is the statement that those in the over $20,000 group on the average have expenditures of $25.39 a day.

I am getting just a little weary of all the various proposals placed before this body wherein we are asked to try and get more money out of the already overtaxed American taxpayer. At the same time of the gouging we are expected to soothe the American taxpayer by saying, "it is only temporary."

Just for once—just once—I would like the administration to live up to the wording, voiced by its official spokesman, Secretary Fowler and, until recently, Budget Director Schultz: "proper control of public expenditures, appropriate monetary policy."

What a wonderful day that will be.

Emergency Work of the Corps of Engineers

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation, and especially the people of Kanauga, Ohio, and Point Pleasant, W. Va., will long remember December 15, 1967, when the bridge between these two towns collapsed during the peak evening rush hour traffic and dumped scores of vehicles, commuters, and Christmas shoppers into the icy water of the Ohio River. Only 13 of about 60 people on the bridge survived, five from submerged vehicles, and eight who were in the section of the bridge which fell on the riverbank.

Local, State, and Federal agencies and officials such as policemen and sheriffs, State troopers, highway departments, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Army Engineers, and hundreds of volunteers responded immediately to the West Virginia Civil Defense Director's call for help. He asked the Army Engineers to direct the emergency search and recovery operations.

The Army Engineers quickly mobilized Government and contractor men and equipment and by nightfall started a round-the-clock operation which eventually involved more than 15,000 man-hours, four derrick boats, several tugs and barges, and more than a dozen diving crews at a cost of about a quarter of a million dollars. More than two dozen vehicles and three dozen bodies were recovered and the more than 4,000 tons of twisted steel of the bridge was reconstructed on banks of the river.

The tragic collapse of the Kanauga-Point Pleasant bridge was another in a long list of catastrophes and emergencies which have always found the Army Engineers ready, willing, and able to respond immediately and effectively to natural or manmade disasters. I could discuss the dramatic restoration of essential public utilities following the Alaska earthquake in 1964, Hurricane Betsy in Louisiana in 1965, or floods in California and Oregon, or the tornadoes in Kansas in 1966.

But the important thing to remember is that the American people have in the Army Engineers an organization which is deployed throughout the 50 States, with a full range of engineering talent, congressional authorities and internal procedures, and the military discipline for extremely rapid mobilization of the engineering profession and the construction industry. It has the leadership and experience to undertake tasks of magnitude and complexity beyond the capability of any other engineering-construction organization in the world.

As a standard procedure for emergency operations, the Army Engineers immediately deploy forces which are normally used in the construction and operation of its farflung flood control, navigation, and other facilities. Their civil works program, emergency procedures, organizational skills, military discipline, and the continuing congressional authorities maintain the Army Engineers "at the ready" day and night to respond immediately, decisively, and effectively to any natural or manmade catastrophe, whatever its extent, scope, or complexity.

Danny Thomas: A Great Humanitarian

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we of California are singularly fortunate in having in our midst a small hamlet known as Hollywood, to which talented people are drawn as by a magnet from all over the country; indeed, from all over the world.

Some make their mark, some do not. But a rare few emerge not only as great talents but as great humanitarians. One such has been loaned to us—permanently, I should hope—by the great State of Ohio. A Lebanese by heritage, he was born Muzyad Yaghoob. His family Americanized his name to Amos Jacobs. He had two brothers, Danny and Thomas Jacobs, and when he entered show business he took their names as his own professional name—Danny Thomas.

In Memphis, Tenn., there stands a hospital, the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, dedicated to helping all children of all faiths and all races. It stands because some 30 years ago a broke and discouraged young comedian got down on his knees in a deserted church and prayed to St. Jude, patron saint of the hopeless. He prayed for guidance. And he promised to build a shrine to St. Jude should he become a success in the one business he loved so well.

Eight years later Danny Thomas began his one-man campaign to finance, build, and support the St. Jude Hospital. In 1960 it opened its doors for the first time. Last October the original $6,180,000 mortgage was burned in a public ceremony.

That $6,000,000 mortgage sprang directly from a $50 a week job that came Danny Thomas' way just a week after he had said his prayer and made his vow.

On Monday night, February 26, Danny Thomas will do something unprecedented in show business. He will give away his nightclub act in a single television performance to millions upon millions of people. An entertainer's nightclub act is his bread and butter. He guards it with his life, for it is his life.

But Danny Thomas has other ideas. He puts it very simply.

> The nightclub act has served its purpose. It has raised the money for St. Jude's. I don't need it any more.

We of California are very proud of Danny Thomas, the Lebanese boy who made the American dream come true. We are grateful to the great State of Ohio for sending him our way. We are happy that the great State of Tennessee shares so actively in the outward manifestations of his humanitarianism. Above all we are grateful for a warm and mighty nation whose youths are still allowed to dream, to work, to learn and to grow, as one of them has grown, to be such a man as Danny Thomas.

Bill To Amend Title 23, United States Code, in Regard to the Obligation of Federal-Aid Highway Funds Apportioned to the States

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, once again this spendthrift Democrat administration has sought to victimize our vital Federal-aid highway program in a phony economy move.

The Secretary of Transportation has announced a $600 million slash in Federal-aid highway obligation levels for calendar year 1968, assertedly to combat inflation.

However, these funds are derived from a special trust fund and have absolutely nothing to do with the irresponsible spending of the administration.

Under the unified budget, however, the President can claim a $600 million saving on paper, then turn around and spend a like sum elsewhere, some perhaps on highway beautification, which the administration's 1969 budget indicates is more important than highway safety.

The administration's reckless politicking with the Nation's highway program has upset construction schedules in virtually every State in the Union and has left State agencies up in the air on planning.

The strain on our national finances has not been caused by the self-sustaining Federal-aid highway program. It has been caused by an overdose of new and often unneeded programs that are politically profitable to the Great Society.

The highway program thus has become a scapegoat and a stepchild, yet not a Member of this House will deny its vital role in our national welfare.

Because of the administration's callous attitude toward the Federal-aid highway program—and because its action in withholding funds can only result in higher ultimate costs—I am today introducing legislation assuring that funds apportioned to the States may not be impounded or withheld by the administration.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. ——

A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provision of this section shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government, except such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the highway trust fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund."

Address of Hon. Thomas N. Downing, of the First District of Virginia, to the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Baltimore, January 18, 1968

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague and friend from Virginia, the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING, whose district adjoins mine and with whom I share a deep interest in the great port of Hampton Roads, has sounded the call that the United States rebuild itself to its rightful position as the world's maritime leader. I have found his address to the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Baltimore, on Thursday, January 18, 1968, to be most timely, one which should be shared with all the Members of the Congress.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING, OF THE FIRST DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, TO THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF BALTIMORE, JANUARY 18, 1968

I am particularly proud and exceedingly happy to be in your port and I bring you greetings from my port, the Port of Hampton Roads, your great sister Port of the Chesapeake Bay Region.

We share innumerable common interests most important of which is a common heritage as centuries-old great maritime centers of America.

I welcome the opportunity to share Maryland hospitality whenever I can. I know you people are very proud of your heritage. I think you should know that there are many of us in Virginia who share your pride in your heritage. I did not come over here tonight to teach you Maryland history, but I would like to recall that the vessels Ark and Dove landed in Virginia before they reached Maryland. It was February 27, 1634, when Leonard Calvert and his band of adventurers stopped at Old Point Comfort where, according to the log, "We were kindly treated for eight or nine days." Old Point Comfort is in *My* Congressional District, and I am very happy that we had the opportunity to show your forebears a sample of Virginia hospitality on their first stop in the new world. I suppose that your fine hospitality to me tonight is an outgrowth of what your people got from my people 334 years ago.

It is indeed wonderful to be in Baltimore once again, a great port city with deep water terminals, shipyards, seafood and maritime people. It sounds, smells and feels just like home to me.

I am especially honored tonight to be in the port of two of the most dynamic leaders and best friends of the American-Flag Merchant Marine, Edward A. Garmatz and Helen Delich Bentley.

One of the great joys of my service in Washington is my association with your tower of strength, our Chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries, Eddie Garmatz. Eddie has the knowledge, the interest, and the backbone that lets him do a job that is the pride of everyone who knows him. He is a peerless and a fearless leader. You have a great man there, and I hope you keep him there for years to come.

Helen Bentley is without question the most knowledgeable and gifted maritime reporter in the world today. She does a great service to the entire industry and everyone who is associated with it. I am not ashamed in the least to admit most openly that I depend on her to keep me abreast of developments. I frequently read under her byline in the morning edition of the Baltimore Sun what I am going to do some time in the future. In addition to her skills in ferreting out information and reporting it in masterly fashion, she has an insight which borders on clairvoyance.

To those of you who are so vitally interested in this great port and in the status of our American Merchant Marine, I say with the greatest confidence that 1968 will be the big year. I mean by that that this should be the greatest year of expansion in our merchant marine since World War II.

The program that we have pleaded for and even demanded for so many years has moved out of the planning stage and off the drawing boards. It was drawn after series upon series of hearings and discussions which have reached all levels of Government, industry and labor. Finally, as the first session of the 90th Congress looked forward to adjournment the program was introduced in both Houses.

Now, let me make one thing clear to you at this point. The current session of Congress will act.

Members of both Houses are well aware of what we must do. I believe we will get the program that is so vitally needed to rebuild our maritime industry, and I believe it will be funded this year. In my judgment, we have the votes and they will be cast.

I hate to dwell on past history because I am a firm believer that the true greatness of any country lies not in its past but in its present and its future. However, there are some events of the comparatively recent past which I do want to recount for you at this point. They are important to me because I was privileged to be a part of them. They are important to you because of your proven maritime interest and because of your rightful pride in our great Chairman of the House Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee who played a leading role in them.

They are important to the Nation because they have placed the feet of this country squarely on the first rung of the ladder which leads upward toward our rightful position of leadership on the high seas.

About the middle of August four of us in the Congress, who have never let up in our efforts to rebuild this vital industry, reached the conclusion that the Administration would and should be made to see the necessity for a strong merchant marine program. On August 23, we took our case to the White House, Senators Magnuson and Bartlett and Chairman Garmatz and I. We found an open ear. The President was interested and listened most attentively to all four of us.

Secretary Boyd was also present at that meeting and when we were about to leave, the President instructed him to work out a program and bring it back for his consideration.

It is seldom that I have been in the company of happier men than I was as the four of us rode back to Capitol Hill that day last August. Our feeling of accomplishment grew as we huddled with Secretary Boyd the following week and found him far more receptive to our proposals than he had ever been in the past.

Some of his demands which he had classified as "nonnegotiable" not only turned out to be negotiable, they became non-existent. For example, his hard insistence in building American ships in foreign shipyards was abandoned altogether.

We left Washington for the Labor Day recess fully expecting the President to soon announce a new, vibrant maritime program. During the last two weeks of September the fiscal crisis and the standoff between the President and Chairman Mills of the House Ways & Means Committee on the tax increase sidetracked the whole business.

We went back to the White House again to see what our chances were and we returned to the Capitol disappointed but entirely respectful of a Presidential reluctance to initiate a new spending program—regardless of its merits. But, sincerely believing in our cause and, believing that the national needs in both commerce and defense justified the expense, and; believing that funds expended for this cause now will be returned many fold in the years to come and; believing that we have the votes—we introduced the legislation which we had earlier hoped would come to Congress as an administration proposal.

I still believe we have the votes and I repeat, in my opinion, we will get the program this year.

It is no panacea for all the ills of our weak industry. It can by no means put us back on top next year or the year after or the year after that but it will start the ball rolling and I predict that the Congress will not have to do this alone.

The President knows the need. He knows the wishes of the millions of Americans who build ships and man them and supply them. He knows that this is a do or die year for the Administration and the Democratic party. I cannot see his remaining quiet on this issue and I fully expect him to come up with a reasonable effort to bring this program into reality.

I do not mean to imply that this vital need of the Nation should become a political football during a Presidential election year. Certainly we have been blessed in the Congress by having strong maritime support on both sides of the aisle. I expect it to continue. However, leadership in the merchant marine has always come from the Democratic party. I think back to the so-called father of the modern American merchant marine, that great chairman, Otis Bland, who represented my district for more than thirty years. I refer to that great chairman, Herbert Bonner, under whom I first took my seat on the Committee and I certainly refer to our great chairman, Eddie Garmatz, whose position on the merchant marine has no negative side.

With this kind of leadership in the House and its companions in the Senate, the Democratic party must continue to play the role of savior in this situation and we have every reason to expect that the President will join us and press the advantage which we already hold.

Republicans make no bones about it. They have already said that they will make the merchant marine a campaign issue. If given an opportunity, merchant marine can be a major plan in their party's platform.

The leadership in both Houses of the Congress has indicated that this will be a relatively short session, particularly if we gauge it in comparison with the first session of the Ninetieth Congress. Everybody knows that we have to be out of Washington before the national nominating conventions touch off the major campaign late in August.

I hope most sincerely that the President will give this program his endorsement and support. He has shown us that he understands the need and is receptive to our thoughts. Now it is up to him to demonstrate this not only to the Congress but to the Nation at large.

When I speak of the merchant marine, I am by no means addressing an audience which consists solely of those who build ships, operate them, man them and supply them. This alone is a significant segment of our Country, proper attention to which is long over due. The maritime base of the United States is far greater.

Who builds ships? I will gladly tell you. Millions of people who work in thousands of industries, in thousands of communities in every state in the union supply and manufacture the materials of ship construction. This same ratio is prevalent throughout all phases of the industry.

The base, however, is broader still. Who maintains the lifeline to our men overseas? Who is fighting this war in Viet Nam? Those brave men who stand lonely vigils in rice paddies and jungles surrounding towns with strange sounding names are connected to the length and breadth of our great land not only by blood and a common cause. Sixty-five percent of those brave fighting men went to Viet Nam in American bottoms under American-flags. These ships were manned by equally brave Americans who were prepared to lay down their lives as their predecessors did before them in wars almost forgotten.

We have not sent these men overseas unequipped. They have the most modern tools and machines of war. Their supply line is one which Caesar would never have dreamed nor Napoleon have dared. It is a supply line of Americans manning American bottoms under American flags. They carry almost 100% of the materials and supplies which sustain our forces in the field in Southeast Asia.

I referred a moment ago to wars which are almost forgotten. The ships which ply the Pacific supply routes have not forgotten these wars. Many of them are veterans. If a man who fought in one war is pressed into service to fight another you call him a retread but there is no way of retreading a rust bucket. The ships are no better than they were during World War II. They are in far worse shape. But let us compare the ships with the men whom they supply. It is very proudly proclaimed that today's fighting man is the greatest in the history of the world. His physical condition is better. His training is better. His arms and equipment are better but the condition of his supply line is worse.

The MSTS Conference which met in Washington in December spoke loud and clear when it said that by no means do we have enough American-flag ships to meet our defense needs of the future. Who is kidding whom? How could we possibly have enough ships to meet our future needs when we do not have enough to meet our present needs—military and commercial?

There are so many things I could tell you, most of which you have heard before. We are concerned about the balance of payments. By carrying only 7% of our foreign commerce, the merchant marine nevertheless earns annually one billion dollars on the plus side of the balance. Can you imagine how great this advantage could be expanded if we carried only 25% of our own tonnage? It would be improper to suppose that the figure would jump more than three times in line with the percentage but the increase would be tremendous.

Those of us with any degree of memory at all know that cargo preference was meant to establish the fifty percent figure as the floor not the ceiling yet there are agencies of the Government which seem to have taken it as the floor and as yet have never climbed out of the sub-basement.

And let us not forget that more than one hundred Members of the House sponsored legislation to create an independent Federal Maritime Agency. Nothing like this had ever happened before. This should have been taken as a clear indication of the national interest in this most pressing national need.

Our victory in the House was obvious from the start in the face of known opposition from the Administration.

The need for an independent Marad can be likened, in a way, to the need for a large stadium on a neutral site for a major football game. Neither the Naval Academy nor the Military Academy has sufficient facilities at home to handle properly the Army-Navy game so they play it in Philadelphia before a tremendous crowd and everybody is satisfied. It has been obvious for years that the Commerce Department is not the proper place for the Maritime Administration. But, neither is the Department of Transportation—unless they build a large ball park for the merchant marine.

All we have said in the House is that Marad deserves more importance and that the uniqueness of ocean transportation—so different from all other forms of transportation—can best be administered by a specialized agency under knowledgeable and dedicated leadership. We said it in a voice that rang loud and clear that brought an overwhelming "aye" when the House voted on this legislation last October.

This same strong voice says today that we are going to carry through and revitalize the American-flag merchant marine in a manner indicative of our respect for the past and our determination for the future.

LSD Menace Must Be Stopped

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced two bills relating to the evils of LSD, STP, and other psychedelic drugs.

Now the administration has taken the first step in what hopefully will result in effective criminal sanctions against traffickers in such dangerous drugs and the other hallucinogens.

We have heard from advocates of psychedelic drug use for the past few years that these drugs are the catalyst to a mystical, transcendent awareness of reality, and minimizing harmful side effects. Years ago, Dr. Sigmund Freud made similar claims for cocaine and other narcotics before there was adequate medical knowledge substantiating the harmful and dangerous effects of these drugs.

Today, with the medical course still uncharted, advocates of LSD are exposing our youth to hallucinogens and stimulants with no warning of the extremely dangerous side effects of the drugs which are now being discovered.

Medical experts, for instance, have recently stated that the use of such hallucinogens can cause birth deformities by chromosome breakdown. The very fact that many of the dangerous reactions from these drugs are still unknown makes it more imperative that inexperienced young people looking for a "kick" should not be exposed to this type of "guinea pig" experimentation, which may well result in permanent psychological and physiological damage.

I therefore applaud the President's realization of this threat to our youth and urge support of controls to stop the flow of these drugs now by imposing heavy penalties on the illicit manufacture or sale of hallucinogenic drugs.

A Tribute to Bob Braun of the WLW Television Stations

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend publicly the selflessness of one of the most popular personalities of the WLW television stations.

His name is Bob Braun and his program is the 50–50 Club. Both are well known to the residents of my congressional district as well as to those residing in central and southwestern Ohio, northwestern Kentucky, and southeastern Indiana.

Mr. Braun and the cast of the 50–50 Club have done a consistently fine job in presenting an interesting and entertaining program.

But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, was the effort of Bob in contributing to the success of the 1967 Ruth Lyons Christmas Fund. The total amount received was $482,280.31, which surpassed all previous records for the annual fund campaign. Benefiting from the proceeds are more than 90 hospitals in Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky.

The Christmas fund drive is conducted annually over the WLW stations to raise funds for toys, books, and playroom, playground, and therapeutic equipment for hospitalized children. Miss Ruth Lyons, who headed the 50–50 Club for 21 years, started the Christmas fund in 1939. The first drive raised $1,000. Since that time a grand total of $6 million has been generated.

The success of the 1967 campaign is a heartwarming tribute to the great lady who started the fund.

It is also a great credit to Bob Braun and the talented cast who worked so hard on this past year's campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Members of the House are inspired, as I am, by charitable activities of this kind which do so much good for our fellow citizens.

Bob Braun can and should take justifiable pride in this successful undertaking.

A Lifesaving Early Warning System

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death and destruction of a tornado can only be prevented by an effective early warning system. Casualties and property damage can be kept at a minimum only if such a system is in readiness before the disaster strikes.

In Chattanooga, this important service is performed by area broadcasters. They pay for it themselves, without the help of any Federal or local subsidies. The Emergency Weather Warning System—EWWS—is tested hourly, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

It has proven a great service to our community, and stands as a model for others who are interested in protecting their own areas from unexpected natural disasters.

The following feature on the Emergency Weather Warning System, by Associated Press writer Jay Bowles, explains how it works and the service it performs.

The article follows:

CHATTANOOGA.—A tornado rips a swath through a town, causing devastating damage and loss of life. The people most affected know about it because they experience it. But they didn't know about it soon enough to get out of its path.

The story is not an uncommon one. Take one weather bureau, one telephone and one meteorologist; then multiply the length of a warning message by the number of persons who have to be called—broadcast media, civil defense, police and fire agencies.

The result was an unsolvable arithmetic problem until some Tennesseans devised a method of communications which provided the proper divisor.

In most places, it takes more than an hour to alert the majority of the citizens of impending disaster.

In Chattanooga and Memphis, it takes three minutes.

The difference is a local network called the "emergency weather warning system." It's of such benefit that the Federal Communications Commission, through its industry advisory committees, has taken E–W–W–S as a prime nationwide project.

"The instinctive reaction of the average person in time of emergency is to turn on his radio or television," explained Gene Landau of radio station W-A-P-O in Chattanooga.

When he does, under E-W-W-S, he hears an immediate broadcast direct from the weather bureau or from civil defense headquarters telling him what the problem is and what to do about it.

The system, as devised by Henry Slavick of radio station W-M-C in Memphis and Gilley Stevens, meteorologist in charge of the Memphis weather bureau, is not a complicated one.

The weather bureau and civil defense headquarters have a direct "hot line" to all radio and television stations, fire, police and other concerned agencies in the immediate area.

Upon learning of impending emergency, either has only to push a button, immediately activating a tone at the receiving points and, in some cases, turning on recorders to tape the upcoming message.

Ten short "beeps" on this hot-line network clear the commercial airwaves for the announcement three minutes later. And the majority of the citizens are informed.

Other broadcast stations farther from the urban centers—as well as schools and offices—have only to install a regular radio to receive the messages.

Simple, but efficient.

"It's being used as a pattern throughout the country," said Slavick. "The operations in Memphis and in Chattanooga are firsts of their kind. In the Memphis area, 46 broadcast stations are signalled by the system."

Similar networks now are being installed in Nashville and Knoxville. Slavick said one is about to be organized in the tri-city area.

Each of the networks is maintained entirely by the broadcast stations themselves, strictly as a public service. There are no Federal funds involved. But each of the stations, in turn, make constant use of the system, whether or not there is an emergency.

Every hour on the hour in Chattanooga, the weather bureau provides broadcast stations with current weather conditions. The same usage is made of the Memphis system once daily.

These provide constant tests of the networks ("You haven't got time to figure out what goes wrong when an emergency comes," Landau said) as well as up-to-date weather information.

"Figure it out," Landau said. "The weather bureau here used to have to make 54 telephone calls to disseminate emergency information. It would take a minimum of a minute a call—no matter how fast you dialed.

"Now, in any situation which presents a threat to life or property, the same information is given out to all of them in three minutes. The system needs polishing, but it has unlimited possibilities."

The President's Sound and Sensible Crime Message

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has presented a sound and sensible series of proposals to meet the rising crime rate that threatens every community in the land.

I am convinced that Congress will promptly enact these measures before adjournment. For, like the President, we in Congress believe there is no more urgent matter before the country than control of crime and a return to law and order.

Report to the People of the First District of Maryland

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the First Congressional District of Maryland on my voting record for the first session of the 90th Congress.

The purpose of the report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bill which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 201 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls.

My voting record follows:

VOTING RECORD OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, 1ST SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS

Rollcall	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 10	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 10	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 246; Ford, 186)	Ford.
3	Jan. 10	H. Res. 1: On a motion to close debate and vote on the resolution calling for an investigation of the right of Representative-elect Powell to take his seat; in the interim he may vote as a Member. (Defeated 126 to 305.)	No.
4	Jan. 10	H. Res. 1: To adopt a substitute motion denying Mr. Powell the right to vote in the House while a committee investigates his right to his seat. (Passed 364 to 64.)	Yes.
5	Jan. 10	H. Res. 7: On a motion to close debate and vote on the resolution calling for the adoption of the rules of the 89th Cong. as the rules of this Congress. (Defeated 196 to 224.)	No.
6	Jan. 10	H. Res. 7: To amend the resolution to remove from the rules of the House, the "21-day rule" as it applied to the Committee on Rules in the 89th Cong. (Passed 232 to 185.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 8	H. Res. 226: To adopt the rule for consideration of the debt limitation bill (H.R. 4573) permitting no amendments from the floor. (Passed 223 to 184.)	No.
12	Feb. 8	H.R. 4573: To recommit to committee the bill raising the debt limitation in order to include within the limitation the sale of participation certificates and to remove the 4-percent limitation on long-term U.S. bonds. (Defeated 155 to 261.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 8	H.R. 4573: To increase the public debt limit from $330,000,000,000 to $336,000,000,000. (Passed 215 to 199.)	No.
15	Feb. 20	H. Res. 2: To suspend the rules and adopt the "reserve bill of rights." (Passed 324 to 13.)	Yes.
17	Feb. 21	H. Res. 83: On ordering the "previous question" on the resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations. (Passed 231 to 85.)	Yes.
18	Feb. 21	H. Res. 83: To approve the resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations as amended not to include overseas travel. (Passed 304 to 18.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278: To adopt the "previous question" halting debate and calling for a vote without amendments on the resolution regarding Representative-elect Powell. (Defeated 222 to 202.)	Yes.
23	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278: To order the "previous question" on the substitute motion to exclude Mr. Powell from membership in the 90th Cong. (Passed 263 to 161.)	No.
24	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278: To substitute for the recommendation of the select committee, a resolution excluding Mr. Powell from membership in the 90th Cong. (Passed 248 to 176.)	No.
25	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278: To approve the resolution as amended to exclude Mr. Powell from membership in the 90th Cong. (Passed 307 to 116.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278: To order the "previous question" on a motion to adopt the preamble to the resolution. (Passed 307 to 9.)	Yes.
28	Mar. 2	H.R. 4515: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing supplemental military procurement, research, and construction in order to provide that none of the funds authorized in this bill shall be used to carry out military operations in or over North Vietnam. (Defeated 18 to 372.)	No.
30	Mar. 9	S. 665: To approve the conference report on the bill authorizing supplemental military procurements, research, and construction for fiscal year 1967. (Passed 363 to 13.)	Yes.
32	Mar. 9	H.J. Res. 267: To approve the resolution calling for emergency food assistance to India. (Passed 311 to 63.)	Yes.
33	Mar. 9	H. Res. 376: To order the "previous question" on the resolution authorizing the House of Representatives to employ special counsel in the court case filed by Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. (Passed 254 to 85.)	Absent.[1]
36	Mar. 15	H.R. 6098: To extend for 2 years the interest equalization tax. (Passed 261 to 138.)	No.
38	Mar. 16	H.R. 7123: To approve the bill providing a $12,190,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense. (Passed 385 to 11.)	Yes.
39	Mar. 16	H.R. 6950: To approve the bill restarting the 7-percent investment credit and the allowance for accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. (Passed 386 to 2.)	Yes.
40	Mar. 20	H.R. 2068: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to veterans' pensions and other benefits. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes.
41	Mar. 20	H.R. 2513: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays. (Passed 313 to 35.)	Yes.
43	Mar. 21	H.R. 5277: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and other purposes relative to the territory. (Passed 371 to 15.)	Yes.
45	Mar. 22	H.R. 7501: To adopt an amendment cutting $185,000 from the appropriations bill for the Treasury Department to eliminate 15 positions from the Office of Secretary of the Treasury. (Passed 210 to 175.)	Yes.
46	Mar. 22	H.R. 7501: On a motion to recommit to committee the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill in order to make a 5-percent reduction in the appropriation as recommended by the President. (Defeated 168 to 217.)	Yes.
47	Mar. 22	H.R. 7501: On final passage of the Treasury, Post Office and Executive Office appropriation bill for 1968 in the amount of $7,500,000,000. (Passed 371 to 7.)	No.
49	Mar. 22	H.J. Res. 428: A motion to recommit to committee the resolution on the Alliance for Progress in order to strike out all after the resolving clause and to adopt language stating that the Congress will give sympathetic consideration to ways of implementing any agreements to be made at Punta del Este. (Passed 234 to 118.)	Paired for.

See footnotes at end of table.

VOTING RECORD OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, 1ST SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS—Continued

Roll-call	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
50	Mar. 22	H.J. Res. 428: To approve the resolution in support for a new phase of the Alliance for Progress at this meeting of American Chiefs of State to be held at Punta del Este. (Passed 234 to 118.)	Paired for.
52	Apr. 5	H. Res. 364: To recommit to committee the resolution providing $250,000 for use by the Committee on Science for employment, travel, etc., in order to provide $30,000 more for employment and staff assistants to the minority. (Defeated 176 to 215.)	Yes.
53	Apr. 5	H. Res. 221: On a motion to order the "previous question" on the resolution providing $350,000 for investigative expenses by the House Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed 305 to 92.)	Yes.
54	Apr. 5	H. Res. 221: On a motion to recommit to committee, the resolution providing funds for investigations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in order that open hearings may be held on request of the committee. (Defeated 92 to 304.)	No.
55	Apr. 5	H. Res. 221: To approve the resolution providing $350,000 for the investigative functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 305 to 92.)	Yes.
57	Apr. 6	H. Res. 413: To adopt the rule under which H.R. 2512, the copyright provision bill is to be considered. (Passed 347 to 42.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 6	H.R. 2512: On a motion to strike the enacting clause from the bill providing for a general revision of the copyright laws. (Defeated 126 to 252.)	No.
62	Apr. 11	H.J. Res. 493: To suspend the rules and approve the resolution extending for 20 days until May 3, the date at which the railroad strike can take place. (Passed 396 to 8.)	Yes.
63	Apr. 11	H.R. 2512: To approve the Copyright Provision Act as amended by the House. (Passed 379 to 29.)	Yes.
65	Apr. 12	H.R. 5404: To approve the bill amending the National Science Foundation Act to make certain changes with organization and operation of the Foundation. (Passed 391 to 22.)	Yes.
68	Apr. 13	H. Res. 418: To adopt the resolution establishing a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. (Passed 400 to 0.)	Yes.
70	Apr. 20	H. Res. 443: To approve the resolution expressing sympathy to the people of West Germany in the death of Konrad Adenauer. (Passed 357 to 0.)	Yes.
71	Apr. 20	H. Res. 207: To provide for the participation for the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant. (Passed 315 to 38.)	Yes.
73	Apr. 27	H. R. 9029: On a motion to recommit to committee the 1968 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior in order to make a 5-percent, across-the-board reduction in the appropriation as recommended by the President. (Defeated 158 to 231.)	No.
74	Apr. 27	H.R. 9029: To approve the $1,300,000,000 appropriation bill (1968) for the Department of Interior and related agencies. (Passed 376 to 11.)	Yes.
75	Apr. 27	H.R. 442: To adopt the "previous question" on the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2508, the bill relative to establishing Federal standards for congressional redistricting. (Passed 284 to 99.)	Absent.[3]
76	Apr. 27	H.R. 2508: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill on Federal standards for congressional redistricting for the purpose of striking out the provisions that "the State of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representative at Large." (Defeated 161 to 203.)	Yes.
77	Apr. 27	H.R. 2508: On final passage of the bill establishing Federal standards for congressional redistricting. (Passed 289 to 63.)	Yes.
79	May 1	H.J. Res. 543: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution extending the "cooling off" period in the potential railroad strike to June 19. (Passed 301 to 56.)	Yes.
81	May 3	H.R. 9481: To approve the 2d supplemental appropriations bill in the amount of $2,040,000,000. (Passed 391 to 6.)	Yes.
84	May 9	H.R. 9240: To approve the bill authorizing defense procurement, research, and development in the amount of $21,400,000,000. (Passed 401 to 3.)	Yes.
86	May 11	H. Res. 161: To approve the resolution providing up to $100 additional allowance for telephone service in the district office of Members of the House. (Passed 189 to 157.)	Yes.
87	May 11	H. Res. 464: To approve the resolution adding 78 officers and members to the Capitol Police Force. (Passed 334 to 16.)	Yes.
92	May 17	H.R. 9960: To amend the appropriation bill for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development by striking out the provision authorizing new contracts in the rent supplement program. (Passed 232 to 171.)	Yes.
93	May 17	H.R. 9960: To recommit to committee the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill in order to reduce the appropriation for model cities from $237,000,000 to $12,000,000. (Defeated 193 to 213.)	No.
94	May 17	H.R. 9960: To approve the $10,000,000 appropriation bill for independent offices and HUD. (Passed 347 to 56.)	Yes.
95	May 17	H.R. 6431: To approve the Mental Health Amendments of 1967. (Passed 353 to 0.)	Yes.
102	May 24	H.R. 7819: To adopt an amendment to the elementary and secondary education bill which would tend to give more Federal assistance to the poorer States. (Passed 221 to 195.)	No.
103	May 24	H.R. 7819: To adopt an amendment to the elementary and secondary education bill which would provide more State control over certain programs under the act. (Passed 230 to 185.)	Yes.
104	May 24	H.R. 7819: To recommit to committee the bill amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in order to hold further hearings on the bill and all germane amendments. (Defeated 180 to 236.)	No.
105	May 24	H.R. 7819: On final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. (Passed 294 to 122.)	Yes.
108	May 25	S. 1423: To approve the bill amending the Universal Training and Service Act as amended by the House. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yes.
110	May 31	H.R. 10345: To amend the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies in order to limit to $1,350,000 the subsidy SBA participation certificate. (Passed 185 to 44.)	Yes.
111	May 31	H.R. 10345: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies in order to limit expenditures in these departments and agencies (except FBI) to 95 percent of the amount requested by the President in the budget. (Passed 171 to 156.)	Yes.
116	June 5	H.R. 10226: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges of the Armed Forces. (Passed 315 to 0).	Absent.[2]
119	June 6	H.R. 10509: To recommit to committee the agriculture appropriation bill in order to make a 5-percent reduction in the bill as recommended by the President. (Except for the school lunch and school milk program.) (Defeated 175 to 222.)	Paired for.
120	June 6	H.R. 10509: To approve the $4,700,000,000 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. (Passed 357 to 38.)	Paired for.
122	June 7	H. Res. 504: To order the "previous question" on the resolution under which the bill authorizing an increase in the debt limitation was to be considered. (Passed 291 to 99.)	Yes.
123	June 7	H.R. 10328: To approve the bill raising the public debt limit to $365,000,000,000. (Defeated 197 to 210.)	No.
126	June 8	H.R. 9029: To approve the conference report on the $1,400,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies which was $5,300,000,000 above the bill as approved by the House originally. (Passed 321 to 49.)	Yes.
128	June 8	H.R. 1318: To amend the bill relating to the food stamp program in order to require States or local political units to pay for 20 percent of the free coupons distributed in the area. (Defeated 173 to 191.)	Yes.
129	June 8	H.R. 1318: On final passage to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. (Passed 230 to 128.)	No.
131	June 12	H.R. 7476: To approve the bill making adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates. (Passed 234 to 109.)	Absent.[3]
135	June 13	H.R. 10738: To approve the $70,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill. (Passed 407 to 1.)	Yes.
139	June 19	H.R. 6111: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center. (Passed 229 to 98.)	Paired for.
140	June 19	H.R. 10730: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965. (Passed 331 to 0.)	Paired for.
141	June 19	H.R. 480: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending for an additional 8 years the act relating to the acquisition of wet lands. (Passed 328 to 8.)	Paired for.
142	June 19	H.R. 482: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing an increase in fee for migrating bird hunting stamps. (Passed 238 to 97.)	Paired for.
144	June 20	S. 1432: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend and extend the Universal Military Training Act. (Passed 397 to 29.)	Yes.
145	June 20	H.R. 10480: To approve the bill to make it a Federal offense to desecrate the U.S. flag. (Passed 385 to 16.)	Yes.
147	June 21	H.R. 10867: To recommit to committee the bill increasing the public debt ceiling in order to set the limit at $336,000,000,000. (Defeated 191 to 224.)	Yes.
148	June 21	H.R. 10867: On final passage of the bill to increase the permanent debt limit to $358,000,000,000 with a "supplementary $7,000,000,000" for fiscal year 1969 and subsequently. (Passed 217 to 196.)	No.
153	June 26	S. 1226: To approve the bill relating to the issuance of marriage licenses in the District of Columbia. (Passed 355 to 6.)	Yes.
154	June 27	H.R. 10783: To approve the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 355 to 14.)	Yes
156	June 27	H.R. 10943: To recommit to committee the higher education bill in order to strike provisions for the Teacher Corps from the bill. (Defeated 156 to 257.)	No.
157	June 27	H.R. 10943: To approve the bill amending and extending title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 311 to 88.)	Yes.
160	June 28	H.R. 10340: To recommit to committee the NASA authorization bill in order to cut $136,500,000 from the bill and to provide for an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. (Passed 238 to 157.)	Yes.
161	June 28	H.R. 10340: To approve the NASA authorization bill as amended. (Passed 342 to 53.)	Yes.
163	July 11	H.R. 10805: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending the existence of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for 5 years to Jan. 31, 1973. (Passed 283 to 89.)	Yes.
165	July 12	S. 20: To establish a National Water Commission to make a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs. (Passed 369 to 18.)	Yes.
167	July 13	H. R. 10595: To recommit to committee the bill prohibiting certain financial institutions from acting as lottery agencies. (Defeated 135 to 257.)	No.
168	July 13	H.R. 10594: To approve the bill prohibiting certain financial institutions (in New York State) from acting as lottery agencies. (Passed 271 to 111.)	Yes.
170	July 17	S.J. Res. 81: To pass the resolution for a settlement of the railway strike. (Passed 244 to 148.)	No.
173	July 18	H.R. 11456: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation in order to reduce expenditures in fiscal 1968 by 5 percent of the budgetary request. (Passed 217 to 189.)	Yes.
174	July 18	H.R. 11456: To approve the $1,500,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense as amended. (Passed 393 to 5.)	Yes.
176	July 19	H.R. 421: To approve the bill making it a Federal offense to travel or use the facilities in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite riot. (Passed 347 to 70.)	Yes.
178	July 20	H. Res. 749: To adopt the resolution making it in order to consider H.R. 11000, the Rat Extermination Act of 1967. (Defeated 176 to 207.)	No.
180	July 25	H.R. 11641: To delete from the public works appropriation bill planning funds in the amount of $1,600,000 for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric dam in Maine. (Passed 233 to 169.)	Yes.
181	July 25	H.R. 11641: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for public works and Atomic Energy Commission in order to reduce the appropriations for each item by 5 percent. (Defeated 168 to 239.)	No.
182	July 25	H.R. 11641: On final passage of the $4,600,000,000 appropriations bill for public works and the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 375 to 26.)	Yes.
186	July 26	H.R. 9547: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing funds for the Inter-American Development Bank in order to cut the amount from $900,000,000 to $750,000,000. (Defeated 185 to 217.)	Yes.
187	July 26	H.R. 9547: To authorize funds in the amount of $900,000,000 for the Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

VOTING RECORD OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, 1ST SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS—Continued

Roll-call	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
189	July 27	H.R. 8630: To approve the bill extending the authority for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States. (Passed 308 to 66.)	Yes.
190	July 31	H.R. 6098: To adopt the conference report on the Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1967. (Passed 223 to 83.)	Absent.[2]
192	Aug. 1	H.R. 11722: To approve the military construction authorization bill for 1968. (Passed 394 to 2.)	Absent.[2]
200	Aug. 8	H.R. 5037: To amend the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act in order to strengthen the authority of the States in planning and administering the programs under the act. (Passed 256 to 147.)	Yes.
201	Aug. 8	H.R. 5037: To approve the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act as amended. (Passed 377 to 23.)	Yes.
204	Aug. 9	H. Res. 512: To adopt the resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 relating to the government of the District of Columbia. (Defeated 160 to 244.)	No.
206	Aug. 10	H.R. 7659: To adopt the bill providing for a mid-decade census beginning in 1975. (Passed 255 to 127.)	No.
208	Aug. 14	H.R. 43: To adopt the bill authorizing the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California. (Passed 235 to 83.)	Yes.
209	Aug. 14	H.R. 6279: To amend bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to provide for the collection, compilation, evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data by limiting the authorization for an appropriation to 1 year in the amount of $1,860,000. (Passed 319 to 2.)	Absent.[2]
214	Aug. 15	H.R. 856: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider H. R. 2516, the bill for providing penalties for interference with civil rights. (Passed 326 to 93.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 16	H.R. 2516: To approve the bill, as amended, providing penalties for interference in civil rights. (Passed 326 to 93.)	Yes.
222	Aug. 17	H.R. 12080: To adopt the Social Security Amendments of 1967. (Passed 415 to 3.)	Yes.
223	Aug. 17	S. 16: To adopt the conference report on the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967. (Passed 404 to 0.)	Yes.
224	Aug. 21	H.R. 12257: To suspend the rules and pass the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967. (Passed 340 to 0.)	Yes.
226	Aug. 21	H.R. 11565: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing during the 1968 and 1969 crop years the intracountry lease, sale, and transfer of acreage allotments for peanuts among farms. (Defeated 208 to 146; a ⅔ vote necessary.)	Yes.
229	Aug. 22	H.R. 12474: To approve the appropriation bill in the amount of $4,500,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 312 to 92.)	Yes.
235	Aug. 25	H.R. 12048: To eliminate from the foreign aid authorization bill the provision giving new authority for the President to arrange credit sales of military arms and services by private supplies with U.S. Government guarantee. (Passed 236 to 157.)	Yes.
236	Aug. 25	H.R. 12048: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization bill in order to reduce the amount of the authorization for technical cooperation and development in fiscal year 1968 from $243,000,000 to $210,000,000 and to eliminate the $260,000,000 authorization for 1969. (Passed 234 to 163.)	Yes.
237	Aug. 25	H.R. 12048: To approve the Foreign Assistance Act of 1947 as amended. (Passed 202 to 194.)	Yes.
239	Aug. 28	H.R. 8965: To approve the bill increasing the contribution of the Federal Government for construction of the interceptor sewer for the Dulles Airport from $3,000,000 to $15,500,000. (Passed 118 to 109.)	Yes.
240	Sept. 11	H.R. 11816: To approve the bill providing benefits to State and local law-enforcement officers or their survivors when they are disabled or killed while apprehending a person who has violated a Federal law. (Passed 310 to 0.)	Absent[2]
241	Sept. 11	H.R. 8654: To approve the bill providing for an appeal by the United States from decisions sustaining motions to suppress evidence. (Passed 310 to 0.)	Absent[2]
242	Sept. 11	H.R 8775: To approve the bill increasing the appropriation authorization for continuing work on the Missouri River Basin. (Passed 225 to 83.)	Absent[2]
244	Sept. 12	H.R. 10738: To approve the portion of the defense appropriation conference report on which there was no disagreement. (Passed 365 to 4.)	Paired for.
245	Sept. 12	H.R. 10738: On a motion that the House agree to strike from the defense appropriation bill the provision that "none of the funds herein provided shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards." (Defeated 144 to 233.)	Paired against.
253	Sept. 14	S. 602: On a motion to reduce the authorization in the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967 by $50,000,000. (Passed 199 to 161.)	Yes.
254	Sept. 14	S. 602: On a motion to recommit to committee the Appalachian authorization bill in order to provide the funds to the Secretary of Transportation instead of the President, to make changes in provisions relative to housing projects, and to supply funds to attack the alewife problem of the Great Lakes area. (Defeated 178 to 184.)	Yes.
255	Sept. 14	S. 602: On final passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act amendments and amendments to the Public Works and Development Act of 1965. (Passed 189 to 168.)	No.
257	Sept. 18	H.R. 4451: To suspend the rules and pass the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967. (Defeated 147 to 175.)	Yes.
258	Sept. 18	S. 1657: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain dairy indemnity payments. (Passed 320 to 7.)	Yes.
259	Sept. 18	H.R. 838: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to observe and study the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (Passed 262 to 52.)	Yes.
262	Sept. 19	S. 953: To adopt the conference report on the amendments to the Food Stamp Act. (Passed 196 to 154.)	No.
264	Sept. 20	H.R. 9547: To recommit to the conference committee the bill amending the Inter-American Development Bank Act in order to insist upon retaining sec. 1 of the House-passed bill providing for an audit of the Bank. (Passed 274 to 126.)	Yes.
265	Sept. 20	H.R. 6418: On a motion to amend the Partnership of Health Amendments of 1967 in order to add $20,000,000 in each of 2 years intended to be spent for rat control. (Passed 227 to 173.)	Yes.
266	Sept. 20	H.R. 6418: On final passage of the Partnership of Health Amendments of 1967 as amended. (Passed 395 to 7.)	Yes.
267	Sept. 20	H.R. 6430: To approve the Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
270	Sept. 21	H.R. 6736: To recommit to committee the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 in order to delete title II establishing a nonprofit educational broadcasting corporation, and in order to authorize $5,000,000 for assistance to existing educational broadcasting stations. (Defeated 167 to 194.)	No.
271	Sept. 21	H.R. 6736: On final passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. (Passed 265 to 91.)	Yes.
273	Sept. 25	H.R. 13042: To approve the bill providing for the election of the school board in the District of Columbia. (Passed 324 to 3.)	Absent.[2]
274	Sept. 25	H.R. 13025: To approve the bill authorizing for the District of Columbia Council to make regulations relating to the sale of alcoholic beverages and to alter the regulations on serving of alcoholic beverages at hotels and clubs in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 153 to 182.)	Absent.[1]
277	Sept. 26	H.R. 12120: On an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1967 to give States and local governments more control over the program. (Passed 234 to 139.)	Yes.
278	Sept. 26	H.R. 12120: On an amendment to the Juvenile Prevention and Control Act to prevent any use of funds authorized under this bill by the Office of Economic Opportunity. (Passed 241 to 132.)	Yes.
282	Sept. 27	H.J. Res. 849: To recommit to committee the resolution continuing appropriations from Sept. 30 to Oct. 31. (Passed 202 to 182.)	Yes.
285	Sept. 28	H.R. 478: To approve the bill establishing procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage area. (Passed 340 to 29.)	Yes.
287	Sept. 29	H.R. 10673: To approve the bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to strengthen and clarify stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities for the management of their stockyards. (Passed 234 to 6.)	Yes.
289	Oct. 2	H.R. 4903: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryuku Islands. (Passed 294 to 80.)	Yes.
290	Oct. 2	S. 233: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in Alaska. (Passed 357 to 1.)	Yes.
291	Oct. 2	H.R. 9796: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending the loan of 15 vessels to certain foreign countries. (Passed 321 to 42.)	Yes.
293	Oct. 3	H. Res. 938: To adopt the "previous question" on the resolution to take up and consider H.J. Res. 853 (continuing appropriations) which would mean that no amendments could be considered. (Passed 213 to 205.)	No.
294	Oct. 3	H.R. 11722: To adopt the conference report on the Military Construction Authorization Act. (Passed 377 to 33.)	Yes.
296	Oct. 4	H.R. 10196: To recommit to conference the Labor-HEW appropriations bill in order to make reductions of $20,000,000 on those items in excess of budget request. (Passed 226 to 173.)	Yes.
297	Oct. 4	H.R. 1411: To approve the bill amendng the law relative to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representation. (Passed 353 to 32.)	Yes.
300	Oct. 10	H.R. 10509: On a motion to insist on House position on conference report on Department of Agriculture appropriations bill that funds for the cropland adjustment program be held at a level to meet existing contracts rather than increased by $52,200,000 to take 2,000,000 additional acres out of production. (Passed 377 to 8.)	Yes.
301	Oct. 10	H.R. 10509: On a motion to insist on House position on conference report on Department of Agriculture appropriation bill that funds for the Farmers Home Administration be kept at budget request rather than increased by $25,000,000. (Passed 326 to 24.)	No.
302	Oct. 10	H.R. 10509: On a motion to insist on House position on conference report on Department of Agriculture appropriation bill that funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation be kept at budget request rather than increased from $1,400,000,000 to $3,000,000,000. (Passed 391 to 3.)	Yes.
306	Oct. 11	H.R. 7977: To recommit to committee the postal rate and Federal pay bill in order to eliminate from the bill provision for a 2d- and 3d-year pay increase and the provision for a "quadrennial commission" to set Federal salaries. (Defeated 199 to 211.)	Yes.
307	Oct. 11	H.R. 7977: On final passage of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967. (Passed 318 to 89.)	No.
309	Oct. 16	H.R. 13048: To suspend the rules and pass the bill making certain technical amendments in the Library Services and Construction Act. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
310	Oct. 16	S.J. Res. 112: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution extending from Mar. 6 to Dec. 31, 1968, the deadline for the report of the National Commission on Urban Problems. (Passed 343 to 10.)	Yes.
313	Oct. 17	H.R. 11456: To recommit to committee the conference report on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill in order to insist on House disagreement with Senate amendments which exceed the President's budget requests. (Defeated 124 to 268.)	No.
314	Oct. 17	H.R. 11456: To approve the conference report on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Yes.
315	Oct. 17	H.R. 11456: On a motion to agree to a Senate amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriation bill providing up to $140,000 in Federal funds for construction of an airport facility at Kelly Flats, Mont. (Defeated 161 to 222.)	No.
316	Oct. 17	H.R. 159: On final passage of the bill to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. (Passed 324 to 44.)	Yes.
319	Oct. 18	H.J. Res. 888: To adopt the Whitten substitute resolution providing that Federal expenditures in fiscal 1968 shall not exceed those of 1967 with certain exceptions; the net administrative budget shall not exceed $131,500,000,000 except those expenditures in excess of $22,000,000,000 which the President finds necessary for the war in Vietnam. OEO is limited to $1,200,000,000 and foreign aid to $2,000,000,000. (Passed 239 to 164.)	Yes.
320	Oct. 18	H.J. Res. 888: To recommit to committee the continuing (and economy) resolution as amended. (Defeated 158 to 244.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

VOTING RECORD OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, 1ST SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS—Continued

Roll-call	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
321	Oct. 18	H.J. Res. 888: On final passage of the continuing (and economy) resolution as amended. (Passed 258 to 143.)	Yes.
323	Oct. 19	H.R. 13178: To pass the bill relative to the safety of the Capitol buildings and grounds. (Passed 336 to 20.)	Yes.
325	Oct. 19	S. 678: To pass the bill prohibiting the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States. (Passed 275 to 47.)	Yes.
327	Oct. 20	H. Res. 241: To transfer jurisdiction over matters involving military cemeteries of the United States in which veterans are buried from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. (Passed 227 to 0.)	Yes.
328	Oct. 20	H. Res. 947: To approve the resolution involving the "rule" under which the House would consider H.R. 10442, the bill to facilitate the exchange of Forest Service land for public school use. (Passed 221 to 1.)	Yes.
329	Oct. 20	H.R. 10442: To recommit to committee the bill to facilitate the exchange of Forest Service land for public school use in order to provide that any money received from the sale of land should go into the general fund of the Treasury rather than into a special fund in Department of Agriculture. (Defeated 30 to 191.)	No.
333	Oct. 23	H.R. 11627: To authorize the State of Maryland to construct and operate 4 bridges or tunnels across the Chesapeake Bay. (Passed 342 to 9.)	Yes.
335	Oct. 24	H.R. 9960: To recommit to the conference committee the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill in order to insist on the House disagreement with the State in 7 instances. (Defeated 184 to 208.)	Yes.
336	Oct. 24	H.R. 9960: On a motion to agree to the Senate amendment to the HUD appropriation bill increasing by $300,000,000 for model cities and certain urban renewal. (Defeated 156 to 241.)	No.
337	Oct. 24	H.R. 9960: On a motion to agree to the Senate Amendment to the HUD appropriation bill providing $40,000,000 for new contracts under the rent supplement program. (Defeated 152 to 250.)	No.
338	Oct. 24	H.R. 13606: To approve the $2,100,000 military construction appropriation bill. (Passed 362 to 26.)	Yes.
340	Oct. 25	H.R. 11641: On a motion to recommit to conference the public works and atomic energy appropriation bill. (Defeated 117 to 278.)	No.
341	Oct. 25	H.R. 11641: On a motion to agree to the Senate amendment providing $875,000 to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs, Maine. (Defeated 162 to 236.)	No.
342	Oct. 25	H.R. 11641: On a motion to remove from the public works appropriation bill the $875,000 to fund continual planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine. (Defeated 283 to 111.)	No.
343	Oct. 26	H.R. 9960: To recommit to conference the appropriation bill on independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to insist upon the House position eliminating funds for new contracts for rent subsidies. (Defeated 184 to 198.)	Absent.[2]
344	Oct. 26	H.R. 9960: To approve the conference report on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill. (Passed 296 to 88.)	Absent.[2]
345	Oct. 26	H.R. 13510: To approve the bill increasing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services. (Passed 385 to 2.)	Absent.[2]
346	Oct. 26	H.R. 2508: To recommit to conference the bill on congressional redistricting in order to add certain provisions. (Defeated 82 to 283.)	Yes.
347	Oct. 26	H.R. 2508: To approve the conference report on the bill on congressional redistricting. (Passed 241 to 105.)	No.
349	Oct. 30	H.R. 10915: To recommit to committee the bill regarding reduction of extra-long staple cotton quota. (Defeated 101 to 244.)	Yes.
350	Oct. 30	H.R. 10915: On final passage of the bill to give to U.S. growers most of the world quota for extra-long staple cotton. (Passed 275 to 63.)	Yes.
354	Oct. 31	H.R. 12144: On final passage of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. (Defeated 403 to 1.)	Yes.
359	Nov. 2	S. 780: To approve the Air Quality Act of 1967 as approved. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yes.
361	Nov. 3	H. Res. 966: To adopt the rule under which S. 2388 (economic opportunity amendments) is to be considered. (Passed 262 to 39.)	Yes.
362	Nov. 6	H.R. 11565: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the transfer of peanut acreage allotments. (Passed 255 to 57.)	Yes.
363	Nov. 6	S.J. Res. 33: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution establishing a National Commission on Product Safety. (Passed 206 to 102.)	Absent.[1]
364	Nov. 6	H.R. 3639: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yes.
365	Nov. 6	H.R. 13165: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending to Mar. 1, 1969, the Secret Service protection of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and children. (Passed 302 to 11.)	Yes.
366	Nov 6	S.J. Res. 114: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. (Passed 308 to 6.)	Yes.
367	Nov. 6	H.R. 3982: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to the transportation of house trailers and members of the uniformed services. (Passed 319 to 0.)	Yes.
368	Nov. 6	H.R. 13669: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to military claims and improvement of the administration and settlement of these claims. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yes.
369	Nov. 6	S. 1552: To suspend the rules and pass the Highway Safety Act of 1966. (Passed 252 to 65.)	Yes.
370	Nov. 6	S. 423: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing funds to help defray certain increased costs of harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii. (Passed 291 to 25.)	Yes.
374	Nov. 8	S. 1872: To recommit to committee the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill in order to insist upon the House amendment which provides that no defense articles may be sold to or purchased from any nation which supplies the Vietcong enemy in North Vietnam, and that Poland shall not have most-favored-nation treatment relative to tariffs as long as she furnishes supplies to Vietnamese Communists. (Defeated 196 to 200.)	Yes.
375	Nov. 8	S. 1872: To approve the conference report authorizing $2,600,000,000 for the foreign assistance program. (Passed 205 to 187.)	No.
378	Nov. 9	H.R. 11641: To approve the motion to agree to the Senate amendment to the civil functions appropriation bill (public works) providing $875,000 for the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine. (Defeated 118 to 263.)	No.
380	Nov. 9	H.R. 8569: To approve the $500,000,000 District of Columbia appropriations bill. (Passed 354 to 6.)	Yes.
386	Nov. 15	S. 2388: To amend the economic opportunity bill by prohibiting use of OEO funds to provide legal defense for anyone charged with a crime growing out of any unlawful demonstration or civil disturbance. (Passed 332 to 79.)	Yes.
387	Nov. 15	S. 2388: To recommit to committee the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 in order to reduce the authorization of funds from $2,060,000,000 to $1,600,000,000. (Passed 221 to 190.)	Yes.
388	Nov. 15	S. 2388: On final passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments. (Passed 283 to 129.)	Yes.
390	Nov. 16	H. Res. 978: To approve the rule waiving points of order against the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance. (Passed 200 to 190.)	Yes.
394	Nov. 17	H.R. 13893: To recommit to committee the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Defeated 135 to 177.)	Yes.
395	Nov. 17	H.R. 13893: On final passage of the $2,700,000,000 foreign aid appropriations bill as amended. (Passed 167 to 143.)	Yes.
396	Nov. 17	H. Res. 509: To approve the rule under which the House will consider H.R. 8 relative to obstruction of the Armed Forces. (Passed 211 to 37.)	Yes.
399	Nov. 20	H.R. 13933: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to modify the Interstate Highway System by allocating 200 additional miles to the 41,000 miles already authorized. (Passed 361 to 1.)	Yes.
400	Nov. 20	H.R. 12010: To suspend the rules and pass the bill granting the consent of the United States to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District compact. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yes.
401	Nov. 20	H.R. 9063: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. (Passed 348 to 10.)	Yes.
402	Nov. 20	H.R. 11527: To suspend the rules and pass a bill relative to the transfer of U.S. land to the University of Maine. (Passed 326 to 24.)	Yes.
404	Nov. 21	H.R. 6430: To approve the conference report on the Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967. (Passed 354 to 0.)	Yes.
405	Nov. 21	H.R. 6418: To approve the conference report on the Partnership of Health Amendments of 1967. (Passed 347 to 3.)	Yes.
406	Nov. 21	S. 1031: To recommit to committee the Peace Corps authorization bill in order to reduce the 1968 authorizations from $115,700,000 to $105,000,000 and to prohibit Peace Corps officials and employees from attempting to obtain a selective service deferment for anyone on account of his service in the Peace Corps. (Defeated 141 to 203.)	No.
407	Nov. 21	S. 1031: To approve the Peace Corps authorization bill providing $115,700,000 for the fiscal year 1968. (Passed 312 to 32).	Yes.
410	Nov. 27	H.R. 12603: To approve the National Visitors Center Facilities Act of 1967. (Passed 316 to 34.)	Yes.
411	Nov. 27	S. 1003: To approve the bill amending the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics. (Passed 325 to 0.)	Yes.
413	Nov. 28	H.J. Res. 936: To extend the date of the continuing resolution on appropriations to Dec. 2, 1967. (Passed 368 to 13.)	Yes.
414	Nov. 28	H. Res. 985: On ordering the previous question on the resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 2275, a private bill which had been amended by the Senate to include legislation relative to congressional districts. (Passed 201 to 179.)	No.
415	Nov. 28	H.R. 12601: On a bill to amend the Internal Security Act with regard to the provisions of that act that deal wth registration of Communist organizations. (Passed 269 to 104.)	No.
417	Nov. 29	H.R. 12144: On a motion to instruct the managers on the part of the House to agree to the Senate amendment to the Federal meat inspection bill. (Defeated 166 to 207.)	
418	Nov. 29	H.R. 13706: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act in order to remove the 6-percent interest rate limitations for 2 years. (Defeated 102 to 269.)	No.
421	Dec. 4	H.R. 11276: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years. (Passed 352 to 0.)	Absent.[2]
422	Dec. 4	H.R. 13054: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to age discrimination in employment. (Passed 344 to 13.)	Absent.[2]
423	Dec. 4	H. Res. 996: To approve the resolution insisting upon the House amendments to S. 2171 to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act and to agree to a conference with the Senate. (Passed 287 to 58.)	Absent.[2]
426	Dec. 6	H.R. 6111: To adopt the conference report on the bill establishing a Federal judicial center. (Passed 230 to 126.)	No.
427	Dec. 6	H.R. 12144: To adopt the conference report on the bill amending the Meat Inspection Act. (Passed 336 to 28.)	Yes.
429	Dec. 11	S. 2388: To adopt the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. (Passed 247 to 149.)	Yes.
430	Dec. 11	H.J. Res. 888: To order the previous question on the conference report on a resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968, thus blocking a Republican motion for an additional $1,600,000,000 expenditure reduction. (Passed 213 to 183.)	No.
431	Dec. 11	H.J. Res. 888: To adopt the conference report on the resolution ordering expenditure reductions in fiscal 1968 totaling $4,100,000,000. (Passed 367 to 26.)	Yes.
433	Dec. 11	H.R. 7977: To adopt the conference report on the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967. (Passed 327 to 62.)	Yes.
435	Dec. 12	H.R. 14397: To pass the bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. (Passed 307 to 77.)	Yes.
436	Dec. 12	H.R. 4765: To adopt the conference report on the bill affecting income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. (Passed 274 to 104.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

VOTING RECORD OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, 1ST SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS—Continued

Roll-call	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
437	Dec. 12	H.R. 10595: To adopt the bill prohibiting certain banks and savings and loan associations from selling State lottery tickets. (Passed 289 to 74.)	Absent.[2]
439	Dec. 13	H.R. 12080: To adopt the conference report on the bill increasing social security benefits, providing benefits for additional categories of individuals, and improving the public assistance program and programs affecting the health and welfare of children. (Passed 390 to 3.)	Yes.
441	Dec. 13	S. 2171: To adopt the conference report on the bill amending the Subversive Activities Control Act in accordance with certain decisions of the courts. (Passed 276 to 114.)	No.
443	Dec. 14	H.R. 13893: A motion to recommit conference report on the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. (Passed 196 to 185.)	No.
444	Dec. 15	H.R. 13893: To adopt a conference report on the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. (Passed 198 to 158.)	Yes.
445	Dec. 15	H.R. 14397: A motion to recommit the bill on supplemental appropriations. (Defeated 108 to 255.)	No.
446	Dec. 15	H.R. 7819: To adopt a conference report on the bill amending and extending the Elementary and Secondary School Aid Act. (Passed 286 to 73.)	Yes.
447	Dec. 15	H.R. 12555: To suspend the House rules and pass the bill liberalizing provisions for governing veterans pensions and to prevent an adverse impact on those pensions by social security measures. (Passed 354 to 0.)	Yes.

[1] If present, would have voted "No."

[2] If present, would have voted "yes."

District of Columbia Recreation: The Opportunity and the Need

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, "recreation" is a familiar word which is assuming greater importance every day. During the past few years, we have witnessed a dramatic advance in urban recreation, from the traditional types of parks and playgrounds to far more innovative, flexible and comprehensive facilities and programs. We have seen in many cities that a solid, responsive, year-round recreation program cannot only direct the energies of youth into constructive channels, but can also serve as a catalyst for community activities involving all ages.

In a thoughtful article in the Washington Post on January 21, Peter Milius surveyed the basic recreation programs of the District of Columbia. Through many interviews and visits to neighborhood centers in various parts of Washington, he found that the District of Columbia Recreation Department still suffers from severe shortages of funds, facilities, and personnel, but despite these liabilities has had a significant impact in many neighborhoods. Not surprisingly, he identified the key to successful programs as leadership, the type of dynamic, persuasive leadership exhibited day to day by many of the recreation department's roving leaders and the staff of individual centers.

There is no question that Washington's basic recreation programs have been greatly improved in recent years; there is no question that we still have a long way to go. Superintendent Joseph H. Cole and his staff need far larger appropriations, both to improve and expand facilities and to supply all neighborhood centers with sufficient supplies year-round. Additional personnel should be obtained and trained for more intensive work with youth in all age groups from 2 to 20 years old. Assurance must be given, through departmental performance, that the last vestiges of racial discrimination have been removed from the department's hiring, assignment and promotion policies. Evidence should be presented, too, to show that funds, facilities, supplies and personnel are being allocated among Washington's neighborhoods strictly on the basis of children's needs, rather than through any artificial or distorted formulas.

One of the most important tasks ahead is securing better liaison between the department of recreation and other local agencies, particularly the board of education, United Planning Organization, and city agencies involved with summer recreation and youth training programs. Toward this end, consideration should be given early this year to proposals to alter the structure of the board of recreation and perhaps make the department an integral part of the District Government.

Mr. Speaker, Peter Milius' article, summarizing both the problems and the promise in Washington's current recreation programs, should be of interest to the entire Congress, as an outline of needs which should be met and the opportunities which we have to serve the youth of the Nation's Capital. The article follows:

RECREATION PROGRAM: AN ASSESSMENT

(By Peter Milius)

One cold afternoon two weeks ago, a boy about eight years old sat bent uncomfortably over a coloring book on a wooden bench in the basement of the Lovejoy Elementary School, 12th and D Streets ne.

The coloring book was a leftover, one of those distributed last summer by the Metropolitan Police Department. "A policewoman comforts a woman who has reported her child lost," one cheerless caption says, "Color her 'dedicated.'"

The boy had one crayon, a red one.

The place in which he sat, a small, dim-lit, dreary room with green paint slowly peeling off its brick walls, is the Lovejoy Recreation Center. A locked steel gate separates the center from the school rooms beyond. There is a narrow asphalt playground out back, opposite some tenements.

The boy, crayoning quietly, had gone unnoticed in the noise from the ping pong table that takes up half the room.

Suddenly he screamed, then began to cry. An older boy standing at the ping pong table had burned him in the back of the neck with a cigarette, he said.

The boy with the cigarette; a fat youth of about 15, laughingly denied it, said that he had only flicked some ashes on the eight-year-old.

The director of the center turned uncertainly back to the visitor. The ping pong game resumed.

The little boy kept crying, rubbing the back of his neck. Finally he got up and slowly walked outside.

The director caught up with him on the sidewalk, and pulled back his collar. There was an angry pink circle on the back of the boy's neck, about the size of a dime.

The director told his visitor that he would deal with the 15-year-old later.

The smaller boy, still crying softly, still clutching his coloring book, walked away, across the street toward home.

At the Benning-Stoddert Recreation Center that same night, across the Anacostia River at 155 Ridge rd. se., the director, Reginald C. Ballard, held what he called a "discussion" with six boys in their early teens.

They were good boys, he said later. At least two might get to college if things worked out right. All six could finish high school.

But one of the boys had not been coming to the center regularly in the last two weeks. Another had had an argument the week before with one of Ballard's assistants over a cigar the boy had boastfully flourished. Several had stopped taking off their hats when they came in to the center.

Ballard thought the boys had started hanging out at a shopping center down the hill from Benning-Stoddert.

His visitor came back a week later and asked how the discussion had worked out. Even Ballard was surprised.

"They formed a chess club," he said. "Two knew how to play and they'll teach the others. They'll meet here Tuesdays and Thursdays."

Insp. Vernon H. Culpepper, now of the Police Department's Community Relations Divisions, previously captain of the difficult 14th Precinct where Benning-Stoddert is located, remembers Ballard well.

"A damned good, conscientious man," said Culpepper when a reporter talked to him later. "He does a lot more than he has to.

"I remember young people he'd bring over sometimes, to see if we couldn't work something out. I remember one case where Reg had a kid bring us in a gun, turn it over to us. God knows what would have happened if he hadn't."

Benning-Stoddert sits in the center of four huge public housing projects, not a place where chess normally flourishes. "I'd hate to see the result if Ballard wasn't there," Culpepper said.

At the Recreation Department's main office on 16th Street NW., Arthur Kriemelmeyer, administrative assistant to Supt. Joseph H. Cole, was talking about supplies.

The department has divided the city into nine regions and each gets a percentage of supplies—basketballs, finger paint, games—according to the numbers and kinds of centers it has.

The percentages schedule is ten years old, Kriemelmeyer said.

When they were first figured out Region A, the sector west of Rock Creek Park, came up with 15 per cent. Most construction since has been east of the park.

The department made a study of the percentages two years ago, Kriemelmeyer told a reporter. Region A came out with 12 per cent then.

It was decided that the difference was too small to justify changing the supply breakdown. "A few percentage points don't make that much difference," Kriemelmeyer said. "What we need is more money from Congress, more supplies for every region."

What the study two years ago means is that Region A, the city's wealthiest, gets 25 per cent more supplies than it is entitled to, that one of every five balls or games or jars of paint sent west of Rock Creek Park belongs somewhere else.

Cole says he is making a study of the system and will change it.

These three small episodes out of the last two weeks are probably as good an introduction as any to the D.C. Recreation Department, the $9.6 million a year bureaucracy responsible for dispensing public fun in Washington, an agency of the District Government that the District Building does not run.

The department, which by law is under the control of a seven-member semi-independent board, is potentially a powerful instrument for raising the quality of life in this city, particularly in its slums. So Benning-Stoddert testifies.

Yet as Lovejoy indicates and Cole himself concedes, in all too many neighborhoods the department is not living up to its potential.

In parts of town where schools and police have lost influence, a recreation center sometimes remains the one workable way of reaching people, especially children.

A "turned-on" center can help lead a wayward child off the streets and out of trouble, back to school, to a job, even to college, can help transform an entire neighborhood.

It can, says Milton C. "Skeeter" Douglas Jr., deputy director of the Roving Leaders, "change the whole thing of how these people feel about themselves."

There are centers in this town like Benning-Stoddert where these things happen every day. There are not very many. Cole and Ralph H. Grier, the director of the department's Neighborhood Centers Division, classify about a third of their 115 neighborhood units as "good." Others think that estimate is high.

Why aren't more that way?

Recreation officials say there is a need for better, more imaginative personnel in the centers.

Yet the department, despite repeated budget requests; has no personnel officer, does only the most casual recruiting. Until recently, Grier says, the department often turned away bright young applicants in favor of less able or enthusiastic types willing to wait several years as per-diem employes until a regular, classified opening occurred.

Only 14 years ago the Department was two separate agencies, one white, one Negro.

Critics—the new recreation employes' union, the Human Relations Council, some members of the Recreation Board—say segregation still exists in the Department. Officials wring their hands over the fact that, though the Department is now more than 70 per cent Negro, few Negroes work west of Rock Creek Park—and few whites east of it.

Meanwhile, Region A, the mostly white region west of the park, has stopped competing in most citywide athletic and other tournaments for the young. It has its own, internal competitions. The explanation: There have been "incidents" when Region A has ventured eastward. A girl was hit in the face with a rock at a track meet. A convertible's top was slashed and the car broken into.

Cole, who has been in office a year and a half, say that he intends to end this separatism.

Cole's department has most of its neighborhood centers in schools. In theory this is a praiseworthy example of cooperation between city agencies, a first step toward the much-discussed idea of 'round-the-clock community schools in which the White House is now interested.

In practice, although the Board of Education has a representative on the Recreation Board, the two groups deal with one another like antagonistic foreign powers.

The Recreation Department runs a preschool program. The schools want to run one. They have never formally discussed a joint effort. Recreation space is finally being planned for in most new schools—and just as quickly taken back for classroom space.

At H. D. Cooke, the recreation room is also the furnace room. At J. F. Cook it is a storage closet and a hallway. At Banneker Junior High, part of the recreation wing has become a music classroom.

Principals and custodians—some, at least—look on after-hours recreation programs as intrusions. Recreation workers sometimes find themselves without heat after 3 p.m. or on weekends. There are locked doors and steel gates like the one at Lovejoy all over town.

The school people have some reason for the locks. There is a genuine problem of vandalism in much of the city. But there is some evidence that the solution may be more recreation, not less.

Sylvester R. Hall is the principal of Woodson Junior High in the far Northeast, where there is a strong recreation center with an active community council. He likes to tell the story of last Halloween.

The school system told its principals to take precautions against vandalism that night, to get in touch with the police. "I didn't," Hall said. "The recreation people gave a party in the school instead. It started at 3 with the young ones. The junior high kids came at 6, the older ones later. They closed at 10. Nobody touched the school."

Cole and the board both say they want a community council at every neighborhood center. Their wishes have been slow to filter down. At many centers there is only a paper council, almost no community involvement. At many, like Lovejoy, where the director can only be on hand half the day and must go to another unit at night, there is little chance for the community to become involved.

Recreation people say most of their problems could be solved with more money, for which they have to look to the District Building and to Congress. There is little doubt that they do need more; recreation has traditionally stood at the bottom of the budget list.

Only a few of the department's programs have captured the public and congressional imaginations—the Roving Leaders, as a weapon against crime, swimming pools and the summer youth effort as means to avert riots, an occasional cultural program.

The department's basic program, the neighborhood centers, which consume some 80 per cent of its budget, have never quite caught on.

But a month of study and some 70 interviews by this reporter suggest that the department needs not only money, but leadership.

Its board, four citizens and one representative each from the schools, District Building and National Park Service, is much like the Board of Education.

The members are well-intentioned. They are not always well-versed. Some of the members themselves say that their meetings are too often inconclusive.

The superintendent has spent more than 30 years in public recreation here. He says that the department must raise its sights and break away from part of its past, a past in which he played a part.

Cole can remeber 30 years ago, when he was the caretaker-director of a center here. "I'd put on overalls in the morning and take care of the grounds," he says. "Then at noon I'd go into the little shack there and put on white ducks, and in the afternoon I'd be a recreation leader."

Cole has a vision of the Recreation Department as a vital instrument in this city, a source of excitement and neighborhood pride.

But even those people sympathetic toward him wonder whether he can get this vision across, and carry it out.

Cole and his lieutenants know about Lovejoy and the centers like it in this town.

They know that Lovejoy, one room in the basement of an old school, is supposed to serve a neighborhood that has more than 3000 children in it aged 6 to 18.

"Skeeter" Douglas, deputy director of the Roving Leaders had said a center ought to "change the whole thing of how these people feel about themselves." What would he do at such a center, perhaps one in the Shaw area that is almost identical to Lovejoy?

"I'd go see the junkman," Douglas said. "You know that junkman across the street from that school? You wouldn't know it, but a lot of people up there know that man. He's important.

"Then I'd go up to the corner, to the grocery store. The man there's important, too. Almost everyone in the neighborhood owes him money.

"There's a drug store a couple of blocks away where the kids hang out, and I'd go see that guy, and the man with the liquor store.

"I'd go see the guy with the Amoco station. He helped me get some uniforms for some kids once. And I'd go see the Pinketts (at John R. Pinkett, Inc., the real estate company). They have a lot of the property around there.

"I'd go to Fides House, and to Shabazz's place (a Black Muslim establishment) and a joint up there where the numbers writers hang out.

"Then I'd start knocking on doors, talking to parents."

What would he tell these people?

"I'd tell them I was there," Douglas said, "that I had the center, what I wanted to do. I'd ask them if they had any ideas, if they would help."

Why, the reporter asked.

The man that Douglas works for, Samuel A. LaBeach, director of the Roving Leaders, interrupted. "So they'd support him," La Beach said.

"They do support you, the junkman, the liquor man, the parents. They tell the kids to listen to you. And the kids do."

What would Douglas do back at the center when he'd finished knocking on all those doors?

"There's another elementary school right there," he said. I think I'd organize some leagues, in baseball, in basketball, anything.

"I'd talk to the principal, and set up a recreational-remedial reading program, after school maybe, maybe even during school. I'd find some things the kids would like to read.

"I'd talk to the custodian, jive him out of some paint, and the older kids and I would paint the basketball court.

"I'd find some of those kids jobs if I could.

"I'd go over to the junkman and get some old tires and make an obstacle course."

Narcia Allen, another of LaBeach's deputies, spoke up. "He'd get me some tires, too," she said, "for flower boxes, and the kids would grow things. But first we'd take them to the Arboretum."

The Recreation Department has no buses for trips of that kind. How would she get them there? "I'd find a way," she said. "Borrow some cars. Maybe I could even borrow a truck."

"There's something you've got to understand," said Douglas. "They talk about professional qualifications for a recreation worker, and that's all right.

"But what he really needs is a course in con. You've got to be a con man.

"You've got to dream. You've got to believe that that little hole in that school is a $2 million multi-purpose center out of this world. Then the kids'll start believing it, too."

"You can have the most beautiful center," added LaBeach, "and it won't make any difference. What you need is leadership. I've seen the best centers wrecked because there wasn't good leadership."

Benning-Stoddert, Ballard's place across the Anacostia, suggests what that kind of leadership can produce.

Ballard, 45, a small man with protruding eyes and brushy mustache who works ten or more hours a day, sometimes six days a week, has been at Benning-Stoddert since it opened seven years ago.

He knows the children and their families. He knows, without benefit of the Moynihan report, that "a lot of these children don't have fathers at home. They want men they can turn to. That's one of the reasons they come here."

Ballard has organized a parents' club that calls on new families in the housing projects, chaperones dances, supplies volunteers on special days.

He has a garden club, a Pig-Tail Club (for little girls), a tutoring program, run by some of the boys who "came up" at his center and have now gone on to college. About 200 children come to the center on a normal day in winter, maybe 600 in summer.

The D. C. Recreation Department of tomorrow may be different from today's.

Mayor Walter E. Washington came here from a year in New York, the "Fun City" of Mayor John V. Lindsay and his unorthodox for the czar of recreation, Thomas P. Hoving.

The Mayor has spoken of his hope to bring the same kind of excitement to this city.

The Mayor has also said he wants to bring about a new kind of cooperation between city agencies. His assistants talk about "program budgets," a new way of thinking about city government to end traditional departmental jealousies over things like the preschool program.

The Mayor has spoken vaguely of some kind of coordinator to iron out differences among the school, recreation and library boards.

Others, including some officials in the Federal Bureau of the Budget, have toyed with the notion of making the Recreation Board purely advisory, and placing the department directly under District Building jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, the Mayor has appointed City Councilman Stanley J. Anderson, who spent years in the department, as the District Building representative on the Recreation Board.

Anderson, who not long ago turned down an offer to be second-in-command of recreation in New York City, may bring the department closer to the men at city hall.

The new city administration has turned its attention to the Recreation Department for another reason; it is now planning this year's summer youth program.

Recreation has traditionally been the orphan in city government. It could now be slowly coming into its own.

A Shipload of Doomed Men

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, an article was published in the January 1968 Harper's magazine entitled "A Shipload of Doomed Men." This article deals with the very heavy and obstructive problem which the Governors of the States are facing in regard to crowding of the cities by people pushed off the farms. The article is an interesting one, but says nothing about the problem of farm prices as the main contributor to the movement off the farms.

In order that my colleagues and other readers may have the benefit of an enlightening addition and comments to the article, I deem it appropriate to insert in the RECORD a letter, dated January 29, 1968, to the contributing editor of Harper's magazine, Mr. John Fischer, by Mr. John Forbes, chairman of the history department, Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill.

The letter follows:

Each day of the past five years more than one thousand men, women, and children in the United States have been made to break up their farm homes and go into the cities, to compete there for bread and shelter against other families exiled from the farms.

That fact and related problems it creates are stated plainly and with full concern in your essay, "A Shipload of Doomed Men," which appeared in this month's *Harper's*.

But the essay does not fully state the causes of the rural poverty that forces the migration. The essay lays the poverty at the door of farm mechanization that puts farm people out of work, and says nothing about the prime cause of the poverty--the level of farm prices. More on this point in a moment.

We must "halt the stream of migration" to the cities and then eventually "reverse the flow," the essay rightly states; we must move "people and jobs away from Megalopolis before it becomes both uninhabitable and ungovernable."

The method which the essay offers is that of "modernizing" government: cut outmoded governmental functions; put into one bureau the work that two or three or four of them are half-doing now; consolidate local units, townships, counties, for somethings even States, into trim, planned, planning, centralizing, overseeing larger governmental units.

This is "Farewell to Home Rule."

But the program is not offered as being democratic. It is offered as a way of cutting tax loads, as a road to "economic planning to attract new industries and jobs," and as "a significant first step toward halting the stream of migration to the big cities."

If the proposed consolidated, "modernized," larger governmental units did prove less expensive than the units they absorbed, they would be the first such in the history of government to do so.

Offered as a method of reversing the migration to the cities, the program duplicates precisely the program advocated by the Committee for Economic Development, a private, international organization whose United States component is "200 businessmen and educators" with headquarters at 711 Fifth Avenue, New York City. *Modernizing Local Government*, published in July 1966, and other public prints by the Committee, state your case in full detail.

How interesting, therefore, to read the same Committee's call, made five years ago, to move two million persons out of farming, to the cities!

In *An Adaptive Program for Agriculture*, published in July 1962 by the Committee (fourth printing, October 1965), on page 59 we read, in context: "If the farm labor force were to be, five years hence [1967] no more than two thirds as large as its present size of approximately 5.5 millions, the [Committee's removal] program would involve moving off the farm about two million of the present farm labor force, plus a number equal to a large part of the new entrants [mostly farm youth finished with their schooling] who would otherwise join the farm labor force in the five years. The total number of workers leaving farming in the five years would amount to 3 to 4 per cent of the present non-farm civilian labor force of some 65 millions. This would be some 400,000 to 500,000 persons a year." Or many more than one thousand men, women, and children each day of the five-year span.

Well, what happened? At the end of 1962 the farm labor force was 5,259,000 persons. At the end of 1966 it was 3,645,000 persons—a removal of 1,614,000 persons. (U.S., *Economic Report of the President, 1967*, Table B–20.) This works out to a removal of 403,500 persons in each year of the four from the end of 1962 to the end of 1966.

The President's 1968 *Report* probably will show that the removal in each twelvemonth of the program, July 1962 through July 1967, averaged about 450,000 persons—dead center in the bracket desired and marked by the Committee.

"A Shipload of Doomed Men" is an anxious but determined statement, so you may wish to ask the Committee how the result that it called and worked for was computed, and came into being.

The root of the matter, of course, is the level of farm prices in the past five years—more exactly, the level since 1950, when full parity was abandoned in favor of "the sliding scale" and the policy described often as that of "keeping down food prices, so that consumers spend more dollars in buying factory output."

The mechanization of farming has put farm labor out of jobs, but it has not kept production up to our own population increase; nor has the mechanization improved the ratio of income to debt for the farmers who remain:

	1950	1966	Percentage change
National population (millions of persons)	152.3	196.8	+29.2
Farm population (millions of persons)	23.0	11.5	−50.0
Total farm production (1957–59 equals 100)	86.0	113.0	+27.0
Crops harvested (millions of acres)	345	296	−14.2
Net farm income (billions of dollars)	13.5	16.0	+18.5
Farm debt (billions of dollars)	12.3	42.5	+245.5
Net farm income per harvested acre	$39.13	$54.05	+37.9
Farm debt per harvested acre	$36.65	$143.58	+291.8

Economic Report of the President, 1967, tables B–11, B–19, B–75, B–76, and B–78.

If, since 1950, *Harper's* debt had increased 7.7 times faster than its net income had increased, automation and a shorter payroll notwithstanding, *Harper's* might be merging with the *Atlantic*.

To no avail, unless that combination found an exit from the situation of the aggregate of the nation's corporations:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1950	1966	Percent change
Corporate profits after taxes	$24.9	$48.1	+95.3
Net corporate debt	142.1	500.9	+252.5

Ibid., tables B-66, B-55.

Did the State Governors, "the doomed men," in conference aboard the *Independence* last October talk about farm prices, and about the tax-base which their States are losing by the depression of farm prices?

At the 1966 Conference of the Midwestern Governors (in Cincinnati), and some weeks later at the Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments, we heard no Governor mention the subject.

Yet the tax-base here in Illinois is being shorted more than a billion dollars by the price of 1967 corn alone. For their No. 2

corn, our farmers are receiving about $1.04 per bushel, one penny more than the average price of corn in 1941–1945, when gross hourly wages in manufacturing averaged 91 cents. In December 1967 those wages averaged $2.77. (*Ibid.*, Table B–27.) Because corn farmers have to pay the wages of the men who make the machinery and chemicals they buy, our 1967 corn—about a billion bushels—is underpriced at least a dollar. By the corn underpayment alone, Governor Kerner and Mayor Daley of Chicago (that city is the Midwest farmers' hub of trade) are being shorted of a billion dollars of the tax-base they must have to forestall or deal with the problems of migration to Chicago.

In 1950 at prices current then, we spent for food (alcoholic beverages excluded) 22.2 per cent of our disposable personal income. In 1966 we spent, at prices current then, 18.1 per cent. Without exceeding the 1950 figure we could, in 1966, have increased by 48.7 per cent the farmers' total cash receipts from their commercial marketings of all the corn and all the wheat, livestock, milk, and other raw materials of our meals. (*Ibid.*, Tables B–9, B–16, B–74.)

The farmers had risked their capital and savings, and had done all the work, to raise the crops. They had earned full payment for them—cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

Did they get full payment? They got about half-payment. (Not four-fifths, as the Government asserts in *Ibid.*, Table B–77. The computation of farm parity reported in the President's *Reports* after 1962, is defective.)

Shall we pay farm families what they earn? Or shall we pay the Federal, State, and city governments to deal with the men, women, and children moved off farms into the cities? The answer may be clearer this summer, in the cities.

The Law of Supply and Demand rules only in conditions of actually free auction. It governs only in competitive markets where the suppliers and the demanders bargain, in the long run of their encounters, as approximate equals. And this has not been the case in Agriculture's market set-up. The suppliers (the farmers) have been many, and not organized; the demanders (the processors) have been few, and tightly organized. Remember this: The farmers have been the only major producers in the United States *who set no price on their production.*

Agriculture's market set-up has given room to domination by private buyers and the Government. Both groups for more than fifteen years have pursued the policy of keeping the price of all American farm production at the price level of world farm production. Domination of the home price by import price and export price has been effected, the home cost of production notwithstanding.

As one result, whereas our 1950 net farm income was $13.5 billion, our annual net farm income 1951 through 1966 averaged $13.1 billion—four hundred million dollars less, almost 3 per cent less, than the 1950 net. (*Ibid.*, Table B–11.)

By contrast, annual national income 1951 through 1966 averaged 167.5 per cent of the 1950 national income. However, our annual total private debt, 1951 through 1966, averaged 224.5 per cent of the 1950 total private debt. (*Ibid.*, Tables B–11 and B–55.)

It cuts no ice to answer: "But each year fewer men were farming." The total of farm income, not how many men are left to use its purchasing power and pay taxes on it, is the effective economic factor. Total farm income equals total farm production times farm *price.*

Farming is a business, and its productive assets must yield a return, as must the capital of any other business. (A farm's productive assets are its real estate, livestock, crops stored on and off the farm, machinery, vehicles, equipment, furnishings, and financial assets.) But Federal reporting of farm income makes no allowance for return on capital invested, a proper charge, although that omission has been called to the attention of the Congress, by Representative Graham Purcell, D., 13th District, Texas. (U.S., *Congressional Record,* 89th Congress, 1st Session, vol. 111, pt. 16, p. 21035.)

On the farm, the family's realized net income for the year *minus* X per cent return on the value of the farm's productive assets (total assets less total debt) *equals* the residual net income, or return, for the family's management and labor expended on the place that year.

The residual net income of our farms, 1950 and 1966:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1950	1966	Percent change
Realized gross farm income	$32.3	$49.5	+53.3
Production expenses	19.4	33.2	+71.1
Realized net income	13.7	16.1	+17.5
Value of the productive assets	120.1	218.3	+81.8
5-percent return on the value of the productive assets	6.0	10.9	+81.7
Residual net income	7.7	5.2	−32.5

In 1950 the farm residual net income was $7.7 billion—a total that works out to $1,753 for each farmer (farm owner-operator or farm manager) in 1950.

In 1966 the residual, per farmer, was $2,482.

In the years 1950 through 1966, by reducing the number of farmers by 52.3 per cent (from 4,393,000 to 2,095,000 men and women), we increased the farm family's residual net income by $729.

In 1966 each farm family's weekly recompense for management and labor was $47.73.

The consumer price index in 1966 for all families, farm and city, averaged 113.1, as compared with 83.8 in 1950. (Index: 1957–1959=100.)

In 1950 each farmer's share of the national total farm debt was $2,798. In 1966 it was $20,286.

In 1950 each farmer's share of the farm debt was 159.6 per cent of his share of the farm residual net income. In 1966 it was 817.3 per cent.

(Sources: U.S., *Economic Report of the President, 1967*, Tables B–42, B–55, B–74, B–79, and *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967*, Table 327.)

Thank you for writing "A Shipload of Doomed Men." It brought home to *Harper's* readers family migration off farms to the cities.

Until farm prices are restored, however, the exile will increase.

Experimental FHA Counseling Service Is Successful

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, more and more emphasis has been placed on the plight of citizens in search of decent housing conditions.

Many people, especially those of low—and moderate—income, members of minority groups, returning servicemen, and others, have difficulty in finding decent housing that they can afford.

This problem was met head-on last fall when the Department of Housing and Urban Development tested a new housing counseling service in five cities, including Milwaukee.

The response to the program was so good that HUD expanded the service to 10 additional cities in October, and, I understand, is planning another expansion of the service in the near future.

At year's end, Milwaukee, one of the five original test cities in the housing counseling program, had shown the greatest amount of activity under the program. Nearly 500 applicants had been interviewed. As a result, FHA had issued nearly 30 home mortgage insurance commitments to families who are buying their own homes. More than half of those interviewed were interested only in renting.

The housing counseling service does not cost HUD any additional money. Personnel performing the service are members of Federal Housing Administration insuring office staffs. The counseling service is also located in the local FHA office.

The following report on the program was issued by HUD in mid-January. The good results, recorded in Milwaukee and elsewhere, fully justify the continuation of the housing counseling service:

> More than 2,000 families and individuals who were having problems finding decent housing they could afford have been helped in the past three months through a new housing counseling service of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
>
> In addition to those helped in personal interviews, some 6,000 other persons who sought answers to housing questions by telephone were helped by HUD's housing counselors now operating in 15 Federal Housing Administration local insuring offices across the country.
>
> As a result of HUD's guidance, more than 100 families who came in for interviews are now buying their own homes, and many others have moved into better rental housing. It is likely that a number of those who telephoned for guidance have also made a move up in housing.
>
> The service has been especially beneficial to members of minority groups who comprise nearly two-thirds of those who have sought help under the program. Some 200 applicants from minority groups have either rented apartments or bought their own homes as a result of the service.
>
> FHA started the program on a test basis in five cities in August. It was extended to 10 additional offices in October, and has been in operation in the 15 offices for three months. Plans are under way to extend the program to more cities.
>
> The counseling service works this way: FHA interviews those seeking help in finding suitable housing. Facts concerning the kind of housing the family wants to rent or buy, credit data, debts, income and other family circumstances are taken by the counselor. This information is kept confidential by FHA.
>
> After considering all data, FHA makes recommendations on rental housing or on sales of homes that seem to be within the family's financial means. The recommendations take into account the type of housing and location that the family desires.
>
> FHA provides the housing seeker with the names of real estate brokers engaged in the sale or rental of FHA- or VA-owned properties. The counselors can also help by making appointments for the family to inspect homes or apartments that are available and are in line with individual circumstances.
>
> HUD Assistant Secretary P. N. Brownstein, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, said, "The housing conseling service was initiated by HUD as part of its policy to bring its programs to the people. The need for this kind of public service is apparent as seen by our experience in those cities in which the service is operating.

People in the cities who are having difficulties finding decent housing now have a place to turn to, a place where they can receive guidance in solving their problem."

At year's end, Milwaukee, one of the five original test cities in the housing counseling program, had shown the greatest amount of activity under the program. Nearly 500 applicants had been interviewed. As a result, FHA has issued nearly 30 home mortgage insurance commitments to families who are buying their own homes. More than half of those interviewed were interested only in renting.

Philadelphia, another of the test cities, is second in housing counseling activity. More than 400 interviews were held there with some 20 home mortgage insurance commitments issued as a result.

The service currently is available in the FHA insuring offices in Baltimore, Md.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Philadelphia, Pa.; St. Louis, Mo.; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Denver, Colo.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Kansas City, Mo.; Louisville, Ky.; Memphis, Tenn.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Richmond, Va.; San Diego, Calif.; and Seattle, Wash.

Our Men on the Front Line

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us are extremely proud of the tremendous job and the great sacrifices of our young men serving in Vietnam and other combat areas.

It is often hard for us to fully realize what these men are facing. I was extremely impressed by a letter which a young officer wrote recently to his parents about his experiences in the demilitarized zone.

With permission, I include the text of the letter from 2d Lt. H. W. Brazier to his parents, Col. and Mrs. H. W. Brazier:

A LETTER FROM THE FRONT

JANUARY 22, 1968.

DEAR DAD AND GOODY: Thank you so much for the camera—I have taken 15 pictures already.

Just spent 3 days "in the bush" about 3 miles from the DMZ—from the high ground I could see about 10 miles into North Vietnam.

We were taken in by chopper late one afternoon to rescue a recon patrol which had been ambushed. I was in the last chopper that made it in the 1st day just after it turned dark—about 70 of us spent the night deep in "Indian country" then the next day the remainder of the company joined us (total about 190).

Two recon people escaped the ambush and popped up near us. As I was leading a squad to them to see if they were gooks or not a chopper positively identified them and picked them up.

We humped to recons objective—the top of a ridgeline and found the other 5 marines—there certainly was nothing glamorous involved in bringing five bodies back from where the gooks had ambushed them. The gooks took a radio but no weapons.

Saw deep into N. Vietnam—area we were in full of bomb craters B–52 type—"Puff" (C–47 gunship) fired not far from us—also the first night friendly artillery boxed us in—the gooks were on our radio frequency and told us *in English* that our unit had better leave the area by night fall.

We were too deep into their territory for such a small force to stay another night so choppers landed (one at a time) on top of the ridge and they extracted us.

I am sure we could have held the hill for days—after that outing I can only reiterate how proud I am to be a Marine Officer. I now see why they make marine training so tough—it must be so because these troops must have the ultimate confidence in themselves and be a little cocky.

I am so proud of my men—not one of them fell out—my mortar gunners carried the 60 mm mortar—*set up* (baseplate, bipod, sight, tube) 45 pounds & their packs, personal weapons, 4 canteens, etc. It is a matter of pride with them to carry it all the way themselves.

They were becoming so exhausted that I ordered one of them to break his down and I carried the bipod—although at that time I did not know we were 200 meters from the top. I loaded all the mortar ammo on I could find so initially I had kids who could not be over 5 ft. 4 in. and 120 pounds *running* off with 40 pound cases of mortar ammo.

Once on the peak we distributed the shells among the troops so that on top of everything else they had 2–3 mortar rounds to carry on their person somewhere. I heard not one complaint, in fact nobody griped about being there. Our Capt. let 3 of my men who had R & R or were leaving Nam for good leave on one of the choppers.

I must tell you that we were called out late one afternoon as the troops were breaking their backs attempting to meet a deadline for sandbagging bunkers. The previous 5 days had been spent sandbagging and my men had worked until dark the 2 days before we left.

The day we left they had already put in 7 hours of very hard work. Then 3 virtually sleepless days and "humping" in the field. These people *never* complain, *never*—I can't believe it.

One 120 pounder of mine had to put down his can of C's to help carry the bodies up to our little LZ—when he was nominated for the detail. He said to his team leader, "I don't want to do it but I will." He did not pick up those C rations to finish his meal.

I learned so much map reading etc. on this operation—next time we will be much better prepared. Tonight we have troops on the perimeter and radio watch and mortar watch. We *never* but *never* go anywhere without a weapon or leave any weapon unguarded.

So it is now 0420, the radio plays all night so the various people up & about can enjoy it and a man sits near our mortar pits & tubes with a clean weapon (done since we returned).

We now have 6 men's lives (5 recon, 1 of our Lts. on the convoy that was ambushed) to think about. One of these days we will have our chance then old Charlie better watch out. My people are only too ready.

The Good Lord saw fit to watch over my men & I do not think for a minute that I did not pray enroute on the chopper (to an unknown situation) or that I was not scared because I was. I see what you mean Dad and I pray to God my son does not have to do this sort of thing.

I must say that I am happy in my present situation, glad I made the choice and *so* very proud of my men.

Love,

KIT.

Time for Equity

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, if enacted into law, would eliminate an inequity in our military pay structure.

Members of the Armed Forces who are separated from their families for more than 30 days, whether on temporary or permanent unaccompanied duty, have for several years been entitled to the family separation allowance of $30 per month for each month of separation. This serves to defray those expenses incurred by the family as a direct result of the separation. This family separation allowance is being denied to those families living in Government quarters, but it is being paid to those living off base.

Mr. Speaker, virtually all the added expenses of a separation are incurred by the family living in Government housing. There appears no justification for this discrimination especially since most separations result from duty with the fighting forces in Vietnam.

I am familiar with this problem because Schilling Manor is located near Salina, Kans., in the district I represent. This Government housing development provides homes for over 600 families separated from the head of the household, many of whom are serving in Vietnam. These families, in my opinion, deserve the same consideration shown those in private, off-base housing.

I would hope the Congress will take early action on this legislation.

Sound Approach

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the February 1968 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, entitled, "Sound Approach to Judicial Salaries." This new law, title II of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, establishes a Quadrennial Commission which I feel can openly meet a problem which has heretofore been thorny and troublesome for all concerned:

SOUND APPROACH TO JUDICIAL SALARIES

A little noticed item of considerable significance to the nation's judges and lawmakers became law at the close of the first session of the 90th Congress. It establishes a Commission on Executivce, Legislative and Judicial Salaries to be appointed every four years, beginning with fiscal year 1969, to study and make a report to the President on salary adjustments for Supreme Court Justices, other federal judges and personnel in the judicial branch, Congressmen and federal executive department heads. In short, it establishes for the first time a rational and systematic procedure for providing realistic compensation for the men in responsible and sensitive posts in government. While sitting federal judges are insulated from political pressures, their salaries traditionally have been tied to those of members of Congress, who, with understandable reluctance, have never been eager to pursue the task of setting their own compensation.

The new law, which is Title II of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, requires that the President, acting on the report of the commission, recommend salary adjustments to Congress every four years. If Congress does not reject or change the recommendations, they become effective in thirty days. The commission will be composed of private citizens, three named by the President, two by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House and two by the Chief Justice.

A method of providing systematic and periodic review of judicial salaries long has been supported in principle by the American Bar Association, acting through its Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure and Compensation. In these pages the inadequacy of compensation for the federal judiciary was noted editorially in our November, 1963, issue (page 1082), in which we published an article by the then Chairman of the Committee, Bernard G. Segal of Philadelphia, urging enactment of a salary increase measure then before the Congress.

The principle was affirmed most recently by the House of Delegates in 1965 when it approved a report of the Committee which noted that a timid Congress had cut by 30 to 40 per cent the salary increases recommended for members of the Congress and the federal judiciary by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, which was authorized by Congress in 1953 and reported in 1954. Mr. Segal, under appointment of President Eisenhower, was the chairman of that commission.

The problem that the new quadrennial commission can help to solve was summed up by its principal sponsor, Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona, who told the House of Representatives that "the average length of time between Congressional and legislative and judicial salary increases is about twenty-four years. We have had seven of those since George Washington's time. It took twenty-eight years to raise the pay from $6 a day to $8 a day and then some members were beaten when they went back and their opponents campaigned up and down the country saying that they had raised their own pay."

We think the establishment of the quadrennial commission will provide the means to attract the very best men and women to the federal judiciary and the halls of Congress. Combined with another provision of the act that prohibits members of Congress and other public officials from placing their relatives on public payrolls for which they are responsible, it serves a substantial and overdue public need.

Pressing Needs of Our Merchant Marine

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech delivered before the Propeller Club of Mobile, Ala., Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the shipbuilders council, very poignantly illustrates the pressing needs of our merchant marine and outlines goals America needs to attain if we are to regain our rightful place on the seas.

I commend his message to the attention of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF MOBILE, ALA., JANUARY 12, 1968

More than 70 members of the House of Representatives, plus 7 members of the United States Senate have sponsored legislation to bring about a much needed improvement in the maritime stature of our country. If enacted, this legislation would reverse a dangerous trend which has prevailed for almost two decades through both Democratic and Republican administrations.

In truth, the numerical, qualitative and functional deficiencies in the American merchant marine, as it presently exists, compose a nonpartisan problem which justifies bi-partisan support. It is a problem of universal import to the entire citizenry, though this point is sometimes not widely appreciated. It is a problem with national security and national economic implications. It is a problem, the solution of which deserves a high degree of concord among the various elements of the maritime industry.

Two years ago, the annual convention of The Propellar Club of the United States had the theme of "unity of purpose." The rationale which led to the selection of this most auspicious theme has a timeliness even today, for without unity, passage of the legislation mentioned at the outset of these remarks is highly improbable. Without unity, a landmark opportunity to revive the American merchant marine could very well be lost and beyond recall for another two decades.

Since the 1966 Propeller Club Convention, despite the good intentions of the delegates from all sections of the country and representing most shades of opinion, the spirit of togetherness within the maritime community has undergone further deterioration. If newspaper and magazine accounts of the past six months are fair criteria, any unbiased observer would quickly conclude that "everything is not roses" at this moment. There are considerable evidences of differences between ship owners and shipbuilders, differences between subsidized and nonsubsidized operators, differences among labor organizations, and differences between Congressional and Administration spokesmen. This is perhaps an oversimplification of the situation, but it is sufficient to demonstrate the presence of disparities which, if not brought into consonance, could severely jeopardize the enactment of a program of benefit primarily to the entire nation and to all segments of the American merchant marine as well.

Unity of purpose with respect to basic objectives and fundamental principles should be a paramount consideration on the eve of Congressional considerations of a long overdue and much awaited remedy for the ills of our merchant marine. To paraphrase an old passage: on summing up together, all should see, not merely in interest, but in honour, they are bound to do something for it--and that now or never is the time.

If there is agreement on basic objectives and fundamental principles, I am confident that the pending legislation can be passed, and there appear to be many others who share the same belief. I do not impugn the motives of some who have indicated that perfection or clarification of certain provisions of this legislation might be necessary or desirable. The important prerequisite is that there be unanimity on the goals to be achieved.

I would find it difficult to believe that anyone in this audience—or anyone serving any segment or subdivision of the merchant marine—would object to achievement of goals along the lines of the following:

1. the carriage of 25 percent of all U.S. trade and commerce in American flag ships rather than the present 7 percent;

2. measures to overcome the overpowering obsolescence in both the active and inactive merchant fleets; (More than 70 percent of the 943 merchant vessels in the active U.S. fleet are 20 years of age or older, and approximately 70 percent of the more than 1,000 vessels of the same vintage in the national defense reserve fleets are destined for scrapping.)

3. the construction of 35/40 merchant vessels annually in U.S. shipyards rather than the present 15 per year;

4. rejuvenation of coastal, intercoastal, Great Lakes, and other domestic waterborne trades which are now either extinct, dormant or serviced by overage and inefficient ships;

5. a three-fold increase in government-sponsored maritime research and development including actions to advance the prospects for nuclear powered merchant shipping; and

6. a determination that the United States will match or exceed the aggressive strength of the Soviet Union on the oceans just as we have resolved to outdistance the Russians in outer space.

From a feeble and unassuming beginning in 1945, the Soviet Union has ascended to a position of awesome and threatening strength on the oceans in 1968. But, we are told—fear not—there is no cause for concern! It is hard to decide whether or not this is wishful thinking or a convenient excuse or expedient cover for the failure of the United States to react effectively. In any event, the Russian Minister of the Merchant Fleet has said: "Already today it (Soviet Merchant Marine) stands on a par with the fleets of traditional sea countries in all its indexes, and in the near future it will have no equal competitors."

Russia emerged from World War II with a nondescript fleet of only 432 merchant vessels totaling less than 2 million tons. It wasn't until 1958—10 years ago—that the Soviets embarked on an ambitious fleet expansion program. By the end of 1965, her tonnage had reached nearly 10 million tons. Her current five-year plan (1966–70) is programmed to attain a fleet totaling 15 million tons by the end of 1970.

There seems to be little question of this goal being met, since in May of last year, Russia had 526 merchant vessels totaling 4.3 million tons under construction or on order. As a point of reference, on the same date, only 45 merchant ships totaling 600,000 tons were under construction or on order for the U.S. merchant fleet. As of November 1967, better than 22 percent of all ships on order or under construction throughout the world were for the Soviet Union. Whereas Russia has taken delivery of more than 100 ships per year for the past several years, deliveries of U.S. flag merchant ships have averaged only 15 ships per year.

With the foregoing as background, it might be useful to review the main provisions of the pending legislation on which, it is said, hearings will commence late in January or early in February. Among these are:

1. a five year maritime program of substantial proportions over those of the past 20 years;

2. the construction of 35/40 merchant ships per year—all in U.S. shipyards;

3. assistance for dry bulk carriers engaged in foreign trade;

4. assistance for U.S. operators in the domestic trades and for U.S. operators of fishing vessels;

5. supplemental aid in the development and construction of nuclear-powered ships for foreign or domestic trades;

6. a comprehensive research and development effort for the purpose of improving the competitive position of the American-flag merchant marine; and

7. alternative methods of subsidizing the operators of American-flag vessels in foreign trade.

It is also envisioned that a Commission on American Shipbuilding will be established to assess the present state of our industry and to submit to the President of the United States, within three years, recommendations on the extent to which Federal assistance is necessary to assure a national shipbuilding capability under all conceivable future circumstances. Such a Commission could go far in putting to rest—once and for all—the acrimony which has occurred in recent years over the question of whether or not merchant ships whose operations are to be subsidized by the public treasury—with the taxpayer's money—should be built in the United States or elsewhere. Of itself, this issue has contributed to the divisiveness about which I have already spoken, but it is to be hoped that by its referral to a group of open-minded experts, there can be agreement among all parties on basic objectives and fundamental principles.

And so I end on the same note on which I began—adding my voice to those who appeal for a unity of purpose in the accomplishment of essential national goals. There are still no assurances that the Administration will support or endorse the maritime legislation—and the program it would authorize—which will shortly come before the Congress for consideration. This uncertainty is all the more reason for a united front. If the Congress, labor and management are of a single mind, it is reasonable to anticipate that such a concordant position will not be wasted on the policy makers and the American public.

Financial Cuts

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury has just released a report that shows cash withdrawals of $44,470,480,772 for the first 7 months of fiscal 1968 by the Defense Department. This does not include $1,346,260,494 of the Atomic Energy Commission. Such expenditures were included with defense expenditures in the President's budget message.

The Pentagon now states that it has "gross unpaid obligation incurred" of over $38 billion. This was largely due to increased contractual obligation signed last summer and fall.

With these facts in mind and noting the increased war activity, it is obvious that defense spending may well go over $80 billion in both fiscal 1968 and 1969 unless the administration makes drastic cutbacks.

Under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an informative article which appeared in the Boston Globe January 4, 1968, under the byline of Allen M. Smythe, a financial columnist. Similar articles appeared in other metropolitan dailies.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Feb. 4, 1968]

LETTERS DEMAND SPENDING CUTS, END TO WAR AND NO TAX HIKE

(By Allen M. Smythe)

The flood of critical letters inundating the Capitol since the President's budget message may decide the fate of the surtax. Coupled with these complaints are protests against heavy defense spending and the ineffectiveness of the war.

Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana, who is one of a number of Democratic senators never invited to the White House, summed up the public complaint as "get out of Vietnam, cut defense spending, and no surtax."

Rep. Gerald Ford, House Republican leader, called the statement that Federal spending could not safely be cut further as absurd. It was pointed out that defense spending this year and next will exceed $79.8 billion, the highest of World War II.

Rep. Melvin Laird, (R-Wisc.) called the estimates misleading and said defense spending was again underestimated by $5 to $1 billion as was the case the last several years. He refers to the estimates of $79.8 billion for spending in fiscal 1969 and $82.3 billion in fiscal 1969 for defense obligations. These each include more than $2 billion for atomic weapons for the first time.

Rep. John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.) and chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee calls the budget requests unrealistic and says defense spending may be $40 billion over the defense costs of $43.2 billion in 1961 when Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara took over the Pentagon and combat troops were first sent to Vietnam.

The U.S. Treasury has just reported the cash withdrawals for defense in the first seven months of fiscal 1968 at $44.2 billion. This is $5.4 billion more than the same period a year ago. This does not include any costs for atomic weapons or any hidden war costs of the State Department, CIA, foreign aid for emergency funds.

The Pentagon reports "gross unpaid obligations incurred" now exceed $38 billion. This was caused by a military buying spree last Summer and Fall and then a stretchout of payments. This alone should keep defense spending at a high rate.

Emergencies can always raise costs. Rumors at the Capitol hint that the 45.000 South Korean troops may be called home and more U.S. troops will replace them.

The budget request includes an item for four FDL supply ships at $45 million each. These are the first of 30 such floating arsenals that would hover off potential trouble spots over the world. The Navy has announced that they would be built at Pascagoula, Miss., the home state of the popular Sen. John Stennis.

More than $500 million could be cut from the construction and reconversion of Navy vessels.

Cancellation of part or all of the expensive F111 aircraft project is a possibility. The new defense secretary, Clark Clifford, before confirmation told the senators he would study the cost and deficiencies of this weapon. A total of $8 to $10 billion is yet to be spent on production.

The Navy has asked five firms to bid on a substitute of their version. The bomber version for the Air Force was an afterthought by McNamara. The Air Force is also designing an inexpensive fighter that could perform some of the missions expected of the F111.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, February 12, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jewell M. Smoot, Court Street Methodist Church, of Flint, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, by whom we are governed, though threatened by the rule of tyranny within and without: Call up the best within us, lest the worst obtain control. Forgive our shortsightedness when we react in fear instead of responding in courage. Enable this representative body to be responsible in its dependence upon Thee and sensitive to the needs of a world which at times gropes in the darkness of bewildering confusion. Make here the statesmanship which will preserve our honor and project our integrity. We pray for all the peoples of this land. Protect the helpless, guide the perplexed, counsel those in danger. Make us worthy as a people under God, with liberty and justice for all. And may our strength be in obedient service of Almighty God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On February 10, 1968:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested,' a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12603. An act to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASKED TO REVIEW QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES—SERVICEMEN TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF BY LOAN COMPANIES—CREDIT UNIONS TO RESCUE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been vitally concerned with the problems that a serviceman faces when he attempts to obtain merchandise on credit or make a loan.

The committee found that a serviceman faced a veritable jungle when he sought credit and was subjected to sharp practices that were beyond imagination. It was not uncommon for servicemen, particularly those stationed overseas, to pay interest rates of 60 to 70 percent on loans. This was especially prevalent among lower ranking enlisted men whose credit sources were extremely limited.

One of the answers to this problem is the establishment of credit unions so that no matter where a serviceman is stationed he will have access to a credit union. Virtually every major large military installation in the United States now has a credit union but in overseas commands there is a scarcity of credit unions. On December 15, 1967, credit union service was authorized for all our troops stationed in West Germany. This is being accomplished by six U.S.-based credit unions which have opened one or more suboffices in West Germany. It is perhaps the most significant step in relieving the serviceman from the burden of high interest rates and sharp practices.

In order to aid servicemen in their search for financing, the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the various exchanges, launched a program several years ago in which finance companies would be able to operate in the exchanges as an independent contractor. While the idea may have had its merits, the execution of the idea was less than desirable. The company receiving the first contract was one of the finance companies that was under investigation by the subcommittee for a large number of questionable dealings. The exchange system did little checking on the company's background before issuing the contract and had exchange officials checked with the military legal section of the various services, they would have learned that the company was causing a great many problems for our servicemen and should not have been allowed to operate out of the PX.

The military and exchange system must be extremely careful to whom they engage as contractors, for a company privileged to operate out of the PX has, in the eyes of a serviceman, the blessing of the military. The serviceman feels that the company has been carefully screened and would do nothing to take advantage of the serviceman.

This situation was made abundantly clear on Okinawa recently where the Air Force engaged an automobile broker to accept orders on the military installation for new cars. The understanding was that the Air Force would receive 2 percent commission for each car sold. In short and concise terms, the car broker pocketed most of the money given to him and skipped the island leaving scores of servicemen not only without cars, but thousands of dollars. The servicemen dealt with the broker because they felt that since he was licensed to sell on the military installation, he had the blessing of the Air Force.

Recently, it has come to my attention that the military is considering expanding a number of finance contractors in the exchanges. I have viewed such an arrangement with alarm because of the history surrounding such arrangements and of the types of companies that are being considered as contractors.

Last week, I wrote to Mr. Alfred B. Fitt, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, seeking information on the need for new contractors and asking that this entire area be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, military credit unions have performed a valuable service for our men in uniform and I have never heard one complaint from a serviceman as to the treatment he received from a credit union. This is in contrast to the thousands of letters that are received by the military complaining about other credit extenders. The fact that six credit unions have volunteered to open offices in Germany, is a further indication of how far credit unions are willing to go to help our servicemen. It does not seem reasonable for a credit union to spend its time and money in setting up a new office in Germany if, at the same time, the military is going to allow other credit extenders to operate out of the local exchange with the full blessing of the military. The military owes a great debt to the credit unions throughout the world that are helping servicemen. But allowing other credit extenders, including some with questionable reputations, to operate under special privileges, is not the way to repay the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of the letter I have written to Secretary Fitt which more fully describes the problems concerning the exchange-financing contractor arrangements:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.

Hon. ALBERT B. FITT,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Department of Defense, in connection with the various exchange services of the armed forces, is considering a plan for expanding its existing contracts with financial institutions to handle automobile financing through the military exchanges.

It should be noted that, at the present time, the exchanges have an automobile financing contract with American Mutual Services Corporation of New York, a company that was granted this contract at the time it was being investigated by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee because of a large number of complaints by servicemen that the firm engaged in sharp practices.

You may recall that a special hearing was held in Newark, New Jersey by Congressman Minish which dealt primarily with American Mutual Services Corporation.

I am informed now that the Department and the exchanges are contemplating bringing in other financial companies and financial institutions to the exchanges for the purpose of providing financing for servicemen.

One of the companies under consideration, it has been reported, is the University National Bank of College Park, Maryland. This bank sought permission from officials in your office to engage in certain practices that were contrary to military regulations. After the bank was denied permission to engage in these practices, it enlisted the services of a high-ranking Army legal officer who apparently is condoning these practices, which include the payment of fees to retired officers and semi-military groups such as wives' clubs for soliciting accounts for the bank.

Recently, the Department of Defense made a tremendous step forward in helping servicemen with their financial problems by establishing credit unions throughout the Federal Republic of Germany. And, for the past few years, the Department of Defense has taken an active role in assisting credit unions in the United States in better performing their role in helping servicemen. It would appear that much of the work done by the Department of Defense would be negated if questionable financial institutions were allowed to operate through the exchange systems. Once the Department of Defense gives its approval to companies operating out of the exchange, the Department becomes a party to any sharp practices engaged in by these companies. Such a situation occurred in Okinawa where the Air Force allowed an automobile broker to sell cars on Air Force installations in return for 2 percent of the sales of the broker. The broker fraudulently obtained thousands of dollars from servicemen but failed to deliver the cars. The servicemen dealt with this company because they felt since the Air Force had allowed the company to operate on the post that it must have been a reliable firm. Such a situation could easily occur if additional finance companies and other financial institutions are allowed to operate out of exchanges.

It would be appreciated if your office would give careful consideration to the advisability of expanding the financing program in exchange systems and to the desirability of continuing renewal of existing contracts.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

VICE PRESIDENT CONDEMNS TRIAL OF CITIZENS OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA BY COURTS OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I have obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include the full text of statements, first, by the Vice President of the United States and the permanent Ambassador to the United Nations on the trial of citizens of South-West Africa in the courts of South Africa which later resulted in their conviction and sentencing to long terms of imprisonment; second, by the court of South Africa prior to the rendering of its verdict; and, third, by one of the defendants before the Supreme Court of South Africa on February 1, 1968.

There follows excerpts from the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on January 6, 1968:

On the third anniversary of the OAU, President Johnson set forth our position: "The foreign policy of the United States," the President said, "is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country and we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

Nowhere are these rights more challenged than today in Southern Africa.

The case of South West Africa is but one case in point. But it contains all the elements of tragedy which characterize this situation.

My government, through all legal and practical means, has tried—both alone and together with other members of the United Nations—to persuade South Africa to change her policies and practices with respect to South West Africa. We shall persist in these efforts.

In 1966, we joined the majority of the United Nations General Assembly in declaring that South Africa had failed to carry out the terms of the mandate over South West Africa. And that the UN henceforth assumed responsibility for the territory.

The South African government is now trying 32 citizens of South West Africa—originally 37—on charges of terrorism.

This trial is being conducted in Pretoria, over 1,000 miles from the homes of the accused. The charges—made under a South African law enacted as much as a year after the alleged crime—could lead to sentences of death.

That trial is a farce. It is based on a law that provided for the retroactive political persecution of wards of the international community. It raises fundamental questions regarding international norms of behavior.

Great legal and human issues are involved here. We believe that the rights and well-being of the 32 are the legitimate concern of all the international community.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the early days of American independence: "All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man . . . the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God."

FULL TEXT OF AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S STATEMENT TO U.N.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the statement of Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. representative to the United Nations, in plenary, concerning South-West Africa, December 14, 1967:

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S STATEMENT TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America). Mr. President, before I begin my statement I should like to say to you how pleased I am to have this opportunity to make it while you are in the Chair.

The position of the United Nations regarding the relationship between South Africa and South West Africa is clear. It was expressed in the overwhelming approval of the General Assembly's resolution on this question more than a year ago. That resolution which the United States fully supported was, as I said at the time, intrinsically sound. South Africa's own actions in breach of its obligations, its disavowal of the mandate, and its disregard of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice provided the basis for the General Assembly's decision that South Africa's mandate for South West Africa was terminated and that henceforth South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is on the basis of this decision that the United Nations has subsequently acted. Members of the United Nations have not always agreed with unanimity on courses of action, but uppermost in our minds have always been the rights of the inhabitants of South West Africa, and the obligations of the international community not only to preserve those rights, but also to seek their full enjoyment for the inhabitants.

Now, if South Africa's own actions led to the forfeit of her rights in South West Africa and formed the basis of the United Nations decision to terminate South Africa's mandate, what have been South Africa's subsequent actions? Unquestionably, the actions of the South African Government since 27 October 1966, reaffirm the wisdom of the General Assembly's decision and constitute the best refutation of South Africa's hollow and unconvincing contention that it administer South West Africa "in the spirit of the Mandate entrusted to it by the League of Nations, and has no intention of abdicating its responsibilities towards the people of South West Africa."

South African proposals earlier this year to impose and promote the fragmentation of the Territory under the guise of self-determination and to achieve piecemeal annexation under the guise of administrative efficiency must be opposed because of their potential long-term harmful effect. South Africa's imposition in South West Africa of its universally condemned policy of apartheid should be a matter of deep concern for all of us. Moreover, these proposals represent clear defiance of the General Assembly's wise injunction that South Africa refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, administrative, political, or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa.

I should like to analyze in some detail the atrocious Terrorism Act, under which thirty-seven South West Africans were charged and brought to trial under conditions which are repugnant to all who believe in justice under law. This Act is significant because of its immediate implication in terms of human lives and its long-run effect in terms of an attempt to break the will of South West Africans to achieve their right of self-determination. The Act, promulgated after South Africa's lawful authority for the Territory had terminated, represents not only South African defiance of the United Nations, but also further proof of South Africa's determination to flout the spirit and terms of the League of Nations Mandate.

Three months ago, on 12 September, the Special Committee of this Assembly called upon the South African Government to release the accused immediately. That Government has ignored that call. At that time, the United States representative, noting that neither lawlessness nor the absence of a lawfully functioning independent judiciary could be contemplated, succinctly stated the reasons why the application of the Terrorism Act to South West Africa was inadmissible. It is still inadmissible. And because it is inadmissible, I have no hesitancy in commenting on this prosecution, which, under ordinary rules, since the matter would be *sub judice*, would not be an appropriate matter for discussion.

In the twenty-year discussion of apartheid in the United Nations, United States representatives frequently have had occasion to comment on legislation passed to implement apartheid. Surely the Terrorism Act rivals the worst of the legislation and, as long as it exists, constitutes a self-repudiation of South Africa's claim to a tradition of respect for the rule of law. Lest some say that this judgment is too harsh, let the terms of the Act speak for themselves:

1. It is retroactive to so-called "offences" performed five years ago.

2. It places upon the accused the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not perform acts, harmless in themselves, with the intent to commit a crime.

3. It subjects persons found guilty of what South Africa calls "terroristic activities" to the penalty provided for treason—death by hanging—or, in any case, imprisonment for life or for not less than five years.

4. It authorizes any commissioned police officer to arrest without warrant persons he believes may have violated the Act or who might be useful as potential witnesses, and to detain them indefinitely, without bail, without recourse to the courts or counsel and without the right to receive visits from family or friends.

5. It allows the Government to try jointly persons accused of separate violations, thereby permitting the guilt of the accused to be judged in a mass trial.

6. It permits a person acquitted of one charge to be tried again on other charges arising out of the same acts.

7. Finally it defines offences with such vagueness as to approach absurdity, if its consequences were not so serious. For example, any person who intentionally "embarrass(es)" the administration of the affairs of the State or who encourages "feelings of hostility between the White and other inhabitants of the Republic" is a "terrorist." Other offences which might otherwise be misdemeanours—for example, obstructing traffic—are likewise made subject to a hanging sentence.

It is the nature of this Act and its unconstitutionality in the court of human and public opinion that compels my comments today, as I have said, in a case on which normally I would not comment because it is *sub judice*.

Who are the defendants at present being tried under this Act? Why were they held without charge, incommunicado and in solitary confinement for up to 400 days? What is the significance of their trial 1,000 miles from their homes in a court guarded by sten-gun armed policemen and police dogs? In the answers to these questions are the principal elements of the tragedy of South West Africa. They illuminate the whole range of the problem before the General Assembly today.

Those defendants are not well known like Nelson Mandela or the Nobel Peace Prize winner, the late lamented Chief Albert Luthuli. However, they too are men who have sought a future for their homeland in which they and the overwhelming majority, who are non-white, may participate in governing their own affairs, free from the restrictions and the discrimination of apartheid. In most democratic societies they would be able to pursue their goals through speeches and publications and would not be subject to hanging under the gross charge of "embarrassing" the Government or promoting a "spirit of hostility."

But to seek the goals of free men in the international Territory of South West Africa is to be subjected to increasing restrictions, culminating in this declaration of terror by the South Africa Parliament on 12 June 1967. Out of these restrictions grows desperation and in that desperation some have found no alternative to violence as an expression of the determination to be free.

The United States does not condone violence. The United States does condemn the brutality of a Government whose official policies have bred violence by closing avenues of peaceful dissent in South West Africa, thereby generating the very behaviour it seeks to punish.

Most disconcerting of all is the possibility that the full story has not been told, since international opinion stands in the way. How many South West Africans who have committed the "crime" of desiring to attain elementary human rights are being held without charge in solitary or other confinement, without knowledge of family, without access to counsel, with no hope of fair trial except under conditions of spurious legality? How many others, if finally brought to trial, will find that serious suggestions of assault during detention are ignored on the basis of a bald denial by a prosecution witness?

As a Member of this international community, however, we have a right and a responsibility, expressed in our co-sponsorship and support of the resolution before us in document A/L.536, to call upon the South African Government to provide us with complete and straightforward answers. We have a right and a responsibility to call upon the South African Government to halt those prosecutions, to release and repatriate those South West Africans and to cease the illegal application of that Act in the Territory. This we do with all the vigour at our command.

I would not wish to conclude my statement tonight without referring to the extreme and ridiculous allegations which we have heard in the past several days with regard to the implementation by the United States of the Untied Nations embargo on the supply of arms and military equipment to South Africa. My country has adhered scrupulously to the terms of that embargo. Despite this unequivocal position, which I reaffirm, on the implementation of the Security Council's resolution on the shipment of arms and military material the United States has been falsely cited by two delegations during this debate for alleged violations in this field. I should like to mention those allegations and insinuations briefly and to refute them categorically.

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that the United States and certain other countries ". . . continue to deliver bombers to the South African racists, as well as air-to-air missiles and various types of small arms" (1628th meeting, p. 57).

It is significant that the Soviet delegation did not provide—nor could it—any details on this sweeping allegation either in the statement from which I have quoted or in its earlier statement on South West Africa. On earlier occasions when similar statements have been made my delegation has directly challenged the Soviet representative to furnish details—details which the Soviet delegation never has provided and could not provide. Those charges were fabricated out of thin air. It is obviously impossible for the Soviet Union to provide details because they do not exist. Faced with that fact, other delegations have resorted to inference and insinuation rather than direct statements such as the one I have quoted. The representative of Hungary, speaking on 11 December 1967, said that: "According to press reports in March 1967, the South African Army and Air Force were interested in an American executive aircraft" (1624th meeting, p. 46).

I cannot confirm or deny exactly what possible purchases interest South African military authorities, but I can deny categorically the suggestion, which the representative of Hungary obviously sought to get across, that the United States is furnishing such aircraft. We are not furnishing any such aircraft to South Africa.

These citations serve to illustrate the extent to which the delegation of the Soviet Union and other Communist delegations with similar intentions go in their frantic efforts to use the debate on South West Africa as one more device for launching attacks on the United States.

While the United States and other countries continue to enforce strictly an embargo on the sale of arms and military equipment to South Africa, that country continues to receive large quantities of modern and sophisticated weapons. The real sources of those weapons are not mentioned by the Soviet representative. Those who criticize the United States, which scrupulously enforces the embargo, might better direct themselves to those countries which do not do so and to ways by which the embargo might be made more effective.

The Assembly's action on South West Africa last autumn was historic, ending a long-standing mandate for just and good cause. The United States will do its utmost, as I promised from this rostrum, by all appropriate and peaceful means to help carry through to fruition the aims which are so broadly shared and which are embodied in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). We will provide full and faithful support to the people of South West Africa in the peaceful pursuit of their goals, in their efforts to assert and to exercise fully the rights to which all men everywhere aspire and are entitled.

REMARKS OF TRIAL JUDGE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, continuing in my account of the trial of South-West Africans in the courts of South Africa, I extend my remarks to include the remarks of Judge Ludorf on sentencing in the trial of the 37:

On January 26th when announcing his findings on the guilt of the 30 accused, the Trial Court Judge said, addressing Advocate Phillips (for defense):

Mr. Phillips, I am prepared to grant the remand that you seek for the purpose of leading evidence in mitigation after you have had an opportunity of considering the judgment.

I think, however, that it would simplify your task and possibly shorten the proceedings if I indicate to you now what my basic approach to the question of sentence is.

In my view it has been proved that the accused, because of the level of their civilisation became the easy misguided dupes of communist indoctrination. Had it not been for the active financial and practical assistance which the accused received from the Governments of Moscow, Peking and other countries, they would never have found themselves in their present predicament. I also think that had it not been for loud-mouthed moral support and incitement by representatives of foreign countries and the persons who published SWAPO newsletters, who have absolutely no respect for the truth, the accused would never have embarked, on their futile and ill-conceived exploits.

It also weighs with me that all the crimes whereof the accused have been convicted on the main count were committed before the Act was passed by Parliament and that this is the first trial in which persons are charged with a contravention of the Act because of the retroactive effect thereof.

For these reasons I have decided not to impose the death penalty in the case of any one of the accused. I will, however, take into account the common law offences which the accused have been proved to have committed in the assessment of the appropriate sentence, although they were not so charged.

MOVING ADDRESS BY CONVICTED DEFENDANT TO COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we who are so fortunate as to live in a land where our legal rights and civil liberties are protected and cherished, sometimes need reminding of our blessings. We who enjoy freedom of speech and representative government may forget that there are people elsewhere in the world less fortunate. Often they are forced to suffer in silence, but occasionally the veil is lifted a trifle and a voice is heard crying out for help for the afflicted.

This happened recently in Pretoria where 37 South-West Africans have been charged by South Africa under an act so unjust that it offends accepted civilized legal principles and grossly violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

One of the defendants, Mr. Toivo Herman Ja Toiva, after being pronounced guilty, addressed the court in mitigation of sentence. He made such an eloquent statement that I am placing it in the Record. It captures the essence of his plight, a plight which this Government has repeatedly protested. His is the plea of a people struggling to be free. Unfortunately his plea so far has had little effect on the South African Government. On February 9 the judge sentenced Mr. Toiva to 20 years in jail and 19 others to life imprisonment.

We can only hope that the censure of world opinion might yet persuade the Government of South Africa in the direction of clemency.

I am privileged to have the full text of Mr. Ja Toiva's moving address to present for reading by my colleagues and by the people of our country:

STATEMENT OF TOIVO HERMAN JA TOIVA BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA, TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL DIVISION, ON FEBRUARY 1, 1968

My Lord, we find ourselves here in a foreign country, convicted under laws made by people whom we have always considered as foreigners. We find ourselves tried by a judge who is not our countryman and who has not shared our background.

When this case started, Counsel tried to show that this court had no jurisdiction to try us. What they had to say was of a technical and legal nature. The reasons may mean little to some of us, but it is the deep feeling of all of us that we should not be tried here in Pretoria.

You, my Lord, decided that you had the right to try us, because your Parliament gave you that right. That ruling has not and could not have changed our feelings. We are Namibians and not South Africans. We do not now, and will not in the future recognize your right to govern us; to make laws for us in which we had no say; to treat our country as if it were your property and us as if you were our masters. We have always regarded South Africa as an intruder in our country. This is how we have always felt and this is how we feel now, and it is on this basis that we have faced this trial.

I speak of "we" because I am trying to speak not only for myself, but for others as well, and especially for those of my fellow accused who have not had the benefit of any education. I think also that when I say "we" the overwhelming majority of non-white people in South West Africa would like to be included.

We are far away from our homes; not a single member of our families has come to visit us, never mind be present at our trial. The Pretoria jail, the police headquarters at Compol, where we were interrogated and where statements were extracted from us, and this court is all we have seen of Pretoria. We have been cut off from our people and the world. We all wondered whether the headmen would have repeated some of their lies if our people had been present in court to hear them.

The South African Government has again shown its strength by detaining us for as long as it pleased; keeping some of us in solitary confinement for 300 to 400 days and bringing us to its capital to try us. It has shown its strength by passing an act especially for us and having it made retrospective. It has even chosen an ugly name to call us by. One's own are called patriots, or at least rebels; your opponents are called terrorists.

A court can only do justice in political cases if it understands the position of those that it has in front of it. The state has not only wanted to convict us, but also to justify the policy of the South African Government. We will not even try to present the other side of the picture, because we know that a court has not suffered in the same way as we have, can not understand us. This is perhaps why it is said that one should be tried by one's equals. We have felt from the very time of our arrest that we were not being tried by our equals but by our masters, and that those who have brought us to trial very often do not even do us the courtesy of calling us by our surnames. Had we been tried by our equals, it would not have been necessary to have any discussion about grievances. They would have been known to those set to judge us.

It suits the Government of South Africa to say that it is ruling South West Africa with the consent of the people. This is not true. Our organization, South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), is the largest political organization in South West Africa. We consider ourselves a political party. We know that whites do not think of blacks as politicians—only as agitators. Many of our people, through no fault of their own, have had no education at all. This does not mean that they do not know what they want. A man does not have to be formally educated to know that he wants to live with his family where he wants to live, and not where an official chooses to tell him to live; to move about freely and not require a pass; to earn a decent wage; to be free to work for the person of his choice for as long as he wants; and finally, to be ruled by the people that he wants to be ruled by, and not those who rule him because they have more guns than he has.

Our grievances are called "so-called" grievances. We do not believe South Africa is in South West Africa in order to provide facilities and work for non-whites. It is there for its own selfish reasons. For the first forty years it did practically nothing to fulfill its "sacred trust". It only concerned itself with the welfare of the whites. Since 1962 because of the pressure from inside by the non-whites and especially my organization, and because of the limelight placed on our country by the world, South Africa has been trying to do a bit more. It rushed the Bantustan Report so that it would at least have something to say at the World Court.

Only one who is not white and has suffered the way we have can say whether our grievances are real or "so-called".

Those of us who have some education, together with our uneducated bretheren, have always struggled to get freedom. The idea of our freedom is not liked by South Africa. It has tried in this court to prove through the mouths of a couple of its paid chiefs and a paid official that SWAPO does not represent the people of South West Africa. If the Government of South Africa were sure that SWAPO did not represent the innermost feelings of the people in South West Africa, it would not have taken the trouble to make it impossible for SWAPO to advocate its peaceful policy.

South African officials want to believe that SWAPO is an irresponsible organization and that it is an organization that resorts to the level of telling people not to get vaccinated. As much as white South Africans may want to believe this, this is not SWAPO. We sometimes feel that is what the Government would like SWAPO to be. It may be true that some member or even members of SWAPO somewhere refused to do this. The reason for such refusal is that some people in our part of the world have lost confidence in the governors of our country and they are not prepared to accept even the good that they are trying to do.

Your Government, my Lord, undertook a very special responsibility when it was awarded the Mandate over us after the First World War. It assumed a sacred trust to guide us towards independence and to prepare us to take our place among the nations of the world. We believe that South Africa has abused that trust because of its belief in racial supremacy (that white people have been chosen by God to rule the world) and Apartheid. We believe that for fifty years South Africa has failed to promote the development of our people. Where are our trained men? The wealth of our country has been used to train your people for leadership and the sacred duty of preparing the indigenous people to take their place among the nations of the world has been ignored.

I know of no case in the last twenty years of a parent who did not want his child to go to school if the facilities were available, but even if, as it was said, a small percentage of parents wanted their children to look after cattle, I am sure that South Africa was strong enough to impose its will on this, as it has done in so many other respects. To us it has always seemed that our rulers wanted to keep us backward for their benefit.

1963 for us was to be the year of our freedom. From 1960 it looked as if South Africa could not oppose the world forever. The world is important to us. In the same way as all laughed in court when they heard that an old man tried to bring down a helicopter with a bow and arrow, we laughed when South Africa said that it would oppose the world. We knew that the world was divided, but as time went on it at least agreed that South Africa had no right to rule us.

I do not claim that it is easy for men of different races to live at peace with one another. I myself had no experience of this in my youth, and at first it surprised me that men of different races could live together in peace. But now I know it to be true and to be something for which we must strive. The South African Government creates hostility by separating people and emphasizing their differences. We believe that by living together people will learn to lose their fear of each other. We also believe that this fear which some of the whites have of Africans is based on their desire to be superior and privileged and that when whites see themselves as part of South West Africa, sharing with us all its hopes and troubles, then that fear will disappear. Separation is said to be a natural process. But why, then, is it imposed by force, and why then is it that whites have the superiority?

Headmen are used to oppress us. This is not the first time that foreigners have tried to rule indirectly—We know that only those who are prepared to do what their masters tell them become headmen. Most of those who had some feeling for their people and who wanted independence have been intimidated into accepting the policy from above. Their guns and sticks are used to make people say they support them.

I have come to know that our people cannot expect progress as a gift from anyone, be it the United Nations or South Africa. Progress is something we shall have to struggle and work for. And I believe that the only way in which we shall be able and fit to secure that progress is to learn from our own experience and mistakes.

Your Lordship emphasized in your judgment the fact that our arms came from Communist countries, and also that words commonly used by Communists were to be found in our documents. But My Lord, in the documents produced by the State there is another type of language. It appears even more often than the former. Many documents finish up with an appeal to the Almighty to guide us in our struggle for freedom. It is the wish of the South African Government that we should be discredited in the Western world. This is why it calls our struggle a Communist plot; but this will not be believed by the world. The world knows that we are not interested in ideologies.

We feel that the world as a whole has a special responsibility towards us. This is because the land of our fathers was handed over to South Africa by a world body. It is a divided world, but it is a matter of hope for us that it at least agrees about one thing—that we are entitled to freedom and justice.

Other mandated territories have received their freedom. The judgment of the World Court was a bitter disappointment to us. We felt betrayed and we believed that South Africa would never fulfill its trust. Some felt that we would secure our freedom only by fighting for it. We knew that the power of South Africa is overwhelming, but we also knew that our case is a just one and our situation intolerable—why should we not also receive our freedom?

We are sure that the world's efforts to help us in our plight will continue, whatever South Africans may call us.

We do not expect that independence will end our troubles, but we do believe that our people are entitled—as are all peoples—to rule themselves. It is not really a question of whether South Africa treats us well or badly, but that South West Africa is our country and we wish to be our own masters.

There are some who will say that they are sympathetic with [our cause, but unwilling to condone][1] violence. I would answer that I am not by nature a man of violence and I believe that violence is a sin against God and my fellow men. SWAPO itself was a non-violent organization, but the South African Government is not truly interested in whether opposition is violent or non-violent. It does not wish to hear any opposition to Apartheid. Since 1963, SWAPO meetings have been banned. It is true that it is the tribal authorities who have done so, but they worked with the South African Government, which has never lifted a finger in favor of political freedom. We have found ourselves voteless in our own country and deprived of the right to meet and state our own political opinions.

Is it surprising that in such times my countrymen have taken up arms? Violence is truly fearsome, but who would not defend his property and himself against a robber? And we believe that South Africa has robbed us of our country.

I have spent my life working in SWAPO, which is an ordinary political party like any other. Suddenly we in SWAPO found that a war situation had arisen and that our colleagues and South Africa were facing each other in the field of battle. Although I had not been responsible for organizing my people militarily and although I believed we were unwise to fight the might of South Africa while we were so weak, I could not refuse to help them when the time came.

My Lord, you found it necessary to brand me a coward. During the Second World War, when it became evident that both my country and your country were threatened by the dark clouds of Nazism, I risked my life for both of them, wearing a uniform with orange bands on it.

But some of your countrymen when called

---

[1] Unclear in transmission, assumed.

to battle to defend civilization resorted to sabotage against their own fatherland. I volunteered to face German bullets, and as a guard of military installations, both in South West Africa and the Republic, was prepared to be the victim of their sabotage. Today they are our masters and are considered the heroes, and I am called the coward.

When I consider my country, I am proud that my countrymen have taken up arms for their people and I believe that anyone who calls himself a man would not despise them.

In 1964 the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) in South Africa were suppressed. This convinced me that we were too weak to face South Africa's force by waging battle. When some of my country's soldiers came back I foresaw the trouble there would be for SWAPO, my people and me personally. I tried to do what I could to prevent my people from going into the bush. In my attempts I became unpopular with some of my people, but this, too, I was prepared to face. Decisions of this kind are not easy to make. My loyalty is to my country. My organization could not work properly—it could not even hold meetings. I had no answer to the question "Where has your non-violence got us?" Whilst the World Court judgment was pending, I at least had that to fall back on. When we failed, after years of waiting, I had no answer to give to my people.

Even though I did not agree that people should go into the bush, I could not refuse to help them when I knew that they were hungry.

I even passed on the request for dynamite. It was not an easy decision. Another man might have been able to say "I will have nothing to do with that sort of thing." I was not, and I could not remain a spectator in the struggle of my people for their freedom.

I am a loyal Namibian and I could not betray my people to their enemies. I admit that I decided to assist those who had taken up arms. I know that the struggle will be long and bitter. I also know that my people will wage that struggle, whatever the cost.

Only when we are granted our independence will the struggle stop. Only when our human dignity is restored to us, as equals of the whites, will there be peace between us.

We believe that South Africa has a choice—either to live at peace with us or to subdue us by force. If you choose to crush us and impose your will on us then you not only betray your trust, but you will live in security for only so long as your power is greater than ours. No South African will live at peace in South West Africa, for each will know his security is based on force and that without force he will face rejection by the people of South West Africa.

My co-accused and I have suffered. We are not looking forward to our imprisonment. We do not, however, feel that our efforts and sacrifice have been wasted. We believe that human suffering has its effect even on those who impose it. We hope that what has happened will persuade the whites of South Africa that we and the world may be right and they may be wrong. Only when white South Africans realize this and act on it, will it be possible for us to stop our struggle for freedom and justice in the land of our birth.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMEN MARINES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I speak with pardonable pride today of the pending 25th anniversary of the women marines as we know them today. Legislation initially sponsored by our late beloved Representative from Minnesota, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, and signed into law on February 13, 1943, is a quarter-century old this month.

Contributing largely to the reputation which the women marines have rightly earned for dedicated service over the past 25 years is the leadership and inspiration provided by the women who have served as their Directors. Three of these—Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter, their first Director, Col. Julia E. Hamblet, and Col. Barbara J. Bishop, who heads them today—come from Massachusetts. Colonel Streeter was born at Brookline, Colonel Hamblet in Winchester, and Colonel Bishop in Boston.

In 1943, women joined the Marine Corps to "Free a Marine To Fight." Today's woman marine enlists to serve her country, as did the many hundreds before her; and, like them, she does her job well.

"Free a Marine To Fight" was their World War II recruiting slogan, and the women lived up to it. Within a year of activation, Women Reserves were serving at every major Marine Corps installation in the United States—in more than 200 different specialist assignments. Besides the expected clerical jobs, they were working in communications, quartermaster, post exchange, motor transport, food services, personnel, intelligence, administration, recruiting, community relations, education, legal assistance, and photography. In aviation, their skills ranged from parachute rigger to Link trainer instructor, to aerologist, to control tower operator.

Within another 4 months, women accounted for 85 percent of the enlisted strength of Marine Corps headquarters and from one-half to two-thirds of all permanent personnel at major posts and stations in the United States. When regulations limiting them to stateside duty were relaxed, the first contingent of Women Reserves arrived at Hawaii; and before the war was over, nearly a thousand women had served with the Marine Garrison Forces at Pearl Harbor and at the air station at nearby Ewa.

Exactly how many marines the Women Reserves freed to fight was often a subject for speculation. Their peak World War II strength—nearly 19,000—approximated the size of a Marine Corps division, and Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, the second wartime Commandant of the marines, once remarked that the Women Reserves could "feel responsible for putting the 6th Marine Division in the field; for without the women filling the jobs throughout the Marine Corps, there would not have been sufficient men available to form that division."

In 1946, when the war was over, the women's units were quickly demobilized; but a small nucleus of trained women was retained to set up a postwar organization through which an expanded Women's Reserve could be rapidly and efficiently activated should the need arise again.

From 1946 until passage of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of June 12, 1948, there were no more than a hundred volunteer women on active duty with the corps. Then, with authority to accept women into the regular Marine Corps, came a slow but gradual buildup of women's units until, when Korean war broke out, 13 organized Woman Reserve platoons were called up for duty when the male Reserves were mobilized in the summer of 1950. Although their numbers did not approach their World War II strength, these women marines—like their predecessors—freed marines for combat duty.

Today, with the Marine Corps heavily committed in Southeast Asia, its women continue in their traditional role—not only in stateside jobs, but in overseas assignments undreamed of by those who set the tradition of freeing marines to fight. Within the past 3 years, women marines have seen duty in England, France, Germany, Italy, Panama, and in the Dominican Republic. Hawaii, long their most distant outpost, has become a stopover for women on the way to duty in the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, and South Vietnam.

On last November 8, when President Johnson signed into law a bill giving women in the armed services equal promotion opportunity with their male counterparts, he remarked:

> Our Armed Forces literally could not operate effectively or efficiently without our women. So, both as President, and as the Commander in Chief, I am very pleased and very proud to have this measure sent to me by the Congress.

Such high tribute to their worth stands as inspiration to all women marines as they enter their silver anniversary year. But, with or without recognition—and this truth they have already proved—so long as marines must defend freedom by force of arms, women marines will stand fast in the tradition that is as old as their service, freeing marines to fight.

The country is proud of these women marines, just as they have shown by their lives their pride in their country. Fully accepted by the men whose marine green uniform they have shared with distinction for 25 years, today's women marines deserve our happiest felicitations and best wishes. A grateful nation marks the passage of time in which they have been, like the men of the corps, "Semper Fidelis."

I am indeed happy to salute the women marines and ask that my colleagues share with me the pleasure of doing them honor.

In my remarks, I include a copy of a letter I have sent to Col. Barbara J. Bishop, U.S. Marine Corps, Director of Women Marines:

Col. BARBARA J. BISHOP, USMC,
Director of Women Marines,
Headquarters Marine Corps,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLONEL BISHOP: Observing with interest the approaching Silver Anniversary of the Women Marines, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you, and to all Women Marines past and present, my sincere best wishes for continuing success in your service to your Corps and Country.

Since the founding of the United States Marine Corps Women's Reserve on February

13, 1943, the dedication to duty shown by the women of the Marine Corps has earned the respect and admiration of all those who are aware of their splendid contribution to the spirit and traditions of the United States Marine Corps.

I am particularly proud to note that of the five women who have headed the Women Marines since 1943, three are from my own home State. Massachusetts gave the Women's Reserve its first Director in the person of Colonel Ruth Cheney Streeter, who was born in Brookline. Colonel Julia E. Hamblet, youngest director of women in the armed services, who served two terms as your Director—first as a Woman Reserve and later as a Regular—was born in Winchester, Massachusetts. And you, entering your fifth year as Director of Women Marines, claim Boston as your place of birth. Massachusetts can be just proud of three such illustrious daughters, and indeed of all its women (and they are many) who have served our Country in the uniform of the United States Marines.

I hope you will convey to your Women Marines, gathered to celebrate their Twenty-fifth Anniversary, my heartiest congratulations and a fully merited "Well Done" for their contribution to the defense of our Nation.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

PRESIDENT'S ANTICRIME PROGRAM

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues who have already praised President Johnson's omnibus anticrime message. The President's forceful and succinct statement on one of the crucial issues confronting urban America, documents without doubt the commitment he holds for improving the quality of our citizens' lives.

Of particular interest to me is the President's recommendation that the model cities program be required to include crime prevention and control plans in the proposals of those presently designated cities as well as those designated later. As a representative of East St. Louis, one of the 63 cities selected, I am pleased by the recommendation. As one of the four cities which has had its work program approved, I am happy to report that East St. Louis' 5-year master plan contains provisions for a model anticrime program, which includes a proposal for improving police-community relations, one of the keystones of any well-designed anticrime program.

I look forward to the implementation of President Johnson's program in East St. Louis.

MOVEMENT NEEDED IN MIDDLE EAST DISPUTE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since my recent attendance in England at the Ditchley House Conference on the Middle East and a subsequent trip to several countries of that area, I have a heightened sense of the dangerous nature of the Arab-Israel impasse, a new realization of the perils which its continuance holds for the United States and a strong conviction that its settlement is urgently necessary.

Not only is the resolution of this dispute desirable in itself, but its continuance has implications for the future security of U.S. interests in the area that must cause us serious concern.

The United Nations has voted a resolution which furnishes the broad basis upon which a settlement may be founded. Of course, it is somewhat general in its language, but this is necessarily so since any initial proposal for a settlement of any dispute must leave room for changes of position and changes of language. This being said, however, this British resolution—which is essentially the same as a resolution previously offered by the United States—contains all the basic points at dispute between the parties. These include establishment of boundaries, recognition of status, freedom of navigation, and settlement of the refugee problem.

It is true that some of the problems will be difficult to solve and agreement will be hard to achieve, but the point which I wish to make is that some movement of the parties toward solution is necessary and time is of the essence.

The passage of time, unfortunately, has not here—as in some cases—brought a relaxation of tensions, but rather an increase. Feelings on both sides remain strong. The U.S.S.R. has spent billions of dollars rearming the Arab States and training their armies on the one side and on the other, the Israelis have destroyed United Arab Republic refineries and have fired upon Egyptian ships in the Suez Canal. Whether rightly or wrongly done, these acts demonstrate that the fires of potential combat burn close to the surface and may flame into a conflagration at any time.

Under the U.N. resolution, Gunnar Jarring is presently in the Middle East and has been there since December 12, 1967. He has talked with various parties to the war of June 5 and has sought to elicit statements of position which might form the first faint foundation for a settlement. In fact, the immediate objective is to gain some recognition for his commission since Israel questions its competence to act in the controversy, it being the position of that nation that face-to-face talks with the Arab nations must be held to provide greater assurance that any agreements reached will have sanction and permanence.

I regret to say that the Jarring mission has accomplished little in the way of achieving a start of discussions. The Arabs insist on Israel withdrawal to the boundaries of June 5, 1967. The Israelis insist on face-to-face discussions without any intermediary, meaning Mr. Jarring. It seems clear to me that these positions will not be accepted by the opposite parties to the dispute. Therefore, unless one believes in the continuation of the present impasse—and there are elements on both sides who for differing reasons advocate its continuance—it is clear that some change of position will be necessary if a resolution is ever to be achieved.

I restate my belief, then, that time is not on the side of agreement. Solutions that were possible 6 months ago are feasible no longer. Public opinion is not what it was in June or July. A return of the Jarring mission to the U.N. with a report of "no cooperation" will not enhance the standing of the recalcitrants.

I believe that a negotiated settlement of this dispute is essential for the peace of the area and the world. A continuation of the present impasse holds increasing promise of renewed and more extensive hostilities as time goes by and attitudes harden and passions rise. There still is a chance to get the wheels turning but it decreases in scope every day that passes.

I feel that it would be a tragedy if Mr. Jarring were to come back to the U.N. with empty hands and report that there was no disposition to even talk about a settlement. The Arab States might then move to implement the resolution with French and Russian support. It seems to me urgently to be desired that both sides search their consciences to see whether or not some possibility exists that a beginning of discussions may be had. In private labor disputes, we say that the parties should "bargain collectively in good faith." That is a fair statement of the objective here. And just as the failure to reach agreement through collective bargaining results in strikes which are disastrous to all concerned, so here a continuation of intransigence may eventually end in a wider and more deadly conflict, that might well not be limited to the parties to last year's dispute, but might draw in the major powers, including the United States.

I suggest, too, that our Government forcibly assert its belief that negotiations are vital for world peace and that the parties should set about reexamining their positions and that Mr. Jarring should be sent back to the U.N. with evidence of material progress.

It is my belief that responsible people on both sides want a resolution of this dispute and the achievement of standards that will have some guarantee of permanency.

I am confident that great progress can be made in this direction if action is taken now. Perhaps neither side will achieve its maximum demands, but such is never the case in peaceful negotiations, and it certainly is never the case in resolution by war. On the other hand, a real attempt at negotiation under the auspices of the U.N. and with its results protected by U.N. sanction should bring a more acceptable arrangement than has previously existed and one which will have less potential for future trouble.

LET US IMPROVE OUR SPENDING AND BUDGET PRACTICES

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal crisis that presently confronts our Government emphasizes with particular clarity the need to establish priorities for the expenditure of the limited funds at the Nation's disposal and the need for a constant reevaluation of the objects and programs on which money is to be spent.

In the executive branch, personnel and programs become entrenched and annual appropriation requests, each higher than the last, are routinely made. While congressional scrutiny may from time to time focus upon particular activities, there is little sustained effort made to determine the effectiveness of, and necessity for, executive programs and the relation of their cost to the total budget. As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I am well aware of the vital role that legislative oversight can play in this area, but all too often, it is only after great waste and damage have resulted in a public outcry that any inquiry is undertaken.

We have, moreover, recently been made aware of the lack of coordination in the work of the various appropriations subcommittees. It would seem from what we have been told that there is little opportunity for each subcommittee to assess the effect of its action in the light of what its fellows have done and in terms of overall expenditures for the year.

The meat-axe approach to expenditure reduction has often been deplored, but never abandoned. Use of this method is encouraged by the relative ease and lack of discrimination with which it can be exercised.

All this suggests the need for an independent panel to develop spending priorities and to evaluate programs in a periodic, orderly, and rational manner. I am therefore introducing today, legislation aimed at creating such a body and I hope that it will receive speedy and favorable consideration from the House.

NOT MEANT TO BE POPULAR

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the fact that the popularity of the United States is at an all-time low throughout the world. We should have learned the lesson long ago that our checkbook diplomacy through our foreign aid program has not bought us friends. Those we have sought to help in South Vietnam and in South Korea are not happy about our recent decisions and actions. The hour has come for us to face the fact that what is important is not popularity, but that we do what is right and what is necessary to preserve freedom and to protect ourselves.

My friend, Mr. John Hamner, the editor of one of Florida's great daily newspapers, the Bradenton Herald, has written a very timely editorial which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial "Not Meant To Be Popular," follows:

NOT MEANT TO BE POPULAR

South Koreans are obviously angered at the United States' reaction to the Pueblo capture and the attempt by North Korean infiltrators to assassinate South Korean President Chung Hee Pak.

This anger has been spelled out officially—they don't like our private negotiations with the North Koreans to get the Americans back, and they don't like what seems, to them at least, our feeling that the Pueblo is the only one of the two outrages that's important.

South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta are giving Americans the dirty look, other reports say. So many civilians were killed or injured during American counterattacks on Viet Cong units that we're blamed for the tragic death toll.

Elsewhere, reports indicate that Americans are not the most popular people in South Vietnam in general. The war is so much more widespread and ferocious now than it was a few years back. And it appears, the Cong attacks considered, nearer an end only by nearing exhaustion of Vietnamese targets to shoot at, or rice paddies to bomb.

These are but a couple of incidents, of course. World-wide, the picture is pretty much the same.

Asians, in short, are members of the same human race as are the French, and in that human race it's a toss-up as to who dislikes America the more, the Communist nations or our friends. "Neutral" nations don't count in the contest. They're too far ahead.

But the U.S. can't shrink from the tasks of world leadership and the attempt to keep freedom as widespread as possible just because nobody likes us either very much or very long. We ought to grow up a little and stop trying to buy friendship and allies. But we ought also to grow up and realize that gold stars on the chart of world opinion aren't what counts.

Popularity isn't the national goal. Survival is. So the U.S. must learn to do what's right, when it's right, to serve that goal. And never mind who likes us or likes the decisions. The most highly regarded person at every funeral can't hear a word of the praise.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, efforts are being made at home and abroad—and this includes the Communist press—to discredit General Westmoreland.

In my opinion, these efforts are against the best interests of the United States. General Westmoreland has been given what is probably the most difficult military task that has ever been assigned to a commander of U.S. forces. He has performed well. The men he commands have performed well.

As in any war, of course, there have been pluses and minuses. To expect nothing but success against as determined a foe as we face in Vietnam under circumstances which greatly favor clandestine attack, is to expect the impossible.

We need to support our men in Vietnam, and we do. We need to support General Westmoreland under whom they serve.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has just made and to be associated with him in the sentiments expressed regarding General Westmoreland.

I think General Westmoreland has done a superb job under the most difficult circumstances imaginable.

I think that anyone who has had the opportunity to meet with him and to discuss the war in Vietnam has come away impressed by his great knowledge and his great spirit. General Westmoreland not only has a tremendous knowledge of the military, political, and economic challenges confronting us in Vietnam, but also demonstrates an inspiring spirit of determination to overcome all of the obstacles to victory in that embattled land. There may be some significance in the fact that many of the voices being heard today in criticism of General Westmoreland are voices that have led a chorus of despair and defeatism for a long time in our country. Surely these are not the voices entitled to weigh in the critical decisions on leadership for victory in Vietnam.

General Westmoreland has demonstrated his ability to rally the forces of freedom in the face of a treacherous truce-breaking attack by Communist forces, and he has remained a calm and forceful pillar of strength throughout his service in Vietnam. The Nation and free men everywhere owe him their appreciation and highest honors.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well that we pause today to pay tribute to one of the great figures of history, and one of the great Americans of all time, whose birthday anniversary is celebrated today—President Abraham Lincoln.

The life and history of Lincoln is one that will always live in the minds of human beings as long as mankind and history exist.

Lincoln looked to the future. Lincoln served as President under the most trying conditions, at a time when there were honest differences between our people, intense differences, and when the very Nation which is ours today was threatened with disunity and threatened with separation. But Lincoln persevered. He had faith and he had confidence.

It is unnecessary to recount the dark days of Lincoln's administrations, particularly his second administration. But they point up the loneliness of Presidents. They are the ones who must make the final decisions concerning the national interests of our country. They receive advice from countless sources, and properly so; but in the final analysis, the President of the United States, who is also the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, must make the ultimate decision.

When the decision involves extreme tension one way or the other, when it involves calculated risks, and when a decision for action or for inaction is made, the President of the United States is all the more lonely.

So projecting my mind into the minds of Presidents who have had these trying questions confronting them during the history of our country, I have said to myself, What would I do if I were in the President's position? I think I might have a little more appreciation of that than most Americans. I say this in no way lowering their appreciation. But I think I might have a little more appreciation because for 14 months after the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy I was next in line for succession to the Presidency of the United States. While the questions directly confront us in Congress, I am frank in stating that many of the problems of that period more directly confronted me because I would ask myself the question, What would I do if I were President of the United States?

So in times of tension, in times of strong emotionalism, it is time for the people to be tolerant and to withhold the statements that might, while our boys are fighting in different parts of the world, constitute shooting them in the back, so to speak. It might be well to develop an understanding mind instead of the cold, critical mind, as if war is being waged on the President of the United States, when our country is engaged in conflict elsewhere and our boys are fighting to preserve liberty in other parts of the world and for ourselves. I make that statement because if anyone thinks that if we would withdraw from South Vietnam, arrogant aggression would not take the next step, the next step, and the next step, just as Hitler did in the 1930's, they are living in a dream world of hope.

So I think it is well to pause today to pay tribute to one of our great Presidents and one of the great figures of history, not because of the political party of which he was a member, but as President of the United States, Chief Executive of our country, who came across the pages of history at a most trying period in our Nation's history, and who—misunderstood, condemned, villified—maintained his faith and his courage, and finally he emerged with that calm, reflective, but firm leadership of his, maintaining unity in our country and making it one Nation.

So we pause today as Americans to pay tribute to the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Two weeks ago, on January 18, this agency reported to me, and to the world, that agreement had at last been reached with the Soviet Union on a complete draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty, which has been submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva for consideration by other nations, is the most significant achievement of the Agency since its establishment seven years ago.

On January 23, I forwarded to the Congress a request that the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be extended for an additional three years. At that time I noted the role of the Agency in bringing us close to the final conclusion of a nonproliferation treaty, and pointed out that the treaty "is not a creation of the United States. It is not a creation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the creation of all nations, large and small. . . ."

While the United States and the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, have had the responsibility for preparing the draft treaty, a reading of this Report will make plain the extent to which the draft has been responsive to interests and views of the nations which do not now have nuclear weapons.

In the course of a long and arduous negotiation, we have learned much of the concerns and desires of these nations. We have learned that it is not nuclear weapons they want, but security; not the destructiveness of the atom, but its benefits. We have been made aware of the depth of worldwide concern about the nuclear arms race.

The non-nuclear states have wanted their renunciation of nuclear weapons to be matched with a binding pledge by the nuclear powers to negotiate a halt in the arms race. They have not asked that the treaty require us to stop making nuclear weapons, or to divest ourselves of those now in our arsenals.

But they have asked us to pledge ourselves to move towards that ultimate goal. They feel the restraints they will voluntarily accept give them the right to such a pledge.

In drafting the non-proliferation treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union have acknowledged that right.

Under Article VI of the draft now before the Disarmament Committee, the nuclear nations will assume a solemn treaty obligation "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures regarding cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament. . . ." It is an obligation the United States will undertake with the utmost seriousness—for it continues a policy begun in 1946, when this nation offered to place its nuclear weapons under international control. We reaffirmed that obligation at Geneva when the Disarmament Conference convened there six years ago.

A reading of this Report shows clearly that the United States is pursuing a broad program of research and negotiation in fulfillment of its commitment to disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty now under consideration is another step in that direction, as the hot line and the limited test ban treaty and the outer space agreement were before it.

No nation is more aware of the perils in the increasingly expert destructiveness of our time than the United States. I believe the Soviet Union shares this awareness.

This is why we have jointly pledged our nations to negotiate towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race.

This is why the United States urgently desires to begin discussions with the Soviet Union about the buildup of offensive and defensive missiles on both sides. Such discussions—and it is important to note that the Soviet Union has agreed to them, in principle at least—will aim at finding ways to avoid another costly and futile escalation of the arms race.

Our hopes that talks will soon begin reside in our conviction that the same mutual interest reflected in earlier agreements is present here—a mutual interest in stopping the rapid accumulation and refinement of these munitions.

The obligations of the non-proliferation treaty will reinforce our will to bring an end to the nuclear arms race. The world will judge us by our performance.

The report I am forwarding today is testimony to the skill and determination with which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William C. Foster, is supporting this nation's effort to keep the somber and grim elements of the nuclear present from obliterating the promise of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1968.*

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the transportation problems of northern Virginia have been of concern to the citizens of my district for a long period of years, as I am sure comparable problems in all of Metropolitan Washington have been of concern to various Members of the House. I would hope that all of the persons interested in a coordinated system of transportation will work together to eliminate the traffic bottlenecks we have. It may be of interest to the membership to see a letter recently received by me from the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce and enclosing a resolution passed by that body on September 26, 1963. Both of these are set forth below. The problem was pressing then, it is very acute now.

VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Richmond, Va., January 31, 1968.
Hon. WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I am sending you a copy of a resolution passed by our Board of Directors on September 26, 1963. We feel that this resolution is as pertinent today as it was then.

The resolution refers to the proposed Three Sisters Bridge. As you know, the Virginia Department of Highways is very much concerned with this project. Also, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, through the work of its Better Roads Committee is concerned with the development of our highway systems in Northern Virginia. The Chamber has also taken a strong stand on the development of Dulles International Airport which certainly would benefit from the Three Sisters Bridge and Interstate 66 construction in Northern Virginia.

In light of the recent developments concerning the Three Sisters Bridge, we simply want to renew our support of this project and to join with other Virginia organizations and the Virginia Department of Highways in seeking some solution to this problem.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

W. H. BOWDITCH,
President.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY FACILITIES IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA BY THE VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, the construction of certain vital links of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the Washington Metropolitan Area has been deferred by a Presidential Executive Order, and

Whereas, the proposed Three Sisters Bridge over the Potomac River, planned jointly by the District of Columbia and the Virginia Department of Highways, a part of Interstate Route 266 and also an essential part of the road network of Metropolitan Washington—is so affected; and

Whereas, Interstate Route 66 is being designated in Virginia to carry eight lanes of traffic from its intersection with the Dulles Access Highway in Fairfax County, to a point near the Potomac River, where two lanes are proposed to enter the District of Columbia over the Three Sisters Bridge and six lanes over the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, now under construction and restricted by law to six lanes; and

Whereas, the denial of access to the District over the Three Sisters Bridge would cause a serious traffic bottleneck in this heavily populated section of Arlington County, Virginia, already suffering from congested streets and highways; and

Whereas, the further congestion of vehicular traffic by denial of the planned outlet to and through the District of Columbia would adversely affect the business, industrial and social life of our thriving Northern Virginia area; now, therefore,

Be it resolved that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce strongly endorses and urges the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and all its connecting links on the Interstate System, by revoking the ordered deferment at the earliest possible date; and

Be it further resolved that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce has no objections generally to the proposals for mass transit, but does not agree that such proposed facilities would reduce the need for highways to the extent indicated; believing on the other hand, that all of the long-planned highway system in the Northern Virginia area will be needed even if all of the proposed transit facilities are constructed; and

Be it finally resolved that copies of this resolution be submitted to President John F. Kennedy; Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges; Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr.; Members of Congress from Virginia; the Virginia General Assembly; and the Virginia Highway Commission.

Respectfully submitted.

VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By J. T. MATHEWS, *President.*

PROTEST RALLY IN WASHINGTON THIS SUMMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, many years ago Adolf Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf." In it he told the world what he planned to do. He then proceeded to do what he planned. The world paid no attention to what he said until it was too late and he had plunged the world into a holocaust.

A number of years ago Frederic Engels and Karl Marx set forth the principles and objectives that the Communists were seeking worldwide. They and their successors since have proceeded to do just what Marx and Engels had said they were going to do. The world paid little attention until it was too late and we are now reaping the results of our apathy.

Last week in Washington, the Reverend Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael met for the purpose of making plans for a huge protest rally in Washington this summer. As is his usual policy, the Reverend King piously pontificates that this is going to be a nonviolent demonstration; he also states that there will be civil disobedience. As is usually the case wherever one of these so-called nonviolent demonstrations is organized, it will result in violence. When this happens, King will sanctimoniously retreat to his ivory tower, after having ignited the fires that cause violence, and say he could not help it; it got out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, we have been forewarned and if the people in Washington and in the Congress do not do something to protect the civil rights of the hundreds of thousands of citizens who have the right to walk the streets in peace—who have the right to go to and from their places of business without being interferred with by these demonstrators, then we are asking for any trouble that comes.

What is it in the makeup of some people that gives them the idea that civil disobedience of the law is permissible even when, engaging in these so-called acts of civil disobedience, they are interfering with the civil rights of the great majority of our people? Mr. Speaker, no one is entitled to the right to say which of our laws he will obey and which he will disobey. Civil disobedience should be, and I submit is, in the same category as criminal disobedience. The first proponent of civil disobedience was probably Henry David Thoreau, but even Thoreau did not try to interfere with the operation of government.

One of the principal purposes of this so-called nonviolent demonstration, as stated by the Reverend Dr. King, is that these people want jobs. The figures released last week show that unemployment is at the lowest level it has been in 14 years and that employment is at the highest level it has been in that period of time. In fact, some commentators have stated that employment is at such a high rate that every person who really wants a job can get a job. Of course, everyone cannot be a bank president, but the great majority of our people of all races are today employed in jobs up to, and in many cases in excess, of their capabilities. There are too many people in this country who prefer to demonstrate rather than work, even when good paying jobs are available to all who will give an honest day's work.

Mr. Speaker, we have been warned before and suffered the consequences because we failed to heed those warnings. Is history going to repeat itself in Washington this summer? I hope and pray not.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished colleague from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HERLONG. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it is about time that we in this Nation, and especially here in the Nation's Capital, back up our law-enforcement officers when we call upon them to protect people who walk the streets of our cities. Certainly, we should back up the law-enforcement officers of the District of Columbia and of our Federal Government when they try to protect the people of this great Capital City of ours.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in regard to people who are out of employment, if the gentleman from Florida had picked up the Washington Post of yesterday morning and had read the "help wanted ads," the gentleman would have noted that those ads covered 16 pages of that great newspaper.

So, in my opinion, if people really want to work, really want to have a job and not look to the Federal Government to train them and to pay them while they are being trained, if they really want to work, in my opinion they can find some type of employment in this city.

Mr. HERLONG. I think the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his contribution to this discussion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield to me?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with what both of my distinguished colleagues from Florida have had to say with reference to this situation. Also, I would like to say that in my opinion the metropolitan police of the District of Columbia will do a good job, more particularly, if they have the support of the President of the United States, and the Department of Justice, and of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall be anxiously awaiting the kind of support that will be coming from these quarters.

Mr. HERLONG. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] has seen in his State and I have seen in my great State, the State of Georgia, the results of civil disobedience, the substance of which is the breaking of laws and infringing upon the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Florida, and I certainly hope and request that his warning be heeded.

ROBIN HOOD GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in reading the comments of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], which I suppose is the definitive defense of the actions of Mr. Eugene Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in granting a certificate of competency to the Universal Fiberglass Corp., of Two Harbors, Minn. I disagree with the views of my colleague, but I must admit that he has come up with some novel theories on how government should operate. As I understand it, this is the essence of the Minnesota-oriented Robin Hood theory of government.

If there are economic problems in a district, the mere fact of their existence justifies raids on the Federal Treasury that may cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

My Minnesota colleague also seems to argue that since he says he had a leading role in delivering a $13,300,000 contract to the Universal Fiberglass Corp. that this exonerates Mr. Neal Peterson, now a special assistant to the Vice President, of any conflict of interest because he had only a minor role as a contact man for the then Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's office.

It seems to me that my colleague is saying that since he was the major figure in this raid on the Treasury that somehow I should not point a finger of criticism at Mr. Neal D. Peterson who was only a lookout on the job for the Vice President.

I cannot accept his reasoning in this matter. Neal Peterson was the Humphrey staffman on this Universal Fiberglass Corp. case and had a responsibility to avoid any circumstances that might give the appearance that he would be anything but objective. It makes no difference whether his role was large or small, he was the Humphrey man handling this case and dealing with Congressman BLATNIK.

At the same time, Universal Fiberglass was represented by Mr. Roger A. Peterson, a brother of Neal Peterson.

I do not believe that Neal Peterson should have been handling any aspect of this case at a time when Roger Peterson was serving as a lawyer for Universal Fiberglass. This was a controversial case, and certainly it would be difficult for Neal Peterson to deal with this case in an objective manner. It would be difficult to imagine his warning either a Minnesota Senator or a Minnesota Congressman of any doubts about the prudence of a certificate of competency for a firm represented by his brother.

Does the Congressman from Minnesota believe that it is proper for Neal Peterson to handle this matter for the Humphrey office while his brother was the attorney for Universal Fiberglass? I would hope not. If he does, then I would have to say that we have vastly different opinions on the standards of ethics that should apply to Members of Congress and their staffs.

Only a few years ago, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, as Senator from Minnesota, had a great deal to say about what he considered the shocking conflicts of interest of Mr. Adolphe Wenzel in the Dixon-Yates case in the Eisenhower administration. There was no allegation that Mr. Wenzel received any money or thing of value, but he was in a dual role in advising the Government while holding a relationship with a firm that was advising the Dixon-Yates group. It was an improper relationship. I did not defend the Dixon-Yates case under a Republican administration, and I do not defend it now. I do contend that Mr. HUMPHREY, the arch critic of Dixon-Yates, should not permit Mr. Peterson to handle a matter for his office when Mr. Peterson's brother is serving as lawyer for the Universal Fiberglass Corp.

It seems to me that the Humphrey office and my colleague from Minnesota are supporting a double standard—one for the Dixon-Yates case under Republicans and another for Neal Peterson, a Minnesota Democrat.

I contend that the same standard should apply to men in both political parties.

While my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] apparently embraces the theory that the end justifies any means that must be used to attain it—no matter how brazen—he is moved to wonder about the lack of documented justification for awarding this contract.

It will be remembered that another protege of HUMPHREY—Eugene P. Foley—was responsible for issuing Universal a certificate of competency after his own experts in the Small Business Administration, as well as those of the General Services Administration, had concluded with prophetic foresight that Universal could not perform the contract.

Let me quote my colleague on this point. He said last week, here in the House, that:

> The point is raised that the certificate of competency should have been backed up with papers and I agree that it should have been. Frankly, with all the detailed correspondence, negotiations, and discussions that went on over a period of months, there must be records—somebody must have documents supporting these facts.

The fact is that if there ever was a shred of proof that Universal had the technical or financial competence to perform this contract, it has been so well hidden that the able and thorough auditors of the General Accounting Office could not find it.

All they were able to find, I remind my colleague, is one brief unsigned paragraph by a phantom author reaching the conclusion, based on thin air, that Universal was competent.

I submit that this type of procedure is certainly not good Government, and I am delighted that my colleague agrees with me on this point.

I am totally opposed to this Robin Hood theory of government—this attitude that anything goes to deliver Government money or Government contracts if it can be demonstrated that there is economic hardship in a district.

Under this Robin Hood theory any questionable actions or pressures become virtuous if it can be argued that it was all done to relieve some local hardship. Under this theory the reports and recommendations of the financial experts and technicians at the GSA and the Small Business Administration are totally meaningless, and can be overturned on the basis of a one-paragraph, unsigned file memorandum.

The Robin Hood theory of government would mean an end to any pretense that Government decisions should be made on the basis of staff work by career Government employees and objective judgment of the merits. It would mean that no holds are barred and political influence would be the entire standard.

We know that political influence peddling and other questionable factors have become involved in many Government decisions, and there is no doubt in my mind that ethical standards have slipped all over the Government in recent years. However, I am not yet ready to accept the judgment that bad decisions should become precedents for more bad decisions, more influence peddling, and more waste of tax money. I am not ready to throw away the keys to the U.S. Treasury.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Edmondson, for 45 minutes, Thursday, February 15.

Mr. Herlong, for today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. Gross, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood, for 60 minutes, on February 21; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois in five instances.

(The following members (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. May.

Mr. Derwinski in three instances.

Mr. Quillen in four instances.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Harvey in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Edmondson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Casey.

Mr. Conyers in three instances.

Mr. Boland in two instances.

Mr. Natcher.

Mr. Long of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. Foley in two instances.

Mr. Vanik in three instances.

Mr. Fraser in three instances.

Mr. Edmondson in two instances.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 9, 1968, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1507. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed budgetary revision involving the transfer of obligational authority among Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 255); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1508. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1509. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of revisions and reprograming necessary with respect to certain projects, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1510. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82–577; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1511. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, transmitting the annual report of the Council; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1512. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the act of October 3, 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1513. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report of two typographical corrections to be made in the schedule of expiring licenses for non-Federal hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1514. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on civilian positions allocated or placed in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 in the Department of Defense during the calendar year 1967, as required by statute; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1516. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 12, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Chipola River at Dead Lake, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvements are being accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 7, 1968, the following bill was reported on February 12, 1968:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14743. A bill to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890; with amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 12, 1968*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2792. A bill to amend sections 281 and 344 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the statutory prescription of fees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10135. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of the surviving spouse of a U.S. citizen who dies while serving in an active duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15300. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 15301. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 15302. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Jackson, Miss., as the Medgar Evers Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 15303. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 15304. A bill to appropriate funds for the study of a deep-draft ship channel extension, Wilmington Harbor, Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15305. A bill to appropriate funds for the hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion project at Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15306. A bill to appropriate funds for continuing construction of the New Hope Dam and Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15307. A bill to appropriate funds for the upper part of Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15308. A bill to appropriate funds for the navigation project at Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15309. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Cape Fear River, above Wilmington, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15310. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate preconstruction planning for the Brunswick County beaches from the Cape Fear to North Carolina-South Carolina State line; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15311. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Carolina Beach and vicinity project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15312. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15313. A bill to provide for the elimination of all grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15314. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15315. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate within the Department of the Interior an officer to establish, coordinate, and administer programs authorized by this act, for the reclamation, acquisition, and conservation of lands and water adversely affected by coal mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15316. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.J. Res. 1084. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 1085. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

305. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the proposal to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide for additional revenues to accrue to the fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

306. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the Federal Meat Inspection Act and its adverse effect on independent slaughterhouses and meatpacking plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 15317. A bill for the relief of Renzo Grassini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 15318. A bill for the relief of Miss Apollonia Redy Vettore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 15319. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15320. A bill for the relief of Chuck Hong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15321. A bill for the relief of Maria Bonavolonta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15322. A bill for the relief of Silvio De Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 15323. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 15324. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tuttolomondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 15325. A bill for the relief of Claudia Schurenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

241. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to placing statues of certain U.S. judges in the U.S. Capitol, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE—*Monday, February 12, 1968*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HAYDEN).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order of Thursday, February 8, the Senate will stand in adjournment until Wednesday next.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 5 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 14, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Parents Proud of Marine Who Hoisted Flag

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, over the past several days, newspapers throughout the country have been beseiged with reports of the latest Vietcong offensive against a number of urban centers across South Vietnam. One of the bloodiest engagements occurred in the city of Hue, capital of Thua Thien Province, where at one point the enemy forces controlled the major portion of the city.

With the determination and spirit that are the mark of our American fighting men, the Vietcong were forced to relinquish the provincial capitol building over which they had flown the North Vietnam flag. In the heat of battle and the ensuing exuberance of victory, three valiant marines raised the Stars and Stripes in its place. I was proud to learn that one of my constituents, Marine Sgt. Frank A. Thomas, Jr., was among those three men. Despite the matter of protocol and custom, which says that the South Vietnamese flag should have been raised, it is a mute point when we consider the inspiration that these men must have felt to see Old Glory fly over the battle-scarred city.

It is a fitting tribute that I include excerpts from articles which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Camden Courier-Post:

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Feb. 6, 1968]

MOTHER IS PROUD, BUT CALM

(By Ken Earl)

"Well, mom, I have to do my duty like everybody else . . ."

With a grim smile Marine Gunnery Sgt. Frank A. Thomas was breaking the news to his mother as gently as he could.

He was soon to be headed for Vietnam.

The 34-year-old Leatherneck made the disclosure while home for Thanksgiving with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Thomas Sr. of 341 N. 37th Street.

PROUD OF UNIFORM

"He was proud to wear the uniform," said his mother, "and tried to make us understand that it was his duty to go to Vietnam."

On Dec. 6 he arrived in the war-torn country.

Mrs. Thomas wasn't surprised when she heard from the Courier-Post today that her son and two other Marines—keeping a vow they had made—tore down the North Vietnamese flag and raised the Stars and Stripes at Hue after recapturing the Thua Thien Province headquarters from Communist forces.

SAIGON BATTLE RAGES ON

(By Eugene V. Risher)

SAIGON.—Enraged U.S. Marines including a Camden, N.J. father of four ripped down a North Vietnamese flag in the still-embattled city of Hue today and ran up the Stars and Stripes. But fighting spread in the Saigon streets and the air war blazed with new fury.

U.S. spokesmen said about 900 Viet Cong moved from the flaming Cholon sector of Saigon back into the center of the city where street fighting broke out anew. There were battles in the suburbs and at the gates of the Tan Son Nhut Airport.

U.S. Marines fought large scale engagements around the coastal city of Quang Tri just below the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and outside Da Nang as spokesmen warned the Communists appeared to be trying to isolate the big cities of Saigon, Hue and Da Nang.

RUNS UP FLAG

UPI correspondent Alvin B. Webb Jr. reported that Marine Capt. Ron Christmas' H Company swore at the sight of the North Vietnam flag atop the provincial Capitol. They smashed through Communist fire, seized the building and Christmas radioed his chief: "We have the building, sir! We're going to run up the American flag."

He turned to his men and said, "Let's go!" and at 4:03 p.m. three Leathernecks yanked down the red flag from the Capitol of Thua Thien province and ran up the U.S. flag—despite custom that says the South Vietnamese flags must fly from South Vietnamese buildings.

The three men were Pfc. Walter Kaczmaret of Port Reading, N.J., Pfc. Allen McDonald of Jacksonville, Fla., and gunnery Sgt. Frank T. Thomas Jr., of Camden, N.J. As they saluted their work machine gun fire splattered in the streets before and wisps of tear gas floated up to them.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 7, 1968]

PARENTS PROUD OF MARINE WHO HOISTED FLAG

Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Thomas, of 341 N. 37th st., Camden, were not surprised when they received word Tuesday that their son, Marine Gunnery Sgt. Frank, Jr., had pulled down a Communist flag in the embattled South Veitnam imperial city of Hue and raised in its place the American Flag.

Mrs. Thomas voiced the thoughts of her husband, a retired 22-year chief boatswain in the United States Navy, when she acknowledged, "We are very, very proud of what Frank has done."

CLIMBS BUILDING

The sergeant was fighting through the streets of Hue in the drive to clear out Vietcong guerrillas who had infested the area for the past week when he saw the Red flag atop the Administration Building of the South Vietnam military headquarters.

He halted his group and led Pfc. Alan McDonald, 19, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Pfc. Walter Kaczmarek, Jr., of Port Reading, N.J., in climbing to the top of the headquarters, tearing down the enemy bunting and replacing it with the Stars and Stripes.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 7, 1968]

HEADQUARTERS AT HUE RETAKEN BY MARINE UNITS

HUE, VIETNAM, February 6.—U. S. Marines, heirs of the Iwo Jima tradition, recaptured the Thua Thien Province headquarters from Communist troops here Tuesday and hoisted the Stars and Stripes above its battered walls.

Across the Perfume River, their South Vietnamese allies narrowed Red holdings within bomb-churned precincts of the walled Citadel, the once ornate home of Vietnam's emperors, which forms most of the northern part of Hue.

U.S. FLAG HOISTED

A Marine battalion commander had told his men the South Vietnamese government's flag should replace the Vietcong banner when they took over the yellow, two-story headquarters, a government landmark.

But the American flag was run up in the exuberance of victory after about 24 Leathernecks stormed over the walls and cleared out the place in room-to-room combat.

Gunnery Sgt. Frank Thomas, 34, of Camden, N. J., ran up the colors with help from Pfc. Alan McDonald, 19, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Pfc. Walter Kaczmarek, Jr., 19, of Port Reading, N. J.

There were lusty cheers from other Marines, many unborn when the Stars and Stripes was raised over Iwo Jima 23 years ago in a dramatic moment of the Second World War.

Under slight sniper fire, the Marines moved on from the building to house-to-house fighting along the palm-ringed plaza wall.

The "Untouchable" Parade

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, just as the Red Vietcong were able to infiltrate South Vietnam and on New Year's Day rise to the surface in a suidical battle against the citizens, we can better appreciate the constant threat from the American Vietcong, the "Untouchables" who are planted in our country—in our Government.

Mr. Capell's "Untouchables, Part VII" should be revolting enough to awaken every patriotic American—liberal, moderate, or conservative—to demand action for removal of these undesirable untouchables.

The President of the United States must appreciate the danger from Madam Jerzy Michalowski, wife of the current Polish Ambassador to the United States and stationed here in Washington, D.C. the nerve center of our Republic.

Her removal needs only that President Johnson declare her husband, Ambassador Michalowski, persona non grata. Why doesn't he do it?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I follow my remarks with "Untouchables, Part VII" from the Herald of Freedom and a clipping from the Government Employees Exchange here in the District of Columbia dated February 7:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Feb. 9, 1968]

THE UNTOUCHABLES—VII

Now emerging as possibility more than an innocent and duped bystander in the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals is the American Ambassador to Poland at that time, Jacob D. Beam. The Government Employees' EXCHANGE, a liberal bi-weekly dedicated to civil service reform, owned and edited by Mr. Sidney Goldberg, carried a story concerning Beam's involvement in its January 10, 1968 issue. Under the red headline, "Sex Scandals Involve Beam," the story stated that Madam Jerzy Michalowski a Communist agent, "has been positively identified as 'one of the chief architects of the 'Warsaw Sex and Spy Scandals'" which disrupted the American Embassy in Warsaw during the incumbency of Ambassador Jacob Beam. . . . In addition, the informant stated the woman has also been identified 'without any question of doubt' as having maintained an 'intimate personal relationship' with Mr. Beam from 1957 to 1961. . . ."

Jacob Dyneley Beam, now U.S. Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, was born in Princeton, N.J. on March 24, 1908, the son of Jacob Newman Beam (a Princeton professor) and the former Mary Prince. He graduated from Kent School and Princeton with an A.B. degree in 1929. During 1930 Beam studied at Cambridge University in England and in 1931 he began his career with the U.S. State Department as a clerk in the U.S. Consulate in Geneva, Switzerland. He was promoted to vice-counsel and remained in Geneva until 1934, his work there being mainly the observing and reporting of the activities of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office.

On November 24, 1934 Beam was made third secretary at the American Embassy in Berlin where he remained until August 1, 1940. In Berlin he was on the staff of Ambassador William E. Dodd, the last U.S. ambassador to Nazi Germany. The Ambassador's daughter, Martha, occupied her time in Berlin as a Soviet agent and even made a try at seducing Hitler. She failed but Unity Mitford, sister of U.S. Communist Jessica Mitford (author of "The American Way of Death"), succeeded in becoming Hitler's mistress. Also in Germany during this period was Howard Trivers who later became involved in the intricate web of the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals.

Martha Dodd, also known as Martha Eccles Dodd, Mrs. George Bassett Roberts and finally Mrs. Alfred K. Stern, was finally indicted on two counts of espionage conspiracy in September 1957 along with her husband, Stern. The Sterns have never been tried as they were in Mexico at the time of the indictment and clandestinely fled behind the Iron Curtain to Czechoslovakia. The Dec. 13, 1967 issue of The Government Employees' Exchange had this to say about Martha Dodd's relationship with Howard Trivers:

"The career of Foreign Service Officer–1 Howard Trivers, at present American Consul-General in Zurich, Switzerland has been included in a 'probe and scrutiny' by a 'top-secret' British Security Survey Team operating in the United States for the past seven months . . .

"The interest of the Survey Team in Howard Trivers originated in information the British received concerning HARD Trivers' contacts during the years 1932–38 when he was attending the Universities of Heidelberg and Freiberg, Germany, the source stated. Part of this information indicated Howard Trivers had been a member of a private courier service organized by Martha Dodd, the daughter of U.S. Ambassador to Germany. . . ."

Other sources report that Trivers was recommended to Martha Dodd by his Princeton classmate, Jacob Beam. Trivers will be remembered as the man to whom Foreign Service Officer Stephen Koczak reported some subversive activities of his superior, Thomas A. Donovan, thereby setting into action the events which brought an end to Koczak's State Department career, through the conniving of the "insiders."

A description of Martha Dodd Stern is found on pages 4885 and 6 of the Senate Internal Security Hearings on "Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States." The information is from a series of articles which appeared in the N.Y. Journal-American Nov. 10–20, 1957 writen by Jack Soble (Soviet spy indicted with Martha Dodd) with Jack Lotto.

"When the door opened, the beautiful stranger threw her arms around me in tight embrace and gave me a long, passionate kiss.

"This was my introduction to Martha Dodd Stern, daughter of the late United States Ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd.

"All I had said was 'I am Sam.'

"This was the code name given me by my Soviet secret police superior to use in contacting her husband, multimillionaire Alfred K. Stern.

"The Sterns, who became my close friends after that first meeting in their swank New York apartment in the winter of 1944, were exact personality opposites. But they were as one in their ardent espousal of Communist causes.

"The slightly built, ever-dapper Stern chased after the Russians to be allowed to do their bidding. Perhaps it was because he was completely over-shadowed, thoroughly dominated by his wife.

"All this quiet, cultured and highly educated businessman had to offer was money. And he was free with it to back Soviet-approved activities. He financed the Boris Morros music company as a business front for Soviet espionage. Likewise, his money helped create pro-Communist propaganda organizations like the Institute of Pacific Relations.

"Gay, vivacious Martha, 11 years younger than her second husband, was always seeking new adventures, and liked to talk about them over martinis.

"And it was over a round of drinks that Martha told me a strange story of her twisted loyalty to the Soviet Union.

"Apparently to impress me, she bragged how she had spied on her own father for the Russians. She said that during her father's term as Ambassador in Berlin in the early 1930's she had had a love affair with an official of the Soviet Embassy, who actually was an NKVD agent.

"At his behest, Martha related, she stole information from the secret files of the United States Embassy—to which she had easy access—and turned it over to the agent.

"This exciting woman, who was seldom without a cocktail in easy reach, had once even trysted with Hitler and later described the Fuehrer as a 'frigid celibate.'"

Martha's impression of the six-foot-two Dyneley Beam has not been recorded for posterity, although she had plenty of time to form an impression as Beam was at the

Berlin Embassy for six years until August 1940. In April 1941 he was sent to the American Embassy in London as vice-consul and third secretary, remaining until the fall of 1944. From early 1945 to August 1947 he was back in Germany, acting as political adviser on German affairs at Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, under General Eisenhower. It was during this period that German and Nazi documents were captured which contained information concerning Howard Trivers, among others, and then mysteriously "disappeared," according to The Government Employees' Exchange.

Beam now returned to Washington, D.C. becoming chief of the division of Central European affairs in October 1947 (Howard Trivers was his Assistant Chief) and acting special assistant in the office of German and Austrian affairs in March 1949. Outlining Beam's career, Current Biography 1959 states at this point:

"For the next few years Beam's attention was centered on problems of the Far East. Having gone to Batavia, Java as consul general in October 1949, he served as the United States representative when the sovereignty of that area was transferred in 1950 from the Netherlands to the new government of Indonesia. As soon as a diplomatic mission was established at Indonesia's capital city, Djakarta (formerly Batavia), he assumed the duties of counselor of the American Embassy, and from October 1950 to April 1951 he had the additional responsibilities of the acting United States representative on the United Nations Commission for Indonesia."

The breaking up of colonial empires was an important part of the Communist plan implemented at the close of World War II. Communist spokesmen in the U.N. and elsewhere were bleating for the "national aspirations" of the colonies to be recognized and the granting of "independence" to them. Communist agents had been active in supplying information upon which these demands for "independence" were based. One such agent was a personal recruit of Martha Dodd Stern. She was Jane Foster, a San Francisco aristocrat, described by Jack Soble, (Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States, p. 4882, on):

"Jane Foster Zlatovski spelled sex appeal.

"This slim, trim modernist artist, who had been born and raised on aristocratic Nob Hill in San Francisco, willingly turned her assets into a Soviet spy weapon.

"Coldly, methodically, this attractive woman worked on American military and intelligence agents to shed their inhibitions and secrets.

"If anybody could be described as a modern-day Mata Hari, that would be the hard-drinking, intensely jealous Jane. For nearly 10 years she turned in her reports, with photographs, on American intelligence and counterintelligence agents. . . .

"When I first met this dedicated Communist Party member she had just finished a 3-year job with the supersecret Office of Strategic Services.

"She was in New York on a vacation before moving into another sensitive spot with the United States Army in Vienna and Salzburg, Austria . . .

"Like her German spy prototype, Jane was married to a ne'er-do-well Army Officer, George Zlatovski, of Duluth, Minn. (born in Russia-Ed.), at the time a lieutenant in the United States Army Intelligence.

"He also became a Soviet agent under my command. His work was to bring terror and fear to many refugees who had fled to the safety of the United States from behind the Iron Curtain.

"The first time I met Jane, I was impressed with her strong dedication to the 'cause.'

"Her first report, apparently, also made a big impact in the Kremlin.

"I received verification of this fact in February 1946, when I picked up a newspaper less than 2 months after Jane had turned over a report on Indonesia she obtained while in the employ of the OSS . . .

"As I read his (Manuilsky—a Stalin collaborator) speech, which accused the British of suppressing the nationalist ambitions of the Indonesians, I thought I recognized statements I had seen before.

"Then it hit me. Manuilsky was fortifying his attack with quotations taken word for word from the report Jane had handed to me.

"Her document was given to me around Christmas of 1945 at the home of Alfred and Martha Stern, wealthy 'angels' of Communist causes and financiers of business fronts for Soviet spy activities . . .

"Jane was recruited for our ring by her old friend and drinking companion, Martha . . .

"Over rounds of martinis, which she devoured like water, Jane outlined her philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, and how she and her husband, George, were prepared to go to any lengths to be useful to the Soviet Union.

"She told me how she had worked for the OSS in Indonesia while married to a Netherlands envoy. . . .

"For Jane Foster Zlatovski soft light, music, and wine were strictly necessary business atmosphere.

"Between stolen kisses, she collected for her Soviet bosses many of the secrets, confidences, and itemized human frailties of American intelligence agencies in Austria and France.

"On weekend affairs, when whisky glasses were seldom empty, and her targets sufficiently relaxed and off guard, her camera clicked during lighthearted frolicking.

"In this manner, this attractive, dedicated Soviet agent obtained compromising details on the sexual, drinking, and gambling habits of men whose identities were closely shielded.

"Her husband, George, an Army intelligence officer, showered his attention on women secretaries in sensitive United States agencies. . . ."

This is the modus operandi of a typical Soviet agent successfully used to compromise United States employees and force them to work for the Communists. The exact same plan was used during the Warsaw Spy and Sex Scandals. Jane and George Zlatovski were indicted on July 8, 1957 on two counts of espionage conspiracy but have never been tried as they fled to France.

Looking to the future, Jacob Beam prepared himself by taking courses in the Russian language and history at his own expense. Thus prepared he began a career of U.S. representative behind the Iron Curtain. He went to Belgrade, Yugoslavia in April 1952. It was here that he met and started dating Miss Margaret Glassford, an officer employed by the U.S. Information Service in Belgrade. They were married in November 1952 and have a son Jacob Alexander Beam. It was in Belgrade also that Beam became friendly with Daroslav Vlahovich, a Foreign Service Officer.

In November 1952 he went to Moscow and was there at the time of Stalin's death and the subsequent power struggle. In June 1953 Beam began a tour of duty in Washington but was still occupied with affairs in Communist countries. Current Biography states: "As deputy director of the policy planning board, he helped to outline long-range diplomatic strategy for the State Department." Then in June 1957 he was nominated by President Eisenhower as United States Ambassador to Poland and arrived in Warsaw in August 1957. He also had another important job—holding meetings with the Chinese Communists. These were terribly important and strictly secret. Realizing this, the Soviets proceeded to bug the new Embassy building and compromise practically the complete staff, including the Marine guards.

In the Warsaw Embassy was Edward Symans, the long-time Soviet agent whom Beam had first met in Berlin. Also on the staff was Daroslav Vlahovich who had been transferred to Warsaw at Beam's personal request. When the State Department in Washington wanted to quickly transfer Symans and Vlahovich, the prime espionage suspects, out of Warsaw it was Ambassador Beam who insisted they be allowed to complete their tour of duty. It was during this period from 1952 to 1961 that Beam reportedly was involved in "an intimate personal relationship" with Mme. Jerzy Michalowski, the wife of the present Ambassador to the U.S. from Poland who was at that time Director General of the Polish Foreign Ministry. Born Myra Zandel on November 23, 1914, Mme. Michalowski might be described as a thoroughly modern Mata Hari.

Her first husband was Dr. Ignace Zlotowski, head of a special Soviet-Polish espionage unit attempting to acquire atomic information in the United States. Zlotowski, whose real name was reportedly Goldman or Goldberg, worked under the cover of being a professor at the University of Minnesota 1941 to 1942, at Vassar 1942 to 1944 and Ohio State University 1944 to 1946. In the early 1940's Myra Zlotowski obtained a position with the Office of War Information and, when her husband left the East Coast for Ohio State University, became known as the wife of Stefan Arski, another OWI employee who worked on the "Polish desk." Arski's real name was Arthur Salman and he assisted the OWI in its efforts to suppress the story of the Soviet massacre of 15,000 Polish officers and soldiers in the Katyn Forest Massacre. The Communists tried to put the blame on the Nazis but subsequent investigations proved that it was the work of the Communists themselves. After Arski returned to Poland he became editor of the Communist paper Robotnik (The Worker), an outspoken anti-American organ.

The present Mme. Michalowski has reportedly been an agent of the Soviet and later Polish Communist Party Central Committee since 1936. As wife of the important Michalowski, who had been in London at the same time Beam was stationed there, she leads a very busy life and is now being glamorized as a Washington hostess. Her life in Warsaw was described in the book "Poland Little Known" as follows:

". . . Roving everywhere is Maria Zientarowa known also as Stefan Wilcosz or Michalina Wilkoszowa or Tadeusz Makowski or Jan Michalski or Stefan Welczar, former friend of comrade Kliszko, former wife of Arski, the Editor-in-Chief of 'Swiat' when he was an employee of OWI, and at present the wife of the Director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Jerz Michalowski. . ."

Myra, through her "friendship" with Ambassador Beam, was able to get information which she fed back to her Soviet bosses. It is now presumed that the high ranking Polish intelligence officer who was supplying the United States with valuable security information from Warsaw was forced to seek refuge in the United States because of her. She is also credited with arranging the Scarbeck Case to take the heat off the important real agents, with Beam himself supplying the information to Dikeos who reportedly broke the case.

Edith Kermit Roosevelt in her column, Between the Lines, discusses Mme. Michalowski and states:

"The various marriages of a Warsaw charmer may provide the incentive that could force the issue of Communist espionage and policy manipulation into the limelight. . . . White House and State Department circles have remained silent. They have confided that they fear the revelations could spark 'a new wave of McCarthyism in the United States.' "

Although "McCarthyism" has been made a dirty word by the liberal press, it is exactly what we need today. It has been estimated that the activities of Sen. Joe McCarthy set the Communist timetable back ten years. Ed Hunter, originator of the term "brainwashing," states in his publication, Tactics:

"The present, pervasive anti-anticommunist propaganda climate was created out of the debris of the McCarthy era. Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy contributed mightily to the cleansing of our Augean stables, but was shot down and killed, in the psychological warfare manner, in the middle of the battle. If the communist infiltration of the White House, the State Department, our military, and other agencies of government had not been frontally attacked, inflicting great damage to the red forces, and forcing them to fall back at many points, it is difficult to see how we could have survived."

We have now reached the stage again where it is difficult to see how we can survive if another cleaning job is not done. How many more Mata Haris are roaming the cocktail circuit and the diplomatic dinners, charming their way into government secrets? More important, what use is being made of these secrets and the roster of "human frailties" of government personnel? Strangely enough the State Department does not seem worried about this angle. The angle they are interested in is: Who is exposing the fact that these things are going on and what can we get on them to make them stop?

The Government Employees' Exchange of January 10, 1968 states:

"In other developments, a different source said that the top secret British 'Security Survey Team,' . . . has extended its operations to Canada and Mexico. In Canada its inquiries have encompassed liaison with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, especially in connection with the trips of State Deparment officials to Canada to obtain information on 'payola' payments allegedly made by Dictator Rafael Trujillo to Congressmen and Senators. The State Department officials were especially interested in establishing whether payments were made to Senators on the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigating State Department security and the Otto F. Otepka case.

'The British 'Security Survey Team' operating in Canada and Mexico is especially interested in the activities of Charles Lyons. . . ."

The State Department action is a two-pronged cover up of the subversive activities of its employees and attempt to "get" those exposing them. The State Department officials involved in this conspiracy, which ties them in with varying degrees of espionage, Communism, subversive activities and involvement with female Soviet agents, are endangering the security of our country. The fact that nothing is done to remove the security risks and prosecute those guilty of various security offenses proves the existence of a powerful clique of "Untouchables."

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Feb. 7, 1968]

SECRET AGENT'S ROLE IN WARSAW SCANDALS CLARIFIED

In its January 10 issue, *The Exchange* reported that Madam Jerzy Michalowski, the "wife" of the current Polish Ambassador to the United States, had been positively identified as "one of the chief architects of the "Warsaw Sex and Spy Scandals" which disrupted the American Embassy in Warsaw during the incumbency of Ambassador Jacob Beam. Mrs. Michalowski was also identified as having maintained an "intimate personal relationship" with Mr. Beam from 1957 to 1961.

The Exchange also reported that date that on the basis of her "intimate personal relationship" with Ambassador Beam, Madam Michalowski, in 1960, obtained from Ambassador Beam details about the dispatches being sent the Central Intelligence Agency by a "Lt Col Michael Goleniewski," an American "agent in place" who had first revealed to United States authorities the existence of the sex and spy scandals in Warsaw. Further, *The Exchange* reported that "as a result of her discoveries from Ambassador Beam, Madam Michalowski, her husband Jerzy Michalowski (then Director of the Polish Foreign Ministry) and Soviet Intelligence agencies uncovered the identity" of "Lt Col Goleniewioski" who had to flee to West Berlin.

The Exchange report of January 10 intentionally did not indicate how or where "Lt Col Goleniewski" was communicating with American officials or how or where Ambassador Beam learned of his existence or of his reports. However, because of certain wrong interpretations or distortions being placed on the January 10 report, a "witting source" has consented to the publication by *The Exchange* of the fact that Ambassador Beam, who had never met "Lt Col Goleniewski," first learned of the existence of the "American agent in place" while the Ambassador was on "consultation" in the State Department in Washington.

Ambassador Beam's own sources in the State Department "consultation" were Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy Henderson and Assistant Secretary of State for Security William Boswell, the source further indicated to *The Exchange*. Under Secretary Henderson and Ambassador Beam, together with Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr. and Consul General Howard Trivers, the latter two involved in the so-called "Stephen A. Koczak selection out case," are all members of the so-called Henderson-Princeton Pact group of Ivy League "old school tie" Foreign Service Officers, the source indicated.

Under Secretary Henderson told Ambassador Beam, the source stated, that the State Department had received its information personally from Richard M. Bissell, Jr., the CIA's Deputy Director for Operations who, as readers of The Exchange will recall, later coordinated the disastrous "Bay of Pigs" action in Cuba which resulted in his own resignation as well as the departure from CIA of its Director, Allen Dulles.

When informing Under Secretary Henderson of the details of the dispatches of "Lt Col Goleniewski" regarding American members of the American Embassy in Warsaw identified as Soviet agents, or otherwise "compromised," Mr. Bissell has requested that none of the suspected American officials in Warsaw be "alerted" by any personnel actions or transfers without prior approval of such action by CIA, the source revealed. To prevent any "inadvertent" personnel actions in Warsaw itself, Mr. Bissell and Under Secretary Henderson had agreed to recall Ambassador Beam for "consultations" and to have him personally informed about the situation in his Embassy, the source stated.

The reason Ambassador Beam had been "totally unaware previously" of the existence and activities of "Lt. Col. Goleniewski," the source explained, was that "Lt Col Goleniewski" was careful to avoid the American Embassy in Warsaw and has sent all his messages to American officials, addressed to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, through his own couriers who dispatched the material from Switzerland or other Western European countries. Thus, Ambassador Beam had never met "Lt Col Goleniewski," the source revealed.

In his meetings with Under Secretary Henderson and Assistant Secretary Boswell, Ambassador Beam did not learn the name of "Lt Col Goleniewski," the source stated, because Mr. Bissell had not communicated it to the State Department. However, the information he did receive was sufficiently detailed so that, when Madam Jerzy Michalowski obtained it subsequently in Warsaw from Ambassador Beam, the Soviet intelligence organization was able to identify "Lt Col Goleniewski" as the American "agent in place," the source stated. This required "Lt Col Goleniewski" to flee for his life to West Berlin and ended his activities as an American agent in the Soviet camp, the source concluded.

President's Message on Crime

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposal for increased security measures for banks and savings and loan institutions, as outlined in his message on crime control, deserves our immediate attention and bipartisan support.

The alarming increase in the number of bank robberies requires immediate action. The FBI Crime Index of statistics submitted by local and state police agencies discloses that bank robbery continued a sharp upward trend with a 60-percent increase during the first 9 months of 1967, over the same months in 1966.

Other statistics made available by the FBI indicate that violation of the Federal bank robbery statute increased approximately 30 percent in 1967. The total number of robberies, burglaries, and larcenies during the calendar year reached 2,551, as compared with a previous alltime high of 1,871 for 1966.

The dollar losses resulting from these crimes are in the millions. But of immeasurably greater concern, is the expanding threat to the lives of customers, bank employes, and police officers which is inherent in these crimes of violence.

The FBI reports that the arsenal of weapons available to robbers and burglars has steadily grown. The newest, a burning tool which came into use in bank burglaries in 1967, is capable of burning through a 6-inch thickness of tempered steel in approximately 15 seconds. It can cut an opening in a 3-foot wall of concrete in a matter of minutes.

Modern technology has placed sophisticated counterweapons at the disposal of banks and other financial institutions at relatively modest costs. An FBI publication which has recently been circulated to banking institutions indicates that reasonably effective alarm systems may be installed and operated for $100, plus a nominal monthly charge. Microphones which may be connected to speakers installed in a local police station cost about the same. Special protective cameras are available for approximately $1,000.

However, despite the success the FBI has reported in tracking criminals with the aid of protective devices, and efforts on the part of the Bureau to encourage voluntary use of safety measures, security and protective measures in many institutions remain grossly inadequate.

The situation can be remedied by Federal legislation placing responsibility for overseeing the installation, maintenance and operation of minimum security devices and procedures in the Federal agencies who perform other supervisory functions in relation to federally insured financial institutions. We should give our law enforcement officers charged with responsibility for protecting our financial institutions the benefits that can be expected from the use of modern methods to make banks and other financial institutions secure from criminal assaults.

Nation's Governors and Boy Scouting

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to conduct surveys of Members of the 89th and 90th Congresses to determine what the Boy Scouts had done for Congress a half century after Congress did something for the Boy Scouts by chartering it as a national organization.

Because of my abiding interest in Scouting, I was contacted by Mr. Keith Douglass of Dover, Del., who conducted a similar survey of our Nation's Governors. I was not surprised to learn that well over half of our Governors have participated in the Scouting program, either as Scouts or as Scout leaders.

It is grand testimony to the free world's greatest youth movement that it has played a part in developing the leadership capabilities of so many of our Nation's outstanding citizens.

There is no better time than during Boy Scout Week to recognize the Governors who have, at some time during their lives, come under the influence of the Scout Oath:

> On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my Country.

Only 21 Governors have had no Scouting experience. Of the 29 Governors who have been associated with the movement, 26 were Scouts, 12 have served as adult Scouters, and nine have been registered in both capacities.

The following Governors have participated in the Scouting program:

Alaska Governor Walter J. Hickel, Scout; Arizona Gov. John R. Williams, Scout; Colorado Gov. John A. Love, Scout; Connecticut Gov. John N. Dempsey, Scouter; Delaware Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr.; Florida Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Life Scout; Idaho Gov. Don. W. Samuelson, Scout and Scouter; Illinois Gov. Otto J. Kerner, Scouter; Indiana Gov. Roger D. Branigin, Scout and Scouter; Iowa Gov. Harold E. Hughes, Scout; Kansas Gov. Robert Docking, Scout.

Also, Michigan Gov. George W. Romney, Scout and Scouter; Missouri Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, Scout; Montana Gov. Tim M. Babcock, Scouter; Nevada Gov. Paul Laxalt, Scout; New Mexico Gov. David F. Cargo, Scout; North Carolina Gov. Daniel K. Moore, Scout; North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy, Life Scout; Oklahoma Gov. Dewey Bartlett, Scout; Pennsylvania Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, Eagle Scout; Rhode Island Gov. John H. Chaffee, Life Scout and Scouter; South Carolina Gov. Robert E. McNair, Scout and Scouter; Tennessee Gov. Buford Ellington, Scout and Scouter; Texas Gov. John B. Connally, Jr., Scout; Utah Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, Scout and Scouter; Vermont Gov. Philip H. Hoff, Life Scout; Washington Gov. Daniel J. Evans, Eagle Scout and Scouter; West Virginia Gov. Hulett C. Smith, Star Scout and Scouter; Wisconsin Gov. Warren P. Knowles, Life Scout.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Gov. John N. Dempsey of Connecticut has been awarded the Silver Beaver Award from the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. His father was a personal aide to Lord Baden-Powell, the founder of the Boy Scout movement.

Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois is a vice president of the Boy Scouts of America and has been awarded the Silver Buffalo Award.

Gov. Branigin of Indiana was President of the Harrison Trails Council of the Boy Scouts.

Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana has been awarded the Most Outstanding Service Award from the Alpha Phi Omega College Scout Fraternity.

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana is an honorary member of the national council and a member at large of the Executive Board of Region Ten.

Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee is a Mid-Tennessee Executive Council member and an honorary member in the national council. He has been awarded the Silver Beaver Award.

Gov. Evans of Washington is a member of the Chief Seattle Executive Council Board.

Gov. Hulett Smith of West Virginia is a member of the Buckskin Executive Council.

Encouraging Action

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, out of riot-torn Detroit, Mich., last summer rose a citizen's committee to mobilize the public and private resources of that community in a future effort to discover and/or devise solutions to build a better life for all citizens. This group was appropriately called the New Detroit Committee.

Recently, I had the pleasure to visit extensively with an individual who serves on that committee, Mr. Robert W. Fezzey, of Detroit. I was most impressed by Mr. Fezzey's comments and the successful efforts of the committee.

During our conversation, I learned that Mr. Fezzey, only a few weeks ago, thoroughly discussed the workings of the New Detroit Committee in an address before the 1967 annual meeting of the Southeast Michigan Tourist Association.

I feel that this address contains information which is of interest to all Members. I urge you to read it and see how one city and one committee is facing up to responsibilities of leadership. His speech follows:

REMARKS BY MR. ROBERT W. FREZZEY BEFORE THE SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN TOURIST ASSOCIATION 1967 ANNUAL MEETING

Thank you,

It's an honor and a privilege for me to be here today. However, I'll admit that I'm here with some trepidation.

When I received Sid Baker's letter indicating that I was to speak on the subject "Building a New Community Through Tourism", I had some severe reservations. I didn't feel qualified to talk on this subject and so I immediately called him, suggesting that there must have been some mistake. I wasn't competent to discuss the topic at hand.

I told Sid that what I *might* attempt to cover would be my impressions of the last five months of 1967, during which I was loaned full-time to the New Detroit Committee chaired by Mr. J. L. Hudson, Jr. I would be glad to briefly recap some points about the committee and its work, and make some observations about what the experience of working with the committee has meant to me personally.

To my surprise (maybe to my chagrin) Sid responded that he felt this would be fine. I suppose there would not have been any "hang up" in my mind if Sid had chosen for a title, "Building a New Community—That Will *Allow* Tourism to Expand"—because that's really what I'll be talking about.

I read with considerable interest your industry's report for 1967—and was indeed impressed. Tourism in Michigan is *certainly* everybody's business as the report indicates. I'm sure everyone in this room is interested—as we are in my business—in creating a social climate within our State and particularly our urban areas that will allow *continuing* expansion of an industry that contributes so significantly to our economic well being. But we have a great challenge facing us and, therefore, we must *all* be involved in attempting to find solutions.

In Michael Harrington's book, *The Other America*, there's reference made to the suburbanite who drives to work each morning, along the expressway to the central city. He works all day in his air-conditioned office, gets into his car, and heads back to suburbia each evening, completely oblivious to the dimensions of the problems of the people who live by the side of his road. Unconcerned, he's one who's grown accustomed to the face of poverty—bleak, monotonous, soon almost invisible, as it whizzes past his car windows. Does that touch a nerve? Mr. Harrington, I have come to realize, was drawing a picture of me. I fitted the pattern. Hopefully somewhat more sensitive than the majority of suburbanites, but still pretty unsophisticated, and uninvolved in any meaningful effort to relieve the stark and tragic condition of too much of the city. After all, I wasn't being bothered. So why not just leave well enough alone?

Then came July 23rd. And the bleak and impersonal face I'd passed so complacently took on a form and got itself recognized. It was an angry face, and it was a threatening face. A face in which hopelessness had turned to despair and despair had turned to blind rage. And I and many others decided right then and there that we never wanted to see that face again.

You all know the story of the riots—"civil disturbances"—if that goes down better. It's a tale of something that couldn't happen in our community, but it *did*. And *maybe* that's the key to it all. Too many of us had failed to realize that the *price* of good human relations, of a wholesome, advancing community, is *dear* indeed. Perhaps we thought we'd learned our lesson a quarter century earlier in 1943. And it's true Detroit had had a long period of peace and prosperity. And on the surface at least it *appeared* that we'd learned our lesson well.

But then it all broke loose. Social analysts will be asking *why* for a long time to come, I suppose. Max Ways, in his editorial in the recent issue of Fortune Magazine, calls our problems "A crisis within a crisis—He says 95% of what is wrong in our cities had developed before the crisis in race relations erupted". I certainly don't want to try to explain it but the shock of riot coursed through the area and we felt its reverberations everywhere, even out in suburbia. No *part* of the metropolis was left untouched by the tragedy of it all.

Let me remind you that in our city more than 500 fires were set, and many others attempted, in an area spanning 10 square miles. Forty-four people died, and a large number were injured. Thousands were charged with serious crimes. Property losses were in the 100s of millions of dollars. Some very brave men lost their lives in efforts to protect people and property and to restore order to a city that was being torn apart. Nothing quite like it had ever happened in this Country. But the chances are all too great that it could happen again. It could happen in Detroit next summer, or sooner. It could happen in any major city of the United States, at any time. For this reason, I think all of us must view the causes of rioting with a sense of great urgency.

But the greater the time interval from the event, the more difficult it seems for us as people to sustain a sense of urgency. There are many who'd like to close their eyes and have the whole problem go away. There are many who actually *have* shut the problem out of their minds. But it's not going to go away.

I'm reminded of the parallel offered by the Flint tornado of a few years ago. That's all we talked about at the time, but we soon forgot it.

Oh, we think of tornados now from time to time—but only when the weatherman warns us that atmospheric conditions are building up that could cause one. We don't have any control over those kinds of conditions.

But there is something we can do about the conditions that collided last July and resulted in the devastating social tornado that crashed down on 12th Street. And let we warn you that too many of those conditions are still in the air—and that the same kind of fearsome social tornado could strike again—and almost anytime.

The riots themselves were clearly and thoroughly wrong. But behind them lie such fundamental causes as the high rate of unemployment among Negroes, alleged mistreatment by some policemen, profiteering by some stores and landlords, sub-standard housing, and the frustration of so many Negroes who see others enjoying so many of the benefits of American life which they don't have, but perhaps most basic—A cry, a demand for dignity!

I think the message to be drawn from the rioting that occurred in Detroit and in other cities last summer is that if we are to look ahead with any degree of confidence, or even hope, for a unified and constructive society, this nation must face up to the need for social and economic innovations in our cities—and we must do it NOW. Business leaders, labor and government, community organizations and researchers, all are going to have to struggle to discover or devise better answers.

It has become evident that the problems which demand immediate solution are primarily in the areas of jobs, housing, schools and public order—all underscored by a basic demand for human dignity.

Business has a critical role to play—in providing jobs, in helping to prepare Negroes for those jobs, in helping to rebuild the cities, and in providing leadership to the community.

And along with this, Negroes must be encouraged to play a larger role in determining how their own problems are to be solved, and in responding with a sense of participation and responsibility within the framework of an orderly and dynamic society.

It was just at the close of the riot period that Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanagh asked J. L. Hudson to organize a citizen's committee to mobilize the public and private resources of our community. As Chairman, he was able to recruit the chief executives of a dozen companies, as well as representatives from education, unions, government and community organizations. This was not the typical "blue ribbon" committee appointed to solve community problems, because the kind of human troubles that Detroit had experienced just could not be met by applying that traditional formula.

"Militant" members of the Negro community were included from the very beginning, in order to be sure that the committee would be tuned in to their viewpoints and to their frustrations. This representation of the "militant" Negro element, *as well as* more moderate members of the Negro community, has served the Committee well.

The Committee includes seven men who are elected governmental officials, ranging from members of the State Legislature in Lansing to the chairmen of the boards of supervisors in three counties and the president of the Detroit Common Council. There are fourteen businessmen, including the chief executive officers of the "Big Three" automobile companies, the heads of our three utilities, three retailers, two bankers, an advertising agency president, my friend, John Pingel who is on your program this afternoon, and a financier. There are four educators. Three labor unions are represented. Nine members of the Committee represent community organizations, including the League of Women Voters and the NAACP. An eminent lawyer who is the president-elect of the American Bar Association and a Federal Judge also are Committee members.

And let me add this. In my business experience I've observed many committees. But *never* have I seen the dedication, the sense of commitment, and the devotion to a common cause that the members of this 39-member New Detroit Committee as well as the task force serving it have demonstrated from the start. The Committee members have set a high record for regular attendance at committee meetings which are held about every two weeks. And you have to understand that in addition to the committee meetings which take a full half day out of the schedules of these very busy people there are normally two or three subcommittee meetings in between each full committee meeting which requires further participation and commitment of their time.

The task force serving the committee and the subcommittees is composed of about 30 men recruited from corporations, labor, universities, and other community institutions. As staff members we were to formulate background information, and generate original and studied recommendations for committee action. Many of the staff people like myself have returned to their jobs after serving five months and are being replaced by new task force men. Let me tell you that those of us returning to our jobs are going back as *different* people—and maybe this will be the greatest contribution made by the New Detroit Committee—the increased understanding of our urban problems by the committee members and the task force personnel that perhaps can be helpful in the future direction of their organizations in this critical area.

The committee has been giving primary attention to nine broad fields for immediate consideration and action:

The improvement of community intercommunication among grass roots organizations and existing community power structure, and at the person-to-person level; community services, both private and public, including health, welfare, public order and recreation; economic development; education; employment; youth and recreation; legal; finance; and, housing.

The New Detroit Committee has developed some interesting principles of operation. *One* is that everything should be done to make full use of existing agencies for the implementation of New Detroit plans and proposals before any thought is given to recommending that a new agency be set up.

Another principle is that pronouncements be minimized and action be maximized. Broadside promises too often lead to disappointment and frustration.

A *third* principle is that everyone in the community—especially the commitee members—need to develop better listening practices.

Something the committee's become aware of so far is how hard it is to get existing private and public institutions, as well as governmental units, to be sensitive to the real, underlying problems. *Too* many organizations provide goods or services as through a human machine to non-feeling machines.

Customers and constituents too seldom get thought of as people with human problems. I think many of us have learned that we can no longer decide what *we* feel should be done is necessarily what the *community* feels its needs are.

My guess would be that those of you that have followed the New Detroit Committee activities with any interest at all if asked what action you associate with the committee the answers might be—the Fair Housing legislation which failed to pass in the Special Session—the request for 5.3 million dollars for emergency educational needs which failed to be acted on—the proposed police study that has failed to materialize—and the proposal for funding indigenous community organizations. This would be a completely unfair assessment of New Detroit—these matters are the headliners—the news makers.

The Committee is hopeful for favorable consideration of Fair Housing in this session of the Legislature. It is working diligently to get the other problems resolved but more importantly the items I mentioned are just a small part of the total picture.

Let me enumerate some of the things the committee *has* been able to do to date which are particularly significant.

"New Detroit" has stepped into a major area of concern—employment. It is succeeding in a massive effort to obtain jobs for unemployed inner city residents. Through the end of the year, 43,000 people have been placed in jobs by the major employers in the Detroit area, with approximately half of those jobs going to Negroes.

The Ford Motor Company has established employment centers in the inner city areas and has hired directly in the inner city neighborhoods nearly 2,000 from the ranks of the "hard-core" unemployed. In this effort they have felt it worthwhile to provide bus money and luncheon money to these new employees prior to receipt of their first pay checks.

Chrysler Corporation, in cooperation with the YMCA, has worked out a "buddy" system to make sure that previously unemployable young men stay on the job once they are hired.

My own company, Michigan Bell Telephone has "adopted" Northern High School for the purpose of helping train students for jobs, to teach them how to seek jobs, and in many other ways to increase and improve employment opportunities for the young people in the inner city.

General Motors has adopted a "buddy" system in an inner city factory with encouraging results.

The J. L. Hudson Company, has developed two interesting programs, directed at the employment of 250 inner city high school dropouts or potential dropouts, and the hiring of 250 inner city residents on referral from inner city ministers.

The New Detroit Committee is looking into the dilemma of the underemployed and it has developed an imaginative, new approach to this longstanding problem. In effect, employers are being asked to look carefully at all their employees, pinpoint those with hidden or untapped qualifications, and upgrade them on a merit basis at the earliest possible date. A sincere review, we believe, will support the overwhelming evidence that advancement opportunities have not been given equally to Negroes, once hired into an existing organization, as they have to whites.

The committee also is currently studying the community college program, particularly in the Wayne County area.

It is investigating ways and means of providing management counselling and equity financing for new or small businesses, with emphasis on indigenous businesses and inner city needs. The committee has drawn up a legislative package to assure adequate insurance for inner city properties of all types.

The committee has worked closely with the Virginia Park Rehabilitation Citizens' Committee, a committee working in a neighborhood very close to the heart of last summer's riots, in developing what appears to be a successful program of direct neighborhood participation in the planning and rehabilitation of their own community, as Housing Director, Robert Knox indicated just this week when announcing long range plans for the 12th Street area.

It is reviewing the community's public and private recreation needs, problems and opportunities.

The committee is trying to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the public and private social services in our community so as to suggest a more effective use of manpower, greater responsiveness to immediate needs, and more effective use of the potential for volunteer assistance in the metropolitan area.

It is developing a youth program through a special task force for youth involvement, and assisted a program called "Homes by Christmas," which launched a successful campaign that raised $180,000 to house 120 families burned out during last summer's riots.

I think this list shows that the committee *has* made a start toward getting an extremely complex and difficult job done.

It became very clear to all of us that were or still are involved in New Detroit that the community-at-large must develop better listening mechanisms. The grass roots people must not only be listened to, but they must be actively and directly involved in the full planning process as well as all implementation efforts. Only insofar as every citizen has reason to consider himself a significant part of this society, can he be expected to work and live to protect and improve it. While this seems fundamental, we find serious lack of understanding or personal concern on this point in many sectors of the white community.

The whole spirit and intent of the New Detroit Committee is summed up in Chairman Hudson's words as he reported on its work to the people of the area:

"We *must* recognize and identify the sources of the frustrations that led to the riots last summer, and then work diligently with all of the resources available in our communities to develop programs of self-help and progress. This is not only for the Negroes in our slums, but also for the whites who live in poverty. They all seek, deserve, and now demand, a better future.

"Community improvement must begin with *human* rehabilitation. This complex task will require the best efforts of all of us for many years to come."

Earlier I mentioned a few examples of what business is doing.

All of us as businessmen can do much more. For instance, we must review our employment practices. Do we truly hire people purely on the basis of qualification? Do we promote those we have on the basis of merit alone? Do we send our recruiters out to all neighborhoods, all sections? Are we willing to take a chance in our hiring now and then? Or do we just sit back and wait for the exactly right person to come along?

This is a hard but necessary thing, to be fair across the board in employment practices. It's something that demands more than lip service from the top. It requires a well-structured program that reaches all the way down to the basic levels of the company. And there needs to be provision made for effective follow-ups, and a cold look needs to be taken periodically to see whether the statistics show any real progress. If you'll pardon another reference to my own company, we've had for years a program of equal opportunity going. It's part of the Plans for Progress program. It takes constant reminders and follow-up. Definite improvement has come as a result, but there is still more to be done.

Now, of course, I cannot predict the future. What it may bring is anybody's guess. But I do know this, the New Detroit Committee, many, many area businessmen, and I personally, are determined to do everything possible to make it a better future for everyone and that we're all going to get there together.

You know, I once heard a story that illustrates the situation we're in. Among the papers that the novelist, F. Scott Fitzgerald left behind at his death was the plot for a novel he apparently wanted to write. The substance of it was roughly this. A group of heirs were gathered in a huge manor house located on a very valuable estate to hear the reading of a will. The substance of the will was simplicity itself. All the rich land around the house, and the magnificent house itself was to pass to the heirs—provided they could learn to live in it together peacefully.

That's something of what we're facing today. It's a wonderful world. Certainly there's enough for everyone, but we can only all share in it if we succeed in learning to live together peacefully.

Thank you.

Italy's Spy Agency Kept Sex Dossiers

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, I have been opposing the establishment of a national data bank on the grounds that it holds a genuine threat for abuse of information. Many people in the statistically oriented professions have reassured me and said that it would be impossible for such a generalized aggregate producer to be turned into an intelligence system of personal dossiers. While I have the utmost respect for their unimpeachable academic credentials and their devotion to civil liberties, it seems to me that such an always expanding collection of computerized information may eventually operate far differently than its noble purposes would suggest. We cannot be sure that benevolent men will always use this highly personal information for benevolent purposes.

This was brought home very forcibly by a news item in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 4. While no one is now suggesting that the proposed national data bank will bear the slightest resemblance to the Italian counterespionage service—SIFAR—it is conceivable that a similar escalation of function and effect may very well occur. I would like to call particular attention to the following line in the news story:

> Its dossiers were limited at first to spy suspects but later grew to include government officials, deputies, senators, industrialists, bishops, priests and artists.

The greater the opportunity to collect and analyze confidential information, the greater the opportunity for abuse. This fundamental fact of human nature seems to me to suggest that we must be very careful before we entrust our personal histories to the tender sensibilities of bureaucrats at any level. It is especially dangerous, in my opinion, when these men are shielded behind the forbidding facade of the Federal Government. I think it would be very wise for all of us to ponder the significance of this highly unfortunate Italian example of dossier-type information being used for purposes that the originators of SIFAR never dreamed.

ITALY'S SPY AGENCY KEPT SEX DOSSIERS

ROME.—The Italian counterespionage service, SIFAR, turned itself into an autonomous power group by digging out the private secrets and sex habits of prominent citizens, including 4500 priests, a Rome court was told yesterday.

Parts of a secret report on SIFAR were read during a libel case. Former army chief of staff Gen. Giovanni de Lorenzo, who led SIFAR from 1956 to 1962, is suing the magazine L'Espresso for alleging that he masterminded a 1964 coup plot.

The report, compiled by an inquiry commission last year, said SIFAR began its "odious and illegal espionage" in 1956. Its dossiers were limited at first to spy suspects but later grew to include government officials, deputies, senators, industrialists, bishops, priests and artists. SIFAR agents were ordered to make detailed inquiries into their sex habits, illegitimate children and frivolous conduct, the report said.

Lt. C. E. Richards, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, Awarded Bronze Star

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the sacrifices being made by our servicemen in Vietnam to protect the interests of this Nation and all mankind deserve the respect and commendation of every American citizen. For this reason, I take personal pleasure in paying special tribute to Lt. C. E. Richards, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps. Lieutenant Richards, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Richards of my district, Nashville, Tenn., received a citation from the President and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievement while serving in Vietnam. The United States should indeed be proud of Lieutenant Richards' act of patriotism and sense of duty.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the citation for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

U.S. MARINE CORPS, HEADQUARTERS,
FLEET MARINE FORCE, PACIFIC,
San Francisco.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Second Lieutenant Clarence E. Richards, Jr., United States Marine Corps for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic achievement in connection with operations against the enemy in the Republic of Vietnam while serving as a Platoon Commander with Company M, Third Battalion, Fifth Marines, First Marine Division. On 13 May 1967, during Operation Union, Company M was assigned the mission of relieving Company K which was heavily engaged with a numerically superior North Vietnamese Army force and had sustained heavy casualties. Displaying exemplary leadership, Second Lieutenant Richards aggressively led his platoon and Company M through dense undergrowth to the right flank of the beseiged company. Disregarding his own safety and fearlessly exposing himself to intense enemy fire, he quickly positioned his men and directed their fire against the North Vietnamese forces. After relieving the pressure on the beleaguered unit, he supervised the evacuation of casualties and, moving from one position to another, encouraged his men and maneuvered them to positions from which they could more effectively bring fire to bear on the enemy. Constantly exposing himself to heavy small arms and automatic weapons fire, he subsequently sustained a serious leg wound from enemy machine gun fire. By his daring and aggressive actions in leading his platoon, Second Lieutenant Richards contributed materially to the success of his company which, in the ensuing fourteen hour battle, inflicted over 120 enemy killed and confiscated a large quantity of abandoned weapons, ammunition and equipment. Second Lieutenant Richards' courage, exceptional professionalism and selfless devotion to duty in the face of extreme personal danger were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service."

Second Lieutenant Richards is authorized to wear the Combat "V".

For the President,

V. H. KRULAK,

Lieutenant General, U.S. Marine Corps, Commanding General, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

A Southern Leader's Timely Biography

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading "The South Rejects a Prophet" by Dr. David M. Abshire. This fascinating political-historical biography was the subject of an article by Jere Sellars in the December 27 issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press. Because of its interest to this body, I place the article in the RECORD:

TODAY'S TROUBLES MIGHT HAVE BEEN AVERTED IF SENATOR KEY'S ADVICE HEEDED—ABSHIRE'S BOOK RELEASED HERE

(By Jere Sellars)

If David M. Abshire interpreted the evidence of century-old letters and clippings with accuracy, then it is less than extravagant to say that the bloodshed and horror of the "long, hot summer" of 1967 might not have happened had the South not rejected the genius of a Chattanoogan.

If his conclusions are correct, the South spent its blood, its fortune and over a half century of its future to purchase the illusion that the dead past could be resurrected.

David McKendree Key—lawyer, senator, cabinet member, soldier, judge, statesman and prophet; twice the pivotal point for swinging the United States away from the brink of a second Civil War—is the subject of "The South Rejects a Prophet."

Mr. Abshire, a native Chattanoogan, was in Miller's today for the first of two autograph parties here to launch the publication of his new book. The book grew out of research for his doctrinal dissertation prepared while doing graduate work at Georgetown University.

COMPILED BOOK

During his studies he learned that an aunt by marriage, Mrs. Sarah Key Patten, the daughter of Sen. D. M. Key, had in the basement of her Chattanooga home a collection of unpublished letters and other materials about her father.

He became so interested in the material and the new information it provided on an important era which had particular relevance to the events of today, that he decided to turn the dissertation into a book.

Mr. Abshire, now executive secretary of Georgetown's Center for Strategic Studies, attended Baylor School, the University of Chattanooga and was graduated from West Point. Between UC and West Point, he joined the Army and rose to sergeant before entering the academy. After graduation he served for a year and a half in Korea as captain for a frontline company. He coauthored "National Security" with Richard Allen and is working on a third book on Portuguese Africa.

His short, historical study of Sen. Key; published by Frederick A. Praeger, 224 pages with notes and indexes, selling for $5.95, officially published today; is a craftsman-like compilation of meticulous research. The facts alone contain the drama of epoch in the making and the tragedy of seeing the visions of a prophet destroyed in his lifetime—plus the deeper tragedy of knowing that today's turmoil need not have been.

The book spent a third of its length describing Key's unremarkable record as a Confederate officer, after he had rejected the guidance of his old friend and mentor Andrew Johnson. He obtained a pardon from President Johnson, who had succeeded the assassinated Abraham Lincoln, after the war and returned to the "carpetbagger" city of Chattanooga to resume his law practice.

NAMED SENATOR

For 10 years Key struggled to rebuild his life, often reflecting on the rashness that had allowed him to answer an emotional call to rally around a futile, erring cause. When Johnson, who had survived an attempted impeachment and returned to Tennessee to become a senator, died in 1875, the young Chattanooga chancellor was appointed to fill the seat until the legislature could meet again to elect a successor.

Before he got outside the city limits, the new senator alienated the political machine of Isham Harris, the secessionist governor, and much of his constituency by supporting national banks and opposing the sentiment that Southern states should repudiate their war debts.

He wasted little time in Washington stirring controversy by raising a voice of moderation and conciliation between North and South; at the same time decrying the injustices being heaped upon the defeated section.

Tammany Democrats thought they had a Southern trained seal and Southern racists thought they had a viper on their hands—neither was correct.

POLITICAL FLAW

Key preached unionism over sectionalism (and though a white supremist, Negro suffrage over segregation and Southern involvement in the economic growth of the nation. He had the politically fatal flaw of honesty—his tenure in the Senate ended after a year when the Tennessee Legislature elected a Harris dupe.

When factions threatened a new civil war over the disputed Hayes-Tilden presidential election in 1876 the only man who could avert catastrophe was the candid, recently defeated back-woodsman from Chattanooga.

CABINET POST

As a moderate Southerner, he was in position to influence enough votes to swing the election from Democrat Tilden to Republican Hayes. An independent position on the Cabinet as postmaster general was arranged by Memphis publisher Col. Andrew J. Kellar, the schism was healed and the cries of "Tilden or blood" faded.

But neither Key nor Kellar could stir the hesitant Hayes into withdrawing federal troops from the Southern states still occupied and, as Key had feared, this bred the hatred and distrust which was exploited by Southern radicals and Northern Tammany Hall politicians to set the stage for formation of a one-party, solid South.

The new postmaster used his politically powerful office to save the presidency when Tilden forces tried to resurrect charges of fraud in the electoral vote decision. The act made him well known and popular at the grassroots level, but drew more hatred from his political enemies.

TO FEDERAL BENCH

Had he run for governor of Tennessee when he resigned from his post in 1880, the author believes, instead of accepting a federal circuit court bench in Chattanooga; he might well have brought about the renaissance which would have led Southern politics away from racism and sectionalism to enlightenment and a broader national outlook.

The forgotten element, the small farmers, had become a dynamic new force and were ripe for exploitation because they had looked hopefully to the Hayes administration for relief from their burden of unrewarding drudgery.

Tennessee Republicans would have given him solid support, industrialists were ready to swing to him, and some agrarians might have followed him because of his association with their hero, the Great Commoner, Andrew Johnson. He did not choose to run.

The South slid back into a morass of color-line politics which kept the radical elements in power, but cost the South a half century of stunted economic and social justice development.

Thomas Alva Edison: Humanity's Friend

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens of the State of New Jersey is Mr. George E. Stringfellow, retired senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of West Orange, N.J.

Mr. Stringfellow was a close personal friend of Thomas Alva Edison and thus his reminiscences about this great man are of particular interest to all Americans young and old, who are fascinated by the career of the man who gave light to the millions.

Just this week, the Kiwanis Club of Kearny, N.J., were honored by the presence of Mr. Stringfellow, whose speech, "Thomas Alva Edison: Humanity's Friend" is worthy of the attention of all Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Stringfellow's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON: HUMANITY'S FRIEND

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, and Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Kearny, N.J., February 7, 1968)

Thomas Alva Edison, father of the electric light and power industry, produced more inventions than any other many in the history of the world and was one of mankind's greatest benefactors. He was born in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847—121 years ago. He died in West Orange, New Jersey, on October 18, 1931.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of one of his largest and most lucrative businesses. Any success I may have had in commerce or civic affairs, is largely the result of my daily association with this great American during the last decade of his long and productive life.

Embellishment can not fittingly pay tribute to one so humble, so plain and retiring.

He was passionately fond of work.

He was a genius in applying organized knowledge.

He was infinitely patient and undaunted in failures.

He brought forth inventions which broadened the lives of mankind.

He brought amusement, joy and romance to man, woman and child. He lessened their labors. He widened their education for a fuller enjoyment of their daily lives. Great industries with employment of many millions followed in the wake of his discoveries. We can truthfully say there came from his laboratory, a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and higher living standards for the world.

At the time of Edison's death it was suggested that as a tribute to him, the electric power of the nation be turned off for one minute. It was felt this token of respect would cause the people to realize Edison's magnificent contribution.

Upon further consideration it was realized that somewhere in the bowels of the earth, men digging in tunnels and mining ore are dependent on electrically-driven pumps for air. Without it they would soon perish. In hospitals surgeons in the midst of operations with life hanging in the balance, are dependent on electricity to complete their work. The telephone and the police and fire alarms are dependent on electric power. And in hundreds of other situations there would be great danger to life and property if the power of the nation was turned off at the source, just for a minute, as a tribute to its creator.

And so, in our very inability to pay as complete a tribute to Edison as we wished, we found a new and higher tribute to him. Life depends on the light and energy he gave us.

Civilization has been built around his work.

At twenty minutes past three o'clock, the morning of Sunday, October 18, 1931, Thomas Alva Edison closed a long life of unparalleled usefulness.

Mr. Edison's approach to death was a wonderful example of unperturbed courage. Its inevitableness was thoroughly understood and on no occasion did he manifest any apprehension of spirit. He dealt with his failing health as impersonally as he did with any research problem. Before he entered the drowsiness which turned into the final coma, Mr. Edison compared himself with an old machine past repair.

The entire world followed the illness and passing of Mr. Edison with interest and sympathy reserved only for its beloved great, which he was. Throughout the eleven weeks of his illness, his home in Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., was a focal point of unusual solitude. Many thousands of inquiries on Mr. Edison's condition came to the inventor's home and to members of his family.

After the word of his passing had been flashed around the world, messages of condolence and tributes to his genius flowed into Llewellyn Park in unprecedented numbers.

Mrs. Edison, who had been his close companion over a period of 45 years, was constantly in attendance at her illustrious husband's bedside. She contributed everything possible to his comfort and peace of mind. She exhibited extraordinary courage and fortitude throughout the ordeal.

On October 19 and 20 Mr. Edison's body lay in state in the library of his West Orange laboratory. Except for the casket and the simple floral decoration, this room was left almost as he knew it, with its galleries lined with reference mementoes of his amazing life.

After Mr. Edison's employees and coworkers had taken their last look at all that remained of their "old chief", the gates obstructing the way to the laboratory were thrown open and the public allowed to pass through the library. Four abreast they waited in line and moved sadly through the room. Old men and women, shabbily dressed, and school children were in line. Limousines with liveried chauffeurs discharged passengers who took their places in line.

During the two days and nights that the body lay in state, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons filed through to render a last act of reverence.

On Wednesday morning, October 21, Mr. Edison's body was carried to his home in preparation for the funeral rites and burial. The funeral service was extremely simple, in keeping with the taste and character of Mr. Edison. While the ceremony was private, more than 400 close friends were in attendance.

After the ceremony the body was carried to Rosedale Cemetery in Orange, N.J. which overlooks the hills and valleys among which he had spent the most productive years of his life. It was dusk when the last rites were being said, and autumn leaves drifted softly to the ground from the distant fringe of trees. President Hoover's wreath of magnolia leaves lay at the head of the grave. Electric lights flashed on in the distance while Mrs. Edison stood in silent contemplation before the flower-banked grave.

Only members of the family and a few intimate friends, including his old cronies, Harvey Firestone and Henry Ford, and their wives, attended the interment.

In commenting on Edison's passing, the New York Times said:

"Edison, the light bearer, has gone into darkness. The master of the waves of sound is silent. Around him had gathered an atmosphere of respect, admiration and affection such as surrounded no other American of our time. . . . He might have wrought all these marvels and remained apart, solitarily in his laboratory. His companionable and social nature, his fine simplicity and boyishness, endeared the man, set up his essential human image in millions of minds. He was not only honored, but loved."

Three years before Edison passed on to his reward, a special Congressional Gold Medal of Honor was given him for "development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization in the last century."

Few men have received, or receiving, deserved such a compliment from the United States Congress.

The manner of his life became the manner of his death. Slowly, calmly, peacefully, he faced death. It found him as unafraid to meet the mysteries beyond as he had been unafraid to explore the mysteries here.

On his deathbed he said, "It is very beautiful over there." How true that must have been with his coming, and equally true it is that he made it very beautiful over here.

He ended his long life, not with a sudden stroke, but with a slow folding-up that seemed perfectly to suit it. No one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least be said of Edison, as it was said of Lincoln, and can be said of very few other: "Now he belongs to the ages."

The Washington Post said of him:

"Few men will have the privilege of influencing the life and civilization of their fellow-beings after they have crossed the bridge of death, so much as this great American."

There are those who feel that Edison's greatest contribution to civilization is not listed in his more than 1,000 inventions and is not a material product of his laboratory. It is his inspiration to youth, his example to those who would dare to dream of new worlds, his challenge to accomplishment that will always spur onward those who fight the past with the future.

President Hoover said:

"It is given to few men of any age, nation or calling, to become the benefactor of all humanity. That distinction came abundantly to Thomas Alva Edison, whose death in his 85th year has ended a life of courage and achievement.

"By his own genius and effort he rose from a newsboy and telegrapher to the position of leadership among men. His life has been a constant stimulant to confidence that our institutions hold open the door of opportunity to those who would enter. He possessed a modesty, kindliness, a staunchness of character rare among men."

Among the lessons from the life of Edison are his uniformly courageous and optimistic outlook, his triumph over his handicap of deafness and his consistent exemplification of the doctrine of self-help. In his achievements he reared for himself an enduring memorial.

Edison's last public utterance remains the best advice given to a perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Thomas Alva Edison was humanity's friend!

President's Message on Education

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson points out in his education message that 1½ million young men and women will leave high school and enter the labor force this year.

But as the President correctly observes, they will be leaving at a time of high employment in this country, a time when job skills are at a premium.

The President predicts:

> Too many of them will find that they have no job skills—or only marginal skills, or skills which are not really needed in their communities.

Yet even in a time of high employment, jobs are continuing to open up. It is estimated that there should be two technicians to every engineer or professional physical scientist; there should be 6 to 10 technicians for every medical doctor or researcher in the health fields.

Obviously, broader training must be offered to high school students in vocational education. Students must be encouraged to stay in school and to undertake technical training.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the President's request for favorable action by the House on the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968.

We already have made much progress under the Vocational Education Act of

1963. In the past 4 years, the number of vocational students in our high schools has increased by more than 1½ million.

Of these young men and women, about 1¼ million have been trained in a business occupation. The remaining ¼ million have been trained in trades and industrial occupations.

In that same period, the number of postsecondary vocational students has increased by more than 900,000. Of these, nearly 800,000 have taken training in business education, and 70,000 have been trained in trades and industrial occupations.

Mr. Speaker, the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act would help the States concentrate their funds where they find the greatest needs in vocational education. It would encourage the States to make long-range plans for better vocational education. I hope the House will act promptly to enact the President's bill.

Fair Pay System for Federal Government Wage Board Workers

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service commenced public hearings relative to the pay of our Government's 800,000 wage board employees, which incidentally is more than in all of the Post Office Department or the combined total employment of any two of our Nation's largest private corporations.

Wage board employees are those in recognized trades or crafts, other skilled mechanical crafts, and in unskilled or semiskilled manual labor occupations. Examples of wage board employees are: laborers, carpenters, painters, and aircraft mechanics. These are frequently referred to as blue-collar employees to distinguish them from the classified or white-collar employees of the professional, administrative, and clerical classes.

Under various laws, especially the Classification Act of 1949, the annual salaries of the white-collar employees are established, from time to time, by the Congress. On the other hand, the heads of the departments concerned establish the hourly wages to be paid the wage board employees. The wages of the blue-collar employees are required to be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

In our continuing study of the salaries and wages of Federal employees, we found a number of inequities and inconsistencies involved in establishing the pay of the blue-collar workers. Principal among these was the significantly different hourly rate for the same work in the same city or area paid by the various Government departments. These inequities were brought to the attention of the Congress and the President. He directed the heads of departments and agencies under the leadership of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to simplify and to coordinate the procedures for establishing pay rates for blue-collar employees.

On December 1, 1967, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission announced a new coordinated Federal wage system for the departments and agencies. In the meanwhile, the Senate passed a bill, S. 2303, in October 1967, to provide for a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of wage board employees.

In 1967, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, spent many months reviewing the pay of our professional, administrative, and clerical personnel. As a result, Congress passed the most comprehensive pay bill in history for those employees. It now appears most appropriate and timely that we give proper and adequate consideration to the pay of our 800,000 blue-collar workers, about 80 percent of whom are in the Department of Defense.

All interested departments and employee organizations will be given an opportunity to express their views on the different proposals to revise the wage board pay system.

On February 6, 1968, in testimony before the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee, Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission reviewed, in depth, the coordinated Federal wage system, and stated that it would be put into effect on an area by area basis beginning July 1, 1968. The principal features of the new system are the same rate of pay for the same type of work in the same area by all departments, standard job classification, and greater employee participation in the reviews leading to establishment of pay rates.

Any comprehensive overhaul of the blue-collar pay system should result in a single wage board pay system in the Department of Defense, which up until now has had two.

The next witnesses to be heard, the week of February 26, will be officials from the Defense Department who will discuss their views.

We certainly want to hear from all employee organizations and others who have an interest in this management area. The blue-collar workers, from laborer to top-level supervisors, must have a fair pay system—one that is truly representative and comparable with the hourly rates of pay of our private economy.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing now pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service more important to the American taxpayers than the undertaking of the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee to insure that the best and fairest wage pay system we can devise is established and implemented as soon as possible.

Fayette County, Ga.

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informs me that there is more to the story of its dealings with the Fayette County School District than has been indicated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] today. I have long been impressed by the Department's good faith in the administration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I am confident that the Department will disclose its reasons for deferring Federal funds as soon as possible.

Interoceanic Links—Release by Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the January 1964 Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone served to dramatize the interoceanic canal problem to a greater degree than any event since the famous dash in 1898 of the U.S.S. *Oregon* from the Pacific coast to join the U.S. fleet off Santiago, Cuba. One consequence has been the encouragement of the thoughtful authors and outstanding authorities to write on various aspects of the canal question.

Among such writers is Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff of Tulsa, Okla., a distinguished geologist formerly head of the department of geology of the University of Pennsylvania, who is well versed on interoceanic canal problems.

In a recent release on "Interoceanic Links," Dr. Meyerhoff presents some Suez and Panama canals and their relation to world commerce.

I quote the indicated release as part of my remarks:

INTEROCEANIC LINKS

TULSA, OKLA., January 21, 1968.—To an air-minded generation, oceans are for cruises. This is the season for Caribbean jaunts, and the Mediterranean may lure the more leisurely and affluent, even tho Athens, Nicosia, and Cairo have lost some of their charm. But the 'round-the-world traveler really has to have time and money, for the only way around is the long way—via Cape Town. Suez is closed to traffic. At least, he doesn't have to round Cape Horn—yet.

The Cock-eyed World.—Geographically the world is cock-eyed. Most of the land is in the Northern Hemisphere, and most of the water is in the Southern. The world's population is even more unbalanced, for a disproportionate amount of it is crowded into the great expanses of habitable land in the Northern Hemisphere. Theoretically concentration is good for business, but practically it's bad for trade. The world's bulk commodities move by water.

In the Eastern Hemisphere the completion of the Suez Canal in 1869 changed the entire pattern of international trade, and especially trade in the British Empire. Britain's navy and bases assured safe passage. Gibraltar—"The Rock"—controlled the entrance to the Mediterranean. Malta guarded the narrows between Sicily and Tunisia. A pact with Egypt and bases at Aden and Solotra took care of the Canal, Red Sea and Gulf of Aden. The final control point on the route to the Indies and Hongkong was Singapore on the Strait of Malacca.

And now? Gibraltar, British since 1704, is under threat from Spain. Malta, Aden and Singapore are independent. And Nasser has bitten off his nose to save face, to the tune of $4 million or more a week in tolls. Oil for Western Europe may have been the most critical bulk commodity to pass thru the Canal, but the 100,000 and 200,000-ton tankers in service or abuilding offer scant comfort to the lesser nations dependent upon low-cost ocean freight for their bulk exports and imports. The added shipping and insurance costs for oil and other raw materials may well have been the final shove that pushed the British pound over the brink.

Lest We Forget.—Nasser has given the maritime nations a timely lesson in the freedom of the seaways, if not of the seas. Perhaps it is one reason why we haven't heard more of the Panama treaty which, only a few months ago, the Administration was prepared to push thru the Senate. Helpfully, Panamanians demonstrated against it and demanded bigger and better concessions at the crucial moment. But what is going on now between the two governments, even the Senators seem unable to discover.

Before the Panama Canal was opened in 1914, shipping between the East and West coasts of the U.S. was severely restricted, and so was West Coast development. It faced the Orient, and trans-Pacific trade was easier—and more lucrative—than trans-continental trade around the Horn. The voyages of the Clipper ships or the forced-draft run of the USS Oregon made dramatic reading, but the trans-continental railroad made more sense. The truth is, it still does.

Movement of mineral raw materials thru the Panama Canal illustrates the point. In an average year 13 million tons of iron ore, copper, nitrate and other minerals pass thru the locks to get from one ocean to the other. Of this amount less than 200,000 tons is internal U.S. trade, and approximately 8.3 million tons, U.S. foreign trade. The remaining 4.5 million tons has a foreign origin and a foreign destination. Over 9 million tons are iron ore, copper concentrate or matte, tin, lead and zinc concentrates, and nitrates from Chile, Bolivia, and Peru, whose economic development dates in large part from the opening of the canal. Other Latin American countries join the list of beneficiaries when agricultural products are totted up.

Administration of this vital interoceanic link is a responsibility that cannot be shared with a country that has nothing to offer but the accident of geography. The U.S. with a feeble assist from the U.N., took Suez out of responsible hands, at a cost the Eastern Hemisphere is now paying. Can it afford to compromise its responsibility to the world in the administration of the Panama Canal?

President Acts To Bring Boating Safety to America's Waterways

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we have acted to achieve safer motor vehicles and highway programs, President Johnson proposed in his consumer message to improve boating safety.

It has become dangerous to launch a pleasure boat on our lakes and waterways.

Last year's figures point out the seriousness of the problem. Some 7,000 persons were seriously injured and more than 1,400 were killed in boating accidents.

In Michigan alone, in 1966, there were 325 boating accidents, in which 90 people were killed, 123 were injured, and property damage totaled nearly a quarter of a million dollars.

These statistics only record those deaths and injuries which were reported—not the many accidents which may have gone unreported.

Boating safety is a necessity for the total enjoyment of our waterways. All levels of government must cooperate in this venture if we are to have a true measure of success. Thus, the President's Recreational Boat Safety Act will provide Federal assistance to help States establish and improve their own boat safety programs—while authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to act and enforce safety standards for boat design and equipment.

Boating should be enjoyable—not hazardous; relaxing—not a risk. President Johnson's program can help eliminate the needless tragedy in our waterways. We must act promptly on the President's proposals.

Motor Vehicle Master Keys

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that in his message on crime in America, President Johnson indicated that the administration will sponsor legislation to control the traffic in so-called motor vehicle master keys in interstate commerce.

Many bills to accomplish this laudable goal have been introduced in this Congress. The senior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL, and I have cosponsored one of these measures. Our bill differs from some of the others, however, in that it would prohibit the interstate shipment of master keys to persons barred by State law from possessing or receiving them.

It is my belief that by relating the Federal law to State statutes, we would both strengthen existing State regulations and encourage those States that have not already done so to enact laws of their own for curbing master keys.

Although we may disagree on the exact form this legislation should take, I think we can all agree that the auto theft problem cries for solutions.

Already much is being done. A campaign undertaken by the Justice Department, law enforcement associations, and automobile clubs has helped educate the general public on steps to reduce auto theft. Many auto owners have been alerted to take such precautions as they can, by leaving car ignitions and doors locked when their cars are unattended. And manufacturers are responding with devices which will make it difficult for a motorist to inadvertently leave his car with the key in the ignition.

Although carelessness by automobile owners still continues to contribute to auto theft—particularly by juveniles who are prone to "joyriding"—even locked cars can be stolen by the use of "master keys" which are readily available to the public through mail-order sales.

For a minimal price, any person can obtain a set of keys which, although advertised as "master keys" are really "manipulation keys," designed to fit the ignition of numbers of cars of designated models. These keys are not of the type used in the locksmith trade, which are specifically designed to open combinations of locks in a planned sequence, but are intended to take advantage of unplanned construction similarities in a series or group of locks.

The "manipulation" or "tryout" key, as it is sometimes called, has little legitimate use. The manufacture and dissemination of such keys must be controlled, so as to prevent them from being available to irresponsible persons who can easily use them for illegal purposes.

I hope that legislation to accomplish this can be enacted this year.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, February 12, marks the day on which we honor one of the greatest heroes of our American Revolution, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of the most valiant and brilliant soldiers of his day. He was also a great soldier of freedom.

Born the son of a well-to-do Polish peasant, Kosciuszko seemed destined to be a fighter for freedom and justice. He was born on February 12, 1746, and at the age of 13 lost his father. This did not deter his resolve, however, for he continued his education with success and in 1765 entered the Royal Military School at Warsaw. He graduated in 1769 with the rank of captain and won a scholarship for study in France where he entered the famous military school at Mesieres, specializing in artillery and engineering.

In 1776, in Paris, Kosciuszko heard of America's fight for independence. Our Revolution stirred his restless, fighting spirit and his desire to act in a righteous cause. With borrowed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that year.

In the United States, Kosciuszko applied at once for military service. He was admitted and first employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware. In 3 months he completed this assignment and earned a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of 1777 Kosciuszko joined the northern army at Ticonderoga. Unfortunately, his plans for fortification there were not followed and Ticonderoga was lost to the enemy. Soon, however, his sound judgment was given due credit at Saratoga. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of constuction of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he saw action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his outstanding services for the cause of our Revolution, Congress made Kosciuszko a brigadier general in October of 1783. Concerned for his own people, he returned to Poland hoping to serve in Poland's struggle for freedom. In 1789 he was made a major general in Poland's Army and for many years continued to lead the Poles in their valiant but hopeless fight for freedom. He ended his career in Switzerland, dying there on October 15, 1817.

It is most fitting that we pay homage to the memory of this gallant son of Poland who was also one of the great patriots of our American Revolution.

A Crumbling Policy

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Vietnam draws on and on, we are led to wonder about the wisdom of a military policy in this area.

Is there a need for a reassessment of the U.S. military posture, with some deep thought being given to a modified approach to this problem?

Walter Lippmann makes some penetrating observations on this subject in an article appearing in the February 12 issue of Newsweek. I insert this article in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A CRUMBLING POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The seizure of the Pueblo has brought home to us that in the coastal waters of Asia lie the outer limits of our conventional military power. It has been a humiliating affair. But it is only an incident in a chain of events which teaches the same lesson, that the Johnson-Rusk Asian policy is a miscalculation of our own power in relation to the power that can be arrayed against us.

The Pueblo affair has made all but the most irresponsible realize that we cannot afford to have a second land war in Asia. This realization has come to us a few weeks after Great Britain, our only important and independent ally in the world, has announced that she will abandon her role as a military power in South Asia—from Suez to Singapore. This leaves us without the support of a single large power anywhere in the world. The withdrawal of Britain from Asia confirms the total isolation of the United States.

The financial crisis which caused the British decision to withdraw left the dollar exposed and vulnerable. By various devices at home and abroad a crisis has been averted. But if the war in Asia spreads and intensifies, there can be little doubt that these financial devices and palliatives will break down. This may well cause a worldwide financial crisis.

Our international financial troubles have now been capped by the domestic budget. Because it is impossible to foresee the course of the war, it is a mystifying budget. The only certain thing about it is that it marks the end of the great "war" on poverty and the promises of a "Great Society."

Amidst all these troubles we are facing the biggest battle of the war in Vietnam. In this battle, General Westmoreland does not have the initiative.

Attempting the Impossible. The series of setbacks would seem to indicate that the Johnson-Rusk policy in Asia is crumbling. What is crumbling is the notion that the United States can by military force determine the order of things on the continent of Asia.

We have had plenty of warning from American soldiers and American experts not to attempt the impossible in Asia. They have told us that we cannot invade and conquer, that we cannot "contain" by surrounding, the masses of Asian peasants.

It is not necessary to read Chinese and Sanskrit in order to understand the essential facts of the strategic and military relationship between America and Asia. It is necessary only to look at a map and to study the statistics. The Johnson-Rusk policy in Asia is based on the assumption that 200 million Americans, because they have a superior technology, can lead and direct the two-thirds of the human race which inhabits the continent of Asia. It cannot be done.

The size of Asia is too great. The distance from America is too great. The distrust of the Western white man's rule is too great. The reluctance of the Western white man to go bankrupt and die is too great. The foundations of the policy are rotten, and they were bound to crumble.

The Pueblo reminds us that in making the strategic mistake of engaging the bulk of our military power at one point, like Vietnam, the response can and will break out at other points. The war is already spreading into Laos, Thailand, Cambodia and Korea. Perhaps it will spread to Quemoy and Matsu, perhaps to the Middle East. The Johnson-Rusk policy of "containment" is like trying to squeeze a gallon of water into a pint-size bottle.

No Victory in Asia. The cardinal mistake in Washington has, however, been the failure to realize that the Soviet Union could not and would not allow us to win the war in Asia. This quite self-evident truth has now been reaffirmed by Chairman Kosygin in his interview with Life magazine: "The United States cannot defeat Vietnam. And we, for our part, will do all we can so that the United States does not defeat Vietnam."

Despite the Communist habit of making big threats, this is a very serious statement. For in this case the Soviet Union not only has real reasons for helping Vietnam but it has the practical ability to do what it says it will do. We cannot prevent the Soviet Union from supplying North Vietnam, and we may be sure that China will not interfere.

But besides supplying Hanoi, the Soviet Union can unleash or foment outbreaks at a dozen places from Korea to the Mediterranean. Even the blindest among us can see that the United States, which has no effective ally in the world, cannot have military superiority all over the globe.

Until the miscalculations of our present policy are understood, the formation of a constructive policy in the emerging and awakened Asian continent will not be possible. We are witnessing the frustration of a military policy. Until we have learned the lesson of the mistake which has caused it, we shall have little political influence in Asian affairs.

Parity Prices

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the farm parity percentages on farm products for the month ending January 15, 1968.

The average price that farmers received this past month is less than three-fourths of the fair price that farmers should be receiving. It is important to point out that not only are farmers being plagued with depression level prices, their costs have been and are continuing to establish new monthly all-time highs. While farm prices are 2½ times higher than they were in 1910–14, their farm production and living costs are 3½ times higher. This past year alone, production costs increased seven points over a year ago. The interest that a farmer pays now, based on a per acre average, is 4.6 times as high as the 1910–14 base; his taxes are nine times as high per acre as the base period, and his wage costs are 8½ times as high as the base period. Parity for the year of 1967 averaged 74 percent, which is 6 percentage points lower than last year, and the lowest of any year since 1933. In the great depression year of 1934 farm parity was at 75 percent.

I call this shocking condition to the attention of my colleagues because continuance of such low returns will finally lead to the reality of painful consequences by the public who today receive the greatest food bargain in the world at the expense of one of the lowest paid segments of our soicety. In effect, the farmer is subsidizing the food consumer and has been for nearly 20 years.

Parity prices for January 1968

	Percent
January	74
Cotton	51
Wheat	54
Corn	65
Peanuts	75
Butterfat	78
Milk	84
Wool	45
Barley	74
Flax	73
Oats	76
Sorghum	68
Soybeans	76
Beef	75
Chickens	64
Eggs	62
Hogs	73
Lambs	79
Turkeys	59

President's Message on Education

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on education gives us an ample agenda for building upon past educational accomplishments and for meeting the educational needs of the young men and women in this country.

We sorely need such an agenda. The changing trends of our national economy and the growing demands upon young men and women to present modern job skills have created a serious gap in our educational system.

New occupations are emerging; old ones are dying out. Broader training must be offered to students in vocational education. Students must be motivated to stay in school and to go on to more advanced training after high school.

It is to these purposes that the President's partnership for learning and earning is addressed. Title I of the proposed legislation would provide grants for model projects in vocational education. The broader training needed would begin here with improved curriculums.

The President's bill also would consolidate next year the existing authority for vocational education programs under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

I think this is most important because the present requirement for separate matching, purpose by purpose and project by project, would be removed. States then would match Federal funds with a statewide total. This would give more flexibility; Federal funds would be directed to the greatest needs.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, it was estimated that the number of jobs for professional and technical workers would increase by 40 percent by the 1970's. Those jobs are continuing to open up. I believe the Congress should comply with the President's request and get on with the task of improving vocational education in this country.

Two State GI's Die in War

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Harold R. Stafford and Sp4. Russell M. Amoss, two infantrymen from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN WAR—H. R. STAFFORD, R. M. AMOSS BOTH KILLED JANUARY 31

Two Army infantrymen from Maryland were killed January 31 in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The latest casualties from Maryland were identified as Spec. 5 Harold R. Stafford, 25, of 2812 Oak Grove Avenue, Baltimore Highlands, and Spec. 4 Russell M. Amoss, of Route 3, Mount Airy.

SERVING SECOND HITCH

Specialist Stafford, a tankman turned infantryman, was killed by gunfire, according to his wife, Mrs. Opal Stafford. He had been in Vietnam since September.

Specialist Stafford, a native of Baileysville, W. Va., was serving his second hitch in the Army. He was assigned to the 25th Infantry Division.

He first enlisted about 1959 and was discharged in 1963. Mrs. Stafford said her husband reenlisted in June, 1966.

"He just felt he was needed," Mrs. Stafford said.

ATTENDED SCHOOL IN WEST VIRGINIA

At one point Specialist Stafford was a tank commander in an armored unit in Germany. He was considering making a career of the Army but had not yet decided to do so, Mrs. Stafford said.

"He never bothered me about the situation over there," Mrs. Stafford said. "He knew I'd just worry."

Specialist Stafford attended high school and plumbing trade school in Baileysville.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son, Richard T. Stafford; a daughter, Tammy R. Stafford; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Stafford, of Holcomb, W. Va.; two brothers and five sisters.

Specialist Amoss, an infantry squad leader, was killed by metal fragments from a explosion, according to the Department of the Army.

IN VIETNAM SINCE MAY

He was 20 years old and had been in Vietnam since May, 1967.

Specialist Amoss lived in rural Howard county, not far from the Carroll county community of Mount Airy. He was a 1965 graduate of Glenelg High School and a pitcher on the school's baseball team.

After graduation, and until he was drafted on November 18, 1966, he was employed by the Fawcett-Haynes Printing Corporation, in Rockville.

In his letters home from Vietnam, his mother recalled last night, "He let me know he was okay, but he wouldn't tell us about anything over there."

SURVIVORS LISTED

Specialist Amoss is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley M. Amoss, of Route 3, Mount Airy, nine brothers, Stanley M. Amoss, Jr., of Baltimore; Earl Amoss, of Frederick; Howard Amoss, of Reddington, Pa.; Robert Amoss, of Mount Airy; Richard Amoss, of Detour, Md.; Kenneth Amoss, of Damascus, Md.; Norman Amoss, of the United States Air Force and Roy and Lloyd Amoss, both of the home; and four sisters, Mrs. Grace Shaw, of Riverdale, Md.; Mrs. Doris Gasaway, of Clarksburg, Md.; Mrs. Mary Gayer, of Sykesville, Md., and Miss Gail Amoss, of the home.

In addition, the deaths of a Navy hospitalman who once lived in Baltimore and an Army Specialist who was born here were reported.

KILLED BY SNIPER

The Navy man was Hospitalman Ralph D. Wheeler 3d, 20, who was killed January 27 by a sniper while he was serving with the 3d Battalion, 4th Marine Brigade, 3d Marine Division.

He was the son of Army Sgt. 1st Class and Mrs. Ralph D. Wheeler, of 315B Forbes road, Trafford, Pa., and as a small child he lived with his parents in Baltimore until his father's assignments as a career soldier led elsewhere.

Hospitalman Wheeler was a 1966 graduate of Trafford (Pa.) high school. He had been in Vietnam since Thanksgiving Day, 1967.

He is survived by his parents; a brother, Mark Wheeler, of Trafford, and a sister, Mrs. Carole Mallory, of Pittsburgh.

The soldier was Spec. 4 David W. Leatherbury, 21, son of the Rev. and Mrs. John R. Leatherbury, of Fort Worth, Texas, who was killed in Vietnam January 12. His parents are both former Baltimoreans.

Foreign Travel Tax Is Unwise

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating editorial appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Wednesday, February 2, in opposition to the proposed tax to be levied upon Americans traveling abroad. This persuasive and timely editorial is reproduced here for the benefit of my colleagues as well as for the edification of those in the executive department who are advocating this unwise measure:

AN ABOMINABLE TAX

It would be hard to devise a scheme more intricate, more difficult to enforce, and more contrary to American traditions of liberty than the proposed travel tax which the administration has dumped in the lap of Congress. Or, for that matter, one less likely to make a significant dent in the balance-of-payments deficit, which Secretary Fowler described as "intolerable."

Not even the administration expects the proposed tax to cut tourist spending overseas by more than 200 or 250 million dollars a year. This is almost trivial when compared with the dollar deficit of about 3.6 billion dollars, or with total tourist spending of about 4 billion dollars, or with the government's own spending abroad on foreign aid, which has been estimated at about 8 billion dollars a year.

In order to bring about this modest saving, American travelers are threatened with a ridiculous amount of red tape and bureaucratic snooping. Anyone planning to leave the western hemisphere would have to file a tax return stating how long he expected to be overseas and how much he expected to spend there. If he expected to spend more than $7 a day, he would have to pay in advance a tax on the excess: 15 per cent up to $15 a day, and 30 per cent over that.

Upon leaving the country, he would have to file a declaration stating how much he was taking with him in cash and travelers checks, "subject to verification by customs officials or other treasury officials" [meaning they could search him]. He would have to pay a 5 per cent tax on his air line or other transportation. Upon his return he would have to declare how much money he had left [and perhaps display it], and within 60 days he would have to file a final return listing his expenses, reporting any money he received abroad beyond what he took with him, and paying any remaining tax due.

Rules like these have been tried by other countries but have never worked. For those who want to evade them, there are at least two ways around every rule. Even with complete public cooperation, they would be difficult to enforce. The purpose of the proposal is to discourage travel, but, to the extent that it does, it would infringe upon what the Supreme Court has declared to be an inalienable right, "a constitutional liberty closely related to rights of free speech and association." In the words of Justice Douglas, an inveterate globe-trotter himself, "Free movement by the citizen . . . is the very essence of our free society."

True, the court was talking about the right of Communists and others to travel abroad against the wishes of the state department. But this makes the proposed restrictions all the more offensive. The administration is not only asking us, as tourists, to atone for its own fiscal sins, but it also wants to impose on a right which the Supreme Court has guaranteed even to Communists in our midst. And all in the dubious hope of trimming at most one-twelfth from the "intolerable" deficit.

Foreign Assistance: A Priority Program

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President for pressing the offensive in the war on hunger he declared last year and for reaffirming the importance of aid programs in health, education, and agriculture.

The programs he proposes are constructive. They offer immediate and long-range solutions to the problems most visibly afflicting the less-developed world. He asks our support in exploiting spectacular breakthroughs in agriculture, in meeting the growing response to our offer of help in family planning.

The health, education, and agriculture programs proposed by the President are the best available guarantee of a healthy and intelligent leadership to carry on with the task of development wherever this leadership is most needed.

The urgency should be apparent to all of us. Population growth today is projected in multiples of billions compressed in steadily diminishing periods of time.

What we are asked to do involves no great sacrifice. We are called on to use our great resources of wealth and technology to help preserve the precarious balance between food and mouths, to eradicate disease and ignorance.

If we are not moved to support this program by a sense of compassion, let us obey our instincts for self-preservation.

If anything offers hope for peace and stability, surely these programs do. They satisfy today's needs in the developing world and keep pace with tomorrow's.

Our experience since the President first emphasized these programs 3 years ago encourages optimism. In cost the program is modest. But modest or not, we cannot afford to give anything less than our full support for these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Congressional Record at this point the text of the President's message sent today to the Congress in support of his proposed foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1969, plus some additional supplementary information on that program:

To Build the Peace

Peace will never be secure so long as:

Seven out of ten people on earth cannot read or write:

Tens of millions of people each day—most of them children—are maimed and stunted by malnutrition.

Diseases long conquered by science still ravage cities and villages around the world.

If most men can look forward to nothing more than a lifetime of backbreaking toil which only preserves their misery, violence will always beckon, freedom will ever be under seige.

It is only when peace offers hope for a better life that it attracts the hundreds of millions around the world who live in the shadow of despair.

Twenty years ago America resolved to lead the world against the destructive power of man's oldest enemies. We declared war on the hunger, the ignorance, the disease, and the hopelessness which breed violence in human affairs.

We knew then that the job would take many years. We knew then that many trials and many disappointments would test our will.

But we also knew that, in the long run, a single ray of hope—a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—can do more to build the peace and guard America from harm than guns and bombs.

This is the great truth upon which all our foreign aid programs are founded. It was valid in 1948 when we helped Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. It was valid in the early fifties when the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a ruined Western Europe into a showcase of freedom. It was valid in the sixties when we helped Taiwan and Iran and Israel take their places in the ranks of free nations able to defend their own independence, and moving toward prosperity on their own.

The programs I propose today are as important and as essential to the security of this nation as our military defenses. Victory on the battlefield must be matched by victory in the peaceful struggles which shape men's minds.

In these fateful years, we must not falter. In these decisive times, we dare not fail.

NO RETREAT, NO WASTE

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1969 is designed to foster our fundamental American purpose: To help root out the causes of conflict and thus ensure our own security in a peaceful community of nations.

For fiscal 1969, I propose:

An economic aid appropriation of $2.5 billion.

A military grant aid appropriation of $420 million.

New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.

A five-year program to develop and manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on millions of children because of malnutrition in their early years.

That the United States join with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development-lending affiliate of the World Bank. For every two dollars the United States contributes, other nations will contribute three dollars.

That the Congress authorize a contribution to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

Prompt appropriation of the annual contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

A further authorization and appropriation of callable funds for the Inter-American Development Bank to stand behind the Bank's borrowing in private money markets.

COMMON EFFORT FOR COMMON GOOD

I pledge to the Congress and to the people of America that these programs will be carried out with strict attention to the six basic principles of foreign aid administration we announced last year.

1. Self-help

Self-Help is the fundamental condition for all American aid. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment. We will help those—and only those—who help themselves. We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement.

2. Multilateralism

This year, 90 percent of our AID loans will be made as part of international arrangements in which donors and recipients alike carry their fair shares of the common burden.

America now ranks fifth among donor countries in terms of the share of its national product devoted to official foreign aid. Japan increased her aid by nearly 50 percent last year. Germany has increased her aid budget despite fiscal restraints which have curtailed domestic welfare programs. Great Britain is maintaining aid levels despite severe financial problems. With the signing of the International Grains Agreement, other wealthy nations will for the first time be obligated to contribute food and money to the worldwide war on hunger.

This year we must take another important step to sustain those international institutions which build the peace.

The International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate is almost without funds. Discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now underway. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealthy nations of the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The Administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support.

3. Regionalism

Last year I joined with the Latin American Presidents to renew, reaffirm and redirect the Alliance for Progress.

The nations of free Asia began a general survey of their joint transportation and education needs, while work proceeded on projects to bring power, water and the other tools of progress to all.

The African Development Bank, financed entirely by Africans, opened its doors and made its first loan.

The coming year will present three major opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts:

A. The Inter-American Development Bank.

This Bank stands at the center of the Alliance for Progress. Last year, the Congress authorized three annual contributions of $300 million each to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations. The second of these contributions should be appropriated this year.

The Ordinary Capital of the Bank, which comes mainly from sales of its bonds in the private market, must now be expanded. Since 1960, we have appropriated $612 million which is kept in the U.S. Treasury to guarantee these bonds. Not one dollar of this money has ever been spent, but this guarantee has enabled the bank to raise $612 million from private sources for worthy projects. We must extend this proud record. I urge the Congress to authorize $412 million in callable funds, of which $206 million will be needed this year.

B. The Asian Development Bank

This Bank has asked the United States, Japan, and other donors to help establish Special Funds for projects of regional significance—in agriculture, education, transportation and other fields. Last October I requested that the Congress authorize a United States contribution of up to $200 million. This would be paid over a four-year period—only if it were a minority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. I urge Congress take prompt and favorable action on this request.

C. The African Development Bank

This Bank has also asked for our help to establish a small Special Fund for projects which cannot or should not be financed through the Bank's Ordinary Capital. We must stand ready to provide our fair share, with full safeguards for our balance of payments.

4. Priority for agriculture and population planning

Victory in the war on hunger is as important to every human being as any achievement in the history of mankind.

The report of 100 experts assembled last year by the President's Science Advisory Committee on the World Food Supply rings with grim clarity. Their message is clear: The world has entered a food-population crisis. Unless the rich and the poor nations join in a long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human affairs, this crisis will reach disastrous proportions by the mid-1980's.

That Report also reminded us that more food production is not enough. People must have the money to buy food. They must have jobs and homes and schools and rising incomes. Agricultural development must go hand-in-hand with general economic growth.

AID programs are designed both to stimulate general economic growth and to give first priority to agriculture. In India, for instance, about half of all AID-financed imports this year will consist of fertilizer and other agricultural supplies.

We have made a good start:

India is harvesting the largest grain crop in her history. Fertilizer use has doubled in the past two years. Last year five million acres were planted with new high yield wheat seeds. By 1970 this will increase to 32 million acres.

Brazil, with AID help, has developed a new grass which has already added 400,000 acres of new pastureland and increased her annual output of beef by 20,000 metric tons.

The Philippines is expecting a record rice crop this year which will eliminate the need to import rice.

In the year ahead, AID will increase its investment in agriculture to about $800 million—50 percent of its total development aid. In addition, I will shortly propose an extension of the Food for Freedom program to provide emergency food assistance to stave off disaster while hungry countries build their own food production.

We must also tap the vast storehouse of food in the oceans which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. I have directed the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Secretary of the Interior to launch a five-year program to:

Perfect low-cost commercial processes for the production of Fish Protein Concentrate.

Develop new protein-rich products that will fit in a variety of local diets.

Encourage private investment in Fish Protein Concentrate production and marketing, as well as better fishing methods.

Use this new product in our Food for Freedom program to fortify the diets of children and nursing mothers.

But food is only one side of the equation. If populations continue to grow at the present rate, we are only postponing disaster not preventing it.

In 1961 only two developing countries had programs to reduce birth rates. In 1967 there were 26.

As late as 1963, this government was spending less than $2 million to help family planning efforts abroad. In 1968, we will commit $35 million and additional amounts of local currency will be committed. In 1969 we expect to do even more.

Family planning is a family matter. The United States will not undertake to tell any government or any parent how and to what extent population must be limited.

But neither we nor our friends in the developing world can ignore the stark fact that the success of development efforts depends upon the balance between population and food and other resources. No government can escape this truth. The United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

5. Balance-of-payments protection

Our ability to pursue our responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. Economic aid now helps—not hurts—our balance of payments position.

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over $600 million. Last year, it was down to $270 million. I have already directed that even this figure be reduced in 1968 to less than $170 million. More than nine dollars of every ten dollars AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans.

Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. Efficient administration

Over the past few years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number of employees overseas in all civilian agencies. In addition, AID is further improving and streamlining its over-all operations.

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Foreign aid must be much more than government aid. Private enterprise has a critical role. Last year:

All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.

The International Executive Service Corps operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counseled local executives.

Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a private, U.S. non-profit organization.

More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.

Thirty-three American states supported development work in 14 Latin American countries under AID's Partners of the Alliance program.

All of these efforts will be sustained and expanded in the coming year. We are committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in and assistance to the developing countries. We shall remain so.

A YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY, A YEAR OF RISK

LATIN AMERICA

I propose appropriations of $625 million for the Alliance for Progress.

The American Presidents met at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

The nations of Latin America have invested more than $115 billion, compared with $7.7 billion in American aid.

Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.

Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

A new course was charted for that partnership in the years ahead. At Punta del Este, the American nations agreed to move toward economic integration. They set new targets for improvements in agriculture, in health, and in education. They moved to bring the blessings of modern technology to all the citizens of our Hemisphere.

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have progressed to the point where they no longer require AID loans. More than two-thirds of our aid will be concentrated in Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Central America. Each has done much to deserve our help:

Brazil increased food production by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real economic growth of 5%. Inflation was cut from 40% in 1966 to 25% in 1967.

Chile, under President Frei's Revolution in Freedom, has launched a strong program of agricultural and land reforms, while maintaining an overall growth rate of about 5%

Colombia has also averaged 5% growth while undertaking difficult financial and social reforms.

Central America leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. Trade among these countries has grown by 450% in the six years of the Alliance—from $30 million in 1961 to $172 million in 1967.

This peaceful Alliance holds the hopes of a Hemisphere. We have a clear responsibility to do our share. Our partners have an equally clear responsibility to do theirs. We must press forward together toward mutual security and economic development for all our people.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

I recommend $706 million for the Near East and South Asia.

Half the people we seek to help live in India, Pakistan and Turkey. The fate of freedom in the world rests heavily on the fortunes of these three countries.

Each is engaged in a powerful effort to fight poverty, to grow more and better food, and to control population. If they succeed, and in so doing prove the effectiveness of free institutions, the lesson will be heard and heeded around the world.

This is a year of special importance for all three countries.

INDIA

India has survived two successive years of the worst drought of this century. Even as she fought to save her people from starvation, she prepared for the day when the monsoon rains would return to normal. That day has come. India is now harvesting the greatest grain crop in her history. With this crop, India can begin a dramatic recovery which could lay the groundwork for sustained growth.

India must have the foreign exchange to take advantage of this year of opportunity. A farmer cannot use the miracle seed which would double or triple his yield unless he can get twice as much fertilizer as he used for the old seeds. A fertilizer distributor cannot sell that much more fertilizer unless it can be imported. An importer cannot buy it unless he can get foreign exchange from the Government. India will not have the foreign exchange unless the wealthy countries of the world are willing to lend it in sufficient quantities at reasonable terms.

This is the crux of the matter. If we and other wealthy countries can provide the loans, we have much to look forward to. If we cannot, history will rightly label us penny-wise and pound-foolish.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan, though also plagued by drought, has continued its excellent progress of the past few years. Her development budget has been increased. Her military budget has been reduced. Agricultural production is growing faster than population. Private investment has exceeded expectations.

Now the Government of Pakistan has undertaken further steps to reform its economic policies—to free up its economy and give more play to the market. These reforms are acts of wisdom and courage, but they require foreign exchange to back them up. Pakistan deserves our help.

TURKEY

Turkey's economic record is outstanding. Her gross national product has grown an average of six percent annually since 1962. Industrial output has grown nine percent per year. Food production is growing much faster than population growth.

Turkey's own savings now finance some 90 percent of her gross investment. Difficult problems remain, but we may now realistically look forward to the day—in the early 1970's—when Turkey will no longer require AID's help.

AFRICA

I recommend $179 million for Africa.

Just one year ago, I informed the Congress of a shift in emphasis in our aid policy for Africa. We moved promptly to put it into effect:

There will be 21 U.S. bilateral programs in Africa in Fiscal 1969, compared to 35 last year.

Most of our bilateral programs will be phased out in eleven more countries in the following year.

Expanded regional and international projects will meet the development needs of the countries where bilateral aid is ended.

The past year has provided further evidence that this support for regional economic institutions and projects is a sensible approach to Africa's problems. It expands markets. It encourages economies of scale. It gives meaningful evidence of our concern and interest in African development.

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 250 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of $480 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort in Vietnam. This effort will be intensified by the need to restore and reconstruct the cities and towns attacked in recent days.

Defense of Vietnam requires more than success on the battlefield. The people of Vietnam are building the economic and social base to preserve the independence we are helping them to defend.

Since 1965, when galloping inflation loomed and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the people of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in combat:

They have written a Constitution and established representative local and national governments through free elections, despite a concerted campaign of terror, assassination and intimidation.

Runaway inflation has been averted, and the foundation laid for a thriving economy, despite the enormous stresses of war.

But still the innocent victims of war and terrorism must be cared for; persistent inflationary pressures must continue to be controlled; and the many problems faced by a new government under wartime conditions must be overcome. The framework for economic and social progress has been established. We must help the Vietnamese people to build the institutions needed to make it work.

In the coming year, we will:

Improve our assistance to refugees and civilian casualties. The wages of aggression are always paid in the blood and misery of the innocent. Our determination to resist aggression must be matched by our compassion for its helpless victims.

Intensify agricultural programs aimed at increasing rice production by 50% in the next four years.

Concentrate our educational effort toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

Stress, in our import programs, the key commodities needed for agricultural and industrial growth.

The rapid program expansion of the past two years—in dollars, people and diversity of activities—is ended. The emphasis in the coming year will be on concentration of resources on the most important current programs.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our ultimate success.

EAST ASIA

I recommend $277 million for East Asia.

For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and urgent business for the nations of East Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

But this year the larger portion of our aid to East Asian countries will be focused directly on the work of development. Asians know—as we do—that in the long run, economic, social and political development offer the best protection against subversion and attack. Despite communist pressure, they are getting on with the job. For example:

For the last three years, the Korean economy has grown by a phenomenal 10 percent per year; domestic revenues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.9 percent in 1962 to 2.5 percent today, and a strong national population program is contributing to further reductions. We are now able to plan for orderly reduction of U.S. economic aid as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will be—maintained.

Indonesia has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and rehabilitation and is moving toward development. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is overwhelmingly in our interest to provide it.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

I recommend $420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of nations on the perimeter of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of Free World collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress.

Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have resisted large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons.

We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with this problem. In addition, we will explore other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through cash and credit sales. I will submit separate legislation to authorize necessary military sales and provide for credit terms where justified.

Our military assistance programs will provide only what is needed for legitimate defense and internal security needs. We will do no more. We can afford to do no less.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The internal peace and order of this steadfast ally is once again threatened from the North.

These threats summon Korea to strengthen further her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

We must help.

I propose that Congress appropriate immediately an additional $100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea.

This can be accomplished within the authorizing legislation already enacted.

With this additional help, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea can gain new strength through the acquisition of aircraft and anti-aircraft equipment, naval, radar, patrol craft, ammunition and other supplies.

AMERICA'S CHOICE

Foreign aid serves our national interest. It expresses our basic humanity. It may not always be popular, but it is right.

The peoples we seek to help are committed to change. This is an immutable fact of our time. The only questions are whether change will be peaceful or violent, whether it will liberate or enslave, whether it will build a community of free and prosperous nations or sentence the world to endless strife between rich and poor.

Foreign aid is the American answer to this question. It is a commitment to conscience as well as to country. It is a matter of national tradition as well as national security.

Last year some Americans forgot that tradition. My foreign aid request, already the smallest in history, was reduced by almost one-third.

The effects of that cut go much deeper than the fields which lie fallow, the factories not built, or the hospitals without modern equipment.

Our Ambassadors all over the developing world report the deep and searching questions they are being asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to fate the weak and the striving who are depending on her help?

This Congress can give a resounding answer to these questions by enacting the full amount I have requested. I do not propose this as a partisan measure. I propose it as an extension of the humane statesmanship of both parties for more than twenty years.

I said in my State of the Union address that it is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will. This is nowhere more true than in the developing countries where our help is a crucial margin between peaceful change and violent disaster.

I urge the Congress to meet this test.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

AID Proposed Program and Legislation for Fiscal Year 1969—Foreign Assistance Act of 1968

I. SIZE OF PROGRAM

$2.9 billion is requested for economic and military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act: A.I.D.—$2.5 billion, Military Assistance—$.4 billion.

The appropriation requested for A.I.D. together with other available funds will finance a program of $2.7 billion (see attached table).

The $2.5 billion requested for A.I.D. is about $130 million less than the President requested for FY 1968. The Congress appropriated $1.9 billion for FY 1968.

The A.I.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid contributions to multilateral institutions (IDA, IDB and the Asian Bank), and Peace Corps, represents about 0.5% of U.S. GNP—only half as much as the target of 1% of GNP set by the UN and OECD. In 1949 the United States put 2% of its GNP into foreign economic aid.

II. CONCENTRATION

Countries: The FY 1969 proposed A.I.D. program is heavily concentrated in key countries—15 countries will receive nearly 90% of all country program funds: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Peru, Tunisia, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam.

Nine of these will get about 85% of development loan country programs: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Korea, Indonesia.

Four will get 95% of Supporting Assistance country programs: Vietnam, Korea, Laos and Thailand.

Agriculture: About $800 million of A.I.D. funds will be used in FY 1969 for agricultural development and increasing food production.

III. REDUCED COST TO U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Ninety-two percent of A.I.D. funds in FY 1969 will be spent on purchases of U.S. goods and services. In 1963 the dollar outflow resulting from A.I.D. operations was over $600 million. In 1967 this dropped to about $270 million. In 1968 it will be reduced to less than $170 million. Repayments of over $200 million on outstanding aid loans will more than offset this outflow.

Ending foreign aid would not, therefore, significantly improve the U.S. balance of payments. But it would adversely affect the U.S. industries, workers and farmers who are manufacturing, producing and exporting aid-financed goods.

IV. OTHERS SHARE THE BURDEN

United States leadership in the aid field has declined. We are now only fifth among DAC donors in share of national income devoted to official aid: eighth, when private investment in Less Developed Countries is included.

Despite fiscal and other economic problems, a number of other countries—Japan, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany—are increasing their aid programs. Britain is maintaining its aid budget levels.

V. SPECIAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR KOREA

A special supplementary appropriation of $100 million will be requested in FY 1968 for additional military aid to Korea, to supply aircraft, anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft and other supplies. This appropriation request will be made under the existing FY 1968 military assistance authorization.

FISCAL YEAR 1969 APPROPRIATION REQUEST AND PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

[In millions of dollars]

Assistance category	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation request	Fiscal year 1969 proposed program [1]
Economic assistance:		
Development loans	765.0	850.3
Technical assistance	235.0	235.0
Alliance for Progress	625.0	685.2
Development loans	(515.0)	(567.2)
Technical assistance	(110.0)	(118.0)
Supporting assistance	595.0	629.5
Contingency fund	45.0	50.0
Contributions to international organizations	154.3	154.3
American schools and hospitals abroad	15.1	15.1
Surveys of investment opportunities	1.5	2.0
Administrative expenses, AID	58.8	61.4
Administrative expenses, State	3.9	3.9
Total, economic assistance	2,498.5	2,704.6
Military assistance [2]	420.0	503.5
Total	2,918.5	3,208.1

[1] The fiscal year 1969 proposed program is the total amount of funds that would be available to carry out programs under the Foreign Assistance Act. The proposed program consists of: The new appropriations requested; and additional funds available for use in fiscal year 1969 such as repayments on prior loans, reimbursements, and uncommitted or deobligated funds from prior years.

[2] Excludes appropriations of $120,000,000 to be requested in a separate military sales act.

AID and the Payments Problem

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has come up with some startling facts in his foreign aid message which I hope will finally lay to rest the old bugaboo about AID's role in the dollar drain. Rightfully, Mr. Johnson points out in the aid message that the ability of the United States to pursue its responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. It is gratifying—and indeed surprising—to learn from the message that foreign assistance is now responsible for virtually none of the tremendous balance-of-payments problem.

For example, in 1963, foreign assistance expenditures added $799 million to the adverse balance of payments. The figure had been drastically cut by 1967 to a total of $270 million. Bear in mind, too, that the repayment of foreign assistance loans last year totaled $208 million. This means, quite simply, that AID was responsible for $62 million worth of a multibillion-dollar drain. The Defense Department alone last year was responsible for $2.7 billion dollars worth of gold outflow—and that is billions, not millions.

In the foreign aid message, President Johnson says he has instructed AID to reduce its overseas expenditures another $100 million during the current year. This means, my friends, that AID will be bringing more dollars home than it is spending abroad. The message, furthermore, calls for further reductions and a greater return of dollars during the coming year.

It is high time that each of us accept the fact outlined in the message that foreign assistance is no longer a part of the imbalance of payments, but has become a positive force in cutting the outflow of dollars.

Reserve Officers Association of America, Department of Pennsylvania, Panama Canal Resolution

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement by the executive branch of our Government of its intention to secure the abrogation of the basic 1903 treaty with Panama under which the Canal Zone was acquired, the Panama Canal constructed, and subsequently maintained, operated, sanitated, protected and defended, legislative bodies of six States and many political, civic and fraternal organizations have passed resolutions opposing the projected surrender of U.S. rights, power, and authority.

The latest resolution in opposition to such surrender was adopted on January 27, 1968, by the Department of Pennsylvania, Reserve Officers Association of America, a body whose members fully understand the vital importance of the Panama Canal to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

The indicated resolution follows:

PANAMA CANAL RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Panama Canal Treaty of 1903 is a permanent land-contract-ownership purchased out-right and for perpetual use by the United States, and is of vital strategic importance to our National Security, our interoceanic commerce, and hemispheric security, and

Whereas, the present existing treaty provided for and effected the outright purchase of the land directly from the individual land owners, thus granting essential rights for defense by the United States Armed Forces for all installations pertaining thereto, and

Whereas, Panama is a Nation of over one million people which at times has been politically unstable, and being mindful of the continuing Communist guerrilla, revolutionary and subversive activities of Latin-American nations in this hemisphere, and in view of the announced revolutionary intentions and aspirations of the present Cuban Communist regime;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Department of Pennsylvania Reserve Officers of America urge and request the National administration of R.O.A. to call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to reject any and all proposed modifications of the current Panama Canal Treaty of 1903, and that the R.O.A. supports the United States' rights to the full and complete utilization, control and protection of the Panama Canal.

Credibility and the "Pueblo"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the attached editorial which appeared in the Copley newspapers in Illinois and California on February 6:

Credibility of the United States of America suffered an incalculable setback with the admission of the administration that the U.S.S. *Pueblo* could have violated the territorial waters of North Korea.

Who can believe us now?

On the day after the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized Jan. 23, Secretary of State Dean Rusk called the piracy—correctly—one which was tantamount to an "act of war."

Now he says it is possibly not.

At the United Nations, January 26, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg correctly labeled the North Korean action a "warlike act" and went to great lengths to prove the U.S. vessel was 15.3 nautical miles from the nearest North Korean land.

Now what can he tell the United Nations?

And the President of the United States declared to the Nation January 26: "This week North Koreans committed yet another wanton and aggressive act by seizing an American ship and its crew in international waters. Clearly this cannot be accepted."

What can he tell the American people now—that it has been accepted.

Can the United States now be believed when it tells the more than 40 nations with which we have treaties that we will defend them firmly against aggressors?

Can one now blame the South Koreans, who have given us staunch support in South Vietnam, if they bitterly complain about being "sold out?" They are not even given the courtesy of being present during negotiations with their implacable enemy, the Communist aggressors.

What can we tell the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo?* That we believe they disobeyed orders and went into North Korean waters?

We do not think the men of the *Pueblo* would want their release at the expense of national honor and integrity for which they willingly worked as members of the Armed Forces. Would these courageous men of the United States Navy want to live a lie?

And now that we are retreating before the propaganda of North Korea, how can we prevent future incidents of the *Pueblo* type from any puny upstart? Must we retreat from the high seas as a maritime nation?

The *Pueblo* capture was stated, of course, as a diversionary tactic to draw attention from the new Communist aggresion in Vietnam.

Can South Vietnam now believe, in view of the diplomatic retreat about the *Pueblo,* that we will not sell them out to obtain the release of more than 800 airmen held by North Vietnam? And if we lie about the

Pueblo, what rationale can we use to tell North Vietnam we are all they claim if this will obtain the release of our men?

The answer of course is national security, integrity and honor. This is why we are fighting in Vietnam. This is why the gallant *Pueblo* took risks off Korea and this is why we maintain a defense posture.

That posture should not be used to perpetrate a lie even for ultimately good motives such as the release of prisoners.

Once we resort to the lie as a national policy we are no different from the enemy we are fighting. We will have lost our national integrity!

Legislation To Provide Electronic Inspection of Airplanes

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1955, July 25, 1957, January 6, 1960, May 22, 1962, and May 7, 1964, the normal course of events was blasted from the front pages of our newspapers by stories of death in the air caused by bombs placed aboard commercial airplanes.

Although air science has been so highly developed in the past few years that we are virtually safer miles above the earth's surface than we are driving on some of our most modern highways, it cannot protect us from the random, madman bomber.

What can be done though, Mr. Speaker, is to employ technology in a different sense—in a preventive sense. So I am today introducing legislation to require all domestic and foreign air carriers operating over the United States to provide electronic inspection of all baggage and freight before enplaning to detect bombs and other destructive devices.

I look for support on this measure from the airlines as well as the public. In addition to the tragic and unnecessary loss of life, on-flight bombs have cost the airlines alone over $9 million in loss of aircraft.

Insurance claims, I am sure, have amounted to millions more dollars lost—all because there was no protection against the random, madman bomber.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is another problem this preventive action will eliminate, that of the prank bomb threat. If we have an effective means of inspecting baggage and freight, these calls can be almost dismissed. As it is now, the passengers have to disembark and the baggage and freight must be inspected, sometimes by hand—a job that takes hours—and then everyone and everything reloaded and the plane rescheduled—once again—all because there was no protection against the random, madman bomber.

Every minute a fully fueled plane is on the ground, it is losing money. Extra manpower is needed, and missed-connections and other inconveniences to passengers must be paid for by the air carriers. All this is very much worthwhile, to find a bomb. But it is an unnecessary expense and an annoying inconvenience simply to assuage a prankster's warped sense of humor.

A poignant example of this, Mr. Speaker, appeared on television in an NBC-produced movie especially for television, entitled "The Doomsday Flight."

This was a story about a frustrated man seeking vengeance for being fired from an airlines job. He planted a bomb on a Los Angeles-to-New York jet. The device he used was an aneroid bomb, one activated by air pressure. As the flight soared above 4,000 feet, the bomb was activated, and if the plane descended below 4,000 feet, the bomb would trigger.

As it turned out, these facts were discovered and the plane set down in Denver—above the 4,000-foot trigger mark—just in the nick of time.

This film points out a number of lessons:

First of all, it was a documentary of terror—almost 100 people trapped for several hours in an aircraft more than 2 miles up, with apparently no possible means of descent.

Second, this movie caused a rash of eight bomb threats for this same aneroid type of bomb.

Bomb scares now number over 400 a year. And in addition to the cost and inconvenience, they disrupt flight and airport docking schedules.

Mr. Speaker, when there is a bomb, it is a tragedy; when there is no bomb, it is a nuisance. But either way, these alternatives can be eliminated by the prompt enactment of the bill I have just presented.

Fino Introduces Legislation To Facilitate Irish and Italian Immigration

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills to ease the restrictions on Italian and Irish immigration to the United States.

Since the most recent changes in the Federal immigration law, several unduly restrictive situations have emerged with respect to Irish and Italian immigration to this country. In the first place, Ireland no longer enjoys the immigration quota it once did; Irish immigrants are now effectively confined to close relatives of American citizens and to skilled workers. Unskilled workers can only come to this country if the Secretry of Labor certifies that no American workers will be displaced. This is a basically good idea, but it enmeshes the prospective immigrant in unnecessary redtape.

My first bill would allow such immigration unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that an American worker would be displaced in effect shifting the burden of proof. Of course, my bill changes the law for prospective immigrants of all national origins, but on the basis of past patterns, a large number of the persons affected would be Irish.

My second bill changes the preference given to brothers and sisters of American citizens, restoring the preference to what it was before the 1965 immigration law changes. This change will be of great assistance to prospective immigrants from many nations, but especially from Italy.

I believe that these are two of the most important inequities left by the 1965 immigration law changes and I hope that mine or similar bills can be passed to rectify them.

Mendell Looks at Soil Conservation

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we in Iowa are losing a great and dedicated leader in the field of soil and water conservation. Frank Mendell is retiring after serving 30 years as the State soil conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service in Iowa.

I have known Frank for many years and am well aware of the tremendous contributions he has made. We in Iowa will miss his steady hand.

Recently Frank reviewed the years he spent as our soil conservationist in an interview in the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman. I think you will agree with me that this contribution and record are unparalleled in Iowa.

The interview follows:

MENDELL LOOKS AT SOIL CONSERVATION

(NOTE.—Frank Mendell is retiring this month as state soil conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service in Iowa. He started in soil conservation work in the state in 1934 and has served 30 years as state conservationist. Booth Wallentine of the Spokesman staff interviewed Mendell to get a look at the progress in soil conservation and the challenges ahead. Here's the interview:)

Looking back over the past 30 years, what improvements in soil conservation in Iowa have you noted?

Well, we've noted many, many improvements. You know when I started out at Shenandoah we were building so-called wire brush dams for gully control and we were planting honey locust trees in the gullies to try to control the gullies. And we found out after while that those weren't very effective in getting conservation on the land.

As a matter of fact, I think you would have to say that we found out that you had to start out at the top of the hill instead of down in the gully where the damage had already occurred. So there has been tremendous progress.

I can remember in 1934 when I started to work in Iowa at Shenandoah that you could hardly find a grassed waterway except for the Northeast area where they had quack grass. And today grassed waterways have developed and are very common.

On the other hand, we face a real problem in the future with waterways because of the use of atrazine. Atrazine destroys grass so if you've got a grassed waterway and you get runoff from a field that has been treated with atrazine, the first thing you know you don't have any grassed waterway anymore.

We really have a solution to this because of the new type terraces with tile outlets for the terraces. This eliminates waterways and this is a real important development in my opinion as we look forward.

Because surely the use of pesticides and insecticides and herbicides will continue in one form or another and we had just better start facing this fact and start preparing ourselves and using practices that are going to fit the needs of the current day farming.

If you can, Frank, measure the growth or improvement or change in the attitudes and knowledge of farmers towards soil conservation.

You find many people today that are ready and willing to accept practices and ready to make changes even before the technical people get back to visit with them. I had a farmer not long ago. He made the comment that nobody was selling conservation and I said what do you mean?

He said he had a farm plan for a long time and wanted to make some changes in it but he had to go in and get the technician to come out and look over the farm to make the changes he wanted to make. Well, you see what I mean, he's moving rapidly in this field because he's recognizing the need for changes.

By contrast though, Frank, as you look back can you recall any instances when you had some real opposition from particular farmers?

Oh, yes, real opposition. I can well remember in the early days of the Little Sioux program, for example, in some of those small watersheds with tremendous gullies in Western Iowa, they said we can't afford this kind of a program because the cost is more than the land is worth today. It's only worth $50–$60 an acre and you're spending $50–$60 an acre for flood control.

So in the short run they were right but today that is $300–$400 land so you can't say that you can't afford to spend today on the basis of the value of the land because who knows what this $600 land is going to be 40–50 years from now.

You have already mentioned two or three of them, but what are some of the programs and techniques and laws that were passed that aided in this physical and attitude development?

One of the real significant acts of the state legislature was the soil conservations districts law which gave the farmers an opportunity to organize soil conservation districts, to elect their own governing body, to exert their local control, their local initiative and their local leadership in the conservation program.

That was 1939 when the law was passed. And the late Governor Wilson told the first state soil conservation committee . . . if you get three districts organized in the next year you'll probably be doing pretty well. He said you get three districts organized.

And Earl Elijah, Clark Huntley and Clyde Spry, who were the first three members, said we aren't going to organize any districts . . . it's the farmers who are going to decide whether they organize districts or not.

And I'm very proud of the fact that I think this was true throughout the state. The farmers made this decision, there was no pressure from the state committee or extension service or others to organize . . . they simply said here's what you can do with a soil conservation district if you want to form one.

What about federal activities?

Federal legislation . . . probably one of the most significant has been the watershed act . . . the watershed act of 1944 that authorized the Little Sioux and the other 10 watersheds in the United States.

And then the Public Law 566, passed in 1954, which set the stage for the present cooperative watershed program. And again one of the significant things in this act was that this placed the initiative and responsibility for the watershed program back with the local people.

We have mentioned one or two of the physical developments—watersheds for one—what are some of the other techniques for soil conservation that come to mind quickly that made a real impact and changed the face of Iowa?

I would say that the terrace program is still the most important single conservation practice and, of course, in the earlier days we laid out terraces according to the lay of the land and they ran around here and streamed around here like a snake in many cases. And through the years, of course, we recognized that with larger equipment you don't farm point rows as well as you do with two row equipment.

So there has been tremendous change in the terrace program, particularly in the past 3 or 4 years with what we've called seeded backslope terraces on the steeper land and building them parallel so that you eliminate insofar as possible the point rows and then making them as straight as possible, going across lines and making cuts and fills rather than going around the natural curve of the land.

And then about 4 years ago now, the service got quite enthused about the potential of the so-called tile outlets for terraces. Paul Jacobson, who was a real enthusiast for this program and was state conservation engineer at the time, and I wondered how many farmers would really want to do this.

But that first year there were about 100 farmers that installed tile inlet for terraces . . . tile inlet-outlets. And that has almost doubled every year since then. So farmers have really accepted this philosophy of parallel terraces with tile outlets and eliminating the problem of grass waterways.

Frank, let's look on ahead. What needs to be done now? What are some of the critical needs in soil conservation—attitudes or physical needs?

I think the consumer needs more information and help on understanding what the farmer's problems are and what he's doing and the contribution he's making to the consumer today in terms of efficiency.

If you sat down and asked people how they felt about this program and you can take the 40 people that depend on the farm for food and fiber today and let them stand around the outside fence of that farm and see you operating and doing a good job, they would have a much better appreciation of what you are contributing to their welfare and to their economy.

And then if they went over to my farm a few miles away, let's say, and those same 40 people that depended on me stood around that fence and they saw me farming up and down hill and raising poor crops and not doing a good management job, I think you know how they would feel about it.

Well, to me this is one way of expressing the recognition and understanding that ought to exist between the consumer and the farmer today. And I think if the consumer still doesn't understand that you are doing a good job and are trying to do the best job you can and that they feel that all farmers are doing what I'm doing then they are about ready to start some legislation . . . they are ready to start pressuring and say why doesn't somebody make it mandatory that Mendell do something out there on this farm instead of doing as he's done in the past.

So we need to learn how to get the consumers more interested and better informed about the need for soil conservation?

I think that's right. I think another area we need to continue to expand is conservation education in schools. A great deal of progress has been made in this in Iowa.

The Springbrook training program for teachers has been going the longest of any training program of its kind in the United States continuously which we are very proud of and I've had a little bit to do with that so I can boast a little if you'll permit me to.

And the teachers' workshop at the 4-H camp in the fall has been attended well and increased attendance every year. And these folks are doing a marvelous job of helping these youngsters understand what natural resources are and how important they are.

And if the youngsters grow up in cities like Des Moines without any knowledge or appreciation of our natural resources, they are going to miss something and they're not going to have the kind of attitude and understanding they ought to have toward the total economy in this country.

Frank, no man works for 33 or 34 years at soil conservation as successfully as you have unless he has recognized a personal challenge. What are some of the personal challenges that have motivated you and kept you involved and interested and urged you on?

Well, I think one thing for all of our people is the confidence that people have expressed. In other words, people have said well I think we can depend on you . . . I think we can rely on you to accept the challenge and to do the things that are necessary and the best job possible.

So I think this challenge has probably been one of the real items that has kept me and most of our people I'd say working hard in this field.

What have you enjoyed most about your job?

Oh, I think I've enjoyed most the working with people, the fine people. As I've said about the soil conservation district commissioners, they're the finest people in the world and they are people who are willing to take responsibility.

You know in this day with the comments about federal domination, if you don't have local people who are willing to tackle these problems, you can't argue much that the government shouldn't come along and tell you what to do.

But district governing bodies have always accepted the challenge. Whenever you've had a problem and we've said what do you think is a proper solution to this, they've come up and said we are willing to stand up and be counted, so to speak, and tell us what they think. And this is a nice feeling and this is appreciated and this keeps you working, too.

Thadeusz Kosciuszko

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, we commemorate the 222d anniversary of the birth of Thadeusz Kosciuszko, a Polish national hero in the war against Russia and a major military figure in the American Revolution. This anniversary is observed by Polish people throughout the free world. Unfortunately, the Polish people are captives of communism, and public celebration of this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

On this great historic day, Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Poland and all the other captives of communism.

The birthday of Thadeusz Kosciuszko is of historical significance to the United States, since this great Polish hero made an outstanding contribution to the American Revolution. He served courageously in a number of Revolutionary War battles and worked on the planning and construction of fortifications for the Delaware River, Fort Defiance, and West

Point. Kosciuszko was given the rank of brigadier general in the American Revolutionary Army for his contribution to our struggle for independence.

He then returned to his homeland and served in Poland as a leader in the unsuccessful insurrection against the Russian invaders.

It is an especially tragic historic commentary to note the great affection of the American people for Poland and the Polish people for America, as well as the great affection for General Kosciuszko and the place he holds in American history, when we note the Polish Communist dictatorship playing a leading role in supplying the North Vietnamese in paralyzing the activities of the International Control Commission in Vietnam.

It is fine for us to commemorate these days, Mr. Speaker, but our commemoration should be a practical one. Therefore, I strongly recommend the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Strong Support for President Johnson's Proposals

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, the late Judge Learned Hand, once said:

> If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment. Thou shalt not ration justice.

The proposals advanced in President Johnson's civil rights message are designed to fulfill this urgent commandment.

They are not panaceas, but rather needed steps in the long, and sometimes painful process of ensuring that every American citizen is entitled to live with dignity, freedom, and justice.

The proposal to outlaw racial violence should be our answer to those who seek to interfere by force with this process.

The House has responded to this task. The Senate must also respond.

The President's proposals, in my judgment, will provide badly needed protections that will preserve the legal and constitutional rights of Americans against those who resort to force and intimidation.

Any doubt of the constitutionality of such legislation was laid to rest by the opinions of Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Brennan—speaking for six of the nine Justices—in United States against Guest, an opinion handed down last year. They stated that there is no doubt that Congress has the authority to enact laws to punish private interference with 14th amendment rights. The same reasoning, of course, applies to 15th amendment rights.

We must ensure the continued vitality of our democracy. I urge prompt enactment of this new criminal law, as well as the other vital proposals contained in the President's message.

I believe Congress is morally obligated to continue the historic progress in civil rights that America has enjoyed under the leadership of President Johnson.

There can be no retreat in matters relating to justice, freedom and democracy. And that, of course, is what civil rights is all about.

Industrial Safety Week, 1968

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the State of California is calling attention to the problem of protecting the worker from the hazards encountered in industry, by designating this week as Industrial Safety Week. It is appropriate, therefore, for me to take a few minutes today, to look at this problem as it applies not only to California but the entire Nation as well.

Between 1912 and 1966, accidental work deaths per 100,000 population were reduced 67 percent, from 21 to 7. In 1912, an estimated 18,000 to 21,000 workers' lives were lost while producing $100 billion worth of gross national product. In 1966, in a work force double in size and producing more than seven times as much, there were only 14,500 work deaths. These are some encouraging facts supplied by the National Safety Council's 1967 edition of Accident Facts.

However, I hope I have not implied that 14,500 deaths is a statistic we can accept with callous complacency. It is small only when compared with the early shockingly negligent days of industrial development in this country.

At least some of this improvement may be traced to the enactment of Federal and State workmen's compensation laws. These laws had their origin in this country in 1908 when the Federal Government passed an act covering certain civil employees. By 1920, all but six States had workmen's compensation laws. Shortly thereafter, Federal laws were passed covering longshoremen, harbor workers and private employees. There can be no doubt that workmen's compensation has encouraged safer working practices since the insurance rate which is charged to the employer is determined by the accident frequency and severity record. In addition, the Federal Government has sponsored such worthwhile safety legislation as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act and Amendments and the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act.

Nonetheless, it is ironic that a nation like ours, with such advanced technology has not made more advancement in regard to health and safety at work. Disabling injuries totaled about 2,200,000 in 1966, an increase of 100,000 over the previous year's count. The National Safety Council also figures that lost time, equipment damage and insurance premiums cost U.S. plants $6 billion in 1966. According to Governor Reagan:

> California's disabling injury rate is approximately 32 for each 1,000 employees in the State. There has been little improvement during the last ten years and, in fact, the injury rate in our large manufacturing industry has increased about 25 percent during this same period.

More production time is lost from accidents than from all other work stoppages, including strikes. The Safety Council says that in the United States job accidents cost 244 million man-days in 1966, nearly 10 times the 25 million man-days the Labor Department says were lost from strikes and other stoppages.

It is to be hoped that Industrial Safety Week, by making all of us more keenly aware of the importance of industrial safety, will bring us closer to achievement of maximum results in the field of safety.

Airline Safety

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on all levels of government, in the press, and in the airline industry, there is mounting concern with the growing tide of congestion at the Nation's commercial airports.

One way to decongest our crowded commercial airports is to limit their use by private or business aircraft.

In so doing, it is important to provide operators of private aircraft with attractive alternate facilities.

It is heartening, therfore—at a time when we are still planning rather than doing—to see some positive action toward easing airport congestion. This action has been taken by Pan American World Airways which has taken over operation of two smaller airports in the New York City area with the intent of developing them into attractive facilities for private aviation.

The extent of the problem of congested airports and details on the Pan Am program were told in a recent article by Ralph de Toledano which appeared in the Reading Eagle and other newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

IN WASHINGTON

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Airlines safety is everybody's business. Newspapermen fly—and so do businessmen, housewives, school kids and movie stars. But because America is so thoroughly airborne, the traffic snarls at major airports are reaching blow-your-stack proportion. And safety is being endangered—no matter how many new safety devices the airlines install.

It comes down to numbers. There are now 2,022 airlines' planes flying today—and 104,000 private planes, known as general aviation. The airlines' planes are piloted and maintained by experts. But it becomes increasingly simple to learn to fly, and those at the controls are sometimes not as experienced as they should be.

The result:

Flying into Washington recently, the plane I was on was making a routine landing. Suddenly, just before the wheels had touched ground, the pilot suddenly brought the plane up, climbing at what seemed a full perpendicular. Had he been less alert, the crowded New York-to-Washington flight would have crashed into a small two-seater that had scooted onto the runway. In the statistics, it was one more "near-miss" instead of a disaster.

A "near-miss" is too close for comfort, and some 600 of them are reported each year, with twice that number going unreported. Most of them involve private or corporation planes. This statistic is understandable. This year, 74.4 per cent of all operations at FAA towers are general aviation, according to the Air Transport Assn.

This preponderance of small planes using major airports affects the air traveler in other, though non-lethal ways. According to the ATA, more than seven million man-hours were lost in passenger delays just for 1965 and that number has been rising steadily. In 1966, businessmen lost $50 million in earning time because of delays in take-off and landing due to heavy air traffic. The airlines lost an estimated $328 million in fuel and crew time—money that could have been plowed into improved services and facilities.

Can something be done about it without depriving general aviation of its rights to airport facilities—rights which the airlines are ready to acknowledge? By 1976, ATA President Stuart G. Tipton estimates, the number of private planes will have escalated to 180,000. The answer is to find other facilities for general aviation. And a real start in that direction has been made, not by the government but by a commercial airline.

The pioneer is Juan Trippe, board chairman of Pan American World Airways. To relieve the congestion at New York's LaGuardia and Kennedy airports, and at Newark airport, Pan Am is modernizing two smaller airports. Teterboro in New Jersey and Republic in New York, for the use of private and other general aviation planes. Pan Am is putting some $20 million in capital improvements for Teterboro alone. And arrangements have been made for limousine service every half hour to these rebuilt airports, with Pan Am picking up any loss for this service.

In moving to establish excellent facilities for private aviation, Pan Am is showing the kind of enlightened self-interest which makes the wheels go 'round. As these airports begin to siphon off private flights from the big New York airports, passengers will not have to undergo the frustration of long delays in taking off and landing. The spectacle of 30 planes lined up nose to tail, waiting for a word from the tower—and of other planes stacked up overhead waiting to put down—may well become a forgotten and unlamented fact of flying life.

Of more importance, the "near-misses"—most of which take place on landing and takeoff—will be greatly reduced. For the millions of Americans who fly, this will be good news indeed. If the other airlines follow suit, a major problem will be eliminated—without the costly and deadening intervention of the federal bureaucracy.

Private Nielson, of Takoma Park, Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. John L. Nielson, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE NIELSON, OF TAKOMA PARK, DIES IN VIETNAM

A 26-year-old combat photographer from Takoma Park was killed January 31 while on guard duty outside Saigon, the Defense Department said yesterday.

Pfc. John L. Nielson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl A. Nielson, of 107 Grant avenue, was reported killed by rifle fire just a few weeks before he was scheduled to go to Hong Kong for rest and relaxation and less than two months before he was due for return to the United States, his father said yesterday.

Mr. Nielson said his son, an amateur photographer and senior at the University of Maryland before his enlistment July 13, 1966, was "always looking for the beautiful."

Private Nielson was a graduate of Takoma Park schools and attended Montgomery County Junior College before enrolling at the University of Maryland.

He had been in Vietnam nearly a year, his father said.

Besides his parents, he leaves his sister, Mrs. Carolyn Gross, of Los Angeles, and a brother, Joseph, of Takoma Park.

V-Day Minus One

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud mother of a marine, I take particular pride in a very special anniversary taking place tomorrow.

Twenty-five years ago, in 1943, on the day after Lincoln's birthday and on the eve of Valentine's Day, women marines were inaugurated into the corps.

The admission of women into this proud old service caused consternation in the hearts of many a salty marine, but their apprehension turned to admiration before the first anniversary.

Now at the quarter century mark, the esteem with which they are regarded by their male comrades is attested to by M. Sgt. Jack Fletcher in an article entitled, "V-Day Minus One," which I include for your interest.

I join Sergeant Fletcher, my son, Officer Candidate James May, and all Marines, in saluting the Women of the Marine Corps for their superb service that has brought them to this auspicious anniversary, and wish them many, many happy returns.

The article follows:

V-DAY MINUS ONE

(By M. Sgt. Jack Fletcher, U.S. Marine Corps)

They don't wear a man's trousers, but they fill his shoes.

During World War II they came to "free a Marine to fight"—and stayed to serve.

Valentine's Day minus one is their Silver Anniversary.

You'll find them up in the control tower, passing a pilot some word; down at disbursing, computing your pay; in data processing, programming a machine; writing a news story for ISO; doing photography. And, should the need arise, manhandling a "six-by."

They serve in the States and overseas—England, France, Hawaii, Germany, Panama, Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Italy, Okinawa; Land of the Rising Sun. And in Vietnam, within sound of enemy guns.

We've "skirted" the identity quite long enough. Add a verse to the Hymn for Her.

It's proud we are to share our Corps with them—the Women Marines.

Happy birthday.

Conference Discusses United Nations Peacekeeping

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging reports resulting from the Eighth Conference on a Strategy for Peace held last October at Airlie House is entitled, "The United Nations: The Third Decade."

The report discusses the experience of the United Nations in the Middle East, Rhodesia, and South Africa and makes suggestions on strengthening the U.N.

I commend to all my colleagues this brief report. Prof. Urban Whitaker, of San Francisco State College, was chairman of the panel that produced this report and Mr. William Butler, of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, was the rapporteur.

The report follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS: THE THIRD DECADE

(By Discussion Group IV; Prof. Urban Whitaker, chairman; Mr. William E. Butler, rapporteur)

As in the past, the United Nations in 1967 remains the single most trusted instrumentality for attaining a modicum of world public order in our anarchical state system. All of us share the hope that more than minimal order can be achieved, that the United Nations can continue to grow in its capacity as a catalyst for transforming the international system into one of peacefully competing rather than constantly warring (*at one level or another*) states. Hence we need not search for justification to focus our inquiry on strengthening the peacekeeping functions and decisionmaking machinery of the United Nations.

If we are to record hopes and expectations, we must also register doubts and disenchantment. Perhaps more than at any previous Strategy for Peace Conference—and in striking contrast to most—a majority of those grouped together believed that the United Nations had reached a plateau in the sphere of political development. Hopefully, this would be a transient phenomenon. While the excellent productive activity of United Nations specialized agencies has been undeservedly overlooked by most critics of the organization, the majority of discussants were of the view that, on balance, the United Nations was a weaker force in the international community than originally intended and a less effective body than the needs of the world demanded. Although it would be misleading to paint too stark a portrait, few present were prepared to postulate a favorable prognosis for the United Nations over the next ten years in terms of playing a qualitatively larger role in ordering the international system.

The reasons for this disaffection—perhaps dismay is a more appropriate term—are not easily articulated. Some no doubt adhere to the feeling that basic changes in the membership, structure, and functioning of the organization will not come to fruition, notwithstanding overwhelming evidence of their necessity. These are discussed below in detail. Of greater importance is the subjective determination that the United States is to an unwarranted degree pursuing its national interests outside United Nations parameters in a manner which is detrimental to both the organization and our country. There appears to be no immediate prospect of change in this regard. All fervently wish it were otherwise.

The peacekeeping role of the United Nations is more vital today than ever before. Section I of this report considers the Middle East, Rhodesia, and South Africa as case studies illustrating where the United Nations is in 1967. The succeeding section examines proposals for improvements in the procedures, structure and authority of United Nations organs with respect to peacekeeping and recommends modifications when deemed desirable and feasible. The last section contains recommendations for United States policy in the United Nations.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PEACEKEEPING

The Middle East

The Arab-Israeli War of 1967, by virtue of special circumstances, did not lend itself to constructive international intervention. Underlying the response of the great powers was the nuclear balance, the clear danger that direct involvement by any of them would entail unacceptable escalation, and the unwillingness of these powers to cooperate in restraining the belligerents while the outcome was in doubt. Moreover, the lightning speed of the campaign precluded organizing collective enforcement action; the United Nations was neutralized by the speed of events. The role of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), however, provoked comment in two respects. First was the action of the Secretary-General in withdrawing UNEF promptly at the Egyptian request. Although there was some sentiment that the Secretary-General could have been diplomatically dilatory in executing the request, the majority of discussants was of the opinion that the United Nations Executive Officer acted legally and properly, showing good judgment in the Middle East crisis, where his role necessarily was modest.

Second, there was consensus that the Arab-Israeli War brought greater clarity with regard to the size, functions, powers, operation, and administration of UNEF. The majority believed that the Secretary-General possessed adequate powers under the United Nations Charter to act in the peacekeeping sphere. What he lacked was sufficient guidance, in a positive manner, from the Security Council or General Assembly. The absence of regularized organizational procedures for administering UNEF, the *ad hoc* character of UNEF operations, the power of states contributing troops to UNEF to request their withdrawal in time of crisis, and the continuing cold war environment of UNEF activity all severely handicap the Secretary-General's ability to execute optimally his peacekeeping duties. It was strongly recommended that these deficiencies be remedied by placing UNEF on a more permanent and explicitly instructed basis. At the same time, the discussants in general were opposed to proposals that would curb the independence and discretion of the Secretary-General by compelling him to consult with the Security Council or General Assembly on peacekeeping activities in each individual instance.

Given the pattern of events in the Middle East crisis, it is unlikely that the General Assembly could have played a larger role, although it happened to be in session during hostilities. The continued opposition of the Soviet bloc and France to a General Assembly peacekeeping role on a voluntary basis was noted. There was general consensus that the United States might exhibit greater flexibility vis-a-vis the Soviet and French position on enforcement action pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in return for a modification of Soviet-French intransigence on voluntary General Assembly peacekeeping. Above all, the lesson for peacekeeping derived from the Middle East crisis was that a minimum favorable political environment must exist for collective enforcement action to be practicable.

Rhodesia

The United Nations Security Council and General Assembly resolutions declaring Rhodesia a threat to international peace and security and calling for voluntary and mandatory limited economic sanctions have committed the prestige of the United Nations on their ultimate success in an unprecedented manner. The group expressed concern that several members of the United Nations, especially Portugal and the Republic of South Africa, had not complied with United Nations resolutions in derogation of their obligations under the United Nations Charter. There was general consensus that at present it would be inadvisable to undermine the principle of universality by depriving states of their United Nations membership in response for failure to implement sanctions, and at the same time it would be inappropriate to resort to force against Rhodesia. There was some sentiment for resuming direct approaches to the white Rhodesians to reach an accommodation on the basis of gradually entrusting the Black majority with a responsible governing role. A substantial majority recommended that the Security Council expand the scope of mandatory sanctions to include presently exempted commodities and financial transactions and to interdict other forms of Rhodesian relations with the outside world. A minority feared that broader sanctions would be counterproductive and would stiffen Rhodesian determination to resist. All, however, urged that the Secretary-General remind nonmember states of their duty to conform to Charter obligations with regard to sanctions against Rhodesia.

South Africa

The United Nations has declared the League mandate held by the Republic of South Africa over the territory of Southwest Africa to be terminated. As a matter of international law and mortality, the problem must be dealt with. There is no doubt that the Republic of South Africa is morally and legally wrong in continuing to administer the mandate. On the other hand, the political and economic realities of Southern Africa dictate a cautious approach. It is unlikely that resort to force or other sanctions against South Africa would be possible or effective at present. Exposure of the United Nations to rebuff would foster an impression of impotence and dismay. Moreover, the organization of a viable indigenous government in Southwest Africa is inconceivable in the foreseeable future. A policy of unheroic temporizing commended itself to the group. Such a policy might take several forms. Some participants suggested that the United Nations establish a symbolic presence in Southwest Africa. Others recommended that the United Nations avoid directly challenging South Africa's control over Southwest Africa, but indirectly establish a presence by granting United Nations technical assistance to the territory, having a comprehensive economic survey conducted by the World Bank, or sending personnel from specialized agencies to carry out health and welfare programs. There was some sentiment for sending the foreign ministers of major states to Southwest Africa in order to assert a United Nations presence, even if this would result in a dramatic and direct political confrontation with the Republic of South Africa.

STRENGTHENING UNITED NATIONS DECISION MAKING MACHINERY

It became clear in the discussion that steps must be taken to restore great power confidence in the efficacy of General Assembly actions. As the General Assembly enlarged its membership from year to year, a disproportionate voice and voting strength passed to states whose desire to alter or guide international politics far exceeded their ability to do so. The major powers in recent years have evidence a marked preference in the area of peacekeeping for Security Council action or unilateral or multilateral actions outside the United Nations system. The United States in particular, although more favorably disposed than the U.S.S.R. or France, appears reluctant to vest greater authority in the United Nations, especially the General Assembly. Several proposals to improve the existing procedures and structure of the General Assembly and thereby enhance great power confidence in that body commended themselves to the discussants.

Weighted voting

On the whole the group was pessimistic about weighted voting schemes. Practically speaking, most doubted that the Assembly majority would consent to reduce its own power. Moreover, some research has suggested that on the basis of past voting patterns the present arrangement was more advantageous to the United States than would be the various weighted voting schemes. However, it was noted that the research was based on the assumption of bipolarity, whereas recently the concern over voting has pitted the major powers against the small state majority. The group urged that more study be undertaken in this area to ascertain whether under these conditions a weighted voting scheme might prove advantageous.

General Assembly committees

One proposal which commended itself to the group as an indirect means of combatting the tyranny of the majority while improving the efficiency of the Assembly would entail the formation of committees smaller than Committees of the Whole. Such committees should reflect in their composition the actual realities of distribution of national power and in their fields of competence should be seised of issues prior to consideration by the entire Assembly. It was felt that the experiences with the Committees of 24 and 33 were not typical because of peculiarities of jurisdiction and leadership. On the other hand, if such a committee were to function in the sphere of peacekeeping and also were to involve advance commitments of funds for peacekeeping operations, several discussants were of the view that the major powers would not accept this proposal unless some sort of veto arrangement were available. Moreover, under this scheme the United States position on the residual authority of the General Assembly to authorize peacekeeping on a voluntary basis would have a bearing on the attitude of the other great powers.

As a modification of the working committee proposal, some suggested that such committees, reflecting international political realities in their membership, might provide expertise to the Assembly on political issues pending in that body. In general, there was consensus that studies concerning the rearrangement of the United Nations political structure to reflect power differential should be pressed with vigor. There was no consensus as to whether such differential should be expressed in financial terms or otherwise.

Ministates

The group noted that extreme differences in size, resources, and influence among newer entrants to the international state system raised the question of differential membership privileges in the General Assembly.

The recent suggestion of the Secretary-General that another form of association, perhaps associate membership with the United Nations, be investigated received approval. It was recommended that a representative working committee of the General Assembly might set down criteria for such association in response to the initiative of the Secretary-General.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

There was a general feeling that the next year or two would be a time for the United Nations to tread water on major issues. Pending the forthcoming United States Presidential election in 1968 and further rapprochement in Soviet-American relations, bold and constructive proposals are not likely to be acted upon in the United Nations. Nonetheless, the group felt that substantial progress could be made on such issues as international trade and development, encouraging Soviet participation in inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency under a nonproliferation treaty, and cooperative ventures in space with the Soviet Union. Extensive consideration was given to two questions: Vietnam and United Nations Charter revision.

Vietnam

There was unanimous opinion that the Vietnam war is an overriding concern to the international community and is having a deleterious effect on progress in many other vital spheres of constructive endeavor in the United Nations and elsewhere. The failure to internationalize this conflict at a much earlier stage contributed significantly to the present state of affairs. Accordingly, it was strongly recommended that incipient or developing crises be brought to the United Nations by member-states or by the Secretary-General, acting under Article 99.

With regard to the present war, the discussants fully recognized the diplomatic and political complexities involved in reaching a settlement and the limitations on the ability of the United Nations to intervene effectively. Nevertheless, there was consensus that, given the unassailable fact that Vietnam is a threat to the peace, the full resources of the United Nations have not been exploited. It was unanimously suggested that the United States continue to search for opportunities to involve appropriate organs of the United Nations effectively in the Vietnam situation, including the General Assembly.

Charter revision

The discussants generally endorsed the statement of the *First Conference on the United Nations of 1975* with respect to Charter revision. Review of the Charter in light of experiences and changing times should be a continuing responsibility of our government and others. The task today is to mechanize the process of concentrating on questions of revision. Hence, the group unanimously called upon the President of the United States to appoint a broadly representative commission of concerned citizens and officials to consider objectives and proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter. It was felt that the creation and operation of such a commission should draw upon the experiences and procedures of the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

In conclusion, the group welcomes and commended for careful consideration the Statement of the *Second Conference on the United Nations of 1975* held at Burgenstock, Switzerland, in July, 1967. It should be noted, however, that in certain respects the present report amplifies some of the proposals made at Burgenstock. In particular, we would draw attention to the concrete recommendations herein for making the General Assembly more responsive to the actual distribution of power in the international community and for the establishment of a Commission to consider the objectives of Charter revision.

The Vulnerable Russians

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now with the *Pueblo* incident, it is interesting to observe how the Red syndicate has exploited the partitioned captive nations for all types of harassment and aggression against free world states, particularly our own country. Placed in perspective, this and previous, premeditated incidents are calculated extensions of the unending cold war.

The new book on "The Vulnerable Russians" provides this solid perspective with its guiding captive nations thesis. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is easy reading, revealing and well-documented. The structure of thought developed in this work will doubtlessly prepare us for many more of such incidents in the future.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work. The excerpts follow:

THE STORY BEHIND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

The resolution and the proclamation struck Moscow with the force of a lightning bolt. Khrushchev precipitantly decried the resolution and viewed with apprehension Nixon's aim in coming to Moscow. In Warsaw at the time he foolishly railed, "The only enslaved peoples are in the capitalistic countries."

* * * * *

Great perturbance was displayed over the "coincidence in the timing" of the proclamation and Nixon's visit. Moscow viewed the resolution as a "new provocative anti-Soviet campaign." One began to wonder who was hysterical when he read these cries of pain and Khrushchev's further spasm that this "hysterical campaign" of "petty provocation" proves that "panic-stricken monopolists . . . are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions."

* * * * *

Khrushchev's tirade at the Soviet-Polish Friendship Rally in Moscow that Captive Nations Week was a "direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs" is an old Russian technique to deflect any world interest from the imperial and colonial spoils of Moscow.

Actually, the affairs of the Soviet Union *per se* are no more internal than those of a jailer incarcerating independent, innocent citizens. Khrushchev knew this all too well, and he feared it morbidly. In fact, as a UPI dispatch well observed, "At the end of his 40-minute speech, as if unable to get the subject off his mind, Khrushchev returned to the 'enslaved peoples' theme."

* * * * *

Before television cameras Khrushchev again cried, "I cannot go on without saying it—if you would not take such a decision [Mr. Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Peoples Week] . . . your trip would be excellent." Then the professed atheist blurted, "Why this was necessary, God only knows. What happened?" The answer to his question is quite obvious. The American people have not been as naive as Khrushchev presumed them to be. The theatrics of controlled cultural exchanges, international cocktail parties, futile talkathons, and other superficialities have not blinded many of the American people to the real issues. Without this Captive Nations Week event and its impact Moscow would have kept on deceiving itself in this regard.

* * * * *

The above review sufficiently demonstrates the undeniable impact and effectiveness of the resolution. The general timing of the resolution could not have been better, though by happenstance the Week coincided with Nixon's visit. Had the observance been two weeks before, the Muscovite reaction would have been the same. Pavlov's dog was not trained in Russia without purpose. Moreover, the resolution was really in no way embarrassing to Nixon. On the contrary, it provided him with a God-sent opportunity, which, as we noted before, he failed to capitalize on to good advantage. Then, too, the President himself saw no embarrassment to Nixon. The parties that were embarrassed and showed it angrily were the Muscovite captors.

* * * * *

Reflecting accurately and impeccably the history of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism these past 50 years, the resolution lists those nations and states as captive which have directly or indirectly fallen under the foreign domination of Moscow. One of its clauses allows for other and new captive nations. Obviously, the basic criterion is the destruction of national independence. In this fundamental sense the Russian nation cannot be construed as captive. There is no doubt that in the sense of a search for surcease from domestic totalitarian tyranny there are millions of Russian captives. But with equal certainty they by and large were not the ones in Khrushchev's packed stadium or those bathing in the Moskva River. It goes without saying that we should always hold out to these individuals the hope for democratic rights and liberties. But the best and most efficacious way to further this hope is by striving to cut the institutional nexus between Russian imperio-colonialism and domestic Russian totalitarianism. The one feeds on the other. This nexus has existed for centuries and has been the key to Russian imperial power whether under the Whites or the Reds.

* * * * *

For the first time our Government has taken official cognizance of the tremendously important fact that the Soviet Union itself is a colonial empire. By these documents we have shown that we are fully aware of the captive status of all the non-Russian nations in the USSR. Indeed, for the first time we have faced the reality that the majority of captive nations are in the Soviet Union and Asia. Historically, the nations in Central Europe, such as Poland, Hungary and others, would never have become captive to Russia if other non-Russian nations, like Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan and others, had not fallen under the imperialist and colonialist domination of Soviet Russia. This is a stubborn truth we cannot escape. It is an elemental historical truth that these documents confirm. It is this confirmation that rocked Khrushchev.

* * * * *

It is also instructive for us to note that some of our State Governors who visited the Soviet Union in 1959 continually spoke of it as a nation. Even those in the Kremlin have hesitated to speak in this vein internally. When basic, elementary truths escape us, how much value can be assigned to the conclusions and recommendations made by these touring Governors or other groups? It is patently evident that the legalistic facade of the Soviet Union befogged their understanding of the foremost issues within this substrate empire.

Khrushchev recognized the psychological blow that the resolution represented. For too long he had boasted of the allegedly rapid strides made by Moscow in economic development, in military prowess, scientific, achievements, cultural betterment and the like. He compared these with the achievements of our nation. But one need only ask whether Russia's over-inflated accomplishments would have been possible without the captive resources of Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia and other rich non-Russian nations subjugated within the Soviet Union.

* * * * *

The well-founded perspective laid down in the resolution truthfully devaluates the boasts and bluffs of Moscow's comparisons with the real achievements of our nation. This is what troubled Khrushchev most. On the basis of this historical perspective the economic, scientific and other comparisons made between the substrate empire and our nation are out of real context. Psychologically and politically it is hardly comforting for the Kremlin and its propaganda apparatus to have the world know that Russia's strength, such as it is, is parasitically built on captive resources both within and outside the Soviet Union. Yet this is the moving truth which we have scarcely tapped. The resolution and the proclamations have in themselves begun to tap it.

* * * * *

Made consistently insecure about its captive millions, Moscow would not push as vigorously its borderland policy in Iraq, Iran and elsewhere; and such organizations as the Central Treaty Organization, which replaced the old Baghdad Pact, would not be under the same pressures. Troubleshooters, like Vladimir Y. Semichastny, the defamer of Pasternak, would have to be sent frequently to areas like Azerbaijan to try to deal with recurring upsurges of "bourgeois ideology." For surveillance and control it has been Moscow's policy anyway to place Russians in the second secretaryship of the party in the captive non-Russian republics. For our national interest and the goal of world freedom these and countless other results would manifest Moscow's basic insecurity. We can insure this insecurity by preventing Moscow from ever thinking that we would accede in any circumstances to the permanent captivity of the more than twenty enslaved nations.

* * * * *

In raising the points that he did Khrushchev was banking on the unfamiliarity of his American readers with the realities of the Soviet Union. First, the introductory sentences on socialism and capitalism can be easily dispensed with. As mentioned above, a point of argumentative deflection was introduced here with no real bearing on the issue troubling Khrushchev. A complete and thorough politico-economic comparison between the national economy of the USA and the empire economy of the USSR would lead to a day-and-night conclusion when it comes to the values of "efficacy," "prosperity," and "happiness."

* * * * *

The second point of interest is Khrushchev's own misreading of the resolution, or, if he read it correctly, then his dishonesty in the treatment of its contents. The resolution specifically refers to enslavement by Russian Communist aggression, not by the vague and meaningless concept of Communism. By this honest specification the resolution is grounded in historical fact, not in philosophical vaguery. Moreover, as concerns the liberation of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, nowhere does the resolution contain any specification of "Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and even a certain 'Ural Area.' " It does specify the Turkestan nation and Idel-Ural, which consists of the Tatars, Bashkirs and other non-Russian peoples between the Volga and the Urals.

* * * * *

But what is most illuminating in these passages is the Russian's use of a spurious argument that has been characteristically exploited by some anti-Communist Russian emigres and their unwary American friends who seek to preserve the territorial integrity of the basic Russian empire. Khrushchev's implied comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and comparable areas in the USSR is, except for geography, a speciosity which has hoodwinked many Americans. Some of our leaders in public life have used precisely the same specious argument.

* * * * *

Here, too, the cardinal objective sought by Khrushchev in the period ahead was again evident. His cynical remarks about prayers and God did not conceal his sustained concern about "interference in other peoples' affairs." Such self-insuring interference on our part is in reality directed at the widespread Russian interference in and domination of all the captive non-Russian nations. In brief, Khrushchev again singled out the resolution, and in the abiding hope that "now times have changed" he bade us not to interrupt his colonialist interference with the lives of the captives peoples. Moscow's victory in this fundamental respect would exceed in value all the military might it now has or will have in the future.

* * * * *

MOSCOW SEEKS TO BURY THE RESOLUTION

Before commenting on the Russian "peace and friendship" or "peaceful coexistence" technique, it would profit us to review briefly several additional examples of Red totalitarian reaction to Captive Nations Week from its inception to recent years. At Camp David, in September, 1959, Khrushchev seemed to be obsessed with the resolution. As described by Governor William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania, who then had been attached to the Department of State and accompanied the Russian dictator, the situation appeared as follows: "I think anybody who was connected with this visit in any way will tell you that this particular resolution made more of an impression on Chairman Khrushchev, and he invected against it at a greater rate almost daily while he was here, than any other single thing that America was doing in the Cold War."

* * * * *

Examples abound for 1961 also. Moscow's *Pravda* attacked the Week at length and held that "it is not at all fortuitous that this time the farce represented by the 'Captive Nations Week' should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question." As another highlight of the period, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the resolution at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.

These vehement assaults continued into 1962. For example, the organ of the Soviet government, *Izvestia,* leveled its big guns against President Kennedy for his proclamation of the Week.

* * * * *

Months before the 1963 Captive Nations Week was proclaimed, a Soviet Russian weekly raised the question, "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States?" Its ostensible reason was: "That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question'."

* * * * *

Among the underlings in the Red Empire, North Korea was about the most vicious that year, smearing the President as a "third-class clown," and, over the Pyongyang Radio, calling the Week "a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

In 1964 the nervous responses were much the same: *Izvestia* rattled along with these choice comments: "With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance" and "The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A."

* * * * *

And, on the very eve of his ouster, Khrushchev once again had to shout before an audience in Czecho-Slovakia, "In the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for twenty years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."

These selected examples for each year form an illuminating background for any consideration of Moscow's propaganda efforts along the lines of "peace and friendship" or "peaceful coexistence."

* * * * *

The Kremlin's denunciations of the resolution from July, 1959 to the present have clearly demonstrated how deeply it has penetrated Moscow's cold war armor. Moscow fears this resolution more than anything else on the politico-psychological front. As we shall see, the chief reason for this is that the law symbolizes enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities.

* * * * *

At the time, many reporters, writers, and analysts required to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia is located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. But what could one expect, when on the highest levels of our Government the USSR has been referred to as "the Soviet nation," and the different nations within the Soviet Union have been arbitrarily and somewhat insularly called "the Soviet people" or "the Soviets."

* * * * *

Furthermore, in terms of the resolution and the wealth of evidence underlying it our many economic, military, scientific, and other comparisons between the USSR and the USA are drawn on false premises. We have pointed this out for the military in an article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the USSR." In a later chapter we shall observe that the same criticism applies to our unrealistic economic comparisons.

* * * * *

One cannot begin to evaluate the breadth and depth of these activities unless his intellectual approach to Moscow's total activity is an integralist and holistic one. A grasp of the total war being flung upon us is impossible also without a working concept of the Cold War. An effective concept of the Cold War holds that it is a twilight condition of neither real peace nor hot war, one where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present except for open military combat between states. As long practiced by imperialist Russia, a cold war is the very soul and spirit of a hot war with the massive body of military conflict kept in secondary reserve.

Reclaiming Lost Manpower

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the Members of this body an important project which has just been launched in my city of Cleveland under the direction of the superintendent of public schools, Dr. Paul Briggs, with the cooperation of the General Electric Corp., which has large industrial commitments in the city of Cleveland.

This projects relates to the establishment of a meaningful practical vocational institution in which the enrollees, regular high school aged students will spend part of their school day in educational activities and the remainder in actual productive manufacturing work to produce salable electrical items.

The school will be run like a regular factory, is located within the ghetto and will deal for the most part with young people who would otherwise be potential or actual dropouts. This project is most exciting and will be followed closely by educators and industrial management people throughout the country. This unique experience is a credit to the forward thinking of the executives and staff of GE and our own superintendent and his splendid staff at the Cleveland Board of Education who give unstintingly of their time and their mental energy to develop and support creative, meaningful educational programs. The story from the magazine Steel on this important project is as follows:

THE DROPOUT—HOW TO RECLAIM LOST MANPOWER

Take a hard look at a program that's being set up in Cleveland. It's jointly sponsored by the Cleveland Board of Education and area business, commerce, and industry and will, they hope, be under way by fall 1968.

"This . . . effort," explains Dr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent, Cleveland Public Schools, "is aimed specifically at breaking the poverty and welfare cycle of the innercity and providing job training for immediate placement in productive work."

Donated by General Electric Co., the four-level, 222,598 sq ft facility in the heart of the ghetto will house a project combining basic education and paid work experience. Students will be "young unemployed dropouts," says Dr. Briggs. "These are the ones we have to get to. We have lost them to date." And unemployment among youths aged 17 to 25, both male and female, who are no longer in school is a staggering 58%. How many can the facility handle? "We don't know the capacity of the project so far."

LOGISTICS

Recruiters who live within the ghetto will contact dropouts about the program's availability, and a bus service will operate between the ghetto and the training center.

Participants will spend part of each day in an environment devoted to learning how to get and hold a job—studying subjects like basic reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as money management, personal hygiene, and good work habits. The rest of the time they'll be in industry-sponsored work areas for on the job training in actual reproduction work.

"An important feature of the program, probably unique, (will) be immediate paid employment upon enrollment," the superintendent points out. Industry will finance this part of the project and will sublease space in the facility for the training setups. General Electric was the first to sign up.

"The participant won't necessarily go to the company which trained him when he's ready for full-time employment," Dr. Briggs tells Steel. "We don't want to 'trap' him that way. And the length of the course will depend on the individual. We'll program it around each person, according to his needs.

"The teachers," he continues, "will come from trade schools and some may be loaned by industry as a special task force. We're also looking to the type of person who has volunteered for VISTA and the Peace Corps."

WHY A PUBLIC-PRIVATE EFFORT?

"While industry can, should, and will provide jobs for underprivileged persons, it cannot be expected, nor does it have the know-how to provide all the training and education required to help build full, productive lives," Dr. Briggs explains.

"The urban school must cooperate with business and industry in finding new ways to help the ghetto youth prepare quickly and adequately for the jobs that are now available and that expanding technology is making available for tomorrow."

Adds Robert V. Corning, general manager of GE's Lamp Div., Cleveland: "The economy now has more jobs than qualified workers. The problem is that the disadvantaged unemployed often are not qualified for industrial jobs. One way that the business community can help is to cooperate with the Board of Education in closing this employability gap . . . Urban problems, like education and employment, have to be tackled on a systems basis—that is, pulling together all the talents and resources of key community groups into a cooperative problem-solving approach."

The project will be run with funds from federal, state, and private sources. "It will be heavily financed—75%, perhaps—through vocational rehabilitation funds," says Dr. Briggs.

Architectural and other fees for setting up the facility may be paid for by a foundation. These, however, will be low compared with the cost of a totally new building—$5 million.

Formation of the Civil Air Patrol Congressional Squadron

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride and pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to the charter issued to the congressional squadron by the Civil Air Patrol, the official U.S. Air Force Auxiliary.

Last Thursday morning, February 8, Brig. Gen. William W. Wilcox, USAF, National Commander of CAP, was guest of honor at the first breakfast held by the congressional squadron. The general welcomed the 20 Members of the House and aides who have already joined this dedicated organization.

In the 1940's I was privileged to be an active member of CAP, and it is most rewarding once again to be a member of an organization that is credited by our Air Force with having flown 70 percent of all search and rescue missions in the United States.

The CAP Congressional Squadron hopes to undertake a program of flight instruction and other skills related to CAP activities, including the enlargement of its youth program. The CAP cadet program, which currently has some 47,000 cadets, is a very potent weapon in combating juvenile delinquency. As General Wilcox has stated, however, the goal is some 250,000 cadets. Our squadron will do everything possible to help the CAP achieve this goal.

On behalf of the congressional squadron I invite and welcome all Members of the House, their wives and families as well as permanent staff assistants to join us in these worthwhile endeavors.

Urgent National Need for a Modern Nuclear Navy

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of Navy magazine, a publication of the Navy League of the United States, contains a very concise but nonetheless complete summary of the inertia displayed by the Pentagon toward providing our Nation with a modern nuclear Navy.

The article, written by the national president of the Navy League of the United States, Charles F. Duchein, deserves careful reading by every Member of Congress.

I trust that this article, which hopefully looks to the newly designated Secretary of Defense, Clark M. Clifford, as an advocate of a nuclear-powered Navy, is prophetic.

I share the hope of the president of the Navy League that Clark M. Clifford will join the Congress of the United States and insist on providing our Nation with a truly modern Navy.

The article, entitled "A Modern Nuclear Navy—An Urgent National Need," is included at this point in the RECORD so as to enable the Members of Congress to reflect on this vital defense problem:

A MODERN NUCLEAR NAVY—AN URGENT NATIONAL NEED

(By Charles F. Duchein, National President, Navy League of the United States)

The congressional clarion has sounded loud and clear.

L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, spoke for a restive Congress recently when he denounced the ploy of the contractual "stretch out," the Pentagon-ordered re-studies of studies already made, and he demanded a halt to the self-imposed moratorium on construction of nuclear-powered surface ships.

"Frankly, I do not know how Congress can make its position on this matter anymore clear. We are bound and determined that we shall provide our Navy with nuclear-powered warships . . ." he said.

Deep is the debt of gratitude owed the Congress by the American people, for its persistent advocacy kept the nuclear-powered surface ship program alive and preserved a major strategic advantage the United States holds over the Soviet Union.

Heavy pressure from the lawmakers gave the Navy, after a five-year delay, its latest—and second—nuclear frigate, the USS Truxtun, which is now at combat ready in the Sea of Japan. Congress, with the wisdom of years of defense experience, re-enforced by the courageous counsel of Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, has set an unfaltering course.

Notwithstanding congressional effort, controversy still marks the pace of the transition from "oil to the atom," reminding one of

President Kennedy's favorite biblical quotations: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

The USS Kennedy, a fossil-fueled carrier, steams toward the 21st century a red-neon reminder of his thoughts on "vision." In glaring contrast to the late President's oceanic vision, is the obsolescent power plant of the ship bearing his name.

Thirteen years after the submarine USS Nautilus first signaled, "Underway on nuclear power," only four nuclear surface ships have joined the U.S. Fleet. For a nation that boasts a yearly gross national product of more than $800 billion, the record is singularly uninspiring.

But hopeful signs show on the horizon. The sharp focus Secretary of the Navy Paul R. Ignatius developed on the spectacular performance of nuclear-powered ships in his 1967 Navy Day talk in Chicago was one. He concluded that three warships during a Viet Nam deployment can accomplish the task of four conventionally powered ships. Notwithstanding the slight oversimplification, the superiority of a nuclear Navy, as an instrument of national policy offering decisionmakers a wider choice of options, was driven home convincingly.

The conclusive evidence of actual operations support this thesis. Commanders at sea appreciate the increased tactical flexibility made possible by unlimited endurance at high speed. Experienced military planners grasp the significance of the totally new strategic and tactical dimension gained with the sustained mobility of nuclear power. They understand the quantum jump in naval readiness provided, but unfortunately this escapes the "Cost Effectiveness" analysts and their computers.

The under-publicized first circumnavigation of the globe by nuclear-powered surface ships on operation Sea Orbit in 1964, dramatically demonstrated the superb strategic performance of the nuclear task force. Throughout the 31,000-mile, 57-day voyage, USS Enterprise, USS Long Beach and USS Bainbridge cruised at close to top speed, showing how quickly the U.S. presence can be re-enforced in remote areas of the world. There were no stops for refueling or replenishment, revealing an unprecedented logistic self-sufficiency. The integrity of the task force in long-range high-speed steaming high-lighted the importance of nuclear destoyers within the task force. The strangulating necessity for slowing or stopping to fuel destroyers having been eliminated, the top speed of advance of nearly 30 knots could be maintained indefinitely.

Subsequent to Sea Orbit, wartime deployments in Viet Nam confirmed the vastly improved tactical performance. Not needing fuel, they remained on the line far longer with an "instant readiness," enhancing their safety.

Both strategically and tactically, even in terms of cost, the concept of a nuclear Navy speaks convincingly for itself. The rapid shrinkage of multibillion dollar overseas bases, the closure of the Suez Canal, the sovereignty struggle for the Panama Canal and the existing power vacuum in the Indian Ocean, coupled with the rapid rise of the Soviet challenge at sea, failed to impress a land-oriented, cost-conscious Defense regime as to the vital need for a nuclear fleet. But these same facts must now be faced up to frontally to fulfill the Nation's future.

I contend, with the Congress, that now is the time to pull out the "nuclear propulsion stops," and gain the full advantage of this revolutionary power for peace. But to do so, a new order of determination is needed.

In building a nuclear Navy, the Polaris precedent is well established. Given purposeful policy by our government, rapid results follow. Forty-one nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarines were built in eight years. The McNamara-prepared Pentagon budget presented to the Congress by the President fails to provide for any new nuclear ship construction in FY 1969. However, the long-awaited breakthrough may have been heralded when Clark M. Clifford, the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, told the Senate Armed Services Committee late last month, that he favors construction of nuclear powered surface ships.

The Navy League pledges its fullest support in this premise to the new Secretary of Defense, holding as a matter of deep conviction, that the course of action proposed by the Congress is clearly in the national interest.

It is our hope that the Navy—to borrow a Churchillian phrase—soon will be able to "stop breeding slow race horses" of the sea, and help the Nation celebrate its 200th Anniversary with a new and modern nuclear Navy.

Safe Streets Bill

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 1 year has passed since the safe streets and crime control legislation was introduced in the Congress. During that year, crime has risen steadily in this Nation and new patterns of civil disorder have emerged in many cities. Meanwhile, during the year, law-enforcement agencies continued to work against difficult odds: hampered by shortages of men, by lack of training, and by outmoded equipment. Some were aided under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965—our Federal grants program for criminal justice—but more, many more, were not. They could not be. Since December 1965, $17.5 million in these LEA grants has been given to the agencies of criminal justice—primarily law-enforcement agencies.

That has meant an average of about $7 million a year available for training police and the staffs of corrections institutions, for research and demonstration in crime prevention and control, and for improvement of courts and the administration of criminal justice. That is a tall order for $7 million. It is not enough and the LEA Act is not broad enough to cope with crime in this Nation, the safe streets bill, as proposed by the administration, is. It will permit a widescale attack against crime, lending assistance to local-law enforcement, stimulating new technology, increasing efficiency with training and equipment support, and encouraging coordination in planning, operations, and research by law enforcement and criminal justice agencies throughout the Nation.

The full national anticrime strategy was laid before us today in the President's special crime message. Although I may not agree with all points, I believe the major program and policies to carry it out are necessary. I believe this legislation, in conjunction with the additional stress on the ever-increasing problem of the misuse of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, as outlined in the President's message, may go a long way, if properly implemented, in curing this ever-growing scourge on America and especially young America.

Address by U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger at American Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, Bangkok, Thailand

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on my recent trip to Southeast Asia I had the privilege of visiting Thailand. What I observed there was a responsible, restrained and widely supported American presence, which the Thai people appreciated and identified with the cause of their own national independence and aspirations.

Much has been said about the American efforts in that country, and it has at times become the focal point for a strain of debate in the continuing controversy over Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, no matter what the result of the American intervention in Vietnam, it is likely to be felt in this more stable, highly nationalistic neighboring state.

Thailand will continue to have an interest, then, in the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. But it should be duly noted here that Thailand's own position is quite different and more secure than that of her neighbor, and that she faces the problems of development and Communist hostility with strength. The King, government, and people of Thailand are aware of their capabilities and share national pride. This pride is coupled with a great sense of respect for Americans, and the active participation we play in Thai development.

The Honorable Leonard Unger, the American Ambassador in Bangkok, recently made a speech at the American Chamber of Commerce there, and outlined some of his most important experiences during his past 10 years—in Thailand and Laos, and dealing in Asian matters in Washington. His remarks clarify a number of questions Americans have about this land—and the stake we have in its survival and prosperity. They leave no room for doubt as to whether or not our efforts have been recognized; and his words should be reassuring to all of us who wonder if it is worth the trouble.

Reading the Ambassador's speech should give one the greatest confidence in the competence of the U.S. Foreign Service, and the deep as well as wide range of knowledge possessed by some of our top diplomats.

Mr. Unger is certainly one of these men. His message is of particular pertinence to the whole issue of what the role of the United States ought to be, in that part of the world.

I highly recommend the Ambassador's remarks to all of us in the House, and to the American people at large. Both "dove" and "hawks" alike will find a refreshing outlook here, and his words are those of experience and realism. They offer a vision of the task ahead, a reasonable respect for the Thai people and a decent hope for the success of our mutual effort. I place his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY U.S. AMBASSADOR LEONARD UNGER AT AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON, BANGKOK, THAILAND, JANUARY 17, 1968

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with members of the American Chamber of Commerce in Thailand, and welcome the invitation to carry on the tradition of an annual appearance by the American Ambassador. Much of what I have to say today will relate to our relations, as Americans, with the Thais in whose country we are living as guests. While the record of Thai-American relations speaks for itself, generally, sight tends to be lost from time to time of certain basic realities which I would like to put in better perspective. I should state at the outset, that in addition to speaking as the President's personal representative to Thailand, I am expressing deep, personal convictions based upon experiences over the past ten years—first in Thailand, then in Laos, and more recently in Washington, where I dealt with many Southeast Asian matters, particularly the problem of Vietnam.

I

Vietnam, by almost any standard, is the most absorbing and complex issue in American political life today. The issue is whether the nations of Southeast Asia shall be able to set their own independent course and be free of subversive aggression. Thailand, therefore, also attachs extreme importance to the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. Its determination equals that of the United States to bring about a final settlement in Vietnam which assures national freedom and fosters the return of peaceful order to Southeast Asian affairs.

The government of Thailand has made its position unmistakably clear. It has done this through active participation in collective defense arrangements under SEATO. Thailand has also enabled the U.S. to bring its air power to bear against North Vietnam and its infiltration into the South. Thailand has sent troops of its own to help defend South Vietnam, and it has taken firm measures to protect its own people against those assaulting not only South Vietnam and large sectors of Laos today, but Thailand itself.

Communist hostility toward Thailand is but one of many reflections of this nation's strategic importance in the total Southeast Asian picture. Ironic as it may seem, another measure of Thailand's key role in Southeast Asian events is this country's growing prominence in the American controversy over Vietnam.

In the cross fire of political battles over Vietnam, many Americans naturally want to examine our commitments elsewhere in the area, and to assess the dependability of those with whom we have aligned ourselves. I do not quarrel with the usefulness of responsible, free debate. I am seriously troubled, however, when I see certain facts about Thai-U.S. cooperation misread in ways that damage Thai-American interests, and encumber the Vietnam problem with negative and discouraging implications which do not actually exist.

The frequency of late of such distortion and misinformation has provided a new and disturbing experience for the Thai government and people. It is never pleasant to find one's country being criticized or subjected to hostile cross examination by foreigners. It is even less pleasant when they seem to question the validity of national policies, programs and institutions that have been carefully developed over the years for the express purpose of self-preservation. Having governed themselves for over 700 years, the Thai feel no need to adjust their way of doing things to meet foreign concepts of how things should be done. Moreover, having decided that defending Vietnam is in Thailand's own best interests, they do not want their actions interpreted—or misinterpreted—in lights cast by the clash of conflicting views over similar U.S. policies. Neither do they want it assumed that their fundamental policies are merely a response to the wishes of a large power. Understandably, they resent the bland assumption that the pattern of events in a neighboring state inevitably will be repeated in their own.

II

Nevertheless, perhaps largely because Thailand is known to have both communist guerrilla forces and U.S. military units in the country, it seems often to be assumed that American forces have been sent here to deal with the internal threat and are more or less covertly engaged in combat against insurgents in Thailand's rural areas. This of course is not the case. The only combat actions in which U.S. forces here participate are those well-publicized out-of-country operations directed against Vietnamese communist targets. U.S. military units in Thailand, other than those belonging to the Air Force, are neither equipped nor organized for combat assignments. The Thai government has stated repeatedly that in suppression action against the guerrillas, the only American help it wants or needs is that giving Thai military and security forces their own means of dealing with the problem.

Combat operations by Thai-based units of the U.S. Air Force are carried out against North Vietnam by our fighter-bomber aircraft, and against Viet Cong concentrations in South Vietnam by B–52 bombers, and have entailed the assignment to Thailand of about thirty-three thousand U.S. Air Force personnel. The Air Force units require in turn, from other U.S. military services here, myriad forms of logistical support in which some seven thousand troops are engaged. There are roughly three thousand additional U.S. military personnel in Thailand serving with the military assistance program, working on engineering and military research projects, and in SEATO.

Let me add, if I may, a footnote to what I hope will end misguided speculation about U.S. involvement in guerilla warfare here. A year ago, Ambassador Martin confirmed for you that unarmed U.S. Air Force helicopters were on assignment in the Northeast. As Ambassador Martin emphasized, this was a temporary, non-combat measure, taken at a time when added mobility was of critical importance to Thai authorities organizing their own resources to blunt an escalating insurgent threat. Accordingly, in January of 1967, after the Royal Thai Government had completed the transitional training required for field operation of its own newly acquired force of forty-nine troop-carrying helicopters, the U.S. helicopters were withdrawn from Thailand. They were replaced in the field by these Thai helicopters, furnished by the U.S., which Thai authorities are using with increasing effectiveness. Additional helicopters have been provided, including ten to the Thai National Police, and more will become available to the armed forces and police as Thai pilots and mechanics complete training courses and can make use of these aircraft.

The lesson here, I think, is two-fold: First, the nature of American assistance to Thai counter-insurgency programs does not lead toward direct American involvement in those operations. On the other hand, we must not become so transfixed by our Vietnam experiences that we lose our capacity here to take decisive, practical steps in providing the training and equipment with which the Thai government, itself can bring the insurgency under control, and in due course eliminate it.

III

We will continue to hear dire predictions, that Thailand inevitably will go the way of Vietnam, and that sooner or later Americans will be fighting communist insurgents here. In fact, Thailand resembles Vietnam only in that it is another intended victim of the same communist effort to expand its domination by using the technique of the "war of national liberation." Violence and killing in Thailand by communist terrorists, most of them trained outside Thailand, does not express grass roots political sentiment.

Thailand's people are united in a rapidly developing nation seeking to work out its political and economic destiny with care and forethought. Land ownership is primarily in the hands of those who work the soil. There is no tendency to split along religious lines, since virtually all Thai are Buddhists. Minorities are for the most part being assimilated and woven into the life of the country. One could cite many other factors working in Thailand's favor—its sense of self confidence developed over centuries of managing its own affairs—its able leadership, competent civil service, and armed forces showing their mettle today in Vietnam—its economic growth rate running around eight percent per annum—its capacity to organize and carry out rural security and development programs—and the social and economic mobility of Thai life.

Furthermore, Thailand's well-educated, skilled and enterprising young people do not migrate to other countries except in rare instances. Among the hundreds who annually go abroad for long periods to further their education or professional experience, all but a few are drawn back by loyalty and family ties and by their country's ample economic opportunities. I think it is fair to say, incidentally, that in large measure these have been created by Thailand's heavy emphasis upon private initiative and enterprise.

Thailand is also unique in that the continuity of its life and institutions has never been broken by colonial experiences. There has never been any need here for a national independence movement aimed at dislodging colonial rulers. Communist bands do not find in Thailand, therefore, as they did in Vietnam, any real opportunity to generate loyalty to a revolutionary struggle, or to identify themselves with compelling patriotic causes.

Above all, there flows from Thai attitudes toward the person of His Majesty the King and the institution of the monarchy a sense of national unity and continuity so strong that it extends into the remotest villages. To the citizens of Thailand, the King's full endorsement of efforts to counter the guerrilla threat is a buttress against subversive attempts to undermine the government's authority. In Thailand, as the communists have discovered even in relatively unprotected rural areas, the task of marshaling popular support for anti-government causes is difficult and unrewarding.

IV

In the Northeast, for example, in a poor area encompassing more than ten million people, where several years of subversive groundwork has been followed by two years of intensive terrorist and recruitment drives, the number of armed insurgents remains below two thousand. Reliable intelligence indicates that considerably more than a thousand of them have been trained outside Thailand in Communist China, in North Vietnam, and Pathet Lao territory.

At present, the mission of the insurgents, almost all of whom are full time fighters, assassins and political activists, is simple. Their mission is to break the links between Thailand's government and villagers, and to then replace the government's authority with their own. While there are isolated villages where this mission has been accomplished for a few hours, there is no point in Thailand upon which the insurgents have thus far been able to impose more than temporary control.

To see the present situation in fair perspective, however, one must look back to 1966. During that year, the level of communist violence increased markedly over 1965, a rise consistent with the insurgent cam-

President Kennedy's favorite biblical quotations: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

The USS Kennedy, a fossil-fueled carrier, steams toward the 21st century a red-neon reminder of his thoughts on "vision." In glaring contrast to the late President's oceanic vision, is the obsolescent power plant of the ship bearing his name.

Thirteen years after the submarine USS Nautilus first signaled, "Underway on nuclear power," only four nuclear surface ships have joined the U.S. Fleet. For a nation that boasts a yearly gross national product of more than $800 billion, the record is singularly uninspiring.

But hopeful signs show on the horizon. The sharp focus Secretary of the Navy Paul R. Ignatius developed on the spectacular performance of nuclear-powered ships in his 1967 Navy Day talk in Chicago was one. He concluded that three warships during a Viet Nam deployment can accomplish the task of four conventionally powered ships. Notwithstanding the slight oversimplification, the superiority of a nuclear Navy, as an instrument of national policy offering decision-makers a wider choice of options, was driven home convincingly.

The conclusive evidence of actual operations support this thesis. Commanders at sea appreciate the increased tactical flexibility made possible by unlimited endurance at high speed. Experienced military planners grasp the significance of the totally new strategic and tactical dimension gained with the sustained mobility of nuclear power. They understand the quantum jump in naval readiness provided, but unfortunately this escapes the "Cost Effectiveness" analysts and their computers.

The under-publicized first circumnavigation of the globe by nuclear-powered surface ships on operation Sea Orbit in 1964, dramatically demonstrated the superb strategic performance of the nuclear task force. Throughout the 31,000-mile, 57-day voyage, USS Enterprise, USS Long Beach and USS Bainbridge cruised at close to top speed, showing how quickly the U.S. presence can be re-enforced in remote areas of the world. There were no stops for refueling or replenishment, revealing an unprecedented logistic self-sufficiency. The integrity of the task force in long-range high-speed steaming high-lighted the importance of nuclear destoyers within the task force. The strangulating necessity for slowing or stopping to fuel destroyers having been eliminated, the top speed of advance of nearly 30 knots could be maintained indefinitely.

Subsequent to Sea Orbit, wartime deployments in Viet Nam confirmed the vastly improved tactical performance. Not needing fuel, they remained on the line far longer with an "instant readiness," enhancing their safety.

Both strategically and tactically, even in terms of cost, the concept of a nuclear Navy speaks convincingly for itself. The rapid shrinkage of multibillion dollar overseas bases, the closure of the Suez Canal, the sovereignty struggle for the Panama Canal and the existing power vacuum in the Indian Ocean, coupled with the rapid rise of the Soviet challenge at sea, failed to impress a land-oriented, cost-conscious Defense regime as to the vital need for a nuclear fleet. But these same facts must now be faced up to frontally to fulfill the Nation's future.

I contend, with the Congress, that now is the time to pull out the "nuclear propulsion stops," and gain the full advantage of this revolutionary power for peace. But to do so, a new order of determination is needed.

In building a nuclear Navy, the Polaris precedent is well established. Given purposeful policy by our government, rapid results follow. Forty-one nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarines were built in eight years. The McNamara-prepared Pentagon budget presented to the Congress by the President fails to provide for any new nuclear ship construction in FY 1969. However, the long-awaited breakthrough may have been heralded when Clark M. Clifford, the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, told the Senate Armed Services Committee late last month, that he favors construction of nuclear powered surface ships.

The Navy League pledges its fullest support in this premise to the new Secretary of Defense, holding as a matter of deep conviction, that the course of action proposed by the Congress is clearly in the national interest.

It is our hope that the Navy—to borrow a Churchillian phrase—soon will be able to "stop breeding slow race horses" of the sea, and help the Nation celebrate its 200th Anniversary with a new and modern nuclear Navy.

Safe Streets Bill

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 1 year has passed since the safe streets and crime control legislation was introduced in the Congress. During that year, crime has risen steadily in this Nation and new patterns of civil disorder have emerged in many cities. Meanwhile, during the year, law-enforcement agencies continued to work against difficult odds: hampered by shortages of men, by lack of training, and by outmoded equipment. Some were aided under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965—our Federal grants program for criminal justice—but more, many more, were not. They could not be. Since December 1965, $17.5 million in these LEA grants has been given to the agencies of criminal justice—primarily law-enforcement agencies.

That has meant an average of about $7 million a year available for training police and the staffs of corrections institutions, for research and demonstration in crime prevention and control, and for improvement of courts and the administration of criminal justice. That is a tall order for $7 million. It is not enough and the LEA Act is not broad enough to cope with crime in this Nation, the safe streets bill, as proposed by the administration, is. It will permit a widescale attack against crime, lending assistance to local-law enforcement, stimulating new technology, increasing efficiency with training and equipment support, and encouraging coordination in planning, operations, and research by law enforcement and criminal justice agencies throughout the Nation.

The full national anticrime strategy was laid before us today in the President's special crime message. Although I may not agree with all points, I believe the major program and policies to carry it out are necessary. I believe this legislation, in conjunction with the additional stress on the ever-increasing problem of the misuse of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, as outlined in the President's message, may go a long way, if properly implemented, in curing this ever-growing scourge on America and especially young America.

Address by U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger at American Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, Bangkok, Thailand

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on my recent trip to Southeast Asia I had the privilege of visiting Thailand. What I observed there was a responsible, restrained and widely supported American presence, which the Thai people appreciated and identified with the cause of their own national independence and aspirations.

Much has been said about the American efforts in that country, and it has at times become the focal point for a strain of debate in the continuing controversy over Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, no matter what the result of the American intervention in Vietnam, it is likely to be felt in this more stable, highly nationalistic neighboring state.

Thailand will continue to have an interest, then, in the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. But it should be duly noted here that Thailand's own position is quite different and more secure than that of her neighbor, and that she faces the problems of development and Communist hostility with strength. The King, government, and people of Thailand are aware of their capabilities and share national pride. This pride is coupled with a great sense of respect for Americans, and the active participation we play in Thai development.

The Honorable Leonard Unger, the American Ambassador in Bangkok, recently made a speech at the American Chamber of Commerce there, and outlined some of his most important experiences during his past 10 years—in Thailand and Laos, and dealing in Asian matters in Washington. His remarks clarify a number of questions Americans have about this land—and the stake we have in its survival and prosperity. They leave no room for doubt as to whether or not our efforts have been recognized; and his words should be reassuring to all of us who wonder if it is worth the trouble.

Reading the Ambassador's speech should give one the greatest confidence in the competence of the U.S. Foreign Service, and the deep as well as wide range of knowledge possessed by some of our top diplomats.

Mr. Unger is certainly one of these men. His message is of particular pertinence to the whole issue of what the role of the United States ought to be, in that part of the world.

I highly recommend the Ambassador's remarks to all of us in the House, and to the American people at large. Both "dove" and "hawks" alike will find a refreshing outlook here, and his words are those of experience and realism. They offer a vision of the task ahead, a reasonable respect for the Thai people and a decent hope for the success of our mutual effort. I place his remarks at this point in the Record:

Address by U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger at American Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, Bangkok, Thailand, January 17, 1968

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with members of the American Chamber of Commerce in Thailand, and welcome the invitation to carry on the tradition of an annual appearance by the American Ambassador. Much of what I have to say today will relate to our relations, as Americans, with the Thais in whose country we are living as guests. While the record of Thai-American relations speaks for itself, generally, sight tends to be lost from time to time of certain basic realities which I would like to put in better perspective. I should state at the outset, that in addition to speaking as the President's personal representative to Thailand, I am expressing deep, personal convictions based upon experiences over the past ten years—first in Thailand, then in Laos, and more recently in Washington, where I dealt with many Southeast Asian matters, particularly the problem of Vietnam.

I

Vietnam, by almost any standard, is the most absorbing and complex issue in American political life today. The issue is whether the nations of Southeast Asia shall be able to set their own independent course and be free of subversive aggression. Thailand, therefore, also attachs extreme importance to the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. Its determination equals that of the United States to bring about a final settlement in Vietnam which assures national freedom and fosters the return of peaceful order to Southeast Asian affairs.

The government of Thailand has made its position unmistakably clear. It has done this through active participation in collective defense arrangements under SEATO. Thailand has also enabled the U.S. to bring its air power to bear against North Vietnam and its infiltration into the South. Thailand has sent troops of its own to help defend South Vietnam, and it has taken firm measures to protect its own people against those assaulting not only South Vietnam and large sectors of Laos today, but Thailand itself.

Communist hostility toward Thailand is but one of many reflections of this nation's strategic importance in the total Southeast Asian picture. Ironic as it may seem, another measure of Thailand's key role in Southeast Asian events is this country's growing prominence in the American controversy over Vietnam.

In the cross fire of political battles over Vietnam, many Americans naturally want to examine our commitments elsewhere in the area, and to assess the dependability of those with whom we have aligned ourselves. I do not quarrel with the usefulness of responsible, free debate. I am seriously troubled, however, when I see certain facts about Thai-U.S. cooperation misread in ways that damage Thai-American interests, and encumber the Vietnam problem with negative and discouraging implications which do not actually exist.

The frequency of late of such distortion and misinformation has provided a new and disturbing experience for the Thai government and people. It is never pleasant to find one's country being criticized or subjected to hostile cross examination by foreigners. It is even less pleasant when they seem to question the validity of national policies, programs and institutions that have been carefully developed over the years for the express purpose of self-preservation. Having governed themselves for over 700 years, the Thai feel no need to adjust their way of doing things to meet foreign concepts of how things should be done. Moreover, having decided that defending Vietnam is in Thailand's own best interests, they do not want their actions interpreted—or misinterpreted—in lights cast by the clash of conflicting views over similar U.S. policies. Neither do they want it assumed that their fundamental policies are merely a response to the wishes of a large power. Understandably, they resent the bland assumption that the pattern of events in a neighboring state inevitably will be repeated in their own.

II

Nevertheless, perhaps largely because Thailand is known to have both communist guerrilla forces and U.S. military units in the country, it seems often to be assumed that American forces have been sent here to deal with the internal threat and are more or less covertly engaged in combat against insurgents in Thailand's rural areas. This of course is not the case. The only combat actions in which U.S. forces here participate are those well-publicized out-of-country operations directed against Vietnamese communist targets. U.S. military units in Thailand, other than those belonging to the Air Force, are neither equipped nor organized for combat assignments. The Thai government has stated repeatedly that in suppression action against the guerrillas, the only American help it wants or needs is that giving Thai military and security forces their own means of dealing with the problem.

Combat operations by Thai-based units of the U.S. Air Force are carried out against North Vietnam by our fighter-bomber aircraft, and against Viet Cong concentrations in South Vietnam by B–52 bombers, and have entailed the assignment to Thailand of about thirty-three thousand U.S. Air Force personnel. The Air Force units require in turn, from other U.S. military services here, myriad forms of logistical support in which some seven thousand troops are engaged. There are roughly three thousand additional U.S. military personnel in Thailand serving with the military assistance program, working on engineering and military research projects, and in SEATO.

Let me add, if I may, a footnote to what I hope will end misguided speculation about U.S. involvement in guerilla warfare here. A year ago, Ambassador Martin confirmed for you that unarmed U.S. Air Force helicopters were on assignment in the Northeast. As Ambassador Martin emphasized, this was a temporary, non-combat measure, taken at a time when added mobility was of critical importance to Thai authorities organizing their own resources to blunt an escalating insurgent threat. Accordingly, in January of 1967, after the Royal Thai Government had completed the transitional training required for field operation of its own newly acquired force of forty-nine troop-carrying helicopters, the U.S. helicopters were withdrawn from Thailand. They were replaced in the field by these Thai helicopters, furnished by the U.S., which Thai authorities are using with increasing effectiveness. Additional helicopters have been provided, including ten to the Thai National Police, and more will become available to the armed forces and police as Thai pilots and mechanics complete training courses and can make use of these aircraft.

The lesson here, I think, is two-fold: First, the nature of American assistance to Thai counter-insurgency programs does not lead toward direct American involvement in those operations. On the other hand, we must not become so transfixed by our Vietnam experiences that we lose our capacity here to take decisive, practical steps in providing the training and equipment with which the Thai government, itself can bring the insurgency under control, and in due course eliminate it.

III

We will continue to hear dire predictions, that Thailand inevitably will go the way of Vietnam, and that sooner or later Americans will be fighting communist insurgents here. In fact, Thailand resembles Vietnam only in that it is another intended victim of the same communist effort to expand its domination by using the technique of the "war of national liberation." Violence and killing in Thailand by communist terrorists, most of them trained outside Thailand, does not express grass roots political sentiment.

Thailand's people are united in a rapidly developing nation seeking to work out its political and economic destiny with care and forethought. Land ownership is primarily in the hands of those who work the soil. There is no tendency to split along religious lines, since virtually all Thai are Buddhists. Minorities are for the most part being assimilated and woven into the life of the country. One could cite many other factors working in Thailand's favor—its sense of self confidence developed over centuries of managing its own affairs—its able leadership, competent civil service, and armed forces showing their mettle today in Vietnam—its economic growth rate running around eight percent per annum—its capacity to organize and carry out rural security and development programs—and the social and economic mobility of Thai life.

Furthermore, Thailand's well-educated, skilled and enterprising young people do not migrate to other countries except in rare instances. Among the hundreds who annually go abroad for long periods to further their education or professional experience, all but a few are drawn back by loyalty and family ties and by their country's ample economic opportunities. I think it is fair to say, incidentally, that in large measure these have been created by Thailand's heavy emphasis upon private initiative and enterprise.

Thailand is also unique in that the continuity of its life and institutions has never been broken by colonial experiences. There has never been any need here for a national independence movement aimed at dislodging colonial rulers. Communist bands do not find in Thailand, therefore, as they did in Vietnam, any real opportunity to generate loyalty to a revolutionary struggle, or to identify themselves with compelling patriotic causes.

Above all, there flows from Thai attitudes toward the person of His Majesty the King and the institution of the monarchy a sense of national unity and continuity so strong that it extends into the remotest villages. To the citizens of Thailand, the King's full endorsement of efforts to counter the guerrilla threat is a buttress against subversive attempts to undermine the government's authority. In Thailand, as the communists have discovered even in relatively unprotected rural areas, the task of marshaling popular support for anti-government causes is difficult and unrewarding.

IV

In the Northeast, for example, in a poor area encompassing more than ten million people, where several years of subversive groundwork has been followed by two years of intensive terrorist and recruitment drives, the number of armed insurgents remains below two thousand. Reliable intelligence indicates that considerably more than a thousand of them have been trained outside Thailand in Communist China, in North Vietnam, and Pathet Lao territory.

At present, the mission of the insurgents, almost all of whom are full time fighters, assassins and political activists, is simple. Their mission is to break the links between Thailand's government and villagers, and to then replace the government's authority with their own. While there are isolated villages where this mission has been accomplished for a few hours, there is no point in Thailand upon which the insurgents have thus far been able to impose more than temporary control.

To see the present situation in fair perspective, however, one must look back to 1966. During that year, the level of communist violence increased markedly over 1965, a rise consistent with the insurgent campaign predicted by Peking in 1965. Communist operations reached a high point toward the end of 1966. In January of last year, the number of armed encounters rose as the Thai government's counter actions developed momentum. By March 1967 the insurgents had adopted the tactic of avoiding contact with government forces, and the number of monthly armed encounters dropped by two-thirds. The rate of forced village propaganda meetings has declined even more dramatically during the past year. Assassinations have shown a slight but steady decline and now are at a lower rate than at any time over the past two years.

A prime explanation of these trends, in my opinion, is the combination of armed pressures by Thai military and security forces and the expansion of Thai Government programs for the improvement of the villager's lot. The forces have chased the insurgents from past operational bases and forced them into other areas. This has broken or strained insurgent connections with established sources—often merely their own kinfolk—of food, intelligence and other forms of support. This has raised significantly the rate of defections and desertions, which reflect in general a lack of political motivation among those villagers recruited through intimidation or promise of material gains.

Given the Royal Thai Government's commitment of additional military and police forces to communist suppression work, its program to establish small, permanent security forces in threatened villages, and its growing attention to the aspirations and legitimate grievances of the villagers, I would expect insurgent efforts to organize the Thai countryside to meet with as little success in 1968 as they did in 1967.

They won't quit, however. Those who dominate the guerilla ranks in Thailand are disciplined, well-trained, fully-indoctrinated insurgents. Thailand's northeast border provinces, where most of them are operating, or some of the other Thai border areas where there have been indications of additional outbreaks of insurgency, are too important to long-range communist plans to create a revolutionary base within this kingdom. More immediate objectives include protection for the flank of communist infiltration routes through Laos into South Vietnam; development of a capability for striking Thai military installations, including those being used to help in Vietnam; inducing the Thai government to question its policy of close alliance with the U.S.; and shaking U.S. faith in the stability of its ally.

V

The Thai government has developed an effective program to contain and compress rural insurgency. It has committed the requisite resources for this as well as for accelerating rural progress to make it increasingly difficult for subversive influences to take root and grow. Our two governments have agreed on how American economic and military assistance can best provide support to such programs. In fostering rural progress, the Thai government plans to continue to emphasize provincial roads and other communications links; expanding agricultural, public health, educational, and other governmental services in rural communities; assisting farmers' organizations; and developing water resources for human consumption and irrigation. Other projects are designed to establish local security forces in more and more of the endangered remote villages, to mobilize military and police forces for quick reaction to the outbreak of insurgent violence, and to modernize Thai military forces for defensive action against larger scale communist penetrations. The U.S. will assist these efforts with substantial levels of economic and military aid which last year totalled more than one hundred-ten million dollars.

In all our programs here, however, whether they fall within economic, military, or other categories (the Peace Corps, for example), there is an additional underlying theme, which must not be overlooked to get a true impression of what Americans are doing in Thailand. That theme is education in the broadest sense of the word. The emphasis upon teaching, technical training, and advisory activities in our assistance programs here is in keeping with Thailand's traditional practice of welcoming and importing advanced knowledge and new skills. Historically the Thais have sought to draw generously upon the experience and know-how of others to improve their own techniques so that they will be in a position to manage their own affairs with ever-increasing effectiveness.

In response to Thai requests, the U.S. has undertaken to provide large numbers of technical advisors, training instructors, professional consultants, and other specialists capable of imparting the special knowledge, competence and skills which Thailand wants in greater abundance. Those who can be classed as advisors, trainers, instructors and educators account for more than three quarters of the total USOM staff of Americans. A substantial proportion of U.S. assistance funds are allocated annually to the training and further education of Thai civilian and military specialists. Under the Participant Training Program administered by USOM since 1949, over five thousand Thais have gone abroad, to the U.S. and elsewhere, for advanced training. Additionally, many of the large scale Thai government projects which receive U.S. assistance are directly concerned with training. These include, for example, a program for training twelve thousand new members of the Thai National Police by the end of this year; the training for Accelerated Rural Development programs of technical personnel, over seven hundred of whom have completed basic courses, while fifteen hundred others are receiving on-the-job training in the provinces; the instruction of paramedics for rural public health services; educating village youths in basic vocational skills taught by instructors in mobile training units. These, to be sure, are but some of the ways in which Thailand obtains professional competence and technical skills to meet problems at home and keep pace with the outside world. By the way, as proof of the wisdom of the Thai Government's policy, I have been impressed with the large number of fields in which Americans and others were providing training here some years ago, when I was last in Thailand, but in which I now find Thai carrying on by themselves.

VI

To understand fully why Thailand and the U.S. have undertaken many of the wide range of projects which engage us here, one must first look outside Thailand—toward Vietnam and beyond—at Southeast Asia as a whole. Within this vast, potentially wealthy area live 250 million people. None of them would be beyond the ambitious, domineering embrace of communism if no adequate obstacles existed to Red Chinese and North Vietnamese expansionism. We must add to this reservoir of Asian manpower, a fertile land mass the size of Western Europe, vast hydroelectric, mineral and petroleum resources, and a geographical position astride the air, sea and land routes joining the Pacific and Indian oceans.

U.S. policies toward the area take those strategic considerations into account, and above all the common determination among Southeast Asian states to preserve their national identities while advancing toward a more secure, stable and prosperous existence. U.S. policies in the individual nations of Southeast Asia are consistent with the basic American posture toward the area, but they vary from country to country, depending upon the capacity of each to maintain itself to its own satisfaction without outside help. The U.S. objective in these bilateral relations is an equal, progressive, mutually advantageous partnership, such as we have long enjoyed with Thailand. Our partnership with Thailand has proven uniquely productive, both in bilateral terms and in the beneficial, steadying affect it has had elsewhere in the area.

Thailand conducts its affairs on the basis of an independent, well-conceived set of policies which it has developed for itself toward the nations of this and all other areas of the world. On such basic matters, Thai and American positions are basically consistent. The effect of our alignment with each other, and with like-minded nations, is to give each of us greater influence than either nation could expect to exert in the absence of reinforcing policies and actions by the other.

Thailand, like America, is helping Vietnam in its own best interests. The United States is aiding Thailand for the same reason, and because it is our common firm belief that Vietnam is but one aspect of a much larger, potentially more formidable problem. Our efforts to solve and settle that problem depend ultimately upon people, both Thai and Americans, living and working in closer contact and in far greater numbers than ever before. This tests the capacity of Thai-American relations to withstand strains that our easy and cordial associations have not known before. I am fully convinced that the long term results from this period of intimate and broad Thai-American contacts will prove wholly positive.

No Harvest for the Reaper

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Education and Labor Committee is currently considering H.R. 4769, to extend the protection of the National Labor Relations Act to agricultural employees.

Numerous witnesses before the Special Subcommittee on Labor have described the continuing exploitation and the painful existence of farmworkers. The exclusion of these workers, who are the lowest paid large occupational group in America, from the labor law that covers almost all other workers is a fundamental cause of bitter grievances.

Now a new witness has stepped forward. NET Journal, a unit of the National Educational Television network, this week broadcast a thoughtful, carefully prepared documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper." It focused on the lives of a group of migratory farmworkers recruited in Arkansas for employment in the potato, bean, and strawberry fields of Long Island, N.Y. It describes in detail the economic pressures they face.

The film is in the tradition of John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath" and Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame." It details in unmistakable terms the personal tragedy of an unjust and unnecessarily cruel system of labor management.

The transcript of this production is lengthy, but it is filled with insights into the feelings and problems of the workers and also the farmers, processors, and labor contractors. I wish each of my colleagues could see the camera work which adds an essential dimension to this text.

A rebroadcast this Sunday at 5 p.m. on educational television will give that opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to include the transcript of the documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper," at this point in the Record and urge the 90th Congress to act swiftly to bring these workers under the Wagner Act.

The transcript follows:

Narrator. The following program is from NET, the National Educational Television Network.

The chronicle begins here in a parched, bloodless, cotton-bankrupt Southern town, with a crew chief, Andrew Anderson, seeking to recruit migrant labor to work the potato rich crops of eastern Long Island in New York.

Recruiter. Is there anything going on for you to do? I'm trying to recruit some guys to go to New York and work for a little while.

Man. Going to New York?

Recruiter. Yeah, about eight weeks

Man. Yeah, well, I don't know nobody.

Recruiter. If you see anybody interested in going, tell them to contact Anderson, Andrew Anderson on Water Street.

Man. Okay.

Recruiter. My boss will be sitting down there so they can contact and there will be somebody there to take the name. And you'll do that.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You fellows already got a suitcase. All you've got to do is get on my bus.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. I'm trying to find some men who want to go to New York and work for a while. You know anybody interested in going, tell them to contact me. Okay. You know Henry DeFrance?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You know him don't you. He's up there.

Man. He's up there? Where does he work?

Recruiter. He works as a grader over there. So, if you see anybody, you tell them to check. I'm going to leave tomorrow evening.

Man. Tomorrow evening, okay.

Recruiter. Yup. I'd appreciate that. Okay.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. Would you be interested in going off for eight weeks?

Man. About eight weeks?

Recruiter. The first of December, that's when my job ends.

I don't rest—tomorrow. I've got about forty boys from here and there around, and Parkin.

Man. I never have any money to go there.

Recruiter. No, that's one thing. I'm getting you up there on credit. You see.

If I don't get you a job, they'll bring you back on credit. Now, I've got to have a job for you haven't I. I sure don't want to feed you and you're not going to work. Isn't that right, Cleo.

See if I were going to do that then Cleo would be ready to go.

What's your name?

Man. David.

Recruiter. David. What's your last name?

Man. Brandon—B-R-A-N-D-O-N.

Recruiter. Is many people out of work here now?

Man. Yeah man.

Recruiter. They need something to do?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. This would help Santa Claus, you see, if they go up and work until the first of December and make 'em four or five hundred dollars. They tell me that's where Santa Claus come by, you know.

Man. Yeah, that's about . . .

Recruiter. You know, in any situation. You're Santa Claus ain't you? You're Santa Claus now?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You don't get no finances, you don't have no Santa Claus huh?

Man. Yeah, for about eighteen years.

Recruiter. I'll look and see what I can find out for you.

Narrator. The next night, six more men had been induced to make the journey north. Some with the help of the Arkansas State Employment Service.

They had been promised good wages, steady work and such creature comforts as decent housing, shower facilities and what is called a centrally located restaurant on the grounds of the labor camp.

Their guide for the 1800 mile trip will be crew leader Anderson. His charge is thirty dollars. Since none can now afford it, they are in debt to Andrew Anderson before the trip begins.

The bus marked "special" will take them away from the indifferent towns of Arkansas, past the county seats of Tennessee into the Virginias, then over hundreds of miles of sterile highway that bypass great mountains of hardbreaking sunsets, until ultimately they reach Cutchogue, Long Island.

Earlier in the season, Cutchogue was a vacation resort, one of the prides of Long Island North Fork. The prim town is resplendent with schools, churches and old homes. It also has a migrant labor camp.

Even back in June at the beginning of the season, the labor camp bore the scars of endless summers past. One of 89 camps in Suffolk County, it is considered better than most by local officials.

Anderson. Alright let's go.

Narrator. On his morning rounds, Andrew Anderson wakes up Charlie White, one of 21,000 migrant workers in New York State, whose circumstances are similar to a half million migrants throughout the United States.

Charlie White's weekly pay averages $47.00. From this he must pay a weekly rent of five dollars, a fuel charge of two dollars and a blanket fee of five dollars.

Although there was a fire at this camp several years ago which took the lives of two workers, this room is not fire-proof. The New York State code requires fire-proofing for buildings housing at least fifteen men; only fourteen live in this area.

Anderson. Get up man. Get out and get this camp in shape.

Narrator. The multiple occupancy dorms labelled "bull pens" by the workers are claimed to be fire-resistant by the farmer owners.

As to actual living space, the New York State code says that if a double-deck bunk is used in such an area, there shall be at least twenty square feet of floor area for each man. For non-migrants, the code insists on eighty square feet. It goes on to say that every bunk, bed, cot, or bunk spring, mattress or pillow shall be in good condition, and every sheet and blanket shall be clean.

The men here pay the same as Charlie White for rent, fuel and blankets. Throughout the season, almost 100 men will use this bathroom facility. Suffolk County officials have managed to amend the State law to outlaw outhouses.

Later in the season, 38 men will have to use a single bathroom. The farmers were outraged by a County violation report. They claimed that only 25 men had to use it. All meals are served at the Dixie Belle Tavern. The centrally located restaurant. In charge of the food concession is Mrs. Andrew Anderson. Breakfast is eighty-five cents. Usually consisting of a sausage bowl, rice, hominy grits, and an occasional egg.

Since the workers rarely have cash on hand, every charge is on credit to be deducted from the paychecks at the end of the week.

The bus takes them into their field work every morning. Roundtrip is $1.25, payable to Andrew Anderson, except when the farmers transport them in themselves, riding them out in pickup trucks; at six A.M. this bus is almost ready to roll.

Anderson. Dave Johnson, Louis Willy, Richard Addison, Fromm, LeRoy Carter, Feeley, Antonio.

Man. He's already up there.

Anderson. Who do I have in there?

Narrator. If the work is slow, as it frequently is, or if the men are not favorites of the crew chief, they stay behind incurring the debts of daily existence. The number three crop in Long Island is strawberries, harvested from June to August. The migrants make ten cents for every quart they pick.

The work is called stoop labor for obvious reasons.

Daily records are kept via paper chits. For every quart, a chit worth a dime to be returned at the end of the day, duly noted, paid at week's end.

The land belongs to one of the farmers who owns the labor camp. William Lindsay.

Auctioneer. . . . (unintelligible—auctioneering) How much?

Narrator. Farmer Lindsay's strawberries yield close to two hundred dollars on the auction block. The migrants who picked it earn a total of twelve dollars for their labor. Two dollars apiece for six men. For six hours of work.

Anderson. Time to get up now.

Narrator. Migrant worker Woodrow Wilson. He wants to go to nearby Riverhead today. The trip, if Anderson allows him to go and furnish his transportation, will cost three dollars.

Anderson. No, really, I can't let you go to Riverhead. I've got work here for the farmers. Okay.

Man. Okay.

Anderson. If you don't make nothing today, I'll let you go to Riverhead, you here. Alright?

Narrator. No one is going to Riverhead this morning. Charlie White is ready to harvest stringbeans. So is Woodrow Wilson. Even though picking a hamper of beans pays only a dollar.

Man. . . . (unintelligible) . . .

Narrator. Jackie Robinson. He's fourteen and says he's been trying to return to Arkansas to reenter school but hasn't been able to buy his way out.

Man. . . . (singing) . . .

Narrator. These are the economics of migrant labor. Charlie White will pick stringbeans from six AM till twelve Noon. He will be paid one dollar a hamper.

Andrew Anderson will take fifteen cents on each dollar as he does on all field workers. For six hours work, Charlie White will earn one dollar and seventy cents.

Man. . . . (singing) . . .

Narrator. Much of the fertile land of Suffolk County is owned by members of the Eastern Suffolk Co-operative, which owns and operates the Cutchogue labor camp, leasing it to Anderson.

For decades the land has been yielding abundant crops: potatoes, cauliflower, strawberries, and stringbeans.

Narrator. On some days, the farmers come to camp to pick up their workers.

Farmer William Chudiak is the President of the Eastern Suffolk Co-op. While he has some cauliflower and strawberry acreage, his principal investment is in potatoes. Seventy-five acres, estimated current value almost three thousand dollars an acre.

Another member of the co-op, Al Patrick, owns seventy-two acres of potatoes, also valued at close to three thousand dollars per acre.

Worker. This is my first time.

Interviewer. First time?

Worker. Uh-huh. I don't like it so well, neither.

Interviewer. You don't. What kind do you like?

Worker. I'd like some kind of inside job or something like that. I'd rather be in Arkansas, I believe, than be here. Rather than be here.

Interviewer. What's the difference between here and Arkansas? Give us some of the advantages of Arkansas.

paign predicted by Peking in 1965. Communist operations reached a high point toward the end of 1966. In January of last year, the number of armed encounters rose as the Thai government's counter actions developed momentum. By March 1967 the insurgents had adopted the tactic of avoiding contact with government forces, and the number of monthly armed encounters dropped by two-thirds. The rate of forced village propaganda meetings has declined even more dramatically during the past year. Assassinations have shown a slight but steady decline and now are at a lower rate than at any time over the past two years.

A prime explanation of these trends, in my opinion, is the combination of armed pressures by Thai military and security forces and the expansion of Thai Government programs for the improvement of the villager's lot. The forces have chased the insurgents from past operational bases and forced them into other areas. This has broken or strained insurgent connections with established sources—often merely their own kinfolk—of food, intelligence and other forms of support. This has raised significantly the rate of defections and desertions, which reflect in general a lack of political motivation among those villagers recruited through intimidation or promise of material gains.

Given the Royal Thai Government's commitment of additional military and police forces to communist suppression work, its program to establish small, permanent security forces in threatened villages, and its growing attention to the aspirations and legitimate grievances of the villagers, I would expect insurgent efforts to organize the Thai countryside to meet with as little success in 1968 as they did in 1967.

They won't quit, however. Those who dominate the guerilla ranks in Thailand are disciplined, well-trained, fully-indoctrinated insurgents. Thailand's northeast border provinces, where most of them are operating, or some of the other Thai border areas where there have been indications of additional outbreaks of insurgency, are too important to long-range communist plans to create a revolutionary base within this kingdom. More immediate objectives include protection for the flank of communist infiltration routes through Laos into South Vietnam; development of a capability for striking Thai military installations, including those being used to help in Vietnam; inducing the Thai government to question its policy of close alliance with the U.S.; and shaking U.S. faith in the stability of its ally.

V

The Thai government has developed an effective program to contain and compress rural insurgency. It has committed the requisite resources for this as well as for accelerating rural progress to make it increasingly difficult for subversive influences to take root and grow. Our two governments have agreed on how American economic and military assistance can best provide support to such programs. In fostering rural progress, the Thai government plans to continue to emphasize provincial roads and other communications links; expanding agricultural, public health, educational, and other governmental services in rural communities; assisting farmers' organizations; and developing water resources for human consumption and irrigation. Other projects are designed to establish local security forces in more and more of the endangered remote villages, to mobilize military and police forces for quick reaction to the outbreak of insurgent violence, and to modernize Thai military forces for defensive action against larger scale communist penetrations. The U.S. will assist these efforts with substantial levels of economic and military aid which last year totalled more than one hundred-ten million dollars.

In all our programs here, however, whether they fall within economic, military, or other categories (the Peace Corps, for example), there is an additional underlying theme, which must not be overlooked to get a true impression of what Americans are doing in Thailand. That theme is education in the broadest sense of the word. The emphasis upon teaching, technical training, and advisory activities in our assistance programs here is in keeping with Thailand's traditional practice of welcoming and importing advanced knowledge and new skills. Historically the Thais have sought to draw generously upon the experience and know-how of others to improve their own techniques so that they will be in a position to manage their own affairs with ever-increasing effectiveness.

In response to Thai requests, the U.S. has undertaken to provide large numbers of technical advisors, training instructors, professional consultants, and other specialists capable of imparting the special knowledge, competence and skills which Thailand wants in greater abundance. Those who can be classed as advisors, trainers, instructors and educators account for more than three quarters of the total USOM staff of Americans. A substantial proportion of U.S. assistance funds are allocated annually to the training and further education of Thai civilian and military specialists. Under the Participant Training Program administered by USOM since 1949, over five thousand Thais have gone abroad, to the U.S. and elsewhere, for advanced training. Additionally, many of the large scale Thai government projects which receive U.S. assistance are directly concerned with training. These include, for example, a program for training twelve thousand new members of the Thai National Police by the end of this year; the training for Accelerated Rural Development programs of technical personnel, over seven hundred of whom have completed basic courses, while fifteen hundred others are receiving on-the-job training in the provinces; the instruction of paramedics for rural public health services; educating village youths in basic vocational skills taught by instructors in mobile training units. These, to be sure, are but some of the ways in which Thailand obtains professional competence and technical skills to meet problems at home and keep pace with the outside world. By the way, as proof of the wisdom of the Thai Government's policy, I have been impressed with the large number of fields in which Americans and others were providing training here some years ago, when I was last in Thailand, but in which I now find Thai carrying on by themselves.

VI

To understand fully why Thailand and the U.S. have undertaken many of the wide range of projects which engage us here, one must first look outside Thailand—toward Vietnam and beyond—at Southeast Asia as a whole. Within this vast, potentially wealthy area live 250 million people. None of them would be beyond the ambitious, domineering embrace of communism if no adequate obstacles existed to Red Chinese and North Vietnamese expansionism. We must add to this reservoir of Asian manpower, a fertile land mass the size of Western Europe, vast hydroelectric, mineral and petroleum resources, and a geographical position astride the air, sea and land routes joining the Pacific and Indian oceans.

U.S. policies toward the area take those strategic considerations into account, and above all the common determination among Southeast Asian states to preserve their national identities while advancing toward a more secure, stable and prosperous existence. U.S. policies in the individual nations of Southeast Asia are consistent with the basic American posture toward the area, but they vary from country to country, depending upon the capacity of each to maintain itself to its own satisfaction without outside help. The U.S. objective in these bilateral relations is an equal, progressive, mutually advantageous partnership, such as we have long enjoyed with Thailand. Our partnership with Thailand has proven uniquely productive, both in bilateral terms and in the beneficial, steadying affect it has had elsewhere in the area.

Thailand conducts its affairs on the basis of an independent, well-conceived set of policies which it has developed for itself toward the nations of this and all other areas of the world. On such basic matters, Thai and American positions are basically consistent. The effect of our alignment with each other, and with like-minded nations, is to give each of us greater influence than either nation could expect to exert in the absence of reinforcing policies and actions by the other.

Thailand, like America, is helping Vietnam in its own best interests. The United States is aiding Thailand for the same reason, and because it is our common firm belief that Vietnam is but one aspect of a much larger, potentially more formidable problem. Our efforts to solve and settle that problem depend ultimately upon people, both Thai and Americans, living and working in closer contact and in far greater numbers than ever before. This tests the capacity of Thai-American relations to withstand strains that our easy and cordial associations have not known before. I am fully convinced that the long term results from this period of intimate and broad Thai-American contacts will prove wholly positive.

No Harvest for the Reaper

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Education and Labor Committee is currently considering H.R. 4769, to extend the protection of the National Labor Relations Act to agricultural employees.

Numerous witnesses before the Special Subcommittee on Labor have described the continuing exploitation and the painful existence of farmworkers. The exclusion of these workers, who are the lowest paid large occupational group in America, from the labor law that covers almost all other workers is a fundamental cause of bitter grievances.

Now a new witness has stepped forward. NET Journal, a unit of the National Educational Television network, this week broadcast a thoughtful, carefully prepared documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper." It focused on the lives of a group of migratory farmworkers recruited in Arkansas for employment in the potato, bean, and strawberry fields of Long Island, N.Y. It describes in detail the economic pressures they face.

The film is in the tradition of John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath" and Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame." It details in unmistakable terms the personal tragedy of an unjust and unnecessarily cruel system of labor management.

The transcript of this production is lengthy, but it is filled with insights into the feelings and problems of the workers and also the farmers, processors, and labor contractors. I wish each of my colleagues could see the camera work which adds an essential dimension to this text.

A rebroadcast this Sunday at 5 p.m. on educational television will give that opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to include the transcript of the documentary, "No Harvest for the Reaper," at this point in the Record and urge the 90th Congress to act swiftly to bring these workers under the Wagner Act.

The transcript follows:

Narrator. The following program is from NET, the National Educational Television Network.

The chronicle begins here in a parched, bloodless, cotton-bankrupt Southern town, with a crew chief, Andrew Anderson, seeking to recruit migrant labor to work the potato rich crops of eastern Long Island in New York.

Recruiter. Is there anything going on for you to do? I'm trying to recruit some guys to go to New York and work for a little while.

Man. Going to New York?

Recruiter. Yeah, about eight weeks

Man. Yeah, well, I don't know nobody.

Recruiter. If you see anybody interested in going, tell them to contact Anderson, Andrew Anderson on Water Street.

Man. Okay.

Recruiter. My boss will be sitting down there so they can contact and there will be somebody there to take the name. And you'll do that.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You fellows already got a suitcase. All you've got to do is get on my bus.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. I'm trying to find some men who want to go to New York and work for a while. You know anybody interested in going, tell them to contact me. Okay. You know Henry DeFrance?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You know him don't you. He's up there.

Man. He's up there? Where does he work?

Recruiter. He works as a grader over there. So, if you see anybody, you tell them to check. I'm going to leave tomorrow evening.

Man. Tomorrow evening, okay.

Recruiter. Yup. I'd appreciate that. Okay.

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. Would you be interested in going off for eight weeks?

Man. About eight weeks?

Recruiter. The first of December, that's when my job ends.

I don't rest—tomorrow. I've got about forty boys from here and there around, and Parkin.

Man. I never have any money to go there.

Recruiter. No, that's one thing. I'm getting you up there on credit. You see.

If I don't get you a job, they'll bring you back on credit. Now, I've got to have a job for you haven't I. I sure don't want to feed you and you're not going to work. Isn't that right, Cleo.

See if I were going to do that then Cleo would be ready to go.

What's your name?

Man. David.

Recruiter. David. What's your last name?

Man. Brandon—B-R-A-N-D-O-N.

Recruiter. Is many people out of work here now?

Man. Yeah man.

Recruiter. They need something to do?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. This would help Santa Claus, you see, if they go up and work until the first of December and make 'em four or five hundred dollars. They tell me that's where Santa Claus come by, you know.

Man. Yeah, that's about ...

Recruiter. You know, in any situation. You're Santa Claus ain't you? You're Santa Claus now?

Man. Yeah.

Recruiter. You don't get no finances, you don't have no Santa Claus huh?

Man. Yeah, for about eighteen years.

Recruiter. I'll look and see what I can find out for you.

Narrator. The next night, six more men had been induced to make the journey north. Some with the help of the Arkansas State Employment Service.

They had been promised good wages, steady work and such creature comforts as decent housing, shower facilities and what is called a centrally located restaurant on the grounds of the labor camp.

Their guide for the 1800 mile trip will be crew leader Anderson. His charge is thirty dollars. Since none can now afford it, they are in debt to Andrew Anderson before the trip begins.

The bus marked "special" will take them away from the indifferent towns of Arkansas, past the county seats of Tennessee into the Virginias, then over hundreds of miles of sterile highway that bypass great mountains of hardbreaking sunsets, until ultimately they reach Cutchogue, Long Island.

Earlier in the season, Cutchogue was a vacation resort, one of the prides of Long Island North Fork. The prim town is resplendent with schools, churches and old homes. It also has a migrant labor camp.

Even back in June at the beginning of the season, the labor camp bore the scars of endless summers past. One of 89 camps in Suffolk County, it is considered better than most by local officials.

Anderson. Alright let's go.

Narrator. On his morning rounds, Andrew Anderson wakes up Charlie White, one of 21,000 migrant workers in New York State, whose circumstances are similar to a half million migrants throughout the United States.

Charlie White's weekly pay averages $47.00. From this he must pay a weekly rent of five dollars, a fuel charge of two dollars and a blanket fee of five dollars.

Although there was a fire at this camp several years ago which took the lives of two workers, this room is not fire-proof. The New York State code requires fire-proofing for buildings housing at least fifteen men; only fourteen live in this area.

Anderson. Get up man. Get out and get this camp in shape.

Narrator. The multiple occupancy dorms labelled "bull pens" by the workers are claimed to be fire-resistant by the farmer owners.

As to actual living space, the New York State code says that if a double-deck bunk is used in such an area, there shall be at least twenty square feet of floor area for each man. For non-migrants, the code insists on eighty square feet. It goes on to say that every bunk, bed, cot, or bunk spring, mattress or pillow shall be in good condition, and every sheet and blanket shall be clean.

The men here pay the same as Charlie White for rent, fuel and blankets. Throughout the season, almost 100 men will use this bathroom facility. Suffolk County officials have managed to amend the State law to outlaw outhouses.

Later in the season, 38 men will have to use a single bathroom. The farmers were outraged by a County violation report. They claimed that only 25 men had to use it. All meals are served at the Dixie Belle Tavern. The centrally located restaurant. In charge of the food concession is Mrs. Andrew Anderson. Breakfast is eighty-five cents. Usually consisting of a sausage bowl, rice, hominy grits, and an occasional egg.

Since the workers rarely have cash on hand, every charge is on credit to be deducted from the paychecks at the end of the week.

The bus takes them into their field work every morning. Roundtrip is $1.25, payable to Andrew Anderson, except when the farmers transport them in themselves, riding them out in pickup trucks; at six A.M. this bus is almost ready to roll.

Anderson. Dave Johnson, Louis Willy, Richard Addison, Fromm, LeRoy Carter, Feeley, Antonio.

Man. He's already up there.

Anderson. Who do I have in there?

Narrator. If the work is slow, as it frequently is, or if the men are not favorites of the crew chief, they stay behind incurring the debts of daily existence. The number three crop in Long Island is strawberries, harvested from June to August. The migrants make ten cents for every quart they pick.

The work is called stoop labor for obvious reasons.

Daily records are kept via paper chits. For every quart, a chit worth a dime to be returned at the end of the day, duly noted, paid at week's end.

The land belongs to one of the farmers who owns the labor camp. William Lindsay.

Auctioneer. . . . (unintelligible—auctioneering) How much?

Narrator. Farmer Lindsay's strawberries yield close to two hundred dollars on the auction block. The migrants who picked it earn a total of twelve dollars for their labor. Two dollars apiece for six men. For six hours of work.

Anderson. Time to get up now.

Narrator. Migrant worker Woodrow Wilson. He wants to go to nearby Riverhead today. The trip, if Anderson allows him to go and furnish his transportation, will cost three dollars.

Anderson. No, really, I can't let you go to Riverhead. I've got work here for the farmers. Okay.

Man. Okay.

Anderson. If you don't make nothing today, I'll let you go to Riverhead, you here. Alright?

Narrator. No one is going to Riverhead this morning. Charlie White is ready to harvest stringbeans. So is Woodrow Wilson. Even though picking a hamper of beans pays only a dollar.

Man. . . . (unintelligible) . . .

Narrator. Jackie Robinson. He's fourteen and says he's been trying to return to Arkansas to reenter school but hasn't been able to buy his way out.

Man. . . . (singing) . . .

Narrator. These are the economics of migrant labor. Charlie White will pick stringbeans from six AM till twelve Noon. He will be paid one dollar a hamper.

Andrew Anderson will take fifteen cents on each dollar as he does on all field workers. For six hours work, Charlie White will earn one dollar and seventy cents.

Man. . . . (singing) . . .

Narrator. Much of the fertile land of Suffolk County is owned by members of the Eastern Suffolk Co-operative, which owns and operates the Cutchogue labor camp, leasing it to Anderson.

For decades the land has been yielding abundant crops: potatoes, cauliflower, strawberries, and stringbeans.

Narrator. On some days, the farmers come to camp to pick up their workers.

Farmer William Chudiak is the President of the Eastern Suffolk Co-op. While he has some cauliflower and strawberry acreage, his principal investment is in potatoes. Seventy-five acres, estimated current value almost three thousand dollars an acre.

Another member of the co-op, Al Patrick, owns seventy-two acres of potatoes, also valued at close to three thousand dollars per acre.

Worker. This is my first time.

Interviewer. First time?

Worker. Uh-huh. I don't like it so well, neither.

Interviewer. You don't. What kind do you like?

Worker. I'd like some kind of inside job or something like that. I'd rather be in Arkansas, I believe, than be here. Rather than be here.

Interviewer. What's the difference between here and Arkansas? Give us some of the advantages of Arkansas.

WORKER. Well so far, you can have more pleasure in Arkansas than up here now. I don't know how it's going to be after awhile, but right now it's not so good.

INTERVIEWER. What made you decide to come up?

WORKER. Oh, I just said I'd try it once. I saw everybody else trying it, saying they liked it. And I decided I'd try it and see if I liked it.

INTERVIEWER. Well, did you think there was a chance to make some money or not?

WORKER. Yeah, I thought there was a chance to make some money. I thought the wages would be a little higher than they were in Arkansas, but I see that they ain't. Not here.

INTERVIEWER. What are you going to do after the crop?

WORKER. Well, I guess I'll go back home if I'm let. Go to Chicago.

WORKER. I'll go home and stay for a time. Someone come pick me up and I'll go to Florida.

INTERVIEWER. What do you work? The citrus crop?

WORKER. No, we do the same thing—potatoes.

INTERVIEWER. Florida potatoes?

WORKER. Yeah. That's right. We stay in Florida about six weeks. Leave Florida to come back to what's called Cape Charles, Virginia. We live in Cape Charles, Virginia and breed potatoes there for a month. We leave there and come back here to Cutchogue. The least long we're supposed to stay here is eight months. We come in in July. We stay from July until March.

We leave here in March, the first of April and go back to Florida. We just go back and forth.

INTERVIEWER. Where is your home?

WORKER. Well, my original home was—where I was raised was in Arkansas, but I was born in Oklahoma City. That's where I'm from. I went back to Arkansas last year and was there about eleven months. I've been a citizen of this State of ten and a half years.

I've been to Rochester, Buffalo, Syracuse, Watertown, Utica, Lockport. All those . . .

I've worked all in the northern parts.

WORKER. I don't want my children to be drifting like I have. Going to and fro, and I'm working by the help of God trying to make a better living, to get a better job, either to be in a place where I can be stationary, where I can get them through school, and try to give them a better living than I had in my life.

NARRATOR. It is July 4th, a paid vacation day to most Americans. And these are the strawberry fields of Farmer Lindsay.

Present are some tourists and friends of the Lindsays, who for a token fee can keep whatever they pick. For the tourists it is fun. For the migrants who are working the fields, it is survival at ten cents a quart.

YOUNG CHILD. I picked half a basket. Then we'll pull in another basket okay?

WOMAN. Okay.

YOUNG CHILD. John, how many baskets did you pull up?

WORKER. Unintelligible.

NARRATOR. Farmer Lindsay records the chits used in payment. He is not enamored of migrant help. They're not men at all, he says, but two-legged animals.

WORSHIPING FARM FAMILY. And to you father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. May Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you your sins and bring you to life everlasting.

Amen.

WORSHIPING FARMWORKERS. We thank thee heavenly father for life. We thank thee our father for the food that we ate this morning. Our father, thou who hast brought us thus far on life's journey, it is with a great deal of humility, and thanksgiving that we're here this morning. We pray heavenly father that they would use our lives as instruments to reach others.

Amen.

Oh, God . . . (unintelligible) . . .
And your people will rejoice in you.
Tell us oh Lord your penance.
Grant us your salvation.
Oh Lord hear my prayer.
The Lord be with you.

GROUP. Singing . . .

FARMER. The labor situation is—it's terrible. No one wants to work. They are interested in what they can get out of you, but not what they can do for you.

You have some boys that are fair. And some of them—they're not interested in nothing but—I probably shouldn't even say it.

FARM WIFE. I'd say that they're okay. But it comes like on a Saturday morning with—when they have nobody to load the trucks if it wasn't for—

FARMER. They don't show up on the job.

FARM WIFE. And Monday mornings. So my husband is actually sick them two days.

FARMER. I have some—like the Puerto Ricans—the same ones come back. But the migrants from the labor camp, I think they come from Arkansas and Mississippi. And quite a few of them has been the same ones. Which makes me feel halfway decent that they appreciate what I do for them.

NARRATOR. The farmers spend more money on tractor repair and fertilizer than they do on migrant housing, yet resent what they call outside do-gooders.

FARMER. There are too many people trying to do too much for the Negro, not knowing the problems the farmers have to face with them.

Nobody helped me. And—so I have nothing against them personally. I mean, they're human beings also. But some of them are so destructive and people that don't have any idea of what they're like are the ones that are doing all the fighting for them.

They ought to come down here to this camp and see what goes on here week-ends. They'd never believe what's going on.

Because I know, we put screen doors up, and we put windows in. We go back a couple of days later, and they're taken right out again. You gotta go back and put them back, and they take them out.

They're very destructive.

INTERVIEWER. Well, how do these problems actually affect your production?

FARMER. Well, they don't exactly hinder our production. When we come into camp and start talking to some of these fellows, they get them so confused that they don't know whether the farmer is giving them the fast run-around, or whether the people who are talking to them are giving them a fast run-around, and they won't believe Mr. Anderson.

They think that he's trying to give them a fast shuffle also. They get awful confused.

NARRATOR. But the only thing that the migrants are confused about is the way they get paid.

At a plant nursery where they receive $1.35 per hour, they learn that another crew from the same camp working at a nursery down the road is being paid $1.75 per hour.

As the men go out to work on this day, they will discuss going to crew chief Anderson and demanding to know why they are being paid less. But of the ten men, eight will decide against a direct confrontation. The remaining two will then feel that since they do not have the strength of numbers, it is just not worth it.

And so on this day, as on every day throughout the long season, the complaints against Andrew Anderson will go unposed, and unanswered.

WORKER. You won't have no help to fight it because everybody is scared to fight against it. They're scared they can't get back home the summer.

WORKER. Puts on a very show, a good show with people that ain't never been no where with him. But it's all different when they get where they're going.

The way I was reading, the way he do's a man, you have to stay in debt. If you work at it, he'd going to possibly get a third of it, of your hours, regardless of what happens. Because they're ain't nobody even if you're out of debt with him, look what he done already beat you for.

WORKER. I left Arkansas to do better. I didn't leave Arkansas to do worse up here.

WORKER. You'll never get out of debt with him. You're in debt with him when you start, and you're in debt with him when you leave.

NARRATOR. The second crew recruited by Andrew Anderson in September is on its final leg of the journey from Forest City, Arkansas, to Cutchogue Long Island. Steady work, good wages, enough money for Santa Claus have been the promises.

Along the way a hitch-hiker has been given a lift. He has been going nowhere in particular. Andrew Anderson decides to recruit him for the camp.

ANDERSON. Well, my purpose on this trip is to recruit some labor so just sit right in, you know.

HITCHHIKER. As I say, I was out looking for a job. If it suits me, I'll go right along with you.

ANDERSON. How long can you work up there?

HITCHHIKER. Oh, well, I'll work about as long as you want me to.

ANDERSON. The contract ends the first of December.

HITCHHIKER. The first of December.

ANDERSON. I'll just find a place.

HITCHHIKER. Yes sir.

ANDERSON. I'll be coming right along down this same route.

HITCHHIKER. Good. I'd like to go with you and work right along with you. What does farm work pay?

ANDERSON. A dollar thirty-five to a dollar and a half an hour.

HITCHHIKER. That's fine. It sounds alright to me. I think it sounds very good.

MAN. Well, for farm work. It's alright for farm work.

ANDERSON. You can get in nine and ten hours a day.

MAN. Good. Oh, that's better you know. When you get in more hours, you get more pay.

NARRATOR. The bus known as "special" arrives at the camp in the midst of rain that has plagued the Island all season long.

The earlier June to September crew is there to receive them.

For Mrs. Anderson, there will be new customers at meal time. And there are now six new workers for whom the farmers will pay a bounty of sixty cents a head each day to Andrew Anderson.

In September the early harvesting of potatoes begins. The steel fingers of field combines disinter the earth and send the variety known as Katahdins bouncing up the chute, where migrants discard the vines and other unwanted natural debris.

Potatoes have made Suffolk one of the 100 richest counties in the nation in farm income. Despite the rainy weather all season, first harvest seems endless.

From the fields, the potatoes are trucked by farmers to grading sheds. In this next phase of marketing it is the processor who takes over. His role is to have the potatoes washed, graded, and packed by migrants, then shipped to New York City supermarkets and to other clients, including fashionable hotels and restaurants.

The processor here is one of the largest in the county and a member of the Eastern Suffolk Co-op, Steve J. Deroski.

DEROSKI. Well, you save me 150 for Philly. Okay. How much is it going to cost me? You mean to tell me you're holding me up for a dime? Boy, you fellows are something else. All right, we give it at two twenty.

Narrator. Lunch for the migrants arrives three hours late. They have been working since seven this morning. Again, all meals are from the concession belonging to the crew chief and his wife.

Deroski. Good enough to eat, Jed? Do you realize how much food that is?

Worker. The potatoes are pretty well done.

Deroski. I don't eat that much.

Worker. You don't do nothing but walk around.

Deroski. What do you mean, I don't do nothing but walk around? You must be joking.

Worker. Huh.

Deroski. While you're working with your hands, I'm working with my mind.

Worker. Mm-hm.

Deroski. Huh? That's right. My wheels are turning upstairs while—while your wheels are turning up here.

Worker. That's right.

Deroski. Right?

Worker. Right.

Deroski. Well, you got plenty to eat there. I believe—I don't know, you're going to be just too fat. You got to go on a diet if you eat that much food.

Worker. Fat?

Deroski. Sure. How can you eat that much? Huh? I just had a little sandwich and I'm satisfied. You mean to tell me you can eat all that?

Narrator. The pay rate in the sheds is supposedly a dollar and sixty cents an hour. But it is the crew leader who determines the men's time, and it is the crew leader who deducts 25 cents from their hourly pay.

As in most sheds, whenever the machinery stops because of mechanical breakdown or an interval in the processing, the pay stops.

But many shed workers are bona fide members of a union.

Worker. He say he 'long to a union, but I mean, the way I see it, I don't 'long to no union, because if you 'long to a union, if you get sick and lay off—I mean if you're sick the union s'pose to see that you get a third of your pay, right? Un' 'pose to see that your hospital bill, everything's taken care of. But dis union do not do dat.

Way I see it, point of view of . . . (unintelligible), all this union does is take your money.

Narrator. In 1960, in a contract signed between the workers and the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative, there was a guarantee of at least 160 hours of work a month—40 hours a week.

But in 1967, in a contract negotiated between the Teamsters Union, Local 202, and the protato processor, the work week guarantee was cut to 26 hours.

Within the same contract there is contained a no strike clause and a no lockout clause.

And the guarantee of transportation without charge back to the workers' destination.

Another clause in the contract talks of the existence of a shop steward, as well as the agreement that the contract shall be posted in a conspicuous place.

In those potato sheds visited by NET Journal, the contracts were nowhere to be seen.

One processor feels the responsibility for payment of unions is not his but that of the labor contractor, the crew leader.

Processor. You have good contractors and bad contractors, the same as you've got good employers and bad employers I mean, it's—you can't just say it's a case that takes place with migrants; it takes place all phases of labor.

As far as the people being exploited, I don't believe they're being exploited by the potato industry themselves. They're being exploited by their own kind. Not by the farmer and the processor.

Narrator. Pay day at the camp. One migrant called it "dust for blood."

When the men work a 40- or 50-hour week, their average pay check is $47. 25 cents on each hour is then deducted by the crew leader. Workers cash their checks with crew leader Anderson, because they have no transportation to the town bank. Besides, pay day is on Friday or Saturday evenings, after banking hours.

Room and board are deducted according to the crew leader's bookkeeping. Andrew Anderson says, however, he doesn't combine room and board, as do many other crew chiefs.

Man. He pays for what he uses, and this is justice. And each worker will feel satisfied in paying for what he get.

Narrator. Pay day and wine are classic partners in this camp, for all the wrong reasons. In town a pint of Twister sells for 51 cents. At the camp it's a dollar.

For the men it is quick therapy. But it also fogs the memory concerning what was charged up and what was not.

One of the men somehow received and cashed his own check, and bought his Twister in town. Crew leader Anderson is not happy.

Anderson. You owe $13 in the kitchen for food, you owe $5 for rent, and another. . .

Worker. No, sir, you're wrong. Last year was . . . (unintelligible)

Anderson. Come over here, Rucker, don't play with me now.

Worker. I ain't got it tonight. I'll pay it directly. I ain't got it tonight.

Anderson. What happened?

Worker. No, sir, I ain't got it, now, no stuff.

Anderson. Why you don't have it?

Worker. $20 kitchen for food?

Anderson. No, no, I didn't say that. You owe a total of $20.

Worker. No, I paid last Thursday night, last Friday night.

Anderson. You pay it every week.

Worker. Well—I owe thirty—$20 right now?

Anderson. Yeah. You owe a dollar 98 cents for kerosene.

Worker. Who, me? I ain't got it . . . (unintelligible)

Anderson. Come on, now, I'm not playing.

Worker. I ain't paying. You can whip me, you can knock me down, drag me. . . .

Anderson. I'm gonna kill you. I mean, if you don't pay your bill, you'd be better off dead.

Worker. Killing? Yeah, kill me. I . . .

Anderson. You know I won't. Come on, Woodrow.

Worker. I ain't never beat you out of a dime this season.

Anderson. Okay. I get your money tomorrow, but your foreman, he going to pay your bill tomorrow.

Worker. He'll fight. He'll fight. . . . (unintelligible)

Anderson. See, I don't 'preciate this at all. Now, you going to pay cash for what you get from now on, too.

Worker. Check. I got—you can say that again, pay you . . . (unintelligible)

Anderson. Come bringing $9 on a $20 bill.

Worker. Check.

Anderson. I really feel I was doing better than this.

Worker. 'Preciate.

Anderson. I don't 'preciate that, Woodrow.

Worker. Fight yourself.

Anderson. I mean, your work is all right, but you shouldn't drink up your earnings.

That's what you get, you see. Actually, all the farmers s'pose to bring their checks in here. Your farmer slipped up.

Worker. Heh, you know what it is? I . . .

Anderson. I'm not going to ask you about it no more, 'cause he's going to pay me tomorrow, hisself.

Worker. Yeah. Yessir.

Anderson. I—I was doing this—cause the only . . .

Man. Man . . . (unintelligible) ship.

Anderson. Well, see, there you have people that really don't have sense enough to even spend their own money. Now, any time you go by the wine store and spend your money before you come . . .

Worker. I wasn't in it. I . . .

Anderson. . . . before you come back to pay your bill . . .

Worker. . . . was . . .

Anderson. Shut up.

Worker. I'm going.

Anderson. Come on back here. Now, you shouldn't have went by the wine store first. You should have paid your food bill and your rent first, where you got to sleep and eat. And then went drinking it up. This is the reason why you don't have—and you're not supposed to get your own check.

This is—this is one of the reasons. But he—he gonna pay the rest of your bill. Now you—you—I don't know, you maybe go on and throw away the rest of your money; you don't care with it.

(Laughter)"

Anderson. Tell Allie to discontinue Woodrow's credit over there.

Narrator. The humiliation, the being without, is to the worker the natural air he breathes every day.

(Song follows.)

Narrator. Reverend Arthur Bryant, Migrant Chairman, Suffolk County Human Relations Commission.

Rev. Bryant. A—a crew chief is big daddy to all of his workers, and he inspires fear and he knows how to spank his people if they don't behave the way he wants them to.

Andrew Anderson is one of the more sophisticated crew leaders. He's convinced that what he's doing is probably for the good of his men. I talked to him recently about how he's able to recruit men for the kind of work that he brings them up to.

He told me that he can go down to Forest City, Arkansas, and recruit all the men that he wants. I said, "why?" "Well," he says, "you know in Arkansas the minimum wage rate is a dollar an hour." He says, "but a lot of the people down there are already exploited to the point where they receive 40 cents an hour for their work."

And he said that this is not publicly known. He says, "but I know it, and when I tell them about a dollar 35 or a dollar 50 an hour here, they feel that they're coming to Eldorado."

First year he tried to be a little bit more lenient and seemed to have gotten into a lot of financial difficulty as a result of that. Last couple of years he seems to have wised up to the system, and he claims to be making a good dollar, the kind of dollar that would probably multiply my income by four.

Interviewer. We're talking specifically, what are we talking——

Rev. Bryant. We're talking about $40,000 a year for his family.

Narrator. Worker Charlie White is interviewed by NET's Morton Silverstein.

Interviewer. Charges, what kind of monies did Andrew Anderson take out of a man's earnings? What were the specific charges?

Charlie White. Well, I tell you this, tell you what he drew. (Unclear) Well, out of your pay is $5, all right. Then you gotta eat. For eat you draw from 18, 19 dollars a week. All these your sodas, and your drinks like that, they run you around about—about 40-some dollars a week. They run right around about 40-some dollars a week. Then you don't have nothing then, 'cause he's got it all. You work hard and he got it all. I say, you can work hard every day, but he—he makes the money.

Like to us, we make it all right, but we don't get it.

Worker. If I could only get enough money, I would go home tonight. But I been here for going on five months, and haven't never got enough money to go home.

Interviewer. How do you expect to get home?

Worker. Really, I've asked myself that question a hundred times within one night. And really, I wouldn't know.

Narrator. As the season drew to a close, camp manager Andrew Anderson was asked:

Interviewer. Are you satisfied that you can look any man in the eye that has worked for you this season, and be at perfect ease with your own conscience?

Anderson. Oh, yeah. I can. I can say that, and I believe that I have been just, and I have treated every man, right down the line, like I would be—desire to be treated. And I don't believe that there's a man in my crew who would be able to say that he have been mistreated or cheated out of something that was due him.

I mean—I'm very concerned—in the worker. I'm—concerned in the fellow man, my fellow man. I pulls for him.

Narrator. Living conditions for migrant workers are the responsibility of the Chief of Housing and Camp Sanitation, Suffolk County Department of Health, Sidney Beckwith.

Sidney Beckwith. This particular camp is not one of our better ones. It does have an oppressive look to it, but it is livable in that when we issue the permit it meets the—the minimum code requirements. But I think as bad as it is, we've been told by visitors that have been touring the camps throughout the state that it is better than the average New York State farm labor camp.

There's been a history of inadequate maintenance, inadequate cleanliness, which is considered to be housekeeping; and I would certainly have to add that there's been, because of this, inadequate supervision.

I think these three items are the serious problems that we find in this camp.

From time to time the Department has recommended that this camp be torn down, and that they would start from scratch and build a modern camp. And as a matter of fact, in 1966 they applied for federal funds in the form of a federal grant. It didn't come through. And so they scrapped their plan.

Narrator. Mr. Beckwith was asked if he felt the farmers would be willing to spend their own money to rebuild the camp.

Beckwith. Well, I would—in my opinion, I don't believe they're interested in doing it in that way.

Narrator. Mr. Beckwith admits codes are minimal, enforcement methods ineffectual; that farmers delay in correcting violations; and that going to court is futile.

Beckwith. The camp is closed and it's a little more difficult to get convictions when you no longer have the violation.

Narrator. In late November the potato land was plowed out. The farmers moaned it was their worst season in years, that they got $1.50 per hundredweight as opposed to a $2.25 break-even price.

Suffolk County urged them to use seasonal labor. The farmers said there was none. The county said, "mechanize." The farmers said, "too expensive."

The board of directors at the Eastern Suffolk Co-op, composed of these farmers, was asked if it was satisfied that migrants were receiving decent living and working conditions.

Board Member. I think for—for what we get from the worker, I think wages are prevailing. And our conditions meet the requirements of the local Department of Health. Occasionally we run into a violation or two, but that's—that's quickly corrected. Our problem is to get satisfactory workers.

Board Member. There's never a word spoken about the farmer. Everything is for the help. I mean, why—why doesn't somebody come out and guarantee us a price for our produce.

Board Member. That is right.

Board Member. . . . year in and year out? But they don't.

Board Member. That's right.

Board Member. The strawberries are begging to be picked. So we get out there at 6:30, 7 in the morning. At 10 o'clock, 10:30, our laborer comes over to you, says, I got a backache, boss, I want you to take me back to the camp. He cares less about my crop, about what he makes.

What am I, a fool to grow this thing? What am I, being crucified for it? Forget it. I will not grow it.

Rev. **Bryant.** These men are—are a sort of a product of their own environment. You have to go back maybe about 30, 35 years, and you find that the exploited farm laborer of that time was a Polish immigrant, who was brought over by members of his own family.

Before that, these people who were exploiting their family members were exploited by good yankee farmers.

There's an old Greek motto that says there's no worse taskmaster than a former slave.

Board Member. I think Reverend Bryant is a very sick man.

Board Member. I'll go along with Frank on that idea. He doesn't—he does not know the farmers' problems. He just going around taking stuff out of the—out of the wind and expressing himself in the papers. I mean, his facts, he has—to me, he has no facts.

Rev. **Bryant.** I know, for instance, the first year we had VISTA Volunteers, I received a call that the plumbing was all clogged up. And for a hundred men there are approximately—I think it's six—johns available. The johns were clogged up for four days. Nobody did anything about it.

So I went into the Health Department offices in Riverhead and sat on a fellow's desk until they sent a man out to fix it. The complaint at the camp by the farmers was that the men had broken the system down by stuffing these johns with beer cans. What we found outside was that the toilet facilities were ruined because a pipe leading under the road was broken, and that the men had stuffed these cans and any-thing they could think into the—these things out of just pure frustration and anger.

Board Member. The conditions which—which exist are done by the residents. And I think it is very unfair for us as board members to be nursemaids to those people, as they wish to live in filth, not wash, and go to the bathroom in their own living quarters, well, there's no way I can stop it if I'm home in my own clean, lily-white sheets, which I change weekly.

Interviewer. If I may sum up, gentlemen, then I think what you're saying is it's not the migrant worker who is being exploited; it's the farmer. Is that correct?

Board Members. By all means.

Very much so.

By all means.

We're the fall guy.

Who cares about us any more?

Who cares?

That is right.

Who cares about us? We're the forgotten people.

Rev. **Bryant.** If we're going to say that the health of an industry is more important than the value of the human life, this sort of thing can catch on and eventually encompass all of us. We have to be concerned about him, because he is us.

Narrator. At the camp itself, one worker expresses hope. Another, outrage.

Worker. And I just got to go, because I don't want to be drug down like this. Gotta go. Because it hurts you inside, when you get insulted, because half of the time you're being insulted, see, for no reason at all, and you—if you—if you got to insult a person, you should have something to insult him for, and thenfor—therefore you're never supposed to insult anyone. But that's the whole idea.

Worker. But you know what I—what I really think? You know what I really think? I really think that one day the world will be great. I really believe the world gonna be great one day.

Narrator. The season which began in the vast darkness of night and soul is now ending the same way. Tomorrow the men will break camp.

On the last day, this legacy, these odors, these noises, these silences. Three men pack to go home. They have worked for almost six months on the fields of Eden, and are irrevocably mired in debt.

Others who leave with money leave with five or ten dollars. The bus trip back to Arkansas will now cost $15, which they will try to work off when Andrew Anderson takes them on to Florida, to the citrus crop.

Eight years ago, in a memorable CBS documentary, "Harvest of Shame," the late Edward R. Murrow urged wage, health, and housing reforms for migrant workers. Eight years later, the migrant condition is still the shame of the nation.

The migrant field worker's minimum wage of a dollar and 15 cents an hour, when he can find work, is far below the national standard. The availability of medical services to him is often lacking. His death rate by tuberculosis alone is more than double that of most other American workers.

His living conditions too often do not respect his sanctity as a man. For the most part he does not have effective union protection.

The shame of the migrant condition must be shared by all of us. For as Reverend Bryant has said, the migrant is us.

Today the season vanishes like the migratory bird. What harvest for the reaper?

Hard Lesson From Communism

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the surprise attacks on oriental New Year throughout South Vietnam when the Vietcong Commies surfaced a band of suicidal terrorists carries with it a hard lesson for us Americans and all of the free world.

If the Communists—through deceit and false information—are able to infiltrate deep into the heartland of a country at war, imagine what they can achieve in a sleeping country where the people are apathetic to the threat.

What the Reds have done in South Vietnam, they most certainly can accomplish right here in the United States.

They have been constantly on the move behind emotional peace moves and tear-jerking fronts, moving in hordes of Soviet Russian and Red Chinese agents, spies, sympathizers, and dupes—far too many planted and unidentified to the American people in strategic locations around the United States.

When and if these Communist fronts come to the surface, I fear we can expect far more damage and loss of life than the Vietcong delivered in Saigon and elsewhere last week.

Think what would have happened to the South Vietnamese had they have had an antigun law. Can this be why some push so hard for antigun laws in the United States?

The objective of the Communist international conspiracy—the Bolshevik apparatus—has been and remains the overthrow of the United States, including peace by death to those who resist and slavery to those who submit and appease. And the Red China/Soviet rift is, at most, a propaganda smokescreen to conceal from the unwary the announced final objective of both.

The bloody murder of civilians, missionaries, and our fighting men in South Vietnam should teach our people to turn a questioning ear to the promises and look instead to their actions—their threats, their overall objectives.

We must suffer under the lesson—bought at a bloody price—that our leaders and patriotic citizens must hunt down and expose all "American Vietcong" wherever they may be. Action must be taken to shore up the breaches in our national security caused by the unconscionable decisions handed down by a hostile Supreme Court and we must be militarily ready against every aggressive action by every Communist front.

Mr. Speaker, I place a recent editorial from the New York Daily News of similar purpose at this point:

SYMBOLISM IN SAIGON

Climaxing their lunar New Year (Tet) surprise attacks throughout South Vietnam, the Viet Cong Reds surfaced a flock of terrorists Tuesday in Saigon itself, capital city of South Vietnam.

These fanatics got into the U.S. Embassy compound, put up a bloody six-hour fight, and at last were wiped out by our paratroopers and other forces.

The performance was symbolic.

By that, we mean that a lot—a growing lot—of Soviet Russian and Red Chinese spies, sympathizers, dupes, et al., planted in strategic spots around the United States, hope to surface some day in this country and do far more damage than the Viet Cong did in Saigon Tuesday.

Their objective is to take over the American people and make slaves of those who submit and kill those who resist. This, in cooperation with attacking forces from Russia or Red China or both—more likely both, we would guess, despite the dear-sirs-you-curs compliments currently flying back and forth between Peking and Moscow.

Forewarned is forearmed—meaning this Saigon melodrama should inspire all patriotic Americans and their government to hunt down for prosecution domestic Reds wherever they may be, and to maintain armed preparedness against all Red nations.

As for British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's current claim that very little lies between war and U.S.-Red North Vietnam peace talks—well, Harold never was much of a prophet, and this Saigon eruption has made him look sillier as a prophet than ever.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in 1776, a 30-year-old Polish engineer and soldier arrived in America and began a 6-year tour of duty with the Continental Army that was to win him the praise of Thomas Jefferson and the sobriquet "the purest spirit of liberty" from the great President. Thaddeus Kosciuszko served two nations, the United States of America and Poland, but he had only one master, and that was freedom. In his 71 years, he never let flag his burning devotion for freedom or his commitment to the securing of liberty for Poland. It is fitting that his birthday, February 12, has become a national holiday for the Polish people who still wear the bonds of oppression and that the spirit of Kosciuszko has become a symbol of independence.

Among the many contributions of this great statesman were the suggestion that a military academy be founded at West Point in New York, a site he defended in the Revolutionary War. His will, left in the care of Thomas Jefferson, directed that his estate be used for the freeing of slaves. He was at once a military strategist and a humanitarian.

Kosciuszko returned to Poland in 1784 and led the reform movement that was sweeping his native land in those trying years. In 1794, he led the peasant troops against the superior Russian Army while wearing a homespun coat that told the Poles, the Russians, and the world that he was a general of the people and not just another seeker of power. A few years later, he refused a title from Napoleon because he could see that the French leader wanted to create an empire and not a free Poland. Kosciuszko died in Switzerland in 1817, never having realized his dream of a free Poland but firm in the knowledge that his service in America had contributed to the liberty that we all enjoy today.

It is an honor to salute a great soldier and a great statesman on this anniversary of his birth and to remember the debt owed to Thaddeus Kosciuszko by a grateful United States.

National Gypsum Co. Aids Cape Kennedy

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the great English statesman, Winston Churchill, once observed that one of the major reasons democracy had so long endured in England was that no matter how great the internal difficulties were, when Britain was faced with a threat from without, they forgot their differences and united to meet the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5, an excellent example of this ability to unite occurred and passed almost unnoticed.

On that day, the National Gypsum Co. sent a 118-foot collapsible aerial tower to Cape Kennedy. It appears that the only other tower of its kind had been in use at Cape Kennedy where it was employed to service missiles. Early in January, that tower broke down and faced the entire missile complex with serious delays if a replacement were not found.

Cape Kennedy was soon on the phone to the tower manufacturer who informed them that the only similar piece belonged to National Gypsum's Kimballton, Va., lime plant.

Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of it, I know that the gypsum industry is one of our Nation's most competitive. Any slight delay or any slight cost increase in any phase of production can cost a company thousands of dollars in orders. But in spite of this, National Gypsum felt that the public interest was better served by taking this aerial tower out of its mine and sending it to Cape Kennedy to forestall a slowdown in the space program.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action is excellent testimony to Mr. Churchill's remarks; and I highly commend National Gypsum for this generous and patriotic gesture. The fact that I am a former National Gypsum employee should in no way detract from the commendation the Buffalo company so richly deserves.

Scandinavia: Socialist Setbacks

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dallas, Tex., Times Herald of January 29, 1968:

SCANDINAVIA: SOCIALIST SETBACKS

(By Frank Langston)

The Socialists have suffered their third setback in Scandinavia.

This could mark a political trend.

And it could mean that more people now are looking at the price tag as well as the benefits from socialism.

The Scandinavian countries, of course, were the first in the West to adopt socialism and the principles of the welfare state. Now they appear to be having some second thoughts on the subject.

In Denmark last week voters defeated the Social Democratic party, which had been in power for the past 15 years.

Norway had ousted its socialist government in 1965 after 30 years of rule.

Socialist Democrat Premier Tage Erlander remains in power in Sweden. But his party suffered its worst setback in 30 years in municipal elections last year.

CLOSER LOOK

All this does not necessarily mean that the Scandinavian countries are going to throw out socialism entirely in the immediate future. But it does mean that they are taking a closer look at the things that go with socialism.

In itself, the welfare state was not an issue in any of the three Scandinavian elections.

And, as a matter of fact, the welfare state concept is not limited to socialist countries, as can be seen from the growing list of social benefits promoted by both the executive and the legislative branches of the U.S. government.

In this country, as elsewhere, the effort to expand cradle-to-the-grave protection to the people apparently can be expected to continue.

COST TOO HIGH

In Norway, Sweden and Denmark the voter rebellion was not against the welfare state itself but against the high cost of paying for it.

In Denmark, the voters were protesting steadily rising taxes and the cost of services. Prices have increased more than 40 per cent in the past seven years and unemployment is on the rise.

In Norway, labor leadership lost its influence amid growing white-collar middle class which voted for right and center parties. These parties promised no reduction in the welfare state but did promise a reduction in taxes, a broadening of opportunities, more housing and better education.

EASY TO PROMISE

This, of course, is painless socialism—welfare state without paying for it. It is easier to promise than to achieve.

Some 30 per cent of Sweden's total government expenditure goes into social welfare, including old age pensions and children's allowances. This now is approaching $2 billion a year.

The Swedish people until last year had shown themselves willing to accept heavy taxation as the cost of security. But in late 1966, as in Norway a year earlier, the voters rebelled against high prices, high taxes, inflation and a severe shortage of housing.

Foreign policies have been major issues in many countries in recent years. But in all three Scandinavian elections they were of only minor importance.

Both Denmark and Norway are members of NATO. Sweden, a neutral, is not.

CRASH OF BOMBER

In Denmark, moreover, political observers saw little indication that voters were greatly influenced by the crash of a U.S. nuclear bomber off Danish-owned Greenland.

This inevitably brings the discussion back to the real cause of the political turn. The Scandinavian countries, which have been Socialist for years, apparently want to continue under the welfare state concept.

But the question now is: Are they willing to pay the price.

The costs go right along with security.

The Scandinavians apparently want to eat their cake and have it, too. But, faced with the fact that they can't do both, they apparently are weighing the benefits of socialism against the cost.

The Work of the General Accounting Office

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make note of the recent annual report of the General Accounting Office which serves the Congress of the United States in investigative matters. The work of this important Office, which carried out 2,203 audits and reviews in the United States and overseas during the fiscal year 1967, is to be highly commended. The efficiency and responsibility of the members of the staff and the Director of the General Accounting Office, the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, is remarkable.

Nearly 1,000 reports were issued by GAO to the Congress, to our committees, officers, and Members and 600 to various Federal departments and agencies. Under the mandate of Congress to assist the House and the Senate, its committees and Members in carrying out their responsibilities, it has become evident in my own work and that relating to my city of Cleveland that GAO works with fairness and consistently high standards to assure that the information we receive is trustworthy and of current interest. We can account in this year alone to over $190 million in savings directly attributable to the work of the staff and director of GAO.

I wish again to commend highly Mr. Staats and his highly competent staff for all of their assistance in the past year to my office and to Congress generally.

Violence in American Society—A Problem of Critical Concern

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago, Abraham Lincoln spoke of "the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country" and warned that "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

These were the words of the young lawyer, later to become one of the most respected and honored Presidents of these United States, and are found in the prefacing written remarks of another great American, J. Edgar Hoover, writing on "Violence in American Society—A Problem of Critical Concern" for the George Washington Law Review.

J. Edgar Hoover, now in his 44th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one of the most knowledgeable authorities in the fields of law enforcement and subversive activities, builds upon these simple words with a forceful commentary on the fate that lies in store lest we develop men and women who have "a reverence for the Constitution and laws." With the profoundness and insight of one who has had long years of experience, Mr. Hoover develops the psychology of lawlessness and the menace of violence "inextricably interwoven in the fabric of America's 20th century life." The role of government is well stated in his own words:

> Government must be a means for men to control themselves, taking into account their personal weaknesses, passions, violence and conflicting aims, yet providing the machinery whereby their common interests can be promoted both as individuals and as a group.

Mr. Speaker, the concluding statements of Mr. Hoover represent both a challenge and an appeal:

> Our approach must be positive. Remedial steps must be taken to eliminate the causes of riots, to cut down on crime, to make less attractive the appeals of ideological groups. Ultimately, the answer must be the development of a sensitive citizen, obedient to the law, but also conscious of the needs of his fellow man.

He alludes again to the wisdom of Lincoln's words in baring the issue at stake, which is nothing less than "the perpetuation of our political institutions."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than ever before we share the grave responsibility to focus our attention and energies on the crisis of violence in our society and to take positive and responsible action. I urge you most earnestly to study the full text of Mr. Hoover's commentary which follows:

VIOLENCE IN AMERICAN SOCIETY—A PROBLEM OF CRITICAL CONCERN

(By J. Edgar Hoover*)

On January 27, 1838, Abraham Lincoln, then a young laweyr, made a highly significant speech before the Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield, Illinois on "the perpetution of our political institutions."[1] In this speech, America's future President spoke about certain things of "ill-omen amongst us." "I mean," he said, "the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions, in lieu of the sober judgment of Courts; and the worse than savage mobs, for the executive ministers of justice."[2]

Lincoln was appalled by accounts of violence from many areas of the country. "Accounts of outrages committed by mobs, form the everyday news of the times. They have pervaded the country, from New England to Louisiana . . ."[3] Such mob action, be told the audience, injured the country. "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."[4] "Thus, then, by the operation of this mobocratic spirit, which all must admit, is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any Government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed—I mean the *attachment* of the People."[5]

The antidote to this "mobocratic spirit," and basic to the nation's welfare, was "a strict observance of all the laws."

Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country; and never to tolerate their violation by others. . . . Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges;—let it be written in Primers, spelling books, and in Almanacs;—let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.[6]

Some of the violence and lawlessness of the 1830's, Lincoln recognized, stemmed from individuals who disliked and hence disobeyed "bad laws," for he points out:

When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws, nor that grievances may not arise, for the redress of which, no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say, that, although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed.[7]

In his closing remarks, Lincoln considered the potential impact of lawlessness on the survival of our political institutions and the need for individual responsibility to insure their perpetuation. The men of the Revolution, who fought and died to create this new nation scarcely five decades before, he said, were passing away through "the silent artillery of time."

They are gone. They were a forest of giant oaks; but the all-resistless hurricane has swept over them, and left only, here and there, a lonely trunk, despoiled of its verdure, shorn of its foliage; unshading and unshaded, to murmur in a few more gentle breezes, and to combat with its mutilated limbs, a few more ruder storms, then to sink, and be no more.

They were the pillars of the temple of liberty . . . now, that they have crumbled away, that temple must fall, unless we, their descendants, supply their places with other pillars, hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason.[8]

This means, among other things, Lincoln said, developing men and women who have "a reverence for the constitution and laws."[9]

Seldom has a great statesman of the past spoken so directly, candidly and poignantly to the America of today—a nation whose

---

Footnotes at end of article.

political institutions are currently under the assault of violence, lawlessness and the "mobocratic spirit." As Lincoln said 130 years ago, "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide." [10]

VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Recent happenings, such as the riots of last summer (and in previous years), the increasing crime rate, and the existence of organizations which espouse hatred and contempt, reflect that violence is a dangerous reality in our society today. Every indicator available to the FBI, from its investigative responsibilities in both the criminal and the security fields, emphasizes that violence is a rapidly growing malady in our national life.

There are some who claim that America at heart is a land of violence. They cite past wars, the Western frontier of the 19th century, the assassination of Presidents, the anarchist bombings of a generation ago. Violence, they assert, is part and parcel of the American character. Admittedly, American history is replete with tragic instances of violence. All too often violence has prevailed over reason in the settlement of problems. Mobs, riots, even a terrible Civil War brought death, injury and bitter rancour. No intelligent observer will deny the role violence has played in our national history or, for that matter, in the history of mankind. Yet, in America we have prided ourselves for developing what Theodore Roosevelt called "an experiment . . . of administering the affairs of a continent under the forms of a Democratic republic." [11] Our Constitution, laws and legal system are designed to provide an effective means by which men of varying interests, backgrounds and desires can live in peace and harmony. Over the years, America's constitutional system has been one of its most noble accomplishments. Wisely, the Founding Fathers understood the true inner nature of man; they realized that a system of government based on law subject to change by the consent of the governed was man's best protection against himself.

It may be a reflection on human nature that such devices (as checks and balances) should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflection on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. . . . In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. . . .[12]

Government must be a means for men to control themselves, taking into account their personal weaknesses, passions, violence and conflicting aims, yet providing the machinery whereby their common interests can be promoted both as individuals and as a group. Therefore, a public acceptance and respect for law has grown in America since 1789. This is reflected in thousands of ways, large and small: citizens obey traffic regulations, pay their taxes, respect their neighbor's property. There will be exceptions, but they are dealt with through our judicial system. The important point is that the overwhelming majority of Americans respect, obey, and uphold the law. If they did not, our government would disintegrate. People realize that only by this method can their personal security and the safety of the community be assured.

Violence can destroy the harmonious functioning of government. Any individual or group which resorts to violence can negate the validity of our system of government. Here is the death knell for peace and security for *all* members of the community.

The violence erupting in America today should cause each of us, particularly members of the legal profession, to ask many questions. Is America a nation of permanently increasing violence? Is violence such an integral part of its culture that it is destined in one way or another to alter future political institutions? What can be done about violence?

Violence is a growing menace in terms of human lives lost, property destroyed and personal anguish and injury incurred. More important, however, it inculcates a psychology of lawlessness—a concept that law and order are not ultimately to be trusted, that only by handling the matter outside the law can a favorable decision be obtained. This view promotes fear, hostility and hatred, often erupting into a blind, nihilistic, sadistic violence whose only purpose is to destroy for the sake of destruction.

This psychology of lawlessness is reflected in myriad ways in our society. For example, there are crimes of violence (murders, crazed gunmen spraying inhabited areas with bullets, physical assaults). Gang fights, underworld crime, and forcible rapes form part of the picture of violence—often abetted by lax procedures of judicial leniency such as parole and probation. Recent urban riots show violence on a massive scale. In the nation today there are many incendiary ingredients which made—or can make—for violence.

But violence in our society cannot be measured alone by overt eruptions such as crime and riots. There are a number of organizations, some ideological in nature, whose main tenets are ultimate appeals to force and violence. Some of these groups would like to see guerrilla-style warfare in the United States. They preach a doctrine of violence. In addition, there are various hate groups whose aims are promoted not by appeal to constitutional methods but to the base passions of man. In summary, in our society today there are many seeds of violence, often lying deep and ill detected. As in a witch's cauldron, these ingredients can foment a poisonous brew for the nation; they must be identified, and their potential as well as actual danger appreciated.

Crimes of violence

A major ingredient of violence in America today stems from the field of crime. According to the Uniform Crime Reports of the FBI,[13] crime in the United States increased 11 per cent in 1966 over the previous year. Crime is increasing roughly seven times more rapidly than population. During 1966, almost 3¼ million serious crimes were reported. This meant, therefore, that six serious crimes were committed in 1966 every minute, day and night, every day of the year.[14]

A large proportion of these crimes are of violence. Actually, the Uniform Crime Reporting program employs seven crime classifications to establish an index to measure the trend and distribution of crime in the United States. These crimes are: murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assaults, burglary, larceny $50 and over in value, and auto theft. They were selected for use in the Crime Index because they represent the most common law enforcement problem; all are serious crimes, either by their nature or in their volume.

Four of the seven major crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—can be categorized as crimes of violence. Of the total number of crimes in the Crime Index in 1966, 87 per cent are crimes against property, that is, burglary, larceny $50 and over in value, and auto theft. This means that violent crimes as a group represent 13 per cent of the total. Thirteen percent of 3¼ million serious crimes, however, represent a total of over 420,000 murders, forcible rapes, robberies and aggravated assaults in 1966— a serious epidemic of continuing violence in our society. Not only is the total volume alarming, but also the trend. During the period 1960 to 1966, crimes of violence rose 49 per cent.[15] This trend continues. For the first nine months of 1967, for example, as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year, the following increases were recorded: murder, 16 percent; robbery, 27 per cent; forcible rape, 7 per cent; aggravated assault, 9 per cent.[16]

For most citizens, crime is synonymous with violence. To have a house burglarized or merchandise stolen from an automobile is a serious violation, but it normally does not place life in jeopardy. The rapist, the mugger, or the street hoodlum, however, bring fear into the hearts of citizens, making them afraid to venture forth on the streets at night or even during the day. Individuals not only lose their lives from crimes of violence, but personal anguish is experienced by the victim, his family, friends and acquaintances. Never can we accurately determine the damage done to both society and individual human lives by the loss of an eye, the paralysis of the body or injuries suffered by multiple stabbings. Countless Americans, without question, have moved their residences, changed the patterns of their lives and taken other preventive steps to avoid becoming victims.

Violence, moreover, is an ingredient of life which often leaves indelible marks even though the intended victim escapes. What psychological effects are left on a child or young person who endures a harrowing experience with a hardened criminal? What tensions are generated in an individual, adult or juvenile, who narrowly escapes being a victim of violent crime? The fear of footsteps following you on a dark street is a nightmare remembered for many years. Nothing erodes the human personality more quickly than fear of physical assault, especially an assault which strikes from unexpected places without reason or purpose.

Careers in crime

The growing role of criminal violence is also reflected in the FBI's Careers in Crime study. In January, 1963, we initiated a study of criminal careers made possibly by the cooperative exchange of criminal fingerprint data among local, state and Federal law enforcement agencies. Fingerprint cards were used to obtain each offender's criminal history. Individuals were initially selected because they had become involved in the Federal process by arrest or release, were serious state violators arrested as fugitives under the Fugitive Felon Act, or were District of Columbia violators. Specifically excluded from this study and resulting tabulations were the fingerprints of chronic violators of the immigration laws and fingerprints submitted by the military. At the end of 1966, a total of 160,310 criminal histories of individual offenders had been incorporated into the program.

This study has reflected many pertinent trends in current criminal behavior. For example, this data documents the existence of the persistent or hard-core offender; the study disclosed that 55 per cent of offenders released to the street in 1963 were rearrested within two and one-half years. Obviously, rehabilitation methods have not been very successful with this type of criminal behavior. Of key interest, however, is that the study showed a tendency toward the commission of more violent crimes by repeaters. For those persons released in 1963 and then rearrested, a large proportion of their criminal repeating was in the property crimes of burglary, larceny and auto theft; however, 19 per cent of the rearrests for the property crime offenders were for the more serious crimes of violence. Primarily the result of this escalation, violent crime offenses on rearrest were more than double those in 1963. This trend in the Careers in Crime study is a harbinger of deep trouble; if it continues, violence in crime will be a growing problem.

Footnotes at end of article.

Violence directed against law enforcement officers

Law enforcement officers in particular feel the violence of the criminal. In 1966, a total of 57 officers were killed while performing their official duties. For the seven year period beginning with 1960, a total of 335 officers have met tragic deaths because of criminal action. Over a third of the 1966 deaths, 37 per cent, occurred while officers were effecting arrests and handling prisoners. Nearly a quarter of the deaths (23 per cent) occurred when the officers answered disturbance-type calls, such as family disputes or a man brandishing a weapon. Another 18 per cent were killings by persons whom the officers had stopped for questioning or investigation. Murders by robbers either caught in the act or fleeing the scene accounted for 16 per cent of the total.[17]

Criminal violence can strike the officer at any time. In 1966, 35 of the officers who lost their lives were on car patrol. During the seven year period 1960–1966, more officers were murdered on Friday than any other day of the week. As for the hours of greatest personal risk, they were 10 p.m. to 3 a.m.—with 130 murders occurring during this 300 minute period.

Of the 442 persons involved as offenders in the 335 police murders since 1960, 76 per cent had been arrested on some criminal charge before becoming involved in the police killing. Over one-half of those with prior criminal arrests had been previously taken into custody for an assault-type crime such as murder, rape, robbery, assault with a deadly weapon and assault with intent to kill. During the 1960–1966 period, a total of 11 police murderers had been charged with the offense of murder on some prior occasion. Revealingly, three of every 10 of the murderers were on parole or probation when they murdered a police officer.

Death is the only part of the story of violence directed against the police officer. A news item tells another facet:

"You cops won't make it out of here alive!" More than 35 persons mauled the four officers, shouting, "kill them . . . punch them . . . grab their guns!" It took 15 more policemen to break up the taproom brawl. . . .[18]

In recent years, as is well known, the number of physical assaults against officers has been on the increase. In 1966, there was a nationwide increase of 13 per cent in the rate of assaults on law enforcement officers. Nationally, statistics reflect 12.2 assaults per 100 officers in 1966, up from 10.8 in 1965. This increase was recorded in every geographical area of the nation. In 38 of every 100 assaults in 1966 physical harm resulted to the officer victim.

A recent study in the FBI's Law Enforcement Bulletin [19] on the rising number of physical assaults on officers comments:

Any individual who attacks a law enforcement officer has to be characterized as vicious, whether or not the attack results in the officer's death. Any attack on an officer is an absolute disregard of and disrespect for constituted authority and reflects positive action taken by the attacker against such authority.[20]

The streak of disrespect for law is also manifested by what might be called verbal violence. More and more officers are being subjected to bitter verbal abuse, scorn and ridicule by citizens. They are called vile names, accused (in most cases unjustly) of "brutality," and vilified in the press. Law enforcement does not consider itself above criticism nor does it attempt to operate beyond the domain of public opinion. But to abuse an officer verbally with catcalls, slanderous names and obscenity is to give vent to attitudes which can only undermine respect for law and order. Increasingly, citizens are refusing to aid officers or to provide vital information on their possession necessary to solve a criminal case. Citizen contempt, fear of personal involvement and lack of interest in police problems are unwitting allies of violence in our society.

Firearms in crime

Firearms play a preponderant role in criminal violence. For example, 60 per cent of the murders in 1966 resulted from firearms. Roughly one out of every five aggravated assaults that year (19 per cent) involved firearms. During the three year period, 1964–1966, assaults with firearms jumped an alarming 36 per cent. In the robbery category, *armed* perpetrators were responsible for committing 58 per cent of the 1966 offenses. The dreary story goes on *ad nauseam*.

In cases involving the murder of police officers, firearms continue to be the major instrument of death. In 1966, 55 of the 57 law enforcement officers killed while performing their duties died from wounds inflicted by firearms. Since 1960, firearms have been used as the murder weapons in 9 per cent of the police killings.

Actually, the time has come when the nation must understand that the ready availability of firearms, of all types, has greatly enlarged the area of violence in our society. In 1966 alone, more citizens were killed or assaulted with guns in American streets and homes than were killed in battle during the entire Korean conflict. We know too well the tragic story of snipers during urban riots, of crazed gunmen (with complete arsenals of weapons) shooting innocent people, of individuals angered in an argument running home for a gun. In a Northern area a city official described a arms cache seized by police:

"The seized weapons included 45 rifles, seven shotguns, 14 hand guns, 18 sticks of dynamite, two cans holding 50 rounds of black powder, one anti-tank gun, one submachine gun, a gun hidden in a cane, three hand grenades, 103 high power blasting caps, one plastic bomb, 12 hunting knives, one machete and 250,000 rounds of live ammunition for . . . guns.[21]

A newspaper commented about last summer's urban riots: "Almost every urban riot this summer has witnessed snipers perched in windows and on rooftops sending a fusillade upon police, firemen and others—with weapons that could be purchased in any sporting goods store merely by putting down the necessary cash." [22]

Better control of firearms is not only desirable, but necessary for the public's safety. In my opinion, mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled and local registration of weapons required and enforced. The chief responsibility is local, but Federal assistance must strongly complement state gun legislation.

Organized crime

In the area of organized crime, violence is the hallmark of daily life. The major syndicate of organized crime, known as La Cosa Nostra, is the modern outgrowth of the prohibition days, when gang wars, murders and torture were common occurrences in many sections of the country. It is a criminal fraternity which has committed virtually every known type of crime. Broken down into groups, geographically or by population areas, each group is referred to as a "family." Each "family" is headed by a "boss," whose authority is virtually unlimited. A ruthless discipline is enforced by violence and terror. The "boss" needs merely to indicate that a Cosa Nostra member, or another individual, is "unwanted" and his death is a *fait accompli*.

The ordinary citizen probably does not appreciate the extent and parasitic nature of La Cosa Nostra's influence on our national life. This group of criminals (employing today high-priced legal talent and endeavoring to operate under legitimate fronts) utilizes violence in enforcing control over corrupt labor unions, in collecting on gambling debts, in fighting competition in such fields as the jukebox industry, in coercing legitimate business to pay tribute, or in blackmailing through usurious loans. Millions of dollars illegally make their way into the pockets of La Cosa Nostra.

Some citizens may say: "A bunch of gangsters. Let them kill themselves off. It's no worry of mine." This viewpoint is categorically wrong. La Cosa Nostra, aside from the financial drain it extorts from the public, injects violence, in many forms, into our body politic. It is virtually a state within a state, with its own laws and discipline, bitterly contemptuous of our concepts of law and order. By the very nature of La Cosa Nostra operations, murders are perpetrated in ways which make the investigative tasks of law enforcement officials most difficult. For example, bodies of murdered individuals have been secretly buried in rural hideouts owned by gang members or weighted down in barrels dropped at sea.

Organized crime pollutes our society. Time after time, using violence or threats of violence (often threats are enough to achieve the syndicate's aims since the intended victim knows the threat will be carried out), La Cosa Nostra has attempted to impede, subvert or nullify the machinery of legitimate government, especially its judicial processes.

Any syndicate member believed to have furnished information to law enforcement officials places himself in physical jeopardy. If a labor leader, businessman, newspaper reporter or other citizen becomes a possible witness in court against the syndicate, he may find himself the object of physical harassment or hoodlum assault. The syndicate will not hesitate to intimidate jurors, use bribery or other types of pressure if they will achieve the desired purposes. Violence begets violence; violence pollutes the society in which it exists. La Cosa Nostra is living proof of this present—and growing—danger.

Riots

Riots, or other types of civil disturbances, suddenly bring violence to the eruption point. People are killed or injured, property destroyed, law and order subverted. Law enforcement responsibility relative to riots is basically local in nature. The FBI's responsibility is to develop and disseminate intelligence information while remaining alert to any violations of Federal law within its investigative jurisdiction. The FBI does not have jurisdiction for either protecting property or persons, or for policing riotous situations.

Riots can be of many types. In recent years, we have seen a variety of riots involving young people, especially at beach resorts. These student riots bring about vandalism, physical violence and mass hysteria.[23] Such actions are justified by some people as "pranks" or "good time fun." Nothing, however, could be more wrong. When mobs, student or otherwise, wantonly destroy property, disobey police regulations and injure people, firm steps must be taken. So-called thrill violence is an earmark of individual and communal disorder.

On occasions violence stems from labor disputes, sports events, demonstrations, picket lines or wherever passions run high on controversial topics. Often a minor incident—an arrest by an officer, a demagogic speech, a fight between two individuals—will ignite a conflagration. Over the years we have had instances of sabotage of many types. Sabotage, especially if committed by trained, fanatical individuals or groups, can be deleterious.

The recent urban riots, as in Newark and Detroit, illustrate the intensity which violence can attain—and the damage which can be wreaked in a few short hours in an urban, highly populated neighborhood. Virtual guerrilla warfare quickly erupts with snipers playing a primary role. Law enforcement officers, unfortunately, find themselves the

---

Footnotes at end of article.

special target of violence. Law and order break down completely.

What do these civil disturbances show? Relative to violence, they tell us that the passions of men flare quickly. No community in our society can feel immune from a sudden, irrational breakdown of law and order. Violence is never completely predictable. Moreover, it often betrays the "beast" in man. "Good people," those who are good citizens, may suddenly be caught up by the passions of the moment, and become involved in violence or counterviolence. Undoubtedly, many students who participate in beach riots, after returning to their schools, feel chagrined over their disgraceful personal behavior. Some adults in urban or other types of riots may feel the same way, but this does not condone their actions. Moreover, riotous situations attract the criminal element. Violence erupts—and almost immediately looting, burglaries and robberies occur. A high percentage of individuals arrested in the recent urban riots had prior criminal records.

Ideological violence

The twentieth century has popularized the term "ideological." In America today we have a number of groups, ideological in type, which are based on principles advocating force and violence. They strive in every possible way to disrupt law and order, to inculate hatred and bigotry and to subvert the institutions of free society. These organizations are of foreign origin and inspiration, small in number, but highly organized; their ultimate loyalties are to foreign nations and anti-democratic philosophies.

Ideological violence has left deep stains of blood and hatred in the world since World World War I. The ideologies associated with Hitler, Mussolini and lesser despots linger, while those associated with Lenin and Stalin have continuing vitality. Ideological violence is particularly cruel, bestial and fanatical (as the concentration camps of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia testify), since reason is dethroned, myth supplants the truth, and law becomes what the ruling clique says it is. The individual exists only for the benefit of the state. Often, as in Nazism, an individual's blood, race or nationality is the determinative factor for personal survival.

History of Ideological Groups in America.—Although America has been spared the ravages of influential ideological parties, the end of World War I saw the planting of ideologies from abroad in our country. In 1919, the Communist Party, USA,[24] which, loyal to the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin, regarded force as the ultimate determiner of the future, was formed. In the absence of strength sufficient to generate such force, its tactics called for encouraging discontent and hatred, and utilizing unrest, caused, for example, by civil disturbances, to hasten the accomplishment of its own purposes.

Soon Communist splinter groups appeared, reflecting the ideological divergences developing in the international movement. The Socialist Workers Party[25] based its ideology on the communist revolutionary teachings of Leon Trotsky, and attempted to subvert United States domestic and foreign policies either through its own activities or through the agitation and propaganda work of its Young Socialist Alliance. These groups were followed by pro-Axis groups associated with Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists.

Since 1945, such ideologically oriented groups have continued to pose security problems for the nation through direct activity, through fear generated by their potential for violence, and through the possibility of their infiltration of riots or demonstrations. Moreover, the Communist Party has attempted to enlist the support of students and younger working people through youth fronts such as the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America.[26] Recently, the Progressive Labor Party, the agressive spokesman for the Mao Tse-tung government, has attempted to arouse a revolutionary consciousness in the United States and has participated in a number of demonstrations, picket lines and marches.[27]

Impact of Ideological Groups.—In this country ideological violence has not meant overt displays of force. We have had no attempted coup d'etats, putsches or storm troopers (though the pre-World War II American Nazis attempted military formations). Ideological groups which operate from definitive revolutionary blueprints realize they are a numerical minority; hence, they hesitate, for tactical reasons, to be implicated in any acts of violence, especially if they might trigger investigations by law enforcement authorities and generate hostile public opinion. This tactic of restraint does not arise from any basic disbelief in violence by the group. The Communist Party's ideology, for example, is anchored on the premise of violence ("Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one," said Karl Marx).[28] Its leaders, however, being realistic interpreters of our society, know that acts of violence would do their cause more injury than good.

Therefore, ideological violence in this country has largely been implicit, rather than explicit; a matter of future threat, rather than immediate preoccupation. The nation's security problem arises from what organizations such as the Communist Party could do, from both present and future strength, to injure this country by acting on their avowed principles of violence. The FBI's responsibility, pursuant to acts of Congress and Presidential directives, is both to gather and disseminate intelligence information and to be alert to any violations of Federal law.

The whole problem of potential ideological violence becomes more serious since the most potent organization, the Communist Party, has mastered the technique of camouflaging its advocacy of force and violence, providing a cover behind which it can develop new strength, both in membership and influence, which may enable it to attain sufficient potency to seize state power. In communism this technique is called "Aesopian language," that is, the use of roundabout or elusive words to conceal the Party's real intentions of violence—words which the "initiated" fully understand in their Maxist-Leninist meanings while the general public is fooled. Hence, the Party is able to operate "fronts," form alliances with noncommunist groups, and encourage citizens to drop their fear of communism. Under the cover of "Aesopian language," the Party is able to draw money, talent and influence for its cause from noncommunist elements of society. The paradoxical situation arises that noncommunists, who actually have no sympathy with communism, are manipulated to support its objectives, enabling the Party to accumulate power for future strikes against our society. We must make no mistake that the Communist Party, despite its "Aesopian language," depends ultimately on the use of force and violence to attain a qualitative change in our society. If ever the conditions of society, through internal chaos or disintegration, permitted the Communist Party freedom of action, it would move to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

Terrorist violence

A rising problem is posed by groups emphasizing terrorist or hoodlum violence. In addition to ideological groups, there are a number of organizations which are basically terrorist and hoodlum by nature. Some, such as the Revolutionary Action Movement and the American Nazi Party, may claim to espouse a type of ideology, but they are not truly ideological since they neither owe allegiance to a preconceived blueprint of principles nor are they integral parts of an international movement. They are chiefly interestd in creating disruption, chaos and trouble.

These groups are chiefly of a hate or "anti" variety—anti-Negro, anti-white, anti-Semitic or anti-minority group; their common denominator is a distrust for law and order and a belief in force and violence. They are purveyors of hate, bigotry and prejudice, eager to stir up discontent, fear and unrest. Some of the groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan,[29] were organized many years ago. Others, such as the American Nazi Party,[30] the Revolutionary Action Movement,[31] and the Minutemen,[32] are recent in origin. Terrorist violence, as in the case of the Klan, is a matter of record. Murder, arson, or bombings have been perpetrated in many areas by the Klan. This violence has a primary purpose of spreading fear; while they stress a policy of nonviolence, it is in reality hypocritical semantics. Through violence, the Klan has usurped and defiled the law. Overt violence, however, does not tell the full story of terror of these groups. A sinister danger lies in the potential for violence inherent in their fanatical appeals to bigotry, irrationality and fear. At hooded Klan meetings, racial violence is preached in frenzied tones. Similarly, the American Nazi Party can deliver a violent anti-Negro, anti-Semitic harangue and suggest the necessary tools for action in a Nazi "kit" which includes such odious items as "selected rocks carefully balanced and weighted for breaking out school windows" and "switchblade knife lightning fast, extra-long blade for stabbing students." The latent violence in these meetings has a potential for realization since these groups attract a variety of misfits, failures and dropouts from society—men who already bear personal hatreds and grudges and are desperately looking for scapegoats. In addition, there are other groups which espouse hatred and look with favor on the use of violence. For example, Nation of Islam (NOI)[33] espouses hatred of the white race, government, law and law enforcement. NOI counsels Negroes not to serve in the armed services and has developed a belligerent black nationalist policy. They present a danger which we as a nation must not overlook.

The whole problem of violence in American society has been accentuated by the recent emphasis on "black power," as interpreted by such individuals as Stokely Carmichael, former chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). To Carmichael and others of his thinking, "black power" means terror and violence directed against the white community. Many of his statements are highly inflammatory;[34] and at a rally in Washington, D.C., he exhorted his listeners to "burn down this city" if they did not get the vote. The danger is not only the threat of immediate violence, when individuals take these words at face value; there is also the danger of seeds being planted which may cause individuals to take violent actions at a later date.

Inflammatory statements about "black power" inevitably bring forth calls for "white power." "White power," meaning reliance on force and violence, also is repugnant. Both concepts, black and white power, mean denial of law and order and reliance on the barbarian tactics of brute force. Far too many young people, in particular, of both races are thinking in terms of power outside the law to solve the problems of society. The proliferation of this type of thinking can only mean trouble ahead.

Civil disobedience

A problem related to the rise of violence is civil disobedience, a pernicious doctrine which is becoming more widespread with tragic consequences for the observance of law and order. Proponents of this theory assert that civil disobedience is justifiable if the acts are open, not violent, respectful of the

---

Footnotes at end of article.

rights of others, and have the purpose of focusing attention on significant moral issues of the day.

To individuals caught up in righteous indignation about problems in current society, the appeal of civil disobedience may seem great. To "gently" break the law, so to speak, for the purposes of your group or cause seems such a "minor" infraction. But suppose every group or individual who honestly believed he had a valid or righteous cause did the same? Chaos would result. Law and order would break down. Society would disintegrate.

What today is peaceful civil disobedience may tomorrow mushroom into open violence. What starts out as a planned, controlled incident of disobedience may infect large numbers and turn into mass violations of the law. What today is a legitimate cause with a moral foundation, justifying civil disobedience to some, may fall into unscrupulous and hoodlum hands with tragic results. In such cases, decisions in society would be made on streets, behind barricades and through gunfire, not by ballot, rational discussion or courts of law.

The new left

A contributory factor in the assessment of potential violence in our society is the rise of a student movement called the New Left, with its basic attitudes of bitter hostility, hatred and opposition to democratic values and the principles of free government. The New Left actually is difficult to define. Chiefly student oriented, it is not so much an organization as a point of view, an attitude, a way of viewing society. Its mood is not one of support for America and its values; rather it is one of hostility, defiance and opposition to our government. The New Left's chief passion is to destroy—our government, our democratic values, our American way of life. In a nauseating air of self-righteousness, it criticizes, belittles, mocks. Contemporary society (contemptuously called the "Establishment") is treated with disdain. New Leftist heroes are Castro, Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh. It counsels evasion of the draft, attempts to disrupt the legitimate operations of Universities, and catcalls at government officials on campus. Some New Leftists are "beatniks," with sandals, long hair, and old clothes. Other are hippies living in a drug-induced world to evade the problems of life. Still others are sincere idealists who are badly misguided.

Our nation needs young people who ask questions, who probe into the questions of life. But strict negativism, cynicism, and pessimism are self-defeating. The New Left, though disliking our society, offers nothing constructive in return. Its aim is to destroy, not to build. A key word of New Leftism is resistance. In recent months, the movement has been moving from protest to resistance. Vague talk is heard about "revolution," creating "a revolutionary movement and socialist political party able to take power in America."

Inevitably, this mood of anarchism and nihilism moves toward violence. In their distorted view of society, feeling personally frustrated and alienated, some of these young people are talking about violence. "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," said one top New Leftist.[35] "We are actively organizing sedition."[36] "I think violence is necessary, and it frightens me,"[37] are other comments.

What if this mood spreads? What if more young people (who will be our leaders tomorrow) become motivated by this anarchism, negativism, and nihilism? Will disrespect for law be enhanced? What about the potentialities for violence in the years ahead?

CONCLUSION

Violence and the potential for violence are current realities in our national life. Violence springs from many sources and displays many faces. No simple explanation or formulation of its origins, motivations or ultimate consequences can be given. The whole problem of violence is inextricably interwoven in the fabric of America's twentieth century life.

That is why the best minds of our nation—the doctor, the psychiatrist, the sociologist, the political scientist, the historian, the attorney, the law enforcement officer—must lend their talents to this problem. If the present trend toward increasing violence continues, the institutions of our society will be gravely imperiled.

As we have seen, violence comes from many sources. Its actuality has been extensive (crime, riots, terrorist groups); its potential for future acts great. It is a feature of contemporary society which needs attention now. Yet our approach must be intelligent and rational, based on sound principles of study and action. Too often emoton, fear, and misunderstanding intrude into the analysis of such national problems. Fear breeds fear; violence begets counterviolence. So-called "power" of one type militates "power" of other types. The end result could actually be an increase instead of a decrease in the potentialities of violence. Therefore our approach must be positive. Remedial steps must be taken to eliminate the causes of riots, to cut down on crime, to make less attractive the appeals of ideological groups. Ultimately, the answer must be the development of a sensitive citizen, obedient to the law, but also conscious of the needs of his fellow man. Now, as in 1838 when Abraham Lincoln spoke at Springfield, Illinois, the issue at stake is nothing less than "the perpetuation of our political institutions."

FOOTNOTES

[*] Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

[1] Lincoln, *The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions*, in I The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln 108 (Basler ed. 1953).

[2] *Id.* at 109.

[3] *Id.*

[4] *Id.* at 113.

[5] *Id.* at 111.

[6] *Id.* at 112.

[7] *Id.*

[8] *Id.* at 115.

[9] *Id.*

[10] *Id.* at 109.

[11] The Inaugural Addresses of the American Presidents 186 (Lott ed. 1961).

[12] The Federalist No. 50, at 285 (Colonial Press rev. ed. 1901) (Hamilton). Other compilations attributes this essay to Madison *E.g.*, The Federalist No. 51, at 356 (Belknap Press, Wright ed. 1961) (Madison) (same essay but given different number).

[13] The Uniform Crime Reporting Program is a nationwide, voluntary effort by law enforcement agencies directed toward the collection, analysis, interpretation and publication of crime figures for the United States. The FBI, as the national clearinghouse, compiles these statistics and publishes them in an annual bulletin. This publication, Uniform Crime Reports, provides data on crime trends and rates by state, geographic division and population group. In addition, supplemental data is furnished on a current basis with statistical releases showing crime trends quarterly. These trends are based on a Crime Index which provides the only nationwide measure of the volume and type of criminal activity.

[14] In January, 1967, the FBI National Crime Information Center (NCIC) was instituted at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The NCIC is designed as the hub of a computerized information network which will serve as a rapid means of processing, storing, retrieving and instantly transmitting vital police data throughout the country in a matter of seconds. NCIC-programmed services include files on stolen vehicles, vehicles used in the commission of felonies, stolen engines and transmissions, stolen or missing license plates when all plates issued for a specific vehicle are missing, stolen guns, other items of stolen property which are serially identifiable, and wanted persons. As the Center expands, other applications will be added. At present the NCIC links law enforcement agencies coast to coast and it is hoped that eventually all law enforcement, local, state and national, will be coordinated by this center. The NCIC represents the entrance of law enforcement into the computer age.

[15] These figures, taken from 1966 Uniform Crime Reports 3–4, represent urban, rural and suburban areas.

[16] Uniform Crime Report Statistics, FBI Press Release, Dec. 11, 1967.

[17] 1966 Uniform Crime Reports.

[18] FBI, *Police Officers Killed in the Line of Duty*, April Law Enforcement Bulletin 25 (1966). The Bulletin is a monthly professional journal published especially for persons associated with or interested in law enforcement and is not available to the general public.

[19] *Id.* at 26.

[20] *Id.*

[21] Wash. Post, Aug. 24, 1967, § A, at A3, cols. 1 & 2.

[22] N.Y. Times, Aug. 27, 1967, § 4 (Magazine), at 4E.

[23] A ranking law enforcement officer describes a Labor Day weekend riot at Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: "Troopers were faced with bricks, bottles, beer cans filled with sand, rocks, and pieces of plate glass hurled at them from shoulder height." Then the student rioters started to throw Molotov cocktails which caused several small fires. "Firemen trying to extinguish the blazes were under constant attack by the mob," and one fireman was stabbed in the leg.

Student misbehavior at a 1967 Fort Lauderdale, Florida, beach riot is set forth as follows: "A soft drink truck, which had been caught in the traffic tie up, and a bakery truck were looted by the rampaging students. Some students started to hurl soft drink bottles at the officers who were attempting to quell the disturbance. . . . Two blocks north of the main trouble area, students tried to tip over a large bus but were dispersed by a squad of officers."

[24] Current officers include Henry Winston, National Chairman, and Gus Hall, General Secretary.

[25] Minor splinter groups from the Socialist Workers Party include the Workers World Party, the American Committee for the Fourth International and the Revolutionary Committee of the Fourth International.

[26] This organization was founded at a convention in San Francisco, California in June, 1964.

[27] In one demonstration, a PLP leader told a crowd: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally. We're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of the judges, and we'll have to go against the army."

[28] Marx, Das Kapital 776 (Int'l Publishers ed. 1939).

[29] The origin of the Ku Klux Klan was in the Civil War South. In the 1920's the Klan reached a peak membership of some four million members, but has experienced long periods of relative inactivity. It is currently experiencing a resurgence, dating from the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

At the present time, there are 14 active Klan-type organizations in the United States. Membership is estimated as approximately 14,000, exclusive of thousands of sympathizers. The largest Klan group, the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, has headquarters in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Led by Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton, this group accounts for over two-thirds of the total Klan membership.

[30] The Virginia-based group, comprising fewer than 100 members and having only a

fabricated connection to the Hitler regime, is violently anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. The assassination of George Lincoln Rockwell in August, 1967, leaves the current status of the Party in doubt.

[31] Currently composed of about 50 members, RAM was organized in 1963 by Negroes who favor the concept of organized violence. RAM would like to bring about a communist-oriented society along Red Chinese lines. The key figure is Robert Franklin Williams, who fled the United States in 1961 to Cuba, and then to Red China, to avoid a Federal warrant issued for his arrest on a charge of kidnapping a white couple during a racial disturbance in North Carolina.

Their basic tenet, as expressed in their "Manifesto," is:

> When massive violence comes, the USA will become a bedlam of confusion and chaos. . . . Stores will be destroyed and looted. Property will be damaged and expensive buildings will be reduced to ashes. Essential pipe lines will be severed and blown up and all manner of sabotage will occur. Violence and terror will spread like a firestorm. RAM Manifesto.

[32] The Minutemen is an extremist guerrilla warfare group, headed by Robert Bolivar DePugh, with headquarters in Norborne, Missouri. Formed in 1960, this group of vigilante superpatriots believes that a communist take-over will occur in the United States and that guerrilla warfare must be waged against the communist conquerors. The Patriotic Party is the political arm of the Minutemen. It is designed to spread the group's propaganda and obtain financial assistance. Total membership is estimated at fewer than 200.

DePugh and four cohorts were indicted and arrested in August, 1966, in Kansas City, Missouri, on charges of conspiracy to violate the National Firearms Act. DePugh and two others were found guilty and given prison sentences. All remain free on bond pending an appeal.

[33] NOI is an all Negro group, with a highly disciplined membership of over 5,000.

[34] "When you talk of black power, you talk of bringing this country to its knees. When you talk of black power, you talk of building a movement that will smash everything western civilization has created." Cleveland Press, Aug. 6, 1966, at 4, col. 1.

[35] N.Y. Times, May 7, 1967, at 1, col. 3.

[36] *Id.*

[37] *Id.* at 74, col. 1.

Distinguished Flying Cross Awarded to Native of Baltimore

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. **LONG** of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Army WO Robert S. Miskimon, a native of Baltimore, has received the Distinguished Flying Cross Medal for heroism during a recent tour as a helicopter pilot in South Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery by including the following article in the RECORD:

AWARD DFC TO CITY MAN

U.S. Army Warrant Officer Robert S. Miskimon, a native of Baltimore, has received the Distinguished Flying Cross medal for heroism during a recent tour as a helicopter pilot in South Vietnam.

Miskimon, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carroll T. Miskimon of 4804 Hamilton Ave., also holds two Purple Heart medals, 31 Air Medals and the U.S. Army Commendation Medal for valor.

A 1964 graduate of Mount St. Joseph's High School, Miskimon is now stationed at Fort Wolters, Tex., serving as an instructor in the U.S. Army's Primary Helicopter Center.

While supporting ground operations of the U.S. Army's 25th Division in Vietnam, he brought a damaged helicopter to its base and then returned to the battle area a second time to assist in medical evacuations.

Introduction of a Joint Resolution To Direct the Federal Communications Commission To Study the Ways in Which Commercial Broadcasters Can Be Required To Provide Financial Support to Nonprofit Public Educational Broadcasters

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a sense of the Congress resolution which would put the Congress on record supporting the view that commercial television and radio broadcasters should contribute substantially to the long range financing of educational television and radio. This resolution would further call on the Federal Communication Commission to study the means by which commercial broadcasters can be required to provide financial assistance to nonprofit educational broadcasting companies and to report back to Congress its recommendations for adminstrative actions and legislative enactment no later than January 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of financing is basic to the long-range independence and scope of educational broadcasting. The success of our democratic institution depends ultimately upon the informed judgment of our citizens. This is one of the important issues of our times. I believe the Congress should go on record now favoring financial support by commercial broadcasters for this public effort.

Last year, the Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act creating a nonprofit corporation and authorizing $9 million in program funds for fiscal 1968. The act contained no provision though, for the long-range financing of educational stations beyond 1968. I believe a well-financed and well-directed educational television and radio system should be brought into being in order to fully serve the needs of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, during the floor debate on the Public Broadcasting Act, I introduced an amendment dealing with this issue. Although it drew much favorable comment from my colleagues in the House, it was narrowly defeated.

I am, therefore, introducing a resolution aimed solely at putting the Congress on record on this important issue and calling for the FCC to undertake a study. It is my hope that the Members of Congress will consider this resolution in light of the single issue on which it focuses. Basically, this resolution is a declaration of policy. It makes it clearly understood that commercial broadcasters have an obligation to contribute toward the cost of educational television and radio. It does not call upon the Congress to determine, at this time, what or how this contribution should be made, but rather is aimed at providing for a thorough study on which Congress can judge that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the President recently stressed the importance of a long-range financing plan, "which would insure that public broadcasting would be vigorous, independent and free from political interference or control." However, he did not focus on the issue of commercial broadcasters providing part of this financial assistance. My resolution is aimed at insuring that this private obligation is studied and that a report is made.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress declared when it created the Educational Broadcasting Corporation "that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television." I offer this resolution as a further congressional initiative toward that end.

Problems of the Narcotics Addict and the Alcoholic

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Speaker, the President has ably pointed out the importance of new methods of meeting the problems of the narcotics addict and the alcoholic. I earnestly urge the adoption of his proposed amendments to the Community Mental Health Center Act. They are important moves against two of this country's pervading and crippling problems: narcotic addiction and alcoholism.

These amendments will greatly strengthen the hands of those who must design the community programs to treat, control, and prevent narcotic addiction and alcoholism. Each represents the most practical and sensible means of helping our States and localities provide services as a part of or an affiliation with the highly successful community mental health centers program.

One of the proposed amendments deals with the need for special services in our communities for those who suffer from alcoholism. Because some courts have upheld the medical view that alcoholism is a disease and not a crime, we must seriously consider the need for adding to our community mental health legislation, support for the construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of specialized facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. The best method to administer the prevention and treatment of alcoholism is under the community mental health centers program.

The other amendment, to transfer the authorities granted under section 402 of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to the community mental health centers program is clearly logical. We would avoid duplication and fragmentation of services by placing this Federal support solidly in the community mental health program we have repeatedly voted to strengthen on behalf of all citizens.

I ask the prompt and favorable consideration of the bill by the committee and this body.

The "Pueblo" Incident

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the lack of confidence in the statements of the administration, and unfortunately even the President himself, has reached alarming proportions as White House and Defense Department spokesmen trip over each other while discussing the *Pueblo* incident. A Chicago Tribune editorial in this morning's edition and a Copley News Service editorial, which appeared in Copley newspapers in Illinois and California, on February 6, articulately observe grassroots American sentiment as they interpret the confusing administration statements.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 8, 1968]

THE ADMINISTRATION "COOLS IT"

It is now two weeks and two days since a boarding party from North Korea communist patrol boats seized the navy intelligence ship Pueblo. At the time, Secretary of State Rusk said that the action could be termed "an act of war" and advised the North Koreans to "cool it."

We haven't seen any evidence that the Communists have responded to this advice, but certainly the Johnson administration has been following Mr. Rusk's counsel. It has confined itself to talking at the United Nations and to secretly negotiating with North Korea at meetings of the military armistice commission at Panmunjom.

Meanwhile the administration has shifted its story so many times that nobody knows what to believe. Its original account was that the Pueblo was in international waters, 25 miles off the North Korean coast, when it was seized, and that the vessel had radioed that it had used no weapons before it was hauled into the communist port of Wonsan.

The Communists disputed this version of nonresistance at the first meeting at Panmunjom after the hijacking. They said the Pueblo had fired on their patrol boats and that one American crewman was killed and four others injured in retaliatory fire or during the boarding.

The Washington columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott have now openly asserted that the Johnson administration has not been leveling with the people and that it fostered an impression of cowardice on the part of the Pueblo's officers and men when the truth was that the ship was taken only after they had made a heroic resistance.

Allen and Scott say that the message sent from the ship to the national security agency's communications center near Washington related that North Korean boarding parties were twice repulsed during a battle of an hour and 45 minutes, that three members of the crew were wounded by enemy gunfire, and that the ship was boarded only on a third attempt, after its two .50-caliber machine guns were put out of action. A fourth crew member was reported seriously injured when he attempted to blow up the ship's most secret equipment. The columnists say:

"These and other still-secret details of the battle waged by the Pueblo crew are being suppressed on direct orders of the President to keep public opinion from being further inflamed. An administration insider says the President is deeply concerned that, if the full story of the crew's valiant resistance were to be made known now, it could trigger nationwide demands that military rather than diplomatic methods be used to try to obtain the return of the ship and its personnel."

Sen. Dirksen has added, "There was some monitoring done and there are some tapes. I think 'most everything was known."

To the grave charge that the President is playing politics with the incident there has not been one word of rejoinder from the White House.

Further evidence of administration dissembling is to be found in Secretary Rusk's television appearance Sunday, when he began backtracking from the original unqualified assertion that the Pueblo was in international waters. His revision was that the United States could not be "1,000 per cent certain" of the position of the ship until the crew was released and could be interrogated.

This is being taken by Congress as preparation before submitting to North Korean demands that the United States admit the Pueblo intruded into its territorial waters and that an apology be made in return for release of the crew.

This is the administration's technique of "cooling it" by resort to cover-up, fabrication, and outright lying.

EDITORIAL IN COPLEY NEWSPAPERS IN ILLINOIS AND CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 6, 1968

Credibility of the United States of America suffered an incalculable setback with the admission of the administration that the U.S.S. *Pueblo* could have violated the territorial waters of North Korea.

Who can believe us now?

On the day after the U.S. *Pueblo* was seized Jan. 23, Secretary of State Dean Rusk called the piracy—correctly—one which was tantamount to an "act of war."

Now he says it is possibly not.

At the United Nations, Jan. 26, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg correctly labeled the North Korean action a "warlike act" and went to great lengths to prove the U.S. vessel was 15.3 nautical miles from the nearest North Korean land.

Now what can he tell the United Nations?

And the President of the United States declared to the Nation Jan. 26: "This week North Koreans committed yet another wanton and aggressive act by seizing an American ship and its crew in international waters. Clearly this cannot be accepted."

What can he tell the American people now—that it has been accepted?

Can the United States now be believed when it tells the more than 40 nations with which we have treaties that we will defend them firmly against aggressors?

Can one now blame the South Koreans, who have given us staunch support in South Vietnam, if they bitterly complain about being "sold out?" They are not even given the courtesy of being present during negotiations with their implacable enemy, the Communist aggressors.

What can we tell the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*? That we believe they disobeyed orders and went into North Korean waters?

We do not think the men of the *Pueblo* would want their release at the expense of national honor and integrity for which they willingly worked as members of the Armed Forces. Would these courageous men of the United States Navy want to live a lie?

And now that we are retreating before the propaganda of North Korea, how can we prevent future incidents of the Pueblo type from any puny upstart? Must we retreat from the high seas as a maritime nation?

The *Pueblo* capture was stated, of course, as a diversionary tactic to draw attention from the new Communist aggression in Vietnam, can South Vietnam now believe, in view of the diplomatic retreat about the *Pueblo*, that we will not sell them out to obtain the release of more than 800 airmen held by North Vietnam? And if we lie about the *Pueblo*, what rationale can we use to tell North Vietnam we are all they claim if this will obtain the release of our men?

The answer of course is national security, integrity and honor. This is why we are fighting in Vietnam. This is why the gallant *Pueblo* took risks off Korea and this is why we maintain a defense posture.

That posture should not be used to perpetrate a lie even for ultimately good motives such as the release of prisoners.

Once we resort to the lie as a national policy we are no different from the enemy we are fighting. We will have lost our national integrity.

Mrs. Carlos Romulo

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were deeply saddened recently to learn of the passing of one of America's warmest friends, Mrs. Carlos P. Romulo.

Mrs. Romulo exemplified the noblest traditions of womanhood as a wife, a mother, and a talented, well-educated, warmhearted, gracious lady. We remember Mrs. Romulo most pleasantly during her years in Washington when her husband served as Philippine Ambassador to the United States. When living in New York while General Romulo served as President of the United Nations General Assembly, Mrs. Romulo continued a tradition of service begun many years before in the Philippines. She will be greatly missed by all who knew her, and her circle of friends extends the world over.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in deepest sympathy to General Romulo and their three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo, and Roberto.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the following article about Mrs. Romulo which appeared in the Washington Post:

MRS. ROMULO DIES IN MANILA—WIFE OF EX-AMBASSADOR HERE

Virginia Llamas Romulo, 62, wife of the long-time Philippine Ambassador to the United States and former president of the United Nation's General Assembly, died of leukemia yesterday in Manila.

A petite island beauty queen, she and her husband, now President of the University of the Philippines, were one of Washington's most popular diplomatic couples during the more than eight years they lived here.

The daughter of a prominent Philippine family, Mrs. Romulo attended convent schools and at 16 won the islands' carnival beauty queen contest. The king chosen to rule beside her was Carlos P. Romulo, a young editor who had recently returned from Columbia University. They were married a short time later.

During World War II, while her husband

was serving as aide-de-camp to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Mrs. Romulo and her four children hid in the hills and jungles of Luzon.

With a price put on her head by the Japanese, Mrs. Romulo and her children kept changing identities, which Mrs. Romulo said was dangerous and confusing for her children, the youngest of whom, Bobby, was only 3. Bobby thought up his own answer when Japanese troops asked him "Who is your father?" Mrs. Romulo said. "He would just say 'Daddy,' " she recalled.

After the war the Romulos were reunited and came to the United States. Brig. Gen. Romulo was then resident commissioner of the Philippines. He became U.N. General Assembly president in 1949, and served at the U.N. until 1954 when he was named Ambassador to the United States.

The Romulos owned a house on Garfield Street nw. for many years, renting it while they lived at the Embassy from 1954 to 1962. Mrs. Romulo created a Philippine room in the house, tiled like a Manila patio and filled with rattan furniture, Philippine carvings and her own paintings.

The Romulos returned to Manila in 1962, when the Ambassador became president of the Philippine University. They returned briefly to Washington in 1964 for a visit.

Besides her husband, Mrs. Romulo is survived by three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo and Roberto. A fourth son, Carlos Jr., was killed several years ago in a plane crash.

Serbian Independence

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 we will join Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader, Karageorge, offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

We must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

It is especially important, Mr. Speaker, that we note the consistent cooperation of the Tito government with the Soviet intrusion into the Mediterranean and the growing menace to world peace that stems from this Soviet imperialistic policy.

Our Space Program

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of questions which I asked of the Honorable James Webb, Administrator of NASA, on February 7, 1968, together with Mr. Webb's replies:

QUESTIONS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO ADMINISTRATOR JAMES WEBB, OF NASA, FOR AUTHORIZATION HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Question I: What is the relative status and progress of our national space program compared to the Soviet space program? Are we ahead or behind? In what areas?

Answer: The Soviet space program has consistently utilized larger boosters than were currently available to the U.S. In the coming year, still larger Soviet boosters will be coming into use. During 1968, or shortly thereafter, they will have available a booster with over ten million pounds of thrust.

The success of the Soviet Venus 4 and the ejection of a sensor capsule into the Venusian atmosphere during its encounter with the planet prove that the Soviets have made great progress in spacecraft command, control, communications, and guidance.

The Venus 4 mission was only one of an impressive list of Soviet firsts, which includes the first satellite in earth orbit, the first lunar orbit, the first pictures of the far side of the moon, the first soft landing on the moon, the first man in space and the first multimanned space vehicle.

Planned Soviet manned space activity has been delayed following the failure of the Soyus-1 mission last spring. However, automatic rendezvous and docking was accomplished by the Cosmos 186 and 188 vehicles. This rendezvous and docking capability now opens the way for the Soviets to proceed with their announced program of large earth orbiting space stations and further exploration of the moon and planets. We believe they have the capability to do a flyby of the moon with some form of life, which some believe could be man. That the Soviets will soon resume manned space operations is indicated by the public announcement of the addition of nine ships to the expeditionary fleet of the Soviet Academy of Sciences for the purpose of research work associated "with observations of space objects in the areas of the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea."

The Soviets continue to launch, within their Cosmo series, important scientific satellites and others which are recovered within one to eight days. Sixty-one (61) Cosmos satellites were launched in 1967 of which 35 were recovered. Three of the Cosmos vehicles were meteorological satellies. Three Molniya communication satellites, the 5th, 6th and 7th in this program, were launched in 1967.

The Soviet research and development effort in aeronautics continues to increase with indications that its supersonic transport will be flying early next year. Last October, the International Aeronautical Federation was requested to certify a world altitude record of 98,461 feet carrying a 4,400 pound payload. A more recent Soviet news release claims a world speed record of 1817 mph over a 500 km. closed circuit. Both were accomplished with the Soviet E-266 aircraft.

In summary, there were 66 launches in the Soviet space program during 1967. This compares with 42 launches in 1966 and 64 launches in 1965, the previous Soviet peak year.

There are no signs that the Soviets are cutting back their space program as we are. New test and launch facilities are steadily added to expand their resource base and a number of space-flight systems more advanced than any heretofore used are nearing completion. They will soon be in a position to utilize a booster with greater thrust than the Saturn V. They continue to move toward a resumption of manned space flights. There is little doubt that they will endeavor to land instrument packages on Mars in 1969 and again in 1971.

In terms of scientific advances and in applications of space systems to economic use, such as meteorological and communications systems, our program has achieved a more advanced state than theirs. But in terms of capability to use large launch vehicles and in the rate of advance toward future greater capabilities, they are and will remain ahead at the 1969 budget level which we are presenting. The hard fact we now face is that just as we have begun to catch up in large-scale booster operations—as shown by the flights of Apollo 4 and 5—we are sharply reducing our program while they continue to advance.

Question II. Last year, I asked NASA what would be the effect of a reduction of several hundreds of millions of dollars in the Fiscal Year 1968 budget request. The reply was to the effect that the program would experience serious and critical setbacks. Such a cut was eventually made before the appropriation was passed into law. How has it been possible for the space program to maintain its pace in the light of these reductions?

Answer: It has not been possible to maintain the pace of the U.S. space program.

The President's Fiscal Year 1968 budget request included funds to continue to advance in space and to augment our aeronautics effort. It also requested funds to begin a limited number of programs significant for the next decade, including NERVA II; Voyager to be used for scientific missions to Mars in 1973 and 1975 utilizing orbiting vehicles and automated landing laboratories; a Mariner flight to Mars in 1971; and Sunblazer, a small interplanetary probe to increase our knowledge of the Sun. In addition, the President's 1968 request would have maintained production of our largest boosters, the uprated Saturn I and the Saturn V, at four of each per year, with spacecraft to use these boosters for Apollo application missions, beginning as early as this year—1968.

Except for the Mariner-Mars 1971 mission, authorization for each of these programs was approved by Congress, but at reduced levels. The FY 1968 authorization totaled $4.866 billion—$234 million below the budget request. The appropriation at $4.59 billion was $511 million below the budget request and $277 million below the authorization.

Thus, for FY 1968 we are operating under appropriations in which—

Research and Development funds, other than for Apollo are 20 percent below the budget request;

Funds for Construction of Facilities are less than one-half of the budget request; and

Funds for Administrative Operations were reduced to $628 million. This has necessitated a reduction in Civil Service personnel by about 5% and total administrative costs by about 7%.

In the Apollo program, no more than nine Saturn V flights can take place by the end of 1969. These nine flights mark a reduction from the 13 which we proposed at the beginning of last year and the 11 which we still hoped for last spring.

In the Apollo Applications Program, there has been a complete revision of the mission content. Hardware delivery schedules have been stretched out and planned production rates reduced to two Saturn V's and two Saturn IB's per year beginning in Calendar Year 1970. Apollo Applications flight IA has now been dropped, as has the second Apollo Applications cluster of a Saturn I Workshop and Apollo Telescope Mount. Since no funding was provided for Manned Space Flight Advanced Mission Studies, and FY 1967 funds are limited, a considerable reduction has been made in the amount of study effort needed to insure soundly-based decisions as to future manned missions. All these steps represent a sharp decrease in the planned rate of acquisition of manned space flight experience and consequently a sharp decrease in our national capability for space operations

In the Physics and Astronomy program, it has been necessary to cancel the Pilgrim Project and to delay Sunblazer.

The Lunar and Planetary Program was redirected with increased emphasis on technology development to retain a base of competent personnel in a period when no flight mission were to be undertaken. The Voyager program was eliminated. Launch Vehicle Procurement funding was adjusted downward. The GOES D and E missions were dropped, and the ATS F and G and Nimbus E and F schedules were delayed. The broad effect of these reductions is to slow down the return of scientific information about the solar system and to delay the application of advances in space science and technology.

In our Advanced Research and Technology programs, the level of effort in Electronic Systems, Space Vehicle Systems, Basic Research, Space Power and Electrical Propulsion Systems, and Chemical Propulsion has been reduced. The NERVA I nuclear engine has been substituted for the NERVA II engine. In our ability to meet future aeronautics and space needs, the effects of these cutbacks will be felt for years to come.

Reductions in funding for Tracking and Data Acquisition has reduced support of a number of satellites still in orbit and still transmitting useful scientific and technical data. In the Sustaining University Program, facility grants to universities have been all but eliminated and a sharp reduction has been made in the number of new graduate students supported. Reduction in the Technology Utilization program has meant a lessening of our efforts to identify, evaluate and disseminate new technology resulting from NASA programs.

The 50% reduction in Construction of Facilities appropriations required deletion or deferral of most construction projects, most notably the test facilities for the proposed NERVA II Nuclear Rocket and the Sunblazer antenna.

Finally, Civil Service personnel are being reduced by over 1700. We have reduced paid overtime by 35%, travel by 15%, and other costs by 17%.

We can conduct a viable and useful program at these lower levels, as we will indicate in presenting the President's FY 1969 budget, but it will be a sharply reduced one.

Question III: The President's Budget Message (see page 874, Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1969) states, in part,

"In calendar year 1969, five manned flights of the Saturn V are planned. Plans call for all of these flights to be conducted with complete lunar landing systems. The mission plans for the first four will be primarily aimed at development and operational testing. It is planned that the lunar landing *will* be made using a Saturn V in calendar year 1969."

In view of the reductions made in Fiscal Year 1968 and the reduced budget level of the Fiscal Year 1969 request, is this estimated date for the lunar landing as firm as is implied?

Answer: In the last seven fiscal years, the President's budget requests for NASA have been reduced by over $1.5 billion. The kind of readjustments required by NASA and its contractors have caused grave problems and delays. Notwithstanding this, and such set backs as the Apollo 204 fire last year, we have developed a system that has continued to move forward with the work required, to meet the nation's needs in space. The first all-up Saturn V, flight tested all of its stages, the Service Module propulsion system and qualified the Apollo heat shield at lunar return speed. The recent Apollo 5 tested the Lunar Module and its descent and ascent engines. We are continuing to move rapidly. The President's Fiscal Year 1969 budget request, if approved by Congress, will permit NASA to proceed on a testing, checkout and launch schedule which, barring a major setback, should enable us to fly the ninth Saturn V by the end of calendar year 1969. However, where we have had in previous years some flexibility to work around major problems, we now have almost none. Even in the light of these factors, we believe that we still have the possibility of making the lunar landing before 1970.

Equitable Development of a National Resource

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to insure that resources developed by the public are not used for the exclusive benefit of a few private utility companies. This bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Aiken of Vermont.

Nuclear powerplants have quickly changed from an interesting idea to an established fact. Fifteen nuclear powerplants are presently in operation in the United States. Many more nuclear plants with much greater capacity are planned. It is estimated that by 1980 some 150,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity will have been built. This will represent over one-third of the Nation's total generating capacity.

Public expenditures contributed substantially to the present technological and economic feasibility of nuclear generating plants. It now appears, however, that private utilities are seeking a monopolistic control over these plants. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 does not contain adequate guidelines for the issuance of licenses for the operation of nuclear plants. It does not insure that the public and cooperative systems will share in the benefits derived from nuclear power. The record is replete with examples of private utilities refusing to cooperate with municipalities and cooperative systems. This record suggests what will happen in the future if adequate safeguards are not established now.

The bill I am introducing today will attempt to insure that a reasonable opportunity exists for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power. The bill amends chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide that no person shall be issued a license to construct and operate a nuclear powerplant unless he has granted to other persons engaged in the distribution, transmission, or production of electric energy an opportunity to participate in the ownership of the facility. Also the bill would require the applicant for the license to make available the electric energy on fair and nondiscriminatory terms to all persons. These provisions will loosen the private utilities' monopolistic grip on nuclear power.

Unfortunately many promising scientific and technological developments pose a threat to our natural resources. Most atomic powerplants are planned to be located near fresh water. The operation of these plants, without water-cooling equipment, will substantially increase the temperature of fresh water. Conservationists, sportsmen, and all interested in the preservation of our natural resources should be concerned about this form of water pollution. To guard against the possible loss of fresh water, the bill would require the Atomic Energy Commission to consult with the Water Resources Council before issuing a license.

The bill will also try to insure that there is an adequate supply of electric energy for all parts of the Nation. The natural requirements for electricity are increasing rapidly. To meet this need, there must be an orderly and varied development of the electrical capabilities and potential of this country.

The most effective and economic use of nuclear generation of electricity can be achieved only with the production by other means of peaking power. The integrated power systems of tomorrow will utilize hydroelectric power for handling the peak loads, leaving the constant base loads to be carried by thermal generation.

This bill is not an attempt to hamper any one industry, but to seek the equitable development of a national resource.

Consumer Protection in Service

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the service industry to the American consumer cannot be exaggerated. Most of our durable goods depend on some kind of service to maintain their value and usefulness. Whether we need resetting of a stone in a treasured ring, or adjustment on our car's brakes or repairs for a television set, we are all dependent on the services implicit in manufactured goods and concerned about their availability, economy, and reliability.

Merchandising Week, in its first publication of this year, devoted a special section to the increasing demand for consumer protection, including the need for better servicing.

This important article follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN SERVICE

The consumer, dropping down from the exhilarating high of buying in unprecedented quantity, has finally discovered that sooner or later (unhappily, too often sooner), everything that moves also breaks down.

Her attraction to convenience-oriented products has led her to the point where she needs a serviceman, a copy of her guarantee, and, ultimately, a drink.

According to Betty Furness, inadequate, overpriced, and often unavailable service facilities have become the consumer's primary complaint. They could become the consumer protectionist's next primary concern. Already, two bills have been proposed before the Senate regarding full disclosure of warranty and guarantee provisions (MW, 18 Dec. 67, p. 1). Both bills are aimed at saving the consumer from shouldering the service burden herself. And, as some Congress-watchers indicate, this is only a beginning.

Consumers would be kept aware of all provisions and conditions of a guarantee under a bill introduced by Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. Disclosure would include the name and address of the guarantor, details of exactly what is covered, the length of the guarantee, who can file a claim under it and the conditions he must fulfill, what portion of the cost must be paid by the person making the claim, when and how the guarantor will fulfill his obligations, and what parts and types of damages are not covered. The Magnuson bill also calls for the establishment of an advisory council on guarantee and servicing problems.

A second disclosure bill, under the aegis of Sen. Carl Hayden (D-Ariz.), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would require manufacturers to meet certain product standards established by the Secretary of Commerce, to provide consumers with deception-free warranties, and to provide for enforcement of these warranties.

To help the repairman, the Hayden bill would also require the manufacturer to pay its service representatives for all services rendered in conjunction with its warranties.

A controversial section of this bill is a clause requiring manufacturers involved in interstate commerce to set up service facilities or representative according to rules set up by the Secretary of Commerce. Also, no manufacturer would be allowed to enter any franchise agreement unless the agreement includes a provision that the franchise holder serve as service representative of the manufacturer.

The two major villains in the service picture are quality control and lack of manpower. If manufacturers worked harder to improve product standards, the inevitable breakdown might at least be postponed. And if there were enough people willing and qualified by training to fill the available service jobs, the consumer might be able to get her appliance repaired more easily when the breakdown does occur.

The lack of service personnel—whether in the small independent repair shop or the larger manufacturer service organization—has grown acute. Insiders like Frank Moch, executive director of the National Alliance of Television and Electronic Service Assns., put the blame on the temptations—in terms of money and employee benefits—placed in the way of the prospective serviceman by other branches of industry. Some repairmen themselves define the problem as a question of image: they say prospective recruits are reluctant to try to buck the low-prestige stereotype of the dishonest repairman.

Attempts at solutions to the manpower problem have been made by manufacturers, who often operate training programs to keep repairmen up-to-date on the changing technology of the modern appliance. High school and adult education courses are also offered to help bring new blood into the repair industry, and apprenticeship programs are increasingly being found important to the success of any proposed repairman-licensing bill.

New blood, however, does not necessarily mean good blood. To uphold standards of quality and honesty in the home electronics repair industry, several state and local governing bodies have been turning to licensing—for home electronics repairmen at least—as a solution to some of the consumer's service complaints.

The licensing question has gained prominence in recent months, as several new proposals have been made to protect the consumer by enforcing a specialized kind of "quality control" over repairmen. Spurred on by so-called "controlled malfunction" checks, in which purposely bugged sets are taken to repair shops and left to be fixed, often to the tune of exorbitant charges and unneeded parts replacements, legislative groups are realizing that licensing measures would help protect the honest repairman from his brother, the crook, along with protecting Mrs. Consumer.

Existing licensing measures in California and Louisiana have been proved effective in reducing repair-job frauds. Now other states—notably New York, where two licensing measures have recently been introduced to the state legislature by New York City Mayor John Lindsay and state Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz—are beginning to discern the value of similar measures.

Most licensing programs call for a specified amount of practical experience and/or specialized technical training before a repairman can be licensed. For the consumer, such measures protect her to a greater or lesser extent—depending on the location, the provisions of the licensing bill, and her own gullibility—from the fly-by-night operator who decides that this week he'll call himself a tv repairman, or the dishonest technician who figures what she doesn't know won't hurt his bill-padding.

Service reliability can be somewhat ensured by licensing. Service availability can be helped, perhaps, by using the resources of the federally organized manpower development program to supply people to fill the empty slots in the repair industry.

Such a solution has been proposed by both Miss Furness and Secretary of Commerce Alexander Trowbridge; both feel the manpower program should be tapped to fill the need for more qualified appliance repairmen. And better quality control on the part of the manufacturer can help minimize the consumer's servicing needs to begin with.

With licensing, improved quality control, increased manpower, and the warranty-disclosure bills, the consumer need no longer feel that a washing-machine breakdown is automatically a catastrophe.

Broadcasting Network Control

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, broadcasting networks, particularly the three largest such organizations, should be placed under effective regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. Joined by Congressmen Moss and OTTINGER, I am today introducing legislation to accomplish this purpose.

The Federal Government now permits a most valuable natural resource—the public airwaves—to be controlled by a few, possibly only three, powerful men in New York City. Three men, as a natural outgrowth of our economic system, necessarily have a primary interest in maximizing profits. This primary interest may, and I believe often does, conflict with the obligation to adequately serve the public interest.

These few men in New York City make the determination as to what most of the people of this country see most of the time on their television sets.

When you consider that there are more television sets in the United States than telephones and that the television set in the average home is turned on for almost 6 hours each day, you can appreciate the influence of the medium.

By the time a child has graduated from high school, he has spent more time in front of a television set than in a classroom.

More than 60 percent of all the fare presented on commercial television is determined by the networks. Virtually all the fare seen in the choice, so-called prime-time hours—when the vast bulk of viewers have the opportunity to watch television—is controlled by networks.

Yet, these networks, using a valuable public resource, are not regulated by guardians of the public interest. Stations are regulated; networks are not.

Those in control of the television networks today are in a position similar to that of petroleum tycoons of a half-century and more ago. The tycoons first gained control of the means of moving petroleum from the great oilfields. They then obtained control of refining facilities. They took over distribution facilities. They formed huge trusts which gave scant attention indeed to the public interest. It took the Federal Government more than 50 years to break up these trusts and bring a measure of protection to the consumer.

Similarly, today the broadcasting networks own electronic pipelines into the homes of 56 million American families. They, too, seek growth. They, too, are taking over increasing control of the actual production of the fare that is being seen. They, too, are ready to move instantly into whatever new form of distribution may open up. For example, the Columbia Broadcasting System only recently set aside $20 million for the acquisition of community antenna television systems.

Using the enormous profits gained from their control of public airwaves, the networks are branching out into a variety of other business endeavors. CBS purchased the New York Yankees because according to some financial sources, the network had so much cash on hand that it had to find some use for the money. NBC recently paid $15 million for only part of golfer Arnold Palmer's business enterprises. ABC owns an ice show.

Networks own publishing companies and toy companies and companies manufacturing musical recordings and companies manufacturing musical instruments.

According to the last financial information supplied by the Federal Communications Commission, the three networks in 1966 made pretax profits of $78.8 million on revenues of $906.9 million, a percentage ratio of 8.7 percent.

But there is another side to this financial coin. Each network is permitted to own five VHF television stations. Now, those 15 network-owned stations in 1966 had profits of $108.1 million on $262.4 million in revenues. That is a profit ratio of 41.2 percent.

It is not at all unusual for a well-run television station to return substantially more than 100 percent each year on its initial investment.

Television can be a fantastically lucrative business. The managers of 593 stations which are not owned by the networks made $206.1 million in pretax profits during 1966, or almost 30 percent of their revenues.

Moreover, the networks are increasingly gaining control of the actual production facilities.

The networks are squeezing out the independent producers by setting up their own large film studios, mostly in Hollywood.

The fact of the matter is that you cannot get a series on television today unless you cut a network in for a share of the production action and a sizable portion of the resulting profits. In some business endeavors, this is called a kickback; I am not sure what the networks call it.

The power of networks is so great that even large business firms are helpless to fight the system. Procter & Gamble, the broadcast industry's largest advertiser, once tried to get a series on the air, after having paid to produce a sample of the show. It could not. It had to take another series, one produced with network involvement in the production expenses and, later, the profits.

General Foods once tried to get a series on the air, made with General Foods advertising money at no expense to the networks. No one would take it. General Foods was forced to take a series in which the network had a financial stake.

The Xerox corporation has produced some superb documentaries through independent companies. No network would touch them. Xerox was forced to place its documentaries on separate, individual stations, creating its own minor-league network for the occasion.

The networks are clearly monopolies. They control the performing talent. They control production facilities. They control the distribution. They control the schedules.

There is nothing wrong with making money but the problem arises when the power of an entity becomes so great that it can act to the detriment of the public. Important priorities get out of balance here.

One of the most astute observers of the television scene, Fred Friendly, wrote in his book, "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control," that the order of priorities in network television goes like this:

First. The ratings.

Second. The effect of these ratings on advertisers.

Third. The effect of these ratings on the company's expected earnings, and their effect on the stock market.

Then, far down the list, No. 4. The company's corporate image as reflected in the press, by the leadership of the community and at the FCC—in that order.

And finally, at the very bottom, No. 5. Responsibility for true public service and personal taste in entertainment and cultural programs.

Friendly's point about the network emphasis on profits has been dramatized recently. The networks currently are suffering a decline in profits. The stock shareholder equity in CBS increased by 485 percent from 1951 to 1964. Its chairman, William Paley, made $40 million on his personal stock in CBS in a few months not too many years back. At the time, he owned 1 million shares and the price went from $40 a share to $80 a share on the New York Stock Exchange.

But then came a temporary drop in profits at CBS and what did the network do?

The first thing it did was to close down a news bureau in Washington, D.C., which had been set up to serve the five television stations CBS owns elsewhere in the country. This news bureau sent special coverage back to stations in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

Next, CBS ordered those stations to tighten the financial belt on local news productions in the five cities.

Then, it expanded its sales department at New York network headquarters.

Those five stations are licensed by the FCC, although the network is not. Yet, when the network felt financial presure, it immediately expanded its unregulated sales department and cut back on the one function that best serves the public interest in cities served by regulated network-owned stations—news and public affairs.

The profit levels of CBS justified continuation of its public service endeavors at the same level.

Local stations fail to fight the system whereby the networks dominate program decisions. With only a few token exceptions, the fact is that the networks determine what most viewers in this country see.

Whatever happened to the American dream of diversity, of open marketplaces, of choices?

With network domination, the entertainment programs on American television have fallen to low estate and low esteem—an outpouring of pat formulas and poor imitations. The formula is to copy past successes and to reach always for the highest ratings. The process squeezes many shows off the air which should be made available to the public. There is just so much really prime time to be filled. If the networks are going to fill that time with an outpouring of slick comedies, westerns and action shows, then there simply is not any time left for more diverse and enriching fare.

A stranger to America, seeing the product of network television, might assume the Nation has only one network, not three. They are all the same, using the same formulas and motivated by the same goal—an ever-increasing accumulation of higher profits. Such a visitor might well conclude we are a nation of idiots from that programing.

In the area of children's programs, the network record is a disgrace. Basically, network children's programs are an outpouring of loud, raucous cartoons which may amuse the child but which add absolutely nothing to his eager mind or its thirst for knowledge about the world in which he is growing. The cartoons sell breakfast cereals and toys in season. To the networks, it appears the sales are more important than what goes into a child's mind.

In the area of public affairs, we are subjected to an outpouring of documentaries which one network producer has called, off the record, "safe controversy."

The world painted by television is unreal, with little relationship to conditions as they really exist.

But this is what happens from undue accumulations of power. Concentration of important decisions in the hands of as few as three men can lead to a most unpleasant situation unless strictly controlled.

Meanwhile, at the Federal Communications Commission, that congressionally appointed guardian of the public interest, we have established an agency which is undermanned and overworked and which we have financed with the not very bountiful amount of less than $20 million a year to oversee a complex industry involving billions of dollars and thousands of radio-TV station operators.

The staff of the FCC has gone on record as advocating that the agency be given the power to regulate the huge television networks as well as individual stations. The recommendations came after massive research. An Office of Network Study was established for the purpose.

For the last 2 years, that office has been idle. Now it is going to be abolished. The FCC, except for an occasional blistering dissent from a lonely Commissioner, has gone on record as saying it does not feel its function is to restructure the broadcast industry.

Yet, the industry is being restructured by the networks themselves, to the detriment of the public.

Having gained control of the electronic pipeline, the networks gained control of the program schedule. Having gained control of program schedules, the networks are gaining control of production facilities. They are closing off competition. What next? Movies, for one thing. The networks now are going into the business of producing feature films. Community antenna systems for another. This means that the networks may assume control of 20 channels—soon to be expanded to 40 channels—into the Nation's homes.

The FCC has certain "duopoly" rules that prohibit ownership of more than one television station in a market. If networks are permitted to own and operate community antenna television systems, the duopoly rule could become meaningless.

Will it happen? There is excellent reason to think it might.

Our fundamental legislation, the Communications Act of 1934, was designed for an age of canal boats, not space communications. It is outdated, outmoded and insufficient to handle the current technology and economic explosions in broadcasting.

We do know that the networks are

ready to take advantage of whatever profitmaking situation may exist while the guardian of the public interest, the FCC, is concerning itself with relatively trivial matters based on patchwork rules and regulations which are becoming increasingly meaningless.

Aircraft Noise Abatement

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, for years, those of us who live near major airports and who represent airport neighbors have been seeking legislation to curb the problem of aircraft noise. We have felt like voices crying in the wilderness. I assume that we have failed to capture the imagination and assistance of our colleagues because they do not have the problem and cannot believe that the noise problem is as great as we have pictured it. I can assure each of you that we do not exaggerate. I can also assure you that, as the jet fleet enlarges and the planes increase in size and power, more and more of you will find yourselves faced with this problem.

The responsibility for aircraft noise abatement has been passed from one agency to another, including local agencies—it has been a classic example of passing the buck.

President Johnson has called for action in this area, and our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held some hearings on H.R. 3400 and related bills, including my bill H.R. 7266. I urge my colleagues on this committee to expedite this legislation.

The National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council has been one forum where all segments of the air transportation industry have been members, a meeting-place, so to speak, where all viewpoints might be considered. Now, it appears that this is breaking down. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in today's edition of the New York Times which reports on the withdrawal from the council of the Airport Operators Council International and further substantiates our demands and claims:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1968]

AIRPORTS FORSAKE ANTINOISE GROUP: ASSAIL MANUFACTURERS AND LINES—ASK U.S. ACTION

(By Evert Clark)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The nation's airport operators have withdrawn from an industry-wide anti-noise council, denouncing airlines and aircraft manufacturers for laying "a smokescreen" over the problem of jet noise.

The action brought to light other evidence of dissatisfaction with the anti-noise council and is likely to stir interest in Congress, where the airport operators have helped lead the the attack on aircraft noise.

The antinoise group, called the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, was formed nine years ago. It has been the principal industry antinoise group and the industry's chief liaison with the Federal Government on noise problems.

Its members include airlines, manufacturers, pilots and, until now, the airport operators. But it became known today that the Air Line Pilots Association ended its financial support of the antinoise group about a month ago and now offers only technical advice.

One pilot source said that many pilots considered the antinoise council "a hoax on the public" because it attempted to gloss over noise problems.

The withdrawal of the Airport Operators Council International was voted by that group directors in San Diego yesterday and was explained today in statements issued here at the group's headquarters. The group, which claims to represent airports handling 86 per cent of the airline business in the nation, said that further membership would be "futile."

CALLED A FEDERAL MATTER

"We of the airport segment of the aviation industry are tired of being the scapegoat for the airlines and manufacturers," James R. Mettler, president of the airport group, said in a statement issued here today. He went on.

"As operators of airports, we can exercise no control over types of aircraft being built for the airlines. We have no control over flight patterns or air routes or air schedules.

"In brief, this is a Federal matter and the sooner we achieve the necessary legislation, the sooner the public can be assured of noise relief."

The airport operators are the most frequent targets of the numerous antinoise suits brought by citizens across the country. The airlines generally take the stand that they fly planes built by someone else along flight patterns set by the Federal Government and are not primarily responsible for the noise the planes make over any given community.

UNITY EFFORT LAGS

In the last few years the Federal Government has taken the lead in trying to unite all segments of the industry in an attack on jet noise, but there has been little noticeable progress.

Although the Federal Aviation Administration has asked Congress for noise control legislation and at least 30 Congressmen have introduced such bills, no bills have been passed.

Many governmental experts, including some in aviation agency, insist that the agency could impose noise controls now, without waiting for new laws. It is understood that the Attorney General's office wrote an opinion to that effect more than a year ago.

But the aviation agency and its parent Department of Transportation take the view that they need a new mandate from Congress before they begin taking actions that could make the Government financially liable in noise damage suits.

The argument is that once the Government assumes the responsibility for controlling noise, it also assumes liability if noise gets out of control.

Critics of the agency charge that the proposed noise control law, as well as interagency antinoise programs, are "a joke" and "a crutch" that simply delay Federal action.

"As long as you can sit back and say you don't have a law, you don't have to do anything about noise," one critic said.

The antinoise council's board of directors accepted the airport operators' resignation today "with regret."

The airport operators urged immediate refitting of planes with quieter engines, faster research into still quieter engines, and "total support" for antinoise legislation. They also asked Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, for representation at all levels of the Federal interagency noise abatement program.

A Tribute to Abraham Lincoln and Carl Sandburg

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, on February 12, people throughout the world will observe the birthdate of the man whom many regard as our greater American—Abraham Lincoln. I therefore believe it to be particularly fitting to call attention at this time to the life and works of another very great American—one whose own life became inextricably involved and interwoven with that of Lincoln. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the biographer of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg.

Poet, historian, and troubadour, Carl Sandburg will be forever remembered for his superb biography of Lincoln and his paean to America, The People, Yes.

Carl Sandburg's integrity and intellectual honesty, his literary attainments and his rich voice will make his life and works a source of inspiration for generations to come.

Carl Sandburg died on July 22, 1967 at the age of 89. Throughout the country various memorial services and exhibitions of his works have been held—and are now being held—to commemorate this extraordinary American. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that a Sandburg exhibition consisting of various manuscripts, correspondence, phonograph recordings and other memorabilia is now on display at the Library of Congress. The exhibition will be open daily to the public until February 18, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I know that one of my most thrilling experiences since coming to Congress was the opportunity, on February 12, 1959, to hear Mr. Sandburg address a joint session of Congress in commemoration of the 150th birthday anniversary of Lincoln—a session presided over by our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. I am sure that all of us who sat in spellbound silence to hear Mr. Sandburg's address will never forget it.

In past generations, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sandburg's magnificent voice would have been lost to the world. Fortunately, that voice has been preserved for future generations in a unique collection of more than 165 tape recordings of Mr. Sandburg, assembled by Mr. Leo Orso, president of Orsonic Recording Services of Washington, D.C., and a personal friend of Mr. Sandburg.

This remarkable collection of Sandburg recordings is now housed at Wayne State University in Detroit, Mich. The university obtained the collection through the generosity of five of America's outstanding labor unions, the International Labor Press Association, the United Automobile Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the United Steelworkers of America, and the Amalgamated Meat Cutters of North America, all of the AFL–CIO. As a tribute to Carl Sandburg—for his many long years of effort in advancing the cause of social justice for American working men and women—these unions donated the tapes to Wayne State University.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Orso and these labor organizations are to be highly commended for their part in assembling and preserving these Sandburg recordings. I am sure that these tapes will bring inspiration and enrichment to generations far into the future.

Included in the collection are such speeches as the address to Congress to which I have referred, news programs, press conferences, readings from Mr. Sandburg's own books, critical evaluations of the arts and current affairs, and a rich heritage of Mr. Sandburg's own philosophy. Of special interest to future historians and scholars are two bound volumes of a typed verbatim transcript of more than 1,200 pages covering the tape contents.

Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Mr. Sandburg's historic appearance before the joint session of Congress on February 12, 1959, and in observance of the birthdate of Abraham Lincoln, I insert at this point in the Record Carl Sandburg's address on that occasion:

Introduction by Speaker Sam Rayburn

The Speaker. And now it becomes my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to present to you the man who in all probability knows more about the life, the times, the hopes, and the aspirations of Abraham Lincoln than any other human being. He has studied and has put on paper his conceptions of the towering figure of this great and this good man. I take pleasure and I deem it an honor to be able to present to you this great writer, this great historian, Carl Sandburg.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Address by Carl Sandburg, February 12, 1959, Before a Joint Session of Congress

Mr. Sandburg. Before beginning this prepared address, I must make the remark that this introduction, this reception here calls for humility rather than pride. I am well aware of that.

Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. Here and there across centuries come reports of men alleged to have these contrasts. And the incomparable Abraham Lincoln born 150 years ago this day, is an approach if not a perfect realization of this character. In the time of the April lilacs in the year 1865, on his death, the casket with his body was carried north and west a thousand miles; and the American people wept as never before; bells sobbed, cities wore crepe; people stood in tears and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in leading cities of seven States ending its journey at Springfield, Ill., the hometown. During the 4 years he was President he at times, especially in the first 3 months, took to himself the powers of a dictator; he commanded the most powerful armies till then assembled in modern warfare; he enforced conscription of soldiers for the first time in American history; under imperative necessity he abolished the right of habeas corpus; he directed politically and spiritually the wild, massive turbulent forces let loose in civil war; he argued and pleaded for compensated emancipation of the slaves. The slaves were property, they were on the tax-books along with horses and cattle, the valuation of each slave written next to his name on the tax assessor's books. Failing to get action on compensated emancipation, as a Chief Executive having war powers he issued the paper by which he declared the slaves to be free under military necessity. In the end nearly $4 million worth of property was taken away from those who were legal owners of it, property confiscated, wiped out as by fire and turned to ashes, at his instigation and executive direction. Chattel property recognized and lawful for 300 years was expropriated, seized without payment.

In the month the war began he told his secretary, John Hay:

"My policy is to have no policy."

Three years later in a letter to a Kentucky friend made public, he confessed plainly:

"I have been controlled by events."

His words at Gettysburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

"We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add or detract."

He could have said "the brave Union men." Did he have a purpose in omitting the word "Union?" Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation? Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there? We do not know, of a certainty. Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over the double grave, "God knows which was right?" We do not know. His changing policies from time to time aimed at saving the Union. In the end his armies won and his Nation became a world power. In August of 1864 he wrote a memorandum that he expected in view of the national situation, to lose the next November election. That month of August was so dark. Sudden military victory brought the tide his way; the vote was 2,200,000 for him and 1,800,000 against him. Among his bitter opponents were such figures as Samuel F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, and Cyrus H. McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper. In all its essential propositions the southern Confederacy had the moral support of powerful, respectable elements throughout the North, probably more than a million voters believing in the justice of the southern cause. While the war winds howled he insisted that the Mississippi was one river meant to belong to one country, that railroad connection from coast to coast must be pushed through and the Union Pacific Railroad made a reality. While the luck of war wavered and broke and came again, as generals failed and campaigns were lost, he held enough forces of the north together to raise new armies and supply them, until generals were found who made war as victorious war has always been made, with terror, frightfulness, destruction, and on both sides, North and South, valor and sacrifice past words of man to tell. In the mixed shame and blame of the immense wrongs of two crashing civilizations, often with nothing to say, he said nothing, slept not at all, and on occasions he was seen to weep in a way that made weeping appropriate, decent, majestic. As he rode alone on horseback near Soldiers Home on the edge of Washington one night his hat was shot off; a son he loved died as he watched at the bed; his wife was accused of betraying information to the enemy, until denials from him were necessary. An Indiana man at the White House heard him say, "Voorhees, don't it seem strange to you that I, who could never so much as cut off the head of a chicken, should be elected, or selected, into the midst of all this blood?" He tried to guide General Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, a Democrat, three times Governor of Massachusetts, in the governing of some 17 of the 48 parishes of Louisiana controlled by the Union armies, an area holding a fourth of the slaves of Louisiana. He would like to see the State recognize the emancipation proclamation:

"And while she is at it, I think it would not be objectionable for her to adopt some practical system by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relation to each other, and both come out better prepared for the new. Education for the young blacks should be included in the plan."

To Gov. Michel Hahn, elected in 1864 by a majority of the 11,000 white male voters who had taken the oath of allegiance to the Union, Lincoln wrote:

"Now you are about to have a convention which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise, I barely suggest for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in—as for instance, the very intelligent and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks."

Among the million words in the Lincoln utterance record, he interprets himself with a more keen precision than someone else offering to explain him. His simple opening of the "house divided" speech in 1858 serves for today:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

To his Kentucky friend, Joshua F. Speed, he wrote in 1855:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty."

Infinitely tender was his word from a White House balcony to a crowd on the White House lawn:

"I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom."

Or to a military Governor:

"I shall do nothing through malice; what I deal with is too vast for malice."

He wrote for Congress to read on December 1, 1862:

"In times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

Like an ancient psalmist he warned Congress:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

Wanting Congress to break and forget past traditions his words came keen and flashing:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for this stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves.'

They are the sort of words that actuated the mind and will of the men who created and navigated that marvel of the sea, the *Nautilus*, and her voyage from Pearl Harbor and under the North Pole icecap.

The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own. He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. "Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life right up to the finish?" Something like that you can hear in any nearby neighborhood and across the seas. Millions there are who take him as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We cannot say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions? Government where the people have the say-so, one way or another telling their elected leaders what they want? He had the idea, It is there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

Our good friend, the poet and playwright Mark Van Doren, tells us:

"To me, Lincoln seems, in some ways, the most interesting man who ever lived. He was gentle but this gentleness was combined with a terrific toughness, an iron strength."

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion, the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Representative Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, had died in May of 1864, and friends wrote to Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of Lincoln's letter, saying:

"Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men."

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well-assured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there, today, tomorrow, and for a long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty, men and women—this country has always had them in crises—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

I thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The Public Safety

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post in its edition of February 8 editorialized about the President's crime message. It supports his Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PUBLIC SAFETY

The special Message proposing measures to meet the challenge of crime, sent to the Congress by President Johnson on Wednesday, reads like an indictment—a true bill charging the Congress, state legislatures and municipal governments all over the country with tragic and terrible neglect of the public safety. The indictment is all the more searing because it is now a familiar one. Its substance was presented to Congress by the President a year ago, and in another Message sent a year before that. The shocking conditions it depicts were documented by the detailed report of the National Crime Commission. And so were the remedies which the President has repeatedly urged.

But Congress has done nothing—literally nothing—about the President's recommendations. The House played politics with them in a frivolous, reckless way, passing a bill last year that warped them into a kind of pork barrel. In the Senate, a cabal has obdurately tried to require a sacrifice of the right to privacy as the price of protecting public safety. And all the while constructive action has been at a standstill.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act has not been enacted. The Right to Privacy Act, also recommended by the President, has been virtually disregarded. The firearms control legislation, for which the President has pleaded again and again, has been cynically pigeonholed at the behest of a lobby content to let Americans be shot down by the thousands like varmints in order to protect the dangerous prerogatives of constituents it calls "sportsmen."

Mr. Johnson takes a thoroughly realistic view of the crime problem. He knows that it is essentially a local matter. "Under our constitutional system," as he says, "the prevention and punishment of crime in the streets is committed to state and local governments. It is essentially the task of mayors and local police, supported by their governors."

It is becoming more and more evident all the time that crime is a social sickness growing in large measure out of neglect and corruption of the country's youth. When we face the figures cited by the President—that three out of four of those arrested for larceny, burglary and auto theft and half of those arrested for homicide, rape, robbery and assault were under 24 years of age, we can hardly blame them or their Creator for their criminality. The President is quite right: "No child is born a criminal." It is the environment in which he lives that makes him one.

The President proposes to have the Federal Government help local governments deal with juvenile delinquency and drug addiction and alcoholism and the proliferation of firearms and other crime-breeding social ills. And he proposes to do it by measures which respect the civil liberties which are this country's glory. It is more than time for Congress to support him in a practical approach to this most pressing of all domestic problems.

A Drive for Unity in Greece

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an article on the editorial page of the February 5 New York Times reports on an effort by Greek exiles "to forge a united democratic front to force the military junta from power in Athens." The article, which documents part of the extensive terror and oppression that have existed in Greece since the junta took over last April, follows:

GREEK EXILES SEEK UNITY AGAINST THE JUNTA

(By Graham Hovey)

Prominent Greek exiles of differing political backgrounds have launched an effort to forge a united democratic front to force the military junta from power in Athens. Some of them say that, if they fail, the United States and the other NATO allies may eventually face "another Vietnam" in Greece.

They are convinced that the junta intends to cling to power indefinitely, with a Constitution rigged to that end, but that its oppressive policies will eventually ignite a popular explosion. Unless the democratic forces can unite, they say, the Communists will dominate the emergent resistance movement.

Many of them believe, however, that a solid democratic front, if supported by the United States and other allies, could still force the junta to leave peacefully. In any event, they see this effort as the only alternative to a civil war that could easily become a wider, big-power conflict.

American pressure is so important for their objective that these Greeks were dismayed two weeks ago, when Washington announced resumption of "normal diplomatic contacts" with the Athens regime. They felt this was a concession that should have been considered only after specific moves by the junta toward democratic, constitutional government. They would regard it a disaster if Washington followed its initial action by resuming the regular military aid suspended after the coup of last April.

Some who have come from Greece recently fear Washington is not yet fully sensitive to the extremist character of the regime or the drastic nature of its purges. They reject the argument that arms aid must be resumed in the overall NATO interest because they say the purge of nearly every experienced high-ranking officer has divided and bewildered the armed forces and made them a liability for the Atlantic Alliance.

THE JUNTA'S PURGE

The junta began by concentrating on persecution of leftists and politicians of George Papandreou's Center Union, but gradually extended its purge into the very citadels of Greece's "Establishment." In the last month alone it has removed 56 university professors; four leading bankers, including the governor of the Bank of Greece; four ambassadors and other senior diplomats, and an additional 79 army officers. It has brought the arraignment of the former Primate of Greece and the Bishop of Salonika. Over a longer period the junta has purged the staggering total of 115,000 mayors and municipal council members.

Greek democrats fear that the extent of the purge and police terror has been obscured abroad by such junta gestures as the freeing of Andreas Papandreou and the dropping of charges against the publisher, Mrs. Helen Vlachos.

They believe the purge of left and right alike indicates that the junta plans to take Greece on a dangerous new course. In this connection they speak of the possibility of a grim future choice between a Nasser-type regime under the colonels or a Communist take-over. This specter gives urgency and a note of panic to their drive for a democratic front, anchored on the Papandreou's Center Union and the rival National Radical Union.

Success will depend heavily on attitudes of the three most prominent exiles: King Constantine, Andres Papandreou and former Premier Constantine Carmanlis. They fought bitterly in the past and may still differ radically.

Even exiles long critical of the royal family believe the King, despite his failure to oust the junta in December, must now be the symbol for uniting all democrats. It is doubtful that Andreas Papandeou, still bitter over Constantine's ouster of his father as Premier in 1965, will agree. He has told Newsweek that the King is "the wrong symbol for the revolution against the junta," though he does not oppose a constitutional monarchy.

Mr. Papandreou believes the King should stay out of Greece until democratic institutions are restored. The King says he will return if the junta meets conditions that include publication of a new Constitution, fixing a date for a vote on it, free parlimentary elections and a free press. It will take delicate negotiations to bring the two men together.

CARAMANLIS IN THE WINGS

With Mr. Carmanlis, whose governments brought Greece its greatest postwar stability and growth, the problem is mostly hurt pride. He has waited in Paris four years for a popular call home that has not come. He demanded in November that the junta quit but has not spoken out since the King's counter-coup.

Greeks working for a democratic front do not discount the obstacles, but they are confident that their effort will arouse positive response inside Greece. They take heart from the fact that Andreas Papandreou, never the most conciliatory of Greeks, said after his arrival in Paris: "All disputes must be laid to rest. I did not come out of Greece to revitalize old quarrels."

Rich Man's Peace Corps

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective U.S. foreign assistance programs in existence today is being carried out by an organization fondly known as the "Rich Man's Peace Corps." This private organization, officially known as the International Executive Service Corps, recruits topflight retired U.S. businessmen to advise local private enterprise in less developed countries. The result has often been a significant increase in local industrial productivity as these men have helped local businessmen solve a multitude of managerial and technical problems.

Financially, not one of these men have anything to gain from tackling the often complex problems of industrial development. But they are justly rewarded in the personal satisfaction derived from knowing that their talents are needed. We as a nation are rewarded by the positive example these men leave behind in these developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have long argued that the retired population in this country represents an unusually potent source of talent for public service. I can think of no better illustration of this "elder power" then the International Executive Service Corps. I wish to insert into the Record an article from a leading U.S. newspaper which describes the success of this program. I know my colleagues in the House will find this article informative. It follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 28, 1968]

Brains Yield Big Profits in "Rich Man's Peace Corps"

The International Executive Service corps, better known as the "Rich Man's Peace corps," has had an impact around the world—an impact far out of proportion to its numbers and budget. In South America the retired businessmen of the corps have increased productivity, helped create jobs and brought the experience of years to specific industrial problems.

This is the way it works:

A manufacturing plant—perhaps in Brazil's great industrial complex in São Paulo—asks for assistance. The corps checks its background carefully. Is it an important, essential plant? Will its success help in the economic growth of the developing country? Will the management co-operate and make modest financial contribution to the cost of the corps' project? If the answers are yes, the corps turns to its list of available American excutives, most of them retired, who might be able to help.

"What it comes down to," says an official "is that these firms get some of the best business and industrial brains in America—men with years of experience who might have been earning $1,000 a day when they retired.

"One man came here to help a luggage manufacturer. When he left a few months later he gave them five patents for new designs, complete with specifications. They can use them only in Brazil, but it has meant a great deal to the firm. They want him to come back."

The International Executive Service corps originally was a David Rockefeller project. Now, it receives some aid funds, but it is run as a private and independent organization. Scores of American firms are sponsor members and there is foundation help in addition to the fee for the executive adviser paid by the firm he assists.

"The beauty of it," says an official, "is that the men who come here to help are exactly the type needed for the job. Most of them have the kind of experience that goes 'way back. They remember what it was like when they started as young men and what industrial conditions were like then. Sometimes you have the same problem in industries in the developing countries.

"A young engineer might come down here and say. 'You've got to buy a million dollars worth of new equipment to make this thing work right.' But these people can't always do that. One of our retired executives may look around the plant and say, 'You can make a big improvement here with a longer conveyor belt.' That might cost a hundred dollars.

"Another thing is that these men don't threaten anyone's job. All the local executives know that he'll be there only a few months. His experience and knowledge are used, but he's not about to move anybody out. And he's not taking a big salary, even for the short time he's there. For the corpsman and his wife, it's a great adventure. For the company he helps, it's a gesture from an American done purely out of good will."

Anyone can volunteer for the I. E. S. C. which has its headquarters in New York, although most of the men are executives who have recently retired or are about to retire. Man who can get a leave of absence from their companies for a few months also are eligible.

The I. E. C. S., of course, screens the applicants carefully. In developing nations many industries are family affairs and in certain areas, notably Latin America, a sense of pride makes some reluctant to ask for assistance. The corps can't use the type who would throw his weight around, order people about and insist they do it his way. That would do more harm than good.

The "Rich Man's Peace corps," is one of those inspired ideas that really works. For a little money an industry in an underdeveloped nation can hire some of the best brains and experience available anywhere—talent that couldn't be bought in the United States at any price. The hope now is to expand the concept in other fields of need.

Support Grows for Amendment to Surplus Property Act

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, nearly half the States of this Nation have indicated their support of H.R. 10189, my bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes.

The explosive population growth in our metropolitan areas, particularly in the suburban areas, is devouring land at a tremendous rate, and the resulting physical expansion has been so rapid as to make the preservation of some remaining land for parks, playgrounds, and recreation areas, increasingly difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to act swiftly on this bill as every day increased population places more pressure on available land and demands added recreational facilities.

I am pleased that so many States support this bill, and I have unanimous consent that these letters of support be printed in the Record. They are as follows:

Department of Planning and
Economic Development,
Honolulu, Hawaii, June 10, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Pelly: Thank you very much for your letter and transmittal of June 5, 1967, informing us of your introduction of H.R. 10189. As the State Liaison Officer to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in implementing the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 in Hawaii, I am very pleased to learn of your strong interest in outdoor recreation and your key action.

Your remarks on the problems of preserving lands for open space and recreation, and the need for the Federal Government to more positively ensure their availability to local governments, are most eloquent. We are in full accord with your proposal and wish to hereby indicate our support for H.R. 10189.

Sincerely,

Shelley M. Mark.

State of Illinois, Department of
Business and Economic Development,
Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Your remarks made in the House of Representatives concerning H.R. 10189 clearly describe the problem we face in providing needed recreation areas in our urban communities. As the official planning agency for the State of Illinois, the Department of Business and Economic Development strongly endorses your position in this matter, and supports your bill which would provide for donation of certain surplus Federal properties to the states and their subdivisions for recreational use.

The number of applications for Federal assistance toward the acquisition of urban recreation areas in Illinois communities is growing. The funds available for such assistance are insufficient to meet community needs. H.R. 10189 is not only consistent with the Federal outdoor recreation program and the recreation program in the State of Illinois, it is a logical and timely proposal which will contribute to the solution of one or our most pressing developmental problems.

Sincerely,

Gene H. Graves.

State Conservation Commission,
Des Moines, Iowa, June 9, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: We are in receipt of your communication dated June 5, 1967, in which you bring to our attention legislation tabbed H.R. 10189, which would in effect amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944. It is our understanding that your amendment would also allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of creating parks and recreational areas.

Please rest assured that it is our intent to lend our assistance in gaining favorable consideration of H.R. 10189.

It is pleasant to note that consideration for acquisition of such property is given to both state government and their subdivisions. In the formulation of overall recreation plans for the benefit of the entire state, it would seem wise to us to incorporate solidly a procedure which would allow state government the number one priority in agencies acquiring such lands.

Thank you for your consideration in forwarding this information regarding H.R. 10189 to my office.

Very truly yours,

E. B. Speaker,
Director.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Department of Finance,
Frankfort, July 11, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Commissioner Joyner referred your letter of June 5 and a copy of your legislation amending the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to me for review and comment. I am directly involved in the administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in Kentucky and have had the opportunity to become acquainted with the problems facing state and local agencies in attempting to acquire recreation land.

As you stated in your remarks accompanying the bill, local agencies are finding it nearly impossible to acquire recreation lands when competing with industrial and residential developers and the state agencies have to pay increasingly higher prices for necessary land.

Even though the receipts from the sale of surplus Federal lands make up a portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it seems to me that more facilities could be provided for more people by conveying surplus land with no monetary consideration. This would allow the state and local agencies to use funds, originally needed to purchase such land, for development of facilities and the acquisition of additional open space.

Your amendment is certainly reasonable, particularly in the light of the Federal government's programs to provide recreation space and we feel it would be beneficial to Kentucky.

Sincerely,

Ted Bradshaw,
Assistant to Commissioner.

State Parks and Recreation Commission, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
Baton Rouge, La., June 14, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Pelly: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter and attachments in regard to the proposed legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, allowing surplus Federal properties to be donated to the States and their subdivisions for parks and recreation areas.

In view of the escalation of land values and the outdoor recreational need, we concur with your proposal.

Yours very truly,

Lamar Girson,
Director-Liaison Officer.
Clyde Funderburk,
Executive Assistant.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Natural Resources,
Boston, June 28, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Thank you for your letter of June 5 and the material forwarded therewith. I am in favor of the objective of H.R. 10189, and will be delighted to do whatever possible to insure favorable consideration of this legislation.

As you are aware, land acquisition in such states of high population density and small land area, such as Massachusetts, is presenting an increasingly difficult problem.

It seems incongruous to me that certain surplus properties should be made available to the states for hunting and fishing purposes at no cost, while we are obliged to pay substantial sums to acquire similar properties for other recreational purposes.

The Commonwealth has acquired recently a portion of the Cohasset Annex of the former Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot at a cost in excess of $300,000. This is a most desirable property for recreation purposes as it lies within the Boston metropolitan area with a population in excess of 2,000,000.

It seems to me that the cause of outdoor recreation would have been far better served had we been able to acquire this area without charge and had used the money received for the purchase cost for development purposes.

With assurance of my support for this legislation, I remain

Sincerely,

Robert L. Yasi,
Commissioner.

Michigan Department of Conservation,
Lansing, June 19, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Pelly: Thank you for your letter of June 5, 1967, and the copy of H.R. 10189. We appreciate receiving this and your remarks to the Congress on your amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Please be assured that the Michigan Department of Conservation heartily endorses your amendment to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes.

Your remarks to Congress are very indicative of the situation in southern Michigan. Over 88 per cent of our population resides in the southern one-third of our state. Yet the vast majority of our public land ownership lies in the upper portion of the state. The urgency for more open space near and within our cities is appropriately mentioned in your remarks.

As you may be aware, Michigan submitted a $378 million dollar outdoor recreation program to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The majority of this program will benefit the urban centers of southern Michigan. Within this area there undoubtedly is land that will someday be declared surplus that could be used for park and recreational purposes.

Again let me express our support and offer to assist you in the adoption of H.R. 10189.

Sincerely,

Ralph A. MacMullan,
Director.

State Park System,
Jackson, Miss., June 22, 1967.

Congressman Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Thank you very much for your letter of June 5, informing us of the introduction of H.R. Bill 10189, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to permit the donation of surplus Federal properties to states and their political subdivisions for parks and recreational areas.

We are very much in accord with this amendment and feel that it will be a great boon to recreational development. It is apparent that you have a real grasp of the need for conserving our land resources for recreational development, and we wish for you every success in your endeavor.

We shall certainly contact our Congressmen and ask their support for your bill.

Sincerely,

R. E. Foster,
Comptroller.

State of Montana,
Department of Fish and Game,
Helena, June 23, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: We were most pleased to receive copies of your proposed legislation, H.R. 10189, with your nice letter of June 5th.

As official recreation agency for the State of Montana, we feel that your bill which would allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of parks and recreation agencies, would be most benefical to these important programs.

Very sincerely,

Frank H. Dunkle,
State Fish and Game Director.
By: Robert F. Cooney,
State Liaison Officer.

State of New Jersey, Department of Conservation and Economic Development,
July 10, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Thank you for your recent communique relative to H.R. 10189 which was introduced by you in the House of Representatives on May 22, 1967.

I have had an opportunity to review the bill and the copy of your remarks on the Floor of the House at the time it was introduced and, in all due candor, I can state that I am in full accord with your observations and your concrete proposal to assist the States and the local levels of government in connection with this problem.

I note that this bill, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. I would appreciate your keeping me apprised as to the progress of this legislation.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Roe,
Commissioner.

State of North Carolina,
Governor's Office,
Raleigh, June 16, 1967.

Hon. Thomas M. Pelly,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Your bill, HR 10189, which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to improve the present plan for disposal of surplus property, should be a great service to our states and subdivisions in regard to parks and recreational areas.

I appreciate your sending me a copy of this bill for my comments.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Dan Moore.

State of New Mexico,
State Planning Office,
Sante Fe, June 13, 1967.

Mr. Thomas M. Pelly,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pelly: Thank you for your letter of June 5, advising me that you had introduced H.R. 10189. The State Planning Office of New Mexico is in complete accord with the purpose of this bill.

As you pointed out in your remarks on the Floor of the House, enclosed with your letter and a copy of H.R. 10189, the needs for lands for park and recreation purposes are mounting daily. The beneficial effects of such uses of lands are, at least, equal to the benefits to be obtained from the uses of surplus properties for which no monetary consideration is required now.

It is only proper that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 be amended, as you have proposed, to recognize the importance of providing adequate public parks and recreation areas for the people.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. ORTIZ,
State Planning Officer.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Albany, June 26, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: I am in receipt of your letter of June 5, 1967 together with a copy of H.R. 10189, introduced by you in the House, and your statement in support thereof.

Inasmuch as there is a considerable amount of Federally owned property within the State of New York which could eventually be declared surplus, we strongly support the intent and spirit of this bill. However, we feel that conveyances for any purpose directed toward conservation or recreation should be without cost to the State, political subdivision or municipality. We would prefer that the various specific categories in present law be deleted and more general terms, such as "conservation or recreation purposes", be substituted.

I wish to express to you our sincere appreciation for an opportunity to comment on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

R. STEWART KILBORNE,
Commissioner.

STATE OF OHIO, DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Columbus, July 5, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for your letter enclosing a copy of your amendment proposal to H.R. 10189, along with your introductory comments on the Floor of the House.

I am sure that this proposal will receive the support of park and recreation agencies at all levels of government as the means of acquiring lands for recreational purposes that could not otherwise be obtained.

We, as one agency, very much appreciate your efforts to give the park and recreation program impetus throughout the nation. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources will support the measure at every opportunity.

Sincerely,

FRED E. MORR,
Director.

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Salem, June 22, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Thank you for your letter and materials of June 5 regarding H.R. 10189, your proposal to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Our primary concern is in regard to the Bill's potential effect on income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The sale of surplus federal property has been a major source of revenue to the Land and Water Conservation Fund during its initial years, and we do not wish to support significant erosion of such sources. H.R. 10189, however, appears to assist recreational development and if adopted as written should be of considerable assistance in that field.

While state and local agencies in Oregon have not secured large acreages of surplus federal lands in years past, this may become more important in the years ahead as recreation pressures increase and properly located lands become increasingly hard to find.

We appreciate your sending us the materials on the proposed legislation.

Very truly yours,

FORREST COOPER,
State Highway Engineer.

SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE RESOURCES DEPARTMENT,
Columbia, June 8, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Your letter concerning H.R. 10189 has been referred to me. I would like to state that I favor it very much and will be delighted to write the South Carolina Congressmen urging their support of this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. MAY,
Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME, FISH, AND PARKS,
Pierre S. Dak., June 21, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Thank you for informing me of the provisions of H.R. 10189.

The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks endorses H.R. 10189.

I am not presently aware of any surplus federal lands in South Dakota which are readily adapted to park use. However, I cannot think of any better use for such lands wherever they may exist.

Sincerely,

R. A. HODGINS,
Director.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT
OF CONSERVATION,
Nashville, June 12, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on your bill HR-10189, legislation which would amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to allow certain surplus federal properties to be donated to the states and their sub-divisions for the purpose of parks and recreational areas.

This is a proposal which I can wholeheartedly endorse. We are involved in a greatly expanded program of park and recreation area development in Tennessee at both the State and local levels and the availability of surplus federal properties to us without monetary consideration would be most beneficial. It is my understanding that educational institutions may receive such properties at the present time without monetary consideration and we believe it proper that park and recreation functions of governmental agencies be given the same consideration.

I am taking the liberty of mailing a copy of this reply to each member of the Tennessee congressional delegation and urge that they support HR-10189.

Sincerely,

E. BOYD GARRETT.

WASHINGTON STATE,
PARKS ASSOCIATION,
Bremerton, Wash, June 15, 1267.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: We were pleased to read that you have introduced a bill to permit the government to donate surplus holdings to cities, counties, and state for park or recreational use. At our 18th annual Washington State Parks Association convention (October 1965) a resolution was adopted to give support to any bill which would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so that government surplus lands can be made available to public park or public recreation agencies at up to 100 per cent public benefit allowance.

Mr. Pelly, the Washington State Parks Association will give your bill all the support we can muster and also encourage other organizations to do likewise. In our next Association newsletter I would like to mention this bill and would be pleased if you would give me the number of your bill and any other information which could be used in our newsletter to inform our member organizations. I also would appreciate any suggestions you may have for us in supporting your bill. We deeply appreciate your interest in helping parks and recreation.

Yours truly,

S. P. "PAT" CAREY,
Vice President.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, June 12, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your letter of June 5 calling my attention to H.R. 10189. This amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is most timely.

The federal, state and local units of government are presently struggling to acquire the needed open space and park lands. As you are aware, many states have passed sizable bond issues and other special taxes designed for this purpose. The population growth and the land price escalation coupled with the citizens' desire for outdoor recreation make it most difficult to acquire the needed acres.

The value to the nation in having open space and park lands where its citizens can pause and recreate and restructure their thinking cannot be minimized. Your bill H.R. 10189 can greatly contribute to the fulfillment of this need.

May I wish you success in its final passage.

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

WYOMING RECREATION COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, July 3, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: Thank you for the information concerning your H.R. 10189. We in Wyoming are certainly quite aware that your amendment would aid our State Parks and Recreation Program tremendously.

I am preparing a letter of endorsement of the amendment to our Wyoming Congressional Delegation and enclose a copy of the correspondence for your files.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. RODERMEL,
Director.

JUNE 23, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRISON: The Wyoming Recreation Commission is vitally interested in Representative Thomas M. Pelly's H.R. 10189, which amends the Surplus Property Act of 1944. The amendment would allow certain surplus Federal properties to be donated to the states and their subdivisions for the purpose of parks and recreational areas.

Our state appropriation has been extremely small over the past years to the State Parks Commission. Now that the State Parks Commission has been combined with the Land and Water Conservation Commission, we must pinch our purse strings even tighter.

Should surplus properties become available to us, you can rest assured that we stand to profit. Your support of the amendment would be most helpful to us.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. RODERMEL,
Director.

The above letter also sent to Senator GALE McGEE and Senator HANSEN.

Mallory Decision Blocks Justice Again

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Supreme Court handed down a decision which freed a guilty rapist. Known as the Mallory case, the action was based purely upon a technicality—that of requiring a suspect to be immediately arraigned before a magistrate following arrest. Already that strange decision has forced the release of a number of desperate criminals. The Nation's Capitol has been shocked by the recent release of a self-confessed killer, not because of any mistreatment of the criminal, or any claim he was denied his legitimate rights ordinarily required during an investigation and trial, but only because of a slight delay in arraignment of the guilty man.

It will be recalled that the House of Representatives on two occasions, several years ago, approved legislation designed to correct the Court's error. But in each instance the House action was blocked in the Senate. Recently we succeeded in getting some language approved in an anticrime bill which is applicable to the District of Columbia. We can only hope this effort will not be knocked down when it is tested before the Supreme Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the February 6, 1968, edition of the Evening Star. That editorial follows:

UNPUNISHED MURDER

With obvious reluctance, a District judge last week freed the self-confessed killer of the widow of James F. Mitchell, a prominent Washington physician.

What this miscarriage of justice puts before us is a shocking example of the Mallory Rule at work—the rule which, to the dismay of this community's "liberal" element, has been modified to some extent by Title III of the new District crime law.

Mrs. Mitchell was suffocated in her Dupont Circle home two years ago by Harry Gross in a dispute over money. Gross, a handyman, confessed after lie detector tests had pointed to him as the guilty party. Now, there was no claim that any third degree tactics had been used by the police, no contention that the confession was not voluntary. And, of course, there was nothing at all to indicate that the jury had found an innocent man guilty of this murder.

The police, however, had waited four hours after the lie detector tests before taking Gross to a magistrate for arraignment. And this delay, under the blindly mechanical operation of the Mallory Rule, was held by the Court of Appeals to necessitate reversal of the conviction and, eventually, the release of the killer. The appellate judges probably were right, yet nothing could more clearly illustrate the wrong-headedness of the Mallory Rule—a rule concerned with a matter of procedure and not with the question of whether justice has been done.

Judge John J. Sirica said that he ordered the release of Gross "with reluctance," and that "if the new crime bill had been in effect when this man confessed he would not be set free today."

We hope that the moaners and the groaners will give a little thought to this—especially those who say, although they must know better, that Title III revives "arrests for investigation." It does nothing of the sort. Since Mallory had nothing whatever to do with any constitutional issue, we would also like to think that we have heard the last of the contention that Title III will be held unconstitutional "in the light of the Mallory Rule." This probably is a vain hope, however, since any such claim must spring not from deliberate misrepresentation but from total ignorance.

Title III may have its imperfections and if so Congress can correct them as experience demonstrates the fact. Meanwhile, we would rather take our chances with this new law than with a judicial rule which frees a confessed killer or a confessed rapist (Mallory) to walk the streets of this city.

C. Austin Barker and the Real Issues in the Gold Cover Question

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to remove the gold cover for Federal Reserve notes—see state of the Union message, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, page 143—raises serious questions of fiscal responsibility.

Better to understand the significance of this proposal, I have read the explanation by C. Austin Barker, a partner in the firm of Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes, and economist for that firm.

I commend to my colleagues for their consideration, Mr. Barker's concise yet comprehensive analysis, which follows:

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF 25-PERCENT GOLD COVER FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

In the President's State of the Union message on January 17th, one of his key recommendations was that having assured the world that America's full gold stock stood behind its commitment to maintain the price of gold at $35 an ounce, it must back up this commitment "by legislating now to free our gold reserves". The president undoubtedly is referring to the fact that U.S. Treasury gold stock declined in recent months to $11.984 billion, the lowest level in 30 years. Current estimates are that we lost about $1 billion for the entire year. Of this total gold stock, about $10.2 billion was to be held as backing for the Federal Reserve notes. Thus there is now less than $2 billion of so-called "free gold", not counting a gold obligation of $1 billion to the IMF.

Last year, there were bills prepared in the Senate and House to remove the gold cover but they were not pushed. In the new Congress bills already have been introduced in the House and Senate to remove the gold backing requirement for Federal Reserve notes. The announcement of one bill called it "a necessary first step to ease the balance-of-payments problems" and further, that its removal would give the U.S. an additional $10 billion to meet foreign demand for gold.

There is much misunderstanding of and misinformation on what the "gold cover" law really means. There have been numerous statements by government officials, Congressmen and others that we must repeal the gold cover law to free up our gold reserves so the entire gold stock stands behind the effort to hold down the price of gold to $35 an ounce. For example, at various times when there has been a loss of confidence in the dollar or the pound, there arises a strong demand for gold in lieu of currencies and the U.S. is forced to dump its Treasury gold on the open market like a surplus commodity to prevent the price of gold from rising above $35 an ounce. In the Bretton Woods agreement, the U.S. agreed to maintain the price of gold either by buying it at $35 an ounce on the open market or by selling it at the same price. However, in view of our 17 years of balance-of-payments deficits since 1949 we have been forced to sell over $12 billion of our Treasury gold to hold the price down and have been able to do very little buying. Such gold as we did buy was usually suppied by friendly nations as a good neighbor gesture.

Our gold cover law does *not* prevent the sale of gold by the U.S. but if such sale violates the 25% statutory reserve requirement, there are disciplinary measures which become mandatory and in themselves could correct the payments deficits by penalty taxes and penalty interest rate increases. These decisions must be followed by the U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve. What the gold cover removal advocates are saying by implication is that they do not wish to accept the disciplinary measures that are mandatory for balancing. This is the real policy issue that should be brought before the public so let us examine it.

The entire $11.984 billion of U.S. monetary gold is already available for sale because the present gold cover law permits temporary and repeated suspensions of its application by the Fed in case the gold drops below the 25% limit. A previous Congress provided penalties in the gold cover requirement law if gold dropped below 25%. These penalties could be painful but were provided as a discipline to force future Administrations and Congress to actually eliminate the payments deficit. If the deficits become so serious that they would cause a drain on U.S. gold to a level below the statutory reserve requirement of 25% of outstanding Federal Reserve notes (our national paper currency), the penalties would become mandatory.

For example, if the gold drops below 25% to 20%, there is a mandatory requirement that the Fed charge a tax of not more than 1% against the Federal Reserve system and the Fed must add that percentage to its rediscount rate. Another stiffer tax and interest penalty follows if it drops below 20% to 17½%. In the latter case, there is a tax of 1½% and it is mandatory that a like percentage be added to the rediscount rate also. If the gold reserve drops from 17½% to 15%, another 1½% tax must be followed by another 1½% increase in the rediscount rate.

There is about $41 billion of Federal Reserve notes outstanding. If the gold stock drained away to 20%, or $8.2 billion, the first penalties operate. If it drains down to about $7.2 billion (17½%), the second penalty steps operate and if it drains down to $6.1 billion (15%), the third step of penalties operates. For example, if the Treasury taxes the Fed, say ⅛%, in this first step, this percentage would also be added to the rediscount rate of the Fed which is now 4½%. Thus the first change in rediscount rate would be to 4⅝%. The second percentage rate added to the rediscount rate would bring it to 6⅛% and the third 1½ percentage points added to the rediscount rate would bring it to 7⅝%. This would indeed induce monetary discipline on the entire economy and the high interest rates could either force Congress to cut back enough foreign aid and non-Vietnam military expenditures abroad to eliminate the payments deficit or, in themselves, bring a flow of capital in from abroad which would get our payments into balance (with some pain to foreign countries and a possible downturn in the U.S. economy if money rates alone had to do the job).

However, the imbedded discipline power in the present cover law is obviously not wanted by the Administration. A removal of the gold cover is not a necessary first step to ease the balance-of-payments problems. In itself, it will do nothing to help the payments deficit and may even cause harm through a further loss in confidence because its removal is considered a sign of weakness. Nor is its removal needed to assure the world that we will maintain the price of gold at $35 an ounce because we can do that under the present gold cover system. The government is still spending enormous sums on foreign aid and military commitments abroad and is proposing further penalties on U.S. corporations' foreign subsidiaries, on bankers who lend abroad (trade credits) and on American travelers abroad in hopes of offsetting this military and foreign aid spending.

Our 1967 balance-of-payments deficit is not official yet but is hinted to be around $4 billion. It would be more except for official arrangements whereby foreign official short-term assets in the U.S. were converted into "long-term" investments (investments of more than one year are statistically treated as capital inflow). Moreover, I suspect that some of the year-end rush of outflow may fall into calendar year 1968 so that the payments deficit probably is greater than has been reported to date and its economic effect is based on actualities, not statistics.

According to the latest official estimate available, a few months ago, the U.S. short-term liabilities to foreigners totaled $35 billion (including the $4.8 billion U.S. dollar holdings of the IMF). Moreover, the Fed had $5 billion of currency "swap" credit last summer of which only $800 million was used to stabilize gold and the dollar because of the Arab-Israeli War. By November 30, 1967, it had to apply for another $1.75 billion of swap credit, following Britain's devaluation. A large proportion must have been used up in the British devaluation crisis and such U.S. swaps become due in six months.

We live in a world of exchange controls, IET, "voluntary programs" etc., and now many expect further controls which are not a remedy and only weaken confidence in the dollar and pit protectionism against free world trade. Thus, some who request the repeal of the gold cover law, by implication do not want this discipline of balancing to become mandatory. Some others who ask for its repeal simply do not like gold or our gold-exchange standard. Yet the latter have not devised a non-gold international (fiat) money that will be acceptable in world trade or avoid worldwide inflation without excessive controls over people and money.

These are the real issues behind the gold cover drama.

Concurrent Resolution Introduced

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the amendment yesterday to the bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to prevent any Communist-bloc country who supplies strategic materials to North Vietnam to obtain credit is an indication that the people of this Nation no longer intend to provide economic benefits to those nations who aid North Vietnam's war machine.

I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which, I think, will go further in stating this mood of the Congress and the American people.

The resolution expresses the sense of Congress "that the Government of the United States should not consider further expansions of trade and credit with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites unless there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Southeast Asia have been redirected toward insuring peace and an honorable settlement and unless there is demonstrable evidence that they agree to abandon their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation."

In the past, the Soviet Union has continued to turn to the United States for trade—particularly in industrial equipment and machinery, technological innovations, synthetics, lightweight metals—to overcome their own economic and technological gaps.

The Soviets have admitted that it is cheaper to buy such items here than to engage in the research, development and production themselves.

We increasingly today hear talk of detente and "building bridges," and President Johnson in his recent state of the Union address broached the idea of undertaking educational and cultural exchanges with China. He also mentioned the possibility of talk on exchange of basic food crop materials.

While there is a fashionable ring lately to words like detente and building bridges, we as a nation must never forget that we are at war. We must remember that we have more than 500,000 American men in Vietnam, and we are spending over $25 billion a year—that is about $70 million a day—in the fight there against the Communist aggressors.

We also must not lose sight of the fact that the Soviet Union supplies more than 80 percent of the war needs of our adversary. The Kremlin, then, holds a key to the solution of peace in Southeast Asia. For if, in the spirit of detente and Glassboro, the Kremlin stopped its aid to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese would be forced to the conference tables.

Has our "bridge building" in the past year been successful? Indeed, the Soviets have increased their aid to North Vietnam and have refused to use their considerable influence to bring about a peace in Asia. They continue to pour money and material into Cuba and supply the guerrilla forces in Latin America. They were openly involved in the beginnings of the Arab-Israel war last June, and are now rebuilding the Arab Nations' war machine.

Certainly, all of us desire a relaxation of East-West tensions, a cooperative world of nations building bridges to peace. But there can be no peace until there is a peaceful solution in Vietnam.

Let us tell the Soviet Union and the Communist-bloc nations that peace is the price of trade with the United States. Let us say to the Kremlin that until there is a clear demonstration that they want peace in Asia, not war, and are willing to work to that end, our storehouses and credit facilities are closed to them.

Some spokesmen will immediately point out that the Soviets only purchase items such as ballpoint pens and permanent press material. However, Bernard Baruch once said there was no such thing as a nonstrategic item in time of war.

The purchase of cheap, good quality ballpoint pens or whatever nonstrategic item it may be enables the Soviets to concentrate its resources and manpower on building SAM rockets, rifles, radars, and trucks for use in Vietnam.

Without the steady flow of material from other Communist countries, North Vietnam would be forced to the bargaining tables. If we continue to help the nations of the Communist bloc, we are seriously undercutting our own national efforts and those efforts of our fighting men in South Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing this concurrent resolution, the text of which follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress recognizes the value of trade with other nations when there is maximum mutual benefit; and

Whereas it is also the policy of the Congress and the desire of the people of the United States to secure a just and honorable peace in South Vietnam; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its East European satellites, by providing a vast majority of the materials of war furnished to North Vietnam to prosecute aggression against its neighbor, are in a position to exert influence to effect a peace in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its East European satellites are evidently pursuing a policy designed to increase trade and expand credit with the United States; and

Whereas commerce is a powerful instrument not only for promoting international peace and good will but also as recognized weapons for preventing or prosecuting war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should not consider further expansions of trade and credit with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites unless there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Southeast Asia have been redirected toward insuring peace and an honorable settlement and unless there is demonstrable evidence that they agree to abandon their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation.

Time To Do What's Necessary: Nation Must Unshackle Military

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego, Calif., Union of February 1, 1968:

TIME TO DO WHAT IS NECESSARY: NATION MUST UNSHACKLE MILITARY

Is there an American whose blood is not boiling today; who does not think that American honor has been demeaned?

Several weeks ago the President of the United States of America said the allies were winning the war in South Vietnam.

The Communist contempt and response was instantaneous and unmistakable. Puny, primitive North Korea with no navy worthy of the name captured a highly important vessel of the United States and is holding the crew and ship while we impotently dance the diplomatic minuet.

Only a few American ships have been captured in history—none during the major world wars. And in each case the United States' retaliation was swift, sure and effective to prevent future piracy.

Now in another direct slap at our president and our nation, plainly labelled as such by the enemy, the North Vietnamese have launched their biggest offensive of the war in Southeast Asia on two battle fronts—the countrysides and the cities.

They attacked the headquarters of the military commander in Vietnam. They beseiged our embassy in Saigon for six hours and sent Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker into hiding. They attacked billets for military men, killed military personnel and civilians in the streets of all major cities in South Vietnam; destroyed millions of dollars worth of aircraft, attacked the presidential palace and raised the North Vietnamese flag in key areas.

For years our military men have been asking for the go-ahead signal in Vietnam to bring sure victory. We have the power to do it, the commanders to direct it and the resources to support it.

The determination to win our wars is woven into the tradition of America. We lost it in Korea in 1953, not on the battlefield, but at the diplomatic tables where the peace was half concluded.

We paid the price of that appeasement in the capture of the USS Pueblo by North Korea which can be interpreted as one of the reasons for intensification of Communist aggression today in South Vietnam.

Unless we alter the restraint policy on the military we will pay a far greater price. Already the pacification program for the countryside has been inestimably lengthened by the Viet Cong attacks in the cities. What farmer can believe he is safe from terrorism when his cousin in the city is not?

We will now have a harder time convincing our allies that we are not bogged down interminably in Vietnam at the expense of our other world responsibilities.

How will we be able to convince the world we are winning when our own embassy in Saigon is besieged? And think of the propaganda Ho Chi Minh now is beaming at Communist revolutionists!

This, however, is not the time to cry over spilt milk. It is time for men in government with the attitudes of Washington, Lincoln, Stephen Decatur, Theodore Roosevelt and John Paul Jones.

This is the time for men with the instinct for victory, the courage to do what must be done by ourselves for ourselves; and for men of wisdom who will listen to the military commanders who have been saying all along how best to do it.

Jet Noise Fight in the Open

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on more than 20 previous occasions I have addressed my colleagues in the House on the subject of aircraft noise—a menace which disrupts the lives of thousands of our residents who live in the shadow of our Nation's airports.

I have repeatedly maintained that jet noise is a national problem which can only be reduced by Federal action. In August of 1965 I requested the President to appoint a White House Commission to study the problem and recommend Federal action. I commend the President for his immediate response and for his recognition of the problem. In February 1966, in his transportation message to the Congress, the President announced the appointment of a White House task force to "draft an action program to attack this problem."

As a result of the task force study and report the administration has requested passage of H.R. 3400, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum aircraft noise standards for use in certifying aircraft. Hearings were held on this legislation at the close of the first session of the 90th Congress. In addition I have introduced broader legislation, H.R. 1398, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish regulations on modifications of airports and of aircraft, to reduce noise and to encourage compatible land use planning programs at the local level to create noise buffer zones.

On January 17, 1968, I introduced H.R. 14677, a bill to create an airport-airway trust fund to finance airport development and aircraft noise research through the imposition of new taxes on aircraft fuel and to increase the aircraft passenger tax from 5 to 10 percent.

In testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, I expressed the view that the major obstacle to progress in reducing jet noise was the cost factor. I believe that American industry—the airlines and the aircraft engine manufacturers have the skill and know how to produce a quieter jet engine. This would admittedly be a costly project but it could bring relief—by reducing noise by 10 to 15 percent.

Last year I was advised that at least one or two of the largest aircraft engine manufacturers had already constructed prototypes of a quieter jet engine. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has started a 5-year, $50 million program to develop a prototype. It seems to me that we could accelerate our effort to reduce jet noise by establishing noise standards now—to be applicable at a given date in the future and by making it crystal clear to the airplane manufacturers that unless the specifications are met by that time aircraft will not be certified.

On February 6, 1968, a major battle in the fight to reduce jet noise developed when the Airport Operators Council International withdrew from membership in the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, an industrywide organization formed 9 years ago to combat the jet noise problem.

The Airport Operators Council has supported Federal legislation to attack the noise problem. This organization has been a responsible spokesman for the airport operators. They have helped draw attention to the urgency of the problem by their action this week.

For the information of my colleagues, I place in the RECORD, at this point, the complete text of the release issued by the Airport Operators Council on February 6, 1968:

SAN DIEGO.—A major battle over jet aircraft noise loomed today when the operators of the nation's leading airports broke with the airlines and aircraft manufacturers, charging that efforts of these two segments of the aviation industry "have been largely a smoke screen which prevents solution of the noise problem."

Directors of the Airport Operators Council International, representing airports which handle 86% of the U.S. domestic airline business, in session here voted to withdraw from membership in the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, industry-wide organization which was formed 9 years ago to seek solutions to jet noise.

Terming further membership futile, the airport operators' directors set forth a "positive action" program, embracing the following:

1. an immediate retrofit program for all present jet engines which would lessen noise;

2. urge more money and full speed ahead on the "quiet engine" program now under development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for future families of jet engines;

3. total support for pending Congressional legislation (H.R. 3400 and S. 707) which would authorize Federal standards and controls of jet aircraft noise.

These bills now before Congress would give the Department of Transportation the power to certificate new aircraft for noise standards and to regulate noise in the operation of present day aircraft by retrofitting of jet engines if necessary.

James R. Mettler, President of AOCI, declared, "We of the airport segment of the aviation industry are tired of being the scapegoat for the airlines and manufacturers. As operators of airports, we can exercise no control over types of aircraft being built for the airlines. We have no control over flight patterns or air routes or air schedules.

"In brief, this is a Federal matter and the sooner we achieve the necessary legislation, the sooner the public can be assured of noise relief."

Telegrams concerning the Directors' action were forwarded to Secretary Alan S. Boyd, Department of Transportation; Air Transport Association of America; Aerospace Industries Association and Air Line Pilots Association.

Members of the Board of Directors of AOCI are representatives of the following airports: Boston, Chicago, El Paso, Los Angeles, Miami, Nashville, New Orleans, New York, Omaha, Rockford, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle-Tacoma, Syracuse, Tokyo, Zurich.

Telegram sent to Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

MESSAGE

On behalf of the members of the AOCI, we want you to know how serious airport operators consider the aircraft noise problem and how important we consider the Federal interagency noise abatement program which you head. Accordingly, by action of AOCI board of directors today, we request AOCI representation at all levels of the interagency program structure. As of this date, we have advised NANAC of our withdrawal from that organization.

JAMES R. METTLER,
President, Airport Operators Council International.

Telegram sent to following:

Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

Karl G. Harr, Jr., president, Aerospace Industries Association, Washington, D. C.

Charles H. Ruby, president, Air Line Pilots Association Chicago, Ill.

James F. Byrne, president, American Association of Airport Executives, Boston, Mass.

Lloyd Hinton, executive secretary, National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, Washington, D.C.

MESSAGE

This is to advise that after careful deliberation the general board of directors of AOCI has concluded that AOCI can no longer be a member of NANAC. Absence of positive solutions to aircraft noise problems through the mechanism of NANAC led the board of directors to this decision. We believe that coordination of our respective views on aircraft noise should be continued through normal association channels.

JAMES R. METTLER,
President, Airport Operators Council International.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for congressional action. I had the privilege of conferring with Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd last week and I am convinced that Secretary Boyd understands the problem and the urgency to find ways to reduce the menace of jet noise.

The logical first step is the enactment of H.R. 3400. At the same time we must accelerate our research by coordinating all Government activity so as to prevent duplication of research activities. We must win the fight against noise and pollution of our environment.

I applaud the action of the Airport Operators Council and I anxiously await and look for the same realistic approach to the noise problem from the airlines and engine manufacturers. In the end we can only solve the noise problem by a joint government-private industry effort. The airport operators have shown the way. Now is the time for statesmanship from the airlines and aircraft engine manufacturers. The reduction of jet noise through development and use of quieter jet engines will not be economically or operationally beneficial to the airlines, and they will not cooperate unless the Congress makes it clear that minimum standards will be established and strictly enforced.

Our responsibility is clear. We must act quickly on H.R. 3400 and related noise abatement bills now pending before the 90th Congress.

Firearms Resolution

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a resolution on firearms passed unanimously by the Fish and Game Commission of California, which was carried in the January–February 1968 issue of Outdoor California:

RESOLUTION ON FIREARMS

Whereas, The Constitution of the United States of America guarantees the people of this state and nation the right to bear arms; and

Whereas, California is a sport-minded state, and hundreds of thousands of its citizens possess firearms used for hunting and other recreational purposes; and

Whereas, The consensus of expert opinion is that state and local laws imposing harsh and certain punishment for crimes committed while armed with effective law enforcement and supported by courts and juries, provide the most certain combination for adequate control; and

Whereas, Any federal firearms legislation further restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement on the Bill of Rights, and could impose such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes that it would completely discourage, and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns; and

Whereas, Any such legislation could seriously damage the recreational economy of the state and nation, damage essential wildlife conservation programs and inflict further federal authority on powers reserved to the states; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to refrain from the passage of the Dodd-Celler Bill, or any similar legislation that would further limit the rights of citizens of this country to possess and bear arms; and be it further

Resolved, That any proposed new legislation be carefully studied to determine if it accomplishes a worthwhile purpose and not just result in further curtailment of the legitimate citizen's right to bear firearms and pursue the recreational opportunities offered by this nation; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption thereof, a copy of this resolution shall be furnished the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Passed unanimously.

Vietnam—War or Peace

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, mine is a diverse district, rich in diverse viewpoints on the questions that face the Nation. Mr. Casimir F. Sojka, past county commander, New York County, American Legion, is a constituent of mine. In a recent speech, he eloquently presented the case for American involvement in Vietnam. I insert his remarks in the RECORD to let it be understood that all honest men should be heard on this vital issue:

VIETNAM—WAR OR PEACE

Never in the history of our country have our free people been united, initially at least, in purpose, spirit and will—on the issue of "Peace or War". There has always been a division—a division which was accompanied by heated if not bitter and vitriolic debate. So too today we have the same division.

Not withstanding such initial division, we have always risen on each occasion—became united—for the sole purpose of stopping a juggernaut which sought to envelop the world in a new form of slavery—without rights, hopes or human dignity.

Needless to say, we have never been prepared adequately for War: and upon entry into a conflict, many of our people feared that we would lose the war. Nevertheless, we became united in purpose—in the course of the struggle—because of the moral fiber of our free people, which had been nurtured and developed under a system of freedom and democracy that the world had never before experienced.

In every major conflict—our common purpose had a slightly different name or epithet such as:

"Taxation without representation is tyranny";

"A country divided (half slave and half free) can not survive or long endure";

"The war to save democracy"; and

"The war to end all wars".

It mattered not what the slogan be! We always fought for freedom's cause. And that has been our salvation.

WHAT OF OUR PURPOSE IN VIETNAM

Our purpose in Vietnam—to me—is quite clear; and known to those who wish to see or hear—even though it has been clouded by those who profess good, misinformed eggheads, peaceniks, beatniks and second-guessing politicians who seek self acclaim or aggrandizement.

That clear purpose is simply this: Do we wish to withdraw from south-east Asia and thereby permit billions of human beings to sink and drown in the quick-sand of fear, ignorance, terror and disease—with no opportunity for education, or self-determination, or self-development, or are we, as the leading western power going to help them win the peace and thereafter participate with them in developing the talents of their people—and the vast and untapped natural resources—for the benefit of its peoples and the world. In the same manner as we did in West Germany, Japan, and the Philippines—and recently in Korea.

I sincerely believe that this underlying purpose has been the governing factor which has determined our foreign policy in Southeast Asia, and course of action, not only under the present administration but under the past four administrations.

For, whether we like it or not, or whether we desire to admit it, the course of history during the next century will largely be determined on how well and how wisely we participate in the development of Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America.

And what of our armed forces; based on all reports and observations—from those of the novice to that of the expert—I daresay that our fighting men honestly believe that this underlying purpose is the sole reason for our being in Vietnam. Oddly enough, the greatest paradox of the war in Vietnam is that the morale and courage of the men on the fighting line is higher by far that that of the people safely at home. And our President—with all his woes—together with his administration must continue to fight for the hearts and minds, not of the Vietnamese, but of his own American people. It is a pity that the courage, spirit, understanding, and patience of our fighting men cannot be transmitted by news media or to our living-room television sets with the same alacrity as to the pictures of the innocent civilian men, women and children who suffer and die in Vietnam, only because modern war cannot and never could confine its casualties to the Armed Forces. I do not know why this is so. But I do know that none of us need to be told or shown that War is Hell, and as such was never meant *to be a subject for exposure on a living-room television set.* I believe it encourages the dissenters in our midst. But what is worse, every dissent brings glees and cheers in Hanoi. Ho Chi Minh—the political animal he is—knows how to capitalize on adverse headlines in American papers. Lacking victories he tells his people about the loud cries of the American dissenters. His stated purpose is to fan further opposition to the war in America. I am convinced that Ho Chi Minh believes that he can beat the Americans the same way it is claimed he beat the French—with frustrating newspaper headlines that will make Americans at home want to quit the war. If this is so, you can imagine the field day Hanoi has, when powerful U.S. Senators can be quoted with abandon.

Be that as it may, I wish to come back to our purpose in Vietnam. I ask you as citizen soldiers—who served in our Major Wars—do you for one minute believe that thousands of our fighting men would wade and wallow in the muddy rice paddies or inch their way in and through ominous jungle thickets and over the treacherous mountain passes—*Day In and Day Out*—searching out the enemy—if they were not honestly convinced that they were attempting to save millions of people from annihilation—and especially, a completely helpless people—uneducated and illiterate to the point where they can be molded almost into common beasts of burden: abused and exploited for generations by the War Lords and the old Colonial powers—living for the most part on a starvation diet of rice and strips of meat or fish—and easily terrified by rumors spread by any pagan devil.

Yet for all of that, I have found them to be an industrious people, who crave only what our own forbears sought, an opportunity to work—to till their fields and tend their rice paddies in relative peace—and a hope that they will be able to keep most of the fruits of their labors.

For even today, the masses of people—mainly peasants—keep very little for themselves—as they must continually pay the piper—whether in taxes, tributes, bribes, tithes, or the like. But, who among us is so young or so old that he cannot look back into history, the history of our country and of our Colonial days—and say that their plight is any different than that of our Colonial Farmers, Sharecroppers, Common Laborers, our immigrants and of our Slaves? I say give them the hope of Freedom and the tools, and they will fight for Freedom's cause. You can be sure that the action of our brave soldiers—and the efforts of our pacification program, however slim and slow, are sowing the seeds of that hope. But don't expect miracles over-night of an abused peasantry which has never tasted Freedom or known Self-Government. Just remember that our reforms, social, economic and political, have taken generations to perfect; and our quest for Civil and Human Rights is still going on. The people of Vietnam and we have Korea as a guide and example.

WHAT OF OUR ENTRY INTO VIETNAM

No matter what is now said—our entry into Vietnam has brought about a complete shift in the balance of power away from Red China and in favor of the West. Throughout Southeast Asia, with perhaps the exception of Cambodia, every non-Communist country has turned away from a policy of strict neutrality and accommodation to communist intentions (which I believe was brought about by fear of the specter of a Chinese dominance of all of Asia): and their national leaders, Led by Japan's Prime Minister Sato: Singapore's P. M. Lee Kuen Yew and Malaysia's P. M. Tunku Abdul Rahman, have risked their domestic political fortunes by publicly expressing support for the U.S. position in Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia and even Burma, long in the claws and clutches of Chinese perversion and subversion have all dared to throw the subverters out in wholesale lots, solely prompted I believe by our course of action in Vietnam.

What is particularly significant—something which could not have happened a year ago—most of these Countries have exchanged State visits with the U.S. Who in his wildest dreams, would have believed only a short time ago, when Indonesia's Sukarno was still curring favor with Peking and Moscow, would today be in virtual exile.

If it were not for our commitments in Vietnam, these Countries would not have dared to break away from their firm ties with China: and to actively seek discourse with the U.S. What else could have prompted Thailand to participate with us in stamping out Communist infiltration and subversion in that far away kingdom: and today are preparing more of their troops for action in Vietnam. Our course of action in Vietnam and our supervision of their post-war development has permitted Japan to become the economic, political and industrial giant of the east. I say to you—a year ago, Premier Sato would not have dared to make a State visit to the United States.

ARE WE PROGRESSING—ARE WE WINNING THE WAR

I think it now appears clear that the various phases of our actions in Vietnam were normal developments and not escalation. You will recall that we first entered as advisers. This policy was quickly changed as we found out that you could not advise raw recruits without any training. Then we brought in our troops to bring about a mere holding action, and this too proved unwise and futile. Our next phase was one of limited action which soon proved to be suicidal. For what else might we expect from a policy which prevented our soldiers from shooting unless they were sure that the other person was an enemy Vietcong. You may also recall that this was a frustrating period when our Armies could not move ahead, without first getting approval of the local village and hamlet chiefs as well as that of the leaders in Saigon. During all these periods our Commander-in-Chief and military leaders were forced to take heed of the dissenters and protestors, both at home and abroad, and thus the course and direction of the conflict was governed more by political than military considerations.

Now that our Commander-in-Chief has finally untied the hands of our military to pursue and attack strategic targets, previously off-limits while he still maintains control and direction of the War, most observers believe the end is in sight. The winning of the peace should be our main if not our only concern. I believe the stakes in Vietnam are high. We have within our power the opportunity to bring light and peace to Southeast Asia or to leave it sink into darkness for generations to come.

In all our great wars, our Country's purpose was one of insuring peace to the world. This is our purpose in Vietnam. We have never worried and never asked: is it Europe's war?, or England's or France's? It has always been—as it is today—a war to insure peace, understanding and opportunity to the world. We cannot take such a course in Vietnam without enduring battles such as The Potomac, Gettysburg, Marne, Bulge, Iwo Jima or the Battle for Hill 875. Let us therefore—as citizen soldiers—give undivided support to our Country—our Commander-in-Chief: our Valiant Soldiers: and the Vietnamese battalions which are slowly but surely emerging as a fighting force. General Westmoreland has control over the military and pacification programs, with Special Presidential Assistant Robert W. Komer, deputy in charge of the pacification program and General Creighton W. Abrams, Jr. deputy in charge of developing the Vietnamese Army, and they are working ably as a combined team.

Any one can be a dissenter protesting loudly: but it is "The DO-ERS" who have made our Country great. They have my support. I hope they have yours.

The Medicare Program

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to rectify a serious inequity that now exists in the Medicare program. Thousands of policemen and firemen throughout the country have become ineligible for basic hospitalization benefits under medicare.

Under my bill, any member of a State or local police unit or fire department who is not otherwise covered by the hospitalization provisions of medicare would now be covered and eligible for these benefits. Of course, these firemen and policemen will be required to fulfill the other criteria for medicare; for example, have reached 65 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey alone over 700 policemen and firemen will find themselves ineligible for medicare when they reach 65 this year. The hardships this discrimination places on the retired policeman and fireman and their families are inexcusable and unjustifiable.

Under the present law the only way a policeman or fireman can become entitled to medicare hospitalization is to moonlight at a job now covered by social security. The policy of the Federal Government should not be to encourage policemen and firemen to seek extra work in order to qualify for full medicare benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice pointed up the nationwide need for police and firemen. Yesterday, the President reiterated this growing need in his crime message to the Congress. Police and fire departments throughout the country are seriously undermanned and the strains on the individual members of these departments are already great. The duties these men are charged to perform demand full time and more. One of the most meaningful ways we can encourage and foster excellence in police and fire protection would be by a policy of security in old age and nondiscrimination in the administration of medicare is a long step toward that security. The policy of the Federal Government should be to promote, rather than hinder, the recruitment of young men to fill out the dwindling numbers of qualified applicants for careers in law enforcement and fire departments. These vital public services cannot compete effectively for manpower with the disadvantage of not being able to offer the men the advantage of full medicare benefits upon reaching 65. It is difficult enough attracting qualified men to serve in these arduous and extremely dangerous careers without this added impediment.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hardships that policemen and firemen face each day of their lives and I know the sacrifices they are called on to make. I was raised on a police widow's pension.

The assurance of adequate medical and hospital care, which really go hand in hand in old age, is the very least we owe the men who daily risk their lives to protect us from crime and disaster. I will make every effort to secure passage of this bill at the very earliest possible time and I am urging the Ways and Means Committee to give this measure a priority status.

"Pueblo": Appeasement Hurts

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems not only the American people resent our soft-on-communism policies over the *Pueblo* and Communist terrorism. Now our stanch anti-Communist ally, the South Koreans, who have nearly 50,000 troops assisting us in South Vietnam in a war to curb Communist aggression, doubt our national sincerity in defending the principles we say we believe in.

To our loyal, free friends of the Orient, I can but say we people of the United States would also like to know what is going on and who is making the decisions.

Even the U.S. Senate is unsuccessful in having the pleasure of the U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk explain our objectives and principles in the Orient.

Seems Mr. Rusk gladly appears on television and attends every Communist embassy and consular party for developing international good will, but is too busy to defend his policies to his people or our friends.

Mr. Speaker, I include clippings from the Washington Evening Star for February 7 following my comments:

PROTESTS MADE ON "PUEBLO" POLICY

(By Young H. Lee)

SEOUL.—Resentment among South Koreans to the way in which the United States is dealing with North Korea's seizure of the USS Pueblo and the recent commando raids in the south continued today.

There have been continuous protests at the American Embassy by groups identified as students, teachers, and families of Republic of Korea troops serving in Vietnam against what they call the "appeasement" policy of the U.S.

The attitude of the demonstrators, reflecting that of the government, is that the United States is overly concerned with the fate of the 83 crewmen of the Pueblo and is downgrading in importance the raids by North Korean soldiers.

Demonstrators today shouted, "We denounce the United States attitude that gives more importance to the 83 crewmen than to the 30 million South Koreans."

Seoul newspapers have been particularly critical of the U.S. A leading paper today said:

"The power of a nation is measured not by the size of its territories, its population or its wealth, but to what extent it is or can be resolute in defending the principles in which it believes. We find regrettably the United States is failing to show resoluteness in its attitude toward North Korea in settling the commando raid on Seoul and the hijacking of the Pueblo."

South Korean's one-house parliament unanimously has approved a nine-point resolution authorizing President Chung Hee Park to take necessary military actions against any future North Korean incursions.

Though it was unlikely Korea would withdraw its nearly 50,000 troops from Vietnam, there have been talks among assemblymen to seriously study this possibility.

Government sources disclose that discharges of Korean army personnel have been delayed until the end of the year.

The Korean air force also is considering a call-up of reservists.

U.S. ARMY TROOPS CLASH WITH SEOUL COLLEGIANS

SEOUL—U.S. Army troops clashed today with about 400 demonstrating South Korean college students about a mile below the demilitarized zone. At least 24 students were injured by bullets or rifle butts, the South Korean national police reported.

The GIs from the 2nd U.S. Infantry fired an estimated 20 rounds of warning shots during the two-hour melee on the Freedom Bridge south of the demilitarized zone, the police said.

Nine students were reported in serious condition. None of the soldiers were reported hurt. The injured included several girls, the police said.

Police said the demonstrators were trying to march over the bridge across the Imvin river to the conference site at Panmunjom, where U.S. and North Korean officials met today at an open meeting of the Military Armistice Commission.

The Pueblo was not mentioned at today's open meeting, which touched briefly on the Communist commando raid on Seoul Jan. 21, which the lone Communist raider captured said was aimed at killing President Chung Hee Park.

SENATORS PROD RUSK TO TESTIFY PUBLICLY

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today voted to invite Secretary of State Dean Rusk to defend the government's Vietnam policy in open Senate hearings.

By a vote of 8 to 4, the panel adopted an invitation to Rusk proposed by Sen. Karl Mundt, R-S.D.

The vote came after more than an hour of "pretty hot discussion," as one senator described it.

Rusk has not appeared before the Senate committee publicly to discuss Vietnam for two years.

He has agreed to appear in private, but the committee has wanted to explore the war with him in open sessions.

The bid for Rusk to testify was sent to President Johnson asking him to free the secretary to appear.

The move arose after Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared—at Johnson's direction—on television Sunday to defend war policy.

Mundt, who previously had opposed inviting Rusk to an open session, changed his mind after the Meet the Press show on NBC.

The program, Mundt told reporters today, "is not quite the appropriate body set up under the Constitution for consultation on the problems of the country."

FULBRIGHT OBJECTS ALSO

Yesterday, the committee chairman, J. William Fulbright, criticized the television appearance as a "more or less controlled exhibition," which was "misleading the public to make them believe it was a full and fair inquiry" into war policy.

Today, Fulbright refused to discuss with reporters the committee's action.

Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said the TV appearance "raised questions" in the light of Rusk's refusal to testify openly. But he added that he thought it might be inadvisable to hear Rusk publicly now "because it might increase the divisiveness in the country."

Mansfield, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was on hand for some of this morning's discussion of the new invitation, but did not vote on Mundt's motion.

One Senator who publicly shared Mansfield's doubts about inviting Rusk, George Aiken, R-Vt., said the public appearance by Rusk would only give the "Monday morning quarterbacks" another forum.

"We have a big surplus of Monday morning quarterbacks and an awful shortage of fall-guys," he said.

Mundt told reporters that he favors the government's current policy in Vietnam. But, he said, "the time has come, once and for all, for a clear-cut statement of our objectives there and the essentiality of not being driven out of Vietnam."

Why It Is a Pleasure To Open the Morning Mail

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this body receives a variety of mail each day and it ranges from the useless to the inspiring. It has always been my practice to go through every piece of mail that comes in. More and more lately, and at least once every day, I will find one letter which makes sorting through all the ads and so forth worthwhile.

As an example, this morning I received a letter from a husband and wife in Plymouth, Mich. I will not use their names, but I would like to share their letter. It is one of those letters that makes it even more worth the effort:

DEAR SIR: In your letter printed in "Time" this week, you call yourself a friend of Barry Goldwater—that is why I'm writing you this letter.

My husband and I, Stevenson Democrats that also voted for Kennedy and Johnson as a matter of course, have come to the conclusion that Barry Goldwater is the only Republican that we could vote for. We believe he was smeared and ruined by the press and others in the last presidential campaign. I have seen him on assorted TV programs and he has come across as a man of character, integrity and sincerity—the type of person this country needs in the White House—now.

We would like to see Barry make himself available. We feel there are plenty of people who have second thoughts about him and are wondering why he hasn't spoken up more and who would stand behind him if he chose to run.

My husband and I are not politically involved. We just feel that Barry is the only Republican we could vote for as president. We also feel that unless he takes an active part in the coming campaign, the Republican Party can't win.

He may have his own reasons for not choosing to run and they may be justified—but we wanted him to know there were at least two former Democrats that were for him.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

I think there are probably many people with the same feelings.

One thing is certain. There is major concern for the Nation and people are looking for other solutions and other leaders to provide these solutions. It is good to see people speak out, whatever their concern.

The mail this morning also contained another letter—this one from California but also showing concern that was sincere. Reasons for writing it were the same, a pronounced concern, but the content was different. The writer has established herself as a "committee of one for Nixon in 1968." She enclosed a copy of the "Career Highlights of Richard M. Nixon" with the message that her concern has prompted her to send this information to "persons within her limited reach."

Again, this is the type of concern our Nation needs and the type of letter that makes opening the morning mail worthwhile.

I include it at this point. It may not be a professional job, but nevertheless it is a job well done:

COMMITTEE OF ONE FOR NIXON IN 1968: CAREER HIGHLIGHTS OF RICHARD M. NIXON

Richard Nixon: The Republican John Alden who speaks in praise of every Republican but never for himself.

"Most Useful Vice President in American History." (*Time*, 1958.)

"First to make the Vice Presidency a more notable, more important and more responsible office." (Bill Moyers, Former Aide to President Johnson, Life, September 10, 1965.)

Postponing a developing legal career, Nixon served four years in World War II, rising from Lieutenant J. G. to Commander. He received two Battle Stars and two Citations, one of which read in part: ". . . he displayed sound judgment and initiative . . . he established the efficient liaison which made possible the immediate supply by air of vital material and key personnel."

Nixon's appraisal of the Vietnam War stems partly from his experience in the Pacific War; he is the only Republican candidate with this kind of experience.

After the war, Nixon served two outstanding terms as Congressman during which he exposed Alger Hiss and won re-election in 1948 by winning the Democratic as well as the Republican Primary.

In 1950, Nixon's Senatorial Plurality was the largest in the nation—almost 700,000 votes. His vote getting ability led to his being chosen at 39, as Eisenhower's running mate in 1952.

In 1960, with over 34 million votes, many believe he was deprived of the Presidency by vote frauds in Texas and Illinois. Documentary evidence exists to support this claim. Dr. Raymond Moley and Chicago Tribune News Chief Walter Trohan believe Nixon won. Walter Winchell says he has documentation of "ballot burglary" which will appear in his book, *Private Papers of Walter Winchell.*

Nixon carried 26 states; Kennedy 23.

Nixon rescued the Vice Presidency from "Throttlebottomism" and was the first creative Vice President in U.S. history, pioneering guidelines for missions abroad and making domestic innovations—"firsts" which his successors flatter sincerely by imitation.

As a member of the National Security Council, Nixon participated in crucial decisions. He headed several important committees, giving brilliant account of himself. His conduct during Eisenhower's illnesses was hailed by observers and insured the smooth functioning of the U.S. Government. Eisenhower has stated that Nixon was one of the most industrious, best informed Vice Presidents and that "no other man had such training and experience for the Presidency."

Billy Graham compared Nixon to Churchill in statesmanship. (*God Is My Witness* by Dr. Billy Graham.)

Nixon persuaded many large organizations, among them was Capital Transportation, to adopt integrated employment policies. (*Mandate for Change* by Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

He fought in Congress for civil rights against segregationalists then led by Lyndon Johnson. (Time, 1957.)

In 1959, with decisive intervention, Nixon helped settle the steel strike that had disrupted the nation's economy for months without any Kennedy table-thumping, threats, price rise or stock market panic as occurred in 1962.

Nixon helped arrange shelter in the United States for Hungarian refugees in 1956; he flew personally to Austria to encourage them. In 1959, Nixon dared stand up to Khrushchev and also gave an unprecedented radio-TV address in Moscow, fostering respect among the Russian people for the U.S. viewpoint.

Later when Nixon visited Warsaw, a million Poles overwhelmed him with enthusiasm. He used the occasion to plead for better treatment of Polish Jews. Israel sent a message of "profound gratitude." Yeshiva University awarded him an honorary degree. In 1967, Nixon was the only prominent American to fly to Israel right after the war ended. He visited both the Israeli and the Arab wounded, many of whom showed effusive gratitude, and shouted, "Gott bensch eich" (God bless you).

Nixon's courage in facing the implacable Communist mobs in Caracas won him respect and admiration in Latin America. Ecuador issued a commemorative stamp in honor of his visit. He was the only American Vice President so honored.

In 1959, a few months after Castro's takeover, while President Kennedy was comparing Castro with Simon Bolivar (*Strategy of Peace*), Nixon warned the State Department that Castro was a Communist. Had Nixon's appraisal been heeded, we might have been spared a Communist take-over of Cuba. (Reader's Digest, November, 1964.)

Today, out of office after twenty years of dedicated service, Nixon at 54 is the youngest of the potential candidates. His counsel is wise, vigorous, and geared to the best interests of the United States. His labors in fund-raising and in electing Republicans to office have been crowned with spectacular success.

Ever aware of civic responsibilities, Nixon succeeded Herbert Hoover as head of the Boys' Clubs of America.

His record of *eloquent deeds and simple words* has won him respect and admiration in his Party and in the nation.

Missouri-Pacific Railroad Strike

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, defense related and perishable products—including poultry feeds, ammunitions pallets, and petroleum in various forms—are not moving from producers because of the Missouri-Pacific tie-up. The strike has already worked a great hardship on Arkansas and is getting worse hourly, as illustrated by the following wires:

W. R. Stephens, president and chairman of the board of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., said:

Strongly urge that you take action to settle dispute between Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Missouri Pacific Railroad in order to restore service. We have three large plants in Arkansas curtailed. Request you use the Railroad Labor Act machinery to try to settle the dispute so that these plants can opreate while settlement is made. Unemployment is spreading in Arkansas due to this strike and if the strike is not ended complete shutdown will be required in many manufacturing plants.

Lex Killebrew, executive secretary of the Arkansas Poultry Federation, stated:

Because of tie-up on Mo-Pac Railroad, Poultry Industry in Arkansas in danger. Grain supply shortage at hand this weekend. Producers face real danger to flocks, hens, broilers, turkeys. Help urgently needed.

G. Ted Cameron, president of Mountaire Poultry Co., Inc., said:

Urgently request your help and influence in bringing the strike of the Missouri Pacific Railroad to an immediate end. Impossible to provide feed for poultry and livestock without Rail service.

Kenneth Smith, of the Mulberry Lumber Co., stated:

Missouri Pacific Rail strike has worked a grave hardship on us as pallet manufacturers. We have several government contracts with strict delivery requirements most of which have to be shipped by rail. These pallets are used for shipping ammunition and supplies to Vietnam. At the present time, our warehouse is filled to capacity. If this strike is not settled immediately we will be forced to shut our complete operation down. This being a labor surplus area would mean that a lot of people would be out of work. We strongly urge you to commute on our behalf as well as others and recommend compulsory arbitration be enacted or some similar action be taken to settle this strike.

Paul McHenry, vice president of MacMillan Ring-Free Oil Co., Inc., in El Dorado, said:

Rail strike preventing movement of 400,000 gallons of motor oil this month against government contracts. Urgently request your help in restoring service as soon as possible.

James A. Ward III, of Ward Furniture Manufacturing Co., in Fort Smith, stated:

Our plants are completely surrounded by the Missouri Pacific Railroad and their continual strikes have caused us a lot of expense. If this wild-cat strike continues 3 or 4 days, we will be forced to shut our plants down. Isn't there something that can be done to prevent these situations?

Don H. Flanders, president of Flanders Manufacturing Co., of Fort Smith, said:

Please do everything possible to end Missouri Pacific Railroad wildcat strike. Since Congress has not acted on S.B. 751, we cannot ship by truck, now we cannot ship by rail. Our situation is desperate.

Clift C. Lane of Lane Poultry, at Grannis, stated:

The Poultry Industry in Arkansas is in real danger because of rail stoppage of Missouri Pacific Railroad. Grain supply will be critical by the end of week. Must have rail service to major production areas or face real danger of mass mortality on hens, broilers, and turkeys. Any assistance you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

Some of the serious effects of the above are illustrated in the wire I received yesterday from Arkansas' Governor, Winthrop Rockefeller. Governor Rockefeller said:

A continued strike and interruption of service on the Missouri Pacific Railroad will result in a devastating impact upon the economy of Arkansas. As Governor of Arkansas, I urge you to appoint an Emergency Board in an effort to compose the differences between the striking employees and the Railroad Management as contemplated the procedures established under the Railway Labor Act. It is in the public interest that you take this action as quickly as possible in order that railroad service affecting the health and economic welfare of the people of Arkansas may be restored. Original message sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Treatment of Narcotics Addicts and Alcoholics

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Johnson sent to the Congress for our consideration his message on crime.

Along with other proposals he made for reducing crime in the Nation, he made several proposals to socially rehabilitate narcotics addicts and alcoholics. Given the serious problems posed by both these groups, I consider it very important that my colleagues have an opportunity to study the proposals in depth. I have asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would administer the proposed programs, to develop fact sheets for my use, and now insert them in the RECORD so they may be studied by all Members of Congress:

ALCOHOLISM

BACKGROUND

Alcoholism is a major health problem in the United States that affects millions of persons directly or indirectly. Currently, the majority of helping agencies—medical, psychiatric and others—do not pay adequate attention to the needs of patients with drinking problems. Action is needed to overcome neglect of this very large number of sick persons.

A special problem requiring rapid action is posed by the increasing number of court decisions which preclude the jailing of chronic alcoholics for the offense of public drunkenness. Arrests for public drunkenness constitute the single largest category of arrests in the United States. Many of these individuals are chronic alcoholics who require a wide range of medical and other services. At present most communities have no adequate services for these homeless individuals.

PROPOSAL

The Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to provide special funds for the treatment and prevention of alcoholism. Under these amendments community mental health centers would be eligible to receive grants for the construction, acquisition, staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities for treatment, prevention and control of alcoholism and rehabilitation of persons with alcoholism and alcoholism-related problems. Without such incentives, few communities will be able to develop the comprehensive network of services that are required to deal with alcoholism.

It is also proposed that the Community Mental Health Centers Act be amended to assist communities in developing services for homeless alcoholics even in the absence of community mental health centers. Services for homeless alcoholics need to be closely coordinated with other community programs—medical, psychiatric, social service, rehabilitation, etc. Funds for the establishment, staffing, operation, and maintenance of specialized residential and other facilities for homeless alcoholics would be made available to communities. The grants for staffing, maintenance, and operation would be for a longer period and carry a higher Federal share than the regular Community Mental Health Centers program. Whenever possible, these facilities for homeless alcoholics would be integral parts of community mental health centers. However, because of the urgency to develop alternatives to the legal-criminal management of chronic alcoholics, communities not yet having developed a community mental health center would also be eligible for grants under this program.

NARCOTIC ADDICTION

BACKGROUND

In 1966 Congress passed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act in an attempt to substantially increase the number of addicts rehabilitated and returned to useful places in our society. Part of this legislation consists of a program of financial assistance to States and communities for the treatment of addicts following their release from hospitals.

This critical phase of aftercare for the addict is best carried out in the community in which he resides. The prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation activities related to narcotic abuse should be incorporated into community mental health centers to get the most out of existing resources, especially manpower. The integration of the addiction treatment facility in the Center would allow staff members to involve themselves in the addiction treatment process without being cut off from the mainstream of mental health.

PROPOSAL

The section of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act dealing with financial assistance to States and communities for aftercare programs would be allowed to expire on June 30, 1968. The Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to add a new section providing for project grants for specialized programs relating to prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addiction. These project grants would include funds for construction, staffing, operation, maintenance, and training of professionals for community services for treatment of narcotic addicts. Additionally, funds would be available for developing specialized training programs or materials relating to the prevention of narcotic addiction, including education of high-risk groups, provision of Public Health services for the treatment of narcotic addiction, development of inservice training with respect to provision of such services, and conducting surveys to evaluate the adequacy of the programs for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

Congressional Medal of Honor

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I attended a ceremony at the Pentagon in the Office of the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Stanley Resor. The occasion was the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Sgt. Donald Russell Long, U.S. Army, of Blackfork, Lawrence County, Ohio.

I wish to honor this brave and dedicated young man who has given his life in service to the United States of America, and to include in this public RECORD the citation which acompanied the award:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to Sergeant Donald R. Long, United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On 30 June 1966, Troops B and C, 1st Squadron, 4th Cavalry, while conducting a reconnaissance mission along a road in the Republic of Vietnam, were suddenly attacked by a Viet Cong regiment, supported by mortars, recoilless rifles and machine guns, from concealed positions astride the road. Sergeant Long abandoned the relative safety of his armored personnel carrier and braved a withering hail of enemy fire to carry wounded men to evacuation helicopters. As the Platoon fought its way forward to resupply advanced elements, Sergeant Long repeatedly exposed himself to enemy fire at point blank range to provide the needed supplies. While assaluting the Viet Cong positions, Sergeant Long inspired his comrades by fearlessly standing unprotected to repel the enemy with rifle fire and grenades as they attempted to mount his carrier. When the enemy threatened to overrun a disabled carrier nearby, Sergeant Long again disregarded his own safety to help the severely wounded crew to safety. As he was handing arms to the less seriously wounded and reorganizing them to press the attack, an enemy grenade was hurled onto to the carrier deck. Immediately recognizing the imminent danger, he instinctively shouted a warning to the crew and pushed to safety one man who had not heard his warning over the roar of battle. Realizing that these actions would not fully protect the exposed crewmen from the deadly explosion, he threw himself over the grenade to absorb the blast and thereby saved the lives of eight of his comrades at the expense of his own life. Throughout the battle, Sergeant Long's extraordinary heroism, courage and supreme devotion to his men were in the finest traditions of the military service, and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Closing the Travel Gap Constructively

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, since New Year's Day a great deal of attention has been focused on the so-called "travel gap," the balance-of-payments deficit which results from Americans spending more dollars in the course of travel abroad than foreign visitors spend in this country. Estimates of the width of this gap in the past year vary tremendously, from about $300 million to perhaps $2 billion.

The administration has proposed to close this gap by clamping curbs on Americans' spending or travel abroad. In my judgment, it would be far more constructive, and far more in keeping with our national traditions of freedom of movement and international communication, to bridge the gap by encouraging more Europeans to visit the United States.

One imaginative way to promote tourism in this country has been advanced by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. He has introduced legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, to establish a system of "travel stamps" to cover part of the cost of travel in the United States for Europeans visiting our shores for the first time. The stamps would be funded jointly by the Government and participating private firms, including carriers, hotels, and motels. This legislation has been endorsed by the American travel industry and I hope that it will receive prompt consideration by the House.

To acquaint our colleagues with this creative initiative, I include in the RECORD today an article on the subject by Mr. REUSS, which appeared in the New York Times on January 20. I would also like to call to the attention of the Congress an article from the Times of January 26, which summarizes the significant position in opposition to travel curbs taken last week by the directors of Discover America, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation established by the Congress 2½ years ago specifically to promote tourism in the United States. The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1968]

TOPICS: A PLAN TO SEE AMERICA—AND EUROPE, TOO—FIRST

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

The President is properly trying to bring under control our balance of payments, including the tourist account. But trying to achieve the needed improvement in the tourist ledger by keeping as many as a million Americans at home who otherwise might visit Europe looks at the problem from the wrong end.

Restricting the freedom of travel of Americans is an odious form of intervention, particularly for a country that talks about "opening windows." It is administratively very difficult, leading to Prohibition-era types of evasion. It may well fall hardest on the student and moderate-income traveler. And it almost inevitably leads to retaliation, official or private.

BRINGING EUROPEANS HERE

Fortunately, it is not too late to switch our signals and accentuate the positive in tourism: Forget about a "head tax" on American tourists to Europe and instead attract to America in 1968—and if needed thereafter—an additional half-million to one million Europeans. This would achieve the same benefits for our balance of payments, but would do so by expansion rather than by restriction.

Since 1961, the United States Travel Service, through its package tours, its offices in leading European cities, its programs to see American homes, industry and scenery, has expanded European travel to this country to 600,000–700,000 annually.

With tens of millions of affluent Europeans now flooding Spain, France, Italy, Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe it would be no great trick to lure an extra one-half million to one million tourists to this country. But how?

We could do it, I believe, if we started now to package tours to the United States in which the bait was a once-in-a-lifetime $100 travel stamp booklet, free to every first-time European traveler to the United States, and spendable in all participating United States air, rail, bus and car rental carriers, hotels and motels. Properly advertised, it could attract the additional Europeans we need, since it would constitute a gift of some 20 per cent of their average expenditures on United States travel.

The American travel industry, meeting in New York on Jan. 9, endorsed the travel stamp proposal. A participating United States business would meet half the travel cost, the United States Treasury the other half.

I estimate the cost of the United States subsidy at $40 million—surely not out of line with the billions we are spending for the supersonic transport with no balance-of-payments payoff until 1975, or with the $200 million the President has requested to promote United States exports.

A SMALL SUBSIDY

Indeed, the budgetary cost need be nothing; the extra $250 million to be spent here by 500,000 additional European tourists (all a plus for our balance of payments, incidentally) would generate some $750 million of gross national product, which in turn would yield the Treasury an extra $75 million in revenues.

The proposed tourist incentive stamp could not possibly be offensive to Europeans. It violates no commitments in the GATT, or anywhere else. It closely resembles the "Eurail Pass" by which European countries grant substantial discounts on their government-owned railroads to Western Hemisphere tourists in Europe.

AID TO ECONOMY

Incidentally, the tourist-stamp proposal could improve business and reduce hard-core joblessness here without causing inflationary pressures. The $250-million infusion of European travel spending into the American economy will fall not upon overtaxed United States resources but upon the transportation, hotel and restaurant industry, all of which now have much under used capacity. The proposal would increase jobs, particularly in transportation, hotels and restaurants, for unskilled and semiskilled workers.

The President's task force, under Ambassador Robert McKinney, is now considering the proposal. If adopted, it could give our balance of payments the maximum of improvement with the minimum of tears.

Representative Reuss, Democrat from Wisconsin, is chairman of the International Finance subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

DISCOVER AMERICA, TRAVEL GROUP, WILL OPPOSE PLAN TO TAX TOURISM

(By Paul Friedlander)

SAN JUAN, P.R., January 25.—The directors of Discover America, Inc., a private enterprise nonprofit organization set up 2½ years ago by Congress, voted here today to oppose a travel tax or any other type of restriction on the free movement of Americans at home or abroad.

Following the directors' quarterly meeting, Robert E. Short, national chairman, announced that a formal statement of the Discover America position on the travel restrictions proposed by the Johnson Administration to support the dollar during its present state of imbalance would be presented to President Johnson, probably next week.

Discover America, Mr. Short said, "believes in the right of the individual to travel freely where he would, in the complete freedom to travel for anyone no matter where he lives in the world."

ADVICE TO PRESIDENT

Copies of the resolution being directed to the President will go also, he said, to Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler and Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who has been reported as having been entrusted by the Administration with the drafting of a travel restriction bill.

Mr. Short said the directors were eager to advise the President of their position on the travel restriction proposal since "we know he will understand our position; it was his position when he appointed me chairman of Discover America and I know it is still his position."

The directors' view, he said, is "that we should forget terms of restriction and marshal all forces of Government and industry into a hard-sell campaign aimed at our own people and at foreign visitors."

HARDLY PAYS CARFARE

The Discover America directors, Mr. Short said, prefer a positive approach to the dollar situation and the so-called travel deficit. He said "we never have recognized the deficit as really as great as other people would have us believe."

Discover America, Inc., operates on a $500,000 annual budget raised from membership of hotels, car rental companies, the Air Transport Association of America, automobile and aircraft and tire manufacturers' associations, the American Petroleum Institute and many individual units of the travel industry.

Mr. Short said the directors endorsed a major increase in the $3-million budget of the United States Travel Service, a unit of the Commerce Department and an expansion of its staff.

"Its present budget hardly pays the carfare of its overseas offices," he said. "It should have the kind of staff that it takes to sell this country properly abroad, and the budget to merchandise it."

These positive steps for promoting foreign travel to the United States were reported to the directors' meeting:

In April, a group of 25 to 30 managers of convention bureaus of American cities will tour Europe to meet with officials of organizations that hold conventions, seeking to persuade them to bring their meetings to the United States and Puerto Rico. Their "hard sell" tour, Mr. Short said, will be aided financially by Discover America.

Members of the Air Transport Association, which includes American-flag airlines that fly overseas and domestically, will meet next week to consider a program of jointly sponsored advertising and promotion campaigns trying to sell the idea of travel to this country.

The firm opposition of Discover America to the Administration proposals to tax and restrict travel abroad was said to be the first formal declaration of opposition made public by such a large segment of private industry. Some board members believed their resolution would be especially effective in Washington because Discover America was established originally during another period of dollar weakness for the purpose of promoting more travel within and into the United States.

Mental Health

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the field of mental health is one in which you will find the most dedicated, energetic workers imaginable. And in light of the problems and hardships faced in this area—it is a good thing.

Recently, I had occasion to participate in several mental health activities in Austin. In early January, I spoke at the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the new Mental Health-Mental Retardation Community Center in Austin. Again, at the University of Texas, I met with people working to educate professional staffers for these centers.

I feel that the progress these people have made under the relatively new Federal-aid program is monumental. And now, in light of President Johnson's latest proposal, we see that they will be called on to extend their work to new but related fields.

The President has proposed important legislation providing for facilities for the treatment of narcotic addicts and alcoholics as part of the community mental health centers program.

Professional consensus supports the integration of treatment programs for addicts and alcoholics into community mental health centers. The reasons are plain. Addiction and alcoholism are associated with emotional problems and therefore are said to be best treated by mental health professionals. Addiction and alcoholism also require a broad range of treatment services. These centers have this range—inpatient and outpatient, day or night care hospitalization, emergency services, along with consultation and education with other agencies likely to have contact with addicts and alcoholics. Coordination of these services by a single agency permits the staff to design treatment appropriate for individual patients needs. The patients can also be followed into the community with long-range rehabilitative support of the kind that is essential to reduce the high rate of relapse originally characteristic of addicts and alcoholics.

It makes little sense to begin now to build a new network of facilities devoted solely to treatment of addicts and alcoholics. More than 250 community mental health centers are in operation or being developed. They have the staff, the knowledge, and facilities to provide these new treatment facilities.

These amendents are, in effect, a move against fragmentation of what are essentially mental health programs.

Toward a More Peaceful World

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have received the President's special message on foreign aid.

In his message the President has wisely observed that "a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—does more to build the peace and guard America from harm than all the guns and bombs." This is a vitally important observation, and one, unfortunately, which has not yet been learned well.

Every 5 minutes somewhere in the world, 35 people, most of them children, die of starvation. These people live in countries which need foreign assistance to help them preserve the very lives of their people. It is quite clear that, as the President has said in his message, foreign aid "is a commitment to conscience as well as country."

My regret, on receiving the President's message, is that he has not asked for a larger amount. I hope that on reflection this body will decide to provide more foreign economic assistance.

The problems of world poverty, of hunger, population, disease, illiteracy are so great that I am fearful that even with several times the present effort they may not be solvable. But we must try—with more resolve and commitment than we have shown up until now.

There are three other points in the Presidential message to which I would like to give special mention.

First, the President has in several instances dealt with the world food and population crisis.

Starvation is a problem now. But unless massive and concerted efforts are made to curb the world population and to improve the world food supply, millions of people will die of starvation in the coming decades. This is a very real and dreadful prospect. It is not reality today, but if we wait until it is reality, it will be too late to do anything about it. The Reverend Malthus has not yet been disproved.

I am encouraged by the efforts which we are planning to take to help avert this disastrous prospect. While they are not sufficient in themselves, they are an important step in the right direction.

I am pleased that the message reiterates our priority commitment to help develop agriculture in the less developed countries.

These are vital efforts, they must be carried out.

In the message, it is clearly recognized that we in the Congress have placed limitations on the use or diversion of American aid for the purchase of weapons by less developed countries.

The President has restated American policy on this subject when he said:

> Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures.

And I would add the caveat that we must enforce very rigidly our condition that we provide assistance to countries only if they prove their military expenditures are for "legitimate defense and internal security needs."

Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign aid message pledges this country to move in the right direction. We should see to it that the full measure of economic assistance requested is provided.

Television Network Practices

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15267, which I have introduced with Congressman Moss and Congressman OTTINGER, draws upon years of study by the Congress and Federal Communications Commission into television network practices and upon legislation previously introduced by distinguished Members of both Houses.

The first comprehensive inquiry into this subject occurred from 1938 to 1940 and resulted in the adoption of chain broadcasting rules in 1943. See 6 F.R. 2282, 5257; 8 F.R. 7355, 8355; 14 F.R. 179; 12 R.R. 1537; 19 R.R. 1501; 20 R.R. 1568, and 25 R.R. 1651. But, these rules were intended merely to govern certain contractual relationships between networks and thier affiliated stations and, significantly as limiting, were promulgated with only radio broadcasting in mind. They were not designed to bring networking, as now practiced, directly into the regulatory fold. They were directed toward, and are enforceable against, licensees rather than network companies. Quite clearly, they have little prophylactic value for the broad domestic and international scope of present-day television network operations.

When these chain broadcasting rules were issued the majority of the Commission felt that—

> They will tend to decentralize the tremendous power over what the public may hear which is now lodged in the major network organizations, and will remove existing restraints upon competition without intefering unduly with the operations of the network organizations. (Supplemental Report on Chain Broadcasting, p. 16, October, 1941.)

However, they stated that if this regulatory trial did not produce results, other action should be taken:

> If the industry cannot go forward on a competitive basis, if the substantial restraints upon competition which we seek to eliminate are indispensable to the industry, then we must frankly concede that broadcasting is not properly a competitive industry. If this be the case, we recommend that the Congress should amend the Communications Act to authorize and direct regulations appropriate to a noncompetitive industry with adequate safeguards to protect listeners, advertisers, and the consumers. (Report on Chain Broadcasting, pp. 88–89.)

Unfortunately, despite their proven inadequacy, these regulations, and the licensing power of the Commission over individual stations owned by the networks, are all that protect the public interest from abuse by these multi-billion-dollar communications cartels.

In 1955, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 112, which authorized a study to determine whether the radio and television networks impeded the development of a nationwide competitive system of broadcasting. Upon its termination in 1957, a report was submitted by the special staff, headed by Mr. Roscoe L. Barrow, to the Congress and printed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Report No. 1297, 85th Congress, second session. Two of the conclusions from this comprehensive 700-page report are particularly noteworthy here:

> An important Commission policy impinged upon by network stricture and practices is that of making the station licensee responsible for broadcasting in the public interest. As has been seen, stations are highly dependent on the network program service, and the network affiliate carries a large schedule of network programs. The networks through their use of the contractual right of option time, and through other practices, have persuaded affiliated stations to accept a larger schedule of network programs than they would otherwise be disposed to carry. In this way, network practices have, to some extent, restricted the programming responsibility of the station licensee and limited the licensee's opportunities to program according to the specific needs of his local community. They have also curtailed the availability of alternative program sources to the station and thus to the public which it serves." (p. 664)
>
> Another statutory and Commission policy directly affected by networking is that of preserving effective competition in broadcasting. Networks have a high concentration of control over important facets of the television industry. The principal factors accounting for the high concentration of control by networks are the shortage of competitive station facilities in the VHF spectrum and the economic advantages to networks and stations inherent in the affiliation rela-

tionship. Despite the very high network profits of CBS and NBC, there is little prospect for the immediate entry of a fourth network. While the three existing networks compete among themselves in many areas, the small number of networks and the formidable barriers to new network entry are limitations on the effectiveness of competition at the network level. The encouragement of greater competition between networks and national spot telecasting, therefore, hold out the principal hope of providing more effective competition in the public interest. However, a number of network practices have served to restrain competition between network and national spot advertising, and to place the station representatives, program suppliers and advertisers using national spot at a competitive disadvantage. These practices, in combination, have restrained competition between networking and the national spot system to a significant degree. (p. 664)

In 1956 Senator John W. Bricker submitted a report to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—The Network Monopoly, 84th Congress, second session—in which he stated:

> Two networks—Columbia Broadcasting System and National Broadcasting Co.—have an unprecedented economic stranglehold on the Nation's television industry. Effective competition is stifled under this yoke of economic dominance. The result is a private monopoly. This conclusion, though startling, is in no degree speculative. It is based on incontrovertible evidence in the form of heretofore confidential financial data furnished the Congress at the express direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As a result of his study he introduced S. 825 on January 28, 1955, to authorize the FCC to establish rules and regulations with respect to networks and their activities.

During 1956 the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also made an exhaustive study of television network practices—The Television Inquiry, Television Network Practices, adopted July 8, 1957, page 99. This report pointed out the anticompetitive aspects of network film syndication activities and network acquisition of interests in independently produced programs. More important, it emphasized the unfortunate anomaly afflicting the broadcasting industry: "So despite the fact that television networks are the most powerful and significant factor in the broadcasting industry, all Government regulations directod toward controlling their operations are couched in terms of prohibitions against action by individual stations—pages 2 and 3.

That same year, hearings were also held before the House Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on "Monopoly Problems in Regulated Industries." Pertinent to this review was a colloquy between Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS and the committee's chairman:

> The Chairman. The FCC adopted rules back in 1941 concerning radio chain broadcasting and those rules were approved by the Supreme Court, which said the FCC had the right to issue those rules. Presently the FCC regulates stations, is that correct?
>
> Mr. Stanton. Yes, that is correct.
>
> The Chairman. And the FCC does not regulate the networks?
>
> Mr. Stanton. Not directly, sir.
>
> The Chairman. They only do it by virtue of their regulation of the stations?
>
> Mr. Stanton. That is correct.
>
> The Chairman. In other words there is indirect regulation by virtue of Commission jurisdiction over stations, but there is no direct regulatroy jurisdiction over networks?
>
> Mr. Stanton. As I understand it, that is a correct statement of the situation.
>
> The Chairman. Now, I would like to ask you this, and you do not have to answer if you do not wish: Would you be averse to having the Federal Communications Commission regulate directly in the way that they now regulate indirectly; that is, have direct regulatory jurisdiction over networks?
>
> Mr. Stanton. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would make sense if that were what the regulation was intended to accomplish. So as not to look as if I am on both sides of the issue, I have opposed network regulation when it was nonspecified, because I feared program control and certain other features that might be introduced into such regulation, but if you are asking me, as I understood your question, would I prefer to have what I have now got, directly as against indirectly, my answer is in the affirmative.
>
> The Chairman. In other words, you would rather see direct regulation concerning what you have now got rather than indirect regulation?
>
> Mr. Stanton. Yes, I think it is a less complicated way to live, because we get our regulation now only as it affects our affiliates and our company-owned stations, whereas if the same regulations were applied directly to us, I think it would be a more businesslike and systematic way to handle the situation. But, it is the blank check kind of regulation that troubles me, and that is the reason I opposed it.
>
> The Chairman. Now, just one more question: If it is found by the Federal Communications Commission that they just cannot change their regulations to conform to what you desire, you would not be averse to changing the statute to give them the power?
>
> Mr. Stanton. No.
>
> Mr. Keating. You had better talk that over with the lawyers first.
>
> Mr. Stanton. I wanted to say just that, Mr. Keating, but if you look through to the end of what the net result is, I think it is better to have the regulations direct than to have them indirect, and I stand by that.
>
> The Chairman. Well, I think it is a natural inference to state that if the Federal Communications cannot do that, but needs changes in the statute, it would seem advisable to make the changes to give them the power. (*Monopoly Problems in Regulated Industries*, Part 2—Vol. 3, *Television*, Hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1956, pp. 5029–5030.)

In February 1959, the staff of the Commission's Office of Network Study was directed to make a detailed examination of the network television program process. This subject had not been within the purview of the earlier Barrow investigations. Over a 3-year period more than 200 witnesses were heard and 11,000 pages of transcript recorded in public hearings in Washington, New York, and Los Angeles. As a result of the early phases of this program inquiry, the Chief of the Office of Network Study submitted two interim reports to the Commission—House Report No. 281, 88th Congress first session, May 8, 1963. Reference to a few of their observations will underscore the network problem:

> . . . Deference to the need of advertisers to conform broadcast programming to their marketing requirements and commercial objectives remains an accepted business practice in network program selection. (P. 58)
>
> . . . The station licensee plays little or no part in the production or selection process. . . . His responsibility to bring his influence directly to bear upon all who "have a hand" in programming his station has been replaced by "practical reliance" on the skill, judgment and integrity of the managers of his network. (P. 58)
>
> . . . As network television is presently operated it is difficult to say who is responsible for what in network entertainment programming. However, it is entirely clear that the notion that actual responsibility for network programs is excercised at the station level is pure sophism. Licensee-affiliates have as a practical matter, delegated responsibility for program creation, production and selection to networks . . . (p. 59)
>
> . . . The overall effect of the development of network television as a national advertising medium and the growth of the policies and practices which have accompanied it has been to render largely impractical the original system of local autonomy devised by Congress. (P. 59)
>
> . . . Each network engages in film syndication and foreign sales, and many of the programs which are currently offered for sale by them derive from their own networks. The net result appears to be that the networks may have strong economic motives to choose for network exhibition and thus to popularize those film series in which they have a right to share in the subsequent and continuing value thus created and enhanced. (P. 76)
>
> . . . A number of witnesses . . . expressed the view that because of the policies and practices of the networks outlined above, much of the diversity in program schedules has disappeared, and the opportunity to attract and develop creative artists and other skills necessary to the continued advance of the medium has largely been dissipated. (P. 87)
>
> . . . Television licensees play only a minor role, if indeed, they play any significant part at all, as decisional factors in the network program procurement process. (P. 96)
>
> . . . Networks produce, own, and control almost without exception, all of the news and public affairs programs which are included in their schedules. (P. 99)
>
> . . . As a practical matter the market for independently produced network programs tends to be composed of the managers of the three national television networks. (P. 99)
>
> . . . Few television licensees, save for multiple owners in the largest markets can afford to produce any considerable part of the programming broadcast through their facilities. They must rely on syndicated programs for much of that part of their schedule which is not network originated. This includes both films originally produced for television and various types of film produced for motion picture theatrical exhibition . . . network companies through their syndication, affiliates or division, compete with independent entrepreneurs to market syndicated programs to be exhibited in available broadcast time on local stations already committed by contract as affiliates to the same network or another network. (P. 102, 103)

In addition to network program ownership and syndication restrictions, recommended for those areas of network policy and practice noted above, the network study staff also urged that congressional authority be given the Commission to do the following: (a) To require networks to exercise supervision and control over the preparation of and to prohibit disciminatory practices in the selection of all matter supplied by such network to any licensee for broadcasting; (b) to prohibit networks from entering into a contract or undertaking with any broadcast licensee which would limit the ability of such licensee to operate his station in the public interest, including, without limitation, provisions relating to exclusive affiliation or territorial exclusivity arrangements; (f) to limit network practices or activities in the representation of stations in the sale of nonnetwork time; (g) to require networks to make reasonable distribution of their programs to stations; (h) to prohibit discriminatory practices by networks in the selection of affiliates; (i) to require networks to provide equal opportunities to legally qualified candidates in accord with the provision of section 315 of the act—page 109.

During 1959 and 1960 the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight conducted hearing into "the rigging of quiz shows on national television hookups and the surreptitious placing of plugs by advertisers on national radio and television programs"—House Report No. 1258, 86th Congress, second session, at pages 7 and 13. The report stated that "these hearings—referring at this point to the rigged quiz shows—demonstrated beyond dispute that imposition of legal responsibility upon the individual licensee for the quality and balance of program content and its freedom from deception has not worked and is not likely to work in the future.

The concept that the airwaves must be used in the public interest requires that definite responsibility should be imposed not only upon the individual licensee but upon the networks, advertisers, advertising agencies, and producers. Guidelines should be furnished by Congress—page 16.

During the quiz hearings in October 1959, the subcommittee staff stated that it was impressed with testimony of former Chairman Doerfer of the FCC that networks should be licensed. Mr. Doerfer stated that:

> I am inclined very much to consider very carefully the licensing of networks, indeed . . . I think that where we cannot reach network practices through our power over the licensee, certainly it calls for the licensing of the network. (See Memorandum of Robert W. Lishman, Chief Counsel to the Subcommittee, dated July 28, 1960, directed to Chairman Harris, Congressional Record, vol. 106, pt. 14, beginning on p. 18361.)

The subcommittee staff were also impressed with the suggestion made by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Rogers, in his report to the President on "Deceptive Practices in Broadcasting Media," that: "legislation could be enacted which would place direct regulatory authority over the networks in the FCC"—report of December 30, 1959.

Amendments to the Communications Act were enacted to correct the specific abuses revealed by the above-mentioned oversight hearings. In addition, Congressman Bennett, of Michigan, introduced a bill to regulate the networks—H.R. 7003, 87th Congress, first session, May 11, 1961—as did Congressman Harris—H.R. 1164, 87th Congress, first session, January 3, 1961. Mr. Harris' amendment to the Communications Act sought to license the networks while Mr. Bennett's would have accomplished this result through legislative authorization for rules and regulations.

The Commission had the following comment on these bills:

> . . . the Commission's continuing studies and consideration have brought it to the view that the present statutory pattern, which places the entire responsibility for broadcast matter on individual station licensees, has been so affected by the realities of network broadcasting that it is no longer adequate to provide reasonable assurance that the airwaves will be used in the public interest solely through regulations of station licensees. Because of this, and other practices evident in network operation, the Commission is in accord with the objective of these two bills to permit the regulation of those network policies, practices, and activities which directly affect the ability of station licensees to operate their stations in the public interest. (P. 7. H. Report 281).

The Commission suggested a substitute for these bills, which was introduced by Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Communications Subcommittee on August 10, 1961—S. 2400, 87th Congress, first session. H.R. 15267 embodies most of the provisions of the Bricker, Harris, Bennett, and Pastore bills but, as discussed below, extends beyond them.

On July 2, 1965 the Office of Network Study submitted Part II of the Second Interim Report to the Commission. It covered in detail the testimony, documentary evidence, information and data contained in the record of the program inquiry—FCC docket No. 12780—which supported the conclusions and suggestions for Commission action contained in part I of the report.

H.R. 15267 embodies the ideals pronounced in the extensive legislative history and concern over network regulation since the late 1930's. It would subject networks to the same regulatory standards as individual stations licensees, and authorizes the Commission to promulgate rules and regulations to insure that network operations will be in the public interest.

Against the backdrop of this discussion, most of the prohibitions are self-explanatory. However, a few need further elucidation.

Section 341(11) of H.R. 15267 would prohibit television networks from engaging in any other business enterprise, with the exception of individual station ownership. This restriction also covers persons controlling, controlled by or under common control with such network. This provision was designed to prevent those who are granted the free privilege of using public domain from engaging in enterprises which conflict with their fiduciary commitment and responsibilities to the public and which would attenuate their fullest efforts and energies which they pledged to the public interest. It effectively precludes anticompetitive activities which often evolve from interlocking management and prevents vertical concentration of control which has proven so harmful to our system of broadcasting diversity. Further, it banishes from possibility the ever-present fear that all communications avenues to the American home could be directed by any small handful of individuals, whatever their motives.

Section 341(12) would take the networks out of the syndication business. A separate enterprise, this lucrative program marketing method, has virtually put most affiliate and independent stations at the complete mercy of the networks and cut licensees off from sources of information and entertainment which would otherwise be available to them. As engaged in by the networks, syndication has also dried up huge reservoirs of production and performing talent in this country and frustrated into extinction the creative idea as a means of electronic expression.

Section 341(13) would extend the recommendations of the Office of Network Study in prohibiting all network owned programs from network presentation. That staff had suggested a 50-percent ownership limitation and none in the news and public affairs area. However, their proposal was made prior to the networks acquiring, in any substantial amounts, ownership interests in major film companies. By virtue of this later occurrence, a much larger percentage of network shows are now produced and owned by them. Whereas a 50-percent ownership ceiling was reasonable in light of prior modus operandi in film production, such a figure today is an unrealistic restraint objective.

International Conference on Trade and Development

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today four articles from leading U.S. newspapers. These articles focus attention on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—presently being held in New Delhi, India. Basically, this United Nations Conference has acted as a forum between the less developed countries—LDC's—and the industrialized nations. Issues presently being discussed are varied and complex, including the shrinking flow of AID funds, the growing economic gap between the "rich" and "poor" nations, and preferential trade treatment for products manufactured in the LDC's.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Committee on Foreign Affairs, I can attest to my fellow colleagues in the House the importance of this Conference. As one of the authors noted, bridging the economic gap between the "rich" and "poor" nations will remain one of the central foreign policy problems facing the United States in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend these four articles to all House Members who have an abiding concern for long-range U.S. foreign policy commitments:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 1, 1968]

CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT: TIME RUNNING OUT ON POVERTY SOLUTION

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Radical new ideas for closing the gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world are circulating in the upper atmosphere of economic thought.

The question is, though, can they be condensed and brought down to earth in time to solve the major problems of national poverty?

For time is running out.

It is a question that will receive at least a partial answer at the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development being held in New Delhi from Feb. 1 to March 25.

FINANCIAL PROBLEM

The first conference was held in Geneva in 1964. It debated the potentialities of world trade as a means of promoting economic development. It sought to make adjustments to the existing system of trade and aid.

This second conference will be very different. Its aim is to change the system.

In this sence UNCTAD Two can be rated as a conference without precedent. Some 1,400 representatives of 132 countries and 47 international and national agencies will be engaged in the task. The whole world is looking for the answer.

The challenge by now is well enough understood. It finds expression in a calculation like this: By the year 2000 each person in the farm population of the developed countries will have 20 times as much land as the average person on the farms of the developing countries. Compared with people in the Far East, farmers in the rich countries will have 50 times as much. And their land will, of course, be far more productive.

Then there is the problem of finance. To ensure their economic growth the poor must have foreign exchange. Otherwise balance-of-payments problems cause them to put the brake on expansion just as those same problems do any other country—even the richest like the United States and Great Britain.

But for the poor countries it is much, much worse.

Only 20 percent of their foreign exchange comes in the form of aid or investments. Eighty percent comes from their trade. But the terms of trade have been moving against them. The proportion of their trade in world trade has been falling. Their international indebtedness has risen from $10 billion to more than $40 billion. The burden of interest payments has quadrupled, too.

DECLINE IN VALUE

But aid itself also has leveled off. Indeed, its effective level has fallen.

Take the consequences of Britain's devaluation as just one example. The total of British official aid will be kept at £205 million a year. That now is worth $492 million instead of $574 million. The fall in the value of Britain's aid will not be quite as great as those figures suggest, for a pound sterling will still buy a pound's worth of most British goods. But the real value of British aid overall will certainly be reduced by from 5 to 10 percent.

The amount the British spend on aid, by the way, is the equivalent of one shilling and fivepence halfpenny (17½ cents) per person per week. This is far more than many other nations spend. And such is Britain's own indebtedness right now, and so perilous is its own balance of payments, that the British can only afford to spend this much with the greatest difficulty.

So it begins to look as if no firm basis can be laid for a new and efficient structure of world aid and trade until the developed countries themselves reform their system of international payments.

CODE OF RULES WANTED

Secondly there is seen to be a need for concerted action among the developed nations to get their interest rates down. Those rates now are at an all-time high. This means that low-interest aid to developing countries has to be severely rationed. And it means that the flow of private capital to developing countries is substantially reduced.

The developed countries are moving in this direction. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris has expedited the work of its "Working Party Three." The OECD also has an active Development Assistance Committee.

The DAC now wants to set out an international code of rules for aid so that the aid performance of donor countries can be judged and improved. It wants donors to commit themselves in advance to a multiyear aid program of an adequate size and to give each program maximum publicity.

But aid, vital as it is, has its limits. You can't make people rich by giving them money. That way you only alleviate their poverty. Maybe you cannot actually make them rich at all; you can only enable them to conquer poverty for themselves. However, to do this they must be provided with the means and the opportunities to be productive.

"The building up of the exports of the developing countries is of paramount importance," the OECD declares.

There is no way of gainsaying this deceptively simple proposition. But no way yet of implementing it.

A global system of preferences for developing countries will be discussed at New Delhi. But, as things stand today, it could be difficult to make such a system effective.

TRADE CONCESSIONS

Preference systems that exist already, for instance within the British Commonwealth and the European Common Market's system of African associates, would have to be renegotiated and opened up. Safeguards for domestic producers within developed countries would have to be held to a minimum. Neither would be easy.

The latest proposal to reduce the difficulties comes from the Atlantic Trade Study. A paper by David Wall of Britain's Sussex University, published by this organization, propounds the idea that an open-ended, Atlantic-based, free-trade area could provide the way out.

A preference system would require great structural alterations in the trade of developed countries. Hence current resistance to the idea, Mr. Wall suggests. But if a "North Atlantic Free Trade Area" (NAFTA) was set up, comprising the United States, Canada, Britain, and the other members of the European Free Trade Association, structural alterations would have to take place anyway. Provisions for trade concessions to developing countries could be built into the system.

As things stand, says Mr. Wall, concessions to developing countries cannot be matched with benefits for the developed countries. NAFTA would produce the benefits, he says, thus promoting the concessions.

INTEGRATED POLICY

The proposal is significant as another example of the way developed countries are tending toward a concerted attack on the problem and toward basic changes in the economic system that nurtures it.

Here in London the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) looks rather to "a coherent set of measures, interlinked and based on specific technical, economic and institutional needs, not emotional attachment to dogmas." In short, it proposes an integrated development policy.

Even in a single country, the ODI notes, one government department may be negotiating the removal of trade restrictions while another will be busy constructing a massive new structure of other restrictions; one may be providing aid for a particular industry in a developing country while another organizes protection for home industries in the same field.

Policy needs to be totally integrated instead, not only nationally but internationally, the ODI declares.

Much thought is being given to ways of expanding the role and effectiveness, too, of private capital in developing countries.

URGENT NEED FOR FOOD

Two main impediments block the way to the expansion of private investment. One is the possibility of expropriation by the local government. The other is the lack of qualified labor. The first requires acceptance by developing countries of the need to provide security for private investors from overseas. The second requires the organization of training programs by private firms, both alone and in conjunction with local governments.

One of the most urgent needs is for private investment that will increase food production in developing countries. Specially there is a need for fertilizers and fertilizer production units and distribution networks. The OECD calculates that by 1980 the annual foreign exchange required for fertilizers alone will exceed $5 billion, the equivalent of almost half of all the aid provided today for all purposes.

A great expansion of agricultural education is urgently needed, too.

FOOD WITHOUT PLANTS

Another idea is the formation of a world food reserve, to cope with emergencies such as the failure of monsoons.

"It is necessary that the developing countries be enabled to undertake the research required to expand agricultural production and to train research workers on their own," the OECD also states.

The most radical innovation of all, it adds, would be to produce food without using plants.

Plant life synthesizes carbon dioxide from the air and mixes it with materials from the soils, using the energy of sunlight. The same process is possible in laboratories.

British Petroleum is producing protein from oils already.

Nuclear scientists are working on the preservation of food by irradiation techniques. Infestation by insects can be reduced, reports Kenneth F. McQueen of the Atomic Energy Agency of Canada. This is important. Almost half the dried fish produced in Africa is at present lost through infestation.

Irradiation can also preserve fresh foods.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 2, 1968]

PLEDGE AT UNCTAD: TARIFF BREAK SET FOR POOR NATIONS

(By Bernard Nossiter)

NEW DELHI, February 1.—The second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development began here today amid strong indications that the 87 poorer nations would achieve some success for at least one of their long list of demands.

Delegates from affluent and influential western nations are at last ready to give tariff advantages or preferences to some finished products of the poor.

By the time the marathon meeting of 131 nations ends here in the spring, there is every likelihood that it will go on record with a pledge of limited preferences.

Even in this one sector, the poor won't get all they want. The pledge will probably be surrounded with safeguards to protect the industries of the rich from too much competition.

MAJOR HURDLE

Another major hurdle will involve reconciling the positions of the United States and France, reluctantly supported by its Common Market partners. Washington is determined to wipe out the tariff advantages that the Common Market now enjoys in France's former African colonies and Paris doesn't want to give them up.

Moreover, any pledge made at UNCTAD is only morally binding. The long task of actually negotiating tariffs down for the products of the poor must still be accomplished and the United States will need approval for this from an increasingly protectionist Congress.

Thus it will be years before a Brazilian machine tool maker can hope to sell his products in Germany at tariff rates lower than that imposed on his British competitor. But even a pledge to move in this area would be something more than the first UNCTAD accomplished in Geneva four years ago.

The other principal demands of the poor, price supports for the raw materials that make up the bulk of their exports and an increase in the shrinking share of foreign aid are running into stiffer opposition. The diplomatic game for the rich West is to appear forthcoming in these areas without making any firm commitments.

Thursday's opening session heard Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India warn "there can be no peace without erasing the harshness of the growing contrast between rich and poor." Speaking in a nation that is wracked by riots almost every day, she said:

"Unless we sense this urgency and use our energy to eradicate the economic causes which make for conflict, men and women will be impelled to revolt, and to use violent means to bring about change."

Mrs. Gandhi, speaking in a hastily-constructed .and still-unfinished wing of the Ashoka Hotel, complained that "our affluent friends seek to curtail their contributions to development . . . the rich nations find it more rewarding to invest their savings in their own security, in the advance of their technology or even establishing contacts with distant planets. They find it more interesting to trade amongst themselves."

BUSINESSLIKE MOOD

She made the ritual bow towards the responsibility that the poor have to develop themselves, but her stress was clearly on the responsibilities of the rich.

"The question before the advanced nations" she said "Is not whether they can afford to help the developing nations, but whether they can afford not to do so."

The atmosphere here was considerably more businesslike than the loose ways of UNCTAD I. The routine compaint of African nations against seating South Africa was disposed of in half an hour. Four years ago it stretched on for days.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1968]

POOR NATIONS' PLIGHT: RICH LANDS' MONEY ILLS AGGRAVATE THE TROUBLES OF BACKWARD COUNTIES—IN SOME LOW-INCOME AREAS, LIVING STANDARDS DECLINE—INEPTITUDE ADDS TO WOES—AID FROM WEALTHY DECLINES

(By Alfred L. Malabre Jr.)

The much-publicized monetary troubles of the rich nations are obscuring—and aggravating—the economic woes of the world's poor countries.

That's the conclusion of a broad range of analysts who keep close tab on the economies of so-called less-developed nations, mostly impoverished lands in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The 1960s were once heralded at the United Nations as the "decade of development" in which poor countries finally would start to close the vast economic gap that separates them from such wealthy lands as the U.S., the major European countries and Japan. But instead, the gap appears to be widening, not only because of monetary troubles but for reasons that range from rich-nation indifference to poor-nation ineptitude.

"The decade of development is going down as the decade of disappointment," says a UN official who reflects the increasing dismay of many American and foreign analysts. "Let us hope that the '70s won't turn into the decade of disaster."

AN UNHAPPY PROSPECT

The UN official's use of "disaster" is perhaps overly dramatic. But the prospect of a world increasingly divided between a few very rich nations and many very poor nations, with the latter containing more than two-thirds of the globe's population, is grim. The picture is not brightened by the harsh militancy of the world's most populous and powerful poor nation, Red China. And adding to the concern is the possibility that sooner or later many poor countries will possess at least rudimentary nuclear weapons.

Signs of a widening economic gap between rich and poor nations show up in statistics pertaining to living standards. One such statistic is gross national product, on a per-capita basis to allow for population growth and in "real" terms to allow for rising prices.

A private study by a large New York City bank shows that since 1965 the "real" per-capita GNP of some poor nations actually has been declining. In Ghana and Indonesia, this GNP figure has dropped roughly 5% since 1965, the bank estimates. In India, in the same period, there has been no increase. In Brazil and Kenya, the increase since 1965 has averaged barely 1% annually.

In the same period, in contrast, per-capita GNP in the U.S. has climbed about 10%. In absolute terms, the statistics are still more striking. The U.S. figure now approximates $4,000, compared with $67 in India, about $85 in Indonesia, $110 in Kenya, $244 in Brazil and $260 in Ghana.

RECEDING RESERVES

Another indication that the gap between the rich and poor is widening appears in statistics covering the amount of gold and foreign exchange, such as dollars and pounds, held by various countries. These reserves, which are used to settle debts between governments, tend to fall when a country is unable to compete effectively in world markets.

Through most of the '60s, the overall reserves of less-developed countries rose steadily, according to figures compiled by the International Monetary Fund. But recently, as the monetary difficulties of the rich world have intensified, the trend has changed. From July through September, reserves of less-developed lands fell to $12.1 billion from a record $12.4 billion, and some analysts believe the decline is continuing, although later overall figures aren't available.

The recent trend has been very different in rich countries, which the IMF classifies as "industrial" lands. In the same three months during which poor nations' reserves declined some $300 million, rich countries' holdings increased to $54 billion from $53 billion. These reserves now exceed $55 billion, economists estimate, nearly five times the reserves of less-developed countries.

Most analysts agree that the recent devaluation of the British pound provides the most dramatic illustration of how the monetary troubles of rich nations are hurting many less-developed countries that have traditionally used sterling as a monetary reserve. Devaluation of the pound, for example, is estimated to have caused a $10.5 million overnight drop in Nigeria's reserves. These reserves, which had been falling even before Britain's November devaluation, have recently been as low as $135 million, down from $227 million at the start of last year.

A FADING GOAL

Rich-nation monetary problems also are hurting backward countries in more subtle ways. Looking for ways to improve their balance-of-payments positions, some wealthy countries, including the U.S., have begun to cut back foreign-aid programs. As a result, the flow of aid from rich to poor countries is shrinking. At the start of the "development decade," it was hoped that the major industrial countries would contribute, on the average, 1% of their gross national product to aid backward economies. Instead, the percentage has been shrinking steadily, from nearly 1% in 1961 to an estimated 0.5% in 1967.

In the U.S., Congress cut foreign-aid funds to about $2.3 billion for the current fiscal year ending June 30, down from about $3.3 billion in fiscal 1967 and the lowest total on record. In fiscal 1967, U.S. aid commitments in Latin America totaled $572 million, $112 million below the previous year, and officials in Washintgon estimate a further reduction of 10% in fiscal 1968. In Africa, where U.S. aid programs amounted to about $360 million in fiscal 1967, officials estimate that cuts will average about 25% in the current fiscal year.

Aid provided by many wealthy nations, moreover, increasingly has strings attached to it; for example, the recipient may be required to purchase items from the donor, even when better bargains are available elsewhere. By one estimate, roughly a fifth of all aid now is "tied" in this fashion. In this week's budget message to Congress, President Johnson stated that "more than 90%" of U.S. aid spending in fiscal 1969 "will be for purchases made in the United States, and I have directed intensified efforts to increase this percentage."

It's becoming increasingly apparent, too, that much of the money flowing from rich to poor countries carries a worrisome, growing debt-service burden. UN officials estimate that yearly debt-service payments, on the average, now amount to more than 10% of a less-developed country's export sales, up from 4% a decade ago. In the case of some countries, it's estimated that the percentage exceeds 30%.

An extreme example is India. Indian officials recently noted that half the financial aid their nation receives from the European Common Market countries in 1968 will have to be used for paying debts and interest to those countries; the officials said the percentage may rise to as high as 90% within a few years.

"There has recently been a marked hardening of the terms on which loans have been offered by the industrial countries to the developing countries," reports Raul Prebisch, secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, or UNCTAD, the UN agency most concerned with economic problems of backward nations. Mr. Prebisch also says that import restrictions imposed by industrial countries on primary products sold by less-developed lands have recently become "more severe."

SEEKING SPECIAL TREATMENT

Mr. Prebisch and other UN officials hope that the wealthy nations can be persuaded to step up their assistance to less-developed lands. To this end, UNCTAD is sponsoring a meeting of 132 nations, rich and poor, in New Delhi. At the meeting, which starts tomorrow and is expected to run for about seven weeks, the have-nots will press for a variety of trade concessions and other aid.

Example: To encourage industrialization, poor countries will seek preferential tariff treatment for their manufactured goods. These goods now make up only about 5% of the total exports of poor countries.

Analysts doubt that the UNCTAD meeting will bring any significant change in the attitude of most industrial countries. "The chances of any big breakthroughs are very slight," says one UN diplomat. "The rich countries are too concerned with their own monetary problems to worry much about the situation in the less-developed economies."

The diplomat notes that the U.S. delegation to the New Delhi meeting has been "cut down to only about 10 persons." He recalls that the U.S. sent about 40 delegates to a similar UNCTAD meeting four years ago. "Partly, this reflects American attempts to keep dollars at home," the official says. "But I'm afraid such reductions also may be a reflection of the generally lukewarm interest of industrial countries" in the New Delhi meeting.

Some economists contend, moreover, that most less-developed nations would be faced with a gloomy economic outlook even if the industrial countries were not preoccupied with their own monetary troubles.

The increasing self-sufficiency of industrial countries is often cited as a major long-range problem for less-developed lands. These nations largely depend on sales of raw materials for their exports. But laboratories in the industrial countries are busy developing all sorts of synthetic substitutes for rubber, wool, cotton, jute and other key exports of poor nations.

The UN estimates, for example, that man-made fibers now account for more than 60% of world textile consumption, up from 30% a decade ago. Other studies show that the average price of raw commodities exported by less-developed countries has dropped 7% in the past decade. An extreme example is natural rubber, whose price has dropped by more than 50% just since 1960.

In addition, industrial nations generally are increasing their own output of raw materials. One UN economist reckons roughly 60% of world exports of primary commodities are from advanced countries, compared with about 45% in 1950. The upshot of such developments, says Mr. Prebisch, is that the less-developed nations' share of world trade has shriveled to 13.5% from 25.4% in 1950. "I'm afraid the decline will continue in 1968 and beyond," the UN economist adds.

"NOTORIOUS" WASTE

The worsening economic plight of less-developed countries, many economists say, also stems from their own ineptitude. "There have been notorious cases of wastage of domestic resources that could have been put to productive use," charges Mr. Prebisch. Examples in recent years, he says, range from the India-Pakistan war to the "costly and opulent" projects of Ghana's deposed dictator, Kwame Nkrumah.

No less discouraging, according to many analysts, have been attempts by less-developed countries to forge price-propping commodity agreements. Typically, such agreements aim at arrangements whereby poor nations agree to limit their output of particular commodities in the hope that prices will increase. However, Mr. Prebisch reports, "apart from agreements on coffee, tin, wheat and olive oil, no headway has been made with measures to stabilize primary commodities."

At least one agreement appears in trouble. The International Coffee Agreement, due for renewal in September, is jeopardized by a dispute between Brazil, the major producer, and the U.S., the main consumer of coffee. The dispute boils down to a squabble over how to regulate Brazil's sales of instant-type coffee to the U.S.

"Failure to renew the agreement could lead to a collapse of world coffee prices," says a New York-based coffee dealer. Even with an agreement, coffee prices have declined in recent years. The wholesale price of Brazilian coffee in New York, for instance, has fallen roughly 20% since 1964. Dealers blame the drop partly on "bootleg" sales by Brazilians and others in violation of the coffee pact.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 6, 1968]

POORER NATIONS ASK MORE HELP

(By David K. Willis)

WASHINGTON.—What officials of the Agency for International Development (AID) see as one of the most significant conferences of the decade has opened. Washington is there taking full stock of the reasons it cannot do more to help underdeveloped nations.

The world's poorer nations are in New Delhi to ask the rich: Will you provide us with more economic aid? Will you buy more from us, on better terms? Must the rich-poor gap keep growing?

Ideally, the richest of the rich—the United States—ought to be able to answer "yes" to the first two questions, and "no" to the third.

At the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UN-CTAD), Washington's likely answers will be, according to informed sources:

"No" to more aid (at least until the Vietnam war is over); "maybe" to buying more; and "we-hope-not-but-we-don't-really-know" to the problem of the gap.

Many senior officials here see bridging the gap as the central foreign policy problem for the United States in the rest of the century.

The rich are getting richer. Their yearly per capita incomes are growing by some 4 percent; but the poor, with soaring populations, can manage only a 2 percent rise, and sometimes less.

Formosa, the Ivory Coast, Israel, and South Korea are bounding ahead, but huge India and sprawling Indonesia are struggling to stay where they are.

ATTITUDES WATCHED

United States predominance is staggering. Its defense budget alone ($79.8 billion for fiscal 1969) is almost as large as the gross national products of all of Latin America combined.

But Washington is not about to provide more economic aid. That much is clear from the fiscal 1969 budget handed down by the President this week.

Mr. Johnson is asking for $2.5 billion for AID programs. It is the smallest amount ever requested. The total assistance budget (including Food for Freedom, AID, the Peace Corps, contributions to the Asian Development Bank, the International Development Bank, the International Development Agency, and others) is $4.255 billion.

This is about 1/19th of the defense budget, AID officials note.

And it is likely to be cut, just as it was in the last session of Congress. At that time, the President asked for economic assistance of $2.6 billion, but received only $1.89 billion. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. W. Fulbright, says he sees no change in congressional attitudes this year.

Congress was, and is, restive about American foreign ventures because of Vietnam. The war costs so much that economic aid suffers as a target for the congressional economy bloc. Economic aid has never been resounding popular; it is even less so today.

Aid officials say they do not go back to Capitol Hill this year to fight for their $2.5 billion "in a halfhearted way, with our tail between our legs."

But even as they speak, they know full well that cuts are in store.

SHORT OF TARGET

Similarly, the World Bank reported last year that aid from other so-called rich nations was either holding steady or declining somewhat.

No other nation matches the range of American assistance, though France channels a great deal of aid into its former African colonies. Britain is contracting overseas spending.

According to a report issued this week by the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, net flows of aid from rich to poor countries in 1965 were about $7 billion.

This falls well short of the United Nations target of 1 percent of gross national products each year in the 1960's. In fact, it averages out at less than one-half of 1 percent, and amounts to only 6 percent of their military outlays.

(World military spending reached $155-$160 billion in 1966, the agency reports: an increase of $15 to $20 billion over the previous year, or twice the annual flow of aid.)

In 1965 the United States disbursed almost $4 billion in economic assistance; the Soviet Union provided only $0.4 billion. (The agency took its figures from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris.)

With the Vietnam war costing upwards of $25 billion per year, and no fewer than 40 percent of AID employees tied down in the Vietnam aid program alone, Washington can offer little hope of more aid flows in the near future, sources say.

PREFERENCES CONSIDERED

What are the prospects, then, for the United States buying more from the poorer nations?

The leader of the American delegation to UNCTAD, Undersecretary of State Eugene V. Rostow, left here this week carrying a significant change in American policy.

Instead of resisting the poorer nations' demand for trade preferences on manufactured and semimanufactured goods, he will tell the conference that Washington is prepared to agree to preferences.

But there are conditions: the preferences must be general, for all poorer nations (to let them sell their goods at a higher profit), and they must be temporary—say, for 10 years.

Moreover, Washington wants all the other rich nations to agree to a concrete effort. The snag here is that Mr. Rostow will, at the same time object to "reverse preferences"—the benefits Britain and France, for instance, receive in return for granting preferences to their former colonies.

Washington wants the rich countries to take nothing in return for offering preferences, thus helping the poor to the maximum degree. But Britain, France, and other Common Market countries object to giving up their traditional ways of doing business.

Officials here say their aim is to avoid a system of competing preference blocs in the world. A struggle in New Delhi is predicted.

Apart from this, the major Western trading nations are generally trying now to sell more and buy less. The poor at New Delhi want exactly the reverse.

FUND FOR FOOD

President Johnson's restrictions on American investment and travel abroad show his deep concern with closing the balance-of-payments deficit. Western Europe, too, is concerned about losing some of its own income abroad.

So, observers note, this is hardly an ideal time for the world's poor nations to be knocking on the door of the rich man's club, petitions in hand.

What will emerge from New Delhi, however, remains to be seen. The poor nations do obtain some leverage from the conference, it is argued here. The change of American attitude on preferences is an example. So was the decision of the "Kennedy round" to share tariff reductions with the poor, and to set up a special fund for food for the developing countries.

Some observers are pessimistic that the poor will actually gain much from New Delhi. Officials here admit that the United States's contribution can only be limited.

But the very existence of the UNCTAD forum is important, it is said. The urgency of the rich-poor gap demands action before long, many believe.

North Viet Shipping Shows Russian Support

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the reported heavy buildup of enemy troops in the Khe Sanh area necessarily causes us to reflect again upon the nature and extent of the enemy's sources of supply. In testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last summer, it will be recalled, Defense Department spokesmen acknowledged that approximately 75 percent of all North Vietnam's imports arrived by sea, and further that the Soviet Union and East European countries provide 60 percent of these total imports, 75 percent of which are delivered through the port of Haiphong. My diligent and able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who has worked hard for many months to dig out the facts about this seaborne trade and bring them to the attention of the Congress and the American people, on January 15 made a yearend report about this traffic which has not gone unnoticed by observers knowledgeable as to its importance.

Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars devoted a recent column to indicating the significance of these shipping statistics and has done so with telling effect. Whether one accepts or rejects General Hittle's recommendations as to the best means for dealing with this seaborne supply route, it is clear that he has made a very strong case and that his proposal deserves careful consideration by the administration. I insert at this point in the RECORD the news article entitled "North Viet Shipping Shows Russian Support," distributed by Copley News Service, appearing in the Sunday, January 28, 1968, issue of the San Diego Union:

TWO SHIPS EVERY 3 DAYS—NORTH VIET SHIPPING SHOWS RUSSIAN SUPPORT

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

WASHINGTON.—The 1967 totals for shipping to North Vietnam are in. And it's not a pleasant story they tell.

Rep. Charles E. Chamberlain, R-Mich., has made the month-by-month compilation a matter of public record. Chamberlain, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, is widely recognized as a one-man "watchdog" committee on seaborne supplies to Ho Chi Minh, premier of North Vietnam.

Anyone who wonders how industrially primitive North Vietnam could escalate the war both technologically and quantitatively to its present level should be puzzled no longer.

The procession of cargo ships pouring war material on the docks of North Vietnam explains the magnitude and the principal sources of the logistic back-up.

Also, those who still believe that Russia wants peace in Southeast Asia will see how flimsy a myth that is.

Here's why: During 1967 a total of 185 Russian ships arrived in North Vietnam. This is a big tonnage in itself. But, to get the complete picture, there should be added to this the 31 merchantmen from Moscow's Eastern European satellites.

That, then, gives a total of 216 Russian-bloc ships delivering the goods of war to North Vietnam in 1967. It means that, on the average, the Kremlin and its satellites were putting about two ships every three days into North Vietnam.

What's more, these ships, in contrast to much of the free world and Red Chinese shipping to Hanoi, were large modern cargo ships of the rapidly expanding Soviet merchant marine.

Among the ships flying free world and Red Chinese registry flags were an assortment of small coastal freighters.

One of the most significant things about the 1967 Russian shipping to Hanoi is how it compares with previous years. The number of Kremlin ships to Ho Chi Minh in 1964 totaled 47. This jumped to 79 in 1965, 122 in 1966, and to the 185 total in 1967.

This is pretty strong evidence that the Kremlin is making good on its promises to Hanoi for increased assistance in the war against us and our allies. There no longer should be any doubt that the Soviet Union is deeply and increasingly committed to our defeat in Southeast Asia. Nor should there be any question, for instance, as to the source of the modern sophisticated missiles and radar-controlled antiaircraft guns that are taking such a toll of our fliers and their planes. Ho Chi Minh doesn't grow them in his rice paddies! They are "made in Russia."

Free world shipping to North Vietnam totaled 78 vessels of various categories. This is a big drop from the 401 free world ships arriving at Ho Chi Minh's ports in 1964. There's little consolation in it, however. Even one ship flying a free world flag in the immoral trade with our enemy is one ship too many.

Two conclusions can be drawn from these totals of shipping to North Vietnam:

1. Russia is clearly the worst culprit in providing the tremendous tonnages of war supplies Ho Chi Minh is getting by sea to support the war against us. This makes the Kremlin, despite its peace propaganda, a partner in the Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

2. It underlines, once again, the strategic necessity of establishing a "Kennedy-type" quarantine to cut off the procession of ships delivering war material to North Vietnam. We blockaded Cuba to cut off delivery of Russian missiles in that crisis.

The lamentable increase in U.S. and allied casualties in Vietnam makes a blockade, in this war, a strategic and moral necessity.

Community Progress, Inc., in Conflict

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report which I prepared on my investigation into the activities of Community Progress, Inc., the community action program in New Haven, Conn.

Since that time, two reporters for the New Haven Register, William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas, have written an eight part in-depth study of CPI in which they evaluate the content of my criticisms of CPI and CPI's rebuttal to that criticism.

Today, I will introduce parts 1 and 2 into the RECORD and will follow on successive days with the rest of the series:

[From the New Haven Register, Jan. 25, 1968]

CPI IN CONFLICT: HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THE JOB PROGRAM? LACK OF A FOLLOW-UP PRECLUDES ANSWER—PART I

(By William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas)

Nobody—not even Community Progress Inc. (CPI) itself—can say truthfully that its $9 million manpower program has been effective in cracking the solid bedrock of hard-core unemployed persons whom it wants to put to work.

And the prime reason why no one can state accurately whether CPI has succeeded or failed in reaching the "virtually unemployable" is that there is little, if any, information on what has happened to the 6,500 or so people CPI claims to have placed in jobs or training "leading to gainful employment."

ONLY SPOT CHECKS

Recognized as the most glaring deficiency one on which there is almost universal agreement, is the lack of a "follow-up" on the persons processed by CPI. Spot checks have been made, but they hardly qualify as meaningful measures of the overall effort.

CPI can cite statistics showing that its manpower operation has led to over 4,000 direct job placements. This figure loses some of its impressiveness when the question of how these men or women are doing on the job—yesterday or today—is raised.

Not knowing if the person placed remains on the job—or if he does, for how long—means that neither CPI nor anyone else is able to determine exactly whether the approach being followed is the best one. The same applies to the training courses.

One of the first to admit that the failure to find out how a person does once he has been placed on a job or completed a training course is a shortcoming in the total manpower effort is Joseph Marci, the $17,674-a-year director of the CPI's manpower division.

There is no question, says Marci, that the manpower program would be strengthened if there was an adequate "follow-up" procedure.

AN ADDITIONAL $100,000 NEEDED

He estimates that it would cost an additional $100,000 to $120,000 per year to carry on a full-fledged program of checking up on the progress or lack of progress of the persons served by his division.

The manpower unit has received upwards of $7,500,000 from various sources between September 1962 and June 1967, according to a five-year recap it submitted to the Ford Foundation last year. But, with all this money, it apparently cannot lay its hands on funds to institute a follow-up program. An attempt to get the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund such a program was unsuccessful, says Marci.

Besides the $7.5 million it has reaped from the Ford Foundation, federal, state and local governments and private sources, the manpower division is expected to spend $1.5 million or more in grants throughout the current fiscal year. And while it averages almost $1,000 a week in "research" expenditures, the research doesn't include a follow-up on people it places on jobs.

Spotlighted in the sweeping criticism of CPI's operation by a former job coordinator was the complaint that the figure for placements in jobs or training courses "is not significant by itself unless answers to some important questions are provided that indicate how these 5,000 people were aided."

WANTS DETAILS

Janette J. Parker, who worked at CPI for almost five years, feels it would be appropriate to find out: "1. Where placed? 2. How many dropped out? 3. Let go? (1st day, 2nd day, etc.) 4. Reasons for dropping out; being fired? 5. How many in menial type jobs? 6. How many upgraded? How much follow-up? Supportive services?"

In her criticism of the manpower program, Mrs. Parker said:

"I believe that the staff and programs, while they looked good on paper, are inadequately implemented to service the poor. Evidence of this was continually shown in the skills center, which was staffed with non-professionals attempting to teach skills to the uneducated or under-educated. Candidates for these programs were placed in various agencies throughout the city without financial obligation to the agency; some for months, others for years, with little or no supervision by the agencies.

"Public and private agencies took the trainees' services for free and gave very little in return. Many who were unsuccessful and could not get permanent jobs returned to the skills center—for more paternalism, inadequate training, improper counseling and a try at another program. Many averaged four different programs—and, as a last resort, were sent for placement to the OJT (On-the-job training) program, which in essence became a dumping ground instead of a specialized placement department for successfully trained applicants."

CPI VIEW DIFFERS

Mrs. Parker's estimate of OJT differs sharply from the view held by CPI, which maintains that it is an "effective way to teach a man, a skill while he earns a living." More than 300 firms have contracted with CPI to give on-the-job training since May, 1964.

In 1967, 211 persons were trained and placed in such jobs as secretary, recreation supervisor, machine operator, carpenter's helper, electrician apprentice, service representative, cook, telephone operator, draftsman, veterinarian's aide, and electronics technician.

"On-the-job training works best for us," says Marci.

Further agreement that the lack of a "follow-up" to the manpower program hinders it comes from Charles Hall, executive director of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce and Joseph Purcell, director of the Connecticut State Employment Service (CSES) here.

Hall feels that the failure to find out how a person does after he has been placed on a job is a major "downfall" in the manpower program.

Purcell is quick to concede that CPI's manpower effort has "had an effect" on the unemployment picture in New Haven. He adds, however, "how we are going to prove the total effect is a problem. We don't know of anyone, as yet, who has come up with the answer."

Attempting to use statistics to determine in a general way the impact CPI may have had on the employment situation in the New Haven Labor Market Area—a 12-community district taking in New Haven and 11 surrounding towns—Purcell noted that the unemployment figure for this area at the end of 1962 was 6,800. That was the year CPI started. At the end of 1966, the figure had been reduced to 5,200. The 1967 figure is not yet available, according to Purcell.

Of course, CPI has been ready to claim credit for reductions in the unemployment rate. In its report to the Ford people last July, it pointed out that the unemployment rate had decreased steadily since 1960, from 5.6 per cent to 3.0 per cent for the months of April and May, 1967. It dropped even further later on.

"A substantial portion of this drop can be attributed to CPI's manpower effort, which has placed more than 7,000 people in jobs and training since 1962. A major factor in the decrease is the general prosperity of the New Haven area," CPI told Ford.

In the meantime, however, the unemployment in this labor market area has risen to the point where the area has had to be reclassified. According to Purcell, New Haven's classification was changed in mid-December from "B" to a "C" rating. The "B" rating is given an area where the number of unemployed persons represents 1.5 to 2.9 per cent of the work force. The "C" classification is given when the unemployment rate reaches 3.0 to 5.9 per cent of the employable population.

Seasonal unemployment plus a few layoffs are the main reasons for the growth in the number of people out of work, according to Purcell.

At the same time, he observes that the number of people available for gainful employment is growing scarcer and scarcer. In addition, he notes that there are some 5,000 unfilled jobs in the greater New Haven area, but a majority of the people now unemployed do not possess the skills necessary to fill them. This is the reason Purcell feels it unfair to compare the unemployment rate with available jobs.

Like almost everyone else interviewed, Purcell realizes that CPI's manpower program is just now reaching the ledge of truly hard-core unemployed persons.

When CPI first started out, intentionally or not, it skimmed the "cream" off the top of the unemployment list. Being selective at the outset gave CPI the opportunity to develop programs that had an outward appearance of success. This was necessary in order to obtain monies from the federal government in order to carry on the programs. According to this theory—a common one in government circles—the federal officials weren't going to continue handing CPI money if the programs met with failure. The more success, the more money. But no one can yet say that the CPI manpower program was successful at the early stages, even when it was skimming the "cream" for easy placements.

And the outlook for manpower development among the hard-core unemployed doesn't look too promising, according to CPI's application for manpower funds to the Office of Economic Opportunity last year.

In the application, which has never been released to the public by CPI, the anti-poverty organization said:

"It is clear, therefore, that the manpower problem in New Haven is such that the goal, of full, meaningful employment for everyone, despite the presence of the manpower program for the past four years is still a distant one.

"In many ways it is an insoluble problem, since it is not a static one; the realities of immigration and population turnover make it clear that as soon as one individual has been assisted toward meaningful employment, another will take his place in need of the services that a manpower program can and should provide. As obvious as this is, it is equally obvious that the effort must continue."

As for CPI's claim that it has "placed more than 7,000 people in jobs and training since 1962," as it told Ford, this figure apparently is the main bone of contention between U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo and CPI.

According to the latest figures compiled by CPI, only 6,445 have been placed in jobs and training programs. This is half-a-thousand less people than the 7,000 reported to Ford.

Reviewing CPI's own reports and grant applications provides some of the most meaningful insight into whether it has dealt effectively with the problem of hard-core unemployed. Regardless of the total number placed in jobs and training, there is a significant figure related to this activity. It has to do with direct job placements, which means—for all practical purposes—that the person had an interview and some tests at the Neighborhood Employment Center and then was referred to a potential employer. At last reading, the number of direct job placements had exceeded the 4,000 mark. That represents nearly two-thirds of the persons passing through the manpower program.

In its unpublished application for OEO funds to cover the 1967–68 period, CPI's manpower division addressed itself to this situation. Explaining that the success of any manpower program depends on the "effectiveness of the direct job placement operation," the report further said that "during 1966, for example, nearly two-thirds of all placements (jobs and placements) were into job placements."

Keeping the above statement in mind, one turns to another part of the application and finds the following obseravtion:

"Despite generally good quantitative results, in terms of numbers of individuals placed, there has been little effort to develop a systematic approach to matching individuals with jobs that provide him with the most opportunity to earn more, and to upgrade his skills and position." This seems to imply that CPI has been interested in simply matching bodies with jobs, irrespective of the person's qualification, and thus making the manpower effort into a statistical success.

Another area which has hindered the manpower program has been the somewhat distant relationship between CPI and the city's business and industrial leaders. It must be noted here, however, that Lawrence N. Spitz, who succeeded Mitchell Sviridoff as head of the operation, is making an earnest effort to enlist the active support of the business community in an effort to develop a good manpower program.

While business and industry, guided by the profit motive, are among the last to get in the swing of things as far as social changes are concerned, there was never any real partnership during the early days of CPI, mainly because Sviridoff was at the helm.

FORMER LABOR LEADER

As Hall, the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce notes, "the businessmen were fearful that Sviridoff would send them labor organizers." Sviridoff was a former president of the State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, and had spent most of his life in the organized labor movement.

Spitz is also a product of organized labor, but he appears more willing to develop some contact with the business people in connection with the manpower effort. The chamber has organized a task force which is looking into the possibility of a business group serving as advisors to CPI. It is still in the talking stage, but the fact is, since the initial Giaimo attack, Chamber leaders have begun to weigh a larger role in CPI manpower work.

Because of their individualistic approach, conservative businessmen did not rush out to greet CPI's move to find work for the hard-core unemployed. CPI has placed its stress on seeking employment opportunities for these persons among small firms, rather than the big ones.

For instance, a spokesman at Olin—one of the biggest employers in the city—said as far as he knew he could recall only "20 to 25" persons who showed up there and identified themselves with CPI. He admitted there could have been others, but they didn't acknowledge their CPI training or contact.

FIRM DID TRAINING

Another firm, after having unsuccessful results with the first batch of people CPI sent to it, finally worked out an arrangement to have CPI simply equip applicants with basic job motivation and the company then trained them itself. This approach apparently is better than some of the others, because at last report at least six of the nine men involved are still on the job after six months. This is what can happen when business assumes the role of a working partner, rather than merely a passive recipient of whomever CPI wants to send it.

Manpower development will "only work when it is fused with business," says Hall, who also notes that "manpower would have been better off if business had been brought into play earlier."

But even with business on the scene, there will still be the need for a "follow-up" which CPI admittedly feel is necessary for the success of a manpower program.

In its OEO application, CPI said, "Follow-up on an intensive level is essential to the success of a manpower program; it has often been said that an individual placed on a job will leave the job within a short time, for reasons which could probably have been resolved, had there been closer communication between him, CPI staff and the employer."

Lacking the "follow-up" which it prescribes for its own programs, CPI can hardly claim that its manpower program has been a success. And without proven success in the manpower projects—which means, in its simplest terms, without jobs for most of the poor and unemployed of this city—the whole CPI program and the national "war on poverty," are both endangered.

[From the New Haven Register, Jan. 26, 1968]

CPI in Conflict: Half-Million in Research Expenditures Has Produced Very Little Usable Data—Part II

(By Donald Dallas and William E. Keish, Jr.)

Rep. Robert N. Giaimo has pointed out—that well over one-half million dollars has, in the midst of the "war on poverty", been poured into a mountainous accumulation of notebooks and file-folders here during the past five years.

For welfare and public service professionals who know how to make use of social science research the great puzzle is that so little usable data has emerged from all the file-filling and questionnaires.

Even CPI officials agree that most CPI research projects have been started and left unfinished, or partially finished, or wound up with less than definitive results. They insist that eventually they will be able to fit the pieces together and to make them relevant to CPI and other cities—when more money, more staff, and added resources become available. With Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz, they predict that "the final report will more than justify the expenditure of the funds."

AMBITIOUS STUDY

Giaimo's basic complaint about research funds being "wasted" centered on an overdue "youth development" study. A highly complicated "pure" research effort designed to produce facts that could be used nationally, this study has taken the bulk of the $625,000 spent by the CPI Research Division.

The original idea was to create a "methodology" or scientific procedure for studying slum youths and then to go ahead with a study of 2,000 inner-inner city young people. The idea was to find out as much as possible about their motivation, education, beliefs, and frustrations, and other things that might contribute to an understanding of urban social needs and particularly the needs of the rising generation of poor young people. The group was then to be interviewed three years later for a direct check on the effect which CPI programs had on their lives, their attitudes, and so on. Obviously, there was the hope that expensive efforts like that of CPI would prove—through solid measurements, that they make life better for the people they serve.

The study remains up in the air. The interviewing started more than four years ago in 1963. It ended in 1964. But the first analysis and documentation is not yet complete. And there's no available money for the "after" part of what is essentially a "before-and-after" concept.

Scheduled for final completion by June, 1966, the study is still being processed 18 months behind-time. The latest word is that part of it should be ready for release sometime within the next five or six weeks. But at the most what eventually emerges will be only half the job that was started.

The study is being completed by Dr. Elmer Luchterhand, who now lives in Scarsdale, N.Y., and teaches at Columbia University and Brooklyn College. He headed up the Research Division at CPI before it was "phased out" last August.

DECLINE COMMENT

Contacted last Thursday, Dr. Luchterhand declined to make any immediate public comment on the report. His reticence exactly matches the reticence at the CPI offices. When CPI officials are questioned about the report, or about other research projects, they refer all inquiries to Luchterhand.

The result—as in other aspects of the CPI record—is the whole thing is kept under wraps.

One CPI official in fact, recently told The Register that Dr. Luchterhand was the only person who could adequately explain the CPI research efforts—or its costs. That comment, surprising as it may seem, was actually put on the record by a CPI research review group in 1966. The review group came to the conclusion that "it did not feel competent to assess present research activity." One member of the group, the report says, "asked bluntly, 'What good does it do?' Would the program be affected by our recommendations?"

The youth survey was—and is—a big one. It involved interviewing 2,000 youngsters, 1,500 in the New Haven area and a control group of 500 in Bridgeport (Who would not come under CPI's control or supervision). What the study will produce, or how it can be given perspective now that the second stage of the research has been completely abandoned, is uncertain.

But the CPI confusion over research extends and far deeper than just that one mountain of notebooks, theories, file folders, etc.

The whole "research" operation—a series of studies, semi-studies, bunches of dates, and what-have-you—has been from the outset fraught with conflict, dissension, diverging directions; a kind of generalized sprawl. Like the entire CPI operation itself, it has developed "like Topsy."

Those, incidentally, are CPI's own words—"like Topsy."

A CPI report to the Ford Foundation last summer after five years and more than a half million dollars of research—points out that CPI research activities "while fairly substantial, far-reaching, and in most cases useful and relevant, have developed like Topsy."

OVERALL STRATEGY

The main deficiency here in New Haven, the 1967 report emphasizes is that many of the programs do not "fit in an overall research evaluation strategy."

This would seem to mean that, at this time and date, the notes in one file cabinet have not been successfully related, in understandable terms, to all the notes in some other file cabinet.

Other shortcomings spotlighted in the CPI report included "instant program planning," the weak quality of the research work itself, the conflict with "pure" and "management-oriented" research interests, on inability to use the data gathered as a useful basis for programs and the failure to find enough independent and qualified people to carry out the research.

The comment concerning "instant program planning" means that because of "radically changing federal grant submission and funding dates," CPI would compose "hastily drawn up application."

This is, in the word used by those familiar with the tricks of federal Treasury-tapping, "grantsmanship." As one CPI board member explained it, the significant CPI change of direction in 1963 from the community school concept to a heavy investment of cash and energy in the Manpower programs was fundamentally due to "grantsmanship." As explained, the money or the grants—were available from the federal government, and "Tom Seessel had a genius for writing programs." The "program" is the proposal made to the U.S. government about why it should provide money for local activities.

Thomas Seessel, who has since left CPI, was head of a small staff of "whiz kids" known as the "department of project processing and program review." Another observer explained how the department worked. He said, CPI, would "lock a joker in a room and not let him out until he had a program proposal."

Not research, thus, nor "neighborhood participation," nor any form of civic decisionmaking—not even "need"—were the basic determinants of the willy-nilly, crazy-quilt, on-off pattern of the availability of federal funds have as much to do with the CPI we know, as the specific needs and problems of New Haven neighborhoods.

PROGRAM TO SELL PROGRAMS

According to Alphonso Tyndall, director of the Dixwell Community House and a critic fundamentally sympathetic with the goals of CPI, this process was the "big thing that hurt." CPI, he concluded, became "not a program to meet the needs of the poor, but to sell programs."

The conflict between the "pure" as opposed to "practical" interests of different researchers among themselves and other CPI staff—and the resulting hangups—is another key reason why research, which could be considered vital in order to plot future CPI programs, had been consistently lagging behind the existing schedule for action.

Giaimo, for example, pointed out that "in the opinion of a former member of the research staff, the research program was of doubtful value because the research objectives were never clearly defined."

Mr. Spitz, at a recent press conference, dismissed these complaints as those of merely an * * *."

But a former member of the research staff, assistant director for evaluation research at the Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, recently wrote the Register (in a basic endorsement of CPI) to say that what was disappointing was that the research did not contribute more to the immediate action effort."

"As a former member of CPI's research staff and as one of those disappointed with the relationship between CPI's research and action efforts," he said, he did not question, the desire of CPI's research division to conduct "long-term evaluative research for . . . CPI's national sponsors." But, "we are disappointed that there is little response to our suggestions that greater efforts be made to focus research on immediate action problems."

Spitz's personal position and preference on the way research should be undertaken, he said at a recent press conference, lies somewhere "In between" the conflicting views of "pure" researchers and practical researchers. Thus, CPI has proposed to the Ford Foundation an "intermediate structure" (the Rand Corporation, a Defense Department "think tank team" has been cited as an example) which would be formed to reconcile and utilize the long-range and the short-range, the abstract and the down-to-earth, the theoretical and the real elements of the CPI research picture.

"Clearly," says the 1967 CPI report to Ford, "one large task for the immediate future should be a thorough review of this work, an effort to relate the pieces, and analysis of what general conclusions may be drawn for assistance in planning future activities." The problem is that these problems, conclusions, and troubles were not resolved long before now . . . and are not resolved yet.

Another Dissenter Leaves State Department

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 the Baltimore Sun announced the resignation of David G. Nes, a Foreign Service officer with 26 years' experience, and on February 7 the Sun carried an extensive article by Philip Potter on the resignation. According to the article, Nes was disenchanted with the "political leadership" of the State Department in handling Vietnam and the Middle East.

Nes' disenchantment extended to the highest echelons of State and even higher. The Sun states:

> The controversial 51-year-old career diplomat, whose resignation was made public yesterday, made clear in an interview today that Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and Nicholas Katzenbach, Under Secretary, were his principal targets, but his criticism extended to President Johnson.

It will be remembered that Nes criticized Ambassador-designate Richard Nolte for his handling of the Arab-Israel issue recently. According to the Sun account:

> Nes feared his evaluation of Nolte as an "amateur" diplomat who arrived in his Cairo post too late on the eve of the Israeli-Arab conflict earned him the hostility of Katzenbach, a Nolte roommate at Oxford. In any case, Katzenbach did not want to see Nes when he came back from Cairo.

Thereafter, the assignments Nes received were without meaning, and he sent in a resignation last December 14, effective January 31, because "no one wants to sit at taxpayer's expense doing nothing."

To a certain extent the case of Nes sounds so much like the Otepka and Koczak cases which I have commented on recently. All three men fell out of grace with the ruling clique at State and were given the "bubonic plague" treatment. Of course, Otepka is a civil service employee, and he is now appealing the recent State Department ruling on his case to the Civil Service Commission. Whether CSC will stall and delay his case as the State Department has done in the past remains to be seen.

In the case of Koczak and Nes, they have no recourse to CSC as they are not civil service employees. This is an area where corrective action is certainly in order. Foreign Service officers are at the mercy of the ruling coterie at State, and if they do not hew the line, FSO's can be selected out without appeal privileges. Or, as in the case of Nes, they can be given assignments "without meaning" and just wait for them to quit in disgust.

Without commenting on Nes' evaluation of the Arab-Israel and Vietnam situations, I think that in the interest of fairplay legislative action is needed to provide a measure of justice to a very key segment of Federal workers and to perhaps prevent Foreign Service officers from becoming little marionettes of an authoritarian leadership in the State Department.

"The Retarded Victims of Deprivation"—An Address by Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, to the 18th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children, Portland, Oreg., October 19, 1967

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many Members of Congress will be interested in a most thoughtful address delivered by Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, at the 18th annual convention of the National Association for Retarded Children which was held in Portland, Oreg., last year.

Mr. Young's address entitled "The Retarded Victims of Deprivation," follows:

THE RETARDED VICTIMS OF DEPRIVATION

(An address by Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

My purpose in being here is to explore with you the intimate connections between my cause—the cause of the people who have been denied human rights because of the color of their skin—and your cause—the cause of the people who have been denied human rights because they have been victims of an accident of nature.

Basically, we all fight for human dignity, we want justice, compassion and understanding extended to all human beings so that hope, joy and fulfillment can be part of the life experience of even the weakest and the humblest among us.

The civil rights struggle is not only a struggle for laws and judicial decisions. It is also—particularly at this time—a struggle against the rejection, the poverty and ill health that millions of Negroes and people from other minority groups still suffer in our affluent society.

Another obvious connection exists between my struggle and yours. We now know that mental retardation is not always the result of an inborn defect. It may be caused—and is indeed often caused—by physical, cultural, or emotional deprivation.

In this way too many children, too often poor Negro children, pay a heavy toll for the injustices of our society.

It is believed nowadays that only about a quarter of all the mentally retarded have brain damage, or an organic defect that can impair brain function. This type of retardation affects all groups similarly, whether they are rich or poor, white or Negro. It is usually severe retardation associated with physical handicaps; its prevention and treatment must be essentially scientific and medical, and our hope for its victims is founded on progress in medical and behavioral research and in a better knowledge of human genetics.

The other three-quarters of the retarded show no obvious brain damage. They have a milder form of retardation and few or no physical handicaps. They usually come from the poorer strata of our society, typically census tracts where the median level of education is 8 years and the median level of income $3,000—or less per year per family. While this second type of retardation occurs at far below 1 percent in high income and well educated groups, it rises to amazingly high levels, as much as 15 percent in deprived rural areas and in the murk of the urban ghettos.

It is of the retarded victims of deprivation—many of them Negroes—that I am going to talk today.

It brings great credit to the true civic spirit and the true feeling of human solidarity of the National Association for Retarded Children that the theme of its convention this year should be "Reaching Out" and that it has invited me to talk about the heavy burden the Negro bears in relation to mental retardation. Indeed, the picture that I am going to draw will be one that will challenge your admirable organization with new problems and new responsibilities.

The Negro community needs your pioneering experience and your support in its struggle.

Because the Negro has suffered generations of discrimination, abuse and neglect, he still lives, by and large, a life of isolation from the mainstream of society; and also a life of poverty, to an extent which is rarely known in the white world. He, therefore, more than the members of any other single ethnic group, pays a heavy price for injustice in the form of a large number of mentally retarded children—children that become retarded not because they have a bad heredity, but only because the frail and sensitive minds of the very young cannot withstand the bleakness, the harshness and the cruelties of the life of the poor.

Since deprivation as a cause of mental retardation is my primary concern here perhaps I should spell out more precisely the nature of the deprivation experienced by millions of poor Negroes.

Despite the legislative and judicial decisions of the last decade and the current thrust toward social justice under the leadership of President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey, a report prepared by the National Urban League shows that while progress has been achieved, it is not fast enough to narrow the gap between the general conditions of the whites and those of the Negroes. Although Negroes enjoy better opportunities than in the past, the prosperity of the white community develops at a much faster rate, so that the actual gap between whites and Negroes increases rather than narrows. This cruel fact means that unless more determined strides are made to break down racial barriers, the disparity between Negroes and whites will be larger in 1975 than it is today.

Let us consider some relevant figures:

Comparative mortality rates are good indicators of underlying social and economic conditions and clearly demonstrate the nature of the gap.

By 1963, there was little difference in *overall* mortality between whites and non-whites (9.5 per thousand and 10.1 per thousand). This shows only that in the end death does not discriminate; all of us, white or black, must die sometime. However, if we look at the age at which we die, radical differences appear.

Infant mortality and the death rate for children between the ages of 1 and 4 are almost twice as high for Negroes as for whites (44.1 as compared to 22.3 per thousand among infants, and 1.8 as compared to 0.9 per thousand among the 1-to-4 year olds). At least three times as many Negroes die between the ages of 25 and 34 as do whites. And for the next twenty years—all through the prime of life—the mortality rate for Negroes is nearly twice as high as for whites.

It is not until you get into the very top age brackets—75 and over—that the white mortality rate exceeds that of Negroes, for the simple reason that relatively few Negroes live long enough to figure in this part of the table. Those few that do are obviously indestructible.

What kind of life does the average Negro live?

POVERTY'S CHILDREN

Negro infants are twice as likely to be born prematurely—and as you know, prematurity in itself is a major factor contributing to mental retardation. This high rate of premature births occurs because of the poor health of mothers, because of their ignorance of family planning and of the importance of medical supervision during pregnancy, and even more often because of a lack of access to resources providing such knowledge or services.

The children of poverty are commonly born to mothers who were themselves poorly nourished in their adolescence; they are children who are often unplanned, unwanted, or born out of wedlock.

Moreover, these children often grow up in homes where there is no father and an unavailable working mother. All too frequently, they are left alone in their cribs, without tactile and other normal adult-child relationships. They are not encouraged to explore their environments nor do they receive the usual complement of loving care which children require in order to grow healthy emotionally and intellectually. They are deprived of the stimulation which all of us experienced when we were children.

Though there may be quite a bit of noise around them, they hear few words in daily conversation from adults and the words they do hear usually have negative connotations.

There are many "unavailable" mothers—not only working mothers, but also those who are unable to supply the needs of their children because of difficulties of their own; they are emotionally unavailable. Yet others cannot arouse themselves sufficiently from their passivity of lethargy to show affection for their children. Others are deeply depressed and mentally ill and they reject their children for any of a multitude of reasons.

Tragically, the parents in such families frequently fail to react to the presence of retardation. They are underprivileged and must constantly fight for survival. There is no proper family structure, the home is disrupted and disruptive, and the difference between the child's IQ and that of the parents is relatively small. Such parents do not see any reason to seek help and very often distrust the social institutions that can provide it.

Under these conditions, people have to concentrate all their meagre energies on keeping body and soul together. They have neither the means nor the ability to provide their children with stimulating conversation, with books, music, travel, or the other intellectual and cultural advantages bestowed almost automatically on most children of the middle and upper income groups.

When motivation and opportunity for learning are lacking in the early years and other adverse conditions are added—poor diet, bad health habits and sanitation, lack of pre-natal and post-natal care, emotional disorders, crowded living conditions—the result is often stunted intellectual development.

Children from families like these arrive at school age without either the experience or the skills necessary for learning. They are backward in language and in the ability for abstract thinking necessary for reading, writing, and arithmetic. Their failure to learn becomes complicated by frustration and anxiety. They eventually graduate to the streets and far too many to the reformatory.

These children are the innocent products of malignant environments, environments which are a catalogue of injurious factors. They are the children who in our otherwise well endowed and affluent society, inherit the circumstances, not the genes, that predispose them to mental retardation.

It is important here to emphasize that I am describing not the Negro family, but the *impoverished* Negro family. Obviously, there is no such thing as *the* Negro.

But when it comes to the conditions under which Negroes live, certain inescapable generalities arise. When Negroes reach adulthood, they find that for them unemployment rates are regularly more than twice as high as those among whites, whatever their occupation, educational level, age, or sex. The Negro college graduate can expect to earn only as much as the white manual worker who never went beyond the eighth grade. At comparable occupation levels, the white worker earns 50 percent more in a lifetime than does a Negro. The Negro is the last hired, the first fired, and when he works he is paid less than his white counterpart.

The unemployment rate in depressed areas often exceeds 50 percent at a time when the over-all rate of unemployment is a low as 3.5 percent. Unemployment in our ghettos is chronically higher than it was for society at large during the great depression. If the same situation prevailed in the entire nation, we would be on the verge of revolution.

WANTED: A MAN WITH A JOB

Art Linkletter once interviewed a little Negro girl on nationwide television and asked her, "What kind of man do you want to marry?" The child said, "I want to marry a man with a job."

You might think that the discomforts and deprivations experienced by a Negro family receiving $2,400 annually would be the same as those experienced by a white family in similar circumstances. But this is not so for many reasons.

For one thing, given the economics of the ghetto, the Negro dollar buys less than the white dollar. First, consider how overcrowded the urban ghettos are. It may interest you to know that if the entire population of the United States lived at the same density as people live in the worst blocks of Harlem, the entire population of the United States could be housed in three of the five boroughs of New York City. Where overcrowding like this exists, the functioning of supply and demand drives rentals up and the Negro pays more for less.

The Negro also pays more than whites for goods bought on credit, largely because he is judged a poorer credit risk. Interest rates in the ghetto are frequently extortionate. Also, poor Negro families are larger than poor white families, so that what the Negro earns, and gets less for, is spread over more people.

Things that improve the lives of the affluent and even for poor whites, often cause reversals in the lives of Negroes. A good example is urban renewal. Because so many urban Negroes live in slums, it is estimated that 60 percent of the persons dispossessed by urban renewal have been Negroes. Poor whites have less difficulty in relocating; there are more neighborhoods to which they can go. Poor Negroes, confined to the ghetto, simply find themselves faced with a reduced housing supply and, with a reduced supply of housing, rents go up. Those displaced by urban renewal usually wind up paying an average of 10 percent more for rent after relocation than before, with no corresponding increase in income.

CYCLES OF FUTILITY

In addition to discrimination in housing, discrimination against Negroes operates in education and in jobs that might otherwise provide an escape from poverty.

In the main, it is fair to assume that poor whites are poor because they are the least able whites. But poor Negroes include not only those who are the least able, but many of those whose abilities are in the middle and even superior ranges. These able Negroes are poor because they are trapped in an endless cycle of poverty, because they are subject to racial discrimination and are denied access to fields in which their earning ability could be developed and made use of. How tragic it is that today the greatest freedom the Negro experiences is the freedom to die in Vietnam. Here, too, America achieves its only true integration and learns, as General Westmoreland puts it, that "over here, the first thing you find out is that geniuses and idiots, cowards and heroes come in all colors. No race has a monopoly on virtue and no race has a monopoly on vice."

The woeful fruits of historic educational discrimination in the South highlight the fact that a failure of education in any area of the United States has its effect everywhere else. In Illinois, the department of public health conducted a test of literacy among poor, able-bodied Negroes, aged 16 to 64. Of those educated in Illinois, 3 percent were functionally illiterate; 35 percent illiterate. Of those educated in Mississippi but resident in Illinois, 23 percent were functionally illiterate and *81 percent*, or four out of five, were illiterate. Obviously, the poor southern Negro, badly educated in the South and transplanted to a northern or western city, where educational standards rise year by year, falls farther and farther behind. Held back by their heritage from the Southern Way of Life, able-bodied Negroes find it harder and harder to compete.

And all this is happening *now*, at a time when the spectre of automation demands higher and higher skills, and when the really pervasive economic problem is the need to upgrade the work skills of whole sections of the population in as short a time as possible.

This is the face of poverty. This is the world of the Negro American, the Mexican laborer, the American Indian, the Puerto Rican immigrant and also to some extent the poor white in impoverished rural areas. It is breeding ground of as much as half of our mentally retarded people, the dull-eyed children, the juvenile delinquents, the dropouts and socially unadaptable youngsters who drive teachers, lawmakers, and governments to despair.

LAW AND JUSTICE

Can there be any doubt why riots occur in such settings? Can there be any doubt about the pathological condition of many of our cities? Can there be any doubt that urban and racial problems are inseparable? And can there be any doubt that the social conditions which produce mental retardation also produce urban conflict? Can there be any doubt about the extent of our common cause, yours and mine?

There is today much hue and cry for law and order. It is time we stopped talking about law and order as ends in themselves. Hitler had law and order. What we must have is law and justice. We shall never have order—and, indeed, will not deserve order, until we have justice.

What is the cost to the nation of mental retardation caused by deprivation? It cannot be estimated in terms of human suffering. The intangibles cannot be measured, for mental retardation involves a human being, a social and psychic nature that has an indeterminable order of magnitude. But the financial cost to the economy is known to be staggering in terms of undeveloped human resources.

We know that to provide adequate care for the severely retarded and handicapped is expensive. But the loss of potential earning power that results from not training and educating those who can be made to lead self-supporting lives, is astronomical.

During World War II, more than 700,000 persons between 18 and 37 were rejected for military service because of mental deficiency. According to the first report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, an estimated 2 million retarded persons capable of learning to support themselves remain untrained today although they have a potential annual earning capacity of 6 billion.

This tragic condition emphasizes how important it is to help the *children* of the poor. It is they, the children, who have the best chance of escaping poverty. A child lifted out of poverty breaks out of the vicious cycle by which poverty is passed on to the next generation.

Unless we take action now, the "culture of poverty" which holds the secret and the key to the problem will go on reaping its grim toll year after year. The "Culture of Poverty," a term created by Oscar Lewis, aptly describes the attitudes of people for whom poverty has become an accepted way of life. It is made up of lethargy and indifference, sometimes strange forms of rebellion and escapism. It is by no means a prerogative of the Negro people (it was first recognized among Mexicans in Mexico City) and it exists among all large, poor, urban communities isolated in the midst of general prosperity. It is a world that has renounced middleclass targets of success and social status, ethics, and social values. Nevertheless, it is a world with its own rules, taboos, pride, and scale of values. This is the world we have to learn to break into, to communicate with and to convince despite its skepticism and its suspicion. I hope I have shown you that anything we can do to solve the conditions which lead to an all too common kind of mental retardation can help to solve the problem that is threatening the very stability of American life today.

Our nation is confronted with a crisis, a crisis which is both urban and racial. At its core lies the same problem of human deprivation that concerns you, because it can be so cruel and evil to young minds that it may damage them for life. To eliminate economic poverty requires removing another kind of poverty afflicting most middle-class Americans—a poverty of will and concern for others.

It is not known precisely how many among those whose retardation is due solely to deprivation are Negroes. Most of them remain invisible, faceless, nameless, unseen and unrecognized, remote from the institutions and organizations that could help them. We may guess, however, that there are many of them. Conventional approaches such as financial relief unaccompanied by family counseling, jobs without job tailoring or training, have often failed in slum areas.

A chronically impoverished population cannot respond to opportunity as if poverty for them was accidental. The harm already done to many of them is too deep. It has long ago penetrated to the very body and soul of its victims. Therefore, only a concerted, comprehensive, multi-faceted approach of economic, social, and health relief can result in rehabilitation.

The type of retardation caused by social and cultural deprivation occurs more frequently among Negroes than among whites for the simple reason that Negroes experience social and cultural deprivation far more frequently than do whites. Severe, inborn defects, however, occur with the same frequency among Negroes as among whites.

Throughout the country, one in a thousand persons is in an institution for the mentally retarded. How does this figure apply to the Negro? Among the severely retarded, Negroes are probably underrepresented because all such institutions have long waiting lists and getting to the top of the list requires a spokesman the Negro seldom has. On the other hand, among the mildly retarded, who may be institutionalized because of mild delinquent behavior, the Negro is often overrepresented. A middle-class child, equally retarded and having committed the same misdeed, is likely to remain with his family, while the Negro child, not having the same social protections, is apt to end up in an institution. Again, the system works against him.

Even more tragic in the over-all picture is the fact that the Negro is apt to encounter segregation and discrimination within the institution to which he is assigned. I know of quite a few settings in which Negroes are housed separately and treated separately, which usually means they are the recipients of poorer programs and that their chances of a return to society are diminished.

THE UNREACHED

Have you asked yourselves whether the proportion of Negroes in relation to whites in such community programs as day care centers, sheltered workshops, etc., reflects the proportion of Negroes in the community? Possibly it does in some places, but in most places it does not. Negroes remain unreached by those with the services Negroes need most urgently, needs which are more desperate because the Negro's economic capacity to cope with a severely retarded child at home is usually less than that of his white counterpart.

THE UNASKED

Ask yourself how many Negro families belong to your local association for retarded children, despite the non-discriminatory bylaws of the National Association for Retarded Children. If you want the help and understanding of society at large for *your* children in need, shouldn't you ask yourself how often *you* have reached out to extend simply sympathy, advice, and moral support to a Negro family burdened with the same needs but timid in calling out for help? As a group, Negroes do not want charity, or paternalism or the isolationism called for by the widely publicized "black power" rebellious fringe. What they *do* want is *justice* and a chance to participate actively in the mainstream of American life, to whose spiritual values they have contributed so much, being the nation's oldest and largest minority group.

If really welcomed to do so, Negro parents will join the campaign against mental retardation and will put their strength and the enthusiasm of a newly found opportunity to the service of the common struggle.

Consider how ridiculous it is that Negroes are so often condemned to unemployment or underemployment at a time when we continually hear cries of concern about a manpower shortage. Why shouldn't they become an important, immediate source of additional manpower, particularly as auxiliaries to professionals in health, education, and social work? It would cost relatively little in money and effort to upgrade even the unskilled to the point at which they would become valuable assistants to presently overburdened professional staffs. Negroes, particularly Negro women, would then discover the joy of a life of meaningful service in the community and could bring their well known love, patience, and devotion to children into play to help those who need it so much.

For a long-range new supply of professional manpower, a well conducted campaign among high school students would motivate them toward careers in special education, and the health professions would reap a rich harvest among young people who yearn for a meaningful future.

I suggest that the National Association for Retarded Children, with its 1,250 local units all over the country, in every type of community, could render an immense service to the community at large, and an even greater service to mentally retarded people, in undertaking this type of reaching out.

We should not delude ourselves into believing that society will treat its mentally retarded citizens as equal and deserving human beings as long as it fails to treat others decently simply because they have dark skin or fails to offer them meaningful help at a time when they struggle so painfully to emerge from centuries of oppression.

My fight and your fight are inseparable in that both aim at changing a general narrow-minded, self-righteous and selfish public attitude into one of enlightenment and compassionate humanism.

We have made some progress, and I am happy to announce that the National Urban League, the National Association for Retarded Children, and the Family Service Association of America are now working on the formulation of a program to combine the expertise and knowledge of each of these agencies in a special effort directed at the mentally retarded and their families. The over-all objective is to help families in low-income areas with mentally retarded members to utilize existing services, of which they are now either ignorant or to which they are hostile, and to stimulate new services designed to meet their needs. We must develop this work wisely.

In searching for the truly mentally retarded among an underprivileged population it is important to bear in mind that intelligence and achievement are intimately related to the amount and quality of schooling. Although race and culture *per se* are irrelevant, our conventional aptitude and achievement tests, most of which rely heavily on middle class concepts and experience, commonly fail to reveal the undoubted intelligence of deprived children, many of whom survive only by the ready exercise of native wit.

In Louisiana, for example, it has been demonstrated that the closer to New Orleans Negro children dwell, the higher their IQ's, for the simple reason that the city schools are better. Also, the longer Negro children from the South live in New York City and attend New York City schools, the higher their IQ's become.

A study of "verbal destitution" among southern Negro college students revealed that those students most retarded in reading and reading comprehension come from small segregated high schools. They had the language patterns typical of the only adult models with whom they had had any contact—that is, poorly educated teachers, parents, and clergy.

One researcher working with the children of the Negro poor found that they invariably failed the question, "What is wrong?" when shown a picture of a house with broken windows. In their environment, broken windows are normal.

In the course of testing a group of Negro children at the University of Pittsburgh, researchers asked them to color a picture of a banana. Every one colored it brown. None had ever seen a fresh banana.

Teaching materials that show a white middle class environment complete with trees, flowers, pets, parks, toys, and comfortable surroundings are incomprehensible to many Negro youngsters. Such unfamiliar images intimidate and disorient them and diminish their ability to learn.

RELATIVE RETARDATION

Einstein was once quoted as saying that in the society of Australian aborigines, he would rightfully be regarded as intellectually deficient for not being able to track a wallaby or throw a boomerang. If the aborigine ever did get around to drafting an IQ test, all of western civilization would presumably flunk it.

DISMAY THROUGH EDUCATION

By the same token, it is entirely possible that a sophisticated five-year-old in the suburbs may know what caviar is, while the sophisticated five-year-old in the ghetto may know what a syringe is. I submit that the intellectual achievement is about equal. Testing and teaching materials must clearly take cognizance of cultural and class differences if the true potential of the individual child is to be recognized and realized.

Traditional methods used so far have tended to ignore the action style of the deprived child. They usually avoid indigenous language and characteristics and place all their stress on middle class modes of behavior which may be totally alien. Differences in cultural background are commonly ignored—a practice that can totally inhibit the deprived child's ability to learn.

I have no respect for the teacher who writes off the deprived child as uneducable because she doesn't get middle class reponses from him. Nor have I any respect for the teacher from an impoverished background whose own hard-won middle class status makes her recoil from the poverty she thought she had left behind her.

Take a slum child, for example, who is asked, "If you had 24 apples and you gave 12 away, how many would you have?" This child may well be able to do the arithmetic, but never in his life heard of anyone having 24 apples or of anyone who ever gave anything away. He may be so utterly overwhelmed by the implications of the question that he can't think of it as a problem in arithmetic. If he is then embarrassed before the class for failing to answer, or to answer within the prescribed time, his difficulty in responding to classroom stimuli will clearly get worse.

Or, again, there's the teacher who asks a child about his father and learns that he hasn't one and exclaims, "Oh, yes, yes, I understand," making it clear from both her tone and manner that she assumes the child is illegitimate, when in fact the child's father is dead.

Slum children survive by being alert to what's going on around them, and in a case like this, the whole class resents the teacher's misunderstanding. The child is humiliated, the class gets a disagreeable insight into the teacher's point of view, and the teacher's rapport with the class is in disrepair.

Another thing that must be borne in mind is that it is basic to all learning that the child have a sense of reward. For a deprived child, rewards may never come in his home surroundings. If he doesn't learn the meaning of reward in school he may never learn it and be confined for the rest of his life to an existence without achievement.

The teacher who has heart as well as head can identify the strengths of deprived children. If they can survive in the slums, they are, by definition, educable. A study of Harvard has visibly demonstrated the importance of teacher-expectation. Teachers in a selected school system were told that certain children, chosen at random, would show dramatic improvement in academic achievement over a period of a few months. Purely because, the teachers' expectations of those children were high. They *did* show dramatic improvement.

Having drawn your attention to the special challenge the deprived child represents, I would list the most desperate needs among deprived Negroes and suggest the kinds of program that would accomplish the most in alleviating the burden of mental retardation among them.

The needs, of course, are both remedial and preventive. All enlightened measures designed to relieve the Negro community of poverty and ignorance are basic to prevention. Adequate housing, economic development of the ghetto, improved medical care, and adequate schools have clear implications for a reduction in the incidence of mental retardation.

The Head Start program, responding directly to the needs of deprived children, is of particular importance, although it should be initiated at earlier ages than at present and sustained throughout the elementary school years in order to compensate more fully for cultural deprivation in the home.

I am delighted to see that the Office of Economic Opportunity has now started experimenting with a program of parent-child centers which is, in fact, a pre-Head Start program of day care for children of the poor who are three years old and younger.

There is a crying need for more maternal and infant care centers at the heart of areas inhabited by "high risk" mothers, areas in which the incidence of prematurity is high and health habits are poor, as is the case in urban ghettos and in the rural South. Easily accessible, community-centered birth control clinics, whose staffs are highly trained not only in the technicalities of birth control, but in respect for human dignity, privacy, and freedom of conscience are an important element in the prevention of mental retardation.

In contrast to general programs of this kind, which are mainly the responsibility of the public sector, diagnostic and remedial services are more directly the responsibility of the private voluntary agencies, because they are better geared to person-to-person relations, more open to innovation, more flexible.

For example, important services could be channeled into target areas through the combined efforts of the National Association for Retarded Children, the National Urban League, and the Family Service Association with their many local chapters. They could assume the tasks of screening target populations to determine individual needs; of locating families in distress because of the presence within the family unit of a retarded child; of awakening legitimate desires for help; of directing children to the proper diagnostic and testing facilities; and later making referrals to appropriate special education classes, to training facilities and specialized medical services. They could undertake programs for counseling and educating parents on proper attitudes toward the retarded child, which should always accompany actual care for the child.

Where adequate services are lacking, the voluntary agencies should advise parents on how to organize themselves to petition for services they are entitled to under the law and how to form pressure groups, the most efficient way for citizens to ensure their rights.

This latter is the area in which the National Association for Retarded Children has functioned most effectively in the past and in doing so has brought immeasurable relief to distressed families. I hope and pray that you, its members, will now open your hearts and minds to the plight of those still beyond the reach of adequate care, that you will reach out to the unfortunate, the timid, and the frightened in genuine concern for all those who need the benefits of NARC's rich experience in citizen organization in the service of the retarded.

Finally, and I must be completely candid with you, NARC cannot conduct an effective outreach program in behalf of the disadvantaged minorities, and be taken seriously, unless these minorities are represented on your boards, your committees and among your staff members where you have professional staff at work. The best witness to your work will not be the result of exhortation or rhetoric. It will be the result of example.

I am aware that this challenge comes at a moment when many Americans are indulging themselves in what is called a "backlash." I recently addressed another national association, and afterwards a fellow came up to me to say that while he had been very sympathetic to the Negro cause at an earlier date, now, with the cries of "black power" and the riots, and one thing and another, he was no longer as sympathetic.

I asked him to tell me what he had done when he was sympathetic. How many Negroes had he hired or trained? How many had he helped to move into his neighborhood, his school, or his country club?

Well, it turned out he hadn't done any of those things. He hadn't done anything at all. My reaction to which is that nothing from nothing is nothing.

I hope and pray that, strong in the feeling of doing justice, you will search out Negro parents and welcome them in the crusade that will finally guarantee retarded children in the Negro community the care and the hope that they have never known in the past.

Gold Still Counts for Trust

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, honest and principled people require few laws for harmonious assembly, and, likewise, honest, altruistic nations could engage in international trade without metallic money.

As the following editorial, which appeared in the San Diego Union on February 3, 1968, points out:

> The fact remains that people and nations do not trust each other.

And therefore confidence in a currency depends upon its being backed by something of intrinsic value—that something generally being gold.

Our economic survival demands the controlling influence of gold backed currency.

The editorial follows:

Gold Still Counts for Trust

It is highly important for congressmen to distinguish between the academic and the practical as they assess Tuesday the value of having gold as a backing for some of our money.

Rep. Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas, underlined one current favorite line of discussion when he said:

"Gold in no way, shape or form gives value to a nation's currency . . . the so-called gold cover (the gold backing for 25 per cent of our paper money) is part of outdated mythology which has no place and no meaning in 20th Century economy."

That is the academic viewpoint.

Far more realistic is the assessment of William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Tucson, Ariz., Star:

"If one assumes that most governments and most people are honest, reasonable and prudent, then it would be possible to dispense with gold as a monetary medium of exchange . . . When people demand too much, governments cannot be honest and gold plays its role."

Still another expert of the value of gold, Premier Georges Pompidou of France gives another pragmatic assessment of the value of gold as an international medium of exchange:

"Gold from the viewpoint of the international system is the policeman. You do foolish things, you spend too much—that costs you gold. You are reasonable, you save, you earn a good sum, gold comes to you . . . When one is not controlled by police, one indulges in excesses."

Whether we theorize that gold is a "barbarous metal" or a part of "outdated mythology," the fact remains that people and nations do not trust each other. Gold remains the ultimate medium of exchange when confidence in a currency without intrinsic value fails.

And unfortunately, the excesses of the United States of America through the so-called "Great Society" at home or the wasteful projects abroad has lessened confidence in the dollar.

As a result, even if the gold cover is removed, the disturbing question remains: What if it doesn't work? Foreigners hold about $30 billion in dollars they could exchange for about $11.5 billion of our gold. Only confidence in the dollar keeps them from doing so.

And the certitude is that even at the optimum if there is no run on U.S. gold, the removal of the gold cover is not a solution to the problem but only buys some time.

Academic polemics about the gold cover may be politically feasible in the approaching season. But if we are thinking of survival we must get down to the practical fact that gold does count and we had better do something about it.

The Future Farmers March Ahead

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Future Farmers of America are preparing for their 40th anniversary celebration. It was in Kansas City, Mo., in the year of 1928, that a small number of high school students met for the first time as a group for the purpose of founding an organization especially for farm youths. In just four short decades this small group has grown to a membership of almost a half million boys in chapters throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico.

Every year, since its beginning, one week in February has been set aside as National Future Farmers of America Week. Every year the activities of the year past have been recounted and evaluated and plans outlined for the coming year. Certainly it is to the credit of these early youths and their leaders, and to those who have followed them, that the agenda has become more ambitious with each succeeding year.

The Future Farmers in Kentucky, and particularly in our Second Congressional District, are very active. Our people take a great deal of pride in these young folk who, by their fresh and enthusiastic approach, are a constant reminder that the farm, both as a family home and a business enterprise, is not losing its place of importance in today's world but, rather, is embued with a new prominence.

Our young farmers are inspired today by the same basic belief that led to the establishment of the Future Farmers of America 40 years ago—a belief in the future of farming. This belief has been sorely tried at times. It is being tried now, for there are some who say that our rural communities and farms are facing extinction. In traveling throughout our district I have met and come to know some of these young men who—or so say the doubters—are about to become extinct. My young friends are somewhat amused by such talk and dire prophecy, for while they recognize the fact that our agricultural way of life is changing, they know, far better than those who are pronouncing their doom, that certainly it is not diminishing.

To embrace the belief in the future of farming, as each Future Farmer has done, is to accept its corresponding responsibility. By the example of their parents and the training within their organization, Future Farmers are encouraged not only to accept this responsibility but to seek it. As we all know, there is a segment of America's young—a small one to be sure—who are in rebellion against all that we revere in our Nation. I believe—sincerely believe—that our rural young have had and want no part of this movement. Although members of the same generation, they find it impossible to identify with the beatniks and the hippies. No need have they for a synthetic utopia for the very nature of farm life, in its simplicity, is nevertheless alive and dynamic. Here on every hand are God's blessings. Here on every hand are the true miracles—the real happenings.

Our Future Farmers are sound and solid. They possess a directness and an ingenuity that perhaps has become lost for most of us. I was told recently of a soldier who solved a rather stubborn problem he encountered in Vietnam. It seems that the bare ground around his camp was just a little toc much for this man. After several unsuccessful attempts at growing native grass he wrote to his family back home for some bluegrass seed. Forthwith he was sent 50 pounds, it flourished and once again Kentucky's fame had spread across mountains, plains, and seas. It came as no surprise to me to learn that this proud Kentuckian—now wearing the uniform of his country—was once a Future Farmer from our congressional district.

The Future Farmers of America have my admiration and my support and I wish them a future replete with success.

Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in December 1967, Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, convened a meeting in Bermuda of a group of private U.S. citizens to consider the grave situation in Vietnam. As a result of this meeting, a memorandum on Vietnam was issued which reflects the substantial consensus of the group.

The memorandum is indicative of the growing alarm at the course of escalation in Vietnam on the part of increasing numbers of responsible Americans. The memorandum is a sober assessment of what is necessary to reverse this dangerous trend. The memorandum and a list of signatories follows:

MEMORANDUM ON VIETNAM, DECEMBER 12, 1967

(NOTE.—The following memorandum represents substantial consensus among those present at a private meeting organized by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in December 1967, although it should not be assumed that every participant agrees with all of it. It does not represent an official Endowment position.)

This statement is not addressed to the past; it concerns the present and future.

There now appears to be serious danger that the momentum of the Vietnam conflict may carry hostilities to disproportionate and even perilous levels. Under the circumstances there is a need to explore policy alternatives for the future. To do so is not to criticize earlier decisions or to suggest abandoning our resistance. But if we were to pursue present objectives by widening the war as by ground probes into Laos and Cambodia, our commitments would escalate along with our risks, and the next step could be an invasion of North Vietnam. Such developments would entail unacceptable risks and threaten world peace.

It seems most unlikely that widening the war, and particularly invading North Vietnam, would lead to military victory or shorten the war. Rather, this would heighten the possibility of direct Chinese and Soviet intervention, further alienate friendly and neutral nations, and jeopardize other world-wide American interests. It would also deepen divisions inside the United States and curtail programs essential to our domestic tranquillity; it could revive isolationism.

The United States should modify its strategy so that it can defend South Vietnam without surrender and without increasing the risks of a wider war. United States policy should not be dependent on Hanoi's decisions.

First, in the war in the South every effort should be made to reduce violence to levels at which a sustained effort can be maintained with the support of both the American and Vietnamese people. The emphasis should not be on the military destruction of communist forces in the South but on the protection of the people of South Vietnam and the stabilization of the situation at a politically tolerable level. Tactically, this would involve a shift in emphasis from "search-and-destroy" to "clear-and-hold" operations.

Second, we should stop the bombing of North Vietnam. From now on the costs of strategic bombing will increasingly exceed the benefits. This step would tend to shift international pressures from Washington to Hanoi. It should not be made contingent upon an immediate military *quid pro quo* nor taken in the expectation that it would lead to early negotiations. If North Vietnam chose to exploit the cessation flagrantly by expanding its forces in the South, bombing of infiltration routes could be resumed, with the prospect of increased domestic political support.

Third, the South Vietnamese government at all levels should be steadily pressed to assume greater and greater responsibility, both political and military, for the defense and pacification of the country. To achieve this purpose, the United States should seek every opportunity to make aid to the South Vietnamese conditional upon fulfillment of their commitments.

Fourth, a major problem arises concerning the role of the National Liberation Front as an organized factor in the political life of South Vietnam. In seeking an end to open hostilities, we should recognize that the risks of attempting to cope with the National Liberation Front primarily by political means on a long-term basis, although real, are less than the risks for the United States of persisting in an indefinitely prolonged attempt to destroy the National Liberation Front or to exclude it by American military force.

In sum, United States policy should aim at moderating the level of hostilities regardless of whether formal negotiations for an ultimate settlement are now possible. In the large, United States posture should be one that can be sustained for an indefinite period with reduced risks and increased political benefits until such time as the conflict can be resolved in an honorable and peaceful fashion.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

Among the participants were the following (Associations are given only for purposes of identification):

Harding F. Bancroft, Executive Vice President, The New York Times, Carnegie Endowment Trustee, former US delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

Lincoln Bloomfield, Professor, Center for International Studies, M.I.T., former State Department official.

Charles G. Bolté, Vice President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former Member of the US Mission to the United Nations.

John Cowles, President, The Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

Daniel Ellsberg, Economist and former member, US Mission in Vietnam.

Miss Frances FitzGerald, author of recent articles on Vietnam in *Atlantic*.

Ernest A. Gross, Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle, Carnegie Endowment Trustee, former US delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

Roger Hilsman, Professor, School of International Affairs, Columbia University, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former State Department official.

Milton Katz, Director of International Legal Studies, Harvard Law School, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

George Kistiakowsky, Professor, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, 1959–61.

Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation, former State Department official.

Richard Neustadt, Director, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, former Special Consultant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Matthew B. Ridgway, General, U.S. Army, retired.

Marshall D. Shulman, Director, Russian Institute, Columbia University, former State Department official.

Donald B. Straus, President, American Arbitration Association, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

Kenneth W. Thompson, Political Scientist.

James C. Thomson, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Harvard University, former White House aide.

Stephen J. Wright, President, United Negro College Fund.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor, Harvard Law School, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Charles Yost, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, former US Ambassador to Laos and US Deputy Representative to the United Nations.

Dramatic Action by Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant publicly made known its plans to significantly reduce air pollution in Saginaw, Mich. It is a tremendously expensive undertaking for this Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant which will replace its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

In this massive 5-year changeover, a company official summed up this project by saying:

> In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today.

It is with pride that I bring to the attention of all Members of the Congress newspaper articles from the Saginaw News in its editions of February 8 and 9, 1968, centering on this dramatic announcement.

With our Federal Government, State and local governments becoming more keenly aware each day of the absolute health needs for clean air, it is significant that this multimillion-dollar project has been planned and now put into effect by the own initiative of this plant and its corporation.

Playing a major role in the planning that took months, yes, years, was Elmer E. Braun, central foundry division's general manager, along with the capable leadership of Charles E. Drury, division works manager, and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

In closing, permit me to quote from the editorial, which sums up what has been called a "great step forward." The quotation is:

> GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is willing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 8, 1968]

MALLEABLE'S NEW FURNACES TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION

Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant announced today plans to significantly reduce air pollution by replacing its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

Elmer E. Braun, division general manager, said the Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant will be furnished with the highest volume induction melting installation in the world, involving the use of giant, coreless induction furnaces.

"In doing so," he said, "we will eliminate a major source of smoke and at the same time modernize the plant's melting facilities with the most advanced equipment available."

Announcement of the plan was made at noon today in a program at the Central Foundry Division headquarters. Attending were state, county, and city officials, area businessmen and industrialists and GM officials.

Details of the plan were explained by Charles E. Drury, division works manager and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager. They said that work on the multi-million dollar first phase has already begun and that the complete changeover will be accomplished in approximately five years.

The decision to use induction melting was based on several factors, some of which may pertain only to the Saginaw plant and its particular product lines, according to Drury. He listed the age of existing melting facilities; the need for melting flexibility and close metallurgical control, evaluation of over three years' experience with large induction furnaces at the Saginaw and new Defiance, Ohio, plants.

"This will be the most ambitious project the Saginaw plant has ever undertaken," Karam said. "It can only be done a step at a time, because we must maintain operations throughout the transition period." The plant employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings—products used extensively in industry and defense.

Phase One, now underway, includes the relocation of some existing facilities, improvement of additional land needed, installation of one melting unit with preheaters, material handling equipment, a building addition, and a new power distribution system. Initial equipment orders have been placed.

The first new furnace will begin operating in 1969, eliminating the need for one of the plant's three operating cupolas. This will reduce the effluent by about one-third. The remaining two furnaces are scheduled to become operational at intervals of approximately 1½ years with corresponding reductions of melting effluent being achieved at each step.

"By early 1972," Karam said, "our induction melting installation should be completely operational and the use of the last cupola discontinued. We then will have achieved virtual elimination of melting emissions, a goal toward which we have been striving since 1946 when we installed the first cupola wet cap control units. Later efforts included improved wet caps, the development of a small experimental cupola gas scrubber, installation in 1960 of a low-energy Venturi scrubber, and extending the stacks to permit installation of gas incinerators. In 1964, we purchased and installed a 33-ton induction furnace, then the world's largest, to provide actual operating experience and data."

Heading the list of GM officials were Joseph G. Godfrey, GM vice president and former general manager of Saginaw Steering Gear Division, and Wallace E. Wilson, vice president and group executive.

State officials included John C. Soet, Lansing, director of Occupational Health Department; Bernard D. Bloomfield, Lansing, assistant director, and Russell Scoville, Saginaw, local engineer for Occupational Health and Air Pollution.

County officials included James L. Collison, chairman of the Saginaw County Board of Supervisors, and Julius Sutto, Saginaw County Comptroller.

City Officials included Mayor Henry G. Marsh, Councilmen Benjamin J. Marxer, Paul H. Wendler, Warren C. Light, Fremont F. Ruhl, Robert L. Loucks, James W. Stenglein; Thomas H. Eynon, city information officer; Dwight D. Hughes, chairman of the city planning commission, and Howard G. Sheltraw, director of the city planning department.

Businessmen and industrialists included B. G. Campbell, vice president of sales for Consumers Power Co.; G. Hutton Schrader, president of the Greater Saginaw Chamber of Commerce, and Anson Hedgecock, Jackson, vice president of Consumers Power Co.

Special guests at the luncheon will be Reidar G. Brustad, Oslo, Norway, public relations manager for GM Norway; Charles B. McCabe, public relations manager of GM Austria; Giovanni Costantani, public relations manager of GM Italia, and Bendt Hansen, public relations manager for GM International in Denmark.

Melting iron in coreless electrical induction furnaces produces little smoke compared to the conventional coke-fired cupola, and that effluent can be easily controlled. Because the heat is produced electrically, no combustibles, such as coke and carbon are required. Further, there is no need for the continuous exhaust of high velocity, high temperature gases which pick up and carry minute, solid particles from cupolas.

The first wide use of induction furnace melting for iron came about in Europe during the early 1950's. Such furnaces at that time had a 5-ton holding capacity with sufficient electrical power input to melt 1½ tons of metal per hour. The advantages in the use of this melting procedure was recognized by American foundrymen. Larger furnaces were designed to meet the larger output required by U.S. foundries. The Saginaw plant's original furnace, which holds 33 tons and melts eight tons per hour, was a major step forward.

The four induction furnaces now in use at the division's Defiance Plant No. 2 are still the largest in the world from the standpoint of electrical power input—each with a power input of 6,250 kilowatts and capable of melting 10 tons per hour. The success of these 33-ton furnaces made practical the development of a 75-ton holding furnace with a 17,000 kilowatt power input. Such a furnace, in combination with preheating of the metal charge, will make possible an output of 40 tons per hour which is equivalent to the output of a large malleable iron cupola.

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 9, 1968]

FOUNDRY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAUDED

Civic, business and health officials have commended General Motors Corp.'s Central Foundry Division following its announcement of a five-year, multi-million-dollar project to install new melting furnaces which will practically eliminate air pollution from the foundry's smoke stacks.

Work already has begun on the electric furnaces—the largest of their type in the world. They will replace the foundry's coke-fired furnaces, eliminating by one-third the smoke, ash, soot and cinders which come from the foundry's stacks. The first new furnace will become operational in 1969. The project, which also includes buildings and power plant additions, will be complete by 1972.

A specific dollar cost was not given for the project at the foundry, which employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings.

John C. Soet, director of occupational health for the Michigan Department of Public Health, was one of those who commended Central Foundry for what he called its attitude of social responsibility and quick response to state air pollution regulations in the emissions control law passed last year by the Michigan Legislature.

Soet was among the state, county and municipal officials at Central Foundry Division's luncheon Thursday at Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant for the announcement of the project.

Elmer E. Braun, division general manager, introduced Soet and their guests who spoke briefly to express appreciation for the company's decision to replace the four coke-fired cupolas now used to melt metal. Others who spoke included Mayor Henry G. Marsh; Wallace E. Wilson, General Motors Corp. vice president and chief of the group of which Central Foundry Division is a part. He gave the corporation's views on air pollution. Charles E. Drury, division works manager, explained details of the replacement program, along with Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

Pollution, especially pollution in the air, is vexing to state health officials, Soet said. He added that operating foundries in the state are significant contributors to air pollution. Members of the Air Pollution Control Commission, he continued, are aware of the industry's value to the state's economy and are gratified by the response of many foundries to the air pollution control program.

Central Foundry's plan to install electric furnaces will reduce considerably the amount of particulates in the air around Saginaw, he said, and is a commendable example of the kind of pollution controls needed.

Marsh expressed to Central Foundry and GM officials the appreciation of the city for the efforts to relieve the problem of air pollution here. He called the decision an "example of progress at its best."

"Central Foundry's program is an excellent start for a campaign to eliminate air pollution," Wilson said, "and is indicative of the General Motors policy on all types of pollution in the air, on land and in water."

Karam told the group in response to a question that the electric induction furnaces for melting iron would virtually eliminate all polluting smoke from the foundry. He said 1972 should let the division reach its goal of eliminating pollution which they had been striving for since 1946 when the first cupola wet cap control units were installed.

Braun also read a message from Lt. Gov. William G. Millikin which expressed appreciation to General Motors and the Central Foundry Division for the air pollution control project.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News,
Feb. 9, 1968]

MALLEABLE PROJECT GREAT STEP FORWARD

To somewhat paraphrase Gov. Romney's recent State-of-the-State theme, anybody interested in a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw—and that presumably includes all of us—will welcome announcement that work has begun to make coke-fired cupolas at Central Foundry Division's Malleable Iron Plant a thing of the past.

This is a dramatic announcement that has to be measured in more ways than merely what it is going to cost General Motors to transform Malleable's melting process into a virtually smokeless operation through installation of coreless electric induction furnaces. Suffice to say that will be plenty.

More important, however, is what this project means in terms of environmental improvement, economic development, industrial advancement and, in fact, public confidence. As with an iceberg these are the things beneath the surface that do not show up in complex blueprints, cost sheets or explanations in the language of engineering.

Obviously the number one factor in the undertaking is what it is going to mean relative to reduced air pollution. And what it is going to mean to the air over Saginaw is great indeed.

There is, of course, no quick route to this changeover. As GM and Malleable officials pointed out Thursday, the foundry's three coke-fired furnaces will have to be replaced one by one in a phasing out program which won't be completed for five years. It is a huge job and production must continue while the changeover installations are being made.

But what is greatly encouraging is the fact that with each replacement, electric furnace for coke-fired, the so-called melting emissions will be reduced by about one-third. That means smoke and it says that by the time all electric furnaces are operative Malleable melting operations will be virtually non-pollutant to the air.

One company official summed up the project this: "In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today." That's a big and encouraging statement.

Yet from still another standpoint, one of the more significant aspects of the Malleable melting furnace modernization program has nothing directly to do with the foundry. This is the very stimulating effect it will have on redevelopment in the South Saginaw area and particularly as it relates to future river front projects.

Virtual elimination of foundry smoke wastes from the air and removal of cupolas will enhance chances for even greater development by removing from skyline view those things which discourage investment.

From the manufacturing standpoint the project speaks for itself. Installation of the electric furnaces at the Malleable plant, the largest producer of iron and certain steel castings, may very well make it the model for all foundry melting processes in the country.

Combining the best in both air pollutant control and advanced production characteristics, the Saginaw project could be the major breakthrough that the foundry industry has been looking for.

It must be said again, however, that nothing transcends the project's worth more than its environmental benefits.

National concern over the quality of the air we breathe is as intense as concern over water pollution. Therefore this city, which yet hasn't been faced with a problem of polluted air as great as that being encountered in many other places, is fortunate to have inherited a cleaner-air project of this magnitude.

This brings us to one of the points made earlier—public confidence. It is perhaps one of the most critical facets of all in the issue of air pollution and industry's responsibility in this regard.

GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is willing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

As far as this community is concerned, it bears a direct relationship to a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw.

A Clearer View of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Ebony magazine features an arresting article concerning Abraham Lincoln's views on slavery and the black man in America. This article, titled "Was Abe Lincoln a White Supremacist?", contains information regarding President Lincoln's attitudes and actions which have never been given sufficient attention, not only by popular accounts, but even by many professional historians.

The author of the article, Lerone Bennett, Jr., senior editor of Ebony magazine, is well-known as a careful and thoughtful historian. This article, and the dialog that I am sure it will provoke among both historians and in the public media, will do much to achieve a more accurate and clearer view of President Lincoln. It is of the greatest importance that contemporary American accurately understand the views and perspective of this famous President.

I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed immediately following my remarks.

The article follows:

WAS ABE LINCOLN A WHITE SUPREMACIST?

(By Lerone Bennett, Jr.)

The presidential campaign was over and the victor was stretching his legs and shaking off the cares of the world in his temporary office in the State Capitol in Springfield, Ill. Surrounded by the perquisites of power, at peace with the world, the President-elect was regaling old acquaintances with hilarious stories of his early days as a politician. One of the visitors interrupted this entertaining monologue and remarked that it was a shame that "the vexatious slavery matter" would be the first question of public policy the new President would have to deal with in Washington.

The President-elect's eyes twinkled and he said he was reminded of a story. According to eyewitness Henry Villard, President-elect Abraham Lincoln "told the story of the Kentucky Justice of the Peace whose first case was a criminal prosecution for the abuse of slaves. Unable to find any precedent, he exclaimed at last angrily: 'I will be damned if I don't feel almost sorry for being elected when the niggers is the first thing I have to attend to.' "

This story, shocking as it may sound to Lincoln admirers, was in character. For the President-elect had never shown any undue interest in black people, and it was altogether natural for him to suggest that he shared the viewpoint of the reluctant and biased justice of the peace.

In one of the supreme ironies of history, the man who told this story was forced by circumstances to attend to the Negroes. And within five years he was enshrined in American mythology as "the Great Emancipator who freed the Negroes with a stroke of the pen out of the goodness and compassion of his heart."

Over the years, the Mythology of the Great Emancipator has become a part of the mental landscape of America. Generations of schoolchildren have memorized its cadences. Poets, politicians, and long-suffering blacks have wept over its imagery and drama.

No other American story is so enduring.

Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation, former State Department official.

Richard Neustadt, Director, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, former Special Consultant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Matthew B. Ridgway, General, U.S. Army, retired.

Marshall D. Shulman, Director, Russian Institute, Columbia University, former State Department official.

Donald B. Straus, President, American Arbitration Association, Carnegie Endowment Trustee.

Kenneth W. Thompson, Political Scientist.

James C. Thomson, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Harvard University, former White House aide.

Stephen J. Wright, President, United Negro College Fund.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor, Harvard Law School, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Charles Yost, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, former US Ambassador to Laos and US Deputy Representative to the United Nations.

Dramatic Action by Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant publicly made known its plans to significantly reduce air pollution in Saginaw, Mich. It is a tremendously expensive undertaking for this Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant which will replace its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

In this massive 5-year changeover, a company official summed up this project by saying:

> In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today.

It is with pride that I bring to the attention of all Members of the Congress newspaper articles from the Saginaw News in its editions of February 8 and 9, 1968, centering on this dramatic announcement.

With our Federal Government, State and local governments becoming more keenly aware each day of the absolute health needs for clean air, it is significant that this multimillion-dollar project has been planned and now put into effect by the own initiative of this plant and its corporation.

Playing a major role in the planning that took months, yes, years, was Elmer E. Braun, central foundry division's general manager, along with the capable leadership of Charles E. Drury, division works manager, and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

In closing, permit me to quote from the editorial, which sums up what has been called a "great step forward." The quotation is:

> GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is willing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 8, 1968]

MALLEABLE'S NEW FURNACES TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION

Central Foundry Division's Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant announced today plans to significantly reduce air pollution by replacing its coke-fired cupolas with electric induction melting furnaces.

Elmer E. Braun, division general manager, said the Saginaw General Motors Corp. plant will be furnished with the highest volume induction melting installation in the world, involving the use of giant, coreless induction furnaces.

"In doing so," he said, "we will eliminate a major source of smoke and at the same time modernize the plant's melting facilities with the most advanced equipment available."

Announcement of the plan was made at noon today in a program at the Central Foundry Division headquarters. Attending were state, county, and city officials, area businessmen and industrialists and GM officials.

Details of the plan were explained by Charles E. Drury, division works manager and Arthur J. Karam, plant manager. They said that work on the multi-million dollar first phase has already begun and that the complete changeover will be accomplished in approximately five years.

The decision to use induction melting was based on several factors, some of which may pertain only to the Saginaw plant and its particular product lines, according to Drury. He listed the age of existing melting facilities; the need for melting flexibility and close metallurgical control, evaluation of over three years' experience with large induction furnaces at the Saginaw and new Defiance, Ohio, plants.

"This will be the most ambitious project the Saginaw plant has ever undertaken," Karam said. "It can only be done a step at a time, because we must maintain operations throughout the transition period." The plant employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings—products used extensively in industry and defense.

Phase One, now underway, includes the relocation of some existing facilities, improvement of additional land needed, installation of one melting unit with preheaters, material handling equipment, a building addition, and a new power distribution system. Initial equipment orders have been placed.

The first new furnace will begin operating in 1969, eliminating the need for one of the plant's three operating cupolas. This will reduce the effluent by about one-third. The remaining two furnaces are scheduled to become operational at intervals of approximately 1½ years with corresponding reductions of melting effluent being achieved at each step.

"By early 1972," Karam said, "our induction melting installation should be completely operational and the use of the last cupola discontinued. We then will have achieved virtual elimination of melting emissions, a goal toward which we have been striving since 1946 when we installed the first cupola wet cap control units. Later efforts included improved wet caps, the development of a small experimental cupola gas scrubber, installation in 1960 of a low-energy Venturi scrubber, and extending the stacks to permit installation of gas incinerators. In 1964, we purchased and installed a 33-ton induction furnace, then the world's largest, to provide actual operating experience and data."

Heading the list of GM officials were Joseph G. Godfrey, GM vice president and former general manager of Saginaw Steering Gear Division, and Wallace E. Wilson, vice president and group executive.

State officials included John C. Soet, Lansing, director of Occupational Health Department; Bernard D. Bloomfield, Lansing, assistant director, and Russell Scoville, Saginaw, local engineer for Occupational Health and Air Pollution.

County officials included James L. Collison, chairman of the Saginaw County Board of Supervisors, and Julius Sutto, Saginaw County Comptroller.

City Officials included Mayor Henry G. Marsh, Councilmen Benjamin J. Marxer, Paul H. Wendler, Warren C. Light, Fremont F. Ruhl, Robert L. Loucks, James W. Stenglein; Thomas H. Eynon, city information officer; Dwight D. Hughes, chairman of the city planning commission, and Howard G. Sheltraw, director of the city planning department.

Businessmen and industrialists included B. G. Campbell, vice president of sales for Consumers Power Co.; G. Hutton Schrader, president of the Greater Saginaw Chamber of Commerce, and Anson Hedgecock, Jackson, vice president of Consumers Power Co.

Special guests at the luncheon will be Reidar G. Brustad, Oslo, Norway, public relations manager for GM Norway; Charles B. McCabe, public relations manager of GM Austria; Giovanni Costantani, public relations manager of GM Italia, and Bendt Hansen, public relations manager for GM International in Denmark.

Melting iron in coreless electrical induction furnaces produces little smoke compared to the conventional coke-fired cupola, and that effluent can be easily controlled. Because the heat is produced electrically, no combustibles, such as coke and carbon are required. Further, there is no need for the continuous exhaust of high velocity, high temperature gases which pick up and carry minute, solid particles from cupolas.

The first wide use of induction furnace melting for iron came about in Europe during the early 1950's. Such furnaces at that time had a 5-ton holding capacity with sufficient electrical power input to melt 1½ tons of metal per hour. The advantages in the use of this melting procedure was recognized by American foundrymen. Larger furnaces were designed to meet the larger output required by U.S. foundries. The Saginaw plant's original furnace, which holds 33 tons and melts eight tons per hour, was a major step forward.

The four induction furnaces now in use at the division's Defiance Plant No. 2 are still the largest in the world from the standpoint of electrical power input—each with a power input of 6,250 kilowatts and capable of melting 10 tons per hour. The success of these 33-ton furnaces made practical the development of a 75-ton holding furnace with a 17,000 kilowatt power input. Such a furnace, in combination with preheating of the metal charge, will make possible an output of 40 tons per hour which is equivalent to the output of a large malleable iron cupola.

[From the Saginaw News, Feb. 9, 1968]

FOUNDRY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAUDED

Civic, business and health officials have commended General Motors Corp.'s Central Foundry Division following its announcement of a five-year, multi-million-dollar project to install new melting furnaces which will practically eliminate air pollution from the foundry's smoke stacks.

Work already has begun on the electric furnaces—the largest of their type in the world. They will replace the foundry's coke-fired furnaces, eliminating by one-third the smoke, ash, soot and cinders which come from the foundry's stacks. The first new furnace will become operational in 1969. The project, which also includes buildings and power plant additions, will be complete by 1972.

A specific dollar cost was not given for the project at the foundry, which employs about 3,000 persons and is the world's largest producer of malleable iron and ArmaSteel castings.

John C. Soet, director of occupational health for the Michigan Department of Public Health, was one of those who commended Central Foundry for what he called its attitude of social responsibility and quick response to state air pollution regulations in the emissions control law passed last year by the Michigan Legislature.

Soet was among the state, county and municipal officials at Central Foundry Division's luncheon Thursday at Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant for the announcement of the project.

Elmer E. Braun, division general manager, introduced Soet and their guests who spoke briefly to express appreciation for the company's decision to replace the four coke-fired cupolas now used to melt metal. Others who spoke included Mayor Henry G. Marsh; Wallace E. Wilson, General Motors Corp. vice president and chief of the group of which Central Foundry Division is a part. He gave the corporation's views on air pollution. Charles E. Drury, division works manager, explained details of the replacement program, along with Arthur J. Karam, plant manager.

Pollution, especially pollution in the air, is vexing to state health officials, Soet said. He added that operating foundries in the state are significant contributors to air pollution. Members of the Air Pollution Control Commission, he continued, are aware of the industry's value to the state's economy and are gratified by the response of many foundries to the air pollution control program.

Central Foundry's plan to install electric furnaces will reduce considerably the amount of particulates in the air around Saginaw, he said, and is a commendable example of the kind of pollution controls needed.

Marsh expressed to Central Foundry and GM officials the appreciation of the city for the efforts to relieve the problem of air pollution here. He called the decision an "example of progress at its best."

"Central Foundry's program is an excellent start for a campaign to eliminate air pollution," Wilson said, "and is indicative of the General Motors policy on all types of pollution in the air, on land and in water."

Karam told the group in response to a question that the electric induction furnaces for melting iron would virtually eliminate all polluting smoke from the foundry. He said 1972 should let the division reach its goal of eliminating pollution which they had been striving for since 1946 when the first cupola wet cap control units were installed.

Braun also read a message from Lt. Gov. William G. Millikin which expressed appreciation to General Motors and the Central Foundry Division for the air pollution control project.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Feb. 9, 1968]

Malleable Project Great Step Forward

To somewhat paraphrase Gov. Romney's recent State-of-the-State theme, anybody interested in a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw—and that presumably includes all of us—will welcome announcement that work has begun to make coke-fired cupolas at Central Foundry Division's Malleable Iron Plant a thing of the past.

This is a dramatic announcement that has to be measured in more ways than merely what it is going to cost General Motors to transform Malleable's melting process into a virtually smokeless operation through installation of coreless electric induction furnaces. Suffice to say that will be plenty.

More important, however, is what this project means in terms of environmental improvement, economic development, industrial advancement and, in fact, public confidence. As with an iceberg these are the things beneath the surface that do not show up in complex blueprints, cost sheets or explanations in the language of engineering.

Obviously the number one factor in the undertaking is what it is going to mean relative to reduced air pollution. And what it is going to mean to the air over Saginaw is great indeed.

There is, of course, no quick route to this changeover. As GM and Malleable officials pointed out Thursday, the foundry's three coke-fired furnaces will have to be replaced one by one in a phasing out program which won't be completed for five years. It is a huge job and production must continue while the changeover installations are being made.

But what is greatly encouraging is the fact that with each replacement, electric furnace for coke-fired, the so-called melting emissions will be reduced by about one-third. That means smoke and it says that by the time all electric furnaces are operative Malleable melting operations will be virtually non-pollutant to the air.

One company official summed up the project this: "In the control of melting emission this is as absolute as you can get today." That's a big and encouraging statement.

Yet from still another standpoint, one of the more significant aspects of the Malleable melting furnace modernization program has nothing directly to do with the foundry. This is the very stimulating effect it will have on redevelopment in the South Saginaw area and particularly as it relates to future river front projects.

Virtual elimination of foundry smoke wastes from the air and removal of cupolas will enhance chances for even greater development by removing from skyline view those things which discourage investment.

From the manufacturing standpoint the project speaks for itself. Installation of the electric furnaces at the Malleable plant, the largest producer of iron and certain steel castings, may very well make it the model for all foundry melting processes in the country.

Combining the best in both air pollutant control and advanced production characteristics, the Saginaw project could be the major breakthrough that the foundry industry has been looking for.

It must be said again, however, that nothing transcends the project's worth more than its environmental benefits.

National concern over the quality of the air we breathe is as intense as concern over water pollution. Therefore this city, which yet hasn't been faced with a problem of polluted air as great as that being encountered in many other places, is fortunate to have inherited a cleaner-air project of this magnitude.

This brings us to one of the points made earlier—public confidence. It is perhaps one of the most critical facets of all in the issue of air pollution and industry's responsibility in this regard.

GM's undertaking at Malleable, we believe, will go a long way toward restoring and preserving that confidence. This one proves that big business is aware, does care and is willing to invest in the most modern of devices to eliminate or drastically reduce air pollution for both the environmental and economic good of all.

As far as this community is concerned, it bears a direct relationship to a better, cleaner, safer Saginaw.

A Clearer View of Lincoln

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Ebony magazine features an arresting article concerning Abraham Lincoln's views on slavery and the black man in America. This article, titled "Was Abe Lincoln a White Supremacist?", contains information regarding President Lincoln's attitudes and actions which have never been given sufficient attention, not only by popular accounts, but even by many professional historians.

The author of the article, Lerone Bennett, Jr., senior editor of Ebony magazine, is well-known as a careful and thoughtful historian. This article, and the dialog that I am sure it will provoke among both historians and in the public media, will do much to achieve a more accurate and clearer view of President Lincoln. It is of the greatest importance that contemporary American accurately understand the views and perspective of this famous President.

I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed immediately following my remarks.

The article follows:

Was Abe Lincoln a White Supremacist?

(By Lerone Bennett, Jr.)

The presidential campaign was over and the victor was stretching his legs and shaking off the cares of the world in his temporary office in the State Capitol in Springfield, Ill. Surrounded by the perquisites of power, at peace with the world, the President-elect was regaling old acquaintances with hilarious stories of his early days as a politician. One of the visitors interrupted this entertaining monologue and remarked that it was a shame that "the vexatious slavery matter" would be the first question of public policy the new President would have to deal with in Washington.

The President-elect's eyes twinkled and he said he was reminded of a story. According to eyewitness Henry Villard, President-elect Abraham Lincoln "told the story of the Kentucky Justice of the Peace whose first case was a criminal prosecution for the abuse of slaves. Unable to find any precedent, he exclaimed at last angrily: 'I will be damned if I don't feel almost sorry for being elected when the niggers is the first thing I have to attend to.' "

This story, shocking as it may sound to Lincoln admirers, was in character. For the President-elect had never shown any undue interest in black people, and it was altogether natural for him to suggest that he shared the viewpoint of the reluctant and biased justice of the peace.

In one of the supreme ironies of history, the man who told this story was forced by circumstances to attend to the Negroes. And within five years he was enshrined in American mythology as "the Great Emancipator who freed the Negroes with a stroke of the pen out of the goodness and compassion of his heart."

Over the years, the Mythology of the Great Emancipator has become a part of the mental landscape of America. Generations of schoolchildren have memorized its cadences. Poets, politicians, and long-suffering blacks have wept over its imagery and drama.

No other American story is so enduring.

No other American story is so comforting. No other American story is so false.

Abraham Lincoln was *not* the Great Emancipator. As we shall see, there is abundant evidence to indicate that the Emancipation Proclamation was not what people think it is and that Lincoln issued it with extreme misgivings and reservations. Even more decisive is the fact that the real Lincoln was a tragically flawed figure who shared the racial prejudices of most of his white contemporaries.

If, despite the record, Lincoln has been misunderstood and misinterpreted, it is not his fault. A conservative Illinois lawyer, cautious and conventional in social matters, Lincoln never pretended to be a racial liberal or a social innovator. He said repeatedly, in public and in private, that he was a firm believer in white supremacy. And his acts supported his assertions. Not only that: Lincoln had profound doubts about the possibility of realizing the rhetoric of the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address on this soil; and he believed until his death that black people and white people would be much better off separated—preferably with the Atlantic Ocean or some other large and deep body of water between them.

The man's character, his way with words, and his assassination, together with the psychological needs of a racist society, have obscured these contradictions under a mountain of myths which undoubtedly would have amused Lincoln, who had a wonderful sense of the ironic and ridiculous. The mythmakers have not only buried the real Lincoln; they have also managed to prove him wrong. He said once that it was impossible to fool all of the people all of the time. But his apothesosis clearly proves that it is possible to fool enough of them long enough to make a conservative white supremacist a national symbol of racial tolerance and understanding.

If the Lincoln myths were the harmless fantasies of children at play, it would be possible to ignore them. But when the myths of children become adult daydreams and when the daydreams are used to obscure deep social problems and to hide historical reality, it becomes a social duty to confront them. When, at the height of the summer rebellion season, President Lyndon B. Johnson said he intended to follow a Lincolnian course, Professor Vincent P. Harding of Spelman College rebuked him, pointing out in a letter to the New York Times that Lincoln's vacillating Civil War posture was a prescription for social disaster today.

Because, as Professor Harding suggested, we are environed by dangers and because we need all the light we can get; because Abraham Lincoln is not the light, because he is in fact standing in the light, hiding our way; because a real emancipation proclamation has become a matter of national survival and *because no one has ever issued such a document in this country*—because, finally, lies enslave and because the truth is always seemly and proper, it has become urgently necessary to reevaluate the Lincoln mythology. The need for such a reevaluation has already been recognized in some scholarly circles. Some scholars have confronted the ambiguities of the Emancipation Proclamation and have suggested that Lincoln's reputation would be more securely based if it were grounded not on that document but on his services as leader of the victorious North. Analyzing the same evidence, David Donald said in *Lincoln Reconsidered* that perhaps "the secret of Lincoln's continuing vogue is his essential ambiguity. He can be cited on all sides of all questions." Donald was not quite correct, for Lincoln cannot be cited on the side of equal rights for black people, a fact that has discomfited more than one Lincoln Day orator. Commenting on Lincoln's determined opposition to a policy of emancipation, Professor Kenneth Stampp wrote: "Indeed, it may be said that if it was Lincoln's destiny to go down in history as the Great Emancipator, rarely has a man embraced his destiny with greater reluctance than he."

To understand Lincoln's reluctance and his painful ambivalence on the question of race, one must see him first against the background of his times. Born into a poor white family in the slave state of Kentucky and raised in the anti-black environments of southern Indiana and Illinois, Lincoln was exposed from the very beginning to racism.

It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for young Abraham Lincoln to emerge unscathed from this environment. By an immense effort of transcendence, worthy of admiration and long thought, Lincoln managed to free himself of most of the crudities of his early environment. But he did not—and perhaps could not—rise above the racism that was staining the tissue of the nation's soul.

It appears from the record that Lincoln readily absorbed the Negro stereotypes of his environment, for he ever afterwards remained fond of Negro dialect jokes, blackface minstrels and Negro ditties. "Like most white men," Professor Benjamin Quarles wrote, "Lincoln regarded the Negro as such as funny." More to the point, Lincoln, as Quarles also noted, regarded the Negro as inferior.

There is a pleasant story of Lincoln awakening to the realities of slavery on a visit to New Orleans in 1841. According to the traditional account, an aroused Lincoln said: "If I ever get a chance to hit that thing [slavery] I'll hit it hard." Since the man who reported this statement did not accompany Lincoln to New Orleans, the story is of dubious value. More telling is the fact that Lincoln distinguished himself as a public official by a reluctance to hit slavery at all.

In the general literature, Lincoln is depicted as an eloquent and flaming idealist, whaling away at the demon of slavery. This view is almost totally false. In the first place, Lincoln was an opportunist, not an idealist. He was a man of the fence, a man of the middle, a man who stated the principle with great eloquence but almost always shied away from rigid commitments to practice. Contrary to reports, Lincoln was no social revolutionary. As a matter of fact, he was an archetypal example of the cautious politician who assails the extremists on both sides. It is not for nothing that cautious politicians sing his praises.

It should be noted, secondly, that Lincoln's position on slavery has been grossly misrepresented. Lincoln was not opposed to slavery; he was opposed to the *extension* of slavery out of devotion to the interests of white people, not out of compassion for suffering blacks. To be sure, he did say from time to time that slavery was "a monstrous injustice." But he also said, repeatedly, that he was not prepared to do anything to remove that injustice where it existed. On the contrary, he said that it was his duty to tolerate and, if necessary, to give practical support to an evil supported by the U.S. Constitution.

More damaging is the fact that Lincoln apparently believed that immediate and general emancipation would be a greater evil than slavery itself. Eulogizing Henry Clay on July 6, 1852, he associated himself with that slaveowner's colonization ideas and said that Clay "did not perceive, as I think no wise man has perceived, how it [slavery] could be at *once* eradicated, without producing a greater evil, even to the cause of human liberty itself." In other speeches of the same period, Lincoln commended travel to black people and noted with admiration that "the children of Israel . . . went out of Egyptian bondage in a body."

A third point of significance is that Lincoln's opposition to the extension of slavery was a late and anomalous growth. In the 1830s and 1840s, in the midst of one of the greatest moral crises in the history of America, Lincoln remained silent and lamentably inactive. In his few public utterances on the subject in the 30s and 40s, he very carefully denounced both slavery and the opponents of slavery.

For many white Northerners, the most agonizing moral issue of the day was the fugitive slave law, which required all Americans to assist in the capture and return of runaway slaves. Many whites, some of them quite conservative, refused to obey the law. Others, more daring, organized an open resistance movement, moving runaway slaves from station to station on the Underground Railway.

Instead of aiding this effort, Lincoln opposed it, publicly announcing his support of the fugitive slave law. In a private letter to Joshua F. Speed in 1855, he said: "I confess I hate to see the poor creatures hunted down, and caught, and carried back to their stripes, and unrewarded toils, but I bite my lip and keep quiet."

Lincoln came down off the fence, rhetorically, in the 50s when the Kansas-Nebraska act reopened the whole question of the extension of slavery to the largely uninhabitated territories of the West. This was, he said, a clear and present threat to free white men and to what he called "the white man's charter of freedom"—the Declaration of Independence. In his public speeches of this period, Lincoln was given to saying in the same speech that he believed in white supremacy as a practical matter and in the Declaration of Independence as an abstract matter of principle.

The Lincoln years in Illinois were years of oppression and reaction. Black people could not vote, testify against white people in court or attend public schools. It was a crime for free black people to settle in the state. Although Lincoln was a powerful figure in state politics for more than a quarter of a century, he made no audible protest against this state of affairs. In fact, he said he preferred it that way. When H. Ford Douglas, a militant black leader, asked Lincoln to support a movement to repeal the law banning black testimony, Lincoln refused.

In the famous series of debates with Stephen Douglas, Lincoln made his position crystal clear. He was opposed, he said, to Negro citizenship and to "the niggers and the white people marrying together." Speaking at Charleston, Illinois, on September 18, 1858, Lincoln said: "I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races (applause) that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes; nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition, to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Lincoln grew during the war—but he didn't grow much. On every issue relating to the black man—on emancipation, confiscation of rebel land and the use of black soldiers—he was the very essence of the white supremacist with good intentions. In fact, Lincoln distinguished himself as President by sustained and consistent opposition to the fundamental principle of the Proclamation that guaranteed his immortality. Incredible as it may seem now, the man who would go down in history as the Great Emancipator spent the first 18 months of his administration in a desperate and rather pathetic attempt to save slavery where it existed. He began his Presidential career by saying that he had neither the power nor the desire to interfere with slavery in the states. And he endorsed a proposed Thirteen Amendment which would have guaranteed that slavery would never be molested in existing states and Washington, D.C.

"My policy," Lincoln said, "is to have no policy." In this famous statement, Lincoln was something less than candid. For he did have a policy and that policy was to win the war without touching slavery. "It is the desire of the President," Secretary of War Simon Cameron wrote a general on August 8, 1861, "that *all existing rights in all states be fully respected and maintained.*" When Lincoln's policy foundered on the reef of Southern intransigence, Lincoln complained sadly to a friend: "I *struggled* nearly a year and a half to get along without touching the 'institution.' . . ."

In accordance with the real policy of the Lincoln Administration, the War Department refused to accept black troops and Union generals vied with each other in proving their fealty to slavery. Some generals returned fugitive slaves to rebel owners; others said that if black slaves staged an uprising behind enemy lines they would stop fighting the enemy and turn their fire on their black friends. Union officers who refused to go along with the "soft-on-slavery" policy were court-martialed and cashiered out of the service. When, in August, 1861, General John C. Fremont emancipated Missouri slaves, Lincoln angrily countermanded the proclamation, telling Fremont's wife that "General Fremont should not have dragged the Negro into it . . ." A year later, when General David Hunter freed the slaves in three Southern states, Lincoln again countermanded the order, saying that emancipation was a Presidential function.

That this policy was changed at all was due not to Lincoln's humanitarism but to rebel battlefield brilliance and to the compassion and perseverance of a small band of Radical Republicans. Foremost among these men where Charles Sumner, the U.S. senator from Massachusetts; Wendell Phillips, the brilliant agitator from Boston; Frederick Douglass, the bearded black abolitionist; and Thaddeus Stevens, the Pennsylvania congressman who virtually supplanted Abraham Lincoln as the leader of the Republican party. As the war continued and as Northern casualties mounted, the Radical Republicans put events to use and mobilized a public pressure Lincoln could not ignore. Delegation after delegation waited on the President and demanded that he hit the south where it would hurt most by freeing the slaves and arming them. Lincoln parried the pressure with heat and conviction, citing constitutional, political and military reasons to justify his anti-emancipation stand. Lincoln usually expressed his opposition to emancipation in a troubled but polite tone. But he could be pushed across the border of politeness. When Edward L. Pierce urged the President to adopt a more enlightened policy, Lincoln, according to Pierce, exploded and denounced "the itching to get niggers into our lives."

The traditional image of Lincoln is of a harried and large-hearted man fending off "extremists of the left and right" only to emerge at the precise psychological moment to do what he had always wanted to do. This image clashes, unfortunately, with evidence which suggests that sudden and general emancipation was never Lincoln's policy.

Lincoln was given to saying that his constitutional duties prevented him from doing anything substantial to give point to his "oft-expressed *personal* wish that all men everywhere could be free." But it is obvious from the evidence that Lincoln's problems were deeper than that. For when his duty was clear, he refused to act. On several occasions he refused to take anti-slavery action which was mandated by Congress and he sabotaged some anti-slavery legislation by executive inaction. Somehow, duty, in Lincoln's view, almost always worked against the black man.

Lincoln defenders say that he resisted emancipation pressures because of his fear that premature action would alienate white supporters in Northern and Border States and endanger the prosecution of the war. But this view does not come to grips with the fact that Lincoln was *personally* opposed to sudden and general emancipation before 1861 and the further fact that he continued to oppose sudden and general emancipation after the circulating Proclamation proved that his fears were groundless. Nor does the traditional Lincoln apologia touch the mass of evidence—in Lincoln letters as well as in private and public statements—which shows that Lincoln was personally opposed to sudden emancipation on social and racial grounds.

It was not the fear of emancipation but the fear of what would happen afterwards that palsied Lincoln's hands. He was deeply disturbed by the implications of turning loose four million black people in a land he considered the peculiar preserve of the white man. He spoke often of "the evils of sudden derangement" and warned Congress against "the vagrant destitution which must largely attend immediate emancipation in localities where their numbers are very great." He said over and over again that it was his considered judgment that "gradual, and not sudden, emancipation is better for all." Count Adam Gurowski believed Lincoln was concerned about poor white fear of black competition. "Be sure," he wrote in a May 7, 1862, letter, "that Lincoln is at heart with Slavery. He considers that *emancipation is a job which will smother the free States. Such are his precise words.*"

Lincoln also feared racial conflict. Like many white liberals, he was consumed by fears of black violence. More than one visitor to the White House found him in agony over the possibility of a Nat Turner-like uprising behind the enemy's lines.

An additional factor in Lincoln's opposition to the principle of sudden emancipation was his racial bias. He considered black people unassimilable aliens. There was not, in his view, enough room in America for black and white people. He didn't believe white people would sanction equal rights for black people and he didn't ask white people to sanction equal rights for black people. Since he did not propose to confront racism, he told black people they would have to travel or accept a subordinate position in American life.

Insofar as it can be said that Lincoln had an emancipation policy, it was to rid America of slaves and Negroes. When he failed in his attempt to end the war without touching slavery, he fell back to a second plan of gradual and compensated emancipation extending over a 37-year-period. This was linked in his thinking with a companion policy of colonizing black people in South America or Africa.

As the pressure for emancipation rose, Lincoln argued passionately and eloquently for his plan of gradual emancipation and abrupt emigration. On August 14, 1862, he called a hand-picked group of black men to the White House and proposed a black exodus. In "a curious mixture of condescension and kindness," to use James M. McPherson's phrase, Lincoln told the black men that it was their duty to leave America. "You and we," he said, "are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it is right or wrong I need not discuss, but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence."

Lincoln did not seek the opinions of his visitors. He did not propose, he said, to discuss racism, to debate whether it was founded on reality or justice. He was simply, he said, presenting a fact: white people didn't want black people in America and therefore black people would have to go. "There is," he said, "an unwillingness on the part of our people harsh as it may be, for you free colored people to remain with us." The only solution, Lincoln said, was a black exodus. "It is better for us both," he said, ". . . to be separated." He proposed a black settlement on Central American land, "rich in coal;" and he asked his visitors to help him find black settlers "capable of thinking as white men."

Although Lincoln's plan received a generally hostile reception in the black community, he pursued it with passion and conviction. For several months after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, he was deeply involved in a disastrously abortive attempt to settle black people on an island off the coast of Haiti. When that venture failed, he shifted to the Southwest, conferring with contractors on the feasibility of settling black people in the state of Texas.

While Lincoln was trying to send black people away, Congress was busy emanicipating. In the spring and summer of 1862, Congress forbade military officers to return fugitive slaves, authorized the President to accept black soldiers, and emancipated the slaves in Washington, D.C. Finally, on July 17, 1862, Congress passed the Second Confiscation Act, which freed the slaves of all rebels. This act, which has received insufficient attention in general media, was actually more sweeping than the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, which came two months later.

Lincoln followed Congress' lead slowly and grudgingly, signing most of these acts with evident displeasure. But the drift of events was unmistakable, and Lincoln changed steps, saying with great honesty that he had not controlled events but had been controlled by them. Conferring with the member of a congressional committee charged with drafting a plan for buying the slaves and sending them away, Lincoln urged speed, saying: "You had better come to an agreement. Niggers will never be cheaper."

Orthography apart, Lincoln caught here the spirit of the times. At that moment, in late July of 1862, the Union war effort was bogged down in the marshes of Virginia, and England and France were on the verge of intervening on the side of the Confederacy. At home, the heat was rising fast, fueled by mounting Northern casualties. Faced with mushrooming pressures at home and abroad, Lincoln reversed his course and "conditionally determined," to use his words, to touch the institution of slavery.

Lincoln adopted the new policy from necessity, not conviction. In public and in private, he made it clear that he was not motivated by compassion for the slaves. Taking his stand on the ground of military necessity, he said his new policy was designed to weaken Southern white men and to strengthen the hand of Northern white men. "Things," he said later, "had gone from bad to worse, till I felt we had reached the end of the rope on the plan of operation we had been pursuing, and that we had about played our last card." Lincoln said he was driven to the "alternative of either surrendering the Union, and with it, the Constitution, or of laying a strong hand upon the colored element."

There was truth in this, but it was not the whole truth. There is evidence that Lincoln was forced to adopt the new policy by political pressures. Edward Stanly, military governor of North Carolina, said Lincoln told him that "the proclamation had become a civil necessity to prevent the Radicals from openly embarrassing the government in the conduct of the war. The President expressed the belief that, without the proclamation for which they had been clamoring, the Radicals would take the extreme step in Congress of withholding supplies for carrying on the war—leaving the whole land in anarchy." Count Gurowski gave a similar version of Lincoln's metamorphosis and concluded, in a fine phrase, that Lincoln was literally "whipped" into glory.

Responding to a parallelogram of pressures, Lincoln issued a preliminary Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862. In this document, he warned the South that he would issue a final Emancipation Proclamation in 100 days if the rebellion had not ended by that time. The proclamation outlined a future policy of emancipation, but Lincoln had no joy in the black harvest. To a group of serenaders, who congratulated him on the new policy, Lincoln said: "I can only trust in God I have made no mistake." To his old friend, Joshua F. Speed, Lincoln expressed misgivings and said he had "been anxious to avoid it." To Congressman John Covode of Pennsylvania, Lincoln explained that he had been *"driven to it,"* adding: "But although my duty is plain, it is in some respects painful. . . ." Still another visitor, Edward Stanly, received a dramatic account of Lincoln's resistance to a policy of emancipation. "Mr. Lincoln said," according to Stanly, "that he had prayed to the Almighty to save him from this necessity, adopting the very language of our Saviour, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me,' but the prayer had not been answered."

On Thursday, January 1, 1863, Lincoln drank from the cup, and apparently he liked neither the flavor nor the color of the draught. When he started to sign the document, his arm trembled so violently, an eyewitness said, that he could not hold the pen. Lincoln, who was very superstitious, paused, startled. Then, attributing his shakes to hours of handshaking at a New Year's Day reception, he scrawled his name, saying he did not want the signature to be "tremulous" because people would say "he had some compunctions."

Nothing indicates this better than the Emancipation Proclamation which is, as J. G. Randall and Richard N. Current indicated, "more often admired than read." Cold, forbidding, with all the moral grandeur of a real estate deed, the Proclamation does not enumerate a single principle hostile to slavery and it contains not one quotable sentence. As a document, it lends weight to the observation of Lincoln's law partner, William Herndon, who wrote: "When he freed the slaves, there was no heart in the act."

There wasn't much else in it, either. Rightly speaking, the Emancipation Proclamation, as Ralph Korngold wrote, was "not an Emancipation Proclamation at all." The document was drafted in such a way that it freed few, if any, slaves. It did not apply to slaves in the Border States and areas under federal control in the South. In other words, Lincoln "freed" slaves where he had no power and left them in chains where he had power. The theory behind the Proclamation, an English paper noted, "is not that a human being cannot justly own another, but that he cannot own him unless he is loyal to the United States."

The Proclamation argues so powerfully against itself that some scholars have suggested that Lincoln was trying to do the opposite of what he said he was doing. In other words, the suggestion is that the Emancipation Proclamation was a political stratagem by which Lincoln hoped to outflank the Radicals, buy time and forestall a definitive act of emancipation. This is not the place to review the political stratagem theory in detail. Suffice it to say that on the basis of the evidence one can make a powerful case for the view that Lincoln never intended to free the slaves, certainly not immediately.

Lincoln's post-Proclamation behavior lends substance to this view. For contrary to all logic, he continued to agitate against his own policy. On the eve of the Proclamation, he again recommended to Congress his favorite plan of gradual and compensated emancipation. And he continued, according to several witnesses, to doubt the wisdom of the Emancipation Proclamation. Three weeks after signing the document, he reportedly told Wendell Phillips that the Proclamation was "a great mistake." Two months later, he told Congressman George W. Julian that the Proclamation had "done about as much harm as good." In the following months, Lincoln repeatedly said that he still favored a gradual emancipation plan which contradicted the spirit of his own Proclamation.

To this bleak picture one should add in all justice that Lincoln can be quoted on both sides of the issue. He reportedly said later that the Proclamation and the arming of black soldiers constituted the heaviest blows against the rebellion. It should also be said that Lincoln, after a period of vacillation and doubt, helped to win passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, which made the paper freedom of the Proclamation real. Having said that, it remains to be said that Lincoln never fully accepted the fundamental principle of the Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment. As late as February, 1865, he was still equivocating on the issue of immediate emancipation. At an abortive peace conference with Confederate leaders at Hampton Roads, Virginia, Lincoln said, according to Alexander Stephens, that he had never been in favor of immediate emancipation, even by the states. He spoke of the "many evils attending" immediate emancipation and suggested, as he had suggested on other occasions, a system of apprenticeship "by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relations to each other."

At Gettysburg, Lincoln shifted gears and announced a new policy of liberation and social renewal. America, he said, was engaged in a great war testing whether it or any other nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" could long endure. The war, he said, would decide whether "government of the people, by the people, for the people" would perish from the earth. But 20 days later when he unveiled his own postwar policy, it was obvious that *all* meant the same thing to Lincoln that it had always meant: all white people. In his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, Lincoln said he would recognize any rebel state in which one-tenth of the white voters of 1860 took an oath of allegiance to the United States and organized a government which renounced slavery. What of black people? Slavery apart, Lincoln ignored them. Incredibly, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Army abandoned his black soldiers to the passions of Confederate veterans who feared and hated them. Lincoln barely suggested "privately" that it would be a good thing for Southern states to extend the ballot "to the very intelligent (Negroes), and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks." But these were private sentiments, not public acts; and they were expressed in an extremely hesitant manner at that. Lincoln didn't require fair or equal treatment for the freedmen. In fact, he didn't make any demands at all. Reconstruction, Lincoln style, was going to be a Reconstruction of the white people, by the white people and for the white people.

It seems that Lincoln never reconciled himself to the implications of emancipation. Shortly before his death, Lincoln summoned General Benjamin F. Butler to inquire about the possibilities of "sending the blacks away." According to Butler, he said, "I wish you would examine the question and give me your views upon it and go into figures as you did before in some degree as to show whether the Negroes can be exported." Butler went away and came back two days later with a sad story. "Mr. President," he said, "I have gone very carefully over my calculation as to the power of the country to export the Negroes of the South and I assure you that, using all your naval vessels and all the merchant marine fit to cross the seas with safety, it will be impossible for you to transport to the nearest place fit for them . . . half as fast as Negro children will be born here."

Lincoln's assassination and the aggressive dissemination of the "Massa Linkun myth" pushed the real Lincoln with his real limitations into the background. And black people were soon pooling their pennies to erect a monument to the mythical emancipator. When, on April 14, 1876, this monument was unveiled, with President U. S. Grant and other high officials in attendance, Frederick Douglass punctured the myths and looked frankly at the man. Douglass praised Lincoln's growth, but he also rehearsed his limitations.

Truth [Douglass said] *is proper and beautiful at all times and in all places, and it is never more proper and beautiful in any case than when speaking of a great public man whose example is likely to be commended for honor and imitation long after his departure to the solemn shades, the silent continent of eternity. It must be admitted, truth compels me to admit, even here in the presence of the monument we have erected to his memory, Abraham Lincoln was not, in the fullest sense of the word, either our man or our model. In his interests, in his associations, in his habits of thought, and in his prejudices, he was a white man. He was preeminently the white man's President, entirely devoted to the welfare of white men . . . In all his education and feeling he was an American of the Americans.*

Speaking thus of interests and passion and public acts, Frederick Douglass, who knew Lincoln well, sounded the discordant notes of a national, not a personal tragedy. For, in the final analysis, Lincoln must be seen as the embodiment, not the transcendence, of the American tradition, which is, as we all know, a racist tradition. In his inability to rise above that tradition, Lincoln, often called "the noblest of all Americans," holds up a flawed mirror to the American soul. And one honors him today, not by gazing fixedly at a flawed image, not by hiding warts and excrescences, but by seeing oneself in the reflected ambivalences of a life which calls us to transcendence, not imitation.

Protests Against South Africa's Ex Post Facto Terrorism Act of 1967

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago an eminent group of American lawyers, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, adopted a resolution protesting the prosecution in South Africa of 35 inhabitants of South-West Africa under the Republic of South Africa's Terrorism Act of 1967. It called on the legal profession throughout the world, including South Africa, to speak out and protest the trial under this ex post facto act. The New York Times, in an editorial, commented on the significance of that resolution. On Sunday, February 11, it commented editorially on the significance of the sentencing of 33 of those defendants. Previously, Mr. Morris Abram, U.S. Representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, made a statement speak-

ing after the news of the sentencing on February 9. He said in part:

> These men, originally 37 in number, were arrested without warrants, dragged 1800 miles from their homes to a foreign land, detained in solitary confinement under a law which permitted their imprisonment without legal interference until such time as they had given answers "satisfactory" to their oppressor. Then they were tried by South Africa, whose mandate over South West Africa had been terminated by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus they were tried by a nation which did not have the jurisdiction to try them, under an *ex post facto* law so recognized by the Justice who passed sentence on them, presumably in mitigation of the sentence which we have been led to believe, might otherwise have been a capital sentence providing for their execution.
>
> As a lawyer, I have examined this South African law under which these men were tried. I concluded at one time that the acts listed by that law as substantive capital crimes are as a matter of fact human rights, human rights recognized under the various provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it is so vague as to furnish no possibility of effective defense or fair trial. It presumed these men to be guilty until they proved their innocence.
>
> Now, one would have thought that some grave civic disruption occurred that had caused the South African Government to stray so far from the rule of law and to invite the disrespect of every person who believes in freedom. But as one looks at the charges and as one peruses the evidence, one finds that instead of there being some grave monstrous, pervasive civil disturbance of uproar in the country, one finds that actually one person had been killed somewhere by somebody in all of the activities which were listed in the charge sheet.
>
> This tragedy is even greater in its dimensions when one considers that it has occurred in a State which pretends to practice the rule of law, namely, South Africa.

I place the resolution, editorials, and statement to which I refer as extension of remarks in the RECORD. This is a matter of urgency and importance which involves the well-being of the people of an international territory, since that territory was made a mandate following World War I. From 1920 on, these people have looked to the international community to protect their rights. Since World War II, the Government of South Africa has increasingly ignored both their rights and the legitimate concern of the international community. It has ignored the actions of the General Assembly to which Mr. Abram refers and resolutions passed by it and by the Security Council, calling for the release and repatriation of these South-West Africans whom it unlawfully holds in jail. It continues to apply the terrorism act, with all its inadmissible provisions to South-West Africa.

The material mentioned above follows:

STATEMENT BY MORRIS B. ABRAM, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION ON THE SENTENCING OF THE SOUTH WEST AFRICANS BY THE COURTS OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Chairman, we listened with interest, sympathy and concern to the intervention a few moments ago by the distinguished representative of Iran. We would like to join him in the expression of outrage at the conduct of the South African Government with respect to the trial and sentencing of the group of South West Africans under so-called Terrorism Act especially adopted for that purpose by the Republic of South Africa—after the alleged crimes had been committed. We feel deep sympathy for these victims of injustice.

These men, originally 37 in number, were arrested without warrants, dragged 1800 miles from their homes to a foreign land, detained in solitary confinement under a law which permitted their imprisonment without legal interference until such time as they had given answers "satisfactory" to their oppressor. Then they were tried by South Africa, whose mandate over South West Africa had been terminated by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus they were tried by a nation which did not have the jurisdiction to try them, under an *ex post facto* law so recognized by the Justice who passed sentence on them, presumably in mitigation of the sentence which, we have been led to believe, might otherwise have been a capital sentence providing for their execution.

As a lawyer, I have examined this South African law under which these men were tried. I concluded at one time that the acts listed by that law as substantive capital crimes are as a matter of fact human rights, human rights recognized under the various provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it is so vague as to furnish no possibility of effective defense or fair trial. It presumed these men to be guilty until they proved their innocence.

Now, one would have thought that some grave civic disruption occurred that had caused the South African Government to stray so far from the rule of law and to invite the disrespect of every person who believes in freedom. But as one looks at the charges and as one peruses the evidence, one finds that instead of there being some grave, monstrous, pervasive civil disturbance or uproar in the country, one finds that actually one person had been killed somewhere by somebody in all of the activities which were listed in the charge sheet.

This tragedy is even greater in its dimensions when one considers that it has occurred in a State which pretends to practice the rule of law, namely, South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, we know that some States have institutions with which they do not comply in practice. For example, there are some States which theoretically guarantee free speech and free press and due process. States which have been reported recently to have secretly tried and sentenced to hard labor teachers, writers and scientists for their writings. However, we did not learn about these circumstances until recently because the glare and the spotlight and the cleansing nature of publicity had not focused on the State in which that had occurred.

However, there was a spotlight on South Africa. It has been of some use though it has by no means been effective. It at least has served to ameliorate these dreadful sentences, and prevented the execution of these South West Africans who ought to be free and who ought never to have been imprisoned. It was the force of publicity, for example, that galvanized bar associations and other private groups in the United States on behalf of these Africans. But the fact that the sentences were modified from what had been expected, namely a capital sentence, does not modify the indignation that we express here today and the sympathy that we express and the outrage that we feel.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1968]

CITY BAR ON SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

In terms almost as strong as those we have already used in these columns, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has now voiced its protest against the infamous trial of 35 South-West Africans under South Africa's "Terrorism Act."

The resolution, virtually unprecedented in its nature, declares that this act offends civilized principles of law, including due process, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on three counts: it was made retroactive for five years; defendants are guilty unless they can prove innocence "beyond a reasonable doubt," and the crime of "terrorism" is defined so broadly that someone could be hanged for an act adjudged to embarrass "the administration of the affairs of the state."

The Association correctly points out that the defendants were imprisoned, held incommunicado, stripped of rights essential for proper defense," and are being tried in South Africa, more than 1,000 miles away from their homes in Ovamboland. Furthermore, South Africa is applying this act to territory it does not own, the international status of which has been confirmed by the World Court and actions of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is very rare that the New York Bar comments on the administration of justice in foreign countries, but its appeal for support in this protest merits wide response and will surely get one, perhaps even from lawyers in South Africa.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1968]

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA INJUSTICE

There is one long-run certainty about the life sentences South Africa's Supreme Court has inflicted on nineteen South-West Africans under the vicious, retroactive Terrorism Act: They will breed more terrorism and Communism than they deter.

When Justice Joseph Ludorf convicted the defendants two weeks ago, he barred the death penalty out of concern that the law had been passed long after the alleged "terrorism" had been committed and the defendants jailed. This concern did not deter him yesterday from giving life sentences to the nineteen and twenty-year sentences to nine others.

Justice Ludorf said the crimes were so grave he was obliged to impose such sentences without considering the ages, marital status or number of dependents of the convicted. But the truth is that all the acts of terrorism of which these men were charged resulted in a single death and not one of the defendants was even accused of participating in that particular incident.

This is typical of the burlesque of justice that has at every stage marked this miserable affair—condemned by the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly and by lawyers and religious organizations around the world.

The convicted are residents of a country South Africa has never owned. They were arrested in South-West Africa, hauled a thousand miles from their homes to South Africa, and held in solitary confinement for as long as 400 days while the Pretoria Government enacted the law under which they then were elaborately tried—in a language only a few among the 37 original defendants could understand.

"We find ourselves here in a foreign country," said defendant Toivo Herman Ja Toivo, standing unafraid before Justice Ludorf, "convicted under laws made by people whom we have always considered foreigners." Then he added: "No South African will live in peace in South-West Africa, for he will know that his security is based on force."

White South Africans, and especially those who live in South-West Africa, will have occasion to remember those words.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1968]

TRIAL IN SOUTH AFRICA

A South African judge has ruled out the death penalty for thirty South-West Africans, but their conviction of "terrorism" under a draconian, retroactive law still remains a travesty of justice and an offense against civilized behavior.

In deciding not to execute the defendants, Supreme Court Justice Joseph Ludorf indicated some concern over the fact that South Africa had passed the Terrorism Act long after most of the alleged offenses in South-West Africa had occurred. This suggests that South Africa's judiciary is not yet as blind as the Government that concocted this monstrosity.

It is regrettable that Justice Ludorf did not throw the case out of court altogether and order the repatriation of the accused, as demanded, by both the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations and by bar associations and religious groups of many countries. For the act denies most of the ordinary legal safeguards. Anyone charged under it is guilty unless he can prove innocence "beyond a reasonable doubt." Above all, the law is being applied to a country South Africa has never owned. In fact, it was enacted specifically for territory administered by Pretoria only under a League of Nations mandate revoked by the U.N. General Assembly even before the law was passed.

Resolution Adopted by the Executive Committee, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, January 3, 1968

Resolved, that The Association of the Bar of the City of New York hereby records its deep concern over and its protest against the actions of the Republic of South Africa in prosecuting 35 South West Africans under the Republic of South Africa's Terrorism Act of 1967, in that:

1. The Terrorism Act of 1967 offends general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, accepted standards of due process of law and the rule of law, and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly:

(a) by reason of the vague and sweeping definition of the crime of "terrorism", punishable by death, which includes an act which "had or was likely to have had" the result of embarrassing "the administration of the affairs of the State" or furthering or encouraging "the achievement of any political aim, including the bringing about of any social or economic change . . . in cooperation with or with the assistance of any foreign government or any foreign or international body or institution"; and

(b) by the provision making the Act retroactive for five years prior to its enactment; and

(c) by the provision that the accused is presumed to be guilty and the burden is on him to prove his innocence beyond a reasonable doubt.

2. The detention of the defendants and the conduct of the trial further offend general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, accepted standards of due process of law and the rule of law, and violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly in that the defendants have been imprisoned, virtually incommunicado and stripped of rights essential for proper defense and a fair trial, and are being tried in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa, more than 1,000 miles from their homes in South West Africa.

3. The application of the Terrorism Act of 1967 to South West Africa and these prosecutions thereunder by the Republic of South Africa ignore the fact that South West Africa has a special international status in view of the terms of the Mandate for South West Africa, the opinions of the International Court of Justice and the actions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Be it therefore further

Resolved, that the Association, recognizing the heritage and traditions of the legal profession and of the judiciary in the Republic of South Africa, calls upon the members of the legal profession in South Africa and throughout the world to weigh the serious issues raised by this Act and the trial, to heed the concern expressed by this Association and to join with us and all others having concern for international due process and the rule of law to speak out and protest this trial.

The Casey Bill Gains Support Across the Nation—Income Tax Deduction for Housing and Home Repair

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, since its introduction, H.R. 358 has steadily gained support. Confronted with a $3.3 billion decline in the home repairs business over a 5-year period beginning in 1960, and by the failure of homeowners to make home repairs because of prohibitive costs, we have now a strong basis for immediate action.

While this proposal is by no means a panacea to the problems of the home repair industry or the homeowner, it does take a significant step toward providing substantial relief to both. The bill itself provides a $750 income tax deduction for the repair or improvement of the taxpayer's home, or for rapid amortization over 60 months for such improvements to rent property.

My statements in the Record of February 27, 1967, and May 15, 1967, discuss at great length the substantive reasons for enacting H.R. 358; however, at this point, I would like to share with my colleagues here in the House, letters and articles representative of the nationwide support forming behind this bill:

[From the Western Paint Review, January, 1968]

Industry Associations Support Home Improvement Tax Deduction Legislation

Joe McManus, Los Angeles Painting & Decorating Contractors comments, "HR 358 is one of the most important measures before Congress! Some 20% of the nation's 63 million units of housing are considered substandard and billions will be spent to rehabilitate the housing of our cities. It is logical and reasonable that some incentive should be given to maintaining the standards of present housing to keep it from becoming sub-standard and in need of rehabilitation. PDCA believes this can best be accomplished through private initiative. Home owners are faced with increasing real estate taxes, school taxes, sales taxes and income taxes which leaves little left to maintain homes in proper condition. The nations home owners need the provisions of HR 358.

Columbia, S.C.,
August 31, 1967.

Representative Robert Casey,
House Office Building,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Casey: It is understood that you are considering a bill (House Bill 358) to allow a tax deduction up to $750 for repairs or improvements to property used as dwellings. Those who know the housing situation in our city consider this a most worthwhile and desirable piece of legislation. In the case of rental housing this legislation is considered urgent and necessary.

As the Building Official for the largest city in South Carolina, I consider this legislation imperative for the following reasons:

1. One of the principal reasons for unrest and disorders in our cities is unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated dwelling units.

2. In our city it is not economically feasible for the owners of dwellings to bring the worst buildings up to decent standards. Of course there are some landlords who charge too much and still do not maintain their rental property. The landlords in general, however, are currently charging the maximum the low income tenants can afford to pay and still do not receive excessive return on invested capital. Landlords are most reluctant to spend $750 to rehabilitate a building when: it is not worth more than $750 in total, they are only getting $25 per month rent now, the tenant could not pay increased rental. If we condemn the buildings which probably should be condemned, hundreds of low income families would be without a place to live. They would most likely move in with other families living in only slightly less squalor and make our housing problems worse. In recapitulation, the hard facts are that the lowest income people just can't afford the decent housing they need.

3. It is believed that the passage of this legislation would bring about the biggest building rehabilitation boom this country has seen and thereby contribute materially to our sagging economy.

4. It is heart-rending to see the conditions under which some of our people live, yet unless landlords are given some incentive to make improvements, they cannot or will not do so.

It appears to me that rehabilitation through private initiative would be more economical and efficient than massive Federal Programs. In fact, I think we need some of both, i.e., some Federal low-cost housing projects and House Bill 358.

Thanking you for your kind attention, I remain,

Very truly yours,

J. E. Altman,
Building Official.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.,
September 18, 1967.

Representative Casey,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Casey: Please push onward in your efforts for H.R. 358. We are in the class of "unfortunate discriminates" who rejuvenated a neglected but still sound old Victorian stone mansion for rentals. Our taxes were raised and with full occupancy (we cater to teachers) we are lucky to break even each month. Right now the only road is to let the property degenerate or lose our shirts.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Maurice Ashland.

Property is in Boise, Idaho but the circumstances are the same the country over.

Los Angeles Paint, Varnish and
Lacquer Association,
Arcadia, Calif., January 8, 1968.

Hon. Robert Casey,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Casey: Our Association sits in one of the most vulnerable areas in the country for violence and destruction. Unless ways are found to subdue this condition or channel it into constructive areas, we will continue to have problems.

Your Bill, H.R. 358 as it pertains to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 would be a great assist in putting idle and potentially destructive hands to work. The opportunity to open additional areas of work for the people of Southern California is of great importance. We support your legislation 100%.

Sincerely,

D. W. Kennedy.

WASHTENAW COUNTY CHAPTER OF THE MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF THE PAINTING AND DECORATING CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
October 5, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: The Washtenaw County Chapter of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America wish to give full cooperation in favor of H.R. 358, The Casey Bill. We feel it will be a benefit to a great number of home owners in our own area—the city of Ann Arbor and Washtenaw County.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WINNICK,
Secretary.

SOCIETY OF PAINTING AND DECORATING CONTRACTORS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
Newtonville, Mass., January 25, 1968.

During the sessions of the 77th Annual Convention of this organization held in Boston on January 19–20, 1968, the delegates unanimously voted to urge your support of H.R. 358 which is presently before the House Ways and Means Committee and to further request that you use your good offices toward obtaining hearings on this legislation in the near future.

The plight of the average home owner today is often pathetic. Many do not have large or increasing incomes. While pride of ownership makes proper maintenance of one's residence most desirable, ever increasing taxes on income, social security and real estate, plus the increase in living costs leaves little remaining for home upkeep and repair. An incentive must be provided to properly maintain these residences. If this is not done, the only alternative will be further need for federal appropriations to remove the horror of blighted areas. The present Congress has been faced with the need of providing astronomical funds for such purposes.

H.R. 358 would provide such incentives and lessen the need for further appropriations. Some will oppose H.R. 358, claiming that the Federal Government will face a heavy loss in revenue. We do not agree with such opinions. Enactment of the legislation proposed would not only increase employment in building material maufacturing plants, but help provide *full* employment for those required in making repairs and improvements. Enactment would also increase job opportunities for the many under employed. Thus this increased employment would provide greater revenue to the government through earnings taxes.

In conclusion, we are of the opinion that enactment of H.R. 358 is just plain good business for the entire nation and its future economy. Again we urge your active participation in speedy enactment of H.R. 358 and your efforts are sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. HASSELL,
Secretary.

INSULATION BOARD INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Ill., November 27, 1967.

Subject: H.R. 13152.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Insulation Board Institute's membership comprises the twelve companies listed on this letterhead which are major manufacturers of various types of building materials including insulation board which is represented by our Institute.

On behalf of our members, I wish to strongly endorse H.R. 13152 which has been introduced by Representative Jerome Waldie of California and provides for tax credits for home improvements on residences and accelerated depreciation on rental property.

It is my understanding that this legislation is the same as introduced by Representative Seymour Halpern of New York, H.R. 11155, and the original Bill of the same type introduced by Representative Bob Casey of Texas.

I urge your support as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee of this legislation when it is considered by your Committee. With the threat again of a shortage of many for construction loans and at higher interest rates, it appears that the construction industry, particularly residential construction, is faced with a continuation of the present depressed market. Legislation of this type which can help stimulate this important segment of our economy, and at the same time without direct government financial subsidy, is obviously in the best interest of the entire economy. It is of particular importance both to homeowners and tenants who can best be served by a strong competitive construction industry, including both builders and manufacturers, which such legislation can help maintain during a continuing lag in housing starts which now faces the industry during 1968.

We will certainly appreciate your active support to the passage of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

INSULATION BOARD INSTITUTE.
CHARLES M. GRAY,
Manager.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Frankfort, Ky., September 20, 1967.

Re House Bill 358.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: As a fellow Kentuckian, Democrat, and Legislator, I am writing to you to express an appeal for your support of House of Representatives Bill No. 358, which is presently pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

As I understand this bill, it would allow for a Federal tax deduction of up to $750.00 for repair or improvement of personal property, which would indeed, encourage a number of people to take long-delayed action toward improving their property, and also, give them an incentive to maintain it properly.

My own district is representative primarily, of middle and low-income families, who would certainly benefit by the passage of this bill, and it seems to me it would also obtain the following results.

(a) Instill in a person confidence and pride to maintain a clean and nice looking home.

(b) Eliminate the slum areas to a certain extent, and prevent other areas from becoming decadent and subject to complaints of becoming slum districts.

(c) Improved housing conditions would be a deterrent to riot situations and acts of violence.

(d) Better housing, as a result, would also bring in increased revenues, particularly, on the local level through sales taxes on equipment and material, would improve employment, and would increase the values of real estate. This would certainly be a stimulant for the state of Kentucky.

Any effort expended by you to get this bill up for discussion and action would be appreciated. Also, if you have any additional information on this bill which you think I might be interested in, I would appreciate your forwarding same to me. Many thanks.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. SIEMENS.

[From Newsletter, National Association of Wholesalers, August 1967]

A BILL TO SPUR HOUSING REPAIRS

A bill to encourage home improvements has been gaining increasing recognition. Introduced last January by Representative Bob Casey (D.-Texas), H.R. 358 would allow "a tax deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer for making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing." For repairs and improvements to his own residence, a taxpayer could deduct the cost up to $750 per year. As to the rehabilitation of rental housing, the taxpayer would be allowed to amortize the cost in a 60 month period, beginning the month after such repairs are completed. At present, capital improvements are now amortized over a much longer period. For example, a new roof is amortized over a period of 20 years. Representative Casey stated that the bill, if enacted, would strike a "crippling blow at urban blight by giving the people a tax incentive to repair their homes and rental properties." The Congressman also cited the incentive as an economic thrust to the lagging home repair and remodeling industry, creating a demand for many products and jobs.

Many wholesaler-distributors who serve the building construction, repair, and decorating industry have expressed interest in the bill. At a July meeting of the NAW Pros, the chief staff executives of member organization recommended to the Executive Committee that NAW support enactment of H.R. 358. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, but to date no hearings have been scheduled.

[From the American Plywood Association's Management Report, Aug. 25, 1967]

BILL PROPOSES HOUSE REPAIRS TAX DEDUCTION

The attention of the forest products industry is directed to House Bill 358, introduced recently by Rep. Robert Casey, (D-Tex.) which would allow a tax deduction up to $750 for repairs or improvements to property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence. Included is a deduction for owners of rental housing who rehabilitate or restore their property with expenditures amortized over a 60-month period.

Some government agencies may oppose such a tax incentive on the basis that it will cost the federal government dearly in revenue. At the same time, other government officials are talking in terms of expending $10 billion, and up, to rebuild blighted areas in major cities.

Rehabilitation through private initiative would seem to be the more economical method. Homeowners, faced with increasing real estate taxes, school taxes, sales taxes and other burdens, need the provisions of H.R. 358.

The Casey Bill appears to be a medium range project, with no action expected this year. But those who regard its provisions as being helpful to the forest products industry may send letters of support to Congressman Casey, or to Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

MEMORANDUM TO ALL LOCAL ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

NATIONAL PAINT, VARNISH AND LACQUER ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1967.

As most of you are aware, NPVLA has taken a lead during the past year in supporting legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax deduction up to $750. for "the repair or improvement of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence" and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate (over a 60-month period) the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing.

Besides paints and allied products, home maintenance and repair will include such products as lumber, concrete, plaster, insulation board, tile, structural clay products, plumbing, heating and cooling systems, electrical systems, roofing, bricks, siding, aluminum, steel and plastics. Altogether some 30 trade associations and labor groups representing these industries have expressed their strong support for this legislation by letters and statements; some have adopted resolutions voicing this support.

Sponsor of this legislation (H.R. 358)—which would be not only a boon to industry and labor, but also would reduce the burden on the harassed taxpayer—is Representative Bob Casey (22nd District—Texas). Similar bills have been introduced by Representatives Seymour Halpern of New York's 6th District (H.R. 11155) and Jerome Waldie of California's 14th District (H.R. 13152). Additional sponsors of this progressive legislation are expected next year in both the House and Senate.

This type of legislation had failed in prior Congresses, but the climate this year seems to have changed for the better—similar tax proposals were made to allow the taxpayer to amortize expenditures deemed to be in the national interest (e.g. college tuition fees and water pollution abatement). Tax concessions for such purposes are no longer considered to be special interest legislation. All Americans recognize the need to arrest the spread of urban blight and decay, and the "Casey" bill would help accomplish this.

No hearings on this legislation were held during the First Session of the 90th Congress because of the more pressing problems of anti-poverty, riots and Viet Nam—taxes—inflation—spending! However, after a brief recess for the Christmas holidays, Congress will return (about January 15th) to tackle the huge backlog of legislation which carries over automatically to the Second Session. It is hoped that the "Casey" bill will be among those called up for hearings early next year.

NPLVA will continue to follow this legislative proposal closely and to coordinate support measures as may be feasible. Rep. Casey will include in the Congressional Record copies of letters, resolutions and other indications of interest. Reps. Halpern and Waldie will do the same. We would be pleased to receive a copy of any evidence of support communicated to your Congressman.

Remember—The expenditure of very large sums are being considered and proposed to halt deterioration of the nation's urban areas and to provide decent living quarters for an ever-expanding population. Available records indicate that approximately $1 billion less was spent for maintenance and repair of owner-occupied and rental property in 1965 than in 1960, yet there were 7 million more homes in 1965. This indicates that these homes are not being maintained adequately; and, unless this trend is stopped, the Federal Government will be forced to spend additional billions in the future to rehabilitate them.

The "Casey" bill (H.R. 358) will not only reverse this trend, but it will stimulate the economy by generating increased production in those industries discussed above, and it will create additional jobs for the vast army of workers required to make the repairs and to paint, install plumbing and electrical wiring, heating units and all the other products mentioned. These stimuli should more than offset the loss of tax revenue from the reduced income tax paid by individuals taking additional deductions under the Bill, which would be the only valid reason for opposition by the Administration.

To ensure prompt attention to this legislation and favorable action, enthusiasm must be generated at the "grass roots" level; and, individual members of Congress, particularly the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, must be convinced of the merits of the legislation and the overwhelming desire of the general public for such a measure.

Your Local Association can be very helpful in this project, and I request that you take all means at your disposal to educate the public in your local area and to foster support for this legislation, coordinating with other building trade industries whenever appropriate.

The following actions are suggested and recommended:

a. Include comments on this legislation in your bulletins and other communications;

b. Schedule, as early in the year as possible, a workshop or discussion on this legislation at one of your regular meetings;

c. Spread the word, as appropriate and feasible, through paint salesmen and paint dealers in your area;

d. Publicize this legislation, whenever practical, before civic and business groups; and

e. Contact personally, if practicable, or otherwise *write your Congressman and urge him to support this legislation.*

Let's all get together now and work hard to get our story across to Congress and to the Administration—to convince both of the tremendous potential benefits of this sound and progressive legislative proposal! To assist you in this project, I am enclosing a copy of Rep. Halpern's bill to New York Associations, Rep. Waldie's bill to California Associations and Rep. Casey's bill to the remainder. I am enclosing also for your information a list of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee before whom the proposal first must be reviewed and approved before it can get "off the ground."

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. ROLAND,
Executive Vice President.

MINNESOTA COUNCIL OF PAINTING AND DECORATING, CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
St. Paul, Minn., February 8, 1968.
Hon. ROBERT R. CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: The Minnesota Council of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America at its annual convention held in Rochester, Minnesota the 25th through the 27th of January 1968, by unanimous vote urges your support of H.R. 358 which is presently before the House Ways and Means Committee and further requests that you use your good offices toward obtaining hearings by the committee on this legislation.

H.R. 358 was introduced by Congressman Casey of Texas and would provide for a tax deduction up to $750.00 for "the repair or improvement of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence" and also would permit amortization over a 60 month period for owner or rental housing who rehabilitate or restore such property. We believe this legislation to be sound and timely and that assisting in its passage during this session of Congress is worthy of our best efforts.

The plight of many home owners today is pathetic. Many do not have large increasing incomes. While pride of ownership makes proper maintenance of one residence most desirable, even increasing taxes on income and real estate, plus increasing living costs, leaves little remaining for home upkeep and repair. Some incentive must be provided to properly maintain these residences. If this is not done the alternative will be a further need for federal appropriations to rehabilitate blighted areas. The present Congress has been faced with the need of providing astronomical sums for such purposes. Enactment of H.R. 358 would provide the incentive and would lessen the need for further appropriations for rehabilitation.

Some will oppose this legislation claiming that the Federal Government will face a heavy revenue loss. We cannot accept such reasoning as being factual. Enactment of this proposed legislation would increase employment in building material manufacturing plants, help provide full employment for those workmen required in making improvement and repairs, and would increase the number of job opportunities for the underemployed. Such increase in employment would thus provide greater revenue to the government through earnings taxes. In conclusion, we are of the opinion that the enactment of H.R. 358 is just good business policy.

It enhances private initiative, provides an incentive to the heretofore neglected nation's homeowners, provides greater employment opportunities, increases property values and further maintains what we like to call our "high American Standard of Living".

Your active participation in a speedy enactment of H.R. 358 is urged and will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

AL SHUSTER,
Executive Secretary.

Turn to God

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at the annual Presidential prayer breakfast, held on February 1, 1968. The address is entitled, "Turn to God":

TURN TO GOD

(The annual "Presidential Prayer Breakfast," held on February 1, was attended by the President, the Vice President, several members of the Cabinet, a Supreme Court Justice, the Governors of seven States, high military officers, and many members of Congress. The function was arranged by the Prayer Breakfast Groups of the Senate and the House. More than 1,000 persons—mostly from the Government—were present. An excerpt from a stirring address follows.—David Lawrence, Editor.)

(By General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army)

For my text I turn to the Letter of James, 3rd Chapter, the 13th through the 18th Verses. I use the Phillips translation:

"Are there some wise and understanding men among you? Then your lives will be an example of the humility that is born of true wisdom. But if your heart is full of rivalry and bitter jealousy, then do not boast of your wisdom—don't deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart.

"You may acquire a certain superficial wisdom, but it does not come from God—it comes from this world, from your own lower nature, even from the devil. For wherever you find jealously and rivalry you also find disharmony and all other kinds of evil.

"The wisdom that comes from God is first utterly pure, then peace-loving, gentle, approachable, full of tolerant thoughts and kindly actions with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

Our Nation today is troubled and uneasy. We have those who believe that we should pull out of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia. We have those who believe we are not doing enough in Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing enough for the underprivileged of our own country. We have those who believe that we are fostering and harboring a segment of parasites within our population. We have those who believe that the laws of our land can be flouted and that they can choose the laws they will obey and the laws they will ignore. We have those who believe that disrespect for the law should be confronted with the club or a gun. Parents across our land are concerned with the use of drugs and dope among our young people.

So, where do we turn? What do we do? How many of us—referring back to James—". . . deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart"? How many of us have given real thought to the commandment that was read in our first scripture:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart."?

We are a part of a social structure that is growing more crowded with each passing day. It is becoming more difficult for an individual to establish an identity. The older among us are too busy and too preoccupied to communicate with the younger. Our consciences become hardened by continuing exposure to both the contemptible and the pitiable. Unable or unwilling to take corrective measures, we offer at first only our contempt or our pity. Contempt and pity give way to acceptance. Acceptance leads finally to the worst attitude of all—uneasy indifference, anomalous as that may seem. We ignore with the vain hope that the distasteful or the hard to solve problem will somehow go away.

I wonder if it isn't time for each of us to reflect upon the 8th and 9th Verses of the 4th Chapter of Genesis. Remember that, after Cain slew his brother, the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" Cain replied, "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?"

The answer is yes. I am my brother's keeper. Each of us is his brother's keeper, and in the eyes of God all of us are brothers. We dare not be indifferent to our brothers' needs, whether those needs be material, spiritual, or just plain communication.

There is a solution to the problems of this world—turn to God. There is a solution to the conflicts between nations—turn to God. There is a solution to the problems of our cities and of our streets—turn to God. Not in a superficial way, but in a human and compassionate way—as man to man and friend to friend. There is a solution to the problem of our young—together with them, turn to God.

"What's in it for me?" Just the satisfaction of becoming a compassionate human being.

Finally, if we ever wonder how far we should carry our love for one another, remember that Jesus was not content with the old commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves. True to His manner, He added glorious new dimensions to that injunction by saying, in the words of our final text, "This is my commandment, That ye love one another as I have loved you."

We can never hope to match His matchless love, but we grow in grace and glory every time we try.

The 50th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the Congress paid tribute to the 50th anniversary of the short-lived free government of the Ukraine. Many of us drew the parallel at that time between the aggressive and expansive communism which has shattered the legitimate desires of the Ukrainians and the new colonialism that employs communism as an allegedly liberating force from governments favorable to the Western idea of a free and open society.

The continued courage of the Ukrainian people and their unshakeable desire to recapture their own destiny nakedly reveals the cynical use of nationalism as the tip of a tyrannical spear. Many nations in the less developed portions of the world are now being manipulated by Communists posing as patriots. As the Ukraine was the first to feel the weight of Soviet communism imposed by force, their unending struggle to assert a true nationalism and the consequent political, economic, and cultural repression of their attempts at freedom represents a very strong argument against the opinion, held by some around the world, that the United States is the only threat to the full expression of a nation's destiny.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 10 brings into sharp focus the ultimate result of a war of national liberation for an independent nationality within the Soviet Union. I commend this editorial to the attention of all those with short memories who believe that the embrace of the Soviet bear is warm and comforting or that communism guarantees a government responsive to a people's needs:

FERMENT IN THE UKRAINE

The infamous judicial frame-ups of dissident literary intellectuals in Moscow in recent years are apparently only part of a broader revival of Soviet secret police activity and ruthlessness.

That is the clear meaning of the recent revelations about the persecution of independent-minded Ukrainian intellectuals who have learned the hard way that today's K.G.B. has forgotten none of the tricks of Stalin's old N.K.V.D. And the Ukrainian heretics have also had to learn at high cost that slave-labor camps like those in which Solzhenitsyn's Ivan Denisovich underwent his ordeal belong to contemporary Soviet life, not merely to history.

But an important element distinguishes the Ukrainian terror campaign from that in Moscow. The secret police is hounding the Ukrainian intellectuals because of their nationalism, a sentiment which has been reborn in a generation conceived and raised under Soviet rule. A Ukrainian does not have to be very perceptive to grasp the fact that the vaunted equality of peoples in the Soviet Union is a sham.

In great Ukrainian cities like Kiev, Kharkov and Odessa, Ukrainian language and culture occupy the role of poor relations to the Russian language and culture. Moscow obviously fears that sensitivity to such affronts may make some Ukrainians reflect that if the Ukraine were independent its rich natural resources, highly developed modern industry and educated population would put it on a par with nations like France and West Germany.

Outside the Communist bloc Moscow's propaganda seeks to inflame nationalism as a force against the West, cheering on Arabs against Israel, Angolans against Portugal, and Hong Kong Chinese against the British. Can there be any surprise then that intelligent non-Russians in the Soviet Union see the aptness of this anti-colonial propaganda to their own situation, problems and aspirations?

Project Concern

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent birthday of one of the most humane and worthwhile enterprises with which I have had the privilege of being associated. Five years ago, Dr. James W. Turpin—minister, physician and practical dreamer—saw the beginnings of realization of his greatest dream. He launched, in Hong Kong, Project Concern, an independent nonprofit organization offering medical care to the needy of all ages.

The project's first year of field activity was filled with challenges, but the dedication and talent of Dr. Turpin and his associates were equal to the task.

From its initial small staff, Project Concern has grown to an international staff of more than 137 doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, teachers, X-ray technicians and supporting staff—and volunteers from more than 30 countries serving in many capacities.

Five years after its inception, Project Concern can point with justifiable pride to some remarkable accomplishments:

Project Concern has registered more than half a million patient visits in Hong Kong, South Vietnam and Mexico.

Project Concern has established in Hong Kong four outpatient medical clinics and now operates both a feeding program for more than 1,000 children and a school program for over 400 students.

Project Concern provides hospital services at DaMpao, Vietnam and a mobile clinic unit which pays regular visits to more than two dozen villages and strategic hamlets. The project has developed in cooperation with the Vietnamese Government a hospital in Dalat, a village medical assistant—VMA—self-help-training program for local young men and women, and gives midwifery training to young women hospital medical assistant—HMA—graduates.

Project Concern operates, in Tijuana, Mexico, an out-patient clinic, a maternity and pediatric ward, a school for 300 children, and a feeding and clothing service.

And looking always to the future, Project Concern soon plans to build Baja Calif.'s first mother-and-child center. It will be a modern and thoroughly equipped hospital for the poor living in the Tijuana area.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Project Concern and Jim Turpin, the extraordinary physician and humanist who inspires its operations, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD, at this point, a message authored by Jim Turpin and appropriately called, "A New Emancipation Proclamation":

A NEW EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

They call me a free man. But am I truly free? In my world I find hungry, sick, poor and illiterate people. They are shackled by chains they cannot loosen. It seems their bonds reach out and rob me of part of my freedom, and partial freedom is no freedom at all.

All men yearn to be fully free, they from their want, I from their need of me. I can choose to attempt eliminating them or their need. Unable to justify their unnecessary death, I choose to help them become self-sufficient.

Be it therefore proclaimed that:

1. No man is free as long as even one man is held in the bondage of hunger, human servitude or dependency on others;
2. A man free only to be hungry, sick, poor or illiterate knows no true freedom;
3. All men everywhere yearn for escape from such privations;
4. My freedom is a freedom to be involved with them in establishing their independence;
5. Ultimate freedom will be ours only when this growing concern reaches all men.

Project Concern invites you to join us in this new Emancipation Proclamation. From the youngest school child to our oldest "freedom fighter," we trust you will become even more deeply involved in the joy of freeing others—now!

Cold War Escalation in the Mediterranean

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, not nearly enough publicity has been given to the Soviet naval buildup in the Mediterranean in the recent past. The February 5, 1968, issue of the Washington Report, the weekly publication of the American Security Council, zeroes in on efforts by the Soviets to expand their influence in this area. States Holmes Alexander, the guest editor of February 5 issue:

> Look north of Britain, look south of France, the Russians are outflanking the landlocked stalemate in the heart of Europe. The combined navies of NATO, which is longhand for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, were supposed to prevent this breakout, but the rules of the Cold War favor the enemy. The crafty Soviets are winning positions-in-strength that can be as disastrous to the Free World as Trafalgar was to the French and the loss of Suez was to the British.

The Soviet buildup was confirmed by representatives to NATO in December of last year at a 3-day conference to the North Atlantic Allies. According to the NATO group there had been a "marked expansion" in Soviet forces in the Mediterranean during the last year.

To make matters worse, there has been a squabble between Congress and the Defense Department concerning the building of nuclear vessels. According to the Washington Daily News of December 9, 1967, Congress, 18 months ago ordered the Defense Department to build two nuclear-powered frigates at a total cost of $258 million. But Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara demurred and Congress agreed merely to "urge" that a start be made toward a nuclear surface fleet.

In the following article, the author recommends that we "give the American Navy whatever it needs to do the job." This is certainly prudent advice in view of the Soviet effort in the Mediterranean over the past year.

I include the article, "The View From Grosvenor Square," by Holmes Alexander, in the RECORD at this point:

THE VIEW FROM GROSVENOR SQUARE: COLD WAR ESCALATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., a seadog of bull terrier poise and fighting propensities, paces his headquarters, Grosvenor Square, London, and growls with frustration. He has reason. McCain is commander in chief, U.S. Naval forces, Europe. The American strategic concept for this part of the world sometimes seems as tattered as a shell-torn battle flag.

Look north of Britain, look south of France, the Russians are outflanking the landlocked stalemate in the heart of Europe. The combined navies of NATO, which is longhand for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, were supposed to prevent this breakout, but the rules of the Cold War favor the enemy. The crafty Soviets are winning positions-in-strength that can be as disastrous to the Free World as Trafalgar was to the French and the loss of Suez was to the British.

One must go to foreign reference for apt analogies. The U.S. Navy has never lost a major engagement that endangered its role as a world power. Today we are slipping toward an Apocalypse catastrophe both in the Mediterranean and the North Atlantic, and McCain can see what's coming. Never was a victory-minded sailor in such a tight set of psychological irons. He cannot order a shot in anger, and does not feel free to talk for quotation. He can only describe the harrowing situation, as he did to this newsman, and exhort the scribe to check it out and report it.

McCain's parting remark was to bid his visitor, headed into the Middle East, to be sure and interview American ship commanders in the Mediterranean. But a few weeks later, three ships of the Sixth Fleet approached Istanbul, Turkey, and were prevented from landing at that NATO port by a mob of student-demonstrators. And in Beirut, Lebanon, when the reporter asked Ambassador Dwight Porter when and if the Fleet might dock, the story was much the same. The people and government of Lebanon were friendly, said the Ambassador, but the dock workers' union wasn't—hence no shore leaves for American sailors.

These tawdry examples indicate the quandary of American seapower, and the vacuum which the Russian Navy is moving to fill. The Sixth Fleet, a detachment of the Atlantic Fleet, has the dual purpose of maintaining peace and friendship in the Mediterranean world and of buttressing that flank of NATO. The purpose of the Russian presence is to nullify our efforts and to bring the entire area into the Communist sphere. Today there isn't anywhere along the Med's eastern and southern shores (unless it's Haifa, Israel, which we diplomatically avoid) that our sailors are welcome.

But Russian sailors, intensely indoctrinated for super-correct behavior and exaggerated friendliness, are warmly received at Latakia in Syria, and Alexandria and Port Said, Egypt. Recently, a delegation of Russian Navy officers made a hush-hush call at Mers-el-Kebir in Algeria, two thousand miles from the Soviet homeland. Actually, it wasn't a social visit. Mers-el-Kebir is a French-built navy base, soon to pass into Algerian control, and it had been receiving Soviet freighters which reportedly were bringing 90-foot missiles.

The turn of events in the Mediterranean staggers the imagination and mocks the witness of personal observation. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis (these self-same Soviet freighters were probably there) the Sixth Fleet, with its two carriers, two cruisers, its Polaris submarines and 40-odd other vessels, was supreme in the waters between Europe and Africa. The Russians had only two to four ships in the million square-mile spread, and these were there under the sorry pennants of a loser's legend, since Russia for centuries hadn't been able to win at sea, and had many times failed to establish herself in warm water.

Despite attempts to take advantage of the early Cyprus troubles, Russia placed no more than 10 or 12 ships in the area in January '67. Then, suddenly, with the Arab-Israeli June war, the Soviet had 47 ships, almost equal to the Sixth Fleet's normal complement of 50. The Communists were not merely making a show of force. Their two cruisers, numerous destroyers and submarines were missile-armed to fight, but more especially they had the short-range missiles and torpedoes for commerce raiding. Particularly intriguing and alarming to American observers were two Russian assault ships, capable of putting 1000 fighting men on beach heads. The U.S. Marine detachment, 1500 strong, was not much larger. Supremacy had passed from American hands, and superiority was in contention.

In a pitched battle, there's no doubt that the Sixth Fleet has the seapower, airpower and nuclear sock to blast the Russians off the water and out of their home cities. It's the Cold War positioning, where bluff and audacity are the plays, that we are losing. The enemy is roaming the Mediterranean, once a NATO lake, in frowning gray hulls that plainly tell the helpless, poverty-ridden, unstable inhabitants that the same force which rules in East Europe is standing offshore from their vulnerable peninsulas and scattered islands. In three years the Soviet presence, measured in ship-days, has increased 600 percent.

Before examining the Soviet sea monster more closely, we must notice the other claw of the pincer which the Admiral watches from Grosvenor Square. This talon arches out from the Baltic Sea and down from the Arctic Ocean where Soviet nuclear-driven, nuclear-armed submarines hide under fog and ice. The Norwegian Sea, off that nation's Atlantic coast, is the practice ground for Russian war games which have increased every year in participants and complexity. The make-believe battles are between surface ships, and between submarines that are pitted against landbased aircraft. From McCain's viewpoint, all this dummy practice for cutting the Western world's lifeline between North America and West Europe.

In two world wars, the Battle of the Atlantic was crucial to eventual victory. Today, with Britain deficient as a naval force and France an arrant deserter, it's very much up to the U.S. Navy's Eastern Atlantic Command which, like the Sixth Fleet, is being drained of men and materials for the war in Asia. Again, if it came to shooting, there's little doubt that the Russian flotillas would end up with Davy Jones. But in Cold War terms the Communists are exerting a relentless and simultaneous abrasion upon the morale and confidence of Norway and Denmark, the northern NATO partners, and upon Greece, Turkey and Italy, the southern partners. Meanwhile, an inexorable time factor seems running everywhere in favor of the enemy.

We must ask whence came this emergence of Soviet seapower. The quasi-peaceful manifestations can be taken as outcroppings of scientific and industrial growth. Russia is the fastest moving nation of all in fish culture, with protein factories off every coast in the world. She has 200 oceanographic and hydrographic research vessels at work. Her merchant marine calls at 500 ports in 61 countries, and ranks far better than our own. Nearly all these craft are of postwar construction and equipped with the best of modern devices. Since Communist statecraft is total, we have to assume that every moving Soviet object in water, air and space is an active gatherer of military intelligence and of potential use in warfare.

Slavic creativeness accounts for much, but the Western World never expected Mother Russia's womb to deliver an armada of warships in an abnormally short period of gestation. Tradition was against it. Professor James Billington, the American Russologist, writes that fear of the sea "was perhaps to be expected among an earthbound people whose discovery of the sea coincided with their traumatic discovery of the outside world." Czarist Russia almost never had a sea victory over its maritime neighbors, Turkey and Egypt, unless allied with such seagoing powers as Britain and France. On occasion a Russian fleet would lurch out from the Bosporus to make a grab at the Greek island of Corfu, the Ionian islands and even at Crete, midway in the Mediterranean. But these conquests never held. An ambitious naval program was blitzed out of existence by the Nazis, and Russian submarine forays in World War II were reckless but feckless. As recently as Khrushchev's regime, the Soviet Navy was a coastal defense unit. Programs for aircraft carriers were begun and cancelled.

But, if U.S. Navy thinkers are right, the modern Kremlin discovered a tenuous relationship between guerilla warfare and operations at sea. The so-called "wars of liberation" could be fought on oceans as well as in jungles. If the capitalist powers were weak by being over-wealthy and too democratic, they were also awkward in being dependent upon their long sealines of supply. Admiral Gorchkov, Chief of the Soviet Navy, wrote in 1963:

"Atomic submarines are the foundation of combat might . . . New submarines, aircraft and surface ships with the powerful weapons have radically changed former concepts of the Navy's missions. . . ."

Soviet leaders made use of the Toynbee principle of challenge-and-response. Natural handicaps of the landmass, inland seas and ice-locked harbors could be turned to advantage. Shipyards could operate in the interior without much foreign scrutiny. The four great fleets at the coastlines of the Arctic, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Pacific could be centrally supplied by intersea transfers.

There was an inland route of every ocean. The Volga-Dan canal system connects the Caspian Sea with the Black Sea which has egress into the Mediterranean. The Marlinski canal system connects the Baltic-White Sea waterway with the Volga River. But by far the most impressive link in the USSR's intersea exchange is the Northern Arctic Sea Route which allows Soviet ships to pass from European Russia to Asian Russia without leaving Soviet territorial waters. The fog-shrouded, ice-jammed passage from Murmansk, just behind the Scandinavian peninsula on the Barents Sea, to faroff Vladivostok on the Pacific is certainly the most difficult regular sea route in the world, and it may be the most significant. Writing in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for December, 1967, Navy Captain T. J. Laforest calls it "an integral geographic part of the Soviet Master Plan for world economic domination."

While these routes were carrying shipping and ship supplies, twenty Navy officers training schools with four year courses in navigation, gunnery, engineering and general seamanship were turning out cadets for summer cruises. Lack of bases was another handicap to be surmounted. Russian planners copied American "fleet trains" to reach distant fleets, and devised floating bases in weather-protected international waters. There are two principal anchorages in the Mediterranean, one off the Greek island of Kithra; another in the Tunisian Gulf of Hammamet. These logistic-depots will serve very well until the Russians get permanent tie-up harbors in Egypt, Syria and Algeria, with a possible missile-base at the latter place just opposite the U.S. Polaris base at Rota, Spain.

Soviet entrance to the Mediteranean is not restrained on the western end, past Gibraltar. Turkey controls the eastern ingress at the Dardanelles, but the Montrieux Convention permits peaceful passage of ships if reported in advance. Turkey has quarreled with Greece, the U.S.A. and Britain over the Cyprus affair, and has become progressively friendly with Russia, despite 13 wars in 200 years with the Bear.

It is not necessary to guess very wildly about Russian capabilities in the Mediterranean. The two Soviet cruisers there during the Six Day War are identified by the Pentagon as OCA–159 (Sverdov class) and CLG–145 (Kirov class), both heavily armed with six inch guns and guided missiles. The destroyers and submarines are also missile-equipped. There is a sizeable complement of Elints (electronic intelligence trawlers) that watches every American move. Soon to join the amphibious assault vessels are two Russian helicopter-carriers for putting "navy-infantry" (the Russian equivalent of Marines) ashore. Last October, in an ominous exhibit of strike-power, an Egyptian Russian-made warship, with a Russian-trained crew, jumped an Israeli destroyer. The Elint was destroyed in a matter of minutes with Russian-made Styx sea-to-sea missile that works by automatic, unjammable, infrared, homing guidance. It was about the fastest job of destruction in naval history.

As U.S. Navy authorities study the Mediterranean, they see hostile or distrustful countries in an almost unbroken line eastward from Algeria to Turkey. On the northern shore they see the client-nation of Franco Spain, the ex-partner of Gaullist France, an Italy flanked entirely by neutralist or Communist neighbors, a disturbed Greece with land frontiers up against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania, a changing Turkey that is contiguous to the USSR and Nasserite Syria.

Only the sea-borders of these nations front on Western power, which means the Sixth Fleet. When American ships had the run of the Mediterranean, a comforting blanket of friendship and encouragement covered them all. The 26,000 merchant ships which carry 99 percent of the imports into innumerable ports and inlets were guarded by mighty vessels, by more than 200 carrier-borne warplanes, by underwater arsenals of nuclear deterrence and, above all, by the immeasurable prestige of an invincible custodian.

But today the Mediterranean inhabitant and politician cannot sight a hull and know it almost surely has to be a guardian of peace. The hull might be a merchant-raider, or it might be the transport of some landing party to support a Communist coup.

From the Grosvenor Square headquarters, the pincer prongs say that Soviet power is no longer contained in continental Europe. The only known way to meet Communist penetration on land or sea is by the employment of such manifestly superior force in which allies have complete confidence. Sadly, the U.S. Navy can no longer display near-omnipotence nor offer full security.

The "drawdowns" ordered by Defense Secretary McNamara to reinforce the Seventh Fleet in Asia have enfeebled the European naval forces. True, as McNamara has insisted, the billets are filled with bodies and the inventories show sufficient supplies on hand or on order. But the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, reporting last year, found many deficiencies: "destroyer escorts . . . unable to go to sea . . . shortages of trained and experienced petty officers . . . boatswains mates, electronic technicians, diesel engineermen, aviation ordnancemen . . . many pilots billets . . . filled by nonpilots."

In both the North Atlantic and Mediterranean, the Russians are approaching naval parity. The deterrence that flows from American superiority, let alone supremacy, is no longer self-evident.

A solution? In layman's language—give the American Navy whatever it needs to do the job.

HOLMES ALEXANDRIA,
Guest Editor.

Vietcong Offensive Has Devastating Effect on the People

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the recent events in Vietnam appeared in the February 12 Newsweek. Everett G. Martin, who has been the bureau chief for Newsweek in Saigon until recently, makes a most sobering statement entitled "The Devastating Effect on the People":

THE DEVASTATING EFFECT ON THE PEOPLE

(By Everett G. Martin)

(*In January, after months of indirect harassment, the South Vietnamese Government effectively expelled Newsweek's Saigon bureau chief Everett Martin. Though no formal reason was given for the expulsion, the evident cause for it was official anger at Newsweek articles dealing with corruption and ineptitude in the South Vietnamese Government and Army. Below, Martin, who is now in New York pending reassignment to Hong Kong, reflects on the current Viet Cong offensive in the light of his two years in Vietnam.*)

Like most journalists familiar with Vietnam, I have long been unconvinced by the deluge of official optimism on the progress of the war. Yet when the enemy attacked last week, I was utterly taken aback by his daring and tenacity—and, most of all, by his ability to coordinate his assaults with a precision he had never before displayed.

The offensive itself, however, came as no surprise. For more than three months, it has been apparent—or, at least, it has been apparent to newsmen on the scene—that the situation in Vietnam's populated areas was steadily deteriorating. There was, first of all, the fact that all enemy forces from local guerrillas to main-force units were better armed and more aggressive than ever before and that enemy defections to the Saigon government were falling off sharply. Time and again, the enemy demonstrated that he retained complete initiative as he drew U.S. forces off to remote border areas and simultaneously demoralized the populated areas by increasingly violent attacks on provincial cities and villages. With U.S. forces spread ever thinner, it was clear to anyone who traveled the countryside that the main roads were no longer as safe as they had been and that virtually every major city was threatened by encircling guerrillas. In fact, the enemy had even penetrated the most prized example of successful pacification—the area around Qui Nhon.

DOUBTS

Now all the fears evoked by these conditions have become reality—and the effect on the people of South Vietnam can only be devastating. With good reason, rural South Vietnamese have long doubted their government's ability to defend them, but today those in the cities who thought they were immune from the war realize that they, too, are no longer safe. Worse yet, they now have reason to doubt the capability of U.S. power to defend them.

Statements that U.S. military men knew in advance that the enemy would attack, while intended to be reassuring, have in reality exactly the opposite effect. Last year after

Quang Tri was overrun, the people were told the attack had been expected. This only upset them more, and they asked the very practical question: "If you knew, why couldn't you do something about it?"

Furthermore, the statement by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker that last week's attacks will be resented by the Vietnamese population and will hurt the Viet Cong politically is extremely wishful. Things just don't work that way in South Vietnam. The Saigon government has as yet failed to provide the people with any reason to support it, and there is even less likelihood that such support will be forthcoming now. It is far more realistic to expect ordinary Vietnamese to react the same way they did after earlier Viet Cong attacks on the cities: that is, with even greater indifference to the efforts of the government and the U.S. to rally their support. And one can only imagine the reaction of the citizens of the heavily populated cities of Saigon, Cholon, and Hué to being bombarded by their own planes in the desperate effort to kill the guerillas in their midst.

U.S. computers have yet to churn out what the effect of the Viet Cong offensive has been on the pacification program, but before I left Vietnam last month there was already mounting evidence that it was not running on schedule. In fact, a high Vietnamese official involved in the program told me flatly that pacification would not work. He may have overdrawn his case, but he said that within two weeks after the so-called Revolutionary Development teams come into a hamlet they are so demoralized by official corruption and obstructionism that they become ineffective.

Making a hamlet secure is often said to be 90 per cent of pacification. If this is true, then last week's events have pushed the program back to its beginnings, for the one cold fact that the guerrillas drove home last week was that no place in South Vietnam is secure.

The U.S. and the South Vietnamese governments must now face the task of putting back together the pieces of a puzzle that the Viet Cong were all too handily able to smash. The first effort in this direction has been the official attempt to convince the world and the Vietnamese people that the enemy paid an intolerably heavy price for his victory. This may prove true, but official estimates of enemy casualties last week should be viewed with the utmost skepticism. Body counts of enemy dead are at best always open to doubt; almost every reporter in Vietnam has his own personal example of inflated reports of enemy dead in battles that he himself has observed. To think that in the midst of last week's chaos and breakdown of communications a careful tabulation of such an enormous number of bodies was actually made defies logic and contributes further to the credibility gap.

THREATS

Of more importance is the question of what will happen to the fledgling democracy that the U.S. has tried so hard to foster. Given the state of open warfare throughout Vietnam last week, it was, of course, necessary that President Nguyen Van Thieu declare martial law. But in the heat of events, it should not be forgotten that the one thing that might restore the shaken faith of the Vietnamese people would be to see representative government finally begin to function.

It is an open secret in Saigon that many in the military junta would much prefer to go back to their old method of ruling by decree with complete suppression of opposition opinion. The capital in recent weeks has seethed with rumors that some members of the junta might stage a coup to bring back military rule. Now the national emergency has given them what they want for the moment. If any attempt is made to return to military rule as a permanent system of government, then the tragedy that befell the South Vietnamese last week will have reached its fullest proportions.

SENATE—*Wednesday, February 14, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

His Beatitude Elisha II, Armenian Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, offered the following prayer:

We come from the holy city of Jerusalem to pray with this august body for armistice and peace in the name of the Prince of Peace and declare unto you, that you, each one of you, your very souls are the essence of our life, the life of Jerusalem, the life of Bethlehem, the life of Nazareth.

We live in you, in each of you; in your pursuit of peace, in your quest of freedom, in your thirst of serenity and love, our life has deeper, truer meaning.

We are bound up inextricably with the soul of all of you and we love you with infinite love; each one of you, each individual soul is a glowing spark of that torch eternal, kindling the light of survival for us within the sacred and hallowed walls of the Holy Sepulcher.

We look to the channel of your being for the pulse of Jerusalem, the heartbeat of Bethlehem; the glory of Christendom's holy shrines.

Vested, as we are, with the Holy Spirit, we ask God's blessing upon you, your blessed country, the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States and all who exercise just and rightful authority. May you continue as the repository of our hope, the citadel of our courage and the anchorage of our resolution.

May you further be endowed with wisdom equal to your strength, and strength equal to your lofty spirit, and courage commensurate with your responsibilities, to the end that your Nation may continue to lead the world in the advancement and fulfillment of the noble goals embodied in your Declaration of Independence and personified by your emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

O Lord, source of our faith, in Thy name we bless this medal of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher, symbol of resurrection and revival of faith, so that the President, who will receive it at our hand, will continue to lead this Nation in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARTKE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1968, and Monday, February 12, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 13, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Two weeks ago, on January 18, this agency reported to me, and to the world, that agreement had at last been reached with the Soviet Union on a complete draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty, which has been submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva for consideration by other nations, is the most significant achievement of the Agency since its establishment 7 years ago.

On January 23, I forwarded to the Congress a request that the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be extended for an additional 3 years. At that time I noted the role of the Agency in bringing us close to the final conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, and pointed out that the treaty "is not a creation of the United States. It is not a creation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the creation of all nations, large and small. . . ."

While the United States and the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, have had the responsibility for preparing the draft treaty, a reading of this report will make plain the extent to which the draft has been responsive to interests and views of the nations which do not now have nuclear weapons.

In the course of a long and arduous negotiation, we have learned much of the concerns and desires of these nations. We have learned that it is not nuclear weapons they want, but security; not the destructiveness of the atom, but its benefits. We have been made aware of the depth of worldwide concern about the nuclear arms race.

The non-nuclear states have wanted their renunciation of nuclear weapons to be matched with a binding pledge by the nuclear powers to negotiate a halt in the arms race. They have not asked that the treaty require us to stop making nuclear weapons, or to divest ourselves of those now in our arsenals.

But they have asked us to pledge ourselves to move towards that ultimate goal. They feel the restraints they will voluntarily accept give them the right to such a pledge.

In drafting the non-proliferation treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union have acknowledged that right.

Under Article VI of the draft now before the Disarmament Committee, the nuclear nations will assume a solemn treaty obligation "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures regarding cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament. . . ." It is an obligation the United States will undertake with the utmost seriousness—for it continues a policy begun in 1946, when this nation offered to place its nuclear weapons under international control. We reaffirmed that obligation at Geneva when the Disarmament Conference convened there six years ago.

A reading of this Report shows clearly that the United States is pursuing a broad program of research and negotiation in fulfillment of its commitment to disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty now under consideration is another step in that direction, as the hot line and the limited test ban treaty and the outer space agreement were before it.

No nation is more aware of the perils in the increasingly expert destructiveness of our time than the United States. I believe the Soviet Union shares this awareness.

This is why we have jointly pledged our nations to negotiate towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race.

This is why the United States urgently desires to begin discussions with the Soviet Union about the buildup of offensive and defensive missiles on both sides. Such discussions—and it is important to note that the Soviet Union has agreed to them, in principle at least—will aim at finding ways to avoid another costly and futile escalation of the arms race.

Our hopes that talks will soon begin reside in our conviction that the same mutual interest reflected in earlier agreements is present here—a mutual interest in stopping the rapid accumulation and refinement of these munitions.

The obligations of the non-proliferation treaty will reinforce our will to bring an end to the nuclear arms race. The world will judge us by our performance.

The report I am forwarding today is testimony to the skill and determination with which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William C. Foster, is supporting this nation's effort to keep the somber and grim elements of the nuclear present from obliterating the promise of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1968.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate, messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS BEATITUDE, ELISHA II, ARMENIAN PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it was my great privilege and pleasure today to sponsor the distinguished spiritual leader who delivered such an inspiring invocation to this Chamber. His Beatitude, Elisha II, Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, has served his people in Palestine for over 40 years, first as a theologian and scholar, then in various official capacities under his predecessors in the Patriarchate, as Archbishop of Jerusalem and finally, since June 1960, as Patriarch in his own right.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him to the Jewish community of Taunton, Mass., early last week, and a biographical sketch of this great, spiritual leader and humanitarian be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS BEATITUDE ELISHA II, ARMENIAN PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM, AT THE 12TH ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD CONCLAVE, MARKING BROTHERHOOD WEEK IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, TAUNTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 11, 1968

"Glory, honour and peace to every man that worketh first to the Jew and also to the gentile."—Romans II, 10.

Dear friends and brethren, we have come from the Eternal City of Jerusalem, the cradle of the great religions to extend to you the blessings of the holy places and the greetings of your brethren there, who day and night keep vigil for the perpetuation of the flame of the Almighty's torch, in those places sacred to all of us as well as in the hearts of men.

We feel greatly honoured, at this moment, to be invited to this assembly, where spiritual and friendly hearts have gathered to meditate and to feel, in a united consciousness, the welfare of mankind. However, serenity and peace in the hearts of men are imperative factors in the realization of that beneficence, which beyond any doubt is the very basic foundation for prosperous and fruitful living.

Needless, even, it is to say that peace, before everything else, is the fruit of love—of that sublime virtue which befriends individuals and peoples; that imbues into the stormy and muddy hearts, the sanctity of God's feeling; and which, endows to human consciousness the stainless brilliancy of resplendent light through which the individual can truly perceive and come to know himself as well as his neighbour.

Religious bodies, as well as their representatives, in order to be able to be together, must be capable and willing to love one another. Human brotherhood is more of a moral communion than a dogmatic one. If the unity of faith has not materialised in the past, it is mainly due to the fact that men have not approached it with Love. God is the object of our faith, and God is Love.

In order to be able to achieve this aim, it is necessary for every church, synagogue, and mosque, for an instant at least, to free themselves from the fetters of obstacles created by historical causes, environmental conditions, racial considerations, and other more or less materialistic reasonings which have limited them in their isolation.

Quang Tri was overrun, the people were told the attack had been expected. This only upset them more, and they asked the very practical question: "If you knew, why couldn't you do something about it?"

Furthermore, the statement by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker that last week's attacks will be resented by the Vietnamese population and will hurt the Viet Cong politically is extremely wishful. Things just don't work that way in South Vietnam. The Saigon government has as yet failed to provide the people with any reason to support it, and there is even less likelihood that such support will be forthcoming now. It is far more realistic to expect ordinary Vietnamese to react the same way they did after earlier Viet Cong attacks on the cities: that is, with even greater indifference to the efforts of the government and the U.S. to rally their support. And one can only imagine the reaction of the citizens of the heavily populated cities of Saigon, Cholon, and Hué to being bombarded by their own planes in the desperate effort to kill the guerillas in their midst.

U.S. computers have yet to churn out what the effect of the Viet Cong offensive has been on the pacification program, but before I left Vietnam last month there was already mounting evidence that it was not running on schedule. In fact, a high Vietnamese official involved in the program told me flatly that pacification would not work. He may have overdrawn his case, but he said that within two weeks after the so-called Revolutionary Development teams come into a hamlet they are so demoralized by official corruption and obstructionism that they become ineffective.

Making a hamlet secure is often said to be 90 per cent of pacification. If this is true, then last week's events have pushed the program back to its beginnings, for the one cold fact that the guerrillas drove home last week was that no place in South Vietnam is secure.

The U.S. and the South Vietnamese governments must now face the task of putting back together the pieces of a puzzle that the Viet Cong were all too handily able to smash. The first effort in this direction has been the official attempt to convince the world and the Vietnamese people that the enemy paid an intolerably heavy price for his victory. This may prove true, but official estimates of enemy casualties last week should be viewed with the utmost skepticism. Body counts of enemy dead are at best always open to doubt; almost every reporter in Vietnam has his own personal example of inflated reports of enemy dead in battles that he himself has observed. To think that in the midst of last week's chaos and breakdown of communications a careful tabulation of such an enormous number of bodies was actually made defies logic and contributes further to the credibility gap.

THREATS

Of more importance is the question of what will happen to the fledgling democracy that the U.S. has tried so hard to foster. Given the state of open warfare throughout Vietnam last week, it was, of course, necessary that President Nguyen Van Thieu declare martial law. But in the heat of events, it should not be forgotten that the one thing that might restore the shaken faith of the Vietnamese people would be to see representative government finally begin to function.

It is an open secret in Saigon that many in the military junta would much prefer to go back to their old method of ruling by decree with complete suppression of opposition opinion. The capital in recent weeks has seethed with rumors that some members of the junta might stage a coup to bring back military rule. Now the national emergency has given them what they want for the moment. If any attempt is made to return to military rule as a permanent system of government, then the tragedy that befell the South Vietnamese last week will have reached its fullest proportions.

SENATE—*Wednesday, February 14, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

His Beatitude Elisha II, Armenian Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, offered the following prayer:

We come from the holy city of Jerusalem to pray with this august body for armistice and peace in the name of the Prince of Peace and declare unto you, that you, each one of you, your very souls are the essence of our life, the life of Jerusalem, the life of Bethlehem, the life of Nazareth.

We live in you, in each of you; in your pursuit of peace, in your quest of freedom, in your thirst of serenity and love, our life has deeper, truer meaning.

We are bound up inextricably with the soul of all of you and we love you with infinite love; each one of you, each individual soul is a glowing spark of that torch eternal, kindling the light of survival for us within the sacred and hallowed walls of the Holy Sepulcher.

We look to the channel of your being for the pulse of Jerusalem, the heartbeat of Bethlehem; the glory of Christendom's holy shrines.

Vested, as we are, with the Holy Spirit, we ask God's blessing upon you, your blessed country, the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States and all who exercise just and rightful authority. May you continue as the repository of our hope, the citadel of our courage and the anchorage of our resolution.

May you further be endowed with wisdom equal to your strength, and strength equal to your lofty spirit, and courage commensurate with your responsibilities, to the end that your Nation may continue to lead the world in the advancement and fulfillment of the noble goals embodied in your Declaration of Independence and personified by your emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

O Lord, source of our faith, in Thy name we bless this medal of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher, symbol of resurrection and revival of faith, so that the President, who will receive it at our hand, will continue to lead this Nation in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARTKE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1968, and Monday, February 12, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 13, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Two weeks ago, on January 18, this agency reported to me, and to the world, that agreement had at last been reached with the Soviet Union on a complete draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty, which has been submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva for consideration by other nations, is the most significant achievement of the Agency since its establishment 7 years ago.

On January 23, I forwarded to the Congress a request that the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be extended for an additional 3 years. At that time I noted the role of the Agency in bringing us close to the final conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, and pointed out that the treaty "is not a creation of the United States. It is not a creation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the creation of all nations, large and small. . . ."

While the United States and the Soviet Union, as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, have had the responsibility for preparing the draft treaty, a reading of this report will make plain the extent to which the draft has been responsive to interests and views of the nations which do not now have nuclear weapons.

In the course of a long and arduous negotiation, we have learned much of the concerns and desires of these nations. We have learned that it is not nuclear weapons they want, but security; not the destructiveness of the atom, but its benefits. We have been made aware of the depth of worldwide concern about the nuclear arms race.

The non-nuclear states have wanted their renunciation of nuclear weapons to be matched with a binding pledge by the nuclear powers to negotiate a halt in the arms race. They have not asked that the treaty require us to stop making nuclear weapons, or to divest ourselves of those now in our arsenals.

But they have asked us to pledge ourselves to move towards that ultimate goal. They feel the restraints they will voluntarily accept give them the right to such a pledge.

In drafting the non-proliferation treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union have acknowledged that right.

Under Article VI of the draft now before the Disarmament Committee, the nuclear nations will assume a solemn treaty obligation "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures regarding cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament. . . ." It is an obligation the United States will undertake with the utmost seriousness—for it continues a policy begun in 1946, when this nation offered to place its nuclear weapons under international control. We reaffirmed that obligation at Geneva when the Disarmament Conference convened there six years ago.

A reading of this Report shows clearly that the United States is pursuing a broad program of research and negotiation in fulfillment of its commitment to disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty now under consideration is another step in that direction, as the hot line and the limited test ban treaty and the outer space agreement were before it.

No nation is more aware of the perils in the increasingly expert destructiveness of our time than the United States. I believe the Soviet Union shares this awareness.

This is why we have jointly pledged our nations to negotiate towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race.

This is why the United States urgently desires to begin discussions with the Soviet Union about the buildup of offensive and defensive missiles on both sides. Such discussions—and it is important to note that the Soviet Union has agreed to them, in principle at least—will aim at finding ways to avoid another costly and futile escalation of the arms race.

Our hopes that talks will soon begin reside in our conviction that the same mutual interest reflected in earlier agreements is present here—a mutual interest in stopping the rapid accumulation and refinement of these munitions.

The obligations of the non-proliferation treaty will reinforce our will to bring an end to the nuclear arms race. The world will judge us by our performance.

The report I am forwarding today is testimony to the skill and determination with which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William C. Foster, is supporting this nation's effort to keep the somber and grim elements of the nuclear present from obliterating the promise of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1968.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate, messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS BEATITUDE, ELISHA II, ARMENIAN PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it was my great privilege and pleasure today to sponsor the distinguished spiritual leader who delivered such an inspiring invocation to this Chamber. His Beatitude, Elisha II, Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, has served his people in Palestine for over 40 years, first as a theologian and scholar, then in various official capacities under his predecessors in the Patriarchate, as Archbishop of Jerusalem and finally, since June 1960, as Patriarch in his own right.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him to the Jewish community of Taunton, Mass., early last week, and a biographical sketch of this great, spiritual leader and humanitarian be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS BEATITUDE ELISHA II, ARMENIAN PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM, AT THE 12TH ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD CONCLAVE, MARKING BROTHERHOOD WEEK IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, TAUNTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 11, 1968

"Glory, honour and peace to every man that worketh first to the Jew and also to the gentile."—Romans II, 10.

Dear friends and brethren, we have come from the Eternal City of Jerusalem, the cradle of the great religions to extend to you the blessings of the holy places and the greetings of your brethren there, who day and night keep vigil for the perpetuation of the flame of the Almighty's torch, in those places sacred to all of us as well as in the hearts of men.

We feel greatly honoured, at this moment, to be invited to this assembly, where spiritual and friendly hearts have gathered to meditate and to feel, in a united consciousness, the welfare of mankind. However, serenity and peace in the hearts of men are imperative factors in the realization of that beneficence, which beyond any doubt is the very basic foundation for prosperous and fruitful living.

Needless, even, it is to say that peace, before everything else, is the fruit of love—of that sublime virtue which befriends individuals and peoples; that imbues into the stormy and muddy hearts, the sanctity of God's feeling; and which, endows to human consciousness the stainless brilliancy of resplendent light through which the individual can truly perceive and come to know himself as well as his neighbour.

Religious bodies, as well as their representatives, in order to be able to be together, must be capable and willing to love one another. Human brotherhood is more of a moral communion than a dogmatic one. If the unity of faith has not materialised in the past, it is mainly due to the fact that men have not approached it with Love. God is the object of our faith, and God is Love.

In order to be able to achieve this aim, it is necessary for every church, synagogue, and mosque, for an instant at least, to free themselves from the fetters of obstacles created by historical causes, environmental conditions, racial considerations, and other more or less materialistic reasonings which have limited them in their isolation.

Governments often co-operate with one another on the surface, but rarely with consideration for their mutual welfare. The only power which would be able to unite the churches and synagogues and mosques in harmony is unparalleled and unvanquished love—from which is born, and which paves the way of, the minds of people for mutual understanding. For, verily, it is only the mind which is free of passions and disputes that can comprehend the truth—peace and love at the foremost, followed by concordance of opinions and doctrines. It is this perception that is revealed in a prayer of the Armenian Church—"Grant to the churches peace, that is to say, love, so that they may be able to have the unity of faith."

Could anyone deny the magnificent achievements of the preaching of the Gospels which the Church of Rome has carried out up to the present times in the remotest confines of the world? Could anyone forget the beautiful and glorious role of the Greek Orthodox Church in the true orthodoxy and verification of Christian doctrine and its luminous results in the past?

What world could we coin for the dedication of our unreserved admiration of those clean and noble activities which the American Christians have undertaken time and again, with increasing incentive, for the realisation of the mystery of faith and the spirit of the gospels in all the aspects of life?

Could we discard that very precious legacy which the Christian Church has received from the Holy Book of the Hebrews?

In the past, as well as at the present, each and every church has had and still has to this day her advantages and the methods of her devotions. It is with the synthesis of these factors that the holy task of Christian service is achieved.

O Lord and Saviour, Thou that said that "wherever two or three persons gather together in Thy name, Thou art there amongst them," we beseech thee, at this solemn moment, be amongst us and with us, we who have gathered here to offer to Thine name the service of love. Unite firstly our hearts and kindle the fire of love in us, so that it may guide us to the path of genuine brotherhood, which originates from you and culminates in you. Amen.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HIS BEATITUDE, ELISHA II, ARMENIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM

Elisha II was born Eleazar Derderian in 1910 in the village of Gaynimiran, Turkey. Following the deportation of Armenians from Turkey in 1915, Eleazar Derderian fled with his family to Iran where his parents died. He was then placed in an Armenian orphanage at Nahr-el-Omar, Mesopotamia.

In 1922, at the age of 12, under the aegis of the Armenian General Benevolent Union, hundreds of Armenian orphans, Eleazar Derderian among them, were brought to Palestine. In 1924 at age 14, Eleazar Derderian entered the Theological Seminary of the Armenian Patriarchate. He was tutored by such distinguished scholars as the late Tourian and Koushagian Patriarchs and Bishops Papken and Aghavnouni.

In 1932 Eleazar Derderian was ordained a priest by the late Patriarch Torkom Koushagian and was renamed Yeghishe. Soon after his ordination, he was appointed macebearer to the Patriarch. In this capacity he frequently accompanied the Patriarch to Europe.

In 1937 Yeghishe Derderian, by then a priest of renown, was named Dean of the Theological Seminary, where he remained until 1945.

In 1945 he was elected Grand-Sacristan under the late Patriarch Guregh Israelian. Upon the latter's death in 1949, Yeghishe Derderian was elected Locum-Tenens of the Armenian Patriarchate, and on the 8th day of July, 1951, was consecrated Bishop in Echmiadzin, Armenia.

In 1952 he was named Archbishop of Jerusalem, and through his unceasing efforts, thousands of refugees from the 1948 war and the more recent Arab-Israeli War, found shelter in the Armenian Convent and within its compound.

On June 8, 1960, Archbishop Yeghishe Derderian was elected the 123rd Patriarch of Jerusalem, tracing his lineage to St. James, 1900 years ago. He adopted the name of Elisha II, which is a translation of Yeghishe, his priesthood name.

As guardian of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, and numerous other Shrines, Elisha II zealously tends Christendom's Holy places.

Apart from his duties as a member of the St. James Brotherhood, His Beatitude has been the Editor-in-Chief of "Sion," the official publication of the Armenian Patriarchate, since 1940, where appeared the best part of his writings and articles. He is the author of five volumes of poetry, "Magdalene in Wax," "Nights of Defeat," "The Passer-by," "Ageghtama," and "Saint Mesrob." He also authored "The Armenian Church Yesterday and Today," "The Nareg Prayerbook in the Armenian Literature," "From the Mountain," and the "Stranger." In addition to his literary work, he continues to lecture in the Seminary on General History of the Church, the Art of Sermonizing, Psychology, Theology, and Philosophy.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE CHRISTIAN SHRINES ON MOUNT ZION

Honorary Chairmen: His Beatitude Elisha II, Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem; His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary, World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr. Charles Malik, Professor, American University, Beirut, Lebanon; His Worship Teddy Kollek, Mayor of Jerusalem; Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Edward W. Brooke, Member, United States Senate.

Joint Committee, Jerusalem: His Excellency Bishop Shahe Ajamian, Chancellor Armenian Patriarchate, Jerusalem; Abbot Leo A. Rudloff O.S.B., Superior, The Dormition Abbey; Father Joseph N. Berkers A.A., Superior, St. Peter in Gallicantu; Prior Benedict Stolz O.S.B.; Father Jan Baptist Franken A.A.

CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 939 to 945, inclusive.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING

The resolution (S. Res. 213) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 213

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations three thousand additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting" held by its Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 963), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 213 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 3,000 additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting" held by its Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations during the first session of the 90th Congress.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies	$542.33
2,000 additional copies, at $115.99 per thousand	231.98
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 213	774.31

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT

The resolution (S. Res. 217) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "United States Foreign Aid in Action: A Case Study" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 217

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "United States Foreign Aid in Action: A Case Study," a study made by Senator Ernest Gruening for the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

The resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings, part 2, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 231

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of part 2 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders."

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT

The resolution (S. Res. 246) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "The National Airport System" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 246

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce eighteen thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Ninetieth Congress, second session, entitled "The National Airport System", interim report of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, January 23, 1968.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 249) to print as a Senate document a report on "The Cost of Clean Water" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 249

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of the Interior, entitled "The Cost of Clean Water", in compliance with the provisions of section 16(a), of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (Public Law 89–234); and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

CHARLOTTE N. HORTON

The resolution (S. Res. 256) to pay a gratuity to Charlotte N. Horton was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 256

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Charlotte N. Horton, widow of Ralph W. Horton, an employee of the Senate at the time of this death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WILHELMINA SIMMS

The resolution (S. Res. 257) to pay a gratuity to Wilhelmina Simms was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 257

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Wilhelmina Simms, widow of Perry F. Simms, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WIRETAPPING AND ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as a former assistant district attorney, a member of the original Wilkersham Crime Commission, and a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] has had the opportunity both to witness crime and its manifold effects and to hear and study the enlightened views of this Nation's specialists on this most urgent problem.

Although this problem has many dimensions, I believe all would agree that one of the most insidious threats facing us is the ever-increasing power and activity of organized criminal conspiracies. In a recently published article in the winter 1968 edition of the Howard Law Journal, entitled "Wiretapping and Organized Crime," Senator Scott carefully analyzes the threat of organized crime, noting that its heaviest impact is often on persons who can least bear it—those in the inner city and in poverty.

After a thorough discussion of the legislative and judicial background of electronic surveillance as well as the policy questions involved, the Senator states that while we all desire to protect the rights of individual privacy, it is essential that we not lose sight of the public good. Recalling that the balancing of individual rights and privacy against the public good is a basic precept of civilized society, he concludes that law enforcement officials must be given the authority to use electronic surveillance devices in limited but appropriate circumstances under strict court order, supervision and control if an effective program is to be mounted against these widespread and ruthless criminal conspiracies.

Legislation to this end has been introduced both by the distinguished chairman of the Criminal Laws Subcommittee, Senator McClellan, and myself and has been incorporated into the crime control bill reported by that subcommittee to the full Judiciary Committee. Because of the timeliness and importance of this issue, I request unanimous consent that Senator Scott's article be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Howard Law Journal, winter 1968]

Wiretapping and Organized Crime

(By Senator Hugh Scott*)

One need make no lengthy study to realize that a major problem facing the Nation is the internal threat created by the increasing incidence of crime. As a result, our citizens cannot lead their lives free of the fear and disquieting atmosphere resulting from the existence and reports of crime.

On March 9th of this year, I spoke at length on this subject in an address on the floor of the Senate entitled "Crime in America." At that time I stated:

"The failure of our society today is its inability to maintain law and order. For what is the purpose of society if not to provide a setting in which citizens may lead productive lives, free of the fear that others are able to abridge their rights, injure, or kill them at will? A nation guided by law must be a nation protected by law.

"It is especially significant that in recent years, while the standard of living in the United States has increased—in economic growth, average income, educational levels, technological know-how—the rate of crime has not decreased. Today it is worse than ever.

"This is a shocking commentary on a 'justice gap.' A nation within reach of the moon cannot guarantee its citizens their safety of the streets." [1]

In this article, I will direct my remarks to the one aspect of this problem which represents the most insidious threat to the continued existence of American Society as we now know it—the threat of organized crime. These are not the spontaneous crimes of passion, or the thrill escapades of misled youth—but rather the planned activities of professional criminals who plot their exploits with the utmost care and precision. As stated in the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice:

"Organized crime is a society that seeks to operate outside the control of the American people and their governments. It involves thousands of criminals, working within structures as complex as those of any large corporation, subject to laws more rigidly enforced than those of legitimate governments. Its actions are not impulsive but rather the result of intricate conspiracies, carried on over many years and aimed at gaining control over whole fields of activity in order to amass huge profits.

"The core of organized criminal activity is the supplying of illegal goods and services—gambling, loan sharking, narcotics, and other forms of vice—to countless numbers of citizen customers. But organized crime is also extensively and deeply involved in legitimate business and in labor unions. Here it employs illegitimate methods—monopolization, terrorism, extortion, tax evasion—to drive out or control lawful ownership and leadership and to exact illegal profits from the public. And to carry on its many activities secure from governmental interference, organized crime corrupts public officials." [2]

It should be patently clear that organized crime does not operate in a vacuum. We can ill afford to stand aside and shake our collective heads at the effects of such criminal activity, for in one way or another, every individual is affected when such activities are permitted to exist in our society.[3] Indeed, some are affected more harshly than others, with the primary victims of organized crime being the disadvantaged persons in our urban areas. For the most part, it is not the upper or middle class who are lured into the web of narcotics addiction, victimized by loan sharks, and the numbers racket, to name a few—it is the urban poor. Moreover, when illegal profits are extracted from the public, as described in the above-quoted passage, it stands to reason that the burden falls heaviest on those who can least shoulder it and have the least share in the advantages of our society.

I firmly believe that any so-called War on Crime that falls short of a total attack on the roots and infrastructure of organized crime is a limited war, being fought for an unrealistically limited objective, with no chance of success in its declared purpose. There is no sound basis for giving organized crime immunity from pursuit and prosecution. Moreover, no matter how well-intentioned and thoughtfully conceived and administered are our efforts to assist those caught-up in a cycle of poverty, no program will be successful unless the effects of organized crime on these very persons is neutralized. It is estimated that the revenue of nationwide crime syndicates reaches nine billion dollars a year.[4] Unfortunately, the heaviest burden of paying this tribute is on the poor in the big cities and far outweighs the benefits of the antipoverty programs.

However, the mere conviction and intent to mount an effective assault on organized crime will not suffice. The very nature of the criminal syndicate increases the difficulty of dismantling it. Due to the complex structures and intricate overlays of authority described above, law enforcement officials have a difficult time in reaching the high command of organized crime. Underlings "on errands" for the boss often come within the grasp of alert law enforcement officials, but they are the "expendables." They either do not know who their real boss is or are fearful of discussing such matters. Under these circumstances, law enforcement is stymied. The reluctance and fear of victims and witnesses do not ease the task.[5]

---

* United States Senator, 1958—; Visiting Fellow, Balliol College, Oxford, England, for the Michaelmas Term, 1967; U.S. Congressman, 1942–1958; Assistant District Attorney (Philadelphia), 1926–1941; LL.B., University of Virginia, 1922.

[1] Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 5, pp. 5973–5976.

[2] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Report, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (1967).

[3] For a most interesting discussion of criminal syndicates, see Cressey. The Functions and Structure of Criminal Syndicates, Task Force on Organized Crime Report, Appendix A, at 25 (1967).

[4] Figures may be found in Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 16, p. 21759; quoted in Childs, Justice or Privacy or a Bit of Both, in Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 16, pp. 21759–21760, supra.

How then do you break into this core and get to the center of this cancer? How do you obtain the necessary evidence when an organization is dedicated to protecting its masters through a code of silence? What do you look for when almost all communication is by word of mouth, and there are no telltale records or memoranda of illicit enterprises? There can be no doubt as to the extent of the problem, the question is how to successfully combat it.

It is against this unique background that I turn to probably the most controversial means of obtaining evidence—the techniques referred to as "bugging" and "wiretapping."[6] There are those who say that these techniques are the only effective tools to fight such criminal activity. Others condemn these methods as a dangerous invasion of privacy. There are valid arguments on both sides. But there should be no doubt that the final decision on how to proceed in this area must be based on both the rights of individuals and the need to protect society, not on an emotional harangue which too often accompanies these electronic surveillance debates. It should also be noted that the present United States law on wiretapping and bugging is totally unsatisfactory. Neither the right of privacy nor enforcement of the law is adequately served.

Anyone who has ever attempted an intelligent discussion of wiretapping and bugging will undoubtedly find himself confronted with a major problem at the outset: the sinister connotations and fear of "Big Brother" and "1984" which has become attached to the very terms themselves due to amazing scientific developments in the field of electronic surveillance. If we could only devise a word to mean "scientific techniques to combat crime," I believe the issue would be placed in much clearer perspective, and discussion could proceed unhampered by the distorted images which are conjured up by the very terms themselves. On this point, an historical parallel comes to mind. In eighteenth century England, when crime pervaded the city of London and the surrounding highways in staggering amounts, attempts to establish a constabulary met fierce opposition. The reason? Englishmen feared the very name "police" as it was a French word connoting foreign tyranny.

In our system of criminal justice, the need to balance the competing interests of privacy and law enforcement occurs at a number of points. The decision as to whether to strike the balance must depend on the specific circumstances involved. Indeed, the concept of balance is not new and, by a reading of the United States Constitution, can be traced. The framers of the Bill of Rights did not establish the privacy of the individual in his person and effects as an absolute right, nor did they establish his home as an impenetrable sanctuary. Protection was only guaranteed against unreasonable—not every—search and seizure. Thus, institutions of law enforcement were afforded the privilege of search and seizure under carefully circumscribed criteria. This is the recognition of a basic precept of civilized society: there is a point at which individual privacy and rights yield to the public good.

The problem, as Pound has described it, is "one of compromise; of balancing conflicting interests and of securing as much as may be with the least sacrifice of other interests."[7] While the striking of this balance is difficult, the study of law and the responsibility of legislating hopefully enable us to arrive at a point of equilibrium. It is clear that before striking any meaningful balance, one must study the competing values and interests so that the problem may be viewed in the proper perspective, since, as Burke points out:

"For that which taken singly and viewed by itself may appear to be wrong when considered with relation to other things may be perfectly right—or at least such as ought to be patiently endured as the means of preventing something that is worse."[8]

It should be clear at the start: what is sought is not the forsaking of "the requirements of the fourth amendment in the name of law enforcement"[9]—but rather a consideration of what is necessary in the name of the survival of the freedoms and liberties constituting our concept of an orderly and safe society.

In a subsequent part of this article, I will discuss the manner in which appropriate legislation can meet the Constitutional guidelines set out in the *Berger case*[9a] in order to ensure that basic guarantees are not disregarded. The following discussion centers on the other half of the equation—the need for modern surveillance techniques if law enforcement institutions are to be able to successfully perform their sworn duty of protecting society.

New York County District Attorney Frank Hogan, whose office has made the most sophisticated use of the techniques under consideration, has stated:

"I believe, as repeatedly I have stated, that telephonic interception, pursuant to court order and under proper safeguards, is the single most valuable and effective weapon in the arsenal of law enforcement, particularly in the battle against organized crime.

It is an irreplaceable tool and, lacking it, we would find it infinitely more difficult, and in many instances impossible, to penetrate the wall behind which major criminal enterprises flourish."[10]

All members of the President's highly respected Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice agreed both on the difficulty of striking the balance between the benefits to law enforcement and the threat to privacy. They shared the view that the authority to employ electronic surveillance techniques, if granted, must be exercised with stringent limitations. But a majority of the members favored enacting legislation "granting carefully circumscribed authority for electronic surveillance to law enforcement officers to the extent it may be consistent with the decision of the Supreme Court in *Berger v. New York*."[11]

The Commission referred to a conclusion by the English Privy Councillors who studied Great Britain's twenty year experience in this area:

"The freedom of the individual is quite valueless if he can be made the victim of the law breaker. Every civilized society must have power to protect itself from wrongdoers. It must have power to arrest, search and imprison those who break the laws. If these powers are properly and wisely exercised, it may be thought that they are in themselves aids to the maintenance of the true freedom of the individual.

"We cannot think it to be wise or prudent or necessary to take away from the Police any weapon or to weaken any power they now possess in their fight against organized crime of this character. * * * If it be said that the number of cases where methods of interception are used is small and that an objectionable method could therefore well be abolished, we feel that . . . this is not a reason why criminals in this particular class of crime should be encouraged by the knowledge that they have nothing to fear from methods of interception. * * * This, in our opinion, so far from strengthening the liberty of the ordinary citizen, might very well have the opposite effect."[12]

Recently, District Attorney Hogan pointed out that no responsible critic of wiretapping—not even the Attorney General of the United States—has urged that it be abandoned in national security situations. District Attorney Hogan views this as a concession that wiretapping and electronic surveillance are vital weapons in the detection of elaborately organized criminal conspiracies.[13] Mr. Justice White, dissenting in *Berger*,[14] has phrased the same vital question:

"If the security of the National Government is a sufficient interest to render eavesdropping reasonable, on what tenable basis can a contrary conclusion be reached when a State asserts a purpose to prevent the corruption of its major officials, to protect the integrity of its fundamental processes, and to maintain itself as a viable institution?"[14a]

In response to those who see Big Brother running rampant, one should point out the practical considerations which rule out the arbitrary use of the wiretapping and electronic surveillance devices and which therefore reduce possible invasions of privacy to a minimum: difficulty of installation, "maintenance" of the equipment once installed, properly monitoring conversations and adequately covering "rendezvous" overheard through surveillance.[15] Thus, in view of the effort, time, and manpower required for the proper use of such modern surveillance techniques, these methods—far from being a substitute for good police legwork—are frequently a preliminary to a great deal of it.

---

[5] Two bills which I have joined in proposing should serve to better this situation. While it is presently a crime to obstruct a court proceeding, it is not a crime to obstruct an investigation. Thus, by successfully stifling the flow of information at the investigative level either through violence or the threat of violence, shadowy interested persons prevent the case from ever reaching the courtroom. S. 676, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) would make such obstruction a federal offense.

A witness immunity statute is also needed. Through the proper legislative framework and with the proper safeguards, this would enable the U.S. Attorney General to grant immunity from prosecution to a witness where that witness could provide testimony essential to the conviction of the accused. Used with the proper attitude and in the appropriate circumstances, S. 677, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) would provide a useful tool in the war on crime.

[6] This article deals exclusively with the need for wiretapping and electronic surveillance to combat organized crime. Though I do not discuss the questions of such surveillance by private and public individuals and related to such law enforcement purposes, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I believe there is no justification whatsoever for such activities and feel the Congress must act to flatly prohibit them. Such prohibitions are contained in S. 2050, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967), discussed later in this article.

[7] Pound, Criminal Justice in the American City 18 (1922).

[8] Stanlis, Edmund Burke: Selected Writings and Speeches 318 (1963).

[9] Berger v. New York, 388 U.S. 41, 62 (1967). This decision will be discussed in detail later in this article.

[9a] Ibid.

[10] Subcomm. on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 1093 (1967) (hereafter cited as Senate Hearings). See District Attorney Hogan's statement before this Subcommittee, at 1104–11, for specific instances of the successful use of wiretapping and electronic surveillance in criminal cases. Mr. Hogan was primarily testifying on a proposed wiretapping statute, but later in his remarks he referred to the "powerful effectiveness" of electronic surveillance investigative activity. Senate Hearings, supra at 1109.

[11] Organized Crime Task Force Report, supra note 2a at 19.

[12] Before Subcomm. No. 5 of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., ser. 3, 1110, 1112–13 (1967). Hereafter cited as House Hearings.

[13] Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 1111.

[14] Berger v. New York, supra note 9.

[14a] Id. at 116.

[15] See Task Force on Organized Crime Report, supra note 2a, Appendix C; Blakey, Aspects of the Evidence Gathering Process in

Congressional concern and activity in the organized crime-surveillance area is somewhat recent, but a quick glance indicates that those who stress the role of partisan politics on this issue do not know their "legislative history." Following World War II, the Congress attempted to pass a wiretap bill on several occasions. However, the primary concern in the 1950's was subversive activities, and it was not until the 1960's that such legislation was envisioned as a means to combat crime. In 1961, the Kennedy Administration endorsed proposals for a wiretapping law authorizing federal agencies to tap in cases of national security, organized crime, and other serious crimes, placing no limits on State wiretapping.

In 1962, the Kennedy Administration sent a somewhat more restricted bill to Congress. It authorized federal wiretapping in cases of national security, organized crime, and other serious crime, i.e., narcotics violations, murder, kidnapping, extortion, bribery, interstate transportation in aid of racketeering, interstate communication of gambling information, and a conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing. It limited State wiretapping to certain serious crimes and outlawed all other wiretapping. Congress took no action on the proposal. The Kennedy Administration recommended passage of similar legislation in 1963, but again Congress took no action.

In 1965, 1966, and 1967, several bills [16] on wiretapping and eavesdropping were introduced in both the House and the Senate, but the administration of President Johnson has not endorsed any that would extend wiretapping and/or electronic surveillance to organized criminal activities. In fact, by Executive Order [17] promulgated in July 1965, President Johnson ordered all federal agencies except the Justice Department to cease wiretapping. The Presidential order permitted the Justice Department to continue to tap wires only in cases of national security, but prior approval of the Attorney General was necessary.

Before discussing in detail the pending legislation in this area, I believe a brief analysis of the existing statutory law on wiretapping and eavesdropping and a summary of major court decisions on the use of these techniques is in order.

The basic statutory law on wiretapping is found in the Federal Communications Act of 1934 [18] which created the Federal Communications Commission and vested it with jurisdiction over radio, telegraph, and telephone communications. Section 605, dealing with interception of messages, reads in part: "no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the . . . contents . . . of such intercepted communication to any person." In construing Section 605, the Supreme Court has read the statutory prohibitions to apply to both interstate and intrastate telephone wires; [19] and has held that "no person" includes state and federal law enforcement officials; [20] and the barring of "divulgence" renders wiretap evidence inadmissible in federal courts.[21] The court has also excluded the fruits of wiretap enforcement official who introduces wiretap evidence in state proceedings technically commits a federal crime, the Court has held that suppression of the evidenec is not required by the statute.[23]

A 1941 statement [24] by Attorney General Jackson to the House Judiciary Committee advanced an interpretation of Section 605 on which federal agencies have since relied. By construing the phrase "intercept . . . and divulge" as an inseparable unit, Jackson's interpretation rendered wiretapping itself permissible. He also stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was a "person" under Section 605 in order to conclude that the interdepartmental sharing of information among FBI personnel would not constitute a "divulgence" in the sense prohibited by the statute.

Testifying on this issue, former Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach stated.

"I agree with my predecessor that the present law regarding wiretapping is intolerable. In fact, I would go so far as to state that it would be difficult to devise a law more totally unsatisfactory in its consequences than that which has evolved from Section 605.

"First, it adequately protects the privacy of no one. To prosecute successfully, the Government now must prove both interception and disclosure. Under these circumstances there is a good deal of illicit wiretapping. . . .

"Second, under present law, use of wiretapping for potentially justifiable prosecutive purposes is impossible. A number of State laws authorize wiretapping by police officials under certain circumstances and procedures. But the Federal law has been interpreted by the courts to prevent the use of this information in a criminal prosecution.

"I think there is general agreement that the President should be permitted to authorize wiretapping for national security purposes so long as this procedure is strictly controlled; wiretapping should not be permitted by private individuals and the law should be strengthened to insure that such abuses do not take place; if wiretapping is to be permitted at all, it should be done by law-enforcement officials, under strict controls." [25]

The present law gives us the worst of all possible solutions. . . .

Congress has never enacted legislation explicitly dealing with electronic eavesdropping. The Federal Communications Commission has recently banned the use of radio transmitting microphones for eavesdropping purposes without the consent of both parties to the conversation, but this ban does not apply to "operations of any law enforcement officers conducted under lawful authority." [26] The Attorney General has recently issued a Memorandum to Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies prohibiting the "use of mechanical or electronic devices by federal personnel to overhear or record non-telephone conversations involving a violation of the Constitution or a statute." [27]

Let us now take a closer look at judicial activity in this area. In 1928 (therefore, pre-Section 605) the Supreme Court ruled in *Olmstead v. United States*,[28] that evidence obtained by wiretapping defendant's telephone at a point outside defendant's premises was admissible in a federal criminal prosecution. The Court found no unconstitutional search and seizure under the fourth amendment because words as intangibles cannot be "seized" and because the tapping of wires at a place removed from the defendant's house is not a "search" (physical intrusion or trespass of a constitutionally protected area) within the Amendment.

In *Goldman v. United States* [29] the Court extended the theory of *Olmstead* to bugging in a case involving a detectaphone, i.e., a telephonic apparatus with an attached microphone transmitter. This decision was followed by *Silverman v. United States* [30] where the Court held that the use of bugging equipment that involved an unauthorized physical entry into a constitutionally protected private area without the consent of one of the parties violated the fourth amendment and rendered evidence so obtained inadmissible. This case concerned a spiked microphone that had penetrated the party wall to a heating duct in defendant's house. In *Wong Sun v. United States* [31] the Court specifically stated that under the fourth amendment verbal evidence, as well as the more common tangible evidence, may be the fruit of official illegality: "It follows from our holding in *Silverman v. United States*, 365 U.S. 505, that the fourth amendment protects against the overhearing of verbal statements as well as against the more traditional seizure of 'papers and effects' ". If one of the parties consents, no constitutional issues are presented, no matter where the interception takes place.[32]

The fifth amendment as such places no ban on the use of electronic surveillance devices.[33] The fourteenth amendment applies to state action the same limitations imposed upon federal action found in the fourth amendment.[34]

Thus, upon a reading of the preceding cases, the law could be stated as: wiretapping or eavesdropping in the absence of physical intrusion of a constitutionally protected area does not violate the Constitution.

This brings us to one very recent Supreme Court decision in this area, *Berger v. New York*.[35] That decision reversed 6–3 a state conviction for conspiracy to bribe based on a court-ordered eavesdrop. The Court held that a search that would otherwise be unconstitutional because of the element of physical trespass into a constitutionally protected area is not validated by a court order pursu-

---

Organized Crime Cases, at 92; and Senate Hearings, supra note 10, testimony of District Attorney Hogan, at 1101–02.

[16] For a comparison of two representative bills introduced in the Senate, see Appendix.

[17] See Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 922, Memorandum of Attorney General, I.A.; and statement of Attorney General Ramsey Clark voicing the Department of Justice's opposition to court-controlled wiretapping legislation, Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 82.

[18] 48 Stat. 1064 (1934), 47 U.S.C. 151–609 (1964).

[19] Nardone v. United States, 302 U.S. 379 (1937); Weiss v. United States, 308 U.S. 321 (1939).

[20] Nardone v. United States, supra note 19; Benanti v. United States, 355 U.S. 96 (1957).

[21] Nardone v. United States, supra note 19.

[23] Schwartz v. Texas, 344 U.S. 199 (1952).

[24] Statement of Attorney General Robert L. Jackson, Hearings on H.R. 2266 and H.R. 3099 before Subcomm. No. 1 of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 77th Cong., 1st Sess. 18 (1941).

[25] Hearings on S. 2189 Before the Subcomm. on Crimnal Laws and Procedures of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 34 (1966). See also statement of Attorney General Clark, Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 82.

[26] 31 Fed. Reg. 3400 (1966), amending 47 C.F.R. 15.11 (1966).

[27] See Attorney General's Memorandum to the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning Wiretapping and Electronic Eavesdropping (June 16, 1967), reprinted in Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 922–24.

[28] Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).

[29] Goldman v. United States, 316 U.S. 129 (1942).

[30] Silverman v. United States, 365 U.S. 505 (1961).

[31] Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471, 485 (1963).

[32] Osborn v. United States, 385 U.S. 323 (1966) (recorder); Lopez v. United States, 373 U.S. 427 (1963) (recorder).

[33] Hoffa v. United States, 385 U.S. 323 (1966) (admission overheard by informer, like result); Olmstead v. United States, supra note 28.

[34] Nardone v. United States, 308 U.S. 338 (1939).

[35] Berger v. New York, supra note 9.

ant to a statute[36] which "on its face" failed to meet certain standards required by the fourth amendment to the Constitution. Thus this opinion partially negates *Olmstead* by finding that conversations are within the fourth amendment and the use of electronic surveillance devices to "capture" them is a search. But the Court did not specifically negate *Olmstead's* other ground, i.e., where oral evidence is acquired by electronic devices which do not physically penetrate a constitutionally protected area, the fourth amendment does not govern.[37]

As discussed below, the *Berger* decision is an invitation to Congress to enact appropriately circumscribed wiretapping and electronic surveillance legislation.[38] An examination of the points stressed by the Court should reveal the basis for this outlook.

The Court found the statute did not require sufficient particularity in the orders concerning the place to be searched, the person's conversations to be overheard, and the expected nature of the conversations and the times at which they will be heard. Significantly, as will be seen below, the Court indicated that a statute meeting these standards would meet Constitutional requirements.

Mr. Justice Clark for the majority stated that the absence of particularization in the statute as to offenses to which it applied and descriptions as to the type of conversations to be overheard gave the officer executing the order a roving commission. While specific words of a future conversation are hardly predictable and therefore difficult to describe with particularity, such particularity ought not to be required. The test under the fourteenth amendment has been sufficient particularly in terms of the subject matter. Thus, where a search warrant may issue to seize equipment used in illegal off-track betting, a surveillance order could issue where the conversation may be described as the placing and receipt of bets on horseracing between suspected persons at a specified location.

The opinion then considered the statute's authorization of a two-month period of continuous surveillance, characterizing this grant as a "series of intrusions, searches, and seizures pursuant to a single showing of probable cause."[39] Thus, the period of the authority to wiretap or eavesdrop must be carefully considered and the standard is that no greater invasion of privacy can be permitted than is necessary under the circumstances.[40]

Moreover, the Court found that the statute apparently permitted surveillance to continue for the duration of the statutory period in spite of the fact that the objective for which the order had been sought may have been realized. A provision for self-termination on the eavesdrop once the conversation sought is seized—shutting down the "plant"—would meet this objection. Language to the effect that extensions of the order could be obtained only upon a showing of present probable cause for continuance would meet the Court's objections to the statutory scheme whereby extensions could be obtained solely on a showing that it was in the "public interest," with no probable cause showing required.

Mr. Justice Clark then discussed the issue of notice. Noting that the success of the electronic surveillance warrant by its nature depends on the absence of notice, he found the statute had no requirement for notice as to conventional warrants nor did it overcome this defect by "requiring some showing of special facts" or "exigent circumstances."[41] But there is precedent for the showing of *such "special facts." Ker v. California*[42] sustained unannounced entry to arrest and to search where reasonable fear existed that an announced entry might lead to the destruction of evidence otherwise lawfully subject to seizure. Specific language conditioning the granting of an electronic surveillance order on a showing that "normal investigative procedures have been tried and have failed or reasonably appear to be unlikely to succeed if tried," would appear to meet this objection.

Mr. Clark's objections that the statute did not require a return on the warrant—a report by the executing officer to the issuing Court on the results of the interception—does not create any legislative difficulties.

Where does this all leave us? On this point, I would quote Mr. Clark's remarks at page 21 of *Berger* in reference to the opinion of the dissenters that no warrant or statute could be drawn to meet the majority's requirements:

"If that be true then the 'fruits' of eavesdropping devices are barred under the [Fourth] Amendment. On the other hand this Court has in the past, under specific conditions and circumstances, sustained the use of eavesdropping devices. . . . The Fourth Amendment does not make the 'precincts of the home or office . . . sanctuaries where the law can never reach,' . . . but it does prescribe a constitutional standard that must be met before official invasion is permissible."[43]

In *Berger* the Court held the statute did not meet the Constitutional standard. But I do not read this case as making the pursuit of such a constitutionally-drawn statute fruitless. Rather, I read this case as an invitation to the Congress to work its legislative will on the difficult problem of drafting a just, effective and comprehensive wiretapping and electronic surveillance statute.

On June 29th, 1967, Senator Roman Hruska, introduced the "Electronic Surveillance Control Act of 1967"[44] which authorized electronic surveillance (eavesdropping and wiretapping) by duly authorized law enforcement officials under court order procedures. This legislation prohibited the private utilization of wiretapping and bugging.

Of utmost importance is that this bill is the only surveillance legislation pending before the Congress which was drafted post-*Berger* and with that decision specifically in mind. Others have also been active in this area—most notably the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Senator John L. McClellan, who has a long history of concern and activity in combating the threat of organized crime in our society. But, as was stated at the time of introduction of S. 2050, every effort was made to respond to the criteria the Court set forth in *Berger* and to develop a proposal which would fully comply.

While I feel a natural reluctance to authorize the overhearing of private conversations, even where there is the possibility that evidence concerning criminal activity may be uncovered, I must admit some doubt as to whether any wiretapping legislation should prevent the use of this weapon in society's struggle against organized crime—especially in view of the unique evidence-gathering problems in this area. The impact of the Crime Commission Reports, revealing testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, on which I serve, and discussions with persons interested and concerned with all aspects of the criminal justice system lead me to believe that if such organized criminal activity is permitted continued immunity while it infests all of our lives, it may well destroy the viability and organization of our system. At the least, I am afraid I may have been wrong to believe that society does not need this weapon in its struggle against organized crime.

It is for these reasons that I have decided to co-sponsor S. 2050, the Electronic Surveillance Control Act of 1967, introduced by Senator Hruska. This legislation has the following major provisions:

1. Private utilization of wiretapping and bugging would be flatly prohibited.

2. Federal authorities would be authorized upon the obtaining of federal court orders pursuant to application of the appropriate U.S. Attorney, to conduct carefully circumscribed and strictly controlled electronic surveillance in investigation of specified crimes involving national security and serious criminal offenses.

3. At the state level, electronic surveillance would be authorized pursuant to state statute and upon order of a court of general jurisdiction.

4. An elaborate system of checks and safeguards would be established whereby criminal and civil remedies would be available to prevent abuses and unauthorized surveillance by public officials and private persons.

I believe that this legislation can provide our law enforcement authorities a useful tool in their investigations of organized crime while not unduly disturbing the privacy of the ordinary, law-abiding citizen.

In short, the advantages to society of this legislation outweigh its disadvantages. If flaws appear in its administration, they can—and must—be corrected. In the hope of encouraging continued discussion on this important question and also of having such discussions shed light rather than heat, I conclude this article by (1) listing what appears to be the basic legislative criteria set out in *Berger*[45] followed by (2) a comparison submitted to me of two pending surveillance bills, one pre-*Berger* and the other post-*Berger*.

1. There must be a neutral and detached authority interposed between the police and the public; that is, orders for interception of communications falling within the privilege of the fourth amendment must be issued upon the order of an impartial judge of competent jurisdiction.

2. Probable cause must exist where the facts and circumstances within the knowledge of the official requesting the order (warrant) and of which he has reasonably trustworthy information, are sufficient unto themselves to warrant a man of reasonable caution to believe that an offense has been or is being committed.

3. The warrant must particularly describe the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

4. The specific crime which has been or is being committed must be identified.

---

[36] N.Y. Code Criminal Procedure, Section 813–a, as amended L. 1958, c. 676, effective July 1, 1958.

[37] To the effect that while wiretapping therefore remains outside the 4th amendment, it would be prudent to consider Berger v. New York, supra note 9, in drafting such legislation, see statement of District Attorney Frank Hogan in Senate Hearings, supra note 10 at 1112. See also, Berger v. New York, supra note 9, Justice Douglas's dissent, at 64, to the effect that the decision completely overrules sub silentio Olmstead v. United States, supra note 28; and letter from Professor Kent Greenwalt, Judicature, Volume 51, Number 1, June–July 197 at p. 29; and statement of G. Robert Blakey in Senate Hearings at p. 934.

[38] On this point, see the excellent statements of District Attorney Frank Hogan and Professor G. Robert Blakey in Senate Hearings at p. 1092 and p. 932, respectively.

[39] Berger v. New York, supra note 9 at 59.

[40] See, Berger v. New York, supra note 9 at 56–58, for a discussion of Osborn v. United States, 385 U.S. 323 (1966).

[41] Berger v. New York, supra note 9 at 60.

[42] Ker v. California, 374 U.S. 23 (1963).

[43] Berger v. New York, supra note 9 at 63–64.

[44] S. 2050, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

[45] See Speech of Senator Roman Hruska, 113 Cong. Rec. S. 9145 (daily ed. June 29, 1967).

5. Precise and discriminate procedures must be spelled out for issuance of the order.

6. The order must relate to specific conversations sought so as to be construed to give authority for a general warrant.

7. Prompt extension of the warrant must be accomplished.

8. There must be probable cause for the continuation of the order.

9. There must be a termination date for the order once the conversation sought is obtained.

10. There must be a requirement for notice—apparently within a reasonable time—to the person against whom the order has been issued.

11. There must be a provision for a return on the order.

I welcome the comments, recommendations, criticism, and assistance of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel, the bar, bench, educators, interested citizens, aspiring law students and all who would work actively to formulate a concrete and reasonable approach to a major problem facing this Nation.* We can ill afford to shirk this responsibility. The need for action could not be clearer.

---

*Ed. Note. Shortly before the publication of this article, the Supreme Court held that the fourth amendment bars the admission of evidence obtained by an electronic eavesdropping device placed by FBI agents, without a search warrant, on top of a public telephone booth, even though no trespass occurred. Katz v. United States, 36 LW 4080 (December 18, 1967).

APPENDIX

COMPARISON OF THE TWO BILLS WHICH HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED RE WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING

	S. 675 SENATOR M'CLELLAN'S BILL, FEDERAL WIRE INTERCEPTION ACT [Pre-Berger]	S. 2050 SENATOR HRUSKA'S BILL, ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE CONTROL ACT [Post-Berger]
Prohibition	Prohibits wire interception to overhear private conversations without consent of one of the parties to the conversation.	Same plus prohibits eavesdropping also (electronic devices).
Exemption	Exempts routine activities of employees of a communications carrier or FCC.	Same.
Penalty	Makes interception, disclosure, use or attempts at such unlawful except where authorized under Act; penalty for violation re this is $10,000 and/or 2 years.	Same as McClellan but penalty is $10,000 and/or 2 years.
Use as evidence	Any information obtained in violation of this Act is inadmissible in evidence.	Same as McClellan.
Manufacturing equipment		Bans manufacture, shipment, advertising of devices useful for eavesdropping and wiretapping. Exempts from those provisions (with the exception of advertising) common carriers in the normal course of business and federal, state or local governments or persons under contract with such units of government. Penalty for violation is $10,000 and/or 5 years.
Seizure		Authorizes seizure and forfeiture of any device used, shipped, or manufactured in violation of this Act.
National security	Excludes the application of this Act to the "President taking such measures as he deems necessary to protect the Nation against actual or potential attack or other hostile acts of a foreign power or to protect the national security information against foreign intelligence activities". No information obtained under this power shall be used in any judicial or administrative proceeding.	Same as McClellan Bill but the information so obtained may be received in evidence—but only where the interception was reasonable.
Leave to intercept—Federal Government	Permits Attorney General to authorize any federal law enforcement agency to apply to a federal judge for leave to intercept, and authorizes such judge to grant leave to intercept wire communications when such interception may provide evidence of certain serious felonies, to wit: Any offense punishable by death or imprisonment for more than one year and concerning violations of the Atomic Energy Act, espionage, sabotage, or treason; Any offense involving murder, kidnapping, or extortion which is punishable under Title 18 of the United States Code; Any offense involving the manufacture, importation, receiving, concealment, buying, selling, or otherwise dealing in narcotic drugs, or marihuana punishable under laws of the U.S.; Any conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing acts.	Same as McClellan Bill, but the leave to intercept is for *eavesdropping* as well as wiretapping. The felonies concerned are (1) all the crimes listed in the McClellan Bill, plus (2) offenses relating to sports bribery, obstruction of justice, injury to the President, and welfare fund bribery.
Leave to intercept—State Government	Permits Attorney General of a State or the principal prosecuting attorney for any political subdivision thereof, to make application to State court judge of competent jurisdiction for leave to intercept wire communications within the State when such action may provide evidence of *any crime* or any conspiracy to commit crime as to which the interception is authorized by the law of that State.	Same as McClellan Bill, but such interception is limited to those cases where evidence of the following specific offenses may be provided: murder, kidnapping, gambling (if punishable as a felony), bribery, extortion or dealing in narcotic drugs or marihuana or any conspiracy involving the foregoing offenses.
Use of information by law enforcement officers	Permits any investigative or law enforcement officer who has obtained knowledge of the contents of a wire communication in accordance with this Act to use or disclose such to another officer to the extent necessary for the proper performance of official duties. Also makes disclosure while giving testimony permissible where knowledge gained in accordance with this Act.	Same as McClellan, but concerns evidence derived from the intercepted communication as well as the communication. Intercepted information, gained in accordance with this Act, otherwise may be disclosed only upon a showing of good cause before a judge with authority to authorize such interception.

APPENDIX—Continued

COMPARISON OF THE TWO BILLS WHICH HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED RE WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING—Continued

S. 675 SENATOR M'CLELLAN'S BILL, FEDERAL WIRE INTERCEPTION ACT [Pre-Berger]	S. 2050 SENATOR HRUSKA'S BILL, ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE CONTROL ACT [Post-Berger]
Contents of application	
Each application for leave to intercept shall be made in writing upon oath or affirmation, and shall state the applicant's authority to make such (Federal or state statute). Each application shall include the following information: Full and complete statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant; The nature and location of the communications facilities involved; A full and complete statement of the facts concerning all previous applications, known to the individual authorizing the application, made to any judge for leave to intercept wire communications involving the same communication facilities, or any of them, or involving any person named in the application as committing, having committed, or being about to commit an offense, and the action taken by the judge on each such application. The judge may require the applicant to furnish additional testimony or documentary evidence in support of the application.	Same as McClellan Bill, plus application must include: identity of the person authorizing it and the number of outstanding authorizations based on grounds similar to those in the present application.
Grounds for issuance	
Judge may enter an ex parte order granting leave to intercept if the judge determines on the basis of the facts submitted by the applicant that there is probable cause for belief that: (1) An offense for which such an application may be filed under this Act is being, has been, or is about to be committed. (2) Facts concerning that offense may be obtained through such interception. (3) No other means are readily available for obtaining that information. (4) The facilities from which communications are to be intercepted are being used or about to be used in connection with the commission of such offense, or are leased to, listed in the name of, or commonly used by a person who has committed, is committing, or is about to commit such offense.	Same as McClellan, with the exception that (3) reads as follows: (3) Normal investigative procedures have been tried and have failed or reasonably appear unlikely to succeed if tried. NOTE.—No probable cause test.
Public telephone	
	No public telephone may be intercepted, unless in addition to satisfying all the foregoing requirements, the judge also determines that: the interception will be conducted in such a way to minimize or eliminate intercepting communications of other users of the facility and there is a special need to authorize such interception.
Privileged communications	
	Conversations between husband and wife, doctor-patient, lawyer-client, or clergyman-confidant, may not be intercepted unless in addition to satisfying all the foregoing requirements, the judge also determines that: the interception will be conducted in a way that minimizes or eliminates intercepting "privileged communications" and there is a special need to authorize such interception. No privileged communication intercepted shall be disclosed or used other than as *it is necessary* in the authorized disclosure or use of an intercepted communication under this Act.
Contents of order	
Each order granting leave to intercept shall specify: The nature and location of the communications facilities as to which leave to intercept is granted Each offense as to which information is to be sought The identity of the agency authorized to intercept The period of time during which such interception is authorized No order granted may permit wiretapping for more than 45 days. Extensions may be granted for not more than 20 days each upon further application made in conformity with the above requirements and the necessary findings by the court.	Same as McClellan Bill.
Emergency situations	
	Law enforcement officials may temporarily waive the formal requirements for authorization so long as the emergency situation requires such a waiver such authorization would be available absent the waiver Formal application must be made within 48 hours after the emergency interception. If the application is denied, no information obtained may be used or disclosed and the person whose conversation was intercepted must be notified of the interception.
Precautions for accuracy	
Applications made to a court and orders granted by a court shall be sealed by the court, not to be made public except in accordance with the Act or by court order.	Information obtained by interception shall be sealed & recorded by the authorizing judge and retained for a period of 10 years. Unless under seal (or no satisfactory explanation of its absence) the information contained in such recording may not be used in any court or other proceeding. Applications for interceptions must also be sealed by the judge and retained for at least 10 years.

APPENDIX—Continued

COMPARISON OF THE TWO BILLS WHICH HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED RE WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING—Continued

	S. 675 SENATOR M'CLELLAN'S BILL, FEDERAL WIRE INTERCEPTION ACT [Pre-Berger]	S. 2050 SENATOR HRUSKA'S BILL, ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE CONTROL ACT [Post-Berger]
Copy to defendant	The contents of a wire interception shall not be received in evidence or otherwishe disclosed in any criminal proceeding in a federal court unless each defendant is furnished a copy of the authorizing court order not less than 10 days before trial.	Same as McClellan Bill, but the information from the interception cannot be used in *State court* as well as in federal court if defendant is not given notice.
Motion to suppress	Any *defendant in a criminal trial in federal court* may move to suppress the use as evidence of any intercepted communication on the ground that: (1) Communication was unlawfully intercepted. (2) The authorization for interception is insufficient on its face. (3) There was no probable cause for believing the existence of the grounds on which the order was issued. (4) The interception was not made in conformity with the authorization. If the motion to suppress is granted, the evidence is inadmissible in any court or proceeding. Disclosure of the contents of the communication could result in criminal penalties depending on the law of libel and slander in the jurisdiction in question.	Same as McClellan, *but* "any *aggrieved person*" (a person who is the direct or indirect object of the interception) may move to suppress in *any trial, hearing, or proceeding.* NOTE.—Though the Hruska bill only contains (1), (2) and (4) as grounds for suppression and therefore not the *probable cause* test of (3), Senator Hruska's man says that the probable cause test is implied in (1). Same as McClellan Bill plus the possibility of civil damages (again depending on the law of the jurisdiction as to libel; what is publication; etc.) U.S. given right to appeal suppression order.
Reports concerning intercepted communications	Within 30 days of the expiration of any order granting leave to intercept, the judge shall transmit to the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts and the Attorney General a copy of the order extensions, and the application(s) made therefor. Within 30 days of a denial of an application or extension, the judge shall transmit a copy of the application to the same parties. Each March, the Administrative Office shall transmit to Congress a report concerning the number (#) of applications made, granted, and denied during the preceding year. Such Report shall state: (1) Number of applications made by each federal agency and the number of orders granting or denying such (2) Number of applications made to, and granted and denied by, each federal or state court (3) Number of applications made, granted, and denied with respect to each category of criminal offense enumerated in the Act (4) Number of applications made, granted, and denied within each state and political subdivision with respect to each category of criminal offense.	Similar to McClellan Bill, plus some information which goes to the issue of the effectiveness of the interceptions and an accounting of the deposition of motions to suppress.
Witness immunity		Permits U.S. Attorneys to seek immunity from prosecution for witnesses in cases involving violations of this Act.
Recovery of civil damages		An individual whose communication is intercepted, disclosed or used in violation of this Act, is given (1) a civil cause of action against the person making the interception, disclosure or use and (2) is entitled to recover— (A) Actual damages but not less than liquidated damages computed at the rate of $100 for each day of violation or $1,000, whichever is higher; (B) Punitive damages. (C) Reasonable attorneys fees and litigation costs. A good faith reliance on an interception order issued by a judge pursuant to this Act shall constitute a complete defense to an action under this section.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting pursuant to law, that the "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board," for the fiscal year 1968 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Annuities under special acts," for the fiscal year 1968, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REPROGRAMING OF PROJECTS AT SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILL.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Properties and Installations, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Air Force Reserve construction program; reprograming of projects at Scott Air Force Base, Ill., within lump sum authorizations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army. Research and Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Army Research and Development contracts (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTIONS IN SCHEDULE OF EXPIRING LICENSES, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting two typographical corrections which should be made in the schedule of expiring licenses for non-Federal hydroelectric projects having an installed capacity of not more than 2,000 horsepower, which was transmitted to the Congress with the Commission's letter of January 23, 1968; to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate (with an accompanying paper and document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Statistics of Publicly Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1966

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "Statistics of Publicly Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1966" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of District of Columbia Armory Board

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 10th annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia Stadium and the 20th annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Office of Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Proposed Amendment of Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing fund, fiscal years 1966–67, Treasury Department, dated February 12, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements for the fiscal year 1966, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 12, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Annual Report Under the Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report under the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Claims Settled by GSA Under Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of claims settled during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, by the Administration under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Interstate Agreement on Detainers

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enact the Interstate Agreement on Detainers into law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Dangerous Drug Penalty Amendments of 1968

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prèscribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Alcoholic and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Federal Bureau of Investigation Positions in Grades 16, 17, and 18

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Air Pollution by Federal Facilities

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to review and enact legislation to modify the new federal meat inspection act and the slaughterhouse equipment regulations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as not to drive the independent slaughterhouses and meat packing plants out of business

"Whereas, twenty-nine states have, on their own accord, adopted compulsory state meat inspection programs, and twelve other states, including South Dakota, have such programs on a voluntary basis; and

"Whereas, in South Dakota a total of approximately ninety (90) meat slaughterhouses, locker plants and packing plants have served the people of this state on the whole, with clean, wholesome meat subject to purity standards enforcement by the South Dakota Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas, the quality will be improved further by the new compulsory state meat inspection program; and

"Whereas, many of these plants, operated in a clean manner by any reasonable standards, are nevertheless small plants which cannot economically continue to operate if forced to comply to present federal slaughterhouse equipment standards promulgated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas, this legislative body is in full accord with the provisions regarding the inspection of meat as to purity and cleanliness;

"Whereas, this legislative body opposes the application of the present U.S.D.A. standards for construction and equipment to the small intrastate slaughtering and processing plants; and

"Whereas, the construction and equipment standards for intrastate slaughter and processing plants should be left under state jurisdiction:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-third Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the President and the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, respectfully, requested to give due consideration to instructing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to adjust its regulations so as not to drive the independent slaughterhouses and meat packing plants out of business and until then to withhold authority to enforce the new meat inspection act; and

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of South Dakota to the Offices of the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the state of South Dakota, and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and

"Be it further resolved, that the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the members of the Congressional Delegation from South Dakota to take immediate steps toward the development of an act amending the meat inspection program as now enacted into law, so as to have the question of equipment and inspection procedure standards resolved by state law.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives January 22, 1968.

"Concurred in by the Senate February 1, 1968.

"James D. Jelbert,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"Paul Inman,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"Lem Overpeck,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the State Highway Commission to increase the gross axle weight permitted for farm to market vehicles using the Federal Aid Highway

"Whereas, the present Federal Aid Highways Act of 1956 limits the load weight of vehicles to 18,000 pounds on any single axle and 32,000 pounds on any tandem axle traveling on Federal Aid Highways; and

"Whereas, the ability to get farm crops from the harvest field to market in the most expeditious manner possible is imperative to efficient farming operations; and

"Whereas, the time consumed in getting farm crops to the market is greatly increased by the present load limit restrictions; and,

"Whereas, the transportation of other commodities is impeded by the existing restriction on load limits on the Federal Aid Highways.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives of the Forty-third Session of the Legislature of South Dakota, that Senate concurring therein, respectifully urge the Congress of the United States to take whatever action might be necessary and appropriate to authorize the Highway Commissions of the states discretionary power to designate load limits of 20,000 pounds on any single axle and 36,000 pounds on any tandem axle traveling on Federal Aid Highways.

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate of the State of South Dakota to the offices of the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the State of South Dakota, the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation, and the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives January 22, 1968.

"Concurred in by the Senate February 6, 1968.

"JAMES D. JELBERT,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PAUL INMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 40

"Resolution urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to consider whether the State Teachers' Retirement is being discriminated against for federal income tax purposes and whether any retirement payments should be subject to federal income tax

"Whereas, Social Security payments are not subject to federal income tax; and

"Whereas, Veterans' Disability pensions are not subject to federal income tax; and

"Whereas, Railroad Retirement pensions are not subject to federal income tax;

"Now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"Section 1. That the House of Representatives hereby urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to consider whether the State Teachers' Retirement is being discriminated against for federal income tax purposes and whether any retirement payments should be subject to federal income tax.

"Section 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the members of the United States Congress.

"Section 3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Education Association and to the Kentucky State Education Association."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact proposed legislation amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965

"Whereas, outdoor recreation is necessary for physical development and is a re-creation of one's sense of purpose and a rejuvenation of one's awareness of himself and others around him; and

"Whereas, the United States and South Carolina have an abundance of natural resources, effective federal, state and local action is necessary to assure the people of America a place in which to recreate; and

"Whereas, it is evident that population will double in the United States by the year 2000 with demand for recreational opportunity tripling during the same period; and

"Whereas, outdoor recreation lands and facilities are deficient in most urban areas; and

"Whereas, high quality non-urban areas must be acquired and preserved now for recreational use by future generations; and

"Whereas, we in South Carolina recognize that in our heritage our Country and State offer many recreational opportunities; and

"Whereas, without proper planning for orderly acquisition and development there is no assurance that needs will be met; and

"Whereas, local communities as well as some states do not presently have the fiscal resources to undertake a planning, acquisition of development program of the magnitude recreation requires; and

"Whereas, we in South Carolina are using the resources of the land and water conservation fund as one of the federal programs which we believe will contribute in a large measure to meeting recreation needs; and

"Whereas, the land and water conservation fund is inadequate in some areas to sufficiently fulfill its purpose of an incentive for recreational acquisition and development: Now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:That the Congress be memorialized to enact, without delay Senate Bill 1401 which proposes to amend Title 1 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide for additional revenues to accrue to the fund.

"Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator and member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by C. Nagel, of Bridgeton, Mo., remonstrating against the moon project; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

A resolution adopted by the Pembina River Flood Control Association, Pembina, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the Pembina River Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ACADEMY OF MICROBIOLOGY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a member of the American Academy of Microbiologists, Dr. Walter A. Zygmunt of Evansville, Ind., who encloses a resolution from that professional organization relating to the practices of Selective Service in drafting graduate students in that specialty.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and be properly referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

RESOLUTION

(Prepared by the Board of Governors, American Academy of Microbiology, Inc.)

Whereas graduate Education is absolutely essential to the continued orderly development and dissemination of knowledge in this country; and

Whereas the current draft legislation is grossly disruptive to this process,

Be it resolved, That the American Academy of Microbiology, Inc. requests the National Advisory Committee to the Selective Service System urge the Selective Service Boards to consider for deferment all graduate students admitted to degree programs in microbiology and who remain in good standing and make normal progress toward the degree. The American Academy of Microbiology is equally sympathetic to a similar consideration for graduate students in other disciplines.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2964. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of Aristides Saketos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2966. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2967. A bill for the relief of Cheng Sat Fu; and

S. 2968. A bill for the relief of Cheung Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 2969. A bill for the relief of David E. Alter III, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. David E. Alter, Jr.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2964—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO REDUCTION IN FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the administration's recent order that Federal aid highway obligations for calendar year 1968 will be held to approximately $4.115 billion, or a reduction of $600 million from previously estimated obligations for 1968, has drawn widespread criticism. Not only the wisdom but the legality of the President's action has been called into question. Coupled with a similar cutback in November 1966, it has lead many citizens to wonder if there is any ' trust" left in the highway trust funds.

This reduction in Federal highway funds is being announced as a device to slow down inflation—which it may temporarily accomplish—yet it will have exactly the opposite effect in the long run. The funds and work may be halted by 5 percent but construction costs almost certainly will continue to rise. It well may be that today we can build a mile of highway for 5 percent less than the cost next year.

The administration is surely aware of increasing costs. Four days after the present cutback was announced, the Department of Transportation submitted to the Congress "The 1968 Interstate Cost Estimate." An increase of $9.7 billion over the 1965 estimate for the 41,000-mile Interstate System was reported. A total of $56.5 billion is now anticipated to be necessary to complete the system. However, it is highly unlikely this will be the last estimate. The final bill to be paid for a system of interstate and defense highways will be increased appreciably because of the reduction of Federal highway funds. In my State alone, the cost of the Interstate System has increased by $26 million over the past 3 years.

Increased costs, while the most obvious consequence of the administration's action, is not the only problem. To attempt to fight inflation by depressing one segment of the economy is anomalous, to say the least. Many taxpayers work in the highway construction industry. Are they to slow down and produce only at 95 percent of their capacity? Are 5 percent of the employees to be fired? Are the construction contractors who have invested heavily in plant and equipment to pay 95 percent of the cost of such equipment or to use it 95 percent of the time? And more importantly, will this action by the administration reduce by 5 percent the tragedy that occurs on our highways every day? In 1967, 53,000 persons were killed in traffic accidents according to the National Safety Council. The cost of these accidents is estimtaed at $11 billion. Better and safer highways can reduce this toll both in terms of lives and property, but it will not be done by continuing to postpone the completion date of the Interstate Highway System.

The consequences I have just mentioned are serious and wide-ranging, but there is a much deeper and broader problem pointed up by the highway fund reduction. This problem, however, is not limited to building highways, it pervades the Vietnam war, education, welfare, and national defense. It is the problem of the growing power of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

It could be that by congressional inaction, a vacuum has been created into which the executive branch has moved. In the past, the Congress has delegated authority broadly, without establishing the necessary guidelines. For example, in legislation authorizing the Peace Corps and the Manpower Act of 1965, the Congress had virtually written a blank check and handed it to the administration. On the other hand, the President, in many cases, has committed the country to a certain policy, leaving no choice to the Congress but to go along with it.

The problem involved in the highway spending fund issue, however, is more direct. The President has refused to spend money that the Congress specifically authorized and appropriated. This has happened before. For example, the President ignored specific congressional directives to build the B–70 bomber and, more recently, to build a full-scale antiballistic-missile system. In essence, this is the power of an item veto which is one the President does not constitutionally possess. It encroaches upon the most fundamental of congressional powers—that is, the power over appropriations.

It is not that the Congress did not make itself clear on the priority of a national highway system. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 specifically stated the policy of the Congress. The language used was not ambiguous. It stated:

> It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the "National System of Interstate Highways."

And further:

> It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate system be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen year (now fifteen years because of a later amendment) period and that the entire system in all the states be brought to a simultaneous completion.

Title I, section 108(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. President, debate has not been absent concerning the meaning of this language. Our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Senator BROOKE, on March 3, 1967, presented a well reasoned argument that the language is mandatory upon the administration. Others have contended that the authorization and appropriation language is permissive and the ultimate decision of expenditure lies with the executive branch of Government. The question, however, has not been settled and its resolution, in the broader sense, has never been more important or critical to our Nation.

If congressional priorities for health, safety, and national defense can be rearranged at the discretion of the President, the constitutional basis for that power, or the lack thereof, should be settled once and for all. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, I have been studying this problem as it manifests itself in various areas of the Government. In order to bring the problem into focus on this additional issue, I offer for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States. This bill is a companion to measures that have been introduced in the House of Representatives, one of which was offered by Congressman ROBERT V. DENNEY from Nebraska.

The bill is direct and points up the precise problem. It precludes any officer or employee of the executive branch from impounding or withholding from obligation any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of section 104, of title 23 of the United States Code. It does, however, except such funds which are determined to be necessary to defray expenditures which will be required to be made from the highway trust fund.

It is hoped that this bill and others like it, will press the issue of whether the President has the authority to negate the expressed intent of the Congress and, in the narrower sense, to disrupt the orderly and timely completion of the Interstate Highway System. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I offer be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2964) to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government, except such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the highway trust fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund."

S. 2966—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO LIMITATION OF CENSUS QUESTIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2966) to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill contemplates limiting the authority of the Census Bureau to require the answer of questions only in areas which clearly aid the Bureau in accurately computing the size of the population.

My bill has its origin in the belief that the constitutional purpose of a census in the United States is to aid in determining the apportionment of the House of Representatives. The Census Bureau should not have the power to invade the privacy rights of our citizens by requiring them to answer queries such as:

> (If a woman) How many babies has she ever had, not counting stillbirths?
>
> Have you been married more than once?
>
> Did your first marriage end because of death of wife or husband?

What is the value of this (your) property?
What is your rent?
Did you work at any time last week?

It is somewhat difficult to see how questions of this nature can aid in arriving at an accurate numerical determination of the population; nevertheless, these questions are taken from a special census of Metropolitan New Haven conducted on April 5, 1967, as a pretest for the 1970 decennial census.

At the present time, according to the Bureau of the Census, 67 subject items are proposed for inclusion in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing; and for noncompliance in responding to the Census Bureau's questionnaire, including essentially personal inquiries, a citizen could be faced with a $100 fine and 60 days in jail.

My bill would limit mandatory response to subject areas clearly related to the constitutional purpose of a census. It would also permit the Census Bureau to seek additional information which might be useful to Government and private organizations, but would make response to such questions voluntary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2928) for the relief of certain distressed aliens.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, his name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2749) to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplement, and for other purposes, introduced by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2617) to establish producer owned and controlled emergency reserves of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, rice, cotton, and flaxseed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to revise the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL COURT ASSISTANCE ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 528

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, during the last session I introduced a bill entitled the National Court Assistance Act, S. 1033. The proposal had two main features: First, authorization of a grant-in-aid program to encourage improved judicial administration in State and local courts; and second, establishment of an Office of Judicial Assistance as a national clearinghouse for up-to-date information on court management. As I pointed out last year, the response to my preliminary circulation of the bill was predominantly favorable, but as may be expected in the case of any legislative proposal, opposition was expressed in some quarters. The main argument in opposition to the bill is that it invites encroachment by the Federal Government upon the autonomy of State and local courts.

I share the concern of those who oppose unnecessary Federal intervention into local affairs, and for that reason I included in S. 1033 provisions to protect the independence and autonomy of state and local courts. Section 5 of the bill provides that the resources of the act may be used only with the approval of the court involved. And section 8 specifically prohibits the Office of Judicial Assistance from exerting any control or influence over State or local courts. These provisions are meant to assure that the initiative for implementing reforms remains with the judges of the local courts.

However, dissatisfaction with the provisions guaranteeing the autonomy of the State and local court systems has remained one of the major sources of dissatisfaction with the bill. To further guarantee the insulation of the State courts from Federal intrusion, I, therefore, submit an amendment to S. 1033. This amendment would establish an Advisory Council on Judicial Assistance, comprised of seven members appointed by the President. In making the appointments the President is to give due consideration to recommendations and endorsements from certain named professional societies and organizations concerned with judicial administration and management techniques. The Council members are to be appointed for staggered 2-year terms, and are to receive a per diem compensation. It will be the duty of the Council to advise and consult with the Director of the Office for Judicial Assistance with respect to the act. The Council will also be empowered to approve or disapprove regulations proposed by the Director for establishing general standards for obtaining grants under this act. The basic content of the regulations is left to the Director and the Council, except that the regulations must provide for regular reports to the Director by any recipient of a grant under the act.

It is my hope that this Council will help ease the fears of those who worry about preserving the autonomy and vigor of the State and local courts against intrusion by the Federal Government.

I remain committed to the principles of the National Court Assistance Act, seeing it as a means to stimulate judicial reform at the local level and to encourage local courts to reevaluate the adequacy with which they deal with judicial problems of today. The act is intended to help State and municipal courts help themselves by obviating any pressure for Federal involvement in matters of local justice, either through an expansion of Federal court jurisdiction or whatever. I believe that the act will strengthen, not weaken, our system of creative federalism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in full in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 528) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 4, line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 3a. (1) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Judicial Assistance, hereinafter referred to as the Council. The Council shall be comprised of seven members appointed by the President, who, in making such appointments, shall give due consideration to recommendations and endorsements from professional societies and organizations concerned with judicial administration and management techniques including the American Bar Association, the American Society for Public Administrators, the Association of American Law Schools, the Association of Consulting Management Engineers, the National Conference of Chief Judges, the National Conference of Court Administrative Officers, the National Conference of Metropoltian Judges, the National Conference of State Trial Judges, the National Conference of Trial Court Administrators, and the North American Judges Association.

"(2) Members of the Council shall be appointed for terms of two years; except that the terms of office of three of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, at the end of one year. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall serve for the remainder of that term. Members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 a day while engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council, and shall also be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties. The President shall designate one of the members as chairman, who shall serve as chairman at the pleasure of the President.

"(3) The Council shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

"(4) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise and consult with the Director of the Office for Judicial Assistance with respect to the Act. Regulations proposed by the Director pursuant to section 5 of this Act shall not be effective until considered and approved by the Council."

On page 4, strike lines 8 to 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Director shall, after consultation with the Council, issue regulations establishing general standards for obtaining grants under this Act. The regulations shall provide for regular reports to the

Director by any recipient of a grant under this Act, and the Director shall from time to time, on the basis of the reports and other information available to him, review and, if necessary, revise the regulations issued pursuant to this section. Such regulations and revisions thereof shall not become effective until approved by the Council."

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has rescheduled Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, National American Indian and Alaska natives policy resolution, for hearing on Tuesday, March 5.

The hearing is scheduled for 2 p.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, and those interested in testifying on this proposed legislation should contact the committee staff at the earliest opportunity in order that a witness list may be prepared.

MARYLAND LAWMAKERS ACT ON "PUEBLO"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, all America continues to be concerned about the return of the *Pueblo* and its crew, and enraged over the act of piracy that brought about its seizure.

For example, on January 31, both houses of the General Assembly of Maryland passed resolutions urging the United States to use force if necessary to free the *Pueblo* and its crew. No opposition was recorded on either resolution.

The resolution in the house was introduced by Delegates Burgess and Warfield, and the one in the senate by Senator Fred L. Wineland.

I believe the texts of these resolutions will be of interest to my distinguished colleagues, and for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

(By Delegates Burgess and Warfield)

House resolution supporting the President and Congress on any action they may take to secure the release from North Korea of the vessel U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew, and expressing sympathy to the families of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*

Whereas, The members of the House of Delegates of Maryland are gravely concerned over the capture by North Korea of the vessel, U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its 83 member crew and

Whereas, this incident will cast a heavy burden on the leadership of this Country and require that very important decisions be made, and

Whereas, all citizens of the United States and especially the families of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* are extremely concerned over the safety of those crew members, now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the members of this body extend their full support to the President and members of Congress on any action they may take to secure the return of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this body extend their sympathy to the families of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to each member of the Maryland delegation of the U.S. Congress.

RESOLUTION

(By Senator Wineland)

Senate resolution protesting the act of piracy committed by North Korea against a naval vessel of the United States and supporting the actions of the U.S. Government in this serious matter

On Monday, January 22, 1968, the Communist Government of North Korea committed an act of piracy against the United States with the armed seizure of the USS "Pueblo" in international waters near Korea.

The facts of this outrageous incident, as reported by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg to a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, disclose that a naval intelligence ship of the U.S. Navy, the "Pueblo", was accosted by a vessel of North Korea while in international waters off the shores of Korea, and after being surrounded by several North Korean vessels was boarded and forcibly taken to a North Korean port.

The evidence presented by Ambassador Goldberg clearly shows that the "Pueblo" was in international waters, more than twelve miles from the coastline of Korea and that the subsequent boarding and seizure of the "Pueblo" was a dangerous and precipitous act devoid of justification or excuse.

Such an action on the part of North Korea is not new. Recently a band of assassins from North Korea attempted to take the life of President Park Chung Hee of South Korea and failed. Other acts of piracy involving the seizure of South Korean fishing vessels and the kidnapping of South Korean Nationals have been successful.

Such acts are clearly an indication of the desperate condition in which North Korea finds itself today. Since the Korean Armistice, South Korea with the help of the free world has prospered economically; North Korea with its communist help and resources has not prospered. The tyrannical regime in control of North Korea must learn that they cannot substitute for their failures, piratical attacks upon the free nations of the World.

To date the United States Government has insisted on resolution of this attack by diplomatic means. If no results are forthcoming, then this government must consider other and more forceful means.

Throughout the history of the United States, other governments have committed acts of piracy against the United States but have suffered retribution, as at Tripoli and prior to the War of 1812.

America is a free nation because its government has protected the liberty and the property of its people. In this latest act of piracy by North Korea, the very ideals upon which our nation has been founded, are now jeopardized. The USS "Pueblo" and its crew must be released immediately.

Now as we face this clear and present danger to our security, the members of the Senate of Maryland have followed with increasing concern the rapid unfolding of the events surrounding the seizure of the "Pueblo", and in the case of the Prince Georges County Senators, with special interest because of the presence on the "Pueblo" of a resident of the county, Marine Sergeant Robert J. Chicca; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Senate of Maryland express their shock with the act of piracy committed by North Korea against a naval vessel of the United States and we extend our unqualified support to the actions of President Lyndon B. Johnson and the United States government in resolving this crisis in a manner which will uphold American honor, ideals and prestige in the world, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey, to Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, to the members of the President's Cabinet, and to Senators Daniel B. Brewster and Joseph D. Tydings and Representatives George H. Fallon, Samuel N. Friedel, Edward A. Garmatz, Gilbert Gude, Clarence D. Long, Hervey G. Machen, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., and Rogers C. B. Morton.

VIETNAM—TRIBUTE TO GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, we are in the midst of probably the greatest and most decisive battles of the Vietnam war.

In the past 2 weeks, the Vietcong forces struck at many of the towns and cities of Vietnam, including the capital at Saigon. Their clear hope was to deal a shattering blow at Vietnamese morale, to destroy the legal government and its administrative machinery in the countryside, and to weaken the Vietnamese and American military forces. They also hoped to weaken American resolve.

Today, large units of the North Vietnamese Army are poised to strike in the northern Provinces—at the outpost at Khe Sanh and elsewhere along the demilitarized zone.

American fighting men have been through a couple of very hard weeks. The weeks ahead may be far harder.

In my judgment, Mr. President, our forces need all the backing, all the encouragement, all the trust it is in our power to give.

And I mean all our forces: the private at his lonely outpost, artillerymen at their stations, airmen flying support—all of them. And I mean, especially, our outstanding field commander, Gen. William Westmoreland.

This brilliant and hard-working officer has for 4 years now given our men in Vietnam inspired leadership. He has beyond any doubt spent more time in the field with his troops than any leader of similar rank in any war. Almost every day, he can be found somewhere near the battlefront, getting a firsthand look at the local situation, talking with unit commanders to get their views and recommendations and chatting with simple soldiers to make sure they have what they need.

He performed a miracle of planning and execution in setting up the elaborate logistics base that supports our combat troops. He has defeated the Vietcong in every major engagement since our men went into real combat. In the past 2 weeks—despite the most careful planning by the enemy, despite the large forces he employed, despite the sneak nature of his attacks during a holiday period—the Vietcong were thrown back by the Vietnamese Army and by General Westmoreland's forces. And the enemy lost more men in 2 weeks than he had previously lost in any 2 months of combat.

One of the Communists' goals in this major assault was—as I have said—to shake American confidence.

Mr. President, I can think of nothing that helps the men in Hanoi more toward this goal than to cast doubt on our own commander in the field. Yet I have read such criticism in the past few days in several publications.

I deplore this type of comment. It only makes things tougher for ourselves—and easier for our enemies.

I do not suggest that mistakes have never occurred. They have. I do not suggest that statements have been made that sound sometime a little too optimistic.

But I do say: show me a commander who thinks he may not win, and I will show you a commander who probably will not win.

Mr. President, show me a commander who does not bear a scar and I will show you a commander who has never been in a fight.

I think all Americans should be proud of the very able, hard-hitting military forces we have employed in Southeast Asia, and particularly their commander, General Westmoreland.

STATE DEPARTMENT ISOLATION WARD

Mr. **WILLIAMS of Delaware**. Mr. President, I was somewhat shocked today to find that the State Department is operating what might be referred to as a special isolation ward or cooler for employees whose only crime is telling the truth to a Senate committee.

When this situation was called to my attention I visited this place. I suggest that Members of the Senate and the press go to 23d and D Streets, on the first floor of the old State Department Annex Building. There will be found an entire floor that is being heated and maintained by the State Department, and much of the building is piled up with a lot of junk. Only one office on this floor is occupied.

The two employees who are in this room are Harry M. Hite, who is a GS–13 at a salary of $15,307, and Edward Burkhard, who is a GS–12 at a salary of $12,890.

Mr. President, these two employees have had practically no work since 1965. They have had absolutely no work at all assigned to them since October of 1966. Their only duty is to report at 9 o'clock in the morning and to remain there until 5:30 in the evening. They have a telephone and a typewriter, and they sit there looking at each other and reading the newspapers. They have repeatedly sent requests to their superiors in the State Department, asking that they be assigned duties. Thus far nothing has been assigned to them.

Mr. President, these two men are being isolated and penalized solely because they testified in the Otepka case. In that case, two or three other employees testified and lied to the committee about whether or not they wiretapped Mr. Otepka's telephone. These two men told the truth, and that is their only crime; they told the truth. Those others who lied to the committee and later, when caught, changed their testimony, have been adequately taken care of by the State Department. They were taken care of because they tried to cover up for them. But the State Department could not fire these two men because it realized it could not sustain charges. The men draw their salaries and sit there twiddling their thumbs for 8 hours a day in what now has the appearance of an old abandoned warehouse.

This is ridiculous, especially at a time when we hear so much about Government deficits.

The State Department is well aware of this situation because these two men have sent repeated memorandums to the Department appealing for some work to do.

Mr. President, I went through the place this morning, and I looked at it. I invite Senators and members of the press to go down there and look at the conditions in that building. If those who go there are unable to find the room at first, do not give up, because I searched for 10 minutes before I could find anybody in the building. The men were there, in room 114, and on the job, sitting there as they have been for the last 16 months, waiting for somebody to give them orders.

Mr. President, I most respectfully suggest that this matter should be straightened out within 72 hours. If not, I am going to submit a resolution asking for the immediate removal of their superior.

DISSENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to last Sunday's Washington Post, in which there appeared excerpts of scholarly and perceptive remarks by Editor J. R. Wiggins on the theory and practice of dissent in the United States. The remarks by Mr. Wiggins were made last week during the Churchmen's Washington Seminar of the National Council of Churches of Christ.

During a time in which too often the vestiges of civilized conduct are cast aside in favor of wanton destructiveness, I feel that anyone who reads Mr. Wiggins' statement will benefit from the wisdom of his well-balanced observations.

He asks whether it is possible to define the nature of the duty to dissent and the appropriate limits on the exercise of this right. And then, using historical examination and his own thoughts, Mr. Wiggins presents his views regarding the principles of dissent.

Mr. Wiggins finds first that a citizen who believes that a governmental policy constitutes a departure from national interest or moral rectitude has a duty to dissent. I would agree with this provided the dissent takes the form of lawful dissent.

> That there is such a duty, it seems to me, is the very essence of self-government, the very spark of a democratic system—

Mr. Wiggins says—

> A people devoid of this impulse would induce such passivity into an electorate as to make the form of government a matter of indifference.

Very carefully, Mr. Wiggins traces major instances of mass dissent in this country from the days just following the American Revolution.

He tells how Thomas Jefferson, who realized the importance of dissent, viewed rather calmly a rebellion of Massachusetts farmers. Jefferson was more concerned about the stern measures taken against Pennsylvania farmers who participated in the Whisky Rebellion. To quote Mr. Wiggins:

> Jefferson knew the country could survive the disorders and that it couldn't survive the disappearance of a spirited citizenry insistent upon its privileges.
>
> "To punish these errors too severely would be to suppress the only safeguard of the public liberty," Jefferson said.

Mr. Wiggins relates how, in five instances in our Nation's history, popular dissent, ranging from civil disobedience to outright violence, has vastly altered national policy, forcing a reversal of legislative intent or executive direction.

Says Mr. Wiggins:

> Such was the case in 1804, when a Republican defeat of the Federalists nullified the Alien and Sedition laws. In 1808 it occured when the Republicans gave in to hot resistance over the Embargo Act.

Lincoln's election climaxed dissent against the Government's proslavery policies. And the Civil War—the ultimate dissent—marked the beginning of the end of slavery in the United States.

The repeal of the 18th amendment was the fourth instance which Mr. Wiggins cited as an example of a major policy change resulting from dissension.

> Then came the years of the Civil Rights demonstrations—

Said Mr. Wiggins—

> and the swift alteration of local and state policy toward discrimination against a racial minority—an interlude of dissent which, of course, still persists and one which already has significantly altered policy.

Mr. Wiggins believes that, in the last generation, some forms of civil disobedience have begun to acquire the status of socially acceptable behavior. He cites nine different guidelines which, in his opinion, are relative to either the tacit acceptance or the rejection of dissent by society.

Unfortunately, he adds, there are some persons who do not seem to comprehend the limits of society's endorsement of dissent. Mr. Wiggins points out that those who fail to perceive the restrictions on civil disobedience have more recently employed acts of civil disobedience in situations not governed by the guidelines or principles enunciated before exploring remedies through normal channels, and sometimes without regard for the safety of innocent persons.

Mr. Wiggins said:

> There have been frequent demonstrations in which violence has been used to disrupt public meetings and interfere with speakers. This is a technique perfected by the fascists and the Nazis.

He added:

> Those who are in dissent ought to be the last to encourage a contest in which the side with the most numbers and least scruples is bound ultimately to triumph.
>
> Those who are in dissent . . . should be the first to demand for those who speak in opposition to them full personal security.

Mr. Wiggins says that certainty seems to be a characteristic of dissenters and that it is dangerous for minds to become closed to the witness of new facts and new forces. He reminds us of the following exhortation by Oliver Cromwell:

> I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken.

Mr. Wiggins concludes:

> While we concede and defend the right of dissent, it is equally important to acknowledge and support the right to conform. If one is precious to a minority, the other is sacred to a majority. They are not long found singly and separately, but exist in a complementary relationship, the existence of each making more secure the perpetuation of the other. The preservation of both depend upon majorities and minorities extending to each other that decent deference and toleration without which no society of origins as diverse as ours can long survive.

I wish that Mr. Wiggins' concluding thought, Mr. President, could be read and comprehended by Americans everywhere, for it expresses the essence of the great problem which faces this Nation today. We will continue to be beset by woes until we reach that precious state of balance between dissent and conformity of which Mr. Wiggins speaks and until each and every American understands the immorality which is implicit in the idea that one man's rights can supplant another's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wiggins' excellent, lucid, and thoughtful comments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DISSENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

(By J. R. Wiggins)

(NOTE.—Excerpted from remarks Thursday before the Churchman's Washington Seminar of the National Council of Churches of Christ.)

The citizens of a nation born in a revolution preceded by almost a generation of disaffection and dissent can be expected to regard disagreement proceeding even to the edge of sedition in a different way than it might be viewed by a people with another heritage.

Americans have historically manifested a toleration toward violent expressions of opposition that has confused many observers from other countries. At the same time, their memory, as a people, teaches them that a long and steadily accelerating tendency toward violent attack upon and obstruction of government may sometimes be a prelude to something even more serious.

There are intervals in every country's history when the normal outlets for political discontent seem inadequate to channel away the dissent of factions and groups who are too impatient to await the outcome of an orderly political contest for the mind of the majority.

Perhaps we are in such an interlude; and if this is so, it behooves us to examine both the reasons for this impatient and impulsive urge and the means of dealing with it.

The vast majority of those who now are dissidents from governmental policy in this country wish to have the Government remove their discontents; but the fact cannot be blinked that a certain minority would rather have the discontents remain and see government pushed to the extremes of force to suppress disorder. This minority, we must assume, is not interested in the rights and responsibilities of dissent within the framework of a democratic society. They are interested in overturning that society . . . With them government and society, if it means to survive, has no recourse but overwhelming military force.

We are not concerned with locating the limits on their rights and duties, for revolution recognizes no limits, admits no responsibilities and contends for unlimited right including the right to use force and violence. As Dr. William Sloane Coffin has put it: "You cannot ask the government to respect your right to be a revolutionary."

THE DUTY TO DISSENT

The citizens with whom we are concerned stand on a different footing. Can we define for them the nature of the duty to dissent and locate for them the appropriate limits on the right to dissent? And if we can establish some general principles perhaps we can proceed to make some particular applications to specific dissents of our time.

Let us begin with the duty to dissent from the policy of government when that policy seems to the individual citizen to constitute a departure from national interest or moral rectitude. That there is such a duty, it seems to me, is the very essence of self-government, the very vital spark of a democratic system. A people devoid of this impulse would induce such passivity into an electorate as to make the form of government a matter of indifference. And a people with this impulse will invest even the most unsatisfactory system of government with the vigor and force that may make it adequate to deal with society's problem.

It was becasue he was interested in keeping this spark of dissent alive that Thomas Jefferson viewed with equanimity the disorders of western Massachusetts farmers in Shays' rebellion and worried over the stern measures taken against Pennsylvania farmers in the Whisky rebellion. He knew the country could survive the disorders and that it couldn't survive the disappearance of a spirited citizenry insistent upon its rights and privileges. "To punish these errors too severely," Jefferson said of Shays' rebellion, "would be to suppress the only safeguard of the public liberty."

Americans have had a lot of instruction on dissent—even some very explicit instruction on civil disobedience. They have been taught by Thoreau that "Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison."

Americans then are inclined to tenderness toward dissent by the instruction of their own history, by the exhortation of their philosophers, by the knowledge that truth is changing and by the counsels of their heart—which incline them, if the truth be told, toward the disrespect of authority and the admiration of nonconformity.

RESPECT FOR ORDER

But there is another strain in their makeup, too—deriving from their respect for order, their belief in representative government, their confidence in the wisdom of the majority and their belief in the integrity of their own government. And these character traits compete with each other in times that put these opposite tendencies in conflict.

No sooner have we digested Thomas Jefferson's admonitions on the virtues of an occasional revolution and the necessity of watering the tree of liberty with the blood of patriots than we come upon such counsels as this about dissent:

". . . As far as my good will go (for I can no longer act), I shall adhere to my government, Executive and Legislative, and, as long as they are republican, I shall go with their measures whether I think them right or wrong; because I know they are honest, and are wiser and better informed than I am."

And as we have imbibed from Locke and Rousseau some principles of revolutionary character, so have Americans taken into their philosophical "bloodstream" the injunction on majority rule that lies implicit in the theories of the social contract.

EARLY REBELLIONS

These were the political theories, pro and con, that engaged American attention. Now what of the practices of Americans through their own government?

Once independence was gained, the new government did not have to wait long to test its principles in operation. Shays' rebellion in 1786 was the first test of policy. It was put down and the rebellious farmers punished. While the disorders were in progress Washington gave advice that he must have taken straight from Francis Bacon. He wrote to Henry Lee, Oct. 31, 1786:

"Know precisely what the insurgents aim at. If they have real grievances, redress them if possible; or acknowledge the justice of them and your inability to do it in the present moment. If they have not, employ the force of government against them at once . . . Let the reins of government then be braced and held with a steady hand, and every violation of the constitution reprehended."

The Whiskey rebellion of 1792 raised more serious issues. Citizens of Western Pennsylvania tarred and feathered a Federal tax collector, excise notices were torn down, collectors' offices were broken into, public meetings threatened ostracism of anyone accepting the office of collector. President Washington mobilized a small army to put down this spreading rebellion. Many citizens were arrested and indicted. Two were convicted of treason—and escaped the death penalty by Washington's pardon.

This first dissent from a Federal law, degenerating into rebellion, was put down with scrupulous fidelity to legal process—but did not wholly satisfy some critics who always argued that the armed forces were not necessary. It is an argument that has been heard frequently since when civil disturbances are involved.

Next came the Fries rebellion in the administration of John Adams—against a direct tax by the Federal Government. Once again, the Federal Government sent soldiers into Pennsylvania, apprehended the dissenters, tried them and had some of them sentenced to death for treason. Once again, the President pardoned the offenders. There could hardly be more salutary precedents for prompt reaction to defiance of the government, quick and constitutional trial of the accused, and compassionate and liberal treatment of the dissenters.

ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS

If President Adams reacted wisely and successfully in dealing with the Fries rebellion, his Administration marred this record by reacting excessively to dissent from the policies of his government that was mostly a matter of utterance. The Alien and Sedition Laws, aimed both at extravagant political denunciation and at some of the immigrants involved in them, was denounced as a "nullity" in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions adopted by Republicans and were abandoned at their termination in the Jefferson Administration. This adventure into the punishment of mere utterance has had a salutary effect on subsequent administrations.

Thomas Jefferson had to deal with resistance to the Embargo Act and in this effort, because of the widely dispersed character of the dissent, he failed. It was still being hotly resisted and disregarded when it was repealed in 1808.

In the decades prior to the Civil War, the United States presented a veritable laboratory experiment in dissent. Abolitionists in the North, kindred in spirit to Henry Thoreau, began with vigorous vocal dissent and proceeded to disobedience and to resistance to the enforcement of the fugitive slave laws and other statutes sympathetic to slavery. The citizens of the slave states responded with other kinds of disobedience and resistance, obstructing the movement of the mails and otherwise countering the abolitionists.

The War Between the States, of course, was a dissent such as the Nation has not seen since, providentially. And it ended, after a long and bloody contest, with the settlement of the issue of secession—itself the ultimate in dissent from central authority. During the anguish of this long struggle there were many other tests of Federal power to suppress dissent, ranging all the way from mere utterance to treason. One of these, especially instructive in our day, was the opposition to the draft law. The most serious disturbances occurred in New York City.

THE DRAFT RIOTS

On Monday, July 13, 1863, while the drawing of draft numbers was proceeding in a building at Third Avenue and 46th Street, a shot was fired and a mob of several thousand people assailed the draft headquarters. Rioting continued for four days, completely beyond control of police and military. Eighteen were killed, a thousand injured and $1,500,000 in property destroyed. Twenty of the rioters were tried and 18 were convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment, according to Rhodes History of the United States. Many of those injured were Negroes attacked by Irish mobs who blamed them for the war. The draft was suspended and not resumed until August 19 when 10,000 infantrymen and three batteries of artillery were sent into the city.

The draft law was attacked in the courts in Pennsylvania but sustained after an interesting struggle. The classic legal contest over the law arose in Indiana where the Sons of Liberty resisted the draft. Three men—Bowles, Milligan and Horsey—were tried by a military commission on the charges of "conspiracy, affording aid and comfort to rebels, inciting insurrection, disloyal practices and violation of the laws of war." They were found guilty and sentenced to death. They were released April 3, 1866 when the United States Supreme Court, in *ex parte Milligan* held that the Government, in an area free from invasion where the civil courts functioned, could not have military authorities arrest, try and convict the accused.

It is interesting that in the midst of the Civil War, public sentiment compelled the Government to retrace its steps on many occasions when military authorities, in an excess of zeal, arrested citizens on the basis of mere utterance.

An episode with a contemporary ring took place in 1894 when the Army of the Commonwealth marched on Washington demanding that Congress issue $500 million fiat money to finance a huge highway improvement program.

Congress, needless to say, did not pass Coxey's highway bill; but one is compelled to say that it really was a pretty good idea and deserved more consideration than it won by the methods that were used to secure its passage.

NEW ERA OF DISSENT

World War I started a new era in the history of dissent in the United States. There were more than 1900 prosecutions and other judicial proceedings during the war, involving speeches, newspaper articles, pamphlets and books, according to Zechariah Chafee Jr.'s classic "Free Speech in the United States."

Once again, the draft and its enforcement, produced a flood of dispute and dissension Secretary of War Baker informed the Attorney General that there were 308,489 known desertions on June 10, 1918. On Sept. 3, 1918, the FBI attempted a roundup of slackers and in three days seized 50,000 men in theaters, restaurants, street cars, railway stations and pool halls and street corners.

In New York, Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, longtime anarchists, formed the Non-Conscription League, with promises of help to those who refused to register and be drafted.

Armed groups resisted the draft in Texas and Oklahoma. At the end of the war there were nearly 300,000 cases of draft evasion still in process.

Following World War I, dissent took its ugliest form. On June 2, 1919, the home of Attorney General Palmer on R Street, across from the home of Assistant Secretary of Navy Franklin Roosevelt, was bombed—the front of the house was blown in and two bodies found in the debris. Eight explosions—at homes of officials and wealthy persons—followed.

At the scene of most of them were found leaflets proclaiming the beginning of a class war and hailing the victory of "the international proletariat." On Sept. 16, 1920, an explosion in Wall Street near the J. P. Morgan building killed 30 and injured 300 persons. These explosions set off a nationwide hysteria against terrorism with Congress demanding action by the Justice Department.

The action came in the notorious Palmer Red Raids of 1921 in which 2500 aliens were arrested on warrants of the Bureau of Immigration. In the end, 446 were deported. The conduct of the raids was protested widely by civil liberties groups. Dissent expressed in violence had its result in the outrageous disregard of the civil rights of many accused persons.

As legal cases originating in these tumultuous years proceeded through the courts to the United States Supreme Court, historic opinion began to shape an American doctrine of dissent.

Schenck vs. United States concerned a clear incitement to resist the draft in circulars mailed to draftees which declared conscription to be unconstitutional despotism. In sustaining conviction the Supreme Court opinion by Justice Holmes laid down this important test of the relation of speech to action: "The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

The contours of American doctrine that emerge are really those of Schenck—with its emphasis on the close relation between utterance and consequent evils that Congress may rightfully try to prevent.

They suggest that citizens who obstruct the war-making powers of the Government by words that directly relate to acts in defiance of it, do so at their peril.

The story of the draft in World War II is a very different story than the draft in World War I. At the end of World War I there were 295,000 men on the rolls as dodgers; but at the end of World War II there were only 8836 on service rolls as draft evaders.

The American Civil Liberties Union in 1943 pointed up the contrast in a statement asserting that the World War II record proved that "our democracy can fight even the greatest of wars and still maintain the essentials of liberty."

REMARKABLE TOLERATION

Once the country had recovered from the postwar hysteria of the 1920s, there began in the United States, in 1930, and continued until after 1944, an era in which dissent expressed in speech and print enjoyed a freedom not exceeded at any period in this country's history and seldom paralleled at any time or at any place on the globe, and even dissent verging to resistance and disobedience was extended a toleration remarkable for any organized society.

Then, in 1945, commenced a new period with a different climate toward dissent. This time, the violence was not evidenced by indiscriminate terror and bombing, but by acts of espionage—the Rosenberg case, the Hiss case, the Fuchs case—and a host of other events and incidents that set afoot a national atmosphere of fear and apprehension of the McCarthy era. This time, there were no Palmer raids or similar acts of executive suppression. The intimidatory impulse originated in Congress—the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, the abuse of legistative inquiry by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Committee on Internal Security.

The country finally began to right itself in the early 1950s. I think the year 1954 can be noted as the commencement of a new era. It was an era of triumph for dissent—dissent, again, as in the pre-prohibition era, from the repression of local and state laws, customs, mores and tradition.

In the ensuing decade, dissent, utilizing the spoken and the written word, employing new varieties of passive resistance and civil disobedience, wrought such a transformation in the discrimination enforced by society upon the victimized Negro minority as seldom has been produced in any country by measures short of outright revolution.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court, in Brown vs. the Board of Education, commenced this era on May 17, 1954. Congress added a succession of Civil Rights Acts. The Executive departments of the Government invoked the military power of the Nation to carry this movement forward in Arkansas, Louisiana and Alabama.

The unique thing about this incredible decade of progress, it seems to me, is the fact that the object of the dissenting words and acts were restrictive, discriminatory and prejudicial local and state laws, customs and mores—and that the Federal Government itself was, by its court decisions, its laws and its national administration, the foremost dissenter.

Then came a succession of acts of violence, beginning with the burning of Watts, on Aug. 11–16, 1965, and followed in succeeding months by violence exploding in the slums of one great city after another. (It is important to distinguish these spontaneous eruptions from anything that might be described as civil disobedience. They were rather irrational outbursts of rage).

At the same time, the dissent in the cities moved from words to acts, dissent against the war and the draft and campus dissent from college and university policies began to swing from utterance to action. Sometimes the three concurrent dissents have merged.

LEVELS OF DISSENT

Comparisons between the level of dissent existing now and that in previous periods when dissenting opinion and acts were widespread is not easy. The dissent from war and conscription is a phenomenon with which the country has had the most experience. And it is clear that so far, this form of dissent has not reached anything like the levels that existed during the Civil War period and the World War I period, or even the World War II period. On Nov. 1, 1967, for example, there were 15,621 draft delinquents out of a total registration of 35,881,000. This is a far cry from the level of nearly 300,000 delinquents at the end of World War I.

The number and percentage of men who fail to report for induction are substantially lower than during the Korean War. During 1967, according to the Selective Service officials, 1306 such cases were filed, compared with 642 the previous year. The previous high under the 1948 Act was 1022 in fiscal 1954.

The disturbances on campuses, on the other hand, are a newer experience for Americans. They are not wholly draft-related, or only draft related, but no doubt are a complex of all current dissent factors—youth revolt, draft revolt and civil rights revolt—predominating in different degrees at different times and places.

The riots in the cities are also phenomena with which the country has had less prior experience.

Can we draw any conclusion or discern any general behavioral phenomenon in this cursory history of American dissent? Can we perfect out of our past experience and current anguish any generalizations about the right of dissent and the duty of dissent?

It is instructive, I think, that in the history of the country, popular dissent, verging to civil disobedience and outright resistance, have in five conspicuous instances vastly altered national policy, compelling a reversal of legislative intent or executive direction. This was the case in 1804 when the Alien and Sedition Laws were left a nullity by the Republic defeat of the Federalists. It happened again in 1808 when the Republicans, now themselves in power, abandoned the embargo in the face of the total inability of the Government to prevent widespread disobedience and defiance of the law.

The election of Lincoln climaxed a long period of rising dissent against the pro-slavery policies of the Federal Government. The Civil War—the very embodiment and ultimate in dissent—reversed the national policy and put slavery on the way to extinction. The repeal of the 18th Amendment was another reversal of national policy coerced by the collapse of enforcement in a rising volume of dissent, disobedience and defiance of law. Then came the years of the Civil Rights demonstrations and the swift alteration of local and state policy toward discrimination against a racial minority—an interlude of dissent which, of course, still persists and one which already has significantly altered policy.

A TENDENCY TO CYCLES

It is, I think, also instructive to note the tendency of dissent and repression to occur in cycles of some kind—to work themselves out through a discernible sequence beginning with disagreement, proceeding to debate and verbal dissent, verging into passive resistance and civil disobedience and culminating in violence. This violent climax then has been followed by a reaction that has tended to reverse the process by starting out to discourage violence alone and that has often proceeded down the scale toward the repression of civil disobedience, passive resistance and even verbal dissent.

It is my own chief interest and concern that the storm and stress of our American dissents leave intact and undiminished the freedom to speak and write against the policies of government (or for them). It is perfectly clear that on frequent occasions in the past the curtailment of the freedom to write and speak did take place under constructions of the Constitution that rendered almost imperceptible the line between mere words and acts.

This clearly happened in the period of the Alien and Sedition Laws, during the Civil War and during World War I and the years immediately after the war. We have a right to ask of authority that the distinction between words and acts be kept clear. But our admonitions cannot run to government alone. Citizens, too, have their responsibilities.

Zechariah Chaffee, in his "Free Speech in the United States," said:

"I want to speak of responsibilities of the men who wish to talk. They are under a strong moral duty not to abuse the liberty they possess. All I have written goes to show that the law should lay few restraints upon them, but that makes it all the more important for them to restrain themselves. They are enjoying a great privilege and the best return which they can make is to use that privilege wisely and sincerely for what they genuinely believe to be the best interests of their country."

Dissent raised from the level of speech and publication to the level of civil disobedience has not enjoyed the same legal or moral sanction as utterance in our society, but some forms of civil disobedience, in the last generation, seemed to be acquiring by slow degrees the status of accepted behavior, under certain circumstances, among most Americans.

The country had grown to accept as tolerable in our society acts of civil disobedience under some circumstances. Can we define these circumstances? I think the consent of society was conditioned upon:

(1) The existence of an evil of such magnitude as to warrant extraordinary measures;

(2) The absence of any remedy within the law or through ordinary political devices;

(3) The presence in the protested laws involved of an alleged illegal aspect (as in local and state segregation laws in conflict with Federal laws or the Constitution);

(4) The use of methods of disobedience not involving injury to innocent people;

(5) The choice of methods of disobedience not infringing on the acknowledged rights of others;

(6) The probability that the disobedience would achieve a remedy;

(7) The selection of a clearly defined and precise object of the disobedience;

(8) The avoidance of violence;

(9) The purity of the motives of those engaged in acts of civil disobedience.

If I am right, it is quite clear that the public had not extended its indiscriminate endorsement to all acts of civil disobedience. And it is quite clear that the restricted nature of the popular franchise for civil disobedience was not widely understood. Acts of disobedience began to be seen in situations where the substantive evils complained of were minor indeed. They began to be employed before any exertions to remedy the situation by ordinary process. They were used against laws burdened by no constitutional infirmity. They were utilized in spite of the threat to the safety of innocent persons.

There have been frequent demonstrations in which violence has been used to disrupt public meetings and interfere with speakers.

This is a technique perfected by the Fascists and the Nazis. Those who are in dissent ought to be the last to encourage a contest in which the side with the most numbers and least scruples is bound ultimately to triumph. Those in dissent, if they are at all farsighted, should be the first to demand for those who speak in opposition to them full personal security. The business of breaking heads is not an enterprise involving so much ingenuity that others cannot be instructed in it or learn to profit by it, if it becomes one of the necessities of public life.

When it does, however, dissenters and nonconformists will not gain the greatest advantage from it. One must look forward with anxiety to the election campaign ahead if public meetings are to degenerate into pitched battles commenced in the name of civil disobedience.

ANXIETY AND MISGIVING

One must also look forward with anxiety and misgiving to a march to coerce Congress into action on legislative proposals by stopping the functioning of the Government of the United States through the obstruction of public offices and buildings if that, as has been reported, is intended. Let us hope this is not so, because citizens have a right to go into and come out of public buildings without molestation or injury or interference.

If there is a widespread attempt to interfere with that right, many will not tamely submit but will call upon the forces of the law to make that undoubted right good and, that failing, will feel free to assert that right on their own. If such an intention exists, it is an intention to deprive hundreds of thousands of citizens of their rights, an intention to violate the laws of the District of Columbia which prohibit obstructive picketing, an intention to illegally disrupt the conduct of the Government of the United States by interfering with officials and Congressmen in the performance of their constitutional duties. Let us hope that there is no such intention.

There are broadly three groups involved in the United States today in the conspicuous dissent and perhaps we need to keep their distinctive characteristics in mind as we weigh both society's proper reaction to them and consider any restrictions upon the forms of dissent that have traditionally been encouraged and those that have been repressed.

The first of these groups is that made up of students.

There is some resemblance between American youth today and English youth of privileged liberal families in the period before World War I as described by Rebecca West in "The Meaning of Treason." Of them she wrote:

"They were brought up in a state of complete immunity from any form of physical want. Not only did they never suffer from hunger or cold or lack of clothing, they lived in a society from which such deprivations were being eliminated more quickly and more thoroughly than ever before . . . Yet they were taught and believed that they were living in the worst of all possible worlds but that they need not despair, as it would be the easiest thing they and their parents ever did to tear it down and make a better one . . . of altruism and truthfulness and austerity they thought well and claimed the monopoly, believing that they, and they alone, were the saviors of society. Of the other virtues, patriotism, it is to be remarked, was the first to get its dismissal. It was naive for a man to feel any conviction that his own country was the best, or even as good as any other country; just as it was naive to believe that the soldier of any foreign army committed atrocities or to doubt that any English soldier or sailor or colonial administrator failed to do so."

Toward the dissent of youth the view of society ought to be marked by patience resting on the knowledge that time will repair many of the excesses into which young men are led, that the rest of them can be tolerated until and unless the commotions of a very small minority interfere with the rights of their contemporaries who wish to get an education or the liberties of others who have a right to speak—even though what they say may depart from the given wisdom of dissenting college students.

In any case, the dissenting students stand in a special position and their dissenting words and acts raise different problems that must be dealt with in a different way.

UNENLIGHTENED POLICY

And so, it seems to me, do those who are engaged in a struggle to right the wrongs that for a century have been inflicted upon a racial minority in the United States. Their efforts to express their legitimate discontent, even when cast in forms that might be objectionable if resorted to by citizens with a long record of equal rights, must be faced with a toleration born out of understanding. If the Negro leaders behave like men who have not had the discipline and training of long political experience, it is we of the white community who have deprived them of that experience and we cannot expect to escape some of the bad consequences of that unenlightened policy.

A campaign of civil disobedience directed against nature itself is not likely to produce the repeal of any of its laws. It will be a long time after all current discrimination has been eliminated before the consequences of historic acts of injustice are removed from our midst. The day will not be hastened if the Negro minority, in a fit of understandable impatience, resorts to acts of disobedience arising out of sheer frustration, or if the white majority, reacting to such acts and frustration, reverts to misdirected repression and resentment.

Those who are not yet adult citizens and those who have suffered from unfair discrimination, in my view, stand on a different ground than that occupied by men and women who always have enjoyed full rights as citizens in our democratic system. Society has a right to apply to its privileged

majority groups the theory of the Social Contract. They have enjoyed the fullest rights and privileges. They have assumed as well the obligations and responsibilities that go with those rights and privileges.

As citizens to whom all kinds of political resources have been available they share responsibility for the policies their country pursues and they cannot wholly separate themselves from the measures they protest. Society justly can hold them to a greater degree of accountability for words or acts that tend toward the disruption of order. They lack that primary grievance of the disenfranchised.

Of these citizens, it seems to me, the Government is entitled to ask forms of dissent and disagreement that comply with our traditions—speech within the limits of parliamentary utterance, actions in conformity with laws adopted by due process. The exact limits on both speech and actions may fluctuate with the occasion, but there surely is a line beyond which such citizens ought not to proceed if they count themselves within the community that does not intend or propose the revolutionary overthrow of this Government by force and violence. If they belong to this revolutionary persuasion, none of the limitations we have been discussing apply to them—and neither do any of the rights and immunities which sovereign nations legally withhold from those who intend the destruction of the nation.

Certainty always has been a characteristic of dissenters. Only people completely convinced that they are beyond all doubt wholly right would undertake the difficulties and discomforts of dissent. It is an attribute that gives force and vigor to dissenters. At the same time, once this stage of certainty is reached, minds close to the witness of new facts and new forces. And, in the fluid world in which we live, this can be a very dangerous thing.

Anyone examining the working papers produced at the Detroit conference of the National Council of Churches last fall would be struck by the lack of any reservation as to the central position of the work groups. The assumption that the Government of the United States was altogether wrong was never challenged. The presence of a reasonable doubt is not an unmitigated disaster in human society. It may dull resolution, but it contributes both to reflective thought and more prudent action. One should not forget the salutary exhortation of Oliver Cromwell: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."

While we concede and defend the right of dissent, it is equally important to acknowledge and support the right to conform. If one is precious to a minority, the other is sacred to a majority. They are not long found singly and separately, but exist in a complementary relationship, the existence of each making more secure the perpetuation of the other. The preservation of both depend upon majorities and minorities extending to each other that decent deference and toleration without which no society of origins as diverse as ours can long survive.

REGARDING REPRESENTATIVE TAFT'S SPEECH IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in Vietnam, we Americans are involved not only in an un-American war but an immoral war which now to many seems unwinnable unless this American war is waged for another 3 to 6 years. Every American has the right to dissent if he so chooses. A Senator, if he so believes, has the duty to express his dissent. Now comes an obscure Member of the other body who was defeated for U.S. Senator in 1964, and then in 1966 managed to be elected to the House of Representatives by about 7,000 majority with the help of the overwhelming Republican majority in our State legislature which gerrymandered his congressional district by changes adding 15,000 registered Republican voters. His statement adds a little touch of hilarity and humor perhaps needed in this grim period. At a small meeting in Los Angeles, Representative Taft, Jr., declaimed that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, J. William Fulbright, should step down as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the interest of national unity because of his dissent regarding the war President Johnson is waging in Vietnam. This is the closest Taft, Jr., will ever come to telling the U.S. Senate how to conduct its business. Junior has the Taft name and the backing of the Taft family fortune, but not much else going for him. He spoke about some traditional cooperation that should exist, he says, between a chairman of a Senate committee and the White House on major foreign policy issues.

The ineptitude of Taft, Jr., recognized by Ohio citizens in 1964, is now made evident on the west coast. For effrontery and pure unadulterated gall this gratuitous advice to the Senate of the United States coming from a Member of the other body who is a junior member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, at the bottom of the totem pole on the minority side of that committee, is, in fact, so ludicrous such criticism should really be ignored as unworthy of mention. Like water dripping down off a duck's back it should probably be unnoticed.

Ohio citizens in 1964 turned back his bid to become a United States Senator. He came closer then than he ever will in the future to having his voice and views listened to in the Senate. Perhaps he himself recognizes this for the other day his small voice regarding the operation of the Senate and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate did not even come from Washington nor even from my State of Ohio, but it came from a little meeting in California about as far distant from the Capitol as anyone could be and still be within the continental United States.

Senator J. William Fulbright, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, first came to the U.S. Senate in 1944 following service in the House of Representatives. He is regarded by all his colleagues in the Senate as a truly great and dedicated American. Throughout our Nation he is held in the highest admiration and respect by citizens generally, and the United States and our citizens have every reason to feel more secure in this trying period that this eminent scholar, high-minded statesman and experienced legislator is serving our Nation as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

MONTANA'S GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, A WINTER WONDERLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times for last Sunday, February 11, 1968, there is published an article, written by a well-known Montanan from Columbia Falls, Mont., Miss Carol Woster. The article is entitled "A Brave New Wintry World Opens Up at Glacier National Park."

I ask unanimous consent that this well written and highly descriptive story of the many glories of Glacier National Park be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Brave New Wintry World Opens Up at Glacier National Park

(By Carol Woster)

West Glacier, Mont.—The million acres of Glacier National Park, a summer playland for decades, are on their way to becoming a winter wonderland as well.

Multicolored hotrods on skis—more familiarly known as snowmobiles or snowcats—are opening up rugged, unplowed areas in Montana's northwest that only skiers and snowshoers used to be able to explore once cold weather set in.

The new winter sport had its modest beginnings about three years ago, when local residents began working a "cat," which can cost $700 to $1,300, into the family budget. Since then, the popularity of the machines, capable of covering more than 200 miles a day at speeds up to 60 miles an hour, has prompted some dealers to make the cats available on a rental basis. The usual rate is $25 to $35 a day.

SNOWMOBILING ENCOURAGED

The use of snowmobiles by sightseeing families is being encouraged by the National Park Service. U.S. 2, which skirts Glacier Park's southern boundaries, is the only route across the park open during the winter, but this has now taken a secondary position as far as anyone having access to a snowmobile is concerned.

The Park Service has allotted to cat users 70 miles of unplowed roadways on the west side of the park and 30 miles on the east side, as well as all the parking lots used by summer tourists.

"The scenery is outstanding in winter, as well as during the summer," Ruben O. Hart, the park's chief ranger, said the other day. "People are really enjoying themselves."

The people, added Roy Lindsey, a snowmobile dealer living near the park, are of all ages. They range in age from 7 to 75, he said, observing that "adults play with them [the snowmobiles] like a kid with a toy."

UNEXPECTED DELIGHTS

"A new world has been created in the winter months," Mr. Lindsey commented, referring to picture-taking and sightseeing.

As travelers zip along, able to cover about as much ground in an hour as a skier can in a day, they seem to find unexpected scenic delights around every bend.

Rugged peaks familiar to many hiking tourists in the summer have new faces. The crevasses are banked in snow, and silvery waterfalls, which plunge hundreds of feet, become sparkling ice formations. Fragrant pines, the sunsets and the intense blue sky add to the exhilarating feeling of riding through the vast park.

The 50 or so glaciers display as many moods and colors as the ever-changing sea. The mountains of blue ice seem to stand in each other's shadow, looking attractive or eerie, depending on whether they are being viewed in the sunlight of day or the dusk of evening.

While the cats can reach speeds of 60 miles an hour, snow conditions, such as two or three feet of powder, generally keep the machines down to about one-third that amount. Their fuel capacity is about five gallons.

This year, as a result of the growing interest by snowcatters in exploring the park, the Park Service has provided two overnight cabins free of charge.

One cabin, called Packer's Roost, is in a forest clearing on the west side. It contains four folding cots, a wood stove and floor space for about four sleeping bags. The shelter is situated in a scenic pocket of mountains, but travelers are not permitted past the point because of the danger of avalanches.

Views from the cabin include the Garden Wall, a ridge of gouged-out cliffs and jagged peaks that tower majestically over the dense forests. Long ago, Indians used to consider the Garden Wall as the backbone of the world.

On the east side of the park is Sherburne, a rough-hewn cabin that accommodates about five persons. It is situated in comparatively open country midway between Many Glacier and Babb, a town in the Blackfoot Indian Reservation.

FOUR-MILE JOURNEY

"To get the spectacular views," Ranger Hart said, "you take the cat about four miles from the Sherburne cabin to the Many Glacier Hotel. Pretty little Swiftcurrent Lake is there in Many Glacier Valley, with Grinnell Point in the background."

The 220-room Many Glacier Hotel is closed during the winter, as are the other hotels hereabout. The snow in the area does not begin to melt until April or May, and the hotels do not open until June, when the tourist season begins.

Snowmobiles are also used by the Park Service. The unplowed portions of Going-to-the-Sun Road are patrolled by the clumsy, bulky Tucker snowcat that was purchased seven years ago for about $8,000. The cat, with an enclosed cab and four pontoons, is used by personnel measuring snow, observing wildlife and counting game.

Alongside the four modern snowmobiles that the Park Service now also owns, the Tucker looks like an old-fashioned steam engine. The newer cats are used for the same purposes as the Tucker, and also on search and rescue missions. The latter is an added duty that became necessary when family snowcatting began to catch on.

Permits are necessary to operate the snowmobiles in the park, and Ranger Hart reports that their use has increased sharply. Last winter, a total of 94 permits was issued; last December, 46 were granted. The demand for January, February and March was expected to be much higher.

When obtaining a permit, the snowmobiler must list his itinerary. No accidents involving the machines have occurred, but their growing popularity has made some regulations, such as the carrying of certain equipment, necessary.

FREQUENT BLIZZARDS

For example, more supplies may be required on the east side of the park because of the frequency of blizzards. Such things as a map and compass probably would not be insisted upon for a short trip on the west side, where heavily timbered roadways lessen the risk of becoming lost.

Among the items that the snowmobiler may be required to take along—and this is strictly up to the park rangers—are an ax and shovel, a first-aid kit, flashlight, bedding, matches, rations, tools, tow rope or chain, fire extinguishers, skis, poles and snowshoes. Guns are not allowed, since hunting is not permitted.

While big game is plentiful in the park, there is only a remote chance of danger. Persons in snowmobiles may spot moose, herds of elk, startled deer and occasionally, in some areas, a mountain goat, a bobcat, a mountain lion or the fur-bearing pine marten.

On rare occasions, a bald eagle might be seen. Bears, of course, are in hibernation.

DAILY TRAIN SERVICE

To reach the park, the same transportation that is used during the summer tourist season is available, but there the similarity ends. The Great Northern Railroad's Western Star, operating between Chicago and Seattle, stops daily at East Glacier and West Glacier; after that, however, the visitor is on his own.

The red buses, always on hand during the summer to take tourists to the busy hotels are absent, and the depots themselves have a windswept, lonely look.

KOREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Baltimore Sun this morning, entitled "Careful in Korea," which supports the President's diplomatic efforts to avoid rash actions in Northeast Asia to bring about release of the *Pueblo* and its crew, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAREFUL IN KOREA

The incident of the intelligence ship Pueblo has served, among other things, to remind us that there are parts of Southeast Asia other than Vietnam, and that there are friendly regimes besides Saigon's with whom our dealings are touchy and difficult. The Government in Seoul, already worried about North Korean raids before the Pueblo was seized, has since that time felt that the United States in its concern for the ship and the crew was downgrading the seriousness of, for instance, the North Korean attempts to assassinate President Chung Hee Park. The feeling has run high enough for President Johnson to dispatch a special representative, Cyrus Vance, to talk to the authorities in Seoul, for reassurance and for discussion of their security problems.

This kind of preventative consultation is in line with the Administration's careful attitude right now on all matters Korean, including the case of the Pueblo. If Mr. Johnson was tempted toward precipitant action—which incidentally might well have placed the crew in greater jeopardy—he resisted the temptation, and he still resists any temptation to build the incident into a major crisis that might lead to new Korean conflict. It is the wise way. We have already had too many Southeast Asia examples of how hasty action can bring consequences unforeseen.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE MANATOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding men in Government today is a distinguished citizen from Rock Springs, Wyo., Mike Manatos.

Mike has taken over the functions of Larry O'Brien insofar as legislative coordination between the Senate and the White House is concerned.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate knows Mike. He is one of those individuals who do not seek to step out in front but who does his job and does it extremely well.

He is a man for whom I have the greatest admiration. He is devoted to the President of the United States and who gives his all to the job, which is his responsibility.

Mike Manatos is available to Senators at any time. He is a man whom I know as a good coordinator, a man who is well aware of the legislative process and its limitations, a man who knows that there is a distinct line between the White House and the Senate, and a man who is fully aware of the difficulties that such a job and a relationship of that sort can, at times, entail.

An excellent article on this shy and modest man has been published in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo. It is entitled "The Man on Call to Presidents," and is written by James Foster.

The article is sympathetic. It is also accurate, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, so that those of us who, perhaps, do not know Mike Manatos as well as others, will be able to get a better insight into the abilities of this man and a better recognition of his integrity as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHONE RINGS OFTEN FOR WHITE HOUSE AIDE FROM WYOMING: THE MAN ON CALL TO PRESIDENTS

(By James Foster)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—The President is as close as the telephone. It rings often.

The mild-mannered Wyomingite at this end of the direct line is Mike Manatos, administrative assistant to two presidents and one of Rock Springs High School's most distinguished graduates.

As Senate liaison officer, Manatos is President Johnson's chief arm-twister on Capitol Hill. It is his job to grease the skids to get Administration legislation through a sometimes balky congress.

Since Lyndon B. Johnson is considered one of the most effective arm twisters of all time, Manatos knows he is working for a pro. The job, he says with a chuckle, offers both "challenge and satisfaction."

The President may call Manatos from the chief executive's oval office right down the carpeted corridor. Or from Texas. Or from West Germany. Or from Australia.

"There are standing orders around here that the President is always available," the 53-year-old explains, straightening his black, silver and gold stripe tie. "On the other hand, he (the President) has no hesitancy in calling you—and it doesn't make much difference what time it is."

The calls from Australia and Germany came at what would have been the middle of the night there, Manatos recalls. The President wanted to check the progress of some special legislation.

"I asked the President if he didn't want me to wait until morning to call him back but he said 'no,' call him back right away."

IMMEDIATELY

In the LBJ time scheme of things, this means immediately, if not sooner.

"Fortunately I had most of the information he wanted in my head. The rest of it I got quickly and called him back. He was waiting for my call."

The urgency of the presidency also means the phone in the Manatos home will ring at any hour of the night. The White House operator says, "The President is calling," and the next voice on the line is the familiar Texas drawl easily recognized by all Americans.

But, Manatos says, all members of the President's staff are required to operate on a high-octane formula of total performance.

He sums it up simply: "Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have expected total effort. Both have expected results."

Manatos sips coffee and tells with undeniable pride of the events that led him from modest mining town beginnings to the inner sanctum of top Government.

"My father, Nick, was a coal miner. He was a Greek immigrant from the island of Crete. He still lives at Rock Springs. My brother, Tom, is head of the math department at Rock Springs High School."

But the dwindling coal mines offered little attraction for Mike. After high school he came to Washington to attend Strayer's College. He received an accounting degree from George Washington University.

ACTIVE MAN

Active in the Wyoming Young Democrats, Manatos returned to the nation's capital in 1937 as administrative aide to a succession of Wyoming senators: Harry Schwartz from 1937 to 1943, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, 1943 to 1953; Lester C. Hunt, 1953 to 1954; O'Mahoney again from 1954 to 1961 and J. J. Hickey beginning in 1961.

Manatos also had been elected president of the U.S. Senate Administrative Assistants Assn., an honor denoting prestige and experience amid the intricate legislative latticework of "The Hill."

GOT CALL

Within a month after going to work for Hickey, Manatos received a call from Lawrence O'Brien, new postmaster general.

O'Brien, known as "the key legislative architect of the New Frontier," had helped engineer the campaign of the new young Democrat President from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy. O'Brien told Manatos his experience could be put to greater national service as a presidential aide.

"I reported for work Feb. 7, 1961," Manatos recalls. "A couple of days later I stepped into President Kennedy's office to thank him. He shook my hand warmly and said, 'Welcome aboard.' The President then said, 'You've been on The Hill a lot longer than I have. I'll need your help,' and that was that."

Manatos remembers asking O'Brien what the hours of the new job would be. "O'Brien said I could come in any time before 9. He didn't say what time I could leave."

That's the hitch, Manatos came to find out. For members of the Presidential team, the work is never done. Manatos still comes in "any time before 9" and considers himself lucky to get home before 7:30 or 8 p.m. It's a 6-day work week—sometimes 7—although normally he only travels weekends when senators accompany the President to the Texas ranch or elsewhere to hammer out key legislation.

DRAWBACKS

The schedule leaves something to be desired as far as home life is concerned. But, Manatos declares, his wife, Dorothy, a native of American Fork, Utah, and their two children still at home would not ask him to give it up.

Andrew, 22, a student at American University here. Daughter Kathleen, 16, attends public high school. Another daughter, 23-year-old Ann (Mrs. George Hatsis), lives at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Although the Manatos family lives comfortably in the above-average suburb of Chevy Chase, there is admitted contrast in dealing with matters of state and those at home.

"I'm afraid I'm spoiled by this existence," Manatos says, no more than a buzzer away from every type of service. "I'm chauffeured upto the Hill every day in a White House limousine. Then, when I have to take my own car (a 2-year-old Chevrolet) to the garage to have the oil changed I sometimes catch myself thinking somebody else ought to be doing it."

NEAT OFFICE

Manatos' office though small, is nice; the art work blends, the magazines are current and the coffee cups, bearing the White House seal, are clean.

However, on the wall hang two reminders of the precarious pinnacle on which public servants perch.

They are certificates of his appointment under the two Presidents. In fine script they allude to prudence and integrity and other qualities Westerners take for granted.

But then in the last line, Manatos points out with mixed-amusement, is the phrase ". . . for the time being." That means, he explains, that in politics particularly the good guys one day aren't always considered good guys the next day. "That little phrase there on the end," he says, "keeps you on your mettle."

Several times Manatos has "seriously considered" jumping into the political waters. In 1966 his name was widely circulated as a candidate for the U.S. Senate. It would have meant a fight in the Wyoming democratic primary with his boyhood chum, Rep. Teno Roncalio.

HAD BLESSING

Manatos, understandably, had President Johnson's blessing. But in 1960, while Manatos worked for Johnson-backer Sen. O'Mahoney, Roncalio beat the Kennedy drum. The primary fight, therefore, could have reverberated clear to the top of the Democratic organization.

"I finally decided," Manatos says, "that the party or its chances were not best served by having a knock-down, drag-out fight with Teno."

Manatos' fights now are concentrated on Capitol Hill. "I found my greatest challenge—even though I had worked on The Hill for years—was to get acquainted and develop a rapport with senators that assured them I was acting in good faith and that my word was bond. That's the way it has been."

While daily he helps oil the wheels of the democratic process, a singular experience three years ago stands out in Manatos' mind as "the greatest proof of how much democracy has to offer."

BIG THRILL

"The Greek prime minister at that time, George Papandreou, was here for a state visit. The President invited not just me and my wife but asked my father to come all the way from Rock Springs for the state dinner. There you had it—an immigrant from Crete shaking hands with the President of the United States and the Greek prime minister.

"That was the greatest day of my father's life."

After seven years within the aura of the presidency, Manatos says he still senses the awe his father felt that night.

"Sometimes you wonder what you're doing there, but there you are."

And with that, Manatos hurries away to a cabinet meeting.

The President is ready—and never, never kept waiting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEAN ACHESON ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the desire of all thoughtful men today is to find a way to end the fighting and dying in Vietnam and bring about an honorable peace in that wartorn land.

Some of the more strident and extreme voices have called for talks with the Communists regardless of safeguards and conditions. You can, they seem to imply, trust the other side to make peace. Others less extreme, but equally concerned, believe that negotiation is almost an end in itself; that any form of talking is a step toward settlement.

Mr. Dean Acheson, the distinguished Secretary of State during President Truman's administration, disagrees. According to his experience, the Communists see negotiation as war carried on by other means. In a television interview late in 1967 Mr. Acheson discussed the difficulties of negotiating with the Communists through the crises of the postwar years. His list includes Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, the Berlin blockade, and a shooting war in Korea. The Cincinnati Enquirer was sufficiently impressed with the insight and wisdom of Mr. Acheson's remarks to make them the subject of a recent editorial which was also reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor of February 9, 1968.

Mr. Acheson's analysis will not be comfortable reading for those who wish to cut and run in Vietnam. Nor will it be enjoyable for those who wish to end the war by beginning talks regardless of safeguards to ascertain Communist good faith.

Mr. Acheson's view will help those who seek a balanced perspective on this difficult problem. He has walked down this trail before. His wisdom comes from participation and experience.

And Mr. President, Mr. Acheson's thoughts of late last year take on an even greater significance in the light of the savage violation by the Communist forces of a Vietnam Lunar New Year truce this past 2 weeks.

The thousands of civilians dead, wounded, missing, displaced, or homeless in the cities and towns of South Vietnam testify to the ruthless brutality and the latest treachery of the Communist forces.

This then, Mr. President, makes it even more important that we understand the Communist interpretation of what negotiation really means.

Mr. Acheson is an excellent guide to that understanding. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial discussing his remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ACHESON ON NEGOTIATIONS

Only a handful of Americans have had more practical, first-hand experience negotiating with the Communist world than Dean G. Acheson. As assistant secretary of state, as undersecretary, and finally as secretary of state, Mr. Acheson had a prominent part in a succession of east-west confrontations from the early days of the cold war through the armistice negotiations in Korea.

When Mr. Acheson speaks, consequently, of the futility of negotiating with the Communists, his words carry an authority unshared by most of those who have advanced propositions for ending the Vietnam war.

Mr. Acheson is quite correct, we think, in recognizing that Communists and Americans look upon negotiations through altogether different eyes. "With us," he says, "negotiations is a David Harum business in which both parties want to reach a result and each one wants to get a slight advantage in reaching a predetermined result—sale of a horse, end of a war, whatever it may be.

"The Communists," the former secretary of state goes on, "have a Clausewitz idea toward negotiation. Negotiation is war carried on by other means, and what they hope to do in a negotiation is not to bring about a peace but to disadvantage somebody in the course of a war—separate you from your allies, cause you domestic trouble at home, and so forth."

In specific terms, Mr. Acheson recalled that "in all the experience I have had with the Communists, negotiation never preceded a settlement or got anywhere. This was true in Greece. They carried on the operations against Greece until they became unproductive, and then stopped.

"In the blockade of Berlin they went on until it was hurting them more than it was hurting us, and then stopped.

"In the case of Korea, exactly the same thing happened."

In terms of the Vietnamese action, Mr. Acheson is convinced that the fighting will stop when the Communists weary of it and that nothing the United States and its allies can do will hasten the day. Negotiations, certainly, are not the answer.

"Negotiation," he says, ". . . will be a pain in the neck and will get you no nearer to the solution of this matter. In fact, it'll get you further [away]."

It is one of the features of the modern liberal syndrome that negotiation is capable of accomplishing any objective, that there is no end that cannot be reached at the negotiating table. That notion fails to take into account the malevolence of the Communist world; it fails to recognize that Communists, except in extraordinary circumstances and for limited ends, do not want problems solved except through the capitulation of their foes.

These convictions account for the magic that the idea of Vietnamese negotiations seems to hold for a great many Americans. In their eyes, the day that negotiations begin is the day that the war is all but over.

Dean Acheson's credentials as a liberal need no elaboration. That he, despite his ideological commitment, nonetheless sees the fallacy of negotiation ought to give all Americans pause.—Cincinnati Enquirer

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND AND THE RECENT SNEAK ATTACKS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Lunar New Year truce in Vietnam has been savagely violated by the Communists who launched a series of sneak attacks upon the urban areas of South Vietnam during the past 2 weeks.

In the wake of these brutal assaults, some individuals have criticized Gen. William C. Westmoreland, claiming he has misled us with unrealistic and inaccurate reports of progress in 1967.

Mr. President, General Westmoreland, like most of us, has been unable to forecast precisely the actions of the enemy in Vietnam. He has had to deal with the evolution of events in an unpredictable and dangerous environment. He has learned the great risk involved in trying to place evaluations of Vietnam efforts in a time frame.

But General Westmoreland has accomplished a great deal. The Communist attacks have not changed this fact.

To realize how demanding General Westmoreland's task has been, one has only to recall the dark days of January 1965. Vietnam stood on the verge of a total collapse. Communist forces were overrunning the hamlets and villages. The South Vietnamese Armed Forces were stretched to the breaking point.

General Westmoreland's leadership and his support of the South Vietnamese averted the collapse that was so imminent. He outwitted the enemy during this period of weakness and buildup, gaining precious time and creating a new foundation for expanded military and civic operations.

U.S. combat forces arrived. The South Vietnamese forces began retraining and revitalization programs. The war was carried into the jungle sanctuaries of the Vietcong. The Communist grip on the countryside was weakened in many villages and hamlets. Security conditions were created, enabling five elections to be held during 14 months despite all Communist efforts to disrupt or destroy them. The culmination was a constitutional government elected by the people of Vietnam in the autumn of 1967.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that General Westmoreland would take pride in helping to achieve these goals and would so report them to the American people?

The Communists were hurt. Their losses were increasing. They had been unable to win a major battle with our forces since 1965.

In this mood and under a mantle of deceit and treachery, the Communists proposed and then violated a Lunar New Year truce. They struck brutally at the cities of South Vietnam for the first time in the war. They killed, wounded, and made homeless thousands of civilians. They turned city streets into arenas of death and suffering. But they failed to gain the active support of the population in those cities who ignored the Communist call for a general uprising. They failed to break the will and spirit of the retrained and revitalized South Vietnamese Army which fought well following the initial period of surprise and shock. They failed to capture the cities. Their forces were rooted out of the towns they invaded, and the bitter house-to-house fighting is going on in a few places at this very hour. These efforts cost the Communist forces thousands of their best men. These include members of their seasoned underground network within the cities.

Stripped of their dramatic aura, these New Year attacks have not changed the basic equation in Vietnam. The achievements of 1965–67 continue to endure. The South Vietnamese Government at this very moment is engaged in new responsibilities of rehabilitation and reconstruction. Final success or failure in Vietnam will depend upon the outcome of these efforts. For the Vietnamese themselves—the burdens they carry—will determine the outcome of the war.

In short, the Communists have created confusion, and there will undoubtedly be more similar attempts. But they have paid a high price. The Vietnamese people have not lost their will.

The question remains whether those who view these events from vantage points outside of Vietnam will possess the same fortitude. Certainly it is clear that General Westmoreland in all of these crises has served his country and the cause of the people of Vietnam well. One desperate, inconclusive Communist lunge at the cities does not negate these accomplishments, however much the enemy might wish us to so conclude. The days ahead will be critical for the final outcome in Vietnam.

VIEW OF VIETNAM AND AMERICA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an interesting and enlightening view of Vietnam and America presented by the noted historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Albert Schweitzer professor of humanities at City University, New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Forum Opens Debate on Vietnam

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

I write as a Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy Democrat deeply disturbed by the course we are following in Vietnam. I believe that many Democrats across the country share this concern. Indeed, it can, I think be safely said that, if a Republican Administration were pursuing this policy, if a Republican President were deliberately widening a war on the mainland of Asia in the evident determination to impose a military solution on a small Asian country, hardly a Democrat in the land would approve.

Yet, because our own party is in office, we naturally suppose that a Democratic President must be carrying out a Democratic foreign policy; and this supposition reinforces the instinctive sympathy with which any citizen must regard President Johnson as he struggles with complex and formidable problems. We know too that the Administration course is backed by earnest and conscientious men. And the situation is further confused by the apparent conviction with which the Administration insists that it is doing no more than walk in the footsteps of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy. But does this continuity really exist? Closer examination shows, I think, that this Democratic Administration, far from simply carrying forward the foreign policy of its Democratic predecessors, is in fact conducting something much closer to the traditional foreign policy of the Republican Party.

Let us look briefly at the points made by the Administration when it claims to be carrying out a traditional Democratic foreign policy.

(1) *That the Johnson Administration is doing today exactly what President Roosevelt did in the time of Hitler.* This argument implies that we are stopping in Vietnam a threat of global aggression equivalent to the one we stopped a generation ago in Europe and Asia. Is this really so? Does anyone in Washington seriously suppose that Ho Chi Minh and his ragged bands, in North Vietnam, a nation of 16 million people with no industrial base, present a threat comparable to that presented by Hitler? That if Ho were to take Vietnam today, he would be in Singapore tomorrow and in Seattle next week?

Obviously no one in his senses could possibly believe this. Therefore, in order to strengthen a sad case and justify what it has sent young Americans to do, the Administration has begun to argue that we are combatting in Vietnam, in the words of the Vice President, "militant, aggressive Asian Communism with its headquarters in Peking, China"—in short, that Hanoi and the Viet Cong are of interest not in themselves but as the spearhead of a Chinese program of aggression. This is quite a point. Yet the Administration has produced wretchedly little evidence to sustain so vital a proposition.

There is no evidence, for example, that Asian Communism is a unified movement, run out of Peking. Nor is there evidence that North Vietnam has been, is or will be a Chinese puppet. If North Korea, which owes its very existence to Chinese intervention in the Korean War, declares its independence of Peking, how can anyone think that North Vietnam, whose whole history has been shaped by resistance to China, will become the obedient instrumentality of Chinese aggression? As good a probability—unless we succeed in driving the North Vietnamese hopelessly into the arms of the Chinese—is that Hanoi, with its vast Russian support, would resist Mao's pressure, and do so much more effectively than the parade of gimcrack regimes we have sponsored in Saigon.

The Vietnam War simply does not offer evidence of any threat of global aggression comparable to that which confronted Roosevelt twenty-five years ago. The analogy is phoney—and the indication is that we are over-reacting to a local war. As for Chinese aggression, this is thus far a prediction, not a fact. If it should come, the realistic bulwark against China in Asia will be, not the intervention of white men from across the seas in the Westmoreland style, but Asian nationalism, even if local nationalism may sometimes assume a communist force.

(2) *That the Johnson Administration is doing today in Vietnam exactly what President Truman did in Korea.* But a moment's reflection, I submit, shows that Korea and Vietnam are quite distinct cases. For one thing, Korea was a clearcut example of aggression across frontiers. North Korea plainly and indisputably invaded South Korea. There was no civil war in South Korea, no South Korean equivalent of the Viet Cong. The government in Seoul, for all its faults, effectively represented its people. Moreover, this was a war backed by the United Nations, not just a unilateral action by the United States. Most important of all, the Korean War took place when Communism was still a relatively unified international movement—when the extension of Communism meant the automatic extension of Russian power and, given Soviet purposes, an automatic increase in the danger to American security and world peace.

It is very different today. The fighting, for example, originated *inside* South Vietnam; the Viet Cong have held a good deal of the country for nearly a decade. When we started bombing North Vietnam in February 1965, the Hanoi regime, according to our own Department of Defense, had only 400 regular troops south of the border. The United Nations has not backed the war; indeed, many nations have called in the UN for an end to our bombing of the north. Even our SEATO allies decline to give us effective assistance in an intervention which we keep claiming the SEATO treaty renders mandatory. Above all, the row between Peking and Moscow has shattered the Communist world. No one can assume any longer that the extension of Communism automatically means the extension of Russian—or of Chinese—power. Polycentrism has transformed the character of the Communist threat.

So the Korean analogy breaks down too. Moreover, when General MacArthur wanted to escalate the war and carried his argument to the Congress, President Truman fired him. The present Administration, very far indeed from the man from Independence, reverently builds up its pro-escalation generals and sends them on stateside speaking tours.

(3) *That the Johnson Administration is simply carrying forward the Vietnam policy of President Kennedy.* It is presumptuous for anyone to claim to know what President Kennedy would have done about Vietnam had he lived. But we know what he said about Vietnam a few weeks before he died: "In the final analysis, it is their war [the people of South Vietnam]. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam." This implies a profound conviction that to Americanize the war would be, in the most serious sense, to make it unwinnable.

President Kennedy called it "*their* war." President Johnson, on the other hand, calls it "*our* war." Nothing describes more succinctly the difference between their two policies. One policy is to help the South Vietnamese to win their war; the other is for Americans to win it for them. No doubt it has become our war in some sense when in some months more Americans are killed than South Vietnamese are drafted. But can we ever win the war in any abiding sense unless the people of South Vietnam show a will and purpose at least equal to that of Viet Cong? Does the magnitude of our intervention really encourage such will and purpose? Is it not true that the more we do, the less they do? Was not President Kennedy right in suggesting that the war could never be won unless the people of South Vietnam won it for themselves?

These are the reasons why this Democrat at least rejects, with a certain indignation, the bland theory that our present policy of throwing our weight around in Vietnam is nothing more than an easy continuation of the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy approach to foreign affairs. Can any Democrat really see any of these Presidents deferring to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the contemporary manner and righteously ordering the squalid bombing of a small nation far beyond the demonstrable involvement of our own national interest or safety? Would any of these great Presidents have suggested that the future of the world depends on a showdown between himself, and, for heaven's sake, Ho Chi Minh? They had—all of them—too much sense of humor, which means sense of proportion.

It is a little difficult for these reasons to see how the course of the present Democratic Administration can be regarded as just the expression of good old Democratic policy. The record shows, I would think, that the Administration has departed considerably from the creative spirit of the Democratic theory of foreign affairs and has come awfully close to adopting the traditional policy of the Republican party.

Up to the present, every Democratic President in this century has profoundly believed at least three things: (a) that nationalism is a political force of tremendous power, especially in what was once the colonial world; (b) that therefore in dealing with nationalism in the ex-colonial world *military* solutions imposed by white powers are an illusion, and local *political* solutions are a necessity; and (c) that in the longer run nationalism must be contained within a framework of effective international organization. Unfortunately the present Democratic Administration, while paying lip-service to these beliefs, denies each one of them in action in Vietnam.

If any expectation is clearly futile, it is that the armed intervention of white men will determine the ultimate course of history on the mainland of Asia. Yet our Administration's assertion that we are not just a Pacific but an Asian power condemns us to precisely this preposterous adventure. The nostalgic faith in gunboat (now aircraft carrier) diplomacy, the hope that by 'zapping the wogs' we can make them do what we want them to do, the theory that B-52's can liquidate nationalism: these are Republican ideas, not Democratic ideas. Anyone who still believes such things badly needs a course in modern history. At the very least he should take a close look at the film *The Battle of Algiers* (which should be required viewing at the Pentagon). In the long run, nationalism will be irresistible—and all the armed intervention of white men does is to deliver the credit and passion of nationalism to the present beneficiaries of our napalm.

Our party's mode in such matters has been to seek political, not military solutions. That is why Roosevelt did not go to war against Mexico in the thirties; it is why he did his best to prevent the return of Vietnam to France after the Second World War. That is why Truman launched the Point Four program to assist national development in the third world. That is why Kennedy acted with such sympathy toward the new nations. This is the Democratic legacy we are rejecting every time our bombers drop a new load of explosives on Vietnam.

More than this, Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy believed that nationalism had to be accommodated within larger international frameworks. They believed that the safety of our country required friends and allies. They were deeply opposed to 'going it alone'—which is, after all, what isolationism is all about. But the Johnson Administration has made other judgments. Its Vietnam policy has in consequence created doubt of American purpose and mistrust of American power all around the planet. Where Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy sought to work closely with the nations most essential to American security, President Johnson's policy has isolated the United States from our best allies—and at the same time it has also provided an immense stimulus and boon to isolationism within the United States. The disconcerting fact is that a Democratic Administration is 'going it alone' more than any American government has done for thirty years.

We are Democrats. Let us look honestly at what we are doing in, and to, Vietnam. Does this have any serious relationship to what Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy inspired us to think about and care about in the world? Going it alone, primary reliance on military destruction, indifference to political solutions, indifference to world opinion: would any of these great Democratic Presidents have defined this as the foreign policy of our Party? Yet exactly these things constitute the basic elements of the approach to Vietnam which the Republican candidate recommended in 1964 and which the Democratic Administration, contrary to the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy tradition, adopted in 1965.

Now Washington is dominated by the men for whom only military power counts in world affairs: "the Commies don't understand anything else." It is fashionable again, as it was in the heyday of John Foster Dulles, to dismiss and deride considerations of world opinion. The hard-nosed men hold sway.

How naive it all is! The American Presidents who achieved the greatest power in the world, Democrats all—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy—did so precisely because they were idealists as well as realists; because they understood that a fundamental component of national power is the capacity to move world opinion. Nothing is less realistic than the supposition that a $70 billion defense budget contributes more to American world influence than the ability to impress the judgment and touch the hearts of plain people.

"What has America lost," wrote James Madison, another Democrat, "by her want of character with foreign nations; and how many errors and follies would she not have avoided, if the justice and propriety of her measures had, in every instance, been previously tried by the light in which they would probably appear to the unbiased part of mankind." Wilson, Roosevelt and Kennedy knew that national strength had its moral as well as its military dimensions. They conquered the world not through the threat of American arms but through the embodiment of American ideals.

Democrats disturbed over the widening of the war in Vietnam should not feel that they are abandoning the Democratic Administration. It is the Democratic Administration which in this area is abandoning the historic principles of the Democratic Party.

U.S. GOLD SUPPLY LOWEST SINCE APRIL 28, 1937

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on February 8, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York announced that the monetary gold stock of the United States had dropped $100 million in that past week, the lowest point in nearly 31 years.

This puts the gold we now hold at $11.884 billion, below $12 billion and the lowest since April 28, 1937.

The more gold we lose, the more we hear some people say, "What is gold worth anyway" as they concentrate on a new setup—CRU's, or SDR's, or other plans.

Maybe gold is worth as little as some say. But would it not be advisable to have some agreement on the substitute before the United States goes off the gold standard if for no other reason than the fact we have no more gold to sell?

IS KING'S NONVIOLENCE NOW OLD FASHIONED?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Robert C. Maynard, Washington Post staff writer, entitled "Is King's Nonviolence Now Old Fashioned?" the article having appeared in the Post on February 11, 1968.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS KING'S NONVIOLENCE NOW OLD FASHIONED?

(By Robert C. Maynard)

The setting and mood were familiar: the packed Baptist church, the freedom songs, the stirring address that precedes the call to contribute, and then the word: "We have come to redeem the soul of America . . ."

Martin Luther King's mastery of oratory electrified this Nation once and pointed a whole generation of Americans toward the fight for Negro equality. But, at the moment he spoke in Washington last Wednesday night, the task to which he has devoted his life never seemed more difficult.

Dr. King, whose commitment to non-violence won him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1965, now faces the challenge of his career as the leading nonviolent spokesman of this generation on the issue of equal rights.

To dramatize the economic plight of the Negro and to demand Congressional action on a massive scale, he plans to bring some 3000 poor people, most of them black, to camp in and be civilly disobedient in Washington, starting in April.

VOICE OUT OF THE PAST

As he leaned forward in the pulpit of Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, he held the integrated audience spellbound, as he has done so often in the decade of his prominence. The turn of phrase has the rolling cadence that moves and stirs.

But hearing Martin Luther King today is hearing the past—even through it is the future that concerns him, a future which he feels will be born of truly treacherous times for the Negro. He holds tenaciously to nonviolence in a time when much violence surrounds him.

He concedes that times have changed since his ringing "I have a dream for America" speech at the Aug. 28, 1963, March on Washington. He concedes the increasing intractability of whites and the growing anger of blacks.

PRESTIGE ON THE LINE

Despite those concessions, Dr. King and his Sotuhern Christian Leadership Conference have laid their prestige and their resources on the line to bring off the 1968 Poor People's Campaign for Jobs or Income.

There is some fear within the King camp that the campaign, which will have a series of legislative demands, may founder before a Congress unenthusiastic on civil rights and a Nation reacting negatively to the urban violence of recent summers.

The King campaign promises to bring to the city this spring "militant nonviolence" and direct action. Thus, for the first time since the March on Washington, the Capital will become the focus for full-scale civil rights demonstrations.

King's drive is aimed at the national Government, but it comes at the same time as the local organizing drive of Stokely Carmichael, the SNCC black power advocate.

PERILOUS IMPLICATIONS

The city, then, is the focal point for organizing efforts of the two leading black activists of our time. The implications are perilous for the city and for the Nation.

Carmichael, whose public break with the posture of nonviolence is nearly two years old, spent two hours with Dr. King and several of his aides Wednesday evening. Carmichael brought along SNCC's chairman, H. Rap Brown.

The Wednesday meeting was the second encounter of the week between King and Carmichael. They both addressed the newly formed Black United Front on Tuesday evening. It was a session that lasted nearly four hours.

Dr. King is often asked to comment on the possibility that his drive will be taken over by violent elements or *agents provocateur*, bent on embarrassing him and his movement, but he minimizes that danger by saying his main cadre will be "trained in the discipline of nonviolence."

THE THREAT OF FAILURE

That danger, perhaps more than any other, can be smothered. What is a greater peril to King's plans is that nothing will happen. Just nothing. A few thousand poor people, some marchers, a few arrests, congressional condemnation, presidential censure, a bridge stall-in, a hospital sit-in, then nothing. Proof.

If that happens, what becomes of Martin Luther King? What becomes of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference? Most important, what becomes of the nonviolence that Dr. King, almost alone of the great civil rights leaders of the 1960s, still espouses?

Dr. King's present drive could be described as an antiriot drive. He has said often that he is working to save the Nation by showing Negroes that nonviolence can work, can get results for them in their economic plight.

Looking beyond the coming summer, he sees a danger in this country if urban violence continues. To group after group, he has drawn the scenario of what the end of the road of ghetto violence could be: "I see a barbed wire fence around the ghettos, I see us in concentration camps." That, he says, will be the end of the America we know now. "It will be a rightwing takeover, a sort of fascist state."

A fascist state, say many SNCC workers, Carmichael among them, is what America is now. When a policeman beats a Negro and goes free, when a landlord can rent hovels at high prices to Negroes without legal censure, when schools do not educate Negro children and when "crime in the streets" becomes more important than hunger in Mississippi or on the Southside of Chicago, they say, we are living in a society that could quickly and easily become overtly fascist.

Washington SNCC has said it is not ready to reveal its current program.

Whatever that program will turn out to be, the chances are that it will address itself to these conditions in ever more strident tones. The differences between their approach and that of Dr. King promise to be sharp.

Despite those differences, Carmichael and King have apparently come to a common understanding on one point: there will be no public denunciation of one by the other. This, as Carmichael has stressed so often, is the age of Black Unity.

In the weeks since Carmichael began his efforts here, and in the last few days when Dr. King was here, the politics of arranging unity began to emerge.

CARMICHAEL AS CONCILIATOR

Carmichael, whose reputation has been that of a fiery revolutionary, has shown an extremely conciliatory style in bringing together a coalition of civil rights activists and spokesmen of every cast.

How well that coalition hangs together remains to be seen. Doubtless there will be defections, but from quite conventional civil rights activists one hears such comments as:

"For God's sake, let's try to stick together. We can't do anything as Negroes unless we learn to work for some common goals."

Maintaining such a coalition, in the face of past failures, will mean some yielding by representatives of both ends of the equal rights spectrum.

In these early stages Carmichael has shown the manner of someone serious about his task. When stung by criticism from someone in the Negro community, he responds by calling the potential adversary "flesh of my flesh and blood of my blood."

It is still to be discovered whether the blood grows thinner as winter turns into spring and spring into summer.

KING'S APPEAL TO PEOPLE

Dr. King's civil rights ecumenism has been practiced in an interestingly different manner. While he has held some intense confrontations with the black nationalists while he was here, Dr. King—and for that matter his staff—dealt with the whole Negro community with a persistent theme that sounded like this:

"We are here to deal with a serious problem in a sick society. We would like to have your support and understanding, but especially your understanding."

As for coalitions: absolutely not.

From ministers to garbage men, from businessmen to disc jockeys, Dr. King has contacted a wide spectrum of groups. In each, he has said essentially the same thing: the situation is urgent, the Congress won't act without being pressured and the way to mobilize that pressure is by appealing over the heads of Congress to the people.

INEVITABLE COMPARISONS

While King's public exposure in three days here was wide, Carmichael in more than a month has made only a handful of public appearances.

Carmichael has played the role of the intense behind-the-scenes arranger, King has played the public "come-unto-me" role.

Although neither would wish to think that it is so, the fact is that as these two men attempt to achieve their ends, inevitably they will be compared.

King, 39, played a unique role in the civil rights movement: it both shaped him and was shaped by him; the child was the father of the man.

A master organizer of demonstrations, he, and SCLC, dramatized the plight of the Negro in the South as had never been done before. As television journalism zeroed in, Dr. King brought Mississippi and Alabama dramatically into the homes of Americans. He made racism in the South come alive.

FRUSTRATIONS OF SNCC

While that effort was touching Americans outside of the South, there was a different and dirty day-to-day job going on in the backwoods of Alabama's Lowndes and Dallas Counties and in Southwest Georgia. That was the one-by-one job of registering Negroes to vote. It was to this job that SNCC committed itself.

It was here that the frustrations of trying to change local injustice piecemeal turned many SNCC workers from idealists to angry young men and women, convinced by 1966 that the job could not be done the way they were doing it. They emerged from their Southern experience with a belief that the whole society had to be dismantled and rebuilt.

Stokely Carmichael has emerged as the spokesman for that group. At the age of 26, he has become the symbol of an indigenous revolutionary.

Dr. King points to civil rights legislation and other social changes as the signs of success that urge him onward, nonviolently, to "help redeem the soul of the Nation." Carmichael, meanwhile, has found nonviolence and nation-saving wanting. They have brought their vastly different viewpoints to a city that is the seat of government—and two-thirds Negro.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on October 22, 1966, the Senate adopted a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 416—urging the President to direct the attention of world opinion through the United Nations and other appropriate international forums to the denial of and the urgency for restoring the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This month, as we celebrate the 715th anniversary of the statehood of the Republic of Lithuania, it is only fitting that we remind ourselves of this honorable commitment and renew our pledge to seek self-government for these brave and suffering peoples.

Mr. President, long before North America was discovered and permanently settled by Europeans, the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state which for centuries maintained the freedom and safety of millions of eastern Slavs. Independence, however, was not to remain theirs forever. In 1795, Lithuania was annexed by Russia. Numerous attempts to throw off the powerful Russian control failed, as did the Russian attempt to utterly destroy Lithuanian language and culture. The people of Lithuania fiercely resisted, steadfastly maintaining their religion, language, and traditions. During World War I, Russian domination gave way to German occupation. Again, the people resisted oppression to the point that, on February 16, 1918, Germany was forced to give up its illegal occupation, and an independent Lithuanian state, based on democratic principles, was proclaimed. After a brief period of Russian intervention, Lithuania was recognized in 1920 as an independent government. On July 27, 1922, the United States officially recognized the independent Government of Lithuania.

Since that memorable day in 1918, however, Lithuania has been the continuous target of powerful and aggressive neighbors. During World War II this small nation became a pawn in the massive struggle between warring nations. First the Russians, then the Germans, then the Russians overran the countryside, each leaving its tragic mark upon the land. Many Lithuanians fled their native country, thousands more were deported to Siberia, countless others were killed and injured. Since then, Lithuania has been regarded as one of the dependent republics of the U.S.S.R.

Representatives of the American Lithuanian community have long been leaders in the movement to reestablish the independence of their mother country. The Lithuanian World Congress in 1958 unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that Lithuanians "have not accepted and never will accept rule by other nations."

With this background in mind, Mr. President, let us reaffirm our belief in the principle of self-determination and the validity of the claim for Lithuanian independence. Every effort should be exerted to relieve the plight of a suffering people.

Let us also extend our prayers and best wishes to all Lithuanians as they celebrate their 715th anniversary as a nation and the 50th year of its declaration of independence.

CHILDREN AND SMOKING: A PUBLIC CONCERN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Public Health Service has recently issued a pamphlet entitled "What We Know About Children and Smoking." Much of the material included in the report is taken from "Clearing the Air," an article written by Dr. Daniel Horn for the December 1966 issue of the PTA magazine. Dr. Horn serves as director of the National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health.

This document should receive the attention of all who are earnestly concerned with the impact of smoking on health in our society—and it is all the more significant because it deals with smokers under the age of 18 years.

The pervasiveness of smoking among the young is growing at an astounding rate. While adults presently quit smoking at a rate of about 1 million per year, this publication informs us that "young people continue to take up the habit at a rate of 1,500,000 a year."

At another point it is reported that "by the age of 18 about half of the teenagers smoke on a fairly regular basis."

Mr. President, it is my contention that the cigarette industry, through its radio and television advertising, has succeeded in making the practice of smoking seem to the young mind an almost essential step to social acceptance. Indeed, with television sets in 93.4 percent of American households, and with the cigarette industry spending $195 million a year on television advertising, it is increasingly difficult for a child to grow up in America and not become a smoker.

At the very least, we must begin to limit advertising beamed to children and youth which depicts smoking solely as a pleasurable, graceful, and competely "in" thing to do, with not even the slightest allusion to any of the health dangers inherent in the habit.

I am a cosponsor of proposed legislation introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to limit the advertising of cigarettes on radio and television during hours when minors make up a significant segment of the listening audience. I support the bill from no desire to regulate the cigarette industry, but rather from the need to consider the health of youth.

Mr. President, the airwaves of our Nation are a national resource, like rivers and mountains, that belong to you and to me and to every other American citizen. A newspaper or magazine is privately owned and can pursue its own advertising policy, but the communications spectrum above the earth cannot be anyone's private property.

Television and radio stations must receive a public license in order to have the privilege of using this communications spectrum. You and I and every American, through our Government, can stipulate any condition for this license, or even withhold it altogether, for these stations make their money through a public asset and therefore must operate in the public interest. It is not just appropriate, but it is essential, that the privilege of using this public resource be governmentally limited when such use threatens the health of children in the name of profit.

The bill that I support would limit the privilege of these multimillion dollar businesses to advertise their product over public airwaves when that advertising is directed toward individuals—especially children and youth—to lure them into a habit that has been proven beyond all reasonable doubt to be dangerous to their health and happiness.

In a recent issue of the Washington Post it is reported that one tobacco company, P. Lorillard Co., will not renew its television sponsorship of National Football League games in the coming season. In a letter to Senators ROBERT KENNEDY and WARREN MAGNUSON, P. Lorillard Co. stated its intention "to select programs that are not oriented to young people." I happily and enthusiastically applaud P. Lorillard Co. for this acceptance of its public responsibility, and I most earnestly hope that other tobacco companies will follow its commendable lead. Surely, voluntary limitation of advertising by the industry is by far the best solution, but, unhappily, few of the companies have shown a willingness to forgo the profitable youth market.

Yet these are profits that must be forgone, for, as this Public Health Service pamphlet informs us:

> There is no longer any question but that the young people who are now taking up cigarette smoking will suffer more illness and die earlier than those who do not.

When health and even death is the issue, the cigarette industry must cease advertising designed to lure minors into the habit of smoking. And once a child begins to smoke, it is extremely difficult to stop—indeed, it is estimated that only 20 percent of the people who try to give up smoking actually succeed. It is one thing for a man or a woman to make a decision of this importance, but it is another thing for youth and even children to be lured into the habit by "get-em-while-they're-young" advertising.

Barring a more responsive performance by the cigarette industry, the Congress has a responsibility to act on this issue. Action on Senator KENNEDY's bill, S. 2895, is pending before the Committee on Commerce. I will continue to work for the passage of this measure unless the cigarette companies begin, as P. Lorillard Co. has begun, to develop an advertising policy that considers health as well as profit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service's excellent pamphlet entitled "What We Know About Children and Smoking" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT CHILDREN AND SMOKING

(NOTE.—Much of the material in this pamphlet is taken from "Clearing the Air," an article by Daniel Horn, Ph. D., which appeared in the December 1966 issue of *The PTA Magazine*, Dr. Horn, a specialist in the behavior sciences, is director of the National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health, Public Health Service.)

Since the beginning of time, elders have asked the question—why *do* children act the way they do? The question is no easier to answer than the companion question of why elders act the way they do. This is as true of cigarette smoking as it is of anything else.

When the Surgeon General's Report, SMOKING AND HEALTH, was issued in January 1964, a great many parents and teachers saw in it a new argument to use with young people.

The argument went like this:

"We adults began smoking cigarettes before science proved they were as harmful as they are. Now we know better, but it is too late to do anything about it, because quitting cigarettes is so hard. You young people, on the other hand, haven't begun to smoke. You are alerted to the dangers of cigarettes and you have your parents' bad example before you. You can now exhibit your native good sense and not start."

As it turned out, this is not what happened. Several million adult smokers have quit cigarettes since the Surgeon General's Report was issued. Adults are continuing to quit at the rate of about 1,000,000 a year. But at the same time, young people continue to take up the habit at a rate of 1,500,000 a year!

A great deal has been said and written about the difficulties of quitting smoking. Almost nothing has been said about how hard it is for the average child to grow up in our society today and not become a smoker.

IS SMOKING REALLY HARMFUL?

Unfortunately, yes. There is no longer any question but that the young people who are now taking up cigarette smoking will suffer more illness and die earlier than those who do not.

In 1964, the Public Health Service issued its famous report on smoking and health. Three years later it followed this report with a new review of the scientific facts about smoking, "The Health Consequences of Smoking." Here are some of the facts, quoted from this new report:

"Approximately one-third of all deaths among men between the ages of 35 and 60, are 'excess' deaths in the sense that they would not have occurred as early as they did if cigarette smokers had the same death rates as nonsmokers.

"Cigarette smoking is now the most important cause of chronic bronchopulmonary diseases and greatly increases the risk of dying from these diseases.

"Men who smoke cigarettes have a death rate from coronary heart disease 70 percent higher than that of nonsmokers. This increases to 200 percent and even higher in the presence of other known 'risk factors' such as high blood pressure and high serum cholesterol.

"Seventy-seven million days of work are lost each year in the United States which would not have been lost if cigarette smokers had the same rates of illness as nonsmokers.

"A relationship between cigarette smoking and death rates from peptic ulcer has been confirmed, and data now suggest that a similar relationship exists between cigarette smoking and morbidity from this cause."

One of the tragic things about cigarettes is that the earlier the child begins, the greater is the likelihood of illness and early death later on.

WHY DO CHILDREN START?

There have been a number of studies about smoking among children and teenagers. Although these vary in their methods, almost all agree on the following conclusions. There are few smokers before the age of 10 or 12. Exploratory smoking increases rapidly in junior high school and fairly regular smoking begins to get a foothold by the 8th or 9th grade. During high school there is a large increase in the proportion of regular smokers, so that by the age of 18 about half of the teenagers smoke on a fairly regular basis.

The trend in recent years has been a slight decrease in smoking among boys and a fairly steady increase in smoking among girls. The reason is a social one. At one time, smoking was a masculine privilege and was considered unladylike, or worse, for women. This distinction has fallen away with the passage of years and the smoking habits of women have grown closer and closer to those of men.

Studies have shown that the child is much more likely to smoke if his parents and/or his older brothers and sisters smoke, and if his friends smoke. Smoking begins at earlier ages among children who have lower goals, less ability, and who achieve less. But there are exceptions to these general findings—many children of smoking parents do not become smokers, and some children of nonsmoking parents do take up smoking; some high school valedictorians smoke and some high school dropouts do not.

There are four basic questions to ask about smoking behavior. Why does a child consider smoking? What makes him actually begin smoking? What satisfaction does he get out of smoking, once he has started? And finally, what outside factors influence him to continue smoking, or influence him to quit?

Why does a child consider smoking? Unfortunately, probably all children consider smoking at one time or another. Why would they not—in a society where 40 percent of the adult population smokes, where cigarettes are advertised, sold, and used everywhere? The better question probably is what factors go into a child's decision not to smoke? Nonsmoking becomes more attractive when admired adults, or friends, or older brothers and sisters are nonsmokers.

What makes a child begin to smoke? For some children, smoking is a positive choice; others seem simply to drift into smoking. There are many reasons for taking one's first cigarette—exploration and curiosity, a desire to imitate adult behavior, a wish to rebel against authority.

What satisfaction does a child get from smoking? A child usually dislikes smoking when he first begins, and does not get the gratifications which an adult gets from smoking. One has to learn to like cigarettes and it is a long time before one becomes a confirmed smoker. In the meantime, quitting cigarettes is easy.

What factors influence the child? The primary influences are family, friends, teachers, school administrators, health workers in general and physicians in particular. Also important is what the child reads, hears on his radio, and hears and sees on television.

The general climate of acceptability of smoking is probably one of the strongest influences that makes smoking attractive to children. But acceptability, being a social phenomenon, *can* be changed. It has already been changed, for example, among physicians. Large numbers of physicians have quit smoking in the past 10 years or so; the result is that today, smoking at medical meetings is rare, and those who do smoke feel embarrassed. On a smaller scale, the same thing can occur within units such as families, circles of friends, clubs, PTA's or work groups.

WHAT CAN ADULTS DO?

Emphasizing the long-term health hazard of cigarette smoking can be very effective with high school students. One study in Portland, Ore., showed that this approach cut in half the rate of taking up smoking in a single school year. Presumably, it is most effective with youth to whom long-range considerations are already important—who plan to go to college, or prepare for a career.

Clearly, the hazards of cigarette smoking appear different to a 17-year-old boy thinking about taking up smoking than to a 57-year-old man who has been smoking for 40 years. It is difficult for a teenager to imagine being 57, ill, or disabled. Recently, scientists have been learning that disability from smoking may result even at relatively young ages. This may make the hazards of smoking seem more real to young people.

Perhaps what emerges most significantly from a study of smoking behavior of children is the importance of the personal behavior of people who work with children. It is easy to see that smoking by a parent, a teacher, or an adult leader can influence the motivation of youth to smoke, can support the perceptions that might lead to the decision to start, can encourage learning to use the cigarette to handle emotions, and can provide strong environmental support for smoking.

Unlike trying to persuade a child to do something once, like getting a tentanus shot, and unlike trying to teach children to do something always, such as "brush your teeth after every meal," we are trying to get young people to *not* do something forever.

To do this, we must teach children that their actions do indeed have lasting effects upon their lives, that ill-health can be caused by their actions and thereby interfere with their enjoyment of life, that what they do and how they behave makes a difference not only to themselves but also to others who imitate or might imitate them, and that they owe it to themselves as well as to others to maintain good health.

STUDENTS SOUND OFF ON SCHOOL ISSUES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a story by Susan Jacoby, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 13, 1968, entitled "Students Sound Off on School Issues."

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Students Sound Off on School Issues

(By Susan Jacoby)

More than 1000 Washington high school students accepted an unprecedented chance yesterday to tell a top public school official what they think is wrong with the city's educational system.

The students met at McKinley High School at the invitation of George R. Rhodes, new assistant superintendent in charge of junior and senior high schools. It is believed to have been the first time a high-level school administrator has publicly called together a group of students to ask for opinions on how the school should be run.

"The first comment which was made when I proposed having this meeting was 'There's going to be trouble when you get that many students together,' " Rhodes said. "I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone should assume there will be trouble when students get together to talk about anything."

FAMILIAR COMPLAINT

Rhodes, who was the principal of McKinley until his appointment last month, said "the one thing I have learned in my experience as a principal is that if you expect students to react in a favorable manner, they do. I have found it much easier to change the attitude of students than those of teachers and administrators."

Rhodes told the students, "I am giving myself three months to accomplish something in this job. If I can't accomplish anything for you in that time, I will be looking for another job."

Complaints voiced by students at the meeting had a familiar ring. They have been raised by activist students at demonstrations this year in several of the city's high schools.

The students' two major complaints are that they have little voice in school policy decisions and that the quality of academic instruction is poor.

POORLY PREPARED

"We know we are being poorly prepared," said Randolph Robinson, a senior at Anacostia High School. "Many of us do not read adequately or work problems in math accurately. We are not being prepared to compete.

"I speak as a black student, a representative of the 90 per cent majority in the schools. It is too late for those of us who are seniors, but it is time for us to group together. The children who are in the elementary and junior high schools must be taught pride and dignity before it is too late. By uniting, we can help accomplish this."

The students at the meeting made up a diverse group. One student from Coolidge made an unpopular request for a return to the track system, saying that "bright children are being deprived of the opportunity to be in classes with other children who want to learn."

QUESTIONS PREMISE

Replying from the stage, Rhodes questioned the premise that slow students have less desire to learn than faster ones. "I don't think there's a student here who doesn't want to learn," Rhodes said, and was loudly applauded.

Other students were members of the Black Student Union, a new group being formed in several high schools. The Modern Strivers, a group from Eastern High School, wore African dress in observance of Negro History Week.

Rhodes requested the students to return to their schools and organize elections to select representatives for a council "which will serve as a kind of pipeline to me." He said he did not want to spell out the functions of the council "because that should be up to the students."

The entire meeting was orderly, although the influx from other high schools brought the total number of students at McKinley to more than 3500 during the morning.

BUSINESSMEN HEAR KING PLEA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a story by Jean White, Washington Post staff writer, entitled "Businessmen Hear King Plea," the story having appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, February 9, 1968.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Asks Help for Poor: Businessmen Hear King Plea

(By Jean White)

It was obviously an audience that was prospering and not feeling hunger pains, but the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. came to the D.C. Chamber of Commerce yesterday to recruit support for his poor people's campaign.

"We are tied together," he told the Negro businessmen. "The Negro middle class is as much the victim of discrimination as the masses of Negroes."

The only difference, said Dr. King, was that the middle-class Negro—like the businessmen in the audience—"gets just enough to know how long and how far he's been out."

Dr. King, the head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, threw out a broad hint on how his middle-class audience might help the poor people that he will bring to Washington in April for the camp-in.

In Selma, Dr. King recalled the poor Negroes took the marchers into their homes, and then added that his poor people's army may want some "pork chops . . . and a few sirloin steaks."

Dr. King addressed the members of the Negro chamber of commerce at a Dunbar Hotel luncheon as he ended his stay here for a SCLC board meeting to approve plans for his spring mobilization of poor people.

Earlier, he took his appeal for support to Negro ministers, garbage collectors, a mass meeting of Washington Negroes, and a broad spectrum of civil rights leaders.

Before Dr. King spoke yesterday, Theodore Hagens, president of the D.C. Chamber, said pointedly that the "time has come for those who have been apathetic" to join in the Negro cause.

No longer, he said, can such people stand idly by and allow people like SCLC "to take all the blows and knocks."

Dr. King drew on the Biblical parable of Dives, the rich man, and Lazarus, the poor man, in his speech to the Negro businessmen.

"Dives did not go to hell because he was rich," the Negro leader emphasized. "He went to hell because he passed Lazarus every day and didn't see him. Dives went to Hell because he was a conscientious objector in the war against poverty."

As for the tactics of the poor people's campaign, Dr. King again pledged it would be "nonviolently conceived and nonviolently executed."

He brushed aside any talk of shutting down the Pentagon or Congress with a "we're-no-fools," statement.

But he then added: "We're sure going to plague Congress. And we are experts in plaguing."

In Congress yesterday, Sen. Spessard L. Holland (D-Fla.) called on Government leaders to give the SCLC leader notice that laws will be enforced during his planned massive demonstration.

DEATH OF RABBI ELIEZER SILVER, OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Ohioans, especially in the area of Cincinnati, were saddened by the death on Wednesday, February 7, 1968, of Rabbi Eliezer Silver.

My contact with Rabbi Silver began about 15 years ago, while I was Governor of Ohio, and throughout our friendship I was always stimulated and inspired by his noble character. He was dynamic and at times humble beyond description. He was possessed of a fine sense of humor; and in the midst of discussions, he displayed firmness of character. He was able to lessen tensions by his keen wit.

In 1907, he came to the United States from Lithuania. During his life in our country, he had the extraordinary privilege of conferring with Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, and with Vice President Alben Barkley.

In addition to his religious leadership, Rabbi Silver was deeply interested in education.

During World War II, his major activity was the bringing of aid to the Jewish victims of Hitler's oppression. During the war, he helped to save thousands of Jews from the extinction that was certain to be their lot from Hitler's hands.

Surviving Rabbi Silver are his wife, Mrs. Pearl Silver; and two sons and two daughters.

With his family, his friends, and the members of his congregation, I mourn his passing.

WHY AMERICANS SHOULD FLY U.S.-FLAG AIRLINES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there is a simple way all Americans can help the Nation's travel deficit—fly U.S.-flag airlines whenever possible.

Government employees and businessmen alone could contribute greatly to correcting the imbalance in the country's international travel account by flying U.S. airlines, because they make up a considerable number of the passengers who take trips abroad. But all Americans—tourists, military personnel, persons visiting relatives—could also help cut this deficit if they planned their overseas visits to include transportation on U.S. planes or ships.

The case for flying U.S.-flag airlines has been well documented in two articles by Columnist Sylvia Porter. Miss Porter is to be commended, not only for her perspicacity and patriotism in calling for her fellow Americans to fly U.S. carriers overseas in the first column; but also for her perseverance in the second article, in which she pursued her argument in the face of criticism of her views from spokesmen of foreign-flag airlines.

Perhaps some of the U.S. airlines—in addition to Trans World Airlines—could communicate some words of encouragement to Miss Porter.

Mr. President, one of the first voices heard on this matter was the voice of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. In a letter dated January 3 of this year to Commerce Secretary Alexander B. Trowbridge, Senator MAGNUSON suggested that the Government, "as the largest user of transportation facilities," do its utmost to encourage the use of U.S.-flag transporation. He also pointed out the "potential balance-of-payments advantages" to be realized by the utilization of U.S.-flag carriers.

If proposed efforts to increase tourism to the United States are successful—and we hope they will be—foreign carriers will enjoy greatly expanded load factors. Europeans historically have shown a spirit of nationalism by flying their national carriers, often not evidenced by our American citizens. We should do all possible to urge our citizens to do likewise.

Of course, that portion of the deficit attributed to international pleasure travel is only a part of the $3.5 billion to $4 billion imbalance in U.S.-international accounts expected for 1967 by President Johnson.

I believe that if Americans are urged voluntarily to fly U.S. airlines, much will be done to keep this deficit under control.

The potential is there: 59 percent of the people flying overseas from the United States are American citizens, but only 44 percent of this traffic moves on U.S. airlines; 74 percent of the North Atlantic passengers are American residents, but only 41 percent of this traffic moves on U.S. aircraft. More than 2 million American citizens live abroad either in the military or in civilian status—excluding Vietnam, Canada, and Mexico; but only 35 percent fly U.S.-flag carriers.

Two out of every three dollars spent on foreign-flag aircraft contribute to the U.S. gold outflow. This part of the outflow could be cut in half if that traffic were on U.S. planes. If Americans flew U.S. airplanes as much as they flew foreign-flag aircraft, the United States would increase its gross revenue from international travel by $180 million.

This problem is one that is serious and growing. The administration is anxious to alleviate the overall deficit; and Congress is currently studying proposed solutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles by Miss Porter, and also the letter of January 3 from the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Senator MAGNUSON, to Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Jan. 9, 1968]

HOW TO CLOSE THE TRAVEL GAP

(By Sylvia Porter)

The passport office at Rockefeller Center was almost as crowded last week as at the peak of the summer tourist season. I had gone to check the responses of these obvious overseas tourists to President Johnson's call for a reduction of $500 million a year in our travel outside the Western Hemisphere.

"It does seem funny to be getting a passport today," said one embarrassed man. "But I'm in the shoe business and I must personally see our suppliers in Rome."

"My husband travels to Europe on an average of once a month and I'm not going to sit back alone." said a middle-aged lady. "A tax on my travel? My husband will pay it."

"My Christmas present from my parents was a summer vacation in Switzerland," said a charming coed. "I don't want to seem unpatriotic, but what difference could my little trip make?"

If these are typical attitudes—and I fear they are—cooling the boom in U.S. tourism overseas will be an enormously difficult task.

Nevertheless, the central fact is that we as tourists are now spending $2 billion more a year abroad than foreign tourists are spending here. This is deficit of crisis magnitude.

Let's get this point very straight now. No matter what we do, we will be criticized. If you visit Santa Fe instead of Seville this summer, the Spanish government will complain that its economy is being unfairly depressed. If you travel on a U.S. airline instead of on a foreign flag carrier, the foreign carrier will insist that unless it earns your dollars, it will not be able to buy U.S. aircraft and everybody will be hurt. There's no easy way out.

But it's a matter of priorities. Assuming that you want to do your part to help save the dollar, here's what you can do:

If you are like the college coed, consider switching your trip to somewhere in North or South America or other approved areas this year.

If you are scheduled for Europe, try to go on a U.S. airline or steamship and make your reservation through a U.S. agent. This will give your dollars to U.S. firms.

If you do go abroad, hold down your spending. Don't load up on goods for which there are U.S. counterparts at home.

If you are a member of a trade organization which holds international meetings, request your officers to schedule the next convention in the U.S. We now play host to less than 10 per cent of the 800 international conventions attended by U.S. citizens each year. This is a ridiculously small percentage. If we could raise it only to 25 per cent, we could cut our balance of payments deficit a minimum of $60 million a year.

If you are like the man in the shoe business, consider bringing your overseas representative to the U.S. for meetings instead of going abroad yourself. The U.S. Travel Service has been trying to promote this through its "Busivisit" program.

If you are in the travel business, start pushing the "See the U.S.A." and "Discover America" programs as never before. These are fine slogans, but so far there has been scant industry-wide cooperation to back them up and even less coordination between private industry and the government.

If you have friends, relatives or acquaintances overseas, encourage them to visit your country, and remember every $1 spent on travel here becomes as much as $3 as it moves through the economy. Every travel dollar is a new dollar, all "plus."

It will be weeks before we know what tourist restrictions Congress will vote and when they'll take effect. But all on our own, we could help close the travel gap. We could do it just by using the above guides to our . . . actions this year.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 1, 1968]

UNDER WHAT FLAG?

(By Sylvia Porter)

Even when scheduling a trip overseas, you can help close our huge tourist gap, I wrote in a recent column, merely by trying to "go on a U.S. airline or steamship and trying to make your reservation through a U.S. agent." It was a simple, single sentence—only one of several suggestions, but it inspired an extraordinary volume of letters.

Among them was one letter from Gordon Gilmore, vice president of Trans World Airlines, and another from S. Ralph Cohen, assistant to the president of Scandinavian Airlines System. Both men are friends of mine and also of each other.

Said TWA's Gilmore, after paying my column a heady compliment: "You hit the nail squarely on the head."

Said SAS's Cohen, after a "more in sorrow than in anger" introduction: "In point of fact, the European airlines bring almost twice as much money into this country as they take out. In 1966 alone, their expenditures in this country were $416 million, as against sales of $213 million. Your plea to Americans not to travel on foreign-flag airlines can only penalize American aircraft workers, American travel agents, American banks and investors, and even American newspapers and magazines."

Since I obviously do not want to penalize any of these groups, I must pursue the question: which of these is correct? Since you, the American tourist, would obviously be making the choice all on your own, the question you also must pursue is: Would you be helping or hurting your country's balance of payments in this emergency by favoring U.S. carriers?

To start with, a fundamental generalization is essential. Because it holds the key to the whole debate. Specifically, the red ink in our international accounts soared to crisis totals toward the end of 1967. A continuation of this level of deficits would be intolerable, for it would invite qualified foreign holders of dollars to turn them in for our gold to protect themselves against a cheapening of the U.S. dollar in terms of gold. It would signal the undermining, if not the destruction, of the international monetary system which has fueled the free world's post-World War 2 expansion.

We must dry up that red ink and as long as Asia is such a drain, we must seek to plug other leaks. One enormous leak lies in the $2 billion more that U.S. tourists spend abroad than foreign tourists spend here. A quick way to help plug this leak is by paying our dollars to U.S. firms when we do travel abroad. This is the fundamental. Now to continue:

The implication of Cohen's statistics is that every $1 you spend with a foreign flagship somehow creates an immediate net inflow of almost $2 to the U.S. This is clearly absurb on the face of it.

What Cohen actually is dramatizing is the benefit the U.S. gets from purchases of U.S. aircraft by foreign airlines. This, though, is a long-range payments benefit, and we are faced with an immediate payments crisis. Gilmore brings up the additional point that "a substantial proportion, TWA estimates over half, of the aircraft purchased by European carriers are for service over routes remote from the U.S. and among whose passengers U.S. ciitzens are very limited."

In short, U.S. planes are purchased for these routes because the planes are superior to competitive types and for no other reason. Thus, the requirements for the U.S. planes would be only marginally reduced by a shift of some U.S. citizens from foreign to U.S. carriers during the current emergency.

A more reasonable perspective on the immediate impact of choice of flags comes from a 1965 Civil Aeronautics Board survey. According to the CAB's figures, when a U.S. resident buys a $300 round trip ticket to London on a foreign flag carrier, about $100 remains in the U.S. to cover port expenses (fuel, station costs, advertising, landing fees, payrolls, etc.) The net deficit to the U.S. is 200. When he flies on a U.S. carrier, about $200 stays here. The net deficit is cut in half to $100.

Any permanent preference for U.S. flagships would be a retreat to economic isolationism which Gilmore finds abhorrent as I or any trade liberal would.

Even now, during the payments emergency, you can choose the flag you wish, without fear of censure. Nearly 60 per cent of transatlantic travel is via foreign flag carriers, incidentally.

But I submit that the safeguarding of the U.S. dollar is the basic goal now. We should hardly be condemned for trying to help temporarily favoring the U.S. flag.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of January 1, 1968, concerning the President's statement of that day outlining a program designed to enhance our balance of payments position.

Although I shall carefully scrutinize the various provisions of the program and look forward to subsequently discussing each of them with you, there is one aspect which came to me immediately upon a reading of the President's statement—that is the great importance of utilizing American flag ocean and air transportation facilities. With an ever-expanding trade horizon, the potential balance of payments advantages to be realized by utilization of American flag carriers becomes increasingly clear. As you know, our American Merchant Marine is now carrying only 7% of our foreign water-borne trade, and surely there is a pressing need for substantial improvements in this area. However, as President Johnson has stated previously with respect to the American Merchant Marine: "Even at its present level, it earns or conserves almost $1 billion of foreign exchange every year, making it a major factor in our balance of payments position."

While not all within or without government have always viewed the importance of utilizing American flag transportation facilities with the same degree of conviction that I hold on this matter, I believe that the present circumstances clarify the appropriatness of such a policy. Surely the government as the largest user of transportation facilities can do much to encourage use of American flag air and ocean carriers, particularly through appropriate action by the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Agency For International Development, and the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce.

I shall be in communication with you further about the various aspects of the President's program, but I did want to call this one matter to your attention at the outset.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT OF AFL–CIO SUPPORTS U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a great deal of concern exists over the longtime failure of the Senate to act in the important area of human rights.

As I speak again today to urge the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, and Political Rights of Women, I refer to a statement by Jacob Clayman, administrative director of the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department. It was made at the Dodd subcommittee hearings last spring and is worthy of recall. He said:

> There's a concern among workers that our nation assume its rightful role as a world moral leader. There is a deep commitment in the American labor movement to the thesis expressed by the late President John F. Kennedy who profoundly observed that the United States: "Cannot afford to be materially rich and spiritually poor."

Mr. Clayman also declared:

> 15 years, 16 years, is a long time to wait for the ratification of any agreement or convention. The long lapse of time, has, I am afraid, blurred our memories and obscured the issue and dulled our conscience. There have been times in our history when the Government has needed prodding or intervention from citizens and citizens' organizations.
>
> There is an almost Alice in Wonderland unreality to the Senate's magnificent speedy approval of the United Nations Charter and the Senate's snail-like pace on the United Nations Human Rights Conventions.

He made mention of the Senate taking only 33 days to approve the U.N. Charter and remaining immobile on the matter of genocide for almost 18 years.

Mr. Clayman's statement was an accurate gage of events and ironic inaction.

We are still immobile, despite the fact that five American Presidents have pointed out the fundamental interrelation between this country's national interests and human rights.

I feel that our adherence to these Human Rights Conventions can make a very real contribution to the basic national interest of the United States.

NEGRO OFFICIAL HITS ALL RACIAL BIGOTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Richard Homan, entitled "Negro Official Hits All Racial Bigotry," the article having appeared in the Washington Post of February 9, 1968.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME CURBS DEFENDED: NEGRO OFFICIAL HITS ALL RACIAL BIGOTRY

(By Richard Homan)

ANNAPOLIS, February 8.—A Negro state senator active in civil rights movements, sharply disputed today a charge by another Baltimore Negro leader that campaigns against crime in the streets are "war on the black community."

Sen. Clarence M. Mitchell III (D-Baltimore) described such charges as "hatred and bigotry" by Negroes, coming from the "voices of irresponsibility."

"I happen to be a part of that black community and I do not see efforts to curb crime as war on it," Mitchell told the Maryland Senate.

He also accused news media of accepting upstart dissidents as community leaders.

Mitchell is one of two Negroes in the Maryland Senate, which still numbers several arch conservatives among its members.

COMPLIMENTED BY JAMES

The grumbles customarily reserved for civil rights speeches, especially those by Negroes, greeted his opening remarks, but when senators caught the drift of his talk, there were murmurs of approval.

"The senator's remarks were well taken," Senate President William S. James commented when Mitchell ended.

Mitchell, 28-year-old scion of a family active in civil rights organizations for decades, said he was referring to an article in Baltimore papers today.

It quoted Robert B. Moore, described as head of the first Baltimore office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, as saying that crime wars announced by President Johnson and Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro mean "war on the black community."

Moore was quoted as adding: "The police are the enemy of the black community. Talk of more policemen is not going to ease tension in the black community."

"The time comes for responsible voices to answer the voices of irresponsibility," Mitchell said. "To remain silent is to become a party to what they do.

"We must condemn the voices of bigotry and hatred, no matter what the color of the skin. These voices of irresponsibility preach the same kind of bigotry and hatred that we have fought on the other side for so long."

STRANGER TO MITCHELL

Mitchell said that the press "has a responsibility not to give play to these voices of irresponsibility, who in fact have no following in our community. I had never heard of Robert Moore until I read the paper today.

"I and the other members of the Negro community would like to reserve the right to determine our own leadership.

"This kind of thing is what has given impetus to the Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels. They are not the voice of the total community. They are the voices of the disgruntled."

Mitchell said that his community "can work with the police department. We know it has faults but by and large it is a good department."

MEMORIAL AT SPRINGFIELD, OREG., TO HONOR AMERICAN DEAD OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, one of the Nation's first memorials to the men of our Armed Forces who died in the Vietnam war was dedicated recently in Springfield, Oreg. This war memorial was created in large part through the efforts of Mr. Don LeBeau, a member of the Springfield Post No. 40 of the American Legion. I desire to take time today to commend Mr. LeBeau for his work to honor the American dead of the Vietnam war. I pray that this memorial—and others like it in other parts of our land—will remind all Americans of the conflict and of the men who gave their lives; and that it will help to bring to an end all wars.

I ask unanimous consent that an Oregon Legionnaire story about Mr. LeBeau and the memorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD LEGION VETERAN'S DREAM IS NEARING FULFILLMENT

Springfield is looking forward to dedication of a unique memorial to Viet Nam veterans of the area. It will be the first in Oregon.

Conceived, promoted and largely constructed by the determined efforts of one concerned Korean war veteran and Legion member (Springfield Post No. 40), the new structure awaits the finishing touches of volunteers, a formal dedication date and invitations to state dignitaries, including Gov. Tom McCall.

Located in the northeast corner of Willamalane Park, near the intersection of Mohawk Boulevard and I Street, the memorial is a vision of Don LeBeau, a Springfield barber whose almost single-handed efforts have borne fruit.

BOYS NOT FORGOTTEN

"It seemed to me that we needed something like this to let the boys know we haven't forgotten them," the Korean veteran stated. "The memorial neither endorses nor condemns American policy in Southeast Asia. It is only an attempt to let our servicemen know we are behind them whether we favor the war or not," LeBeau said.

Adjutant Jack Larson of Post No. 40 is acting as liaison officer with LeBeau in all projection for the memorial. Larson stated that LeBeau has been "most active" in Portland No. 40. "In fact, he single handedly created the float for the Portland Rose Parade two years ago and won first prize for Springfield with his float, known as "The Donkey Serenade."

POST DONATES FOUNTAIN

Larson also reported that Post No. 40 Auxiliary donated $150 for a drinking fountain at the memorial. Total cost of the project will be about $500 with much of the labor and materials donated.

The project includes an etched, angular concrete base, flagpole surrounded by a raised flower bed, five-foot rock wall along the back edge of the memorial, with three sections containing plaques listing Viet Nam veterans and a marble slab containing Springfield those who have died.

"I'd be very happy if we never have to engrave another name in the marble slab," LeBeau asserted.

VETERANS AIDED

LeBeau presented his plans and received approval of officials on Sept. 26. Mayor John McCulley broke ground for the project on Oct. 18. Negotiation to obtain two old cannons to be placed on each side of the flag pole from the U.S. Arsenal, Rockland, Ill. was a factor delaying dedication of the memorial. Upon learning that the cannons were not immediately available, LeBeau has decided to go ahead with dedicatory ceremonies as soon as possible.

HAIPHONG—KEY POINT IN VIETNAMESE CRISIS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Haiphong—Key Point in Vietnamese Crisis," published in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of February 11, 1968.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAIPHONG: KEY POINT IN VIETNAMESE CRISIS

Pessimism concerning the prospects for achieving the objectives of the United States in South Vietnam is being encountered on nearly every hand. Events of the past two weeks have shocked the nation. In particular, Americans are wondering whether the South Vietnamese themselves will make the effort necessary to win the conflict that has been raging in their country for years.

Nearly all U.S. correspondents in South Vietnam appear to feel that the massive Viet Cong attacks on dozens of cities throughout the land could never have been so successful without the passive or active assistance of many thousands of South Vietnamese.

Peter Arnett, the veteran Associated Press correspondent whose dispatches have been unusually reliable over the years, wrote in this newspaper on Feb. 7 from Saigon:

"Observers foresee a major reassessment of tactics forced upon the U.S. military high command in Vietnam, particularly in view of the now proven vulnerability of major population centers and administrative capitals."

Arnett quoted the unfortunate appraisal issued by General Westmoreland in late December concerning "the improved attitude of the people," and his statement that "everywhere I go I note a feeling of optimism."

This is grim reading, in view of what has happened—a hole blasted in the wall of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, the embassy almost successfully seized, and devastating attacks launched by the Viet Cong in all parts of the country.

Apparently the only important commentator (excepting only BARRY GOLDWATER) who sees something encouraging in all this is Joseph Alsop. Paradoxically, Alsop has been extremely bullish on Vietnam for years, while hanging crepe all over the map in nearly every other area of the globe. He seems to think that General Giap and the Viet Cong suffered a great reverse in their massive assault on cities and towns, and says:

"In any war, when one side hazards a high proportion of long-hoarded near-irreplaceable resources, and suffers fearful losses as the main reward, the result must be accounted a serious defeat."

Maybe so, maybe so. But while Giap's forces did sustain large casualties, it is greatly to be feared that they launched the offensive knowing that heavy losses were inevitable, while reasoning that the total disruption of the enemy's (our) pacification timetable would be worth it.

One of those who sees no ground for cheer is Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., who told the Senate on Thursday:

"The series of coordinated Viet Cong attacks against American bases throughout Vietnam, the overrunning of a U.S. Special Forces camp by a North Vietnamese tank company, the massing of a North Vietnamese division south of Da Nang, and the menacing buildup of North Vietnamese forces around Khe Sanh bring new urgency to the question of shutting off supplies going to the enemy through the . . . port of Haiphong."

Senator Byrd points out that the joint chiefs have been urging the President for months to shut off the shipments of gasoline, shells and antiaircraft missiles from Russia that have been pouring through that port.

The Times-Dispatch recommended last summer that several old ships loaded with cement be sunk in the channel leading to Haiphong. But all such proposals have been ignored, and nothing effective has been done to stop the deadly flow of supplies to our enemies.

U.S. forces in Vietnam are now heavily on the defensive, and it is necessary that something be done at once to change the picture drastically. Senator Byrd is right. Let's stop the lethal traffic into Haiphong.

DEATH OF REV. DANIEL A. POLING

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Dan Poling, a native son of Oregon who became one of our country's foremost spiritual leaders, died last week at Philadelphia at the venerable age of 83. He was most highly esteemed and greatly beloved by countless numbers of citizens; his life was long and good. I know him well and enjoyed a long friendship with him. His letters were wonderful; his visits a joy. We all greatly mourn his passing, but we will remember his fine face and his labors to bring kindness and goodness and peace to every man. We will remember Dan Poling's preaching and we will remember that he put into practice what he preached.

He was active. He was gallant. He fought the good fight as he saw it and tried his best to bring together those of different religious convictions. Little more than a week ago he spoke at the Interfaith Chapel of the Four Chaplains. Dan Poling has died, yes, but his spirit and his good works will be with us for generations to come.

Mr. President, I should like to review some of the highlights of the life of the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, a fellow Oregonian by birth, who served more than 50 years as a leader of the American Protestant movement. These words would have been uttered in the Chamber last Friday, but I have postponed my remarks until today, since the Senate was in adjournment during the past 5 days, and the RECORD, therefore, was not published.

Dan Poling was born in Portland, Oregon, on November 30, 1884. He was the son of Charles C. Poling, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, and Savilla Ann, one of the first women evangelists in the American West. He was graduated at the head of his class from Dallas College—now defunct—Dallas, Oreg. He then moved on to Lafayette Seminary, in Oregon, and then to Ohio State University, where he finished his theological training. Dan worked as a lumberjack, a newspaper reporter, and a farmer before he began preaching in his first parish, in Canton, Ohio. He was pastor at Marble Collegiate Church in New York from 1923 to 1929 and then served abroad with the International Society of Christian Endeavor.

He was a leader of the prohibition movement and, in fact, ran as a prohibitionist in 1912 in Ohio as a candidate for governor. He served as the temporary chairman of the Prohibition National Convention in 1916. When World War I began, Dr. Poling served in France with the American Expeditionary Forces. He was gassed in battle. When the war ended, he remained in Europe to aid families hurt by the war.

The Rev. Dr. Poling was in and out of politics but always drew a sharp line between political and church activities. He believed in separation of church and state. He practiced separation of church and state.

He believed, too, in hard work and followed a schedule which would have left many men behind him. He wrote sermons, he wrote letters, he wrote books, he wrote essays, he wrote novels; and he served for more than a quarter of a century as editor of the Christian Herald. He believed in physical fitness and kept himself in excellent condition throughout his life.

He believed that the mission of the Protestant church was "not to change society, but to change men and women who will then do the changing of society." I should like to quote another famous expression of Dr. Poling's. Dan Poling believed that the whole story of the life of Jesus Christ could be summed up in these words:

> He went about doing good.

Dr. Poling advocated our participation in World War II and said we must win the war before we could win the peace.

It was during World War II, in 1943, when his son, Clark, a chaplain, joined three other chaplains who gave their life jackets to men who had none and then went down with their ship. Dan Poling later wrote of this tragedy and said that the four chaplains gave all of us who survived the war another fighting chance to turn victory into permanent peace.

Dan Poling had strong views on world events. He expressed his views clearly and cogently and consistently; and he listened to those who did not share his views.

The Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, native of Portland, Oreg., was a man who did the very best that he was able to do.

God bless you, Dan Poling.

We will miss you; but your works and your spirit will endure. Rest in peace.

ESCOBEDO IS CONVICTED AGAIN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch recently published a most pointed editorial concerning Danny Escobedo, the criminal whose name is now enshrined in our legal records because the U.S. Supreme Court recently decided to void his murder conviction on the ground that he had not been permitted to consult his attorney prior to making a confession to police.

Subsequently, Escobedo was arrested again, this time by the FBI on the charge of selling narcotics.

According to the Herald-Dispatch:

> Presumably Escobedo was carefully informed . . . that he could have a dozen lawyers if he wanted them. They couldn't shake the evidence carefully gathered by the FBI.

The editorial further pointed out:

> We don't know how many drug addicts Escobedo served or enslaved in the years when he should have been in prison, but it is likely that some of these unfortunate victims would be free of the habit today if Danny Escobedo had been where he belonged.

I fully concur in the Herald-Dispatch's sentiments and ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Escobedo Is Convicted Again," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ESCOBEDO IS CONVICTED AGAIN

An infamous name flipped back into the nation's crime news this week when Danny Escobedo was found guilty in a federal court in Chicago on four counts of possessing and selling heroin.

Escobedo made legal history in 1964 when he appealed to the United States Supreme court from a murder conviction on the ground that he was not permitted to consult an attorney before stating that he had killed his brother-in-law.

The court overturned the conviction and Escobedo was turned loose—to become a suspect in several other crimes before finally getting caught on dope-peddling charges last year.

Escobedo and Daniel Aguirre, who was also convicted on charges of trafficking in narcotics, were accused of selling dope to an FBI agent. The government produced tape recordings of conversations between the agent and the alleged "pushers."

Presumably Escobedo was carefully informed this time that he could have a dozen lawyers if he wanted them. They couldn't shake the evidence carefully gathered by the FBI.

This doesn't prove anything much except that the Escobedo rule, like the Mallory Rule discussed here yesterday, has made police work infinitely more difficult. Restrictions on police, caused by the necessity of obtaining a lawyer for a suspect at any hour of the day or night, delay investigations of crimes and the interrogation of suspects. Sometimes these delays permit other suspects to get away and important evidence to be destroyed.

We don't know how many drug addicts Escobedo served or enslaved in the years when he should have been in prison. But it is likely that some of these unfortunate victims would be free of the habit today if Danny Escobedo had been where he belonged.

INVESTIGATION OF THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the interest of permitting the President to conduct his negotiations for the release of the *Pueblo* with the greatest freedom of action, I have purposely delayed any prior request to investigate the circumstances surrounding the ship's seizure.

However, in the weeks that have elapsed since the ship was taken, it has become apparent to me that any initiative that the Senate might take regarding the actual incident would not adversely affect the measured steps now being pursued by the President.

Accordingly, I believe that it is a duty to my constituents and to the general public, who have repeatedly asked me for explanations of certain aspects of the *Pueblo*'s seizure, to formally request a thorough investigation of the *Pueblo*'s seizure. I have therefore sent a letter to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
February 13, 1968.

Senator John Stennis,
Chairman, Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In the weeks since the seizure of the USS Pueblo by North Korea, several aspects of the affair appear questionable, and warrant investigation to uncover certain shortcomings in our defense policies. These are separate considerations from the current effort by the Executive branch to obtain release of this ship and crew. In my opinion the following military points are pertinent:

1. The fighting man's code of conduct. Article II of this code is as follows:

"I will never surrender of my own free will. If in command I will never surrender my men while they still have the means to resist."

Some doubt has arisen as to the instructions given the commanding officer of the Pueblo, and whether these instructions conflict with the code of conduct mentioned above.

2. The absence of air power, Naval escort, or even the simplest form of emergency plan for military support of the Pueblo.

3. The failure of the entire chain of command to send help or instructions to the Pueblo during the crisis.

4. The apparent requirement for military commanders to obtain clearance from the Executive branch at the seat of the government before making a military response in an emergency.

5. The inability of our Armed Forces to react quickly with force in the Sea of Japan at the time of the incident. This reflects an unhealthy military condition of readiness and indicates an apparent world-wide drawdown of men and equipment in order to conduct the Vietnam War.

In my opinion it is well within the responsibilities of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to look into these aspects of the case. Further, I believe that this investigation can be conducted without adversely affecting any negotiations being conducted by the President.

I trust that you will deem it advisable and in the best interests of the nation to undertake a complete investigation of the Pueblo incident with specific reference to the points that I have raised above.

With kind regards and best wishes,
Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond.

THE LONDON ECONOMIST VIEWS SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, sometimes it does us good to look at our situation as others see it. In its February 3 issue, the excellent British journal, the Economist, looks at the big battle shaping up in Vietnam, including the recent Vietcong attacks upon the cities and towns of the south.

General Giap has set it rolling, observes the article in the Economist. His purpose, it concludes "is to force a settlement before it is too late." Too late, that is, for the North Vietnamese and their Vietcong allies.

> The confrontation now taking place could well be decisive—

Says the Economist—

> because President Ho and General Giap know the score.

So the Economist infers that the very possibly decisive battle at Khe Sanh could decide not only which side will have the upper hand militarily, but in peace talks as well, for it remains obvious to the Economist that the war in Vietnam will ultimately have to end in a political settlement. General Giap's big push is intended to hustle America into a settlement favorable to North Vietnam's goals.

I think this article, entitled "This Is It," gives us real insight, indeed. I would observe only that it makes the point that America must not be hustled into such a settlement. Our resolve must hold firm. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Economist be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THIS IS IT

General Giap has set it rolling. This is the big battle, at last. Beautifully synchronized, and timed for the middle of the truce, the action he opened this week should settle the Vietnam war one way or the other. General Giap is one of the best tactical commanders of our generation. He seizes the local initiative by moving his troops faster than anyone has a right to expect given the other side's control of the air. And he is a master of the surprise diversion. This week's attacks by the Vietcong on eleven South Vietnamese cities unmistakably bear his stamp: though the Vietcong is nominally an independent army, its last known commander was a North Vietnamese general and it does not plunge in like this unless General Giap gives the word. In all these things—and in the way he cannot stop himself jumping in to take tactical control at the key moment in the fight—General Giap is remarkably like another great tactical commander: Erwin Rommel.

But he may resemble Rommel in another way too. Rommel in north-west Europe in 1944 was a master-tactician trying to cope with what he knew was in the long run a strategically hopeless situation. The more one looks at the offensive General Giap has been planning since the autumn, and which led to the attacks on the towns this week, the more it looks as if its real aim is not a military one at all. Its aim is political: if possible, to shake American public opinion into electing a peace-making president in November; failing that, to get negotiations going on relatively favourable terms before the Americans' firepower eats deeper and deeper into the communists' hold of the back-country. General Giap might have preferred to hold his hand until closer to November, but he is obliged to strike now because the weather will turn against him in the spring. It is an attempt, conducted with brilliant tactical dash, to force a settlement before it is too late.

Three years ago, before the Americans sent their army in, these attacks on South Vietnam's cities would have been the last stage of the guerrillas' war: having mastered the countryside, they would have been mopping up the towns according to Mao's schedule. Unless everybody has been wrong about Vietnam, they are not capable of this now. The Americans have been made to look foolish by losing control of part of their own embassy in Saigon. They will be in serious trouble if they and their allies cannot root the Vietcong squads out of all the cities attacked this week. But it is very difficult for little bands of men with small arms to hold out in street-fighting against a determined regular army. The last people who tried holding a city against armoured troops were the Hungarians in 1956, and remember what happened to them. And if the allies do regain control, this week's attacks will look in retrospect like a pretty desperate adventure. The casualty count—it was 5,000 Vietcong against 530 allied dead by Thursday, though the figures may conceal a lot of civilian casualties—was bound to go against the attackers: that is what happens when you throw yourselves at the enemy's strongpoints. The probability is that it will also end up as a propaganda defeat for the Vietcong. Certainly the Vietcong could not be stopped from getting into the cities. That will impress the nervous. But in doing so the suicide squads have caused a lot of civilian deaths. This time it is the Vietcong's victims in the horror-picture: that should help to restore the balance of emotion about this war.

For a time, at mid-week, a lot of people thought that this was the big attack and that the communist build-up around Khe Sanh in the north-west corner of the country was a diversion to pull American troops away. It is almost certainly the other way round. It is at Khe Sanh that General Giap is looking for a victory that will achieve his political purpose: the raids on the cities are a diversion to draw the Americans' attention away from the testing place.

The campaign that General Giap launched at the end of last summer has followed a perfectly clear pattern. First he made an artillery attack on the marines' base at Con Thien, near the demilitarized zone in the far north. The Americans duly sent reinforcements scurrying up from farther south. He then launched his North Vietnamese and Vietcong infantry, from jumping-off points in Cambodia and Laos, into a series of attacks starting in the south and moving steadily northward; at Loc Ninh, Dak To and now Khe Sanh. The fact that each new attack has taken place to the north of the previous one is a tribute to the effect of the Americans' bombing of his supply lines. It takes him about eight weeks, under this hammering from the air to assemble a force big enough for a major fight. If President Johnson had called off the bombing, General Giap could have put in more attacks, at quicker intervals, and he could have darted from point to point much more nimbly. At Khe Sanh he is now at the stump-end of his supply lines. The battle that is presumably going to take place at Khe Sanh this month may be his last chance of taking the offensive before the monsoon clears away from this part of Vietnam in April; and when the monsoon goes the sky will be wide open to the Americans' airpower.

This was the setting for this week's attacks on the cities. The decision to set the whole campaign under way was presumably taken in the middle of last summer, when the American public opinion polls began to show a sharp decline in the Americans' popular support for the war. The communist attacks at Loc Ninh and Dak To were bloody failures, and in December the polls seemed to show that the Americans were recovering their self-confidence. It is all the more important for North Vietnam that the Khe Sanh attack should succeed. This must be why President Ho Chi Minh took the enormous risk of giving the Vietcong the order to go for the cities. It is something he never dared to do before, even in the chaotic months of 1965 and early 1966 when the Saigon government was rocking on its feet and the Americans had just started coming ashore to help it out. If he is taking the risk now, it is because he feels he must.

The confrontation now taking place could well be decisive. President Ho and General Giap know the score. So far this winter they have lost the big-unit battles. The communists have taken far heavier casualties than the Americans have; American opinion at home has hardened in support of the war. Nor has the decision to draw the Americans into a series of big battles stopped the allies from slowly whittling down the area the Vietcong controls. The statistics are moving against the communists where it matters: in the number of people under each side's governance; in the miles of roads relatively secure from attack; in the casualty ratios. They are moving slowly, but they are moving. And North Vietnam's leaders know that after the presidential election there will be very little they can do to recapture the advantage.

The next President, if he is still committed to the war, will have three years in which he can ram the allies' military superiority home virtually at will. The Russians and the Chinese have made their position pretty plain. One or both of them might intervene if North Vietnam were invaded, though even that is far from certain. But short of that they are leaving it to the North Vietnamese. If the Vietnamese communists accept the failure of their attempt to put their sort of government into power in Saigon, Russia and China will accept it too.

So unless General Giap's regulars and the Vietcong irregulars do something about it now, they will be on a long, unstoppable slide downhill. And "now" means by April, when the planes will once more have an uninterrupted view through the clouds in the northern part of the country, which is the part General Giap can still get at. It has always been obvious that this war will have to end in a political settlement. Neither side wants, or has the power, to kill or capture the entire enemy army. The question is whether it will be a settlement that makes South Vietnam into a communist-run country or leaves it to develop under a pluralist system. It is a decision that will send its effects rippling through the rest of southern Asia. The big push that has now begun—General Giap's righthook at Khe Sanh, coupled with the Vietcong's demonstration in the towns—is intended to hustle Mr. Johnson into accepting the sort of negotiations that will eventually leave South Vietnam to the communists; or, if Mr. Johnson won't, to frighten the Americans into electing someone else who will. It is up to the soldiers. If the allies cannot reassert their control over Saigon and the other big towns, the Americans will have to negotiate their way on to the troopships. But if they hold the towns, and stop Giap at Khe Sanh, they will have won the upper hand in the war, and in the peace talks.

REVEREND KING STIRS MORE TROUBLE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Wheeling News-Register of February 12, 1968, presented an editorial by Mr. Harry Hamm entitled "Reverend King Stirs More Trouble." The editor poses this question:

> How much longer can the Rev. Martin Luther King get away with this masquerade in which he seeks to portray himself as the leader of "nonviolent" protest in this country?

The editor comments on his own question by saying:

> Even a schoolboy can judge by reading the continuous stream of inflammatory statements and threats uttered by Mr. King that rather than discourage disorder he is only inciting more violence and more trouble for our cities.

Mr. Hamm goes on to state a very pertinent point, which is as follows:

> The politicians and government leaders had better stop pampering Mr. King and others like him and begin speaking out against those who would bring more violence and lawlessness to our country.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVEREND KING STIRS MORE TROUBLE

How much longer can the Rev. Martin Luther King get away with this masquerade in which he seeks to portray himself as the leader of "nonviolent" protest in this country?

Even a schoolboy can judge by reading the continuous stream of inflammatory statements and threats uttered by Mr. King that rather than discourage disorder he is only inciting more violence and more trouble for our cities.

Last week Mr. King was at it again. It was the same old story. "Our summers of riots are caused by our winters of delay," said Mr. King declaring that Congress must adopt a $10 billion-a-year program providing jobs or income for the urban poor.

To save their cities as well as their souls "from going up in flames" he said the white majority in this country must persuade Congress to act now.

"White Americans cannot see the cities die because that is where they make their money," Mr. King declared. "They may live in the suburbs, but as a matter of self interest we believe they will not allow the cities to go up in flames." He repeatedly predicted violence in the cities "unless there is a massive lifting of hope" among the poor that would "save America's soul."

Then the Negro minister told of plans to stage massive demonstrations timed to begin in Washington during the first or second week of April, the height of that city's tourist season. He said it would begin on a relatively small scale with perhaps 2,000 persons "camped in" in tents or poor shanties "imported for their educational value." He hinted that the number of demonstrators would reach as high as 300,000. There is a possibility, Mr. King admitted, that the demonstrators would disrupt Washington traffic.

The summer-long siege may be lifted momentarily for sorties of demonstrators to the Democratic and Republican National conventions, to be held in Chicago and Miami Beach, respectively in August, according to the Negro minister.

By election day next November, Mr. King said, "We will have Negroes so fired up that I believe they will withhold their support from candidates who do not respond to their demands."

So it is clear that the agitation by Mr. King hardly can be expected to produce nonviolent protest. He talks about cities "going up in flames" and "firing up the Negroes" and this means serious trouble. Bringing together 3,000 or 300,000 demonstrators from all parts of the country into Washington, D.C., can only lead to disorder and Mr. King knows it.

The politicians and government leaders had better stop pampering Mr. King and others like him and begin speaking out against those who would bring more violence and lawlessness to our country. It is time for President Johnson to take a hard, tough line with these rabble-rousers who advocate anarchy.

Former President Harry Truman stated it well some time ago when someone admonished him for criticizing the Rev. Martin Luther King. Mr. Truman was reminded that Mr. King had been the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. Mr. Truman responded. "Well I didn't give it to him."

FACTORY WORKERS LOSE GROUND IN FIGHT FOR HIGHER WAGES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO News for February 3 contains some interesting comparisons showing how factory workers across the United States are losing ground in their fight for higher wages to offset the increasing taxes and cost of living.

The labor publication reported that in December last year the single production worker's take-home pay—his gross earnings less social security and Federal income taxes—averaged $84.45 a week while the worker with a wife and two children averaged $91.99 a week.

It then reduced these to "real spendable earnings," measured in 1957–59 constant dollars, and came up with take-home pay of $71.45 for the worker with no dependents and $77.83 for the worker with three dependents with inflation squeezed out of the figures.

The AFL–CIO newspaper noted the latter figures represented a drop of 19 and 27 cents respectively in real earnings since December of 1966.

Next, the publication turned its attention solely to the worker with three dependents and carried its comparison back 1 additional year, to 1965, and cited average take-home earnings for the year rather than the month.

It reported these average annual earnings climbed in actual dollars from $86.30 a week in 1965 to $88.55 in 1966 and $90.98 in 1967, but dropped in constant 1957–59 dollars from $78.53 a week in 1965 to $78.29 in 1966 and $78.23 in 1967.

I have no quarrel with the AFL–CIO News comparisons, but I decided to carry the comparisons a few years farther back into history, and I found the figures even more interesting.

I contacted the Bureau of Labor Statistics and obtained comparable weekly pay amounts for the year 1959. These show the following startling facts:

The worker with three dependents who took home an average of $77.83, in 1957–59 dollars, in December last year actually took home more spendable earnings—$78.23 a week—throughout 1959.

The average take-home pay of the worker with three dependents for all of 1967 was exactly the same as the average for the same type of worker in 1959 in "real spendable earnings," the amount being $78.23 a week.

The single worker is slightly better off today than he was in 1959, but hardly enough to cheer about. He averaged $70.83 a week in 1959, compared with $71.45 in December of 1967 and $71.80 in all of 1967.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is still making slight refinements in its 1967 figures, but the figures I have used are those which appear on the Bureau's records as of today for workers in all the private trades. I checked with the Bureau and established that they cover the same categories of workers as the AFL–CIO News figures.

The facts are, Mr. President, that the average family workingman in the United States today is worse off economically today than he was in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, in 1959, and the average single working man has gained less than a dollar a week in true earning power during the same period.

I should point out that the figures which the AFL–CIO News and I have quoted do not even include State and local taxes, which we all know have risen also since 1959.

Despite all the ballyhoo about rising employment, more and better jobs, annual increases in the gross national product and rising incomes for all types of workers, the average worker with a family today is pinched tighter financially than he was 8 years ago.

And while the average workman is deeper in the hole than he was in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. President, those of us from agricultural States know that the farmer because of his cost-price squeeze has skidded even deeper into the hole.

The fact is that Government-inspired inflation, fed by more taxing and spending with bigger and bigger annual deficits, is taking a cruel toll. It is setting Americans back while they are being told they are moving ahead. The creators and promoters of the policies which have fostered this condition are trying to perpetrate a hoax on the American people. I have confidence that the people will hold the administration in power responsible for it.

THE MOOD OF VIRGINIANS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, during the past 5 days I have been in Richmond, Virginia's capital; in Norfolk, Virginia's largest city and one of the Nation's greatest sea ports; in Smyth County, in the mountains of southwest Virginia; and in Winchester and Berryville, in the Shenandoah Valley.

Wherever I went—public meetings, private homes, along the streets, in bowling alleys—I found deepening concern and increased dissatisfaction with the way the Vietnam war is being conducted.

The Virginia people are patriotic; they support the American troops who have been sent to Vietnam to fight; they support our Government in time of crisis; but increasingly they question the wisdom and judgment of our leaders.

If I sense accurately the mood of my fellow-Virginians, the national leadership has lost to a considerable degree the confidence of the public in its handling of the Vietnam war.

The massive buildup of U.S. manpower in Vietnam began almost 3 years ago. In April of 1965, we had 29,000 men in Vietnam. Today, nearly 3 years later, we have 500,000 there—with 10,500 additional on the way.

During the past 2 years, which is to say the calendar years 1966 and 1967, the United States suffered an average of 1,000 casualties a week. During the first 5 weeks of 1968, U.S. casualties averaged 2,000 a week.

Is not now the time for a reappraisal of our policies and objectives in Southeast Asia—and, more important, the methods and procedures for obtaining these objectives?

Recent events should cause us to realize that our Nation's farflung commitments make us vulnerable to attack at many points. The seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* showed this, as did South Korea's reported demand yesterday that the United States repudiate the Korean armistice agreement if North Korea persists in hostile thrusts against the south.

We are vulnerable in the potentially explosive Middle East, too, where there has been a sharp buildup of Soviet influence and Soviet military presence following the Israeli-Arab war last June.

All of these events, I feel, dramatize the need for the administration to develop a sense of urgency in bringing the Vietnam war to an honorable and early conclusion, which is not likely to be accomplished without a change in policies and procedures.

WHY DE GAULLE HATES US

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1968, carried an article in This Week magazine entitled "Why De Gaulle Hates Us." The article is by Seymour Freidin, and I commend it to the attention of Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DE GAULLE HATES US

(By Seymour Freidin)

PARIS, FRANCE.—Viewed from any commonsense point of view, France's towering President, Charles de Gaulle, has been making little sense lately. He seems, in fact, to be going out of his way to hurt his friends, please his enemies and undermine his own country.

However, if you look at him with one simple thought in mind, his otherwise erratic behavior suddenly becomes logical.

The thought is that he hates the United States.

Consider some major Gaullist decisions of last year alone:

Get out of Vietnam, he told us and went so far as to talk to Ho Chi Minh's men when he visited Cambodia. Why, when he himself did everything possible to keep France in control of Vietnam after World War II? Because he does not want to see us win where he lost.

Move, was his imperious order to NATO headquarters outside Paris. There was no choice. NATO allies, at great cost, dismantled and set up shop in Belgium. Although his military units are still formally under Alliance direction, this year our top commands fully expect de Gaulle to give us notice that he will leave NATO entirely.

Meanwhile, he extends the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union, going so far as to include Russian paratroops in a French exercise in France.

HE GAVE THE RUSSIANS A KEY TO NATO

This startling invitation came during his trip to the U.S.S.R. the previous summer. Then an ostensible pillar of NATO, de Gaulle spoke of ancient Franco-Russian ties and recommended renewal. It is part of his oft-proclaimed program of alliance from the Atlantic to the Urals. Thus, the Russians were able to achieve a breakthrough that years of vast expense and menace never had attained—that of coming in the back way into NATO.

Then came the blow-up in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab states. De Gaulle was furious that the Israelis had acted and won so spectacular a victory in the Six Days' war. After all, as some high officials in Israel told me, de Gaulle had said nothing would happen. He prompty sided with the Arabs—and with the Soviet position supporting them. What's more, he let it be known, the Americans were behind Israel's compulsion to fight. Now it was up to him, de Gaulle, to redress the balance of power.

At the glittering spectacle that passes for a de Gaulle semi-annual press conference in Paris, the French President slammed the door a second time on faltering Britain's attempt to enter Europe's Common Market—a move that backfired as other countries increased their criticism of such high-handed tactics.

With Britain forced into a humiliating currency devaluation, de Gaulle went after the U.S. He deliberately attacked us on the world money markets. His tactics were simple—and shocking to his own bankers and the majority of France's economists. His backlog of dollars, made possible through years of American generosity and aid, was redeemable in gold, and he demanded that we give him the gold.

The plan was to shake confidence in the Yankee dollar. Big-time speculators followed the Gaullist lead. In a few weeks about half-a-billion dollars worth of gold was redeemed, but it didn't begin to upset our economists, businesses and friends. De Gaulle still wants to return to the classical gold standard. That would increase the price of gold, devalue the dollar and bring a huge profit to the two major gold-mining governments, Russia and South Africa.

At the same memorable press conference, de Gaulle spoke scathingly of Israel. The Jews, he said, were "at all times an elite people, sure of itself and domineering." The Arabs hailed his pronouncement, and he obtained a predominant position to explore for oil in Iraq. The fields had been developed by Britain and, more recently, by the U.S.

Next, de Gaulle turned his attention to the French part of Canada, which, he declared, was capable of acting as a sovereign state.

HE STUCK HIS BIG NOSE INTO CANADA

It was direct interference in the affairs of another nation and one that is still his ally. It was a repeat of his call to secession, when he shouted "Vive Québec Libre," in Montreal last summer.

His conclusions, he explained to his puppet Cabinet, were based on U.S. economic penetration of Canada. Only an independent French-speaking Canadian state would be able to fend off any further American encroachment.

The fact that France, through investment and all other contributory forms, has provided French-speaking Canada with a pittance for the last century never bothered de Gaulle. In any given week of 1967, American investment and expenditure in Canada has exceeded the French total for 100 years.

Most de Gaulle-watchers trace his anti-Americanism back to World War II, when, in his opinion, he was treated shabbily by Roosevelt and Churchill. Actually, its roots go much deeper than that.

De Gaulle emerged a hero from World War I. He had been wounded and taken prisoner. Upon return to active duty, he scoffed at the U.S. role and our doughboys. France and only France, he insisted, had won the war. When he drafted his manual on armored warfare, which ironically the Germans adapted, de Gaulle also found few takers among American strategists. After all, we had our own specialists, such as the late Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

In the '30s, de Gaulle began to speak of domineering Americans. It was the same term he used recently in speaking of Jews. Moreover, he fiercely resented the rather easy good fellowship between U.S. and British officers he encountered.

"It is more useful for all assembled here to speak French," he told an astonished class of foreign officers gathered to hear him lecture in the equivalent of our War College.

One of the officers present, now retired, remembers how *le grand* Charles then imperiously dismissed the interpreter. It was at that time, too, that de Gaulle mentioned the U.S. as a "cowboy country." Nobody, including visiting Americans, took him seriously. Even then, before 1939, de Gaulle spoke disparagingly of American technical skill. On the cultural level, he dripped contempt—we were barely removed, he told friends, from the primitive Red Indian stage.

The tragic collapse of France in 1940 gave him his change, as he saw it, to remold and lead his nation back on the path of power and grandeur. Churchill sent de Gaulle out to head a Free French movement in those dark days. And the trouble began.

As de Gaulle proclaimed in a broadcast, France had not lost the war; just a battle. Flaunting his emblem, the Cross of Lorraine, he demanded more arms and equipment from slender British stocks.

"The Cross of Lorraine was the heaviest cross I have ever had to bear," groaned Churchill.

Nor did de Gaulle endear himself to us when his Free French forces sought to seize the tiny islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, just off Canada.

After we entered the war, personal relations between our higher-ups and de Gaulle became even more neuralgic. Fres. Roosevelt frankly disliked him, and vice-versa. We tried to place another French general beside him after the invasion of North Africa. "Impertinent and unacceptable," snapped de Gaulle. "Only the Americans in their ignorance of history would try this."

De Gaulle was furious that he was told about the invasion of Normandy only at the very last moment. He saddled the blame on the Americans, to a lesser extent on Churchill. He never thanked us for helping him to return to Paris in triumph—he won the war, he later said, "despite the Americans."

COMMUNISM, HE SAID, DIDN'T SCARE HIM

The U.S., de Gaulle contended at the time, was deliberately shouldering France out of all negotiations for post-war Europe. It was a calculated, personal affront, he told some of us—when America snubbed de Gaulle, we snubbed France.

That was the theme of his constant complaint. Yet the French-at-large challenged him, too. In high dudgeon, he abandoned the office of Provisional Premier for his country estate at Colombey-les-Deux Eglises, emerging on rare occasions to sneer at the Communists as "separatists." But the Russians, in his view, were essentially friends of France. One day, he predicted, he would bring them back into the European fold—in spite of us.

When governments tumbled in France and the war with Algerian nationalists followed defeat in Indo-China, a call surged for a strong hand. Charles de Gaulle had been waiting for the call 12 years. In tumultuous days of late spring in 1958, France rang with cries of "De Gaulle to power" and "Algerie Francaise," or Algeria is French. All opposition—right, left, center—was on the defensive.

Into the No. 1 spot of France came de Gaulle. His paunch showing beneath a double-breasted jacket, he promised France a settlement (on which he was deliberately vague) of the issue in Algeria.

His supporters promptly began a whispering campaign that the Americans had tried, with money and blocking tactics, to prevent de Gaulle's return. Then, de Gaulle demanded a three-way directorate to rule NATO. He put France first, of course, following by "Les Anglo-Saxons," Americans and British. When our other allies refused, de Gaulle set his sights on wrecking our position.

First, he entered into a deal with the Algerian nationalists, causing many supporters, who had helped restore him to power, to charge him with betrayal. Some fled. They were accused of being American tools. In Europe, de Gaulle turned to reconciliation with West Germany. The late Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, was eager for an arrangement, but he balked, as did his successor, at a Gaullist ultimatum—abandon the U.S. and rely only on France.

HE BLAMED THE CIA FOR THE REVOLT

De Gaulle then proclaimed that the loss of Germany's Eastern provinces to Russia and Poland should be accepted. Britain and the United States long had agreed it had been a Soviet grab.

De Gaulle coldly turned his back on an allied position of vast strategic importance with this rebuff. The Germans, hoping that de Gaulle might yet help with reunification, stayed mostly mum.

But a group of generals rebelled against de Gaulle, accusing him of betraying French interests in Algeria. France teetered on the brink of civil war. De Gaulle blamed the U.S. for the rebellion.

De Gaulle's propaganda apparatus put out that our CIA had organized the plot. There wasn't a word of truth in it. The generals' conspiracy fizzled because of factionalism and no real plan.

The anti-Americanism boomeranged. A vast reservoir of goodwill, dating back to the American Revolution and two world wars, couldn't be shrugged off. De Gaulle came close to losing a Presidential election.

Without batting an eye, he told his country that the Americans had poured money into his opponent's campaign coffers. If worst came to worst, he suggested strongly, he could always rule by decree.

Unvarnished anti-Americanism took absolute priority. The huge volume of post-war private and government aid we poured into France he ignored—likewise the unselfishness of the Marshall Plan. We were investing in Europe, he sneered, to take it over. The British, he contends, are simply front-runners for us.

He has turned to contriving a made-in-Paris brand of accommodation with the Soviet Union. French government programs on foreign affairs are endorsed in a matter of days by *Pravda*, the Soviet party mouthpiece. On Vietnam, he is increasingly virulent against our role. His public and private denunciations often outstrip those of the U.S.S.R.

De Gaulle is by no means a Communist. But he firmly believes, despite the tragic record of those who have tried, that he can cooperate with the Russians and even the Red Chinese, and that France can be made the control center of the world—if the Americans would only get out of his way.

"Right now the American Embassy, for example, operates in France as it would in an unfriendly or occupied country." That is the considered opinion of a foremost man of state in our government and it has an admirable counterpart in a statement attributed to the French diplomat, Paul Claudel, many years ago: "Most statesmen have long noses, which is very lucky because most of them cannot see further than the length of them."

POLICIES AND STRATEGIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the wake of recent events in Vietnam, particularly the Vietcong raids against the cities of that country, there has been much handwringing. There has been some soul-searching. There have been attacks launched here at home against those, particularly the President, responsible for American policies and strategies.

What need to be considered before we can seriously reassess the situation in Vietnam are the reason behind the enemy attacks on the cities, the success of the impending battle in the DMZ, and such other vital factors as the integrity of the South Vietnamese Government following the onrushing events which appear, indeed, to be heading toward a climax.

Do the American people have the resolve to stay the course, or at least withhold their judgment and pressure until the decisive battles are finished? That is a question asked by Richard Wilson, writing in the Evening Star of February 12. His question and his counsel are echoed by other writers, including William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who observed, in a recent column about events in Vietnam and Korea, that—

> Americans generally would do well to keep their shirts on in this period of uncertainty.

Mr. President, other writers have taken a deep look at these recent events, and have given us more insight into their meaning. Among them are columnists William S. White, and Orr Kelly, of the Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that columns by Mr. Hearst, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. White and an interpretive report by Mr. Kelly be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 12, 1968]

Red Attacks Clearly Aimed for Viet Takeover

(By Richard Wilson)

Hatred of the war twists a man's judgment of conditions in Vietnam out of all proportion to the reality of what has been happening there. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy's recent outburst against President Johnson is the most outstanding example of how opponents of the war can be carried away by any series of events they think proves that the President has been willfully deluding the American people.

But now that the prophets of disaster and the counselors of dispair have echoed Cassandra's laments down the halls of current history a little clearer light is thrown upon what has been happening in Vietnam.

Now we know that the attacks on provincial capitals and center of government control were not by any means merely a psychological warfare demonstration. They were a coordinated series of attacks planned since last summer, committing the full strength of the main force Viet Cong units to wresting administrative control of the entire country from the Thieu-Ky government.

The attacks were intended to render South Vietnam leaderless, and with whole divisions of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam joining a newly invented organization called the "Revolutionary Armed Forces." Civilians and others could join the "Alliance of National and Peaceful Forces."

Plans for administrative control of many provincial capitals were in the hands of the attackers. They were told to expect a popular uprising, and, after the new administrative revolutionary system had been set up in the cities and capitals, there would come a "second round" of attacks, a coup de grace from Viet Cong and North Vietnam army groups of divisional strength positioned outside Saigon, Dak To and Da Nang.

The first phase of this grandiose plan failed. It was not conducted by wandering guerrillas for its shock value and to prove that neither the Americans nor the South Vietnamese could control South Vietnam. It was a takeover operation on a big scale using the full strength of the National Liberation Front, and it did not succeed.

Hanoi has been trying to tell itself and the world ever since that it did succeed and that the Americans were left hanging on the ropes, but this is more likely to delude the war objectors in Washington than it is to convince the Defense Ministry in Moscow.

It would be the pinnacle of imprudence to conclude that the expected "second round" would not spread havoc in Vietnam. This attack may have come or be in its early stages by the time this column is published. But if it comes, and whatever its results, it must now be concluded that the first round had merely a greater impact on American and world opinion than upon the actual administrative control of South Vietnam.

Yet there were many who were eager to cry havoc, unwilling to wait until the conclusive battles were finished before arousing anew American opposition to the President. It was as if they were counseling no defense in the critical engagement at Khe Sanh, and saying in effect, "let it all go. We can't win. Why lose any more men?"

This, of course, is what the men in Hanoi would like. The problem as it now exists is fourfold. First, will the second-round come and what will be its effects? Second, can we handle the attack at Khe Sanh? Third, is the government of South Vietnam sufficiently resilient to keep control of the country under these critical circumstances?

And, fourth, do the American people have the resolve to stay the course, or at least withhold their judgment and pressure until the decisive battles are finished?

Perhaps that last point is academic. Events are running very fast on a course that cannot be altered. There are likely to be other casualties that the Marines at Khe Sanh if matters go badly. It is hard to believe Gen. William C. Westmoreland could survive a military disaster.

It is hard to believe also that Johnson's policy would not have to undergo drastic revision.

Red Gains in Viet Cities Like Last Nazi Spasm at the Bulge

(By William S. White)

In the Vietnam war the position now may be summed up in a somber sentence. The phase of agony—for those who must fight it, for those in authority here and in Saigon who must conduct it, and for those private men who in duty and in conscience must support it—has ended. Opening now is the phase of anguish, and conceivably also of the last real crisis.

For whatever may be said of the enemy spasms of recent weeks, and however debated may be which side won and which lost, one stark reality now towers above all else. The Communist assailants are farther away than ever before from any intention to listen to any honest overture and are accordingly putting all their chips into the pot, to win all or to lose all.

To grope as best as one can through the miasma of Washington today—a miasma surely not exampled since Lincoln's ordeals of the Civil War a century and more ago—the weight of all the evidence suggests certain other clear realities.

The Communists—the Vietcong Fifth Column and the now heavily committed regular troops of North Vietnam—scored undeniable propaganda and morale successes in their suicide guerrilla assaults upon the cities and civilians of South Vietnam. They did, however, suffer enormously wasteful casualties; and in naked objectivity their operation, apart from propaganda terms, is likely in the end to turn out to have been self-defeating—with one immense and poignant qualification.

It will ultimately be seen as a poor investment if the authority and integrity of our South Vietnam Government Ally—the real and central target of these guerrilla attacks—remains sustained in the afterlight. This is the great and fateful kernel; and this is why it is so infinitely harmful to the common cause for American politicians now to join the assault, as some are doing, upon that authority and that integrity.

The elementary decency of the Soviet Union was most dubious in the 40s; but the Allied leaders knew enough never to cooperate with the Nazis in assailing it, lest the Nazis win on the morale front what they sought to win on the battleline. Granted some tolerance for the undoubted weaknesses—and some compassion for the ghastly burdens—of the Saigon regime, this brutal eruption will at last sink into the category of an ugly episode rather than as a victory.

For the real name of the game militarily is still the major battle shaping up at Khesanh, an action capable of dwarfing in meaning and violence all that has gone before. The highest American military authorities—and there is really no reason, except among peaceniks lost in rage and terror, to suppose that those devoted professionals are liars or fools—believe that we can take the enemy's measure here and possibly fatally blunt his main cutting edge.

One of the ablest military heroes known to this columnist, a man totally unconcerned with hissing political argumentation, sees this climactic test at arms as holding a potential parallel to the Battle of the Bulge of the Second World War. There the Germans undertook a suicide spasm of their own. There the Germans won a giant propaganda windfall. But in the harsh ultimate logic of warfare they lost there. For the commitment was in truth a commitment not of wisdom but of desperation and could only have paid off given a disruption of Allied morale that never came.

This is not to say that any man should refrain from "dissent" or critcism for a moment. But rational dissent and criticism do not mean pillorying a general in the field like Westmoreland; do not mean attempts by a tiny Senate minority to destroy a Secretary of State for remaining faithful to an American commitment of honor; do not mean trying to expose the last details of American intelligence operations before hostile eyes. And they do not mean conscious and determined defeatism.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 9, 1968]

Reassessment on Vietnam Is Needed

(By Orr Kelly)

A serious reassessment of the situation in Vietnam will have to be made as a result of the Viet Cong attacks of the past week and a half, in the view of military leaders in Washington.

But they feel it is far too early to make that reassessment or to jump to any conclusions—pessimistic or optimistic—on the basis of information now available.

So far these leaders, who declined to be quoted by name, have seen no reason to believe that the situation calls for any abrupt increase in the U.S. troop level in Vietnam, which has just passed the level off at 525,000 by midyear.

Nor have they seen any reason so far to contemplate any drastic change in the basic U.S. strategy, although the way the strategy is carried out will almost certainly be modified in some ways as a result of the eventual assessment of the enemy offensive.

INTENSITY SURPRISES

Although military leaders were expecting an offensive before or after—but not during—the Buddhist holiday of Tet, they acknowledged that they were surprised at both its intensity and its coordination.

But they feel that it will be weeks or perhaps months before they are in a position to tell with any certainty what the enemy intentions were, how well they succeeded and what this means for U.S. planning for the future conduct of the war.

As these leaders here view it, the enemy push against the cities in South Vietnam can probably be interpreted in two ways.

One theory—the one they would like to believe—is that the enemy leaders saw their strength gradually dwindling away and decided that, if they were to retain any hope of winning the war, they would have to strike now with all their force.

The other interpretation is that the enemy chose this as the opportune moment for an attempt to topple the South Vietnamese government and that the attack was not, as in the first interpretation, an act verging on desperation.

They are inclined to believe, even on the basis of the raw and incomplete information now available, that the enemy hoped to do more than hit and run—that they were seriously counting on a general uprising against the government.

NUMBERS CITED

That belief is based on two factors:

1. The way in which virtually the whole Viet Cong military structure was thrown into the effort, not only using up precious manpower and resources but also exposing hidden units.

Even though thousands of suspected Viet Cong soldiers have been captured, no evidence has yet been turned up that they had escape plans. Almost invariably in the past, the V.C. have planned their retreat after an attack as carefully as they have planned the attack itself.

One indicator of the meaning of the fighting that is being watched here with special care is the estimate of enemy dead. Figures made available in Saigon show that well over a third of the estimated 60,000 men involved in the assaults lost their lives.

While this estimate is so high as to cast doubt on its validity, reports reaching here of the number of weapons captured during the battles is described as tending to bear out the estimate of enemy dead. This is based on a rule of thumb which says an estimate of enemy casualties generally can be believed if the number claimed to have been killed is not more than three or four times the number of weapons captured. The figures coming from Vietnam seem to fall within these boundaries.

If the enemy commanders threw everything they have into the recent attacks and if their losses were as heavy as they appeared to have been, this would have one meaning for U.S. strategists.

But if they were not risking everything on this widespread surge of attacks and if they were not too badly hurt, then this will have to be taken into account in future U.S. plans.

Even though they were surprised at the intensity of the attacks, military leaders here felt that, in one sense, they demonstrated the effectiveness of the strategy that has been followed over the last 2½ years.

If it had not been for the search and destroy missions that have pushed enemy main force units back along the borders, they said, these units would have been massed outside the cities, waiting to reinforce the smaller units infiltrated into the cities.

[From the Hearst Newspapers, Feb. 4, 1968]

OUR ILL-ADVISED ADVISERS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This week of Communist hell raising in the Far East has certainly been a great time for our Monday morning quarterbacks, of which we have an obviously inexhaustible supply.

As far as I can recall, I have never heard such an outpouring of half-baked, irresponsible second guessing as has been going on simultaneously about our troubles in Vietnam and North Korea.

Never have so many said so much with such little knowledge of what they were talking about.

It is only natural that the bad news would provide a field day for our barroom generals and admirals, whether they are members of Congress, television pundits or Just Plain Joe and Josephine Doakes.

North Korea's piratical seizure of the Pueblo was an outrage. The Vietcong suicide raids in South Vietnam, and particularly the attack on our embassy in Saigon, were real eyebrow-raisers.

For Americans—any Americans—not to want to discuss sensational acts which the enemy considers to be triumphs would be less than human. Yet to err is human, too, and that's what most of our barroom strategists have been doing.

Probably the commonest mistake they have been making is an assumption I have heard from many quarters—that this nation was caught unaware by both North Korea and the Vietcong. It is an assumption not based on fact.

Both Communist actions succeeded simply because there is no way to guard against totally irrational acts. Every possible reasonable defense precautions, you may be sure, have been and are being taken in both trouble areas.

Thus, in South Korea, we have 50,000 men who have been guarding that country from Communist aggression ever since the Reds signed an armistice 15 years ago with their fingers crossed. Our troops, however, have never been able to halt enemy terror raids any more than the helpless Pueblo could resist piracy.

So far as the raids in South Vietnam are concerned, here again there was no possible effective safeguard. No amount of police and military checkups in the teeming, open city of Saigon ever did or ever could halt the infiltration of Vietcong arms and members.

The fact is that Gen. William Westmoreland knew that terror raids were imminent as part of an all-out enemy offensive now under way. Captured Vietcong orders had spelled out all but the details. Yet nothing could be done except to wait for the attacks and then kill the terrorists.

You can't stop men from doing sensational things in a war if they are willing to accept sure death to do them. And you can't stop a country from seizing a virtually-unarmed ship when that country is willing to act in defiance of international law.

So, I submit, anybody who says we have been caught with our pants down is simply in error. We have our pants on tight and it is the ammunition in our belt which eventually will win the Communist showdowns, not temporary propaganda victories by the enemy.

All this, of course, is ignored in the flood of wild talk filling the halls of Congress, our airwaves, and even drowning out the juke boxes in barrooms. Over here there is a guy who says we ought to start dropping H-bombs. Over there is one who says we have made inexcusable mistakes. Behind the bar, likely as not some joker saying Washington isn't telling us the whole truth.

Well, the fact of the matter is that the whole truth hasn't been told and it simply can't be told for reasons of national security. Our country is trying in many delicate ways to achieve peace talks in Vietnam, just as it is maneuvering in every diplomatic way possible to get the safe release of the Pueblo's crew.

The responsible, hard-headed, fully-informed men at the helm of our government and armed forces have no need of advice from irresponsible, hot-headed and ill-informed outsiders. Even the most sensible of our laymen are unable to pass judgment on much that has happened because the full facts are unavailable.

Take the case of the Pueblo. Lots of people have been blaming the captain for losing his ship. He somehow should have managed to prevent a vessel loaded with highly secret equipment from being seized by the Reds. Why didn't he get help from our planes? Why didn't he blow the ship up? And so on.

It simply hasn't been made clear what really happened in the seizure. At the same time it can be reasonably assumed the captain took all prudent measures at his disposal to protect his crew and his secret intelligence-gathering equipment.

He certainly couldn't have blown up his whole ship without blowing up himself and his crew. On the other hand there is no basis for assuming that the Communists got his ship intact. In fact there is every reason to assume that the Reds did not get any of the Pueblo's vital equipment intact.

All naval vessels on such precarious missions as the Pueblo have standing operational orders to meet any foreseeable emergency. Unquestionably there was such a plan by which the really secret apparatus aboard would be destroyed or rendered inoperable if it was in imminent danger of enemy capture.

Still, even here, we don't really know. Perhaps something went wrong with the destructive mechanism. If so the ship actually may have been taken intact. Such a thing happened when the Russians captured our U-2 spy plane.

All I have been trying to say here is that Americans generally would do well to keep their shirts on in this period of uncertainty. It is very tempting for irresponsible citizens to criticize the actions of responsible officials in Washington.

Let's give our side and our leaders a break with less wild talk and more patience.

It will all come out in the wash.

Who knows? Maybe we wanted the Communists to capture the Pueblo. Maybe it was loaded with a lot of outmoded equipment and a lot of planted false information.

If this sounds crazy to you, it's still no crazier than a lot of talk that's been going around this week.

"THE ENEMY IS ON THE RUN"—UPDATING GENERAL CUSTER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the gift of satire is not only rare, but for a master of its employment it is also social commentary. It is Washington's good fortune to have among us a man who can, and does, puncture pomposity and leave in the wake of his humor some of the most telling barbs to be found on current follies.

We have been treated recently to the official pronouncements on the events in Vietnam, in which a coordinated attack has quite disrupted Saigon, Hue, and a host of provincial capitals. Yet if one were to rely wholly on the officials accounts, rather than on reading also the accounts of reporters on the spot, the conclusion would be that we—the United States and South Vietnam—have actually wrung a victory from these attacks.

Art Buchwald turned his satirical tongue-in-cheek humor to the grim facts of our Vietnam victory in a most devastating way the other day. Writing with an imaginary date line of June 27, 1876, from Little Big Horn, Dakota, he produces an interview with the same kind of optimism about General Custer's "victory" as that optimism which claims recent events in Vietnam a victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in the Washington Post of February 6, 1968, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"We Have Enemy on the Run," Says General Custer at Big Horn

(By Art Buchwald)

Little Big Horn, Dakota, June 27, 1876.—Gen. George Armstrong Custer said today in an exclusive interview with this correspondent that the battle of Little Big Horn had just turned the corner and he could now see the light at the end of the tunnel.

"We have the Sioux on the run," Gen. Custer told me. "Of course, we still have some cleaning up to do, but the Redskins are hurting badly and it will only be a matter of time before they give in."

"That's good news, General. Of course, there are people who are skeptical about the military briefings on this war and they question if we're getting the entire truth as to what is really happening here."

"I just would like to refer you to these latest body counts. The Sioux lost 5000 men to our 100. They can't hope to keep up this attrition much longer. We know for a fact Sioux morale is low, and they are ready to throw in the towel."

"Well, if they're hurting so badly, Gen. Custer, how do you explain this massive attack?"

"It a desperation move on the part of Sitting Bull and his last death rattle. I have here captured documents which show that this is Phase II of Sitting Bull's plan to wrest the Black Hills from the Americans. All he's going for is a psychological victory, but the truth is that we expected this all the time and we're not surprised by it."

"What about the fact that 19 Indians managed to penetrate your headquarters? doesn't that look bad?"

"We knew all along they planned to penetrate my headquarters at the Indian lunar new year. The fact that we repulsed them after they held on for only six hours is another example of how badly the Sioux are fighting. Besides, they never did get into the sleeping quarters of my tent, so I don't really think they should be credited with penetrating my headquarters."

"You seem to be surrounded at the moment, General."

"Obviously the enemy plans have gone afoul," Gen. Custer said. "The Sioux are hoping to win a big victory so they'll be able to have something to talk about at the conference table. Look at this latest body count. We've just killed 3000 more Indians and lost 50 of our men."

"Then, according to my figuring, General, you have only 50 men left."

"Exactly. They can't keep up this pressure much longer. The truth of the matter is that their hit-and-run guerrilla tactics haven't worked, so they're now resorting to mass attacks against our positions. Thanks to our interdiction of their supply lines, they are not only short of bows and arrows, but gunpowder as well."

An aide came in and handed Gen. Custer a sheet of paper. "I knew it," the General said. "The latest body count shows they've lost 2000 more injuns in the last hour. They should be suing for peace at any time."

"How many did we lose, General?"

"Our losses were light. We only lost 45 men."

"But general, that means you have only five men left, including yourself."

"Look, we have to lose some men, but we're taking all precautions to keep our losses to a minimum. Besides, we can always count on the friendly Indians in these hills to turn against the Sioux for starting hostilities during the Indian lunar new year."

The aide staggered back in, an arrow in his chest. He handed Gen. Custer the slip of paper and then dropped at his feet.

"Well, they just lost 500 more. And we only lost four. It looks as if they've had it."

"But, General, that means you're the only one left."

"Boy," said the General, "would I hate to be in Sioux shoes right now."

PIOUS U.N. ATTITUDE ON SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a column by James J. Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 11, 1968, the column being entitled "Pious U.N. Attitude on South-West Africa."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pious U.N. Attitude on South-West Africa

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

For a textbook example of what ails the United Nations and lends the weight of moonbeams to its awesome resolutions, it is instructive to consider the U.N.'s record in regard to South-West Africa. It is a record of futility, hypocrisy, and blatant disregard for law.

The General Assembly's most recent resolution, adopted on January 27, is fully consistent with all that has gone before. Watching the Assembly in action, one is compelled to remark that these solemn fellows apparently take themselves seriously. But who else does?

The January resolution begins by taking note of an earlier resolution by which the General Assembly "terminated South Africa's mandate over South-West Africa." This was in October of 1966, nearly 16 months ago. It was a unilateral action on the Assembly's part, but on paper, at least, it appeared to be a formal order to South Africa: Get out.

Now, organizations that would be taken seriously ought not to issue orders they are incapable of enforcing. As events proved, the U.N. was utterly incapable of enforcing this one. In June of 1967, the Assemblymen denominated an 11-member council to administer the affairs of South-West Africa and appointed a gentleman named Constantin Stavropoulos as Governor General, in effect, of the country.

That was the last anyone has heard of the council or of Mr. Stavropoulos either. South Africa has not recognized the existence of these impotent dignitaries by so much as a flutter of Prime Minister Vorster's eyelid. The U.N. to this day has as much authority over South-West Africa as a den of Cub Scouts over the public affairs of South Chicago.

Nevertheless, the Assembly's January resolution maintains the fiction. The resolution is concerned primarily with condemning "the illegal arrest, deportation and trial at Pretoria of 37 South-West Africans, as a flagrant violation of their rights." The Assembly demands that the defendants be set free.

What about all this? The 35 persons (not 37) who were put on trial in Pretoria were arrested last summer under South Africa's newly enacted Terrorism Bill. It is not denied that they were members and leaders of the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Neither is it denied that SWAPO's purpose is to take over the government of South-West Africa by whatever means are handy.

The defendants were charged in a 41-page indictment with specific acts of terrorism and conspiracy. They were brought to Pretoria where they were arraigned in August before Mr. Justice Joseph Francis Ludorf in the Transvaal Supreme Court. In this land of apartheid, four of South Africa's most distinguished attorneys were appointed as counsel for the defense. To judge from the record available here and in Washington, they fought for their clients every inch of the way. The trial proceedings were open to the public; they were freely reported in the press.

Evidence against the defendants was overwhelming. The prosecution produced what the court described as a "breath-taking number" of machine guns, pistols, ammunition, and other weapons that had been seized in the defendants' hands. It was shown that the defendants had been trained in techniques of terrorism in Algeria, Ghana, Tanzania, and Zambia, under the tutelage of Chinese and Russian Communists.

Documentary evidence was introduced, linking the defendants to a "war plan" of May 10, 1966. The terrorists intended to "blow up the power station at Windhoek." They plotted to attack police stations at other localities, to kill white settlers, and to destroy bridges. Other evidence of violent conspiracy was drawn from the SWAPO newsletter.

No country on earth would regard such activities as lawful. In most of Africa, terrorists caught in revolutionary conspiracy would be shot on sight. The example of the Congo comes readily to mind. But South Africa proceeded openly, under terms of its own law. In the end, 30 of the defendants were found guilty on the principal charge; three were convicted on a lesser charge; one was acquitted; one remains in a hospital.

Has the General Assembly condemned trial practices in the Soviet Union? In the Congo? In Algeria? No, indeed. Here the rule is observed that the United Nations has no authority to intervene in the internal affairs of any state. Where Africa is concerned, the winds of piety blow only to the south. South Africa will survive, but the U.N., if it persists in idle bluster, in time will blow itself to impotent bits.

HISTORY'S VERDICT ON U.S. ACTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a column by Howard K. Smith, entitled "History's Verdict on U.S. Action in Vietnam," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 11, 1968.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

History's Verdict on U.S. Action in Vietnam

(By Howard K. Smith)

History—Kosygin said in Life Magazine the other day—will never forgive the Americans what they are doing in Vietnam. That simple thought is a mighty one. To many Americans the thought of eternal damnation in the conscience of posterity is not merely a thought; it is the guiding thought that cancels reason and erodes the will in dealing with our imperfect little world. So, it deserves a moment's consideration.

Experience suggests that moral condemnation is a kind of paper tiger. History, on examination, appears to have a conscience about as well developed as that of the lower porifera. One wishes it otherwise, but in fact about the only thing history refuses to forgive is failure.

When in 1956 the Russians moved into rebellious Hungary and obliterated the Hungarian freedom fighters in a generous blood-letting, one periodical after another said that history would never forgive the Russians or the native puppets who urged them to come back in.

Recently I finished fine-tooth combing all the news of the past year in seven periodicals, American and foreign. There was, eleven years after the event not one mention of the Hungarian bloodbath. The most prominent mention of Hungary was the news that the U.S. had elevated that nation's legation in Washington to the status of an embassy. And all the Western nations were making elaborate efforts to improve relations with the partners of the crime—the Communist rulers of both Hungary and Russia.

In 1961, public figures were effusive with prophecies that history would never forgive the Russians and Ulbricht for isolating West Berlin with a hideous prison wall. The news of 1967 records that Ulbricht, largely due to his wall, was enjoying prosperity, and he was attaining a certain respectability as West Germans for the first time sought to improve contacts.

Americans are paralyzed with worry about something that does not really exist. We are like Thomas Hardy's Jude, who suffered tortures of conscience each time he stepped on an insect. He was thus condemned to a life of pain that ended in awful death for himself and for those he loved and sought to protect.

The outsized American conscience is taking its most awful beating in Vietnam. The reasons are clear. The enemy has perfected a form of warfare which in fact amounts to hiding behind the civilian population. Each day at cocktail time, we are treated on television to a one-eyed view of what goes on: Americans shooting, killing and occasionally burning down a village. Occasionally, but very rarely, some overwrought American soldier will actually commit an atrocity, and there is a complete pictorial record of it in the next day's world press.

That vision of the war is in fact a huge lie. There is only an occasional perfunctory word and no pictorial record whatever of the essential truth: that the enemy's war is a vast, carefully planned, thoroughly intended atrocity.

The American effort is in fact amazingly humane in the circumstances. Why do the Viet Cong regularly raid U.S.-held areas of Vietnam, but avoid those held by the South Koreans? The answer is that the South Koreans meet the Viet Cong with a certain rough reciprocity. The areas long held by the South Koreans, in Binh Dinh province, have the best pacification record in the country.

Harrison Salisbury's loaded reporting from Hanoi last year revealed things he may not have intended. Among other things he conveyed the Communist allegation that in 100 raids on the important town of Nam Dinh our bombs killed 89 civilians. To give meaning to those figures one must recall that in World War Two in a single raid in Hamburg, bombers killed 20,000 civilians. Obviously our attacks on the vital node of Nam Dinh were carried out with a care unprecedented in warfare.

The conscience-stricken need to recall that in the long cold war, the U.S. has never once taken the initiative in a conflict. We have defended in Greece, Turkey, Berlin, Cuba and Korea, as we are doing in Vietnam. In each case, we were ready to stop defending whenever the enemy would stop aggressing.

It is clear where guilt has consistently lodged. Given our good moral record, history has a simple imperative for President Johnson: Don't lose.

HANOI'S TRUMP CARD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to a very interesting and informative article by Richard Critchfield, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of February 11, 1968. Mr. Critchfield has recently returned to Washington after spending 3½ years in Vietnam for the Washington Star. The article is entitled "Hanoi's Trump Card: Fomenting Internal Strife."

I commend Mr. Critchfield's article to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOI'S TRUMP CARD: FOMENTING INTERNAL STRIFE

(By Richard Critchfield)

Much more light has been shed the past two weeks on what the men in Hanoi have described since 1966 as their most "clever tactic" against the United States.

This has been the skillful application for the last five years of the Leninist principle of "exploiting internal contradictions in the enemy camp." It is the key to Hanoi's current strategy of terrorist commando raids in the cities, massive military pressure at Khe Sanh and the DMZ and an intense worldwide Communist peace offensive. The aim is to end the war on terms allowing the legal existence of a Communist-led popular front movement in South Vietnam while preventing the South Vietnamese non-Communist majority from creating an organized political base themselves to rival the Communist one.

Without such a base, it is naturally impossible for the many in South Vietnam, even when supported by the United States and other allies, to achieve a final political victory over the few.

The United States might conceivably win a temporary military victory. But without an indigenous non-Communist political base this would leave almost every single internal problem unsolved, most important (1) inequitable land distribution, (2) the breakdown of rule of law and (3) the collapse of an effective rural administration. Unremedied grievances would in turn allow a new popular front to come to power ostensibly through legal and political means, supported by covert Communist direction, intimidation and skillful manipulation of individual ambition.

DEFINED IN 1966

The Hanoi leadership first publicly defined and described this tactic in mid-1966 in a defense of its policies from Communist Chinese criticism.

At that time a growing number of Western scholars on Southeast Asia were reaching the conclusion that Vietnam was not, after all, a testbed for "People's Revolutionary War" on the classic Mao Tse-tung model. Douglas Pike concluded in his book, "Viet Cong," that the Hanoi leaders were a cynical "alliance" rather than fanatic "philosophical" Communists. Sir Robert Thompson, the British expert, wrote in "Defeating Communist Insurgency," that Hanoi had not been waging a "People's War" but instead, used this "revolutionary form of warfare" to "enable a very small ruthless minority to gain control over the people."

Retired U.S. Marine Brig. Gen. Samuel B. Griffith, like Thompson, one of the sharpest critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam, noted in mid-1966, that "Peking has for several years insisted that the struggle in Vietnam is a 'People's War' and that the outcome (which she sees as assured) will validate Lin Piao's thesis." This thesis was the expression of China's strategic doctrine of September, 1965, in which Lin predicted the industrialized West would be inevitably isolated and captured by the Asian, African and Latin American revolutionary forces.

During this same period Prof. Donald Zagoria of Columbia University noted, "The single most important element in the advance of communism in Vietnam, as in China itself, was that a local Communist party captured a nationalist movement during and after World War II in the course of a national struggle against a foreign invader." Second, said Zagoria, was that the nationalist opposition in Vietnam was "divided" and "without effective organization at the rice-roots level."

GUERRILLA TACTICS

Although Western scholarship denied Vietnam was a classic Maoist "People's War," Peking continued to insist it was; in 1966 and early 1967, Mao's theories on revolution and guerrilla war become sacred writ in China during the struggle between Maoists and "revisionists" in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

In Maoist warfare, the soldiers are drawn from the supporting masses of the peasants around them, so that they may move flexibly and secretly in their own familiar element, as a fish swims in water. The revolution must come from the people, and the revolutionary must therefore be self-reliant, not heavily dependent on foreign help. Moreover, since a people's war must usually be fought by lightly-armed guerrillas against regular army units with modern weapons and air support, their creed must be that man in the mass beats the machinegun.

From 1959, the year the armed Viet Cong insurgency began in the Mekong Delta, until late 1964, when regiment-sized Viet Cong units began defeating the South Vietnamese army piecemeal, the North Vietnamese appeared to be earnest subscribers to these tenets. According to the famous 26-page letter from Le Duan, North Vietnam's party first secretary, which was captured in early 1967, Peking wanted Hanoi to bog down the enemy for many years, possibly seven, until China was strong enough to launch an armed offensive action in its support.

Hanoi's first visible departure from Maoist principles occurred in early 1965 when there were fewer than 20,000 Americans in a nearly-defeated South Vietnam. Hanoi threw regular North Vietnamese units into the battle both in expectation of a quick killing and to ensure Hanoi's control over the southern Viet Cong at the moment of victory in Saigon.

HANOI'S PRINCIPLE

Peking bitterly disapproved. Only a classical, long-drawn-out guerrilla campaign would produce a vindication of Mao's thesis. The bigger and more conventional war led to the commitment of American forces and Hanoi's growing dependence on the Soviet Union for modern scientific weapons.

The Communist leaders in Hanoi appeared to calculate quite incorrectly that President Johnson would never commit American troops for fear of international and American opinion.

In answer to Peking, Le Duan—who had the functions of a Rusk, McNamara and CIA Director all rolled into one—declared in Hanoi in July, 1966, that while man in the mass was important so was technology. Besides, said Le Duan, in their struggle against the Americans, the North Vietnamese had "evolved unique tacitcal methods" which enabled a small force to attack a big one.

Le Duan spelled this out in the September, 1966, issue of Hoc Tap, North Vietnam's most authoritative party journal, in which he declared Hanoi's ideological independence from both Peking and Moscow. "While (Soviet) revisionism is the principal danger," he wrote, "with (Chinese) dogmatism, the revolution will fail."

FOLLOWED LENIN

Instead, said Le Duan, North Vietnam had worked out its own "clever tactic." drawn directly by the teachings of Lenin. He cited Ho Chi Minh's policy of founding a popular front with the anti-French nationalists from 1936 to 1939. He also listed the Viet Minh Front during the Indochina war, the Lien Viet—or Fatherland—Front that today rules the north, and the National Liberation Front, as the Viet Cong's political arm in the south, especially the NLF's "policy of upholding the mottoes of independence, democracy, peace and neutrality and so forth" as "typical examples of the clever application" of Lenin's principle.

He then quoted the relevant passage from Lenin's works: "It is possible to defeat a stronger enemy only through . . . taking advantage very minutely, very attentively, very carefully and very cleverly to any rift, even the smallest, among the enemy; any contradiction, even the smallest one, among . . . the interests of various bourgeois groups and factions in each country."

Le Duan boasted:

"It united with anyone who could be united, won over anyone who could be won over, neutralized anyone who could be neutralized, completely isolated the imperialists and their most dangerous lackeys and concentrated the spearheads of the attacks on them to overthrow them."

Le Duan intended this as a rebuttal to Chinese criticism. Peking's reply came back dogmatically, "Acting contrary to Mao's theory will only lead to defeat."

Le Duan had revealed the principle that provided the North Vietnamese Communist leadership with its blueprint for victory in South Vietnam: to explicit internal contraditions in the enemy camp to keep him weak, divided, and unable to form a rival political base.

The greatest contradiction in South Vietnam was the deeply ingrained regionalism that already divided its society.

In all its history, Vietnam had been united under a single national government for less than 60 years, under the Emperor Gia Long in the early 19th century. From 111 B.C. until the 9th century, Vietnam was a colony of China. In 1630, the Nguyen dynasty of the south built two huge walls across the plains of Quang Tri just a few miles north of the present DMZ to keep out the northern feudal Trinh warlords for 150 years. The French in 1884 divided Vietnam into the colony of Cochin China (Saigon and the Mekong Delta), the semi-autonomous kingdom of Annam with its capital at Hue, and the self-governing protectorate of Tonkin (Hanoi and the Red River Delta.) Each had a different constitution and the growth of Vietnamese nationalism thus differed between the conspiracy, anarchy and revolutionary fervor of Tonkin and the growth of religious sects and conventional Western-style politics in Cochin China.

CLAIMED COCHIN CHINA

At the end of World War II in 1945, Ho Chi Minh, then an unknown agitator, seized Hanoi with a small band of fellow Communists and declared the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The French were willing to recognize Ho's government as an autonomous republic within a French union of all five former Indochinese states.

Ho insisted on laying claim to rice-rich Cochin China, regardless of the wishes of the Cochin-chinese. Talks broke down in 1947 and the 21-year-war began.

When Vietnam was partitioned in half by the 1954 Geneva accords, its population was divided into the native Cochinchinese majority, the Annamite inhabitants of the southern half of the old kingdom and around 800,000 mostly Catholic Tonkinese who had fled the north as refugees. Aside from this regional contradiction, there was a religious one: Ngo Dien Diem, the first president, was a Roman Catholic while most of the South Vietnamese were Confucian ancestor worshipers, although there were large minorities of Catholics, Buddhists, Montagnard tribal animists, Protestants, Muslems and the regionally-strong Cao Dai and Hoa Hao feudal sects.

Hanoi first applied Lenin's principle of exploiting internal contradictions in early 1963, after years of patient preparation. Its main instrument was a Buddhist from the northern half of divided Annam, Tri Quang. As a boy he was schooled in Hue under the tutelage of a Marxist monk who today runs Hanoi's puppet church, trained in Marxist-Leninist agit-prop techniques in Hanoi in 1946 and 1947, spent several years in the countryside with Viet Minh guerrilla forces, made periodic trips north until 1959 and then established himself as a Buddhist leader in Hue. He was joined there by two fellow ex-Viet Minh he had known in the late 1940s Nguyen Dang, who by 1963 was the local province chief and Hoang Trong Ba, who had become a close personal advisor of Diem's brother, Can, the governor of Hue.

On May 8, 1963, these three carefully orchestrated an incident in which it appeared Diem's troops had fired into a Buddhist demonstration protesting alleged "religious persecution."

Desipte emphatic denials of any evidence of religious persecution from Ambassador Frederick Nolting, CIA Chief John Richardson and Diem's British advisor, Sir Robert Thompson, all of them veteran observers in Vietnam, Tri Quang's propaganda apparatus, especially after seven Buddhist "self-immolations," managed to convince the world audience.

KENNEDY'S COMMENT

In September, 1963, President Kennedy told a CBS television interviewer he felt the "repression" of Buddhists by Diem was "very unwise." Kennedy said he felt the South Vietnamese government could only win popular support if there were "changes in policy and perhaps with personnel." Although from May to September, perhaps as many as 95 percent of the South Vietnamese people had no inkling what was happening at the political center. Kennedy's words were like a green light to the commanders of the big American-created Vietnamese army, which increasingly held effective power.

In response to the start of the Viet Cong insurgency in the Mekong Delta in 1959, Diem had launched a strategic hamlet program which he realized could build up in the peasantry a base of political support to counterbalance the large army. Both the program and this effort to create a political base by rooting the Saigon government in the peasant and the land, collapsed with the Diem regime.

Diem had lasted nine years. Now Gen. Duong Van Minh fell in three months; Harvard-trained banker Nguyen Xuan Oanh, six days; Gen. Nguyen Khanh, eight months; Tran Van Huong, the only Cochinchinese civilian of the lot, three months, then Khanh again for 30 days; Dr. Phan Huy Quat for five months and finally Nguyen Cao Ky for 27 months.

LEADERSHIP CHANGED

During most of this turbulence, the major contradiction was the conflict between the popular desire for an indigenous civil government and the realization that only the Vietnamese army had effective power.

In February, 1965, for the first time in Cochin China's history, power in Saigon fell into the hands of a small group of Tonkinese, first under Quat, then Ky and Thieu.

In a short time, a dozen young Tonkinese military officers, most of them Nguyen Cao Ky's high school classmates from North Vietnam's Son Tay Province near Hanoi and fellow alumni of the first Vietnamese Army reserve officers' class in 1952, held all the key levers of power in Saigon.

But their monopoly of power in Saigon created an ultimate internal contradiction; while the United States' stated aim of fighting in Vietnam was to allow the South Vietnamese, the vast majority of whom were Cochinchinese, the right to choose their own government, this government had in fact come to be dominated by the Tonkinese they had fought hundreds of years to resist.

Moreover, the continuation of this Tonkinese political domination—embodied as it was in a small militaristic faction of soldiers who controlled the army—was highly dependent on a continuation of the big military war, including the air war against North Vietnam. Success in pacification and social reform, which, as Diem realized, would create a rival power base among the peasantry, would put the Tonkinese out of business.

BUNKER'S MANEUVER

This contradiction could have been eliminated in the September, 1967, presidential and parliamentary election. The Tonkinese were aware of their vulnerability and Marshal Ky stepped out of the race in favor of the junta chairman, Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, a native South Vietnamese from the southernmost tip of Annam.

Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker recognized that while the northern-dominated military leadership held effective power, and would probably win the election, it was essential that a genuinely popular Cochinchinese, in this case, former Premier Tran Van Huong, be brought into a government of national coalition, to break the Tonkinese power monopoly.

At first, newly-elected President Thieu allied himself with Bunker, but Thieu later capitulated to the Tonkinese, who still retained the key levers of power and were allowed to choose an obscure, pliable southerner as their premier.

Fortunately, President Thieu has the constitutional power to remedy this situation and force the Tonkinese to share power with the Cochinchinese on a proportional basis. This week both the United States and Cochinchinese leaders are bringing intense pressure on Thieu to do so. All that is required is a reshuffle of the cabinet and military command, not a change of government. Two of the eight most powerful Tonkinese soldiers have already resigned their posts in recent weeks.

It is obvious that a predominately Cochinchinese government in Saigon willing to undertake dramatic social reform could alter the nature of the war almost overnight. As the late Cochinchinese leader, Tran Van Van told me just two weeks before he was shot to death in Saigon in December 1966: "Without a southern civil government Saigon can never rally the vast population of the Mekong Delta to the anti-Communist side. In the present situation, calls for national unity are but an echo in the desert and we are driving the southern masses into the arms of the Viet Cong."

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, is also acutely conscious of this regional contradiction. "North Vietnamese are not welcomed by the Viet Cong in the Mekong Delta," he told a press briefing a few months ago. "It's the same situation as in our country during the Civil War; Yankees were not welcomed in Alabama and Georgia."

Hanoi's main present strategy centers on exploiting this contradiction and its appeals are now primarily directed to the politically alienated and disinherited Cochinchinese and Tonkinese Catholics—especially the educated middle class.

Last September, Hanoi announced a new liberalized NLF program, "upholding," as Le Duan put it in his 1966 apologia, "the mottoes of independence, democracy, peace and neutrality and so forth."

This was an apparent failure. On January

31 at the height of Hanoi's call for a "general uprising" the Viet Cong's clandestine Liberation Radio announced the formation of a new and fifth popular front movement called the "Alliance of National and Peace Forces." It too appears aimed primarily at the Catholic and Cochinchinese middle class and claims its members include "many intellectual figures, industrialists and representatives of many political parties and religions." (Whether or not Hanoi really went all out this time for a "popular uprising" remains in doubt, since it chose not to surface its large political underground in Saigon.)

While this new front would seem to have no more chance of succeeding than the NLF, there is one difference.

MARTIAL LAW LIMITED

Under the new April 1, 1967, Constitution, President Thieu can declare martial law for only 12 days, when it is then subject to parliamentary review.

Moreover, the constitution makes the House of Representatives the ultimate repository of South Vietnamese sovereignty. The Senate and House and not the President are constitutionally given power to "decide about holding peace talks." While the Senate is heavily Catholic and conservative (although its 60 members include at least six known Communist sympathizers) it can veto legislation initiated in the House but the House can override it by a two-thirds vote, giving it, legally, the final say on making peace.

At least 25 of the 137 House members were leaders in the 1966 Buddhist-led civil insurrection and have been loyal to Tri Quang in the past. Tri Quang, since he has been accused of using his pagoda as a Viet Cong military command center last week, seems sufficiently discredited, but like Sherlock Holmes' Prof. Moriarity, he has always been able to make a comeback.

But the key figure in the House is Prof. Ho Huu Tuong, a veteran Marxist with the reputation as a Trotskyite. Last winter, just after the Red Guards stormed the Russian Embassy in Peking and it looked like a final Sino-Soviet break was imminent, Prof. Tuong called me to his house.

HANOI'S TERMS

He described what he claimed were Hanoi's peace terms. As a bargaining point, he said, Hanoi would demand a coalition government, cabinet posts for NLF leaders and a military guarantee of safety from the United States.

What Hanoi really wanted, he went on, was to get President Johnson to agree to the establishment of a legal covertly Communist-led popular front movement in exchange for a neutralist, non-Communist South Vietnam. He said the fighting would cease, the South Vietnamese Communist party be disbanded and the NLF dissolved. This new front would be called "The Alliance of National Force," which could also be translated as "The United Nation Alliance of the People." Prof. Tuong was elected to the House last October by the second highest plurality in Saigon, and has been its most dominant figure.

I took Hanoi's terms to Edward Lansdale, the American counter-insurgency veteran in Saigon, who exploded: "Nobody understands this problem. Washington doesn't. Diem didn't. You don't. Land reform is a gimmick. The military side is a gimmick. It's fundamentally a question of forming a military base. Now these boys come driving right down the avenue. They know all right."

A few weeks later China and Russia stepped back from a break and all mention of the "Alliance" was dropped. The question just ahead is whether La Duan can pull off in the South Vietnamese parliament what he has failed to do with the South Vietnamese people and what the United States and President Thieu can do to restore to the people the right to choose their own government.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 705 (H.R. 2516), a bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its further consideration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What is the amendment now pending before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], which deals with housing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the pending amendment would provide for an opportunity for all Americans throughout this country to buy or rent housing without discrimination. I intend to speak in favor of that amendment. I earnestly hope the amendment will be adopted. I believe it should be.

Mr. President, last year we saw violence and rioting in the streets of our major cities—in New York, in Detroit, in Milwaukee, and elsewhere. The crisis in our central city ghettos is the No. 1 domestic problem facing our country today. Big city ghettos such as Watts and Harlem are near the boiling point. By jamming millions of Negro Americans into the narrow confines of the ghetto, we have created a tinder box of social unrest and discontent.

The whites have escaped their responsibility by fleeing to the suburbs, taking with them the central city's tax base and source of civic leadership. In the process of moving to the suburbs, the whites have been careful to exclude Negroes. The so-called suburban white noose exerts a strangle hold around our large central cities, and the noose is slowly choking those cities to death. If present trends continue, many of our large cities will soon be predominantly Negro, surrounded by an increasingly hostile white suburban ring.

Today, almost 13 million nonwhites are jammed into our central cities, and one-third of them are living below the poverty level. Moreover, the evidence suggests that Negro poverty in the ghetto is getting worse, not better. A recent census in the Watts area of Los Angeles showed that Negro median family income dropped 8 percent from 1959 to 1965. That was a period when the country as a whole enjoyed remarkable prosperity, tremendous expansion, and a great increase in incomes generally; but the average family income of Negroes living in this ghetto section of Los Angeles fell 8 percent during that period of time.

A similar survey in the Hough section of Cleveland showed median income falling by 16 percent. However, during the same period national incomes rose by 24 percent. While the suburban middle class was getting richer, Negro families in the ghetto were getting poorer.

Mr. President, it would be a mistake to look at the vast migration to the suburbs solely in racial terms. The movement of population and jobs to the suburbs has primarily been the result of basic economic forces. Industry has located in the fringes of our cities because it is more efficient. The development of modern plant technology, the growing importance of truck transportation, and the rising cost of land in the central city have all contributed to the dispersion of industry. One prominent urban economist, John Kain of Harvard, has concluded that—

> Yearly percentage increases in suburban population, while considerable, are only about half as large as the increases in suburban employment. Jobs were moving to the suburbs at a faster rate than people.

For example, from 1954 to 1958, suburban population grew at the rate of 6.4 percent a year, however, employment in services grew at 17 percent, in retailing at 13.5 percent, in wholesaling at 16.6 percent, and in manufacturing at 7.4 percent. More recent data suggest this disparity in the growth of jobs and population has continued.

While employment is booming in the suburbs, it has been declining in the central city. The economic functions of central cities have been gradually changing from manufacturing centers to centers for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class. Not many from the ghetto can qualify in the changing job market of the central city. Manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing employment, the traditional users of semiskilled and low skilled labor, has been declining in the central cities. The decline is sharpest in the ghetto. A study of Chicago employment, for example, showed that between 1958 and 1963, jobs in the ghetto declined at a yearly rate of 3.2 percent.

The evidence seems clear that there is a basic economic imbalance in the distribution of jobs and population in our metropolitan areas. Jobs, and particularly semiskilled and low skilled jobs, are moving to the suburbs and the outlying portions of our central cities. And yet a considerable fraction of the potential supply of labor to fill these jobs has been left behind in the central city ghettos. Moreover, our urban mass transit programs, which subsidize the affluent suburban commuter, do little for the ghetto resident. One of the conclusions of the McCone Commission, following the Watts riot, was that there was a severe lack of public transportation from the ghetto to sources of employment. According to Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Metropolitan Development:

> The high cost of transportation—in both time and money—prevented residents of Watts from achieving access to other parts of Los Angeles and exaggerated the isolation of the community.

When looked at in cold economic terms, the obvious solution to the problem of the ghetto is a policy of open housing. If there is an imbalance between people and jobs, then move the people to the jobs. This simple solution is frustrated by discrimination—but at a high economic cost. There is a loss to our national economy through the underutilization of our labor supply. And there is an ultimate social cost of discrimination which culminates in sharply increased expenditures for welfare, crime prevention, and municipal services. One study has shown that public expenditures in the slums are nine times greater than tax revenues. I wonder how long General Motors would tolerate one of its divisions running 900 percent in the red? Unfortunately, we as a nation do not keep our books as efficiently as General Motors.

There are three basic approaches to the problem of the central city ghetto.

One is to continue our present policy, which is basically a no-win policy. The existing programs of HUD and OEO and other agencies might be marginally expanded, but it seems clear the magnitude of the problem far exceeds the resources the Federal Government is presently willing to commit. For example, 18 years of public housing has made but a small dent in the stated goal of providing a decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family. The consequences of our no-win urban policy are likely to be found in more crime and violence and a perpetuation of the cycle of poverty from one generation to the next.

A second policy has already been called a Marshall plan for the ghettos. There is no doubt that if we are willing to pour $30 billion or more a year into the ghettos, they can be made a tolerable place in which to live. But unlike the Marshall plan aid to Western Europe, such massive expenditures in the ghettos are likely to be continuing subsidies rather than one time investments. With more and more industry moving to the suburbs, massive investment in the ghetto is likely to be a failure in the long run. It is simply out of tune with economic reality. This is not to say that increased expenditures may not be needed in the short run.

Aside from economics, there are serious social questions involved in a policy which is basically aimed at bribing a generation of Negro militants into docility. Suburban Americans can purchase tranquillity while still preserving the ghetto, if they are willing to pay the price—but it is likely to be exorbitant, both in economic and social terms.

A third approach might be termed a policy of dispersal through open housing. This approach would look to the eventual dissolution of the ghetto and the construction of low and moderate income housing in the suburbs and outlying portions of central cities. It would be aimed at providing ghetto residents with access to better housing, to improved job opportunities, to better education, and to a sounder environment in the suburbs. Such a policy would be in harmony with basic economic trends and would clearly be the cheapest of the three alternatives. But it does imply an end to the practice of racial discrimination, which has heretofore kept our suburbs virtually 100-percent white.

The benefits of an open housing policy are numerous. For example, it is doubtful that Negro education can ever be brought on a par with white education when Negroes are concentrated in all black central city schools. Thus, continued residential segregation will perpetuate the transmission of frustration and despair from one generation to the next. This vicious cycle can be broken by giving the Negro child the same educational opportunity which white children receive.

Second, a policy of dispersion will move Negro residents closer to job opportunities and reduce Negro unemployment with a constant reduction in welfare and unemployment compensation payments.

Third, by dispersing Negro residential opportunities throughout a metropolitan area, the social unrest and violence in the ghetto is diminished. A famous historian from the University of Wisconsin, Frederic Jackson Turner, observed that the existence of a western frontier served as a safety valve to alleviate social upheaval in our cities during the 19th century. A man and his family could always move West. Today, there is no comparable safety valve for the resident of the Negro ghetto. He is locked in. In the long run, I believe America must move toward dissolving the ghetto simply because no other solution will work. The only question is when. I believe the time is now.

Mr. President, the fair housing bill now before the Senate is a modest attempt to insure that every American family can buy or rent a home free from racial discrimination. But more importantly, it commits this country to a basic moral conviction that racial discrimination in housing is wrong.

Those who are anxious to secure the rights of fair housing for all Americans have sometimes been critical of landlords, real estate developers, rental agents and the like. I think much of this criticism misses the point. It is true that there are a few unscrupulous real estate agents who engage in "block busting" tactics. But the vast majority of those in the real estate industry want to do the right thing. I have talked to a number of dedicated and conscientious real estate developers who privately would have no compunctions about selling to Negroes. The unmistakable fact is, however, that any developer or landlord who elects not to discriminate runs the risk of losing business to those who continue to discriminate. It is easy to talk reform. However, in real life it is quite costly—in dollars and cents—to be a reformer.

It is a simple matter to solve the dilemma. No single developer or landlord can afford to undertake reform alone. To be effective and fair, everyone must stop discrimination. It is not fair to say that some may discriminate but some must not.

I am glad to see that the fair housing measure before the Senate would eventually apply to the entire rental and housing market. Such a law would take the beleaguered landlord off the hook. Under the present situation, it is possible for a small but vociferous minority to intimidate and harass any landlord who plans to integrate an apartment project. I am convinced that the vast majority of Americans have no deepseated objections to open housing. It is the prejudiced minority that is able to call the tune. Thus, a Federal fair housing law would take thousands of landlords off the hook. It would give the conscientious landlord and developer an effective answer against the vocal bigots who would attempt to impose their prejudices upon the community at large.

In order to understand fully the need for a national policy against discrimination in housing and the enactment of a comprehensive Federal fair housing law, it is well to look into the results of housing discrimination.

For more than a quarter of a century, Negroes living in rural areas have in large numbers moved into the cities. Much of this migration was out of the South and into the North and West. Within the South, too, Negroes have been drawn out of rural areas into the cities.

In 1960, nearly 10 million of the 19 million Negroes in the United States lived in the central cities of metropolitan areas. This is more than double the number prior to the outbreak of World War II. In the Nation's 25 largest cities, which include six in the South, only in Memphis did the population of nonwhites in the total population fail to rise between 1950 and 1960.

During this decade, in Los Angeles, the nonwhite population nearly doubled, while the white population rose only 17 percent. Chicago saw a 64-percent gain in its nonwhite population while facing a 13-percent loss in whites. New York experienced a 47-percent gain in nonwhites; Detroit 60 percent; Cleveland 69 percent; Baltimore 45 percent; Milwaukee—in my own State—189 percent; and Buffalo 95 percent.

Millions of the Negroes who migrated from rural areas to central cities in recent decades are trapped in racial ghettos from which they cannot escape because housing is not freely available on equal terms to all Americans

The housing of nonwhite families is consistently of poorer quality than that of white households in the same income levels. This is due in large part, to the fact that the nonwhite families do not have freedom of choice in selection of their homes.

In 1960, 44 percent of all nonwhites lived in substandard housing as compared with 13 percent of all white families. Think of that Mr. President. Nearly half of all the nonwhite population in our country lived in slum housing. Sixty-two percent of the nonwhite households rented as compared to 36 percent of the white households. Forty-eight percent of the nonwhite renters lived in substandard units as against 19 percent of the whites. Three times as large a proportion of nonwhite families, 28 percent, lived in overcrowded homes, as did white households, 10 percent; and this overcrowding was prevalent in all income classes.

For example, of nonwhite families with incomes of $6,000 or more, 25 percent lived in overcrowded conditions. This compares with only 9 percent for whites in the same income classes.

Mr. President, the crises in our cities demands responsible action by Congress. To ignore the rising tension is folly.

Just over the weekend, President Johnson said that he anticipated, unfortunately, that, whereas we are likely to have a hot summer, indeed, in our big cities because of racial tension, we could expect many more hot summers in the future before our problems are solved. I am sure the President shares my conviction that the violence and the tragedy that can develop in our cities will be far, far worse in the absence of fair housing legislation.

To adopt overly repressive police state methods to repress unrest would be a national tragedy. To talk big and do little can only add to the disillusionment and despair prevalent in the ghetto.

Congress can and should act. A program of fair housing can offer a significant improvement in our urban problems:

Fair housing is morally right.

It is economically sound.

It is socially responsive.

It is legally and constitutionally correct.

In short, a fair housing law is a commitment to uphold American ideals. It permits millions of Americans to participate in the mainstream of American life. It removes the depressing and degrading experience of racial discrimination which can wound for life man's inner dignity. Who among us can say such practices should continue unchallenged?

Mr. President, I was presiding in the Senate last week when the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was speaking in support of the pending amendment. In the course of his address, he and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] engaged in a colloquy. Senator ERVIN made the point that if open housing can reduce the likelihood of riots in the big city ghetto, why is the problem so acute, why the riots last year since 30 percent of our people now live in jurisdictions which have some type of open housing law? Why do we still have the problem? I should like to answer that question. I could not do so, unfortunately, last week, because I was presiding.

I should like to answer that question with reference to Milwaukee, because in Milwaukee we have a situation in which the city is theoretically covered by a fair housing law. Wisconsin has passed legislation which provides for fair housing, or open housing. The trouble is that it is the same type of law which applies in most of the States that now have such legislation—that is, the exemptions are so big that only a minority of housing units are covered and the very great majority of homes are not covered. This means that most homes are closed, they are not open, they are not available to the minority family, the Negro family, that wants to make a purchase.

This is especially clear in the city of Milwaukee, because every day since last summer there have been marches in this city. There have been protest marches by minority groups, protesting one issue, and one issue only—not the absence of jobs, nor educational opportunity, but the failure of the city council to enact a far-reaching open housing ordinance.

It is true that if we should enact this proposed amendment into law, it would not solve the problem overnight. Many other things have to be done. But I believe we overlook the decisive psychological impact of saying to minority groups that they are free to buy a home anywhere in America where the home is offered publicly for sale. That is what the Mondale-Brooke amendment would do. After all, can we do less? We should have done this long, long ago.

As I have said, the economic reasons for doing this are clear and emphatic. The moral reasons are undeniable. I do hope the Senate agrees to the pending amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his very enlightening and persuasive remarks to the Senate on this occasion. He has truly been a leader and a champion of open housing legislation. I think it is highly significant that this statement was made by the Senator from the great State of Wisconsin, where, as he has said, day after day there have been marches, not so much for jobs, not so much for education, but for open occupancy in housing.

I believe that it augurs well for the importance of open housing legislation, because education, job opportunities, and other equal opportunities will generally flow if a man is given the opportunity to live where he chooses, and if he believes he can, as other immigrant groups have done in the past, leave the ghettos and move into areas where he can get a better education, better jobs, and a better way of life.

Therefore, I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin for he has certainly given us a great address this afternoon, and he has put his finger on the heart of the situation as applies to a minority group in this country.

I hope the Senate will heed his sage advice and sage counsel for certainly we can do no less than adopt this amendment which will give hope to millions of Americans who desire a better way of life with the right to live in decent housing in this country.

Mr. President, even the occasional visitor to our shores appreciates the necessity for fair housing in America.

During my recent visit to Africa, I was privileged to meet and talk with an eminent Kenyan journalist, Mr. Narain Singh, feature writer for the Nairobi Sunday Post. Mr. Singh had just completed his first visit to the United States in October and November of 1967. Upon his return to Kenya he wrote a series of articles in the Sunday Post on a subject of great interest to his readers—race relations in the United States.

His comments were for the most part encouraging. The Negro in America had made great strides, and by his own efforts was winning acceptance in a number of fields. But then, he had this to say:

> During my conversation with many white Americans I learnt, however, that when it comes to housing, desegregation automatically becomes for them, a severe, an almost insurmountable problem. For example, if a Negro buys a house in a hitherto purely white locality, even if his neighbors are willing to accept him, the real estate agents and others with vested interests will create the scare of property values falling as the result.

He then went on to comment on the likely causes of such a phenomenon in a relatively free and open society:

> The big phenomenon affecting the Negro problem during the past couple of decades has been the flow of many persons of that race from the south to the north and from the countryside to the cities. The pressure on housing and all other amenities of modern life has therefore increased very rapidly.
>
> Many white Americans have escaped to the suburbs which have mushroomed all over the States, leaving the Negroes in what have become, in effect, ghettoes. Ghetto here indicates a locality to which a people of a particular race are restricted and who, because of their own economic backwardness and lack of political influence, suffer, and often suffer terribly, as the result.

Mr. President, that is the view of an African of the gretto situation in the United States. I believe that Americans must agree that Mr. Singh's observations are accurate. The question before this body is what we can do to relieve the difficulties to which he has referred.

Mr. President, the findings of modern social science leave no doubt of the devastating effects of discrimination in housing. Studies abound to demonstrate these effects, but action to relieve them has yet to be taken.

I call to the attention of the Senate the cogent and perceptive work of Eunice and George Grier. In a recent study published in Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, they make the following observations regarding the social costs of segregation:

THE COSTS OF SEGREGATION

> Today's wide-scale patterns of segregation, and the prospect of their further expansion, have several extremely important consequences for the nation as a whole. One of the most dramatic of the current ramifications is the fact that the problems long associated with the Negro ghetto because of generations of discrimination—educational deficiencies, high rates of illness and social disorders, low employment rates, and predominantly low incomes even among those who are employed—all press with increasing force upon the cities as the ghettos continue to grow. At the same time, the financial and leadership resources of the cities have been severely depleted by the middle-class white

movement to the suburbs. As a separate political entity, the city has, with growing force, been deprived by the expanding rings of suburbia of the resources it needs to set its house in order.

The newly emergent residential patterns have thus transformed segregation from a parochial concern largely confined to the South (though posing a moral dilemma for the entire nation) into the hardest kind of practical economic problem affecting all the urban centers of America.

But the problem no longer stops at the city line. Today, segregation increasingly threatens the rational planning and development of entire metropolitan areas—a consequence of profound significance in light of continued population growth and the scarcity of urban land, which make it essential that future generations be housed in a less haphazard fashion.

In recent years choice land on the periphery of the larger cities has been devoured at a ferocious rate. In metropolitan Philadelphia, for example, while the population of the "urbanized" or heavily built up area grew by 24 percent during the 1950's, its geographic spread doubled. This reckless consumption of land cannot continue much longer. Municipalities are already grappling in various ways with the challenge of making more efficient use of the land which is still within feasible commuting distance. The aim of their plans is to keep the metropolitan areas fit places in which to live, with a satisfactory balance of the various elements that together constitute an adequate human environment: homes, commercial and cultural centers, adequate transit facilities, industries, parks, and other necessities and amenities.

In metropolitan Washington regional planning agencies recently devised a "Plan for the Year 2000." This plan is essentially a general set of principles for meeting the needs of a population that is expected to grow to more than twice its present size before the end of the century. The plan suggests that the future growth be channeled along six radial "corridors" extending outward in star fashion from the central city. Highways and transit lines would run alongside the corridors; centers of commerce and various service areas would be located at appropriate intervals. To preserve as much as possible of the green countryside, parks and open recreation areas would be placed between the corridors.

The plan, however, fails to take into account one vital consideration: the effect of race. If the movement of the city's population continues in its present directions, three of the planned corridors will be heavily Negro. They will have their central origins in neighborhoods which currently are Negro and which already are expanding outward in the directions proposed by the plan. The other three corridors will be almost exclusively white, since they originate in the only white residential areas that remain within the city. Thus segregation will be extended for an indefinite period into the new suburbs. If, on the other hand, Negro expansion is cut off along the three corridors which are presently "open," the future population growth will be forced back into the city, thereby intensifying dangerous pressures which already exist.

Still another instance of the way racial segregation thwarts planning can be found in the emerging new towns which, in some parts of the country, at least, may soon begin to offer an alternative to the previous norm of suburban sprawl. These new communities—of which Reston, Virginia, and Columbia, Maryland, both already underway, are two important examples—will be planned and built from the outset as complete urban complexes, with a full panoply of shopping, employment, and recreational facilities. The most comprehensive of the new towns will also contain a wide selection of housing, ranging from bachelor apartments to large single houses, so that the residents will be able to satisfy their changing needs without moving from the community. Over-all population densities in these new communities will be considerably higher than in the dormitory suburbs of the recent past. Yet, through imaginative planning, they can offer their residents an even greater sense of spaciousness and privacy.

Already popular in Europe and Great Britain, the new town concept offers important advantages over the formlessness that characterizes America's postwar suburban development—advantages that accrue not merely to the residents of the towns but to the entire nation. The new towns offer a way of comfortably accommodating population growth while conserving irreplaceable green space. The proliferation of multi-million-dollar superhighways can be slowed down. Pollution of the air by exhaust fumes will be reduced. Speedy, economical mass transit systems, now virtually unfeasible in many areas because of the low density and wide geographic spread of suburban growth, will become practical once more. There will even be substantial savings in taxes for municipal services, as well as in utility and commuting costs.

But the new towns, despite the hopeful prospect they represent, also confront the ever-present specter of race. To be successful in realizing their diversified goals, the towns will require a large number of service workers—including manual laborers, domestics, custodians, and sales people, to mention only a few categories. Today, the only significant reservoir of labor available for many of these occupations is the Negro population. Furthermore, civil rights laws now require equal access by all citizens to employment opportunities. Yet, in most instances, the new towns will be located too far from the central cities for easy and economical commuting. Thus, in all likelihood, the workers will have to be housed in the towns themselves.

But on what basis? Will the new towns contain, from the outset, pre-planned ghettos? If not, how is integration to be accomplished, given the differential income levels of the people involved and the many problems connected with providing low-cost housing under private auspices? Even if this last obstacle is overcome—as might be possible if Congress implements new and imaginative forms of governmental aid and subsidy—will white Americans long conditioned with the encouragement of their own government to rigid spatial separation, not only of races but of economic groups, accept any other arrangement?

If, on the other hand, the new towns do not offer accommodations to families of low income, what will happen as they draw away more and more of the cities' remaining affluent residents, while providing no comparable outlet for their growing low-income populations? Will vast new towns then be planned especially for the low income populations, thus extending patterns of racial segregation upon a scale even now unknown? Or will the cities merely be expected to absorb the population increase indefinitely?

Within some cities, the low income housing needs are already reaching crisis proportions. In Washington, D.C., for example, public attention has recently been focused on the problem through widespread civic protests. With virtually no vacant land remaining, and with a population which has grown since 1960 both in total numbers and in the proportion of low-income Negroes, Washington now faces a perplexing dilemma indeed. Virtually every improvement of any magnitude in its physical structure, whether publicly or privately sponsored, further reduces an already inadequate low income housing supply.

Development of expressways to relieve traffic congestion has been threatened as a result. Even code enforcement aimed at improving housing conditions is endangered because it often results in evicting poor families with no place else to live. Yet private construction, stimulated by Washington's booming economy and unhampered by considerations that often affect public action, is proceeding apace. Almost all centrally located homes which are privately renewed for occupancy by middle class families, and many of the sumptuous new apartment houses and office buildings as well, gain their valuable land by removing additional units from the low income housing supply. Some Washington observers are wondering how much longer this process can continue without triggering racial outbreaks similar to those which have already disfigured other major cities.

The complex issues which surround land development, both present and future, constitute only one of the concerns made increasingly problematical by the city-suburban racial split. Paradoxically, it presents obstacles also to current major attempts to aid minority groups in escaping from poverty and deprivation.

A good case in point is the multiple efforts to upgrade Northern public schools in a state of *de facto* segregation. For the most part, these schools are desegregated in principle, but because of surrounding residential patterns have become segregated in practice. A considerable amount of this segregation, it should be realized, occurred during the fifties as a direct result of population shifts. At the time of the Supreme Court decision barring school segregation, Washington, D.C., which is located among the border states, had a completely segregated educational system. Once the decision was announced, the city immediately desegregated. Yet only a decade later, because of intervening population shifts, the school system once again is almost entirely segregated. "Resegregation" is the term some concerned local citizens have coined for this disturbing phenomenon.

De facto segregation tends to create poor, inadequately serviced schools. The concentration of culturally disadvantaged Negro children makes it difficult to provide the intensive programs they need to reach an equal footing with their white contemporaries. In racially mixed schools, their deficiencies are leavened through contact with children more fortunate in background and home environment. One attempted solution has been to bus Negro children to better schools which are underutilized and for the most part are predominantly white. But this approach has met with strenuous resistance from many of the parents (including some Negroes) whose children attend the better schools. Some officials fear that continued busing in the face of such protests would cause even more middle-class whites to leave the cities and thus make the situation even worse in the long run.

The whole problem is exacerbated by the fact that most heavily Negro schools are located in the older and more depressed neighborhoods of the city. Both the schools and their surroundings are often in physical and social decay. Thus, in addition to everything else, it becomes difficult to attract or keep good teachers.

But the nation quite rightly, although belatedly, has committed itself to providing equal educational opportunities for all its citizens. In the face of *de facto* segregation, it is now trying to meet that commitment by a huge complex of experimental programs costing millions of dollars. If the programs are successful, their extension to all those who need them will ultimately mean the spending of many more billions. But aside from the question of money, the nation currently confronts the much more difficult question of whether the programs can in fact work, given the complex of environmental obstacles which exist.

Most of the dilemmas and problems posed

by residential segregation in the United States are brought into focus by the current war against poverty. Can poverty among Negroes ever be eliminated while rigid segregation increases within the metropolitan centers? On the other hand, can the metropolitan areas ever be desegregated as long as the majority of Negroes remain poor? As segregation continues to grow and Negroes reach numerical predominance in more and more urban centers, will not the cities which house the majority of the nation's industrial and commercial life find themselves less and less able to cope with their problems, financially and in every other way? What then will be the answer for the metropolitan complexes where two-thirds of America's population currently reside and where as much as 85 per cent of the nation may live by the year 2000?

Aside from these large and basic questions of public policy and social change, residential segregation causes havoc on a more personal and individual level. And the personal damage is not to Negroes alone. Many of the neighborhoods newly entered by Negroes since World War II have been occupied by middle-aged and retired white families who often look upon their current homes as being their last—and whose emotional attachment to both house and neighborhood is based upon ties of familiarity and friendship built up over many years. These occupants feel deeply threatened by the entrance of a Negro family. The result often is mental stress, misery, and loneliness, as well as a sense of overwhelming personal loss at being "forced" to leave a home and neighborhood one had grown to love.

The effects of precipitate change are particularly sad in ethnic neighborhoods where much of the community's life has centered around a house of worship and where neighbors often include kinfolk as well as friends. In such cases, the change is harmful not only to individual families but to institutions and social organizations that can rarely survive transfer to another location. Constant change is normal, of course, and neighborhood institutions should adapt constructively to it and help their members to adjust. Nevertheless, many institutions are unprepared, and the rapidity of racial change often gives them little opportunity to catch up with their responsibilities.

In all these ways, then, residential segregation is or has become central to major domestic problems of the nation. There is no way to determine the ultimate sum of its costs. It ranges into so many areas that it may accurately be designated the key question of our national life in the 1960's.

Mr. President, this is a problem we have only begun to recognize in the very recent past. For although the rights of Negro citizens have been abridged for decades, other forces, wider and newer than racial discrimination, have compounded the situation. Let me again refer to the notable research of Eunice and George Grier:

The background to all that has happened lies in certain facts concerning the rapid urbanization of America's people—facts racially neutral in themselves, but having profound racial effects. As the nation has grown more populous, its inhabitants have located increasingly within metropolitan centers. A century ago Americans numbered 31 million, about one-fifth of whom lived in urban areas. By 1920 the total population had risen to 106 million, and the urban proportion had grown to one-half—a ninefold jump in absolute numbers (from about 6 million to 54 million) in only sixty years.

After World War II, population growth accelerated sharply. The largest ten-year increase in the nation's history took place between 1950 and 1960. During that decade 28 million new citizens were added, a total nearly equal to the entire population of a century ago. About 85 per cent of this increase occurred within 212 metropolitan areas, making about two-thirds of the nation's people urban today.

In addition to increase through births and immigration during these fruitful years, the cities gained also from large-scale population movements from the center of the country toward its boundaries (especially to the seacoasts and Great Lakes region) and from the South to the North. These streams of people, most experts agree, were both "pulled" toward the cities by job opportunities and other urban attractions (especially in the coastal areas) and "pushed" out of the rural areas by shrinking labor needs, especially in the depressed portions of the agricultural South. Negroes and whites shared in the migration—Negroes to a somewhat, but not drastically, greater degree in proportion to their share of the total population.

Migration to the cities helps explain why, after World War II, the nation turned to its suburbs in order to satisfy housing needs which had been accumulating during almost two decades of economic depression and world conflict. The previous growth of the cities had used up most of the land suitable for development within their boundaries. Yet the people had to be housed somewhere, and swiftly. The easiest place, requiring no costly and time-consuming demolition of existing buildings, was the suburbs.

How should the suburbs be developed? In answering this question certain key public policy decisions—involving racial implications which were probably neither foreseen nor intended—joined with private actions to help produce the present situation. Primary among these was the critical decision to allow the private-enterprise system to meet the housing shortage on its own terms. Most of the government mechanisms mobilized to aid in the task, especially the mortgage guarantee provisions of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration, served to support and encourage the efforts of private enterprise.

Such a decision was completely in accord with America's social philosophy and economic structure. And, in light of the inherent dynamism of the private-enterprise system, it is not surprising that the home-building industry was able to provide usable physical shelter. Indeed, this success can be counted as one of the major achievements of a nation which has never been satisfied with small accomplishments. Almost every year following World War II more than one million dwelling units were constructed and occupied, a figure which is double the rate at which new families were formed. And, despite rapid population growth during the fifties, the 1960 Census showed that Americans were far better housed than ever before. Overcrowding and "doubling up" (two or more families in one dwelling) had been considerably reduced. So had dilapidated and otherwise substandard housing. To a greater or lesser degree, the entire population benefited from this widespread improvement—even Negroes, though they continued to be less adequately housed than whites.

Nonetheless, the decision to let private enterprise satisfy the housing need carried with it unfortunate consequences for future residential patterns. It meant that the great majority of the new postwar suburban housing was built for those who could afford to pay the full economic price. Thus the basic mechanisms of the private enterprise system, successful as they were in meeting overall housing needs, selectively operated to reinforce existing trends which concentrated low-income families in the cities. At the same time, they encouraged the centrifugal movement of those who were more wealthy to the outskirts of the cities.

Most Negro families were among those with low incomes, the result of generations of discrimination in employment and education. Quite apart from direct racial discrimination, in which the private housing industry also indulged whenever it felt necessary, economics posed a giant barrier to the free dispersal of the growing Negro populations. The findings of a market analysis conducted by Chester Rapkin and others at the University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Urban Studies at the peak of the postward housing boom in the mid-1950's were quite typical. At that time, only 0.5 per cent of all dwellings costing $12,000 or more in Philadelphia had been purchased by Negroes—a fact which the authors laid mainly to economic incapacity. This was about the minimum cost of a modest new house in Philadelphia's suburbs.

But this is only part of the story. Federal policies and practices in housing reinforced and increased the separation between the "Negro" cities and the white suburbs. In part, this was intentional. From 1935 to 1950—a period in which about 15 million new dwellings were constructed—the power of the national government was explicitly used to prevent integrated housing. Federal policies were based upon the premise that economic and social stability could best be achieved through keeping neighborhood populations as homogeneous as possible. Thus, the Underwriting Manual of the Federal Housing Administration (oldest and largest of the federal housing agencies, established by the Housing Act of 1934) warned that "if a neighborhood is to retain stability, it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial group." It advised appraisers to lower their valuation of properties in mixed neighborhoods, "often to the point of rejection." FHA actually drove out of business some developers who insisted upon open policies.

More recently, a number of studies by competent real-estate economists have thrown serious doubt upon the thesis that Negro entry lowers property values. Laurenti, in his thorough analysis entitled Property Values and Race, found that prices rose in 44 per cent of those areas which Negroes entered, were unchanged in another 41 per cent, and declined in only 15 per cent. These were long-term trends, and they were measured relative to trends in carefully-matched neighborhoods which remained all white—thus obviating any possibly misleading effects of generally rising prices.

Surveying the literature, Laurenti noted similar results from other studies in various cities extending back as far as 1930. But erroneous though the allegation of nonwhite destruction of property values may have been, it nonetheless provided "justification" for widespread discriminatory practices, as well as active encouragement of private discrimination, by agencies of the federal government during a period of critical importance in determining present residential patterns.

However, discrimination per se was only a small factor in the impact of federal policies and practices upon radical patterns during this crucial period. Much more important were more basic aspects of the structure and functioning of federal housing programs. Three major progams have dominated the field. The largest and most significant has been the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program, with its post-World War II counterpart for veterans, the Veterans Administration's loan guarantee program. Both granted their benefits chiefly to the "modal" family recently embarked upon married life, with children already born or on the way, and willing to commit itself to the responsibilities of home ownership with a mortgage. For such families, down-payment requirements were minimal, repayment periods lengthy, and credit restrictions lenient. A certain minimum of present earnings and good prospects for future income were paramount, as well as some evidence of faithful repayment of past obligations. Households which did not fit these criteria—

> smaller families, older couples, single persons, people with low or precarious earnings, families who sought dwellings for rent rather than for sale, even families dependent upon the wife's employment for an adequate income—all were required to satisfy their needs chiefly through the older housing left vacant by people moving to new homes in the suburbs.
>
> Prominent among those left behind, of course, were Negroes. The federal programs permitted them to "inherit" the cities, along with an assortment of whites who did not meet the conditions for access to the new suburbs: the old, the poor, the physically and mentally handicapped, the single and divorced, together with some persons of wealth and influence who preferred the convenience of living in the central city. The significance of the housing programs for residential patterns, however, lay also in their tendency to pull young and upwardly mobile white families away from the cities and out toward the suburbs.
>
> It may be that a large number of these families, given free choice, would have preferred to remain within the cities, close to work and to older relatives. But the FHA and VA programs generally did not provide nearly so liberal terms on the mortgages of older homes in the cities. Down payments were usually larger; repayment periods shorter; monthly payments higher. For most young families, therefore, the suburbs were the only practical areas in which to solve their housing needs. In this way, the FHA and VA programs, essentially independent of any direct racial bias in their decisions on applications, enhanced the tendency toward white dominance in the suburbs.
>
> The second of the federal government's major housing programs is subsidized low-income public housing, administered by the Public Housing Administration through local housing authorities. Its criteria for admission are based upon maximum rather than minimum income levels. Under these conditions relatively small numbers of whites can qualify because their earnings exceed the required standard. In many areas, even where conscious efforts are made to attract an interracial clientele, the great majority of residents are Negro. In further contrast to the FHA and VA programs, most public housing projects have been constructed in the central cities rather than in the suburbs—since one of their objectives is to reduce the incidence of blighted housing.
>
> The differences between the two programs thus reinforce each other in their effects upon patterns of residence. While the FHA and VA have helped promote white dominance in the suburbs, public housing has helped enhance Negro dominance in the cities.
>
> The third of the major federal housing programs is urban renewal. Established by the Housing Act of 1949, its chief goal is to combat physical decay in the central cities. In a sense, urban renewal has worked against FHA and VA programs, since, among other things, it attempts to draw back to the cities the more prosperous of the families who have left it. Until recently, the renewal program has usually cleared off blighted sections and replaced them with housing units priced in the middle- to upper-income brackets. Most often, as might be expected, the occupants of the site before renewal have been low-income members of a racial minority. They have been displaced by housing which, for economic reasons alone, was available mainly to whites and to very few Negroes. Some civil rights groups therefore have dubbed urban renewal "Negro removal."
>
> Renewal agencies are required by law to relocate displaced families into "decent, safe and sanitary" housing. Relocation procedures have recently received a great deal of criticism throughout the nation. Whether or not all of it is valid, it is an undeniable fact that most relocatees move only a short distance from their former homes. One study found, for example, that two-thirds of them relocated within a radius of twelve city blocks. As a result, displaced low-income minorities ring the renewal site.
>
> Sometimes this movement appears to set off a chain reaction. Whites in the neighborhoods to which the displacees move take up residence elsewhere—as do some of the more secure Negroes. The ultimate effect too often is to touch off spreading waves of racial change, which in the end only produce a broader extension of segregated living patterns. Thus, if the FHA, VA, and public housing programs have helped produce metropolitan areas which increasingly resemble black bullseyes with white outer rings, urban renewal has too often created small white or largely white areas in the center of the bullseyes—simultaneously causing the black ghettos to expand outward even further.
>
> Combined with rapid population growth in the metropolitan areas, the interacting effects of federal policies and practices in the postwar era did much to produce the present segregated patterns. But they were not the only factors. Clear discrimination by private individuals and groups—including the mortgage, real-estate, and home-building industries—has also played its part. The activities of the "blockbuster" provide a good focus for examining the way this works.
>
> The modus operandi of the blockbuster is to turn over whole blocks of homes from white to Negro occupancy—the quicker the better for his own profits, if not for neighborhood stability. Once one Negro family has entered a block, the speculator preys on the racial fears and prejudices of the whites in order to purchase their homes at prices as low as possible—often considerably below fair market value. He then plays upon the pent-up housing needs of Negroes and resells the same houses at prices often well above their value in a free market situation. Often he makes a profit of several thousand dollars within a period of a few days. Studies have indicated that skillful blockbusters frequently double their investments in a brief interval. They can do this only because tight residential restrictions have "dammed up" the Negro need for housing to such a point that its sudden release can change the racial composition of a neighborhood within a matter of weeks or months. Apart from the damage done to both sellers and buyers and to the structure of the neighborhoods themselves, blockbusters have a far wider negative impact. By funneling Negro housing demand into limited sections of the city (usually around the edges of the Negro slums, since these neighborhoods are easier to throw into panic), the blockbusters relieve much of the pressure which might otherwise have encouraged the dispersion of Negroes throughout the metropolitan areas.
>
> Technically speaking, blockbusters represent an unscrupulous minority of the real estate industry—"outlaws" in a moral if not a legal sense. However, their activities would not prove profitable if racial restrictions on place of residence were not accepted and enforced by the large majority of builders, brokers, and lenders, backed by the supporting opinion of large segments of the white public.
>
> By restraining the Negro market and permitting its housing needs to be satisfied only on a waiting-list basis, "reputable" members of the banking and housing industries have helped perpetuate the conditions under which their less-scrupulous colleagues can flourish. For reasons they consider entirely justifiable, they guard assiduously against the entry of Negroes into white areas. In recent testimony before the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the President of the Mortgage Bankers Association of Metropolitan Washington stated bluntly that "applications from minority groups are not generally considered in areas that are not recognized as being racially mixed." A study by the Chicago Commission on Human Relations found that such a policy was pursued by almost all lending sources in that city. Voluminous evidence from both social research surveys and testimony before legislative and executive bodies indicates that the same is true of most real-estate boards in cities throughout the country.
>
> Supporting this activity is the subjective equivalent of the ostensibly objective economic argument that underlay federal housing policy for years: the belief in neighborhood homogeneity—that is, neighborhood exclusiveness. The general attitude of much of the public (or the most vocal) has been that neighborhoods were better off when the people within them all belonged to the same broad socioeconomic groups and had the same ethnic or racial origins. In practice, of course, this commitment to neighborhood homogeneity has tended to exclude individuals who fell below a certain status level, not those who were above it. The latter, however, usually have "excluded" themselves in neighborhoods restricted to occupants of their own status.
>
> After 1948, when the Supreme Court ruled that racial and religious covenants were unenforceable in the courts, minority groups began to find it somewhat less difficult to obtain access to neighborhoods on the basis of financial status and preference. Still, neighborhood exclusiveness remained a commonly accepted value, widely enforced by the real-estate, home-building, and lending industries. It served as the final factor in the constellation which created the nation's new patterns of residential segregation.

(At this point, Mr. MONDALE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, fortunately, we have a number of reasons to be optimistic as we approach the problem of housing all our people in an equitable manner. I was very much pleased to hear the distinguished Senator from Oregon state that among Oregon's pioneering legislation was an open occupancy housing law—a fair housing law to enable the 2 million citizens of that great State to live in decent housing and to live where they choose to live. Nothing augurs so well for a happy solution to these issues than the upsurge of citizen concern with them.

Reading further from Eunice and George Grier:

> Over the past decade and a half, as the situation has worsened, the significance of residential segregation has steadily been pushing itself into the forefront of the national consciousness. As public comprehension has grown, one response has been a groundswell of concern and action on both public and private levels. This development cannot be overvalued. It is a change of almost revolutionary proportions, a change that has been accomplished not through violence or political disorder but through the constitutional mechanisms of the government and through the exercise of individual freedoms that form the basis of American society. Yet, this counteraction, despite its importance, is in itself presently insufficient for the task at hand. The best way to indicate both the limitations of the current activity and the general direction in which the country must now move is to outline the various ways in which mounting public concern has expressed itself.
>
> Between 1950 and today, the federal government has completely reversed its racial policy, moving from official sanction of segregation to a Presidential order that prohibits discrimination in any housing receiving federal assistance. The first official impetus for this change came in 1948, when the Supreme Court ruled that restrictive racial covenants were legally unenforceable. At first the Federal Housing Administration declared that

the decision was inapplicable to its operation. Finally, late in 1949, it removed the model covenant and all references to neighborhood homogeneity from its manual and declared that after February 1950 it no longer would insure mortgages having restrictive covenants. The Veterans' Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration both issued similar statements.

Further changes ensued. By 1960, they included the following: both the FHA and VA had ruled that the insured property they acquired (usually under foreclosure proceedings) would be made available to all buyers or renters, regardless of race, creed, or color; the administrative head of the FHA had instructed local offices to take "active steps to encourage the development of demonstrations in open occupancy projects in suitably located key areas"; both the FHA and VA had signed a series of formal agreements of cooperation with state and local agencies responsible for enforcing laws and ordinances against housing discrimination; the government had dropped a system of racial quotas in housing built for persons displaced by urban renewal; and it also had banned discrimination in a special loan program to assist the elderly in their housing needs.

These regulations and directives clearly represent a large stride forward from the directly discriminatory policies pursued before 1950. Yet their practical effect on the rigid patterns of segregation that had developed over the years was very small. In 1962, federal reports revealed that nearly 80 per cent of all public housing projects receiving a federal subsidy were occupied by only one race. Segregated projects were located as far North as Scranton, Pennsylvania, and Plattsburgh, New York—and, as might be expected, in practically every locality in the South. The vast majority of new suburban housing backed by FHA and VA mortgage guarantees was occupied exclusively by white families. A scattering of developments built on urban renewal sites were made available to both Negroes and whites; but they were limited mainly to the largest cities of the North and West and generally priced at or close to luxury levels. Where integration existed, it was largely the result of state and local laws rather than national directives. Only seldom, however, were these laws adequately enforced.

Nonetheless, by 1962, partly because of the ineffectiveness of previous changes, it had become clear that the broad problems of discrimination and segregation were too interwoven to be solved with piecemeal changes in federal policy. The first step toward a more comprehensive approach came on November 20, 1962, when the late President Kennedy issued an Executive Order barring discrimination in all housing receiving federal aid after that date. At the end of April 1964, it was estimated that 932,000 units of housing had come under the directives of the Order. In June 1964, it was estimated that between 12 and 20 per cent of all new residential construction was covered.

But the segregation that had developed in previous years still remained. Charles Abrams summed up both the limitations and the value of the Executive Order shortly after it was issued in the following way:

"The Executive Order will . . . touch only a small fraction of the housing market. If any real gains are to be made, its coverage must be widened or more individual state laws laboriously sought. The President's Order is no more than a small first federal step toward breaking the bottleneck in housing discrimination.

"Nevertheless, its importance cannot be discounted. First steps in civil rights legislation have often led to second steps when the will to move ahead has been present."

The federal government has also made special, though limited, efforts to mitigate the unintended racial effects of its housing programs. Housing legislation gave the FHA, in cooperation with the Federal National Mortgage Association, the right to issue insured loans from government funds at below-market interest rates for housing to be occupied by families with incomes too low to acquire new homes in the private market. This indirect form of subsidy was intended in part to reach a larger number of Negro families. Urban renewal programs have begun to pay more attention to relocation procedures and to stress rehabilitation of existing dwellings rather than total clearance. In some cities, Community Renewal Programs aided with federal funds are attempting to develop comprehensive plans for housing all groups in the population. In the public housing program, where Negroes predominate, federal action has paradoxically been least decisive. Still, many local authorities have tried to promote racial balance in their projects, and some have been experimenting with various types of nonproject housing scattered throughout the community.

But the fundamental orientations of the federal programs remain today—as do the deeply entrenched consequences of their operation throughout the peak years of the post-World War II housing boom. It will take more than piecemeal efforts to shatter such a solid foundation for the continued growth of segregated living patterns.

While the federal government was moving toward its policy of nondiscrimination in housing, many states and municipalities were moving in the same direction—and, in recent years, at a more rapid pace. Prior to 1954, only a few of the states in the North and Midwest had legislation which barred discrimination in any segment of their housing supply. The laws usually covered only low-rent public housing and, occasionally, units receiving such special forms of assistance as tax exemptions or write-downs on land costs.

As of mid-1965, however, sixteen states and the District of Columbia had barred discrimination in a substantial portion of their private housing supply. At the 1960 census these states together contained about eighty million people, or 44 percent of the total population. Thus nearly half the citizens of the United States are now living in communities whose public policy is clearly opposed to deliberate segregation on the basis of race—even in housing built under private auspices. President Kennedy's Executive Order of 1962 therefore was basically an extension on the federal level of a principle already gaining widespread acceptance in states and localities across the nation.

However, mere nondiscrimination cannot by itself overcome the problem of segregation. It will take vigorous positive efforts on the part of government and private citizens to halt, let alone reverse, trends now so firmly entrenched.

CONTRIBUTORS TO CHANGE

Changes in public policy can usually be attributed to the determined efforts of a small minority of citizens who recognize a need and work tirelessly to bring it to public attention. In no case has this been more true than with residential segregation. Led by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing—a small and meagerly financed organization which grew out of the first successful campaigns for housing laws in New York—religious, civic and labor groups in many parts of the country have spearheaded similar campaigns in their own states and cities. The resulting laws have provided a foundation upon which other types of private effort could build.

A second important variety of private effort toward housing desegregation is the intentional development of new housing on an open-occupancy basis. Beginning in 1937 with a small Quaker-sponsored project in southwestern Pennsylvania, the spontaneous development of nondiscriminatory housing by private groups got underway in earnest following World War II. Despite concerted opposition by the federal government, many local governments, and most segments of the real estate industry, a 1956 survey found that some fifty new interracial communities had been produced by private efforts up to that time. Some of them had been inspired by civic and social service organizations to foster racial equality, but a number had been constructed by businessmen for profit. Today, such developments are estimated to number in the high hundreds or even the thousands.

In a third approach, "grass-roots" organizations in many cities across the country have sought to stabilize the occupancy of their own neighborhoods following the entry of Negroes. In numerous instances they have accomplished what many once thought impossible—quelling panic, avoiding possible violence, maintaining sound neighborhood conditions, even bringing new white residents into areas where formerly the prognosis had been for complete transition to all-Negro occupancy.

Finally, in the suburbs of a number of cities, concerned white residents have banded together to help open their own neighborhoods to Negro families able to pay the price. The first of these "fair housing committees," established in Syracuse, New York, in the mid-1950's, was sponsored by the local Quaker Meeting. Religious influence of various denominations remains strong in many of the later organizations, now estimated to number more than one thousand.

These private efforts represent one of the most encouraging examples of the inherent strength of American democracy and its capacity for change. They have helped shatter many racial myths, have opened new housing opportunities for Negroes in areas not previously open to them, and have done much through practical demonstration to alter the attitudes of the white majority toward the prospect of Negro neighbors.

But in the face of population forces, they can have little effect in destroying racial segregation. The point was passed some years ago where either legal bars against discrimination or the best-intentioned of meagerly financed "grass roots" endeavors could accomplish the task. If Americans wish not only to create truly equal opportunity for all, but also to solve the many domestic problems which stem from inequality and artificial separation of the races, they must now be prepared to move beyond mere nondiscrimination and good will—in a sense, beyond equality—into an area of positive and aggressive efforts to undo the damage already done. It will require a massive national effort, calling upon the full resources of both the public and private sectors.

That the country possesses the fundamental resources it needs to solve the problem is fortunately clear. What is required is less the creation of new mechanisms than the effective harnessing and, where necessary, the reorientation, of those which already exist. Otherwise it will be impossible to meet the goal of rendering segregated housing patterns ineffective as an obstacle to the objectives of the "Great Society."

This aim, it must be stressed, need not be sought through methods which run counter to the basic tenets of American democracy. For example, it needs not be attempted through forced redistribution of population. Force is not only intolerable, but unnecessary. The normal mobility of the American people is so great (about half of all households moved during the latter half of the 1950s alone) that redistribution can be achieved through the operation of free choice—if sufficient resources are applied to make socially desirable patterns of residence as attractive to the public as socially undesirable ones have been in the past.

Nor is it necessary to attempt a rigidly planned dispersal of Negro households. The aim, rather, should be to achieve complete freedom of choice in place of residence without respect to racial barriers. Within this framework of unconstrained choice, some substantial concentrations of Negro families would doubtless persist, just as Jews have remained in certain neighborhoods even after obstacles to their residing elsewhere have largely been eliminated. But the present monolithic character of the Negro ghettos, their inexorable growth, and the social evils they encourage would be broken.

The following are some specific measures which would help achieve the goal. The list is not all-inclusive; doubtless many readers will think of others which would be of value:

A central federal agency possessing the competence to plan comprehensively for all phases of urban development and the authority to translate plans into effective action. This agency must have the power to draw together federal operations in such diverse areas as housing, urban renewal, highways, transportation, and community facilities and to guide them toward a set of common objectives. The newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development can be such an instrument—if it can overcome the handicap of its origin in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a loosely knit combination of essentially independent agencies, and achieve better coordination of individually powerful organizations than has the similarly amalgamated Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This will not be easy.

A total strategy for desegregation. The segregation problem is too complex to be solved without a total approach which recognized all the manifold forces which brought it to its present magnitude and threaten to enlarge it further. This approach must take maximum strategic advantage of all available resources and knowledge. It must be adaptable to varying local conditions and flexible enough to permit changes as "feedback" from early applications dictates. But it must be directed always to a clear and unwavering set of goals.

Broadened federal incentives for effective action by local governments and private entrepreneurs. Incentive programs have proved one of the most acceptable means of applying governmental leverage in a democratic system, for they do not involve compulsion and do not infringe upon freedom of choice. In housing, for example, incentives have promoted urban renewal (through grants to local authorities to clear slum land for redevelopment) and the construction of specific types of housing (through liberal mortgage insurance). Incentives must now be used to encourage comprehensive planning and action toward social goals. For example, suitable incentives can encourage private builders to construct balanced communities serving all population groups, can attract and assist low-income minority families to move to such communities, can stimulate existing neighborhoods to self-renewal and racial stabilization, can encourage local governments to attack segregation in the comprehensive manner it requires by cooperation throughout the metropolitan areas.

Imaginative new forms of subsidy for low-income families. Traditionally, housing subsidies have been available almost exclusively for units built by local nonprofit authorities— chiefly in the form of multi-unit public "projects," which stood apart from their surroundings and amassed the social ills associated with poverty in much the same fashion as did older and less solidly constructed ghettos. More recently, various localities have experimented with methods for widening the range of choice and location in subsidized housing. The Housing Act of 1965 contains provisions which can make subsidies a much more valuable tool in combatting segregation. But their operation toward this end cannot be left to chance; it will require vigorous and imaginative guidance.

Comprehensive measures to increase minority incomes: Any measure which increases the purchasing power of racial minorities will bring a corresponding reduction in the critically important economic barriers to desegregation. Minimum wage floors must be raised; present ones are actually below the level defined by the federal government as "poverty." Federal resources must be directed toward expanding the number of jobs available, particularly for those of limited education. The most important need of the minority poor is for decent jobs at decent pay. Economic measures can and should be tied to housing. For example, low-income minority persons should be trained for the specific kinds of jobs which will be made available in the new, comprehensively planned communities on the outskirts of metropolitan areas. Housing should be planned for them close to these new job opportunities. Similarly, relocation from urban renewal areas should be coupled with a range of services, including training and assistance in finding employment, to help assure that displaced families improve not only their housing conditions but their economic situation as well.

Intensive efforts to improve the attractiveness of central cities: To date, urban renewal, in its efforts to draw middle- and upper-income families back to the urban cores, has focused mainly upon the physical aspects of decay. It is increasingly obvious that social renewal is required also—that many of the economically more capable families, Negro as well as white and especially those with children, will not be persuaded to return to the central areas until they are assured of protection from the social pathology of the ghetto. City schools, for example, must be drastically improved; yet there is growing evidence that this will require not merely replacement of individual buildings and teaching staffs but also comprehensive restructuring of entire school systems. Crime and violence are among the greatest deterrents to affluent families who prefer to live in central areas, and the cities will be at a disadvantage until they prove that they can control both the chronically lawless and those driven to crime by frustration and economic need.

Vigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws and affirmative measures to promote equal opportunity: As noted earlier, anti-discrimination laws in themselves are unable to solve a problem which stems from much broader causes. But, if vigorously enforced, they can prove a most important weapon in the arsenal of measures against segregation. Further, as many of the more effective law-enforcement agencies already recognize, it is not sufficient merely to remain passive and wait for a minority conditioned by generations of segregation to recognize and claim its newly guaranteed rights. Affirmative measures are necessary to promote awareness of the law both among those it protects and those who offend against it.

Expanded support for "grass-roots" citizen efforts. While the efforts of spontaneous, citizen-led groups have had impressive success in helping change attitudes, practices, and laws across the nation, these groups have been severely handicapped by their meager resources. A few have been fortunate enough to receive substantial support, usually from local foundations. Where funds have permitted hiring full-time staff, the increase in effectiveness has often been dramatic. Compared to the many millions spent annually by philanthropic organizations on problems of comparable or even lesser importance, the few thousands devoted to housing segregation have been infinitesimal. This is still another way in which available resources must be redirected if the problem is to be solved.

A national educational campaign: For the first time in American history, the majority of the white public appears aware that discrimination and segregation defeat the goals of democracy. But it is a long step forward from this recognition to a vigorous and affirmative effort equal to the need. This will require a type and degree of comprehension and commitment, by majority and minority peoples alike, which are still far from achievement.

National consensus is most readily achieved through full information about the problem and stimulation of public debate on the means of solution. A full-scale campaign to arouse and inform the American people must begin immediately if public understanding and support are to reach the necessary levels before segregation grows so much larger that it appears insoluble to many. The turning point may well come with the 1970 Census. If some tangible progress has not been made—or at least a plan of action proposed—before its statistics appear, discouragement may rule.

The core of organized citizen support necessary to mount such a campaign already exists—in such national organizations as the American Friends Service Committee, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing and in the hundreds of citizen fair housing groups across the country. But their efforts must be focused, coordinated, and, above all, adequately financed. And they must be brought into the context of related activities such as urban planning and the war on poverty.

The task of eliminating segregation rests ultimately with the American people as a whole—led, as in every major struggle in their history, by a small group of devoted citizens. If they do not succeed, the result will almost certainly be the continued spread of Negro ghettos; large-scale physical blight generated by population pressures and exploitation; economic loss to many citizens of both races; persistent social disorder; and spreading racial tensions which strike at the very foundations of a free and democratic society. The choice is not merely between segregation and desegregation, but between wholesale destruction of property and human values and the continued growth and security of American society itself.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jordan of North Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the fair housing bill now before us would establish, once and for all, the principle that in housing all Americans are equal. For white Americans, that principle is older than the Nation itself. What we can do by enacting H.R. 2516, as amended, is to make the principle closer to a practical reality by placing behind it the force of law.

I think that most real estate brokers, tract developers, and owners and operators of apartment houses have no strong personal prejudice. Today the great majority of them feel compelled by business pressures to maintain the existing patterns of race and color in housing, no matter what they may personally believe. They think—in my opinion, wrongly—that to break the pattern would be to risk financial loss or ruin.

By requiring all who are in the business of housing not to discriminate, however, this legislation would relieve the pressure on each. When every businessman must by law treat his customers equally, there will be little or no risk of loss for those who do. In the course of the 1966 hearings on a similar fair housing bill before the House Committee on the Judiciary, prominent builders testified that before the States in which they operated enacted open housing laws, they never sold homes in their developments to Negroes, but that when open housing laws were enacted, they stopped discriminating and have continued an open housing policy ever since. They testified that they now have Negroes and members of other minority groups in all their developments and have experienced no friction or economic loss of any kind. Furthermore—as though to emphasize the contrast between States with open housing legislation and those without—these same builders testified that when operating in different States, even at the same time and with otherwise identical developments, they would discriminate where there were no laws to stop them and not discriminate where there were such laws.

Mr. President, I believe that one of the most compelling single elements developed in hearings on the proposed fair housing amendment was that presented by members of the real estate industry which represented experienced and substantial realtors with wide experience in communities with a biracial makeup.

They testified that they now have Negroes and members of other minority groups in all their developments and that they experience no friction or economic loss of any kind.

Furthermore, they emphasize the contrast between States with open housing legislation and those States without open housing legislation. The same builders testified that when operating in different States, even at the same time, and with otherwise identical developments, they would discriminate where there were no laws to stop them and they would not discriminate where there were laws to stop them.

In short, open housing laws have proved beyond doubt their effectiveness as applied to professional housing developers.

Persons engaged in the real estate business came before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to express their strong support for a Federal open housing law. Indeed, I think that the strongest testimony we received, and the most urgent pleas we heard for a law which would be comprehensive and strong, came from the representatives of the real estate industry. I regretted that their national association took a different view. But I believe now that the old view, that realtors were opposed to fair housing proposals, has been shattered. We now know that many, substantially experienced realtors are fully committed to the adoption of fair housing proposals.

One view expressed by the members of the real estate profession who supported the legislation was that the concept of the importance of a seller's right to select the purchaser was an illusion.

One of these witnesses stated:

> An experienced real estate broker knows that up until the time the race question entered the picture not one seller in a hundred cared about who was going to buy his house so long as the buyer had the money and met the seller's terms.

In other words, the sale of a home is a commercial transaction. The test applied is purely a financial one, except where the factor of race, religion, or national origin is involved.

Similarly, the concept that the movement of a Negro into a previously all-white neighborhood depresses property values in that area is also an illusion. One witness, a man with 14 years of experience in appraising residential property values, stated:

> Value is determined by the law of supply and demand. If a lot of similar housing is on the market at the same time and there are no buyers to absorb them, prices will go down. Similarly, if there is a great demand in a neighborhood, because of the popularity of a certain school or some other factor, and there are not many houses being offered for sale, the prices are going to rise, regardless of the color of the neighbor's skin.

Because of the economic factors involved, the passage of fair housing legislation will not cause a deluge of Negroes into white neighborhoods and create new ghettos. The District of Columbia has a fair housing ordinance which allows Negroes to move into previously all-white areas of the city. There are Negroes in Chevy Chase, Cleveland Park, where the present speaker lives—and American University Park, but their numbers are regulated strictly by their ability to pay.

I am proud that in the block in which I live resides a magnificent Negro family.

Mr. President, I should like to emphasize one point. The Real Estate Association persists in talking about the precious right of the seller not to sell. Several of the subcommittee's witnesses agreed that in their experience as real estate brokers—and their experience has been substantial—they had not been parties to nor had heard of any transaction in which someone, exercising the "right not to sell," had refused to sell for any reason whatsoever when the buyer was ready, willing, and able to purchase.

Mr. President, the hearings on the Fair Housing Act of 1967 before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency heard from a distinguished panel of realtors. That testimony begins on page 396 of the hearings.

We heard from Mr. Ferd Kramer, Chicago, Ill.; W. Evans Buchanan, Rockville, Md.; Elliott N. Couden, Seattle, Wash.; Edward Durchslag, Chicago, Ill.; Tighe E. Woods, Washington, D.C.; and Kennon V. Rothchild, St. Paul, Minn.

If there were ever any doubts that fair housing was a practical and workable concept, that it would receive the cooperation of responsible real estate industry, those doubts are exploded and set to rest forever. I would commend to my colleagues, and to the country, if they have any doubts about the proposition before us, that they read the testimony of the realtors to which I have just made reference.

Mr. President, there are many reasons why I hope the Senate will support the bill now pending before it. It is legislation of this kind—intended to meet and to master one of the Nation's most critical domestic problems—that is particularly deserving of such support. It is not difficult, Mr. President, to cite examples of expressions of support for such legislation from leaders of both parties.

I am proud that the coauthor of the pending amendment, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], is a member of the Republican Party. Well, that should be, because the Republican platform in 1960, in speaking of equality under the law, included the following statement:

> [Equality] becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education and employment.

In education and employment, Mr. President, we have accomplished a great deal. Much remains to be done, as we all must surely recognize—but we have made significant beginnings and we are continuing to work toward solutions in these areas.

But in the field of housing, equality under the law has not even begun to be a reality of American life.

The arguments against fair housing legislation, Mr. President, often take the form of positive, self-righteous assertions about the "right to deal with whom you choose" or the "right to sell property without interference," despite the fact that, as the realtor witnesses testified, never once in their real estate experience had they known a seller to question the right of any eligible and able buyers to purchase except on the basis of race.

Aside from the fact that these assertions ignore the possibility that a parallel "right to purchase" may exist, the argument denies decades of history as well. Property rights have been regulated by government since the beginning of the concepts of "property" and "government."

Theodore Roosevelt, in 1910, expressed this same idea when he said:

> Every man holds his property subject to the general rights of the community to regulate its use to whatever degree the public welfare may require it.

In 1949, Congress set for itself and for the Nation the goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." I submit, Mr. President, that 19 years later, we are still a long, long way from that goal. There is no question that the goal set out in the Housing Act of 1949 has not been reached; the only question is, are we nearer, or farther away, from that goal than we were 19 years ago? The increasing urbanization of our population has made substandard housing a greater problem than it has ever been. The image of the tumbledown slatboard shack in the rural South has been replaced by what is to my mind an even more regrettable, more terrible alternative—the filthy, freezing urban slum tenement. Added to the monumental problem of poverty in the cities is the totally-related problem of segregated housing. These two monstrous national disgraces are really only one, Mr. President. I quote from an article by Loren Miller, entitled "Government Responsibility for Residential Segregation":

> The total population growth for 1960's ten largest cities from 1930 to 1960 was 3,480,295; the Negro increase was 3,222,347. Central city growth *was* Negro growth. The standard metropolitan area for those same ten cities had a total population gain from 1930 to 1960 of 4,174,537 and a Negro gain of 146,540. Whites outgained Negroes in the suburbs by some thirty to one.
>
> The statistics confirm what the eye can observe: residential segregation has been on the aggresive increase in the centers of our cities in the past three decades with a concomitant exclusion of Negroes from outlying suburban areas. Statistics confirm what the eye can observe—

The author states, and the eye can so observe within 5 minutes walking distance of this Chamber. Our cities do not merely contain ghettos, Mr. President: they are fast becoming ghettos. We stand in the center of a prime example of that process in action.

But, opponents of this legislation may say—the District of Columbia has a fair housing ordinance—why does that not operate to cure the problem of segregated housing? The answer is obvious. There is scant opportunity for Negro citizens of the District of Columbia to join their white coworkers in the suburbs. There has been great effort on the part of progressive citizens in all the areas surrounding this city to end segregation in the suburbs, but to date the victories in that effort have been minor ones, and the virtually all-white suburban communities surround the declining central city as they have since this problem began to emerge many decades ago.

To refer to the statement I made some days ago, at the beginning of this debate, there is growing evidence, encouraging evidence, that more and more American Negroes have licked their own economic problems, and they now enjoy middle and upper incomes from their employment; but thousands upon thousands of them, despite that fact, are nevertheless pinned in the ghetto because they cannot exercise the right of all other American citizens to buy housing of their choice in some other location.

We had the testimony of a Navy lieutenant, who was assigned by the U.S. Navy to a post not more than 30 miles from where we are, who went to 39 different places, seeking to buy a home, and was turned down in every instance—a handsome, able young man, who had served this country for 8 years, who is good enough to defend this Nation, but is not good enough to live near us.

Washington is not unique. "Typical," would be closer to the truth of the matter. We must decide, Mr. President, whether to take appropriate action to relieve some of the mounting pressures of the ghettos, or to stand by and observe the destruction of our urban centers by loss of jobs and business to the suburbs, a declining tax base, and the ruin brought on by absentee ownership of property.

The reasons for this legislation may be summed up by quoting from former Attorney General Katzenbach's testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee in 1966:

> By now it should be plain that a patchwork of State and local laws is not enough. The work of private volunteer groups is not enough. Court decisions are not enough. The limited authority of the executive branch is not enough. . . . Durable remedies for so endemic and deep-seated a condition as housing segregation should be based on the prescription and sanction of Congress. This is all the more so as the issue is national in scope and as it penetrates into so many other sectors of public policy such as the rebuilding and physical improvement of our cities.

This legislation, Mr. President, will not bring an end to the ghetto. Only a concentrated, well-directed program of education, public housing, and job development will accomplish that huge task, and then only at the expense of many years of hard and dedicated effort.

But this legislation will help. It will offer hope for the many persons who have shown themselves and their neighbors that they can make it as worthwhile citizens—but who cannot convince the suburban landlord. It will offer an immediate improvement in living conditions for middle class Negroes who already can afford better housing—but cannot find it in the ghetto.

The side effects of this legislation would also be beneficial, Mr. President. It would, for example, restore honesty to the suburban apartment manager who now misleads, avoids, or even lies to the Negro father who comes to him seeking a home for his family. It would help to restore as well the pride that many citizens have had to swallow in the face of such mindless rejections.

We have waited long enough to enact this legislation. The need is clear beyond any possible dispute. It is time for action.

Mr. President, we have heard repeatedly about the problems of the exploding American cities, and well we should, because it is as profound an issue as this Nation faces or has ever faced. It is, at bottom, an issue of fairness, of employment, of training, of education, of housing, of environment, which challenges everything that this Nation possesses in terms of material goods and spiritual commitment.

Indispensable to the solution of the problems of the exploding American city is the alienation and the separation of the races. The psychology of rejection which is found everywhere in the black cores of the rotting centers of American cities is fundamentally the rage and the frustration and the despair which we see expressed everywhere, and, tragically, even in the form of violence.

We tend to make our arguments on the basis of material problems, whether it be housing, employment, education, or environment, and well we should; but we had many witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee testify to the psychological effects of segregation as being a fundamental basis for the rage with which we are clearly confronted. I am inclined to think that this is a factor that is widely underrated. We are saying to the ghetto dweller today, "Solve your problems, have confidence in yourself, find a job, take the training available to you, apply yourself and gain an education, try to elevate your capacity to earn."

But, on the other hand, we are saying, "Even if you solve all your problems, despite how capable you prove yourself in achieving these objectives, we are not going to permit you to have the right that every other American has to buy any house which you are able to purchase. There is something about you, regardless of every other characteristic that you might have, based on your color, that will prevent you from living with us."

This is an outrage from any standpoint. I do not think this country can solve its urban problems, the problems which we face in the American cities, until we take the simple step of agreeing that we are going to live together, and not separately.

It is a simple fact, and yet it is a profound concept that lies at the core and the heart of this serious social problem which we face together as Americans.

I suppose there is no more humiliating experience for a father, the head of a household, the symbol of authority in his family, than to go up to a house that is for sale, one which he can afford, one which his endeavors over the years have suited him to live in, and be told that house is not available to him.

Perhaps he is a professional man. Two of our witnesses, Negroes who could not buy suitable housing, were typical. One was a Navy lieutenant with 8 years of experience, a handsome, impressive, young man. The other was a distinguished professor of literature, earning more than $11,000 a year in Philadelphia. Both of them had spent months going to homes which had "For Sale" signs out in front, to homes which were listed in the newspapers, with their families, with their children, only to be rejected—not because they could not afford the property, but because they were not intellectually and in every other way suited to live in the neighborhoods, but simply because of their color.

I do not, I repeat, believe that this outrage can continue, and that at the same time we can solve the problems of our exploding American ghettos. The insult is too great, too profound, too indefensible. It is an outrage to our concepts and beliefs of freedom, and an outrage to anyone's belief in God. I hope that Congress will not underestimate the seriousness of the issue we face here; for I fear that time is running out. I believe the decades of neglect have run their course, and that it is now too late to extend to the ghetto dwellers only more empty promises.

The credibility of moderate civil rights leaders is being undermined. As Whitney Young—surely one of our great Americans—put it in testimony recently, after he had been complimented for his role in trying to cool down our American cities:

> I enjoy the compliment, but it isn't transferrable. We need action. I must have something in my hands when I talk to my ghetto-dweller neighbors.

One of the things that I am sure must be had in hand is the removal of this outrageous course of segregated residential living, so that those who can afford and wish to do so may, like all other Americans, buy any house they can afford to purchase, and those who live in the ghetto but cannot afford to buy housing outside it will know it is their failure to solve their economic problems, and not their color, which pins them in the ghetto.

Mr. President, we have now discussed this fair housing proposal for more than a week. Many Senators have risen and given remarkable speeches, setting forth in detail the new knowledge we have about fair housing. The old scare stories of the real estate industry have now been exploded by the experience of several States and many other communities that now have fair housing laws and ordinances which in the main are operating effectively and, in an impressive way, helping to bring about a solution to this heartbreaking problem.

I believe the U.S. Congress is trailing behind the States and the local communities on this issue. That is certainly true in my State, for we have, if not the strongest, one of the strongest fair housing laws in the country. It was passed with bipartisan support. I would say one would have to look hard, in our State, to find a single living Minnesota politician who is opposed to fair housing. All the scare stories have been forgotten; many of the realtors who opposed these proposals now support them; and, where once there was almost solid opposition, there is now almost solid support.

The experience we have had in Minnesota can be duplicated in many other States. Therefore, for every practical reason and for every moral reason, the time has come for Congress to rendezvous with its conscience and adopt an effective fair housing amendment.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 507, 508, AND 513

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand three amendments, Nos. 507, 508, and 513, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] expects to propose to the pending bill. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments now be considered as having been read so as to meet all of the requirements of rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION OF MEN AND EQUIPMENT TO THE WAR ZONE BY AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR RESERVE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the recent announcement that more combat troops would be sent immediately to Vietnam emphasizes the seriousness of the situation there. The decision to send additional men is now well known and widely publicized. I am confident that these combat men will perform in the highest traditions of our military services. They are, of course, part of the active forces.

There is one operation associated with this rapid buildup in Vietnam that has not been widely publicized but which the public should know more about. That is the part the Air National Guard and Air Reserve will have in transporting men and equipment to the war zone. Simultaneously with the decision to send additional men to Vietnam, the Air National Guard was asked to provide 230 missions to and from Vietnam within the next 14 days. Within the first hour after the request was made the Air National Guard transport units throughout the United States had firmly committed 82 of the missions and five airplanes were available for take off within that hour.

In less than 24 hours the Air National Guard has committed the full 230 missions. Although many of the Air Reserve units have been called to active duty those remaining will fly 50 additional missions.

I emphasize that these air transport units are not on active duty. They are manned by men who are regularly employed in civilian life. They are asked to perform this additional duty on a voluntary basis, making it unnecessary to order them to active duty. Many of these men will be away from their jobs, others will take vacation time, but the significant point is these missions needed urgently to support the war effort in Vietnam will be flown.

Mr. President, this is not only a personal sacrifice to the men who are involved but it is also a considerable sacrifice to their employers. I believe we should remember that also.

This points out the very valuable contributions these air transport units as well as all other Reserve and National Guard units are making to our national defense effort. It is further evidence that they are needed and must not only be continued but strengthened with the equipment, manpower, and training necessary to make them a first line force.

Under the present plans of the Defense Department, four of the units that will be making these emergency flights to Vietnam are scheduled to be deactivated later this year. The fact that they are now called upon and are likely to be called upon in the future for just such emergencies is conclusive evidence to me that these units scheduled to be deactivated should be retained.

Certainly, there are Guard units that Congress has kept alive for 2 successive years because of mandated language in the appropriation bill, units otherwise scheduled to be deactivated. These matters clearly illustrate the need for these units. The need is clearly illustrated where there is involved transporting over 10,000 men and equipment half way around the world, and all of the missions are in the hands of the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve.

I am especially pleased that one of the units that responded immediately and with its full resources is located in Mississippi. The 172d Air Transport Group in Jackson, Miss., immediately volunteered to fly five of the missions which is the maximum number they can fly with the equipment and manpower they have available. In addition, the 118th Air Transport Wing of which the Jackson group is a member has volunteered to fly 11 additional missions, five to be flown by the Air National Guard Group in Memphis and six by the Air National Guard Group in Nashville.

The officers and men of all these air transport units are to be commended for their quick response to this call. This was a voluntary response.

I also want to pay special tribute to those Air Reservists both Air Force and Navy who were called to active duty early this year and are now undergoing intensive training. These men answered the call of their country in the typical spirit that reservists have shown throughout the years. Many of them are now serving on active duty at some financial sacrifice, others have had their schooling interrupted, some have been called away from their jobs and professions at a very critical time. The overwhelming attitude, however, has been one of willingness to fulfill their responsibilities which they accepted in joining the Reserve program. The Nation is indebted to them for their dedication, and for their desire to serve their country.

Mr. President, these units, which can be operated at about one-fifth the cost of a regular unit, and in which these men are kept in condition and ready to go on the shortest notice, prove the wisdom of our Reserve system. In paying compliments to these men, we must not forget the men who serve through the Selective Service System, and those who serve as professional soldiers. They continue to render fine military service in Vietnam. We have never been represented by finer American fighting men than we are in this unfortunate war.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

(At this point, Mr. HART assumed the chair.)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has brought to my attention and to the attention of the public a valuable contribution which is being made to the war effort. I know something about these units and the sacrifice these men are making, as well as the dedication they have.

There is also demonstrated the wisdom of keeping these two units in force at a time when the Department of Defense was insisting on taking them out.

I, too, hope that not only these units, but also the other units will be retained because the additional 10,500 troops being sent to Vietnam will have to be serviced. We do not know what supplies will have to be flown there, and sometimes it takes time to get there. These men have shown a readiness that is remarkable.

I hope the Department of Defense will not deactivate a single one of these units. They have done a great job.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I share his views.

THE 109TH BIRTHDAY OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, today we celebrate the 109th birthday of the State of Oregon and I would like to take this occasion to snap on a light in the Oregon archives and pull some books and other documents off the shelves to bring to this Chamber once again some of the contributions which the men and women of my native State have made to the Nation. I might mention at the outset that although Oregon was granted statehood by the Congress on February 14, 1859, the word did not in fact arrive at Salem, Oreg., until 1 month later. The word moved slowly in those days. In any event, Oregonians had gone ahead the year before in 1858 and elected State officers.

Be that as it may, since Oregon's birthday falls just 2 days after Abraham Lincoln's birthday I would like to take this opportunity also to discuss Lincoln's relationship to Oregon. It happens that Lincoln had been offered the governorship of the Oregon Territory in 1848 and that he had given the matter serious consideration. Had he not declined the governorship he might have watched the timber fall in the Douglas-fir and Ponderosa pine forests rather than guide the Nation during the Civil War when our soldiers fell at Antietem and Gettysburg. One of the men who fell early in the war was Col. Edward Dickinson Baker of Oregon who was believed to be the first Member of Congress killed in the Civil War.

Baker was a close friend of Lincoln. Lincoln named his son Edward Baker Lincoln for his friend Baker. Baker was London-born and came to the United States with his parents. He lived in Indiana, Illinois, and California. He served as U.S. Senator from Oregon from October 2, 1860 to October 21, 1861, when he was dropped by eight bullets at the Battle of Ball's Bluff, a place on the Virginia shore of the Potomac River about 25 miles from where I stand and speak today. Baker had become friends with Lincoln in Illinois. He was a lawyer, statesman and warrior. He had led a regiment of volunteers in the Mexican-American war. His statue stands today in white marble on a red marble pedestal in the southeast portion of the rotunda in the Capitol between Washington and Jefferson, a justly honored place and not too many steps from where we are gathered at this very moment. The statue seems a heroic stance with Senator Edward Dickinson Baker holding a scroll of some sort in one hand and gesturing with his other hand. Beside him on the ground rests a hat, book and sabre. Well, we are all indebted to Senator Baker for his courage in battle and for his service in politics. He was a State representative and State senator in Illinois, and was elected as a Whig from Illinois to serve in the Congress. He had moved west in 1852 to California to practice law and to engage in public speeches. Republicans and Douglas Democrats invited him to Oregon to become a Senator from my State. He did so and served nobly. In a way one might stretch things a bit and say that Edward Dickinson Baker was one of Oregon's gifts to the Nation. Yes, he was a native of England; he resided in the midwest and California; he fought in Mexico; but nevertheless as an Oregon representative in the U.S. Senate for less than a year and as a battlefield commander we like to claim him for our own. Today Edward Dickinson Baker—like all of his comrades of the great conflict—belongs to all Americans.

Remember the cry, too, of "Fifty-four forty or fight"?

The yell and the slogan referred to a boundary line which was then in the far north of the far corner of the Pacific Northwest. It is, in fact, about midway in what is today British Columbia. The American-Canadian boundary is at the 49th parallel. "Fifty-four forty or fight" occurred during the administration of James Knox Polk, 1845–49. It was a day when the call was for more room, for salt from both oceans, for spreading our national limits to the frozen seas. One orator declaimed:

> Withered be the hand that dismembers Oregon, and palsied the tongue that consents to an act so treasonable, foul and unnatural. Let Freedom's holy banner be planted on the farthest ice-bound cliff.

So much for splendiferous prose.

Senators and Representatives and other officials of Government will be especially interested in Oregon's contributions to the political life of our great national commonwealth; for Oregon has indeed been in the forefront of political activity and political reform. Oregon resides in the far corner of the country; but it sometimes performs center stage in politics.

Of particular interest at this time in our political life is the Oregon presidential preference primary election—a primary election where all candidates generally advocated or recognized as candidates for President are placed on the ballot. One may withdraw if one is not a candidate. Those who remain offer the Oregon voters a fair test of potential nominees for President in our two great political parties.

The initiative petition, referendum vote, and the recall power all helped to set a pattern for other States to follow. The initiative and referendum were approved in 1902 and the recall power was created by Oregon voters in 1908. In point of fact Oregon voters have used the initiative petition for statewide measures more than 200 times. Referendums—or should I say "referenda"—have been used almost 50 times. The recall measure has been employed sparingly because of the high quality of statesmanship generally demonstrated by those who practice the political arts in the Beaver Commonwealth.

In recent years Oregon has continued to rank as one of our country's leaders in progressive legislation to serve the best interests of her people—to promote "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" for all people—through the enactment of unemployment compensation laws, workmen's compensation, a State fair employment practices commission, an open housing ordinance to give people a fair chance to buy the home of their choice, and laws to clean up the pollution of our air and water.

Oregon moves forward; her people move forward with her and sometimes push her forward; she does not move backward; she stumbles at times, no doubt about it; but Oregon keeps going in a way to do the best she is able to do. Among the first to move into Oregon and tell of her prospects were Lewis and Clark.

President Thomas Jefferson dispatched Meriwether Lewis and William Clark across the continent in 1804 to open a new route to the West and to open new territory for a growing country. Their path became the famous Lewis and Clark Trail. Names that spring to mind along with Lewis and Clark at other times in Oregon's history include John Jacob Astor and his fur company, Dr. John McLoughlin, Jason Lee, Nathaniel Wyeth, Marcus Whitman, Henry Spaulding, Hall Jackson Kelley, Jedediah Smith, Elijah White, Samuel Barlow, Levi Scott, Jesse and Lindsay Applegate, Donald McKay, Joe Meek, Chief Joseph, and Ben Holladay. One could fill scores of pages with names just as famous, just as significant in the history of the Oregon country. All of their roles have been amply recorded in books and I have mentioned a few of them here simply to bring to mind some of those who went before us and who helped to make our land what it is today.

What Oregon was then—in 18th- and 19th-century America—was largely a wilderness which turned toward farming and mining and fishing and logging and early manufacture to turn a profit. Banks, merchants, steamship lines and builders of one stripe or another helped to construct this new State and to transform it from a primitive territory to a modern and comfortable industrial State. What Oregon remains today is a State rich with resources—rich with material, spiritual and cultural resources.

Oregon boundaries enclose a land which includes the high country of the Cascade Mountains and the central plateau of the State, the desert country in southeastern Oregon where antelopes still roam, the coast range and the Pacific Ocean shore, and the fertile meadows and well-sprinkled green lands of the salubrious Willamette Valley.

Hunting, fishing, camping, outdoor sports a-plenty; all are there for citizens to enjoy.

Although Oregon, a State with a population which now totals 2 million souls, has not been in the forefront of the arts, sciences, and humanities it need not turn its head aside when asked of its culture, its schools, its society in general, if you will. The State has many institutions of higher learning which are a credit to the Nation, and also several fine musical ensembles, art galleries, theaters, literary groups, historical associations, and various private institutions of learning and entertainment. Oregon has a fine record of business and economic development, responsible trade union organization, and attention to the proper maintenance of public facilities—roads, bridges, parks, playgrounds, and campsites.

Oregon yields to no State in the military service of her sons.

So there is a brief birthday statement about Oregon, a State whose motto is "The Union." It is the home of the Oregon holly grape, the western meadowlark, the Chinook salmon, the Douglas-fir tree, the thunderegg State rock, and the beaver on a flag of blue and gold.

Oregon, 33d State to join the Union.

On this 109th anniversary of statehood I would like to invite all of my colleagues here in the Senate and all others who might hear or read these words to take time to visit Oregon. You will have a good time. Your journey will be something to remember, something of value.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to commend my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the great State of Oregon, for giving to the Senate the benefit of his thoughts about the great State that he represents.

I congratulate the great State of Oregon on its 109th birthday anniversary and wish its people a happy birthday.

Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that we are proud to have this information in our records concerning the 33rd State—the State of Oregon.

I commend the people of Oregon for their wisdom in sending to the Senate, among other great leaders sent here over the years, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] who has given us this excellent presentation this afternoon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

A THREAT TO NATO FROM THE NORTH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is far from secure.

Not only has it been beseiged by French President Charles de Gaulle, as well as weakened by the continued feuding of member states Greece and Turkey, but, if a report in the Washington Star, February 12, is correct, danger lies in the northern tier of member states as well.

The Star's article points out that—

> Pro-Soviet political elements are moving in a serious bid to shake the Western Alliance.

If true, this fact is one which should be viewed with grave concern by our Government. We must not let our preoccupation with the situation in Vietnam blind us to other dangers which may be equally serious. Such a course of action would be most dangerous for the United States as well as for all of Western Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Pro-Soviet Elements Map Anti-NATO Drive in Scandinavia," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRO-SOVIET ELEMENTS MAP ANTI-NATO DRIVE IN SCANDINAVIA

(By Smith Hempstone)

COPENHAGEN.—Coups and counter-coups in Greece, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the near-war between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, and Russian naval maneuvers in the Mediterranean have served to focus the attention of western strategists on NATO's shaky southern flank.

It is here, however, at the opposite end of the geographical spectrum, in NATO's extreme northern tier, that pro-Soviet political elements are moving in a serious bid to shake the Western Alliance.

The crash Jan. 21 of an American B52 nuclear bomber on the ice of North Star Bay near the U.S. Air Force base at Thule, Greenland (a Danish province), unquestionably will be used to dramatize the issue.

Norway and Denmark are NATO nations ruled by center-right coalition governments. Sweden, which has had Social Democratic governments for 35 years, follows a non-aligned foreign policy.

Finland, which shares a long land frontier with the Soviet Union and has Communists in its coalition government, is forced to walk a neutralist tightrope which is slightly pro-Soviet.

REDS HOPE FOR SPLIT

Although their military might is inconsequential, Moscow would dearly like to see Norway and Denmark withdraw from NATO when the treaty's initial 20-year period expires next year.

Like Turkey to the south, Norway and Denmark sit astride one of Russia's three outlets to the Atlantic, and on the flank of a second.

Nuclear submarines assigned to Russia's Mediterranean squadron seldom use the Turkish-controlled Dardanelles, where by treaty they must give eight days notice of all fleet movements.

Instead, according to western intelligence sources, such U-boats either follow the Arctic route from Murmansk down the Norwegian coast or sail from their Baltic bases through the Kattegat and Skagerrak.

It would be naive to think that Danish-based U.S. observation teams do not monitor such ship movements. It would be equally implausible to believe that the Russians would not like to see such operations cease.

LEADERS OF OPPOSITION

Word of the Thule crash, which was delayed by some 18 hours, came too late to have much discernible effect on the Danish elections Jan. 23, which toppled Prime Minister Jens Otto Krag's Social Democratic government.

Opposition to Danish membership in NATO is led within the new Folketing (parliament) by the four spokesmen of the left-wing Socialist party. The left-wing Socialists, who broke away last year from the Socialist People's party, describe themselves as "more progressive" than the Communists.

The parent Socialist People's party, which has 11 members in the new Folketing, has been described by writer Donald Connery, an objective observe, as "a fascinating mixture of warmed over Communists, far-left neutralists, pacificists, ban-the-bombers, anti-Americans and assorted malcontents." It can be expected to support the four left wing Socialists in their anti-NATO crusade.

More serious is the fact that the Radical Liberals, who hold five of 17 cabinet posts including the premiership in the new coalition government, are officially opposed to participation in NATO, although they have supported Danish defense policy since 1960.

Radical Liberal Premier Hilmar Baunsgaard belongs to his party's moderate wing and is unlikely to support any such maneuver as the much-talked-of Danish "NATO plebiscite." His coalition partners, the Moderate Liberals and the Conservatives, favor NATO ties for Denmark, although all accept that this country's present shaky economic situation calls for cuts in defense expenditure.

The Danish Communists, who polled 255,236 votes and won 18 Folketing seats in 1945, largely on the strength of their anti-Nazi resistance record, have not been able to win a parliamentary seat since 1960. They can be expected to spearhead the anti-NATO drive outside parliament among students and intellectuals.

Although Norway joined NATO in 1949 by a vote of 130–13 (11 Communists and two Labor MPs voting against), the country, perhaps because it and Turkey are the only member-states sharing land frontiers with Russia, always has been a bit nervous about its NATO ties.

Just as Denmark will not allow nuclear armed U.S. bombers to fly over its territory, Norway does not allow foreign troops to be stationed on its soil.

Like Denmark, Norway has a center-right coalition government which, at the moment, is committed to NATO. But there is general political agreement that the question of continued mmebership after 1969 (when any country can withdraw after giving one year's notice) is so important that it must be the subject of public and parliamentary debate.

The two Marxist representatives of the Socialist People's party, supported by left wing Labor MPs, can be expected to lead the attack within the Storting (parliament). The Norwegian Communist party, like its Danish counterpart, has not been represented in the Storting since the euphoric post-war elections.

But the tactics of the Communists and their fellow-travelers seems to be to seek cross-party support for their move to get Norway out of NATO.

An organized campaign to that effect was launched in Oslo on Jan. 28. The group's action committee is headed by Olav Rytter, a former United Nations information officer, and includes a young Labor politician, Rune Gerhardsen, son of former Labor Premier Einar Gerhardsen, who was swept from office in 1963.

In neither Norway nor Denmark are leftist elements likely to be able to generate enough political steam to force NATO's two Scandinavian members to leave the alliance.

But the Scandinavian politico-military scene, in view of the Thule incident, Soviet reconnaissance flights along the Norwegian coast, and the passage of Russian nuclear submarines through the Baltic straits, will bear watching in coming months.

CROWDED COURTS COULD CAUSE CRISIS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the problem of overburdened criminal court judges and crowded court dockets is not one that is unique to the District of Columbia.

The District's problems are only symptomatic of a much larger nationwide problem that affects every metropolis and to a lesser degree, every smaller city and town in our country as well.

New York City has been acutely struck by this problem.

According to a news story in the New York Times, February 12:

> There are 78 (judges) in the Criminal Court system (in Manhattan) to cope with a caseload that has doubled in a decade. No judges were added in that time.

I think that it is high time this problem be given the careful study that it deserves.

If some of our courts are verging on chaos today from overcrowded dockets, I shudder to think what may happen 20 years from now if positive steps are not taken to increase the number of judges, and courtrooms as well as to modernize administrative procedures.

American justice must never be debased by bargain basement practices. Every defendant deserves a studied and fair trial, not the "instant justice" which one noted jurist says aptly describes present conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "City Courts Facing a Growing Crisis" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City Courts Facing a Growing Crisis

(By Edward C. Burks)

Every few minutes the assembly-line in the city's awesomely overloaded Criminal Court System lurches forward to produce a new defendant in an atmosphere of thinly masked impatience.

He is like a factory product—"like a can of peas being processed," says an important criminal lawyer—to be labeled, handled briefly, then moved on, and often forgotten.

The heavy volume forces such rapid handling—a dismissal, a guilty plea or an adjournment for a later hearing that everyone is under pressure to get out of the way for the next case.

The courtroom is noisy and has an abrasive air of confusion.

Lawyers and defendants of one case stand around talking while the next one is being heard over their voices. In a seat in the spectators section a narcotics addict falls forward in a drugged stupor. Pimps in red, yellow or green trousers swagger in the hallways, waiting to put up bail for their prostitutes. A woozy, unshaven Bowery bum staggers out of a courtroom, newly freed, and pauses to pick up a half-smoked cigarette near a cuspidor. A self-styled minister, drunk, roams the corridors, ranting and cursing.

This is the scene in the towering Manhattan Criminal Court building at 100 Center Street, where 235 defendants are arraigned every day. Each arraignment takes less than three minutes on the average. In Brooklyn and The Bronx the scene and situation are roughly parallel to Manhattan, except the buildings are older. Queens and Richmond fare somewhat better.

Lester C. Goodchild, administrator of the system of 64 courtrooms, says that the pressure for quick decisions brings about a bargaining situation that is unfair to defendant and the people alike.

Although the defendant may get a circus-barker style announcement of his case and his legal rights, many judges and prosecutors believe that the process favors him.

There is pressure to dismiss cases where the guilt is not immediately obvious because there is not time to develop the evidence. Even an obviously guilty man, for the sake of time, may be permitted to plead guilty to a lesser charge under which he will receive a greatly reduced sentence.

GUILTY PLEAS URGED

On the other hand, there is pressure on the defendant to make a guilty plea to avoid a possible stay in jail before a trial can be held—usually a delay of at least 8 to 14 days.

"The system causes judges to abdicate some of their responsibilities," according to Mr. Goodchild, "and the case is taken over by the defense lawyer and prosecutor who work out a disposition."

At arraignments, lawyers on either side have only a few minutes to prepare their cases. As for judges, there are 78 in the Criminal Court system to cope with a caseload that has doubled in a decade. No judges were added in that time. The great majority of them get their $25,000-a-year jobs on recommendation by district political leaders. The job, in short, is a political plum. The Mayor appoints them for 10 years.

In the last 10 years, felony cases (the most serious crimes, such as murder, robbery, and grand larceny) have more than doubled. Last year, there were 58,000 felony arraignments—more than 1,000 a week, a 10 per cent gain over 1966. That meant an average of 740 felonies for each of the judges, who rotate through the system.

Misdemeanor cases (not including traffic) rose by 14 per cent in the 10-year period, to 105,000, an average of 1,500 a judge last year. Traffic cases, which reached a total of more than four million in 1967, were up by 134 per cent in 10 years. And the traffic court system, part of the over-all Criminal Court apparatus, falls ever further behind because less than one half of the cases are settled each year. The average load of traffic cases a judge has now exceeded 50,000 a year.

The only category of cases to show a drop in the past decade—a modest 7 per cent—was "violations" or "summary offenses" other than traffic—offenses such as drunkenness, gambling and prostitution, which are less than misdemeanors. The reason was simple: The police were ordered to stop bringing in so many of the drunks and derelicts who used to jam the courts regularly.

Even so, there is a formidable workload. According to the most recent figures available, the system had a backlog of 33,000 cases, not including a four-month backup in traffic cases.

The Legislature, which has the power to create new judgeships has failed to do so in recent years because of squabbles over how the judgeships should be divided politically. This session there is strong evidence of bipartisan support for more judgeships, and the citywide Association of the Bar is backing such efforts, but only if the judgeships are not to be allocated on the basis of political parties.

Meanwhile, the city system remains so crowded that the 10-minute trial is the general rule. But most of the time things do not reach a trial stage. If they did, there would be chaos, according to judges and court administrators.

Concerning the heavy percentage of guilty pleas, Jerome Kidder, a bureau chief in the Manhattan District Attorney's office, says: "A guilty plea is almost always a plea to something less than the original charge. Although he is not given a specific promise (of leniency) the defendant knows that if we let him plead to a lesser offense, he has a good chance of getting a reduced sentence on that charge, too."

A prominent criminal lawyer, surveying the carnival atmosphere of many Criminal Court rooms, declares: "The whole place looks like a block party on 110th Street."

"Maybe," says Mr. Goodchild, "somebody—the public, that is—ought to walk into court someday and shout, 'Stop! What are you doing here?' This thing is running on rather uncontrollably. Sure, they're moving the cases into and out of court. But because of the speed it's all sort of blurred. Nobody seems to be in control."

Harris B. Steinberg, a Broad Street lawyer specializing in "white collar" criminal cases, says: "The tremendous volume makes for a lack of feeling that there's any serious deliberative process going on."

"Instant justice" is the way Justice Bernard Botein, Presiding Judge of the Appellate Division for Manhattan and the Bronx, describes the Criminal Court process. "We're holding it together with Scotch tape and wire because of lack of manpower—lack of judges and court personnel," he explains.

At a time when the public is clamoring for greater police protection, Judge Botein explains why overloaded court personnel groan at the thought of more arrests. Most programs to combat "steadily rising crime rates" have a simple "cops and robbers" approach, he says—more policemen to catch more criminals with no thought of bolstering the sagging court system. He is urging 15 more Criminal Court judgeships.

Here is the present situation in the Criminal Court system:

One case in five (not counting traffic cases) is dismissed within a few seconds of a defendant's first-appearance before a judge, at the time of his arraignment. The reason: not enough evidence or not enough time to develop the evidence.

Roughly another 10 per cent of all cases, except those dealing with traffic, end at arraignment because of a guilty plea.

More than one half of the defendants who move beyond the arraignment procedure to hearings or trials plead guilty later in the process, often to a reduced charge.

Only a quarter of all defendants arrested on felony charges are actually indicted and tried for felonies. Half of them have the charges reduced to misdemeanors. The remaining 25 per cent are dismissed at the outset.

The Criminal Court, with its many parts, is the court of original jurisdiction. It has no juries. Defendants charged with felonies cannot be tried in that court unless the charge is "knocked down" to a misdemeanor. Otherwise, a defendant is held for the grand jury; if indicted, he is arraigned in the criminal branch of Supreme Court. But only 5 per cent of those indicted actually go through a complete trial.

Justice Edward R. Dudley, administrative judge of Criminal Court, has been trying to keep pace with the massive caseload by keeping marginal cases out of court and by streamlining the mass of paperwork.

"This court will break a man," he says of the caseload on his judges, half of whom are more than 60 years old.

In Manhattan and in Brooklyn, the district attorney is now in charge of the "complaint rooms," where the actual charge is drawn up. Formerly the policeman and a court clerk drew up the complaint. Now, when the assistant district attorney in the complaint room feels that evidence is too flimsy he recommends immediate dismissal as soon as the defendant goes before the judge.

The "universal summons," a simplified, multicopy snap-out form, replacing several different forms, went into effect Jan. 1, saving policemen much paperwork and copying. This new form also permits traffic defendants for the first time to plead not guilty by mail. They fill in the proper space and get a trial date by return mail.

MICROFILMING SAVES SPACE

An ambitious microfilming operation has been introduced to overcome a massive accumulation of paper traffic summonses. Because of the huge backlog in unsettled traffic cases, it takes 1,430 filing cases to hold just the Manhattan cases—and the filing cases side by side would extend the length of 13 football fields. In the future, the paper will not be kept for long. A total of 20 million summonses can be stored on microfilm in a filing case only two feet wide.

Another shortcut is a lock-box arrangement with the Chemical Bank, under which fine payments are mailed to the bank—and not the court for—processing.

Bewildered defendants—and complainants—still have to contend with an enigmatic nomenclature in the court system. Various sections of the system have such names as these in Manhattan: Part 1A1 (for daytime arraignments), 1A2 (night court), 2A2 (misdemeanor trials), 2B3 (misdemeanor cases before three judges), 3 (youth court), and 1D (felony hearings).

The busiest courtrooms have 150 felony hearings or 200 misdemeanor hearings on the calendar for a single judge in one day—an obviously impossible load. As a result, the court process in these parts becomes an exercise in clearing the calendar through quick dispositions or repeated adjournments to new dates.

Prisoners in the city's detention houses—where the census is 150 per cent of original capacity—are called first in these crowded parts. The detention homes have added to capacity by installing two bunks a cell.

"Give me a date," a judge often mutters with resignation, and a case is put off again, perhaps for the fifth or sixth time.

Repeated adjournments are a commonplace. "They are a great boon to the guilty man," especially under today's system of low bail or parole for many defendants, according to Justice Saul S. Streit, administrative judge of the First Judicial District (Manhattan and the Bronx).

The injured party in a mugging has to come back again and again, for example, before a hearing takes place, and if he loses patience, or cannot afford the time off from his job, the defendant goes free. Conversely, defendants, especially those who cannot make bail, are more likely to plead guilty to a lesser offense to put an end to the repeated postponements.

QUALITY OF JUDGES

Many of the judges—men like Daniel S. Weiss and Reuben Levy—who must contend with the staggering workload are admired by the lawyers who appear before them. But there is a widespread feeling among such lawyers that many other judges are at best mediocre.

"Maybe 50 per cent of the judges are qualified," says a prominent lawyer closely associated with the Criminal Court for a quarter of a century. "Half of them just don't belong. They slow things down by just trying to clear the calendar because that means adjourning cases to new dates and no disposition. They just compound the confusion. Many of them don't know the law."

"The horrible fact," adds a prosecutor who used to be a defense lawyer, "is that a man's fate in these courts depends on the luck of the draw in judges. Many judges do not know the law, even though there are also some excellent ones. There are certain cases, for instance, that I could put before any of some 10 judges and be sure to get a conviction, and before one of 10 others there would surely be an acquittal."

Another lawyer notes that each judge is equipped with an array of rubber stamps bearing elaborate language on the disposition of cases. "If they took those stamps away," he says, "the judges would be helpless."

Paul DeWitt, executive secretary of the Association of the Bar, which has 8,500 members, says he doubts that crooked judges are a serious problem. "I don't think venality is the problem," he says. "The vice is mediocrity and that can be more serious, affecting more people."

TIME CRISIS CITED

The opposing lawyers in Criminal Court—an assistant district attorney and usually a young defense lawyer provided free of charge by the Legal Aid Society—may have 5 to 10 minutes to study a case before arraignment.

"Five minutes is more like it," says a Manhattan prosecutor.

"Fifteen minutes to prepare a case would be a luxury," according to a Bronx assistant district attorney.

Because of the pressures on both lawyers and the judge, there are usually some prehearing negotiations between the opposing counsel. The lawyers don't like to use the term "deal," but that is what these conferences amount to.

"A busy criminal lawyer is just like we are," says Assistant District Attorney Kidder. "He can't try all his cases either. Usually the initiative for a reduced charge comes from the defense and there's a little bargaining."

The outcome, in which the defandant pleads guilty to a reduced charge, is known as "an offer to walk him."

About 75 per cent of all Criminal Court defendants in Manhattan, and a large proportion in the other boroughs, are represented by lawyers provided by the Legal Aid Society, which helps defendants unable to pay for their own lawyers.

Assistant district attorneys who work closely with the Legal Aid lawyers say they are "frequently better than retained counsel." But some court administrators and lawyers see the Legal Aid Society as just another cog in the Criminal Court apparatus and they contend the Legal Aid lawyers join in the general effort to get through the calendar as quickly as possible, regardless of whether justice is being done.

"These Legal Aid people walk around with their clipboards, interview a client when he is practically before the judge and handle scores of arraignments on a single shift," says one high official of the Criminal Court system. "A whole new spirit is needed in their operations."

Such an appraisal is resented by Anthony F. Marra, a bustling veteran of courthouse battles who heads the criminal justice branch of the Legal Aid Society, which receives $1.2 million from the city and $800,000 from foundations and individuals to support a staff of 134 lawyers who get from $7,500 to about $10,000 a year.

"We are an independent agency," he says, "and we don't have to look to judges or politicians for our jobs. We don't have to submit to pressure from any agency."

Those cases that are not handled by Legal Aid lawyers are often taken by the "Baxter Street irregulars," whose names comes originally from the street behind Manhattan's Criminal Court building.

The philosophy of these lawyers, according to one of Manhattan's top prosecutors, is simple: "Whatever the defendant can scrape up, that's the fee, and from then on all the lawyer is interested in is disposition of the case as fast as possible."

Despite efforts to keep defendants moving in and out of the courtroom, the inmate population of the city's detention houses has risen sharply, from a daily average of 3,370 in 1957 to 4,975 in 1967.

Most do not spend long terms awaiting disposition of their cases. According to the best available figures, nearly two-thirds of all adult prisoners awaiting disposition of Criminal Court cases spent less than 10 days in detention. Ninety-two per cent were incarcerated for fewer than 30 days.

In the case of indicted prisoners waiting for trial on more serious charges in Supreme Courts, a third were in detention fewer than 30 days, almost three-quarters were held fewer than four months and only about 1 in 200 were held more than a year.

These figures are for 1965, but officials say that the time in detention today is about the same.

After all of the sifting in Criminal Court, only a small percentage of cases—one quarter of the felony arraignments—reach the stage of a grand jury indictment requiring disposition in the criminal branch of Supreme Court. There the overload problem is of a far different nature.

Only about 5 per cent of these Supreme Court cases go through a trial to completion. Justice Botein says: "If that percentage were ever increased much we'd have to close down completely."

About 80 per cent of the Supreme Court cases end with a plea of guilty, often to a reduced charge. Justice Streit says: "If such a big percentage didn't plead guilty justice would be at a standstill."

The judge gives the reason: Trials last two to three times as long as they did only a few years ago because of United States Supreme Court decisions protecting the defendant's rights. In addition, there are protracted pretrial and posttrial hearings having to do with motions to suppress evidence on the ground of illegal search or to nullify confessions on the ground of coercion or failure to notify the defendant of his rights.

Judge Streit fully indorses these extra protective devices, but notes that in the Bronx and Manhattan Supreme Courts there has been no increase in judgeships since 1923.

In summary, Judge Botein laments: "It is a pity that so many programs to combat crime are frustrated and so much public money dissipated by the inability of the courts, through sheer lack of manpower and facilities, to handle their workload adequately with justice to the prosecution and defense."

OEO "GUIDE" IS BLASTED ON THREE FRONTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "OEO Guide Is Blasted on Three Fronts," written by Eve Edstrom, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OEO GUIDE IS BLASTED ON THREE FRONTS

(By Eve Edstrom)

The Nation's mayors and county officials yesterday criticized the new Federal antipoverty community action program guidelines as circumventing Congressional intent.

Their official spokesmen said the guidelines, made public Friday, encourage continued domination of community action programs by private nonprofit groups.

This is "not in the spirit" of the Green amendment to the 1967 antipoverty law, they said. That amendment, they explained emphasizes that local governments should be given a clear option to assume leadership of community action programs. At present about 80 per cent of the more than 1000 local community action programs are run by private nonprofit groups.

GREEN ARTICLE CIRCULATED

The criticism, in separate statements, came from John J. Gunther, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties.

In addition, Hillenbrand circulated an article that the author of the controversial amendment, Rep. Edith Green (D.-Ore.), wrote for the Association's magazine prior to the issuance of the guidelines.

In it, she states that critics of her amendment usually cry "keep the state or local politicians out" of community action efforts.

"This does not keep the politicians who have been rejected by the voters out of it," she writes. "This does not keep the selfstarting politician, who dreams of empire building, out of it. My answer is to bring the local elected politicians into it."

Mrs. Green insists that the 1967 law, which "makes community action agencies a state or political subdivision of a state," clarifies the intent of the original war on poverty bill.

SHOULD BE ACCOUNTABLE

That intent, she says, was never to "legislate a revolution in American politics" by creating autonomous groups to displace decisions of state, county or local governments or to fund with Federal dollars groups bent on reversing decisions of local officials.

Instead, she maintains, locally elected officials should be accountable for the spending of public antipoverty money and for the successes or failures of the programs.

The guidelines issued by the Office of Economic Opportunity detail how local officials can assume control of the programs. But they also require that the local governments have contractual powers that may be barred by local statutes and, therefore, could disqualify the local public bodies.

DRAFTING PROTEST

Hillenbrand said he was drafting a protest to OEO, as well as an informational bulletin to county officials so they can aggressively seek the objectives contained in the Green amendment.

It is understood that Mrs. Green is preparing an attack on the guidelines because of their "business as usual" tone. She is vacationing in the Virgin Islands and could not be reached for comment.

CARMICHAEL RAZZED AT HIGH SCHOOL TALK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Carmichael Razzed at High School Talk," written by Paul W. Valentine, and published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Carmichael Razzed at High School Talk—Catechism on Black Power Draws the Wrong Answers

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Stokely Carmichael got off to a rough start yesterday when he mispronounced Roosevelt High School as *Rooze-velt* and the students in the auditorium at 13th and Upshur Streets nw. razzed him pretty hard about it.

He took it good naturedly and tried to continue his discussion of the Negro's problems.

The students, some 600 in all, though the number dwindled during his hour-long session, murmured busily among themselves and laughed or cheered sporadically when some attempted to engage Carmichael in debate.

"Who needs help—black people or white people?" Carmichael asked the overwhelmingly Negro crowd.

"Both," came the answer from a dozen different voices.

"Do you think white people know in the slightest way that they are doing us wrong?" he asked.

A scattering of "yeses" and "noes" answered. Most said nothing. Some were pulling on their coats and leaving.

"Does the white student or the black student get the better education in Washington?" Carmichael tried again.

"You get the education you want to get," snapped a youth.

Other students vied among themselves to ask Carmichael questions. The murmur of voices rose to a steady drone. A small group of pro-Carmichael students cheered piercing when Carmichael said, "Be black, be beautiful." Other students giggled. Carmichael's voice was drowned in the clatter.

He raised his hands beseeching. "We have got to be serious," he said, "because our people are at stake. We have got to be serious because our lives are at stake."

The students moved restlessly in the auditorium seats. The murmuring resumed.

Carmichael, invited by the Roosevelt student council to address the school as part of its regular Tuesday afternoon seminar program, jotted down a lot of words on a chalk board: poverty, segregation, unemployment, drugs, police (cheers from the auditorium), bad housing, crime.

"These are the problems black people face," he said. "Does *Rooze-velt* High School prepare you to cope with them?"

A thin scattering of yeas and nays was mixed with hisses and laughter at his pronunciation of Roosevelt. "Okay," he said, "*Rosevelt*. Okay?" Slight applause.

At the end of the session, Carmichael mentioned the plan announced Monday by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee here to create a "shadow" school board of persons to increase Negro influence in local education.

"This system is 93 per cent black," Carmichael said. "We intend by any means necessary to take over the system so that it will respond to black people's needs."

As he spoke, a school bell rang. The students rose from their seats. Few reacted to his last statement. Most streamed out of the building, while some clambered onto the stage to get a closer look at Stokely Carmichael.

"This was a bad session," he said. "Too many voices trying to get the floor at the same time. But I didn't want to lecture to you. I wanted to talk with you."

KING'S "CAMP-IN"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record three letters to the editor printed in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, February 14, under the caption "King's 'Camp-in.'"

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

King's Camp-in

Sir: If the administration allows Martin Luther King to go through with his proposed "camp-in" in April all its talk about crime prevention will be so much empty babbling. The biggest crime in recent years is the complete abandon with which riots, strikes and civil disobedience have been allowed to flourish. It is beyond the wildest dream to imagine that this "camp-in" could take place without disturbance.

As I get the picture Dr. King thinks the complete cure for this is to abolish poverty. Even though he does mention jobs, you will notice that he avoids use of the word wages—wages being payment received for doing a job—but asks for a guaranteed annual income. This would allow the able-bodied welfare recipient to continue resting idly at home.

I submit that all the money in the world is not the cure for crime. "The devil finds work for idle hands" was never more true than today. One of the best ways to stem the tide of crime is to get all these able-bodied "guests" of the Welfare State up off their lazy verandas and make them go to work.

Instead of Dr. King "educating" the people of Washington and other cities to the "handout" let him and his disciples be educated to the concept of work and acceptance of the already available jobs. Let them also be educated to the fact that it's not customary to start out at the top, but to begin at the bottom and work up. Let them be educated to the idea that pride is something that comes with earning not taking. Let Martin Luther King himself be educated to using the time, energy and money directly on the poverty stricken rather than on a wasteful disturbance.

In the beginning days of this country there was a rule, for every able-bodied citizen, of "no work, no eat." It's still a good idea!

Virginia Phillips.

Silver Spring, Md.

Sir: As many of us recall with shame and remorse the summer march on The Pentagon, we read of Martin Luther King's projected spring civil disobedience campaign with the question upon our lips, "Does this have to happen in the Capital City of a nation which finds it increasing difficult to maintain law and order?" Or any other place in our nation?

In a Washington motel three notorious troublemakers, King, Carmichael and Rap Brown, met upon the vicious premise, "We seek to say to the nation . . . that if you don't straighten up, then you're writing your own obituary. When we come here (in the spring campaign) we will come not to beg, but to demand that the nation grant us what is truly ours."

Will a nation committed to providing for common defense and insuring domestic tranquility abide or ignore such a threat to its security and the safety of its people? Will our nation through its leaders be intimidated to grant a threatening and disobedient mob what the mob determines as its rightful inheritance? Why not a federal injunction to keep these troublemakers, and other of like mind, out of the Nation's Capital and restrain their promotion of such campaigns anywhere within the bounds of the United States of America? If the injunction should fail, why not try iron bars, without bail.

If reason, fair play and a sincere desire for the good of all cannot combine forces in legislation, social and economic development to secure the blessing of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all of our people, there seems to be scant hope for lawlessness and violence to do so.

Thomas W. Sunderland,
Pastor, Epworth Methodist Church.

Sir: First, I must say that this country is the greatest place on earth and I don't belive we should sit around and let just a few destroy all the things we stand for.

I am referring to those few who would destroy this country in the name of civil rights, and simply because they don't want to face the true facts of life. There are too many of my race that feel that the country owes them a reward just because they are Negroes. Too many want something without working for it. And because of our many, many freedoms, too many just take advantage of them.

What I am trying to say is that we have many strong laws but for some reason they are not used. This is a new day, and I feel that some of these so-called freedoms are outdated. I believe that all people must be made to respect the law of the land. We have the President, the Supreme Court and many agencies that make the law; and I do believe the President has the power to control marches on Washington like that planned by the Rev. Martin Luther King.

I am sure that nothing good can ever come out of such as this. Also, being a Negro myself, I would like to know just what these so-called civil righters want. We have come a long way. What good will it do now to have to start all over again?

My only hope now is that we all will wake up and come to our God-given senses before it is too late.

George W. Stewman.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 15, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1968:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Joseph M. Bowman, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice W. True Davis, Jr., resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Edward E. Archer, of California.
John A. Barcas, of New Jersey.
Alan H. Bergstrom, of North Dakota.
David L. Boerigter, of Michigan.
Charles H. Brayshaw, of Colorado.
Edward S. Dubel, of New Jersey.
George S. Durgan, of Connecticut.
Alan R. Flanigan, of Tennessee.
Frederick H. Gerlach, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur Houghton, of the District of Columbia.
David K. Hutchinson, of Kansas.
Larry Craig Johnstone, of Washington.
Wendell H. Jones, of Minnesota.
Allen J. Kampel, of New York.
Duane L. King, of Washington.
Sheldon I. Krebs, of New York.
Ernest H. Latham, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Lewis R. Luchs, of Virginia.
Miss Clara Sigrid Maitrejean, of California.
James N. May, of North Carolina.
James P. Nach, of New York.
Thomas R. Reynders, of Massachusetts.
James L. Robb, of Nevada.
William Frederick Rope, of New York.
Harlan R. Rosacker, of Nebraska.
Robert S. Simpson, of California.
Robert H. Stern, of New York.
W. Kenneth Thompson, of the District of Columbia.
James C. Todd, of California.
Edward A. Torre, of Maryland.
Edmund van Gilder, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Sandra L. Vogelgesang, of Ohio.
John H. Will, of Texas.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Leo F. Cecchini, of Maryland.
George H. Haines III, of New York.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 8 to class 7:

Richard L. Bagnell, of Washington.
Victor H. Borcherdt III, of Colorado.
J. Grant Burke, of Massachusetts.
Thomas H. Carter, of Florida.
Martin W. Cooper, of Virginia.
Miss Mary Teresita Currie, of New York.
David B. Dawson, or the District of Columbia.
James P. Dodd, of Kentucky.
James A. Edris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert P. Gallegher, of Rhode Island.
Daniel V. Grant, of North Carolina.
Peter R. Jones, of California.
Delmar Karlen, Jr., of New York.
Chris Kunz, of Missouri.
John G. H. Muehlke, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Miss Marilyn L. Muench, of Idaho.
Miss Marguerite M. Orr, of Virginia.
Raymond J. Pardon, of New York.
B. Donovan Picard, of Alabama.
George E. Richardson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Elizabeth Molin Roueché, of Maryland.
Miss Barbara L. Schell, of Pennsylvania.
Lange Schermerhorn, of New Jersey.
Kirby L. Smith, of Florida.
Miss Marsha D. Smith, of Maryland.
Luis G. Stelzner, of California.
David M. Walker, of California.
Christopher G. Ward, of New York.
Miss Melinda A. Wendell, of California.

For promotion from a Foreign Service Officer of class 8 to class 7 and to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Thomas P. Doubleday, Jr., of New York.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Mary J. Anderson, of Iowa.
Robert W. Beales, of Virginia.
David Russell Beall, of Michigan.
John P. Bell, of Virginia.
Barry L. Bem, of Colorado.
Robert Brenton Betts, of California.
Charles G. Billo, of New York.
Miss Dorothy Jean Black, of California.
Miss Janina Bonczek, of California.
William G. Crisp, of Virginia.
Sherwood H. Demitz, of Michigan.
William Robert Falkner, of Virginia.
Leon S. Fuerth, of New York.
Robert Barry Fulton, of Pennsylvania.
Patrick D. Gallagher, of California.
Robert A. Gehring, of Connecticut.
Ronald D. Godard, of Texas.
Victor S. Gray, Jr., of New York.
Christopher M. Henze, of California.
Paul W. Hilburn, Jr., of Texas.
James H. Holmes, of New York.
Thomas R. Hutson, of Nebraska.
Seth Robert Isman, of New York.
Thomas F. Johnson, of New York.
Stan W. Jorgenson, of Illinois.
John J. Kadilis, of Maryland.
Philip S. Kaplan, of California.
William A. Kirby, Jr., of New Jersey.
Arthur L. Kobler, of New Jersey.
David K. Krecke, of Michigan.
George D. Langham, of Arizona.
Miss Judith E. Lee, of Louisiana.
Alexander T. Liebowitz, of New York.
Sherwin W. Liff, of Illinois.
Jeffrey H. Lite, of Illinois .
Richard A. Macken, of Illinois.
John F. Maisto, of Pennsylvania.
Jim D. Mark, of Georgia.
Larry L. Marshall, of California.
Donald J. McConnell, of Ohio.
Miss Marilyn Ann Meyers, of Minnesota.
Thomas Parker, Jr., of North Carolina.
Paul E. Paryski, of New York.
Lee M. Peters, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph Edward Quinn, of Massachusetts.
Douglas S. Rose, of Oregon.
Elliot Rothenberg, of Minnesota.
Leonard H. Rushfield, of New York.
Robert G. Schmidt, of Pennsylvania.
Terry B. Shroeder, of California.
Jeffrey E. Silver, of New York.
David H. Stebbing, of the District of Columbia.
Robert K. Thomas, of New Mexico.
Miss Maria P. Tschampel, of Arizona.
William J. Weinhold, of Wisconsin.
Peter D. Whitney, of Tennessee.
John G. Wilcox, of Michigan.
Lacy A. Wright, Jr., of Illinois.
Vincent J. Farley, of New York.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Victoria P. Blickman, of New York.
Charles R. Bowers, of California.
Ralph M. Buck, of Florida.
Miss Elizabeth A. Cain, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Suzanne C. Campbell, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Frances D. Cook, of Florida.
Miss Jane E. Donley, of Ohio.
Miss Cynthia J. Fraser, of Texas.
John Christopher Grigassy, of Texas.
L. Michael Haller, of Illinois.
Miss Anita Jeanne Heger, of Pennsylvania.
E. Stewart Johnston, of California.
Richard Dale Kauzlarich, of Illinois.
George C. Kinzer, of California.
Miss Katherine Kline, of Ohio.
John R. Malott, of Illinois.
William H. Maurer, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George E. Moose, of Colorado.
John J. Morgan, of Indiana.
Eric David Newsom, of California.
James C. Pollock, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Joanne A. Rinehart, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Judith Rodes, of Texas.
Andrew D. Schlessinger, of New York.
Miss Ernestine H. Sherman, of Oregon.
James A. Smith, of Ohio.
James E. Smith, of Ohio.
Robert E. Snyder, of Massachusetts.
Frank J. Spillman, of Hawaii.
Randolph A. Swart, of California.
Garry V. Wenske, of Idaho.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Clarence E. Cornes, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Edgar R. Nickle, Sr., of Florida.
George T. Walsh, of Massachusetts.
William H. Weathersby, of California.
Ralph R. Westfall, of Virginia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

O. Rudolph Aggrey, of the District of Columbia.
James L. Atwater, of North Carolina.
Joseph C. Bernard, of Michigan.
Marion L. Bohanan, of Virginia.
Donald E. Boyd, of Missouri.
Bruce B. Cheever, of Maryland.
James L. Culpepper, of Washington.
Jerome Fox, of New York.
Raymond L. Garthoff, of the District of Columbia.
Donald Y. Gilmore, of Maryland.
Arthur S. Giuliano, of New Jersey.
Gerry F. Gossens, of Texas.
Thomas J. Hazlett, of Massachusetts.
Allan L. Hollis, of New Mexico.
Philippe G. Jacques, of Maryland.
John L. Kelly, Jr., of California.
John J. McCavitt, of Massachusetts.
Gary M. Miller, of Maryland.
Roderick G. Murchison, Jr., of North Carolina.
Morton M. Palmer III, of Virginia.
John F. Ritchotte, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Manuel Martinez, of New Jersey.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Albert F. Barbieri, of Montana.
Ted H. Barlow, of Tennessee.
Robert J. Bel, of California.
Paul F. Bigelow, of Virginia.
Miss Gwen L. Cavanagh, of Maryland.
Joseph P. Cheevers, of Kansas.
John M. Cooper, of California.
Miss Diane Dillard, of Texas.
Miss Deborah Duda, of Ohio.
Jon G. Edensword, of the District of Columbia.
William F. Finnegan, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Janice F. Friesen, of California.
Manuel R. Guerra, of Texas.
Jack H. Hansel, of Missouri.
Harold A. Herbert, of Michigan.
Miss Sharon L. Hill, of California.
Thomas R. Kresse, of Ohio.
Duane T. Linville, of Indiana.
Robert H. Lupton, of New York.
Miss Tommye Lynn Mallory, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Judith M. McHale, of Maryland.
James M. Murray, of Illinois.
Henry J. Paoli, of California.
Clarence E. Pierce, Jr., of North Carolina.
Miss Jerrilynn Pudschun, of California.
Thomas H. Raymond, of Washington.
Michael S. Royle, of Utah.
Carl N. Schmidt, of Oregon.
Miss Judith Ann Schmidt, of Illinois.
Donald R. Schoeb, of Maryland.
Norman A. Singer, of Wisconsin.
Miss Noreen Snyderman, of New Jersey.
Donald M. Welch, of Missouri.
Miss L. Louise Wolf, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Mabel F. Woodcock, of Massachusetts.
Miss Evelyn A. Wythe, of California.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. John M. McNabb, FR5037, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John I. Martin, Jr., FR7556, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee V. Cossick, FR8679, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee M. Lightner, FR18923, Regular Air Force, Dental.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Shaefer, FR10096, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel E. Riley, FR3768, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George E. Brown, FR4425, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Roland A. Campbell, FR4535, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Kruzel, FR4640, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward M. Nichols, Jr., FR7805, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry B. Kucheman, Jr., FR8353, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John E. Morrison, Jr., FR8459, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward B. Giller, FR8696, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John R. Murphy, FR8944, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederick E. Morris, Jr., FR9166, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Louis T. Seith, FR9756, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sherman F. Martin, FR9963, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edmund F. O'Connor, FR10200, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Burl W. McLaughlin, FR10624, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott, FR13694, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie M. Burke, FR4642 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Curtis, FR7448 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Pete C. Sianis, FR7945 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald W. Johnson, FR8671 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Courtney L. Faught, FR8781 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lester F. Miller, FR9004 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward A. McGough III, FR9819 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James F. Hackler, Jr., FR9839 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton W. Marshall, FR9999 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. James B. Nuttall, FR19239, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Charles H. Snider, FR19009, Regular Air Force, Veterinary.

Col. Louis G. Griffin, FR4403, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard G. Bulgin, FR4902, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Cardenas, FR5056, Regular Air Force.

Col. John French, FR5210, Regular Air Force.

Col. Maurice A. Cristadoro, FR7920, Regular Air Force.

Col. George P. Cole, FR8093, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alex W. Talmant, FR9082, Regular Air Force.

Col. Spencer S. Hunn, FR9442, Regular Air Force.

Col. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., FR9719, Regular Air Force.

Col. Rexford H. Dettre, Jr., FR9768, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edmund B. Edwards, FR9787, Regular Air Force.

Col. Chester J. Butcher, FR9846, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert J. Holbury, FR9893, Regular Air Force.

Col. Arthur W. Holderness, Jr., FR10095, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robin Olds, FR10128, Regular Air Force.

Col. William G. King, Jr., FRT8356, Regular Air Force.

Col. George W. McLaughlin, FR8796, Regular Air Force.

Col. Henry J. Stehling, FR9197, Regular Air Force.

Col. Cleo M. Bishop, FR9777, Regular Air Force.

Col. Roger K. Rhodarmer, FR9921, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edwin L. Little, FR9977, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jonas L. Blank, FR10119, Regular Air Force.

Col. Clare T. Ireland, Jr., FR10123, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harvey W. Eddy, FR10912, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene A. Stalzer, FR11347, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edwin S. Wittbrodt, FR33201, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard N. Cordell, FR33228, Regular Air Force.

Col. David L. Carter, FR12035, Regular Air Force.

Col. James G. Silliman, FR22644, Regular Air Force.

Col. John W. Baska, FR33311, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry C. Bayne, FR12289, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas B. Kennedy, FR12723, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert V. Spencer, FR13230, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard M. Hoban, FR23658, Regular Air Force.

Col. Theodore S. Coberly, FR33954, Regular Air Force.

Col. John O. Moench, FR14318, Regular Air Force.

Col. Sanford K. Moats, FR14948, Regular Air Force.

Col. James A. Bailey, FR49199, Regular Air Force.

Col. Maurice R. Reilly, FR15624, Regular Air Force.

Col. George H. McKee, FR15663, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert E. Hails, FR15775, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alan C. Edmunds, FR15875, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald E. Stout, FR16198, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harold R. Johnson, FR16208, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alfred L. Esposito, FR16278, Regular Air Force.

Col. John C. Giraudo, FR16296, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald H. Ross, FR16313, Regular Air Force.

Col. James A. Hill FR24324 Regular Air Force.

Col. Jimmy J. Jumper FR35078, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Maloy, FR16580 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Alton D. Slay, FR17201 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Jonah Lebell, FR19786 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Abraham J. Dreiseszun, FR36902 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Warner E. Newby, FR37082 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Ralph T. Holland, FR37362 (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Col. Lee M. Paschall, FR38002 (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Maurice Candide Fournier, 01167424.

Brig. Gen. William Percival Levine, 01055895.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Merrill Brown Evans, O545711, Infantry.

Col. Arthur Elberg Hutchinson, O1174003, Artillery.

Col. David Bernard Kelly, O1013091, Armor.

Col. Ivan Adam Reitz, O739856, Civil Affairs.

Col. Roger Emerson Whitcomb, O350552, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Taylor Hardin, O388679.

Brig. Gen. James DeWitt Scott, O381931.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Albert White Adams, O338796, Artillery.

Col. Thomas Donald Blackwell, O405117, Infantry.

Col. Oral Lee Davis, O1165277, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Thomas Onas, Lawson, O393290, Armor.

Col. Paul Victor Meyer, O425206, Infantry.

Col. Bernard Andrew Nurre, O1318073, Infantry.

Col. Leonard Cecil Ward, O374608, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Leonard Fish Wing, Jr., O1326177, Armor.

Col. Edward Francis Wozenski, O351415, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph Gale May, O961583, Adjutant General's Corps.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Jr., USMC, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by Transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290.

To be second lieutenant

Hass, Charles J., OF106317.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3283 through 3294, and 3311:

To be captains

Baker, Richard D., O4032284.
Bland, Bigelow B., Jr., O4010831.
Blume, Robert M., O2274926.
Coor, Vinton K., O4074672.
Harrington, Wayne C., O5301614.

Lagas, Joseph V., O5405439.
Oram, Charles J., O4031097.
Ruskin, Margaret M., N2304660.

To be first lieutenants

Bailey, William H., Jr., O5224344.
Bartlett, James A., O5322355.
Blalock, William R., Jr., O2318376.
Brady, Thomas F., O2308627.
Curtiss, Norman L., O5418948.
Feldman, Arnold, O2313750.
Foster, Joe B., O5317787.
Ginsberg, Alvin L., O5418797.
Goff, Robert C., O5007204.
Harting, Bruce W., O5325268.
Hennies, Clyde A., O5318353.
Hunter, John G., O5406666.
Lane, Jack F., Jr., O2328157.
Lewis, James M., O5324960.
Lockner, John E., O2316503.
Lutz, Edwin C., O5533306.
Moore, William F., III, O5311644.
Mora, Edward A., O5414812.
Mullins, Cager W., Jr., O5412807.
Nix, Larry K., O2310437.
Piper, Paul K., O5412864.
Porreca, David P., O5018778.
Ross, Raymond R., II, O5317439.
Scarboro, James H., O5406365.
Turchiano, Nicholas J., O5018075.

To be second lieutenants

Boyd, Morris J., O5420124.
Chernesky, George M., Jr., O5228718.
Christiano, Michael F., O5240154.
Corcoran, James W., O5713394.
Fields, Jerry L., O2326733.
Fox, Richard W., O5420596.
Gibson, Claud L., O5975425.
Hall, Gene P., O5244599.
Kraynak, Joseph J., O5018064.
Martinelli, David F., O5536702.
Ness, Robert L., Jr., O5021172.
Nuccitelli, Robert J., O5023257.
Predmore, Keith E., O5328391.
Siler, Kenneth K., O5536451.
Summerford, Ted W., O5328188.
Tubre, Stephen R., O5243993.
Turner, Gary D., O2319059.
Umstot, Samuel G., Jr., O2327090.
Williams, Michael D., O2325249.
Yager, Charles S., Jr., O5533826.

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290:

Abney, Lincoln M.
Adamczyk, Richard D.
Albertazzi, Robert J.
Alexander, William W., Jr.
Allen, Darrel G.
Anderson, Frederick H.
Annon, Michael C.
Antonitis, John E.
Aquino, Michael A.
Avery, David L., Jr.
Baldwin, Alan R.
Barbeau, Raymond A.
Barrett, Danny P.
Barter, Donald B.
Baskin, Jerry S.
Baylor, Peter N.
Bazan, James D.
Beaudette, Edward H.
Beaulieu, Rowland R., Jr.
Becker, Richard H.
Becker, Robert J.
Bender, John F.
Bennett, Robert H.
Berdan, Robert J.
Bergh, Roger S.
Berry, Phillip C.
Biliter, Patrick E.
Bischoff, John M.
Biskey, Alan D.
Black, Frederick H.
Bodie, George A.
Bond, Richard J.
Boone, Larry G.
Boyer, Jeffrey B.
Bradley, Grover C., Jr.
Bray, Kenneth A.
Brewer, Robert S., Jr.
Brink, Gary S.
Brown, Felix M.
Brown, Robert F.
Brown, Thomas L.
Buch, Stephen H.
Buchan, William D.
Bucholz, Douglas D.
Burdick, Douglas B.
Burlingame, Russell H.
Byrd, Bronson F.
Cameron, Thomas B.
Carter, J. Floyd, III
Carter, Oscar E., III
Cecil, Robert R.
Chamberlain, Edward M., III
Chapla, John D.
Chicoine, Gary S.
Chun, Carl W.
Ciccoiella, Charles S.
Clark, David R.
Clark, James F.
Clevenger, Brian L.
Clyde, Harry M.
Cohen, Michael A.
Coleman, Ronald L.
Constantine, Edward L., Jr.
Cook, Craig A.
Cooper, Walter R.
Cox, Joseph T.
Corrigan, Michael L.
Cradduck, Marcus L.
Cramer, William B.
Crane, Joe D.
Criser, Richard L.
Cross, Billy H.
Cruikshank, Kenneth
Dale, Glyndon A.
D'Andrea, Richard E.
Daniels, Richard S.
Dauphinee, Donald D.
De Guire, Michael A., II
Dickson, James M.
Dickson, Joseph D.
D'Orazio, Gene S.
Dirusso, Anthony F.
Dollar, Douglas O.
Dorfman, William I.
Doyle, John E.
Drake, Robert E., Jr.
Duff, William P.
Dukes, Dan K., III
Dunbar, Layton G.
Dunklin, Gerald W.
Edwards, George H.
Egidio, Carmine A.
Ellicott, Michael A.
Esterrich, Tomas
Estler, Gary L.
Euart, John F., Jr.
Evans, Nathaniel R., II
Faircloth, Clifford W., Jr.
Farrenkopf, Robert A.
Fernandi, Joachim S.
Flaugh, Keith O.
Flickinger, Dennis
Flynn, James F., Jr.
Foster, John P.
Fouty, Lawrence D.
Frame, Charles L.
Gaffney, John J.
Galehouse, Lawrence D.
Garbutt, Dale B.
Gargano, Ronald A.
Garten, Jeffrey E.
Gilbert, John R.
Gilbert, Michael D.
Gilbert, Richard E.
Gile, Greg L.
Gilmore, David H.
Goldsby, Boyd D.
Gong, Richard D.
Gordon, James C.
Goss, Roger W.
Gracon, Gary R.
Grealish, Denis L.
Green, Paul H.
Gresh, Gary L.
Grice, John P.
Griffin, Steven R.
Grigg, Paul B.
Grimsley, James A.
Griscom, Frank N., III
Grisdale, Ernest E., II
Guptill, Stephen A.
Hanretta, Kevin T.
Hanson, Ernest R.
Harding, Richard M.
Harker, William L.
Harnagel, Harold W.
Harpin, Paul H.
Hartrum, Thomas C.
Hawthorne, Richard C., Jr.
Hazel, Crosby E.
Hendrickson, Timothy P., Jr.
Henne, Charles A., II
Hibbard, Robert S.
Hill, Frank C.
Hill, William T., Jr.
Hilsher, Francis E.
Hinkelman, Darrel D.
Hiter, Thomas Y.
Hobbs, Stephen D.
Holder, Claude E., Jr.
Hollist, J. Penton
Hopke, John R., Jr.
Horner, Charles T., III
Hoshibata, Calvin Y.
Howard, Hugh E., II
Hruska, James M.
Hubbard, Robert W.
Huff, Robert L.
Hyland, Robert J., Jr.
Ingram, Walter C.
Irish, Richard W.
Jacobs, Randall, III
Jacobs, Riley A.
Jacobs, Rolly W.
Jasiak, Michael C.
Jeffrey, Jewell W.
Jhin, Philip.
Johnson, James E.
Johnston, Richard J.
Jones, Gary C.
Jones, Richard S.
Jones, Rudolph M., Jr.
Kasabula, Joseph J.
Keas, William O., III
Keenan, David A.
Kelly, John E.
Kelly, Lester A.
Kemp, Robert F.
Kent, Grover M.
Kershaw, Dean A.
Kevorkian, Harold H.
Kirstein, Kenneth W.
Knox, Richard L.
Kohn, Lauren D.
Koren, Philip F.
Kotula, Mitchel L.
Kresge, Robert R.
Lamneck, Philip W.
Leggio, Frank J., Jr.
Levaas, Larry N.
Lewis, Thomas.
Lewis, William P.
Lichty, Donald T.
Lindsey, Richard H.
Long, Dennis H.
Lucas, James E.
Lucas, Michael D.
Lunghofer, Terence J.
Lupus, Lawrence G.
Lutz, John P.
Lyko, Richard A.
Lynch, Peter M.
Mackey, Bobby C.
Maloney, William M.
Mann, David A.
Margary, Agustin.
Marohn, Edward J.
Matus, Kenneth J.
May, James J., III
Mazzeno, Laurence W., III
Mazzie, Richard R.
McAtee, William E.
McCance, William D.
McCormick, Rodney I.
McDonnell, Carbra J.
McGaw, Douglas B.
McGrann, Thomas J., Jr.
McMillin, Charles D.
McMullen, William H.
McNiel, David E.
Mealus, Peter M.
Meeks, William M., III
Meisel, Dale A.
Menzel, Roger A.
Meriwether, Thomas N
Millan, William W.
Millar, William K., Jr.
Miller, Gregory S.
Miller, Steven C.
Mims, Samuel E.
Mitchell, Michael T.
Mitchell, Robert R., Jr.
Mitchell, Stanley M.
Mitchell, William G.
Molino, Thomas M.
Monacelli, Paul R.
Montgomery, Dennis L.
Moore, Edward G.
Moore, Lewis W.
Morgan, John W.
Morton, John M.
Mosteller, James H.
Munro, Mark F.
Murphy, Lamar H.
Myers, Randall R.
Myers, Thomas C.
Naldi, Lawrence J.
Nesmith, William C.
Nestor, Douglas D.
Nishimoto, James K.
Norman, John L.
Norris, William F.
Noyes, Albert L., Jr.
O'Connor, David G.
O'Donnell, Brian J.
O'Harra, Michael B.
Omer, Roger W.
Osborne, Alfred E.
Osborne, Zebulon L.
Osgood, Arthur H., Jr.
Ourso, Nicholas C., Jr.
Pangburn, Kenneth D.
Parker, Gary A.
Patterson, James A.
Patterson, John H.
Peterson, Calvin L.
Petrucci, Michael J.
Phillips, David K.
Phillips, Robert L.
Pierce, Kenneth R.
Pierce, Steven O
Polk, Artie L.
Popwell, William L.
Powanda, John R.
Powers, Arthur G.
Puzey, Paul B.
Quitiquit, Sylvester V.
Ragans, Charles C., Jr.
Raho, Steven A., Jr.
Rainwater, Ross A.
Rapski, Neil J.
Ray, Fredrick L.
Ray, Martin H.
Read, Richard D.
Rector, John M., Jr.
Reese, Ronald L.
Reigle, Daniel H.
Reilly, John M.
Rice, James H.
Ricks, Ned B.
Rigby, Randall L., Jr.
Robbins, Frank H., Jr.
Robinette, Stephen H.
Robinson, Michael I.
Rollins, Henry M.
Romito, Joseph A.
Rose, Robert R.
Roth, Lester C.
Rothwell, Daniel M.
Rudd, Jimmie G
Rundle, Michael T.
Ruppert, Raymond C.
Russell, Victor J.
Rust, Charles S.
Ryan, Lawrence M.
Ryan, Sylvester A., Jr.
Ryan, William W., Jr.
St. Laurent, Paul J.
Sammon, William L.
Sams, Michael D.
Sarnowski, Donald A.
Scheftel, Paul A.
Scherer, William F.
Schlanser, Lawrence E., Jr.
Schowalter, Dennis F.
Schultz, Douglas P.
Scott, John L.
Scotto, David W.
Seals, James L.
Seidel, Alfred W., II
Senerote, Leonard A., Jr.
Sheridan, Philip A.
Shields, Michael R.
Shipp, Michael D.
Shrigley, Ralph E.
Shugart, Wayne R.
Siemon, Kurt K., Jr.
Sinclair, Robert G.
Slocum, Robert W.
Smith, Chester R., Jr.
Smith, Donald H., Jr.
Smith, John S.
Smithee, Ronald G.
Sorenson, John D.
Sorenson, Timothy W.
Sowell, James M.
Spining, William P.
Spraggins, Gerald E.
Stalzer, Thomas E.
Stanfield, Thomas D.
States, Alan E.
Steck, Earl N.
Steindam, Russell A.
Stevely, David R.
Stevens, Charles G.
Stewart, David E.
Stull, Lynn B.
Sullivan, Michael V.
Sullivan, Neil L.
Surface, Richard L.
Susmarski, Kenneth J.
Suyama, Robert M.
Tait, Robert R.
Tanksley, Elmer L., Jr.
Thiessen, Gerald R.
Thomas, Harry O.
Thurnbeck, Robert J.
Tilley, Gary
Tipping, Eldon G., Jr.
Toland, Ray B.
Tomes, Jonathan P.
Tomlinson, William G.
Tracey, Lawrence D.
Trudo, Robert F.
Tulloch, Walter S., II
Utley, William E.
Valentine, James I., Jr.
Valle, Roberto, Jr.
Varga, S. Gary
Vaughn, Jack A.
Venator, Rex M.
Viehweg, Peter A.
Vigent, James G.
Von Loewenfeldt, Carl G.
Wagner, Edward J., Jr.
Wagner, Harold W.
Walko, Dennis P.
Wardega, Francis J.
Watts, Dennis R.
Welch, James M.
Weller, A. John
Wemlinger, John V.
Westlake, Leighton D., Jr.
White, David R.
White, Eugene J., Jr.
Wiess, James E., Jr.
Wilkinson, James A.
Wilson, Robert C., Jr.
Wintrich, Frederick M., Jr.
Wolf, Jerome R.
Wollenberg, Richard F., Jr.
Woodhouse, Robert F., Jr.
Woodyard, Leon W.
Wright, Sumner C.
Yeatman, Gentry W.
Young, David A.
Zehrer, David G.
Ziomek, Robert L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions 10 U.S.C. 2106 through 3288, and 3290:

ROTC cadets

Acoach, Arvel L., Jr.
Adams, Samuel B.
Ahlgren, Keith H.
Alba, Emilio S.
Alberici, John S.
Alexanderson, Ernst F. W.
Allen, Richard G.
Allen, Robert C.
Allred, Larry W.
Ammons, James D.
Anderson, Charles E., Jr.
Anderson, David J.
Anderson, Edward M.
Anderson, James H.
Anderson, Robert D.
Andzik, Albert L., Jr.
Angel, James W.
Antoon, John, II
Argentieri, Joseph P., Jr.
Armour, Wayne T.
Arnold, James J.
Artale, Vincent C., Jr.
Atkison, George V., III
Atkinson, James D., III
Bamford, David K.
Bancroft, Ronald K.
Barker, John R.
Barrett, Michael B.
Barry, Charles L.
Battaglia, Paul
Baumer, Richard E.
Bell, Nathan J., IV
Bernhardt, Paul G.
Bidwell, Alex L.
Billions, Gary L.
Bishop, Lawrence W.
Blackwood, William O.
Blair, James P.
Blouch, Gerald B.
Bodenhorn, Philip G.
Bogese, Michael J., Jr.
Bolen, George L., Jr.
Booth, Richard H.
Borey, Donald E.
Borowski, Paul D.
Boston, Thomas D.
Botwright, John S.
Bourdette, John R.
Bourne, Garrett, D.
Brasfield, Thomas A.
Brewer, William J., Jr.
Brockwell, Reginald H.
Brownfield, Albert R., III
Bruns, Kenneth E.
Bryan, Robert J.
Buchicchio, Robert J.
Budde, James H.
Bueno, Antonio
Bunn, Giles F., III
Burke, William T.
Burkett, Frederick J.
Busby, Lonnie L.
Butler, Young F.
Canda, Francis E.
Carr, Richard S.
Carrigan, Horace M.
Carter, Terry J.
Casassa, Edward B., Jr.
Chamberlin, Paul F.
Chambers, Edwin H., Jr.
Charland, John J.
Charpiot, Frederic H.
Chase, Edward N.
Chisam, Phillip M.
Choban, Gregory G.
Choi, Chris S. W.
Christopher, Paul E.
Chubb, James M.
Cline, James D.
Clowery, Stephen M.
Comisky, Benedict J., III
Conrad, Donald A.
Coombs, David J.
Cooper, Louis
Cooper, Robert S.
Copeland, Reuben
Corey, Jon M.
Cornelius, Donald R.
Cosumano, Joseph, Jr.
Cottrell, Jon R.
Coverstone, James M., III
Covington, Johnnie, Jr
Cox, James M.
Cox, John R.
Cox, Walter B., Jr.
Coyle, John B., Jr.
Craig, Wesley E., Jr.
Crenshaw, Robert S., Jr.
Crites, Harold F.
Cross, James B.
Crow, David M.
Crowther, Bruce H.
Culpepper, David A.
Cunningham, James E., Jr.
Daniels, John A.
Dattoli, Joseph P.
Daugherty, Darrell W.
Davenport, Charles D.
Davidson, Millard M.
Davis, John J.
Davis, Roger L., Jr.
Dawson, Scott D.
Decker, Thomas A.
Deet, Thomas J.
De Francisco, Gerald M.
De Long, Frank W., III
Denler, Douglas P.
Denny, Edward F.
Devos, Robert S.
Dillon, Gerald F.
Dolak, James J.
Dorn, Russell W.
Doston, Glenn A.
Dowd, James P.
Downey, Terry L.
Dragavon, John A.
Drewry, Guy H., III
Du Moulin, Todd T.
Dye, Craig W.
Dykes, Roy K., Jr.
Eargle, Francis L., Jr.
Early, Michael J.
Eastman, Thomas G.
Eber, Arthur G.
Eckhardt, George S., Jr.
Eckmann, William R.
Ellenberger, Barry R.
Ellermann, Donald R.
Ellis, James C.
Elston, Kenneth D.
Erickson, Raymond G.
Ericson, Dean A.
Estabrook, Robert H.
Evans, Robert J., Jr.
Evans, William L.
Fairman, Roy M., Jr.
Falcone, William D.
Farmer, Edgar T., Jr.
Farmer, James R.
Faulkenberry, Victor D.
Faulkner, Ronald W.
Fellows, David C.
Fennell, Anthony G.
Ference, Thomas J.
Ferguson, Maurice B.
Ferguson, William G.
Fithian, Michael J.
Flavin, William J.
Flowers, Chipman L.
Ford, Don C.
Ford, Grover M.
Forrest, Christopher P
Forsythe, George M.
Foster, Russell J.
Fowler, Leonard T.
Fowler, Winfield S.
Francis, James T.
Frey, Roger B.
Fronckowiak, Michael J.
Fullenkamp, Leonard J.
Fuller, Clark W.
Fuller, Harold W.
Fuller, Wayne R., Jr.
Funderburk, Charles C., Jr.
Gallageer, Peter J.
Garges, Frederick C.
Garlock, Warren D.
Garrett, Douglas W.
Gates, Roland C.
Gesele, Eugene C., III
Gibbens, Charles A., Jr.
Gilbert, Bartow B., Jr.
Gilhooly, William P., Jr.
Gillaspy, Thomas D.
Gillham, John P.
Ginn, William T., Jr.
Godfrey, James D.
Gonzalez, Cipriano A.
Goodin, Albert C., Jr.
Gore, Jimmie R.
Gormly, James L.
Goyetche, Steven L.
Graf, Norman D.
Grant, George R.
Green, Thomas R.
Greer, Dan B., Jr.
Griffin, Derek L.
Grigsby, James R.
Grist, Wing A.
Gross, Donald E., II
Gruhn, Arthur W.
Guppy, Christopher M.
Haag, David E.
Hagerman, David S.
Halcomb, Cecil M.
Halcomb, Darrell
Hall, Robert W.
Halle, Peter E.
Halley, Wilson F.
Hamje, Neil C.
Hancock, Larry T.
Harper, Thomas L.
Harris, Richard
Hartwig, William F.
Hawkins, Eric W.
Hebert, Paul V.
Hedleston, Carl A.
Henglein, William G.
Henry, James E., Jr.
Herman, Martin W.
Hickenlooper, Andrew
Higgins, Michael J.
Hightower, Steven C.
Hildebrand, William E., III
Hill, Reginald A.
Hiroshige, James Y., Jr
Hitchcock, Robert L.
Hoag, John R.
Hobin, Gary R.
Hoeft, Julius A., Jr.
Hoffman, Roy R.
Hoffman, William G.
Hogan, Terry M.
Hoisington, Donald W.
Holder, Larry G.
Hollo, Ernest
Holloway, Perry B., Jr.
Holman, Donald W.
Hopkins, John G.
Hopping, Kenneth H.
Hopson, Lloyd D.
Horky, David L.
Horn, Stephen A.
Howe, Gaylon L., Jr.
Hudgens, James M., Jr.
Huffman, Kirby W., III
Hughes, Patrick M.
Hughs, Lawrence M.
Huhtanen, Dale E.
Huling, William W., Jr.
Hull, Jonathan C.
Hunt, Thomas R.
Hutchinson, Charles W.
Hutchison, Robert L.
Imai, Eugene S.
Inderbitzen, Robert E.
Irby, Charles C., Jr.
Isaacs, James L.
Jackson, Ronnie D.
Jarrett, Donald R.
Jensen, Carl E.
Jensen, Carl L.
Jerome, David L.
Johnson, Allan M.
Johnson, Richard P.
Johnson, Robert J.
Jonas, Clyde L.
Jones, Anthony L.
Jones, Daniel R.
Jones, Lewis S.
Jones, Overton J.
Jones, William C.
Jones, William W.
Jordan, Edwin F.
Judge, John F., Jr.
Jurchenko, Andrew J.
Kaminski, Walter J.
Kamper, Timothy J.
Karas, Donald S.
Keck, Richard F.
Keeney, Norbert S., II
Keller, Joseph F.
Kelley, Ivan F., III
Kemper, John E.
Kessler, Craig M.
King, Alan F.
Knafl, Terrence D.
Kolbay, Michael L.
Koll, Robert A.
Korenek, Stephen D.
Kot, Wendell D.
Krebs, William D., IV
Kreis, Kenneth H.
Kunzweiler, Paul
Kurano, Theodore T., Jr.
Lafevor, James R.
Lambert, David A.
Lambert, James H.
Lamster, Richard D.
Landmesser, John F.
Lane, James R., Jr.
Lang, Edward H., III
Langer, William H.
Langowski, John F., Jr.
Lanier, Phillip L.
Lanning, Michael L.
Lapin, Kenneth W.
La Porte, Leon J.
Larson, Lawrence P.
Lawrence, Donald T.
Lazzeroni, Barry D.
Lea, Tracy S.
Leake, Paul F.
Leimbach, William F.
Lemoyne, John M.
Leo, Theodore J.
Lepore, Michael W.
Liebgott, Edward J., Jr.
Loftis, Larry G.
Long, James R.
Lowe, Gregory A.
Luckeroth, Joseph P.
Ludgate, Theodore A.
Lukacs, Michael, Jr.
Lyon, David A.
Lyons, Alton O.
MacDonald, Harry J.
Maguire, Patrick J.
Maloney, Peter R.
Mantle, Gregory E.
Marbach, Jerome C.
Marbutt, Hoyt D.
Marhevsky, Andrew M.
Marlar, Gary J.
Marsh, Jeffrey B.
Martin, Daniel T.
Martin, David L.
Martinez, Lorenzo J.
Maseda, Gerald L.
Mason, William R.
Matsuno, Richard T.
Mattingly, Paul K.
Mattison, Kenneth M.
Maurice, Steven C.
Mauser, Richard A.
Mayberry, David T.
McBride, Grady E., III
McCall, James A., Jr.
McCarthy, Paul E.
McClatchey, Michael D.
McConville, David
McDowell, William E., Jr.
McFall, Ben P., Jr.
McGraw, Dennis F.
McKenna, Milton F.
McLeod, Hugh S., III
McMahon, Thomas J.
McManus, Albert T.
McMullan, Ernest E.
McNeal, Jeffie, Jr.
McPherson, Larry P.
Medley, Neil A., Jr.
Meiwerth, Barry R.
Meriwether, Hunter M.
Merrill, George B.
Merritt, Wayne M.
Meshover, Stephen
Migliori, Albert
Miller, Paul D.
Millman, Michael L.
Mills, James M., Jr.
Miscally, Arthur E., Jr.
Mischenko ,Walter
Mitchell, James B.
Mitchell, James E.
Mitchell, Walter L., Jr.
Mitura, Stephen T., Jr.
Monte, Lawrence J.
Moore, Thomas C., II
Moran, James R.
Morehead, Arthur E., III
Morgan, William R.
Morin, Powell J.
Morris, William A., II
Morrison, James G.
Muehlser, Edwin S.
Mullins, Ralph
Murphy, Porter C., Jr.
Murray, Robert E., III
Music, Walter C.
Myers, Marley D.
Nakahara, Frederick A.
Nance, Frank W.
Nelson, Franklin K.
Nery, Gerald B., Jr.
Nettrour, Bryton F., Jr.
Nickell, William C.
Novotny, Edward J., Jr.
Nowik, William J.
Nygaard, Nathan A.
O'Connell, Thomas W.
O'Connor, Peter R.
Oelschlaeger, Edward R.
Okumura, Gordon A.
Olmstead, Cecil J., III
Olson, Robert E.
Orr, Larry L.
Ota, David H.
Owen, William D.
Papadeas, Elias G.
Pardee, James E.
Parker, Michael D.
Peirce, Chadwin H.
Pelone, Peter F.
Perryman, Perry R.
Philipps, John M.
Pickering, Michael H.
Pieper, Ronald A.
Piergallini, Alfred A.
Pinchuk, Nicholas T.
Pinkett, Larry C.
Pinson, Jerry W.
Piper, Robert E., Jr
Plum, Larry R.
Plymesser, Kenneth
Poggi, John J., Jr.
Pollitt, James L.
Pope, Theodore
Porter, Judson C.
Potter, Marcus B., Jr.
Price, Robert E., III
Proctor, Hawthorne L.
Przbyla, Ernest F.
Putnam, James B.
Quisenberry, George W.
Rachel, James N.
Rankin, Richard K.
Rautio, Wayne M.
Ray, Ronald C.
Raymond, Dennis L.
Reahl, Eugene R.
Reece, Landis D.
Reid, Anthony T., Jr.
Reid, John H.
Rhodes, Eugene G.
Richardson, Archer L., III
Richardson, Earle C.
Ricketts, Thomas A.
Riddle, Terry L.
Rinehart, Charles R.
Rios, Hector M.
Robbins, Fred L.
Robertson, Darrell G., II
Rolewick, David F.
Root, Morris J.
Rose, John P.
Rosenberger, Carl M.
Ross, Paul H.
Roth, Dale H.
Rowe, Frederick M.
Roy, Joseph H., Jr.
Ruppert, Dennis J.
Sander, Robert D.
Sarisky, Michael G.
Sasser, Carl M.
Sawyer, Robert A.
Schaefer, James A.
Schnelle, James F., Jr.
Schoper, Gregory C.
Schultze, Richard W.
Scott, Richard A.
Scott, Robert V.
Seay, Stephen M.
Serio, Dennis F.
Shannon, William P., III
Shaw, Robert W.
Shearer, James F., Jr.
Sheehan, Michael J.
Sheffield, Allen W.
Shepard, Carey M.
Shepherd, John D.
Sherwood, Edward L., Jr.
Shugg, Wilbur C.
Shumate, David M.
Shupp, Howard M.
Siegel, John R.
Skidmore, Keith L.
Skillicorn, Thomas D.
Skipper, David J.
Slader, Bruce L.
Smith, Alvin B.
Smith, Andrew D., III
Smith, Henry G., Jr.
Smith, Joe O.
Smith, John H.
Smoak, William R.
Sneed, Joel W.
Snoddy, William H.
Sorrell, Shawn T.
Sowders, Steven A.
Spiers, James V
Stamm, Richard P.
Steel, Talbot A., Jr.
Steinhauer, Stephen C.
Sterling, Elliot, Jr.
Stewart, Jerry M.
Stewart, Richard O., Jr.
Stinnett, George H.
Stirling, James H.
Stovall, Willard M.
Stranburg, Lee A.

Street, Marquis D.
Strother, Lane H.
Sunderland, Gerard P.
Szymendera, Francis L.
Taffs, Thomas P.
Tangney, William P.
Tarantelli, Frederick
Tarter, Donald W.
Taylor, Donald W.
Taylor, Donald R.
Taylor, James L.
Tharp, Jerry L.
Thayer, Michael J.
Thomas, Charles F. IV
Thomasson, Duncan A.
Thompson, Edward H., III
Thompson, Gayden E.
Tillman, Larry E.
Timmons, John B.
Tinervin, Richard R.
Tobey, Curt R.
Tobin, John W.
Tomko, Jerome
Trapp, Gary L.
Trautman, John W.
Treadwell, Bobby D.
Trevino, Manuel G.
Tsakopulos, William H.
Tufts, Frederick L.
Tupa, James E.
Tyler, John, Jr.
Upton, Paul D.
Upton, Robert L.
Vann, Robert M., Jr.
Vick, William R.
Vince, Steven W.
Wakeman, Robert I., III
Wall, William T.
Wallach, Richard S.
Walsh, Michael C.
Ward, Michael C.
Ward, Talmadge O.
Warren, Viron G.
Weihs, Edward J., Jr.
Wells, Elgia
Wheeler, Paul D.
Whidby, Paul M.
White, Gregory K.
White, Stephen
Whitley, Milton A., Jr.
Whitmore, Harry L.
Wieland, William K.
Wignall, Robert A.
Williams, Gregory
Williams, James O., Jr.
Williams, Robert H.
Wilson, Errol D.
Wilson, Stephen E.
Wilson, Thomas G.
Wilt, David W.
Windebank, Donald
Winford, Benny F.
Wojsko, William S.
Wolfe, John E.
Wood, Charles L., III
Woteki, Thomas H.
Wright, Fred J.
Wright, Fredrick W.
Wright, Less P.
Wright, Thomas R.
Yacka, John D.
Young, Nathaniel L., Jr.
Yount, Everett R., Jr.
Zakrzewski, Stephen C.
Zelski, Robert F.
Zepko, William F.
Zepp, Frederick K.
Zimmerman, Loren D.
Zinser, Roy F., Jr.
Zureich, Herbert H., Jr.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1968, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3284 and 4353:

Ackerman, Arthur W., Jr.
Adam, George F., Jr.
Adams, Daniel E.
Adams, James R.
Adams, Maurice D.
Adams, Robert A.
Adams, Ronald K.
Ader, Steven W.
Adkins, Charles P.
Aker, Alan B.
Alexander, David L.
Alexander, Robert M.
Allen, Andrew B., Jr.
Allen, Rand L.
Allgood, John C.
Altemose, James L.
Alward, Henry W., II
Ambrose, Anthony
Anderson, Andrew R.
Anderson, James F.
Anderson, John L.
Anderson, Jon C.
Anderson, Monte R.
Andrews, Donald L., Jr.
Armstrong, John H.
Audrain, Erin F., Jr.
Austin, Gene P.
Babitz, Gregory M.
Bachman, William A.
Baerman, Vincent P.
Baird, James T.
Baker, Larry C.
Baker, Robert M.
Baker, Russell J., II
Balliett, Timothy D.
Balog, Robert J.
Banks, Floyd T., Jr.
Barnes, Thomas A., Jr.
Barnett, Mark L.
Barton, Wallace W., Jr.
Bayer, John P., Jr.
Beahm, Robert H.
Becker, Dean B., III
Beckley, Stewart D., Jr.
Beckwith, Charles E., Jr.
Beierschmitt, Thomas A.
Belasco, Marvin S.
Benefield, Michael E.
Bennett, Harry S.
Benson, John O.
Besanceney, Charles F.
Bevans, Jum M., III
Billingsley, Michael L.
Black, James A.
Blevins, John M.
Bodenhamer, James D.
Bonasso, Russell P., Jr.
Bowers, Richard E.
Bowland, Warren F.
Bowling, Martin L., Jr.
Bowman, Stephen L.
Brace, Robert A., II
Brennan, Michael J.
Bressler, Michael A.
Broderick, Charles R., Jr.
Brooke, Richard A.
Brooks, Bruce S.
Brooks, Charles R.
Brown, Bruce H.
Brown, Robert M., II
Brown, Timothy W.
Brown, William M.
Broyhill, Ted K.
Bruce, Michael E.
Buckley, Jerry L.
Buckley, John A., III
Bunnell, Danny R.
Burdette, Frederick E., II
Burke, Geoffrey K. W.
Burns, Robert A.
Burrell, Clarence A., II
Burrell, Dennis M.
Burwell, Stanley A.
Bussa, John J.
Calabro, John A., Jr.
Caldwell, Steven J.
Camp, Gregory C.
Campbell, William N.
Canella, Charles J., Jr.
Carl, David L.
Carleton, Ardenne S.
Carlson, Richard G.
Carman, James W.
Carpenter, Timothy L.
Carraway, David W.
Carroll, Daniel F.
Carson, Craig S.
Casey, Robert F.
Catron, Alan D.
Cerne, Antone C.
Cerrone, Michael J., III
Chapuran, Frank J., Jr.
Childers, Stephen D.
Christensen, George L.
Cima, James P.
Cinquino, Joseph M., III
Clappier, David J.
Clark, John J., Jr.
Clark, William R., Jr.
Clarke, Robert B.
Clemm, David H.
Cliff, Richard G.
Cobb, Jerald M.
Cobey, Elwood A.
Cochran, John H., Jr.
Cohn, Douglas A.
Colglazier, Donald R.
Connor, Peter M.
Conway, Barry T.
Cooch, Francis A., IV
Coogler, Arthur C., Jr.
Copley, John B.
Corcoran, Andrew W.
Cowperthwaite, Neil F.
Craig, James D.
Craven, William J., Jr.
Crawford, Gerald E.
Crecelius, Allan M.
Creeden, Joseph V., Jr.
Creighton, Francis M., Jr.
Crenshaw, John C.
Crist, Paul H.
Croft, Hugo W.
Crowe, Myles J.
Cruden, John C.
Crupper, Gordon, Jr.
Cullen, John F.
Cummings, Douglas M.
Cummings, Kenneth T.
Cunningham, David F.
Curl, Walton W.
Curran, Patrick M.
Curran, William M.
Cutting, Edward B., Jr.
D'Alessandro, Ralph
Dallen, John A., Jr.
Darling, John E., Jr.
Darmody, Donald J.
Dauth, Michael A.
Davis, Donald C.
Davis, Louis S.
Day, Kenneth M.
De Blaquiere, Joseph A., Jr.
De Coursey, Paul A.
Decker, James G.
Delia, Francis S.
Des Jardien, Richard F.
Di Benedetto, Michael A. J.
Dickerson, William J. E.
Dienes, Nicholas S.
Dodson, John A.
Dodson, Jonathan B.
Donahue, Daniel J., III
Donohue, Stephen P.
Dooley, Joseph M.
Drummond, David I.
Dull, Andrew L.
Durham, Orlin A., Jr.
Durkan, Joseph D.
Dyer, William B., Jr.
Easton, William G., Jr.
Echols, Robert M., Jr.
Edelman, Mark A.
Einbinder, Michael P.
Ericson, William F., II
Erion, Bruce F.
Eustice, Abe L.
Everett, Surry P.
Fabrey, Robert H., II
Farrugia, Victor R.
Fay, Michael J.
Feher, Ronald D.
Fellows, Michael H.
Fetterman, Richard E.
Finley, Joseph C.
Finney, John R., III
Firehock, Robert A.
Fisher, Michael J.
Fisher, Timothy A.
Flanigan, Richard C.
Florance, Jared E.
Flowers, Earl W.
Flowers, Ernest, II
Flynn, Richard J.
Font, Louis P.
Ford, David P.
Fourqurean, James E.
Fowler, Joseph C., Jr.
Fraley, Ralph R.
Francis, James H., III
Fravel, George H.
Frinak, John C.
Frushour, Stephen J.
Fryer, George E., Jr.
Fuhrman, Russell L.
Fulton, Larry S.
Furr, James R.
Gaddis, Walter D., Jr.
Gaiser, James A.
Galak, Robert C.
Garcia, Victor
Gardepe, William M.
Gardes, George A., Jr.
Gardner, Jon S.
Garrison, James E., III
Gatlin, Jesse C., III
Gerard, David W.
Gerke, Jack E.
Germann, George E.
Glasson, Charles B.
Gilhuly, Michael J.
Gilliard, Richard P.
Gonzalez, John J.
Goodell, Richard R.
Gooding, Daniel E.
Gora, Robert R.
Gorecki, Michael E.
Grabowski, William S., Jr.
Grant, Gary E.
Greeby, Gordan T., Jr.
Greenberg, James L.
Gregor, Henry F.
Griffin, Leon R., II
Grygiel, Michael L.
Guignon, Joseph G.
Guinn, John W., III
Gustafson, Karl J.
Hall, Donald G.
Halstead, Gary W.
Hammond, Edward D.
Hansen, Dale W.
Hansen, Louis J.
Hansen, Mark F.
Hanson, Peter B.
Hargis, James V.
Harmeling, John T., Jr.
Harper, Howard F.
Harper, Stephen J.
Harrelson, Keith B.
Hart, Lawrence T.
Hart, Michael R.
Harter, James M.
Hatcher, David M.
Hathaway, John G.
Hauck, Kenneth W.
Haven, Kendall F.
Havey, Michael E.
Hawkins, Charles F.
Hawley, Richard A., Jr.
Hayes, Harry E.
Hayes, Robert L.
Heckman, George J., Jr.
Hedley, John C.
Heil, Benjamin F., Jr.
Heisel, John E.
Heller, Edward J.
Henderson, Robert H.
Henningsen, Kim J.
Henry, Joseph R.
Hensler, Robert M.
Hergenrether, Dennis J.
Herman, Stephen M.
Hewitt, Glen M.
Hiatt, Victor E.
Higgins, William J., III
Hill, Charles R.
Hittner, Barry G.
Hobbs, Edmund R.
Hoblit, Frederic H.
Holderness, Jerome W.
Holland, Terence C.
Horn, John B.
Horton, James D.
Hostler, Dorsey D.
Houck, Russell J.
House, Jeffrey L.
Howard, James T.
Hughes, Neil D.
Hunt, Robert D.
Iaconis, Christopher S.
Irvin, William R.
Jack, Harrison U.
Jacobs, Gilbert A.
James, Charles R., Jr.
Javorski, Joseph J., Jr.
Jeffries, William C., Jr.
Jennings, James J.
Jetland, Robert T.
Jewell, Thomas K.
Johnson, Claude A,
Johnson, Denny L.
Johnson, Donald A.
Johnson, Fred B.
Johnson, Gregory B.
Johnson, Jay D.
Johnson, Oliver R.
Johnston, John C.
Jonas, Arthur P.
Jones, Charles W.
Jones, David S.
Jones, Don W.
Jones, John A.
Jordan, Larry R.
Joseph, Paul F.
Kaufman, Daniel J.
Keane, John J., Jr.
Kecki, Thomas M.
Keller, Richard F.
Keller, Robert L.
Kelley, James F.
Kelly, James D.
Kelly, Robert C., Jr.
Kendall, Ronald R.
Kennedy, Terence J.
Kent, Richard R., Jr.
Kimball, Alvion R.
Kimball, James F.
Klein, Charles F., Jr.
Knecht, David A.
Knitt, Kenneth P.
Kohler, James D.
Korda, Bruce M.
Kremenak, Kenneth J.
Krieger, Paul T.
Krohnfeldt, Leslie D.
Krueger, Philip J.
Kruger, John D.
Kulikowski, Bogdan M.
Kulpa, Norman D.
Kunz, Eric R.
Kunzman, William A.
Kurilko, Nicholas M.
Kurkjian, Thomas G.
Kympton, Howard W., III
Kyzer, William R.
Laing, Michael P.
Lambert, Virgil F., Jr.
Lane, Ronnie J.
Lark, William N.
Larson, Edward D.
Laswell, George R.
Laughlin, Terence K.
Laughton, Nelson E.
Lawton, James F.
Leatham, Karl J.
Lee, Dwight E.
Lieb, Charles R.
Limbaugh, Daniel B.
Little, William F., III
Llewellyn, Jim O.
Locher, James R., III
Lopes, Peter A.
Lorbeer, Robert C.
Lorentzen, Edward J.
Lovett, Paul D., III
Lower, Robert S.
Lowry, Samuel O.
Ludwikoski, John H.
Lynch, Frank J., Jr.
Lynch, William R., III
Lynes, Claude D.
Lyons, Steven G.
MacDonald, Ray W.
MacLaren, Michael G.
MacVittie, Dennis K.
MacFarlane, Douglas E.
MacKall, Charles L., Jr.
Maddux, David T.
Madora, Albert J.
Magathan, Wallace C., III
Mahan, Charles S., Jr.
Main, Larry B.
Mance, Joseph F.
Mangino, Joseph N.
Mann, Michael J.
Manning, Larry A.
Manske, Dennis W.
Marcuccilli, Stephen J.
Margrave, Thomas E.
Markley, Marvin E.
Marriott, William T., III
Martin, David
Martin, John T.
Martin, John T., III
Mase, Roy W.
Mason, Richard M.
Mathews, Toney A.
Matlach, William J.
Mayer, John D., Jr.
McAdams, William J., Jr.
McCaffrey, Joseph S.
McCauley, William T.
McClain, James E.
McClary, Michael V.
McClelland, Richard E.
McConnell, Thomas C.
McCrone, Willard P.
McDonald, John W.
McDonald, Robert G.
McElroy, Howard C.
McKenna, Brian J.
McKenna, Charles D.

McLane, Donald J.
McLean, Neil A., III
McLellan, Barton J.
McNaugher, Thomas L.
Mears, Harvey M.
Medici, Antonio W., II
Meinshausen, Walter D.
Mendoza, Edward M.
Mente, Alvin L., III
Merriam, John C.
Merritt, Keith F.
Merritt, Robert L.
Messel, Robert B.
Milinski, Edward L.
Miller, Charles P., III
Miller, Charles R.
Miller, John F.
Miller, Johnnie
Miller, Norman E.
Miller, Roy D.
Miller, William S.
Mills, Robert L.
Millson, Edwin H., Jr.
Moe, Patrick J.
Moore, Thomas M.
Moran, Kenneth J.
Morand, Leon F., III
Morris, John W.
Mulvey, William L.
Munson, John H.
Murphy, Maurice E., II
Murphy, Steven L.
Murray, Malcolm M.
Myers, Charles R., Jr.
Nader, Frank R.
Nagy, Ross L.
Nahorniak, Nicholas
Nash, William L., Jr.
Neill, George V., Jr.
Nelson, Dale R.
Nelson, Edward L.
Nerdahl, John H.
Neswiacheny, Bohdan
Nettesheim, Daniel D.
Newsome, Earl E.
Neyses, David A.
Nicholson, Kenneth R.
Nickols, Jess R., Jr.
Nippell, George D.
Nolan, Jon B.
Nolan, Thomas J.
Noonan, Michael A.
Norton, Leo E. Jr.
Nyquist, Stephen J.
O'Connell, Michael J.
O'Connor, Craig E.
O'Connor, Joseph P., Jr.
O'Keefe, Patrick J.
O'Meara, Norman T., II
O'Neil, Michael A.
O'Reilly, Lee J.
O'Toole, Lawrence G.
Ohle, David H.
Ohlinger, Christopher R.
Olivier, Roland E.
Olmsted, David W.
Olsen, Russell A.
Olson, Roger T.
Olvis, Charles T.
Onasch, Thomas D.
Oneal, John R.
Orahood, James A.
Osborn, Stephen L.
Outlaw, Le Roy B.
Oventile, John C.
Palke, Richard L.
Palone, Michael F.
Parker, Allen S.
Parker, Fred C., IV
Parry Bruce E.
Parsons, Tyler B.
Patrow, Michael L.
Paulson, Peter G.
Pedrotti, Paul B.
Peduto, John C.
Peirce, Thomas H.
Pence, Thomas E.
Peplinski, William J.
Perry, Floyd L.
Petcu, Larry J.
Peters, Michael P.
Petruska, Charles W.
Pierce, Louis L.
Pigott, Joel E.
Pinzuti, Robert A.
Piraneo, Charles J.
Pirnie, Lyle E.
Popov, Dan
Post, Francis W.
Potter, Michael W.
Powell, Daniel R.
Powell, Richard D.
Poynter, Hayden C., Jr.
Price, Wilbur F., Jr.
Prosnik, George J.
Ptasnik, Paul E.
Puckett, Frank M., Jr.
Puffer, Raymond H., Jr.
Quinney, George K.
Rader, Steven R.
Raines, William B., Jr.
Rapisarda, Lawrence A.
Ratcliffe, Lamar C., Jr.
Rebovich, George, Jr.
Reed, John T.
Reffett, William M.
Reichert, William F.
Reid, Jack J.
Reilly Gilbert J., Jr.
Reynolds, Frederick D.
Rhoades, Richard T.
Rhodes, Lyle R., Jr.
Rider, Fred I., Jr.
Riek, Jeffry R.
Riser, Henry L., Jr.
Roberson, Gary F.
Roberts, Donald L.
Robertson, Lewis H.
Robinson, Benny L., Jr.
Robinson, Daniel F.
Robinson, Frank T., Jr.
Robinson, Franklin P., III
Robinson, William E.
Robinson, William L.
Rodgers, Stephen J.
Rogers, Jeffrey C.
Rolfes, Jude R.
Romash, Michael M.
Rorie Wilson L., Jr.
Rosenberry, Dennis L.
Ruiz, Miguel O.
Russell, Richard T., Jr.
Ryan, Daniel A.
Ryneska, John J.
Sackett, David L.
Samuel, Philip J.
Sands, Arthur C.
Sayre, Gordon E., Jr.
Scaglione, Richard J.
Schaeffer, Lee M.
Schappaugh, Garry L.
Schlipper, Louis W.
Schulte, David A.
Schutsky, William R.
Schweitzer, George W.
Seebart, Daniel B.
Selvitelle, Michael D.
Shaffer, Hugh A.
Shaffer, William D., III
Shahid, Fred J., Jr.
Sharples, Dale S., II
Shaw, Robert C.
Shaw, Steven A.
Sheaffer, Michael K.
Sherman, Robert L., Jr.
Shields, Buren R., III
Shimp, Robert E.
Shipley, Richard D.
Shoener, George B.
Silverthorn, Andrew C.
Simmons, Thomas H.
Simonich, Michael L.
Sleder, Albert, Jr.
Smith, Alan J.
Smith, David A.
Soeder, Arnold H., Jr.
Soice, Michael R.
Sorrow, Jerry W.
Sowa, Peter T., Jr.
Speer, Louis E.
Speidel, Louis J.
Spelman, Mark G.
Spencer, James P.
Spengler, Henry M., III
Spengler, John D.
Sperber, Horst G. R.
Sprinkles, Randolph S.
Stallings, Jon K.
Stanley, James M., Jr.
Steel, Charles L., IV
Stefan, James M.
Steiner, Richard W.
Stettler, James J.
Stevenson, Douglas F.
Stevenson, Larry L.
Stewart, Duncan F., Jr.
Stites, Thomas E.
Stolp, Werner J.
Strand, John A., III
Stratton, Andrew B.
Stroble, Charles R.
Strong, Marvin P.
Stroud, Robert A.
Swan, Peter A.
Swaney, Jack W.
Swedock, Robert D.
Sweeney, Robert C.
Sweeny, Bruce D.
Sweet, Ross B.
Swinney, James R.
Szigethy, Robert E.
Tallman, James A.
Tangen, Neil M.
Tanski, James M.
Taylor, Daniel R., Jr.
Taylor, David L.
Thal, Edmund A.
Thomas, Eric E.
Thomassy, John E.
Thome, James J.
Throckmorton, John L., Jr.
Thuss, Michael F.
Thygerson, William R.
Tijerina, Gilbert
Tildon, Ralph B., Jr.
Tillery, George G., Jr.
Timboe, Harold L.
Toczylowski, Henry M., Jr.
Toffler, Patrick A.
Toole, Michael T.
Toraason, John D.
Torres, Arthur F.
Trauner, Theodore J., Jr.
Trexler, Kent M.
Trollinger, Michael L.
Tuccillo, Ralph R.
Tucker, Frederic L., Jr
Uhler, Robert B.
Unangst, Gregory J.
Utermahlen, Charles B.
Van Cook, Donald F., Jr.
Van Horn, Larry J.
Vehlow, Charles A.
Veidt, Robert T.
Vennum, Michael D.
Vickers, Wilford S., II
Vinton, Raymond S.
Vitters, Alan G.
Volk, Karl W., III
Vollrath, Thomas L.
Wallace, Peter P.
Wallin, Leonard A., II
Walsh, James F.
Walsh, John P., Jr.
Wantuck, Donald F.
Wantuck, Thomas A.
Warncke, Ronald M.
Weeks, Gerald B.
Wells, Michael C.
Westerlund, John S.
Wheless, Douglass T.
Wiedenbeck, Richard J.
Wilcox, John T.
Wildrick, John T.
Wilhite, Harold L., Jr.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Gary S.
Williams, George K.
Williams, John N., Jr.
Williams, John R.
Williams, William E., III
Wing, John B.
Winsor, Stephen A.
Winter, Daniel J.
Witherspoon, Richard H.
Witschonke, Carl F., III
Witwer, Randall K.
Woessner, Carl F., Jr.
Wohlers, Everett T.
Wong, Terrence K. H.
Wooten, Marvin, Jr.
Workman, Donald R.
Worthen, James K.
Wright, Leslie R.
Wright, Richard K.
Wyman, Samuel D., III
Yager, Harold E.
Yasukawa, Ronald N. H.
Yoshitani, Tay
Yoshizumi, Gary R.
Younts, James O., III
Ziots, George J.
Zophy, F. Gordon, II

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3283 through 3294:

To be captain

Scanlan, William H., O88914.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3283 through 3294, and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel

Thomas, Merle D., O468692.

To be majors

Coultrip, Raymond L., Jr., O5540645.
Lent, Peter S., O4014548.
Mcmaster, Stanley C., O2271286.

To be captains

Alexander, Byron B., O2309352.
Alexander, George W., II, O5204318.
Barrington, Tillman E., MN2300377.
Barry, Michael J., O5232897.
Baskin, Alan R., O5024643.
Beard, Graham E., O5232309.
Beckers, Robert G., O2289623.
Bernier, William E. B., O5525182.
Blubaugh, Edward C., O5438403.
Bonham, Terrence J., O2315823.
Buck, Harper, J., O2314090.
Colley, Martin D., O2313002.
Cresci, Anthony B., O5000645.
Cruzen, Oran G., MN805837.
Doyle, William F., O5015301.
Dunn, Bruce E., O5013345.
Heilman, John P., Jr., O5211900.
Hohe, Paul T., O5525899.
Johnson, James E., MR5701656.
Jones, William W., Jr., O5307358.
Kato, Ronald H., O3066696.
Kucera, James, O2292634.
La Beau, Russell F., Jr., O5540294.
Laurence, Charles H., MN902159.
McCann, David T., O5540932.
Rausch, Francis M., MN2296706.
Ricotta, Salvatore A., O5232696.
Sa'adah, David M., O5227846.
Santaella-Latimer, Luis R., O5826833.
Shaw, James E., O1876670.
Stables, Frederick M., O5304382.
Sullivan, William G., O5518702.
Swim, Vernon G., O2307789.
Thomason, Phillip R., O5319970.
Tuller, Jerome D., O2306012.
Venn, Raymond D., O4023572.

To be first lieutenants

Ayers, James E., O2332423.
Barrie, Jeffrey E., O5320600.
Belisle, Paul A., O5232865.
Bell, Jerry L., O5413359.
Bergstrom, Jon F., O2321160.
Berry, Larry G., O5222477.
Billick, Bernard M., O5222306.
Brisendine, Esther A., N5520057.
Brown, Clarence D., MM221441.
Burke, Lucien F., O2325450.
Calhoun, William I., O2325412.
Carr, Joel S., O5239158.
Craft, Phil D., O2320683.
Cranford, James S., O5216493.
Crawford, Robert C., Jr., O5712917.
Crawford, William C., O2331787.
Crumpton, Alfred T., Jr., O5414242.
Cunningham, David E., O2325032.
Czyhold, Michael W., O2325410.
Dalzell, Daniel P.
Davis, Benjamin S., MR231370.
Dockal, Harvey J., MN2305793.
Dommer, Paul P., O5005643.
Drake, Frank R., Jr., O2325509.
Fedde, Charles W., O2325419.
Fesler, Ken W., O5423635.
Flanagan, Clyde M., Jr., O2320954.
Foley, Patrick J., O2333358.
Goddard, Richard J., O5517228.
Gushwa, Robert L., O2316671.
Haines, Joe O., O2325506.
Harrison, Holmes C., III, O2328120.
Hicks, John L., O5540191.
Hutson, Richard M., O2325857.
Idzik, Martin F., O5016029.
Jagels, Arlen E., O5712231.
Jones, David D., O2310643.
Keeports, Richard L., O2325508.
Landes, Richard D., O5223843.
Lenaham, John C., O5011617.
Marshall, James S., O5017230.
Morgan, Don W., O5413380.
Neal, Gary L., O2320736.
Olszewski, Clarence A., O2317960.
Ong, Harry M., MM2307999.
Patterson, Michael B., O5321695.
Phillips, James E., O5330637.
Rathert, Roger A., 05531359.
Redmond, Hight S., O5313915.
Rosheim, Waldron A., O5501669.
Sakson, Donald A., MM2310319.
Sandell, Lawrence J., O2331462.
Sanders, Harold L., O5519741.
Shaffer, Edward L., Jr., O2320800.
Sheffield, William M., O5331014.
Shoup, Kenneth J., O2311415.

Silverman, George S., O5014386.
Stroud, Richard M., O5406792.
Szilvasy, John A., O2322160.
Taylor, Byron H., MN2319250.
Taylor, Warren H., O5415116.
Teaford, Alan K., O2325593.
Torgerson, Leslie A., 02321162.
Wagner, Stanley C., O2325353.
Wilson, Sherley A., R5411616.
Xenakis, William A., O5008226.

To be second lieutenants

Bowen, Marshall J., MN5024857.
Chappell, George B., O5299548.
Dance, Robert L.
Dell'omo, John L., Jr., O5237730.
Frier, Ronald C., Jr., O2324024.
Herrick, Christopher Q., O5228733.
Israelson, David H., 03171453.
Johnson, Ralph E., O5228737.
Marquette, Ralph L., Jr., O5234259.
McElwee, Thomas P., Jr., MN2323824.
Sierra, Albert J., Jr., O2322144.

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bush, James E.
Brumfield, James E.
Cloman, James F.
Fejfar, Richard A.
Hara, Glenn S.
Hixon, Harry J., Jr.
Medina, Refugio O.
Stevens, John H.
Stohner, George A.
Watkins, Deems C.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Peter A. Acly
William S. Alexander
Joe E. Allen
Robert L. Alvarez
Lester E. Amick III
Timothy J. Anderson
James L. Anderson
Clarence T. Anthony, Jr.
John W. Anuszewski, Jr.
Rodney A. Arena
Rufus A. Artmann, Jr.
Richard G. Averitt III
Paul C. Bacon
Marion R. Baggs
Ronnie J. Bailey
David L. Baker
Raymond F. Baker
Robert E. Ballinger
John J. Banning
John C. Barber
Arry E. Bare
Robert C. Barnes, Jr.
Sheldon J. Bathurst
David C. Beaty
James H. Beaver
Lawrence C. Begun
James E. Bell
John L. Bilodeau
Richard A. Bircher
Walter R. Bishop
Bert Black
William R. Black, Jr.
Patrick C. Blackman
Frank R. Blakemore
David W Blizzard
James R. Bohlig
David A. Boillot
John A. Boivin
Michael A. Bonacci
Jay F. Boswell
Ervin J. Boudreaux
Jack B. Bounds
Thomas A. Braaten
Bernard F. Bradstreet
Clifford A. Brahmstadt
Robert Bright III
James A. Brinson, Jr.
Steven F. Broderick
Richard C. Brookes
David T. Brown
David L. Brown
Michael B Brown
Richard M. Brown
Robin L. Brown
Kenneth H. Bruner
James F. Buchli
Paul D. Budd
Robert J. Buechler
John L. Burgoyne
Phillip G. Burke
John D. Burrill
Ronald L. Burton
Milburn C. Butler, Jr.
Donald J. Buzney
Mark A. Byrd
John H. Carson
Edgar M. Carson
Howard C. Carver III
Richard J. Carver
Roy J. Casteil
Michael R. Cathey
Mario E. Cecchetti
Merritt N. Chafey IV
Charles R. Champe
Roger G. Charles
Bruce B. Cheever II
Robert E. Chiesa
Leslie A. Christian
Kenneth L. Christy, Jr.
Raymond J. Clatworthy III
William E. Clawson
John J. Cochenour
Clelland D. Collins
Charles A. Collins
Peter L. Colt
Michael C. Connor
Blair P. Conway
William A. Cook
C. R. Cooper, Jr.
Albert J. Cormier
Ronald J. Cornetta
John P. Cress
Randolph E. Crew
Herbert T. Cross
Joseph T. Crowe
Stephen Cucchiara
William L. Culver
Angelo J. Cuttaia
Paul R. Daigle
William E. Dakin, Jr.
Crane Davis
Dean R. Davis
Carson R. Day
Andrew P. Decker
Alan C. Decraene
Terence T. Deggendorf
Jack E. Deichman
Robert C. Delones
Michael P. Delong
Samel T. Delong, Jr.
Marion F. Demming
Michael J. Dineen
Dennis T. Dinota
Joe Dominguez
William R. Donnelly, Jr.
Robert C. Dopher, Jr.
Stuart A. Dorow
Daniel C. Douglas
Kevin M. Doyle
Wayne C. Doyle
John W. Dumas
Joseph G. Dunacusky, Jr.
James V. Dunlap
Charles C. Dunn
Charles W. Durie
Richard F. Dworsky
Darryl F. Dziedzic
Robert L. Earl
Max B. Eaton
William M. Eaton
David J. Eckenrode
James S. Ehmer
Charles R. Eisenbach II
Dalton R. Ellis, Jr.
Michael B. Ellzey
William P. Etter II
William C. Evans
James J. Ewing, Jr.
Jonathan P. Feltner
Charles J. Ferg
Michael J. Ferguson
Patrick J. Finneran, Jr.
Patrick D. Finton
Thomas E. Fitzpatrick, Jr.
John R. Fogg
George S. Ford
James L. Foresman
Richard R. Foulkes
Stephen P. Freiherr
Claude R. Fridley
William P. Friese
Douglas B. Frisbie
Harold E. Frye, Jr.
Leonard R. Fuchs, Jr.
James R. Fuller
William J. Ganter, Jr
Algimantas V. Garsys
John R. Gazdayka
David M. Gee
George F. Getgood
James A. Gettman
Carl R. Gibson
Robert E. Gleisberg
Daniel M. Glynn
Neil W. Goddard
James A. Goebel
William G. Goodwin
Adrian J. Gordon
Donald E. Gordon
Robert L. Graler
Randall W. Gravenor
Terrence C. Graves
Philip Greco
Alfred Grieshaber, Jr.
Francis L. Gualandri
Grant P. Gustafson
Steven P. Hadar
John R. Hagan
David W. Hammel
Robert W. Hansen
Norman F. Hapke
Patrick J. Harrington
John T. Hart
Edward Hatton III
David W. Haughey
Eldwin D. Heely
Klaus-Peter Heinemeyer
Floyd P. Henry
Edward J. Hepp, Jr.
William R. Higgins
Harold D. Hockaday
James C. Hodges
Harold C. Holden
Robert J. Holihan, Jr.
John N. Holladay
Gary E. Holtzclaw
Richard G. Hoopes
Raymond A. Hord
Patrick G. Howard
John M. Hudock, Jr.
Richard B. Hudson
James R. Hughes
Frederick L. Huntington III
Robert H. Hutchison
Robert P. Isbell
William P. Isbell
Albert E. James, Jr.
Richard M. Jessie, Jr.
George H. Johnson, Jr.
Ronald P. Johnson
Russell L. Johnson
Russell H. Johnson, Jr.
James F. Jones
Stuart C. Jones, Jr.
Alexander P. Jukoski
John E. Juneau
Harold D. Kadolph
Frank J. Kaiser
William B. Kalish
Michael R. Kanne
John F. Karch
Thomas A. Keene
Jack H. Kemeny, Jr.
Edward R. Kenney
Cecil D. Henninger
Alan A. Kettner
Gerald L. Keys
Grady L. Hicks
John A. Kieffer, Jr.
Gary J. Kiel
Charles W. King
Dennis D. King
William J. Kirkpatrick
John J. Kispert, Jr.
Manfred A. Koebig
Fred W. Koehler
Donald E. Koppenhaver
Frederick T. Krabbe
Earl A. Kruger
Richard H. Kunkel, Jr.
Richard C. Kurth
Gregory S. Kuzniewski
Albert S. Kyle
Richard O. Laing
Carl E. Lambert
John A. Lancaster
Michael D. Langston
John P. Larrison
Robert E. Lavender
John B. Lawson
Luther L. Lawson III
Kenneth J. Leahy
Edward G. Lewis
William R. Leisher
Francis E. Lewis
Fred M Lewis
James T. Lewis
Frederick A. Libby
Richard F. Liebler
Ralph Lippe
Dennis L. Lister
Robert M. Lloyd
Robert E. Logan, Jr.
Lawrence Lookenbill
Francis B. Lovely, Jr.
Paul J. Lowery
John F. MacKnis
Robert J. MacNamara
James G. Magee
John C. Malinowski
John H. Masters, Jr.
Anton J. Matics
Donald J. Matocha
Phillip R. Mattox
John F. Matus
Bernard J. Maxik
Dennis M. McCarver
Michael E. McClung
Paul R. McConnell
James F. McCool III
Orval W. McCormack
Patrick J. McDonald, Jr.
Thomas M. McEntire
George L. McGaughey, Jr.
Harold S. McGinnis, Jr.
John J. McGinty
Donald E. McGuire
Robert N. McGuire
Donald S. McKee
James H. McKelligon
Richard S. McLaughlin
Daniel D. McMurray
James R. McNeece
Walter S. Meads, Jr.
William R. Melton
Max C. Meltzer
Thomas H. Meurer
Richard Metli
John C. Millen
Edward H. Mills
Wallace W. Mills
David L. Mix
Robert E. Moe
John W. Monk, Jr.
Thomas M. Moorman
Freddie M. Morgan
Michael D. Morgan
Michael K. Morrison
Michael K. Morrow
Cyril V. Moyher
Garrell S. Mullaney
William H. Munyoa
Edward J. Murphy
Bruce C. Murray
James E. Murray
John K. Narney
Richard O. Neal
Rafael Negron
James H. Nelson
Jan H. Nelson
Robert B. Newlin
Raymond J. Norton
Frank A. O'Brien III
James M. O'Brien, Jr.
John J. O'Brien, Jr.
Spencer F. Olsen
Robert J. O'Rourke
Edward M. O'Shaughnessy, Jr.
Dallas W. Owens
James E. Owens
Eugene M. Ozment
Jerry G. Paccassi, Jr.
Peter Pace
Robert A. Packard
Ernest B. Palmer, Jr.
Matt Parker III
Paul D. Parker II
David B. Peake
Thomas R. Pearson, Jr.
Anthony J. Pesavento
Arthur R. Peter, Jr.
David W. Peters
George M. Pfeiffer, Jr.
Lloyd O. Phelps
George Philip III
James B. Phipps
Bernard T. Polentz
John C. Powers
Ronald E. Pruiett
Kenneth R. Ptack
Harry Q. Radcliffe
James T. Ranstead
Charles D. Raper
Leonard D. Raub
David D. Ray
Richard E. Rebmann
Nathaniel H. Reed
William R. Reese
Thomas L. Reilly
Andrew D. Reistetter
Joseph F. Renaghan
John C. Rhoderick
James S. Richardson
Orin J. Riddell
Durwood W. Ringo, Jr.
Robert K. Ripperger
Larry E. Roberson
Joseph A. Robitaille, Jr.
Craig S. Roepke
Joe G. Rogers
Raymond A. Roll
William G. Ross
Michael G. Roth
James E Roy
George N. Samaras
Jack L. Sammons, Jr.
James C. Sanborn
Michael B. Sandberg
Johnie A. Sanfratello
Edward A. Saunders
John A. Sawyer, Jr.
Anthony F. Scarangello
Donald A. Scheer
Philip M. Scherer
Charles W. Schillinger, Jr.
John A. Schmid
Robert E. Schmidt
Charles J. Schneider, Jr.
Karl R. Schroeder
Richard S. Scivicque
James F. Seagraves
Jules B. Selden
William C. Sellmer II
Richard A. Sergo
Jimmy J. Sevic
Kenneth L. Shackelford, Jr.
Dennis R. Shaw
William J. Sheahan III
Robert A. Shearer
Michael K. Sheeley
Michael F. Shields
Robert F. Short, Jr.
James O. Singer
Thomas D. Sizemore
Gregory G. Sloan
John J. Slough
Ronald F. Smee
Authur G. Smith
Clinton A. Smith
Leo I. Smith
Michael D. Smith
Phillip R. Smith
Ray L. Smith
Frederick G. Snocker
Kenneth A. Solum
Michael F. Sommers
William E. Southerland
Johnny L. Sparks
John G. Spindler
Richard D. Spitz
Anthony D. Stabile
Norman S. Stahl
Christopher C. Staley
Charles Steele
Edward R. Stepien
Norman R. Stocker
Raymond R. Stohschein
Ronald M. Stoll
Worth A. Styles
John J. Sullivan, Jr.
Stephen I. Szabolos
Bayard V. Taylor
Benjamin L. Tebault
William J. Tehan III
Samuel M. Tharp III
John W. Theisen
Robert W. Thomas
Robert F. Thompson
Robert W. Thompson
William G. Thrash, Jr.
Richard J. Tipton
Warren S. Titcomb
Charles J. Toeniskoetter
Alan S. Toppelberg

John B. Tritsch
Thomas R. Trompeter
Benjamin H. Trout II
Alan J. Tucci
Courtney L. Tucker
Robert E. Tuttle
Colin B. Tweddell
Carl W. Ulrich
Douglas C. Vassy
Richard W. Vaughn
David A. Vetter
Sidney S. Wade, Jr.
Paul H. Wallace
Robert W. Waller
Charles F. Warford, Jr.
Roger N. Warr
Clifford B. Warren III
Brian L. Webber
Tony A. Weda
Robert O. Weddle
David E. Weir
Thomas J. Weiss
Marshall R. Wells
Joseph R. Welsh, Jr.
Victor D. Westphall
Edward J. Wietecha, Jr.
David E. Wilbur
Thomas L. Wilkerson
Charles D. Williams
Michael J. Williams
James G. Williams
John T. Williamson
Bruce B. Wilson
Frederick W. Wilson
James Wolfe, Jr.
Johnny M. Wood
Larry A. Wood
Philip E. Worley
Henry A. Wright
John W. Wuethrich III
James F. Wzorek, Jr.
Jessie B. Young
Kenneth W. Young
Walter R. Young
George A. Zahn, Jr.
Jeffrey M. Zimmerman

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Michael C. Abajian
Charles K. Ables
Walter Acuff III
John F. Adinolfi
John H. Admire
Bernard A. Allen, Jr.
Granville R. Amos
George A. Ampagoomian
George D. Andersen
William G. Andersen
Gerard Anderson
Lee H. Anderson
Terrence E. Anderson
William R. Andrews, Jr.
James H. Armstrong
Steven C. Argabright
Edmund V. Armento
Gregory G. Armstrong
John W. Arnn, Jr.
John P. Arthur III
James P. Asher
David D. Auld
Frederick S. Avery III
John P. Aymond, Jr.
David J. Baccitich
Richard A. Bagby
James R. Bailey, Jr.
Jay R. Bailey
John W. Bailey
Leslie W. Bailey, Jr.
Richard H. Bailey
Robert G. Bailey
Ross E. Bailey
Thomas A. Bailey
Bradley R. Baird
James W. Baker
Theodore G. Balderree
William I. Barba
Andrew R. Barkovich
Gerald L. Barlow
John W. Barnes
Judybeth D. Barnett
George B. Barney
James V. Barrios
Oliver K. Batte, Jr.
Lewis C. Beard
James S. Becker
Carl E. Beimfohr
Michael C. Bell
David J. Bena
Jon R. Bergquist
Rudy W. Bernard
Leonard G. Bethards
Spencer G. Bihler
John E. Bishop
Frank S. Blair III
George M. Blakely III
Richard J. Blanchfield
William A. Blatter
Joseph H. Blichfeldt III
Leslie P. Blobaum
Edward L. Bloxom
Peter M. Blum
Robert U. Bokelman
Donald E. Bonsper
Jon R. Boston
John W. Bottoms, Jr.
Peter G. Bouker
Charles G. Bowen
John W. Breiten
Randolph H. Brinkley
Robert K. Brooks
Daniel J. Brown
Donald P. Brown
Fred A. Brown
James C. Brown
Robert M. Brown
William F. Brown
Paul C. Browne
David N. Buckner
Robert M. Buelow
Stephen G. Bulkley
Robert F. Bunch
Rodney E. Burdette
Charles E. Burge
John J. Burke
John G. Burns
Raymond M. Burns
Edward B. Burrow, Jr.
Carl D. Burtner
James H. Butler
Robert R. Butterfield
Robert L. Byrnes
George E. Cadman III
William C. Calle
William J. Caldwell
Bert V. Calhoun
Michael J. Campbell
Paul D. Campbell
Wallace L. Campbell
Wallace R. Campbell
William B. Campbell
William S. Campbell
Ray G. Canada
Michael D. Carey
Kenneth T. Carlisle
Carl J. Carlson
James R. Carpenter
John L Carroll
Thomas A. Carter
John J. Caskey
Paul E. Caswell
Albert L. Catallo
James P. Cawley
Douglas W. Chamberlain
John T. Chapman
Johnny D. Chapman
Rodney R. Chastant
Lee A. Chilcote, Jr.
Marvin E. Christians
Kenneth P. Clarendon
Frank S. Clark
Jack L. Clark
Lawrence D. Clark
Paul G. Clark
David C. Cleveland
Charles P. Cochran
John B. Colaprete
Forest L. Cole
Benjamin F. Collins III
Geoffrey M. Collins
Joseph P. Colly, Jr.
John I. Condon, Jr.
Leslie R. Conklin
Robert F. Conley
Dennis A. Conroy
Martin E. Conway II
Kenneth E. Cook
Charles D. Cooksey
John A. Cooper
Arnold B. Corbett
Ronald W. Corner
Richard K. Couch
Thomas N. Cox
Thomas P. Craig, Jr.
Kenneth D. Cranston
Arthur O Cravets
Stephen M. Creal
James K. Croney
Gary E. Crowell
Henry L. Cullen, Jr.
Jack W. Cunningham
John T. Cusack
Thomas L. Czechowski
Benjamin R. Dadd, Jr.
Lewis I. Dale
Richard W. Dambrosio
Michael Danchak, Jr.
Michael G. Dane
Walden L. Daniel
Walter E. Daniell
John P. Dapolito
John J. David
William A. Davidson III
Alan F. Davis
Herbert J. Davis
James C. Davis
Henry D. Davis
Stephen M. Day
Dominic J. Dean
Leo R. Deangelis
Walter S. Deforest
William C. DeFries
Christopher F. Delafleur
Arthur J. Delahoussaye
Earl G. Delarue
Conrad A. Delateur, Jr.
James R. Denton, Jr.
John E. Depenbrock, Jr.
Gerald L. Dereberry
Edward C. Desaussure
Kenneth W. Dewey
William W. Deyle, Jr.
William J. Dibello
Daniel A. Doberstein
Robert A. Dobies
Gary D. Dockendorff,
John B. Doherty
Harry C. Dolan
Gustavus L. Donnelly
William H. Dotterer
Thomas C. Downs
Stanley L. Dowson
James J. Doyle, Jr.
Robert F. Drake
Donald D. Drobny
Reginald W. Dryzga
Mark M. Duffy
James W. Dugger
Thomas J. Duhig
Dennis M. Dunagan
Albert R. Eastman, Jr.
Thomas H. Eagen, Jr.
Russell D. Eaton
Ronald E. Edwards
Ronald E. Edwards
Karl J. Ege
William E. Egen
Edwin Eggen
Barry A. Eklund
Della J. Elden
Lawrence G. Elder
Edward H. Engle, Jr.
Stephen J. Erickson
Delano R. Esguerra
William W. Eskridge
Michael J. Esposito
John C. Eudy, Jr.
Gerald C. Fagersten
Lynn W. Farmer
John P. Farrell
Paul E. Fearon
Earl W. Ferguson
Michael S. Ferneau
Thomas M. Fine III
Dennis M. Finnance
Charles W. Fish
Charles J. Fitzgerald
James E. Flanagan
Charles E. Fleming, Jr.
Joseph E. Fluet, Jr.
Joseph J. Flynn, Jr.
Walter H. Flynn, Jr.
Henry R. Folgate
Charles J. Fonzone
John W. Foos
Douglas O. Ford
William R. Ford
John D. Forter
William N. Foust
John O. Fox, Jr.
Charles J. Franklin, Jr.
Joseph S. Franzia
Robert A. Fraser
Richard H. Freeman
John B. Fretwell
Frederick T. Frey
Robert S. Friedrick
Laurence V. Friese
Gary A. Fry
Dennis B. Fryrear
Jimmy H Furlow
Kenneth R. Furr
David T. Gaar
Donald S. Gallaspy, Jr.
Neil C. Galloway
Gerald T. Galvin
Eugene R. Gannon
Henry W. Gardner
Malcolm C. Garland
Jerald B. Gartman
Robert L. Gartner
Neil A. Gaughan
Jeffrey A. Gaugush
Frederick L. Gause
Thomas G. Gavin
John R. Geisel, Jr.
Jerry R. German
Terry G. German
Wayne M. Gibbons
Walter M. Gibbs
Stephen A. Gilkerson
David D. Gillespie
Woody F. Gilliland
Stephen H. Gimber, Jr.
John T Gipson
John S. Gleason III
Gary L. Glisan
Richard Gnazzo
Walter H. Goedeke
Frank J. Gollatz, Jr.
Paul J. Goodine
Frank Grace, Jr.
David P. Graham
John H. Grant
Courtland P. Gray III
Roy L. Griffin, Jr.
Thomas H. Griffith, Jr.
Gary M. Griggs
Peter R. Grimm
Frederick A. Grimshaw, Jr.
Gunnap Gudjonsson
Frederick X. Guldi
Stanley R. Gustafson
James J. Guzzio
Gustav E. Gyllenhoff
David I. Habermacher, Jr.
Harry A. Hadd, Jr.
Patrick C. Hagans
Gunnar K. Hagen
Donald J. Hager
Peter D. Haines
Calvin T. Hair
James C. Hallman II
Frederick R. Hamil, Jr.
Joseph Hancharick, Jr.
Harold D. Hansen, Jr.
Michael F. Hanson
Robert L. Harding
Ronald I. Harkless
James G. Hart
Stephen M. Hartnett
Jerry M. Haugh
Jack E. Hawley
David H. Hayes
William E. Healy
Harvey A. Heikel
Edward C. Hein, Jr.
Phillip R. Hemming
Charles M. Hendricks
Michael C. Henry
James E. Henshaw
James S. Herak
Leslie B. Herman
Ronald G. Herms
James D. Herrin
Richard D. Hess
Milton J. Hester
Larry T. Higbee
David A. Higley
Alan S. Hill
Steven M. Hinds
Marl L. Hodder
T. D. Hoffner
Richard E. Holbein, Jr.
Thorvald P. E. Holm
Robert A. Holt
Harold L. Honbarrier, Jr.
Allen W. Hoof
Harry L. Hooper III
Marvin T. Hopgood, Jr.
Ronald J. Hornberger
Robert P. Horne, Jr.
David G. Horsey
John T. Horvatich
Mary J. Houlahan
Albert A. Hubbard
George L. Hubler
Merlin R. Huckemeyer
John C. Hudock, Jr.
Stanley P. Huey, Jr.
Therlon E. Hughes
John R. Hulo
Thomas W. Hummel
David R. Hunter
Richard O. Hunter
Gerald D. Huntoon
Derald D. Hurlbert
William L. Hydrick
Michael J. Hyland
Terence G. Hynes
Thomas H. Idema
Carlos J. Indest III
Charles H Ingram, Jr.
William H. Iredale
Thomas R. Irvine
William L. Jackson
William T. Jackson
Bradford Jealous, Jr.
John M. Jeffries
William G Johannsen
Elsie M. Johnson
Richard M. Johnson
Robert E. Johnson
John L. Jones
Joseph W. Jones III
Phillip D. Jones
Robert A. Jones
Louis S. Jumbercotta, Jr.
Thomas A. Kahl
Patrick J. Kahler
Larry G. Kaprich
Thomas W. Kaugher Jr.
Arthur J. C. Keener
Elvin W. Keith III
Dixon W. Kelley III
Nilton G. Kelsey
Calvin M. Kempf
William C. Kemple
Laurence J. Kennedy
Rodney C. Kicklighter
Lynn J. Kimball
Kenneth M. King
Raymond C. Kinkhead
Christopher F. Kinney
Edward V. Kirkland
Timothy R. Kirkman
Roy C. Kline
Joseph J. Klocek
Francis M. Klunk
Gerald S. Knapp
Robert W. Knight
David E. Knop
James H Knox
Kenneth A. Koeliln
Joseph J. Kollar
Bruce F. Kostad
David M. Kowalski
Thomas R. Kray
Melvin P. Krone
Alan E. Krusinger
Peter E. Kump
Carl S. Kusky, Jr.
Scott R. Laidig
Lawrence C. Lalick
Alexander E. Lancaster, Jr.
Malcolm V. Lane, Jr.
James L. Laney
Robert L. Larkin
Raymond R. Lau
Peter E. Laux
William F. Lawlor III
Stephen F. Lawrence
Steven R. Leach
Harry E. Lee III
Robert L. Leroy
Robert L. Lester
George S. Libey
Robert B. Liesegang
Douglas P. Light
Stephen E. Lindblom
Allen A. Lindeman
Hans W. Lindholm
Jimmy L. Lindsey
Robert M. Linvill
Junior D. Littlejohn
James L. M. Littlef III
John C. Livingston
Thomas R. Llewellyn
Willard F. Lochridge IV
George M. Lohnes, Jr.
Michael G. Loughman, Jr.
Gary F. Loveridge
John R. Lucas
Gary K. Lulfs
Joel J. Lynn
Christopher T. Mabley
Walter S. Mack, Jr.
John S. Mackay
Gary W. MacLeod
Terry L. Machamer
James M. Magot
Lawrence E. Malby
Michael G. Malone
John C. Maloney II
John M. Maloney
Joseph F. Markanthony

John H. Marks
Jon A. Marshall
David P. Martin
Thomas J. Marziaz
Frederick H. Matthys, Jr.
Robert E. Mattingly
John C. Maynard
Robert W. Maynard
Patrick J. McCann
Daniel P. McCart
James E. McClenahan, Jr.
Alexander McClinchie
Daryl S. McClung, Jr.
William E. McCollum
Ronald D. McDaniel
John R. McDermott
Thomas C. McDonald
Patrick J. McDonnell
Gary W. McDowell
Walter O. McDowell, Jr.
Jeffery E. McElroy
James R. McEvoy
James E. McGowan
Michael E. McIntosh
David L. McInturff
Thomas J. McKay
John H. McLaughlin
Robert S. McLellan IV
Frederick C. McQuigg
Matthew G. McTiernan
Thomas J. Meehan
Thomas H. Meeker
Ronald R. Meints
Robert B. Meissner
David L. Mellon
John C. Minahan, Jr.
Herbert T. Minnis
Frank D. Mitchell, Jr.
John J. Mondry, Jr.
Alan V. Monette
Michael T. Montgomery
Jack M. Moore
John R. Moore
Thomas W. Moore
Bucklyn M. Morgan
Charles H. Morrison III
John R. Morrison
Michael J. Moss
Meredith R. Moyer
Richard A. Mueller
John J. Mulholland
Richard H. Mullen
Richard W. Mullen
Robert L. Mumper, Jr.
James W. Murphy
Joseph G. Murphy, Jr.
Joseph I. Murphy
William F. Murphy
William M. Murphy
James B. Murray
John D. Murray
James M. Mutter
Lonnie M. Myers
Melba J. Myers
Richard A. Nagle
Gary J. Nash
Thomas H. Nash
Richard L. Neal
Richard L. Needham
Thomas A. Neidhart, Jr.
James C. Nelles
David W. Nelson
John J. Nelson, Jr.
John W. Neubauer
Ronald S. Neubauer
William H. Neuss
James C. Newman
Richard C. Norris, Jr.
Craig W. Norton
Rhodes B. Nunley
Robert G. Nunnally
Ronald C. Oates
Clarence E. O'Brien
David E. O'Brien
George W. T. Odell
Lawrence W. Oelrich
James T. Okelley, Jr.
Edward P. B. O'Neil
Wilbert E. Orem
Philip G. Ostrom
Simone J. Pace
Glen E. Packwood
Allen D. Parker
William A. Parker
Lioned Parra
Stanley J. Pasieka, Jr.
Howard C. Patterson
Jimmy A. Payne
Donald E. Pellecchia
John W. Perrine
Louis R. Peters
Frank K. Peterson
Robert L. Peterson
Richard M. Petroski
Allan D. Pettit
John B. Pevateaus, Jr.
Albert R. Pfeltz III
John D. Phillips
Jeffrey C. Pickett
Darvin D. Pierce
Richard F. Pinion
Ted R. Pittman
Wililam E. Platz
Grant L. Polk
Michael H. Ponder
William S. Poole
Henry L. Preston
Charles L. Pritchard
Sara J. Pritchett
Val P. Prost
James M. Puckett
Roger M. Pullis
John J. Quaid
William E. Ramey
Edward C. Rathbun
Philip H. Ray
Joseph M. Reber
Robert J. Redell
Henry L. Reed
Claude W. Reinke
Calix L. Reneau
Robert R. Renier
Philip F. Reynolds
James F. Rhodes
Larry D. Richards
John G. Richardson
Dean J. Richman
David A. Rochwine
Michael A. Rigney
Charence C. Riner III
John D. Rivera
Frederick M. Rivers, Jr.
Robert S. Rix, Jr.
Reno G. Rizzo
Jerry N. Roach
William L. Roach
Jerry L. Robertson
Lawrence R. Robillard
Everett A. Robison III
Arden E. Romsos
Robert C. Rosenau
Loretta J. Ross
Peter R. Rounseville
Morris E. Ruddick, Jr.
Jack A. Ruffer
James A Rumbley, Jr.
Bernard R. Rusthoven
Patrick F. Rutkoski
Edward M. Rynne
Richard D. Sachse
Charles A. Saldarini
Gerald H. Sampson
James J. Sanchak
William J. Sandberg
William C. Sauer
William E. Schaaf
Don F. Schafer, Jr.
Francis R. Schigg
David J. Schipper
Robert C. Schramm
Edward C. Schriber
Ernest U. Schultes
Peter A. Schwartz
John R. Schworn
Robert V. Scobie
Richard R. Scolio, Jr.
James B. Scuras
Raymond L. Seaborg
John W. Sears
William T. Sermeus, Jr.
Merlyn A. Sexton
Richard J. Sexton II
Robert L. Shara
John E. Sharkey
Robert C. Shearer
Robert C. Shepherd
Michael S. Shirley
Michael F. Shisler
Craig S. Sim
William R. Singer
John C. Singleton
Paul B. Skibsrud
Douglas L. Smith
Cary M. Smith
Gordon W. Smith, Jr.
James M. Smith
John J. Smith
Michael W. Smith
Robert D. Smith
Samuel W. Smith, Jr.
Richard E. Souza
Stephen M. Snyder
Richard H. Sokolowski
Ernest F. Spencer
William R. Spicer
Thomas J. Stack
Michael A. Stankcsky
Peter Starn
Douglas L. Starr
Edward M. St. Clair
Allan H. Steel
Gregory C. Steele
Steve R. Stegich III
William B. St. John, Jr.
Louis C. Stengel III
Brian M. Stevermer
Edward W. Stillman
Robert E. Stimson
John E. Stocking
John W. Stone
Stanford I. Storey
David M. Stout
James M. Stoy
Thomas L. Strohecker
Robert J. Sullivan
John A. Summa
Lem W. Surghnor, Jr.
John E. Sutton
William R. Sutton
Howard L. Swain
Ronald E. Swantkowski
Steven F. Szabo
Edward A. Taber III
Robert M. Talent
Donald G. Taylor
Harold W. Teasdale
Jesse H. Terpstra, Jr.
Raymond A. Thomas
James M. Thompson
Leroy A. Thompson
Fredric M. Timm
Herschel M. Timmons, Jr.
Leonard E. Torres
Stanley J. Trachta
William A. Trader
Andrew F. Traynor, Jr.
Frank L. Turner
Charles S. Tutt
Herbert S. Upton
Victor R. Urbanski
Dennis R. Vandervoort
Del R. Vandiver
Gary R. Vangysel
Mitchell C. Vickers
Wylie M. Vickery
Warren C. Vining III
Frederick J. Vogel
Donald A. Vogelgesang
Richard J. Vogt
Richard H. Voigt
John M. Wagner
John F. Walker, Jr.
George H. Walls, Jr.
Lawrence J. Walsh
Matthew F. Walsh, Jr.
George F. Ward, Jr.
Jimmie A. Warfield
Richard E. Waters
Charles L. Weaver
James M. Weaver
Ronald H. Wecht
Edward B. Weick
Jerome L. Weis
Robert F. Wemheuer
Roger V. Wellbrook
Danield T. Wellman, Jr.
Andrew S. Wells
Darrel A. Wells
Earl C. Wentworth, Jr.
Gerald C. Westendorf
Wade S. White
Avera S. Williams
Dale W. Williams
Gary L. Williams
Robert S. Williams
Samuel M. Williams
Robert O. Wills
Robert T. Willis
Jeffery A. Wilson
Walter R. Wisniewski
Bruce G. Wolfe
Robert W. Wood
Lance P. Woodburn
Robert M. Woodbury
John A. Woodhead III
Howell F. Wright
James L. Wright
John W. Wroten, Jr.
Thomas P. Wyman
James T. Wynn
Lonnie V. Yanda
Thomas R. Yanger
Earl W. Young II
John F. Younger, Jr.
Norman P. Ytterdal
Charles W. Zadel, Jr.
David E. Zaenglein
Thomas Zalewski
Ronald R. Zappardino
Paul J. Zohlen

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Ratification of U.N. Conventions

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are two United Nations conventions which the Senate may be asked to approve: the first deals with the political rights of women; the second is concerned with the abolition of forced labor. These conventions may appear innocuous. Both subjects have been dealt with decisively by constitutional amendments. The Committee on Foreign Relations has refused to approve these conventions, and with good reason.

Human rights, as Americans know them, are mere words in most of the world. More often than not, the concepts embodied in such humanitarian resolutions are used as weapons in international politics, and are rarely followed in the nations which anxiously seek authority for intervention in the internal affairs of other nations.

James Jackson Kilpatrick recently discussed these conventions in an excellent column which was published in the State newspaper of January 9, 1968. Mr. Kilpatrick, with his usual perception, points out the essential danger in these and similar treaties: they ought never to deal with matters of internal law.

Writing in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal, John M. Raymond, a distinguished attorney who now lectures in international law at the University of Santa Clara School of Law, takes the position that the ratification of these two treaties would not advance these human rights in the nations which do not now grant them. This is an excellent article on an important subject that I believe should be called to the attention of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Is This Really One World?" written by James J. Kilpatrick, and the article entitled "Don't Ratify the Human Rights Conventions," written by John M. Raymond, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Jan. 9, 1968]

IS THIS REALLY ONE WORLD?—TREATIES SHOULDN'T AFFECT INTERNAL LAWS

(By J. J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Now and then a fateful little sentence comes on tiptoe through the news—softly, softly, making no rustle—and the hair on the back of your neck goes prickle-prackle. The superstition used to be that a rabbit was crossing your grave. Just such a sentence crept into President Johnson's message on the international balance of payments.

"More than ever before," said the President, "this is one world—in economic affairs as in every other way."

Probably the reference to "one world" was no more than passing rhetoric, mere bunting to dress up a speech, for the rest of the President's message was surely nationalistic. Yet one wonders. Back in the fall, Mr. Johnson asked for Senate ratification of two more of those giddy United Nations conventions, and

Wisconsin's Senator William Proxmire has said that willy-nilly he will see to it that the Senate has a chance in 1968 to vote them up or down.

One hates to sound darkly suspicious, but when the President of the United States asserts that ours is "one world in every way," it is time to hook the shutters and check the locks on the doors. Mr. Johnson's mind has a sort of beltway breadth; he travels on two or three lanes at once. When he asks approval of these UN conventions, he is asking nothing less than an annex to the Constitution, for treaties, once ratified, become part of the supreme law of the land.

It may not be amiss, therefore take a fresh look at these instruments of international law. The first of them, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1952, is a convention intended to insure "the political rights of women." In substance, it binds the ratifying nations to agree that women shall have the right to vote and to hold office in their countries on equal terms with men.

The second, adopted by the International Labor Organization in 1957, is a pact on "the abolition of forced labor." It would bind the signatories to suppress, and not to use, forced labor as punishment for the expression of political views, for economic development, as punishment for participation in a strike, or as a means of racial or religious discrimination.

At the last count, 53 nations had ratified the convention on women's rights and 78 had ratified the convention on forced labor. On their face, the two treaties seem innocuous. Senator Proxmire, who made 175 speeches last year in favor of ratification, says they embody no more than already is embodied in the Constitution and laws of the United States. If formal Senate approval would gain us some Brownie points in international good will, why not vote the treaties into law?

The solid reasons for opposing these two conventions—and others that may come after—were spelled out in September by Eberhard P. Deutsch, of New Orleans, in a brilliant presentation to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Deutsch is chairman of the American Bar Association's standing committee on such instruments. What he said, in essence, is that treaties among nations should deal solely with relations among nations; they ought never to deal with matters of internal law.

The political rights of women in, say, Switzerland, Sweden or Peru simply are no business of the United States. Conditions of internal labor (we are not talking here of the slave trade) ought not to be fixed by international treaty. It is not enough to say that "women should have equal rights," or that "forced labor is terrible." Doubtless these are laudable views; they have been embedded in U.S. law for some time. But they are not the stuff of which treaties are made.

Not, that is, unless we truly are prepared for the "one world" concept, in which human rights are decreed by a World Court rather than by our own courts. Various agencies of the UN are working in precisely this direction, with persistent help from the State Department. Other UN conventions are pending that deal with marriage, holidays with pay, and pregnancy leave for working mothers.

Who ever supposed these matters were matters for world law? The UN's global thinkers, that's who. Come the millennium, they may be right. But come 1968, the U.S. Senate would do well to vote the pending conventions down.

[From the American Bar Association Journal, February 1968]

DON'T RATIFY THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

(NOTE.—Replying to an article entitled "A Costly Anachronism" in last October's *Journal*, Mr. Raymond argues that failure of the United States to ratify two human rights treaties now before the Senate—those on forced labor and on the political rights of women—would not be anachronistic, but rather would be eminently sound. Our adherence to these treaties, he writes, would not advance these human rights in the nations that do not now accord them.)

(By John M. Raymond)

The article by Richard N. Gardner, "A Costly Anachronism" (October *Journal*, page 907), presents no really convincing argument for ratification by the United States of the two human rights conventions now before the Senate, those on forced labor and on the political rights of women; [1] nor does it answer satisfactorily the objections of opponents of ratification. Those objections are not to the principles the conventions enumerate but to the use of the treaty procedure to accomplish the desired end. The conventions are not a mere declaration of principles, as was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but they are binding international compacts creating legal rights and obligations. It is neither an anachronism nor an "embarrassing contradiction" (to use Professor Gardner's expression) to recognize that additional considerations are involved when one moves from the advocacy of principles to the making of legally binding agreements.

Treaties are, in effect, contracts between two or more states, and they should be employed as contracts are used—to gain some advantage for the contracting party. As a long-standing regulation of the Department of State puts it: "Treaties should be designed to promote United States interests by securing action by foreign governments in a way deemed advantageous to the United States." [2] These human rights treaties are designed solely for the purpose of trying to bring about the abandonment of forced labor in countries that permit this practice and the granting of political rights to women in countries where they are lacking. Since forced labor is not imposed on Americans anywhere and American women would in no event have political rights abroad, we must look elsewhere to find how United States interests will be advantageously promoted by such internal changes in foreign countries.

The position of proponents of ratification, as expounded by Professor Gardner, is understood to be that if a country which has the objectionable practices ratifies these treaties and implements them, social and economic progress will be promoted in that country, and that this in turn will create a better climate there for American business, cultural and political relations. It is also claimed that these improved conditions will forestall the possibility of certain disorders that could disturb world peace and security. Many question this thesis on the argument that such claimed advantages to the United States are much too remote and indefinite to be considered.

Be that as it may, the proponents' position is so tenuous as to be unrealistic. If a state having the objectionable practices is prepared to reform its ways, it would seem that it would take the appropriate action without any necessity of first assuming an obligation to do so under an international agreement. Even if it felt it needed the force of an international obligation in order to achieve its internal reform, it could secure this by ratifying the treaties now and becoming bound to those states that have ratified, without the necessity of ratification by the United States. If the state is not prepared to take such measures, it would hardly become a party to the treaties; and if it should by some change become a party, it follows from the hypothesis that it would not implement them.

Even granting, for the sake of argument, that the treaties might bring about the desired result in certain countries, this in no way explains why the United States should become a party to them. We have long since granted these rights to our own people. Our ratification would have no effect, legal or otherwise, which would accomplish this result in other countries. These reforms can only be brought about by domestic action of each country concerned.

Professor Gardner advances the argument that our ratification "will encourage other nations to adhere" to the conventions, and he quotes Ambassador Goldberg thus: "If we do not consider it important to sign the conventions, why should they? Or, more important, why should they implement the conventions?" But these statements are quite different from and fall far short of saying that states which today have the objectionable practices will ratify the conventions if we ratify. "More important," they certainly do not say that such states will implement the treaties by their own action provided we ratify. The conclusion that any objectionable practices would be eliminated by our ratification is a complete *non sequitur*.

All that would be accomplished by our becoming a party to either of the conventions would be that we would acquire a right to assert a legal claim against another party that was in default on its obligations under the treaty, should an erring and reluctant nation chance to become a party thereto. It is hard to believe that the United States would ever rely upon legal pressure to secure social and political reforms within a foreign country unwilling voluntarily to make the changes. This would hardly be a procedure designed to improve the climate for American interests in that country.

The practical way to attempt to secure the desired reforms would seem to be by education, persuasion and example, not by the use of a legal claim. The use of the treaty procedure for this purpose smacks of impracticality. Suppose, on the local scene, Mr. A habitually uses abusive language toward Mrs. A—a matter clearly domestic to A's household but of neighborhood concern. No one would think of trying to stop this abuse by means of a contract, designed to be signed by the men of the neighborhood and, it might be hoped, by Mr. A, under which each signatory makes a legally binding commitment to each of the others not to use abusive language toward his own wife.

Likewise a treaty is quite an inappropriate and impractical vehicle to employ for the purpose of putting an end to abuses and deficiencies which exist in another state's domestic practices.

Professor Gardner also thinks we would be in a better moral position to influence other states if we ratified; but how our moral position would be improved by the act of agreeing to do what we have already done is not apparent. It is usually thought that actions speak louder than words and that example is the hallmark of leadership.

He is quite right, however, in stating: "The positive consequences of United States adherence are hard to measure." Indeed, they are completely illusory. We should neither ratify nor encourage the drafting of such legal documents, but we should use our influence to secure common acceptance of sound principles in the field of human rights, to educate the newer countries about their value and to persuade them to eliminate objectionable practices.

Professor Gardner fails to present any convincing argument against the basic objection to ratification: that it is improper—at least for the United States—to employ a treaty to deal with problems that are exclusively between a government and its own people. The arguments in support of the objection are ably presented in the report of the American Bar Association's Standing

---

Footnotes at end of article.

Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations.[3] In capsule form they may be stated:

"Our Constitution envisages a Congress to enact laws on matters within the federal jurisdiction, and State legislatures to enact laws on matters reserved to the States, while the treaty power is given to the Executive to deal with international affairs. Since legislatures have the power and the duty to provide the necessary laws relating to domestic matters, a treaty should not be used to deal with matters of purely internal concern. Traditionally it has not been so used.

"The effect of ratification of the proposed treaties would be to make their provisions the law of the United States, even though no change in presently-existing law would result. The provisions of the conventions which would thus become our law deal exclusively with the relations between a government and its people. Such relations are not international affairs but are matters solely of domestic concern. They are not an appropriate subject for a treaty. Indeed, at the international conference which drafted the Forced Labor Convention the Representatives of the United States announced that under the constitutional system of the United States this was not an appropriate matter for a treaty. The reasons underlying this announcement apply with equal if not greater force to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women. The conventions should not be ratified."

Professor Gardner misconstrues the argument. There is no claim that the present conventions would "alter in undesirable ways the laws of the United States", or that they would "move into the federal domain certain subjects hitherto reserved for state action". Rather the objection is that these conventions would move into the international domain subjects hitherto reserved for domestic action.

Professor Gardner quotes Charles Evans Hughes as saying treaties are to be used for matters of "international concern" and he claims that by the United Nations Charter human rights have become a matter of international concern. However, he is taking Hughes's statement out of context. What the former Chief Justice said was this: "The [treaty-making] power is to deal with foreign nations with regard to matters of international concern. . . . [It] is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns . . .".[4]

The 1916 convention with Canada for the protection of migratory birds, which was involved in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), was not a departure from this principle, as Professor Gardner thinks. The problem there involved was one which required international co-operation to resolve. The birds flew from one country to the other. Protection against their indiscriminate slaughter in only one of the countries would not stop their extinction as long as there was no restriction in the other. The treaty committed both countries to take parallel action to prevent this. The situation is in no way analogous to the present case.

The Slavery Convention of 1926 and the current supplementary convention were aimed, in substantial part, at the international traffic in slaves, likewise a problem extending across state borders and requiring international co-operation to resolve. None of these cases constitutes a precedent for any present departure from the sound traditional limits on the use of treaties as stated by the former Chief Justice, who was also a former Secretary of State.

It is perhaps significant that, about the time the present conventions were submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, the regulations of the Department of State were amended by deleting a sentence which read: "Treaties are not to be used as a device for the purpose of effecting internal social changes or to try to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."[5] Not only did the department have on hand at that time the Convention on Forced Labor and the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, but it knew that there were, in various stages of preparation, a number of so-called human rights conventions, such as the Conventions on Marriage, on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, on Economic and Cultural Rights, on Civil and Political Rights, on the Elimination of Religious Intolerance, and on Freedom of Information.[6] All of these conventions deal with "what are essentially matters of domestic concern". To handle such matters by the treaty method is to "circumvent the constitutional procedures established" in the United States.

Professor Gardner and, indeed, most advocates of ratification somewhat emotionally take the position that human rights would be advanced around the world by our ratification of all such treaties. We are told that we must take the lead in this great movement to promote human rights, not only by advocating the granting of them and explaining their value but by becoming a party to all such conventions. The fact is that our ratification would not bring about any change in the objectionable practices. On the contrary, what it would do would be to make us a party to treaties that run directly contrary to our traditional practice and long-standing constitutional doctrine regarding the use of treaties. Our ratification would move into the international sphere matters which have always been considered to be clearly domestic. It is obvious that there are countless matters which may thus be dealt with once the trend is started.

The time to take a stand is now. The United States should decline to ratify the Convention on Forced Labor and the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The Supplemental Slavery Convention is of a different character. After Professor Gardner's article appeared, the Senate gave its advice and consent to this convention.

[2] Section 311, Foreign Service Manual.

[3] Significant portions of the report are reproduced in 1 Int'l Law. 600–629 (1967).

[4] American Society of International Law, 1929 Proceeding 194 (emphasis supplied).

[5] Section 2, Department of State Circular No. 175, eliminated when the regulations were transferred to Section 311, Foreign Service Manual.

[6] 1 Int'l Law. 620–623 (1967).

Preventing Conventional Arms Races

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent conference on arms control was recently conducted by the World Affairs Center of the University of Minnesota.

The following story from the Minneapolis Star tells of the speeches by Dr. William Higinbotham, John F. Loosbrock, and Dr. Herbert Scoville.

In addition, there were speeches by Morton Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, for Policy Planning and Arms Control; by Charles Van Doren, Deputy General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and by John G. Palfrey, consultant to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Excerpts from Mr. Van Doren's excellent address on "Preventing Conventional Arms Races" follow.

The University of Minnesota is to be congratulated for bringing another excellent program to the upper Midwest. Faculty members who participated in the conference are Dr. William C. Rogers, director of the World Affairs Center; Dr. Harry Foreman, associate dean, international programs, University of Minnesota; and Dr. Burton Sapin, director, Center for International Relations and Area Studies. Pierce Butler III, an attorney in St. Paul, also took part as a moderator.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 30, 1968]

PROSPECTS FOR END OF ARMS RACE CALLED LESS

(By Peter Vaughan)

Prospects for the control of the nuclear arms race between the world's nuclear powers have lessened in the last year, three experts on arms control agreed Monday at a conference on arms control.

The speakers were participants in the conference which was held at the Thunderbird Motel, Bloomington, and sponsored by the University of Minnesota World Affairs Center in Co-operation with the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Dr. Herbert Scoville, assistant director of the arms control agency, said two recent developments had set back hopes for limiting the nuclear arms race.

The development by China of nuclear capability, he said, would lessen chances of future agreements on nuclear arms control between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Scoville also pointed to the recent decision of both the U.S. and the Soviet Union to go ahead with limited antiballistic missile (ABM) defense systems as an escalation of the nuclear arms race.

The effect of the ABM system, he said, was to stimulate the production of more sophisticated delivery systems by both countries. The Russian suborbital delivery system and U.S. multiple warhead missiles are indications of this trend, Scoville said.

Dr. William Higinbotham, head of the instrumentation division of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, agreed that some Soviet-U.S. agreement on the limitation of the ABM systems was imperative if the nuclear arms race is not to spiral out of control.

He said that arms control has always been a second priority item in the thinking of U.S. leaders and that it must become a first priority item if the "great gamble and great uncertainty" of the arms race is to be eliminated.

He urged the 100 persons attending the conference to "use your voice" to gain public support for arms control.

John F. Loosbrock, editor of Air Force magazine, said the nuclear arms race as supported by the military is only "a means of buying time for the political leaders" to solve the world's problems.

The political figures, including presidents since Truman and Congress, have largely failed in making the use of the time that they have been given, he said.

Loosbrock, however, added a note of caution to those who feel that disarmament will necessarily bring world peace.

"Disarmament," he said, "may not be workable, for what we want is peace and stability. It is conceivable that a disarmed world could be more unstable than it is now."

All three speakers focused on the danger to world stability of the development of new weapons systems. As the situation exists today, they concurred, the deterrents of both the U.S. and Russia make a "first strike" a very unattractive move.

The new systems, multiple warheads and suborbital delivery systems, are aimed at increasing the effectiveness of the "first strike" and therefore make nuclear war more attractive as a possible policy.

The conference was financed by a grant from the Pierce Butler Foundation of St. Paul.

PREVENTING CONVENTIONAL ARMS RACES

(Address by Charles N. Van Doren, Deputy General Counsel and Chairman, Arms Transfer Advisory Council, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, at a conference presented by the World Affairs Center, General Extension Division, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., January 29, 1968)

INTRODUCTION

This morning we were focussing on the *strategic* arms race, and the prospects of preventing a costly, competitive escalation thereof. This problem is a relatively neat one to analyze, because (apart from the still fairly modest Chinese threat), it is essentially a race between only two super-powers. I am convinced that Secretary McNamara is right, and that intensification of this race on one side can only lead to a responsive intensification on the other, and that such escalation will add nothing to the security of either. The name of the game here is mutual deterrence, and if both parties forgo further escalation, such deterrence can be maintained at present levels at least as well as at higher levels of strategic offensive and defensive capabilities.

Whatever the level, mutual deterrence—together with a due appreciation of the incredible destructive power of nuclear weaponry—has *worked* thus far in the strategic field. No strategic weapons have been used since the first uses of nuclear weapons at the end of World War II. All the wars and military engagements that have actually occurred since then have been fought with non-nuclear, conventional arms. Thus it is time to look at the possibilities of controlling conventional arms races.

* * * * *

III

If the developing countries don't seize the initiative on this matter, the next question is whether we can make it more clearly in their interest to do so.

We have been bending every effort to persuade the Indians and Pakistanis to put a lid on their military expenditures, with some modest success in the past year. But there are vast differences between their respective views of what would constitute a stable balance, and we have had to face the contention that what they do in the interests of their national security is *their* problem, in which we should not interfere.

At least to the extent that it dissipates our economic assistance to that region, it clearly *is* our business. And the most recent session of Congress has made this abundantly clear in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 and related statutes.

First, it stated that in determining whether and to what extent the United States should furnish development assistance, the President must take into account the extent to which a country's governmental expenditures are allocated to key development areas, including agriculture, health and education *and not diverted for unnecessary military purposes*.

This objective was furthered by the Symington amendment which requires the President to consider the percentage of the recipient's budget which is devoted to military purposes and the degree to which it is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment, and if he finds that U.S. development assistance is being diverted to military expenditures, or that the recipient is diverting its own resources to unnecessary military expenditures to a degree which materially interferes with its development, directs him to terminate U.S. economic assistance and sales to the recipient until he is assured that such diversion will no longer take place.

The Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act went even further, and forbade the use of appropriated funds to finance the purchase or acquisition of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, by or for any developed country other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, Republic of China, the Philippines and South Korea unless the President furnishes Congress with a finding that such acquisitions are *vital to the National Security of the United States.*

It also requires the President where he cannot furnish such a finding to Congress, to withhold economic assistance to any developing country other than those just listed in an amount equivalent to the amount *spent* by such country on such sophisticated weapons systems.

Returning to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, it provides that U.S. military sales programs shall be administered so as to encourage regional arms control and disarmament agreements and so as to discourage arms races, and state the purpose of military sales legislation to be to authorize measures consistent with that objective to enable allied and other friendly foreign countries *having sufficient wealth to develop and maintain their defense capabilities without undue burden to their economies*, to purchase defense articles and services from us.

It terminates previous statutory authority to make and guaranty sales of military equipment on credit.

Next, it places regional limits on the aggregate amounts of U.S. military assistance and sales to Africa and Latin America, and restricts the purposes of such assistance and sales to internal security and civic action in the absence of a contrary Presidential decision reported to the Congress.

The legislation also tackles the problem of third party transfers—that is, the resale or retransfer of equipment of U.S. origin to recipients to whom we would not sell or or give such equipment directly. Essentially, it requires purchasers under the military sales program to agree to give the U.S. a veto on such retransfers. This provision bears on the disposition of the large stocks of military equipment that has been sold to our NATO allies, and are now up for replacement. Unless we can control the disposition of such materiel to developing countries, our policy with respect to the direct sale of equipment to such countries could be completely frustrated.

Not only can the U.S. use these new legislative tools, but it can also seek parallel action by international groups dealing with economic assistance, such as the various international aid consortia, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. In fact, the new legislation includes a requirement that the U.S. use its voting power in the latter organization for the purpose of disapproving any loan which might assist a recipient country to acquire sophisticated or heavy military equipment.

IV

A third approach to the problem is mutual restraint by the major suppliers of military equipment. We attempted this approach in the Middle East in the early 1950's. The United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a tripartite declaration of their intention to restrict military shipments to the Middle East, and founded the Near East Arms Coordinating Committee to implement such restrictions. But the entry of the Soviet Union as a supplier to the area beginning in 1955 frustrated this effort. In the face of some $2 billion of Soviet supplies to the Arab states, the western suppliers felt they had no choice but to help counterbalance those shipments.

But after the blood-letting last June, there seemed to be a chance for a fresh start. On June, 1967, President Johnson said:

". . . this last conflict has demonstrated the danger of the Middle Eastern arms race of the last twelve years. Here the responsibility must rest not only on these in the area—but upon the larger states outside it. We believe that scarce resources are better used for technical and economic development. We have always opposed this arms race, and our own military shipments to the area have been severely limited.

"Now the waste and futility of the arms race are apparent to all. And now there is another moment of choice. The United States, for its part, will use every resource of diplomacy, and every counsel of reason and prudence, to find a better course.

"As a beginning, we propose that the United Nations should call upon its members to report all shipments of military arms to the area."

The same day we set forth in a draft resolution as one of the prime requisites of a stable and lasting peace in the Middle East: "the regulation and limitation of arms shipments into the area."

Here again, the results have been less than was hoped for. The Soviets mounted a resupply effort which has brought the Arabs nearly back to their pre-June level of armament. But there are some encouraging signs: First, the Soviets do not appear to have escalated the types of equipment being supplied to the Arabs (e.g., they have not introduced ground-to-ground missiles); second, generally speaking they have not yet gone further than to replace the amounts of equipment lost by the Arabs in the June hostilities; and third, in November, 1967, they publicly recognized the desirability of restraint in a draft UN resolution which called on states to "take measures to limit the useless and destructive arms race" in the area.

We are obviously watching the Soviet moves very carefully as President Johnson hinted in his communique at the close of Prime Minister Eskhol's visit to the US, which said that we would keep Israel's military defense capability under active, sympathetic examination and review in light of all relevant factors "including the shipment of military equipment by others to the area."

Let us hope the Soviets get the message.

Criticism of South African Prisons by United Nations Group

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, public documents and authoritative investigations in the past 20 years leave little doubt that treatment of prisoners in Communist jails ranges from intensive brainwashing to torture almost beyond imagination.

Yet, today, we have a group representing the United Nations which has called for further investigation of the penal institutions in South Africa, despite a thorough investigation into their prisons in 1964 at the invitation of the South African Government. The United Nations will never become an authoritative body in world affairs as long as it permits groups such as this to badger a country without cause when obvious persecutions exist in many nations behind the Iron Curtain.

A succinct editorial on this subject entitled "Predictable Finger-Pointing," was published in the February 7, 1968, issue of the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREDICTABLE FINGER POINTING

In 1964, it appears, South Africa asked the International Committee of the Red Cross to investigate prison conditions in that country. George Hoffmann, delegate general of the International Committee, visited prisons and places of detention. His report was published and the South African government accepted his recommendations.

Now, according to William Fulton of the *Chicago Tribune*, another group, after having "wined and dined in London and elsewhere for nine months, listened to 26 witnesses, and spent $309,000, toward which American taxpayers will contribute one third," has just blasted South African prison conditions again.

The group met in London under the auspices of the United Nations. Although composed (in its own self-description) of "eminent jurists and prison officials," there wasn't a single recognized penologist among them, nor did the group ever manager to get to South Africa, much less to the prisons themselves.

Moreover, the 26 witnesses who appeared before the U.N. group had long been known for their hostility toward the South African government. Some were known saboteurs; others, on their own admission, were Communists.

Understandably, South African officials were displeased by the group's statement concerning prison conditions. Ambassador Matthys Botha declared, "Prison management in any country is patently a domestic matter and the South African government is not prepared to renounce its jurisdiction in this regard—a view no doubt shared by all states."

He had the already published Red Cross report to refer to, and that seemed quite sufficient.

Perhaps if UN junketeers would undertake to investigate prison conditions in Soviet Russia or Cuba or Algeria (where former Congolese Premier Moise Tshombe is still being detained), we might consider the resultant reports worth the money.

But as things stand, it seems the UN is never where it is needed *when* it is needed. More often than not, the UN can be counted on to stick its nose into matters which affect neither the peace of the world nor the charter of the United Nations itself.

Speech by Mrs. James T. Broyhill Relative to Reopening of Ford's Theater

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, at a time when we celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a speech delivered by Mrs. James T. Broyhill, wife of the Representative of the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, dealing with the reopening of Ford's Theater and the influence the theater played in the life of the Great Emancipator.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This year we as Republicans have a fresh and exciting occasion to talk about the greatest of all presidents—a founder of our party. On his 159th birthday, the theater he loved so well will memorialize him. Yes, this year Ford's Theater will light up and look just as it did 103 years ago—when the performance was halted by Lincoln's assassination.

Behind this inauguration has been three years of exacting and painstaking work and almost three million dollars. An impressive modern museum, the historic theater itself, and live professional drama could make this landmark one of the three most important for visitors in Washington.

And they will not be disappointed! The many who have toured the old Lincoln Museum and said, "But where's the theater?" will be happy with the result. Even the interior decor of this perfectly restored theater is loaded with such interest that Ruth Wagner of the Post said:

"Don't be surprised if the historic restoration starts a whole new trend in interior decorating—a return to the elegant detailed style of the mid-nineteenth century." Around the balcony is a molded plaster frieze with the carved cherub look. The balcony rails are bright red velvet. Another feature is the terracotta and red fleur de leis designs painted on the ceiling. Prominent also are the many little glass gas lights which line the balcony. This detailed look is also accomplished by red runner carpeted aisles broken by warm toned floors rather than the continuous look of wall to wall floor covering. The cane seated audience chairs, less comfortable than authentically reproduced, are of two colors—light and dark. It wasn't an easy task to substantiate what went where, whether it was wall paper or paint, or if it was possible to get the original. The shock and horror on the Good Friday when Lincoln was shot resulted in such indignation over reopening the theater that it was shut tight, most of its furnishings disposed of and the clues necessary for this project scattered hither and yon. If it had not been for some photographs Matthew Brady was allowed to take right after the assassination, questions might have remained unanswered about how it all looked originally. His pictures captured in detail the royal plush appearance of the presidential box. It is wall papered with ,a wine pattern. Its focal point is a red Victorian sofa—the original one that Mr. Ford used to bring from his living quarters when he knew that Mr. Lincoln would be in attendance. However, when the president entered half hour late that night and the orchestra interrupted the performance with All Hail the Chief, he sat down in a walnut rocker, which is owned by a Museum in Michigan. A copy of this along with two crimson chairs have been reproduced and are also placed in the box.

The stage imparts a feeling of fantasy. It is outlined by fancy green and gold design painted on white background side scenery. The Corinthian columns by the side of the stage are also throughout the theater even in the balconies completing a uniform look in architecture.

This interior actually has a personality. You respond to it as you would to a painting—seeing far beyond paints and canvas. It was as if you were there in that 1865 audience trying to escape your enormous problems by a few hours of entertainment. Such contrasting moods as heaviness and light heartedness seem to manifest themselves the contrasting fabric decor. The lacy white feminine curtains of the VIP boxes on one eye level. The federal important look of gold brocade draperies on another. Five deep colored flags also drape and hang from the upper level at the base of the Presiden't box. One of the flags was copy of the Treasury Guard flag which John Wilkes Booth caught his foot in when after he shot Lincoln he jumped from the President's box to the stage and broke his leg. The actual flag is on exhibit in the contemporary museum below the theater. The restoration plans provided for this $60,000 museum by excavating 15 feet deeper than the first foundations. Among the 4000 pieces on display are the gun used for the assissination and Booth's diary minus the pages which were mysteriously ripped out by someone in Lincoln's Administration. The suit the President was wearing when killed and which Mrs. Lincoln gave to the doorkeeper was traced to and purchased from a needy woman in North Carolina for $25,000 and donated to the museum.

The real climax to the rebirth of Ford's Theater will be the return of live performances to this famous stage. With the advent of the play, John Brown's Body February 12, the National Repertory Theater could bring exciting promise to Theater in America. While France, Austria, Germany and others have excelled in the performing arts; theater in America has suffered. The taint and unsavory reputation that John Wilkes Booth gave to the profession, for one thing, was hard to overcome. The first plays after the assassination actually had to be introduced by preachers. It was in the 20's when acting finally began to take hold—and it met with another obstacle—the depression. Then came the war, motion picture industry and competitive television. But now in an art conscious climate, it should thrive. When the National Repertory Theater (NRT) starts its career here it brings with it an enormously successful background. The producers, Michael Duvell and Frances Doughtery have award winning plays, breaking box office records from city to city. It is the only major repertory theater to tour the country. The company shares the same dedication to a cultural education for the student that the Ford Theater founders have. In fact one third of all seats will be set aside for special student programs.

Who is responsible for Ford's rebirth. Senator Milton R. Young a Republican initiated the idea and the $200,000 needed for the study of its possible restoration.

It is rather fitting that the Lincoln's theater have such a Republican complexion. Even the resolution for the restoration was signed into law by Eisenhower. Republicans should take advantage of this in this election year and speak of this at Lincoln day dinners and other events. It is, of course, not a political speech, but it could be a political help. I think of the many times I have suddenly been asked to say a few words about my life in Washington and wish I had been better prepared. Ford Theater is new, big, terribly interesting and has a cultural impact—certainly important to this country. Not all of us talk on political issues. I for one can converse, but not controverse and show my most favorable side. Through this non political type speech ideas, subtle but effective, can be put across. Just as Mrs. Johnson talks about Beautification and Crime in the Streets to imply her hung on the right track, lets remind people that we stand for the ideals of Abraham Lincoln when we talk about Ford Theater.

Lincoln's love for humanity was nowhere better illustrated than his love for the theater. It has been recorded that he attended Ford's 45 times and assumed that he went more than that. Not only did it give him diversion from the weighty problems which confronted him but it gave him the opportunity to be with people. Lincoln loved people with all his heart. The theater contributed not only to his personal enrichment in appreciation of the arts but it helped him to achieve both the love and understanding that made him our most human president. Drama is the art more than any other—that concerns people. Emotions, feelings, predicaments and pleasure come across in a very direct and personal way from living actor to sympathetic audience. Lincoln could identify with others and perhaps it was this trait more than any other that made him immortal.

Mary Todd Lincoln comparing him with her former suitor Stephen Douglas (Yes, Lincoln's rival in love too) said Mr. Lincoln may not be as handsome a figure, "But the people are perhaps not aware that his heart is as large as his arms are long."

Children sensed this. One little girl who had been told that the President was very homely was taken by her father to the White House to see the President. Lincoln took her upon his knee chatted with her for a moment in his merry way and she turned to her father and exclaimed "Oh Pa, he isn't ugly at all. He's just beautiful."

One little story not only illustrates Lincoln's charm and humor but his humility as well:

Lincoln had always blacked his own boots when he lived in Illinois and when he won the presidency and went to live in the White House he saw no reason to change. One day the Secretary of the Treasury caught him at this and said, "Mr. President, gentlemen don't black their own boots in Washington."

Without even looking up from his work Lincoln asked, "Well whose boots do they black?"

Certainly Lincoln was in some measure molded by all he read and by his contacts with people whether on stage or off. The development of a total Lincoln had to be laid to many factors. The significant thing was that at a time when self-government, our republic and our democracy stood its greatest trial, our Nation had such a man. It is appropriate that the theater where he was refreshed in such a critical time is his memorial. Perhaps we in this century can through this very human art bring back something of our greatest President of all times.

Busing To Integrate May Be Illegal

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the distressing aspects of the entire civil rights controversy has been the apparent willingness of many people to subjugate all other considerations to achieve the goals of the so-called civil rights movement. We can see this in the present bill, H.R. 2516, where proponents of this legislation are willing to risk Federal disruption of local law enforcement in order to solve an alleged abuse by State law enforcement agencies. We can see this in the pending amendment on housing, where the proponents are willing to violate the rights of homeowners all over the Nation in order to satisfy this "movement."

The most disturbing aspect of this trend has been the willingness of these same people to destroy the neighborhood school by busing schoolchildren to achieve racial balance. It is indeed refreshing when an action contrary to this trend appears in a Northern State. Such an action was the recent decision of the Federal circuit court in Michigan enjoining the Lansing Board of Education from putting in effect a plan calling for the busing of students to achieve racial balance.

This decision was discussed in an editorial published in the Greenville News of February 4, 1968, with that newspaper's usual degree of insight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSING TO INTEGRATE MAY BE ILLEGAL

While the pattern in some federal courts, notably in the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, has shown a frightening trend toward denying freedom of choice in any form for either White or Negro children in the public schools, there are some signs of a letup.

There is evidence that the courts may tend to back off, or shy away from lower judicial decisions and federal bureaucratic policies, regulations and coercion aimed at achieving something no one has been able to define but is called "racial balance."

We hasten to interject here that the district and special three-judge courts in South Carolina, and the Fourth Circuit Court which has jurisdiction over this and several other states, have shown an admirable measure of the ancient principle of judicial restraint. None of our courts has attempted to break new legal ground, but have judged the facts and issues within the firmly established precedents.

The freedom of choice principle is in danger from other quarters. It may be stricken down by the Supreme Court itself, if and when it takes action on any appeal from the New Orleans case.

Meanwhile, however, a Northern Circuit Court has permanently forbidden (enjoined) the Lansing, Mich., Board of Education to put into effect a plan calling for transferring children and transporting them from one school to another merely to create racial balance. The plan, devised in 1966, was aimed at correcting what was called "racial imbalance."

Some aspects of the ruling are intensely interesting, and might apply to pending issues in this state, perhaps in Greenville County.

The three circuit judges said that the plan would be "discrimination in reverse"—"discrimination for instead of against" Negroes. They said that discrimination can be used for or against a person, and it should not be permitted in either direction.

This is to say that White children should not be discriminated against for the benefit of Negro children, just as the Supreme Court said many years ago that Negro children should not be discriminated against for the benefit of Whites, if, such be the case.

It would be stretching the point far less than some courts already have strained it to say that denying freedom of choice, or transferring and busing Negro children to White schools could be, and most probably is, discrimination against the Negroes.

By the same token, an effort to deny Negro children their desire to stay together in their own school in order to further demolish the "dual system," or to extend integration, also is discrimination against the Negroes.

One other aspect of the ruling, however, may render it practically ineffective. The judges said the Lansing Board could change its boundaries (presumably district lines or attendance areas) and transfer students on the basis of geography. Spelled out in the baldest lay terms, this would be plain old "gerrymandering," an ugly word.

It seems rather odd that, while the federal courts have ruled against gerrymandering as a means of preventing or minimizing integration, this one now sanctions it as a means of achieving more integration.

Be that as it may, it is noteworthy that a federal court one might expect to go all out for integration has taken judicial notice of the fact that efforts to eliminate real or fancied discrimination in one direction can produce the same thing in another direction.

It is interesting also that the court rose above the clamor for massive integration regardless of individual desires and the general welfare to recognize again that individuals of both races have certain rights and interests worthy of protection.

In Memory of Mrs. Ella F. Harllee

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 19, a Texas lady, whose dedication to her fellow man and to her country made her famous far beyond our State, passed away. She was Mrs. Ella F. Harllee.

Mrs. Harllee was a Texan transplanted to Washington by marriage. She was the mother of Rear Adm. John Harllee, retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, and Miss Ella F. Harllee, president of the Educational Communication Association.

Mrs. Harllee, daughter of one of Texas' well-known jurists and educators, Zachary Taylor Fulmore, ended an Austin career as a newspaper correspondent and concert soprano with her marriage to the late Marine Corps Brig. Gen. William Curry Harllee in 1909. His work brought them to Washington.

Mrs. Harllee called the Nation's Capital home for almost 60 years, and during that time served as recording secretary for the District of Columbia League of Women Voters, as chairman of the Colonial Dames' education committee, and as a president of the Armistead Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

She was a member of the Central Presbyterian Church and belonged to many local organizations including the Army-Navy chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Chevy Chase Country Club, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, the First Families of Virginia, the Marine Officer's Wives Club, and the Texas State Society.

Mrs. Harllee and her family have been very dear to me. Mrs. Harllee was a great lady of the southern tradition. She loved life and beauty; and she inspired a love of history and tradition in those around her.

To this fine lady I wish to pay tribute. I ask unanimous consent that the account of her passing from the following newspapers be printed in the Extensions of Remarks: The Washington Post, January 22, 1968; the Washington Evening

Star, January 22, 1968; the San Antonio Express, January 22, 1968; and the Austin American, January 23, 1968.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 22, 1968]

ELLA HARLLEE, MOTHER OF FMA CHAIRMAN

Ella Harllee, mother of retired Adm. John Harllee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Administration, died Friday night after a heart attack she suffered while visiting at the home of friends in Philadelphia. She was in her 80s.

A resident of Washington for 55 years, Mrs. Harllee was a member of a number of civic and historical organizations. She was former recording secretary of the D.C. League of Women Voters and had served as chairman of the educational committee of the Colonial Dames.

She was also a former president of the Armistead chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and a member of the Army-Navy chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

A native of Salado, Tex., Mrs. Harllee received her bachelor's degree in music from Salem College, Winston-Salem, N.C., and studied journalism for a year at Columbia University in New York City. Before her marriage, Mrs. Harllee worked as a correspondent in Austin for several Texas newspapers.

A soprano by training, she also gave a number of vocal concerts.

She was the widow of Marine Corps Brig. Gen. William Curry Harllee, who died in 1944.

Besides her son, she is survived by a daughter, Ella Harllee, of Washington, and a sister, Mrs. Imogene Harrison, of Houston, Tex.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 22, 1968]

MRS. WILLIAM C. HARLLEE, MOTHER OF MARITIME CHIEF

Mrs. William Curry Harllee, widow of Marine Corps Brig. Gen. William Curry Harllee, and mother of the chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, died Friday in Philadelphia after a brief illness.

She had lived at 1753 Lamont St. NW for the past 55 years.

Born in Salado, Texas, Mrs. Harllee spent her pre-marriage years in Austin, working as a concert singer, and as a correspondent for several newspapers. She graduated from Salem College in Winston-Salem, N.C., with a bachelor's degree in music in 1903. She also attended Columbia University's graduate journalism school.

In 1909, the former Ella Florence Fulmore was married in Austin, Texas, and moved to the Washington area. Although she and her husband traveled all over the world on military assignments they were able to use their home in Washington as "home base."

Mrs. Harllee was a former recording secretary for the D.C. League of Women Voters, former chairman of the Colonial Dames' education committee, and former president of the Armistead chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Other organizations that she belonged to were the Daughters of the American Revolution's Army-Navy chapter, the Chevy Chase Country Club, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, the First Families of Virginia, the Marine Officers' Wives Club, and the Texas State Society. She was a member of the Central Presbyterian Church, here.

Mrs. Harllee leaves her daughter, Miss Ella F. Harllee, of the home address: one son, retired Rear Adm. John Harllee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, of 2950 Legation St. NW; a sister, Mrs. Imogene F. Harrison, of Houston, Texas, and one grandson, John Harllee Jr., of 5307 Moultrie Road, Springfield, Va.

Friends may call from 7 to 9 p.m. today and from 2 to 4 p.m. and 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow at the S. H. Hines Funeral Home, 2901 14th St. NW.

Services will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday at the Ft. Myer Chapel, with burial in Arlington Cemetery.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, Jan. 22, 1968]

ADMIRAL'S MOTHER DIES

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. William Curry Harllee, mother of Adm. John Harllee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, died of a heart attack Friday while visiting at the home of friends in Philadelphia. She was in her 80s.

A native of Salado, Texas, she was a concert singer and journalist in that state prior to her marriage to the late Brig. Gen. Harllee of the Marine Corps.

In addition to her son, she is survived by a daughter, Miss Ella Fulmore Harllee of Washington and a sister, Mrs. Imogene Fulmore Harrison of Houston, Texas.

Funeral services will be in the Ft. Meyer Chapel at 11 o'clock Tuesday morning with burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Jan. 23, 1968]

ELLA P. HARLLEE DIES; RITES SET WEDNESDAY

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Ella Fulmore Harllee, descended from prominent Texas pioneer families and the widow of a commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, died of a heart attack in Philadelphia Friday night and will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery here Wednesday.

Mrs. Harllee is the mother of Retired Rear Admiral John Harllee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. She has lived in Washington since the 1944 death of her husband, Brig. Gen. William Curry Harllee, top officer of the Marine Corps before World War II.

Born in the historic Robertson Mansion in Salado, Mrs. Harllee is the granddaughter of Maj. Sterling C. Robertson, early day Texas impresario. Her father was Judge Zachary T. Fulmore, Texas educator and jurist for whom Fulmore School in Austin was named.

Sen. Ralph Yarborough and Rep. Jake Pickle of Austin will be among the honorary pallbearers, as will former Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Wallace M. Greene.

Mrs. Harllee received a bachelor of arts degree from Salem College, Winston-Salem, N.C., and studied journalism at Columbia University, New York. In Texas, she was a concert singer and writer.

In Washington, Mrs. Harllee was a leader in a number of civic, historical and patriotic organizations. She held office in many organizations, including the celebrated First Families of Virginia.

Besides her son, she is survived by a daughter, Miss Ella Fulmore Harllee; a daughter-in-law; a grandson, John Harllee Jr.; and a sister, Mrs. Imogene Fulmore Harrison of Houston.

The "Pueblo" Crisis

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the seizing of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by the North Koreans has provoked much public discussion, including the asking of searching questions about the foreign policy of the United States. The February 6, 1968, edition of the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., discussed the *Pueblo* seizure in both an editorial and a column by Paul Scott.

In the editorial, entitled "The Hot Potato," the highly relevant point is made that the solution to this incident must concern itself with more than repossession of the ship and its crew, as important as these objectives are. A further concern must be the reestablishment of our military position in the world. If this is not done, more incidents of this type, with graver consequences, will surely follow.

In the column entitled "*Pueblo:* One of Many 1968 Crises?" Paul Scott discusses the possibility that the *Pueblo* seizure is the first of a series of crises supported by the Communists to harass and embarrass the United States in 1968. Others would include intensive escalation of racial rioting and antiwar demonstrations. The purpose of this campaign would be to involve the administration and the military in numerous diversionary actions in an effort to hamper our Vietnam war effort.

Both of these discussions pose serious questions about our defense and foreign policies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOT POTATO

Well, The Security Council of the United Nations has postponed debate on the Pueblo crisis indefinitely. That's the "last, best hope of mankind" for you: Always on the job.

Soviet ambassador Platon D. Morozov, at one point said he found it difficult to take an interest in what U.S. ambassador Arthur Goldberg was saying. Indeed, he wrote on his face an expression of complete and utter boredom—as though to say, "You'll get your ship back when were ready to give it back, and not before."

The Associated Press reported last week that, privately, the Russians accept Americas explanation that the Pueblo was in international waters when the North Koreans seized it. But they're embarrassed. Pyongyang, it seems, didn't tell Moscow it was going to board the Pueblo.

Nevertheless, as usual in a crisis, Communists everywhere must publicly stick together. Thus, the deadlock.

Meanwhile, what has happened to America's credibility and prestige as a world power?

"The Communist world has been jointly testing the proposition that the United States is over-extended, over-committed, and underprepared to act," said Richard Nixon last week. "The Pueblo seizure has undermined our credibility. What we have to insure is that it has not been irrevocably undermined . . . The long-range need is to re-establish the credibility of American policy by reestablishing the credibility of American power."

While it is certainly true that the realities of military strength in the world today caution prudence on all sides, it is also true that the maintenance of freedom and peace absolutely depends upon superior U.S. military power.

Everyone within arm's length of a newspaper or TV set knows that spies are a fact of life in 1968. The Communists spy upon us, and we spy upon them, and both sides know most of the time about each other's spies.

So, there was no need for the Pueblo

seizure. Even if a Soviet spy ship were (accidentally) to venture within the three-mile limit near an American shore, it would be some time before we'd risk the hoopla that would ensue if we seized it.

Two weeks ago, President Johnson said that the seizure of an American ship and its crew in international waters "cannot be accepted." He said this is a dead-level tone of voice, looking point blank into the eye of a TV camera. Millions of Americans saw and heard him say it.

If it turns out now that the U.S. is indeed prepared to accept the Pueblo seizure, who then will again believe the President of the United States—or respect America?

"PUEBLO": ONE OF MANY 1968 CRISES?—REDS COORDINATE STATEGY OF HARASSMENT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is being warned that the seizure of the USS Pueblo is only the first of a series of converging crises the U.S. will face before the coming presidential election.

The President's intelligence advisers believe the Kremlin is setting the stage for a series of closely connected crises in Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Berlin that will involve U.S. forces with those of other Communist nations, but not the Soviets directly.

At all of these East-West confrontation points, the Russians are supplying vast new amounts of arms, increasing their military advisers and technicians, and encouraging local Communist leaders to stir up new trouble for the U.S.

An interchange of information between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveals that the new crises will be linked closely to the outbreak of new racial rioting and increased anti-war demonstrations in the U.S.

For example, North Vietnam's big offensive against the U.S. Marines near the demilitarized zone is being timed to coincide with the February 5–6 invasion of Washington by 3,000 to 5,000 anti-war protesters, most of whom will be clergymen.

The other coming crises, including those brewing in the Dominican Republic and Berlin, are expected to explode during the spring and summer when Dr. Martin Luther King is "disrupting" Washington with his "massive disobedience" program.

For several weeks, one government security agency has been monitoring short-wave radio exchanges between a pro-Castro black militant leader and stations in Havana and Moscow.

The black militant, now organizing Negroes in Washington for King's invasion, reported that Washington, Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit are to be their main targets during 1968.

This information bears out FBI reports that many of the militants involved in riots in other cities in 1966 and 1967, are beginning to gather in these four cities.

Most immediate danger area outside of Vietnam and Korea now appears to be the Dominican Republic, where Havana-trained terrorists are beginning to return in large numbers.

Alexander A. Soldatov, the new Soviet ambassador to Cuba, has been given the assignment of directing the overthrow of the pro-U. S. government in that nearby Caribbean trouble spot.

Since the seizure of the USS Pueblo, the U. S. has intercepted a message Castro sent Kim Il-Sung, the Soviet-trained premier of North Korea, pledging to open a "third front" against the U. S. "at the appropriate time."

Significantly, Castro in his message praised Premier Kim "for diverting American men and ships from the Vietnam war" and "helping to increase the peace-war contradictions inside the U. S."

Premier Kim, who reached the rank of general in the Soviet Army before going to North Korea, wrote in a publication that followed the Tri-Continental conference of Communist nations in Havana early in 1967 "wars of national liberation should be started around the globe." He stressed that "nations like North Korea and Cuba should take the lead in helping North Vietnam by launching diversionary military actions."

Arrival of late model jet aircraft from Russia during the past nine months has boosted Cuba's air force to 250 planes and makes it clearly the dominant force in the Caribbean.

In the past year several crack regiments of Castro's 90,000-man army have been equipped with new Soviet arms and shifted into nearly prepared defense positions near the U. S. Naval base at Guatanamo Bay.

In East Germany the Russians several months ago began stockpiling 120-days' supply of food and military equipment, including all types of spare parts and ammunition, with the East Berlin armored divisions that now encircle West Berlin.

Since the Kremlin's policy has been to limit these forces to a week's supply, this change is considered to have major military significance.

One military intelligence group, which correctly forecast last July that the next major crisis would come in Korea this winter, warned that the supply build-up is preparation for a possible blockade of West Berlin later this year.

Their report points out that Soviet party boss Leonid Brezhnev and Secretary Mikhail. A. Suslov held a highly unusual meeting in January with all the top East German military and civilian officials in East Berlin.

It is also the opinion of this group of intelligence experts that the seizure of the USS Pueblo is part of a synchronized general Communist operation for taking pressure off of North Vietnam by involving U.S. forces in numerous diversionary actions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 15, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

They that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing.—Psalm 34: 10.

O Thou in whose presence our heads bow and our hearts are open, we thank Thee for our country—for her glorious past, her glowing present, and her growing future. Help us to see that the greatness of our Nation does not depend on wealth or fame or success but upon character rooted in honesty, faith, and good will between men and nations.

In this sacred moment we remember again our beloved Emancipator. May his words ring out anew in our day—"with malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his children—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1968, was read and approved.

MORE ABOUT THE FOUNDATION FACTORY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the hearings of the Subcommittee on Foundations of the House Small Business Committee, which were held last October and November, proved conclusively that attempts are being made to mass produce tax-exempt foundations. Here is an interesting article from the Lansing, Mich., State Journal of January 24, 1968, which describes how it is done:

HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR OWN FOUNDATION

(By Lawrence R. Gustin)

FLINT.—How would you like to join the company of the Fords, Rockefellers, Guggenheims and Motts and form your own nonprofit foundation?

You don't have to be a millionaire to do it, and the tax exemptions can be attractive, to say the least.

Take the R. O. Hayes Foundation in nearby Grand Blanc Township, for example. The Hayes Foundation is not the largest foundation in the country, nor is it the smallest, according to Robert O. Hayes, president and executive director.

Until recently, however, it was rather widely unknown. What made it pop into prominence was an article in a national magazine about small foundations similar in tax status, if not in size, to the Rockefeller, Ford and Mott foundations.

The R. O. Hayes Foundation is one of hundreds in the country formed under the direction of Americans Building Constitutionally, an Illinois-based outfit of which Hayes' father, Robert D. Hayes, is managing trustee.

The story uses the R. O. Hayes Foundation as an example of small foundations formed by ABC. It notes that the foundation made recent grants of $2 each to the Easter Seal campaign, the American Cancer Society and the Muscular Dystrophy Association.

"That's right, we did give these grants," says R. O. Hayes. "When somebody comes around to the door for a donation, most people will give a buck. With the foundation approach, we can do a little better."

ABC was founded to bring the foundation concept, used by the Kennedys and Johnsons and other wealthy families, to the "average well-off citizen." It recommends that a man form a foundation with a stated purpose which relates to some degree with his work. The man may then make himself and his family principal directors, assign his assets to the foundation and try to arrange for his client fees or salary to be paid to the foundation instead of to him personally.

Then he may arrange for the foundation he controls to hire him to do his regular work for the benefit of the foundation, and to pay him a relatively small salary, on which he pays income tax.

There are many advantages. The foundation may give him the use of his car, travel expenses and a large life insurance policy.

The Wall Street Journal reported the case of a doctor who benefitted from ABC membership. He formed a foundation which collected his fees and in turn provided him with a house, car, retirement plan and insurance. The doctor's four children are attending college on educational grants from the foundation.

If a man's heirs are involved in the foundation, he can also protect his estate from inheritance taxes following his death. Hayes says it is not difficult for any middle-income person to set up a foundation.

"He must determine, first of all, in his own mind something he would like to do for the benefit of mankind," he says. "This can touch anything in the world, but it is best if the purpose has some relation to the kind of work he does."

It is also a good idea if the purpose is stated in general terms in the application to the Michigan Corporation and Securities Commission.

The official purpose of the Hayes Foundation is "to receive and disburse funds for the purpose of research and development in its broadest sense, in management, human relations and industrial operations throughout the country for educational and public welfare purposes."

It was chartered by the state Aug. 8, 1966, requiring a $20 filing fee and a three-day wait through the mails.

What does the Hayes Foundation do?

"The foundation provides services which might be helpful to other people" said Hayes. Pressed to be more specific, he said the foundation "provides information for people who are interested in improving their situations for their family, their country and themselves."

"We analyze their personal financial situation to determine how they can best reorganize their personal affairs to gain the greatest good for their family and country," he added.

For the services provided, the person helped pays a fee to the Hayes Foundation, which pays the salary of Hayes.

Hayes would not say how many similar foundations have been set up in the Flint area except that there are "a number of them." He also prefers not to divulge financial data on the foundation, or its members, other than to say he and his wife are principal officers and that two lawyers are involved.

He does, however, say that the Hayes Foundation gave its biggest grant, $750, to the Philippa Schuyler Memorial Fund, of New York. This foundation, he said plans to help farmers in Vietnam use modern farming techniques. The Schuyler Foundation, on whose boards is Henry Cabot Lodge, is an ABC member.

R. O. Hayes, a 1952 graduate of the University of Illinois, worked for Sun Oil Co. in Detroit and Flint in sales and management before joining AC Spark Plug Division in 1956. He was a supervisor of sales training, management training instructor, quality control field man and a supervisor before leaving AC last March to devote full time to his foundation.

Characterizing himself as a conservative Republican, Hayes said he is opposed to the income-tax structure in this country and that the ABC foundation concept allows many persons to take advantage of tax exemptions formerly reserved only for the very wealthy.

He scoffs at suggestions that tax exemptions for many persons, particularly the self-employed, would place more of a tax burden on the salaried employee and wage earner.

He also said he thinks U.S. Rep. Wright Patman, D-Texas, is being "facetious" when Patman claims that "if this sort of thing is carried to its logical conclusion, there would be nobody left to pay taxes."

Patman's house subcommittee on foundations has been investigating the whole field for more than five years, and the Internal Revenue Service is becoming more and more interested.

BANK CREDIT CARD OPERATORS INVADE OUR CITIZENS RIGHT OF PRIVACY—CREDIT "SMEARS" NOT UNCOMMON—HEARINGS TO RESUME

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last November 8 and 9, the Committee on Banking and Currency held 2 days' hearings on my bill, H.R. 12646, to prohibit banks from sending out unsolicited credit cards. This terrible practice has become a real racket, and I can assure the House that your Banking Committee plans to resume hearings on this bill—probably in an expanded form—as soon as our legislative schedule subsides a bit.

Solicited or unsolicited, bank credit cards, as well as all other extensions of credit, should not be vehicles whereby our citizens right of privacy is stripped from them by the organized, automated buying and selling of credit reports. I plan to introduce legislation to control this evil right away. It is indeed a Federal problem in that federally insured financial institutions working hand in hand with nationwide credit bureaus are involved. In fact, it is the unauthorized sale and use of confidential, personal information that makes usury so profitable in this country.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House should be aware of some of the concrete cases of abuse growing out of the credit card racket. How easily one may become the innocent victim of a credit "smear" should be of particular concern to all of us. I insert at this point in the Record an article appearing in the February 5 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

Prying for Pay—How Credit Bureaus Collect and Use Data on Millions of Persons—Critics Hit Sources and Wide Dissemination of Material; Sex, Drinking Are Checked—But Firms Need Information

(By Stanford N. Sesser)

Atlanta.—Some people look upon it as "Big Brother Inc." Others defend it as an essential tool for the conduct of business.

The organization at issue is Retail Credit Co., an Atlanta-based company with 1,800 offices across North America. You may not have heard of Retail Credit, but there is a good chance that it has heard of you; each year it investigates millions of Americans who apply for insurance or employment.

It has records on more than 45 million individuals, with information ranging from the size of their families to the amount of liquor they consume. A file might touch on any number of allegations, including reports of extramarital affairs and homosexuality. A total of 40,000 customers get 5 billion reports from the firm each year.

The business of credit, insurance and personnel investigations is burgeoning, and Retail Credit Co., though by far the largest individual firm in the field, is only part of the industry. There is also, for example, Associated Credit Bureaus of America Inc., an affiliation of 2,200 local credit bureaus by which each bureau has access to files on 110 million persons.

ASSAULT ON PRIVACY?

Organizations such as Retail Credit and Associated Credit Bureaus (ACB) are pursuing their business relatively unhampered by state or Federal regulations at the same time a debate rages in Washington about a proposed National Data Bank. It would use a centralized computer system to collect information on individuals scattered through many Government files. Congressional investigators wonder if private industry isn't quietly accomplishing much the same thing—a centralization of personal and potentially harmful information.

The staffs of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate antitrust and monopoly subcommittee are taking a searching look at the operations of credit bureaus and insurance investigators, and many industry executives seem resigned to the prospect of eventual hearings. "I expect we'll have our day in court like everyone else," says Frederick E. King, president of Hooper-Holmes Bureau Inc., a Morristown, N.J. credit firm.

The many critics of credit investigators acknowledge the need for such organizations in today's society. The increasing use of credit cards has made the business of credit-checking more essential than ever. The critics' complaints center on the way information—or, occasionally, misinformation—is used.

Consider Credit Bureau of Greater New York Inc., the largest local bureau in the nation. This cooperatively owned organization, which does credit checks for department stores, auto-rental firms, oil companies and other large credit grantors, has records on 8.5 million persons. Its filing cabinets occupy an entire floor of an office building.

IN THE FILES

A typical file contains a person's address, family status, place of employment, approximate salary and credit history—where the person has charge accounts and what his payment record has been. Often there is a more controversial item: Most banks will divulge to credit bureaus the approximate size of a customer's checking account and, in rare instances, the size of his savings account.

Each year about 780,000 so-called "derogatory items" go into this vast compendium of information on New Yorkers. Some items involve nonpayment of bills. Others record court judgments. But the vast majority of them, about 550,000, are information on lawsuits gleaned from court records. One important fact—how the suits were decided—never gets recorded.

This practice can produce inequities. A woman in one Eastern city tells this tale: She ordered a rug. A carpet of the wrong color was delivered. The merchant refused to take it back and sued for payment. The suit was thrown out of court, but the woman's credit record showed only that she had been sued for nonpayment. As a result, her credit was cut off elsewhere.

"It's impossible to get the disposition of a suit," says Rudolph M. Severa, executive manager of the New York credit bureau. "It would be extremely expensive." Mr. Severa explains that each case would have to be looked up by researchers, and he says, "Our members know they should draw no conclusion from the fact that a suit has been filed. It's up to them to check into it further."

LOOKING INTO THE RECORD

Can a person get his credit record corrected? "We'll sit down with a person and talk over his file in general terms," Mr. Severa says, "but we won't tell him who said what." Whether the credit organizations do recheck disputed entries is a matter of considerable debate.

Chester J. Straub, a Manhattan lawyer and New York State assemblyman, says he was turned down by a major credit card company because of an erroneous report from a credit bureau. "The entry indicated that a judgment was outstanding against me which in fact wasn't mine," he says. "It belonged to someone with a similar name."

But at the outset, all Mr. Straub knew was that he had been turned down. He went to the credit bureau. "All they would tell me was that my credit report was unfavorable," he recalls. Only after repeated telephone calls—emphasizing that he was an assemblyman—did he find out about the error.

"I'm an assemblyman," Mr. Straub notes. "What happens to the poor guy who walks in off the street with no leverage of any kind?" The incident has led him to introduce a bill that would require credit bureaus in New York to provide a person with a copy of his record.

At the Credit Bureau of Greater New York, any of the 500 employes have easy access to the 8.5 million files; so do any of the 14,000 employees of ACB affiliates across the nation. Last year ACB members exchanged more than seven million reports, largely those of persons who changed their residences.

Eventually any of ACB's 110 million files will be available to local bureaus at the touch of a button. ACB, working with International Business Machines Corp. and the Dallas and Houston credit bureaus, is designing a computerized system that it expects to become nationwide in time. A central switching system will connect computers at all local bureaus.

Credit bureau workers aren't the only ones who can look into the files. Investigators from such Federal agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the State Department get copies of more than 20,000 records from the New York bureau each year, Mr. Severa says. What are they used for? "Frankly, we don't ask the Government what they're doing," Mr. Severa says. "We don't feel that's our prerogative."

With equal ease, Government agencies can get copies of insurance investigation reports by visiting Retail Credit or Hooper-Holmes, whose combined files contain information on 54 million persons who at some time have applied for insurance. "The FBI can do just about anything they want to do," says Mr. King of Hooper-Holmes. "They're constantly in our files."

THE SENSITIVE FILES

If the information in credit records is potentially troublesome, the allegations in insurance inspection files can be devastating. Credit bureaus concentrate on financial and legal information, but the insurance companies are interested in what they call "moral hazards"—extramarital affairs, homosexuality, heavy drinking or other aberrations that could lead to violence, blackmail, accidents or death. Some insurance companies won't write policies for persons they believe to be homosexuals.

"When someone accuses you of violating their privacy when you investigate them—yes, you are invading their privacy, there's no question about it," Mr. King acknowledges. But, he adds, "That person has initiated a request to the insurance company to gamble thousands of dollars on him."

And how does an inspector go about obtaining this delicate information? Mr. King candidly describes the procedure with a married man suspected of an extramarital affair. "You go to a neighbor and establish rapport," he says. "Then you ask, 'What's your opinion of X's home life: how do you think of him as a family man?' This will usually elicit some hint—through the expression on their faces or the way they answer. Then you start digging. You press them as far as they go, and if they become recalcitrant, you go somewhere else. If you go to enough people, you get it."

Homosexuality, Mr. King concedes, "is one of the most difficult things to determine." But he points out, "If you have that sixth sense that something is wrong, you dig. The tipoff is their mode of living, their circle of friends and the organizations they belong to." Is it fair to simply report the suspicions of neighbors? "We won't say he's a homosexual," Mr. King replies. "We'll report, for example, that certain people feel he has homosexual tendencies."

JUST COLLECTING INFORMATION

In defense of the system, Mr. King says information won't be recorded unless it is reported by more than one source. Even when it is recorded, Hooper-Holmes doesn't "make judgments," he says. "We're just reporting what we have in our files."

Almost any plausible customer can get access to the files of Retail Credit or Hooper-Holmes. Charles M. Watt, vice president and secretary of Retail Credit, says material from the insurance files may be used when a prospective employer calls about a job applicant. And another Retail Credit executive notes that the company will handle as few as 10 investigations for a customer a year; thus small customers as well as large can delve into the files.

There is one notable exception to the generally easy access—the person who wants to see his own record. Retail Credit won't even confirm that it has done a report on a person. This, Mr. Watt says, is to avoid lawsuits. If a person raises a question about his record, he is invited to write a statement about whatever may be bothering him, and, says Mr. Watt, "we tell him if we did a report, we'll send the statement to anyone who asked about him."

In some quarters of the industry, there is concern about inaccurate and freely disclosed information. Credit Data Corp., a rapidly growing, computerized company whose biggest customers are New York and California banks, won't let Government agencies look at its files without a subpoena. "We're very sympathetic to the people who are concerned with the invasion of privacy," says Harry C. Jordan, president. Such invasion, he is convinced, occurs "not because of a computer but because of unauthorized access to the data."

Dale L. Reistad, an official of the American Bankers Association, said recently that bankers should demonstrate concern over "some obvious intrusions into individual privacy today." He proposes a "consumer-oriented" credit bureau whose files would be organized by identification number rather than name.

A person would carry an ID card, for presentation to a merchant seeking a credit report. The report would be a "mathematical credit score" that would add up all relevant factors on a standardized basis. The merchant wouldn't find out the person's salary, bank balance or other personal data. And finally, the person would be guaranteed the right to review his own credit listing.

CONGRESS, THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE THRIFT INDUSTRY MUST ACT NOW TO REDUCE HIGH HOME MORTGAGE RATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we are to succeed in our efforts to assist home builders and home buyers in 1968, it is absolutely necessary that the conventional mortgage be made more attractive to institutional investors. Given the Federal Reserve Board's latest tight-money, high-interest-rate stance, it behooves the Congress, the administration, as well as those in the home-building and home-financing industries to come up with some fresh, new ideas in order to avoid a repetition of the 1966 mortgage market collapse.

Something must be done about these exorbitant interest rates on home mortgages, which in some areas are approaching 8 percent. Discount points—commonly known as loan fees—must also be eliminated.

No one has a cure-all for this tremendous problem, but removing interest-rate ceilings cannot be the answer. In a recent letter to the Honorable John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, I offered the suggestion that savings and loan associations be permitted to sell "packages" of participations in mortgages to all institutional investors—investors who would not otherwise enter the mortgage market. I strongly believe that this represents one of the numerous possible approaches which, if immediately adopted, will reinvigorate the mortgage market and reduce interest rates.

I also raised the question why savings and loan associations should not be encouraged to tap the funds of real estate investment companies by offering them participations, or perhaps even actually sponsor such companies. Both types of entities are intended to function as means of savings and investment for the purpose of providing real estate financing.

With unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I will insert at this point in the RECORD my letter to Chairman Horne dated January 15, 1968, and his response of February 8, in which he agrees that removal of the limitations on sale of mortgage participations has merit:

JANUARY 15, 1968.

Hon. JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HORNE: It was with great interest that I read where the Board has amended section 563.9–2 of its rules and regulations to broaden the class of eligible purchasers of participating interests in mortgage loans without Board approval to include non-insured savings and loan associations.

Personally, I feel this is a great step forward to better provide an adequate flow of funds into the home mortgage market through savings and loan associations. Very aggressive moves by your agency are necessary so that we can take care of home buyers without raising the 6% interest rate ceiling on F.H.A. loans and to eliminate the vicious "point" system at the same time. Of course, immediate enactment of H.R. 13718, the Federal Savings Institutions bill will be of tremendous help in this regard.

Getting back to the matter of sales or participations in home loans by insured associations, I urge you to consider permitting the sale of participations to all institutional investors under streamlined procedures. It would seem to me that among such investors, real estate investment trusts might be an excellent market for participations. In fact, I have often wondered why more insured associations do not work closely with these trusts or even establish their own REIT's as a collateral source of funds for liquidity and loan expansion.

I would be happy to have your thoughts on these suggestions. I think the Board is generally doing an excellent job in carrying out the provisions of the Home Owners' Loan Act and related statutes, but I am quite disappointed that interest rates on home loans remain at such high levels and that "points" and "loan fees" are being charged.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1968.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This further acknowledges your letter dated January 15, 1968. You feel that the Board's recent amendment to Insurance Regulation 563.9–2, which permits the purchase of participating interests by non-insured savings and loan associations, is a step forward to provide an adequate flow of funds into the home mortgage market through these institutions; you urge that the Board give consideration to permit the sale of participations to all institutional investors, including real estate investment trusts; and you suggest that we move so that home buyers can be taken care of without raising the 6 percent interest rate ceiling and without the need to pay "points" on FHA-insured loans. You ask for my thoughts on your comments.

The Board currently is giving consideration to permit the sale of participations to institutional investors as part of its broader review of the participation regulations. My personal view is that the removal of the limitations on sale has merit; we will certainly consider the matter very fully. Hopefully, that will be fairly soon.

We will continue to do our best, as you urge, to improve the market for FHA and VA loans. Diversified lenders are a very important factor in the FHA market. They tend to be influenced very strongly in their acquisition of FHA loans by market conditions. And as you know better than I, the strong argument that lenders and builders make in favor of discount points is that they make possible a competitive rate of return on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans. We have always shared and continue to share your dislike for discount points. Without that factor, though, it is possible that the availability of FHA-insured mortgage funds could be considerably hampered. Moreover, we are not able to determine much if any action that this Board can take to ameliorate significantly the conditions in the FHA and VA markets because we are not the money creating Agency. Additionally, as I am sure you know, it is recommended in the February 1968 issue of the Economic Report of the President that the 6 percent limit be lifted.

The Board's policies, I can assure you, have as their primary objective that interest rates on residential construction and home mortgages be at the lowest possible rate consistent with reasonable earnings levels. The impact of the present rate ceiling on the availability of funds for FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages under investment opportunities elsewhere minimizes the Board's opportunities toward its objective. I am hopeful that if the savings and loan industry has a continued net inflow of savings and can maintain a strong liquidity position, competition may keep interest rates, if not down, at least from going higher in many areas.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S VETERANS PROPOSALS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent message on servicemen and veterans presents a challenge to every legislator to insure that those who have served their country in the most elemental, yet most dangerous and difficult way, shall not be neglected. The President's program represents the least that should be done for the men who have contributed so indispensably to the maintenance of our way of life.

Particularly interesting in the President's program was the manner in which the needs of veterans are to be coordinated with the broader interests and objectives of national policy—improvements in health care and education, and filling the vacancies in law-enforcement and other public-service positions.

In a time of tasteless and often raucous dissent, the extent to which former military men continue to serve and support the Nation after returning to private life, is also noteworthy. The conspicuous patriotism of our veterans organizations demonstrates that those who know at firsthand the costs of defending freedom will be most dedicated to preserving it.

Important improvements in veterans' benefits were enacted in the first session of the 90th Congress. I urge that in this session, the Congress implement the President's additional proposals, where necessary, by appropriate legislative action. In doing so, we shall best serve those who have best served the Nation.

THE PRICE OF BRITISH DEFENSE CUTS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There wsa no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent devaluation of the British pound and the accompanying decision to pull out all United Kingdom forces east of Suez has created shock waves which are still agitating the chanceries of the world.

Needless to say, the effects upon U.S. policy and U.S. interests will be profound. In fact, the extent of the impact upon our international security is only beginning to be understood.

Since we as Americans comment with diffidence upon internal political matters of another country, it is helpful and illuminating to find that this whole problem of the abruptness of the British decision and the motivation which prompted it has been discussed by a British editor. Because it is so complete and thorough, I believe that it should be read by more Americans.

I am happy to append to these remarks this editorial, "Real Price of Defense Cuts," by Robert Blake, which appeared in the Illustrated London News on February 3, 1968:

REAL PRICE OF DEFENSE CUTS

(Westminster scene—Lack of confidence in the Government springs from the increasing evidence that despite its ardent claims, planning is foreign to its nature. This alarming defect, says Robert Blake, is seen as starkly in the attempts to cope with devaluation as in the handling of the events which precipitated it. Above all, the defense cuts may be sorely regretted.)

There has now been time to consider in a calmer light the Government's cuts and their consequences. There has been time for passions to cool, for first thoughts to be amended, for the benefit of the doubt to be given—if warranted. Alas, the more one examines the policies and attitudes of the Cabinet, the worse they seem. As the head of a famous Oxford college observed many years ago apropos of some undergraduate scandal or other. "There is nothing so black that, when you look into it, it does not become a great deal blacker."

The most deplorable feature is that there still seems no certainty, to put it at its most favorable, that there may not be another devaluation. This lamentable state of affairs stems principally from the Prime Minister's personal behavior on the morrow of the original devaluation. His broadcast to the nation was one of the worst performances ever put up by a man in his great office. If it reminded one of anything at all—and happily there are few precedents in our history—it was the address to the nation made by Neville Chamberlain on the outbreak of the Second World War.

Indeed, in many ways Mr. Wilson is in a situation like that of Neville Chamberlain. He has seen the collapse of all the policies for which he stood, largely because of his own myopia, complacency, and misjudgment. He has, however, lost the confidence of the nation to an even greater extent than Neville Chamberlain, for although the collapse of Chamberlain's policies and the mortal peril in which Britain stood were in part his own fault, there was after all the not unimportant matter of Hitler's responsibility. Britain in 1939 was up against a ruthless and unscrupulous foreign enemy; Chamberlain, it could be argued, had been deceived by a man of unparalleled wickedness and duplicity. There is no such let out for Mr. Wilson, and even Neville Chamberlain did not long survive the collapse of his policies in spite of the rally to the government which war nearly always brings. Whether Mr. Wilson will remain prime minister is anyone's guess. It is very difficult to remove a prime minister who is determined to stay put. But if national and party morale sink below a certain point, if the misgivings of his colleagues and the mockery of the Opposition reach a certain pitch, then even the most brazen prime minister may begin to lose his confidence.

The political climate is so unpredictable just now that almost anything might happen.

What really alarms me is not only Mr. Wilson's reaction, but that of the whole Cabinet to the crisis. It is now clear that there had been no plan whatever for the eventuality of devaluation. In this respect Mr. Wilson's Government has been caught off its guard with much more serious consequences than befell Mr. Macmillan after de Gaulle's veto in 1963. True, there was no plan then for what to do if the General said no. But in a sense this mattered less, anyway in the short term, for the country could go on ticking over much as before.

But a devaluation is quite a different matter. It requires action at once, if it is not to be followed by another; and every week's delay means that the measures taken to restore confidence have to be that much more drastic. If it is really true that Mr. Wilson forbade the possibility of devaluation to be even discussed after the original decision to defend the pound in 1964, then he must bear a very grave personal responsibility. But so too must Mr. Callaghan, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Stewart, who surely could have insisted on some sort of precautionary blueprint. After all, was not "planning" supposed to be Labor's *forte?* There should have been an immediate announcement of cuts in public expenditure, severer terms for hire-purchase, a rise in indirect taxation, and above all a statutory incomes freeze.

Whatever the allocation of personal responsibility, it is quite evident that no proper thought had been given to the appropriate action. It is now, alas, all too clear that wholly inadequate thought has been given to it since. For the measures taken are either irrelevant to the immediate crisis or, if relevant, not enough. High on the list for irrelevancy come the cuts in defense, and the decision to pull out east of Suez. For his failure to resign on this point one can only regard Mr. Denis Healey with contempt, though one should not exhaust all of it on him but reserve a share for Mr. George Brown.

The reason for censuring them should be made clear. If they had been sacrificing their long-held convictions about Britain's world role to the urgent necessities of an economic crisis, their conduct would be comprehensible. Such sacrifices do sometimes have to be made, and departmental ministers cannot fight all the way against the collective sense (or nonsense) of the Cabinet. But pulling out of the east is not going to have any economic effect till the 1970's. It will make no difference, or at any rate very little, to the immediate problem, namely to achieve during the next two years a massive switch of national resources into exports or import substitutes.

Now it is fair to say that there are more general arguments against the east of Suez policy and that some members of the Cabinet—Mr. Roy Jenkins is said to be one of them—have always argued in favour of withdrawal on grounds of British long-term inability to maintain such a burden. In the end the countries of South-East Asia must stand on their own feet. But the great question is when "the end" is to be; and that, surely, is a matter for careful consideration and consultation, not a panic decision to break overnight a whole series of promises to friends, allies, and patrons. Our "presence" in the east is analogous to the American "presence" in Europe from 1946. What would be the verdict of history if because of a dollar crisis the Americans had suddenly withdrawn in 1948, and if, as is not impossible, a large part of Western Europe had become Communist?

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the defense cuts stem less from a belief that they are essential in order to meet the present crisis, than from a belief that they are essential in order to reconcile the Labor party to other measures. The abandonment of Malaysia, Singapore, and the Persian Gulf is the price being paid, in terms of internal party politics, for the imposition of prescription charges and the postponement of the school leaving age.

This is why the obloquy deservedly descending upon Mr. Wilson ought not to be his monopoly. The Secretary for Defense and the Foreign Secretary have no moral right to remain in the Cabinet after it has imposed such a reversal of their previous policies, and for such ignoble reasons. Their word will not be believed on anything now—and it is no consolation that this state of affairs has long since been true of their Prime Minister and leader.

What is more, the defense cuts in the form that they have taken could make our economic situation worse. One of the assets which the Government has had in the past, and Mr. Wilson's prestige benefited from it, has been a large measure of American goodwill. But for it the economic crisis of the last three years would have been worse. The recent reductions in American overseas investment were far less severe on Britain than on the EEC. This goodwill is not likely to survive the unilateral reversal of a defense policy on which, rightly or wrongly, President Johnson places considerable store. In so far as Britain depends on a sympathetic attitude from Washington, the defense cuts may do harm—marginal perhaps, but we are too close to the margin to afford any risks.

The cuts other than defense make reasonable sense. I do not share the educationalists' fury over the school leaving age. On the contrary, it seems an obvious economy. But one respects Lord Longford for resigning if he felt strongly on the matter—an agreeable contrast with Miss Jennie Lee's ludicrous behavior over prescription charges. As for the rest, one may argue over details, but there is nothing silly about them in themselves. What, however, should not be forgotten is that the total sum of them merely means that next year's increase will not be as astronomical as it otherwise would have been. They do not represent any real reduction in the level of public expenditure. On the contrary it will run far higher than before, which was too high anyway. There has been a lot of talk about Labor's "sacred cows," but the sleekest and fattest of them—the dogma that public expenditure should invariably go up—remains as sacrosanct as ever.

In view of this, one can only rub one's eyes at the Chancellor's postponement of hire-purchase changes and taxation increases. There may be a certain logic in allowing a spending spree now, when there is a measure of unemployment in the industries producing such consumer durables as washing machines, and in clamping down later when, as one piously hopes, the export drive gets under way. I am sure the figures have been added up correctly. But there is the whole intangible question of confidence to consider. This government of pusillanimous doctrinaires, after over three years of folly and blunder, still fails to grasp the basic elements of how to gain confidence at home or abroad. This is the most disturbing feature of their whole course of action since devaluation.

SENATOR BENTON RECEIVES HIGHEST CIVILIAN AWARD

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the field of public service, the affairs of this Nation are conscientiously conducted by thousands upon thousands of persons whose names never reach the headlines and whose achievements are too often taken for granted or lost in the shuffle of bureaucracy and administration.

But among this nameless legion a few individuals stand out unmistakably for their dedication to duty and their distinguished service.

In the Department of State those most deserving of commendation are annually given the Distinguished Honor Award, the highest recognition possible for "outstanding contributions of national or international significance to the public service, or to the accomplishment of a specific mission." On December 7, 1967, this award was presented to former Connecticut Senator William Benton by Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Senator Benton's citation noted:

> As Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs (1945–1947) and as United States Member of the Executive Board of UNESCO (1963–present) he brilliantly pioneered new techniques in United States diplomacy and promoted new efforts in international intellectual cooperation.
>
> In the first tradition of the United States public service, he tirelessly and conscientiously fought for the principles of freedom of information, the first flow of people and ideas and the strengthening of mutual understanding between nations, while at the same time significantly enhancing the appreciation abroad of American scholarly and cultural achievements.

As Assistant Secretary of State, Senator Benton was instrumental in organizing America's first peacetime program of international information and educational exchanges. This included the "Voice of America" broadcasts, the maintenance of U.S. information offices overseas, and the exchange of students.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, William Benton has always served his country well. He has probably served as chairman of the U.S. delegation at more international conferences than anybody in the United States, between 15 and 20 times in all, and has well earned the commendation which he recently received.

I take pleasure in reporting to my colleagues the conferral of the Distinguished Honor Award to William Benton, and I am sure that they join with me in extending to him their deep appreciation and best wishes.

SOUZAY SINGS SCHUBERT SUPERBLY

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 11, Gerard Souzay and his accompanist, Dalton Baldwin, provided Constitution Hall listeners with a magic afternoon of music.

Mr. Souzay presented Schubert's "Die Winterreiese" in its complete form with only a brief intermission.

Mr. Souzay's singing was artistry of the highest sort and his performance is one that has probably never been equaled in the history of the rendition of Schubert's song cycle.

As one who was privileged to attend this magnificent recital, I want to express my appreciation for the performance of Mr. Souzay and the contribution of his accompanist, and as a record of this event which was made by one more qualified and competent than I to write it in meaningful terms, I include with these remarks a column, "Souzay, Baldwin Show Touch of Miraculous," by Paul Hume, the distinguished music critic of the Washington Post, which appeared in that newspaper on February 12:

SOUZAY, BALDWIN SHOW TOUCH OF THE MIRACULOUS

(By Paul Hume)

It was an extraordinary thing that Gerard Souzay and Dalton Baldwin created yesterday afternoon in Constitution Hall. In simple terms it was a performance of Schubert's song cycle, "Die Winterreise." But those few words do as little to suggest all that lies in and behind a great reading of these 24 songs as do some of the very notes that Schubert wrote in such a song as "Wasserfluth." There Schubert needed only the fewest notes, and shaped them in the most fundamental relationships. Yet what he makes of those notes!

And what Souzay and Baldwin made of those anguished stark songs! There is a touch of the miraculous that it should be a French baritone who has made himself so great a master of one of the most elusive of all music's treasures. That Souzay is unrivaled in the songs of his own country is something we have come to know through great experience. That he is also one of the world's rare masters of the art of German song is another fact which he has proven over and over.

But "Die Winterreise" stands continually as a singular challenge to all singers, few of whom should never risk it. Its poetry is not immortal, except as Schubert may have made it so. Its sentiments, though familiar enough, are not unusually profound, until the final songs in which the bleakness of total loneliness becomes an overwhelming emotion.

What these songs demand is the utmost penetration into the reason behind each single note for singer and pianist, who share evenly the task of disclosing the greatness that lies therein. Having found that reason, the musicians must then project, in a rare atmosphere of sustained sharing, the meanings they have discovered. It is not difficult music for either artist. It is merely the almost impossible responsibility of recreating that which Schubert's supreme mastery brought forth in his finest inspirations.

Yesterday Souzay was in magnificent form, whether one considers the flexibility with which he colored his voice from the deep velvet of the lower notes to the shining gold of the high baritone range, or is concerned with his endless genius for shading and shaping every word. No tinge of bitterness was left unexplored, but no ounce of hope was passed by without the thought that perhaps a love now seemingly lost might yet be regained.

It would be an injustice to suggest that one song reached higher than any other, for there was a parity among them that was astounding. Yet there were many moods, and it was a matter for marveling to move with the singer from the impetuous hopes of "Die Post" to that final barren, unspeakable emptiness of the final "Leiermann."

The whole cycle depends as much on the musician at the piano as upon the singer. From the opening notes of "Gute Nacht," to the infinitely touching final notes of "Leiermann," Baldwin never ceased his devotion to the perfect inflection, the subtlest pause, the unrivaled touch and sound. With such a pair, it was no wonder that the audience remained to applaud until the lights were turned up and the artists had made it clear that they had sung their last song for the day. These experiences come rarely, but they remain vivid in the memory.

BILLS INTRODUCED TO CLOSE GAPS IN SECURITY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today which will plug certain gaps in our national security which were left by the Supreme Court decision of United States against Robel, rendered on December 11, 1967.

As many of my colleagues will recall, this decision stated that employment in defense facilities cannot be denied persons merely because of affiliation with Communist organizations.

I strongly disagree with the majority decision in Robel, and feel that the better reasoning is found in the dissenting opinion of Justices Harlan and White. Therefore, I propose that Congress either rewrite existing security control legislation, or amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so that these security gaps are corrected.

My first bill is identical to S. 2778, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, on December 13, 1967, and would supplement the existing legislation. It would create a Central Security Office and would apply security standards to all departments of the Government, and not just the Department of Defense.

In the alternative, I am introducing a bill which would bring the Subversive Activities Control Act within the guidelines set down by the Supreme Court. The Court struck down certain provisions of the act as being vague, and said that more specific language should be used in such legislation. My bill would amend the act by using more specific language as to who may and may not be employed in defense facilities. It would provide the specific language demanded by the majority of the Court, and would also meet the objectives of the minority decision.

I would never advocate Congress taking away the constitutional rights of any American, but I feel strongly that traitors and subversives should not be privy to our national secrets. My bills seek to correct this situation arising from the recent Court decision in which sensitive positions may be filled by people who would overthrow our Government if given an opportunity.

There is an urgent need for immediate action on this vital issue. Congress should act without delay on these bills, to restore a safe measure of security to our defense plants and installations.

THE PROPOSED TRAVEL TAX

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration unveiled its proposed tax on travel. The Washington Post of February 6, 1968, in an editorial called the proposal "a thoroughly objectionable measure."

Middle income persons, who save for a trip in modest comfort, will have to pay a travel tax of perhaps 20 percent plus a 5-percent excise tax on air or steamship passage. Those who are in a position to write their trips off as business expenses will pay nothing at all.

This proposal is counter to our tradition of free travel; it is the kind of scissors and paste solution to our international balance-of-payments difficulties which postpones the more basic adjustments which are necessary to avert crisis, and it invites retaliation. How ironic that at a time when the United States is promoting free trade it should be laying the foundation for a wall of travel restrictions.

The spirit and the mechanics of this proposal invite evasion. Certainly the administrative expense and machinery to enforce such a tax must be considered.

In addition to being regressive, the proposed travel tax identifies a false culprit. It is not the "travel deficit" which is responsible for our balance-of-payments difficulties. The greatest single cause is rather our mounting arms expenditures. In 1967 expenditures in Vietnam contributed $1.3 billion more to the payments deficit than in 1964.

An interesting pamphlet by the American Express Co., citing Department of Commerce statistics, breaks down the so-called $1.9 billion travel deficit. Only $363 million, or 19 percent, is accounted for by pleasure spending by American tourists in Europe and the Mediterranean.

The administration's plan to tax travel in inequitable; it is not directed at the most serious causes of our payments problems; and it will only incur retaliation, to the mutual harm of all nations concerned.

I include the Washington Post editorial of February 6, 1968, entitled "A Regressive Tax," and excerpts from the American Express Co. pamphlet:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1968]

A REGRESSIVE TAX

Having imposed severe restrictions on business investment in Western Europe, the Administration now proposes to apply the principle of "equality of sacrifice" to those who would travel. Its "travel tax" proposal, unveiled yesterday by Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, is a thoroughly objectionable measure. It is a regressive tax that would fall principally upon those in the middle income brackets who cannot write off their trip to Europe as a "business expense." The mandatory declarations of how much money is being taken out of the country and the need to account for it on return would subject travellers to an intimidating volume of paper work as well as to penalties and fines. Finally, there is no guarantee that other countries would not retaliate against this proposed "devaluation" of the tourists dollar with measures that would reduce further our trade or current account surplus.

Secretary Fowler made much of the fact that the tax on travel expenditures will not fall heavily upon those with small incomes. The first $7 of daily expenditures in Europe is exempted from the tax; the next $8 of expenditures is taxed 15 per cent; and all expenditures in excess of $15 a day are taxed at a 30 per cent rate.

People in very modest circumstances who visit Europe and reside with relatives may indeed pay little or no travel tax. But what of the middle income traveller without relatives in Europe, the tourist who demands not luxury, but a modicum of comfort. The single person who spends $750 to travel in Europe for 20 days would, in addition to a proposed 5 per cent tax on a plane or steamship ticket, have to pay a travel tax of $159 or 21.2 per cent. Adding 21.2 per cent more to the cost of trip might not be a great burden for the very wealthy, but it surely would be for those in the middle income group. A family of four planning to spend $1500 for a 20-day tour of Europe, would be taxed $186 or at the rate of 12.4 per cent.

In addition to the regressivity of the travel tax—the same rates for all, irrespective of income or ability to pay—those who can deduct the trip as a business expense get reduction in the travel tax rate. A single traveller in the 50 per cent income tax bracket cuts his travel tax rate in half. Moreover, those with cash personal balances in Europe, or access to corporate cash balances in branches or affiliates, may escape paying the tax altogether.

There is no doubt that this measure would discourage some travel to Europe. But it does not follow that the balance-of-payments deficit would be significantly diminished. Increased travel by Americans in the Western hemisphere will result in a substantial migration of dollars to Europe unless this country adopts outright, rather than disguised exchange controls. And why does the Treasury assume that Europe—which has a bilateral deficit on trade account with the United States—will permit us to place a high tax on tourism, one of the most important "services" which they provide for Americans?

It is argued that other countries, notably the United Kingdom, impose far more stringent restraints on foreign travel. But one set of clumsy controls does not justify another. Before Ways and Means endorses the travel tax, it ought first consider alternatives to piecemeal dollar devaluation through the proliferation of controls.

Excerpts From the American Express Co. Pamphlet

First, more than half a billion dollars of the travel deficit represents a "transportation deficit." That is, the difference between the amount U.S. residents paid out to foreign airlines and steamship companies and the passenger revenues which American carriers received from foreign residents during 1967.

Technically, this may be a deficit, but it's a bookkeeping deficit, because it doesn't take into consideration—

More than $2.6 billion in U.S. manufactured aircraft, including spare parts and engines, now in use by foreign commercial airlines. In 1966 alone, they purchased an estimated $224 million worth of our equipment.

The millions of dollars spent here annually by foreign government tourist offices and by foreign airlines and steamship companies doing business in this country. In 1966, foreign airlines alone spent more than $192 million in the U.S. for staff, advertising, airport charges, communications and commissary expenses.

Second, nearly half of a billion dollars of deficit represents the difference between the amount spent by American travelers in Canada and Mexico and the amount spent by Canadian and Mexican travelers in this country in 1967.

These are special situations dictated by our common borders, our very close relationships and the large trade surpluses that the United States enjoys with these two good neighbors.

Third, a $135 million portion of the deficit arises from American travel spending in overseas areas other than Europe—such as the West Indies, Central America, South America, Asia and Africa. In many instances these are developing areas where foreign exchange earned from travelers helps to purchase American-made products and, also, serves as a useful adjunct to existing aid programs.

Fourth, this leaves a $755 million travel deficit with Europe and the Mediterranean countries. It is estimated that some 52% of American travel spending in European and Mediterranean countries goes for nonpleasure trips taken for business, educational, scientific, and other serious purposes. If we assume a similar proportion of serious-purpose spending in the USA by travelers from these countries, we then find that approximately $392 million of the U.S. travel deficit stems from non-pleasure travel spending.

Finally, this leaves an estimated net of only $363 million of the entire U.S. travel deficit to be attributed to spending on pleasure trips in the European and Mediterranean countries.

From these figures, two points are clear:

Pleasure spending by American tourists within the countries of Europe and the Mediterranean accounts for a relatively small portion of the total deficit—an estimated $363 million, or only 19 per cent of the $1.895 billion U.S. travel deficit.

By providing many countries with the means of buying more American-made goods, travel dollars generate a lot of indirect benefits for the U.S. economy. They help support our commercial aircraft manufacturing industry and they play a major role in contributing to our trade surplus—a trade surplus which amounted to $3.65 billion in 1966.

ROY L. REUTHER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, the trade union movement lost a dedicated and talented leader. Roy Reuther played a major role in advancing the cause of American labor for over three decades.

Born on August 29, 1911, Roy Reuther began his membership in the labor movement at the age of 18 by joining the Electrical Workers Union of the American Federation of Labor. Beginning in 1936, he was one of the early and most effective organizers for the United Automobile Workers, probably the key man in the campaign to organize General Motors workers in Flint, Mich. Within a year, thanks largely to his efforts, union membership in the Flint area rose from 200 to 43,000. Little wonder that he was elected first president of the Greater Flint CIO Council.

After serving with the War Production Board and the Army in World War II, he returned to the UAW and, in 1948, became administrative assistant to John W. Livingston, the vice president. The very next year he was appointed administrative assistant to the president and made director of the UAW's well-known citizenship program. He knew as well as any man the importance of labor's contributions to civic and political programs, as can be seen from the fact that in 1960 he became deputy director of John F. Kennedy's national voters' registration committee, and 2 years later, in 1962, he served as national director of the AFL–CIO's voter registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns.

The integrity, the ability, and the dedication of Roy Reuther have contributed not only to the growth in the power and influence of organized labor, but to social and economic justice for Americans everywhere. We can be grateful for all he accomplished in the 58 years of his life. America will continue to benefit from his influence in the years to come. To his family and to his fellow union associates, I express my most sincere sympathy.

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] has performed a notable service by initiating a House resolution, which I am pleased to cosponsor, proclaiming this week as Negro History Week.

For the past 42 years, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History has celebrated the week surrounding February 14, the birthday of Frederick Douglass, as Negro History Week. Our resolution would give this celebration the official recognition which it deserves. It is appropriate that Frederick Douglass should be so commemorated. His words written in 1849 remain true of the civil rights struggle to this day:

> The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that all concessions yet made to her august claims have been borne of earnest struggle . . . if there is no struggle, there is no progress.

If the struggle for equality is to be successful in the future, it will require that the truth be told about the past. The truth is that the many contributions of Negro Americans—in political, cultural, educational, scientific, and military endeavors—have all been excluded from the history books. Recognition of the past heritage is central to the achievement of full citizenship in the present day.

Negro history deserves to be given widest recognition and to be marked by Americans of all races. I am hopeful that the early passage of the resolution will nobly serve this end.

I include at this point in the Record an editorial from the Amsterdam News of February 10, 1968:

Negro History Week

Negro History Week is 42 years old this month and the increasing interest in this observance almost makes it seem that "life begins at 40," or thereabouts.

The late Carter G. Woodson, an ex-coal miner and school teacher, who dedicated his life to systematically researching our history, initiated this racial pause that refreshes in 1926 and is called Father of Negro History.

Helping to carry on his scholarly devotion to this neglected area of the world's history are the branches of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, an organization that he formed 'way back in 1915 when even Rap Brown's father was a wicked gleam in his father's eye.

Negro History Week, February 11–18, is a brief but important reminder that "the achievements of the black man properly set forth will crown him as a factor in early human progress and a maker of modern civilization."

ARMS TO JORDAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the State Department has learned nothing whatever from the Middle East war of last June. Yesterday the State Department announced that it would resume arms shipment to Jordan.

Before the tragic war of last June, the United States supplied arms to Jordan, including Patton tanks, on the dubious grounds that, if we did not, the Russians would and that such arms supply was necessary to maintain our influence in that area.

The war last June exploded that theory, and our much heralded influence was useless to prevent the outbreak of war, and particularly to prevent Jordan's attack on Israel. The arms which we had provided Jordan were used against Israel.

Now we learn that Jordan, whose King Hussein last June turned over the command of his armed forces to Nasser, is to again receive arms shipments. This is in the face of press reports of new Jordanian shelling of Israel positions on the west bank of the Jordan River.

Did the 6-day war, which signaled the total failure of our arm-the-Arab, policy, really take place, or was it a dream? Is the State Department's memory that short? For what earthly purpose would Jordan use tanks, artillery, and supersonic jet F–104's except against Israel?

Moreover, it is reported that 25 Jordanian pilots have been receiving training at two U.S. Air Force bases in Texas. This I submit is contrary to the expressed will of the Congress as enunciated during floor debate on the foreign aid bill last year.

No matter what history demonstrates the same stale policies continue to be implemented. The rule book says that arms sales promote American influence. So the State Department arms Jordan, in the face of every indication that these arms will be used against our friend and ally, Israel. In 8 months, after a bloody and tragic war, have we learned nothing?

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—PERMISSION TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Monday, February 19, to file a privileged report on the urgent supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman give the House some information as to the number of items for which consideration is being asked and the amounts for each of the programs?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The largest item, by far, will come from our Subcommittee on HEW on which I happen to serve. It will be $1.135 billion. This amount is needed in order to pay the grants in aid to the States for welfare cases, for aid to dependent children, for the blind and the totally and permanently disabled, the medicaid program and two or three others that fall in this general category of public assistance. The next largest item, except for claims and judgments, will be the funds for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and exservicemen. They are practically out of money for the payment of unemployment compensation for ex-Federal employees and returning veterans. The number of veterans being discharged has increased considerably. All of these are of an emergency nature.

There should be no controversy with this bill. The chairman has assured all Members on our side that the controversial supplemental items will be treated separately in another supplemental bill at a later time. Because of the emergency nature of this bill, none of us on the committee want anything in it that might be controversial and hold up its passage.

Mr. GROSS. This action then, is necessitated by reason of the fact that not enough money was appropriated last year, and deliberately so. Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. Well, at the time the HEW appropriation bill was on the floor I stated that day that the aid to the States for public assistance had been underestimated by $500 million in the budget submitted by the President. They said I was wrong at that time. I was wrong. I was too conservative. It should have been $1.135 billion instead of the $500 million I said. So there was an underestimation. There is an underestimation in these unemployment compensation payments to veterans and Federal employees. Even with this supplemental they have underestimated the amount of money needed to go until June 30 in this account by over $13 million.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the estimates in these matters were made, in part, by the States. They proved to be inadequate and insufficient. Payments must be made under the law. This is a matter of fifth-grade arithmetic.

Further than that, there has been a greater turnover among Federal employees than had been anticipated.

There will also be a provision in the bill to take care of certain claims and judgments which have been rendered against the Government. This just about wraps up what will be in the so-called urgent supplemental.

Mr. GROSS. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished majority leader, when would it be planned to take up this bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I had hoped to get the floor for the purpose of making that announcement. After discussing it with the gentleman from Texas and with the gentleman from Wisconsin, it will be our plan to program this bill either on Tuesday or any day thereafter next week.

Mr. GROSS. If I may ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], would it be possible to program the bill for Wednesday or thereafter in view of the fact there is important business on Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we had tentatively agreed—and I discussed this with the distinguished Speaker and with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who does not think it will take long to dispose of this matter, to schedule it as the first order of business on Tuesday, immediately preceding the gold cover bill, and following the call of the Private Calendar.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.)

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks during the colloquy just held to make it in order for the House to consider the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for 1968 on Tuesday, February 20, or any day subsequent thereto.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, may I ask when the hearings and the report on the supplemental will be available?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the hearings were very short. They will be available to the gentleman as well as all Members. They have not been printed as yet. However, they will be available by Monday morning of next week; but, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] would like to see the transcript of the hearings, it will be available to the gentleman today.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that the hearings, if possible, would be made available before Monday. However, I understand the difficulty.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, the public document upon which the hearing was held is House Document No. 254, which outlines the requests and the reasons therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CLARIFICATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House may be fully aware of the change in the program, I take this time to announce the fact that the supplemental appropriation bill will be added to the previously announced program and, unless changes are made between now and then, will be the first order of business following the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 20, will be the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian nation which will always stand out as one of the memorable events in the long battle for freedom by the Lithuanian people.

No nation over the centuries can boast of a more valiant struggle to win self-government and maintain national freedom than Lithuania. The powerful Russian Government under the czar, for long years at different intervals of time, imposed its tyrannical rule upon this nation. During five different periods of its long history, the Lithuanian people rose in open rebellion against terrific odds in opposition to Russian domination of its country by the tyrannical czars. In each rebellion, the Lithuanian people fought against terrific odds in numbers, armament, and power, but never at any time gave up their battle for freedom and independence.

During recent years, the Communist tyranny has practically isolated the Lithuanian people. The Iron Curtain has been lowered further on this nation than the average satellite nation by the Communists. The Lithuanian people have suffered by reason of the rigid regulations, prison camps, and other crimes inflicted on helpless people in order to subjugate them under Soviet enslavement. The Lithuanian people will continue their struggle for independence and freedom until self-government is restored to these valiant and heroic people. The Communist tyranny is today exerting every effort to discredit and defeat the purposes of the United Nations organization—their leaders have not given up their fight for world domination.

I know the people of Lithuania, and all satellite nations now under the Communist heel, will support every effort being made by our Government as the leader of the free world to continue the fight against Communist expansion and to aid all enslaved nations in their battle to regain freedom. World history reveals that no tyrant or group of tyrants through the force of prison camps, massacres, tortures, and so forth, can permanently enslave human beings. The spirit for human freedom burns in the hearts of all mankind and cannot be destroyed by tyrants, regardless of their force and power. Someday the enslaved nations will gain self-government and freedom and Lithuania will continue its valiant fight for freedom until victory is won.

THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], the only Spanish-American War veteran now serving in the Congress of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD his annual speech on the sinking of the *Maine*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INDIANA REDISTRICTING PROBLEM

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to inform the Members that we have had a great deal of difficulty in Indiana on the redistricting problem of congressional districts.

The State legislature failed to exercise its duty to redistrict the congressional districts in the recent session. The Federal appellate court of three members took the matter up and on yesterday a final decision was made by three members of the appellate court, and their decision was certainly a repetition of the political attitude of the State legislature.

The three-member Federal court which heard the evidence was composed of two Republicans and one Democratic member. The two Republican members of the court, for some mysterious reason, rendered a decision which coincides almost 100 percent with the recommendations of the Republican leaders of Indiana. They made a Chinese puzzle out of the congressional districts in Indiana which, in fact, if their decision is not reversed will make the eleven congressional districts in Indiana into a Republican bloc of nine districts out of the 11 districts.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Committee on the Judiciary of the House at the proper time to have a complete investigation made as to all the machinations, political and otherwise, on the part of the legislature and on the part of the two Republican Federal judges who undoubtedly must have sat in with the Republican hierarchy, the political hierarchy in Indiana, in order to arrive at that Federal court decision. The Indiana Republican leaders have been conspiring and conniving this traversity on justice since the legislature met last year.

I think that the Congress of the United States should have a little to say about the actions of the State legislatures and the Federal judges who arbitrarily revolutionize and twist all commonsense in scattering Federal districts through townships and counties with nothing more than political intent involved. This unfortunate decision was made on February 14, St. Valentine's Day. As far as the fair minded citizens of Indiana are concerned it was a "political St. Valentine's Day massacre."

I think the House of Representatives should go into this Indiana situation as to the machinations, political and otherwise, that took place in order to bring about this unjust decision. I think everyone should be interested, especially the Members of this Congress from every State in the Union. All Congress should have something to say on how the Members of this body should be elected. Local politicians and politically minded Federal judges must be curbed in their thirst for political power and desire to destroy the two-party system in electing Members of the National House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NECESSARY ON SAFE STREETS AND CRIME CONTROL ACT

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson more than any other Chief Executive has committed the Federal Government to fighting crime in the United States. Under his leadership, the Congress has enacted pioneering legislation such as the historic Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965.

But the President's national strategy against crime has been stymied for lack of congressional action on the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act which he proposed a year ago.

The urgency with which he requests passage of this act in his message on crime is understandable. For crime is a major and a growing problem in this country. And the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act would permit effective action to reduce and control the problem.

In the interest of all law-abiding Americans, I urge immediate action on this proposed legislation and other recommendations contained in the crime message.

WE CAN BEST DECIDE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, while a guest of the American people, warned that the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam by our troops would be "lunacy—sheer lunacy." Mr. Wilson is hardly in position to advise the United States on matters of policy. The British, regretfully, are not now shining examples of success in either international or domestic affairs. They have allowed themselves to degenerate into a welfare state with little prestige or prospects. This is one of the tragedies of modern times, for they are both friends and kin.

The United States should use whatever weapons are found to be most effective to win the war in Vietnam. In actuality, there has been little to recommend the use of nuclear weapons, for the targets are elusive and widely scattered. Thus far, there have not been concentrations of troops or supplies which would make the use of these weapons profitable. Nevertheless, if the occasions arise when their use is needed, the administration should feel no compunction about using them. We are up to our necks in an ugly situation and victory with the least possible loss of American lives must remain our primary objective.

HONEY PRODUCERS INDEMNITY BILL

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to honey producers for losses sustained by reason of the application of Government-approved insecticides on adjoining croplands.

It has been necessary to spray the cotton fields in southern California because of a dangerous infestation of the pink bollworm. One result of this chemical spray program has been the killing of a great number of honeybees in the area causing considerable economic difficulty to the apiary industry. This legislation would help not only the beekeeping industry but also the agricultural industry. Bee colonies pollinate a great variety of vegetable, fruit, and seed crops. In fact the role of the apiary industry in agricultural pollination far outweighs its economic impact as a honey producer. The needs of both the agricultural and apiary industries will be served by the passage of this legislation and I urge the Congress to give this legislation every consideration.

A HARD LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, friends of foreign assistance repeatedly are faced with the problem of assessing the merits of assistance to developing nations whose poverty and misery give vivid testimony to their need. Our instinct to help is dictated not only by the bonds of common humanity but by self interest as well. We recognize that in today's world every nation has a stake in the well being of its neighbors. But we are aware, too, of the very real limits on our generosity and of the endless demands for our largesse.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I frequently face this dilemma of weighing our national goodwill against the realities of our pocketbook. The need for critical reevaluation of foreign assistance assumes added weight when one senses that recipient nations are failing to exert the all-important ingredients of self-help and national discipline in structuring their own developing economies.

The distinguished U.S. businessman, Mr. George Woods, retiring President of the World Bank, recently reminded delegates to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—meeting in India, of the responsibility which leaders of the developing nations have to fight the waste in their countries, to set and to meet economic planning goals, to face realistic facts of food-population ratios, and to institute progressive tax and investment programs. Unless these nations can give evidence of success in their own behalf, our most generous aid—military or economic—will be for nought.

News analyst Bernard D. Nossiter, writing from New Delhi this week, gives further details of Mr. Woods' remarks to the UNCTAD delegates. I submit the text of Mr. Nossiter's column for my colleagues' careful attention:

Rich, Poor Nations Hit at Trade Talks

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

New Delhi, February 12.—Every time South Africa's man at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) here gets up to speak, the delegate from Asia and Africa march out of the hall and head for the carpeted lounge, the hard-currency liquor shop or other soothing places.

The Arabs and some of their Communist bloc friends have been giving the same treatment to the diminutive Ze'ev Sharef, Israel's Commerce Minister. He just giggles and says: "Look what a power I am. A little man like me, and I can make 20 ministerss move."

For veteran followers of the U.N.'s alphabetical circuit—ILO, FAO, the first UNCTAD and others—this is a well-worn routine. It is always good for plenty of space in the press of the countries taking a stroll. Its relevance to the hard work of economic development is dubious.

Indeed, the question of relevance has only marginally engaged the dozens of orators who have mounted the rostrum at the Vigyan Bhacan, New Delhi's sparkling new hall where UNCTAD II is being staged. This is why the blunt words here last Friday of George Woods, the hard-bitten, one-time Wall Street man, were so unusual and also why they received such a cool reception.

CANDOR IS RARE

Woods is on his way out as president of the World Bank and so could speak with a candor distinguished for its absence here. Like everyone else, he deplored the evident failure of the rich nations to contribute enough and on reasonable terms to the poor. But unlike everyone else, he came down hard on the failures of the poor themselves.

He reminded them that too many were led by self-seeking leaders, eager to feather their own nests and wasting funds on unproductive public works. As he spoke, another Indian state government was collapsing because a leading politician had been denied a lucrative minister's post.

Woods deplored the Southern Hemisphere's habit of evading responsibility and blaming others for its plight. The standard excuse for India's wretched performance in the '60s is the rains that didn't come and the war with Pakistan. Few here recall that Pakistan suffered the same weather and the same war and is growing at a brisk pace nevertheless.

Woods hit especially hard at leaders of developing nations who shy away from programs that mean sacrifice. He need have looked no farther than India, which spares its well-off farmers from taxes that could finance needed investment, which coincidentally benefits the principal prop of the ruling Congress Party.

These attitudes at the top, Woods said, breed, apathy and cynicism all down the line. This is reflected in the 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. office hours worked by most government officials in New Delhi (an 11 to 4 working day is normal in provincial capitals). It shows up in the production line of India's leading auto maker, who turns out shoddy cars for a public that has no choice and workable ones for politicians and other important personages.

Above all, Woods scored the 40 developing nations that can't feed themselves and spend precious foreign exchange to buy food. UNCTAD's agenda calls for consideration of the food problem but it is receiving little attention here.

BIRTH RATE PROBLEM

Just as worrisome, Woods observed, is the rise in births that eats up food, housing, schools and other forms of scarce social capital. A few countries have tackled this dilemma with force. But India here again has barely made a move and turns to family planning leaders with a fondness for trivial advertising gimmicks.

Too many poor nations, Woods said, are wasting their assets, failing to service and oil their machines, which is common in Indian plants. Another tough-minded pragmatist, Russia's Premier Alexei Kosygin, was recently in town on a not dissimilar mission. He was so disturbed by what he saw in Soviet-aided Indian plants that he promised to send in managers to show how they should be run and to buy up the output of idle factories.

None of this, from Woods or any other competent observer, means that the rich nations are entirely blameless for the failure of what was supposed to be the "development decade."

Aid from the wealthy has been niggardly and on harsh terms that eat up much of the potential benefit in repayments. The World Bank's soft-loan fund, the International Development Association, is soon to be filled up again at a level 60 per cent higher than in the past. But even this blessing will be tainted by conditions imposed by the biggest contributor, the United States. These strings reflect the West's own attachment to restrictive habits, particularly the habits of the obsolete international monetary system.

The world's trading game, too, is rigged so that the poor earn relatively less from the raw materials they sell, and pay relatively more for the finished goods they buy. On top of this, nearly everything that the poor sell runs into tariff and other barriers.

At best, UNCTAD will touch only the surface of all this. Its one solid accomplishment is likely to be an outline agreement on a new tariff system that will give products of poor nations a place of advantage in rich markets. But unless the poor do something about their habits of work and trade, even this will prove of little value.

India, for example, couldn't sell its shoddy toothbrushes, breakable hairpins and slapdash radios on a Western market even if the tariffs on these items were wiped out completely. An industry that has grown up in a fully protected home market and operates on a notion that performance standards are a foreign luxury is just not able to enter world trade.

This may be why Minister Sharef of Israel smiles when UNCTAD's Arabs walk out on him. Hard-working Israel can produce for markets abroad. When preferential tariffs are finally put in place, on present form it will be Tel Aviv and not Bombay that will benefit the most.

KOREAN POLICY

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the past 15 years, over $4 billion of American aid has gone to help develop a viable South Korean economy. During that same time, many thousands of American soldiers have ably helped to patrol and protect the borders of South Korea. Until recent outbreaks, Korea has recognized U.S. contributions in building its nation, and good feeling has prevailed.

In this light, I find it hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that America can rightfully be accused of backing out on the people and leaders of South Korea.

I can only view with skepticism a request for additional aid following on the heels of last week's outbreak of anti-Americanism in Korea. It has the hint of undue pressure being put on us by a government we have helped generously in the past. It has the hint of Seoul's trying to be the master of American policy in the area. As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations, I plan to view any requests for additional aid with this skepticism in mind.

In calling it "regrettable that the *Pueblo* sequence has led some officials in Seoul to express a narrow anti-American point of view," the Washington Post, in its lead editorial of February 12, was milder in its assessment of Korean reaction than that nation has been in its evaluation of U.S. action.

Although I question whether we should commit $100 million to "help hold a rumbling situation still," I believe the editorial makes some sobering points about the situation in Korea, and I call it to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

KOREAN POLICY

The "hawks" in South Korea want to be masters not only of Seoul's but of Washington's policy. They want the authority to determine which North Korean provocations to answer—frontal attacks or acts of infiltration—and how to answer them. This is an understandable attitude for a nation under fire, and Americans ought to sympathize with the impulses of security and self-preservation behind it.

But the United States cannot for one instant allow its policy to be taken over by Seoul. The basic condition of American protection is that the United States reserve the right to set its terms. There is, unavoidably, an element of intrusion upon Korean sovereignty. But in return, South Korea has the benefit—literally, the saving benefit—of the American shield.

It is regrettable that the Pueblo sequence has led some officials in Seoul to express a narrow anti-American point of view. By so doing, they have spoiled the normally good temper of Korean-American relations and distracted attention from legitimate Korean anxieties. With reason, official Washington has been disturbed.

Fortunately, the American reaction has not been guided by pique. Realizing that South Korea deserves to be reassured, and that North Korea needs to be reminded that there is no weakening of the American defense commitment, the United States has moved on several roads. First President Johnson asked Congress to provide "immedaitely" an extra $100 million in military aid, and then he dispatched Cyrus Vance as his "personal representative" to Seoul. Yesterday, in an effort to rebuild American-Korean confidence, the United States asked that Seoul's representatives attend the next session at Panmunjom.

The very offer of extra aid, particularly in such a round resounding sum, ought to assuage the South Koreans. Indeed, there is reason to believe the purpose of the offer was as much psychological as military. The military case for it has not been publicly made; we hope it will be. But if the offer of expenditure of $100 million can help hold a dangerously rumbling situation still, then no one should begrudge it.

Mr. Vance, with peacemaking calls to Detroit and Cyprus already under his belt, is fast on the way to becoming the Administration's most valuable un-official. Americans can be relieved, and Koreans encouraged, that he is at work in Seoul.

ABOLISH THE CONGRESSIONAL SALARY COMMISSION

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 provided for the creation of a Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. Throughout the entire history of this Nation, the determination of such salaries has been the exclusive responsibility of the Congress. It should still be such.

The delegation of such power to a Commission is most unprecedented and unwarranted. With all deference to my colleagues who voted for this provision and for the bill which contained such, this amounted to a shameful abdication of congressional responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I voted for an amendment to strike this provision from the bill. The amendment failing, I then voted against the bill. I could not under any circumstances support a bill which contained such a provision.

The Congress has heretofore had the courage to face up to this responsibility. It is wrong to assume that future Congresses would not be possessed of such courage or have the integrity and ability to make an appropriate judgment as to what these salaries should be.

And this is no inexpensive Commission, Mr. Speaker. Its nine members are authorized to draw $100 per day and all travel expenses, including per diem allowances. It is authorized to hire a very large and highly paid staff and occupy expensive office space in Washington or at any other point it chooses.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this amounted to nothing short of an abdication by the Congress of its responsibility to do this job. It is shameful that this Congress has evidenced its unwillingness to face up to it. The creation of the Commission was offensive to the public. It was condemned far and wide by the national press. It should have been condemned.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to repeal the authority for establishment of this useless Commission. Passage of my bill will put the responsibility of determining executive, legislative, and judicial salaries back in the hands of the Congress where it belongs and where it has always been. This is our job. We ought to face up to it.

WALL STREET LOAN SHARKS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, new evidence is at hand justifying the antiloan shark amendment which the House attached to the truth-in-lending bill.

According to a newspaper article based upon an interview with New York County assistant district attorney, Michael Metzger:

> Crime in the street—Wall Street—may prove to be organized crime's most sophisticated effort yet in infiltrating big business.

In less sophisticated times, the loan shark's only goal was the "vigorish," the trade name for interest on the loan. Typically, this was "6 for 5," or a $6 payment for a week's loan of $5. Today, the goal is different; the stakes are higher. The modern Wall Street loan shark loans money in order to exploit the services of the borrower who finds that he cannot repay principal and interest timely.

The technique is simple and effective. The Cosa Nostra acts as a "fence" for stolen securities acquired at bargain prices from petty thieves who stole them from private homes, from messengers on the street or from brokerage houses. The loan shark approaches a Wall Street clerk who needs "fast money" to invest in a "hot tip" he has picked up in the performance of his duties. The tip goes sour. He is unable to pay the interest. Graciously, the loan shark grants a grace period. The price of his generosity is the clerk's agreement to arrange a sale of the stolen securities. The loan shark pockets the profit. The clerk is still in default on his loan.

The Wall Street loan shark is only one of the targets of the amendment to the truth-in-lending bill. Other techniques are employed by other loan sharks in the organized crime complex. Nearly all are involved in or have an impact upon interstate commerce. State and local governments need the investigative assistance of the Federal Government which this amendment would give them.

PROFILE OF A CITY—SEASIDE, CALIF.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the city of Seaside, Calif., which I have the honor to represent, is neither large nor does it boast an old and glorious history. It is, however, a city with well-deserved pride in its development over the past few years. It is a city that demonstrates what miracles can be worked through an interested and ambitious people striving to better their environment.

The story of change in Seaside is so remarkable that it was featured in a recent issue of HUD Notes, the magazine of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In "Profile of a City—Seaside, Calif.," the author points out:

> Seaside, just a few years ago a California coastal "sand dune" community, inhabited by jack rabbits and a few hardy "squatters" in tar paper shacks, is now a desirable neighborhood of new or rehabilitated houses. Business is bustling and growing.

I commend this article to my colleagues in the House and under unanimous consent place it at this point in the RECORD:

PROFILE OF A CITY—SEASIDE, CALIF.

Seaside, just a few years ago a California coastal "sand dune" community, inhabited by jack rabbits and a few hardy "squatters" in tar paper shacks, is now a desirable neighborhood of new or rehabilitated houses. Business is bustling and growing.

Seaside (1966 population 24,000) proves that a community does not have to be a large, teeming metropolis—nor does it need to be suffering from the ravages of many generations—to benefit from the wide range of HUD community development and upgrading programs.

Seaside's history spans only a half-century. It was incorporated as a city only 13 years ago; 25 years ago its population was 5,000.

HISTORY OF THE CITY

Seaside is located on the Monterey Peninsula, between the City of Monterey and Fort Ord, and adjacent to Pebble Beach and Carmel. Its history begins in 1909, when land speculators bought hundreds of acres of land to the north and east of the old Del Monte Hotel, then a favorite spa of Northern California's social set and Hollywood greats. Promoters plotted the land into "paper" subdivisions, with 25′ x 75′ lots and 30′ streets. Using the proximity of the Del Monte Hotel as a lure, the developers advertised these lots for sale throughout the country. They spoke in glowing terms of the climate, the views, and the quick profits. The promoters, however, provided no streets, utilities, or other public improvements, so that no sound development could take place. Hundreds of lots were sold, and the promoters pocketed their profits and disappeared, and the land lay relatively untouched.

As the years went by, occasionally an owner or squatter would build a shack, drill a well for water, and settle down in the sagebrush and sand. During the depression of the 1930's there was a new flurry of land activity—a thousand lots were offered for sale for a total of $1,000, or $1 per lot. At one time a San Francisco newspaper offered a free lot in Seaside with every subscription to the paper. Thus Seaside, in the early 1940's, was a scattered collection of shacks on virtually worthless land.

Suddenly, in the early 1940's, what had been worthless land began to have value. Fort Ord, which adjoins Seaside, was established as a major World War II training center. Thousands of soldiers and civilian workers descended on the area. Construction activity boomed in Seaside. Most of the structures were jerry-built and located with no regard for planning considerations. Without adequate building codes and ordinances, much of the already blighted Seaside area spread out as a frowsy and unkempt town, vigorous but ugly. With the end of the War, Fort Ord was made a permanent facility. In 1950, Seaside was an unincorporated community of 10,000 people, requiring all sorts of basic community needs such as streets, water, sewers, and fire and police protection. But its growth continued—by 1954, it had become a young adult and was incorporated. A special Census in 1956 showed its population to be 15,381. The residents of the new city rolled up their sleeves and began in a noisy, boisterous fashion to tackle their civic problems. Building codes and ordinances were adopted; a General Plan was developed; and the city began to change its image. While it had been unlovely at birth, it showed great promise for the future.

A NEW CITY'S PROBLEMS

Seaside was the site of many of the less desirable industrial, commercial, and service activities for the Peninsula. Its commercial center was dominated by automobile graveyards, repair shops, junk yards, laundries, and fringe commercial establishments. It was the orphan child of the affluent Monterey Peninsula. It contained the cheap hotels, bars, and other facilities customarily found near military installations. Of its 5,800 housing units, one-fourth were dilapidated or deteriorating. Among its other problems were:

An extremely high unemployment and underemployment rate.

An urgent need for public facilities.

An exceptionally high and growing percentage of the low-income and ethnic minority residents of the Peninsula.

A very high rate of transients.

A low tax base and lack of employment opportunities because of the type of business activity that predominated.

The almost complete lack of public and private medical, health, and social welfare facilities.

Inadequate school and juvenile services.

A community self-consciousness about the long-standing negative image of Seaside as a place to live and do business.

This was the situation when the new city came into being. It was obvious that only a massive redevelopment program could solve Seaside's problems. In 1957, the City Council established the Redevelopment Agency and approved the Noche Buena area as the first urban renewal project. Federal approval for Noche Buena was given in April, 1958. This was the first step in the city's upgrading efforts.

Since that time, Seaside has been busily engaged in remaking itself and preparing for its future, using a variety of Federal assistance programs in the process. One-third of the city's area is undergoing renewal. It is becoming a community of new neighborhoods, paved streets, streets with landscaped median strips, buried utility lines, adequate sewers, storm drains, parks, and play areas. Effective planning and the enactment and enforcement of building codes and zoning ordinances have replaced the unplanned, haphazard development that characterized the city's past.

SEASIDE'S UPGRADING PROGRAM

Urban Renewal. Four projects, totaling 532 acres. Federal grant reservation, $13.3 million. In addition to the usual project activity, Seaside has the only Section 102(b) loan ever approved by HUD. The loan, for $906,000, provides for flood control drainage, storm drain, sewer, and sewage disposal facilities, both inside and outside project areas. The 10-year loan will be repaid under the terms of California's Tax Increment legislation—whereby increased tax collections will be applied to amortization.

Model Cities. An application has been filed for a $125,000 grant for planning a Model Cities neighborhood.

Urban Planning Assistance Grant. Shared with 11 other localities.

Urban Beautification Grants. Two projects for $22,000.

Sewer and Water Facilities Grant. $100,000.

Section 115 Rehabilitation Grants. Number of grants: 32; amount $35,725.

Section 312 Rehabilitation Loans. Number: 53; total 68, 413.

Low-Rent Public Housing. Application filed with Monterey County Housing Authority for 300 units of rental housing.

RENEWAL PROJECTS

Noche Buena. A 66-acre area that reflected the haphazard development of the city. The 340 buildings in the area were mostly substandard. Almost 100 of these were beyond hope and had to be demolished. The others have been rehabilitated to meet project standards. Street and lot lines were altered and 20 of the buildings moved. Five neighborhood parks were provided, equipped with benches, recreational and play equipment. Trees were planted; curbs, gutters, and sidewalks were installed along newly paved streets. Ninety-eight residential lots were sold for redevelopment. Average price of the new houses built was $13,000.

Del Monte Heights. 240 acres, primarily open space. Residential structures were generally in more blighted condition than any other part of the city. Of the structures in the area, 237 have been cleared; 259 buildings are scheduled for rehabilitation; 182 have been completed. On the cleared land, three new schools, 180 units of FHA (221(d)(3)) moderate-income housing, and 80 units of senior citizens housing are to be built. A number of new houses in the $20,000 to $25,000 price class are already completed. 316 lots have been sold; 254 more are available. The Del Monte area suffered from an unreliable water supply and distribution system. The LPA solved this in an unusual way. Utilizing Title I funds, the Agency built its own water system at a cost of $514,150 and turned the facilities over to the City. The City operates the system which may, at a future date, be extended to serve areas of the city outside the project boundaries.

Hannon. 153 acres. Predominantly rehabilitation. Of 689 structures to be rehabilitated, 133 are under way, 43 have been completed and demolition started on the first increment of 150 structures. Reuse is scheduled to be mostly residential with some neighborhood commercial.

Gateway. 73 acres. A blighted central business district area. Primary reuse will be for an automotive center for the Monterey Peninsula. Eight franchised auto dealers have already purchased land for sales and services facilities. Negotiations are under way for the remaining two sites.

Renewal benefits: 77 percent of building permits issued in 1967 have been for construction in urban renewal project areas. Of the 319 families thus far relocated, 95.4 percent have moved to standard housing, one-third in sales housing.

Rehabilitation. Seaside's rehabilitation effort involves over 1,200 housing units, more than 20 percent of the city's total. This ambitious program has been very successful. On October 31, 1967, 742 of the units were undergoing rehabilitation; 496 had been completed. Value of completed rehabilitation was $689,767.50: Noche Buena: 241 at average of $1,000 each, Del Monte Heights: 179 at average of $1,063.50 each, Hannon: 76 at average of $3,400 each.

The LPA has provided property owners with comprehensive assistance in determining deficiencies to meet project standards and in financing the work. When necessary, financing help, including assistance in obtaining Section 115 grants and Section 312 loans, has been provided to homeowners. A *Design Review Handbook* was prepared by the Agency Design Review Board and issued to property owners and contractors. The Handbook covers criteria for design, site development, exterior design, color and finishes and landscaping. Major emphasis has been placed on design objectives. Not only the visual quality of the rehabilitated house, but its proper placement on the lot, and the blending of the house into the total fabric of the community, have been stressed.

MEETING LOW-COST HOUSING NEEDS

Relocation housing within the financial means of displaced senior citizens is a major problem in Seaside. The staff of the Redevelopment Agency began studying experiment low-cost housing projects two years ago with the idea of using a number of small lots scattered throughout the projects. The objective was to create a well-designed and constructed small home suitable for senior citizens.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development was conducting similar experiments in the field of low-cost housing for migrant field workers. With some assistance from the Department staff, a two-bedroom, single-family dwelling house was developed, containing 800 square feet of floor space, a single car carport, and low maintenance landscaping, for $9,500, complete.

The Agency's relocation staff cooperates with the contractor in numerous ways to cut the normal costs—eliminating sales commissions, absorbing some of the title costs, and working out financing arrangements with potential purchasers in advance of construction. In this way, each house in essence is almost a "custom" home.

In addition to the $9,500 home, the Redevelopment Agency has made application to HUD for a Sec. 207 grant to construct prototype models of a similar house using advanced techniques of construction which might reduce the cost of the house by at least $1,000. This concept utilizes a series of modular components.

The Agency is also developing new approaches to lease-purchase buying techniques, which may permit other low-income families who have not been acceptable purchasers because of poor credit ratings to acquire decent, safe, and sanitary homes.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, the Senate passed the Legislative Reorganization Act (S. 355). Since that time, the House Committee on Rules has taken protective custody of the act and has firmly refused to permit its consideration by the House.

In the meantime, the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform has been laboring to get this act out of committee and onto the floor for open debate.

Of the many contributions the task force has made toward congressional reform, the most recent is a detailed, scholarly comparison of the provisions of the principal reorganization bills.

For the consideration of my colleagues, I am inserting into the Record a portion of this comparative examination, dealing with budgetary and fiscal information gathering for the Congress. Specifically, this is a digest of title II, parts 1 and 2, sections 202–208 and 221, of S. 355 and the related provisions of the other reform proposals.

One of the great problems facing the Congress is its appalling inability to obtain sound, current information—essential for accurate and productive decisions. For example, from the several difficulties encountered in seeking supporting data relevant to budget estimates on the war in Vietnam, I have rapidly come to realize the importance of an independent and modern information source for the legislative branch. The information gathering and processing facilities of the Congress are shamefully antiquated, and have to be updated if the House and Senate are to be effective in the years to come.

The comparison follows:

TITLE II—FISCAL CONTROLS

PARTS 1 AND 2—BUDGETARY AND FISCAL INFORMATION AND DATA

Section 202. Data processing system

S. 355. Directs Comptroller General, Secretary of the Treasury, and Director of Bureau of the Budget to develop, establish, and maintain *a standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data* which will be used by all Federal agencies.

Bolling. Deletes Comptroller General from above; adds "as far as practicable": to the establishment of an ADP system.

Reid. Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3. Provides that "The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, *in cooperation with* the Comptroller General . . . shall develop, etc."

Note.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 27: "1. In cooperation with the executive branch, an effort shall be started toward the design of a Government-wide budgetary data system."

Section 203. Budget standard classifications

S. 355. Directs the Comptroller General, Secretary of the Treasury, and Director of BOB to develop, establish, and maintain *standards classifications of programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures of Federal agencies.* Initial classifications are to be established on or before Dec. 31, 1969. The CG, Sec'y, and Director are to perform their functions per above as part of a joint program and are to report to Congress on or before Sept. 1 each year.

Bolling. Authorizes Comptroller General to *assist* Sec'y and Director should they so request. Deletes time requirement for initial classifications to be established. Report shall be submitted by June 30 each year.

Reid. Same as Bolling except that report shall be submitted by June 1.

Print No. 3. Provides for Sec'y and Director to work in *cooperation with* Comptroller General. Deletes time limit on establishing initial classifications. Deletes provision that CG, Sec'y, and Director shall perform their functions as part of the joint program established by Accounting & Auditing Act of 1950.

Note.—Section 203 not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 27: "2. In order to facilitate the utilization by Congress of automatic data processing capabilities and modern program evaluation techniques, the General Accounting Office shall develop systems design and cost-benefit analysis capabilities necessary to meet adequately the needs of the Congress. To facilitate performance of this responsibility, the GAO shall arrange to provide the functions described below: (a) Participate in the establishment of a standard classification code of activities and expenditures by Federal departments and agencies. This effort should be a joint undertaking of the Comptroller General in his participation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury under the joint financial management improvement program."

Section 204. Distribution of program and fiscal data

S. 355. Directs the Comptroller General to provide information to Congress on the location and nature of data available in the various Federal agencies with respect to programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures, upon request of any Member or committee or joint committee.

Bolling. Requires that the Secretary of the Treasury and BOB Director provide this information, upon request of any committee or joint committee. Section 221 of S. 355, dealing with supplemental budget information, is deleted from the Bolling bill. Instead, he has a subsection in Sec. 204 requiring the Sec'y and Director, upon request of any committee or joint committee, to "furnish to the Congress on June 1 of each year, beginning with 1968, a supplemental summary of the budget submitted in January of such year for the ensuing fiscal year when there has occurred substantial alterations in estimates of expenditures and receipts, or substantial obligations imposed upon each budget after submission in January."

Reid. Bolling language *except* for supplemental budget info, which is treated in Sec. 221.

Print No. 3. Bolling language, except info is to be provided by Comptroller General.

Note.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report pages 27–28: "2 . . . the GAO shall arrange to . . . (b) Provide information as to the location and nature of fiscal data available in the various agencies and departments. Such information shall be available on request to any committee or individual Member. Summary tables of the data shall also be prepared as requested." All four bills provides for summary tables "to the extent feasible."

Section 205. GAO assistance for cost effectiveness studies

S. 355. Directs the Comptroller General to have available in GAO employees who are expert in analyzing and conducting cost effectiveness studies of Government programs. Upon request of any committee or joint committee, the CG is to assign such experts on a temporary basis to assist that committee and its staff in conducting cost effectiveness studies of programs under its jurisdiction.

Bolling. Same as S. 355, with inclusion of the phrase: "excepting nondomestic intelligence activities."

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

Note.—Section not amended by Senate, See Final Report pages 27–28: "2 . . . the GAO shall arrange to . . . (c) Provide expert assistance to Congress in the analysis of cost-effectiveness studies prepared by agencies and departments under the planning-programing-budgeting concept. These experts shall be on call by the Appropriations Committees and the other committees of Congress to assist them in analyzing cost-effectiveness studies or to assist in making independent cost-effectiveness studies on program under their jurisdictions."

Section 206. Updating the budget

S. 355. Directs the Comptroller General to collect information and data available in the various Federal agencies with respect to changes in the figures shown in the budget as submitted by the President; to furnish to each Member and committee of both houses, from time to time, reports showing revised budget information and totals reflecting the information and data which he has collected, and, to the extent feasible, upon request of Members or committees, tabulations of such budget information.

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Provides that Comptroller General, upon request of a committee or joint committee of either house (*not* individual member), shall, to the extent feasible, furnish *tabulations* of such data, except data on increases and decreases in expenditures or estimated expenditures by reason of enactment of laws other than appropriations acts.

NOTE. Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report pages 27–29: "2 . . . the GAO shall arrange to . . . (d) Prepare tabulations of individual budget data as may be requested by any committee or individual Member of Congress, and update budget information, including changes in budget totals because of appropriations action, new legislation, changes in revenue estimates, and the like."

Sections 207, 208. General Accounting Office: personnel, etc.

S. 355. Authorizes Comptroller General to establish within GAO such offices and divisions and hire such experts as may be necessary to carry out functions and duties imposed on him by reorganization bill, with annual report to Congress. Sec. 208 defines "Federal agency."

Bolling. Under S. 355, not more than *15* experts may be hired at any one time, at rates not to exceed *$200* a day, and no expert may be employed for more than 120 days in any calendar year. Bolling restricts number to 8 and rate to $100 per day; no limit on number of days for which an expert may be hired in any year. (Sec. 206 of Bolling bill.)

Reid. Same as Bolling. (Sec. 206 of Reid.)

Print No. 3. Essentially S. 355 language. New Sec. 208 of Print No. 3 provides that "Nothing contained in this Part (Sections 202–209) shall be construed as impairing any authority or responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General of the U.S. under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, as amended, or any other Acts."

NOTE.—Sections not amended by Senate. Authority for these provisions implied in Final Report recommendations and supporting language pages 27–29.

Section 221. Supplemental budget information

S. 355. Directs the President to transmit to Congress on or before June 1 each year, beginning with 1968, a *supplemental summary of the budget submitted in January*. This summary is to reflect all changes relating to the fiscal year for which the budget was transmitted which have occurred since the transmittal of the budget in January.

Beginning with FY 1970, the President is also to transmit to the Congress on or before June 1 each year (1) summaries of estimated expenditures for the four fiscal years following the fiscal year for which the budget was transmitted in January which will be required under continuing programs which have a legal commitment for future years or are considered mandatory under existing law, and (2) summaries of estimated expenditures in future fiscal years of balances carried over from the fiscal year for which the budget was transmitted in January.

Subsection d requires that the budget submitted in January shall include information showing the gross amount of expenditures and estimated expenditures of all programs of the Government.

Bolling. See section 204.

Reid. Same as S. 355 except that in place of the 4-year summaries and carry-over balances (see second paragraph under S. 355 above), Reid requires supplemental summary to include "a comparison of the amount of revenue received through personal and corporate income taxes with the estimates made of such revenues."

Print No. 3. The President's supplemental Budget summary for the upcoming fiscal year is to be delivered *not later than* June 1, to include any recommendations he may care to make, and to include up-to-date data on the current fiscal year. Deletes requirement of summary of estimated expenditures for next four fiscal years, and strikes requirement that the Budget shall include gross amount of expenditures and estimated expenditures of all Government programs.

Adds language requiring "as to each proposal for new legislation in the budget involving creation or expansion of any function, activity, or authority, and to be in addition to those functions, activities, and authorities then existing, a tabulation showing the amount proposed in the Budget for appropriations and for expenditure for the ensuing fiscal year and the estimated appropriation required on account of such proposal in each of the following four fiscal years during which such proposal is to be in effect."

NOTE.—Section 221 not amended by the Senate. See Final Report pages 29–30: *"3. The budget document shall include the following information:*

(a) Multiple-year financial projections on proposed or existing legislation which are ongoing programs with commitments for future years and programs considered mandatory under existing law.

(b) The description of carryover balances shall indicate the anticipated expenditures by year for future years to the extent practical.

(c) On June 1 of each year, budget summaries shall be updated to reflect changes which have taken place since the presentation of the budget, revisions in revenue and expenditures estimates, effect of congressional action in new legislation and appropriations, and projections for new expenditures which were not included in the budget document.

(d) The budget document shall continue to contain emphasis on program or functional classification with adequate indexing and cross-referencing for use by the Appropriations Committees in studying the budget on an agency basis.

(e) In the comprehensive cash budget, all programs shall be reflected on a gross rather than a net basis.

(f) All financial assumptions as to expenditures and receipts shall be stated."

FEUD BETWEEN AMATEUR ATHLETIC FEDERATIONS

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the end to the perpetual feud between the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Amateur Athletic Union is not yet in sight. While these rival sports federations wrangle, the amateur athletes caught in between suffer.

The patience of the American people and the Congress is wearing thin as this interminable dispute wears on.

On February 1, 1968, the Sports Arbitration Board, established 27 months ago, to arbitrate the dispute, rendered its decision. Although the parties involved were required to respond to the rulings by February 10, 1968, it is not clear whether the feuding sports groups will comply with the Board's findings. The lack of immediate, positive reaction by these organizations is consistent with the negative spirit displayed throughout the arbitration. The Board's report noted that "none of the parties were willing to subordinate self-interest to the general good to the extent necessary to compromise the issues."

If this battling does not soon cease, the Congress may have to act to protect young men and women from arbitrary interference by sanctioning bodies.

In anticipation of this need, I am today introducing a "bill of rights" for amateur athletes. My bill would prohibit the disqualification of any amateur athlete from competition on the grounds that such athlete engaged in previous competition conducted by a rival organization.

The bill would also prohibit sports associations from imposing unreasonable restraints on an athlete's freedom to enter sporting events.

Athletes whose rights under this legislation are infringed upon may seek injunction relief in Federal district court. Willful violation of an injunction or order would constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to $1,000, or imprisonment for a maximum of 6 months, or both.

The NCAA–AAU power struggle is for authority to certify world records, and to administer open track and field events. Again, I quote from the Board's findings:

> The central issue, however, is one of "jurisdiction" and "sanctioning." The basic contest is one for power, and "jurisdiction" and "sanctioning" are the boundaries and tools of power. Each side claims with evident sincerity that it would use the power more wisely than the other, but the protestations cannot be allowed to obscure the essential character of the contest. It is—we repeat—a struggle for power in which the athletes are being used by both sides as pawns so long as the contest continues.

The basic jurisdiction of the NCAA in track and field encompasses college and university meets in which member schools and athletes representing member schools compete. The AAU includes amateur athletic clubs and individuals throughout the United States, and conducts track and field meets. The AAU has additional jurisdiction as it is the U.S. representative to the International Amateur Athletic Federation.

The NCAA maintains that the AAU should not administer all track and field meets, and insists that it participate in the control and administration of open track and field meets. The NCAA claims that it is responsible for the welfare of its student athletes. The AAU rejects this, asserting that international rules prohibit meet approval by any organization other than itself.

Both the NCAA and AAU have invoked penalties against their members during repeated clashes over sanctioning meets.

The Sports Arbitration Board six-point program must be agreed upon by the AAU, the NCAA, the USTFF, and the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics—an AAU ally. The presidents of these groups have been instructed to declare whether they accept the findings and whether they would recommend unconditional acceptance by their organization's governing bodies.

The Arbitration Board decided that the AAU is the sole sanctioning and governing authority for international competition. Because of this status, the AAU was recognized as having ultimate responsibility for the international aspects of domestic competition. Thus, open domestic meets would require an AAU sanction under "carefully limited and confined conditions."

The Board stated that NCAA's approval of aspects of an open meet which are directly relevant to the educational welfare of undergraduate students may be required for the participation of undergraduate students enrolled at member institutions.

A coordinating committee was established by the Board, with equal numbers of AAU–NAIA and NCAA–USTFF members, and an impartial permanent chairman. This committee would have the power to render a final and binding decision in disputes over the interpretation, application, or alleged violation of the Board's rules.

The issuance of the Board's decision apparently has not finally ended the bickering and the threats. It is not my purpose now to comment on the substance of the Board's findings. But enough time has elapsed for these sports federations to work out their jurisdictional rivalries.

Although all of the organizations involved have submitted replies by the deadline date, several have requested additional clarification of technical points. Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Commerce Committee which conducted hearings on the dispute, was portrayed in the press yesterday as believing that the responses suggest a clear disposition on the part of the disputants to accept the decision of the Board.

For the sake of our young athletes, I hope that the Arbitration Board's report brings peace. But if the decision does not stop this warring, I urge action by the Congress to protect our amateur athletes.

SILVER QUILL AWARD GIVEN TO SECRETARY GARDNER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, February 8, Secretary John W. Gardner, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered a very significant address as he received the Silver Quill Award at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

I say "significant" because Secretary Gardner has set out for leaders in business and government what they will have to face up to if we are to solve the many problems of our times.

The key to the solution, Mr. Speaker, is cooperation. The message that runs through the Secretary's speech is that we must all learn to work with one another to keep this Nation bound together.

The speech is typical of this great public servant, Secretary Gardner, who is leaving us. He is a man of positive vision. He can see the job ahead and he can define the solutions.

His message is one that all of us should heed.

The speech follows in full:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

These are difficult times, and those who care about the well-being of this land are more than ever concerned to serve it well. We want to strengthen the Nation and preserve its vitality. We want to expand its tradition of freedom. We want it to stand for the best. We want it to be true to itself.

But the problems of the Nation are complex, and—at least at the level of leadership—it can only be served well by those who are willing to understand and cope with complexity. I'm going to talk tonight about some aspects of that complexity.

In the course of my career I've been involved in the foundation world, the business world, the universities, the military services and government. And somewhere along the way I developed a strong interest in how the various pieces of this society fit together.

Many people now see that relations between the Federal Government and other elements in the society are in swift transition, and they see that the American people had better understand that transition if we want to shape it to their purposes.

The difficulties facing this society today are of the utmost gravity. They may get much worse before they get better. I do not believe that as a nation we have acknowledged the seriousness of our situation. We must bring to bear on those problems the best minds and energies that this Nation can offer.

We must find better means of appraising our problems as they emerge, better means of devising and testing social solutions, and above all, better ways of mobilizing the abundant talents, resources and institutional strengths of this society. Without such mobilized effort we stand little chance of gaining command of the problems that threaten to overwhelm us.

But as this audience knows so well, we have a system characterized by the dispersion of power and initiative, and we like that attribute of the system. So we must develop means of mobilizing talent and resources that will move us toward our goals and at the same time will disperse power and initiative. Stated in simpler terms this means:

We must find far more effective ways of relating the Federal Government to State and local governments.

We must find new and better ways of involving private enterprise in the pursuit of social goals.

We must ask the universities to become even more deeply involved in carrying out public functions.

We must utilize increasingly a wide variety of nonprofit agencies in getting public work done.

And we must make certain that the relations between the Federal Government and all these other elements—State, local or private sector—are such as to preserve the integrity and vitality of the non-Federal partner.

President Johnson has urged and encouraged the creation of just such mutually respecting partnerships.

When I came to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I initiated a thorough review of relations between the Department and the States. After a year of study I met with the governors and told them there were many specific and concrete measures that the Department could and would take to provide them with greater initiative and flexibility. This has since resulted in organizational changes in the Department, in legislative innovations, and in a revolutionary improvement in communications between the governors and the Department.

Let me give you one example, from the field of health. We had developed—over the years—fifteen separate grant programs through which the Federal Government made money available to the States for specified purposes, after the State had met prescribed conditions. Last year we merged those fifteen programs into one. Now each governor is asked only to assure us that he has adequate machinery for assessing what his State's needs are and then he is free to use his Federal aid for what he and his senior health officials deem important. There's a lot more to be done in redesigning our relations with the States, but we're taking the first steps.

The Department has taken comparable steps to review its relations with the universities. I have set up a committee of college and university presidents to provide a continuous channel of communication. And we're already taking some practical, down-to-earth steps to remove sources of irritation from that relationship.

Finally, let me turn to the relationship between the Federal Government and private business. I know that many of the organizations represented here tonight have shown a deep and constructive interest in improvement of that relationship.

Business serves the nation well and the Federal Government well when it preserves its own vitality and forward movement. It is not only this country's chief source of economic growth and vitality, but the principal source of opportunity for the individual.

From the earliest days of this Republic, businessmen have seen in their government not only a keeper of the peace, an enforcer of contracts, a collector of taxes and a regulator of ways of doing business but also a provider of subsidies (sometimes in cash, sometimes in credit or in tax concession).

More recently, government has been given heavy responsibilities in the effort to promote economic growth, to maintain economic stability and to foster full employment. And in the years since World War II the government contract has come to play an increasingly important role in accomplishing a broad range of national purposes.

Even in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which does not deal primarily with the business world, there are innumerable examples of the relationship. Aerojet General has developed a computerized patient manikin which promises to revolutionize the teaching of anesthesiology. McDonnell-Douglas Corporation is working on a power source for the artificial heart. United Aircraft is working on radar devices to aid the blind.

Less conventional and less well known is the Department's relationship to Blue Cross and to commercial insurance carriers in administering Medicare. In the Medicare program, health care is purchased from private, State or local hospitals, and claims are handled and payments made by Blue Cross or commercial carriers—all without a Federal employee having a hand in it.

The Food and Drug Administration, one of the constituent agencies of HEW, is collaborating with General Foods on an interesting experiment in self regulation of food processing. General Foods and FDA have agreed upon standards, and General Foods is reporting periodically on the evaluation of its own operations, with a view to eventual reduction in government inspection.

These examples—involving the universities and State and local governments as well as business—demonstrate that as a nation we are developing new ways to relate the Federal Government to each of the nongovernmental elements.

If those relationships are to develop in such a way as to maximize this society's creative abilities while preserving our system of dispersed power and initiative it will be because we planned it that way. And by "we," I mean all who are involved—those in the private sector, and those in government.

As leaders in the private sector address themselves to the future of the relationship, what should they be thinking about? Let me give you what I think of as a strategy for the private sector—and I refer not just to the business world but to all the nongovernmental sector—the universities, foundations, professions, and so on.

First, face up to the largest and toughest problems of the society. No factor has been more conclusive in the emergence of big government than the failure of the private sector to look squarely at the real problems of the community and the nation. Even today there are many in the universities and in the business world who somehow imagine that their special worlds can flourish while the society decays. It cannot be. Our society is wholly interdependent today, and decay in one part endangers all.

Today each of the varied segments of the private sector appraises its own special problems, but none examines the larger issues facing the nation. As a result, those larger problems end up in the lap of government. And that makes little sense when one considers the extraordinary resources of talent and expertise available in the private sector. Individuals and institutions in the private sector are perfectly capable of appraising the major problems facing the society and of developing policy alternatives.

What should our future system of health care look like? How should it be organized and how financed? What should our higher educational system be like 20 years from now, and how do we get from here to there? What steps will have to be taken over the next two decades to control environmental pollution? How can we save our cities? The way in which these questions are answered will deeply affect the private sector.

Second, understand the processes of government. The day is past when leaders in the private sector, whether they are corporation or university presidents or something else, can delegate to their Washington representatives the problem of understanding the Federal Government. The leaders in the private sector should be deeply and personally concerned about how the society is governed. Many should take their turn at governing. They should know how government functions.

I'm not talking about the shallow arts of influence—what official or what Member of Congress to see to get what results. I'm talking about a real comprehension of how the system works.

Third, re-examine the relationship between the Federal Government and each non-Federal element. What are the principles that should characterize the Federal Government's relationships with State and local government, with business, with the universities? How can relationships be designed so that the non-Federal partner is not weakened and subordinated? These are questions that should be asked insistently and *they can be answered*. But they cannot be answered with rhetoric or generalities. It is necessary to get down to the specific principles governing the relationship—and those principles must be embedded in legislation, in regulations, and in tradition.

New forms of collaboration need to be devised even as existing relationships are reexamined. In the case of business, for example, we must seek ways of adopting established tools—the credit subsidy, the tax concession, the contract and the grant—to provide the inducement (in business terms, the market) that will bring the creative force of business to bear on social goals.

And in thinking about the Federal Government's relations with non-Federal elements, I urge that everyone give thought to the future of State and local government. Our system of dispersed power and initiative is anchored in two sets of relationships: the government-private sector relationship and the Federal-State-local relationship. Anyone who cares to preserve the system had better care about the latter as well as the former.

Fourth, strengthen existing institutions in the private sector and design new ones where needed. In the intricately organized society of the future, inefficient institutions will be squeezed out. To mention those that I see at close range, some of our private hospitals, private charity institutions and private schools are among the most inefficient institutions in the nation. They should be subjected to continuous re-examination and renewal. They are too important to our future to be neglected. (I don't need to add that government agencies need equally rigorous scrutiny.)

Let me conclude with a word about the way in which leadership is organized in this nation. It is characteristic of our system that a great deal of the significant leadership in our society lies outside of government. But today that non-governmental leadership is rarely an effective voice in the larger issues facing our society. That can and must be remedied. We need, outside of government, an effective body of leaders, local as well as national, who are committed to preserve the vitality and stability of the community despite the ups and downs of partisan conflict.

The need for such a layer is dramatically evident in our major cities where City Hall is virtually helpless without the strong assistance of local leadership by industry, labor and minority groups.

Our society has become so complex, change so swift, and the social forces impinging on us so tumultuous that it's pretty close to being more than we can manage. If we are to retain any command at all over our own future, the ablest people we have in every field must give thought to the largest problems of the nation.

The whole point of my remarks tonight is that they don't have to be in government to do so. But they do have to come out of the trenches of their own specialty and look at the whole battlefield.

One final comment. Even the ablest and most willing leadership will not be effective unless we can halt the deep cleavages that are appearing in our society.

Anyone who has listened to the messages from the ghetto, and the words uttered in paneled offices and country clubs knows that there are destructive and divisive sentiments in circulation that could tear this Nation apart.

The place to combat those sentiments is where they start—in our own minds and in the conversations of our friends and colleagues. And leaders in every segment of our national life have further responsibilities: To strive to diminish tensions in their own communities, to act constructively under stress, to bind the Nation together.

Every time we salute the flag we pledge allegiance to "one Nation indivisible". And one Nation indivisible it must remain.

THE MARDI GRAS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to advise my colleagues that this is a very happy period of the year for those of us who come from Louisiana. It is the time when we celebrate our annual Mardi Gras festivities—here in the Nation's Capital.

I happen to have the pleasant duty this year of being chairman of the activities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of the House that the theme of our Mardi Gras Ball, which has become a very significant event in the Nation's Capital during the past several years, will be the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of New Orleans, that great city which I have the honor and responsibility of representing here in the Halls of the Congress.

It is, of course, one of the oldest and one of the most historic areas in our great country.

We shall feature at our ball on Saturday evening next the nine flags which have flown over that city.

Mr. Speaker, the lovely daughter of our Governor, Miss Rebecca McKeithen, will be our queen and Mr. Zac Carter, one of the leading shipbuilders in the United States, will be our king.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Of course I am glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in the remarks which are made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] in advising us in the manner that he has of the coming event to be celebrated. However, I feel that all the Members of the House will be interested in knowing that this is the birthday anniversary of our dear friend from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. And, I know that I speak the sentiments of all Members of the House in extending to the gentleman from Louisiana our highest congratulations and the hope that he will enjoy many, many more future anniversaries.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for reminding me that this is indeed the birthday of the gentleman from Louisiana and I wish to join the distinguished Speaker in congratulating the gentleman. The gentleman looks younger every February 15.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished majority leader, and all the Members of the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENT'S ANTICRIME MESSAGE SUPPLIES HARD ANSWERS

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's anticrime message supplies the hard answers to America's soaring crime rate.

The cost of crime to our Nation—and to our way of life—is incalculable. It is seen in the killed and injured, in the tremendous loss of property, in the fear instilled in our honest citizens, and in the depravity of those who choose its path.

President Johnson's anticrime message embarks this country on a new beginning—a real effort to eradicate crime from our midst. At stake is nothing less than the public security. We will not have a better America until we secure a safer America.

The President's proposals will afford a mosaic of protection for Americans in their homes, on their streets, and in their shops.

He has tailored strong penalties to curb drug abuse and proposed new legislation to improve alcoholic rehabilitation. The President also launched an all-out attack on organized crime—through an expanded strike force program, improved gambling laws, and more efficient means of prosecution.

He has boldly met—with new answers—the growing problems of automobile thefts, urban riots, and bank robberies. And he has taken urgent steps to strengthen local law enforcement agencies—for this is where crime prevention must begin.

The President has put his dream of a safe and secure America into a blueprint for action. That dream can become a reality if we in Congress answer the Nation's call to action.

A MESSAGE FROM VIETNAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include one of the finest and most expressive, and one of the most patriotic messages I have ever read, written by Sp4c. Robert J. Burns, of the 173d Airborne Brigade, to his mother, Mrs. Robert J. Burns, of 47 Bowdoin Street, Dorchester, Mass.; a poem which reflects the thoughts and feelings of those in our armed services serving in South Vietnam, and which appeared in the Dorchester Argus-Citizen of February 8, 1968:

A MESSAGE FROM VIETNAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following poem was sent to the Argus-Citizen by Mrs. Robert J. Burns of 47 Bowdoin Street, Dorchester. She said she had received it from her son, Sp4c. Robert J. Burns, Jr., who is in Vietnam, and was sure it reflects the thoughts and feelings of all the boys in the 173rd Airborne Brigade, in which outfit her son is serving. Sp4c. Burns graduated from Dorchester High School in June, 1966, and enlisted the following August. He is 19 years old.)

THE HILL

The order was out
It must be taken
This hill, so bare, so forsaken.
They all knew the cost would be high
But all knew they must do or die.
They all lived by the airborne code
"Death before dishonor",
This hill that claimed Smith, Brown, and
O'Connor.

The wind was dry
The sun was hot
And every man had the thought of
Liberty, and for freedom, too.
That this land might be free
Like the land he knew.

Yes, they won the hill that day
Why they did isn't hard to say.
For the price of freedom is very high
For you know when you see another cry.
Yes, many a man would now be alive
But they had to take—"Hill 875".

—Sp4c. ROBERT J. BURNS.

THE MORAL SICKNESS WHICH PERVADES THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if any Member of the Congress or the public still has doubts that something is rotten in the Agency for International Development, the events of the last few days should lay them to rest once and for all.

The moral sickness that pervades this Agency apparently runs from top to bottom and in less than 2 weeks we have all seen the evidence of it—the acceptance of kickbacks from foreign contractors and favors from party girls; the falsification of travel vouchers by the Agency's top security officer, John G. Bradley; providing an expensive training course for a retiring employee—and, I am sure, this is only the beginning.

Perhaps the most significant indication of the decay within AID is the frantic attempts to cover up these scandals and hide them from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial by the Scripps Howard Newspapers and two articles from the Washington Daily News that illustrate some of the shocking and intolerable goings-on in this branch of the State Department:

[Scripps Howard editorial]

SCANDAL AT AID

Our ministry of economic aid otherwise known as the Agency for International Development (AID) is not exactly leak-proof, as its long history of operations from Afghanistan to Zanzibar has shown.

But now, added to off-and-on fleecing by foreigners, there is a new "inside" scandal at AID, involving alleged kickbacks of $250,000 or more from a Belgian company contracted to repair U.S. surplus property in Europe.

So far there are no charges filed. But the handling of the affair by AID's top management and its parent State Department looks more like an attempt of bureaucrats to cover up an embarrassment than the work of public servants aiming to give us taxpayers a square accounting. Namely: Four AID employees have been allowed to resign since the start of the investigation of "certain irregularities" concerning the case. Not suspended and told to stick around to answer questions, but allowed to resign. (A fifth man, Herbert J. Waters, Hubert Humphrey's ex-aide who formerly headed AID's Office of Material Resources, also resigned but said that had no connection with the investigation.)

AID has been conducting its investigation in slow-motion and in ultra-secrecy. The probe began last August and was revealed Wednesday only because it came to the attention of Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware.

Several days ago AID Administrator William S. Gaud told Scripps-Howard correspondent Dan Thomasson, "You will get zero on this from me."

So much for AID's candor and the new Freedom of Information law.

Likewise, the Office of the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance attached to Secretary of State Dean Rusk's secretariat refused to answer questions.

"Anything you get will have to come from Gaud's office," said a spokesman, thus completing the ring-around-the-rosey.

President Johnson has said "self help" is a necessary part of our foreign aid programs. We thought he was speaking of foreign governments, not AID's hired hands. Mr. Gaud ought to show as much concern and urgency about the kickback allegations in his shop as he does when he pleads for his budget on Capitol Hill.

We'd feel better about him and his agency.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 14, 1968]

HIGH AID OFFICIAL PROBED—FALSE EXPENSE VOUCHERS

(By Dan Thomasson)

A highly placed Agency for International Development security official is being investigated in connection with falsified travel vouchers, Scripps-Howard Newspapers learned today.

Agency sources said charges have been filed against the official within the State Department.

It is the second scandal to rock the agency within the last week and the security official is the fifth top aid official to undergo investigation.

FORCED TO QUIT

Last week, it was disclosed that four top AID employes had been forced to resign recently because of alleged kickbacks from an Antwerp, Belgium, contractor in AID's surplus property repair operations.

AID sources said the investigation of the falsified travel vouchers is not connected with the kickback case, which has been turned over to District Attorney David G. Bress here by the Justice Department.

The sources said falsification of travel vouchers apparently has been going on for some time. They did not say how much money was involved.

H. Rex Lee, assistant administrator for AID, refused to discuss the case. He said strict Government rules prohibit talking about personnel.

MONEY PROBLEMS

Another official within the Department, however, said he believes the subject of the investigation has been "beset by money problems."

Scripps-Howard also learned today Belgian police authorities helped prepare a file on the four persons involved in the kickback case and the file included allegations of sexual misconduct.

AID Administrator William S. Gaud confirmed that Belgian police and judicial authorities have been involved in the case. He said they still are investigating.

Rep. John S. Monagan (D., Conn.), meanwhile, told Scripps-Howard a special government Operations Sub-committee he chairs intends to conduct its own investigation of the case.

"We're not going to let this rest, Rep. Monagan said.

The Monagan sub-committee visited the Antwerp plant last October and talked with several of the persons later involved in the kickback case. At that time, the sub-committee recommended several ways the contract with the Belgium firm could be tightened.

COVERUP CHARGES

AID officials for more than a week have said they couldn't comment on the case because it had been turned over to the Justice Department. Their reply to inquiries brought angry charges of "coverup" from some members of Congress.

But it was learned today that only one of the files in the case had been turned over to Justice until last Friday when the cases against the three other persons involved were hurriedly sent to Government attorneys.

Sources said Justice official consider the case "such a political hot potato" they have not yet decided exactly how to handle it. Involved in the decision would be whether to call a Federal grand jury into the investigation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 14, 1968]

AID AIDS YOU TO RETIRE

(By John Cramer)

I suggest that Agency for International Development, zealous I'm sure to save taxpayer funds, investigate an item which appeared in the January bulletin of Lodge 1534 (AID and State Department) of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Government Employes.

It read:

"It has come to our attention that the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kans., runs a series of seminars for executives who spend a week to take a clinical look inside themselves.

"May we suggest the course for some of our brightest State-AID candidates—like the one who recommended—successfully—a costly training course at Government expense for an employe who planned to retire within six weeks after finishing the course."

Lodge 1534 officers are reluctant to elaborate on their charge. But I've done a little checking, and if AID really wants to investigate—it was an AID case—here are some leads:

The individual assigned to the wasted training was a woman.

She retired within the past six months.

When the subject of the special training first came up, she was honest enough to point out that she planned to retire soon. Her superior, however, brushed that off with the suggestion that the training would help her after retirement.

The training course lasted approximately four weeks.

I'm sure AID can take it from there. If it wants to.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT ANNEX

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on 23d Street, in Washington, D.C., across the alley from the glittering marble edifice that houses the State Department, is a ramshackle, virtually abandoned structure of some seven stories known as the State Department Annex.

In that dirty, debris-strewn, rat-infested annex there has been established a Great Society "Siberia" in the form of a cubbyhole office for two longtime State Department personnel security officers, Harry M. Hite and Edwin A. Burkhardt.

Apparently their great crime against humanity is that when summoned to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, investigating the case of Otto Otepka, they testified under oath to what they were convinced was the truth.

Each day for some 16 months these two men have reported at their "Siberia," read the newspapers and looked at the dirty walls and windows of their cubbyholes. They asked for work and were refused. They are civil service employees with combined service of more than 40 years. They refused to resign and thus were made the victims of unconscionable State Department punishment.

The wasted pay of these Government employees, together with a secretary-stenographer, has probably totaled $60,000.

But the real issue here is the despicable effort to insidiously destroy these men because their honesty and decency did not conform to the politics of certain officials in the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this "Siberian treatment" has no place in America. The latest report is that these employees are to be moved and offered other assignments. Some of us in Congress will want to know the nature of these assignments and we want to know who in the State Department is responsible for the disgraceful action of the past 16 months.

SALUTE TO A BRAVE ALLY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I reported to the people of Oklahoma a series of conclusions regarding the military picture in Vietnam, based in large part upon my own observations during the period of January 18 to January 26 in three of the four major military zones lying between Danang in the north and Mytho in the south.

In that report to my constituents I commented at some length upon the tremendous buildup of our own military strength since my last Vietnam visit in the fall of 1965, and paid what I felt was a well-deserved tribute to the splendid morale and spirit which I found among our American fighting forces.

I have never been prouder of our country and our servicemen than I am today, after seeing at first hand and close range the courageous and resourceful conduct of our troops, airmen, and sailors who represent the United States in Vietnam.

There are no summer soldiers or sunshine patriots in the uniform of our country in Vietnam. I believe the strongest American supporters of our commitment to defeat Communist aggression and preserve the independence of South Vietnam will be found in the fighting forces who have spent at least 6 months in combat there—seeing at first hand the enemy we confront in Asia, and meeting on a day-to-day basis the brutal, ruthless, and treacherous tactics of that enemy.

The latest and most glaring example of these treacherous tactics, in which North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces broke a truce which they had loudly proclaimed, viciously attacking the civilian centers of population in South Vietnam, in the midst of traditional Tet celebrations, has not altered in any way my personal conviction that the Communists have become desperate for victory in the face of rising allied strength—and have resolved to "go for broke" in a far-reaching offensive in which both their reservoirs of goodwill among the people and of military manpower are recklessly squandered.

The overwhelming losses of men and equipment which the VC have suffered during the past 3 weeks—during which they have failed to establish firm control of a single population center or to generate general revolt in any province—are convincing proof to me of the military superiority which has been established in South Vietnam, and the lack of public support for the Red cause.

My principal purpose in these remarks, however, is not to draw military conclusions or testify as a military expert.

My total time in South Vietnam and its adjoining waters, in three visits since 1955, is less than 22 full days.

I hold no credentials as either a military authority or an expert on Asian affairs. Most of what I know has been learned through personal observation or questioning of Americans and South Vietnamese—both in and out of government—and both here and in Vietnam.

Like most of you who share my deep concern about this war and our involvement in it, I have also tried to read what the so-called experts have to say on the subject—including Professors Fall, Kahin, Lewis, and Schlesinger and the battery of editorial statesmen who write for the New York Times.

I make no claim to greater knowledge or understanding than anyone else who has made a reasonable effort to study and understand the conflict now raging in Vietnam.

The remarks which I make today have not been inspired, suggested, or edited by anyone, and the views expressed are my own.

I appreciate this opportunity, in the hall of this great legislative body, to state those views.

A WORD ABOUT OUR FRIENDS

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words today about a brave people who are engaged in a life and death struggle for freedom from Communist tyranny—the people of the Republic of Vietnam.

I believe it is time an American Congressman acknowledged both the bravery and sacrifices of that people, and paid a well-earned tribute to the men and women who are working in the government of that Republic—at hamlet, province, and national level.

There has been a great deal said in criticism of the Government of South Vietnam. Much of it has been deserved—and some of the strongest criticism of all has come from the leadership of that Government, acknowledging its faults and appealing for correction. In a few minutes I will refer to some of that self-criticism and to some of the constructive proposals for reform and progress now pending in the newly organized Congress of the Republic.

For the moment, however, I would like to make brief reference to several well-established, unquestioned facts about the role of the Republic of Vietnam and its armed forces in the war now being conducted.

There is nothing new or secret about any of these facts—and all of them can be confirmed readily by military authority in Washington.

Most Americans are acquainted with the fact that our forces in Vietnam, at the beginning of February, totaled approximately 500,000 men. Many also know that Republic of Vietnam forces, at about the same time, totaled approximately 730,000 men—well in excess of our own forces.

American newspapers naturally highlight the action of our forces, and cover the story of what our forces—our troops and our planes—are doing. Our own command naturally stresses this side of the news, when it briefs the press from all over the world, and it does so almost daily.

The heavy toll among our forces has also been reported many times, and many of us know that 17,296 Americans had been killed in action, by hostile forces, as of February 3, 1968. No one can deny that this is a tragic figure, and all Americans mourn the loss of these young servicemen.

But how many among us know, Mr. Speaker—how many Americans know—the number of soldiers, sailors, and airmen wearing the uniform of the Republic of Vietnam, who had been killed in action, by hostile forces, as of February 3, 1968—the same day for which I quoted the American total of 17,296?

The total for our Vietnamese allies, Mr. Speaker, as of that same day, was 54,875—more than three times the American total.

More than three times the total number of servicemen killed, Mr. Speaker, in a country less than one-twelfth the size of our own—that is the tragic, heroic story of the country with whom we are engaged in fighting for freedom in Vietnam today.

If we had suffered losses in the same ratio as that suffered by our principal ally in Vietnam, based on our population and the percentage of population lost in action, our losses would total nearly 800,000 men—more, by far, than American forces killed in any war in the history of our country.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Vietnamese casualty figure which I have just quoted is the figure for armed forces alone—killed by action of hostile forces—and does not include the many thousands of hamlet, village, province and government civilians, who have been ruthlessly killed in coldblooded assassinations by VC and North Vietnamese forces.

The other day many Americans were shocked to see a picture in our newspapers of an entire family, including the wife and six small children, of a Vietnamese Army officer shot down in cold blood in his home by VC soldiers.

The people of South Vietnam know this is no isolated incident, Mr. Speaker, but rather one repeated hundreds of times each month, from one end of South Vietnam to the other.

In the month of November 1967—well before the wholesale terror of 1968—more than 900 cases of assassination or abduction of hamlet, village, or province officials and their families were reported in South Vietnam—according to American Government sources in Saigon.

That is part of the heavy toll in lives being paid by our brave allies in South Vietnam—who continue to fight on and to pay a price many, many times our own in the battle for freedom.

What do you think the effect would be in our country, upon the morale and stability of our government personnel if more than 900 of our mayors, city councilmen, county officials, and chiefs of police were assassinated or kidnaped by guerrilla forces in a single month?

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the wheels of government do not move as smoothly and efficiently in South Vietnam as we would like to see them move?

Is it any wonder that some of the reforms the National Government would like to put into effect in the countryside have been delayed or not yet effected?

The real wonder, Mr. Speaker, is that government continues to function at all levels in South Vietnam; that brave men and women continue to volunteer for government services of all kinds; that roads and bridges continue to be repaired, schools and hospitals continue to be built, new agriculture programs continue to be inaugurated, and new ideas for improvement continue to be advanced.

DOLLARS AND PIASTRES

One more word needs to be said on the subject of relative effort in the Vietnam war.

We hear a great deal about the heavy cost of this war to the American taxpayer, and all of us know that more than $2 billion a month of our tax money is going to pay the cost of our military effort there.

This is an enormous figure, representing nearly 14 percent of our total Federal budget—and all of us know what this tremendous outlay has cost the American people in deferment of urgently needed domestic programs, and mounting inflationary pressures.

Let us consider for just one moment, however, the comparative figures for the Republic of Vietnam.

In the budget just submitted to the Congress .of that Republic, President Thieu has called for war appropriations which total 66 percent of that nation's total Federal budget.

While it is true that the American contribution to the war, in dollar figures, far exceeds the contribution of the South Vietnamese—it is equally true that our gallant ally is devoting a far greater percentage of his national expenditures—more than four times as great, in fact—than are we in the United States.

And what about inflation in South Vietnam?

All of us are deeply concerned about an annual increase of 3 to 4 percent, and rightly so. We know what it costs us to have this happen.

In the capital city of Saigon, last year, the consumer price indexes went up 31 percent—in a nation with an annual per capita income of $130. Here, once again, the cost of the war to the people of South Vietnam far exceeds the cost to the allies of the Republic of Vietnam—including the United States.

In the light of these facts and figures, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the time has come for all Americans to acknowledge, generously and fairly, the tremendous snare of the war burden being borne by the people of the Republic of Vietnam—a contribution by that country, and by its government, which compares favorably with that of any other nation, including our own.

I do not cite these facts to belittle in any way the magnitude of the American contribution, or the importance of what is being done by the Republic of Korea, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the soldiers of Thailand, or any other allied force.

Nor do I wish to convey the impression that I believe the Republic of Vietnam is doing all that it can do—or all that it should do—to win the war which is primarily their war, in the first place.

Far more importantly, the leaders of the Republic of Vietnam have made it very clear that they wish to improve, in many ways, both the quality and the effectiveness of their recently created constitutional system.

PRESIDENT THIEU'S PROGRAM

Recently, in Saigon, I had the opportunity to attend the first joint session ever held of the new Congress of the Republic, on the occasion of President Thieu's initial message to a joint session.

In a single address, the President of the Republic presented his views of the national situation, the Government's policies and program, and the 1968 draft budget.

It was a tremendously impressive message, which I wish every American could read and study, for in it are summarized the major problems and difficulties of this struggling new nation, the hopes and aspirations of its chief executive, and an abundance of wisdom and commonsense.

I was greatly impressed by President Thieu's ambitious proposals for far-reaching tax and land reforms, improvements in education and health facilities, upgrading of the civil service, and construction of urgently needed transportation and communication facilities.

The President frankly recognized the depth and complexity of the problem he and the new Congress face in building a democratic system of government, saying:

> Our construction of a progressive democratic system is only in an initial phase now. We have finished building its form, but a genuinely democratic system cannot exist only through an external form. Democracy is a very rich and complex form and a formula for political activities. The building of

> such a system should be extended over a long time—10 or 110 years—and demands fundamental changes in organizations and laws, as well as in political and social structures and habits.

The President commented upon the unfinished business of establishing courts and completing a civil code, a penal code, and a code of penal procedure, and pointed out that the Nation—while constitutionally directed toward a bipartite system—was still fragmented in a number of political parties and factions, and urgently needed at least two strong national party structures to mature and survive.

I do not recall ever having heard more straightforward talk from a chief executive than these words by President Thieu:

> We must realize that at the central level as well as the regional levels, the administrative system is still cumbersome, complex and slow, lacks coordination, and still suffers from corrupt practices, injustices, and bribery. In short, the administrative machinery has not yet met the requirements of a country which wants to escape from a backward state soon.

How many times have you heard the leader of government in your State or in this country indict his own Government, with the directness of these words by President Thieu?

Following up this forceful criticism, the President called upon the Congress to consider some of the questions of administrative organization arising from constitutional definitions of district and province authority, and said:

> Concerning administrative personnel, we must recognize that we lack a rational program for organizing and using cadres, a sound personnel rotation plan, and a clear-cut and just reward and punishment policy.

Again, at a later point in his address, President Thieu emphasized:

> Corruption and bribery must strictly be eliminated. It is necessary to implement a policy of discriminate reward and punishment in accordance with an impartial and effective line in order to stimulate the civil servants' confidence and eagerness to emulate in serving the people. It is necessary to give assistance to civil servants. In the face of a hike in prices, the government will seek all means to improve the civil servants' livelihood through such measures as supplying commodities, selling houses on the basis of installment, and so forth.

The President's commitment on education policy was clear and in the democratic tradition:

> In the field of education, the Republic of Vietnam policy is to achieve mass and practical education. This education is not aimed at benefiting any particular class but the majority. With this goal in view, the government will give everyone an equal opportunity to acquire an education, at least at the minimum level. The government, therefore, will have to carry out a free, compulsory education system for children up to the elementary level, and, at the same time, foster education among the masses in order to wipe out illiteracy and improve the people's knowledge.

Specific educational programs and projects recommended by the President during 1968 include the opening of four new technical schools to accommodate 4,000 students, construction of 219 classrooms for children of anti-Communist refugees, a new training program for 500 junior high school teachers, construction of new university facilities in Saigon, Can Tho and Hue, and the opening of many new primary and secondary schools throughout the country.

The refugee problem drew extended comment, including recognition of the fact that 800,000 of the 2 million refugees have only been temporarily settled and must be aided substantially.

Imagine the problem of 2 million refugees, if you will—just look at the problem of the organization and stability of any country—with 2 million refugees being thrown on the economy of a country hard hit by war and by guerrilla activity.

This is one of the basic problems in the Republic of Vietnam today.

With only two sentences, President Thieu highlighted his country's basic medical problem:

> In the health field the government has not yet been able, despite great efforts, to provide hospital beds at the ratio of two for every 1,000 persons. The country has only 250 physicians, which means that there is only one physician for each 64,000 persons.

Under the Thieu budget program, 1,100 new hospital beds would be provided during 1968, and a national institution for public health would be built to begin the long-range attack on epidemic diseases.

The President, in his message, also faced squarely the issue of lagging government action on land reform:

> The results achieved so far are not satisfactory. Of a total of more than 1 million hectares of land of various categories earmarked for distribution to the peasants, only 270,000 hectares, only 23 per cent, have actually been allotted. Of more than 200,000 hectares of ricefields purchased from French nationals, only 4,000 hectares, less than 2 per cent, have been distributed to the peasants.

All of the expropriated lands and at least 40 percent of the lands purchased from the French would be allocated to the people during the first 7 months of 1968, under the President's proposed program.

THE VIETNAMESE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to overlook, in this brief report of personal impressions, the very fine initial impression which I received at the joint session of the Congress of the Republic, on January 25.

The handsome Senate building was the scene of this historic session, with House members occupying one side of the chamber and Senators the other side. The President of the Senate presided, and presented the President of the Republic to the joint session. It was a dignified and solemn occasion, witnessed by the diplomatic corps of the capital, members of the press, and government officials and others. Television cameras were in evidence, much as in our joint sessions.

That leads me to recall a comment which I heard made by a camera crew from one of our great networks in the elevator of the hotel as we were going down to the lobby of the hotel to go over to this first joint session in the history of that country, a session being addressed by the president of a new republic for the first time.

One of these television crewmen turned to the others and said, "What is the news in this thing that we are going over to cover?"

The other fellows with him said, "There will not be any unless there is a bomb dropped over there."

Now this was the first joint session of the two newly constituted houses of the Congress of that country, a session occurring after the Communists had attempted to block the adoption of a constitution in the first place, and had attempted to block the election of the members of the Congress and had attempted to block the election of a president. Despite all of these obstacles and interference and harassment and the terror of many months by the VC, when the session convened in joint session for the first time and the president rose to address them with his state of the Union and budget message, in the view of at least one television cameraman the only news that was worth going over there to take pictures of would be if a bomb was dropped.

Unfortunately, that illustrates the attitude of some of our newspapermen as they cover the war in Vietnam.

Fortunately, there are other newsmen who are constructive in their approach and who covered the event for its historic importance and reported some of the recommendations of the president in full.

Following the President's address, he and the Vice President and members of his cabinet retired, and the meeting was adjourned.

That evening, the Senate was the scene of a reception where I had the opportunity to meet and talk with a number of Members of both legislative bodies.

All who spoke with me were enthusiastic in their expressions about the legislative work ahead and most of them spoke warmly of their determination to make the legislative branch of Government effective. Several spoke to me of an investigation already underway in the Senate into a recent Government purchase agreement.

I am told that when some of our Government's economic advisers spoke recently to some of President Thieu's cabinet about the need to revise tax laws, they were reminded firmly that this was a function of the Congress under the Vietnamese Constitution.

The Senate investigation which I have mentioned, and the attitude on tax responsibility, seem to me excellent indications of a healthy situation which is sure to remind all of us of our own Capitol picture.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to conclude these remarks without quoting President Thieu on two additional points.

The first is the Vietnamese President's view of his country's relations with the United States:

> In the present struggle, the United States is our principal ally, because the two nations share the same ideals of freedom and democracy, as well as common aspirations for a world in which frontiers cannot be unilaterally changed by the force of arms. The U.S. Government has also recognized that if communist expansion is not checked in time,

> security of other free nations will sooner or later be jeopardized.
>
> The U.S. role in Vietnam today is not different from its role in Europe in the two world wars. Communist North Vietnam, with the support of Communist China and their aggressive strategy for conquest based on infiltration, subversion, sabotage, and terrorism, constitute to Southeast Asia a threat no less serious than the one posed to the security of Europe by Nazi Germany during World War II. Likewise, if the Communists succeed in taking over all of Vietnam and expanding throughout Southeast Asia, the balance of power will be seriously disrupted and this will gravely affect the chances for international security and a durable peace in the world. Therefore the Republic of Vietnam is fully justified in requesting the assistance and receiving the help of the United States and other freedom-loving countries in resisting Communist aggression.
>
> In their devious propaganda, the Communists naturally try to picture us as lacking independence vis a vis the United States. This propaganda is not without regrettable effects on international public opinion. Conversely, on this side, in some countries a segment of the press has dramatized the differences, real or imaginary, between the Vietnamese and the U.S. governments and seem to expect all viewpoints and approaches of the Vietnamese Government always to be identical to those of the U.S. Government. These expectations are not realistic. Furthermore, they are harmful to our common cause, because the Communists exploit these manifestations to push their propaganda line in which they pretend to be the standard bearers of the independence of the south.

The final point in the Thieu address is one on which I personally believe the Vietnamese President is a wise counselor indeed, and one with a message for this Congress as well as the one which meets in Saigon:

> In the common effort to resist Communist aggression, unity is indispensable to final success, and we should be careful not to fall into the Communist stratagem of fostering division between us and our allies.

While I do not question in any way the right of every American to speak freely and fearlessly his convictions and his beliefs on a matter as vital and important as the war in Vietnam, I do believe it is timely to emphasize several basic facts about that war:

First. American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are fighting a ruthless and determined enemy in Vietnam.

Second. The Republic of Vietnam is our ally in that fight—an ally with 730,000 men in the field, and more than three times our number of battle dead.

Third. Harsh and intemperate criticism of an ally—particularly on points which the ally recognizes and is seeking to correct—is likely to "foster division" and may substantially aid the enemy.

Surely it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the policies to which our Government is committed in Southeast Asia—policies resulting from the decisions of three Presidents, two major political parties, and the continuous support of this Congress by resolution, authorization, and appropriation—without aiding the enemy. Surely it is possible to avoid unnecessary injury and insult to a brave ally.

Surely it is in the best interest of our country, and in the highest and best tradition of the Congress of the United States and the most powerful Nation in the free world, to do both of these things.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my fine colleague for his very thorough and comprehensive report of his findings during his recent visit to South Vietnam. He has done the Congress and the country a service by bringing these matters to our attention.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my friend from Oklahoma, our distinguished majority leader, very much.

CONSUMER PROTECTION UNDER THE WHOLESOME MEAT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House should be warned that an attempt is being made to reduce the protection that consumers will receive under the Wholesome Meat Act passed only a few months ago and perhaps even to undermine all consumer legislation.

Some of the much discredited State secretaries of agriculture who had not done their job or who had inadequate laws to work with but joined those meat packers and processors who were bilking consumers to oppose Federal laws, are still trying to determine ways to reduce the protection provided by that law. They or the processors who were bilking consumers to the tune of more than $1 billion per year have apparently duped at least one reporter and one Washington newsletter into reporting their trivia and immaterial allegations to support a conclusion that the law was not needed or should be changed. The newspaper articles and Washington newsletter were so misleading and based upon such a false premise as to constitute a fraud upon the readers. The newsletter gives as one reason for passage of the bill a naked allegation that it makes it easier for labor unions to organize processing plants. This, on its face, is absolutely false because whether a plant has or does not have Federal inspection has nothing whatever to do with whether a union represents the employees there and in fact some employees of the largest nonfederally inspected plants are represented by unions.

Another claim is made that some of the reports made by Agriculture Department inspectors overstated the bad situation existing in some plants in order to help secure a new law. The premise here is erroneous because it is well known that the impetus for the law did not come from the Department at all and that, in fact, most of those in charge of this program in the Department would have preferred that the stronger law not pass and that they not be given an additional work to perform. The State secretary of agriculture of one State even alleged that the Department sent inspectors into that State to find something wrong and claimed he was threatened that he would be sorry if he opposed the stronger bill. That is obviously a hoax. If there was nothing wrong, he should have welcomed the inspectors; but anyway, since the Department was dragging its feet on the stronger bill, there would be more reason to believe they were looking for a chance to report that there was nothing wrong. While saying that they personally would never eat nonfederally inspected meat, too many Department employees wanted to cater to the State secretaries of agriculture opposing the bill and they did not want any extra work. The Department also has an official who maintains constant contact with these State secretaries and vigorously gave all their arguments at internal meetings. If the Department would have had an inclination to doctor the reports, it would have been to have made statements understating rather than overstating the bad situation existing in some plants. In fact, they held the bad reports for several years to help to keep the situation from becoming common knowledge. For every report that overstated the bad situation existing, I can guarantee that there are more reports that understated the bad situation and if these people want to enter into a contest as to who can produce the most understatements as compared to overstatements, it may soon start.

The assumption that these reports were the only evidence needed for the legislation was erroneous anyway. I was pressing for this legislation before there were any reports at all. Some of those who opposed this legislation did not believe the situation was as bad as I was saying and thought the reports would prove their point, but they turned out otherwise. There was also direct testimony, and I challenge anyone to prove that any statement I made was an overstatement of the bad situation and practices followed by some packers and processors.

The article also indicated that California law is equal to the Federal requirements. The hearings were full of testimony that California has the best law of any of the States and does the best job of any, but that consumers were subjected to inadequately labeled products. Competing packers state that some hams in California contain as much as 30 percent added liquid, without consumers being informed of this fact. The new Federal law will require adequate labeling so that consumers will know what they are buying.

Another claim is made that inspection now does not show the conditions as bad as reported last fall. That should be true, because the new Federal law requires conditions relating to unwholesomeness to be cleaned up, but the fact that the new law and revelations caused some to improve their handling of meat does not mean that the law was not needed, nor that it should now be weakened.

If it were not that they misled some people, the method used in the articles in trying to discredit the basis for the new law would be amusing. The trivia in the news articles never does answer the thrust of the reports but mostly deal with some relatively insignificant and immaterial matters. They claim what amounts to a small percentage of the huge stack of reports overstated the bad situation;

but, even representatives of the meat industry admit that the general situation needed to be corrected. I do not know of anyone that ever claimed that all of the nonfederally inspected plants were bad. But when there was no State law to violate in many cases, there was no hope for correcting it without a Federal law. I am sure there will also be a few isolated examples where Federal inspection of an individual plant needed to be improved, but at least whoever is involved is in violation of a law, and there is an immediate remedy upon complaint and revelation of the situation.

To prove that some of the plants were not in as bad a shape as indicated, one news reporter interviewed the managers of those plants which were cited for bad conditions, and the State secretaries of agriculture in the States involved. They were asked if they thought a new law should have been passed to assure proper labeling and wholesome meat from their plants and if the situation needed improving. That is like alleging that Goldwater should have been declared the winner over Johnson in 1964 and proving it with an opinion by the president of the Arizona State John Birch Society.

Mr. Speaker, I think Members of the House have become aware of the need for consumer legislation; and these attempts through the use of trivia, immaterial matter, the statements of those who profit by deceiving the public, and in some cases outright false statements to discredit Ralph Nader and others who have pushed for consumer legislation, are contributing to a campaign to discredit all consumer legislation. Up until now the relatively small percentage of culprits in each of the important industries have financed the opposition to needed legislation. It may be that we are now seeing the beginning of a campaign by a general coalition of those who want to continue to deceive and take advantage of the unorganized consumer. I urge all those who read these articles to carefully examine the conclusions as related to the trivia and kind of evidence that is used in an attempt to support the conclusions.

CALL FOR STRATEGIC DECISION ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today about Vietnam, and I do so after many months of thought and study on this issue. As I look at the situation there today all indications are that our position in the field and the allied position in the field continues to deteriorate. I believe the situation there is critical. I think it is time we looked at this issue as it is—not as we might like it to be—or not as some might tell it is—but look at this issue as it is. So I will discuss Vietnam today from three points of view. I want to talk for a time about how it is we got there, where we are today, and how we can wind this thing up. Let me begin by summarizing my involvement in this issue.

I serve on the Committee on Appropriations. On that committee I serve on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, which is the subcommittee that oversees all international spending by the United States. This is the subcommittee which must authorize and approve all spending for pacification and nation building in South Vietnam.

About a year ago the man representing the U.S. Government economic assistance effort in Vietnam, our top AID official in the field, Rutherford Poats, came before our committee to testify in behalf of our nation-building program in South Vietnam. When I knew he was coming, my staff and I endeavored to prepare all the material available on the background of this program. At that time there was considerable discussion in the press and elsewhere about alleged widespread corruption and mismanagement in our program in Vietnam. So we endeavored to pull together all the facts and assertions so that we could prepare a brief with which to cross-examine this key witness, this ranking administration official who had managed our program there for 3 years in the field. He came before the subcommittee, and I began to question him at length. Thanks to the great courtesy and kindness of my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], this discussion went on for 3½ hours. Within the first 40 or 50 minutes Mr. Poats very readily admitted that there were tremendous inefficiencies in our program in the field. The United States had incurred tremendous losses and there was altogether too much leakage in our AID pipeline. To verify this was like shooting fish in a barrel. But after a time, as we pursued the questioning, bigger facts began to emerge and some much larger conclusions were revealed which had a vastly different meaning.

Basically, Mr. Poats had two things to say. First, he said there was an insufficient South Vietnamese commitment to the war. Second, in the face of this insufficient South Vietnamese commitment to the war, he acknowledged that we were steadily, day by day, Americanizing our participation in Vietnam. Not just on the military side, we had Americanized that a long time ago; but I am talking about the pacification program, the nation-building area. Yes, we were and are Americanizing the pacification program. And please bear in mind that these admissions come from the President's top man in the field. He said, yes, we are Americanizing all the way down to the village level in South Vietnamese nation building.

It is all in the record—September 19, 1967—and you can revew it and draw your own conclusions. You will see that at that time—and I think it is true today—we were not building self-sufficiency in Vietnam. Rather, we were not only carrying out our half of the bargain, but theirs as well. We were actually building long-run dependency.

Now, that is not the way to build a nation. No parent can go to school for his child and earn an education for him. The child has to earn the education for himself. In the same manner, a country has to build itself. We can help, but we cannot go in and build a nation for another people. We cannot and we should not. We found that in Vietnam the rich were getting richer and poor were getting poorer. Those were Mr. Poats' admissions. They stand on the record. There is no better expert nor anyone else of higher authority in the administration who can refute those statements.

So, after we studied his testimony we called for a series of reforms. He had said that the taxes being collected in Vietnam were inadequate. The people in Vietnam who are profiting greatly from the war often have no interest in paying taxes, and when the South Vietnamese tax collector would go and knock on their door, these people would say, "Do not bother me, because we are not going to pay up." Now, when the South Vietnamese who can pay taxes do not do so, there is only one other source that that revenue can come from. This is the American people. And it is the American people that have footed this bill.

There were no price and wage controls in South Vietnam. There are none today. There was no rationing in South Vietnam and there is none today. There was no crackdown on corruption, which is endemic in South Vietnam and in the whole of Southeast Asia, and there is only a token effort now underway in this respect. I asked that these reforms be undertaken. I asked that South Vietnam go to full mobilization and get the country on a total war footing. That has not taken place. We asked for land reform there. The progress in that area has been so pathetic that it is not worth talking about. I asked that more of our aid assistance find its way out of the cities and into the villages, into the hamlets, and to the little man in these areas of Vietnam because we have found that we have been doing a miserable job in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for these recommendations and for these plans to be implemented. I said, "If you are serious about nation building in Vietnam, then these recommendations will have to be followed."

So, Mr. Speaker, I went to see the top officials in the administration and laid out these facts. However, we found that these recommendations were not pushed and that South Vietnam did not accept them and undertake to carry them out. Our administration seemed reluctant to force them to do so. So, I began to wonder why. I asked, "Why is it that the administration cannot get this sort of performance out of the South Vietnamese?" What I found was that this administration had lost its leverage in South Vietnam because it had gotten in too deep. And when our top governmental officials in the field would ask the South Vietnamese officials for these reforms, they were turned down. In other words, the South Vietnamese would respond by saying, "And what are you going to do if we do not implement these reforms?" And that was the end of the conversation. Our administration had lost its leverage and was unable to exact these reforms—and these needed changes have not yet been undertaken in a serious way. So the nation-building process was not taking place. It is not taking place there today to any degree worth talking about.

You will recall that at that time, a year ago, the No. 1 justification offered by the administration for our involvement in

South Vietnam was that we were there "nation-building." They said, the reason that we had our own American manpower stationed out there was to create a temporary military shield, a temporary shield behind which the South Vietnamese could go to work to build their nation. But with the evidence showing that genuine nation building was not taking place, it became clear that we could not justify the war on that basis.

So, Mr. Speaker, the official U.S. justification for our Vietnam effort had to change, because what we were dealing with was a growing American land war in Asia that would likely continue indefinitely. One cannot call it by any other name. Of course, there is only one justification for that sort of U.S. commitment and that is American strategic self-interest and the strategic self-interest of the free world.

So we said to the administration at that time, if that is the reason why we are in Vietnam—American strategic self-interest—why not level with the people and tell them the truth about the change in the situation, the change in the rationale for the war?

Mr. Speaker, since that time, the administration has indeed changed its official justification for the war in Vietnam. Many will recall that late in the past year Secretary of State Rusk was asked a question as to why we were in Vietnam. He said we were there to prevent 1 billion Red Chinese from sweeping down through Asia. That is a quite different rationale than "nation building." The official rationale has since been revised again and escalated. Just the other day Vice President HUMPHREY, when he was asked the question, "Why are we fighting in South Vietnam?" answered that we were fighting there to avoid a "nuclear holocaust." This is an awesome rationale for the war.

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. HUMPHREY's assertion is true, and represents something more than an emotional statement as to why we are in South Vietnam, then he ought to provide the specific detailed analysis that leads to such a momentous conclusion.

After months of study, the need became clear for an independent study to determine the strategic importance of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia to the security of the United States and the free world as a cross reference to the statements of the administration. My staff and I undertook to do this by setting up what we called an information matrix and we began to collect information. We then analyzed this information and all the other data which was available. One of the first things we did was to collect the President's last 60 speeches on Vietnam. And we began to analyze them, line by line, to see exactly what he had said a year ago, 2 years ago, and 3 years ago as to why we were in Vietnam.

As we analyzed those speeches and looked at his expressed rationale and his justification for U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam, we found that it changed over time. When it was a small war, there was a small justification offered. When the war got larger, bit by bit, then the justification grew larger. But analysis showed the justification got larger after the fact. Additional U.S. manpower and resource commitments were made in Vietnam and then the justification was brought along after the fact to shore up this expanding commitment.

We also began a strategic evaluation of what we defined as the three critical elements of an analysis which would show the strategic importance of South Vietnam and its neighboring countries, to the security of the United States and the free world. This included: First, the strategic military importance; second, the strategic economic importance; and, third, the strategic political/geopolitical importance.

So we went to the Department of Defense and asked them this question, "Examine South Vietnam and Southeast Asia strictly from a military point of view, and give us a precise statement of the strategic military importance of South Vietnam to free world security."

There was an exchange of seven letters over a period of months and two major conclusions were offered. Let me quote one of them from Mr. Steadman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, who responded saying:

> From a purely military viewpoint, the U.S. does not require control of the land mass of South Vietnam to meet possible further communist armed aggression against countries with which we have treaty obligations (although our problems in this regard could be greatly compounded were South Vietnam to be controlled by a government hostile to the U.S. and its allies.)

So from the point of view of strictly military considerations, Vietnam, according to the Defense Department, just does not stack up strategically.

But we kept pursuing the issue and we have a further statement by Vice Admiral Johnson from the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said that there are really two ways to define a strategic military commitment. One is the traditional issue of whether a piece of real estate is so significant and important from a strict military point of view that it must be held at all costs. But as I have said, the Defense Department had earlier indicated that that does not apply in the case of Vietnam.

But the letter said there is another way that a country could have strategic military importance and that was if the President of the United States says that it is a national goal that we should stand there.

And, if the President should say this—for whatever reasons, and even in the absence of a strategic rationale—then by definition, it becomes a preemptive strategic military commitment. And it was indicated that this applies in the case of Vietnam today.

This reasoning makes you wonder. Is that not putting the cart before the horse? One must ask the question of what specific factors and analysis went into such a Presidential determination—and I have not been able to find that answer.

As to the economic question, we went to the AID people and said, "What is the strategic economic importance of this area?"

The answer came back that it does not amount to much. The strategic economic importance does not justify carrying on a large scale American war—and for that matter not even a small war.

So we found that basically the administration is hanging its case on political/geopolitical considerations—the so-called domino theory.

We then set out to find out how good this reasoning was, because I was not interested in having this rationale offered on the basis of emotion or intuition or gut feeling. We wanted to know the reasoning behind this political rationale and in very specific terms.

So we went out to talk to some of the experts in this field. We went to the University of Michigan and talked to Prof. Alex Eckstein, the chairman of the China Studies School there. We sought the advice of the men who are the most eminent authorities on Red China and Southeast Asia in this country today.

We then asked Professor Eckstein and five of his colleagues on the faculty of the University of Michigan to serve as a Vietnam study group to undertake an independent analysis of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia to determine exactly what the strategic and political implications were. They did that job and did brilliant work on it.

After they completed it, we invited them to Washington to meet behind closed doors with 18 Congressmen, nine from each party—hawks and doves—to present their findings.

And they made their presentation and what they said challenged the basic assertion of the administration that there was a strategic political reason for us to commit ourselves to an American land war in Asia.

This study group material was inserted in the RECORD of December 15, 1967.

It raises into clear view all the substantive questions about these political-geopolitical factors. And, it concludes that the strategic political-geopolitical importance of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia to the security of the United States and the free world is a very open question. They challenged the assertions of the administration in very specific detail.

Now with reference to war data. We found that Members of Congress just like the American people are having great difficulty in getting good, solid, current consistent information about our progress in the war.

So we asked the Department of Defense for 85 statistics on war progress and asked for them on a monthly basis.

They are providing these reports to the House Committee on Appropriations for the use of the members of that committee. To my knowledge this is the first formal regular report on war progress to be prepared and offered to any committee in either House of the Congress. So we now have these statistics and we are analyzing them.

As these war statistics are classified, we cannot talk about them in specific terms.

But, in general terms, I can tell you one thing about the statistics that you should know and that you have a right to know.

Let us look at the size of the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam—just the indigenous South Vietnamese Vietcong—not North Vietnamese regulars.

If you will look at the Defense Department figures at the end of 1967 versus those at the end of 1966, you will find there were more Vietcong in South Vietnam at the end of 1967, than there were at the end of 1966. And the increase in Vietcong strength was greater in both absolute amount and in percentage terms than the growth of the military forces of the South Vietnamese, who are our allies there, over the same period. More than that, the Vietcong launched more armed attacks in 1967 than they did in 1966, and they were far better equipped.

Now, I believe that many of the people around this country had been given the idea and had been led to believe that the Vietcong were about to be blown off the map, that they were about to whither away. If our people developed this misimpression, it was because they were offered assessments and statements by ranking officials, which I believe gave a false impression. These stark facts from the Defense Department war data report speak more loudly to me than hopeful generalities offered by administration spokesman.

We needed statistics on pacification. We needed to know how we were doing in nation building. There was no detailed report available on this. There is today. We are getting the 67 statistics we asked for. We have analyzed these statistics and the picture is bleak. One cannot take much encouragement from these facts.

This then, is a part of the analysis my staff and I have done over the past 7 or 8 months. What does this comprehensive evaluation show?

I will tell you the conclusions I have reached.

The first is this. All the evidence we can find indicates that our present level of commitment in Vietnam was never anticipated, nor was it ever formally justified by the administration as being in the strategic self-interest of the United States or the free world.

Now, you may ask: Is there public evidence of this? I will just cite two instances.

The other day on "Meet the Press," Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara both appeared. Secretary McNamara was asked by one of the reporters if he had ever anticipated, if this country had ever anticipated, if the Defense Department had ever anticipated, the level of U.S. military commitment that we have in South Vietnam today. And he admitted, candidly and forthrightly, no, he did not, that the Defense Department never anticipated it. According to Secretary McNamara, we never expected to be where we are today.

Secretary Rusk says it another way. He is often asked about escalation. People ask, "How much more can we escalate without causing the Chinese or Russia to intervene?" His answer is this:

> If you had asked me two years ago if we could have escalated to the point we have without bringing in the Russians and the Red Chinese, I would have said it could not be done.

Well, that is another way of saying that a year or two ago, when he was looking at this problem, he never anticipated we would be where we are today.

How, then, did we ever get to where we presently are in Vietnam?

How did this happen? How did the present level of commitment develop, if in fact it was never anticipated?

Our present level of involvement appears to be the product of a day by day policy that all the way along has been based on a false assumption. And that is the assumption that the war would soon be over, that if we just put in a little more effort—not a lot more, but just a little bit more—then we would get the edge on the enemy, and he would throw in the towel, and that would be the end of it. That has been the assumption we have followed. That has been the illusion we have pursued. But the enemy has not thrown in the towel.

If you go to a Presidential briefing and listen to the President, in his own words he makes the point that there is a phone line today in the White House, a special phone line so that if Ho Chi Minh wants to call President Johnson and say, "Look, let us sit down and settle this thing," he can do so. One of the President's most frequent comments when I was there was that he could not understand why the phone did not ring. He said:

> We have been waiting for months for the phone to ring. We have done everything humanly possible to get the phone to ring, but the phone does not ring.

Well, the phone has not rung. It is not clear the phone is going to ring. And, I do not believe we ought to base our policy on the expectation of a phone call, and that is what we are doing today. And that is what we have done for months.

Where does this policy take us, if we continue it? If we continue the present policy, the one we have today, then this war is far, far, far from over. In fact, there is a very real question as to whether we can rip up the Vietcong infrastructure woven all through South Vietnam without tearing the whole country to pieces. And if we tear the country to pieces, if we tear out this guerrilla infrastructure and tear the country to pieces in the process, then the question is, Can we put it back together and will it mean something at that time? This is an open question, as well.

Now, as to the people who say drop more bombs, we must point out that this war is being conducted primarily in South Vietnam, and we do not have a bomb we can drop there that is so sophisticated that when it comes down it separates into pieces and only kills the bad guys and not the good guys. There is no bomb like that, and the war cannot be fought in that manner.

There has been an escalation of the official U.S. rationale of our involvement in the war. Tom Wicker, of the New York Times, spoke about this a week ago in Sunday's New York Times. The rationale has escalated. It used to be nation building, but it is not any more.

Now, how much has gone into this war to date? We have lost over 17,000 American men. We have had well over 100,000 casualties in the field, and we are losing 250 to 300 men each week—each week. We have invested in this struggle already over $130 billion. We spent some $30 billion in Vietnam this past year. Now, to understand the strategic impact of this investment of resources, we must not just think about it as $30 billion, but rather as some 25 percent of our national budget, because that is what it was last year.

Now, to spend 25 percent of your national budget on one problem is a strategic commitment, and we had better face up to it, because it has an impact on every other objective we have at home and around the world.

We see this in the Appropriations Committee and we see it on my other subcommittee on which I sit, the District of Columbia Subcommittee. The people come to that subcommittee to ask for money to build schools in the District of Columbia, but we do not have the money. Why not? Because, in part, we are spending some 25 percent of our budget in South Vietnam. Let us face up to the fact that this is a strategic commitment and that it has these impacts—all across the board.

If the war lasts for another 5 or 10 years, we can look forward at the present level of commitment to investing another $150 billion to $300 billion in it. We can look forward to another 50,000 to 100,000 of our men sacrificing their lives out there. In terms of wounded, we can talk about somewhere between half a million and a million Americans being wounded there.

What has happened? Our citizens are asking in disbelief: "How has this come about?" Well, they have a right to know. And the answer is that we drifted into a strategic commitment. In essence that is it. There is no evidence that this level of U.S. commitment was ever anticipated. Two or three years ago when this was a $5 billion operation, with 75,000 men involved, it was not, in the fundamental sense, a strategic commitment. However, it has moved along so that here we are today spending $30 billion with 500,000 men engaged in the field. Now this is a strategic commitment which we have made there.

Well we must ask how we can end this war. We are at a fork in the road in South Vietnam, and we have been at that fork for months now. There are only two roads that lead away.

I say to you that this administration has not yet made the basic decision on Vietnam. That decision involves the tough choice between the two alternatives that are available for ending the war. What are these alternatives? Obviously, one is the military alternative. Can we call it military victory. I do not.

I do not think that is a good description. Call it a military grind-down, that is a more accurate description. It is very tough and very brutal. Call it an accelerated military grind-down. What will it require? Certainly an expanded and decisive U.S. military commitment. Obviously full mobilization of South Vietnam along with major reforms by the South Vietnamese Government which have not been undertaken and which I referred to earlier.

Now, what is the other fork? It is to begin to de-Americanize this conflict, to rebalance our effort which means compromise and negotiation. And let us not delude ourselves about it. It may very well mean a coalition government with Vietcong participation.

Events show clearly that the administration has refused to make this decision. It has avoided this tough decision, and has instead pursued an indecisive day-by-day policy which has Americanized the war, while systematically destroying South Vietnamese self-sufficiency. I think it is time we made the basic decision on Vietnam. We should select and pursue a new course aimed at ending the war.

It is my own judgment that either of these two alternatives, as ugly as they are, are much better than to bog down on dead center in the present enlarging stalemate. It is clear, however, that if the President chooses to pursue the military fork of this road with all of its associated sacrifices—and I am going to talk about them in just 1 minute—then he must first present a comprehensive strategic justification for doing so. He has not done this to date. It is not clear that such a strategic justification can be made. I have serious doubts that it can. I am unable to construct such a justification—and this may be the reason the President has agonized so long on this decision.

Certainly neither choice is pleasant. Both reveal the fundamental fact that our resources are not infinite in this country—and we cannot begin to impose our will in Southeast Asia unless we are willing to ante up the full price, and a tremendous price it is.

Mr. Speaker, if we pursue this military grind down, we must be realistic about the additional sacrifices it will require. Certainly, it will require sending a great many more American servicemen to Vietnam—probably hundreds of thousands more. We must remember that guerrilla warfare requires a 10-to-1 ratio in manpower—and if the enemy should put another 50,000 men into the war, this would require a matching American manpower commitment of 500,000. It is going to mean deep budget cutting; it is going to mean putting virtually all of the Great Society programs aside until the war is over, because we are out of money ond we cannot do all these things at once. It is going to require a tax increase; it is probably going to require price and wage controls and most likely full mobilization in the United States. It will almost certainly require a declaration of war.

And, beyond that, we will have to face up to the very real possibility that we will have to establish and maintain a U.S. military occupation force in South Vietnam for the indefinite future. If we were to achieve the military advantage in the field tomorrow, it is not realistic to assume that the South Vietnamese could hold this advantage—even for a short time.

Mr. Speaker, what would the military alternative mean to the South Vietnamese? They are going to have to clear the decks, and knuckle down, and put all their resources into the war effort. They are going to have to enact price controls, impose rationing and higher taxes and they are going to bring into their fighting force all of their eligible men. It will require an all-out drive against corruption.

Mr. Speaker, today the South Vietnamese military fights a 5½-day week. We will probably have to merge their armed forces with the U.S. Armed Forces as we did in Korea.

Further, Mr. Speaker, they will have to draft all of the South Vietnamese who are 18 and 19 years of age, get them off their motorbikes in Saigon, and into uniform. And these statements are not meant to demean the sacrifices already made by the people of South Vietnam—they are made to bring to light what the massive additional sacrifices are that are urgently needed if we are going to make headway.

The other fork in the road is the de-Americanization fork. That fork of the road is not much better than the one which I have just described. It means we will have to scale down our goals and our commitments, and we would have, in fact, to face the risk of possible VC participation in a coalition government. Such a policy would necessarily force all parties at interest in South Vietnam to compete in the political arena, including the Buddhists, the Catholics, the South Vienamese military regime, as well as the Vietcong, because someone is going to have to earn and keep public support. It is not clear to me that the existing South Vietnamese Government enjoys broad public support in any substantive way. That is not something which we can do for them. These political adjustments would have to be the product of Vietnamese initiative.

So, Mr. Speaker, neither fork is pleasant. In other words, would one rather have his arm cut off or his leg cut off? It is a tough choice. There is no question about it. However, it is time that we made that choice; it is time that we made that decision; it is time that we faced up to the realities of the situation.

Perhaps it is better to languish on dead center? Maybe it is better to preserve the stalemate which now exists by feeding some 250 to 300 young American men into this endless Asian meat grinder.

Perhaps it is better to blindly assume that the administration has done its homework—and sweep indications to the contrary under the rug? Maybe it is better to accept the 20-year war concept and avoid coming to grips with the tough decision today.

Well, I don't think so. I think that this ugly war has drifted long enough. I think it is time that we made the tough choice and mustered sufficient courage to bring this war to an end.

The American people deserve this decision, the men in South Vietnam deserve this decision. But, let us not deceive ourselves about the price which is involved. It is an awesome price whichever fork we take—and much of that price is the penalty for past mistakes and indecision.

Mr. Speaker, the question is this: Is it worth it? If we take the military fork, what can we expect to accomplish from that expenditure of men and resources.

Mr. Speaker, if the President of the United States can make the case for the decisive military alternative, then it is time he did so. Let him come before this Congress and go before the American people, as he has failed to do in the past, and demonstrate convincingly why he believes that this ought to be a strategic commitment for the United States. If he can provide the reasoning for the massive additional effort required—then it is time that he do so. Above all, he must present to the American people a realistic picture of the situation which exists. If he can do that, then we shall back him up.

The people of this country are more than adequate to that sort of challenge. We always have been. This country has survived 180 years and every time the people have been asked to meet a challenge, they have met it. When this country falls short of the mark, it is not because the people have failed the Government—no, it is the other way around—it is because the public officials fail the people. That is what is happening today.

These are the facts. The power in this country—the energy, the vision, and the strength and the wisdom—is not in the White House. It is not here in this House Chamber, nor is it in the State capitals across the country. It is in the homes of the people across this country. Our people are the country. The people will stand up to the truth. They are big enough for that and they are ready and eager for it. So let them have the truth—they deserve to have it and it is time they got it.

And if the President cannot make that case for the military alternative; if he cannot put together a compelling strategic justification that makes sense and upon which reasonable men can agree; if past errors of judgment have caused us to overcommit ourselves beyond the point of strategic free world self-interest, then let him be big enough to say so. Let him be big enough to come here before the people and say that we have to scale down our goals in Vietnam and revise and reduce our commitments there.

Let him say that. Let him say one thing or the other. We do not have that decision—and there is a desperate need that it be made and made quickly.

Our fighting men in the field are in battle at this moment. Above all others, they deserve a decision—if the commitment is worth it, then let us give them all they need—the full resources of our Nation. If it is not worth it—then let us abandon the indecision of the day-by-day policy and begin scaling down our commitment. Let us face up to that reality, Mr. President—it is time that we did.

BATTLE AT KHESANH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days involving the buildup of enemy forces and the overture by way of enemy action that indicates a major battle at Khesanh seems to me to require some comments in reference to the American effort there and particularly the high caliber of our military leadership and the able men they lead.

The first question that occurs is why is the battle being joined at Khesanh.

There are those who would say that we should not commit our defense at Khesanh, and I suspect that had we withdrawn from Khesanh, many of these people would then say, "Why did we abandon Khesanh?" Simply stated, the reason the battle is being joined at Khesanh is because the enemy has chosen Khesanh as his point of attack. This point alone seems to me to indicate that it has strategic importance to the enemy and, therefore, indicates why American efforts to establish a defense there are based on sound, strategic, and tactical considerations.

It seems to me that those who are raising questions about why we are in Khesanh should also raise the question of why are the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese at Khesanh. A battle there can be avoided in a very easy manner and that is by the enemy simply withdrawing from the area.

Many reasons have been outlined in the press by our military commanders and policymakers that this is a very strategic outpost from the standpoint of the control of supply routes and the prevention of infiltration into Vietnam by the North Vietnamese. This appears to be one of the major reasons that Khesanh is under attack, and, second, the North Vietnamese hope they can win there and, therefore, achieve a psychological victory. In either event, it seems that the enemy wants Khesanh very badly.

I am convinced that they cannot take Khesanh and, in fact, will be defeated.

Parallels are being made to the battle of Dienbienphu that occurred in the spring of 1954 and, in effect, marked the end of effective military action in Indochina by the French.

Because questions have been raised in the press and other media by commentators and other spokesmen in America, as to whether or not the outcome of this impending battle might be a disastrous one for us in the pattern of the French, I think it is helpful to make some observations.

I might also add that because there are those who are raising questions about the leadership of General Westmoreland, which, together with the apprehension that is voiced about the battle of Khesanh, contribute not only to public misunderstanding, but a lack of confidence in our leadership when I feel this apprehension and doubt are not consistent with events and the facts. I also feel this doubt and lack of confidence is not in the national interest. I would like to present several points that occur to me in reference to this engagement and our leadership there.

Although it is inevitable to look at Khesanh in reference to Dienbienphu, there are many distinguishing features. References are made to the terrain and the geography of the area. Although there are similarities, they are not exact, and there are differences from a terrain standpoint. If one uses the analogy of terrain to draw similarities in battles, I would point out that the coastal areas of France that were the scene of two major engagements in World War II were more nearly identical than the comparison between Khesanh and Dienbienphu. One of these engagements in France was Dunkirk, and the other was Normandy. Both occurred on the French coast. The point I am trying to make is that the fact the terrain may be similar does not mean the outcome of a battle will be the same.

There are many other reasons why, militarily, Khesanh is different from Dienbienphu, and I would like to cite some of these.

First, the American military strategy of mutual support of combat units. I mean by this that Khesanh, unlike Dienbienphu, is not an isolated fortress that cannot receive support from major combat units which can be moved into the area. Unlike the French, we have the capability of carrying the offensive to the enemy, not relying solely on a defensive posture.

In reference to mutual support, I might mention the second front that was sought to be established in the recent Vietcong offensive aimed at the cities of South Vietnam. Although this would indicate a kamikaze type of capability that was surprising both as to its scope and ferocity, nevertheless, when our military commanders indicate that it was not successful, their comments go to the concept of success by way of establishing a diversionary type of effort that would siphon off military resources and thereby make it impossible to implement support for a principal point, such as Khesanh.

Except at Hue, where they have met with limited success, the failure to open a second front must come as a disappointment to North Vietnamese field commanders at Khesanh, who were seeking to limit continuing support to that area of the conflict.

Second, we are capable of bringing to bear on this military situation a very devastating thrust through the use of tactical air support. Our tactical air arm in Vietnam and its capabilities is a vastly significant feature in an action of this type. The French lacked this capability.

Third, we have a capability to keep flowing into Khesanh a constant resupply of materiel and sinews of war. We can keep food and medical supplies moving by cargo aircraft and airdrop techniques that have been developed in the last decade but were unheard of and beyond the French capability in 1954.

Fourth, a major, and I emphasize, "major," new dimension in our military effort is the use of the helicopter. In addition to being able to continue a troop buildup at the outpost, helicopter resupply of materiel, movement of personnel in aerial envelopment, evacuation of the wounded, and delivery of supporting fire is a tremendous breakthrough in warfare. It gives us a flexibility and mobility of forces and support that cannot be discounted by any enemy in a situation of this type. The French did not have this capability.

Fifth, communications. The communications capabilities of the modern infantry and artillery-type units enables commanders at all levels from the squad to division to corps to theater commander, to have an up-to-the-minute account of the progress of the action, and enables them to formulate a response commensurate with the need. Within moments, through a report from a listening post or observation post near the perimeter of Khesanh using sophisticated radio equipment, commanders at all levels can be apprised of developing enemy action. The French lacked this capability.

Sixth, the caliber of the American fighting man. I do not want to take anything away from the French troops who were serving in Indochina. They were fine units. Many were in the French Foreign Legion, but as to ground troops, I am convinced that the American fighting man in Vietnam, whether he is in the Army or the Marines, is the best soldier that has ever been put in the field by any nation. The French Legionnaire in Dienbienphu knew that he had been undermined at home, and I suspect that his attitude toward that struggle was a fatalistic one. That is not the attitude of the American fighting man at Khesanh.

In recent days, there has come to the surface increasing questions and criticisms of our senior commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland. I think the first thing I would say is that he is a military commander and not a magician. I think a great deal of this criticism is being voiced by people who will not recognize his achievements to date.

General Westmoreland took command in Vietnam when the situation there was on the verge of collapse and defeat was closer than probably any of us realize today, and, certainly did not realize at that time. He has been required to build a substantial American effort in a short period of time, all the while engaged in combat operations and confronted with a most difficult political situation in the country where he was required to perform his mission.

This buildup has occurred with remarkable orderliness and efficiency, and while any wartime operation is bound to be disorganized and wasteful, I think there has been a minimum of these two factors. A great deal of the credit is due General Westmoreland for this. A great deal of credit is due also to the armed services for their prior planning and staff procedures which are paying off by such accomplishments.

Other criticisms are directed at the general for his emphasis on the South Vietnamese Army and what are termed overoptimistic assessments of that army's capabilities. I, for one, think we should be cautious about criticisms in this area. Ultimately, the security of South Vietnam, both from external aggression and from internal guerrilla warfare, is dependent upon a strong South Vietnamese Army. I think one of General Westmoreland's goals is to build such an army. Certainly, if we are going to reduce the American troop commitment in Vietnam, it is axiomatic that we develop a security force that justifies these troop reductions. In short, in order to bring the boys home, we must build up the capability of the Vietnamese Army and the quicker we can do that, the quicker our men will come home.

I think it should be remembered that, insofar as the development of the Vietnamese Army is concerned, General Westmoreland is in an advisory role. I am sure that he is as much aware of the weaknesses and limitations of that army as anyone, but the fact remains that South Vietnam, even though we undertake the major military effort, is still the host nation, and it would not be in our best interests for our theater commander to be making public attacks and criticisms about a military force that he is seeking to upgrade. In short, I do not see how we can expect the Vietnamese to have confidence in themselves if our commanders and advisers develop an attitude of resignation evidenced by lack of confidence themselves.

Everyone mourns the Nation's loss when one of our men dies in Vietnam. The establishment of an effective Vietnamese Army will not only lessen American casualties, but it will lessen the casualties of the Vietnamese Army.

There is a real lesson to be learned from the Korean Army during the crisis in 1950 and 1951. Resort to press accounts of that era express concern about the performance of Korean forces, but history shows that they have developed into one of the finest fighting forces in the world. In fact, the two Korean divisions that are in Vietnam—the Capitol Division and the White Horse Division—are superb troops. Therefore, I feel that the efforts of General Westmoreland in regard to Vietnam forces are based on a long-range strategic planning that will be proved correct and will inure not only to our advantage, but to the future stability of Vietnam.

I have mentioned the magnificent performance of the American fighting men in Vietnam. I think something should be said for the quality of American leadership in Vietnam from the squad leader to the theatre commander. They are professionally competent, dedicated and deeply interested in every man they command. Second only to the parents and families of those men who become casualties, comrades and commanders of the fallen grieve the most. In the press of our daily lives and in the pursuit of our own interests at home, we are too likely to look at casualty lists as being statistics. They are not statistics to the commanders in Vietnam.

This capable leadership is not limited to just those who serve in that country today, but it has been characteristic of every officer and noncommissioned officer who has served in that war. Many of them have been reassigned to posts in other parts of the world and here in the United States; however, they continue to give the benefit of their advice and experience to the training and development of those who succeed them in that theater of operations.

Recently, General Abrams was designated to direct the American effort in Khesanh. He is a highly capable soldier with a distinguished record. Principally, he is remembered for his outstanding action as an Army commander in the Battle of the Bulge.

Aside from Lt. Gen. Robert E. Cushman, who commands the marines in South Vietnam, and Col. David E. Lownds, who commands the marines at Khesanh, both highly trained and combat-seasoned officers, many other marine commanders, commissioned and noncommissioned, fought in the South Pacific in such battles as Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima and served in Korea. I cite these things because I believe they are indicators of confidence that every American should have about the impending action at Khesanh and the conduct of the war generally by the military in Vietnam.

Today, American forces have a capability in communications, mobility and firepower that pose a formidable force to any enemy that challenges them. Our leadership is oriented to the concept of minimizing losses, which is carried out through such techniques as the massing of fires, air envelopment and immediate evacuation and expert medical treatment of wounded. Using the massive firepower of our units, our concepts are based on the vast expenditure of ammunition through preliminary fires, maximum artillery barrages, concentrated supporting fires and delivery of tremendous small arms fire by the individual soldier. In short, the emphasis is on the expenditure of ammunition rather than the expenditure of lives.

In summary, I am convinced that at Khesanh are all the ingredients of an American victory, not solely through the factors of terrain and strength of arms, but more importantly, the ability and spirit of the American fighting man and those who lead them from the squad leader to the theater commander. Those who fight for us there are not seized by doubts as to what they can do and I do not think that we should doubt that they can do it here at home.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Smith of Iowa, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Talcott, for 15 minutes, on February 20.

Mr. Riegle, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Marsh (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Tunney (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 15 minutes, on February 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Mahon and Mr. Laird during the colloquy on the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for 1968 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Vigorito to extend his remarks on soil conservation.

Mr. Cohelan and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Hall.

Mr. Derwinski in four instances.

Mr. Curtis in two instances.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. McDade.

Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Morse of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Esch.

Mr. Goodell.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Marsh) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Blatnik in five instances.

Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Dingell in three instances.

Mrs. Mink in two instances.

Mr. Hungate in three instances.

Mr. Van Deerlin in two instances.

Mr. Teague of Texas in two instances.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Rosenthal in four instances.

Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Madden in two instances.

Mr. Giaimo in three instances.

Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Vanik in two instances.

Mr. Zablocki in two instances.

Mr. McCormack.

Mr. Friedel.

Mr. Clark in two instances.

Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Diggs in two instances.

Mr. Ryan in five instances.

Mr. McCarthy in two instances.

Mr. Rooney of New York.

Mr. Roush.

Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Brademas.

Mr. Rees.

Mr. Howard in two instances.

Mr. Holland.

Mr. Rarick in two instances.

Mr. Marsh in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1517. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Doc. No. 257); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1518. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports to Congress, pursuant to the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the rules of the House (H. Doc. No. 233); to the Committee on House Administration and orderd to be printed.

1519. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 10th annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia stadium, and the 20th annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80–605 and Public Law 85–300; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1520. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Fund, fiscal years 1966–67, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1521. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Statistics of Publicly Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1966"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1522. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "A bill to enact the interstate agreement on detainers into law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, a statement of claims settled during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 240–243; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 12, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Apalachicola River and Blountstown, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1958. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvements are being accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

1525. A letter from the Federal and State Cochairman, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, transmitting a report of the activities of the Commission for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 15326. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 15327. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 15328. A bill to amend section 13(b) of the act of October 3, 1962 (76 Stat. 698, 704), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 15329. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15330. A bill to provide for the election of President and Vice President as required by the article of amendment to the Constitution proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the 90th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 15331. A bill to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15332. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15333. A bill to provide flexible interest rates for mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 15334. A bill to provide that the appropriation requests of certain regulatory agencies be transmitted directly to Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15335. A bill to establish a Central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15336. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15337. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15338. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased rates of disability compensation, improve service-connected benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 15339. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15340. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15341. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 15342. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 15343. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 15344. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15345. A bill to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 15346. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 15347. A bill to provide for the broadest possible participation by amateur athletes in competitive sports by prohibiting unreasonable restrictions on such participation by private sport groups and operators which sanction or encourage amateur athletic events; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15348. A bill to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to grant a special 30-day period of leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15349. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 15350. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the offer of employment required with respect to any alien desiring to be classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(6); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 15351. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15352. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15353. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15354. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15355. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15356. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 15357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that industrial development bonds are not to be considered obligations of States and local governments, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 15358. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to honey producers for losses sustained by reason of the application of Government-approved insecticides on adjoining croplands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 15359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 15360. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 15361. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 15362. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States; and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto; and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15363. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. MIZE):

H.R. 15364. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 15365. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 1086. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. NIX, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.J. Res. 1087. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as Afro-American History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOW, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. PELLY):

H.J. Res. 1088. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as Afro-American History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. RESNICK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 1089. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as Afro-American History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.J. Res. 1090. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 1091. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as Afro-American History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1092. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period March 17 through March 24, 1968, as International DeMolay Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 1093. Joint resolution authorizing a study of the feasibility of establishing a JudiCorps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 1094. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the approval of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. DENT, and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1096. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1968, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana):

H.J. Res. 1097. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the government of Quebec and the State of Louisiana on cultural cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.J. Res. 1098. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Con. Res. 644. Concurrent resolution concerning the need to demand payment of the French World War I obligation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 645. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 1064. Resolution authorizing payment from the contingent fund for purchase of uniforms, equipment and general expenses of the Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 1065. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to provide for payment of certain additional compensation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Res. 1066. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

307. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, relative to exemption of retirement payments from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to authorizing State highway commissions discretionary authority in designating axleload limits on trucks traveling on Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15366. A bill for the relief of Jesusa Bacalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15367. A bill for the relief of Maria Vallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 15368. A bill for the relief of Pang Tai Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 15369. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Binanti and Mrs. Rosa Binanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15370. A bill for the relef of Sangki La and Myung Sook La; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15371. A bill for the relief of Enid Dawson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15372. A bill for the relief of Filippo Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15373. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Di Giacinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15374. A bill for the relief of Filippo Mandala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15375. A bill for the relief of Pietro Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15376. A bill for the relief of Domenico Viscariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 15377. A bill for the relief of Hawk Ken Seto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15378. A bill for the relief of Cecre Anthony Luciane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 15379. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Erdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15380. A bill for the relief of Ronald V. Fugiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 15381. A bill for the relief of Vladko Dimitrov Denev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 15382. A bill for the relief of Mr. Benito Milano and his daughter, Lorenza Milano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15383. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 15384. A bill for the relief of Leonard Ronald Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Res. 1067. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 15179, entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

242. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to creation of a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

243. Also, petition of Lebanon County Bar Association, Lebanon, Pa., relative to the creation of an additional judgeship on the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1967 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $394. E. (9) $21.15.

A. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.

E. (9) $3,799.49.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $440. E. (9) $768.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,238.75. E. (9) $4,238.75.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $282.05. E. (9) $18,489.85.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $4,197.95.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $68.29.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,690.98. E. (9) $448.10.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,763.50. E. (9) $1,849.20.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $44.08.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $90.69.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,783.44.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $3,600.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,250.

A. Mrs. Dita Davis Beard, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $5,115.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,692.08.

A. Robert S. Bourbon, 8121 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

B. American Association of Bioanalysts, 805 Ambassador Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles R. Bragg, 90 Stony Corners Circle, Avon, Conn.

B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.

E. (9) $3,099.80.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $37.65.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,701.95. E. (9) $79.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $17,034.28. E. (9) $17,034.28.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,645.62.

A. Dan L. Butler, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) $1,573.14. E. (9) $3,480.44.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Channel, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $240.

A. William F. Claire, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Collins, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $298. E. (9) $8.59.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $11,716.31.

A. Paul Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $155.37.

A. Council of Savings & Loan Stock Companies, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $600.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $935.92. E. (9) $935.92.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.

E. (9) $29.85.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

E. (9) $29.50.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $17.18.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,281.25. E. (9) $529.93.

A. Harry J. Donohue, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,908. E. (9) $79.67.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $102. E. (9) $37.50.

A. James B. Elrich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) 278.05.

A. Milton Eisenberg, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Dominium International, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,252.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Savings & Loan Stock Co., 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Dorothy A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,524.50. E. (9) $1,107.72.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $489. E. (9) $12.10.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Vernon LeRoy Ferwerda, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $71.90.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $29.82.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $68.29.

A. Frederick W. Ford.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $834. E. (9) $43.50.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Committee, Inc., 209 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $18.98.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,840.72. E. (9) $1,840.72.

A. Jack Golodner, 286 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.

B. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $41.65.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

E. (9) $361.85.

A. Wilfred H. Hall, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,562.51.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $8.70.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Hartman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $62.88.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. O. Henderson, Box 381, Washington, D.C.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $476. E. (9) $39.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC retired, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $67.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C

D. (6) $400.

A. Harold K. Howe, 734 15th Street NW., D.C.

B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $320. E. (9) $122.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $105.

A. Imports Committee on Tube Division, Electronics Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $6,972.32.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $248.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $440. E. (9) $20.67.

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. Thomas L. Jones, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $31.70.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. George J. Kelley, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $856.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $389.18.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $1,361.23.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1,319.98.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Lauzier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.75.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $475.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
D. (6) $450.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $3.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $6.

A. Lovre & DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Major Professional Football, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,687.50. E. (9) $57.55.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Leonora B. Hopkins, Security Trust Building, Miami, Fla.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $35.95.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Packers Limited, 410 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,387.50. E. (9) $43.80.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $2,558.15.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., Post Office Box 3591, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $811.81.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,406.63.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Andrew Marandon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $628.30.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $436. E. (9) $30.29.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $535.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $227.50.

A. Alan W. Mercill, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association & American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $601.55.

A. Mid-America CATV Association, 11 North Lee, Oklahoma City, Okla.
E. (9) $6,105.73.

A. Albert J. Milloy, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,189.10.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Murden & Co., Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Foreign Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $171.10.

A. John J. Murphy Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers International Union of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $330.90.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,446.72. E. (9) $1,278.54.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,645.62.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,094.43. E. (9) $13,140.31.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $486.31.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) ($74,793.03) Minus item due to refunds. E. (9) $11,788.80.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13,023.62.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,828. E. (9) $2,828.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
D. (6) $77,040. E. (9) $70,654.32.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $524.82.

A. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $385,115.25. E. (9) $5,294.89.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $147,624.16. E. (9) $12,038.83.

A. National Federation of Professional Organizations, Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of U.S.D.A., Box 381, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,906.30.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,864. E. (9) $3,621.12.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28,123. E. (9) $6,317.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,028.37. E. (9) $5,320.50.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $487.78.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,012.32.

A. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.
E. (9) $3,099.80.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $83.80.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $570.36. E. (9) $1,134.87.

A. Outdoor Advertising Association of Oklahoma, Inc., 6702 East 11th Street, Tulsa, Okla.
E. (9) $2,323.16.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,038. E. (9) $2,067.05.

A. J. Francis Pohlaus, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.50.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,376.97.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $228.95.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $2.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $1,476.49.

A. William A. Reynolds, 1210 Kermac Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Mid-America CATV Association, 11 North Lee, Oklahoma City, Okla.
D. (6) $4,999.99. E. (9) $1,105.71.

A. William A. Reynolds, 1210 Kermac Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of Oklahoma, Inc., 6703 East 11th Street, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $323.16.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $44.13.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd (N.Y.), d/b/a Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $125.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $0.55.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $79.89.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $439.97.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,081.28.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $121.05.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $231.82.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Z. Shows, 2108 Huntington Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Custer Channel Wing Aircraft Corp., Hagerstown, Md.
E. (9) $791.65.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill

D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $164.10.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mrs. Annalee Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.

D. (6) $580. E. (9) $2,669.49.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $90.72.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $39.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,592. E. (9) $72.27.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manpower, Inc., 820 North Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Speigelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Speigelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Haley Community Building, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Speigelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md., and 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $22.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,062.50. E. (9) $30.28.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert A. Watkins, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $6.40.

A. Charles A. Webb, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Association of Intercity Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $11,214. E. (9) $127.97.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,092. E. (9) $2,092.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1967:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------- ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

Note on Item "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------Total now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ------------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	Total

Note on Item "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------Total from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------Total now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	Total

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,119.20.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,158.10. E. (9) $6,158.10.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,690.74.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18. E. (9) $19.07.

A. Louis J. Allen, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,068.75. E. (9) $61.69.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
E. (9) $3,349.43.

A. American Association of Bioanalysts, 805 Ambassador Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The American Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.
D. (6) $4,600.80. E. (9) $3,448.86.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,994.48.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $530. E. (9) $1,065.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,064.11. E. (9) $4,064.11.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,399. E. (9) $32,399.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $38,967.83.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,122.80. E. (9) $4,844.47.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $16,225.91. E. (9) $16,225.91.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 South Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $2,689.96.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $1,650.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,927. E. (9) $6,927.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $248.40. E. (9) $248.41.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $16. E. (9) $16.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $942.39. E. (9) $46.67.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13,375.14.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,715.55.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $40.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $48,460. E. (9) $5,250.

A. American Optometric Association, 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $4,943.37. E. (9) $4,943.37.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,932.90. E. (9) $562.81.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,792. E. (9) $11,018.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,906.35.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, care of E. C. Conner, 324 Ellington Road, Longmeadow, Mass.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $15,134.64. E. (9) $15,134.64.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,493.55.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $14,511.87.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $275.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $98,601.43. E. (9) $500.

A. The American Waterways Operations, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,345.68. E. (9) $3,345.68.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d St., Chicago, Ill.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1102 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,604.19. E. (9) $38.13.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Association, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,083. E. (9) $2,741.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users.
D. (6) $21,870.87. E. (9) $21,870.87.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,284.63. E. (9) $4,284.63.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,060.77.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $11,848.30. E. (9) $7,589.14.

A. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aerospace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $274.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn., Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn., and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $336.32.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. John Barnard, Jr., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $11.92.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $15.43.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America, and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $494. E. (9) $208.34.

A. Eugene T. Bartkowiak, 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Roy Battles, 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. (Mrs.) Dita Davis Beard, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,800. E. (9) $5,110.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,117. E. (9) $726.29.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $58.47.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen W. Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,978.24.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $670.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $538.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $403.86. E. (9) $183.60.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,600. E. (9) $1,036.75.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Diamond & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $70.55.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Thomas Hale Boggs, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.46.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $104.48.

A. Mary Ann Boukalis, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Robert S. Bourbon, 8121 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.
B. American Association of Bioanalysts, 805 Ambassador Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO–CLC, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,687.25.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,575.41. E. (9) $331.67.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. Bragg, 90 Stony Corners Circle, Avon, Conn.
B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.
E. (9) $1,866.53.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Motors Corp., 13250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $215.55.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Noah M. Brinson, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $21.40.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,173.10. E. (9) $353.18.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Del Monte Corp. (formerly California Packing Corp.), 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $75.

A. Joseph P. Brosnan, 9160 Springhill Lane, Greenbelt, Md.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, 217-19 North Sixth Street, Lafayette, Ind.
E. (9) $3,952.37.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $19,561.82. E. (9) $19,561.82.

A. E. Fontaine Broun, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $94.78.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,048.93.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $104.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $15.41.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $87.97.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $43,515.46. E. (9) $455.05.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $854.50. E. (9) $356.24.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.50.

A. Dan L. Butler, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the National Automatic Merchandising Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $480.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $165.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,425.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Ten.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Marvin Caplan.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,981, E. (9) $146.80.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C.3, England.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,032.61.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip Carlip, 650 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. District 2, Marine Engineers Beneficial Association .
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $103.20.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $960.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $249.97.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,906.74. E. (9) $12.18.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,516.39. E. (9) $307.95.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Ralph E. Casey, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,760. E. (9) $454.15.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Label Manufacturers National Association, Inc., Agricultural Publishers Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $63.80.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoeniz, Ariz.
D. (6) $13,555. E. (9) $2,749.12.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $98.72.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, 5727 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.16.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E (9) $133.86.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Newspaper Committee for a Free and Competitive Press, 33 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $88.33.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $141.97.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $125.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,397.89. E. (9) $6,176.93.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell T. Christison, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.
D. (6) $74. E. (9) $22.79.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $31,655. E. (9) $320.56.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,716.63.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $43.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $194.62.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $165.32.

A. David Cohen.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,839. E. (9) $219.15.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,365. E. (9) $10.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Colley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $220.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, care of the Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $480.

A. James F. Collins, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Paul C. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,301.98.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,185.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. T. Compton, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $183.10.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $832.60. E. (9) $707.37.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $205.

A. Paul Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $187.61.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,624.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,134.80.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $26.50.

A. Darrell Coover, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $611.76.

A. Thomas L. Copas, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,800.54. E. (9) $26,987.31.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $247.92.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $588.80. E. (9) $588.80.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.
E. (9) $27.90.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
E. (9) $41.75.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Moller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Companies, Post Office Box 2976, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $117.59.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $16.08.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $342.62.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. A. Crowder, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Michael B. Crowson, 1132 Pennsylvania Building.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $213.50.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,599.95. E. (9) $904.86.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,550. E. (9) $2,358.16.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,020.83. E. (9) $26.11.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,244.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway Co., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,145.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $738.03.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Union Tank Car Co., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lowell Davis, Post Office Box 45682, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $179.50. E. (9) $179.50.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor, Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $255.36.

A. Michael B. Deane, 611 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Meat Importers Council, Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Debevoise, Liberman & Corben, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.
D. (6) $9,600. E. (9) $216.48.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Sparrow Pacific Corp., 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $262.51.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manfacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Co's, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John deLaittre, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,250. (9) $2,661.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,281.25. E. (9) $1,085.74.

A. Steven B. Derounian, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amperex Electronic Corp., 230 Duffy Avenue, Hicksville, N.Y.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $92.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Russell C. Derrickson, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Responsive Environments Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750. (E) (9) $900.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Deaborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $174.17.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $2,168.28. E. (9) $133.29.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $1,613.72. E. (9) $63.77.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.

D. (6) $1,229.50. E. (9) $29.50.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.

D. (6) $12,750. E. (9) $1,739.75.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $3.

A. Paul R. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $250.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. C. L. Dorson, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,400.48. E. (9) $140.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $125.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $150.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $300.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $553.14.

A. Robert G. Dwyer, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. George V. Egge, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,512.50. E. (9) $1,867.43.

A. Milton Eisenberg, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Dominium International, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wilson E. Hamilton, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $58.25.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.

D. (6) $2,605.10. E. (9) $2,744.01.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $575. E. (9) $17.02.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $65.

A. Dorothy A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,524.50. E. (9) $1,201.25.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $37.20

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $4,042.50.

A. Employee Relocation Real Estate, Advisory Council, Inc., 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $5,747.40.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,990. E. (9) $217.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $394.50

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $2,174. E. (9) $10.20.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $141,911. E. (9) $22,465.11.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward L. Felton, Holland, Va.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Maxwell Field, 4575 Prudential Tower, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 4575 Prudential Tower, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $8.64.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver. B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $7,125. E. (9) $125.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $55.96.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $135.65.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $18.09.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gene Fondren, Box 192, Taylor, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.
D. (6) $1,597.12. E. (9) $1,078.59.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $13.02. E. (9) $13.02.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,650.50. E. (9) $129.56.

A. Charles E. Foster, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $203.15. E. (9) $322.32.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $159.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. Walter L. Frankland, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $26.08.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1619 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Philip P. Friendlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,470. E. (9) $9,631.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,329.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Medical Laboratories, Inc., 6060 Northeast 112th Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $16.50.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anchor Corp.
D. (6) $9,625. E. (9) $154.34.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brazilian Embassy, 3007 Whitehaven Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.99.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Corporation of America, 1010 Second Avenue, San Diego, Calif.
E. (9) $204.47.

A. Henry E. Gardiner, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9).$29.39.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $80.93.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $1.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,650.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,376.48. E. (9) $199.80.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Associations.
E. (9) $1,288.31.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $341.06.

A. Royce L. Givens, 224 Seventh Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. International Conference of Police Associations, 224 Seventh Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,908. E. (9) $8,601.88.

A. Jay W. Glasmann and Richard Barker, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Employee Relocation Real Estate Advisory Committee, Inc., 209 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $357.78.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jack Gelodner, 286 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. W. S. Gookin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,856.03. E. (9) $3,481.97.

A. Harry L. Graham, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive, Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $12,536.03. E. (9) $12,536.03.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Gray, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,562.61.

A. James A. Gray, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $203.75. E. (9) $116.99.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc Co.
D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lester M. Haddad, 5005 Wickett Terrace, Bethesda, Md.
B. Committee for the Evaluation of Industrial Aid Financing, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $3,419.05.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $520.29.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $72.

A. John R. Haire, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,403.83.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $239.94.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $10.

A. Carlton B. Hamm, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oceanography Association, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $70.80.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $60.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $60.36.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,020.83.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David Hartsough, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $390.

A. James L. Hatcher, 4222 Suitland Road SE., Suitland, Md.

A. Clifford J. Havison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16. E. (9) $14.51.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $16.17.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,531.25. E. (9) $41.28.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $42.70.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $411.63. E. (9) $411.63.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $13.60.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. C. O. Henderson, Box 381, Washington, D.C.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Mrs. Elizabeth S. Hendryson, 6303 Indian School Road NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,256.69.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $486.31.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
E. (9) $292.58.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $295.51.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $60.55.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $195.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $10.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $10.50.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Insurance Companies, Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $5,750. E. (9) $1,523.17.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Imports Committee on Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $425.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,304.24. E. (9) $10,304.24.

A. Harry A. Inman, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y.
D. (6) $865. E. (9) $10.40.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $4,500.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,644.45.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,531.57.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,562.61

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $350.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,392.23. E. (9) $3,310.50.

A. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $15,864.88.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles Jackson, Jr., 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles E. Jackson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $618.50.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $323.75.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $265.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $200.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,770.51. E. (9) $53.64.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Gene Johnson, 814 Fleming Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $784.03. E. (9) $32.52.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,038.27. E. (9) $203.61.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $216.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $21.35.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $229.26.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association.
D. (6) $25.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $15.27.

A. Eugene Adams Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $950.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $110.40.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,504.22.

A. William F. Kenney, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $550.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $135.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $115.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $195.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $538.65. E. (9) $8.85.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $1,278.90.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $522.54.

A. A. R. Kirkley, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $331.25. E. (9) $15.53.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $345. E. (9) $49.30.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $142.80. E. (9) 204.44.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $73.04.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1.250. E. (9) $42.50.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO and CLC, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180 Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1,181.32.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $103.20.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $443.31.

A. June Kysilko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,530.40.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,872. E. (9) $967.26.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,706. E. (9) $7,871.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,783.16.

A. Laborers' Political League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,327.93. E. (9) $700.

A. Julian J. Landau, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Morton Langstaff, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $126.60.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $31.80.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $475.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $303.01.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $528.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120.

A. Richard Leighton, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,250.12.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $26.22.

A. Mrs. Alfred Letzler, 237 North Galveston Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National PTA, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5.52.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arden Publishing Co., Tucson, Ariz.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morris J. Levin, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 132 3d Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,637.46. E. (9) $14,982.32.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,281.08. E. (9) $4,281.08.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,562.50. E. (9) $296.48.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $2.

A. Donald O. Lincoln, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $339. E. (9) $4.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80.20. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,085.91.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $19.54.

A. John J. Long, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $60.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $16.70.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Lovre & DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $197.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Major Professional Football, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Financial General Corp., 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Dr. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Legislation and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,990.48. E. (9) $754.50.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $300.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,741.66. E. (9) $40.40.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $3,437.49. E. (9) $1,235.10.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. McAuliffe, Jr., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Land Title Association, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55. E. (9) $10.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,730.80.

A. Robert L. McCarty, 935 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Evan Jones Coal Co., Jonesville, Alaska and Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc., Usibelli, Alaska.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $397.85.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consumer Products Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $418.21.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Magnavox Co., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $386.73.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Leonora B. Hopkins, Security Trust Building, Miami, Fla.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Packers Limited, 410 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $150.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,823.23. E. (9) $101.14.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,492.28. E. (9) $93.39.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $372.25.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.

B. International Paper Co., 220 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $157.16.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,524.50. E. (9) $335.76.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $80.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,416.66. E. (9) $26.75.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,492.28. E. (9) $212.73.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $720. E. (9) $248.85.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $5,250.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $465. E. (9) $4.82.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $3,960.07.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Printing Industries of America, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $475. E. (9) $820.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway Northeast, Knoxville, Tenn.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. George E. MacKinnon, 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Investors Mutual, Inc., et al.

E. (9) $2,173.27.

A. Macklin, Hanan & McKernan, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Fred Alger & Co., Inc., 120 Broadway New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $391.10.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.

B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., Post Office Box 3591, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,487. E. (9) $524.51.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.

D. (6) $968.75. E. (9) $686.05.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carter Manasco, 5032 Chesterbrook, Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $110.01.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $4,034.58.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Mrs Olya Margolin, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,296.20. E. (9) $129.09.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $221.60.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $41.70.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $66.16. E. (9) $177.65.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $120.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, American Committee on Japan, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

(D) (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,499.91. E. (9) $1,200.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $691.59. E. (9) $892.62.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $219.44.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,820. E. (9) $21.50.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James E. Meals, 1143 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $100.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,291. E. (9) $14.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,160.30. E. (9) $962.97.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,950.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $195.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Box 128 Cazenovia, N.Y., and Shawano, Wis.

A. Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $3,406.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchange, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Music Publishers' Association, Inc., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $270.56.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $130.17.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $317.44.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,307.60. E. (9) $27.90.

A. Robert H. Miller, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tenneco, Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $63.28.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Company Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Jack Mills, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Marion Daniel Minchew, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $165. E. (9) $2.14.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, care of W. W. Dalton, Law Department, Frisco Lines, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $36.50.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1735 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Box 311, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $158.

A. Carl A. Modecki, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael Monroney.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $850.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32.24. E. (9) $40.01.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $23.90.

A. Morrison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) Under $50.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. T. H. Mullen, 4301 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va.
B. Union Camp Corp., 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Murphy, 2794 Wilelinor Drive, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. John J. Nangle, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $775.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Sarah Anne Nation, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $16.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $10.25.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $966.45. E. (9) $17,773.43.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55,221.40. E. (9) $2,023.88.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $506,210.24. E. (9) $16,767.70.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,115.11. E. (9) $5,115.11.

A. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3329 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35,000. E. (9) $11,423.47.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $481.65. E. (9) $645.68.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $48,855.95. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
E. (9) $551.13.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA), 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $47,316.42. E. (9) $47,316.42.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $700.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,058.40.

A. National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,690.74. E. (9) $1,690.74.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 2309 Fannin, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $3,275.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,438.55. E. (9) $2,438.55.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $708.33. E. (9) $729.26.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Instrument Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $145.56.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $190.48.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Encyclopedia Britannica, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,249.99.

A. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,139.44.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, 720 Davis Avenue, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,301.46.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63,332.75. E. (9) $5,320.06.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $137,871.93. E. (9) $12,493.25.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,664.17. E. (9) $24,664.17.

A. National Federation of Professional Organizations, Box 381, Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $461.65. E. (9) $482.77.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,250.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,782.87. E. (9) $15,854.61.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $62.08.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,077.67. E. (9) $332.83.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,630.25. E. (9) $1,630.25.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,944.20. E. (9) $1,944.20.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,854.95. E. (9) $3,854.95.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $633.38.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,674.60.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,177.83.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,044.19.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $93,961. E. (9) $2,484.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $75.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,449.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,650. E. (9) $6,645.09.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.33.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,994.69.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,455.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,260.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $684.45.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $337.40.

A. William E. Neumeyer, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. GT&E Service Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $81.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,166.67. E. (9) $25.

A. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 4575 Prudential Tower, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $408.64. E. (9) $408.64.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,384.61. E. (9) $1,160.04.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $353.90.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $686.63.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.
E. (9) $11,683.01.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $6,369.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $235.60.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. Frank J. O'Brien, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Leo O'Brien, 99 Hawthorne Avenue, Albany, N.Y.
B. Home Rule Committee, Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249. E. (9) $257.50.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Barden Investment Management Corporation, 18610 James Couzens Highway, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $345.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Company, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $422.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fingerhut Manufacturing Co., 3104 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $1,145. E. (9) $139.72.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,397. E. (9) $618.59.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7705 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $83.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,867.41.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,080. E. (9) $691.83.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,030.79.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33.21.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12.80.

A. Jarry H. Opack, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,091.74.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,651. E. (9) $1,080.81.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md., and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Company, 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $159.11. E. (9) $87.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.
D. (6) $5,749.98.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $148.32.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $190.40.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,263.95.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $3,453.58

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aldens, Inc., 5000 West Roosevelt, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Psychological Association, Post Office Box 8227, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Kennth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employes and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,125.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $250.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $48.90.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.18.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $124.50.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,360.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $17,674.70. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Joseph M. Pollard, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County of Los Angeles, State of California, Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $337.77.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $222.59.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,764.20. E. (9) $2,653.65.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Haley, Bader & Potts, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,000.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $166.74. E. (9) $83.36.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $13,250. E. (9) $7,311.45.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $350.97.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161.60.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Raleigh, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Carl R. Ramsey, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 239 Beach Road, Alameda, Calif.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $42.23.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Getty Oil Company.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $185. E. (9) $35.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $64,250.91.

A. Campbell L. Reed, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $21.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $175.31.

A. Research To Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U.S., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $215,920.75.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $56.75. E. (9) $179.53.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,705.70. E. (9) $7,224.68.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William Neale Roach, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. John P. Roche, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $210.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $157.50. E. (9) $2.39.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 750 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562 50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. Michael J. Romig, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $464. E. (9) $52.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Realty and Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.24.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Great Salt Lake Mineral & Chemical Corp., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,031.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $154.43.

A. James S. Rubin, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $596.93.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $456.36.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $114. E. (9) $35.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $451.05.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) 642.93.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. Charles E. Sandler, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $500.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.16.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co., Post Office Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $8.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $34.25.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $357.57.

A. Durwood Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,445.24. E. (9) $326.91.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $123.63.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $310.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and National Association of Electrical Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $835.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 3939 Lisa Lane, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $750.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., publishers.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alvin V. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $780.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. George Shuff, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $895.

A. David Silver, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $292. E. (9) $153.36.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $626.50. E. (9) $1,909.18.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4.39. E. (9) $2.21.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $7,820. E. (9) $3,742.50.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $57.62.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $31.50.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $951.74.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
B. North Dakota Railway Lines.
E. (9) $93.65.

A. Robert B. Smith, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,963. E. (9) $593.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $888.75. E. (9) $643.50.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $148.26. E. (9) $79.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $80.05.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,847.60. E. (9) $5,212.29.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $944.35.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $185. E. (9) $185.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Lynn E. Stalbaum, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Newton I. Steers, Jr., 4419 Romlon Street, Beltsville, Md.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. California Olive Growers and Canners Industry Committee, 572 East Shields, Fresno, Calif., and Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $6.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Aniline Products, Inc., 25 McLean Boulevard, Paterson, N.J.
D. (6) $680. E. (9) $2,669.43.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $27.62.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Imports Committee of Tube Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305. E. (9) $18.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,152.50. E. (9) $121.39.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,388. E. (9) $1,061.68.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $245.27.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Spring, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manpower, Inc., 620 North Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Haley Community Building, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,675.98. E. (9) $542.34.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $600.89.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $655.30.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) 43.30.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.80. E. (9) $231.13.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 604–5 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 604–5 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $835.95. E. (9) $515.46.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $174.83. E. (9) $110.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,414.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $79.75.

A. John H. Todd, Post Office Box 23, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $481.63.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $42.60.

A. John P. Tracey, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $50.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,087.50. E. (9) $30.38.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) 76.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,501.50. E. (9) $809.22.

A. A. O. Turek, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $340. E. (9) $98.91.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $84.97.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $987.25.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,055.68.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $560,970.65. E. (9) $50,104.26.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $174.99.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28,073.48.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $480.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. John M. Vansant, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49.50. E. (9) $2.25.

A. G. W. Vaughan, 233 Broadway, New York, NY.
B. Union Camp Corp., 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $98. E. (9) $14.15.

A. Veterans of World War 1, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $120.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.48. E. (9) $26.61.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $237.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $316.83. E. (9) $7.22.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,910.54. E. (9) $762.30.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 1750 Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Herbert A. Watkins, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $21.66.

A. Charles A. Webb, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $82.74.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $161.74.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $858.26.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $956.25. E. (9) $121.50.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation.

A. Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill., and National Institute of Drycleaning, 909 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $200.55.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas D. Wilcox, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $798.73.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. John Wilder, Somerville, Tenn.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $3.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Conferated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. Ray McDermott & Co., Inc., Oil Division, Houston Club Building, Houston, Tex.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N. Dak.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Francis S. Williams, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $16.18.

A. Harding Williams, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $111.87.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,887.07. E. (9) $595.86.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,580.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $387.25.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,153.86. E. (9) $1,159.76.

A. James Woodside, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,417. E. (9) $532.50.

A. World Trade Committee of Parts Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,870.95. E. (9) $3,870.95.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Holly Corp., 1111 West Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif.; General Development Corp., 2828 Coral Way, Miami, Fla.; Cherokee Village Development Corp., Cherokee Village, Ark.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $60.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corp., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $20.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Savings Associates, 315 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $190.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $324.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1967:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. John R. Ale, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Association of Bioanalysts, 805 Ambassador Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. American Fur Merchants' Association, 224 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of J. C. Tumblin, O.D., 4836 Broadway NE., Knoxville, Tenn.

A. Dr. Davis M. Batson, 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George Burnham 4th, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Steel Corp., 525 William Penn Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, 5727 Blake Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.
B. The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.

A. Committee on Military Obligations (COMO), 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Cope, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Debevoise, Liberman & Corben, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., 176 Cumberland Avenue, Wethersfield, Conn.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Ethyl Corp, 611 Madison Office Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Corporation of America, 1010 Second Avenue, San Diego, Calif.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mead, Johnson & Co., Evansville, Ind.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill.

A. Charles Jackson, Jr., 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Johns Hopkins Hospital, 601 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Johns Hopkins Hospital, 601 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Zachary, Smith Reynolds Trust, care of Mercantile Safe Deposit & Trust, Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Harold V. Kelley, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 9401 West Grand Avenue, Franklin Park, Ill

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Maurice Kramer, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Landowners Protective Association, Box 294, Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Producers of Ferroalloys and Related Products, care of Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.

A. Edward Lippert, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consumer Products Division, Electronic Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ian R. MacGowan, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Martin, Whitfield & Thaler, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Financial General Corp. (a Virginia corporation), 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan W. Mercill, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank J. O'Brien, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John K. Pickens, 201 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John K. Pickens, 201 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Potomac Basin Federation, care of John R. Moulton, R.F.D. 1, Charlestown, W. Va.

A. Publicom, Inc., 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Publicom, Inc., 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, New York, N.Y.

A. William L. Reynolds, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Johns Hopkins Hospital, 601 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust, care of Mercantile Safe Deposit & Trust, Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Fur Merchants' Association, 224 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y., and Scandinavian Fur Farm Organizations, Langagervej 60, Glostrup, Denmark.

A. Spaulding, Reiter & Rose, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Chemical Fibers Association, 3, 3-Chome, Muromachi, Nihonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Woolen & Linen Textile Exporters Association, 4, 4-Chome, Bingomachi, Higashiku, Osaka, Japan.

A. Syndicated Industries, Inc., 8724 East Fort Foote Terrace, Oxon Hill, Md.

A. Robert E. Synnestvedt, Post Office Box 8, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Rev. Charles C. Talley, 3 High Street, Waterford, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Bush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. W. Lloyd Tupling, 235 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Johns Hopkins Hospital, 601 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Zachary, Smith Reynolds Trust, care of Marcantile Safe Deposit & Trust, Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Richard B. Walbert, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Rockefeller, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Edward Weck & Co., Inc., subsidiary of Standard International Corp., 49–33 31st Place, Long Island City, N.Y.

A. Charles E. Walker, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert A. Watkins, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. James G. Watt, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Weck & Co., Inc., 49–33 31st Place, Long Island City, N.Y.

A. Earl Wilson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 886 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Peter L. Wolff, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Zachary, Smith Reynolds Trust, care of Mercantile Safe Deposit & Trust, Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

SENATE—*Thursday, February 15, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Omnipotent, Thou only art the help and hope of our distracted world. Thy mercy endureth forever, in spite of all human denials and betrayals.

Make plain to our understanding that our economic adjustment in the realm of trade and commerce, in themselves, cannot bring social starvation, except as they clear the way for the spiritual undergirding without which we labor in vain and all our endeavors are as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

With Thy benediction may we face the toil of these days with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all deceit and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and self-giving. In the spirit of the Master we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 14, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] be recognized for up to 20 minutes at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I enter an objection, by request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would give farmers and ranchers the right to bargain collectively with respect to the price level of products of the farm and ranch in the commerce of the nation

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

"Whereas, South Dakota is one of the most agricultural states of the nation; and

"Whereas, the economic well-being of South Dakota is very dependent upon the economic condition of its farming and ranching areas; and

"Whereas, a great disparity exists at the present time between the level of agricultural prices throughout the nation and the price level of non-agricultural wages, salaries and products, with the parity index at approximately 73% of parity; and

"Whereas, the inability of farmers to participate in the pricing of their own products is well known and is contrary to the public interest in South Dakota and nationwide; and

"Whereas, products of the farms of the United States in the export trade is the greatest single item in this nation's overall trade with the nations of the world; and

"Whereas, the volume of grains in the export trade is very large at the present time but with the unfavorable price level of such products it may well be said that Agriculture is not holding up its end with respect to United States balance of trade and balance of payments deficit; and

"Whereas, at this immediate time there is grave concern on the part of this nation as to its balance of payments deficit in world trade; and

"Whereas, there is now in the Congress and will be in the 90th session of the Congress legislation to provide the legal means by which farmers and ranchers of the nation may legally and actively bargain collectively in the determination of price levels of the products of farms and ranches,

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Senate of the 43rd session of the Legislature of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, respectfully urge the United States Senators from South Dakota, the Honorable Karl Mundt and the Honorable George McGovern, and members of the Congress, the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Ben Reifel, to support legislation in the Congress providing for collective bargaining by farmers. We respectfully urge their support of such legislation as they may believe to be in the interests of the Agriculture of South Dakota and in the public interest of this nation, to the end that the Congress may pass such legislation.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of the Senate of the state of South Dakota be directed to transmit copies of this Memorial Resolution to his Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Honorable Karl Mundt, and the Honorable George McGovern, United States Senators from South Dakota; the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Ben Reifel, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, within ten days after the passage and approval of this resolution.

"Adopted by the Senate January 23, 1968.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 7, 1968.

"Lem Overpeck,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"James D. Jelbert,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Paul Inman,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to review and enact legislation to modify the new federal meat inspection act and the slaughterhouse equipment regulations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as not to drive the independent slaughterhouses and meat packing plants out of business

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

"Whereas, twenty-nine states have, on their own accord, adopted compulsory state meat inspection programs, and twelve other states, including South Dakota, have such programs on a voluntary basis; and

"Whereas, in South Dakota a total of approximately ninety (90) meat slaughterhouses, locker plants and packing plants have served the people of this state on the whole, with clean, wholesome meat subject to purity standards enforcement by the South Dakota Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas, the quality will be improved further by the new compulsory state meat inspection program; and

"Whereas, many of these plants, operated in a clean manner by any reasonable standards, are nevertheless small plants which cannot economically continue to operate if forced to comply to present federal slaughterhouse equipment standards promulgated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas, this legislative body is in full accord with the provisions regarding the inspection of meat as to purity and cleanliness;

"Whereas, this legislative body opposes the application of the present U.S.D.A. standards for construction and equipment to the small intrastate slaughtering and processing plants; and

"Whereas, the construction and equipment standards for intrastate slaughter and processing plants should be left under state jurisdiction:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-third Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the President and the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, respectfully, requested to give due consideration to instructing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to adjust its regulations so as not to drive the independent slaughterhouses and meat packing plants out of business and until then to withhold authority to enforce the new meat inspection act; and

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of South Dakota to the Offices of the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the state of South Dakota, and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and

"Be it further resolved, that the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the members of the Congressional Delegation from South Dakota to take immediate steps toward the development of an act amending the meat inspection program as now enacted into law, so as to have the question of equipment and inspection procedure standards resolved by state law.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives January 22, 1968.

"Concurred in by the Senate February 1, 1968.

"JAMES D. JELBERT,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PAUL INMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the State Highway Commission to increase the gross axle weight permitted for farm to market vehicles using the Federal Aid Highway

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

"Whereas, the present Federal Aid Highways Act of 1956 limits the load weight of vehicles to 18,000 pounds on any single axle and 32,000 pounds on any tandem axle traveling on Federal Aid Highways; and

"Whereas, the ability to get farm crops from the harvest field to market in the most expeditious manner possible is imperative to efficient farming operations; and

"Whereas, the time consumed in getting farm crops to the market is greatly increased by the present load limit restrictions; and,

"Whereas, the transportation of other commodities is impeded by the existing restriction on load limits on the Federal Aid Highways.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives of the Forty-third Session of the Legislature of South Dakota, that Senate concurring therein, respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take whatever action might be necessary and appropriate to authorize the Highway Commissions of the states discretionary power to designate load limits of 20,000 pounds on any single axle and 36,000 pounds on any tandem axle traveling on Federal Aid Highways.

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate of the State of South Dakota to the offices of the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the State of South Dakota, the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation, and the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives January 22, 1968

"Concurred in by the Senate February 6, 1968

"JAMES D. JELBERT,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PAUL INMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., U.S. Air Force Reserve, for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve and major general, Air Force Reserve.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 122 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Rear Adm. Fred G. Bennett, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Brig. Gen. Charles Lutcher Southward, Army National Guard of the United States, to be major general;

Col. John Richard Carson, Army National Guard of the United States, to be brigadier general;

Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Salisbury (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and sundry officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Frank J. Puerta, Air Force Reserve, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve;

Lee E. Bains, and sundry other officers, for promotion in Naval Reserve; and

Harold L. Oppenheimer, Marine Corps Reserve, for appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 1,233 promotions in the Army in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below, 2,392 appointments in the Air Force in the grade of major and below, and 1,909 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of 2d lieutenant and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Louis A. Cabral, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Grey C. Axtell, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Jerome Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Edward L. Menning, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2970. A bill to establish an independent Office of Government Procedure to assist the Congress in its oversight of the execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, the evaluation of procedures of executive and independent agencies of the Government, and the adoption of improved means to carry into effect the policies of the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks by Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2971. A bill for the relief of Dr. C. J. Phalangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2972. A bill to enable baby chicks, started pullet, laying hen and table egg producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain and develop orderly marketing conditions at prices reasonably to consumers and producers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2973. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2974. A bill for the relief of Dr. Houshang Vossoughi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2975. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2976. A bill relating to planning in the District of Columbia and its environs in connection with developments and projects of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2977. A bill for the relief of Melencio Acerimo Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2978. A bill to repeal the exemption applicable to ordinary livestock in the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2979. A bill to establish a Commission on Negro History and Culture: to conduct a study of all proposals to research, document, compile, preserve, and disseminate data on Negro history and culture; to recommend such legislative enactments as may be required to provide for the integration of such data into the mainstream of American education and life; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2970—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT PROCEDURE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT, I introduce today a bill to create an Office of Government Procedure which, I believe, would do a great deal to strengthen the ability of Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility in the making of public policy and also to better assure the maintenance of a viable, responsive democracy.

The authority and responsibility of Congress to make public policy is clearly identified in article I, section I, of the Constitution which states:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Yet over the years, and particularly within the past three decades, the executive branch has assumed—both in a practical and legal sense—enormous and increasingly greater law making powers.

Actually although the enactment of statutory law is the sole responsibility of Congress, the sharing of public policymaking between the two branches of Government is inherent to our constitutional and political system. The presidential power to issue executive orders and the bureaucracy's authority to promulgate administrative rules has always meant that the function of the executive branch was never limited to that of simply administering the precise letter of statutory law. Moreover, the President's constitutional responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, his roles as Chief of State and Commander in Chief coupled with the fact that he is the Nation's chief political officer assured the presidency, from the very beginning, broad power to influence the formulation and enactment of public policy. And the Nation's great growth and the ever increasing complexity of these modern times has necessarily encouraged the centralization of leadership and direction in the affairs of state.

Thus it is natural and inevitable that the executive branch should be a far greater force in the making of public policy today than in early years of our development.

But despite this, Mr. President, I think it is now clear that we must seriously consider the question of whether or not the distribution of policy powers has not become unbalanced. I believe it has. I believe the increasing assumption of policymaking powers by the executive branch has now reached the point where the ability of Congress to meet its own constitutional responsibilities has been jeopardized. Furthermore, I believe that this trend presents an increasingly serious challenge to our historic and continuous effort to create and maintain a government that is truly representative and responsive in all its various parts.

Mr. President, the trends of which I have spoken are particularly manifested in, first, the expansion of the bureaucracy's "legislative" function, and second, the increasing capacity of the President to dominate the formulation and enactment of public policy.

First I would discuss the reasons for the growing power of the bureaucracy and the problems and dangers inherent in this trend.

The sheer number and complexity of today's problems and the Federal programs intended to deal with them makes it quite impossible for Congress to write statutes so detailed and specific that the administrators charged with putting them into effect would have only to apply the letter of the law. Thus it has been necessary to delegate broad powers to the executive and independent agencies with the result that much of the legislative function has been transferred to the administrative process. And a subtle and inexorable change has been affected in our system of Government.

The volume of agency legislation now exceeds by many volumes the corresponding additions to the statute books. Americans are bound in countless ways by a vast array of rules and regulations by an army of appointed administrators rather than by elected representatives of the people. Administrative policies have an impact on practically every human endeavor. They prescribe individual, group, and institutional behavior. They have the force of law and their violation incurs the loss of government service or the imposition of sanctions.

Mr. President, lawmaking by the bureaucracy need not be incompatible with the system of representative government. But it is essential that Congress be able to maintain oversight control over the manner in which the administrative agencies exercise the powers which the Congress has delegated.

Such control is necessary not only to assure that Congress meets its constitutional responsibilities but also to assure that the bureaucracy is responsive to the needs and wishes of the people. No modern-day government can survive with a large bureaucracy, but limited and representative government cannot be maintained unless the bureaucracy is responsive to democratic controls.

The Congress has long recognized the dangers of an uncontrolled and unregulated bureaucracy. Thus Congress has passed laws requiring executive and independent agencies to observe certain procedural safeguards and to make many of their records available to the public.

In addition, Congress requires agencies to make reports on their operations. It has authorized and directed the Comptroller General to audit accounts, to make expenditures analyses of executive agencies to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently expended, and in the case of government corporations, to ascertain and report whether any activity has been carried on without authority of law. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it is the duty of each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to exercise continuous watchfulness of the administrative agencies.

Supplementing these modes of review are the informal day-to-day investigations carried out by individual Members of Congress and their staffs as part of their service to constituents whose rights are affected by actions of particular agencies. In addition, the Senate has the constitutional authority to withhold consent to nominees for agency positions.

When administrative abuses are discovered, the Congress can act to expressly reduce or eliminate the authority of the agency in question. It can reduce the agency's appropriations, reorganize it, or abolish it.

No one should belittle the importance or effectiveness of these various measures. But there is widespread agreement that they are grossly inadequate. Members of Congress, acting individually or through committees, simply do not have the time or the means to keep up with the manifold activities of executive and independent agencies. The mission of the Comptroller General is too limited to enable him to supply information on all aspects of those activities.

Congress and the public urgently need additional assistance from experts empowered to survey the entire range of administrative activity, to report what is actually being done and to recommend needed changes in procedures and laws."

In his excellent book, "Bureaucracy on Trial," William W. Boyer effectively stated the need for such a body this way:

> From the frames of reference of limited government and popular control, there is as much justification for legislative audit of administrative lawmaking as for legislative audit of administrative spending.

He went on to argue that given the complexity of modern government—

> . . . the chasm so apparent now between the legislative process and administrative policy making will deepen, unless reasonable and workable accommodations between the two are effected. Otherwise, government in the United States is destined to drift either toward chaos or major constitutional, structural, and political surgery. Either alternative could exact a high price in individual liberty and democracy.

Mr. President, the second major difficulty Congress encounters in attempting to properly fulfill its constitutional responsibilities for the making of public policy is that of acquiring the information necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of programs it has enacted as measured against the objectives that Congress intended to be achieved with enactment of these programs.

If the Congress is to adequately fulfill its policymaking responsibilities, it must have the available means by which it can evaluate the legislation which it enacts. It needs the information necessary to determine whether the programs are working as intended; whether they are having undesirable or unintended side effects; and what types of changes are necessary.

The congressional committees, of course, do valuable work in this area of program evaluation, but given the enormous increase in the number and complexity of Federal programs in the past decades it has simply become a physical impossibility for the committees to acquire and digest all the necessary information.

Thus, today it is the executive branch of Government which has a near monopoly on the type of information needed for program evaluation both on a day-to-day basis and a long-range basis as well. It is much beter equipped than the Congress to acquire and evaluate the data needed to measure public problems and needs. And once Federal programs to deal with these problems are enacted it has a great advantage over the Congress in terms of evaluating the effectiveness of these programs, pinpointing their strengths and weaknesses and determining what changes are needed.

The staff resources and professional expertise are concentrated almost entirely in the executive branch. Much of the necessary basic data is available to Congress and the public; but some of it is not, particularly the most current data which is often the most valuable. However, even more important than the availability of basic data is the matter of analysis and evaluation, and Congress has only limited access to this type of service.

This lopsidedness in the availability of program evaluation data and accompanying staff resources is of course one of the principal reasons why the Congress has steadily lost ground to the Executive in the formulation of public policy.

But the implication of this trend goes beyond the issue of the Chief Executive's growing domination of the formulation of public policy. For once programs proposed by the President are enacted an inevitable climate of vested self-interest sets in and regardless of how well intentioned the administrators may be one must inevitably question whether or not they will use their great program evaluation resources objectively. There will always be a tension between the demand for candid and objective evaluation and the natural human tendency to defend and justify one's own work.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce is designed to provide, first, the institutional means whereby administrative actions and procedures can be regularly audited and studied to assure compliance with statutory law and prevent abuses of bureaucratic authority. Second, it would serve to provide the Congress with the necessary information for program evaluation.

The Office of Government Procedure would be completely independent of the executive branch and solely responsible to the Congress. Like the General Accounting Office, it would be directed by an official appointed by the President and confirmed by the Congress for a period of 15 years and who could be removed only by joint action of both Houses of the Congress.

The function of this Office would be to conduct studies and investigations and make reports on two basic questions: First, are statutory laws being interpreted and administered in the manner intended by Congress; and second, are the laws achieving the results sought by Congress.

To provide Congress with these answers the Office of Government Procedure would be assigned the following eight specific duties:

First, to conduct studies to determine whether the administrative procedures of the executive and independent agencies of the Government are in all respects in compliance with the letter and intent of the laws passed by Congress;

Second, to conduct studies of specific fields of administrative law, and otherwise assist the Congress to conduct such studies, in order to effect more adequate and clear statutory standards of delegation of policymaking discretion to such agencies;

Third, to report periodically to the Congress incidents of noncompliance by executive and independent agencies with laws governing administrative procedures;

Fourth, to audit the substance and procedures of administrative action of such agencies to ascertain the extent to which agency policies are not published as rules as required by law;

Fifth, to investigate and advise the Congress as to the extent to which the policies of the Congress could be more effectively carried out if the responsible agencies which exercise adjudicative powers were to formulate, publish for public information, and comply with statements of principles to govern the interpretation of provisions of law;

Sixth, in its discretion to investigate and evaluate complaints made concerning administrative procedures of such agencies;

Seventh, to gather and transmit to Congress the information necessary to effectively evaluate program performance by executive and independent agencies of the Government, and to ascertain whether legislative programs are achieving the policy objectives anticipated by the Congress; and

Eighth, to submit recommendations, from time to time, directly to the Congress for additional legislation which the Office deems necessary or desirable to further the purposes of this act.

Mr. President, I believe that the language of most of these duties is self-explanatory, however, a few comments are in order.

Duty No. 2 was written into the bill because there is general acknowledgment among Congressmen and bill-drafting experts that the issue of congressional delegation of authority to administrative agencies is greatly complicated by the absence of guidelines on how to write statutory language that clearly identifies the nature and limits of the authority which Congress considers necessary to delegate. The Office of Government Procedure would be charged with the responsibility of studying this and then advising Congress as to the development and use of such guidelines.

Duty No. 5 is an attempt to deal with one factor which has significantly increased the difficulty experienced by both Congress and the public in trying to follow administrative action; namely, the widespread tendency of agencies to dispose of matters brought before them by adjudication on a case-by-case basis, rather than by the promulgation of general rules embodying general policies and interpretations of law. This practice is, of course, particularly characteristic of the regulatory agencies. Because of this, it is extremely difficult for Congress to determine how the statutory laws are being interpreted at any given time.

In addition, this absence of general policy guidelines often works the hardship of uncertainty on the individuals and groups affected by the law in question. Thus the affected interests must employ extensive legal counsel to study each case and attempt to interpret how the particular agency is interpreting the law in question at any given time. As a result, a whole new field of legal service has come into being in recent decades.

Now it is not suggested that the case-by-case approach be abolished. Likewise it is recognized that in the development of any general policy guideline care must be taken not to destroy the flexibility which is necessary in the exercise of adjudication. But there should be no insurmountable reason why the tensions between the desirable flexibility of the case-by-case approach and the justified need for general policy guidelines cannot be bridged. It would be one of the duties of this office to advise the Congress how this might best be accomplished.

Duty No. 6 authorizes the Office to receive and investigate complaints concerning administrative procedures. I would emphasize that it is not intended that the Office of Government Procedure assume the function of an ombudsman. However, the receiving of complaints from the public would be a necessary and useful means whereby the Office could better fulfill its basic functions of determining administrative compliance with statutory law and the measuring of program performance.

Mr. President, in conclusion I would emphasize that in proposing the Office of Government Procedure there is no intent to create an administrative straitjacket or otherwise unduly hamper the administrative process. But it is clear, I believe, that Congress's delegations of power over the past few decades have outstripped the machinery for checking administrative operations under them. Thus an independent agency, staffed by experts, giving undivided attention to all aspects of the administration of statutes has now become necessary if Congress is to halt the further erosion of its constitutional responsibility.

Likewise in stressing the need for Congress to equip itself with the tools that will strengthen its capacity to formulate public policy it is not proposed that the capacity of the executive branch to formulate policy be correspondingly reduced. Rather the objective here is to better assure the balance of policymaking power which the Constitution requires and democracy demands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I introduce today to create the establishment of an Office of Government Procedure be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2970) to establish an independent Office of Government Procedure to assist the Congress in its oversight of the execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, the evaluation of procedures of executive and independent agencies of the Government, and the adoption of improved means to carry into effect the policies of the Congress, introduced by Mr. Pearson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2970

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Office of Government Procedure Act of 1968".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. The Congress declares that the full and proper exercise of its legislative authority and responsibility conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States makes necessary the establishment of an Office of Government Procedure independent of the executive branch of Government to aid the Congress in exercising oversight with respect to the compliance with policies embodied in legislation enacted by the Congress by executive and independent agencies charged with the administration thereof, and to provide means whereby the Congress can determine the extent to which the policy objectives of such legislation are achieved through the execution and administration thereof.

OFFICE ESTABLISHED

Sec. 3. (a) To assist the Congress in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility to make all laws, and for the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act, there is hereby established the Office of Government Procedure (referred to hereinafter as the "Office").

(b) The Office shall be headed by a Director appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of fifteen years.

(c) The Director may be removed by joint resolution of both houses of Congress upon prior notice and stated cause and after hearing before a joint committee of the Congress established for that purpose and by no other means.

(d) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for the compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States.

STAFF OF THE OFFICE

Sec. 4. (a) The Director shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule of pay rates.

(b) The Office may procure temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

DUTIES OF THE OFFICE

Sec. 5. (a) It shall be the function of the Office to—

(1) conduct studies to determine whether the administrative procedures of the executive and independent agencies of the Government are in all respects in compliance with the letter and intent of the laws passed by Congress;

(2) conduct studies of specific fields of administrative law, and otherwise assist the Congress to conduct such studies, in order to effect more adequate and clear statutory standards of delegation of policymaking discretion to such agencies;

(3) report periodically to the Congress incidents of noncompliance by executive and independent agencies with laws governing administrative procedures;

(4) audit the substance and procedures of administrative action of such agencies to ascertain the extent to which agency policies are not published as rules as required by law;

(5) investigate and advise the Congress as to the extent to which the policies of the Congress could be more effectively carried out if the responsible agencies which exercise adjudicative powers were to formulate, publish for public information, and comply with statements of principles to govern the interpretation of provisions of law administered by them;

(6) in its discretion to investigate and evaluate complaints made concerning administrative procedures of such agencies;

(7) to gather and transmit to Congress the information necessary to effectively evaluate program performance by executive and independent agencies of the Government, and to ascertain whether legislative programs are achieving the policy objectives anticipated by the Congress; and

(8) submit recommendations, from time to time, directly to the Congress for additional legislation which the Office deems necessary or desirable to further the purposes of this Act.

POWERS OF THE OFFICE

Sec. 6. (a) (1) Under such regulations as the Director shall prescribe, the Director, or any employee of the Office duly designated by the Director, may conduct such hearings as may be required for the performance of the duties of the Office, administer oaths for the purpose of taking evidence in any such hearing, and issue subpenas to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of relevant documentary evidence in any such hearing. Such subpenas shall bear the signature of the Director, and may be served by any person designated by the Director for that purpose.

(2) The provisions of section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply to witnesses summoned to appear at any such hearing. The per diem and mileage allowances of witnesses so summoned under authority conferred by this section shall be paid from funds appropriated to the Office.

(3) Any person who willfully neglects or refuses to appear, or refuses to qualify as a witness or to testify, or to produce any evidence in obedience to any subpena duly issued under authority of this section shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both. Upon the certification by the Director of the facts concerning any such willful disobedience by any person to the United States Attorney for any judicial district in which such person resides or is found, such attorney shall proceed by information for the prosecution of such person for such offense.

(b) The Director is authorized to enter into contracts or other agreements with Federal agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of such research or surveys as may be required in the performance of the duties of the Office.

(c) The Director is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the United States Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics required for the discharge of the duties of the Office under this Act. Subject to the requirements of national security, each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Office upon written request made by the Director.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 2972—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO THE EGG INDUSTRY

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my brief explanatory remarks.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Mr. President, today I introduce the industry egg legislation bill, to permit the egg producers of our Nation to decide for themselves whether or not they want to bring the supply of eggs in line with demand. It is my belief that the producers should have this privilege because the price of eggs has been below the cost of production.

The election provided for in this legislation will be administered by the Department of Agriculture, with the producers themselves having the only voice involved as to whether they want to place controls on their own laying flocks.

If the results of the referendum show that a majority of the producers are against this egg quota legislation, then the current practice of producing eggs will continue. If, however, the producers are in favor of egg quota legislation, then controls will be placed on the number of hens that each producer may maintain by a national egg board that will be composed of two producer members from each egg production district.

I want to make it quite clear that this program is solely for the producers to elect, and the Government will only be the administrator of the election.

The bill (S. 2972) to enable baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain, and develop orderly marketing conditions at prices reasonable to consumers and producers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2972

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. That this Act shall be known as the Table Egg Marketing Act.

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is declared that disruption of the orderly exchange of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs and products thereof in interstate commerce impairs the purchasing power of farmers and destroys the value of agricultural assets which support the national credit structure and that these conditions affect transactions in agricultural commodities with a national public interest, and burden and obstruct the normal channels of interstate commerce. The efficient production of such commodities and the maintenance and expansion of their existing markets and uses is vital to the welfare of producers and those concerned with marketing, processing, and using the commodities to the extent that their orderly production and marketing is a matter of national interest and affects the economy and general welfare of the nation. That owing to the causes beyond their control, those engaged in the production and marketing of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs and products thereof have, from time to time, been unable to anticipate the quantity of table eggs reasonably required to meet the ultimate needs of consumers with the result that cycles of excess supply have often reduced market prices below actual cost of production and cycles of deficient supply have often caused relatively high consumer prices. That such fluctuations in supply and demand have from time to time repeatedly created unstable and chaotic conditions for both producers and consumers and is likely to do so in the future without proper regulation tending to produce a reasonable balance between the supply of and demand of such commodities.

SEC. 3. It is declared to be the policy of Congress—

(A) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act, to establish and maintain such orderely market conditions for baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs and products thereof as will establish, as the prices to producers of table eggs, parity prices as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, 52 Stat. 31, 62 Stat. 1258, 63 Stat. 1054.

(B) To protect the interest of the consumer by (1) approaching the level of prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in subsection (A) of this section by gradual correction of the current level at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture deems to be in the public interest and feasible in view of the current consumptive demand in domestic and foreign markets, and (2) authorizing no action under this Act which has for its purpose the maintenance of prices to producers above the level which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in subsection (A) of this section.

(C) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act, to establish and maintain such minimum standards of quality and such grading and inspection requirements for baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs and products thereof as will effectuate such orderly marketing of such commodities as will be in the public interest.

(D) Through the exercise of the power conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act, to establish and carry out a program to provide an orderly flow of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs in commerce as will avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supply or of prices of table eggs and as will tend to consistently provide an adequate supply of high-quality products to meet the needs of consumers at prices which are reasonable to consumers and sufficient to allow a reasonable and adequate return to producers by (i) stabilizing table egg prices, (ii) diverting surplus baby chicks, started pullets, or laying hens from the production of table eggs for the commercial egg market, and (iii) research and development of production and marketing programs designed to improve quality and promote the consumption of table eggs or the products thereof.

(E) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act, to continue for the remainder of any marketing season or marketing year such regulation pursuant to any order as will tend to avoid a disruption of the orderly marketing of table eggs and be in the public interest, if the regulation of such commodity under such order has been initiated during such marketing season or marketing year on the basis of its need to effectuate the policy of this Act.

ORDERS REGULATING THE HANDLING OF EGGS

SEC. 4. (A) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, issue, and from time to time amend, orders applicable to (1) persons engaged in the marketing or handling of laying hens, baby chicks, or started pullets intended for development into laying hens, intended for the production of table eggs for marketing in commerce, and (2) producers, dealers, and processors of eggs and products thereof. Such orders shall regulate, in the manner provided in this Act, only such handling of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs or products thereof, as is in the current of interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity, or which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects, interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof.

COMMODITIES TO WHICH APPLICABLE

(B) orders issued pursuant to this section shall be applicable only to the following agricultural commodities: baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs and products thereof. Baby chicks started pullets, and laying hens may be combined with table eggs in any combination under an order for the purpose of improving the economic conditions of the producers of table eggs.

NOTICE OF HEARING

(C) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that the issuance of an order will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act with respect to table eggs or products thereof, he shall give due notice of and an opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed order. Such hearing may be requested by any group of table egg producers which is deemed by the Secretary to be representative of a significant volume of the table eggs currently marketed in commerce and such group may submit to the Secretary a proposal regarding the form and content of any such order, and nothing done by any such group or the members thereof in connection with the drafting or formulating of such proposals shall be held to be in violation of the anti-trust laws of the United States or deemed to be unlawful.

FINDINGS AND ISSUANCE OF ORDER

(D) After such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue an order if he finds, and sets forth in such an order, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing, that the issuance of such order and all the terms and conditions thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act.

REQUIRED TERMS IN ORDER

(E) Any order issued pursuant to this Act shall contain the following terms and conditions:

(1) Providing for the establishment of a National Egg Board to be composed of two producer members from each egg production district established by such order, which districts shall not exceed six in number. Each member shall be elected by producers in a manner prescribed in the order and confirmed by the Secretary. No board member shall serve more than two consecutive three year terms. Said order shall define the National Egg Board's powers and duties, which shall include the following:

(a) to administer such order in accordance with its terms and provisions:

(b) to make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and provisions of such order;

(c) to receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary of Agriculture complaints of violations of such order;

(d) to formulate and recommend amendments to such order; and

(e) to acquire, compile, and analyze factual economic and statistical information necessary to perform its functions under the order and to disseminate relevant information to the industry and to the public.

(2) Providing for provisions incidental to, and not inconsistent with, the terms and conditions specified in this Act and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such order.

PERMISSIVE TERMS OF ORDER

(F) Orders issued pursuant to this Act shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions and (except as otherwise provided in Section 4(E)), no others.

(1)(a) Providing for the determination, or a method for the determination, of a total quota of baby chicks, started pullets, and laying hens, which all producers of table eggs may acquire in a designated period or periods, based on the desirable total quantity of eggs to be marketed by all producers in a designated period or periods. In developing such quota, consideration shall be given to balancing the supply of table eggs with anticipated market demand therefor in the light of historical production, consumption, and other uses and any reasonably expected changes in these factors occasioned by population trends, per capita consumption, or other reasons.

(b) Providing for the allotting, or a method for allotting, on a uniform basis to each producer of table eggs, a proportionate share of the total quota of baby chicks, started pullets, and laying hens each producer may acquire, based on the quantities of such commodities acquired, and eggs marketed, by each such producer in a prior representative period.

(2) Providing for the allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of table eggs or products thereof, of any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all producers thereof (including a handler's own production) under a uniform rule based upon the amounts sold by such producers in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or upon current quantities available for sale by such producers, or both, to the end that the total quantities of table eggs or products thereof to be purchased or handled during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers.

(3) Providing for a market diversion program for table eggs, which may include open market purchases of table eggs, (including liquid, frozen or dried eggs) of any grade, size, type or quality, when the Secretary determines that the then current or the estimated price for table eggs is such that the average return therefor to producers would not be reasonable in view of the prices of feed, the available supplies of feeds, economic conditions affecting table egg production, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for table eggs, and providing further, that a table egg market diversion fund may be established by an assessment, at a rate set forth in the order, upon each dozen of table eggs marketed or handled under the order.

(4) Providing for a market diversion program for baby chicks, started pullets, and laying hens, which may include open market purchases of such commodities, when the Secretary determines that the then current or the estimated price for such commodities is such that the average return therefor to producers of such commodities would not be reasonable in view of the prices of feed, the available supplies of feeds, other costs of production, economic conditions affecting production, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for such commodities, and providing further, that an egg poultry market diversion fund may be established by an assessment, at a rate set forth in the order, upon each baby chicks, started pullet, and laying hen marketed, or handled under the order.

(5) Providing for the control and regulation of the sale, transfer, assignment, or other disposition of all or any part of an allotment issued under this section.

(6) Providing for the licensing, under procedures set forth in the order, of: (a) persons who are producers of table eggs; (b) persons handling baby chicks, started pullets, and laying hens; and (c) persons who handle table eggs. An order may also provide for collection of a fee for such licenses in an amount or amounts sufficient to pay the cost and expense of administering the order. Such fees may be in a uniform amount to each handler or may be established as to each handler on a pro rata basis, based on the quantity of the commodity handled by each handler. Such fees may also vary as between handlers of different commodities. The Secretary, in establishing the fee arrangement, shall determine the amount necessary to administer the order, and, in the event of varied fees as to handlers of different commodities, shall assign a larger proportionate share of the administrative cost to handlers of the commodities to whom, he determines, accrue a greater benefit from the order program.

(7) Establishing, or providing for the establishment of, research and development, advertising, and other programs designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing and distribution of table eggs and to improve the quality and increase consumption of table eggs or egg products, and providing further that a research and development fund for table eggs may be established by an assessment, at a rate set forth in the order, upon each dozen of table eggs marketed or handled under the order.

(8) Providing for exemption from the application of the regulatory and assessment provisions of an order of the marketing and handling of such minimum quantities of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs, upon which the Secretary determines such regulation and assessment would not be necessary to effectuate the policy of the Act or the order and which, if regulated and assessed would result in unduly burdening the administration of the order.

(9) In the event the licensing authority provided in subsection (6) of this section is not used, providing for the establishment of an administrative expense fund to pay the cost and expense of administering the order by assessments made on handlers of baby chicks, started pullets, laying hens, and table eggs subject to regulation under the order. Such assessments may be in a uniform amount to each handler or may be established as to each handler based on the quantity of the commodity handled by each handler. Such assessments may also vary as between handlers of different commodities. The Secretary, in establishing such assessments, shall determine the amcunt required to administer the order, and, in the event of varied assessments as to handlers of different commodities, shall assess a larger proportionate share of the administration cost to handlers of the commodities to whom, he determines, accrue a greater benefit from the order program.

(10)(a) Providing that all persons subject to an order shall keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the order. Such books and records shall be open for inspection at all times during normal business hours by authorized representatives of the National Egg Board and the Secretary. Such reports shall be furnished in such form and contain such information prescribed by the order. The Secretary is authorized to examine such books, papers, records, copies of income tax reports, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, or memoranda as he deems relevant and which are within the control of such persons, or any party having, either directly or indirectly, actual or legal control of or over such person or of any subsidiary of any such person.

(b) All information furnished to or acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture or the National Egg Board pursuant to this section shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and of the National Egg Board and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them and then only in a suit or administrative hearing at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary of Agriculture, or to which he or an officer of the United States is a party, and involving the order with reference to which the information so to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit (i) the issuance of general statements based upon reports of a number of persons subject to an order, which statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or (ii) the publication, by direction of the Secretary, of the name of any person violating the order, together with a statement of the particular provisions of the order violated by such person. Any such office or employee violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both, and shall be removed from office.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM AND PRODUCER APPROVAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of table eggs for commerce for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of an order is approved or favored by producers. No order issued pursuant to this Act shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such order is approved or favored by (a) not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in such referendum and those producers voting in favor of the order produced not less than fifty-one per cent of the table eggs produced during such representative period, or, (b) not less than a majority of the producers voting in such election and those producers voting in favor of the order produced not less than two-thirds of the table eggs produced during such representative period.

AMENDMENT, SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF ORDERS

SEC. 6. (A) The Secretary shall, whenever, he finds that any order issued under this Act, or any provision thereof, obstructs, or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, or is not in the public interest, terminate or suspend the operation of such order or such provision thereof.

(B) The Secretary may conduct a referendum at any time, and shall conduct a referendum on the request of two-thirds of the entire membership of the National Egg Board, or 10 per centum of the table egg producers by petition to determine whether the producers favor termination or suspension of an order; and the Secretary shall suspend or terminate such order whenever he determines that suspension or termination of the order is favored or approved by a majority of the producers voting in such election and that those voting for suspension or termination produced a majority of the table eggs during a representative period determined by the Secretary.

(C) The termination or suspension of any order, or any provision thereof, shall not be considered an order within the meaning of this Act.

(D) The provisions of this Act applicable to orders shall be applicable to amendments to orders.

ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE IN REFERENDUM

SEC. 7. At least thirty days prior to conducting any referendum under this Act the Secretary shall issue a public notice fixing a time and place in each county where producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary have been engaged in the production of table eggs for commerce, may register their names and addresses and disclose such other pertinent information regarding their operations as the Secretary may require. The Secretary may exclude any person who fails to so register or who is otherwise ineligible from participating in the referendum.

PETITION AND REVIEW

SEC. 8. (A) Any person subject to an order may file a written petition with the Secretary stating that any such order or any provision of any such order or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final, if in accordance with law.

(B) The District Courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction in equity to review such ruling, provided a complaint for that purpose is filed within twenty days from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the Court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the Court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the Court, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section 8 shall not impede, hinder or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 9 of this Act.

ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 9. (A) Any fee assessed pursuant to any order issued hereunder shall be due and payable to the National Egg Board by the person liable therefor under the terms of the order. In the event of failure by any person so assessed to pay any such fee in accordance with the terms of the order, the Secretary, in addition to refusing to issue any further certificates or quotas to such person, may, upon request of the National Egg Board, cause a suit to be instituted against such person in a court of competent jurisdiction for the collection thereof.

(B) Any producer who violates any provision of an order duly issued by the Secretary hereunder, including the failure or refusal to pay any fee or assessment under the order, shall be liable civilly in an action brought in the name of the United States for an amount not exceeding $1,000 for each separate violation.

(C) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any provision of this Act or any provision of any order or regulation made or issued pursuant to this Act.

(D) Upon request of the Secretary it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to enforce the provisions of this Act and any order or regulation issued under this Act.

(E) The Secretary may make such investigations as he deems necessary for the effective carrying out of his responsibilities under this Act or to determine whether any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or of any order or rule or regulation issued under this Act. For the purpose of any such investigation the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers and documents which are relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States. In case of failure or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, the Secretary may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers and documents; and such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Secretary, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(F) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers and documents before the Secretary, or in obedience to the subpoena of the Secretary, or in any case or proceeding, criminal or otherwise, based upon or growing out of any alleged violation of this Act, or of any order or rule or regulation issued thereunder, on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that any individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

REGULATIONS

Sec. 10. The Secretary is authorized to make such regulations with the force and effect of law, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and the powers vested in him hereunder.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means interstate or foreign commerce and that commerce which affects, burdens, or obstructs interstate or foreign commerce.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

(c) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, and any other business unit.

(d) The term "egg" or "table egg" means an egg produced by a female chicken excepting broiler breeders.

(e) The term "producer" or "table egg producer" means a person engaged in the production of eggs through ownership or control of laying hens and/or buildings used for the housing of laying hens.

(f) The term "handler" means a person who markets or in any way places in the stream of commerce table eggs of producers, including table eggs of his own production, baby chicks, started pullets, or laying hens.

OFFICERS; DEALING OR SPECULATING IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS; PENALTIES

Sec. 12. No person shall, while acting in any official capacity in the administration of orders issued pursuant to this Act, speculate, directly or indirectly, in any commodity or product thereof to which this Act applies or in contracts relating thereto, or in the stock or membership interest of any association or corporation engaged in handling, processing, or disposing of any such commodity or product and any person violating this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both: *Provided, however,* That no such person shall be deemed to be acting in an official capacity, within the meaning of this section, unless such person receives compensation for his personal services from funds of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided, however,* That the funds so appropriated shall not be available for the payment of the expenses or expenditures of the National Egg Board in administering any provision of any order issued pursuant to the terms of this Act.

SEPARABILITY

Sec. 14. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 15. This Act shall take effect upon enactment.

S. 2975—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

The proposed bill has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point together with the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Vice President dated February 8, 1968, in regard to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2975) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283–2831) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 17. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized (1) to vote for an increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the agreement as recommended by the Board of Executive Directors in its report of April 1967, to the Board of Governors of the Bank; and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the $1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the increased U.S. subscription to the capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, $411,760,000."

The letter, presented by Mr. Fulbright, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 8, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the President's special message on foreign aid, there is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes."

At the annual meeting of the Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank in April 1967, the Governors unanimously agreed to recommend to their Governments that appropriate steps be taken to permit a $1 billion increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank and to permit members to subscribe—on a callable basis requiring no cash payment—to their proportionate share of such increase. Callable subscriptions enable the Bank to raise needed resources by borrowing in various private capital markets. They are subject to call only when required to meet the obligations of the Bank on its Ordinary Capital borrowings and guarantees.

The proportionate share of the United States in the proposed callable capital increase would be $411,760,000. By the Act of January 22, 1964 (P.L. 88–259), the Congress approved U.S. participation by the same amount in a previous capital increase of identical purpose and size.

I believe that this proposed increase in the callable capital of the Bank is vital to permit the Bank to continue to play a leading role in the Alliance for Progress by financing the economic development of its Latin American member countries. I believe, further, that participation by the United States will be fully consistent with the balance of payments program announced by the President on January 1.

The Inter-American Development Bank was established in 1959 with an authorized capital stock for all members of $850 million, of which $400 million was to be paid in and $450 million was to be callable. The initial United States subscription to paid-in Ordinary Capital was $150 million and $200 million to callable Ordinary Capital.

The callable capital of the Bank was increased by $1 billion in 1964. The U.S. share of that increase was $411,760,000 and was subscribed in two equal installments in 1964 and in 1965. The Bank has not been required to make a call on any of its callable capital stock, and thus none of the funds appropriated by the Congress for callable capital have been paid to the Bank.

Under the proposed increase, each member is to subscribe to one-half of its proportionate share in calendar year 1968, with the remaining half to be subscribed in 1970. An appropriation of $205,880,000 will thus be sought in this session of Congress, but again it is not expected that this would be paid out to the Bank.

Since it began its lending operations in 1961, the Bank has made a major contribution to the social and economic development of Latin America, and has clearly demonstrated the wisdom of pursuing the goal of regional development through multilateral financial institutions in which all members may contribute their talents and resources and may share attendant burdens. The Bank has made 448 loans totaling $2,390.8 million. Of these, 155 loans totaling $901.8 million were made from the Bank's Ordinary Capital resources which constitute the Bank's so-called "hard loan window". As of December 31, 1967, the uncommitted Ordinary Capital resources of the Bank were approximately $65.8 million. The proposed increase in callable capital will enable the Bank to borrow sufficient sums in private capital markets to continue its projected level of lending through the end of 1970.

On January 1, 1968 the Bank inaugurated a new program designed to mobilize additional resources from developed countries which are not members of the Bank. This program relates the use of Bank funds for procurement in non-member developed countries to the level of resources provided to the Bank by those countries. The program is intended to provide the Bank with greater access to the private capital markets of other industrialized countries, and the Bank is vigorously pursuing that end.

A special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies relating to the proposed increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank is being transmitted to you and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. An identical bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

S. 2979—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON NEGRO HISTORY AND CULTURE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, America is an amalgam of cultures. From the earliest settlements until today our land has absorbed peoples from all corners of the earth and welded them into a society whose strength depends in large part on its diversity.

We have done a credible job of recording what many people have contributed to American society as we know it today. But we are sadly lacking in a full appreciation of the achievements of Negroes in America.

I am today proposing legislation to give us a better appreciation of those achievements.

The Negro contribution to this country is not known by many Americans. This dearth of knowledge among our multiracial society is the mother of much of the prejudice that is aimed at the Negro minority.

Children in our schools study the heroes of the past and aspire to emulate—if not the deeds of such men, surely their motives. Youth wishes to identify with the great ones who share with them some other common denominator than that both are human beings.

Negro children have not been exposed to the knowledge of their great ones such as the approximately 5,000 Negroes who served in the Continental Army and Navy during the Revolution. Or of Crispus Attucks, a runaway slave who was shot at the Boston Massacre while leading a mob protesting the presence of British troops, thus becoming the first American to die in the cause of freedom. Or of Prince Estabrook, one of 70 minutemen, who faced the British at Lexington on the very first day of the Revolution.

How many Americans are aware that one of the original settlers of Chicago was Jean Baptiste Point DuSable—a Negro?

The Revolutionary generation produced Negroes who excelled. But the next century, produced disheartening setbacks. With the introduction of the cotton gin into the South, cotton and slaves became vital to its prosperity. Laws were passed which prevented association by slaves with Negro preachers and teachers. These restrictive laws closed many schools and churches. Laws were also passed to segregate black Americans in almost all phases of life.

Courageously, men like Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey and Nat Turner, fought against slavery, but with little chance of success. These men put their principles on the line against great odds; they did fight. How many Americans, black or white, know of these men and their battle against slavery?

Since 1900, Negro Americans have made great progress up what many consider to be the "down staircase" in the house of America. However, the steps once gained have not always been maintained. American Negroes are far below the level of some of their earlier advances. At one time, the South's leading craftsmen and mechanics were Negroes. At one time, horse racing was dominated by Negro jockeys who won nine of the first 13 Kentucky Derbies. Rarely in America today is there a Negro jockey. At one time, Negroes held public offices in the South as Congressmen, Lieutenant Governors, State legislators, superintendents of education, county commissioners, and city councilmen. Few Negroes hold such offices today. How many Americans, black and white, know the names of any of these men of history?

Negroes took many steps up the "down staircase" during World War I only to suffer bitter setbacks when the war was ended. Too few Americans know that the all-Negro 369th Regiment of the 94th Division was on the front line longer than any other American regiment during World War I.

One million Negroes served in the armed services during World War II but most of them in segregated Army and Navy units. The services were integrated after the war and Negro and white servicemen served side by side on all levels. Thus, another step up the "down staircase" after 170 years the return of an integrated state in the armed services.

In 1915, Carter G. Woodson, historian and author, organized the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and later began the observance of Negro History Week, which is held each year during the week in which Lincoln's birthday falls. This year the celebration of Negro History Week began on Sunday, February 11—the 42d observance.

I am pleased to report that my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of about 18 States observing that week. Therefore, today, on behalf of my able and distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], New York [Mr. JAVITS], New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I am introducing legislation similar to that which is pending in the House of Representatives. It would establish a Commission on Negro History and Culture to conduct a study of proposals to research, document, compile, preserve, and disseminate data on the role of the Negro in history.

As man draws constantly on his heritage for inspiration in dealing with present and future situations, it is vital that the Negro also have his opportunity to put together the pieces of the puzzle of his life in order to become a whole person, and to aid those not of his ethnic group to look upon him with a knowledge of what actually has gone before.

Today, a conference on Negro history and culture is taking place on Capitol Hill. This conference is sponsored by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Inc., and coincides with the celebration of Negro History Week. Because of my deep interest in, and desire for, the success of this conference, I have assigned a member of my staff, Mrs. John Reed, to attend.

Today, the Negro is running hard against the downward motion of the "down staircase." Because he is an American first and a Negro second, he desires to change the motion of the escalator to an up staircase. Let us lend every encouragement to his inspiration—drawn from his own heritage—to devise the ways and means of accomplishing this essential progression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2979) to establish a Commission on Negro History and Culture; to conduct a study of all proposals to research, document, compile, preserve and disseminate data on Negro history and culture; to recommend such legislative enactments as may be required to provide for the integration of such data into the mainstream of American education and life; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Negro History and Culture (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of eleven members, appointed by the President from persons who are authorities on Negro history and culture.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman, and one as Vice Chairman. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) Members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission, including traveltime; and while so engaged when away from their home or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

(d) The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or at the call of a majority of the members thereof.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Commission may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Persons so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Commission, but not in excess of $75 per diem, including traveltime. While away from his home or regular place of business in the performance of services for the Commission, any such person may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall conduct a study of all proposals to create a better understanding and knowledge of Negro history and culture and shall make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress with respect to legislative enactments which it deems appropriate to carry out such proposals. Such study shall include consideration of the following:

(1) The steps necessary for research, collection and the preservation of historical materials heretofore uncollected dealing with Negro history and culture.

(2) The steps necessary to compile and catalogue existing materials.

(3) Examination of the possibilities of the establishment of a Museum of Negro History and Culture or a Center of Negro History and Culture.

(4) Consideration where such a museum or center should be located, whether it should be independent or a part of an existing establishment, and how it should be financed.

(5) Consideration of possible methods of disseminating such data so that the information can be best integrated into the mainstream of American education and life.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress not later than twelve months after the date of enactment of this Act. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after such report is submitted.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2938) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so orderd.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 524—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in addition to myself, the names of the following Senators be shown as cosponsors of the pending amendment, numbered 524, the so-called fair-housing amendment:

Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate today: Hon. E. L. BARTLETT and Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE.

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 100th birthday anniversary of William Allen White, the nationally and internationally known editor and journalist, was celebrated last week with ceremonies taking place in El Dorado, Emporia, and Lawrence, Kans.

Mr. White passed away 23 years ago on January 29, 1944, at the age of 76.

On Saturday morning, February 10, a marker honoring Mr. White was unveiled at the Emporia Service Center on the Kansas Turnpike. The speaker for that occasion was Rolla Clymer, of the El Dorado Times, Kansas' most distinguished editor.

At noon on the same day, several hundred outstanding citizens of Kansas, including most of our State's editors, attended a luncheon at the Kansas State Teachers College in honor of Mr. White's service to journalism. On this occasion, I was privileged to speak on the freedom of the press and Mr. White's great contributions to our democracy through a free press.

On Saturday evening, February 10, William L. White, the distinguished son of William Allen White, gave a dinner for a large number of Kansas citizens who were friends of his late father and mother. At this banquet, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor and a close friend of Mr. and Mrs. White, recalled many personal experiences he and the family shared and enjoyed. Mr. Canham also underscored his famous friend's contributions to the American press through his vigorous brand of journalism.

A granite monument with inscription and a bas-relief likeness of this famous editor was dedicated on the lawn of the U.S. post office near the site of his boyhood home in El Dorado, Kans., on February 11.

On February 12, William L. White, a nationally known author and journalist in his own right, reminisced of his boyhood days and growing up with his famous father and mother at the William Allen White tribute luncheon.

His remarks were followed by an address from Mark F. Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, the recipient of the William Allen White Foundation Award for 1968. The award is given each year to an outstanding journalist for service to their profession and community. Mr. Ethridge told how William Allen White met the problems of his day with frank and honest discussion—an attribute sorely needed today. A dinner in Mr. Ethridge's honor followed on that evening.

William Allen White has literally become the symbol of the tolerance, sanity, and greatness of small-town America. As his biographer, Walter Johnson, so aptly put it:

> He is the folk hero, of the middle class.

Mr. President, in order that William Allen White's legacy of courageous journalism might be read and preserved by all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the February 10 luncheon honoring this great country editor be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson, William Allen White Memorial Foundation Luncheon, Emporia, Kans., February 10, 1968

It is indeed a great honor and privilege to share in these commemoration activities on this, the 100th anniversary birth date of William Allen White—one of our nation's outstanding journalists—a great Kansas editor and a close personal friend.

The purpose of these ceremonies is to commemorate the life of William Allen White in the cause for better understanding among all mankind.

What a wonderful purpose to commemorate the memory of such a wonderful man! These ceremonies are especially appropriate in that today this memorable man's legacy of fearless and courageous journalism is sorely needed—a tradition that must be preserved. His legacy is one of true humility—of courageous and forthright enthusiasm—and of common sense—a legacy that must continue to provide a conscience for an ever-changing society.

Perhaps the most important, single statement I can make here today is that the spirit of this great Kansas editor is as vital to the preservation and safety of our great democracy as it was in his day. That spirit must never be extinguished—for the day that men like William Allen White are not allowed to champion the public's right to know—our days as a democracy are numbered.

The spirit of William Allen White is with us here—strong and vibrant. The William Allen White School of Journalism at Kansas University graduates young men and women dedicated to the same principles that made him famous.

The memorial library serves his home community in the same fashion that he once did—giving the people access to information and offering them a challenge to think for themselves.

I am especially pleased and personally thankful that out-of-town visitors have had the opportunity to visit the William Allen White Memorial Drive here in Emporia—that a granite monument will be dedicated tomorrow in El Dorado, his boyhood home, and that a Kansas Historical Marker has been unveiled at the Emporia Turnpike Service Center.

All of these things not only promise to carry on the tradition of this great man but to preserve and protect as well the very thing he stood for—the public's right to know in a free democracy.

I have always considered myself fortunate to have known Mr. White personally. For me, his personal friendship meant I had a special insight into Kansas history. I am grateful that I had the opportunity to be a friend of William Allen White—a man who made Kansas history a rich heritage for which we can all be proud.

And, although we are here to commemorate the memory of William Allen White, I think I would be remiss if I did not mention the obvious fact—that we have with us here today another great publisher, author and journalist of the same name.

The old adage "like father, like son" applies in this case. I am sure that if Mr. White were here today he would pridefully point out to his old friends how the White tradition in journalism has been carried on. I am referring, of course, to William L. White, his son.

He, too, is a personal friend of mine. We served together in the Kansas Legislature. In the 1931 session, I was Chairman of the Committee On Assessment and Taxation. He was Vice-Chairman.

Earlier I said that the tradition of William Allen White was synonymous with the very taproots of our society—the public's right to know in a free democracy.

Like other great newspapermen before him, he used the press neither as a sword or shield to coin a well used phrase. He used the press to shine the light of truth into confused darkness. He did not tell the people what to think but he sure let them know what was going on and challenged them to think for themselves.

Today, we realize the struggle for a free and responsible press is a never ending battle. Today, the press must face a world full of change with the same common sense, humility, and courage that he used.

When Mr. White was young, Kansas was going through the rigors of social change that brought on Populism. The change and challenge is still with us. The William Allen Whites of today must seek to be as candid and forthright.

There will always be attempts to restrict the freedom of the press. Men of great zeal but with little understanding will seek public control over private news media. The talk will begin with guidelines—codes—standards—and privileged information—subtle controls over a free press.

Behind these good intentions we can easily see not so subtle men and controls. We all have a responsibility—clergyman, educator, businessman, public official—to defend a truly free press. For you see, freedom of the press and personal freedom go hand in hand—if we lose one we lose the other.

Today's journalist does face some unique situations that William Allen White did not have to face. According to the latest figures, the taxpayers are presently paying $450 million a year on government public relations and information programs.

The cost of this federal deluge is more than double the combined expense for news gathering by the two major news services—the three major TV networks and the ten largest American newspapers. To wade through this questionable information coming from this propaganda mill is enough to make any editor shake his head.

In Mr. White's day, his beat was the town's main street—and no one knew the pulse of the community better than the "Sage of Emporia."

Consider the plight of the reporter today. War and international problems beset us at every turn abroad. At home a set of social revolutions—each one as significant to the future of this country as the Populist revolution—demand specialized and objective reporting.

Because of these social revolutions and the change in today's fast growing—complex and technical society—Americans have witnessed a mass media communications explosion. The world is shrinking beyond belief and we find ourselves under detailed and close scrutiny. Judging from the reflection in the news media mirror—though the image may be somewhat distorted—the picture is not particularly pretty or flattering.

We have been judged by the fourth estate and found wanting. It is only natural then that some have found the news media short on responsibility and long on sensationalism in return. Adopting a reactionary attitude, some have even recommended suppression of news.

We are in an age where we are high in material well-being and low in moral conscience and trust. The man in the street wonders about the much publicized credibility gap, becomes skeptical and adopts a policy of apathy. Virtually every public official's word and intent are questioned and doubted.

The credibility gap between the press and our government seems to be reaching canyon proportions and is reinforced by the adopted policy that the government has a right to mislead.

Freedom of the press and access to government information has become such a crucial issue that a special program to help newspapers—broadcasters and the public gain access to federal information has been developed by the Freedom of Information Center in Washington.

These developments—I am sure—would make Mr. White shake his head in wonder and his typewriter would hum with resulting editorials that would clear the air with salvos of level headed—no nonsense logic.

As in the days of William Allen White, the press must continue to object when the government forgets its most sacred responsibility—that of telling the people who hire and pay the government, the truth. Stated simply, once again, the public has the right to know. The simple art of telling the truth is paramount in these troubled times.

William Allen White fought bigotry and censorship without regard to personal safety when he took on the Ku Klux Klan. We should follow his example to safeguard our free press in America.

Today—right this very minute—more than half the people of Europe still live without freedom of the press. There are still 12 European countries with a population of over 350 million people where the government controls all channels of information or subjects the press to surveillance and censorship.

For many today, the choice between total acceptance and free dissent is the choice between life and death. Let us not take our freedoms for granted. Today, the highly publicized right of dissent is of primary importance. Truth is benefited by free expression. It is the fundamental foundation of our great country. There may be great error in such expression, but the "right to be wrong"—the right of dissent—must be afforded every citizen.

John Peter Zenger went to trial in the early days of this country to prove that right. Courageous editors down through American and Kansas History fought with pen in one hand and a gun in the other to preserve that right—never was this more true than in the early days of Kansas.

Men in authority will always think that criticism of their policies is dangerous. We must make sure that men like William Allen White have the freedom to prove them wrong.

There is another basic point to consider however. Especially with the kind of dissent we face today. The only limitation that William Allen White placed upon the right of dissent was that of responsibility.

I think we should emphasize that while Mr. White was a champion of freedom of the press—he was also the champion of a free *and responsible* press. Responsible dissenters do not slander—write or broadcast obscenity—or incite others to commit crime. These same limitations are those that a free society must impose to protect itself and its citizens.

I am afraid that these limitations are too often being ignored by many of our so-called dissenters. We can carry the torch of dissent too far. If we don't apply a little common sense, dissent may well turn our bill of rights into a warped excuse for anarchy.

As I have said before, the rich tradition of William Allen White is a living—present day entity. Although his modern-day counterparts are busy each day carrying on his tradition, I cannot help but wonder what tomorrow's editorial would say if he—in his unique style—could again comment on the problems of the world.

He never lost his humility—that rare country editor trait of never taking himself too seriously, but seriously taking on his responsibility of being a conscience of a community—a state—and a nation.

Here was a country editor who loved his work—who loved the people of his community and state. Part of the reason for his great success was that when he wrote—he wrote what the people were genuinely thinking. His very heart beat was in tune with the pulse of the people and the fortunes of Kansas. Lesser men withdraw to ivory towers to criticize and complain. Bill White wrote what the people were thinking and wanted to hear—and the people loved him for it.

Recently, I again had the opportunity to glance through a book compiled by the Kansas Historical Society entitled "Kansas In Newspapers". There, on the now famous front page of the Emporia Gazette, dated Thursday, August 20, 1896, was the editorial you are all familiar with—"What's the Matter With Kansas".

In the midst of the McKinley-Bryan campaign, William Allen White took on the Populists and their solutions to hard times of the day. Mark Hannah—the famous chairman of the Republican Party—reprinted that editorial and distributed it across the country. Hannah said that it helped materially to elect McKinley president.

That editorial represents Mr. White's brand of journalism in full flower—I might add a flower that bloomed in virtually every political campaign.

His interest in taking part in political matters transcended political activity as we know it today. He believed political activity was a citizen's responsibility. He thought one could achieve almost anything through maintaining an active voice in politics. Once he even attributed a much needed summer shower during a dry spell to a Republican rally.

William Allen White had his non-political side too. Read his prose describing his love for the beauty of the Kansas flint hills—his deep rooted appreciation of nature's loveliness and I will venture to say any Kansan will be hard put to remain dry eyed.

And, of course, his literary masterpiece, "Mary White"—a father's farewell to his daughter who died at 16—has become a legend. The article puts into words and describes what is impossible to describe—and it does so with such tenderness that people who suffer the same kind of tragedy today gain strength and comfort from it.

In retrospect, I wish William Allen White were here with us today to help us achieve better understanding in our endeavors to climb the ladder of progress. Perhaps tomorrow's editorial would have read, "What's the Matter With America".

What a wonderful thing it would be if we could really achieve the purpose of these ceremonies in the memory of this great and humble man. The courageous and forthright lessons of William Allen White applied today would certainly be a breath of Kansas fresh air into a jaded and polluted atmosphere of skepticism and credibility.

I think it is noteworthy that these ceremonies are but a few days away from the birthday of another great American who also gained fame through his use of reason and humility to unite the common man into shouldering the responsibilities of mutual understanding.

Abraham Lincoln said that if you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never again gain their respect and esteem.

We must again re-dedicate ourselves to these principles. Rather than launching a great society to change or capture men's minds—let us strive to free men's minds with plain fact and rational discussion.

Our system of self-government has been built upon the trust of government in the people's ability—and the people's trust in the integrity of government.

In 1907, William Allen White wrote the obituary of old time journalism in Kansas when he observed—"Unfortunately, for the picturesque in journalism, the old time editors are nearly all dead or in the poorhouse. We seldom hear of them anymore and we sigh for the touch of a vanquished hand and the sound of a voice that is still."

I don't think William Allen White ever gave a serious second thought to the fact that his courageous brand of journalism would stand as a living tradition for Kansans today and tomorrow—he was too busy doing his job as a country editor—providing a humble conscience for his community, his state and his nation.

As he stated—we miss his picturesque journalism—and we long for the voice that is still. But were William Allen White here today, he would dismiss such sentimentality in a gruff manner and say we should get to the business at hand.

Our business—ladies and gentlemen—is that of increasing the sum total of man's well-being and wisdom for the cause of better understanding among all mankind.

In his memory, let us all strive to achieve that goal.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Boggs in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TYRANNY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 12, 1968, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., published an editorial entitled "A Threat to Free Choice." The editorial portrays the tyranny of HEW's new office for civil rights and illustrates anew Woodrow Wilson's aphorism that centralization of power always precedes the destruction of human liberties. As I pointed out on the Senate floor at the time the bill was under consideration, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 robs all Americans of rights more precious than those it attempts to confer upon some Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Threat to Free Choice

There should be no mistaking the gravity of warnings from officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Greensboro Board of Education and other North Carolina public school units that federal funds for local schools may be terminated. At issue is not only the degree and pace of racial integration, which is crucial enough in itself, but also whether white and Negro students can continue to be educated at all and whether local citizens of both races can choose to operate the schools in the best interests of their community.

The recent agitation for faster integration of the schools has come from HEW's new Office for Civil Rights, which a few months ago replaced the U.S. Office of Education and Commissioner Harold Howe II as the enforcing agent for provisions of the 1964 Civil Right Act. After merely studying North Carolina statistics the officials decided that all but 32 of the state's 160 public school units are showing too little progress toward an OCR goal of eliminating dual school systems by September, 1969.

If the local units do not show sharp improvement, the OCR has warned in several ways, actions will begin to stop federal aid to the schools. The compliance schedules varied (Alamance County was given only 30 days to make substantial changes), and some units fear their expected funds may be deferred. Even temporary withholding is serious, for in all local systems federal tax dollars pay a growing portion of the school budgets.

Much can be said, of course, about the disservice to government and education (not to mention the patent absurdity) of having bureaucrats in Washington decide on the basis of population and school registration figures that local schools across the country are not serving the needs of their communities. However, the OCR attack on the Greensboro City Schools and our "freedom of choice" desegregation plan is particularly unreasonable.

GREENSBORO'S METHOD

The plan was established here according to federal guidelines issued in December, 1966. Each spring any student, Negro or white, may apply to any school in the city—no matter what his "home" district may be—for any reason or for no particular reason. If he arranges his own transportation (as nearly all city pupils must) the student may seek his education in whatever school he wishes to attend. Exclusive courses at some schools encourage this sort of voluntary desegregation, and school staffs are integrated. Transfers from any residential section to a different school district are routinely approved by following the guidelines. In some schools the degree of integration is not yet high, but Greensboro school officials say they have had *no* complaints from Negro citizens that the free choice plan is unfair. Evidently, integration is progressing at a rate determined by all Greensboro pupils and their families, which is as it should be.

This is not satisfactory for the Office for Civil Rights. Apparently because the most recent registration period did not show "enough" numerical increase over last year in Negro students attending predominantly white schools and vice versa, the OCR has warned the Greensboro Board of Education to try other methods. Instead, the board called the threatened termination of federal aid "strictly blackmail" and voted unanimously to continue the locally satisfactory free choice plan. Now a team of examiners from the regional HEW office will come to Greensboro for a first-hand look at progress in school desegration.

The investigation should have come *before* the warning; and now that federal officials are coming here the responsibility will be theirs to demonstrate that the free choice plan is *not* working. We believe the school board's decision was right. We hope the visiting investigators will realize that because of present school locations, housing patterns, school bus shortages and varying curricula the free choice plan is Greensboro's best means to achieve school integration. If they think it is not, the onus will be on them to develop a truly better method.

While the officials are here they should be required to explain, if they are able, exactly what it is that they *want* our school system to do. Director Peter Libassi of the OCR wrote in a December 27, 1967, memorandum: "The new policies are not expected to reflect any change in the department's present position that free choice procedures are an available means of eliminating a dual school structure if they lead to significant year-by-year progress toward the establishment of a single system of nonracial schools."

EXPLANATION REQUIRED

That would seem to mean that Greensboro displeased the OCR by not showing sufficient statistical improvement. But a few days ago the OCR's information director Michael Berla said that is not so because since last fall "the terms of negotiation have been different." Well, are the terms different or not? And if they have changed, *how* have they changed? No school system can achieve compliance unless it knows what to comply with.

Other fundamental questions are raised by the OCR's stated goal of abolishing "racially identifiable schools" by the 1969–70 school year. Certainly the dual systems must be eliminated eventually if full integration is to be achieved, but why the rush to do it all within the next year and a half? Is every local unit suddenly to follow the dramatic example of the Chapel Hill system by eliminating "predominantly white" and "predominantly Negro" schools and replacing them with one statistically integrated school? That method has not worked well in a small college community, and it could be disastrous in a city the size of Greensboro.

Aside from the political and social upheaval of immediately creating nonracial schools, the financial cost would be tremendous. Yet to "encourage" school systems in this task the OCR would withhold the federal share of their budgets. A more likely result would be the crippling of public education—and all by September, 1969.

Ultimately, the threat of denying federal funds is as self-defeating as it is unfair. It works against improving the education of all pupils, which is one of the things the Civil Rights Act sought to do. And the threat is not to be taken lightly. Although federal aid has not been formally terminated yet anywhere in North Carolina, some of our school systems have real cause for concern about next year's budget. When the local share of school revenue runs out, these units may be forced to increase their taxes or decrease their services to the community. Then all students of both races would suffer.

LESS LOCAL CONTROL

No doubt the federal education officials need to apply pressure for integration in many school systems, and it could be argued that the federal share in local budgets gives the government a right to make its influence felt. But to deny federal aid would be to deny education for many. What the Office for Civil Rights threatens—with or without the legal power to do so—is to restrict local control over local schools. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare apparently would have Greensboro schools operated by appointees in Washington instead of city representatives directed by state law.

We do not oppose the principle of racial integration—in the schools or anywhere else. We most certainly do oppose the Office for Civil Rights' authoritarian means to a democratic end. Greensboro's progressive school integration plan still appears to be in keeping with the desires of our citizens. If we must end free choice in our schools we could lose free choice in governing our community.

HEW'S PHONY FIGURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 12, 1968, the Statesville, N.C., Record and Landmark published an editorial entitled "Those Phony Figures," which makes apt comment upon the phony figures assembled by National Opinion Research for the Public Health Service at a cost to the American taxpayers of at least $140,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE PHONY FIGURES

Thanks to Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., we now know the story behind those 100,000 doctors who quit smoking and it isn't pretty.

It all started when the Post Office department announced that mail trucks would carry posters displaying this statement: "100,000 Doctors Have Quit Smoking (Maybe They Know Something You Don't)."

This seems to say, in a roundabout way, that your doctor has found out something about smoking that you should know and for some reason or other is not telling you.

This moved Senator Ervin to go behind the statistics. How did the government come up with such a statement? Since many reputable doctors are in disagreement about the hazards of smoking, how about those 100,000?

Senator Ervin learned that, at a cost of $140,000, the Public Health service had a poll taken by the National Opinion Research center.

Out of 242,569 practicing physicians in the country, questionnaires were sent to 5,000. Only 1,867 responded. That is less than 1 percent and the survey should have been abandoned at that point.

But it wasn't. The National Opinion Research center sorted through the 1,867 replies and found that exactly 828 doctors said they had stopped smoking.

Any doctor who said that he had once smoked and had stopped was put down as a doctor who had "quit smoking." No attempt was made to determine why or when.

But that isn't all. On the basis of the finding that 828 doctors had "quit smoking," the research center deduced this to indicate that 81,018 or more doctors had quit smoking for medical reasons.

And why stop there? It was assumed that retired and nonpracticing doctors had, naturally, given up smoking at the same rate. That raised the 81,018 figure somewhat. Then resident doctors and interns were thrown into the hopper, and that increased the total of those who had given up smoking still further.

So, the Opinion Research center came up with the plump, round 100,000 figure.

It was not only just right for a poster; but it probably comes closer describing the number of dollars profit Opinion Research made from the survey than it does the number of doctors who have quit smoking.

Preparing and printing the original 5,000 questionnaires and mailing them at the old five-cent first class rate probably cost less than $500. Tabulating and analyzing those 1,867 returns by the most expensive consultants in the country might have cost $1,000 more. Then throw in $30,000 for brain power, and it is still difficult to determine why a survey of 5,000 doctors should have cost the taxpayers $140,000.

Now that we have $140,000 worth of useless information, what are we going to do with it? The answer is typically bureaucratic—spend a few thousand more having posters printed and affixed to our mail trucks and maybe we can brainwash a few more Americans against free enterprise.

There is nothing scientific or factual behind the statement that 100,000 doctors quit smoking; yet the Public Health Service uses it freely. If the cigarette manufacturers were half as careless with their facts, the Federal Trade commission would prohibit their advertising as false and misleading.

Indeed, a more scientific case can be made against leaded gasoline as a health hazard than has been made against cigarettes. Recent drillings into the Greenland ice cap have established that the lead content in the atmosphere has increased many fold since it was introduced into gasoline. Lead is one of the most toxic poisons known. But you can sit back for a good long wait before any responsible agency of the government starts a drive to remake the oil industry.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

THIEU AND KY SHOULD BEGIN TO PACIFY AND PROTECT SOUTH VIETNAM—WE SHOULD UNCONDITIONALLY STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM AND DISENGAGE AND GRADUALLY WITHDRAW OUR COMBAT FORCES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Vietcong attacks on Saigon and other major cities and provincial capitals throughout South Vietnam demonstrate once again the hollowness of the Saigon regime's pretensions of sovereignty over South Vietnam, and the fraudulence of claims of imminent victory by our generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and high-ranking administration officials supporting President Johnson's war in Vietnam. The very fact that these devastating raids could be conducted in the heart of supposedly secure territory shattered any claim that President Thieu, Vice President Ky, and the military junta of the Saigon regime exercise the normal authority of a viable government.

The Vietcong attacks throughout South Vietnam were apparently well planned and carefully coordinated. We have CIA agents and operatives all over the place in South Vietnam, and the success of the Vietcong offensive action is another black mark against their intelligence and operational failure. Nor were our generals in South Vietnam and intelligence officers of all branches of our Armed Forces alerted.

The attacks again clearly revealed that our military leaders have grossly misjudged the character of this war and the basic untenability of the American military position. Everywhere—and I was there recently—in every section of the area of South Vietnam during the grim days from late January to mid-February the Vietcong had far inferior numerical strength to the combined forces of the

Saigon regime and our half million men. Yet we were on the defensive and the Vietcong held the offensive. General Westmoreland must accept responsibility for failure to make the best use of the forces under his command.

These Vietcong attacks could have happened only because the Vietcong encountered feeble resistance from South Vietnamese military forces and police. The longstanding practice in the rural areas of local South Vietnamese commanders making corrupt bargains with the Vietcong to avoid fighting evidently has now spread to the cities. The Associated Press reported that, during the recent fighting in Saigon, Americans living there were compelled to defend their own homes without assistance of South Vietnamese troops or police.

It is now clear that only American soldiers and marines can defend the cities of South Vietnam. They are, therefore, vulnerable to a deadly strategy in which our forces are stretched thin to defend meaningless outpost fortresses, and then stretched even thinner to protect the cities which the South Vietnamese are supposed to protect and should have pacified and controlled months ago. It is doubtful that even a million American soldiers and marines can indefinitely withstand such bitter attrition.

While in South Vietnam last month, I conferred with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who told me that we Americans should not halt the bombing of North Vietnam. He stated that North Vietnam and VC armed forces were massing in huge numbers just above Khesanh, and General Giap was proposing to achieve another Dienbienphu by attacking our marines who were on the defensive at Khesanh. However, he and other generals in that area north of Danang boasted that reinforcements from the southern areas of South Vietnam were being brought north to back up the Khesanh area, and that the huge onslaught would be hurled back. Many thousands of our mobile forces were withdrawn from the Mekong Delta area in the southern portion of South Vietnam and from the environs of Saigon, all being taken by helicopters and planes to areas closer to the Demilitarized Zone to defend against and repulse the enemy engaged in the anticipated mass attack on Khesanh, which the generals and our intelligence officers predicted would occur during the Tet Lunar New Year holiday or within a few hours afterward. The Lunar New Year holiday is from January 30 to February 2, inclusive. High-ranking officers, apparently believing in General Westmoreland's infallibility, echoed his assurance that we would reverse Dienbienphu. All of them were completely fooled. The VC outwitted and outgeneraled our generals. This is a very sad situation and a humiliation for us.

It is now evident that the VC never intended an attack on Khesanh and in massing their forces it may be they paraded their men back and forth in the darkness of the night. The forces of the National Liberation Front, the VC, struck everywhere except Khesanh, which we have greatly reinforced. General Westmoreland was outwitted and outgeneraled. The VC attacked 38 of the 44 provincial capitals that General Westmoreland had believed to be pacified, and for a period of hours—and in fact in Saigon, Hue, and other important cities for a period of days, in fact weeks, maintained control. A tremendous rice harvest was waiting in South Vietnam. The VC seized or purchased huge quantities of rice, recruited or impressed into military service thousands of boys 13 to 20 years of age right up to the suburbs of Saigon, and at the same time lashed out in furious assaults in the provincial capitals and hamlets, even breaching the huge fortified U.S. Embassy in Saigon completed only last September at a cost of nearly $3 million. VC commandos invaded the Embassy compounds and buildings and killed American defenders. They were not finally out until after 6½ hours. The too friendly forces of South Vietnam remained friendly. More than half of the South Vietnamese soldiers and officers were away enjoying the Tet lunar holiday. Even as late as February 14, a large densely populated area of Saigon is in possession of the VC, or is being fought over. An entire American division was hurried into Saigon to save the city, and American soldiers have been doing most of the fighting there. The principal activity of General Loan, chief of the South Vietnamese police, and Ky and other leaders of the Saigon regime seems to be to execute VC prisoners.

General Westmoreland's optimistic statements of victory, which he has been making from time to time, have been proved fraudulent and wrong. Our forces, superior in number, intelligence, training, and equipment including the Marines at Khesanh and elsewhere, the finest offensive fighting men in the world, have been occupying defensive positions waiting, simply waiting, for a massive attack in depth that General Westmoreland expected but which has not come and may never come. The Vietcong struck elsewhere. In the Civil War, numerous Union generals were also outwitted or defeated—Generals McDowell, McClellan, Rosecrans, Burnside, Hooker, and Pope, to name a few—and President Lincoln relieved them of their commands. This is a matter entirely in the hands of our Chief Executive as Commander in Chief.

The fact is that millions of American citizens are shocked over the defeats and setbacks recently suffered by the friendly forces of South Vietnam, so called, and American forces under the leadership of Gen. William Westmoreland. His confident predictions over recent months just do not seem to have any validity. President Johnson, in my considered judgment, has every justification to relieve him of his command and appoint a more competent general.

It is unfortunate that President Johnson always seems to yield to the advice of General Westmoreland and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have consistently been proved wrong in their predictions and recommendations, continually and repetitiously made over the past 7 years, for greater and greater escalation and expansion of the war. Now Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says that he would not rule out the use of nuclear weapons at Khesanh if that seemed necessary to defend our defensive position there and to prevent it from being overrun. This is really a shocking statement. As Prime Minister Wilson of Great Britain recently stated while visiting this country, to employ tactical nuclear weapons at Khesanh would be sheer lunacy. It could easily lead to a third world war—a nuclear war. It is rumored and has been stated that tactical nuclear weapons are stockpiled in South Vietnam. Americans very prayerfully should hope that the denial of this by our generals in South Vietnam is in this one instance true. Unfortunately, all along we have been misinformed.

The Constitution of the United States provides that civilian authority should always be supreme over military authority in our Nation. The President's continued deference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to other political generals seriously threatens to reverse and eliminate that great safeguard written into the fundamental law of our Nation—the Constitution—by the Constitutional Convention and to threaten that great doctrine of civilian control of the military. Among the patriots who drafted our Constitution were Benjamin Franklin; James Madison; and Gen. George Washington, a member of the Convention and its presiding officer.

Let us hope that President Johnson will reject the pleas of those whose advice could carry the world to the brink of disaster—nuclear war.

Our forces suffered a severe setback throughout South Vietnam. The VC, by the taking over, for a period of days and even weeks, of lush areas with rice ready for harvesting, have added to their food supplies and to their armed forces by enlistments or conscription. President Johnson would be praised by most American citizens were he to exercise his authority as Commander in Chief and replace General Westmoreland with some top general now in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, recently the Washington newspapers and newspapers throughout the Nation published two extremely thoughtful and informative columns by two of the Nation's most distinguished and perceptive news reporters and columnists, who have clearly and concisely set forth compelling reasons for replacing Gen. William C. Westmoreland as our commanding officer in Vietnam. One, by Marquis Childs, entitled "On Westmoreland, Generals, and War," appeared in the Washington Post of February 7, 1968; and the other by Clayton Fritchey, entitled "Westmoreland's Vietnam Strategy," appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 9, 1968. I commend both of these outstanding articles to Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1968]

ON WESTMORELAND, GENERALS, AND WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

In the agony of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln, as Commander-in-Chief of the Union forces, searched after the terrible defeats of the early years for a general who could win. One of his gravest trials, he nevertheless had the resoluteness to relieve politically popular generals until he found Ulysses S. Grant.

The courage of the Civil War President is recalled at this time against the uncertainty and doubt over military leadership in Vietnam today. The doubts have grown with the shock of the Vietcong successes and the impending threat of the biggest battle of the war about to begin. Inevitably, the doubts center around Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the American commander in Vietnam and the author of the "search and destroy" strategy spreading ground forces the length and breadth of the country.

Less than three months ago, Westmoreland returned to Washington ostensibly for a conference on the course of the war. With him came Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and others of the Saigon team. They put on what was, in effect, a high-powered propaganda campaign, creating the impression that all was going well with allied military operations, bound to bring triumph in the foreseeable future.

Westmoreland outlined Phase III for 1968 with the South Vietnamese forces greatly strengthened, the number of American advisers with South Vietnamese units reduced. Then would come Phase IV, the final phase, when in the not-too-remote future at least token withdrawal of American forces could begin.

Reports from Vietnam indicate that almost exactly the opposite is happening. South Vietnam units have been slow or reluctant to meet the wave of terrorist attacks. Instead of American forces leveling off or even anticipating withdrawals, alarmed Senators now predict a rise above the 1968 ceiling of 525,000.

Most remarkable were Westmoreland's statements in his principal speech.

He said the enemy could fight his "large forces only at the edge of his sanctuaries . . . his guerrilla force is declining at a steady rate. Morale problems are developing within his ranks."

The question being asked here is whether these were considered military judgments or whether Westmoreland was influenced by the need to reassure the American people that all was going according to plan. At the end of the round of upbeat speeches and press conferences after Westmoreland and Bunker had gone back to Saigon, White House Press Secretary George Christian said that no decisions concerning the war had been taken during their stay.

Political generals—either self-propelled or pushed into the vortex—have been no novelty in this capital. Lincoln's biggest headache was Gen. George Brinton McClellan who in the initial phase of his command of the Army of the Potomac won important battles. He got a popular billing with the nickname "Little Mac: The Young Napoleon." Then he faltered and the Northern armies took fearful losses.

But Lincoln bit the bullet and relieved him of his command, knowing there would be a loud outcry. McClellan was nominated by the Democrats to run against President Lincoln on a platform calling for a negotiated peace with the South and an immediate end of the war. While the general repudiated the platform, he was decisively defeated.

Harry Truman relieved Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his command in Korea for going against the Commander-in-Chief. In this instance, however, the damage had already been done, since MacArthur, by advancing to the Yalu, brought on a mass invasion of Chinese troops and the American forces suffered perhaps the worst rout in our military history. MacArthur made a gesture at the Republican convention in 1952 which got nowhere.

Despite several Republican boomlets sent aloft for Westmoreland, he has steadfastly maintained a nonpolitical stance. He has held the soldier's posture in the face of the temptations inherent in the President's action in having him speak before a joint session of Congress. The acclamation that goes with the reflected glow from the White House is heady wine.

Increasingly Johnson, as at his last press conference, cites the authority of Westmoreland for his personal judgments on Vietnam. And he backs this up by reciting what the Joint Chiefs of Staff tell him. He seems at times to be reversing the Constitution of the United States which holds that the President as Commander-in-Chief exercises the supreme authority.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 9, 1968]

WESTMORELAND'S VIETNAM STRATEGY

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Putting aside other questions about Vietnam, surely both hawks and doves ought to be able to agree on one dismaying but ever more obvious fact, which is that the field commander, General William C. Westmoreland, seems to have no idea how to win the war, assuming it can be won.

Westmoreland is rated as an able officer, and he might even be an excellent commander in a conventional war, but after three years of going around in Vietnam to no lasting purpose, it is painfully evident that he doesn't know how to master a guerrilla war of this unorthodox character.

Since early 1965, Westmoreland's strategy if it can be called that, has consisted of demanding and getting ever more U.S. troops to throw into what he terms his war of "attrition." All that attrition means is that the fighting continues until one side or the other runs out of men.

This sterile concept was abandoned 50 years ago after millions of soldiers were futilely slaughtered during the exhausting stalemate on the Western Front in World War I. Asia is no place for the U.S. to revive it. North Vietnam has 17 million people; China, its neighboring ally (committed to supporting Hanoi), has 700 million more. Attrition would hardly seem to be the best road to victory. It would seem to be the worst.

If President Johnson is going to prosecute the war to the bitter end, he at least ought to give the troops a commander with a new and more inspiring strategic concept. American forces have never fought more bravely, but should they be needlessly exposed in operations that are not settling anything?

Under Westmoreland, U.S. combat forces in South Vietnam have expanded from 25,000 to 500,000, and more are on the way. Yet, as events of the last week have demonstrated, Saigon and other key centers were safer three years ago than they are now.

It is time to change generals as Lincoln did when he replaced McClellan with Grant to break the Civil War stalemate. It is time to send a commander to Vietnam who is capable of plotting a winning strategy or, if there is no such thing, who is capable of telling the President so.

In any case, it is time that the President, the Congress, and the people begin to challenge the endless reassurances of Westmoreland that the situation is "very, very encouraging," that the guerrilla forces are "declining at a steady rate," and that the end of the war "begins to come into view."

If a war was being fought on our own continent would Americans believe victory was at hand if enemy troops invaded Washington, broke into the White House complex, seized parts of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and 26 state capitals, attacked West Point, and shot up key airfields? That is about what the enemy has just done in South Vietnam.

President Thieu frankly admitted the situation had become "critical" but Westmoreland has persuaded the President that the enemy operation was a "complete failure." The general may well believe this, but that kind of thinking is no substitute for realistic judgment. We are in trouble today because the general has made the following miscalculations:

1—He has consistently underestimated the enemy's will to fight, his capacity to absorb punishment, and his ability to meet every U.S. escalation with a counter one.

2—Conversely, he has grossly overestimated the South Vietnamese army's capabilities and has closed his eyes to its unreliability and indifference.

3—He has put too much confidence in air power to interdict and knock out the enemy in this kind of a war.

4—He has put military operations ahead of absolutely essential political and economic reform. Under Westmoreland, the much-heralded "pacification" program to stabilize the rural areas has been a deep disappointment.

The general's defense could well be that he is doing all that is possible in the circumstances, and that if the U.S. wants a quick victory it has got to take a chance on invading North Vietnam and even be prepared to use nuclear weapons if necessary. If that is the case, he ought to say so, then the American people, knowing the price, can judge whether they want to pay it. As it is, they don't know what to believe.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we Americans, instead of escalating the war, which has resulted in a stalemate and casualties of more than 120,000 Americans killed and wounded, should immediately proceed to disengage. Furthermore, we should unconditionally halt the bombing of North Vietnam.

I recommend as a first step toward disengagement from our involvement in the miserable civil war in Vietnam that we compel President Thieu and Vice President Ky to take complete control and pacification, within 30 days, of four, eight, or 10 of the 44 Provinces in South Vietnam.

When it has been determined that the South Vietnamese leaders or their military junta in Saigon will take four, eight, or 10 Provinces, and the Provinces have been determined, a commencement will have been made toward disengagement, and we should then withdraw, on that date, all of our civilian personnel, all our AID personnel who are cluttering Saigon and elsewhere in South Vietnam, all our CIA operatives who are everywhere in South Vietnam, all our forces, and even our so-called military advisers, and make it clear to President Thieu and Vice President Ky that we are disengaging, and then compel the Saigon regime to assume sole responsibility for the control and pacification of the four, eight, or 10 Provinces. They would either have to hold or pacify those Provinces, or lose them, and if they lost them, it would be their tough luck. This would be a commencement toward disengagement.

After a few months, we should repeat this process by adding eight additional provinces, continue the process of disengagement, and gradually withdraw our forces to coastal bases in South Vietnam and Thailand and then from Southeast Asia altogether. This process might well take 2 or 3 years.

I agree that it is not the best thing to disengage while some fighting is going on. There may be a risk in that, but we should take that risk. We are taking a greater risk now.

Sallust, the great Roman historian, about 40 years before the birth of our Saviour, wrote:

> It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

That is certainly as true now as it was then. I feel, in making this suggestion, Mr. President, that I have offered a constructive suggestion for an armistice and a ceasefire that we should strive to obtain in South Vietnam, instead of expanding and escalating this immoral and un-American war.

STATE DEPARTMENT ISOLATION WARD CLOSED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed an outrageous situation wherein two employees of the State Department had, for a period of 2 years, been assigned to an isolated area with no duties whatever to perform. I am glad to report that after my disclosure the State Department called last night and stated that they had corrected this situation and that the two aides had been reassigned and duties given them. I am happy to note in an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune that they have also apologized to these men and promised that the situation has been corrected and will not happen again. Apparently these men were being punished for having testified before a congressional committee and telling the truth.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "State Department Ends Two Aides' Exile," written by Willard Edwards and published in the Chicago Tribune of Thursday, February 15, 1968.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT ENDS TWO AIDES' EXILE—OUTBURSTS IN CONGRESS SPUR ACTION—OFFERED APOLOGY, NEW JOBS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The state department, responding to outbursts of indignation in Congress, today ended the exile of two veteran security officers who have been confined in forced idleness to a condemned, rat-infested building since November, 1965.

Apologies to the two men, Harry M. Hite, 42, and Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, were rendered by Robert T. Hannemeyer, chief of functional personnel. He said he was speaking for Idar Rimstad, deputy undersecretary for administration.

PROMISED NO RETURN

Rimstad was "totally unaware" of the conditions imposed on Hite and Burkhardt and deeply regretted them, Hannemeyer said. "You will never have to go back to your present offices," Hite and Burkhardt were told.

New assignments in new offices were offered the two officers, who had been sending a flow of memoranda in quest of employment for nearly two years. Hite, who has a law degree, was offered a post with the director of the office of personnel. Burkhardt also was offered a job in the personnel office. They will receive the same salaries.

TWO LIVE IN DESPAIR

Until yesterday, Hite and Burkhardt lived in despair that their confinement would ever be relieved. Their plight was disclosed that day by THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, and the report stirred a reaction in Congress which culminated today in these developments:

1. A telegram to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from Chairman James O. Eastland [D., Miss.] of the Senate judiciary committee and its subcommittee on internal security, urging Rusk to personally investigate the "working conditions" of the two men and demanding "an immediate explanation and remedial treatment."

2. A Senate floor speech by John J. Williams [R., Del.] the Senate's celebrated investigator, giving the state department 72 hours to restore the rights of the two men and rescue them from "the state department's isolation ward." If no action was taken in that period, he pledged, he would seek action, thru a Senate resolution, to fire the superior responsible for "an incredible outrage."

3. The issuance of a special report by the Senate internal security subcommittee declaring that Hite, a veteran of 20 years in government service, and Burkhardt, with 26 years of service, had been subjected to a "Chinese-torture type of system."

4. Announcement by Rep. H. R. Gross [R., Ia.] that, when the House met tomorrow, he would seek action on a resolution similar to that proposed by Williams in the Senate. "Heads should roll," he said, "and the first man to go should be Secretary Rusk himself."

MOVES WITH SPEED

Within three hours, the state department had moved with unprecedented speed. Rusk was reported to have instructed Rimstad to quell the congressional disturbance.

Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber Jr., in charge of congressional relations, paid a visit to Hite and Burkhart, looked around, exclaimed, "What an awful place!" and fled.

Growing panic in the state department, as it received reports of thunderous oratory in Congress, was climaxed when a television crew showed up to take scenes of the rubbish-filled interior of the old building, known as state department annex No. 1, which adjoins the new 48 million dollar state department building.

OLD JOBS ABOLISHED

In midafternoon, the two men received a summons to report to Hannemeyer for "new assignments." Both said they would take the offers under advisement. Their former jobs as security officers, they were told, had been abolished and were not available to them.

Williams and Gross disclosed that they had made personal inspections of the condemned building from which all state department employes except Hite and Burkhardt had long ago been transferred. The building has been condemned and is scheduled to be torn down.

They described their wanderings thru the eight-story structure, its deserted rooms filled with rubbish and gutted of furnishings, in a search for the only two permanent tenants remaining.

NO WORK ASSIGNED

"I was shocked and dismayed," Williams told the Senate, "to find that the state department is operating a special isolation ward or cooler for employes whose only crime is telling the truth to a Senate committee.

"I invite the entire Senate and the Washington press to visit this junk-filled, deserted building. After a long search, I found these two men hidden in a corner office. They have had no work assignments since October, 1966, and their repeated requests for work have been ignored.

"These two men are being isolated and penalized solely because they testified truthfully in the Otepka case. Three other employes testified falsely and were rewarded. They were taken care of. But these two men sit twiddling their thumbs in an old abandoned warehouse because they told the truth."

SUPPORT HIS DEFENSE

Hite and Burkhardt were associates of Otto F. Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the department's office of security. They supported his defense against charges of conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

Otepka was discharged in November, 1963, allegedly for supplying confidential documents to the Senate internal security subcommittee but actually, Williams noted, for testifying candidly about the protection of security risks in the department. Four years later, in December, 1967, after Otepka had waged a costly legal battle, Rusk evoked the dismissal, substituting a severe reprimand and demotion involving a $5,479 salary cut. Otepka has appealed this decision to the Civil Service Commission.

REPORT IN CASE

"No one who has not seen the utterly appalling conditions which surrounded Hite and Burkhardt could possibly believe that they were ordered by officials of the United States government," Gross said. "There are absolutely no excuses for this unspeakable disgrace."

A special report on the treatment given Hite and Burkhardt by the state department was issued by the Senate internal security subcommittee. It gave this summary:

"The department of state at the highest level has pursued a vendetta for five years against Otepka. Much has been said about the relentless persecution of Otepka by the state department.

BLAST AT SYSTEM

"But the drive against his associates continues to be equally relentless in an effort to cow them into submission and, if at all possible, obtain their resignations and removal as professional security officers.

"Now, the new information brought out shows the Chinese-torture type of system introduced against these men by the state department.

"Contrived efforts by these officials to force despair on Hite and Burkhardt thru solitary confinement and lack of authentic assignments by which they could utilize their skills have failed.

"The state department, stooping again to a new tactic, designed to achieve its ends and thwart the intent of the Senate internal security subcommittee, has placed these men in quarters which cannot even be compared to a hovel. Whisky bottles litter the floor. Bait for rats is cast in every corner of their office.

"There is no security guard even tho the project to which Hite and Burkhardt were assigned on paper was justified by the state department as being top-secret and extremely sensitive in nature. Windows do not have locks. Cardboard covers panes of glass to keep out the cold. Restroom conditions are filthy.

OUTRAGED AT PENALTY

"With all this, these two career civil service employes remain the past two individuals on their floor of a building which is scheduled to be demolished within a very short time.

"Will this be the way to get rid of them—by razing the building with these two men still inside? Members of the subcommittee are not only concerned but outraged at the cruel and inhuman punishment being meted out against these two men because they dared to testify truthfully before it.

"We shall not permit the state department's lack of decency nor stand for its subtle personnel assassination."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope that the Department will be a little more careful hereafter and that this will not happen again. In the meantime I suggest that the administration apologize not only to these two men but also to the American taxpayers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER MUST BE MAINTAINED

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow and regret that I see and hear predictions of more rioting, looting, burning, and murder in our cities this summer. It saddens me especially that the President has indicated that city riots are inevitable.

For us to accept such riots as inevitable is purely tragic. For it means that we accept the inevitability of death and destruction which falls disproportionately upon our Negro and other minority citizens.

And it means we accept as inevitable the disintegration of civil order to the degree that normal law enforcement can protect none of our citizens.

What these assurances of riots to come do, Mr. President, is to create an atmosphere in which—

Our Negro citizens see an unconscionably long history of oppression and misery extended. The hopes which may have been kindled in their revolution to achieve equality—hopes shared by the vast majority, I am convinced—and which we have yet to meet, all are submerged in the fear of violence and lawlessness.

No progress toward righting the very grave and real wrongs of centuries is possible.

All our citizens, of whatever race or view, are put on notice that normal peace and order cannot be maintained. To proclaim the inevitable course of civil disorder simply feeds the fires of extremism. Black power extremists are reinforced in their predictions of warfare. Bigots are simply encouraged to react violently. But the vast majority of us, white and Negro, desperately want assurances that peace can be lawfully maintained.

Predictions of sure destruction, this summer and in summers to come, simply arm the criminal and the extremist, while dashing away the necessary grounds for hope and progress upon which the majority of Americans—Americans of all races—stands.

I would have hoped, Mr. President, that the President, our Governors, and mayors would have made it clear, again and again, that order will be maintained by lawful force sufficient to the task. Attempts at rioting, looting, arson, and murder will be dealt with firmly and promptly—they simply will not be allowed to spread.

Had the President made this clear earlier in the week, rather than shrugging in the face of inevitable disaster, he would have reinforced the position of all who are seeking desperately and by peaceful means to right the tragic injustices of centuries. As it is, I fear the President's much-cited statement of Monday has given the advantage to the hotheads, black and white.

By contrast, the firm line Mayor Daley has taken in Chicago—assuring that the lawful authorities can and will maintain order—must give hope to the people of that city. Progress can be made, but only in the context of order lawfully maintained.

To put the case I have made here in sharp focus, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "City Riots Inevitable, L. B. J. Says; Hopes Problems Can Be Eased," written by Carroll Kilpatrick and published in the Washington Post of February 14, 1968; an article entitled "Hot Summer Is Foreseen by Johnson," published in the Baltimore Sun of February 13, 1968; and an editorial entitled "Nobody Is Going To Tear Chicago Apart," published in the Chicago Tribune of February 14, 1968.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

CITY RIOTS INEVITABLE, L. B. J. SAYS: HOPES PROBLEMS CAN BE EASED

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Johnson believes that more riots in the cities are inevitable this summer and in future summers.

In an off-the-cuff talk to college students late Monday, the President said that "we will have several bad summers before the deficiencies of centuries are erased."

The President gave his reply in answer to a question from a Negro student who wanted to know whether the President could avert another bad summer.

Mr. Johnson gazed at the rug a moment, and said: "We can't avert it."

He said that the best would be done with the resources available, but he did not see that anything could prevent more trouble in the cities this year and in the future.

There will "still be millions in poverty after we do all we can," he said.

The President said he hoped that Congress would pass all of the appropriations he had requested for education, health, model cities and antipoverty programs.

"If we get these we will make a dent in some of the causes of unrest, and give hope to people to the point that they would be inspired and stimulated to hold on rather than throw up their hands and say there is no hope," he said.

The President referred to the meeting he has planned for later this month with the Nation's governors and to meetings he has had with industrial leaders and with mayors to try to attack the problem of hard core unemployment.

He said that "we are making the biggest attempt ever made in the history of this land in terms of measures and dollars to attack illiteracy, ignorance and discrimination, and we have been getting some results."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 13, 1968]

HOT SUMMER IS FORESEEN BY JOHNSON—HE SAYS HIS PROPOSED PROGRAMS WOULD EASE TENSIONS

WASHINGTON, February 12.—President Johnson tonight predicted that America faces another summer of racial tension, and warned that it will be worse if Congress rejects his programs aimed at solving urban problems.

Asked by a Negro among a group of college students visiting the White House how another urban crisis could be averted this summer, Mr. Johnson replied grimly, "We can't avert it. We will have a bad summer. We will have several bad summers before the deficiencies of centuries are erased."

The urban problems cannot be solved between now and the summer, Mr. Johnson said. But he emphasized that congressional backing for the proposals he has already made, aimed specifically at the hard-core unemployed in city ghettos, would "make a dent in some of the causes of unrest."

PROGRAMS GIVE HOPE

Such programs, he asserted, "will give hope to people to the point that they will be inspired and stimulated to hold on, rather than throw up their hands and say there is no hope."

In an impromptu question and answer session with about two dozen White House Fellows and a dozen college students who are organizing a nationwide presidential referendum in April on 2,000 college campuses, the President underlined his efforts to interest American business and industry in the problems of "the other half."

The men who are his target, said Mr. Johnson, are the tycoons who "fight all day to make a better mousetrap, shoving and revving up."

THEY DON'T KNOW

"They don't know what is happening in Harlem or Brooklyn or even Long Island," he declared.

Mr. Johnson pointed to his recent move in recruiting such men as Henry Ford 2d to head an alliance of leading businessmen in becoming actively interested in producing jobs for the hard-core unemployed.

"We are trying to provide business with guidelines for training these people, working it out to the point where the unemployed can be pulled up by their bootstraps to the stage where they can hold a job, then get one."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 14, 1968]

NOBODY'S GOING TO TEAR CHICAGO APART

It is disgusting to hear what Police Supt. James B. Conlisk calls "apostles of gloom and doom" predicting that Chicago is in for the hottest summer ever at the hands of instigators of racial conflict. Last summer, because of the firmness of Mayor Daley in announcing in advance that trouble makers would get what was coming to them, there were only minor and sporadic disorders.

In 1965, however, there was rioting on the west side, and in 1966 "open housing" marches promoted by the Rev. Martin Luther King and his lieutenants produced considerable tension, tho the police prevented outright violence. Now, again, we are hearing threats that this will be the "worst time" Chicago has seen.

Dick Gregory, an unfunny comedian, has announced that he has hatched plans to disrupt the Democratic national convention here next August. He says the police will be tied up by "50 or 60 demonstrations in different directions at the same time." Last October a threat was made at a New York radical meeting that the convention would be stopped even "if we have to burn down the hall."

Saul Alinsky, a professional agitator who has been active in other cities, recently returned to Chicago with the word that the city was too quiet and he intended to stir it up. One description of him is that, "for a fee, he contracts to come into your city and, so to speak, bust up the joint."

The great body of fine and decent Negro Chicagoans should combine with the real leaders of the colored people to stop these threats before they can be translated into action. These people have found homes here, their incomes are constantly improving, and their opportunities are expanding. They have the impartial protection of the law, and they are accustomed to peace and order.

Certainly they know that rioting and the destruction of property improve nothing and accomplish nothing, and that their best service is in contributing to Chicago, not trying to tear Chicago down.

Every effort is being made here to improve housing, education, opportunities for solid employment, and social communion. Interchanges of views can provide solutions to those things which may still be out of joint, but bricks and bottles and fire bombs will only destroy what has already been gained.

We are encouraged by Supt. Conlisk's statement yesterday that he sees no reason for major disturbances and is optimistic that racial amity will continue to prevail. Those who say the contrary and try to inflame street crowds should be isolated and denied the opportunity to try to foment disorder.

All of us in Chicago should unite in the conviction that Chicago, far from facing its worst season, is going to continue to progress toward a better day for everyone.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2973—INTRODUCTION OF BILL ENTITLED "NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL BARGAINING ACT OF 1968"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the National Agricultural Bargaining Act of 1968, for myself and Senators BURDICK, MCCARTHY, NELSON, MCGEE, PROXMIRE, MCGOVERN, YOUNG of North Dakota, METCALF, and MANSFIELD, and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2973) to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this legislation, which would create a national collective bargaining system for determining fair farm prices, offers two approaches toward providing greater economic muscle for farmers. Title I of the bill enables farmer-elected marketing committees to bargain and negotiate with processors and other buyers for decent and adequate prices on a commodity-by-commodity basis. Title II makes all commodities eligible for marketing orders, and provides a broad new range of powers for farmers under market orders—including collective bargaining for minimum price and nonprice terms of sale of the particular commodity involved.

I expect that this proposal will become a center of controversy. This is, in fact, one of the main functions it is intended to serve. Farm bargaining has been debated and considered for many years, but nothing has been done because it has been too controversial.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has contributed, in statesmanlike fashion, to the discussion of the objective of improving the bargaining power of the farmers, which I think is wise and proper, because I believe the time has come now to fish or cut bait, to get down to the hard specifics of legislation to see how this concept can best be achieved. This proposal is intended to accomplish that objective, by encouraging and focusing debate on the benefits and problems that may be associated with farmer collective bargaining.

This legislation, or something very nearly like it, is sorely needed and must be passed if we expect the American family farmer to continue in the business of farming. Without it, farmers are doomed to economic disenfranchisement. Without it, farmers will continue to be the low man on our economic totem pole, without any real hope of attaining the just portion of national income to which they are entitled.

No business—and farmers do run substantially large businesses—could function or stay in operation under the conditions under which farmers operate. First of all, they are at the mercy of many variables, including the weather, entirely outside their control. In addition, farmers have no economic power to establish the price on the commodities they produce. They must take, in all reality, whatever is offered by way of the market price or federal programs. They have no alternative.

There is no doubt, and the records are clear, that this inherently weak bargaining position has caused the American family farmer to lag far behind the prosperity enjoyed by nearly every other segment of our society. The record is quite clear. Consumers in this country are estimated to have expended about $85.5 billion during 1967 for domestic farm products. This represents an increase over the last 20 years of 100 percent.

The farmer's share or the farm value of that food marketing bill is only $27.5 billion and has increased in the last 20 years by only one-half.

It certainly is instructive to note what the farmer's share of the consumer dollar amounts to for market basket commodities. The farmer receives only 2.7 cents for the wheat in a pound of a loaf of white bread, or 12 percent of the cost of that loaf. The farmer receives overall only 39 cents out of every dollar spent on food by the American consumer. And this share of the consumer dollar has not varied materially in the last 10 years despite a marked increase in the farm retail spread.

It is fact that the American farmer subsidizes his consumer counterpart, by continuing to produce food for substandard returns. At the same time the farmer has been increasing his own productivity fourfold over the last 30 years. Between 1950 and 1965 alone, the output per manhour in agriculture rose nearly three times as fast as in nonfarming occupations, 132 percent in agriculture against 47 percent for the rest of the economy. In one sentence, that sums up the farm subsidy to consumers. Consumers pay more but farmers get less.

It is not unheard of to seek to improve the economic and bargaining position of depressed segments of our society. The most striking example of Federal legislation to achieve this purpose is, of course, the Wagner Act of 1935. This legislation has very successfully eliminated sweatshop conditions and permitted working men and women with no commodity to offer other than their labor, to bargain and receive a fair price in return for that labor.

Statistics from 1966 adequately show the tremendous strides made by organized labor in improving their wages and working conditions. General construction trades laborers earned an average of $3.87 an hour, trucking warehouse workers $3.18 an hour, railroad workers $3.09 an hour, factory workers $2.71 per hour, and retail food workers $2.39 per hour. The farmer average return per hour was only $1.60 an hour, and this will undoubtedly appear high to many and perhaps most of the American family farmers, where the average for most major types of farming operations was closer to $1 an hour.

And, therefore, I think the American farmer must borrow a page out of the book of organized labor. The American farmer needs a magna carta for agriculture similar to the Wagner Act of 1935.

And, therefore, I think it is very important that we begin this year to consider in a constructive manner the farm bargaining legislation which is introduced today and which might be introduced in the future by others. I intend to ask that the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee conduct searching in-depth hearings on this issue. I am hopeful that all interested persons and groups will join critical comments with alternative ideas, proposals, and suggestions. Only in this way will we be able to determine the wisest course of action to follow.

I wish to make clear that this bill is not a replacement for existing farm programs. We do not regard the National Labor Relations Act as a total solution for all the ills of the workingman, nor can this bill be a panacea.

This approach to bargaining, or any other, cannot work without substantial unity among farmers, and a willingness to act as a cohesive group. Unity is an absolute essential. This bill is a self-help tool which farmers can use if they wish. It is not, therefore, a replacement for existing farm programs. The National Labor Relations Act has not superseded the need for minimum wage legislation or unemployment compensation legislation, and I do not see how we can regard farm bargaining as a substitute for existing programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL BARGAINING ACT

TITLE I. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL BARGAINING ACT

Section 101. *Policy and Findings.*—Farmers do not have the opportunity to bargain effectively for a fair and reasonable return for their production, because of an inherently weak economic position.

Section 102. *National Agricultural Relations Board.*—This independent five-member Board, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, is established to provide administrative, technical, and supporting assistance to farmer Marketing Committees and Purchasers Committees. It does not represent either farmers or buyers. It would administer farmer referendums and assist the Committees in holding meetings.

Section 103. *Marketing Committees.*—

Section 103(a). *Petition and Referendum.*—When the Board receives a petition from the producers of a particular agricultural commodity, stating that the average market price is below a fair and reasonable level, it shall proceed to conduct a referendum among producers to determine whether a Marketing Committee should be established and who should be elected to that Committee. The Board may also initiate a referendum upon its independent determination that the market price is below a fair and reasonable price. This procedure may be used for any commodity or commodity group.

Section 103(b). *Referendum.*—The Board supervises and administers all phases of the balloting, including voting qualifications in addition to 103(c).

Section 103(c). *Voting and Candidates.*—ASC County Committees will furnish names of candidates to the Board, which shall include on the ballot at least twice as many as will be elected. Candidates may be elected at large or from lesser subdivisions. Basic eligibility for voting and membership requires that at least 60% of income must be from farming or ranching, and the particular commodity must be a "significant portion" of the farming operation.

Section 103(d). *First Meeting.*—Upon a majority referendum vote, the Board will convene the first meeting of the Marketing Committee.

Section 103(e). *Notification to Prospective Buyers.*—The Board must notify prospective purchasers of the existence of the farmer Marketing Committee, requesting them to select a Purchasers Committee to meet and negotiate price and nonprice terms of sale of the particular commodity involved.

Section 103(f). Board is authorized to fix the time and place of a meeting between the Purchasers Committee and the Marketing Committee. The Marketing Committee must invite consumer representatives to present the viewpoint and information on behalf of consumers at such meetings.

Section 103(g). Statistical and factual data are to be supplied to the respective Committees by the Board and USDA. Provides that the Board may act as an arbitrator if both Committee invite its participation and if both Committees accept the Board's conditions.

Section 103(h). *Failure of Referendum.*—Provides procedures for resubmission through referendum on the questions of establishing the Marketing Committee and the membership in following years.

Section 103(i). *Powers of the Marketing Committee.*—

Establish minimum price and nonprice terms of sale pursuant to agreements in negotiations.

Where negotiations for whatever reason do not result in a minimum price, the Board is required to mediate the dispute. If this does not lead to agreement within 30 days, the disputed issues are referred to a Joint Settlement Committee composed of a Purchasers representative, a farmers representative, and a neutral selected by each. The Joint Settlement Committee, after reasonable opportunity for the parties to be heard, must decide the questions at issue, and its decision is judicially reviewable.

Other powers dealing with operation of the Marketing Committee, and enforcement of their responsibilities. See also Section 111.

Section 103(j). *Dissolution of Marketing Committees.*—Provides for termination of a Marketing Committee unless approved by referendum every three years.

Section 103(k). *Prohibition.*—Prohibits the sale or purchase of the commodity below the established price.

Section 104. *Recordkeeping.*—Farmers are required to keep certain records to aid in carrying out the Marketing Committee's functions.

Section 105. *Exemption.*—The Board may, with the approval of the Marketing Committee, where it will not interfere with the purposes of this Act, allow some farm production in the commodity to be marketed for specific markets outside the limitations of this Act.

Section 106. *Injunctions and District Courts.*—Injunctive proceedings provided, through U.S. Attorneys in U.S. District Courts.

Section 107.—The Board is required to pay for and conduct all referenda, and cost of operation of the Marketing Committee.

Section 108. The Board's decisions on the boundaries of marketing areas, the scope of the commodity, and the results of the referenda are final.

Section 109. *Appropriation authorization.*

Section 110. *Antitrust exemption.*

Section 111. *Supply Control.*—Provides that the Marketing Committee, when necessary to achieve the purposes of the Act, may prepare in consultation with the Board and the Secretary of Agriculture a plan of marketing allotments, with or without acreage or production limitations, for submission to farmers for approval in a referendum. If approved, the Secretary of Agriculture will administer the program.

Section 112. Authorization for the Secretary to implement the plan approved under Section 111.

Section 113. *Definitions.*

Section 114. *Separability.*

TITLE II. MARKETING ORDERS

Section 201. Amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, in eight respects, as follows:

Section 201(1). Amends Section 8c(2) to make any additional agricultural commodity or product (except canned or frozen products) eligible for a marketing order if the Secretary, after a special preliminary referendum of affected producers, finds that a majority of those voting favor making that commodity or product eligible for such an order.

Sections 201(2) and 201(5). Provide authority to include in marketing orders provisions establishing a method of establishing, by collective bargaining (including provisions for the designation by election of committees of producer representatives to bargain with handlers or groups of handlers), minimum prices and terms and conditions under which handlers may acquire a regulated commodity or product thereof (other than milk and its products) from producers or associations of producers. The minimum prices and other terms prior to becoming effective would have to be agreed to by the handlers of 50 per cent of the commodity and would be subject to approval by the Secretary.

These provisions also specify special pricing standards to be the statutory objective for such price determining purposes if the Secretary finds that parity for a regulated commodity is not adequate. The alternative pricing standard would take into account factors such as production costs, prices to consumers, and other factors affecting supply and demand for the commodity, including any limitations on marketings that may otherwise be included in the marketing order.

In addition, Section 201(5) would authorize the pooling of proceeds of sale of a commodity other than milk when minimum prices are established on a use-classification basis. If the Secretary found that pooling and producer marketing quotas were necessary in conjunction with pricing provisions to provide equitable distribution of returns and market opportunity among producers, he could require the use of such combined authority.

Section 201(3). Authorizes the establishment of minimum pricing for milk through a collective bargaining process.

Section 201(4). Amends Section 8c(6)(A) through (e) by adding "species or other classification" after "grade, size, or quality" to make this regulation available by such categories with respect to livestock and other commodities.

Section 201(6). Adds a section 8c(7)(E) to—

(1) Authorize the Secretary to issue producer allotment bases for any commodity including milk on the basis of (i) the amount produced or marketed by such producer or from the farm on which he is a producer in a representative prior period, subject to adjustment for abnormal conditions and other factors the Secretary may determine, or (ii) the current quantities available for marketing by such producer, or (iii) any combination of (i) and (ii) that will result in the total allotment being apportioned equitably among producers. A minimum allotment could be fixed for producers whose production does not exceed that amount.

(2) Establish an administrative procedure, with subsequent court review, for reviewing the lawfulness of a producer's allotment. This would be similar to the section 8c(15)(A) and (B) review procedure for handlers.

(3) Specify that a handler may not handle more of a producer's allotment base than is authorized to be marketed.

Section 201(7). Adds a Section 8c(2) to authorize the Secretary to establish a producer advisory committee for any commodity to provide advice on starting proceedings to promulgate a new order and formulate specific hearing proposals.

Section 201(8). Provides that orders containing price bargaining or producer allotment provisions under proposed Section 8c(6)(J) or Section 8c(7)(E) (see items 5, 6) would impose administrative assessments pro rata on producers, payable through handlers to the agency administering the order. Handlers would have the responsibility of collection from producers.

Section 202. Would make it clear that the new authorities provided by Title II shall not supersede the provisions of other statutes relating to marketing quotas, acreage allotments or limitations, or price support and that no action taken or any provision of an order issued under Title II shall be inconsistent with such other statutes or actions taken by the Secretary thereunder.

TITLE III. AGRICULTURAL FAIR PRACTICES

Sections 301 to 311 include the substance of the version of S. 109 on which the Senate held hearings, with amendments recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its report on that bill.

Section 312 would protect associations and organizations of producers and their members or officers from being held responsible for acts where it is not clearly established that they participated in, authorized or ratified such acts after full knowledge and limits the authority for issuance of injunctions to instances where after a full hearing the Court

> finds that such association or person actually engaged in the acts in question authorized them or ratified them with full knowledge thereof. This is similar to the type of protection given to labor organizations involved in labor disputes. (29 U.S.C. Sections 106 and 107).

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

TITLE I

Mr. MONDALE. Very briefly, title I of the bill provides that when the price of a particular agricultural commodity is unfair and unreasonable, farmers producing that commodity may ask the newly established National Agricultural Relations Board to conduct a farmer referendum for the purpose of electing a bargaining committee to negotiate a fairer price and other terms of sale in bargaining sessions with a similar committee representing processors and other purchasers of that commodity.

The Board is established as an independent agency to assist farmers and buyers in the process of bargaining. If no agreement can be reached—whether on price or nonprice terms of sale—or if the purchasers fail to bargain in good faith, the unsettled or disputed issues would be resolved by a three-man joint settlement committee. This joint settlement committee would be composed of a farmer representative, a purchasers representative, and a neutral party.

The price and nonprice terms of sale of the commodity, whether reached through the bargaining process or through the joint settlement committee, would be binding on all producers and all buyers.

This procedure is available to the producers of all commodities without exception, and would also permit the farmer bargaining committee to recommend a plan of marketing controls for approval by farmers in an additional referendum.

The bill does not provide a specific, detailed test for determining whether farm prices are unfair or unreasonable, but relies on basic economic realities and prevailing market factors to achieve this objective. While farmer bargaining committees would be free to ask for any price level they feel necessary, they could not demand an unreasonably high price without running a very serious risk of competition from substitutes, increased integrated farming, loss of export markets, increased imports, or, in the absence of supply control, tremendous surplus-producing increases in production.

But while this proposal will require the fullest consideration of the realities of the marketplace it does seek to overcome the American family farmer's chief handicap; namely, that he is the weakest link in the marketing chain from the land to the table. He does not have the power he needs to achieve a fair price for his production. Thus we have seen his prices reduced while what he must buy increases in price. We have seen his prices fall while the price to the consumer on that production rises. This measure seeks to remove this cruel predicament in which the farmer has traditionally found himself.

The bill does not describe in detailed terms who may serve on a purchasers committee, nor spell out how that committee must be selected by the purchasers. It seems to me that further detail on this question may fairly be reserved until we have the viewpoint of the purchasers during hearings on this measure.

TITLE II

Title II is an amendment to the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937. It would enable the producers of any agricultural commodity to form a market order, with a new broad range of powers available for use in the order—including collective bargaining for the establishment of minimum prices.

Under this title, an agricultural commodity is eligible for a market order if a majority of the producers favor the establishment of an order in a special referendum conducted for that purpose by the Secretary. Orders could include collective bargaining, minimum pricing, pooling of proceeds for commodities in addition to milk when prices are established on a use-classification basis, and producer allotments based on historical marketings or quantities currently available or any combination to assure equitable distribution of returns.

Prices or other terms agreed upon between farmers and processors or handlers would become binding on all producers and all buyers on the approval of the Secretary and on reaching agreement with processors or handlers taking 50 percent of the volume of the commodity.

Provision is also made for the establishment of a producer advisory committee for the guidance of the Secretary on formulation of new market orders and specific order provisions.

In my judgment, titles I and II are not contradictory. Congress could pass either or both or a combination of the two. They are different approaches to the same objective bargaining power for farmers.

There is little doubt that this measure, or something very close to it, must be adopted if the American family farmer is going to stay in the business of farming. Without it, thousands of farmers and farming as we know it are doomed to extinction.

The reason is concisely stated in a quotation from a statement by President John F. Kennedy:

> The farmer is the only man in our economy who buys everything he buys at retail, sells everything he sells at wholesale, and pays the freight both ways.

This has remained true despite the important progress made in farm legislation and farm income over the last 7 or 8 years.

If I may be permitted to reach back into the past, some 20 years ago, another individual said much the same thing in forceful terms. He said:

> The farmer is an individual. He has no economic power to protect himself in our present big economy. He cannot strike. Our farm organizations and cooperatives have never suggested such a weapon. He cannot fix the prices of his commodities.

That speaker went on to say, concerning the farmer's inability to set his own prices:

> Organized labor would strike before accepting such a position of economic disparity. Manufacturers would not produce except in control of price making. Banks would liquidate instead of continuing services under such doubtful conditions as confront farmers. Public utilities would liquidate if their present protection were to be discontinued.

These words are taken from the testimony of a great farm leader before the Senate Agriculture Committee in late 1947—the testimony of M. W. "Bill" Thatcher. For as long as I can remember—and for much longer than that—Bill Thatcher has been a strong advocate and champion of the concept of a Wagner Act for Agriculture.

The farmers of his country ought to recognize the tremendous debt they owe him for his refusal to abandon such a worthwhile and necessary proposal. Farmers need only look around them to know that in just about every way that the adequacy of farm income can be measured, they are the low man on the economic totem pole.

The existing programs have worked very well in eliminating and preventing disastrous surpluses and tailspins in prices. They have provided a floor under farm income, but have not helped the farmer bring his return up to an adequate level. In short, they have prevented disaster but have not assured prosperity.

This measure would not solve every problem of the family farmer or of agriculture in general. But it could permit the farmer to get what he deserves through his own efforts, and it would provide "self-help" tools to achieve fairness in farm income.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 2973

A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the National Agricultural Bargaining Act.

TITLE I

Policy and findings

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that production and marketing of agricultural commodities constitutes a fundamentally basic and essential industry of the United States, involving the supply of the Nation's food, feed and fiber which must be available in adequate volume without impairing or wasting the soil resources of the country.

The bulk of agricultural commodities are produced for commercial purposes and are marketed either in the current of interstate and foreign commerce or in a manner which directly burdens, obstructs or affects such commerce and the marketing of that part of such commodity as enters directly into the current of interstate and foreign commerce cannot be effectively regulated without also extending the regulations, in the manner provided in this Act, to that part which is marketed within the State of production.

Farmers, ranchers and other producers of agricultural commodities are located and operate throughout the United States, produce the same or similar or competitive crops in many States carry on their farming operations with the use of borrowed funds and on leased land as well as their own land, and their operations are subject to uncontrollable and unforeseeable natural causes which often adversely affect the supply and directly affect consumer and national welfare.

Agricultural producers do not now enjoy the opportunity, comparable to that of industrial workers and those in many other forms of enterprise or employment, to organize and bargain effectively for a just and reasonable return or compensation for the commodities they offer for sale in domestic and foreign commerce. Neither is adequate government protection or assistance available to the vast majority of them in their effort to market their agricultural commodities in an orderly manner at reasonable prices. The producers of agricultural commodities are one of the very few economic groups, if not the only economic group, which must sell in markets largely controlled by the buyers, brokers, commission agents and other representatives of buyers. As a result, producers of agricultural commodities are unable to effectively prevent or avoid the wasting of natural resources, the disorderly marketing of their commodities, congestion in transportation, storage and processing and other burdens on interstate and foreign commerce.

Disorderly marketing of abnormally excessive supplies of agricultural commodities unduly depresses the prices received by the producers, burdens and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce, causes wide and injurious disparity between the prices received by producers of such commodities and the cost to such producers of the materials and supplies required to produce such agricultural commodities, thus depressing the net return received by such producers and threatens the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities to meet the requirement of the Nation and the consumers of said commodities.

National Agricultural Relations Board

SEC. 102(a)(1). There is hereby created a board, to be known as the "National Agricultural Relations Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of five members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, two for a term of three years, and two for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

SEC. 102(a)(2). The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

SEC. 102(a)(3). The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the business it has conducted over the preceding year, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

SEC. 102(a)(4). Each member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties.

SEC. 102(a)(5). All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

SEC. 102(a)(6). The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title I of this Act.

SEC. 102(a)(7). The Board is authorized to use the services of the employees of the Department of Agriculture and of the committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, in the performance of all of its duties and responsibilities provided for herein.

Marketing committees

SEC. 103(a). In order to effectuate the policy of this title, whenever a representative group of producers of any agricultural commodity or relative group of commodities or any market classification or product thereof the initial sale of which is customarily made by the producer or his cooperative or other marketing representative, shall file with the Board a written petition stating that the average market price received by the producers of said agricultural commodity or commodities is below a fair and reasonable price to the producers thereof or that the price to the producer of said agricultural commodity or commodities may reasonably be expected to be below a fair and reasonable price to the producer thereof during the next marketing season or seasons and shall define the area within which said agricultural commodity or commodities is commercially produced or, if said agricultural commodity is produced in a lesser area than the entire United States, shall define the boundaries of the lesser area by States or political subdivisions of States; or, if the Board finds and determines that the average market price received by the producers of any agricultural commodity is below a fair and reasonable price to the producers thereof or that the price to the producers of such agricultural commodity or commodities during a future marketing season may reasonably be expected to be below a fair and reasonable price to the producers thereof, taking into account: (1) the direct cost of production, including hired labor; (2) the reasonable value of the time, skill, and experience of the individual producing such commodity or commodities; (3) a fair return upon essential invested capital; (4) continuation of the American family farm pattern of agricultural production; and (5) other appropriate factors, including compensation comparable with that of other persons engaged in other means of earning a livelihood for themselves and their families, the Board shall announce the receipt of said petition or its findings and determination and promptly thereafter shall initiate and conduct a referendum among producers of such agricultural commodity to determine whether or not said producers favor the establishment of a representative marketing committee of the producers of said commodity to be chosen by such producers for the purpose of negotiating with purchasers of the commodity to determine a fair minimum price or nonprice terms for the sale and purchase of said commodity. If the Board determines that such agricultural commodity is commercially produced in a lesser area than the entire United States it shall so state in its announcement and define the boundaries of the lesser area by States or political subdivisions of States. Commodities of the same general class or which are used wholly or in part for the same purpose may be treated as a separate commodity for the purposes of this title.

SEC. 103(b). All phases of said referendum, including preparation and distribution of ballots, establishment of voting places and procedures defining the further qualification of producers eligible to vote, the tallying of the vote upon the issue of whether or not a marketing committee shall be created and authorized and the number of the initial members of the marketing committee for said commodity as hereinafter provided shall be prepared and conducted by the Board.

SEC. 103(c). Said referendum ballot shall contain the names of at least twice as many persons as the membership of the proposed initial marketing committee, to be selected by the Board from recommendations submitted to it by the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees established by section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotments Act, as amended. The membership of the marketing committee shall be elected at large or the whole area may be divided into divisions or subareas and the number of members to be selected from each division or subarea to be elected by the eligible producers resident in such division or subarea shall be fixed by the Board. No person shall be eligible to vote for or serve on any marketing committee unless more than 60 per centum of his annual gross income received from production during each of the preceding three calendar years has been derived from farming or ranching as owner-operator or lessee-operator and the commodity named in the Board's announcement constitutes a significant portion of the total farming or ranching operations of said proposed marketing committee member.

SEC. 103(d). If a majority of producers eligible to vote and voting in said referendum shall approve the establishment of such a marketing committee, the Board shall so publicly announce and shall promptly notify the persons elected as the initial members of said marketing committee that a meeting of said committee will be convened at a time and place, either in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere, for the purpose of organizing and planning the work of the committee.

SEC. 103(e). Concurrently with its announcement of the creation of a marketing committee as provided for in this title, the Board shall give notice to prospective purchasers of such commodity and request such prospective purchasers to select a purchasers' committee for the purpose of participating in negotiating a minimum price at which said commodity shall be offered for sale and sold by the producers thereof and negotiating nonprice terms of such sales.

SEC. 103(f). If prospective purchasers do not select a committee which is fairly representative of all prospective purchasers of the commodity within thirty days after date said invitation was issued by the Board, or within such additional period as the Board may fix, the Board is authorized to select a committee which it determines is fairly representative of all commercial purchasers of said commodity. The Board is authorized to fix the time and place of a meeting or meetings of the marketing committee and the purchasers committee for the purpose of negotiating a minimum price at which such commodity is to be offered for sale and sold by producers and on nonprice terms of such sales. The marketing committee and the purchasers committee shall bargain in good faith during such meeting or meetings. The marketing committee shall also invite the Chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Consumer Problems to designate one or more persons to represent the interest of consumers in said meeting and to present such data and information, recommendations and suggestions on behalf of consumers as said consumer representatives deem desirable.

Sec. 103(g). The Board and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized and directed to make available to the marketing and purchaser committees such information, statistics and assistance as are reasonably available to them and will assist in determining the facts relating to the production and marketing of said agricultural commodity and a fair and reasonable minimum price. But no employee of the Board or of the Department of Agriculture shall participate in any meetings of such committees except that the Board or its delegate may act as an arbitrator in any bargaining negotiations between the marketing and purchaser committees if invited by a majority vote of the membership of both committees and both committees accept the terms and conditions prescribed by the Board concerning the scope and nature of its participation in such negotiations.

Sec. 103(h). If less than a majority of the producers eligible to vote and voting in the referendum favor the establishment of a marketing committee, the Board shall make public announcement of that fact and shall not take any further action to establish a marketing committee for that commodity during the current marketing year or season. The Board shall, however, be authorized to submit a referendum to the producers within the same area applicable to a subsequent marketing year or season, except that if a majority of said producers voting fail to vote in favor of a marketing committee in three successive referenda, the Board shall take no further action to establish a marketing committee for said commodity produced within said area unless at least 20 percent of the producers of said agricultural commodity in such area shall sign and submit to the Board a petition requesting another referendum.

Sec. 103(i). Each marketing committee constituted pursuant to this title shall be authorized and empowered:

(1) To establish the minimum price by size, grade, quality, or other type of condition, and other nonprice terms of sale, and the date upon which said price and terms shall become effective, for the agricultural commodity described in and produced within the area defined in the Board's announcement, in accord with agreements reached after negotiations with representatives of prospective purchasers of such commodity as provided in this title; or, if said representatives of the prospective purchasers of the product fail or refuse to negotiate, or, if after a reasonable period of negotiations in good faith as determined by the Board, the parties fail to agree upon a minimum price, then the Board shall promptly offer and provide such conciliation and mediation services to the marketing committee and purchasers committee as may be useful and helpful in bringing them to agreement. If such agreement is not thereupon reached within 30 days, the issues under dispute shall be submitted to a joint settlement committee to be selected as follows: One member to be chosen by the marketing committee, and one member by the purchasers committee, and the third member to be chosen within five days by the first two. If the first two members cannot agree upon such third member within such period, the latter shall be a neutral appointed by the Board. The Board may apply to the appropriate Federal district court to compel action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed under this section. The joint settlement committee shall proceed to resolve such issues, allowing the marketing committee and purchasers committee reasonable opportunity to present pertinent information and argument, through submission of written data, views, or arguments, with or without opportunity to present the same orally in any manner. The decision of the joint settlement committee on the issues in dispute shall be judicially reviewable in the appropriate Federal district court to the extent provided hereafter. The reviewing court shall hold unlawful and set aside decisions found to be (1) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with this Act; (2) affected with bias or prejudice on the part of the neutral member of the joint settlement committee; (3) in excess of jurisdiction or authority granted under this Act; or (4) without observance of procedures required herein.

(2) To announce said minimum price and the effective date thereof of the commodity by any one or more of the usual and available media of publication and communication.

(3) To establish reasonable rules for the operation of the committee, including the rules and procedures for the election of their successors and to fill vacancies on the committee.

(4) To establish terms of service on the committee.

(5) To request the Board to submit referenda to producers from time to time for the committee's guidance.

(6) After the second year or season of its operations, to recommend to the Board a reasonable assessment on the producers of the commodity, by unit or by value, for the cost of carrying on the activities of the committee, to be assessed and collected by the Board through the committees established by section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

(7) To recommend to the Board that injunctive or related actions to be instituted to prevent any buyers from purchasing or any producers from selling the commodity at less than the minimum price established under this section or in violation of other, non-price terms of sale so established.

(8) To establish additional penalties for violation of section 103(k) by producers after approval in a referendum by a majority of producers eligible to vote and voting.

Sec. 103(j). All marketing committees created pursuant to this title shall cease to have any authority and shall be dissolved by the Board after three years from the date of its first meeting if, during the third year of said three-year period, at least a majority of the producers then eligible to vote and voting fail to vote in favor of the continuation of the marketing committee in a referendum conducted by the Board.

Sec. 103(k). In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, no producer shall offer to sell or sell and no buyer shall offer to purchase or purchase from a producer said commodity at a price lower than the minimum price agreed upon and fixed by the marketing and purchasers committees or, in the absence of an agreement by said committees at the price established by the joint settlement committee under this section. Compliance by a producer with the minimum prices established by a marketing committee under this title for a commodity shall be established by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support, loans, purchases, and other similar payment authorized under any other Act.

Sec. 104. All producers of a commodity covered by the provisions of this title for which a marketing committee has been elected shall keep such records and furnish such reports with respect to production, storage, marketing, and other relevant matters as the marketing committee may require; and all persons purchasing or acquiring possession of any such commodity shall supply such information concerning such commodity as the marketing committee finds to be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of this title. Any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this subsection or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500.00.

Sec. 105. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this title the Board may, with the approval of the marketing committee, if it deems such action will not substantially interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this title or the effective operation of the marketing committee, determine for any agricultural commodity a uniform amount of production (in terms of acreage, production units or commodity units) per form which may be marketed in specified markets free of restriction for all uses or limited uses.

Sec. 106. Injunctive proceedings or other penalties provided for by this title shall be brought by the Board in the name of the United States. The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction of such suits, and it shall be the duty of the United States attorneys in their respective districts, at the request of the Board and under the direction of the Attorney General, to prosecute such proceedings. The remedies and penalties provided for herein shall be in addition to and not exclusive of any of the remedies or penalties under existing law.

Sec. 107. To effectuate the purposes of this title, the Board is directed and authorized to pay the costs of conducting any referendum required to be submitted to producers, including the cost of publishing notice in newspapers, radio and television announcements, posting notices throughout the area, giving notices to prospective purchasers of the commodity, pay the costs of operation of the marketing and purchasers committees including a meeting room, temporary clerical and stenographic assistance, necessary transportation, meals and housing costs of members while traveling to and attending such meeting or any adjournment or continuation thereof.

Sec. 108. The decision of the Board with respect to the boundaries of the area and the commodity to be affected by his announcement and the results of the referendum conducted pursuant thereto shall be final.

Sec. 109. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable it to carry out the purposes of this title I including the reasonable and necessary expenses and per diem of any marketing committee elected by the producers of a commodity. Obligations may be incurred in advance of appropriations therefor and the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance from its capital fund such sums as may be necessary to implement this title during any current fiscal year.

Sec. 110. No bargaining or negotiating activities by a marketing committee pursuant to this Title and no price agreement reached as a result of such negotiations and bargaining shall be deemed to be in violation of any of the antitrust laws of the United States.

Sec. 111. Whenever a marketing committee shall have established a minimum price for any commodity and thereafter shall also determine that the total supply of said commodity produced within the defined area will so substantially exceed the effective demand for said commodity during the marketing year as to nullify or defeat the purposes of this title, said marketing committee, in consultation with the Board and the Secretary of Agriculture, shall develop a plan or program of marketing allotments, with or without acreage or production limitations, and shall request the Board to submit said plan or program by referendum to the producers of said commodity within said defined area for the approval or rejection of said producers. If a majority of producers eligible to vote and voting in said referendum approve said plan or program, the Board shall instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed immediately to put said plan or program into effect.

SEC. 112. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to establish all reasonable rules and regulations necessary to effectuate such plan and program, including the fixing of reasonable penalties for the violation of said rules and regulations. The Secretary is further authorized to use any existing authorities available to him for the purpose of putting said plan or program into effect and, in the event he determines that he is without sufficient authority to effectuate any part of said plan or program, the Secretary is directed to suggest enabling legislation before the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 113(a). For the purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) "Commodity" shall mean any agricultural commodity or any regional or market classification, or product thereof, the initial sale of which is customarily made by the producer, or his cooperative, or other marketing representative, and shall further include a combination of agricultural commodities of the same general class which are used wholly or in part for the same purpose. The plural shall be included whenever the context so requires.

(3) "Total supply" of any agricultural commodity for any marketing year shall be the carryover at the beginning of such marketing year, plus the estimated production of the commodity in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of the commodity into the United States during such marketing year.

(4) "Marketing year" for an agricultural commodity shall be any period determined by the Board during which substantially all of a crop or production of such commodity is normally marketed by the producers.

SEC. 114. If any provision of this title, or any section thereof, is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person, circumstance, commodity or product is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this title and the applicability thereof to other persons, circumstances, commodities or products, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE II—MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 201. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 8c(2) is amended by inserting after the third sentence ending with the words "Southwest production area," the following:

"Notwithstanding any of the commodity, product, area, or approval exceptions or limitations in the foregoing sentences hereof, any agricultural commodity or product (except canned or frozen products) thereof, or any regional or market classification thereof, shall be eligible for an order, exempt from any special approval required by the preceding sentences hereof, if after referendum of the affected producers of such commodity the Secretary finds that a majority of such producers voting in such referendum favor making such commodity or product thereof, or the regional or market classification thereof specified in the referendum, eligible for an order: *Provided, however,* That such referendum shall not be required for any commodity or product for which an order otherwise is authorized under the preceding sentences of this subsection (2) and for which no special approval or area limitation is specified therein."

(2) Section 2(3) is amended by inserting "such minimum prices and other terms and conditions for the acquisition of commodities by handlers as are provided for in section 8c(6)(J)," immediately after "establish and maintain".

(3) Section 8c(5)(A) is amended by inserting "by collective bargaining in good faith (including provisions for the designation, by election of committees of producer representatives to bargain with handlers, or groups of handlers), or otherwise," after the phrase "method for fixing."

(4) Sections 8c(6) (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) are amended by inserting ", species or other classification" after the words "grade, size, or quality" wherever the latter words appear.

(5) Section 8c(6), as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(J) Providing a method for establishing by collective bargaining in good faith between producers and handlers (including provision for the designation by election of committees of producer representatives to bargain with handlers or groups of handlers), the minimum price or prices and other minimum terms and conditions under which any such commodity or product, or any grade, size, quality, variety, species, container, pack, use, disposition, or volume thereof may be acquired by handlers from producers or associations of producers: *Provided,* That no such minimum price or prices or other terms and conditions shall become effective unless agreed to by handlers who during the preceding marketing year acquired from producers at least 50 percent of the commodity sold by producers which was produced in the production area subject to the order and unless thereafter approved by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the parity price of any such commodity, other than milk or its products, for which such minimum prices or other terms or conditions are to be established is not adequate in view of production costs, prices to consumers, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for such commodity subject to such order (including any marketing limitation of the commodity otherwise provided by such order), the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine a price or prices for such commodity at such levels as he finds will insure a sufficient market supply of the commodity, reflect such factors, and be in the public interest, and such price or prices shall be used in lieu of the party price for the purpose of section 2 of this title: *Provided further,* That the agency designated to administer provisions authorized under this subsection shall be a committee primarily composed of producers of the commodity: *And provided further,* That an order containing provisions authorized under this subsection shall also contain provisions authorized under section 8c(6)(K) or section 8c(7)(E), or both, if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that such combination of provisions is necessary to provide an equitable distribution of market opportunity and returns among producers.

"(K) With respect to orders providing for minimum prices on a classified use basis (i) providing for the payment to all producers or associations of producers of uniform minimum prices for the commodity or product marketed by them (within their allotments, if any), irrespective of the use or disposition thereof, subject, however, to adjustments specified by the order, including but not limited to adjustments for place of production or delivery, grade, condition, size, weight, quality, or maturity, or any other adjustments found to be appropriate to provide equity among producers, and (ii) providing a method for making adjustments in payments as among handlers (including producers who are also handlers), to the end that the total sums paid by each handler shall equal the value of the commodity or product purchased or acquired by him at the classified use minimum prices fixed pursuant to such order."

(6) Section 8c(7), as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(E) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title:

"(1) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the quantity of such commodity or product or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each producer may be permitted to market or dispose of in any or all markets or use classifications during any specified period or periods on the basis of (i) the amount produced or marketed by such producer or produced on or marketed from the farm on which he is a producer in such prior period as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be representative, subject to such adjustment for abnormal conditions and other factors affecting production or marketing as the Secretary may determine, or (ii) the current quantities available for marketing by such producer, or (iii) any combination of (i) and (ii), to the end that the total allotment during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers. Allotments hereunder may be in terms of quantities or production from given acres or other production units. If the Secretary determines that such action will facilitate the administration of a marketing order hereunder and will not substantially impair the effective operation thereof he may fix, or provide a method for fixing, a minimum allotment applicable to producers and producers whose production does not exceed such minimum shall not be subject to the regulatory provisions of the order except as prescribed therein;

"(2) any producer for whom an allotment is established or refused under the authority of this subsection may obtain a review of the lawfulness of his allotment as prescribed by the order of the Secretary establishing the allotment and rules and regulations thereunder, which shall constitute the exclusive procedure for review thereof and section 8c(15)(A) of this title shall not apply thereto. Under such order, rules or regulations any officers or employees of the Department or any committees or boards created or designated by the Secretary of Agriculture may be vested with authority to perform any or all functions in connection with such review proceedings including ruling thereon. Committees or boards created or designated for this purpose shall be deemed agencies of the Secretary within the meaning of subsection 8c(7)(C) and section 10 of this title. The ruling upon such review shall be final if in accordance with law. The producer may obtain a judicial review of such ruling in accordance with the provisions of section 8c(15)(B) of this title;

"(3) when allotments for producers are established under this subsection the order may contain provisions allotting or providing a method for allotting the quantity which any handler may handle so that any and all handlers will be limited as to any producer to the allotment established for such producer, and such allotment shall constitute an allotment fixed for each handler within the meaning of section 8a(5) of this title."

(7) Amend section 8c by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (20) as follows:

"(20) PRODUCER ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The Secretary of Agriculture may establish a producer advisory committee with respect to any commodity, or group of commodities, for which a marketing order is potentially authorized. Such committee shall be composed of producers of the commodity or commodities for which the committee is established. Such committees may be called on by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide advice and counsel with respect to the initiation of proceedings for the promulgation of a marketing agreement or marketing order for such commodity or commodities and may also formulate specific proposals for purposes of a public hearing concerning such a proposed marketing agreement or marketing order. The establishment of such a committee shall not, however, be deemed necessary to the initiation of any such proceeding to promulgate a marketing agreement or marketing order."

(8) Amend section 10(b)(2) by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (iv) as follows:

"(iv) If the order contains provisions authorized by section 8c(6)(J) or section 8c(7)(E) it shall provide that the assessments payable by handlers under subsections (i) or (ii) shall initially be payable pro rata by the producers of the commodity to such handlers thereof, who shall be responsible for the collection thereof from producers and payment to the authority or agency established under such order."

SEC. 202. Nothing in this title shall supersede the provisions of other statutes relating to marketing quotas, acreage allotments or limitations, or price support, with respect to agricultural commodities and no action taken or provisions in an order issued under this title shall be inconsistent with the provisions of such other statutes or actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture under such other statutes.

TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL FAIR PRACTICES

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. When used in this title—

(a) The term "handler" means any person engaged in the business or practice of (1) acquiring agricultural products from producers or associations of producers for processing or sale; (2) grading, packaging, handling, storing, or processing agricultural products received from producers or associations of producers; (3) contracting or negotiating contracts or other arrangements, written or oral, with or for producers or associations of producers with respect to the production or marketing of any agricultural product; or (4) acting as an agent or broker for a handler in the performance of any function or act specified in clause (1), (2), or (3) of this paragraph.

(b) The term "producer" means a person engaged in the production of agricultural products as a farmer, planter, rancher, dairyman, fruit, vegetable, or nut grower.

(c) The term "association of producers" means any association of producers of agricultural products engaged in marketing, bargaining, shipping, or processing as defined in section 15(a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, as amended (49 Stat. 317; 12 U.S.C. 1141j(a)), or in section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922 (42 Stat. 388; 7 U.S.C. 291).

(d) The term "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

Prohibited practices

SEC. 302. It shall be unlawful for any handler knowingly to engage or permit any employee or agent to engage in the following practices:

(a) To coerce any producer in the exercise of his right to join and belong to an association of producers, or to refuse to deal with any producer because of the exercise of his right to join and belong to such an association; or

(b) To discriminate against any producer with respect to price, quantity, quality, or other terms of purchase, acquisition, or other handling of agricultural products because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers; or

(c) To coerce or intimidate any producer or other person to enter into, maintain, breach, cancel, or terminate a membership agreement or marketing contract with an association of producers; or

(d) To pay or loan money, give any thing of value, or offer any other inducement or reward to a producer for refusing to or ceasing to belong to an association of producers, or

(e) To make false reports about the finances, management, or activities of associations of producers or interfere by any unfair or deceptive act or practice with the efforts of such associations in carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; or

(f) To conspire, combine, agree, or arrange with any other person to do, or aid or abet the doing of, any act made unlawful by this title.

Enforcement

SEC. 303. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any handler has violated or is violating any provision of this Title, he shall cause a complaint in writing to be served upon the handler, stating his charges in that respect, and requiring the handler to attend and testify at a hearing at a time and place designated therein, at least thirty days after the service of such complaint; and at such time and place there shall be afforded the handler a reasonable opportunity to be informed as to the evidence introduced against him (including the right of cross-examination), and to be heard in person or by counsel and through witnesses, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Any person for good cause shown may, on application, be allowed by the Secretary to intervene in such proceeding, and appear in person or by counsel. At any time prior to the close of the hearing the Secretary may amend the complaint; but in case of any amendment adding new charges the hearing shall, on the request of the handler, be adjourned for a period not exceeding fifteen days.

(b) If, after such hearing, the Secretary finds that the handler has violated or is violating any provisions of this Title covered by the charges, he shall make a report in writing in which he shall state his findings as to the facts, and shall issue and cause to be served on the handler an order requiring such handler to cease and desist from continuing such violation. The testimony taken at the hearing shall be reduced to writing and filed in the records of the Department of Agriculture.

(c) Until the record in such hearing has been filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as provided in section 305, the Secretary at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as he deems proper, but only after reasonable opportunity to the handler to be heard, may amend or set aside the report or order, in whole or in part.

(d) Complaints, orders, and other processes of the Secretary under this section may be served in the same manner as provided in section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45).

SEC. 304. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have power, upon issuance of a complaint as provided for in section 303 of this title charging that any person has engaged in or is engaging in a practice in violation of this title, to petition the United States district court within any district wherein the practice in queston is alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. Upon the filing of any such petition, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant to the Secretary such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper.

SEC. 305. (a) An order made under section 303 shall be final and conclusive unless within thirty days after the service the handler appeals to the court of appeals for the circuit in which he has his principal place of business, by filing with the clerk of such court a written petition praying that the Secretary's order be set aside or modified in the manner stated in the petition, together with a bond in such sum as the court may determine, conditioned that such handler will pay the costs of the proceedings if the court so directs.

(b) The clerk of the court shall immediately cause a copy of the petition to be delivered to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall thereupon file in the court the record of such proceedings, as provided in section 212 of title 28, United States Code. If before such record is filed the Secretary amends or sets aside his report or order, in whole or in part, the petitioner may amend the petition within such time as the court may determine, on notice to the Secretary.

(c) At any time after such petition is filed, the court, on application of the Secretary, may issue a temporary restraining order and injunctions, restraining, to the extent it deems proper, the handler and his officers, directors, agents, and employees, from violating any of the provisions of the order pending the final determination of the appeal.

(d) The evidence so taken or admitted, and filed as aforesaid as a part of the record, shall be considered by the court as the evidence in the case. The proceedings in such cases in the court of appeals shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

(e) The court may affirm, modify, or set aside the order of the Secretary.

(f) If the court determines that the just and proper disposition of the case requires the taking of additional evidence, the court shall order the hearing to be reopened for the taking of such evidence, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file such modified or new findings and his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his order, with the return of such additional evidence.

(g) If the court of appeals affirms or modifies the order of the Secretary, its decree shall operate as an injunction to restrain the handler, and his officers, directors, agents and employees from violating the provisions of such order or such order as modified.

(h) The court of appeals shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record with it shall be exclusive, to review, and to affirm, set aside, or modify, such orders of the Secretary, and the decree of such court shall be final except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28, if such writ is duly applied for within sixty days after entry of the decree. The issue of such writ shall not operate as a stay of the decree of the court of appeals, insofar as such decree operates as an injunction, unless so ordered by the Supreme Court.

SEC. 306. Any handler, or any officer, director, agent, or employee of a handler, who fails to obey any order of the Secretary issued under the provisions of section 303, or such order as modified—

(1) After the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition in the court of appeals to set aside or modify such order, if no such petition has been filed within such time; or

(2) After the expiration of the time allowed for applying for a writ of certiorari, if such order, or such order as modified, has

been sustained by the court of appeals and no such writ has been applied for within such time; or

(3) After such order, or such order as modified, has been sustained by the courts as provided in section 305;

shall on conviction be punished by a fine not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, or imprisonment not less than six months nor more than five years, or both. Each day during which such failure continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

SEC. 307. Any person injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of, or combination or conspiracy to violate, any order of the Secretary issued under section 303 of this title may sue therefor in the district court of the United States for the district in which defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages sustained, and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

SEC. 308. For the efficient administration and enforcement of this title, the provisions (including penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9 and 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 721–723, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 46, 48, 49 and 50) (except the last paragraph of section 9), and the provisions of subsection 409(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1096, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 409(1)), are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in administering and enforcing the provisions of this title and to any person, firm, or corporation with respect to whom such authority is exercised.

SEC. 309. The provisions of this title shall not be construed to deprive the proper State courts of jurisdiction in actions for damages.

SEC. 310. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to supersede, displace, or in any way interfere with the jurisdiction of any Federal court or Federal agency.

SEC. 311. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 312. No court of the United States shall hold any officer, member of any association or organization of producers of agricultural commodities participating or interested in the marketing of agricultural commodities or any such association or organization responsible or liable for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof. No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a temporary or permanent injunction in any case against such an association or organization relating to activities in connection with actions relating to the marketing of agricultural commodities including disputes with respect to prices or other terms in connection with the acquisition thereof except after hearing the testimony of witnesses in open court (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath, and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered, and except after findings of fact by the court to the effect that unlawful acts have been threatened and will be committed unless restrained or have been committed and will be continued unless restrained, but no injunction or temporary restraining order shall be issued on account of any threat or unlawful act against such an officer, organization, or member thereof except one making the threat or committing the unlawful act or actually authorizing or ratifying the same after actual knowledge thereof.

SEC. 313. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MONDALE. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has probably been the Senate's chief spokesman on behalf of the American farmer.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I want to commend the junior Senator from Minnesota for his preparation and introduction of an Agricultural Bargaining Act, on which I have joined him as a cosponsor.

I know that the draft bill represents a great many hours of work, conferences, drafting and redrafting—an extremely arduous task for which his reward is undoubtedly going to be a great harvest of additional work. I hope that criticism will be constructive, but I suppose some will not be.

A radio broadcaster in my State commented Monday that Senator MONDALE's bill was coming, and added:

> It or any other farm bargaining legislation is expected to be ripped, torn, shredded, dissected, pieced together, and repeatedly attacked.

The Senator from Minnesota has embarked on a voyage into uncharted waters. Intensive study is needed of how to give 3 million family farmers enough bargaining power to survive—and to keep the agricultural segment of our society economically and socially healthy in competition with big industry and big labor. There appears to be a majority consensus in favor of bargaining power for farmers as a general idea. But there has been no consensus on the "how" of it, and the Senator from Minnesota is brave, indeed, to offer a specific proposal as to how bargaining should occur. The consensus on the general idea may vanish as the discussion moves on to his specific proposal.

I have joined as a coauthor of the measure because I believe that agriculture is being exploited to the detriment of our society; its financial returns have not kept pace with other segments of our economy, and the disparity must be corrected before millions more rural people migrate from rural areas to already overcongested cities.

I suspect all of us, including the Senator from Minnesota, will have suggestions to make in regard to a farm bargaining measure as we go into hearings, and debate develops on specific proposals. But it is time that the debate moved from generalities to specifics, and I want my colleague from Minnesota to know that I admire his courage, energy, and initiative in presenting this measure, his acceptance of legislative responsibility, and his thoughtful workmanship.

However much it is ripped, torn, shredded and dissected in whatever course lies ahead for it, I am sure that it will prove an excellent vehicle with which to make a start toward the solution of a very critical national problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 approved by the members of the senate and house of representatives at the current session of the South Dakota Legislature endorsing legislation providing collective bargaining for farmers, urging those of us in the South Dakota delegation to support it, and Congress to pass such legislation.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

(Introduced by Mr. Jones of Marshall and Roberts and Mr. Poppen)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would give farmers and ranchers the right to bargain collectively with respect to the price level of products of the farm and ranch in the commerce of the Nation

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Whereas, South Dakota is one of the most agricultural states of the nation; and

Whereas, the economic well-being of South Dakota is very dependent upon the economic condition of its farming and ranching areas; and

Whereas, a great disparity exists at the present time between the level of agricultural prices throughout the nation and the price level of non-agricultural wages, salaries and products, with the parity index at approximately 73% of parity; and

Whereas, the inability of farmers to participate in the pricing of their own products is well known and is contrary to the public interest in South Dakota and nationwide; and

Whereas, products of the farms of the United States in the export trade is the greatest single item in this nation's overall trade with the nations of the world; and

Whereas, the volume of grains in the export trade is very large at the present time but with the unfavorable price level of such products it may well be said that Agriculture is not holding up its end with respect to United States balance of trade and balance of payments deficits; and

Whereas, at this immediate time there is grave concern on the part of this nation as to its balance of payments deficit in world trade; and

Whereas, there is now in the Congress and will be in the 90th session of the Congress legislation to provide the legal means by which farmers and ranchers of the nation may legally and actively bargain collectively in the determination of price levels of the products of farms and ranches: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 43rd session of the Legislature of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, respectfully urge the United States Senators from South Dakota, the Honorable Karl Mundt and the Honorable George McGovern, and members of the Congress, the Honorable E. Y. Berry and Honorable Ben Reifel, to support legislation in the Congress providing for collective bargaining by farmers. We respectfully urge their support of such legislation as they may believe to be in the interests of the Agriculture of South Dakota and in the public interest of this nation, to the end that the Congress may pass such legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate of the state of South Dakota be directed to transmit copies of this Memorial Resolution to his Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Honorable Karl Mundt, and the Honorable George McGovern, United States Senators from South

Dakota; the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Ben Reifel, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, within ten days after the passage and approval of this resolution.

Adopted by the Senate January 23, 1968.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 7, 1968.

LEM OVERPECK,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.
JAMES D. JELBERT,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

PAUL INMAN,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I of course greatly appreciate the comments made by the able Senator from South Dakota, particularly in light of the fact that the name of Senator MCGOVERN has been identified with the best thinking in American agriculture. The Senator from South Dakota has been not only a battler here in the Senate but he has been the philosopher for the American family farmer in our country since his arrival in Congress.

As we all know, the Senator from South Dakota recently published a book containing the most advanced and thoughtful proposals to deal with the perplexing and, in some cases, the tragic problems of the American family farmer. I know that American farmers and Americans generally have come to identify the name of Senator MCGOVERN with the best thinking and the most responsible leadership in this field.

The fact that the Senator from South Dakota would cosponsor this measure contributes enormously to the serious discussion which I hope we will shortly have in order to explore all facets of the objective of the measure introduced today.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his generous comments.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the measure I introduce today has been discussed for more than 20 years. It was discussed perhaps most brilliantly, and ahead of his time, by the general manager of the National Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Mr. M. W. Thatcher who, over 20 years ago, testified before a Senate subcommittee and pleaded that they deal with the problem of bargaining power for the farmer so that the farmer would get a decent return for his efforts. I hope that in the near future we can contribute to the dream of this great American agricultural statesman who for some years tried to achieve this goal.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota referred to my book. The selection I included in the book was from the pen of M. W. Thatcher who, in a national speech in the forties, called for a concept very similar to that outlined in the Senator's proposal. He pointed out at that time the bargaining capacity that the American farmer needs to secure a more just price for the products he has to sell. That proposal has been around for a long time. What the Senator from Minnesota has done is to put it in specific form.

I do not think it is hard to get people to agree that we need to improve the bargaining capacity of the farmer. There is a general consensus on that matter. However, what is needed now is to have somebody with the courage to come forward with a specific proposal, so that we can start to examine into the matter and perhaps improve the situation as we go along. Until that step was taken, we were talking about a theoretical matter. However, we now have a concrete proposal before us. I hope that we can move forward.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, we have been working on the proposal for well over a year. I have repeatedly discussed some of the problems involved in the matter and have repeatedly sought the help of the Senator from South Dakota. We have discussed this problem with farm economists throughout the country, officials in the Department of Agriculture, and representatives of farm groups who expressed interest in the objective. And we have tried to incorporate in this proposal all of the known, responsible suggestions for achieving this objective.

We have also tried to incorporate our best tentative notions as to the mechanics of those principles and how they might best be incorporated into a practical, working measure.

I believe, therefore, that this proposal does include all of the known suggestions in this field.

I think one of the encouraging elements in seeking this objective has been the statements made by the President of the United States, who, I believe, is the first President to ever announce in favor of national bargaining for the farmer, and the statements made by the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture who has repeatedly called for an exploration of these objectives. Thus, I anticipate and hope that we will see support forthcoming for a thorough exploration of this objective from the Executive as well, following on the heels of the leadership which we have seen from the White House and from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McGOVERN. I look forward with great eagerness to working with the distinguished Senator in the progress of the proposed legislation.

Mr. MONDALE. I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has introduced his bill.

There has been much talk about this matter in the past, and up to now the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, has not had the opportunity to study the proposal.

At the last meeting of our committee, we decided to hold open hearings on the Farm Act of 1965, which will expire with the crop of 1969. Instead of having the Department of Agriculture present to us a bill as to what should be done about the renewal or extension of the act of 1965, the committee thought it best to prepare or have prepared a memorandum indicating how the 1965 act was operated, and to go to the grassroots for information as to how the act was administered.

As all Senators know, we gave the Secretary of Agriculture, in the administration of this act, much flexibility, and I doubt that it will be necessary to change much of the act. But we are eager to find out the extent to which the Secretary of Agriculture has used the flexible language that was put in the bill and how we can improve on the present law.

Undoubtedly, there will be much discussion on the bill that has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I believe it might form a basis for discussion. As a matter of fact, in the memorandum that I have prepared for distribution among the farmers as well as the organizations, I have stated generally what we intend to do in respect to creating a bargaining authority for the farmers. With this bill, we may be able to make a good start.

I am very hopeful that when we hold our hearings, probably starting April 3, we will have a full week of open hearings, so that all who desire to offer suggestions may be heard.

It is my hope that we can obtain sufficient information; but if we do not, we might obtain permission to hold hearings in the fall, in various States, so that we can go to the grassroots and find out how best to amend or change or treat the present law.

So far as I am concerned, I shall do my best to get all the information possible. I am hopeful that we will have a full attendance of the committee, so that all can listen, offer suggestions, and be prepared, and that next year, when the 91st Congress convenes, we will have sufficient information to form the basis for the introduction of a committee bill in order to amend, change, or to do whatever is necessary to make the present 1965 act better.

It is my suggestion that the subject that the Senator has just discussed might be incorporated in the overall picture of whatever bill we propose next year.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the delights that I found in coming to the Senate was, first of all, to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which comes under the able, creative, and experienced leadership of the Senator from Louisiana, and to have worked under his leadership in the development of the 4-year farm program which he is now bringing before us for further review. I believe that in that measure the chairman succeeded in assuring that the committee heard everyone who had any reason to express himself before the committee. We had full and ample public and private opportunity to explore not only every principle but also every sentence and comma of that measure.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, I frankly believe that I learned more about agriculture in the 2 months we considered that bill than I have ever learned at any other sitting in my life. I shall always be grateful for this opportunity to have served with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

As the chairman of the committee knows, in introducing this legislation I am not certifying I have a bill that is ready to be passed. I am simply saying that I have done my best over the past year to take the theory of bargaining power and put it to paper in the best way that I could, short of hearings and short of the searching inquiry the chairman suggests, and to provide a basis for discussion in terms of some of the practical and mechanical problems one has in seeking to achieve the objective of farm bargaining power.

As the Senator knows, my proposal is based on the assumption that existing farm programs are necessary and essential. Many times those of us who have worked hard on these proposals are chagrined by suggestions that these proposals have not been helpful. It is fair to say if it had not been for these proposals now on the books, administered by the Department of Agriculture, most of the family farmers who are now in business would have long since been gone.

We have a farm structure that is very important to the security of our farmers and the very fine bargain that American consumers enjoy in food products today. In no sense was the introduction of this measure intended to diminish what I consider to be the fundamental importance of these farm programs.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. I have looked into many of the rulings and administrative regulations issued by the Secretary, and there is one thing in which I am a little disappointed. I felt that the original measure would probably make it possible at the end of 4 years for us to get the Government out of the hair of the farmers because many of them complain, as the Senator will remember, about Government interference. However, somehow the bill, up to now, has not been what I thought it would be. It would seem to me that if we can get supply and demand balanced, which was the intent of the 1965 act, particularly with respect to our wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and cotton, which are our staple crops, that the farmers could look for their revenues at the marketplace, that the prices would be automatically fixed under our private enterprise system, and that they would depend on supply and demand.

As I have said, as I see the picture now, it would seem to me that we would have to continue some kind of price support; we would have to continue some kind of restrictive planning on the many fertile acres that we have throughout the Nation. There is no doubt we have the most productive agriculture in all the world, and if we were to put into cultivation all of the available acres we now have, there is no telling how much surplus we could produce.

Mr. President, that possibility is something against which we must guard. As the Senator will remember, back in 1961 we had huge surpluses dangling over the market which had a depressing effect on prices. That situation was particularly true with respect to wheat, corn, and other feed grains. We were able to gradually reduce that situation to the point where we thought we had reached a balance of supply and demand.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, unfortunately the situation has not developed in that way. It is my hope that with the information we will be able to obtain in light of the administration of the bill in the last 3 years that we might be able to get new clues to assist us in providing ways and means so as to better serve the farmers.

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **ELLENDER**. I yield.

Mr. **MONDALE**. Mr. President, I believe that the statement of the Senator from Louisiana cannot be controverted. The point of beginning in agricultural economics is, in most areas, supply and demand. If there is excessive supply the price is going to be driven down. We experienced this situation, as the Senator pointed out, in 1961, when not only had surpluses reached the danger stage, to which the Senator made reference, but also the situation came close to destroying the entire farm program. The American public saw pictures of mounds of surpluses rotting away in the fields and the farm programs were losing support which they needed.

It is fair to say that in the last few years a much better level of supply management has occurred. I believe that one of the things we could explore would be the international relationship of supply and demand. Last year was disappointing in the sale of American commodities for cash. American farm production has been our chief dollar earner in world trade. I suspect that it still is but the dollar figure has dropped. Some of that situation is caused by barriers and variable levies in the Common Market. Sometimes I think we do not do as sharp a job in international trade as we should. Sometimes we voluntarily accept the role of residual supplier. Other nations are willing to let us supply free markets—and I am a strong advocate of our doing our share in connection with world hunger—while they run away with the cash markets.

We should make certain that our programs leave our international grain traders in a position where they can compete effectively for these cash markets around the world.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, we have had the surplus disposal law on the statute books since 1956. It has worked fairly well in relieving us of much of the surplus we accumulated over the years. However, I find that if we have on hand a lot of surplus, we become residual suppliers to the world.

What many countries do is to buy, with their cash, from other areas and then look to us for more or less donations or sales with soft currencies. I am very hopeful that if, as, and when we consider Public Law 480, which is the surplus disposal law, we will tighten up a little bit on that law and not be so liberal in making this food available for free or for sale for the local currencies of those countries who are able to pay.

Mr. **MONDALE**. The Senator will recall that under his leadership——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition in the Chamber at the moment, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. **MONDALE**. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. As the Senator from Louisiana recalls, the 1965 Food for Peace Act, which was developed under his fine leadership, had some basic changes in it over previous legislation, or at least we thought it did, among which was, first, deletion of the "surplus removal" concept for food distribution; and, second, a change in emphasis from simply distributing food to considering it self-help, and conditioning such aid on measures to be taken by the recipient food-deficit country to help solve its own food and population problems. We did so because the figures show that by 1985, unless something is done by the food-deficit countries to become self-sufficient, we would arrive at the point that even if we produced everything we could and gave it away, there would still be literally millions of people left starving.

Thus, if we gave food away without conditioning it on a solid program of self-help, we might actually do more harm to the program. I am hopeful that when we review the food-for-peace program, we can explore and see how the self-help programs are coming along.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. In that connection, let me say to my good friend from Minnesota that last December and the latter part of November of last year, I had the good fortune to visit all of the countries to the south of the Soviet Union and China which were not at war. Those countries were India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon. I found that particularly in India, as well as in Pakistan, quite an effort has been made on the self-help proposal but they are far from reaching their goal.

It would seem to me that much more could be done, so far as family planning is concerned. I noticed some of it going on here and there, but it was hard to determine whether those programs were effective. It strikes me that when we do extend the act—that is Public Law 480—it might be well for us to consider whether to make it voluntary or obligatory on the part of the countries receiving our aid, because there is no doubt in my mind that unless we have family planning in countries such as India and Pakistan, in particular, even if the whole world produced all that it could, including our full capacity, we could not supply the required food necessary to feed just those two countries alone.

Mr. MONDALE. As the Senator knows, one of the unique features added to the last food-for-peace proposal was the population assistance measure. I hope that we can explore how that is coming along and the use being made, for example, of foreign currencies to help them establish decent and adequate population measures, because that is really the other side of the picture. Unless they are making progress there, the future will be bleak, indeed.

The Senator's recent tour of those critical areas will be valuable to the committees when we discuss that subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, let me further say that as the Senator knows, we disposed of quite a lot of the food to the countries and accepted their currencies in return. We used part of the currencies for our own use—that is, to pay for the use of our embassy staffs—in fact, all Americans abroad—but it seems to me that we might use a greater amount of the proceeds to foster larger family planning operations. It seems to me that is a "must" in addition to self-help.

I might also announce at this time that on tomorrow or Monday I will introduce a bill to extend Public Law 480 and emphasize family planning. Hearings on Public Law 480 will begin March 13 and continue for a few days, at which time all who have an interest should appear before the committee.

Mr. MONDALE. In the 1965 Food for Peace Act, we not only conditioned our food aid on efforts in the population field, but we also adopted a unique, new proposal which released certain funds over those that would be needed in the next 2 years to be used on a more liberal basis for self-help objectives, which included population. I think it would be well in order for us to inquire of our aid missions just what they are doing with this new authority and the new resources in this field to improve population efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAUNTROY PONDERS DUAL ROLE IN DR. KING'S SPRING DRIVE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post on yesterday, written by William Raspberry, and entitled "Fauntroy Ponders Dual Role in Dr. King's Spring Drive."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAUNTROY PONDERS DUAL ROLE IN DR. KING'S SPRING DRIVE

(By William Raspberry)

Walter E. Fauntroy must be wishing that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference had chosen another city for its spring campaign for jobs or income.

But SCLC's director, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, has picked Washington, and the Rev. Mr. Fauntroy finds himself in a real bind as a result.

A few months ago it wouldn't have mattered. But that was before Mr. Fauntroy was appointed vice chairman of the D.C. City Council—when he was merely a pastor, a civil rights activist, head of the Shaw area Model Cities program and Washington director of SCLC.

Now his dual role, as a member of the local government and as a director of the organization whose campaign might well include disruption of that government, has the young (he was 35 on Sunday) minister wondering just what he ought to do.

"I really haven't made up my mind yet," he says. "I can either do all I can to make sure that the campaign is productive, or I can sit on the sidelines."

But if he chooses to sit it out and the campaign flops—or, worse, degenerates into violence—"I'm going to get saddled with it, whether I'm officially a part of it or not, because of my ties with Dr. King."

So far, he has been steering a tricky course down the middle—involving himself in the planning, but avoiding any close identification as a leader of the campaign.

He can't hold that course for long. When the campaign moves from the planning to the action stages, he'll have to get in or out. There is plenty of justification for either decision.

He is the one man who is in a position to be thoroughly familiar with both Washington (of which he is a native) and SCLC (of which he is a longtime executive). The Rev. Jefferson P. Rogers has taken on much of Mr. Fauntroy's work with SCLC since Mr. Fauntroy became a member of the City Council.

But Mr. Rogers doesn't know SCLC and the mechanics of nonviolence as intimately as Mr. Fauntroy who has been active with the organization since 1960 and was a key planner of the 1963 march on Washington, the 1964 Selma (Ala.) march and the Meredith march to Jackson, Miss., in 1966.

He knows the mechanics of planning effective civil rights campaigns, selecting achievable goals and setting the tone of nonviolence.

He has been steeped in the philosophy and the execution of nonviolent action, a fact that would make him ideally suited for a major role in the Washington compaign—were it not for his seat on the City Council.

Mr. Fauntroy, of course, is aware of all this. "I've been on the horns of this so-called dilemma ever since I was appointed to the Council," he said, recalling that it was a similar consideration that prompted him to give up the executive directorship of the Model Inner City Community Organization (MICCO). He still is president of the board of the group, but somewhat less subject now to conflict-of-interest problems.

But, just as he has been unwilling to quit MICCO completely, he also is unwilling to step out of the rights movement.

"We have got to find some alternative to violence as a way to get things moving," he said. "I'm totally committed to that. And doing nothing is not a real alternative. If Martin succeeds, we'll all be sinners; if he fails, we're all in trouble."

Will the city be worse off if Dr. King fails than if he had never made the attempt?

"Well, it's a risk," Mr. Fauntroy acknowledges, "but I'm not sure we really have a choice. There are too many guys out there working too hard to turn the city toward violence. Those of us who are committed to nonviolence have to do what we can."

And if that means that Mr. Fauntroy will be both a member of the local government and an agitator for change, he thinks the two roles aren't necessarily incompatible.

"Some people seem to expect me to take one position as a man of conscience and another as a city official; they assume that being a part of government automatically puts you on the other side of the fence.

"Well, I just don't quite see it that way. I mean whose government is it anyway?"

PREVENTING RIOTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Evening Star on yesterday, written by Richard Wilson, and entitled "Hopes on Preventing Riots Yield to Foreboding."

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPES ON PREVENTING RIOTS YIELD TO FOREBODING

(By Richard Wilson)

Although six months have passed since last summer's disastrous urban riots, and more trouble looms ahead six months from now, it is not demonstrable that any significant progress has been made in preventive action.

Washington is apprehensively awaiting some kind of mass civil disobedience and obstruction demonstration planned by Martin Luther King. The national political conventions are threatened by disruptive action. The mood in the ghettos has not improved. Congress stands adamant against new civil rights legislation. Civil rights activity has come to be equated with crime in the streets. The future is foreboding.

To top this all off, the one program which might have done some good is now acknowledged to be a failure. A confidential government report reveals that the single program depended upon most to give the firebrands of the ghettos something to do and some hope for the future simply isn't reaching those is was intended to help.

Instead of providing jobs for hard-core unemployed in 146 key urban and rural areas, and thus preoccupying the rootless thousands who can find nothing to do but riot, from 65 to 90 percent of those enrolled in the program in various cities are women.

While it may be useful to help women who must support fatherless families find some means of decent livelihood, the great hidden masses of men who have faded into the shadows of the ghettos still remain unreachable.

This is a strange aspect of our society. The ghettos are roamed by faceless and nameless men whose primary aim in life is to escape the notice of the census-taker, the bill-collector, or anyone connected with government. These are men who do not officially exist. Most of them have never held a steady job. Some 500,000 are included in what is called the hard-core unemployed. How many the census taker has missed nobody knows.

President Johnson marshaled his government programs more than a year ago to the task of finding useful occupations for these men and others who live in the depressed downtown areas of the cities. All the resources of a half dozen programs were focused on what was called CEP, the Concentrated Employment Program—the resources of the employment service, manpower training and development, Youth Corps and poverty agencies. These agencies found women to enroll in CEP but not the men.

Today hundreds of thousands are roaming aimlessly through downtown streets, lurking in doorways, hanging out on street corners. Anyone in Washington who wishes to see them need only walk a few blocks from his downtown office.

The failure of this program brings on somber thoughts because it may be that even if such programs were to succeed they still would not have reached the root causes of the urban rioting. The more this phenomenon is studied the more baffling it becomes. Those who rioted in Detroit were not rioting over jobs. Most of those arrested for rioting had jobs placing them above the currently credited poverty level.

They were most probably rioting against an environment which contained a whole complex of circumstances arousing incompletely reasoned resentments which burst into flame because the weather was uncomfortable or some little incident triggered an explosion.

Who can look at conditions as they still exist in Negro populated areas and say that except in isolated instances, any general progress has been made in removing the causes of the riots?

Would it not be more likely, in fact, that the reckless linking of the civil rights movement with protest against the Vietnam war, would cause more trouble than before?

The whole atmosphere in this field is discouraging. Committees and commissions find no generally acceptable answers. Congress reacts in stubborn resentment against the agony the racial equality movement cannot seem to avoid creating.

Individual programs, such as the hiring of firebrands in the poverty program to try to mollify them, arouse more resentment than they prevent. It all adds up to an alarming prospect if only because no one in government has yet come close to finding the answer.

VIETCONG MASSACRE OF MISSIONARIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Evening Star yesterday, written by David Lawrence, and entitled "VC Massacre of Missionaries."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VC MASSACRE OF MISSIONARIES

(By David Lawrence)

A few days ago the American people were shocked to see on the front pages of their newspapers a photograph showing the South Vietnamese police chief, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Ngoc Loan, in the act of shooting a prisoner on the streets of Saigon. It was explained that, although in civilian clothes, the victim was an officer of the Viet Cong forces engaged in the attack on Saigon. General Loan said: "They killed many Americans and many of my men."

The execution was widely condemned as inhumane, though there had been news reports previously of similar shootings by the Communists in the capital city, primarily the murder of the families or relatives of government officials.

On the day before the episode in Saigon, six American missionaries operating a hospital in a remote area of South Vietnam were slain by the Viet Cong. No pictures are available, but what happened is described in a letter, dated Feb. 5, written from Formosa to this correspondent by Charles E. Notson of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. He writes:

"In a brutal and vicious attack the Viet Cong have massacred the entire staff of the Christian and Missionary Alliance leprosarium in Ban Me Thuot. In a cold-blooded, premediated mass murder they have deprived their countrymen afflicted with that dread disease—leprosy—of having loving care and skillful treatment of dedicated missionaries.

"Here is a vivid illustration of the heartless cruelty that is characteristic of all communism. It was not a case of these troops not knowing what the foreigners were doing there in that mountain station. On May 30, 1962, they had perpetrated a raid on the leprosarium and had taken captive three missionaries: the hospital administrator, Rev. Archie Mitchell, Dr. Ardell Vietti, and a volunteer male nurse of the Mennonite church, Dan Gerber. Then they warned the other members of the hospital staff to get out and to stay out of Ban Me Thuot.

"Fully aware of the hazard involved in ignoring a Viet Cong order, the missionaries continued their ministry of mercy and love. They would not desert the helpless patients, even though they continued at the risk of their lives in that exposed outpost. After all they were obeying orders from a higher authority than the Viet Cong.

"In the intervening years the hospital staff has been aware that every move was being watched. Because the Communist did not further molest the hospital, they assumed that even the Viet Cong had come to respect such a ministry, and comforted with that thought they persisted in their task.

"What advocate of communism can step forth in an attempt to justify this foul deed? How can anyone further argue that the struggle in Vietnam is a civil war? It is not against their fellow countrymen in the South that the Viet Cong are fighting, but, like all Communists, they are animated by a perverted hatred of all that is good and all that is righteous. Their war is against humanity and against the creator of mankind. How many more such tragic examples of this infamous concept do we need to observe before we close our ranks and begin to deliver the concerted blows necessary to break its power?

"This was no act of war when with malicious aforethought and intent the Communists killed Bob Ziemer, Ed and Ruth Thompson, Ruth Wilting, Carolyn Griswold and Carolyn's father who was on a visit, wounded Marie Ziemer and captured Betty Olsen. In calculated cowardice these rabid devotees of a heinous doctrine have attacked unarmed and unresisting messengers of mercy. In so doing they have revealed their true colors once more. The blood of these heroic dead cries for judgment. Let men of conscience respond."

An Army chaplain reported that all of the mission buildings, including the leprosarium, were "totally obliterated," but the fate of its 2,000 patients is unknown.

The massacre of the missionaries serves to emphasize the horrible nature of the war in Vietnam and the improbability of bringing order to the country without increasing the number of American and allied troops now engaged in the conflict.

CARMICHAEL HECKLED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Evening Star on yesterday, by David Braaten, and entitled "Students Talk Back—Carmichael Heckled at Roosevelt High."

I invite attention to this one sentence:

> Carmichael had been invited to speak on "current events," at an assembly sponsored by a number of teachers.

Mr. President, I think it might be appropriate for the Board of Education to determine the identity of the "teachers" who are inviting this revolutionist into the schools of the District of Columbia, and I hope that it will make every effort to discourage further invitations of this kind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENTS TALK BACK: CARMICHAEL HECKLED AT ROOSEVELT HIGH

(By David Braaten)

Stokely Carmichael was either too old or out of his class yesterday at Roosevelt High School.

The kids not only talked back to the Black Power spellbinder—some of them walked out on him.

The after-school assembly drew about 400 students to the school auditorium—virtually all Negroes.

"I came out of curiosity," said a girl putting on her fur-lined coat. "I've heard enough and I don't agree with him."

POOH-POOHED POINT

One well-dressed young man pooh-poohed Carmichael's point that schools need equal funds to provide an equal education.

"Good equipment doesn't make you bright," he said.

And a well-dressed young lady even had the effrontery to probe Carmichael's psyche.

"I'd like to know what caused you to turn to Black Power, what incident in your life?" she asked.

"I was born black, that's what," snapped Carmichael. Then he added, "If you're black, that's it, no matter if you're a dope peddler or a high school principal. That's it."

"Why sit and holler and wait for somebody to come and pick you up? Shouldn't you take an interest in yourself?" asked another girl.

"Do you think everyone has an equal opportunity?" asked Carmichael.

"I'M WRONG"

The girl hesitated, then said, "I don't know."

"Okay, you're right and I'm wrong," said Carmichael. "Everyone has equal opportunity."

Carmichael had been invited to speak on "current events," at an assembly sponsored by a number of teachers. As a lecturer, he ranged from Latin to the vernacular.

After explaining the derivation of the word "education" ("The E comes from ex and means out of; the DUC means to lead, so education is to lead you out of the problem you face"), he asked: "Do the black children get an education that leads them out of the problems they face?" Some students answered: "No."

"Do black people need help, or do white people need help?" he asked at another point.

"BOTH! BOTH!"

"Both! Both!" was the response. And a student rose to express the feeling that what is needed is more understanding.

"If I'm standing on your toe and I won't get off, what do you do?" asked Carmichael. "Will you be satisfied if I say, 'Take it easy, I'll be off in 10 years?'

"How long have they been doing this?

Would you believe 400 years? You've got to help yourself."

If he failed to set the student body afire, Carmichael did arouse hero-worship in a couple of dozen students, mostly girls, who crowded up on the stage at the close of the program. Some asked for his autograph—earning a polite refusal—and the rest followed him out of the hall, crowding around, laughing and talking.

How did Camichael himself feel about his reception at Roosevelt High School?

"No comment," said Carmichael, ducking into a waiting car. "No comment."

THE STUDENTS' VOICE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Evening Star on February 13, written by Ernest Holsendolph, and entitled "Rhodes Maps New Meeting on Students' Voice in Schools."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODES MAPS NEW MEETING ON STUDENTS' VOICE IN SCHOOLS

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

Student representatives from District public high schools will meet in about two weeks with George R. Rhodes, assistant superintendent in charge of secondary schools, after an assembly yesterday of some 1,800 students engaged in a spirited session on student administration relations.

Rhodes said three representatives would be elected from each school. He asked the students to discuss in the meantime what areas of decision-making such a council should have.

Student representatives from all the high schools at the extraordinary session yesterday at McKinley High School heard Rhodes promise a new era in student-administration relations.

However, many of the students were skeptical of Rhodes' promise.

"I give myself three months to make some change in the school structure and if I can't, I will leave," he said during the 1½-hour session. "Besides, I enjoyed being principal of McKinley," he added.

Rhodes told the students he is sympathetic to their call for more self-expression and greater freedom to bring about change in their schools.

Common complaints voiced by about a dozen students concerned the quality of teaching, the inadequacy of student government and a lack of attention to the individual needs and abilities of students. A number of students from Eastern High School repeated their call for a "freedom school for black students," made originally at the District Board of Education meeting last Wednesday.

Rhodes told the Eastern students he was considering conducting a poll of all Eastern students, with the militant Modern Strivers as poll watchers, to see if the proposed freedom school to teach Afro-American culture is desired by the student body at large.

Perhaps the fact that there was a meeting yesterday with two "delegates" from every homeroom in the city, was more striking and important than anything that was said.

But speakers drew loud applause when they called for student unity to solve the problems of students.

"There has been a tendency to dictate to young people," Rhodes said. "If you expect students to behave favorably or to learn, they do it. It's as simple as that."

The former McKinley principal gained a reputation for his handling of students' requests for self-expression, and observers feel this was one of the reasons he was made supervisor of secondary schools. Student militancy has been mounting throughout the school year.

David J. Hardin, a Coolidge sophomore, opened the meeting and caused the first split in audience opinion by complaining that bright students are the most neglected in the District since abolition of the honors track last year.

"It has been a disappointment to the children who enjoy the excitement of learning to be placed in classes where they must wait for slow students to catch up," he said.

"We have neglected the bright child—the potential leaders of our city and nation," he continued.

Young Hardin, who was supported by other students during a post-assembly press conference, asked that "two or three" special schools for the best students be established in the District.

Rhodes, who presided at the meeting, had to call for quiet several times as many students noisily expressed disagreement with Hardin.

The new assistant superintendent told students at the press conference, mainly for high school reporters, that the teacher is responsible for the progress of all students in a class, regardless of the ability range. He said new programs for staff development and in-service teacher training would equip teachers to handle their students of mixed ability better.

Lewis Anthony, an articulate 10th-grader at Western, who once was an effective spokesman for Shaw Junior High students, said "teachers just don't seem to care anymore."

Other students defended teachers during the press conference, criticizing students for not showing enough initiative.

Said Dave Affelder, a Coolidge senior: "This is probably the first time that we have been a part of the democratic process—we are told that student councils are examples of democratic participation. If so, it is a tragedy."

The program ran in an orderly manner, despite the fact that McKinley officials counted 1,650 visitors from other schools, as well as 200 McKinley delegates, bringing the morning population at McKinley to about 4,000.

Forty students were counted standing in line to speak when the meeting was adjourned at 11 a.m., presenting a heavy traffic problem handled ably by a corps of 50 McKinley cadets armed with two-way radios.

PROMINENT BRITISH JOURNALIST SAYS THANKS TO THE YANKS FOR STANDING FAST IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Americans have become so accustomed to criticism from abroad, that when compliments are sent our way by articulate members of the foreign press we do not react with sufficient vigor.

One of these articulate journalists is Bernard Levin of London, who as a biting satirist and critic has made a world reputation. Mr. Levin has now said publicly and passionately—Thanks to the Yanks for standing up to communism in Vietnam.

It is Levin's contentions, expressed in the London Daily Mail of February 1, 1968:

> America is in Vietnam . . . because they know that, where aggression is concerned, the appetite doth grow by what it feeds on; and because they (the Americans) know that however great the price of the war in Vietnam, it is still less than would be the price of the war we will all one day have to fight elsewhere if it is lost.

I share Mr. Levin's sentiments, and I know the President and the American people share his sentiments. And I must say that it is heartwarming to see such sentiments expressed without reserve in one of England's largest newspapers.

This is a time for Americans to stand by their President and our allies.

This is a time for strength and perseverance. We must not permit the smoke of battle to cloud our basic objectives in Vietnam. And an intelligent British has said it clearly. He merits our thanks.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the Bernard Levin article from the Daily Mail of London and a similar article by William Stoneman from the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objections, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Daily Mail, Feb. 1, 1968]

MAKE NO MISTAKE, AMERICA IS FIGHTING FOR US

(By Bernard Levin)

I spent yesterday evening at the opera (Wagner, of course). You, I dare say, spent it helping your children with their homework, or watching television, or learning the piano, or reading a book.

A lot of Americans and South Vietnamese, however, spent it dying.

Strange to relate (and I imagine that many of them would find it as strange as anyone), they spent it dying so that you can go on watching television, learning the piano, reading books and helping the children with their homework, and so that I can go on listening to Wagner.

I don't know about you, but I am grateful, and will now say why.

A battle was launched in Vietnam on Tuesday, in which bands of North Vietnamese and Vietcong swept through South Vietnamese towns, killing and pillaging, while others launched a major offensive against the American base at Khe Sanh.

It is not, I believe, too, fanciful to describe the battle as potentially one of the major turning-points of civilization, and to think of General Westmoreland and his men in the way that, with the perspective of history to aid us, we think of Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae, John Sobieski facing the Turks at the gates of Vienna, or Lord Dowding and the Fighter Command in the Battle of Britain.

THEIR HORROR

For each of those battles changed the face of the world for the better; or rather, prevented others from changing it for the worse.

And so it may be at this moment in Vietnam. The war there is confused and horrible; its aims blurred, its methods savage, its cost in innocent blood uncountable. But if it is lost, if the Americans finally get tired of doing the world's work for nothing but the world's abuse, if South Vietnam is left to its fate, then what will follow is not merely the piecemeal engulfing of the rest of South-East Asia.

What will follow, as surely as Austria followed the Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia followed Austria, and Poland followed Czechoslovakia, and six years of world war followed Poland, is a nuclear confrontation on a global scale between the forces at present engaged in one tiny corner of the globe.

And that, in the end, is why my Wagner and your children are at stake this day in "a far-off country of which we know nothing." The Americans are not fighting the war there so that Saigon racketeers can grow fat on black market profits; indeed, they are only secondarily fighting it so that Saigon may stay free long enough for a society to grow up there that will be strong enough to dispense with the racketeers.

They are not even there because if they leave they will one day be digging gun emplacements in California, as the Australians will be digging them round Darwin.

They are there because they know that, where aggression is concerned, the appetite doth grow by what it feeds on; and because they therefore know that, however great the price of the war in Vietnam, it is still less than would be the price of the war we will all one day have to fight elsewhere if it is lost.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are not alone in knowing this. The Australians and New Zealanders know it; the Thailanders know it; the South Koreans know it; the Filipinos know it. But in this country, it seems, we do not know it.

Well, it is time we did. And the battle now going on in Vietnam is as good a time to find out as we shall ever have. On this battle, the Communist forces have staked a great deal; for some time now they have been promising their increasingly disillusioned troops that one last push will see victory—if not military victory, then "victory-by-coalition."

The Communist strategy in Vietnam is to inflict such a major reverse on the Americans and South Vietnamese that they will be desperate to make peace even at the price of an agreement that gives the Communists a share in the Government of South Vietnam, with the full take-over following a few months later.

I do not think that the American resolve will crack. But a word of thanks and admiration from Britain may help to show America that her resolve is recognized for what it is—a resolve to hold the front for civilisation, by convincing those who would destroy it that they are not going to succeed in doing so.

OUR THANKS

I would prefer that word to come from our Government. Unfortunately, it won't. Nor will it even come from our opposition. So it has to come from us—from those of us who recognise the connection between what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam and what we like to do with our evenings in Britain.

We are not, I believe, all that few. But few or many, let me now say on behalf of us all, to the Americans and South Vietnamese and their allies, even now fighting and dying in Vietnam: "Our words may be useless, but they are all we have to offer. We understand why you are there, and know that your cause is ours too. And we thank you."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 2, 1968]

THANKS, YANKS, FOR FIGHTING—BRITON

(By William H. Stoneman)

LONDON.—Britishers have been treated to a refreshing outburst of pro-Americanism by Bernard Levin, a brilliant nonconformist intellectual who writes a widely read daily column for the London Daily Mail.

Using twice his usual space allotment, Levin braved the indignation of his fellow countrymen by reminding them that Americans and South Vietnamese were fighting and dying for their protection.

"We spent yesterday evening at the opera. You, I dare say, spent it helping your children with their homework or watching television or learning the piano or reading a book," he wrote.

"A lot of Americans and South Vietnamese, however, spent it dying

"Strange to relate, they spent it dying so that you can go on watching television, learning the piano, reading books and helping the children with their homework and so that I can go on listening to Wagner.

"I don't know about you, but I am grateful and will now say why.

"A battle was launched in Vietnam on Tuesday in which bands of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong swept through South Vietnamese towns, killing and pillaging, while others launched a major offensive against the American base at Khe Sanh.

"It is not, I believe, too fanciful to describe the battle as potentially one of the major turning points of civilization and to think of Gen. William C. Westmoreland and his men in the way that, with the perspective of history to aid us, we think of Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae, John Sobieski facing the Turks at the gates of Vienna or Lord Dowding and the fighter command in the Battle of Britain.

"If the war is lost," he continued, "if the Americans finally get tired of doing the world's work for nothing but the world's abuse, if South Vietnam is left to its fate, then what will follow is not merely the piecemeal engulfing of Southeast Asia.

"What will follow, as surely as Austria followed the Rhineland and Czechoslovakia followed Austria and six years of world war followed Poland is a nuclear confrontation on a global scale between the forces now engaged in one tiny corner of the globe."

Levin concluded:

"Let me now say to the Americans and South Vietnamese and their allies, even now fighting and dying in Vietnam: Our words may be useless but they are all we have to offer. We understand why you are there and know that your cause is ours, too. And we thank you."

OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Johnson announced today grants of $1,096,000 to the National Council on Aging and $1,129,520 to the National Council of Senior Citizens. The grants are being made by the Department of Labor. These grants are a first major step toward establishing Older Americans Community Service Corps across the Nation.

The money will be spent in a number of cities, some of them not yet pinpointed.

The aim of both projects is to search out community needs which can be met by elderly people and to find elderly people with the experience or skills required who are willing to devote their time and energy to meeting these needs.

During the hearings on the legislation which I introduced, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was highly enthusiastic about the idea and said he was not going to wait for legislation, but was going to develop a program on his own.

I am delighted that he has done so and that President Johnson has given his endorsement to it.

The grants announced today will enable us to begin on a pilot scale. I am confident that experience will show that the program should be established across the Nation.

The studies by the Senate Special Committee on Aging and testimony at the hearing on the Senior Community Service Corps bill showed that elderly people are anxious to remain busy and productive.

And, we were told repeatedly, they are more than willing to volunteer their time and a lifetime of experience in service to their neighbors. In a few areas, on a limited basis, this is being done now. Elderly persons are serving as teachers' aides, foster grandparents, and in a number of other capacities. And we have barely begun to touch the potential.

I was pleased, also, at the President's announcement of the funding for Project Green Thumb. It will be doubled next year.

This has been one of the few antipoverty projects which has been directed toward the rural poor and the only one, really, solely devoted to the elderly.

It has been a remarkable success. In New Jersey, retired residents of rural areas have been hired, part time, to beautify our State highways and do similar work.

Reports on the program have been uniformly good. And this has been one antipoverty program which really accomplished what it set out to accomplish—supplement the income of the rural, elderly poor. Some 87 percent of the money appropriated for the program actually went into the pockets of those who participated.

DEATH OF ARVID E. MILLER, BOWLER, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, 1 month ago, Wisconsin and the Nation lost one of our most effective and admired community leaders, Arvid E. Miller, of Bowler, Wis., a proud member of the Stockbridge-Munsee Indians.

He was a leader in every respect. As a longtime chief of the Stockbridge Community Tribal Council, he served as a steadying force for this community of American Indians who came to Wisconsin from New York and New England early in the last century. As an officer of the National Congress of American Indians and as a member of the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights, he showed his deep concern for the well-being of all Indians and all Americans deprived of an equal opportunity in our society. As a founder and president of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, he worked to develop the concept of progress through regional unity without destroying the traditions of individual tribes. As the executive director of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council community action program, he directed a 500-member Neighborhood Youth Corps project, seven Headstart programs, 10 resource coordination and community development programs, and a landmark housing project.

Arvid Miller was an American Indian; a man who served his people and his country with devotion and purpose. His contributions toward improving the welfare of his fellow man are now a part of a proud history of service and sacrifice. He will be missed.

I ask unanimous consent that four articles relating to Mr. Miller be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader, Jan. 15, 1968]

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR TRIBAL CHIEF 2 P.M. WEDNESDAY

Funeral services for Arvid E. Miller, 59, Bowler, who died at Wausau on Saturday, January 13, will be conducted on Wednesday at 2:00 p.m. at the Lutheran Church of the Wilderness, Town of Bartelme. The Rev. Edgar E. Barg will officiate and interment will be in the church cemetery, Town of Bartelme. Friends may call at the Gaffney Funeral Home, Gresham, from 7 o'clock this Monday evening until noon on Wednesday and then at the church until the time of the service.

Mr. Miller was the executive director of the Great Lakes Intertribal Council, Inc. He died shortly after collapsing of a heart attack at a council meeting held at the Wausau Vocational and Technical School.

He was born Oct. 10, 1908, in Red Springs. His parents were the late Mr. and Mrs. Carl Miller who lived near Bowler. His marriage to Bernice Davids took place on April 28, 1935, at Red Springs. She survives.

Mr. Miller, who lived at Bowler, was a longtime chief of the Stockbridge-Munsee Indians who occupy a reservation of more than 15,000 acres in the town of Bartelme and Red Springs a few miles from Bowler. The Stockbridge tribe's Wisconsin history goes back to 1822, when it came to the state from New York and Massachusetts.

Mr. Miller was a former chairman of the board of directors of the intertribal council, which was formed in 1961. He became executive director when it became a community action agency.

He was a former area vice-president of the National Congress of American Indians and was a member of the governor's commission on human rights.

Mr. Miller was a member of the Lutheran Church of the Wilderness, Town of Bartelme.

[From the Great Lakes Indian Community Voice, Jan. 29, 1968]

IN MEMORY OF ARVID E. MILLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GREAT LAKES INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL, INC., COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, BOWLER, WIS.

It is with sincere regret that we report the death of Mr. Arvid E. Miller, who served as Executive Director of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. Community Action Agency from July 1966 until his death due to a heart attack on Saturday, January 13, 1968. Mr. Miller was born in Bowler, Shawano County, Wisconsin, on October 10, 1908, where he attended school, later going into business training.

For several years he served as a clerk for the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Indian Division, Tomah, Wisconsin. In 1939 he became President of the Stockbridge Community Tribal Council and served in that capacity until 1966. In 1958 he was elected President of the Indian Security Foundation. He was a Charter Member of the National Congress of American Indians which was formed in 1944, and was a former Area Vice President. The area which he represented in the National Congress of American Indians consisted of the States of Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa and Wisconsin. For several years he was employed as Manager of the Stockbridge-Munsee Arts and Crafts Enterprises. He was a member of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights. For many years he served as a member of the Town Board, Town of Bartelme, Shawano County. Mr. Miller served as President of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. until 1966, at which time he resigned his presidency to become Executive Director of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. Community Action Agency, Bowler, Wisconsin.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Jan. 16, 1968]

INDIAN LEADER ARVID MILLER'S FUNERAL SET

GRESHAM, WIS.—Services for Arvid E. Miller, 59, executive director of the Great Lakes Intertribal Council, Inc., and longtime chief of the Stockbridge-Munsee Indians, will be at 2 p.m. Wednesday at the Lutheran Church of the Wilderness on the reservation near here.

Mr. Miller died in Wausau Memorial hospital Saturday shortly after collapsing of a heart attack at a council meeting at the Wausau vocational and technical school.

Mr. Miller, who lived in Bowler (Shawano county), was a former chairman of the board of directors of the intertribal council, which was formed in 1961. He became executive director when it became a community action agency.

He was a former area vice-president of the National Council of American Indians and was a member of the governor's commission on human rights.

He is survived by his wife, Bernice; 11 children; his stepmother, Mrs. Dolly Miller, Bowler, two brothers, Robert, Bowler and the Rev. Occum, Cottonwood, Ariz.; and two sisters, Mrs. Howard Cannon, Joliet, Ill., and Mrs. Charles Glover, Milwaukee.

Surviving children are: Richard, Carl, James, Marlene, Kristy and Tammy, all at home; Alfred, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Arvid, Jr., San Jose, Calif.; Mrs. Harvey Kroening, Clintonville; Mrs. Merle Moede, Bowler, and Mrs. Marvin Heath, Milwaukee.

[From the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., Newsletter, November–December, 1967]

WISCONSIN TRIBES WORK FOR PROGRESS

"Some people think Indians need to quit being Indians to meet today's challenges, but we don't go along with that. The Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council is working to adapt, and not discard, our ways toward building a modern Indian way of life."

This statement of purpose is that of Mr. Arvid Miller, Community Action Program director for the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council in Bowler, Wisconsin. GLITC is a relatively new development in Wisconsin Indian affairs, but in less than two years of operation, the Council has mounted self-help and community development programs totaling more than $1,500,000.

The programs include a Neighborhood Youth Corps involving a total of some 500 high-school students. Head Start preschool programs on seven reservations, full-time resource coordinators and community workers on ten reservations, and a unique mutual-help housing project. In addition, over 100 adults work full- or part-time running the programs and supervising as many as 42 VISTA workers.

Equally important in Miller's view, the GLITC and its programs are helping to shape an enduring spirit of intertribal cooperation that is replacing generations of separateness.

The first Indians entered the area now knows as Wisconsin some 4,000 years ago. The last influx was during the first half of the 19th century when three tribal resettlements occurred as a result of the pressure of colonization and expansion. Subsequently, tribal holdings decreased and with the exception of the Winnebagos, who live in central Wisconsin, the various tribes were settled on reservations in the northernmost counties of the state, both east and west.

Early efforts at organizing an intertribal council to serve the scattered reservations failed. Lack of funds for travel expenses was a major problem. The threat of termination of federal services to Indian reservations in the late 1950's intensified the need for such an organization; however, there were only occasional meetings during the next few years. Wisconsin tribal leaders, such as Arvid Miller, the Reverend Mitchell Whiterabbit of Black River Falls, and Norbert Hill of Oneida, continued to work toward organization.

They sought and received assistance from outside agencies. Especially helpful were Mrs. Helen Sheirbeck of the University of Wisconsin Extension, Mr. Robert Neal Smith, now acting director of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, Mrs. Veda Stone of the State Division of Children and Youth, and Green Bay attorney Rodney Welch. Travel expenses for tribal representatives still presented a serious problem.

In 1965, responding to a request from GLITC, the Association on American Indian Affairs made the first of several grants to cover travel and telephone costs.

The first official meeting of GLITC was held in January of 1966 in Wausau, Wisconsin. The Council was incorporated and chartered by the state. Arvid Miller was elected president. In March, at the invitation of the Council, AAIA executive director William Byler traveled to Wisconsin to work with the GLITC and state resource people in efforts to expedite the planning of an ambitious "war on poverty." By summer, Council membership included the Oneidas, the Stockbridge-Munsees, Winnebagos, Forest County Potawatomis, the separate tribes of the Chippewa nation at Bad River, as well as the reservations of Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau, Red Cliff, Mole Lake and St. Croix. At this point Miller resigned the presidency to accept election to the executive directorship. The Reverend Whiterabbit, long-time Winnebago tribal chairman, was elected president.

The Council swung into full operation and things began to happen fast. During the summer of 1966, with a grant of $131,810 from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, the GLITC Neighborhood Youth Corps enrolled an average of 150 Indian teenagers who worked 32 hours per week on community improvement projects on ten reservations. When school began in the fall, a 12-hour a week in-school program started. In 1967, the NYC budget was cut to $89,000 and the number of enrollees dropped. Nevertheless, the results continue to be impressive.

In June of 1966 a Head Start program, with a budget of $46,806, drew some 60 children to six centers. Directors, teachers, assistant teachers and volunteer workers were local Indian people. The Head Start grant was increased in 1967, and GLITC is now awaiting approval of a grant for a year-round program for 120 five-year-olds on four reservations.

A Conduct and Administration grant of $116,400 in 1966 (later supplemented with $7,789) established full-time community coordinators on ten reservations. An increase in 1967 brought the total Conduct and Administration budget up to $187,455 and 15 community workers were added, plus a nurse and a home economist who will visit all tribes.

The community coordinators and community workers seek to involve reservation residents in community affairs and problem solving. They advise on community resources and services, and serve as a liaison between Indian people and the various agencies and organizations. Other areas receiving attention are: assistance for the aged, job training for the underskilled, and the development of permanent jobs on or near the reservations. The Wisconsin State Employment Service has responded by creating five new staff positions to serve Indian communities, and has hired Indian people to fill them.

GLITC's 80-unit mutual help housing is a national project with several unusual features. A short-term bank loan for $600,000 was taken by the four participating reservations to guarantee completion of the project. Prospective owners of the homes (mostly three bedroom) are cooperatively involved in construction, each contributing 550 hours of labor backed by a 19-week training program in building trades. Perhaps the most unusual feature is the high degree of coordination GLITC has managed to promote between the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Public Housing Administration. The goal is for the housing to be 90% complete by October of 1968.

According to director Miller, housing is greatly needed. Nine-tenths of reservation housing is considered seriously substandard, attributable in part to a per capita annual income of only $750 for Wisconsin Indians.

In addition to Head Start and adult education, GLITC sponsored an Upward Bound program for 80 high-school students, and is supporting, in conjunction with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, an enrichment program for grade-school children at Wisconsin State University in Superior.

A Nelson-Scheuer Amendment grant to GLITC of $90,000 is employing older residents on four reservations to carry out beautification and clean-up projects.

GLITC has qualified for Wisconsin Judicare, a free legal aid program for low-income persons, and issues Judicare certification cards. To date, the 50 or so cases handled by Judicare have included hunting and fishing rights, property questions and wild-rice rights.

Working with the University of Wisconsin's Center for Community Leadership Development, GLITC is seeking funds for reservation-oriented health programs, a tribal-leadership training program and an experimental community-development program for an intensive effort on one reservation. There is also an arts and crafts production center in the GLITC headquarters at Stockbridge-Munsee sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Extension.

The Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council represents a valuable asset for the Indian reservations in Wisconsin. Its programs are aimed at improving life on the reservations through education and self-help. Arvid Miller notes, with pride, that the measure of GLITC's success is that its resources are getting to the people.

TOUGHER CRIME PROVISIONS URGED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President recently sent his crime message to the Congress. Composed of 22 proposals hopefully capable of reversing the rising rate of crime across the Nation, this message could represent the basis for a blueprint for progress and a plan of action. But mere rhetoric and expressions of concern will not solve our problems. Forthright action of the kind that works must be taken. We cannot wait until the bolted door and the fearful glance totally pervade our society. The need, as well as the urgency, could not be clearer.

The President's message stresses the need for coordination in anticrime programs—a laudable goal. Yet, on two vitally important points, he appears to be working at cross-purposes to such an end. Inadvertently, therefore, the message seems weak in efforts to fight organized crime and national crime syndicates.

The President's proposed Safe Streets Act calls for direct Federal grants to individual units of local government, largely bypassing the Governors of the States. Yet the crime message goes to great lengths to emphasize that law enforcement is primarily a State and local responsibility. Why create such a system that leads the way to Federal control and restrictions while encouraging fragmentation and confusion among existing State law enforcement agencies and services?

The President's own Crime Commission pointed out that one of the major problems of effective law enforcement is in the fragmentation of police efforts. As an example, in my own State of Pennsylvania, one county—a metropolitan area needing highly coordinated law enforcement services—has approximately 129 police departments. Imagine the result if each local political subdivision could apply individually for Federal assistance without any overall coordination. I am sure similar instances can be found across the Nation.

Why encourage such fragmentation? This inadvertently plays into the hands of those who would step across city boundaries or county lines in order to evade the law. I urge that we stimulate intrastate activity and interstate cooperation by adopting the bloc grant approach incorporated into the House-passed crime bill. Under that approach Federal money goes to the States which administer the programs with local law enforcement agencies. By giving those States that are willing to meet their responsibilities the opportunity to formulate comprehensive plans of action, that method of providing crime-fighting funds would encourage the pooling of services, effective regionalization, and increased coordination in law enforcement activities.

Second, I object to the President's proposals that would prohibit the use of the most modern technology and equipment to combat organized crime.

The threat presented by organized crime is well documented in the President's Crime Commission report. In fact, a majority of the members of this highly respected group favored enacting legislation "granting carefully circumscribed authority for electronic surveillance to law enforcement officers to the extent it may be consistent with the decision of the Supreme Court in Berger against New York."

We all desire to protect the rights of individual privacy. But even the Bill of Rights does not establish the privacy of the individual in his person and effects as an absolute right. Protection was only guaranteed against unreasonable search and seizure. That is the basis of carefully limited search warrants and the authority for electronic surveillance which I favor, providing it is guarded by the most specific and rigorous supervision. After all, the balancing of individual rights and privacy against the public good is a basic precept of civilized society. This balance requires that the public good prevail.

I do not believe, however, there is any justification for such surveillance activities being carried on by private individuals.

I have discussed this entire matter at great length in an article entitled "Wiretapping and Organized Crime," originally published in the winter 1968 edition of the Howard Law Journal. The article appears at page 2947 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, February 14, 1968.

This approach, strictly supervised law enforcement surveillance and the total prohibition of such private surveillance, is one of the amendments added to the crime bill by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, on which I sit. It deserves, in my considered opinion, our strong support.

RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the District of Columbia and the Nation lost a great and noble citizen with the death of Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld. For many years he had shared in the life of this city as a selfless civic and religious leader.

On January 29, the Washington community participated in great numbers in the memorial service for Rabbi Gerstenfeld. There could have been no finer evidence of the respect in which this good man was held. Vice President HUMPHREY has shared with me copies of the two memorial addresses that were delivered at the service.

I ask unanimous consent that the eulogies by Dr. Eugene Mihaly, Professor of Rabbinic Literature and Homiletics, Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio; and Dr. Edgar E. Siskin, Rabbi, North Shore Congregation Israel, Glencoe, Ill., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORY OF RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD

(Address by Dr. Eugene Mihaly, Professor of Rabbinic Literature and Homiletics Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio)

When a distinguished member of the Academy died, talmudic tradition tells, his colleagues would appoint a spokesman, a *meturgeman*, to deliver the public eulogy for the departed scholar and sage. That is my mission today. I speak as the representative of a community of scholars—the faculties of the Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion, the Seminary of Reform Judaism where Rabbi Gerstenfeld received his ordination over three decades ago.

For perspective we turn to the imagery of the biblical poets. The author of the Song of Songs appears to speak to us as we grope for meaning:

"My beloved has gone down to his garden . . . To gather lillies."

"My beloved," Jewish tradition, is the Holy One, Blessed be He; "the garden" is this terrestrial world; and "the lillies," are the righteous who bring beauty, purpose and worth to the world. Yes! The Beloved of men descended into his garden . . .

We do not presume to say we understand. Death robs of meaning. We stand dumb in its presence. It is the ultimate challenge of meaninglessness; the apparent victory of mortality, of finitude—of nothingness, especially when we feel death's chill before it is time, in the vigor of creative maturity, when one has yet much wisdom and inspiration and beauty to offer. We rebel; we curse; we blaspheme. But somehow, as a formal ritual at first, and then, as the profoundest residue of our experience, we wrest the blessing even from tragedy and with countless generations disciplined by pain we whisper, *Barukh Dayyan Ha'emet*, Blessed be the true Judge."

I have been sent by the scholars and students of Reform Judaism to say to this family of mourners that we at the Hebrew Union College—the spiritual home of Rabbi Gerstenfeld—in our classrooms and in our studies, will keep alive and perpetuate the blessing that was the life and shall ever be the memory of this dedicated Rabbi, the beloved spiritual mentor of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.

The ideal as envisioned by Jewish tradition is a life devoted to study, worship and deeds of loving kindness. The classic formulation of this doctrine is found in *The Ethetics of the Fathers*: "The world stands on three things—study, service of the heart, and acts of love." A parallel to this reach of historic Judaism is the familiar triad: The true, the beautiful, the good. Rabbi Gerstenfeld embodied these to a remarkable degree.

For a generation Reform Jews he was an outstanding example of the dignified, learned, intellectual Rabbi. He was the son of a great talmudic scholar, a professor of Talmud, the descendant of a long line of Rabbis. He personified the tradition of the nobility of the mind—deliberate, rational endeavor rooted in deep learning and knowledge. He esteemed, he loved scholars and scholarship. The Scholar Series which he initiated and to which he devoted so much effort is an adornment to this entire community. It has inspired numerous similar projects throughout the United States and remains today the unequalled example of the significant contribution a synagogue can make to serious study.

Rabbi Gerstenfeld's imaginative and creative life bore witness not only to the nobility of the mind but to the religious potential of all of man. Humanity is more than disembodied reason. Man expresses his highest spiritual longings through art and music. Rabbi Gerstenfeld fully appreciated and had an unusual sensitivity for religion of the heart, for "the beauty of holiness." His concern for enriching the synagogue service, the liturgy, with beautiful music; his vision of the arts as testimony to the living God—a religion of the mind and the heart—these are the blessings bequeathed to us by this dedicated Rabbi.

At the very core of Rabbi Gerstenfeld's varied activities his total dedication to the good—an ethical concern which knew no parochial boundaries; it encompassed all men. Decades ago, he perceived that if religion is to address contemporary man, it must reach out beyond narrow institutional interest, break down the age-old, encrusted prejudices and hatreds and encourage serious dialogue between all men. He spared no effort in sponsoring, from the earliest of his ministry, a variety of inter-religious programs which would serve to bring splintered man into the presence of the one God.

In all these endeavors, Rabbi Gerstenfeld had the loving help of a devoted family, of his wife whom he adored and who adored him—his *eshet hayil*, a woman of true valor, of his loving children and of a devoted Congregation. They shared and shall perpetuate the vision of this noble Rabbi: A Judaism that is coextensive with life, universal in its concern; a religious way which is the highest expression of man's total striving—the rational, the aesthetic, the ethical; a faith of truth, beauty, goodness.

The mind is skeptical but the heart wants to believe. Somehow, somehow I envision Rabbi Gerstenfeld in the *Yeshiva shel ma'alah*, the Academy on High, arranging the greatest Scholar Series of them all—with Solomon and Soccrates, Akiba and Aristotle, Maimonides and St. Thomas—and the Good Lord Himself smiles.

May his soul be bound in the bond of eternal life. Amen.

RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD

(A eulogy by Dr. Edgar E. Siskin, rabbi, North Shore Congregation Israel, Glencoe, Ill., Jan. 29, 1968)

Dear friends, a deep sorrow is in our hearts this day. For a great leader in our midst has been gathered to his fathers, taken in the full tide of his years. Norman Gerstenfeld, outstanding rabbi, distinguished communal leader, singularly endowed personality, servant of God, friend of man, no longer walks among us, and we have come here this afternoon to show by our presence a measure of the esteem, admiration, and affection in which we held him while he lived.

It is surely unnecessary for me to remind you who knew him of the many admirable qualities which comprised his character and person.

There was the reach of his mind, to which Professor Mihaly has already so tellingly referred. He was at home both in the realm of ideas and in the world of Jewish learning. But beyond this, he was astonishingly well informed on a wide variety of subjects. When we were students together at the Hebrew Union College, I recall going into his room one evening and seeing some large folio volumes on his desk. I wondered what they were and upon examining them, discovered that they were a series of detailed studies in the science of oceanography. Near the books was a neat stack of cards filled with notes on the contents of these volumes in Norman's own crabbed and quite illegible hand. He had a hunger for knowledge. And in this community a generation of Templegoers and radio listeners have been the beneficiaries of the learning, wisdom, and insight of this master of gracious and felicitous expression.

There was not only the reach of his mind; there was also the depth of his spirit. He was sensitive to the world around him—to its people; to its places, both here and in the exotic removes of wide travel; to its events; to its art, with which he had a connoisseur's familiarity; to its music, which he loved; and to its spiritual intimations and dimensions to which his soul was attuned.

There was in addition to the reach of his mind and the depth of his spirit, the breadth of his concern. For he was sensitive to another kind of music—the music of humanity, of a humanity striving for, but too often failing to achieve, harmony and peace. With Joseph he proclaimed, "I seek my brothers." He cared for fellow Jew and for fellowman. He cared for brotherhood—for all the children of God regardless of creed, race, or national origin. He cared for the men, women, and children of his congregation, partaking of their joys, sharing their sorrows. He cared for his community and for his country, for the needs and hopes of the America he loved. He cared for all of these and in their behalf, raised his nobly eloquent voice.

There was also the boldness of his imagination. Like Joseph, he was not afraid to dream. These dreams were not infrequently dismissed as impractical and visionary by the cautious and earth-bound. But under his skilled and inspired hand, more often than not they came to triumphant fruition. This magnificent Temple, this noble music, the Sunday Scholars Series, the annual Institute of Judaism for the Christian Clergy, are but some of the examples of his capacity to translate dreams into reality.

Norman Gerstenfeld was distinguished for all of these qualities—reach of mind, depth of spirit, breadth of concern, boldness of imagination. But there was one attribute especially which set him apart from the generality of men; that attribute was style. Norman had incomparable style. He embodied a dignity, a grace, a charm, a wit, a flair, a sensibility, a sophistication, which made him quite unique among the men I have known. It was always a delight to be in his presence. He was a person of unerring and impeccable taste, whether in his personal appearance, or in his functioning role as rabbi, or in the pattern of his life, or in his expectations. His standards were high, in a sense perfectionist, and for none higher than for himself. Nor do we have to look far for the evidence of this. It is all about us.

All of these talents he brought to his rabbinic vocation and they were focused brilliantly in his role as rabbi, as minister to men and as servant to God. He loved the rabbinate in all of its Protean facets and gave himself to his sacred calling unsparingly. This was indeed the purpose and the goal of his life, and we are here this day to attest that this purpose and goal were amply fulfilled.

One cannot think of Norman Gerstenfeld, his work and achievements without thinking of his wife, Louise. For she has been his true and perfect helpmeet, sharing his interests, tastes, predilections, and aspirations. A rare and precious bond united them as they faced together through the decades of marriage every condition and vicissitude that life brought. Life surely holds no greater prize than such perfect companionship, transcending as it does every change in time and tide and circumstance. His children also brought him great joy, the children to whom he was a devoted father. How proud he was of Jon and Lynn and Roger and Norma, proud of the bright promise of their young lives! He was a loyal and splendid brother, the proud inheritor, with his brothers and sisters, of a legacy of learning and piety bequeathed by a noble mother and a devout father, of blessed memory.

Now he is gone from us. Too soon, we say. Yes, too soon if estimated by mortal man's measure of time. But if measured by a higher standard, in terms of worth, intensity, and contribution, surely Norman Gerstenfeld lived a long life. Let us not be deceived by the numerical sum of a man's years. A sage once wrote: "We should strive not to live long but to live rightly. A life is really long if it is a full life . . . One's age may be incomplete, but one's life may be complete . . . Let us see to it that our lives, like jewels of great price, be noteworthy not because of their width but because of their weight. Let us measure them by their performance, not by their duration." The other day someone said to me of a friend who had died. "He lived two days in every one." In this sense, the span of Norman's years was long indeed. Let us be grateful for the precious gift of life which was his and which we were privileged to share.

Let us be grateful also that he is now at peace. Released from the pain, the frailties, the infirmities of the body, he is now at one with eternity, with the God whom he served so faithfully in life. An ancient faith whispers to us that all is well with him, and we are thankful.

In a conversation we had not too long ago, I brought up the subject of retirement. There are moments even in the ministry when retirement seems a very alluring prospect. I remember what Norman said to me on that occasion. "I don't think I could ever retire," he said. "I love my work too much." He never retired. And now his work is done—and so well done. And a grateful congregation in the midst of its sorrow, recalls in thanksgiving the life and contribution of the man who was its spiritual leader for more than three decades. A community pauses in its busy life to remember in gratitude a distinguished leader who never separated himself from any worthwhile civic or religious cause. As the *Washington Post* so movingly editorialized this morning, "Men and women of every faith will be diminished by his death." And you and I, and a much larger community of men, women, and children beyond these walls, feels personally bereaved. What are these but the tokens of work well done, of life fulfilled, of faith vindicated!

We shall not soon meet his like again. He has left us a singular heritage. If we would honor his life and his name, let us who respected and admired him as rabbi and friend, and especially you who loved him as your own, strive to go forward in his spirit, animated by the ideals of prophet and seer, of country and faith, of man and God.

If he could speak to us now, he would perhaps echo the poet's words:

"If I should die and leave you here a while,
Be not like others, sore undone, who keep
Long vigil by the silent dust, and weep.
For my sake turn again to life, and smile,
Nerving thy heart and trembling hand to do
That which will comfort other souls than
thine;

Complete these dear unfinished tasks of
mine,
And I, perchance, may therein comfort you."

"The memory of the righteous is for eternal blessing."

Amen.

PEGGY FLEMING: QUEEN OF THE ICE

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, the entire world had its eyes focused on pretty Peggy Fleming from Colorado Springs, Colo., during the Olympic competition in Grenoble, France. And, the world was not disappointed. Miss Fleming was the star of the entire show, capturing the Olympic Gold Medal for the United States.

The world, the Nation, and particularly the people of Colorado, are proud of Peggy Fleming. We in Colorado are especially happy to call her our own. She is truly an inspiration to all of us. I join in speaking for all the people of our State, and for the Nation as a whole in paying tribute to this outstanding young lady.

Mr. President, the midwinter 1968 edition of Colorado magazine, as part of its special Olympic issue, featured Peggy Fleming in an article entitled "A World Champion." Unfortunately, it is not possible for the beautiful color reproductions of Miss Fleming in action to be printed in the Record, but I would ask unanimous consent to have the story itself printed in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A World Champion: Peggy Fleming

The news report was datelined Brussels . . . the day was February 15, 1961. "A Sabena Airlines Boeing 707 crashed near Belgium's International Airport early today killing 73 persons, including the 18 members of the United States Figure Skating Team . . ."

Grim, gruesome details continued to filter across the wires. The world was shocked, particularly that portion centered around the Broadmoor Ice Arena in Colorado Springs—home and training ground for many of the American champions aboard the ill-fated aircraft. During the previous 13 years, the United States had completely dominated international figure skating competition, having won 11 world titles. And the future had looked even brighter.

Peggy Fleming, a petite 12-year-old junior skater in California, wept at the news. "I was very young and it was hard to accept. It took time to get over it," she now recalls. Along with American Olympic officials, she believed the sports experts who conjectured that the United States would need at least a decade to produce another championship team.

No one, particularly, modest, brunette-and-blue eyed Peggy could predict that within four years this fragile youngster would be acclaimed the figure skating champion of the world—and furthermore would be ranked as one of the greatest women skaters of all time.

Today, only 19 and looking like 16, this "shy Bambi on blades" (as she was dubbed by the news writers of Europe) from Colorado Springs has won every major ice crown except the Olympics. Four-time winner of the US title, she has owned the world skating title for the past two years. And, in February of this year, Peggy is the overwhelming favorite to seize the gold medal for the United States at the Olympic figure skating competition in Grenoble, France.

"It all started," Peggy remembers, "because my Dad wanted to keep me out of mischief and took me ice-skating when I was nine years old. That was in Cleveland. According to family legend, my ankles didn't wobble even that first day. I know I fell in love with skating right away. Looking around at skaters doing jumps and spins, I was determined to do them, too. Learning the basics was difficult and I might have become discouraged, but my whole family was behind me, getting across the idea, 'you can do it.' And it's always been that way."

Her father, Albert Fleming (who died in 1966) was a pressman by profession but with a life-long ambition to be an athlete. "He had great natural ability—he could have been a baseball or football star—but never had the opportunity," Peggy says. He recognized her talent on the ice and encouraged her, "But we never pushed Peggy," her mother Doris Fleming is quick to point out. "We never had to."

With a modest smile, the greatest figure skater of them all thinks back to the early days. "The first time I ever saw a figure skating competition, I was in it. And I won." And then a grin as she adds, "I thought I was really good. But the next time I competed I came in last." Philosophically, sipping her coke, "It was the best thing that could have happened. I had a taste of winning and a taste of losing."

By 1960, not yet a teen-ager, Peggy was whirling her way to regional and sectional championships in California. At the age of 13, petite Peggy (at 19 she's a mere 108 pounds) started toward her major victories, taking second place at the National Championships in the novice division. A year later, she had won the sectional championships held at Los Angeles and Berkeley competing in the senior divisions, knocking out favorites and reigning champions with apparent ease.

As the date drew near for the 1964 National Championships, it became a time of decision for the Fleming family. The question: Should she remain in the junior division and win for sure, or should she move up to the senior division? "She's always been the underdog," Mrs. Fleming says, "skating against champions much older and more experienced." Albert Fleming was convinced that his 15-year-old daughter had what it would take. And the decision was made to try for all the marbles. One member of the committee, hearing of the decision, ranked her as 11th (out of 11 competitors).

Somewhat prophetically, the 1964 National Championships were held in Cleveland where less than six years earlier Peggy had tied the laces on her first pair of skates. Even before the judges had announced the decision, the audience knew that Peggy had dethroned the reigning champion. Later that same year, America's newly-crowned queen took sixth place at the Olympics—an amazing finish for this tiny teen-ager from Colorado.

"We were pleased about her performance," Mrs. Fleming recalls, "and were somewhat deflated when we returned to the States and listened to some of our friends say, 'What happened?'" Peggy only smiled, inwardly vowing that by the next Olympics she would be the best in the world.

Peggy's successes and her acclaim from the experts affected the lives of everyone in the Fleming household: Moving from California to Colorado Springs to train at the Broadmoor under the great Italian skating coach Carlo Fassi, putting aside hard-earned extra dollars to pay for trip expenses, and revising family schedules for compatibility with arduous practice sessions. But, Mrs. Fleming points out, "We decided that we would do this thing right. And that meant that we had to remain normal people. If we couldn't, it wasn't worth doing."

Both Peggy and her mother learned much through the increasing pressures of competition. "At the Junior Nationals in Long Beach, we drove from our home in Pasadena to the competition that same morning. We realized, when it was too late, that we should have spent the night in Long Beach." Peggy tired during the competition and the fatigue probably cost her the national title.

According to Peggy, "My attitude had been foolish. I had let myself be overawed and, even worse, I had listened to several skaters talking just before the competition and became upset by their pointed analysis of my skating weaknesses. There are lots of angles.

"Sometimes the others are nice to you," she says, "and sometimes they don't speak to you at all. But you always have the feeling they would like to reach out and knock you down." Peggy doesn't have any locker-room tactics. "I just ignore all of it. I think that's the best way to handle it."

"Our move to Colorado Springs was no accident," her mother says. "Altitude training is important. And here Peggy trains on both indoor and outdoor ice." Her father had seen Peggy weaken in the 1965 world meet at Colorado Springs and finish third. And he knew that conditioning would be vital for the next title meet at Davos (elevation 5,164) in 1966. "It's a major factor," Peggy believes, "in my success. I just barely get through my routine at the Broadmoor arena, but by comparison it's a breeze at a more normal altitude."

Although she appears as fragile as a Dresden doll, her stamina is matched only by the grace and perfection of her movements.

By the unknowledgeable, Mrs. Fleming has been criticized for pushing her famous daughter too hard—assuming, apparently, that the predawn to dark practice schedule is Doris Fleming's idea. That, says the champion's mother, is ridiculous. "We have always let Peggy set her own alarm clocks. That way she had to do it herself. Nobody pushed her to skate. That's what really gets me" she continues. "Peggy will go outside after dinner and practice out of doors. Although it sometimes gets bitterly cold around seven o'clock, she still practices for an hour every evening. And people ask if I push Peggy. That makes me laugh. You don't see me out there with her at night."

By the end of 1965, Peggy had conquered North America. Not only had her graceful, ballet-like movements and her unbelievable precision in school figures convinced the judges that she epitomized perfection, but her delicate manner and shy smile had charmed everyone who watched her perform. She was, in fact, America's sweetheart on ice, and now, in March of 1966, Peggy Fleming was ready to captivate the hearts and plaudits of the world.

As George Gross reported in *Sports Illustrated*, following Peggy's performance of the compulsory school figures at the World Championships in Davos, Switzerland, "Only four times in the 60-year history of the women's world figure-skating championships had a defending titlist been dethroned in a competition, but reigning champion Petra Burka's crown was wobbling." Former Olympic champion Dick Button refused to be optimistic. Before the competition he said, "Petra should do it again, although Peggy could be her closest challenger."

Taking her school figure lead into the free skating portion of the competition, Peggy, wearing a tight-fitting dark rose costume and a white ribbon in her hair, flowed flawlessly through a difficult and demanding four-minute free skating program to the music of Verdi, Tchaikovsky, and Rossini to gain the only perfect score in the championships. When it was all over, she had become the first American girl to win a world figure skating championship since Carol Heiss in 1960. Coach Carlo Fassi, after congratulating his newly-crowned champion, said, "It is her determination that makes Peggy great. She has an excellent disposition, which makes her forget a bad practice in 10 minutes. But at the same time, she learns from all her mistakes."

And Peggy, her blue eyes flashing, just

smiled and nonchalantly said, "Gosh, I'm glad the big scare is over."

"Everything," Fassi recalls, "went right at Davos. Peggy hadn't been skating very well before Davos, but did great skating in the competition." And what happened to the former world champion? "Peggy's performance in the first figure skating competition beat Petra. After that, Petra lost her nerve or something," he said.

At Davos, Peggy played her role as underdog for the last time. In March of 1967 at the World Championships in Vienna, Peggy was the overwhelming favorite. Nothing, said the experts, except a complete collapse could prevent her from repeating as the world champion. Dressed in a costume of pink jersey, with a gum wrapper stuck inside her glove for luck, Peggy swirled onto the ice and moved into one of her most difficult figures, the double axel. As the TV cameras beamed her performance to the world, Peggy suddenly fell and skidded toward the wall on the seat of her pink pants. Her coach, Fassi, remembered only too vividly the time, a few years back, when Peggy had fallen four times during a performance. And Peggy's mother thought of Dick Button's comment that Peggy was perfection—unless something unexpected were to happen.

Mrs. Fleming knew that later in the sequence her young daughter would be repeating the same figure—unless she decided to eliminate it from her routine ("I was praying that she wouldn't try it again").

But Peggy picked herself up, and, as Bob Ottum wrote, looking "as fragile as a Viennese chandelier, waltzed her way with ease to her second world figure skating championship."

Although Peggy's fall received most of the publicity, several of the other competitors had similar accidents which were not reported by the press. "Actually," her mother says, "it may have been the best thing that happened. The rink was smaller than the practice area and she might have crashed into the wall if she hadn't taken a spill."

Like the champion she is, Peggy doesn't make excuses. "I slipped at the take-off and couldn't regain control in the air." And then she adds, "I'd like to go out and do the whole thing over again and do it right." Coach Fassi believes that the powerful TV lights, coupled with the fact that skaters were not permitted to practice on the ring where the competition was held, contributed to the fall.

"Peggy pioneered a style all of her own—a combination of ballet along with the athletic leaps," Mrs. Fleming notes. "It took great courage to stick with this style, since it was not what the judges were used to seeing. And now, hers is the accepted way. She's had a tremendous influence on figure skating."

National magazines and newspapers throughout North America, Europe and Japan have lavishly praised this shy and talented Bambi on skates. In Vienna, the press called her "that whirlwind from Colorado," and "the fragile skater." Experts agree universally that Peggy is the only skater who swings gently into a turn, picking up momentum by arching her body rather than stroking off powerfully with one leg. Gabriele Seyfert, her ranking rival, says of Peggy: "She has no weaknesses. I am the more athletic type. The ideal thing would be to skate as Peggy does, which is softly, and then connect it with the high jumps between."

Watching her perform today, with perfection, with confidence, with the grace of a swan, it is difficult to imagine that this is the Peggy who once was ill-at-ease and sometimes terrified as she performed before an audience only a few years earlier. "I used to pretend that people in the audience were cabbages. And I'd tell myself, how can you be intimidated by rows of cabbages?" She also used to practice the modern, teen-age dances—the watusi and the pony—in front of a full-length mirror. Dancing with wild, free movements did much, she says, "to get me out of my shell."

"In one way," she says with a smile, "I've been a bit of a bad influence on Mr. Fassi. He used to be a purist—being Italian and all—about music who recognized just the classics. Now he keeps time to Beatle music! I caused his downfall by bringing records from home to play during my free-skating practice."

Peggy's first skating idol, and perhaps the person who had the greatest influence on her style, was Tenley Albright. "Tenley brought the grace and classic beauty of ballet to ice skating. The motions of the body," Peggy believes, "are much the same in free skating as in ballet, although the leg action is completely different. Actually, skating can be freer than ballet because of the glide and the possibility of great speed." Peggy has surpassed her idol.

One of her most avid fans and critics—in addition to her coach and her three sisters—is Dick Button. While praising her on the one hand ("Peggy has a unique combination of athletic ability, technical control, great style and immense musicality,") he lectures her fiercely on the nutritional superiority of steak over macaroni. At times, when they happen to be eating together, he refuses to allow her to leave the table until she's finished all her protein. But he compares her with the greatest. "She is a delicate lady on ice. She is not a fiery skater, and she shouldn't be made to be. With some skaters there is a lot of fuss and feathers, but nothing is happening. With Peggy there's no fuss and feathers, and a great deal is happening."

Although Peggy in her role as champion has the world at her feet and is idolized by virtually every young skating hopeful on a rink, at home she is in many ways the typical teen-ager, neither seeking nor receiving any special treatment from her three sisters. In fact, competition is keen within the Fleming household, and Peggy is as proud of her cooking and sewing talents as she is her medals and press clippings. "We listen to records, try new hairdos and, like any family, we tease each other a lot."

"Her sisters are good for her," Mrs. Fleming says, "and they understand her. If Peggy is especially tense before a competition, they'll come to me and say, 'Don't worry, Mom, we'll handle things'. And then they'll start to kid her, or maybe end up in a pillow fight. At least, they get rid of the tension."

With Peggy, as with most US amateur athletes, the financial problem of being a champion is not an easy one. Although some of Peggy's expenses are paid under the AAU's strict code, Mrs. Fleming has to pay her own way. "Promising European athletes," her mother stresses, "are subsidized by their governments from the local level upward. Here you have to make the national team before you even get expenses. I've seen skaters at the Nationals who couldn't afford to eat. That's hardly the way to encourage young skaters to develop their skills. And if we're going to stay on top, we'll have to. The Iron Curtain countries and the Russians, in particular, are beginning to develop hordes of figure-skaters—just like they've done in other sports in the past."

Mrs. Fleming travels with her daughter to all of the major competitions and has been criticized by the New York press for minding her daughter's business more than she should. "It's just a sour grapes attitude," she comments. "I'm concerned about my daughter, as any mother would be. It's surprising the things that happen. In Paris, for example, the papers ran a picture of Peggy with a Russian boy and implied that it was a big romance. Actually, there'd been a whole group of people in the picture, but it was cropped to show just Peggy and the Russian. Peggy's even been accused of being a secret agent for the CIA." Her mother grins, "I just told them that they had us confused with Ian Fleming."

Peggy prefers to leave politics to the politicians, and spends most of her free time while traveling around the globe shopping for her friends and, more particularly, her one-and-only romantic interest, a pre-med student she met in Austria. "At the competitions, the participants all stay together. And we have lots of fun together. At the parties, it's mostly dancing." She says, "Language isn't a barrier. We're all young people and we understand each other."

Interest in skating throughout Europe is much greater than in the US. "In Germany," Peggy recalls, "we were putting on an exhibition at an outside rink. It was pouring rain, but 12,000 people waited six hours to see the exhibition. It was really funny, seeing all of the audience under umbrellas. Our outfits were completely soaked, but it was one of the best performances we ever gave."

One of the tragedies of Peggy's young life came close on the heels of her exciting triumph at Davos. Following a tour of Russia, she received word at the Moscow airport that her father had died April 6 of a heart attack. "It was a real blow, although we knew of his heart ailment. He had a tremendous influence on me—on our whole family." At least, Albert Fleming saw his dream come true—Peggy as the world champion—before he died.

Since last October, Peggy had been in training for the most important event of her life—the 1968 Olympics at Grenoble, France. Peggy's schedule—with the Olympics just around the corner—is rigorous—calling for seven hours of skating six days a week. Normally, the young champion starts her practice routine by doing slow, simple circles, gradually working into the compulsory school figures, ranging from the familiar forward figure eight to the complex paragraph double three. Frequently she spends as much as a half hour on a figure, or longer if she's not satisfied with her performance. With a total of 48 compulsory figures, it takes a week to get through the complete set.

"Peggy is one of those rare individuals," Coach Fassi notes, "who has the control and precision necessary for perfect school figures—and is equally good at free figure skating." Fassi believes that skaters sometimes over-train and end up giving a flat, uninspired performance during the event. Peggy begins to taper off during the two weeks prior to competition. As Fassi says, "You train too much, it gets you nothing but big legs."

Following the National competition in January, the Olympics in February, and the World Championships thereafter, Peggy will tour Europe and return home, very possibly to retire from skating competition. "People keep asking me, will I turn professional? Gee," she answers, "I really look forward to leading a life of my own, a kind of other life."

Mrs. Fleming concurs that Peggy will quit this year. "Frankly, we can't afford it anymore," her mother emphasizes. What happens to the women's figure skating championship after Peggy? "I think there'll be a gap in the US, at least for a few years. The East Germans and Czechs will probably control the international skating competitions."

And what of Peggy's future. "I'll most likely go to college full time and train as a kindergarten teacher." After a month of vaction: "I want time to do all the things I've been longing to do. Like swimming, sleeping late, eating pastry, getting a sun tan and staying up late at parties." Peggy has taken the fame she has earned in typical teen-age stride, and unsophisticatedly, honestly admits that it excites her to get mail from Europe addressed simply, "Peggy Fleming, USA," or to have people ask her for autographs. "It's fun," she says. Her comment when her picture appeared on the cover of *Sports Illustrated:* "I thought it was great."

And her comment on being the best: "It makes you feel good. I like the feeling very much."

At the moment, the Flemings and Coach Fassi are looking forward only to this year's Olympics. "If we have good ice," Fassi says confidently, "Peggy should have no trouble in beating the others." Regardless of the outcome, the Fleming philosophy will prevail. In the words of Mrs. Fleming, "Peggy's father believed that the most important thing he could teach her was sportsmanship. He taught her to be a good competitor. If you win, you win. If you lose, lose gracefully. Certainly we want Peggy to win. But if she loses, so what? It's certainly not the end of the world."

Win or lose in the weeks ahead, blue-eyed Peggy Fleming from Colorado Springs will remain a champion—and the most exciting queen on skates that America has ever seen.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence, thus realizing a goal for which the people had been striving through 120 years of Russian domination. Two years later, the Soviet Government in Moscow signed a peace treaty in which it recognized Lithuanian independence and affirmed its belief that all peoples have the right to self-determination. The treaty stated in part:

> Russia recognizes . . . the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania . . . and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

History has provided irrevocable proof that the Soviet Union betrayed the Lithuanian people with its insidious promises. Two decades later, under the guise of defending Lithuania from the powerful Nazi onslaught, the Soviets occupied the country and took control of of the government. In 1940, the Supreme Soviet in Moscow declared the entrapped nation a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R., thus obliterating the last vestiges of Lithuanian sovereignty.

For the past 28 years, the Lithuanian people have been subjected to all forms of Sovietization, aimed at destroying their nationalist spirit. Yet, although a government must succumb to a stronger force, the hearts and minds of those who possess a will to freedom can never be enslaved.

Fifty years ago today, the Lithuanians chose to govern themselves by principles of freedom and democracy. For 20 years, they enjoyed the fruits of liberty. They watched their beloved nation grow and prosper through their own earnest efforts. Inspired by that memory, they continue to struggle against Communist domination and to hold fast their national identity.

The Lithuanian cause has evoked the hope of free men everywhere that the ardent desire of the Lithuanian people for liberty and self-government will ultimately become a reality.

IMPROVED HOUSING FOR THE RURAL ELDERLY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, home maintenance is a serious burden for elderly citizens. Shoveling walks, cleaning windows, and mowing grass can be formidable chores when bones are aging and vigor declining.

For some of our senior citizens, apartment living can solve the problem—if desirable rental apartments are available. But in rural communities, the "if" is a big one. Second-floor apartments in homes or store buildings seldom meet the needs of older persons; for there are frequently too many stairs to climb and too much noise for comfort.

There is a growing demand in small towns throughout Minnesota, and throughout all of rural America, for that matter, for rental units designed to meet the needs of elderly residents. I am gratified to learn that the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture is cognizant of the housing needs of our senior citizens and is making determined efforts to be an ever-present partner in revitalizing this segment of rural America.

Through wise administration, the Farmers Home Administration is using its rental housing loan program to help local people to build and develop projects suitable for our senior citizens. Through the rural rental housing program, this agency is helping to assure that retirement is truly a "golden age" for our senior citizens, a time filled with the security and dignity that a lifetime of labor deserves.

Last fiscal year, for instance, some 1,100 rural people—mostly senior citizens—were able to move into well-constructed, comfortably designed apartments located in the countryside as a result of $5.5 million in loans advanced by the Farmers Home Administration. In my State, about 150 rural senior citizens were able to obtain apartments in new or improved rental housing units during the last fiscal year, thanks to the more than $500,000 in credit advanced by the Farmers Home Administration under this program.

A recent issue of the Farmer contained a fine article written by Margaret Landin, the family and farm editor of that magazine, which tells of the joy and pleasure senior citizens are having as residents of rental projects in Minnesota, particularly in Grove City. This excellent article is probably the best summary made so far of this little known program that is of such great benefit to our senior citizens in rural areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "FHA Retirement Housing—Is It Working?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FHA RETIREMENT HOUSING—IS IT WORKING?

(By Margaret Landin)

"So, you're from the Farmer," Mrs. W. L. Paul, Grove City, Minn., greeted us at her door. "Well, you're why we live here.

"Mr. Paul and I read about the retirement homes in your magazine in 1964, and though we'd been retired from our farm about nine years and lived in Redwood Falls, this sounded just grand—and it is."

Hers was the first of many enthusiastic comments from people who live in Grove City Community Homes, which the Farmer revisited recently, three years after its first feature on retirement facilities for farm families. Grove City was the first retirement center in the U.S. okayed for an FHA loan.

Equally pleased with their new homes are people living in Heights Court Apartments, a more recently completed center at Wyoming, Minn.

Non-profit, rural retirement housing centers may be set up by rural communities with populations under 5,500. They will be granted USDA Farm Home Administration (FHA) loans if area residents support the project and plans are approved. Community support is demonstrated by sale of individual memberships for enough to establish a bank account that amounts to about 3% of the loan requested from FHA.

The housing is designed for healthy, independent, older individuals and couples who no longer need or want a large farm or home to care for. Rents are moderate and those who live in the centers need not make any investment, other than a $10 or $20 membership.

Mr. and Mrs. Paul moved to Grove City, a town of about 500, in July, 1966. "There are such good neighbors here—people were friendly and easy to know right from the beginning," Mrs. Paul said. "Tell folks not to be afraid to move into one of these retirement centers. They have privacy plus the convenience of being close to town, have a central laundry so this need not be done in your own house and a caretaker who does yard work. And there are many, many good friends close by.

"The apartments are easy to take care of. Tile floors wipe up quickly; closets and cupboards are more than generous. In fact," Mrs. Paul laughed, "I gave away things I'd have had plenty of room to store."

Another couple visited, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Olson, have lived in Grove City Community Homes about one year. "Sometimes when you think or talk about retirement projects, you wonder if people will look down on the idea," Mr. Olson told THE FARMER. "But it isn't like that at all. We're tickled pink—this isn't a poverty project."

Mrs. Olson, who is crippled with rheumatism and uses a walker, likes living near neighbors. "You know," she said, "I lived most of my life in the country where I couldn't even see a neighbor's house. Now I can get to meetings in the community center, even though I have a hard time walking. Today, for instance, we're getting together to see about forming a craft club where we can work and exchange hobby ideas—over coffee, of course."

Frank Silseth, caretaker for Grove City Community Homes, was one of the project's originators. He sat on the board of directors until accepting his position as caretaker. He farmed about two miles outside of town and lived on his farm the first year he worked at the homes. He liked his job and the homes so much that he has rented his farm and moved into one of the apartments.

"One pleasant feature here is that a person can have a vegetable or flower garden if he wants," Mr. Silseth, an avid gardener himself, said. "This last summer we had five vegetable gardens and nearly everyone had flowers. We've plenty of space because the homes own 17 acres."

"And you know," he went on, "we've had only one elderly tenant leave, and that was because he was no longer able to walk well and wanted to live right downtown."

Another plus is the central community building with its big activity room, its handy, equipped kitchen, a big laundry room with coin-operated washers and dryer, and two apartments on the second floor.

Cooperation from people in the area has continued strong, according to Donald Peterson, Grove City businessman and president of the non-profit, Homes Corporation. Originally, 278 memberships were sold for $10 each, with memberships including corporation voting privileges. The project is operated by a board of ine area citizens. Area groups and individuals have given strong support in landscaping, furnishing the community room and the community kitchen.

Grove City Homes is maintaining about 90% occupancy. There are 21 one-bedroom apartments which rent for $55; five two-bedroom units, renting for $75. Tenants pay for electric heat and light, plus telephone. The homes furnish refrigerator and 30-inch stove for each unit, water (hot and soft), grounds maintenance, help with windows when needed and repair work. When residents want to go visiting or on vacation, they just walk out and lock the door, regardless of weather. The caretaker checks temperature and takes care of seasonal chores for them.

"Financially," says Mr. Peterson, "the Grove City venture is now into the plus columns. Our original construction was delayed because of bad weather so we didn't start collecting rents as soon as planned. But now, retirement home groups can delay their first loan payment two years—a necessary change in rules. Despite our original delay, we're now in good shape and have requested another loan from FHA to build a 10-car garage. We figure $5 rent per month will meet that expense easily.

"Another FHA rule that has changed, which we think is desirable, allows the corporation to write bylaws so young people with modest income can live in the centers. Income for young, childless couples must be no more than $4,000; for couples with children, $6,000. The $6,000 yearly maximum income for people over 62 still holds," Mr. Peterson said.

Turnover of younger people is more because this is really a temporary situation for them, until their salaries increase and they can afford to buy homes. But, residents of Grove City enjoy having young folks around and watching the children play, saying they are well-behaved and no bother.

"Offering these homes to young people has been to our advantage," Mr. Silseth said. "We've been able to provide good and moderately-priced housing to teachers. Some smaller communities have a real problem in this area."

The retirement center at Wyoming, Minn., a town of about 700, is set up in a slightly different way, reflecting FHA's desire that each community plan and design for their own special, local area.

Donald Grans, Wyoming postmaster and secretary-treasurer of Heights Court Apartments, Inc., was one of the prime movers in getting that project going. He is now manager of the court.

"Our buildings are four-plexes," he told the Farmer. "Each apartment is on the ground level. Rents, which include everything but electricity for lights, and phones, are $75 for one bedroom; $90 for two bedroom apartments. Our recreation room, not quite completed, is a big, walk-out room on the lower level of one building. It overlooks the yard, woods and a small creek. Our land covers two acres. We have four buildings and there's plenty of room for curb parking and gardens—we had six vegetable gardens last summer.

"Now," he continued, "we have a request in to FHA for money to put up one more four-unit building."

The Wyoming group's bylaws state that residents must be 62 years or older, because the board feels older people enjoy peace, quiet and one another. Apartments aren't isolated from the community, but border a lovely, wooded residential section which is just being planned and built.

"We sold about 100 memberships at $10 apiece to get rolling," Mr. Grans continued. "Robert Ackerman, Afton, Minn., architect, drew our plans. We think we have buildings that will last for years with minimum repairs, at least of a major nature."

Residents at Wyoming Heights are area people; about half are retired farmers. Those the Farmer talked to were just as enthusiastic as residents at the Grove City retirement center.

Mr. and Mrs. Russell W. Carlson were getting ready to leave on a delayed wedding trip when the Farmer called. They met, as neighbors at Heights Court, about a year ago and were married in September.

"I was lonely when I first came here from Center City," Mr. Carlson said. "But people were so nice."

Mrs. Carlson originally lived in Forest Lake, Minn. She sold her home because it got to be too much work. "I considered a trailer home," she said, "then I visited Heights Court. The cramped trailer idea went out the window when I saw these lovely, roomy apartments."

Mrs. Eva Wentze, a widow who lived at Martin Lake, Minn., feels her two-bedroom apartment is as nice as any home. "Just look at the birch woodwork, oak floors and ceramic bathroom tile. Grand, big windows crank out easily and you can change storms or screens at will. My kitchen is a gem, too," Mrs. Wentze continued. "The floor is inlaid vinyl, stove is a full, 30-inch size, the refrigerator has a good-sized freezing compartment and there's plenty of cupboard space for storing grocery supplies. They've let me carpet my living room floor and I could easily bring all the old treasures I wanted to keep. Closets are huge—even a great big linen closet outside the bathroom door."

Wyoming's loan for its four original units was $53,000. It was acquired after the interest rate was reduced to an even 3%, and the corporation took advantage of the two-year option to make the first payment.

Lower interest rate, the two-year option on making first loan payment and a chance for each community to decide whether or not its members will let young people move in have been the major changes in FHA rules to date. "All in all," Arthur Hanson, state FHA director, told The Farmer, "the plan has worked well and enthusiasm throughout the state is growing.

"We have a couple suggestions for community groups thinking about retirement centers. Perhaps most important, we are encouraging them to buy smaller parcels of land. This means less original investment on their part and it isn't difficult to get more money for additional buildings, once the first units are filled.

"Actually, even very small towns can now have a retirement unit—we'd consider loans on a single building on one lot."

Roger Runestrand, engineer for Minnesota FHA and the man who helps supervise community building plans, feels that having buildings or groups of buildings scattered throughout the community is a commendable idea. "If you get older people out where they can see kids and cats, you keep them involved in more local activities," he points out.

Another FHA suggestion is that original membership fees be set at $20. "The higher fee," Mr. Hanson continued, "keeps the person more actively interested in the project and he's more likely to continue his support because of his larger investment.

"We've also found that total collection from original membership sales should be about 3% of the loan. This money in the bank assures the group of a cushion for extra expenses and equipment until rents start coming in."

Minnesota now has five non-profit retirement centers in operation under FHA loans. They are at Wyoming, Askov, Gonvick, Red Lake and Grove City.

Four more centers are under construction at Halstad, Fosston, Bejou and Waverly. FHA also has tentative commitments on loans to groups in Isle, Belgrade, Hinckley, Sebeka, Newfolden, Grygla and Brooks.

THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, in a speech before the Colorado Association of Broadcasters on the 26th of January of this year, I made it known that I intend to seek repeal of the Federal Communications Commission's so-called fairness doctrine. Apparently, this should have been done much earlier, for, if the Commission's decisions on cigarette advertising and political candidates appeared absurd, the FCC's latest application of the doctrine is a mockery of fairness.

To be specific, the FCC required radio station WHN in New York to grant equal time to the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs in response to a WHN editorial accusing the DuBois organizations of being Communist fronts. It was a 6-to-1 decision, with Commissioner Robert E. Lee dissenting. Commissioner Lee was quoted as saying:

> We have to draw the line somewhere.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Lee, but unfortunately the majority on the Commission seems unwilling to make any rational decisions in implementing the doctrine.

For anyone not familiar with the DuBois Clubs, let me say that former Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach labeled them Communist-front organizations, as did FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Mr. Hoover specifically warned that the DuBois Clubs are making a strong effort at fomenting revolution among our Nation's youth. W. E. B. DuBois, by the way, was an obscure Communist whose writings have apparently inspired a part of the new left.

The requirement that equal time be afforded those organizations who aid the Communists in their goal of internal subversion and world domination is such an extreme perversion of the intent of Congress that obviously the fairness doctrine must be abolished. I would not be surprised to see the Commission require radio stations in the metropolitan Washington area which produced documentaries on the assassination of George Lincoln Rockwell to grant equal time to the American Nazi Party. I would ask the Commission, Is this in the public interest? Does the Commission feel that it is in the public interest to expose the American people to the views of Communists who are not clearly labeled as Communists? Obviously, the Commission does; and, obviously, before too many broadcasting stations are required to air treasonous declarations against the United States and its interests, the second session of the 90th Congress must act to correct this outrage.

Mr. President, in the near future I will submit a bill to the Congress dealing with the fairness doctrine, and I hope it will be given every consideration.

IS THE SST A WORTHWHILE PUBLIC INVESTMENT?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, Prof. Karl Ruppenthal, director of the transportation management program at Stanford University, delivered a superb speech at the California Institute of Technology the other day about the supersonic transport. I commend the speech to the attention of all Senators.

The speech sums up as well as any statement I have yet seen all the reasons why our Government should adopt a "proceed with great caution" attitude toward this project.

Professor Ruppenthal, at one point in his speech, stated:

> Although there are thousands of sophisticated investors eagerly seeking growth situations; although there are literally billions of dollars in risk capital ready to be invested in attractive, business-like speculations, not one broker in the world has offered to underwrite the supersonic transport project.

He continued:

> There is no mystery to this reluctance. Said one of the bankers who made a study of the project, "Without the guarantee of the government, there would be absolutely no market for the securities." In other words, even to the sophisticated investor with risk capital to invest, the financial prospects don't look good.

SST uses this as an argument for heavy Government participation. But I question whether the SST is a reasonable Government investment when private investors eager for profits will not touch with a 10-foot pole. If some great public purpose were served by Government investment in the SST, then it might be a reasonable investment. But the controversy that surrounds the SST dwells on just this point: Does the SST serve any important public purpose, particularly at a time in our history when we have so many tasks that are so obviously important?

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Ruppenthal's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC FLIGHT

(By Karl M. Ruppenthal)

Blasé though we may be after having become accustomed to announcements of immense progress and gigantic leaps in the multifarious areas of science and technology, there is, nonetheless, an understandable sense of excitement as we contemplate the possibility of supersonic flight. There is a quickening of the senses, a feeling of anticipation that comes with each new advance in transportation technology. There is an undeniable thrill that comes with each new advance in speed. No doubt that thrill was felt by the primitive inventor of the wheel as he attached his invention to some crude chariot and then went careening down a hill. No doubt that thrill was felt by the Wright Brothers as they detached themselves from the earth and actually managed to coax their contraption into the air. And that thrill is anticipated by the visionaries and the promoters who would soon have the people of the world travelling about at three times the speed of sound. Here is what one of them has to say:

"Racing along above the troposphere you will actually outdistance the sun. Washington to Paris in but three short hours; Los Angeles to New York in even less. The ski slopes of the Andes and the beaches of South America will be no farther from Chicago than Detroit is by air today. Outracing the sun, no place on earth will be more than hours away. Every remote and idyllic area in the world will be brought virtually to your very doorstep. A new day will dawn with the advent of supersonic flight."

It almost sounds like Paradise—at least to the efficient practitioner of that well-known Madison Avenue trade. But like many artful advertisements, it does not even speak of the price. And before we leap too fast into the supersonic age, it may be well to explore some of the environmental aspects of supersonic flight. In modern business parlance, we need to undertake an economic analysis to determine cost-benefit relationships. Or, in more commonplace language, it seems wise to know more about the costs of what we are getting before we sign the contract to buy.

There are four types of benefits that could flow from the construction of a U.S. supersonic transport. First, and most obvious, is speed. It is obvious that a plane traveling at 1800 mph can cover the distance more quickly than one poking along at one third that speed. Second, a substantial number of jobs can be created whenever the government undertakes any new and expensive project. That is true whether we speak in terms of the SST, Cancer Research, or the WPA. Third, there would be a "fall out" in technology. It seems likely that the multi billion dollar expenditures for the SST would enable us to learn more about the metallurgy of titanium, some problems in hydraulics, and the secrets of radiation. Indeed, as in any program of research and development, it is entirely possible that incidental and unforeseen benefits of undetermined value would spring from these efforts.

Fourth, it would tend to feed our ego. As Americans we have long nurtured the idea that in certain, selected areas we should, if possible, always be first. And on those rare occasions when some competitor beats us to the punch, we should nonetheless be preeminent. America is always best!

Our ego is bruised at the thought that the British can rival us in accomplishment in any of these proprietary areas. Our pride is wounded if the French ever succeed in doing anything as well as we. And our national honor is surely at stake whenever the Russians do better than we.

We have long felt, and with some justification, that aviation is really an American domain. Stunned with the notion that the British-French Supersonic Concorde may actually be the first commercial plane to fly faster than the speed of sound, we are bound and determined to drive it from the skies—notwithstanding the fact that there is abundant evidence to indicate that the Concorde will be underpowered, inefficient and expensive; indeed there is mounting evidence to indicate that the Abominable Concorde may never really make it off the ground.

These, briefly, are the benefits to be received from building our own version of the SST. And now, a look at the other side of the coin. What is the nature of the problems that are involved in its construction and operation and what is the magnitude of the cost?

The problems may be classified according to the various environments in which they will exist. One environment concerns the plane itself and its occupants. This is the physical environment through which the plane would pass. The second environment concerns the people on the earth—the human beings over whom the Supersonic plane would pass. The third environment is economic. What is the magnitude of the costs that are involved in the development, construction, and operation of the supersonic transport? Who will bear these costs And what is the probable return on their investment?

There are a variety of interesting problems that concern the in-flight environment of the SST. These, briefly, involve heat, cold, pressurization, and radiation. Since it is contemplated that the transport will operate in a wide variety of physical conditions, its various systems must take into account enormous variations in pressure and temperature. The plane should be able to take off at sea-level tropical airports, but its hydraulic systems must function properly when the plane is flying fifteen miles high over the frozen arctic wastes. Systems utilizing liquids must be operable when it is so hot that certain fluids would boil and when it is so cold that ordinary jet fuel will freeze.

In cruising flight the skin of the plane will reach 550° Fahrenheit—so hot that it could easily be used to grill a steak. Yet the metals used in the structure must not shrink or lose their shape if the plane lands in Iceland on the coldest winter night.

Pressurization presents certain problems. If the cabin of a transport is ruptured while flying at subsonic altitudes today, the emergency oxygen system can be relied upon to serve until the plane descends to a viable altitude—perhaps 10,000 feet. But this will not be true in the case of supersonic flight. Flying unpressurized at 70 to 80 thousand feet, a human's blood would boil. Result: The pressurization system must not be allowed to fail.

While we are rapidly learning more about the hazards of radiation, there is still a good bit more to learn. It now appears that there will be little radiation danger to the passenger on the routine supersonic flight. There is less certainty about the amount of continuous exposure which the flight crew members can tolerate. And there is work to be done in relation to predicting the incidence of severe radiation disturbances, or at least in locating them in relation to the projected Supersonic flight path. Once such disturbances are located, it seems probable that the SST could descend to a lower altitude or in some other appropriate manner alter its projected course.

While these problems involving the environment of the supersonic transport itself are not unimportant, there is little doubt that they can be solved. All that is required is the passage of time, the application of the requisite brainpower plus a plentiful supply of money. These problems are technical in nature, and a satisfactory solution can surely be bought.

A far more important set of problems concerns the people who live on the earth—under the flight path of the supersonic planes. It is they who must contend with the sonic boom.

At the outset it may be appropriate to examine the nature of the sonic boom. This phenomenon is created whenever any object passes through the air faster than the speed of sound. It results from the inability of the molecules in the air to move fast enough to get out of the way of the plane. The result is a shock wave, or sonic boom, variously described as a sharp crack or a thunderous roar.

While some things are known about the sonic boom, many questions still remain. It is known, for instance, that the size and intensity of the boom bears some relationship to the altitude of the plane, its speed, its shape, and its size. Generally speaking, the larger the plane, the bigger the boom. But there are several other related factors whose relationship is not yet clearly understood. While it is known that the intensity of the boom varies in different atmospheric conditions, the reasons for the variations have not been identified. It is also known that the signature of the boom—its shape and pattern, if you will—may vary with the attitude of the plane. While the boom created by a small plane flying straight and level in supersonic flight may cause no more than slight annoyance, when that same plane turns and banks, it sometimes creates a destructive boom.

How much boom will there be? The answer to that question is not yet fully clear. If the U.S. SST cruises at between 60,000 and 70,000 feet, as now appears probable, it will leave in its wake a continuous boom in the shape of a cone. As the underside of the boom strikes the earth, it will resemble a sonic carpet some fifty miles wide. What is not known is the severity of the boom; how it will be magnified whenever the plane banks, turns, or changes its course; nor the effect of the boom on ships, marine life, or other planes following it in the air.

Thus far several thousand claims have been filed against the United States for boom damage and the claimants have been paid something like a million dollars for property damage that thus far has been sustained. There is no record of the number of people who have been damaged or annoyed but did not take the trouble to file a claim.

Before becoming complacent about the amount of reparations that have been paid for boom damage inflicted, it is well to remember that these claims have resulted from relatively small sonic booms—mostly caused unintentionally by over-eager or under-trained Air Force pilots operating in relatively small planes. It does not require an Einstein to appreciate the number and size of the claims for boom damage that could result from a thousand larger and faster planes plying the nation's air ways.

The quasi-official calculations made by the proponents of the SST estimate that about 500 of the planes can be sold if they are restricted to over-water operations and that an additional 700 of them can be sold if they are allowed to fly over land. If but one fourth of this latter fleet—175 planes—were allowed to fly the transcontinental routes of the United States, people living in their wake would have the joy of being boomed some 700 times per day. If the pleasures of the boom were distributed evenly throughout the day and night, that would mean a sonic boom every 2 minutes, more or less. But lest the people of Denver, Omaha, or Des Moines becomes disconcerted at that melodious thought, they may take comfort in the knowledge that under normal conditions the sonic boom carpet gracing their city should ordinarily be no more annoying than the sound of a modern-day subsonic jet airborne at the end of the runway with full take-off power.

Apparently that would mean that when the supersonic age is full blown, the quietest place to live may well be at the threshold of the airport itself. For the thousands of miles of flight-ways over which these planes fly would be subject to a continuous and never ending boom.

Faced with an increasing storm of protests because of booms caused by Air Force planes, one inventive General proposed the addition of a new public relations man to his staff. He saw it simply as a problem in education. In the interests of progress, the public must learn to live with the boom.

One of the most disheartening aspects of the whole supersonic program has been the matter of the sonic boom. Well aware of the fact that a boom is created whenever a plane achieves supersonic flight, the members of an early SST study committee sought some answers to the problems of the boom. Even then they knew that there were limits to the noise and annoyance to which the American people would allow themselves to be subjected even under the guise of progress, paternalism, or patriotism.

Since neither they nor the public then knew much about the nature of overpressure—the amount of boom-created pressure in excess of that of the atmosphere itself—they sought to find some understandable translation. As one of the members of that committee expressed it, "We found that a boom of 1 psf (pressure per square foot) was somewhat annoying and that a boom of 2 psf was a little like being shoved."

Although they felt that the public should not be asked to tolerate a boom in excess of 1 psf, that specification was not achieved by any of the designers of the SST. Privately concerned about the public reaction to the boom, a series of boom tests have been made—each of them under carefully supervised—and antiseptically artificial—conditions. While there is disagreement about the results, one thing is abundantly clear: The full public reaction to the boom has not yet been revealed, for the tests are sorely incomplete. Since it is not yet known what will be the signature and intensity of the boom created by the U.S. SST, the public reaction to that boom is clearly unknown. Some of the proponents of the SST answer this question by saying that we must simply try it out. Once built and in the air, the people themselves can determine their collective reaction to the boom. In other words, since the laboratory tests are inadequate, why not make guinea pigs out of the American people themselves.

Incidentally, if the British-French Concorde actually makes it to the air, its specifications call for a boom of 2½ psf, more or less, at take off and about 2 psf during cruising flight.

The third environmental area is economic. How much is it likely to cost? And who will pay for the plane? While there are still many uncertainties concerning the full cost of research, development, and construction, there is indeed little doubt that the taxpayers will pick up the tab. In this connection it is interesting to note that although the financial problems of the SST have been studied by some of the most astute bankers and financiers that the United States can boast, not one of them has ever seriously suggested that the plane be financed by the private enterprise system itself. Although there are thousands of sophisticated investors eagerly seeking growth situations; although there are literally billions of dollars in risk capital ready to be invested in attractive, business-like speculations, not one broker in the world has offered to underwrite the supersonic transport project.

There is no mystery to this reluctance. Said one of the bankers who made a study of the project, "Without the guarantee of the government, there would be absolutely no market for the securities." In other words, even to the sophisticated investor with risk capital to invest, the financial prospects don't look good.

The fact of the matter is that it is hazardous indeed to forecast the financial prospects for the SST. Until the probable size of the market for the plane can realistically be determined, it is impossible to set a rational price for the plane itself nor to know how much of the research and development costs to charge each plane that is built. And the greatest of many uncertainties concerning the market for the plane itself concerns the willingness of the American people to suffer the sonic boom.

There is real danger here. Billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money may be invested on the implicit assumption that the boom will be heard only on the over-ocean routes. There is now some official claim that the project could be successful even if the plane did not fly over land; or if it did, that it would fly at subsonic speeds. But the danger is that with these restrictions the supersonic plane would be a colossal economic flop and the multi-billion dollar investment would risk going down the drain.

Faced with a financial loss of such gigantic proportions, there would be enormous pressures to change the rules and allow full operation over land. If that day comes, peace and quiet in much of the countryside will truly be a nostalgic thing of the past.

In this connection it is important to note that Sir William Hildred, then Director General of the International Air Transport Association, has said that the financial assumptions underpinning the SST were so tenuous that a change of but one per cent in certain critical elements could convert an assumed profit into an important loss. And as any forecaster knows, this is an exceedingly close parameter for any prognosticator to use.

While it is true that there have been exhaustive studies concerning the technical aspects of the SST, as yet very little has been done about the environmental problems of the SST. We know precious little about its probable effects on wildlife, dairy cattle, or sleeping babes. We know little about its effects on human irritability, blood pressure, or ability to get a good night's sleep. We know almost even less about the startle effect and what it can mean to a surgeon, scientist, or a person who is critically ill. These are important considerations, and they should not rudely be swept under the rug. Knowing of their existence, it does not seem prudent to ignore them, hoping that with the advent of the supersonic plane itself, they will, somehow, magically disappear.

One of the regrettable aspects of the whole supersonic project is that it is the technicians who have been in control. Instead of looking at the human aspects of the problem, too often technology itself has been their God.

Probably the most important problem entwined in the project concerns the living qualities of the earth. Who should make the decisions concerning booms, noise, stench, and screams? Who should set the allowable limits to pollution in the air, pollution on the ground, and pollution of serenity? Who should decide these questions, involving as they do the very living qualities of the earth? Should they be left to the technicians and the promoters and the artists of Madison Avenue? Or should the people on the earth have some small voice in their determination?

THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE JUDICIARY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the outstanding Maryland trial judges, the Honorable Kenneth C. Proctor, circuit judge of Baltimore County, last month presented to the Maryland Judicial Conference an address which outlined, in fine style, a code of conduct for all judges. I have had the opportunity to read Judge Proctor's remarks, and I believe they are well worth sharing with Senators.

Judge Proctor's concluding words are particularly worthy of note. He said:

> Very few of us will be known as great judges and the public will neither know nor care. What the people want and have every right to expect from us are integrity, humanity, consideration, devotion to, and reasonable expedition in, our work, diginity, freedom from outside influences, such as business and politics, self-restraint—in short—good judges.

In this day—when court dockets are burdened as never before in our history—the bench cannot perform its public function unless it is composed of judges of the caliber and with the human charactertistics Judge Proctor calls for. As Socrates said centuries ago, judges must "hear courteously, answer wisely, consider soberly, and decide impartially." The bench today must not be the repository of man appointed principally for their political activities or elected for their appeal in the political circuit. Our clogged court calendars will never find relief if the bench is reserved as a sinecure for lawyers no longer able to face the rigors of practice.

Every judge, be he a trial magistrate or a Supreme Court Justice, would do well to follow Judge Proctor's suggested code of conduct. Only industrious, conscientious, temperate, and courageous judges can meet the challenges facing justice today. And, as Judge Proctor so aptly states:

> If the people lose faith in the courts, they lose faith in the government.

Mr. President, Maryland, and particularly Baltimore County, can be proud of Judge Proctor. He has served the State on the bench since May 1965, and is a judicial member of the American College of Trial Lawyers. An extremely able lawyer, he served as past president of the Maryland Bar Association. He is a former deputy State's attorney and assistant Maryland attorney general.

I ask unanimous consent that Judge Kenneth C. Proctor's speech, entitled "The Public Image of the Judiciary," be printed in the RECORD.

These being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE JUDICIARY

(Presentation by Judge Kenneth C. Proctor at the Maryland Judicial Conference January 11, 1968)

The public's concept of the Judiciary is reflected from not just one—but several mirrors. The first, and probably the most important, is what I will call the Court House mirror. From it we are observed by every one employed there, from the custodial staff to our fellow judges; by jurors, court attaches, witnesses, litigants and attorneys; by casual visitors; and finally, by representatives of the various news media who report our activities to the world.

The second is the Extra Curricular mirror which reflects all those occasions when we come in contact with the general public away from the Court House—while driving our cars, at our clubs, walking on the street, in restaurants, at the theater and meetings.

The third is the Semi-Private mirror which shows us, quite often with our hair down, to our friends and acquaintances and, I might add, to our colleagues—while at cocktail parties, private dinners and bench meetings.

We all know that collectively these mirrors reflect everything we do from the moment we leave our homes in the morning until our return in the evening—many times until we retire for the night. A few of us, however, apparently are not fully aware of the code of conduct to which we all should adhere so that the reflections from these mirrors will lend dignity to the office which each of us holds and will result in respect by all those whom we serve.

What are the standards of conduct which all of us should follow? I suggest that the following ten commandments embody them with reasonable objectivity:

1. The first and indispensable standard is that, like Caesar's wife, we must be above suspicion—not most of the time but all of the time. Ours cannot be the morals of the market place, for we are required to judge them every day. We must not only be fair and impartial in the trial of cases and in handling our other judicial duties, we also should give the appearance of fairness and impartiality. Those who appear before us—whether as attorneys, litigants or witnesses—should carry out of the court room the feeling that, right or wrong, we have been fair. It should be observed that our public image in this regard may very well be reflected from all three mirrors—not just from that which picks up our court room conduct.

2. We must at all times remember that we are public servants—not kings, little or big. We can and should run our courts with a taut rein. We should not, however, act as autocrats who can do no wrong.

Judge Harold R. Medina has said—"After all that is said and done, we cannot deny that a judge is almost of necessity surrounded by people who keep telling him what a wonderful fellow he is. And if he once begins to believe it, he is a lost soul."

3. We should be considerate. We expect our court attaches to jump at our slightest request. We expect counsel to be respectful. We expect jurors, litigants and witnesses to be prompt in their attendance. The least that we can do is to open court at the designated hour—make recesses as brief as possible. The judge who does not do these things leaves a very bad impression on those he keeps waiting. When delay is unavoidable—as it occasionally is—we should be careful to explain to all concerned exactly why that is so.

4. We should remember that serving as a judge is a full time job. Today the volume and complexities of litigation and of administration of the judicial process require all of our energy and full time in court or chambers. The day when a judge could perform his duties in three days a week—nine months a year is long past. I'm not suggesting that we have to punch a time clock or that we can't take off for an occasional golf game or attend grandmother's funeral on opening day. However, it has been said that a lazy judge is a poor judge. We can't shirk our responsibilities by taking four day weekends and vacations of three months. We cannot expect the public to provide bigger and better Court Houses for more and more judges, some of whom would not be needed if we all bore our fair share of the overall judicial load. If the hoped for increase in and equalization of salaries and pensions are realized, those who sit in counties where the workload is comparatively light must expect assignments where it is heavy. In fact, without a good public image so far as our work habits are concerned, we can't expect the legislators to approve and the taxpayers to pay such increased and equalized salaries and pensions.

Only recently, the Legislative Council in approving proposed legislation affecting judicial salaries and pensions added the following preamble to the proposed bill: "It is the intention of the General Assembly that the circuit court judges throughout the State shall be paid uniform salaries and that the judicial work-load shall be distributed as uniformly as possible by exercise of the authority of assignment by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals. It is further the intention of the General Assembly that the Court of Appeals shall by rule establish a uniform procedure for the scheduling of judicial vacations and leaves of absence throughout the State."

5. We should respect the views and opinions of our colleagues. In administering the judicial process there are bound to be many occasions when we do not agree with our fellow judges. Nevertheless, disagreements should be respectful—not bitter. Ability to negotiate and compromise is one of the factors which made us reasonably successful lawyers. Let us not discard that ability now that we are on the bench. Let us discuss and determine our administrative problems in the meeting room—not in the public press.

6. We should never forget that we were lawyers before we were judges. Counsel are entitled to and should be accorded consideration in and out of court. We should not, of course, play favorites.

If it becomes necessary to censure counsel, it should be done, if possible, in chambers.

Many times in the trial of cases it is incumbent upon us to question a witness. When we do so I suggest certain guide lines: (a) As a general rule, such interrogation should be reserved until counsel have exhausted the witness—the question may become unnecessary. (b) Our questions should not be slanted—should not indicate any degree of bias. (c) We should at all times bear in mind the old chestnut—the injunction of the young lawyer to the interfering judge "Your Honor, I don't mind you trying the case, but please don't lose it!" (d) In jury trial we should ask as few questions as possible and be particularly careful not to ask questions which might prejudice either side. (e) Ask questions if necessary to prevent manifest injustice.

7. We should be expeditious in deciding cases. Delayed justice many times results in injustice. Even if we are not prepared to decide a case from the bench, upon its conclusion we should at least hand down our findings of fact. We will never be better prepared to make those determinations and quite often such findings lead to an inevitable conclusion. Prompt action on the facts leaves a good impression on litigants and attorneys.

If we delay unduly in deciding cases it adversely affects our overall effectiveness as judges. We lag in handling our fair share of the work and our colleagues have to take up the slack. We should not kid ourselves that the public do not know the judges who work effectively and those who don't. They do!

8. We must not engage in partisan politics. Whether we like it or not the public look upon politicians with suspicion. A judge who is active politically or who associates with politicians is promptly labelled by the people as one of them. To the public this label connotes bias—subject to influence.

9. We should not engage in business or be associated with business ventures of any kind where such association would be an inducement to others to deal with such concerns or would interfere in any way with the performance of our judicial duties. Any such association would necessarily involve some of our time and energy and would probably result in undue disqualifications and public belief of bias.

Since preparing this talk, the State Constitutional Convention has adopted the proposed new Constitution (subject to the approval of the voters on May 14, 1968). Section 5.25—Restriction of Non-Judicial Activities in part provides as follows:

"No judge shall practice law, or seek public elective office other than the judicial office he then holds, or contribute to or hold office in a political party or political organization, or participate in a partisan political campaign or serve as officer, director or employee of any business formed with the intention of making a profit. * * *"

10. We should at all times be temperate and I use the word in two senses. First, we should be self-restrained in our dealings with others—in and out of the court room. Kindness and patience pay big dividends in all walks of life and particularly where the relationship is judge—counsel—litigant. Restrained dignity is impressive—lack of it is inexcusable. We should not lose our temper in court—Count ten and recess.

Second, we should be temperate in our consumption of alcoholic beverages. Intemperance not only seriously limits our ability to function as judges—it results in a permanent black eye so far as the public is concerned.

If we do a little soul-searching, I doubt if any of us can conscientiously say that day in—day out we abide by all of these standards. Yet, I submit, the breach of any one of them by any one of us does damage to the public image of all of us—the Judiciary of the State of Maryland. Collectively we constitute one of the three great branches of government in this State—in fact the greatest because it is the last resort of the people in times of stress—be such problems public or private. If the people lose faith in the courts, they lose faith in the government.

Very few of us will be known as great judges and the public will neither know nor care. What the people want and have every right to expect from us are integrity, humanity, consideration, devotion to, and reasonable expedition in, our work, dignity, freedom from outside influences, such as business and politics, self-restraint—in short good judges. With dedication each of us can be a good judge. A good public image will follow as day the night.

THE DECLINE OF RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, almost every day another petition to discontinue a major passenger train is reported in the press. So frequent have these reports been that I think Members of Congress and the American people are hard pressed to keep track of them. Thus, I was most interested to learn that the National Association of Railroad Passengers in Chicago, Ill., has conducted an exhaustive survey of the current status of long-distance passenger trains in the United States.

Among other things, the survey revealed that 75 intercity passenger trains had been discontinued between July 1 and December 31 of last year, reducing the number of intercity runs throughout the Nation to 650 compared with over 20,000 in 1929. In addition, the survey notes that another 108 applications for discontinuances of trains are pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other regulatory agencies. Should all of these petitions be granted, only 542 long-distance trains would continue to operate in the United States.

The association statement notes:

> This rash of abandonments and applications to discontinue service follows on the heels of the U.S. Post Office Department's wide-spread cancellations of railroad mail contracts and diversion of the mail to the highways and airways.

As Members of the Senate know, I have long contended that there is a close interrelationship between RPO abandonments and the decline in railway passenger service. This survey by the association points up more dramatically than anything I have ever seen the seriousness of the rail transportation problem and certainly demonstrates why the administration should change its policies to give high priority to this national catastrophe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the survey prepared by the National Association of Railroad Passengers, showing the present posture of passenger train operations in the United States, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSENGER TRAIN DISCONTINUANCE SURVEY

	Railroad																																						Total all railroads
	Alaska	A.T.S.F.	A. & W.P.	B. & O.	C. of G.	C. & O.	C. & E.I.	C. & N.W.	C.B. & Q.	C.M.S.P. & P.	C.R.I. & P.	C.S.S. & S.B.	D. & H.	D. & R.G.W.	E-L	F.E.C.	G.T.W.	G.N.	G.M. & O.	I.C.	K.C.S.	L. & N.	MoPac.	Monon.	N.Y.C.	N.Y.N.H. & H.	N. & W.	N.P.	P.R.R.	R.D.G.	S.C.L.	S.L.S.F.	Soo	S.P.	Southern	S.P. & S.	U.P.	W.P.	
Trains operated, July 1, 1967	2	42	6	22	6	24	4	16	36	30	16	24	4	6	6	2	10	20	6	28	6	16	24	2	55	58	22	14	80	4	50	2	2	22	26	6	24	2	725
Trains discontinued July 1 to Dec. 31, 1967:																																							
ICC decision	--	4	--	--	--		--	--	8	2	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	2	2	--	--	2	2	2	--	2	2	--	4	4	--	--	--	44
State commission decision	--	2	--	2	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	4	--	23
Appeal to ICC from State commission denials	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	....
Court decision	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	....
Unilateral action by railroad	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	8
Total	--	6	--	4	--	2	--	--	8	2	4	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	4	--	--	2	2	9	--	2	2	4	--	2	2	--	4	6	--	6	--	75
Train discontinuances denied by all regulatory authorities, July to December 1967	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12
Trains operated, Dec. 31, 1967	2	36	6	18	6	22	4	16	28	28	12	24	4	4	6	2	8	20	6	24	6	16	22	--	46	58	20	12	76	4	48	--	2	18	20	6	18	2	650
Pending discontinuance proceedings, Jan. 1, 1968:																																							
ICC	--	14	--	--	--	6	2	--	4	4	2	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	8	6	--	--	--	4	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	4	--	66
State commission	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	24
Appeals to ICC from State commissions	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6
Court	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Announced but not yet filed	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	10
Total	--	24	--	--	--	8	4	--	4	4	4	--	--	2	2	2	--	2	--	8	6	--	6	--	4	--	4	4	2	--	2	--	2	4	2	--	6	2	108

Sources: Official Guide of the Railways; Moody's Transportation; Traffic World; NARUC Bulletin; various press reports.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, while we are on the subject of the declining number of passenger trains, which unquestionably has been brought about by the discontinuance of Railway Post Office cars, I felt that the editorial by Luther Miller in the February 12 edition of Railway Age made an outstanding contribution to bringing the RPO controversy into focus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE EDITOR SEES IT

(By Luther Miller)

POST HASTE?

"Our railroads," grumbles a correspondent, "have been pilloried in the press and crucified in Congress for their alleged failure to haul the mails with sufficient speed and efficiency to suit the Post Office. Has anybody bothered to check up on how the airlines are doing the job, now that they have it?" The answer is yes—the airlines *have* been checked up on. And they're doing a fantastic job.

THE WAY IT WAS

Sixty-five years ago one of our Chicago editors could put a parcel of manuscripts on the "20th Century Limited" late in the afternoon, and be reasonably sure it would be in the New York office the following day. Over the years we took full advantage of this excellent service. So did millions of others.

AND THE WAY IT IS

Then the airplane came along; gradually the Post Office began to shift the bulk of its traffic from rail to air. Last year there was wholesale abandonment of Railway Post Office cars. The "20th Century Limited" was among the casualties. Up in the air went the mail. Now what happens?

HERE'S WHAT HAPPENS

On Thursday, Feb. 1, Engineering Editor Merwin Dick (Chicago) stuffed an envelope with manuscripts due in New York the next day, stamped it "Air Mail," and entrusted it to the Chicago Post Office. At about the same time Senior Editor Gus Welty (also Chicago) filled a second envelope with news stories and stamped it "Air Mail—Special Delivery." In New York, Friday came and went—but no manuscripts.

NINETY-SIX HOURS LATER

Hope springs eternal, and on Monday morning the New York copy editors and layout men were primed and waiting for the first mail. But two mail deliveries passed before the missing manuscripts limped in early in the afternoon—96 hours after being posted. The special-delivery parcel carried a stamp certifying that it was received at the New York GPO at 9:30 a.m., Monday Feb. 5. It took only three hours to travel three miles downtown—apparently the fastest leg of the journey.

WHO NEEDS IT?

Blame the weather; blame the Post Office; blame the airlines (which, reportedly, have so much mail that they sometimes stuff it into unoccupied passengers' seats); blame the railroads, if you will. But an incontrovertible fact remains: What took 24 hours by rail in 1905 took 96 hours by air last week. How much more of this kind of progress can our transportation system stand?

CHILE RATIFIES POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CONVENTION—UNITED STATES STILL MISSING FROM LIST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the total number of nations which have ratified the Political Rights of Women Convention has grown to 55.

Just recently, the Government of Chile decided that ratification of this Human Rights Convention was not only in the interest of universal establishment of human dignity, but also very much in its own national interest.

I do not believe that the people of Chile or Albania or Ghana or Pakistan care more about political equality for their female citizens than we in the United States do. But the conclusion is inescapable. These governments have all ratified the Political Rights of Women Convention and our Government has not.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of 55 nations which have ratified the Political Rights of Women Convention be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTRIES WHICH ARE PARTIES TO THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CONVENTION

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentina
Belgium
Brazil
Bulgaria
Byelorussia
Canada
Central African Republic
Chile
China
Congo (Brazzaville)
Costa Rica
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Finland
France
Gabon
Ghana
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
Iceland
India
Indonesia
Israel
Jamaica
Japan
Lebanon
Madagascar
Malawi
Mongolia
Nepal
Nicaragua
Niger
Norway
Pakistan
Phillipines
Poland
Republic of Korea
Rumania
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Sweden
Thailand
Trinidad & Tobago
Turkey
Ukraine
U.S.S.R.
United Kingdom
Yugoslavia

NEGRO LIFE AND HISTORY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last Sunday, February 11, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] was the principal speaker at the 31st annual meeting of the Pasadena Association for the Study of Negro Life and History which was held at the Beckman Auditorium on the campus of Caltech in my State.

The remarks of the Senator from Iowa are most timely and meaningful, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR JACK MILLER, OF IOWA

Today we begin National Negro History Week, and I am, indeed, most honored to open your program.

My first real, in depth contact with Negro history was during my high school days when I read a book on the life of Booker T. Washington. As you can well imagine, it left a lasting impression on me—one, I am sure, which has been of great value in my understanding of and appreciation for the contributions made by the American Negro in our march towards fulfillment of the American dream.

These contributions have been significant—not just in the world of competitive athletics (where they assuredly have merited international acclaim), but in every facet of American life: literature, painting, music, dancing, voice, sculpture, Medicine, scientific research, education, diplomacy, religion, politics, and business. Significant contributions will continue, and they will multiply.

The work of your association in furthering the study of history to fill the gap which has existed in the education of so many of our people is most commendable, because the filling of that gap is essential to the understanding and the full sense of values which must be present in a good society.

A great amount of history in Negro life has been produced in the last decade. The foundation for much of it was laid by the United States Supreme Court decision in the school desegregation cases. In 1957, the Congress, at the urging of the Administration, undertook for the first time since the Civil War to implement the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal constitution. This was essentially a voting rights Act under which the federal government, through the Department of Justice, was empowered to obtain court injunctions against obstruction or deprivation of voting rights. Another feature was the creation of the Civil Rights Commission.

In 1960, with a bipartisan majority prevailing over both those who desired more federal intervention to protect constitutional rights and those who wished none at all, the Congress approved amendments designed to strengthen the 1957 Act. The principal one was an authorization to federal judges to appoint referees to help deprived citizens register and vote. Criminal penalties were also provided for bombings and bomb threats, and also for mob action designed to obstruct court orders, whether or not any of these anti-social activities involved racial considerations.

Bipartisan efforts in Congress brought about the Civil Rights Act of 1964—"the most significant piece of legislation produced by the Congress in the 20th Century", I called it during final debate on the measure. This Act genuinely committed the nation to work to remove racially-motivated injustices and to do so within the framework of our federal constitution. There were some Members of Congress who believed that some of its provisions exceeded constitutional limits; and some lower federal courts apparently agreed. However, appellate decisions have all held in favor of constitutionality. Of almost equal significance was that, preliminary to passing the 1964 Act, the Senate, for the first time in history, voted to invoke cloture to end a fillibuster on a civil rights bill.

In addition to providing new guarantees against a denial of voting rights, the Act covered discrimination in public accommodations, employment, and federally-assisted programs; empowered the Attorney General to initiate suits to desegregate schools and public facilities; established a Community Relations Service; and extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

Notwithstanding these various Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, there still was need for a swifter mechanism to secure the right to vote to all American citizens. Recognition of this need by a bipartisan coalition brought forth the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which not only curtailed the use of voter qualifications as a device for discrimination, but also authorized direct federal action (through the Department of Justice) to protect registration and voting instead of having to resort to long, drawn out individual court actions required under previous Acts. The 1965 Act also established severe penalties for false registration, for paying someone to vote, and for accepting payment for voting—these provisions designed to protect the votes of good citizens secured by this legislation from being diluted or cancelled out.

Those who supported the 1964 and 1965 acts were persuaded that a right without a remedy isn't much of a right, and that justice delayed is justice denied. I might point out that since enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, over 500,000 Negroes have been registered in the five states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—a 72% increase in two years.

During the 1964 and 1965 debates, I well recall there was a great amount of talk about "States Rights". I happen to believe strongly in the principle of States Rights, for after all I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution; and I often join in the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag and to the Republic for which it stands—a Republic of fifty individual, sovereign states which, along with their people, retain all powers of government except those granted the federal government. But the point missed by the States Rights arguments was that these rights have correlative states responsibilities which, when not lived up to, leave an affected citizen with no recourse except through action by the federal government. At the same time, it was intended that such action under these Acts be in reasonable consonance with the preservation of states rights. Thus, the 1964 Act, for the most part, gives the states an opportunity to carry out their responsibilities first; and then, if they don't do so promptly, the federal government will step in.

To those of our citizens who had been deprived of their constitutional rights, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 was a national expression of good faith and trust that, upon securing their rights, these citizens would reciprocate that faith and trust by living up to the responsibilities accompanying those rights. For example:

The right to vote has a correlative responsibility to do one's political homework; to know whom and what one is voting for; to vote intelligently and not, for instance, to vote superficially for the candidate who happens to promise the *most*, but rather for the candidate who makes responsible promises and matches his promises with deeds; to bear in mind Jefferson's warning that majority rule is no guaranty against despotism; that the necessary and sufficient conditions to the success of the great American Experiment in self-government is consent of the elightened majority.

The right to equal educational opportunities has a correlative responsibility to work hard in school, to develop one's God-given talents, to not become a "dropout"—a responsibility shared by both parent and child. Moreover, as President Nabrit of Howard University so aptly said last year: "The student has responsibilities to his fellow members of the University community, the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights which promote essential purposes and processes of this community."

The right to equal employment opportunities has a correlative responsibility to acquire skills, to work hard and honorably, to be tolerant of one's fellow-employees and loyal to one's employer, and to seek advancement on the basis of merit.

Finally, the enjoyment of all these rights carries with it the responsibility to join with one's neighbors in uplifting one's community, in exerting one's influence towards observance of the law, respecting other people's rights and property, and not to look the other way when the good name of one's community is being harmed.

During the 1964 debate, I observed that we must never forget that in a democracy the force of public opinion will make or break any law passed by a legislative body. At that point of history in 1964, public opinion decided that racially-motivated injustice had to go. But public opinion can change, and it is generally agreed that since 1964 the riots and demonstrations resulting in injury to innocent people and their property have adversely affected public opinion. As the Washington Evening Star recently put it: "If there is any area of the national life in which Americans can truly be said to be color blind, it is in the area of crime. The victims or their survivors couldn't care less about the color of the criminal. They want him caught. Or, even better, they want the crime prevented."

There are extremists who seem bent on changing public opinion back—communists and fellow travelers, paid trouble makers and cowards who burn or bomb churches, homes, and shops, and un-American groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Muslims. They have received publicity out of all proportion to their true importance, and this publicity has not only encouraged them in their misguided activities, but it has had a detrimental impact on public opinion. I hope that members of the press will recognize this and realize they, along with all responsible citizens, have a responsibility in not aiding and abetting a backward step in public opinion.

The challenge is to move public opinion forward—not backwards. The proceedings of the Third Conference on Federal Civil Rights Legislation at the University of Notre Dame a year ago points the way. The Conference found that legal remedies now exist for most of the traditional forms of discrimination practiced under color of law or official action, but that passage of civil rights laws has generated expectations that are still far short of fulfillment; that persistence of the wide gap between law and achievement presents a serious danger of disillusionment over the effectiveness—and, worse, the good faith—of the federal government. I might add, the federal government mirrors public opinion.

The Conference well said "the achievement of equal opportunity requires that both real opportunity and really equal access to it be provided simultaneously." For example, and I quote: "equal job opportunity means nothing to the individual who has been deprived of the necessary education and training to qualify for it. Similarly, equal job opportunity is an empty promise unless enough jobs of the right kind are available for those who need them." In this connection, the Conference recommended greater federal support for expanded on the job training programs that would include disadvantaged persons not currently eligible. When it called for the "right kind" of jobs, the Conference was talking especially about jobs in private industry—not federal handouts and artificial make-work programs without a future. This is why government programs simply must enlist the assistance of business and industry. Moreover, the Conference was not thinking only of the cities, but of all sectors of our society. We should remember that nearly half the poor families in the nation live in the rural areas.

In referring to the Employment Act of 1946, which commits the federal government to creating and maintaining conditions of full employment and maximum purchasing power, the Conference impliedly criticised the inflation which is sweeping our country today. This has accompanied the multi-billion dollar deficits voted for by a majority of the Members of Congress, and it is well known that increases in the cost of living hurt low income people worst of all. Inflation in 1967 amounted to $25 billion, and California's share of this was the equivalent of an 8% sales tax on the backs of every man, woman, and child in this state—rich and poor alike. It won't do for the federal government to aid the poor with the right hand and then, with its left hand, stab the poor with the knife of inflation.

There are other significant pages of history in Negro life being written today in a far away land called South Vietnam. War is always a terrible tragedy—both in human and material resources. We are troubled when we realize how much of our national budget goes for war when there is so much that needs to be done here at home. But we must understand that if those who believe the individual exists to serve the government—not the government to serve the individual, who believe in aggression by force, who believe in violence and terror for political ends, who despise freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion—if those possessing these attitudes prevail, then material progress here at home will not be worth much.

It has been said that this war is a set-back for the cause of civil rights, because resources needed to wage the war on poverty are being wasted in our war effort. On the contrary, I suggest that history will show that the cause of civil rights has been served with more far-reaching positive effects than all the money that would otherwise be going to deal with the poverty problem. History is filled with examples of heroism of Negro members of our armed forces during all of our wars. After World War I, General Pershing said: "I cannot commend too highly the spirit shown among the colored combat troops." In World War II, members of the 92d Infantry Regiment—a Negro unit—received over 12,000 decorations and awards for fighting in the Italian campaign—many of them awarded posthumously. In the Korean War, in just fourteen months, members of the Negro 24th Infantry Regiment received two Congressional Medals of Honor, nine Distinguished Service Crosses, 300 Silver Stars, 500 Bronze Stars for valor, two Legion of Merits, and 65 Commendation Ribbons. This heroism is being exemplified by Negro fighting men in South Vietnam today. But most important, this is the first war in which all military units are fully integrated, and no amount of money spent on the poverty war could inspire the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God which is being born out of the blood, sweat and tears of our boys over there in the foxholes, the bunkers, the rice paddies, the ships in the Tonkin gulf, the aircraft over North Vietnam, and the hospitals.

There are a few cynics who have suggested that these boys will return to the United States—the Negroes to lead the riots in our cities and their white comrades to fight against them. But I believe that history will show that they will, instead, return to join hands and hearts and minds in the common cause of justice, tolerance, and brotherly love.

I would like to read the recent citation of a young Negro soldier upon his award of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

"Private First Class Milton L. Olive, III, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty while participating in a search and destroy operation in the vicinity of Phu Cuong, Republic of Vietnam, on 22 October 1965. Private Olive was a member of the 3d Platoon of Company B, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 503d Infantry, as it moved through the jungle to find the Viet Cong operating in the Area. Although the Platoon was subjected to a heavy volume of enemy gun fire and pinned down temporarily, it retaliated by assaulting the Viet Cong positions, causing the enemy to flee. As the Platoon pursued the insurgents. Private Olive and four other soldiers were moving through the jungle together when a grenade was thrown into their midst. Private Olive saw the grenade, and then saved the lives of his fellow soldiers by grabbing the grenade in his hand and falling on it to absorb the blast with his body. Through his bravery, unhesitating actions, and complete disregard for his own safety, he prevented additional loss of life or injury to the members of his platoon. Private Olive's conspicuous gallantry, extraordinary heroism, and intrepidity at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty are in the highest traditions of the United States Army and reflect great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of his country."

My friends, Milton Olive will not be returning to the United States to lead a riot. The Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously.

JUVENILE CRIME IN VFW MAGAZINE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, crime is becoming, indeed it has already become, the principal threat faced by the young people of America on their road to maturity as successful, productive citizens.

The adolescent years are really a crossroads, the time of decision for our young. They are no longer children, but not yet fuly grown and mature. They are not yet ready to participate in all of adult life, and yet they have left behind the playthings of their childhood.

It is during these years that time hangs heavily on their hands. The lack of direction and the need to fulfill a natural desire for accomplishment and recognition combine with the all too often result that a juvenile turns to crime to distinguish himself among his friends.

There is a gap in the home life of the teenager created when parents are caught up in the family-defeating pursuits of an acquisitive society. The price of keeping up with Jones' second car is often both parents away from home working, and a house is not a home without parents.

So now add to the cost of that second car the life of an adolescent who, at the crossroads, turned to juvenile crime for something to occupy his time while rattling around in a house without parents.

The government and the community is doing much to fill the gap in the home life of a teenager. More must be done to give teenagers a sense of purpose, that secret ingredient which distinguishes the delinquent juvenile from the successful juvenile.

The February issue of VFW, the monthly magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, publishes a thoughful article by William D. Schul, staff member, the Menninger Foundation, which discusses this facet of the juvenile delinquency problem. It is entitled "Delinquency: Its Cause and Cure." I recommend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELINQUENCY: ITS CAUSE AND CURE

(By William D. Schul)

"Johnny, you have left me no choice. I am going to send you to the Boys Industrial School."

Frightened and bewildered, the 15-year-old youth looked over at his huddled parents, took in the unmoving court officials and turned back to the judge. His mouth worked several times before he managed, "Well, a guy has to have somethin' to do!"

The retort was not meant for anyone in particular. It was a cry against the forces which had conspired against him: a summer vacation without a job, a house emptied by working parents, endless days with nothing to do but hang out on the streets and try to overcome boredom. This last demand had finally been met by stealing cars and breaking into vending machines.

Such tragedies and waste in young life have come in the wake of great social and economic changes which have altered the patterns of childhood and adolescence.

It wasn't too many years ago that the kindly reader could weep over tales of spindly urchins slaving 12 hours a day in coal mines, or the pallid little ragamuffin braving the wintry blasts to peddle his newspapers in order to take bread home to an invalid mother.

It was well that the reader did respond to these heartbreakers. Much in the same manner that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* contributed to emancipation and temperance plays to prohibition, these stories helped bring about laws governing social welfare, child labor and mandatory school attendance during the early part of this century.

Before the enactment of these laws, the protection of children depended upon the interest and capabilities of their parents. They attended school only if their parents so desired and if they could be spared from bearing their part of the family workload. Employment of the young depended upon the whims of the employer. If a child committed a crime, he was tried under the same laws and faced the same penalties as an adult.

Aroused federal and state legislatures, through enactment of welfare laws, reduced the abuse and neglect of children. The mandatory school attendance laws promised at least some education to all children. Federal and state child-labor laws prohibited employment of young children and limited employment of older youngsters to non-hazardous jobs during hours when school was not in session. Juvenile laws placed the jurisdiction over juveniles in juvenile courts, starting in Cook County, Illinois in 1899. The juvenile court, considered as a substitute parent, provided special treatment for young offenders.

Yet, this evolution spawned a new tragedy which is drawing its share of tears from parents, judges and educators. One must question now whether the elimination of these injustices wasn't too thoroughly accomplished.

Consider the 14-year-old lad who wants a part-time job but can't get one because of his state's child-labor laws. Since both parents work, he doesn't like to go home after school so he loiters on the streets with other boys. They are always looking for something to do, trying to figure out ways of getting some money.

I marvel sometimes that we do not have a much higher rate of delinquency among teenagers. At this age the human body has an amazing amount of vitality and it seems the height of folly for us to believe the teenager can make constructive use of his many leisure hours. Despite its mileage, the adage, "Idleness is the devil's workshop," is still valid.

J. Edgar Hoover told me that we can expect nearly one million crimes by teenagers this year.

Perhaps of even greater consequence than child labor laws are changes occurring in the home. Before the era of economic plenty the family was a closely-knit unit with the father as the final authority. Children learned strict discipline at an early age and helped out with the family workload.

Came the great industrial explosion with technological advances and, in its wake changes in American thinking.

The father, in his search for larger paychecks—material things became the staus symbol—relinquished all child-rearing duties and most of the authority of the home to the mother. Father became less dominant and mother became more assertive.

The mother, faced with a role for which she was not physically, tempermentally nor psychologically fitted, became frustrated and the children, used to being told explicitly what they could or could not do, no longer felt the security of well-drawn boundary lines.

The mother, fearing the loss of her children's affection, perhaps found it increasingly difficult to deprive her offspring of pleasures as a method of punishment. Good behavior was often bought through gifts, over-protectiveness, over-love, over-possessiveness and over-indulgence. Many children reacted to this flexible discipline with rebellion and disrespect.

During this period of struggle between mothers and their offspring, John Dewey's theory of progressive education came into its own. Many educators and psychologists embraced this new philosophy of allowing children to express themselves freely. This doctrine of permissiveness often gave the frustrated mother the reassurance that the non-disciplinary approach to child-raising was the right one.

In the opinion of some authorities, this inaugurated an era of juvenile domination. Family activities centered around Junior's demands and the spoiled adolescent became the new autocrat. Contributing nothing to the family upkeep, the adolescent became a consumer without being also a producer.

Underlying all theories of child-rearing—and lending an air of urgency to them—is the greater theory that man, except for hereditary factors, is exclusively a product of his environment. Especially his environment during his first years of life.

True or not, if one accepts this theory without qualification, it is not too difficult to then surrender all individual responsibility. For if a man's behavior is set in infancy, he may well look upon himself as being a chip tossed helplessly by forces beyond his control.

I believe that this doctrine of placing responsibility somewhere other than within oneself is eroding the moral fiber of many young people today.

Today's teenager has become a special breed. So often, he is not taught responsibility and is not held morally or legally responsible by society. Consequently, he does not feel responsible. He does not find himself an integral part of the family where his services are needed, and beyond this threshold, too, he learns he is a consumer but not a producer.

"Who needs me?" a new member at a state reformatory asked me recently. The question is being asked by many young people.

The evolution we have been considering so far is one that has taken place mainly in middle and upper class families. The evolution taking place among lower class families is of quite a different nature and might be termed The Great Welfare Tragedy.

With the coming of the industrial revolution, threats to individual rights came from the great industrial empires, which could and often did exploit their employees. Consequently, there was a shift in emphasis in our laws—from the protection of the property owner to the protection of the individual.

Noble in their concept of protecting persons from exploitation, the trade unions, the new federal and state laws, and the welfare programs unwittingly gave birth to selfish expectations, creating a feeling of dependency and loss of purpose. Worth became no longer a matter of accomplishment but simply a matter of being.

Accepting public assistance has come to be considered an honorable career, with politicians weeping over welfare recipients and courting their favor. The youngster of a family whose "breadwinner" is on the public dole sees little reason to finish school to get a $50-a-week job when one can get that much without working.

Dr. Marston McCluggage, sociologist at the University of Kansas, predicts that if present trends continue, by 1975 half of the male population of this country will be dependent upon the other half.

But as Dr. Karl Menninger of the Menninger Foundation in Topeka says, "Human behavior forever thwarts the charted course. Man not only survives, but he perseveres and prevails." And definite hopeful signs are beginning to appear.

The idea of individual responsibility is being resurrected. And the shouldering of this responsibility demands education and training. Vocational education facilities are springing up throughout the country to train the unskilled and to retrain displaced workers under the Federal Manpower Development Act. Conservation camps for the young are growing in number, as are "work-reation" programs which combine part-time employment and recreational activities for teenagers during the summer months. An increasing number of communities are subsidizing employers who will train apprentices.

We are re-learning that individual worth, self-respect and a sense of purpose come to a person only through his own efforts to help himself and that philosophies which contribute to dependency undermine the morale fiber of the individual—and eventually the nation.

This is the lesson we must teach our youth.

LAZINESS: A GROWING PROBLEM AMONG AMERICANS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the February 2, 1968, issue of the Morgantown, W. Va., Post entitled "Laziness: A Growing Problem Among Americans."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LAZINESS A GROWING PROBLEM AMONG AMERICANS

"We have too many people in this country who think they can work eight hours and sleep eight hours in the same eight hours."

Calvin Dean Johnson, an official of a large office machine firm, delivered this indictment of a growing number of workers at a national convention the other day.

An apparent "anti-work movement" in America is approaching critical stage, a nationwide survey by an insurance company indicates.

Twenty-five to thirty per cent of the work force dislike their work, according to studies cited by Dr. Charles S. Dewey, consulting psychologist in Chicago and professor of industrial psychology at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

"Our problem is that so many of our people have been working at such a slow pace for so long that they don't realize they aren't doing a good job," said the training director of a transportation company. "We have become so accustomed to mediocrity that we accept it as normal."

Absenteeism, a symptom of estrangement from work, cost American industry $10 billion in lost but paid-for labor in 1966. An average of more than two million employees are absent every day. The hours they don't work are three to six per cent of the total possible work hours, says Jerry D. Adams, management consultant in San Antonio and an expert on absenteeism.

Nearly three million employees stretched their weekend by an extra day last summer, according to a national survey. An estimated one-half of them were only sick characterwise.

An "incredible correlation" exists between absenteeism and major sports events, according to Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., New York. A study in an oil refinery in the southwest uncovered an inverse relation between man daily temperature and absenteeism rate.

Even when they're at work, many employees are "absent." A personnel man calls this phenomenon "on-the-job absenteeism." In a cartoon the boss is saying to an employee who has asked for a raise. "I know you've been with us for 30 years, but how long have you worked here?"

In many offices, factories and stores, the surest way to be blackballed is to voluntarily do more work than required.

By their laziness, employees often are counteracting the effects of routine, isolation and oversimplification produced by modern industrial methods, the Northwestern National Life survey report stated.

Nevertheless, most people must work, whether they like it or not. J. Pieper gave one reason for work in his book, "Leisure, the Basis of Culture." "One must work if not from taste, then at least from despair," he wrote. "For to reduce everything to a single truth, work is less boring than pleasure."

Millions of Americans would disagree. Nothing, they would say, is more boring than work when it is sliced up into trivial, repetitive tasks as many jobs are in our technological society. This is the basic reason why some people are "non-oriented to productivity," as a certain Irish industrialist describes his lazy employees.

One reason for wanting work motivation is an increase in job and pay-check security that reduces the urgency about providing for physical needs.

A tight labor market makes it possible for an employee to risk laziness. He feels sure that if he gets a pink slip with his paycheck, he can walk down the street and get another job, and he probably can.

Many people are "distracted" by pleasure and leisure, says Dr. Dewey. Too much leisure and comfort tend to suppress interest in work.

Some people actually are allergic to work, in a medical sense. According to a report submitted to a recent medical conference in Caramanica, Italy, muscular activity can release an excessive amount of histamine, a powerful chemical stimulant, into body tissues, causing rashes and allergies.

"Young rebels" in the work force seem to be especially cursed with work alienation. A minority of new male employees are "rebellious youngsters who don't care much about work, but care intensely about making trouble for those who do," says a labor relations vice president.

Robert Newcomb and Marge Sammons, husband and wife who operate a Chicago firm that specializes in employees communications, report that they "fairly often encounter the cynical, sometimes even belligerent new, young employee."

They seem to feel that the world owes them a living. Many were raised in affluent families in which they enjoyed luxuries and privileges they don't earn. When they begin their first jobs and find that they must work for their rewards, they rebel.

Despite the visibility of laziness in America, hard work hasn't gone out of style. Some people still grieve that each day has only 24 hours. They relish challenge and achievement, or they are motivated by altruism or a social consciousness. It never occurs to them not to bolt down their meals and leap out of bed in the morning so they can get on with their work.

They would disagree with Jerome Jerome, English humorist and playwright who died in 1827, who said: "I like work. It fascinates me. I can sit and look at it for hours."

They would agree with Voltaire, the French philosopher, who said: "Not to be occupied and not to exist amount to the same thing."

Another good solution to the laziness problem seems to have occurred only to Calvin Johnson who advised: "Let's get back to work."

TET ATTACKS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an interesting editorial appeared in the February 14, 1968, issue of the Hampshire Review, a weekly newspaper published in Romney, W. Va. The editorial is entitled "Tet Attacks." I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TET ATTACKS

The Communist attacks that resulted in the devastation of nearly every major city of South Vietnam are having a profound effect on the attitude of the American people towards the war we are waging for the freedom of that country. Coming as they did on the day of the Vietnamese New Year—known as Tet—they shocked the sensibilities of even the Viet Cong supporters in this and other countries because this has always heretofore been the first day of a cease-fire period and had been so proclaimed this year.

The brilliant coordination of the attacks and the havoc that was wrought on the cities and the civilian population by the attacks and the counter attacks by American and South Vietnamese troops have caused many to reassess their thinking about the war. Most of us had been led to believe that the cities of South Vietnam were completely secure from anything more than an occasional terrorists bombing and that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces had been so weakened by the long fighting and mounting casualties that they would be unable to mount any kind of major assault anywhere except near the Demilitarized Zone.

A great many people here at home had begun to feel impatient that we were taking so long to bring defeat to a motley collection of guerrillas mixed with a few units of the regular forces of the Communist country to the north. Many of the self-designated experts whose knowledge was sometimes, although not always, based on a brief VIP visit to Southeast Asia, were basing their criticism of our policies on the theory that we were using too much time, men and material to defeat such a small opponent, that it was wrong for a mighty nation like the United States to pick on him, and even that it was somehow unfair for us to use our vast resources and modern, sophisticated weapons and equipment against the little peasants armed with obsolete hand weapons.

Suddenly we were faced with the fact that the enemy was a great deal stronger and better organized than we thought. Out of hiding came a well trained, well organized and well equipped force of considerable magnitude in a marvelously conceived and coordinated attack that raged the length and breadth of the land. Why it was done and what the enemy hoped to achieve by it is still a matter of speculation as is its eventual effect on the course of the war. The immediate result has been to bring home to the people of the United States the realization that we are embroiled in a major military effort against a major enemy and a rising determination to see it through.

BLACK FRONT BACKING FOR MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Robert C. Maynard entitled "Black Front Will Back King, Join Fight Against Freeways," which appeared in the February 15, 1968, edition of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BLACK FRONT WILL BACK KING, JOIN FIGHT AGAINST FREEWAYS

(By Robert C. Maynard)

The Black United Front, a civil rights coalition operating behind closed doors here for more than a month, spelled out its purposes and participants to the public yesterday.

At a packed press conference of more than 50 reporters and photographers at the New School of Afro-American Thought, 2208 14th st. nw., five spokesmen of the Front announced that:

It would support the aims of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's April campaign for aid to poor.

Membership of individuals and organizations in the front is now wide open, but the organizations must be at least half Negro and send a Negro delegate.

The Front will support the local fight against freeways in Negro neighborhoods.

About 75 organizations now hold membership but the number of individual members will not be disclosed.

The purpose of the organization is to help "all black people in the District of Columbia . . . obtain a rightful and proportionate share in the decision-making councils . . . and proportionate control of the economic institutions of the black community."

Stokely Carmichael, who called the coalition together early in January and who was identified yesterday as the temporary chairman, remained silent throughout the 40-minute press conference.

"Why can't Carmichael speak if he's the chairman?"

"The trouble is," the Rev. Channing E. Phillips said, as the discussion became more heated, "Black folks and white folks have different conceptions of the function of a chairman."

Carmichael and others in the Front have said they do not want the organization to bear the image of any individual.

The spokesmen yesterday, in addition to Mr. Phillips, were Calvin Rolark, publisher of the Washington Informer, a weekly newspaper; the Rev. David Eaton, executive director of the Opportunities Industrialization Center; Marion Barry of Pride, Inc., and C. Sumner Stone Jr., former aide to unseated Harlem Congressman Adam Clayton Powell.

Questioned sharply by reporters about being all-Negro, Front spokesmen remained firm on the point.

"Why shouldn't there be an organization that is all for black people?" said Stone. "You don't see any Italians in the Polish-American Association . . . or any Irishmen on the board of B'nai B'rith."

Pursuing the argument, a reporter asked about possible membership for white persons with strong liberal identification in the community. "Take Joe Rauh, for example," he said.

The question was never finished, because the Front officials roared with laughter. "You take Joe Rauh," one of them said.

"He sold out black people at the '64 convention," shouted Stone. The discussion ended there.

Attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr. is active here in Americans for Democratic Action and in the Democratic primary campaign of Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.), who is challenging President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

Regarding Dr. King's April campaign for jobs, the Front spokesmen made it clear that endorsement of his goals did not mean endorsement or rejection of his nonviolent tactics. While all-out support for Dr. King may be forthcoming from some of the individuals, the Front limited itself to endorsing his goals.

For the first time, the Front made public the names of its Board of Conveners, the committee responsible for the group's administration.

The list released yesterday follows:

Louise Barrow, local representative of the National Welfare Rights Organization; Barry; Marshall Brown of SNCC; Carmichael; Mr. Eaton; the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, local representative of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and vice chairman of City Council; Dr. Nathan Hare, who is leaving Washington for a post at San Francisco State College; James W. Reese II; Charles Jones of Access, an open-housing group; Doug Jones, of the New School of Afro-American Thought; Herb Kelsey of the United Planning Organization; Kenneth C. Kennedy, Northeast Model Inner-City Coordinating Committee, and Mr. Phillips, head of Housing Development Corp.

Also, the Rev. Jefferson P. Rogers of the Church of the Redeemer and a member of the SCLC board of directors: Stone and Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY GOV. SPIRO T. AGNEW, OF MARYLAND, AT FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEGE

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, former Senator Harry P. Cain has taken an active role in the rejuvenation and relocation of Florida Memorial College, a predominantly Negro institution in Dade County, Fla. Formerly located in St. Augustine, the college recently was moved to Miami, and with its program of expansion will eventually accommodate 2,000 students. This expansion has been greatly contributed to by former Senator Cain's devoted attention. More than $8 million has been raised in pledges and cash, some of it at a testimonial dinner in honor of Senator Cain which was held in Miami on December 11.

I invite attention to the extraordinary testimonial dinner at which the Governor of Maryland, Hon. Spiro T. Agnew, was the guest speaker. I might say, in a personal reference, that a testimonial dinner was given for me that same night, December 11; and when the Governor of Maryland put the question to me, I urged him to keep the Florida Memorial College engagement.

His remarks are so illuminating on the question of our country's situation with respect to higher education, the work of the State of Maryland, and what needs to be done about this critically important question that I ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. SPIRO T. AGNEW AT DINNER HONORING FORMER U.S. SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN AND THE ADVENT OF FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEGE, MIAMI, DEAUVILLE HOTEL, MIAMI, FLA., DECEMBER 11, 1967

Tonight is essentially a double celebration and therefore, I am doubly grateful for your invitation. For tonight we honor a life of distinguished service and celebrate the prospects for a college of distinction.

While some private citizens are fortunate enough to go through life without encountering moral conflict, few public officials have the opportunity to avoid such confrontations. While private citizens may speak out or make "a separate peace" on the issues of the day, their courage or complacence rarely affects their careers. However, when a public official refuses to compromise his conscience and consistently counters the current of popular will, it is bound to affect his career and consequently, requires special courage.

It is the kind of courage that the eminent Eighteenth Century Jurist, Edmund Burke, had in mind when he wrote: "Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Senator Harry Cain's life has been characterized by this special courage. Early in World War II, as Mayor of Tacoma, Harry Cain stood almost alone among West Coast elected officials in his opposition to the internment of Japanese-American citizens.

If Senator Cain's convictions on fundamental rights and human liberty had been cerebral in Tacoma in 1942, they became visceral in Germany in 1945, when the then Colonel Cain viewed the horrors of Nazi concentration camps.

In a speech before the authorities and citizens of the German town of Hagenau—a populace assembled to view the burial of two hundred Jewish victims destroyed in the local camp—Colonel Cain said: "These dead who lie here were driven and starved and beaten to slake the unholy thirst of your German war machine. . . . The Allies shudder because they never dreamed or visualized that human leadership, supported by the masses, could so debase itself as to be responsible for results like those who lie in these open graves. The civilized world shudders on finding that a part of its society has fallen so low. . . . If there *be* a soul within the German nation it will rise now to make impossible the doing of such future wrong. If there *not* be a soul in this German nation, its future is forlorn and totally lacking in hope."

Almost a decade later in 1954, Senator Cain, as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, saw the soul of the American nation threatened by injustices not so grave in impact but in implication.

Deeply disturbed by what he regarded as violations of fundamental liberties, Senator Cain noted that injustices, completely out of consonance with the American tradition, were being perpetrated against employees of the Federal government and against many citizens as well.

His own words say best why, as he has put it, "I would not remain silent and live with myself":

"Our exaggerated fear . . . (Senator Cain has written) had become a plague. It led brother to spy on brother, as in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. It broke the lives of many decent little people, who, in a number of cases, were convicted by malicious rumor, plain dirty lies and the words of professional informers. The victims were thrown out of jobs and their characters stained. . . . It mocked our American justice with a security net that touched one out of every ten adults in the United States."

As expected, Senator Cain was fiercely denounced by those he describes, with great insight, as being "more concerned with politics than justice." But in his temerity and determination to speak up, he demonstrated what a New York Times editorial declared to be "courage unique in the political scene."

Harry Cain, characteristically modest about his role in those tempestuous days a decade ago and about the significance of his actions, describes his behavior as that of a *true conservative*. He has portrayed himself as "a basically conservative person—meaning conservative to include *respect for individual rights*." "Every government worker," he insists, "must be loyal and reliable, but there is no reason why he must be rigidly orthodox in his thinking. There is every reason to encourage the iconoclast *as well* as the conformist to serve the Republic on the public payroll you taxpayers support. Whether in or out of government, the orthodox mind, because of its strength and singleness of purpose, *maintains and preserves progress*, but the dreamer and the non-conformist *make* progress. The opportunity to be different while being strictly loyal is a climate we ought to take pains to develop."

Harry Cain's brand of conservatism is thus one involving the conservation of human dignity and the protection of individual freedom.

Thus at home and abroad, Harry Cain decided—as the poet put it—in the strife of truth with falsehood, to choose the good, and avoid the evil side.

Later, Harry Cain looked southward to

Miami and to another career in which his many talents could be utilized! For it was to be this move to Miami that would provide us with the basis of tonight's testimonial to him and our salute to the college which he serves as patron and friend.

It is not surprising that this conservator of human liberty should be in the vanguard of the crusade to bring new life and location to Florida Memorial College.

In associating himself with the present welfare and future of Florida Memorial College, he demonstrates further his conviction that the struggle for human dignity will be won in the last analysis through the liberating process of education.

I am sure that these present enterprises of his are most congenial to Harry Cain. Indeed, there are few things more exciting or rewarding than participating in the development of a college. For one of the most characteristic and stimulating features of American education and of American society in recent years has been the virtual tidal wave of youth washing through the corridors of higher education.

Never before and never anywhere else have so many youngsters had access to such an extended educational opportunity. And opportunity it is. The classic cliché of our time remains profoundly true: Ours is a world of such social and technological complexity that no man can be well enough educated. Therefore, for this opportunity to be a bona fide one, there must be quality and relevance in the exposure to college.

What are these elements of quality and relevance that we hope to see in Florida Memorial College and in every college throughout America?

The first is inner coherence. A criticism often heard today is that our nation's colleges represent a society without inner coherence—that they reflect two worlds. One of these college worlds, the criticism goes, is the province of the faculty—rationalistic and detached in outlook, isolating the individual from the surge and uproar of the world outside.

The other college world, the critics say, is the province of the student—pragmatic in outlook and very much involved in that surge and uproar.

Admittedly, the criticism may be overdrawn. But it contains a degree of validity. A college cannot exclusively be an asylum for elderly research scholars any more than it can be exclusively a forum for student protest. The function of higher education must be social and cultural as well as intellectual. Even better, it should be a union of these three.

This brings me to the second element of collegiate quality—relevance to the pressing issues of the day. Of necessity the academic community—students and faculty alike—must function in the world outside and relate to events, conditions and obligations which they probably cannot and certainly should not escape. If a college cannot address itself to these issues, imparting to its student body an attitude and an appetite to confront contemporary challenges, it is not functioning at full force. It is failing its student body.

As the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead once remarked: *"So far as the mere imparting of information is concerned,* no university has any justification for existence since the popularization of printing in the fifteenth century . . . the justification for a university (for a college too, we may add) is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, by uniting the young and the old in the imaginative consideration of learning."

Unless Whitehead's stricture is seriously understood and used as a guide to action, I fear that our colleges may become what some have described as a world of planned juvenility—a world which has little, if any, functional relevance to the life from which the student comes or that into which he will presumably enter after graduation.

I know that many college people are aware of this and are working toward a better balanced, reality-oriented curriculum. I am proud that the higher educational institutions of my State have devised, and are continuing to experiment with, a variety of programs and projects to meet this problem.

We are taking a serious look at current curricula and developing a new set of intellectual and academic priorities which will prepare our undergraduates not only to function in, but to contribute to their communities. Particular emphasis has been placed upon creating curricula in fields where professional personnel shortages are acute and in areas that the academic community has long neglected—such as law enforcement and police science.

In teacher education we are moving to institute attitude training as a co-equal partner of academic learning. The knowledge explosion is so great that we cannot aspire to teach secure, technical truths but we can provide our youth with the attitude to adopt and the aptitude to learn through a mastery of the learning process. We are also preparing our teachers to address the immediate social and environmental problems of our day within the context of classroom routine. Prejudice and pollution, crime and delinquency, narcotics and sex can be handled skillfully and sensitively if our teachers are properly trained.

Finally, in Maryland, State government has won the cooperation of the academic community in the creation of a Graduate Corps which will unite graduate and undergraduate classroom work with work experience in State administration. It is our hope that by providing opportunity and exposure we will attract more of Maryland's talented students to careers of public service.

This naturally leads into the third element of collegiate quality—involvement in and contribution to the immediate community. Each campus has the potential not only to cultivate its students' intellects but to bring culture and thought stimulation to the total mature community. By sponsoring informal lecture series, art shows, concerts and theater productions, the college can become the cultural patron of the community.

At the same time political, social and economic researchers can gain by using their communities as living laboratories . . . and in turn their discoveries may well bring increased insight, progress and reform to the community.

Florida Memorial College has a great opportunity to create those qualities as it constructs its new campus; and I would hope that it would use this hiatus in its historical development to consider what new and special contributions it can bring to Miami. Certainly because it is a predominantly Negro institution, but one which welcomes qualified students of all races, creeds and nationalities, the Negro community can take pride in being the host rather than the guest on this sparkling new campus.

Certainly, the spirit in which this new campus has been founded, with generous support and tremendous interest provided by both races, is a cause for pride and an expression of true mutual respect and responsibility that does all Miami credit. This campus represents an island and a hope that our fundamental faith in brotherhood is not sham sentiment, and as such it is making a contribution to Miami, to Florida, to the United States and its image throughout the world.

It would be presumptuous for me to prescribe in detail what should be done to unify life with learning on the Florida Memorial campus. Only the faculty, administration and trustees of this institution, with *responsible* student participation, can appraise the situation and shape the strategies and the tactics. A Nigerian proverb says, "The owner of the house knows where the roof leaks."

Seventy-five years ago a few farsighted, public-spirited Christian leaders founded this college. Although tonight we pay tribute to present leaders and a future campus, we also celebrate the continuity of a tradition expressed by the college's ideals—character, leadership and service. In the years ahead, the college will continue to draw inspiration from its founders, its officials and faculty. Yet, it is my hope that it will supplement this by translating the special courage of its special patron—Senator Harry Cain—into meaningful programs and challenging curricula on controversial, contemporary issues. Above all, I hope that Miami's Florida Memorial College, within as well as without, shall reflect not only the sparkle of new steel but the far brighter glow from the spirit of brotherhood, good will and good faith among men, a spirit that is so much a part of its new campus.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARTIN LUTHER KING'S PLAN TO PROTEST IS DECRIED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of yesterday entitled "King's Plan To Protest Is Decried."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING'S PLAN TO PROTEST IS DECRIED

L. Brent Bozell warned members of the District Bar Association last night that if the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's poor people's camp-in in Washington this April is permitted to succeed it will have a devastating effect on law enforcement across the country.

Bozell, former editor of William Buckley's National Review and a panelist on "Protest and the Law" at the Mayflower Hotel, said he saw no difference between Stokley Carmichael's methods and those announced by Dr. King for the camp-in.

"It is an attempt to strike fear in Congress and stampede it into acceding to Dr. King's demands," Bozell said. "It will be the first wave. But there will be a second . . . and people will proceed in the Nation without any thought for law whatever."

Bozell, Buckley's brother-in-law, also said the Administration and Congress had undermined respect for law by scorning the Constitution and waging a war in Vietnam without declaring war.

A second panelist, Michael E. Tigar, Berkeley law graduate who lost a Supreme Court clerkship in 1966 after protests by right wing elements, likened today's draft-card burners to suffragettes, abolitionists and labor stickers. "Our country is healthier because these people violated the law to awaken a sleeping government," he said.

Tigar, now with Edward Bennett Williams' law firm here, cited the Selective Service Act as an example of a law that cannot be protested unless they are violated, since Congress has prohibited legal challenge of the laws.

Tigar said that unless the government found ways of acceding to just demands of black Americans and war protesters, then it is bound to be confronted with civil disorder.

The third panelist, Robert E. Jordan III, deputy general counsel of the Army, told the group that all protesters must remember that the First Amendment protects speech, not acts, and that the Government cannot accept the obstruction of Government as a legitimate form of protest.

DR. KING TO MEET WITH MAYOR ON BIG MARCH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Paul Delaney, Star staff writer, under date of February 14, 1968, entitled "King To Meet With Mayor on Big March," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING TO MEET WITH MAYOR ON BIG MARCH—FAUNTROY SAYS PLAN FOR JOBS CAMPAIGN WILL BE PRESENTED

(By Paul Delaney)

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. will meet with Mayor Walter E. Washington in the next few weeks to inform him of plans for the massive demonstrations that King hopes to launch here in April.

City Council Vice Chairman Walter E. Fauntroy, who heads the local unit of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said yesterday that a meeting between King and the mayor would be "very useful" before the nonviolent demonstrations begin.

"I'm sure that when Dr. King's plans for the spring campaign are finalized, he'll want to apprise the mayor of them," Fauntroy said. "And I'm sure the mayor will want to meet with him."

Mayor Washington, when asked at a press conference yesterday if he felt such a meeting would be in the best interests of the city, replied: "I suppose so, at the proper time."

PLANNING FOR CONTROL

As the city's top officials indicated that efforts would be made to insure order during King's "poor people's" demonstration for jobs and income, the man who coordinated the Army's response to the massive peace march on the Pentagon last October said the government must be willing to "make a tremendous commitment of resources" to control civil disobedience here.

Robert E. Jordan III, deputy general counsel of the Army, told members of the D.C. Bar Association yesterday that the most effective deterrent to large-scale civil disobedience was a policy of "restraint" and "passive defense." He spoke of the Pentagon demonstration last fall but did not refer specifically to King's upcoming campaign.

He said the general government response in Washington has always been to commit "large resources" to make demonstration control as non-violent as conditions permit.

Jordan said that the massive numbers of troops used by the Pentagon to back up law officials during the demonstrations had caused comment in the press and from public officials.

BACKS MASSIVE SUPPORT

Massive support is necessary, he said, "unless you are going to stop it by shooting or tear gas. Then you can get by with a small number of people to enforce that policy."

Jordan's remarks came during a panel discussion on "The Law and Protest," as part of a bar association meeting at the Mayflower Hotel.

His philosophy of large-scale "passive defense" is involved in current discussions at the District Building, where it is known that city officials have been quietly conferring with representatives of several federal agencies and the military about planning for possible disorders here this summer.

At the press conference yesterday, Mayor Washington was asked if he were making such contingency plans.

"We're making plans for the summer, fall, winter and spring," he said. "We're always making plans."

The mayor expressed optimism about the summer. He remarked that "all cities have problems, we know that. If problems develop here we'll have to handle them. I'm optimistic."

Fauntroy was asked yesterday whether black power militant Stokely Carmichael would be asked to sit in on a meeting between King and Washington. The Vice chairman questioned whether it would be necessary to include Carmichael.

"I don't know if Stokely's presence at such a meeting would be relevant," Fauntroy said. "Dr. King's interest is in the jobs or income—poor people's—campaign. He's not here to mix nonviolence with violence."

Fauntroy said he saw no potential conflict between the mayor and King, since King's demonstrations will be aimed at Congress and not the District. The vice chairman added that the fact that District policemen might have to arrest demonstrators won't be a problem.

"I think people place too much emphasis on arrest," Fauntroy said. "It's not planned in the initial stages for people to be arrested—only if Congress proves uncooperative.

"However, by the very nature of civil disobedience, if the demonstrations get to that point, the participants expect to get arrested and to stay in jail.

"We are in for a new experience," Fauntroy added.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "THE COST OF CLEAN WATER"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its adoption, yesterday, of Senate Resolution 249, to print as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of the Interior entitled "The Cost of Clean Water"; that the Senate amend the resolution, in line 5, by striking out "Public Law 89–234" and substituting in lieu thereof "Public Law 89–753"; and that the resolution as thus amended be adopted.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTION SLATED THIS WEEK ON PUPIL DEMANDS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Ernest Holsendolph, Star staff writer, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, entitled "'Action Slated This Week on Pupil Demands."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION SLATED THIS WEEK ON PUPIL DEMANDS

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

The District's assistant superintendent for secondary schools will meet with high school principals Friday to begin some of the change requested by students at a citywide meeting Monday.

George R. Rhodes said yesterday he will insist that principals "re-examine the nature of student involvement" in their schools and extracurricular activities.

Sources within the school administration say privately there is a "quiet desperation" among officials to "get the initiative" from militant students who have been gaining followers in every high school in the city since last spring.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the District is attempting to organize separate, citywide groups of Negro students, parents and teachers which together may link up with Stokely Carmichael's Black United Front to seek substantial "black community" control over schools in Negro neighborhoods.

A SNCC spokesman said yesterday that the student, parent and teacher groups were being mobilized by William W. Hall, a SNCC field organizer.

The recently formed Black Students Union at various District high schools would serve as a nucleus for the citywide student group, the organization hopes.

Form letters distributed by Black Student Union members at Monday's citywide student gripe session at McKinley High School urged that students to "become aware of your power in unity" and join the organizations. The telephone number of SNCC headquarters was listed at the end of the flyers for persons desiring further information.

"We have just got to stop merely reacting," an official said.

Rhodes said he will instruct principals, as a first step, to drop requirement for membership in student councils and other governing organizations.

"I'm convinced that, with the exception of the honor societies, there should be no requirements for participation in a group except for membership in the student body," Rhodes said.

Among other notions which he will begin exploring with the principals Friday is the need for more support for college-bound students of all abilities.

"I want to set up some year-round equivalent to the Upward Bound programs operated by the University of Maryland and Howard University, and other enrichment efforts to get students oriented toward college," Rhodes said.

"We should do all that we can to assure the success of every student who tells us he wants to go to college."

Rhodes said he feels the enrichment programs are needed as a "step beyond" the superintendent's announced expansion of courses to be offered after school and Saturday mornings.

STIPENDS SUGGESTED

Rhodes hopes to help students who often must make a hard choice between taking part in a summer enrichment program or working to earn needed money.

"I'm sure we can find money that can be paid to students as stipends equal to the $1.40 an hour that most of them earn on summer jobs," he said.

Rhodes said he would make it clear to principals Friday that a representative group of the city's students to be formed within the next two weeks must be freshly elected—not just designated from existing student groups.

Rhodes said yesterday after emerging from a meeting with school officials:

"Above all else I want the students to understand that we were not just talking yesterday. We mean to do something about their grievances."

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE].

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have joined in sponsoring the fair housing amendment because I am convinced that residential segregation on a racial basis is a basic inequality that underlies and stimulates other forms of discrimination. For the Congress to refuse to deal with this most blatant form of discrimination in the pending bill to protect constitutional rights seems to me unthinkable.

More than a decade ago, the Supreme Court ruled out segregation in education, pointing out that "separate but equal" is in fact "inherently unequal." The same principle applies in the field of housing. Indeed, I believe there is even less justification to assert equality in separation.

It has been pointed out many times that housing is the only commodity that is not available in the open market according to a man's ability to pay. Yet housing is a basic necessity, a commodity which no family can do without. And it bears importantly on all major aspects of living—health, education, employment, and recreation among them.

Restricted access to the whole housing market because of race has been a major cause of the concentration of nonwhite population in our cities. In 1910, it is estimated that 73 percent of the Negro population lived in rural areas. Today that same percentage, 73 percent, lives in urban areas, mostly in ghettos. To our shame, the Federal Government has helped to build these ghettos.

The Federal responsibility here appears to be little known. But it is great, as the National Committee Against Housing Discrimination showed in its report, "How the Federal Government Builds Ghettos." A powerful indictment of Federal policies and practices in the housing field, the report, issued in February 1967, warned:

> The ghetto system, nurtured both directly and indirectly by Federal power, has created racial alienation and tensions so explosive that the crisis in our cities now borders on catastrophe. It has excommunicated Negro and other minority-group citizens from membership in the American community. It has isolated the white majority inside a world of conscious and subconscious racism.
>
> Housing segregation is at the root of the ghetto way of life and all of its attendant evils and turmoil. Witness the intolerable conditions of life in the impacted racial ghetto, and the inevitable hopelessness, bitterness and rebellion of those who are imprisoned within its confines. Witness mounting strife over segregated, overcrowded, inherently unequal schools. Witness unemployment and under-employment of millions of nonwhites in the midst of unprecedented affluence among whites. Witness the appalling disparity in mortality and health statistics between the privileged and the discriminated-against. Witness the widening breach between white suburbia and the inner city. Witness the deterioration and decay of the nation's cities, with their shrinking tax bases and expanding costs for essential services.

The report points out that from the time the Government entered the housing field in the late thirties, it has shunned any real responsibility for affirmative action to assure equal housing opportunity. In its earliest days, the Federal Housing Administration actually urged use of restrictive covenants to keep out "inharmonious racial groups." Up until a few years ago the Federal Home Loan Bank and the Home Owners Loan Corporation recommended racial segregation in residential neighborhoods as a means of protecting the stability and values of the area. And all along the line, the financing agencies have, again and again, protested their powerlessness to take positive action to root out the evil of racial discrimination.

One result has been, according to the NCDH, that while the FHA and the Veterans' Administration have together financed more than $120 billion worth of new housing since World War II, less than 2 percent of this has been available to nonwhite families, and much of that only on a strictly segregated basis.

I know from personal experience the apathy and lack of interest within the agencies to establish, much less promote, programs to open the housing market to all citizens on an equal basis. For example, some years ago I sought executive action against a builder who stated publicly that he would not sell to Negroes in a burgeoning subdivision in southern New Jersey. But the HHFA insisted that it was unable to halt the flow of Federal assistance which enabled him to continue with construction of the development.

We all recall the "stroke of the pen" so much talked about in the 1960 campaign. It was not until 1962 that the Executive order was finally signed and, according to the testimony of Secretary Weaver before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency this year, the order is an ineffective instrument. Indeed, this is the basis on which the Secretary supported the fair housing bill before the committee.

The absence of any strong effective push for integrated housing has also been noted by the American Friends Service Committee. In its report to the President in May 1967, it stated:

> Executive Order 11063 is being widely and flagrantly violated by builders, brokers and lenders who participate in FHA and VA programs. We are struck by the disparity between the stated policies of President Johnson and the actions of federal agencies charged with the execution of these policies.

The committee's report stated further:

> More disturbing and more harmful than the industry's disregard to the imperatives of the Executive order have been the inertia, obstruction and lack of sympathy the American Friends Service Committee has found in the two Federal agencies charged with primary responsibility for enforcing the nondiscrimination and equal opportunity requirements in federally assisted housing.

The story with respect to public housing is an equally dismal tale. Again, let me cite an example from my own State. In July 1966, I wrote to the Department of Housing and Urban Development with regard to testimony before the New Jersey Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission which indicated that public housing in the city of Newark was becoming more rather than less segregated and that policies of the local housing authority were in large part responsible.

It took 6 months before HUD replied and its reply, I regret to say, was misleading to say the least. I was totally unable to discern in it any real concern for the central problem. Rather, its whole thrust was to present the housing authority in a creditable light, emphasizing its good intentions and deemphasizing, indeed omitting, many salient facts. Since then, many of these facts have been made plain in the ugly riots that occurred in Newark last summer and in the report just released of the Governor's commission to inquire into the causes of the riot.

The letter I received from HUD reads, in part, as follows:

> Our New York office made a special review of the Newark Housing Authority's compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and we have analyzed their findings as well as other data available to us. Our New York office has concluded, and we concur, that the Newark Housing Authority is fully aware of its responsibilities under Title VI; and that it is attempting to make progress toward achieving open occupancy and racially balanced tenancy despite difficulties occasioned by population shifts, traditional biases and social behavior patterns and problems. We do not mean to represent or imply that the racial distribution of the Newark Housing Authority tenant body leaves nothing to be desired. There are five projects in Newark's Central Ward which are over 90 percent Negro-occupied. There are five projects in other parts of the City which are less than 10 percent Negro-occupied. The racial distribution of tenants in the Authority's other seven projects shows more racially balanced proportions. The reasons for this distribution appear to be related to factors which have little to do with the Housing Authority's tenant selection practices or with changes in its regulations. We are enclosing with this letter a summary of the Newark program which serves as a substantiation for our conclusions.

When I submitted this report to the chairman of the New Jersey Advisory Committee hearing, I was advised that—

> No progress has been made in achieving racial balance in the last four years, since the U.S. Commission hearings in September 1962, in Newark. At that time there were 14 projects in Newark under the authority—four of them over 90% white and 2 over 90% non-white. At that time the announced policy for integration, as stated on page 127 of the Commission hearings, was this: ". . . if an apartment adjacent to a Negro family were offered to a white family and it was refused on that ground, or vice versa, the refusing family should not be accorded the opportunity to choose another apartment, if such were available."
>
> Now, we have 17 projects under the Newark Authority. 5 are over 90% white, 5 are over 90% non-white. In July 1966, at the public meeting of the N.J. Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commisison on Civil Rights, reference was made by a Committee member to the policy described above (Page 213 et seq.) and this was the answer (page 216): "Our policy on integrating the projects from 1950 for a number of years thereafter was the policy you have read. We haven't that policy of compulsion any more."

And, page 217, "If they were to refuse and we exercised the policy by not giving them—that would be a denial to them of public housing at all." (transcript of Committee meeting.)

Another excerpt from the HUD report:

The Housing Authority has developed five additional projects in various sections of the city. These projects show varying proportions of Negro occupancy, ranging from 21 to 81 percent.

The comment from the Advisory Committee chairman:

This paragraph is misleading. Five projects were not mentioned. It should have read, "There are 9 other projects—5 over 90% white, one 79% and 3 over 60%."

At the time that I inquired as to the Authority's practices, I also submitted a long list of allegations with regard to the maintenance and administration of the buildings. They included serious charges of corruption and failure to provide police protection to residents. Since July 1966, I have been in repeated touch with HUD to ascertain the results of its investigation. Finally, in January 1967, I received this reply:

We have just received from the Inspection Division, HUD, a closed Report of Investigation regarding activities of the Housing Authority of the City of Newark, New Jersey, which is being reviewed by our New York Regional Office. As soon as we receive a final Disposition Report from that office we will be glad to report to you on the matter.

I have had no word since, despite continuing efforts to secure the report promised. Perhaps now that the Governor's Commission has recommended a grand jury or other appropriate official investigation into similar charges, the Department can be stirred to interest itself in the matter.

For their guidance, they could well use the outline of his testimony presented to the 1966 hearing of the New Jersey Advisory Committee by the pastor of an Abyssinian Baptist Church in Newark. It reads:

OUTLINE

I. CLEANLINESS

A. More and better Janitorial Services are needed.

B. More and better Janitorial equipment.

C. More and better personnel.

II. POLICE PROTECTION

A. Population density—demands it.

B. Senior Citizens and ordinary adults male and female are afraid to go out at night.

III. LAW ENFORCEMENT

A. Because of population density—projects become cesspool for breeding crime.

B. Curtailment of dope traffic, rapings; muggings, robbings, break-ins, etc.

IV. ACCULTURATION

A. Housing vs. herding.

B. Landscaping, etc.—"Beautiful City." Adequate recreation for Children.

V. ADEQUATE RECREATION FOR CHILDREN

A. To satisfy cravings for adventure, i.e. (Boy on carnival track).

B. To give exercise to muscles and experience to growing brain cells; i.e., the new will occupy time and burn up energy—thus "rock-throwing" will be minimized or interest in or time for such acts reduced.

VI. LAWS AND REGULATIONS ARE NEEDED

Also penalties to occupants (and even ejections) who persist in vandalizing public property and who litter.

VII

A. Federal Housing is too expensive to be permitted to set any example but the ideal ones. Federal housing should demonstrate what housing should be.

B. Federal Slums are no more desirable than private Slums.

C. Federal Slums are more easily recognized than private slums—they are usually larger.

VIII

Children grow up in these conditions who will be either our soldiers or our criminals, builders or destroyers, scholars or delinquents, civil servants or wards of welfare.

Even the existence of a good open housing law in the State of New Jersey cannot mend situations like that of Newark public housing. Our law, most recently revised in 1966, prohibits discrimination in all private housing transactions except for the rental of rooms in a single-family dwelling by the occupant thereof and the rental of a portion of an owner-occupied, two-family dwelling. Provision is made for enforcement through the division of civil rights in the department of law and public safety. Further, New Jersey law forbids discriminatory advertising and requires that posters mentioning individual rights under the fair housing law be shown in real estate offices and wherever houses are offered for sale or rent.

The implementation of the law is far from perfect, but it is ironic that a chief offender against the law should be the Federal Government.

The administration professes deep concern with resolution of the racial problems that embroil our cities. It is difficult to square its expressions of concern with its lack of support for an amendment which would give it the authority it claims to lack to enlist the full resources of the U.S. Government in a struggle against prejudice that the Nation must win if we are to survive as a civilized democratic society.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I believe it is essential that all our citizens have genuine equality of opportunity so that they may fully participate in America's political, economic, and cultural life. This requires the elimination of artificial barriers to the exercise of free choice by individuals.

One of the major barriers to the exercise of such free choice is in the realm of housing. The open-housing amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and a number of other Senators to H.R. 2516, an act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, seeks to remove this housing barrier. I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of the fair housing amendment.

I am proud of the State of Oregon's record of progress in intergroup relations, and I believe that out of this experience we can see certain basic evidence which could be helpful to us in the consideration of the legislation now before the Senate, on the Federal level. In the great federal system, the States have oftentimes been able to provide, through experimentation, the direction for progress, the models for action that the Federal Government can take, and thereby share with all the other parts of the Union.

The modern march of progress in improvement of intergroup relations in Oregon started with the enactment of Oregon's Fair Employment Practice Act, in 1949. The State bureau of labor began administering this act on July 16, 1949.

I believe it is pertinent at this point to review, in quick succession, the measures which have been recognized as the great civil rights legislation in the State of Oregon.

First, in 1949, we enacted the Fair Employment Practice Act, which guarantees to each individual in our State equal employment opportunities, without distinction as to race, religion, color, or national origin.

Then, in 1951, we enacted what is called the vocational schools law. This law prohibits discrimination in vocational, professional, or trade schools in Oregon.

In 1951 we progressed further and built upon the record of the past by repealing the law prohibiting interracial marriages.

We repealed the prohibition with respect to selling liquor to Indians.

We repealed the statute requiring a census of sanitation and thrift habits of Japanese and Chinese residents.

We had a Governor's executive order directing the National Guard to pursue a strict policy of nondiscrimination.

A Governor's executive order was issued establishing a State council on Indian affairs, to further guarantee their rights as citizens in all the procedures and laws and also the customs, of our State.

In the same year, 1951, the State insurance commissioner issued an order to insurance companies in Oregon requiring the elimination of surcharges formerly levied against nonwhite drivers.

In 1953, we moved on with a further foundation leading to our own Housing Act, with the public accommodation law. This law in the State of Oregon prohibits discrimination in places of public accommodation, resorts, or amusement places, and establishes the rights of all persons to equal facilities.

We also amended the constitution of the State of Oregon by deleting the word "white" with respect to a reapportionment of population, which was based previously on the white population.

In 1957, we strengthened the Fair Employment Practice Act, the vocational schools law, and the public accommodations law by amendments.

In 1957, we enacted our first Housing Act. This is similar to the proposal which we are discussing and debating these days in the Senate. But in 1959 we found, through the experience of our initial act, that we should strengthen it, so we enacted the second Housing Act in that year.

In 1959 we amended the real estate broker law to make a violation of the Housing Act by a realtor a cause for the revocation or suspension of the realtor's license. This was, of course, a very important step in our State's history and in the development of our civil rights legislation.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that with all these laws—of which we are mighty proud in our State—it can be seen that Oregon has been a leader among the 50 States in enacting civil rights legislation. In spite of all these laws, I do not attempt today to portray Oregon as being free from discrimination or as a State which no longer has problems in matters of intergroup relations. What I do say, however, is that, with all these laws, I believe we have established a pattern in our State by indicating to the citizens of our State that the law implies a duty, and that the law can be responsible for a learning process; that some of the old prejudices and old habits can break down and can bring people into confrontation one with another, into an association; and, to the surprise of many people, they find that some of the old thoughts, old ideas, and old concepts of discrimination are truly without foundation.

We use law in our State not as an end in itself but to help people learn to understand one another and to help govern their actions. But changing their minds and their hearts one toward another still is a matter at which we must constantly work, through government and voluntary and nongovernmental associations.

Oregon was the sixth State in the Union to pass a law which guarantees job democracy. There is nothing intricate or involved about Oregon's Fair Employment Practice Act, any more than there is anything intricate or involved about Oregon's Open Housing Act. It means simply that our State has an act; that in the act we have made sure that each inhabitant is guaranteed the fundamental human right to earn a living at a job commensurate with his ability and skill; and that he shall not be prevented from doing so because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, because we have declared such action to be an unlawful practice.

We have used this as the foundation for our Open Housing Act. The objective in our Fair Employment Practice Act of giving every person in the population an equal chance to obtain and maintain employment without discrimination became accepted as public policy.

I think it might be well to review the simplicity of the provisions of the law, its administrative setup, and its practice, because—and permit me to emphasize—I am using this particular Fair Employment Practice Act as the example and the foundation upon which we built our Open Housing Act.

There are those who had led us to believe there is something terribly complex and something that is to be feared with all of a State's difficulties, difficulties impossible to overcome.

I think that by relating the experience, at the State level, of one State we can indicate that there are difficulties, but that they are not beyond the scope of man to solve. This was our experience, which I think is highly relevant and pertinent to the pending legislation.

First of all, the statute we enacted at the State level defines opportunity for employment without discrimination as a civil right. It is a simple proposition and a simple statement but has great and profound meaning.

Second, the law assigns the responsibility for enforcement to the commissioner of the State bureau of labor. Here we focus responsibility on one single officeholder.

Third, it spells out the two major administrative functions: First, to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment by employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, and other persons who aid, abet, incite, compel, or coerce the doing of any acts forbidden under the law; and, second, to develop a positive educational program in all fields of human relations.

Fourth, this Fair Employment Practices Act, upon which we based our later civil rights legislation, establishes special privileges for no one. It sets forth job qualifications such as aptitude, training, skill, character, and job experience as the sole prerequisites to employment.

No system is set up whereby any group, black, white, or any other color or division of men, has a special privilege, but all people are looked upon with equal rights for job opportunities.

Fifth, it provides for receiving and processing complaints. Any aggrieved individual may file with the bureau of labor a verified complaint containing specific allegations regarding discrimination in hiring, firing, upgrading or promotion, compensation, conditions and privileges of work, employment application forms, membership in labor unions, or practices of employment agencies.

Sixth, after all pertinent data has been gathered and analyzed, a determination is made. If an unlawful practice is found, an effort is made to correct the violation through conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

Here again, one of the basic strengths of our law was that we sought through the informal relationship of conferences and oral persuasions to have correction made rather than holding the club of some civil or criminal legal action over the head of the violator.

In our Open Housing Act, which later followed, we used the same approach, a conciliatory approach, whereby effort is made through persuasion to seek a solution to these problems, with hopeful conference and discussion.

Seventh, if and when conciliation fails, the commissioner of labor is empowered to hold a hearing and issue an order for the respondent to cease and desist from the unlawful practice. If necessary, this order can be enforced by a court.

On the other hand, if it has been determined that the respondent has not engaged in unlawful employment practices, the complaint shall be dismissed.

Eighth, in fulfilling the educational function, the bureau of labor is charged with the utilization of all methods of communication available to carry out effective community education programs for improvement of intergroup relationships.

Here we recognize the specific responsibility under the law to employ powers of persuasion through the instrumentality of education.

Ninth, the bureau is empowered to organize and work in communities throughout the State in fostering good will and conciliation among various groups and elements in the population.

I wish to return to the issue of community councils because here we found much assistance in the enforcement and understanding of our civil rights law through the voluntary association of leaders at the community level who assumed the responsibility for intergroup activity and understanding. It was one of the groups which added much and contributed much to our race relations and intergroup relations.

Tenth, in addition, the law provides for the appointment of a citizens advisory committee responsible for assisting the Bureau in carrying out the intent and purposes of the act.

Discrimination in job opportunities had been experienced in some degree by segments of the Oregon population throughout its history as a State. European and Asiatic immigrants, in their turn, faced resistance to their efforts to use their native skills in economic competition with the earlier settlers of the Oregon territory. In later years the migrating American Negro, in search of a place in the growing commerce and industry of the West, met even greater opposition. The native Indian was shut out completely.

The law against discrimination in employment provided the legal sanction needed to meet a crisis and a special challenge. World War II manpower demands had ended, but workers, who had come in the period's migration, were remaining to knock at the doors of Oregon employers. It was clearly evident throughout the State that the traditional pattern of hiring, combined with the pinch of a recession, was creating a condition destined to cause special hardships for minority group wage earners and difficult law enforcement problems. Regulating behavior that is based on attitudes, social habits, and traditional practices accumulated over a long period of time, is a most difficult task. Many sensible and fairminded men and women believed that these things could not be changed by law. There existed a substantial body of public opinion which held the sincere conviction that no workable law could ever be devised in the emotional field of human relations.

There were others who demanded a ferocious crackdown. Those who had confidence in a fair employment practice law supported features of education and conciliation as a means of directing and controlling human behavior. It was agreed that statutes cannot force a person or group to like others. This was not the fair employment practice objective. The objective was to set standards of behavior which might lead to changes of attitude and, more importantly, to more equitable treatment with improvement of opportunity for Oregon's disadvantaged minorities. Accordingly, the overall policy of the bureau of labor in its administration of civil rights laws has been not to build up caseloads of complaints but to build up new public attitudes and practices.

This initial policy began opening doors to workers from minority groups. Employers eliminated questions on race, religion, and national origin from their employment application forms. Newspapers struck discriminatory phrasing out of their help-wanted columns. The use of photographs in job applications by teachers agencies or others was forbidden.

Prior to July 1949, the principal sources of employment for the minority group worker in Oregon were limited to a few industries and services. Although considerable improvement had been gained over the years respecting members of religious and nationality groups, many businesses and industries had a policy of completely excluding nonwhite workers. Firms which did employ members of the nonwhite minority did so on a token basis, in certain restricted jobs, and often with little or no opportunity for advancement.

There were instances where whole industries adopted a change in their former employment practices. Prior to the Fair Employment Practices Act, not a single Negro worker was known to be on the production lines of any laundry. Today this industry hires without discrimination, as do a growing number of other large industries.

The first large department store to hire Negro sales personnel interspersed them throughout the store. Some were stationed at counters with Caucasians. Some had their own counters. To make clear what the company policy was, one Negro salesgirl was placed at a counter just inside the store's busiest entrance. Other stores, observing the success of this practice, quietly began to follow suit. It has become commonplace to see a new non-Caucasian face on the sales floor of these stores.

Again, let me point out that as people began to work together we found that working side by side in stores, shops, and industries led to the belief that they could even live as next door neighbors because they found in their working relationships that they had forgotten some of the old prejudices that they might once have held. That is why this experience was the beginning of the foundation of the civil rights action in our State leading to the open housing law we have there now.

Among the first fair employment practices complaints filed with the bureau of labor was that of a Japanese-American veteran, who had qualified through civil service examination for a State government position but was denied employment for the reason "as an identifiable member of a minority group, he was unsuited for dealing with the public." Investigation of the case disclosed no dispute concerning the applicant's qualifications for the job; in fact, he topped the list of eligibles. The commissioner of labor, upon examining the facts, insisted that this applicant be considered for the position solely on the basis of ability and merit in accordance with the provisions and intent of the fair employment practices law. He was hired and soon recognized as an efficient and highly acceptable worker.

This action opened the way for employment of qualified minority group workers in other State agencies. Today, Oregon's minority citizens are employed in all levels of civil service, in Federal, State, county, and municipal government. They are found also teaching in public schools, in all kinds of classrooms and communities. This change in teacher hiring practices followed the only organized resistance to any provision of the law or administrative ruling promulgated in connection with it. Strong objections were made by some school administrators to the ruling that request for an applicant's photograph constitutes an unlawful employment practice.

The pattern of differential treatment accorded non-Caucasian persons was a result of assorted fears, assumptions, stereotyped beliefs, habits, customs and economic and social pressures. For instance, study of the problem of reluctance to hire minority group workers in a previously majority group setting has found that, in a significant number of cases, the reluctance results from the employer's fear that he cannot discharge these workers if they prove to be incompetent. Employers have been assured by evidence that, once an employe has been hired on the basis of merit and without regard to his minority group status, he is not likely to have to be discharged for incompetency. But, if he does fail to live up to employer expectations, the employer's right to discharge such a worker has been fully supported in dispositions of complaints filed.

Other top fears of employers have proved to be the fear of losing business through customer reaction to being served by non-Caucasians and the fear that employes might leave when non-Caucasians were hired, in spite of their qualifications to do the job. Some other employers simply doubted the efficiency and job performance of non-Caucasian wage earners.

By 1954, a majority of Oregon employers had the answer to their most common fears. That such legislation would lead to turmoil and intergroup strife had been exploded as a hollow myth. In no case, had any employer indicated that he had suffered loss, inconvenience or other disadvantages in complying with the law.

Some of these same fears were raised at the time we were considering our open housing act.

I can say that after this period of experience, we found that the same fears, the same thoughts, and charges which were made against the enactment of that act, were exploded by that experience.

Employers gained—not lost—business as a result of changed policies. Their right to select qualified workers had been strengthened, not impaired. No employee had walked out in protest against the hiring of minority group workers. Disgruntled jobseekers had not flooded the bureau of labor with groundless complaints. No new problems came into being although qualified Negroes were found to be filling satisfactorily a wide range of occupations in which they previously had not had the opportunity to work.

Today's labor practices are a far cry from the nine complaints against one union, which brought about the first civil rights case to reach the public hearing stage in Oregon. The respondent organization was charged with barring from membership the nine complainants solely because they were Negroes. In this case, a decision was handed down, on August 29, 1951, by former State Labor Commissioner William E. Kimsey, finding a lodge of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen guilty of race discrimination under the Fair Employment Practices Act. The union was ordered to cease and desist from such discrimination.

Once tightly closed memberships of labor unions generally have been opened to an extent that has drastically altered employment practices in a variety of fields. A survey of organized labor practices today will show that almost all local unions in Oregon extend full membership privileges, including official leadership opportunities, without restrictions on race, religion, color or national origin. The State AFL–CIO convention has established by resolution, and annually reaffirmed its stand, in support of the Oregon fair employment practices law and other civil rights legislation. This support has been furthered by the State labor council in providing for close cooperation of its labor education office with the bureau's civil rights division.

The State apprenticeship council has helped further fair employment practices objectives by developing training opportunities for members of minority groups. An increasing number of Negroes, Orientals, Spanish-Americans and American Indians are entering apprenticeable trades. Employment barriers against non-Caucasian apprentices have begun to be lowered. Apprentice openings have been made for minority group applicants even in very technical trades, including those of tool and diemaker, optical technician, auto mechanic, boot and shoe repairman, and inside technician.

The employment agency, which represents an important source of job information, is in a crucial position for promoting democratic employment practices. Oregon employment agencies are becoming increasingly essential to the orderly flow of labor into business and industry. When the fair employment practices law was enacted, the agency door to job changes was largely a closed one to minority group persons, except in a few traditional service and nonskilled occupations.

It was difficult to reach as a job source since violations were hard to detect and control. The agency is in a position to either serve, if it so chooses, as a buffer or screen for a discriminatory employer, or as a barrier between the applicant it does not want to refer to a particular job opportunity and the employer who might be quite willing to hire the applicant in question.

It has been the task of the civil rights division staff to convince the employment agency that its role is simply registering and referring qualified applicants to employers needing such workers, while the decision to hire is solely that of the employer. All private employment agencies, which charge a fee to the applicant for their service, are licensed by the bureau of labor. This has made possible a closer control of their activities and helps to resolve more easily problems of a discriminatory nature.

However, no exemption from provisions of the fair employment practices law is made for non-fee-charging employment agencies, as distinguished from fee-charging employment agencies, nor is any exemption provided for nonprofit employment agencies as distinguished from commercial agencies operating on a for-profit basis.

The Oregon State employment service set an early example in adopting a policy of refusal to accept discriminatory job orders of any kind. The policy was made clear to all the service's personnel in an interoffice instructional bulletin, part of the employee's manual. It set the tone for compliance with the provisions and intent of the fair employment practices law and for cooperation with the civil rights division program on fair practices in employment.

Today it may be said that there is almost no expressed opposition, and positively no organized opposition, to the fair employment practices law.

Let me again emphasize the point that the fair employment practices law provided the basic foundation upon which all of our other civil rights laws were predicated, culminating in the open housing act that we have in our State.

Oregon was the 19th State in the Nation to enact a public accommodations law. The Oregon law establishing the civil rights of all persons to equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of any place of public accommodation, resort, or amusement, was enacted in 1953. It became effective July 21, 1953, after opponents of the act failed to secure sufficient signatures on a referendum petition. The statute provided for a civil remedy only. The measure was supported by an ad hoc committee comprising 59 community organizations and called the Oregon Committee for Equal Rights.

This traditional litigative approach toward eliminating discrimination in public accommodations because of race, religion, color, or national origin did not prove as successful as expected.

Many persons refused public accommodation were loath to institute court proceedings. Others were deterred by the expense and time involved or the anticipated publicity. Furthermore, some public officials had shown equal reluctance to bring criminal prosecutions against local community violators.

In talking about that bit of history, I may say that, as a member of the Oregon Legislature in 1953, I recall vividly the kind of opposition that was raised. There were those who said we would no longer have a good convention trade in the State, because people would not come to Oregon and hold their conventions in hotels and motels that provided equal accessibility for people of all races. We were told all sorts of things about why the act could not succeed. I remember, too, that as we were pleading for this cause, as we were fighting for this law in our State, not only did some people try to raise economic problems, but some people maintained that by passing such a law we were doing so without the necessary evidence of discrimination in our State.

It is very easy for people to point their fingers at certain geographical locations of the United States as being locations of discrimination, but I believe, speaking as a person from a Western State far removed from the Mason-Dixon line, that discrimination exists in all parts of the United States, at least those parts with which I have had contact; and when discrimination exists in any part of our country, it becomes a concern of all of us. I think it ill behooves any of us to point a finger at any one area as having certain characteristics of discrimination.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I would like to underscore the point the Senator from Oregon just made, because I think it is central to the issue we face with the pending fair housing amendment, which the Senator from Oregon cosponsors. It has been said by some opponents of the measure on fair housing that it is different from other civil rights bills in that it deals with a northern problem and not just a southern problem; that, in a sense, many of the advocates of civil rights from the North are hypocrites; that we are perfectly willing to point a stern finger at the South, but not a stern finger at ourselves, when in fact we have a similar problem.

The Senator from Oregon makes an important contribution to this debate when he points out and acknowledges the existence of discrimination in the North.

I come from a State which is very similar to the Senator's, except that it has a better tourist industry than his. I have freely acknowledged for years the discrimination problem. I am pleased to say that a few years ago we adopted a measure to strengthen the public accommodations provisions, particularly the enforcement part, to develop an easy method of restraining discriminatory practices. But I think we have to begin this debate by acknowledging that discrimination exists in the North, and purge ourselves of this complaint which has some validity. It is one thing to vote to remove discrimination in the South, say, in voting or transportation, and the rest, and it is another thing to vote on a measure which affects our own constituents.

The Senator from Oregon courageously and properly accepts the challenge that has been laid down—the challenge that we have been hypocritical in the past.

If we fail to enact fair housing legislation, there will be a necessary implication that we are not quite as courageous in dealing with our own problems as we are in dealing with others.

If, on the other hand, those who are raising the argument prohibit us from having the right to vote on the issue, by extended discussions, sometimes called filibusters, and we are not able to get to the issue so that a majority of the Senate can work its will, then I would say we have answered the issue of hypocrisy. If, because of their strategy, we have been unable to work our will, that is another matter.

I highly commend the Senator from Oregon for making what I think is a very, very important observation, one which puts the responsibility not on the back of the South alone, but of the North, as well.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his comments, and wish to underline again the point which he has so eloquently made. Not only must we assume responsibility for that which we know to exist in our own areas, and to try to take action that is going to constructively and positively solve that problem; we must also be equally concerned about the kind of responsibilities we have on an international level. Whenever we as the United States posture ourselves in a position of world leadership—whether or not we want to be in that position, that is where we are—I think to give meaning to that which is recognized as the American ideal and the American philosophy, it certainly has to be fulfilled in the practices in which we engage as between and among our own people.

It is not only a matter of local concern and national concern; it also takes on a truly international dimension as we seek to provide leadership in the world as between those who would deny men their rights and those who would give men those rights; as between political autocracies and political dictatorships which would deny to men the political and other rights that we hold dear, and those who support those rights. When we posture ourselves in opposition to that kind of philosophy, I think we have to be all the more careful to make certain that our own house is in order, and that all the people within our own borders are enjoying the kind of freedoms and equality before the law that all other citizens enjoy.

So it has great significance, as the Senator indicates, and I am, I repeat, very proud to join with him in the sponsorship of his amendment.

The history of successful activity in States, which had amended their FEP laws to give their commissions against discrimination jurisdiction over complaints in the field of public accommodations gave weight to the suggestion that this approach had great merit for Oregon.

Meanwhile, in line with the Oregon declaration of discriminatory practices being a matter of State concern, the bureau of labor endeavored to educate citizens concerning their obligations under the Public Accommodations Act, insofar as department facilities permitted. Under this policy, an appreciable number of unlawful discriminatory practices in public accommodations were resolved through conference, conciliation, and persuasion in the years 1953 to 1957.

The 1957 legislature showed its confidence in effectiveness of the conciliation process by amending the Public Accommodations Act to provide for its administration by the bureau of labor. The provision for a complainant's recourse to civil court action was retained. The act also was expanded to cover trailer parks and campgrounds, sources of a number of complaints of racial discrimination.

Under the amended statute, a person claiming to be aggrieved by an alleged discrimination in public accommodation, resort, or amusement may file a complaint with the bureau of labor in the same manner and expect the same type of handling as the FEP complainant. Charges of discriminatory advertising by a place of public accommodation similarly may be handled by the bureau of labor.

As we move forward with our regulatory and educational program, it is expected that the time will come when members of minority groups will feel no hesitancy in patronizing any place of public accommodation. Under conditions of a decade ago, even a nonwhite person of celebrity status had great difficulty in obtaining hotel or motel accommodations.

Many weak links in the chain of compliance have been indicated in filed complaints and civil suits in which the respondent was found guilty. Some proprietors of places of public accommodation still fear that nondiscrimination in services to the public will result in financial loss despite all visible evidence to the contrary. Smaller establishments, particularly, hold this fear. Some proprietors attribute their reason, for evading service to non-Caucasian customers whenever possible, to intimidations of a few disgruntled patrons or stubborn employes.

In spite of these facts, the record of compliance is encouraging. The success of the law has been most notable in hotels, motels, and restaurants where free movement is close to full realization. Other areas made completely or relatively free from discrimination are amusement and recreation parks and places, hospital and public health services, public transportation, and theaters. The areas chiefly represented in filed complaints are taverns and clubs where alcoholic beverages are sold, and barber shops, beauty parlors, and slenderizing studios. The latter places have not yet been included in provisions of the Oregon Public Accommodations Act. In contrast to some other States, Oregon's minority groups experience little or no problem of discrimination in public schools and libraries or in the general area of law enforcement.

Violations of the public accommodation law have been promptly investigated and quickly corrected. In no instance, to date, has a second violation by an offender been recorded.

In Oregon, as in other States across the Nation, housing is the one commodity on the public market that members of certain minority groups cannot purchase or rent freely. Housing has proved to be the most resistant of all fields to the demands for equal opportunity.

In recent years, there has been an accelerated flight of white families from the central city areas into new suburban subdivisions—from which minorities are generally barred—and an increase of nonwhite families in the urban areas. The pattern of segregation in housing has not changed substantially in recent years. Oregon's minorities can find shelter chiefly in the oldest, most unattractive neighborhoods of each city among the most substandard dwellings deteriorating through age and neglect after being abandoned by previous occupants. The situation is the telltale witness that we still are only halfway to democracy in Oregon.

The impact of housing segregation reaches into almost every other aspect of daily living—employment, education, public accommodation, religious worship, and social relations. The visible disparity between majority and minority housing conditions, with its attending social problems, aroused considerable public concern among Oregon community leaders. Intergroup tensions were rising as minority group families sought shelter outside the painfully overcrowded, circumscribed areas of minority concentration. There was growing recognition that a national, statewide fair-housing program was essential to the public peace and welfare. The State legislature, on May 21, 1957, enacted the Publicly Assisted Housing Act. Oregon became the sixth State to have such a law.

This act confined enforcement powers to violations in housing benefits from public aid. Two years administration of the act disclosed that it did not get at the roots of the housing matter. However, it did establish certain facts related to the basic problem:

First. In the main, the real estate industry traditionally has stood sentry over residential properties, translating prejudice into discriminatory action by negotiating the sale or rental of property to minority persons only in certain circumscribed areas. This was based on the belief that to do otherwise would adversely affect the industry.

Second. Underlying the exclusion of nonwhites from white neighborhoods is the unwillingness of many white people to live in proximity to Negroes or other minorities.

It was apparent then that, although the group prejudices of the white population provided support for the residential segregation of minority groups—with only occasional exceptions—the real estate industry applied the actual restrictions and controls.

These facts were helpful in bringing about a new housing law, effective August 5, 1959. The act extended coverage beyond housing with some public character to the housing field generally and the practices of the housing industry. It prohibits all persons "engaged in the business of selling, leasing, or renting real property" from refusing to sell, lease or rent property solely because of the race, color, religion or national origin of the would be purchaser or lessee, or any other person.

Oregon is a pioneer in the administering of such a housing law. Our goal has been twofold:

First. To win the acceptance of previously excluded minorities by neighbors—in accordance with the intent and spirit of the law.

Second. To win the confidence and willingness of the housing industry to eliminate practices of catering to a restricted neighborhood policy (in conformance with provisions of the law).

The Oregon Housing Act, adopted in 1959 has resulted in only 191 formal complaints in 8½ years; one-half or 86 of these complaints resulted in findings of discrimination; the thorough investigation of the 86 cases and the subsequent conciliation conferences resulted in the satisfactory elimination of the basis for the complaint in each instance except two. And those two are now in the courts on appeals from the orders of the State Labor Commissioner.

Twenty-four informal complaints were investigated by the Civil Rights Division of Oregon Bureau of Labor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Oregon for his most interesting analysis of the various civil rights proposals that are now a part of the law of Oregon. It is reassuring to know of his personal involvement in this important human progress in his State.

As I listened to the Senator's review of measures to protect against discrimination in employment and labor, to his discussion of measures to protect against discrimination in public accommodation, and then to his discussion of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, I noted that in each case the State of Oregon acted over objections when it adopted legislation to correct those wrongs.

I ask the Senator whether in each of these instances when the proposals to correct these wrongs were presented, the opposition did not conjure up horror stories and visions of disaster if the State of Oregon were to pass a law prohibiting discrimination in employment, public accommodations, or housing, and if so, did these dire predictions come true.

Mr. HATFIELD. The opposition did just that. But I point out to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am not aware that we had any formal organizational action or opposition.

Most of the opposition came from individuals or groups of individuals, but I recall very vividly the open housing act which we passed in 1959. As the then Governor of the State, I was called upon to sign the bill after the State Legislature had acted upon it. Not only during the time in which I was considering the signing of the bill, but also during the time when the bill was being considered, my office was besieged by those who, by letter and by personal visitation, informed me that we would have chaos in our community.

Those people did conjure up stories to create fear in the minds of people. They approached the subject from the economic viewpoint. They claimed that it would depreciate the land values for people who owned their own homes, especially those who were retirees and people in the middle-income group in our community.

These individuals claimed that because of the passage of such legislation, people would eventually lose their homes; that retired and older people would be driven out of their homes and communities and would therefore go on public welfare, because they would have lost their investments in their homes.

We were told stories that not only related to the economic concern of people, but also that indicated that we would have a large influx of Negroes from other States and would find ourselves, as a result, burdened with additions to our welfare rolls. We were told that these people would see in Oregon a State offering great new advantages which they were not then enjoying in other States and would, as a consequence, migrate there en masse and flood the small, middle, and larger communities with people who were without skill or means.

We were told that this in-migration of people would result in additions to our welfare rolls. Stories were conjured up to the effect that once a Negro moves into a community, that constitutes the first step toward intermarriage and a breaking down of the traditional patterns that people follow in our State. Although we had repealed the prohibition on interracial marriages in our State years ago, this claim was raised again as a fear that would support their opposition viewpoint.

I am sure that we heard every kind of story that could be conjured up, in Minnesota or any other State. However, I say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], that those stories were not promoted by any organized groups.

The stories were from individuals in private life, individuals who were sincere in their beliefs, but who were wrong. They based their beliefs upon myths and a lack of information. By and large, they based their beliefs on a lack of association.

I asked a number of these individuals as they visited my office: "What kind of contact have you had with racial minority groups? Have you ever gone to school with racial minority groups or with individuals from such groups? Have you ever belonged to an organization to which they belonged?"

Almost without exception, the responses were in the negative. They had not had the experience of going to school with people from the Oriental, Negro, Indian, or any other of the non-Caucasian groups.

They had, almost to a person, no experience in background or association with such people at work or in any kind of an organization. I believe that if some of those people would follow through and be frank about it, they would find after such association that their fears would probably disappear.

It is true that there was some transition. We had communities on the brink of deterioration. We had communities already in the process of becoming old and rundown. Those communities contained the cheaper properties, so to speak. Negroes began to move into such places because that was where they could afford to move.

There then seemed to be those who felt that once the Negroes started to move into a community, the white people would move out. And they did. Places that formerly constituted a white neighborhood became almost totally a colored neighborhood.

Interestingly enough, some of those properties began to cease going down in physical deterioration. Some of them began to be rebuilt and strengthened in economic value. Some of them became well-kept pieces of property.

We have had problems with others, there is no question. However, some of those neighborhoods were already on the deterioration side. Therefore, any deterioration did not depend upon whether white, black, yellow, red, or any other color of people were living there.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator has recited the many fears which opponents of the State fair housing law expressed at the time of its adoption. I understand that legislation was passed by the State of Oregon in 1959.

Mr. HATFIELD. That was the second part of the law. The first part was enacted in 1957.

Mr. MONDALE. The State of Oregon, then, has had experience with open housing for 10 years in one form or another.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. What has been the experience of the State of Oregon with these measures? Have the fears been confirmed, or has the law worked out satisfactorily?

Mr. HATFIELD. I point out here, to be completely factual and as objective as one can be, that we have in our State about 2 million people. Two percent of that population is non-Caucasian. One percent is Negro. However, 99 percent of the Negro population resides in the one city of Portland. It resides in that city because it is the largest metropolitan and industrial center of Oregon. Someone might say: "Obviously, you do not have a real understanding of the problem. You have only 1 percent of the community that is Negro. We have 40 percent, or 60 percent."

We do not claim to have all of the answers in our State. We do not claim that we have the same problems that any other State has. However, I do feel that we can say that there is a microcosm here. There is a ghetto in the city of Portland. There is a concentration of Negroes which represents some of the same urban, employment, and racial relations problems that exist in Detroit or in any other city that has a high percentage of non-Caucasians.

Having said this, I believe I should point out further that much of our experience in the civil rights area has been successful not only because we have the laws but also because we have worked diligently in developing educational programs and educational activities, to help educate people to understand these laws and to support the laws because of their understanding of them.

We also have created the community councils, and I believe this is a fundamental point of our success. We have created in these community councils an organization which is voluntary, which is not governmentally sponsored, and is not governmentally controlled. It is a group of individual citizens making up the leadership and the followership of the community. They analyze their community problems, their complaints, and they help to resolve them on the informal, nongovernmental basis.

I should like to list in specific terms what our experience has been under our Open Housing Act. These figures, by the way, were obtained as of yesterday, so they are the most up-to-date figures we can get on it. Of the 191 formal complaints that we have had in the eight and a half years of the actual experience under the 1959 act, we found, after full investigation, that in only approximately one-half of them had there actually been discrimination. In other words, there had been some false complaints or some evidence in the minds of some persons that there had been discrimination, when the facts did not bear it out.

Then we went further into the 86, the ones in which there had been some basis for the complaints, and found that all 86 of them were finally satisfactorily resolved except two, and they are now in the courts.

We have had 24 informal complaints, which were investigated by the Civil Rights Division of the Oregon Bureau of Labor. Only seven of them were found to involve discrimination, and the practices were corrected.

To answer the Senator's question, I believe we have had, in this type of experience, ample evidence and ample time to prove that when people are sincere and with concern expressing themselves in many different ways, seeking to solve a problem of intergroup relations, they can do so. They can do so with voluntary action and with the kind of coercion that comes with law. It takes both. It cannot be done only with the one. I do not believe that all the civil rights laws with which we could load the statute books would eliminate or solve the problem, unless we coupled those laws with very aggressive citizen action and administration of those laws with fairness and with equity by the persons charged with the administration of the laws. The mere presence of such laws on the statue books, unaided, by these other efforts, would not be terribly meaningful.

Oregon civil rights legislation over the many years since 1949—almost 20 years of experience, as I have recited this afternoon—and the administrative practices in carrying out these statutes have evoked the interest of other States, judging by the number of inquiries received by the office of the Governor and by the bureau of labor.

There has been no attempt in Oregon to repeal any of these laws, nor has there been any court challenge of the constitutionality of such laws.

So I believe that in making this report to the Senate today, I am indicating not that Oregon has reached the ultimate or that we have a model, but that this is only one State's experience. I believe it is pertinent to our discussion in the Senate, and I believe it should be encouraging to the Senate to fulfill its duties and responsibilities by enacting such a law on the national level.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that of the 2 million people in Oregon, only 1 percent are Negroes?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that of this 1 percent, or 20,000 people, most live in Portland?

Mr. HATFIELD. Approximately 18,500 of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator referred to a ghetto. Do the 18,000 live together in Portland in one area?

Mr. HATFIELD. Predominantly so, yes. As I indicated, they live in what might be referred to in the language of today as a ghetto.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator from Oregon think the law, as it was described by him, could be administered in a State where, let us say, the Negro population is approximately 35 to 38 percent, as is the situation in many Southern States? I can well understand that with only 1 percent, or 20,000 Negroes, located in Portland, most of them in a ghetto, it could be handled easily. Judging from what the Senator has said, I do not suppose there are many Negroes in Seattle or in any of the other larger cities in Oregon. But suppose that instead of 1 percent, Oregon had, let us say, 38 percent. Would the Senator evaluate what would happen then?

Mr. HATFIELD. I would be happy to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. HATFIELD. The experience of our State, the record of our State, as I have indicated today, was carefully predicated on the fact that we had been pioneering in this legislation, that we had enacted original bills which we found, after experience, had to be modified, had to be changed, had to be improved. Therefore, I would say that it would be the same, whether it is 1 percent or 38 percent.

We are sharing with you today what has been our experience; and when we talk about discrimination, I believe that whether it exists in a quantitative or qualitative measure is not important.

The point is that where discrimination exists at all, where any man in any part of this country, whether he constitutes 1 percent or 38 percent of the population, is denied the right to buy a home within a community according to his economic ability, wherever he might please, merely because his skin is of a different color, there is a denial of a right that belongs to all Americans, and therefore this should be corrected. We should not merely try to excuse ourselves by doing nothing, whether it is 1 percent or 38 percent; and if it is 1 percent, then perhaps we do have an easier way to do a little experimentation. That is why I presented this evidence today. We had, no doubt, an easier situation in our State, with only 1 percent. But the fact remains that we took action. We undertook to try to remove the discrimination which existed de facto, and we have had a certain experience which I believe is worthy of consideration. If it can be done on a smaller scale, it can be done with improvements and modifications on a larger scale; because I point out that where discrimination exists, it makes little difference whether those discriminated against represent 1 percent or 38 percent of the population.

We have a higher percentage of Indians in our State than perhaps there are in other States. But if discrimination exists against the Indians of our State—as it has—then it certainly behooves us all the more to take action to remove that discrimination because we have a larger percentage of Indians than other States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator say that the ghetto in Portland contains the 18,000 or 20,000 Negroes in Oregon?

Mr. HATFIELD. I said that 18,000 of them live in the city of Portland, and a goodly portion of them live in a ghetto. But Negroes live in all parts of our city of Portland, according to their economic ability.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us how many live in the ghetto? To be frank, I am surprised that there is a ghetto in Portland or in Oregon, with so few Negroes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am disappointed.

Mr. HATFIELD. We are disappointed, too. That is why we are taking action to try to eliminate it.

A ghetto, in my opinion, cannot be eliminated by merely passing an open housing act. We must have educational facilities that are adequate to meet their needs. We must have job opportunities that can give them employment. We must have all these various things in order to attack the problem of the ghetto.

As I said a while ago I am not pointing my finger to any part of the country other than my State because we have enough problems and conditions there that exist that need correcting. I feel I am only indicating what has been our experience.

However, the ghetto that does exist is gradually being eliminated by educational programs sufficient to meet the needs of those people, and job opportunities for all of the people in the Portland area whereby they can raise their standards and abilities. We have urban renewal programs and improved housing programs which are available to the Negro in other parts of the city. All of these things are being used to attack the problem of the ghetto. The Negro living in the ghetto today is not restricted to the ghetto if he has the economic ability to remove himself from the ghetto because he can buy in any part of the city, if he has the means. He has the right, the freedom, and the legal protection to buy a home in any part of that city within his economic income or capability.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator describe conditions in other parts of Oregon? Are there any Negroes in Tacoma?

Mr. HATFIELD. Salem has Negroes, Eugene has Negroes, Medford has Negroes, and one can find them scattered throughout the community. There are about 200 Negroes living in Salem, which is the capital, and there are Negroes in all parts of the city and not in one section.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the population of Salem?

Mr. HATFIELD. The population there is about 60,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are only 200 Negroes among the population of 60,000 there?

Mr. HATFIELD. With the right to live in any part of that city.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that the problem there would be nil with so few Negroes out of a total population of 60,000.

How many Negroes are there in Tacoma?

Mr. HATFIELD. Tacoma is in the State of Washington. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have confused the cities of Washington with those of Oregon. I am sorry. I had mentioned Seattle a while ago, which, of course, is in the State of Washington also.

Mr. HATFIELD. It all belonged to the Oregon Territory at one time. I do wish to say to the Senator that when he states the problem is nil in a city like Salem, I can remember when Marian Anderson was denied a room in a hotel in that city because she was a Negro; when Paul Robeson, when he was on the concert stage before he was on the political stage, was denied a room in a hotel in our city of Salem; and when a minister of the Gospel was denied a room in a hotel.

The point is that we have a problem. We always have a problem, in my opinion, wherever there is discrimination, when it is directed against one man or one group and, I, therefore, feel even though we have few Negroes in number, we have tried to solve this problem on a scale commensurate with our problem.

I think it is applicable and pertinent to the matter here under discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated that there are two cases pending in Portland.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the act under which these proceedings are pending provide that the court shall have jurisdiction or a commission that is created under the law?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Commissioner has jurisdiction and his decision can be appealed to the courts. He has original jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. But he has original jurisdiction, and whatever he decides can be immediately appealed.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. His decision can be appealed by any aggrieved person.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the basis of

the two cases about which the Senator spoke? Does the Senator know?

Mr. HATFIELD. In connection with those two cases I cannot give the exact details. One arose in Eugene and the other in Portland. I believe they involved attempts to purchase or rent housing. The property was on the market and it was on the market in the general knowledge of the public. That is to say it was either advertised or listed by a realtor. Negroes attempted to purchase or rent, who had the financial capacity to do so. They were denied or the terms were changed so that they were denied the opportunity to occupy the properties.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume these two suits are to test the validity of the law.

Mr. HATFIELD. The constitutionality of the law is not in question. It is a matter of factfinding relating to the Commissioner's first decision. We have no case now pending, or any case previously brought, before the courts on the matter of constitutionality.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator spoke of the law enacted in 1957 and another law enacted in 1959. What gave rise to those laws? How did they come about? Did they arise because of complaints of Negroes?

Mr. HATFIELD. No. The act passed in 1949, the FEP Act, the Public Accommodations Act of 1953, the first housing act of 1957, and the housing act of 1959, all originated within the community councils, supported by individuals and by interested citizens groups. They arose because of the efforts of the people of Oregon trying to solve existing problems and prevent them from becoming bigger problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the law enacted in 1959, deal only with housing, or were other discriminatory practices involved?

Mr. HATFIELD. No; the law of 1959 was called Oregon Housing Act, and it had to do with rentals and sales of apartments and such. The 1953 act had to do with public accommodations, hotels, motels, amusements and recreation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 1959 act dealt only with housing?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2976—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO THE REORGANIZATION OF PLANNING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, our cities today enjoy a great potential for shaping their future character and development. They can make themselves better places for their inhabitants to live and work in. By providing sufficient recreational facilities and open spaces, they can make their environment a place where human beings can live and will want to live. They can provide neighborhoods which are human in tone and with which the individual will want to identify. In such a neighborhood, the individual resident could enjoy either privacy or neighbors of similar interests or diversified backgrounds whatever his individual choice; and whatever his income could enjoy, housing which is livable, desirable, and inexpensive.

The potential for achieving these objects comes from the rational and effective use of planning and development tools by the local jurisdiction. Planning as a governmental function brings about the rational use of available social, economic, and demographic information on conditions and needs to develop future patterns and objectives for the city's growth. Development as a governmental function makes possible the channeling of all available resources into the achievement of these future objectives.

Some cities have been able to tap the full potential of these functions to radically transform their character. New Haven, Conn., is probably the most nationally acclaimed city in this regard. Under the leadership of Mayor Richard C. Lee and as a result of the highly centralized operation of the city government which included both the planning and development functions, the mayor was able to direct and fully harness the thrust of all of the city's resources toward the goal of a better city.

Unfortunately, the government of the District of Columbia stands at the opposite pole from that of New Haven in its ability to rationally and effectively utilize available resources in the planning and development areas. Where the organization of Mayor Lee's government allowed a total commitment and followthrough on development and execution of planning and development programs, the nature of planning and development functions in the District of Columbia is so highly fragmented as to make virtually impossible the establishment, let alone the execution, of a cohesive and consistent policy. The overriding characteristic of the District of Columbia is the profusion of independent agencies, each of which enjoys some authority for planning, or some development function.

Among these many separate jurisdictions there exists little or no coordination in program execution or even in the establishment of policy objectives. The National Capital Housing Authority, the Redevelopment Land Agency and the District government, for example, all possess authority to initiate redevelopment projects. The National Capital Housing Authority has primary responsibility for the construction and maintenance of public housing, which during land acquisition and construction involves it in urban renewal. But NCHA has little coordination with the agency primarily responsible for urban renewal in the District, the Redevelopment Land Agency. Neither of these two agencies in turn has close coordination with the District of Columbia government, which itself has an office of urban renewal, a community redevelopment program, and a model cities office.

As early as April 1961 the need to bring about a coordinated approach was pointed out by Chairman JOHN McMILLAN of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. At that time, Chairman McMILLAN introduced a bill and held initial hearings on a proposal to centralize all District redevelopment functions in an office in the District government. Last August, following the passage of Reorganization Plan No. 3, the ranking Republican member of that same committee, Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, called for the centralization of planning and development functions in the District government. The reorganization plan, he declared, did not go far enough to meet the real problems of the District government. The reorganization plan did not go far enough to meet the real problems of the District government which the fragmentation of authority created. Finally, in early January the mayor's task force called for centralization of authority for these areas in the District government.

In addition to the profusion of separate jurisdictions responsible for initiating redevelopment proposals the complicated review procedure found in the District further acts to fragment and decentralize planning and development. A single initiating body like the Redevelopment Land Agency must secure the approval of other independent agencies before it can begin to execute its proposal. RLA must get the approval of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District government. While NCPC has no power to initiate urban renewal proposals it can effectively block them through its review procedure of proposals developed by the Redevelopment Land Agency. The result is not only a total absence of cohesive or consistent policy among the separate authorities, but a hamstringing of each individually in its own operations.

In addition to the other two problems, the National Capital Planning Commission, which is theoretically the central planning unit for the District of Columbia, lacks any positive power to implement its plans. It lacks authority to initiate plans of its own. The only power the NCPC has to effect its plans is the negative power to reject proposals or force modification in those submitted to it for its review by other agencies and jurisdictions. But even here, this rejection can and is frequently ignored. The net effect is that planning in the District of Columbia which is supposed to act to rationalize development for the future is unable to have any real influence on the shaping of the city.

In an attempt to remedy some of these problems, I am today introducing legislation to establish an agency within the District of Columbia government responsible for exercising all local planning and development functions in the District. The powers and functions of the National Capital Housing Authority, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the District planning functions of the National Capital Planning Commission would be transferred to this agency.

I understand that the President is considering the use of his reorganization powers to bring about a similar transfer of powers to the District government. I would enthusiastically welcome such action on his part in this regard. And as far as I understand what the President expects to propose, there is no conflict between his proposals and what I am today proposing.

The only major difference between the two is in their scope. The President's power under the Reorganization Act of 1965 are limited. He can only reorganize already existing powers and functions. It is one thing to transfer the existing powers of planning and development of established governmental units to a centralized authority; it is quite another to provide the additional tools necessary to do an adequate and effective job of planning and development for the District. There is much that can be achieved through reorganization. Only through additional legislative action can many of these needed tools be supplied.

In 1910 the current restrictions on building heights in the District of Columbia were passed. Tradition has it that these restrictions were intended to protect the position of the Washington Monument as the highest structure in the Nation's Capital. However, nice this sounds, it is not the reason the legislation was passed. In 1910, firefighting equipment could only reach a certain height. Legislation was passed to prevent the construction of structures too tall to be reached by the fire equipment of that day. But while the technology of firefighting has changed since 1910, the limitation still remains, and the result of its continued existence has been a substantial and unnecessary limitation of the growth of the District, particularly in commercial areas of the city.

There is, of course, a need to protect the historic quality of the District. This can be achieved through adequate planning. At the same time here is also a need to provide economically viable patterns of land use in the District. Giving the Zoning Commission power to waive the height limitation for proposals which complement or further the objectives of District conservation, planning, and development is one significant way of achieving this.

In addition there is a need to utilize public space for more than just one purpose. Space in the District is too limited, for example, to allow 3 acres to be used solely for a school site which will be used only during daylight hours. There is a need to provide the authority for the schools and other District government units to combine different uses in a single structure, different public uses, or to even combine complementary public and private uses. New York City recently began work on a facility which would combine a school facility with private housing. The District of Columbia should have the widest range of tools at its disposal to make the Nation's Capital a model place not only to visit, but in which to live and work. This power would be an additional tool which could be used toward that end. This could be achieved in the District of Columbia by empowering the Agency for Planning and Development to approve the acquisition of land to be used for a public District purpose and other public and private purposes.

The legislation I introduce today provides for both the relocation of the height limitation and the multiple use of public facilities. It provides the District planners and developers with other mechanisms as well to effectively produce a better city. The planning mandate of the agency is not limited to physical planning as is currently true of the 1952 act establishing the NCPC. It would bring about the inclusion of social and economic factors as elements to be considered in the development of plans and does not arbitrarily limit the planner to physical considerations. The legislative proposal establishes the post of urban economist in the agency to provide the kind of economic analysis necessary for effective planning which takes into account economic consequences.

It stands to reason that no city can permit arbitrary removal of a substantial part of its tax-producing structures, properties, and improvements; and yet in the past there has been no consideration, no official charged with the responsibility, of pointing out the economic factors of planning and development within the District of Columbia. I think the 1985 plan is an unfortunate example or symptom of the complete failure of planning processes in the District. There you have a "plan" which actually does not really plan for the development of the city, but merely takes into account certain patterns, and assumes that those patterns cannot be changed, and comes up with certain results which would actually be a city which no one of us would like to see or live in.

In addition the legislation authorizes employment of nonprofessionals to assist in planning and development. The employment of nonprofessionals would be the professional planners in direct contact with individuals who have lived in the environments that the professional is attempting to improve.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the need to centralize and make more effective planning and development in the District of Columbia. But even if this were to be fully achieved, one important component would still be missing, one factor which is too frequently ignored by government today, and which, I am sure, was one of the primary causes of the summer riots in the past 4 years. I am referring to the lack of concern for the impact of government projects on the citizen. Government too frequently functions in spite of rather than in behalf of the very people for whom it is theoretically working. Too often government does what it thinks is best for people without consulting them and taking their views of specific needs into account. This is particularly true in the District which lacks even the rudimentary mechanisms of elections to bring about a dialog between the citizen and the public official. Nor are the residents in the city able to use what channels may be open. Those who are totally or partially uneducated or are "uncultured" to middle class ways do not know how to articulate their wants functionally into the system.

Prior to 1958, the meetings of the National Capital Planning Commission were held behind closed doors. Even today most of the business of the Commission is conducted in executive sessions to which the public is barred. Moreover, the public meetings of NCPC do not provide a mechanism for the citizen to express his sentiments. With the exception of two sets of public hearings the public has been strictly barred from participating in the "public" meetings of the NCPC. This is not the way to achieve an awareness of citizen needs and desires. Much the same can be said about the other government bodies in the District for the development of the model cities proposals by the District government as well as for other projects undertaken by the various jurisdictions exercising planning and development functions.

One obvious solution is to require public hearings at which the public can testify on all major planning and development proposals. But the public hearing has two serious limitations as a vehicle for citizen impact and involvement. First, it must of necessity be held after the proposal has been pretty well developed. There is thus less of an opportunity to effect major modifications in the proposal short of out right rejection by groups testifying. Public hearings do not allow the public "to get in on the ground floor," so to speak, of the development of the proposal. Second, public hearings are most effectively used by individuals and groups which are highly articulate and enjoy greatest professional competence. For it is they who are capable of fully understanding the proposals, being able to develop alternatives and explain in technical terms the reasons for their views. The member of a lower-income family has neither the time nor the ability to collect data on the proposal, to understand it fully, to be able to develop alternatives, or to prepare testimony or articulate his views. While public hearings provide part of the solution to citizen involvement, something more is needed.

The concept of advocate planning as suggested by Paul Davidoff, of Hunter College in New York City, and successfully applied in such diverse localities as Boston and San Diego represents a means of overcoming some of the obstacles faced by lower-income citizens in achieving a full understanding of technical planning and redevelopment proposals, and being able to articulate his sentiments if a channel is available through which his sentiments can have an impact on the proposals. The concept of advocate planning concerns citizen groups being advised by professional planners. The profession helps to translate the technical jargon of planning into terms readily understood. In this way the citizen can achieve an understanding of exactly what a proposal does and does not do, and at the very least the gap of misunderstanding and ignorance can be avoided.

On many occasions, it is the misunderstanding of a proposal that creates hostility and antagonism. The advocate planner would be able to advise the citizen as well of the potential consequences and impact of the proposal, and be able to suggest alternative proposals in line with the reactions of the citizen. The planner could then help prepare any formal recommendations or testimony of the citizens' group. Where this idea has been tried notably through private groups such as the Urban Planning Act, Inc., in Boston and through the city government, as in San Diego, it has been quite successful. Such a mechanism makes it possible for the nonprofessional to channel his sentiments into the decisionmaking process of planning just as the nonprofessional is represented before a court by the lawyer.

To achieve the objectives of citizen impact and articulation on the planning and development process, the legislation I am introducing today establishes public hearings requirements and empowers the District of Columbia Council to set specific requirements and procedures with respect to such hearings. In addition there are established a series of neighborhood planning councils through which residents of each neighborhood can develop their responses to proposed plans and redevelopment proposals. Each council would be provided with professional planning assistance to aid the resident in understanding and developing his positions.

This concept is not a totally new one to the District of Columbia, for in December 1966 neighborhood planning councils were established to plan the summer youth program for the next year. Such councils were highly effective in developing what was called the most successful summer program the District has ever had. Within certain limits laid down by the District government, each council was free to design whatever kind of program most appealed to it. This legislation would take the prototype of the neighborhood planning councils and establish them with planning functions. It would further establish mandatory referral of all proposals developed by the planning and redevelopment agency of the District government to the neighborhood councils which would be affected by them.

The councils would then be free to meet with agency officials and testify at the open hearings. This in no way would affect the right of any other organized groups in the District to express their views on the proposals at the time of the public hearings. In fact, the legislation would require the planning and development agency to supply information on their proposals to all interested groups. The legislation would also establish a small office to service the neighborhood planning councils.

This legislation reflects two basic objectives, the centralization and strengthening of the planning and redevelopment functions of the municipal government to make it more capable of developing and carrying out coordinated and rational policies and the involvement of the citizen in that process. Traditionally, these two objectives have not been sufficiently reconciled. This legislation attempts to strike a sufficient balance between the two to make them not only compatible but complementary.

Mr. President, the impact of Federal office buildings and other facilities is quite significant on many areas of the United States. It obviously has a particularly great impact on the Washington metropolitan region because of the concentration of office buildings and other Government facilities in the region. The location of these facilities of necessity has a major impact on the nature and development of the region. A rational location can have a highly beneficial effect while an irrational location can act as a strongly detrimental factor.

The Federal Government has been a pioneer in initiating regional planning through requirements that local jurisdictions applying for road construction funds must have a regional thoroughfare plan, and that localities applying for Federal grants must submit their requests to the regional planning council for comment on conformity with regional planning before submission to the Federal Government.

Yet while it is so progressive in getting others to do their planning and development on a regional basis, the Federal Government is lacking in this regard in its own backyard, the Washington metropolitan region. We find in the Maryland suburbs of Washington as well as those in Virginia irrationally scattered Federal buildings and other facilities. Virginia, for example, saw the irrational development of airport facilities while Maryland witnessed the placement of an Atomic Energy Commission building on a site where no major highway or other form of transportation reached for a couple of years after the building had been completed.

Nor is there any real coordination or even attempt at coordination within the executive branch of the agencies' location plans. Today, there exists on paper a mechanism for coordinating Federal facilities in the region, but that is all it is—a paper mechanism. The key to the effective placement of Federal buildings is continuous and coordinated contact with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and the local jurisdictions, and an effective and active coordinating mechanism in the executive branch itself.

To achieve this third objective my proposed legislation establishes an Office of Federal Development in the Washington metropolitan region with responsibility for devising, in consultation with COG and the local jurisdictions, of a Federal site and Government facilities plans. Such a plan should complement the development patterns for the region established by COG and the local jurisdictions. The Office would be in the Executive Office of the President where it would have sufficient prestige and power to be able to deal with the agencies. It would review agency plans for sites in the region, based on the criteria of and the comments of COG and the local jurisdictions. All proposals would be mandatorily referred to COG and the local jurisdiction before a final decision on a plan could be made. A Commission composed of five prominent and distinguished planners and architects appointed by the President would advise the Director of the Office on each proposal. Public hearings on all proposals would be required. In addition the agencies would be required to submit 5-year or more capital improvement plans to the Office each year.

The proposed legislation covers the three broad areas of planning organizations, in the District of Columbia citizen participation, and the impact of the Federal establishment of the Washington metropolitan area. My comments of necessity have covered each element only briefly. It is my hope that hearings on this legislation, will be able to bring out the important elements of each of these areas and serve as a forum in which these three questions which affect many cities and urban areas across the country can be focused upon.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to meet the objectives I have just outlined; and I ask unanimous consent that a summary of this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 2976) relating to planning in the District of Columbia and its environs in connection with developments and projects of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The summary, presented by Mr. TYDINGS, is as follows:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION BY SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS TO REORGANIZE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLANNING, PROVIDE FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, AND COORDINATE FEDERAL BUILDING SITE DEVELOPMENT IN THE REGION

This legislation establishes an agency in the government of the District of Columbia (the Agency for Planning and Development) responsible for exercising all local planning and development functions. Unlike the National Capital Planning Commission, its planning mandate would not be limited to physical elements. The agency would be able to take into account social and economic factors as well as physical. The powers and functions of the National Capital Housing Authority, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the District planning functions of the National Capital Planning Commission would be transferred to this agency. The director of the agency would be directly responsible to the Mayor-Commissioner.

The Zoning Commission would be given the power to waive the building height limitation and the Agency for Planning and Development the power to approve the acquisition of land for mixed public and private uses. In both cases the exercise of the powers would have to comply with District comprehensive plans and planning objectives. The functions of the Advisory Commission on Zoning would be likewise transferred to the new agency, and the authority of the current Board of Zoning Adjustment would be given to a single administrator appointed by the Mayor and located within the new agency.

The proposed legislation further sets up a series of Neighborhood Planning Councils (NPC) based on the prototype of the existing Neighborhood Planning Councils, which developed the District's 1967 summer youth program. All residents of a neighborhood would be members of the Council. Each council would elect a chairman and a board of directors for one year term. These councils would be concerned with planning and would be able to hire professional planners to advise them on proposed plans, and organizers to interest residents of the community in the activities of the councils. The chairman of the District of Columbia Council would be authorized to designate members of the (D.C.) Council to maintain contact with each NPC.

The Agency for Planning and Development would be required to provide the NPC's and any other interested citizens' groups with full information on proposals that it was developing which affected specific neighborhoods. The Agency would also be required to consult with the NPC's and to hold public hearings prior to any action being taken upon any proposal. At these hearings the NPC's and anyone else could present their views and alternatives.

There would also be established an Office of Neighborhood Planning to service the Neighborhood Planning Councils. The director of this Office would be chosen by a majority of the chairmen of the NPC's and he would serve a one year term. His appointment would be subject to the approval of the Mayor.

The federal agency planning functions now exercised by the National Capital Planning Commission would be transferred to a new unit, the Office of Federal Development in the National Capital Region, in the Executive Office of the President. This Office would review all agency proposals for building sites and other federal facilities in the Washington region. A commission composed of five distinguished planners and architects appointed by the President would advise the Office on the proposals it was considering.

The Office would be required to refer all agency proposals submitted to it to the local jurisdictions and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) for comment. The Office would also be responsible for the development in cooperation with COG and the local jurisdictions (including the District) of federal site plans for the region which complemented other regional and local planning objectives. It would then review the agency proposals on the basis of their conformity to the federal plan and on the basis of the comments of the local jurisdictions and COG.

The agencies would be required to develop their own five year (or longer) capital improvement programs for their facilities needs in the region and to submit these to the office for review.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the fair housing amendment.

In this session of Congress we have talked about and will continue to talk about manpower training programs to remedy hard-core unemployment and about the deplorable state of ghetto area schools. One of the means the Senate and this Congress can begin to remedy these situations is through the passage of a fair housing law.

The pattern of racial segregation in housing affects employment opportunities and the racial composition and quality of schools. Any city planner planning the ideal city will tell you that journey-to-work considerations are crucial in the location of housing and employment. Low-income people cannot afford the expenses of private transportation to work. In the first half of this century, industry and most employment in American cities was located in the cities' central sector, and housing for the low-income groups was also located in the central sector.

Among the many reasons for industry's move to the suburbs in the past 15 years are the requirements of mechanized assembly lines which need space all on one level and the requirements for increased parking areas. In addition, the increase of interstate truck transportation required that industries locate on the outskirts of large cities. Industries found no barriers to moving out where more land was available, but discrimination in housing prevented the nonwhite workers from following them. Those who could not afford the transportation to work were left without employment.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert Weaver, testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency's Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs that in the first 5 years of this decade, one-half to two-thirds of all new factories, stores, and other mercantile buildings in all areas of the country except the South were located outside the central cities and metropolitan areas. If this trend continues, and it is expected to, expanding job opportunities will be in or near the suburbs rather than in core cities.

Eighty percent of the nonwhite population of metropolitan areas in 1967 lived in central cities. Under present conditions, these persons are unable to move to suburbia because of housing discrimination practices and because of the lack of low- and moderate-cost housing. They are the least able to afford the high cost of transportation and, unable to live in the central city and work in the suburbs, they will be deprived of many jobs.

Recently U.S. Department of Labor reports show that unemployment is so much worse in the slum ghettos than in the country as a whole. National unemployment rates do not begin to show the problems of minority workers. Unemployment figures of 3.7 or 4 percent do not indicate the rate of unemployment in the slums. In the slums, few persons have decent jobs, up to one-half are unable to earn better than a poverty-level income, and between 10 to 20 percent of those who should be working are not working at all.

I give a few specific examples presented by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing showing the movement of jobs from the central city to the suburbs. New York City lost more than 180,000 manufacturing jobs in the years 1951 to 1965 when its nonwhite and Puerto Rican population was increasing by almost one-quarter of a million. New employment gain of approximately 30,000 jobs occurred especially in manufacturing industries in the suburbs of the cities.

Between 1962 and 1965, when St. Louis city's employment increased less than 3,000, St. Louis County gained almost 53,000 jobs, mostly manufacturing and service type jobs.

In Baltimore between 1951 and 1965, total employment increased only 1,450. Baltimore lost almost 20,000 jobs in manufacturing and urban Baltimore gained 86,272 in those years.

The city of Philadelphia lost nearly 50,000 jobs from 1952 to 1965, but the ring around Philadelphia gained 215,000 jobs.

What is the transportation situation for the inhabitant of the Negro ghetto out to these jobs? In New York, the monthly commuting total on the Long Island Railroad equals $30. In St. Louis there is no public transportation to many of the areas to which jobs moved. Where there is transportation, the trip costs about $6.50 a week and takes from 1½ hours to 2 hours each way.

In Baltimore, the trip ranges from $4 a week and a 40-minute ride each way to $15 and an hour's ride each way. In Philadelphia, a person working in Montgomery County would have to change buses at least three times and pay about $6.60 a week in commuter tickets.

The Watts riots in Los Angeles indicated that the problem is even of greater magnitude in California. I commend to the reading of the Senate the remarkable book entitled "Rivers of Blood, Years of Darkness," by Robert Conot. This book spells out many of the aspects that contributed to the tragic rioting in the Watts area and the fact that one of the key factors was this pool of unskilled employment, penned in the ghettos and sealed off from employment, unable to afford cars or public transportation. There is in addition the inconvenience of spending time to find jobs, if jobs can be found. These factors were such as to discourage completely efforts to find employment. I think the best example of that is the recent Aerojet-General plant located in the center of the Watts area. That company produces military tents under Federal contract. The initial employment was to be 75 employees. In response to help wanted ads, more than 5,500 residents of the Watts area applied. That showed the absolutely pathetic need for unskilled jobs in that one area alone.

The same situation exists in San Francisco. To commute from any one of the several Negro ghettos in San Francisco or the East Bay to job openings in South San Francisco, Martinez, Livermore, or Point Richmond, a person would find it almost impossible if he had to rely on public transportation. To commute from Hunters Point in San Francisco to a job in Contra Costa County in the East Bay would require from three to four transfers, a cost of about $15 a week, and a 4- to 5-hour commute time each day. A more reasonable commute, via Alameda or West Oakland, to jobs in Contra Costa County costs about $11.50 a week, takes at least 2 hours each way, and is restricted primarily to travel during peak rush hours, which makes any off-hour job of this kind virtually impossible.

Unless the county is willing to invest billions of dollars in a cheap, fast, and multidestination transportation system, ghetto residents will not be able to reach most jobs. A much simpler solution to one facet of the employment problem would be to open housing to everyone.

The pattern of racial segregation in housing also affects the racial composition and quality of schools. The neighborhood school concept, until recently, coupled with patterns of racial housing, operated despite a Supreme Court decision in Brown against the Board of Education to keep Negroes in de facto segregated schools. And the condition of these schools is a question of considerable concern for many. The schools in Washington, D.C., in New York City, and in other large city ghetto areas have been the subject of intense criticism. Jonathan Kozol's book, "Death at an Early Age," depicts the conditions of schools in Boston. The book describes the efforts of a young teacher in the Boston school system to deal with the deplorable conditions which literally destroy the young students attending those schools.

The stopgap solution for this result of lack of fair housing measures has been, as for unemployment, to provide transportation. For education this has come in the form of busing. Neither de facto segregation nor busing would be the case if we could do away with discrimination in housing.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has recently published a study entitled "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools." This report demonstrated that there is a relationship between the confinement of Negroes to central city ghettos and inferior educational opportunities. For this reason, since housing discrimination produces inequality of educational opportunity, the Commission recommended in that report a Federal fair housing law in order to minimize the impact of housing segregation on education.

Open housing is absolutely essential to the realistic achievement of such accepted goals as desegregated schools and equal opportunity. Much of the statutory civil rights progress of recent years will be little more than theoretical until open housing becomes a reality. Because the composition of the student body is determined by the composition of the residents of the area in which this school is located, the soundest way to attack segregated education and the quality of the schools resulting from it is to attack the segregated neighborhood. Testimony at the hearings on the Fair Housing Act brought out that it is virtually impossible to provide high quality education to disadvantaged minorities as long as they are restricted to living in older congested sections of cities. The opportunity to go to school with members of other racial and ethnic and economic groups tends to improve the educational achievement of disadvantaged children, according to findings of educational research including the Coleman report.

De facto segregation in schools and education is directly traceable to the existing patterns of racially segregated housing. We cannot afford to allow our efforts to provide the best education possible to all Americans to be thwarted by actions of private persons, actions which are antisocial, immoral, and which ultimately amount to contravention of our public policy in favor of equal educational opportunity. Fair housing is therefore more than merely housing. It is part of an educational bill of rights for all citizens.

Without it, the dream of full and fair social opportunities for all Americans is an illusion.

(At this point, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey assumed the chair.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the open housing amendment to the pending bill declares that it is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination in the purchase, rental and occupancy of all housing. Title II of the amendment provides that the bill will take effect in three stages, that is, its provisions shall apply to the Federal Government and its agencies immediately. After December 31, 1968, the provisions of the amendment would also then apply to all dwellings in which the owner is not a resident at the time of the sale, and dwellings intended for occupancy by five or more families. The final stage of the bill is December 31, 1969, when it would apply to all dwellings. However, there are exempted dwellings which are occupied by no more than four families, if the owner actually occupies one of the living quarters as his residence.

The amendment further provides that discrimination in the sale and rental of houses is not only unlawful, but also the printing or publication or any statement or notice indicating a preference based on race, religion, or national origin. Apparently, under this provision any newspaper publisher who accepted an advertisement indicating a preference by the owner of a certain race or religion would be in violation of the law. Apparently, freedom of speech and press guaranteed in the Bill of Rights is to be abolished with the inauguration of this open housing amendment.

The amendment also provides that any person involved in the financing of housing who in any way discriminates against a person applying for a loan would be made criminally liable.

Any person operating a multiple listing service or real estate brokers' service, who indicated a preference for one race or another, would be in violation of the law. In the hearings held in 1966 and 1967, most of the real estate organizations testified against the whole open housing bill, and not just this section alone. The amendment further provides that it is unlawful to interfere, coerce, intimidate, or do anything which would interfere with the so-called right of open occupancy. There is exempted from these provisions the right of a religious organization to show preference in any institution controlled by it for its own members.

There would be created an additional Assistant Secretary to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement the provisions of the amendment. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or his agents, are given unlimited power to implement and enforce the so-called right of open occupancy. He is given the power to entertain complaints, engage in factfinding in particular disputes, render judgments on the charges of discrimination, issue restraining orders and subpenas, and assess penalties for failure to comply with his judgments. Never in the history of the United States or of the civilized world has a political appointee been granted such far-reaching and sweeping executive and judicial powers. He may even institute proceedings against an alleged violator without having even received a complaint.

The intent of the proposed amendment gives authority to the Secretary to conduct what is termed "educational activities." He is authorized to pay out sums of money to bring groups of people together to be educated in this new social order. It is indeed a sad day for the United States when Congress would even consider permitting a political appointee to engage in this type of propaganda and brainwashing of our own citizens. I do not believe that it is unfair of me to say that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is the poorest run department of any of our Federal agencies, even taking into account that it is a relatively new department. The officials charged with the administration of the programs have indicated an ignorance of congressional acts and congressional intent to an unbelievable extent. The bureaucratic bungling in the Department of Housing and Urban Development is unparalleled in any of our executive departments.

As Senators know, I have supported every housing act which has become law in the last 31 years. In my earlier years in the Senate, I was a member of the committee which considered all housing legislation. I toured the country to ascertain the housing needs of the American people. I have done everything in my power to see that all people in this country, regardless of race, have had decent housing. In very recent years, I have even supported rent supplement programs at considerable political cost, I might add. Each and every time I have attempted to secure any information of value from the Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding new proposals or the operation of existing programs, I have been met with nothing but delays, misinformation, lack of information—no information.

In granting power and authority to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and his agents, we must proceed on the assumption that the least qualified people will occupy those positions of power because there is no assurance that the best people will ever hold these jobs. As has been said by one of my colleagues, "no good Secretary would want such power as this amendment invests in him, and no bad Secretary should have it."

This open housing amendment holds out the traditional bait to the Northern States by providing that their local open housing laws may take precedence over the Federal law and the Secretary is authorized to refrain from enforcing the Federal law in such States.

I may say, Mr. President, that quite a few States have such laws. We have heard a discussion this afternoon of such a law in the State of Oregon.

As I suggested to my good friend the Senator from Oregon, with the State having only 1 percent of its population Negro, and most of the 1 percent located in the city of Portland, they have no problem.

I was surprised when the Senator from

Oregon stated that there was a ghetto in Portland, when only 20,000 Negroes live throughout the State, and more than 18,000 of them are in the city of Portland.

The Secretary or his agents are authorized to hold hearings and investigate, and to have access to premises, records, documents, and individuals and any other evidence to determine if there are any violations of the provisions of this act. Here, again, is another constitutional safeguard to the right of privacy, a citizen's right to be secure in his home, trampled underfoot by this amendment. As I said before, it is unbelieveable that the Senate would consider for a moment enacting the provisions of this amendment into law, taking away all of the rights which were fought for so long and so hard.

This bill is so obnoxious because it weights the controversy so heavily in favor of the person who claims to have been discriminated against. There is no attempt to maintain evenhanded justice. A person can file a complaint against the owner of a dwelling or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development can file the complaint, or the Attorney General can bring an action in the U.S. District Court against an alleged violator, all independently of each other, or all working together, depending upon their own discretionary choice. Anyone who violates the Secretary's orders can be fined $50 a day for disobeying such an order. In the past, Congress has created special commissions such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and has endowed it with quasi-judicial functions. It has made certain by the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act—APA—and other rights of redress against arbitrary acts of the Commission to insure that a respondent or violator would be protected in his constitutional rights. However, in this case, an ordinary political appointee of the President and his agents who hold office at the pleasure of the President, are invested with these overwhelming executive and judicial powers, without any safeguards for the rights of an accused person. To my knowledge, this is the first time a partisan political official in this Government would be granted such powers.

The pending amendment on open housing represents the ultimate in social extravagance in the United States. Every cherished liberty purchased at a high cost in Anglo-American history over the centuries is cast aside. All personal rights and liberties of the individual are ripped away for the alleged purpose of preventing discrimination. All the personal liberties wrung from the sovereigns from the Magna Carta to the Bill of Rights are trampled under foot. If this amendment becomes law, those guaranteed rights will be nothing but lies and dead concepts. The curators of our archives have placed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution in a steel and concrete vault. How stupid and foolish. Do they not know that the protection of the Constitution is here on this very floor and in the minds and actions of all Americans? The vault contains but empty promises on faded parchment. The fulfillment of the promises has not been kept.

Under this amendment the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would become a virtual commissar of housing—violating every right of life, liberty, and property. Sweeping judicial powers, I repeat, are given the Secretary and his agents to investigate the facts of alleged discrimination, render judgments against an accused and assess penalties. No right to file a complaint in court is granted an accused until 6 months after the Secretary or his agents have rendered their judgments that a violation has occurred. However, if the Secretary should decide against one of the so-called aggrieved persons he can go into Federal court in 30 days. In other words, if a so-called aggrieved person does not get a favorable decision from the Secretary within 30 days he can get the Attorney General to go into Federal court with his complaint. However, the poor fellow accused of discrimination cannot get a fair trial in a duly constituted court for 6 months.

Nothing so monstrous has been perpetrated on civilized people since the French and Russian Revolutions. The howling mobs are always the same—whether it is Paris in 1793, Petrograd in 1917 or Detroit in 1967. It is always in the name of democracy and equality. Equality is the last refuge of the trifling, the shiftless and the incompetent. This amendment runs into many of the same constitutional objections as the pending bill does, only it violates more provisions of the Bill of Rights.

The amendment is more or less the same bill that was considered in 1966 and 1967. On May 27, 1966, the Attorney General of Louisiana filed an opinion in the form of a memorandum with the Judiciary Committee on the constitutional questions raised. At some future time I shall quote from his very thoughtful and learned opinion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 16th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 1, the 16th consecutive annual Presidential prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also present were presidents of national and international labor unions, outstanding leaders in the field of industry and business, chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, from communications, and from every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast, but also to millions of citizens across this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the text of the program and the proceedings.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Invocation: The Hon. John A. Volpe, Governor, State of Massachusetts.

Introduction of Head Table and Statement: Sen. Frank Carlson, Kans.

Greetings from House Breakfast Group: Rep. Ben Reifel, S. Dak.

Old Testament Reading: Rep. John W. McCormack, Mass.; Deuteronomy 6:4–17, Read by Sen. Joseph Tydings, Md.

Greetings from Senate Breakfast Group: Sen. John Stennis, Miss.

New Testament Reading: John 15:1–17, The Vice President of the United States.

Prayer for National Leaders: Hon. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary Housing and Urban Development.

Message: General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Address by Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States.

Closing Prayer: Hon. Price Daniel, Office of Emergency Planning.

Closing Song: The Singing Sergeants.

INVOCATION, GOV. JOHN A. VOLPE

We raise our voices in prayer to the God of men and nations acknowledging our dependence on Him and our earnest intention to do His will. On this earth we only see dimly His divine light. After we hear too softly the sound of His voice. May His grace make us each day more sensitive to our duty, more conscious of how helpless we are without Him. As we ask His blessing on ourselves, we ask Him also to guide this nation and all others into the paths of peace and justice. Too often in our bewildered world, His sons are enemies separated by conflict and violence seeking to resolve by power what must be earned in peace. Those who call Him Father must by this fact be brothers, but how easily oppression, persecution and discrimination divide them one from the other and make a mockery of brotherhood and justice. The world God made for man, man has remade according to his own weakness. Help us, oh Lord, to know your ways and give us strength to follow them. Make us humble before You, loving toward our fellow man and forgiving of the faults of others. In these times of stress we ask His special blessing on the man who guides the destiny not only of our nation but indeed the entire world. Our President is burdened with problems which affect the people of every nation on earth. We ask that your divine guidance give him the foresight, intuition, knowledge and wisdom necessary to resolve that which has been placed before him. We ask that his virtue and love for his fellow man be spread throughout the world in order that all may live in peace and understanding. Let everything that we do find favor in your sight so that when life's cares are at last set aside, we may live eternally in your presence. Amen.

INTRODUCTION: SENATOR FRANK CARLSON

What does it accomplish? Each week, when Congress is in session, men from the United States Senate and from the House of Representatives meet to discuss and pray together. And it is in that spirit that we meet today.

Since the inauguration of this breakfast this idea of men in positions of responsibility meeting together privately and without publicity has spread to every State, scores of cities and to over 50 nations of the world—in parliaments and congresses on every continent.

Once a year men in leadership from various aspects of our national life meet together with the President of the United States and his official family to rededicate ourselves and our nation to almighty God. Now, the beginning of our nation, the United States of America, is recorded in the experiences of groups of people who left their homes and country, confident that they were being guided by the Lord to find a new country where they could worship Him in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. While still onboard the ship their leaders assembled in the cabin and prepared a compact which was to be their guide in their newfound home. This document was the historic Mayflower Compact. Later they prepared a document, the Declaration of Independence.

These documents declared that they were dependent upon God for their preservation and their continued existence as a people and as a government. Out of the 13 colonies grew the United States of America. Again and again the leaders of this new government reaffirmed their assurance of the protection and their guidance. Their faith as expressed in national documents, statements of the Presidents in their inaugural addresses, in the preambles of the States' constitutions and chiseled in the stones and marbles of monuments and public buildings.

Our Presidents have, to the man, called upon almighty God to help them meet the awesome responsibilities vested in them as President of the United States. April 30, 1789, in the first Inauguration, George Washington said these words: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that almighty Being who rules over the universe."

Those of us who are gathered here today believe that the United States of America is truly a nation under God. We're meeting today as citizens feeling our complete unworthiness, because we know of our public and private sins, but also recognize that we are charged with a serious and unique responsibility to pertpetuate this trusting faith in God to the oncoming generations.

After giving some thought to what I might say, if I only had the opportunity to say one more thing to the leaders of by beloved country, this being the end of 40 years of public service, it's just this:

Men, do not take the God of our fathers lightly or allow Him to be squeezed out of our lives through the neglect or our own selfish appetites. Only through our commitment to love Him with all our hearts, our souls and minds, and our neighbors as ourselves, will be safeguarded all that is worthwhile for our children and for our country and for the peoples of the world.

Now, it becomes my pleasure to present those at the head table who will not participate in the program. We have a great group of distinguished guests here this morning, and as I read their names, I hope they will rise, remain standing and that we hold our applause until all have been introduced.

I'm going to start at my extreme left with Dr. Abram Vereide; the Honorable Dewey Bartlett, Governor of the State of Oklahoma; the Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia; the Honorable Charles Terry, Jr., Governor of Delaware; Dr. don Napoleno Alcerro, who is Vice President-Designate of Honduras; the Honorable Allen Boyd, Secretary of Transportation; the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Ramsey Clark; the ambassador from Nicaragua, our very fine friend Dr. Sevilla-Sacasa; Dr. Hernan Garron Salazar, president of the National Assembly of Costa Rica who, by the way, brought with him a letter to the President from the President of Costa Rica which I shall deliver.

Now, I'm going to start at my extreme right. The Honorable Joe Tydings, the Senator from Maryland; the Governor of the great State of West Virginia, Governor Hulett Smith; the Governor of North Dakota, the Honorable William Guy; the Governor of the State of Mississippi, the Honorable John Bell Williams; the Honorable Mr. Pennell, Solicitor General of Canada; the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry Fowler; Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Marshall; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack.

Rep. REIFEL. Mr. President, honored guests, friends: I bring you the warmest of greetings from the prayer breakfast group of the U.S. House of Representatives. We meet at 8 a.m. for breakfast in the Capitol on nearly every Thursday that the Congress is in session. As you are aware, many of you more than I, our Government was established and nurtured by men of meaningful commitment to the faith of our fathers and a belief that the supreme power beyond themselves watches over its destiny. We meet on these Thursdays as the inheritors of their great work that we might collectively give expression to our reliance also on God's help and ask Him for His guidance for ourselves, our President and all others in authority that whatever we shall do will be in keeping with His will.

We go from these meditations hopefully so reaffirmed in our belief that each in his humble way may walk a bit closer to the path that God would have us follow and with the psalmist say reassuringly, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me."

For several years past, many of us have been privileged to share in this international commitment of free men that we might join in giving praise to our Lord, and together with meek hearts call upon Him for divine guidance. We know that we do not depend upon the frailty of man to face the challenges of that come to us from all around. And again, this day we will be reassured in the knowledge that our President ever strives to lead our nation and assist all mankind in the light of the deep and abiding spiritual heritage that is ours.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. President, Senator Carlson, and other friends, I bring special greetings of good will and good wishes from our Senate Breakfast Group. Without formality, some 15 to 20 of us meet informally at breakfast, each Wednesday morning for fellowship and to exchange views and comments in an attempt to apply spiritual values to present problems. Our responsibilities in Washington also demand spiritual food.

Within less than an hour from now I shall open hearings on a $79 billion military program for fiscal year 1969, the second largest in our Nation's history. There we shall be briefed on airlifts and sealifts, missiles and anti-missile missiles, conventional weapons, and ultimate weapons—all weapons.

Throughout such testimony, and during other days ahead, a grave question always plagues my mind: Is the real challenge in material things or in spiritual things?

I often feel encouraged to recall a recent air flight across the Atlantic when I visited the chief pilot of a giant passenger liner of the air as it winged its way over the trackless ocean. I asked him to explain how he took his bearings, how he kept his plane on its course and how he finally reached his true destination. Observing lights from several surface ships far below, I asked him if the ships gave him signals. His reply was piercing:

"Senator, I would never stay on my course if I took my bearings from strange and unknown ships at sea. I have trustworthy instruments here on my panel board. I know how to operate and read them. Furthermore, if those instruments should be inadequate, or if storms should overtake us, this plane has the power to climb above the clouds; I would then take my bearings from the stars."

As I left him and returned to my cabin, I knew this splendid pilot had given me a lasting message, great and true!

And I believe it was also a true message for our people, for our country and for the free world.

We have our instruments and panel boards of liberty and personal freedom. We have been trained to understand and to operate these instruments.

We have economic freedom, an instrument of happiness.

We have material resources, and the ability to convert these resources into material strength.

We have political freedom and a system of government which permits the people to govern themselves and preserve both their personal and their economic freedom.

Furthermore, we have the priceless heritage of religious freedom.

And, thankfully, we have been trained from our youth to rise above the clouds and look to the stars and to a Higher Light and Higher Power and thus find our bearings and our course.

Though the future may appear dark, as now, the challenge is not in the material world but in things of the spirit. So let us use the instruments on our panel board in charting our way and then purpose in our hearts to do our part in following that course.

Let us take courage. In other generations, the way has also been hard. At another uncertain time in history when our Constitution was being written, Delegate Benjamin Franklin addressed the Convention with these words:

"I have lived a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of man. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

The Convention thereupon adopted Mr. Franklin's motion that the sessions be opened each morning with prayer. Within less than two weeks, basic agreements were reached which led to the final adoption of our present Constitution, a document which has been the charter and protector of our own freedom, as well as the inspiration and guide of free men everywhere. By it, we have taken our bearings and stayed on our course.

We, too, must rise above the clouds and

look to the stars, and even beyond for the Higher Light. With the help of that Divine Light, we will find our way. May God sustain us as we look forward and face the future unafraid.

Senator CARLSON. At this time we are going to be led in prayer for our nation and for our national leaders by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver.

PRAYER FOR NATIONAL LEADERS

Our Father we thank Thee for the communion we enjoy together as we break bread here. We ask your guidance that we may create in this nation and on this earth a world in which men's deeds are governed not by their fears and hates but by their faith and hopes. Grant us peace and brotherhood thy most precious gifts and enable us to be messengers of peace. Bless our country and strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship between all the inhabitants of our land. We ask in particular that in your divine wisdom you will grant your love and guidance to our president that he may find renewed vigor and insight in facing the awesome decisions that rest upon him. And we call upon thee, oh Father, to encourage those of us who are in positions of national leadership so that we may find the patience and understanding to transform despair into hope and replace frustration with vision. Hear our prayer, oh Lord, Amen.

ADDRESS OF GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Introduction

Senator CARLSON. We have as our guest speaker this morning a great Christian layman, one of our nation's great military leaders, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Harold Johnson.

General JOHNSON, Mr. President, Senator Carlson, friends in God:

"I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord;
Real service is what I desire.
I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord;
But don't ask me to sing in the choir.
I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord—
I like to see things come to pass.
But don't ask me to teach girls or boys, dear Lord,
I'd rather stay in the class.
I'll do what you want me to do, dear Lord;
I'll yearn for the kingdom to thrive.
I'll give you my nickels and dimes, dear Lord,
But please don't ask me to tithe.
I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord,
I'll say what you want me to say.
But I'm busy now with myself, dear Lord,
I'll help you some other day."

Does that strike a familiar note to anyone?

Three years ago, when the honor, the privilege and the responsibility of appearing before this distinguished audience was accorded to me, I was pretty apprehensive. I asked then and I ask now: what in the world is this Johnson doing up here this morning?

And I said then and I say now that I don't believe that it's because I happen to share the same name as my Commander-in-Chief, but because, like our President, I believe in the power and the glory and the strengths of Almighty God. And as the task of preparing for this appearance this morning began to close in once again, I asked: What more can I say? And then I began to reflect back over a great number of events in my own life, and I started out with a number that I was going to tie together. And I had them boiled down to two last night, and this morning as we sat here at breakfast, I reduced it to just one that I want to relate very briefly:

I reflected back to late September, 1945, when I returned to the shores of this magnificent country after more than five years' absence, of which nearly 41 months had been spent out of communication, with little information and no sensing at all of public attitudes here at home. And the most vivid impression that I received when I came home and that I still carry with me—and, I might add, the greatest shock that I felt when I returned—was a national attitude of "what's in it for me?"—money under the counter if you expected to rent an apartment, must know a friend to get nylons for your wife or even a white bath towel, must know someone on the Ration Board to get tires for your car—"What's in it for me?"

And as I thought about this, I decided I had become so presumptuous as to try to give a brief message today despite the fact that I know in my heart that my qualifications really place me as a listener rather than as a speaker up here. I acknowledge that I am no paragon of virtue and that I violate the very things that I am going to speak about much more and perhaps much, much more than anyone who listens this morning.

And I want to use the third chapter of the letter of James, the thirteenth through the eighteenth verses, and I am going to read from Phillip's translation, and I quote: "Are there some wise and understanding men among you? Then your lives will be an example of the humility that is born of true wisdom. But if your heart is full of rivalry and bitter jealously, then do not boast of your wisdom. Don't deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart. You may acquire a certain superficial wisdom, but it does not come from God. It comes from this world, from your own lower nature, even from the devil. For wherever you find jealousy and rivalry, you also find disharmony and all other kinds of evil. The wisdom that comes from God is utterly pure, then peace-loving, gentle, approachable, full of tolerant thoughts and kindly actions, with no breath of favortism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness in other people and in themselves."

Our nation today is troubled and uneasy. We have those who believe that we should pull out of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing enough in Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing enough for the underprivileged of our country. We have those who believe that we are fostering and harboring a segment of parasites within our population. We have those who believe that the laws of our land can be flouted and that they can choose the laws they will obey and the laws they will ignore. We have those who believe that disrespect for the law should be confronted with a club or a gun.

Parents across our land are concerned with the use of drugs and dope among our young people.

So where do we turn? What do we do? How many of us—referring back to James—and I quote: "deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart"? How many of us have given real thought to the commandment that was read in our first scripture: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thine soul and with all thine might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart"?

We are part of a social structure that is growing more crowded with each passing day. It is becoming more difficult for an individual to establish an identity. The older among us are too busy and too preoccupied to communicate with the younger. Our consciences are becoming hardened by continued exposure to both the contemptible and the pitiable. Unable or unwilling to take corrective measures, we offer at first only our contempt or our pity. Contempt and pity give way to acceptance; acceptance leads finally to the worst attitude of all—uneasy indifference, anomalous as that may seem. We ignore, with the vain hope that the distasteful or the hard-to-solve problem will somehow go away.

And I wonder if it isn't time for each of us to reflect upon the eighth and the ninth verses of the fourth chapter of Genesis. Remember that after Cain slew his brother, the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" And Cain replied: "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?" And the answer is: "Yes, I am my brother's keeper." Each of us is his brother's keeper, and in the eyes of God, all of us are brothers.

We dare not be indifferent to our brothers' needs, whether those needs be material, spiritual or just plain communication.

Now, there is a solution to the problems of this world: Turn to God. There is a solution to the conflict between nations: Turn to God. There is a solution to the problems of our cities and our streets: Turn to God, not in a superficial way, but in a humane and compassionate way. As man to man and friend to friend, there is a solution to the problem of our young: With them, turn to God.

What's in it for me? Just the satisfaction of becoming a compassionate human being.

Finally, if we ever wonder how far we should carry our love for one another, remember that Jesus was not content with the old commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves. True to His manner, He added glorious new dimensions to that injunction by saying, in the words of our final text this morning: "This is My commandment—that ye love one another as I have loved you."

We can never hope to match His matchless love, but we grow in grace and glory every time we try.

ADDRESS OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Distinguished head table guests, reverend clergy, gentlemen: At this season of the calendar, the nights are long, the winds are chill, the light of day is often dull and gray. Our minds know that the chill will pass, that spring will come, that the days will be brighter once again.

What our minds know, our spirit often forgets. We weary of the winter and despair of the coming of the spring. We are tempted to turn from the task of duty and lay down the works that are ours to do.

At this season of the affairs of man, it is all much the same. The nights are very long. The winds are very chill. Our spirits grow weary and restive as the springtime of man seems farther and farther away.

And it is for such seasons as this one that man was given by his Creator the saving strength of faith—the strength that we summon to sustain us when we pray.

Once again, this is a season now when America needs to draw upon the strength of our many faiths. In this great office of all the people, it is not my right or my privilege to tell other citizens how or when or what they should worship. I can—and I do—tell you that in these long nights your President prays.

And in the hours of this night that just past, I found these lines of prayer that were repeated a quarter of a century ago by another President. It was in 1942, when we were challenged in both oceans, at a season when the winds of the world blew harsh and the dawn of a brighter day seemed very far away, Franklin Delano Roosevelt offered to this nation these words and I repeat them in these times:

"God of the free, we pledge our hearts and our lives today to the cause of all free mankind. . . . Grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace, that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own lands, but throughout the world. And in that faith let us march toward the clean world that our hands can make. Amen."

We cannot know what the morrow will bring. We can know that to meet its challenges and to withstand its assaults, America never stands taller than when her people go to their knees.

Senator CARLSON. The closing prayer will be given by a former Governor, a former United States Senator from the great state of Texas, and he is presently the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, the Honorable Price Daniel.

CLOSING PRAYER

Now Father, we thank Thee for these inspiring messages from the President of the United States and the other speakers on this program. We thank Thee for the privilege of this meeting, of the leaders of our nation and visitors from other lands in which we have pledged anew our faith in Thee and the spiritual ties which bind us together. We pray again Thy blessings upon the President of the United States and all who are in authority. Go with us now as we depart from this meeting, guide and direct us in our thoughts and actions in order that we may hasten the day when Thy teachings of justice, love and brotherhood may prevail in our nation and throughout the world. In the Master's Name, we pray. Amen.

Buy Dow

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, the Dow Chemical Co., headquartered in my district in Midland, has been the target of mob harassment and vilification solely because Dow is the only producer of napalm used by our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Largely generated on college campuses, these smear tactics by a lunatic fringe have attempted to identify this fine company with an allegedly immoral policy of the United States. On February 1, 1968, there appeared an editorial in Forbes which bears directly on this matter. I am pleased indeed to present it for reproduction in the RECORD, as follows:

BUY DOW

The kicking around that Dow Chemical Co. is getting both literally and figuratively on college campuses because it makes napalm to meet defense orders is completely unfair.

The sort of publicity that accompanies these episodes is presumably damaging to the company's public image, and any company realizes the vital importance of its image.

I just wonder, however, if Dow really is or will be hurt by all this. Is it too much to expect that the vast majority of Americans will recognize the inequity involved?

No matter what one thinks of our course in Vietnam, that's got absolutely nothing whatever to do with those supplying what the United States Government asks for in carrying out its policies. One might as well boycott the airlines that fly to Vietnam, the tire and auto companies that supply the vehicles for use there; the mills that make the uniforms and the companies that supply the fibers, and so on ad infinitum.

Protesting policy and casting ballots are part and parcel of the American way of life.

Downing Dow isn't.

I both hope and believe this sort of irresponsible abuse will boomerang, that more people might buy Dow things now to demonstrate disapproval of this misdirected abuse.

Tribute to the Women Marines

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on February 13, 1943, the U.S. Marine Corps brought into existence the women marines. When one considers that the U.S. Marine Corps antedates the signing of the Declaration of Independence, one realizes that that service took due deliberation before removing a rib for the creation of a women's section. They have never regretted their action.

The women marines have, by their very fine service, added to the luster that surrounds the U.S. Marine Corps record in war and in peace.

During my own service as a private in the U.S. Army, I had the opportunity of observing the fine work of the women marines and when, upon my discharge, I formed my own commercial company, I chose a former woman marine sergeant as my assistant.

That most capable person, former S. Sgt. Rusty Work Schwall, is now my administrative assistant and has served in that post for almost 20 years. I mention this only to prove my contention that the training that one receives in the U.S. Marine Women Corps prepares one for a position of great responsibility.

In 1943, upon the creation of the women marines, over 100 women volunteered for service in the first 24 hours of the call. They were rapidly followed by 18,000 more who flocked to the service to "free a marine to fight."

The question of a title for this new group soon arose. The Army had its WAC's, the Navy its WAVE's, and the Coast Guard its SPARS's. When questioned as to his choice, Marine Commandant Gen. Thomas Holcomb stated:

They're marines. Call them marines.

Certainly all will agree that these ladies by their dedicated service have well earned that envied right.

A mother of two women marines has written an excellent poem dedicated to all past and present members of that part of the U.S. Marine Corps. That poem by Mrs. Margaret C. Norris follows:

TO A WOMAN MARINE

A tall young girl in forest-green stands proud
And straight as she salutes her country's flag.
This woman soldier has a right to brag
Because she stands apart in any crowd.

A tall young girl in forest-green stands proud
And straight; her uniform reflects a long
And faithful service to a nation, strong
Because Marines, with honor, so have vowed.

Such people deem it duty to uphold
The principles of freedom, tolerance and justice, with self-government the means.

The Corps consists of people free and bold;
Today the women stand beside the men,
So proud to be: United States Marines!

Once more the United States finds itself in a serious war and our Marine Corps is as usual in the forefront of the fighting. As in the past, its capabilities have been tested by the foe who have found that the marines of today are living up to their traditions. The women marines have shared in these responsibilities and they too have earned the right to assume the proud title of "marine."

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. L. F. Chapman, a great fighting general has issued a proclamation in tribute to the women marines, past and present, it follows:

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C.

Twenty-five years ago, our Corps looked to woman-power to meet a new war's unprecedented demands for man power; and America's women—19,000 strong—answered the call to "free a Marine to fight."

Since that time . . . . in war and in peace . . . . those women and others like them have faithfully sustained the strongest military tradition in the world, that of the United States Marine Corps.

With pride in your past achievements . . . with faith in your promise for the future . . . . I extend to you—Women Marines past and present, congratulations on your Silver Anniversary and best wishes for the years to come.

L. F. CHAPMAN, Jr.,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

It is indeed timely that this tribute to the women marines appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so close to Valentine's Day for they are indeed the beloved "valentines" of us all.

We owe a debt of gratitude to those noble, patriotic women who have or are serving in the U.S. Marine Corps.

When the history of our national defense is written, their service will occupy an honored place.

Equal Employment Opportunities

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an inspiring article that describes how the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co. found that it was a good business to be concerned with equal employment opportunities. The author of the article is Mr. Thacher Longstreth, executive vice president of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and a Republican member of the Philadelphia City Council. Mr. Longstreth has distinguished himself over the years by showing a very deep concern for the rights and opportunities of all minorities.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXTRAORDINARY ACHIEVEMENT

Although I have not made it a practice in this column to discuss the activities of individual corporations, this week will be an exception because of the rather extraordinary achievement of the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company during 1967 in the hiring of a large number of non-whites.

In June of 1966, First Pennsylvania management decided that the less than 80 Negroes employed by the bank did not represent any real approach to the problem of unemployment facing Philadelphia's Negro community. So word went out through the Personnel Department that a particular effort be made to hire non-whites wherever possible, without at the same time causing any strain in the very happy relationship which the bank enjoyed with its several thousand white employees. It was a tall order but it has worked like a charm.

In addition to the emphasis given to the employment of black people through the regular channels of employment, Project 35 was set up in 1967 to provide special opportunities for low income persons who would not ordinarily have qualified via education, work experience or test at First Pennsylvania. Thirty-five people were selected, following a total waiver of the usual personnel requirements. In addition to a regular work day, these people were given 15 weeks of night training on a voluntary basis which concentrated on improving their reading and mathematical skills and provided special instruction for the jobs they were occupying during the day. Incidentally, these special employees were charged against an executive budget rather than against any departmental budgets, so that none of the department managers had to worry about the possibility of learning time or poor performance being charged against departmental records. This played an important part in achieving close working relations between supervisory personnel and the 35 newcomers. At the end of four months, 27 of the 35 were permanently hired, with six having dropped out along the way and two others lacking skill and performance records to warrant permanent employment. A second Project 35 started a month ago and is continuing on the same basis.

The Bank also initiated Project STEP, which set up a secretarial program for 15 girls along similar lines, and Project BEEP, which employed 25 high school boys from the 11th and 12th grades of predominantly Negro high schools who work Monday through Friday from 1 or 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. The Friday work period is devoted to a seminar by an appropriate bank official in the Board Room. These boys were selected by the counseling staffs of the schools and are paid $1.75 an hour for their work. All 26 of these youngsters have been with the bank since the program was inaugurated last fall. There have been no dropouts among them, either from First Pennsylvania or from school. Sixteen of the boys have no father in the family and their grade level in reading and mathematics is approximately at the 6th or 7th year.

Although these programs all stem from the intense interest of the First Pennsylvania's top management, spearheaded by Bill Walker, John Bunting and Nat Bowditch, in creating vastly increased opportunity for Negroes within the job structure of the bank, the driving force behind the programs has been Jim Blocker. Big, handsome, black and dynamic, Blocker is the first Negro to achieve officer status in a Philadelphia bank, and his program development at First Pennsylvania has made a big hit with both blacks and whites. Most important of all, of course, is the fact that a conservative, supposedly slow-moving institution like a bank has been able to increase its Negro employment from less than 80 to nearly 400 in slightly over a year. First Pennsylvania is quick to admit they expect this to be good business as well as good citizenship. Negro depositors and small loan users are increasing rapidly. The bank is working, through a Negro enterprise—the Business Development Corporation under attorney John Clay—with an ever increasing number of Negro businessmen who need financial assistance in starting up new enterprises or expanding present ones.

Is all this good business? No one can tell for sure yet, but perhaps it is more than coincidence that First Pennsylvania's vast involvement in Negro employment came in a year when the bank enjoyed the highest percentage growth in profits of any of the nation's top 25 banking institutions. It is my fond hope that other Philadelphia institutions in all kinds of business will take a leaf from First Pennsylvania's successful book.

Achievement of a Society of Abundance and Individual Freedom

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Special Programs in the Department of Transportation made a most perceptive and provocative speech on February 1 at St. Mary's College, in Moraga, Calif. Mr. Agger discussed the roles of private enterprise and government in our evolving effort to achieve a society of abundance and individual freedom. I commend this speech to Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, AT THE 11TH EXECUTIVES' SYMPOSIUM, SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE, MORAGA, CALIF., FEBRUARY 1, 1968

I'm going to begin today with a complaint, and my complaint is that our sponsors have rigged this program against me. Not only am I the only bad guy on the program—that is to say, the only full-time Government worker; even our topic is rigged.

I am reminded of what Thomas Reed Powell said: "I can win any argument if you will allow me to state the question." The question before us is, "Private Enterprise and Big Government: Friend or Foe? What does it mean? Well, in the American tradition, "private enterprise" is a good thing and "big government" is, of course, a bad thing.

How about this for a topic? "Creative Government and Heartless Big Business: Friend or Foe?" You see, a lot depends on how you state the question.

For the last 5 years or so, we've been hearing a great deal in this country about the dangers of big government. I, for one, am deeply concerned about the danger of making government too big and the danger of giving government too much authority. For 15 of those years I have been watching the Federal monster ooze across our national landscape. In a minute or two, I want to articulate for you my conviction that government must never be called upon to do things that can be done effectively outside of government.

At the same time, I think that in any discussion such as this one, we should keep in mind that if government is big, so is the nation. We have more than 200 million citizens—citizens with needs, citizens who make demands. Our big government didn't simply spring forth fully developed, the realization of someone's bureaucratic dream. Our government grew with our nation, and it grew in response to the demands of the people.

I would point out, too, that on many occasions the spokesmen for private enterprise have been among the most demanding of the citizens. It was private enterprise, just as much as the consuming public, that needed regulatory agencies like the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission. It was private enterprise that needed the Small Business Administration. Most observers today would tell you it's private enterprise that needs urban renewal.

The airline industry was built with Federal nourishment and financial support. Many advances in technology (the supersonic transport and the high-speed train, for example) are made possible, and can be made profitable, only because of government—only because that same big government which we rightly fear is underwriting so many ventures.

And private enterprise thrives on Federal research money. One economist has pointed out that research and development in the United States has been undergoing a distinct process of nationalization—that three fourths of the money spent in this nation for research and development is spent by the Federal government. You don't often hear private enterprise complaining about that.

Friend or foe, then I submit that the question is invalid because it assumes that private enterprise and government are either friends or enemies, but in any event, separate from and somewhat alien to each other. In our complex society, this simply is not the case. The edges are blurred—and sometimes not only the edges. Our concepts of private enterprise have changed and evolved right along with our concepts of government, and the result is a complicated mixture of roles and responsibilities.

One private entrepreneur will tell you that Congress ought to repeal most of the regulatory laws of the Federal Government, and the next private entrepreneur will tell you that without anti-trust laws, or without subsidies, or without import restrictions, or without even so-called "fair trade" laws, he couldn't stay in business.

I would ask also, exactly what is private enterprise? Is it the fellow who takes the family savings to open a hardware store on the corner? Or is it AT&T, whose annual revenues are in excess of the combined annual revenues of more than half the states? Is it really private enterprise when 90 percent of a company's gross income can be traced to contracts let by the government? And is it private enterprise—is it private enterprise in the traditional sense—when a corporation's assets are owned by millions of stockholders—stockholders who are known by their friends as citizens and voters and consumers, and whose primary concerns never are directed to the corporation whose stock they happen to hold?

AT&T now has more than three million share owners. France has some 50 million citizens—all share owners, you might say, in the French national corporations. Which is more private, AT&T or one of France's *Societes Nationales?* And where is the breakoff point—at five million share owners, or 15, or 50?

And what of big government? I would suggest to you that American government today is what it was always intended to be: a system of checks and balances—and more than that, a system of built-in tensions. One of the first things the schoolboy learns about his government is the concept of separation of powers. But American government in the 20th Century has gone a step further. There has developed within the Executive Branch what might be called a concept of the separation of interests, or the separation of pursuits. I would no doubt make headlines tomorrow in somebody's newspaper if I stood here and whispered to you that a certain Federal agency in Washington is looking out for the welfare of a certain corporation. That would be wrong, and it would be news. But I would shock no one if I told you that the Department of Agriculture has been looking out for American farmers, or that the Department of Labor has been promoting the interests of American workers, or that the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Treasury are helping manufacturers increase their exports. We seldom say such things, and I think the reason is that they seem so obvious. Nevertheless, in a discussion of whether business and government are friends or enemies, the point is worth making.

In 1892 a man by the name of Charles E. Perkins was president of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Mr. Perkins was dissatisfied with the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and he happened to be a personal friend of Richard Olney, who was Attorney General under President Cleveland. So Mr. Perkins wrote the Attorney General and urged that he work in Washington for the abolition of the ICC. The Attorney General's reply is interesting. Let me read you part of the letter:

"My impression," said the Attorney General, "would be that looking at the matter from a railroad point of view exclusively, it would not be a wise thing to undertake. . . . The attempt would not be likely to succeed. If it naturally succeeded and was made on the grounds of the inefficiency and uselessness of the commission, the result would very probably be giving it the power it now lacks. The commission, as its function has now been limited by the courts, is, or can be made, of greater use to the railroads. It meets the popular clamor for a government supervisor of railroads at the same time that the supervision is almost entirely nominal. Further, the older such a commission gets to be, the more inclined it will be found to take the railroad view of things. . . . The part of wisdom is not to destroy the commission, but to utilize it."

I want to make a proposal today, and I'm going to direct my proposal to the Steering Committee for next year's Executives' Symposium here at Saint Mary's College. My proposal is that next year's topic for discussion be this: "Friend or Foe: The Public Interest vs. the Government-Industry Coalition." That is, government and industry on one side; the public interest on the other. I would like to hear a group of businessmen engage the question of whether their political power and their public relations and lobbying resources have been so strong as to weight the scales of government on the side of industry. I would like to hear your views as to whether the missions of private enterprise includes a responsibility to let government serve the public interest undeflected by the vested interests.

So far I've said that I can't really define private enterprise and that I can't categorize very neatly all the elements of government. But I will state my own definition of the aims of the two. The primary goal of government is the well-being of its citizens—all its citizens. The primary goal of private enterprise is making money.

I start—as I'm sure you do—with the premise that a free enterprise system, or more accurately, a private enterprise system, is the best economic system to fulfill the needs of all the people of a community. One can construct all sorts of philosophical or sociological or even theological arguments to support that thesis. Today, I will plead only the historical argument—which is to say that a free enterprise system works. Heaven knows, it has worked for the United States.

Private enterprise built this country and helped unify the various sections of this country. Private enterprise helped make individual citizens physically and economically healthy. It helped us through a domestic war and through foreign wars. The world in the 20th Century is a sort of living laboratory of economic systems. Many theories have been tested. I think there is no question in the minds of any of us that the private enterprise way, the American way, has stood the test. And it will continue to do so.

Still, I think all of us would agree also that we could not have a healthy economic system if private enterprise were completely unchecked by government. Without the counter-balance of government, John D. Rockefeller might have had all the money; and all the rest of us would have been poor. I think it is clear, therefore, that one of the legitimate functions of government is to help private enterprise work—in a sense, to help protect free enterprise from self-destruction.

I said before that the primary goal of private enterprise is making money and that I believe this goal coincides, for the most part, with the government's goal of enhancing the well-being of the people. But now let's draw the contrast. While the people weren't paying attention—and thus while the government wasn't paying attention—private enterprise helped pollute our air and our rivers. It contributed to the decay of our cities. It spoiled large areas of scenic and recreational value. It helped solidify the divisions among the races. It shored up social systems which denied economic and educational opportunity to certain groups of citizens. It sold us unsafe automobiles and diseased meat.

I am by no means indicting the private enterprise system; but I would ask you, should private enterprise set limits on its goals so that in its eagerness to expand assets and income, it does not trod upon the interests of the nation as a whole? Or should government set those limits?

And what of social stability? What is the responsibility of private enterprise to the worker whose talents are made unnecessary by new technology? In my office in the Department of Transportation, we talk about what has been called "the container revolution"—the use of large containers, or boxes, to ship quickly and efficiently the cargoes that traditionally have been moved laboriously, item by item, from rail to ship or from ship to truck. The container can be packaged at the factory and moved from one mode of transportation to another and never opened, never unpacked, until it reaches the final destination somewhere across the ocean. The container threatens to put thousands of longshoremen out of work. This is what we mean when we talk about technological unemployment. Now I ask you, whose job is it to look after these men?

Are they the responsibility of private enterprise—the same private enterprise which boasts so often that it provides jobs and good lives for so many Americans?

Or are they the responsibility of government? And if so, why is it, then, that when the government suggests a new program to solve the problems of unemployment, businessmen sometimes lead the attacks against the program?

I say that private industry can't have it both ways. Perhaps industry has no responsibility to the people displaced by its shiny new machines. But government can't take that narrow a view—not in our society; not, if you will, in a democratic society.

My own bias is that the marketplace ought to be allowed to operate at the lowest cost and price levels possible. I would like the marketplace to function without regard to a great many social problems. But the social problems must be met, and you're aware, I'm sure, of the overhead involved in running an operation out of Washington.

Where containerization is concerned, the shipping interests and the longshoremen's union here on the West Coast have reached an accommodation which is at least creative and which could set a pattern for other industries. In 1960, the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union signed a contract which anticipates that fewer and fewer longshoremen may be needed. The contract provides both lump-sum payments to the union and incentives for the early retirement of individuals. In this instance, the dynamics were such that private enterprise fashioned an agreement which appears to be working satisfactorily for most of those involved.

I don't know what is the long-term point of the story about the ILWU and containerization. But I would point out to you that it does contain a question of fundamental social and economic importance. To what extent should technological unemployment be viewed as the financial responsibility of the industry as in the case of the longshoremen? Is this problem more properly a responsibility of the society as a whole—of big government if you will, be it state or federal government?

Not long ago I read a heartening article by Victor H. Palmieri, the president of the Janss Investment Corporation. Mr. Palmieri suggests that one of the critical questions facing the nation is whether the business community is really willing to scrap its almost habitual opposition to government action, and whether business will join the effort to find new ways to meet public needs.

Let me quote Mr. Palmieri:

"The old principles, or rather the process in which they operate, can be stated this way: Politics expresses the public need. Government accepts the mandate to fill the need. The business community, following its traditional policy of containment, first denies the need, then seeks to limit the response of government. Two decades later both the particular need and the governmental response are accepted as legitimate and appropriate; a new administration comes to power with a new mandate for social action; and the whole melancholy process is repeated.

"The result," says Mr. Palmieri, "is not failure so much as it is a discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress as a nation and as a free people."

Now there are some people who would suggest that this "discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress" has served the nation well. They would argue that without foot-dragging by business and others, the nation would have gone too far too fast. Perhaps so.

I submit, however, that time is running short for the solution of some problems. Our cities were on fire in 1967. In that situation, can we afford a process in which needs are first denied and responses are then limited?

Last October, Paul Goodman spoke in Washington at a symposium sponsored by the National Security Industrial Association. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the views of Paul Goodman. It is a vast understatement to say that they are controversial, especially when Mr. Goodman is speaking to the leaders of large corporations. I'd like to quote something Mr. Goodman said.

He was talking about urban affairs, and about whether American business is equipped to assist in the vast urban clean-up and renovation which most Americans now agree is mandatory. This is Mr. Goodman speaking to the executives:

"Unfortunately, it is your companies who have oversold the planes and the cars, polluted the air and water, and balked at even trivial remedies, so that I do not see how you can be morally trusted with the job."

And a little later, he said:

"Your thinking is never to simplify and retrench, but always to devise new equipment to alleviate the mess that you have helped to make with your previous equipment."

Let's assume for the sake of argument that Mr. Goodman's indictment has some validity. (Who would deny that it has at least *some* validity?) If so, then for at least a portion of the time, business and government *ought* to be enemies.

We hear quite a bit these days about how business has developed a conscience—how it's going to help clean up the slums and clean up the rivers and construct new bulwarks against urban sprawl. All you've got to do is turn on the television set to see a petroleum company telling that its refineries are so pollution-free that the fish and the waterfowl live in health and luxury and social welfare in the marshland just outside the refinery doorway. All you've got to do is flip to the inside of a magazine to see a producer of tractors or fertilizers or pharmaceuticals telling how its products are going to help save the overpopulated and undernourished world.

Regardless of how much real substance there is behind the advertising campaigns, we entered a new era when we reached the point that business felt it had to try to convince the public that it has a conscience. We've come a long way. There is hardly anyone successful in business today who would think of uttering such a statement as "the public be damned."

But I think we've got to go somewhat deeper than the advertisements if we want to explore seriously the question of whether the corporation can be an institution, as someone said, "for good as well as gain."

I hope private enterprise can find ways to accomplish good things and still stay in business. I hope corporate managers are ingenious enough to do some of the things that must be done, and that they can do so without making the stockholders too angry. I hope that technology will provide us new tools for improving the lives of all our citizens at costs they and the nation can afford.

The reason for my hope is simple. I don't think governmental institutions as we know them are any better at getting things done than non-governmental institutions. Indeed, I'm convinced that institutions outside the government are generally better equipped for action than any governmental institutions which have yet been devised.

But I will say that private enterprise has usually lacked the motivation to work for good as well as for gain; and private managers have felt for good reason that they lacked the mandate to work for good as well as gain. If all that is changing, I rejoice in the prospect.

Just two weeks ago, President Johnson in his State of the Union Address called for a partnership between government and industry to work for certain national goals such as full employment. The President was serious when he suggested this partnership. And I think I can say that the President, and all of us in government, will be delighted if private enterprise chooses to be the leading partner—if business decides to lead the way.

I think that today, more than ever before, businessmen know they have a stake in solving problems such as unemployment. This is made abundantly clear by a glance at the list of corporate participants in a group such as the Urban Coalition, which reported last summer on the plight of the nation's cities. The courageous nature of that group's proposals is evidence that businessmen can be as daring as any other group in the search for solutions to the nation's problems.

On the other hand, we would be naive in the extreme if we assumed that government can safely abdicate to industry the basic responsibility for those activities in which the profit motive is absent. What we must do is assure that private industry recognizes and encourages the need for government activity at the same time that private industry is maintaining relentless pressure on government in order to keep the bureaucracy's greedy tendencies under control.

That brings me to my final point. Anything as large and powerful as government represents a vast potential threat to that unit in our society which is of greater value than government or business; that is, the individual. I want to close this little sermon with an appeal, and my appeal is that private enterprise become the aggressive and untiring defender of the individual in American society.

If private enterprise can do this job—if private individuals working through private institutions can assume this role, then private enterprise will become in truth what its public relations people have always said it was and what it has always wanted to be.

Let me explain what I mean. This great nation is challenged today in ways no nation has been challenged before. It is challenged to prove, against increasing odds, what Americans have always felt to be true. It is challenged to demonstrate that a growing, wealthy, highly industrialized nation can provide plenty of privacy, plenty of breathing space, plenty of choice for the individual.

Let's examine the threat. We have come to a time in history when the problems of expanding population, on the one hand, and the possible answers offered by technology, on the other hand, tempt us to do things which would not have occurred to previous generations.

Someone has said that the most awesome thing he ever saw was machines making machines. But that isn't nearly as awesome or as frightening as the possibility we now face—the possibility not that machines will make people, but that they will shape people and direct people's lives.

We're coming to a time, too, when machines can talk to machines—when your computer on the West Coast can interrogate someone else's computer on the East Coast and when, between the two of them, they can catalogue just about all there is to know about such-and-such an individual. What are the consequences going to be for the American individual when the computers have stored up, along with his Social Security number, every little bit and piece of his life—every time he got in trouble, every failure, every success?

At Columbia University, Zbigniew Brzezinski has described the period we are about to enter as "the Technetronic Age"—a time in which society is shaped by the impact of technology and electronics, especially computers and communications devices. Brzezinski asks these questions:

"Can the individual and science co-exist, or will the dynamic momentum of the latter fundamentally alter the former; can man, living in the scientific age, grow in intellectual depth and philosophical meaning, and thus in his personal liberty too; can the institutions of political democracy be adapted to the new conditions sufficiently quickly to meet the crises, yet without debasing their democratic character?"

Brzezinski and others look to a time when human life will be, as he says, "less spontaneous and less mysterious"—when we'll be able not only to determine the sex of our children, but when we'll be able—with drugs—to control their personalities and also, perhaps, the extent of their intelligence.

Private enterprise has always pictured itself as the realm of opportunity for the individual in America. And it has pictured itself also as a bastion of private choice—the institutional framework which allows the individual to make his own decisions and select his own way.

I suggest that private enterprise can do a service for this country if it will establish itself as the defender of the traditions it has preached. Private enterprise can make itself the stalwart refuge for the individual—the place where promising new ideas are welcome; the place where any man, regardless of class or caste, can prove himself on the strength of his intelligence and his ingenuity and his willingness to work. And does the corporate personnel man really have to interview the candidate's wife before he may join the corporate congregation?

I'd like also to see private enterprise lead the fight against the demeaning institutionalization which threatens our pride as human beings. I'd like to see private enterprise lead the fight against invasions of our private lives.

I recommend to you the work that has been done in Washington by such men as Senator Ervin of North Carolina and Representative Gallagher of New Jersey. They have recognized that technological snooping devices and information-storing computer systems are threats to our freedom. Senator Ervin has called upon American industry—upon private enterprise—to devise safeguards against the use of such devices to invade our privacy.

Look also at the race problem. In our laws and in our public institutions we have eliminated much of the racial discrimination which has shamed us as a nation. Now private enterprise can lead the way in providing private opportunity, and it can use its special talents of innovation and inventiveness to do so.

Look what Ford Motor Company is doing—going into the ghettos to recruit workers and offering them bus fare and lunch money until that first pay check arrives. And look at Neiman-Marcus, the department store. It announced recently to its suppliers that in the future, the store—and I quote—"would rather do business with a company which is actively and sincerely pursuing a policy of equal opportunity than to continue to do business with one which is not." Stanley Marcus, the president of the store, noted that the Federal government demands that its suppliers be equal opportunity employers. And he said: "We believe a private company should do no less."

I don't know whether the Neiman-Marcus plan or the Ford plan or any other specific private undertaking of this sort appeals to you as a businessman. But I do suggest that you as businessmen have the know-how and the tools to help make this nation continue to be a nation in which private, individual achievement is encouraged.

The strength of the United States has been found throughout our history in the riches of our diversity. I have had the uneasy feeling that our diversity is threatened by technology—not only by the machines, but by the technocrats who man them—the system systems people. I like to call them; the people whose formulas make no provision for a flash of brilliance or an admission of error. These are the input-output people—the tyrants who change our nouns and our adjectives to verbs, so that we finalize projects instead of completing them. They would, in fact, computerize everything. And they would program all our lives—everything from the sexual act to the transplant.

They would palletize our people, and they would commit our very souls to a flow chart. They would quantify us—that's the way they would say it—so that we will violate none of the parameters they have assigned for our journey through memoranda-ville.

Our individuality is at stake; and our diversity—our heritage as a pluralistic society. I look to private enterprise as a fully appropriate guardian of that heritage.

What Is Illinois Like?

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, since the onset a few weeks ago of the yearlong

celebration of Illinois' 150th anniversary as a State, much has been said and written about its history, its virtues, its people, and its future. Few of these utterings, articulate though they are, are as warm and moving as that composed by a young man from my district.

What Robert Trizna, a high school sophomore from Joliet has to say about our beloved Illinois—and how he says it—merited space in the editorial column of the Joliet Herald-News. I believe that those who read it will know why, and will know as well a feeling of fellowship, be they an Illinoisan or not.

WHAT IS ILLINOIS LIKE?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was the winner in the Catholic Women's League essay contest sponsored as part of the Illinois Sesquicentennial celebration. It was written by Robert Trizna, a sophomore at Joliet Catholic High School.)

On December 3rd, 1818, Congress met in Washington, D.C., and admitted the territory of Illinois into the Union as the 21st state. Named for a tribe of the Algonquin Confederacy, this section of wilderness, bounded on the west by the Mississippi River, first became acquainted with the white man in 1673, when Father Jacques Marquette and explorer Louis Joliet paddled down the Fox River to the Mississippi. Since then Illinois has become "the hub" of the nation. But Illinois means something more than just history.

Miles and miles of boring flatlands and cornfields in the first impression most travelers get of Illinois. To them it appears to be one vast farm. They are partially right, because Illinois is one of the country's leaders in agriculture. Corn, wheat, and soybeans pour out of the Prairie State almost unceasingly to other parts of our country and the world. Its major city, Chicago, is a giant meatpacking center and the "Wall Street" of the grain world. Here is commemorated the first self-sustained nuclear reaction on the campus of the University of Chicago. As the convention capital, Chicago is now preparing for the "68" Democratic Convention. O'Hare field, the world's busiest airport, adds to Illinois' credentials as a major economic and social center, as well as an agricultural capital. Such is the Illinois of the visitor's view.

But to the people who live in the state, this is only one facet of Illinois. It is also the cities, the suburbs, the subdivisions, and the small towns. It's the quiet "Main Street" of Willisville, with its dry goods store, hardware store, and diner. It's bustling State Street of Chicago, with Marshall Field, Rothschilds, and Marina City. It's the "ole swimmin' hole" outside of Addieville, where the farm kids gather on a warm day; it's Lake Michigan, whose beaches overflow with scantily clad urbanites, and upon whose piers are unloaded cargo from many lands. The wooded areas, parks, and forest preserves are very much a part of Illinois too. They provide city dwellers with that rare chance to commune with nature. There they can hunt; they can also fish in the numerous rivers and streams which cut through the land. The Mighty Mississippi graces the western boundaries of Illinois. Now, as in the days of Louis Joliet and Fr. Marquette, the Mississippi is an important thoroughfare for cargoships and barges. Just as these ships provided the early settlers with articles needed for survival, they now provide us with oil, cotton, coal, and other necessities. Such is the Illinois of the citizen's view.

But to me, Illinois means even more. It is Joliet, the town in which I live. It's my parish and my school. It's the rural areas near Channahon where the wheat fields in spring and the corn fields in summer are the overland seas of gold and green. It's the DuPage river, where carp and catfish swim as in the days of the first settlers. The warmness of the people would be difficult to equal anywhere else, for Illinoisans are a pleasant mixture of city slicker and country folk. This is the Illinois that I love, the place where I will always remain, in spirit if not in body; for Illinois is My Home.

All of this is Illinois; it's the traveler's view, the citizen's view, and my view combined. But it is even more than this. The heritage of Illinois is something you or I could appreciate. Every drop of sweat shed by the first settlers is part of it. Their ambitions, their joys, and their labors have contributed significantly, even inestimably, to this heritage. We are celebrating the sesquicentennial of Illinois' statehood. We should be even prouder of the work of our forefathers who first tilled the soil of Illinois and brought forth the abundant fruits which are now so much a part of the Prairie State. This is our heritage; for Illinois is . . . Our Home.

The Great Swamp of New Jersey

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion lately—albeit accompanied by too little action—about air pollution and water pollution. But there is still relatively little understanding of threats to our total environment.

Theodore M. Edison, of West Orange, N.J., is a mechanical and electrical engineer who years ago became concerned about the imbalance between our enthusiasm for technology and lack of attention to the impact of that technology upon our environment. Experienced in implementing and assessing the technology of which he speaks, Mr. Edison is well qualified as a knowledgeable and concerned citizen about the problems of our environment.

On February 1967, Theodore M. Edison submitted testimony before a public hearing of the Fish and Wildlife Service on New Jersey's Great Swamp which was being considered as a site for a jet airport.

Mr. Edison discussed the lack of awareness of the effects on our own environment and the accompanying lack of rational planning to meet, rather than compound, the problems of tomorrow.

His statement was reprinted in the May 1967 issue of the National Parks magazine. I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

[From the National Parks Magazine, May 1967]

THE GREAT SWAMP OF NEW JERSEY: JETPORTS AND "PROGRESS"

(Several years ago the Great Swamp of New Jersey was being viewed as a site for a jet airport. The swamp, rich in scenic, plant, and animal interests, was saved from development then by conservationists and local residents, and part of it was incorporated into the national wildlife refuge system. But recently there has been more talk of the Great Swamp as a jetport site.

(In February the Fish and Wildlife Service held a public hearing on its plans for Wilderness in the Great Swamp Refuge. Presented here is a statement submitted for the hearing record on that occasion by Theodore M. Edison of West Orange, New Jersey, in which the author asks some disturbing questions about a philosophy which the conservationist Darwin Lambert has called "the perpetual growth mania.")

Three years ago, Public Service Electric and Gas Company distributed throughout the nation handsome sets of picture postcards in an effort to bring more business and industry to New Jersey. The pictures showed an awe-inspiring expanse of port facilities and other examples of modern developments, as well as several beautiful views of farm country and wild areas. To induce employers to come here, it was pointed out that "New Jersey is a beautiful state and one that offers the industrialist and his employees and visitors many opportunities to enjoy the great outdoors." It was further stated that "Few other states can boast of such a desirable diversification and balance in land utilization."

Political and business leaders are continually taking part in similar sales campaigns that stress the importance of economic growth. However, statements like those just quoted make me wonder why so much effort should be spent on trying to expand the very developments that may soon destroy the diversity and balance that are said to make the state attractive. It is argued that more industry will be needed to provide jobs for the rapidly increasing population, but it seems to me that we cannot follow the "more, more" policy much longer without "progressing" toward serious blight.

Projections indicate that if every bit of vacant land within fifty miles of New York City were to be developed to the maximum permitted under present zoning, there would not be enough room to take care of the increased population expected there in less than thirty years. Even if we sacrifice most of our remaining farms and wildlands to supply the added millions of people with water and other essentials up to the year 2000, what will we do when the population doubles *again* in a few more years? Unless there is a general awakening to the urgent need of reducing the rate of population growth immediately, I fear that there will be rapid deterioration in our environment, and that the present generation may live to see us reach the point of disaster. We already face serious problems with smog, water supply, waste disposal, traffic strangulation, and many forms of social frictions and cost inflations that result from crowding, and I predict that these problems will mount with amazing speed as we run out of the relatively open spaces into which we have been expanding.

If we need another jetport now, we will probably need several more a few years hence, but present difficulties in finding a site show that it will be virtually impossible to meet the later demand. If we are going to be forced to find alternatives to more jetports anyway, why not concentrate on such alternatives *now,* instead of ruining our best remaining rural and natural areas to get only inadequate results? As certain problems of traffic congestion, noise, and smog production can probably best be solved by reviving and improving mass rail transportation, there would seem to be good reason to eliminate subsidies to at least the more dubious airports and highways that are helping to defeat the railroads. If rail services are allowed to deteriorate to the point of abandonment, revivals may become almost prohibitively difficult and expensive.

It has been implied that just a few selfish people with estates near the Great Swamp are blocking the selection of that swamp as a jetport site, but I feel that that is far from the case. The public outcry against loss of the swamp has been very widespread. And when it comes to selfishness I doubt that those concerned with aviation are in a good position to throw many stones. For example, one airline, in its current T.V. advertising of new direct flights to Lima, Peru, wonders how long Peru can survive the American tourist. It comes right out and says that it is making it much easier for tourists to get there and much harder for Peru to stay unspoiled, and then quite logically concludes with the advice that travelers should go early. It is nice to know that if jets succeed in eliminating the last shreds of tranquility here, it may still be (temporarily) possible for people with enough time and money to escape in those jets from our own rat race to help spoil a remote place. And we can make even faster progress in that direction if we can just get the great majority of Americans (who seldom or never fly) to put up with shattering sonic booms.

John Cummings of the Philadelphia Inquirer

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is a most distinguished American priest who has made popular the saying, "Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

There is one man who has lighted 10,000 candles. His name is John Cummings, and he writes for the Philadelphia Inquirer.

I am almost tempted to say that the mind of man goes not back to the time when John Cummings was not writing. That would be an exaggeration, but it would be a pardonable one. For decades he has written with a delightful and whimsical humor, with a sharp, perceptive mind. Now he has passed his eightieth birthday, and will be starting another decade of political punditry which will delight everyone who has any interest in the passing scene of Pennsylvania or national politics.

I am sure that everyone in this House joins me in wishing John well, and in wishing him many more decades of toil over his typewriter. I am sure, also, that all of you would want to read the delightful column Harold J. Wiegand wrote in the Inquirer on January 23. It is a splendid tribute to a distinguished son of Olyphant, in my own congressional district.

The column referred to follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY: HE IS 80

(By Harold J. Wiegand)

People don't get to be eighty every day in the week, not even John M. Cummings' Uncle Dominick. But on this particular day of the week, John Cummings has reached that rather remarkable point in his lifetime, and we have taken the liberty of nudging him out of his corner of the editorial page to say a few words on the subject. That is more than anyone could possibly get from Cummings—a few words.

Some friends of the columnist will gather at dinner to salute him at three-score and twenty, to pump his hand, to tell him a few lies about how young he looks, to drink a toast or two, and so on. There will be newspaper people and politicians and judges and assorted characters who knew him "way back." There will be some of his favorite women (including our own favorite among them, first name Margaret). There will be singing friends from the Kelly Street Chorus and talkative friends from the Clover Club and drinking friends from all over. You can bet this: no one will have a better time than the guest of honor.

He has been having a good time, and helping others to have a good time, for years beyond memory. All that time he has been piling up a unique record as one of the most widely read political writers in the State. His pungent comments on the political scene and its participants, his gently biting observations, his use of a sledgehammer when appropriate, have made his column prescribed reading for several generations.

Because John Cummings has been around for such a long period, some persons have the impression that he covered the Johnstown Flood, had to shovel his way out of the Blizzard of '88 and held Nick Hayes on his lap as an infant. None of this is true, although other legends have foundations in fact. It is true, for example, that he fought in the First World War, returned home as a first lieutenant and was promptly given a field commission as captain by George Brennan, then the venerated political editor of this newspaper. Hence the nickname "Cap" attached to the Cummings name ever since.

Cummings is a transplanted coal-cracker. His home town of Olyphant is not precisely a coal patch; but it is not a metropolis, either. Give heed to Cummings' nostalgic prose, however, and you'll think it is the Athens of America, with a philosopher behind every bar and cracker-barrel.

The columnist has covered every National Convention since 1920, when he secured a news beat on the impending Republican nomination of Warren G. Harding—getting it from Ed Vare on the train carrying the Pennsylvania delegation to Chicago.

He has been on a first-name basis with every Governor of Pennsylvania since Martin Brumbaugh, every Mayor of Philadelphia since Rudolph Blankenburg, and, we might add, with every manager of the Bellevue Stratford since Claude Bennett.

He has been a long-time president of the Clover Club, an ancient assembly of bon-vivants whose hearty slogan is "When we die we die all over; when we live we live in clover." He is president of the Kelly Street Chorus, which had its prehistoric origin in the bar room of Pete Dooner's Hotel, where reporters and politicians of another generation used to gather after hours to hoist a few beers and songs. As the closest Cummings has come to having a singing voice is his membership in the Welsh Society, it is evident that he was not chosen president because of his vocal talents.

He is also the oldest member of the Pen and Pencil Club, itself the oldest newspaper club in America, and he is dean of the Pennsylvania Legislative Correspondents Association, a Harrisburg organization that antedates Harvey Taylor—but barely.

His baronial residence near Blue Bell, tastefully captioned "Horsefeathers," has become a historic place of interest in upper Montgomery county, a tourist attraction, and a refuge for cats, guinea hens, courthouse politicos and other strays.

Readers of the Cummings column have at time seen something leprechaunish in his humor, going back, perhaps, to County Mayo by way of the Delaware & Lackawanna. We wouldn't know about that, but this is for sure: he has lightened and brightened the beginning day for uncounted thousands who will wish for him, on his 80th birthday, many more!

The 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of the Sacred Heart in North America

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, 1968, the Society of the Sacred Heart is celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding in North America.

The Society of the Sacred Heart was founded in 1800 in France by St. Madeleine Sophie Barat. In 1818, at the age of 49, Mother Rose Philippine Duchesne arrived in New Orleans and made her way by steamboat to St. Louis, Mo., intending to bring quality education, culture, and love of God to the "little savages" who lived there. She and the other nuns were met by Bishop du Bourg who directed them to set up their school in St. Charles, Mo. Upon their arrival in St. Charles, Mother Duchesne commented that—

> Divine Providence has brought us to the remotest village in the United States.

Despite this and the many other hardships which were encountered in those years, she set up her convent and school. Called the Academy of the Sacred Heart, it became the first free school west of the Mississippi. The institution grew with the community of St. Charles, and in 1821, St. Charles became the first capital of the new State of Missouri. The Academy of the Sacred Heart was a basic ingredient of the cultural growth of not only this area, but of the State of Missouri as a whole.

Mother Duchesne lived to be 83 years of age. During her life in the service of God in America, she established two other convents in the St. Louis area, and the great success of the society in North America can be traced directly to her influence. The society has educated thousands of women in this country who have made their marks in every field of endeavor, and it shall continue to do so as long as the living spirit of, and the tradition of excellence engendered by blessed Philippine Duchesne is honored as it is in this sesquicentennial year of the founding of the order on this continent.

Private Morality and Public Law

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable William Graham Cole, president of the Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill., has an interesting and well-researched article in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal concerning the relationship of private morality and public law.

The article emphasizes that our young people must accept responsibilities that accompany constitutional rights which they choose to exercise. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place excerpts from this article in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE MORALITY AND PUBLIC LAW

(By William Graham Cole, president, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.)

Edmund Burke was speaking as the classical conservative who believes that the human will contains appetites which require restraint, either external or internal, when he said:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites. . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

The liberal, on the other hand, perhaps nowhere better personified than in Rousseau, regards man as naturally filled with sweetness and light, peaceful and generous toward all, corrupted only by the artifical structures of society. In our own political history, both of these viewpoints have had their advocates, from the conflict between Hamilton and Jefferson down to the present day. Neither side has entirely won the battle. Our heritage represents a remarkable synthesis of both ingredients. Some eras have witnessed the temporary ascendancy of emphasis upon the freedom of the individual from external restraints, with much talk of rights—religious, political or civil. Other times have stressed the necessity for a strong governmental hand, and this has resulted in the frequent use of words like duty, obligation, responsibility.

There have been some curious historical twists here and there. Jefferson was all for minimal national government, until the government was his. Jackson spoke for the freedom of the common man, but threatened to hang the nullifiers of South Carolina. Lincoln supported the right of peoples to revolution, and suspended the writ of habeas corpus. The Democratic Party spent the last half of the nineteenth century fighting for states' rights against the centralist power of Republican administrations, and then completely reversed the field in the twentieth century. The same turnabout occurred with respect to protective tariffs. And in 1964, we witnessed the curious spectacle of the party of Abraham Lincoln joining forces with Southern Democrats to check the movement for the civil rights of Negroes. American politicians and parties have never been for long guilty of that foolish thing called consistency!

Just now we are locked in one of our perennial struggles between private morality and public law, and all the cards seem to be falling to the advocates of individual rights. No one has much to say these days about duty and obligation and responsibility, or if someone does, not many hearers are in evidence. Youth in general and students in particular are loudly proclaiming their protests over any attempts to regulate their lives by law. They claim to be mature enough and responsible enough to decide for themselves what is right and wrong, good and bad. There is no valid evidence to suggest that any very radical change has occurred in the private morality of students in their practices with respect to alcohol and sex. There is more drunkenness (and there may be less) on the campus today than in my time a generation ago. There are a few emotionally mixed-up kids who are sexually promiscuous and there is a fair amount of premarital sex between youngsters in love and planning to be married. But then there always has been. Today's students do not seriously clash with public law at these points. Many of them drink before they are twenty-one, and thus violate the law of most states, but often their liquor is served to them by their parents or their parents' friends. The debutante parties given by the leading citizens of society fracture the law spectacularly in this particular regard! And while the official position calls for sexual abstinence until marriage and monogamous fidelity thereafter until death, students know full well that their elders honor this law very much more in the breach than in the observance.

Today's clashes between students and college and university administrations are again nothing new. The President of Amherst College in the 1890's was forced to resign by a student riot led by a young radical named Harlan Fiske Stone! In the 1770's the President of King's College in New York was so terrified by a student torchlight parade to his house that he fled down the back stairs to a British warship in the harbor, on which he sailed home to England, never to return. The student leader of that parade was Alexander Hamilton.

What is new in this particular conflict is the fact that students are clamoring today for all of the rights and privileges of full citizenship. Aided and abetted by certain faculty members, they are demanding that in all academic discipline, the full paraphernalia of adversary proceedings be used, including the right to counsel, to cross-examine accusers, to trial by a jury of peers. They want their dormitory rooms protected against search without a warrant. They want to be able to refuse to answer questions on grounds of self-incrimination. They want due process with a capital D and a capital P.

There has been a historic concordat between town and gown, due to which members of a university or college have always enjoyed a certain immunity from the civil authorities. Students apprehended by local police *flagrante delicto* have traditionally not been arrested and brought to trial but rather turned over to the dean for his discretionary discipline. In 90 per cent of cases involving student dereliction, the problem has not been one of establishing guilt or innocence. The student has been guilty as hell and has admitted it! The problem was to let the punishment fit the crime, and on the whole deans have historically been pretty good at that. Much better by and large than student courts, who have in the past tended to be overly severe. What students are now saying is that they no longer want to be treated so, no longer want the college or university to be *in loco parentis*. They are not, they say, minors but majors and they demand all of the privileges appertaining thereto.

But this means that they must also accept the responsibilities that accompany the rights. If deans can no longer serve as parent surrogates, if academic administrators must act in all respects like the civil authorities, then there will inevitably be increasing resort to these authorities. To be blunt, the college will "call the cops". Student misdemeanors will no longer be dealt with *in camera* with wide discretionary powers exercised by the dean but in court with counsel. Convictions will become a part of the student's permanent and public record, not kept in a confidential dean's file, regarded as youthful pranks to be forgotten and forgiven. Where narcotics are involved, and they are unfortunately on a sharp increase on all campuses, administrators requiring search warrants will go to the police and offenders will be treated as violators of federal statutes. Unfortunately, many students today regard their own private notions of morality concerning marijuana and other psychodelic substances as superior to and surpassing the public laws. It is doubly unfortunate that they are given aid and comfort in this position by supposedly competent medical authorities who regard the use of some of these substances as relatively harmless. Using that kind of expert ammunition, students argue that these drugs are merely like alcohol—both give one a pleasant buzz. No one seems able to make them see that pot is rather like alcoholism, where every time one drinks he does so to the extent that he loses contact with reality and ceases any longer to be a responsible human being.

In any event, student demands for protection under the law are going to have consequences unforeseen by them and their advisers. They are appealing from one law, which they currently regard as arbitrary, to another, which they find more just. Their private moral judgments see only the rights due them as individuals under adversary proceedings. They cannot see that behind every right lies a responsibility; behind every privilege there is an obligation. The first cannot exist in the absence of the second. Without some form of public order, no individual has any civil rights. He has only what he can protect by his own brain and brawn. Just now today's youth are obsessed with demanding their rights. But if history is any judge, they will learn that those rights carry a price tag. No society can long endure on the philosophy of what the French call *"la culte de moi"*. Without a willingness to accept responsibility there can be no enduring rights. So what in actuality students are doing is not to appeal to private morality against public law. They are only exchanging the law of the police and the courts for the law of the dean and the trustees. The alternative is anarchy.

A similar principle holds with respect to the civil rights movement. In the early stages of the sit-ins, the demonstrations, the marches, the boycotts, what was happening was that the participants were testing certain public laws, local ordinances clearly discriminatory in nature, against another and higher public law, the Constitution of the United States. The private consciences of the protesters told them the local laws were wrong and they deliberately disobeyed them, seeking arrest and trial so that these laws could be tested in the higher court against the higher law. That sort of relationship between private morality and public law is altogether legitimate and has a long and noble tradition behind it. To argue on the other hand, however, that my private morality is superior to the highest law of the land and that I can disobey that law with entire impunity is quite another matter. The individual, of course, always has the option of martyrdom. Against arbitrary tyranny, disobedience and resistance are often heroic, and the annals of human nobility shine with the courage of such stars. But those great ones were never under any illusions that the regime against which they moved would simply say to them, "There, there, that is perfectly all right. Here is a mild slap on the wrist. Now go, and sin no more." They knew perfectly well that they risked apprehension, imprisonment and often death.

What our contemporary "heroes" are demanding is that in the name of their private morality they be permitted to violate laws that are perfectly constitutional and then be excused for such violations on the grounds that they were done for conscience's sake. They seriously believe that they should be allowed to stop traffic during rush hour at busy city intersections, to move in and occupy buildings and offices, making it impossible for the rightful owners and occupants to transact normal business, to prevent trains carrying troops or munitions from arriving at their destinations. No matter whose conscience is involved, I know of no law or court decision which makes that kind of behavior permissible in an orderly society. If it is excusable on grounds of conscience for a group of civil rights demonstrators to disrupt a city's traffic, then why is it not equally excusable for a white citizen's council also on grounds of conscience to disrupt a civil rights rally?

Many, indeed most, of our present protesters will not only accept but demand the full protection of the law for their rights to dissent, to demonstrate, to speak, publish and assemble. If the police do not act to shield them from hecklers and bullies, they are outraged. But they cannot see that those same police are merely doing their same duty when they break up an illegal sit-in or march. There is a hint of philosophical anarchism behind some of the more bizarre protest groups in our midst—the hippies and mods, the beatniks and Vietniks who drop out, op out or cop out, thumbing their noses at society and its values. They suggest in their actions if not in their words that all authority, all order, all structures of law are beneath contempt. What they curiously fail to recognize is the strong likelihood that if their vision of society prevailed, they would themselves be the first victims of the lawlessness they advocate. Unrestrained by police and civil law, an outraged public would move in on these "kookvilles" and clean them out! The inner city police so often accused of brutality and prejudice come in very handy in protecting legal demonstrations against illegal bullies.

I am not suggesting that direct action should be banned, though techniques once effective because they were called forth to dramatize desperate situations have lost much of their effect by being used to express a sometimes merely petulant disapproval. There are situations, as in labor strikes, where negotiations break down and no other avenue is open except to strike and picket, or as in the South, where local authorities flagrantly denied Constitutional rights to American citizens. These call for extreme measures. But they do not call for violating the rights of other American citizens. Not in a democratic society, where the people are governed by their own consent. Societies sometimes reach the point where the people have no recourse except revolution. We of all nations should know that. And we have been known across the years to support a revolution or two elsewhere in the world. But until that time comes, any nation-state has not only the right but the duty to protect itself and its citizens from minorities who attempt to set their private morality above the public law. When and if the time comes when the public decides the minority is right and the law is wrong, then the law will be changed or there will be a revolution. But until then, we must assume that the law represents the wish of the public and it must be enforced.

We as a nation have been remarkably tender toward dissenters. With the possible exception of Great Britain we can boast a better record than any other nation in the world. We have some scars here and there: the denial of habeas corpus during the Civil War, the Communist hysteria and its tragic excesses after both World Wars, but on the whole we do not come off too badly. People today in the heat of passion over Vietnam forget that there has been a noisy, strong-minded minority vocally opposed to every war we have ever fought, saving only World War II. It was true of Korea, "Mr. Truman's war", of World War I, of the Spanish-American War. Many opponents of our own Civil War were absolutely persuaded that military victory was impossible in that one. Young Congressman Lincoln was among those against the Mexican War. And both 1812 and the Revolution were bitterly opposed by many Americans. Yet we have allowed the dissenters their voice, have tolerated those who lash out savagely at the whole fabric of our society. And never in our history have the protections accorded under the law to individuals and groups been stronger. We cannot permit espionage, sabotage or treason. But subject only to the clear and present danger limitations we allow even a lunatic fringe to sound off at will. When a speaker can stand before an audience and exhort them to "Burn it down, baby, burn it down!", and that not only once but numerous times, and stay out of jail, I have no fear for the civil liberties of dissenters! Even the accused American criminal today has greater protection than the upstanding citizens of half the world.

And yet, despite that record, despite a heritage which should evoke pride, there are large numbers today who seem to hate their country and virtually everything it stands for. Our press, our educators, our churchmen, our political leaders outdo one another in damning and denouncing our President, our Supreme Court, our Departments of State and Defense, our admirals and generals, our chiefs of police, our superintendents of schools, our national policies, foreign and domestic. As I read editorials and columns these days, listen to speeches and panel discussions of the so-called "opinion makers" of our society, whether conservative, liberal or middle-of-the-road, I wonder why anyone should any longer be proud to be an American. All we hear any more from anyone is what is wrong with us, and those few individuals who dare now and then to speak up in defense of our really very impressive past *and* present are accused of being administration finks! It has become very fashionable nowadays to be very sophisticated, very cynical and very critical. Dissent and difference from whatever party or person happens at the moment to be in power is one thing—an important and essential part of any democracy. But we lack the British concept of a "loyal opposition", opposed to the present administration but faithful to the nation.

I was much impressed last March on a trip behind the Iron Curtain to find the schools and universities of the socialist countries doing an extraordinarily impressive job of educating their young people toward a thoroughly positive desire to make their own individual contribution to the larger goals of the society as a whole. The students are not by and large brainwashed or propagandized Communists. They are properly skeptical about the more extreme and outlandish claims of the bureaucrats. But they are all the same thorough patriots, devoted to their countries. We used to do this. All of us were subjected to civics courses which made us glad and proud to be Americans. But no more. Today it is fashionable not to praise but to blame, not to emphasize the advantages of being part of this society but rather the way we deprive individuals of opportunities and rights.

And of course every society does have shortcomings. So long as men are men and not gods, we shall falter and fail. It becomes largely a question of emphasis, whether one concentrates on one's blessings as compared with other actual societies or on one's bane as compared with "Utopia". Eric Severeid has well observed that the young can see only one dimension—forward from where we are to the future world of their hopes and ideals. Older people must, he says, from the imperatives of experience take account of two other equally valid dimensions—backward to the way things used to be and sideways to the way things are in other societies they know.

Promise of Tomorrow

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, the words "promise of tomorrow" seem a little shopworn sometimes, but people in Pennsylvania's Crawford, Mercer, and Venango Counties are making them words of action. That action is being translated into new jobs, better recreation facilities, protection from floods, sound land-use planning, a broader tax base, and a host of other benefits.

People in the three-county area were among the first to concentrate their efforts in a coordinated program to speed up resource development which will have a far-reaching impact on the economy and standards of living in the area. Early in 1964, they accepted the opportunity to launch one of the first 10 resource conservation and development projects approved by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to receive technical and financial aid from the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. Their project is named the "Penn Soil" and covers 1.5 million acres.

I have maintained an active interest in this project because two of the three counties involved—Crawford and Mercer—are located in my congressional district.

Like all resource conservation and development projects, the Penn Soil project is strictly a locally planned and supported program. More than 20 groups of local people worked with representatives of Federal and State agencies in developing the plan, which they started to carry out late in 1964.

Most of the project measures planned were inspired by the fact that the people got together and talked about their needs and recognized that this area of rich natural beauty held great potential and that the exodus of people could be stopped by developing it.

Although sponsors of the Penn Soil project expect it will take from 12 to 16 years to complete their plans, important developments are already in evidence:

First. Comprehensive land-use planning is taking place in all three counties.

Second. Important to land-use planning is the soil-survey information that is being speeded up through the project. In Mercer County, the soil survey is now complete and I understand that the information is available to anyone who needs it, even though the survey has not yet been published.

Third. A unique feature of the project is a proposed $1 million conservation education center. The Pennsylvania General Assembly has enacted legislation that provides up to $50,000 for purchasing 200-some acres for the center. Sponsors estimate that the center will increase income in the area by about $100,000 annually.

Fourth. Significant headway has been made in treating critically eroded areas, including strip-mined lands. Local Boy Scouts and underprivileged boys have helped with some of this work.

Fifth. A new 1,250-acre rural recreation subdivision in Mercer County, with a 250-acre lake, is already adding $50,000 to $60,000 annually to local government treasuries.

Sixth. Two small watershed projects have been completed. Both include recreation benefits as well as flood prevention. They have created 100 man-years of employment and increased income nearly $1½ million annually. Four other watershed projects are in the planning or construction stage.

The soil and water conservation districts in the three counties—which are sponsoring the resource conservation and development project jointly with the county boards of commissioners—have had strong soil- and water-conservation programs for many years. The local people have shown their initiative in solving their soil and water problems through district programs. And they have had good local leadership. It is no coincidence that David J. Woods—who is president of the Penn Soil resource conservation and development project steering committee has been chairman of the Mercer County Soil and Water Conservation District directors.

I believe the people in the Penn Soil area show the spirit of Americanism which we all admire. They are on their way to making rural America an attractive place in which to live with a future of opportunity.

This is one of the 41 areas in the United States which presently are carrying out resource conservation and development projects. I think they bear watching, for they are setting a fine example for others to follow.

The McNamara Gap

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written concerning the resignation of Secretary of Defense Robert Strange McNamara. If after 7 years in the Pentagon, Mr. McNamara were to run all the data concerning his tenure of office into a computer, he and the American public would discover an enormous increase on the liability side of the Defense balance sheet. Among the debits are the TFX—"flying Edsel"—the M–16 rifle, the loss of the U.S.S. *Pueblo,* and the growth of Soviet nuclear missile strength. This "McNamara gap" is brought to light by an article that appeared in the highly respected weekly, Barron's, on February 5, 1968, entitled "Balance of Terror."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the RECORD, as follows:

BALANCE OF TERROR: THE "MCNAMARA GAP" WILL COST THE NATION DEAR

With apologies to C. Northcote Parkinson, whose word is invariably Law, we would like to propound the following tentative rule of thumb: the weight of kudos heaped upon a public figure these days varies inversely with the size of his achievement. On this score, for the historically minded, we might cite the sudden rediscovery of Crispus Attucks, hitherto obscure Negro stevedore, whose sole claim to fame—he chanced to stop a bullet during the Boston Massacre—has gained him a place among the "Founders of Our Nation" in the Bobbs-Merrill "Childhood of Famous Americans" series, as well as a newly established school holiday in Newark, N.J. There is also the man whose announced resignation as Secretary of Defense last fall evoked an equally extravagant appraisal of net worth. One Democratic Senator, who may as well be nameless, hailed Robert S. McNamara as: "One of the finest public servants ever produced by this country . . . the finest Secretary of Defense . . . a man for all seasons (who) leaves behind him a legacy of accomplishments in the defense complex which will stand for many years."

In a day and age of rapid change, technological and otherwise, some weapons may be obsolete before they leave the drawing board. By the same token, barely eight weeks after the lawgiver's salute appeared in print, the quick-march of time has made a shambles of the Secretary's service record. Shortly after Mr. McNamara handed in his resignation, Great Britain dropped its option on the controversial TFX, a command decision which the U.S. Navy is maneuvering adroitly to follow. By pulling out of the Middle and Far East, moreover, the British have exposed not only the weakness of their own position but also the folly of a U.S. strategy in Europe based heavily upon their crumbling strength. With friends like these, Mr. Secretary, who needs enemies?

"Which ones are the enemy?", in effect has come the reply. Under Mr. McNamara the civilians in the Pentagon have overridden unanimous decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, undercut the authority of field commanders and subordinated strategic and tactical imperatives—the lives of Americans in uniform, to be blunt—to the dictates of dubiously programmed computers. Some Whiz Kid—with what a House Armed Services subcommittee later condemned as "bordering on criminal negligence"—decided to substitute a cheaper powder for the intricately designed M–16 rifle, thereby causing repeated malfunction. The vulnerable Pueblo, operating 13 miles off North Korea, had standing orders to ignore harassment and not to fire. Finally, by urging the doctrine of nuclear parity between the U.S. and Soviet Union, refusing to deploy an effective anti-ballistic missile system and stifling weapons development, the "finest Secretary of Defense," perhaps more than any other man in Cabinet history, has come alarmingly close to tipping the balance of terror against his own country. Unlike the fraudulent missile gap of 1960, which helped him to office, what the American Security Council flatly labels the "McNamara gap" today looms perilously real.

The gulf between image and reality shows up perhaps most starkly on the fighting fronts. McNamara apologists like to boast of their man's skill at cost-effectiveness and the "far-reaching managerial revolution" which he brought to the Pentagon. To all of which we say "Tell it to the Marines"—and to the Army, Navy and Air Force. The rifle which lacked the right kind of cartridge has been cited. Two years ago (Barron's, December 13, 1965) on-the-scene observers reported "serious miscalculations of needs and shortages of equipment. . . . Dozens of M–13 military personnel carriers, for example, have been red-lined for lack of parts. To keep some vehicles running, the Automotive Tank Command has begun to cannibalize others." Since then, thanks to some management genius' urge to slash inventories, U.S. forces have run dangerously short of combat aircraft, to the point where the Pentagon reluctantly had to authorize the re-opening of shutdown assembly lines. Air support wasn't available for the Pueblo because the few planes close enough to help were rigged to carry nuclear bombs. Since cost effectiveness ruled out nuclear escorts as inefficient, the U.S.S. Enterprise, now cruising off Wonsan, remains tied to a slow-moving conventionally powered fleet. Further flare-ups anywhere in the world will find the U.S. defense posture dangerously strained.

Emergencies aside, the nation's longrange military planning somehow has gone awry. For decades the North Atlantic Treaty Organization served the Western world as shield; U.S. nuclear power was the sword. However, under Mr. McNamara (who really hates to waste money on arms and should be happier ladling it out at the World Bank), both shield and sword have fallen into disrepair. Largely at the behest of the so-called defense intellectuals, and with scarcely a by-your-leave to its NATO allies, the U.S. in 1961 began a unilateral retreat from the policy of massive retaliation, and toward a new doctrine of graduated response, which envisions the use of nuclear power only as a last, and long-deferred, resort. In mid-December, as he was emptying his desk at the Pentagon, Mr. McNamara had the satisfaction of seeing his brainchild promoted to official NATO strategy.

Few others in the free world will celebrate. For graduated response, perhaps more than any other issue, alienated Charles de Gaulle, who quite correctly viewed it as a softening of the U.S. resolve to defend the Continent, and led France to withdraw its forces from NATO's military command. The security of Europe thus has come to rest on a dwindling band of U.S., British and miscellaneous troops, which, instead of reinforcements, as official reliance on conventional weaponry might seem to demand, gradually are getting transportation home. This winter, Washington and London withdrew some 40,000 men, or over 10% of their total contingent, from the Continent; the Canadians and Belgians soon may follow suit. Manpower aside, graduated response, as the bloody stalemate known as McNamara's War suggests, simply is no substitute for victory.

Secretary McNamara, to be sure, rarely speaks in such terms. Instead, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union—which remains the would-be architect of U.S. destruction—he stubbornly clings to the hope of disarmament and detente. Time after time he has shown an otherwise inexplicable willingness to give the Communist world the benefit of the doubt long after grounds for reasonable doubt had vanished. Last summer, in a grim appraisal titled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, USA vs. USSR," the authoritative American Security Council, a blue-ribbon group which includes a number of retired admirals and generals, estimated that the Communists were adding 400 missiles per year to their nuclear arsenal. After repeated denials, Mr. McNamara last week cited the same figure. The Council also averred that "the delivery capability of U.S. strategic weapons systems, as measured in megatons of nuclear yield, has been going down steadily, while the Soviet capability has been steadily growing." Hence, it concluded that by mid-1968, if not before, a dangerous "megaton gap" would begin to open in favor of the Reds. The Pentagon scoffed at the claim. Last week, however, in a significant statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee, it struck a different note. Specifically, it urged modernizing the Minuteman missile force; defending all Minuteman emplacements with Sprint antimissile systems; and developing a deadlier successor. After seven years of appeasement, retreat and defeat, maybe even the icy Secretary of Defense has lost his cool. It's high time somebody got mad.

Governmental Relations in the College and University Setting

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul E. Bragdon, director of governmental relations of New York University, recently delivered an excellent speech on the subject of lobbying and education to the American Alumni Council-American College Public Relations Association conference.

Mr. Bragdon preceptively discusses what a university can and cannot expect from Government and the best ways to deal effectively with Government higher education programs effectively.

Mr. Bragdon's speech of January 18, 1968, entitled "Governmental Relations in the College and University Setting" follows:

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SETTING

(By Paul E. Bragdon, director of governmental relations, New York University, to the American Alumni Council-American College Public Relations Association conference for the Middle Atlantic States, Atlantic City, N.J., January 18, 1968)

On the day following adjournment of the 1965 session of the New York State Legislature, my dinner companions were the Republican leader of the upper house and the recently and happily resigned Republican State Chairman. As the legislative representative of New York City and its retiring Democratic Mayor, I expressed regret that I would not be returning to Albany as the City's representative in the following year. I added that I had just begun to learn "which shell the pea is under" in the legislative halls.

Today, approximately ten months after entering the world of higher education—I find, incidentally, that government and politics provide an excellent prep school education for the life of an administrator in higher education—I have somewhat the same sentiments in addressing you as I expressed to my dinner companions in Albany.

Inclusion of governmental relations on the program of this conference confirms my impression that considerable interest in the function exists outside as well as within my own university.

In this partial accounting to you, I will give the reasons, as I understand them, for the creation of the position of Director of Governmental Relations within the officer structure of New York University. Thereafter, I will give you my own views on:

What a governmental relations program is, and what it is not—what it can do, and what it cannot.

What order of man or woman a college or university should seek for its governmental relations officer. (Any resemblance between the person described and the speaker is purely Walter Mitty.)

What the general role, and functional relationships, of the governmental relations specialist should be within the institution. (The views expressed are those of the speaker, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the sponsoring university.)

Before proceeding, I must note that my remarks are addressed principally to my colleagues from the independent institutions. For those associated with public institutions, created and sustained in whole or substantial part by government, governmental relations, by whatever name, are ever present—a habit, an instinct—and there is a degree of sophistication not as yet uniformly evident in the private sector. As a final prefactory aside, I am not presuming to advise those administrators and faculty members with supremely sensitive detection devices for governmental contract research grants and with well-worn paths to the sources on how they can improve on the unimprovable.

Two principal reasons led the administration of New York University to create the position of Director of Governmental Relations. The first was the recognition that the University, like her sister institutions and other institutions in our society, is increasingly concerned with the actions and policies of all levels of government. The President and other top officers of the University were devoting an increasing part of their time to significant questions relating to government. Secondly, the conviction developed that the maintenance and development of our system of higher education required what some have called "a mixed economy"—that most independent institutions *must* develop additional financial support from public sources; both public and independent institutions, providing a common public service, should develop financial support from diverse sources, public and private. It was decided, then, that the University should have an officer whose primary commitment would be to governmental questions—to assist the President and Administration in formulating policy on governmental matters, and to be concerned with the development of direct financial support from public sources for independent institutions.

Many myths—some imbued with romance and mystery, others of a more sinister cast—surround the activities known as "governmental relations" and its subdivision called "lobbying." Generally, those engaged in such activities do nothing to disabuse laymen of the notion that legerdemain is a necessary part of their craft.

It is commonly thought that "contacts," i.e., the ability to gain access to public officials, enable the governmental relations specialist to produce results marvelous to behold, instant miracles. Closed doors obviously preclude results. But "contacts" merely permit a presentation, the success of which depends on the attractiveness of the public policy involved at a given time and/or the strength of the forces supporting a position. Moreover, access does not require a governmental relations specialist, but can be gained by the old school tie, cocktail party conversation, one's trustees or a brother-in-law.

Often terms like "wining and dining" are associated with governmental relations. The bars of Albany, among other seats of government, are supposedly lined with purple-veined noses—the owners of which drop names with abandon and extract large fees from uninitiated, but otherwise sophisticated clients for little in the way of results. The fact is that, increasingly, the most *respected* practitioners in governmental relations are those who know the substance of the policy they espouse or oppose, and are capable of communicating their position effectively to a wide variety of public officials. And the most *successful* practitioners are uniformly those blessed with a position representing attractive public policy and/or supported by significant elements in the community. Thus, an extravagant program of high proof entertainment would not only be inappropriate and improper—it wouldn't work.

If access to public officials, while necessary, and a modest social program, while helpful, do not constitute a "governmental relations" program, what is the essence of such a program? Briefly, it is the substitution of a continuous and systematic program for occasional and sporadic activity. There are many analogies for a governmental relations program in existing programs within our colleges and universities. The public relations or development programs serve as useful precedents. Consider, for example, what goes into a major capital program:

1. Analysis and recognition of the status of the institution, and setting a direction for its future.
2. Appraisal of fund-raising potential, and setting of fund goal (with allocation of proceeds of drive, and establishment of a system of priorities and alternatives).
3. Initiation and maintenance of informational campaign addressed to the public-at-large and special audiences to give a favorable portrait of the institution, its educational objectives and the necessity of raising money to meet such objectives.
4. Identification of prospective individual and institutional donors, and compilation of data on such prospects.
5. Determination of best way to approach each prospect, and survey of field for possible allies in seeking gift.
6. Preparation of specific proposal for presentation to each prospect, with alternatives.
7. Patience, persistence, continuity.

By changing a few words, each of the stated steps can be translated into parts of a governmental relations program. All of which is to say that governmental relations is neither mysterious nor magical, but merely the systematic application in a different arena of the intelligence, reason and imagination employed in many other institutional activities.

At minimum, a successful governmental relations program should assure (1) information on any proposed governmental action which would affect the institution, (2) consultation on matters affecting the institution, (3) avoidance of actions which would have an unintended effect, (4) ability to affect legislation or regulations of a technical or non-controversial nature. At maximum, such program can lead to the passage of desired major legislation or to the defeat of offensive legislation. Similarly, it can produce favorable governmental decisions. As pointed out earlier, the maximum can be achieved if it represents attractive public policy at the time and/or substantial support within the community exists. Needless to say, it is part of the governmental relations program to help produce the climate conducive to maximum achievement.

In seeking a governmental relations specialist, a college or university should look, first, for a person who believes in the commitment of our society to higher education, and wants to participate in fulfilling that commitment. He should think it worth his while to help support an environment devoted to free inquiry, the pursuit of knowledge and the education and training of men and women. He should be able to understand the aspirations of his institution and the community of which it is a part. He should be a comfortable citizen of the academic community—as comfortable as possible in a time of challenge necessitating innovation and change. I am reminded of a thoughtful letter written to a friend by Dean Acheson some ten years ago, in which he says of public service:

> "[There is] no better or fuller life for a man of spirit. The old Greek conception of happiness is relevant here: 'The exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence, in a life affording them scope.'
>
> "It explains also why to everyone who has ever experienced it, the return from public life leaves one feeling flat and empty. Content, interested, busy—yes. But exhilarated—no. For one has left a life affording scope for the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence . . . The requirement of scope is hard to come by in this age, outside of public life . . . painted with all the warts, [public service] is a life of scope for the exercise of all one's vital powers, even though one may become a casualty in exercising them."

It seems to me that service in higher education is one of those endeavors "hard to come by in this age," which affords "scope," which, "painted with all its warts," permits the "exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence." And, yes, the possibility that one "may become a casualty in exercising them."

I am suggesting, of course, that the public service is a good recruiting ground for an institution's governmental relations specialist. Not just because of specific experience, but because a college or university can offer "scope," sometimes "exhilaration" and can assure avoidance of "feeling flat and empty."

We must remember, of course, that "public service" and "government service" are generic terms encompassing numerous skills, specialties, functions and levels of responsibility. As an example, while serving the Mayor of New York City, I was alternately or simultaneously a lawyer specializing in legislation with peripheral public relations responsibilities, a public relations man, a decision-maker within designated policy guidelines. I was in the position of offering judgment on a broad range of governmental and political problems—usually, it seemed, in a crisis under multiple pressures and with an array of alternatives keenly competitive in their unattractiveness.

As we dig deeper into "government service" or "public service" in pursuit of our man, we will find most commonly, I suspect that our candidates will be lawyers with experience in or a sense of public relations, or a public relations specialist who knows when he needs to call his lawyer. I see no reason, however, why the search should be circumscribed. Why not, for example, an economist with a public relations sense who knows when to call his lawyer? More important than specialty, it seems to me, are qualities and experience, including:

Readiness to evaluate men and women on quality, character and performance, not on labels, background or other outward indicia.

A disciplined openness of mind to the significant facts.

Exercise of judgment generally, in company with responsibility, on a broad range of matters which count.

Once attired in a suitably tattered academic gown, our recruit must, of course, be placed in the administrative structure of the institution. Clearly, our man is part of the family addressing itself to the various publics outside the college or university—the general public, the media, the community and the alumni. There should be harmony and consistency, or at least agreed-upon inconsistency, in this family. I believe that the central relationships should be established in this area, and of course the same hand should hold the related strings. Obviously, however, the governmental relations specialist must be closely related to the development and planning officers and the fiscal officers of the institution—and some, quite reasonably, would see these as the primary relationships. Finally, since the governmental relations specialist will often be concerned with laws, proposed legislation and regulations with an impact on all or part of the institution, a rapport must be established with its general counsel.

Now, what about the two questions I've been asked most frequently: contract research and grants and direct lobbying. Precedent exists in the four-year colleges and smaller universities for including the contract research and grant functions in the office of the government relations specialist—and this practice seems appropriate. For the larger universities, however, both history and volume argue against the combination of functions. I have a tentative view that the administrator of the research and grant program should be under the umbrella of the governmental relations specialist, and a firmer conclusion that regular reports and periodic summaries should be transmitted as a matter of routine to the governmental relations officer.

On the question of lobbying, I would not advocate regular patrols of the legislative corridors. Rather, except on specific occasions, I would have the governmental relations specialist direct and coordinate the activities of counsel in the national and state capitols. Although the vice president of Temple University charged with responsibility for governmental relations operates successfully and most frequently in Harrisburg, I hold to the opinion that, ordinarily, the governmental relations officer should primarily function within his own institution in the development of policies and strategy and tactics to achieve implementation of such policies. Our experience with the 1967 Constitutional Convention in New York would indicate that our most effective communication with government on significant issues is achieved by making common cause with the other five independent universities with extensive graduate programs, and by acting through The Association of Colleges and Universities and The Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities.

My parting recommendation is that the judgment and experience of the governmental relations specialist should be called upon on general institutional problems, and this is so for several reasons:

Our recruit must develop a "feel" for the institution, a sense of living with its problems, so that he can perform effectively and with high morale in his area of prime responsibility.

The perspective of a governmental relations specialist may be a useful one to add in considering a problem.

Anyone who has acted in a responsible position in government has faced a variety of difficult problems under trying conditions ("No One Knows the Troubles I've Seen" would be a suitable theme). Surprisingly, he may have dealt with the very problem under consideration. As I look at recent problems on campus, I can't help but remember my view from my City Hall window in 1964 of demonstrations, protests, sit-in's and confrontations—and my direct responsibility in 1965 for security of New York's City Hall, including the decisions on "arrest or not to arrest," "confrontation and avoidance."

And, above all else, our recruit came seeking "scope" for the "full exercise of his powers." Retention of his interest and securing the maximum value of his services depend, after all, on his finding the expected opportunities—opportunities which exist in higher education, perhaps more than in any other private area of society today.

Dollar Appeal

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, even though there have been alarms raised by our recent balance-of-payments position, the dollar continues to be well liked in the world money market.

Mr. J. A. Livingston, in the February 12 Washington Post, stated it in a more roundabout way when he said:

> Maybe the world doesn't love Americans. The dollar is another matter.

The dollar continues to be backed by the great productive capacity of the United States. It has a history of 100 percent parity with gold since 1935—a history that the lira, the franc, the guilder, the pound, and the mark have reason to envy.

The problem with our balance of payments is the liquidity situation of the United States, and Mr. Livingston compliments the President for describing this so well when he said in his Economic Report:

> The United States in its international economic affairs is much like a wealthy and prosperous businessman whose liquidity has come under strain. His commercial operations remain highly successful.
>
> His large long-term investments yield an excellent return . . . His income and his net worth are growing strongly every year . . . But he has been borrowing extensively at short-term to help finance his long-term investments. That man needs to pull back for a while to strentghen his liquidity.

Mr. Speaker, I found Mr. Livingston's article to be a good statement of the situation and commend it to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 12, 1968]

MAYBE EUROPE DOESN'T LOVE US, BUT THE DOLLAR IS ANOTHER MATTER

(By J. A. Livingston)

Recently, I suggested to a French official in Washington that a dollar poll in Europe would be useful. Businessmen and investors in France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands would be asked:

"Suppose you were offered a promissory note, payable in ten years in dollars, francs, marks, lire, or guilders, which IOU would you select?"

The French official asserted at once that no poll is necessary. "Times have changed. Three years ago, they'd have chosen the dollar. Maybe even two years ago. But today they'd pick the French or German or Dutch IOU. Probably the French."

I had my doubts. I felt that was a Gaullist response—a rigidly official French viewpoint.

So I tried it on a German. He didn't think anyone would choose the franc or the guilder, but the mark, yes, the mark. "You know it's a very strong currency these days."

I still had doubts. Maybe I'm guilty of Americanism, of chauvinism. My hunch is that the majority of moneyed Europeans, of informed Europeans, would choose the dollar as a store of value.

Admittedly, the devaluation of the pound in November fevered speculation in the London gold market. Surely the dollar would be next. Surely the price of gold would be raised from $35 an ounce to $70 and maybe even $105.

The central banks of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, etc., don't want any more dollars. Yet they still cooperate with the U.S. Treasury. They still play the central-bank game—Don't upset the applecart—in self-interest.

Even the French go along at times. During the sterling crisis, the Bank of France acquired $400,000,000. Its dollar holdings rose to a billion, as against its normal quota of $600,000,000. Those extra dollars were not promptly turned in for gold.

Nor does the drop in U.S. gold holdings since 1949 from more than $24 billion to about $12 billion mean that the dollar is a weak currency.

A dozen years ago, the world was short of dollars. The United States deliberately set out to lose gold—by encouraging travel abroad, granting economic and other aid, and subsidizing American companies to invest abroad.

The nervous reaction in Europe to President Johnson's plans to curb foreign lending, investing and travel is evidence that the dollar hasn't lost all its might. Maybe the world doesn't love Americans. The dollar is another matter.

In any poll abroad—Which promissory note would you choose?—the dollar has two assets. The first is economic—the great productive capacity of the United States.

The second is European history. It is pockmarked by wars, inflation and currency devaluation. Only the dollar and the Swiss franc have preserved 100 per cent parity with gold since 1937.

The Italian lira is down 97 per cent, the French franc 95 per cent, the Belgian franc 88 per cent, the Dutch guilder 50 per cent, the British pound 51 per cent and the German mark lost nearly all value.

No one has described the dollar's weakness better than President Johnson in his Economic Report to Congress.

"The United States in its international economic affairs is much like a wealthy and prosperous businessman whose liquidity has come under strain. His commercial operations remain highly successful.

"His large long-term investments yield an excellent return . . . His income and his net worth are growing strongly every year . . . But he has been borrowing extensively at short-term to help finance his long-term investments. That man needs to pull back for a while to strengthen his liquidity."

In tightening controls, the President is treating symptoms. He needs also to treat the basic weakness—inflation at home and overextended commitments abroad. The U.S. has spread itself thin—with butter and guns.

Col. Daniel "Chappie" James

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge announced today that Col. Daniel "Chappie" James will receive one of its top freedom awards.

The Air Force colonel will receive the George Washington Honor Medal and a $100 cash prize for a letter he wrote on his "heritage of freedom" while serving as vice commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing in Southeast Asia. The presentation is set for Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22.

Presently assigned as vice commander of the Tactical Air Command's 33d Tactical Fighter Wing, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., James added 78 combat missions over Communist North Vietnam to his battle total that included 101 missions during the Korean war.

The fighter pilot wrote in part:

> Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a Nation.

Invited to the White House by President Lyndon B. Johnson upon his return from the battle area last December, James reported to the President the morale of the men engaged in the air war was "great."

He said:

> Fighter pilots have always had a great morale; it is the greatest fraternity in the world. They like the equipment, the challenge, and the job.

He explained to the Chief Executive and then to newsmen when questioned on the effects of the bombing:

> We like to keep up the pressure. It is having an effect in slowing down goods and supplies.

Support of American ground troops fighting in South Vietnam is one of the colonel's favorite themes.

> We must stop the flow of men and supplies to the South.

He said in an interview before leaving Thailand:

> The ground troopers in South Vietnam depend upon us for that and we can't let them down. The Marines at Con Thien and along the DMZ are catching hell. With air support hitting at the total length of the Communist supply lines, we can put a ceiling on the amount of fire power that can be brought against our troops.

Cramming his 6-foot 4-inch, 235-pound frame into the front seat of the F-4 Phantom, James led the Thai-based fighters on a myriad of missions over the Communist north.

Colonel James entered aviation cadets in January 1943. After earning his Air Force wings, he served as a flight leader for 4 years, flying P-47's at various stateside locations. He went overseas to Clark Airbase, P.I., in 1949 and was sent to Korea from that assignment.

I include a letter from Colonel James, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1967.

The strength of the United States of America lies in its unity. It lies in free men blessed and ordained with the rights of freedom working to provide, build, enjoy and grow. Those who would subvert us—or any free people—try to disrupt this unity by breaking the small parts from the whole—driving in the wedges of fear and discontent.

I am a Negro and therefore I am subject to their constant harangue. They say: "You James are a member of a minority—you are a black man." They say: "You should be disgusted with this American society—this so-called Democracy." They say: "You can only progress so far in any field that you choose before somebody puts his foot on your neck for no other reason than you are black." They say: "You are a second-class citizen."

My heritage of freedom provides my reply. To them I say: I am a citizen of the United States of America. I am not a second class citizen and no man here is unless he thinks like one, reasons like one or performs like one. This is my country, and I believe in her, and I believe in her flag, and I'll defend her, and I'll fight for her and serve her. If she has any ills, I'll stand by her and hold her hand until in God's given time, through her wisdom and her consideration for the welfare of the entire nation, things are made right again.

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other because of race, creed, religion, political party or social strata. We must stop using personal grievances as an excuse to break the laws of the land. We must not join with any lawless mob no matter what the provocation in disregard for law and order. A thief is a thief—I don't care what he gives as his reason for stealing. A mob is a mob—I don't care what the provocation is.

We can't afford it in this great country of ours. It is our responsibility to preserve our freedom and our unity. Good, thinking men must help unite those with whom they come in contact through hard work and participation. Our contributions to the total effort can be a by-product of what we achieve through excellence in our chosen fields. In our daily lives we must become a strong link in the chain of unity and freedom that has always been the strength of these United States of America.

I am an American. My heritage is bound by the tenets of freedom inherent in that simple statement. My responsibility is to allow my children to join a community of free people everywhere who have the right to say: "I am what I am . . . because I have the freedom to say it."

DANIEL JAMES, JR.,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Vice Commander,
8th Tactical Fighter Wing.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 59 of our colleagues—not even enough to conduct the routine business of this House—could find themselves with the power to choose the next President of the United States.

I do not question the integrity or the honesty of any Member of this distinguished body. But no group of 59 men and women should have such power, however remote the chance that it will ever be exercised.

For this reason, I am introducing today a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would remove from the House of Representatives the mandate to select a President when no candidate in the national election receives a majority of the electoral votes. The new amendment would provide for a runoff election between the two candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes if neither receives a majority.

At the same time, I am introducing legislation to move the date of the presidential election back about 3 weeks to the second Tuesday in October. The runoff, when one is necessary, would then be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, the present election day.

This proposal would insure adequate time for the transition between administrations after a runoff election. With the increasing complexities of Government and the enormous growth in presidential power, it is unthinkable that there would not be a transitional period longer than the 2 weeks which are available under the present system when an election is thrown into the House. Shifting the date of the main election back to October would also encourage shorter, less costly presidential campaigns in an age of modern communications when a candidate no longer needs 8 or 9 weeks to reach the national electorate.

Under the system of choosing a President in the House of Representatives, as established by the 12th amendment in 1804, each State delegation casts one vote. In such an eventuality, the largest State in the Nation—with more than 19 million residents—has the same vote as the smallest State, which has fewer than 300,000 inhabitants. In fact, if the Representatives in delegations with an even number of votes divide evenly in their choice of a candidate, the entire delegation is neutralized and does not cast a single vote, regardless of the size of the State.

At the present time, for example, the Illinois delegation—fourth largest in the House—is split right down the middle between Democrats and Republicans. Such a situation cannot develop in the smallest delegations, which consist of only a single member.

A candidate controlling the votes of a majority of the House delegation in each of the 26 smallest States would become the Chief Executive of the world's most powerful nation. To control these 26 delegations, he would need the votes of only 59 Members—about 13 percent of the membership of this House—no matter what the other 376 Members might desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty of democracy.

Only once since 1804 has a presidential election been thrown into the House. The outcome, on that occasion in 1825, was an orgy of wheeling and dealing by candidates and Members of Congress, blatant offers of political "deals," and the election of a President who did not have even a plurality of either the electoral vote or the popular vote.

I do not believe the American people would tolerate such a gross distortion of our democratic principles today.

This problem is presented to us with particular force this year, when many political analysts say the Nation might be confronted with just such a situation. Although there may be little likelihood that a constitutional amendment will be approved by Congress and ratified by the necessary number of States before the 1968 election, Congress can—and must—act now to make sure this frightening prospect never faces us again.

A number of proposals to provide this assurance have been introduced in each House of Congress. Some of these call for the Members of both Houses, meeting in joint session, to elect a President if no candidate in the national balloting receives a sufficient plurality. Others would abolish the system of electoral votes entirely and substitute direct popular election of the President.

The former plan would certainly be an improvement over the existing system, in that each Member rather than each State would have one vote. But it shares many of the present defects. For example, by making the President dependent on Congress for his election, it leaves the door wide open for political deals.

The national electorate, moreover, may prefer a presidential candidate of one party while the voters in each separate congressional district are returning a Congress dominated by the other party. Not only is the electorate different in each case, the same person may be motivated by different considerations in voting for the President and for his local Representative.

This, of course, is exactly what happened as recently as 1956.

The objection is even stronger if the Senate participates in choosing a President, since only one-third of the Senate seats are up for election at any one time. About 66 of the 535 electors under the joint-session plan would have been chosen by the voters from 2 to 4 years before the most recent presidential election.

As for proposals for direct popular election of the President, as desirable as this might be—and I believe it is most desirable—it has been rejected innumerable times in the past, and I can see little chance of its acceptance today.

Historically, it has aroused the opposition of the smallest States, which are assured under the electoral system of at least three votes, regardless of how small their population might be. At the same time, paradoxical as it may seem, direct popular election is now strongly opposed by many perceptive spokesmen for the large States, who recognize that the concentration of electoral votes under the winner-take-all system induces both major parties to give special attention to the needs of the large, big-city States.

Also in this political lineup are the advocates of strong State authority, who fear that popular election would lead to irresistible pressures for national laws governing voting qualifications and other electoral questions now left largely to the States.

Faced with this concerted opposition, a constitutional amendment calling for direct election of the President—even if it is approved by two-thirds of the Members in each House of Congress—would probably not be ratified by the required three-fourths of the States.

Under these conditions, I believe the Congress should take more limited—and thus more acceptable—steps to deal with the intolerable situation which now confronts the Nation. This is the principal reason for the proposed amendment which I am introducing.

Because our method of electing the President has never functioned as the Founding Fathers intended, there is another serious defect in the present system which my amendment would also correct. This is the potentially disruptive and dangerous power of electors to disobey the instructions and the wishes of the voters.

A recent example of how this undemocratic provision operates was presented in 1960, when all of Mississippi's electors and six of Alabama's 11 withheld their votes from both national candidates and cast them instead for a man who was not even a declared presidential candidate. The same man received an additional vote from an Oklahoma elector.

To prevent a similar occurrence in the future, the amendment which I am introducing would abolish the so-called electoral college and the slates of individual electors. In their place, each State would be allotted the number of electoral votes corresponding to its representation in the House and the Senate, and these votes would be cast automatically for the presidential candidate receiving the most popular votes in that State.

The authors of the Constitution, writing that remarkable document before the development of a two-party system in our country, intended that each State would choose its wisest, most distinguished citizens as electors, and that these eminent individuals would then deliberate and cast their votes. But with the growth of two major political parties after 1789, the electors came to be chosen merely as representatives of a party, and independent deliberation and voting virtually disappeared after 1800.

Today, when most people could not name a single elector who represented their State in the most recent presidential election, continuance of the electoral college is meaningless.

Under my proposed amendment to the Constitution, the candidate receiving the greatest number of electoral votes would become President. Since, however, the presence of a large number of candidates could conceivably distort the national preference as reflected at the polls, the amendment provides for a runoff between the two top candidates if neither wins a majority of the electoral vote. This seems only reasonable, since an administration with an unreliable plurality might be not only undemocratic but unstable.

The runoff already works well in a number of States where it is used in party primary elections. And I might point out that American officials recently expressed considerable disappointment that the new Constitution of South Vietnam includes no provision for a runoff. As a result of that failure by the South Vietnamese constituent assembly, the winning presidential ticket in that country had a plurality of only 32 percent.

The situation I have been describing, in which the leading presidential candidate in this country fails to receive a majority of the electoral vote, has not occurred in more than 140 years.

Nevertheless, no one can deny that the possibility exists—and with it, the menacing prospect of confusion, deadlock, or even chaos in our efforts to select a national leader.

Mr. Speaker, to avoid that prospect and protect our democratic system of government, I urge the Congress to give my proposals its most serious consideration.

The text of my proposed amendment and legislation follow:

H.J. RES. 1086

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In lieu of the method of election provided in section 1 of article II and in the twelfth and twenty-fourth articles of amendment, the President and Vice President shall be elected as provided in this article.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall have a number of electoral votes for President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which that State may be entitled in the Congress. The places and manner of electing the President and Vice President shall be prescribed by law in each State; but the Congress may at any time by law prescribe the places and manner of electing the President and Vice President.

"SEC. 3. The people of each State shall cast their votes for the candidates for President and Vice President. The candidate for President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes shall receive that State's electoral votes for President, and the candidate for Vice President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall receive that State's electoral votes for Vice President.

"SEC. 4. The person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for President, shall be president, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes; and the person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President, shall be Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes.

"SEC. 5. If no person has a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, there shall be a runoff election in which the names of the two persons with the greatest number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, as the case may be, shall appear on the ballot in each of the several States. The winner of such election shall be decided in the same manner as the election provided by sections 3 and 4 of this article.

"SEC. 6. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall have a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State.

"SEC. 7. The Congress may provide by law for the determination of any case affecting the election of the President or Vice President for which provision is not made by this article."

H.R. 15330

A bill to provide for the election of President and Vice President as required by the article of amendment to the Constitution proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the election of President and Vice President required by section 3 of the article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress shall be held on the second Tuesday in October.

(b) The runoff election required by section 5 of such proposed amendment shall be held, if necessary, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

SEC. 2. Section 25 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 7) is amended by striking out "Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every second year" and inserting in lieu thereof "second Tuesday in October, in every second year".

SEC. 3. (a) The first section of this Act shall apply only after the ratification of such proposed Constitutional amendment.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to elections of Representatives to the Congress for terms beginning after January 1 of the year during which the term of the first President and Vice President elected under such proposed Constitutional amendment commences.

Disabled American Veterans Statement Before Committee on Veterans' Affairs

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Francis J. Beaton, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 7, 1968. In my judgment it is an unusually fine statement, and speaks to the conditions of our times. I commend it to the Members, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS J. BEATON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is, indeed, a privilege and a pleasure for me, as National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, to appear before you and present our Legislative Program for the Second Session of the 90th Congress.

On behalf of the DAV National and State Officers assembled here this morning, I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the cooperation, interest, and help extended to us by your Committee throughout the past year.

We are also deeply indebted to you for your patience and understanding, and the personal consideration given to our many legislative requests.

The same compliments are extended to the very able staff members of the Committee, who have gone out of their way to assist us.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the ingredients of DAV Legislative Programs are found in resolutions adopted by our governing bodies, the National Convention and the National Executive Committee.

Our most recent National Convention, held in Denver, Colorado, July 31st through August 4th, 1967, approved more than 150 resolutions. A majority of the proposals call for modifications in existing veterans programs, while others would authorize new ones. Additionally, a limited number of proposals relate to our country's policy and position in Southeast Asia.

On this last score, with your permission, I would like to voice a few observations about the current epidemic of urban riots and antiwar demonstrations. I am thinking in particular of those who desecrate our flag, the draft-card burners and others who confuse freedom with license. Such matters may not be directly related to the immediate concerns of your Committee; but I submit that they are of general concern to all members of Congress—and to all Americans who cherish and understand the full dimensions of freedom.

Let me say first that no one, surely, understands better than the Members of Congress how precious is the right to dissent. We also recognize that our institutions have been carefully framed to accommodate all kinds of utterly opposing viewpoints—including the merits of our Vietnam policy. It so happens that the DAV is pledged by mandate of our National Convention to support our policy in Vietnam—and we are proud to be counted in that category. But we recognize the right to those in opposition to disagree.

What we do not recognize—what we do condemn—what we view with disgust and outrage—are the antics of those who abuse their freedom, make a mockery of their rights and who subvert the whole meaning of liberty.

Let there be no confusion about the identity of these willful delinquents: I am talking about the so-called demonstrators who burn their draft cards, vilify the sacrifices of American soldiers, desecrate our flag, interfere with the movement of men and supplies, sit in at the Pentagon and, in other viciously childish acts and protests, render aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear.

No single right of citizenship exists without a corresponding responsibility. Freedom is not license. The right of one individual cannot be equated as outweighing the rights of many individuals. There must be limits to tolerance. Otherwise we are inviting anarchy.

It is all well and good for crusaders to argue that personal folly and criminal disorder are the products of ignorance, want and lack of privilege. But this country, this government and this Congress are fighting ignorance, want and lack of privilege as never before in our history.

This great fight cannot and will not be sustained, if citizens cannot walk their streets in safety, if our shopkeepers are terrorized by criminals, if our police are maligned and attacked for doing their duty, if—in short—something is not done—and done soon—to insure law and order.

Kooks and cowards have a right to their kookiness and a right to be cowardly in the privacy of their own kennels. They have no right to cripple the progress of our nation and the pursuit of its legitimate policies in peace as well as war.

A man who burns his draft card or who counsels others to do so is in clear violation of the law of the land and must be prosecuted.

If there is no law to prohibit burning of the American Flag, there definitely ought to be. The Flag is more than a piece of silk or cloth. It is a symbol of all we honor and cherish.

It is heartening to know that the House of Representatives has already passed and sent to the Senate two bills to curb some of these manifestations of idiocy. I am referring to H.R. 10480 which would make the burning of or malicious damage to the flag a federal crime, and H.R. 421 which would impose severe penalties for using interstate communications to incite, organize and promote a riot.

We realize that proposals of this nature invariably invite controversy as to their constitutionality. We do not profess to be expert in constitutional law. But when anarchy becomes a "Way of Life" for certain individuals, and when people who obey the law suffer outrages beyond the point of endurance, we think a legislative solution to the problems must be found. The DAV sees the provisions of H.R. 10480 and H.R. 421 as steps in this direction and we earnestly hope the full Congress will soon concur.

Before turning to our own National Convention resolutions, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter demanding brief comment.

We would be remiss if we did not at this time express our deep appreciation to this committee, and to the Congress, for your prompt and favorable response to the historic recommendations made a year ago by President Johnson in his unprecedented veterans message to the first session of the 90th Congress. The message was the first of its kind but, as we all know, it was not the last.

Later on in this testimony I shall address myself to the newest veterans message received by Congress; but it is only fair, I think, to recap here the results of that first message. There's never any shortage of people telling you what you've done wrong. So I think it's only fair to have someone tell you occasionally what you've done right.

Among other things—

You have expanded educational allowances under the GI bill.

You have widened opportunities for veterans with educational shortcomings.

You have eliminated inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans.

You have given substantial pension boosts to some 2 million disabled veterans, widows and dependents.

In short, you took the recommendations of the President's first veterans message and contributed much to the comfort and well-being of those who, in the President's own words, "have brought greater justice and decency to the world."

Yet as always there is unfinished business. We hope, for example, that the Senate will quickly pass H.R. 12555 which the House approved last December. It is needed to protect pension rights against automatic reductions as a consequence of increases in other federal retirement benefits such as social security. We are happy that the President, too, has asked for Senate concurrence in his newest message.

I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to voice our special thanks and deep appreciation for the steadfast support this Committee gave to H.R. 2151 which provides for an annual audit of our accounts by the U.S. Comptroller General. As Public Law 90–208, this statute will enable us to avoid duplication and waste of effort in connection with filing our financial reports at state and city levels. Indeed, it will effectively serve to eliminate a perplexing problem that has plagued the DAV for a long time.

In particular I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of this Committee for steering the bill so competently through the full House of Representatives. He has our profound gratitude.

It is further in order, Mr. Chairman, to express our confidence in the work of the Veterans Advisory Commission whose report is due at the White House very soon.

The DAV is privileged to be represented on that Commission by a gentleman well-even a plurality of either the electoral vote or the popular vote.

I do not believe the American people would tolerate such a gross distortion of our democratic principles today.

This problem is presented to us with particular force this year, when many political analysts say the Nation might be confronted with just such a situation. Although there may be little likelihood that a constitutional amendment will be approved by Congress and ratified by the necessary number of States before the 1968 election, Congress can—and must—act now to make sure this frightening prospect never faces us again.

A number of proposals to provide this assurance have been introduced in each House of Congress. Some of these call for the Members of both Houses, meeting in joint session, to elect a President if no candidate in the national balloting receives a sufficient plurality. Others would abolish the system of electoral votes entirely and substitute direct popular election of the President.

The former plan would certainly be an improvement over the existing system, in that each Member rather than each State would have one vote. But it shares many of the present defects. For example, by making the President dependent on Congress for his election, it leaves the door wide open for political deals.

The national electorate, moreover, may prefer a presidential candidate of one party while the voters in each separate congressional district are returning a Congress dominated by the other party. Not only is the electorate different in each case, the same person may be motivated by different considerations in voting for the President and for his local Representative.

This, of course, is exactly what happened as recently as 1956.

The objection is even stronger if the Senate participates in choosing a President, since only one-third of the Senate seats are up for election at any one time. About 66 of the 535 electors under the joint-session plan would have been chosen by the voters from 2 to 4 years before the most recent presidential election.

As for proposals for direct popular election of the President, as desirable as this might be—and I believe it is most desirable—it has been rejected innumerable times in the past, and I can see little chance of its acceptance today.

Historically, it has aroused the opposition of the smallest States, which are assured under the electoral system of at least three votes, regardless of how small their population might be. At the same time, paradoxical as it may seem, direct popular election is now strongly opposed by many perceptive spokesmen for the large States, who recognize that the concentration of electoral votes under the winner-take-all system induces both major parties to give special attention to the needs of the large, big-city States.

Also in this political lineup are the advocates of strong State authority, who fear that popular election would lead to irresistible pressures for national laws governing voting qualifications and other electoral questions now left largely to the States.

Faced with this concerted opposition, a constitutional amendment calling for direct election of the President—even if it is approved by two-thirds of the Members in each House of Congress—would probably not be ratified by the required three-fourths of the States.

Under these conditions, I believe the Congress should take more limited—and thus more acceptable—steps to deal with the intolerable situation which now confronts the Nation. This is the principal reason for the proposed amendment which I am introducing.

Because our method of electing the President has never functioned as the Founding Fathers intended, there is another serious defect in the present system which my amendment would also correct. This is the potentially disruptive and dangerous power of electors to disobey the instructions and the wishes of the voters.

A recent example of how this undemocratic provision operates was presented in 1960, when all of Mississippi's electors and six of Alabama's 11 withheld their votes from both national candidates and cast them instead for a man who was not even a declared presidential candidate. The same man received an additional vote from an Oklahoma elector.

To prevent a similar occurrence in the future, the amendment which I am introducing would abolish the so-called electoral college and the slates of individual electors. In their place, each State would be allotted the number of electoral votes corresponding to its representation in the House and the Senate, and these votes would be cast automatically for the presidential candidate receiving the most popular votes in that State.

The authors of the Constitution, writing that remarkable document before the development of a two-party system in our country, intended that each State would choose its wisest, most distinguished citizens as electors, and that these eminent individuals would then deliberate and cast their votes. But with the growth of two major political parties after 1789, the electors came to be chosen merely as representatives of a party, and independent deliberation and voting virtually disappeared after 1800.

Today, when most people could not name a single elector who represented their State in the most recent presidential election, continuance of the electoral college is meaningless.

Under my proposed amendment to the Constitution, the candidate receiving the greatest number of electoral votes would become President. Since, however, the presence of a large number of candidates could conceivably distort the national preference as reflected at the polls, the amendment provides for a runoff between the two top candidates if neither wins a majority of the electoral vote. This seems only reasonable, since an administration with an unreliable plurality might be not only undemocratic but unstable.

The runoff already works well in a number of States where it is used in party primary elections. And I might point out that American officials recently expressed considerable disappointment that the new Constitution of South Vietnam includes no provision for a runoff. As a result of that failure by the South Vietnamese constituent assembly, the winning presidential ticket in that country had a plurality of only 32 percent.

The situation I have been describing, in which the leading presidential candidate in this country fails to receive a majority of the electoral vote, has not occurred in more than 140 years.

Nevertheless, no one can deny that the possibility exists—and with it, the menacing prospect of confusion, deadlock, or even chaos in our efforts to select a national leader.

Mr. Speaker, to avoid that prospect and protect our democratic system of government, I urge the Congress to give my proposals its most serious consideration.

The text of my proposed amendment and legislation follow:

H.J. Res. 1086

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In lieu of the method of election provided in section 1 of article II and in the twelfth and twenty-fourth articles of amendment, the President and Vice President shall be elected as provided in this article.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall have a number of electoral votes for President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which that State may be entitled in the Congress. The places and manner of electing the President and Vice President shall be prescribed by law in each State; but the Congress may at any time by law prescribe the places and manner of electing the President and Vice President.

"SEC. 3. The people of each State shall cast their votes for the candidates for President and Vice President. The candidate for President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes shall receive that State's electoral votes for President, and the candidate for Vice President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall receive that State's electoral votes for Vice President.

"SEC. 4. The person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for President, shall be president, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes; and the person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President, shall be Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes.

"SEC. 5. If no person has a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, there shall be a runoff election in which the names of the two persons with the greatest number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, as the case may be, shall appear on the ballot in each of the several States. The winner of such election shall be decided in the same manner as the election provided by sections 3 and 4 of this article.

"SEC. 6. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall have a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State.

"SEC. 7. The Congress may provide by law for the determination of any case affecting the election of the President or Vice President for which provision is not made by this article."

H.R. 15330

A bill to provide for the election of President and Vice President as required by the article of amendment to the Constitution proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the election of President and Vice President required by section 3 of the article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress shall be held on the second Tuesday in October.

(b) The runoff election required by section 5 of such proposed amendment shall be held, if necessary, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

SEC. 2. Section 25 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 7) is amended by striking out "Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every second year" and inserting in lieu thereof "second Tuesday in October, in every second year".

SEC. 3. (a) The first section of this Act shall apply only after the ratification of such proposed Constitutional amendment.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to elections of Representatives to the Congress for terms beginning after January 1 of the year during which the term of the first President and Vice President elected under such proposed Constitutional amendment commences.

Disabled American Veterans Statement Before Committee on Veterans' Affairs

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Francis J. Beaton, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 7, 1968. In my judgment it is an unusually fine statement, and speaks to the conditions of our times. I commend it to the Members, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS J. BEATON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is, indeed, a privilege and a pleasure for me, as National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, to appear before you and present our Legislative Program for the Second Session of the 90th Congress.

On behalf of the DAV National and State Officers assembled here this morning, I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the cooperation, interest, and help extended to us by your Committee throughout the past year.

We are also deeply indebted to you for your patience and understanding, and the personal consideration given to our many legislative requests.

The same compliments are extended to the very able staff members of the Committee, who have gone out of their way to assist us.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the ingredients of DAV Legislative Programs are found in resolutions adopted by our governing bodies, the National Convention and the National Executive Committee.

Our most recent National Convention, held in Denver, Colorado, July 31st through August 4th, 1967, approved more than 150 resolutions. A majority of the proposals call for modifications in existing veterans programs, while others would authorize new ones. Additionally, a limited number of proposals relate to our country's policy and position in Southeast Asia.

On this last score, with your permission, I would like to voice a few observations about the current epidemic of urban riots and antiwar demonstrations. I am thinking in particular of those who desecrate our flag, the draft-card burners and others who confuse freedom with license. Such matters may not be directly related to the immediate concerns of your Committee; but I submit that they are of general concern to all members of Congress—and to all Americans who cherish and understand the full dimensions of freedom.

Let me say first that no one, surely, understands better than the Members of Congress how precious is the right to dissent. We also recognize that our institutions have been carefully framed to accommodate all kinds of utterly opposing viewpoints—including the merits of our Vietnam policy. It so happens that the DAV is pledged by mandate of our National Convention to support our policy in Vietnam—and we are proud to be counted in that category. But we recognize the right to those in opposition to disagree.

What we do not recognize—what we do condemn—what we view with disgust and outrage—are the antics of those who abuse their freedom, make a mockery of their rights and who subvert the whole meaning of liberty.

Let there be no confusion about the identity of these willful delinquents: I am talking about the so-called demonstrators who burn their draft cards, vilify the sacrifices of American soldiers, desecrate our flag, interfere with the movement of men and supplies, sit in at the Pentagon and, in other viciously childish acts and protests, render aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear.

No single right of citizenship exists without a corresponding responsibility. Freedom is not license. The right of one individual cannot be equated as outweighing the rights of many individuals. There must be limits to tolerance. Otherwise we are inviting anarchy.

It is all well and good for crusaders to argue that personal folly and criminal disorder are the products of ignorance, want and lack of privilege. But this country, this government and this Congress are fighting ignorance, want and lack of privilege as never before in our history.

This great fight cannot and will not be sustained, if citizens cannot walk their streets in safety, if our shopkeepers are terrorized by criminals, if our police are maligned and attacked for doing their duty, if—in short—something is not done—and done soon—to insure law and order.

Kooks and cowards have a right to their kookiness and a right to be cowardly in the privacy of their own kennels. They have no right to cripple the progress of our nation and the pursuit of its legitimate policies in peace as well as war.

A man who burns his draft card or who counsels others to do so is in clear violation of the law of the land and must be prosecuted.

If there is no law to prohibit burning of the American Flag, there definitely ought to be. The Flag is more than a piece of silk or cloth. It is a symbol of all we honor and cherish.

It is heartening to know that the House of Representatives has already passed and sent to the Senate two bills to curb some of these manifestations of idiocy. I am referring to H.R. 10480 which would make the burning of or malicious damage to the flag a federal crime, and H.R. 421 which would impose severe penalties for using interstate communications to incite, organize and promote a riot.

We realize that proposals of this nature invariably invite controversy as to their constitutionality. We do not profess to be expert in constitutional law. But when anarchy becomes a "Way of Life" for certain individuals, and when people who obey the law suffer outrages beyond the point of endurance, we think a legislative solution to the problems must be found. The DAV sees the provisions of H.R. 10480 and H.R. 421 as steps in this direction and we earnestly hope the full Congress will soon concur.

Before turning to our own National Convention resolutions, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter demanding brief comment.

We would be remiss if we did not at this time express our deep appreciation to this committee, and to the Congress, for your prompt and favorable response to the historic recommendations made a year ago by President Johnson in his unprecedented veterans message to the first session of the 90th Congress. The message was the first of its kind but, as we all know, it was not the last.

Later on in this testimony I shall address myself to the newest veterans message received by Congress; but it is only fair, I think, to recap here the results of that first message. There's never any shortage of people telling you what you've done wrong. So I think it's only fair to have someone tell you occasionally what you've done right.

Among other things—

You have expanded educational allowances under the GI bill.

You have widened opportunities for veterans with educational shortcomings.

You have eliminated inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans.

You have given substantial pension boosts to some 2 million disabled veterans, widows and dependents.

In short, you took the recommendations of the President's first veterans message and contributed much to the comfort and well-being of those who, in the President's own words, "have brought greater justice and decency to the world."

Yet as always there is unfinished business. We hope, for example, that the Senate will quickly pass H.R. 12555 which the House approved last December. It is needed to protect pension rights against automatic reductions as a consequence of increases in other federal retirement benefits such as social security. We are happy that the President, too, has asked for Senate concurrence in his newest message.

I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to voice our special thanks and deep appreciation for the steadfast support this Committee gave to H.R. 2151 which provides for an annual audit of our accounts by the U.S. Comptroller General. As Public Law 90-208, this statute will enable us to avoid duplication and waste of effort in connection with filing our financial reports at state and city levels. Indeed, it will effectively serve to eliminate a perplexing problem that has plagued the DAV for a long time.

In particular I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of this Committee for steering the bill so competently through the full House of Representatives. He has our profound gratitude.

It is further in order, Mr. Chairman, to express our confidence in the work of the Veterans Advisory Commission whose report is due at the White House very soon.

The DAV is privileged to be represented on that Commission by a gentleman well-known to the members of this Committee: Mr. Claude L. Callegary, of Baltimore, Md., a Past National Commander of the DAV. Mr. Callegary has had a long and distinguished record of service to the cause of America's veterans. We are proud, very proud, to have him as our Representative on the Advisory Panel.

Our National Director of Legislation, Chet Huber, was given the opportunity last October 3 to appear before the Commission and to discuss, in a general wrap-up, the recommendations of other DAV officers in previous appearances before the Commission.

The fact that the vast majority of our recommendations are concerned with the disability and death compensation programs is a reflection of the major emphasis placed on these issues by the mandates of our National Convention.

I think, in these matters, we can anticipate that the Veterans' Advisory Commission will have quite a bit to say when it finally reports. This conviction is further bolstered by the fact that the President's message last week on veterans' affairs did not come to grips with these questions. The Administration has itself acknowledged that it is looking forward to the recommendations of the Commission which has a mandate of its own for a comprehensive study of such matters.

We applaud the decision to put democracy to work in this fashion. But since we have only this opportunity to outline our own views, we cannot wait to see whether and where our philosophy may parallel the Commission's ultimate recommendations. Thus we come, Mr. Chairman, to the heart of our testimony.

After a thorough study of the subject, we have concluded that the present rates of disability and death compensation are grossly inadequate to permit the veteran or his widow a position in our society which we feel they are entitled to enjoy.

Much has been said concerning the adverse effect of the continued increase in the cost of living upon those who are compelled by circumstance to subsist on fixed incomes. The 90th Congress has already enacted legislation to ease the economic burden of military personnel, federal employees, social security beneficiaries, welfare recipients and non-service-connected pensioners. Sponsors of such legislation in each instance have documented and justified the necessity of increasing these benefits to bring them more closely in balance with the rise in the cost of living. The DAV also recognizes the need for these increases to offset the shrinking value of yesterday's dollar on today's market.

Surely, then, no one in this room needs to be reminded that disability compensation is also fixed income established by law. Or that the service connected disabled veteran has also been caught in the very same economic squeeze that has so seriously affected other federal beneficiaries.

The average increase of 10%, granted by P.L. 89–311, effective December 1, 1965, fell short by six per cent of bridging the gap between the buying power of the compensation dollar and the increase in living costs. This deficiency has since been compounded by an additional seven per cent rise in the cost of living. Moreover, it is a sad certainty that prices will continue to advance through 1968 at a rate of about four per cent. This will result in a corresponding decrease in the value of the veteran's compensation dollar.

We think it is abundantly clear that an overwhelming case exists for restoring the full value of disability compensation at the earliest possible date. This applies with special force to those who are so severely disabled as to be unemployable. This group has suffered an even greater erosion of their living standards.

It should be acknowledged that since 1933, when the present system of disability evaluation was established, there has been an overall increase of 154.6% in the rates of service connected disability compensation. However, during this same period, the average wage has increased nearly 60%, leaving a gap of over 400% between the increases in the rates of compensation and the wage of employed workers.

It should also be pointed out that the median annual income of full time employed veterans is now $7,300.00.

The veteran who is rendered totally unproductive because of disability incurred as a result of military service cannot reach this level of economic security. Because his total loss of earning power came about as a result of service to his country, it seems a matter of simple justice that the compensation payments for this particular veteran should be increased to a point commensurate with that of his able-bodied wage-earning contemporaries.

Veterans who are living solely on disability compensation payments stand to suffer most as the dollar's buying power diminishes. The net effect of this will be to push the veteran yet another step down on the economic scale. To forestall this adverse circumstance, the distinguished Chairman of this Committee has recently introduced at DAV request, H.R. 14995, a bill bearing the title "Service Disabled Veterans' Compensation and Benefits Act of 1968."

We realize, Mr. Chairman, that there will be numerous and varied requests made to your Committee during the course of its hearings. We realize also that priorities in these matters must be established.

We hope and pray that serious study and thoughtful consideration of this bill and the facts set forth above will lead your Committee to give its highest priority to recommendations for well-deserved increases in the rates of service connected disability compensation. As President Johnson has said: "We have not forgotten nor shall we ever forget their service to our country."

Another significant DAV proposal on the subject of compensation calls for a long-delayed increase in single statutory awards payable for loss of limbs, body organs and arrested tuberculosis. On July 1, 1952, there was granted an increase of $5.00 per month over the rate which had prevailed since September 1, 1946, a period of 21 years.

We believe that further consideration of the facts of this matter by the Committee will lead to recommendations for substantial increases in the special monthly compensation for these disabilities.

Moving now to the subject of service connected death benefits, Mr. Chairman, the DAV most emphatically supports the enactment of legislation to increase the present rates of Dependency and Indemnity Compensation payable to the widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans whose death resulted directly from service connected causes. Our reasons for urging the adoption of such increases are essentially the same as those expressed earlier with respect to the need for increases in the rates of service connected disability compensation.

Mr. Chairman, I would at this point like to mention, in concise fashion, a few of the proposals which represent some of the most prime and pressing problems for disabled veterans and their dependents. Nothing in the order of presentation should be construed as indicating degrees of priority.

The proposals call for: Extending the full range of wartime benefits for veterans disabled as a result of extra-hazardous service; additional monthly compensation for veterans who have suffered the service connected loss of a kidney or the loss of a lung; clothing allowances for veterans who, because of service connected disability, wear prosthetic appliances which tend to wear out or tear their clothing; raise to a realistic level the present $1600 allowance for the purchase of an automobile; to establish an independent Court of Veterans' Appeals; to provide an additional monthly allowance for widows who are receiving service connected death benefits and who are in need of regular Aid and Attendance; to provide for concurrent payments of compensation and pension under a specified formula; to provide additional compensation for dependents of veterans whose disability is rated not less than 40%; to increase the present burial allowance to $400; to provide Dependency and Indemnity Compensation to widows of deceased veterans who are rated 100% service connected for 20 or more years; to extend war orphans educational benefits on a proportionate basis to children of veterans rated at not less than 40%.

As expressed earlier, Mr. Chairman, time does not allow a detailed accounting of all our National Convention Resolutions. There is an assortment of proposals relating to employment, GI home loans, insurance and the National Cemetery programs that will demand our attention during the course of this session of Congress.

In the field of insurance we favor, among other things, the enactment of legislation to increase the maximum coverage of GI insurance to $30,000.

On the subject of housing, we request an increase in the grant for specially-adapted housing in line with the increase in building costs and an extension of this benefit to veterans who have suffered the service connected loss or loss of use of an upper and lower extremity. We also recommend that the maximum entitlement for guarantee of home loans be increased to at least $10,000.

The National Cemetery System is a subject which has the abiding interest of the Disabled American Veterans. We support current legislative proposals calling for transfer of national cemetery operations from the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration.

Last October the DAV was pleased to support H. Res. 241 which transferred jurisdiction over legislation relating to the cemeteries to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. This change in control is a firm attempt to improve the cemetery situation, an attempt which has been clearly nourished by support from President Johnson in his recent message to the Congress. The President told the Congress that every veteran should have the right to burial in a National Cemetery situated reasonably close to his home. The President said "I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make certain that the recommendations of the (Veterans' Advisory) Commission include proposals to assure this right in a meaningful sense."

The President's attitude, we are pleased to note, is in marked contrast to the Administration's policy, which for the past two decades has urged halting any expansion of the Cemetery System.

Another area of veterans' benefits which is of special importance to the DAV is the VA Hospital and Medical Treatment Program.

The Disabled American Veterans has a deep and abiding interest in the continuing effort of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery to maintain its prominence in the entire field of medical care.

One of the most serious obstacles to further progress is a shortage of adequately trained medical personnel. This shortage threatens to grow more serious as private hospitals compete for manpower. Moreover, unless more professional personnel in specialized fields are attracted to the VA, there will be a downward trend in the high level of patient care.

We are certain that this distinguished Committee will continue to give its full and close attention to this aspect of the medical program.

Another facet in this field which requires attention is the furnishing of out-patient medical treatment. Under present law this benefit is generally restricted to service connected disorders. Thus, with limited exceptions, veterans suffering from totally disabling service connected disabilities are not presently entitled to outpatient treatment for non-service disabilities.

Complete medical services, including drugs and medicines, are, however, available for the non-service-connected conditions of veterans of the Spanish-American and Indian Wars and to certain pensioners found to be in need of regular Aid and Attendance.

Because of the drastic reduction in the general health of a totally disabled veteran, we think it reasonable that he be entitled to out-patient medical treatment for any disability.

The DAV has a vital interest in the highly useful services performed by the Veterans' Employment Service in the Department of Labor. We have been and will continue to be concerned about adequate staffing of this federal agency to assure that the disabled veteran receives effective job counseling, employment placement, and referral to occupational training opportunities to which he is entitled under the law.

In this connection, the President, in his recent message, placed a high degree of emphasis on the need for enlarging the opportunities for veterans' employment. The President proposed that service disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation on a part-time basis be given a training allowance. As you know, Mr. Chairman, presently a disabled veteran can take vocational rehabilitation and receive a training allowance only if he trains full-time. The President declared that "The disabled veteran should be able to keep his job while he prepares for a better one through vocational training, drawing the allowance it provides."

Mr. Chairman, my presentation this morning represents a general outline of our legislative objectives. There are many other significant proposals, both legislative and administrative, of high importance which we cannot possibly bring to notice at this hearing. It is a program that reflects the DAV's historic principle which seeks to improve the physical, social and economic well-being of men and women who sacrificed themselves for America. It focuses attention on the need for enhancing opportunity for employment and proper job placement so that the residual ability of the disabled veteran is used in the most productive way; that expert hospital and medical care be provided to restore disabled veterans to a state of good health; and to provide adequate and just compensation for service incurred disabilities. In short, we want to assure that the disabled veteran is restored to as good a position in civilian life as that to which he may have aspired had he not been disabled in the service of his country.

At present, the people of our country are particularly conscious of military service and the national defense. The intensity of the war in Vietnam has markedly stimulated public interest in that war and its related issues.

These related issues, of course, are meaningfully represented in the programs which this Committee and the Congress have approved for the benefit of the wartime disabled, his widow and orphans. These problems will continue to warrant and receive the attention of the DAV. As already indicated, the main-stream of our effort for this session of Congress is directed to improving the compensation program. As the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased, we feel it necessary to help the recipients of compensation by giving them substantial increases.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this hearing has been the high point of our Mid-winter Conference, and to say again that you have been most courteous and indulgent, and we do appreciate it.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit for the record, copies of our National Convention Resolutions and an additional statement which the DAV presented on October 3, 1967, to the United States Veterans' Advisory Commission. The statement sets forth a full and comprehensive account of the legislative objectives of the Disabled American Veterans.

St. Charles Industrial Development Corp. Given Approval of Ninth SBA Loan

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the progressive advancement of Missouri's business economy is being ably assisted by the Small Business Administration. A good example of the type of SBA programs utilized by the State of Missouri is the local development company loans. This program is based on the principle that each community bears a major responsibility for its own economic growth and health. Under this program loans are made exclusively to local development corporations. The local development company in turn uses this money along with its own funds to acquire or erect facilities and businesses they wish to help.

Missouri has learned the value of using SBA's local development corporation program to diversify her economy, create new jobs and stimulate business activity. My State proudly reflects the importance of the American small business community to a continued growth and prosperity. President Lyndon B. Johnson shows a keen interest in the small business community, and today he applauds the contributions made by nearly 5 millon small businesses. He renewed his support of small business in his proclamation of Small Business Week, May 1967, when he stated:

> We must insure that they will continue to hold a vital place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the impact which the local development corporation program is making on Missouri's expanding economy is expressed in a news story from the Community News, O'Fallon, Mo., January 3.

I commend the St. Charles County Industrial Development Corp., and include the news story of a loan totaling $252,000, at this point in the RECORD:

ST. CHARLES INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORP. GIVEN APPROVAL OF NINTH SBA LOAN

It has been announced that a Small Business Administration loan has been approved in Washington, D.C., to assist in construction of new facilities in St. Charles for the Pundmann Motor Company.

The announcement was made by Henry J. Elmendorf, Secretary-treasurer for the St. Charles County Industrial Development Corporation, who said he received confirmation of the action from U.S. Senators Stuart Symington and Edward Long and Congressman William Hungate.

Elmendorf said the loan, in the amount of $252,000, was approved for the Industrial Development Corporation which will construct new facilities for the Pundmann Motor Company and then lease the facilities to the company.

The lease will be for a term of twenty-five years with the company having the option to buy during or at the end of the lease period.

Elmendorf said facilities for the St. Charles auto agency would consist of a 26,376 square foot building located on a six acre tract in the 2600 block of West Clay st. General contractor will be Arthur Ostmann.

Elmendorf pointed out that this is the ninth loan received by the local I.D.C. from the Small Business Administration and that the total amount of approved loans now totals $2,022,800.

Through the efforts of the I.D.C. he said, St. Charles County will now have in excess of an additional $2,500,000 worth of real estate on the tax books when all facilities have been completed.

He said that this will make the I.D.C. one of the top owners of real estate in the county, which helps broaden the tax base for all citizens of the county. In addition, he said the nine facilities receiving assistance through the I.D.C. will employ approximately 800 persons in St. Charles County.

The total amount of money going into the Pundmann Motor project will be $315,000. Of this $126,000 will come from the Small Business Administration and $126,000 will come from participating banks. The I.D.C. investment in the project will be $63,000.

Former Congressman Eugene O'Sullivan

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I inform my colleagues of the passing of a former Member of this body, Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Omaha, Nebr.

Gene O'Sullivan served in this House in the 81st Congress. He was a lawyer of exceptional ability. During the early part of his legal career he specialized in criminal cases and was known throughout the Midwest as an outstanding practitioner of the criminal phase of the law. Later he became an outstanding legal specialist, not only in criminal cases, but also in civil cases and general legal practice.

He was a lifelong Democrat and was a delegate to many Democratic National Conventions. He had the honor at the 1924 Democratic Convention of nominating the late Gov. Charles W. Bryan for Vice President of the United States. In that year the Democratic ticket was headed by the late John W. Davis for President, and Gov. Charles W. Bryan for Vice President.

In the beginning years of my practice of law I was associated with him in many cases and always admired his honesty, industry, and remarkable legal ability. He was always active in civic affairs pertaining to his city, county, and State. Omaha and the State of Nebraska have lost a great citizen and an outstanding American. Mr. Speaker, I insert with my remarks an obituary notice from the Omaha World-Herald of February 8, 1968, concerning our former colleague, Eugene D. O'Sullivan:

EX-CONGRESS MEMBER DIES—EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, NOTED FOR LAW WORK

Former Congressman Eugene D. O'Sullivan, died Wednesday at an Omaha hospital after a long illness.

A leader in the Democratic Party for many years, Mr. O'Sullivan had been a delegate to five Democratic National Conventions.

He was widely known as defense counsel in criminal cases but his practice also included much civil work.

Mr. O'Sullivan was elected United States Representative from the Second Nebraska District in 1948, defeating Republican Howard Buffett. He lost to Mr. Buffett two years later.

NATIVE OF KANSAS

A native of Kent, Kans., he was graduated from the Christian Brothers College at St. Joseph Mo., in 1903. After attending St. Benedict's College in Atchison, Kans., for two years, he entered Creighton University Law School. He received his law degree in 1910.

Before going to Congress, Mr. O'Sullivan served as a deputy Douglas County attorney and member of the Metropolitan Utilities District board.

In 1934 he made an unsuccessful bid for the Nebraska Governorship.

He was president of the Omaha Bar Association in 1948 and 1949.

Several criminal cases in which Mr. O'Sullivan appeared as defense counsel received broad news coverage.

In 1957 he helped upset the first-degree murder conviction of Loyd Grandsinger, 24-year-old part Indian.

ARRANGEMENTS PENDING

Grandsinger was sentenced to die in 1954 for the slaying of a state patrolman near Valentine. After an appeal failed, Mr. O'Sullivan was appointed as one of Grandsinger's new attorneys.

Grandsinger received several stays of execution while Mr. O'Sullivan and Charles Flansburg of Lincoln waged a long court fight that ended in voiding of the conviction. Grandsinger was acquitted in a second trial.

Until his illness Mr. O'Sullivan had been associated with his son, Eugene, Jr., in the firm of O'Sullivan and O'Sullivan. His home was at 3833 South Twenty-fourth Street.

Surviving besides the son is a daughter, Mrs. Robert DeVaughn of Omaha, and nine grandchildren.

Services will be 9 a.m. Saturday at St. Bridget's Church with Larkin Mortuary in charge. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery.

Judge David Diamond

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of New York suffered a tragic loss, Justice David Diamond passed away.

Justice Diamond's life reads like an almanac of civic achievement. He lent his wise and good counsel to a host of public services.

We, who knew him, are much the richer for his acquaintance. But many more, who indirectly benefit from his wisdom and dedication, will be the poorer for his passing.

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to Justice Diamond, and as an expression of condolence to his wife, Mrs. David Diamond, of Buffalo, N.Y., and his daughter, Mrs. Arnold C. Sternberg, of Washington, D.C., I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of Saturday, February 10, in today's RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE DAVID DIAMOND

For former State Supreme Court Justice David Diamond, dead now at 69, the esteem and affection felt by all who knew him reflected the qualities of character that distinguished whatever civic role he undertook.

As Buffalo corporation counsel in the administration of Mayor Holling, Judge Diamond was a powerful force in helping to make that City Hall period a benchmark of good government.

The countless enterprises for community, social or professional betterment to which he contributed his time and talents attested to the exceptional range of his interests and dedication. As a jurist, a teacher at the UB law school, and a prominent figure in the state and local bar associations, Judge Diamond worked diligently to advance justice.

Judge Diamond's concern for the wider problems of his native city found expression in his commitment to such worthy purposes as those of the Buffalo Council of Social Agencies, the International Institute of Buffalo, and the Buffalo Board of Community Relations. By the valuable services he rendered the Jewish community, as by the enlistment of his intellectual vigor on behalf of civic and cultural advancement, Judge Diamond made his years rich with good works.

Rural, Smalltown America Draws Increased Attention

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the importance of rural and smalltown growth and development is underlined in a recent issue of my newsletter, Capitol Comments, which I place in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA DRAW INCREASED ATTENTION

(By JOE L. EVINS, Fourth District, Tennessee)

Progress is being made in our effort to focus attention and resources of all levels of government on the problems of Small Town and Rural America. Your Representative this year introduced on the first day of the Second Session of the Ninetieth Congress the Rural Development Incentive Act of 1968, designed to stem the tide of out-migration from our rural areas to our already crowded and congested big cities.

This Bill would provide employment and opportunities in small town and rural areas through tax incentives to encourage industry to locate and expand in rural areas. There have been these other encouraging developments:

Creation of a Small Town America Office in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, at my request, to assist smaller communities in their programs of progress by providing them information and assistance on Federal programs of grants and assistance.

The publication of a report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, which calls for a strengthening of programs to assist the 14 million rural Americans classified as being below the poverty level. The recommendations include tax incentive provisions like those proposed in my Bill—which I have called the Rural Development Incentive Act of 1968.

Modifications of requirements for workable programs in smaller communities to avoid placing "unreasonable burdens" on smaller cities in their preparation of applications and plans for progress which are requirements for participation in a number of Federal Grant-in-aid programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The announcement that a thousand small communities have been assisted in obtaining public works through the public facility loan program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Since 1955, this program has provided more than $422 million for construction of 1,100 facilities in small towns throughout the United States.

Announcement by the Farmers Home Administration that in fiscal 1967, 2130 grants and loans totaling $250 million had been approved for construction of rural water and sewer systems.

Last year the importance of the development of Small Town and Rural America was accorded major recognition. It is encouraging to note that this momentum is continuing into 1968 and certainly, your Representative will endeavor to focus attention on and to urge a concentration of Federal resources for our rural areas.

The key to the success of any program is local leadership, local initiative and local participation. The Federal government can provide assistance and resources—but the leadership must come from the people themselves for growth and progress.

Many of our communities are moving ahead with their programs of growth and progress. New public facilities are being built, new industries are moving in, existing business are expanding, and jobs and opportunities are being created for our people for advancement, growth and progress.

New Safety Features for Superjets

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a number of recent aircraft accidents, my Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings last fall on this subject in an effort to find ways to make airplane travel safer. These hearings have not been concluded and I expect to schedule additional witnesses during this session of Congress.

In keeping with my long interest in and dedication to flight safety, first as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and now as its chairman, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the recent action taken by Pan American Airways to install new radar systems on their fleet of Boeing 747 Superjets to increase air travel comfort and safety.

Pan Am is to be commended for taking the initiative in this vital area and for investing $1 million of its funds with Radio Corp. of America to equip each of the Superjets with an advanced technology weather radar system.

Pan Am has 25 Superjets on order and will put the world's first 747 into scheduled passenger service in late 1969.

A weather radar unit is designed to alert the crew of bad weather in the flight path ahead of an aircraft. The unit depicts cloud formations as an image on a radar screen in the aircraft cockpit.

The RCA radar system for Pan Am's 747 fleet has a 300-mile range compared with the 150 miles of units on today's jet transports. The radar system will offer pilots greater operational reliability over single system units used today because of its improved circuitry and use of transistors instead of conventional vacuum tubes.

My committee will continue its efforts to find ways to eliminate aircraft accidents. In the meantime, Pan American has taken a big step in the right direction.

Lessons in Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of the Vietnam war—and there are many—is the tragedy of self-delusion. We have heard assertions that it was the enemy's attacks which destroyed the latest chance for negotiations, when a month went by without a real test of North Vietnam's public statement that negotiations will follow a cessation of bombing. We have heard assertions that the reverses suffered during the Tet offensive were really victories and General Westmoreland's bland statement that the enemy was seeking to cause "maximum consternation." These and too many more are reminiscent of Orwell's "Newspeak," in which war is peace, hate love, and ignorance strength.

Joseph Kraft has written a perceptive and compelling assessment of the situation in Vietnam. The column from the Washington Post of February 6, 1968, entitled "Red Glare of Battle Illuminates Lessons of Vietnam Nightmare," follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 6, 1968]

Red Glare of Battle Illuminates Lessons of Vietnam Nightmare

(By Joseph Kraft)

There is something pathetic in the repeated assertions that the United States did not suffer a military defeat during the past week of nightmare in Vietnam. For the true point of the nightmare is very different.

The lesson of events is that the purely military logic—the logic of victory and defeat—is absurd. The events teach that there is a basic incongruity between this country's objectives in Vietnam and what it can achieve by military means.

In reading the event the first thing to notice is the most striking feature of what has happened—the element of surprise. Nobody can seriously claim that American authorities in Washington or Saigon were ready for what came. The mark of what they expected is that just before the attack on Saigon and the other cities began, Gen. William Westmoreland called off the Tet truce in the northern provinces of South Vietnam—but not around Saigon or the other major cities.

Nor was it only the place and the fury of the enemy action which caught this country off guard. Elaborate preparations were made—arms cached, men moved, tunnels dug, positions prepared—in the very midst of the American presence. The preparations were not divined by the American authorities, nor were they made known by the local people.

Nor is that really surprising. The large American control over the economy, and the possession of captured documents by the thousand may give some the illusion that the United States is truly plugged in Vietnam. But actually the Americans there are set apart from the local population by language, customs, living standard and the certain knowledge that before many months or years, the Yankee will go home.

American diplomats are regularly surprised by what friendly Vietnamese political leaders do. American commanders can barely distinguish friendly Vietnamese from hostile ones. That the enemy could spring such a surprise only confirms the condition of a wide gulf between the Americans in Vietnam and the local people.

That gulf cannot be closed by American military power. For what happens when the American military power is applied?

Well, the events of the last week show what happens. Large sections of Saigon and Hue have been bombarded from the air and raked by artillery fire. Homes, shops, and schools have been destroyed.

No doubt the use of planes and artillery was essential to rout the enemy. But ordinary Vietnamese know chiefly that their protectors are obliterating their villages and cities—that the American presence means trouble. That is why so few are actively aligned with this country.

In theory, of course, the gap between the American military and the local population should be filled by the Saigon government. But the American military presence has called forth a certain kind of government. It has called forth the regime run by the two former generals—President Nguyen Van Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky.

That is a government, as we have now seen, with a police chief who shoots captives out of hand. That is a government which counts as one of its best divisions the division which lost Hue in a couple of hours. That is a government with corrupt military authorities who do not turn out troops to help protect the American embassy. This is a government, in other words, which cannot enlist the support of the local population.

All this, to be sure, does not prove that the United States has suffered a military defeat. It proves that the United States is at the outer limit of its military power—the place where force cannot accomplish useful political results.

To be sure, more force will have to be applied to stabilize the situation in the cities, and to hold at Khesanh. But there is no point in trying to get even, or to go one up by expanding the war to North Vietnam or Laos or Cambodia.

The right thing for this country to do is the hardest thing. It is to hold firm for now, and then to move, as the President has recently been moving, down the path to the negotiated settlement which alone can serve the basic American interest.

Salute to St. Luke's Hospital Auxiliary

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of us are convinced that the reason the United States continues to remain a power—in spite of the bumbling and faltering of this administration—is the voluntary effort of the many individuals who are willing to sacrifice so that the community may endure.

In my district in Wisconsin there are many individuals and groups who serve their area on a voluntary basis each and every day, just as there are literally thousands of such dedicated folks in the State. Today I would like to salute one such representative group which points up the strength and character of these volunteers who keep us strong.

The women who form the auxiliary of the St. Luke's Hospital in Racine work long and arduous hours for the good of mankind. They ask for nothing in return for their services and contribute mightily to their community. I am proud to salute these outstanding women for their untiring devotion to the cause which is so necessary to serve the good of all who reside in their locale. These ladies typify the spirit of the community action exhibited by them and their counterparts throughout the district I am privileged to represent.

Whither Mass Transit?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress passed and the President signed into law the Urban Mass Transportation Act. The 89th Congress established a Department of Transportation, in the expectation that at long last the Nation's transportation problems would be attacked in a meaningful, comprehensive way. I was one of many who had hopes that, at long last, the mad urge to pave over the countryside with highways would be tempered by a realization that mass transportation is a vital part of any national transportation program.

Unfortunately, mass transit is still a stepchild, undernourished by congressional parsimony and hidden away in the dark recesses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the meantime, railroad passenger service continues to decline.

David C. Anderson of the Wall Street Journal has written a timely and penetrating study of this critical situation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and present it herewith for inclusion in the Record:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1968]

Muted Whistle-Stops—Escalated Termination of Passenger Trains Causes Woes for Hundreds of Communities

(By David C. Anderson)

Leoti, Kans.—Even the biggest booster in this windblown prairie town admits that life in Leoti just hasn't been the same since the Eagle stopped coming through. "And we're more than a little bitter about it," adds one of them.

The Colorado Eagle, the Missouri Pacific Railroad's once-elegant passenger train, used to stop twice daily on its round trip between Kansas City and Pueblo, Colo., dropping off passengers, mail and, most important to local businesses, parcel post and railway express shipments.

But all that abruptly stopped in April 1966. To get here today you may ride the Union Pacific to Oakley, 70 miles north, or the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe to Garden City, 61 miles south. From there you can hire a car, charter a plane, or hitchhike—Leoti (pop. 1,401) doesn't have bus service.

The town's plight is mirrored in hundreds of communities throughout the U.S., including many much larger places, such as Wichita Falls, Texas (pop. 101,724), Rochester, Minn. (pop. 47,797), Bloomington, Ind. (pop. 42,058) and Casper, Wyo. (pop. 38,930). In 1952, all 70 towns in Kansas with 2,500 people or more had railroad passenger service. Today, a third are without it and in the others, service has been drastically curtailed.

Chopping off passenger trains has escalated sharply of late. Of the 400 interstate passenger trains discontinued in the past decade, 50 of them have been axed since July and another 75 are on the block, says Anthony Haswell, executive director of the National Association of Railroad Passengers, a Chicago-based group seeking to preserve passenger train service.

PASSING OF PART OF AMERICAN SCENE

Many of the trains gone and going bear prestigious names—a part of the American scene itself. The New York Central's Twentieth Century Limited, perhaps the best known of all, was laid to rest in December. And the California Zephyr, whose Chicago-San Francisco run may be the most scenic in the U.S., is doomed if the Western Pacific succeeds in dropping the Western portion of the Zephyr's trip.

The Mainstreeter from St. Paul to Seattle is in jeopardy. The Northern Pacific is trying to end its run at Fargo, N.D. And, the Kansas City Southern would like to get rid of its Southern Belle, from Kansas City to New Orleans, along with all the rest of its passenger trains.

Though it's still possible to get a comfortable bed and a tasty meal on trains like the Santa Fe Super Chief, which leave Chicago each evening for the West Coast, many such trains, especially those the railroads would like to eliminate, are reduced to parodies of their former luxury.

The once formidable Wabash Cannonball, fabled in song "listen to the jingle, the rumble and the roar . . ." shed its observation parlor car long ago and recently lost its dining car. Lately it has consisted only of a baggage car, a single coach and a snack car on its all day St. Louis-Detroit run.

A recent passenger on the New York Central's Wolverine, from Detroit to Chicago, describes windows too mudcaked to yield any view. The dining car's bread was moldy, he testifies, and one of the coaches "looked as if there had been a party and nobody had cleaned up afterwards," with beer cans and bottles strewn about.

PRIORITY FOR FREIGHT TRAINS

Passenger trains typically sit still for long periods of time while conductors mutter about freight trains going through up ahead. On some trains passengers spend the dinner hour—once a time of gracious service—in a car full of food vending machines.

Railroads contend that curtailing service is the only way to keep down mounting losses—passenger revenue plummeted 23% from 1961 levels to an estimated $480 million last year (freight revenue increased 18% in the same period). But they are touchy about gripes that they discourage passenger travel with deliberate inconvenience, dirt, discomfort and discourtesy. Such allegations are "untrue and deeply resented" said a recent Baltimore & Ohio—Chesapeake & Ohio press release.

In some cases, the railroads seem to be setting obstacles in the way of passengers who seek to board their trains. In testimony earlier this month on the application of the Kansas City Southern Railroad to discontinue service between Kansas City and New Orleans, the railroad's attorney asked Mayor Harry C. Shute of Pittsburg, Kan., when the last time was that he had ridden a train.

"The last time I tried was last Monday," the mayor said. "With others, I went to the depot at 4 a.m. to ride the 4:10 a.m. train. We were told it would be late, so we went out for breakfast and came back only to be told it wouldn't arrive before 7 or 8. So we got a car and drove to Kansas City."

But the Interstate Commerce Commission, traditionally limited to either allowing or disallowing passenger service cuts, is seeking legislative authority to set passenger service standards. And its hearings on the downgrading of passenger service on the Southern Pacific could eventually produce ICC power to ensure "reasonable service" on passenger trains, observers say.

Railroad enthusiasts and small-town dwellers are probably involved in a futile tilt against the jet airliner, which cuts the 40-hour Chicago to Los Angeles train ride to a three hour and 50 minute hop, and the superhighway on which an intercity traveler can rival train speeds on his own schedule. Both are diverting revenue-producing mail from trains to planes and trucks, further jeopardizing passenger service. Even Mr. Haswell, who stalwartly takes the train to Washington to lobby for better passenger train service, concedes he often flies back.

These realities of modern travel are scant comfort in Leoti and other towns far from regional airlines stops and still unreachable by superhighways.

A 3-HOUR, 38-MILE RIDE

But freight service continues to both Leoti and its neighbor, Scott City (population 4,200) and the Santa Fe even runs a half-baggage, half-coach car up to Scott on spurline from Garden City. It covers the 38 miles in three hours.

The mail, which used to come in from east and west on the Eagle, now takes at least a day longer than it used to, and may suffer longer delays in the complex of air and truck connections between Kansas City and Pueblo.

Small freight deliveries, vital to the Main Street merchant, are even more of a headache, despite the fact that motor freight service to the area has expanded since the discontinuance of the Eagle.

"It may take three days to get an irrigation engine part, when it used to be overnight," says a Scott City banker. "That's hard for the farmer whose field is burning up from drought to understand."

Prepared for such situations, Irv Wilken, Leoti's mayor and manager of the local John Deere Agency, says he has had to expand his parts inventory by 15%—$7,000 to $8,000—since the Eagle disappeared.

Local doctors find it difficult to convince elderly patients to go to Kansas City medical centers for treatment. Formerly it was a convenient ride on the Eagle. "Who would want to retire to a place like this?" asks Mary Herndon, a long-time Leoti resident. "Unless you can drive, you just sit."

Leroy and Ruth Keener, who operate a Scott City flower shop, must put approximately 500 extra miles on their car monthly to drive the 74-mile round trip to Garden City to meet plane, bus and truck shipments that used to arrive on the Eagle.

When an emergency, such as a sudden funeral, drives up local demand for flowers, "we just have to apologize" for lack of adequate stock, Mrs. Kenner says. She once could call her Colorado suppliers as late as 3 p.m. and have all the flowers she needed when the Eagle pulled in that night. Such dependable efficiency is imposible now.

GETTING MONEY SHIPPED

As for the Scott City mortician, he now must either arrange to have bodies flown in on air taxis or drive out to pick them up himself. For years the dead came home to Scott City on the Eagle's baggage car.

Don Christy, president of the First National Bank in Scott City, complains of the slowdown in mail service. "It's tough getting money shipped," he says. "We used to get our clearings overnight from Kansas City." Now it takes two or three days, he says. Postmaster Homer Vaughn has another point: "Take a banker who used to transfer $100,000 overnight. Now it takes longer and he loses the interest. I don't blame him for complaining."

Scott City's city attorney, James Wallace, reflects the upset of many of his neighbors at the loss of the train: "H—, the railroad built this country," he says. The town's library displays photos of early Scott City families, many of whom took advantage of the extension of the rail service to move west.

"That Eagle used to be one of the most beautiful trains you ever saw," recalls Mr. Wallace. "I can remember when there'd be cars from over a three county area here to meet that train."

The Missouri Pacific says the $2 million Eagle profited for many years from luxury-loving Kansas City vacationers, but by 1963 the train was running a $700,000 annual deficit. A 1964 cut in service reduced that year's loss to $200,000, but in June 1965 the train lost its railway Post Office car, which had produced over $300,000 in annual revenue. With the annual loss over the $500,000 mark again, the railroad filed to discontinue the train.

The railroad says a 1964–65 survey showed that an average of only 1.3 passengers boarded the eastbound Eagle daily at Scott City, while a passenger boarded every 1.5 days at Leoti with lesser boardings westbound.

But some residents of the towns don't consider revenue and traffic declines a sufficient excuse. "We have operations in this bank that are unprofitable," says Scott City First National's Mr. Christy. "We maintain them as a public service."

Railroad passenger service continues to run downhill

CHICAGO.—Railroad passenger service has been running downhill for years. The following table indicates the decline in miles of road in passenger services for all Class I railroads and the number of passenger cars in service since 1929.

	Miles	*Cars*
1929	226, 703	47, 797
1939	172, 031	30, 353
1949	156, 821	27, 903
1959	99, 989	17, 695
1967 (est.)	69, 000	10, 000

Breakfast at School

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the beginning of the breakfast feeding program in Cleveland public schools was greeted with widespread favorable comments.

The program was put into effect this month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and I wish to join with those expressing their approval.

In that connection I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared on December 15, 1967, in the Cleveland Press which terms the feeding program a "mission of mercy." I heartily concur. The editorial follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Dec. 15, 1967]

BREAKFAST AT SCHOOL

"A hungry child can't learn," says Cleveland School Supt. Paul W. Briggs. That short, simple statement tells plenty about the special problems of teaching the children of the poor.

In its fight on poverty, the Federal Government could hardly have done better than to allocate food and funds to feed some 26,000 hungry boys and girls in Cleveland juice, cereal and milk each morning. The program begins next month.

This is indeed a mission of mercy, in the best humanitarian tradition of this country. America has spent foreign aid funds to feed the hungry in many impoverished lands; it is only right that the same attention be focused on the undernourished at home.

In a related mercy mission, the Salvation Army has donated 1000 certificates valued at $5 each for new shoes which the school system will distribute to poorly shod pupils. The Army is footing the $5000 shoe bill this year instead of donating Christmas toys.

While it's too bad that some youngsters are losing out on toys, it is perfectly obvious that warm feet must come first. The Salvation Army has the right sense of priorities.

Sportsman's Position on Firearms Legislation

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misrepresentation as to the position of sportsmen's groups and conservation organizations on firearms legislation. There are those who seek to leave the impression that such groups and organizations oppose firearms legislation per se. Such is not the case. Sportsmen's groups and conservation organizations support enactment of meaningful firearms legislation—legislation which would keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and irresponsible persons, but protect the right of law-abiding citizens to acquire and own firearms for sporting and home defense purposes.

The February 2, 1968, issue of the Wildlife Management Institute's Outdoor News Bulletin carried an excellent article on the subject of firearms legislation. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the institute's views, I am inserting the text of the article at this point in the Congressional Record:

CONSERVATION LEADERS ASK CONGRESS TO ACT ON FIREARMS

Leaders of a number of the country's foremost conservation, wildlife, and sportsmen's groups are renewing their requests that Congress approve legislation this year that would help reduce the misuse of firearms, according to the Wildlife Management Institute. Concern is being expressed that continuation of the bitter fight between those who would ban all firearms and those who object to restrictions of any kind will harm sportsmen and other legitimate firearms users.

Acceptable legislation, the leaders say, would embody principles contained in S. 1853 and S. 1854, bills by Senator Roman L. Hruska (Neb.) and others, pending in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

In brief, S. 1853 would prohibit a manufacturer or dealer from shipping a firearm in interstate commerce to any person in violation of state or appropriate local law; provide that no person may transport or receive in his place of residence a firearm acquired by him outside the state if such acquisition or possession is unlawful in the place of his residence; require that no carrier may deliver any handgun to a person under 21 years of age.

Another key provision of S. 1853 would require that the purchaser of a handgun in interstate commerce, mail order or over-the-counter, make an affidavit of eligibility which is filed with the purchaser's local law enforcement agency. The seller must wait at least one week after receiving evidence of delivery of the Affidavit before shipping the handgun to the buyer.

These provisions, if implemented by Congress, would correct weaknesses in the existing Federal Firearms Act. They would close loopholes mentioned time and time again by witnesses appearing at Senate and House hearings on firearms in recent years.

S. 1854 would regulate so-called destructive devices, such as bazookas, mortars, and grenades by placing them under the National Firearms Act which now controls machine guns and other gangster-type weapons. Congress will find there is tremendous national support for these two bills, conservation leaders say.

Who Are the Criminals?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Justice Department can find no authority or law to stop the American "Cong" mock takeover of Washington, D.C., nor does it find moral or social need to corrall the Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns—yet, in a matter of hours after an unfortunate fracas in South Carolina, this same Justice Department has already tried and condemned the entire city; that is, all but the parties responsible for provoking the affair.

No suits or actions were brought against the taxpayers in Detroit, Watts, Newark, or a hundred other black power targets. Why Orangeburg? Another double standard?

What does the Justice Department seek from Orangeburg—to justify riot-provoking causes and encourage more violence? This raises the question, Who are the criminals under this inverted rationale?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I follow my remarks with the Associated Press release of February 14 and several letters to the editor from the local Evening Star:

UNITED STATES SUES TO INTEGRATE ORANGEBURG HOSPITAL

ORANGEBURG, S.C.—The U.S. Justice Department has filed a court suit to desegregate an Orangeburg hospital as an internal struggle threatens the town's biracial council.

The council was formed Friday in the wake of racial violence that left 3 young Negroes dead and 37 injured.

On Saturday, the Justice Department filed suit to desegregate the town's only bowling alley—target of Negro student demonstrations that led to the Thursday night violence. A second desegregation suit was filed yesterday—this one against the Orangeburg Regional Hospital.

Dr. Charles Thomas Jr., head of the town chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has withdrawn from the biracial unit in a dispute over its membership. He says the NAACP should appoint the Negro members.

"They want just a talkathon group they can control," Thomas said of city officials last night.

CLAIMS BOYCOTT EFFECTIVE

The struggle for power within the biracial unit comes at a time when the NAACP is the apparent driving force behind a "no-buying quarantine" against white businesses. Thomas claims the two-day-old boycott is 95 percent effective.

The Justice Department's second suit alleges the hospital practices racial discrimination in the assignment of rooms, floors, wards and wings and in its medical care, treatment, services and training programs.

Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark said the suit, filed in U.S. District Court in Columbia, asks for an injunction against discrimination and for court affirmation of a Jan. 8 order by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cut off federal aid to the hospital.

The law enforcement agencies involved in Thursday night's outbreak of shooting were sharply criticized yesterday by Dr. Martin Luther King.

King said in a telegram to Atty. Gen. Clark that "evidence presented by eyewitnesses to the events in Orangeburg, S.C., shows that all the students were shot in the back and that many were wounded while lying in the ground . . . We demand that you act now to bring to justice the perpetrators of the largest armed assault undertaken under cover of law in recent Southern history."

CURFEW AIDS BOYCOTT

Officers reported they came under fire before the students were killed and wounded. Students denied possession of any weapons.

The business boycott continues to be assisted by a dusk-to-dawn curfew in the city. Gov. Robert McNair said yesterday he has no idea when the curfew will be lifted.

McNair said 600 National Guardsmen and 200 state highway patrolmen still remain in the city. He said he foresees "a big problem" in the expense occurred maintaining the troops.

Negro requests for an investigation into the three shooting deaths were supported today by an editorial in the Orangeburg Times and Democrat.

The editorial requested that an FBI investigation probe "how deeply the black power movement is rooted on the South Carolina State College campus to determine if the All-Star bowling lanes was a target of integration or an excuse for violence."

KING'S "CAMP-IN"

SIR: If the administration allows Martin Luther King to go through with his proposed "camp-in" in April all its talk about crime prevention will be so much empty babbling. The biggest crime in recent years is the complete abandon with which riots, strikes and civil disobedience have been allowed to flourish. It is beyond the wildest dream to imagine that this "camp-in" could take place without disturbance.

As I get the picture Dr. King thinks the complete cure for this is to abolish poverty. Even though he does mention jobs, you will notice that he avoids use of the word wages—wages being payment received for doing a job—but asks for a guaranteed annual income. This would allow the able-bodied welfare recipient to continue resting idly at home.

I submit that all the money in the world is not the cure for crime. "The devil finds work for idle hands" was never more true than today. One of the best ways to stem the tide of crime is to get all these able-bodied "guests" of the Welfare State up off their lazy verandas and make them go to work.

Instead of Dr. King "educating" the people of Washington and other cities to the "hand-out" let him and his disciples be educated to the concept of work and acceptance of the already available jobs. Let them also be educated to the fact that it's not customary to start out at the top, but to begin at the bottom and work up. Let them be educated to the idea that pride is something that comes with earning not taking. Let Martin Luther King himself be educated to using the time, energy and money directly on the poverty stricken rather than on a wasteful disturbance.

In the beginning days of this country there was a rule, for every able-bodied citizen, of "no work, no eat." It's still a good idea!

Virginia Phillips.

Silver Spring, Md.

Sir: As many of us recall with shame and remorse the summer march on The Pentagon, we read of Martin Luther King's projected spring civil disobedience campaign with the question upon our lips. "Does this have to happen in the Capital City of a nation which finds it increasingly difficult to maintain law and order?" Or any other place in our nation?

In a Washington motel three notorious troublemakers, King, Carmichael and Rap Brown, met upon the vicious premise, "We seek to say to the nation . . . that if you don't straighten up, then you're writing your own obituary. When we come here (in the spring campaign) we will come not to beg, but to demand that the nation grant us what is truly ours."

Will a nation committed to providing for common defense and insuring domestic tranquillity abide or ignore such a threat to its security and the safety of its people? Will our nation through its leaders be intimidated to grant a threatening and disobedient mob what the mob determines as its rightful inheritance? Why not a federal injunction to keep these trouble makers, and other of like mind, out of the Nation's Capital and restrain their promotion of such campaigns anywhere within the bounds of the United States of America? If the injunction should fail, why not try iron bars, without bail.

If reason, fair play and a sincere desire for the good of all cannot combine forces in legislation, social and economic development to secure the blessing of life, liberty and the pursuant of happiness for all of our people, there seems to be scant hope for lawlessness and violence to do so.

Thomas W. Sunderland,
Pastor, Epworth Methodist Church.

Sir: First, I must say that this country is the greatest place on earth and I don't believe we should sit around and let just a few destroy all the things we stand for.

I am referring to those few who would destroy this country in the name of civil rights, and simply because they don't want to face the true facts of life. There are too many of my race that feel that the country owes them a reward just because they are Negroes. Too many want something without working for it. And because of our many, many freedoms, too many just take advantage of them.

What I am trying to say is that we have many strong laws but for some reason they are not used. This is a new day, and I feel that some of these so-called freedoms are outdated. I believe that all people must be made to respect the law of the land. We have the President, the Supreme Court and many agencies that make the law; and I do believe the President has the power to control marches on Washington like that planned by the Rev. Martin Luther King.

I am sure that nothing good can ever come out of such as this. Also, being a Negro myself, I would like to know just what these so-called civil righters want. We have come a long way. What good will it do now to have to start all over again?

My only hope now is that we all will wake up and come to our God-given senses before it is too late.

George W. Stewman.

The Great Society Drops Out

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, too few of us are comprehending the true cost of the Vietnam war. One cost is the gutting of the spirit and much of the substance of President Johnson's own Great Society. As the economist, Robert Lekachman, points out in an article from the New Leader, of February 12, 1968, when social welfare spending is considered on a per capital basis, one sees that the Great Society is not merely standing still—it is in full retreat.

Professor Lekachman, who is chairman of the Economics Department of the State University of New York at Stonybrook, goes on to point out how a misassessment of the causes of inflation led the administration to call for the surtax, which set off further political demands for reduced domestic spending. The article is an excellent study in the intertwining of politics and economics which has resulted in a disarray in our priorities. It follows:

Cost-Push or Demand-Pull

(By Robert Lekachman)

The President's economic program for the coming year eerily reads much of the time as though Ho Chi Minh and Wilbur Mills had collaborated in its composition. The two notes sounded by the tired rhetoric of the Budget, the State of the Union Message, and the Economic Message are perseverance in Southeast Asia (despite "the cost of our commitment to freedom" as President Johnson humorously puts it) and the utter necessity of retrenchment at home. For some time past a sour joke, the Great Society is now a drop-out even from Lyndon Johnson's public prose.

In its new "honest" dress, the Budget includes trust fund accounts as well as the consequences of the government's vast lending operations. Thus the projected total budget outlay for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, is a majestic $186.1 billion, a figure that has set conservative tongues to clucking. By any budgetary concept, the actual total is only $10.4 billion above the current fiscal year's expenditures.

The *only* deserves emphasis because the entire $10.4 billion goes to defense, Social Security and Medicare (financed largely out of payroll taxes), higher military and civil service pay, more generous veterans' pensions, and, unavoidably, higher interest payments on the Federal debt. If proper attention is paid to the country's increased population and higher price levels, it is plain that the sums available for social welfare in real terms per capita are considerably smaller than they have been. The Great Society is *not* standing still: It is in full retreat.

The details make the flesh creep. Here are some of the flowers in the large garland of program reductions: The Administration plans to close 16 Job Corps camps, and as an odd response to last summer's riots, it proposes to hold down the summer youth programs. The same government which touts the passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act and advances toward victory over Tainted Tuna, also plans to curtail grants to communities for improved sewage treatment—just possibly a more important problem. Although the President does seek to shrink the space agency's swollen budget by $447 million (over the anguished protests of Werner von Braun), he has found a quarter of a billion dollars for the idiotic, environmentally destructive supersonic transport.

The President's affection for education is notorious and the details of his early days as a schoolteacher have bored a nation. All the same, this year he plans to lop $361 million off education programs, one of the causes, presumably, of John Gardner's resignation from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result there will be fewer books and fewer libraries to put them in, a smaller number of laboratories and lab equipment, and fewer dormitories, although there will naturally be a great many more students seeking college admission and the price of their books and supplies will be rising.

Why has the President crippled what he labored so hard to create? Like most answers these days, the response goes back to Vietnam and Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. By now the Administration is committed to the incessant repetition of a one-note economic song: Raise taxes. As the Administration sees the world, unless Congress speedily enacts the tax surcharge, the wage-price spiral will quicken, what is left of our favorable merchandise balance of trade will vanish, and our large deficit in the over-all balance of payments will worsen.

Already under assault, the dollar will be attacked by the speculators with redoubled enthusiasm and the consequence will be either a humiliating increase of the dollar price for gold—to the benefit of South Africa, the Soviet Union, and General de Gaulle—or, even worse, a reversion to economic protectionism that will soon be emulated by other major trading nations.

The case is founded upon what economists term demand-pull influences. As this story goes, prices rose over 3 per cent last year simply because individual consumers, business investors, and government agencies in concert spent too many dollars, stimulating too many price hikes. Not all economists, myself included, accept this tale, preferring instead an emphasis upon actions by large unions and large corporations which in the jargon of the trade has been dubbed cost-push inflation. Whether out of conviction or convenience, Congressman Mills has attached himself to this wing of economic opinion.

During last November's performance of the Theater of the Absurd that the Congressman from time to time conducts for the harrassment of the Administration, he grilled Charles Schultze, then still head of the Budget Bureau, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin on the official version of inflation. Mills pointed to such contradictory auguries as sluggish retail sales, high consumer saving, unused factory capacity, and the modest real growth of the economy. How, he wondered, could a tax increase master the problem when unions were capable of negotating 5–6 per cent wage increases and large corporations were able, within generous limits, to set profit targets which necessitated higher prices for their realization?

Such a diagnosis might lead an old-fashioned trust buster to cry anew for the dissolution of General Motors and the lesser goliaths annually celebrated in *Fortune's* directory of the 500 largest American industrial corporations. The analysis might induce a modern economist to advocate further experiment with wage-price guideposts, some version of English compulsory reporting and review, selective wage and price controls, or even general controls and rationing. Congressman Mills' conclusion is decidedly different: an insistence on further reductions in non-defense spending (he is hawkish on Vietnam), and the installation of the new principle that public spending should grow more slowly than private spending.

For what the quality may be worth, Mills has displayed exemplary consistency. In a recent *Newsweek* column, Paul Samuelson has blamed him for a year's delay in the passage of the 1964 tax cut and the consequent loss of $10 billion in the Gross National Product. Rather bitterly, Samuelson now suggests that Mills' present tactics will compensate for the loss by causing an extra $10 billion of inflation.

Politically the Administration's posture is uncomfortable. If the President holds the budgetary line, maintaining that all possible cuts have already been made, he risks the death of the surcharge in the House Ways and Means Committee. And even Administration stalwarts, more or less convinced that higher taxes are necessary, will in an election year breathe a small, silent prayer of thanks to their Arkansas colleague. But it is by no means certain that if the Administration yields to Mills and shaves two or three billion dollars more off the education, model cities, job retraining, and economic opportunity budgets, the Congress will act favorably upon taxes.

The point is simple enough. Since expenditure reduction and tax increases are alternative means of dampening down aggregate demand, the more there is of the first the weaker is the case of the second. Under these circumstances, it is quite possible that Mills will get what he wants, the wreckage of social programs, and the President will never receive his yearned-for recompense, the surcharge.

The contretemps is largely politically inspired, but truth to tell, the Administration's intellectual position does not deserve much better. Winning the praise of even the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Economic Report* comes out strongly against mandatory wage and price controls on the grounds, traditional to economists, that "they distort resource allocation; they require reliance either on necessarily clumsy and arbitrary rules or the inevitable imperfect decisions of Government officials; they offer countless temptations to evasion or violation; they require a vast administrative apparatus." This would be a fair statement of the conventional wisdom on this subject if the *Economic Report* were not at frequent odds with its own position.

Take one important point: Although the Council of Economic Advisors emphasizes demand elements in inflation, it does not deny the relevance of market power to recent price increases. Now it is legitimate enough to contrast free markets and government controls as allocative mechanisms to the praise of the former and the derogation of the latter, but the inconvenient fact is that wherever concentrated corporate or union power is important, corporate and union officials, not the free market, do the allocative work. Is it obvious that their work is to be preferred to that of public officials?

The Council's own criteria suggest either the substitution of public for arbitrary private allocation or a serious attempt to make powerful corporations and unions behave as though they were governed by free market forces. The first response the Council excluded. The second was embodied in the wage-price guideposts.

The original guidepost standard for wage increases was 3.2 per cent annually, roughly in line with per capita productivity increases. Last year's average settlement won unions 5.5 per cent. What the Council proposes in the face of this experience is almost embarrassing to describe. The *Economic Report* inevitably urges labor and management to behave responsibly. Then it proposes a new mechanism, a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability charged with the preparation of "studies in depth of economic conditions in those industries which are a persistent source of inflationary pressure," and provided with a mandate "to reach some consensus on appropriate general standards to guide private price and wage decisions." The last point is a retreat from the Administration's claim up to this year that such standards had already been enunciated.

As if all of this were not bad enough, the Administration is pledged to a series of controls over American travel, bank loans to foreigners, and investment in Western Europe. If these devices do not interfere with the sacred allocations of the free market, what on earth does? The President and perforce his subordinates dodge the large fact that any war represents a serious misallocation of resources. In past wars the administrative response has been general control of the economy so that whatever was left over from the appetites of the military could be reasonably allocated to the various civilian claimants. The inconsistencies of the Administration's positions are a testimonial to the general unpopularity of the Vietnam war.

A word is in order about the only novelty of the Presidential message season. This is JOBS, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. The President proposes to enlist the business community, not heretofore enthusiastic, in the solution of hard-core unemployment. He wants $350 million to create 100,000 new jobs over the next 18 months. The rationale is this: It may cost as much as $5,000 per trainee to absorb "severely disadvantaged" workers. Business, however public-spirited, cannot be expected to bear the training, counseling, and supervisory costs. At $3,500 per person, business will cover its costs, a particularly intractable variety of unemployment will diminish, welfare costs will drop, and peace will return to the slums.

Understandably, the notion has won converts among the more enlightened members of the business community. In Detroit, Henry Ford seems engaged in a serious attempt to suspend the usual screening devices which automatically exclude the hard-core unemployed. Members of the Urban Coalition are publicizing the President's program and the general advisability of a greater business commitment. And indeed something may come of the program, less because of business altruism than because of labor shortage. One suspects that a good many businessmen will be receiving public subsidies for hiring and training the same people they would have recruited at their own expense. Unless standards are high, these businessmen will be making substantial profits out of the scheme.

In 1968 this may be the best we can do as a nation. But if one returns to the subject of resource allocation, the proposal illustrates the disorder of our priorities. Only a year or two ago, the Automation Commission identified something like five million public service jobs unfilled according to present definitions of staffing need. One could usefully employ several hundred thousand people just making additional mail deliveries. This might do rather more to raise growth rates than laboriously created jobs in the private sector. It is hard to preserve one's patience with an Administration which preaches rational resource allocation and cannot so much as deliver the mail on time.

The picture before us is of a President who has presided over the liquidation of the fragile period of social reform he did so much to initiate. For his pains, he has not even won the war which has caused all the trouble. Lyndon Johnson would deserve our sympathy if we did not need it all for ourselves.

Statement of the Honorable Richard D. McCarthy Upon Introduction of a Joint Resolution To Establish a JudiCorps

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the despair and rejection of the ghettoites and the slumdwellers of our inner cities cannot be stopped by bullets and blood and tear gas alone. We learned that last summer.

Nor can it be stopped by the ceaseless flow of dollars into untrained and unmotivated hands alone. We learned that last summer, too.

And we learned another bitter lesson last summer: that the violence that flared but confined itself to limited areas gave rise to hatred and other violence, not from the rioters, but from the average citizen whose fear of social war had reached paranoid proportions and sought reprisals against the underprivileged and the deprived, the causes of their discontent.

Mr. Speaker, the one common denominator in the hatred and counterhatred which the violence engendered was the great need for adherence to law and order.

Those whose homes were not burned and relatives not shot at, claimed the sole cause of the riots was disrespect for the law; while the burned-out and shot-up minority claimed the violence was necessary because the law did not work.

Mr. Speaker, in their far-reaching decision, Gideon against Wainwright, in 1963, the Supreme Court declared that defendants in criminal cases must have a lawyer—as an inalienable right, not a luxury. This decision was indeed a milestone; but it did not and it could not enter that other, and far more extensive body of proceedings, the civil action.

Many of our cities today have slums where exorbitant rentals are charged for filthy, ill-kept and crowded dwellings. Yet these same cities almost all have zoning laws and health and fire ordinances. The problem here, then, is adherence.

We cannot expect every city to hire crowds of inspectors to keep daily vigils on landlords of blight. We can also not expect the individual tenants, struggling to keep their financial heads above water, to pay the high prices of a competent attorney. But our answer is not in subsidizing building inspectors. The inspectors come and go and conditions may change a little, but the tenants, the actual victims, have no hand in the undoing of their own misery. No lesson is learned, no confidence is gained.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is to provide opportunities for these people to take part in their own betterment. In the major areas of deprivation and underprivilege — over-pricing and understandard everything—this means civil actions, and this in turn, means lawyers. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should go into the civil law profession. On the other hand, though, I do not think we can let this call go unheeded.

I am, therefore, today introducing a joint resolution to establish a JudiCorps. The actual language of this measure directs the Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to study the feasibility of establishing the JudiCorps and then report back to the Congress within 90 days.

The JudiCorps would be staffed by law students, paid in fellowships, and would be under the direction of law professsors and other concerned lawyers who would receive $1 a year. Their purpose would be to work as an extension of the present legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity in bringing legal facilities, both criminal and civil, at low or no cost, right into the depressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, several law schools with the help of random foundation grants are starting their own such programs. Georgetown University Law School is an excellent example. With only graduate students participating, they had in the first 6 years of their program tried over 2,500 cases, winning the following praise from District Judge J. Skelly Wright:

> (Georgetown has) probably the most systematic and thorough training in trial advocacy offered anywhere in the country.

Spurred on by Supreme Court Justice Brennam's remark that 75 percent of law school graduates are unready for practice leaving law school without having confronted "one live man or woman who is in immediate need of legal advice." other pioneers like Georgetown have proven that the law schools themselves are a great untapped source of legal wealth. The JudiCorps, which I have proposed, would tap this source.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I advocate this program because it is a low-cost means of vitally extending the critical program of legal aid to the poor. We must, foremost of all, let the poor know that they can better their lot through the law, not around it. And I advocate the JudiCorps because it would involve young, intelligent, interested, and committed individuals, as does the Peace Corps, in the plight of the poverty-stricken. This strong commitment to the principle of the JudiCorps has already been eloquently expressed, Mr. Speaker, in the words of one Georgetown law student:

> I came here interested in corporate practice and good living. I've been made to feel guilty if I'm not defending an indigent.

A New Program for Attacking the Problems of Narcotics Addiction and Alcoholism

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a far-reaching program for attacking the problem of narcotics addiction and alcoholism.

We have been asked to consider amending the Community Mental Health Centers Act to deal more effectively with these problems. Since both these sicknesses are essentially symptomatic of mental disorders, the proposed amendments placing their treatment and prevention in mental health programs seem eminently logical to me.

For one thing the range of services furnished by the Community Mental Health Centers represents the range of services needed to treat and rehabilitate addicts and alcoholics.

Second, maintaining isolated facilities for these special needs would hamper the recruitment of personnel. Flexibility in staffing the programs of these centers will help meet this particular problem.

Third, the Centers are affiliated with other local agencies, maintaining contacts that are also needed in serving those who suffer addiction and alcoholism.

I support the proposed amendments and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Redwood National Park

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the contention has been made that the proposed exchange of national forest lands for privately owned lands to be included in the proposed Redwood National Park would be advantageous to people of California living in the area adjacent to the proposed Redwood National Park. This contention has been effectively refuted by Mr. LaVerne M. Nelson, the road commissioner and county engineer of Del Norte County. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Nelson's views, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of his December 13, 1967, letter to the Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County, Calif., and the chart to which he alludes in this letter.

DEL NORTE COUNTY,
Crescent City, Calif., December 13, 1967.

Subject: Potential loss of Road Department Forest Receipt Funds from Redwood Purchase Unit.

Hon. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
County of Del Norte,
Crescent City, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: On December 11, 1967 the U.S. Forest Service presented your Honorable Board with a Fact Sheet on the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit located within the County of Del Norte.

There has been some discussion as to whether trading the purchase unit to timber companies for loss of their forested lands to the proposed federal park would be advantageous to the people of Del Norte County.

I can only speak for the Road Department. However, the loss of over $64,000 per year to this department (½ of the average annual forest service receipts shown in item 3 of the Fact Sheet) would have a very serious effect on our county road system.

We have averaged annual road improvement expenditures of $200,000 per year over the past three years. Loss of the forest service receipts presently derived from logging in the purchase unit would result in reducing future road improvement expenditures by 32 per cent. If we would not have had these funds in the past three years, it would have meant that the recent improvements to Washington Blvd. between Northcrest Drive and Highway 101; Lake Earl Drive southerly of Fort Dick; and Pebble Beach Drive in the Marhoffer Creek area could not have been accomplished.

Our road system still contains well over an estimated $2,000,000 worth of serious road deficiencies. As traffic increases, demands for wider, straighter, and surfaced roads adds to these deficiencies. Obviously, even if we didn't lose any of the forest service receipts and could continue to expend $200,000 per year for improvements, it would take over 10 years to overcome our present day deficiencies.

An example of the seriousness of these deficiencies is an accident that occurred on Howland Hill Road in the late afternoon of December 9, 1967. One young man was killed and a second very seriously injured because they were walking in the roadway and ground fog obscured them from a passing motorist. This road is in our improvement program for 1967–68 but financing has delayed its improvement to date. Had there been an adequate shoulder for pedestrian use, the life of this young man would very likely not have been lost.

Any decrease in road improvement expenditures in the years ahead is certain to delay correction of major road deficiencies. This can only result in unnecessary traffic accidents causing untold loss of life and suffering to users of Del Norte's road system.

I understand the U.S. Forest Service does not anticipate raising its annual cut in the remainder of the forest to compensate for this loss of logging in the purchase unit if such should occur. This primarily because they are on a sustained yield cutting program cycled for 100–110 years.

There is an estimated 1,100,000,000 board feet of timber within the 14,500 acre purchase unit. According to the county assessor, at the present tax rate this timber would yield $397,300 worth of revenue to the general fund if it were in private ownership. The land would yield an additional $9,000 worth of revenue. However, it is estimated that 100,000,000 board feet of timber would be harvested each year by the new private owners and this would reduce the assessed valuation annually.

Taxes returned to the county from the purchase unit over the next 12 years if it were in private ownership would likely be similar to those shown in the enclosed chart. Notice that the average annual taxes on both land and timber would be $203,775 over a 12 year period. It's also notable that after 12 years all timber will have been harvested and the only taxes returned to the county would be $9,000 per year on the land. Since tax deferments on harvested timber run for 40 years, it would be many years before a timber tax on the land would again be reaped by the county.

Of course, it could be hoped that after 12 years Miller-Rellim will have made substantial improvements to their industrial complex. This could have the effect of making up the loss in timber revenue previously obtained from the purchase unit.

The purchase unit is presently on a sustained yield annual cut of 18,000,000 board feet. At present day timber prices this should bring a minimum annual revenue to the county of $180,000 for perpetuity. However, since no sales have been made within the purchase unit during the past two years, considerably more than 18,000,000 board feet would be sold in the next few years.

A special feature of the purchase unit is that all of the 25% receipts derived from logging within it are presently allocated to Del Norte County. Funds from logging all other national forests within Del Norte County are only allocated in part to Del Norte.

Certainly we want to protect the industry we now have—industry that means jobs and payrolls. Certainly we also want to protect our county general fund revenues. However, I sincerely hope present road revenues will in no way be sacrificed. This, I feel, would be doing a grave injustice to citizens of our country.

It would not seem logical to support trade of the purchase unit in the federal park proposal unless the Park Bill had definite provisions within it to assure that income formerly derived from the purchase unit was not lost by either the Road Department or the School System of our county.

Respectfully submitted.

LA VERNE M. NELSON,
Road Commissioner and County Engineer.

CHART SHOWING POTENTIAL 12-YEAR TAX INCOME FROM PURCHASE UNIT

Year	Taxable timber (thousands)	Timber taxes	Land taxes	Total
1	1,100,000	$397,300	$9,000	$406,300
2	1,000,000	361,000	9,000	370,000
3	900,000	325,000	9,000	334,000
4	800,000	289,000	9,000	298,000
5	700,000	253,000	9,000	262,000
6	600,000	217,000	9,000	226,000
7	500,000	171,000	9,000	180,000
8	400,000	135,000	9,000	144,000
9	300,000	99,000	9,000	108,000
10	200,000	63,000	9,000	72,000
11	100,000	27,000	9,000	36,000
12	0	0	9,000	9,000
Total				2,445,300

Note: Average 12-year taxes: $2,445,300 divided by 12 equals $203,775 per year.

Use and Abuse of Credit Reports—II

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a truly gratifying response has resulted from my recent efforts to help consumers protect themselves against erroneous, incomplete, or malicious credit reports and information.

Among the letters which I have received is one from Mr. Robert J. Klein, economics editor of the highly respected Consumer Reports, a periodical published by the nonprofit Consumer's Union.

Mr. Klein expressed interest in my proposal and enclosed an article from the May, 1967, issue of Consumer Reports on the subject of credit information.

The article, entitled "When Credit Is Flatly Refused," is a close examination of the problems that all too often beset individuals who are refused credit for no apparent reason and without explanation.

Finding out why credit has been refused often is virtually impossible under present procedures governing the operation of credit rating bureaus. As the article notes, these credit bureau practices smack of a star chamber proceeding.

The magazine makes the point well when it asserts:

> Credit is not everyone's right, but it has become an indispensable privilege for most. Surely, everyone should have the right to know the evidence used against him by potential creditors—just as he has a Constitutional right to confront witnesses against him—and to have the evidence corrected if wrong or amended if incomplete.

In a few days I plan to introduce a bill to establish some right of "due process" for consumers in their dealings with credit rating agencies. Because of the widespread interest in the subject matter, I commend to my colleagues attention the Consumer Report article:

> Everyone knows it's easy—too easy—to buy on credit or open a charge account. But at least a few people also know how it feels to be turned down for no apparent reason.
>
> One REPORTS reader and her husband recently shopped at a discount store that advertised it would open charge accounts on a half-hour's notice. After applying for an account, they filled a shopping cart with goods and returned to the credit desk, only to be told they were not eligible.
>
> "We were astounded," she wrote, "because we have at least 10 credit cards. We have paid off large purchases and are in good standing with all of them. Although we asked for an explanation of why we were 'black-balled,' we were told no further information could be given us."
>
> She was disturbed, and rightly so. The marketplace judges buyers partly by their credit rating. A good rating is synonymous with a good name. Rejection of a credit application without explanation implies the existence of detrimental information in some file known to the commercial world but not to the applicant. That smacks of a star chamber proceeding.
>
> The credit seller must, of course, be the judge of the information he uses in deciding whether or not to grant credit. The applicant supplies some of the information: what he earns, where he works, references, and so on. Some stores decide on that information alone. But most rely on credit bureaus.
>
> According to the 2200-member Associated Credit Bureaus of America, a store offering "half-hour" charge accounts may be forced to make its decisions on the basis of incomplete reports from a credit bureau. That is, the data may be out of date or misleading. "In such cases," says the ACBA, "the credit granter should order an updated report." An updated report takes far longer than 30 minutes, and even so is subject to error.
>
> "Because credit information must be assembled through fallible human sources," the ACBA tells us, "inaccuracies occasionally occur. . . . Identities may sometimes be confused, despite all precautions." It goes on to say that a buyer can get a bad name simply from having defended his own interest. If he withholds payment on faulty merchandise until the store makes good, for example, his record may show only that he was delinquent.
>
> Any adverse information in your dossier will be kept secret from you by the store. Credit bureaus do not allow their clients to divulge it. But according to the ACBA, stores can and should refer rejected applicants to the credit bureau itself, and most bureaus will grant face-to-face interviews with consumers. Challenged information will then be checked out, the ACBA says, and errors will be corrected. If there has been a disagreement between a customer and a store, it says, "the bureau is glad to make the subject's statement a part of the record."
>
> But, as our reader found out, the store will not always reveal the source of an adverse report or even indicate whether it comes from a credit bureau. In that case, all you can do.to erase the blot on your reputation is to track down the credit bureau yourself and have things out with it.
>
> You may be able to identify the leading bureaus in your area by asking the Chamber of Commerce or by writing to the Associated Credit Bureaus of America (6707 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex. 77036). If most bureaus will be glad to go over your file with you, as the ACBA says, you may be able to erase any false or misleading information about yourself.
>
> Ironically, slipshod credit checking, while occasionally injurious to reputable buyers, may be a sign of imprudent lending policies. Stores generally want very much to sell credit. If anything, they are much too careless about whom they sell it to, relying on high finance charges and tough collection methods rather than on thorough credit checks.
>
> Credit is not everyone's right, but it has become an indispensable privilege for most. Surely, everyone should have the right to know the evidence used against him by potential creditors—just as he has a Constitutional right to confront witnesses against him—and to have that evidence corrected if wrong or amended if incomplete.

President Johnson's Action Now Program for the Consumer

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a Presidential message received the editorial attention now being given to President Johnson's comprehensive and realistic consumer protection message.

That message ticked off a list of things which Government must approve to serve the consumer in the growing and technically complicated marketplace of today—from a new evaluation of auto insurance to the assurance of wholesome fish and poultry control of deceptive sales practices.

The Washington Post of February 11, said the President's consumer program "offers a useful legislative program which, if enacted by Congress, will add much to the safeguards already provided."

The Christian Science Monitor of February 8 said:

> At long last the consumer . . . may be coming into his own.

The Minneapolis Star of February 8 said:

> The Federal government is slowly but inevitably fashioning a protective mantle for the American consumer.

I believe the President has presented the Nation with a bill of rights for the American consumer.

He has presented a program which reflects care and concern for the citizen and for his comfort, safety, and well-being.

And he has asked Congress to join him as an ally. I stand with the President as I know all responsible Members of this House do.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD editorials from the newspapers cited which commend the President for his consumer initiatives:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 11, 1968]

ARM AROUND THE CONSUMER

President Johnson's message on protection of the consumer is a hodgepodge running all the way from new weapons against sales rackets to safety on the waterways. But it offers a useful legislative program which, if enacted by Congress, will add much to the safeguards already provided.

It is quite proper that the sales rackets, especially those in the home-improvement field, drew first attention. The President cited National Better Business Bureau estimates that consumers lose between $500 million and $1 billion yearly to home-improvement racketeers. To deal with this menace, the Administration would give the Federal Trade Commission new powers to stop fraudulent and deceptive practiecs by means of court injunctions without waiting for final FTC or court decisions. No doubt that will be a very useful weapon, but much will depend upon vigorous enforcement of local laws. We hope that the President's message will center attention on Senator Tydings's package of reforms in this sphere for the District of Columbia.

Since Congress passed a salutary meat-inspection bill last year, it should have no difficulty in extending the safeguards of that measure to fish and poultry, as the President requested. Nor can there be any serious question about giving the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare authority to study the hazards of radiation and to set and enforce standards to control those hazards. Doubtless many lives can also be saved by the boat-safety program that the Secretary of Transportation will be urging.

The President has at least earned the thanks of every consumer by taking up the common beef that appliances do not last until they are paid for. No panacea is at hand for this critical weakness in our mechanized society, but the Administration is setting a group of experts to work on the problem. One of the first tasks of the proposed Consumer Counsel in the Department of Justice may well be to determine whether legislation is needed in this area of consumer interests.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1968]

Caveat Vendor

At long last the consumer—who at times has been victimized by fraud, sharp practices, carelessness and gouging—may be coming into his own.

The American economy produces magnificently any day in the week. But sometimes there is a glaring slip "twixt the cup and the lip"—between the production of goods and services and the consumer's normal enjoyment of them. Once in a while appliances get out of whack too quickly. Auto insurance is high and complex. Interest charges are concealed. Some meats, fish, and poultry have gone uninspected. New products develop unsuspected hazards. "Home improvement" sharks flourish, with no office larger than a telephone booth.

President Johnson evidently believes that the consumer is finally sufficiently alert and annoyed so that there is political advantage in championing his interests. (Or maybe the White House toaster went "pfft.") But the government does seem determined. Betty Furness, the President's decorative Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, evidently is "for real" after all.

Much will now depend on whether Congress, susceptible to the interests of those who don't want government snooping and prodding, reacts to the President's consumer message. But the President proposes an eight-point program. He has asked for a consumer counsel, to operate out of the Justice Department. And the Federal Trade Commission would be given the quick-acting remedy of court injunction against home-improvement rackets and any other fraudulent or deceptive practices.

We hope Congress will give consumer legislation full support. This protects not only the consumer but also the honest businessman, for then he can pursue his course of candor and fair dealing without having some chiseler attempt to outmaneuver him.

Nearly everything in the President's message is worthy of "Action this day": Auto insurance merits a comprehensive study. Pleasure boats need nationwide safety standards. Hazardous radiation from color TV sets requires investigation. Industry should cooperate in providing adequate warranties and economical repairs for automobiles and household appliances. Federal inspection should be extended to fish and poultry. Interest rates should be fully disclosed. Interstate gas pipelines should be assuredly safe.

An industrial economy cannot be a quality society if these improvements are not made. Let's get moving.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Feb. 8, 1968]

Guarding the Consumer

The Federal government is slowly but inevitably fashioning a protective mantle for the American consumer. Last year, Congress passed legislation toughening federal meat inspection controls. Soon to be passed is a truth in lending bill. Still pending in committees are bills to regulate sales commissions and management fees by mutual funds, to curb fraudulent land sales, and to set safety standards on natural gas pipelines.

Now President Johnson has asked for still more protection for the consumer. He has called for a cabinet-level survey of auto insurance industry practices, and wider powers for the Federal Trade Commission to permit it to deal more quickly with deceptive sales practices. The President also asked for legislation to improve poultry and fish inspection, establish safety standards for recreational boats and equipment, and set manufacturing standards to control hazardous radiation from color television sets. In addition, the administration will seek industry's cooperation in providing adequate warranties and repairs on automobiles and appliances.

The consumer, who now has become as "holy" a figure for Congress as the veteran, is not likely to object to these programs and proposed legislation. There will be objections from some states, which see a further erosion of their powers, and from industries which feel they are being "Nader-ized."

But there is political mileage to be gained in safeguarding the health and pocketbook of the consumer, and few congressmen are going to forego this benefit. They should remember, however, that at some stage, the protective mantle they are weaving could become a straitjacket, restricting the consumer's freedom of choice.

Impressions of a Student on the Travel Tax

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, since the first mention was made by the administration of proposals for restrictive taxing of foreign travel, arguments have been developing on all fronts in opposition to almost every aspect of the tax plan.

My first reservation to the travel tax program stems from its limitation on the traditional freedom of movement that I hold to be basic to the values of any free people. The understanding, tolerance, and vast scope of educational experiences gained through international travel are self-evident and priceless benefits to our aspirations of individual self-development, mutual understanding, and international cooperation.

I feel that this aspect of the proposed travel restrictions deserves intensive consideration—perhaps more consideration than any other single practical or economic argument for or against the program. Although such a tax might well prove to be technically constitutional, the people of this Nation and their representatives in Congress will not accept a severely restrictive tax on foreign travel as a legitimate means of righting an economic wrong if, at the same time, it brings forth a complex array of objections and reactions that stem from sources much deeper than economics—sources within our traditional framework of freedom of movement and the spirit of international brotherhood.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I bring the following article to the attention of my colleagues and other officials involved in the consideration of the proposed travel tax program. This thoughtful statement was submitted to me by Joseph G. Mason, a student at the University of Michigan Law School. His comments offer an interesting legal view toward the program. The questions raised in his analysis must be answered in the weeks ahead.

The Impressions of a Student

SUMMARY OF POINTS

American national interests can be more adequately protected by means which, when compared with the proposed travel tax, are more suitably respectful to the constitutional liberties of United States citizens.

1. The right to travel abroad is an important aspect of the citizen's liberty guaranteed in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

2. Any travel tax, such as presented by the administration, severely handicaps and runs counter to intrinsic objectives of higher education.

3. The political impact of a travel tax would be to encourage the retardation of American thinking, back into unrealistic isolationism.

1. *The right to travel abroad is an important aspect of the citizen's "liberty" guaranteed in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.*

All United States citizens have the right to move from state to state as a fundamental privilege under the Constitution, according to *Crandall* v. *Nevada*, 6 Wallace 35, 18 L.Ed. 745 (1868). This case stated the doctrine which shortly thereafter became the Fourteenth Amendment. The factual situation has interesting analogies to restriction of international travel. The court held that a state cannot levy a tax upon persons residing in the state who may wish to get out of it, and upon persons not residing in it who may have occasion to pass through it.

In *Kent* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 78 S. Ct. 1113, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1204 (1958), the right to travel abroad was recognized as a fundamental right of all citizens under the Fifth Amendment. The language of the case is particularly clear:

"Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was a part of our heritage. Travel abroad, like travel within the country . . . may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of values." (at pp 125, 1118, 1210)

The court regarded the Constitutional right to travel as being well established and closely related to rights of free speech and association.

Recognizing the importance of each citizen's right to travel, President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress in 1958 which said:

"Any limitations on the right to travel can only be tolerated in terms of overriding requirements of our national security, and must be subject to substantive and procedural guaranties." (Message from the President—Issuance of Passports, H. Doc. No. 417, Congressional Record, vol. 104, pt. 10, p. 13046.)

Here it can be seen that the right to travel is not absolute, but there is the suggestion that the degree of restraint on travel must be weighed against the dangers to national security. Congress, then, cannot exercise its legislative powers under reasons of "national security" without due regard to the right to travel which may be affected.

The sweep of Congressional power over matters of "national security" was dealt with in *Aptheker* v. *Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500, 84 S. Ct. 1659, 12 L. Ed. 2nd 992 (1964). This case held Section 6 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 unconstitutional for sweeping too broadly across the Fifth Amendment protections in its attempt to restrict passport privileges of members of Communist organizations. The right to travel is central to the discussion, and one is left with the question of whether there should be any restriction of that right when matters of "national security" are absent or only distantly related. The concurring opinion of Justice Douglas is notable on the latter point:

"Freedom of movement is kin to the right of assembly and to the right of association. Absent war, I see no way to keep a citizen from traveling within or without the country . . . unless he has been convicted of a crime or unless there is probable cause for issuing a warrant of arrest." (at 378 U.S. p. 520, S. Ct. p. 1671)

The proposed travel tax clearly restricts every citizens' Constitutional right of movement. Granted, the basic *purpose* of the plan is not to prevent travel to Europe, but to reduce as much as possible the amount they spend when they get there. But, is not the *effect* of a travel tax on many people the same as a prohibition?

2. *Any travel tax, such as presented by the administration, severely handicaps and runs counter to intrinsic objectives of higher education.*

In a country that places such emphasis upon the educational process. European travel contributes invaluable understanding in respect to our cultural heritage. The President's proposed travel tax will cause immediate reductions in student travel abroad. University of Michigan President, Robben Fleming, has sent a telegram to the President, urging student exemptions from the travel tax. Otherwise, he fears, education abroad will seriously suffer. Most educators agree.

The President repeatedly vows his support of open and better higher education for everyone. Just recently, he has proposed an increase in the financial aid available to students. Travel and education go hand in hand. Education in the Great Society can be complete only if it includes the enlightenment which results from association with peoples of all countries. Any educational policy which includes a travel tax, disallowing exemptions for students, is patently inconsistent with itself.

3. *The political impact of a travel tax would be to encourage the retardation of American thinking, back into unrealistic isolationism.*

A healthy world economy is in the United States' best interests. Such an objective is critically hampered by a travel tax policy which restricts the exchange of people and ideas. Serious consideration should be given the National Association of Travel Organizations' suggestion to "compete, not retreat" on the market for foreign visitors. In line with that alternative is the proposal by Senator Jacob K. Javits to adopt national travel policies which improve domestic travel for foreign visitors. A travel tax is not the only answer to the "balance of tourism payments."

History has shown the pitfalls of American attitudes which assume that isolation from the world community is possible. Now, more than ever, Congress should search for indirect means to achieve the same ends. And not the least of these avenues might lead through the tightening of military spending, since the greatest single budgetary expenditure is for "defense." To oversimplify a bit, who wants to see the day when an American can afford a visit to foreign countries only by enlistment in the U.S. Navy?

A Lawyer's View on Firearms Control

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the October 1967 issue of the Michigan State Bar Journal carries a well-reasoned and scholarly article entitled, "The Second Amendment and the Right To Keep and Bear Arms." The author is Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general of the State of Michigan and a leading figure in the Michigan Bar. In recent years he has contributed much time and energy to the establishment and chairmanship of the State Bar Committee on Conservation Law. For the past 20 years he has served on the staff of the attorney general of the State of Michigan, assigned to handling legal work for the conservation department.

So that my colleagues will have the benefit of the views of a seasoned and respected lawyer and public servant on the question of firearms control, I am inserting the text of his article at this point in the Record:

The Second Amendment and the Right To Keep and Bear Arms

(By Nicholas V. Olds)

"A well-regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people *to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." United States Constitution, Amendment II.* (Emphasis supplied)

Recent events and circumstances have brought into sharp focus the question of whether the private citizen of our day still has the constitutional right to keep and bear arms for purposes not connected with the maintenance of a militia.

Reasons given for the curtailment of this right are the alarming frequency of crimes committed with deadly weapons, the assassination of President Kennedy by means of a rifle obtained from a Chicago mail-order house, and the development of nuclear weapons which have virtually outmoded conventional warfare.

THE MILITIA, A BODY OF PRIVATE CITIZENS

Historically, our constitutional right to keep and bear arms had its origin in the militia organizations which came into being prior to the American Revolution. Colonial militia groups were first formed because of the need for united action in wars with the French and Indians; however, these militia groups were composed of private citizens who kept firearms for hunting of wild animals for food and pelts, killing of animals which depredated crops, and instant defense against marauding Indians.

Each colony had its own militia organization, composed of every able-bodied man from 16 to 60. Each member was required to appear for training at his town seat for a specified number of days in a year. In emergencies, the militia commander upon direction of the colonial government called out his men, usually through a process of volunteering, but by drafting if necessary. During the French and Indian wars, the colonial militia forces joined with British regulars in about equal proportion.

The militia was well recognized at that time as an ancient British institution; but since Britain's wars after 1660 were fought largely on sea or in foreign lands by the professional soldier and seaman, the need for a militia in that country had become obsolete. However, in the American settlements the need for a citizen soldiery reasserted itself. Although the use of militia had disappeared in England, the right of private citizens to arm themselves was still acknowledged and colonial militia groups were utilized to great advantage by Britain in her wars with France. "A military organization normally reflects the society from which it springs,"[1] and this was true of the American colonial militia prior to the Revolutionary War.

NO STANDING ARMIES

As the colonies maintained no standing armies, the militia was their only defense against foreign or domestic enemies. The only regular troops were those sent out from England under the direct command of royal rather than colonial officers. The colonists objected strongly to the presence of these troops in time of peace, and one of the grievances recited in the Declaration of Independance was that the King had kept standing armies among them in times of peace without the consent of their legislatures

When General Gage dispatched an expedition of British regulars on the night of April 18, 1775 to seize and destroy certain military stores at Concord, the colonists felt that this arbitrary attempt to disarm the citizenry violated their basic rights as British subjects. All Americans are familiar with the immortal story of the "embattled farmers" who resolutely mobilized to defend what they considered to be a righteous cause.

Following the battles of Lexington and Concord, General Gage confined the inhabitants of Boston strictly within the limits of the town, which had been occupied as an armed garrison. To procure their release, the people entered into a treaty stipulating that if they deposited their arms with their own magistrates, they would have freedom to depart with their personal effects. They delivered up their arms as agreed; and thereupon General Gage ordered that the arms be seized by his soldiery and most of the citizens detained. Their indignation at this outrage is eloquently expressed in the "Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms" drafted by representatives of the United Colonies in Philadelphia on July 6, 1775:

"They accordingly delivered up their arms, but in open violation of honour, in defiance of the obligation of treaties, which even savage nations esteem sacred, the governor ordered the arms deposited as aforesaid, that they might be preserved for their owners, to be seized by a body of soldiers; detained the greatest part of the inhabitants in the town, and compelled the few who were permitted to retire, to leave their most valuable effects behind."

ENGLISH ORIGINS OF CITIZENS' RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

In considering the natural assumption of the inhabitants of Boston that they possessed the right under English law to keep and bear arms as private citizens, as well as a unit of a militia organization, it is interesting to trace its historical origins. The right to keep and bear arms had evolved as a natural, basic right of citizens throughout the long development of the common law. However, it developed gradually, over a period of centuries, and had to be wrested from

---

Footnotes at end of article.

despotic monarchs who felt that an armed citizenry threatened the unlimited exercise of their despotism.

In 1328 the Statute of Northampton, 2 Edw. III, ch. 3, declared that no man should "* * * go nor ride armed by night or by day in fairs, markets, nor in the presence of the justices or other minister, nor in part elsewhere * * *."

Such conduct was probably regarded as tending to terrify peaceful people and to provoke breaches of the peace, and was indictable under the common law.

The statute of 22 Car. II, ch. 25, sec. 3 (1682), provided that "* * * no person who had no lands of the yearly value of 100 pounds, other than the son and heir of an esquire or other person of higher degree, should be allowed even to keep a gun."

Read in connection with the earlier statute of Edward III, this statute indicates that a right to keep and bear arms was not then regarded as a fundamental right of every Englishman.

PRIVATE ARMIES

However, from very early times land owners according to their degree and estate were required to have in readiness specified arms and equipment and men-at-arms at their own expense for military service when required by the government. These land owners, with their armed tenants and retainers, constituted the militia of the kingdom. At the time of the restoration of the monarchy in the person of Charles II, no other armed force was recognized as lawful.

However, King Charles II, having observed during his exile in France the autocratic power of a king possessing a standing army independent of the people, began to organize a body of soldiers armed, equipped, and paid out of the royal revenues as guards of his court and person.

His successor, James II, increased this nucleus into a regular army for general military service, greatly to the resentment of his subjects, Whig and Tory alike. Following the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion, James deprived many of his protestant subjects of militia status on the excuse that it was necessary for preservation of the peace and security of the government.

In the Declaration of Rights proclaimed by the Convention Parliament after the flight of James, these acts were condemned as an "endeavor to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of this kingdom" and "contrary to law." The subsequent statutory Bill of Rights based on that declaration held "* * * that the raising or keeping of a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace unless it be with the consent of parliament is against the law."

It was also enacted "* * * that the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defense suitable to their condition, and as allowed by law."

This assertion of the protestant subjects' right to have arms was to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, not to enable their violation.

During their long controversies with the king and parliament, the American colonists had become familiar with English political history and the various charters of English liberties, including the Bill of Rights of the reign of William and Mary. In this last, the provisions relating to standing armies and the right of subjects to have arms for their defense were closely related. This right and a reliance on a citizen soldiery or militia were coupled together in colonial thought and experience.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES

About 35 states have constitutional guarantees, each varying somewhat in scope and interpretation. In the Massachusetts Bill of Rights the language is:

"The people have a right to keep and bear arms for the common defense, and as in times of peace armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without consent of the legislature."

In that of Connecticut: "Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state."

In that of Pennsylvania: "The right of the citizens to bear arms in defense of themselves and the state shall not be questioned."

In that of South Carolina: "The people have a right to keep and bear arms for the common defense."

In that of Virginia: "A well-regulated militia composed of the body of the people is the proper, natural, and safe defense of a free state."

In some states the language is condensed into: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The language in Michigan is somewhat similar: "Every person has a right to keep and bear arms for the defense of himself and the state."

SOME CASES

In *Bliss* v. *Commonwealth*, 2 Litt. 90, 13 Am. Dec. 251, the Supreme Court of Kentucky decided that any restraint on the right of citizens to "bear arms in defense of themselves and the State" was unconstitutional, and this right was violated by an act to prevent carrying concealed weapons such as a pocket pistol, dirk, large knife or sword in a cane. However, a later constitutional provision gave the general assembly the right to prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons. All other states deciding this issue have held that a statute prohibiting the carrying or wearing of concealed weapons does not violate the constitutional provisions guaranteeing to citizens the right to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves and the state. For example, it is stated in *Carroll* v. *State*, 28 Ark. 99:

"The constitutional right to bear arms in defense of person and property does not prohibit the legislature from making police regulations for the good of society as to the manner in which such arms shall be borne." A similar decision was rendered in *Strickland* v. *Georgia*, 72 S.E. 260.

In *Salina* v. *Blaksley*, 72 Kan. 230, the Supreme Court of Kansas went further, holding that the state constitutional provision that "the people have the right to bear arms for their defense and security" limits legislative power to enact laws prohibiting the bearing of arms in the militia, but does not limit legislative power to enact laws prohibiting the promiscuous carrying of deadly weapons.

Besides prohibiting individuals from using certain weapons, there are also restrictions as to use of legal weapons on specified days. This restriction was held constitutional in *Walter* v. *State*, 35 Ohio C.C. 567, where it was decided that a game law [2] prohibiting hunting on Sunday does not unconstitutionally deprive one of the right to bear arms and protect property, but is a valid exercise of the police power.

Certain weapons such as those not usual or suitable for use in organized warfare (dirks, bowie knives, sling shots, brass knuckles, etc.) have been prohibited from use as not negating the constitutional guarantee of a right to bear arms. An example of such prohibition is a Michigan statute, 3 Comp. Laws 1929, Sec. 16751. The statute applies to all persons except peace officers, certain manufacturers, military and licensed persons, and contains no limitations as to place, time, purpose or use. It prohibits the possession of the enumerated weapons by anyone other than an excepted person in private as well as in public, in the home or elsewhere, for whatever purpose and contemplated use.[3]

In *People* v. *Persce*, 204 N.Y. 397, 97 N.E. 877, it was held that the legislature may prohibit the possession of "* * * instruments (a slingshot) which are ordinarily used for criminal and improper purposes and which are not amongst those ordinary legitimate weapons of defense and protection which are contemplated by the Constitution and the bill of rights."

And in *State* v. *Duke*, 42 Tex. 455, the court said:

"The arms which every person is secured the right to keep and bear (in the defense of himself or the State, subject to legislative regulation), must be such arms as are commonly kept, according to the customs of the people, and are appropriate for open and manly use in self-defense, as well as such as are proper for the defense of the State."

It was held in *People* v. *Brown*, 253 Mich. 537, that

"The list of weapons in section 16751, supra, is significant and demonstrates a definite intention of the legislature to protect society from a recognized menace. It does not include ordinary guns, swords, revolvers, or other weapons usually relied upon by good citizens for defense or pleasure. It is a partial inventory of the arsenal of the 'public enemy,' the 'gangster.' It describes some of the particular weapons with which he wars on the State and reddens his murderous trail . . . The statute does not infringe upon the legitimate right of personal or public defense but is within the reasonable and constitutional exercise of the police power of the State to curb crime."

In addition to constitutional restrictions on various types of weapons, certain classes such as women, young boys, the blind, tramps, and persons *non compos mentis* or dissolute in habits have been prohibited by statutes from carrying weapons.

In some statutes all persons have been prohibited from carrying concealed weapons. It has been held that military arms may not be carried in all places even by persons competent to serve in the militia; they may be excluded from courts of justice, polling places, school houses, churches, religious and political meetings, legislative halls and the like, and the carrying of military arms in street parades and other public demonstrations may be forbidden.[4] In *Presser* v. *Illinois*, *supra*, speaking of an Illinois statute, the court said:

"We think it clear that the sections under consideration, which only forbid bodies of men to associate together as military organizations or to drill or parade with arms in cities and towns unless authorized by law, do not infringe the right of the people to keep and bear arms."

ASPECTS OF THE RIGHT WHICH CANNOT BE PROHIBITED

There are certain aspects of the right which cannot be prohibited. Legislatures cannot forbid the simple possessing or keeping of weapons even though they can restrict carrying weapons by individuals. Also, the guarantee is applicable to aliens as well as citizens. *People* v. *Zerillo*, 219 Mich. 635, held that while the legislature may regulate the carrying and use of firearms, it may not prohibit a person, alien or citizen from possessing a revolver for the defense of himself and his property: [5]

"The true meaning of this provision is well stated in the constitution of the State of Colorado (Art. 2, Sec. 13):

" 'That the right of no person to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person or property or in aid of the civil power when thereto legally summoned, shall be called in question; but nothing herein contained shall be construed to justify the practice of carrying concealed weapons!' "

However, later the Michigan Supreme Court stated in *People* v. *Brown*, supra, that although the provision is a limitation upon the power of the legislature to enact any law to the contrary, the legislature does possess, under the police power, the right reasonably to regulate the carrying of weapons:

"The authorities cannot be reconciled ex-

Footnotes at end of article.

cept in basis of the proposition that, regardless of the basis of the right to bear arms, the State, nevertheless, has the police power to reasonably regulate it. The police power is, of course, subject to the limitation that its exercise be reasonable and it cannot constitutionally result in the prohibition of the possession of those arms which, by the common opinion and usage of law-abiding people, are proper and legitimate to be kept upon private premises for the protection of person and property."

The police power of the states to regulate the bearing of arms for the maintaining of public safety and peace is not confined merely to the establishment of conditions under which all sorts of weapons may be privately possessed, but it also takes into account the character and ordinary use of weapons and interdicts those commonly employed to violate the law. The exercise of this power must, of course, be reasonable, and cannot constitutionally result in the prohibition of those arms which, by the common opinion and usage of law-abiding people, are proper and legitimate. The right is not subject to virtual destruction or confiscation through the medium of extreme legislative proposals.

The courts should carefully scrutinize the constitutionality of laws which require a license to have a firearm (not a concealed or gangster-type weapon), or which make the right to have a gun depend upon the whim of some public officer, or which require registration of firearms or impose a discriminatory tax on them, or which totally prohibit their possession.

SECOND AMENDMENT APPLY?

When the first ten amendments to the constitution were being drafted, the people doubtless had well in mind the events which preceded the battles of Lexington and Concord. In view of the close historical connection between the weapons used by the militia and those kept by private citizens, the framers of the Second Amendment must have considered that every citizen should have the absolute right to keep and bear arms, not only to defend his country, but also to defend his person and possessions and for other lawful private reasons.

The right to bear arms is not granted by the constitution; neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The second amendment means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress and has no effect other than to restrict the powers of the national government,[6] and, hopefully, the powers of the states. In 11 Am. Jur., Constitutional Law, Section 7, page 607, it is said:

"It has been aptly said that written Constitutions sanctify and confirm great principles, but do not bring them into existence, and that a Constitution is not the cause, but a consequence, of personal and political freedom."

To what extent is the federal right to keep and bear arms applicable to the states?

A text-writer, following the views of some state courts in very early decisions, says that the second amendment of the U.S. Constitution "seems to be of a nature to bind both the state and national legislatures, and doubtless it does."[7]

But the U.S. Supreme Court has twice expressly decided that this second amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a limitation only upon the power of congress and the national government, and not upon that of the states.[8]

Until recent years, a number of decisions before and after the *Presser* case held that the first ten amendments did not restrict the states, but were a restraint only upon congress. The court states in *Ex parte Spies*, 123 U.S. 131:

"The first ten articles of amendment were not intended to limit the powers of the state government in respect to their own people, but to operate on the national government alone; this was decided more than a half century ago, and that decision has been steadily adhered to since."

However, the Supreme Court is gradually inclining to hold that all provisions of the Bill of Rights have been incorporated into the constitution, as applied to the states, by enactment of the 14th amendment.

In 1962, William J. Brennan, Jr., associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, lectured at the New York University School of Law on the subject "The Bill of Rights and the States."[9] As to natural or basic rights he says:

"The constitutions of the original states anticipated the national Constitution in declaring the doctrine that there are human liberties which are inalienable. This doctrine has ever since been the center and core of the American idea of limited government. The government of each state was the creation of the people of the state; the source of power was the people of that state. The only end and aim of government was to secure the people in their natural and civil rights."

Justice Brennan traces the history of cases which mark the steady progress of the court toward applying the provisions of the Bill of Rights to the states. He cites as an example the case of *Adamson* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 46, where an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court by Admiral Dewey Adamson while California was waiting to execute him for murder. The appellant contended violation of certain rights accorded him by the Bill of Rights and claimed protection of these rights through the vehicle of the Fourteenth amendment, Sec. 1:

"No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any citizen of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Nevertheless, the majority of the court still clung to the doctrine of the old decisions, holding that the Bill of Rights was not applicable to the states by the fourteenth amendment. Justice Black, however, wrote a notable dissent, contending that the *fourteenth amendment* was meant by its framers to make the Bill of Rights (first ten amendments) binding upon the states.

Justice Brennan indicates in his article that, although the Supreme Court has not accepted the incorporation of the Bill of Rights as a whole, it has proceeded piecemeal to hold that certain of the ten amendments restrict the states. He points out that the Supreme Court has extended the protection of the *fourteenth amendment* as to freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly and petition under the *first;* as against searches and seizures under the *fourth;* as to just compensation in eminent domain proceedings and rights granted to accused with respect to confessions under the *fifth;* and as to furnishing of counsel to an accused in criminal cases under the *sixth*.

But what about the right to bear arms, is it too a natural, basic right? A quote from Justice Brennan's lecture supports an affirmative answer:

"The Bill of Rights is the primary source of expressed information as to what is meant by constitutional liberty. The safeguards enshrined in it are deeply etched in the foundations of America's freedoms."

This statement strengthens the assertion that the second amendment expresses a basic right. Our founding fathers thought the right to bear arms so important that it was incorporated in the Bill of Rights directly after the first amendment protecting freedom of speech and religion.

Norman Redlich, professor of law at New York University School of Law, in an article concerning this same subject, the Bill of Rights,[10] also reviews decisions of the Supreme Court which extend many of these restrictions to the states. In addition to those mentioned, he includes the eighth amendment. He predicts the future in these words:

"As already indicated, however, most of the major provisions of the Bill of Rights have either been incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment, or are likely to be in the near future."

If the United States Supreme Court were confronted today with the specific issue of the right to bear arms contained in the second amendment, there is a reasonable probability that it would extend the restrictions of this amendment to all of the states.

DOES THE SECOND AMENDMENT APPLY TO THE INDIVIDUAL?

Does the federal guarantee of the right to keep and bear arms apply only to the organized militia and not to the individual? Blackstone regarded the right to keep and bear arms as being equally important to citizens as the primary rights of personal security, personal liberty and of private property, in that it was sometimes necessary to vindicate those rights when violated by a tyrannical government. He expressed this principle in Chapter I, "Of the Rights of Persons," under the subheading "Of the Absolute Rights of Individuals:"

"The fifth and last auxiliary right of the subject, * * * is that of having arms for their defense, suitable to their condition and degree, and such as are allowed by law. Which is also declared by the same statute, and it is indeed a public allowance, under due restrictions, of the natural right of resistance and self-preservation, when the sanctions of society and laws are found insufficient to restrain the violence of oppression."

Section 200 is a summary of the chapter:

"In these several articles consist the rights, or, as they are frequently termed, the liberties of Englishmen: liberties, more generally talked of than thoroughly understood; and yet highly necessary to be perfectly known and considered by every man of rank or property, lest his ignorance of the points whereon they are founded should hurry him into faction and licentiousness on the one hand, or a pusillanimous indifference and criminal submission on the other. And we have seen that these rights consist, primarily, in the free employment of personal security, of personal liberty, and of private property. So long as these remain inviolate, the subject is perfectly free; for every species of compulsive tyranny and oppression must act in opposition to one or other of these rights, having no other object upon which it can possibly be employed. To preserve these from violation, it is necessary that the constitution of parliament be supported in its full vigor; and limits, certainly known, be set to the royal prerogative. And, lastly, to vindicate these rights when actually attacked or violated, the subjects of England are entitled, in the first place, to the regular administration and free course of justice in the courts of law; next, to the right of petitioning the king and parliament for redress of grievances; and lastly, to the right of having and using arms for self-preservation and defense."

Thus, Blackstone believed that the right to have and bear arms was considered a basic right under the old English common law.

In *United States* v. *Miller*, 83 L. Ed. 1206 (1939), the United States Supreme Court considered and recognized the origin and *raison d'etre* of the militia. Although the court held that the defendant in this case had violated the national firearms act by possession of a sawed-off shotgun capable of concealment, it reviewed the basic constitutional principles involved by stating (p. 1209):

"The Constitution as originally adopted granted to the Congress power 'To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union', etc., . . .

"With obvious purpose to assure the con-

Footnotes at end of article.

tinuation and render possible the effectiveness of such forces the declaration and guarantee of the Second Amendment were made. It must be interpreted and applied with that end in view.

"The Militia which the States were expected to maintain and train is set in contrast with Troops which they were forbidden to keep without the consent of Congress. The sentiment of the time strongly disfavored standing armies; the common view was that adequate defense of country and laws could be secured through the Militia—civilians primarily, soldiers on occasions.

"The significance attributed to the term Militia appears from the debates in the Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of approved commentators. These show plainly enough that the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense. 'A body of citizens enrolled for military discipline.' *And further that ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time."* (Emphasis supplied)

It is interest that the report of this case shows that no person appeared before the court on behalf of the defendants (appellees); and the case was decided entirely on arguments made by the United States.

SECOND AMENDMENT

Although the second amendment refers to a "well-regulated Militia" by way of preamble, nevertheless the imperative language of the amendment states, "the right of the *people* to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." (Emphasis supplied)

As previously argued, the trend of the Supreme Court is toward application of the first ten amendments to the states by virtue of the fourteenth amendment. However, the positive command of the second amendment that the "people" shall not be deprived of their right to keep and bear arms, reinforces the argument that the fourteenth amendment not only imposes the commands of the first ten upon the states as sovereign governments but also accords the protective mantle of the second to the people residing in the states.

Inasmuch as the term "militia" in its historical context means every able-bodied adult male citizen, the command of the second amendment would seem to afford to individuals the constitutional right (although somewhat qualified) to keep and bear arms.[11]

There are several compelling reasons why the people as individuals should have the right to keep and bear arms.

If the body of law-abiding citizens is legally disarmed, it follows that they are thereby deprived of the means of defense against a lawless minority which is always able by some means to supply itself with lethal instruments.

If anything, the disarming of the populace would encourage the criminal in his activities, knowing that he would be dealing with an unarmed and defenseless citizenry.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

This phase of the problem was thoroughly reviewed in a pamphlet entitled "Pistol Regulation, Its Principles and History," by Karl T. Frederick, published by the National Rifle Association, Washington, D.C., 1964. This publication relates the results of the New York Sullivan Act, one of the most restrictive gun laws in the nation. This report shows that in 1963 there was an 8.1 percent rise in homicides compared to the previous year; and that out of 549 homicides committed during 1963, guns were used in 138 cases; knives, sharp instruments and physical force in the remaining 411. On page 25 it states:

"The folly of the law lies in the fact that to a great extent it disarms the decent and law-abiding citizen through its requirement of a license to purchase or possess a pistol. We must not be understood as asserting that the purchase of pistols should not be surrounded with safeguards. A license to purchase, however, places upon the citizen a burden of hardship which is an effective bar to his procuring the weapon for legitimate purposes in the case of all but the most determined person. This is proved by the fact that during the first year of the Sullivan law the purchase of pistols by legitimate buyers in New York fell off by approximately 94 percent. That such a result was not desirable is shown by the steady increase in homicides and other crimes of violence and the rapid rise in robbery-insurance rates since that time."

Also, even in this modern day, it would be an extreme injustice to farmers to remove from them the means of eliminating wild animals which still prey upon their crops and livestock. This situation was picturesquely illustrated by the Michigan Supreme Court in *People* v. *Zerillo,* 219 Mich. 635, 639–640:

"Must an alien owner of a farm sit with folded arms and watch henhawks steal his chickens? No, the act permits him to kill noxious birds and animals, when necessary, in defense of his person or property. But what is he going to use for that purpose? Until the occasion arises, if this statute is given the construction contended for by the people, it is a crime for him to possess a firearm, and he, therefore, cannot be prepared to exercise the leave granted without committing a crime. Woodchucks could burrow in his yard and meadows with impunity, owls rob his hen roost, rats run about his feet at chore time, and in some sections of the State, wolves could sit on his very door step, and howl defiance. Even the predatory skunk, in the open season, would be more offensively armed than the unnaturalized farmer faring forth to drive it away. Must such a farmer whistle off the dog discovered in the act of killing his sheep? Another statute gives him the right to kill such a dog discovered in the act. Must he request the burglar to come unarmed because he has been unarmed by the law? This act, if construed as contended for by the people, is so sharp shod as to calk itself."

As a further cogent reason for justification of the right of the individual to keep and bear arms, modern history itself illustrates the urgent need for a citizenry equipped to defend itself in a national crisis. Prior to World War II England had enforced such restrictive laws on the possession of ordinary weapons that the populace found itself disarmed and defenseless in the face of imminent invasion by Hitler's hordes in 1940. During this crisis the *American Rifleman* published the following appeal from the American Committee for Defense of British Homes:

"Send a Gun to Defend a British Home. British civilians faced with threat of invasions, desperately need arms for the defense of their homes. The American Committee for Defense of British Homes has organized to collect gifts of pistols—rifles—revolvers—shotguns—binoculars from American civilians who wish to answer the call and aid in defense of British homes."

Winston Churchill dramatically emphasized the likelihood of such action in two famous speeches in 1940: ". . . we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."[12]

"We shall defend every village, every town and every city. The vast mass of London itself, fought street by street, could easily devour an entire hostile army; and we would rather see London laid in ruins and ashes than that it should be tamely and abjectly enslaved."[13]

Even though the all-inclusive destructiveness of nuclear weapons would seem to eliminate the need for the armed citizen, it is still an axiom of warfare that the overwhelming of a country's military force, is always followed by the imposition of occupation troops upon the citizenry. It is not within the American tradition and spirit to submit meekly to any such invasion. No matter how desperate our situation at the time, in the event of an enemy occupation Americans would continue to resist individually and collectively, with any weapons at hand.

The very frightfulness of nuclear armament has so far precluded its common use and modern warfare is still confined to local areas and conventional weapons, as in Korea, Israel and Vietnam. The Cubans are a prime example of a people under the heel of a dictator who, if they were supplied with ordinary armaments, would have at least a chance to effect their liberation.

In considering any hasty proposals for disarming our populace, contemporary history should supply valuable and hard-learned lessons.

PROPOSALS TO RESTRICT

The assassination of President Kennedy brought on a flurry of congressional proposals for restrictions on the purchase and transportation of all species of weapons in interstate commerce. The main bill then pending was the Dodd Bill, S. 1975, introduced by Senator Dodd of Connecticut. The provisions of this bill as introduced were generally considered reasonable; but immediately following the assassination, Senator Dodd proposed amendments of a more severely restrictive nature.

Many of these extreme proposals resulted from the fact that the President was shot by means of a rifle with a telescopic sight, purchased from a Chicago mail-order house.

Fortunately, as the congressional hearings continued, cooler minds began to prevail. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, stated on August 10, 1964, that "calm judgment" and "refusal to act precipitiously on anti-firearms legislation" were needed. As a consequence, none of this proposed legislation has yet been reported out of the committee.

In combatting such proposals we are fighting not against reason but against emotion. The nature of a democratic government is such that it may be temporarily dominated by crises which inflame the popular mind, and it is erroneously thought at the moment that all the ills can be cured by restrictive legislation. But it would be utterly ridiculous and foolhardy to believe that a man bent upon assassinating the President could be effectively deterred by any statute regulating or prohibiting the purchase and possession of lethal weapons.

NEED FOR GROUP ACTION

In a statement on the Bill of Rights in January, 1963[14] Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court spoke the following realistic words:

"We have a Bill of Rights designed to keep government out of private domains. But the fences have been broken down; and machinery to restore them has been denied. The Bill of Rights—with the judicial gloss it has acquired—plainly is not adequate to protect the individual against the growing bureaucracy. He faces a formidable opponent in government, even when he is endowed with funds and with courage. *The individual is almost certain to be plowed under, unless he has a well-organized active political group to speak for him."* (Emphasis supplied)

Some such groups have already spoken emphatically and effectively on the issue concerning the right of individual citizens to bear arms.

The American Rifle Association, through its officers and president, appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee and made its presentations against the proposals.

The Board of Commissioners of the State

Footnotes at end of article.

Bar of Michigan on February 28, 1964 adopted a resolution opposing the restrictive amendments to S. 1975.[15] This resolution pointed out that Michigan, being a leader in the sale of hunting licenses, might lose considerably because such restrictions would tend to discourage persons desiring to engage in this extensive and salutary form of recreation. The resolution further indicated that: "It is the view of the State Bar of Michigan that any law restricting rights granted under the Second Amendment is not a function of Congress but that any necessary regulation should be made by State statute under the police power which rests in the States and not in the Federal government."

In September, 1964 the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at its annual meeting passed a resolution stating in part:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved * * * that legislative proposals at all levels which require a license or permit to purchase or possess a firearm ordinarily used in outdoor recreation by hunting or shooting, or which leave the right to possess such a firearm dependent upon the whim or will of a public officer, or which require the registration of such a firearm, or which impose a confiscatory tax or unreasonable regulation on such firearms, or which totally prohibit the possession of such firearms—all such proposals should be vigorously opposed and rejected."

PROBABLE VIEW OF SUPREME COURT

Had these highly restrictive bills been passed, in effect disarming the entire citizenry of the United States, what would be the view of the United States Supreme Court when confronted by this issue?

In his 1963 statement on the Bill of Rights[16] Justice Douglas remarked:

"Fear of assassination often produces restraints compatible with dictatorship, not democracy."

Great constitutional questions are not decided by the Supreme Court in a vacuum. That august body scrupulously considers all factors, circumstances and conditions, past, present and future, which bear upon the meaning of the issue and its effect upon our necessities and culture. It is therefore logical to assume that in deciding the question here at hand the Supreme Court would give proper weight to all facets of the problem, in an atmosphere apart from the temporary hysteria which generated the drastic proposals now pending in Congress.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions which may be drawn from this body of fact and argument are:

(1) The second amendment applies not only to states, but also protects the individual citizen in his right "to keep and bear arms" for the defense of himself, his property and his country.

(2) If Congress legislates with respect to this subject under the commerce clause, it should do so in such fashion as not to infringe unreasonably on the exercise of that right by the "people."

(3) All states, those not having protective clauses in their constitutions as well as those that have, may enact reasonable regulations as to the purchase and use of firearms under the police power. This power must be aimed at the correction of a clearly identified evil; and it cannot be so extreme as to accomplish a virtual disarmament of the people.

FOOTNOTES

[1] ROTCM 145-20, American Military History 1607-1958, Headquarters, Department of the Army, July, 1959, p. 11.

[2] 97 Ohio Laws, 463, 470.

[3] *People* v. *Brown,* 253 Mich. 537, 539.

[4] *Commonwealth* v. *Murphy,* 166 Mass. 171, 44 N.E. 138.

[5] Sec. 5, Art. II Michigan Constitution (1908).

[6] *U.S.* v. *Cruikshank,* 92 U.S. 542.

[7] Bishop, Statutory Crimes, Sec. 792.

[8] *Cruikshank,* op. cit., and *Presser* v. *Illinois,* 116 U.S. 252.

[9] 36 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 761.

[10] 37 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 787.

[11] Op. cit., Footnote 1, p. 18.

[12] Winston Churchill's Speech on Dunkirk. House of Commons, June 4, 1940.

[13] Winston Churchill's Radio Broadcast, July 14, 1940.

[14] 38 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 210

[15] This matter was again brought before the Board of Commissioners of the State Bar of Michigan on April 14, 1967 with respect to pending bills before Congress, namely H 5384 and S 1, and after discussion thereon was tabled.

[16] Ibid.

Gold Cover Removal: A Threat or a Solution?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the promoted stampede to remove the gold cover from our U.S. currency appears lacking in any merit, and can only create new problems rather than provide a solution. The causation would remain untouched and a greater fiscal problem might well be the only result.

President Johnson, in his Economic Report to Congress on February 1, had this to say:

> U.S. gold reserves have declined to about $12 billion. This is still ample to cope with foreseeable demands on our gold stock. But persistent large U.S. deficits would threaten the entire international monetary system.

The question is then raised as to whether the gold cover removal is sought for U.S. needs or the world banking community under the 1944 Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

In fact, the President in his February 1 message confirms this reasoning in his comment:

> I am, therefore, asking the Congress to take prompt action to free our gold reserves so that they can unequivocally fulfill their true purpose—to insure the international convertability of the dollar into gold at $35 per ounce.

If the "they" means the U.S. Congress, how did the true purpose of Congress become a purpose to stabilize the mistakes and misgivings of a bunch of international bankers?

Since the President in his message concedes we have sufficient reserves to cope with demands on the U.S. gold stock, why the need for any action by Congress at all?

If the international bankers need the U.S. gold kitty for their manipulations, certainly they are aware that under the Federal Reserve Act, section 11(c), they can reduce the gold reserve below the statutory 25 percent under suspensions of 30 days and extension of periods not exceeding 15 days. And the only penalty is a slight tax against the Federal Reserve of 1 percent per annum.

The purpose for the bill then appears but an attempt to bamboozle through Congress a bill not needed or necessary except to free the Federal Reserve from any 1 percent penalty tax because of their action in suspending the gold reserve below the established 25 percent of currency in circulation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that the truth is lacking, but rather that a full open disclosure of all the facts are not being told. I include the Federal Reserve Act, section 11(c), and articles from the Wall Street Journal dated May 22, 1967, and January 24, 1968, following my remarks:

CHANGES IN TEXT OF EXISTING STATUTES

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the text of existing Federal statutes or parts thereof which the bill, as reported, would amend or repeal is printed below, with the proposed changes shown (*a*) by enclosing in black brackets material to be omitted, (*b*) by printing the new matter in italic type, and (*c*) by printing in roman type those provisions in which no change is to be made.

Federal Reserve Act

* * * * *

POWERS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

SEC. 11. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be authorized and empowered:

* * * * *

(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding thirty days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding fifteen days, any reserve requirements specified in this Act [:*Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this Act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 per centum, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 per centum per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 per centum, and when said reserve falls below 20 per centum, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ per centum per annum upon each 2½ per centum or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 per centum]. [The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.]

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1967]

THE CASE AGAINST DE-EMPHASIZING GOLD

(This article is a reply to an earlier essay by John Parke Young advocating that the U.S. alter its gold policy. What Mr. Young suggested, briefly, is that the U.S. work toward the point where it would redeem foreigners' dollars for gold only at its own option. Mr. Groseclose is a parner in Groseclose, William & Associates, a Washington-based economic consulting firm.)

(By Elgin Groseclose)

That the value of the dollar is determined by the strength of the U.S. economy is an assumption yet to be proved, and to date the money managers are fearful of putting it to the proof. The proper truth is that value of the dollar depends upon the liquidity of the U.S. economy.

An analogy with business will illustrate. It is a maxim of financial management that businesses go bankrupt not from want of trade but from want of working capital. The strength of a business enterprise is its power to produce. The liquidity of a business depends upon its ability to produce and sell at a profit, that is, to generate a flow of dollars sufficient at all times to meet its dollar costs. The immediate cause of all business failures is thus not lack of business (i.e. volume), but lack of cash to meet bills presented for payment.

The recent misfortune of the Douglas aircraft enterprise, which forced it to merge with McDonnell, did not arise from lack of customers or orders—perhaps from the opposite, from a volume of business beyond the capacity of its working capital. The Krupp interests of Germany have recently experienced the same pinch of an insufficiency of cash to support the business being done, compelling a financial reorganization.

This simplest principle of financial management is seemingly unfamiliar to exponents of a credit dollar.

ONLY GOLD IS UNIVERSAL

What cash is to a business enterprise, gold is to sovereignties. However willing foreigners may be to take dollars (and they take them today not so much because the dollar is strong but because it is the least weak among many weak currencies), when they accept dollars they receive nothing more than a due bill. Dollar due bills remain at par only because and only so long as the U.S. Treasury continues to redeem them on demand with the only cash that has universal validity, with gold.

That the dollar today is not as "good as gold," despite our enormous economic power and productivity, is plainly evidenced by the fact that foreigners have for some years been drawing down gold for dollars. Why should they prefer gold for dollars, which bear an attractive interest yield, while gold does not?

The bald fact is that today the U.S. Government is insolvent. Insolvency is the condition before bankruptcy. National bankruptcy occurs when the sovereignty ceases to pay out gold to meet obligations due, when currency convertibility is suspended. The U.S. Government has been insolvent for 34 years.

Bankruptcy was successfully avoided so long as the principal creditors were domestic. By its sovereign power and by legal fiat, the Government prevented domestic creditors from demanding redemption of their currency by the expedient of declaring the possession of monetary gold a crime.

Since the Federal fiat ends at the frontier, the Treasury continued to meet foreign claims for redemption, by gold payments at the statutory rate. Until 1949, mainly as a result of the war, foreigners were debtors on balance, and not in position to press redemption. Beginning in 1949, primarily as a result of the foreign aid program and the Administration slogan "get the dollars out," the balance turned, and with the exception of 1957, the U.S. economy has been in chronic deficit since. Since 1949, gold has been flowing out until the reserve is now down to nearly half the 1949 figure.

The diminished outflow of the past two years is not the result of rising confidence in the dollar, but of pressures put upon foreign central banks not to convert their dollar holdings. These pressures have recently been officially confirmed in Germany. Without these pressures and other expediencies there can be little doubt that the Treasury would be compelled to suspend gold convertibility, that is, officially to declare bankruptcy.

Can these pressures be maintained? Can gold in fact be disestablished, and can the stability of the dollar be maintained under such disestablishment? No doubt the policy framers in Washington, confident in the political economic and military power of this country, believe it can. To date they have been able, except in the case of France, to persuade the principal central banks to refrain from further conversion of dollars.

Regrettably for their hopes, however, counter-pressures are arising that are not so easily restrained. These pressures are becoming increasingly insistent. They arise from the inchoate and unorganized demand for gold not from banks and institutions, but from a public that is free to express itself in almost every part of the world except the Communist and other totalitarian countries, the U.S. and Great Britain. In these countries, individuals are forbidden by powerful governments to hold monetary gold.

Elsewhere governments are unable to coerce the people so easily. Last year, it appears that for the first time since the rise of the powerful network of central banks, these individual buyers took more gold than the mines could supply from new production. The difference was met from the London Gold Pool, which the U.S. Treasury is committed to replenish as need arises.

The question then arises: Assuming U.S. economic, political and military power is able to restrain foreign central banks from converting their dollar holdings into gold, is it powerful enough to compel them to satisfy the popular demand for gold at the cost of their own reserves, or conversely, compel them to refrain from satisfying such demand?

In short, the practical object of a credit dollar, without gold, can be achieved only if all countries that use dollars as monetary reserves adopt the same inconvertibility.

Would dollar stability be achieved by universal inconvertibility, with all currencies linked to the dollar, and the dollar maintained at parity with such other currencies by regulating (if that were possible) our balance of payments and by keeping a constant surplus of trade and services?

Let us assume that sufficient power could be so exerted. What would be the practical consequences?

WHERE WOULD GOLD COME FROM?

Since none of the principal sovereignties whose currencies dominate world trade (Canada perhaps excepted) produce sufficient gold to satisfy their own industrial demand for the metal, from where would they replenish their supplies? South Africa, the principal supplier of gold today, can sell all the gold it produces at $35 an ounce. Should the U.S. Treasury declare it was no longer interested in buying gold (and supposing it could persuade the other central banks to adopt the same course) what would be the effect, say, upon South African gold producers?

Traditionally, and to the present time, despite political alienation from Britain, South African mine production is sold through London agencies. Would it continue to be so sold? Some inconvenience might result from setting up other market mechanisms, but the effects can hardly be doubted. The enormous private demand for gold would be satisfied by sales from South Africa direct. What would be the consequences of U.S. Treasury aloofness to this market? None, for the U.S. has not been a buyer of gold on balance since 1949.

What would buyers pay for this gold? To put the question in reverse, what would sellers ask for their gold? Would they accept 35 inconvertible dollars per ounce when they have been used to getting 35 convertible dollars per ounce? This is hardly likely. And certainly bidders would arise who would prefer an ounce of gold to 35 inconvertible dollars.

A better grasp of the monetary problem would be gained by more reading of historical experience, more familiarity with actual business and less with monetary theory, particularly current monetary theory.

Throughout history the value of money has been a compound of intrinsic worth of the medium and the authority or confidence enjoyed by the issuing agency. Remove the latter and barter results; remove the former and monetary chaos follows. Historically, precious metals became the principal medium of barter by reason of their intrinsic utility and convenience for trade, second by the certification of the weight and fineness of the bar or ingot by an accepted authority.

At first this authority was a respected trader of Babylonia or adjacent countries. Later it was the temple—in Rome, the temple of Juno Moneta, the "Warner" (from which we obtain the word "money"). Eventually the function of striking metal into coinage was absorbed by the state. The power of the state to declare it legal tender for debt, and its willingness to accept it in payment of taxes, gave the official standard a value beyond—but not to the exclusion of—its intrinsic (metal) content. Since, however, the fiat of the state is coterminous only with the power of its arms, the legal tender or fiat value of money ends at the frontier, and beyond that its worth is measured by the intrinsic content. (Even within the frontier the fiat of the state is not always supreme.)

PAPER TREASURE

Marco Polo brought back from his China travels a rosy description of the "means whereby the Great Khan may have, in fact has, more treasure than all the Kings of the world." The means was the issuance of pieces of paper (papermaking being a Chinese invention) bearing the imperial seal, which were declared exchangeable everywhere in payment of taxes or dues, and for which the emperor's subjects were compelled to turn in their gold.

"This paper currency," Marco Polo wrote, "is circulated in every part of the Great Khan's dominions; nor dares any person, at the peril of his life, refuse to accept it. . . . All his majesty's armies are paid with this currency. . . . Upon these grounds it may certainly be affirmed that the Great Khan has a greater command of treasure than any other sovereign in the universe."

As a substitute for gold, however, the device was a failure, for the Mongols, though powerful enough to conquer all of Asia and half of Europe, were not powerful enough to compel everywhere acceptance of their paper money. In his enthusiasm Marco Polo neglected to mention that the paper was at a discount of 50% to gold, and he did not remain in China long enough to observe the economic havoc caused by the use of paper money.

Later instances could be multiplied, for the history of Europe from Roman times on is that of currency debasement and monetary inflation, in the earliest years by coin clipping and alloying, and after the introduction of paper money in the 13th century, by imitation of the Chinese example.

While it is ultimately true that the soundness of the money of a sovereignty depends upon the vigor and productive power of its economy, the reverse is also true that the vigor and productivity of the economy depends upon a sound and stable money. Historians have generally agreed that a chief source of Byzantine influence and power, sustaining the sovereignty through eight centuries of political and military impotence, was the bezant, which down to the Latin conquest of the 13th century was the accepted standard of account and exchange from the Baltic to Ceylon. This was due to the fact, unparalleled in history, that since its first issuance by Constantine the Great the bezant continued to be minted by the Byzantine authorities at its original weight and fineness.

Today the dollar is the unchallenged standard of the world. Probably two-thirds of the world's trade, whether in U.S. commodities and services or not, is quoted, transacted or paid for in dollars. It would be a universal tragedy if the views of theoreticians and jingoists were to prevail, that the economic might of the U.S. is sufficient to protect the dollar and enforce its acceptance throughout the globe at its nominal equivalence of gold.

A final question can only be dealt with briefly. Given the state of monetary decay, what is the viable solution? An inconvertible dollar we reject, for the reasons just described. A return to full convertibility—the object of the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy—is a theoretical ideal, but unrealistic in today's condition of thinned and inadequate gold reserves.

The only practical solution is the historical procedure for insolvency: A declaration of bankruptcy and a writing down of creditors' claims to the measure of the liquifiable assets. With sovereignties this is done by a revaluation of the currency. Undoubtedly such a procedure here would have the same effects as elsewhere—it would merely set the stage for a new spiral of inflation, and is therefore abhorred by conservatives. For this reason, a further step is required, to preserve the discipline of gold upon the money managers: A Constitutional provision limiting the power of the Federal Government to regulate the money.

A precedent is found in the oaths that in ancient Greece, following the Solonian debasement of the drachma, the diakasts were required to take on assuming office, that they would not tamper with the currency. It is a paradox of history that it was the influence of this oath, coupled with the Greek tradition, that preserved the integrity of the bezant for so many centuries and maintained the influence of Byzantium far more effectively than the armies of its emperors.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1968]

Tragical—and Dear—Tale of Two Deficits

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The setting and the theme of this tale differ from those portrayed in Mr. Dickens' "Tale of Two Cities." London and Paris are involved, but so are all other national capitals from Washington across Europe and Asia to Saigon.

The theme of this brief tale is not heroism, selfless devotion and sacrifice, but economic and financial mismanagement and their retributive consequences. These consequences were summed up by Mr. Micawber when he said that the result of outgo in excess of income was misery. Ordinarily, one deficit would be enough to warrant the Micawber judgment, but when the affliction extends to two of the same, it is misery compounded.

The U.S. is in this situation today. It has had a chronic budget deficit for the greater part of three decades, and over the past 17 years it has had a serious deficit in the international payments account.

Superficially it would appear that these deficits, singly or in combination, have not produced the melancholy result that would have been anticipated under economic concepts now regarded as obsolete. The gross national product has increased by leaps and bounds, personal and business incomes have soared and the money supply has been expanded steadily. It has been assumed that we could support both a military war abroad and an economic war against poverty at home.

For some time cracks have been showing in the wall and foundation of this prosperity, but until recently they have been disregarded or whitewashed over. Neither of our wars has been going well; inflation continues and an increasing proportion of GNP growth has reflected price rise rather than more real output; interest rates are at or near an all-time high; the Federal budget has gone into orbit, and the little island of personal freedom continues to be eroded further by the vast ocean of centralized power that surrounds it.

Legally, the dollar has not been devalued since 1934, but it has lost more than half of the purchasing power it represented after that action. It has recently been under severe attack, not only from some who may seek its destruction but also from others whose confidence in its future may be weakening. It may be only coincidence that the President's new program for its support followed closely after a warning from the 21-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that "belt-tightening" was imperative.

CONTROL FACTORS

Some similarities between domestic and international deficits will be noted, and attention will then be directed to the basic factors involved in their control, as distinguished from temporary or stopgap measures.

First, the two types of deficit are alike in that each measures a gap between receipts and outgo. In the popular view this is known as an unbalanced budget. However, since all bills incurred are eventually paid there is, actually, a balance between available funds and expenditures. The popular distrust of an unbalanced budget is intuitively sound, despite the New Economics, for the methods of obtaining the money to pay all of the bills are not always palatable. In the case of a domestic budget deficit these methods would include prompt increase of taxes or borrowing. If popular resistance to higher taxes is sufficiently strong, enough debt paper can be forced into the market to cover even an astronomical budget deficit.

Likewise, the international accounts are always balanced out, the deficit being the measure of the supplemental funds needed to produce this result. The debtor country has no taxing jurisdiction beyond its own borders, but it can restrict imports by tariff duties and import quotas. It can levy discriminating taxes on foreign investment, restrict foreign travel, subsidize exports, and so on. Such actions are self-defeating, for they can be, and often are, countered by other countries to the detriment of world trade. Foreign loans can be floated if investors are found, who are willing to take the risk. In the end, all other measures failing, the payments gap is closed by transfer of gold. The so-called "Big Ten" nations have engaged in a diligent search for an operable method of assisting even the affluent countries with short-run payments difficulties.

Second, it can be argued that our policy of budget deficits and their recent trend toward larger amounts have been an important factor in our balance of payments difficulty. This view is essentially correct but some qualifications should be noted.

Deficit financing, continued as long as it has been in our case, increases the money supply, which in turn exerts upward pressure on prices. Wage increases, granted not only as cost of living adjustments as prices rise but also as concessions in union bargaining, contribute to the spiraling interaction of prices and costs.

A high price market is a good place in which to sell but not so good in which to buy. Foreign producers push their wares in such a market, and foreign buyers turn elsewhere for better bargains. The rising imports of steel, automobiles, textiles and other products testify to the advantage of our inflation-induced "sellers" market. Rising costs and prices may have hurt our export volume, but despite the inflation we have still had a sufficient advantage, absolute and comparative, to maintain a substantial margin of exports over imports in the sector of private transactions, including visible and invisible items.

It would appear, therefore, that if the only factors involved up to now had been the private dealings between American business and individuals on one hand, and foreign business and individuals on the other, there would have been thus far no imbalance of payments against us. This does not mean that a reckless fiscal and monetary policy can be defended or that it could safely be pursued indefinitely. By such a policy we could, in time, price ourselves out of foreign markets by letting the cost-price spiral rise beyond the point of which the boasted American "know-how" could maintain a competitive position in world trade.

It does mean, however, that to the present the unbalancing factor in our international payments equation has not been the budget policy, damaging as that has been to the economy and the value of the dollar. Rather, it has been the outflow of Government spending abroad. Corollary to this outflow has been the diminishing confidence of foreigners in the dollar, induced by our own disregard for its value at home.

The foreign aid program began with the Marshall Plan, which was limited in amount and duration. The purpose was rehabilitation of war-damaged countries, and there was concern then over the "dollar gap," which meant that other countries did not have enough dollars to buy all that they needed, nor could they earn dollars until the war damage to their industrial complex had been repaired. Like almost every other Government program, foreign aid was not terminated as scheduled but was continued and expanded in amount and coverage. Since 1946 well over $100 billion have been spent, lent without recourse, or given away, and the dollar gap has been transformed into a dollar glut.

It follows that the principal source of both types of deficit has been the errors, wrong judgments and confused purposes of Government policy. After a period of large, rising budget deficits deliberately incurred in the mistaken view that a price-inflated rise in the GNP was as good as an increase of real output, the citizens are asked to pay higher taxes. After flooding the world with dollars in the mistaken view that we were thereby cementing firm friendships and buying solid support for democracy, American style, business firms and individuals are to be subjected to regulation and harassment.

NOT JUST TRIMMING

It is clear that remedial action, in the case of both types of deficit, must begin at the source of the trouble if anything like satisfactory long-term results are to be achieved. And it is a long-term problem in each case, not just a question of trimming the budget deficit or of shrinking the balance of payments gap for a year or so.

So much should be obvious. Nevertheless, most of the proposals thus far indicate, or imply, a short-run approach. The tax surcharge and the curbs on European travel are to be effective for two years. Mandatory control of foreign investment is not definitely limited, but its undue prolongation would seriously damage both political and economic relations with the countries to which it applies.

Two matters of particular concern stand out in the President's program made public at the year end. The first is the emphasis on the responsibility of business firms and individuals for reducing the payments gap, as if this gap had been caused by their excesses. Nothing was said in the official statement about reducing the cost of the Vietnam war or the scope of foreign aid. Instead, we are to "continue to meet our international responsibilities in defense of freedom" without a reappraisal of their effectiveness as a contribution to our own security.

The second conspicuous feature of the new program is its vulnerability to reprisal abroad, and its naive assumption that we can persuade other countries to adopt, in our behalf, measures exactly contrary to those we plan to apply against them.

For example, we shall stop foreign investment but we shall ask foreigners to buy more corporate and Treasury securities; we shall restrict foreign travel but we plan a program to attract more foreign visitors to this country; we shall ask our NATO allies to assume more of the cost of troop support in Europe, but to do this by purchasing more of the necessary supplies in our high-cost market; we shall ask countries with payments surpluses to bring their international accounts into equilibrium by exporting less and importing more. All of this is more of a strain than international altruism is likely to bear, especially when there has been time for second thoughts after the pressure missions sent to various countries to "explain" the new program.

LINT-PICKING APPROACH

An example of lint-picking in the official statement is the instruction to the Secretary of Defense to "find ways to reduce the foreign exchange impact of personal spending by U.S. forces and their dependents in Europe." The most effective way to do this would be to limit such spending to the post exchanges and to stock these exchanges with American products only. It would then be off limits for a soldier's wife to buy even radishes and strawberries in a local market.

Beyond doubt, the future stability of the dollar is a matter of grave concern for the entire trading and investing world. Much too late the gravity of the situation has had official attention, but the contradictory and self-defeating program that the President's advisers have produced is inadequate and unconvincing. These advisers would have served the President and the country better if they had coupled their insistence on a tax increase with a really drastic reduction of the budget. This would convince the people that higher taxes would not be used to support spending as usual.

These advisers should also have pointed out that the record of our foreign spending, lending and giving away has not been, in all respects, a tribute to our managerial skill and political acumen, and that a searching review of foreign commitments could be profitable contribution to reduction of the payments gap. It is futile to rely for very long on the good will and cooperation of other nations to eliminate this gap, and it will be disastrous to continue doling out, or pouring out, gold for the purpose.

After that, and once reckless spending in excess of income at home has been halted, the stability of the dollar at home and abroad will be assured. No other course is likely to save it.

Travel Levy Looks Worse

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago Daily News editorial on Monday, February 12, contained a very thought provoking analysis of the President's foolhardy travel tax proposal. The editorial follows:

TRAVEL LEVY LOOKS WORSE

The more we hear about the proposed tax on travel overseas the worse it sounds.

Even if it works as its authors intend, it would not cut the so-called tourist deficit by half a billion dollars, as some have contended, but only by $100,000,000. The rest of this half billion would be domestic revenue, from the tax itself and from increased customs collections. This has no bearing on the international balance of payments.

Washington has been using a figure of $2 billion for the extent of the present tourist deficit. This is artificially high. In 1966 the deficit was $1.6 billion, including a questionable transportation item. Without this it was only about $1 billion. American tourists visiting Expo 67 in Montreal, a once-in-a-lifetime occurrence, accounted for most of the increase last year, and their spending would not have been affected by the proposed tax.

The tax plainly invites retaliation at a time when the tourist pendulum is swinging strongly toward a balance without these restrictions. Americans spent $1.4 billion in foreign countries other than Mexico and Canada in 1966, an increase of 41 per cent in six years. Foreigners from these other countries spent $560,000,000 in the United States in 1966, an increase of 155 per cent in six years. This promising growth is nearly four times as rapid as that of U.S. tourist spending and offers the only long-range answer to the problem. Foreign countermeasures, like those the United States now proposes, could halt this development quickly.

The announced tourist deficit takes no account of sizable purchases by foreign countries of U.S.-built aircraft and similar travel-connected dollar spending. Air France, for example, has bought or ordered jets worth $410,000,000 in recent years, with options amounting to another $300,000,000. The company will spend $37,000,000 of its dollar earnings this year for operating expenses in this country, another $30,000,000 for aircraft components and spare parts, and is installing a $30,000,000 U.S. computer system.

If international traffic is cut back by U.S. action at least some of these outlays will be curtailed. Japan has cautioned it might have to reconsider jetliner orders in the United States. There are many vulnerable points.

Most ominous of all, the tourist tax seems slated in Congress to become a stringbag for any number of other protectionist measures. Their individual backers, lumped together, could override the genuine and justified opposition to the travel tax as such. In an election year the temptations to indulge in this congressional horsetrading are magnified. A generation of hard-won progress toward freer trade and travel, with all their multiple benefits, could be reversed.

Project Ketch: Underground Explosion of AEC

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 there will be a forum at Lock Haven, Pa., to discuss the proposed atomic explosion for the creation of an underground natural gas storage area near the Clinton-Clearfield County line.

I would suggest that the sure way to halt such a plan is for the Commonwealth to insist that Columbia Gas System Service Corp., sole beneficiary of any such project, assume full liability for whatever damages might occur to water, land, property, and people.

If the company, which is promoting expenditure of enormous Federal funds so that it will have a subsidized reservoir to store its product, is willing to put its assets on the line to protect the innocent public, then perhaps citizens of the Commonwealth will have a measure of safety assurance that is otherwise absent. There is certainly no reason for the Atomic Energy Commission or any other Government agency to accept responsibility for the property and health hazards that can come from an atomic explosion and the accompanying release of radioactive gases.

Many Pennsylvania residents have already been subjected to heavy shock by the proposal to set off a blast in the Clinton-Clearfield County area when final results of the pilot test in New Mexico last December may not be known for another year or two.

The AEC's underground spree is another indication of the need for investigating the Commission and its programs. If, as reported in the Washington Post of January 31, there are to be between 40 and 50 atomic underground explosions in the coming year, Congress should determine whether the cost justifies the need. If the experiments are necessary to the defense of this country, there will be no objection; if they are no more essential than the blast proposed for Pennsylvania, then it is time to find out why they are even under consideration at a time when the administration budget is so far out of balance.

Congress will also want to know how many AEC employees are engaged in this type of activity and whether or not it would be possible to reduce personnel in the interest of economy.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to insert in the RECORD three items from the Pittsburgh Press. The first, an editorial appearing last December 12, points up the possible danger of the underground blasts and asks to what extent the Government should provide subsidies for private profit. On January 26, one news story quoted a Pittsburgh professor who warns against permitting the proposed blast in Pennsylvania and another explained the length of time required to determine the results of the New Mexico experiment. The articles follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Dec. 12, 1967]

CRANKING UP "GASBUGGY"

"Project Gasbuggy" was a rather self-disparaging title for an event of such era-opening promise. The world's first commercial nuclear explosion underground in Northwest New Mexico Sunday.

Phase one, at least, was a success. A 26-kiloton atomic bomb stuffed into a 4240-foot hole was fired with a rumble heard 55 miles away. (Hiroshima was hit with a 20-kiloton A-bomb.)

The Atomic Energy Commission, which set off the blast in co-operation with the El Paso Natural Gas Co., said it worked; that is, it melted and vaporized enough rock to produce a skyscraper size gas storage tank deep underground. And no radiation is said to have escaped to the surface.

It will take months of "cooling" and testing, however, before the final results are in. If gas flows copiously into the storage tank, as expected, and is sufficiently free of nuclear contamination, "Gasbuggy" will turn into a Cadillac. And if other areas could be exploited similarly, the nation's gas reserves could be doubled (from the present 317 trillion cubic feet).

Even before "Gasbuggy" was fired, other companies were planning other peaceful atomic explosions to extend copper mining, oil extraction and coal mining.

The blast Sunday (which took place across the state from the first A-bomb test at Alamogordo in July, 1945) opens the door to the exploitation of a whole new world of natural riches now locked deep in the earth.

As we enter into this era, however, let's remember two things: we are playing with fire, and we are dealing in big money.

Despite an understandable eagerness to use nuclear explosions to exploit natural resources, there have to be absolutely foolproof safeguards against the leakage of radiation. We can't have that stuff on the loose.

It is very well for the Government and industry to co-operate in this endeavor. But we are going to get into the question of what belongs to the people and what is open to private industry. The "shale oil" question—the estimated $3.5 trillion of oil in Rocky Mountain beds—is an example.

Should the U.S. conduct the explosion for a fee and let companies reap windfall profits? Or should the resources be regarded as in the public domain and profits used for public purposes (such as digging us out of the national debt, which now stands at 345 billion dollars)?

Congress should be debating this issue. As the "Gasbuggy" explosion shows, we are rapidly heading into a new era.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 26, 1968]

PITT PROF RAPS A-BLAST PLAN—GAS-CAVITY PROJECT CALLED HAZARDOUS

A Pittsburgh professor of radiation-physics urged today in a letter to Gov. Raymond P. Shafer a change in the site of the proposed experimental "Project Ketch" underground atomic explosion.

Prof. Ernest J. Sternglass, a consistent critic of underground atomic blasts, criticized the proposed explosion to create a test gas-storage cavity 30 miles north of State College, Centre County.

The professor cited "serious potential health hazards to the poulation of our state that could arise if the . . . explosion . . . were to be carried out."

Dr. Sternglass suggested that the sponsoring Columbia Gas Co. and Livermore Laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission be required to perform any such experiment somewhere else.

He added that such a site should be "in areas of low population density, far from the large dairy-farming regions of Eastern Pennsylvania."

Otherwise, he warned, radioactivity "might be released into the atmosphere" if anything goes wrong with the experiment's massive safety precautions—such as planning the blast three miles under solid rock.

"An accidental release of even small amounts of radioactive iodine-131 and strontium-90 would do irreparable harm," he said—possibly even threatening infants and unborn children with leukemia.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 26, 1968]

GASBUGGY SUCCESS HINTED—NEW MEXICO PROJECT MAY NEED 1 TO 2 YEARS FOR FINAL RESULTS

The underground nuclear explosion, detonated last Dec. 10 in New Mexico to release natural gas, may have been successful, U.S. officials at the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva report.

Project Gasbuggy liberated a great amount of gas and the radioactivity in the gas was less than had been expected. Final results of the Government-industry experiment, however, may not be known for one to two years, participants in the project caution.

Use of nuclear explosives to form an underground gas storage area in Pennsylvania have been discussed.

Preliminary technical data was released yesterday on the project of the El Paso Natural Gas Co., the U.S. Dept. of Interior's Bureau of Mines and the Atomic Energy Commission to determine whether nuclear explosives can be used to stimulate the production and recovery of natural gas from formation where gas can not be economically recoverable under present methods.

Vietnam War Petition

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 19 members of the William Roger Greeley chapter of the Laymen's League, the First Parish Church in Lexington, Mass., have sent me an important and timely petition in regard to the conduct of the Vietnam war and I am submitting it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It merits the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives, for I think that the statements of this conscientious group of citizens reflect the growing concern throughout the Nation.

The petition follows:

We believe that United States policy with respect to Vietnam is leading to an "escalation of moral numbness." We are especially disturbed by the recent statement by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Barnett that an individual can be moral but that a nation should not always be expected to act morally.

We feel that in order to put Vietnam in proper perspective the United States government should: (a) deal more realistically with the meaning of the cold war, (b) develop and enunciate a clearer policy toward China, and (c) examine the morality of our position in Vietnam.

More on New Haven's Community Progress, Inc.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1968, I am introducing parts 3 and 4 of the New Haven Register's series on Community Progress, Inc., New Haven's community action program, as follows:

CPI IN CONFLICT: RESEARCH DOLLARS BUY CONFUSION, NO CONCLUSION

(By William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas)

The deeper the exploration of CPI "research" the greater the evidences of confusion, the fewer the indications of the kind of "conclusions" which Webster defines.

"Research: . . . critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having for its aim the discovery of new facts and their correct interpretation, the revision of accepted conclusions, theories or laws in the light of newly discovered facts, or the practical applications of such new or revised conclusions." (*Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.*)

U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo has charged that Community Progress research efforts "have wasted $625,000". Some of this impression, say CPI officials, springs from the fact that the agency has been given money to make several highly theoretical studies which do not have an instant "practical" application in the war on poverty. But even where down-to-earth results might be expected, Community Progress seems to stub its research toe.

Even more startling, the CPI Manpower Division has been spending about $65,000 a year on employment and training data since 1965. This averages out to more than $1,000 a week for research analysis of what the Manpower Division is doing. Yet there seems almost nothing—in the middle of this public crisis for CPI—which the Manpower Division can produce to show the effectiveness of its overall program—and very little to describe specifically what is going on.

CPI research for the New Haven Housing Authority was designed to get sociological data on the placement of large, low-income families in private dwellings through rent subsidies. According to CPI's report to the Ford Foundation, this study was finished a year ago for use of the Housing Authority. However, Director of Public Housing Robert T. Wolfe said last week that the report has not yet been completed "satisfactorily."

It is "too long and wordy," said Wolfe, who further explained it is in the process of being tightened up before it is forwarded to federal officials.

The editing job has now been going on for a year or more. Although the report's "evaluation" is good, Wolfe said, the final payment on the $30,000 contract with PCI has not been made because it has not been officially accepted.

The research work covered the initial 27 families in the Housing Authority's program. The contract was signed in 1963. It wasn't until two years later, in 1965, that the actual research began because that was when the large, low-income families were first placed in private accommodations in different city neighborhoods. The CPI study was to reach conclusions which New Haven could use in enlarging the "scattered site" plan.

Apparently pushed by the need to take action in providing poor people with housing regardless of delays in delivering the survey, Wolfe's agency has gone ahead and placed a total of 174 families in private housing. He expects to provide similar quarters for another 100 or more in the near future.

WELFARE AGENCIES STUDY

Still another early research effort financed by CPI was designed to help the Community Council of New Haven find out what persons were using what New Haven social and welfare agencies and how often.

Some $28,000 was spent for a 2½-year period simply considering the best ways to proceed with this project. The project itself was never carried out.

But the Community Council did attempt to get money from both the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Ford Foundation to put the plan into effect. It asked OEO for $600,000. The Council was turned away at both places, apparently because those in charge of giving out the money felt the plan of action was much too complicated, and saw little hope of success. So perhaps the initial $28,000 pre-study study paid off as a sort of caution signal.

Reportedly, the plan has since been simplified and there is a possibility the Council may secure some funds to put it into effect.

DELAYED RELEASE

Another report, an attempt to evaluate a Unified Social Services (USS) project here that poured in extensive welfare services for poor people in the Farnam Courts housing project was dated August 1967.

Strangely, it was one of only two reports—others remain unavailable—that were released to The Register by CPI just a few days ago. The other just-released report, concerning CPI's "neighborhood services," was dated Dec. 1, 1965. The delay in releasing the reports is something CPI officials explain with silence.

The USS-study points out, as now seems more or less customary at CPI, that "the original plan for evaluation (of the Unified Social Services project) . . . could not be completed because of a discontinuance in federal funding."

It also says, "The question of whether Unified Social Services was generally effective or not cannot be answered definitively because of the lack of comparison groups of residents who did not receive social services."

Thus, in a couple of opening sentences a kind of bar-door excuse (one that can swing in either direction) seems to be established for any failure in the whole research effort. First, it's incomplete because there isn't enough money; and second, you can't check the accuracy because there's no control-group to use in making sensible comparisons.

Aside from this, the report on Unified Social Services seems to be a standard example of that kind of sociological study which leaves ordinary citizens and ordinary readers bemused. One of its apparently-significant paragraphs says:

"In summary it appears that non-professional involvement leads to more input in cases but better outcomes occur for medium contact cases when both professional and non-professionals are involved. Although long-term cases in general are more successful, however, this success rate is only slightly higher than that achieved by medium contact cases served by the combination of professional and non-professional. From a program planning point of view, therefore, it would seem that the most efficient use of resources may require that professional-non-professional team social service be preferred with cases of medium input. This would maximize success at reduced costs because of less amount of service and use of lower paid non-professionals."

The statement is taken out of context and it is made in professional terms. But it may illustrate, to some degree, the difficulties that CPI has had with applying research to reality.

REPORT'S PURPOSE

The basic purpose of this USS research report was to relate CPI "opportunity" programs in employment, education, and housing to the various neighborhood social services which were to help the poor be more successful in those programs. The report avoids hard and firm conclusions about how successful any single one of these general categories of CPI efforts might have been.

But it does note more relative success in employment and housing than in education and it suggests—in another totally unsurprising deduction—that "the immediacy of the payoff" may be the "key factor that determines successful outcomes." This conclusion seems to mean, very simply, that a poor person is likely to respond more enthusiastically and strive more earnestly for something with an immediate advantage for him—like a job or a low-rent apartment—than for something as relatively vague as a grammar school diploma.

PRACTICAL RESEARCH

Turning to the more "practical" or "management oriented" research, the CPI report to Ford of last year points out "The most heavily evaluated programs have been in manpower and employment. On the other end of the scale, perhaps the most poorly evaluated have been in community participation and education. Reports and studies from the various programs are not uniform in format or approach, because of the ad hoc patchwork style of development."

Joseph Marci, director of the CPI Manpower Division, points out that the separate employment and training data collection and processing unit has cost CPI about $65,000 a year since 1965. This is where an average of $1,000 a week for manpower data comes in. Yet he admits there is no data on the effectiveness of the overall program, and very little on specific parts of it. CPI does not know, for example, how many of the people who were placed on jobs are still on them, what quality of jobs they hold or what financial gains—if any—they have made. The $65,000 is separate and distinct from CPI's "Research Division" costs. The two major CPI divisions each had their own data departments, techniques—and costs. These divisions are Manpower and Community Services formerly Neighborhood Services.

EDUCATION UNIT

In educational areas the same inconclusiveness prevails.

Concerning the Ford Foundation education unit in the Board of Education from 1963–1965, the 1967 report to Ford also points out, "Very little in the way of conclusive results emerged from any of these studies."

But, in general, it goes on, none of the programs studied "seemed to have much impact on the overall quality of classroom education." The report concludes a "more general total attack on the problem should be made."

The new focus, it says, should be on the "way the system operates so that the structure and pattern can be changed to more nearly fit the individual needs of students."

But except for these reformist implications the CPI research on education seems just as unspecific as the analysis in other fields.

A report which CPI compiled and submitted to the Ford Foundation last summer was entitled "New Directions"—and it may have something specific to say in regard to New Haven educational programs, plans, and projects.

But CPI has repeatedly refused to release this document to the press or to the public—because, as one CPI official explained it, CPI is afraid of unduly "Raising hopes."

What is necessarily one of the great oddities—and one of the great ironies—of the way CPI has mired itself in its own swampy research, is the fact that the research specialists of a great university, Yale, have done little or nothing to keep it on the right track.

Back in its original 1962 presentation—outlining with Ford Foundation dollars the "Opening Opportunities" in New Haven—Community Progress, Inc. attached to the document a letter signed by Kingman Brewster Jr., Yale University president:

"I want to record Yale's support and my personal enthusiasm for the program of social and educational development for which New Haven seeks support from the Ford Foundation . . . I see the proposed program as an opportunity for mutual benefit and contribution on the part of both the City and the University."

YALE INDIVIDUALS

In 1967, however, the picture had changed. "Individual Yale faculty members participate (in research) from time to time, but it is difficult to engage them for sustained periods," says one report made last summer to the Ford Foundation.

"Yale and other local colleges and universities have been involved with CPI in numerous effective, though scattered and unco-ordinatad, ways," it says in another place. And finally in a more plaintive vein, it asks the question: "Where do agencies such as CPI look for research work and assistance?"

The question is a good one—primarily because the welter of mixed-up, uninformative, and unfinished research projects at CPI is a real and immediate dilemma for New Haven citizens who expect so much of CPI.

CPI IN CONFLICT: BRAIN DRAIN TAKING ITS TOLL ON EFFORT HERE

(By Donald Dallas and William E. Keish, Jr.)

"Deputy Director, with demonstrated administrative and supervisory experience in public agency management or related field. Excellent fringe benefits. Salary open." (A CPI want ad.)

"And a-way we go!" (Comedian Jackie Gleason.)

New Haven's "Opening Opportunities" program has helped not only to find work for some of the city's hard-core unemployed, but it also has opened many employment opportunities for top-salaried Community Progress Inc. (CPI) executives and planners who have left here for bigger and better paying jobs.

"CPI has been one of the nation's most important training groups for leaders in anti-poverty and urban-improvement programs," according to CPI itself.

For instance, of the 19 highest-paid persons listed on the CPI payroll in May, 1966—19 months ago—only six are still with the anti-poverty organization.

If Milton A. Brown, the $20,000-per-year director of the community services division, had to sing a chorus of "That Old Gang of Mine," he would have to do a solo. He's the only one of the original top men who has stayed with the operation since 1962.

FORMER OFFICIALS

Gone are Mitchell Sviridoff, the first executive director of CPI; George Bennett, original director of the manpower division; Howard Hallman, deputy director under Sviridoff; Bernard Shiffman, director of program development and training; Elmer Luchterhand, director of the research division; David A. Altschuler, director of administration; and Miss Mary White, educational consultant, all of whom had a hand in plotting the course taken by CPI.

In a recent news release, CPI said:

"In its five-year history, CPI has attracted a considerable number of well qualified professionals who, though they could have commanded higher salaries in private industry or with other agencies, chose to work in New Haven because of the challenge and promise they found here."

"In casting their lot with the New Haven program, they have exposed themselves to controversy and harassment by elements in the community which have not seriously attempted to understand or work with the purposes and methods of a human resources program. Moreover, the uncertain funding of the anti-poverty program is such that no employe is assured of tenure or the normal protections associated with other kinds of employment."

While CPI thus assumes its standard posture of self-praise, about the activities and progress of executive-level personnel, there are some people who feel that the comings-and-goings in key offices have not helped the program.

"Whatever you want to call it, 'Upward Bound,' 'Opening Opportunities,' 'Headstart,' 'Higher Horizons'—you name it and the executives had it," says one humorously inclined employe of Community Progress. "They all liked Jackie Gleason's catch-phrase, 'Away we go!' "

SVIRIDOFF DEPARTS

Of all the departures, Director Mitchell Sviridoff's was obviously the biggest blow to leadership and continuity in CPI.

Jeanne R. Lowe, in her 1967 book "Cities in a Race With Time," writes: "One important and informed observer from outside New Haven has suggested that Community Progress did not start early enough to plan programs with the people and develop the talents in neighborhoods. He feels that CPI has been authoritarian and has been imposed on the people from the top. 'If you pull Mike (Sviridoff) out, nothing is there, because the people haven't been utilized enough.' "

New Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz seems to agree, in susbtance, with the kernel of this criticism. Describing the "one error" of the CPI early years in an address last Tuesday before the Rotary Club, Spitz stated that CPI "did not involve the people of the ghetto as they should have been." One member of the CPI Board of Directors, who feels that a number of the Giaimo criticisms are valid, dated the time of major CPI internal troubles with Sviridoff's apparently-sudden departure to the Lindsay administration in New York.

Sviridoff had been working part time with Lindsay, building up a human resources "plan" for New York. But he had assured the CPI Board of Directors he would not take the New York job on a permanent basis, the board member asserted.

Sviridoff, who was making $25,000 per year when he left New Haven, took the New York Human Resources Administration post at $40,000. The search for a new executive director thus had to be launched with little if any advance warning, and it was many months before the board could find Spitz to take the helm of CPI.

After a year with Lindsay, Sviridoff again made headlines with a surprise announcement of his resignation from that key post to take a $50,000 a year job as executive vice president for Urban Affairs of the Ford Foundation. The New York Times wrote an editorial accusing Sviridoff of copping out when things got rough. Sviridoff argued it was a better job, and would give him more opportunity to influence national policy.

WORK IMPEDED

Other executive "opportunities" also hurt CPI in its attempt to open new opportunities to the poor. In the report of last summer to the Ford Foundation, for example, CPI points out:

"Several factors which the agency is working to offset have impeded the development of citizen participation at the level and rate originally projected. One has been the departure of several experienced staff members to direct community action programs in other cities." New people, obviously, would have to get to know the neighborhoods and their people before they could help develop further citizen participation.

"Fortunately," the report goes on, "they have been replaced, in most cases, by staff members with excellent potential. The training of these persons has been accelerated so that adequately trained and seasoned staff will be available for the citizen—participation program."

Apparently this has not been enough. CPI director Spitz is presently still in the process of assembling his own team to run the operation.

And CPI is currently looking for not only a deputy director, but it is also advertising for a director of program development to plan community action programs with resident groups.

Another criticism of this movement "upward and out" is directed by CPI, in the Ford report, not only to the top-level administrators, but also to the indigenous personnel it trains.

"In a number of instances," says the report, "the very success of CPI opportunity programs have proved to be an obstacle to the participation (by the poor) effort.

"This is because leaders in the participation structure have moved from their original neighborhoods as the opportunity programs have helped them to improve their economic condition. In some cases, the community action program has stimulated these leaders to enroll in school or in advanced opportunity programs, leaving them without the time required for neighborhood leadership."

One of many critics who feels strongly that this "up and out" process in neighborhood leadership should be reversed to "up and back," is the Rev. Robert Jones, executive director of the Fair Haven Parents Ministry, a social service program partially financed by CPI.

Like the others, Jones feels strongly that indigenous leaders should be encouraged to work in their home neighborhoods, to share the results of their training and opportunity programs with the more unfortunate. CPI apparently feels this way too, but has not yet shown an ability to change its structure or incentives to encourage such movement.

Complains Jones: "So much of their money has gone into research. That's a thing of the past."

"You go into the community itself, and find out from the community itself, what services need to be offered."

INADEQUATE STAFF

This is what CPI itself has several times said it plans to do. But whatever its original well-staffed situation, it apparently does not have the staff to do the job at present.

The fact is, the first-level originators at CPI have gone—and the agency is now under "second-generation" leadership all the way.

Sviridoff is at the Ford Foundation, where he repeatedly refuses to be interviewed by The Register about his views on CPI.

Bennett is the director of the Federal government's community-action agency. Hallman is chief consultant to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower. Shiffman is the deputy commissioner of the New York City Welfare Department. Luchterhand is teaching at Columbia and Brooklyn Colleges. Altschuler has resigned to resume his business.

Besides Altschuler, who was serving as director of the division of administration at $18,000-per-year, other recent CPI losses included Isadore Wexler, who received an annual salary of $14,292 as a department specialist; the comptroller, James T. Melillo Jr., who was paid $12,360 a year; and Edmund Clark, the assistant director of the Community Action Institute, whose salary was $11,000.

Wexler, like Altschuler, resigned, while Melillo and Clark took jobs with the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington, D.C. In both instances, they received higher salaries than what CPI paid them.

SALARY DISPUTE

The departure of Melillo and Clark was used by Spitz in rebutting criticism levelled by U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo about high salaries of CPI personnel. If CPI's salaries are so high, argued Spitz, how come these men left for better paying positions with the federal government.

When Sviridoff left, that was also the signal for many others to start looking elsewhere for jobs. Among them was Thomas Seesel, who was the director of project processing and review. He is now director of the division on Equal Opportunity in the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

Others who have left CPI, the positions they held here, and the new jobs they hold, are as follows:

Rocco Fazio, a former administrative assistant, to manpower specialist, North Carolina Fund: Edward Fortes, former manpower evalutaor, to director of the New Haven Commission on Equal Opportunity (CEO): William Iverson, former associate director of the Community Action Institute, to director of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Center, Russell McCabe, former Job Corps coordinator, to the manpower section of the Department of Labor in Boston; Samuel Santoro, former director of the Elm Haven project, to the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources in Pittsburgh, Pa.; Leonard Weller, former associate research director, to the teaching staff at Bar Ilan University, Israel; and William Will, former associate director of program development and training, to director of the Philadelphia Model Cities Program.

OTHERS WHO LEFT

Others who have departed the CPI staff are:

Alfred Dennis, Job Corps coordinator, to director of placement and job development Job Corps, New York City; Lawrence Shobe, social worker, to executive director, Greater Middletown Community Action Agency; Margaret McMillan, a CPI co-ordinator, to field representative and program analyst with OEO; Robert Hill, of the Community Action Institute, to director of the Opportunities Industrial Center; Jon Christianson, a vocational cquncilor, to the Community Renewal Team, Hartford; Alex Harth, assistant coordinator of the Unified Social Services demonstration program, and John Pollard, neighborhood worker in Fair Haven, to the Connecticut Department of Community Affairs, Hartford; Arthur Solomon, an assistant to the Manpower director, to Manpower director, United Progress Organization, Washington; Richard Brooks, assistant to Sviridoff, to director of the Thames Valley Community Action Program; Allan Talbot, director of administration, to Urban America Inc., Washington; and Francis Looney, director of Unified Social Services, to the social work department, Hartford Board of Education.

Among those who have gone to the Boston community-action agency in directors' positions are Thomas Flood, a former CPI neighborhood co-ordinator in the Hill; Donald Forest, a former Manpower evaluator; and Burton Carlson, a former member of the project processing and program review staff.

This is an impressive list of alumni for an agency five years old.

The "proof of the high calibre of CPI personnel, past and present, is the large number who have moved on to much higher-paying positions in the northeast and elsewhere in the nation," says CPI—in implicit defense of a high salary schedule for executives and junior executives.

But stability and a sense of local commitment might have accomplished more for CPI than its role as a rung on the ladder to success. The problem today is that the programs must all be staffed and restaffed by new administrators while the same poor people in the same poor neighborhoods wait for the CPI promises to bear fruit for them, too.

St. Valentine Day Massacre in Indiana

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my protest against what can only be described as a "St. Valentine Day Massacre" which took place in my State of Indiana yesterday, February 14, 1968.

The massacre to which I refer is no less than the massacre of the legislative process by two judges of the U.S. court, and their decision yesterday poses a problem so grave in terms of the fair and equitable process of our system of government that I call on the House Committee on the Judiciary immediately to conduct an investigation of their action.

The action of which I speak was a decision handed down by a 2-to-1 majority of a three-judge Federal panel in a case involving the correction of the 1965 congressional districting statute passed by the Indiana Legislature which plan was in 1967 found unconstitutional.

There are several reasons that I have in making so serious a charge and why I feel that an investigation is in order.

In 1965 the Indiana General Assembly passed a statute creating 11 congresisonal districts. In 1967 this statute was declared unconstitutional on grounds that it did not conform to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling.

The Indiana General Assembly, however, in 1967, as at present is a politically divided one with a Republican House and a Democratic Senate, and was not able to come to agreement on a statute correcting the districts so as to conform them to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote doctrine.

In view of the action of this Congress last year to prohibit at-large congressional elections the only recourse in this situation was for a three-judge Federal Court to make the appropriate corrections. The three-judge court, however, in a 2-to-1 decision went far beyond the appropriate bonds of judicial action and almost completely rewrote the 11 congressional districts of Indiana. The two-judge majority ignored for the most part the existing 1965 constitutional districts and wrote a completely new plan with the obvious purpose of defeating incumbent Democratic Congressmen from Indiana and replacing them with Republicans. In order to achieve this nakedly political purpose the two Federal judges, both Republicans and one a former Republican State chairman in Indiana who was appointed to the Federal bench on the recommendation of the U.S. Senator William Jenner, drew up a plan that moved an estimated 1.215 million citizens of Indiana into new congressional districts, more than one quarter of the people in Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that this politically motivated judicial gerrymandering is gravely vulnerable on at least two counts. In the first place the court usurped the prerogative of the Legislature of Indiana by completely revamping the congressional district lines. In four other States where congressional districting has been declared unconstitutional and where the Federal courts have corrected them, the courts recognized the last expression of the State legislature as being the starting point of adjusting districts in order to conform with the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote mandate, and the courts in all these cases made only those corrections necessary to increase the underpopulated districts and decrease the overpopulated districts so as to bring them in line with the one-man, one-vote doctrine.

The Indiana case represents the first time that a three-judge Federal court has taken upon itself to get into the political thicket of such a case and to usurp the legislative powers of a State government.

I think it is more important in this respect, Mr. Speaker, to quote here from the dissenting opinion of Judge S. Hugh Dillon. He said:

> It is not, however, constitutionally permissible for this court to enter the political arena as the majority has done and to impose upon the powers of a coordinate political department, the General Assembly of Indiana, by adopting a re-districting scheme of its own devising bearing no reasonable relationship to the plan last adopted by the last General Assembly. The plain error into which the majority has fallen is that it has misconceived the failure of the politically divided General Assembly to enact a new districting plan to have somehow given carte blanche to this court or to a majority thereof, to usurp all legislative prerogatives and to attack the problem as if Chapter 205 of the Acts 1965 [1965 State statute] . . . had never been enacted. But such is not the law, on the contrary, all courts which have spoken on the subject have unanimously held that the judicial power is limited to reviewing the last (albeit unconstitutional) legislative act and to making such corrections as are *necessary* to bring it into conformity with the "one man, one vote" principal. This must be so since it has long been the law that the courts have no power to perform administrative actions.

In my judgment, here, it should be pointed out that only 140,000 persons needed to be moved from their existing districts in order to bring the three underpopulated districts and the eight overpopulated districts in line with the Supreme Court one-man, one-vote doctrine.

As Judge Dillon stated further in his dissenting opinion—

> The majority plan moves a total of 1,215,606 persons from districts created by Chapter 205 into other districts! This gross deviation of more than one thousand percent demonstrates beyond a doubt that the majority plan is not an objective one of necessary correction, but rather is an original and novel plan conforming only to the subjective impulses of the majority.

The congressional redistricting plan adopted by the two Republican judges has a greater deviation in population than a plan passed by the Senate of the Indiana General Assembly of 1967. Moreover, Judge Dillon demonstrates in his dissenting opinion that by moving 140,000 people in the 1965 plan of the Indiana Legislature the one-man, one-vote doctrine can become a reality in Indiana in that, by splitting only four townships out of more than one thousand townships in Indiana and by splitting only 12 of 92 counties in Indiana, the 1965 plan of the legislature can be brought directly in line with the one-man, one-vote doctrine. Indeed, were this done, the greatest deviation in any one district from the ideal population would be 118 persons while the greatest variation in any district in the plan adopted by the Republican judges has a variation of 6,705.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of the House of Representatives, whatever their party, can only be offended at this St. Valentine's Day massacre of the legislative process by politically motivated Federal judges for what can happen in one state can surely happen in another State. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, renew my call on the House Judiciary Committee to make a full and thorough investigation of this action.

The 47th Anniversary of Armenian People's Revolt Against Soviet Union

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 18 will mark the 47th anniversary of the Armenian people's revolt against the Soviet Union. Despite their heroism, however, the brave Armenians were overcome by force of arms and remain to this day captives of communism. They are, unfortunately, forbidden to celebrate this great day in their history by their present Red tyrants.

The uprising of the Armenian people in 1921 was especially tragic since the Soviets has seized their land only 2 months earlier under the guise of protecting it. Freedom-loving people everywhere share the desire of the Armenians to be free and independent, and we must take practical steps to keep up their courage and determination.

One effective method of calling the world's attention to the captivity of millions of Armenians and other peoples would be for the House to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Another would be for the Voice of America to provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave Armenian people and all the other captives of communism. We must use every means available to deliver the message of truth to them so that their resistance will not be weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

President Johnson's Proposal To Assure the Citizen Healthy, Wholesome, Edible Fish Products

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I welcome President Johnson's recommendation that we pass the Wholesome Fish Act of 1968, and I trust the House will move quickly to comply with his request. This is a piece of consumer protection legislation we have long needed.

The President is correct. The regulation of fish and fish products in the United States is spotty and ineffectual, varying greatly among jurisdictions. There are voluntary programs, and there are compulsory programs, but neither kind is very successful.

The Public Health Service, for example, has administered the national shellfish sanitation program since 1925. With the help of various States and agency representatives, the Public Health Service has supervised growing areas and plant processing and has encouraged State certification of shellfish shippers. But there is no direct Federal control over intrastate production, and the voluntary nature of the program reduces its effectiveness.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior operates another voluntary program. It makes a fee-for-service inspection available to any applicant having a financial interest in a fish product. But coverage of products, plants, and vessels is small —only about 1 percent—and the Bureau has no way to condemn or to restrict the movement of low-quality seafood.

Perhaps the most effective program is administered by the Food and Drug Administration under provisions of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Factory inspection and laboratory analysis of samples ensure the integrity of products covered.

But the Food and Drug Administration program, limited to interstate commerce, cannot take in fish products packed and marketed within a State. It can inspect only a fraction of American processing plants. It has no capability to survey fish or fish products packed in foreign countries.

It is true that we already have a variety of fish inspection programs, but gaps in the laws are allowing billions of pounds of uninspected fish and fish products to reach the unsuspecting consumer. I urge the House to support the President's request for the Wholesome Fish Act of 1968. This act is needed to assure the housewife and the citizen that the food they place on their table is safe, wholesome, and edible.

Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., one of the three major drug firms presently involved in an antibiotics antitrust suit, has their home plant in my congressional district. It has come to my attention that the president of the company, Mr. John J. Powers, Jr., in his concern for the integrity of the company and the impact this litigation will have on the company and its employees, sent a letter to all Pfizer employees giving them his word and views on the antitrust suit.

At this point, I include with my remarks Mr. Powers' letter and the press statement mentioned in that letter:

CHAS. PFIZER & CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 8, 1968.

To All Pfizer Employees:

As you know, a jury in the Federal Court in Manhattan rendered a verdict on December 29th against Pfizer, American Cyanamid and Bristol-Myers (Squibb and Upjohn were charged as co-conspirators but not defendants) in the antibiotics antitrust suit filed in 1961 by the Department of Justice and covering events which occurred in the period 1953–1961. I am enclosing a copy of the press statement which states the Company's position on the verdict.

To our press statement I want to add my personal word—I was in the top management of our Company at that time and I tell you *there was no conspiracy* to fix prices or monopolize the market for broad spectrum antibiotics or anything else. We will appeal and we will continue to fight to win.

My concern and yours too is, first of all, the integrity of the Company and, second, the impact this may have on the Company. I want to talk to you personally and directly about these two points and give you some of my impressions about the case.

My main interest is that you should understand that the integrity of the Company is untouched by this inference case. This was a case based as we said in our release on "unjustified inference and suspicion" and nothing else. There was no direct evidence of conspiracy submitted by the government. It seems to me that the primary element in this case was pricing and the contention by the government that an *inference* of conspiracy among Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, Upjohn and Pfizer should be drawn from the fact that during the period November 1953 to July 1960 there was a close similarity and stability of *published catalog prices* among these companies for tetracycline products as well as Terramycin and Aureomycin, and further, that these prices were unusually and suspiciously high. Yet no satisfactory standard was provided by the government as to what constitutes a "high" price or as to whether the prices listed by the companies were unusual or unique for significant new discoveries in the pharmaceutical industry.

It is a peculiarity of this case that the government did not go back to the beginning of the broad spectrum market which it defined as including Aureomycin, Terramycin, the tetracycline products and, interestingly, Chloromycetin, although Parke, Davis was not included in the suit. The fact is that broad spectrum catalog prices were reduced four times prior to 1953 and this showed a familiar pattern of activity for a new drug market. Broad spectrum products were priced at closely similar levels prior to 1953 and this similarity continued after 1953, obviously not as the result of any action taken in 1953.

The government chose the settlement of the tetracycline patent interference between Pfizer and Cyanamid in November/December 1953 as marking the beginning of the alleged "conspiracy". And the settlement two years later of the Pfizer infringement action against Bristol, Squibb and Upjohn was claimed to be the time when these three companies joined the inferred "conspiracy". But even the evidence submitted by the government indicated that both these settlements had normal, even obvious, business reasons and there was no evidence that any understanding about price or monopolization was arrived at by those who negotiated these settlements. Nor was it claimed that either of the settlement agreements themselves was illegal. The jury was simply asked to *infer* that those involved in these meetings must have entered into a conspiracy regarding prices and monopolization. But I repeat, there was no conspiracy. Pfizer's decisions were arrived at independently by its own management group.

Finally, I would like to point out that although there were a number of patent aspects involved in the case, the government did not claim that our tetracycline patent is invalid or unenforceable. Furthermore, it is clear that no one knew of the existence of tetracycline until it was discovered by our Dr. Lloyd Conover. The government conceded the importance of this discovery.

As to the impact on the Company, first let me say there are several procedural steps to be taken in the trial court and, if necessary, appeals will be taken all the way to the Supreme Court.

With regard to suits for treble damages, here is what this is about: When a company loses an antitrust case—and the case is not "lost" until all appeals are exhausted—the law provides, within certain limitations, that anyone who has been injured as a result of such violation of the antitrust laws can use the final judgment as evidence in a suit for such damages as he may be able to prove. Without trying to get into all the legal technicalities involved, let me simply say that this particular case presents to any possible claimant a number of somewhat unusual and difficult legal questions to overcome. As a matter of plain common sense, whatever the state of the law, it is hard for me to see how or to what extent resellers of these drugs at a mark-up would have suffered injuries or damages. As to sales in areas where bidding was normally employed, the bidding was intensely competitive—a fact which was established in the case. These are not all the problems such claimants would meet, but this may give you some appreciation of the fact that, while the Company may have to face some unusual liabilities, the position of claimants, in this situation, is far from clear. There may be considerable publicity with respect to suits of this type and the damages claimed will more than likely be greatly inflated. This is the usual way such claims are made. However, if any damages at all are awarded or paid, it is fair to assume that they will be substantially less than the original claim.

Therefore as we look at the situation today, we see only that the Company with its great strengths will continue to grow and prosper and that its future is bright.

I know that each of you shares with me a sense of surprise and severe disappointment that this verdict has been rendered against Pfizer. Let me assure you that our legal staff and outside counsel are all most capable people and that we have every confidence in their handling of the case and its appeal. I know, too, that all of you have a deep interest in the success and growth of the Company and you want to assist in any way that you can at this time. For myself and for you, our best contribution will be simply this: to work together to make 1968 the most outstanding year in the history of our great Company. And let's start with a great first quarter.

My very best wishes to you and your family for the New Year.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. POWERS, Jr.

PFIZER TO FIGHT ANTITRUST JURY VERDICT

NEW YORK, December 30.—A jury in the Federal Court in Manhattan rendered a verdict late Friday evening against Pfizer, American Cyanamid Co., and Bristol-Myers Co. in the antibiotics antitrust suit filed in August, 1961 by the Department of Justice. Pfizer today issued the following statement:

"We disagree with and are deeply disappointed by the verdict and we shall continue to fight vigorously for vindication. The verdict, in our view, could only have been based upon unjustified inference and suspicion. Each of the steps taken by Pfizer in marketing its broad spectrum antibiotic products was based upon normal and independent business practices. These facts could appear 'suspicious' only if the existence of a conspiracy were assumed. *No direct proof of conspiracy has ever been offered—and indeed no conspiracy existed.*

"We at the same time recognize that the jury was confronted with a formidable task. Day after day, it was faced with a profusion of complex facts dealing with chemistry, Patent Office practice, licensing, sales and marketing, economics and accounting. The jury was then asked to apply vague principles of antitrust law to this record of more than 5,000 transcript pages and more than 1,000 pages of documentary exhibits.

"We did not conspire with anyone and we did not monopolize. We made our own decisions, independently and for the best interests of our company—and we believe for the best interests of the public. It is unfortunate that the trial occurred in an atmosphere of unfavorable publicity about the drug industry, emanating over the years and during the trial from Congressional investigations and debates.

"We are not guilty of the charges made against us, and we look forward to pursuing this case further in the courts."

John J. Powers, Jr., president of Pfizer, addressing himself to all Pfizer employees, reminded them that "the case is in the hands of our capable legal staff and outside counsel, and the rest of us should devote our attention to making 1968 the best year in Pfizer's history."

President's Message Marks National Commitment To Fight Crime

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's crime message to Congress is eloquent testimony to his—and the Nation's—aroused desire to eradicate crime.

America faces no more serious problem than its soaring crime rate. Crime's tragic cost is written in wrecked lives, lost property, unsafe streets, and insecure homes.

While none are untouched with its effects—there has been too much talk and too little action to fight crime. With the President's message today, let America declare—loud and clear—a national commitment to take bold and immediate action to stem the rising tide of crime.

The President's comprehensive anticrime program will help crime prevention, improve criminal detention, and modernize penal correction. It calls for action at all levels of government—and by all concerned citizens.

We will no longer tolerate the wanton violation of our laws, destruction of our property, and injury to our citizens. We have the President's program for action in hand—let us move swiftly to write it into law.

Poles Contribute to World Culture

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the great contributions to world culture made by the people of Poland over the years have been those in the fields of poetry and prose.

People of Polish extraction in many lands, including the United States, have had occasion during the recent anniversary of Poland's Millennium to recall these outstanding works.

Clearly, Polish poets and writers have played an important role in keeping the spirit of Poland alive in its difficult days of oppression.

Mr. Speaker, a splendid recollection of the great poets and writers of Poland over the years has been compiled by the Polish-American Journal and, with permission, I include the text of the article in my remarks:

Great Poets Kept Polish Spirit Alive

Eliza Orzeszkowa, an eminent Polish novelist of the late 19th century, once wrote to Joseph Conrad severely criticizing him for writing in English. Had she lived longer she might have come to realize that the acclaim Conrad received as a Master of English prose was something of which every Pole could be proud.

When another distinguished Pole asked Conrad why he did not use his native language, the author replied: "Sir, I hold our beautiful Polish literature in too high esteem to introduce to it my poor writing. To write in Polish is a great thing. For that one must be a writer like Mickiewicz or Krasinski."

The two poets Conrad mentioned are hardly known in the English-speaking world, yet the brilliant output of these and other superlative writers kept the spirit of Poland alive during the 150 years the country was dismembered by Russia, Austria and Prussia. Conrad's greatest respect for Poland's greatest writers is shared by people of Polish ancestry who this year are observing Poland's Millennium.

Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855) is the most beloved and supreme Polish poet. His "Pan Tadeusz" ranks probably as the one genuine world epic of recent centuries. In it he drew a marvelous and many-sided portrait of Polish country life and national culture at the time of Napoleon's invasion of Russia. In this and other works—ballads, sonnets, odes and a Promethean dramatic poem, "Forefathers' Eve"— Mickiewicz kept up the morale of the nation and instilled it with a faith in a better world. He saw the resurrection of Poland linked with mankind's future. Actively aiding the freedom movements of all the nations of Europe, he also founded in Paris the newspaper called "The Tribune of the Peoples."

Zygmunt Krasinski (1812–59) wrote his masterpiece, "The Undivine Comedy," when only 21. While motivated by intense patriotic feelings and although written in 1883, this dramatic work projects a remarkable vision of the revolutionary epoch of the 20th century.

Another contemporary of Mickiewicz, Julius Slowacki (1809–49), also dedicated his poetry to the rebirth of Poland. Slowacki's verse "sparkles with all the colors of the rainbow." In sheer lyricism and linguistic invention, he even surpasses Mickiewicz. His poetic dramas, fantasies and allegorical narrative poems draw psychological portraits of the Poles. In his sublime work, "The King-Spirit," Slowacki traced the working of the national genius in Poland's men of history.

A contemporary of these three romantic poets but ignored in his own lifetime was the proto-symbolist, Cyprian K. Norwid (1821–83), who created an intellectual poetic language adept at handling both abstract and concrete ideas. An apostle of freedom (he has two poems in memory of John Brown), Norwid held that liberation was only a means for him to face his duty to better himself and society.

Poland had many great poets, beginning with Jan Kochanowski (1530–84), whose lyric power was unrivaled before Mickiewicz's time, and the "Christian Horace," Maciej Sarbiewski (1595–1640) whose Latin lyrics were known throughout Europe. Ignacy Krasicki (1735–1801), an archbishop, wrote fables and satires that exposed the laziness, pride and drunkenness of the nobles and bad monks of the 18th century.

Other writers whose works vividly mirrored the ruling classes were Mikolaj Rej (1505–69) called the "father of Polish Literature," and comedy playwright Alexandro Fredro (1793–1876.)

Great poets emerged in modern times, including Jan Kasprowicz (1860–1926), Leopold Staff (1878–1957), Julian Tuwim (1894–1954) and Stanislaus Wyspianski (1869–1907), whose poetic drama "The Wedding" is the most lofty of a number of plays.

Notable among other brilliant poets are Szymon Szymonowicz (1558–1629), Maria Konopnicka (1842–1910), Adam Asnyk (1838–97), Antoni Lange (1862–1929), Casimir Tetmajer (1865–1940) and among living bards, Zbigniew Herbert and poets in exile Cashimir Wierzynski and Czeslaw Milosz.

Henry Sienkiewicz (1846–1916), author of "Quo Vadis" and a trilogy dealing with Poland's 17th century struggle against Cossacks, Tatars, Swedes, Russians, Germans and Turks, is the most widely translated Polish novelist.

He and Wladyslaw Reymont (1868–1925), author of the matchless prose epic "The Peasants," won Nobel prizes, but Stefan Zeromski (1864–1925) ranks as the foremost master of Polish prose.

In language rivaling the highest type of lyric poetry, Zeromski's novels depict problems of social evil with great power and realism. His humanitarianism is equalled only by that of Boleslaw Prus (Alexander Glowacki (1845–1912), whose "The Doll" and "Emancipated Women" give unequalled pictures of Polish life in the late 19th century.

A masterful saga of provincial Polish society at the turn of the century is the six-volume "Nights and Days" by Maria Dabrowska (1892–1965). Special mention should be made of Jozef Ignacy Kraszewski (1812–87), half of whose 600 volumes were popular historical novels devoted to the same patriotic goal that Sienkiewicz called "the strengthening of hearts."

Hard Words Versus Hardware

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Frank W. Davis, president of the Fort Worth Division of General Dynamics made a speech dealing with the F–111, a product of his company. I need not call attention to the controversy which has raged over this plane, but I would call attention of each Member of this body to Mr. Davis' speech which in my estimation certainly places everything in its right perspective.

The speech follows:

Hard Words Versus Hardware

(An address by Frank W. Davis, president, Fort Worth Division of General Dynamics)

I would like to take this opportunity to bring you up to date on the F–111 program and to provide you with some background information which, I believe, may be useful.

Perhaps the first question I should answer is why General Dynamics has remained silent since 1963 in the face of such continued harsh criticism of the F–111 program. The answer is really quite simple. We are airplane builders and not debaters; and having learned from the original hearings how much time and effort were required to engage in the debate, we decided against diluting our efforts in what I think would have been a fruitless endeavor. At times it has been difficult to keep our cool, but I believe we are further along for having done so.

You must realize that in this kind of debate, the attacker who has no responsibility for the success of the program is free of any obligation to produce anything to support his position. However, those of us who bear the burden of responsibility and are in a position to know the facts are under obligation not only to observe facts but must ultimately back up our brave words with action and hardware—we have to produce. Since shouts of alarm normally make more news than calm action, any charge, however distorted, is likely to get printed somewhere. Anything going according to plan does not create much of a stir.

If all of this is true, why have we chosen now to stand up and join the battle of words?

The first reason is that the situation has changed. We are delivering aircraft to the Tactical Air Command at Nellis Air Force Base, and the Air Force crews there are doing an outstanding job with the F–111. So, now the hardware is speaking for itself.

It is, of course, speaking through the users. *They operate the F–111, they like it, and they are proud of it.* So, the difference is that now we have a real airplane in the hands of real pilots, giving a good account of itself, and we believe that the facts will speak louder than the criticisms. We, of course, want to help in the amplification of this voice.

A second reason for opening up is that four years of turning the other cheek has not produced any discernible letup in the viciousness of attacks against the F–111.

To look at the criticism in some perspective, let's see how it started and speculate a little on why it continues. After that I would like to give you some cold facts which you may find useful with your friends.

I heard Senator Jackson say he started the original investigation. Inasmuch as he is from the state of Washington, I think we can surmise that it was on behalf of the defeated competitor, Boeing, even though Boeing says it did not ask for the investigation. He used the investigating committee of Senator McClellan, of which he is a member, as the instrument for the hearings.

It didn't take long after the hearings started for fireworks to develop between the Committee and the Department of Defense.

Why should this fire be burning as merrily as ever after nearly five years? The simplest answer, and very possibly the most nearly correct one, is that both Senator McClellan and Secretary McNamara are men of great endurance.

But I might add, so are we. And we are on the right side in this contest. What we are doing is constructive. It's dynamic, it's breaking the technological frontier, and it's breaking new ground on many management frontiers.

Now let's list some of the misunderstandings about the F–111 program, and then consider a few facts and figures which will help straighten out these misunderstandings and misconceptions.

Had you listened to the opponents of the program who make all the noise, you would have concluded that our design was second best, that our prices have escalated, that the Navy airplane is hopelessly overweight, that the program is far behind schedule, that the performance is completely unsatisfactory, that the airplane is of questionable safety, that the pilots don't like it, and that commonality is a failure.

Let's go through these items now and see what can be said about each.

Was our design second best? I think not. In scoring the proposals submitted by the competitors, the Evaluation Group, consisting of 284 civilian and military experts, scored General Dynamics over Boeing by 175.6 to 172.1. The Military Source Selection Board took those scores and weighted the various elements to give more emphasis to those of greater importance, and after those sources were added up, General Dynamics was still the winner, 662.4 to 654.2. *It's very clear from this that General Dynamics had the best design, not the second best.*

If that is so, and I can assure you it is, how has the opposite impression been made? In spite of the fact that the Military Source Selection Board had these scores before it, it chose to recommend Boeing as the contractor. It had every right to do this if it wanted to. This recommendation was endorsed on up the line. This fact has been distorted to give the impression that there was unanimity in the choice of Boeing, except for Secretary McNamara. That simply isn't so. This false notion was then firmly implanted by repetition—saying it over and over again.

The facts of the scoring as I have relayed them to you are buried on pages 1911 and 1912 of the TFX contract investigation. The figures are from the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force. There are a thousand pages of testimony from disgruntled witnesses before the first "gruntled" one took the stand, and that was "yours truly." No wonder it's hard for reporters to dig out the truth when they have deadlines to meet.

As to price escalation, on the F–111 Research and Development program, our bid submitted in 1962 with the proposal was for $478.9 million for the 23-airplane R&D program. We were put in work under letter contract, and *the final price was negotiated in 1964 at $2 million less than our proposal.* That doesn't sound to me like price escalation.

Nevertheless, the R&D program is pictured as having grown tremendously. "Prices have soared," I believe is the phrase which critics have used.

What has happened is that, subsequent to the original contract, the Air Force has added to that contract the cost of developing the ground-support equipment, the cost of spares to support the test program, the cost of the Strategic Air Command and United Kingdom versions, the cost of the advanced Mark II avionics system for the third wing and on, and many other elements of additional task which will raise the contract value to something like $1.2 billion. But that isn't price escalation growing out of the program problems as our opponents would lead one to believe.

On the F–111 production program, we made our first firm bid in 1965 for 431 aircraft at $1.889 billion. A year later, we arrived at a negotiated settlement with the Air Force at $1.653 billion, *over $200 million less.* Sixty-two aircraft were then added, making the 493 currently under contract. That contract was not finally negotiated until 1967, and for the 493 it was $1.821 billion, or *somewhat less than the original bid for 431 aircraft.* That happens to be $3.7 million each for 493 aircraft. But that doesn't include the engines and other government-furnished equipment.

If these are the facts, and I again assure you they are—they are a matter of record—how can the opponents of the program make a charge of price escalation? It's very simple. In 1962 during the competition, the competitors and the Air Force and the Department of Defense all made their separate estimates of what a 1700-airplane program might cost. The assumption was that all 1700 would be just like the proposal design, and they would be built at a certain rate during a certain period of time.

When the opponents of the program want to make the price escalation argument, they usually use one of the planning estimates for the average cost of the airplane and compare it to the average cost of one of the 493 aircraft. An obviously unfair comparison. I would hasten to add, however, that they have some firmer ground in that planning estimates today are higher by a considerable margin than the planning estimates were in 1962. These estimates are redone about two or three times a year for all programs, and unless one considers the planning estimates associated with all other programs as well as the F–111 in 1962 and compares those with planning estimates in 1967, and unless he takes into account the program changes in all programs, which is a very difficult thing to do, a fair comparison cannot be made. Nevertheless, opponents of the program piously recite these distorted comparisons to prove whatever point they wish to make.

It has been repeated ad nauseam that the Navy airplane is overweight. This has been projected to all sorts of conclusions. The fact is that the Navy set a weight target in 1961 which was out of reach for an airplane having the characteristics of an F–111B. *In trying to meet that target we probably have created the lightest aircraft in history in the sense of having no weight in excess of that necessary to meet the requirements for strength and load-carrying ability.* More effort and more money have been spent on weight saving and weight avoidance in the F–111 than in any prior aircraft program. Among other things it was lightweight structures that made it possible for the B–36 and B–58 to do things that many people had declared impossible, and the same designers who did the impossible have been designing the F–111 structure.

From a purely contractual standpoint, we stand somewhere between 7½ and 11 percent overweight. But offsetting this, we have provided a 9 percent increase in maximum lift and an 8.2 percent improvement in weight ratio.

Weight ratio is the measure of structural efficiency having a major effect on aircraft performance. The 8.2 percent improvement in weight ratio provides 27 percent improvement in range. *But most important, the Navy says officially that the F–111B will be able to operate from all the carriers it was designed for, and without having to modify the carriers for its weight.*

For those who say the program is hopelessly behind schedule, I would point out that we delivered the first research and development aircraft 11 days ahead of a very tight 25-month schedule. *All 23 R&D aircraft were delivered an average of only 17 days behind the schedule in the contract.*

Of importance, also, is the fact that we were able to incorporate most of the changes, such as weight improvements, at a point two-thirds of the way through deliveries of R&D aircraft. This kind of change is not normally incorporated until the production aircraft.

The Navy schedule has been and is now primarily keyed to the development of the Phoenix missile system—a very advanced and sophisticated air-to-air system. The development of the aircraft and the development of the Phoenix missile are currently in consonance with one another.

Had there been a requirement for getting the Navy F–111B into service prior to the Phoenix system, I believe we could have met it inasmuch as the Air Force airplanes are being delivered to the inventory right now. The fact that there wasn't such a requirement has allowed time for incorporation of a substantial number of improvements into the Navy aircraft which should make them even better. These include a higher-thrust engine, more visibility over the nose, and some further refinements to the low-speed handling characteristics which are already outstanding.

I recently went aboard a carrier in an A–3, and if the F–111B doesn't go aboard easier than that, I'll eat it.

A number of charges have been made that F–111 performance is unsatisfactory. Let's take a look at some of the performance objectives.

The airplane was to have intercontinental range. It has.

The airplane was to have supersonic low-level penetration capability. It has.

It was to be capable of short-field operation. It is.

It was to provide a highly accurate navigation and bombing system. It does.

It was to provide a nuclear capability and an iron bomb capability. It does.

It was to provide unprecedented reliability and maintainability features. It does.

The airplane was designed to operate at 30 hours per month with a 35-manhour-per-flight-hour maintenance requirement. In the current "Harvest Reaper" program, airplanes were scheduled for 45 hours per month and have actually been averaging 60 hours per month with some as high as 90.

It was to provide an airplane satisfactory for carrier operation; and while individual characteristics such as low landing speed and good low-speed handling characteristics have been demonstrated, actual operation aboard a carrier will not occur until next spring.

Improved crew safety was also to be provided through the use of an escape capsule. This was first demonstrated successfully in real life on October 19 when Dave Thigpen and Max Gordon ejected from an F–111 and walked away without a scratch.

If we look at the record of century series fighters, we find that in the first 5000 hours of flight the number of major accidents was as follows:

The F–100 had 7.
The F–101 had 11.
The F–102 had 9.
The F–104 had 14.
The F–105 had 8.
The F–106 had 7.
The F–4 had 6.
The F–111 had only 2.

If we include this last F–111 accident at about 5300 hours, our record would be three, which is less than half the lowest of any other airplane.

Two major objectives at the beginning of the F–111 program were to provide an improved fighter-bomber for the Air Force and an improved fleet air defense system for the Navy.

If we compare the F-111 with the best fighter-bomber in service today, we find it provides twice the range, with twice the payload, is 20 percent faster, is 58 percent shorter on takeoff and landings, and provides 8 times better navigational accuracy with its inertial navigation system.

As compared to the next best fleet air defense system, it provides twice the loiter with one and one-half times the missiles. The missiles have three times the range. It provides six times as many kills per salvo. It will operate from 500 miles greater distance with the same bomb load, and its approach speed for the carrier landing is 15 to 20 knots slower.

Another charge is that the F-111 does not meet its specification requirements. Here, let me make a distinction between objectives, requirements, and specifications. I have already cited a number of the objectives of the F-111 program which are currently being met. Let's take one for example: the objective of providing a fighter with intercontinental range. Obviously the F-111 has intercontinental range. It has been flown to Europe without external fuel tanks and without additional fueling from a tanker—this was the objective. The military requirement is a quantitative expression of this objective. A range of so many miles. The requirement is set high enough to take into account operational problems such as headwinds, weather, and provides for landing at a number of different airfields.

Military requirements are set before the proposals are made. Since they must be set several years in advance of the time the hardware appears, they can at best be only an approximation of what inventions and ingenuity can produce. They should be, and generally are, set very high in order to stimulate the highest level of ultimate performance.

Specifications are developed as the design proposal is being made, and thus represent a further refinement in the projection of what the designers may be able to produce in the ultimate hardware. These may or may not exactly match the requirements. In the case of the F-111 the specifications were negotiated by the government buyers, in many cases, considerably above the performance level of the requirements. These specifications become the contract obligations, which the company has to meet. Changes throughout the program to accommodate government-requested modifications, or performance of government-furnished equipment, of course, modify the specifications.

Thus we see that the specifications for development weapons like the F-111 represent targets of excellence based on projections of what we think the state-of-the-art and our ingenuity can produce. We expect the specifications to be set high. There are literally hundreds of them, and in the airplane business as in real life we expect to exceed some, to meet some, and to miss some.

This kind of specification is a very different thing from the kind provided by your architect or contractor when you build a house. With a house, you know that a six-inch thick concrete wall can be constructed. You know that the rafters and floor joists can be of a certain material and spacing; you know the plumbing and electrical fixtures called for can be obtained. This is simply a matter of performing to requirements which you know can be met. With a development program like the F-111, many specification items will appear which no one knows at the time of the writing can be achieved. We do know that if you were to set all of the specifications low enough—so that you could be sure of meeting them—the airplane would be obsolete before the ink was dry.

Let's look now at where we stand on the F-111 program in this context. If we take 20 items of performance, one-half Air Force and one-half Navy, including speed, altitude, and range, et cetera, and compare our performance with the military requirements as laid down in 1962, it appears today we will exceed seven, meet five, and miss eight. Neither the "exceeds" nor the "misses" are very great or critical. If we were to adjust the military requirements for government-approved changes and performance of government-furnished equipment, we would exceed 12, meet five, and miss three.

I explained that the specifications on the whole were more demanding than the requirements, and that specifications are always adjusted for government changes and government furnished equipment. With respect to these, we would exceed seven, miss six, and meet seven.

There were 16 items chosen on which bonuses and penalties were established by the contract. At the present writing, we have won two of these for sure. We may win another. It appears we will tie on seven or eight, and may lose on five to seven.

From this array, I would say two things are apparent. One, the requirements as laid down were not too far off the mark in projecting what the state-of-the-art could produce; and two, as a contractor we have done commendably well against a very demanding set of specifications.

One of the tricks which has been used by foes of the program is to invent a requirement which does not exist. A recent example of this was a statement that the airplane could not fly over Pikes Peak with a full load of bombs in military power. The intent of the statement was to show that the airplane was woefully inadequate in terms of combat ceiling. The fact is that the airplanes in flight test have been consistently bettering the altitude requirements. A full load of bombs for the F-111 is over 20 tons of bombs hung virtually all over the airplane, and I know of no target having the elevation of Pikes Peak which would require that kind of a bomb load. I don't know of a target at all at that elevation.

The other little lulu in this charade is that while military power sounds like it ought to be full power, it is only 45 percent of full power on the TF-30 engines in the F-111. It happens to be the power without afterburning.

Another trick of F-111 foes is to state that the Marine Corps does not want the airplane. The implication is that it's because the airplane is no good. But, in fact, the Marine Corps has never been involved in the F-111. It was not designed for any mission assigned to Marine Corps aviation.

These are just a couple of examples of the kind of fallacies which have been used to attack the F-111 program.

Another one, obviously directed towards the Department of Defense, is that commonality is a failure. The argument is, of course, based on the premise that you can design a special airplane to do a particular mission better than an airplane compromised by other mission requirements. Since this is obviously true, the unsophisticated reader or listener is led to believe that commonality is a failure. Let's look at it.

You, your wife, and four children all need transportation, and it could be held with this logic that the transportation of each individual is best served if he has his own vehicle, specifically designed to his needs. And if you were an indulgent father, and had more money than you could use, you might actually provide this type of transportation. But in the real world, most of us compromise, and somewhere along the line you have a family car, and it does provide satisfactory transportation, and it does not send you to the poorhouse.

In the case of major weapon systems, such as the F-111, the United States is funds-limited. There are simply more ideas of how to do the job, costing more dollars than the taxpayers are willing or able to supply. It makes sense, then, to develop a weapon to meet a broad spectrum of requirements. In 1967 it is easy to see that the United States, in order to fulfill its commitments throughout the world, needs air weapons versatile enough to meet a variety of threats. We have the Koreas, Lebanons, Cubas, and Vietnams, to name but a few, posing a different kind of threat and calling for a different level of response. This was recognized when the requirements of the F-111 were laid down.

When this kind of requirement is coupled with the advanced technology represented by the variable-sweep wing, the fan-afterburning engine, and the F-111 avionics, it is possible to produce an airplane of great versatility. Given a design with a higher level of versatility and some foresight, it is possible to envision a basic design developing into a family of airplanes for a wide variety of missions. Thus, we have the F-111A/D for the Tactical Air Command, the F-111B for the Navy, the F-111C for Australia, and F-111K for Britain, the FB-111 for the Strategic Air Command, and probably several versions of reconnaissance 111s.

In the past, versatile airplanes have just happened and in a few cases have been put to use in more than one way—the F-4 is such an airplane. The F-111 is the first airplane built with this idea specifically in mind, and to that end it is successful and commonality is successful. *It takes no genius to recognize that a program for a family of aircraft growing from one common design is less expensive than an equal number of separate unrelated programs.*

A few years ago reliability and maintainability were considered qualitative design features, but they were made quantitative specification requirements on the F-111 with great success. In the same way, versatility was a matter of chance in the past, but it became a specification requirement for the F-111, leading directly to commonality.

It has been charged that pilots don't like the airplane. About 230 different pilots have flown the airplane, or flown in it, and I have yet to find one who did not come away with an increased enthusiasm for the airplane and program.

Nevertheless, accurate quotations have been taken from test pilots' reports indicating a number of deficiencies in the F-111. What is seldom explained is that the test pilot's job is to search diligently for anything about the airplane which can be improved, and the reports must be considered in that context.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Dr. Frosch, put this neatly to bed in a recent speech by reading a group of critical statements from Navy test pilots. They sounded like double-trouble and as though they must be about the F-111. Dr. Frosch then went on to explain that those remarks came from the Navy preliminary evaluation of the F-4 airplane in 1958; and as we all know, that has since become a first-class airplane for both the Navy and the Air Force.

I hope I have been able to give you the background information which will help you to be proud of the F-111, as I am, and as the men who fly it are.

Lithuanian Independence

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 50th year since the tiny nation of Lithuania declared its independence and joined the community of free nations.

For the first 20 years, the brave people of Lithuania worked hard to develop a stable economy, educational system, and a free political system. They knew that there could only be a future for their children and their children's children if freedom of choice prevailed in their land.

However, this dream was not to flourish. The Lithuanians, forced through political circumstances and the growing tensions in Europe in 1939, had to admit Russian personnel to erect airbases on her territory. In short order, the Russians engineered a fixed election and on August 3, 1940, occupied Lithuania.

When the Nazis drove the Russians out, it was too late to make a difference to the Lithuanian people. The Nazis were not about to allow the little country to enjoy independence. It was merely a case of exchanging one totalitarian regime for another. Finally, in 1944, the Soviet Union reconquered Lithuania. Since that time the Baltic nation has become another innocent victim of Communist imperialism.

Just as the Soviets tried to destroy other cultures and religions, so they tried to russify the Lithuanians. Through it all, these proud people have fought constant pressures and harassments in order to maintain their own language, customs and religious beliefs. They are a living symbol of the strength of man's faith in freedom, justice and equality.

Let us hope and pray they will soon realize their dream of a free Lithuania.

What Patriotism Means to Me

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an essay by one of my constituents, Susan Arden. Miss Arden, who lives in Westchester, Ill., has written eloquently on the subject, "What Patriotism Means to Me."

I am confident that this young lady speaks for the overwhelming majority of her generation.

The essay follows:

WHAT PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By Susan Arden)

I am devoted to my country in the same way I am devoted to the people I love. Because I live in a nation whose actions may be influenced by my ideas, there are responsibilities I owe my country. I must express what I feel my nation should do, and follow its actions with concern and interest. I remain loyal toward my country, for I know that its leaders speak on my behalf. Only when I fail to communicate with them, only when I cease to work in maintaining our relationship, will we grow apart. Then the loss will be all mine, and I will be to blame.

I naturally hold pride in my nation's worthy achievements, but I also experience disappointment in its mistakes and anger in its wrongs. But my country is only human in its make-up; its government the extension of imperfect people, and, as such, subject to their vices as well as their virtues. I stand by my nation, expecting others to do the same, to work for a better today and a brighter tomorrow.

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of hearing Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien address the 19th annual banquet of the AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education in Philadelphia on February 10, 1968. It struck me that his historical presentation of the fight for a higher minimum wage would be a helpful reminder to Members of Congress of some of the progress we have made in this Nation since 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the Postmaster General's address:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE 19TH ANNUAL COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION BANQUET, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 10, 1968

Thank you very much, Ed Toohey, Rev. Barnhart, Senator Clark, Mayor Tate and Mrs. Tate, Congressman Bill Green, Congressman Bill Barrett, Congressman Jim Byrne, Congressman Joshua Eilberg.

Presidents, officers and members of organized labor's Committee on Political Education.

I am delighted to be here with so many long time friends and associates tonight.

Perhaps the finest friend of labor as mayor of any city in the nation is a man who has gained a national reputation for leadership and vision—Jim Tate.

You know, next to the Presidency, the toughest administrative job in this country is that of mayor of a large city. Just think of today's problems—rebuilding our cities, providing decent housing, unsnarling traffic, and a thousand and one vital but often thankless tasks—and you can see why being mayor is like swimming up Schuylkill River wearing a cement life jacket—but Jim Tate has certainly proven himself an able and powerful swimmer.

Of course, this city has outstanding representation in the Congress of the United States with Bill Barrett, Bob Nix, Jim Byrne, Joshua Eilberg along with a man who now wears a second hat as Democratic City Chairman, Bill Green. I have worked intimately with all of these great legislators and you can be proud of them. This city, this state and the Nation owes each of these outstanding Americans a great deal of gratitude.

As everyone in this room is keenly aware, Pennsylvania's needs, your needs, are forcefully presented in the Senate of the United States by a man whose energy and commitment to more effective government is unsurpassed. As Chairman of the powerful and important subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senator Joe Clark is in a position to make his commitment to a fair shake for labor count in the right place—and he does just that.

My friends, I want to remind all of you here tonight of a fact that is very well known in Washington, on Capitol Hill and in the White House. Senator Joe Clark's record on labor issues—99%—during the last 11 years is one of the most outstanding of any Senator any time from any state.

And that, of course, is one of the major reasons why he has received the endorsement of the Pennsylvania AFL–CIO for his third term in the Senate. Your President, George Meany, has given Joe Clark one of the warmest endorsements I've ever heard.

"No member of the labor movement," President Meany wrote, "can quarrel with the continuing support you have given forward-looking measures in the fields of education, consumer legislation, health measures, improvements in the Social Security System, housing, and to all other progressive measures we have endorsed."

And when your President closes his letter with a sentiment with which I agree 100 per cent—"With all good wishes for your success in the 1968 election . . . George Meany."

Before I come here today, I spoke with another man who knows how to get things accomplished—President Lyndon Baines Johnson. He asked me to give you a message, and I think it is one worth remembering. "Today," the President said, "many of labor's old battle cries are fading away. The slogans that once fired labor's blood: yellow dog contract, the lockout, the company police, company unions, strikebreakers, blacklisting, non-recognition, arbitrary firing for union activity, starvation wages—have largely vanished. Today, the working man in this country is the envy of the world. Chances are he lives in a nice home—maybe in a suburb. Chances are he knows more about battling with crabgrass than trudging on a picket line. But, though the old drama is gone, though the villains are not so easily spotted, there are still anti-labor forces in this country . . . underground perhaps, but ready to move when the climate is right. The strength that labor enjoys, the power of labor's voice were not inherited; neither were they thrust upon labor. They were *won*. They were won in battle after battle. They were won through the bitter sacrifices of families who wouldn't give in, who would rather starve than knuckle under. If labor for one moment forgets how it got where it is, if it neglects its own history of struggle, then it is setting the scene for its own decline."

I think that is a message we should all ponder.

I personally remember years ago when Detroit's Cadillac Square was crammed with tens of thousands on Labor Day. Now it is difficult to fill a hall. The crowds are out with their boats on the lake or turning a steak into cinders on the backyard barbeque.

Perhaps there's no longer a need for Labor Day rallies . . . but I think we should all remember that eternal vigilance is the price of prosperity as well as freedom.

I know you haven't forgotten that fact here in Philadelphia. You have proven it—on the record—time after time—at no time more effectively and dramatically than in your recent city election. The effectiveness of COPE is proof that though the old rallying cries may be muted, the spirit is not. It warms my heart to hear the exhortation Register and Vote. As one who likes to consider himself a pro—I salute you—you have proven you are truly *pros*.

Coming here today on the plane, I heard an interesting conversation across the aisle.

There were two very prosperous and self-satisfied looking gentlemen, and another, not so well dressed or sure of himself. But this third fellow made up in friendliness for his obvious lack of worldly goods.

He tried several times to strike up a conversation with these over-stuffed fellows.

Finally, one said, stiffly: "Name is Scrooge; Republican, retired, married, two sons: doctors." The other followed suit: "Name is Clinkscales, Republican, retired, married, two sons: lawyers."

The little man looked abashed for a

moment and then said slowly and quietly: "Name is Smith, Democrat, still working, never married, two sons—both Republicans."

I also remember another trip to Philadelphia in November 1960, with a young man who was seeking your support, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I wonder how many of you remember the condition of our economy in those days.

Here's how John F. Kennedy described what was then the dismal present and his hope for a better future.

"I believe," he said that night in Convention Hall, "in an America where every man, or woman, who wants to work can find work—a full week's work for a full week's pay; where every man or woman of talent can use those talents; where the waste of idle men and idle machines, of steel mills half shut down, and coal mines boarded up, of chronic recessions and slumps, can be limited; where a growing economy provides new jobs and new markets for a growing nation . . ."

Well, this Keystone State was one of those that gave John F. Kennedy the thin margin of victory. You gave him your votes. And he gave you all that he could give . . . his vision . . . his imagination . . . his inspiration . . . his ability to get this country moving . . . and, finally, he gave his life.

When he was struck down, Lyndon Johnson kept faith with John Kennedy. He took the torch so tragically handed to him. He created the finest monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the kind of monument he would have wished for—the enactment of John F. Kennedy's New Frontier program. And President Johnson did more. He took an economy that President Kennedy had gotten off dead center and moving, and kept it moving. As a result, next month the American economy will reach a new milestone as it enters its eighth year of sustained economic advance, the longest in our history. Each month we see the creation of more jobs, more and higher incomes, rising living standards.

When John Kennedy spoke here in Philadelphia in November, 1960, do you know what the unemployment rate was? Four per cent? Five per cent? Six per cent? Surely, you say, it couldn't have been more than six per cent. But it was. Seven per cent . . . seven percent of the working force was out of work. That was the legacy left to us by the Republicans.

And do you remember what the minimum wage was back in those days? One dollar an hour. Forty dollars a week.

While still a Senator, John Kennedy worked to increase the minimum wage by 25 per cent. The conservatives were opposed, claiming that $1.25 minimum wage would cause massive unemployment.

Well, John Kennedy kept his pledge to the nation's working men and women. He managed to get the minimum wage up to $1.25 . . . and he extended coverage to 4 million more workers.

And what about the gloom-filled predictions of catastrophe? Nonsense, of course. More people having more money meant, as common sense might indicate, that the economy picked up tempo. More jobs were created. No jobs were destroyed.

The Democratic Party under President Kennedy kept its pledge to labor. We could have rested on our laurels. But we didn't.

The very first legislative battle fought by Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson in the Roosevelt Administration was for the initial minimum wage bill. It was almost political suicide in those days for a Congressman from Texas to vote for minimum wage. But Lyndon Johnson not only voted for it, he signed a petition to get action on the bill. The bill passed, and the revolutionary principle of a minimum wage was established. It almost seems funny now that so many conservatives were so frightened about paying a minimum of two bits an hour. That was the first minimum wage. Twenty-five cents an hour. Ten dollars a week.

Well, on September 23, 1966, twenty-eight years after the first law was passed, President Johnson had the pleasure of signing the most recent minimum wage law: Sixty-four dollars a week . . . and coverage was increased by eight million more workers, a thirty per cent increase.

Again, we are not satisfied. As President Johnson said when he signed that law, though he was proud of the moment, "My ambition is that no man should have to work for a minimum wage, but that every man should have skills that he can sell for more."

That is typical of President Johnson's approach to government. While he is justifiably proud of the great accomplishments of his administration, he is not going to sit around reciting history.

The President clearly understands that anyone who tries to win elections by merely reciting the record is misjudging the voter. Yesterday is the past. Tomorrow is what counts.

While many applaud the significant gains of the last several years, most take them for granted, and some even assume they have always existed.

America looks, and rightly so, toward the future. Not what did you do, not even what did you do for me lately? But what will you do tomorrow and next year?

This is the question that is asked. This is the question we must answer.

And the Johnson Administration has its goals for the future. We do have an unfinished agenda. Our program is no less than a new Bill of Rights.

The President feels that Americans have the right to be protected from misrepresentation and sharp practice.

The President feels that every American child has the right to a healthful start in life.

The President feels a more than $800 billion-a-year nation should be able to afford good housing, that Americans should have a right to live in a decent place of their choice—that every American must have full equality—full opportunity—in every phase of American life.

The President will settle for nothing less than that.

The President feels deeply that all Americans have a right to a job, to be gainfully employed. That's why the President working together with business and labor, seeks to place the half-million hard-core urban unemployed in training programs that will lead to useful work.

There is also a right that Americans must enjoy. The right of safety on our streets. It is President Johnson who first proposed the Safe Streets Act and it is President Johnson who will see it enacted into law.

As the President said in the State of the Union address, "there is no more urgent business before this Congress than to pass the Safe Streets Act this year that I proposed last year. Law and order must prevail.

And finally, Americans must never relinquish their hope of living in a world of peace and security, to enjoy their right to live in peace and security. Americans, because of our position of power, cannot afford the luxury of most other people in the world. We cannot afford to sit on our hands and dream of the wonders of peace. If there is to be a better world, we must work for it, here and abroad. Freedom cannot be an island. It is indivisible. If we lose our nerve, if we accept easy and irresponsible positions, based either on too much force or too little backbone, we are weakening our own freedom and denying freedom to friendly nations in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

This, then, is our hope and our plan—our vision of America's future. We plan to continue working for a better America and a better world. We pray with all our hearts that God will see those plans fulfilled.

Why Lincoln Grew a Beard

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we honor one of the greatest men that this country has ever produced, Abraham Lincoln. Not only was his life a sage of dedication to national service but it was also filled with countless examples of the man's humanity.

One of these intriguing stories of Abraham Lincoln is retold in the February 1968, edition of the Reader's Digest, in an article entitled "Why Lincoln Grew a Beard." It was first published in the publication "Lincoln's Little Correspondent," by Hertha Paul.

It tells the story of how 11-year-old Grace Bedell, of Westfield, N.Y., wrote Mr. Lincoln in October of 1860 to urge him to grow a beard to help him win votes for the Presidency. Later Lincoln stopped at Westfield, chatted with Grace and assured her that he would, indeed, let his whiskers grow.

It is a charming story and one in which those of us from Chautauqua County, N.Y., take great pride. I am pleased to place the Reader's Digest story at this point in the RECORD:

WHY LINCOLN GREW A BEARD

Though he wore his beard only four years, today we cannot think of Abraham Lincoln without whiskers. He often talked about the little girl in upstate New York who was responsible for the famous beard. Few know her name; there is no mention of Grace Bedell in some of the thickest Lincoln books. But Lincoln himself would tell the story with relish and add, with a chuckle, "How small a thing will sometimes change the whole aspect of our lives!"

Grace Bedell sat in her little attic room looking at the picture her father had brought from the fair. It was not a drawing and it was not a painting; there were neither lines nor colors in it, and yet you could make out every hair on Mr. Lincoln's head and every crease in his clothing. It was the first photograph Grace had ever seen. It gave her an uncanny feeling that the gaunt man himself was looking at her.

Grace's dingy oil lamp drew strange, shadowy patterns on the black-and-white photograph. The features seemed to come alive. A frame of shadows lay around the thin face and filled it out. The hollow cheeks were gone. Whiskers!

How becoming, Grace thought. Somebody ought to tell him. She reached for pen and ink and began to write:

WESTFIELD,
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY, N.Y.,
October 15, 1860.

HON. A. B. LINCOLN.

DEAR SIR: I am a little girl 11 years old, but want you should be President of the United States very much so I hope you won't think me very bold to write to such a great man as you are.

Have you any little girls about as large as I am if so give them my love and tell her to write me if you cannot answer this letter. I have got four brothers and part of them will vote for you any way and if you will let your whiskers grow I will try to get the rest of them to vote for you. You would look a great deal better for your face is so thin. All the ladies like whiskers and they would tease their husbands to vote for you and then you would be President.

Grace Bedell.

At that time about 50 letters a day arrived at the Lincoln campaign headquarters. Only those from friends and very important people got past the two young secretaries, John Nicolay and John Hay. Nicolay in particular went about the job in dead earnest.

John Hay leaned back in his chair, and picked up another batch of letters.

"Now," he said, "the little girls start telling the Chief how to get elected."

"Wastebasket," said Nicolay crisply.

"She has an original idea." Hay grinned "Thinks he ought to grow whiskers."

"Throw it away and get on with your work, Hay."

"I'll do no such thing, my dear Nicolay. Out of the mouths of babes—"

A stocky, blue-eyes, scraggly bearded man swaggered in without knocking. He said, "Good morning, young fellows," and Hay said, "I appeal to you, Mr. Herndon—"

Nicolay ignored him. "Let's have no more whiskers. No little girl. Let's have a little responsibility."

"Little girl?" Herndon's eyes turned suddenly gentle, seeking the inner door. It was ajar, and Billy Herndon lowered his voice. "He loves them. Can't pass one in the street without stopping to talk to her, and each of them is his 'little sister.' What were you saying about a little girl?"

"I said to drop her into the wastebasket!" Nicolay was thoroughly angry. "And then, Hay, you'd better rush the reply to the governor of Pennsylvania. That is pressing—"

"Why? He's old enough to be patient," said Lincoln's calm voice from the inner door.

And it was not long afterward that Grace got the following letter:

Springfield, Ill.,
October 19, 1860.

Miss Grace Bedell,
Westfield, N.Y.

My Dear Little Miss: Your very agreeable letter of the 15th is received. I regret the necessity of saying I have no daughters. I have three sons, one seventeen, one nine, and one seven years of age. They, with their mother, constitute my whole family. As to the whiskers, having never worn any, do you not think people would call it a piece of silly affection (*sic*) if I were to begin it now?

Your very sincere well-wisher,
A. Lincoln.

Word came that on February 16 a special train carrying the newly elected Mr. Lincoln to the White House would stop at a station near Westfield. The Bedell family arrived to find "Hail to the Chief" spelled out in big letters on a streamer across the tracks and the Star-Spangled Banner flying from the station roof.

As Grace looked around at the swarms of strange people, there was a sudden hush. A thousand ears strained to listen. "Here she comes!"

Grace stretched as high on her toes as she could and saw the top of a black funnel pass slowly behind many heads, hissing and puffing smoke, and then the flat roof of a car, and another, and a third with the Stars and Stripes fluttering over the platform.

A very tall, very black hat, quietly sticking out of a lot of fidgety black hats—this was all Grace could see. Cries of "Speech! Speech!" rose above the din, and Grace held her breath. All around there suddenly was dead silence.

"Ladies and gentlemen," someone said, "I have no speech to make and no time to speak in. I appear before you that I may see you, and that you may see me."

Grace felt ice-cold. It was *he*. She stretched so that it hurt, but all she saw was the wrinkled stovepipe hat.

"And I'm willing to admit that so far as the ladies are concerned I have the best of the bargain."

Laughter rippled, swelled, burst through the crowd as though a spell were broken.

Lincoln was speaking again. "I have but one question, standing here beneath the flag of our country: Will you stand by me as I stand by the flag?"

Hands and hats and women's handkerchiefs rose into the air amid thundering echoes: "Yes—yes—we sure will, Abe!"

Once more she heard the voice that made you feel you had heard it all your life. "I have a little correspondent in this place," he said. "This little lady saw from the first what great improvement might be made in my appearance. If she is present, I would like to speak to her. Her name is Grace Bedell."

Her father took Grace's hand and led her forward. She went without knowing how, without noticing that a path was opened for them and that they were trailed by pointing fingers and whispers. She went to him who had asked for her by name.

There were steps ahead, and her father gave her a boost up to the platform in sight of a thousand people, up to a pair of big, blackbooted feet. Somewhere above she heard a slow chuckle. "She wrote me that she thought I'd look better if I wore whiskers—"

He stooped. Grace felt strong hands under her arms. Suddenly, as effortlessly as if she had no weight at all, she was raised high in the air, kissed on both cheeks, and gently set down again. And her cheeks burned not only from bliss but from a scratching.

The thousand people were forgotten. Grace looked and laughed happily, for up there, sprouting darkly all around the rugged face, and covering cheeks and jaw so that only the upper lip remained free, were the whiskers.

"You see I let them grow for you, Grace," said Mr. Lincoln.

Grace could do nothing but look at the tall, gaunt, plain, great man. He took her hand. She heard him say that he hoped to see his little friend again sometime; she understood that this moment had to end. He helped her down the steps and she went obediently, like a good girl, back to her proud father.

Grace heard a shrill whistle, a rumbling and puffing. People cheered and waved after a train that was already far down the gleaming tracks. But in her mind Grace heard only three words repeated over and over: "My little friend."

If you come to Springfield, Ill., today you can't miss Abraham Lincoln's house, plain, white, two-storied, with broad eaves and a fence around it. They say it looks exactly as it did then, outside and inside. Loving care has preserved fixtures and furniture, draperies and knick-knacks. On the wall of one room hangs a piece of paper covered with childish scrawls: "Dear Sir—I am a little girl 11 years old."

Lincoln's carefully penned reply remained in the Bedell family until two years ago when it was sold at auction for $20,000 by three of Grace's grandsons. The buyer, TV producer David Wolper, is a collector of Civil War memorabilia and a self-confessed "Lincoln fan," who prizes the letter, quite understandably, "from an emotional point of view."

Earl Turner, a Texan, Adds Provocative Views on Current Fiscal Problems

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, every thoughtful American is concerned about Government spending, taxes, and fiscal problems and policies. In recent months the press has given wide circulation to various viewpoints on these matters of men in and out of government. During the last Congress spending occupied the center of the stage; taxes and spending will no doubt be a battleground of the current session.

I have recently had an opportunity to scan a book by Earl Turner, entitled "Stable Money." Mr. Turner is executive vice president of Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association of Austin, Tex. I find myself in disagreement with many of Mr. Turner's fiscal views but I find the book most stimulating and interesting. Economists and students of Federal budgets and trade and fiscal policy will, in my opinion, find "Stable Money" a provocative approach to the problems which confront us.

No Rise in the Gold Price

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, following the devaluation of the pound sterling and subsequent gold speculation, there has been renewed interest and discussion of the future role of gold in the international monetary system.

Recently Herbert Bratter, Washington correspondent of Banking, interviewed Dr. Paul Einzig and me on this subject. Dr. Einzig argued for an impressive rise in the gold price which would strengthen the position of gold as the keystone of the international monetary system. I contended that gold should remain at $35 an ounce until such time as it can be demonetized, when its price as a commodity would fall sharply.

On December 12, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] joined me in reaffirming congressional determination to maintain the present gold price.

Yesterday, William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, asserted that an increase in the gold price is "neither necessary nor desirable as a solution to the problem of international payments imbalance or to the problem of assuring adequate growth in international reserves.

I include hereafter the interviews of Dr. Einzig and myself which were published in the Baltimore Sun on January 15 and February 5, 1968, respectively:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Jan. 15, 1968]

GOLD AND THE DOLLAR: ARE WE LOSING THE BATTLE?

(Note.—Paul Einzig holds the D.Sc. in economics and politics from the University of Paris and has published well over fifty books, mostly on international finance and money matters. One of the senior experts in the field, he has been since 1945 London correspondent of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of New York. Herbert M. Bratter is Washington correspondent of Banking, the journal of the American Bankers Association and a frequent contributor to The Sun's editorial page. Mr. Bratter has prepared a series of questions on the current status of and the outlook for the dollar to which Dr. Einzig gives his own answers in the exchange below:)

BRATTER. Dr. Einzig, from your ringside position, what are the chances that the pound sterling will hold its new par value of $2.40 through 1968?

EINZIG. It depends on whether the British government is prepared to make really drastic cuts in public expenditure. (By public expenditure I mean not only government spending but also spending by the local authorities and by nationalized industries.) The main reason why the deflationary measures adopted by the Socialist government between 1964 and 1966 were unable to eliminate the balance of payments deficit and to restore confidence in sterling was that the measures were confined entirely to the private sector of the economy, while the orgy of over-spending continued unabated, indeed on an increasing scale, in the public sector. This meant that, although the deflationary measures adopted in July 1966, were indeed drastic, the inflated purchasing power they mopped up was replaced, and more than replaced by public over-spending.

But if, as I cannot help suspecting, the so-called cuts will only amount to a slowing-down of the increase in public spending, then I am convinced that as soon as the foreign exchange market comes to realize this, a sweeping attack on sterling will develop. In that case the Government will either devalue once more or it will adopt the system of floating exchange rates, and under it the pound will be allowed to depreciate.

BRATTER. What does the pound sterling matter to Americans? The pound and the dollar are not Siamese twins. If the pound should be devalued again this year, would it affect the United States?

EINZIG. It is true, technically that the pound and the dollar are not linked to each other. But the experience of November–December, 1967, when the devaluation of sterling was followed by a heavy flight from the dollar into gold, shows the extent to which the link does indeed exist in practice. If even a moderate devaluation of sterling produced such spectacular effect on the dollar, it is easy to imagine what the effect of a further and possibly more substantial devaluation would be. We must bear in mind that last year only a few currencies of secondary importance followed sterling's example, but in case of a second devaluation many other currencies, some of them of considerable importance, are likely to devalue.

Such a wave of devaluations would leave the dollar obviously overvalued and this would affect the competing capacity of American industries unfavorably. The result would be a widening of the trade deficit in spite of the very drastic measures announced by President Johnson on New Year's Day. The mere anticipation of such a development would be sufficient to inspire a sweeping wave of distrust in the dollar.

BRATTER. Washington has pegged the dollar price of gold, the so-called monetary price, at $35 an ounce ever since 1934, although few Americans of today have ever seen a gold coin in circulation. Indirectly, the United States monetary price of gold is the world price, although in speculative markets non-monetary gold trades at higher prices. Wouldn't an increase in the official price mean inflation?

EINZIG. It would not automatically entail inflation either in the United States or in other countries. But since it would make it unnecessary for the United States Government and for other governments to defend their exchanges and their balances of payments by resisting inflation, there would be more temptation to allow inflation to proceed and to disregard its effects on domestic prices.

But then the same effect would be produced through a substantial artificial increase in international liquid resources by the application of the project tentatively approved by the International Monetary Fund at its last meeting. If the amount of reserves is increased, whether by writing up the book value of gold reserves or by creating fictitious reserve units, inducement for governments to keep down the pace of inflation would weaken considerably.

BRATTER. You have long been known as an opponent of a higher price of gold in terms of dollars. Now suddenly you have reversed your position. Why?

EINZIG. Because the abandonment of the defense of sterling's old parity has opened the floodgates for irresistible pressure on the dollar. Each devaluation of an important currency, following on repeated solemn promises that it would be defended, undermines confidence in similar pledges by other countries. Even in the absence of a second devaluation of sterling, the continued defense of the dollar has become extremely difficult and would entail very drastic deflationary measures detrimental to production and to the standard of living.

Until the devaluation of sterling it was my very firm belief that such sacrifices would be well worth making for the sake of international stability. But the change brought about by that devaluation has compelled me reluctantly to come to the conclusion that, in trying to defend the dollar at $35 the United States is fighting a losing battle. The choice is between devaluation now while the United States still possesses $12 billion of gold or later after the greater part of that amount has been lost.

BRATTER. Since you now say the United States should raise the price, when and how and by how much do you recommend it do so?

EINZIG. It would be a mistake to raise it to an extent that would leave a widespread impression that this was only the first installment. The unsatisfactory result of a small devaluation of sterling has proved that undue moderation in this respect is a mistake.

Since there has been so much talk about the need for doubling the price of gold the public has come to think in terms of a price of $70. If the United States must change the price it might as well make an impressive job of it instead of merely nibbling at the problem.

I am for an immediate swift action without any delay, because any delay would cost the United States further billions of dollars in losses of gold. It must be made by unilateral decision. Devaluation negotiated by a conference of international experts is impracticable because its deliberations are bound to leak out and there would be a landslide of withdrawals of gold before the new price comes to be applied.

BRATTER. From the standpoint of your recommendations, does it make any difference whether the price is raised by the Secretary of the Treasury informally through open market trading, under powers which he has, or by formal act of Congress changing the statutory gold content of the dollar which is the United States monetary unit?

EINZIG. As it would take time for Congress to pass a highly controversial act changing the price of gold, the resulting publicity that would inevitably precede the change would produce an even more disastrous effect than the leaks from an international conference debating the subject. By the time the act is passed there would be no gold left in Fort Knox. Informal action by the Secretary of the Treasury is the only practicable solution. Its effect on the actual dollar price of gold would surely be ratified by Congress subsequently.

BRATTER. If the United States follows your advice, what would be the effects on the United States and on other countries and their currencies?

EINZIG. At its devalued level the dollar would attract foreign money once more. There would be dehoarding of gold on a very large scale, as there was after 1934, and much of the gold thus released would find its way back to the United States. Its financial power and prestige which have been on the decline in recent years, would increase once more. Although for psychological reasons it would still be advisable to apply President Johnson's measures—the delay in measures to defend sterling at its devalued rate has jeopardized the success of the devaluation—I am convinced that the restrictions on the economy could be relaxed as soon as the extent of the favorable reaction becomes visible.

Needless to say, sterling and other currencies would have to follow the devaluation of the dollar. As I said above, that need not result in immediate inflation, but it would create the possibility of further inflation. This is the main reason why I was opposed until recently to an increase in the United States price of gold. But even an acceleration of the pace of the rise in world prices would be a smaller evil than the mounting pressure on the dollar and the atmosphere of uncertainty which would develop if a desperate attempt should be made to hold the present price. And the ultimate result would be the same, with the difference that when the United States is forced eventually to devalue it would find itself in a weak position similar to that of the United Kingdom today.

BRATTER. Would it not be detrimental to the prestige of the United States to abandon the resistance to pressure to raise the official price of gold?

EINZIG. Not if it is done now, while decision still rests with the Administration, as an act of deliberate policy, instead of its being forced to abandon the dollar parity as a result of irresistible pressure after the decline of the gold reserve to a level at which a devaluation becomes inevitable. The prestige of a currency, and of a country, depends not on its past record but on its present position and future prospects. In 1931 sterling and Britain came to command incomparably higher prestige after the abandonment of the old parities than during a period when sterling was hanging on precariously to its indefensible parities. In spite of their records for devaluations, the French franc and the Deutsche mark command more confidence today than the dollar.

In any case, while considerations of prestige cannot be disregarded altogether, they should take secondary place when vital interests are at stake. So long as the United States continues to remain on the defensive, its production and its capacity to play a decisive part in international finance and international politics is bound to suffer.

BRATTER. Would an increase in the price of gold not help the Soviet Union?

EINZIG. The extent to which a higher income from the Soviet Union's gold output would help is negligible compared with its benefits from a weakening of the United States through continued loss of gold and through defensive measures handicapping its production and its capacity to help other free nations.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 5, 1968]

GOLD AND THE DOLLAR: "WE SHOULD SCARE THE SPECULATORS"

(NOTE.—On this page January 15 Dr. Paul Einzig, an author and expert on foreign exchange, gave his views on the related questions of gold and the American dollar in answering questions put to him by Herbert Bratter, the Washington correspondent of Banking and a frequent contributor to The Sun. Dr. Einzig predicted that it will be necessary to devalue the dollar sooner or later and recommended that the United States raise the price of gold now rather than be forced to do so after it has lost the greater part of the gold still in Fort Knox.

(Representative Henry S. Reuss (D., Wis.), a member of the House Banking Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic subcommittee on international exchange and payments, gives his views below on these subjects in answer to questions from Mr. Bratter:)

Bratter. Dr. Einzig's first point was that a sweeping attack on sterling is likely to depress the pound substantially below its new parity of $2.40, causing a wave of devaluation accompanied by distrust in the dollar. Do you agree?

Reuss. In the first place, I am not at all sure that a sweeping attack on sterling will develop. Britain's mid-January retrenchment on foreign commitments, plus its domestic austerity program, gives the pound a good chance to make the grade at the present $2.40 parity.

But if the pound should be devalued again—and I don't believe it will be—I don't go along with Dr. Einzig's prediction that other important currencies—presumably Common Market currencies—will also be devalued. They would not deserve to be. The International Monetary Fund, if it wants to continue to command respect, should oppose it. I just don't believe that the free world monetary managers have so taken leave of their senses as to contemplate a series of competitive devaluations.

However, if there is another attack on the pound, it must be reckoned with that the dollar would also come under attack, as happened in November–December, 1967, when speculators against the pound got panicky about paper money generally and decided to get into gold. The gold pool lost about $1 billion the last time. It now has many billions in its hands, and is determined to use it to flood out any speculators. And some sensible interim arrangements by monetary authorities can act as a further deterrent to speculation.

Bratter. Einzig holds that in trying to defend the dollar on the basis of the $35 price of gold established in 1934 we are fighting a losing battle. In a decade the United States gold stock has shrunk from almost $23 billion to $12 billion. Since we have been losing the balance of payments battle for a decade, should we reconsider our gold policy and double the price of gold?

Reuss. No, we should not double the price of gold. Though we have lost $11 billion of gold in a decade, that was what our swollen gold supply was there for—to give us a breathing spell while the free world moved toward a better ordered international monetary system than the out-of-date gold exchange standard. The International Monetary Fund's Special Drawing Rights Agreement should be promptly ratified and activated. I believe that it will be, and that we can win the Perils-of-Pauline race to get a better system before our present inadequate system causes too much trouble.

The objections to doubling the price of gold have been extensively stated, and they are still valid:

1. To do so would break faith with the many foreign monetary authorities who have held dollars instead of demanding gold, in reliance on our commitment not to raise the price of gold.

2. If the dollar should become overvalued (and it is currently not overvalued, since traders and investors are delighted to hold it), merely raising the price of gold won't cure the overvaluation, since other countries would also raise the price of gold.

3. Doubling the price of gold would give windfalls to the two unattractive gold-producing countries, South Africa and the Soviet Union, and to the two gold-heavy countries, France and the United States. It would hurt countries, including Japan, Latin America, Norway, which used dollars rather than gold as their major reserve.

4. Doubling the price of gold would create such an increment in world reserves as to present a real inflationary problem, one that could only be warded off by very drastic domestic measures. By contrast, the increase in the new Special Drawing Rights ("paper gold") of the I.M.F. would be carefully calibrated so as to avoid inflation.

But why talk about the United States raising the price of gold? We aren't going to. Even if a panicky President or a trigger-happy Secretary of the Treasury decided to do it (and I am completely confident neither our President nor our Secretary of the Treasury has the slightest intention of trying to do it), only Congress has the legal power to raise the price of gold. This was made clear by my exchange with the Treasury which is included with the hearings of the House Banking and Currency Committee on the gold cover removal on January 23, 1968. And in a colloquy on the floor of the House on December 6, 1967, the House leaders joined with me in affirming our determination never to raise the price of gold—never to break faith with our creditors, and never to reward the speculators against the dollar.

Bratter. Assuming that the Government decided to raise the price of gold, if it did so to an extent that it would not be interpreted as only a "first installment," Einzig says, foreign capital would again be attracted to the United States, much gold would be de-hoarded as in 1934, and United States financial power and prestige would be restored. Do you agree?

Reuss. I certainly do not agree that doubling the price of gold would enhance United States financial power and prestige. Just the opposite, we would stand exposed as an international four-flusher who enticed foreign monetary authorities to hold dollars instead of demanding gold, and then double-crossed them. While it is probably true, as Dr. Einzig says, that a doubling of the price of gold would result to some dishoarding from private hoards, who needs gold at such a time? Dishoarding would simply accentuate the inflationary problem that would come about through the initial doubling of the price of gold.

Bratter. Dr. Einzig says that raising the gold price would not be automatically inflationary, yet even an acceleration in world prices would be less evil than a desperate attempt to hold the $35 price, which would reduce the United States to a weak position like that of the United Kingdom today. What is your view of this?

Reuss. I don't see anything "desperate" in attempting to keep the monetary price of gold at $35 an ounce from rising. As soon as Special Drawing Rights are activated—and the sooner the better—gold can be progressively dethroned as a monetary reserve. Some nations will prefer to keep it as a reserve, and there is no reason not to humor their antiquarian whims.

But the time will come—I hope sooner rather than later—when all official dollar creditors of the United States will have had an opportunity to take all the gold they want, and we can then move toward disposing of the rest of our gold stock (less whatever we may need for cloak-and-dagger operations, and as a small industrial stockpile). To make sure we keep getting $35 an ounce for what we sell, we should probably continue as occasional small purchasers of gold at $35 an ounce so long as we have much of it left.

As a considerable portion of the world's $45 billion of monetary gold leaves the system, it will depress the private market for gold well below $35 an ounce—according to some observers to below $10 an ounce.

This is something that speculators in gold ought to ponder. The United States Congress is never going to raise the price of gold above $35 an ounce. And the likelihood that gold will be totally or partially dethroned within a few years makes it entirely possible that gold will sink drastically in market value.

Speculators in gold now figure they have a commodity which could go up in price, and can't go down. In fact, what they have is a commodity which can't go up in official price—Congress won't let it—and which may well go down.

In short, I disagree with Dr. Einzig. I don't think we should let the speculators scare us. We should scare the speculators.

Tribute to Miss Polly Bergen in Recognition of Her "Outstanding Woman Executive Award" by the Downtown Association of St. Louis and for Her Accomplishments in the Areas of Human Welfare

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the world of big business has been, by tradition, a man's world, so it gives me particular pleasure to call attention to an outstanding success achieved by a woman with the courage to enter the highly competitive arena.

I am referring to Miss Polly Bergen, one of Hollywood's most versatile stars and an outstanding actress of international renown in all areas of the entertainment world—motions pictures, television, and music recordings.

As a longtime resident of Beverly Hills, Calif., Miss Bergen, in addition to her multifaceted career, has still found the time to participate in various civic activities as well as in diversified areas of philanthropy.

We of the Beverly Hills-Los Angeles area of California are indeed proud that an important civic organization of a sister American city is paying a signal honor to our own Polly Bergen.

Each year the Downtown St. Louis Association of St. Louis, Mo., selects someone to be honored as the outstanding woman executive in the United States, the ultimate award offered to women in the business world.

This year's award went during this month of February to Miss Bergen, in recognition of her leadership with the "Oil of the Turtle" cosmetics company—a major American industrial organization that grew from an idea into a $5-million business in less than 2 years.

It gives me great personal pleasure to salute Miss Bergen's energetic leadership and success. Although married to a prominent Hollywood executive, and the mother of two children, she had the initiative to go forward with this new business venture and prove, by her personal leadership, that her talents extend far beyond those of an actress in the world of show business.

In receiving the Outstanding Woman Executive Award, Miss Bergen joins a group of outstanding women who have won this coveted honor in past years, such as Lucille Ball, news executive Pauline Frederick, and Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. The citation from the Downtown St. Louis Association is a well-deserved tribute to these exceptional women.

It is therefore fitting and proper for us as fellow Americans to join the St. Louis Downtown Association in paying tribute to Polly Bergen and commend her for her outstanding contributions in the world of business and also for her dedication to philanthropic endeavors aimed toward bettering the lives of her fellow man.

David Schoenbrun on Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Members of both Houses were privileged last week to hear the articulate and cogent views of David Schoenbrun, known best to Americans as the former CBS chief in Paris and Washington. Mr. Schoenbrun can claim unique knowledge of Vietnamese and Indochinese affairs. He interviewed Ho Chi Minh several times, the first being in 1966. He was the only American on the scene at the crucial battle of Dienbienphu. He attended the Geneva Conference which followed in 1954. He has since traveled repeatedly to Vietnam, most recently as a private visitor to North Vietnam. He currently teaches at Columbia University the only course on the history of Vietnam offered in any college in this Nation.

During his series of meetings here last week, Mr. Schoenbrun spoke convincingly and authoritatively about the great mistake we are now making in Vietnam. I am pleased to report that his appearance was extremely well received, and that he will be returning to Washington within the next 2 weeks to continue his discussions with Members.

I insert in the RECORD one of Mr. Schoenbrun's excellent articles, titled "Vietnam: The Case for Extrication," in which first appeared in the February 6, 1967, issue of Christianity and Crisis, and has been circulated widely since then. The article follows:

VIETNAM: THE CASE FOR EXTRICATION

(By David Schoenbrun) [1]

Most of the men who rule Saigon have, like the Bourbons, learned nothing and forgotten nothing. They seek to retain those privileges they have and to regain those they have lost. In Vietnam only the Communists represent revolution and social change. The Communist Party is the one truly national organization that permeates both North and South Vietnam. It is the only group not dependent on foreign bayonets for survival. For its own strategic and political ends the United States is thus protecting a non-Communist Vietnamese social structure that cannot defend itself and that perhaps does not deserve to be defended.

Our responsibility for prolonging what is essentially a civil conflict may be one of the major reasons for the considerable amount of confusion, guilt and soul-searching among Americans over the Vietnam war. I simply cannot help worrying that, in the process of waging this war, we are corrupting ourselves. I wonder when I look at the bombed-out peasant hamlets, the orphans begging and stealing in the streets of Saigon, and the women and children with napalm burns lying on the hospital cots, whether the US or any nation has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends.

I agree with the paragraphs above although I did not write them. They are composed of sentences excerpted from a much remarked-upon article in *The New York Times Magazine* (Oct. 9, 1966) "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk" by Neil Sheehan, who has been covering the Pentagon since returning from Vietnam last August.

Neil Sheehan is not a Nervous Nelly, not a Peacenik, not a Vietnik, not even anything so supposedly un-American as an intellectual. He is a professional reporter who once "believed in what my country was doing in Vietnam," but who, as of October 9, 1966, no longer believes. Along with many of his fellow citizens, he goes so far as to "wonder" whether his country "has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends." His is the cry of anguish of an honest man who has gone far toward the realization that his country is doing something very wrong. He has not yet gone that one vital step further to the only attitude that has both practical and moral importance: the willingness to right the wrong. His cry of anguish ends with a whimper: "Despite these misgivings I do not see how we can do anything but continue to prosecute the war"—and with a pious prayer: "I hope that we will not, in the name of some anti-Communist crusade, do this again."

A professional reporter myself, with long experience in Vietnam, particularly the larger region—Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos—once known as French Indochina, I read Sheehan's article with strong emotion: admiration for the sweep and depth of his reporting; respect for his distress and soul-searching; bemusement as to why he did not include more of these facts in his daily reports from Vietnam; finally, a hot flash of anger at his grotesque conclusion that we must continue to prosecute an evil war that cannot be won. How many readers, like myself, clutched at their sanity as an otherwise lucid writer concluded that there is no way out of a frightful mess other than to dig deeper into it?

A PERSONAL AND NATIONAL DILEMMA

If this were Neil Sheehan's personal dilemma it could easily be dismissed in light of his valuable documentation. But the greater value of Sheehan's article is that it so fully reflects a national dilemma, broad and deep across the country and, indeed, within the government itself. I have met and talked with many Neil Sheehans, in the White House, in the State Department, in the Congress and in lecture tours, symposia, teach-ins and other public and private discussions of the Vietnamese war. At the Bankers Association of Omaha, the Community Center of Oak Park, Ill., the World Affairs Councils of Buffalo, Philadelphia and Chicago, the Forum of Miami, the Merchants Club of Dallas; from Garden City to Beverly Hills, from Minneapolis to New Orleans, in almost one hundred meetings with some hundred thousand people I have heard this same cry: it's a dirty war but we're stuck in it.

All of the evidence that I have seen, including analyses of the opinion polls, indicates that an overwhelming majority of Americans wants an end to the war. What clouds the issue is that the majority is divided into three groups: those who think the war can be ended by an all-out escalation, those who think it can only be ended by de-escalation leading to negotiation, and finally—perhaps the majority of the majority—those citizens neither hawk nor dove, who, as Sheehan correctly describes them, are confused, feel guilty, and let themselves be pulled into deeper waters by the powerful tides.

Of all the conflicting attitudes this war has stirred up perhaps the most extraordinary is one that every lecturer and teacher knows well; it astonished Senator Robert Kennedy on his recent trip to the Far West, when he was addressing the student body of a West Coast university. He told them that he was opposed to the student deferment system, which favors those who could afford to go to college. He was almost hooted off the platform. Startled at the outburst, Kennedy then asked the students whether they favored greater escalation, and they roared their approval. Such twisted thinking can be summed up: More War Without Us—or escalation without participation.

I have run into this attitude in every part of the country and not just among students. In Omaha, the executive vice president of a bank told me that he hoped we could hit hard enough to get it over before his son was drafted. Another man told me he had advised his son to study a special branch of science that would require four years of postgraduate study. "In the meantime let's bomb the hell out of them and get it over."

Get it over, get it over, is the cry heard across the nation. For some it is a cry of personal fear. For some it is a cry of moral anguish. For most, I am afraid, it is only a cry of anger—a howl of frustrated pride that has little to do with morality and everything to do with proving America's power and saving Uncle Sam's face. This attitude is most frequently expressed in the statement: Maybe we shouldn't have gotten into this, but since we have, we must see it through.

Perhaps the most prominent spokesman for this view is General Eisenhower, whose recent reversal of attitude reflects this widely held position. In October, 1966, Eisenhower said we must do everything necessary to wage the war successfully, and he refused to rule out even the possibility of using atomic weapons. Yet I heard General Eisenhower talk very differently two years ago.

I visited Eisenhower at his farm in Gettysburg, on August 25, 1964, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Paris. In the course of a talk lasting several hours the General reminisced about the French Indochinese War and the pressures he had put upon the French to conduct it differently. They could not rally the people to their side, he recalled, adding that no white, Western nation could win a colonial war in Asia. He then talked about our own dilemma in Vietnam and his decision to give economic aid to Ngo Dinh Diem to help them resist Communism. "That's the only way it can be done," Eisenhower told me. "We can only help them to help themselves." He thought then that we could not and should not try to do their fighting for them. Today he thinks differently and the reason is surely evident: our massive commitment to defeat Communism in Vietnam has in Eisenhower's view created a new situation.

Eisenhower has not contradicted himself. He now believes that the context has so changed that we need no longer concern ourselves with what changed it; perhaps we should never have gotten involved, but there is no point in dwelling upon past history. Historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. apparently agrees. He began his article "A Middle Way Out of Vietnam" in *The New York Times Magazine* (Sept. 18, 1966) by stating: "Why we are in Vietnam today is a question of only historical interest. We *are* there, for better or for worse, and we must deal with the situation that exists. . . . Our stake in South Vietnam may have been self-created, but it has nonetheless become real."

---

[1] David Schoenbrun is perhaps best known for his reports from Paris on both radio and television for CBS News. A combat correspondent with the First French Army in World War II, he was decorated by the French Government with the Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre. This article is reprinted from The Columbia University Forum, Vol. IX, No. 4. Copyright 1966 by the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York.

THE VALUE OF LOOKING BACKWARD

Nothing could be more dangerous than this kind of thinking. The point in examining the past is not to cry over spilled milk or to indulge in useless blame-finding, but to find out what went wrong and why so that we might see more clearly, first, how to put it right and, second, how best to answer Sheehan's prayer that we don't do it again.

To illustrate the value of looking backward in the dispute, let us examine the question of the nature of the war, particularly the issue of aggression. The Johnson Administration talks constantly of North Vietnamese "aggression," sometimes simplifying it to "Communist aggression." Over and over at the Manila Conference, and in its final communique, aggression was the word used to describe the war. If we simply accept this charge without checking it against the historical record—that is, if we persuade ourselves that "now" is unrelated to "then"—it will be almost impossible, I believe, to find the way to peace. Hanoi will certainly not enter negotiations as the "aggressor."

Examination of the record would show a situation very different from today. (Is that why we are so often urged to forget it?) Certainly Hanoi is taking aggressive action now in sending regular soldiers to fight in South Vietnam. But Hanoi's view, which is accepted by most observers outside the U.S. is that the original provocation was committed by the South Vietnamese and by the U.S. in jointly refusing to carry out the provisions of the Geneva Accords. North Vietnam did not send troops south until after the American build-up.

Hanoi has been reacting to both the American intervention and the refusal of South Vietnam to hold free elections. It is also reacting to the usurption of power by a military clique that is not representative of the Vietnamese people, and not even of the South Vietnamese, since Premier Ky and his principal aides are refugees from the North.

It does not invalidate these facts to argue that Ho Chi Minh does not represent the people either, or that what we are facing is some new kind of internal aggression. That is precisely what all the turmoil has been about. From the very start there has been a civil war among the Vietnamese, not a Korean-like aggression by the North against the South. And if this fundamental truth cannot be accepted, then any kind of an honorable settlement is beyond hope. You can't settle a fight if you do not know what it is all about.

I do not speak of history only from hindsight. I watched all of this happen. I was at the Battle of Dienbienphu; when I saw the Chinese mortars going into position on the crest of the hills above the valley, I knew I was watching the end of the era of Western dominance in Asia. I flew from Hanoi to Saigon to Geneva with Prince Buu Loc, then Prime Minister of South Vietnam. I covered the conference and interviewed the principal actors. They came to the conclusion that Western powers could no longer determine the flow of history in Asia; that the best that could be expected for the West was an independent, neutralist Vietnam, Communist but not a satellite of China.

I have come to believe that period deserves the closest study by American citizens, not because errors were made or evil done intentionally, but because the leaders of our country, Eisenhower and Kennedy in turn, either were not aware of the dynamics that would follow from their decisions or discounted the dangers too readily. If we turn our backs on the dynamic process that led us, without intent, into a war we know we should not be fighting, how will we avoid making the same mistakes in the future?

Our predicament began with the judgment of John Foster Dulles—a correct judgment—that Ho Chi Minh had become so popular a national hero that he would win free elections by a big margin (80 per cent, President Eisenhower estimated in his memoirs). Every informed observer concurred. It was not the judgment that was wrong, but the conclusion Dulles drew from it. Dulles decided that we must organize an Asian equivalent to NATO, support an anti-Communist leader in South Vietnam and stall off the free elections provided by the Geneva Accords. This led to Eisenhower's letter to Ngo Dinh Diem, our selection as anti-Communist champion, offering economic aid.

Eisenhower then believed that the South Vietnamese needed only our friendly help and guidance. This policy was based on America's brilliant success in Europe, where the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO combined to provide the fruitful use of economic aid under a military shield against external aggression. The error, of course, was the assumption that a policy that had worked in industrialized, technologically advanced, white, Christian Europe could also work in rural, backward, yellow, non-Christian Asia.

We also failed to understand how the mechanism of our program of aid leads inexorably from butter to guns. We start with the simple proposition that Communism is evil and should be stopped from spreading. Therefore anti-Communists must be helped. When we give economic aid, we soon discover we must also provide technological help.

To persuade Congress and the people to give tax dollars the anti-Communists are described as fighters for freedom. When they fail to carry out our proposals for reforms, the fact is hidden because more aid must now be given to prevent their collapse. The investment in aid and technical advisors becomes so great that soldiers are sent to protect it. The soldiers are shot at, so they are authorized to shoot back. The Communists strike harder to prevent the American program from shoring up the adversary. More soldiers are sent and bases are built. Once our honor and power are committed, it becomes our war. And once it becomes our war, then we devise new rules. Thus an Eisenhower who once believed that only Asians should fight an Asian war can two years later approve an American commitment greater than the commitment of the South Vietnamese themselves.

FROM LUCIDITY TO ABSURDITY

How can we avoid the dynamics that lead from economic aid to all-out commitment? The mechanism that springs the trap is our unilateral programming. By giving aid directly, we directly involve our flag, prestige and power in the success of the recipient, and so become the servant of a Chiang Kai-shek or a Marshal Ky—men who stand for the very opposite of the democratic cause we suppose we are defending. If instead we gave aid through international organizations—the World Bank and OECD are two of many—we might find a palliative for the ills of our foreign aid program. We could commit American dollars without committing the American flag.

Maybe then we would not find ourselves in situations that inevitably become polarized into the fatal alternatives: victory or defeat. This false dichotomy is what leads a Neil Sheehan from lucidity to absurdity. He and many other Americans see only a continuation of the war or a "precipitate retreat, degenerating into a rout." Or, as I have heard it said again and again across the nation, "we can't turn tail and run." Of course that isn't the answer; the trouble is, it isn't even the question. The real question is how to find a middle ground between victory and defeat. Is there, as Sheehan suggested, really nothing to do but make a bigger mess?

It is at this point that a huge dense cloud seems to descend upon even the clearest-thinking Americans. We cannot seem to perceive the shape of that middle ground. Mr. Schlesinger called on us to find it in his *Times* article, but he did not describe exactly where it might be found. He saw no reason for "our reluctance to follow the Laos model and declare neutralization, under international agreement, our long-run objective," but he only proposed de-escalation and put major emphasis on our need "to regain our cool." President Johnson too employed this in-cliche in his Princeton address when he urged his critics not to blow their cool.

But here I lose my own cool. It seems to me singularly inappropriate for anyone conducting a major war to accuse others of being overheated. Has President Johnson kept his cool in Vietnam in dropping more tons of dynamite on that tiny country than were dropped on Nazi Germany in World War II? Are doves really more hotheaded than hawks? Is there some intrinsic virtue in keeping cool before so tragic and cruel a war as this? Indeed isn't it about time to *get hot* about demanding an end of the war? It is said that Senators Wayne Morse and J. William Fulbright hurt themselves badly by losing their cool. Perhaps they did. But they have also done their country a great service, and were it not for men like them, we might still be awaiting responsible nationwide discussion of the Vietnamese and Chinese issues.

It is at this point that I feel only an intense anguish for the crisis of my profession and of my country. I know that Neil Sheehan is not the only reporter to suspect that he had been fooled, not the only correspondent to be torn between the realization that the war is corrupting us and a failure to see any honorable way out of it. I watch my colleagues agonizing about it, struggling to keep cool, but ending up by stepping away from the truth. They denounce the war but advocate that we continue to prosecute it. It is not that the press is cynical, but it seems paralyzed by the war, an avowed mistake, the correction of which appears so difficult and costly that it seems easier just to continue it.

Many fellow countrymen, like my colleagues, recognize the mess but cannot agree on how to clean it up. Some advocate greater peace efforts; others, the plurality, greater efforts to win. Both doves and hawks agree, however, on the desirability of ending the war swiftly. Hardly anyone has much stomach for Johnson's policy of a long, hard war.

IS IT TOO LATE TO REVERSE OUR ERROR?

It is at this point that someone inevitably asks: what can be done about it? I would suggest first of all that we stop using such loaded words as withdraw or retreat. Our problem is rather to *extricate* ourselves from a difficult position, not to fight our way out or to turn tail and run. To extricate ourselves would require a lot of truth-telling. Yet very few Americans even try to examine what others think is the truth.

We charge China with being aggressive and expansionist, but most of the world believes that *we* are the expansionist power. American soldiers, businessmen, and technicians are seen almost everywhere in the world. Hardly a single Chinese soldier is seen outside China, and few Chinese diplomats or technicians are seen anywhere. We believe we are not expansionist because we clearly do not covet territory, but we fail to see that others regard the extension of influence on a global scale as a new form of expansionism. They do not believe that we are in Vietnam only to prevent a South Vietnamese Communist victory of a South Vietnamese military clique. They have long believed—and feel their suspicions confirmed by President Johnson's Asian tour—that the US, a Pacific power, now has a new objective: to extend its power from the Pacific to the continent of Asia.

I have never believed that America's vital interests were at stake in the Vietnamese civil war. I have never accepted the correlation between Munich and a settlement in Vietnam. Mao Tse-tung is not a Hitler, nor is Ho Chi Minh his servant. North Vietnam is not a powerful imperialist nation like Germany. If Ho is comparable to any European, he is the Tito of Asia. That is, a national Communist, at the head of a small state, trying to keep independent of an enormous Communist neighbor—in the case of Tito, Russia, in the case of Ho, China. If we can live with Tito to the tune of one billion dollars of aid, why is it so unthinkable to live in a world with Ho? Why do we fight for the South Vietnamese when we did not go to war for the Freedom Fighters of Hungary or for the East Germans? By what logic do we now offer more trade and closer relations with Russia and all of Eastern Europe but feel we must make war in Vietnam?

The crux of the matter is this: should not the Vietnamese have been permitted to determine their own fate in the first place? And is it now too late to reverse that error? Can we not return to the basic principle of the Geneva Accords: the creation of a military cease-fire and the beginnings of a negotiation among the Vietnamese themselves by themselves, between the NLF and Saigon in the South and also between South and North?

THE ANSWER: NEUTRALIZATION

It seems to me to be possible and certainly desirable for the US to change its role from belligerent to interested party, one among many who have an important stake in peace in Asia, Japan, India and Pakistan surely should be associated with efforts to end the war and encourage negotiations among the Vietnamese. The only way such negotiations could succeed and produce an enduring peace would be to quarantine Vietnam off from the world power competition, that is, to neutralize it.

By "neutralize" I mean something comparable in spirit and form to the neutralization of Austria. All foreign forces—Russian, American, French and British—were withdrawn from Austria. The Austrians drafted a constitution under which the country would not enter into a military alliance with any foreign power. This did not preclude many forms of cooperation between Austria and the West. Austria was neutralized but not neutral. This represented a real sacrifice on the part of the Russians for they were pulling out of a country they knew would henceforth be Western-oriented even in its neutralized state. They did not, of course, withdraw very far—just across the border to Hungary.

But we would not be very far off from Vietnam either, if we withdrew as a result of a treaty of neutralization. Our Navy and Air Force control the seas and air of Vietnam. And we have a firm base of operations in Thailand. There would be no great strategic danger of a phased withdrawal as a result of a negotiated treaty of neutralization. South Vietnam, without direct American military engagement, might not be able to maintain itself as a non-Communist state. The Communists might well be the dominant element of a coalition government. But which is the greater danger to America and the world: a nationalist-Communist Vietnam, neutralized by an Asian treaty, guaranteed by the great powers, or the current danger that Vietnam might become a world battlefield?

I feel strongly that it is possible to bring about a situation now where all foreign forces can be withdrawn, and Vietnam first, neighboring countries later, brought under a general great-power agreement to guarantee the neutralization of Southeast Asia. Britain has already indicated it would approve. So has Russia. General de Gaulle proposed the neutralization of Southeast Asia as far back as 1964. Eventually, and the sooner the better. China would have to be brought into the great-power agreement. There can never be any stability in Asia without Chinese consent—certainly not now that China has become a nuclear missile power. There would still be great problems. Neutralization would not solve any of the internal problems of the states in Southeast Asia, but it would solve the external problem, which is becoming the gravest problem in the world.

Neutralization is not a blueprint. No detailed plan would be of any real value today in any case. What is more immediately important than a plan is a change of attitudes and of objectives. If it becomes more important to Americans to end the anguish of this war than to continue it, there will be no problem finding a plan. Plans are, after all, only ways of carrying out what one wants to do. If we want to end the war, to keep Southeast Asia from becoming a world battleground, to neutralize it for everyone's safety, then the detailed plan will easily be found.

Neither a plan nor a prayer would be meaningful except in the service of a new policy.

Homeownership: A Congressional and Republican Initiative To Meet Certain Aspects of the Urban Housing Problem

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress has had a spotty record for developing programs originated by the study and efforts of its own membership. All too often this Congress has given priority to legislative leadership coming from the Executive of our Government. However, one of the few conspicuous examples of healthy congressional resurgence is in the area of low-income urban housing.

Beginning at once in the first days of the 90th Congress in January 1967, Senator CHARLES PERCY, of Illinois, took the floor of the Senate to unveil a new plan for low-income homeownership. By April 20, 1967, all 36 Republican Senators followed him in introducing the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. At the same time, led by my able colleague, Representative BILL WIDNALL, of New Jersey, over 100 Republican Congressmen sponsored the bill in this body. Surprisingly, this was the first major piece of urban housing legislation introduced in a Congress, all of whose membership campaigned for election in the wake of the urban riots of 1966 and a further crisis in 1967.

The National Home Ownership Foundation Act placed new emphasis on four major principles. First, that there should be, whenever possible, homeownership, as this provides a basic and healthy self-confidence and pride in people. It makes them savers and investors. This is translated into improved upkeep and further improvement of their homes. Second, that there should be a continued emphasis, rather than a deemphasis as is so often the case, in Government programs on the involvement of the private sector and the utilization of the private enterprise system to meet social problems. Third, that there should be more coordination of the various programs designed to help low-income groups. The NHOF in supplementing homeownership assistance can concomitantly provide guidance in job training and employment. Fourth, that individual self-help and participation in community projects is primary and that governmental programs are ancillary. They should support, and not supplant, efforts undertaken by the individual and local private groups.

The administration, speaking through Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver, issued a negatively critical statement the day after the introduction of the bill which notably offered no additional proposals on behalf of the administration. The legislation subsequently submitted by the administration in the area of housing was the old programs warmed over, extension of public welfare programs, model cities, and rent subsidies.

Fortunately the Congress, most notably the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, forged far ahead of the Executive in the area of low-income housing needs. The extensive hearings of that subcommittee in July of 1967 resulted in a bill (S. 2700) containing many major provisions of the original National Home Ownership Foundation Act. Specific provisions of S. 2700 traceable to the congressional NHOF initiative are, interest payment subsidies to lower the cost of homeownership for low-income families, broad assistance to neighborhood organizations, expanding opportunity for "sweat equity"; namely, allowing the homeowner to contribute his labor as down payment on his home, reimbursing lenders for the unusual expenses in initiating mortgages for low-income families, and the establishment of a federally chartered National Home Ownership Foundation.

Significant differences can be found in S. 2700 from the original Percy-Widnall proposal, but the homeownership initiative has taken hold and the dialog in the concept is growing. Noting the administration's default, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, in our statement on the President's economic message, unanimously agreed that "more is demanded than mere lipservice to the concept that our private institutions and State and local governments must be given new incentives and mobilized to play a key role in meeting our public problems." In direct response to "our cities, seething with discontent and the possibility of civil strife" we then urged the adoption of the National Homeownership Foundation Act.

In the July 1967 hearings before the Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Secretary Weaver gave mild endorsement to the homeownership concept. Because of this switch of positions, certain expectations were raised that the Johnson administration may soon present to Congress a housing message emphasizing homeownership. I certainly hope it does.

"The Vulnerable Russians"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent episode of Hanoi's attacks in South Vietnam bears all the hallmarks of carefully calculated psychopolitical warfare. In essence, the broad campaign against the cities of South Vietnam was far more psychological and political in objective than military. This is an important lesson for us to learn both in the present and for the future.

The new book on "The Vulnerable Russians" shows the background of this type of warfare in the case of the Soviet Russian totalitarians and, through them and their specialized schools in this warfare, the cases of all other Communist functionaries, including Ho Chi Minh. Authored by Dr. Lev D. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is simply written, revealing in numerous ways, and consistently documented. With broad perspective, it shows the foolhardiness of viewing Vietnam, Korea, or any other part of the Red empire in divorce from the power center; namely, Moscow itself.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work.

The excerpts follow:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."
—JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Imperialist Russia exerts every effort to discredit the annual Captive Nations Week observances held in this country. In the United Nations, through its various propaganda media, by diplomatic pressure toward accommodation for its empire, and even in the form of alleged letters from once-free officials in the captive nations, colonialist Moscow strives to achieve this objective. A year does not pass without a heavy barrage of invective against the observance, for, indeed, every observance has served to reinforce the Captive specter over Moscow.

* * * * *

Circles within and outside the United States, which strive to appease Moscow, overemphasize the political consequences of foreign aid and propagate falsehoods and exaggerations about substantial changes in the Soviet Russian Empire, have been contributing heavily to this dangerous tendency. Fortunately, there have been many other determining events to offset this tendency toward false coexistence.

* * * * *

The Izvestia interview and Stevenson in the U.N.

* * * * *

For instance, there was no reason for the President to assert, "Now we recognize that today the Soviet Union does not intend to permit reunification, and that as long as the Soviet Union has that policy Germany will not be reunified." As one of our leading columnists put it, "This unnecessary concession will dash the hopes of the German people and indicate to the world that the United States accepts indefinitely Communist domination not only of East Germany, but of Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and of the other captive nations of Europe and Asia." * * *

Worse still are the concepts and conceptions revealed by Kennedy in regard to our chief adversary. These aspects have been completely overlooked by otherwise critical observers and analysts. There can be no doubt about Moscow capitalizing on them. First, the President could have displayed a more valid understanding of the Soviet Union when, with reference to World War II, he said: "I will say that the United States also suffered, though not so heavily as the Soviet Union, quite obviously." We can well imagine Adzhubei's reaction to the more valid answer: ". . . though not so heavily as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Georgia, and Russia." As a matter of fact, the non-Russian nations in the USSR suffered far more in the war than did the Russian.

* * * * *

Further assertions by the President that the "Soviet Union is a strong military power"—and that "no one is ever going to invade the Soviet Union again. There is no military power that can do that"—not only furnished a propaganda bonanza to the totalitarian Moscow regime but also betrayed a serious unfamiliarity with the military history of the Russian Empire and with what essentially constitutes "military power" in any empire. These, too, were plainly gratuitous and detrimental statements which can only give comfort and encouragement to the enemy and depress the hopes of the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union.

* * * * *

In sharp contrast to Kennedy's conception of the Soviet Union, Stevenson's memorandum on Soviet Russian colonialism described Moscow's empire as being barbaric and as enslaving nations in the Soviet Union as well outside it. To be sure, the President in his brilliant UN address raised this signal: "Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe." But, judging by the *Izvestia* interview—not to mention other examples—his measure of fullness failed to approach the conception disclosed by Ambassador Stevenson. This example of comparative strides in the development of a captive nations awareness, consciousness, and even an ideology is seen over and over again.

* * * * *

Why Captive Nations Week?

The annual Captive Nations Week observances in this country represent marked strides in the cultivation of captive nations consciousness and ideology. In connection with examples similar to that given above we may well ask ourselves, "Why do we need a Captive Nations Week?" From time to time many people have asked, "What is the significance of this Week?"—"What do you hope to accomplish by it?" Complete answers to these questions require a number of preconceptions and perspectives such as appear in the immediately succeeding chapters.

* * * * *

Considering the first requisite on the nature of our own nation, one cannot but recall President Kennedy's remarks concerning our revolution: "We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution." If you will re-read the clauses of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, you will be impressed by its initial emphasis on the revolutionary symbol of American independence. This symbol cannot be anything but a living and dynamic one, signifying strong motivation to action itself. And such concrete action does not mean passive living "by example" or a mere model.

* * * * *

Many who give purpose and direction to the Captive Nations ideology are living evidences of the history of Sino-Soviet Russian aggression. As Calvin Coolidge once said, "Whether one traces his Americanism back three centuries to the Mayflower or three years to the steerage is not half so important as whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine." Whether many of these citizens are products of the Hungarian Revolution, the free voices of a conquered Poland, the escapees of a Russian-genocided Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia, past fighters of a Ukrainian or White Reuthenian underground, or past victims of tyranny and oppression in Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Yugoslavia, or in the Caucasus and Asia and now Cuba—or indeed, freedom-loving Russians who have found a haven here—their Americanism is no less than that of those born and reared here. Together we share a common conviction about the nature and independence of our nation.

* * * * *

We have not even begun to tap the enormous potential of non-Russian nationalism within the Soviet Union. The insecurity of Moscow's imperio-colonialist domination over the captive non-Russian nations, from the Danube to the Pacific, would be permanently sealed and intensified once we seriously begin to direct the paraphrased words of President Kennedy to the peoples of the two dozen-plus captive nations: "Fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man." Regrettably, in relation to the captive nations in the aggregate these words have yet to be expressed with implementative intent.

* * * * *

Lest we forget, above everything else Moscow craves to have its captive world undisturbed and neglected by the Free World. This is much of the motive behind its unremitting efforts toward negotiations. But it should be obvious that we must never allow this imperio-colonialist power to consolidate its far-flung empire. Moscow's haunting insecurity about the captive nations is our great weapon in the Cold War, not to speak of a hot war. Nor must we ever forget that the field of the Cold War is also Eastern Europe and captive Asia, not just the Free World. More, it is a war not only between the imperialist centers of Moscow and Peking and the Free World, but also between the captive peoples and the colonialist puppets and satraps imposed on them. Thus, terms such as "Communist nations," "Communist peoples" are pure nonsense.

* * * * *

As in Poland, Hungary and elsewhere, there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union—in fact, more so by far. Khrushchev showed his concern about this when he attacked those "who say the Soviet Union's Asian Republics are colonies." If this problem were emphasized more and more in the forum of world opinion and attention, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major and more powerful imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. The Kremlin well understands this and rants endlessly. However, too many in this country still remain puzzled and bewildered by all this. We have muffed our opportunities on this score before, and we do so now.

* * * * *

Our opportunity will be seized once we actively recognize a number of basic truths. The first is that the issues of colonialism and imperialism in Moscow's empire are prime targets for our national concern and effort. The second is the fact that the Soviet Union, which pretends to be an equal of the United States, is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the captive nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackie, North Caucasia, and Idel-Ural.

* * * * *

There is no agency in government or private life that continually and persistently studies and investigates all of the captive nations. We have desperately needed such a body. Both in the 1961 and 1962 observances, as well as in subsequent years, calls for a Special Committee and the passage of the Freedom Commission Bill were vigorously voiced. We shall surely continue to lose the Cold War until we decide to develop a cold war strategy and apparatus. The Red totalitarians have theirs.

* * * What we failed to do at the beginning of the 1950's with regard to the European captive nations, we must do now with regard to Cuba. The fact of a new captive nation existing at our doorstep should awaken us to the need of forming units of Free Cuba, prepared for guerrilla warfare and the process of liberating Cuba. The National Captive Nations Committee, which from Washington guides the nation-wide observances, was severely criticized when it first designated Cuba a captive nation. A year later in his October address on Cuba, President Kennedy himself used the term.

* * * In the meantime we virtually leave the enemy's vulnerable areas untouched, e.g., Turkestan and the Caucasus. There are over thirty million Moslems in the USSR who deserve our closest attention and whose significance for the entire Islamic world is immense.

Captive Nations Week action has also been directed at the restoration and extension of the Champion of Liberty Stamp series. Over the years the goodwill impact of these stamps had been well demonstrated. The decision of our postal authorities to downgrade the series is mystifying and even irrational, especially when many fighters for freedom among the captive nations should be appropriately honored.

* * * * *

The nature and the meaning of the Week, then, are manifested in these and other ideas, projects, proposals, and actions. There is no question that in time most of them will be realized. They stand in the best interests of our nation, for the survival of freedom, and for the avoidance of a cataclysmic hot global war. From decades of experience and evidence colonialist Moscow knows best that it cannot trust its own armed forces. This was shown in World War I, World War II, and in Hungary in 1956. The momentous conflict of our day will not be resolved by military arms but, instead, by non-military means, primarily in the field of psychopolitical propaganda.

The 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Don Cossacks

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, we will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks. Unfortunately, the Cossacks are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is prohibited by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day for the Don Cossacks, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

The February 16 declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks was followed by a similar proclamation by the Kuban Cossacks on May 5, 1918, but these valiant people were subjugated by the Red armies. The Cossacks still maintain, however, a defiant attitude toward Communist attempts to absorb them into the Soviet Union because of their strong tradition of self-government and nationalism.

In addition to commemorating national days such as this, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. Therefore, I reiterate my plea for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations and also for lengthier and more effective broadcasts to the brave Cossacks by the Voice of America.

The Arnheiter Case: A Plea for Review

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a recent column by James Kilpatrick entitled "The Arnheiter Case Won't Die." This column appeared in the February 14 edition of Newsday as well as other papers throughout the country.

The careers of two naval officers are involved in the Arnheiter-Alexander cases and the relationship between the Department of the Navy's actions with respect to these two men is at best vague.

Congressman JOSEPH RESNICK of New York, our distinguished colleague, has introduced a House resolution proposing the formation of a select committee to conduct an investigation of this case. The syndicated columnist James Kilpatrick also states a convincing case for a thorough review of this matter by the Congress.

I place in the RECORD at this point the text of Mr. Kilpatrick's column for the information of my colleagues:

THE ARNHEITER CASE WON'T DIE

(By James Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy has begun to return fire in the Arnheiter case, and a good thing, too—for it suggests that the top brass who have closed ranks in this sad affair are feeling pressures that may yet produce the full public airing that is urgently needed.

For those who just came in: Lt. Cmdr. Marcus Aurelius Arnheiter, 42, is the gung-ho naval officer who took command of the USS Vance, an aging destroyer-picket ship, in December of 1965. It was his first command, after a brilliant performance as executive officer of the USS Ingersoll. It was also his last command. Ninety-nine days later, when his ship arrived at Subic from combat patrol off Vietnam, Arnheiter was summarily removed from command. He has since been beached in San Francisco, and passed over for promotion. His career has been utterly destroyed.

Now, it may seem strange, at a time when so much is going on, for a columnist to return to the Arnheiter case. But if a gross injustice has been done to even one career officer—and a great many responsible persons are convinced that Arnheiter is a pathetic victim of cumulative blunders—the story of this one man ought not to be buried in topical news.

Until this past week, the Navy has preserved a stony silence on the Arnheiter case. Secretary Paul Ignatius was suggesting, deadpan, that there was no direct relationship between the Arnheiter case and the abrupt "resignation" of Arnheiter's articulate defender, Captain Richard G. Alexander, as prospective skipper of the battleship New Jersey. For two months, the official line was that since Arnheiter had filed certain legal proceedings in California, the Navy could say nothing.

Now the Navy is insisting publicly that Arnheiter had his day in court, that the verdict against him was impressively reviewed, and that his "derelictions" abundantly justified the decision to deny him further command assignments. Without questioning the sincerity of these gentlemen, it has to be said that many an outside critic, after searching review of the case, will flatly disagree.

If Arnheiter were as completely in the wrong as the Navy now contends—if the case were all that black against him—it is bewildering that so many respected voices should have been raised in his behalf. Vice Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, now retired after 51 years in the Navy, reviewed the entire Arnheiter file and gave the young officer complete support. Rear Adm. Dan Gallery has angrily described Arnheiter's ordeal as "the old story of bigshot professionals covering up each other's mistakes." Vice Adm. Lorenzo Sabin concurs. Even more significant, perhaps, is the eloquent testimony of enlisted men who served on the Vance under Arnheiter. They knew what Arnheiter sought to achieve.

And what was this? The evidence is convincing that Arnheiter inherited a sloppy ship, infested with cockroaches, suffering from miserable morale and lax discipline. He had one month before going on the line. In this month, he sought by admittedly Draconian measures to build a taut warship out of an easy-going pleasure yacht.

Hearsay charges against him were circulated behind his back. He lost his command before he could say one word in his own defense. The Navy never lifted a finger against the junior officers who fomented disloyalty. In the light of the Navy's own regulations, it is incredible that an officer's career could have been so ruthlessly destroyed on such flimsy evidence of such trifling allegations. Why did it happen?

So far as the Navy is concerned, Arnheiter is dead. His only hope for vindication lies in a congressional investigation, or in constant pressure by the press. He is one man, gravely wronged. So was Dreyfus.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pass judgment on the Department of the Navy's actions in this matter, but I do believe the facts in this case should be aired and reviewed.

A New Secretary General for the OAS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is a significant event. It has broken a 3-month deadlock over the election of a new Secretary General. The final solution was a compromise that took the efforts and influence of all OAS members equally and heralds a more effective working arrangement between the

United States and the Latin American members. It brought Galo Plazo Lasso, an exceptionally well-qualified man, to take a position of authority and responsibility. Mr. Plaza is noted with high praise in editorial comments of both the New York Times and the Washington Post as a statesman of strength and sensitivity, and an administrator equal to the opportunities and the responsibilities of the Organization.

The OAS is fortunate indeed to have a man of his quality as its new Secretary General both because of his personal ability, and because it marks the OAS for a stronger future and the opportunity to deal creatively and effectively with some of the problems before it.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE OAS COMES OF AGE

The Organization of American States has worked itself out of a leadership crisis in a way that opens exciting possibilities for a more active, more significant, future. In breaking a three-month stalemate over the election of a new Secretary General, the O.A.S. Council opted simultaneously for several objectives.

It clearly reflected the long-held desire of a majority of the 22 active member governments for an expanded O.A.S. role in promoting hemispheric cooperation and solidarity. It did so by electing Ecuador's talented Galo Plaza Lasso, a man uniquely qualified to administer those greater O.A.S. responsibilities and to make the most of them.

In the process, the council also served notice on recalcitrant Governments—the United States included—to get on with ratification of the amendments adopted a year ago by the American Foreign Ministers. These spell out an important part of that enlarged O.A.S. activity and responsibility.

Mr. Plaza, the ablest President in Ecuador's history and a seasoned United Nations mediator, survived handicaps and humiliations to win the O.A.S. post. He had been tagged—unfairly—as the United States candidate, and he also had to contend with the hopes of small Central American and Caribbean countries that they would elect one of their own.

None of this should handicap or inhibit Mr. Plaza when he takes office in May. At 62, he is a ruggedly independent but sensitive statesman who sought the job only when convinced that most member nations wanted a "strong, dynamic, creative" organization with an executive to match. He understands the United States well, but a more unlikely errand boy for the Johnson Administration would be hard to conceive.

The Central American group has been satisfied by the designation of Salvador's able Miguel Rafael Urquia as Assistant Secretary General. For giving up that number two post, the United States will be asked to name a new Assistant Secretary-General for Administration with a view to tightening up the whole O.A.S. operation and thus guarding against the financial irregularities that added to the Organization's crisis last November.

As things have turned out, Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was off base last week in accusing the United States of "inept diplomacy" in its support of Mr. Plaza. Instead, the quiet pressure-free diplomacy of Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz paid off in a way that seemed impossible two months ago.

The result was that the O.A.S. Ambassadors themselves worked out the compromise solution that now seems to please most of them and that opens new vistas for the Organization. For once, as one observer put it, the United States played throughout the role of "partner of the enterprise rather than boss of the enterprise."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

OPPORTUNITY AT THE OAS

The election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is as important for the way it was done as for what it does. With enough effort of the right sort by all the members of the inter-American system, it may well turn out to be the best thing that's happened to the OAS and to political life in this hemisphere since the principle of multilateralism was first introduced.

What it does is place at the head of the OAS a man of stature and energy who has been President of his own country, Ambassador to this country and an effective United Nations trouble-shooter in Cyprus, the Congo and Lebanon. It is not too much to say that he is very probably the best man for the job—and therefore, by past practice, the last man likely to get it. He got it the hard way, on the sixth ballot, after three months of political and diplomatic tugging and hauling in as honest a demonstration of the democratic processes at work as the hemisphere system has ever seen.

What was different about the way it was done this time was the way the United States played its hand. The traditional approach (still very much accepted by some State Department professionals) has been for the United States Government to pretend publicly to have no preferences, while twisting arms unmercifully behind the scenes on behalf of a captive candidate. This time, thanks largely to the refreshing influence of an able amateur, Ambassador to the OAS Sol Linowitz, who is anything but a traditionalist, the United States made no big secret of its admiration for Galo Plaza, but employed persuasion rather than the familiar power play. The Latin American members of the OAS were given time and opportunity to exercise their own influence, individually and collectively, on the result. That it was a sensible result is no mark against the other leading candidates, Eduardo Ritter-Aislan of Panama, and former Foreign Minister Falcon Briceno of Argentina. Rather it is a mark of increased maturity for the system as a whole.

A strong Secretary General means a stronger inter-American system, and a brighter opportunity for all of the members to grapple together, to greater effect, with the momentous political and economic problems of the hemisphere. Above all, a stronger OAS opens opportunities for the Latin Americans, if they have the wit and the will, to work in their own interests and in the interests of the hemisphere as a whole on a more equal footing with the United States.

Restrictive Travel Tax Threatens To Hurt Positive Efforts To Cut Travel Deficit

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one part of the administration's program for reducing the deficit on international travel by $500 million in 1968 is an intensification of efforts to attract more European tourists to the United States.

The Industry-Government Travel Task Force, headed by former Ambassador Robert M. McKinney, is expected to make its recommendations to the President within a few days. Increased European travel to the United States is almost universally recognized as the only long-term solution to the travel deficit consistent with the United States' traditions and liberal objectives.

But we must also rely upon the positive aproach to correcting the travel deficit in the short run. We may well doom our efforts to increase European tourism to the United States if we harness them to a travel tax on Americans aimed at reducing the dollar earnings of Europeans by $250 to $300 million.

In a January 31, 1968, letter to Ambassador McKinney, Hugo Mayr, general manager for North America of Swissair, describes the steps already taken by Swissair to promote European tourism to the United States. He expresses the willingness of Swissair to continue to cooperate in stimulating travel to the United States and recommends increased promotional activities by the U.S. Travel Service as well as measures to reduce travel costs within the United States.

He observes, however, that such measures "must be free to work in a prevailing atmosphere of international good will. For, if the approach of the U.S. Government should be a combination of constructive measures linked with a restrictive policy for travel to Europe, it would be strictly self-defeating. One can hardly expect that European nations would be receptive toward traveling to a country which, through restrictive legislation upon its own citizens, is depriving the friendly European countries of the income vital to their own national economy."

I include the text of Mr. Mayr's informative letter:

SWISSAIR,
New York, N.Y., January 31, 1968.

Mr. ROBERT M. MCKINNEY,
Chairman, Industry Government, Special Task Force on Travel, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: At the outset let it be known that Swissair and Switzerland are thoroughly cognizant of the tremendous gravity of the United States' balance of payments deficit and the drastic consequences which may be expected should it continue to increase. The President's proposals do indeed contain a sting for a company such as ours, but we feel—as we did in the past—that we have an inherent responsibility toward doing our part to maintain world confidence in the stability of the dollar at all costs.

In 1965, when the travel industry first came under scrutiny as a possible source of improvement to the gold drain crisis, we took immediate and positive steps to counteract the apparent disparity in tourist spending by Americans in Europe as opposed to European tourist expenditure in this country. Although we had been effective marketers of travel to the U.S. for many years already, we called an emergency meeting of our top sales, advertising, and marketing executives from Europe in New York which resulted in the creation of our highly successful "Visit U.S.A." Department, with branches both in our Zurich headquarters and New York. In addtion, we established a separate advertising budget of a quarter of a million dollars strictly for "Visit U.S.A." advertising programs. This amount, which represents a third of our entire advertising expenditure in Europe, is exactly the amount spent by the United States Travel Service for all advertising in Europe. The inequity of a situation wherein an airline company of our modest size invests the same amount to promote travel to the U.S. as does the arm of a government which annually earns close to two billion dollars in tourist receipts is immediately obvious. Nevertheless, as a direct result of our revitalized efforts we have succeded in bringing the ratio between the percentage of our European passengers to the U.S. and our American passengers to Europe into much closer proportion.

Ten years ago, 70% of our traffic on the North Atlantic consisted of Americans travelling to Europe. Today Swissair passengers originating in this country represent only 54% of our total traffic on this route. And the trend toward a continued closing of this gap is definitely indicated. In the year just passed, Swissair carried some 70,000 European visitors to these shores. It is also interesting to note that of our total passenger increase on the North Atlantic in 1967, *two thirds* originated in Switzerland. Thus, it can be plainly seen that Swiss traffic to the United States is growing at twice the rate of U.S. traffic to Switzerland.

To appreciate this in proper perspective, one must realize that such dramatic development is done in a marketing area of approximately ten million population; for our potential marketing area in Europe consists primarily of Switzerland, southern Germany and northern Italy. This is in sharp contrast to a potential market here of some two hundred million. Furthermore, we are proud to say that on a per capita of population basis Switzerland generates the second largest number of citizen visitors to the United States of any nation in this world.

On the other side of the ledger, let us take a look at what the United States is doing in a positive way toward the development of new visitors from abroad. Five years ago, it founded the United States Travel Service. It is rather difficult to determine exactly how much of the subsequent increase in European visitors to the United States is directly attributable to their efforts, but it is certainly no coincidence that since its inception traffic from Europe has been growing at the rate of 20% annually as compared with an average growth of 9% annually in the ten years previous. Despite such apparent success, the Administration has consistently tightened the purse strings on this new agency, and its present budget is a mere three million dollars. Switzerland itself spends nearly as much in promoting abroad a nation one-seventeenth the size of Texas. It is quite clear to us that this inequitous situation should be rectified. If the United States feels that a solution must be found to eliminate the "real" deficit in the balance of tourist payments between Europe and the U.S. of $380 million as demonstrated in the excellent study released by the American Express Company, we feel they should limit themselves to strictly positive methods, such as expanding the efforts of the USTS. At the same time, the Government in cooperation with the domestic travel industry must take some realistic and constructive steps toward making a visit to this country both attractive and economically feasible to the middle class European. Special hotel rates, reduced rate packages, further airline reductions domestically must all be met by an improvement in facilities for assisting the foregn language traveler in a mono-lingual country.

We at Swissair are quite willing to consider directional fares at a future date—but we certainly do not feel that the airline industry should pick up the complete tab. We would like first to see evidence that others are contributing their rightful share of the burden. And if such steps are subsequently taken by all the responsible parties, they must be free to work in a prevailing atmosphere of international goodwill. For, if the approach of the U.S. government should be a combination of constructive measures linked with a restrictive policy for travel to Europe, it would be strictly self-defeating. One can hardly expect that European nations would be receptive toward traveling to a country which through restrictive legislation upon its own citizens is depriving the friendly European countries of the income vital to their own national economy. So it is that we can only hope that the United States will reject the restrictive measures proposed and surge forward with positive steps to attract Europeans to this great land.

In the meantime, Swissair intends to continue the reinforcement of its own marketing strategies. In addition to our normal advertising expenditures for "Visit U.S.A.", another move this year will be to send over a group of some 200 European travel agents for an indoctrination on the potential of this country as a tourist destination. We shall continue our long-standing policy of purchasing U.S.-manufactured aircraft exclusively, and paying for them with fully-convertible Swiss Francs backed one hundred and forty per cent by gold. In 1968, we shall spend some 63 million dollars to do business in this country.

Even with a healthy growth rate, we shall realize a mere 30 million dollars in traffic revenues. In other words, we shall continue to assume a considerable portion of responsibility in closing the travel gap. With the conviction that measures which we consider unwise will not be taken, we shall move ahead in the truespirit of free enterprise and democratic ideals in fervent hopes that solutions to your nation's financial crises will be successfully found elsewhere.

Sincerely yours,

HUGO K. MAYR,
General Manager for North America.

The Public Conscience

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk in recent months about the deep danger in which this Nation finds itself—at home as well as abroad. We are being told on every side that a democratic society cannot correct the social injustices which we have inherited from earlier periods when the concept of human equality and dignity were less fully accepted as a part of the meaning of this country. Some—not many, but some—who believe strongly in the concept of equality tell us that our system cannot achieve it, and that we must turn violently to some other system of government and economics. Some—not many, but some—tell us that we cannot have both freedom and equality and that to preserve freedom for those who enjoy it now, we must give up trying to find justice for those who have been denied both freedom and justice.

I am convinced that both extremes are wrong. Those who despair of democracy's ability to serve the ends of justice are as wrong, but no more wrong, than those who think the justice would cost too much and that the comfortable majority can continue to ignore the plight of those who do not share in the Nation's affluence.

There is excellent reason for this conviction of mine, Mr. Speaker. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, and later in his manpower message to the Congress, pledged the prestige and power of his office to a massive program to find employment for the hard-core unemployed. And the labor movement and a substantial segment of the business community have responded alike to the demands of our grave internal crisis. The Urban Coalition, which will soon have the benefit of the superb leadership of John Gardner, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has continued to speak for enlightened labor and enlightened business in trying to find ways to bring to reality the magnificent potential of our system of government and our system of economics for the benefit of every American.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO, speaks, I believe, for both groups in a recent editorial which appeared in the January-February edition of Agenda, the magazine of the IUD. In the same magazine, an article by Henry Ford, president of Ford Motors, speaks to the same subject. I include both these articles at this point in the RECORD:

A RENEWED CALL TO THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE

(By Walter P. Reuther)

Throughout history, man has built great cities and seen them destroyed—sometimes by natural catastrophe, more often by his own hand.

Rome was burned, and so was Chicago.

Forces deep within the earth destroyed Pompeii and San Francisco.

The most urgent problem facing the United States as we begin 1968 is to find ways to prevent forces deep within the minds and hearts of men from erupting in a frenzy of rage and frustration that will result in the destruction of our great cities.

Everyone who was shocked by the riots of 1967 knows that our cities can be destroyed. Buildings can be leveled, physical facilities can be blown up and vital services can be disrupted. But there can be an even greater destruction of the tolerance and mutual dependence which make it possible for great masses of people to live together in harmony in a small space.

This potential damage to the human spirit is far more frightening than the destruction of property. Property would be replaced despite the tremendous cost because the city is indispensable to modern civilization. But large-scale rioting, looting, burning and killing, with its attendant overtones of racial and class warfare, would tear asunder the fabric of our free society and set social progress back several generations.

Every concerned American knows that this could happen.

As one American, I believe it *likely* to happen unless there is a massive, determined and effective attack on the root causes of unrest and violence.

Much is being done; much more, in fact, than most people seem to realize. It's being done by many Americans of different philosophy, occupation, political belief, color and religious conviction. They are working side by side in a great emergency effort to bring jobs, decent housing, better education and just plain hope to the poor and discouraged.

More is being done than ever before, but only because so little was done before. What we're doing is not enough, and it falls far short of what can and must be done. We need to raise our sights as a people and a nation. We need a deeper sense of national commitment, a greater sense of national urgency and a more realistic and responsible allocation of our national resources.

But while recognizing that we can and must do more, nobody, including the President and the Congress, should underestimate the significance of the social and economic forces that have joined together to find solutions.

These combined forces are best represented in the Urban Coalition—an ad hoc committee of leaders of business, labor, civil rights, religion and city government. The Coalition was formed at an emergency convocation in Washington last August, following the riots in Detroit, Newark and other cities. Men who in their ordinary occupations were considered on different sides sat side by side in common dedication and purpose.

At that time the United Automobile Workers were in the middle of tough contract negotiations with the Ford Motor Company. Everyone in the room knew of the tense situation that prevailed between the two organizations. Yet Henry Ford and I both addressed the group, and each of us tried to convey our conviction that the people in that room must join together in an urgent effort to save the cities.

I opened my own remarks by saying: "Henry Ford and I are on opposite sides of the negotiating table right now, but on this issue we are on the same side of the table."

The business community must make a positive and meaningful response to its own obligations within the Coalition. Several major corporations have already drastically revised their hiring practices and many are actively recruiting workers in the ghettos who had previously been considered unemployable. The speech given by Henry Ford before the Urban League in December, which is reprinted in this issue of AGENDA, rings with a sense of concern and responsibility which not long ago few people would have expected from a leading businessman.

Other segments of the Coalition, including labor, civil rights, religion and city government, are also working hard to meet the problem.

More and more local communities are facing up to their own responsibilities. To date, local urban coalitions have been formed, or are in the process of being organized, in 27 cities in every part of the country. Others have displayed an active interest in getting their own programs going.

But in final analysis we can begin to meet the problem adequately only if private and local efforts are accompanied by a bold and massive effort by the federal government.

The public sector is lagging far behind, and the blame rests squarely with the United States Congress. The first session of the present Congress did little toward providing effective solutions to the urban crisis. Essential bills were either not enacted at all or were so mutilated and circumscribed as to be of little help.

The second session of Congress, meeting in this election year, must move promptly and positively on a wide range of social and economic proposals to provide real help and hope to the poor of our cities.

Congress must act now—forcefully—or we may all live to remember their failure and regret the dire consequences.

THE HARDEST NATIONAL TASK

(By Henry Ford II)

(NOTE.—At a conference of the National Urban League in New York City last November 17, the chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Company presented a thoughtful address about a national problem of major proportions, excerpts of which are presented here.)

All of us are united by our deep concern over three intertwined problems—the decline of our great cities, the persistence of poverty in the midst of plenty and the explosion of racial unrest and discord.

It is good to be reminded that the bewildering tangle of problems we face is reducible, in large part, to one problem, which can have only one answer.

That single problem is the absence of opportunity for millions of Americans.

And that single answer is the creation of opportunity for every American.

It is already clear that the summer of 1967 will prove to be a turning point in the history of our nation's long and halting quest for equal opportunity. After the holocaust which swept Detroit and Newark and other cities last summer, things can never again be the same. Whether they change for the better, or for the worse, remains to be determined.

Whether our nation harvests the crop of opportunity or the crop of fear and hatred depends, in the first instance, on our willingness to see things as they really are. Then, on the basis of the facts, we will need to work out a drastic reordering of our national priorities.

The achievement of genuinely equal opportunity is, in fact, the most urgent task our nation faces. It must be placed first on the national agenda, and it must be given the massive commitment of material resources and human effort it requires.

The truth is usually more complicated than it seems, and the truth about equal opportunity is no exception.

Privileged Americans believe, by and large, that substantial progress has been made against poverty, racial discrimination and urban blight. They are right, and they are understandably bewildered when they see progress greeted by impatience, anger and violence. By many measures—including income, occupation, education and political representation—progress toward equal opportunity for Negroes has been hastened markedly in recent years.

Dispossessed Americans believe, however, that equal opportunity is still a distant dream. They, too, are right and they are understandably angry and impatient to close the gap. All the measures which show that the gap is narrowing also show that it is still very wide. And the narrower the gap becomes, the more outrageous it seems that it should exist at all.

In some ways, moreover, the gap has not been narrowed. Many Americans—white as well as black and rural as well as urban—have been left behind by progress. The gains of the great majority only make the burden of poverty all the heavier for those whose lives have not improved.

Within both the white community and the Negro community there are now fundamental disagreements over priorities. The reason why these splits have occurred, it seems to me, is the failure to see that the coin has two sides.

Poor Negroes are encouraged by extremists to believe that orderly progress within the structure of American life has not happened and can never happen. When this message is believed, the only alternatives that seem open are insurrection or withdrawal from white society and the establishment of a separate Negro nation within a nation. But these, of course, are not real alternatives. Insurrection can lead only to anarchy and repression. Withdrawal can lead only to continued poverty and denial of equal opportunity.

White people, too, are deceived by extremists who refuse to see the other side of the coin, who encourage them to believe that Negro unrest is the product of agitators, that equal opportunity has been achieved and, indeed, that Negroes are rapidly becoming a privileged class. When this message is believed, violence again may seem to be the appropriate response. At the very best, the fruit of such misconceptions is indifference and tokenism.

We are caught in the crossfire between these two extremes. The common ground we seek to defend is not moderation, but what Whitney Young calls "responsible militancy." Our goal is not moderate progress, but the fastest possible progress toward genuinely equal opportunity.

To achieve that goal, we must, of course, earn the confidence and support of the people we are trying to help. We must listen—really listen—to their grievances and aspirations. We must help them find ways to transform destructive and random protest into constructive and practical action. We must help them discover a sense of influence over decisions that affect their lives. We must try to give them the outside assistance they need without robbing them of the will to do for themselves what no one else can do for them.

One other thing we must not do, however, is suspend our own judgment and good sense.

We must not let the poor be persuaded that their problems can be solved without the support of people and organizations that have money and experience in the ways of politics and power. We must not surrender, out of some misplaced sense of guilt, to the voices of fantasy and hatred that are now being raised in the name of black power. If we do, we are guilty of the worst form of condescension. Even worse, we are guilty of standing by while the chance for real progress slips out of reach.

I believe that victory can be won. We have already come so far that the remaining problems are of manageable proportions. It is entirely possible to eliminate all but the most stubborn vestiges of poverty in less than a generation, if only we can summon the will and the wisdom to make the necessary effort.

We are not making the necessary effort now. The new alliance between municipal governments, business, labor, community agencies and the poor themselves—which is manifested in the Urban Coalition, the New Detroit Committee and similar organizations in other cities—is a very hopeful sign.

But, while much more is being done at the local level, many in Congress are unwilling to escalate the struggle against poverty at the national level.

Quite apart from the cost of the war in Vietnam, there are many signs that our national priorities are in disorder.

Consider the direct effect of public policies on the incomes of poor people.

About half of the people who are below the poverty line, as defined by the federal government, receive no payments of any kind from any level of government. But almost all of them pay taxes which have been estimated to total about $6 billion per year.

When the net effect of public policies is to reduce the incomes of at least half of our poorest citizens, something is wrong with our priorities.

I cannot attempt to explore that whole vast area of priorities for equal opportunity, but I would like to discuss briefly the question of priorities as they relate to employment opportunity. I choose this one aspect both because I believe it is the most important, and because it is the one I know most about.

I have no doubt that the first priority for equal opportunity should be the maintenance of a high level of economic growth and demand for labor.

Almost as important as the need for jobs is the need for equal access to existing jobs and promotion opportunities. It goes without saying that where employment discrimination exists, whether by unions or employers, it must be stamped out, by law if necessary.

Employers are just beginning to learn, however, that equal employment opportunity requires more than the elimination of deliberate racial discrimination. Opportunity is not equal when people who would make good employees are not hired because they do not know of openings, because they lack the self-confidence to apply, or because formal hiring criteria screen out potentially good employees as well as potentially poor ones.

I believe that employers must take aggressive steps to overcome such barriers.

It is not enough to provide technically equal employment opportunities. Management should be willing to go directly into the city, to seek out the unemployed, to make sure that hiring standards are not unnecessarily or unrealistically restrictive, and to lend a helping hand in adjusting to the work and the work place. . . .

A third priority in the search for equal employment opportunity is a vast improvement in the education and pre-employment training of those who now receive the poorest preparation for work.

The nation's schools have failed to meet the needs of deprived children of all races. The evidence is overwhelming that poor children fall farther and farther behind the longer they stay in school. This appears to be true even of those who have had the benefit of efforts to compensate for their handicaps by enriching their school experience.

School integration is important but it is not the main issue. Providing a little more money to do a little better what the schools are now doing will not be enough. It seems clear that we need radical departures, new educational approaches, to reach children who are hardly touched by present methods. Meanwhile, we shall also have to expand and improve our efforts to provide basic literacy and work skills for teenagers and adults whose earlier education did not take. . . .

The war on poverty and racial discord and urban blight cannot, of course, be won by businessmen alone.

But it will not be won unless businessmen take their place in the struggle along with national, state and local officials and legislators, union officers, civil rights groups, religious leaders and other powerful community forces. It will not be won unless business leaders take a personal stand and exert their personal influences in their communities, among their friends, and above all, in their own companies.

"Active 20–30 Week" Designated by California Legislature

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress that the week of February 12 through 18, 1968, has been designated as "Active 20–30 Week" by the international board of directors of this great service club.

This organization is made up of young business and professional men between the ages of 20 to 39 years of age who are interested in citizenship, fellowship, and community betterment.

The 20–30 International was founded in Sacramento, Calif., in the district of Congressman JOHN MOSS and myself in 1922, and merged in 1960 with the Active International, which was formed in Aberdeen, Wash., to become the Active 20–30 Club International. It now has a membership in excess of 7,000 members, represented by 13 countries throughout the world.

They serve their community and country well with such standing committees as the 20–30 International Rheumatic Fever Foundation and their outstanding foreign exchange student program. Their work in Scouting and traffic safety are well recognized in the communities which they serve.

I am pleased as a Member of Congress and former member and past president of the Vallejo, Calif., 20–30 Club to include under unanimous consent, the resolution of the California Legislature which has the full support of my colleague JOHN MOSS and myself.

I have additionally been privileged over past years to have on my Washington staff 20–30 Club Past Presidents Lee Wilber and Owen Chaffee. They epitomize to the highest degree the 20–30 motto that "youth to be served, must serve."

The resolution follows:

[Assembly, California Legislature, 1967 Regular Session]

H. RES. 81

Resolution relative to Active 20–30 International Week

Whereas, Active 20-30 International is a young men's service organization devoted to helping children disadvantaged from either medical or economic circumstances; and

Whereas, The objectives of Active 20–30 are to develop young men, by precept and example, into a more intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship, and to create in them a desire to participate actively in civic and welfare work in the community; and

Whereas, Active 20–30 International was formed in 1960 by the merger of Active International, founded in Aberdeen, Washington, and 20–30 International, founded in Sacramento, California; and

Whereas, Active 20–30 International has over 200 member clubs throughout North and South America, having main offices in Sacramento, California, and in Mexico City, Mexico, and

Whereas, Its motto is "A man never stands so tall as when he kneels to help a child"; and its emblem is an hourglass, symbolizing the passing of time and the urgency of the cause, enclosed within a buzzsaw, symbolizing the vigor and enthusiasm of youth and its power to cut away the shrouds of despair; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members urge Governor Ronald Reagan to name the week of February 20–26, 1967, as Active 20–30 Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Governor Reagan and to Active 20–30 International.

House Resolution No. 81 read and adopted unanimously February 20, 1967.

JESSE M. UNRUH,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Dean Rusk's Pesthouse

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the latest installment in the continuing story of the Otto Otepka case is one that should leave any fairminded citizen fuming. Some of us here in Congress have indeed been fuming over this case, and this reaction includes both Democrats and Republicans. As an illustration of the interest which this case has generated, there appears on page 1888 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1 a listing of items which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or press releases dealing wholly or in part with the Otepka case, dating back to September 1963.

The items—overwhelmingly in favor of Otepka's position—number over 100.

Those following the case know that not only was Otepka the victim of State's vendetta but subordinates who supported him got the "Siberian" treatment. Two such supporters who are being quarantined are Harry Hite and Edwin Burkhardt who worked under Otepka in former times, and who are still with the State Department. Hite and Burkhardt were assigned to a new department entitled "Bureau of Inter-American Affairs." They, along with the others assigned to this department were told that the function of this body was so highly classified that its purpose could not be divulged—even to them.

It turned out that this undertaking was indeed highly secret. So secret in fact that since October 1966, they have received no work assignments and Hite could not get to see his superior for over a year. Their requests for assignments went unanswered.

But State's flagrant deception is a secret no longer.

On Tuesday of this week the veteran reporter and columnist for the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, told of his visit to State Department Annex No. 1, an eight-story building condemned and awaiting demolition, standing next to the plush State Department complex on 23d Street, where State's two "lepers" are housed. State's supersecret operation was declassified at last.

The pesthouse probably rocked when in the front door walked at various times Senator JOHN WILLIAMS; Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER; that bane of bureaucracies, Congressman H. R. GROSS; Clark Mollenhoff, the Pulitzer Prize winning reporter of the Cowles Publications; the AP, the UPI, representatives of local newspapers and TV; and heaven only knows who else.

Today, Willard Edwards came out with his second column on the case of the dump on 23d Street, along with an article on later developments. Also, in less than 48 hours after the cleansing zephyrs of publicity had wafted through Annex 1, State apologized to Hite and Burkhardt, somehow found new assignments to offer them, and promised new quarters.

This, then, is the latest episode in the continuing story of the Otto Otepka case. With the help of Congress, the press, and, most of all, the American people, this chronicle is going to have a just and equitable conclusion. When more people learn of the courageous stand of Harry Hite, Ed Burkhardt, and Otto Otepka, the heat will become unbearable in State's kitchen. In the meantime, I would request of the State Department that if they have other un-American and totalitarian isolation wards in operation, please, please do not—as in the case of Annex No. 1—fly the American flag over the building!

Here are the three excellent accounts by Willard Edwards which fumigated with a breath of fresh air another of State's deep, dark, and dismal machinations:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Two condemned men report daily to a condemned building, otherwise deserted and infested with vermin, in the heart of a sprawling complex of federal structures, luxury hotels, and apartment houses in the nation's capital.

To the thousands who pass in and out of the portals of the glittering new 48-million-dollar state department headquarters across the street, the cavernous and crumbling eight-story structure of World War I vintage is merely an eye-sore, marked for destruction.

It is obviously unfit for human habitation. Rats scamper thru its dark corridors and offices strewn with rubbish. Condemned years ago and scheduled for demolition, it still carries over its main entrance a sign reading, "State Department Annex one."

Only the few in the know have given it another title in whispers—"Dean Rusk's pesthouse." For, incredibly, two state department officers are daily confined here in an isolation almost as complete as if they had been shut away from the world as victims of a plague in the middle ages.

All other government employes were transferred long ago and one small group on the fifth floor is preparing to leave.

TWO TARGETS OF WRATH SIT IN IDLENESS

The remainder of the old building has been given over to bugs and rodents with one exception. On the first floor, huddled into a small office, two targets of the secretary of state's wrath sit in enforced idleness each day.

There, since November, 1965, these two veteran security officers, with unblemished records, have been reporting. They have nothing to do. All their appeals to superiors, written and verbal, seeking some knowledge of their future fate, have been met with grim silence.

They have become, in the language of Orwell's "1984," nonpersons.

A visitor to the building enters a gloomy and seemingly deserted building. Dirt and desolation prevail in offices, long stripped of all furniture. Empty whiskey bottles litter the floor. The silence is broken only by the rustle of fleeing roaches and the patter of tiny claws.

In the shadows at the end of a long corridor, one door was shut. Opened, it disclosed two men sitting at desks. They looked up in surprise. From the time they report in the morning until they leave at the end of the day, no caller disturbs their solitude. When they go out for lunch, other state department employes dare not give them even a friendly nod.

Harry M. Hite, 42, and Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, were happy to talk about their plight, to discuss the reasons for a quarantine which has become increasingly severe over a four-year period. They were calm, not too resentful, even capable of displaying a wry humor over their predicament. Neither revealed the slightest hint of willingness to surrender to what they regard as oppressive intimidation.

What is the crime for which they are suffering?

Hite put it simply:

"We have been sentenced without trial, our careers put in jeopardy, isolated, and confined to this rat-infested prison, and ostracized for telling the truth and supporting Otto Otepka."

LAST OF 6 OTEPKA ASSOCIATES

They are the last of six associates of Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the state department's office of security. All were punished when they came to his defense when he was dismissed in November, 1963, for testifying truthfully about lax security in the department. Two surrendered, accepting employment overseas. Two others won appeals, then promptly resigned and sought nongovernment employment. Otepka, meanwhile, is still waging a legal battle for vindication altho Rusk, after a 4-year delay, revoked his dismissal and substituted a reprimand and demotion.

Hite, with 20 years of government service, and Burkhardt, 26 years, decided to stick it out. They are civil service career men.

"The department was never able to charge us with any wrongdoing or deficiency in performance," Hite noted. "It is attempting, instead, to break our spirit, forcing us to resign.

"It is hard to fight an invisible foe. We keep sending a flow of memoranda to our superiors, pleading for assignment. They act as if we had disappeared from the earth.

"We are not going to break down. This is a question of right and wrong, of honesty and dishonesty. One of these days, the building may be torn down over our heads but we're not going to submit to the dictum that government employes must cover up for their bosses when summoned to testify before a qualified committee of Congress." Additional aspects of this bizarre case will be examined in a following column.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 15, 1968]

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The unsung heroine of today's drama, in which two state department officers were suddenly rescued from a state department "Siberia," is Mrs. Janet Hite, a sweet-faced young mother, wife of one of the two condemned men.

Her husband, Harry M. Hite, 42, and his partner, Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, had virtually given up hope that they would ever be relieved from their exile. They regarded themselves as forgotten men, doomed to isolation until they succumbed to state department pressures and resigned.

Mrs. Hite decided last week to do something about it. She called on her congressman and visited other Capitol hill offices but found little interest in her story. Then, someone suggested she call this reporter who, like many others, was disinclined at first to believe that government employees could be subjected to such treatment as she described.

A visit to the "isolation ward," as Sen. John J. Williams [R., Del.] described it, and an interview with the two men confirmed the shocking reality of her report. Today, less than 48 hours after first publication of the two officers' plight, congressional indignation had forced the state department to apologize and offer them new assignments and a transfer to livable offices.

HAPPY, BEWILDERED BY SUDDEN EVENTS

Hite and Burkhardt confessed themselves both happy and bewildered by the rapidity of events which ended their dark isolation of 16 months. They remained skeptical of the state department's future attitude when today's indignation on Capitol hill has died down.

They were gratified, however, at the prospect of something to do even tho they will not be allowed to resume the profession of security officer for which they trained long years. This is ultra-sensitive work—evaluating the loyalty and trustworthiness of government employes—which is vital to government security.

The years of enforced idleness have taken their toll, they confessed. The inactivity forced upon them often became an almost unbearable agony. They were deprived for four years of the right to work at a meaningful task. For eight hours each day, they sat staring at each other, reading newspapers, listening to a radio, or writing memos to their superiors in futile pleas for employment. These petitions, until today, were never even acknowledged.

"We could take everything—the ostracism, the turning away of heads of fellow employes, the incarceration in a rat-infested building—but the strain of idleness was beginning to wear on us," said Hite.

HAVE COMBINED SERVICE OF 46 YEARS

"We came to realize that this was the probable purpose of the treatment—to break us down mentally until we started shouting at each other. It didn't work but we don't know whether it might not have, eventually."

The two men have a combined government service of 46 years. Hite is a grade 13 civil service employe, annual salary $15,307. Burkhardt is a grade 12, salary $12,989. Conscientious to a fault, they were disturbed by the realization that they had collected in four years a total of about $113,000 in salaries for which they performed no useful services. This dissipation of taxpayers' money did not bother the responsible officials—until today.

"We know that every government worker was watching the eventual outcome of our treatment," Hite remarked. "We hope that today's developments will help encourage those who still believe that a federal worker has the right to give honest testimony before a congressional committee, without subsequent harassment.

"Sometimes, during the last four years, we found it hard to believe that all this was happening in the United States. I guess it can't as long as Congress and the press are around to expose what is going on."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 15, 1968]

OUTBURSTS IN CONGRESS SPUR ACTION—OFFERED APOLOGY, NEW JOBS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The state department, responding to outbursts of indignation in Congress, today ended the exile of two veteran security officers who have been confined in forced idleness to a condemned, rat-infested building since November, 1965.

Apologies to the two men, Harry M. Hite, 42, and Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, were tendered by Robert T. Hannemeyer, chief of functional personnel. He said he was speaking for Idar Rimstad, deputy undersecretary for administration.

PROMISED TO RETURN

Rimstad was "totally unaware" of the conditions imposed on Hite and Burkhardt and deeply regretted them, Hannemeyer said. "You will never have to go back to your present offices," Hite and Burkhardt were told.

New assignments in new offices were offered the two officers, who had been sending a flow of memoranda in quest of employment for nearly two years. Hite, who has a law degree, was offered a post with the director of the office of personnel. Burkhardt also was offered a job in the personnel office. They will receive the same salaries.

TWO LIVE IN DESPAIR

Until yesterday, Hite and Burkhardt lived in despair that their confinement would ever be relieved. Their plight was disclosed that day by the Chicago Tribune, and the report stirred a reaction in Congress which culminated today in these developments:

1. A telegram to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from Chairman James O. Eastland [D., Miss.] of the Senate judiciary committee and its subcommittee on internal security, urging Rusk to personally investigate the "working conditions" of the two men and demanding "an immediate explanation and remedial treatment."

2. A Senate floor speech by John J. Wil-

liams [R., Del.] the Senate's celebrated investigator, giving the state department 72 hours to restore the rights of the two men and rescue them from "the state department's isolation ward." If no action was taken in that period, he pledged, he would seek action, thru a Senate resolution, to fire the superior responsible for "an incredible outrage."

3. The issuance of a special report by the Senate internal security subcommittee declaring that Hite, a veteran of 20 years in government service, and Burkhardt, with 26 years of service, had been subjected to a "Chinese-torture type of system."

4. Announcement by Rep. H. R. Gross [R., Ia.] that, when the House met tomorrow he would seek action on a resolution similar to that proposed by Williams in the Senate. "Heads should roll," he said, "and the first man to go should be Secretary Rusk himself."

MOVES WITH SPEED

Within three hours, the state department had moved with unprecedented speed. Rusk was reported to have instructed Rimstad to quell the congressional disturbance.

Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber Jr., in charge of congressional relations, paid a visit to Hite and Burkhardt, looked around, exclaimed, "What an awful place!" and fled.

Growing panic in the state department, as it received reports of thunderous oratory in Congress, was climaxed when a television crew showed up to take scenes of the rubbish-filled interior of the old building, known as state department Annex No. 1, which adjoins the new 48 million dollar state department building.

OLD JOBS ABOLISHED

In midafternoon, the two men received a summons to report to Hannemeyer for "new assignments." Both said they would take the offers under advisement. Their former jobs as security officers, they were told, had been abolished and were not available to them.

Williams and Gross disclosed that they had made personal inspections of the condemned building from which all state department employes except Hite and Burkhardt had long ago been transferred. The building has been condemned and is scheduled to be torn down.

They described their wanderings thru the eight-story structure, its deserted rooms filled with rubbish and gutted of furnishings, in a search for the only two permanent tenants remaining.

NO WORK ASSIGNED

"I was shocked and dismayed," Williams told the Senate, "to find that the state department is operating a special isolation ward or cooler for employes whose only crime is telling the truth to a Senate committee.

"I invite the entire Senate and the Washington press to visit this junk-filled, deserted building. After a long search, I found these two men hidden in a corner office. They have had no work assignments since October, 1966, and their repeated requests for work have been ignored.

"These two men are being isolated and penalized solely because they testified truthfully in the Otepka case. Three other employes testified falsely and were rewarded. They were taken care of. But these two men sit twiddling their thumbs in an old abandoned warehouse because they told the truth."

SUPPORT HIS DEFENSE

Hite and Burkhardt were associates of Otto F. Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the department's office of security. They supported his defense against charges of conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

Otepka was discharged in November, 1963, allegedly for supplying confidential documents to the Senate internal security subcommittee but actually, Williams noted, for testifying candidly about the protection of security risks in the department. Four years later, in December, 1967, after Otepka had waged a costly legal battle, Rusk revoked the dismissal, substituting a severe reprimand and demotion involving a $5,479 salary cut. Otepka has appealed this decision to the Civil Service commission.

REPORT IN CASE

"No one who has not seen the utterly appalling conditions which surrounded Hite and Burkhardt could possibly believe that they were ordered by officials of the United States government," Gross said. "There are absolutely no excuses for this unspeakable disgrace."

A special report on the treatment given Hite and Burkhardt by the state department was issued by the Senate internal security subcommittee. It gave this summary:

"The department of state at the highest level has pursued a vendetta for five years against Otepka. Much has been said about the relentless persecution of Otepka by the state department.

BLAST AT SYSTEM

"But the drive against his associates continues to be equally relentless in an effort to cow them into submission and, if at all possible, obtain their resignations and removal as professional security officers.

"Now, the new information brought out shows the Chinese-torture type of system introduced against these men by the state department.

"Contrived efforts by these officials to force despair on Hite and Burkhardt thru solitary confinement and lack of authentic assignments by which they could utilize their skills have failed.

"The state department, stooping again to a new tactic designed to achieve its ends and thwart the intent of the Senate internal security subcommittee, has placed these men in quarters which cannot even be compared to a hovel. Whisky bottles litter the floor. Bait for rats is cast in every corner of their office.

"There is no security guard even tho the project to which Hite and Burkhardt were assigned on paper was justified by the state department as being top-secret and extremely sensitive in nature. Windows do not have locks. Cardboard covers panes of glass to keep out the cold. Restroom conditions are filthy.

"OUTRAGED AT PENALTY"

"With all this, these two career civil service employes remain the last two individuals on their floor of a building which is scheduled to be demolished within a very short time.

"Will this be the way to get rid of them—by razing the building with these two men still inside? Members of the subcommittee are not only concerned but outraged at the cruel and inhuman punishment being meted out against these two men because they dared to testify truthfully before it.

"We shall not permit the state department's lack of decency nor stand for its subtle personnel assassination."

Better Information-Handling Methods for Congress

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a column by Marquis Childs in the February 14 issue of the Washington Post points up the increasing seriousness of the credibility gap between the administration and the people.

The story is related of a Senator X—and this could be any Senator, of course—who visits Vietnam and is told by American officials there that "the war is being won. It is not stalemated."

Then the Senator has dinner with five or six reporters. He gets exactly the opposite picture. The war cannot be won. It is stalemated.

The Senator is, to say the least, torn by these conflicting views.

The Senator's dilemma is further compounded if, within his committee, and within Congress as a whole, he is served up a diet consisting primarily of views and opinions which may or may not be based on adequate knowledge of the facts. And this is true in any subject matter area, not just of the war in Vietnam.

Of course, Congress is the traditional and necessary and proper forum for the expression of disparate views within the society. But Members of Congress must also have objective information and a presentation of the facts to help them render decisions on matters of public policy.

It should be remembered that the first step taken by our early Congress in the direction of intelligent information handling was to create committees charged with the responsibility of gathering and studying facts which would subsequently be reported to the full Congress. Second, and simultaneous with the creation of committees, was the establishment of the Library of Congress to serve as a repository of the collected wisdom of our society. With the advent of the 20th century, the Legislative Reference Service was established within the Library to distill, process, and organize relevant information necessary to the Congressman for decisionmaking on an ever-expanding scale, both quantitatively and in the complexity of the issues.

Now, in the second half of the 20th century, we are often faced with a problem of too much information in unusable form. It is true that Members of Congress still fail at times to get all of the information they need on a particular subject, but the problem in general is that we are suffering from a "processing" gap. One no longer talks about information coming into the Library of Congress in numbers of books, reports, and so forth; material is wheeled in daily in moving van-type vehicles. Incredibly, the processing of this information is still done almost entirely by hand, by old-fashioned paper and pencil methods which for some years have been considered obsolete not only in business and industry and in our higher institutions of learning, but indeed by officials in the executive branch of the Government.

In the second issue of "Law and Computer Technology," published by the World Peace Through Law Center, Robert L. Chartrand, Information Sciences Specialist for the Legislative Reference Service, comments on the urgency of the congressional information-handling problem, some of the new techniques and their applications to specific areas of data handling, and the beginning steps that are being taken to remedy the situation. This is a concise, factual, well-written article, and its significance should command a wide readership. In

particular, I hope all Members of Congress will read this article with care and concern.

The article follows:

COMPUTER-ORIENTED INFORMATION FOR THE U.S. CONGRESS

(By Robert L. Chartrand*)

The Congressional milieu of the 1960 decade is vastly different from that of the earlier years of the 20th century. Scientific and technological advances in such areas as space exploration, nuclear energy development, and automatic data processing (ADP) have left their imprint throughout the Nation. The responsibilities of governing a populace that is continually increasing in size and complexity, and which has a high degree of mobility, have caused those who govern to consider carefully their role. In addition to ensuring national security, the Federal leadership must strive to achieve a continued rise in the standard of living for all citizens.

The elected members of the United States Congress derive their support from all sectors of society—business, commerce, the academic world, and unaffiliated individual citizens—and their decisions must reflect the needs and the desires of these groups. The contemporary Congressman, unlike his predecessor of even forty years ago, must be knowledgeable about a great many subjects. As Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, an eminent authority on the role of the Congress, notes: In a given session of Congress there are forty or fifty major issues . . . which are a reflection of a specialized, but interlocked technical age where social and economic and political structure is intricate, sensitive, dynamic, and at the same time scarcely understood even by the wisest and the best informed of men." [1]

The sheer volume of legislation introduced into the two chambers of the Congress is a reflection of the magnitude of governing a large nation. In the 89th Congress (1965–1966), a total of 26,566 public and private bills and resolutions were introduced, and eventually 4,016 legislative measures were passed.[2] This work load is in contrast to the First Congress which produced 118 bills and resolutions.[3]

The Senator or Representative of today is faced with the requirement to identify, locate, acquire, select, assimilate, and apply that information which is relevant to a given problem. Since the number of topics for which information must be obtained is large, and the resources of a Congressional office are limited, recent attention has been given to finding new ways and means of handling the information which is a *sine qua non* for effective decision-making. Not only is the spectrum of Congressional information needs virtually infinite, but the emphases change constantly. The awareness of the Congressional members of this problem was reflected eloquently in a recent survey of general categories of problems encountered by a House member: 78% cited "complexity of decision-making; lack of information" as a key concern.[4]

All too often there comes the realization that the basic problem may be one not of too little information, but too much. Professor Kenneth Janda, a perceptive student of the Congressional information dilemma, comments that: "Congress still needs much information it does not get . . . Congress' problem is one of obtaining relevant information. What Congress really requires is a procedure for acquiring the information it needs and a method for processing that information in order to learn what it wants to know." [5]

At the present time, the Congressional member or committee desiring to obtain a certain type of information will turn to traditional sources such as the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) of the Library of Congress, various Executive Branch elements, or to the private domain (e.g., universities, lobbyist organizations). Although these groups often provide an excellent quality of support, the Congressmen who are most concerned about combatting the effects of the "information explosion" in their day-to-day functioning now are attempting to establish new, tangible capabilities for information handling.

Among the possible antidotes identified to help overcome the Congressional information malaise is that of employing automatic data processing equipment and programs. Vice President Humphrey, in the forefront of those urging that relief for the harassed Congressmen and their staffs might be found in the power, flexibility, and massive storage capability of the electronic computer, has urged that:

"The legislative branch should, itself, take the lead. Few groups of men and women in the world need more, better or more varied information than 535 elected Representatives and Senators. Congress' committees and subcommittees and Members need push-button, preferably display-type access, to specialized 'banks' of information. Each major 'bank' should serve the interested committee—Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Foreign Relations, Interior—and so on, down the alphabetic line." [6]

Legislation now pending before the 90th Congress (H.R. 21, et al.) provides for the establishment of an automatic data processing facility to render support to the Congress. Representative Robert McClory of Illinois, the sponsor of the first bill calling for an ADP facility, has pointed out that the Legislative Branch "must use every possible mechanism to insure that Congress executes its traditional responsibilities." [7] He and a bipartisan group of supporters in the House of Representatives have stressed the importance of using the great capacity of the electronic computer and modern program evaluation techniques as an aid to Congressional budgetary review. Other priority applications cited included the handling of digests of bills being considered by Congressional committees, their associated legislative histories, and the establishment and maintenance of selected data on Federal programs in machine-readable form.

A similar provision for an ADP facility was introduced by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and included in the Senate version (S. 355) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, now pending before the House Committee on Rules.[8] The placement of the computer facility within the nonpartisan Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress would allow optimum utilization of its complementary capabilities both by the Congressional user and the LRS research specialist.

It has been shown that the demands upon the Congressman and his staff are legion, and that oftentimes reliance must be placed upon outside groups. In addition to simply acquiring key information, there may be a need for detailed reports to be prepared, intensive analyses to be undertaken, and statistical compilations to be produced. Maximum objectivity is a recurring criterion for the preparation of these various background "think pieces" for the Congress. Also, there may be the need for a confidential analysis of a problem. In this respect, the role of the Legislative Reference Service is of singular value to the Congress. Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa, in the volume *We Propose: A Modern Congress*, stresses the value of the LRS support:

"Members of Congress receive from the Legislative Reference Service that rarest of all Washington products: the disinterested point of view, the undistorted fact, the impartial and non-partisan analysis and evaluation of controversial public policy issues." [9]

The Legislative Reference Service, which commenced serving the United States Congress in 1914, is the only group external to the Congress *per se* dedicated exclusively to providing research, information, and related services to that body. A group of subject specialists and support personnel with access to an impressive repository of highly varied information comprises LRS. In testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, the forms of assistance provided by LRS to the Congress were enumerated:

"It is a place that Members can turn to for . . . preparation of background reports on public and legislative issues; for pro and con analyses of bills; for studies of alternative proposals for solutions of national problems; for legal opinions; for surveys of court decisions; for spot factual information; for newspaper searches; for assistance in preparing draft statements or speeches; for translations; for legislative histories; for the preparation of charts, graphs, and maps; for bibliographies; for tabulations of statistics; for consultations with subject specialists; for assistance in answering constituent inquiries; and so forth." [10]

The number of requests initiated by Congressional members, staff personnel (both personal and committee), and from constituents via the Congressional offices has continued to increase, with foreseeable pressures on the LRS staff. In 1946 an LRS staff of 131 [11] received 19,732 inquiries; [12] by 1966 with a staff of less than twice the size (228)[13] 117,062 [14] inquiries—member, committee, constituent—were sent to LRS. The average number of inquiries during fiscal year 1965 was 343 per Senator and 136 per Representative.[15]

The potential value of utilizing ADP within the Legislative Reference Service in fulfillment of many of the Congressional requests for information has been recognized in many quarters. The lessons learned by numerous agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal government substantiate the claim that:

"No single technological advance in recent years has contributed more to effectiveness and efficiency in Government operations than the development of electronic data processing equipment." [16]

The primary objective of all Congressional staff information handling efforts, and supporting activity by such groups as LRS, is to provide the Congressman with selective information and analyses in order to render knowledgeable decisions. In discussing this omni-important consideration, Professor James A. Robinson of Ohio State University reinforces the innate essentiality of correct information to the legislator by pointing out that "as problems proliferate, the amount of information increases." [17] A concomitant effort needs to be made to retain a sharp perspective of the function and role of that data and interpretive material which is provided the Congressman. It must be remembered that: "information systems are *not* . . . devices for grinding out policy decisions, and they are not designed to replace human judgment. Rather, they are intended to provide the human decision-maker—here, the Congressmen—with knowledge for making informed choices." [18]

A brief review of the areas in which computer-oriented information might benefit the Congress is in order at this juncture. In some instances, the information provided may be focused on the need of the Congress as a whole, or an individual chamber. In other cases, the committees (or subcommittees) or the individual members may be the chief beneficiaries.

Centralized information concerning the status of pending legislation and the schedule of committee activities is recognized as an area where ADP could be of significant value. Not only could daily printouts, specially formatted, be generated for each of

---

Footnotes at end of article.

these two functions, but special (*ad hoc*) requests could be handled in a more expeditious way. The computerization of selected bill information could be integrated with the preparation of the Digest of General Public Bills and Resolutions by the Legislative Reference Services.

With nearly 140 committees and subcommittees active in the 90th Congress, the need for an up-to-date schedule of executive sessions, public hearings, lists of witnesses to appear, and other key information is undeniable. Histories of committee action for years past, and files of priority subject matter information for committee use, also could be maintained in computerized form.

Often mentioned as an area where the electronic computer has proven to be a valuable tool is the indexing, storage, and retrieval of various types of legal information. While it is true that most Senators have Legislative Assistants and many House members have staff personnel serving in a similar capacity, the members often must go outside his own resources for assistance in obtaining analyses-in-depth, advisory opinions, digests or citations, surveys of state laws and court decisions, or the full text of some requisite documentation. With the advent of ADP, a new dimension has been added to legal research and related decision-making. Significant pioneer work in creating and maintaining useful legal information repositories has been performed by a number of university, government, and foundation groups. Perhaps the work of greatest magnitude has been conducted at the University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center under the leadership of Professor John Horty. The full-text holdings, available upon request to such outside groups as the U.S. Congress, include the complete codes of several states, the United States Supreme Court decisions from 1950, the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations, and other legislative, court, and ordinance material.[19]

Another important source of legal information in ADP form is Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics),[20] under the aegis of the Department of Defense. This system features "keyword-in-context" access to: the complete United States Code (updated to the 1965 supplement), the Comptroller General's Decisions complete to the last published volume (and the unpublished decisions from 1955 to the present), the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, international law agreements of interest to the Department of Defense, and other assorted items.

Finally, several Executive Branch agencies—the Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Department of the Treasury, etc.—have established limited holdings of legal information on magnetic tape. Other information of a legal nature is stored in ADP form at various American universities, by a few states, and some private commercial organizations now are commencing to provide systems design and data processing services in the legal area.

Outside of the legal information area, Congress has yet other needs. An automated index to Congressional documents has been identified as a useful tool. Current information on issues up for vote and readily accessible post-vote information represent other possible applications for ADP systems. Lobbyist activity information and key data on Federal contract awards also have been considered for placement in a computerized file. The applications of ADP in the Congressional environment are many, and have been examined in a study prepared for the Congress entitled "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress." [21] Figure 1 sets forth a summary listing of projected applications of ADP in support of the Congress.

Enhanced Congressional access to information that is complete, accurate, timely, and relevant has become in many ways a problem of information management. These questions must be asked:

What specific elements of information are needed to make what judgments? Where are these elements located? How are they to be retrieved? And how should they be presented in order to be meaningful? [22]

The United States Congress, then, has demonstrated a willingness to examine the ways in which modern tools and techniques can assist its legislative and housekeeping activities. Action is being taken to determine how systems technology (including ADP) can aid the Congressman as he functions in his three major roles:

1. As a legislator, responsible for scrutinizing, debating, and making decisions regarding issues of national and international scope;
2. As a representative of his district (or State), with prime concern for its welfare, growth, and relationship to other governmental elements, and the legislative responsibilities involved; and
3. As an ombudsman of sorts, looked to by each individual constituent as a point of reference for assistance in any one of a thousand forms.[23]

In the years to come, as the Federal Congress fulfills its responsibilities to the citizenry of the nation and to the world, those who govern must do so with increasing wisdom and insight. The products of man's ingenuity and industry must be utilized to the fullest. President John F. Kennedy expressed his view of the impact of science and technology on contemporary civilization in these words:

> The expanding wonders of science . . . have captured man's imagination, challenged the powers of his mind, and given him the tools for rapid progress.[24]

The ability to govern a nation such as the United States necessarily will be contingent upon the efficacious marshalling and allocation of all resources, both human and technological. By this action, the continuing development of the nation and its contributory role on the international scene will be assured.

REGISTRY FOR SOFTWARE NAMES

To tackle the problem of duplication among software names and acronyms, the Special Interest Group on Programming Languages (SIGPLAN) of the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) in the United States has established a Registry Subcommittee which will maintain, for the international computing community, a registry for the names of computer programming languages and major publicly reported software packages, where inadvertent duplication of names could cause confusion in the computing literature.

The registry is planned to contain the following for each entry:

(a) Name or acronym of the programming language or software package;

(b) Derivation of the name or acronym;

(c) Indication as to whether the name is legally protected, e.g., as a trademark;

(d) Brief one- or two-sentence distinguishing description;

(e) List of computers for which availability is current or planned;

(f) Conditions of availability, e.g., free or leased;

(g) Bibliographic references to authoritative documentation;

(h) Names and addresses of responsible contracts;

(i) Date of initial registration and latest revision, validation, or cancellation;

(j) Miscellaneous or additional information or comments.

The services to be provided by the Software Registry include:

(a) Register submitted names and acronyms. Duplicates will be registered, but submitters will be informed of previous registrations and their legal status and advised to cancel their entry and make some other choice.

(b) Answer queries regarding registered names and acronyms.

(c) Annually solicit and regularly accept revisions to existing entries.

(d) Annually publish the complete register.

FOOTNOTES

* Information Sciences Specialist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Prior to joining the Library of Congress, Mr. Chartrand spent six years with private corporations concerned with the development of information technology. His most recent assignment was with Planning Research Corporation as Manager of Applications Development. With the Federal Systems Division of the IBM Corporation he fulfilled technical and managerial positions, performing systems analysis in such areas as legal information retrieval and graphic data indexing and retrieval. As a Member of the Technical Staff for the Ramo-Wooldridge Division of TRW, Inc., he helped develop large scale information handling systems for the Department of Defense. For several years before entering industry, he served as an intelligence analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency and with the United States Navy at continental and overseas posts. He has lectured widely on information technology before professional, government, and industrial groups; has conducted special seminars at several universities; and is the author of several studies for the United States Congress on the subject of information systems and the role of automatic data processing. His academic work includes a Master of Arts Degree in history and government from the University of Missouri, with additional graduate work at Louisiana State University. (The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Legislative Reference Service nor the Library of Congress.)

[1] Ernest S. Griffith, *Congress, Its Contemporary Role* (New York: New York University Press, 1961), p. 72.

[2] 112 *Cong. Rec.* D 1045 (daily ed. Nov. 21, 1966).

[3] George B. Calloway, *History of the House of Representatives* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1961), Appendix G, p. 303.

[4] Kenneth Janda, "Information Systems for Congress," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), Table 1, p. 42.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 426.

[6] Address by Senator Humphrey, "The Computer Revolution," Eastern Spring Computer Conference. Remarks in the Senate, Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 7, p. 9075.

[7] Remarks in the House by Representative Robert McClory on "An Automatic Data Processing Facility to Support the Congress," Congressional Record, vol. 112, pt. 20, p. 27824.

[8] Remarks in the Senate by Senator Hugh Scott during the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 3, p. 3732.

[9] Fred Schwengel, "Information Handling: 'for a vast future also'," *We propose: A Modern Congress*, ed. Mary McInnis (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 307.

[10] U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Organization of Congress, Part 7. Hearings before the Joint Commtitee (89th Cong., 1st Sess., August 2, 1965). Washington U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965. p. 1111. [Testimony of Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree.]

[11] U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967 (89th Cong., 2nd Sess., May 9, 1966). Washington, U.S. Govt. Print.

Footnotes at end of article.

Off., 1966. p. 232. [Testimony of Lester S. Jayson.]

[12] U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Organization of Congress. *Op. cit.*, p. 1176.

[13] U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967. *Op. cit.*, Table 3, p. 226.

[14] Statistics provided by Basil T. Owens, Administrative Officer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, May 1967.

[15] U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967. *Op. cit.*, p. 235. [Testimony of Lester S. Jayson.]

[16] Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Report to the President on the Management of Automatic Data Processing in the Federal Government. Washington, February, 1965, p. 1.

[17] James A. Robinson, "Decision Making in Congress," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), p. 265.

[18] Janda, *Op. cit.*, p. 435.

[19] Law school research projects reported, *M.U.L.L.*, September, 1965, p. 122.

[20] Status information provided by Grant Reynolds, Office of the Air Force General Counsel, June 1967.

[21] Robert L. Chartrand, "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress," in extension of remarks of Representative Robert McClory, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 2, p. 1801.

[22] Charles R. Dochert, "Availability of Information for Congressional Operations," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), p. 172–173.

[23] Address by Robert L. Chartrand, "The Potential of Systems Technology for the Federal Congress," Systems Management Research and Study Forum, Temple University, June 20, 1967, p. 32.

[24] Address by President John F. Kennedy, Reception for Latin American Diplomats, Washington, D.C., March 13, 1961.

Two 21-Year-Old Maryland Enlisted Men Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Jonathan E. Sykes and Sp4c. Jack A. Beard, two young men from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

SOLDIER, MARINE DIE IN VIETNAM WAR—J. E. SYKES, J. A. BEARD DEATHS REPORTED

Two 21-year-old Maryland enlisted men have been killed in the Vietnam fighting, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

A marine from Baltimore, Cpl. Jonathan E. Sykes, was shot dead while patrolling in Quang Nan province February 6; and a soldier from Boonsboro, Spec. 4 Jack A. Beard, died of battle wounds while with the 25th Division.

Corporal Sykes was a native of Philadelphia who grew up in Baltimore and later went to high school in Trenton, N.J.

ENLISTED AFTER PROM

His mother, Mrs. Dorothy Sykes, of 3708 Winterbourne road, said he enlisted "right after his senior prom."

Corporal Sykes was home for a 30-day furlough last summer when he told a reporter he had volunteered to return to Vietnam for an extra five-months tour to help "stop the spread of communism," because, he said, "I have a commitment to my country."

He had already completed the regular twelve-month tour and could have remained on an American marine base until his discharge which was set for this month.

On January 12, his mother said, his seabag arrived home. Then she learned that he had volunteered to serve yet another three months in Vietnam.

"He was a good marine, that little hardhead," his mother said. "He made me think it was a picnic. He was not the complaining type. He said he had learned to like the people over there. I never thought that anything could happen to my child when he had an attitude like that."

Corporal Sykes is survived by his mother, his father, Robert Sykes, of Trenton; and a sister, Miss Judonna Sykes.

Specialist Beard was a native of Hagerstown and a graduate of Boonsboro High School.

He enlisted in February, 1967, and went to Vietnam in July.

Survivors include his parents, Jack M. Beard, of Boonsboro, and Mrs. Geneva Beard, of Hagerstown; his wife, Mrs. Judith Beard, of Boonsboro; two sisters, a half-brother and a half-sister.

Vets of Dienbienphu Appraise Khesanh

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Wednesday edition of the Washington Post an article taken from the London Sunday Times by Edward Mortimer that discusses the comparison between Dienbienphu and Khesanh, as viewed by three veterans of the French-Indochina conflict. These three individuals were officers in the French Army and fought at Dienbienphu, and I believe their views are of special significance as we look at the situation in Khesanh. I include them herewith:

VETS OF DIENBIENPHU APPRAISE KHESANH

(By Edward Mortimer)

PARIS.—Is Khesanh a second Dienbienphu?

This question about the Marine stronghold was put to three French officers who tried to counter the 1954 siege that led to their country's withdrawal from Indochina.

General Clement Blanc, Chief of Staff of the French army at the time and now head of the National Association for Retired Officers, replied: "No, the present situation is not comparable to the situation then because the enemy has had more than ten years to build up his strength. Probably in 1953 or 1954 there was a possible solution, but now you are faced with a real national front. We never had to cope with attacks on Saigon and Hue, not even on Hanoi.

"The situation which the Americans face now is much worse—a general insurrection, which is the fourth and last stage of revolutionary warfare. They lack a position of strength from which to negotiate. Even so, they must negotiate. There is no other solution.

"Tactically the American position at Khesanh is much stronger than ours was at Dienbienphu, which was 300 kilometers [about 186 miles] from the nearest air base. Arguably it was a mistake to try and hold Dienbienphu at all. We should have fallen back on Luang Prabang [in Laos, still associated with France at that time]. But there is no reason why the Americans should be defeated at Khesanh and, in any case, Khesanh is not the determining factor. What's important is the phenomenon of revolutionary warfare."

SEES U.S. ADVANTAGE

Retired Gen. Rene Cogny, who was commander of all land forces in North Vietnam, said: "The comparison between Khesanh and Dienbienphu is a tendentious one thought up by the press and the radio. The fall of Langvei [the U.S. Special Forces camp five miles west of Khesanh, overrun Feb. 7] cannot be compared in importance with the fall of the first two outposts of Dienbienphu. If the Americans had thought it was important, would it have been defended by only 30 regulars and 400 auxiliaries?

"At Dienbienphu the enemy cut the lines of communication very early. Nothing like that has happened at Khesanh. The Americans still have the means to bring in new supplies and personnel and the chance to maneuver. At Dienbienphu we had no reserves to bring up and we were condemned to immobility. I don't deny that the situation in Khesanh is serious, but I don't think the camp is really in danger. The Americans still have both the means and the will to win the battle.

"Strategically, the Vietminh [members of the organization that preceded the Vietcong] have got the initiative at the moment by launching a counter-offensive simultaneously at Khesanh and throughout the country, but General [William C.] Westmoreland [the U.S. commander in Vietnam] has every chance of regaining the initiative on both these fronts."

AIDE DE CAMP'S VIEWS

The third French officer questioned was Maj. Jean Pouget, who was only a captain in his thirties at the time of Dienbienphu. But he was aide de camp to Gen. Henri Navarre, the Commander-in-Chief for Indochina, and consequently attended all the meetings at which strategy was worked out.

Later Pouget was parachuted into Dienbienphu itself and was taken prisoner when it surrendered. After his release, he served as a paratrooper in Algeria then left the army to devote himself to writing. As well as being the model for the hero of Jean Larteguy's best-selling novel about Indochina, "The Centurions," Pouget has done extensive research on the documents of the period and written a book of his own, entitled "We Were at Dienbienphu."

"Of course, there are superficial similarities," he said. "For example, both Dienbienphu and Khesanh are in hollows. But it's absurd to say we were beaten at Dienbienphu because it was a hollow. People talk as if the Vietminh were attacking us from above, but in fact they were always attacking us from below because we held the surrounding peaks. When the last peak was taken we were finished.

"But in relation to the war that [Vo Nguyen] Giap [then the Vietminh's commanding general, now Defense Minister of North Vietnam] was fighting, Khesanh belongs to a similar phase—that of the general counter-offensive. It wasn't the defeat at Dienbienphu that provoked the collapse of the French army: We had lost the war from the moment we agreed to negotiate.

"It's the same with the Americans. [President] Johnson may not actually be negotiating now, but he's agreed in principle to stop bombing and the American people are thinking in terms of negotiation. That is the psychological moment when Giap chooses to launch his general counter-offensive—so that the Americans will think, 'If we're going to negotiate, we'd better get on with it.'

"In 1954 he held back his attack on Dienbienphu until he was sure negotiations were going to start. The attack started the day after [British Foreign Secretary Anthony] Eden announced in Berlin that the West and the Russians would meet the Chinese in Geneva. I remember, because we'd been dropped on Muong Sai [in Laos] and we were completely surrounded and outnumbered.

"Then during the night the enemy suddenly disappeared and moved up to attack Dienbienphu. We probably owe it to Mr. Eden that we got out of Muong Sai safe and sound.

GIAP'S POSITION

"Today Giap has the initiative and the situation has to be judged in relation to his intentions. To take Khesanh he would have to use 40,000 men and lose half of them. But if he does that and the psychological effect is to make the Americans give up quickly, he will have won.

"What he wants is to control the population of South Vietnam. American opinion is concentrated on Khesanh, while political commissars are speaking in the public squares of every small village and even Saigon itself, and they have a whole party apparatus behind them devised by Lenin and Mao Tse-tung.

"Giap isn't a classical general like Westmoreland or Navarre. He's a genuine Marxist. He'd have got very bad marks at Sandhurst, or West Point, or the Ecole de Guerre.

"Giap has often explained his strategy. He told Paris Match in 1955: 'I don't understand why you criticize your soldiers. Dienbienphu was perhaps the most dangerous thing for us they could have done. They forgot nothing except the most important thing: That for a Marxist, strategy is above all politics.' "

Progress Noted in First Lady's Beautification Campaign

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, Philip Meyer reports in the Sunday Oregonian that the First Lady's beautification campaigning is succeeding—despite its grumbling cynics.

A cross-country trip confirms his observation. Today there are more green, open areas and fewer billboards and eyesores—particularly near our newest highways. Many of our cities have developed aggressive local beautification programs.

What began as Mrs. Johnson's personal commitment to beautify our Nation's Capital has been transformed by her into a national commitment to remove the barriers to beauty from our midst.

Mrs. Johnson has not only mobilized all levels of government into the battle. In a nation fed up with ugliness, thousands of citizens have heeded the First Lady's call to beautify our country from the grassroots up. Thousands of letters pour into the White House monthly testifying to America's pledge to restore its ancient beauty.

Much remains to be done to remake the face of America. Generations of neglect and scorn are not erased overnight. But the commitment has been written by Congress and already—as Mr. Meyer notes—"the country is indeed more beautiful in spots." Mrs. Johnson has appropriately summed up our progress to date:

> The ugliness trend has been reversed. People are getting on the beauty bandwagon.

We must maintain the high enthusiasm of the First Lady if we are to finally succeed. I am confident that we will.

With unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the article by Philip Meyer in the Sunday Oregonian:

LADY BIRD'S BEAUTIFICATION CAMPAIGN SUCCEEDING DESPITE SNICKERS

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign to beautify America is three years old next month, and the country is indeed more beautiful in spots—but you have to know where to look.

Despite grumbles and a few snickers, the First Lady has succeeded in getting a lot of people to talk about beauty, and some of the talk has led to visible results. Examples:

A cross-country auto trip will take you past more green, open space and fewer billboards than did the same trip three years ago.

This eye-pleasing effect is due to the increased interstate highway mileage and the suppression of billboards by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

If you happen to pass through San Pablo, Calif., you will find that a pleasant, tree-shaded plaza has replaced the junky collection of signs, poles, and wires at the town's main intersection.

A peek out of the right office windows here in Washington reveals flowers, shrubs and pleasing arrays of park benches on patches of government ground that used to be bare.

And you can't visit Boston, Philadelphia, Rochester, or other cities which have been aggressive about getting the federal beautification grants without admitting that they are pretty in places.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has spent more than $115,000,000 in the last two years on city beautification and open space grants. Another $90,000,000 was appropriated for highway beauty two years ago, but Congress went home last month without renewing that appropriation. This omission may be corrected in the new session.

"It's working. I don't think there's any question about it," says Mrs. Henry Fowler, wife of the Treasury secretary, and head of a traveling squad of cabinet wives and other prominent Washington women who make speeches around the country to spread the beauty gospel.

A truck driver in Mystic, Conn., agrees. He wrote:

"DEAR MRS. JOHNSON: I would like to express my appreciation for what you have done to make the highways more pleasant to drive on . . . If you should ever find time, you should take a ride on I-95 (Interstate 95) east out of New London . . . this stretch of highway would show what you have done for us truck drivers."

Mrs. Johnson does not claim the credit for this new national concern. The country was already getting fed up with ugliness. "I just got on a moving train," she says, according to her staff director, Elizabeth Carpenter.

CAMPAIGN OUTLINED

Her campaign began in February, 1965, when Mrs. Johnson appointed a group of prominent Washingtonians to an informal committee for a more beautiful capital. It quickly got things going to set an example for the rest of the country.

In the last three years, more than $2,000,000 has come from private donors to beautify the nation's capital. Federal and municipal funds have provided another $15,000,000 to landscape and improve parks, playgrounds and streets here.

Mrs. Johnson's concern began very early to spread beyond the capital. In the spring of 1965, she opened a White House conference on natural beauty and called for a grass roots battle against ugliness.

"It is one problem which every man and woman and child can attack and contribute to defeating," Mrs. Johnson said.

Since then, Mrs. Johnson's office in the east wing of the White House has served as a kind of clearing house for exchange of ideas among citizens with beautification problems.

"One of the most thrilling things is to see how much people are doing on their own," says Miss Wilson, who opens the letters arriving at the rate of more than a thousand a month. "It amazes me to see how much can get done without public funds."

Occasionally, Mrs. Johnson has used her position to get direct government action. Her staff director, Elizabeth Carpenter, likes to tell the story of the Dayton (Ohio) baker who wrote to the First Lady about three junked aircraft that marred his daily view as he drove past Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

"I showed the letter to her," Mrs. Carpenter recalls. "It so happened that Defense Sec. (Robert S.) McNamara was coming to dinner that night, so she kept it and gave it to him. Listen, that man is faster than sound. The next night, he called to say the airplanes had been pulled away from the highway and screened from the road. You never saw a citizen's complaint acted on so quickly."

Most of the mail, however, produces somewhat less dramatic action. Correspondents receive a pamphlet titled "Ideas for Beauty-minded People." Sample ideas: "Place planters filled with shrubs and flowers in front of your store or office. Your customers will appreciate their cheer." And, "if you have a surplus of plants, pass them along to friends and neighbors."

EXAMPLES SHOWN

By the few objective measures that are available, the country as a whole is not much more beautiful than it was three years ago. Indeed, Mrs. Johnson may have succeeded merely in slowing the trend toward ugliness.

The Highway Beautification Act, labeled "Lady Bird's Bill" by the President, is supposed to make roadsides prettier by removing billboards, screening junkyards and planting greenery. But so far, less than 4 percent of the 17,000 affected junkyards have been touched.

Highways completed since the act are noticeably free of billboards, but this may not last. Congress was never too happy with the bill and the loopholes in it may soon be widened.

Mrs. Johnson is the first President's wife to get directly involved in public policy since Eleanor Roosevelt. Bess Truman, Mamie Eisenhower and Jackie Kennedy kept out of such matters, and Lady Bird is exposed to criticism and ridicule from time to time.

RIDICULE HURLED

Republican Rep. Bob Dole, now a candidate for the U.S. Senate from Kansas, offered an amendment when the Highway Beautification Act was passed, that drew a few chuckles. His amendment would have struck out all references to the secretary of commerce, who administers the act, and substituted the words "Lady Bird."

Said Dole: "When one chooses to step down from the pedestal of the dutiful, preoccupied wife of the President . . . and to wade into the turbulent stream of public controversy, one must expect to at least get her feet wet."

There have been other Republican complaints. "While we are spending money in Vietnam to defoliate," said Robert Michel of Illinois, "we are spending money at home to prove Lady Bird has a green thumb."

There also has been some grass roots grumbling. When the Cape Cod town of Truro, Mass., was awarded a landscape beautification grant, local editors called it insulting. They said their area was pretty enough before.

STAND SUPPORTED

Instead of the $72,000 worth of "all sorts of nonresident pines and junipers, off lowering shrubs and such, many who live in and love Truro might actually prefer the pitch pine, wild rose and cranberry cover that is there already," said the weekly Cape Coder.

Even friends of the program worry about whether the little federal money that is available is going to the right place. Most of the cities getting beautification grants already had a lot going for them with local officials pushing vigorously for programs of their own.

Philadelphia, for example, with the largest single federal grant, $1,000,000 is spending another $19,000,000 of its own on beautification.

Other cities, like Washington, have historic spots, natural scenery, or other redeeming features to make the effort seem worthwhile. San Pablo, Calif., is cited as the rare case of a city that started from a base of near-total ugliness.

"You're never going to get the country completely cleaned up," admits Mrs. Carpenter, the First Lady's enthusiastic spokesman. "But you can make people more aware of ugliness. You can make citizens conscious of the need to save their strip of trees along the river or the park down town. I think the ugliness trend has been reversed. People are getting on the beauty bandwagon."

Joint Resolution Regarding Afro-American History Week

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce today a joint resolution regarding a matter of importance to the 25 million Afro-Americans in the United States.

For 42 years, Afro-Americans have observed the week including February 14, Frederick Douglass' birthday, as a special time to commemorate the contribution of the black man to civilization. Several States have made proclamations relating to Afro-American History Week. However, the Federal Government has never officially recognized this week by special proclamation as it does for so many other commemorative days, weeks, and months.

The 55 Congressmen who have joined me in introducing this joint resolution feel as I do that it is time that Congress corrected this oversight. The 42d observance of this week by Afro-Americans was chosen as the time to introduce this resolution to give special emphasis to the omission.

We look forward to Congress passing this resolution in time for next year's celebration.

The text of the joint resolution introduced today is as follows:

H.J. Res. 1087

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested annually to issue a proclamation designating the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I am honored that this joint resolution is being cosponsored by so many of my colleagues. As part of my remarks, I would like to have the full list of sponsors printed in the Record. I am hopeful that other Members will join with us:

Fifty-Six Sponsors of Joint Resolution Designating the Week Including February 14 as Afro-American History Week

CALIFORNIA

George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, Don Edwards, Augustus F. Hawkins, Thomas M. Rees, Lionel Van Deerlin, Charles E. Wiggins.

COLORADO

Byron G. Rogers.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas J. Meskill, William L. St. Onge.

DELAWARE

William V. Roth, Jr.

FLORIDA

Claude Pepper.

HAWAII

Spark M. Matsunaga.

ILLINOIS

Frank Annunzio, William L. Dawson, Thomas F. Railsback, Robert McClory.

INDIANA

John Brademas, Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harold D. Donohue.

MICHIGAN

John Conyers, Jr., Charles C. Diggs, Jr.

MINNESOTA

Donald M. Fraser, Clark MacGregor.

MISSOURI

Thomas B. Curtis, William L. Hungate.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

Henry Helstoski, Joseph G. Minish, Peter W. Rodino, Jr.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jonathan B. Bingham, Daniel E. Button, Barber B. Conable, Jr., John G. Dow, Seymour Halpern, Theodore R. Kupferman, Richard D. McCarthy, Joseph Y. Resnick, Howard W. Robison, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James H. Scheuer, Herbert Tenzer.

OHIO

Thomas L. Ashley, Clarence J. Brown, Jr.

PENNSYLVANIA

William S. Moorhead, Robert N. C. Nix, Richard S. Schweiker, Joseph P. Vigorito.

TENNESSEE

Richard H. Fulton.

TEXAS

Bob Eckhardt, James C. Wright, Jr.

WASHINGTON

Thomas M. Pelly.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Kastenmeier, Henry S. Reuss.

Since the date for establishing Afro-American History Week is the day which Frederick Douglass chose to celebrate as his birthday, I would like to insert in the Record immediately following my remarks a brief biography of Douglass whose courage, conviction, and outspokenness have made him a legend and an inspiration for all black people. Frederick Douglass escaped from slavery as a young man and fought throughout his life for the still unachieved goal of social and economic equality for all Americans. His speeches have the same force and relevance today as they did during the 19th century.

The following biographical sketch is taken from "Great Negroes: Past and Present," by Russell L. Adams:

Frederick A. Douglass (1817–95): Golden Trombone of Abolition

The first day of 1863 was bitter and cold. The 3,000 abolitionists and free Negroes gathered in Tremont Temple, Boston were excited and waited impatiently for news from Washington D.C. Among those in the hall were Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Wells Brown and Frederick A. Douglass, people whose lives had been dedicated to bringing about this moment. The crowd had gathered early and passed the time with oratory and singing. Douglass, the greatest orator of them all, had spoken and now he, too, was waiting with the rest. Into the hall burst a man shouting, "It is coming, it's on the wires, the Telegram is coming in!" The Telegram was news of the Emancipation Proclamation, now taking effect. The crowd quickly translated the Telegram into song:

> *"Sound loud the timbrel o'er Egypt's dark sea*
> *Jehovah has triumphed: His people are free!"*

Four million black men and women would soon be free. Not all of them and not all at the same time but, inevitably, all one day would be free.

For Frederick A. Douglass, already a free man, this night was the high point of his life. From Tremont Temple, Douglass could look back on a life which had begun in slavery and obscurity. Rising like some bronze Phoenix, Douglass for years had been the golden trombone of abolition, ever pressing for the freedom of his fellow Negroes. No one knows just how this ex-slave, ship caulker, wood cutter, coal handler and odd job man, almost overnight, became the spokesman of his race. Born in 1817 on Maryland's hard scrabble, Eastern shore, Frederick Augustus Bailey as a child often had to fight with dogs over bones in order to get enough food. His rebellious spirit kept him in trouble with his master and once he was whipped each week for six months in an effort to break his indomitable spirit. Exasperated, his master sold him when he was ten years old. When Frederick Augustus Bailey was 21, he escaped and went to New Bedford, Massachusetts, the city of Paul Cuffe. Here he finally learned to read and write and to know that there were many others who felt slavery to be wrong.

In 1841, now a married man, Frederick August Bailey changed his name to Douglass and began to attend meetings of the various anti-slavery societies, telling of his experiences as a slave. The Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society engaged him as lecturer and expected him to tell simply what had happened to him and leave the broader issues to others, such as William Lloyd Garrison and the society general agent, William Collins. But like Garrison, Douglass determined that he would be heard. "It did not entirely satisfy me to narrate wrongs. I felt like denouncing them." From this point forward, Douglass traveled all over New England and much of the North. His travels were not without hardship and danger, for he was still a fugitive slave. Nor was the North itself completely sympathetic with his cause. In Pendleton, Indiana for example, he was beaten unconscious and left for dead by a white mob. Undaunted Douglass continued to denounce the evils of slavery.

It was perhaps in the crucible of the antislavery lecture circuit that the real education of Douglass was earned. So great was Douglass' skill as an orator his fame soon overshadowed that of other able Negro spokesmen such as Charles L. Remond, Henry Highland Garnett and even caused tension between himself and some of his white colleagues. Three things contributed to his success as a spokesman: the inherent justice of his cause in a North growing increasingly doubtful of the wisdom of slavery, the vigor of his oratory and the drama of his person. A powerfully-built, strong-featured mulatto with a huge leonine head, Douglass' bearing was nobility itself. James Russell Lowell said that "the very look of Douglass was an irresistible logic against the oppression of his race."

In 1845 against the advice of his friends, Douglass decided to write an account of his life, fully aware of the possibility that this would mark him as the "Bailey, runaway slave of Thomas Auld." When his *Narrative of the Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* appeared in this same year, Douglass went to England and continued to speak out against slavery. English friends raised money to secure his formal freedom from his old master and two years later Douglass returned to America to start a newspaper, first called *The North Star*, and later *Frederick Douglass' Paper*. In his own words, Douglass managed "to keep my anti-slavery banner steadily flying during all the [slavery] conflict from the autumn of 1847 till the Union of the states was assured and Emancipation was a fact accomplished."

Shifting slowly from the spoken to the printed word, Douglass now moved even closer to direct action. In 1848 he joined the short-lived Liberty Party. During the early winter of 1850, he met with John Brown before his raid on Harper's Ferry and cautioned the latter, declaring that "from insurrection nothing can be expected but imprisonment and death." Douglass' prediction came true and Douglass himself had to live in Canada for a while.

When the impending crisis finally erupted in outright war, Frederick Douglass urged Lincoln to free the slaves and arm Negroes. He also recruited Negroes for the Union armies, among them his own sons.

When the Union emerged victorious, Douglass turned his attention to the status of the freedmen, urging education as a way out. Many of these ideas were read by Booker T. Washington and embodied in Tuskegee Institute. Douglass was also quite interested in universal suffrage, women's rights, and world peace. He held a variety of offices with the U.S. government, including that of Recorder of Deeds, Washington, D.C. and Minister to Haiti.

Frederick Augustus Douglass lived until 1895 and saw the pendulum of history swing from slavery toward the beginning of freedom.

SENATE—*Friday, February 16, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us run with patience the race that is set before us. Hebrews 12: 1.

O God, Lord of men and of nations, to Thee we turn for peace and strength. Let this time, wisely set apart by this body to acknowledge Thee, be a time of fresh fellowship with Thee and a new experience of Thy presence and love. Come close to us and especially to the Members of this important group of dedicated men, and beyond the power of any human words spoken in prayer, meet our needs.

Here today we pray that Thou will quicken the minds and challenge the courage and illumine the spirit of those who have the responsibility of making decisions that ultimately determine our destiny as a nation.

In this place we are aware of our history, remembering great men and inspired decisions of the past and present. We also feel conscious of another presence that has been here throughout our history and we feel is here now, even Thy presence. For this we are thankful and we renew our loyalty to Thee in this hour.

Be with those brave men who represent us in the fields of battle as well as those who represent us here. Hasten the day when wars shall cease to the ends of the world. Thank Thee for Thy help, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1968, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 14, 1968, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 491. An act to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 1542. An act to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD AT CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CHURCH ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be allowed to proceed for 1 hour at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Harold L. Oppenheimer to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN AIR FORCE, ARMY, AND MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed, en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators, under authority of Public Law 86–42, to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held at Washington, D.C., on March 20–24, 1968: AIKEN (Chairman), ELLENDER, STENNIS, MANSFIELD, LONG of Louisiana, TYDINGS, SPONG, HICKENLOOPER, COOPER, JORDAN of Idaho, FONG, and GRIFFIN.

The Chair, under the authority of Public Law 86–420, appoints the following Senators to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, to be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on April 11–17, 1968: SPARKMAN (Chairman), MANSFIELD, GORE, YARBOROUGH, INOUYE, MONTOYA, MONDALE, SMITH, FANNIN, FONG, HANSEN, and BAKER.

The Chair appointed the following Senators to attend the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference which was held at Geneva, Switzerland, on January 18, 1968; PASTORE, GORE, RIBICOFF, HICKENLOOPER, CARLSON, and COOPER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Proceedings Concluded Under Indian Claims Commission Act

A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the proceedings under the Indian Claims Commission Act that have been finally concluded (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Permission of Federal Employees To Purchase Shares of Federal or State Chartered Credit Unions Through Voluntary Payroll Allotment

A letter from the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, expressing adverse reaction to the bill H.R. 6157, to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal or State chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report Under Export Control Act of 1949

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 82d quarterly report under the Export Control Act of 1949, for the fourth quarter, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report Under Fair Packaging and Labeling Act

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, developments under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of November 3, 1966, for the fiscal year 1967 (with accompanying papers and report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Property Disposed of Under Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property donated to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions for the period, July 1 through December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of the Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available if shipping containers for military electronic equipment are reused, Department of the Army, dated February 15, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Concession Contract in Hot Springs National Park, Ark.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Director and the reports of the annual and special meetings of the Judiciary Conference of the United States for 1967 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission

A letter from the Federal Cochairman, and State Cochairman, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Projects Committee, National Rivers and Harbors Congress

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report of the Projects Committee of that organization (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

JOINT RESOLUTION CALLING ON THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TO SERVE THE YOUTH OF THE NATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter. The joint resolution was ordered reported out of the committee on yesterday, February 15, 1968. In reporting the joint resolution, there was no written report. There was unanimous support for ordering the joint resolution reported by the committee.

This is a joint resolution on the 52d anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America by Congress, calling upon the Boy Scouts of America to extend its field of service.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of both parties, be added as cosponsors of the resolution as reported, and that their names be added on subsequent printings of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the names will be added, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The names, ordered to be added on subsequent printings of the joint resolution, are as follows: Senators HILL, MORSE, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, PELL, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, NELSON, KENNEDY of New York, JAVITS, PROUTY, DOMINICK, MURPHY, FANNIN, and GRIFFIN.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 2980. A bill to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for the reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government; and

S. 2981. A bill to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2982. A bill for the relief of Lee Wang; and

S. 2983. A bill for the relief of Chon Ah Show; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2984. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2980—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO EXTEND THE PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE PRESIDENT MAY TRANSMIT TO THE CONGRESS REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend until December 31, 1972, the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code, formerly referred to as the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

Similar authority has been made available to Presidents, with few lapses, since 1932. The President's current authority to submit reorganization plans will expire on December 31, 1968. This bill would extend this authority for an additional 4 years. No other change in existing law is proposed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2980) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for the reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2980

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 905(b), title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1968", and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1972".

The letter, presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN, is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The reorganization statute (chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code) provides that the President "shall from time to time examine the organization of all agencies and shall determine what changes therein are necessary" to accomplish various purposes, including more effective management, reduction in expenditures, and elimination of duplication. The responsibility vested in the President by the statute is indefinite.

The President is also authorized to prepare and transmit to the Congress reorganization plans necessary to carry out the purposes of the statute. However, under present law, a reorganization plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to the Congress before December 31, 1968.

I urge that the Congress extend for four years the period during which reorganization plans may be transmitted to the Congress. To accomplish this there is transmitted herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code, relating to executive reorganization."

The continuing need for authority granted by the reorganization statute is clear. Similar authority has been available with few lapses since 1932, and each President has used it to improve the organization and operations of the Federal Government.

The obligation of the President to see that the new programs of recent years as well as older programs are well administered and coordinated and to insure that our agencies are most effectively organized is unquestionable. The procedure set forth in the reorganization statute provides an important, workable, and time-tested means to assist the President in fulfilling his obligation.

The creation of sound machinery to administer our laws is not an easy task, and it is never finished. The increasing complexity of modern life, the rapid growth of our population, and our commitment to the new programs of recent years make the task harder but more important. As the President said in his letter to the Congress on this subject two years ago, "Government has a responsibility to its citizens to administer their business with dispatch, enthusiasm, and effectiveness." The reorganization statute is a vital tool in achieving that goal.

I know the Congress repeatedly has recognized the importance of the statute and the need for an ever-continuing study of the organization of the Federal Government. Therefore, I urge prompt action by the Congress on the proposed amendment of the reorganization statute.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

Enclosure.

A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code, relating to executive reorganization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 905 of title 5 of the United States Code, is hereby amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

S. 2981—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO EXPEDITE PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to provide temporary authority for expediting procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes.

This bill was drafted by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the President of the Senate for introduction, in order that the objectives enumerated in the President's message of March 17, 1967, on the quality of American Government may be fulfilled. The President of the United States recommended that legislation be enacted to permit "Federal agencies to combine related grants into a single financial package, thus simplifying the financial and administrative procedures—without disturbing, however, the separate authorization, appropriations, and substantive requirements for each grant-in-aid program."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to remove or simplify certain administrative and technical impediments which hamper or prevent the consideration, processing, approval and administration of projects which draw upon resources available from more than one Federal agency, program or appropriation. This bill would enable the State and local governments and other public or private agencies to use Federal financial assistance under two or more programs in support of multiple-purpose projects. Under this bill—

Federal agency heads would be authorized to establish uniform requirements of certain provisions of law so that jointly funded projects would not have to be subject to conflicting rules and regulations;

In appropriate cases, Federal agencies would have authority to delegate to other agencies power to approve portions of projects in their behalf;

Federal agency heads could establish joint management funds in their agencies to finance multiple-purpose projects drawing upon appropriations from several different accounts;

The President would prescribe appropriate regulations for, and approve agency delegations of power and functions under this act. He would make reports to the Congress on actions taken, and make recommendations for additional legislative action, including proposals for consolidation, simplification or coordination of grant programs.

The Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1948, would not, except as specifically provided, affect substantive provisions of law relating to Federal assistance programs but would provide a legal basis for consolidating some of the financial procedures under centralized direction and control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter dated August 11, 1967, addressed to the President of the Senate from the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2981) to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2981

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1968".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to enable States, local governments and other public or private organizations and agencies to use Federal assistance more effectively and efficiently, to adapt that assistance more readily to their particular needs through the wider use of projects drawing upon resources available from more than one Federal agency, program or appropriation and to acquire experience which would lead to the development of legislative proposals respecting the consolidation, simplification and coordination of Federal assistance programs. It is the further purpose of this Act to encourage Federal-State arrangements under which local governments and other public or private organizations and agencies may more effectively and efficiently combine State and Federal resources in support of projects of common interest to the governments, agencies and organizations concerned.

BASIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE HEADS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Sec. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act and subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, the heads of Federal agencies may take actions, by internal agency order or interagency agreement, including but not limited to:

(1) identification of related programs likely to be particularly suitable or appropriate for providing joint support for specific kinds of projects;

(2) development and promulgation of guidelines, model or illustrative projects, joint or common application forms, and other materials or guidance to assist in the planning and development of projects drawing support from different programs;

(3) review of administratively established program requirements in order to determine which of those requirements may impede support of projects and the extent to which these may be appropriately modified, and making modifications accordingly;

(4) establishment of common technical or administrative rules among related programs to assist in the joint use of funds in the support of specific projects or classes of projects; and

(5) creation of joint or common application processing and project supervision procedures or mechanisms including procedures for designating lead agencies to assume responsibilities for processing on behalf of several agencies and for designation of managing agencies to assume responsibilities for project supervision on behalf of several agencies.

(b) The head of each Federal agency shall be responsible for taking actions, to the maximum extent feasible under applicable law, which will further the purposes of this Act with respect to Federal assistance programs administered by his agency. Each Federal agency head shall also consult and cooperate with the heads of other Federal agencies in order similarly to promote the purposes of this Act with respect to Federal assistance programs of different agencies which may be used together or jointly in support of projects undertaken by State or local governments or other public or private agencies and organizations.

APPLICATION PROCESSING

Sec. 4. Actions taken by Federal agencies pursuant to this Act which relate to the processing of applications or requests for assistance under two or more Federal programs in support of any project shall be designed to assure, so far as reasonably possible (1) that all required reviews and approvals are handled expeditiously; (2) that full account is taken of any special considerations of timing that are made known by the applicant that would affect the feasibility of a jointly funded project; (3) that the applicant is required to deal with a minimum number of Federal representatives acting separately or as a common board or panel; (4) that the applicant is promptly informed of decisions with respect to his application and of any special problems or impediments which may affect the feasibility of Federal provision of assistance on a joint basis; and (5) that the applicant is not required by representatives of any one Federal agency or program to obtain information or assurances concerning the requirements or actions of another Federal agency which could better and more appropriately be secured through direct communication among the Federal agencies involved.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES—BASIC CONDITIONS

Sec. 5. Where appropriate to further the purposes of this Act, and subject to the conditions prescribed in this section, heads of Federal agencies may use the authorities described in sections 6, 7 and 8 (relating to the establishment of uniform technical or administrative requirements, delegation of powers and responsibilities, and establishment of joint management funds) with respect to projects assisted under more than one Federal assistance program. These authorities shall be exercised only pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President. Those regulations shall include criteria or procedures to assure the authorities are limited in use to problems that cannot be adequately dealt with through other actions pursuant to this Act or other applicable law; that they are applied only as necessary to promote expeditious processing or effective and efficient administration; and that they are applied consistent with the protection of the Federal interest and with program purposes or statutory requirements of a substantive nature.

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM TECHNICAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 6. (a) In order to provide for projects which would otherwise be subject to varying or conflicting technical or administrative provisions of law, the heads of Federal agencies may adopt uniform provisions respecting:

(1) inconsistent or conflicting requirements relating to financial administration, including accounting, reporting and auditing, and maintaining separate bank accounts, but only to the extent consistent with the requirements of section 8;

(2) inconsistent or conflicting requirements relating to the timing of Federal payments where a single or combined schedule is to be established for the project as a whole;

(3) inconsistent of conflicting requirements that assistance be extended in the form of a grant rather than a contract, or a contract rather than a grant.

(4) inconsistent or conflicting requirements for merit personnel systems, but only to the extent that the combination of assistance contemplated would cause those requirements to be applied to portions of projects administered by agencies not otherwise subject to such requirements;

(5) inconsistent or conflicting requirements relating to accountability for, or the disposition of, property or structures acquired or constructed with Federal assistance where common rules are to be established for the project as a whole; and

(6) other inconsistent or conflicting requirements of an administrative or technical nature, as defined in regulations of the President and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe.

(b) In order to permit processing of applications in accordance with the purposes of this Act, Federal agency heads may provide for review of proposals for projects by a single panel, board or committee in lieu of review by separate panels, boards, or committees when such review would otherwise be required by law.

(c) In promoting the more effective and efficient use of Federal assistance resources, Federal agency heads may waive requirements that a single or specified public agency be utilized or designated to receive, supervise or otherwise administer a part of the Federal assistance drawn upon by any jointly funded project to the extent that administration by another public agency is determined to be fully consistent with applicable State or local law and with the objectives of the Federal assistance program involved. This authority may be exercised only upon (1) request of the head of a unit of general government, with respect to agencies which he certifies to be under his jurisdiction, or (2) with the agreement of the several State or local public agencies concerned.

DELEGATION OF POWERS

Sec. 7. With the approval of the President, agency heads may delegate to other Federal agencies any powers relating to the approval, under this Act, of projects or classes of projects under a program if such delegation will promote the purposes of that program. Agency heads may also delegate to other Federal agencies powers and functions relating to the supervision of administration of Federal assistance, or otherwise arrange for other agencies to perform such activities, with respect to projects or classes of projects subject to this Act. Delegations under this section shall be made only on such conditions as may be appropriate to assure that the powers and functions delegated are exercised in full conformity with applicable statutory provisions and policies.

FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Sec. 8. (a) In order to provide for the more effective administration of funds drawn from more than one Federal program or appropriation in support of projects under this Act, there may be established joint management funds with respect to such projects. The total amount approved for such a project may be accounted for through a joint management fund as if the funds had been derived from a single Federal assistance program or appropriation. There will be advanced to the joint management fund from each affected appropriation, from time to time, its proportionate share of amounts needed for payment to the grantee. Any amounts remaining in the hands of the grantee at the completion of the project shall be returned to the joint management fund.

(b) Any account in a joint management fund shall be subject to such agreements, not inconsistent with this section and other applicable law, as may be entered into by the Federal agencies concerned with respect to the discharge of the responsibilities of those agencies and shall assure the availability of necessary information to those agencies and to the Congress. These agreements shall also provide that the agency administering a joint management fund shall be responsible and accountable for the total amount provided for the purposes of each account established in the fund; and may include procedures for determining, from time to time, whether amounts in the account are in excess of the amounts required, for returning that excess to the participating Federal agencies in accordance with a formula mutually acceptable as providing an equitable distribution, and for effecting returns accordingly to the applicable appropriations, subject to fiscal year limitations. Excess amounts applicable to expired appropriations will be lapsed from that fund.

(c) For each project financed through a joint management fund established pursuant to this section, the recipients of moneys drawn from the fund shall keep such records as the head of the Federal agency responsible for administering the fund will prescribe. Such records shall, as a minimum, fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipients of Federal assistance received, the total cost of the project in connection with which such Federal assistance was given or used, the amount of that portion of the cost of the project supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(d) The head of the Federal agency responsible for administering such joint management fund and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients that are pertinent to the moneys received from such fund.

(e) In the case of any project covered in a joint management fund, a single non-Federal share may be established according to the Federal share ratios applicable to the several Federal assistance programs involved and the proportion of funds transferred to the project account from each of those programs.

AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Appropriations available to any Federal assistance program for technical assistance or the training of personnel may be made available for the provision of technical assistance and training in connection with projects proposed or approved for joint or common funding involving that program and any other Federal assistance program.

(b) Personnel of any Federal agency may be detailed from time to time to other agencies as necessary or appropriate to facilitate the processing of applications under this Act or the administration of approved projects.

FEDERAL-STATE ASSISTANCE AND AGREEMENTS

SEC. 10. Subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, Federal agencies may enter into agreements with States or State agencies as appropriate to extend the benefits of this Act to projects involving assistance from one or more Federal agencies and one or more State agencies. These agreements may include arrangements for the processing of requests for, or the administration of, assistance to such projects on a joint basis. They may also include provisions covering the establishment of uniform technical or administrative requirements, as authorized by this Act.

AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 11. In addition to powers and authority otherwise conferred upon him by this Act or other law, the President may take such action, prescribe such procedures, and promulgate such rules as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that this Act is applied by all Federal agencies in a consistent manner and in accordance with its purposes. He may, for this purpose, require that Federal agencies adopt or prescribe procedures that will assure that applicants for assistance to projects under this Act make appropriate efforts (1) to secure the views and recommendations of non-Federal agencies that may be significantly affected by such projects, including units of general government, and (2) to resolve questions of common interest to those agencies prior to submission of any application. The President shall also, from time to time, make reports to the Congress on actions taken under this Act and make such recommendations for additional legislative action as he may deem appropriate, including recommendations for the consolidation, simplification and coordination of Federal assistance programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. As used in this Act—

(1) "Federal assistance programs" are programs that provide assistance through grant or contractual arrangements, and include technical assistance programs or programs providing assistance in the form of loans, loan guarantees or insurance.

(2) "Applicant" includes one or more State or local governments or other public or private agencies or organizations acting separately or together in seeking assistance with respect to a single project.

(3) "Project" includes any undertaking, however characterized and whether of a temporary or continuing nature, which includes components proposed or approved for assistance under more than one Federal program, or one or more Federal and one or more State programs, if each of those components contributes materially to the accomplishment of a single purpose or closely related purposes.

(4) "Federal agency" includes any agency in the executive branch of the Government.

(5) "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND EXPIRATION

SEC. 13. This Act shall become effective one hundred and twenty days following the date of enactment and shall expire three years after it becomes effective, but its expiration shall not affect the administration of projects previously approved.

The letter, presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN, is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are transmitting herewith for appropriate consideration the proposed "Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1967."

This proposal was drafted in response to the President's request—in his March 17 Message on the Quality of American Government—for legislation that would make it possible ". . . for Federal agencies to combine related grants into a single financial package, thus simplifying the financial and administrative procedures—without disturbing, however, the separate authorizations, appropriations, and substantive requirements for each grant-in-aid program."

A number of Federal assistance programs which finance different activities can often be brought together in a single project to support similar or directly related purposes. Such combinations of related programs would enable State and local governments and other grantees to use the wide variety of Federal assistance programs more effectively and efficiently.

However, such combinations cannot be "packaged" and administered easily under existing laws and regulations. Each Federal grant program may have different requirements in such matters as application forms, accounting procedures, advisory panels, reporting dates, etc. Further, the grantees must often work with several Federal agencies (or constituent elements of a single agency)—each with its own distinct administrative practices. As a result, considerable effort is required and significant delays are encountered.

The purpose of this proposal is to remove or simplify certain administrative and technical impediments which hamper or prevent the consideration, processing, approval and administration of projects which draw upon resources available from more than one Federal agency, program or appropriation. The Act would enable State and local governments and other public or private agencies to use Federal financial assistance under two or more programs in support of multi-purpose projects. Under the bill:

Federal agency heads would be authorized to establish uniform requirements respecting technical or administrative provisions of law so that jointly funded projects would not have to be subject to varying or conflicting rules or procedures;

In appropriate cases, Federal agencies would have authority to delegate to other agencies power to approve portions of projects on their behalf;

Federal agency heads could establish joint management funds in their agencies to finance multi-purpose projects drawing upon appropriations from several different accounts;

The President would prescribe appropriate regulations for, and approve agency delegations of power and functions under the Act. He would make reports to the Congress on actions taken, and make recommendations for additional legislative action, including proposals for consolidation, simplification or coordination of grant programs.

The Act would expire after three years.

The Joint Funding Simplication Act of 1967 would not, except as specifically provided, affect substantive provisions of law relating to Federal assistance programs such as eligibility criteria, maintenance of effort, matching ratios, authorization levels, program availability, etc. Problems presented by the diversity in such provisions as these would be studied in connection with proposals for grant consolidation. In the Message on the Quality of American Government, the President also requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget "to review the range of Federal grant-in-aid programs to determine . . . areas in which a basic consolidation of grant-in-aid authorizations, appropriations, and statutory requirements should be carried out." That effort is now underway. Experience gained under the Joint Funding Simplification Act will be of great assistance in the development of a workable grant consolidation program.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

S. 2984—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROTECT ENDANGERED SPECIES OF THE WORLD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the growing population of America, and of the world, has created many problems of population, decreasing available land, pollution, and the endangering of a growing number of species of wildlife. In America, concern is growing for the protection of these species, which are becoming every day more rare, through population growth and through carelessness.

In America, we have expressed our concern in such special programs as are now restoring the western bison, the whooping crane, the American bald eagle, and other vanishing species. These programs have been effective in more ways than one, for they have brought to the attention of our public the plight of such beautiful and distinctive animals, while they have gone far to prevent the eradication of the species themselves.

Like these well-known American species, though, the distinctive species of other nations are becoming scarcer. As man acquires and develops the country they inhabit, they kill increasing numbers of the wildlife for food, fur, or simple decoration.

Today, Americans go to their local zoos in increasing numbers; they attend movies and watch television, to see the wildlife that is so intimately connected with the beauties of our natural world. And, increasingly, they are informed that these are species in imminent danger of extinction. The leopard, a favorite for lush coats and distinctive decoration; the polar bear, the most distinctive form of life in the polar regions; the elephant, largest land animal; the whale, extolled by famed American author Herman Melville; and the rhesus monkey, which has been so invaluable in medical research—all these invaluable, irreplaceable species are in danger because of unregulated destruction.

In the last session of Congress, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, to convene an international conference on wildlife conservation. Since then, I have been confronted by a great gap in America's own protection of the world's endangered species.

There are, indeed, regulations within the countries of Africa, the East, and Europe, for the preservation of these species. There are almost everywhere animal preserves where only a limited quota of animals may be taken for exportation or other purposes. Yet, these rules are almost impossible to enforce, when in countries like America the horns and hides of these animals are sold for high prices, without regard to origin. As we here in America are finding it difficult to preserve our native alligator, because there is no law to prevent its sale in interstate commerce, so are the African and Asian nations in turn finding their own problems next to impossible to solve, as long as people continue to buy, and pay the high prices asked, for these rare and beautiful, although often illegal, goods.

It is for such a purpose that I today introduce here in the Senate a bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife into the United States, and to prevent interstate shipment of our native wildlife taken contrary to State law. This bill, introduced in the House by Representative ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina, and proposed also by Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, both outstanding leaders in conservational legislation, would bring America into a leadership role in the conservation of world wildlife. It would eliminate the United States as a major market for endangered wildlife, and bring about a decline in the traffic in vanishing or illegally obtained species.

The problem, Mr. President, is this: It would be illegal in a foreign country to take these animals, which are nearly extinct. But once the trappers take them illegally and get them out to bootleg exporters, we pay fabulous prices for the illegally taken hide of a rare species, nearly extinct.

The bill is designed to prevent the importation of illegally taken hides. The need for such protection in America has become increasingly acute during the last few years, as our growing fashion market has utilized and advertized the exotic furs over those grown for the purpose. The furs of endangered species are used, while we have excellent domestic mink and other furs, and our exceedingly accurate and beautiful synethetic furs which could be used. Domestic mink is produced from mink farms where they are not about to exterminate a species. We also have the beautiful synthetic furs that could be used.

I am not against the use of furs but I am concerned with the extinction of rare animals. If the present practice is continued without regulation, it would soon erase from the earth most of the beautiful animals man enjoys, especially through color television where these rare animals can be seen by many children in their natural habitat.

Such a trend of taking the furs of these nearly extinct animals and selling them on the market has become an increasing danger to the world's wildlife. One measure of the effect was given recently in testimony before the House's Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by Dr. Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. He mentioned that, in Kennedy Airport in New York, there were in a period of just 77 days 334 declarations of imported live wildlife from June 26 to September 11. These included Galapagos tortoises, orangutans, and timber wolves, all seriously endangered species. The figure did not include hides or other parts of animals imported into this country.

A notable book, "Animal Gardens," written and researched by well-known American authoress Emily Hahn, carried a chapter on the conditions which she inspected personally in Florida, in warehouses of animal dealers in that State. She viewed such species as the rare Australian skink, maltreated and dying, in crowded, smelly warehouses, while animals found in lesser quantities were treated with the care that betokens great profits to be gained. She described also the monkey hunts in tropical forests, where more monkeys are killed than are saved, by natives who are paid token sums in comparison to the final profit to the dealer.

The world has become more and more aware of the need for protection of its disappearing wildlife, and many countries have instituted comprehensive programs for this protection. India, for one, provides leadership in this field, having long held animals of different species to be an important and valuable part of the environment which man inhabits.

Also doing valuable work in the field is the Soviet Union, creating dangerous possibilities of a new "lag"—the species gap. Or, more seriously, a disappointing lapse of conscience on the part of America. Recently instituted in Russia is the animal census, for purposes of controlling killing of their rare species, and for utilization of the abundant wild game there. This indicates great advances in the value given to wildlife: for, as has been pointed out by international conservationist organizations such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, further use in their native country of African wildlife could greatly profit the developing nations by increasing tourist trade, as well as feeding the people where vegetation is insufficient to support the more delicate domestic animal.

Mr. President, research in connection with meat production in areas of Africa has shown that they can raise more meat per acre if they leave the native plants and animals than if they bulldoze those plants down and place cattle in there. They have small gazelles and antelopes that can eat from branches on the lower levels; they have browsers that can eat higher up; and they have giraffes that can eat from the branches that are still higher. They have hoofed animals that produce meat and that eat grass and shrubs up through about four levels, whereas domestic cows graze on the ground. All of this shows that they can get more meat per acre if they leave more of the plants and animals than if they kill them all off and introduce domestic species.

It is time that America stopped her wastefulness in the lives of our world's endangered species, and acted in the interests of the species which may soon vanish from the earth. America has represented the cause of conservation to the world, and has encouraged protection of species by their mother countries through many conservationist organizations. But she has at the same time allowed the commerce which is the basic cause of danger to these species to continue here at home. Thus, the time has come for America to end her dual front to the world, and to act sincerely to promote the interests she has taken up, by preventing further exploitation of vanishing species in her own backyard.

Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce this bill at this time, when the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is the Presiding Officer, because when his father was here he was one of the leading conservationists in this body. He was a great exponent of national parks, such as the Shenandoah National Park, and he gave me much assistance in connection with the development of the seashore areas, and particularly Padre Island, in Texas. He rendered many services in connection with furthering the national park system, and this was one of his great achievements in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2984) to prevent the importation of endangered species or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2984

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no person shall import into the United States, its territories or possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife or parts thereof which the Secretary of the Interior determines to be threatened with extinction, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section. A species or subspecies of fish or wildlife shall be regarded as threatened with extinction whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds, after consultation with the affected foreign country, and when appropriate, with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, that its existence is endangered because its habitat is threatened with destruction, drastic modifications, or severe curtailment, or because of commercial exploitation, through exports and imports of animals and parts thereof, or by other means, or because of disease, predation, or other factors. He shall, from time to time, publish in the Federal Register the names of the species or subspecies of fish or wildlife found to be threatened with extinction under this section.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may permit, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the importation of any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife or parts thereof that are threatened with extinction for zoological, educational, and scientific purposes.

(c) For the purposes of facilitating enforcement of this section and reducing the costs thereof, the importation of all fish or wildlife and the parts thereof into any port in the United States, except such as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury as ports of entry for vessels or aircraft, is prohibited.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe by regulations such terms and conditions as he shall deem necessary to implement his administration of the foregoing provisions of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, enforce the foregoing provisions and any regulations of the Secretary of the Interior issued with respect to importations subject to the provisions of this section. Any person who violates any provision of this section or the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior issued thereunder or any permit provision shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more tha six months, or both. Any person authorized to enforce the provisions of this section and the regulations prescribed thereunder or any provision of a permit may, with or without a warrant, arrest any person who violates such provisions or regulations in his presence or view, and may execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction, and may, with a search warrant or as incident to a lawful arrest, or incident to the arrival from outside the customs territory of the United States of any merchandise or person, search for and seize any fish or wildlife or parts thereof or property taken, used, or possessed in violation of said laws, or regulations. Anything so seized shall be held by such person or by the United States marshal pending disposition of the case by the court. Any fish or wildlife or parts thereof seized shall be forfeited to the Secretary of the Interior to be disposed of in such manner as he deems appropriate; and, upon conviction, any property seized may be forfeited to the United States or otherwise disposed of by the court.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "fish or wildlife" means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean;

(2) the term "person" means an individual, corporation, association, organization, or partnership.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 43 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "wild mammal or bird" in paragraphs 1 and 2 and inserting "wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean".

(b) Section 43 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new paragraph after the second paragraph in said section to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly transports or ships, or causes to be transported or shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, or knowingly sells or causes to be sold, any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean or parts thereof which were captured, killed, taken, purchased, sold, or otherwise possessed or transported in any manner contrary to this section or any Act of Congress or regulations issued thereunder or contrary to the laws or regulations of any State, District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, possession of the United States, or foreign country, or knowingly sells or causes to be sold any products manufactured, made or processed from such wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean or parts thereof; or;"

(c) The last paragraph in section 43 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Shall be fined not more than $1000 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both; and the wild mammals, wild birds, amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, or crustaceans, or the dead bodies or parts thereof, or the offspring or eggs thereof, shall be forfeited.".

SEC. 3. Section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42," after "to enforce sections" and by inserting a comma after "43".

SEC. 4. Section 3112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42", after "to enforce sections" and by inserting a comma after "43".

SEC. 5. The first paragraph in section 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting "wild animals or birds, or the dead bodies or parts thereof," and inserting "any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, or reptile, or the dead bodies or parts thereof, or any mollusk or crustacean,".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 of the Black Bass Act (44 Stat. 576), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852), is amended—

(1) by inserting before the words "any foreign country" the words "or from"; and

(2) by inserting after the words "District of Columbia" the words "or any foreign country".

(b) Section 3 of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852a), is amended by deleting the comma after "commerce" and inserting therein "or foreign commerce,".

(c) Section 6(a) of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852d(a)) is amended by changing the words "any employee of the Department of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this Act" in the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

"The provisions of this section and any regulations issued thereunder shall be enforced by personnel of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary may utilize by agreement with or without reimbursement personnel and facilities of other Federal agencies, and such personnel."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926), is amended by adding a new subsection at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of sections 1 through 3 of this Act, the term 'fish and wildlife' means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean."

(b) Section 2(d) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926), is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows:

"The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise any privately owned land, water, or interests therein, within the boundaries of any area hereafter administered by him, to conserve, protect, restore, or propagate any selected species of native fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction without regard to any limitation on appropriations applicable to such area under any other provision of law and each such acquisition shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such area."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2935) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that the definition of the term "disability," as employed therein shall be the same as that in effect prior to the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2613) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that farming losses incurred by persons who are not bona fide farmers may not be used to offset nonfarm income.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added as a cosponsor of S. 2040, a bill to provide for Federal assistance in the planning and installation of works and measures for the control and prevention of damages resulting from erosion of the roadbeds and rights-of-way of existing State, county, and other rural roads and highways, from erosion of the banks of rivers and streams, and from erosion of unrestored or unrehabilitated surface or strip mined non-Federal lands, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO FARMING LOSSES INCURRED BY CERTAIN PERSONS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 529

Mr. METCALF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2613) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that farming losses incurred by persons who are not bona fide farmers may not be used to offset nonfarm income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE 1968 CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week, February 7, I had the honor to speak before the Town Hall of California, in Los Angeles. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my comments on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1968 CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN POLITICS

The events of the past several weeks have unfolded with such swiftness and sudden force, that it is, perhaps, impossible to place them in any clear perspective. One day's developments seem to supersede those of the day before, or at least to obscure them. Seldom in past generations have Americans faced such enormous problems, on so many fronts, fraught with such grave hazards. The dread scourge of war now raging in Southeast Asia threatens to break out in new and indefinable dimensions like a plague before an ill wind. The destiny of our great country seems to hinge on the ruthless behavior of two minor totalitarian states, possessing but a tiny fraction of our power, none of our responsibilities, and, so far as I can determine, little, if any, of our virtue.

And these are only part of our trials. Nations in Europe, which, in bygone years we aided and defended in unprecedented scale, now almost eagerly add to our burdens. The United Nations, once the exhilarating dream for world order, sits helpless in the face of explosions from the Suez Canal to Wonsan Bay. While, surely, we live in an interdependent world, where freedom and peace must depend on the cooperation of like-minded, freedom-loving nations, it appears paradoxically that, with each passing day, the United States seems to be more on her own.

Here at home, hopes for domestic progress are dashed by a growing penchant for racial extremism, and by increasing limitations on our available resources. Our economy has been knocked askew by over-commitment, and by faulty management of the public purse.

There is a growing gulf between citizen and public servant. The orderly processes of government are stymied by doubt and mistrust of official pronouncements. In some areas, there is outright defiance by citizens of the laws of our land.

In such times of trouble, what do citizens of the United States do? A world of peoples, by now long accustomed to American leadership, or at least to vigorous American courage in standing up for decency among the members of the world's family, is looking for this answer. So, too, are we at home.

Our nation, the mightiest and wealthiest in the history of mankind, is capable of meeting today's challenge. Americans are people of good will. We seek neither to dominate the world, nor to make it over in our image. We believe in peaceful settlement of international disputes as opposed to the law of the jungle. We reject aggression in any form. But our motives are today widely misunderstood. Our task now is to get the message of America through.

The broad participation of citizens in their government is the operating principle of American politics. Commitment to this concept is essential. In this period of crisis, as in such trials in the past, the best response is to begin at home, to rally our national will, to use the freedoms of our democratic society without abusing them. The times cry out for a national leadership of vigor and frankness.

Like you, I believe in the American system, and in the ability of the American people to make it work. My vision, somewhere down the corridors of time, is for a world ruled by reason and law, where justice rests on right and not on power.

Today, no people can exist in isolation; the bonds of common interest in trade, development and mutual defense, are indispensable. They cannot be severed. Population will grow, but our geography will remain static. Science, to the contrary, will continue to shrink distance. We become more of a neighborhood every day. But the dream of resolving disputes in a world neighborhood, by reason, rather than force, has succumbed to the nightmare of prolonged hostility, in a torrid period misnamed "the Cold war."

America has led independent and non-Communist nations in establishing an almost worldwide system of collective security. In our nation, this was a bipartisan undertaking led by Arthur Vandenberg and Harry Truman, and by Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy. I believe in that effort. I have voted for the program of mutual security they sponsored to give aid to free friendly countries. Foreign aid, with all its administrative errors, helped to give Indonesia the will and the zeal to throw off Red Chinese Communism, and to become a friend of the West. American foreign aid made South Korea into a free and viable republic, which recently celebrated 15 years of independence. Almost 50,000 of her sons fight for the freedom of their neighbors in Vietnam.

As an American, I devotedly believe in the absolute necessity of the Atlantic Alliance, the foundation of strength in the Western World. As you know, I support our cause in Vietnam. As a Californian, I strongly believe that America's role is vital to peace and stability of the far Pacific in its struggle against an aggressive brand of Asiatic Communist expansionism.

I have not hesitated to support efforts to achieve peace by reason and law. I voted for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as a first cautious step toward ending the nightmare threat of nuclear holocaust. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have repeatedly voted to provide the forces, both nuclear and conventional, to keep America strong. The fact is that this world contains today two super powers, each with an enormous nuclear strike capability. Ours is clearly the stronger, and must remain so. I have no illusions about the ultimate aims of the Soviet Union for global domination, nor do I underestimate the zeal of its leaders in the Communist cause. However, they know also the peril of total war. They know that a surprise attack against the United States would unerringly bring a retaliating, obliterating strike against their own homeland. They know that is too high a price for them to pay. If they, in a moment of clarity, see the value of resolving the nuclear threat, America must not deny herself a chance, by consultation, of seeking to make the world safer.

Patriotism is not born of fear, but of the courage to stand up for conviction. The old argument that the choice might lie between "Red or Dead" is a snare. Our true choice, instead, is clear: To preserve the American system and to improve it, or, to the contrary, to evade our duty or to pursue self-defeating isolation. I am confident Americans will make the right choice.

The Soviet bogey-man is no giant. He is an adversary whose dogmas are the antithesis of our own. He deals in strength and he respects it in others. But he has his own bogey-man in China. And at home, his people, with the passage of time, have begun to yearn for creature comforts, Western style.

The same faith in our system we show to the world, we must show at home. No society can tolerate lawlessness and prolonged disorder. Government has the power, and the duty, to maintain our freedom and keep the public order. Some may contend that history proves ours is a society based on revolution. With them I disagree. Our people did not undertake revolution as an end in itself, but, as a means to achieve freedom and to throw off an oppressive foreign yoke bent on denying human rights. That was the genesis of our independence. That is the base of our power. We continue to expand that base, as our forefathers predicted. Despite opposition from those who reject freedom as a working principle, and from those who would rather sit on the shelf as an anachronistic museum piece, the struggle to achieve equal rights for all our people goes on. Even now in the United States Senate, we are striving to make it a crime for any citizen or public official forcibly to deprive another of the rights given him by our Constitution. I joined as a co-author in offering that measure in the Senate, as in the past I have joined the bipartisan leadership guiding every piece of civil rights legislation that has become law in the Twentieth Century.

I firmly believe that the broad gulf between the black and white races of our society can be narrowed, and I have a keen sense that it must. We can build a bridge of understanding by giving fellow humans, black or white, an opportunity to have a respected place in our society.

It is no longer just a matter of helping fellow humans, of seeing social justice done for those who have suffered too long. That time has passed, and our record on the whole is rather shabby. But now self-interest, too, is involved. The ghetto is impinging more, and more, and more on American pocketbooks in the form of taxes, and on American activity outside the ghetto as population swells. The choice—if it really remains any more—is whether to take a voluntary step to meet the problem, or to let events and the ghetto continue their unguided course until they spiral out of control.

The choice must be made to commit the private sector of the United States to the ghetto in great quantity, and with the dedicated aim of promoting viable private sector activity located within the ghetto and owned and run by ghetto residents. Only by taking this initiative can non-ghetto America hope to see its cities become whole and healthy again, with every segment of the urban population self-sufficient enough to contribute, rather than to drain.

Sometimes, the public and private sectors of our economy mesh together. For example, slightly over a year ago, I succeeded in amending the Federal Housing Act to encourage private home ownership in areas threatened by riot. Private lending agencies were understandably afraid to make home loans in such potential trouble spots. The security might go up in smoke. My amendment permitted FHA to assume some of the risk in a purchase money mortgage on a home in a riot area. The response of the business community to that new statute has been heartening. Last year the insurance companies of our country took advantage of this law to pledge one billion dollars worth of new housing for blighted urban areas. Some of our American institutions are working. The tragedy is that it took illegal, horrifying acts in the city slums to make those institutions work.

The paramount concern of our people, by virtue of its tragic costs and dogged persistence, is the war in Vietnam. Three times now in the past generation American men have been called to fight for freedom and independence of the peoples of East Asia. The recent seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*—which appears to be an act of piracy—has threatened yet another conflict. America's stake in the Far Pacific is deep. Our people are determined to come away with nothing less for ourselves and for our allies than peace with honor.

The critics of America's effort in Vietnam often seem more numerous than those of us who support it. But there is one point on which all agree. The American fighting forces have performed magnificently under the most difficult conditions imaginable. Battle lines are non-existent. Visibility in the jungle is severely limited and reduces the advantage of our firepower. In a strange land, it is hard to tell friend from foe—giving the enemy added opportunity for concealment. The severest critic of our policy would not dare to take away one jot of credit from the gallant battle our men have waged. We must never throw away what they have fought so valiantly to win.

In the last few days, the Communist offensive has led some Americans to despair of achieving a solution through our military effort in South Vietnam. I hesitate to comment. Politicians ought not to play general, particularly in the heat of battle. But I want to restate what I said last fall on return from an inspection trip to Southeast Asia:

"Domestic American politics does not offer satisfactory basis for a winning strategy in world affairs. North Vietnam, unable to win a military victory, seeks, as I say, a political one. She counts on our moral paralysis in the face of mounting pressure for peace of almost any kind in connection with next year's elections." Their objectives, even in their acts of terror and violence of last week, continue to be political and diplomatic. They fight with an eye on the conference table and an ear to political opinion in the United States.

Our diplomacy, unhappily, has not fared as well as our military effort. The Administration has failed to obtain a worldwide condemnation of North Vietnamese aggression. This has been a major shortcoming. It has left us to go-it-alone in the United Nations. In Vietnam, we have been largely abandoned by our European allies. Two years ago, Couve de Murville, the French foreign minister, said, "International crises no longer center in Europe, but in Asia, and the majority of NATO countries is not involved in Asia." He thus sought to isolate Western Europe from Asia, exactly as some Americans, prior to the Second World War, thought they could isolate America from the quarrels of Europe. Part of the responsibility of American diplomatic leadership is to convince our allies in Europe that a conflagration in Asia cannot be outside their own concern.

We need desperately to reweave the fabric of collective security which must remain the keystone of our foreign policy. That is the great challenge to American government. The mistakes of the past must not be repeated. We must, I repeat, beware of the perils of going it alone. It is as true today as it was in the early days of our country: "In Union there is strength."

This is the nub of the negotiation problem. At times the possibility of peace talks seems to come nearer, only to vanish in the clamor of new battles. Despite intense fighting, the conditions for opening talks are successively diminishing. But no discussions can be productive unless they lead to a broad international conference representing all nations interested in peace in Asia. Our task will not be complete until the nations of Asia accept an honorable settlement, and, more important, agree to maintain it. That is no simple prescription, but it is a valid one. It represents the difference between a peace with some durability, and some kind of cease-fire with none at all.

The costs of standing up to aggression abroad and to unrest and violence at home are high. Today every American is acutely aware of the continuing spiral in the cost of living. The cause of continued and mounting inflation, in my view, is not only the cost of crisis, but of mismanagement of the public purse. America has the strength to meet her challenges, but her powers are not inexhaustable. We have seen in Great Britain how an economy which fails to husband its resources eventually pays for its mistakes. The sad story of the British pound must not be repeated with the American dollar. Our Federal budget was less than 100 billion dollars only four short years ago.

Expenditures have grown by more than 50 percent since that time. In 1964, the Congress reduced the tax rates. Today we are considering the second increase in as many years. Our Federal deficit for the current fiscal year has been variously estimated at from 12 to 30 billion dollars, depending on whose figures you choose to accept.

Congress has taken some stern action to retrench, to minimize the budget's impact on inflation and interest rates. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I joined my colleagues in cutting over four billion dollars from this year's Administration budget requests last year. And, in the closing days of the first session, Congress decreed that by the end of the fiscal year this total will be nine billion dollars. But, for the good of this country, the upward pressure on prices and interest rates must be stopped. We must stanch the outward flow of gold from our national Treasury.

On January 17, the President announced a deficit for the forthcoming fiscal year of eight billion dollars. This figure was computed under a new Federal budget concept recently approved by a distinguished bipartisan committee. The principal difference is that the new budget includes, for the first time, the income and outgo of trust fund monies like social security taxes. Many of these trusts generate a surplus, but the surplus can not be used to pay the general cost of government because it is committed by law to the trust purpose alone. It is a commitment that our President appeared to ignore in his state of the union message, for he sought to reduce the estimated expenditure deficit by using the projected trust fund surplus. By this arithmetical legerdemain, the projected deficit is reduced magically to eight billion dollars from the 15.4 billion dollars it would be otherwise. In the same fashion, the deficit has been reduced still further by including revenues from a tax proposal which is not yet enacted and may not be. The deficit could realistically be figured as high as 28 billion dollars with a wider gap threatened next year.

Urgent action is necessary. In my view, the House of Representatives should have acted on the Administration's tax proposals long ago. Each day's delay makes the cost of solvency higher. The British example continues before our eyes. The remedies are evident and available. Certainly it is far more consistent with the idea of democracy to ask patriotic Americans for a slight general tax increase than to try to solve our problems by curtailing our freedom of movement. The Administration's proposals to restrict foreign travel by imposing a high per diem duty favors the affluent, restricts the people's opportunity for knowledge, and violates the spirit, if not the letter, of our Constitution. They are no substitute for a little fiscal courage.

I should like, for a moment, to suggest a national political problem which we may have to face this year. Effective democracy in our country depends on the give-and-take of the two-party system. It offers the best means yet discovered to make government responsive to the people. But this year, for the first time in 144 years, our citizens may lose the advantage of this system.

The appearance of a third-party threat must be taken seriously. A secession of Southern states to the American Independent Party would yield as many as 90 electoral votes to Mr. George Wallace. It is highly possible that no candidate will have a clear majority in the Electoral College. This would leave the election of the President of the United States to the House of Representatives.

The Constitution provides that it is the newly elected Congress which makes this choice. In olden times, when the pace of business was slower, it did not seem important that the people of the United States might wait two months or more for the outcome of a Presidential election. In 1968, this would be intolerable.

I invite you to imagine the pressures that would be generated by a prolonged delay in the selection of the man to hold the most powerful office on the face of the earth. The entire gamut of our foreign relations would be left in suspended animation. The leadership, so desperately needed on behalf of the Free World, would disappear. The unity of command given by our Constitution to the office of President would be lost. The incumbent President would not know if he were a lame duck or a spring chicken. It would be almost impossible for him to arrange an orderly transfer of office.

The political ramifications of the arrangement of the election of the President would hamper the effective discharge of his office for a full four years. The Congress could well have a captive President. That could be about as bad for our country as a dictatorship. The one would take away our freedom; the other would seriously undermine our national unity.

The mischief of the Wallace movement is the danger of electing the next President in the House of Representatives. Splinter parties of left and right should be rejected by the American people.

The American people are fully alive to the challenge of this crucial year in our history. The greatest need today in our land is for reaffirmation of faith in our nation and the growing and productive institutions that make it work. This, my fellow citizens, is the year of fateful choice.

"SKIP" RENEGAR: A GRAND OLD MAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President—

> It may be that fate will give me life
> And leave to row once more—
> Set some strong man free for fighting
> As I take awhile his oar.
> But to-day I leave the galley.
> Shall I curse her service then?
> God be thanked! What e'er comes after,
> I have lived and toiled with Men!
>
> —KIPLING: "The Galley Slave."

"To have lived and toiled with men!" as Kipling put it in his poem, "The Galley Slave," is probably one of the finest descriptions that could be found to sum up the distinguished 30-year career of Lt. Comdr. Garland M. Renegar who recently retired from active duty with the U.S. Navy.

Toiling on his father's Statesville, N.C., farm, "Skip," as his friends call him, was lured away by the siren call of the sea on November 3, 1937, which in and of itself was not unusual.

The Renegar family, however, can be termed unusual in that the six sons all have served with or are serving in this country's Armed Forces, and to this date have amassed a total of 121 years of military service. This one family's record, incidentally, is believed to stand unchallenged in military history. Furthermore, there is another unusual aspect in that the family has not been together since that November 3, and this occasion served as a sort of family reunion.

Generally speaking, formal retirement services such as this one are unusual, but because of their high regard for "Skip" Renegar, the officers and men of the Fleet Tactical Support Squadron at the Patuxent River, Md., Naval Air Station went all out in arranging the January 31, 1968, fete. The arrangements and invitations were literally worldwide in scope.

Those who were able to attend this aforementioned reunion and retirement ceremony included the father, Edgar D. Renegar, Statesville, N.C.; and brothers: Ray, major, U.S. Army, Fort Monmouth, N.J.; Jack, first lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps, Camp Lejeune, N.C.; Gerald, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army, retired, Pinesville, La.; and Charles, a retired Air Force master sergeant of Rivera Beach, Fla. Unable to be present were the mother, who was kept home due to an illness, and brother Harold, sergeant, first class, U.S. Army, currently in Korea.

Also witnessing this milestone event were Renegar's wife, the former Jean Wolfe of Cedar Bluff, Nebr., and their two sons, Kent, a postgraduate student at Vanderbilt, and Douglas, an undergraduate at Wake Forest University.

"Skip" is now employed by the North Carolina State Forestry Service and I know that his longtime service as a naval aviator will serve him in good stead since his return home to the "Old North State."

Mr. President, in such troublous times, when much is made of draft dodging, draft-card burning, and protest against military service, it is indeed refreshing to learn of one family's dedication to their country. It is even more gratifying, of course, when members of that family happen to be fellow Tarheels.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of

the program, a letter, a press release, and newspaper articles about the event be printed at this point in the RECORD in order that others may read about and share my pride in this remarkable family.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM: FLEET TACTICAL SUPPORT, SQUADRON 1; LT. COMDR. G.M. "SKIP" RENEGAR, U.S. NAVY, NOVEMBER 3, 1937 TO JANUARY 31, 1968

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

1340—Troops fall in; arrival of guests.

1400—Rear Adm. D. F. Smith, Jr., arrives with honors; March on the colors.

1405—Personnel inspection: Capt. F. G. Koenig and Lt. Comdr. G. M. Renegar.

1415—Lt. Comdr. Renegar (front and center).

Résumé of career (Capt. Koenig).

Presentation of letter of commendation by Rear Adm. Smith.

1425—Lt. Comdr. Renegar's retirement orders (Capt. Koenig).

1430—Band plays "Aloha, Aloha," following which Lt. Comdr. Renegar is piped over the side.

1435—March off the colors.

1440—Guests depart.

1445—Dismiss the troops.

Music, courtesy of the Comnavairlant Band.

GUESTS

Rear Adm. D. F. Smith, Jr., commander Naval Air Test Center and Commander Fleet Air Patuxent.

Rear Adm. R. E. M. Ward, retired, now living in Santa Cruz, Calif.

Capt. V. P. O'Neil, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.

Capt. R. F. Lyons, American liaison, U.S. Naval Attaché, Mexico City, Mexico.

Capt. J. J. Vandale, director, Naval District Affairs Division, BuPers, Washington, D.C.

Capt. W. D. Davis, retired, now with Naval Reserve Association, Washington, D.C.

Comdr. C. B. Kirbow, retired, now chief clerk, Senate Committee on Armed Forces.

Mr. Scot MacDonald, retired Navy Chief Journalist, now with Armed Forces Management, Washington, D.C.

Mr. E. D. Renegar, father of the six brothers of Statesville, N.C.

Maj. Ray Renegar, U.S. Army, Army Aviation Detachment, Fort Monmouth, N.J.

Lt. Col. Renegar, U.S. Army, retired, now of Pineville, La.

First Lt. Jack Renegar, U.S. Marine Corps; Headquarters Battery, 10th Marines, 2d Marine Division, FMF, Camp Lejeune, N.C.

M/Sgt. Roland Renegar, U.S. Air Force, retired, Rivera Beach, Fla.

Sfc. Harold Renegar, U.S. Army; Headquarters Battery, 7th Battalion (Hawk), 5th Artillery, Korea.

SKIP RENEGAR: A GRAND OLD MAN

Thirty years ago, Garland M. Renegar was an apprentice seaman who wielded a swab regularly and chipped paint aboard the U.S.S. *Gilmer*, one of the Navy's old four-piper destroyers. Today, Renegar is a lieutenant commander who is at the end of a distinguished naval career that has spanned those three decades.

From the farm

On November 3, 1937 "Skip" Renegar had worked in the field all day plowing with a team of mules on his father's tobacco and cotton farm near Statesville, N.C. He came to the house about 9:30 at night and was met by his mother, who told him the Navy recruiter would pick him up the following day. He left early the next morning with the recruiter after saying goodbye to his parents, his sisters, and his five brothers.

That was the last time that the entire family was together at one time. The other five brothers—Gerald, Roland, Harold, Ray and Jack—all joined the service and all have been career military men.

Through the combined efforts of the Navy and many other local and national organizations the Renegar family is once again united today at this retirement ceremony.

"Corn" philosophy

Skip—a nickname he has had for many years, and whose origin has been lost for a long time is a pleasant, soft-spoken, unassuming man who at times lets a little North Carolina "corn" philosophy sneak into his speech.

If you approach to talk to him he begins immediately rustling through his brown leather flight jacket, looking for his glasses. He seems to speak better with them on.

His gold-striped hat pushed back on his head reveals a balding crop of light brown hair. On his face is always the same warm, sincere smile.

At the squadron—the Navy's oldest air transport squadron—he can be seen at many odd hours of the day. He might be sitting in one of the many squadron offices—shooting the breeze with one of the enlisted men who works there; or out on the squadron's flight line helping with the movement of equipment or planes; or just standing around the hangar deck, making a silent survey of the work going on there.

Maintenance officer

Officially, he is the assistant maintenance officer of the squadron. Unofficially, he is the squadron's trouble-shooter. His many years of varied and diversified aviation assignments have given him an unlimited storehouse of knowledge which he draws on continuously to help solve maintenance, material, and personal problems of the squadron and its men.

First assignment

After his first assignment in the Navy ended, with the decommissioning of the destroyer *Gilmer* at the Philadelphia Navy Yard in 1938, he was sent to the precommissioning unit of the light cruiser *Phoenix*. In 1940 he left the *Phoenix* for the Aviation Machinist's Mate School in Norfolk. While he was in school he made aviation machinist's mate third class. From there he was assigned to the air station at Pensacola, Fla.

There he became a part of the commissioning unit of the Jacksonville, Fla., Naval Air Station. He is a "plank owner" (part of the commissioning crew) of "Jax". "When I reported into Jacksonville we had to drive some cattle off the road in order to get into the duty office to log in," he recalls. There he was assigned to Training Squadron 12.

He moved up in rate to second and then first class while assigned to the squadron. Later he made chief petty officer and gained his second commissioned status in August 1955 while serving as attaché pilot for the American Embassy, Mexico City.

Antarctic duty

His assignments since then have been from one end of the world to the other, including a tour of duty with the Quonset Point, R.I.-based Air Development Squadron 6 at Antarctica.

Several years ago he received notification that the Department of Interior had named a glacier for him, in honor of his reconnaissance missions over unchartered regions of the Antarctic.

Great leaders

Skip recalls with fondness some of the great men he has served under during his long career. Men like Lt. (j.g.) K. L. Veth, his division officer aboard the *Phoenix*, who is now a rear admiral and Commander Naval Forces, Vietnam. Lt. John T. Hayward, senior naval aviator on board the *Phoenix*, now a vice admiral and president of the Newport, R.I., Naval War College. Lt. (j.g.) Harold I. Ewen, who now has a doctorate in radio astronomy from Harvard and is with the Ewen-McKnight Corp. of Boston, Mass. Retired Rear Adm. R. E. M. ("Run Every Minute") Ward, now living in Santa Cruz, Calif. Cmdr. Noel F. Gaylor, who Commander Renegar served under as a chief pretty officer. Gaylor, now a vice admiral, is deputy director of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff, Omaha, Nebr.

Total of 121 years of service

They just weren't cut out to be farmers—those six sons of Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Renegar of Statesville, N.C.—who together have a combined total of 121 years of service with the U.S. Armed Forces. This total accumulated by the immediate members of one family is believed to stand unchallenged in military history.

Out at the family farm, the father of the traipsing military men says, "I've gotten used to it by now, but it's still hard to do without them." Naturally, he and Mrs. Renegar are proud of their sons wanting to serve their country. Mr. Renegar said that when each one joined up, he told them "Don't do less than your best." He said, "That's the encouragement I gave them, and they've done mighty well."

Two have retired

Four of the brothers are currently on active duty from Korea to New Jersey. Today, Skip joins the retired list with his other two brothers: Army Lt. Col. Gerald E. Renegar now living in Louisiana; and Air Force M/Sgt. Charles Roland Renegar now residing in Florida.

Still active

The other brothers still on active duty include: Army Sfc. Harold E. Renegar, who is now in Korea; Army Maj. Ray V. Renegar, at the Army Aviation Detachment, Fort Monmouth, N.J.; and Marine Corps 1st Lt. Edwin Jackson Renegar, Camp Lejuene, N.C.

Wife and sons

Skip is married to the former Miss Jean Wolfe, of Cedar Bluffs, Nebr. They have two sons: Kent, a graduate of Nebraska Wesleyan University, who is now doing postgraduate work at Vanderbilt; and Douglas, now in his second year at Wake Forest University.

JANUARY 31, 1968.

Lt. Comdr. GARLAND M. RENEGAR,
Assistant Maintenance Officer, Fleet Tactical Support Squadron 1, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.

DEAR COMMANDER RENEGAR: Today marks another successful milestone in the history of the Renegar family and I wish to take this opportunity to express my congratulations. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I too, share your parents' pride on this occasion of your retirement from 30 years active service to the United States Navy and to your country.

The significance attendant to this ceremony almost overshadows the equally significant fact that you and your brothers have contributed a combined total of 121 years of service with the United States armed forces. Surely, this noteworthy and commendable record is unmatched by any other family and it should serve as a landmark of devotion to country.

This dedication, as exemplified by you Commander Renegar, is an example of what has made the United States in general and the U.S. Navy in particular, such a great force in the world and I salute you and your family for a job well done.

With all kind wishes for your future as you return to North Carolina, I remain,

Sincerely,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.

[News release, Fleet Tactical Support Squadron 1, Feb. 2, 1968]

A Grand Old Man

(By Lt. W. I. Harris and JO1 Bill Wedertz)

For the first time in thirty years five of the six sons of Mr. E. D. Renegar were together when LCDR Garland M. Renegar retired January 31, 1968, at the Naval Air Station Patuxent River, Maryland.

Fleet Tactical Support Squadron One (VR–1), the Navy's oldest transport squadron, gave "Skip" Renegar a Very Special Retirement Ceremony this week upon the completion of 30 years of service to his country.

THREE DECADES OF NAVY SERVICE

"Skip" is a very remarkable man who was the first of six brothers to enlist in military service. Starting as an apprentice seaman in 1937, he rose to the rank of Lieutenant Commander.

During World War II he became a Naval Aviator and since then has flown to all corners of the world in many types of Navy aircraft. While serving in Antarctica he became one of the few men to have a glacier named after him. His duty at VR–1 besides being a C–131 aircraft commander, was assistant maintenance officer, however his many years of varied and diversified aviation assignments made him the squadron's troubleshooter. His experience gave him an unlimited storehouse of information which he drew on continuously to help solve maintenance, material and personal problems of the squadron and its men.

Respected by all, from his Commanding Officer, Captain F. G. Koenig, to the seamen who worked for him, Skip is a man who believes strongly in his country, and what it stands for. "Skip Renegar is an unusual man," said one of the squadron's enlisted men. "He may wear an officer's hat, but he is really an enlisted man at heart."

A SPECIAL RETIREMENT

After the ceremony, in which a letter of commendation from VADM E. P. Holmes, Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet was presented to LCDR Renegar by RADM D. F. Smith, Commander Fleet Air Patuxent, Skip said, "For an old man to receive this kind of honor from his country makes me realize that, as long as we have servicemen like my shipmates, the President of this nation need fear nothing from any nation, or any individual, and that the people of today who would be critical of this nation are small within themselves, and would contribute nothing toward what so many people have in the past have given so much," and then he added, "I mean that, verbatim."

Later, at a party given in his honor at the Officer's Club, "Skip" was presented a framed portrait, signed by the members of his family, the guests, and all of the officers of the squadron.

He also received a plaque and mug embellished with the squadron emblem. As a spoof concerning his new job with the North Carolina Forestry service, he was given a "Smokey-the-Bear" hat adorned with a special hand carved set of aviation wings which had a rocking chair in the center.

Speaking of the ceremony which brought together his father, Mr. E. D. Renegar and four of his five brothers for the first time in 30 years, LCDR Renegar said, "How they did it I don't know. When I first got wind of it a couple of days ago I didn't think it could be done."

TOTAL 121 YEARS OF MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. E. D. Renegar, the 80 year old father of the six boys who have compiled a total of 121 years of military service, is a retired farmer who still lives on his farm in Statesville, N.C. While surrounded by his sons he observed, "They just weren't cut out to be farmers, however, I told them as they left, never do less than your best, and they have made me very proud of their accomplishments."

VR–1's send off for Skip and the presence of this family awed the old man and made him so happy that it brought tears to his eyes.

Mrs. Renegar, Skip's 77 year old mother, was invited but a heart ailment kept her in Statesville.

BROTHERS SPREAD FAR AND WIDE

Major Ray Renegar, U.S. Army Aviation Detachment, Ft. Monmouth, N.J., a veteran of three wars said "This is one of the most memorable events that has ever happened to our family. We greatly appreciate the efforts the Navy put forth to gather us all together."

Lt. Col. Gerald Renegar, U.S. Army (Ret.), now working at the Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant and living in Pinesville, La., had this to say. "This has been one of the most impresive ceremonies I've ever seen and its a wonderful feeling to be reunited with our family."

1st Lt. Jack Renegar, U.S. Marine Corps, HQ Btry., 10th Marines, 2nd Mar. Div., at Camp Lejeune, N.C., attended with his wife after being flown from Puerto Rico where he was on maneuvers. Among his comments he said, "Although we are widely separated geographically, we are a close family and the honors bestowed on Skip here today have made us all proud and very happy."

M/Sgt. Roland "Chuck" Renegar, U.S. Air Force (Ret.) now living in Riviera Beach, Florida, observed, "I've always maintained the Air Force was tops, but after seeing what the Navy has accomplished here today I might have to change my views. Getting our father off his farm and away from his 39 year old mule "Red" was a major accomplishment in itself."

Skip's wife, Jeanne, the former Miss Jeanne Wolfe of Cedar Bluffs, Nebr., attended with her mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Ira Wolfe.

Skip's son, Kent, a graduate of Nebraska Wesleyan University, who is now doing postgraduate work at Vanderbilt, and Kent's wife, Sandy, and Skip's youngest son, Douglas, now in his second year at Wake Forest University, were seen at the ceremony with great pride, in their father and his accomplishments, beaming from their faces.

Recent events prevented the sixth brother, Sfc. Harold Renegar, HQ Btry., 7th Bn. (Hawk) 5th Artillery, Korea from attending.

Over 20 telegrams and messages from all over the world congratulating Skip were put into a scrapbook and presented to him at the conclusion of the ceremony.

At the end of the party all concerned went their separate ways with the hopes that the next reunion would not take 30 years.

Skip has said "Sentiment has no place in the Navy, where a man may be asked to risk his life at any time," but there were very few people who didn't have a lump in their throat when the NavAirLant Band played "Aloha, Aloha", and a "Grand Old Man" was piped over the side.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Feb. 1, 1968]

It Was a Big Day for the Renegar Clan

PATUXENT, MD.—Edgar Renegar, a 79-year-old farmer from Statesville, N.C., got together with five of his six sons Wednesday for the first time in 30 years.

All six are in the service or used to be, and Renegar said jokingly: "Maybe I've made a mistake. Now I don't have anyone left on the farm."

The farm, begun in the mid-1920s with 57 acres, is now 110 acres of cotton, peanuts and tobacco outside of Statesville.

"A little bit of everything" is the way Renegar describes his crops. He still works every day, managing the operation.

The occasion for the family reunion was the retirement from the Navy of his oldest son, Lt. Cmdr. Garland ("Skip") Renegar, 49, who enlisted as an apprentice seaman Nov. 3, 1937, and came up through the ranks.

At a special ceremony, Cmdr. Renegar inspected the 350 men of the Fleet Tactical Support Squadron at Patuxent Naval Air Station, where he has served for the past year.

Then he went to the front of the squadron while his commanding officer, Capt. F. G. Koenig, spoke on Renegar's career. Adm. Daniel F. Smith Jr., commander of the Naval Air Test Center at Patuxent, read a commendation from the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet.

Renegar's retirement order was read, he was "piped over the side," by a boatswain's pipe, and he gave his farewell salute.

There were tears in the eyes of the commander's father, and some of his brothers, who had seats of honor down front on the folding chairs set up in a hangar for the 40-minute ceremony.

"The most wonderful thing in years . . . I didn't think it could be done," said Charles Roland Renegar, a retired Air Force sergeant from Riviera Beach, Fla.

The other former serviceman among the elder Renegar's sons was Gerald Renegar of Shreveport, La., a former lieutenant colonel in the Air Force.

The sons still in service, who attended in uniform, were: 1st Lt. Edwin "Jack" Renegar, a Marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., flown to the states by the Navy from Puerto Rico, where he was on maneuvers, and Maj. Ray Renegar of Ft. Monmouth, N.J.

The only son missing was Sgt. 1.C. Harold Renegar of El Paso, Tex., who is stationed in Korea. The elder Renegar's wife, who is 77, has had a heart ailment and was unable to make the trip to see her sons.

A spokesman at Patuxent said it was unusual for the Navy to have such a ceremony on an officer's retirement.

"Skip Renegar is an unusual man," said one of the enlisted men at the base.

"He may wear an officer's hat but he isn't really an officer; you know he's an enlisted man at heart."

His squadron has the task of supporting the Navy's Atlantic Fleet by moving personnel and supplies to where they're needed.

A letter from Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., offered congratulations on "another successful milestone in the history of the Renegar family."

Jack Renegar left after the ceremony to get back to Puerto Rico. The others will leave today, with the elder Renegar driving to New Jersey with son Ray before flying back to North Carolina.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Feb. 1, 1968]

Reunion and Retirement—Father, Five Sons Gather for Ceremony

PATUXENT, MD.—Edgar Renegar, a 79-year-old farmer from Statesville, N.C., got together with five of his six sons Wednesday for the first time in 30 years.

All six are in the service or used to be, and Renegar said jokingly: "Maybe I've made a mistake. Now I don't have any one left on the farm."

The farm, begun in the mid-1920s with 57 acres, is now 110 acres of cotton, peanuts and tobacco outside Statesville.

"A little bit of everything" is the way Renegar describes his crops. He still works every day, managing the operation.

The occasion for the family reunion was the retirement from the Navy of his oldest son, Lt. Cmdr. Garland "Skip" Renegar, 49, who enlisted as an apprentice seaman Nov. 3, 1937, and came up through the ranks.

At a special ceremony, Cmdr. Renegar inspected the 350 men of the Fleet Tactical Support Squadron at Patuxent Naval Air Station, where he has served for the past year.

Then he went to the front of the squadron while his commanding officer, Capt. F. G. Koenig, spoke on Renegar's career. Adm. Daniel F. Smith Jr., commander of the Naval

Air Test Center at Patuxent, read a commendation from the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet.

Renegar's retirement order was read, he was "piped over the side" by a boatswain's pipe, and he gave his farewell salute.

There were tears in the eyes of the commander's father, and some of his brothers, who had seats of honor down front on the folding chairs set up in a hangar for the 40-minute ceremony.

"The most wonderful thing in years . . . I didn't think it could be done," said Charles Roland Renegar, a retired Air Force sergeant from Riviera Beach, Fla.

The other former serviceman among the elder Renegar's sons was Gerald of Shreveport, La., former lieutenant colonel in the Air Force.

The sons still in service, who attended in uniform, were: 1st Lt. Edwin "Jack" Renegar, a Marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., flown to the states by the Navy from Puerto Rico, where he was on maneuvers, and Maj. Ray Renegar of Ft. Monmouth, N.J.

The only son missing was Sgt. 1.C. Harold Renegar of El Paso, Tex., who is stationed in Korea. The elder Renegar's wife, who is 77, has had a heart ailment and was unable to make the trip to see her sons.

A spokesman at Patuxent said it was unusual for the Navy to have such a ceremony on an officer's retirement.

"Skip Renegar is an unusual man," said one of the enlisted men at the base.

"He may wear an officer's hat but he isn't really an officer; you know he's an enlisted man at heart."

His squadron has the task of supporting the Navy's Atlantic Fleet by moving personnel and supplies to where they're needed.

A letter from Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., offered congratulations on "another successful milestone in the history of the Renegar family."

Jack Renegar left after the ceremony to get back to Puerto Rico. The others will leave today, with the elder Renegar driving to New Jersey with son Ray before flying back to North Carolina.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer, Feb. 1, 1968]

THIRTY YEARS PRECEDE REUNION

PATUXENT, MD.—Edgar Renegar, a 79-year-old farmer from Statesville, N.C., got together with five of his six sons Wednesday for the first time in 30 years.

All six are in the service or used to be, and Renegar said jokingly: "Maybe I've made a mistake. Now I don't have anyone left on the farm."

The farm, begun in the mid-1920s with 57 acres, is now 110 acres of cotton, peanuts and tobacco outside Statesville.

"A little bit of everything" is the way Renegar describes his crops. He still works every day, managing the operation.

The occasion for the family reunion was the retirement from the Navy of his oldest son, Lt. Cmdr. Garland "Skip" Renegar, 49, who enlisted as an apprentice seaman Nov. 3, 1937, and came up through the ranks.

At a special ceremony, Cmdr. Renegar inspected the 350 men of the Fleet Tactical Support Squadron at Patuxent Naval Air Station, where he has served for the past year.

The sons still in service, who attended in uniform, were: 1st Lt. Edwin "Jack" Renegar, a Marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., flown to the states by the Navy from Puerto Rico, where he was on maneuvers, and Maj. Ray Renegar of Ft. Monmouth, N.J.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Feb. 1, 1968]

STATESVILLE FARMER REUNITED WITH SONS

PATUXENT, MD.—Edgar Renegar, a 79-year-old farmer from Statesville, N.C., got together with five of his six sons Wednesday for the first time in 30 years.

All six are in the service or used to be, and Renegar said jokingly: "Maybe I've made a mistake. Now I don't have anyone left on the farm."

The farm, begun in the mid-1920's with 57 acres, is now 110 acres of cotton, peanuts and tobacco outside Statesville.

"A little bit of everything" is the way Renegar describes his crops. He still works every day, managing the operation.

OCCASION A RETIREMENT

The occasion for the family reunion was the retirement from the Navy of his oldest son, Lt. Cmdr. Garland "Skip" Renegar, 49, who enlisted as an apprentice seaman Nov. 3, 1937, and came up through the ranks.

At a special ceremony, Cmdr. Renegar inspected the 350 men of the Fleet Tactical Support Squadron at Patuxent Naval Air Station, where he has served for the past year.

Then he went to the front of the squadron while his commanding officer, Capt. F. G. Koenig, spoke on Renegar's career. Adm. Daniel F. Smith Jr., commander of the Naval Air Test Center at Patuxent, read a commendation from the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet.

"PIPED OVER THE SIDE"

Renegar's retirement order was read, he was "piped over the side" by a boatswain's pipe, and he gave his farewell salute.

There were tears in the eyes of the commander's father, and some of his brothers, who had seats of honor down front on the folding chairs set up in a hangar for the 40-minute ceremony.

"The most wonderful thing in years . . . I didn't think it could be done," said Charles Roland Renegar, a retired Air Force sergeant from Riviera Beach, Fla.

The other former serviceman among the elder Renegar's sons was Gerald of Shreveport, La., a former lieutenant colonel in the Air Force.

The sons still in service, who attended in uniform, were 1st Lt. Edwin "Jack" Renegar, a Marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., flown to the states by the Navy from Puerto Rico, where he was on maneuvers, and Maj. Ray Renegar of Ft. Monmouth, N.J.

SUCH A CEREMONY UNUSUAL

The only son missing was Sgt. 1.C. Harold Renegar of El Paso, Tex., who is stationed in Korea. The elder Renegar's wife, who is 77, has had a heart ailment and was unable to make the trip to see her sons.

A spokesman at Patuxent said it was unusual for the Navy to have such a ceremony on an officer's retirement.

"Skip Renegar is an unusual man," said one of the enlisted men at the base.

"He may wear an officer's hat but he isn't really an officer; you know he's an enlisted man at heart."

His squadron has the task of supporting the Navy's Atlantic Fleet by moving personnel and supplies to where they're needed.

A letter from Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D—N.C., offered congratulations on "another successful milestone in the history of the Renegar family."

Jack Renegar, left after the ceremony to get back to Puerto Rico. The others will leave Thursday, with the elder Renegar driving to New Jersey with son Ray before flying back to North Carolina.

SENATOR MANSFIELD HONORED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, on last Sunday, February 11, 1968, the people of Maine and the University of Maine were privileged and proud to welcome the distinguished majority leader and Mrs. Mansfield as guests for a memorable day.

The occasion was the university's founders day convocation. The setting—a crisp Maine day with blue skies and newly fallen snow—must have been somewhat reminiscent of Montana.

Senator MANSFIELD was warmly received by a capacity audience of 3,000 students, faculty, and citizens in the university's fieldhouse. He chose to discuss our policies in Korea and Vietnam.

As we have come to expect of him, his message was thoughtful, constructive, and responsible. It was received by a hushed and attentive audience which responded with a standing ovation.

Senator MANSFIELD's speech was a major contribution to the continuing debate over our policies in Korea and Vietnam. It is worthy of widespread and thoughtful consideration. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM

(Speech of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, at the University of Maine convocation, Orono, Maine, February 11, 1968)

My remarks, today, deal with Viet Nam. Before proceeding to them, however, I wish to refer to the USS Pueblo incident. When added to the Vietnamese conflict, it is illustrative of the hydra-headed character of military involvement on the mainland of Asia. War spreads readily on that continent; the difficulty lies in curbing it. I would emphasize, therefore, that while the urgency in Viet Nam is to bring one bloody conflict to a close, the imperative in Korea is to prevent the opening of another.

In the latter connection, it will help to bear in mind the essentials of the Pueblo affair. A U.S. vessel—that it was an electronic listener of some sort is not disputed—was in a position off the North Korean coast. What vital national need prompted the dispatch of this particular mission or why the vessel went undefended are not as yet, fully known.

All reports available to me in both the White House and the Foreign Relations Committee, indicate that the Pueblo was in international waters at the time it was taken. As of the moment, the Pueblo is now at anchor in Wonsan harbor and the 82 surviving crewmen who were aboard—one other has died—are interned in North Korea. That ineluctable fact is in no way altered by a sense of outrage or indignation.

The crew aboard the Pueblo was carrying out a dangerous assignment. The "why" and the "how" of the mission are moot at this point. What matters now is the obligation to those men. In our reactions to the Pueblo affair, lives must not become the pawns of either pride or petulance. Every effort to bring about their release must be made.

We will also do well to bear in mind that the one war in which we are engaged on the Asian mainland has become a source of immense grief. Any move which leads into a second Vietnamese-type conflict in Korea will compound the grief but hardly serve the interests of this nation.

In sum, what most matters at this point, it seems to me, is: (1) return of the 80-odd American crewmen alive—I repeat, alive—and; (2) prevention of a second war in Korea on the pattern of Viet Nam which could the more readily become World War III.

The firm restraint which President Johnson has exercised from the outset of the Pueblo affair has set a wise course for this nation. The question has been raised at the United Nations Security Council by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. It has been pursued at the Panmunjom truce site in discussions between our representatives and those of

North Korea. Other channels are also being tapped which might lead to the release of the crewmen. In short, the President's policy at this time is to seek a solution by diplomacy. It is the course of prudence and reason in what is, at best, a delicate and dangerous situation. It deserves every support of the nation.

There is no certainty that the present efforts will bear fruit. Other possibilities, however, may also be available. I would point out, for example, that, if necessary, the matter should be pressed further at the United Nations which has had a definite responsibility in Korea for almost two decades. If it comes to that, it may be feasible to seek impartial arbitration or mediation or a presentation of the entire matter to the World Court. May I say that precedent for the latter procedure is to be found in a similar dispute two decades ago over the loss of two British destroyers off the Albanian Coast.

Whatever the specific recourse, in my judgment, the efforts to find a peaceful solution in the Pueblo affair are attuned to this nation's interest. What matters in my judgment is saving lives, not saving face. What matters is the substance not the shadow of this nation's interests.

That is true in Korea; and it is no less true in Viet Nam. The nation's interests in Viet Nam, in my judgment, lie in bringing the war to an honorable conclusion at the earliest possible moment. The pursuit of a negotiated solution was right for this nation before the recent coordinated offensives in the South Vietnamese cities. It is right today, while that offensive continues in certain areas and when a second offensive may be on the verge of opening, if not in Khe Sanh, somewhere else in the remote highlands of central Viet Nam.

Insofar as I can see, negotiations are and have always been the only rational alternative in this situation to an indefinite U.S. involvement on the Southeast Asian mainland. Two years ago I joined four Senate colleagues, including Senator Edmund Muskie, my close and trusted friend, the distinguished dean of the Senate Republicans, Senator George Aiken of Vermont and the equally distinguished Senators from Delaware and Hawaii, J. Caleb Boggs and Daniel Inouye, in a report at conclusion of a visit to Southeast Asia. Our principal observation, then, was that the American position in Viet Nam had the character of "pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open-ended." We added this comment: "How open is dependent on the extent to which North Viet Nam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force." It is more apparent now than it was at the time that the war is open-ended. How open may be uncertain—in my judgment it is still wide open—but in any event, to date, the NLF and the North Vietnamese have been both able and willing to meet increased force with increased force.

At the beginning of 1966, the United States already had 180,00 men in Viet Nam. American forces directly involved in the war have since tripled to something approaching 600,000—with over 500,000 on the ground in Viet Nam, 40,000 in Thailand, 40,000 in the 7th Fleet in the South China Sea and similar back-up forces in Japan, Okinawa, Guam and elsewhere. Total American casualties have gone well past 100,000. Last year's toll of those killed in action showed a great increase in two years, from 1,964 in 1965 to 9,353 in 1967.

This increase in the American military effort has been met by increases in the North Vietnamese-NLF effort; their casualties, too, have increased greatly. The war, in short, has risen over the past three years to ever higher intensities of destructiveness. The basic juxtaposition in Vietnam, however has not been altered as anticipated. In the spring of 1965, the all-consuming objective of the American effort was to prevent the collapse of a government with which we had allied ourselves. Almost three years later, countless thousands of lives later, and tens of billions of dollars later, that is still the objective.

One can put whatever interpretation one chooses on the recent events in Viet Nam. To me, however, they suggest that the survival of the Saigon political structure, in its present form, may now be more uncertain. The pacification program appears to have gone the route of at least a dozen prior schemes for "winning the people" by providing them with security and a stake in the structure. The cities of South Viet Nam which have heretofore been spared most of the ravages of the war, almost by tacit understanding, have now been drawn into the vortex of its terrible devastation. If there is an alternative to chaos in what has heretofore been the core of the government's strength, it will lie in yet another costly task of reconstruction and rehabilitation which can hardly be borne by the South Vietnamese government.

What is now clear is that no part of South Viet Nam is secure for anyone. The hamlets, villages, and the cities of Viet Nam are seen to be honeycombed with a NLF infrastructure which has undoubtedly existed for many years, which is still intact and which may well be stronger than ever.

It is possible to point to one-sided casualty figures and to echo one-sided words of reassurance. If we are interested in saving lives rather than saving face, however, I think we will find the realism to confront the implications of the present situation. The Saigon political structure is no stronger today than it was three years ago in the sense of being able on its own to govern, to defend or to rally the people of South Viet Nam. Indeed, its very survival now appears more dependent upon American military power than at any time in the past. In short, once again there is not the beginnings of a beginning of a stable political situation in South Viet Nam.

That such is the case, in no way reflects on the courage or the competence of the military forces which have carried the burden of combat in Viet Nam for many months. In statistical terms, these forces have been immensely effective. They have won major engagement after engagement. The figures say that over 87,000 enemy troops were killed last year, that another 27,000 have crossed over to the government side and that countless thousands were captured or were otherwise put out of action. Naval and air power have pounded so much of North Viet Nam into rubble that there are left unscathed scarcely any military or industrial targets.

Nevertheless, for the kind of war which is being fought in South Viet Nam, the forces in opposition continue to obtain adequate and, apparently, ever more sophisticated military supplies over the infiltration routes from the North. The NLF remains omnipresent, from the demilitarized zone at the 17th parallel to the Mekong Delta and its regular forces and guerrillas are steeled to accept great privation and to make enormous sacrifices. The Viet Cong remain entrenched and virtually untouched in their traditional strongholds—the swamps, paddy-fields and hamlets of the Mekong Delta—from whence they are now seen to be able to dispatch forces to Saigon and other cities. North Viet Nam has committed to the war in the South considerably less than a quarter of the well-trained forces of General Giap. And beyond North Viet Nam lies the untapped manpower of China and the supply sources of both China and the Soviet Union.

These are some of the realities which the computers of "progress" in this war do not measure. These are some of the realities which urge us to recall the original purposes for which the nation was committed to South Viet Nam. They were, above all, limited purposes. We went into Viet Nam not to take over a war but on the assumption that we were summoned to aid the people of South Viet Nam.

From the outset, it was not an American responsibility and it is not now an American responsibility to win a victory for any particular Vietnamese group, or to defeat any particular Vietnamese group. It was not then and it is not now an American function to insure that any political structure shall be enshrined over the smoldering ruins of a devastated Viet Nam. Even if we could, we should not seek to synthesize a government or system for South Viet Nam. That is not the responsibility of the American military command, the American economists and the American political scientists who are gathered in Saigon or elsewhere. That is a responsibility which can only be exercised by the Vietnamese people themselves. The sooner that the limits of our commitment are recognized by all directly concerned, therefore, the better for all concerned.

We need to face the probability, bluntly, that the build-up of the American involvement, in its very immensity, may well have already extended the role of this nation beyond those limits. In so doing, it may not be aiding—as it was intended—to resolve the situation in accord with the wishes of the people of South Viet Nam. It is apparent, for example, that the more that U.S. forces have taken the major combat role, the slacker have been the efforts of the allied indigenous forces. It is apparent, too, that a massive U.S. technological presence in South Viet Nam has exerted a revolutionary impact on the whole of the fabric of traditional Vietnamese society.

In a physical sense, the crushing weight of modern warfare has fallen not only on the Viet Cong—the NLF—and the North Vietnamese but on all Vietnamese. The terrible cost in lives and property throughout Viet Nam is borne by Vietnamese of all political colors.

Our immense effort, in short, has gone a long way in altering the character of what was once an inner struggle among Vietnamese. In the end, however, the future of Viet Nam must depend on the Vietnamese themselves. It is their country; they live in it. They will be living in it long after we are gone from it.

Our commitment is to support, not to submerge. To strip the Vietnamese struggle of its Vietnamese character, to convert it into a war to be won or lost by this nation, detracts from its relevance both to the people of Viet Nam and to the people of the United States. To do so is to consolidate an American involvement on the Southeast Asian mainland of indefinite duration and obscure purpose whose terminus is not visible—not in Viet Nam, not in Laos, or in Cambodia. Indeed, it may well be an involvement which is without exit except in World War III.

This nation is deeply committed in South Viet Nam but let us not make the mistake of interpreting that commitment as compelling us—in the name of victory or whatever—to see to it that every last member of the NLF is either dulled, dead, or fleeing to the North, and that North Viet Nam has been bombed back into the Stone Age. That course leads not to an ending but to an endless succession of violent beginnings. An interminable involvement of American forces may meet the desires of some in Viet Nam or of some other nation, but that course does not accord with the substance of the interests of the United States.

President Johnson has repeatedly stated that this nation's objective is ". . . only that the people of South Viet Nam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." He has stated that he is willing to move at any time in negotiations which might bring about that result.

It should be made clear to all concerned—Americans and Vietnamese—that that is the extent of this nation's commitment. The commitment is to all of the people of South Viet Nam. We have no obligation to continue to pour out the blood and resources of this nation until South Viet Nam is made safe for one faction or another.

Indeed, in my judgment, there is little prospect of meeting our actual commitment to the people of Viet Nam in the visible future unless there is a prompt restoration of peace. On that basis, every avenue—in the United Nations or elsewhere—should continue to be explored in an effort to reach an honorable conclusion. In so doing, this nation needs no sanction or approval from any group, leader, or whomever in Viet Nam or anywhere else.

In the hope of bringing about a peaceful settlement without adding to the burdens of the American forces in the south, I have joined Senator John Sherman Cooper, a distinguished colleague with whom I served in the U.N., & a former Ambassador to India and others in urging that the bombing of North Viet Nam be restricted to the infiltration routes at the 17th parallel. I am frank to say, however that while it may well result in negotiations, I am not at all sure that a cessation of the bombing is the critical factor in bringing this war to an honorable conclusion. More important, in my judgment, is the framework in which the war in Viet Nam is seen and within which its conclusion is negotiated. It is doubtful that there is a basis for fruitful negotiations if the conflict is defined as a simple case of aggression on the part of the North against the South. The reality is far more complex, far more subtle. That is true insofar as the relationship between North and South Viet Nam is concerned. It is true insofar as the relationship of the various groups and elements within South Viet Nam is concerned. The government in Saigon, as it is presently constituted continues to be run by a faction of military officers—indeed, most of whom are northerners—and they are by no means the whole political coin. There are other groups of southern Vietnamese, the Cao Dai, Hoa Hoa, Buddhists, Dai Viet, Catholics, Montagnards, & others who must be taken more into consideration if there is to be an end to the bloodshed in the foreseeable future. These groups include not only those within the National Liberation Front but elements which are now without significant voice in either camp.

A negotiated solution, if there is to be one, may well involve preliminary discussions among the political, religious, and sectarian groups, as well as the ruling military group, which are to be found under the Saigon structure. If there can be some common agreement among them to seek a settlement of the war, it is at least conceivable that there could then be discussions with the National Liberation Front. Needless to say, such discussions can hardly take place if the Saigon government regards even words of compromise as treasonable.

If the door could be opened to peace-talks among the South Vietnamese themselves, one would hope that it would make easier the opening of doors to negotiations between this nation and North Viet Nam and among all the nations directly or indirectly concerned in the conflict. A basis might then be laid for applying the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 in determining the future relationship of the two parts of Viet Nam and for guaranteeing the neutralization of Viet Nam and all of Indo-China. May I add it does not much matter whether such discussions are held under United Nations auspices or in Geneva, or in some other appropriate forum. What is necessary is that they encompass all who are closely involved, including China, if there is to be a durable peace in Viet Nam and Indo-China.

I do not know whether there are any greater prospects for progress towards peace in this approach than in the countless others which have been suggested. I believe, however, that unless there is the beginning of a negotiated peace, the fires of war in Viet Nam will blaze ever more fiercely. They will spread further and further, leaving ever wider arcs of a piteous wreckage. And if the fires burn out of control to World War III, what nation will claim the victory? Indeed, what nation will be left to claim it?

Mr. MUSKIE. It was highly appropriate, Mr. President, that following his speech, the degree of doctor of laws should be conferred upon Senator MANSFIELD by the president of the university, Dr. Edwin Young. As evidence of the great respect in which the majority leader is held by the people of Maine, and the pride we take in him as an honorary alumnus of the university, I ask unanimous consent that the citation read by Dr. Young be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION READ TO SENATOR MANSFIELD, UNIVERSITY OF MAINE CONVOCATION, FEBRUARY 11, 1968, ORONO, MAINE

Born in New York City and raised in Great Falls, Montana, he became a grammar school dropout at the age of 14, when he enlisted in the United States Navy to serve in World War I. At the close of the war, no doubt feeling that a variety of experience would be useful later on, he re-enlisted and served a one year hitch, but this time in the United States Army. This prepared him for the ultimate in military activity, two years "on the land and on the sea" with the United States Marine Corps.

Passing up a career in the Air Force, he returned in 1922 to Montana to work in the mines. Soon his desire for more knowledge and wider horizons led him to take a qualifications examination to enter college. After a start in the Montana School of Mines, he went on to the B.A. and M.A. Degrees at Montana State University. Meanwhile, his interest in peoples beyond our borders had become deep and strong. After further studies at UCLA he was for 10 years a professor of Latin American and Far Eastern History at Montana State and is still professor of History on a permanent tenure at the University of Montana.

While still a college teacher he was elected to Congress in 1942 and served 5 terms in the House of Representatives. He is now in his third term in the Senate. His unusual qualities brought him the post of Assistant Majority Leader even in his first term. In 1961 he became Majority Leader of the Senate, a position he still holds. He is an influential member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Few men in politics are so well qualified for this work. In the past 16 years, under 4 Presidents, he has served his country with exceptional distinction, especially in foreign affairs as related to Europe and his long-term interests—Latin America and Southeast Asia.

In recognition of your distinctly American rise from modest beginnings, of your exercise of statesmanlike qualities over a quarter century of public service, and of your wide reputation for integrity, forthrightness, and steadiness in a trying profession in trying times, the Trustees of the University of Maine are pleased and proud to confer upon you the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws; and by virtue of authority granted to me by the Board of Trustees, I declare that to Michael Joseph Mansfield belong all the rights and honors of the degree which has been granted and that his name shall forever be borne on the rolls of the University of Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Bangor Daily News of February 14, 1968.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US HAVE MORE FRONT-RANK VISITORS

We congratulate the University of Maine, assisted by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, for bringing to the Orono campus last Sunday such a distinguished visitor as Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, Democratic chieftain in the Senate.

As honor guest at the Founders Day Convocation, Mansfield gave an interesting talk and news interview. His words provided copy for the news media of the nation, bearing the dateline of Orono, Me. He talked very frankly about such controversial matters as the Vietnam war and the proposed travel tax. It was a stimulating day.

We hope it will spur efforts to bring other prominent leaders into the state from time to time. Maine is small in terms of population and not very influential in national affairs. But its citizens and educational institutions are first class, and rate a fair share of attention by front-ranking national leaders. This was recognized, by the way, by no less a person than the late President John F. Kennedy, whose visit to Orono in 1963 was a most memorable event.

Let's think big when seeking distinguished guests for college commencement exercises and other important occasions relating to affairs within the state.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO U.N. COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS URGES U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, where the great issues of human dignity and world peace are being debated, the U.S. failure to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, and Political Rights of Women is particularly embarrassing to this Nation and our allies.

To those people who represent our Nation at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, the embarrassment is especially acute. Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, our representative to the Commission, eloquently expressed her own convictions and experiences before the Dodd subcommittee last spring when she said:

> We recognize the fundamental and intrinsic importance of human rights; we have learned through bitter experience that systematic and deliberate denials of human rights have a direct relationship to the preservation of world peace. Peace and security cannot be assured in a world in which peoples who are denied their individual rights are pressed to resort to measures of violence against their oppressors. And the governments which violate the fundamental human rights of those whom they control cannot be expected to respect the rights of other members of the international community.

Once again, Mr. President, I earnestly urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to these Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, and Political Rights of Women without further delay.

PROPOSED REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] early last session introduced the bill S. 886, which several other Senators including myself cosponsored. This bill would redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and transfer various functions from the Department of the Interior and others to the Department of Natural Resources.

On February 6, Senator Moss spoke before the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo., in support of this bill. In order that all Members may have the opportunity to read this excellent speech, I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, at the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 6, 1968

I welcome this opportunity to talk to the members of the Mississippi Valley Association for several reasons.

First, I find myself in a friendly community of people truly concerned with preservation of our country's natural resources.

Second, this organization has a long and constructive record of support of water resource development, and by virtue of the broad base of participation in your program, you have substantial influence in the National Congress.

Finally, I want to take advantage of this discussion to try to enlist your increasing support for policies and programs which are much broader than the Nation has ever had before concerning the care and development of water resources and the expansion of our utilization of these resources.

After these remarks, I will be happy to answer questions if your schedule permits.

It is not my purpose here today to ask your endorsement of legislation which I am sponsoring to establish a Department of Natural Resources. I say only that the proposed act, S. 886, is designed to bring about better coordination and direction of Federal efforts in the entire field of care and utilization of our natural resources.

It is my purpose to ask you to consider the condition of the Nation's water resources. I urge that you then devote as much effort as you can spare in the months and years ahead to the attainment of objectives which we might agree on here this morning. You may come up with a better solution than the one I have proposed. One way or the other, we should join forces in the interest of saving our country from an unpleasant fate.

Dr. Lamont C. Cole, an ecologist at Cornell University, presented a paper before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in New York last month on the general subject of pollution—of the air, of our waters, including the oceans, and the land itself. His paper was titled: "Can the world be saved?" He said the title was his second choice. His first, having been used by a fellow scientist some months before, was: "Is There Intelligent Life on Earth?"

Dr. Cole was discussing the destructive impact of a revolution which Walter Lippmann calls the most radical in the history of mankind.

"This revolution," said Lippmann, "is a transformation of the human environment, and of man himself by technological progress which, beginning about two centuries ago, has now acquired enormous momentum."

This revolution multiplies the effects of man's exploitation of resources. Man's abuse of the land is centuries old. What is new is the speed, or, as Lippmann says, the momentum, which is a function of both speed and mass, of our compulsion to alter the environment.

Long before the industrial revolution, great civilizations deteriorated and disappeared as a consequence of unsound soil and water utilization practices. Plato determined on his own that deforestation and over-grazing could cause soil erosion and ruin fertile land, but he couldn't change the practice.

We speak of the countries struggling in those parts of the world which suffer from erosion, aridity, and poverty as the underdeveloped countries. Some of them are overdeveloped—or it might be clearer if we say their development is over. Surely, the evidence of past glory and past folly can be seen in the Middle East, in the valleys of the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Jordan, and the Nile. Are we living through the same cycle? Can we assure Dr. Cole that the world will be saved? In our country, the signs are disquieting. Look at any part of it you want. This association's own reason for being—Ole Man River—is asked to carry a heavier load than ever before and is threatened with being bled for massive transfusions to other basins. In the northeast, the cyclic droughts which used to be taken in stride are now near calamities. One of the Great Lakes is dying. Appalachia, probably one of the most important water-producing regions in the world, is scarred by strip mining and its hills are skinned of their timber. The Southern High Plains are mining their groundwater. The whole southwest is threatened with water shortage. Major cities are covered half the time with a layer of smog. With the pollution of water and atmosphere and the paving over of the greenstuff of the earth, says Dr. Cole, we may even be so inhibiting photosynthesis as to reduce regeneration of the oxygen used in combustion.

But it is not enough to abate pollution and conserve the resources we have. We must extend our resources, not just prevent their despoilation. Our need for raw materials continues to increase—and the rate of increase increases.

Resources for the Future. A Washington based economics analysis group, says we will triple our requirement for energy and metals by the end of this century, almost triple our demand for forest products, and double our need for farm products and our withdrawal depletions of fresh water.

The restoration and care of water resources and the efficient utilization of our fresh water supplies, covering everything we need to do to preserve and extend the life support capabilities of natural water endowment, is a most critical area of National concern for our future.

There are many indications that the American people realize the seriousness of the water situation.

One can be seen in the legislation passed in the last five years, or, more accurately, since the massive study and report in 1961 of the Senate select committee headed by the late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma. That report is the real foundation for everything the Congress has done since.

We still have a lot to do, but the legislation launching the pollution control program, establishing the water resources council and providing for the basin commissions, and legislation authorizing such studies as the Appalachian and the northeast water resource surveys by the corps of engineers, are true landmarks of progress. No other presidents, unless it be the two Roosevelts, have even come close to Presidents Johnson and Kennedy in their support of resource care and development.

I link care and development on purpose. Too often we tend to overlook their interdependence. We can't have development without productive conservation, even though developmental projects on their way to approval must run a rough gauntlet of criticism from those who oppose any alteration of nature.

There is a principle involved here which must have public understanding and acceptance.

Every natural resource development project that changes nature's pattern of distribution of her blessings, every withdrawal of her wealth, must be weighed in the balance of nature's capacity to support future life.

In other words, we must always look first at what any project would do to nature's ongoing capability to supply several hundred million of us for as long as we want to live here.

It is obvious that we cannot leave nature alone. Unaltered and untended, she simply wouldn't support us. We have to take care of the forest fountain sources of rivers, and we have to fend off flood assaults. We have to catch and store for controlled flow and use more and more of the runoff water on its return to the sea. Irrigation and navigation are two of the benefits of such work. More and more, recreation is becoming a priority benefit on its own because as our population pressure increases, people need release for their energies and relief from urban crowding.

My point is that, with all due respect to the scenic conservationists, we still have to build dams and we have to store, convey, and contain water. And increasingly, we're having to redistribute it.

Some interesting prospects are coming into view on the subject of redistribution. Water resource planners are looking over and beyond the rims of river basins.

Patterns of precipitation were not designed by nature to fit population distribution. As a result, the people and the water of the North American continent are out of phase.

Climate, of course, is one of the principal reasons. Some of the less appealing parts of the continent as places for people to live are exactly the areas most generously supplied with water. I speak now or northern Canada. Canada's north has unmeasured supplies of water, but her population is concentrated along the southern rim of the country.

It is time for the question to be asked seriously and studied: Can Canada expect to settle the northern areas with enough people to utilize the immense amounts of water now running off each year into the northern seas? If not, then can she not make good use of those waters by selling some to the United States? I, for one, am urging that talks begin along these lines.

Now this is truly long range planning, but the complexities are such that we should give the matter serious study starting now. I have spoken several times in Canada on this subject, emphasizing the point, of course, that both countries have a lot of homework to do before we can enter into further water trade agreements. I am beginning to feel very strongly now that after an initial, and perfectly understandable negative reaction to the whole idea, the Canadians are giving it a very hard look.

My interest in the possibilities of imports of water from the far north for my own State of Utah and for the whole southwest stems from the publication in the spring of 1964 of a report by the Ralph M. Parsons Company on a concept labeled NAWAPA, for North American water and power alliance.

The company makes no proprietary claims on the idea. It invites critical analysis and improvement, or extensions. The real significance of the Parsons work is that it indicates both the economic and technical feasibility of development of water resources on a continental scale.

In 1964, I served as chairman of a Senate Public Works Subcommittee which found that the NAWAPA plan could deliver twice the water for about 25 per cent greater cost when compared with our own maximum program. This was actually based on a list of all the water resource development projects proposed in the U.S. for the next twenty years by the four principal water resource agencies of the Federal Government. More importantly, the NAWAPA concept was subject to expansion and has since been extended to give greater attention to the Great Lakes. It has also spurred a half dozen other plans of less than continental scope but all following the approach of massive inter-basin transfers of water.

One of these is the plan of Thomas H. Kierans, an Ontario engineer, who would bring new water into the Great Lakes from the James Bay watershed. He says sufficient water could be transferred to enable the lakes to be used as a great distribution manifold to supply the central and eastern parts of the United States, obviously benefiting the Ohio and Mississippi systems.

In addition to tapping the James Bay supply, though on a lesser scale initially than the Kierans scheme, the Parsons plan would bring water into the lakes from the northwest via a 30-foot channel seaway across the prairie provinces of Canada. There would be a 12-foot barge channel connection to the Garrison Dam on the Missouri and into the upper Mississippi via the Minnesota River. The NAWAPA system would permit low-flow augmentation of both the Missouri and the Mississippi, as well as putting new water into the lakes in sufficient quantities to redistribute through the New York State barge canal and thence into the Susquehanna and Delaware.

Some of these suggestions have not been checked out. It is clear, however, that a number of old waterway extension ideas gain in merit and some new ones show great possibility once we begin to look at the continent as a whole. It is simply a matter of making constructive redistribution of some of the literally hundreds of millions of acre-feet of water which resource planners say could be recovered every year from the northern reaches of the continent.

All of the proposed improvements or extensions of the inland waterway network of the United States, from the Dakotas to Florida and from New York to Texas, take on fresh appeal if they become parts of an integrated continental system. Midcontinent development is only half the story.

There is a western mainstem of the NAWAPA concept which could deliver upwards of 75 million acre-feet to the arid States of the West and some 15 million to Mexico. At the same time, it would permit better regulation of the Columbia and full utilization of its entire basic power potential. It could give Southern California all the water it needs and supply much of Nevada, most of Utah, Arizona and New Mexico, and bring additional supplies into the high plains of Texas. It would stabilize flows in both the Colorado and the Rio Grande, and bring new water into West Texas.

As I have said, many variations have been suggested on the general concept. The most recent was proposed by a retired reclamation engineer, Lewis G. Smith, whose plan is being circulated by the Federation of Rocky Mountain States, an organization of Governors.

All of this, of course, is based on swivel-chair engineering. Some of it may not stand up on close analysis and field study.

You may well ask why we don't get busy and check some of these prospects. If the engineers are right, Canada can assure herself of a continuing inflow of capital from a sustained yield crop while both the United States and Mexico could import enough water to sustain their greater population densities.

Why don't we check these ideas out? Why don't we examine the basis for all these plans—importation from Canada—and decide if it would be good for us in the long run or not?

I'll tell you why we don't. There's no place in the sprawling Government of the United States to which we can turn for help. No agency has broad enough responsibility, to take on such a job. This is one reason why I have proposed a department of Natural Resources.

We are unable to answer the critical questions because we have no machinery to evaluate a water resource proposal that involves the whole country. Some parts of the questions are, of course, being studied within some agencies. Some are being studied by the river basin commissions set up under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, but these commissions are prohibited by law from studying inter-basin transfers. The Water Resources Council is trying to guide their work toward some kind of a unified plan. The law setting up the council calls for a biennial national assessment of our water supply situation and the first report will soon be available, but it can do little more than describe the problem.

Henry Caulfield, director of the professional staff of the council, who, I am told, spoke here last year, has a very difficult job. He has to keep peace not only between the States and the Federal forces but within the Federal family as well. Aside from the fact that every agency involved has to approve the document, in order that the national assessment not reflect unfavorably on any agency's policies or program, the council-type machinery is too cumbersome to do the job.

The chairman of the council is the Secretary of the Interior. He is the single most powerful water man in the Federal Government by virtue of his supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. But even his jurisdiction is limited. The oldest hand in the water resources field and the biggest in terms of a continuing water resource development program is the civil works division of the Army Corps of Engineers, which has had an assignment in this field since 1824. The Secretary of the Army is, therefore, a key member of the council. These two executives had no formal mechanism at all, cumbersome or otherwise, for coordination of programs until the passage of the 1965 act.

There are other very important people and organizations which have a stake in the deliberations. The Federal Power Commission, whose chairman is a member of the council, has an important interest because of licensing responsibility for hydroelectric generation. The Secretary of Agriculture has a key role by virtue of the Department's program of development of watersheds and the role of the U.S. Forest Service in the care of water-producing lands.

The Secretary of Transportation is a member of the council because of the national importance of water transport. He, of course, should be one of the most active promoters of integrated national water resource planning in order to strengthen the Nation's overall transportation resources.

Probably the most concerned member of the water resources council, who serves by invitation and not by statute, is the secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He has to be thinking about the urban distribution to another hundred million Americans within the next half century. Where will he get the water for them?

I can tell you this. He is going to have a hard time getting enough good water to these new urban complexes through the system we have set up so far to manage the Nation's waters.

Coming from Utah, my first concern with water is to supply my State and region, which are water-short. As an American, my interest necessarily covers the interests of all our people. Moreover, I recognize the problems of any region can be solved only in a national context and—to some degree—through Federal programs. This does not mean that the traditional responsibilities of States, counties and cities in the water field will disappear. On the contrary, they will increase as our population and per-person use of water go up. More and more, however, our Nation needs unified natural resource management.

Where do we stand? In concrete terms, what needs to be done in the water field that we are failing to do?

1. We are not doing enough to take care of the water harvest areas of the country. In other words, we need work productive or developmental conservation work.

2. We are not making full use of the waters of the United States. No coordinated national plan exists for collection, storage, and redistribution of water. Therefore, we fail to realize the full potential of recreation, hydroelectric generation, and navigation, none of which need cost us any increasingly precious water, and all of which can contribute to our economic momentum and social enjoyment of the land.

3. We are still not doing enough to clean up the water courses. Heavily polluted, many are not economic sources of supply because of low quality.

4. We are not exercising sufficient discipline in our actual uses of water, improving industrial processes, employing more recycling, and avoiding waste.

5. We face serious consequences for lack of an irrigation policy. We have not estimated our total requirements for irrigation water nor attempted to balance supply and demand with available resources.

6. We are missing much of the potential of inland waterborne transportation and we suffer unnecessary flood damage because we have no coordinated national plan of water supply development and distribution.

Most importantly from the standpoint of my subject today, we are unable to mount a unified attack on all these problems. We are not planning with intelligent concern for the longevity of our national life. We are failing to safeguard nature's continuing capability to support us in the manner to which we have become accustomed.

I am not alone in this dismal assessment. Last spring, for example, in the course of hearings on a bill to establish a Committee on Technology and Human Environment, Senator Muskie of Maine made this comment on the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior. I quote from the transcript:

"You made the point, and I think it is a valid one, that despite the Theodore Roosevelts and the Franklin Roosevelts, and the other conservationists, our conservation effort by and large has been a failure. It achieves objectives, of course, but I think it is fair to say that in a sense we are worse off than we were when we began. This is not because we lack workers dedicated to the conservation ideal but because technology has moved faster than we have been able to develop conservation policies."

The Secretary of the Interior said: "That is right."

Senator Muskie continued:

"We want to get away from conservation by crisis. We want to get into conservation by deliberate planned design, avoiding the bad consequences of technology advance and taking advantage of technology to avoid such consequences."

I should mention one new and hopeful sign. Legislation should soon be submitted to the President establishing a National Water Commission of private citizens with a five year mandate to write the kind of water policy guidance that we are not able to develop at present. I support this bill heartily, even though I do not believe the Commission's recommendations will be enough, or come soon enough.

The problem is one that necessarily concerns every American. I plead for your support of the Water Commission effort, but also for efforts to bring into being the administrative machinery which can deal with the water problem across the board.

I say this because my conclusion is that the existing Government machinery is not adequate. We're not getting the most for our money and we are not giving our professional people a fair chance to meet the challenge which confronts the Nation.

As a matter of fact, it isn't fair to the professionals in the resources field to expect them to meet today's challenge in yesterday's administrative harness.

If you look at our problems, they are not primarily technical. Many of them are organizational and these are the ones I am trying to correct. We know what tools to use. The engineers, the foresters, the water and land use specialists in the civil works division of the Corps, in the Bureau of Reclamation, in the Forest Service and other agencies know their jobs and know what is needed. Freed of the restraints and obstacles that stem from division of authority and inter-departmental dilution of responsibility, they will be able to apply their expertise with much greater return to the Nation and greater professional satisfaction for themselves.

In my testimony on the natural resources bill, S. 886, before the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization last October, I said our needs in resource development and conservation have simply outrun our agency structure.

When the present organizational structure grew up (and it came to maturity like Topsy, "it just growed"), we had no such things as multipurpose projects. We didn't have to plan a dam, a canal, a sewer system—each was sufficient to itself. We didn't have to worry about pollution, and we didn't worry about it. Within the past century-and-a-half since the Corps was given the assignment to clear the channel on the Ohio, we have come to the absolute requirement of multipurpose investment in water resources. But we have no multipurpose agency to handle the investing.

This bill, which I introduced and which has six additional sponsors in the Senate, would assign to a new Department of Natural Resources all the major Federal responsibilities and functions relating to the care and development of our natural resources including both the oceans and the air.

The program realignment and reorganization envisioned by this bill is long overdue. There is still much debate to come, but the legislative process itself contributes to public understanding, and therefore public support of measures which truly serve the national interest, even though they mean drastic remodeling of the bureaucratic house we've lived in for so long. The need is urgent. We should get on with the job.

My plea, to the Mississippi Valley Association today, is to invest the great resources of one of the most powerful citizen groups in the Nation in seeking a solution to the total national problem, mobilizing and consolidating the great breadth and variety of your traditional interests in the national interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MARINE WRITES FROM VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, recently the Everett, Wash., Daily Herald, my hometown newspaper, published a letter written by Sgt. Thomas Freeman, of the 3d Marine Division in Conthien, Vietnam. A constituent of mine, Mr. L. P. Rowe, of Everett, was most gracious in sending me a copy of the clipping with the observation, "It speaks for itself."

Sergeant Freeman, a marine who has seen some of the toughest fighting of the war at Conthien, responds to questions asked him as to why he is fighting in Vietnam. His response is eloquent and I am sure will be of great interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LETTERS: PEOPLE ASK

3RD MARINE DIVISION,
Con Thien, Vietnam.

People ask why should I be here fighting, and this is what I have to say:

I am American and I have realized that the price of freedom is not back home protesting what the U.S. is doing in South Vietnam. We are free because all these years we have backed our government, not fought against it. Our fathers and our fathers' fathers have died for a free country and now it may be our turn. Do you think we should turn our backs on this country because it is so far away? Not after you have had a mother tell you her son was shot because he didn't want to fight with the Viet Cong; nor when you hear her say: "If only we could live in peace."

Now, your country is calling for your help. Why should you turn your back? It has given you 20 years or even more of freedom and now it is time you do something for your country. You say, this isn't your war, why should you fight? But just think—if your father and his father had said that, do you really think this country would be as free as it is now?

Now as I sit here at the top of this bloody hill and look at my fallen buddies my heart skips a beat. There my buddy lies, his heart very still; no more danger will enter his life. With tears in your eyes you suddenly realize he has given his life for you and for his country.

My God, my God, why can't the American people realize the price of freedom? If it is my life I have to give for this country's freedom I will gladly give it—and then hope more people will come to realize what we are trying to do.

Sgt. THOMAS FREEMAN.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH—WOMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senate—and all Americans—will be interested to know that our only woman Senator has been selected by congressional employees as "Woman of the Year." The Capitol Hill newspaper, Roll Call, reported yesterday that the Congressional Secretaries Club had chosen Maine's senior Senator, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, for this honor. I am sure the Senator from Maine considers this as great an honor as to be listed in the Gallup poll as one of the most 10 admired women in the world.

Among her other honors, Senator SMITH is the first woman Senator ever to serve as chairman—or chairwoman—of her party's conference in the Senate. Also, she holds the title of having answered more consecutive rollcall votes than any other Senator in history.

On March 23, at the Shoreham Hotel, the senior Senator from Maine will be formally awarded her latest honor at a dinner to be given by Capitol Hill secretaries.

OUR WORLD ALLIANCES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I read recently an assertion that our alliances around the world are crumbling and our world position is undermined.

Politicians sometimes seek to advance their interests by making statements like that. It is not the highest form of politics nor the highest form of patriotism.

In this case, it is simply not true.

We have had no new alliances in the 1960's. NATO and SEATO and ANZUS were sanctioned in earlier years, as was the Organization of American States.

Looked at closely, all of these alliances, as well as certain of our bilateral security arrangements, have met the test under President Johnson, which measures the vitality of any alliance: can it successfully grip new problems and move forward.

In the case of NATO, for example, we have faced the defection of France from the integrated military defense of Europe. This was a serious decision. But what happened? All the other members of the alliance stayed together. They moved to Brussels. SHAPE, the integrated command in the field, is as vital as ever. The effectiveness of the deterrent in Europe has been maintained and even strengthened.

More than that, freed of the foot-dragging by the De Gaulle government, NATO has plowed new ground. There are now, for the first time, an agreed strategic concept in NATO and agreed force levels. There is an agreed procedure for neutralizing the foreign exchange costs that arise from the location of forces within the alliance. And now NATO is considering joint work on certain major political issues where there is a common interest, notably East-West relations.

In nonmilitary fields our cooperation with Europe has become more intense and more effective. It was essentially European cooperation with the United States that made possible the success of the Kennedy round negotiation. Europeans have for the first time accepted a regular responsibility in food aid.

Europe and the United States worked together to produce the new International Monetary Fund Reserve Unit. Right now Europeans and Americans are cooperating to deal with our policy of improving our balance of payments in ways which expand and do not contract the world trade—which lead to greater liberalization rather than a protectionist spiral.

With respect to Latin America, the Alliance for Progress—born at Bogotá, carried forward by President Kennedy—has never been more vital than in recent years. The Latin Americans have come to accept what they had to accept if they were to succeed; namely, that it was mainly their job, with the United States as junior partner. At the summit conference at Punta del Este, they undertook to move in the 1970's toward an effective common market. In the meanwhile, they are working together on many multinational projects to open up the inner frontiers of South America, to exploit natural resources, to improve communications, and to bind their destinies closer together.

Now what about Asia? It is true that certain members of SEATO have, for whatever reasons, decided that they could not put their forces into the battle in Vietnam. But the Australians are there, and the Thais and the Filipinos and the New Zealanders. The South Koreans, in a remarkable effort, have sent more than 50,000 of their men to fight the aggression against South Vietnam. From Djakarta and Singapore to Tokyo and Seoul there are 300 million Asians who know that their independence and freedom depend on our seeing it through—whether their forces are engaged or not.

And whether they acknowledge it publicly or not, the leaders of India and Pakistan have often confessed privately to many of us who have visited here that it is the simple truth for them and their nations.

In these past few years under President Johnson's leadership a wholly new pattern of cooperation has emerged in Asia. Nations which had never worked together before are now joined together in the tasks of economic development through the Mekong Committee and Asian Development Bank and special programs in education, transportation, and other fields.

In Southeast Asia, for example, there is ASPAC—the Asian and Pacific Council—in which 10 countries have joined together to examine their political problems. There is also a grouping of five nations—the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, including Indonesia and some of its neighbors.

This new sense or common destiny and cooperation throughout Asia—this conviction that, because we are seeing it through in Vietnam, they have a common future to build—is one of the most heartening and important events in the pastwar years.

It is too bad that some Europeans have turned their backs on the New Asia. It is too bad that some Americans do not understand how important it is for the future of this country—for our children and grandchildren—that free and independent Asian nations join together in this way.

But Asia is where two-thirds of humanity lives. An Asia in chaos and war, in stagnation and poverty, nations split among themselves and vulnerable as the playthings of other powers, would surely endanger the security and the prosperity of the United States.

Yes, the battle in Vietnam is hard. We all wish it would go away tomorrow.

Yes, there are dangers still ahead. And the outcome for Asia and the world cannot be predicted with certainty. But the simple truth is that the world position of the United States remains strong; our alliances are active and vital; and, in a complex, revolutionary era, we are working with others to widen the area of security and order.

Let us, then, have less handwringing. Let us remember that every day that passes makes isolationism less possible as a basis for the policy of America. Let us recognize that in Europe, Latin America, and Asia there are those who not only depend upon us but, every day, are willing to move a step away from dependence, a step nearer true partnership.

That is the road President Johnson has taken in these 4 years. It is a record of which every American can be proud and for which every American should be thankful.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on February 12 and 13 the New York Times printed articles demonstrating the difficulty of the copper workers in the present labor dispute afflicting that industry.

More than 10,000 Arizonans are idled because of the strike called by the United Steelworkers of America. It seems paradoxical to have union leaders in the steel industry dictating policy that vitally affects the lives and jobs of thousands of copper workers, but that is the case. Such is the political power of the unions that they are able to cow the White House into inaction on this vital matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1968]

DESPAIR SETTLES ON COPPER TOWNS BUT BOTH SIDES ARE HOLDING FAST

(By David R. Jones)

BUTTE, MONT., February 8.—The chimes atop the Metals Bank and Trust Company gave out a strangely dolorous sound the other day as they rang the hours over this snowswept mountain mining town.

Experts here said the chimes were off key because a recent bout of severe cold weather sent the temperature tumbling to 35 degrees below zero and fouled up their mechanism.

But local humorists said the bells were moaning, rather than ringing joyously, as a symbol of the despair that has settled over this region because of the long copper strike and spread throughout the West since it began last July.

FACES ARE GRIM

The frustration and bitterness the long strike has generated can be seen in the grim faces of copper executives and union pickets—from the idle Anaconda Company mines in the hills here to the idle facilities on the Mexico border, and as far east as Connecticut.

"You can just about feel the tension when you walk down the street," says Andy Murphy, city editor of The Daily Press in Silver City, N.M.

"It's bad," says red-haired Frank Brunson, a 29-year-old striker, as he pauses to chat on the main street of Magna, Utah. "I'm having trouble keeping my head above water. The workers are getting pretty tired of it, but nobody's going back without getting some increase."

"There's a feeling of futility," says an Anaconda official wearily as he sips coffee in the Finlen Hotel here. "Everybody wants it to end, but no one knows how to end it."

The 26 unions involved are utilizing newfound unity built around last year's merger of the United Steelworkers union and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union. Those former rivals have been joined by such diverse unions as the machinists, the electrical workers, the iron workers and the teamsters.

The strikers are showing surprising solidarity as the shutdown heads this week into its seventh month. A major reason is that they are being supported better than in the past through welfare payments, Federal food stamps and union strike benefits—a combination that has kept most of them from hunger.

JOE HILL RECALLED

The dispute has lately become more of a crusade for the antagonists than a mere labor dispute—reviving the memory of Joe Hill, the legendary folk poet whose songs rallied workers seeking to organize against the Western copper barons 50 years ago.

The copper strike has gained little public notice outside the affected mining regions because big stockpiles and a sharp increase in the rate of copper imports have prevented a severe shortage so far. But here in the West the shutdown is creating a revenue crisis for several states and misery for thousands of families.

The brunt of the cost has been borne so far by five Western states—Arizona, Utah, Montana, Nevada and New Mexico—where the bulk of the nation's copper mining and processing is located.

But as labor contracts have expired at plants in the East, the scope of the shutdown has grown so that more than 60 facilities in 23 states are now directly affected.

More than 60,000 men are on strike. Thousands more have been laid off across the nation as the impact of the shutdown has rippled to hundreds of businessmen and bankers.

MORE THAN $530 MILLION LOST

More than $530-million has already been lost in production, wages and tax revenues in the five Western states alone. The unions involved are believed to have spent roughly $8-million to $10-million on the strike so far.

The Johnson Administration has avoided using the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to force the strikers back to work for 80 days, and it is showing no inclination of doing so in the near future.

The Administration has expressed doubt that it could prove in court that the strike was threatening the national health or safety, as it would be required by law to do. It also has doubts that such a short resumption of production would help alleviate any copper shortages, and it is under strong pressure from organized labor not to break the strike.

But the price of imported copper now is running about 65 cents a pound against the pre-strike domestic price of 38 cents. This is forcing up costs for defense producers, and has pushed the nation's adverse balance of payments for copper from a monthly rate of $18-million to more than $60-million.

The Administration now has a special three-man panel trying to mediate a settlement, but it has made scant progress so far. The panel has had some success in efforts to get direct negotiations resumed, but it has no present plans to recommend settlement terms because the parties still are so far apart.

COORDINATED BARGAINING

The strike has become a focal point in the broader labor-management fight over the growing union affection for coordinated bargaining by several unions dealing with the same employer.

The copper industry unions, after years of scrapping among themselves, have joined this year in a show of unity to win their goals. The companies are not refusing to bargain with the coalition, but labor's success in this struggle seems certain to influence its future efforts to forge such common fronts.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, believes the copper fight is "something more" than a strike and "seems to be a throwback to the early days of this century." The copper companies are trying to "destroy the unity of the trade union movement," he said recently, and "this is a strike we cannot afford to lose."

The labor movement has backed its determination by pouring more than $800,000 so far into a copper strike fund, its first such effort since the long 1959 steel strike.

PLAN TO RAISE DUES

The United Steelworkers of America, which represents about 40,000 strikers, is spending more than $1-million a month on the strike. It plans to raise dues next month to help foot the bills.

The companies, on the other hand, are receiving strong support from such powerful forces as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. They are pushing the Administration to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act.

The dispute is proving to be particularly tough because the unions are trying to win a change in the bargaining format that would fundamentally increase their power in dealing with the companies in the future. But the companies are fighting back bitterly to keep things unchanged and retain their relative strength.

The key union demand is for "companywide bargaining" that would require each producer to sign simultaneously contracts for all plants and mines with common expiration dates and approximately the same economic package. The companies in the past have agreed to common contracts for only part of their operations, and have signed separate agreements with almost every local.

PRODUCER INSISTENCE

Joseph P. Molony, the chief union negotiator, says the producers have "insisted on fragmented collective bargaining" in nonferrous operations to weaken the unions by playing one local against another to get cheaper settlements.

The strike "can be settled readily" when the companies "make an adequate economic offer" and "decide that they must cease trying to continue their outmoded practice of bargaining plant-by-plant and union-by-union," he says.

"That day is past for them," he adds.

The four major companies—Anaconda Company, Kennecott Copper Corporation, Phelps Dodge Corporation, and American Smelting and Refining Company—have stanchly refused to agree to company-wide bargaining for fear it would strengthen the unions and lead to more costly settlements.

The copper companies produce various products, including lead and zinc, and officials contend the economics in each differs so much that it would be suicide to put them all under identical contracts. Anaconda and Kennecott officials have hinted that they might shut down facilities in Nevada and Montana if this happened.

The companies also contend that it is uneconomic to put fabricating plants under the same contracts as copper mines. They contend the steel union recently signed contracts with competitors at lower rates than the strikers had already been offered.

OFFICIALS WORRIED

Copper officials are worried, too, that the unions will push next time for industrywide bargaining if they get company-wide settlements this year. The executives abhor that thought because they fear it would result in crisis bargaining, more strife, more Government intervention and bigger settlements.

"It's clear and obvious that they will, if their power allows them, move toward industrywide bargaining as fast as they can," says John C. Kinnear, general manager of Kennecott's western mining division in Salt Lake City. This would give the unions "a life and death throttle you just don't give anybody willingly," he adds.

The soft-spoken executive looked steadily across the bright red carpet in his office overlooking the many-spired Mormon Temple and, pounding a fist on his broad desk, said firmly:

"We aren't going to have companywide bargaining."

"Their idea of a fringe benefit is to abolish flogging," Mr. Molony said of the copper executives a couple of days earlier as he lounged in his shirt sleeves in his Washington hotel room. "They know they've got a good thing and they're not going to surrender it."

But the unions, he added, are equally adamant about winning their point.

Most informed sources believe the unions and companies could rather quickly agree on a settlement costing about 90 cents an hour over the next 3½ years, patterned after a recent accord with White Pine Copper Company, if they could resolve the bargaining format issue.

The unions reportedly have been talking in that price range with Phelps Dodge. The copper workers average between $2.94 and $3.22 in hourly earnings.

SEVEN-MONTH STRIKE ENDED AT COPPER PLANT IN JERSEY

A steelworkers local ratified a new contract yesterday with the United States Metals Refining Company, ending a seven-month strike at the company's copper refinery at Carteret, N.J.

The major gains won by Local 837 were in the area of wages, pensions, health insurance and fringe benefits. The union said that the value of the package was $1.07 an hour. The contract expires June 3, 1971.

In addition to a 51-cent-an-hour wage increase, the contract provides for improvements in the pension program amounting to 31 cents an hour. Employe contributions were eliminated from health and welfare insurance.

The contract increases the minimum wage to $3.11 an hour, and the maximum to $4.24.

The nationwide strike against major copper companies will enter its eighth month on Thursday.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1968]

COPPER STRIKERS GLUM AFTER 7 MONTHS BUT RESOLVED NOT TO QUIT

(By David R. Jones)

MAGNA, UTAH, February 10.—Vincent Zito sat in a blue and silver picket trailer parked near silent Kennecott Copper Corporation refinery here the other day and talked solemnly about the long copper strike.

"I think most of the guys are a bit discouraged—I know I am," he said softly. "This thing's just going and going and going. It's going to take me three years to clean up my responsibilities."

Mr. Zito, who has worked in the red brick refinery for 18 years, was earning $3.47 an hour as a machinist when the strike began last July. For the last seven months he has been eking out a living for his wife and three children on $25 a week in union strike benefits.

He paused for a while, staring down at a table littered with cookie cartons, old Playboy magazines and soft drink cans as he thought out what he wanted to say. Then he summed up his feelings this way:

"If you fight for anything you believe in you forget about your losses. We're taking a beating but in the long run this is what has improved our standard of living. We're fed up all right but we're solid behind the strike."

UNHAPPY BUT DETERMINED

Mr. Zito's view of the shutdown, which involves 60,000 members of 26 labor unions at four major companies, was echoed by a large majority of the strikers interviewed in the five states most affected—Arizona, Montana, Nevada, Utah and New Mexico.

Most of the men were unhappy that the strike had dragged on for so long and most acknowledged that they were feeling a severe economic pinch. Few, however, showed any inclination to go back to work before the contract dispute was settled.

"There is definitely disenchantment with the strike," said the Rev. James P. Dowall, pastor of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church in Anaconda, Mont. "On the other hand, now that they've been out this long they figure they may as well go for broke."

"Financially, I'm busted," said Wilbur E. Moses of Anaconda, a curly haired machinist's helper with eight children. "But there ain't much we can do about it. We can't go back to work."

Peter Roberts, who has worked only three days since the strike shut down the Kennecott operations in Ely, Nev., has cashed savings bonds he planned to use to educate his three children, and borrowed from relatives to meet his $75-a-month rent.

TAKING TO IRONING

Inside the house of Robert Summerfield, a crusher operator at Inspiration, Ariz., his chunky wife, Janis, was busy at the ironing board. "I hate to iron," she said. "But since the strike I have taken in ironing for $2 a dozen pieces. You'd be surprised how far we stretch that $2."

The solidarity of the copper strikers seems to be a blend of many factors.

One is that most of the men are clearly mad at the companies.

Another is the strong union tradition of the mining towns, where any strike-breaker would be treated as an outcast or worse.

And one of the most important is that many strikers receive wide support from a combination of public welfare, Federal food stamps and union strike benefits.

Ed Johnson, head of the steel union's Local 6002 in Anaconda, said that nearly 900 of the local's 1,500 members were getting strike benefits of $12 to $24 a week, depending on family size.

In addition, he said, 500 others are believed to be getting county welfare payments of about $100 a month and almost all of them receive Federal food stamps, which provide about a week's free groceries each month.

This expenditure of public funds to sustain the strikers does not go down well at Anaconda or Kennecott or the other two struck concerns, the American Smelting and Refining Company and the Phelps Dodge Corporation.

Martin K. Hannifan, general manager of Anaconda's Montana operation in Butte, typified the copper executives' reaction when he snapped:

"This is the way the unions make their power struggle work. In the old days, their strike benefits would have been gone long ago."

IRRESPONSIBLE UNION LEADERSHIP

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, at a time when public employees are allowed to flout the law, endanger the public health and welfare, and allow garbage to pile up in the streets of our largest city, irresponsible union leadership continues to cry for more and more strangulation power.

The recent labor troubles that have beset New York City—the transit strike, newspaper strike, taxi strike, garbage collectors' strike—are just a small indication of the troubles that are in store for the rest of the Nation if we continue to allow ambitious union leaders to arrogate to themselves a throttlehold on our economy.

William F. Buckley, Jr., manages to view our common problems with the proper mixture of alarm and humor that is his specialty. His recent newspaper column pinpointing the problem, pricking some egos and undoubtedly plunging many a unionist deep into his dictionary, is worthy of the Senate's attention.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Buckley's column on union outrages, printed recently in the Washington Star, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Union Outrages Suffered in Silence

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

It is increasingly difficult to work up public indignation over outrage, as long as it is committed by a labor union. In the past few years in New York City labor unions have closed down newspapers and killed off three of them. Labor unions have shut down the ships at sea, closing off passenger and freight traffic. Labor unions have grounded the airlines, or most of them, leaving passengers the option of flying either to Toronto or to Detroit, but nowhere else.

The labor unions have shut down the schools, all the schools, in violation of the laws which it is the supposed purpose of the schools to preach obedience to. The labor unions have shut down public transportation, causing something very like a closing of the entire city. The labor unions struck the taxis, and violence was inflicted on the independent operators who declined to join in the strike.

New York's severest retaliation against these strikes, some of them illegal, others merely convulsive, economically, socially, and culturally, was fifteen days in jail during the Christmas holidays for Albert Shanker, the leader of the teachers' union, during which he is said to have run out of tea and crumpets on the third day, resulting in a loss of weight of three and one-half ounces.

I remember three years ago arriving at a television station and meeting at the elevator Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, all six feet five of that eminent intelligence, who always gives the impression that he is on very temporary leave of absence from Olympus, where he holds classes on the maintenance of divine standards. We rode up the elevator and met Billy Rose, the impresario, rich, famous, a little cranky, and (if my memory serves) Dick Gregory, the amiable but extremely touchy Negro comedian. It was opening night for a new talk show hosted by David Susskind, and the gimmick was a Sony-sized television, set on a swivel, which would face whichever member of the panel the questioner, who spoke a half mile away from Grand Central Station, was addressing his question to.

Now gentlemen, Susskind explained, there has been a jurisdictional question between the unions here on the question which union has the responsibility for turning the knob at the control booth which swivels the television set towards the guest being questioned. So, when a question is asked, the person the question is directed to should get up from his chair and run quickly towards the chair opposite the television, exchanging places with whoever was sitting there.

To this day—I cannot believe it!—we all received our instructions so dutifully as if we had met at the rim of Mt. Sinai to receive there from our transfigured Maker eternal commandments concerning our future behavior. I dimly remember an evening spent jumping up from my chair and passing Galbraith running at sprintspeed from his chair to occupy mine, diving into the empty chair, panting, and attempting a suave answer to the lady or the gentleman from Grand Central Station who little knew what heroic physical exertions were involved in situating the guest in front of the little screen.

I do solemnly believe that if the Queen of England had asked Galbraith or Rose or Gregory or myself, to make such asses of ourselves in order to indulge her imperial pleasure, we'd every one of us have said: Madam, go jump in the royal lake. But not so the labor unions. You treat them as fatalistically as a fog, a drought, or a hurricane.

The other day a colleague of mine, a lady of bright disposition and middle years, went to her garage to fetch her car, only to find the garage doors closed and her car interred inside. A strike. She has asked the doorman of the apartment building to raise the garage door, but he has informed her that the striking garage attendants removed the spark plugs from the machine that hoists the doors, so that there is no feasible way to lift them. I spoke of "her garage" intending to be precise. She owns her apartment, and, accordingly, a part of the garage which is a part of the building. So that her car is being detained in her garage against her will, and if you think that big brave courageous law-abiding people-loving John Lindsay is going to utter one word of reproach to the labor unions, let alone dispatch a unit of policemen to wrench open that garage door and restore a citizen's rights, you are a romantic, and a patriot, and out, out of this crazy world.

THE CASE FOR EAVESDROPPING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an interesting editorial entitled "The Case for Eavesdropping," published in today's New York Daily News. The editorial commends and supports the position taken by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Case for Eavesdropping

Sen. Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) urged the Senate yesterday to make it possible for law enforcement agencies to plug themselves in on the conversations of bigtime criminals.

He would make wiretap and electronic bugging legislation part of the crime package now before Congress, despite the loud objections of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

We never have understood the squeamishness of these two gents about butting in on the plotting and scheming of organized crime.

Under proper safeguards, wiretapping would be an important weapon in combating the shenanigans of men who have proved all but immune to other police procedures. By all means, let's have it.

THE PROPOSED 1969 FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Thursday, February 8, the President sent his foreign aid message to the Congress, accompanied by a draft of proposed legislation. However, it was indicated that a separate legislative proposal authorizing $120 million to continue the military sales program would be submitted later.

In its actions on the foreign aid bill last year, the Committee on Foreign Relations tried to make it clear that, in its view, the economic and military aid programs are directly related and that the positive effects of economic aid on development were all too often negated by the impact of U.S. military aid. After giving the problem much study the committee voted to abolish the Department of Defense's authority to finance easy term credit sales to developing countries. The Senate supported the committee's position and this position prevailed in the conference, although the House conferees took the view that the matter would be reviewed by them again this year.

I am not disposed to open the military sales issue again, since it was settled last year as far as I am concerned. But I will, of course, carry out the traditional courtesy of introducing the administration request, at the proper time. I am withholding introduction of the foreign aid bill, however, until the military sales bill has been submitted and we have had an opportunity to review the two bills together. I make this statement for the record since the administration's basic foreign aid bill has already been introduced in the other body. As soon as a military sales bill is submitted to the Senate, and we know the full picture for the proposed economic and military aid program, the proposed legislation will be formally introduced, perhaps by combining the two bills to simplify the committee's work.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN IGNORED

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the American Indian will search in vain for any substance to the rhetoric of President Johnson's recent message on education.

Although indirectly the Indian receives benefits through Operation Headstart and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, subjects to which the President did allude, neither of these admirable programs can reach the dilemma of Indian education. The Federal school system devised for the American Indian child cries out for change. It forces the child from his home at ages as early as 6 to spend 9 months of the year in the lonely dreariness of a boarding school hundreds of miles from home. And the President says nothing about it in his message. A national crisis, ignored by the White House.

I am told by my friends in the legal profession that when arguing his case a good appellate lawyer goes for the jugular—a vivid way of describing an essential rule of action. The President instead of going for the jugular avoids even the opportunity to plead the American Indian's case. By his inaction, there is left little hope for Indian education, except in the Congress. The White House silence is our mandate.

HOW LONG, O. HOW LONG?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. Buck Martin, editor of the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal, recently published a brief but thought-provoking editorial on the godlessness of recent Federal court decisions.

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago ruled against this innocuous verse:

> We thank you for the flowers so sweet
> We thank you for the food we eat
> We thank you for the birds that sing
> We thank you for everything

Mr. Martin's editorial pointed out that verses such as this have been recited in American schools since colonial times.

And yet now—

He said—

> we have judges who suddenly find all of this to be interfering with somebody's constitutional rights. These are the same judges who hand down decision after decision protecting the criminal and endangering the public safety. How long are the American people going to take this sort of behavior from the federal courts—

Mr. Martin asked.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial from the Martinsburg Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LONG, O, HOW LONG?

"We thank you for the flowers so sweet
"We thank you for the food we eat
"We thank you for the birds that sing
"We thank you for everything."

Although a critical poet might not go along with the meter of the above little verse, we can't see why anyone would object to having his child repeat it. Certainly, it is a pure and clean and nice thought.

The United States Court of Appeals in Chicago—backed up by the United States Supreme Court—has ruled, however, that the saying of such a verse is definitely religious and hence cannot be recited in a public school.

This public school was a kindergarten class where the teacher had chosen the verse for opening of the daily routine.

In justifying the decision, Judge Luther M. Swygert said: "The secular purposes of the verse were merely adjunctive and supplemental to its basic and primary purpose, which was a religious act of praising and thanking a deity."

This is just another example of how far our present-day federal courts are going in trying to make us a godless nation. Verses such as this have been said in public schools since colonial times and yet now we have judges who suddenly find all of this to be interfering with somebody's rights. These are the same judges who hand down decision after decision protecting the criminal and endangering the public safety.

How long are the American people going to take this sort of behavior from the federal courts?

CAPITALIZING ON COMMUNISM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Arnaud de Borchgrave, senior editor of Newsweek, has written a most informative article on the rapidly developing trade between Western and Eastern Europe. Entitled "Capitalizing on Communism," the article appeared in the December 25 issue of Newsweek.

Mr. de Borchgrave remarks that by selling Eastern Europeans sophisticated industrial equipment, and then providing them with the know-how to make this equipment work, "Western Europe has launched what, in many respects, amounts to a latter-day 'Marshall plan' for the East." He goes on to comment that as this process of economic development intensifies, Communist planners have been obligated to reexamine their economic structures and to modernize and liberalize their economic systems.

Mr. de Borchgrave observes that the United States has so far shown little initiative in carving out a place for itself in Eastern Europe, while Western European businessmen "have been quick to seek a foothold in what is the fastest-growing market for industrial goods in the world—the 350 million people who live under Communist rule from Berlin to Vladivostok."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article mentioned above be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITALIZING ON COMMUNISM

(By Arnaud de Borchgrave)

"Russian government buys 60-percent interest in Belgian oil company," "Dutch concern building $40 million hothouse complex for Bulgaria," "France's Schneider on schedule with Rumanian powerplant," "Czech government negotiating for license to build Franco-British computers for eastern market."

An optimist's vision of Wall Street Journal headlines for the year 2000? Not at all. Instead, these are descriptions of business deals currently in progress—deals of a kind that have become almost daily occurrences between the capitalist and Communist halves of Europe. After years of eyeing each other suspiciously across the gulf of ideological difference, the men who run Europe's factories have begun to discover a common language in trade. And in a way few people on either side of the Berlin wall yet understand, the decisions made in executive suites from Manchester to Novosibirsk are beginning to have a profound impact on the political life of the Continent.

That all this should come as a surprise to anyone is eloquent testimony to the suddenness with which East-West trade has burgeoned. In the last two years, for example, Italy's exports to East Europe have increased a staggering 46 per cent, while total East-West trade is surging ahead at a rate of some 20 per cent a year. Three years ago, there were 333 flights a week between the two halves of Europe; today, there are 800—and 1.5 million people are expected to make the trip in 1968. West European businessmen who used to complain about shoddy, accommodation in the East will shortly be able to spend the night at luxury hotels being built by a Pan American Airways subsidiary in Budapest, Bucharest and Prague. And in deference to their bourgeois visitors, more than 100 Communist hotels and restaurants now welcome a Diner's Club credit card.

Though goods are flowing in unprecedented quantities in both directions, it is, quite understandably, the more technologically advanced firms in the West that are writing most of the big orders. By selling the Communists the most sophisticated industrial equipment and then providing them with the knowhow to run it, Western Europe has launched what, in many respects, amounts to a latterday "Marshall plan" for the East. And inevitably, as this development process intensifies, Communist planners have been obliged to re-examine their economic structures. "The more they trade with us," remarked one Belgian businessman, "the more pressure they're under to modernize their economic system."

REFORMS

The effects of this pressure are by now clear. Already, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Poland have instituted sweeping economic reforms, and Hungary and Rumania have made plans to follow suit. In most East European countries next year, plants that turn a profit will be allowed to keep up to 50 per cent of their foreign-exchange earnings to be used to make their products more competitive in both price and quality. And few Communist economists make any secret of the fact that the object of all this eventually to establish a market-oriented economy with a minimum of state controls. Says Dr. Otakar Pohl, the director-general of the Czech State Bank: "Both economically and politically, there is no other choice but to proceed with economic reforms to make our industry more efficient and to instill in it a spirit of enterprise."

By now, economic liberalization in the East has developed its own momentum and there is little the Communist Party's Nervous Nellies can do to slam on the brakes. As a result, ponderous state committees, padded with party hacks, are increasingly bypassed. There is a growing cleavage, too, between conventional Communist political wisdom and the dynamics of a modern technological society. "It is beyond dispute," declares Czech jurist Pavel Peska, "that economic reform needs an adequate political ssytem to replace the old one." And although some Communist leaders are understandably concerned that their experiments with international trade will create serious dislocations in their domestic economies, many Europeans, Communists and non-Communists alike, are beginning to look forward to the day when all of Europe will function as a single trading unit, permitting a new and more rational division of labor between East and West.

IMPULSE

So far, the U.S. has shown little initiative in carving out a place for itself in this "new order." This strikes many Euroepans as ironic since it was President Johnson who provided the prime impulse for the current boom in East-West trade when, last year, he endorsed the principle of "building bridges to the East." Says an official of Britain's Board of Trade: "Before that speech, Western Europeans were always looking over their shoulders to see if the U.S. was watching. Now, they charge ahead, ignore agreements to limit credits to five years and are totally unconcerned about U.S. reactions." Meantime, the U.S. Congress—bitterly divided by the struggle against Communism in Southeast Asia—has apparently shelved the President's new East-West trade relations bill for the duration of the Vietnamese war.

Making the most of the political advantage they enjoy because their nations are not involved in Vietnam, Western European businessmen have been quick to seek a foothold in what is the fastest-growing market for industrial goods in the world—the 350 million people who live under Communist rule from Berlin to Vladivostok. While the U.S. still maintains prohibitively high barriers against trade with the East, the members of the Common Market have abolished import restrictions on hundreds of Eastern European products. The result is that West Europe's two-way trade with the East is now nearing the magic figure of $10 billion a year.

The past eighteen months have seen a veritable cascade of "turnkey" operations for the delivery of complete plants, joint East-West ventures, partnerships and licensing agreements. Most commonly, Western firms supply the technological know-how and machinery, the Eastern partner provides site, plant and cheap labor, and risks and profits are split 50–50. All told, West European companies have completed or are now building some 150 plants throughout East Europe and Russia—and more contracts are on the way.

For the first time, Eastern plants which are anxious to increase their export capacity are beginning to discuss management contracts with Western firms. And in the most astonishing development to date, Olivetti, which is already the Soviet Government's adviser on mechanization and automation of office procedures, is about to land a $100 million to $150 million contract for the modernization of the Soviet bureaucracy—a deal that will automatically make the Italian firm privy to Russia's corridors of power.

The trickle-down effect of all this on the Western European economy is immense. For example, the golden fallout from the $890 million deal under which Italy's Fiat is building the Soviet Union a 730,000-car-a-year auto plant is settling all over Italy. Italian firms are getting $322 million worth of orders to supply 4,000 of the 12,500 machine tools for the Fiat-built plant at Togliattigrad. Pirelli is building six factories in the Soviet Union that will manufacture everything from rubber components for the Fiat-designed TAZ car to latex swimsuits. Olivetti will computerize the plant and Innocenti will make $50 million worth of U.S.-designed presses.

SWAP

The picture in other countries in Western Europe is the same. Britain's ICI, the largest chemical company in West Europe, has negotiated what, in effect, is an exchange of advanced technological know-how for Soviet pure research—a deal made possible because Russia is now willing to pay for patents and is anxious to sell its own overseas. Czechoslovakia has paid $9 million for a license to build Renault cars and plans to use the French firm's worldwide facilities to service export models. And recently, Air France became the first Western carrier to lease Soviet IL-62 jetliners.

How long East-West trade can continue to grow at the present rate no one really knows. The Eastern nations have long shopping lists; Rumania alone is currently placing orders for almost $300 million in plant and equipment, including steel strip mills, newsprint plants, nitrogen fertilizer factories and a nuclear power plant. But at the same time the East is increasingly falling short on means of payment. At first, barter arrangements were accepted to get trade rolling. But now such deals are the exception rather than the rule. Instead, Western credit terms are growing ever more generous. France which once limited itself to seven-year credits at 6 per cent now gives eight-and-half years at 5.5 per cent. And since repayment only starts when the goods are actually delivered, the true credit period, in effect, is frequently ten years.

CREDIT

Some experts, moreover, believe that if East-West trade is to continue to grow, credit will have to be stretched to the point where it will be tantamount to a West European aid program. This is the view of Vladimir Velebit, a Yugoslav who formerly headed the U.N.'s Economic Commission for Europe, an organization devoted to the promotion of East-West trade. Says Velebit: "The East must increase its export earnings and this can only be done with more flexible Western credit policies. After all, the East European nations have proved themselves conscientious debtors. Not one has ever defaulted on a payment. They have always paid on time and with such a good record they obviously deserve to be treated more generously."

Neither the IMF nor the World Bank has ever done a survey of the Eastern countries' economic potential and credit-worthiness. But Velebit believes Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland would readily agree to such a study. "Most of their reforms are designed to develop a dynamic export drive," he says. "But first they must go in for marketing research in a big way. Then they must concentrate on better quality, better design, better after-sales service. The Russians, for example, have done well with cameras and their watches are up to Swiss standards. They are very advanced in mining machinery and drilling equipment. But on many items they are still a generation behind in design and reliability."

Velebit also believes that the enterprises of the future, East and West, will develop along the same lines; whether state-operated, state-owned or privately owned, they will all be run by products of the managerial revolution. "Renault in France belongs to the state just as Skoda does in Czechoslovakia," Velebit notes, "and both are run by rightly educated technocrats on salary."

DANGER

Velebit also foresees another similarity between the Eastern state trusts and the leading Western corporations: all will be gigantic. In Bulgaria, 40 state trusts employ some 600,000 people and supply 35 per cent of the country's production. Rodopa, the huge Bulgarian agricultural trust, is a state within a state, running its own transport network and stores and dealing directly with its foreign customers. "Eastern Europe's cartels," says Velebit, "are the equivalent of your mergers. You're all getting bigger and they are, too." (Curiously, Eastern economists now seem almost as concerned as their Western counterparts about the danger of throttling competition. "Trusts which are economically independent," one Rumanian economist has written, "can only be allowed in a socialist economy to the extent that they do not become monopolies and do not appreciably curtail competitive forces.")

By American standards, of course, the Communist world is no trading El Dorado. But the odds seem great that it will be one day and that, when that day comes, the Western Europeans will have already occupied the ground floor.

SALES SURGE TO THE EAST—WESTERN EUROPE'S BURGEONING TRADE WITH THE COMMUNIST BLOC

[Western exports to Eastern Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and U.S.S.R.). In millions of U.S. dollars]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Austria	176	187	197	215	246	260
Belgium-Luxembourg	93	94	83	85	110	120
France	240	270	230	359	302	387
Greece	52	50	57	64	75	93
Italy	216	235	265	274	330	357
Netherlands	77	77	72	75	104	116
Spain	15	16	26	18	24	57
Sweden	114	153	133	169	155	164
Switzerland	66	58	64	65	84	112
United Kingdom	295	310	345	280	315	410
United States	135	125	165	340	140	198
West Germany	473	505	438	552	588	696

WALL STREET JOURNAL BACKS DISTRICT PLAN FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there has been considerable speculation in editorials and political columns recently on the role the electoral college may play in electing the next President of the United States.

The Wall Street Journal of February 13, 1968, placed the problem in its proper perspective and in addition endorsed the district plan for electoral college reform. The district plan as embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 12 would elect electors from existing congressional districts, or from separately drawn districts that are compact and contiguous in nature as well as being equal in population. In addition two electors, corresponding to the two electoral votes allocated to each State for its two Senators, would be elected statewide.

As the Wall Street Journal points out, this system provides most of the benefits of the direct ballot but does not have the drawbacks of a direct election plan. Specifically, the editorial mentioned that a direct popular election could weaken our traditional two-party system by scattering votes among several candidates. Impliedly, it indicated that a direct election plan could never be adopted because it seems to many Americans to constitute too radical a change. I believe this is true. Serious doubt exists as to whether the necessary numbers of States, particularly small States, would ever ratify a constitutional amendment calling for a direct popular election.

Mr. President, there are many more reasons why a direct election plan is not the best alternative for the present unit vote system, including the threat of Federal control of elections and the reneging on a promise made to the smaller States when the Constitution was adopted. The fact remains, however, that a reform of the electoral college is overdue. It should have been taken up in the past so that the specter of a third party candidate throwing the upcoming election into the House of Representatives would not be hanging over us at this time.

It is too late to cry over spilt milk but action should be taken now, while the reform movement is riding high, to prevent these problems in the future. Adoption of the district plan of electoral college reform would prevent these problems and I hope that the Congress will soon have an opportunity to vote on Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial be included in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1968]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: A REMINDER FROM MR. WALLACE

For more than a century there has been talk of reforming the U.S. system of electing a President, and now George Wallace's announcement of his third-party candidacy should help spur the nation to action.

Not even the former Alabama governor really believes he has any chance of achieving the nation's highest office. It is quite possible, however, that he could influence the election result. More remotely, he might even be able to influence the policies of the successful candidate.

We are by no means suggesting that Mr. Wallace's American Independent Party or any other splinter group should be denied the opportunity to seek a place on the ballot. Though the nation's political stability owes a lot to the two-party system, voters unhappy with both major parties should have the right to look elsewhere.

At the moment there are indeed many Americans who are both disenchanted with the Democrats and as yet unpersuaded by any of the possible Republican candidates. For a variety of reasons some of these voters will cast ballots for Mr. Wallace.

The reason mentioned almost exclusively by the Alabaman's critics is, of course, race. Mr. Wallace's fervent oratory—"segregation now . . . segregation tomorrow . . . segregation forever"—undoubtedly has won over a number of die-hard racists. Yet the ex-governor himself does not actually think any such aim is capable of achievement; he stood "in the schoolhouse door," all right, but he stepped aside to permit the inevitable.

Greater numbers of Americans, we suspect, question the politicians' theory that social ills developed over centuries can be cured overnight by hastily devised legislation. Other voters agree with Mr. Wallace's contention that the Federal Government generally plays too large a role in the nation's life. Still others are merely confused and unhappy in general about the nation's current malaise.

Many of these citizens wouldn't dream of voting for the former governor if they thought he could be elected. They hope instead that their ballots will serve as a quiet protest, a demand that Washington more thoughtfully appraise its abilities, its resources and its true responsibilities.

In the process Mr. Wallace will pull votes from both major parties, a fact they both deplore. But we do not believe that the Democrats and Republicans have any inherent right to the votes of Americans who simply don't like what the two parties stand for.

A more valid concern for the nation, in our opinion, is that the Alabaman might carry enough Southern states to deny either major-party candidate a majority in the Electoral College. The election then would be thrown into the House, where each state, large or small, would have a single vote. In such a circumstance a man with a sizable popular plurality could lose.

If the election turns out that way, moreover, Mr. Wallace has made it quite plain that he would try to bargain with one or both of the major candidates, trading his support for concessions to his ideas. We can hope that neither big party would make such a deal, but it's too bad that there's even a chance for it to be proposed.

It is obviously too late to do anything about the Electoral College before November's election, but the Wallace candidacy, whatever happens, should put some push behind at least one of the reform proposals now in Congress.

A Constitutional amendment naturally should be drawn with care. Direct popular election of the President, though the most democratic way, still seems to many Americans too radical a change. Direct election, for one thing, could weaken the two-party system by scattering votes among several candidates.

In any case, most of the benefits of a direct ballot could be obtained in another way: By choosing the bulk of the electors by Congressional districts instead of picking them all statewide, as at present. The electoral vote then would be much more likely to reflect the popular result.

Reasonable reform of the Electoral College is long overdue. By reminding everyone of that fact, Mr. Wallace has done the country a favor.

ROY REUTHER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, when Roy Reuther died last month, people who only knew of him mourned the passing of a great labor leader.

But those who knew Roy Reuther best mourned the passing of one whose desire to improve the life of anyone he met is unexcelled. "A great humanitarian" is an overworked and not always understood phrase—but of Roy Reuther it is applied in literal truth.

Roy was able to accomplish as much as he did because self-interests were always subjugated to the problems and needs at hand—leaving his tremendous energies for the tasks that he believed in.

His full concept of life was so eloquently stated by two of his closest friends at memorial services that I hereby ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in my remarks the eulogies of the Honorable George Edwards and the Honorable Wade McCree, Jr., both judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY OF ROY REUTHER, SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1968

(By Judge George Edwards)

Most of us here present today remember a great deal about Roy Reuther. He was born in 1909 in Wheeling, West Virginia. He was one of five children of Mr. and Mrs. Valentine Reuther. His family was a pioneer labor and social democratic family. It's only accurate to say that Roy's life was inspired by the heritage of his home. From both his father Valentine Reuther and his mother Anna who is with us here today, he was taught from childhood that working people have a right to more of the good things of life—more security, more dignity, a better standard of living, better working conditions, an opportunity to give their children as good an education as possible, that democracy in American society needed to be broadened and deepened and that all human beings of whatever race, creed or color were equal before God and before their fellow man. This was the sort of home which produced five great children. Roy and his brothers Ted, Walter and Victor and his sister Chris have always been very close. They've been together continually through their lives both in periods of joy and in periods of crisis. And this closeness of family as a tradition has been mirrored in Roy's own intimate home. It's been mirrored in the love which bound him to Fania and to their two sons David and Allen.

I don't think Roy would want his family or us to meet here today just to mourn. Memories of one who has left so much that was so good with so many do not need always be painful.

I remember Roy as a radiant man. When he wasn't radiating humor he was radiating enthusiasm. There was always a smile and usually a laugh in any conversation with Roy Reuther.

Actually, if Roy knew we were gathered here together today in such numbers he would probably want to know whether we had distributed nominating petitions or had talked about raising funds for the coming voter registration drive.

Mr. Justice Holmes once said, "as life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at the peril of being judged not to have lived." Judged on this basis, Roy Reuther lived the equivalent of several lives. Wade has already spoken eloquently of his great contributions in political and community affairs. And I shan't repeat this theme. Roy inherited not only the social vision of his family, he saw and he lived both as a young man and afterwards with the great social problems of his time. He, like many of us, was a child of the depression. He knew the unemployment line, the soup kitchens. He saw the poverty and the insecurity in the lives of millions, millions which then encompassed the automobile workers. He was one of the leading organizers of the great movement we now know as the United Automobile Workers-AFL-CIO. He is indeed one of a limited number of men about whom it might truthfully be said, that without him the American labor movement as we know it today might never have come to exist.

His periods of service to the labor movement were most important in the days when the very survival of the union itself was at stake. In Flint, in 1937, in the General Motors strike, he was the organizer, the orator and the planner of victory. In subsequent history he has been given credit for initiating the strategy which carried the union through to victory in that strike. And his contribution begun then, has never lessened in the years which have followed. In the days of the second great test of the existence of the UAW as a movement in 1939 in the tool and die strike, he played a key role as the assistant director in charge of union affairs in Pontiac. And in the very crucial periods in the history of the UAW when first there was the threat of dictatorial influence and company influence in an effort to take over leadership of the union, Roy played a major role on the side of the forces that won through to democratic control of the UAW. Still later in the 40's when there was a real possibility of dictatorial influences and devisive influences from the communists becoming a reality in the leadership of the UAW, Roy Reuther's contribution on the side of democratic unionism was a very magnificant one and one which, with others, became decisive. But while these are the great events of his career as a member of the labor movement, they by no means represent all.

In the grand sense of the term, Roy Reuther was a simple man and he understood common people and he had a feeling for the rank and file of humanity which they reciprocated. He always gained strength from being near to them and close to them whether at a union meeting or a political action meeting or on a picket line. It was typical of him that he was at Selma in the great struggle for civil rights for that portion of our nation which had been most deprived of those in the history of this land. It was typical of him that he was in Jackson, Miss. on that tense and difficult day when Medgar Evers was committed to the grave. And it was typical of him too, that when the farmworkers in the Rio Grande Valley needed assistance, Roy Reuther was marching with them in a little town called Rio Grande City, helping the citrus workers of that state. He had a great sensitivity to other peoples' problems. Not the only, but only the most recent instant of this was his decision to leave everything involving his national concerns and national responsibilities to go to be with one of his staff members, Pancho Medrano, when Pancho was faced with overwhelming family tragedy. Roy flew 2,000 miles to stand with Pancho beside his mother's grave.

And then there's Roy's role as a member of the justly famed Reuther brothers team. The three brothers, Walter, Victor and Roy were as close as brothers could ever be. From the days of the General Motors strike when there was a Reuther in Flint, another in Detroit and another in Anderson, Indiana, to more recent years when there was a Reuther in world affairs, a Reuther running the union and another Reuther in national political affairs, their opponents in and outside of the union must have felt that there was at least one Reuther brother everywhere.

Finally, in the labor movement, Roy typified the insistence of many that the labor movement should always remain a movement and never become just a business. He was a person of commitment and a person of dedication. And, he demanded and expected commitment and dedication from others. When a situation arose that offered conflicting moral problems in the UAW, Walter was often likely to say, "Let's give this to Roy, let's let him worry about it for us." And more recently he was heard to observe, "We've got to take care of this guy. He's our conscience." Roy's commitment came from deep belief in the common fate of mankind and the possibility of that fate being better in the future than it has been in the past.

He believed in the brotherhod of man, he gave his life working for the brotherhood of man. And there's a relationship no doubt, between that depth of belief and commitment and a side of Roy which not too many people got to know about or to see, because he had a respect for the mystery and the beauty of the universe as mirrored in nature. He built his home when he got a chance to do so, so that he was in contact with the beauties of nature. And in recent years, this great influence in his life led him into expressing himself and his thoughts in sculpture and painting. Generally his subjects were drawn from the nature which so much intrigued him. He sought to express in statuary and on canvas the mystery and the beauty of the universe which inspired him.

The selections which were played here today from Brahms and Bach were selections which were among Roy's favorites. He loved to sing, he never missed a symphony concert when the chance was presented to attend one.

And so you see in this view of Roy a deeply committed person in tune and aware of eternal verities and it was this that led him to conclude many a speech with these words which are perhaps most typical of him, "Let us then look to the stars. Let us dream our hopes and aspirations for that better tomorrow."

Roy Reuther really had two great loves, his work and his family. His beloved wife, Fania, came by her social conscience entirely independently of Roy. But because it was a matter of depth and conviction with her, she was able to give him the great support and the great strength in his work which he needed. It was a close and lovely marriage, and it produced two wonderful sons of whom Roy was exceedingly proud in David and Allen. As we who stand here are privileged to have Roy live in us because of his inspiration and example from the past; so in a very much more meaningful fashion, Roy lives in David and in Allen, the sons whom he loved so, and in whom he took such pride.

Seeking to mirror this man to our memory, I turn to the words of Robert Browning in closing:

"Being who?
One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise,
Are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake."

Roy Reuther

(By Judge Wade H. McCree)

Roy Reuther's death is the occasion for this assembly of his friends and Roy would never permit a gathering of this size to take place without employing the event to accomplish a good purpose. In his characteristic selfless way, Roy would achieve whatever worthwhile goal he selected with hardly anyone being aware that he was the *deus ex machina*, pulling and hauling the recalcitrants, stimulating and maintaining the activists, and in the end, pulling together the entire enterprise to make secure whatever gains were realized.

Roy wouldn't want to permit this assemblage to adjourn without doing something to improve the quality of the lives of everyone. Although I am certain that he would veto my present intention because it would offend his principle of working anonymously and unsung, nevertheless, the greatest purpose this occasion can afford is to permit us to reflect on Roy's legacy to all of us and upon the obligation of each of us to him.

Every life has its own peculiar design, some portions of it often so intricate as never to be disclosed even to ones self. Roy's life was one of forthrightness, openness and courage; an enterprising spirit and a great ease of human contact. With Roy, identification with every other human being was as natural to him as was the fact of his own existence. The discovery of anyone who felt alienated was accepted as a challenge to devise some way to effect a reconciliation.

His winning approach of concentrating on the goal and of subordinating his own personality has special relevance today in our two most pressing national issues—the Asian war and the urban crisis. Roy never lost a fight by being diverted over concern for saving face or by preoccupation with his own leadership position vis a vis others who were working in the same area.

Another of his qualities which we all recall was his great good humor. How many were the times when a grim frozen impasse was thawed under the warmth of his broad spreading grin which gently ridiculed all that was absurd and false in an intransigent posture and because of its manifest good nature precluded any personal resentment to its employment?

Tough-minded honesty, all embracing humanity, indefatigable energy, self-effacing participation, great good humor, these were some of the qualities he contributed to his many community activities which others today will relate in detail.

Tragically, Roy's great heart which beat so resolutely wasn't equal to the limitless demands he made of it in his uncompromising struggle against injustice.

If I were saying this of someone else, Roy would be tugging at my coat at this point to remind me that enough had been said and that there was work to be done. I will be responsive to this gentle scolding and conclude by suggesting that if we would be true to Roy and worthy beneficiaries of his legacy, let each of us dedicate himself to carry on Roy's unfinished task.

As Benjamin Britten wrote,

We would be undaunted by the thought of our mortality. Life is ours, rich in hope and rich in memory. Its glory is not that it endures forever, but that it for a time incarnates so much that is beautiful. We do not demand from the flower that it shall never wither, the sunset that it shall never fade, the song that it shall never cease. Nor would we rail at life because at length its beauty shall be ashes, its music silence, and all its laughter and all its tears forgotten. Life, the reality, is ours. We would not linger, like a timid mariner, in port, but live dangerously, devoting ourselves with abandon to what seems to us the good, the beautiful, the true.

THE CHANGING FACE OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I think some recent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon concerning the problems of rural areas, deserve the close attention of us all. They are a characteristically bold and thoughtful statement on the plight of the farmer and the relationship between his problems and those of the cities. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, along with some questions and answers of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that followed the delivery of his address.

There being no objection, the address and questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGING FACE OF AGRICULTURE

(Address to the National Canners Association, by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from Oregon)

Mr. president, distinguished guests, members of the Association, and friends:

It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity of meeting with you today to share with you some of my concerns about your problems. These are problems which the farmers who produce the goods you package and distribute and the ultimate consumer, and you, must all meet and resolve equitably.

Yours is a great industry. I am told the wages you pay annually exceed $9 billion and this goes to more than 1.5 million men and women. Your output, again I understand, annually exceeds $75 billion in value.

These are sums of magnitude and importance which measure the service you render as the middlemen between production and consumption. It is just because of your strategic position in our national economy—it is just because the actions you collectively take can have consequences in every other segment of our society—that in meeting with you I propose in my discussion to play, if you will, the part of an advocate of your partners in this enterprise of America and to lay before you some propositions for your consideration which reflect the needs and the wants of the producer and of the consumer

It is for this reason that my remarks are entitled, "The Changing Face of Agriculture," since using this as the theme I can perhaps draw to your attention the importance of widening areas of agreement and diminishing to the greatest extent possible areas of disagreement among you and your partners in progress, the farmer and the consumer.

Perhaps, as an ex-teacher I ought to begin in the traditional way by defining my terms. What do I mean by the consumer interest? Here I am indebted to an editorial essay which was published last December in an issue of the *Rural Electric Newsletter*, a publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The consumer interest really is:

"It is the universal economic and social interest of all people. . . . The consumer interest is the mother or father shopping for the family's food and hoping to get good quality and full measure and sanitary, clean products at prices that are fair to both consumer and the producer. . . ."

Your industry is to be commended for the work that it has done in making it possible in almost every settlement across the country and in almost every home within this land for that expectation to be met.

It is a safe generalization, I believe, to state without very many qualifications that never in the years of recorded history have so many people been able to obtain the variety of foods, packaged under sanitary conditions and delivered in wholesale state to so many people of all income levels, at a cost which, by and large, is reasonable.

The economies that you have achieved in your manufacture and in your distribution of commodities have resulted in savings which you have shared with both producer and consumer to some degree. Certainly, in the area of standardization of can sizes alone you have earned the gratitude of every housewife and of most bachelors.

But there are social costs involved in this, too. These costs have by and large been borne by your other partner, the farmer. The pressures on the producer of food have been accelerating and are unremitting. We must not forget that agriculture is the base for our present economic abundance. It is our number-one weapon in the struggle against hunger here and abroad. It is the key to small town prosperity or economic decline. The price the farmer receives at the farm gate is crucial. As it declines the cash registers on the main street of our small towns and in our urban centers stop ringing. What is the situation today from the farmer's standpoint? He now receives six percent less for the food he produces than the price he received two decades ago. This at a time when he is paying 30 percent more for the supplies he needs to produce it.

He feels that the dice of the economic game are loaded against him. Central to his concern is the marketing problem. He feels that the government pays greater attention to problems in other areas than it does to the economic problem he faces. Many of us feel that the Secretary of Agriculture has gone about as far as he can under existing programs to shore up farm prices.

When wheat and corn prices started to drop the Secretary announced plans to withhold Commodity Credit Corporation stock from the market. CCC holdings, he said, will not be available to buyers until the 1967 crop, under regular loan or reseal, exceeds the six million tons of overage expected this year. Even then, it will not be available except at the market price or 115 percent of the loan plus carrying charges, whichever is higher.

The Secretary then authorized 1967 farm stored grain from being held under loan or reseal to be moved to commercial storage and to be converted to reseal under commercial reseal provisions. This allowed continued holding of the 1967 crop and makes farm storage available for 1968 production.

In addition, the Department shifted some 6,700 storage units to storage short areas to help farmers hold their crop for an improved price situation.

If the so-called Purcell bill had passed I believe this administration could have kept the market price of wheat and feed grains at least ten cents per bushel higher. That would have meant an additional $300 million to $500 million in added income for wheat and feed grain farmers. The Purcell bill, as I am sure most of you know, would have given the Secretary of Agriculture power to adjust annual supplies more closely to market needs.

In former years, the government would have been able to buy grain, firming up prices. In short years, supplies could have been sold under carefully prescribed conditions. Unfortunately, this bill was voted down in the House after we had passed it in the Senate. The statements of those who killed it made it clear that partisan politics carried the day. It is significant that upon its defeat both wheat and corn markets reacted sharply downward.

Thus, as I say, we have gone about as far as we can under existing programs to strengthen farm prices. The more I cope with this so-called farm problem, however, the more convinced I become that it is in reality a bargaining problem. Just as you in your industry have placed premiums on efficiency of operation, so, too, has the farmer. The American farmer can match production records against industry and win hands down in most cases, but when it comes to marketing he feels that just the reverse is true.

The American farmer too often in his own eyes is reduced to a beggar status, to a hat-in-hand, what will you give me approach.

This is a very hard problem to resolve. There are a great many obstacles. Thousands of farmers will grow the same product, but they have only a handful of outlets they can sell to.

For example, there are some 1,750,000 farmers whose grains are used in the manufacture of breakfast cereals, but four manufacturing firms process 85 percent of these grains for the nation's market. Twenty processing firms presently can the vegetables it takes more than 2,600 farmers to produce. And this is just one aspect of the problem.

Commodity production often is scattered over a large geographic area making it difficult for the producers to get together. It is difficult for farm organizations to control distribution of an agricultural product because large quantities of a product can be quickly and economically shipped over great distances. Some feel that these problems are insurmountable, but I am not one of those.

Recently, a committee of the National Planning Association said it felt collective bargaining held very limited promise for improving farm profits. The committee, composed of economists and farmers, did see some possibilities for gain but these they felt would be largely confined to specialty crops grown in compact geographic areas.

Several farm organizations spokesmen took exception to parts of the report, charging it was too pessimistic; that in evaluating the collective bargaining approach, the committee assumed that no supply management provisions would be incorporated into the enabling legislation.

Would this approach work? What kind of approach can we and you come up with that will give farmers a bargaining lever to match that that you have? In your own case as you view it from the other fellow's perspective what do you think would work? What approach, what combination of approaches could you suggest to him?

There are a number of legislative ideas which will be discussed. You may wish to look at them, evaluate them, and consider them carefully, because they will, if enacted affect your interests.

There are proposed bills to create a national farmer bargaining board that would do for farmers what the National Labor Relations Board does for organized labor. The board, at the request of the producer group, would determine the boundaries, size, and composition of the product bargaining units based on existing market patterns. Then, if more than one group wanted to represent the growers, the board would supervise an election. The winner would be certified as the bargaining agent and the board would take steps to insure that the processors bargained with that organization in good faith.

Another approach upon which your advice would be most helpful is broader use of marketing agreements to cover new commodities, to establish minimum prices and other terms under which you could acquire products from producers and providing where necessary, for producer allotments and marketing quotas.

Again, how do you feel about a legislative proposal which would ban coercion against farmers who joined bargaining associations? Does the solution lie in making farmers cooperatives more effective, thus providing the individual farmer with more muscle at the bargaining table? As you know, some gains made by farmers, particularly smaller farmers, through cooperative associations founded with Federal funds have been phenomenal.

These are just a few of the approaches that are being explored in Congress and wherever farmers or their representatives meet.

Now, vital as these agricultural considerations may be, they are, however, only a part of the larger over-all concern. We are running low on solution time for major problems along a broad economic and social front. One of the greatest problems now arising to confront the American public is the challenge of space, not outer space, but terrestrial space, practical, down-to-earth, everyday, living space.

Today, 70 percent of our population lives on less than two percent of our land. The other 30 percent are left to rattle around in a vast reservoir of under-utilized space. By the year 2000, this people-space equation will become even more unbalanced. Another hundred million Americans will have crowded their way into already overcongested cities where 140 million live today.

I have come to you today from the Nation's Capital, a city that already sprawls up to 30 miles in some directions from the downtown core. The sight of this suburban sprawl of subdivisions and shopping centers stretching as far as the eye can see and further depresses me each time I fly back to the city, and this is only the beginning of the spread, a mere indication of what is to come.

Population experts tell us that by the year 2000 the city of Washington will become a seamless sprawl of humanity that will stretch from north of Boston to south of what is now the Richmond, Va., area.

I hate to think of what life will be like if we permit this to happen. Social unrest, crimes, riots can be expected to increase as the sheer weight of humanity crushes man's standards of social behavior and overcomes the ability of institutions to administer to human needs and wants.

Outside the metropolitan complex with continuing relative depopulation small communities will find it next to impossible to support quality education, to build community facilities, to provide the jobs needed to hold their young people.

I just don't think the nation can continue to careen down this one-way road to the year 2000. The fabric of our society will tear and rend into tatters in the next 32 long hot summers unless we turn around, chart a new course and begin to change it. That's what the people-space equation is all about.

President Johnson recently spoke for the moral imperative of the national policy of population and opportunity balance when he said at Dallastown, Pa.:

"Millions of Americans feel deprived of a fundamental human right: The right to live where they choose.

"History records a long, hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and to live where he chooses. It took many centuries to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"We need thriving, healthy, rural areas and thriving cities. But does it really make sense, on this great continent which God has blessed to have more than 70 percent of our people crammed into one percent of our land?"

The changing face of agriculture mirrors the changing face of America. So far I have spoken within the framework of the producer, of the distributor and the consumer. But I would call to your attention another ally who too often is overlooked, and that is the man or woman who works for you.

No element of agriculture's transition into the practices of industrial business is more meaningful than its increasing use of hourly wage earners. As the raising and processing of crops moves further from the family home unit and into the employment of labor at hourly or even weekly wage rates, the more it takes on the earmarks and attributes of industry.

So, to a greater degree than you have ever considered before I put it to you that you must expect to operate within the framework that industrial democracy has established for labor relations.

In 1966, the exclusion of farm workers from minimum wage coverage was removed. The overtime exemptions for workers in the processing industry were reduced. Producers in all phases of agriculture must expect this trend to continue. The next consideration of minimum wage amendments would reduce even further and perhaps eliminate exemptions from overtime for food processing.

It must be borne in mind that when the first wage and hour law was recommended to Congress in the mid-1930s by President Roosevelt there were no exemptions in it for farm employees or food processing employees. The exemptions were added by Congress. In the view of many they remained in the law longer than was justified.

For just as I cannot accept the idea that a family farmer should net no more than $2,000 or $3,000 a year from his farm entity as the return on his investment of capital and his own labor power, neither can I accept the idea that working men who hire out for farm production should be paid only poverty level wages, live in the worst housing in the nation, and raise uneducated and illiterate children. Why, my own state of Oregon could utilize without waste all of the funds for the entire nation that were provided in last year's budget for the replacement of obsolescent farm housing.

There is no justification whatever for cheap food prices for American consumers that are kept low at the expense either of the man who owned and worked the farm or the man who did the work for hire. For far too long American agriculture has been the prisoner of the desire for cheap food. It has provided it at least in part, through rural poverty in every section of the country. Rural poverty in turn, has contributed to the blighting of the cities.

As one walks through the slums of any large urban center it is a shattering thought that those who have come to live in these areas are actually finding a better life than the life they left on the farm.

So I plead with you as in your deliberations you look to the immediate problems which confront you, that you also as citizens of America look to the broader questions which are of concern to you as citizens. I ask you not to accept the easy and ineffective solutions but to go deeper. A sticking plaster is no substitute for surgery. The ailment should be treated, not the symptom. If you do this, then you will be acting in your own long-range economic best interests.

So, too, it is to your own long-range economic interests to cooperate with the Congress in its consideration of legislation proposed by the President in his State of the Union message. Here I speak of such measures as those which would insure the quality and freshness of fish sold over the nation's market counters to consumers. Such legislation, if enacted, would in all probability increase your cost, but your ingenuity and your increasing productivity as an industry will enable you, it is my hope, to absorb many of these costs. And by giving increased quality at the same or lower costs to the consumer, you will be providing a service to your necessary ally, the consumer.

So, too, on the other hand, by taking the long view and by increasing the price you pay to the primary producer and by absorbing in large part this increased cost to your own operations without burdening the consumer, you can achieve an equitable solution.

This morning I have been deliberately and unduly provocative. I have perhaps in the view of a great many of you, overstated strongly the case. I must plead guilty in part. But I wanted you in your meetings here to think seriously about the problems we all face and to express to you what I have learned in my years in the Senate, that the test of the sound program is the way in which it affects human beings, in the long run and promotes the general welfare.

Yours is a young industry—it is a virile and strong industry—it is an industry which makes maximum use of our scientifically trained young people. The gains you have made and they are tremendous, are the result of careful planning and plain hard work at the desk, in the laboratory, and in the library, yes, and in the law schools which trained your very effective attorneys who so ably present your case to the public authorities. You owe much to them and to the men and women of great talent in advertising and packaging who have helped to form the tastes and desires of the consumer.

In the decade to come you will need to use more and more of these well trained, highly skilled individuals. Your operations are already computerized in many instances. This trend will grow. These machines and their successors will demand even more skillfully trained brain workers. So as citizens-statesmen I suggest to you that in areas of public interest such as the support of education at the local, state and national levels, you have a long-range vested interest. It is the same interest that every other segment of our economic society has—that we make an investment of capital now to the end that we shall have available when we most need it the product of an education—complete, adequate, and excellent enough—to meet the challenges of the year 2000.

A baby born today will be 32 in the year 2000. He may very well sit in a convention such as this to listen to a speaker who speaks of the problems of that day and how you as a major industry have the responsibility in your own self-interest to seek to find equitable solutions to the problems which are common to you and your allies, the producer, the consumer, and your own employees. And so I close by reminding you of the words of the great and wise cleric, who was also one of the most thoughtful of the great English poets, John Donne. You will recall them. He said:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

(NOTE.—Senator MORSE had a few minutes to answer questions following his presentation, before returning to Washington. This portion is carried below:)

Question. Senator, do you feel that marketing agreements are essential—an essential part of collective bargaining on the part of agriculture?

Senator MORSE. I'm certainly not in a position to give you any final judgment as to what I am going to do in regard to the proposal for marketing agreements. I would say that what I have heard thus far establishes a prima facie case for them, and we are going to have to take the evidence to see whether or not it stands up. But this is really a matter of saying the responsibility of those that would be involved in the marketing agreement would bring to us their case. Don't forget, all I am is, after all, a legislative judge on these issues. That's the role I should play and not a legislative advocate when I have to sit in a committee and decide whether I am going to vote for or against legislation or modify it.

So all I can tell you is that my mind is open, even though I tell you that I think thus far the proponents of marketing agreements seem to be establishing a prima facie case.

Question. Senator, this is not so much a question. I want to say that I admire you for the stand, that you want to determine the facts in the best public interest.

I do want to raise a question: When you say industrial democracy, if you feel that when you have to sit across the bargaining table and deal with the unions who've gotten industry-wide monopoly power, you'll realize it's not a fact that we have industrial democracy in this country. It's industrial imperialism on the part of industry-wide bargaining unions.

Senator MORSE. I know exactly what you mean. I arbitrated my first case 32 years ago. I still question the statistic but the spokesman for the Department of Labor told the President of the United States when we were considering the recent railroad case, that I had been involved in the settlement of more major labor disputes in the last 23 years than anyone else in the country. I don't think that's true. If he said one of 10 I would have accepted that.

I know these problems in trying to work out decent, fair, equitable collective bargaining agreements. I know the abuse on both sides. I know the man in the middle certainly must live up to what I have announced as any major premise this morning, try to find out what the facts are, and you can't always be sure you've got them, and often you don't have them. You have such facts as they give you, and on the basis of that package of facts you have to make your recommendation. You have to be willing to change your mind when you get new facts.

A lot of people think of a politician who changes his mind as a bit queer, but I always change mine when the facts warrant it. So I want to tell you, I know the problems that confront this industry in the field of labor relations. That's why I think it is so important that we work out a procedure that we will see to it that your legitimate rights are protected through the procedure for it.

I think the second thing I would leave with you this morning, in addition to the premise that you talked about is this: I used to drill it into the heads of my law students from the first day they entered my class as freshmen until they graduated; I want you to remember it because it applies to all human institutions, whether it's a courtroom, whether it's a congress, whether it's an executive branch of government, or ladies aid society. The substantive rights, I used to say to my students, of your clients will be no better than their procedural rights in any tribunal before which their substantial rights are considered.

And that's true of labor negotiations. That's true of the National Labor Relations Board or any other board that has jurisdiction over labor problems, and true of any special board appointed by the President. That's why in the recent railroad dispute when the President asked me to write a bill, after I made clear that I would be no party to a compulsory arbitration bill (I happen to be one of the two senators that voted against the only compulsory arbitration bill that was ever passed by the Congress of the United States, and that was a sad day, 1963, and interestingly enough involved another railroad case) because the procedures of compulsory arbitration can't be squared with economic freedom.

And I'm at a loss to understand why some leaders of industry every once in a while, because they have bad experiences in so-called voluntarism, are willing to bring in a third man, or a third group to determine their economic way of life. I'll be no party to it. I'll not impose it on either employers or workers, and therefore I wrote for the President the bill which you know was passed.

A lot of criticism came from labor for the same procedure that we followed in the War Labor Board mediation during the war; yes, mediation with finality; but it was up to the parties to compromise their differences, and then it was up to the Board of Mediation, in this instance, the War Labor Board, to offer compromises to them, not sit in a judicial capacity, but to work out common sense agreements.

I know the kind of case that you have—the type of case that you have in mind, where you don't have the procedure that gives you the guarantee that I'm talking about. Over 2,100 cases during the war were settled on the basis of this kind of mediation procedure, but it was a procedure that guaranteed just voluntarism in the settlement, and not compulsion by way of seeking to dictate prices, and dictate operation policies, and dictate wages and hours, and conditions of employment.

If you think for a moment that I don't recognize the need for great changes in labor procedure on both sides of that table, you couldn't be more wrong. And I hope that this session of Congress and future sessions of Congress would be willing to come to grips with the need for reform here.

We'll take one more question then I'll have to leave.

Question. Senator, I'm a Canadian and I just wondered about your comment on this proposed new three percent tax subsidy on exports and three percent tax on imports. We're quite disturbed about this in Canada.

Senator Morse. I think you should be disturbed. I'm disturbed. But let me say, it goes to a more basic problem. I happen to be for open trade, but open trade calls for reciprocity. What we're confronted with, and I'm not talking hypothetically, what we're confronted with in American trade relations with so many countries is that it's become pretty much a one-way street, or predominantly most of the traffic is going one way, from our country to other countries, from the standpoint of the vehicles being concessions.

We're the ones that are making most of the concessions, and our allies and friends and neighbors are putting too many restraints upon us.

I mentioned the log problem, a problem with Japan. They want no restrictions on the exportations of logs, but it's perfectly all right for them to put weight restrictions upon finished products that we send into Japan; far outweigh our trade relations with them.

I speak most respectfully, and as a good neighbor we have some of those problems with Canada. We have some of those problems with Canada in the matter of lumber, and that's why there was this drive during the first year of the Kennedy administration, you remember, for a lumber quota on Canadian lumber. I thought it was unwise. I thought we ought to work it out by negotiations. And there was a joint commission, you may recall, it was set up by President Kennedy; great progress was made in trying to make this area of trade between the United States and Canada more reciprocal.

The basic problem here, I think, to meet this drive and it's a very, very heavy drive at the present time in Congress for more and more restrictions on the importation of goods is because, I'm sorry to say, we have been on the short end of it when it comes to reciprocal relations with countries with which we trade.

I wish I could tarry longer, because I learn more than you learn from me as I listen to your questions, and this is the way I learn. Thank you, very much. Good day.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it was with the utmost satisfaction and approval that I read President Johnson's message urging new legislation on behalf of the servicemen and veterans of the United States. It recommends the correction of inequities in existing laws, and it proposes in dramatic yet carefully considered fashion an entirely new field of endeavor in which returning veterans can continue to serve our great Nation.

I refer, of course, to the proposition that we create a corps of veterans in the public service, bringing their experience, their maturity and their patriotic zeal to the service of those who have been neglected and passed over in the complexities of our modern life.

This proposition, and I see this in full understanding of the deep, inner meaning of the words, is statesmanship of the highest most enduring type.

The President also directed our attention to an existing problem of the most personal nature to our veterans and their families. I refer to the urgent need to revamp the national cemetery system. I sincerely believe that nothing is more basic than a veteran's right to burial in a national cemetery if that be his wish. It is our sacred obligation to provide this choice. We are committed to find the most expedient method of correcting this situation. I have considered the matter, and it is my conclusion that the national cemetery system should be placed under the direction of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs. His agency is geared to meet the veterans' needs and it certainly has the facilities to solve the dilemma in a minimum amount of time. Therefore, I strongly recommend that we take the action necessary to accomplish this.

I will feel proud to endorse heartedly and without hesitation each of the President's proposals. In fact, I feel that we can do no less than to bring into speedy actuality the complete program offered by the President.

Not only will our veterans and those still in service be benefited by our action but the entire Nation will reap the rich reward of worthwhile endeavor in this brave attempt to solve, while facing a foe abroad, the problems that beset us at home.

ADDRESS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE AT MOUNT ST. MARY'S COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have just recently had the opportunity to read the inspiring address which Chief Justice Earl Warren made to the graduates of historic Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., last June 7, 1967, when he accepted an honorary degree from the college.

It was indeed fitting that the Chief Justice of the United States should address the 159th annual commencement of this great Catholic college which has been dedicated to the education of our Nation's youth since its founding in 1808 at Emmitsburg, Md., by the devout French priest, Father Dubois. There is a historic connection between Mount St. Mary's College and our Supreme Court. First, Father Dubois performed the marriage ceremony of Roger Brooke Taney on July 6, 1806, 2 years before the good father founded the college. As we know, Roger Brooke Taney served as Chief Justice of the United States from 1836 to 1864. Taneytown, situated in the beautiful western part of my State, is named for the family of the former Chief Justice.

Second, another Chief Justice of the United States, Edward D. White, of Louisiana, who served on the Court from 1910 to 1921, and his brother, James, attended the preparatory school of Mount St. Mary's in 1856.

Chief Justice Warren paid high tribute to the smaller colleges and universities, saying:

> Indeed, I think it can safely be said that the core of our system of higher education has from the very beginning been the smaller private colleges and universities.

He also challenged the 160 graduates to follow, each in his own way, the teachings of Pope John XXIII in his encyclical Pacem in Terris, which calls for the recognition of the dignity of all men.

Bishop T. Austin Murphy, the beloved auxiliary bishop of Baltimore, presided at the commencement exercises.

I cannot close my remarks without inviting the attention of Senators to the fact that my administrative assistant, John F. Sullivan, is a graduate of Mount St. Mary's College and was the first and only All-America basketball player that that distinguished college has ever had, and that the record he set while a student and a player there still stand.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Chief Justice be printed in the RECORD. I hope that Senators and all other persons interested in our small colleges and universities will read the speech. They will find it interesting, informative, and rewarding.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great privilege to be with you today and to participate in these Commencement Exercises at Mount St. Mary's College. It is an important day not only for you of the graduating class and your parents but for the members of the faculty, who can take justifiable pride in the recognition which is today being accorded to the accomplishments of the senior class.

This is the loveliest season of the year. Nature is adorned in her finest trappings, and it is the time when millions of students in thousands of American colleges, universities, and secondary schools complete another year of preparation for the advancement of human values in the society in which we live. It is the time of year when we renew our faith in the youth of America to carry on the quest for and make more meaningful the great goals of our Nation—freedom and equality of opportunity for all in a peaceful world.

It is the season when hundreds of thousands of the finest young minds in America complete their training and leave their sheltered college world to launch their careers into an unchartered and turbulent world. We have great faith in them and not only hope but believe that they will carry on in the finest American tradition. We believe they will not only grapple intelligently and humanely with the problems of the new day, but will also make significant gains in some of the age-old problems that we are bequeathing to them. And one cannot read our morning paper or view our television without appreciating how great some of those problems are.

There are two facets of the background of Mount St. Mary's which especially concern me because they involve two of my distinguished predecessors. One of these noteworthy historical items is that it was your founder, Father Dubois, who performed the marriage ceremony of Roger Brooke Taney on July 6, 1806, over two years before he established this college.

Of perhaps even greater interest is that another of my predecessors, Chief Justice White, attended Mount St. Mary's for a year. Both he and his brother, James, had come up from New Orleans and entered the preparatory course. That was in 1856, when Edward was only eleven years old. During his year at the Mount, White was given honorable mention for his work in arithmetic, as well as in French composition and translation. But aside from these conventional subjects, together with Writing, History, and Geography, this young lad, who was later to become Chief Justice, pursued other subjects which even you seasoned scholars of the graduating class will have to concede sound rather formidable today. These included the works of Ovid, Nepos, and Sallust in Latin, along with Latin Prosody. In addition, he studied Greek Grammar and Xenophon's *Anabasis*. That strikes me as constituting a rather impressive academic regimen for a mature college student, not to mention an eleven-year-old preparatory scholar.

The year that White attended Mount St. Mary's recalls another aspect of life in those days that will be of considerable interest to you parents in the audience. The annual fee for tuition and board was then $200.00. That fee included washing, mending, the use of bed and bedding, and an item described as "doctor's salary." Though current fees at the Mount seem extremely reasonable in comparison with those of many other institutions, one cannot help recollecting with pardonable nostalgia the charges when Chief Justice White was a preparatory student here. I believe it was Bennett Cerf, who recalling that at the time he was a youngster ten cents was a lot of money, remarked, "How dimes have changed!"

White served on the Supreme Court for 27 years, as an Associate Justice and later Chief Justice, from 1894 to 1921. During this period, marked by two wars, America became a major world power. Domestically, the epoch saw enormous industrial and commercial development and an increasing role by the national government in the country's affairs. Inevitably, the social and economic problems of the day were reflected in the litigation before the Court. White viewed the Constitution as an expanding document, flexible enough to respond to conditions not envisaged by the Founding Fathers. Rather than a "barrier to progress," it was to him "the broad highway through which alone true progress may be enjoyed."

Mount St. Mary's is what is generically known as a "small college." Why have the 850 young men in attendance here come to Emmitsburg instead of going to New York, Cambridge, New Haven, Los Angeles—or the many other seats of learning which are structured on a considerably larger scale? What do such places have that you don't? What do you possess that they lack? What, in short, is the place of the small college in America today? What is its future?

These are difficult questions and I am sure that there are no easy answers to them. But one thing I do know. There is today, as there has been for a long time in the past, a very distinct, unique, and highly significant place in the United States for the small liberal arts college, be it secular or religious, coeducational or not.

Indeed, I think it can safely be said that the core of our system of higher education has from the very beginning been the smaller private colleges and universities. They came into being before the great state universities and colleges, and throughout our history they have supplied the friendly competition essential in keeping our publicly supported universities and colleges alert and responsive to the needs of American youth. These private colleges are now numbered in the hundreds, and their graduates in the hundreds of thousands. These graduates, like the colleges from which they come, are found in every nook and corner of our land—in every line of human endeavor. In the aggregate, they represent a force of tremendous magnitude in our national life. Because the vast majority of these colleges have been founded for either a religious or other humanitarian purpose, they are leaven in the loaf of our society. To have operated so successfully in this category of educational institutions for almost 160 years as has Mount St. Mary's College should be a source of considerable satisfaction to all of you here today.

In our times, we are witnessing megalopolies, oligopolies, indeed bigness in infinite variety. This is true not only with respect to the economic and urban aspects of life in our Nation as we know it, but with respect to many other aspects as well. Though I do not maintain that in all circumstances the movement toward bigness is ominous, there is nevertheless an ever-present and distinct danger that our sense of values will be submerged in the process. This thought has been aptly expressed as far as educational trends are concerned by a prominent educator, Dean Brown of Princeton, when he said:

"In the climate of bigness and diversity which prevades America today there is danger that we may lose sight of those values in our society which size and complexity do not automatically enhance. In fact, there is reason to believe that bigness and diversity make it ever more difficult to reinforce in the minds and purposes of the multiplying numbers of persons and groups in our society the values which should motivate the whole."

Dean Brown went on to point out that the danger of attenuation of a sense of values in the very large university is evident in the way our institutions of higher learning have been developing. At the same time, these are the very institutions whose responsibility is the nurturing of our sense of values. Though he was addressing himself to what he termed "the squeeze on the liberal university," his comments apply with perhaps even greater force to the pressures on the small liberal arts colleges. They, too, stress values in our educational system which are somewhat different from those of the aggregates of educational, research, and service instrumentalities sometimes now known as "multi-versities."

What are some of these special qualities of the small college in comparison with those of the larger educational complexes? To paraphrase Dean Brown's analysis—the large institution appears to emphasize useful knowledge; the small college stresses humane values and the personal development of the individual student and scholar. The large institution assumes that values and dedication are a man's own business; the small college assumes that knowledge is but a means to attain wisdom and that it should, through its way of life and example, enhance the values and dedication of those participating in that way of life. The large institution accepts an attenuated sense of personality largely limited to prestige and easy visibility; the small college strongly maintains its sense of personality in the continuity and relationships of its trustees, alumni, faculty, and student body.

Yes, the small college still has much to offer and it would be a tragedy if it, too, should be a victim of bigness. The threats are real, and mostly of a financial nature. Income and endowment sources are not available on anything like the same scale that the larger universities command. Money from foundations usually goes to institutions which already have strong faculties and student bodies which have been highly selected. Similarly, federal money for higher education often goes for research and, therefore, often is not available to smaller institutions lacking in extensive research facilities. Colleges like yours which have made their contributions to the Nation and communities by providing education for the clergy and teachers as well as others not in the higher income brackets seldom enjoy the luxury of rich alumni. As was so aptly noted in connection with your recent Achievement Campaign, "Mount St. Mary's has been a place of lean purses and rich scholarship."

Though financial and related problems will continue to confront small colleges like yours, I do not for a moment believe that these problems are insuperable. As long as small colleges retain their perspective and perform in those areas where their special aptitudes lie, they will not only survive but they will prosper and continue to be what I previously described as "the leaven in the loaf of our society."

Though I am convinced that small colleges will remain a powerful and effective force in our society, one ominous cloud forces a qualification for hopeful appraisals of any sort. I refer to the persistent threat to world peace. If universal war should result from the conflicts which already rage in certain areas of the world or from the sources of disagreement which at any moment can lead to conflict elsewhere, everything that civilization has accomplished up to the present time will be destroyed.

I can think of no more fitting time than this perilous moment in world history, nor any more suitable occasion than a graduation exercise such as this to recall the teachings of one of the great men of history—the late Pope John XXIII—for no one has made a more impressive contribution in the pursuit of the search for peace than this great spiritual leader. He was able, as perhaps no one else within our memory, to appraise intuitively the hopes and the needs of mankind. He was a man of singular endowments, not the least of which was humility. In addition to his other great attributes, he possessed a fine sense of humor. If I may digress for a moment, I should like to recall one example. A visitor once asked Pope John how many men worked in the Vatican. "Half of them," the Pontiff replied.

Of the many accomplishments of Pope John's all too brief reign, one of the most outstanding was the Encyclical which he published in April 1963 entitled "Pacem in Terris." It is acknowledged in all quarters that this great document belongs to all people, to non-Catholics and Catholics alike. In fact, it is the first Encyclical in history ever addressed to "all men of good will" and not just to those "in peace and communion with the Apostolic See." This historic Papal proclamation is premised on the realization of the uniqueness of man and that his very survival depends upon resolution of differences to achieve the common cause of peace. As one commentator has expressed it, "It is not man's particularized beliefs but his own uniqueness that counts. For what threatens him is the loss of the basic conditions that make life meaningful and purposeful. The premise for this underlying postulate is made clear at the very outset of Pope John's Encyclical in these words:

"First of all, it is necessary to speak of the order which should exist between men. Any human society, if it is to be well ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature, which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable."

After eloquently detailing these precious rights which are man's heritage, Pope John reminds us that obligations exist as well as privileges. It is also clear in human society, the Pontiff is careful to note, that all persons have a duty to respect the rights of others. We would do well to bear these strictures in mind today. We are a people who value our rights and liberties. We acknowledge today, in partial atonement for the errors of the past, our failure to accord these rights to our minority groups. Yet, without diminishing our commitment to the meaningful vindication of those rights, we must see to it that they are realized consistently with the law and order that are the very bulwark of our society.

And just as is true in the area of domestic affairs, so in the relations of nations to one another, the rule of law and order must prevail. The Pope stresses the importance of a public authority with worldwide power and instituted by common consent. He expresses the hope that the United Nations Organization "may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day will come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person."

Within the compass of these few moments, I have not been able to do adequate justice to the "Pacem in Terris" Encyclical—indeed, I have not been able to probe more than the surface of its vast treasures. But, on this graduation day, I can think of no worthier commitment for the members of your Class of 1967 than to pledge yourselves to fulfilling as best you can the great promise which this document holds for mankind. You can do your part, humble and modest as it may seem, to make the Encyclical, not a document but a living reality, remembering, as I trust you will, the immortal words of our beloved late President Kennedy that: ". . . here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Our President designated Memorial Day, a week ago yesterday, as a day of prayer for permanent peace. He urged everyone to join him in prayer to the Almighty for the safety of our Nation's sons and daughters around the world, for His blessing on those who have sacrificed their lives for this Nation in this and all other struggles, and for His aid in building a world where freedom and justice prevail, and where all men live in friendship, understanding and peace. I trust that every one of us will join in that prayer not only for Memorial Day but for each and every day of the year.

In conclusion, I would like to say again that I have great faith in the young people of today, and I am confident you will make full use of the opportunities which lie before you. It is the simple truth that in this Nation each succeeding generation has had greater opportunities than the one which preceded it. Surely your generation is on the threshold of a great cycle of human advancement. The means are at hand for the loosening of the bonds of disease, hunger, ignorance, oppressive toil, and war. In realizing these objectives, you will explore, not only the far reaches of the space above us and the core of the earth beneath, but also the souls of men. I wish you every success as you pursue this exciting and challenging quest.

ADDING FUEL TO THE MIDDLE EAST FIRES—RESUMPTION OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO JORDAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers give added details concerning the resumption of fighting on the Jordanian-Israeli border.

It is no mere coincidence that the resumption of the border fighting came shortly after the United States announced that it was lifting the ban on military assistance to Jordan.

The Washington Post points out in an editorial this morning:

> There is no evidence that the purchase of American rather than Soviet arms would make Jordan a responsible, or more responsible, state, and there is the evidence of the June war to indicate contrarily that suppliers cannot control the use to which the recipients put their arms.

The resumption of open hostilities between Jordan and Israel certainly bear out the truth of this assumption.

On October 4, 1967, I said on the floor of the Senate:

> The time has come for the United States to view King Hussein realistically and not through illusory, rose-colored glasses. Further economic and military assistance to Jordan should be stopped at once and should not be resumed until Jordan has agreed to sit down at the peace table with Israel. If King Hussein chooses to squander his country's meager economic resources on armed aggression rather than on its economic development, he should not be supported in these rash endeavors by U.S. economic and military assistance.

How long will it take the United States to realize that in attempting to prop up King Hussein of Jordan time and time again the United States is relying on a weak reed indeed—a reed which is bent by every passing breeze.

In resuming arms shipments to Jordan, the United States is inviting the resumption of hostilities in the Middle East. Further than that, the United States is giving further evidence of the bankruptcy of U.S. foreign policies throughout the world—policies which are earning for the United States the enmity and not the continued friendship of more and more of the nations of the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from the Washington Post for February 16, 1968, entitled "Arms for Jordan" and the account by James Feron of the fighting on the Jordanian-Israel border as it appeared in the New York Times on the same date.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1968]

ARMS FOR JORDAN?

The stated reason for resuming arms shipments to Jordan—that otherwise Moscow would gain the upper hand—is a bad reason which does not justify the decision. The American interest in Jordan is not that the United States have more influence than the Soviet Union but that Jordan pursue regional peace. There is no evidence that the purchase of American rather than Soviet arms would make Jordan a responsible, or more responsibile, state, and there is the evidence of the June war to indicate contrarily that suppliers cannot control the use to which the recipients put their arms.

Jordan is weak but is it also in danger? Certainly not from Israel, which last June took from Jordan all it could possibly want. True King Hussein is in danger from his fellow Arabs, particularly Iraq, which still keeps 15,000 troops in Jordan. But who will argue that the United States ought to be sorting out Arab quarrels, at the cost of increasing tension and accelerating an arms race between the Arabs and Israel?

There may be one plausible reason for selling Jordan arms: that for his personal pride and his national bargaining position, King Hussein needs the increment of independence they would provide. This is not a consideration to be dismissed. But it does not outweigh the embarrassment of supplying arms to countries which would be likely to use them against each other, or the danger of building up the level of arms in a region still so far from peace. The extent of that embarrassment and the depth of that danger are clearer than ever after yesterday's savage outbreaks on the Jordan-Israel frontier.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1968]

ISRAELIS USE JETS IN DAYLONG CLASH WITH JORDANIANS—TANKS AND ARTILLERY ARE ALSO EMPLOYED IN BATTLE ACROSS RIVER—JERICHO SHELLED

(By James Feron)

JERUSALEM, February 15.—A battle between Israel and Jordan involving jets, tanks and artillery erupted today along the Jordan River. Israeli officials said that the west-bank town of Jericho had been shelled by the Jordanians.

The incident began, as have many others in the last few weeks, with an exchange of light-weapon fire across the river in the Beisan Valley, south of the Sea of Galilee.

The Israelis said that the Jordanians had started the shooting and that, unlike recent incidents, they had begun to bombard settlements on the Israeli side of the border.

[The Tel Aviv radio reported that firing stopped late Thursday night and a similar announcement was made in Amman by a Jordanian spokesman, according to The Associated Press.]

Shells crashed into about 15 houses in Kfar Ruppin and several buildings were hit in Maoz Haiyim. By midafternoon the settlements of Gesher and Beit Yosef had come under fire.

ISRAELI PLANES CALLED IN

The Israelis, who had been returning the fire, called in their air force at this point, and within minutes the Israeli jets were striking at targets within a 10-mile band on the east side of the river.

[Maj. Gen. Moshe Daynan, the Israeli Defense Minister, canceled a visit to the United States, which was due to have begun Friday.]

Witnesses said that Jordanian antiaircraft fire was coming from within villages in the area and that the Israeli jets were hitting these positions. They were pounding positions in the foothills of the plateau and on the plateau itself.

By nightfall, when these Jordan River exchanges usually end, shells continued to fall on both sides. Soon the shelling extended southward along the river, which forms the ceasefire line on the eastern border of the west-bank territory.

The Israelis reported that by about 8 P.M. the town of Jericho had come under Jordanian artillery fire. It was the first time that this historic town was involved in one of the river exchanges.

Israeli officials said that firing continued at a heavy pace at several other points along the river. It was not known whether the jets continued their attacks after dark.

Israeli military officials declined to discuss the day's activities, presumably because shooting was still going on long after nightfall.

Earlier in the day, Arab civilians from the west bank and Jerusalem crossed the Allenby Bridge, near Jericho, without hindrance. One of the last travelers to cross, at about 4 P.M., said it was an eerie and frightening experience.

He said that both sides had pulled back for about half a mile from the bridge, once a thriving passageway, where Israeli and Jordanian soldiers, officials and travelers mingled.

This time, the West-Bank and Jerusalem Arabs, who had crossed a few days earlier with passes issued by the Israeli authorities, returned across a virtual no man's land between the Jordanian and Israeli officials, both of whom were still polite and accommodating in their more protected positions.

PLANES HEARD OVER JERUSALEM

During the day, jets and light aircraft could be heard occasionally over Jerusalem.

Todays air force strike followed warnings issued by Israeli Government leaders for the last few days in response to what they have asserted to be mounting Jordanian provocations.

It also seemed to underline the Israeli decision to forego the prewar type of retaliation raid, which was usually launched after several sabotage and terrorist incidents, or the massive but delayed response such as the shelling of the Egyptian refineries in Port Suez a few days after the sinking of the destroyer Elath.

Defense officials are understood to now

favor the immediate response, such as trading artillery shell for artillery shell or the jet strike in reply to what the Israelis said today was the well prepared shelling of civilian settlements.

THIRD USE OF AIR POWER

The air force strike was the third such use of air power by the Israelis on the Jordanian front since the end of the six-day war last June.

It was similar to the encounter on Jan. 8, when Israeli jets attacked Jordanian positions after the shelling of Kfar Ruppin and Maoz Haiyim. The first air strike came in November, after an Israeli jet had been shot down by the Jordanians.

The Israelis said that they had not lost any planes. One civilian and one soldier were wounded in today's exchange, according to the Israeli report.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1968]

Jordan Says Fighting Rages

Amman, Jordan, February 15.—Fighting was raging tonight between Israel and Jordanian troops all along the cease-fire line between the two countries.

By late tonight, the shelling, with both sides using artillery and tanks, had gone on for about six hours.

A military spokesman said here tonight that Israeli artillery was shelling a large area of Jordan and concentrating on the villages of Zamalia, Wakkau, Vakhraba and Es-Sammeh, in the northern Jordan Valley.

Earlier today, a spokesman said four Israeli fighters had been hit by Jordanian anti-aircraft fire. [Israel later denied this.]

Israeli aircraft swept over the border and bombed Jordanian positions shortly after the clash started with a tank and artillery barrage on Jordanian advance posts in the Jordan Valley, the spokesman said.

DAYAN CANCELS U.S. TRIP

Maj. Gen. Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Minister of Defense, who was scheduled to arrive here today, has canceled his visit, according to word received by the United Jewish Appeal.

General Dayan was scheduled to have made several speeches for the fund-raising group. It was believed that his decision to cancel the trip was forced by the new fighting between his country and Jordan.

ARMS SHIPMENTS TO JORDAN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the State Department announcement that the United States will resume arms shipments to Jordan causes me grave concern. This decision appears to be entirely contrary to the establishment of a permanent peace in the Middle East and to the protection of the vital interest of the United States.

Regrettably, the Arab nations refuse to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. They openly admit that their foreign policy is based upon a plan to destroy Israel.

In this tragic and almost unbelievable adventure they are armed and abetted by the Soviet Union.

We are committed to the preservation of Israel's integrity and independence and her ability to exist among her Middle East neighbors. But now it appears that we are about to feed the hand that bites her.

The answer of course is to end the arms race, not to contribute to it.

Look at what happened yesterday. In Washington, the announcement was made that the United States has decided to resume arms shipments to Jordan. At the same time, Jordan and Israel were engaged in the most serious outbreak of fighting since the end of the war last June.

The main purchase item that interests Jordan is expected to be several squadrons of U.S. F-104 supersonic starfighters.

Just a few weeks ago, Israel Premier Levi Eshkol was in the United States to also seek supersonic fighters from this country.

The United States has not publicly announced a decision on Israel's request for assistance.

But it is known that Maj. Gen. Amer Kammash, Chief of Staff of the Jordanian Army, was in the United States for 3 weeks of secret preliminary negotiations at the Pentagon.

We talk of peace but now are apparently about to supply the tools of war to an avowed aggressor. To me this policy seems to be most inconsistent.

Bluntly stated, this is the situation:

First. The Arab nations were the aggressors in the war last June.

Second. Since that war, the Soviet Union has undertaken a massive resupplying of arms to the Arab States.

Third. Whatever interpretation might be placed on Jordan's position, there is no doubt where Jordan stands. Jordan was at war with Israel last June, and is still at war with Israel.

From the developments of the past several months, I believe the U.S. policy in the Middle East should be based on these fundamental points:

First. There should be no arms shipments of any kind to Arab nations. Rather, to preserve the balance of power that Israel must have, the United States should honor Israel's request for the jet fighters she needs to counter the Soviet-supplied arms buildup in the Arab states.

Second. All efforts must continue in the United Nations for establishment of a permanent cease fire and peace in the Middle East.

Third. Both Israel and Arabs alike must share a joint responsibility for the permanent resettlement of a generation of refugees.

Fourth. Agreement also must be reached among the nations of the Middle East on policies and programs to assure the adequacy of water supply and use of water resources in an area where the availability of water is a major factor.

This is the policy that will best serve the United States and our goals in the Middle East. It is a policy that is severely shattered by the decision to resume arms shipments to Jordan. That decision should be rescinded.

Mr. President, the Washington Post, in today's editions, contained an editorial on this subject with which I fully agree. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arms for Jordan?

The stated reason for resuming arms shipments to Jordan—that otherwise Moscow would gain the upper hand—is a bad reason which does not justify the decision. The American interest in Jordan is not that the United States have more influence than the Soviet Union but that Jordan pursue regional peace. There is no evidence that the purchase of American rather than Soviet arms would make Jordan a responsible, or more responsible, state, and there is the evidence of the June war to indicate contrarily that suppliers cannot control the use to which the recipients put their arms.

Jordan is weak but is it also in danger? Certainly not from Israel, which last June took from Jordan all it could possibly want. True, King Hussein is in danger from his fellow Arabs, particularly Iraq, which still keeps 15,000 troops in Jordan. But who will argue that the United States ought to be sorting out Arab quarrels, at the cost of increasing tension and accelerating an arms race between the Arabs and Israel?

There may be one plausible reason for selling Jordan arms: that for his personal pride and his national bargaining position, King Hussein needs the increment of independence they would provide. This is not a consideration to be dismissed. But it does not outweigh the embarrassment of supplying arms to countries which would be likely to use them against each other, or the danger of building up the level of arms in a region still so far from peace. The extent of that embarrassment and the depth of that danger are clearer than ever after yesterday's savage outbreaks on the Jordan-Israel frontier.

AMERICA DOWN THE DRAIN?

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a most perceptive editorial appeared in the Arizona Republic last Sunday. It cites Nikolai Lenin's 1917 prophecy that America would "spend herself out of existence."

Furthermore, the Republic's editorial writer points out that Lenin's predictions about Germany and England have already come to pass.

Mr. President, I am convinced that it lies within the power of this body, the Senate of the United States, to see to it that the prophecy of one of the founding fathers of international communism does not come true. If the courage and integrity of the American people can be expressed correctly through their elected representatives in the Senate, I think the Republic may yet be rescued from the reckless course charted by this administration and go on to prove Lenin wrong.

So that Senators may have the benefit of this perceptive editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 11, 1968]

Will America Also Go Down the Drain?

"Germany will militarize herself out of existence, England will expand herself out of existence, and America will spend herself out of existence." So said Nikolai Lenin in 1917.

Germany has fulfilled the prophecy. England has fulfilled the prophecy. America is in the process of doing so.

Our country has already reached the point where our profligate, wasteful, extravagant and unnecessary government spending is threatening the entire future of our nation and our people. We keep being reassured that we can afford all those billions, that "the people" need or want these expensive programs at home and abroad, that we only owe our huge debt to ourselves. But the dollar is in trouble. Inflation is increasing. We are losing gold at unprecedented rates. And taxes are still increasing.

In 1960 our total federal budget was $94 billion. Last year it was almost double that—$172 billion. The President has asked for $186 billion for 1969. And every state is increasing expenses and increasing taxes.

Do we really need to spend all these billions? Do "the people" want to be taxed all those billions?

There have been 112 "new" federal programs since 1960. The President has asked for 16 new ones this year. Since 1960 only one federal program has been abolished. All the rest have been increased. Congress last year increased the budget by $13.5 billion—more than the biggest total budget of Roosevelt's peacetime years!

We have spent $152 billion on foreign aid and interest on what we borrowed to spread this money around to more than 100 countries. What good did it do? What good did it do you? What good is it doing now?

There is $23 billion "in the pipeline" for foreign aid—all so far unspent. Yet the President keeps asking for more and more billions to add to it!

Do you want to spend the $36.5 million Vice President Humphrey just promised to send to the Ivory Coast while the President was proposing a tax on American tourists going abroad?

The administration is spending millions to beautify our highways and tear down ugly signs. At the same time it is spending $5 million to erect new signs to put up along the highways!

Do you want to pay taxes to finance a $2,350 picnic shelter in Manitowoc County, Wis.? How about the $2.5 million we spent to build houses in Rio de Janeiro? The $1 million we spent on trains in Thailand? The $1.5 million we spent on a WAC barracks in Maryland just before the WACs were sent to Florida? Or the $45,000 flagpole?

You paid $33,398 for 130 knobs at the Pentagon that retailed at only $210. You paid for 27,000 tons of food that was just plain "lost" overseas. That cost $4.3 million, or the same amount that an entire city of 10,000 people pay each year in income taxes.

You are paying the salaries of 276,000 more federal employes this year than last. Nondefense spending has almost doubled since 1960. The national debt has increased 14 times since 1960. Since President Johnson entered the White House, your cost of living has increased 9 per cent!

The Federal government spends $17 billion on "research." That is enough by itself to wipe out this year's inflation-producing deficit. What is this research for? Nobody knows. The Library of Congress tried to find out and reported that nobody in the federal government knows how many research laboratories are federally financed or where they are!

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spends more than $100 million a year on research programs like "Understanding the Fourth Grade Slump in Creative Thinking." The Commerce Department spent $95,000 to find out why shipping rates are lower on imported goods than exported goods.

The National Science Foundation financed a study of the 1966 governor's campaign in Maryland. What on earth for? The National Institutes of Health spent $11,782 to finance "A Social History of French Medicine 1789–1815." It spent $10,917 for "Emergence of Political Leadership; Indians in Fiji."

The Office of Economic Opportunity shelled out $39,000 to find out why some underprivileged youths reacted favorably to "It's What's Happening, Baby"—a nationally televised rock and roll show praising the Job Corps. The National Science Foundation gave Stephen Smale, who organized demonstrations aimed at halting troop trains in California, $6,556 of your tax money to go to Europe!

U.S. government agencies subsidize with your taxes $2 billion a year in university "research." The result has been that 40,000 professors have stopped teaching to do federal "research." Dr. W. T. Lippincott of Ohio State University calls federal research grants "the most powerful destructive force the higher education system ever faced."

Is all this, and much more, really necessary? Is it even desirable? Does it do any good for the people of the United States who support it? Do you "demand" these services, implore your federal government to start new programs at the rate of more than 100 every 10 years?

The average American is being taken by his government and its sycophants to the tune of billions of dollars. He gets nothing back but the bills for hundreds of unnecessary and useless programs that the government loads on his back.

How much can you take? How much can the nation take? How much, before we go down in the dust under this intolerable burden?

Unless this is stopped—and soon—Lenin will be proved right. "America will spend herself out of existence" and we will all lose the "last best hope of earth" to the tyranny of communism.

VIETNAM MYTHS AND FALLACIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Emmet John Hughes, writing in Newsweek for February 19, 1968, cogently analyzes the reasons for the tragic military involvement of the United States in Vietnam, points out that the American people must face one overriding truth in facing the current day of reckoning with respect to the inevitable disintegration of U.S. policies in Vietnam:

> The reckoning was inevitable because it was forever flawed. Such a truth is almost too bitter to bear . . . its full warning is not to be read as a matter of what America *failed* to do but what America *tried* to do.

He points out that the Vietnam "tragedy" was structured on four elements:

> I. *The Abuse of History.*—The dogged insistence that the war in Vietnam signaled precisely the same political commitment as all U.S. actions since World War II . . . deterring Communist aggression. On the contrary: . . . *No* previous conflict cast America in the audacious role of an effective heir to hated colonial authority . . . *No* previous conflict engaged America in the audacious labor of creating a new sovereignty . . . You cannot truly win a conflict that you cannot truthfully define.
>
> II. *The Extravagance of Pretense.*—A policy so grandiose would have had to (1) admit the absence of any national tradition of democratic self-government, (2) budget the American cost for the crusade at $25 billion annually and an expeditionary force of at least 500,000 men, (3) insist on the populace's agreeable appreciation of a war making 20 per cent of them refugees, and (4) enjoin against impatient demands for political success in less than ten to fifteen years.
>
> III. *The Tyranny of Weakness.*—The whole strategy of American bombing followed not from any illusion of mortally hurting the north but from the exigency of morally helping the south. . . .
>
> IV. *The Fertility of Falsehood.*—Thus the fixed American dogma on the Vietnam upheaval—not truly civil war but naked foreign aggression—almost inexorably made believing Americans confused witness to the whole conflict, as they positively predicted the collapse of Viet Cong morale or jauntily presumed the loyalty of the cities to Saigon and their gratitude to Washington. . . .

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent analysis in Newsweek by Mr. Hughes of the fallacies upon which U.S. military involvement in Vietnam are founded be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Feb. 19, 1968]

THE LUCKY AMERICANS

(By Emmet John Hughes)

As America now ponders the price of its policy in Asia, the quest for any healing wisdom must begin with the facing of one truth: the reckoning has been inevitable, for the policy was forever fatally flawed. Such a truth is almost too bitter to bear. For many, it will be so much easier to explain away the Vietnam tragedy in terms of cruel misfortunes or chance misjudgments. But this kind of history has not been decreed by blunders—but by premises. It has not been ruled by anguishing circumstance but by avowed purpose. And its full warning is not to be read as a matter of what America *failed* to do but what America *tried* to do.

The tragedy, in short, has a structure. Of what elements has it been built—from the beginning? To name them—too bluntly and too simply . . .

I—The Abuse of History.—The fateful basis for national policy has been the false analogy—the dogged insistence that the war in Vietnam signaled precisely the same political commitment as all U.S. actions since World War II, from Greece to Korea, deterring Communist aggression. On the contrary: the intervention in Vietnam has been unique and unprecedented. To cite but two governing facts . . . *No* previous conflict cast America in the role of an effective heir to hated colonial authority, alienating rather than arousing nationalist pride. And *no* previous conflict engaged America in the audacious labor of *creating* a new sovereignty, rather than shielding an authentic sovereignty-in-being . . . A policy disdainful of such historic differences could have but one end. You cannot truly win a conflict that you cannot truthfully define.

II—The Extravagance of Pretense.—If a quixotic claque of liberal dreamers had conceived, for some imaginary foreign realm, a policy so grandios as the American design for Vietnam democracy, the nation's conservative chorus would have laughed and yelled its derision. For the matching design for this remote Camelot would have had to (1) admit the absence of any national tradition of democratic self-government, (2) budget the American cost for the crusade at $25 billion annually and an expeditionary force of at least 500,000 men, (3) insist on the populace's agreeable appreciation of a war making 20 per cent of them refugees, and (4) enjoin against impatient demands for political success in less than ten to fifteen years. Yet such an unworldly fantasy has appeared wondrously transformed into a sober matter of national security. Such is the miraculous anointing power of the sacred cause of anti-Communism. Thus blessed, the whole scheme remained, of course, entirely irrational. It simply became indisputably holy.

III—The Tyranny of Weakness.—There is no more notorious danger for a great power than to shape decision and action to fit the wants and weaknesses of a small power. Yet this has been the very pattern of Washington's alliance with Saigon. The whole strategy of American bombing followed not from any illusion of mortally hurting the north but from the exigency of morally helping the south—at a time when Saigon seemed stumbling to defeat. And the government sustained by such drastic devices thus came to possess but one kind of strength—the arrogant assurance that, since the commitment of America could be viewed as irrevocable, the counsel of America could be ignored as irrelevant.

IV—The Fertility of Falsehood.—From the distorted definition of reality, there must follow the monotonously false observations of events, as judgment is twisted to conform to premise. Thus the fixed American dogma on the Vietnam upheaval—not truly civil war but naked foreign aggression—almost inexorably made believing Americans confused witness to the whole conflict, as they positively predicted the collapse of Viet Cong morale or jauntily presumed the loyalty of the cities to Saigon and their gratitude to Washington. And so the chain of snarled inference goes on—until the American commander hails as a triumph the recent devastation and a new army of refugees 345,000 strong.

There is a final measure to be taken of this tragic American mission. The belligerency of North Korea has served as sudden reminder of what has been almost smugly forgotten: the power of "the Communist conspiracy," all these years, to spread the agony in Vietnam to other arenas. Obviously the crisis in Asia today could already have become appallingly *more* grave . . . *if* China had not been locked in its own civil strife . . . *if* its schism with Russia had not widened . . . or *if* Communism were, in short, the monolithic menace of American mythology.

So the future historian may look back upon the grim present only to conclude, surprisingly but sensibly: the Americans were incredibly lucky. The Communist world did not behave by the cunning and dreadful prescriptions of American folklore. And the historic cost of the American adventure was dramatically reduced by happy contingencies entirely beyond American contriving or foreseeing.

There remains for us but to wonder whether a mindless reliance on reprieve-by-chance holds much promise of a long life to a great power.

GOVERNMENT PRESS SECRETARIES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, an appreciation and understanding of how the world learns about many of the important news developments at the White House, Department of State, and the Department of Defense is extremely valuable today.

In an era of fast-breaking, crucial news stories, the capacity of individual citizens to interpret for themselves the significance of each story is essential to the strength of our Nation.

News correspondent Donald R. Larrabee recently described the men who speak for the President, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, in a feature story for the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram.

Mr. Larrabee profiled Presidential Press Secretary George Christian, the State Department spokesman, Robert McCloskey, and the Defense Department spokesman, Phil Goulding. Mr. Larrabee's description of these men's jobs and the sensitivity of their work is especially significant today, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Larrabe's article appear in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON LARRABEE TAKES YOU BACKSTAGE IN CRISIS NEWS

WASHINGTON.—In the White House at high noon last Monday, after a week-end in which the crisis over the USS Pueblo had gotten no better or no worse, George Christian, 41, the rotund, pleasant, impassive presidential press secretary, held his regular briefing with reporters. He said virtually all that anyone in government would say—officially at least—that day.

Christian's is a powerful voice because it is the voice of the President and, indeed, the Administration. He speaks with authority and he never speaks without the President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense knowing generally what he will say, on matters of global importance.

Before he enters the room to face the regular White House reporters—and the dozens of others who are attracted to the Executive Mansion by an international crisis—Christian has already:

Spent vital minutes with the President himself, possibly in his bedroom, reviewing the latest intelligence reports and the current status of our Korean involvement. He has a thorough understanding of the President's purpose and the Government's posture.

Conferred with Richard Moose, foreign service officer, borrowed a few months ago from the State Department to work with the President's national security adviser, Walt Whitman Rostow. Moose has talked with high-level officials at the State and Defense Departments, going over the existing situation point-by-point and laying the groundwork for the "policy line" that will be voiced throughout the Government during the day.

Checked with the official spokesman at the Defense Department, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Phil G. Goulding, and the State Department's official press spokesman, Deputy assistant secretary Robert J. McCloskey. These men decide on where the responsibility will rest for making certain statements. The important point is that Goulding and McCloskey know basically what the White House will tell the world when the regular late-morning briefing is held. There will be one voice and one policy position and McCloskey, in his routine 12:30 briefing with State Department correspondents, and Goulding, in his more informal chats with the Pentagon reporters, will not deviate from it.

When the "briefing" call is sounded at the White House, especially in a time of crisis, one word can be important—and world capitals are listening. The press corps knows the cautious, taciturn Mr. Christian will not open his mouth unless he has the word straight from the President.

Cape Elizabeth's Harold (Hal) Pachios, who was part of the White House press staff until a few months ago, put it this way: "Every word attributed to the President is significant. Every sentence will be taken apart and put together again 15 times, not only by the press in this country but also by intelligence forces of foreign countries."

On this particular Monday, after a grim uncertain week-end, Christian has in his hand a carefully-prepared statement which he will either read or use as a basis to answer questions. He begins by calmly stating that he expects the President will be meeting off and on during the day with senior advisers on the Pueblo situation . . . just as he has been over the week-end and for the past few days. The President has talked with McNamara, Rusk, Rostow and others by phone.

"Can you characterize where it stands now?" a reporter asks.

Christian glances down at his notes and proceeds, without emotion: "We're continuing our efforts to reach a peaceful solution. The security council is meeting again this afternoon. There are a number of other channels available to us which are active at this time. It wouldn't be desirable to discuss these. The International Committee of the Red Cross is attempting to contact the North Korean Red Cross to get information on the crew and the identity of our casualties. We've heard nothing further on this since the request was made to the Red Cross last Friday."

"Has the president been in contact with (Soviet) Premier Kosygin?"

Christian repeats that there are some things that can't properly be discussed. He then moves on to an obviously prepared text. He emphasizes the United States is engaged in a "prudent, orderly and limited deployment" of its forces in the area. He calls attention to the President's remarks of the previous Friday that these moves are "precautionary". He reiterates that these matters will not be discussed in specifics at the White House briefings.

A reporter says he heard former Under Secretary of State George Ball predict on a television show that the Pueblo's crew would be released in two weeks. Christian gives no credence to the thought that there is any official timetable. He smiles when the reporter says Ball was willing to bet $10 the men would be released. "I hope he wins," says Christian.

"Do we know where the men of the crew are?" he is asked.

"I would hesitate to speculate," Christian replies.

That's it—and the reporters move out to file stories which they can attribute to the White House. The quotes are those of George Christian, Press Secretary. But the office of the President of the United States stands behind them.

Christian, a 41-year-old native Texan who began his newspaper career as a sports writer in Temple, Tex., came to the White House via professional political press chores for two Texas governors, including the current one, John Connally. He moved into his present job when Bill D. Moyers left the President about two years ago.

Although many reporters find him difficult to take, since he seemingly has so little to give in the way of hard news, Christian is probably the ideal spokesman for a man like Lyndon Johnson. They now understand Christian is entitled to be present whenever and wherever there's a "happening" involving his boss.

To gather new material for this Telegram article. I saw George Christian in his offie after the briefing last Monday. Christian unwound slightly and explained his role and his approach to the job of chief information coordinator for the most powerful government in the world:

"Normally, I talk to the President at least twice a day in advance of my morning and afternoon press briefings. But, in reality, we keep a running dialogue all day long. The main protection I have is that I attend everything the President attends. Anything he does, I have a right to be there. If you're oblivious to what's going on, you're helpless."

Our talk was interrupted by a call from State's Department spokesman Robert McCloskey who had just completed his noon-hour briefing of the press. Christian confirmed that he had voiced the official line for the day. McCloskey said there had been nothing untoward at his briefing. He had answered a question clarifying our Vietnam position on a bombing halt. Christian had not been asked the question. If he had, the White House Press Secretary was prepared to give the very answer given by McCloskey.

Christian said, with an audible sigh, that things had gone well around town since the Pueblo crisis erupted. The lines of communication with the Pentagon and State Department now seem well established. But Christian lives in fear that there will be a breakdown.

"The magnitude of it causes the whole thing to wobble some times," he remarks, recalling the uproar last June during the Middle East crisis when McCloskey told his "briefing" that the United States was intent on being neutral in thought, word and deed.

"It didn't take us long to realize that what he said had been construed rather hard," Christian recalls. "He didn't mean it quite the way it sounded, as if the United States was above assuming any responsibility in the situation.

"I didn't want to leave the White House and McCloskey in complete conflict: But Im afraid I did an inadequate job of trying to explain the difference between neutrality and non-belligerency. Finally, I prevailed on Secretary Dean Rusk, who was at the White House, to see the press as he left the building. He drew the proper distinction and it helped. After all, Rusk was someone to quote who overrode both me and McCloskey."

M'CLOSKEY

Aside from a crisis situation of the current variety, Christian likes to operate with a "minimum of overlay" in relation to his counterparts at State and the Pentagon. He admires and respects McCloskey and Goulding, both former newsmen who have proven their good judgment. Bob McCloskey, who joined the Department as a foreign service staff officer some 12 years ago, has been in the Bureau of Public Affairs since 1957. He worked for a paper in Bethlehem, Pa. and with the Associated Press before entering government service.

Christian says he feels the State Department, generally speaking, ought to be the spokesman on foreign policy "and I want to keep the White House out of any detailed discussion of things that ought to be handled in State Department briefings."

The White House Press Secretary adheres to the view that the State Department is more closely in touch with developments, moment to moment, and in a better position to keep conflict at a minimum if there's not too much White House involvement.

GOULDING

By the same token, he would rather leave detailed discussion of military leaders in the expert hands of the very affable and capable Goulding who, while on the job for only about one year, had been a deputy to former Pentagon Press Chief Arthur Sylvester for about two years. More importantly, Goulding spent 15 years in Washington for the Cleveland Plain Dealer where he specialized in military and defense coverage.

Goulding, incidentally, has two deputies who know their way around the Pentagon which is both a mental and physical feat. They are Richard Fryklund, long the respected military editor of the Washington Evening Star and Dan Z. Henkin who covered the Pentagon for the Journal of the Armed Forces.

Old Pentagon hands see not much difference between a crisis situation and the day to day operations in the long corridor that separates the regular Defense Department press corps and the civilian brass.

"Goulding sees the Secretary every morning and throughout the day, as necessary. He's kept up to date. He can get special briefings from anyone when he needs to. He keeps in touch with the State Department and the White House at the public affairs level. He's very close to McNamara (and presumably will be with Clark Clifford, the incoming Secretary).

"When Goulding gets ready to drop around to the press room to give one of his irregular briefings, he might pick up the telephone and call McNamara to tell him what he proposes to say—just to be certain he's in line. Goulding's office is pretty much open all day. He runs an informal shop," one of his close associates explained.

BACKGROUNDERS

When Christian, McCloskey and Goulding speak at their formal briefings, they are usually quoted in their capacities as official spokesmen. But no examination of Washington news coverage would be complete without at least a cursory glance at the way news is developed from the unofficial sources who must not be identified, except as "Defense officials" or "high government sources" or "usually well informed sources." There are a variety of attributory expressions which are supposed to lend authenticity to the views.

In the Pueblo crisis—as in all others—newsmen are desperately trying to get something more than what is being offered by the official spokesmen. They seek out the known workhorses in the State Department and the Pentagon, the advisers and the experts who help to shape decisions. They may not learn any real secrets but they quite possibly will obtain clarification so that an interpretative article can be written, stating that "The real meaning of today's events is . . . etc. . . ."

In this context, a Defense Department news officer referred to the Pentagon as a "five-sided sieve". He hastened to assure me that military men are not leaking defense secrets willy-nilly but he indicated that many are willing to talk privately within their area of competence.

This is not necessarily bad, if it helps a reporter's understanding of a complex defense development. But the situation can get a bit sticky when a man, like Gen. William Westmoreland comes to town and agrees to visit a few newsmen for an off-the-record "backgrounder."

The General last Fall attended a private party at the home of the Baltimore Sun's military writer Charles Corddry. He agreed to talk without any of the reporters present attributing the remarks to him. Westmoreland made news at the dinner and some of the reporters who were not present were able to report the source of the information on our plans to turn over more of the fighting to the South Vietnamese.

The "backgrounder" is, in fact, a journalistic ritual in Washington nowadays. Almost every Thursday, Secretary McNamara meets with a little band of Pentagon journalists to talk over weapons, budgets, strategy and politics. Usually, the American people learn next day about what U.S. officials think. They are not told that the thinking is that of the top U.S. defense official.

A similar performance takes place at the State Department, usually around 6 p.m. on Fridays. Secretary Rusk's remarks may appear as coming from a "high official", "people in a position to know" or "government experts."

There is a danger, the critics say, that reporters may swallow the material that arises from backgrounders, without realizing that some people use them to promote pet projects and policies. George Christian indicated that the White House often gets trapped by a remark made by a foreign diplomat which can't be refuted easily but which tends to lend credence to the "credibility gap" charge.

"We're defenseless against this sort of thing," he said.

There have been instances, though, when newsmen have been contacted by diplomatic representatives of other countries to become intermediaries with the Government. The most notable recent publicized incident was that of ABC's John Scali who was picked by the Soviets to play a key role in diplomatic negotiations at the height of the Cuban missile crisis.

During the Kennedy years, Press Secretary Pierre Salinger deliberately set out to coordinate all important news of the executive branch because of the embarrassment of the Eisenhower Administration in the U-2 incident. Salinger said the Administration's response to that incident in 1960 was an "information catastrophe". Within hours of the time Francis Gary Powers was shot down over Communist Armenia, four different Washington press officers put out four different stories. We appeared to be lying in our teeth, as Salinger put it.

And so Kennedy's press officer formalized the clearance of top-level information at the White House level. He felt strongly that the President had a right to expect that his Administration would speak with one tongue and in support of his policies.

Christian told me he has abandoned the coordinating committee and holds no such meetings. He himself, is part of the important "Tuesday lunch" at the White House where top officials of the State and Defense Departments, CIA Director Richard Helms and one or two officials on the security staff may well reach some of our most important life-or-death decisions. Because he is part of this inner circle, Christian is not operating in a vacuum when he speaks.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have been more accessible to reporters than any of their predecessors. They have met with them privately and tossed their ideas around with the clear understanding that the views were not to be attributed to the President. Generally, this sort of thing does not happen in a period of crisis, however.

Ted Sorensen says Kennedy's general experience, particularly with the State Department and the Pentagon, was that those who knew, didn't tell and those who told, didn't know. Sorensen, who was Kennedy's right hand man, recalls that the late President's general rule was to say relatively little to a newsman in confidence, even off the record, that he could not afford to have published. President Johnson has followed the same practice.

PRESIDENT MOVES TO MODERNIZE OUR AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, President Johnson's consumer message is particularly notable for its proposal to launch the first nationwide study of America's automobile insurance system.

While every American must be concerned with automobile insurance—none can be completely satisfied with it. Consumer complaints have escalated as rapidly as insurance costs and cancellations.

Premiums have soared by as much as 30 percent over the past 6 years in some areas. Arbitrary coverage and unexpected cancellations are all too common—particularly for our minorities, the young and elderly, and the American serviceman. Automobile accident claims often result in grossly unfair compensation—as well as agonizingly slow payment. Courts are so clogged with automobile accident cases that the average claim takes from 2 to 3 years just to get to trial.

An enlightened nation can—and must—do better, for the problem has reached epic proportions.

The President's proposed study can lay the foundation for new legislation—to streamline and modernize an antiquated and inequitable system. I support such a study because it can be, in the words of the Baltimore Sun, of "immense value to the industry itself, to State insurance officials, and ultimately to all consumers."

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the Baltimore Sun editorial along with an editorial in the Houston Chronicle praising the President's proposal.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 8, 1968]

Consumer Laws

The President and Congress are playing "can you top this?" in the field of consumer legislation, and the consumer is the certain winner. Three times in the past three years Congress has improved on Administration proposals in the consumer protection field. This year the President has recommended the most far-reaching proposals ever. Among the many abuses he wants stopped are those involving unhealthy fish and poultry, various sales frauds, and unsafe pleasure boats. All invite legislation.

The President also recommends an investigation of the automobile insurance industry by the Department of Transportation. Certainly an investigation is needed. In recent years policyholders' complaints have escalated as fast as costs and cancellations have. A thorough, honest, nonpolitical study would be of immense value to the industry itself, to state insurance officials, and ultimately to all consumers.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 8, 1968]

Something for the Consumer

The most recent message to Congress from the President, urging measures to provide broader protection for consumers, will probably receive more friendly attention than other presidential communications which have been delivered in this session.

The "consumer mood" built up in the last session and resulted in passage of the wholesome meat act, stricter control over flammable fabrics, establishment of a product safety commission, and a law to improve clinical laboratories.

Only last week the House overwhelmingly approved a truth-in-lending bill. In this election year, Congress can be expected to be even more consumer (voter) conscious than in previous sessions.

Included in Mr. Johnson's consumer message are new proposals to insure the sale of wholesome fish and poultry, to protect individuals from radiation from such items as color television sets, and to encourage safe boating.

The suggestion with the broadest appeal, however, is for a comprehensive study of the automobile insurance system which the President properly labeled a "mess." The search for ways to improve the system would be made by the Department of Transportation.

As the President pointed out, premiums have been steadily rising and in some parts of the country this has meant a 30 percent increase over the last six years. Another frequent complaint is arbitrary coverage and cancellations.

One local example of this is the man who was rear-ended three times through no fault of his own and the insurance company placed him in a high-risk pool with a fatter than normal premium.

Youngsters frequently find it hard to get insurance unless they use the same company which insures their parents. Cases have been reported in which insurance was denied because the applicants "lived in the wrong part of town."

Two law professors who have made a study of auto insurance contend that only half the money paid out in premiums comes back in benefits. They and other researchers have found that auto accident litigation has clogged the courts and these cases constitute 65 to 80 percent of the civil cases tried in U.S. courts each year.

The inequities and wastefulness in the existing system have been fairly well documented. The most important element of the proposed study should be to devise or determine a more equitable system. In this effort, it would be best if the insurance industry did some work on its own. To ignore or battle the study would be fruitless.

The goals Mr. Johnson has set in the consumer-legislation field are desirable and favored by a majority of the people. It remains to be seen if Congress will adopt effective and fair legislation to accomplish them.

SHELTERED WORKSHOPS FOR HANDICAPPED HURT BY MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to address a nationwide conference of Goodwill Industries executives in Phoenix, Ariz. These men and women, who have for so long been engaged in the laudable work of trying to help people who want to help themselves, are now hampered by the minimum wage legislation enacted in 1966. Under the provisions of that legislation, passed by Congress, the minimum wage jumped 20 cents an hour February 1, and now stands at $1.60 an hour.

This legislation has had a predictable effect on organizations such as Goodwill. They have been forced to curtail their operations in many parts of the Nation and, indeed, right here in the Capital City.

Some of us saw this happening when the legislation was proposed, and tried to warn against it. But we were accused of being nonprogressive, or opposed to the welfare of the working man.

Mr. President, I quote from the views I recorded in connection with the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> I am concerned about the committee's action with respect to the operation of the Nation's sheltered workshops for handicapped people. At the very time our country is doing everything it can to offer more opportunities to the physically and mentally handicapped, to bring them into the productive work force of the Nation, we now are asked to approve legislation which will set the whole workshop effort back many years.
>
> The vast majority of organizations which operate these special workshops are violently opposed to this legislation. The committee members received voluminous mail from the Goodwill Industries and other respected organizations, nearly all of it urging that these provisions on wages in workshops for our handicapped people be deleted.
>
> These workshops are operated for the most part by local voluntary groups. They represent thousands of local leaders who have a sense of civic responsibility and a desire to help severely disabled people who have no place else to turn. These are nonprofit groups; they cannot pass higher wages along to the consumer. If we pass this legislation, we will force to the wall many fine local workshops whose only mission in life is to help people in distress. After that we can expect to pay for our mistake in the form of more Federal funds to care for these people whose work opportunities have been destroyed.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the predictions I made then have now come true.

I have collected a series of newspaper editorials and accounts that give some of the impact of the minimum wage legislation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 5, 1968]

Socially Regressive

On Feb. 1, the federal hourly minimum wage jumped 20 cents to $1.60 an hour.

Whereupon Congress paused to pat itself on the back for its humanitarianism in passing the law last year. Organized labor congratulated itself for having exerted sufficient pressure to insure passage of the law. And those without even a rudimentary knowledge of economics hailed what they considered to be a socially progressive measure.

In fact, the minimum wage law is neither humanitarian nor progressive. On the contrary, it is not only reactionary, in that it contributes to unemployment. But—as economics Prof. Milton Friedman has pointed out—the law "is the most anti-Negro law on our statute books—in its effect, not its intent."

"The greatest help we can give the Negro today is to repeal the statutory minimum wage," said Prof. Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago. And W. Allen Wallis, president of the University of Rochester, has described the law "as anti-Negro in its effects as its advocates are pro-Negro in their intentions."

What happens when the minimum wage is boosted by law is that the unskilled (i.e., the low-paid) are affected. Those who remain employed will receive higher wages, but fewer will be employed.

And the overwhelming majority of unskilled workers are Negroes, particularly Negro teenagers. Therefore, by discouraging employers of marginal businesses from hiring them, the law forecloses opportunity for them to learn the on-the-job skills which would enable them to earn far more than the statutory minimum.

Before the minimum wage was raised to $1 in 1956, unemployment among Negro boys (14 to 19) was around 8 to 11 per cent, approximately the same as among white boys. Within two years after the raise, that figure shot up to 24 per cent for Negro boys and to 14 per cent for whites. Both figures have remained approximately the same since.

Prof. James Tobin, a member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, acknowledges that poor people who lack the capacity to earn a decent living need to be helped. But he noted that the most likely outcome of minimum wage laws is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all.

In other words, what the law does—despite the humanitarian goals of those who support it—is to lower the wage to zero for a great many people. And as Professor Friedman has said, "It has always been a mystery to me to understand why a youngster is better off unemployed at $1.60 an hour than employed at $1.25."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1968]

Goodwill Lays Off 99, Cites $200,000 Deficit

(By Carol Housa)

The Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries here will lay off 99 workers, most of them handicapped, to cut costs and help pay off a $200.000 deficit, executive director Richard A. Nelson announced yesterday.

The 99 employes, whose last working day will be Jan. 26, represent nearly a fourth of the Goodwill staff here. They include 60 handicapped persons and 39 regular employes earning an average wage of $1.89 an hour. Three are severely handicapped persons earning 80 cents an hour.

Nelson told a news conference that 99 workers were being "furloughed," or temporarily laid off until the agency can afford to hire them back.

He said Goodwill faced a choice of laying off the 99 employes or shutting down its operations and putting more than 400 persons out of work. The layoffs will save about $5000 a week in wages, he said.

Nelson blamed declining retail sales, lower salvage profits and rising costs and wages for Goodwill's $200,000 deficit.

The agency's 14 metropolitan area retail outlets face competition from discount stores offering inexpensive new merchandise, as well as from other second-hand stores, he said. Monthly retail sales have dropped from $85,000 to $90,000, compared with the earlier normal of $120,000 to $130,000.

Goodwill has applied to the Health and Welfare Council for a share in the proceeds of the 1968 United Givers Fund.

"Our chances are rather slim," said Nelson. He said the Council had told Goodwill it did not have enough money for its existing agencies.

The Goodwill director appealed for donations of cash and usable goods, but noted that the agency could not continue to pick up items so costly to repair that they could not be sold at competitive prices.

Nelson also asked businessmen for contract work on seasonal, emergency or "nuisance" jobs such as packaging, collating and mailing. He said the agency has set up a contract work department because it can no longer support itself on the refinishing and sale of donated goods.

The layoff will affect eight of the contract department's 21 employes, according to manager Hosea Price. Two are mentally retarded workers paid the sub-minimum 80-cents-an-hour wage who cannot keep up production with other handicapped employes. The department could rehire the laid-off workers if it gets more business contracts, Price said.

Nelson said Goodwill's personnel office would attempt to find new jobs for the laid-off employes, but said most would have to seek welfare grants.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 22, 1968]

HANDICAPPED FACE JOB LOSS OVER NEW MINIMUM WAGE

Social service agencies that provide jobs, training and rehabilitation to the handicapped said Sunday they face a financial crisis because new federal wage minimums now apply to handicapped workers. A spokesman in Washington said Goodwill Industries may be forced to lay off some of its more severely handicapped workers because of the wage requirement.

Other agencies are expected to decide whether to cut from their rosters the severely handicapped or seek subsidies from outside sources and continue their employment.

MINIMUM WAGE $1.60 AN HOUR

In the Philadelphia area, 15 agencies employing thousands of handicapped persons have been hit hard by the new minimum and its wider application.

The problem arose when Congress, in raising minimum wages—which become $1.60 an hour beginning next month—ruled that handicapped workers must come under the minimum wage rule.

Until recently sheltered workshops operated by the agencies have been allowed to pay workers according to their production.

A person who was able to produce at a rate of 70 percent of normal was paid 70 percent of the normal wage.

SUPPLEMENTS URGED

Under the old system, the average handicapped worker earned about $1 an hour.

Last fall the Labor Department recommended the payment of Federal wage supplements to workshops that employ the handicapped.

The Goodwill Industries spokesman said, however, that no action has been taken to provide such supplement.

Goodwill President Eugene Caldwell said, "The rise in wage rates is in keeping with the Goodwill Industries philosophy of doing the most possible to provide full lives for handicapped people.

"But individual productivity has not increased at the rate of the required wage increases . . . and our program cannot apply labor-saving devices or other techniques to keep pace with the rate of wage jumps."

HANDICAPS MORE SEVERE

Roger Davis, executive director of the Philadelphia Goodwill unit, said that in recent years his organization has hired workers more severly handicapped than the Goodwill employes of 10 or 15 years ago.

The worker of today, he said, is less able to keep up with full production and, subsequently, draws less salary.

Davis added that his organization concerns itself with training a person for eventual employment by private industry rather than providing him with a permanent Goodwill job.

"We're not in any way against minimum wage laws," Davis declared.

CONSEQUENCE WEIGHED

He said that under the new system Goodwill might have to drop workers and that they might have to go on public welfare.

In the Philadelphia area, Goodwill Industries employs about 1500 persons each year, Davis said. He said he didn't know how many were jeopardized by the new regulations.

Saul Leshner, of the Jewish Employment Vocational Service, said his organization would either have to price its work contracts higher, which would pit it against private industry, or turn to the community for financial aid.

PAY INCENTIVE USED

Leshner said none of the workers would be cut because "we're in business to work with individuals for their welfare. Our policy as a community agency is to serve those who need us most."

"We are well aware that people need more money to get along on than what we pay them," Leshner said. "But we're not in the business of exploiting our clients."

He said the JEVS uses wages as an incentive for workers.

"As they respond to the incentive, our first objective is to get them out of the shop and into competitive industry," he said.

He added that the organization had set a floor of 35 cents an hour for workers, but even at this low rate JEVS has to subsidize wages by about $10,000 a year.

JEVS employs 750 to 850 a year at its shop at Wayne and Windbrim aves., in North Philadelphia.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 23, 1968]

INSTITUTE LAYS OFF HANDICAPPED WORKERS DUE TO PAY-FLOOR RISE—WORKSHOPS OF NONPROFIT FIRM, GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, SAY DISMISSALS ARE CONSIDERABLE

(By Byron E. Calame)

LOS ANGELES.—Some of Goodwill Industries major local workshops around the country say they've had to lay off considerable numbers of handicapped workers due to the increase in the Federal minimum wage slated for Feb. 1.

Goodwill Industries is a nonprofit institution with workshops in 135 cities employing handicapped persons, largely in the repair of used clothing and household articles for resale. Its activities are conducted essentially for training and rehabilitation.

The Federal minimum wage is being boosted to $1.60 an hour from $1.40 on Feb. 1 in the second of three increases that will bring the minimum wage to $1.80 an hour next year. "Sheltered" workshops that employ the handicapped can pay as little as 50% of the regular minimum wage, but the Labor Department is requiring that they match the percentage increase on all their wages.

Philadelphia's Goodwill has laid off between 80 and 100 of its 400 handicapped workers, according to Roger P. Davis, executive director. In Washington, D.C., the local Goodwill has furloughed 99 of its 450 handicapped employes, a spokesman says. The Portland, Ore., Goodwill says it has trimmed its handicapped employes 7% from the past year in anticipation of the boost in minimum wages.

Robert E. Watkins, national executive vice president of Goodwill Industries, declines to estimate the total number of handicapped workers who might have to be laid off by the organization's 135 local workshops. These workshops normally have about 20,000 handicapped workers on the job. Over a year's time the workshops employ a total of about 50,000 handicapped persons.

TYPES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Officials say Goodwill Industries is employing more and more mentally and emotionally handicapped persons who aren't able to produce as much as the physically disabled who once constituted the bulk of its employes.

An analysis of the handicapped persons on the payroll of all Goodwill Workshops during one payroll period in 1966 showed the percentage with some neurological, mental or social affliction rose to 42% that year from 32% in 1960. In the same period, the percentage of crippled and deformed persons dropped to 15% from 20%. At the big Los Angeles Goodwill, the "invisibly" handicapped account for 42% of its employees, up from a mere 9% in 1955.

"Industry now has recognized the ability of the physically handicapped," says Philadelphia's Mr. Davis. "They are generally educated and easier to rehabilitate," he notes, "and are readily hired. But now we're working with multiple-handicapped persons whose mental retardation or emotional illness makes them difficult rehabilitation problems and often less productive as well."

COSTS INCREASE

Mr. Davis says that the Philadelphia Goodwill now has to employ two or three of these more severely handicapped workers to accomplish the same amount of work that one physically disabled worker used to do. But if the wages of these severely handicapped workers have to be increased 15% across the board, Mr. Davis warns that Goodwill will just have to quit trying to employ the most severely handicapped.

At the same time they're faced with hiring less productive workers, Goodwill workshops have had to cope with the increased costs associated with the rehabilitation of the more severely handicapped workers. For example, Goodwill rehabilitation staff salaries in Portland have shot up to $140,000 a year from only $25,000 a year ago, despite the 7% decrease in handicapped employes, according to Marion Smith, executive director.

Richard Nelson, executive director of the Washington, D.C., Goodwill, emphasizes that the coming 15% increase in wages wasn't the sole cause of the layoff of 99 handicapped workers there. He mentions the higher cost of training and evaluating the severely handicapped, a decrease in sales through Goodwill's second-hand stores and a lower quality of the materials contributed to the Goodwill there. In addition, he notes that discount stores have cut sharply into the Goodwill's business and that all but 49 of the workshop's 200 collection boxes have had to be pulled off the streets of Washington because they were being pilfered.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1968]

POTOMAC WATCH: CRISIS FACES GOODWILL INDUSTRIES

(By William Raspberry)

A used furniture dealer buys discarded furniture, does little or nothing to it, and sells it for enough to pay his help and make a profit.

At Goodwill Industries, they get their merchandise free, pay their handicapped employees to fix it up, and then find that they can't sell it at prices competitive with those of the used furniture merchants.

And this is one of the main reasons that Goodwill is slowly going out of business. The agency, the area's biggest rehabilitation center for the handicapped, is faced with a $200,000 deficit and has been forced to lay off 100 handicapped workers, most of whom probably will have to go on relief.

Officials, bemoaning the agency's financial straits, talk about inflationary spirals, declining salvage markets and escalating minimum-wage standards. But these are secondary problems. The key one is that Goodwill is no longer competitive.

The reasons are partly administrative, partly philosophical.

"The junk stores don't do anything to their stuff," explains Richard Nelson, executive director of Davis Memorial Goodwill at New Hampshire Avenue and M Street nw. "They just bring it in and sell it as is. But we're not basically a second-hand store. Our reason for existence is to train people, and that includes training them to repair donated items."

Take a case where someone donates a used sofa to Goodwill. A driver and a helper have to go out and pick it up, other men have to handle it on the loading dock, someone has to clean it up, refinish the woodwork, repair the springs and perhaps even reupholster it.

At each step of the operation someone is learning a skill. But also at each step someone has to be paid for his labor. The result may be $50 in labor and materials, and that sets a minimum price for the sofa. There may be no profit at all.

A second-hand dealer might buy the same sofa for $5 and sell it for $15 or $20. Even after deducting his labor and handling costs, he comes out with a profit.

This is no news to Nelson. "Oh, we could make money here all right," he said. "If somebody said to run this as a junk shop, I'd make a million. The first thing I'd do would be to fire all the handicapped workers."

And that, really, is the crux of the matter. Used-furniture stores are designed to make a profit. Goodwill is designed to provide jobs and training. The two are becoming increasingly incompatible.

There are other problems. The increased minimum-wage standards that go into effect next month will be an added burden to Goodwill, even though the Labor Department has granted exceptions to the wage requirements for certain handicapped workers. And when increases go to those workers at the bottom of the scale, the effect is felt at the top. (When a worker who was paid $1.25 an hour goes to $1.40, the former $1.40 worker has to be raised to maintain the differential.)

Another problem is the declining quality of items contributed to Goodwill. They used to get worn-out but good furniture from middle-class homes. Now they get mostly worn-out items that were junk even when they were new.

"I think what's happening is that they are selling their best discards to the second-hand stores and giving the rest of it to us," Nelson said. "Most of it is irrepairable. Some time we're just hauling people's junk away."

Some goods that can be repaired aren't worth it, he said. He recalled the time someone gave Goodwill a used steam iron. "We bought some parts and repaired it. The actual cost of labor and material was just about $6, so we priced it at $5.95. It happened that the same day we put it on sale, a local discount house had a brand-new iron for $5.95."

That introduces yet another problem: Competition from discount houses and credit furniture stores.

As Nelson sees it, his alternatives are to:

Transform Goodwill into a purely training operation, with Government and other agencies picking up training costs so that it would be unnecessary to rely so heavily on sales.

Get out of the retail business altogether and devote more effort to contract work—using handicapped workers to fill seasonal, emergency or "nuisance" orders, like stuffing envelopes and assembling mailings.

Nelson seems to be pinning his hopes on the latter, but some contract workers were among those laid off. Nor has he assigned anyone the chore of drumming up more contract work, relying instead on the informal efforts of members of his board.

It may be that Goodwill's future rests in contract work; it may be that large Federal subsidies or increased citizen support are the answer, or it may be that a proper mix of junk shop and training center can bail Goodwill out of trouble.

In no case, however, should the community permit Goodwill to close its doors to the handicapped merely because it isn't making money.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro temproe. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call not to exceed 10 minutes, and that I do not lose the floor in the meantime.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending Mondale amendment occur at 2 o'clock p.m. on Monday next.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending Mondale amendment occur at 2 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will send to the desk shortly a motion on cloture.

The pending measure has been before the Senate for over a month. It is neither presumptuous nor precipitate, in my opinion, to ask at this time whether the debate has been adequate—whether the issues have been fully developed and explored. The cloture motion simply asks these questions.

Admittedly, use of cloture is not commonplace. The very fact that it requires 3 legislative days to execute makes it extraordinary. Most major bills are passed in far less time than that.

By suggesting that the debate be limited through cloture, I do so with the sincere belief that the time has long since arrived when positions have been firmly fixed and the continued frustration of the legislative process serves only to jeopardize equally important proposals that lie dormant in Committee in the wake of this endless debate.

This bill, H.R. 2516, has virtually been the Senate's only business this year. The debate has lingered for over a month; an impasse has existed since early in the discussion. Honest efforts have been made to accommodate the differing attitudes but without success. The issue must be met in its present posture.

During the past month, the Senate has decided only one issue in relation to this bill but that issue was of great significance. Last week, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to reject Senator ERVIN's substitute for the committee bill. The rejection of the amendment was significant but even more so was its offering. To offer an alternative in the form of an amendment is predicated upon the need for positive legislative action. The issue was thus quickly reduced to choosing between the alternate methods of meeting the legislative need. The vote tabling one of the alternatives can only be interpreted as a judgment by the Senate that the committee bill presents the most favorable approach.

The criticism that the committee bill offers special treatment to a special few is without foundation. The bill grants no rights that do not already exist. The bill, after exhaustive consideration in committee, was drawn carefully and limits severely the Federal authority. It is a simple proposal. In essence, it merely permits a Federal prosecution—rather than a prosecution in the county courthouse—but only where the Federal involvement is absolutely essential to insure substantial justice—a need demonstrated repeatedly in cases of crimes committed against the free exercise of already guaranteed rights. In fact, the bill goes to great lengths to preserve the current balance in the Federal-State judicial system—permitting the Federal prosecution when, and only when, the climate in a local community unmistakably requires such a Federal role if justice is to be done.

I would point out that even before the measure came to the Senate, the other body supported it by the overwhelming vote of 326 to 93, with 161 Republicans joining 165 Democrats to assure passage.

On a percentage basis, therefore, more

Republicans in the other body voted for this measure than did the Democrats.

That action demonstrates not only the overwhelming support for the principle of the Hart bill but also the bipartisanship of that support.

To devote 1 month to any bill seems to me an overly generous allotment of the time available in any legislative session. But to devote that much time and then fail to reach the merits of the proposal is not only wasteful but ridiculous as well. A dispositive vote on the merits is the only justification for such an emphasis; especially in view of the fall-out effects on the entire legislative program. While a debate of this nature takes place, other important measures are simply forced to linger in committee or on the calendar. Their frustration gives but an added reason for bringing this issue to a head.

The opportunity for all Americans to have the freedom of choosing a home has long been sought. The return of this long sought issue to the debate in no way alters the present situation and the need for final action. The other body met the housing issue 2 years ago and here in the Senate the proposal was debated week after week. There have been exhaustive hearings and the record is amply documented. The Senate should at long last be afforded the opportunity to face it upon its merits.

In short, an inordinate amount of time has been devoted to this measure; no end to the debate is in sight. Significant legislative proposals lie frustrated. Each Senator understands fully the merits of the pending measure; I am sure each has decided how to vote; in such circumstances each Senator should be permitted to vote his conviction rather than continue this exercise in futility that seriously detracts from the effectiveness and the dignity of this body.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I call up the cloture motion, and I urge that, at the appropriate time, the Senate approve it.

Mr. KUCHEL and **Mr. JAVITS** addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would rather have the motion brought up before I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the motion.

The bill clerk read the motion, as follows:

MOTION FOR CLOTURE

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending business, **H.R. 2516**, an act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

MIKE MANSFIELD, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, CLAIBORNE PELL, WALTER F. MONDALE, PHILIP A. HART, FRANK CHURCH, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, DANIEL INOUYE, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Ohio, ROBERT KENNEDY, New York, STUART SYMINGTON, CLIFFORD P. CASE, GEORGE D. AIKEN, T. H. KUCHEL, LEE METCALF, GALE W. MCGEE, ERNEST GRUENING, J. JAVITS, JOSEPH S. CLARK EDWARD KENNEDY, Massachusetts, HUGH SCOTT, MARK O. HATFIELD, HENRY JACKSON, HARRISON WILLIAMS, New Jersey, VANCE HARTKE, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, CHARLES H. PERCY, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that other Senators may be permitted to sign the cloture motion until the close of business today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise simply to indicate that this is a bipartisan effort; that the cloture motion today is signed by Democratic Senators and by Republican Senators. Every charge that the able leader of the majority party made this morning is correct. The U.S. Senate in this session has come up with a miserable beginning. I want to salute my friends on the Democratic side and on my side who have manned the ramparts during these past few weeks in an effort to give the Senate an opportunity to vote upon this legislation, as well as other amendments which are pending.

I hope cloture will be invoked by the Senate, and that we will then proceed as the distinguished Senator from Montana has asked us to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the purpose of clarification, on the basis of the cloture motion being laid down today, when will the motion be voted on?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule provides that the motion will be voted upon 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one. If the Senate meets on Monday next, it will be voted on 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair. I yield now to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I shall, of course, finish quickly. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] wishes to be recognized. I join the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] in what he had to say about the nonpartisanship of this effort, and I think the majority leader's motion is absolutely proper, justified, and due. Nineteen out of the 36 Republicans voted in favor of the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], which was the first expression of view on this matter. Two additional Republican Senators declared themselves in favor of the motion to table, making 21 out of 36 Republicans in favor of the motion. I think that indicates widespread support on this side of the aisle.

May I ask the majority leader whether it would now be in order for Members of the Senate who have any amendments pending, or who have additional amendments to qualify, to have them laid on the desk and read, or to obtain unanimous consent to dispense with having them read to the Senate, so that they may qualify for consideration if there is cloture?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding, but again, I would refer the matter to the Chair to make absolutely certain what the status of the amendments to be offered is.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will amend that, including the pending amendment of Senators MONDALE and BROOKE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With that amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all amendments will be qualified under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all amendments which are printed; or what is the ruling?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All amendments that have been submitted and printed will be qualified under rule XXII.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, just one last question.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order so we can hear the questions and answers?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the Chair refer to amendments which have been printed or which will be printed between now and Tuesday?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All amendments which have been printed heretofore. There will have to be a unanimous-consent request as to all future amendments, or they will have to be read.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, just one other question. Is it now a fact that we face realistically what so many of us have always argued—that, in the final analysis, it takes a two-thirds vote of those present and voting in order to act in the Senate, notwithstanding the general public understanding and the constitutional provisions with respect to a majority? As a practical matter, in order to act in the Senate, we now face the fact that we need a two-thirds vote, and it is important that both our colleagues and the people understand this, because it is necessary to bring Senators with deep convictions on the subject here so they will be here Tuesday and will be able to vote and the issue will be determined by their understanding of the facts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The rule states that it takes two-thirds of those present and voting to invoke cloture, and it is my intention to send telegrams to every Democratic Senator urging him to be here all next week.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. May I say here, if the majority leader will allow me, that I have gotten the most enormous pleasure and satisfaction from the work of Senator HART in the handling of the bill. I think the manager of the bill is entitled to enormous tribute for, as Senator KUCHEL has said, occupying the long spaces which have gone on, which could not have been done if he were a lesser man.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the floor manager of the bill now pending, who has shown such patience and understanding in the 5 weeks in which he has had control of the measure.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I join in every syllable expressed by the Senator from New York

[Mr. JAVITS] as to the part the Senator from Michigan has played.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from California very much.

First I thank my leader and the Senator from New York, as well as the Senator from California, for their kind comments. I should like to use the same adjectives the Senator from New York has used to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his patience and understanding. I thank him, as did Senator JAVITS, for the effort he made to permit the Senate to have an up-or-down vote on the pending amendment. I regret very much that such an opportunity was denied us. "Denied" may be the wrong word, because the able Senator from North Carolina was acting quite within the rights accorded him under the rules of the Senate. My quarrel and criticism is with the rules and not with the Senator from North Carolina.

As the able majority leader said, it is ridiculous—that is the word I believe he used—that after these long days of debate we cannot have a vote up or down on the merits of the bill and amendment. The majority should be permitted to work its will. Again, I congratulate the majority leader for the clarity of his arguments in support of this committee bill and the housing amendment; I thank him and the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] for their support and kind words.

I do not, nor do any of us, have any illusion that the majority is always right. Majorities make mistakes on occasion. But to deny the majority the opportunity after weeks of debate to act on the merits buys even greater trouble than to accept the occasional mistake of a majority. History is replete with that lesson.

The next time we talk about changing rule XXII, let us keep clearly in mind the danger, in a society such as ours, that the Senate, one of its principal institutions, on critical occasions, finds it is not possible to permit the majority to control its actions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish first to call to the attention of the Senate, and to have it appear in the RECORD, that the cloture motion just filed applies not only to the pending Hart bill, but also to the pending amendment to that bill, the open-housing provision, and to other amendments already offered and read, as well as to amendments that may be offered and read between now and the time of voting on the cloture motion.

I wanted to call attention to that at this time because it seems to me that, in addition to the original Hart bill, we have before us a major measure which the Senate refused to vote upon and consider only 2 years ago, the pending amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and other Senators, which in effect would require what is called open housing, applicable to all private housing, rental housing, and multiunit housing throughout the Nation, with only one very minor exception.

Mr. President, adverting to the bill, it appears that every time any Senator from the portion of the Nation which I have the honor to represent in part, called the Southland, gets up and says anything, his statement seems to be immediately subject to some suspicion; there seems to be some feeling that it is not worthy of much attention; and the press pays no attention to it except in our own States. That is a situation which, whether properly or not, we have gotten used to and are accustomed to. We make no complaint about it.

But because of that situation, and because of the fact that both the press and many Members of the Senate promptly forget what many of us who are strongly opposed to the pending legislation, and particularly to the pending amendment, propose or say, I am going to quote today, for the RECORD, statements of some others whose opinions I think are entitled to be considered respectfully by Senators, and I hope they will do so.

First of all, I leave our country, to quote a distinguished man who happens to be a full-blooded Chinese. At this point I think it is helpful to quote the viewpoint of a distinguished citizen of another nation who looks with affection upon our country and has written down his ideas in a notable book published last fall under the title "The World of Pat Chung." Those of us who have not read that book ought to do so, because here is truly a world citizen, with a tremendous record of accomplishment, writing not only about the particular matter with which we are now engaged, but about many other world problems; and so far as I am concerned, I respect very greatly his opinions, and have been glad to read them.

The writer is Patrick Wilkinson Chung, who was born in British Guiana in 1906 of poor, Chinese immigrants. Later he became an insurance underwriter—one of the largest if not the largest in the world—and a developer of real estate. He moved to Jamaica in the 1930's.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May we have order, Mr. President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suspend while the Chair tries to obtain better order?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would appreciate some courtesy from the back rows in the Chamber. Even if those Senators do not care to listen, they can at least show some courtesy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order while the Senator from Florida continues his speech.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as a man of oriental ancestry, born in the British colony of British Guiana in 1906, a minority citizen for many years of Jamaica, now an independent commonwealth, and in many respects a citizen of the world, he is shown in the book to be a strong friend and admirer of the United States and, I think, an observer who can state some worthwhile ideas with reference to the problems of the Negro minority in our country and the policies of our Nation relative to the Negro minority.

Incidentally, a part of his foreword, pages 7 and 8, reads as follows:

> To put it crassly and directly: God knows I have sold enough insurance in my time, and enough real estate, and enough of other things; now I feel the time has come for me to try to sell more intangible and more important commodities, such as human love and understanding and common sense, and perhaps, an idea or two.

I quote, therefore, from his book, from pages 251 to 256, inclusive.

Mr. President, generally I do not like to quote at length, but here is an expression on the point we are talking about—racial relations in the United States—from a world citizen, a world traveler, a man who has come up to great success from the most humble beginnings, as a member, always, of a minority group; and I think it is worth while to listen to him.

He says:

> Every nation on earth has a history of persecuting its recognizable minorities, and the United States is no exception. When the Chinese first came to the West Coast, to help build the western section of the transcontinental railroad, they were abused and insulted because they were regarded as cheap competitive labor. Riots occurred in San Francisco and injustices were perpetrated, but the Chinese remained and endured and, eventually prospered. They earned the respect of the community, and some of San Francisco's most treasured citizens are Chinese. The city even has a Chinese postmaster.
>
> The Irish also had their troubles. Nativist thugs and Protestant bigots persecuted them for their religion, burned down convents and churches, stoned priests and nuns to death. The Irish fought back and overcame their tormentors. They ended up seizing, through lawful methods, political control of the communities in which they were so widely abused.
>
> The Italians, the Poles and the Latin Americans have all, in varying degrees, had cause for serious complaint at their treatment but endured and lived to see better days.
>
> None of these minority groups was given anything like the help that the negro has been given. Their assimilation took place long before the day of the billion-dollar social programs. They helped themselves and they helped each other and they carved their niche in American life the hard way.
>
> Over the years, negro leadership has been deficient. The negro press, which could have been an enormous force for good, has been shoddy, destructive and often venal. Talented negroes who have made a success in the white man's world—doctors, lawyers, scientists, merchants—have shown more inclination to maintain their fingerhold in the white society than they have to go back and work among and help their own people.
>
> The negro population of the United States—roughly 13 percent of the whole—has suffered mightily from this power vacuum at the top. Into the vacuum have rushed the loud-mouthed irresponsible firebrands, the professional agitators, the Communist *agents provocateurs*, the demagogues who preach hatred, rapine, murder and black power.
>
> Even those leaders who began their careers as responsible men, like Nobel Prize winner Martin Luther King, have shown alarming tendencies toward extremism when they felt they were losing their influence among their followers. The most responsible and moderate of all negro leaders, Roy Wilkins, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has been shunted aside and ignored by the wave of hysteria that has engulfed the noisiest elements in the negro community.
>
> It is my opinion that the American political leadership has been far too indulgent to-

ward this irresponsible negro leadership. It is unfair to the responsible negroes, who make up the vast majority of the community, and are injured by the excesses of the firebrand minority. If a white demagogue were to make the same kind of anti-negro inflammatory speeches that the black demagogues make against the whites he would be pounced upon by the Federal authorities and led away to durance vile. The white power structure lets the negro agitator get away with it, and the negroes regard this as proof of the white man's weakness. Thus far, "whitey's" restraint has merely encouraged the negro demagogue to even more criminal excesses.

Some of the indulgence toward the negro has been caused by a feeling of guilt and compassion among American leaders, but far too much of it has been inspired by the crassest kind of political considerations. Millions of negroes have migrated northward from the deep South and have clustered in the big northern cities. In many of these cities they now hold the balance of political power, especially as white urban dwellers have foolishly moved out of the cities, abandoning them to negroes rather than running the "risk" of living next to them. More than any other segment of the American populace, negroes vote as a bloc, pretty much the way their leaders tell them to vote. Since control of the big city vote is essential to the success of the Democratic Party in America, the negro has been courted by Democratic politicians to an almost painful degree. More than 90% of the negro voters in America are Democrats.

I would not dream of setting myself up as an expert in American politics, but it does seem to me that the gambit of over-indulging the wrong kind of negro has backfired. The population of America is still 87% non-negro, and the non-negro is showing ample evidence of the fact that he is sick and tired of being threatened and bullied by an irresponsible minority among the negroes. They demand more aggressive protection from their political leaders and, if they do not get it, they will make their anger known at the polls.

Ironically enough, the Democrats seem to get little or no thanks from the new breed of negro leader. Lyndon Johnson, for either compassionate or political reasons, has tried to do more for the negro than other President in American history, with the exception of Abraham Lincoln. Yet, in Detroit, in New York, in Newark, in Atlanta, in San Francisco and in scores of other American cities, negro demagogues have called him the vilest of names while their supporters cheered themselves hoarse.

In Washington, D.C. recently, less than a mile away from the White House, a negro firebrand, out on bail that morning on charges of inciting a riot, illuminated his hour of freedom by calling Lyndon Johnson, a "mad, wild dog" and an "outlaw" and urged his cheering audience to burn down the city and shoot their white "oppressors." The police shrugged their shoulders and contented themselves merely with keeping reasonable order among the natives.

It could well be that in the 1968 elections the negro will desert the Democratic Party either by boycotting the elections entirely, or by forming a splinter party of their own. It should be remembered that the only negro U.S. Senator, and the first member of his race to be elected to the Senate since reconstruction days, is the brilliant and outstanding Edward Brooke, a Republican who is eminently reasonable on racial matters. The new breed of negro leaders level violent verbal attacks upon any member of their race who makes a success in the white world. All such successful negroes are labeled as "Uncle Toms."

The negro unrest in the United States has got out of hand, and will continue out of hand, unless stern counter-measures are undertaken. No nation should be subjected to the kind of disorder that has paralyzed and terrorized the cities of America, the most powerful nation in the world, in recent years. It is obvious that these riots have been well-planned and have been synchronized by central planners, probably agents of the Communist conspiracy. Riots must be put down with sufficient severity to discourage their occurrence elsewhere, and the principals responsible for them should be hunted down and punished expeditiously and severely, through due process of law. The Federal Government must make it clear to the irresponsible elements that it will stand no more nonsense from black or white citizens.

During the past 10 years the Federal Government has spent approximately $300 billion on programmes to benefit the poor, the unemployed, the ignorant, the ill. Most of that money has been spent on the negro population, but the more the money has been spent, the more the rioting grew. Detroit has received $100 million in six years for its urban renewal program—building better living quarters for the poor, and especially for the negroes—and this is where the riots are worse.

Too many negroes have been told by their demagogues that they "deserve" everything their hearts desire and there is no need for them to work to earn the luxuries of life. One of the leaders of the Detroit riot said that the widespread looting was planned and encouraged so that "his people" could steal and take away items which they could not afford to buy, such as colour television sets! He regarded it as inherently right for the negroes to do this. It did not seem important to him that millions of white and negro Americans, hard working and responsible, cannot afford colour television sets, but have no intention of breaking windows and stealing them out of stores.

For too long negro demagogues have been telling the most volatile and least responsible elements of their people that all their troubles are caused by imaginary injustices perpetrated by the white man. Most of the injustices never existed but, no matter, it gives the ne'er do well an excuse for his inherent inadequacy and a "justification" for committing wholesale theft.

This kind of gravely reprehensible teaching must be counteracted. The young negro is being told that he "deserves" executive jobs with executive salaries, without having had the education necessary for such advancement, or without having the sense of responsibility which must accompany executive position.

America, to a great extent, is in danger of being spoiled by its own success. Her technological advances have made life remarkably easy for many of her citizens, and, as a result, fewer and fewer Americans are willing to work hard to achieve an improved standard of living. Too many Americans of every ethnic strain are mesmerized by the "easy way" to gain success. This is apparent in almost every field of endeavor.

Work is indispensable to the individual and to the nation. Man needs it, not only for his economic and artistic success but for the preservation of his personal integrity. America's success, the most astonishing success of any nation on the face of the world, was built on a prodigious national talent for hard work. If she throws away this priceless heritage upon the altar of limitless welfare programmes, limitless give-away schemes, limitless plans for withering away incentives, she will lose her position of dominance among the countries of the world and become once again a second class nation. She could even become a vanquished nation.

Americans must realize that there is not—and never was—any such thing as a free lunch. Everything we get in life must be earned and paid for in one way or another. Nothing, but nothing, is given us free of charge.

The negro, especially, must learn this truth.

The vast majority of negroes in America are decent, hard working, middle class people who have made their way in the white man's world, often against stupefying odds. They know that conditions are far, far better than they were when they were young. They are proud of what they have achieved through hard work and intelligence, and they resent the mindless violence and unreasoning uproar caused by the least intelligent element of their race.

The riots in 1966 and 1967 took place in negro sections of American cities. The negroes burned up their own homes and the homes of their more affluent negro neighbors. The riots were a protest, but were masochistic in their effect. They did harm only to the negro communities and to certain white merchants who did business in those negro communities. The white man was not severely injured by the riots, the negro was. The white man will be hurt by having to direct his tax money to the reconstruction of the burned out areas. The negro must find a place to live, a place to buy food, a place to work, a place to eat. He is the real sufferer from the intemperance of his own people. What sense is there in that?

The demagogues who preach the doctrine of total war against the white man, usually issue their preachments from localities far removed from where the shooting is likely to take place. They are ideological hit-and-run artists more interested in stirring up strife than in participating in it. They have done an immense amount of harm to the middle class negro, and have exploited the lowest classes of negro to a point where they have, under the power of emotional stimuli occasionally become less than human in their brutality and viciousness.

Mr. President, these are not my words. These are the words of a very distinguished citizen of Jamaica, a black commonwealth now, to the tune of some 99 percent of its people. He is not a black man, but of Chinese ancestry. He has been all the way through the experiences of being a colonial in British Guiana and then a colonial again in Jamaica, and is now a minority citizen of a black commonwealth. He has become a world citizen and has amassed a very great fortune as an insurance salesman and as a developer of real estate.

In this chapter in his book about America—I am sorry I cannot make all of it available—he expresses the very greatest admiration for our country, the greatest affection for it, and the greatest desire for its permanence and for its success. He has taken time out of his experience to voice, in a rather hard place to voice it—in Jamaica—just what is going wrong in connection with the false leadership that many Negroes, who should be sound leaders, are giving to their brethren.

Mr. President, concluding my reading from the book "The World of Pat Chung," a Chinese citizen of the Commonwealth of Jamaica, I think it would be appropriate to say that I cannot help remembering the words of the famous Scottish poet Robert Burns:

O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!

I think we could get some real value out of looking through the friendly eyes of Mr. Chung upon the sorry, questionable, and trouble-making performances which we have witnessed recently, performances which deal with our colored citizens, particularly with their willingness to let so many of their leaders, who should lead them soundly, lead them down false roads and into dangerous performances of many kinds.

Mr. President, I shall quote again. Since some of our distinguished colleagues—who are generously absent at the time southern Senators take the floor to speak on any so-called civil rights questions—are so apt to forget everything, I like to remind them occasionally that there are some of us who, in surroundings not nearly so friendly to the cause of so-called civil rights, have exerted ourselves many times in the past in efforts to provide a higher degree of opportunity for our Negro citizens.

Without dwelling too long upon that point, I want the record to show that as a member of the State senate of Florida, I was glad to support actively the effort, in 1937—and that was 31 years ago—to do away with the poll tax requirement for voting in the State. That certainly meant a great deal to the Negro citizens of my State as well as to many white citizens who were not people of means.

I want the record to remind the Senate also that for 13½ years I urged submission to the States of a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll taxes in any State as a requirement for voting in any election of Federal officials. That effort is now represented by the presence in our Constitution of amendment No. 24.

I do not think it can be said by anyone, anywhere, at any time, that Senators from the South—I could recite many things about other Senators—have been unmindful of the fact that our Negro citizens need greater opportunities. As a matter of fact, we have done many things to move in that direction. I think we have done it more soundly than has been attempted here so often and has been done here so frequently in the past 10 years.

The major riots which have occurred in other parts of the Nation indicate that those supporting the civil rights bills which have been passed in the past 10 years or more are thinking, almost entirely, about doing something in the South, forgetting the fact that those so-called civil rights bills did nothing for the Negro citizens of the North. I think that when the Negro citizens of the North found that out, they were so disappointed that that disappointment and frustration reflected itself largely in the riots which we have witnessed in the past 2 years and which have been so costly to the Nation, particularly to the northern and western areas.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not sure that the Senator, by his remarks, has made it clear that he was the chief cosponsor of the constitutional amendment which prohibited the use of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections. I am correct, am I not, in believing and in stating that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was the chief sponsor of that legislation when it was considered by the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I offered the amendment 13½ years before it was ever submitted. I kept offering it, in Congress after Congress, without any let up, and I kept speaking about it. I believe that the record will clearly reflect that fact. I am the author and, in that sense, its principal sponsor.

The 24th amendment passed the Senate on March 27, 1962, and the 38th State, South Dakota, ratified that amendment, making it a part of the U.S. Constitution, on January 23, 1964, or less than 2 years after the time of its submission.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I was glad to support the amendment when it was before the Senate. I commend him on his vision and leadership in having helped to bring about the Senate's passage of the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from West Virginia. I want the record to reflect the fact that the Senator from West Virginia strongly and actively supported the effort to submit the 24th amendment, as it has now become, and that throughout his service in the Senate he has always been an ardent friend of the effort to make voting free for the people of all the 50 States.

Mr. President, I am going to again do some reading, because, as I have just said, Senators are so apt to look with a little bit of suspicion upon anything that comes from the South in this field that I want the record to reflect a small part of what has been said in official hearings before Senate committees in opposition to the open-housing proposal, which is the pending amendment to the bill which is now before us.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held exhaustive hearings in 1966 on an omnibus bill which was pending at that time, but which included as its title IV the open-housing measure, similar to the one now offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

At that time, various witnesses appeared from other parts of the Nation than the South, some of them very able men, and I want people not to forget that fact. The first one that I shall mention is Prof. Sylvester Petro, who was a professor of law at the New York University School of Law. He appeared in opposition to the open-housing provision and testified at some length before that committee.

Appearing before our Senate committee, Professor Petro testified strongly in opposition to the so-called open-housing provision in the bill that was then being studied by that committee.

I shall read Professor Petro's testimony in part at this time.

> Mr. PETRO. Thank you very much, Senator Ervin—

Senator ERVIN was the chairman of the subcommittee—

> for having invited me down. I find that the subject to which I am going to address myself is one of the most fascinating that I have encountered in a long time, one of the most incredible as a matter of fact. I find it hard to this day to believe that in this country, which prides itself on freedom, so thoroughgoing an assault upon so intimately a significant freedom as the right of property should be possible.
>
> I understand that there is a tremendous amount of confusion everywhere in the world, not only in this country today, concerning the meaning of key terms, such as freedom, voluntariness, compulsion, and so on. I sincerely hope, Senator, that I am going to make a contribution today toward the clarification of some of this confusion.
>
> Freedom is a condition to which the right of private property is indispensable. If you tell me that I must sell my house to A instead of to B, or instead of taking it off the market, you have deprived me of my right of private property, and of my freedom. If you force me to sell without providing me with traditional safeguards, then you have not only deprived me of liberty and property, but you have done so without due process of law. The fundamental defect of title IV of Senate bill 3296 is that it proposes the most far reaching, the most offensive, and the most arrogant deprivation of property without due process in the history of the United States.

I digress to say that title IV of Senate bill 3296 was the open-housing provision now before us in the form of an amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and other Senators.

I continue to quote from Professor Petro's statement:

> I address myself to title IV exclusively. I wish to emphasize this point, because title IV is it seems to me sharply distinguishable from the other titles of the bill. The other provisions propose to remedy denials of civil and personal rights. As such, they cannot be called defective in principle, though they might prove to be evil in policy and practice, and I believe that that is so, that they would prove evil in practice. Title IV, however, exercises me a great deal more. For it is a clear denial of right, vicious in both principle and practice, because it cannot possibly be administered in accordance with due process of law, and because it adds materially to the forces already at work to introduce the police state into this country. It is just possible that title IV will not work at all. And I shall try to explicate my reasons for that statement before long. But if it does, if it does work, it will do so at the expense of liberty, property, and due process. I propose now to demonstrate the accuracy of this charge.
>
> My first point is that freedom and the right of private property are one and the same thing.
>
> It is customary among proponents of such legislation as title IV to praise it in the name of freedom. However, the briefest examination of the legislation and the barest acquaintance with the condition known as freedom will expose the error of identifying title IV with freedom.
>
> Title IV would force individual homeowners, real estate brokers, and financing institutions to sell and finance the sale of homes in circumstances in which they would prefer not to do so. Homeowners are told in section 403 that, no matter what their own preferences may be, they are compelled by law to sell, rent, or lease their dwellings without regard to the race, color, religion, or national origin of prospective purchasers or tenants. Brokers and financial institutions are subjected to corresponding and implementing deprivations of their rights. Sections 406 and 407, as we shall see, encourage the most aggressive possible prosecution of the policies of the legislation.
>
> No great acumen and no tortured analysis are necessary in order to perceive how dras-

tically title IV invades and restricts freedom and property, and therefore how incorrect and deceptive it is to identify title IV with freedom. A man is free precisely to the extent that his property rights are intact, because the condition of freedom and the condition of slavery are distinguished on the basis of the right of private property. A freeman owns himself and whatever he comes by lawfully. A slave owns nothing. He does not own himself, and, if he is in full slavery, he can own nothing else; not even his children are his. They belong to his master.

Ownership, however, means more than the possession of formal legal title to things. It means control. Control means authority over use, and over disposition as well. It means the condition in which one has the authority to follow his own preferences. Obviously it does not mean that one may use his property in a way which destroys the property of others. The rights and the freedom of others are entitled to the same status and condition as his. But that qualification poses no serious problem. It is easy to see that property rights and freedom cannot exist where some are permitted to invade the rights of others.

Legislation such as Title IV is sometimes advocated on the theory that freedom involves the right to live wherever one chooses. Indeed, I infer that this is Senator Douglas' position. It is the position of people who speak in those terms that one is not free unless he is in a position to buy whatever he wants to buy. But this is an incorrect usage of the term "freedom", and it is very easy to demonstrate the error. For if I have the right to live wherever I choose, then someone else must have the duty to permit me to do so. Suppose I prefer my neighbor's home to my own. Have I the right to force him to sell to me? Obviously I do not—not in a free country, anyway. For if I did, I should possess, not freedom, but power. And if he were obliged to sell, it would be foolish to speak of him as a freeman with his property rights intact.

The same is true of the so-called "right to buy." No one in a free country, when one thinks seriously about these matters, has a right to buy anything. If he is a freeman, what he has is a right to offer to buy. And if the man on the selling side is a freeman, in a free country, he has the right to offer to sell or to refuse to offer to sell. A completed transaction occurs, in a free country, when a willing and able buyer encounters a willing and able seller and they get together on terms which are mutually satisfactory.

Title IV does not promote freedom. It destroys freedom and creates power on one side. To speak of it in the name of freedom is to engage in an ugly perversion of the central principle of the good society.

I read the Attorney General's statement before the House Judiciary Committee, and there were a number of things in the Attorney General's statement that I thought interesting enough to call for comment. It brought out some of the issues that I think are paramount, in a particularly striking way. He said, for example, that "the ending of compulsory residential segregation has become a national necessity." His use of the terminology "compulsory residential segregation," to speak kindly, is strained. Taking the words in their natural meaning, one would have to conclude that the Attorney General is engaged in fantasy or science fiction. I am not aware of the existence of "compulsory residential segregation" anywhere in the United States. Indeed, since the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, even contractual residential segregation is no longer possible, for that case held racially restrictive covenants unenforcible.

The truth is that the only kind of residential segregation which exists in the United States today is purely voluntary. The further truth is that the persons ultimately responsible for such voluntary housing segregation as exists are individual homeowners. The Attorney General seeks to shift the onus. He said to the House Judiciary Committee:

"I believe it is accurate to say that individual homeowners do not control the pattern of housing in communities of any size. The main components of the housing industry are builders, landlords, real estate brokers and those who provide mortgage money. These are the groups which maintain housing patterns based on race."

Everywhere in the United States today homeowners are free to sell their homes to whomever they wish among those who bid. Nowhere are they prevented from selling to Negroes, Jews, Puerto Ricans, or any other so-called minority. It is unlawful everywhere for anyone to interfere with a man's right to dispose of his property as he sees fit. If one real estate broker refuses to deal with members of a given race, the homeowner is free to seek another. If he can find no broker who will deal indiscriminately, the homeowner may take over the selling function himself, as many do. I am confident that there is not a newspaper in the United States which would reject an advertisement offering a house for sale or for rent to all comers.

The Attorney General's strained use of the strange terminology, "compulsory residential segregation," I believe must be accounted for by his natural reluctance to describe the effect of title IV accurately. But no valid purpose is served in beating about the bush. The purpose and effect of title IV are to deny freedom and to restrict the right of private property, not to protect and advance them. The particular and ultimate victim is the homeowner—not the builder, not the real estate broker, and certainly not the banker. For them, in their commercial roles, housing is purely a commercial matter. They will not be hurt in those roles by a law forbidding the discriminate sale or renting of private homes. But the individual homeowner will be. He will find his freedom and his most cherished values savagely mauled.

I want to refer to another aspect of the Attorney General's strained terminology about compulsory residential segregation: his reference to "national necessity."

When one removes the tortured indirectness from the Attorney General's language, what remains is this assertion:

"The policy of this Administration is to favor a compelled amalgamation of all races, colors, and creeds in residential areas; individual preferences, the right of private property, and personal freedom must all be sacrificed to this overriding policy."

He refers to "national necessity." What meaning are we to give to "national necessity" when that expression runs counter to individual preference? The purpose of title IV, to repeat, is to produce a racial mixture in residential areas. If that mixture does not now exist it is because individual homeowners have preferred something else. But this is a nation of homeowners. Is not the residential pattern therefore an expression of their desires, and as such an expression also of national policy? By what right does the administration arrogate to itself the authority to frustrate such desires and to identify contrary wishes as "national necessities"?

A man's family and his home are dear to him, the things he cherishes most in the world. He will work for them as he will work for nothing else. In fact I have a considerable number of calluses right now on my hands, Senator, from clearing several acres of woods, a living testimonial to the drive built into a man to take care of his home. A man will work for his family and his home as he will work for nothing else. And out of such striving great things have emerged. America as we know it today, with all its power and wealth, is a byproduct of the efforts that men have expended in building their families and homes. All the massive edifices in Washington, D.C. all the vast means at the disposal of the Government of the United States, are mere incidentals to the main business of the ordinary American, who works for his family and his home—not for "national necessity," whatever that pompous phrase may mean.

We must get these things straight. Governments do not produce either men, families, or wealth. Men produce those things. The only thing that government produces is more government. If, in producing more and more government, a country should destroy the mainspring of human striving, the fact that the destruction has been cloaked in the verbiage of "national necessity" will not change the consequences. The country will regress; its wealth diminish; its government become a fourth-rate power; its general tone will become puny.

I take no position one way or the other on the desirability of racially amalgamated residential areas, and I do not see how any other mere mortal can do so, for it seems to me to be entirely a matter of personal preference.

I believe it was the right of the people in Senator Douglas' Hyde Park-Kenwood area to undergo the integration experience that they have undergone, and I might add from personal direct knowledge that the experience was a good deal more horrifying than Senator Douglas suggested. To repeat, I don't know what the pattern of any residential neighborhood should be. What I do know and assert is that the goodness, wealth, and power of this country are products of the striving of freemen in the pursuit of their preferences; in short, products of the right of private property. I know, furthermore, that title IV, whatever the Attorney General may say about it, is the most far-reaching and thoroughgoing invasion of the right of private property that has ever been proposed in this country. The Attorney General refers to title IV as a "national necessity." I believe it better described as a national disaster.

I turn now to the procedural aspects of this bill. I find the procedural aspects of title IV as questionable as its substantive policy, perhaps far more serious in the inroads it makes on the rights of homeowners.

It encourages unmeritorious and vexatious litigation despite the crowded conditions of court dockets all over the country. It creates evidential problems which are likely to make a mockery of due process of law. Its provision for remedies are likely to intimidate the decent citizen. The powers of intervention granted the Attorney General are vague and ill defined and smack more of the police state than of a society ruled by law.

Consider the matter of unmeritorious and intimidatory litigation. Section 406(b) authorizes the Federal courts, whenever they "deem just," to subsidize proceedings against homeowners who have allegedly refused to sell or rent on the basis of race, creed, or national origin. No such subsidy is made available to the defending homeowner. Thus a disappointed purchaser has everything to gain and nothing to lose by suing the homeowner. Under section 406(b) the would-be purchaser may commence a civil action "without the payment of fees, costs, or security * * *." This means he may secure even an ex parte restraining order, preventing the homeowner without notice or hearing from selling to another, without forfeiting a bond or security. This is different from the situation which prevails in the case of any other kind of litigation whatsoever.

There is no need to dwell at length upon the evils of this provision. They are obvious. Every homeowner in the country is a potential victim when he puts his house up for sale, whether or not he has violated the law. The normal restraints upon vexatious litigation are gone.

As we shall see, it is likely that the burden of proof will come to rest swiftly upon the homeowner, rather than, as is traditional, at least in due-process countries, upon the complaining party. The difficulty of sustaining the burden of proof together with the subsidizing of the complainant add up to a massive instrument for the intimidation of of homeowners.

Even without the subsidy provision, title IV, if enacted, is likely to produce a flood of litigation, and litigation of a peculiarly complicated character. With the subsidy, of course, there will be even more. I do not suggest that the litigation-breeding charge is ever a valid argument against an otherwise meritorious law, for I believe that if a proposal has merit, it should pass even though it increases the burden on the courts. The trouble with title IV, however, is that it is both bad in principle and likely to encourage great volumes of unmeritorious and purely vexatious litigation, when the Federal courts are already heavily burdened.

The probable result is that proceedings under title IV will work the most vicious kind of injustice. Complainants, that is to say, disappointed purchasers from a minority, will ask for restraining orders, pending a full trial, which is likely to be long and drawn out. Homeowners will thus lose their purchasers, while the complaining parties, on the other hand, will have nothing to lose, especially when even their attorneys' fees and security costs are covered by the taxpayers. The net effect is likely to create discrimination in favor of members of minority groups. Indeed, that seems to be the object of all the procedural features of title IV. The compulsions and the denials of freedom which characterize the substantive features of title IV will probably be surpassed by the compulsions inherent in its procedural features.

I turn now to problems of proof and due-process implications.

Every time a belligerent member of an identifiable minority bids unsuccessfully on a home, or a rental, he is in a position to make life miserable for the hapless homeowner. Suppose a Jewish homeowner, with his house up for sale, receives equal bids from two persons, one a Jew, the other an Italian. If he sells to the Jew, the disappointed Italian has the basis for a suit. The Italian may petition for a temporary restraining order, thus blocking the sale to the Jew, pending full trial. How long will the Jewish purchaser keep his offer open?

And what will happen at the trial? The law is vague. It forbids refusing to sell to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin. How much proof is required? What kind? On whom will the burden of proof come ultimately to rest?

We have considerable experience with a similarly vague law. An analogous provision in the National Labor Relations Act prohibits discrimination by employers which tends to discourage union membership. The National Labor Relations Board considers itself as having a prima facie case of discrimination when a union man is discharged by an employer who has betrayed antiunion sentiment. At that point the burden of proof shifts to the employer. He must show that there was some good cause for the discharge—a violation by the discharge of some strictly enforced rule, or a failure by him to meet objectively demonstrable standards. If he fails in this showing, the employer will be found guilty of unlawful discrimination.

The homeowner under title IV is in a much more difficult position than the employer under the National Labor Relations Act. How is the homeowner to prove—in the case I give—that he had some objectively demonstrable cause—other than race or religion—when the Italian made the same offer that the Jew made?

It is possible that the Federal courts, unlike the National Labor Relations Board, will require objective evidence of discriminatory motivation before they hold homeowners guilty of title IV violations. But if the courts take that position, title IV will become a dead letter; ocular proof of discriminatory motivation is in the nature of things unavailable.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and observation with the understanding that he not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, those observations were based upon the original bill containing certain sections which provided for access to courts.

The pending Mondale amendment denies anyone access to the court, which is inconsistent with due process and fair dealing. It provides that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall be charged with the duty of administering the so-called forced-housing provisions of the amendment, and not only that he shall receive complaints, but also that he may make complaints, investigate the complaints, act as prosecuting attorney and prosecute the complaints, act as the jury and make the decision on the questions of fact binding on the court, and then act as judge and enter the order.

It combines the contradictory roles of the complaining party, the prosecutor, the jury, and judge in one man. It is about the most monstrous proposed prostitution of the judicial process that America has ever seen.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for making that point. I had expected to make it later. I was only reading the testimony of this able professor of law from New York University on the other provision which is lighter in that regard than the one before us. I intend to explain it later. I am glad that the Senator brought it out.

The fact is that this able professor of law, not from the South, but from New York University, testifying with regard to the earlier provisions of title IV of the omnibus bill on which hearings were held in 1966 under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], found so many things wrong with that lighter provision that I thought it well to have something in the RECORD to indicate that the complaints do not all come from the South, but also come from people learned in the law all over the land. And it was not hard to get these complaints from the professor. I am going to put in the RECORD another complaint from another professor from the New York University of Law which is at least as strong, if not stronger than this complaint.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senator to section 1 of article III of the Constitution, which provides that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in the Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

The Senator will note that it does not say that a part of the judicial power will be vested in the courts, but it says that the judicial power of the United States—which must relate to all judicial power of the United States—will be vested in the courts.

Does not the Mondale amendment undertake to vest in a Cabinet officer—namely, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development—judicial power, which is the power to settle controversies between parties with respect to their legal rights?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly does undertake that. And, as the Senator has just said, it would allow the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to occupy the roles of complaining witness, prosecutor, jury, and judge, and would then allow him to hand down an enforceable decree in the matter.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Florida agree with the Senator from North Carolina that under the system of government ordained by our Constitution, the exclusive power to regulate the title to real estate belongs to the States in which the real estate is situated?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, that is true.

Mr. ERVIN. Is there anything in the Constitution that guarantees to the Congress of the United States the power to regulate the title to real estate?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not that I know of or have heard of. And I have not heard anybody during the course of this debate go that far. Of course, the bill they support does go that far.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, do not virtually all of the States of the Union have what they call a statutes of frauds which provide that no contracts relating to the leasing or conveyance of land shall be valid unless they are reduced to writing and signed by the owner or by his duly authorized agent?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know how many other States have such a statute. My own State has such a statute, and I know of a few other States, the laws of which I have been familiar with, that have statutes of fraud.

Mr. ERVIN. Despite that fact, does not the Mondale amendment provide that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development can enter any order he believes necessary to enforce the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The proposed amendment does so provide.

Mr. ERVIN. And would not that provision nullify all State statutes of fraud and substitute for written contracts, oral offers to sell, and even oral refusals to sell?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, this provision, if it became law, would run roughshod over a State's citizens, over State laws, over property located within States, and over what I believe is the real meaning of our Constitution, that this field is reserved to the States.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to read to the Senator from Florida a statute of North Carolina, which is codified as section 47–18 of the North Carolina General Statutes:

> § 47-18. Conveyances, contracts to convey and leases of land.—(a) No conveyance of land, or contract to convey, or lease of land for more than three years shall be valid to pass any property as against lien creditors or purchasers for a valuable consideration from the donor, bargainor or lessor but from the time of registration thereof in the county

where the land lies, or if the land is located in more than one county, then in each county where any portion of the land lies to be effective as to the land in that county.

That statute provides that before any contract or conveyance can be valid against a future mortgagor or purchaser of value, it must be reduced to writing. Its purpose is to stabilize land titles and enable prospective purchasers to look to the record in the registry office to ascertain whether they are buying a good title.

Mr. HOLLAND. The instrument must be in writing and must be recorded—both those provisions. That is similar to a provision in my State, and I believe it is generally true in all States.

Mr. ERVIN. Statutes of that nature are designed to make it possible for one who desires to purchase a piece of land to ascertain from registered documents whether or not he is procuring good title. Is that not so?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. And would not the power that this amendment would vest in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development make it possible for him to nullify statutes of that nature throughout the country?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly would. If this amendment became law, there would be no way to avoid that conclusion.

Mr. ERVIN. Would not the adoption of this amendment bring chaos into the law of land titles throughout the 50 States of the Union?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it would. That is one of the reasons why I am opposing the amendment as well as the bill to which it is proposed to be attached.

I thank the Senator for his most helpful comments.

I continue to read from the testimony of Dr. Petro, a law professor of the University of New York:

> Hence the probability, if title IV is to be viable, is that the courts will do what the Labor Board has done; that is, rely upon presumptions and inferences. In that case title IV will become an even more pervasive instrument for the denial of due process that the Labor Act has been. The burden of proving lack of discriminatory motivation will fall upon the homeowner, and in 99 cases out of a hundred, he will be unable to carry that burden. He will not be able to prove, in the case I have cited, that there was a nondiscrimintory basis for his refusal to sell to the Italian.
>
> Add this to the fact that he will probably have been restrained by the court from conveying to the Jewish purchaser, pending trial, and it becomes evident that title IV puts the homeowner into an impossible position when he is confronted with purchases from different minorities. No matter which he chooses to sell to, the other is in a position to make life miserable for him. An age-old instinct of the common law was to conceive rules in the manner most likely to encourage and promote the alienability of realty and chattels. It would appear that the aim of title IV is, at least, in part, to frustrate realty transactions.
>
> If the homeowner is confronted with offers from a Negro and a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, he has no choice under title IV at all. Preferring the Anglo-Saxon will, if the disappointed Negro is belligerent or fronting for a pressure group, produce an immediate restraining order, frustrating an immediate sale and probably inducing the purchaser to go elsewhere, for many important family matters hinging upon the timing of home purchases. Again, there will be a trial, probably prolonged, and how will the homeowner establish that his choice was not on the basis of race or religion? He has everything to lose and nothing to gain from fighting the case.
>
> Title IV takes away his precious freedom, his right of private property, and makes a mockery of due process while doing so. "National necessity" is cited as the jurisdiction for this vicious betrayal of some of the best of the American tradition. But I am unable to understand how it can be nationally necessary to destroy what is good and strong in a nation. Title IV is an instrument useful only to beat the country's homeowners into a state of supine submission. Perhaps they will rebel against it, however, in which case there will be chaos.
>
> Perhaps title IV will stimulate evasive hypocrisy on a universal scale, an even more repulsive possibility. But meek submission is what the bill seems to aim at, and I can think of nothing more foreboding than the realization of that aim. No great society was ever built by sheep or cattle.
>
> Intimidatory remedies: There is an infinity of evil in title IV. Section 406(c) provides that "the court may grant such relief as it deems appropriate, including a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, and may award damages to the plaintiff, including damages for humiliation and mental pain and suffering, and up to $500 punitive damages."
>
> Section 406(d) authorizes the court to "allow a prevailing plaintiff a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs."
>
> In the light of these penalties, the homeowner will have to be foolhardy indeed who refuses to sell to the member of any minority group.
>
> The bill puts no limit on the amount that may be awarded for "humiliation and mental pain and suffering." Apparently the sky is the limit. It is true that there is a "reasonable" limitation on the amount which may be assessed against the defendant for a successful plaintiff's attorney's fees. The fee may still grow to a substantial amount, however. Equity proceedings and a prolonged trial may easily involve work and time for which thousands of dollars constitute a reasonable fee. And it must never be forgotten that the victim of title IV will usually be an individual homeowner. More than that, he will usually be a man of modest means, for the wealthy will never have problems under title IV, and even the well off will rarely have trouble with it.
>
> Special note must be taken of the variety of court orders authorized by section 406(c): "permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order." Obviously there is plenty of room in this catalog for the most extreme type of court order, the mandatory injunction. In short, a homeowner may be ordered to convey his property to a person to whom he does not wish to sell it, or even, indeed, after deciding to withdraw it from the market. Consider this type of case, which occurs often enough: after getting only one offer for his home, and that from a Negro, the homeowner decides after all that he does not wish to sell; the Negro, or some supporting organization, gets its wind up, creates a great deal of publicity, leading to what may be called humiliation for the would be purchaser, and then files suit, demanding a mandatory injunction and all kinds of damages allowed for in the bill. Moreover, the Negro convinces the court that he lacks means and thus acquires a subsidy for all court costs, fees, and other costs.
>
> What is the position of the homeowner in such a case? He made no formal announcement that he was withdrawing his house from the market. Born and raised a freeman he felt no obligation to clear his change of mind with anyone. He just went ahead and adjusted numerous complicated and intimate family plans to his new decision. But how will he prove that there was no discriminatory motivation in the face of the evidence—the prima facie case—against him? Should he fight the case? If he fights, the costs will be heavy, and his means in all probability slender. There is no provision in the law covering his costs, if he wins. Can one afford to fight such a case? Why fight, anyway? Why not just let the court take away the house and convey it to the person who wishes to purchase. It's only a house, after all, and the family can adjust to a move.
>
> I said title IV would stimulate the growth of police state conditions. What I had in mind was section 407 (a) and (b) which give the Attorney General a roving commission to institute or to intervene in title IV proceedings pretty much as he pleases. Section 407(a) permits him to institute suit whenever he (not the court) "has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights granted to this title."
>
> All the forms of relief available in private suits are made available in suits instituted by the Attorney General.
>
> The Attorney General has even broader and more vaguely defined power to intervene in actions commenced by private parties. Under 407(b) he has the authority to intervene if he merely certifies that the action is of "general public importance."
>
> The effect of these two sections is to authorize the Attorney General to police every real estate transaction in the United States. Obviously even the enormous tax revenues of the United States and its prodigious number of officeholders are not sufficient to permit the Attorney General to intervene in every transaction yet. He will have to pick and choose. The picking and choosing is likely to be dictated in title IV cases largely as it is in all similar instances of governmental intervention. Political, publicity, and psychological considerations will play an important part. Thus the full power of the Federal Government will be thrown against the homeowner who happens for one or another of these reasons to constitute a suitable target. The police state implications of this boundless grant of power are too obvious to require comment. Pity the poor homeowner who finds himself caught in the middle.
>
> In conclusion, there is no doubt in my mind of the proper disposition of title IV of S. 3296. It should be rejected. I repeat: I take no position on the question whether racial amalgamation of residential neighborhoods is desirable; in a free country, residents should make that decision each for themselves—not politicians or government agents, or courts. What I am convinced of is that compulsory amalgamation has no place in a free country. What I am convinced of further is that title IV is a measure devilishly and deviously contrived in each of its provisions to work a compulsory amalgamation. Title IV is advertised by its proponents as a "national necessity" designed to promote freedom and justice. In fact, it is a national disaster which destroys freedom while spreading injustice across the land. Whatever the Attorney General may say about it, the principal target and ultimate victim is the individual homeowner. This lonely individual will find himself in title IV proceedings fighting against preposterous odds for the things most dear to him. He will finance his opponent in individual proceedings in many cases, and his tax money will be used against him in proceedings brought by the Attorney General. Title IV is a stacked deck against the individual homeowner, his liberty and property. If title IV is passed it will amount to a declaration of war by the Government of the United States against its sturdiest and most productive citizens, the homeowners of the

United States. The consequences for the country cannot be anything but evil.

Mr. President, I wish to state again that this is the testimony before an able and distinguished Senate committee on title IV of the omnibus bill of 1966, which is similar in many of its respects and identical in many of its respects to the pending amendment. It is an opinion by a member of the law faculty of the University of New York and it is not an expression by the Senator from Florida, although the Senator from Florida agrees very strongly with the expressions of Dr. Petro in this statement.

Mr. President, I close by again reading the last two sentences by Dr. Petro. They are as follows:

> If title IV is passed it will amount to a declaration of war by the Government of the United States against its sturdiest and most productive citizens, the homeowners of the United States. The consequences for the country cannot be anything but evil.

(At this point, Mr. HART assumed the chair.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for an observation and a question with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor by so doing?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Carolina with that understanding.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida called the attention of the Senate to the statement of Prof. Sylvester Petro that forced housing laws smack of the police state.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Florida this provision of the Mondale amendment which appears on page 14 beginning at line 10:

> SEC. 12. (a) In conducting an investigation the Secretary shall have access at all reasonable times to premises, records, documents, individuals, and other evidence or possible sources of evidence and may examine, record, and copy such materials and take and record the testimony or statements of such persons as are reasonably necessary for the furtherance of the investigation.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida if that provision does not undertake to vest in the Secretary the power to have access to the homes of individuals, subject only to the limitation that he shall have such access at reasonable times?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is correct. The wording of that provision is very clear.

Mr. ERVIN. So that here, for the first time in American history, as far as I know, the power is given to an executive officer to have access to the homes of free Americans.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida, since there is no requirement that the Secretary get a search warrant for any of these matters, how that provision can be reconciled with the fourth amendment, which provides:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

In the absence of some requirement that a warrant shall issue on probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, how can the provision of the Mondale amendment be reconciled with the fourth amendment of the Constitution?

Mr. HOLLAND. I say to my distinguished friend that it cannot be reconciled, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida. It is completely irreconcilable with the constitutional provision which has been recognized many times by many courts and is still a part of the law of the land.

Mr. ERVIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the provisions of the Mondale amendment which appear on page 12. These provide that if he "finds that discriminatory housing practices have occurred or are about to occur, the Secretary shall issue an order requiring the respondent to cease and desist such practices and take such affirmative action as will effectuate the policies of this act."

I would like to ask the Senator if that does not, in effect, confer upon the Secretary the powers of a court of equity to issue a cease-and-desist order in the nature of an injunction?

Mr. HOLLAND. It does.

Mr. ERVIN. So it is vesting judicial power in an executive officer, despite the doctrine that the powers of the judiciary shall be kept separate from the powers of the executive.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I invite the attention of the Senator to the provision on page 13, which provides:

> Temporary orders may extend beyond ten days only if the respondent is first given reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard. The Secretary may condition the issuance of a temporary order upon the posting of a bond by the person or persons seeking protection from discrimination, with such sureties, if any, as the Secretary considers necessary.

The Secretary could issue an order in the nature of an injunction to keep a homeowner from selling his property, could he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct; and then prescribes how large the bond should be.

Mr. ERVIN. He could refrain from setting any bond.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. So, he has the power to require a bond, or he can issue one of these orders enjoining the sale by the owner to some third person without requiring the bond. Then, if it turns out in the final hearings on the merits before the Secretary that there was no discriminatory practice, the man has lost his sale and is without remedy against the person responsible for losing his sale; is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That is in pursuance of what the Attorney General said is national necessity. In that case, it would mean that he thinks it is nationally necessary and that the seller, the owner, or many of them, and there may be thousands, will lose their sales no matter how important they may be at that time. I do not agree with the Attorney General. I think the pending bill is a monstrosity. Dr. Petro thought so, because he said so very clearly. He said that passage of the bill would be a national disaster.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the Senator from Florida, like the Senator from North Carolina, heard that argument made by the proponents? They have shown by their arguments that the sole purpose of the bill is to coerce white people into selling homes in exclusively white neighborhoods to colored people; is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That certainly is its principal purpose. I think that the speeches of our friends of the opposition show that very clearly.

Mr. ERVIN. The overall purpose of the bill is to take away from American citizens the freedom to establish residential patterns in conformance with their own personal desires and to vest in the Government, acting through the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the dictatorial power to tell all Americans what kind of residential section they will live in; is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The Senator knows the proverb, "Birds of a feather flock together." The bill would attempt to make that inoperable as to the human race.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. Now I should like to ask the Senator from Florida this question: The seventh amendment provides:

> In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

Proceeding on that basis, although it might involve thousands of dollars, instead of only $20, under the pending amendment there would be a denial of the right to a trial by jury in all cases, would there not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Florida agree with the Senator from North Carolina that laws should be passed only for the purpose of preventing evil?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think so.

Mr. ERVIN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to page 4, subsection (c) of the Mondale amendment—and I omit the words not germane to the point I am trying to make—"To make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling that indicates any preference, based on race, color, religion, or national origin."

Can the Senator from Florida tell the Senator from North Carolina what the evil is in a man preferring to sell a home or to rent his property to a person of his own race or his own religion?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida sees no evil in it. Quite to the contrary, he thinks that it is part of the property right that the owner has to state his preference. We should not, by any law, make any effort to deprive him of that right.

Mr. ERVIN. I am not so foolhardy as to predict what the Supreme Court of the United States, as now constituted,

would hold if the pending amendment were to be adopted by Congress, but I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that every relevant decision of the Supreme Court to date that I have been able to find has held that any law which makes the right of the owner of property to use his own property according to his own notions dependent upon the will of other individuals constitutes a deprivation of property without due process of law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is correct. I have so stated repeatedly in the course of my arguments today. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his most helpful intervention.

Now, Mr. President, I will pursue my original objective, to place in the Record and show that the objections to the pending amendment, and to the pending bill, do not come solely from the South.

I have here a statement made by Prof. Bertel M. Sparks, professor of law at New York University, which was made with reference to title IV of Senate bill 3296, upon which hearings were held by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and his Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in June of 1966.

I am not going to weary the Senate by reading the statement in full, but just want to show that Dr. Petro, whose statement I have read in full into the Record, is not standing by himself. Here is another law professor, out of the same law school, taking the same position and taking it very strongly, and in such a way that there can be no question about it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement of Professor Sparks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Bertel M. Sparks, Professor of Law, New York University

First, I am deeply grateful and I feel highly honored at the privilege of being before this distinguished committee to present my views. This is especially true in view of the fact that I am here for no reason and in no capacity other than that of being a citizen of a free Republic. I am not representing any particular group or faction or special interest or anything of that sort.

A person might be against a proposed piece of legislation because he does not approve of the objectives sought or he might approve of the objectives but still be opposed to the particular statute because he does not consider it a proper means of achieving the desired goals. It is assumed, and I am willing to assume, that the objectives of title IV of Senate bill 3296 are to provide additional means for enforcing the constitutional provisions for equal protection of the laws and to give to Negroes, and possibly other groups, a better opportunity to obtain more desirable housing.

These are worthy goals indeed and it is doubtful if anyone can be found who will disagree with either of them.

I assume that there is no one present or absent who would disagree with that.

But in spite of the good intentions, inquiry must be made into the actual results title IV is likely to produce in the marketplace. For I believe that Daniel Webster spoke the truth when he said the "Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions."

In the popular press, the bill is being referred to as a civil rights bill. But the experienced legislator can never be content with labels alone. He must ask himself, in connection with civil rights, what rights, to whom are they being given, and who is giving them? Upon these questions title IV is extremely ambiguous. It purports to give a right to everyone to purchase or lease real estate without regard to his "race, color, religion, or national origin." But that right already exists in every instance where the prospective buyer locates the desired housing and offers the price for which a willing seller is prepared to sell.

That brings us more directly to the question as to how title IV proposes to improve the buyer's position. A reading of the bill, especially section 403, makes it quite clear that its purpose is to improve the buyer's position by providing for him a willing seller in circumstances where a willing seller might not otherwise be available.

There are a number of rather extensive enforcement provisions concerning the bringing of lawsuits, payment of attorney's fees, and the regulation of real estate brokers and financial institutions. Many of these are of highly questionable viability within themselves.

I might say that I have assumed that a lot of them were put in there for negotiating purposes. But that is not what I am going to talk about now, because I assume they are all in one way or another to support or supplement what purports to be the one basic right extended to the buyer. It is that central basic provision that I wish to discuss. And it will be my position that if the bill is enacted, its principal effects will be (1) to reduce the total amount of housing available by discouraging building, and (2) to put Negroes and other groups the legislation is intended to help at an increasing disadvantage in their attempts to buy what is available.

The bill attempts to provide a willing seller by denying to every property owner the right to consider "race, color, religion, or national origin" as influencing factors in the selection of a tenant or customer. But that provision raises two further questions of primary importance: (1) What personal right does this take from every homeowner in the land? and (2) What effect will this have upon the ability of Negroes and other minority groups to obtain better housing? These are important questions.

The constitutional prohibition as well as the longstanding legal tradition against the taking of property without due process of law brings us down to bedrock as to the meaning of the word "property" and what constitutes a "taking." The question is an important one, not only because of the provision in the Constitution, but also because of its significance in every aspect of human affairs. I am afraid that my discussion on this point will appear excessively esoteric to some and excessively simple and unnecessary to others. Whichever group you happen to be in, I beg you to bear with me because I believe a careful analysis of the nature of the property being taken is essential to an understanding of the effect this bill is likely to have in the marketplace.

In its legal sense, the word "property" does not refer to material things such as houses and lands, articles of clothing, tools, machinery, or other things capable of being owned. But rather property has reference to an individual's legal rights with respect to those things. There is the right to use, the right to exclude others, the right to sell, the right to devise, and others. A person's property in a given object then consists of the total bundle of rights he has in that object. Those different rights are all different items of property. They are not all of equal importance.

It is possible that one or more of them may be taken away while the others are left undisturbed. One of the dangers inherent in this possibility is that we might consent to having them taken away one by one until there is scarcely anything left in the bundle. Another danger is that we might let one slip away thinking that we can hold on to all the others and then discover too late that that one, the one we have surrendered, is the one upon which the very existence of all of the others essentially depend.

The particular right involved in title IV is the right to sell. And here I am using the word "sell" to include the right to transfer for a term, that is to say, the right to rent or lease. In an effort to evaluate the importance of that particular right it might be well to begin by reminding ourselves briefly of a bit of history that all of us have been taught but which we might have a tendency to forget in this age when we are more concerned with the enjoyment of the fruits of freedom than we are with the sacrifices necessary to achieve it. And I might say necessary to maintain it.

And if I seem to dwell too long on what appears to be history of a bygone age, my purpose is to call attention to the fact that the right to sell, the right that is under attack in title IV, is the very right which supports and sustains most of the civil and political liberties held sacred by all Americans. While we might overlook that fact in our day, the Founding Fathers certainly did not forget it in theirs.

From the very foundation of our Republic, and in English jurisprudence even before that, down to the present time, our legal system has considered the right to sell as an essential feature of any free society. Some of our State constitutions have provisions declaring the right of property to be "before and higher than any constitutional sanction." (Arkansas constitution, art. 2, sec. 7.)

And more recently it has been declared that, "In organized societies the degree of liberty among human beings is measured by the right to own and manage property, to buy and sell it, to contract." (Garber, "Of Men and Not of Law" 34 (1966).)

Now one, certainly, is justified in asking whether all these assertions are mere examples of holiday rhetoric or whether they actually do epitomize the lifeblood of freedom and the building blocks of a free society and economic stability.

A close examination will reveal that it was the right to sell, to give away, or even to dissipate one's interest in property that enabled the serfs and villeins of the feudal period to emerge from their servile status to the status of freemen.

Maybe it doesn't appear that there is any need to go back to that, but I think there is. It puts us right in our present predicament.

The men who occupied the land and tilled the soil were referred to as freemen even in the feudal period, but then, as is true in the minds of some men even now, freedom had become deeply involved in semantics. A freeman in that period could not transfer his holdings, which in practical experience meant he could not cash in on the fruit of his own labor without the consent of his lord, his lord representing an ascending political hierarchy with the crown, in other words the state, as the ultimate authority.

Of course the lord was under a similar burden so far as his efforts to transfer his own holdings were concerned. But his position was different in that his holdings were larger and of a higher order. He was economically secure and had a comfortable income.

It was the fellow who had the least that was under the heaviest burden for until the man higher up let loose, there was nothing available for the man on the bottom to acquire. And whether a clog on the right to sell is labeled a medieval doctrine of feudal tenure or a Civil Rights Act of 1966, its effect in the marketplace will be the same and the man at the bottom will still be the loser.

Of course it must be recognized that during the feudal period there were restrictions upon the right of inheritance, use, and other incidents of property ownership as well as upon the right to transfer. But the point to be made here is that the right to sell was the particular right that held the center of the stage, and until that right was achieved, political freedom and the whole gamut of civil rights, that we like to talk about so much, lay dormant, and it will become dormant again. And that right to sell, that economic mobility, or in the jargon of the profession that freedom of alienation, soon became the chief factor in the development of individual freedom of all kinds and it stimulated the economic development of property.

When the occupant of land became free to sell at a price agreeable to him without seeking the consent of his lord and without paying a fine to his lord for having done so, he began to take on the coloration of a freeman in the true sense of that word.

This might sound rather obvious to us, but we should remember that that right to transfer land has not prevailed throughout the world and has not prevailed throughout history. But where it has prevailed happens to be that particular area of the earth's surface where the better things of life we might say, the comforts, have been developed.

Ownership took on new meaning. It included a power to cash in as well as a power to use. And when that freedom was obtained men no longer remained serfs, they no longer remained slaves, and the economy no longer remained static. It is no mystery that the real beneficiaries of this political and economic transition were those who possessed the least, it was the "have nots" rather than the "haves."

With free economic mobility the fellow at the very bottom of the heap could exchange his services for a share in what was held by the man near the top. In this system of free exchange, not only was there no necessity for serfs or slaves but there ceased to be any place for parasites. Property tended to shift to those who put it to the most economic use. And there emerged the day of plenty which, although it is unique in the history of the world and is to this day confined to a comparatively small part of the earth's surface, it is so taken for granted in this country that we tend to forget its source.

But this personal liberty to deal in, dispose of, and profit from ownership of property did not come at a single stroke nor will it be lost at a single stroke. Its coming was a step-by-step process in which each step was characterized by a bitter struggle. Those who are already wealthy, who are already entrenched, who "have it made," are more likely to be interested in preserving their holdings than they are in searching for easier means of transferring it. But unless that right to transfer is recognized and is readily available, the "have not" fellow has little opportunity to improve his lot. The legal history from the feudal period into the industrial economy of our present era can be quite accurately described as a struggle for an expansion of the rights of property ownership available to the individual and it can be asserted with a high degree of confidence that if we retreat back into a lethargic age of tyranny, it will be a step-by-step surrender of those same personal rights. And let no one forget that it is a personal right that we are dealing with in title IV. It is the right of an individual to deal with the fruits of his own labors in the way that seems most pleasing to him. And if he is not free to sell that which he acquires, he will be much less interested in acquiring it. If the restrictions imposed by title IV are imposed upon the ownership of property, it is inevitable that there will be less incentive to acquire, build, and develop. This means that there will be less housing and you will not improve the housing of Negroes or anyone else by reducing the total amount of housing available.

You might point out to me that title IV doesn't take away the right to sell, that it takes away only a limited part of that right, that is to say the right to select one's own customers, and that is true. But how much have you withdrawn from the rights of a prospective seller when you have withdrawn or even restricted his power to choose the persons with whom he deals?

There is a 1965 decision in the North Dakota Supreme Court [*Holien* v. *Trydahl*, 134 N.W. 2d 851 (N.D. 1965)] that casts some light here. It held that freedom to select one's customers was such an inherent part of ownership that an arrangement entered into by the voluntary act of private parties requiring an owner, even though offering his property to a particular person before being permitted to sell to anyone else, was void.

In the North Dakota case the restriction wasn't imposed by the State. No principles of constitutional law were involved. Nevertheless the North Dakota Supreme Court considered even this mild restriction on the power to select one's own customers such a state of ownership that it was not to be tolerated in a free society, even where the parties so desired.

It is doubtful if very many of our courts will go quite as far as the North Dakota court did, but it does illustrate the importance at least some judges have attached to the doctrine of economic mobility.

Title IV proposes, not only to permit a much greater restriction on the freedom to select customers, but to impose that restriction without regard to the wishes of the parties.

Now to say that a provision such as title IV will discourage building, and thereby make less housing available is no idle guess. Any kind of building, whether it be individual homes or apartment houses, calls for a substantial investment. It requires the assumption of substantial responsibility.

There will always be some people who will prefer the relative calm of remaining a tenant to the responsibility and uncertainty involved in ownership. And the tenant by preference group will necessarily be enlarged by anything that increases the risks of ownership without offering commensurate hope of reward.

There are a number of States, as you gentlemen are all well aware, that already have laws similar to title IV, although I do not know of any that is quite so broad in the extent of its coverage. I have not heard or read anything to indicate that housing is any more readily available to minority groups in these States than it is elsewhere. Nor should anyone be surprised at that.

The so-called ghettos, where members of a particular racial or religious group are congregated in large numbers are not brought about by the refusal of landowners in other areas to sell to the members of that racial or religious group. The thing that prompts a free man to sell is his own self-interest, and the price he receives is far more important in the marketplace than is the racial characteristics of the person from whom the price is being obtained.

Some of the high concentrations of a particular racial or religious group have developed because the members of that particular group chose to live near each other. Others have developed because the members of conflicting racial or religious groups have moved away. This tendency to move away until the minority becomes the majority is probably the biggest single factor in the development of what is popularly known as ghettos or ghetto areas.

I believe that each one of you can confirm that within your own experience, if you will just take a serious look at the Negro sections of the cities with which you are familiar—not what I say, not what you read, not anything else. Just look at those areas with which you are personally familiar and I dare say that you will find very few if any that have developed because of a refusal of persons outside that area to sell to Negro customers.

What you are more likely to find is that a once thriving white population has moved away. That is precisely what is happening in New York City, especially Manhattan at the present time. And New York City was one of the first, if not the first, localities in the country with a so-called fair housing law. And although it started in the city, it was soon extended to the whole State.

There is no evidence that I have been able to see anywhere that the statute has had any effect on the continued tendency of Negroes and Puerto Ricans to become concentrated in particular areas. Title IV makes no provision for preventing whites from moving away from these areas. We may say it would be sad if it did, but it doesn't. And yet this tendency to move away, not the tendency to keep others from buying, appears to have been the principal factor in the development of the existing ghettos.

But even if the freedom to select one's own customers should be considered less important than I have indicated, and if it did not have any depressing effect upon the economy and did not curtail the total housing available, the question still remains as to whether title IV will make it easier for a Negro or member of some other minority group to purchase appropriate quarters.

I should like to reduce that to very simple terms and discuss it from the point of view of a homeowner who is ready to sell his house and has listed it with a real estate broker. When a prospective buyer presents himself, there are many factors to be considered and many reasons might arise as to why the seller does not wish to deal with that particular buyer. The most important of these is usually the buyer's financial position.

Concerning that one item, uncertainties and doubts might arise that cannot be objectively demonstrated, but which are sufficient to discourage the seller, who will then choose not to deal.

Or on purely subjective grounds, but for reasons sufficient to himself, the seller might suspect that the buyer has such a personality that he will be difficult to deal with on the matter of the transfer of possession, condition of the premises at the time of transfer, or some other relevant circumstance of that sort. For any one of these reasons, or for no reason at all, the seller might elect to do business or he might elect not to do business with that particular buyer who has presented himself.

If title IV becomes law, how have you changed the situation? If title IV becomes effective, a potential seller will be in precisely the same position as we have described, except for one thing. In his mind now all customers, all prospective buyers, are divided into two groups. In the usual situation, for this is the main target of the limitation one group will be whites and the other group will be Negroes. Let's say that our particular seller is unconcerned as to the race of the buyer, but he is still interested in these various objective factors previously mentioned.

Title IV tells him that if he rejects a white buyer for whatever reason, no explanation will be called for. But if he rejects a Negro buyer, he will subject himself to possible litigation, and the necessity of proving that the Negro was not rejected because of his race. What kind of proof will he present?

As already indicated, many of the usual reasons for refusing to deal with a customer are subjective, and they are not susceptible to judicial proof. But even if our seller succeeds in his proof, he will have been subjected to troublesome, embarrassing, and expensive litigation, in which no good citizen desires to become involved. Faced with this situation, with these two groups and these two prospects, what is the seller most likely to do? If he is at all prudent, he will avoid seeing any colored buyers.

Now I realize that the proposed law prohibits this, but such a provision just can't be enforced. It has been analogized by some people before this committee as being somewhat similar to the prohibition, but I think that is treating it too fairly. I would say it is much more analogous to a law prohibiting a man from kissing his own wife in his own home after dark. Anyone who knows anything about the buying and selling of real estate knows how easy it is to avoid offers he doesn't want to receive.

One method that I am told is currently a common practice in some areas where State laws similar to title IV are already in effect is that of managing not to be at home when the broker shows up with a Negro to look at the house. There are many ways that this can be done and still be absolutely immune from the detection by even skillful investigators.

But this is only one method of never receiving this unwanted offer, and while it has some practical shortcomings, I assure you that there are lots of ways that can be used, and no broker's office need be confined to any particular scheme.

The important thing here is what title IV has done to the Negro. The seller in our illustration had no objection to selling to Negroes. In the absence of title IV, he would have had no objection to seeing them or selling to any one of them who otherwise met with his approval. But now the danger of litigation that has been forced upon him is going to force him into searching for devious ways to avoid ever receiving the offers that he would have otherwise been happy to receive and possibly have been happy to accept.

Or let's take another illustration. There is the university professor who takes a year's leave of absence, in order to accept a temporary appointment at another institution as a visiting professor. He plans to move his family to the new location for 1 year. He would like to rent his house, and he has no objection to renting it to a Negro. But he wants to be reasonably sure that he can trust the tenant to take reasonably good care of his furniture.

He also knows that if he rejects a prospective tenant who happens to be a Negro, he might be called upon for the same kind of proof that was demanded of the seller in our previous illustration. But here the real reasons are likely to be even more subjective and less susceptible of proof than they were when a sale was involved.

As a result, the professor is likely to employ some scheme similar to that used by the seller, or he might decide to avoid the difficulty by leaving his house vacant for the year.

If he chooses the former, a prospective Negro tenant has been deprived of the opportunity to bid on an accommodation that was actually on the market. If he chooses the latter, there will be one less housing unit in that city that year than would otherwise have been the case. In one instance, Negro tenants are the losers, and in the other, all tenants, both Negro and white, are losers.

Someone might ask "what about the seller who refuses to sell for no reason other than the race of the buyer?" We must assume that some sellers of that type do exist, but I would suggest that any estimate of their number is likely to be based more on emotion than it is on fact.

It should be pointed out, however, in order for them to exist at all, there will have to be a seller who is more concerned about the race of his buyer than he is for the purchase price that he receives. I doubt if there are very many sellers who are that oblivious to the power of the dollar. But even if they exist in large quantities, they will always have available to them all the devious subtleties employed by the nonprejudiced sellers who are merely trying to avoid exposure to litigation. Their apprehension will be next to impossible.

If title IV becomes law, it is going to have two significant effects, in my judgment. It is going to discourage building, and it will deprive the members of minority groups of opportunity to compete for the housing that remains available. The entire bill, gentlemen, should be rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are, of course, many quotations from the statement which I think might be of some interest for me to advert, but let me read this one excerpt:

> Or let's take another illustration. There is the university professor who takes a year's leave of absence, in order to accept a temporary appointment at another institution as a visiting professor. He plans to move his family to the new location for 1 year. He would like to rent his house, and he has no objection to renting it to a Negro. But he wants to be reasonably sure that he can trust the tenant to take reasonably good care of his furniture.
>
> He also knows that if he rejects a prospective tenant who happens to be a Negro, he might be called upon for the same kind of proof that was demanded of the seller in our previous illustration. But here the real reasons are likely to be even more subjective and less susceptible of proof than they were when a sale was involved.
>
> As a result, the professor is likely to employ some scheme similar to that used by the seller, or he might decide to avoid the difficulty by leaving his house vacant for the year.
>
> If he chooses the former, a prospective Negro tenant has been deprived of the opportunity to bid on an accommodation that was actually on the market. If he chooses the latter, there will be one less housing unit in that city that year than would otherwise have been the case. In one instance, Negro tenants are the losers, and in the other, all tenants, both Negro and white, are losers.

Mr. President, there is so much good "meat" in this statement that I invite all Senators to read it in full.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks today I want to make it very clear that the Senator from Florida is perfectly competent and perfectly willing to talk in his own language for a good deal longer than I have been speaking today in opposition to the proposed amendment to the pending bill.

I have chosen, instead, to place in the RECORD this expression from a world citizen—that is, Mr. Pat Chung, a citizen of Jamaica, but a man of complete Chinese blood, dwelling upon the general problems which we face in this country and, particularly, upon the fact that Negro leadership has been, so far, unsound and, so far, unsafe in much that it has done in the past 2 years.

The Senator from Florida has twice, in the last few days, commented on statements made by Dr. Martin Luther King, who once received a Nobel Peace Prize, but who now seems, for some reason not made clear yet—but probably through the desire to retain his threatened leadership—to propose to do something very different, in coming to this city, in camping in here, as he terms it, in the building of shanties, in the erection of tents, in the bringing of thousands of people here from other areas of the United States, in an announced intention to disrupt the Government and the Congress, and to make it impossible for us to transact normal business.

I think the statement of Mr. Chung, a friendly but disinterested observer looking at us through the eyes of a Chinese-Jamaican, may perhaps do us some good in making us realize how very false has been the leadership of so many Negro leaders. Unfortunately, it is reaching out now to affect persons who, at some time in the past, had views which were much sounder in what they advised citizens of their color to do.

When we find this general tendency on the part of Negro leaders to bid now for the support of violent Negroes, who want to burn, who want to destroy, who want to do everything that means a violent disruption of American life, that leadership is unsound, and should certainly be avoided by the great majority of Negroes who are law abiding, and many of them property owners.

Mr. Chung, in the statement in his book, made it very clear that violence and destruction in the great cities—and I am glad the Senator from Michigan is in the Presiding Officer's chair at this time; he refers to Detroit—has been directed largely against the Negroes themselves, and particularly occur against law-abiding Negroes and property-owning Negroes, where great losses have been sustained by them. Why? Because their leadership has been so false and unsound.

I am glad we have this view of our situation here as presented to us in this book by Mr. Chung.

Now with reference to the testimony given by the two able law professors from New York University, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that they have not hesitated to speak out. They come from an area that is particularly affected by reason of the destruction and violence of this leadership. They have not hesitated to speak out to make it very clear that what is proposed in this legislation would take away and destroy very precious personal rights, without due process of law, and in complete violence to our American system.

Mr. President, there are millions of people in this country who feel just that way. When the matter has been voted upon in Seattle and Tacoma and the State of California, and the results have been against open-housing legislation in those areas, it clearly indicates that it is not just southern property owners who are affected by this matter.

I want to say something like what I said when we argued the earlier civil rights bills. You do not know it, I say to the Senator from Michigan, but it is true that your own white people and your own law-abiding Negroes are going to be much more adversely affected by this legislation, if it passes, than will be the case in the South. So far as the South is concerned, we have well recognized the patterns of residence.

We have had frequent instances in late years that our Negro citizens prefer to continue their children in Negro schools. We have had frequent instances showing they want to preserve their State

Negro university as such. We have had repeated invitations to the dedication of new facilities for private Negro colleges. I have had two such invitations in the last few weeks, one for a Negro institution moving from St. Augustine to Miami, set up there in very pretentious buildings, where they can do a much better job than they had been able to do before, and the other likewise a Negro institution at Daytona Beach, which has done very fine work, and I commend them for it.

Incidentally, I may say to the Senator from Michigan that on the morning that I was getting ready to set out, with my family, to go to the State capitol to be inaugurated as Governor, a choir from Bethune-Cookman College got up before dawn to come 100 miles, or whatever the distance was—I think it is a little over 100 miles—to serenade us outside our door and to bid us goodby and to state their good will.

We have had repeated evidences of these good relations which exist between our colored people and our white people, and the pride our colored people have in the existence of their own institutions and in the education of their own trained men and women, who prefer to teach in those institutions.

Mr. President, anybody who thinks these so-called civil rights bills are going to deeply disturb the pattern of living in the South just is not conversant with the feeling of our people down there. I say this in all good humor to the Senator from Michigan. He is going to find, just as developed with respect to the other bills passed in the last 10 years, which did nothing for the northern Negroes, and which were followed by the violence and disruption and the burning and all kinds of crime in the northern cities, if this bill is passed it is going to give much more trouble in his own area than in ours. I wanted to be on record in predicting that, in perfectly good humor, because that is what I see in this legislation. It is inconceivable to me that the Senate should pass it, particularly this amendment, in the form it is in.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia). Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HART. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Florida in yielding to me for a brief comment, and I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to assume the chair when he sensed that the Senator from Michigan might want an opportunity to react to the comments of my good friend from Florida.

I have no illusions of ever being able to persuade the Senator from Florida to support the housing amendment that is pending or, indeed, the basic worker protection bill.

I think a good many of us from the North have tried to make clear, and I rise only to make the effort again, that we acknowledge that discrimination exists North and South alike. No region is free of it. It, I think, takes differing forms, and even here we incline to oversimplify.

I think in the South one could say it is a little more hard nosed, a little more direct, and involves differing areas of community life than in the North. In the North—and I regret to say this, but I feel it to be true—it is a little more sophisticated. If you are on the receiving end of it, I do not know which would be crueler, but I am very fortunate, by accident of birth, that I will never know, because I am a white man.

In the South, as I read the record, the frustration, the concern, centered on the rejections on occasion that occurred around voting places and in restaurants. In the North it most frequently shows up at the hiring hall—and the trade unions are not immune from this criticism, any more than employers—and residential housing.

The areas where the problem surfaces are different, but the reason for it is everywhere the same, and the position that I feel that Congress, speaking for America, should take should be the same for all of America. The Housing amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], for example, indeed does affect the North in a far greater degree than the South. Again, I hate to have to admit this, but the reason we do not have as much steam and enthusiasm in 1968 for a civil rights bill that we had in 1964 and 1965 is that all of a sudden people in my State know we are not talking about Mississippi, we are talking about next door. But our reaction should be the same as we have been preaching it should be over the years. We should simply make a flat commitment that nobody should be required to run a litmus test of color or religion or national origin when he seeks to buy a home.

Does this destroy the notion that my home is my castle? Well, that notion comes more out of romance than law, to begin with. Anglo-Saxon and old English law made very clear that one was restrained in the disposition of his property, even with respect to his own bloodline.

I never understood the rule very clearly, but it had something to do with restraints against alienation, or the rule against perpetuities. I was not a master of it in law school, and I certainly am not now; but I know the basic proposition is that even as to your own kin, public policy judged that there were certain things you were not free to do with your own property.

The amendment now pending is premised on the same approach: That the public good requires and community stability will be advanced if we state that you cannot, with respect to the disposition of your property, run a color test or a test of religion. I think we would all be better off if this were our national position. It would conform much more closely to what we preach we stand for.

I return to the note I sought to sound early in this debate after the offering of the pending housing amendment: I am a very poor witness in support of a housing bill. As I say, I, by accident of circumstance, would never have any problems, if I had the money; unless I ran into a householder who hated politicians, I probably would be able to make my purchase.

The fellow who should be on the floor of the Senate urging us to adopt the housing bill is a Negro—a Negro who has done all the things that teacher and church and home taught him to do. He has worked hard all his life, and he has saved his money. He seeks to give his children the opportunity to live in a better neighborhood. He goes out one day to buy the house. He comes back that night and how does he tell the children that he was not able to make the buy? How does he explain that? And what kind of reaction will those children have?

This is the witness we should be listening to, as we approach a vote, not even on the merits of the amendment, unhappily, but on the proposition, Shall we be permitted to vote on it?

As I say, I am grateful to the Senator from Florida for yielding to permit this reaction. I know the depth of his conviction, and its sincerity. Though our view of the problem is very different, I have never doubted for a moment that the Senator from Florida speaks exactly what he thinks is in the best interests of this country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend. I accord to him just as much sincerity and decency as he has graciously shown to me; but I think I know a little more about the situation than he does.

I was raised in a community where white and Negro people have lived together in peace throughout the 75 years of my life, and where the first indication of real trouble—not in my own community, but in some other communities of Florida—has come since this agitation has been going on, and since some of these bills have been passed. There has been very little trouble in my State. It has been inconsequential as compared with what, for instance, has happened in Detroit. We have had no general destruction in any town. We have not had a loss of life, that I am aware of, from this cause in any town.

We have had a few demonstrations. I have been picketed a time or two myself; and I have smiled about it and kidded them about it, and it ended without any real trouble. The picketings have not taken place in my own home, or in any other typical Florida town, but at the State university, where we have a good many who have come from outside, and a good many of these long-haired, bearded individuals who know so much more about life and how it ought to be lived under the American system than the Senator from Michigan or myself, or anybody else in the Senate.

We have to take these things in good nature. I propose to continue to do so. But I am not going to permit, by anything that I do, a law such as this to be proposed, seriously considered, or even passed without my expressing my very sincere opposition and my fear that it will be a troublemaker of the gravest sort, if it should be enacted.

The Senator from Michigan, I am sure, would do exactly the same. If legislation were proposed which, in his conscientious judgment, would be a troublemaker for our Nation and for the area in which he lives, I am sure he would be on his feet fighting such a law.

That is the way I feel about this proposal. I think it is very bad. I think it is entirely unnecessary. I believe the Negroes have made great progress. I believe, as stated by Mr. Chung in his book—and I hope the Senator will read at least all of the chapter about the United States, which country the author admires so greatly and praises so highly—that the Negroes in this country are happier and more prosperous, have more opportunities, and have a better chance than Negroes have been given anywhere else, and that their leaders ought to tell them that, because they know it to be so. Those leaders happen to be among those who have had those opportunities and have enjoyed the prosperity, and they should be advising their followers more soundly.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, some men fought for 7 years to make America free. And despite the feeling of those who oppose unlimited debate on this subject, I intend to do everything allowable under the Senate rules to keep America free. I shall oppose this amendment.

James Madison said:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands, whether one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elected, may justly be denounced as the very definition of tyranny.

The Founding Fathers recognized that. Thomas Hobbs spoke the truth when he said:

> Freedom is political power divided into small fragments.

Consequently, our Founding Fathers drafted a Constitution which divided the powers of government between the Federal Government on the national level and the State governments on the local level. And they left to the States the power to regulate all contracts to convey real estate and all conveyances of real estate.

I read the following from volume 11 of American Jurisprudence at page 331:

> From the general powers heretofore stated, it naturally follows that all instruments affecting the title to real estate, no matter what their nature, must be governed, as to their execution, construction, and legal sufficiency, exclusively by the laws of the state in which the real estate is situated.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, there is not a single decision of any court which declares that Congress has the power to regulate the conveyance of real estate or contracts to convey real estate.

The pending forced housing amendment undertakes to transfer from the 50 States of the Union to the banks of the Potomac River, and to one man on the banks of the Potomac River—namely, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development—the power to control the transfer of real estate in every locality in the 50 States. And it proposes to do it under a system which denies to all the landowners in America the right to have access to courts of law and trial by jury for the establishment of their rights.

To be sure, it contains a little provision to the effect that after the Secretary has found the facts and rendered a verdict, one can go to the courts. However, the courts will be powerless to change his findings of fact if they are supported by evidence, no matter how conflicting the evidence may have been and no matter how overwhelming the evidence may have been in opposition to his findings.

Anyone who has practiced law knows that the important thing in a case is the findings of fact or the verdict. And if anyone will let me write the verdict, I do not care who writes the judgment, because the judgment has to be based on the verdict.

This is one of a series of bills which bear the beguiling name of civil rights bills. Every year Congress meets, and men stand before the Nation and say that the minority race can be transported on flowery beds of ease to a more abundant life by the passing of these so-called civil rights bills.

We have passed them and the people that were supposed to be transported on flowery beds of ease to more abundant lives without exertion on their part have not been so transported.

While I do not profess to be an authority on the subject, I honestly believe that much of the violence and rioting that we have had in our cities has been prompted by frustration growing out of the assurances of the advocates of such bills that these bills could transport these people without exertion on their part to more abundant lives.

Anybody who claims that we can legislate any man by means of a law to a more abundant life is either fooling himself or trying to fool somebody else. It cannot be done. The only way that any people can achieve a more abundant life is by their own exertions, and their own sacrifices. And, as I say, anyone who maintains the contrary is either fooling himself or trying to fool somebody else.

The proponents of the Mondale amendment hold it forth to the people as something that will revolutionize America and lift people out of the ghettos.

We already have proof of the fact that there is no soundness in any such assertion. At this moment while I speak, 60 percent of all of the people of America live in areas which are covered by what some people call fair housing laws. However, these laws can truthfuly be described as forced housing laws. The worst ghettos we have in America and the worst scenes of rioting we have had in America have been located in areas where such laws are in existence, and in some cases have been in existence for many years.

So we come here promising the patient that we are going to cure him with another dose of the same medicine he has been taking, which has not in any way alleviated his unfortunate condition.

To my recollection, the people of the United States, whom we are supposed to represent in Congress, do not favor fair housing laws, or forced housing laws, whatever you choose to call them. In every instance—North, South, East, and West—where the people have been permitted to vote on the question of whether they would have fair housing laws in their States or in their communities, they have rejected such laws. And the Senate of the United States would be going against the popular will of the people as thus expressed if it were to adopt the Mondale amendment.

No one has been impressed by the chaos, which the passage of such an amendment would engender in the area of land titles in the United States. Virtually every State in the Union has what is called a statute of frauds, which requires that all agreements and conveyances relating to land titles shall be in writing and shall be signed by the owner or by his duly authorized agent. I read such a statute from the North Carolina General Statutes, section 22–2:

> All contracts to sell or convey any lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any interest in or concerning them, and all leases and contracts for leasing land for the purpose of digging for gold or other minerals, or for mining generally, of whatever duration, and all other leases and contracts for leasing lands exceeding in duration three years from the making thereof, shall be void unless said contract or some memorandum or note thereof be put in writing and signed by the party to be charged therewith, or by some other person by him thereto lawfully authorized.

This statute and similar statutes in virtually every one of the other 49 States were passed to prevent the perpetration of frauds in respect to lands. They outlaw oral contracts as set out in the statute in order to prevent the perpetration of fraud. The Mondale amendment would nullify that statute and similar statutes in the other 49 States and would make the titles of land dependent upon oral offers to sell and even upon oral refusals to sell.

If we are to have any development in this country in the way of building upon lands, we will have to have one place where everyone can go to view the evidence of title and determine whether he can obtain a valid title to the property he seeks to acquire and upon which he seeks to build.

So we have laws, such as another North Carolina statute, in all 50 States. I read from section 47–18 of the General Statutes of North Carolina:

> § 47–18. Conveyances, contracts to convey and leases of land.—(a) No conveyance of land, or contract to convey, or lease of land for more than three years shall be valid to pass any property as against lien creditors or purchasers for a valuable consideration from the donor, bargainor or lessor but from the time of registration thereof in the county where the land lies, or if the land is located in more than one county, then in each county where any portion of the land lies to be effective as to the land in that county.

This statute was passed in North Carolina, and similar statutes were passed in all the other States of the Union, so that a man could search the recorded evidence of titles and determine whether or not he could acquire a valid title to the land he desired to purchase or the land upon which he desired to take an encumbrance. But under the Mondale amendment, these statutes would be nullified, for all practical intents and purposes, in all 50 States; and since the title to land would be made to hinge, under the Mondale amendent, on oral offers to sell or oral refusals to sell, there would be no place that any person could ascertain with any degree of certainty whether he could acquire a good title to a piece of land which he proposed to purchase, if the land contained a residence or was susceptible of development for residential purposes.

This is the chaos which the Mondale amendment, if adopted, would introduce into land titles throughout the United States. It would transfer to the Federal Government powers which the Constitution and our system of government leave to the States. And it would do so on a strange pretext.

The gist of the Mondale amendment can be summed up in the words which appear on page 4 of the amendment, which would make it unlawful "To make any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale or rental of a dwelling that indicates any preference based on race, color, religion, or national origin."

What evil is there in a man preferring to sell or rent his residential property to a person of his own race or of his own religion?

The argument has been made on the floor of the Senate that we have white residential neighborhoods in the United States because of prejudice entertained by the people who reside in such neighborhoods against people of other races or because of similar prejudice entertained by real estate agents who sell property in such neighborhoods. I believe that argument is unsound.

In all areas of the country I have visited, I have noticed that where people are left free to select associates for themselves and their children of tender years, they virtually always select as their associates members of their own race. I have noticed that Members of Congress of Caucasian ancestry, both those who advocate the adoption of the Mondale amendment and those who oppose it, elect to live in communities inhabited by members of their own race. I do not think this comes about as a matter of prejudice. I think it is entirely in conformity with the natural law that like tends to seek like.

I say this further: Even if you assume there is something wrong in preferring to sell or lease your residential property to a person of your own race, it is necessary for the Government to allow people to continue to do so if they are to have any freedom. If a man is to be told by the Government to whom he can sell or lease his property, then he has no freedom. If a man has no freedom to choose to do wrong as well as right, he has no freedom whatever.

Mr. President, this is an attempt to destroy one of the fundamental freedoms of the American people, and that is the right of private property.

Property does not consist merely of the physical thing to which one may have title. It consists of all the attributes of that thing, such as the right to use it as one pleases, the right to lease it as one pleases, and the right to dispose of it as one pleases.

This is an attempt to destroy the basic property rights of all Americans. It is proposed to rob all Americans, 200 million Americans of all races, of a basic right, in the expectation that such action will make them forget race or religion and live in integrated fashion. This has not happened among the 60 percent of our Nation where these laws are now in effect.

I am against this bill. I am against it because I believe the supreme value of civilization is the freedom of the individual, the freedom of the individual to do what he wishes to do with his own, regardless of whether it may suit some people in political office, and regardless of whether it suits some of these pressure groups which are constantly and unceasingly demanding that all Americans be robbed of their precious personal rights in order that they might impose their wills upon them.

This bill, which would transfer from the 50 States and the innumerable localities throughout the United States, to the banks of the Potomac, the power to control not only all sales and leases of residential property, but also the power to compel the financing of purchases of land is the most serious assault on the liberties of our people that has been presented to the Congress since I have been a Member of the Senate. I am opposed to it.

Mr. President, a great Virginian, Woodrow Wilson, who understood American government and its purposes better than anyone who ever occupied the Presidency, said this:

> Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power and not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power we are resisting processes of death because concentration of power is what always precedes destruction of human liberties.

This amendment is an attempt to concentrate the greatest power in Federal Government of any measure ever proposed to the Congress, and as Woodrow Wilson said, illustrates the truth that the concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

Under this amendment the Federal Government acting through an executive officer, would assume judicial as well as executive powers, dictate to the American people to whom they could sell their property, and to whom they could lease their property, and dictate to every financial institution in the United States what property they had to finance. I cannot imagine anything that would be more destructive of the right of the people of this land to manage their own affairs than the Mondale amendment.

I have noticed since I have been in Washington that when men seek to rob the American people of their freedom, they always concoct a measure like the Mondale amendment, which denies the right of trial by jury, thereby making it certain that justice will not be done. There never has been a more flagrant example of that than the Mondale amendment.

Under this amendment controversies respecting property in cases covered by the amendment could not be tried in the courts in the localities where the property is located. They would have to be tried by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or his designee. The Secretary is the man who is charged with the responsibility for carrying out the policies of the bill.

He is the man who is given the power to receive complaints, to investigate complaints, to make investigations on his own volition, to make complaints on his own volition, and after he investigates the complaints, then he acts as prosecutor, and while acting as prosecutor he acts as the jury, he finds the facts, and then acts as the judge and imposes the judgment.

Mr. President, if the Constitution means what it says in the third article, that all the judicial power of the United States is vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish, these provisions, which give the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development powers greater than those enjoyed by potentates, are unconstitutional.

It would be a denial of due process of law to place all these powers in a person who has a motive to rule a certain way. It is undoubtedly true that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would have a strong motive to rule in favor of the persons who make the charges or in whose behalf the charges are preferred. This is true because, in the first place, the Secretary is charged with the responsibility of administering the provisions of the amendment. He is also charged with the duty of investigating the complaints and of holding hearings on the complaints.

Certainly a man who is charged with the investigation of complaints before he tries a proceeding based on those complaints will reach the conclusion that he was right in the investigation, and will proceed to frame his opinion in harmony with the findings of the investigation. Any person who acts in the capacity of prosecutor should never be the judge; it is contrary to American jurisprudence.

Under the Mondale amendment, the Secretary could also conduct proceedings in secret with the consent of the parties, despite the fact that one of the fundamental principles of the administration of justice in the United States is that courts shall be open at all times.

I read from the opinion of Mr. Justice Black in the case of *In Re Murchison* (349 U.S. 133), omitting some material that is not pertinent:

> We have previously held that such a Michigan "judge-grand jury" cannot consistently with the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment summarily convict a witness of contempt for conduct in the secret hearings.
>
> The question now before us is whether a contempt proceeding conducted in accord-

ance with these standards complies with the due process requirement of an impartial tribunal where the same judge presiding at the contempt hearing had also served as the "one-man grand jury" out of which the contempt charges arose. This does not involve, of course, the long-exercised power of courts summarily to punish certain conduct occurring in open court.[2]

The petitioners, Murchison and White, were called as witnesses before a "one-man judge-grand jury." Murchison, a Detroit policeman, was interrogated at length in the judge's secret hearings where questions were asked him about suspected gambling in Detroit and bribery of policemen. His answers left the judge persuaded that he had committed perjury, particularly in view of other evidence before the "judge-grand jury." The judge then charged Murchison with perjury and ordered him to appear and show cause why he should not be punished for criminal contempt.[3] White, the other petitioner, was also summoned to appear as a witness in the same "one-man grand jury" hearing. Asked numerous questions about gambling and bribery, he refused to answer on the ground that he was entitled under Michigan law to have counsel present with him. The "judge-grand jury" charged White with contempt and ordered him to appear and show cause. The judge who had been the "grand jury" then tried both petitioners in open court, convicted and sentenced them for contempt. Petitioners objected to being tried for contempt by this particular judge for a number of reasons including: (1) Michigan law expressly provides that a judge conducting a "one-man grand jury" inquiry will be disqualified from hearing or trying any case arising from his inquiry or from hearing any motion to dismiss or quash any complaint or indictment growing out of it, or from hearing any charge of contempt "except alleged contempt for neglect or refusal to appear in response to a summons or subpoena"; (2) trial before the judge who was at the same time the complainant, indicter and prosecutor, constituted a denial of the fair and impartial trial required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The trial judge answered the first challenge by holding that the state statute barring him from trying the contempt cases violated the Michigan Constitution on the ground that it would deprive a judge of inherent power to punish contempt. This interpretation of the Michigan Constitution is binding here. As to the second challenge the trial judge held that due process did not forbid him to try the contempt charges. He also rejected other constitutional contentions made by petitioners. The State Supreme Court sustained all the trial judge's holdings and affirmed.[4]

Now, omitting some parts not germane, and continuing:

> A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. Fairness of course requires an absence of actual bias in the trial of cases. But our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness. To this end no man can be a judge in his own case and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest in the outcome. That interest cannot be defined with precision. Circumstances and relationships must be considered. This Court has said, however, that "every procedure which would offer a possible temptation to the average man as a judge . . . not to hold the balance nice, clear and true between the State and the accused, denies the latter due process of law."

Mr. President, there is a good deal more discussion on this matter which should be made available to all Senators; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the entire opinion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Opinion of the Court No. 45: Argued April 20, 1955; decided May 16, 1955]

IN RE MURCHISON ET AL.: CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MICHIGAN

"A Michigan state judge served as a 'one-man grand jury' under Michigan law in investigating crime. Later, the same judge, after a hearing in open court, adjudged two of the witnesses guilty of contempt and sentenced them to punishment for events which took place before him in the grand jury proceedings. *Held:* Their trial and conviction for contempt before the same judge violated the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment." Pp. 133–139.

"The power of a trial judge to punish for a contempt committed in his immediate presence in open court is not applicable to the contempt proceeding here." P. 137. 340 Mich. 140, 65 N. W. 2d 296, and 340 Mich. 151, 65 N. W. 2d 301, reversed.

William L. Colden argued the cause for petitioners. With him on the brief were *James A. Cobb, George E. C. Hayes* and *Charles W. Jones.*

Edmund E. Shepherd, Solicitor General, argued the cause for the State of Michigan, respondent. With him on the brief were *Thomas M. Kavanagh,* Attorney General, and *Daniel J. O'Hara,* Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. JUSTICE BLACK delivered the opinion of the Court.

Michigan law authorizes any judge of its courts of record to act as a so-called "one-man grand jury."[1] He can compel witnesses to appear before him in secret to testify about suspected crimes. We have previously held that such a Michigan "judge-grand jury" cannot consistently with Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment summarily convict a witness of contempt for conduct in the secret hearings. *In re Oliver,* 333 U.S. 257. We held that before such a conviction could stand, due process requires as a minimum that an accused be given a public trial after reasonable notice of the charges have a right to examine witnesses against him, call witnesses on his own behalf, and be represented by counsel. The question now before us is whether a contempt proceeding conducted in accordance with these standards complies with the due process requirement of an impartial tribunal where the same judge presiding at the contempt hearing had also served as the "one-man grand jury" out of which the contempt charges arose. This does not involve, of course, the long-exercised power of courts summarily to punish certain conduct occurring in open court.[2]

The petitioners, Murchison and White, were called as witnesses before a "one-man judge-grand jury." Murchison, a Detroit policeman, was interrogated at length in the judge's secret hearings where questions were asked him about suspected gambling in Detroit and bribery of policemen. His answers left the judge persuaded that he had committed perjury, particularly in view of other evidence before the "judge-grand jury." The judge then charged Murchison with perjury and ordered him to appear and show cause why he should not be punished for criminal contempt.[3] White, the other petitioner, was also summoned to appear as a witness in the same "one-man grand jury" hearing. Asked numerous questions about gambling and bribery, he refused to answer on the ground that he was entitled under Michigan law to have counsel present with him. The "judge-grand jury" charged White with contempt and ordered him to appear and show cause. The judge who had been the "grand jury" then tried both petitioners in open court, convicted and sentenced them for contempt. Petitioners objected to being tried for contempt by this particular judge for a number of reasons including: (1) Michigan law expressly provides that a judge conducting a "one-man grand jury" inquiry will be disqualified from hearing or trying any case arising from his inquiry or from hearing any motion to dismiss or quash any complaint or indictment growing out of it, or from hearing any charge of contempt "except alleged contempt for neglect or refusal to appear in response to a summons or subpoena"; (2) trial before the judge who was at the same time the complainant, indicter and prosecutor, constituted a denial of the fair and impartial trial required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The trial judge answered the first challenge by holding that the state statute barring him from trying the contempt cases violated the Michigan Constitution on the ground that it would deprive a judge of inherent power to punish contempt. This interpretation of the Michigan Constitution is binding here. As to the second challenge the trial judge held that due process did not forbid him to try the contempt charges. He also rejected other constitutional contentions made by petitioners. The State Supreme Court sustained all the trial judge's holdings and affirmed.[4] Importance of the federal constitutional questions raised caused us to grant certiorari.[5] The view we take makes it unnecessary for us to consider or decide any of those questions except the due process challenge to trial by the judge who had conducted the secret "one-man grand jury" proceedings.[6]

A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. Fairness of course requires an absence of actual bias in the trial of cases. But our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness. To this end no man can be a judge in his own case and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest in the outcome. That interest cannot be defined with precision. Circumstances and relationships must be considered. This Court has said, however, that every procedure which would offer a possible temptation to the average man as a judge . . . not to hold the balance nice, clear and true between the State and the accused, denies the latter due process of law." *Tumey* v. *Ohio,* 273 U.S. 510,

---

[1] Mich. Stat. Ann., 1954, §§ 28.943, 28.944.

[2] *Sacher* v. *United States,* 343 U.S. 1; *Cooke* v. *United States,* 267 U.S. 517, 539; *Ex parte Savin,* 131 U.S. 267. See also *In re Oliver,* 333 U.S. 257, 273–278.

[3] The contempt charge signed by the judge reads in part as follows:

"It therefore appearing . . . that the said Patrolman Lee Roy Murchinson [*sic*] has been guilty of wilfull and corrupt perjury, which perjury has an obstructive effect upon the judicial inquiry being conducted by this court and the said Patrolman Lee Roy Murchinson [*sic*] obstructed the judicial function of the court by wilfully giving false answers as aforesaid, and did also tend to impair the respect for the authority of the court, all of which perjury and false answers given by the said witness aforesaid was committed during the sitting of, in the presence and view of this court and constitutes criminal contempt;

"It is therefore ordered that the said Patrolman Lee Roy Murchinson [*sic*] appear before this court on the tenth day of May, 1954, at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon and show cause why he should not be punished for criminal contempt of this court because of his aforesaid acts."

[4] *In re White,* 340 Mich. 140, 65 N.W. 2d 296; *In re Murchison,* 340 Mich. 151, 65 N.W. 2d 301.

[5] 348 U.S. 894.

[6] That we lay aside certain other federal constitutional challenges by petitioners is not to be taken as any intimation that we have passed on them one way or another.

532. Such a stringent rule may sometimes bar trial by judges who have no actual bias and who would do their very best to weigh the scales of justice equally between contending parties. But to perform its high function in the best way "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice." *Offutt* v. *United States,* 348 U.S. 11, 14.

It would be very strange if our system of law permitted a judge to act as a grand jury and then try the very persons accused as a result of his investigations. Perhaps no State has ever forced a defendant to accept grand jurors as proper trial jurors to pass on charges growing out of their hearings.[7] A single "judge-grand jury" is even more a part of the accusatory process than an ordinary lay grand juror. Having been a part of that process a judge cannot be, in the very nature of things, wholly disinterested in the conviction or acquittal of those accused. While he would not likely have all the zeal of a prosecutor, it can certainly not be said that he would have none of that zeal.[8] *Fair trials are too important a part of our free society to let prosecuting judges be trial judges of the charges they prefer.*[9] It is true that contempt committed in a trial courtroom can under some circumstances be punished summarily by the trial judge. See *Cooke* v. *United States,* 267 U.S. 517, 539. But adjudication by a trial judge of a contempt committed in his immediate presence in open court cannot be likened to the proceedings here. For we held in the *Oliver* case that a person charged with contempt before a "one-man grand jury" could not be summarily tried.

As a practical matter it is difficult if not impossible for a judge to free himself from the influence of what took place in his "grand-jury" secret session. His recollection of that is likely to weigh far more heavily with him than any testimony given in the open hearings. That it sometimes does is illustrated by an incident which occurred in White's case. In finding White guilty of contempt the trial judge said, "There is one thing the record does not show, and that was Mr. White's attitude, and I must say that his attitude was almost insolent in the manner in which he answered questions and his attitude upon the witness stand. . . . Not only was the personal attitude insolent, but it was defiant, and I want to put that on the record." In answer to defense counsel's motion to strike these statements because they were not part of the original record the judge said, "That is something . . . that wouldn't appear on the record, but it would be very evident to the court." Thus the judge whom due process requires to be impartial in weighing the evidence presented before him, called on his own personal knowledge and impression of what had occurred in the grand jury room and his judgment was based in part on this impression, the accuracy of which could not be tested by adequate cross-examination.

This incident also shows that the judge was doubtless more familiar with the facts and circumstances in which the charges were rooted than was any other witness. There were no public witnesses upon whom petitioners could call to give disinterested testimony concerning what took place in the secret chambers of the judge. If there had been they might have been able to refute the judge's statement about White's insolence. Moreover, as shown by the judge's statement here, a "judge-grand jury" might himself many times be a very material witness in a later trial for contempt. If the charge should be heard before that judge, the result would be either that the defendant must be deprived of examining or cross-examining him or else there would be the spectacle of the trial judge presenting testimony upon which he must finally pass in determining the guilt or innocence of the defendant.[10] In either event the State would have the benefit of the judge's personal knowledge while the accused would be denied an effective opportunity to cross-examine. The right of a defendant to examine and cross-examine witnesses is too essential to a fair trial to have that right jeopardized in such way.

We hold that it was a violation of due process for the "judge-grand jury" to try these petitioners, and it was therefore error for the Supreme Court of Michigan to uphold the convictions. The judgments are reversed and the causes are remanded for proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Reversed.

MR. JUSTICE REED and MR. JUSTICE MINTON, dissenting, with whom MR. JUSTICE BURTON joins.

The Court holds that it is unconstitutional for a state judge to punish a contempt, previously committed before him while acting as a so-called one-man grand jury, after a full hearing in open court. It holds that White, in being so punished for his blanket refusal to answer any questions before the grand jury, and Murchison, in being so punished for perjury before the same body, were deprived of their liberty without due process of law.

This conclusion is not rested on any irregularity in the proceedings before either the grand jury or the court. Under Michigan procedure a single estate judge makes the grand jury investigation, not in secret, but with other public officials to aid him, and a transcript is made of the testimony. There is certainly nothing unconstitutional about this. A State may reduce the customary number of grand jurors to one, and impart the investigatory duty to a member of its judiciary if it so desires. Further, the accused is afforded a full hearing in open court, with a statement of charges, benefit of counsel, and a full opportunity to explain his conduct before the grand jury, before being held in contempt. Thus all the requiremenets set down in *In re Oliver,* 333 U.S. 257, are met.

The Court's determination is rested on the sole fact that the same judge first cited petitioners for contempt committed in his presence, and then presided over the proceedings leading to the final adjudication. It is neither shown nor alleged that the state judge was in any way biased. Nor is this required by the Court, for it holds, as a matter of law, that the judge's "interest" in a conviction makes the proceedings inherently prejudicial and thus constitutionally invalid. The fact that the "interest" of the state judge in this procedure is no different from that of other judges who have traditionally punished for contempt leads us to dissent.

In *Sacher* v. *United States,* 343 U.S. 1, we upheld the power of a federal district judge to summarily punish a contempt previously committed in his presence. In that case, after a trial which had extended for some nine months, the trial judge issued a certificate summarily holding defense counsel in contempt for their actions during the trial. There were no formalities, no hearings, no taking of evidence, no arguments and no briefs. We held that such a procedure was permitted by Rule 42 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which codified the "prevailing usages at law." The Court specifically rejected the contention that the judge who heard the contempt was disqualified from punishing it and should be required to assume the role of accuser or complaining witness before another judge. In *Offutt* v. *United States,* 348 U.S. 11, the Court simply stated an exception: when the trial judge becomes personally embroiled with the contemnor, he must step aside in favor of another judge. That decision was rested upon our supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice in the federal courts. The Court now holds, even though there is no showing or contention that the state judge became embroiled or personally exercised, or was in any way biased, that as a matter of constitutional law—of procedural due process—a state judge may not punish a contempt previously committed in his presence. This seems inconsistent with all that has gone before.

The Court, presumably referring to the situation in the federal courts, states that the "adjudication by a trial judge of a contempt committed in his immediate presence in open court cannot be likened to the proceedings here." The reason that it cannot, we are told, is because "we held in the *Oliver* case that a person charged with contempt before a 'one-man grand jury' could not be summarily tried." This is hardly explanatory, for the question of whether the hearing is to be summary or plenary has no bearing on the attitude or "interest" of the judges in the two situations, which is indistinguishable. The simple fact is that in the federal courts we allow the same judge who hears the contempt and issues the certificate to punish it subsequently and summarily, but in this case we do not allow such punishment even after a full court trial. The only factual difference between *Sacher* and this case is that the contempt in *Sacher* was committed at a public trial. When the contempt is not committed in open court, we require that the criminal conviction be in public and that the individual be given a full hearing, with an opportunity to defend himself against the charges profered and to make a record from which to appeal. *In re Oliver,* 333 U.S. 257. Petitioners had all this. They are not entitled to more.

We do not see how it can be held that it violates fundamental concepts of fair play and justice for a state judge after a full court trial to punish a contempt previously observed when acting as a grand jury, when it has been held that it is perfectly proper for a federal judge to summarily punish a contempt previously observed in open court. It seems to us that the Court has imposed a more stringent requirement on state judges as a matter of due process than we have imposed on federal judges over whom we exercise supervisory power.

The Court relies heavily on *Tumey* v. *Ohio,* 273 U.S. 510. There we held that it deprives a defendant of due process to "subject his liberty or property to the judgment of a court the judge of which has a direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary interest in reaching a conclusion against him in his case." *Id.,* at 523. It is one thing to hold that a judge has too great an interest in a case to permit the rendition of a fair verdict when his compensation is determined by the result he reaches. It is quite another thing to disqualify a state judge as having too great an interest to render a due process judgment when his sole interest, as shown by this record, is the maintenance of order and decorum in the investigation of crime—an interest which he shares in common with all judges who punish for contempt.

---

[7] See, *e.g.,* Note, 50 L.R.A. (N.S.) 933, 953–954, 970–971.

[8] Apparently the trial judge here did consider himself a part of the prosecution. In passing on a request of Murchison's counsel for a two-day postponement of the contempt trial the judge said, "There are two points that suggest themselves to me.

"One is that if the respondent is going to claim that he was in Shrewesberry, Ontario, Canada, on March 9, 1954, that *we* ought to be furnished with information so that *we* could between now and two days from now, which I am going to give you, *we* could do some checking and investigating *ourselves.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Because of the judge's dual position the view he took of his function is not at all surprising.

[9] See, *e.g., Queen* v. *London County Council* [1892], 1 Q.B. 190; *Wisconsin ex rel. Getchel* v. *Bradish,* 95 Wis. 205, 70 N.W. 172.

[10] See *Hale* v. *Wyatt,* 78 N.H. 214, 98 A. 379. See also, Witnesses—Competency—Competency of a Presiding Judge as Witness, 28 Harv. L. Rev. 115.

The State of Michigan has decided that in the administration of its criminal law it is wise to have the investigating power in the hands of a judge. It has also decided that the judge who observes the contempt is to preside at the trial of the contemnor. It does not seem that there is here such a violation of accepted judicial standards as to justify this Court's determination of unconstitutionality.

We would affirm.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I say that the Mondale amendment, which charges the Secretary with the responsibility to enforce the law, which vests in the Secretary the power to receive and make complaints, which vests in him the duty to investigate, which vests in him the power to determine whether a proceeding or a trial should be had, and which vests in him the power to act as prosecutor, jury, and judge, makes it certain that justice will not rule. It would constitute a denial of the due process of law because he would have an interest in rendering a decision contrary to the landowner.

If we want to resist the processes of death described by Woodrow Wilson, we must strike down this tremendous effort to centralize in the Federal Government in Washington the power to control the sale, leasing, and financing of residential property throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I shall have other remarks to make on a future occasion on this subject, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to resume my remarks on a subsequent occasion and have the remarks made today and those made on a subsequent occasion count as only one speech on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, fair housing legislation for this Nation is long overdue. We have passed laws which guarantee equal opportunities in education and jobs, and equal access to public accommodations, the voting booth and the jury box. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe in the rightness of these laws.

Yet many of our citizens are fenced into ghettos.

Most persons in this country can rent or buy the dwelling of their choice, if they have the money or credit to qualify. But others, even if they have unlimited funds and impeccable credit, often are denied access to decent housing simply because of the color of their skin.

There is a crisis in human relations in America today. Negroes in this country are demanding that they be accepted for what they are—human beings with rights commensurate with their status as citizens of the United States.

Our multiracial society can pursue its dreams in harmonious concord, or it can continue to burn its energy in futile discord. Congress can face the issues boldly and lay down the guidelines for greater cooperation between all members of our society, or it can sidestep the issues, and leave the field open to prejudice and unreason.

Earlier this week, President Johnson said that race riots in our cities are "inevitable" this summer and in future years. I am not ready to concede that they are inevitable. Certainly, we must offer constructive alternatives to racial strife.

Enactment of a fair housing bill will, in itself, not solve all of our problems. But failure to recognize the rights of all our citizens to equal access to decent housing within their means will certainly aggravate those problems.

Solutions to America's racial problems will ultimately be found in the understanding, compassion, and mutual concern among the people themselves. But we in Congress can set the framework for that understanding and compassion. We must lead the way by appealing to man's conscience.

The proposed fair housing amendment would add a second title to the pending civil rights protection bill. With some modifications, it is virtually identical to title IV of S. 1026, the Civil Rights Act of 1967, and to S. 1358, the Fair Housing Act of 1967, on which 3 days of hearings were held last August by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I am a cosponsor of both measures as well as the pending amendment.

The proposed amendment prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or rental of housing. It would be carried out in three stages.

Immediately upon its enactment, the act would apply to housing already subject to the President's order on equal opportunity in housing of November 20, 1962. That Executive order covers federally assisted housing—essentially housing with FHA- or VA-guaranteed mortgages or public housing.

On January 1, 1969, the act's coverage would be extended to housing held for sale or rent by someone other than its occupant and to housing for five or more families.

Finally, on January 1, 1970, all housing except two categories would fall within the scope of the act. Religious institutions, or schools and other agencies affiliated with them, may give preference in housing to persons of their own religion despite the act. The "Mrs. Murphy" clause excludes from the act's coverage dwellings for four or fewer families.

The fair housing amendment also prohibits blockbusting, discrimination in the financing of housing, discrimination in the provision of services or admission to membership by real estate organizations, and interference with or threats against persons enjoying or attempting to enjoy any of the rights which the act grants or protects. These prohibitions go into effect immediately upon enactment of the law.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would administer and enforce the act. During the gradual extension of the act's coverage, he would undertake an educational campaign to acquaint the housing industry and the country generally with the act's provisions.

The Secretary must seek a voluntary solution in every case. If his attempt is unsuccessful, he may issue a complaint, hold hearings, and, if the evidence disclosed that discriminatory acts had occurred, issue orders granting appropriate relief. All orders are subject to judicial review.

A person who believes that he has been injured by a discriminatory housing practice may file a charge with the Secretary. The Secretary does not have to conciliate or issue a complaint on the basis of every charge filed, but if he does not, the complainant may start an action himself in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The Attorney General may initiate suits to enforce the act in U.S. district courts when he has reasonable cause to believe that there is a pattern or practice of housing discrimination, that is, where there is concerted or persistent interference with rights protected by the act.

The act leaves existing State and local fair housing laws in effect. In appropriate cases, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may cede his jurisdiction to State and local agencies, or cooperate with them in joint enforcement of Federal, State, and local fair housing laws.

Last year, Pennsylvania's Gov. Raymond P. Shafer signed into law one of the broadest open housing measures in the Nation, which prohibits discrimination in the sale of all housing in the State. At that time, he said:

> What we have done this year is really only part of the beginning—the frame on which we must now put human wisdom and understanding to work in ending the race crisis this Nation faces.

I hope that we can act at the national level with equal courage and wisdom.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, recent years have seen dramatic progress in providing the American Negro with the rights enjoyed by all other Americans. Laws designed to guarantee equal rights for all in using public accommodations, in education, voting, in employment opportunities, have advanced the Negro in his struggle to achieve the rights which never should have been denied him. The proposed fair housing amendment presently before the Senate is the logical, essential and inevitable next step toward a more complete realization of those rights.

The time is now for Congress to pass a law insuring all Americans an equal choice in their selection of housing. Our technology is capable of producing for us a wide range of opportunities for choices of living patterns that are the principal virtues of metropolitan life, of a free economy and of a technological society. But when those opportunities and those choices are withheld from certain segments of society, they can lead only to social disorganization and chaos.

The fact is, our social structures, and the political machinery which responds to the attitudes of our people, are changing with agonizing slowness. And as the events of last summer have demonstrated, time is running out. The performance of our society has not kept pace with the promises of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

A number of proposals have been made to cope with this crisis in our society. They have included recommendations for massive investments in the physical resources of our cities, new approaches in terms of private investment, full appropriations for existing programs, and new techniques for the application of our national resources.

The embodiment of all of these proposals is the model cities program. This program provides for a comprehensive, concerted attack on all the ills of a specific community, to eliminate slum and blight, and to engage in physical and social renewal. The Model Cities Act was the result of our realization that we cannot deal with each aspect of poverty separately and expect to achieve any meaningful, lasting results. The aim now is to provide vastly expanded opportunities for the slum resident to help him improve every aspect of his life.

However, we must not deceive ourselves that a completely revitalized model city area, or "golden ghetto" as it has been called, is the final solution to the plight of the Negro. For no matter how livable a neighborhood is, and no matter what social and educational resources it provides, it will be of no help to the resident whose job has moved elsewhere. It will provide no satisfaction to the Negro who would like to move elsewhere but who is forced to remain because he cannot find other suitable housing due to his color.

A critical problem of the core city is the decline of industry. The office buildings which are replacing industry in our cities offer few jobs for the unskilled. Employment opportunities which do arise in our cities are being filled by suburban dwellers who take away much from our cities and contribute little to them. While we can make every effort to retain and increase employment opportunities in the city, we cannot overlook the need for and advisability of the city dweller being able to seek the best possible job wherever it is. The exodus of industry from the city has been a bitter development for the Negro. He cannot afford to commute to the relocated plant and he is denied an apartment to rent or a house to buy in the suburbs simply on the basis of his race. Fortune magazine recently conducted a study which revealed that the majority of suburban towns have experienced next to no influx of Negroes, while the few gains which have occurred have been in towns which had a sizable Negro population to start with. The current Negro movement to suburbia is still far too slow to stem the increasing trend toward black cities ringed by white suburbs.

Americans have long prided themselves on having the freedom to achieve personal success to the extent of one's initiative and ability. For most Americans, the goal and reward of personal endeavor is a satisfying job and a good home. Regretfully, both of these are often off limits to the Negro who is told where he can and cannot live.

It is not enough to eliminate segregation in only certain, select areas of our lives. We must not rest until all segregation is banned, and certainly housing is one of the most serious areas in which it still exists. The Senate hearings on fair housing held last year pointed up time and again that the American Negro is aware of his lack of choice in housing and places it high on his list of priorities where equal rights are concerned. Karl E. Taeuber, in an article on residential segregation for Scientific American, cited a block of exceptional housing built in Harlem by architect Stanford White when Harlem was a white section. After it became a Negro section, the block became known as "Strivers' Row" because so many white collar and professional Negroes sought to live there.

A "Strivers' Row" should not be necessary in this country in this age. No race should be limited by segregation in its choice of housing. No one of any race should have to vie for a home in a few select areas to which it is limited by lack of fair housing laws.

At present, 22 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have laws banning discrimination in some kinds of housing. These laws represent some amount of progress in fair housing, but the variations in both content and the extent to which they are enforced from State to State leaves much to be desired. What is needed is a fundamental, national policy applying equally to all parts of the country. Clearly, the responsibility rests with the Congress to establish that policy.

While we seek the long-term causes of civil disorder, while we propose and evaluate and enact long-term solutions, while we appropriate moneys for existing programs, we have at hand the means to make an immediate demonstration of faith to the Negro. It is we in the Congress who should take the lead in securing the fundamental right of fair housing for the Negro in 1968.

In closing, Mr. President, I offer to my colleagues as a pertinent observation for today's discussion, the philosophy of government held by Gov. Joshua Chamberlain of Maine over a hundred years ago:

> A government has something more to do than to govern, and levy taxes to pay the governors. It is something more than a police to arrest evil and punish wrong. It must also encourage good, point out improvements, open roads of prosperity and infuse life into all right enterprises. It should combine the insight and foresight of the best minds of the State for all the high ends for which society is established and to which man aspires. That gives us much to do.

FOREIGN TRADE RESTRICTIONS ON U.S. COMPANIES IN CANADA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Canadian subsidiaries of American companies are bound by U.S. law and Treasury Department regulations to observe the same restrictions on trading with the enemy as apply to their parent firms in the United States.

They are not permitted to trade with Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, or Cuba, and they are restricted from trading in strategic goods with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc countries of Eastern Europe.

In a report made public yesterday, this U.S. policy was sharply criticized by a task force of economists commissioned by the Canadian Government to study this matter.

The report proposed to end U.S. restrictions on exports to Communist countries by U.S.-owned Canadian companies, and to require all companies, regardless of nationality of ownership, to fill any export order that is permitted under Canadian law or foreign policy. This would mean U.S. companies in Canada would be required to trade with Communist China, or some of the other countries I have mentioned, if an order for exports is received.

Mr. President, I have great admiration for the people of Canada. They have long been friends and firm allies of this country.

But I do want to express my support of the Treasury Department acting with the guidance of the State Department in putting these restrictions on American subsidiaries in Canada.

Our country has suffered more than 100,000 casualties in the last 2 years at the hands of North Vietnam. For the first 6 weeks of 1968, U.S. casualties averaged 2,000 per week. China, the Soviet Union, and countries of Eastern Europe provide the bulk of war materiel going to our enemy in North Vietnam.

I would hope that American companies, wherever they might be located, would voluntarily refrain from trading with these countries. Certainly they should not be required by Canadian law to engage in such trade.

Mr. President, I fully support the Treasury Department in this matter. It has acted to faithfully carry out the will of the American people and the intent of Congress as expressed in the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Virginia. I feel the same as he does with regard to this subject.

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING BY CONSTRUCTION TRADE UNIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate the extraordinary development in the trade-union construction field, which has now gotten together to eliminate any residual concept in the public's mind that they are not fully cooperating to make available apprenticeships, journeymen, and other opportunities to Negroes and other minorities in the building-trade unions. There has been a lot of controversy about that. I rise only to wish them well in their effort and to assure them of my full cooperation, and I think that of every other person interested in this matter. I think this is a very desirable development. One does not know how it will work, but certainly we want to give them our encouragement.

I ask unanimous consent that statements from the unions and news reports on the subject may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

Eighteen Unions Pledge To Seek Negroes for Building Jobs—Assure Labor Department They Will Try To Prevent Discrimination by Locals

(By Peter Millones)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 13.—The building trades unions assured the Department of Labor here today that they would actively recruit Negro members, discuss apprenticeship programs with civil rights groups and try to prevent discrimination by their local unions.

Without setting specific quotas or timetables, the presidents of 18 international unions with 3.5 million members promised to see that more Negroes worked side by side with whites as plumbers, metal workers, crane operators, carpenters and in a host of other trades.

The heads of the building unions have long smarted under frequent charges of job discrimination made by Federal Government and civil rights leaders.

Today they said they would order all 8,500 union locals not only to recruit Negroes for apprenticeship programs but also to provide instruction where necessary so that Negroes could get into apprenticeship programs.

TWO-DAY PARLEY ENDS

The action was taken by the executive board of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. The board completed a two-day meeting here today.

Up to now, the building trades have largely taken a passive attitude toward Negro employment, concerning themselves mostly with fending off charges of discrimination. In this respect, they carefully point out, they have been like other segments of the community, including many businesses.

In a letter to the union leaders, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said:

"When these proposals are carried out, they will, in my opinion, represent a strong and progressive forward step toward answering, once and for all, complaints that building trades unions may not be exerting their best efforts in full support of private and public action to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

At the same time, the Secretary stated that the Labor Department would continue to oversee apprenticeship programs to make sure there was no discrimination. Many of these programs use Federal funds or involve Federal contracts.

The unions have never agreed that they exclude Negroes because of their race. They have said that Negro membership in some trades, such as metalworking, is low because educated Negroes seek white-collar work and those who seek work in the skilled crafts usually lack basic qualifications.

Negroes who are admitted, the unions add, often lack the motivation to remain with an apprenticeship program, which can take as long as four or five years.

The union leaders who announced the recruiting steps today—and missed the sunniest beach day here in a rain-filled week—also made other proposals.

They said they would support existing and future programs in cities that are designed to provide training and jobs for Negroes.

They said that local unions would be encouraged to publicize apprenticeship programs and actively seek out community leaders who had contact with minority groups.

Another proposal is expected to take an approach that is totally new to some local unions. This is the leaders' recommendation that there be "maximum utilization of responsible civil rights organizations willing to join in a cooperative effort" to carry out the apprenticeship program.

A SPUR TO ACTION

The Labor Department has for some time been attempting to spur the building trades into recruiting more Negroes. It has held over the heads of the unions the possibility that some might be banned from federally financed work unless they did more to erase discrimination.

The unions have complained that they have been harassed and that the Government has too often played what they call a numbers game. That is, a union that does not have a certain percentage of Negroes as members is often questioned about possible discrimination, they have said.

The dispute between the Labor Department and the heads of the building trades was said to have reached a peak in the late fall and early winter.

Then Secretary Wirtz and the top trades union leaders took personal command of the dispute, had their own share of arguments and finally agreed on the active steps proposed today by the union.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

Texts of the Haggerty and Wirtz Letters on Union Discrimination

(The texts of letters exchanged by C. J. Haggerty, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, and W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, follow:)

HAGGERTY LETTER

The Building and Construction Trades Department, desiring to implement the action taken by its 54th convention which endorsed affirmative action generally and in principle for the purpose of preventing any possible discrimination in the operation of local unions, chartered by its affiliated international unions, proposes to undertake, both directly and through the individual general presidents, subscribing hereto, the following:

[1]

To foster, with the cooperation of appropriate management organizations:

(A) Programs of recruitment of qualified applicants for apprenticeship from the Negro population and other minority groups, and

(B) Programs for special attention to deficiencies affecting the full qualification of Negro and other minority group applicants, if such exist, and remedy the same if practical;

[2]

To endorse and support projects such as Outreach and Leap in those 48 cities where such projects have been undertaken and in other cities where such projects are started in the future, urging local unions to give full cooperation, not only by disseminating information concerning the apprenticeship program to those who operate the project, but also by working actively with the project so that it may be better able to recruit applicants specifically according to the needs and requirements of the apprenticeship program;

[3]

To counsel and urge its affiliates to consider appropriate means whereby suitable minority candidates may be recruited;

[4]

To recommend that apprenticeship programs, sponsored or cosponsored by its local unions, disseminate full information concerning program entrance and necessary qualifications, not only to the Bureau of Apprenticeship and training, but also to one or more sources of potential minority candidates within the community;

[5]

To urge upon all affiliate local unions the social and economic necessity of striving for satisfactory minority participation;

[6]

To recommend that affiliate local unions and joint apprenticeship committees explore mutual problems with appropriate organizations directly representative of minority groups within the community.

Each segment of the industry will adopt this proposal according to its structure and requirements with full recognition of the joint characteristics of the apprenticeship program. There will be maximum utilization of responsible civil rights organizations willing to join in a cooperative effort to effect this proposal with full recognition of the necessity for industry to formulate its requirements for employment and entry in the trade.

We offer this form of public-private cooperation as a means of recognizing and meeting social responsibilities in full and voluntary support of Government efforts to eliminate, once and for all, discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin, with the endorsement of the department's executive council.

WIRTZ LETTER

I am gratified to receive your letter of Feb. 1, 1963; in behalf of the Building and Construction Trades Department and subscribing general presidents. In your letter, you express in detail an affirmative action program to eliminate any discrimination in apprenticeship programs, thereby proposing to implement action taken by your 54th convention.

When these proposals are carried out, they will, in my opinion, represent a strong and progressive forward step toward answering, once and for all, complaints that building trades unions may not be exerting their best efforts in full support of private and public action to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

This action of yours is entirely in accordance with my remarks to you at your convention, and I welcome your complete expression of cooperation with the thought that best possible solutions may lie in voluntarism by the unions themselves, in cooperation with appropriate management organizations. This is, indeed, recognizing and meeting social responsibilities in support of Government efforts under law. You are to be commended for the forthright position you have taken.

Meanwhile, in the light of these assurances and in furtherance of my responsibilities under Executive Order 11246 and the Fitzgerald Act, P.L. 75–308 (Aug. 16, 1927), I propose to continue carrying out antidiscrimination provisions concerning apprenticeship, contained in 29 CFR 30, without change or amendment, through the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, in accordance with present regulations. Any conflict between governmental action under these regulations and the activities of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance shall be called to the attention of the Under Secretary of Labor for satisfactory resolution.

REGARDING OUR RECENT SETBACKS AND HUMILIATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is now obvious that we have lost the military initiative in Vietnam—if, indeed, it was ever ours. The Vietcong have been and are on the offensive except at Hue where we have been fighting to dislodge the VC who in late January captured the Citadel and the historic shrines within, including the beautiful and historic palace of the Emperors of Annam of past centuries and other shrines within the Citadel. It is clear that the military leaders of the forces of the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the VC, have made carefully coordinated attacks, well planned and perfectly executed, and we have been on the defensive.

While in South Vietnam last month, Gen. William Westmoreland, Gen. Robert Cushman, Jr., and other general officers of our Armed Forces assured me that the Vietcong were engaged in a huge buildup in front of our Marine outpost at Khesanh, and that according to our intelligence, an attack on a huge scale would occur a couple of days before the Tet Lunar New Year holiday and that the VC and the North Vietnamese anticipated they would celebrate their overrunning of our forces at Khesanh and thereby make their Tet holiday joyous. Our generals were confident that the forces under their command would successfully defend this outpost at Khesanh. I was informed by our generals that reinforcements of GI's from the interior and southerly part of Vietnam had been brought to the area close to the Khesanh outpost as available reserves to help if needed to repel this attack they were certain would be made shortly before the Tet holiday.

Now it is evident that General Westmoreland has been outgeneraled and outwitted by the Vietcong leadership. There has been no massive attack at Khesanh. Probably none was ever intended by the VC or north Vietnamese forces. Instead, the VC assailed 38 provincial capitals throughout South Vietnam including tremendous attacks in the Mekong Delta and other lush rice producing area. In every area in south Vietnam VC forces penetrated the cities attacked. Our befuddled generals claim we are outnumbered in the south and because of this the Vietcong were able to overrun Saigon and to invade and hold for 6½ hours our huge fortress of an embassy there and to capture and hold other cities attacked including most of Saigon for several days.

If we are outnumbered in the south, it is because throughout all this period our marines, the greatest, most intelligent and best equipped offensive fighters in the world, trained for amphibious landings and spearheading attacks, have been kept on the defensive at Khesanh and other remote outposts south of the demilitarized zone awaiting that huge offensive attack which, of course, did not take place. General Westmoreland and the generals under his command were completely outwitted and outgeneraled by the Vietcong. Our marines detailed to wait and defend and for pacification were given assignments which should have been given to the south Vietnamese forces.

The validity of criticism published some months ago that Secretary of Defense McNamara felt General Westmoreland was not making the best use of approximately half a million Americans under his command, and the 50,000 Koreans, and that too many were engaged in support and clerical duties and too few were engaged in actual combat service is now evident. Far too many soldiers and marines have been and are performing supply, support, pacification and clerical work behind the lines. Too few are engaged in combat, and combat casualties and deaths have been far too high as a result. Also, if we are to continue to fight this immoral and un-American war, at least we should not give over to the enemy the advantages of mobility which our air power gives to us and also the advantages of superior firepower from our artillery and warships. Very definitely, under General Westmoreland's leadership we have lost the initiative.

It should now be evident to the President that the South Vietnamese Army does not fight. Also, it is now clear that the Thieu-Ky regime does not command the support of the majority of the people of South Vietnam. The Government of South Vietnam must be broadened to include all elements of political life in South Vietnam—a coalition government which should include representatives of the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong, of the Buddhists, of so-called neutralists such as Duong Van Minh—"Big" Minh—who was barred as a candidate for President by Ky's highly questionable and arbitrary action, and also certain tribal sects all of whom were denied the vote last September by arbitrary actions of Ky and his militarist clique. The election of last September was a sham and a fraud. At that, Thieu and Ky only received about 34 percent of the total vote.

Furthermore, the fact is that the more we escalate the bombing of the north the greater are our losses. Every act toward expanding and escalating the war by us has been met with an equal escalation by the VC and North Vietnamese. We must unconditionally halt the bombing of North Vietnam hoping finally to accomplish a cease-fire and an end to the fighting by a diplomatic settlement without a victory for either side.

Negotiating for an armistice and cease-fire while fighting is still going on has its disadvantages. It has an advantage, however, over no negotiation whatever. Gradually, let us hope we turn over province after province of the 44 provinces of South Vietnam to the sole control of representatives of the Saigon military government, withdrawing our Armed Forces and civilian officials of various alphabetical agencies including the CIA, and after a few years we may retire first to our enclaves or coastal bases and eventually withdraw altogether.

That may take some 2 or 3 years, but that is far better than waging this ugly American war, following the intervention by this administration in a civil war in Vietnam—this American war which has already cost the United States more than 120,000 killed and wounded young Americans, and many more who have died of hepatitis and other jungle diseases.

If we can accomplish an armistice and a cease-fire and then a diplomatic settlement, and, after a few years, withdrawal of our forces from Southeast Asia, that is a consummation devoutly to be wished. I state again that the United States of America has no mandate whatever from Almighty God to police the entire world.

Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there appeared an excellent article by Roland Evans and Robert Novak, entitled "United States Had To Scrap 1968 War Plan Even Before Assault on Viet Cities."

In the article, those perceptive journalists clearly pointed out the failure of General Westmoreland's strategy in Vietnam. I commend the article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1968]

UNITED STATES HAD TO SCRAP 1968 WAR PLAN EVEN BEFORE ASSAULT ON VIET CITIES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Even before the Communist assault on South Vietnam's cities, Gen. William Westmoreland's secret 1968 battle plan had to be tossed in the ashcan to join countless other aborted victory plans of both French and American authorship.

The three-pronged 1968 plan was initialed last fall by the U.S. High Command and Gen. Cao Van Vien, chief of the South Vietnamese army's joint general staff. Westmoreland and Army generals in Washington briefed Pentagon civilians on the plan extensively late last year.

But clever Communist tactics forced the abandonment of that plan. Once again, it is Hanoi—not Westmoreland—determining the strategic shape of the endless war.

In essence, the Westmoreland plan had three parts: first, frontier defense, consisting of a series of border outposts along the long boundary between South Vietnam on the East and Laos and Cambodia on the West. These would link up with the still-to-be-constructed electronic barrier—the McNamara line—across the 17th Parallel.

Second, intensification of search-and-destroy operations, with the objective of rooting out all remaining enemy base areas in 1968.

Third, "territorial defense"—pacification of the countryside.

This plan, the most comprehensive allied plan devised thus far, is now out of the question for 1968 for one simple reason: instead of holding the initiative, the United States had lost it to the Communists well before the new year started.

This critical loss of initiative had little to do with last month's Vietcong raids against the cities. Rather, the failure can be found in the first part of the Westmoreland plan: building border strong points to block infiltration of regular North Vietnamese units.

As soon as a strong point is established in a border area, it becomes the beleaguered target for enemy assault. Again and again this dreary history has been repeated. The Marine strongpoint at Conthien and the still-growing concentration of U.S. military power at Khesanh are only the most recent examples.

At least 5000 U.S. Marines are bottled up at Khesanh. An additional 20,000 U.S. troops are in reserve in the 1st Corps northern area somewhere between Dongha (the Marine base near the Demilitarized Zone) and the embattled city of Hue.

This vast array of U.S. military power is immobilized so long as the enemy poses its threat to Khesanh. The presence of the U.S. force is predicated entirely on the enemy's initiative. If the estimated 20,000 to 40,000 North Vietnamese in the Khesanh area should decide never to attack the Marine outpost in earnest, the United States would still be pinned down there until the enemy disperses.

Furthermore, the enemy has an immediately accessible sanctuary off limits to American forces—across the border in Laos and North Vietnam.

Simply by concentrating large numbers of his own forces near a U.S. strong point along the border, the enemy is able to force the United States to send reinforcements. These reinforcements can only come from what the Communist theoreticians call "the front in the rear"—that is, troops that Westmoreland had planned to use to carry out Phase Two and Three of his 1968 war plan—the politicaly critical phases essential to victory.

Thus, even before the assault of the cities, Westmoreland's 1968 war plan had become a victim of the siege of Khesanh. It was no surprise to the Communists.

The deputy chief of staff of the North Vietnamese army, in a document captured early last year, boasted that "if they (the United States) concentrate their forces to stop reinforcements from North Vietnam, they cannot stand firm on the front in the rear. If they oppose our peoples' movement in the South, they will be unable to stop reinforcements from North Vietnam.

That's not all. President Johnson now has been compelled to rush 10,500 troops to Vietnam from the United States, another sign that the U.S. strategic plan has been overtaken by events. Whether the 1968 U.S. troop limit of 525,000 can be maintained is now a matter of doubt.

In disrupting U.S. strategy, the Communists may pay a high cost. Westmoreland, hopefully, can impose staggering losses on the enemy at Khesanh, as he unquestionably did in the Communist assaults on the cities.

But as the French discovered, killing Communists alone can neither win the war nor force negotiations. That's why powerful Washington politicians of both parties are privately questioning the over-all war plan and particularly the tactic of border strong points.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FEBRUARY 19 TO FEBRUARY 20, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday next, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968".

TITLE I—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 101. The Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program is needed in this country to provide more effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable and necessary for the Federal Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended, to provide a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research program; fire safety education and training programs; and demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 102. The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278e), is further amended by adding the following sections:

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to—

"(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants—

"(1) investigations of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity, and other pertinent factors;

"(2) research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"(3) educational programs to—

"(A) inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques, and

"(B) encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"(4) fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

"(5) educational and training programs to improve, among other things—

"(A) the efficiency, operation, and organization of fire services, and

"(B) the capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"(6) projects demonstrating—

"(A) improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage,

"(B) application of fire safety principles in construction, or

"(C) improvement of the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

"(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"(1) fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"(2) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of this Act—

"(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions. Such a grant may be up to 100 per centum of the total cost of the project for which such grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purpose for which the grant is sought. For the purposes of this section, 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and 'public agencies' includes combinations or groups of States or local governments.

"(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments and agencies for the performance of any such functions, and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 16 of this Act with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers.

"(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529).

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to carry out such functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such functions of this section, including rules and regulations which—

"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures, and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 16."

NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sec. 103. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purposes of this Act, $5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1970.

TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of the loss of life and property from fire is a matter of grave national concern; that this problem is particularly acute in the Nation's urban and suburban areas where an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that as population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond purely local capabilities; and that there is a clear and present need to explore and develop more effective fire control and fire prevention measures throughout the country in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish a commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the destruction of life and property caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby established the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed as members (1) shall be eminently well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission, and (2) shall be selected so as to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal, State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, laboratories, trade associations, and other interested institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

(1) two Members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

(2) two Members of the Senate who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

The advisory members of the Commission shall not participate, except in an advisory capacity, in the formulation of the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission or in its advisory membership shall not affect the powers of the Commission, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country in addition to the steps taken under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act). Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

(1) a consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques and improved inspection procedures;

(2) an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted housing and in the redevelopment of the Nation's cities and communities;

(3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

(4) an evaluation of present and future needs (including long-term needs) of training and education for fire-service personnel;

(5) a consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and suggestions for the standardization and improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires;

(6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

(7) an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

(b) In carrying out its duties under this section the Commission shall consider the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act), and consult regularly with the Secretary in order to coordinate the work of the Commission and the functions carried out under such sections 16 and 17.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the Commission has been duly organized.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 204. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.

(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including an independent agency, is authorized to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 205. (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 202(b), who is a Member of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 203(c).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order of February 15, 1968, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1968, at 12 meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 1968:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

John R. Petty, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Winthrop Knowlton.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Joseph B. McDevitt, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth M. Turner, Wildomar, Calif., in place of W. E. Turner, retired.

GEORGIA

Henry H. Johnson, Alma, Ga., in place of J. J. Smith, transferred.

William D. House, Americus, Ga., in place of J. F. Chappell, retired.

Sara R. Grider, Harlem, Ga., in place of W. P. Phillips, retired.

Martha H. Cauthen, Meansville, Ga., in place of L. H. Cochran, retired.

ILLINOIS

Steven E. Ducaj, Riverside, Ill., in place of F. C. Stolfa, retired.

IOWA

Lynn F. Gowdy, Melborne, Iowa, in place of Glen Vauthrin, retired.

Harold E. Engel, Ocheyedan, Iowa, in place of J. H. Kout, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Jimmie L. Massey, Ethel, La., in place of B. R. Kemp, retired.

MAINE

Dorothy R. Crockett, Harborside, Maine, in place of J. B. Howard, retired.

Henry H. Porter, Sr., Springvale, Maine, in place of L. S. Marquis, retired.

MARYLAND

Warren S. Thompson, Jr., Loveville, Md., in place of A. M. Bullock, retired.

Edna V. Sinclair, Oxford, Md., in place of J. L. Thompson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

James B. Hamilton, Pittsfield, Mass., in place of D. R. Biron, retired.

MICHIGAN

John D. Nordeen, Gwinn, Mich., in place of M. E. Mussatto, retired.

Thomas P. Clark, Howell, Mich., in place of G. T. Hughes, deceased.

William L. Bonning, Lake Orion, Mich., in place of A. H. Weitschat, retired.

Lyle L. Ashmore, Mayfield, Mich., in place of H. L. Wilson, retired.

Edward C. Szymanowski, Wyandotte, Mich., in place of A. A. Hebda, retired.

Simon P. Eaglin, Ypsilanti, Mich., in place of W. M. Dawson, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Peter Marinoff, Pengilly, Minn., in place of F. E. Oja, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Muriel E. Barraclough, North Sutton, N.H., in place of V. F. West, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Robert J. Bell, Hamburg, N.J., in place of T. L. Edsall, retired.

NEW YORK

John F. O'Hagan, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y., in place of R. J. Daggett, deceased.

Michael A. Turco, Chelsea, N.Y., in place of H. V. Kessler, resigned.

Manuel Smith, Franklin Square, N.Y., in place of A. B. Nicastri, retired.

Joyce S. Brazier, Glasco, N.Y., in place of A. C. Raimondi, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

C. Wayne Harton, Franklin, Pa., in place of J. A. Murrin, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sumter M. Carter, Fort Lawn, S.C., in place of Eunice McKeown, retired.

TEXAS

Edmond F. Croix, Alvin, Tex., in place of V. C. Johnson, transferred.

Thornton D. Campbell, Ringgold, Tex., in place of C. M. Davis, retired.

Beverly W. Allen, Smithville, Tex., in place of J. W. Hampton, retired.

Douglass E. Lindsey, Willis Point, Tex., in place of Rebecca Sewell, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert E. Johnston, Smithfield, W. Va., in place of Ray Merrifield, retired.

John R. Harmon, Terra Alta, W. Va., in place of L. B. Ott, retired.

Alfred L. Sidaway, Jr., Wiley Ford, W. Va., in place of H. M. Wright, retired.

WISCONSIN

Raymond L. Neisius, Iron Ridge, Wis., in place of G. W. Kaepernick, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1968:

U.S. AIR FORCE

Brig. Gen. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., FV-669752, U.S. Air Force Reserve, for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve and major general, Air Force Reserve, under the provisions of section 8019, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Salisbury, FR4224 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John H. Bell, FR4185 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jay T. Robbins, FR5029 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glenn A. Kent, FR3701 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howard A. Davis, FR3860 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William H. Brandon, FR4712 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Oris B. Johnson, FR5025 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lawrence F. Tanberg, FR8286 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Royal B. Allison, FR8451 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson, FR3117 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., FR4072 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert W. Schinz, FR4646 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gordon F. Blood, FR4766 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, FR4875 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert F. Worley, FR4906 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas N. Wilson, FR5255 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James T. Stewart, FR8692 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Norman S. Orwat, FR9489 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Larry A. Smith, FR19176 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. James M. Vande Hey, FR3941 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William P. McBride, FR4179 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dudley E. Faver, FR4202 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Ault, FR4462 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James D. Kemp, FR4517 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Dacey, Jr., FR4631 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie M. Burke, FR4642 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David V. Miller, FR4763 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard R. Stewart, FR5096 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William S. Harrell, FR5240 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Wright J. Sherrard, FR5249 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allison C. Brooks, FR4363 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Franklin A. Nichols, FR4809 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Curtis, FR7448 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joe T. Scepansky, FR7879 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Morgan S. Tyler, Jr., FR7923 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Pete C. Sianis, FR7945 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold C. Teubner, FR8145 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William A. Hunter, FR8623 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald W. Johnson, FR8671 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Courtney L. Faught, FR8781 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John H. Herring, Jr., FR8800 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Donald F. Blake, FR8926 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lester F. Miller, FR9004 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth W. Schultz, FR9096 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank K. Everest, Jr., FR9100 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Herbert G. Bench, FR9190 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter R. Hedrick, Jr., FR9353 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George J. Eade, FR9515 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Waltz, FR9672 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William F. Pitts, FR9796 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Louis L. Wilson, Jr., FR9803 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward A. McGough III, FR9819 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James F. Hackler, Jr., FR9839 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Carlos M. Talbott, FR9853 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton W. Marshall, FR9999 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. August F. Taute, FR4256 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James W. Little, FR8099 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Carl W. Stapleton, FR8893 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul N. Bacalis, FR9227 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Augustus M. Hendry, Jr., FR8645 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell K. Pierce, Jr., FR18118 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Rene G. Dupont, FR11836 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Dixon, FR14462 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Donavon F. Smith, FR14577 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John M. Talbot, FR19171 (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert A. Patterson, FR19250 (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35, sections 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Frank J. Puerta, FV401051, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John W. Bitner, FV361602, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles D. Briggs, Jr., FV797454, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John O. Gray, FV410193, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Campbell Y. Jackson, FV431357, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Justin G. Knowlton, FV664321, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Homer I. Lewis, FV400799, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Theodore C. Marrs, FV2261128, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Henry J. McAnulty, FV549989, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Wendell B. Sell, FV4067313, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Farmer S. Smith, FV863256, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John P. Gifford, FG949201, Tennessee Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Nevin W. Dodd, FG3041219, Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Col. William R. McCall, Jr., FG756295, District of Columbia Air National Guard.

Col. Robert McMath, FG825933, Michigan Air National Guard.

Col. George M. McWilliams, FG2067864, Mississippi Air National Guard.

Col. Leon A. Moore, Jr., FG823665, Florida Air National Guard.

Col. Richard B. Posey, FG430845, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Col. John J. Stefanik, FG430864, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

Col. Kenneth M. Taylor, FG409061, Alaska Air National Guard.

Col. Charles S. Thompson, Jr., FG429541, Georgia Air National Guard.

In the U.S. Army

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles Lutcher Southward, O329922, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier general

Col. John Richard Carson, O1574211, Adjutant General's Corps.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992 Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

In the U.S. Navy

Rear Adm. Fred G. Bennett, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Lee E. Bains
Gayle T. Martin

MEDICAL CORPS

Allan D. Callow

SUPPLY CORPS

Frank E. Raab, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

George Reider

In the U.S. Marine Corps

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Harold L. Oppenheimer

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning Edward L. Menning, to be major, and ending Waldemar C. Zisch, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 1968.

In the Army

The nominations beginning Jerome Aaron, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Stephen M. Blue, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 1968.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Grey C. Axtell, to be second lieutenant, and ending John D. Wright, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 1968; and

The nominations beginning Louis A. Cabral, to be chief warrant officer (W–4), and ending Robert C. Zwiener, to be chief warrant officer (W–2), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 18, 1968.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Consumer Product Standards

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the need for additional consumer protection in many fields was illustrated in an excellent series of articles recently in Merchandising Week. One of these articles, dealing with consumer protection in product standards, indicates the many possibilities for Congress and the country in improving our present safeguards for consumers. The article follows:

The Industry Gets a Chance To Provide Its Own Regulation in Product Standards

Betty Furness and Federal Trade Commission Chairman Paul Rand Dixon are both fond of noting in their respective addresses on consumer protection that: "If a customer plucks down $3,000 for a car, he wants a car that is worth $3,000. The car should be as good as the check that paid for it."

The means by which a consumer can determine how close that car measures up to its retail value are, however, much different than those that he must use when evaluating a $400 refrigerator, for example, or a $250 automatic washer. When it comes to home appliances, consumer protectionists suggest, shopper's have considerably fewer guidelines to use in determining what they need and how much they should pay for it.

The problem of standards, barring the emergence of an appliance-oriented Ralph Nader, is an issue that for the time being, the industry will be left to cope with by itself. Protectionists like New York City-area Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal, however, have firmly established that a problem does exist.

Rosenthal, taking a cue from a similar program already operating in Great Britain, has proposed in Congress a national clearing house for consumer information that would, among other things, provide customers with comparative information to be used in determining how much a particular appliance offers for the money it costs.

In his House proposal, Rosenthal does not ask that the information include actual value judgments, but rather that it present and describe the "product characteristics" of greatest interest to the consumer. In other words, Rosenthal's bill seeks to establish a means of providing and publicizing standards of operation for appliances and other consumer goods.

Why are protectionists interested? Many consumers, they indicate, are led into purchasing products that are unsuited to their specific needs because they are ill-equipped to decide which product can best fulfill those needs.

With automobiles, consumers are at least aware of their basic prerequisites: seating capacity, luggage space, and size and power of the engine. With an automatic washer, however, the consumer may know only that she wants to get her clothes clean, and have little idea that some units may be equipped to handle her particular laundry problems, while others may prove totally unsatisfactory.

The result of this lack of standard criteria for consumer selection, according to the protectionists, if often customer dissatisfaction with a product that wasn't meant for her in the first place. The obvious solution, they admit, is to provide knowledgeable, objective salesmen at the disposal of appliance shoppers. But, advertising's pre-sell, profit-oriented sales techniques, coupled with the poorly informed salesmen that result from constant employee turnover, have prevented this in enough cases to generate a rising concern on the part of protectionists.

The appliance industry, of course, is working to provide its own system of standards. It has the cubic foot and Btu ratings for determining capacities of refrigerators and air conditioners, and this is some help to consumers. But horsepower means more on the road than in the home, and customers are still asking for more information.

The Assn. of Home Appliance Manufacturers (AHAM) is working on a comparative rating system for automatic washers that would indicate a product's abilities in several areas: soil removal, gentleness, sand removal, rinsing effectiveness, whiteness retention, tangling, and water removal. Such a system, similar to that favored by Congressman Rosenthal, but self-perpetrated by the industry, is regarded hopefully by protectionists as a commendable first step toward bringing appliance standards to the consumer.

Retailers have possibilities of themselves providing customers with the information that some legislators feel they have long lacked. Existing standards can be promoted effectively and explained carefully at retail; this would not only make the salesman's job considerably easier, but, in the process, would also alleviate a source of consumer complaint.

Macy's "world's largest store," located on New York City's Herald Square, for example, featured a Btu explanation chart in a massive air conditioner display used last spring. Surrounded by two walls of honeycombed air conditioner units, a customer information poster explained the Btu system and indicated how the average shopper could use it to select an air conditioner for her particular needs.

Similar opportunities exist in promoting refrigerator standards. The AHAM certification sticker can be prominently displayed, for example, with an appropriate explanation of what it means and how it is earned. Retailers can draw on their own product knowledge and devise simple means to allow customers to determine for themselves just what they are looking for in a washer, dryer, or dishwasher.

When it comes to product safety standards, which it often does when consumer protection is mentioned, the appliance industry has apparently maintained a good record of at-least-adequate performance. Explaining that she and her counterparts in Congress must act on a "squeaky wheel" system, Betty Furness suggests that consumer protectionists find themselves forced to concentrate on problems that are creating immediate annoyance or hazard. At the moment, she says, the appliance industry's wheel is not "squeaking"—at least not loud enough to put it at the top of the list for immediate action.

The newly formed National Commission on Product Safety will certainly have something to say about the appliance industry when it reports to the President after the first of next year. After the Commission is selected, the members will work to determine the areas to which the government should direct itself to insure safe household products, citing specific cases of industry-created household hazards, and recommending courses of action.

Until the Commission's report is developed and presented, however, the appliance, home electronics, and housewares industries have only to guard against a headline-maker, such as the recent color to radiation leakage problem, to keep out of the reach of protectionists. The color tv issue, coming at a time when comment on the proposed National Commission had become somewhat heated, did put the industry under scrutiny, however, and protectionists are expected to be watching closely for any signs that the appliance-tv industry is loosening the reins on product safety.

State Department Isolation Ward—Exposure Is the Corrective

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune of February 16 contains an excellent editorial entitled "Exposure Is the Corrective." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPOSURE IS THE CORRECTIVE

Rarely has a newspaper story brought quicker action to correct a manifest injustice than did that of Willard Edwards of our Washington bureau concerning two men consigned to Coventry by the state department. And rarely has the statement in THE TRIBUNE Credo that "the newspaper is an institution developed . . . to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide" been more fully vindicated.

Mr. Edwards' story of Tuesday, relating how Harry M. Hite and Edwin A. Burkhardt had been immured for 16 months in an abandoned and condemned state department annex, cut off from their fellows and with only rats as their companions, brought relief to them within 48 hours. It produced an indignant and all but universal outcry in both houses of Congress, compelling the department to recall them from their "Siberia."

The two men, with combined government service of 46 years, were caught up in the department's vendetta against Otto F. Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the state department's office of security. After originally being dismissed and his case kept on the shelf for four years, Otepka was reprimanded and demoted last December by Secretary Rusk. His offense was that he testified truthfully about the department's sloppy loyalty and security clearances before the Senate internal security subcommittee.

Hite and Burkhardt, members of his security staff, were ostracized by their superiors for telling the truth and supporting Otepka. They were confined to the gloomy and deserted building, given no work, and, with their solitude undisturbed, sat thru the days in enforced idleness. Their memoranda appealing for assignment were met with silence. The obvious intention was to break them down.

Their plight went unnoticed. Mrs. Hite reported the facts to her congressman and visited other Capitol hill offices but failed to get attention until she called on Mr. Edwards. He, too, was at first disinclined to believe that government employes could be subjected to such treatment, but, plodding thru the debris of the abandoned building, he came upon the men and confirmed the facts. For four years, they told him, they had been given no duties, and for 16 months they had been quarantined in what has become known as "Dean Rusk's pesthouse."

Mr. Edwards' report brought threats from Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware and Rep. H. R. Gross of Iowa to introduce legislation to fire the superior responsible for what Mr. Williams called "an incredible outrage" if the men were not rescued from the "isolation ward" within 72 hours. The Senate internal security subcommittee released a report referring to the "Chinese-torture type" of treatment to which they had been subjected.

Growing panic in the state department led to an expression of apology to Hite and Burkhardt from lower echelon officials and new assignments as personnel officers. The two men were given the assurance that they would never have to go back to their dingy and hopeless surroundings. Had Mr. Edwards' story never been published, you may be certain there would have been no redress. Without newspapers, every citizen would be at the mercy of the conscienceless bureaucracy.

There remains the matter of justice for Mr. Otepka, who has been the victim of the state department's hypocrisy over the years. His appeal from the reprimand and demotion visited upon him by Rusk is before a civil service panel, and one assumes that the secretary of state will use this as a pretext for inaction. It is up to Congress to get President Johnson to cut thru the red tape and order Otepka's rights restored, with adequate apologies from his persecutors.

New Haven Community Progress, Inc.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing parts 5 and 6 of the series of articles written by William E. Keish and Donald Dallas, reporters for one of Connecticut's leading newspapers, the New Haven Register. The articles comprise a critical analysis of the operations of Community Progress, Inc., the OEO community action program in New Haven, Conn. Parts 1 and 2 appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1968, and 3 and 4 in the RECORD of February 15, 1968.

The articles follow:

CPI IN CONFLICT: AGENCY, GIAIMO DEBATE $18 MILLION COSTS BUT $22.5 MILLION WAS REPORTED TO FORD

(By William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas)

"Without CPI, the impact on the taxpayers for urgently needed inner-city programs would have been much heavier." (A CPI statement.)

While U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo has focused his critical attention on the $18 million in anti-poverty funds that have been funneled directly through Community Progress Inc. (CPI), the fact is that nearly $22.5 million has been poured into New Haven's community action effort over a five-year period stretching from September, 1962, to June, 1967.

And, in addition, CPI estimates the cost of running its programs during the current 1967–68 fiscal year at $5.1 million. Taking this figure into account, it means that upwards of $27.5 million will have been pumped into the city's "human renewal" program since it was initiated nearly six years ago.

Though the directors of Community Progress Inc., issued a lengthy position paper to The Register last week, the agency has consistently used the congressman's expenditure estimate of $18 million in all its references and has made no allusion to the $22.5 million total which it used in its own report to the Ford Foundation last June.

Giaimo's $18 million figure deals mainly with the monies that have been pumped into CPI by the Ford Foundation and various federal agencies. He lists receipts of $5.1 million from Ford, $11.9 million from the federal government and $1 million from other sources. His estimate covered funds received until the end of June, 1967.

The $22.4 million figure, contained in a CPI financial report on the "New Haven Community Action" program which was submitted to Ford last year, covers a much broader area. It involves funds received from local and state governments and, apparently takes more federal monies than Giaimo did into account.

As an example, Giaimo listed federal receipts of $11.9. The CPI report shows a total of $15.5 in federal funds received here. That's a big difference.

Giaimo and CPI are also at odds when it comes to the amount of money the Ford people have allotted New Haven. Giaimo says $5.1 million, but a CPI report on the "Distribution of Income Received by Funding

Source" puts the Ford contribution at $4.1 million up until the end of fiscal 1967, which concluded last June.

In the latest explanation of what it's doing, released earlier this week, CPI stated:

"Had CPI not brought these funds to New Haven, these services (the ones it provides) would have to have been paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers. Without CPI, the impact on the taxpayers for urgently needed inner-city programs would have been much heavier. Under ordinary circumstances they would have had to pay taxes for the services which CPI was able to provide with private funds." CPI overlooks the obvious fact that the majority of the funds channeled into the anti-poverty program come from government sources, which are fed by taxpayers—including New Haven taxpayers.

CPI claims that without it the burden on the New Haven taxpaying public would be overwhelming.

But this is what has happened to the cost of local government since CPI arrived on the scene back in 1962:

That year, the tax rate in New Haven was $39.25 per $1,000 assessed valuation. The tax rate for the current abbreviated six-month fiscal period is $24.25 per $1,000 of assessed valuation. If this figure was extended over the full year it would be $48.50 per $1,000—as it was all last year.

There is every reason to believe that when the city's fiscal fathers unveil the 12-month budget which starts this July, the tax rate will be considerably more than $48.25 per $1,000. As is obvious, New Haven's taxes are becoming heavier whether CPI is here or not. There is no element of blame for CPI in this; what it shows is that CPI has not pushed burdens down for City taxpayers.

Making a comparison of the annual budget during the period of CPI's existence in New Haven shows that the expenditures for the first six months of this year are approaching the cost of running the local government for the entire year of 1962.

The current six-month budget amounts to $21,117,331, which would double in size to $42,234,662 over a full year. For 1962, the total cost of running the entire city—which had a larger population then than it does now—was $26,986,957.

In a released statement on its "highly successful efforts" to obtain private and other noncity funds directly, CPI notes that this effort "has resulted in $1,737,694 in private funds for the improvement of and strengthening of the New Haven school system."

In this regard the difference between an effort to improve and strengthen local education and the actual accomplishment is one the community is now weighing in several ways. The parent-teacher-student committees at Hillhouse, the study by the National Education Association, and other current analyses all stem from a concern with inadequacies in our schools.

EDUCATION COST DOUBLE

While the public school population has remained almost static over the past five years with slight variations along the line, the cost of public education has nearly doubled—which is another indication that New Haveners are full-fledged participants in the education aspects of the anti-poverty effort in spite of the CPI indication that outside sources are shouldering the financial burden. New Haven taxpayers are as involved as Ford or the federal government in the anti-poverty program, whether CPI wants to admit it or not.

In 1962, the year CPI began its ambitious effort to uproot poverty in New Haven, the budget for the city's public education system was $9,855,731. For the first six months of 1968, the system has been allotted $8,789,176. This is only about $1 million less than was spent for the entire year in 1962. Of course, it must be noted that the first six months of the year are the costliest for school systems because they are in session for the full six months as opposed to only four months at the end of the year, but still the increase in spending here is an impressive one.

The Connecticut Public Expenditure Council shows New Haven's expenditure of $726 per pupil is among the states top-20 expenditures.

CPI expenditures for travel, telephone service and leased property are among the figures in which even CPI answers promote questions.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

Giaimo had criticized CPI for spending $90,000 for travel. In responding to this criticism, CPI explained that $37,503 of it was spent during a 10-month period—from Sept. 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967—on "local transportation for CPI personnel."

Using CPI's own figures, it means that "local transportation for CPI personnel" averaged $3,750 per month during that period. Based on a five-day work week, four weeks a month, the cost of "local transportation for CPI personnel" works out to approximately $187 per day. This is a substantial amount of inner-city travel—up to a thousand miles of it per day even if we use the exceptionally high estimate of 20 cents per mile as a base.

CPI further explained that only $41,100 of the travel cost went for long-distance travel, with nearly half—$20,416—being expended by the Community Action Institute, which has been designated by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to conduct training programs in cities throughout New England and most of New York State.

The other half involved travel necessary to obtain funds for New Haven. The CPI explanation left $11,500 in travel expenses unaccounted for.

Giaimo also had some critical comment about the facilities leased by CPI. According to Giaimo CPI was paying approximately $19,300 per month during fiscal 1967 for leased accommodations. He also noted that there was some 1,200 feet of vacant space at CPI headquarters on Orange Street. In answer to Giaimo, CPI said the congressional cutback on antipoverty spending forced cancellation of a program which formerly occupied this space. It also noted that it had made efforts to sub-lease it.

While Giaimo apparently had access to the leasing figures, The Register has been unsuccessful so far in finding out just what properties are leased by CPI and how much they are paying for them. A request for the figures was made over two weeks ago to Eric Sandahl, the anti-poverty agency's $16,500-per-year public information director.

Sandahl said he was in the process of gathering the figures, but he added that CPI officials were attempting to determine if they had to release them under the "Right to Know" law because of what Sandahl described as "malicious intent" on the part of reporters seeking the figures.

Several attempts have been made since then to secure the leasing figures, but they have been fruitless.

The latest word from Sandahl is that he has drawn up a list of the leaseholds and turned it over to Lawrence N. Spitz, the $30,000-per-year executive director of CPI. According to Sandahl, Spitz is seeking a legal opinion from one of CPI's legal advisers about whether the leasing agreements have to released for public knowledge.

PAYMENTS TO BENEFICIARIES

Not all of CPI's funds go into administrative costs such as salaries for its 274 employes plus other operating costs. Many thousands of dollars go to trainees and other persons who benefits from some of the programs.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps (out-of-school), is expected to use $204,990 of its $303,590 budget for 1967–68 to pay wages to persons participating in the program. According to CPI, some 367 youngsters from 16 to 21 have been enrolled during the past year in the program that teaches and trains dropouts who are unemployed or underemployed because they are unskilled.

In the Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School and Summer Programs, three-fourths ($299,140) of the budgeted sum of $395,140 goes for wages paid to young men and women between the ages of 13 and 18 who take part in the program which is run by the Board of Education.

Other CPI programs which provide wages to its participants include "New Careers" and "Foster Grandparents."

Of the $147,390 budgeted for "New Careers," $87,860 went for wages. The program involves 28 trainees who start at aide level in such jobs as laboratory technician, child development specialist, housing inspector, and field representative for the Redevelopment Agency. OEO pays stipends and the cost of college courses for trainees who want to reach professional level.

The "Foster Grandparents" program involves 85 elderly persons who are employed at the New Haven Regional Center for the Retarded, Association for Retarded Children, New Haven Rehabilitation Center and St. Raphael's Hospital. The participants will receive $115,000 of the program's $168,063 in wages.

Two of the costliest programs affiliated with the CPI operation are the "Head Start" program, which is considered one of the most effective of all anti-poverty programs and a pace-setter throughout the nation, and the Community Action Institute (CAI).

The "Head Start" program, which has a budget of $514,967 for 1967–68, is designed to equip poor children with the necessary academic skills and experiences that their homes could not supply. There are 21 preschool classes operating throughout the inner city.

Although the cost of the Community Action Institute is credited against CPI, it is far from being strictly a local operation. The institute trains anti-poverty program staff and board members from 133 agencies in the six New England states and most of New York. During 1967, it trained more than 4,000 persons.

One of the big gripes Giaimo had about the anti-poverty effort being waged here was the cost of administering the program. According to its figures, the 1967–68 budget contains $868,954 for administrative purposes, which works out to about 17 per cent of the overall cost.

The figure includes $305,833 listed as general administration plus $291,772 for administration and program support and another $271,182 for program planning, development, budgeting, finance, review and program services.

Few people would deny what CPI makes as its major claim: that the funds it has gathered "have made possible for the deprived and disadvantaged people of the inner city a great number of opportunities which were never available, the economically disenfranchised to train for good jobs and to obtain social and health services for themselves and their families." The problem for CPI is showing that the money and the programs actually lead to jobs and better living for the inner-city poor.

The $22.4 million spent here already and the $5.1 to be expended in the current fiscal year represent an average expenditure of $5 million a year since CPI began. This high cost in a spreading series of efforts and experiments is carried by New Haven taxpayers as well as the Ford Foundation and the federal government. The city's own tax structure reflects, in its upward climb, a CPI impact. And this is one good reason that CPI finances and accomplishments deserve constant scrutiny and candid airing.

CPI IN CONFLICT: YOUTH CENTER BRINGS NEW APPROACH TO HARD CORE—COST: $8,200 EACH

(By Donald Dallas and Williams E. Keish, Jr.)

"The Residential Youth Center will almost unquestionably lead to a new national program."—Mitchell Svirdoff in a Register interview in August.

According to Mitchell Svirdoff, vice president for national affairs of the Ford Foundation, and Dr. Ira Goldenberg, Assistant Professor of Psychology at the Yale Psycho-educational Clinic and key designer of the Residential Youth Center, the experimental youth center at 501 George St. appears slated to become a new approach in the "war on poverty" that will be adopted nationally.

For one thing, argues Goldenberg, it does a better job of aiding "hard core" youth than other programs like the currently-fading national Job Corps which has the same kind of objectives argues Goldenberg.

The center, which opened in September, 1966, is termed a "home away from home" for boys from 16 to just under 22 years of age who were judged to need some relief from their home environment—even temporary relief—if they were to succeed in training and employment or educational endeavors.

PER BOY, $8,225 YEARLY

The center operates in an old Victorian house at the corner of George and Dwight Streets. While it is notably not "plush" in its looks or atmosphere, its expenses average out on an annual basis to about $8,225 for each of the 21 boys it can handle at a time.

The center budget indicates it is currently spending about $3,300 a week or $158 per week per boy.

You could keep a boy in a good prep school or college for two years on an investment like this.

Center personnel point out, however, that it is not a prep school—that it provides strong psychiatric, health and other counseling services and that the boys involved are not necessarily self-sufficient types. They may be remarkably independent but they are not "making it" on their own and hence they are given an atmosphere which offers them many supports not otherwise available.

Center personnel also point out that the substantial per capita investment is widely spread, that the 21-capacity house sheltered and served 51 boys during its first 12 months of activity.

The staff at the Resident Youth Center even shows an unexpected willingness to economize—particularly by suggesting that administration costs (as apart from the major operational expenses) might be cut in half if the administrative work was done in the center itself instead of at CIP offices.

The whole concept of a Resident Youth Center was financed here under the auspices of the federal Office of Manpower Evaluation and Research (OMPER) with a $156,000 grant for research and practical activity the first year. It received a $172,738 grant from OMPER for its second year of operation.

GIRLS' CENTER

Based on the apparent success of the boys' center, OMPER laid out an additional $156,000 for a similar center for girls. The girls' center, at 1342 Chapel St., began its operation a few weeks ago—just as Rep. Giaimo attacked the fact that it had operated with a director and a staff of five persons—with payroll costs of $7,000—for several months before a single girl "client" was enrolled.

As an illustration of per capita costs at the Residential Youth Center for boys, the $156,000 first-year monies served 51 boys and 35 families or relatives. Of the boys, 11 were "emergency" residents at the center, staying less than a week. The other 40 residents stayed at the center an average of slightly less than six months, at a cost of slightly less than $4,000 each if one does not include services to the parents.

The costs, argues Goldenberg, are less than the Job Corps, which deals with a less troubled type of youth. And his research, he says, gives "enough hard facts" to show the RYC-type endeavor would be more fruitful on a national scale.

Although comparisons are difficult, he also feels the RYC would come out favorably when judged with other war-on-poverty projects, reform schools, mental institutions, etc.—none of which are quite comparable because of the differing groups each serves and differing methods to serve them.

UNVISITED BY SPITZ

Despite their positive indications about the center, its promise and its probable future, members of the RYC staff point out that CPI Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz has never visited the big building at 501 George St. where it operates.

And they do not seem unhappy about this.

Indeed, and despite the fact that the center is termed a CPI "delegate agency" members of the center prefer to disassociate themselves from the "parent" organization, and consider themselves independent of and separate from CPI.

Except for administrative tasks such as bookkeeping and payroll, the center staff runs its own programs, and does its own research, they point out.

According to Wesley Forbes, who earns $11,000 yearly as its director, the center would be better off doing its own "administration" too. In a discussion about costs, Forbes said he felt the RYC could handle "administration" for about $10,000 a year—which is precisely half the CPI figure for those costs.

Generally, though, as one staff member commented, the center seems pleased that "downtown doesn't bother us" and does add a note of praise for CPI Manpower Director Joseph N. Marci who tries to "get us the things we need downtown" when the RYC makes a request.

Unlike a number of other "poverty" projects, Dr. Goldenberg points out, research plays a significantly important role at the RYC. He notes the title and purpose of the "research and evaluation" finding agency, OMPER, in this connection.

The program deals with youths who have been "failures" in other aspects of the "poverty" program, and in most general terms the findings so far made seem to indicate that the "hard core" problem is greater than imagined. This means that the present sense of success for the Youth Center idea is not always matched by a record of individual success for its boys.

REPORT ON SUMMER

Says a CPI report to the Ford Foundation of last summer, for example:

The RYC (Residental Youth Center) was formed for boys "who previously were not succeeding in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Analysis of the reasons for their failure invariably showed unsettled, acrimonious home environments. It was impossible for the boys to gain anything from the program unless they were removed from the scene of their emotional conflicts."

"Although still experimental, the RYC is proving beneficial to most of its residents.

"Some, however, have dropped out of all programs and the residence as well. The answer for them is not within the range of CPI's services. Some need intensive therapy, some medical care, others need partial or total institutional care."

Based on observation of failures in the Neighborhood Work Crews and the Job Corps, Dr. Goldenberg and some six work crew foremen from the National Youth Corps got together to outline a framework for the residential center. They noted, basically, that Job Corps and Youth Corps results were not "sticking" for a number of youths. Explained Center Director Forbes: the youths would obtain some positive benefits from the programs while on the job but would "blow it" when they returned to their home environment.

In the case of the Youth Corps, the return home would be on evenings and weekends. In the case of the Job Corps, a project that takes the youth to an out-of-town center for the training, it would be when the youth returned home after several months away. The center aimed instead, to make the results "stick".

The Job Corps was out-of-town, Goldenberg pointed out. The residential center, as developed here, is in the youth's home community.

The Job Corps generally employed teacher and workers from the community in which the center was based. They were strangers to the boys, the residential center employs its staff from the neighborhoods which the youth knows. The local staff is largely "non professional"—a group that has "lived" some of the ghetto experiences of the youth and has "made it."

Thirdly, the center helps prepare and train youths for job openings available in their area, another contrast to the Job Corps which does not have local focus in this respect either.

STAFF NONPROFESSIONAL

Except for Goldenberg, who was the center director for the first six months, the staff is non-professional. Forbes, who now heads it, was a former entertainer, a work crew foreman with the NYC. Born on Dixwell Avenue, he came from a family with a welfare background, as do almost all of the center's youth.

It is the only project of its kind in the United States, except for the recently-opened girls center here and a somewhat similar boys' project conducted from a YMCA in Chicago.

The boys were recruited—with participation strictly on a voluntary basis—after questions to neighborhood workers, educational personnel and others to determine who, in their opinion, most needed the services.

Of the initial 20 youths, 10 were considered to have difficulties on a regular, long-term basis in job training programs because of serious emotional difficulties.

Another 10 were felt to be able to "make it" relatively easily if they had the support of full-time center environment for a while.

In another move to make the center "responsive" to immediate needs, the center adopted what Forbes likes to call a "horizontal structure." This, in an apparent contrast to the CPI "from the top down" structure of organization and decision-making, involves seeming "equality" or "togetherness" among staff and youth.

Besides Forbes, the staff includes an assistant program supervisor, three PYC workers, three live-in counselors who are roughly the boys' own ages, a secretary, and a cook. Except for the latter two, each worker carries a case load.

And, as part of the plan, each worker substitutes in another of the staff positions two days a week. Forbes, for example, could be a cook one day, a live-in counselor another.

PAY 30 PERCENT OF WAGES

The boys pay 30 percent of their wages or up to $15 a month for room and board, do their own laundry and housekeeping, and odd jobs around the center.

They also take part in a host of informal activities such as sports at the YMCA, or shop, pool, music in make-shift rooms set aside with some equipment at the center for these activities.

What does all this amount to? To what extent does it work? Why does it work for some and fail for others?

The answers to the latter question, Dr. Goldenberg admits is not known.

An early study, comparing center youths with a "control group" of similar young men here in New Haven points to a relationship between "alienation" and "employment" which Goldenberg feels is very significant.

The less alienated the boys become according to an "alienation scale" the more they tend to perform better in employment. Goldenberg, who feels this finding important, pooh-poohs those who dismiss the research as obvious fact. He counters: "We knew that anyway," with the question, "Well, then, what have you done about it?"

In defending sociological and psychological studies of this type he points out that, traditionally, there has been a long time-lag between the findings of science and their practical application. Alienation has to do with the extent to which the youths feel a part of society, "that society cares about them, and that they care about society," Goldenberg explains. The amount of individual alienation was one of several variables measured by verbal testing.

The control-group RYC comparison, Goldenberg pointed out, was "weighted against the RYC group" to start with. That is, the RYC group were more "hardcore" and had many more real personal problems than the youth who were not served by the program.

After six months, however, "Overall, the control population became significantly more negative in their view of the world, while the RYC group became significantly more positive. For the RYC group, the greatest change was in viewing the world as 'fair' rather than the pre-RYC view of the world as 'Unfair.'"

FIGURES COMPARED

An exact 40 per cent of the control group was unemployed at the outset as opposed to 46.4 per cent of the RYC group. After six months, 50 percent of the control group were unemployed, as compared to 6.7 of the RYC group, most of which was still at the center. The youths at the center, of course, had far more incentives and aids in keeping a job.

At the outset, arrests per boy in the RYC group had averaged 1.87 each. After six months, the figure had declined to .96 each. The control's groups arrest average, meanwhile, had jumped from 1.7 per boy to 2.08 during the same period. The average of .96 which Dr. Goldenberg cites as encouraging still comes very close, of course, to being one arrest for every boy in the Youth Center program.

In terms of dollars and cents and public anxieties, these figures have significance, he says. The improvement in employment means less welfare dollars and cents. The improvement in arrest records, means less jail, court, and police and legal aid dollars.

Dr. Goldenberg had no hesitancy about showing and explaining his research to the press. In fact, he is writing a book about it, and the RYC, which he expects to be published in March.

Likewise, the spirit of the RYC staff appeared frank, candid, and receptive to all questions. Too, they appeared strongly interested in the boys, and one of the staff produced figures, that show most of the staff works almost double the required 35 hours work week at CPI.

A follow-up study of 25 youths that had "graduated" from the first year of the program, Goldenberg said, revealed 76 percent of them who were "employed" and for whom the positive results of the center apparently had "stuck"—lasted.

SERVED 56 FIRST YEAR

According to the study, the center served 56 youths during its first year. Of these 11 were "emergency" cases served a week or less, nine of the youths had remained at the center, five had returned to the center after having left, and for another six there was no information available.

Of the resultant 25 "graduates," however, 15 said they had liked the center and it had taught them how to "make it" in the world of work. Three said they disliked it. And seven had "no comment." So there is something less than unanimous enthusiasm for the exceptional investment of $15 per week per boy.

Of the "76" percent of "successes" in the 25, four were in the army, three were in school, and the other 12 or 13 were employed at jobs with an average hourly wage of $1.72—which, although by no means heroic, was approximately double the previous average of the group.

Some six youths of the 25, however, had been arrested a total of seven times, and one of these had been arrested on the advice of his RYC worker who felt, in this case, it would be best if probation were revoked.

Despite only partial success, its local boosters say that RYC seems to be making better headway with the "hard core" than other programs. They predict that the approach developed on George Street will be headed for larger applications nationally.

The point that dominates all the high hopes and hard work—for New Haven as well as for other places—is the fact that the concept gobbles up dollars. In less than three years well over $300,000 has been poured into the Residential Youth Center—and yet it counts its total involvement as hardly 100 boys. Of this 100 boys many still remain jobless, many still remain arrest-prone. Though steady Federal cut-backs seem to indicate that the Job Corps concept is, indeed, a failure, there is serious question as to whether the national government, or New Haven, can expand a rehabilitation effort—whatever its hopes—when the cost runs to more than $8.000 per boy per year.

A Salute to Lithuanians on the 50th Anniversary of Their Independence

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today, February 16, we send a warm word of encouragement to a people celebrating their 50th anniversary of freedom—although presently they are under suppression by Communist Russia.

The tiny nation of Lithuania fought its way to independence in 1918 and then made 20 years of unprecedented progress toward the goals of freedom for all men.

During the Second World War, however, the current of events brought Russian armies into the small nation; and after the fighting was over, they simply stayed.

They are still in possession. The Lithuanians, however, have not given up hope of regaining their lost freedom. Each year at this time they celebrate their day of independence.

We in the United States, believers in the rights of men of all nations to be free, rededicate ourselves today to support the liberation of Lithuania.

We cannot forget Lithuania. We cannot allow a terrorist regime to simply take over in any country. We must maintain a positive stand against further Communist infiltration into other lands. Lithuania is a Communist-occupied nation, but it remains a symbol of faith in freedom for those who have seen the tyranny of its present totalitarian rule.

I join the many courageous Americans of Lithuanian descent in Texas, in the United States, and throughout the world in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day. Let us pledge our support to the triumph of right and decency in the international system of nations.

Honor Our Flag Through Knowledge

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a most laudatory project by the American Legion Post at Paul, Idaho, is presently being conducted. It is one to which I desire to invite the attention of Senators.

Concerned with promoting an appreciation for and an understanding of our American flag, the members of the Paul American Legion have prepared a flag study manual which is now being distributed among Idaho fifth grade classes.

Because such patriotic service as this should not go unrecognized, I think it appropriate at this time to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a recent article published in the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News summarizing the efforts of these fine Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTH GRADERS IN IDAHO WILL LEARN ABOUT U.S. FLAG IN LEGION COURSE

PAUL.—About 3,000 flag study booklets are ready for distribution to fifth grade students throughout Idaho.

According to Otha McGill, Idaho flag study chairman for the American Legion, this amount is not sufficient to supply all 16,000 fifth graders in the state, but he feels it is a good start.

The flag study is a course started by Mr. McGill and members of the Paul American Legion, who felt the American people were in need of a flag and Americanism study course. Fifth grade students were selected as the best age-level to take the instruction.

The booklet is a compilation of information taken from similar flag study manuals and is the result of four years study. Information in the booklet is presented on a fifth grade level in a language each can understand.

This is the fifth year the study has been offered in Minidoka County, which served as an experiment to see how the course would be accepted. Boyd Earl, Heyburn School principal, is county coordinator, assisted by Camden Meyer, county school superintendent.

The course has been approved by D. F. Engleking for schools throughout the state.

The first booklet was presented this week to Mr. Meyer, who took several booklets with him to Boise to distribute to school superintendents in Idaho.

The Paul Chamber of Commerce purchased 100 booklets for fifth grade students at the Paul School, the Heyburn Chamber of Commerce purchased 100 for the Heyburn School and Larry Duff, Minidoka County Prosecuting Attorney, plans to present 20 at the Idaho Youth Ranch.

Other orders have been received from Okinawa, the University of Idaho and Wyoming.

Prior to this year, all expenses for this literature has been paid by the Paul post. Mr. McGill said the post has gone as far as it can and is now asking support of other clubs and organizations.

Approximately 2,000 youngsters have completed this five-week Americanism course. The study has been well received and praised by both students and parents.

The booklet, containing 24 illustrated pages, is titled "Honor Our Flag Through Knowledge." Art work was contributed by Mrs. Harold Wilson, Paul, and Glenice Stevenson, Burley. The Legion is selling the booklets at cost and anyone wishing to purchase one may contact Mr. McGill at Paul.

This flag study program prompted the nomination of the Paul Legion Post and Mr. McGill for the Freedom Foundation award for Americanism sponsored by the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

Mr. McGill, who is one of the most avid supporters of Americanism in the area, said "I believe that if we ever lose faith in our God and loyalty to our country then we have lost everything."

Plugging the Drain

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Press, in a perceptive comment on our balance-of-payments problems, pointed out that the travel tax proposed to help restore this balance is both difficult to enforce and basically of small concern. The paper argued persuasively that the travel tax is not, and cannot be, an important element in facing this fiscal problem. The editorial follows:

PLUGGING THE DRAIN

Everybody talks about reducing the United States balance-of-payments deficit, but the only concrete thing Congress and the administration appear ready to do about it is wallop the traveler.

As one member of the House Ways and Means Committee said the other day, after lengthy questioning of Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, "It looks as though travelling is the only ox to be gored." All other proposals for improving the payments situation are only vague generalities.

Mr. Fowler has been trying to sell the administration's travel tax on overseas spending to the House, contending it would cut the $3.5 billion deficit by up to $500 million.

Parts of the program, such as five per cent excise tax on international air fares and on water transportation outside the Western Hemisphere, and a 90 per cent reduction in the duty-free privileges on goods bought abroad, seem reasonable. But the graduated tax on travelers' spending above $7 a day outside the hemisphere is harsh and complicated and difficult to enforce, thus inviting evasion.

Despite its shortcomings, even this travel tax might be justified if travel were the main source of the deficit. But it is not.

Dollars are flowing out through many other corporate and government channels. Travel is only a small part. The travel tax may be useful as a dramatic, psychological device to bring home the message of the need to plug the dollar outflow. And it might make sense if it were part of a concerted plan aimed at all sources of the drain. But it is manifestly unfair—and of questionable value—to force one finger into the dike when many other holes are left unplugged.

What Way in Vietnam?

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the attention of all Americans has been focused on the day-to-day events in Vietnam and their impact on our policy in Southeast Asia. Two respected Wisconsin newspapers have recently spelled out their respective positions on the war. The Milwaukee Journal, in an editorial dated February 6, 1968, argues very cogently that the time has come for "reassessment, a hard look at new policies, for new determination to bring this horror to an end before it leads to greater horror."

The Journal editorial follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 6, 1968]

WHAT WAY IN VIETNAM?

The war in Vietnam may have reached a decisive stage. It is clear from events of the last week that the Communists are far from defeated. The pacification program exists mainly on paper. The South Vietnamese army is still far from able to take over the fighting job. The army and the police have not secured the population centers.

Guerrillas overran 26 provincial capitals, swept over scores of villages, spread terror the length of the land. They stormed the American embassy in Saigon itself and broke into the grounds of the presidential palace. Even now they hold pockets at the edge of the Saigon airfield.

At Khe Sanh our military leaders predict a massive enemy attack, an attempt to create another Dien Bien Phu. It is unlikely the Communists can succeed. We are stronger and more mobile than the French were. But the danger exists.

It is a time for reappraisal of policy. American policies in Vietnam have not worked. We have poured in more and more troops and our casualties have increased. We continue to bomb the north when there is little left to damage there and when, as Secretary of Defense McNamara has said, bombing hasn't shut off supply lines. We talk of peace and make peace offers, but they bring no, response from the enemy.

Where do we go from here? Roger Hilsman, formerly director of intelligence and research and undersecretary of far eastern affairs in the state department, said in Milwaukee Monday that he fears we may escalate further by invading the north with ground troops. He says that is where present policies are leading. If that happens, war with China and even the Soviet Union becomes a critical danger.

An alternative could be a slowing down of the war, a gradual deescalation, a cessation of bombing in the north, a holding operation in population centers, coupled with renewed efforts at negotiation.

It isn't enough to say, as President Johnson does, that "we Americans will never yield." There is going to have to be yielding on both sides. The Communists in their reign of terror have unquestionably bettered their bargaining position. They surely have rocked the confidence of any in the south who thought things were improving.

The time has come for reassessment, a hard look at new policies, for new determination to bring this horror to an end before it leads to greater horror.

Mr. Speaker, the Chippewa Herald-Telegram of Chippewa Falls, Wis., took a strong position on the war in Vietnam in a three-quarter page statement on January 19, 1968. This preceded the countrywide attacks launched by the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies, but these attacks strongly buttress the Herald-Telegram arguments that the bombing of North Vietnam is ineffective and should be halted as the first step toward settlement of the war.

The thrust of the Herald-Telegram editorial is to call for a reassessment, a new direction in our policy toward Southeast Asia. I commend the publisher of the Herald-Telegram, John M. Lavine, for his personal courage in setting forth a detailed, logical, and persuasive argument, not only with regard to Vietnam, but to other Southeast Asian nations, as well. His statement in favor of halting the bombing reiterates the statements of many thoughtful Americans, both military and civilian.

After a week at home, it is clear to me these are some of the thoughts our constituents are thinking today. Those in responsible policy positions in the administration, and we, in Congress, ignore the significance of these thoughts at our peril. I accordingly urge you to review the Herald-Telegram position which follows:

[From the Chippewa Falls (Wis.) Herald-Telegram, Jan. 19, 1968]

THE UNITED STATES MUST PHASE ITSELF OUT OF VIETNAM

OUR POSITION

We believe that the United States should not have gotten into the Vietnam war, and now that the United States is in Vietnam, we believe that America should draw back and, if possible, get out quickly and with as few losses of life as possible.

WHAT ABOUT THE PACIFIST POSITION?

During the last week Betty Boardman was in Chippewa Falls. Mrs. Boardman is a Quaker, pacifist, and member of the ship, the Phoenix, which went to North Vietnam with medical supplies.

The Herald-Telegram begins this discussion of Vietnam with the position that Mrs. Boardman and all pacifists represent because, in our opinion, it is the most easily disposed of position—since we emotionally admire pacifism, but rationally we strongly disagree with it.

The pacifist believes that all war and killing is wrong and that one should not engage in war for any reason.

Certainly, according to the 10 Commandments this position is justified. Also, it is a moral idea that we believe is right, but, unfortunately, we also believe that before it can be lived, all men must follow it.

And it is a sad matter of fact that all men do not believe in, "Thou shalt not kill."

Hence, as long as men are willing to go to war to gain power over other men and to snuff out other men's freedom, we would go to war to stop such action. Obviously we would do this only if no honorable alternative can be found to fighting.

Certainly, for example, our country's fighting World War II was necessary. Hitler, Nazi Germany and Japan would not be talked out the differences they had with the Allies. And even though the Herald-Telegram believes that no one likes the idea of going to war because of the circumstances, we support, without qualification, America's participation in World War II.

In conclusion, then, we believe that Mrs. Boardman and all pacifists are idealistically right, but in this less than idealistic world, we believe that their position is wrong.

WHEN SHOULD THE UNITED STATES ENTER WARS SUCH AS VIETNAM?

Having said that we are willing to fight a war, it is only reasonable that we now set forth the criteria upon which the Herald-Telegram believes that the United States should fight a war in another country.

The criteria we now note we have borrowed from Wisconsin Senator Gaylord Nelson—one of the first senators who, years ago, voted against the introduction of U.S. ground forces into Vietnam. We have adopted these criteria because we believe they are sound and because Nelson, like the Herald-Telegram, is not against all wars. Rather, based on these criteria, he is specifically against U.S. entry into the Vietnam war. The criteria are:

First, the United States should only enter a war if such an entry is in our country's best interests. It is simply impossible for this country to enter any war that any friendly nation stirs up.

The United States does not have the lives to waste nor the money to spend on such wars. Rather, this nation can only go to war when to do so is in our country's best interest, as determined by a majority of the Congress and by the executive.

Second, America should only enter a war in another land if the government of that country has the majority of its people behind it. Further, that nation should have at least the military potential to fight a substantial offensive battle by itself.

The reason the Herald-Telegram stipulates this second condition is simple to understand. If the people of a country are not in favor of a war that America and its government are fighting, the war cannot be won. It cannot be won since the enemy will get too much support from the country's population.

Also, if the country the U.S. is helping does not have even the military potential to muster an offensive fighting force of its own, we will find ourselves fighting and, hopefully, winning a battle for the country we are helping—only to have them lose what America has won after our troops have left.

THE MILITARY ASPECTS OF VIETNAM

To understand why the Herald-Telegram is against the war in Vietnam, one should understand some miltary facts about that war.

First, though the U.S. is not winning the Vietnam war in the South, we are now slowly making military progress there. Yet, for reasons we will go into later in this presentation, the Herald-Telegram believes that the U.S. can never win the Vietnam war in a conventional, military sense of the term.

Second, there has been a great deal of talk about the worth, or lack of worth, of bombing North Vietnam. Yet, joining the secretary of defense—as recently as a few months ago—as well as a number of other military experts, the Herald-Telegram feels that the bombing of the North has possible psychological effect, but has little military effect.

That is, U.S. intelligence sources point out that the North Vietnamese can carry into South Vietnam on their backs and on bicycles all of the war materiel that is necessary. Hence, the bombing does not at all slow down the flow of materiel to the South.

What does it do, then, if it does not slow down the flow of materiel? It does cost the Communist countries—such as Russia, China, the satellite countries, etc.—more materiel for them to supply to North Vietnam. But that cost will not stop nor continue the war.

Also, the bombing of the North does not seem to have pushed the North Vietnamese into admitting defeat, as it was supposed to. Quite the contrary, like the bombing of England, the bombing of North Vietnam seems to have helped build up morale in the North. And though the bombing of England could be defended on the basis that it, and a blockade, stopped supplies and essentials from reaching England, the bombing of North Vietnam cannot be looked at in the same way. North Vietnam is not an island. As a result, despite the bombing North Vietnam can always get supplies from China on its northern border, even if America shut off all shipping to North Vietnam.

WHY WE CAN'T WIN THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

There are a number of reasons why the Herald-Telegram believes that neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese can win the war in the South of Vietnam.

The prime reason harkens back to the second criterion we set forth for this country going into any foreign war.

That is, from the support that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese regulars are getting from the natives in the villages and towns of South Vietnam, it is obvious that the South Vietnamese people are not, in a majority, in favor of their government and-or this country fighting a war with the North.

A crucial distinction in this situation can be drawn between the war in South Vietnam and any other war the U.S.A. has fought. Certainly, when this country fought in Europe in either of the World Wars or in Korea, one basic difference was that our men knew that once they had captured or recaptured a village or city, the natives—with little exception—welcomed the U.S. and allied troops. And the natives were, by and large, quick to turn over any and all enemy guerrillas who were hiding among them.

Yet, this sort of support is almost totally lacking in Vietnam.

It is also because of this lack of support that the U.S. faces the situation that, even if this country negotiated a peace settlement that we were happy with, all that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese would have to do is to tell their troops to again break down into small, guerrilla units that dress like, act like, and live among the South Vietnamese villagers.

Doing this, the V.C. and North Vietnamese could continue to fight the war forever with no fear of our ever being able to find and destroy them.

One other military fact should be noted about the war in South Vietnam. That is, with the exception of a few "show units," the South Vietnamese are not basically fighting the war against the North Vietnamese regulars and against the V.C.

The South Vietnamese are not fighting the offensive war. The United States is.

Again, following the second of the two standards we set forth for U.S. participation in a foreign war, the question should be asked: even if the U.S. wins the Vietnam war and gets a peace settlement, can the South Vietnamese hold onto what has been won when U.S. forces have in majority, pulled out after a settlement?

THE DOMINO THEORY

One of the reasons that the United States is fighting in Vietnam according to the U.S. government is that, by the Domino Theory, if Vietnam falls so does the rest of Southeast Asia.

At the outset, it should be noted that this theory is not true.

In fact, many Asian experts effectively argue that Asia's so-called "wars of national liberation" are more aggravated by the presence of U.S., white, western soldiers than they are helped by any degree of possible aid the U.S. can give them.

Also, no form of logic that the Herald-Telegram can follow suggests the following: Because America will not fight a war in South Vietnam and because America does not believe that the Vietnam war can be won, therefore all of the rest of Southeast Asia will go Communist.

Quite the contrary, in Indonesia, for example, the Communists were butchered by the thousands by the Indonesians themselves—and this happened at a time when the United States was not only not in Indonesia, but was doing quite poorly in South Vietnam as well.

Also, just because the Herald-Telegram believes that America should not be fighting and cannot win in South Vietnam, does not mean that we believe that the United States shouldn't fight for example, in Thailand or Israel or Latin America if we were asked to fight there. We should fight if the country who asked us to help them met our criteria for U.S. entry.

Obviously, as a matter of common sense, however, America should try to support these other countries in every way short of war. But, if they meet our criteria, and if support short of helping them fight does not suffice, then we would certainly consider combat help.

SUMMATION OF WHY THE HERALD-TELEGRAM OPPOSES THE VIETNAM WAR

Based on the preceding, the Herald-Telegram believes that the United States should not be involved in the Vietnam war.

The government of Vietnam obviously does not represent the will of the people of South Vietnam. If they did, the people would support the American and South Vietnamese military efforts, and they are doing so only in a minority—which makes the Viet Cong continuance possible.

Also, the Herald-Telegram believes that the bombing of North Vietnam should stop, as it only drives the North Vietnamese together and does not materially slow down the war—as so many, many months at such great expense have shown.

Now, though the Herald-Telegram believes that Vietnam is not a conventional war and cannot be conventionally won, we do believe that communism must be stopped, if—and this is the important qualification—if the country where the Communists are active wants our help in getting rid of them; if the government which asks for our help is representative of the majority of the people; if helping is in America's best interest; and if America—together with the rest of the allies—helps in every way short of war before our government considers combat help.

Finally, having established that the Vietnam war cannot be won, a final point should be made.

Not only can the U.S. not win the Vietnam war, but to escalate that war would only force Russia and China to enter the war. China would enter because she will think that America is trying to surround her, since North Vietnam is on China's border. And China's entry would force Russia into the action, if Russia is going to maintain her place as leader of the Communist world.

And America certainly does not want to go to war with Russia and China at the risk of the destruction of the world, for a war in Vietnam which we cannot win anyway.

Furthermore, our bombing of North Vietnam and major involvement in the Vietnam war directs America's attention to small Vietnam.

If we were not involved in the Vietnam war, however, America could take advantage of the very real and deep split between Russia and China.

That is, Vietnam is now keeping Russia and China somewhat together. While if the U.S. were not in Vietnam, the Sino-Soviet split would certainly work in favor of limiting the power and activities of Russia and China to the benefit of the allies and the free world.

OUR SOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

The Herald-Telegram believes that the first step towards any solution of the Vietnam conflict requires a stopping of the bombing of North Vietnam.

It is politically impossible for Ho Chi Minh to be able to suggest peace talks to his people while his country is being bombed. And, as we pointed out in the preceding, the bombing of the North has given our forces little, if any military benefit. Hence, stopping it will not materially hurt the U.S. position; and it would put the responsibility for peace talks where it belongs—on North Vietnam's shoulders.

Second, to date, the South Vietnamese have not handled the majority of the offensive part of the war. Rather, it has been our U.S. troops which have led most of the search and destroy missions and most of the activity in the DMZ.

Now, as the Herald-Telegram noted in our second criterion for America to enter another country, it is essential that the country the U.S. is fighting with have adequate military potential to be able to be offensive by itself.

Certainly, the U.S.A. has been in South Vietnam long enough and has given the South Vietnamese military all of the training and material they need to fully develop their military potential.

It is now time for this country to turn over to the South Vietnamese the offensive side of their war. Their troops should conduct the Search and Destroy Missions and the activity in the DMZ and the Delta.

And if the South Vietnamese cannot militarily handle this activity, then America had better learn this now. If America finds the South Vietnamese unable to be offensive, then any further fighting on our part would be useless—as the South Vietnamese Army would lose whatever America wins for them as soon as the war is over and the U.S. has withdrawn.

In short, the Herald-Telegram believes that the U.S. should stop the bombing of North Vietnam.

If the stopping of the bombing does not bring about peace talks—and we think that Ho Chi Minh will have to talk if the bombing stops—then the Herald-Telegram would still support America cutting back our military action to defensive and advisory status. By so doing, the U.S. would also be able to see if South Vietnam really wants to fight its own war, and if the South Vietnamese are capable of doing so—which, sadly, we doubt.

America should not have gotten into Vietnam on a combat level in the first place. Yet that decision is now history.

Since our country is in Vietnam, we cannot just pull out overnight, but we can substantially change the emphasis and degree of U.S. involvement in the war. We can change it so that the move for peace is North Vietnam's—not ours. And we can change it in the South so that it becomes a war fought, in the main, by the South Vietnamese—and not by Americans.

Certainly, those two steps would be vitally important moves towards ending hostilities and towards putting American involvement in its proper and lesser place.

National Young Citizens' Committee for an Atlantic Convention

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the formation of a National Young Citizens' Committee for an Atlantic Convention.

The committee is composed of State and National leaders of the junior bar section of the ABA, the Jaycees, Young Republicans, and Young Democrats. These individuals have joined in this effort with the thought in mind of evidencing to the Congress the broad scope of appeal that Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 enjoys.

The concurrent resolution was submitted in this session by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] and myself and has received cosponsorship from 17 of our colleagues. The concurrent resolution would place the Nation in support of an Atlantic Convention, which would seek to develop some sort of Federal answer to the problems now facing the NATO alliance.

The chairman of the Young Citizens' Committee is D. Bruce Shine, an attorney from Kingsport, Tenn., who served on the staff of two former Members of this body from Tennessee, Senators Estes Kefauver and Ross Bass.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names and addresses and biographical data of the committee members be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

List of Members of Young Citizens' Committee for an Atlantic Convention

Joy Aulani Ahn, 29; 3762 Claudine Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96816; Hawaii State Young Democrats, National Committeewoman; Vice President, United Nations Assoc., Hawaii Chapter.

Alan Ahrens, 24; Elberfeld, Ind.; Former College Republicans Chairman for Indiana.

Robert Apps, 29; 46 Beauchamp Road, Malvern, Worcestershire, England; Chairman, West Midlands Area Young Conservatives; Member, Young Conservative National Advisory Committee.

Gary L. Avery, 23; 1015 Huntoon, Apt. 4, Topeka, Kansas 66604; Director, Little Rock Jaycees; Executive Committee, Young Democrats.

Miette Baeteman, 19; Leopoldwal, 29, Tongeren, Belgium; Delegate to ATA Assembly, Munich and Luxembourg, 1966 and 1967; law student, Free Univ. of Brussels.

John A. Berman, 35; 242 Thumbull St., Hartford, Conn. 00103; Member, Committee on Awards, Young Lawyers Section, American Bar Association.

Claude E. Berreckman, 34; 801 Meridian Ave., P.O. Box 214, Cozad, Nebraska 69130.

Carl R. Biletta, 34; 1316 Riviera Blvd., Vineland, N.J.; Past National Director, New Jersey Jaycees.

Edward F. Bishop, 35; 50 Barnes St., Providence, R.I., 02906; Past President Providence Jaycees; Past State Vice President, Rhode Island Jaycees.

David L. Bowers, 23; 4002 Sylvania Ave., Toledo, Ohio 43623; Chairman, Midwest Federation College Republican Clubs; Past Chairman, Region V, College Republican National Committee.

Mrs. Sandra Braren, 23; 6322 Magazine St., New Orleans, La. 70118; President, 2nd District Young Republicans; Member, Board of Directors, Metropolitan New Orleans Republican Political Action Council; Member, Louisiana Republican State Central Committee.

Russel L. Brown, 32; 501–C Front St., P.O. Box 1125, Ketchikan, Alaska 99901; Chairman, Young Democratic State Central Committee; Chairman Ketchikan Consolidated Democratic Precinct Committee.

Paul Burke, 33; 5110 West 87th Street, Prairie Village, Kansas 66207; Commissioner, Kansas Turnpike Authority; Past Chairman, Prairie Village Republican Central Committee.

J. Frank Cafferty, 33; 1601 Interlaken Pl., E., Seattle, Washington 98102; Staff Member, Washington State Senate; Former President, Overlake Democratic Club.

Marvin C. Cecil, 31; 105 7th St., North, Naples, Florida 33940; Past President, Naples Jaycees; Past Vice-President Florida Jaycees.

Len Chow, 27; P.O. Box 2698, Boise, Idaho 83701; National Director, Idaho Jaycees; President, Capital Jaycees.

Darryl R. Cochrane, 28; 1564 Harvey St., Muskegon, Mich. 49442; Chairman, Young Lawyers Section, Western Michigan, Michigan Bar Association; Democratic Precinct Delegate.

Milton-Core, Jr., 34; P.O. Box 652, Denham Springs, La. 70726; Past President, Louisiana Jaycees; Secretary-Treasurer, local Rotary Club; Manager, local Chamber of Commerce.

P. D. Darrah, 30; 27 Kelton St., Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada; English-Speaking Section, Young Liberal Federation of Canada.

Peter Dölle, 23; 6419 Silger/Schule, West Germany; Student.

Charles J. Driebe, 34; Box 565, Jonesboro, Georgia 30236; President, Young Democrats of Georgia.

Dennis Elpern, 21; RD No. 1 Etters, Pa. 17319; College Republican National Committee, 1966–67; Chairman, D.C. College Republicans, 1966–67.

Fritz Endris, 29; 722 E. Main St., Greensburg, Ind., 47240; Past President, Decatur County Young Democrats; elected Mayor of Greensburg, Nov., 1967.

David T. Flaherty, 38; 803 Hospital Ave., Lenoir, N. Carolina 28645; National Co-Chairman of Campaign, National Federation of Young Republicans.

Douglas R. Fonnesbeck, 23; 295 N. 1st W., Logan, Utah 84321; Regional Director, Young Democratic Clubs of America; National Committeeman, Young Democrats of Utah.

Wolfgang V. Geldern, 22; Groner-Tor-Strasse, 14–15, 34 Göttingen, West Germany; President, CDU Students, State of Niedersachsen/Bremen.

John Robert Gower, 36; 507 N. Joslin St., Charles City, Iowa 50616; Past President, Charles City Jaycees; Past State Vice President, Iowa Jaycees; Member, Young Republicans.

William M. Hartman, 28; 420 So. Kenilworth, Oak Park, Ill. 60302; Educator.

Wolfgang Häseker, 21; Grimmstr, 7, 44 Münster, North Rhine Westphalia, West Germany; Chairman, Christian Democratic Union's Student Organization, 1967.

Jörg Herrmann, 27; Regensburger Str. 14a, Berlin 30, West Germany; State Chairman, Christian Democratic Students.

Gene Karp, 30; 5855 E. Wilshire Terrace, Tucson, Ariz. 85711; Arizona Democratic Precinct Committeeman.

Roger J. Keast, LL.B., 24; "Gwellyets," Treyew Road, Truro, England; Chairman, West of England Area, Young Conservatives; Member, Young Conservatives National Executive; Ex-Chairman, Exeter University Conservative Club.

Henry E. Kerry, 34; 200 Fort Worth Club, Fort Worth, Texas; President State Junior Bar Association of Texas; Member, Executive Council, Young Lawyers Section, American Bar Association.

Joseph Paul Kieboom, 29; Willem van Oranjelaan 56, Den Bosch, The Netherlands; Member, International Student Movement for the U.N.; Member, The European Movement; Vice-President, Organizing Committee of The Congress of Europe, Atlantic or Continental Orientation, 1965.

Jacob W. Kipp, 25; 525 S. Bernard St., State College, Pa. 16801; Vice-President, Centre County Young Democrats; Chairman, Pennsylvania Democratic College Caucus.

James M. Klebba, 24; 330 8th St. S.E., Minneapolis, Minn. 55414; Past Director, New England Region, College Young Democrats; Past President, North Central Region Association of International Relations Clubs.

Dr. Lothar R. Kraft, 31; Tulpenbaumweg 23, 532 Bad Godesberg, West Germany; Secretary General, Young Christian Democrats Union.

Peter Krätz, 27; Saarbrückerstr. 171, 6604 Brebach-Fechingen, West Germany; President, Department of the Press and Information, Youth Union of the Saar.

Mrs. Norma Laskey, 36; 6164 Guilford Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48224; Vice-Chairman, Wayne County (Detroit) Republican Committee; Past Member, Young Republican National Executive Committee.

Raymond Long, 38; RR3, Campbellville, Ontario, Canada; Educator.

Hon. Donald B. Lukens, 36; Suite 1338 Longworth Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.; U.S. Congressman from Ohio; Past National Chairman, Young Republican National Federation.

Darrell March, 33; Box 407, Wyoming, Ill. 61491; Past National Director, Illinois Jaycees; Editor, Illinois Future.

William D. Mason, 33; 14 Oxford Road, Scotch Plains, N.J. 07090; Past National Director, New Jersey Jaycees.

Mrs. Donald R. McCullough, 35; 4402 Humble St., Midland, Texas 79701; Secretary Midland County Young Republicans; Secretary, State of New Mexico Young Republican Federation.

Michael McGuinnes, 22; 768 Maple St., Rocky Hill, Conn. 06067; Chairman and Former Treasurer, Fairfield University Young Democratic Club; Former Secretary and Treasurer, Connecticut Young Democratic Research.

Patrick P. McNally, 29; 4 Hedgley St., Lee Yoren, London S.E. 12, England; Member, Campaign for a Political Community; Member, Canadian Peace Research Institute.

Manford L. Meade, 32; 6th and I Ave., Limon, Colo. 80828; Past Vice-President, Colorado Jaycees.

Jack M. Meyer, 31; 1338 Ellison Ave., Louisville, Ky. 40204; Past Vice-President, St. Matthews (Louisville) Jaycees; Past International Affairs Director, Kentucky Jaycees; Tabulation Chairman, "Nunn for Governor" (Republican) campaign, 1967.

Anthony N. Moore, 19; 2408 Longview, Apt. 202, Austin, Texas 78705; Member, Young Democrats.

Don Moyor, 37; North St., Duncan Falls, Ohio 43734; President, Muskingum County Young Democrats; National Committeeman, Ohio Young Democrats.

William G. Myers, M.D., 36; 9 East Coconut Way, Hobe Sound, Florida 33455; Chairman, Martin County Republican Executive Committee; Past President, Martin County Young Republicans; Hobe Sound Chamber of Commerce.

Dieter Noll, 27; An der Ochsenwiese 18, 645 Hanau, West Germany; President, Christian Democratic Students in Hessen; Student in Mannheim.

Roger D. Olson, 32; Box 1022, Mitchell, South Dakota 57301; Chairman of the Board and Past President, South Dakota Jaycees.

Edward J. Orlett, 33; 726 Redway Circle, Dayton, Ohio 45426; President, Greater Dayton Jaycees; Past Chairman, National Council of Catholic Youth; Past National President, National Newman Student Association; Past President, Young Democrats of Montgomery County, Ohio.

Robert J. Owens, 23; Blue Earth, Minn. 56013; National Committeeman, Minnesota Young Democrats; Past President, Minnesota Young Democrats.

Robert D. Parks, 34; 1520 S.W. 70th St., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73159; National Treasurer United States Jaycees (1966–67).

Philippe L. E. Picard, 31; Des Taxandres #5, Brussels 4, Belgium; Member, Belgian Atlantic Treaty Association; Attorney.

George W. Porter, 36; 1047 W. Sixth St., Ontario, Calif. 91762; President, West End Barristers' Club; Vice-President, Western San Bernardino County Bar Association.

A–1c. Robert Powell, 41; Box 5947, 26th CSG, APO New York 09012.

Richard Rausch, 31; No. 201, 220, 2nd St., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003; Deputy Chief, Mid Atlantic VISTA Recruitment; Executive Secretary, Young Democratic Clubs of America, 1962–1964.

Alan Reed, 27; 5141 Randolph St., Lincoln, Nebraska 68510; Member, Nebraska Young Democratic State Executive Committee; APSA; ACLU.

Darrell G. Renstrom, 36; 1255 New Hampshire Ave., NW, No. 601, Washington, D.C. 20006; Legal Counsel, National Education Association; Post Chairman, Northwest Conference Young Democrats.

Martin R. Root, 24; 4200 S.E. Jennings Ave., Portland, Oregon 97222; Chairman, Western Federation of College Republicans; Congressional District Director, Oregon Young Republicans.

Dr. ivr. ubr. Erich Röper, 28; Kaiserstr. 26, 53 Bonn, West Germany; Vice-President, Federal Board, Student Organization of CDU–CSU.

Bruce P. Rossley, 21; 227 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass. 02116; Immediate Past President, New Hampshire Young Democrats; Past Member, Young Democrats National Committee.

Jürgen-Bernd Runge, 23; Walter-Dinze-Str. 11, Berlin 45; West Germany; Member CDU party; Leader, Christian-Democratic Student Organization, University of Berlin.

K. G. Rush, 37; 1750 Pembrook Road, Springfield, Ohio 45504; Past State Chairman, Board of Governors, Young Lawyers Section, Ohio State Bar Association; Past Chairman, Lawyers of Other Lands, Young Lawyers Section, American Bar Association; Past President, Clark County (Ohio) Young Democrats.

John E. Shandbower, III, 32; 6 Mardrew Road, Baltimore, Md. 21229; Membership Committee, Young Lawyers Section, American Bar Association.

C. B. Savage, 33; 1001 Petroleum Club Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103; Democrat; Former President, Oklahoma Young Lawyers Section, American Bar Association.

Albert Schedl, Jr. 31; Unterslingerweg 52, 84 Regensburg, Bavaria, West Germany; Member, Federal Board, Young CDU–SCU.

Richard Scheve, 33; 1005 Willow Drive, Olathe, Kansas 66061; Past President, Olathe Jaycees; Member, Olathe Jaycees and Olathe Chamber of Commerce; Past National Director, Kansas Jaycees.

Paul Schmandt, Jr., 37; Rathausplatz 11, 479 Paderborn, West Germany; Member, Federal Board, Youth Union CDU–CSU for Westfalia.

Wulf Schönbohm, 26; Kaiserstr. 26, 53 Bonn, West Germany; Federal Chairman, Union of CDU–CSU Students.

Werner Schreyer, 29; Saarbrücker Str. 120, 6604 Brebach-Fechingen, Saar, West Germany; President, Young CDU–CSU of Brebach-Fechingen; President, District of Saarbrucken Young European Federalists.

Larry E. Simpson, 33; RFD #1, Sebago Lake, Maine 04075; President, Maine Jaycees; Standish Republican Town Committee.

Charles R. Singman, 21; 8121 Pleasant Plains Road, Towson, Md. 21204; President, Towson State College Democrats; Vice President, Maryland Federation of Young Democrats.

Myron C. Smith, 36; 10569 Main St., Suite 510, Fairfax, Va. 22030; National Committeeman, Young Democrats of Virginia.

B. J. Steinerson, 26; Box 52–213 Patio, Wendover, Utah 84043; Member, Young Democrats.

Gerald M. Stevens, 37; 1009 Meadow Drive, Oqosso, Mich. 48867; Member, Clients' Security Fund, Young Lawyers Section, ABA; Young Republican.

Edward H. Stoll, 34; 221 East 10th St., New York, N.Y. 10003; Colorado Delegate, 1965 Young Democrats National Convention.

Bernard A. Streeter, Jr., 32; 26 Indiana Drive, Nashua, New Hampshire 03060; Former National Director, U.S. Jaycees; Vice-Chariman, New Hampshire Federation, Young Republican Clubs; Past President, Nashua Young Republicans and Nashua Jaycees.

Robert O. Voreis, 18; 725 Windsor St., Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115; Former State Teen Age Republican Chairman.

Dr. Rudolf Wagner, 45; Clemenstr. 18/111, 8 Munich, West Germany; President, Union Atlantischer Federalisten; Board Member, International Movement for Atlantic Union.

Christopher Ward, 24; 2 Pinkneys Road, Maidenhead, Berkshire, England; Member, Berkshire County Council; Chairman, Wessen Area Young Conservatives.

Daryl R. Watts, 30; 410 S.E. 3rd St., Eagle Grove, Iowa 50533; Past National Director, Jaycees; Past State Vice-President, Iowa Jaycees; State Chaplain, Iowa Jaycees.

M. Suzanne Weaver, 37; 136½ Mill St., Athens, Ohio 45701; President, Athens Business and Professional Women's Club.

Richard Weber, 26; Box 425, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501; State President, North Dakota Young Democrats; National Director, Association of Political Sicence Instructors; Member, American Political Science Association.

Ted E. Wedemeyer, Jr., 34; 110 E. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. 53202; National Vice President, U.S. Jaycees.

James W. White, 40; 354 N. Jefferson St., Kittaning, Pa. 16201; Past President, Young Democrats of Pennsylvania; Former Special Assistant to President of Young Democrats of America.

Charles T. Whitney, 23; 1607 Pioneer Road, Des Moines, Iowa 50309; President, Young Democratic Clubs of Iowa National Executive Committee; College Young Democrats of America.

James M. Wilkes, 29; 1110 Transamerican Bldg., Tucson, Ariz. 85710; Vice-President Young Lawyers Association of Arizona.

Avery Lee Williams, 32; 26 Jenny Lind St., North Easton, Mass. 02356; Past State President, Massachusetts Jaycees.

Edith E. Williams, 35; 1818 Security Life Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202; Past National Committeewoman, Colorado Young Republicans; Member, Denver Chamber of Commerce.

Guy B. Wilson, 24; 2545 Murville, Brossard, Quebec, Canada; President, Quebec Student Liberals; Vice President, Young Liberals of Canada.

G. Dean Zimmerman, 25; 815 East Lincoln Ave., Olivia, Minn. 56277; National Executive Committee, United Campus Christian Fellowship.

Limited War—Limited Peace?

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in my search for possible solutions to the war in Vietnam, I have researched and studied some of the circumstances and events leading up to our negotiations with the North Koreans during the "Korean police action."

Many U.S. citizens are yearning for

the commencement of "negotiations for peace."

An article written by Capt. E. J. Carroll, Jr., U.S. Navy, more than a year ago regarding Korean negotiations is still pertinent to the Vietnam conflict.

Under unanimous consent I include this discussion from the December 1966 "United States Naval Institute Proceedings":

LIMITED WAR—LIMITED PEACE?

(By Capt. E. J. Carroll, Jr., U.S. Navy)

As the Vietnam conflict accelerates into its third year since the Tonkin Gulf torpedo boat attacks, the question of final resolution becomes increasingly vital. Will we have general war? Will the Viet Cong melt away into jungle and swamp to return and fight another day—or decade? Or will peace talks materialize and result in a negotiated settlement as did the Korean conflict 13 years ago?

There is much in the present politico-military situation in Vietnam which suggests an armistice as the logical outcome. The apparent unwillingness of the United States to resort to strategic warfare and weapons appears to be matched by that of the Soviet Union. Such action is beyond the current capabilities of Communist China.

The cautious expansion of the level of conflict by the United States, plus our repeated entreaties for peace talks, indicate the greatest reluctance to force the enemy into a position where "the golden bridge" of negotiation is not open to him. The long Communist record of pragmatic realism makes it seem highly unlikely that Hanoi will simply abandon its many positions of strength in the face of military defeat without accepting peace negotiations. Thus, if our increasing military pressure prevails, we may logically anticipate an armistice arising from negotiations with a Communist foe.

It is in this sense that we may look to the Korean Armistice as a valuable source of guidance. The Korean Armistice clearly evidences many weaknesses which are traceable to failures in the negotiating process. Some of these failures, in turn, were due to poorly defined objectives, or lack of unanimity among U.N. representatives. A careful examination of the strong and weak points of the Armistice Agreement, with an explanation of their genesis, will lead to certain conclusions concerning how related matters might better be treated in Vietnam.

First, what is an armistice? From a legal standpoint there is very little which is formal or foreordained. International Law establishes only a rough framework within which agreement must be reached. Three points are critical in the framing of a traditional armistice. These are: determination of the duration of the agreement and specification of the conditions warranting resumption of hostilities; a list of prohibited acts; and, delineation of the geographic scope within which the provisions of the armistice apply. Modern practice, as evidenced by both the Korean Armistice Agreement and the Geneva Agreements of 1954 concerning Indochina, looks to the creation of neutral supervisory authorities to enforce the observance of an armistice. There is no provision of either conventional or customary law which requires such supervisory bodies. It is entirely fair to say that the final form and content of an armistice is more a reflection of the relative strength of the parties than it is of International Law. Force of arms, preparation, determination, and negotiating skill are all important elements which decide the degree to which one side may impose its will upon the other in an armistice agreement.

In Korea, we fared very well on the issues of duration and geographic scope. The armistice was to "remain in effect until expressly superseded either by mutually acceptable amendments and additions or by provision in an appropriate agreement for a peaceful settlement at a political level between both sides." It has! Despite frequent major and minor breaches of almost every provision of the Agreement, it remains an important aid in the maintenance of an uneasy peace in Korea.

The Agreement was particularly successful in establishing the geographic scope of the Armistice. The carefully defined, marked, and patrolled geographic boundary established between the opposing forces had prevented any possibility of the inadvertent resumption of hostilities. Only by a major, overt, and obviously premeditated attack can one side pose a significant military threat to the other side. The elimination of the temptation to engage in ambiguous, nibbling encroachment, with its attendant risk of gradual escalation into a state of general hostilities, is certainly the prime virtue of the Korean Armistice Agreement.

These two strong features of the Agreement were accepted by the Communist side at a time when the U.N. delegation, led by Vice Admiral C. Turner Joy, was at the peak of its effectiveness. A brief review of the history of the negotiations explains this fact. Truce talks first opened on 10 July 1951 at Kaesong, Korea. Both the time and the place were dictated by the Communists. They exercised full military control in Kaesong and exploited this fact to humiliate both U.N. delegates and representatives of the Free World's press. The despicable treatment accorded our senior officers at Kaesong was intended to place them in the role of defeated supplicants who had come to beg for mercy from the victors. Admiral Joy's description of this in his book *How Communists Negotiate* is a chilling reminder of the importance of the physical and procedural aspects of the negotiating process. He also stresses the importance of developing an objective agenda before opening talks, noting persistent Communist attempts to dictate an agenda which contained many provisions favorable to their side.

Recognizing our error in commencing the talks without proper preparation and under highly unfavorable conditions, talks were broken off in August and remained recessed at U.N. insistence until 25 October 1951 when they reopened at Panmunjom under acceptable conditions. Furthermore, U.N. military pressure during the long recess helped to persuade the Communists to renew the negotiations in a spirit much more conducive to early agreements. Almost immediate acceptance of the basic U.N. proposals concerning duration and geographic scope resulted.

In return for acceptance of the U.N. proposals, the Communists pushed hard for a *de facto* cease fire in November 1951. General Matthew B. Ridgway, the U.N. Commander, strongly opposed such an agreement:

"To accept a *de facto* cease fire would jeopardize the United Nations military position and military negotiations in Korea. A *de facto* cessation of hostilities prior to reaching agreement on armistice terms would enable the enemy to augment his ground and air strength in close proximity to the battle line. The security of United Nations Command forces would thereby be seriously compromised. With a *de facto* cease fire the enemy could prolong indefinitely discussions on other agenda items."

Regrettably, General Ridgway's penetrating analysis of the Communist strategy was not reflected in his concurrent order of 12 November to the Eighth Army. General James A. Van Fleet was ordered to cease offensive operations in Korea and begin an active defense of the Eighth Army's front. This surrender of the military initiative to the Communist forces led to growing initiative and intransigence on the part of their negotiators.

From this point on, critical decisions went very poorly for the United Nations. Vital U.N. proposals concerning arms control measures; the membership functions, and authority of the Military Armistice Commission and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission; reporting requirements; limitations on airfield development; and provisions for aerial observation were all rejected or emasculated.

We tamely accepted ineffective, imprecise Communist counterproposals which greatly weakened the Armistice Agreement as a peacekeeping measure. The failure to prohibit the rehabilitation of airfields in North Korea guaranteed that a major shift in the military balance would occur as soon as U.N. air operations ceased. Limitations on the number of ports of entry subject to inspection by the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC) Inspection Teams as well as Communist inspired restrictions on the freedom and authority of the Inspection Teams insured the opportunity for illegal reinforcement and re-equipment of Communist forces in North Korea.

Similarly, the failure of the Military Armistice Commission (MAC) and NNSC to contribute significantly to the maintenance of peace in Korea may be attributed to weakness at the bargaining table resulting from the premature relaxation of military pressure on the enemy. The MAC is now a debating team with no real authority to redress any violation of the Armistice. The NNSC is almost totally devoted to ceremonial functions, exercising no control whatsoever over the opposing sides anywhere in Korea.

Every Communist-sponsored compromise foredoomed these agencies to impotence. As a result, the real sanctions against the resumption of hostilities in Korea today are huge, heavily armed, expensive military forces maintained there by both sides, not the terms of the Korean Armistice Agreement.

Negotiations finally collapsed completely in October 1952 on the issue of voluntary repatriation for prisoners of war. Just as General Ridgway had warned months before, the absence of military pressure gave the Communists freedom to "prolong indefinitely discussions on other . . . items." On this one simple, relatively unimportant point the conclusion of an Armistice was delayed 17 months. The United States alone suffered more than 24,000 casualties while this one issue was resolved. It is difficult to believe that vigorous prosecution of favorable military conditions enjoyed by the U.N. in November 1951 would not have produced much earlier agreement on this point. It is a fact that the Communist side almost immediately communicated its willingness to reach a final settlement very shortly after Secretary of State John Foster Dulles "leaked" the word to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India that the United States would expand the war unless satisfactory progress was made soon in peace negotiations. Even the threat of significant military pressure seems to have produced willingness to reach an agreement in 1953.

Even more illuminating is the fact that on this one issue the U.N. representatives returned to the well prepared, detailed, and determined negotiating tactics adopted immediately after the Kaesong debacle. After the Communists offered a vague and ambiguous eight-point proposal for effecting the exchange of prisoners, the United Nations countered with a precise 26-point proposal which left no room for later dispute. A Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (NNRC) was established. Unlike the weak supervisory bodies previously created, this one was given a strong independent Executive Agent (India). The Executive Agent was authorized to employ its own armed troops in the execution of the POW exchange. Backed by its own power, free of crippling restrictions, not bound by the need for unanimity as were the other supervisory agents, the NNRC effected an orderly exchange of prisoners despite significant difficulties generated by both parties to the exchange.

Thus, the pattern emerges. The Korean Armistice Agreement is still strong and viable on those issues which were well planned and fought for vigorously by the United Nations. It is weak, or openly repudiated by both sides, in those features which were determined during a period when the United Nations allowed an overpowering desire for an early peace to blind us to the realities of dealing with an unscrupulous enemy. Careless compromise, unenforceable prohibitions, and ineffective agencies were all accepted by the United Nations after surrendering the military initiative to the Communist side. We pay a heavy price for these shortcomings every year in order to maintain peace in Korea.

How may we improve on these results in Vietnam? A number of actions seem obvious. First, start preparing for negotiations now! Plan the conduct of armistice negotiations just as military campaigns are planned. An Armistice Planning Group should be established immediately. Appropriate military and civilian members with good, tough minds and a high degree of physical stamina should be selected. Given authoritative policy guidance from the highest levels of government concerning the exact political objectives to be satisfied by a cease-fire agreement, the members should work out detailed proposals for a military settlement to achieve these objectives. Such proposals should be tested in moot truce talks against "devil's advocates" in order to analyze probable enemy counter proposals and to strengthen the arguments and negotiating techniques of our own members. The most effective members of the Planning Group should be selected for duty with the true talk delegation.

Next, sufficient military pressure must be sustained to induce the enemy to make the first overtures for actual negotiations. There can be no question that our present level of military activity in Vietnam has been carefully controlled by U.S. policymakers with just this result in mind; and, that the control exercised in Vietnam is the most sophisticated, sensitive, effective political direction the U.S. military has ever received. A difficult political situation with global ramifications has been managed adroitly to date. If we continue to be resolute in our military policies we shall be in an excellent position to force the enemy into making the first concrete proposals for peace talks.

It is safe to predict that the first Communist gambit will be to hint at a willingness to talk if we stop bombing in North Vietnam. No such concession should be considered. One need only look at the results of the U.S. bombing moratorium in North Vietnam from 24 December 1965 to 31 January 1966 to see the danger of such action. Our "peace offensive" was regarded as a sign of weakness by the Communists who ridiculed and maligned our motives. At the same time they exploited the hiatus by repairing their roads and railways, doubling the infiltration rate of troops into the Republic of Vietnam (RVN), and expanding SAM antiaircraft defenses into new sectors of North Vietnam. While the "peace offensive" may have been necessary in the world community, and may have produced political gains there, the military costs are still being paid in Vietnam. Not one element of military pressure should be relaxed as a prelude to negotiations. Conclusion of an acceptable armistice should be the only signal for ceasing operations.

The enemy's invitation to open peace talks should be accepted only under conditions entirely satisfactory to the United States and the RVN. Any proposal to conduct peace talks as an extension of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina must be rejected. Neither the United States nor the RVN ever accepted the Geneva Agreements because they represented the terms of an abject French surrender to Communist pressure, not a workable plan for peace in the area. Any attempt to revive these moribund documents can work only to the advantage of the Communists. A firm, agreed-upon agenda must exist before negotiations begin. The location of the talks must be open, neutral territory. All members of our delegations and press representatives must be accorded appropriate courtesies. In Admiral Joy's words, "We must not negotiate merely because the enemy wants to do so . . . We must negotiate not merely from strength, but with strength."

Our initial demands should be presented in carefully detailed drafts. As subsequent bargaining points, drafts should contain several proposals which are not essential to our interests but are known to be unacceptable to the Communists. Negotiators should be authorized to yield on these points only in return for concessions and agreements on issues which are critical to our side. Once presented, the demands must be repeated verbatim, day after day, unchanged and unchanging, until the opposition makes the first concrete offers of compromise. Our negotiators should refuse even to discuss vague or insignificant concessions. And, obviously, all demands should be reinforced with the maximum appropriate military pressure.

Finally, some recognition must be given to the fact that the geography and political subdivisions of Southeast Asia do not lend themselves to the creation of a neat, well defined Demilitarized Zone as in Korea. This fact certainly represents one of the great problems in devising effective means for peace keeping throughout the Indochina area. There is a critical requirement for a peace-keeping measure to take the place of the DMZ in Korea. A strong, neutral, independent supervisory agency, comparable to the Neutral Nations repatriation Commission in Korea, is suggested as one feasible solution. Such a body must be composed of true neutrals, not satellites of each side. The group must be afforded complete, unrestricted freedom of movement and the right to conduct thorough inspections on their own initiative at any point within all areas specified in the armistice agreement. The inspection units must be large and well armed so that they may not be inhibited in the performance of their duties except by the open, deliberate opposition of superior military force. Overt opposition would constitute an unambiguous threat to the peace, fully justifying the imposition of severe sanctions by the supervisory agency. Appropriate sanctions should be prescribed in the armistice agreement. The offended side would always have the option of resuming hostilities as the ultimate sanction.

The advantages of a strong neutral supervisory body are threefold. First, it could redress minor violations of an armistice promptly. Second, it would reduce greatly the danger of a resumption of hostilities due to a series of minor, ambiguous, threatening actions by one side. No claim is made that even the most aggressive supervisory authority could prevent the resumption of hostilities if one side openly breached the armistice in such gross fashion as to create an unacceptable threat to the other side. It is only argued that an effective, armed neutral agency can remove the aura of uncertainty from ambiguous situations, thus preventing the inadvertent and unintended resumption of hostilities. Third, a dynamic policing agency operating as a buffer between opposing forces might very well permit each side to reduce the number of nearby military units, thereby further reducing tension and the danger of serious incidents.

In this imperfect world, it may well be impossible to agree to grant this degree of authority and control to any neutral body. However, in the words of U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations:

". . . when the situation is serious enough, Governments are prepared to waive certain attributes of national sovereignty in the interest of keeping the peace."

When one considers that the only other apparent alternative in Vietnam is to accept the expense and danger of a semi-permanent armed truce, just as we now do in Korea, it is possible to believe that the better choice may be made.

By its very nature, a limited war tends to end in a form of limited peace. Whether the degree of peace we achieve in Vietnam will satisfy the basic security requirements of the United States and the Republic of Vietnam will be a direct consequence of the military force, skill, knowledge, and determination we bring to bear against our enemies during the negotiation of a final armistice agreement. Now is the time to begin!

Lower Rio Grande Water Committee and City of Harlingen Endorse Flood Control Plan

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a few days ago I asked for and received unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a resolution of the Cameron County, Tex., commissioners court endorsing the International Boundary and Water Commission's plan to prevent a reoccurrence of the flooding in the valley of Texas as followed Hurricane Beulah this past fall.

The city of Harlingen, located in Cameron County, was one of the urban areas that was hardest hit by the flood. That portion of the city along the Arroyo Colorado suffered very severe damage. Some 1,800 residences and other improvements were damaged, causing the evacuation of about 8,000 people which is equal to 20 percent of the city's population. A number of residences built below the high bank of the arroyo were flooded to the roof. Residences at the level of the bank were flooded to a depth of 3 to 4 feet. The crest of the flood in Harlingen was estimated to be 10 feet above the level reached in the 1958 flooding.

Naturally, the city of Harlingen is very interested in any future flood control preparation; and the city commission has passed a resolution endorsing with certain modifications the IBWC plan.

Two of the urban areas inundated by flooding in the valley, Harlingen and McAllen, are considered as in the lower valley. Thousands of acres of farmland in the lower valley were flooded, and some are still under water. Thus the Lower Rio Grande Water Committee is interested in increased drainage and flood prevention in the lower valley; and the committee in its meeting on January 26 passed a motion placing it on record as supporting the IBWC plan as it affects the lower valley.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of January 23, adopted by the City Commission of Harlingen, signed by Mayor George F. Young, attested by the city secretary, Dorothy

Bernard, together with the letter of transmittal dated January 24 and signed by the city secretary, Dorothy Bernard, and the excerpt from the minutes at the meeting of the Lower Rio Grande Water Committee on January 26 concerning the IBWC plan, together with the letter of transmittal dated January 31 and signed by Jack Drake, secretary-treasurer, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 68R-103 OF THE CITY OF HARLINGEN, COUNTY OF CAMERON, STATE OF TEXAS

Whereas, in order to prevent a recurrence of severe flood conditions experienced by the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas following Hurricane Beulah, the IBWC has proposed a plan for improvements to and control structures in the interior floodway system intended to limit the water elevation in the Arroyo Colorado River to 30 to 31 feet at the "F" Street bridge in the City of Harlingen, and

Whereas, although the maximum of 30 to 31 foot water elevation in the Arroyo Colorado at the "F" Street bridge in the City of Harlingen contemplated by the planned 21,000 cfs flow of water into the Arroyo Colorado during maximum flood condition, is a relatively safe water elevation, such plan is inadequate in the following particulars:

1. The 21,000 cfs maximum flow at Mercedes producing the 30 to 31 foot elevation at Harlingen does not take into consideration a potentially preexisting abnormal water elevation resulting from local heavy rains or use of the Arroyo Colorado in the Cameron County Drainage plan for drainage of excessive surface water, and

2. Such plan does not provide for restoration of river banks severely eroded by the Beulah flood and constituting a serious hazard to improvements existing adjacent to the Arroyo Colorado outside flood control easements nor for improvements necessary to prevent further erosion of such banks and the consequent complete destruction of such improvements, and

3. Such plan does not provide for work necessary to drain or correct stagnating pools left by the Beulah flood.

Now, therefore, know all men by these presents, that the City Commission of the City of Harlingen commends the IBWC for its expeditious efforts to protect the City of Harlingen and the Lower Rio Grande Valley from a recurrence of the Beulah flood and urges its immediate adoption and implementation with the following modifications:

1. That the control structure proposed at Mercedes to limit and control the flow of water into the Arroyo Colorado be designed with such flexibility as may be necessary to further restrict the flow of flood water into the Arroyo Colorado to such quantity as will not result in a water elevation of in excess of 30 to 31 feet at the "F" Street bridge in Harlingen, taking into consideration the amount of water existing in and to be drained into the Arroyo Colorado downstream from Mercedes;

2. That such plan be expanded to include such restoration of and improvements to eroded banks as may be necessary to alleviate the immediate hazard to existing improvements and to prevent further erosion in time of high and rapidly flowing water; and

3. That such plan be expanded to provide for drainage or otherwise eliminating stagnating pools left by the Beulah flood.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution signed by the Mayor and City Secretary be forwarded forthwith to Commissioner Joe Freidkin, International Boundary and Water Commission, Congressman Kika de la Garza and Senators Ralph Yarborough and John Tower.

Dated this 23d day of January, 1968.

GEORGE F. YOUNG,
Mayor, City of Harlingen.

Attest:

DOROTHY BERNARD,
City Secretary.

CITY OF HARLINGEN, TEX.,
January 24, 1968.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: At a special meeting of the City Commission of Harlingen held on January 23, 1968, the Commission unanimously approved the enclosed resolution.

Any consideration you can give to this resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY BERNARD,
City Secretary.

Enclosure.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 26, 1968

Chairman McManus said he felt that this problem is bigger than the individual and the groups, and the entire Valley must be protected from floods. He asked the committee's pleasure on the plan.

W. D. Parish moved that the committee go on record as endorsing this plan to improve the flood control system and to handle any future floods, which Commissioner Friedkin has submitted. Mr. Vaughan seconded the motion.

Mr. Etchison asked that the motion be amended to include "because of the assurance Commissioner Friedkin has given us that the government will do all in its power to protect the bridges and pumping stations, if feasible and reasonable." Mr. Parish and Mr. Vaughn agreed to the amendment being made. The question was called. The motion, as amended, passed unanimously.

LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER COMMITTEE,
Weslaco, Tex., January 31, 1968.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The Executive Committee of the Lower Rio Grande Water Committee has unanimously gone on record as approving Commissioner J. F. Friedkin's proposal regarding increased drainage for flood protection in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

This action was taken at a meeting held in the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce auditorium on Friday, January 26.

It is the Committee's feeling that the raising of the levees and the changing of the diversion channels will meet the needs of this area.

Your support of this project will be deeply appreciated.

Very cordially,

JACK H. DRAKE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

How Powerful Are We?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* raised many questions, most of which have not been answered yet. An enormous question about how America uses its power in the world has not been raised clearly enough by this unfortunate incident. Richard Rovere, in a recent New Yorker Letter from Washington, asks what kind of power we have that can get us into various difficult situations yet seems helpless to get us out. His article follows:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

JANUARY 27.—The official statements are tough, self-righteous, unyielding, ungraceful. But below what may be called the "spokesman" level, the word is being passed that there will be no use of force, and that if all else fails, as all else now seems bound to do, the government will drop its demand for the return of the Pueblo and seek only the release of its crew. This may not be information but a kind of extrapolation—a reading of the "options" by subordinates whose thinking may be colored by their hope of getting out of this mess as quickly as possible. It is, of course, far from certain that the North Koreans would find such a deal acceptable. If it interested them at all, they would probably demand that along with the addition to their navy, in which the Pueblo would be the largest ship, they get some kind of acknowledgment of wrongdoing on our part and some assurance that we will in the future keep a healthy distance from North Korea's territorial waters.

If it comes to that, it is being said here, an apology will reluctantly be made. (Senator Mansfield has this afternoon advocated that we put all questions of fact aside and make any apologies required to free the Pueblo's crew and avert war.) Again, all this may be nothing more than a prophecy by interested persons who would like to see it fulfilled. No one knows whom, if anyone, the President is listening to these days, or whether there is in the Administration anyone challenging his judgment and pleading with him to take a hard look at the available courses of action and inaction. In any event, the view of most observers here is that the only alternative to a compromise that would surely be humiliating to the government is a war that it is in no way—not even militarily—prepared to wage. In dealing with a country which we do not recognize, which we bar from membership in the United Nations, and with which we have no normal relations of any kind, our power avails us little. We can communicate with North Korea only through field commanders on an armistice line and, if we can find any, through intermediaries who have more sympathy with its position than with ours. We have nothing to threaten but destruction, and nothing but destruction to withhold. There is little to negotiate except that which by definition is not negotiable.

Most people here are as skeptical as any Communist diplomat could be of the Administration's account of what happened in the Sea of Japan earlier in the week. It is not only that the Administration's record for veracity is so poor; it is as much a case of doubting whether the government, regardless of how it planned to deal with the public, is even capable of getting at the truth. How can Arthur Goldberg or Dean Rusk know where the Pueblo was in the days and hours before its capture? Who would tell them, and why should they believe their informants? The only assurance that Rusk could give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was that the ship's commander was under instruction to stay at least thirteen miles offshore. He said that its radio had been silent until shortly before the seizure; if true, this suggests that the Pueblo was concealing its position.

After testifying at the closed hearings, the Secretary was asked by reporters whether at any previous time the Pueblo had ventured within North Korea's twelve-mile limit. He said, "We have no information whatever pointing in that direction." This was candid enough; had he gone on, he might have said that he had no information pointing in *any* direction. It can be doubted whether anyone in high appointive office had ever before heard of the Pueblo or understood the missions that it and similar vessels were supposed to be performing. And a knowledge of what it was authorized to do would not necessarily be the same as a knowledge of what it was actually doing. Even today, it seems impossible to get a straight answer to the question of which office in the Pentagon or the C.I.A. or whatever the ship's commander reported to. If the reason could be security, it could also be ignorance and confusion; it could be that no one wants to talk, or it could be that no one knows how to find out. And there is an understandable vagueness, which may not be dictated by security, as to what benefit the republic derives from the existence of such ships (known in the trade, it seems, as "elints"—gatherers of "electronic intelligence") and the data they are said to send back. What is the point of having all this gadgetry afloat in the Sea of Japan "monitoring" North Korean "communications"?

The official reply is that with fifty thousand American troops south of the Thirty-eighth Parallel it is clearly advantageous to learn in advance of any hostile intentions on the part of North Korea. But now it seems that anyone with a cheap transistor radio could have picked up North Korean announcements broadcast only a week ago—not in any code but in crude, clear English—that American "armed spy boats" were in imminent danger. It would seem that either the Pueblo's equipment was, in Pentagonese, too "sophisticated" to pick up messages so conventionally transmitted or, as it is only too easy to believe, the warnings arrived and were immediately thrust into a file cabinet or an off-duty computer, unread and undigested by any human being.

Two crises in this decade—this one and the one in 1960 that followed the downing of the C.I.A.'s U–2 spy plane near Sverdlovsk—arose as consequences of the malfunctioning of an intelligence system that has no excuse for being except as an aid to the avoidance of the kind of danger we now confront. It can be maintained that at times—perhaps more times than the public has ever been told about—the system has helped keep the peace. It was a U–2 that detected the Soviet missile emplacements in Cuba in 1962; this led to an extremely tense period but probably nowhere near as dangerous a one as we would have faced if knowledge of the installations had come at a later time and by some other means. U–2 flights in the closing months of the Eisenhower Administration have been credited with gathering the evidence, generally regarded as authentic, that we had greatly overestimated Soviet nuclear and missile capacity. This was useful to know; without such information, it is unlikely that the test-ban treaty of 1963 could ever have been negotiated. But a crisis as severe as the present one followed the shooting down of the U–2 piloted by Gary Powers, and there were then, as there are today, people asking whether such risks are worth taking.

There can, of course, be no closely reasoned answer, since it is given to very few to know what the "intelligence community" does with the money and equipment provided for it, and among those who do know there are probably very few who have the kind of moral and political judgment that would give any serious person reason to respect their opinions. But if we apply to the C.I.A. and other intelligence agencies a general knowledge of the functioning of bureaucracies, we can be reasonably sure that a great deal is being done that is of no benefit to anyone except the people thereby provided with employment.

This is an inflexible rule of government, testified to most recently by those ambassadors who were elated at the news that, to cut down overseas spending, all embassy staffs were to be reduced by ten per cent. And it would seem to follow that secret bureaucracies are more given to pointless, mindless operations than those that are more or less subject to the scrutiny of Congress and the press. Since some of what these faceless bureaucrats are up to can expose us and the rest of the world to the danger of wars that could lead to extinction, it is hard to escape the conclusion that our lives are all quite often at the mercy of mere boondogglers.

When and if the present crisis is past, there will be some kind of congressional investigation, accompanied by demands for closer civilian surveillance of those who are supposedly in the business of military surveillance and the gathering of intelligence. But this is merely one aspect of the way we use our power, and the largest question raised by the events of this week is how it has come to pass that our power is so useless in achieving the ends our government professes to seek and is so often a source of danger not to our "enemies" but to ourselves. Because the B–52 bomber, armed with hydrogen bombs, that crashed in Greenland fell far from centers of population and in nominally friendly territory, it did not bring on a crisis similar to that caused by the Pueblo's capture. But it might have fallen elsewhere and made the week doubly agonizing.

People here were almost as much surprised to learn that such a plane had been in the air as they were to hear of its falling. Although the Strategic Air Command was never dissloved and probably never will be, there was a mistaken but widespread impression that, whatever disasters they might ultimately lead to, our intercontinental ballistic missiles and Polaris submarines had at least reduced some of the dangers of maintaining an "airborne alert" at all times. But, clearly, the dangers have simply multiplied, and if it can be said that this is what invariably happens when power is endlessly being added to power, it must also now be said that this seems to be about the only thing that happens.

In the late fifties, there was great dissatisfaction with the Eisenhower Administration's military policy, which was to place almost complete reliance for the prevention of war on nuclear deterrents, on our capacity for "massive retaliation." A number of military men and many Democratic opponents of the Administration, among them John F. Kennedy, argued that this was the most perilous of courses. It meant that any conflict in which we were engaged would shortly have to become a nuclear conflict, and that we had no way of defending American interests except an ultimately self-defeating one. The cry then was for "balance" and "diversity" in military defense, and in 1961 Robert McNamara set about reorganizing the armed services so that they might be able to fight "limited wars" for limited ends.

This sounded sensible at the time, and perhaps it is still a sounder policy than the one that had been in effect; we can never know whom, if anyone, we should thank for the fact that we are still alive. But what is surely the case is that, except insofar as our nuclear weapons may be preventing general war, our military power is not of much use, even in the pursuit of military victory. We have created the kind of forces we were told were needed in order to fight "brush-fire wars"—several of which, it was said, might be going on simultaneously—and yet we cannot "win" even the one in which we are currently engaged. And in the last few days we have been advised by our military men that if the Korean war were resumed, the drain of Vietnam on our resources would compel us to employ "tactical" nuclear weapons.

The power we have today can get us into trouble of many kinds, but it seems useless for getting us out. There seems to be no way in which its use or the threat of its use can achieve even as small and defensible an aim as the return to our shores of eighty-three of our citizens. It is, in fact, the cause of their detention; in a similar fix (if one can be imagined), it would probably be easier for Costa Rica, which lacks any military forces, to obtain the release of her nationals. One cannot, to be sure, maintain that American power has no beneficent uses, no excuses for being, and that we should emulate Costa Rica in having none of it. The world is, as the Secretary of State keeps saying, "a violent place," and our power has at times been used for the lessening of violence and in defense of humane aims. But now it seems to stand in need of at least as much reassessment as it did in the late Eisenhower and early Kennedy years. At its present level and in its present deployment, it seems damaging to just about every legitimate interest we have in the world and a threat to our own society.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, February 19, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Beatitude Elisha II, the Armenian Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem, offered the following prayer:

From Jerusalem, the City of David, from Jerusalem, the site of the Temple of Solomon, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Mosque of Omar; from the height of Mount Zion and the Armenian Cathedral of St. James, where for centuries pilgrims have prayed for peace; from Bethlehem, the birthplace of our Lord, from the holy shrines sanctified by His passion and glorified by His resurrection, we extend our hand and our heart and our prayer:

Almighty and beneficent God, endow us with the grace to invoke Thy blessing upon the men and women of this honorable assembly, the House of Representatives, and the illustrious Speaker, that they may legislate in the spirit of the holy dimension of their existence. Help them, we beseech Thee, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in their deliberations to relate to the ultimate and integrate the self into the holy order of living.

With gratefulness which makes the soul great, we pray that You intervene in their lives, that Your will prevail in their affairs so their bond with the past will continue to engender hope for the future.

Father of all men, implant in this noble body the strength to uphold the ideals cherished by the Founding Fathers of this great Republic and in the radiance of the Founding Fathers let them behold the worth of effort and determination. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1123. An act to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. AIKEN (chairman), Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SPONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. FONG, and Mr. GRIFFIN to attend, on the part of the Senate, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., on March 20-24, 1968.

TRIBUTE TO HIS BEATITUDE ELISHA II, THE ARMENIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, His Beatitude Elisha II, Armenian patriarch of Jerusalem, guardian of Christendom's holy shrines, has journeyed from the Holy Land to bestow his blessing upon the 90th Congress;

His Beatitude Elisha II, one of the world's great spiritual leaders and humanitarians, has conferred honor upon the Capitol of the United States by his visit here;

His Beatitude Elisha II, by precept and example, inspires loyalty, fidelity, and patriotism; and

His Beatitude Elisha II, faithfully serves the cause of peace, especially in the Middle East, fostering mutual understanding among nations and minorities; therefore, I know I express the views, the wishes, and the thoughts of the Members of the House of Representatives when we acknowledge with deep appreciation the presence of His Beatitude Elisha II. I know we all extend to him the hospitality, respect, and felicitations that are due him.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in welcoming one of the great religious leaders of the world as a guest of the House of Representatives today. His appearance in our country, I am sure, will bring blessings to our land. We are most grateful that he is among us. We appreciate, as do men and women around the world, the great work that he is doing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend from Massachusetts and the majority leader in welcoming to this historic legislative Chamber His Beatitude Elisha II, the Armenian Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem. His Beatitude is one of the outstanding churchmen of the world, a great leader in the field of religion, and one who wields tremendous influence by reason of this position of great competence in other aspects of the world and in other problems confronting the world.

I want His Beatitude to know that we in the House of Representatives welcome him not only as a great churchman but as a friend, and that we are highly honored by his presence with us today.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the first time within the memory of those present, a clergyman who is not an American citizen blessed this House. It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this break with tradition was made by such a distinguished churchman as His Beatitude, Elisha II, the Armenian patriarch of Jerusalem. I would like to add my message of appreciation to those already expressed this morning to Patriarch Elisha for bring the blessing of Holy Jerusalem to this House.

His Beatitude, since his ascension to the exalted position of Armenian patriarch of Jerusalem and his assumption of responsibilities as one of the three guardians of Christendom's most holy shrines, has done much humanitarian work. During the last decade he has been instrumental in restoring to position of dignity countless refugees from injustices: Christians, Jews, and Moslems alike. His efforts in behalf of peace in the Holy Land have earned the gratitude and praise of all who have come to know him. His trip to the United States is for a noble purpose, that of rebuilding damaged Christian shrines in Mount Zion. Serving with His Beatitude, Patriarch Elisha, as honorary chairmen of a joint committee working for the restoration of these holy places are you, Mr. Speaker, His Eminence Cardinal Cushing, Senator EDWARD BROOKE, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Dr. Charles Malik, and His Worship Teddy Kollek, mayor of Jerusalem.

The sacred task undertaken by this committee knows no denominational boundaries or national boundaries. It is an honor and a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to meet and pay homage to such a distinguished personage as His Beatitude and to express the hope that his labors in quest of peace will continue. Members of the Armenian Church in the United States and the world over are fortunate to have such a distinguished personage as their patriarch in Jerusalem and the Christian church is fortunate in having such an able guardian for its most holy shrine.

DRAFTING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the directive issued late last week by Selective Service Director Hershey demonstrates a clear and potentially dangerous failure to recognize the priorities that confront this Nation.

Graduate school education provides us with young men adequately and properly trained to handle the growing array of awesome technical and human assignments involved in building the United States. While we have tens of thousands of troops in Active Reserve units it is a grave failure of the system to draft graduate students. If manpower needs dictate, the Reserves should be activated before graduate school deferments are ended.

The effect of General Hershey's directive is that in 3 years this Nation will be left without what will be a sorely needed crop of graduate students trained in engineering, the social sciences, technical subjects, and the other vital areas of graduate study.

To prevent graduate school from becoming a means of avoiding the draft, however, all draft eligible men permitted to pursue graduate study should be required to enter a Reserve unit and undergo training to guarantee that upon completion of graduate study that they will equitably serve their country.

It would be a much wiser and infinitely more sophisticated use of our resources to call up people already in the Reserves before ending graduate school deferments.

What else is a Reserve for?

GEN. HANFORD MacNIDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, death has ended the long career of the distinguished and colorful soldier, statesman, and industrialist—Gen. Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa. He passed away last Saturday in a Sarasota, Fla., hospital at the age of 78.

General MacNider has been described as one of the greatest citizen-soldiers in the history of the United States and surely he ranks as Iowa's greatest soldier-statesman.

His personal courage in leading troops in the battlefield has enshrined him as one of America's top war heroes. Only Gen. John Pershing was awarded more medals in World War I. Among General MacNider's awards for valor was the Distinguished Service Cross with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

When World War II broke out, he insisted on being recalled to active duty and camped in the office of an Assistant Secretary of War until he was called. He was the first American general officer to be wounded in action in the Pacific theater of operations—on November 23, 1942.

During his illustrious career, he served as national commander of the American Legion in 1921, Assistant Secretary of War from 1925 to 1928, and Minister to Canada in 1931 and 1932.

A stanch Republican and conservative, he was a major candidate for the Republican vice presidential nomination in 1932.

In political as well as business life, General MacNider was a man of stern conviction and blunt spoken. Having once taken a position, never did he yield to expediency.

Although he retired as president and general manager of the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co., of Mason City in 1960, he remained active in guiding his family's banking, industrial, and farming interests. He also retained an active interest in politics and community affairs.

I am proud of the fact that I had the honor of representing this great American in the Congress of the United States. More than that, he was a true friend and I will always cherish the memory of my visits with him whenever I was in Mason City.

To his widow and family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, another of his close friends is on the floor of the House today, one of our former colleagues, Mr. Ben Jensen. I am sure he would join me in these remarks had he the opportunity to do so.

THE ULTIMATE OBJECTIVES OF GEORGE WALLACE'S CANDIDACY

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if there were ever any illusions harbored by the American people concerning the ultimate objectives of a George Wallace candidacy for President, the candidate himself this past week dispelled them and disclosed his true intentions.

Mr. Wallace, at a February 16 news conference in Chicago, acknowledged the distinct possibility that his objectives could be achieved not by winning the Presidency himself but rather just by preventing either major party candidate from receiving a majority of the electoral college vote, thus throwing the decision into the House of Representatives. Under such circumstances, Mr. Wallace admits that he would then seek to enter into "a covenant" with either candidate who was willing to make his policies, supported by only a small minority of Americans, the policy for all Americans.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Wallace candidacy is a cynical attempt to capitalize upon the vagaries of our presidential electoral system in order to get what the electorate of this country will never grant him; namely, a stranglehold on national policy.

The American people would not wish us to stand idly by while a minority presidential candidate attempts to blackjack either major party candidate into such an unholy alliance.

The hour is late, but it is not too late. Measures are pending both here in this body and in the Senate which would amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for direct popular election of the President and the Vice President of this country. Those measures should be acted upon immediately. An amendment recommended by our Judiciary Committee will surely be favorably treated here in this body and in our sister body, and time will still permit the necessary three-fourths of our State legislatures to be called into special session to ratify such constitutional amendment before this coming summer.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that that committee have until midnight tonight to file two special reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DESIGNATING THE OAHE RESERVOIR AS LAKE OAHE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2901) to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2901

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota shall be known and designated hereafter as Lake Oahe in honor of the Indian people who inhabited the great Missouri River Basin. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is referred to by any other name shall be held and considered to refer to such reservoir by the name of Lake Oahe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAME OF TWIN BUTTES DAM AND TWIN BUTTES RESERVOIR TO BRYANT DAM AND BRYANT RESERVOIR

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 297) to change the name of Twin Buttes Dam and Twin Buttes Reservoir on the San Angelo project, Texas , to "Bryant Dam" and "Bryant Reservoir."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 297

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the name of Twin Buttes Dam and Twin Buttes Reservoir on the Middle and South Concho Rivers, San Angelo project, Texas, be changed to "Bryant Dam" and "Bryant Reservoir", in honor of M. D. Bryant. Any law, regulation, document or record of the United States in which such dam or reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such dam or reservoir as "Bryant Dam" and "Bryant Reservoir".

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAME OF SAN ANGELO RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS, TO CULBERTSON DEAL RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 358) to change the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, to "Culbertson Deal Reservoir" project, Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res 358

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, be changed to "Culbertson Deal Reservoir" project, Texas. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as "Culbertson Deal Reservoir" project, Texas.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Texas." and insert "Texas, in honor of Mr. Culbertson Deal."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING THE DEFINITION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13315) to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 127 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a subsection (c) reading as follows:

"(c) Cities are included in that district in which are included the counties within the exterior boundaries of which such cities are geographically located or out of the territory of which they have been incorporated."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after "Cities" insert "and incorporated towns".

On page 1, line 8, after "cities" insert "and incorporated towns".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSOLIDATION AND USE OF FUNDS ARISING FROM JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF APACHE TRIBE OF MESCALERO RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1727) to authorize the consolidation and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CREDIT TO KINGS RIVER WATER ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2402) to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall credit outstanding obligations of all members of the Kings River Water Association incurred pursuant to the master agreement among the members and the association and the United States dated December 30, 1963, and the Alta Irrigation District, Consolidated Irrigation District, Fresno Irrigation District, Kings River Water District and Tulare Lake Canal Company pursuant to agreements dated December 23, 1963, in a total amount of $1,098,597.92 representing excess payments over their share of the operation and maintenance charges of Pine Flat Reservoir, Kings River, California, during the years 1954 and 1955. Such amount shall be credited to the total repayment obligation and not to the annual installments thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2447) to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2447

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act is amended by striking out "the Secretary of Commerce" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Transportation".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASTERS' LIENS FOR WAGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14401) to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14401

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the master of a vessel documented, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States shall have the same lien for his wages against such vessel and the same priority as any other seaman serving on such vessel.

(b) Sections 4546 and 4547 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 603 and 604) shall not apply in any proceeding brought by a master for the enforcement of the lien granted by this section.

(c) Section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 600) is amended by striking out "seaman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master or seaman".

(d) Section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), is amended (1) by striking out "seaman or apprentice" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master, seaman, or apprentice", and (2) by striking out in the first proviso thereof "any seaman" and inserting in lieu thereof "any master or seaman".

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), the term "master" shall include every person having command of any vessel documented, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, except a person who has a financial interest valued at 5 per centum or more either of the corporation, partnership, or association which owns the vessel against which the lien is claimed, or of the market value of the vessel against which the lien is claimed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

REDUCTION OF RATIO OF CAREER SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES TO REGULAR EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14934) to reduce from 5 to 4 the ratio of career substitute employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3302 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out, in subsections (b) and (c) thereof, the word "five" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four"; and

(2) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(f) In determining the number of career substitute employees which may be appointed in accordance with this section, the Postmaster General may not include supervisory employees as regular employees.

"(g) The Postmaster General may not appoint, at any first class post office, any person as a temporary substitute employee in any of the categories listed in subsection (b) of this section unless a period of one hundred and twenty days or more has elapsed since he was so employed and such appointment shall not continue for a period greater than one hundred and twenty days, except that the limitations of this subsection do not apply to—

"(1) any category of employees at a post office at which there are less than twenty-five employees;

"(2) employment after November 14 in any year and before January 1 of the immediately following year;

"(3) any category of employees for which there is not available a register of a sufficient number of eligibles; and

"(4) appointments made with the concurrence of the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of providing part-time employment to special groups of persons.".

SEC. 2. Effective as of the beginning of the first applicable pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967, the per annum (gross) rate of compensation of the position of Superintendent of Garages (House Office Buildings) under the Architect of the Capitol is $12,540. Such position is subject to the provisions, pertaining to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, in section 212 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 634; Public Law 90–206), relating to the implementation of salary comparability policy.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14934 was cosponsored by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] and myself on the basis of an official recommendation of the Postmaster General. It was supported unanimously in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The purpose of this legislation is to permit the Postmaster General to increase the number of career substitute postal employees in relation to the number of regular postal employees, with a corresponding reduction in the number of temporary employees in order to provide a more stable work force and to remove the undesirable situation resulting from the excessively high turnover rate of temporary employees.

PROVISIONS

The first section of the bill reduces the ratio of substitute to regular employees from 5 to 1 to 4 to 1. The bill includes a provision which prevents the counting of supervisor employees in the count of regular employees in establishing the ratio. Also in the case of temporary employees, a gap period of 120 days will be established whereby temporary employees would not be eligible for reemployment. It had been the practice to rehire many temporary employees for continuing periods without a break of any kind.

This provision will not apply—

First, to post offices with less than 25 employees;

Second, during the Christmas period, which begins after November 14 and expires before January 1 of the immediately following year;

Third, where there is not available a register of a sufficient number of eligibles for a particular category of employees; and

Fourth, where appointments are made with the concurrence of the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of providing for part-time employment to special groups of persons.

All of these provisions are now in the bill. The committee amendment adds section 2, which corrects an oversight by which the Superintendent of Garages did not receive a pay increase granted all other legislative employees by the Federal Salary Act of 1967, Public Law 90-206.

The amendment will grant a 4½-percent increase in compensation to this employee and assures him of any increase that may be granted in July 1968 and July 1969, pursuant to implementation of the salary comparability policy of section 212, Public Law 90-206.

The 5-to-1 ratio was enacted into law in 1955. This restriction on career substitutes, by necessity, has forced the Post Office Department to hire an excessive number of temporary employees. Several events have occurred since 1955 which require that this matter receive immediate legislative attention.

The provisions of sections 3571 and 3573 of title 39, United States Code, relating to hours of work and overtime compensation for postal employees, were changed considerably by the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965—Public Law 89-301—to require that all regular employees be assigned to a basic workweek of 5 full 8-hour days, and no longer period than 12 consecutive hours. These provisions also were amended to require the payment of overtime compensation to a substitute employee for work in excess of 40 hours in a week.

These changes tended to reduce, for economic reasons, the use of regular employees for half days on Saturdays, and of substitute employees for work in excess of 40 hours a week, in order to avoid the payment of overtime, thereby creating a greater demand for additional substitute employees.

Since there is no longer a sufficient number of career substitutes under the ratio to fill the gap left by the lag in authorizing regular positions to provide off-day coverage, it has become necessary to utilize temporary substitute employees.

Normal absences on approved leave, including regular off days, vary from 23 to 35 percent in the postal service on any given day. This exceeds the present flexibility of career substitutes which, under the 5-to-1 ratio, provides only about 20 percent.

An additional reason for the use of substitutes rather than regulars arises by reason of around-the-clock daily mail processing requirements. The substitutes are used to fill in outside the 40-hour workweek schedule.

It is therefore necessary that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible time to change the ratio in order to provide additional career substitute positions in lieu of hiring an excessive number of temporary employees.

Temporary employees are not career employees. They are not entitled to the fringe benefits granted Federal employees, such as civil service retirement, Federal life insurance, or Federal health benefits, nor do they have any job security. Temporary employees have a turnover rate of 89.9 percent compared to a turnover rate of 32.6 percent for career substitute employees and 8.2 percent for regular employees.

The use of temporary employees cuts down the use of substitute employees who have to work when work is provided them. Last year the average substitute employee worked less than 30 hours a week. He has to be on call. He is a career employee and must continue as a substitute so that he will one day become a regular employee. Some employees have remained substitute employees for many years. This bill will enable substitute employees to come closer to making a living wage. The Post Office Department concedes that substitute employees are more efficient and better employees, who will in all probability devote their entire careers to the Post Office Department. Temporary employees, on the other hand, have very little hope of remaining with the Post Office Department. The new 1-to-4 ratio will permit the Post Office Department to make approximately 17,000 additional career substitute appointments.

CONCLUSION

This bill provides for a necessary adjustment in the Postal Field Service. It is for the benefit of all employees and the postal service itself to make more career appointments and fewer temporary appointments. Career workers have carried the much maligned postal service to a point where the Post Office Department delivers more mail than all of the countries of the world combined. This bill is a matter of fundamental justice and good sense. I hope that the House will support the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 14934, to reduce the ratio of regular postal employees to career substitutes from 5 to 1 to 4 to 1, was approved by our committee without objection and I offer my support in favor of its passage.

The Postmaster General is, by law, presently bound to a fixed ratio of 5 regular employees of the postal field service to 1 carrier substitute in his employment practices. The result of this restriction, according to testimony presented at hearings before our Subcommittee on Postal Operations, is the necessity of hiring temporary substitutes to accomplish the day-to-day work in our postal facilities.

By changing the ratio, the Postmaster General will be able to appoint more employees as career substitutes and curtail to some extent the practice of hiring temporary substitutes. To explain further, a career substitute enjoys practically all of the advantages and fringe benefits of a career regular, except that the substitute is not guaranteed a regular workweek. His average workweek is 28 hours.

The Post Office Department spokesmen strongly emphasized the desirability of career employees over temporaries by reason of their higher efficiency, broader postal knowledge, and interest in the service.

Those appointed as temporary substitutes, according to the testimony our subcommittee received, generally are among the least qualified of those seeking postal employment, and are less efficient. The turnover rate of this group of employees is 89.9 percent, which obviously does not contribute to a stable operation of the postal service.

It should be stressed that this legislation, in and by itself, will not create a larger work force in the postal service. The increased number of career substitute appointments will be offset by a corresponding decline in temporary appointments, the Post Office Department has assured us.

If this legislation will result in an improved and more efficient postal operation, then I strongly favor giving the Postmaster General the administrative tools to accomplish this.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, H.R. 14934, as amended, and recommend its approval.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see consideration being given to questions of personnel in the postal service. Hopefully, the suggestion made will have some effect on delivery of mail.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation, H.R. 14934, which will permit the Postmaster General to increase the number of career substitute employees in the postal field service.

The committee bill is a compromise between the legislation recommended by the Postmaster General and the recommendations of the employee organizations who testified before our Subcommittee on Postal Operations.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Robert N. C. Nix, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, are to be congratulated for being able to work out such an acceptable compromise.

Understandably, the employee organizations have as their goal the appointment of more full-time regular employees rather than more career substitute employees. All of the parties were interested in having fewer temporary postal employees.

The legislation recommended by the committee will afford the Post Office Department an opportunity to appoint additional regular substitute employees and fewer temporary employees, and will still afford the protection requested by the employee organizations. The protection is accomplished by not including the supervisory employees in the ratio of one career substitute to each regular employee, and by placing a limitation on the period for appointment of temporary employees.

Mr. Speaker, this is beneficial legislation to both the Post Office Department and to the employee organizations, and I urge your favorable action here today on H.R. 14934.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen], a member of the committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Nebraska and all of my colleagues on the subcommittee and on the full committee, and very particularly the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] on this splendid legislation.

I think we are all trying for the goal that we would not have a class like temporary employees and that we would move them all into the substitute class or the permanent class.

I think that is our goal. This is a step in the direction of making the proposition of employment in the Post Office Department a more permanent, a more steady, and a more reliable employment, so that our employees can rely upon the Post Office Department for employment, and that our post office can in return rely upon these employees for faithful service.

In addition to the regular employees of the post office whom we are all familiar with—the letter carriers and the clerks at post office windows who take our mail—there is a group of employees who form part of the auxiliary force of the postal service. They work at odd hours and substitute for regular employees, plus coming to work during rush periods. The postal service is unique in that it has no control over the input, the mail going into the system. The peaks and valleys of the mail supply is completely in the hands of the public. Therefore, an extra labor supply must be available to keep the mail moving. If the supply of the mail cannot be controlled, an extra labor force must be available.

This auxiliary labor force is divided into two categories—substitute career employees and temporary employees who do not have a regular status. Temporary employees are for the most part hired for a short period of time. They are not career employees. Substitute employees are career employees and are for the most part waiting for the chance to become regular full-time employees.

These two groups of employees are, in effect, competitors with each other. They compete for irregular work to the extent that last year substitute employees received less than 30 hours work per week. This is particularly bad because all regular postal employees have to be substitute employees before they can become regulars. The average service as a substitute is from 1 to 3 years before he gets a regular assignment. That means that new employees who have every intention of becoming full-time career employees have to skimp along at less than a living wage in the hope of getting regular employment.

The Post Office Department supports this bill because it wants to increase the number of substitute career positions within the postal service. Temporary employees have a turnover rate of 89.9 percent whereas substitute career employees have a turnover rate of 32.6 percent. As a result of rapid turnover, temporary employees are not as competent as substitute employees. Nor do temporary employees have the incentive to learn their jobs and remain in the service.

This bill then will make available 17,000 more substitute positions in the postal service. These positions will be taken from the temporary employee job roster, so that the efficiency of the Post Office Department will be increased.

What is more, this bill, by its provisions limiting the period of service of temporary employees by establishing a gap period of 120 days before reemployment, increases the working hours for substitute career employees. A living wage for substitute employees is an absolute must. They now work less than 30 hours a week as I have said, and they need more work. This bill will get it for them.

I ask the House to support this bill because it is fair to labor and management and will result in greater service to the American people through a better postal service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14934, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF MAILING OF MASTER KEYS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14935) to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicles ignition switches, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Any key or other manipulation type device which—

"(1) is designed or adapted to operate the ignition switches, door locks, and trunk locks, or any of them, of two or more motor vehicles, the ignition switches, door locks, and trunk locks of which are designed to be operated with a different key or set of keys for each such vehicle, and

"(2) is defined in regulations which the Postmaster General shall prescribe,

is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs. Notwithstanding the immediately preceding sentence, such key or manipulation, type device may be transmitted in the mails, in accordance with regulations which the Postmaster General shall prescribe, to—

"(A) a bona fide locksmith, dealer in motor vehicles, officer or employee of a parking facility, officer or employee of a common carrier or contract carrier, or officer or employee of any motor vehicle rental business, for use in connection with his business;

"(B) an officer or employee of an automobile club or association operating in more than one State, or of an affiliate of such club or association, for use in connection with the activities of such club or association; and

"(C) supply or procurement personnel of the Government of the United States, a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a possession of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, for use in connection with the activities of such government.

The Postmaster General may require, as a condition of the transmission of any such key or manipulation type device in the mail to an addressee described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of this subsection, that the mailer file with the postmaster at the time of mailing—

"(i) a certification of the addressee that the addressee is qualified to receive such key or manipulation type device through the mail under one of the eligible categories of addressees described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of this subsection, and

"(ii) a certification of the mailer that, according to the information and belief of the mailer, the addressee is so qualified.".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14935 is a bill which received unanimous support from Members of both sides of the aisle. This bill has also been cosponsored by many Members of the House, including 11 members of our committee. I introduced this bill and it was cosponsored by Mr. Olsen, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Gross, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Derwinski, and Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina. A companion measure was introduced by Mr. Button, Mr. Scott, Mr. Ruppe, and Mr. McClure.

The purpose of this bill is to make nonmailable master automobile keys and other manipulation devices designed to unlock ignition switches and/or door and trunk locks. Exceptions are provided in the bill for the mailing of master keys to specific classes of individuals such as locksmiths for use in their business. Nothing in the bill permits persons listed in the excepted classes to mail master keys unless the addressee is also a member of the excepted classification. The Congress in the past has barred, both from the mails and interstate commerce, items which are not in themselves harmful or dangerous but which are destined to be used for unlawful purposes, such as lottery tickets.

This bill upon passage will serve a limited purpose in that it will make it more difficult for individuals to receive master keys. Young people under 18 commit 63 percent of the car thefts in the United States. It is easy to obtain these keys through the mail by replying to advertisements in girlie magazines and like publications, and receiving for less than $10 a set of master automobile keys which will open the doors and start the motor of almost any make of car in the United States manufactured from 1955 to the present. This bill is one step toward controlling the easy mass distribution of these keys through the U.S. mails at a cost of one 6-cent stamp per set of keys.

Automobile theft is the third most serious crime in the United States in terms of magnitude. In 1967, there were over 650,000 automobiles stolen, resulting in direct financial loss of over $140 million—100,000 of these cars were involved in serious accidents. Sixteen percent of all auto thefts resulted from the use of a key, and over half of the locked cars that were stolen were stolen with the use of a master key, according to a Justice Department survey of 1,659 felons convicted of auto theft. Eighty percent of all auto theft was committed by young people under 25.

PROVISIONS

This legislation will amend section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the nonmailability of certain items, to add a new nonmailable category—master automobile keys and other manipulation devices designed or adapted to operate the ignition switches, door or trunk locks of more than one automobile, except when mailed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General and to certain authorized persons. The specific definitions of these type of keys will be set out in postal regulations.

The authorized persons who fall into the exempt categories because of a direct connection with their business are: bona fide locksmiths, car dealers, officer or employees of parking facilities, officer or employee of a common or contract carrier, officer or employee of a car rental business, officer or employee of automobile clubs, or affiliated organizations or the supply or procurement officers of Federal, State, or local agencies, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

The Postmaster General may require that a certification by the addressee and mailer be filed with the Postmaster at the time of mailing, to the effect that the addressee is a person who falls within the excepted classifications under the bill. If the certification is false, the certifier will be subject to penalties under title 18, United States Code, section 1001. Such keys may be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs when mailed to an addressee outside of the cost excepted classes. This bill, if passed, will become effective on the 60th day following the day of enactment. The making of these keys or devices does not now violate any Federal law or postal regulation.

There is no basis on which to estimate the cost to the Post Office Department of this additional enforcement measure.

SUPPORT

This bill is supported by the American Automobile Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, American Insurance Association, American Mutual Insurance Alliance, and the National Association of Independent Insurers. The Post Office took no position on this bill but suggested that an earlier bill include some form of sanction, either administrative or criminal.

CONCLUSION

I ask that the House support this legislation because of the serious nature of the problems we face with master keys. The post office system is being used to make these devices easily available on a mass basis. The expense that automobile manufacturers are incurring in installing new locks and even buzzer systems in new model cars will be wasted if these keys become even more widely distributed. Some of our young people become easily involved in car theft and from there in lifetime criminal careers with untold cost to themselves and society. H.R. 14935 will prevent the U.S. mail service from being used as the unwitting tool of car thieves.

There have been more than 25 bills—many with cosponsors—introduced during the 90th Congress to restrict the mailing or transportation of master automobile keys in interstate commerce. Several bills include provisions for criminal penalties. These bills are pending before either the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

On December 6, 1967, I sponsored H.R. 14300, which would provide criminal penalties for the introduction into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles. This bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

On December 12, 1967, I sponsored H.R. 14404, which would permit the Postmaster General to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle locks. This bill was referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I scheduled hearings early during the second session of the 90th Congress on H.R. 14404 and similar bills in order to stop, at the earliest possible time, the undesirable practice of mailing the master keys. This problem began to arise in 1964 and the sale of the keys through the mails had opened an easy avenue in the aid of automobile thefts.

The subcommittee invited comments from the Department of Justice and was advised on January 19, 1968, that while the problem had been under review for quite some time, Justice had not yet reached any conclusions or recommendations which would be of any help to the subcommittee. The Deputy Attorney General's letter on this subject is printed in the hearings on page 2. The committee report on H.R. 14935 was filed on February 6, 1968, and on February 7 the Attorney General sent his recommendations for the Auto Theft Prevention Act of 1968 to the Speaker of the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] introduced the legislation, H.R. 15215, recommended by the Attorney General, which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Section 3 of Mr. Celler's bill will make nonmailable all motor vehicle master keys of any pattern, impression, or mold from which a motor vehicle master key may be made, and advertisements for the sale of such keys or patterns, impressions, or molds. Violation of this prohibition carries with it a criminal penalty and, of course, these provisions are proposed as an amendment to title 18, United States Code.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee bill, H.R. 14935, proposes amending title 39, United States Code, to make nonmailable master keys or other manipulation-type devices designed to unlock the ignition switches or locks of more than one automobile, except when such devices are mailed to certain authorized users, such as locksmiths, dealers in motor vehicles, officers or employees of parking facilities, common carriers, or motor vehicle rental businesses for use in connection with their business, or to officers or employees of an automobile club or association for use in connection with club activities, or to procurement personnel of Federal, State, or local governments for use in government activities.

The Attorney General's proposal also includes provisions for criminal penalties, but does not provide for any exceptions such as mailings to locksmiths, dealers in motor vehicles and similar organizations and persons. Moreover, it does not provide for the inclusion of standards as to the mailability under title 39, United States Code.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee bill, H.R. 14935, properly includes the standard of what is nonmailable under title 39, United States Code, and includes the several worthwhile exemptions mentioned above.

During the deliberations by the Subcommittee on Postal Operations the question came up as to whether we should delay consideration awaiting the recommendations of the Attorney General. However, upon checking with the Department of Justice, it was ascertained that they still had not come to any final recommendations; consequently, the subcommittee felt that they should not delay any longer, particularly since it was the view of the members of the subcommittee that the standards to be prescribed for nonmailability should be recommended as an amendment to title 39.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked the provisions of our bill out on the basis of testimony presented during our hearings. We have provided for exceptions to the prohibitions in order to permit the use of the mails for sending the keys to legitimate users such as locksmiths and motor vehicle dealers.

We believe we have an acceptable bill. Now that the Attorney General has submitted a recommendation including criminal penalties, I am sure that the Judiciary Committee will give it immediate consideration and come up with an acceptable recommendation.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in support of H.R. 14935. I congratulate the gentleman for introducing this legislation and the committee for passing it by unanimous consent.

I do think we ought to point up, though—and I think the gentleman will agree with me—this is not the cure-all for automobile theft, but it is just a step toward retarding automobile theft. Is that correct?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. It is not a cure-all, but it is a step forward to meet and, indeed, allay the situation with which we are faced.

Mr. OLSEN. It is a step that must be taken, is it not?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully with the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14935, a bill to make nonmailable, master automobile keys, with certain exceptions. This is a bill which is aimed at devices which for all intents and purposes are burglary tools. They are keys which have as their only purpose entrance into someone else's car. It is true that there are legitimate uses for such keys. These exceptions are outlined in the bill and take care of people whose business it is to help owners who have been locked out of their own cars.

What this bill does really is to take away the ease of distribution of these keys. The easiest and most effective mass distribution system in the world is the U.S. mail system. A teenager can clip an advertisement, use the mails and receive in return a set of keys giving him entrance to every car in the United States. This is bad enough, but the cost to him is less than $10. This bill will deny the wide distribution to first offenders, joyriders, and amateur thieves. The professional thief will make his own keys or steal them, but a youngster cannot easily do this.

The shame of the whole master key business is that a few mailers for a few pennies profit can turn any joyriding youngster into a professional car thief. Car theft is a crime committed by young people. Eighty percent of America's car thieves are under 25 years of age; 63 percent are under 18 years of age. For most of these young people it is their first crime, and for a good many, their first firm step on the way to a life of crime and prison.

We are all concerned about juvenile delinquency. Here is a bill that will make juvenile crime more difficult. In short, keep master keys to automobiles out of the U.S. mails, for the same reason you would keep master keys to every home in America out of the U.S. mails. It is the mass distribution system provided by the Government itself that must be taken away from the disposal of unscrupulous mailers. I ask the House to support this bill.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the committee.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, sponsored legislation to regulate the mailing of master keys for automobile ignition switches and door or trunk locks, and I was a cosponsor of the committee-reported bill, H.R. 14935.

I believe the members of our Subcommittee on Postal Operations, under the able leadership of the Honorable ROBERT N. C. NIX, chairman, are to be congratulated for finally taking action on legislation which will remove an easy means of distributing master keys to individuals who have the sole purpose in mind of using the keys for illegal or improper purposes.

It is the intent of this legislation to make nonmailable, master keys or other manipulation type devices designed to unlock the ignition switches or locks of more than one automobile, except when such items are mailed to certain individuals.

As the President stated in his crime message to the Congress, the crime of auto theft is a national problem which demands immediate attention. It is the third most frequent, and the second most costly, crime in our country. Stolen automobiles, especially when driven by the young, constitute a major danger to highway safety. The theft of an automobile is often a tragic step which leads the young offender into a lifetime of crime.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that automobile thefts can be reduced by taking measures to reduce the ease with which the crime may be committed. One of the devices which is employed in the theft of automobiles are keys, or sets of keys, commonly referred to as master keys, which have been advertised and are readily obtainable through the U.S. mails.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which has the legislative responsibility over the U.S. mails, has taken the appropriate steps in recommending this legislation which will restrict the mailing of master keys.

The promoters for the sale of master keys through the U.S. mails first began their big operation in 1964. The 4 intervening years, during which the sale of these keys has increased tremendously, has been more than ample time during which legislation such as this should have been enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members here today to support the favorable consideration of H.R. 14935.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I have had some experience in the State senate with auto theft investigations, and in Atlanta particularly we had a very bad situation.

This was aggravated by the fact that keys could be purchased by mail order for $10 or $12, and the auto thieves used the keys extensively.

I am delighted with the persistence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the fact that this bill has reached this stage. I fully support this bill and urge all our colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my distinguished and able colleague for a very splendid and timely statement. We hear a lot about juvenile delinquency. So often we do little about it. I want to congratulate and commend my great colleague for his outstanding statement and certainly for his advocacy of this timely legislation. I will support it.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to say to the House that I have served in this great body for almost 20 years and during that time it has been an inspiration to see the dedication and devotion to duty and country of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has concern and compassion for the youth of our Nation. I commend the gentleman for introducing this bill, for advocating it in committee, and for his great address today in the House and I now believe it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. NIX. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14935, in order that we may have immediate action on legislation to discontinue the use of the mails for the distribution of master keys for the primary use by individuals who wish to commit automobile thefts.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate our chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNING-

HAM], for all they have done in initiating and processing this legislation for our consideration here today.

The incidents of automobile theft can be controlled and reduced by taking measures to reduce the ease with which the crime can be committed. Among the devices which are employed in the theft of automobiles are master keys. Now that the manufacturers of these keys are using U.S. mails for the distribution of their product, we must take steps immediately to close this means of distributing an item which is used to implement the automobile thefts.

None of us believe that the prohibition of the U.S. mails for the distribution of this item will stop automobile thefts, nor are we naive enough to believe that it will stop completely the distribution of master keys indiscriminately. We are convinced that the prohibition will aid in reducing the joyriding and the theft of automobiles by juveniles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote favorably on this legislation here today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Members of the House of Representatives to recognize this problem I introduced master key legislation on February 28, 1967. My bill H.R. 6246 was referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am also the coauthor of H.R. 14935 which is before us today.

The purpose of both bills is the same; the means of enforcement is different. The bill before us will provide the Post Office Department with a strong weapon against the mass mailing of these master keys, whose purpose is nothing less than entry into any American-made car.

I have received from constituents copies of circulars advertising sets of keys for every Ford product, every General Motors product, every American Motors product, and every Chrysler product. The keys will fit the ignitions, doors, and trunks of all these cars. They can be used for any make of car produced in this country from 1940 to 1967. There are legitimate uses for such keys. Locksmiths, car rental owners, and others are provided for in this bill in that they can obtain by mail sets of these keys. But our problem is the mass distribution of these keys to teenagers. I mention teenagers specifically because 63 percent of the cars stolen in the country today are stolen by people under 18; 1,800 cars are stolen each day and the cost to the American public has reached a figure of $140 million a year even though most cars are recovered.

Our present laws do not cover the indiscriminate mailing of these keys. Bills before the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee provide other remedies. This bill is one that will provide a mail remedy in title 39 looking toward seizure of the keys, certification by the mailer and mail patron that the mail patron is within the exempted classifications under the bill. What we are doing here is to slow down and break up the mail distribution of these keys. It is a mail problem and it needs a mail solution.

There have been predictions that within the next 4 years, 4 million cars will be stolen. Automobile manufacturers are spending millions changing the lock systems on cars for ignitions, doors, and trunks. But all of this will be to no avail unless we pass this bill and bills like it to prevent the wholesale distribution of such keys. A survey by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the other body showed that 35 percent of the keys mailed went to people with prison records for car theft and receiving stolen property. A great many things must be done. This is one of the steps that must be taken. As a sponsor of legislation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and a cosponsor of this bill which comes from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I ask that the House support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the legislation before us, H.R. 14935, I rise in support of this measure and I urge its prompt approval.

As has already been explained, this bill has as its purpose the regulation through the U.S. mails of master keys or other manipulation type devices designed to operate the ignition switches, door locks, and trunk locks of two or more motor vehicles.

It should be pointed out that this legislation deals only with the introduction into the mails of these master keys and is specifically drawn so as to keep them out of the hands of juveniles or other persons who would have no legitimate use for them. The legislation has the latitude so as not to interfere with the lawful sale of this item through the mails. This is accomplished through a series of exceptions which recognize those persons or organizations having legitimate reasons for purchasing and possessing master keys.

The President, in his message on crime and law enforcement, stressed the seriousness of the trend in auto thefts. It is the third most frequent crime in America and the second most costly. Studies show that more than 60 percent of all auto thefts are committed by persons under the age of 18 and that often times this is the first crime of their lives.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, goes directly to that problem by removing the temptation to capriciously purchase through the mails master keys which would lead directly to automobile theft and pilfering.

It should be noted that this legislation does not pretend to totally solve the problem of auto thefts. Congress may wish to take additional steps in this direction as it sees fit. However, members of our committee are convinced that this one avenue of master key procurement—their mail-order purchase—should be closed immediately.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I again urge the prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14935, a bill that will strike a hard blow against juvenile delinquency. A car theft in the United States is a crime that is committed 63 percent of the time by young people under 18 years of age. It is a crime that involves serious injury since there is a 200-percent better chance of an accident in a stolen car. One hundred thousand stolen cars last year were involved in accidents. Over 700,000 automobiles were stolen last year at a rate of 1,800 car thefts a day in the United States.

Car theft has increased 57 percent since 1960. One of the reasons for this great increase can be laid at the door of mailers who, for a price just under $10, can send master automobile keys which will start almost any car in the United States and every American-made car. These master keys make useless the attempts to install new locks and safety devices in newly manufactured cars. This represents a considerable investment on the part of American industry and all for nothing, because master car keys are easily available through the mail to youngsters and anyone who has $10 and who can mail a coupon. The financial loss resulting from auto theft comes to a total in excess of $140 million.

The use of master keys first came to my attention in December 1966 through a letter from a motel owner in my district who was astonished to receive a solicitation for his order of master keys. Only $10, said the advertisement, will buy keys for all Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors products manufactured since 1940. The advertisements proudly proclaimed that the keys would fit the ignitions, doors, and even trunks on cars and trucks. In March of 1967, I introduced H.R. 7219, which was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is a bill similar to the bill we are considering today, H.R. 14935, of which I am a coauthor. During my testimony before the Nix subcommittee, I pointed out that these master keys had been adapted for use on car doors and trunks, and appropriate language was written into the bill to take care of this problem.

This bill does not contain all of the provisions that I would have preferred. It does not contain a criminal penalty, nor does it include interstate commerce. These provisions, however, are included in the bill I, as well as many other Members, introduced last year.

Nevertheless, I feel strongly that the legislation we have before us now is a needed step in the right direction. The bill has received stanch bipartisan support among members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14935 to amend title 39 of the United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches and door locks.

However, it does not go far enough. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, auto theft is the third most frequently committed felony throughout the Nation, following only burglary and grand larceny. Moreover, I am informed that in measurable financial loss, auto theft is second only to burglary. In New York City, it is now the No. 1 property theft problem. This is why I, myself, introduced in 1966 H.R. 16657, reintroduced in the 90th Congress as H.R. 3774, legislation similar to that before the House. In addition, however, my bill would reduce thefts of motor vehicles by prohibiting the exportation of unidentified motor vehicles, as well as by prohibiting the unauthorized possession and transmission in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys. My original statement with respect to it is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 13, page 17550.

The increasing problem of auto thefts is particularly disturbing to me because there is already such a high incidence of crime committed within the New York City area. In 1960, according to the FBI, there were 24,325 car thefts in Manhattan. In 1962, this figure jumped to 27,366, or 246.4 cars stolen per 100,000 people in the metropolitan area.

In 1964, there were 39,638 car thefts in the New York metropolitan area as contrasted with 49,228 thefts that year in all New York State. In other words, in 1964 there were 348.9 cars stolen per 100,000 people in New York City as compared with 274.8 cars stolen per 100,000 inhabitants of New York State.

Statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that more than 60 percent of all auto thefts are committed by youngsters under the age of 18. The all too familiar pattern experienced by law enforcement officials is that of the "joyride," where the car is stolen, used and then returned or left for the owner or police to find.

Aside from the serious consequences of an arrest, trial, and conviction of our youth, "joyriding" presents a real threat to all those who use the Nation's streets and highways. The young driver's unfamiliarity with the stolen car, together with his apprehensive state of mind and lack of pride of ownership in the vehicle serve to insure a reckless drive thereby creating a hazard to innocent motorists.

One way in which we can reverse the current climb in the number of auto thefts in the United States is to recognize and stop a means employed to accomplish this crime which has recently developed with alarming speed.

I refer to the fact that thousands of car thieves are aided each year by the use of so-called master keys. Master keys are designed to fit some or all makes and models of cars and are usually ordered and sent by their manufacturers through the mail.

On July 22, 1967, the New York Times covered my demonstration in New York City of how easy it is to open a car door with master keys obtained through the mail with no questions asked.

In preparing for this demonstration to take place just outside my district congressional office, I purchased 18 master keys for $10 through the mail from an organization in Florida.

Indiscriminate sale of these keys allows them to fall into the hands of juveniles and professional criminals alike, and are perfect instruments to enable them quietly and quickly to steal a car and to remove its contents or valuable parts, such as engines and radios, without being discovered.

I would strongly urge our Nation's automobile industry to cooperate in a massive national effort to reduce auto thefts. One way in which they could help would be voluntarily to improve the lock mechanisms of the ignition and other parts of the automobiles so that they will be more difficult to pick.

Another of the ways in which thieves are able to disguise the stolen automobile is to grind the serial numbers off the engine while at the same time repainting the car a different color so that it may be disposed of on the open market.

The difficulty with this procedure, however, is that it is time consuming, and time is a precious ingredient to the successful operation of the auto thieves ring. Also, it requires technical resources.

Therefore, a much faster and thus safer means is generally employed by the professional auto thieves to dispose of their "hot" cars. The cars are simply shipped, trucked or driven out of the United States to be sold in a foreign country close to the United States, or in many cases, overseas.

This method of disposition of the stolen vehicles is made considerably easier for the thieves primarily because, under present law, there is absolutely no requirement that the U.S. customs service make a check to ascertain proof of ownership of any motor vehicle being shipped, flown, trucked or driven out of the United States, nor is it their policy to do so.

To require some evidence of ownership or lawful identity in addition to the routine statistical check made by Custom officials of those seeking to export vehicles at our borders would be a far less hardship than to continue to allow the felons who steal our motor vehicles and endanger our lives, rapidly and successfully to complete their plans by simply removing the stolen vehicles from the country.

This is why I introduced H.R. 3774, a bill which would provide that it shall be unlawful for any person to transport a motor vehicle or motorcycle out of the United States without first making a satisfactory showing of proof to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the ownership or lawful identification of the motor vehicle being exported.

I believe it is imperative that the Federal Government take action now to come to the aid of local and State law enforcement officials in their struggle to effectively deal with the growing menace of auto theft. The enactment of legislation to prevent the unauthorized transportation of automobile ignition master keys across State lines is a step in this direction, but more is needed.

By letter of August 3, 1966, J. Edgar Hoover informed me that his organization had no jurisdiction to cope with the problem of shipment abroad. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 14, page 18427. His letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The "News Release" dated July 28, 1966, concerning legislation introduced by you proposing proof of ownership of vehicles to be exported has been received.

In connection with your comments in this article that the FBI does not compile statistics of the number of stolen automobiles exported from the United States, I would like to bring the following information to your attention.

In 1954, the United States Bureau of Customs indicated to the FBI it had no specific regulations regarding documents which must be filed with that agency by a shipper of automobiles in foreign commerce. It was also learned it was not the practice of Customs to physically check vehicles being shipped to see of any declaration filed corresponded with the automobile. Customs advised it would not be feasible from a budget or personnel standpoint for it to physically check automobiles being exported to determine whether they were stolen.

In 1962, the FBI was advised by the United States Department of Commerce that its regulations did not require the shipper to present documents of ownership for automobiles being shipped out of the United States.

We made inquiries in 1963, at major United States seaports of Customs officials and steamship lines engaged in carrying automobiles to foreign countries to determine procedures being followed for the detection of stolen automobiles being exported. It was determined from these sources that automobile title papers need not be presented by a shipper and no physical inspection of automobiles is made by Customs.

Based upon the above information, regulations for the exportation of automobiles and the acceptance of documents governing the motor vehicle being exported are not the responsibility of the FBI. It is the function of the United States Department of Commerce to set up regulations for the exportation of automobiles. Unless a check of each vehicle being exported is made to determine whether the documentation is in proper order, a determination cannot be made as to whether a vehicle is stolen. Consequently, no information is available as to the number of stolen automobiles exported in foreign commerce.

The jurisdiction of the FBI in stolen automobile matters is found in Section 2312, Title 18, United States Code, dealing with the interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles. An investigation under this statute is initiated upon the receipt of an allegation that a motor vehicle has been stolen and has moved in interstate or foreign commerce.

I trust this will clarify our position in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

It is nigh time that the Department of Justice took the the necessary steps in the premises to remedy this situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in our anxiety to find quick solutions to the vast problems of our society, we sometimes grasp at broad, generalized answers. Too often, we lose sight of the fact that most of these problems, like a jigsaw puzzle, are composed of a great number of different-shaped fragments.

If we are to devise meaningful answers, we must examine each of these pieces carefully and tailor individual solutions.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14935, a bill to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicles.

Automobile theft is now the third most serious crime in the United States, measured in terms of incidence. During 1966, there were more than one-half million vehicles stolen. It has been estimated that these thefts resulted in direct financial losses of more than $140 million.

It has also been estimated that 63 percent of all auto thefts are committed by persons under 18 years old.

According to the Better Business Bureau, a dozen or more firms presently make master keys available to anyone who sends them the $8 fee.

These firms, advertising in national magazines, claim their keys will unlock any car made between 1955 and 1967 and start the ignition.

The Criminal Division of the Department of Justice conducted a survey of auto thefts in 1966 which showed that in 16 percent of the cases, entry was gained by means of a key, either a master key, a key from another car, or the key of the stolen car.

A study by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee revealed that one company sold 22,000 sets of master keys in 18 months, largely by direct mail advertising and advertising in magazines.

In 11 cities, the committee interviewed or otherwise checked on 950 key buyers and found that 35 percent of them had police records.

The apparent ease with which a person may drive away with another's car contributes to the broader climate of crime with which we are all concerned.

The purpose of this legislation is to get at a portion of the problem. It would prohibit the mailing of master keys and other manipulation-type devices designed to unlock the ignition switches or locks of more than one vehicle. The only exception would be in the case of those with legitimate use for such devices, such as locksmiths, auto dealers, parking lot operators.

This legislation would not solve the problem of auto thefts, nor would it completely do away with the availability of master keys and other such devices to those who would misuse them.

It would not, for example, prevent these keys from being distributed by means other than through the mails.

It would make less available, however, one of the most tempting and accessible tools of the auto thief.

In that sense, this legislation is a reasoned and specific approach to a particular aspect of the larger problem—a fitting of one piece in the puzzle of crime and criminality and what to do about it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 14935, we have before us to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicles is of vital importance to the American public. This measure warrants our favorable consideration. These is an imperative and ever-increasing need for this legislation.

This bill is designed to prevent the sale of master keys for motor vehicles through the U.S. mails to persons who do not have a legitimate need for them. It will not preclude the sale of master keys through the mails to those persons who do have a legitimate use for such keys.

There is persuasive evidence that a substantial portion of the auto thefts are carried out by minors and professional thieves with the aid of master keys. On this point, Mr. Michael J. Murphy, president of the National Automobile Theft Bureau, said in testimony last year before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee that—

> Our agents and police with whom we work point to a rising number of stolen cars recovered which show no signs of forcible entry, an increasing number of cars stolen from once comparatively safe parking lots and garages, and frequent arrest of persons in possession of master keys.

One of the most common crimes committed in the United States is auto theft. During 1966, there were 557,000 automobiles stolen. From 1961 to 1966 the number of automobiles stolen increased by 71 percent. For the first 9 months of 1967, FBI statistics show that the number of automobiles stolen for that period in comparison with the same period in 1966 had increased by 17 percent. At our present rate of a 17-percent annual increase in the number of automobiles stolen, we will reach the 1-million mark in 1970. From 1964 to 1965 the percentage increase in the number of vehicles stolen was 12 percent, from 1965 to 1966 the increase was 14 percent, and now it is 17 percent. Not only do we have an increasing number of vehicles being stolen annually, but we have an increasing percentage rate.

Under our present laws there is no restriction on the sale of master keys. In a speech on the floor of the House last March 15, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, JAMES T. BROYHILL said:

> I have seen several advertisements which advertise sets of these master keys for as little as $4. The ads proudly proclaim that the keys will fit ignitions, doors, and even trunks on cars and trucks of major companies manufactured since 1947. Personally, I cannot think of a better way to encourage criminal activity in the theft of automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, I think Congressman BROYHILL's remark goes to the heart of the matter. I believe that the indiscriminate sale of automobile master keys is contributing to our increasing crime rate and especially juvenile crime. Because of the total number of persons arrested for auto thefts in 1966, 80 percent were under 21 years of age, 63 percent were under 18 years of age, and 17 percent were under 15 years of age. Thus, we are confronted with the question: to ignore this problem are we contributing to our increasing national crime rate of auto thefts?

In 1966, the average dollar value of each auto stolen was $1,029. The loss for vehicles stolen and not recovered amounted to $63 million. It has been estimated that the average damage cost for each vehicle stolen and later recovered amounts to about $200 per auto. In addition to these estimated costs, there are innumerable other costs that have to be borne by the individuals who are deprived of their vehicles for regular use.

Mr. Speaker, this problem of advertising and selling master keys to persons who do not have a legitimate need for them is a national problem. We must have national legislation to change this undesirable condition. The States cannot act to control the flow of master keys to undesirable and irresponsible elements of our society when these keys can be ordered, paid for, and delivered through the U.S. mails from and to any point in the country. I urge that we face up to this problem now and vote affirmatively on the bill H.R. 14935.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us to ban the use of the mails for the shipping of master keys for automobile locks and ignitions.

It should be noted that national advertising campaigns have been launched with the purpose of convincing motorists to remove the ignition keys from their cars and to lock all of the doors. But it must come as a shock to the diligent automobile owner to discover that for only $10 anyone can obtain a master set of keys that will fit every Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors car manufactured since 1940. Advertisements in magazines have promoted mail-order trade in these master keys, providing a tremendous encouragement for criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, auto thefts continue to rise at an alarming rate. The individual vehicle owner still has a big responsibility in protecting his own property, but Congress should act to reduce his burden by shutting off the indiscriminate sale of master keys.

I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly approve this bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the action taken today by the House in considering H.R. 14935, the so-called master keys bill, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches. Quick action by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and prompt passage by the House are clear indications that the Congress is in a serious anticrime mood.

In the last few years the Nation has witnessed an alarming increase in the crime rate. Congress is now responding with sensible legislation which not only protects the cherished rights of Americans to individual freedom but also affords them protection against criminals who would deprive them of their property.

I support H.R. 14635 as an excellent first step toward decreasing the accessibility of master keys. Much of the traffic in these keys is through the mails, and the action taken today will effectively control such traffic. However, to complete the success made today, I again urge passage of H.R. 14230, which I introduced last November. My bill would go beyond restrictions on mailing master keys, and, with certain necessary exceptions, would prohibit all transportation of master keys in interstate commerce. It would thus afford greater protection against the thieves who make illegal use of master keys.

More and more the citizens of this Nation are demanding safety for themselves and security for their property. Recently at the Rochester Products Division of General Motors I saw new antitheft devices which are industry's answer to that demand. These devices will soon become standard automotive equipment. Industry's developments of this type stand in the highest tradition of public service, and deserve our appreciation. And the best interest of the American people deserves further action against crime from the Congress. My stronger master keys bill was introduced in direct response to the public's demand for further anticrime protection. We in Congress must not fail to act in response to such legitimate need.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent and increasing need for the proposed legislation, H.R. 14935, to regulate the mailing of master keys. This legislation is designed to deal with one more aspect of our growing crime problem.

I have been disturbed about this problem for some time. It is a problem that has to be dealt with by enactment of national legislation. In the last session of Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14359, which is very similar to the one we are considering here today. The objective of this bill is to continue the availability of master keys to those persons who have a legitimate use for them, but to deny this availability to persons who do not have a legitimate need.

The proposed legislation would not preclude the sale of master keys through the United States mails to bona fide locksmiths, dealers in motor vehicles, officers or employees of parking facilities, officers or employees of automobile clubs or associations operating in more than one State, supply or procurement personnel of the Government of the United States, a State, and any political subdivision thereof for use in connection with the activities of such governments, and all other persons who have a legitimate use for master keys. In short, this bill is intended to prevent the sale of master keys to all persons who do not have a legitimate need for them in the performance of their business or duties.

This legislation would take away from juveniles and undesirable elements in our society the easy and ready availability of master keys. Under present circumstances, anyone can order and obtain through the U.S. mails rings of master keys that will unlock and operate motor vehicles. Popular magazines carry advertisements of master key sets for sale ranging from about $4 upward. The apparent single qualification necessary to obtain through the mails a set of master keys is that the order be accompanied by a remittance of the listed price. This open and easy way in which master keys are sold encourages the stealing of automobiles.

Auto theft is one of the most common crimes committed in the country. In a 5-year period, Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics show that the number of vehicles stolen has increased by 71 percent, from a total of 326,000 in 1961 to 557,000 in 1966. Thus, in 1966, on the average, an automobile was stolen in the United States every 56 seconds throughout the year. FBI data on the number of auto thefts for the entire year of 1967 are not yet available. But, unfortunately, the statistics for the first 9 months of 1967, January through September, show an increase of 17 percent in automobiles stolen over the number for the comparable period of 1966. At the present rate of increase in auto thefts, we will pass the 1 million mark of automobiles stolen within 1 year in 1970. At such time this would mean that automobiles would be stolen in the United States on the average of one every 30 seconds.

Another startling fact about auto thefts is that they are committed mostly by youthful offenders. It is largely a crime of the young. Auto theft has the highest arrest rate of persons under 18 years of age of any category of crime. Of the total number of persons arrested for auto thefts, 80 percent are under 21 years of age, 63 percent are under 18 years of age, and 17 percent are under 15 years of age. These are alarming statistics that we cannot afford to ignore.

One wonders, how many young people have stolen an automobile because they had easy access to a set of master keys by which they could unlock a car on the street and drive it away? How many of these young people have ended up in prison or a reformatory? What will be the future costs to society to try to rehabilitate these persons? How many people have been injured or killed? What has been the cost of property damage? There are many other questions that could be posed. The answer to any one of these questions would justify the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the mail order sales of master keys is a national problem. The laws of individual States cannot be effective where sales are made through the U.S. mails crossing State boundaries. This problem requires a national solution. A solution is imperative. Therefore, I urge that we start on the road to the solution here by voting favorably on this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1967, I came before this body in support of the measure now under consideration, to restrict interstate commerce in automobile master keys to unauthorized persons. At that time, I cosponsored this bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, at that time I cited figures showing that the projected rate of motor vehicle thefts in Buffalo, N.Y., would increase by 30 percent. I was informed this morning by Buffalo Police Commissioner Frank N. Felicetta that auto thefts actually increased by 70 percent—from 2,900 in 1966 to almost 5,000 in 1967. Commissioner Felicetta also estimated that a substantial amount of these thefts are the direct result of the easier accessibility of mail-order master keys.

Mr. Speaker, in my speech on August 2, I further cited a dramatic incident in which one of my constituents, Lewis P. Fons, editor of Photo News, in cooperation with Robert G. Williams, chief of police of the town of Hamburg, N.Y., stole a car—a police car—with the aid of a set of master keys obtained from a Florida firm.

Mr. Speaker, this incident as well as the startling increase in the number of auto thefts points out the strong need for this legislation. Master keys provide not only a method of stealing the car but they also provide access to the trunk and glove compartment which a thief can easily rifle.

Mr. Speaker, let us act today to end this "mail-order mayhem."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14935.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 14935 just passed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SIGNS POINT TO NATIONAL BACKFIRE AGAINST VC ATTACKS IN VIETNAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, events of the past week have provided mounting evidence that the people of South Vietnam are reacting strongly against the brutal, truce-breaking attacks launched in that country by the Vietcong on January 30. A real backfire appears to be developing against the Communists, in which a number of antigovernment leaders and organizations are joining government supporters in a strong stand for national unity against the Vietcong-North Vietnamese aggression.

The latest significant development illustrating this national backfire against the Communists is reported by the Associated Press in a story by Barry Kramer in this morning's Washington Post.

The full text of the Post article, identifying some of the "leading antigovernment figures" who have joined progovernment leaders in a newly organized "People's Congress for National Salvation," follows at this point:

ANTI-RED FRONT FORMS IN SAIGON

(By Barry Kramer)

SAIGON, February 18.—More than 200 South Vietnamese politicians—many of them strongly opposed to the present government—met today to form an anti-Communist front.

An unusual aspect was that the meeting, organized by pro-government figures and government officials close to Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky, attracted politicians who as recently as a few months ago had vowed never to rest until Ky and President Nguyen Van Thieu had been removed from office.

The general theme of speakers at the "People's Congress for National Salvation" was that the coordinated Communist attacks have created such a dangerous situation that all nationalist and anti-Communist groups must stand together.

Leading anti-government figures at the convention were former Premier Tran Van Huong, former Chief of State Phan Khac Suu, and Ha Thuc Ky, a leader of the nationalist Vietnam Kuomintang.

All three men ran against Thieu and Ky in the presidential election last September and then claimed fraud when the two generals were elected. Suu was elected chairman of an anti-government front of defeated candidates which announced it would work to have the national legislature reject the Theiu-Ky election as fraudulent.

The legislature approved the election and Suu's group faded from the scene. Suu was last heard from shortly after the Vietcong's first wave of attacks began when his wife told newsmen that he had been taken against his will into government "protective custody" at national police headquarters.

One Vietnamese official noting the presence of Suu at the meeting, said: "These Vietcong attacks have made a whole new man out of Suu."

The convention elected a standing committee, one of whose three members is Saigon lawyer Tran Van Tuyen. Several weeks ago about 20 of Saigon intellectuals headed by Tuyen anonymously circulated a detailed plan for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. At that time the authors declined to disclose their names for fear of government retaliation.

The plan called for a coalition government to include the present government and the Vietcong's National Liberation Front. The Thieu government opposes a coalition, and refuses to recognize the NLF.

Organizers of the new Peoples Congress are former Gen. Tran Van Don and Ton That Dinh, both members of the Senate, and Dang Duc Khoi, the information chief in the office of Vice President Ky. Don and Dinh are close to Ky and their actions in the Senate, where they are leaders of a major bloc, are generally considered pro-government.

Several members of the Senate and House of Representatives also were present, as were representatives of the Buddhists—including followers of the moderate Thich Tam Chau and the militant monk Thich Tri Quang—Roman Catholics, Cao Dai and Hoa Hao groups. The Cao Dai and Hoa Hao are nationalist religious groups.

The standing committee, and several advisory committees elected at Sunday's session, are expected to meet Wednesday to begin drafting a national program "to organize the people for the safety of the nation."

It is too early to determine if the front will have any cohesiveness, or if the various groupings would put aside their own programs in the interest of unity.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to afford urgently needed protection for postal employees against vicious and even homicidal assaults to which they are being exposed with alarming frequency in the course of their official duties.

My bill corrects serious shortcomings in both postal and criminal statutes that have left letter carriers, clerks, and thousands of other postal workers without the protection to which they are entitled.

These gaps in the law have been highlighted by recent sharp increases in assaults on postal employees.

The bill adds a new and positive provision in the Postal Code for disciplinary action by the Postmaster General against any official or employee who assaults another postal worker.

In case of such an assault, the change would permit an offender to be suspended, demoted, or separated from the service if the circumstances warrant.

The bill also places all postal employees under the protection of present laws that fix stern criminal penalties for assaulting, intimidating, interfering with, or killing certain other Federal workers in connection with the performance of their official duties.

Postal inspectors are the only postal employees who now have this protection. It should be extended to all postal workers as provided in my bill.

I am confident that this bill will have the enthusiastic support of all postal employee organizations.

But it has been of special concern to the members of the National Association of Letter Carriers, with whom I have consulted in some detail in preparing the legislation.

There is urgent necessity to provide full protection for the letter carriers who walk our streets and corridors. They are particularly vulnerable to assaults and threats because of the nature of their duties.

The letter carrier—many still call him the "mailman"—traditionally has been a symbol of respect and even affection on the part of those he serves so faithfully day in and day out.

While this fine tradition continues for the vast majority of Americans, most regrettably we find more and more instances of hoodlums, hooligans, thieves, and others attempting to destroy it.

Here in the Nation's Capital just last week—indeed, on Lincoln's birthday—a letter carrier was waylaid while on his rounds in the LaSalle Building. He was severely injured and required hospitalization. His mail was stolen.

The gravity of the situation is demonstrated by recent examples of aggravated assault reported in the Postal Record, the official magazine of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I include excerpts from the Postal Record:

A letter carrier continues to lie in a coma in a Brooklyn hospital following a vicious attack on November 1.

Nineteen other Brooklyn letter carriers have been victims of thieves who stole checks since early in 1967.

A Long Beach, California, letter carrier is undergoing treatments for eye injury suffered when two men brutally assaulted him as he attempted to protect his mail.

A Kansas City, Missouri, letter carrier has just recovered from a fractured nose, and other bruises, which resulted from a patron's attack following the carrier's unintentional killing of a dog beneath the wheels of a mailster.

A Corpus Christie, Texas, letter carrier has recovered from a gunshot wound suffered when a deranged patron fired at him promiscuously as he made his deliveries.

A Los Angeles letter carrier was shot and killed by two gunmen.

A letter carrier's throat was slashed by an assailant.

A driver was forced from his truck during the robbery of parcels.

Another carrier was robbed of C.O.D. funds and personal cash in an apartment hallway.

A parcel post driver was knifed by teenagers.

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, in this era of rapid technological and scientific change, we must never forget that our progress as a nation moves only as fast as the progress of our people.

While the products of man's labor must be understood and improved, man himself must be understood so that his opportunities for development will never be diminished.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is devoted to this study of man's social, moral, and esthetic values. H.R. 11308 to be considered this week is concerned with the reauthorization of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

To increase your appreciation of the necessity for the continuing study of arts and humanities in the United States, I am happy to place in the RECORD these remarks with this article, "The National Endowment for the Humanities—A Self-Portrait," which appeared in the Washington International Arts Newsletter, March 1968:

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—A SELF-PORTRAIT

The legislative effort to create a unified Federal program of support for the humanities began in 1964, largely in response to a report by the Commission on the Humanities sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United

Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. The report of this Commission began with the statement that:

"The humanities are the study of that which is most human. Throughout man's conscious past they have played an essential role in forming, preserving, and transforming the social, moral, and aesthetic values of every man in every age. One cannot speak of history or culture apart from the humanities. They not only record our lives; our lives are the very substance they are made of. Their subject is every man."

In the report, the Commission stressed two fundamental points: 1) that expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the Federal Government; and 2) that Federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation.

The first Congressional proposal came in August 1964, when Congressman William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill, on which no action was taken, to establish an independent agency for the advancement of culture. In a speech at Brown University a month later, President Johnson endorsed the idea, saying:

"The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal . . . for a national foundation for the humanities."

In his state of the Union message to the 89th Congress the following January, the President again endorsed the concept of a national agency for the arts and humanities. Three months later, on March 10, 1965, he transmitted the Administration's recommendations for a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to Congress, with the statement that:

"The humanities are an effort to explore the nature of man's culture and to deepen understanding of the sources and goals of human activity. Our recommendations recognize this effort as a central part of the American national purpose, and provide modest support to those whose work offers promise of extending the boundaries of understanding."

The result of presidential and congressional interest was P.L. 89–209, creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which, under the leadership of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, passed the Senate on June 10 and the House of Representatives, with minor amendments, on September 15. The Senate agreed to the House version of the bill on September 16, and the President signed it into law on September 29, 1965.

The Endowment has a broad legislative mandate with regard to its activities. The charge authorizes the Endowment to:

(1) develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities;

(2) initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the humanities by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals or groups to support such activities;

(3) award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities. Fellowships awarded to individuals under this authority may be for the purpose of study or research at appropriate nonprofit institutions selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time;

(4) foster the interchange of information in the humanities;

(6) support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities.

To accomplish the function vested in the Endowment by law, Congress established a chairman of the Endowment, who appoints the staff, and who is also Chairman of the National Council on the Humanities, an advisory group of twenty-six distinguished private citizens appointed by the President for staggered terms. Dr. Barnaby C. Keeny, former president of Brown University, is the Chairman of the Endowment. In 1966, he succeeded the interim Chairman, Dr. Henry Allen Moe. The National Council, which met three times during the last fiscal year, serves to advise the Chairman on policy and grants.

The Chairman, who is solely responsible for policy decision, is assisted by a staff divided into three operating divisions and two staff offices corresponding to the present major activities of the Endowment. These are Education and Public Programs, Fellowships, Research and Publication, the Office of the Chairman, and the Office of Planning and Analysis. This last entity coordinates the overall planning of the Endowment, advises the Chairman of long-range activities and directions, and conducts modest grant-making activities.

Individuals and organizations interested in securing Endowment funds apply for grants for projects which conform to the guidelines of the Endowment programs as determined by the Chairman, the Council, and the staff. All applications are screened by the Endowment staff to determine their clarity, completeness, and eligibility for support; and are then studied by outside consultants and/or panels of reviewers who report on the quality of the proposals and make recommendations to the Council. The Council then reviews the proposals and advises the Chairman who commits the Endowment's funds.

The Endowment tries to avoid duplication of Federal or private activity both in development of programs and in support of applications. Consequently, close working relationships with other Federal agencies in the field of education have been an objective. Chief among these agencies are the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Historical Publications Commission, and the National Endowment for the Arts. In terms of cooperation with private agencies, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 provides that unrestricted gifts made by private individuals and organizations may be matched with Federal funds for the purposes of the Endowment.

The legislative mandate of the Humanities Endowment is sufficiently broad, and the humanities themselves are so diversified, that the chief task of the past two years has been to identify areas of greatest need and to develop methods of supporting them. The Endowment, in its initial stages, decided to concentrate upon four broad but closely related objectives: 1) the support of education at all levels; 2) the stimulation of public understanding and use of the humanities; 3) the support of individuals through fellowship programs; and 4) support of research and publication which is important to the development of scholarly fields, as well as likely to have an impact upon a broader public.

The public programs of the Endowment have two major emphases: developing the vehicles of humanistic knowledge and encouraging direct confrontation of the public with the humanities. This is a dual effort to help existing institutions deal more effectively with the humanities, and to better acquaint the public with the humanities.

In the area of elementary and secondary education, the Endowment has, in the last year and a half focused greatest attention on proposals for programs which will help disseminate curricular innovations throughout the schools of certain regions and, ultimately, throughout the country. Always, there has been a gap between the development of improved curricula and their implementation in the school program, and this gap is often widened by a lack of contact between university and secondary school teaching staffs.

As an approach to a solution of this problem, the Endowment announced in November of 1967 award of a grant for $50,000, a sum which represents a $25,000 unrestricted gift to the Endowment from the Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation matched with an equal sum in federal funds, to establish a Commission on the Humanities in the Schools. The Chairman, Dr. Frederick Jackson, President of Clark University, will preside over a group of twenty-five distinguished citizens representing all areas of endeavor. The Commission will meet approximately every two months throughout the academic year and will make general recommendations regarding humanities subject matter and curriculum revision.

As a second focus of concentration, the Endowment is interested in programs for the culturally deprived. For example, during the summer of 1967, the Endowment, again with private gifts matched by federal funds, supported the Washington-based Friends-Morgan Project. In this program, children from Morgan Elementary School (an inner-city public school in the District of Columbia) and from Sidwell Friends Lower School (a private District of Columbia day school) were enrolled in a summer program stressing mastery of basic skills of reading, mathematics, listening, and observation.

These goals were pursued through activities centered on the arts. The program permitted children of limited cultural background to have greater contact with a variety of cultural resources and provided valuable contact between youngsters of diverse age. It successfully demonstrated that the humanities serve as a highly appropriate vehicle to help children become better acquainted with their society and heritage.

The goal of the Endowment to fund programs designed to improve secondary school teaching is matched by a program for college staff. By providing greater opportunities for the humanist, it is hoped that more talented people will consider entering the humanities and humanistic social sciences, and will, by virtue of their larger numbers and improved position, speak with greater authority on matters relevant to higher education.

The Endowment has supported two types of projects designed to improve the level of teaching in colleges and universities. The first of these, teaching residencies, is an arrangement whereby a graduate student or young instructor planning a teaching career in higher education, spends a year at college working under the guidance of an older, experienced faculty member. During this year of internship, it is expected that he will develop teaching skills that will serve him well during his career. As a second approach to the challenge of improving college and university instruction, the Endowment has also supported programs to encourage cooperative projects among institutions of higher learning. It becomes increasingly evident that colleges and universities in the same region will benefit from a pooling of resources and faculties.

The public programs of the Endowment have as their objective the stimulation of public interest in the humanities in order to help create in American public life a climate in which the human dimensions of problems can be more clearly seen, and more centrally considered. This is also achieved through two major programs, one promoting the development of vehicles through which the humanities can be disseminated to the public—communications media, museums, historical societies, and other such institutions; the other dealing with efforts to provide direct confrontation of the public with the humanities through support for public conferences, regional activities, and activities directed at special segments of the public, for example, women, disadvantaged children, the culturally and educationally deprived, Indians, and convicts.

Last year, in working out ways to aid these groups and organizations effectively, the Endowment chose two areas of specialization, strengthening the capacities of television and newspapers to handle material of humanistic content, and improving the training of museum and historical society personnel. In November, the Endowment announced award of two separate grants totaling $100,000 to the American Association for State and Local History. This represents the first step in a major effort to develop the ability of the nation's historical societies to disseminate the humanities to the general public. There are over 3,500 historical societies, with an estimated membership of between two and three million Americans.

The first grant was made for a study of the present financing of historical societies, and the dimensions of support needed for the societies to play a major role in American community life. Additionally, the study will make recommendations to the societies and other interested organizations about programs which they should undertake in order to attract greater financial support and make an impact upon larger numbers of citizens. The study will be supervised by a committee of ten distinguished citizens appointed by the president of the American Association for State and Local History. The second grant was made to support a continuing program of seminars and institutes designed to improve the competence of historical society personnel. This is the second grant for this purpose that the Endowment has made to the Association.

The Endowment supports two fellowship programs, senior and junior, both providing funds for uninterrupted full-time study and research. The senior fellowships support established scholars and the junior program grants stipends to those scholars who have recently completed their professional training and have embarked on their careers. In the last year, of a total of 876 applications for both these programs, 285 awards were made to scholars in 186 colleges and universities in forty-four states and the District of Columbia.

In the Senior Fellowship program, last year's budget permitted the Endowment to grant fifty-seven year-long fellowships to scholars whose contributions to humane learning have already brought them distinction. These men and women were the first recipients of Senior Fellowships. Two months ago, in November, the Endowment announced award of thirty-three more such awards. This latter group was chosen from approximately 600 applicants, 250 of whom were judged to be extremely well qualified. All fellows received sums equal to their previous year's salary, up to a maximum of $15,000. In addition, when the proposed research so justified, travel funds were granted.

The range in subject matter of the studies undertaken by these Senior Fellows is as broad as the humanities themselves. It included a particularly large number of projects focused on the understanding of contemporary problems in the United States, among them, "The American West in the Twentieth Century," and "American Society and Culture during World War II." Other studies included biographical works on such literary figures as Jonathan Swift and James Fenimore Cooper. Anthropologists are delving into the early history of the Mediterranean world. Research in art, history, music, foreign languages and literatures, and interdisciplinary areas as well is being carried on by the Senior Fellows who, in themselves, would comprise an extraordinary university humanities faculty.

For the younger scholar, the nature of the academic world bears an inherent contradiction. During the years of work leading to his doctoral degree, he is trained to do scholarly research and required to read broadly in order to develop his capacity as a scholar-teacher. However, for the first years after he enters the teaching profession, he is assigned heavy teaching loads and various administrative duties, all of which prevent him from continuing his development as a researcher. Too often, there is a danger that he will be trapped in a cycle of no time for study and research, no study or research accomplished, therefore, no reward of released time for research.

The Endowment, in its program for the younger scholar attempts to alleviate this problem in two ways: 1) by awarding summer stipends which release him from the necessity of teaching during the summer and, 2) by offering fellowships which are adequate to free the young scholar for six to eight months. The younger scholar fellowships provide the time to initiate, if not complete, a major research project. Both plans give the younger scholar the "research momentum" needed to carry him through the next few years until sabbatical and other research opportunities become available.

During the last year, 100 fellowships and 130 summer stipends were awarded to younger scholars. As is also characteristic of the senior fellowships, their studies range through all of the humanistic disciplines. While it is not a requirement of the program, the plans of most of these scholars include publication of the results of their studies. Thus dual objectives are met; the first, the development of the individual's skills as a scholar and teacher and, the second, the production of knowledge available to all those interested in the humanities.

In order to gain a wide geographical and institutional spread among fellowship recipients, the Endowment requires that applicants for the younger scholar program be nominated by their institutions. Each institution is limited to one nominee for each of the two awards. This means that each applicant, having already been chosen in competition with his peers on his own campus, is presented as the best of the many good young scholar-teachers in his institution. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that virtually all applicants are deserving of support and an award to any one of them would be a sound investment in this country's scholarly and educational manpower.

In the areas of research and publication, the Endowment supported a very broad program designed to further appreciably the development and dissemination of humanistic knowledge. It is significant that much of what all Americans read and see is, in the final analysis, based upon humanistic research. For example, the historical presentations on television showing the conditions of living and the attitudes toward life in the nineteenth century are based upon reconstructions developed by scholars in the humanities. The same is true of historical novels, and, indeed, of most books, whether fiction or nonfiction, on non-technical subjects. The attitudes of the authors and their characters, and the setting in which each author places his characters all depend to a certain degree upon humanistic research.

In the last year, a total of $1,439,498 was funded to eight-one research and publication projects. Among the most significant was the Endowment's contribution to the Modern Languages Association Center for Editions of American Authors. This grant will permit preparation and publication of critical editions of the works of major American nineteenth-century authors. Six volumes in this series will appear this spring, among them, Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*, and Herman Melville's *Typee* and *Omoo*. Editors are currently working on texts by Mark Twain, Washington Irving, Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Walt Whitman.

The grant program for research and publication will also make possible a reassessment of the age of Washington and Jefferson, publication of the letters of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, and support for an American Historical Association project to assist scholars by organizing the vast amount of material not now fully available to American historians. Also, it will provide uniquely valuable source material on the careers of Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson, contribute to our knowledge of classical and American archaeological sites and provide training resources for young American archaeologists, and initiate the first publication of the complete works of John Dewey.

As a final note, one of the objectives of the Endowment is to support American research institutes abroad. Last year, a small contribution was made to the American research institute in Turkey as a pilot effort to test the validity of a larger program in this area of endeavor. Research institutes abroad serve as bases from which American scholars can work without having to cope individually with problems of office space, housing, and in-country travel, all of which can be troublesome and time-consuming to the scholar. Such institutes facilitate the scholar's access to the resources of the host countries by serving as centers of communication and cooperative endeavor between American and foreign scholars.

The end purpose of this support of research and scholarship is to make knowledge available to all Americans so that they can form better judgments to carry out their heavy responsibility to themselves and to the country. Both the fellowship and research programs feed directly into the Endowment's education programs, which touch that percentage of our population enrolled in schools and colleges; and into the public programs, which seek to remedy an important deficiency of American education, namely the unevenness of teaching quality in the humanities. In the long run, the major educational effort will be in colleges and universities.

Last year, as indicated above, the Endowment supported two small programs: one to encourage cooperation among institutions, the other to improve college teaching through support of residency programs where graduate students teach under the supervision of older, experienced colleagues. From these small beginnings, the Endowment expects to develop four major higher education programs: the first, grants for institutional planning and support; the second, divisional, departmental, and professional school support for particular purposes; the third, inter-institutional cooperation; and the fourth, improvement of teaching.

Most colleges and universities have suffered in the last decade from a lack of funds necessary to develop their programs in the humanities and have benefited from the availability of funds for the development of programs in the sciences. The result has been a considerable imbalance which is increasingly felt by students and faculty. The Endowment hopes first to make some small planning grants which will enable institutions to develop programs for improving instruction in the humanities both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Substantial grants would then be made to those

Institutions would be selected which have the potential to develop into outstanding centers of teaching and research. The grants might range from one to three and one-half million dollars spread over a period of three to seven years. Institutions would be sought which would serve as exemplary models for the development of a geographically distributed national pattern—large urban and state universities, and smaller liberal arts colleges.

In the area of public programs, as in educational ones, the Endowment plans to expand those programs already successfully initiated. In addition, it foresees supporting conferences on major public issues to which the humanities are relevant and disseminating the conclusions of their sessions through the expanded use of the media, particularly television. Such efforts already exist, but they only reach small groups. In the realm of television, the Endowment envisions a grant program which will sponsor programs on humanities subjects.

In time, the Endowment hopes to develop a national center or a series of regional centers for the humanities at which young researchers can work with mature scholars. At a next step, it would be most appropriate that relevant conclusions reached be communicated to decision makers, particularly those in government. In such a manner, the humanities can play a stronger role in our national life. What has thus far been accomplished is only a promise of what may come in the future if the Endowment is given the means to carry out its mandate to serve the American people as they need and deserve to be served.

CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL PROBE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, some 3 weeks ago the St. Louis Globe-Democrat published a news article exposing the meeting between Federal Judge John W. Oliver, Missouri Governor Warren Hearnes, and Democrat leaders of the Missouri Legislature. The problem of Missouri's congressional redistricting was discussed. This ex parte communication was a serious breach of judicial ethics, since Judge Oliver wrote the majority decision that struck down Missouri's congressional redistricting and since Judge Oliver, in his capacity as a member of a three-man Federal court may once again rule upon any new redistricting plan that may emerge from the present special session of the Missouri Legislature.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I called for an investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary into the unprecedented acts of Judge Oliver. In the meantime other Members from Ohio and Indiana have asked for similar investigations due to the results of congressional redistricting decisions within their States. It is not results that I am concerned with nearly so much as the breach of legal propriety and ethics to which I address my request for an investigation. The people of Missouri also want to know the answers to the many questions that arise because of Judge Oliver's conduct. Only a congressional investigation can resolve these questions.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat in an editorial entitled, "Call for Congressional Probe," printed in their February 15, 1968 edition, requests that the "air be cleared" by congressional investigation of Judge Oliver.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL PROBE IN THE JUDGE OLIVER CASE

Congressman Durward G. Hall of Missouri has made a trenchant demand upon the House Judiciary Committee for a full investigation of Kansas City's District Judge John W. Oliver in his grossly indiscreet conduct regarding Missouri congressional redistricting.

Indiscreet is a mild description indeed of Judge Oliver's conferences with Gov. Warren E. Hearnes and other Democratic chiefs, at which redistricting plans were discussed while the issue was still within the judge's jurisdiction.

Judge Oliver should be disqualified from all further consideration of redistricting. He should be reprimanded by the Supreme Court. The House Judiciary Committee has an obligation to make an exhaustive probe of Judge Oliver's arrant breach of judicial propriety.

Mr. Hall declared the Judge's conduct severely tarnishes the federal judiciary, over which the House committee has definite controls. The Congressman called the Oliver demeanor a "serious breach of judicial ethics," as most in the state, regardless of political party, must consider it to be.

Rep. R. J. (Bus) King, GOP leader of the Missouri House, insists the judge resign or be ousted.

This week Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee, stated he has given a "great deal" of consideration to charges about Judge Oliver and asked Congressman Hall for any additional information.

What more information could be needed?

Judge Oliver solicited meetings with Gov. Hearnes and State Rep. F. E. Copeland, author of a gerrymander plan for redistricting, hatched after a three-judge federal panel declared the 1967 redistricting act invalid. Judge Oliver was a member of this panel. The conferences were held secretly. The redistricting issue was admittedly discussed.

Judge Oliver's court still has jurisdiction over the issue, which has been appealed to the United States Supreme Court. It is possible Judge Oliver might be called upon to rule on a new redistricting plan, when one is devised.

The judge has a long record of vigorous labor in the Democratic vineyard, prior to his appointment to the District Court bench. He has been a partisan political worker in every national campaign from 1932 until he was made a judge.

His breach of legal propriety has smirched the federal bench. When asked about his meetings with Democratic political figures, he fobbed them off as "social" talks, when obviously they centered on redistricting which he should have discussed with no one, let alone political leaders.

Was he seeking to tell the Governor what kind of a redistricting the court would approve, before a new proposal had been adopted? Was he attempting to dictate redistricting for the state? Was he lifting a threat that the court would order its own redistricting, which in fact there is no constitutional or other right for a court to do?

These are legitimate questions. They are questions the congressional committee should demand answered.

Sufficient facts are already known to warrant a thorough congressional scrutiny of Judge Oliver's conduct in this whole issue. We believe the House Judiciary Committee has a duty to order an inquiry forthwith.

OUR STUDENTS, OUR SCHOOLS, AND THE DRAFT

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last year, when the Congress passed legislation extending the draft for 4 more years, I voiced strong objections to the final version of the bill, and the lack of congressional attention to reform. In particular, I regretted that the House gave only about 1 minute to the complicated question of student deferments.

Now the consequences of that haste have become clear. Unless action is taken very soon, a large percentage of our male graduate students may be drafted this summer.

Officials at the University of Maryland, for example, have predicted that, if draft calls remain high and the law is not changed, there may be a loss of up to 25 percent of the university's entire graduate school enrollment—up to 2,100 young men, out of a total expected enrollment of about 8,320.

If this occurs, Maryland—and all universities—will lose, on short notice, many of the teaching assistants they had counted on to instruct undergraduates. Many important research projects will be delayed, and a serious crimp will be put in our programs for advanced teacher training. University planning has already been disrupted by uncertainty about enrollment, demand for fellowships, and needs for faculty and facilities. Of course the same uncertainty is troubling the students who could be affected—at least 200,000 in the Nation as a whole.

The current problem arose because the 1967 law restricted students—2–S—deferments to undergraduates. Last year, those young men already in graduate schools were generally permitted to finish the academic year, so this June both they and the 1968 college graduates will be liable for the draft.

The new law gives the National Security Council authority to designate occupations and fields of study as "essential" and thus defer men in those fields. But the Council has now ducked the decision to the local boards.

Finally, under the law the President can decide, by executive order, which age groups should be drafted first. His present ruling is "oldest first," meaning that the 24-year-old graduate student who becomes 1–A next summer is more likely to be called than a 19-year-old. This system could be changed to "youngest first," or the ages could be "mixed," but the President has not chosen to change the system.

All of the reasonable solutions at this point have liabilities. If student exemptions are extended to all in graduate school, advanced study could become a shelter for avoiding the draft forever. If occupational deferments are granted to some fields, imbalances and strains in the universities will be produced. Yet some action, among unhappy and limited alternatives, is imperative.

In a broader sense, this dilemma

dramatizes the fact that the Selective Service System, which was created over 25 years ago, today imposes inequities and injustices on many individuals, and is inefficient and ineffective in serving national needs. The draft should not have been extended last year without far more thought, consideration and care. We should not wait another 4 years to seek reforms.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 14743

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, chronic deficits in our international balance-of-payments accounts have resulted in large dollar balances being accumulated by many of our international trading partners. Significant amounts of these dollar balances have been converted to gold by these trading partners either through their central banks or by private individuals. This has resulted in a 50 percent reduction in our gold reserves over the last 8 years. Today we find ourselves with about $12 billion in gold reserves yet we have foreign claims on this gold that could amount to as much as $30 billion if these claims were exercised.

The President is now requesting that the Congress in effect release this remaining gold to foreign claimants with few, if any, strings attached.

We are told that this action is prudent because the true strength of the dollar lies in our vast economic and industrial capacity and our capability to produce more and better goods than any other nation on this globe. Gold, we are told, contributes little or nothing to the strength of the dollar.

The administration asserts that this action will help restore international confidence in the dollar and will result in a lessening of demand on our remaining gold reserves.

While I commend the lofty aims of this optimistic approach, history dictates that realistic safeguards must be adopted.

It seems ironic to me that restrictions are placed on the purchase and sale of U.S. gold by United States citizens who hold ultimate title to it while our international trading partners and foreign nationals are faced with no such restriction.

Mr. Speaker, in order to remedy these inequities and to help safeguard our remaining gold reserves, I am tomorrow introducing a bill to prohibit direct and indirect transfers of gold bullion from the United States to countries which permit speculation in gold bullion by private citizens, and for other purposes.

I insert a copy of the amendment I plan to introduce to carry out the purposes of the bill, when H.R. 14743 is called up for debate:

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and notwithstanding any provision of any treaty or other agreement to which the United States is a party, no gold of the United States may be transferred by sale, redemption, or otherwise to

(1) any nation which permits private citizens or nationals thereof to deal in gold bullion in any manner; or

(2) any nation which permits any gold held by it to be transferred directly or through any financial institution or intermediary to a nation described in paragraph (1).

MISTAKE OF PROVIDING OF ARMS TO JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is no wonder that the American people are confused and bewildered when our Government pursues such idiotic courses as to provide arms to a nation which has avowed to pursue a policy of war and to drive the Israelis into the sea.

It is impossible for me to understand the reasoning used by the administration which prompted the decision as announced last week that the United States is going to provide additional military hardware and arms to Jordan, which along with the United Arab Republic precipitated the armed conflict last summer, and which have consistently refused to work toward a peaceful settlement with their neighbor, Israel. In the official statement which our Government released along with its announcement that we would be providing arms to Jordan, it was inferred that this was in the best interest of the United States, for if we did not give these arms to Jordan, surely Russia would. This appears to be some of the same reasoning used as to why we should provide the money to build an automobile factory in Russia because if we do not someone else will.

Mr. Speaker, if we refuse to provide arms to Jordan, and if Russia does provide these arms, this means that somewhere else in the world there will be fewer Russian arms available for other countries. By our providing arms to Jordan, which has an announced intention of aggression against Israel, we are in no way furthering the cause of peace, but indeed are escalating the arms race. For surely we must immediately turn around and provide Israel with all the necessary arms to counteract the new threat created by American arms in the hands of the Jordanians.

I was very interested in reading that, according to Senator BREWSTER, who is violently opposed to this idiotic policy of our Government, the main purchase item that interests Jordan is expected to be several squadrons of U.S. F–104 supersonic Starfighters.

I am certain that this will be one of the main items that interests Israel as well, for the Israelis have shown a determination to protect the geographical integrity of their boundaries from ground troops, and certainly if they are to be protected against air attack it is going to be necessary that Israel obtain additional supersonic aircraft. Inasmuch as France is now refusing to provide these aircraft, we must, in the interest of preserving the peace and balance of power, supply these to Israel. But why in the sake of sanity must we make the already complex problem even more difficult by supplying arms to Jordan, only to have to counter them with arms to Israel.

It appears to me that we, the American public, is going to have to let out such a howl about this idiotic course being pursued by our Government that sanity will prevail and stop the actual shipment of these arms to Jordan, a nation which has avowed to following a course of aggression against its neighbor, and which has refused to pursue the path of peace.

KUPFERMAN CHARGES DRAFT CHANGES RUINOUS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent changes in the selective service regulations on draft deferments for graduate students may result in the bankruptcy of educational institutions from coast to coast.

Not only is this change contrary to the national interests, but it will wreak havoc in industry and graduate schools for years to come, and this is not to say what effect this change will have on the scientific and intellectual leadership role the United States is fighting to maintain in the world today.

If our graduate schools suffer irreparable harm and our society loses a generation of scientists, teachers, jurists, poets, and philosophers, history will record this era not as that of the Great Society but as the "sick society."

I call upon the President and the Selective Service System to revise their approach and avoid educational disaster.

NEW SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing new social security legislation providing for sweeping increases in benefits to the aged. In my judgment, we have a fundamental commitment to our elder citizens to assure them a life of dignity and self-respect, free from normal financial worries. The present level of benefits does not assure them that life. They are inadequate. They must be increased.

The legislation I am introducing today increases social security benefits by an average of 35 percent and establishes a minimum benefit level of $100 for an individual and $150 for a couple, as compared to $55 and $82.50 respectively under present law.

The Nation has been aroused in recent years by disclosure of the very basic needs of the aged that are not being met. The elderly, themselves, have been led to think that substantial and effective help was on the way from their Government. But, those high expectations were not met in 1967, and may turn to bitter frustration if Congress fails to act meaningfully in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, my bill also calls for automatic cost-of-living increases in social security benefits. During the last decade, average social security benefits have increased 27 percent, while the cost of living has increased 14 percent. It is obvious from these figures that over half of the benefits received went to cover rising living costs. This situation must be remedied.

One of the longstanding inequities in social security has been the limitation placed on widow's benefits. Present law limits these benefits to 82½ percent of the deceased husband's retirement level. This bill would raise her benefit to the full 100 percent that her husband had received.

It has been almost 3 years since Congress passed that landmark in social legislation, medicare. Recently, the medicare program completed its first full year of assistance with approximately 25 million medical bills being processed under the voluntary part and about 5 million inpatients receiving benefits. Yet, medical costs continue to climb and many elder citizens continue to live in fear of long-term illnesses which could deplete their life's savings. One of the biggest costs experienced in any illness is that of drugs. Regrettably, drugs are not covered under medicare. They should be. My bill proposes such coverage, specifically for all prescription drugs.

Those of us who come from large urban areas in large urban States like New York fully understand the tragic implications of the welfare restrictions passed last year as part of the 1967 Social Security Amendments. I am speaking of the restrictions placed on Federal contributions to State medicaid programs and on aid to families with dependent children—AFDC. The conservatives in Congress used economy as an excuse for cutting these programs. But no excuse will negate the need of these people or our unfulfilled commitment to them. I am, therefore, introducing amendments repealing these restrictive measures on medicaid and AFDC and eliminating the compulsory work-training program under AFDC.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation lies at the crossroads. We can either ignore the plight of those Americans who fail to share in the benefits of our rich society, or we can move to strengthen and correct our program of assistance to fill these needs. I propose that we strengthen this program.

NEWSPAPERS BY AIRMAIL

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on the House floor I said that the use of air transportation as standard service for first-class mail is a logical, inevitable, and highly commendable step in the development of the modern mail delivery system our Nation needs and has every right to demand. But, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, the switch to airlift of first-class mail cannot be made without encountering some problems along the way.

One of the most widespread problems resulting from the airlift program has been its effect on the delivery of newspapers and news magazines. This may sound strange, because—as most of my colleagues know—newspapers and magazines are second-class mail. However, for many years, newspapers and magazines with news value have been getting expedited or so-called red-tag service from the Post Office.

Up to now newspapers and magazines receiving red-tag treatment were handled virtually the same as first-class mail. They did not pay first-class rates; they continued to pay just the normal second-class rate. But they were accorded expedited delivery under the theory that prompt dissemination of news is in the public interest.

The precipitous decline in passenger train service and the resulting development of a nationwide airlift system for first-class mail mean that in many areas there are no passenger trains to haul newspapers and magazines. Publications that get red-tag service are not airlifted—nor should they be. This would add substantially to the already big loss the Post Office incurs on the delivery of second-class mail.

The postal rate bill developed last year by the subcommittee that I have the privilege of chairing, and which subsequently was enacted into law, included a provision directing the Postmaster General to establish second-class airmail service. I believe this is the best and most equitable solution to the problem of expedited service for news publications.

Naturally, this second-class air service will cost more than regular second-class mail. Those publications which want especially fast service should be willing to pay for it.

The Post Office Department is now making the necessary rate and transportation arrangements to begin second-class air service. It will require a number of months, however, to put this new service into operation.

In the meantime, the Post Office Department is making every effort to assure that publications entitled to red-tag treatment get the best and fastest delivery service possible under existing modes of ground transportation.

Every postmaster in the Nation whose office handles publications that receive red-tag service has been instructed to personally check the preparation, processing, dispatch, and routing of these publications to see that the service they receive is the best available. I know that other members of the House who have been contacted by publishers in their districts about transportation difficulties on second-class mail will join me in commending Postmaster General O'Brien and his Department for giving special attention to this problem.

I am including with my remarks a copy of the directive sent to all post offices about the handling of news publications, as follows:

ALL POST OFFICES: MAKEUP AND DISPATCH OF SECOND-CLASS PUBLICATIONS AFFORDED NEWSPAPER TREATMENT

Changing transportation patterns and mail schedules incident to the increased use of airlift and truck service for the movement of first-class mail require that mailers of second-class publications afforded newspaper treatment keep current in the proper makeup and labeling of their mailings. It is, of course, most important that postmasters meet their responsibilities in this area by keeping abreast of changes in makeup and labeling requirements as they occur.

Postmasters at all offices where second-class publications afforded newspaper treatment are entered for mailing are to review this matter personally. Mailers of such matter shall be contacted and action taken to assure that the mailings are prepared and labeled to provide the most expeditious processing and dispatch authorized for this class of mail. Changes in labeling and sacking arrangements will be made, where needed, and suggestions made to the publishers as to the time most appropriate for deposit of their mailings to assure connection with the authorized dispatch.

Postmasters are to personally contact the publishesr whenever it is feasible to do so. Where this is not feasible, customer relations representatives and distribution and dispatch expediters shall be utilized to assist in review and correction of mailers' dispatch lists. Each publisher of second-class matter receiving newspaper treatment must be visited by the postmaster and/or his representative for this purpose within the next 30 days. Regional Directors will provide technical or other assistance to postmasters, when requested or where need is indicated, to assure prompt and careful attention to this task. Each postmaster concerned shall, within 30 days of date of receipt of this notice, advise the Regional Director of the action taken.—*Bureaus of Operations and Transportation, 2–1–68.*

HATCH ACT REPORT

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, of which I was privileged to be a member, issued its report and recommendations to the President and to the Congress. The report contains the results of a year's hard work by the Commissioners, as well as its excellent staff, assessing the effects of laws regulating political activity of all public employees.

Each Member of Congress has received a copy of the Commission's report, the volume containing the Commission's substantial research, and the text of the hearings which we conducted.

There has been considerable interest by my colleagues and by Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as many other interested persons, in obtaining additional copies of the Commission's three volumes. Unfortunately, the budget of the Commission was limited, and therefore, we were unable to print a sufficient number of copies for everyone.

In order that as many persons as may be interested will have the opportunity to become acquainted with the Commission's report, I am introducing into the Record volume 1 of the Commission's report which contains its findings and recommendations. At the appropriate time I will submit for the Record the text of various studies and surveys which are contained in the research volumes.

In order that this may be used by many interested parties throughout the country, I place the contents of the Commission's report in full at this point in the Record:

The Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel—A Commission Report—Findings and Recommendations—Volume 1

Letter of Transmittal

Commission on Political
Activity of Government Personnel,
Washington, D.C.

The President of the United States.
The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
The President of the Senate.

It is my pleasure to submit for your consideration the report of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel. This report contains, in summary form, the results of nearly a year's work by the Commissioners and staff, in assessing the effects of current laws regulating the political activity of public employees, Federal, State and local. It also embodies the Commission's recommendations for change in this vital area.

The Commission believes that the recommendations offered, if enacted by the Congress, will enhance the protections currently afforded individual employees, and the merit system itself. At the same time, they would permit a wider range of activity to any employee who desires to participate in the political affairs of his community. There should accompany whatever action Congress takes a vigorous effort within the executive branch to educate public employees about their responsibilities under this new legislation.

The Commission held hearings in six cities and undertook several substantial research projects. The detailed results of those efforts are contained in volumes II and III of this report.

We received assistance from many other agencies, Federal and State, and we are very appreciative. In particular, we want to thank the Chairman, Commissioners and staff of the Civil Service Commission.

Respectfully submitted for the Commission:

Arthur S. Flemming,
Chairman.

The Commission

Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman;* Daniel B. Brewster, *Vice Chairman;* Charles O. Jones, Malcolm C. Moos, Ancher Nelsen, Frank Pace, Jr., Austin Ranney, Roger W. Jones, George L. Murphy, Arnold Olsen, Robert Ramspeck, Frank M. Wozencraft.

Staff

Jon W. Linfield, *Executive Secretary;* James Emerson Titus, *Research Director;* Lawrence M. Mann, *Counsel;* Dennis D. Clemens, *Statistician.*

Research analysts

Arlen I. Erdahl, Bush Foundation Fellow; George E. McGrath, Jr., June F. Mulcahy, Constance B. Newman, Robert F. Owens, Carole I. Singer.

Special consultants

Sheldon E. Bernstein, Thomas Clark Matthews, Jr., Nathan Siegel, Webster P. Maxson.

Introduction

Formation of commission and its procedures

In October, 1966, the Congress established the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel to investigate and study Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal or state officers and employees in political activity. This Commission was also directed to report to the President and to Congress by the end of 1967 with recommendations for legislative changes, to the extent deemed desirable. P.L. 89–617.

At the outset, this Commission sought the views of the Civil Service Commission at both formal hearings and informal conferences. This Commission also conducted a series of public hearings in the key cities of Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Dallas, Chicago, Boston and San Francisco. At the hearings the Commissioners heard representatives of government employees unions, local political leaders, political scientists, representatives of interested organizations, such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Civil Service League, and directors of state merit system offices. A few government employees testified on their own behalf.

In addition to the views presented at these public hearings, a major survey of Federal employee opinion, inquiries to state employees and state and county political party chairmen, staff research, and information gathered from other available sources provided the basis for extensive discussion of issues by the Commission members. The results and recommendations are set forth hereafter.

Summary of Recommendations

The overriding problem confronting this Commission was to accommodate and reconcile two vitally important, but sometimes competing objectives.

On the one hand, in our democratic society it is important to encourage the participation of as many citizens as possible in the political processes which shape our government. All citizens must have a voice in the affairs of government.

On the other hand, it is equally important to assure integrity in the administration of governmental affairs and development of an impartial civil service free from partisan politics.

In attempting to accommodate both of these important principles to a maximum degree, the Commission recognized that any restrictions on the freedom of government employees to engage in political activity must be consistent with the rights of free speech and association guaranteed to all persons by the Constitution. At the same time, it recognized that protection against coercion and official pressure is essential if the government is to succeed in attracting and retaining capable, dedicated, and impartial employees.

In the opinion of this Commission, the best protection that the government can provide for its personnel is to prohibit those activities that tend to corrode a career system based on merit. This requires strong sanctions against coercion. It also requires some limits on the role of the government employee in politics. It was the unanimous view of the Commission members, however, that these limits should be clearly and specifically expressed, and that beyond those limits political participation should be permitted as fully as for all citizens.

This Commission proposes to the President and the Congress a bill which is intended to strike a fair and workable balance between these competing considerations. A copy of that bill is part XII of this report. On virtually every provision of this bill, while preliminary differences were expressed, the eventual decision of the Commission was unanimous. There are only two areas, which will be discussed below, in which substantial agreement was not achieved.

The basic thrust of the Commission's proposal is to expand, within limits, the area of political activity permitted for Federal employees, and to expand even more the area of such activity permitted under Federal law for State and local employees administering the ever-increasing number of programs financed by Federal funds, while strengthening the sanctions at all levels of government against coercion and misuse of official position.

The recommendations by which the Commission seeks to achieve these goals are as follows:[1]

Recommendation I (Sec. 1621): Public employees should be permitted to express their opinions freely in private and in public on any political subject or candidate.

Recommendation II (Sec. 1622): The law regulating political activity of government personnel should specify in readily understandable terms those political activities which are prohibited, and specifically permit all others.

Recommendation III (Sec. 1623): The distinction between local political offices which can be campaigned for and held by Federal employees, and those which cannot, should be based on the nature of the office itself, without reference to a "partisan" or "nonpartisan" distinction or to the geographic area where the employee lives.

Recommendation IV (Sec. 1625): At the Federal level, the U.S. Civil Service Commission should have the sole responsibility for enforcement, and its jurisdiction should be extended to cover not only merit system employees, but also excepted employees over whom the employing agency presently has enforcement jurisdiction.

Recommendation V (Sec. 1622, 1624, 1625): Enforcement of the act should be strengthened and made more flexible by adding to the present criminal penalties administrative sanctions and procedures. These should be designed to insure timely investigation and adjudication of complaints, while preserving adequate protection for persons charged with violations of the law.

Recommendation VI (Sec. 1633): At the State level, employees administering programs financed by Federal funds should be subject to the same prohibitions against political coercion, abuse of official authority, fund-raising and campaigning for Federal office which apply to Federal employees.

Recommendation VII (Sec. 1636): The several States should be encouraged to develop systems for controlling political activities which are comparable to the system prescribed by Federal law. With the approval of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, those states which develop such a system would have the responsibility for enforcement of all political activity restrictions applicable to State employees within that jurisdiction, including those working on programs financed by Federal funds.

Recommendation VIII (Sec. 1641): The U.S. Civil Service Commission should study and report on the feasibility of establishing a plan of voluntary political contributions patterned after similar programs in private industry.

Recommendation IX (Sec. 1641): The U.S. Civil Service Commission should study and report on the feasibility of establishing a new Office of Employees' Counsel within the Civil Service Commission to which individual Federal employees can report instances of political coercion, intimidation, misuse of official authority, and other alleged violations of the law.

---

[1] Each recommendation is followed by a citation to the appropriate section of the proposed bill.

Recommendation X (Sec. 5): Up to $1 million should be appropriated annually for enforcement of the law, in contrast to the $100,000 or less appropriated annually since 1939.

Candidacy for local office and holding political office

The only matters as to which there was substantial disagreement within this Commission related to the kinds of local public office and local political party office a Federal employee should be permitted to hold.

Under the present Hatch Act, the Civil Service Commission establishes different rules for political participation by Government employees in areas of concentrated Federal Government employment. It also draws a distinction between partisan and nonpartisan candidates and elections.

This Commission was in substantial agreement that the rights of Government employees should not be determined on a geographic basis. A substantial majority also concluded that the distinction between partisan and nonpartisan elections was often illusory, and tended to promote so-called "nonpartisan" slates which in reality were partisan, thereby contributing to a political fragmentation which might threaten the two-party system.

As a substitute for these tests, this Commission suggests that, with the approval of the agency head, a Federal employee be permitted to hold any local office which is not full time and the compensation for which is nominal. Although some concern was expressed that this might open the door to partisan activity, most of the Commissioners are satisfied that these limitations will exclude most local offices having substantial political significance in terms of the major parties.

The other limited area of disagreement, which proved even more difficult, related to the extent to which Federal employees should be permitted to serve as officers in political organizations. Commission members are in unanimous agreement that Federal employees should be barred from positions of chairman, vice chairman, or treasurer of any national political party.

A substantial majority of the Commissioners felt that this prohibition should also extend to similar State, county, or city political offices, but that there should be no limitation on participation in political conventions.

The Commission divided evenly on the question of whether a Federal employee should hold the post of ward or precinct committeeman. Six Commission members voted to permit this possibility on the ground that such positions would involve neighborhood responsibilities, not of sufficient significance to be considered party offices in the generally accepted sense. If Federal employees are not permitted to engage in such neighborhood activities, then they are cut off from a basic and important role of free citizens.

The other six Commissioners felt that any direct role as an official of a political party, even at the lowest level, would impair the image of an impartial public service. They hold the view that these offices are important enough, and closely enough identified as party offices, to make it desirable to exclude Federal employees from holding them. The draft bill reflects this division.

This Commission recognizes that these questions as to local party and political office do not lend themselves to generalized answers, since the circumstances may vary in different parts of the country. However, the Commissioners felt that they should nevertheless make their recommendations to the Congress, recognizing that these are matters on which the members of Congress may have different reactions based on their experience and judgment in the field of practical politics.

The exceptional degree of unanimity of this bipartisan Commission in supporting the major recommendations in this report leads its members to hope that Congress will enact legislation in substantially the form of the Commission's proposed bill.

I. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

A. The move for civil service reform

Federal administration in the United States and the establishment of an expert, permanent and impartial civil service started without an experienced bureaucracy. Politics almost immediately became a factor in administration. As early as 1801, Thomas Jefferson expressed his dissatisfaction at the political activity of Government officers and employees which was directed at controlling or influencing elections.[2]

Through 1828, both Federalist and Jeffersonian-Republican Presidents appointed Federal employees from the better educated families composed largely of the well to do. There was no thought of a permanent, broadly representative civil service. When Jackson first ran for president, there were complaints of an administrative aristocracy based upon wealth. During the administration of Jackson's predecessor, John Quincy Adams, public employees found themselves caught in the conflict between political parties. To the loyal party worker on either side, political success came to mean reward by public employment, on petty terms that today's political officers and career public servants alike would not tolerate.

George W. Curtis, an early leader for civil service reform, described the situation in 1860 as follows: "Every 4 years, the whole machinery of Government is pulled to pieces. The country presents a most ridiculous, revolting, and disheartening spectacle. The business of the Nation and the legislation of Congress are subordinated to the distribution of plunder among eager partisans."[3] The Nation was plagued by a spoils system that caused inefficiency, favoritism and corruption.

In 1832, Henry Clay spoke against the spoils system on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

"It is a detestable system, drawn from the worst period of the Roman Republic. And if it were to be perpetuated—if the offices, honors, and dignities of the people were to be put up to public scramble, to be decided by the result of every presidential election—our Government and institutions, becoming intolerable, would finally end in a despotism as inexorable as that at Constantinople."[4]

W. H. Seward, later to become Lincoln's Secretary of State, wrote of President Zachary Taylor's inauguration, "The world seems almost divided into two classes: Those who are going to California in search of gold, and those going to Washington in quest of office."[5] President Abraham Lincoln found spoils a hindrance in both civil and military administration. He once remarked, "If ever this free people—this Government itself—becomes utterly demoralized, it will be the result of this incessant human wriggle and struggle for office."[6]

Many Presidents tried to correct the situation but, by 1865, the resurgent tide of patronage, even though a national scandal, appeared irreversible. General Grant in 1868 ran for President on a platform to curtail the patronage system, and in 1870 asked Congress for a law "to govern * * * the manner of making appointments."[7] Elected officials had begun to realize that the promise of public employment was an illusory means of building public support. If the party lost, loyal workers felt they should have been on the other side. If the party won, there were not enough jobs to go around.

Forces working to change the patronage system were accelerated by the assassination of President James A. Garfield in 1881 by Charles J. Guiteau, a Republican Party worker who daily visited the White House in an effort to press his claim for an appointment as U.S. consul in Paris. The spoils system had cost the Nation millions of dollars and finally the life of a President.

Reform began in earnest with the passage of the Civil Service Act and establishment of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in 1883. But reform did not take place overnight. Rules were established to protect the public employee. Little by little, merit system employees felt a sense of security in their employment. A major role in this effort was played by Theodore Roosevelt during his service on the Civil Service Commission. Roosevelt was a hardheaded realist as well as a crusader.[8] He set the stage for a steady growth of the merit principle. Following his example, men who have served on the U.S. Civil Service Commission brought it to a position of stability and respect with an unblemished reputation for honesty and impartiality.

By the Civil Service Act of 1883, Congress had authorized the President to promulgate rules providing, among other things, that no Government officer should "use his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of any person or body." 22 Stat. 403, 404 (1883). The evil against which this prohibition was directed was coercive activity; no attempt was made to limit voluntary political activity.

Restriction against voluntary political activity was first imposed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907. At that time, the President, by amendment to a civil service rule, stated that while persons in the competitive classified service could express privately their opinions on all political subjects, they "shall take no active part in political management or in political campaigns." Executive Order 642, June 3, 1907.

B. Legislative history of the Hatch Act

Criticism directed toward the alleged use of funds for political purposes in the emergency relief program brought forth a directive from the program's director, Harry Hopkins, on February 21, 1936, that "persons who are candidates for or hold elective offices shall not be employed on administrative staffs on the Works Progress Administration." (WPA). In June 1936, when the program's appropriation bill was before Congress, an amendment was added that essentially incorporated Hopkins' directive. This became a practice in WPA appropriation bills.

A special Senate committee investigating employment and relief in 1937 influenced Senator Carl Hatch to offer an amendment to the 1938 WPA appropriation bill. The amendment was designed to prevent any person employed by the Federal Government in an administrative capacity and paid from relief funds from using "his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or influencing a convention, a primary, or other election, or affecting the results thereof." This amendment sought to apply to persons in administrative positions of the WPA the same restrictions then imposed on civil service employees by civil service rule No. I.[9] This amendment was defeated in the Senate on June 2, 1938.[10]

---

[2] Richardson (ed.), "Messages and Papers of the President," vol. X, p. 98 (1899).

[3] Charles Cooke, *Biography of an Ideal*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., p. 17 (1959).

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[8] Roosevelt's feelings about the spoils system were expressed in a letter dated Feb. 8, 1895. "The spoils system was more fruitful of degradation in our political life than any other that could possibly have been invented. The spoilsmonger, the man who peddled patronage, inevitably bred the vote-buyer, the vote-seller, and the man guilty of misfeasance in office." *Ibid.*, p. 17.

A few days later, June 7, 1938, Senator Millard Tydings, along with several other Senators, asked that a special committee be created to investigate the alleged use of relief and work-relief funds for political purposes. This request passed (S. Res. 290), and the investigation was assigned to the Special Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures and Use of Governmental Funds. Senator Hatch was a member of that committee which was chaired by Senator Morris Sheppard.

On January 3, 1939, the Sheppard committee reported to Congress[11] with 16 specific recommendations. On the day after the committee's report, Senator Hatch introduced two bills (S. 212 and S. 213) which he later incorporated into a single bill, S. 1871, cosponsored by Senators Sheppard and Warren Austin. This bill, introduced on March 20, 1939, was enacted and became known as the Hatch Act.

In a January 5, 1939, message to Congress on the needs of the WPA, President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that he intended to bring administrative employees of the WPA under civil service. This, however, Congress prohibited. Roosevelt's idea was that if these employees were brought under civil service, they would become subject to the general prohibitions governing political activities which applied to other Federal employees covered by civil service.[12]

The Hatch Act passed the Senate on April 13, 1939. Fourteen days later, President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress on relief needs, again suggested placing administrative employees of the WPA under civil service. This message read, in part:

"The Congress has recently made provisions against improper political activity on the part of persons connected with the work relief program—provisions affecting not only Federal employees but all persons who may be in a position to bring improper pressure to bear.

"Such legislation was recommended in my message of January 5, 1939, and has my hearty endorsement. However, insofar as the administrative employees of the Works Progress Administration and of the other agencies connected with the work relief program are concerned, I believe that the political provisions just mentioned would be more constructive and their enforcement would be simpler if the Congress would place such employees within the classified civil service."[13]

At his White House press conference on July 28, 1939, President Roosevelt said he favored the objectives of the Hatch bill, then on his desk for final action, but raised questions as to its operation. But on August 2, 1939, Roosevelt signed the bill and sent a message to Congress recommending additional legislation to deal with these two matters: (1) maintaining the exception to the civil service regulation permitting employees permanently residing in the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland and Virginia to run for local office; and (2) extending the Hatch Act to cover State and local government employees who participated actively in Federal elections.[14] In 1940, both recommendations were incorporated into the law by amendment.

Since 1939, when the Hatch Act was enacted, the American political system has changed dramatically. The growth of Federal responsibilities, the parallel growth of technology in Government, and the need for skilled personnel are eroding away traditional patronage schemes. Not only has the American political system changed, but the growth of the merit principle and impartial administration of Government programs have been integral elements in this transformation.[15]

Under the Hatch Act, the Civil Service Commission has worked to maintain high standards and integrity in public service consistent with the need for voluntary and desirable political activity by Government employees. By and large, the public employee wants and needs the protection from coercive activity which the Hatch Act affords. But the line between permissible and forbidden political conduct has been a shifting one. It could not remain fixed as political methods were altered and the Government developed in size and in the nature of its activities. Moreover, there are ever-increasing difficulties confronting public employes in ascertaining what the statutory restrictions mean under the Hatch Act, and in knowing what interpretation has been given to the act by the Civil Service Commission in rulings which often are not published or readily available in usable form.

More than 4.5 million public employees at the Federal, State, and local levels are subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act. This act limits what a public employee may do in politics. Yet his counterpart in private employment is not burdened by this kind of statutory limitation. Public employees, for example, may attend political conventions as spectators, but "may not take any part in the convention, * * * and must refrain from any public display of partisanship or obtrusive demonstration or interference." A public employee "may not publish * * * with any newspaper generally known as partisan" a signed or unsigned letter to the editor. "It is not required that a publication be regarded as the organ of a political organization or that it have an official connection with any political organization or party * * * The objective behind this restriction on activity in connection with such publications or newspapers is prohibition of political activity of a partisan character through the medium of the public press by a person subject to the statute and the rule."

How well does the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939 serve the Nation today? This question raises a number of specific problems which this Commission has considered in detail and to which it has applied different techniques of research, analysis, and public discussion, as well as many hours of detailed debate and discussion among Commission members.

II. HOW THE COMMISSION PROCEEDED WITH ITS ASSIGNMENT

Political science research techniques were combined with public hearings in an effort to gather as much information about the effect of the Hatch Act as limited time allowed. This Commission's most ambitious research attempt was a nationwide, scientific, sample survey of Federal employee opinion about the law's effect. The research findings are reported in detail in volume II of this report. The transcripts of the public hearings are reproduced in volume III of this report.

A. Public hearings

More than 90 witnesses testified in hearings held by the Commission in the following cities on the dates indicated.

Washington, D.C., May 15, 16, 17.
Atlanta, Ga., May 29.
Dallas, Tex., June 2.
Chicago, Ill., June 12, 13.
Boston, Mass., June 19.
San Francisco, Calif., June 29, 30.

The Washington hearings probed the effect of existing law upon Federal employees. In hearings outside Washington, special emphasis was given to problems arising from extending the law's coverage to employees of State and local governments.

B. Scientific sample of Federal employees' opinion

Much was said in the hearings as to how public employees feel about existing laws and their application. To test the opinion of employees themselves, the Commission contracted for the services of the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, an organization that has been conducting national political surveys since 1952.

The survey's starting point was a statistical sample maintained by the U.S. Civil Service Commission of every Federal employee whose social security number ends in 5—a tenth of all Federal employees. From approximately 167,000 entries on magnetic tape prepared by the Civil Service Commission, the sampling section of the Survey Research Center drew a sample of 1,108 Federal merit system employees who, with the cooperation of the Federal agencies, were interviewed at work during July and August 1967. The result, by October, was a survey of 980 Federal employees' opinions about the Hatch Act. The survey allows generalization on a statistical basis to 1,641,190 Federal employees.

C. State employees' opinions

Obtaining State employee opinion presented a different problem because time and money were insufficient for a scientifically designed probability sample with field interviews. Accordingly, a case study of State employee opinion was made in the four most populous States—New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Employees who are covered by the Hatch Act in three kinds of State agencies (employment, health, and welfare) were sampled. Although this study used a mailed questionnaire, an approximate 60 percent overall response enhances the study's validity and gives the Commission a reasonable "block of opinion" from which to draw its conclusions.

D. Party chairmen opinions

The Commission sought another set of opinions from State party chairmen and county chairmen in whose counties 1,000 or more Federal employees lived or worked. These people, knowledgeable about party politics, were asked to make observations as to the effect of the Hatch Act on their political parties. The questionnaire was mailed to 102 State chairmen and 489 county chairmen. Again, the response rate approximated 60 percent.

E. Additional research

1. *Compilation of State laws.*—All but a few of the 50 States have passed laws regulating the political activities of State employees. Our system of federalism is frequently characterized by experimentation at the State level. The knowledge thus gained in legislative experiment can then be passed on to the National Congress. The Commission's study of State legislation regulating political activities includes the pertinent text of all State laws and column tables that allow for comparisons between the States.

2. *Regulations in other nations.*—A study of legislation and rules regulating political activity of public employees in Sweden, Great Britain, France, West Germany, Australia, Canada, and Japan is included in the research with tables that allow comparison between these countries.

3. *Study of Civil Service Commission cases.*—The Civil Service Commission completed an analysis of all Commission cases since 1939 in which charges were issued. The study includes 965 cases, showing processing time, geographic distribution of cases, infractions charged and penalties assessed. This Commission construed the law under which it operated as not giving it investigative authority to go into specific cases of al-

---

[9] Civil Service Commission rule I was first adopted in 1884 and was revised in 1907.

[10] Congressional Record, vol. 38, pp. 5569 and 7999–8000.

[11] S. Rept. 1, 76th Cong.

[12] "The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt," vol. 8, pp. 58–59.

[13] Ibid., p. 289.

[14] Ibid., pp. 414–415.

[15] Since the passage of the Hatch Act in 1939, no major Federal agency has been created that was exempt from the merit system.

leged violations of the Hatch Act. Examples of such cases specifically called to its attention were a subject of Commission discussions. (See vol. III of this report.)

4. *Select bibliography.*—For simplicity and ease of reference, the abundance of material yielded by this Commission's research has been edited into a select bibliography of books, articles, cases, and legislative documents of current interest.

III. THE OVERRIDING PROBLEM; A RECONCILIATION BETWEEN CONSTITUTIONALITY ASSURED POLITICAL EXPRESSION AND PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Two major objectives, both desirable, were of primary concern in this Commission's deliberations.

First, a democratic society depends for strength and vitality upon broadly based citizen participation in the political processes of the Nation, and governments are responsible for granting their citizens the constitutional rights of free speech and association.

Second, to assure the honest, impartial, and efficient transaction of the public's business, a democratic society equally needs a government that functions with a permanent system of employment under which persons are hired, paid, promoted, and dismissed on the basis of merit rather than political favoritism.

Some conflict is inevitable between these two goals since neither can be fully achieved without some loss to the other.

This was the crux of the Commission's assignment—to reconcile constitutional freedom with controls against political excesses. The Commission sought to strike a just and reasonable balance between citizen participation in the democratic process and protection of honest, efficient, and impartial public service.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Twenty years ago, in *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell*, 330 U.S. 75 (1947), the Supreme Court confirmed the authority of the Congress to protect the integrity of the public service by legislation directed, within reasonable limits, against political excesses, notwithstanding that the controls imposed might fetter political conduct of public employees.

In the *Mitchell* case, the appellants challenged the constitutionality of section 9(a) of the Hatch Act insofar as it forbids Federal employees to take an "active part in political management or in political campaigns." The Court rejected the claims of unconstitutionality by a four to three decision.

The Court viewed the issues under the first, fifth, ninth and 10th amendments as basically the same—whether section 9(a) improperly violated "what otherwise would be the freedom of the civil servant" under those amendments. The Court stated that the "fundamental human rights" involved are not absolute but subject to proper regulation. The task of the Court was to "balance the extent of the guarantees of freedom against a congressional enactment to protect a democratic society against the supposed evil of political partisanship by classified employees of government." 330 U.S. 96. Pointing out that Congress and the President "are responsible for an efficient public service," the Court concluded that "if in their judgment, efficiency may be best obtained by prohibiting active participation by classified employees in politics as party officers or workers, we see no constitutional objection." *Id.*, at 99.

In a companion case, *Oklahoma* v. *United States Civil Service Commission*, 330 U.S. 127 (1947), the Supreme Court upheld section 12(a) of the Hatch Act which prohibits State and local officers and employees employed in activities supported by Federal funds from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns. Under that section, the Civil Service Commission may request the State to remove a violating employee, and if he is not removed, the Commission may direct the appropriate Federal agency to withhold from the State or local government an amount equal to 2 years compensation of the employee. In answer to the contention that section 12 constituted an attempt to regulate the affairs of the State contrary to the 10th amendment, the Supreme Court held that while the United States "has no power to regulate, local political activities as such of State officials, it does have power to fix terms upon which its money allotments to States shall be disbursed." 330 U.S. at 143.

The *Mitchell* and *Oklahoma* cases have not been overruled or questioned by any subsequent Supreme Court decisions. However, in drafting its recommendations this Commission has considered recent State court treatment of State legislation regulating political activities of affected public employees. In *Minielly* v. *State of Oregon*, 242 Ore. 490, 410 P. 2d 69 (1966), the Oregon Supreme Court overturned an Oregon statute that was more comprehensive than the Hatch Act. This decision holds that a restriction on first amendment rights may be imposed only when a compelling governmental interest is directly threatened. Similarly, in *Bagley* v. *Washington Township Hospital District*, 65 Cal. App. 540; 421 P. 2d 409 (1966), the California Supreme Court held that the State's "Little Hatch Act" was invalid for what the court described as "overbreadth," 421 P. 2d 411, 416. The court stated that:

"A governmental agency which would require a waiver of constitutional rights as a condition of public employment must demonstrate: (1) That the political restraints actually relate to the enhancement of the public service, (2) that the benefits which the public gains by the restraints outweigh the resulting impairment of constitutional rights, and (3) that no alternatives less subversive of constitutional rights are available, 421 P. 2d 411."

These judicial trends have strengthened this Commission's convictions that legislative prohibitions which restrict political activities of public employees should be drawn as specifically as is feasible. They should be no more extensive than is necessary to protect the merit system and the integrity of the public service. The Commission believes that its proposed bill achieves this goal.[16]

V. PROBLEM AREAS OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY AFFECTING THE PUBLIC SERVICE

A. Protection against coercion should be more effective

Full and effective protection of the public employee from political coercion and intimidation is an indispensable part of the bill recommended by this Commission. In this regard, the present law is most deficient. Mr. John Macy, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, stated in testimony before this Commission:

"The prohibitions on coercion and use of official authority or influence for political purposes are quite inadequate."

Despite the findings in the Federal employee survey, this Commission considers this a major problem. When Federal employees were asked if they, or any member and 76.5 percent said "No." When employees of their household, had been requested to give money or buy tickets to help pay the campaign expenses for a political party or candidate in 1966, 22.8 percent said "Yes" and 76.5 persent said "No." When employees were asked if the solicitor was "someone at work," 0.1 percent responded: "I work for him." When the same question was asked—not about a specific year (1966), but about any time back to 1960—again 0.1 percent indicated that they were solicited by someone for whom they work. When Federal employees were asked whether their supervisors had ever encouraged them to participate in certain kinds of political activities, the response was:

"Contribute money to a party or a candidate," Yes, 1.5 percent; No, 98.3 percent.

"Distribute campaign materials," Yes, 1.2 percent; No, 98.6 percent.

When the question was expanded beyond the personal sphere, and employees were asked about ever having heard about cases of supervisory pressure, the response was "Yes," 6.1 percent and "No," 93.9 percent.[17]

Although the evidence of coercion established by the survey is not substantial, this Commission believes that any evidence of coercion is a serious matter. The Commission believes, therefore, that, the existence of effective administrative sanctions against coercion will protect Federal employees more effectively.

Three provisions of the Hatch Act relate specifically to the problem of coercion. Both the Federal-related (5 U.S.C. 7324(a)(1)) and State-related (5 U.S.C. 1502(a)(1)) provisions prohibit the use of "official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with the result of an election." Title 5 U.S.C. 1502(a)(2) contains an additional provision applicable only to State and local employees which prohibits coercion for political purposes. Another prohibition applicable only to Federal employees provides that they "may not request or receive from, or give to, an employee, a member of Congress, or an officer of a uniformed service a thing of value for political purposes."

Sections 7321–7322 of title 5 give the President authority to prescribe rules prohibiting coercion and involuntary political contributions.

The above provisions should be made equally applicable to Federal, State, and local employees. The language needs to be clarified to eliminate vagueness. Moreover, convictions have been rare under the provisions of the criminal code involving intimidation, coercion, and improper use of Government funds since their passage in 1939 (18 U.S.C. 591–614).

This Commission is persuaded that adequate administrative procedures and sanctions are essential, even though the criminal provisions remain. New provisions will encourage reporting of violations, allow greater dispatch in processing cases and complaints, and permit more equitable enforcement by the Civil Service Commission through administrative sanctions. This will not only strengthen the law but make it more flexible.

---

[16] This Commission has also taken into account other Supreme Court decisions in recent years which, while involving the first amendment did not deal with the Hatch Act: (1) That first amendment guarantees were "fashioned to assure unfettered interchange of ideals for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people"; *New York Times* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 269 (1964). Accordingly "debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide open," ibid., 270; (2) that "Because first amendment freedoms need breathing space to survive, government may regulate in the area only with narrow specificity" dictated by "a compelling State interest in the regulation of a subject within the State's constitutional power to regulate"; *NAACP* v. *Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 443, 338 (1963). See also *Bates* v. *Little Rock*, 361 U.S. 516 (1960); and (3) that "Even though the governmental purpose be legitimate and substantial, that purpose cannot be pursued by means that broadly stifle fundamental personal liberties when the end can be more narrowly achieved * * *" *Shelton* v. *Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479, 488 (1960).

[17] Some members of this Commission believe that the incidence of such coercion is greater in areas with heavy Federal employment than is shown in the present survey.

B. Existing law relating to political activity is restrictive and ambiguous and should be clarified

1. *Existing Pattern of Do's and Don'ts Confuses Public Employees.*—The Hatch Act, in a single sentence, sets a general policy proscribing political activity. Through the technique of adoption by reference, Congress incorporated all then existing Civil Service Commission rulings and decisions adopted prior to 1940. In consequence, the law incorporates a lengthy series of administrative definitions of "permitted" and "prohibited" political activities that are not readily available.

From this lengthy list of "do's" and "don'ts" an employee must determine where he stands if he wants to be active politically. The Federal employee survey tested the knowledge employees have about these regulations. More than 85 percent of those responding had heard of the Hatch Act, but there is varied response as to what employees think they can and cannot do as shown in table I following:

TABLE I.—PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AS TO WHAT POLITICAL ACTIVITIES THEY THINK THEY "CAN' AND "CANNOT" DO UNDER PRESENT HATCH ACT RULES

Activity	Can	Cannot	Not sure
a. Make a speech at a rally held by a political party (prohibited)[1]	15.8	69.4	14.6
b. Put a political sticker on his own car (permitted)	63.0	24.4	12.5
c. Hold office in a political party organization (prohibited)	8.5	80.6	10.7
d. Run for State or national political office (prohibited)	8.9	81.0	9.6
e. Write a letter to his Senator or his Congressman (permitted)	96.0	1.5	2.2
f. Drive people to the polls on election day (prohibited)	45.0	40.5	14.2
g. Run for a school board position where people are not candidates of either major political party (permitted)	66.5	15.8	17.3
h. Become actively involved in local issues such as civil rights and taxes (permitted)	49.5	32.6	17.3
i. Participate in voter registration drives (prohibited)	48.1	35.6	16.0
j. Distribute campaign materials for a party or candidate (prohibited)	18.6	71.2	10.1

[1] Words in parentheses added for this report. Respondents were not asked if activity was prohibited or permitted.

Six of the 10 political activities listed in table I are prohibited by current civil service rules. The other four are not illegal. If an employee, for example, made a speech at a rally held by a political party, he would violate the law. But he can put a political sticker on his car.

In analyzing this information, it was decided to "score" employees on their knowledge of the "do's" and "don't's." If an employee knew exactly what activities were permitted and prohibited, he would rate a perfect score of 10. If he knew nothing of the law's effect, he would score zero. None of the employees surveyed scored higher than eight correct responses as shown in table II, following. Only 0.7 percent did not make a single correct choice. A grouping of these scores, as is shown in table II, indicates that 64.1 percent of the Federal employees understand five or less of the restrictions in the law. Only 358.8 percent understand six or more of the restrictions, and no employee understands more than eight out of the 10.

TABLE II.—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' UNDERSTANDING OF PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED POLITICAL ACTIVITIES BASED ON SCORES CONSTRUCTED FROM TABLE I, IN PERCENTAGES

Score (number of correct choices)		Percent
0	64.1	0.7
1		1.2
2		3.0
3		10.9
4		19.4
5		28.9
6	35.8	25.5
7		8.8
8		1.5
9	0	0
10		0

A further complication arises because even a permitted activity raises questions of degree and propriety. A Federal employee, for example, can put a candidate's bumper sticker on his private automobile, but it is a violation if the employee puts 20 or 40 stickers on his car making it appear to be a "campaign wagon."

As times change, apparently certain political activities become more acceptable. In table I, both activity f, "Drive people to the polls on election day" and activity i, "Participate in voter registration drives" are prohibited by exisitng Civil Service Commission rules. Yet of all of the six prohibited activities listed, the responses to these two show almost one-half of the respondents (45.0 percent and 48.1 percent) thought these were permitted activities. In the 1930's, these two activities were associated with organized political parties. In the late 1960's, these two activities have become almost a part of good citizenship in which civic organizations and nonpartisan groups and even individuals actively participate to get out as large a vote in the local community as possible. This is at least a partial explanation of Federal employees' ambivalence toward these two kinds of political activities.

Employee uncertainty as to what is right and wrong under the law governing political activity is hardly surprising since the Hatch Act incorporates by a single sentence all of the Civil Service Commission rulings and decisions issued prior to adoption of the act. This means that a working knowledge of the law requires one to be familiar with the approximately 3,000 decisions issued by the Civil Service Commission between 1907 and 1939. With such a mass of information, few public employees can be sure about their status under the law. Civil Service Commission Pamphlet No. 20 purports to be a compilation and summary of this information, but its language is unclear at several points. Certainly, the pamphlet assumes too much when it states that each employee "* * * is presumed to be acquainted with the legal provisions applicable to him, and his ignorance of them will not excuse a violation."

2. *Public Employees Should Be Barred Only From Such Statutorily Specified Political Activities as Congress Finds a Serious Threat to the Public Service.*—Faced with compelling evidence that the existing law unduly confuses and restricts more than 4.5 million Federal, State, and local public employees, this Commission proposes a new approach. It recommends that Congress eliminate the confusing array of do's and don't's by clearly defining permitted activities and prohibitions in the statute. The prohibitions would be only those that Congress finds necessary to protect employees against actions that would threaten the integrity, efficiency, and impartiality of the public service.

By using this approach, the Commission feels that controls necessary to preserve the integrity of the public service will be established; constitutional questions can be put in clearer focus; the Civil Service Commission will be relieved of the case-by-case accumulation of the do's and don't's; public servants will be given a greater opportunity of knowing the line between lawful and unlawful activities.

For too long, in this Commission's view, governmental institutions, business, industry, and universities have tended to deprive our society of valuable human talent by saying, "No, you must not participate in politics!" As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government should become a model employer, encouraging political participation which does not endanger the public service. To allow Federal employees greater freedom to participate in the political affairs of the Nation undoubtedly involves some risk—at least it entails exposure of the employee in the arena of public discussion.

Federal merit system employees are aware that some risks are involved. When asked, "If Federal employees were allowed to be more active in politics, do you think that would change things like promotion decisions and job assignments?" 54 percent answered "No," but 52 percent said "Yes." Nonetheless, 65.5 percent of the respondents think the law should be changed.

In spite of uncertainty about what might happen if the law were changed, Federal employees were divided on the question of "less participation," "more participation," or "about the same participation." Only 1 percent wanted "less." Forty-eight percent thought participation should "remain about the same," and 47 percent wanted "more" political participation.

The survey also shows that even though Federal employees vote in presidential elections at a rate nearly 25 percent higher than the population as a whole, nearly 60 percent of them indicated they would not be more politically active if the law were changed to allow it.

This question, however, cannot be decided by numbers alone. Only a minority of all citizens participate actively in the political process other than by voting. The rights of those few who want to participate were of concern to this Commission. This concern is reflected in the Commission's recommendation that any regulations of political activity should be made in understandable statutory terms, and those that are not prohibited should be specifically permitted.

C. Existing Hatch Act distinction between nonpartisan and partisan activities is unworkable and unrealistic

There are two exceptions to the Hatch Act's blanket prohibition against Federal employees running for public office. One is contained in section 18 (5 U.S.C., 1503 and 7326) and allows Federal and State employees to run for local public office if the ballot does not designate political parties and if the issues involved in the campaign "* * * not specifically identified with any National or State political party." The second exception, in section 16 (5 U.S.C., 327), applies to Federal employees who live "* * * in any municipality or other political subdivision in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States." When its conditions are satisfied the first exception is general and permissible. The second exception is specific for each community and must be approved by the Civil Service Commission. Even after approval is granted, the following restrictions apply: (1) Federal employees "* * * must not neglect their duties and must not engage in nonlocal partisan political activities; (2) must not run * * * as candidates of a political party or manage the campaign of a party candidate; and (3) as a candidate for local office Federal employees must run as independent candidates."

Both of these exceptions raise the vexing problem of "partisan" and "nonpartisan" politics. A person may be partisan for a person, an issue, or a candidate without having any feeling of identification with one political party or another. A majority of this Commission's members feel there is no such thing as a nonpartisan campaign or nonpartisan election.

A Federal employee who runs for local school board under the general exemption in section 18 must be certain his campaign is strictly local and "* * * completely unrelated to issues and candidates that are identified with State and National parties." But what is the local candidate to do if a party nominee for Governor comes to his community and says his party is supporting a State plan of financial aid for local schools? It is difficult for the local candidate to disregard this issue if, in a public meeting, his neighbors demand that he state his position on it.

A Federal employee who runs for local office under the section 16 geographic exception can discuss State and National issues. He is often opposed by candidates of the political parties. This raises a question of equal application of the law. Federal employees in Arlington, Va., enjoy a privilege that Federal employees in Youngstown, Ohio, are denied. Of the Nation's Federal merit system employees, 64.2 percent feel this exception is unfair.

The geographic exception poses another problem. In communities where the majority of voters are Federal employees, they sometimes organize into powerful, so-called nonpartisan political organizations. Such has been the case, for example, in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Those nonpartisan organizations have contributed to a political fragmentation which was not anticipated when the Hatch Act was passed.

For reasons derived from the reality of American politics, a majority of this Commission recommends abolishing any reference to "partisan" or "nonpartisan" campaigns or organizations in the proposed statute. The distinction between local political offices which can be held by Federal employees, and those which cannot, should be based upon the nature of the office itself.

D. Statutory coverage and exemptions should be uniform

The present law provides that an individual employed by a State or local governmental agency whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government shall be subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act. As a result, some highway engineers working on State financed highway improvements are not covered, while engineers at the next drafting board working on federally financed projects are. Similarly, welfare workers on cases for aid to families of dependent children are covered, while welfare workers on adoption cases are not.[18]

Testimony given at this Commission's hearings in San Francisco graphically illustrated the position of Alameda County employees and administrators who are caught between the Hatch Act, county regulations and the State laws on political activity.

Other illustrations of inequity occur in every instance of the exemption for Federal workers in impacted areas. The Civil Service Commission may, in areas where a majority of voters are Federal employees, permit those employees to participate in "nonpartisan" political activity. It seems clear that employees living in such areas have a substantial privilege that is denied vast numbers of employees living elsewhere. The Commission recommends that there should be no distinction based on geographic location. Other exceptions concern political appointees, Federal retirees, and the employees of educational institutions. Respondents in the Federal employee survey were asked about these exceptions, the inquiry being directed to their reactions as to whether the exceptions were fair. Eliminating those who replied "Don't know," we find the following responses—

[In percent]

Exception	Fair	Unfair
1. Persons appointed by the President	33.7	59.0
2. Retired Federal employees	86.4	10.7
3. Employees of educational and research institutions	61.3	32.4
4. Employees in selected geographic areas	26.8	62.4

Federal employees consider the exception for retired employees the most fair (86.4 percent) and the exemption for employees living in selected geographic areas as the most unfair (62.4 percent). Over one-half of the employees in the competitive service (59 percent) feel that the exception for persons appointed by the President is unfair.

An inequity of a different sort occurs because of the method of enforcement. "Excepted" employees, that is, those Federal employees who are not part of the competitive civil service, while covered by the act itself, are policed, not by the Civil Service Commission, but by the agency in which they are employed. Instead of one central enforcement agency, there are more than 50, with the resulting uneven enforcement. This Commission recommends correction of this deficiency in recommendation IV (sec. 1625) by vesting all enforcement authority in the Civil Service Commission for all Federal employees.

This Commission believes that all the inequalities in the present coverage and enforcement are undesirable. It further believes that general broadening of the act's coverage is not the way to correct inequality. The proposed legislation would provide uniform enforcement, abolish the exceptions for impacted areas, and permit States which voluntarily meet certain standards to enforce their own political activity laws without Federal intervention. If the States fail to meet the standard, or fail to enforce the law, Federal law becomes applicable. Such proposals, if adopted, would restore to the political life of our communities a substantial number of informed, able citizens who heretofore have unnecessarily inhibited from meaningful political participation. Public employees should participate. They are a part of the society in which they live and work. They should not be insulated from citizen responsibilities.

E. The penalty provisions; suggested revisions

Under present law, removal is required for any violations in Federal cases, unless the Civil Service Commission votes unanimously against removal. A minimum penalty of 30 days' suspension from employment must be imposed, if the vote is against removal. This minimum penalty is applied uniformly, without consideration of the type or severity of the offense involved. In many cases, this is a harsh penalty for the individual and his agency.

To maintain deterrents without penalizing the employee or the agency unduly, various witnesses in the hearings, including those from the Civil Service Commission, recommended that the Commission be given discretion in assessing penalties ranging from reprimands to removal. This Commission's draft bill provides for such latitude and also gives discretion to bar reemployment in any Federal agency for an appropriate period. The bill would remove the present permanent bar on reemployment in the same agency, and would require unanimous Civil Service Commission approval for so severe a penalty as dismissal.

F. Enforcement requires adequate budget

The record of appropriations for enforcement of the Hatch Act leaves much to be desired. Unquestionably, the longstanding limitation on annual appropriations has restricted the ability of the Civil Service Commission to cope with its responsibilies under the act. Lack of funds causes understaffing of legal and administrative requirements. This in turn results in heavy per capita caseloads, causes inadequate investigation and preparation, and produces delays in processing cases. Suspension or curtailment of the Commission's activities effectively inhibits proper enforcement.

At the statute's inception, the 1941 appropriation for administration was $100.000. Twenty-seven years later, with Federal Employment trebled and State and local coverage over 1.5 million employees, a $100,000 limitation is absurd. No appropriation since 1939 has been greater than $100,000. This Commission recommends a tenfold increase in these funds and strenuous efforts at increased enforcement.

VI. ADMINISTRATION

A. The subpena power should be broadened

Under existing law, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to issue subpenas in State cases, but there is no corresponding authority in cases involving Federal employees. This distinction has no valid justification. Without authority to issue subpenas it is difficult to obtain necessary evidence in proceedings where employees are sometimes reluctant to testify against a superior, coworker, or neighbor.

Another problem in effective development of a case is consideration of a grant of immunity from criminal prosecution to witnesses whose testimony is requisite. Such immunity is not permitted under present law. Since there have been few criminal prosecutions for offenses related to prohibited political activity, giving power to grant immunity would appear to have slight, if any, deterrent effect on effective enforcement and would appear to be an aid.

B. Expedition of case handling and resolution

Much concern has arisen over the time lapse between the filing of a complaint and final disposition by the Civil Service Commission. This Commission has already noted that delay is often the byproduct of inadequate administrative and enforcement budget. Analysis of Civil Service Commission statistics on cases considered since 1957 shows a total of 131 Federal and 43 State

---

[18] In 1940, when State employees were first covered by the Hatch Act, the Federal Government made grants totaling $572,870,614 to the States. The estimate of covered State and local employees was considerably under 500,000. The estimate of total Federal aid to States and local communities in 1967 is approximately $17.5 billion. More than 1.5 million non-Federal public employees work in programs financed by that money. Yet, it seems quite clear that this is but a beginning. Informed projections indicate that by 1980, Federal grants to State and local government will amount to $60 billion. While there is no reason to believe that a 400 percent increase in grant money will mean a corresponding increase in the numbers of employees covered by the Hatch Act, it is quite clear that there will be a substantial increase in coverage. A significant development since 1965 has been the extension of the Hatch Act principle to certain private sector groups receiving Federal antipoverty funds. In May 1967, approximately 60,000 employees of private nonprofit Community Action agencies were covered by comparable provisions of the Act. Should this effort to extend the Hatch Act principles beyond public agencies become a trend, predictions as to the numbers of people who might be covered would become impossible.

Cases. Federal cases have taken an average of 14 months to complete with an average 7½ months elapsing between the time charges are issued until final disposition.

For a variety of reasons the disposition of State cases takes about one-third longer than Federal cases.[19] A recent report by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate containing "evaluation charts on delay in administrative proceedings" [19a] showed that Hatch Act enforcement proceedings by the Civil Service Commission ranked 35th among 61 different types of administrative proceedings by other executive agencies with respect to the time consumed in processing a case.

An adequate budget would provide a partial remedy for the delay in case disposition. The time required to dispose of cases could be reduced by setting reasonable guidelines that impose time limitations upon Civil Service Commission actions. Such guidelines are recommended in the proposed bill.

C. Problems related to judicial review

The Hatch Act expressly provides judicial review for State and local employees' cases 5 U.S.C. 1508. There is no corresponding right to judicial review in Federal employee cases. Federal employees, however, can seek relief either in the Court of Claims or the appropriate U.S. district court in the same manner as for other cases involving removals or suspensions. The proposed legislation provides for judicial review in all cases.

In connection with judicial review under 5 U.S.C. 1508, a stay of proceedings is permitted. But the statute requires that the employee be suspended as a condition of the stay. This practice is contrary to the traditional function of a stay order to preserve the status quo so as to guard against irreparable injury pending review. Consequently, the courts have been reluctant to apply this provision.[20] Moreover, this aspect of the law is inconsistent with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 705, which gives the court authority to issue stay orders preserving the status quo pending review.

While the statute requires State and local employees be suspended pending judicial review, there is no assurance they will be restored to their position should the court reverse the Civil Service Commission. There is no established right to recover backpay should the employee prevail in the courts, although Federal employees, not presently included in the review provisions of 5 U.S.C. 1508, are by statute entitled to recover backpay.

Fairness dictates that the foregoing judicial review provisions be made equally applicable to Federal and State cases. The requirement of suspension pending judicial review should be deleted. An employee found to have been wrongfully suspended should be entitled to backpay. The Commission recommends these administrative changes with the expectation that adjudication of complaints and investigations will be more timely while preserving adequate protections for persons charged with violations of the law.

VII. ENFORCEMENT SHOULD PASS TO THE STATES UPON THEIR ADOPTION OF A PROGRAM ACCEPTABLE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Since 1940, ever-increasing numbers of State government employees have become covered by the political restrictions of the Hatch Act.[21] This results from cooperative federalism under which Federal grant-in-aid funds are made available to the States for such programs as health, welfare, highways, education, and employment services.

Studies of opinion by this Commission as part of its research program, reflect that 31.9 percent of State employees questioned are in favor of continuing this Hatch Act coverage, and 53.1 percent of the State party chairmen responding and 51.5 percent of the county party chairmen who answered are in accord. While these views reflect concern as to the impact of local political pressures, at the same time the question arises whether continuing Federal control of State and local employees is desirable under our federal system. Since the 1930's, American federalism has moved consistently in the direction of applying standards set up by Congress and Federal agencies to the administrative procedures of State governments. In consequence, there has been greater standardization of State procedures by Federal agencies responsible for administering grant-in-aid programs.

A new and potentially valuable advance in creative federalism can be made by changing the administrative controls of political activities of State and local public servants as proposed in the accompanying draft legislation. Simply stated, the concept is to permit the several States to administer and regulate the political activities of their employees without intervention of the Federal Government whenever the State has created a general plan of regulation consistent with the standards of Federal law. Approval of the adequacy of the State plans is to be a function of the Civil Service Commission. Approval could be withdrawn should it become evident that State violations were unchecked and protection not being afforded State employees.

This Commission believes that withdrawal of the Federal Government from control of State and local employees is worth a trial. Fourteen of the 50 States have regulations that substantially meet the standards of the legislation recommended by this Commission. All but nine of the 50 States have some type of law regulating the political activities of their employees. Thirty-three State laws are not as restrictive as the existing Hatch Act. Some are more so, particularly with respect to making contributions for political purposes. A few State laws have been overturned for constitutional reasons discussed earlier in this report. In any event, with some modifications, most existing State legislation could be brought within the standards of the draft legislation recommended by this Commission. (See volume II of this report, "Compilation of State Laws".)

The National Government has a legitimate concern to assure the efficient administration and spending of moneys it provides. Nevertheless, this Commission believes a compatible Federal-State relationship would be better served by permitting the States to police potential political interference with such administration and spending, so long as the standards for policing are compatible with Federal standards. Thus conceived, the recommended program would serve both a Federal purpose and a constructive Federal relationship with the States.

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF AN OFFICE OF EMPLOYEES' COUNSEL TO AID IN INVESTIGATION AND FOR EMPLOYEES' PROTECTION

To protect against a revival of the spoils system, adequate channels through which employees can voice their concern when they are threatened with political coercion appear necessary. As the situation now stands, Federal employees are generally confused as to where and how to report violations of the Hatch Act. This Commission feels that a better atmosphere for enforcement and employee cooperation and security might be created by establishing an office within the Civil Service Commission concerned with employees' rights and thus create a system that would give public employees confidence that they have a friend and protector in the public service. Such an action, however, requires more study than time has permitted this Commission to give it.

The primary function of the employees' counsel, would be to receive, to investigate, and to refer to the Civil Service Commission, employee complaints of violations under the law.

As this Commission discussed the ramifications of this concept of an employees' counsel, it became apparent that the device had applications beyond the limited scope of legislation concerning the political activities of Government employees. For example, it might also be charged with such functions as protecting the privacy of Federal employees or receiving complaints of mismanagement of Federal funds. Such considerations led the Commission to ponder how such an office could best be administered.

Because of the foregoing ramifications, which extend beyond the mandate of this Commission, it is recommended that the Civil Service Commission be given the responsibility to investigate and study the potentials of such a device as an employees' counsel and report to the President.

IX. CONSIDERATION OF VOLUNTARY BIPARTISAN CONTRIBUTION SYSTEM

This Commission firmly believes that our country's political health depends upon broadly based citizen participation in all of its political affairs, and participation at all levels and in all legitimate ways, including voluntary contributions of time or money by all citizens. With this goal in mind, the Commission recommends investigating the feasibility of establishing a voluntary program of political gift giving within Federal agencies to be patterned after similar programs now effectively operating in private industry. The California Good Citizenship Committee operates a statewide program illustrative of the concept. Such a program, of course, should include adequate safeguards against coercion and political pressure and insure the confidentiality of all contributions. It must not impair the prime function of "minding the store" with which the public service is charged. It should therefore be no larger in scope than, for example, the Combined Federal Campaign. Most importantly, the program should be voluntary and bipartisan in both form and substance without any question of administrative pressure either for any specific party or candidate or, indeed, to contribute at all unless the employee is so minded.

If such basic standards are met, this Commission is of the view that the Government will have advanced in at least three directions. It will have joined the ranks of progressive employers who have in recent years instituted similar employee programs. It will have taken a small step in resolving the problem of ever-spiraling political campaign costs. It will have provided a legitimate and controllable outlet and means for Federal employees desiring to contribute to political causes. The latter aspect of such a program would serve the public employee either as an outlet for his voluntary desire to contribute politically or as a shield against coercive solicitations.

---

[19] Disposition of State cases tends to take longer because of the difficulty of proving that the "principal employment" of the State employee involved is in an "activity financed in whole or in part" by the Federal Government. Such proof involves extensive documentary evidence often difficult to collect. State cases usually involve a lengthier transcript and more exhibits. Less cooperation and greater resistance to enforcement appears to be met with at the State and local levels. Enforcement requires communication and aid from intervening independent State and local officials who are sometimes noncooperative.

[19a] Committee Print Evaluation Charts on Delay in Administrative Proceedings, 89th Cong., second sess. (1966), p. 50.

[20] See, e.g., *Palmer* v. *United States Civil Service Commission*, 191 F. Supp. 495 (N.D. Ill. 1961) reversed, 297 F. 2d 450 (7th Cir. 1961), cert. den. 369 U.S. 849 (1962).

[21] The present law applies to an employee of State government who "* * * as a normal and foreseeable incident to his principal job or position * * * performs duties in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants * * *." U.S. Civil Service Commission pamphlet 20, May 1966, p. 18.

Complete development of a voluntary program of political gift giving is beyond the scope of this Commission's mandate. However, this Commission has included in the recommended draft legislation provisions authorizing the Civil Service Commission to study and report to the President on the feasibility of such a voluntary good citizenship program.

X. ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

(Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN)

It is apparent from the discussions we have had that virtually all of the members of this Commission agree that in the years since the Hatch Act was passed, there has been a profound change in the nature of the Federal civil service. The recommendations we have made clearly reflect much of that change. But we think not all of the Commissioners recognize that many of the very same factors which resulted in changes in the Federal work force also had a profound effect upon the manner in which the political parties must operate.

Thirty-five years ago the job of precinct committeeman or precinct captain was a patronage job—often salaried and if not, other tangible benefits were generally available. The precinct committeeman was a figure of some importance within his community. He spoke for the party. He acted for the party. He was The Party.

Is that the situation today? We submit that it is not. The late V. O. Key estimated that there were more than 100,000 political precincts in the United States with a potential of over 200,000 positions. Yet a substantial number of those jobs are unfilled, with an estimated vacancy rate of 50 percent midway between elections. And even on election day, fewer than 90 percent of the positions are even nominally filled.

Here then are perhaps 50,000 opportunities for interested citizens to serve, yet the opportunities are unrealized. Six of our colleagues insist that these positions as precinct committeemen are so partisan, so likely to subvert the Federal civil service that they may not be filled by Federal employees. We cannot agree.

While the importance of the precinct committeeman to his party has not diminished, his role has changed, both in fact and in the eyes of the public generally. No longer is he "Mr. Republican" or "Mr. Democrat" for 10 square blocks. He is far more likely to be the man across the street who works for IBM or the mother of one of your children's classmates.

In a sophisticated and largely affluent society, the rewards the modern precinct committeman seeks are the old fashioned ones—service to his community, service to a program or ideal, service to his country, and very often service for a specific candidate, as well as service to his party. The mass media tell the candidate's story today, not the precinct committeeman, whose role has changed almost 180 degrees. Instead of the spokesman for the party, he has become the spokesman for his neighborhood to the party. That, it seems to us is the significant change which has occurred within the last 35 years, and one which we believe makes it not only possible to allow Federal employees to serve as precinct committeemen and committeewomen, but very nearly demands that they be given the opportunity. We cannot conceive of such service as a threat to the impartial image of the Federal merit system.

One additional aspect of the Commission's work causes us to disagree in part with our colleagues. We cannot concede that any public office in this Nation should be barred to any citizen, otherwise qualified, simply because of his employment. Yet this Commission's proposed bill does deny Federal employees the right to run for any but "local" offices. Those "local" offices are very important, and we in no way wish to minimize the importance of the change the Commission is recommending in this area. But we would go further.

The additional safeguards we have provided against coercion and misuse of official authority render the likelihood of abuse of office for campaign purposes extremely unlikely. Should they occur, we have every confidence that the Civil Service Commission would move promptly against the offender. And what other valid reason is there to deny Federal employees the rights other citizens enjoy? We know of none.

Professor Ranney joins us in the comments concerning precinct committeemen.

(Congressman ANCHER NELSEN)

Public Law 89–617 enacted by the Congress in 1966, establishing the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, had my complete support. Its stated purpose is to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws having to do with the limitation on participation of Federal and State employees in political affairs with a view to the determination of any need for strengthening, revision, or elimination of the same and the possible undesirable results which might come from such changes. My support for the achieving of this goal has not changed over the life of the Commission during the past year.

The Commission, through hearings, surveys, and related research has unanimously come to certain excellent conclusions and recommendations: (1) for realistic clarification of provisions of current statutes relating to those activities permitted and prohibited so that the employee may have a clearer understanding of his position under the law, (2) for the revision of the enforcement procedures to give a more automatic response to violations when they occur, and (3) for the revision of the penalty provisions to enable the Civil Service Commission to mete out punishment for violations without doing an injustice to the employee, i.e., to make the punishment fit the crime. Added to these are a number of other changes which will facilitate the administration and enforcement of the Hatch Act and related statutes by the Civil Service Commission. In these matters there has been a gratifying unanimity among the members of the Commission. In all our labors there has been a dedication by the Commission to meet the responsibility given us by the Congress.

Unfortunately, there cannot be unanimous support for all of the recommendations the, majority of the Commission has seen fit to make. I must respectfully depart from that position taken by a majority of my colleagues on the Commission on the crucial recommendations concerning the expansion of certain permitted activities, particularly recommendation III. It would open the door to participation by the Federal employee as a partisan candidate or for partisan political management activity in local elections.

I believe the sincere position of some in seemingly wanting to grant to the Federal employee all the political rights enjoyed by his fellow American not employed in the public service beclouds facts which I consider undeniable. In order to maintain a completely impartial and effective public service, those involved in such service must owe primary loyalty to the government by which they are employed, and not to a particular individual, party, or faction. For this reason it is necessary to impose certain limited restrictions upon the political activity by those governmental employees. The journey from the spoils system in many local and State governments and in the Federal Government has been a long and arduous one. The limits to which we have advanced the merit principles in those governments are most certainly not inviolate. There are still certain areas of the Nation in which the spoils system is not dead, as we learned in our hearings in Chicago, and other areas. There still are persons who would not hesitate to utilize the government employee for whatever political purposes possible, whether through pressures for contributions or of some other kind.

We have seen abundant evidence in the news during the past few years of an increasing tendency toward the "arm twisting" of the Federal employee for political contributions, both in the form of "suggested" purchase of political dinner tickets and otherwise. This has been especially true in impacted areas of Federal employment. Congressmen and others have been the reported beneficiaries of such functions. As a result of the long periods required for investigative and final administrative action in cases of reported violations, the Federal employee (especially in the area where these abuses have taken place) has had no alternative but to believe that no certain protection is offered him under the law as now written and administered.

It was my expressed opinion within the Commission that we had sufficient authority and reason to investigate specific violations of the Hatch Act, especially in the Washington area, in order to better understand the extent and nature of such violations to the end of recommending adequate remedial legislation. The majority was not in agreement with me on this point. However, I do believe that we can eliminate some of these practices through the implementation of our recommendations for improved enforcement procedures by the Civil Service Commission. I firmly support those recommendations. But I further believe that experience has shown that much of the protection for the employee against such pressures must come through the restrictions regarding political activity placed on each employee, wherever he may be in the governmental structure.

The proposal to open the door to partisan political activity by the career Federal employee within either of the two major political parties of this country, in my judgment, is a first dangerous step toward a return to the political spoils system. There are numerous examples of testimony in the Commission hearings from Federal and State employees recommending that the present policy of the Hatch Act in this respect be maintained. If we are unable to adequately police pressures put on the Federal employee at the present time, operating as they are under the nonpartisan restrictions, how can we but believe that the injection of major partisan activities into the structure will make such enforcement virtually impossible? Under our political system I do not believe it is practically possible to deny any partisan candidate the freedom to manage and conduct his campaign in all respects allowed to his opponent, whether those activities go to solicitation of funds or other political action. Also, the local party organization is inextricably connected with the national party organizations. Local leaders almost inevitably play a part in the State and National political affairs. To think that we can confine a person's involvement in partisan politics to certain limits on the local level is wishful thinking.

The possible benefits to be gained by allowing a desirous few to participate in partisan political candidacy and political management activity, when weighed against the dangers that such activity poses to an impartial, efficient public service and the hundreds of thousands of employees in it, is simply not worth the inherent risk in such action. The benefits of the impartial public service, whether they be of tenure, job assignments, and promotions on merit, or simply freedom from the many insidious types of pressures present in partisan operations, compensates the employee many times over in return for the relatively few restrictions placed on his action. Indeed, under the present Hatch Act, and surely under a revised act should the Congress see fit to accept many of our recommendations, the Federal employee is and will be allowed far more liberty in political action than is actually taken by all but a very minor percentage of our population as a whole.

In the Federal employee survey which the Commission conducted, it is significant that among those persons stating they would like to see some change in the Hatch Act, only 4.2 percent said the employee should be allowed to campaign for a political party or candidate of his choice, a mere 1.5 percent stated that the employee should be allowed to hold political or partisan office, and only 1.6 percent stated he should be allowed local participation of all kinds.

In response to the arguments concerning the inequality of treatment of the Federal employee from one geographical area to another through the greater freedom of political action given those persons living in the so-called federally impacted areas, I can state that I am in agreement that such inequality exists. I offered the suggestion that this might be cured by the extension of what is now the nonpartisan exemption in the impacted areas to the entire United States. This was rejected by a majority of the Commission. However, I believe the idea merits the consideration of any future Congress studying the proposed legislation we submit as a Commission.

For substantially the same reasons I have stated above in my opposition to the extension of permissive candidacy and active political management to the partisan realm, I also find myself one of the six members of the Commission voting to oppose inclusion in the other limited area of disagreement, that concerning the extent to which Federal employees should be permitted to serve as officers in political organizations. Specifically, I oppose the inclusion in permitted activities of the right to serve as partisan ward and precinct committeemen or committeewomen.

The points upon which the Commission has been able to agree are numerous and will receive my full support in future legislation. But the unwise recommendation for expansion of activities permitted the Federal employee in the partisan realm involving political activity within both our major parties in the candidacy and active political management fields is unwarranted. Well-reasoned testimony before our Commission cautioned against it. Even our survey of Federal employees did not support it. Certainly if enacted into law, it would open a Pandora's box of troubles in the continuing fight for the preservation of a true merit system and an efficient, impartial public service.

Senator Murphy joins me in this statement.

(Robert Ramspeck)

Based on my experience in public affairs, it is necessary for me to differ with the majority of the Commission in some respects. I have spent almost 30 years in public service—city, county, State, and Federal levels.

During my 16 years as a Congressman, I tried to improve the Federal service and to eliminate the spoils system. While progress was made, practice of political patronage still exists in the Federal Government. It will always exist if public employees can be used for political campaigns.

It is my belief that no public employee should be permitted to seek an elective public office without taking leave without pay. No such employee should hold any office in a political party, faction, or organization. No such employee should be permitted to manage a campaign or speak at a campaign meeting. All public employees, except those holding policymaking positions, should be under a merit system.

In my opinion, the best protection we can give the employees against coercion is to prohibit those activities that endanger the maintenance of a merit system for employment, retention and promotion. We can have impartial administration only through such a system.

Under the existing law, Federal employees vote by a higher percentage than does the general public. A secret ballot is the most effective right our citizens have, and with that right protected public employees do not need to engage in political management or campaigning.

XI. SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE DRAFT BILL

The recommendations of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel have been embodied in a draft bill. A summary of the more important features of the bill to the extent that they would affect existing law are set forth below. In general, the bill is directed at correcting major ambiguities, deficiencies, and inequalities.

Sec. 1601. Policy and purpose

In its first section, the draft bill sets forth important, and sometimes competing, aims which it is necessary to reconcile to the maximum degree possible. One is the need to prevent exploitation of public employees for political ends, to preserve the integrity and efficiency of the public service, and to insure the impartial administration of the public business. In order to achieve these objectives the bill would expressly define the limit of permissible political activities for Federal employees and employees of States and local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by Federal grants or loans. On the other hand, the bill would also reflect the intention and policy of Congress that any restriction on the lawful political activities of public employees must be consistent with first amendment rights, and that all rights of political participation, not barred by the bill or other Federal or State laws, shall be encouraged.

Sec. 1602. Coverage

The bill adjusts the coverage of the existing law to deal more effectively with contemporary conditions and to achieve the basic purposes of the law.

(*a*) The bill expressly excludes the President and Vice President from its coverage.

(*b*) All other high officials in the executive branch of the Federal Government, although subject to provisions prohibiting coercion, abuse of official authority, and undue influence for designated political purposes, are expressly exempted from restrictions on taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns.

This exemption would apply also (except for members of the U.S. Civil Service Commission) to members of an independent commission, board, or establishment, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Assistant to the Commissioner, and members of the District Council.

The exemption would, moreover, apply to persons on leave without pay for 1 year or more. Under this exemption officers of employee labor unions would be permitted to engage in political activity while on leave to serve their union.

Sec: 1621. Permissible activities

Present Hatch Act delineation of proscribed noncorrupt political activity is obscure and not readily the subject of reference, since it incorporates rules and regulations adopted by the Civil Service Commission prior to 1940.

The bill takes an entirely different tack, spelling out what activities are permitted, and what are barred. For example, it makes clear that government employees may speak freely in public on any political issue or candidate. It permits "active" participation in the affairs of a political party except as prohibited in sec. 1622. An employee who is a member of a political organization would be permitted to make motions, prepare or assist in preparing resolutions, serve on committees and the like. Most important, the Federal employee would be permitted to become a candidate for and serve in a local office, to be discussed more fully hereafter.

Sec. 1622. Prohibited activities

(a)(b) The bill takes over and incorporates, for administrative enforcement by the Civil Service Commission, major provisions from the criminal statutes designed to protect Federal employees from corrupt political pressures. These would apply to all officials and employees of the executive branch except, as noted, the President and Vice President. This change would permit more serious cases, such as those involving coercion, to be handled administratively without delay. If, however, a matter warrants criminal prosecution, such action would not be precluded.

Sec. 1622. Political management and political campaigns

(c) The bill would clearly prohibit certain political activities which have been the particular object of abuse and public criticism. Among such activities prohibited are these:

(1) partisan political fundraising at any level;

(2) engaging in political activity while on duty or on government property;

(3) becoming a candidate or campaigning for or holding an office of the United States, a State, or other office except a "local office" (to be discussed below);

(4) managing a campaign for a candidate seeking such an office;

(5) acting at any polling place as an official recorder, checker, watcher or challenger;

(6) serving as an officer in a political organization such as chairman, vice-chairman, or treasurer of any National, State, county or city political party. (No recommendation is made as to ward and precinct committeeman.)

Sec. 1623. Candidacy for local office

Under the present statute, Government employees are permitted to engage in political management and political campaigns on a nonpartisan basis in nonpartisan elections. In addition, the Civil Service Commission is authorized by regulation to permit Government employees residing in certain municipalities near the District of Columbia and in other communities where there are concentrated large numbers of Federal employees to be candidates for, and to hold, local office in those municipalities. This preferential treatment, which enables merely a very limited number of Federal employees to engage in partisan political activities, has been the subject of severe criticism.

The bill would wipe out these inequalities and extend to Federal employees the right to hold local office on a nationwide basis without regard to whether the election is nonpartisan or partisan. At the same time, however, the bill includes a number of safeguards so that Federal employees may run for and hold local office with the minimum risk to the proper administration of the Federal business.

Sec. 1624. Penalties

Under present law, removal is required for any violations in Federal cases, unless the Civil Service Commission votes unanimously against removal. In the event of the vote against removal, however, the Commission is presently required to impose a minimum penalty of 30 days' suspension. This minimum penalty must be applied uniformly without regard to the character of the offense involved. This requires a harsh penalty even for minor and technical violations.

The bill is aimed at assuring full and effective enforcement of the law without penalizing an employee by a sanction which is out of proportion to the offense. It would vest discretion in the Civil Service Commission to impose penalties, depending upon the gravity of the offense, ranging from simple reprimands to removal. The bill would also broaden the discretion of the Civil Service Commission to ban reemployment of the offending employee in any Federal agency for a period to be determined by it. The bill requires unanimous Commission approval where the penalty is dismissal.

Sec. 1635. Investigation and hearings

Generally, the bill would clarify, specify, and expand the authority of the Civil Service Commission to investigate charges of violation and to hold hearings therein. Presently, the CSC maintains authority for enforcement solely as to merit system employees; the authority for enforcement as to excepted service employees is a matter for the employing agency. The bill would centralize the administration and enforcement functions in the CSC. The provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act have been carried over in many respects to govern the conduct of hearings where employees are charged with a violation, but the bill includes additional features tailored to process a case. The bill would require a final decision by the Commission within 60 days after the date upon which the record was submitted to it for final decision. Such time could, however, be extended by the Commission upon good cause shown and stated in writing.

Although the Commission has authority to issue subpenas in State cases, it presently has no corresponding authority in Federal cases. The bill would fill this gap, and in addition give the Commission authority to grant immunity from prosecution after the witness first claims his privilege against self-incrimination.

Sec. 1636. Political activities of certain State and local employees

In recognition of the proper relationship which should prevail between the Federal Government and the States, the Commission concluded that there should be no greater Federal control over political activities by State and local employees than is essential to assure honest and efficient administration of Federal funds. This accounts for several distinctions made in the bill between the regulation of political activities of Federal employees and those of State and local employees. For the purpose of convenience, the provisions relating to State and local employees have been placed in a separate subchapter even though many of these provisions are the same for both Federal and State employees.

The bill treats top-level State and local administrators and officials in the same way comparable Federal officials are treated. Unless the State is, by delegation of authority from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, authorized to administer its own enforcement program, the Commission would enforce at the State and local levels the provisions forbidding coercion, solicitation, illegal payment and other more serious prohibited activities. The bill gives greater latitude to State and local employees in campaigning activity and in holding State or local office.

Under current law, Federal agencies may withhold from a grant to a State an amount equivalent to 2 years' annual salary of the offending employee for noncompliance by the State in disciplining the employee. The bill would require that an amount equivalent to 25 times the annual salary of the employee be withheld from the State where the penalty is dismissal, and an amount equivalent to 10 times the annual salary of an employee who should have been suspended.

The bill also provides that Federal administration under the act should pass to the States upon their adoption of a plan which is approved by the Commission and meets specified standards laid down in the bill. Approval could be withdrawn, subject to judicial review, if the Commission, after a hearing, concluded that the plan had been materially changed, or that in the administration of the plan, there was a failure to comply.

Miscellaneous

There are four other matters in the bill which merit attention. One deals with the feasibility of establishing within the Federal executive branch, under the supervision of the Commission, a plan for voluntary contributions to political parties and candidates.

The second deals with the feasibility of establishing within the Commission an Office of Employees' Counsel. The function of this office would be to receive complaints from Federal employees, make investigations and initial determinations as to the validity of the complaint, and make recommendations for remedy or redress.

The bill would authorize the CSC to make a study of both these proposals and to report on them to the President for transmittal to Congress within 1 year from the date of enactment of the act.

Third, the bill would authorize as an appropriation a sum not to exceed $1 million per year. Presently the CSC is limited to spending an amount not to exceed $100,000 to enforce the Hatch Act. This restriction, first imposed in 1941, is of course grossly inadequate in 1967.

Fourth, the bill directs the Secretary of Defense to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to political activities of personnel in the Armed Forces.

XII. PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to provide for the regulation of political activities of public employees, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Political Activities Act of 1968."

SEC. 2. Part II of Title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 16—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

"SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec.
"1601. Policy and Purpose.
"1602. Definitions.

"SUBCHAPTER II—POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"1621. Permissible Activities.
"1622. Coercion, Solicitation or Illegal Payment and Other Prohibited Activities.
"1623. Candidacy for Local Office; Holding Office.
"1624. Penalties.
"1625. Administration.

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

"1631. Basis of Regulation for State and Local Employees.
"1632. Definitions.
"1633. Coercion, Solicitation or Illegal Payment and Other Prohibited Activities.
"1634. Penalties.
"1635. Administration.
"1636. State Program of Political Activity Administration.

"SUBCHAPTER IV—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

"SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 1601. Policy and Purpose.

"Congress finds that in order to prevent exploitation of public employees for political ends, to preserve the integrity and efficiency of the public service, and to insure the impartial administration of the public business, it is necessary to define the limits of permissible political activities for persons employed by the Federal Executive Agencies, the District of Columbia, and State and local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants. Congress recognizes that any such restrictions on the lawful political activities of public employees must be consistent with the rights of free speech and association guaranteed to all persons by the Constitution of the United States, and further that all rights of political participation not hereinafter prohibited by this chapter, or other laws of the United States or the several States, or regulations thereunder, should be encouraged.

"Sec. 1602. Definitions.

"For the purposes of this chapter—

"(a) 'Commission' means United States Civil Service Commission;

"(b) 'Federal employee' means any individual employed or holding office in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States, other than the President and Vice President; and any individual employed or holding office in or under the Government of the District of Columbia; but does not include, unless otherwise provided, the following:

"(1) any individual paid from the appropriation for the White House Office, from funds for special projects to provide staff assistance to the President, or persons on special assignment to the White House, unless such individual holds a career or career conditional appointment in the competitive civil service;

"(2) the head, deputy or assistant head, and one personal assistant to be designated by the head of an executive agency; members of an independent commission, board, or establishment (other than the Commissioners of the United States Civil Service Commission);

"(3) the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Assistant to the Commissioner, and members of the District of Columbia Council;

"(4) officers or employees of an educational institution or system that is supported by the United States or the District of Columbia;

"(5) persons who are retained temporarily by an executive agency to perform special services on a fee basis and who take no oath of office;

"(6) such categories of persons as may be prescribed by the Commission who are employed temporarily, intermittently, or without compensation under appointments not to exceed one year;

"(7) persons employed or holding office in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States while granted leave without pay for a period of one year or more;

"(8) Ambassadors and Ministers of the United States;

"(9) Members of the armed services of the United States.

"(c) 'agency' means any agency, department, or unit of organization of the executive branch of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof;

"(d) 'officer' of a political party or party organization means the chairman, vice-chairman, or treasurer, of any national, state, county, or city political party whose primary purpose is to elect candidates, and the national, state, country, city, [ward and precinct committeeman and committeewoman] or any positions having equivalent responsibility;

"(e) 'local office' means an office in any branch of the government of a political subdivision of a state, the duties of which require less than full-time service, and the compensation of which is nominal.

"SUBCHAPTER II—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"Sec. 1621. Permissible Activities.

"(a) Federal employees are permitted to:

"(1) register and vote in any election;

"(2) express opinions freely in private and in public on any political subject or candidate;

"(3) join a political party or other party organization and actively participate in its affairs, while not on duty, except to serve as an officer as defined in Section 1602(d) of this chapter;

"(4) contribute money voluntarily for political purposes;

"(5) become a candidate for and serve in a local office as provided in Section 1623 of this chapter;

"(6) serve as a delegate to a political or constitutional convention, so long as such service does not interfere with the time and attention required as Federal employees.

"Sec. 1622. Coercion, Solicitation or Illegal Payment and Other Prohibited Activities.

"(a) Coercion; Use of Official Authority.—Any Federal employee or any individual referred to in Section 1602(b) (1)—(9) of this chapter is prohibited from—

"(1) using his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of any election or the nomination or the election of any candidate for public office or political party office;

"(2) using his official authority or influence for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten or coerce any person for the purpose of interfering with the right of, or causing, such person to vote or not to vote as he may choose;

"(3) directly or indirectly intimidating, threatening, coercing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee to pay, lend or contribute anything of value, including services, to a party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes;

"(4) using official authority or influence to coerce or attempt to coerce any political action of an individual, group of individuals, or organization;

"(5) using or attempting to use official authority or influence over any person by conferring any benefits, such as a promise of employment or compensation, or effecting any reprisal, such as deprivation of employment, position, compensation or promotion, because of political contributions or political activity, or lack thereof, of such employee or person;

"(b) Solicitation or Receipt of Payment.—Any Federal employee or any individual referred to in Section 1602(b)(1)–(9) of this chapter in prohibited from—

"(1) soliciting, receiving payment for, or offering to pay for voting or refraining from voting, or voting for or against any candidate;

"(2) soliciting or receiving anything of value, including service or activity, either for personal reward or as a political contribution in return for the promise to use, or the use of, influence to secure an appointive office under the United States, a state, or political subdivisions thereof;

"(3) paying or offering payment for the use of influence in securing appointive office under the United States, a state, or political subdivisions thereof.

"(c) Other Prohibited Activities.—A Federal employee is prohibited from—

"(1) either directly or indirectly soliciting, receiving, collecting, handling, disbursing, or accounting for assessments, contributions, tickets, or other funds for political purposes, except any activity, participation, contribution, or other service of value in connection with matters such as bond issues, referenda, constitutional amendments or other matters which do not directly or immediately affect the interest of any organized political party or candidate of such party shall not be considered as having a political purpose.

"(2) engaging in political activity while on duty, or in or at an office leased or owned by the United States, a state or any political subdivision thereof, or while wearing a uniform which identifies him as a public servant, except as may be specifically permitted;

"(3) becoming a candidate or campaigning for or holding elective office if the office sought is;

"(A) an office of the United States; or

"(B) an office of any state; or

"(C) any other public office including local offices except as local office is defined in Sec. 1602(e) of this chapter.

"(4) acting at any polling place as an official recorder, checker, watcher, or challenger, of any political party or party faction;

"(5) serving in a political organization as an officer as defined in Sec. 1602(d) of this chapter.

"(6) managing a campaign for any candidate seeking elective office, if the office sought is an office of the United States, or any office of any state, or any local office except those permitted by the provisions of Section 1623 of this chapter.

"Sec. 1623. Candidacy for Local Office; Holding Office.

"(a) Any Federal employee desiring to become a candidate for elective or appointive local public office or to hold such office shall notify his agency in writing, and shall request approval from the head of the agency and a determination that such candidacy or holding of office will not be adverse to the best interests of the United States, and the agency head shall take prompt action in writing to approve, or disapprove any such request. He shall grant such approval and make such a determination unless:

"(1) the duties to be undertaken by the employee as an appointive or elective officer will create a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest with the employing agency; or

"(2) the duties to be undertaken by the employee as an appointive or elective official will interfere with the time and attention such employee is required to devote to the work of the employing agency; or

"(3) the campaign for office will interfere with the time and attention the employee is required to devote to the work of the employing agency; or

"(4) the candidacy or holding of office conflicts with the provisions of any other law, or regulations issued thereunder, applicable to the agency and its employees.

"(b) Any Federal employee granted approval to become a candidate for local public office shall not campaign for such office, while on active duty, but may be granted or required to take leave under such conditions as may be prescribed by the head of the employing agency.

"(c) The head of any agency may issue such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this section as he deems necessary to carry out its provisions and shall publish any such rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

"(d) The head of an agency shall furnish a copy of any approval and determination and any disapproval made under this section to the Commission.

"Sec. 1624. Penalties.

"(a) A Federal employee who violates Section 1622 of this chapter may be:

"(1) ordered to be removed from his position if all members of the Commission vote for such action, in which event he shall not be reemployed by any agency of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia for such period as the Commission may prescribe; or

"(2) ordered to be suspended without pay from his position for such period as the Commission shall deem appropriate; or

"(3) ordered to be disciplined in such lesser manner as the Commission may direct, which order shall become a permanent part of his record;

"(b) The Commission shall notify the employing agency of any penalty it has imposed as the result of a violation. Such agency shall certify to the Commission the measures undertaken to implement the penalty.

"(c) If the Commission finds there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (b) of Section 1622 of this chapter by an appointive official referred to in Section 1602 (b)(1)–(9), it shall notify the President of such violation.

"Sec. 1625. Administration.

"(a) The Commission shall have authority to investigate reports and allegations of activity prohibited by Section 1622 of this subchapter. As a part of the investigation, the Commission shall provide to the Federal employee involved an opportunity to make a statement concerning the matters under investigation and to support such statement with any documents he wishes to submit.

"(b) (1) If after investigation it appears to the Commission that no violation of this subchapter has occurred, it shall so notify the Federal employee and the agency in which he is employed.

"(2) If after investigation it appears to the Commission that there has been a violation of Section 1622 of this subchapter, the Commission shall serve upon the Federal employee a notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, or if notice cannot be given in this manner, then by any method calculated to reasonably apprise the employee—

"(A) setting forth specifically and in detail the charges of alleged prohibited activity,

"(B) advising the Federal employee of the penalties provided by this chapter.

"(C) affording a period of not less than 30 days within which the Federal employee may file a written answer to the charges and, in addition, if he so desires, appear in person to answer the charges, in the manner prescribed by rules issued by the Commission, and

"(D) giving notice to the Federal employee that unless he answers the charges, in writing, in the manner prescribed by rules issued by the Commission, the Commission shall be authorized to treat such failure as an admission by the Federal employee of the charges set forth in the notice and a waiver by him of his right to a hearing on the charges.

"(c)(1) If a written answer is not duly filed within the time allowed therefor, the Commission may, without further proceedings, issue its final decision and order.

"(2) If an answer is duly filed, the charges shall be determined by the Commission on the record after opportunity for hearing in accordance with the requirements of Subchapter II, Chapter 5, Title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding any exception therein for matters involving the tenure of an employee. If a hearing is held, it shall be commenced and conducted without unreasonable delays. As soon as practicable after the conclusion of the hearing, the examiner shall serve upon the Commission and upon the Federal employee his recommended decision with notice of opportunity for exceptions. The Commission shall issue its final decision and order in the proceeding no later than 60 days after the date upon which the record was submitted to it for final decision. The Federal employee shall not be removed from active duty status by reasons of the alleged violation of this subchapter during the pendency of the proceeding provided herein or at any time prior to the effective date specified by the Commission in its final order.

"(d) (1) At any stage of a proceeding or investigation under this subchapter, the Commission may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary or other evidence relating to the proceeding or investigation at any designated place, from any place in the

United States or any territory or possession thereof, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia. In case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpena, the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the person to whom the subpena is addressed resides or is served may, upon application by the Commission, issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or produce documentary or other evidence if so ordered, and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. Any member of the Commission shall have authority to sign and issue subpenas under this subsection.

"(2) The Commission may order the taking of depositions at any stage of a proceeding or investigation under this subchapter. Depositions may be taken before an individual designated by the Commission and having the power to administer oaths. Testimony shall be reduced to writing by or under the direction of the individual taking the deposition and shall be subscribed by the deponent. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and to produce documentary or other evidence as provided by this subsection.

"(3) A person may not be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to a subpena of the Commission on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence. No person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court, except that no such person shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(e) A Federal employee upon whom a penalty is imposed by an order of the Commission under subsection (c) of this section may, within 30 days after the date on which the order was issued, institute an action for judicial review of the Commission's order in the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the Federal employee resides or is employed. The institution of an action for judicial review shall not operate as a stay of the Commission's order, unless the court specifically orders such stay. A copy of the summons and complaint shall be served as otherwise prescribed by law and, in addition, upon the Commission. Thereupon the Commission shall certify and file with the court the record upon which the Commission order was based. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceeding and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce the evidence at the hearing conducted by the Commission, the court may direct that the additional evidence be taken before the Commission in the manner and on the terms and conditions fixed by the court. The Commission may modify its findings of fact or order in the light of the additional evidence, and shall file with the court such modified findings or order. The Commission's findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The court shall affirm the Commission's order if it determines that it is in accordance with law. If the court determines that the order is not in accordance with law, it shall remand the proceeding to the Commission with directions either to enter an order determined by the court to be lawful or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, is required.

"(f) The Commission, in its discretion, may proceed with any investigation or proceeding instituted under this chapter notwithstanding that the Commission or the head of the employing agency has reported the alleged violation to the Attorney General as required by section 535, title 28, United States Code.

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

"Sec. 1631. Basis of Regulation for State and Local Employees.

"It is essential to the national interest that grants and loans from the United States to State and local governments be used for designated and legitimate public purposes. For this reason, it is necessary to impose certain limited restrictions upon political activity by those State and local government employees who are primarily engaged in the implementation of federally-funded activities. However, nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing Federal action which has the effect of depriving State or local government employees from enjoying as wide a range of freedom to participate in the political activities permitted in section 1621 of this chapter.

"Sec. 1632. Definitions.

"For the purposes of this subchapter—

"(a) 'State or local employee' means an individual, other than the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or individual acting as Governor when authorized by law, employed by a State or local executive agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or a Federal agency but does not include, unless otherwise provided—

"(1) elective officials of a State;

"(2) heads and assistant heads of executive departments of states whether elective or appointive;

"(3) elective officials of a political subdivision of a state;

"(4) officers or employees of an educational institution, or system that is supported by a state or a political subdivision thereof;

"(5) officials of a political subdivision of a state appointed to serve in policy-making positions.

"(b) 'state' means a state or territory or possession of the United States, but does not include the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 1633. Coercion, Solicitation, or Illegal Payment and Other Prohibited Activities.

"Employees of a state or political subdivision thereof not qualified to participate in the State Program of Political Activity under Section 1636 of this chapter shall be subject to the following provisions as administered by the Commission:

"(a) COERCION, USE OF OFFICIAL AUTHORITY.—Any state or local employee or any person referred to in Section 1632(a)(1)(5) of this chapter shall be prohibited from—

"(1) using his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of any election or the nomination or the election of any candidate for public office or political party office;

"(2) using his official authority or influence for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten or coerce any person for the purpose of interfering with the right of, or causing, such person to vote or not to vote as he may choose;

"(3) directly or indirectly intimidating, threatening, coercing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any employee to pay, lend, or contribute anything of value including services to a party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes;

"(4) using official authority or influence to coerce or attempt to coerce, any political action of an individual, group of individuals, or organization;

"(b) SOLICITATION OR ILLEGAL PAYMENT.—Any State or local employee or any person referred to in section 1632(a)(1)-(5) of this chapter is prohibited from—

"(1) soliciting, receiving payment for, or offering to pay for voting or refraining from voting, or voting for or against any candidate;

"(2) soliciting or receiving anything of value, including services or activity, either for personal reward or as a political contribution in return for the promise to use, or the use of, influence to secure an appointive office under the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof;

"(3) paying or offering payment for the use of influence in securing appointive office under the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof;

"(c) OTHER PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—State and local employees as defined in section 1632 of this subchapter are prohibited from—

"(1) either directly or indirectly soliciting, receiving, collecting, handling, disbursing or accounting for assessments, contributions, tickets, or other funds for political purposes.

"(2) engaging in political activity while on duty or while in or at an office leased or owned by the United States, a state or any political subdivision thereof, or while wearing a uniform which identifies him as a state or local employee except as may be specifically permitted;

"(3) managing a campaign for any candidate seeking elective office if the office sought is an office of the United States.

"Sec. 1634. Penalties.

"(a) A state or local employee who violates section 1633 of this chapter may be:

"(1) ordered to be removed from his position if all the Commission vote for such action in which event he shall not be reemployed by any agency of the same state or a political subdivision thereof, which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, for such period as the Commission may prescribe; or

"(2) ordered to be suspended without pay from his position for such period as the Commission shall deem appropriate; or

"(3) ordered to be disciplined in such lessor manner as the Commission may direct which order shall become a permanent part of his record; and,

"(4) the Commission shall notify the employing agency of any penalty it has imposed as the result of a violation. Such agency shall certify to the Commission the measure undertaken to implement the penalty.

"(b) If the Commission finds there has been a violation of subsection (a) of this section by an appointive official referred to in Section 1632(a)(1)-(5) of this chapter it shall notify the Governor of such violation.

"(c) WITHHOLDING FUNDS.—If a state or local employee ordered to be removed or suspended by the Commission,

"(1) has not been removed or suspended from his position within 30 days after the Commission has given notice that the violation of such employee or official warrants removal or suspension; or

"(2) has been removed or suspended but subsequently has been reemployed by the same state or any other political subdivision thereof within the period prescribed by the Commission—

the Commission shall certify to any appropriate agency of the United States that its directive for removal or suspension has not been complied with and require the agency of the United States to withhold from loans or grants to the employing agency of the state or political subdivision thereof amounts computed as follows:

"(A) If removal is ordered, the amount equal to 25 years' compensation at the rate such employee was receiving at the time of the violation; or,

"(B) If the suspension is ordered, the amount equal to 5 years' compensation at the rate such employee was receiving at the time of the violation

"Sec. 1635. Administration.

"(a) The Commission shall have authority to investigate reports and allegations of activity prohibited by Section 1633 of this subchapter. As a part of the investigation, the Commission shall provide to the state or local employee involved an opportunity to make a statement concerning the matters under investigation and to support such statement with any documents he wishes to submit.

"(b)(1) If after investigation it appears to the Commission that no violation of this subchapter has occurred, it shall so notify the state or local employee and the agency in which he is employed.

"(2) If after investigation it appears to the Commission that there has been a violation of Section 1633 of this subchapter the Commission shall serve upon the state or local employee a notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, or if notice cannot be given in this manner, then by any other method calculated to reasonably apprise the employee—

"(A) setting forth specifically and in detail the charges of alleged prohibited activity,

"(B) advising the employee of the penalties provided by this subchapter,

"(C) affording a period of not less than 30 days within which he may file a written answer to the charges and in addition if he so desires, appear in person to answer the charges, in the manner prescribed by rules issued by the Commission, and

"(D) giving notice to the state or local employee that unless he answers the charges, in writing, in the manner prescribed by rules issued by the Commission, the Commission shall be authorized to treat such failure as an admission by the employee of the charges set forth in the notice and a waiver by him of his right to a hearing on the charges.

"(c)(1) If a written answer is not duly filed within the time allowed therefor, the Commission may, without further proceedings, issue its final decision and order.

"(2) If an answer is duly filed, the charges shall be determined by the Commission on the record after opportunity for hearing in accordance with the requirements of subchapter II, chapter 5, title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding any exception therein for matters involving the tenure of an employee. Either the State or local officer or employee or the State or local agency employing him, or both, shall be entitled to appear with counsel at said hearing. If a hearing is held, it shall be commenced and conducted without unreasonable delays. As soon as practicable after the conclusion of the hearing, the examiner shall serve upon the Commission and upon the State or local employee his recommended decision with notice or opportunity for exceptions. The Commission shall issue its final decision and order in the proceeding no later than 60 days after the date upon which the record was submitted to it for final decision. The State or local employee shall not be removed from active duty status by reason of the alleged violation of this subchapter during the pendency of the proceeding provided herein or at any time prior to the effective date specified by the Commission in its final order.

"(d)(1) At any stage of a proceeding or investigation under this subchapter, the Commission may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary or other evidence relating to the proceeding or investigation at any designated place, from any place in the United States or any territory or possession thereof, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia. In case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpena, the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the persons to whom the subpena is addressed resides or is served may, upon application by the Commission, issue an order requiring such persons to appear at any designated place to testify or produce documentary or other evidence if so ordered, and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. Any member of the Commission shall have authority to sign and issue subpenas under this subsection.

"(2) The Commission may order the taking of depositions at any stage of a proceeding or investigation under this subchapter. Depositions may be taken before an individual designated by the Commission and having the power to administer oaths. Testimony shall be reduced to writing by or under the direction of the individual taking the deposition and shall be subscribed by the deponent. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and to produce documentary or other evidence as provided by this subsection.

"(3) A person may not be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to a subpena of the Commission on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence. No person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court, except that no such person shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(e) A State or local employee upon whom a penalty is imposed by an order of the Commission under subsection (c) of this section may, within thirty days after the date on which the order was issued, institute an action for judicial review of the Commission's order in the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the State or local employee resides or is employed. The institution of an action for judicial review shall not operate as a stay of the Commission's order, unless the court specifically orders such stay. A copy of the summons and complaint shall be served as otherwise prescribed by law and, in addition, upon the Commission. Thereupon the Commission shall certify and file with the court the record upon which the Commission order was based. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceeding and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce the evidence at the hearing conducted by the Commission, the court may direct that the additional evidence be taken before the Commission in the manner and on the terms and conditions fixed by the court. The Commission may modify its findings of fact or order in the light of the additional evidence, and shall file with the court such modified findings or order. The Commission's findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The court shall affirm the Commission's order if it determines that it is in accordance with law. If the court determines that the order is not in accordance with law, it shall remand the proceeding to the Commission with directions either to enter an order determined by the court to be lawful or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, is required.

"(f) The Commission, in its discretion, may proceed with any investigation or proceeding instituted under this chapter notwithstanding that the Commission or the head of the employing agency has reported the alleged violation to the Attorney General as required by Section 535, Title 28, United States Code.

"Sec. 1636. State Program on Political Activity Administration.

"(a) Any state desiring to participate in a State Program on Political Activity Administration under this subchapter may do so by establishing a state plan which is approved by the Commission for carrying out the purposes of this subchapter. The Commission shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by a state commission or agency;

"(2) applies to all 'state and local employees' as defined in Section 1632 of this chapter;

"(3) provides for such procedures as may be necessary to assure compliance with the plan;

"(4) prohibits coercive practices, solicitation, illegal payments and other activities substantially as provided by Section 1633 of this chapter;

"(5) provides sanctions, including removal or suspension of the state and local employees subject to this section substantially equivalent to the sanctions provided by Section 1634 of this chapter for the same or similar violations;

"(6) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information prescribed by the Commission, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commission to perform its functions under this title.

"(b) In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Commission, if said Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State Commission or agency administering such plan, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been changed so that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions, the Commission shall issue an order to such State Commission or agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under section 1633 until the Commission is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"(c) A copy of such order shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to such State Commission or agency and to the agency of the United States which makes the grant or loan to the State. While this order is in effect the Commission shall enforce the provisions of this chapter.

"(d) A State or State agency adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the Commission under this section shall be entitled to judicial review thereof, as provided by section 1625(e) of this chapter.

"(e) In the event that a State is found to be ineligible to participate in a program under this section, the Commission shall be entitled to exercise the same authority under section 1634 of this chapter as if the State had not proposed a program under section 1636.

"SUBCHAPTER IV—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1641. "(a) The Commission is authorized and directed to study and to report to the President within one year from the date of enactment of this Act, for transmittal to Congress the feasibility of establishing within the Federal executive branch, under the supervision of the Commission, a plan for voluntary contributions to political parties and candidates. Such study should consider the experience of the individual employees, employers and major political parties in California since the establishment of the California Good Citizens Program, and such similar plans as exist in business and industry.

"(b) The Commission is further authorized and directed to study and to report to the President for transmittal to Con-

gress within one year from the date of enactment of this Act, the feasibility of establishing within the Commission an Office of Employees' Counsel. Such study should consider the desirability of providing a single office within the Federal Government to receive complaints from Federal employees, make initial determinations as to the validity of the complaint, and make recommendations for remedy or redress.

"SEC. 1642. "(a) The Commission shall have authority to adopt and promulgate rules, regulations, and procedures as may be necessary for the proper effectuation of the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Any period of time fixed by the provisions of this chapter for the filing of a document or other procedural step in a proceeding conducted by the Commission may be extended by the Commission upon good cause found and stated by it in writing.

"SEC. 1643. If any provision of this chapter or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held to be invalid, the remainder of this chapter and the application of such provision to persons and circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 1644. An individual removed or suspended under this chapter, and subsequently reinstated or restored to duty because the action was unjustified or unwarranted is—

"(1) entitled, on correction of the personnel action, to receive for the period for which the personnel action was in effect an amount equal to all or any part of the pay, allowances, or differentials, as applicable, that the employee normally would have earned during that period if the personnel action had not occurred, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during that period; and

"(2) for all purposes, is deemed to have performed service for the agency during that period, except that the employee may not be credited, under this section, leave in an amount that would cause the amount of leave to his credit to exceed the maximum amount of the leave authorized for the employee by law or regulation.

"SEC. 3. Section 133 of Title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(a) The Secretary of Defense shall, to the maximum extent which he determines to be practicable, promulgate rules and regulations and establish programs in accordance with the policy and purposes of chapter 16 of Title 5, United States Code, for members of the Armed Forces."

"SEC. 4. "(a) The analysis at the beginning of Part II of Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the item relating to chapter 15 of such part; and

"(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new item:

"16. Political Activities.............. 1601"

"(b) Chapter 15 of such title is hereby repealed.

"(c) The analysis at the beginning of chapter 73 of Title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the matter relating to Subchapter III.

"(d) Subchapter III of chapter 73 of Title 5, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. To carry out the purposes of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $1,000,000 per year."

LEGISLATIVE MANDATE TO THE COMMISSION

(Public Law 89–617, 89th Congress, S. 1474, October 3, 1966)

An act to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members appointed under subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem of individuals.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) STUDY AND INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view of determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal.

(b) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and to the Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act[22] at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission shall contain such proposed legislative enactments as, in the judgment of the Commission, are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. secs. 192–194, inclusive), shall apply in the case of failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 2018 (Committee on House Administration).

Senate Report No. 408 (Committee on Rules and Administration).

Congressional Record: Volume 111 (1965), August 25, considered and passed Senate; Volume 112 (1966), September 19, considered and passed House.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION—BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES

Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman:* President, University of Oregon, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare 1958–61; member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for 9 years.

DANIEL B. BREWSTER, *Vice Chairman:* U.S. Senator from Maryland; member Maryland House of Delegates, 1950–58; Member, U.S. House of Representatives; Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Charles O. Jones; Professor, Department of Government, University of Arizona; associate director, National Center for Education in Politics; Brookings Institution Research Grant, 1966.

Roger W. Jones: Special Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget; Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1959–61; Chairman, Conference on Public Service, 1964.

Malcolm C. Moos: President, University of Minnesota; administrative assistant to the president, 1958–60; special assistant to president, 1960–61; director of planning, Ford Foundation.

---

[22] Extended to December 31, 1967 by P.L. 90–55.

George L. Murphy: U.S. Senator from California; twice elected president, AFL–CIO Screen Actors Guild; member of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Ancher Nelsens Representative in Congress from the Second District of Minnesota; Lieutenant-Governor of Minnesota in 1952; administrator of National rural electrification program.

Arnold Olsen: Representative in Congress from the First District of Montana; attorney general of Montana for 8 years; member of House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Frank Pace, Jr.: President, International Executive Service Corp.; Director, Bureau of the Budget, 1949–50; Secretary of the Army, 1950–53.

Robert Ramspeck: Former Representative in Congress from Georgia; chairman of the House Civil Service Committee; Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1951–52.

J. Austin Ranney: Professor of political science, University of Wisconsin; managing editor, *American Political Science Review*.

Frank M. Wozencraft: Assistant Attorney General, in charge of the Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice; former partner in Baker, Botts, Shepherd, and Coates in Houston, Tex.

NAVAL RADIO TELESCOPE PROJECT, SUGAR GROVE, W. VA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara soon will be leaving his Pentagon post, and while I do not wish to mar his exit, another of his costly mistakes has come to my attention—one which I wish to point out to his successor, Clark Clifford.

And, as I will point out, it is not yet too late for him to cancel this latest outrageous spending project.

I am referring to a piece of McNamara folly that involves the site of the ill-fated Navy radio telescope project at Sugar Grove, W. Va., commonly known as the "Big Dish."

Many Members of the Congress and the public will remember that this fantastically costly project was finally and belatedly canceled in July of 1962 after approximately $64 million in public funds had been heaved out the window.

I suspect that most Members of the Congress and the public believed that cancellation of this project meant the end of the story. Those who did were wrong.

Prudent, practical men, when they have suffered a defeat—when their judgment has been proved wrong—whether in the stock market, in business, or in any other endeavor—will chalk it up to experience and strive to avoid similar mistakes.

But such elemental caution does not, apparently, prevail among certain inhabitant of the Pentagon. Saving face is an obsession in the Defense Department, and the Navy in particular had a lot of face to save after the Big Dish incident.

Cancellation of the Big Dish earned the Navy reams of adverse publicity, but it took their face savers only 7 days to invent a solution.

They discovered—within a week—that the Navy's long-range radio station at Cheltenham, Md., near Andrews Air Force Base was experiencing electronic interference.

In a memorandum to the then Secretary of the Navy, Fred Korth, on July 25, 1962, it was stated:

> In connection with the halting of work at the Naval Radio Research Station (NRRS), Sugar Grove, and the intent to find other uses for the site, we have an electronic encroachment problem at Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland, which is getting progressively worse.
>
> We are investigating Sugar Grove as a replacement for Cheltenham; as soon as we can, we will work up cost figures.
>
> This information is provided in order that disposal of NRRS Sugar Grove may not be otherwise agreed without knowledge of this possible use.

That was on July 25, 1962. On September 25, 1962—2 months later—Korth recommended that McNamara spend $3,810,000 to move the radio receiving station to the wilds of West Virginia. Not quite 2 months later McNamara agreed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sometime after Secretary McNamara made his decision, somebody in the Pentagon decided that it might be nice if there was some justification on the record for this move, and so a study was authorized.

A Waltham, Mass., firm was given the job of finding out whether there was more or less radio interference at Sugar Grove than at Cheltenham.

The contractor said Sugar Grove was a superior site, but, it develops, the contractor had to base his conclusions "on scanty information on antenna requirements without the benefit of preliminary engineering. The antennas finally programed for installation at Sugar Grove represent a major change from those originally envisioned."

However, armed with this favorable report, McNamara—who had already approved the move to West Virginia—authorized the spending of $3.8 million of fiscal 1964 military construction funds for the project.

I can report, Mr. Speaker, that not everyone in the Navy was, at this time, taking this face-saving waste of the taxpayer's money lying down. There had, in fact, developed quite a controversy over the moving of this radio station at Cheltenham. The Navy's Bureau of Ships undertook an "in-house" review of the entire project and reached the conclusion, on July 27, 1965, that:

> The Cheltenham receiving site is a good one and does not have a serious problem of encroachment and associated man-made noise.

The Bureau of Ships report said further that:

> The Sugar Grove site has serious technical deficiencies, primarily in terrain blockage of low angle high frequency signals, ground conductivity and absence of possibilities to expand the antenna field. Land usable for antennas, after extensive earthwork, is less than 50 acres.
>
> A move to Sugar Grove will result in an initial expenditure in excess of 13 million dollars to establish a receiving site which is definitely no better, and in our opinion worse, than the present site at Cheltenham.

This report received the backing of the chief of naval material who, on August 19, 1965, agreed in writing with the Bureau of Ships and made these additional points:

> It is also noted that material support, including logistics of all kinds, will be very difficult at the Sugar Grove site.
>
> The need for additional funds to complete the project as envisioned is a particularly serious problem and reprogramming of funds for this purpose is not recommended. A portion of funds now available could better be used to modernize and make permanent the Cheltenham site, and the remainder better used on priority projects of greater military worth.

The chief of naval material went one step more by saying this to his superiors:

> It is strongly recommended that the Chief of Naval Operations consider terminating this project and leaving the receiving facilities for NCS Washington at the present site in Cheltenham, Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, the chief of naval operations apparently placed more stock in face saving than the chief of naval material because, on October 13, 1965, he suggested to Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze that the move to Sugar Grove should proceed. In support of this recommendation he volunteered the curious justification that:

> Our receiver capability at Sugar Grove will be at least as good as it is at Cheltenham, although it may not be greatly improved.

Mr. Nitze, perhaps aware by this time of the controversy within the Navy concerning this projected move of the radio station, did not buy the chief of naval operations' suggestion. Instead, he appointed a review board which concluded, on December 3, 1965, that:

> An adequate technical/operational base has not been established for moving the present communications receiving function from Cheltenham, nor to moving it to Sugar Grove, if it were decided to leave Cheltenham.

Of course, as things turned out, this opinion by the Navy's own experts was not enough, so another study—this one for just under $1 million—was authorized. RCA and the Commerce Department's Institute for Telecommunication Sciences and Aeronomy got the job.

And, in addition, Secretary Nitze established what he was pleased to call a "steering group" to oversee this third review of the 1962 decision to pour good money after bad.

In June of 1966, RCA completed its study and reported as follows:

> Sugar Grove does not appear to offer special or unusual merit as a relocation site for the Cheltenham station on the basis of propagation and radio noise consideration. Technical uncertainties in predicting performance capability, especially of large antenna arrays as installed at the site, are believed to be numerous, due to terrain conditions. The Cheltenham site does not appear to be providing obviously inferior performance at present.

The RCA report went on to say that a great amount of study would be necessary to reach a conclusion as to the possibility and likelihood of manmade interference with operations at Cheltenham in the next 20 years.

At least two members of Secretary Nitze's "steering group" are on record in connection with this RCA study and the events that preceded it, all the way back to 1962.

One member, the representative of the Defense Communications Agency, said on June 27, 1966, that:

> Based on these surveys, no clear-cut technical advantage for either site is apparent.

Another member, representing the Defense Department's Electronics and Information Systems research and engineering branch, reported on the same date that, in his opinion:

> The overall communications performance probably would not be significantly different. . . . However, to attain performance at Sugar Grove equivalent to that at Cheltenham could entail a somewhat greater cost at Sugar Grove.

Mr. Speaker, as things turned out, these gentlemen just quoted, might as well have gone fishing on the day they wrote their reports. Perhaps unknown to them, but a fact nevertheless, is that on April 25—2 months before they delivered their opinions recommending against the move to Sugar Grove, Robert Strange McNamara had delivered his opinion that the move—barring a calamity—would be made.

The next step in this ludicrous chain of events was this:

On June 29, 1966, the Secretary of the Navy received the following communication from the vice chief of naval operations concerning this costly move of the radio station from the Washington, D.C., area to the mountains of West Virginia:

> The Vice Chief of Naval Operations recommends that the Secretary select Alternative 4 (continue operations at Cheltenham essentially unchanged, diverting all or part of electronics under procurement, and providing minimum essential improvements to the installation on a programmed basis at a 5-year cost varying up to $6.6 million) and that the following language be used in support of this position:
>
> From the technical point of view it makes little difference whether or not the receivers are moved. In view of our present fiscal situation, presidential statements on minimizing expenditures, and the deferral of many projects so as better to support our efforts in Southeast Asia, the adoption of one of the more expensive alternatives does not appear warranted at this time. It could, of course, be reviewed at a later date when the financial situation may have been eased. I therefore recommend adoption of Alternative 4.

It must be remembered that the Secretary of the Navy actually had no choice, because of McNamara's prior decision to move the station, but to recommend in favor of the plan.

And that, of course, is exactly what happened.

While this move has not been completed, it has already cost the taxpayers of this Nation $5.6 million. If it is not stopped, these same taxpayers are going to shell out an additional $11 million over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the case I have just outlined came to my attention late last year and the basic points were confirmed by sources in the Navy Department I consider to be reliable.

To obtain further confirmation, however, I asked the General Accounting Office to double check and to give me its considered opinion as to the possible waste of public funds involved in this project.

The GAO has stated to me in part:

> It appears that it will cost the Government an additional $16.5 million over the next 5 years to relocate to Sugar Grove without considering possible costs for upgrading facilities at Cheltenham if the move were not made.
>
> Further, we have not been able to find any evidence that technical advantages would be realized by the relocation to Sugar Grove.
>
> We did not perform an analysis of the state of completion of the numerous contracts involved; however, we believe that savings would be realized if the project were terminated.
>
> We have been informed by an official of the Naval Electronic Systems Command that the electronics equipment purchased for the Sugar Grove site is generally common to naval communications stations throughout the world. Therefore, the equipment could probably be used elsewhere.
>
> Also, according to the Navy's own estimates, it will cost about $1 million more annually to operate at Sugar Grove than at Cheltenham. Therefore, in addition to the savings in construction costs that could be made through terminating the project as soon as possible, annual operating savings of almost $1 million could be obtained.
>
> In view of the above, it appears that the move to Sugar Grove was premised on some basis other than the relative cost associated with the two locations.

Mr. Speaker, in their usual gentlemanly, understated way of saying things, the General Accounting Office people have, in that last sentence, posed an intriguing question.

It is abundantly clear that there is no technical reason for moving this radio station from the suburbs of the Nation's Capital to the mountains of West Virginia. Indeed, it appears that it will result in great operational disadvantages.

It is clear, also, that there will be a waste of $11.5 million in public money if this move is completed, to say nothing of an additional $1 million a year in operating costs.

But it is not so clear why the Secretary of Defense—the self-annointed denouncer of waste in the Pentagon, the champion of his own so-called cost effectiveness doctrine, has approved this costly move that has been rejected by almost every technical expert who has been called upon to give an opinion.

When the new Secretary of Defense takes office I propose to make available to him the facts of this case and the views of the General Accounting Office concerning it.

I trust he will agree with the then vice chief of naval operations who said, nearly 2 years ago, that the project should be canceled "in view of our present fiscal situation, presidential statements on minimizing expenditures, and the deferral of many projects so as better to support our efforts in Southeast Asia."

STAFF STUDY BY FAA—"ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR REDUCING DELAYS IN TERMINAL AREAS"

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to a most significant study and set of recommendations made in a staff study by the Federal Aviation Administration. It is entitled "Alternative Approaches for Reducing Delays in Terminal Areas." It is focused on the problem of delays in the air and on the ground as we now suffer them and as they will undoubtedly increase with the passage of time. While not hoping to cope with all of the attending technical problems of air safety, the study does point up dramatically the urgent nature of changes and additions to our existing airport complex if aviation is to remain a viable service for the traveling public, businessmen, and the rest of the flying population. It treats of several vital geographic areas, but I would like to point out the parameters of the problem it delineates for the Chicago area.

It is no secret to those familiar with the aviation industry, nor to those citizens whose chief knowledge of aviation comes from being the fare-paying passenger, that Chicago was well named "The Hub." Just as it was the hub of ground transportation and scores of business activities for many decades, it also, with the advent of nationwide aviation service, became the acknowledged and actual hub of airline and other aviation operations. Hardly any air traveler has made trips between eastern and western points without becoming acquainted with dear old Midway Airport. In its heyday it handled more flights and more passengers than any airport in the world. And there were times when the weather was bad when one might have thought they all arrived at once.

The growth of air activity in the Chicago area can be recognized by observing the development of the great O'Hare Airport. In recent months the old and comparatively deserted Midway has become once more a terminal for airline flights to major metropolitan centers, and it will no doubt become once more a major air terminal.

But this is 1968. The future rushes at us so rapidly in the aviation business. New planes are developed which fly faster and carry many more people. More and more people find it convenient, safe and pleasant to use air transportation. And in the midst of it all Chicago is becoming a truly international city. Foreign ships unload on its waterfront, and more foreign flags can be observed in its airport. This trend will grow. It is no longer necessary for passengers to or from foreign lands to touch down at the edge of the ocean and then rearrange their travel accommodations. Now they can come to the center of things—Chicago. And they will—in ever increasing numbers.

Not a staff study nor a research paper, such as I referred to earlier, but the hardheaded projection by FAA of the future needs for air facilities at metropolitan centers disclose some startling expectations. Based upon present policies and facilities, this projection sees for the Chicago area in the 1970–80 period 14 airports of which only two would be air carrier oriented and equipped. The other 12 would be general aviation airports relieving the pressure on O'Hare and Midway. Three of these are seen as potentials for air traffic control systems. The three are Joliet, Waukegan, and Gary. Meigs already has air traffic control.

Against this very modest group of airports is projected the following expectations for traffic. In 1970 there should be 575,000 scheduled flights and 869,000 general aviation flights. By 1980 these figures will rise to 960,000 and 1,805,000, respectively. The first is nearly double and the latter is more than double.

At the same time the passenger load will rise from 15.3 million domestic and 6 million international passengers in 1970 to 44.4 million and 17.5 million, respectively in 1980.

The projections to be found in this same appraisal of needed facilities try to make some estimates of the floor space and the countering and the baggage handling necessary to keep these passengers moving. The figures are astronomical, and I will not try to outline them in detail here. What they add up to is a picture of either complete breakdown of service or the expansion of the existing airports beyond all sensible proportions, and probably far beyond any physical possibility when we take into account land acquisition problems and the rest.

To return now to the "think piece," the staff study on delays and the way to lick them before they happen. Its recommendations cover several areas and several different approaches, not necessarily mutually exclusive. First and foremost it recommends a new major airport for Chicago. After looking carefully at all of the interconnected problems of tooling up to handle the increases in traffic, that is the only one that makes complete sense. It is the only one that can tackle the problem realistically and directly. All other suggestions, such as limiting the number of operations at an airport and raising landing fees during peak hours, only nibble at the edges of the problem. And while they may help, they do not end up with more actual capacity. It is more than likely that all of these suggestions will have to be used by the time we reach the full potential of air travel.

Now that these cards are on the table and the long range solutions clear enough to constitute a call to action, I urge that the Administration take steps to implement the recommendations in this study. I urge Congress to use its legislative and appropriations authority in such a way as to promote and hasten the development of a major new airport in the Chicago area. I urge the State of Illinois and all governmental subdivisions of the State to take all possible steps to plan for and execute the necessary preliminaries to such an ambitious project.

I do make it clear that it is not just Chicago that is interested. It is all of Chicago land. Included in this is my own area in central Illinois which is served by Ozark Airlines. If we are to have service for Ozark on connecting flights, it is necessary that Chicago have the airports ready to receive the traffic.

Let us get cracking now. Let us be not merely ready when the crush of traffic arrives, let us be ahead of the need. It is the destiny of Chicago to be "The Hub," and we must do everything necessary to make it function as such—as a center of dynamic activity and not as a bottleneck of the future.

WHAT HAPPENED TO OUR ORDERLY HIGHWAY PROGRAM? DISORDER AND DISCRIMINATION WILL RESULT FROM PRESIDENT'S 1968 CUTBACK ORDER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 of this year, I took the floor of the House to discuss the most recent cutback in our highway program which, until the present administration decided to manipulate it as a fiscal gimmick, was one of the best examples of an orderly Federal-State partnership program.

Since that time, I have had an opportunity to calculate the impact of the highway cutback on the programs of the individual States. Following my remarks is a tabulation showing the amounts estimated to be available for obligation, the limiting amounts imposed upon each State, and the amount of each States' cutback in dollars and in percentages. A look at the table indicates the disorder and discrimination that will result from this 1968 cutback.

The administration has indicated that the limiting amounts for each State are not firm, but may be increased or reduced, depending upon circumstances. In instructional memorandum 30–2–68, issued January 23, 1968, the Director of Public Roads stated:

> It will be our purpose to make continuing analyses of the progress being made in utilizing the funds available for obligation under this limitation. Adjustments will be made in the schedule as appropriate to permit full use of the available funds.

What this apparently means is that the Federal Highway Administration plans to increase as it sees fit and by Executive action the amounts available for particular States by reducing the amounts to be available to other States within the cutback nationwide ceiling. This seems to me to be a very dangerous and precedent-making power to be assumed by the Administration, and is certainly not in accordance with the intent of Congress which has devoted so much effort to try to make sure that the individual States are treated fairly and equitably according to established formulas in the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds.

Some years ago, the Bureau of Public Roads inaugurated the so-called reimbursable obligation plan which was designed to limit expenditures from the highway trust fund to amounts which would be available in the highway trust fund. Under this plan, quarterly obligation allotments were made to each of the States. As of December 31, 1967, unobligated balances of reimbursable obligation allotments previously made totaled approximately $1.002 billion. The balances available to each individual State are shown in the first column of the attached table. In January of 1968, an additional allotment was made to the States of $1.1 billion. It was estimated that three additional allotments would be made during calendar year 1968 totaling $1.1 billion, $1.257 billion, and $1.250 billion respectively. It was thus estimated that there would be a total of $5.716 billion allotted and available for obligation during calendar year 1968. The cutback to $4.1 billion is 28 percent of this amount.

The Bureau of Public Roads estimated that revenues available in the highway trust fund would support obligations during calendar year 1968 of only $4.715 billion. Experience has proved, however, that ordinarily, most of the States do not use all of the funds available to them in any given year. It was estimated that allocation of $5.716 billion would result in obligation of about $4.715 billion, which could be financed by the highway trust fund.

Under the cutback imposed by the administration, obligations during calendar year 1968 would be limited to $4.115 billion. This is a reduction of $600 million below the level that could be borne by the highway trust fund, or about 13 percent less than the highway trust fund could support.

Aside from my opposition to manipulation of the Federal-aid highway program as a fiscal gimmick, I am deeply concerned about the uneven and inequitable treatment to the individual States under the plan of the administration. Those States which in the past have moved rapidly with the highway program in terms of obligating Federal-aid highway funds will not be hurt badly, while those States which have proceeded slowly will now be prevented from speeding up their programs and perhaps catching up with the faster States.

For example, Colorado, Kentucky, and Massachusetts suffer no cutback at all since the "limiting amounts" imposed on those States are greater than the amounts they would have received under the reimbursable obligation plan. This is a result of the fact that those States had already obligated practically all of the funds available to them as of December 31, 1967.

On the other hand, States which had large carryover balances on December 31, 1967, will suffer severe cutbacks. Comparing the limiting amounts imposed by the administration against the reimbursable obligation amounts which otherwise would be available to the States, we find that the cutback is some 89 percent for the District of Columbia, some 84 percent for the State of Maryland, 73 percent for Delaware, 53 percent for Florida, and 50 percent or more for several of the States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the States suffering the most severe cutbacks actually intended to expedite their programs to the point where they would utilize all or most of the available funds. If these States did expect to speed up, however, as some undoubtedly intended—including Florida—the cutback effectively prevents them from doing so. The situation under which some States have proceeded rapidly with the completion of the Interstate System, while other States are lagging badly will be perpetuated. This certainly was not the intent of Congress when it declared in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 that—

> Prompt and early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways * * * is essential to the national interest and is one of the most important objectives of this Act. It is the intent of Congress * * * that the entire System in all States be brought to simultaneous completion.

The table follows:

HIGHWAY CUTBACK

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Reimbursable obligations, balance available Dec. 31, 1967	Fiscal year 1968 3d and 4th quarter apportionments	Estimated fiscal year 1969 1st and 2d quarter apportionments	Total available reimbursable obligations, calendar 1968	Calendar year 1968 limitation	Amount of 1968 cutback	Percent
Alabama	53, 326	46, 044	52, 600	151, 970	75, 544	76, 426	50
Alaska	34, 254	18, 494	21, 200	73, 948	34, 261	39, 687	54
Arizona	2, 244	32, 328	37, 000	71, 572	60, 576	10, 996	15
Arkansas	2, 766	19, 616	22, 400	44, 782	37, 141	7, 641	17
California	720	195, 312	223, 200	419, 232	359, 258	59, 974	14
Colorado	5, 123	27, 722	31, 600	64, 445	74, 335	9, 890	+15
Connecticut	21, 604	41, 008	46, 800	109, 412	58, 449	50, 963	47
Delaware	15, 143	5, 056	5, 800	25, 999	7, 034	18, 965	73
Florida	31, 309	47, 684	54, 400	133, 393	62, 417	70, 976	53
Georgia	8, 943	35, 110	40, 200	84, 253	66, 245	18, 008	21
Hawaii	47, 339	16, 950	19, 400	83, 689	32, 737	50, 952	61
Idaho	8, 487	14, 310	16, 400	39, 197	33, 686	5, 511	14
Illinois	51, 604	117, 858	134, 600	304, 062	212, 907	91, 155	30
Indiana	20, 565	48, 090	55, 000	123, 655	107, 594	16, 061	13
Iowa	11, 342	30, 326	34, 600	76, 268	50, 837	25, 431	33
Kansas	4, 596	21, 930	25, 000	51, 526	49, 954	1, 572	3
Kentucky	8, 051	43, 382	49, 600	101, 033	102, 498	1, 465	+1
Louisiana	603	50, 838	58, 000	109, 441	96, 894	12, 547	11
Maine	5, 437	10, 734	12, 200	28, 371	16, 405	11, 966	42
Maryland	156, 144	33, 286	38, 000	227, 430	37, 282	190, 148	84
Massachusetts	325	44, 990	51, 440	96, 715	122, 411	25, 696	+21
Michigan	86	66, 676	76, 200	142, 962	126, 656	16, 306	11
Minnesota	1, 707	50, 924	58, 200	110, 831	103, 358	7, 473	7
Mississippi	3, 749	25, 686	29, 400	58, 835	49, 519	9, 316	16
Missouri	1, 661	53, 948	61, 600	117, 209	110, 247	6, 962	6
Montana	32, 833	24, 166	27, 600	84, 599	45, 506	39, 093	46
Nebraska	6, 576	16, 658	19, 000	42, 234	27, 969	14, 265	34
Nevada	9, 459	14, 812	17, 000	41, 271	19, 848	21, 423	52
New Hampshire	10, 134	10, 326	11, 800	32, 260	21, 707	10, 553	33
New Jersey	98, 020	54, 214	62, 000	214, 234	107, 606	106, 628	50
New Mexico	8, 664	26, 478	30, 200	65, 342	40, 234	25, 108	38
New York	17, 219	114, 208	130, 600	262, 027	245, 611	16, 416	6
North Carolina	1, 146	26, 546	30, 400	58, 092	54, 861	3, 231	6
North Dakota	702	12, 870	14, 800	28, 372	24, 116	4, 256	15
Ohio	22, 020	124, 024	141, 800	287, 844	206, 594	81, 250	28
Oklahoma	10, 409	26, 534	30, 400	67, 343	48, 680	18, 663	28
Oregon	10, 426	36, 638	41, 800	88, 864	63, 238	25, 626	29
Pennsylvania	52, 809	102, 712	117, 400	272, 921	193, 847	79, 074	29
Rhode Island	536	11, 984	13, 600	26, 120	21, 844	4, 276	16
South Carolina	6, 753	16, 854	19, 200	42, 807	28, 392	14, 415	34
South Dakota	3, 108	20, 770	23, 800	47, 678	39, 815	7, 863	16
Tennessee	735	46, 654	53, 400	100, 789	88, 456	12, 333	12
Texas	8, 000	113, 456	129, 600	251, 056	202, 899	48, 157	19
Utah	19, 077	30, 444	34, 800	84, 321	53, 863	30, 458	36
Vermont	7, 544	14, 134	16, 200	37, 878	34, 575	3, 303	9
Virginia	7, 234	62, 350	71, 200	140, 784	112, 751	28, 033	28
Washington	26, 977	48, 970	56, 000	131, 947	103, 803	28, 144	21
West Virginia	36, 190	44, 098	50, 400	130, 688	71, 470	59, 218	45
Wisconsin	104	24, 768	28, 400	53, 272	53, 107	165	(2)
Wyoming	8, 072	21, 070	24, 000	53, 142	33, 566	19, 576	37
District of Columbia	89, 185	25, 430	29, 000	143, 615	15, 878	127, 737	89
Puerto Rico	10, 894	3, 034	3, 400	17, 328	3, 393	13, 935	80
Total[1]	1, 001, 957	2, 200, 000	2, 514, 000	5, 715, 957	4, 115, 000	1, 600, 957	28

[1] Columns do not add due to rounding.

[2] Less than 1 percent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. **King** of California (at the request of Mr. **Albert**), for today through March 26, on account of official business—attending the Second U.N. Conference on Trade and Development.

Mr. **Corman**, for today through February 21, on account of official business.

Mr. **Rarick**, for today through February 22, on account of death of father.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Zwach**) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Talcott**, for 15 minutes, today, February 19.

Mr. **Thompson** of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today, February 19.

Mr. **Farbstein** (at the request of Mr. **Evans** of Colorado) for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. **Poage** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Edmondson** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Aspinall** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **O'Neill** of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Madden** in two instances.

Mr. **Hall**.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Zwach**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Quillen** in four instances.

Mr. **Pelly**.

Mr. **Mize** in three instances.

Mr. **Winn**.

Mr. **Brown** of Michigan.

Mr. **Ashbrook**.

Mr. **Springer**.

Mr. **Kupferman** in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Colorado) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. MOSS in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in four instances.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. REUSS in 12 instances.

Mr. PEPPER in eight instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. NIX in four instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. GALLAGHER in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in four instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1124. An act to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1526. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for an appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States (H. Doc. No. 258), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1068. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 14743, a bill to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890 (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1069. Resolution for the consideration of S. 989, an act to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15399. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 15385. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide flexibility in interest rates under the various FHA mortgage insurance programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 15386. A bill to provide flexible interest rates for mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 15387. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for disciplinary action against employees in the postal field service who assault other employees in such service in the performance of official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15388. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase monthly benefits (with subsequent cost-of-living increases), to provide higher widow's and widower's benefits, and to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes; to amend title XVIII of such act to provide coverage for certain drug expenses under the supplementary medical insurance program; and to amend titles IV and XIX of such act to eliminate certain restrictions and limitations added in 1967 to the programs of aid to families with dependent children and medical assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 15389. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15390. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that the definition of the term "disability," as employed therein, shall be the same as that in effect prior to the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15391. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to improve vocational rehabilitation training for service-connected veterans by authorizing pursuit of such training on a part-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15392. A bill to provide special encouragement to veterans to pursue a public service career in deprived areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15393. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the Enrico Fermi nuclear accelerator in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 15394. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 15395. A bill to provide salary step advancements and adjustments for employees moving to and from different pay systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 15396. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a minimum primary benefit of $70 a month, to liberalize the retirement test, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15397. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide flexibility in interest rates under the various FHA mortgage insurance programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RESNICK, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. DOW, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 15398. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 15399. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 1099. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 646. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 15400. A bill for the relief of Pius Siu-Cheung Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15401. A bill for the relief of Carlos Echegaray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15402. A bill for the relief of Jose Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 15403. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vicente G. Rubin and his wife, Dr. Fe M. Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15404. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bernardino Aragon Alonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 15405. A bill for the relief of the Sanborn Lumber Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15406. A bill for the relief of Antonio Iula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15407. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Muraca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15408. A bill for the relief of Michele Pernice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15409. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15410. A bill for the relief of Dominador G. Ferreria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15411. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pollina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15412. A bill for the relief of Esmeralda Antonia Ramierez y Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15413. A bill for the relief of Chu Yi Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

244. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the 100th anniversary of the 14th amendment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, February 19, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light.

For this sacramental moment, closing the doors to a noisy world full of terror and alarm, we enter this pavilion of quietness and peace, to acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee—Thou who hast made us in Thy image.

Make us tall enough for these testing days. Cast out our pride—national, racial, and personal. Join us to those who labor to bring sense and system to this disordered world; and, grant that our eyes may yet look upon a world that will have found a path leading to the plains of peace, universal and righteous.

In the name of the Prince of Peace, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 16, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 986, Senate Joint Resolution 138.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "America" strike out "to serve" and insert "further to advance its service to"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

S.J. RES. 138

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States calls on the Boy Scouts of America further to advance its service to the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter to the end that more boys in every segment of our society will be involved in its program and future generations of Americans will be better prepared with the skill and confidence to master the changing demands of America's future and prepared to give leadership to it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was pleased to introduce the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138, and now request favorable Senate action, calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

The great service which this organization has been to this country and its great contribution to the boys of this Nation are well known to all Americans. In 1966 Congress passed a concurrent resolution marking the 50th anniversary of the granting by act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America—the first youth organization to be granted such a charter by Congress.

This resolution again expresses the appreciation of Congress for the good work of the Boy Scouts and calls upon them to continue their great service.

This year is a significant one for the Boy Scouts of America, as they have just launched their long-range program for expansion, as expressed by Mr. Edwin H. Gott, a member of the executive board of the Boy Scouts, at the breakfast held on February 7, 1968, which 200 Members of Congress attended.

I know it is the sentiment of all of us that we wish the Boy Scouts well in their endeavor to bring Scouting to one out of three boys of the Nation and increase their membership by 40 percent in the next 9 years.

The strong support which Congress has given the Boy Scouts is illustrated by the unanimous request by all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to be added as cosponsors of this measure. I am appreciative of the support which this joint resolution received from the Senate, and I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will give prompt consideration to the passage of this worthy joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION CHANGING NAME OF THE ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE TO THE ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Army Medical Service to the Army Medical Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Publication of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "World Power Data, 1965" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the advisory committees which assisted him in carrying out any of his functions under the Social Security Act, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of NASA on Disposal of Certain Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of certain foreign excess property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Annual Report of Office of Coal Research

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1968 annual report of the Office of Coal Research (OCR) describing contract research performed during calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classification for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Academy of Sciences

(S. Doc. No. 66)

A letter from the President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

Report on Positions in Grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—REPORT ENTITLED "THE MIGRATORY FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1006)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," and ask unanimous consent that it be printed, together with the individual views of Senators Murphy and Fannin.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2985. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, in order to make widows of veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam era eligible for educational assistance under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2986. A bill to extend Public Law 480, 83d Congress, for 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ellender when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2987. A bill for the relief of Zafar H. Israili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Thurmond):

S. 2988. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Eastland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2989. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; and

S. 2990. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, under certain circumstances, to transfer or assign to the Standby Reserve persons who have been classified as key Federal employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2986—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 480 FOR 2 YEARS—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend Public Law 480, 83d Congress, 2 years, encourage greater use of funds for population control, and broaden the clause authorizing the use of foreign currencies for educational activities.

The first section extends Public Law 480 for 2 years.

Section 2 deals with population control programs. At present, section 103(a) of the act requires the President to take the foreign country's efforts to control population growth into account in administering the act; section 104(h) provides for the use of foreign currencies to finance programs related to population growth; and section 109 of the act requires the President to consider the extent to which the foreign country is undertaking self-help measures to increase per capita production.

Section 2(a) of the bill would require at least 5 percent of total sales proceeds to be made available for voluntary population control programs, if requested by the foreign country. More could, of course, be made available if the United States and the foreign country saw fit.

Section 2(b) of the bill would specifically include "carrying out voluntary programs to control population growth" among the self-help measures to increase per capita production to be considered by the President under section 109(a) of the act before entering into an agreement.

Section 3 of the bill broadens section 104(b)(2) of the act, which deals with cultural and educational exchanges. Section 104(b)(2) is now limited to activities under programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Section 3 of the bill would extend it to any activities which would either assist such exchanges, or provide for strengthening educational agencies for international studies and research under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and a number of additional listed acts.

I also want to announce again that public hearings on the extension of Public Law 480 have been scheduled for March 13, 14, and 15. All interested parties are invited to attend.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2986) to extend Public Law 480, 83d Congress, for 2 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ellender, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PRESS CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Friday last, the President of the United States called an impromptu press conference at which he made several announcements, one of them dealing with the resignation of Secretary of Commerce Alexander Trowbridge. This resignation I greatly deplore, because, in my opinion, Alexander Trowbridge has been an outstanding Secretary of Commerce. His departure will be deeply felt, and his shoes will be hard to fill.

The President also answered some questions of great and immediate import. These questions had to do with the present status of the AID program, the status of Gen. William Westmoreland, the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam, the prospects of negotiations with Hanoi, the coming visit of U Thant, relations with South Korea, and the status of our forces in Vietnam.

The President has taken a most praiseworthy initiative in answering questions which are of immediate significance and importance to the American people and to Congress which represents it as a whole. There should be no question now as to the high degree of confidence which the President places in General Westmoreland; there should be no question now as to the President's forthright statement on the possible use of nuclear weapons in which he states that "no recommendation has been made to me" about their use, and also his statement that—

> The President must make the decision to deploy nuclear weapons. It is one of the most awesome and grave decisions any President could be called upon to make.

The President was not very hopeful about talks with Hanoi. As a matter of fact, he seemed pessimistic. I detect, however, that the President, in line with his statement made early last week, is still very much open to negotiations and would welcome that possibility at any time and under almost any circumstances.

On the question of the President's meeting with Secretary General U Thant, which reports seem to indicate had been put off for some unknown reason, it was stated that it was U Thant's desire that the meeting should be this coming Friday, February 23, but that the President moved it up to Wednesday, February 21.

The President made as frank a statement as he could on the results of Cyrus Vance's visit to South Korea and also on United States-South Korean relations at this time.

In response to a question as to the possibility of increasing the level of our forces in Vietnam, the President gave as good an estimate as he possibly could at this time and has since stated that "if necessary, U.S. troop strength would go above the present stated goal of 525,000."

It appears to me, Mr. President, that this interview, undertaken at the initiative of President Johnson, was frank, straightforward, and met the issues raised head on.

I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the President's press session of February 16 at the White House, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 17, 1968]

PRESS SESSION AT WHITE HOUSE—JOHNSON: GENERAL WESTMORELAND HAS "MY FULL SUPPORT"

The PRESIDENT. George tells me that he has given you something not to announce today. I want to give you something you can announce just as soon as you get out of here.

We have accepted with very deep regret the resignation of Mr. Sandy Trowbridge, Mr. A. B. Trowbridge, the Secretary of Commerce. The resignation is effective March 1.

We will send to the Senate the name of Mr. C. R. Smith, the former president of American Airlines, and the present chairman of the board of American Airlines.

Mr. Smith was born in Minerva, Texas, and for the last 30 years has been associated with American Airlines, residing in New York.

Mr. Smith is a member of the Business Council and has been for some 10 or 12 years. He is recommended very warmly and strongly by Secretary Trowbridge and other leaders, including Secretary Wirtz, with whom he will have to work closely.

Mr. Smith has agreed to move to Washington and join us effective March 1.

As you know, some time ago Mr. Charles Murphy informed us of his desire to leave the Civil Aeronautics Board. We are accepting his resignation from that Board. For the time being, he will be a consultant to the President, acting as a counsel for me here in the White House on a part-time basis.

He will be succeeded as chairman of the board, the Senate willing, by Mr. John H. Crooker. Mr. Crooker is a member of the law firm of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & Bates, in Houston, Texas.

I first knew him 38 years ago when he defeated my debating team in Houston High School. He was a star senior debater. I later took one of my men and Mr. Crooker and they defeated the State champions.

Since that time, Mr. Crooker has graduated with honors from the Rice Institute, and with honors from the University of Texas Law School. He was on the Law Review there.

He is presently a resident of the District of Columbia, representing his firm here. His nomination will go to the Senate very shortly.

He was born in 1914, and Mr. Smith was born in 1899. Mr. Smith is 67 years of age. Mr. Trowbridge is 37 years of age.

I think that is all I have. George will give you the biographies on these men.

Q. Is it health in Mr. Trowbridge's case?

A. The doctors had some question when he became Secretary of Commerce. He went through a very thorough examination. He had had a heart problem. He decided to accept the challenge. He did a very fine job.

He has been working long and hard, but he has suffered a little relapse. He has been out for a few weeks. After completing his examinations at Johns Hopkins with other doctors in the last few days, he gave me his letter yesterday resigning as Secretary of Commerce.

We are very hopeful that we can utilize his services to the extent his health will permit in some other capacity, but we have not even discussed that.

Q. Is he returning, Mr. President, to his private company?

A. I just answered that. As far as I know, he said to me that he would be available to us for anything he could do, so far as his health is concerned. But do not think he has made any plans of any kind. I think he will have to speak for himself.

My judgment is he would wait for some time to see how his health comes along. Then if we could use him on something not so strenuous as a Cabinet job, we might be able to get him to do that. If not, he will make some private connection, I am sure.

Q. How long did he serve? From last June, Mr. President?

A. George will supply that information to you.

DEPARTURES

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned by what may seem to some as a considerable number of departures from your Administration at high levels?

A. We always hate to see anyone depart, particularly men like Mr. Trowbridge. But in the light of the circumstances, I think I wouldn't want him to stay and I don't think you would, either.

MURPHY'S DUTIES

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us anything more specific about what Mr. Murphy will be doing for you here?

A. He will be a counsel here at the White House, advising with the President, reporting directly to the President. His specific duties will be primarily legal. He was counsel to President Truman. He will be available, I think, for any assignment that the President desires to give him.

Q. I wondered, sir, if you might have any political assignments in mind for him.

A. None whatever.

CHIEF OF HEW

Q. Do you foresee a new Health and Welfare Secretary soon?

A. I don't have any immediate timetable on that. We have a very outstanding man as Under Secretary. I would anticipate that he would act for at least a few weeks.

AID PROBLEMS

Q. Mr. President, there have been some problems relative to the AID program lately. I wondered if you could give us your viewpoint as to what this amounts to, if you feel it jeopardizes your AID program this year, and what you are doing about it?

A. The AID program always has its problems with the Congress. The information I have about it is that the matter is now under consideration by the Justice Department. The Inspector General of the State Department has been very diligent in attempting to make a thorough study of the problems in the AID program. He is making his report available to the Attorney General and to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

WAR AND POLITICS

Q. Mr. President, you may have noticed that Gov. Romney now refers to our force in Vietnam as the Johnson-Nixon policy. Does that ring any bell?

A. No. I would think we shouldn't play politics with the war and try to associate it with name-calling.

I think most of the Americans at one time or another have agreed with the policy and there have been some departures from the ranks. But I am not going to say anything that I consciously believe will involve the war and the men who are fighting it in a political campaign.

WESTMORELAND

Q. Mr. President, sir, there have been some rumors in the last couple of days from various members of Congress that Gen. Westmoreland might be transferred. Can you comment on that?

A. I think that has been thoroughly covered. I should think you could observe from the sources that they are not either my confidants or Gen. Westmoreland's.

I don't want to attribute bad motives to anyone, that the Commander-in-Chief would get information about the future of Gen. Westmoreland from a Republican Congressman from Wisconsin. I think that would be apparent to almost anyone.

I think that Gen. Westmoreland is confronted with one of the great tests of his career, as we are in this country.

Just before he goes into battle there in South Vietnam—Khensanh, or whatever engagements may follow—I would not want to have him in doubt for a moment, or a single one of his men in doubt, about his standing with his Commander-in-Chief or with his superiors.

I am amazed that you would give the attention to him that you do in the light of my expression of admiration and respect for him so recently—in December, at Camranh Bay, when I spoke very personally about him and gave him one of America's highest decorations.

I have observed this question being raised. I think it was first raised abroad. It continues to be raised here every day.

I don't know how to put a stop to it, except to say that I have never known a man with whom I have worked in the military for whom I had a higher regard or a greater respect.

I would hope that that statement could end the gossip and the rumors about Gen. Westmoreland's future.

I think we all know that he has served there at my insistence and with the approval of the Joint Chiefs longer than one would ordinarily serve in an ordinary post.

But these are not ordinary times. They require each of us to help along and contribute whatever we can.

Just as Gen. Taylor said to me, "I have been away from my family now in three wars, but I am ready to go back again if they need me." Gen. Westmoreland has said that he would stay there as long as I want him to stay there.

While I don't want to be inconsiderate of him, I do think that it is in your interest and the Nation's interest, and the free world's interest, that this man, with his background, his experience and his knowledge of conditions there be there at this critical stage.

I know the credibility problem. I cannot say to you that he will never leave.

I know he has been there over four years already. But I can tell you that I have no intention of seeing him leave, I have no plan for him to leave, and, if I did have, I don't think it would come to you the way it did.

I think all of you should give consideration to how these things come to you. Because if you flash around the world the doubt that someone has and then remove that doubt he has to make a statement, when, in the normal routine of things it should be changed, then you say, "You misled us." So if you get it either way—"Have you stopped beating your wife?"

I said to Gen. Westmoreland, when I saw reports in the intelligence of what was being said about him, and I saw them picked up by certain overseas newspapers, and before they came into wide circulation here but appeared, I think, in one brief reference, that I wanted him to know very bluntly that I had never known a man in the military whom I had more confidence in. I don't know how to go any stronger than that.

But there is a campaign on to get over the world that we have doubts in Gen. Westmoreland. That campaign I don't believe is going to succeed. It is not going to succeed with me. I have no doubts about his ability, about his dedication.

If I had to select a man to lead me into battle in Vietnam, I would want Gen. Westmoreland.

Does that make it clear to anybody and everybody, including all the foreign press that may want to pick it up?

You see, what irritates me is that I see these things about a week or two ahead of time. They originate, go around the world and then they get real hot here. There are reasons for doing these things. One of the reasons is to destroy people's confidence in the leadership.

With all the men we have at stake there, with all the lives that are involved—I just don't think that is the way to play it.

I see where Gen. Westmoreland may be named a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have never discussed that with Gen. Westmoreland for one second.

So far as I am concerned, if there is any way Gen. Westmoreland could go, it would be up. Right now, he has the most important assignment I know of, and I am going to try to help him. I hope I am helping him by making it clear—repeat, clear—loud and clear—that every person that I know of who deals with Gen. Westmoreland has great respect and confidence in him.

A-ARMS IN VIETNAM

Q. Mr. President, could you address yourself, please, sir, to the gossip and rumors about nuclear weapons in Vietnam?

A. I think the press secretary covered that very well.

The President must make the decision to deploy nuclear weapons. It is one of the most awesome and grave decisions any President could be called upon to make.

It is reasonably apparent and known to all that it is very much against the national interest to carry on discussions about deployment of nuclear weapons, so much so that the act, itself, tries to guard against that.

I have been in the Executive branch of the Government for seven years. I think I have been aware of the recommendations made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense during that period.

So far as I am aware, they have at no time ever considered or made a recommendation in any respect to the employment of nuclear weapons. They are on our planes on training missions from time to time.

We do have problems. There are plans with our allies concerning what they do.

There is always a person available to me who has full information in connection with their deployment, as you newspapermen know. I think if any serious consideration were ever given, and God forbid there ever will be, I don't think you would get it by some anonymous caller to some committee of the Congress. I think most of you know that, or ought to know that.

No recommendation has been made to me. Beyond that, I think we ought to put an end to that discussion.

HANOI TALKS

Q. Mr. President, do you see any new, hopeful prospects for negotiating with Hanoi?

A. We look for them every day.

I would like to be able to say "yes." In the last few days, preparatory to closing out the statement that Secretary Rusk issued yesterday, I believe, or the day before, we reviewed Hanoi's actions in response to more than 20-odd proposals made by well-intentioned and interested people.

We reviewed the many overtures that we had made, including the most recent one where we thought we went as far as honorable men could go—the San Antonio proposal.

As near as I am able to detect, Hanoi has not changed its course of conduct since the very first response it made.

Sometimes they will change "will" to "would," or "shall" to "should," or something of that kind. But the answer is all the same.

While we were prepared to go into a Tet truce, they were moving thousands of men from the North into the South for the subsequent attacks on that sacred holiday. I think that ought to be an answer that any elementary schoolboy or girl could understand.

If you want to go to the negotiating table, if you want to talk instead of fight, you don't move in thousands of people with hundreds of trucks through the night to try to catch people—innocent civilians—by surprise in the city, anticipating a general uprising.

We are familiar with all the approaches that have been made to them, and we have encouraged them all the time. But when it is all said and done, I don't want to leave the American people under any illusions, and I don't want to deceive them.

I don't think Hanoi is any more ready to negotiate today than it was a year ago, two years ago, or three years ago. I don't think it has been at any time during any of that period.

Yes, Mr. Lisagor?

MEETING SET

Q. Could I ask you whether your review included anything you may have had lately from the Secretary General of the United Nations, or does that await your visit with him next week?

A. The answer is "yes," that does include such reports as we may have on conversations that have taken place in other capitals.

We have responded on occasions to other requests the Secretary General has made of us. We applaud his efforts to try to bring about a just negotiation, and to get all sides to the peace table.

Ambassador Goldberg had a long meeting with the Secretary General and got a full report on his recent trip, just as I got a full report on Prime Minister Wilson's recent trip.

I have received a good many reports from folks who have visited other capitals. We are always glad to hear those reports, although we are saddened, sometimes, that they don't bring us the hope we would like to have.

Ambassador Goldberg told me that the Secretary General would like to see me. He had been to the Soviet capital and met with the leaders there. He had been to the British capital and met with the leaders there.

He has been to India. He has been to the French capital and met with the leaders there.

I told the Secretary General that, of course, as long as I was in this place, I would always be glad to meet with him any time that he desired to. He suggested next Friday. I told Mr. Goldberg that I didn't know what plans you might have for Friday, but George tells me you always get a little restless, jittery, tired, worn and snappish on Fridays. Washington's birthday is Thursday. Maybe if we wanted to get the maximum out of this, we ought to be here where you could be with us on Wednesday. So we moved it up to Wednesday.

On Wednesday I expect to see the Secretary General and thank him very much for another try, to hear his views and to give him mine.

Q. Will this be lunch or dinner that he is coming for?

A. That will be 11 o'clock.

INTELLIGENCE REPORTS

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned a worldwide movement or scheme to undermine confidence in the American military leadership.

A. No, I don't think I said a world-wide scheme, I said we first heard reports in our intelligence reports that come to me every morning. At that time, the strategy was to discredit Gen. Westmoreland's leadership. He had suffered great losses out there.

That was before it was determined that they didn't hold any of the cities they had attacked. But that followed with comments in other capitals, as it frequently does; namely, that there was great division in Washington, and that it was very probable that because of this great disaster Gen. Westmoreland had suffered, he would have to be recalled.

All I ask you to do is just imagine how you are going to feel if the rumor is around that the Chicago Tribune is getting ready to replace you and it gets into the papers, even when you haven't a battle on. Put yourself in Gen. Westmoreland's position.

The very morning that we anticipated one of our most difficult attacks, this came through in reports.

I called in my secretary and dictated a wire to Gen. Westmoreland. I said, "I want to put it just as bluntly as I know how, that your Commander-in-Chief has never had more confidence in any military officer with whom, under whom or above whom he served. Whatever you choose to do here will have my full support."

I made it just as strong as I know how to write it. Sometimes down in my country you can make things pretty strong. I didn't circularize it because I thought that would just give added encouragement to those who would like to feel there was a division.

I did, in response to a series of queries from a number of people, send him a wire. I told only one man and my secretary. I hadn't told Secretary McNamara and I hadn't told Secretary Rusk.

That afternoon I had three inquiries from newsmen about the wire saying, "We know you sent it to him. Give it to us."

I learned I couldn't even trust anyone on a matter like that except my secretary.

I haven't made the wire public, but I am telling you the contents of it.

That happened many days ago and I feel just as strongly about it now as I did then.

I want to emphasize that I don't want to leave the impression with any soldier in that command, with any parent of any man out there, that there is any justification whatever for all this rumor, gossip, talk, about Gen. Westmoreland's competence or about his standing with this President.

SOUTH KOREA RELATIONS

Q. Mr. President, how do you assess United States relations with South Korea in the wake of Mr. Vance's visit?

A. I think Mr. Vance's visit was a fruitful one. I think he had a very cordial and understanding discussion.

South Korea feels very distressed about the attempt that was made to assassinate their President and all the members of his family, as we certainly do.

We feel very deeply our problem connected with the Pueblo.

We have an understanding a treaty, with them.

Mr. Vance had spent a good deal of time on matters of this kind in the seven years he has been here.

He had lengthy talks with the Defense Minister, and the President.

He made that report to the Cabinet Committee yesterday. We thought it was a very good report and his mission was a very helpful one.

FORCES IN VIETNAM

Q. Mr. President, are you giving any thought to increasing the level of our forces in Vietnam.

A. Yes, we give thought to that every day. We never know what forces will be required there. We have, tentatively, a goal. We would like to reach that goal as soon as we can. In light of the circumstances that existed when we set that goal, we hoped to reach it sometime this year.

In light of the developments and the subsequent substantial increases in the enemy force, Gen. Westmoreland asked that he receive approximately half of the remaining numbers under that goal during February or early March.

Did you mean enemy forces or our forces?

Q. Our forces.

A. I said in light of substantial increases in the enemy force. You understood that, didn't you?

Q. Yes.

A. So Gen. Westmoreland told us that.

We carefully reviewed this request in light of the information that had come in. We made certain adjustments and arrangements to comply with his request forthwith. That will be done.

When we reach our goal, we will be constantly reviewing the matter many times every day, at many levels. We will do whatever we think needs to be done to insure that our men have adequate forces to carry out their mission.

WILSON STATEMENT

Q. Mr. President, in light of your earlier comments on negotiations with North Vietnam, could you discuss with us the basis for Prime Minister Wilson's statement to the House of Commons, that there was only a narrow margin between the U.S. and Hanoi positions?

A. I have given you my views. I assume you have means of getting any details of the Prime Minister's from him.

My views are very clear. I don't know anything I can add to them.

If I have confused you somewhat, I will be glad to help clear it up.

I have told you that I have never felt that they have changed their position, modified it, or moderated it.

The Press. Thank you, Mr. President.

ADDITIONAL SIGNER OF CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a signer of the cloture motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HAYDEN INITIATES ACTION ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe it is well to note that 56 years ago today, the dean of this body, the senior Senator from Arizona, the President pro tempore [Mr. Hayden] entered Congress.

It is also of interest that Senator Hayden is initiating hearings today on the 1969 Department of the Interior appropriation bill. This was one of the two appropriation bills which passed the Senate prior to July 1, last year. It is anticipated that the dean of this body, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will lead the way this year in bringing about faster action on the appropriation bills, to the end that, if at all possible, we may adjourn, with all hope, by August 2.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I applaud the statement of the distinguished majority leader that we adjourn early in August, and I recommend that we bear that in mind every day we are here.

PROPOSED TRAVEL TAX

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the United States is faced with a serious and dangerous deficit in its balance of international payments.

The Nation has had a payments deficit every year since 1950, with the exception of 1957. President Johnson said recently that the deficit for 1967 was between $3.5 and $4 billion.

This means that the United States last year spent from $3.5 to $4 billion more for goods and services in foreign countries than those countries spent in the United States.

Continuing deficits for so long a time and in such great amounts are a threat not only to our own economy but to the economic health of the entire free world. Such continuing deficits in Great Britain recently contributed to the devaluation of the British pound and the resulting hardship to the people of that land.

The vulnerability of the U.S. economy was recently dramatized when France began cashing in its dollars for U.S. gold in "an attack on the dollar."

President Johnson recently proposed that we reduce our payments deficit by severely taxing Americans who travel outside the Western Hemisphere.

The new tax proposals make me wonder if we are not about to lose a right which was guaranteed by a ruler more than seven centuries ago. The Magna Carta, approved in 1215, provided:

> In the future it shall be lawful (except for a short period in time of war, for the common benefit of the realm) for anyone to leave and return to our kingdom safely and securely by land and water, saving his fealty to us.

The measures which the President recently proposed would:

First. Impose a graduated tax on all overseas expenditures outside the Western Hemisphere by American tourists and businessmen.

Second. Reduce the duty-free exemption for American tourists from the present $100 to $10.

Third. Eliminate the provision which allows Americans traveling abroad to mail tax-free presents to people in the United States.

Fourth. Impose a 5-percent tax on all overseas airline tickets and on ship tickets for destinations outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I agree that the payments deficit is serious and we must undertake measures to alleviate the pressures on our economy.

I expect to be able to support a head tax or ticket tax to the extent that they might help the balance of payments.

OPPOSITION FOR THREE REASONS

But I am opposed to a per diem tax or heavy discriminatory taxes which operate unfairly against selected groups of our society for three reasons.

First of all, I do not think they will materially affect our balance of payments.

In its most recent annual report, the U.S. Travel Service said that 16.6 million Americans traveled outside the borders of the United States. But four-fifths of those travelers went to Mexico, Canada, and other points within the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, the proposed taxes would have an effect on only about one-fifth of the Americans traveling out of the country. How can one realistically expect that to make a substantial contribution to balancing our international payments?

Of the 3 million people this bill is designed to affect, I venture to say that most of them will continue traveling as in the past. The casual tourist to Europe will simply shift his plans to go north or south instead of east or west.

In other words, although these taxes may have the laudable effect of shifting American expenditures into the Western Hemisphere instead of Europe and Asia, it will do mighty little to improve our payments balance since the money will be leaving the United States in any event.

Second, while the travel tax will not make a major contribution to balancing our payments, it will hurt some people who are least able to pay the increased cost of travel.

Some people will have to go to Europe. The teacher of Italian language or Roman history needs to visit Italy. The Greek scholar must visit the land where his language and history were developed. The pilgrim to the Holy Land cannot shift his plans to travel in the Western Hemisphere. These people will be penalized. But they will not be stopped, and the money will flow out of the United States anyway.

Finally, the administration's travel proposals would establish an increased bureaucracy to collect the new taxes, which will considerably reduce the net yield.

Mr. President, these travel tax proposals are a mere drop in the bucket and I suggest that the Congress ought to take another look at the bucket.

POSITIVE APPROACH

I strongly recommend that we take a positive approach to the imbalance of payments and try to do those things that would not decrease American travel and trade, but rather would increase the flow of foreign expenditures into the United States and perhaps inhibit the outflow of U.S. money through other measures.

In its January 1968 report, the Treasury Department called attention to a statement made previously by President Johnson that, "the most satisfactory way to arrest the increasing gap between American travel abroad and foreign travel here is not to limit the former but to stimulate and encourage the latter."

Although 16.6 million Americans traveled abroad in 1966, only 8.5 million foreign visitors came across our borders. It is logical to assume that we could be doing more to get foreign visitors into the United States.

I was cosponsor of the legislation which created the U.S. Travel Service—USTS—in 1961. The USTS is primarily responsible for encouraging foreign travel in the United States, but the national administration has never been willing to fight for congressional approval for full funding of the Travel Service.

Last year, the U.S. Travel Service operated with a $3 million budget—a budget that compares with $10 million for Canada, $10 million for Spain, $7 million for Mexico, $5 million for France, and $5 million for Greece. I do not understand why the United States cannot spend as much to promote tourism in America as the Spanish Government does to promote their tourist trade. I have cosponsored the International and Domestic Travel Act of 1968 which would, among other things, increase the USTS budget to $15 million. Would this not be a reasonable expenditure of seed money to encourage more of the lucrative tourist trade into the United States?

I also fail to understand why our Government has not undertaken any of the travel-incentive innovations to attract more foreign tourists, such as:

An incentive plan which would provide $100 in trade stamps to foreigners visiting this country for the first time to help defray the costs of their airline tickets, hotel rooms, and meals—costs to be shared equally by the participating U.S. businesses and the Federal Government.

The use of vacant university dormitories for visiting groups of foreign students.

Discounts for foreigners purchasing and driving a U.S. car during their vacation in this country.

Low cost airplane tickets on a "space available" basis for foreign visitors in this country, and for transoceanic flights for foreign students coming to this country.

Obviously, however, we need to do more than stimulate increased foreign travel to the United States.

The administration urges that the balance-of-payments deficit requires that we restrict Americans' travel abroad. I suggest an alternative far less harsh than limiting what many consider a basic freedom. The U.S. Supreme Court in 1958 held:

> Travel abroad may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic on our scheme of values.

I propose that we reduce our balance-of-payments deficit by strengthening industries of vital importance to our national security and preserve American employment at the same time.

STEEL

One of these industries is steel.

In 1967, the value of steel imports exceeded the value of steel exports by more than $877 million. When this figure is adjusted to exclude Government financed exports and to include freight and insurance charges—normally included in the value of imports of most other nations—our steel trade deficit in 1967 amounted to $1.1 billion.

It would indeed be of material help to our balance-of-payments deficit to reduce some or all of those losses. But, we have other reasons to undertake such actions in support of American steel.

Steel is a vital commodity to our defense effort. It is crucial to our national security and must be kept viable and able to expand promptly to meet the Nation's demands. In 1967, steel imports accounted for approximately 12.2 percent of our national consumption of steel. What would this Nation do in time of national emergency if our foreign sources of steel were suddenly cut off?

It has been estimated by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] that about 6,400 people are now employed in our steel plants for every million tons of finished product shipped in a year. Senator HARTKE estimates that an additional 1,300 persons are involved in coal and ore mining and in transportation. Thus, Senator HARTKE concludes, every million tons of domestic steel mill production means employment for approximately 7,700 Americans.

Therefore, the 11.5 million tons imported in 1967 can be reasonably considered to have deprived 88,550 Americans of jobs in the steel and steel-support industries.

Any effort to reduce this outflow of dollars would be helpful. Therefore, I am cosponsor of the Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act of 1967, a moderate quota bill that limits imports in any year to 9.6 percent of recent consumption.

TEXTILES

"Textiles have been declared second only to steel as a prime necessity for our defense," according to a recent study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Textile imports, which had totaled 5 percent of domestic production in 1961, jumped to 10 percent in 1966. In 1966, the latest year for which figures are available, textile imports contributed $800 million to our balance-of-payments deficit. They also are estimated to have replaced more than 200,000 jobs directly and more than 100,000 jobs indirectly.

Ironically, one of the centers of our textile industry, which is particularly hard hit by increased exports, is Appalachia, where we are spending millions of dollars in assistance programs for the hard-core unemployed. Senator JOHN PASTORE, of Rhode Island, has estimated that 435,000 jobs—26 percent of all manufacturing employment—in Appalachia are in danger.

Almost half of all our textile imports come from Japan and Hong Kong, two very affluent areas of the world and neither of which is in need of American assistance at the price of American unemployment.

It is worth noting that the U.S. average wage for textile workers is $2 per hour. In Japan, it is 36 cents per hour. In Hong Kong it is 25 cents per hour.

Therefore, I urge enactment of S. 1796, the textile import quota bill, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation would limit future imports of textile products to an average of their recent annual quantity.

I urge Congress to consider most carefully the administration's proposals to reduce deficits in our international payments. There is no question that something must be done. The question is where it can be done most effectively and at least cost to America's long-term interest at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by Mr. John Chamberlain, which appears in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1968]

NIGGLING TRAVEL TAX UNNEEDED TO WIPE OUT U.S. DOLLAR GAP

(By John Chamberlain)

If you send a boy to do a man's job, he's got to be some boy. But in proposing a travel tax on American citizens to cut the deficit in our balance of payments, the Administration would be sending a baby on a Batman's mission.

The U.S. Treasury estimates of the amount of balance of payments savings that would derive from limiting tourist travel run between $300 and $500 million a year. It looks like a tidy sum, but savings it is to be achieved by doing conspicuous hurt to a lot of vocal foreigners in the hotel, restaurant, amusement, and air travel business who would assuredly do their best to provoke retaliation.

By drumming up further distrust of America, the outraged critics would lend impetus to the move to cash in paper dollars for gold. This could be truly ominous, for there are already ten times more dollars in foreign hands than would be saved in a year by all of the Administration's defensive proposals.

Given the atmosphere of revenge that a tourist tax is bound to create, our $12 billion in gold would melt away like snow in April.

The sad thing about it is that the niggling negativism of the Administration is entirely unnecessary. There are several good ideas floating around the halls of Congress that might be picked up by an Administration eager to close the balance-of-payments gap by a positive expansion of the world's energies.

For example, Rep. Henry Reuss of Wisconsin has proposed a travel incentive subsidy to Europeans who are anxious to visit America, cashable in the form of stamps at hotels and on air lines and trains.

Reuss thinks the expansion of business that would result from this would generate the taxes needed to pay for the subsidy.

This column has already written about Eugene M. Lang's ideas for giving tax incentives to exporters and to small American companies which have patents and know-how to contribute to overseas industries in exchange for stock.

Vance Hartke of Indiana is among those Senators who have expressed an interest in Lang's proposals. Lang, for purposes of identification, is a New Yorker who has specialized in acting abroad as an agent for American businessmen who lack the time and the knowledge to cope with unfamiliar languages, laws, and markets for themselves.

Senator Hartke is very much aware of the huge refugee "Eurodollar" pool that exists abroad. Consisting of dollars held by overseas American companies and by Europeans, this pool amounts to more than $16 billion, which is more than the whole U.S. gold reserve. It stays abroad for reinvestment because of the Interest Equalization tax. If repatriated and reported as earnings, it would be subject to the regular 48 per cent corporate tax rate.

Hartke says "we could bring at least $2 billion of it home immediately, with more to come, if we would immediately reduce the tax to 26 per cent.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL OPEN OCCUPANCY LAW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, for the last several days, the Senate has been debating the fair housing amendment to the pending civil rights protection bill. In rising to support this amendment, I want to compliment my colleagues who have already spoken for its adoption. An informative and valuable record is being built during this important debate.

Senators who have preceded me in presenting the case for the pending amendment have covered its provisions and the arguments against it in great detail. My purpose in rising today is to reiterate my deep concern with the crisis in human relations that exists in America today and to underscore the urgent need for doing something about it.

On August 20 of last year, I invited the attention of the Senate to an editorial entitled "America at the Crossroads," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of that date. The editorial was written in the midst of the senseless and destructive riots that ravaged many communities across the land.

America is indeed at the crossroads. Are we one nation under God, indivisable, with liberty and justice for all? Or are we to be two nations—one for the vast majority of citizens who just happen to be white, the other for the Negroes who just happen to be black?

That is the crux of the issue of civil rights. I opt for one nation, and I believe that almost all Americans prefer that alternative.

Are we going to accept our Negro brethren as human beings? Are we going to allow them the same opportunity for a good life that is available to white Americans? Or are we going to cordon them off in ghettos where they can, at best, live as second-class citizens, or, more likely, die a slow death in hopelessness and despair?

The choice is simple and it is clear. The continued existence of the United States as a single united country demands that we accept the Negro as one of us, to be treated just as we whites expect to be treated—as a man.

We are talking nowadays about laws—a civil rights protection law, a fair housing law, and others. They are necessary and worthy of support.

But I realize that the problem encompassed within the questions I have just asked is one of the spirit, of attitudes. I realize that government by law cannot tell a man to love his neighbor as himself. This is an act of conscience. But those of us in government and in other walks of public life can appeal to men's consciences.

That is what I am doing today.

There is, ultimately, one argument for a fair housing law and for any other measure designed to guarantee equal opportunity for all of our citizens. It is compassion.

I believe that the invocation in the fourth chapter of Genesis still has bearing. We are, whether some of us like it or not, our brother's keeper. The Negro residing in North Philadelphia, Pa., or in the Shaw area of Washington, D.C., is every bit as much our brother as our neighbor in Montgomery County, Pa., or its namesake in Maryland.

Each of us owes it to God, country, and ourselves to care for our fellow man. We are our brother's keeper. This is what compassion means.

Compassion compels me to favor equal opportunity for all. Compassion and a sense of what is just motivates my support of measures designed to insure an opportunity for decent housing.

The disturbances of recent summers should have taught us a lesson by now. We cannot fence the Negro in. The inner cities of our great metropolitan areas and the Negro ghettos of our smaller cities as well are seething with frustration bordering on desperation. White Americans cannot keep the lid on while looking the other way.

It is patronizing to pretend that our Negro brethren are malcontents who should be grateful for what they have. Nor is there any use for those of us, who are conscious of the plight of our Negro brethren, to run away from their problems.

A national open-occupancy law is badly needed. Its enactment, while not instantaneously curing our society's ills, would represent a step forward in the struggle to secure equal opportunity for all our citizens.

In enacting this measure, Congress would not be insensitive to the feelings of the vast majority of Americans who enjoy freedom of choice in housing. For one thing, this legislation would go into effect gradually between now and January 1, 1971, so that they would have the opportunity to become fully acquainted with its provisions and to understand that its implementation would not result either in a massive outflow of residents from the inner cities or in a deterioration of property values or the quality of neighborhood life. Knowledge and time can correct mistaken notions.

Also, the fair housing law would not be harsh or vindictive. In every instance involving an allegation of housing discrimination, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be required to settle the issue through conciliation leading to voluntary compliance. Failing voluntary settlement, he could issue a cease-and-desist order which, if not observed, could result in a fine. The emphasis in enforcement, then, is on moral suasion with a minimum of compulsion.

Open housing is near the top of vital measures remaining on the unfinished civil rights agenda. It is pointless to talk about education or job opportunities for individuals who, because of discriminatory barriers erected against them, cannot secure decent housing for themselves.

Shelter is one of the bare necessities of life. If we indeed accept the Negro as our fellow man and fellow citizen, we should have no qualms about giving him as much of a chance to find a decent home as the next man who just happens to be white.

This is what fair housing is all about. I urge adoption of the pending amendment.

GUIDEBOOK FOR A WORKABLE REVOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an interesting book review of Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. Since Mr. Young's comments are relevant to the pending Mondale-Brooke fair housing amendment to H.R. 2516, I ask unanimous consent that his review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDEBOOK FOR A WORKABLE REVOLUTION

Triumph in a White Suburb. The Dramatic Story of Teaneck, N.J., The First Town in the Nation to Vote for Integrated Schools. By Reginald G. Damerell. 351 pp. New York: William Morrow & Co. $5.

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

"Integration . . . presents something of a paradox: it is an idea most whites fear and dread and resist hysterically, yet accept when it happens. Courage and leadership are necessary to make it happen." This is one of the conclusions Reginald G. Damerell draws in "Triumph in a White Suburb," an excellent reportorial account of Teaneck, N.J., a town which faced the issues of racial discrimination in housing and education. His is an important book, and a well documented one.

His conclusion suggests some questions worth asking. Why does integration present a paradox? And why is it an idea most whites fear and dread and resist hysterically? One of the interesting facets of the matter discussed by Mr. Damerell is the fact that much of the fear, dread and hysterical resistance is due to "the discrepancy between the Negro stereotype and reality." In other words, people become so color-conscious they become color-blind. In his description of how a ghetto, a very expensive and well-groomed ghetto, was formed by panic selling in the northeast section of Teaneck, he tells the story of a white couple selling their house in panic and mistaking a white couple for Negroes simply because they thought that none but Negroes would be interested in buying it. In another case the white friend of one of the first Negroes to move into the area completely forgot about making any racial distinctions and complained to him that Negroes were moving into the area.

Coupled with this, the author describes most of the white reaction to Negroes as Pavlovian, conditioned response. If a white builds a $35,000 house in an area containing $20,000 houses, he has made an improvement. If, on the other hand a Negro built the same house in the same neighborhood—whether he were a baseball hero or a nuclear physicist—property values would be bound to plummet and the neighborhood would be "degraded."

Interestingly enough, Negroes do not play a large role in the action of the story. Instead, it is a story in which panic selling creates a ghetto, the ghetto creates a racial imbalance in the school system, which in turn creates a battle for quality integrated education, and with the success of that battle the ghetto is broken up by whites buying back into it. Another thing that plays a large role in the story is the nature of prejudice. Mr. Damerell illustrates the smallness of the number who are "pro" and the small number of those who are "con," and the vast number waiting on the sidelines to be motivated one way or the other, vacillating between the sentimentally emotional appeal of prejudice and the sense of doing what is right, ethically and patriotically. The Negro, in simply being Negro, is a catalyst in the battle. His humanity is beside the point, and at the same time, the only point. This is the paradox.

I will never forget the meeting during which a Negro woman asks, with tears in her eyes, what is expected of her race. Education, she has found, does not matter. Wealth, dignity, honesty do not matter. Nothing matters. It is the plight of the minority that the majority sees it and envisions it as a dark, faceless mass bent upon destruction. The minority is envisioned as the embodiment of an idea that can—for instance—create panic, enough panic, so that one professional earning more than double the national average and living very, very well, can allow the influence of a realtor, who is spreading lies and suspicion, to change his attitude and his life, so that he succumbs to panic selling. It is the plight of the minority that it must have the consent of that confused and inarticulate majority in order to live.

While Teaneck may be unique in a number of ways (it is primarily a bedroom community for New York City, composed of highly educated, middle-class people who enjoy high incomes), it is not unique in its reactions, moods or expressions. As a matter of fact, in 1949 the Civil Affairs Division of the United States Army selected it as the model American city, an example to the people of occupied Germany and Japan. This was before the term, "New Neighbor" became a euphemism for "Negro" in the life of Teaneck. Teaneck tried so hard to avoid its racial problem that it tried translating it into terms of anti-Semitism and anti-Communism. But the ruses did not work. Today, it is a model American town which created heroes in the American tradition.

They are the heroes who are not led, but lead. They are the heroes who worked. They are the heroes who were color-conscious, but not color-blind. Foremost among them was their level-headed Superintendent of Schools, Harvey B. Scribner.

There are lessons to be learned in "Triumph in a White Suburb," and they are: democracy works against slander and fear if there are people ready to work against slander and fear; the stereotype is ineffective against reality; committed individuals, even though small in number, can influence and motivate those in need of guidance.

There are a host of other invaluable lessons; Mr. Damerell has written a guidebook for workable revolution—revolution that can work within this country, within its towns and cities. And it is a guidebook for those who believe in the precepts of our system, our Bill of Rights, our Constitution, our moral rights.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] be recognized for 40 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLLUTION OF CALIFORNIA WATERS BY FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the quality of our environment has been too long ignored. Now, as the air and water pollution problems of many areas of our country approach critical proportions, the outcry and the reaction are great. All levels of government are concerned. Some are taking action. In many instances the Federal Government is leading the way in combating and preventing the pollution of our environment through application of technology and of financial assistance programs. But this is not always the case. It seems to me that the Federal Government should get its own house in order first, certainly before berating the pollution control efforts of others.

On November 14, 1967, I requested the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of the Interior to provide a study of waste treatment practices at Federal installations in California. Last week I received a report covering 99 of the 1,271 federally owned installations and facilities in California.

While a great percentage of the large number of installations and facilities are office buildings, post offices, and other facilities connected to municipal sewer systems, or unoccupied land, unmanned automatic facilities, such as navigational aids, and very remote, seldom-visited places; there are many extremely large, often city-sized installations on which great activity and large numbers of people exist. It is the pollution control activities of these large installations and facilities that concern me primarily.

While the report to which I have referred indicates that many, indeed most, of the Federal installations in California are responsible to carry out pollution control duties, there are some dangerous examples of continuing threats to California waterways posed by some of our Federal facilities. For example: At the Alameda Naval Air Station, 525,000 gallons per day of industrial waste from paint booths, plating shops, aircraft washing, and photo laboratories are discharged into San Francisco Bay after passing only through oil separators. At the Lemoore Naval Air Station in Kings County, 600,000 gallons per day of domestic waste water with excessive solids and boron are discharged into the Kings River after treatment, and 100,000 to 600,000 gallons per day of storm drainage runoff with high mineral content drains into the Kings River from the air station with no treatment at all. At the naval industrial reserve facility at Todd Shipyard in San Pedro, Calif., 50,000 gallons a day of domestic waste is discharged into the west basin of Los Angeles Harbor, after only primary treatment—settling and skimming—while 100,000 gallons per day of cooling water and an unknown quantity of chemical waste is discharged into the west basin under permit issued by Los Angeles City Health Department. From the Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station in Orange County, 140,000 gallons of primary treated and chlorinated domestic sewage is dumped into Anaheim Bay. At Lassen Volcanic National Park over 1,000 gallons per day of effluent from campground septic tanks leaks into Summuit and Manzanita Lakes.

While correction of these and other inadequate pollution control practices has been promised, I intend to insure that the Federal facilities in my State will not contribute to the pollution of our bays, streams, and lakes. I want to encourage and support the continuation, and possible expansion, of the Federal pollution control assistance and research going to the States, localities, educational institutions, organizations, and individuals. We must not ease our efforts to restore and protect our environment until that goal is achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a listing of the inadequate waste water disposal practices to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, ALAMEDA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 525,000 gpd industrial waste from paint booths, plating shop, aircraft washing, and photo laboratory discharged into San Francisco Bay after passing through oil separators.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, CONCORD, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 4,500 gpd primary treated and 3,000 gpd untreated domestic sewage from toilets on piers and wharf discharged into San Francisco Bay Tidal Area.

NAVAL FUEL DEPOT, POINT MOLATE, RICHMOND, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 6,000 gpd domestic sewage discharged into San Francisco Bay after primary treatment in Imhoff tank and three septic systems. Other septic tanks discharge to subsurface soil absorption fields.

NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE, KINGS COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 600,000 gpd domestic wastewater and excessive dissolved solids (from infiltration) and boron (2.0 mg/1) discharged into Kings River after secondary treatment. 100,000 to 600,000 gpd storm drainage runoff with high mineral content drains into Kings River.

NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 2,000 gpd domestic sewage from pier area treated in septic tanks and discharged into Long Beach Harbor.

NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE FACILITY, TODD SHIPYARD, SAN PEDRO, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 50,000 gpd primary treatment domestic waste discharged into West Basin, Los Angeles Harbor.

100,000 gpd cooling water and unknown quantity of chemical waste discharged into West Basin. Permits in each case have been issued by Los Angeles City Health Department.

NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION, PASADENA ANNEX, SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 10,000 gpd domestic sewage discharged into the Pacific Ocean from the headquarters area, San Clemente Island.

EL TORO MARINE BASE, ORANGE COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 1,200,000 gpd sewage receives secondary treatment with post chlorination. Unknown quantity of industrial waste discharge to San Diego Creek with skimming only.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, SEAL BEACH, ORANGE COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 140,000 gpd primary treated domestic sewage discharge to Anaheim Bay after chlorination.

NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE, CORONADO, SAN DIEGO, COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: Industrial waste from equipment wash racks flows through grease traps and is discharged into San Diego Bay.

NAVAL AIR STATION—MIRAMAR; MIRAMAR, SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 25,000 gpd untreated industrial wastes discharged to normally dry bed of Rose Canyon Creek.

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 160,000 gpd primary treated and chlorinated domestic sewage discharged into the Oneonta Lagoon. The Regional Water Quality Control Board recommends prohibition of any sewage discharge into the lagoon.

NAVAL STATION, TREASURE ISLAND, SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: *Yerba Buena Island*—20,000 gpd primary treated and chlorinated sewage discharged into San Francisco Bay.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY NAVAL SHIPYARD, HUNTER'S POINT, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: Overflow of combined storm-domestic wastes discharged into San Francisco Bay during wet weather. Some proportion of 75,000 gpd untreated industrial wastes discharged into San Francisco Bay.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, STOCKTON, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 250,000 gpd primary treated domestic waste with post chlorination discharged into Burns Cut-off.

SAN FRANCISCO NAVAL SHIPYARD, MARE ISLAND, SOLANO COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 1,600,000 gpd domestic sewage receives primary treatment before discharge into San Pablo Bay. During heavy rains some untreated sewage overflows from combined sewer system into Mare Island Strait. Part of 150,000 gpd untreated industrial waste discharged into sanitary sewer system and part into Mare Island Strait.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, SKAGGS ISLAND, SONOMA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 130,000 gpd primary treated and chlorinated domestic sewage discharged into Second Napa Slough.

PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE, POINT MUGU, VENTURA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 360,000 gpd main base domestic waste provided sedimentation followed by oxidation and polishing ponds with discharge to Mugu lagoon. (Equivalent to high level of secondary treatment.) 40,000 gpd from Beach Officers' Club and Transportation areas treated in six septic tanks with effluent discharged to West Mugu lagoon.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER, PORT HUENEME, VENTURA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Navy

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 700,000 gpd primary treated domestic sewage chlorinated and discharged into the Pacific Ocean at Port Hueneme Harbor. 100,000 gpd industrial waste discharged into Port Hueneme Harbor.

OAKLAND ARMY BASE, OAKLAND, ALAMEDA COUNTY

Department of Defense—Army

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 500 gpd wastewater from vehicle wash rack (Bldg 1073) discharged into San Francisco Bay through storm drain after passing through grease and sediment traps.

FORT ORD, MONTEREY COUNTY

Department of Defense—Army

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 2,577,000 gpd effluent from waste treatment plant bypasses clogged percolation beds to a storm drain which discharges onto the beach at Monterey Bay.

KLAMATH AIR FORCE STATION, REQUA, DEL NORTE COUNTY

Department of Defense—Air Force

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: 29,000 gpd primary treated domestic sewage and 100 gpd industrial waste discharge into Pacific Ocean.

MATHER AIR FORCE BASE, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Department of Defense—Air Force

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: Undetermined quantity of industrial waste flows through oil skimming device in main drainage ditch leading to Morrison Creek.

LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK, SHASTA COUNTY

Department of the Interior—National Park Service

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment:

a. North Summit Campground. 500 gpd effluent from septic tank seeping into Summit Lake.

b. Manzanita Lake campground. 500 gpd effluent from septic tank seeping into Manzanita Lake.

PARKER DAM CAMP, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Department of the Interior—Bureau of Reclamation

Type of Discharge and Present Treatment: Effluent from septic tank serving 250 persons discharged into defective subsurface absorption field near the Colorado River.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, SACRAMENTO JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Saturday, Februray 10, 1968, I had the honor to speak before the State board of directors meeting of the Sacramento Junior Chamber of Commerce, in Sacramento, Calif., under the auspices of the Sacramento Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Sacramento Junior Chamber of Commerce is composed of splendid young people representing business and industry in California, and, beyond that, across the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a partial text of my comments on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING THE FABRIC OF OUR SOCIETY

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the State board of directors meeting, Sacramento Junior Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Calif., February 10, 1968)

A little less than 52 years ago, in St. Louis, Missouri, Henry Giessenbier, Jr., brought together 32 young men dedicated to serving the interests of their neighbors and their community. The group called itself "The Young Men's Progressive Civic Association." Today, as you well know, that organization has skyrocketed to a membership of about 275,000 Americans and goes by the more familiar title—The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. Despite this fantastic growth and a title change, its simple goal remains the same. Close to 6,000 communities throughout America are receiving the benefits of unselfish service by their local Jaycees.

I am highly honored to join with members of the California Junior Chamber of Commerce, as you meet in Sacramento, and as you seek better means by which to achieve your goals.

In these days of growing challenge to America, when grave and ominous events seem to unfold with increasing rapidity almost every day, when even the most rudimentary order has been difficult to maintain in some parts of this land, the task of serving our society becomes far more crucial and important for each of you in your communities, for every public servant at every level of government, for every American who cares about his country's future. Today, as never before, the challenges we face, in our cities and across the oceans do not merely threaten the needs of man in his daily existence—they threaten the very survival of the entire human race.

On one occasion, an envious European was heard to say: "God takes care of drunks, little children, and the people of the United States." Be that as it may, I am thankful that the Lord has been on our side. We have grown to greatness under a Constitution written to bring our people the blessings of liberty. We stand as a symbol of success to virtually every other nation on earth. We have achieved unparalleled prosperity. We have made affluence obtainable by our people to an extent unknown in recorded history. Our ability as a people and as a Nation to produce material prosperity is a goal now actively sought by all of the world's developing nations. It is said that based on our average growth rate, we will have by 1971, a Gross National Product exceeding one trillion dollars. We have been generous, sometimes to a fault, with our friends, and we have cared for the needs of our vanquished enemies. Over the years, we may actually have acquired a tiny bit more of human virtue.

But our prospect for future development here at home is diminished by the gathering clouds of economic unrest and social upheaval. The historic America of our forefathers' dream was a land of hope and promise. But the sad fact is that there are some among us who sneer at our society and our laws, whose motivation seems based on hate and destruction.

Last summer, Americans bore witness to one of the most terrible chapters in our history—whole sections of some of our largest and model cities devastated by civil disorder and riots which led to death and destruction. And the chapter is not yet over—police, community leaders, leading sociologists and some who want to start a new inferno, have predicted guerrilla warfare in American streets in 1968.

This free society of ours cannot afford repeated holocausts brought on by people who wish to destroy our very way of life. It is about this pressing public question that I wish to speak today.

Thus threatened from within and from afar, faced with overwhelming economic and social turmoil, every American is rightfully concerned with the continued survival of society as we know it.

But our response to date has been limited. To truss up our economy, we have turned too often to political expedients. To find solutions to our urban problems, we have turned too often to government. The result has always been the same—a growing centralization of Federal Government and little success in finding and resolving the underlying causes of our social and economic disorder.

To be sure, the answers are not simple. Government does have a legitimate role to play. But some have long since lost sight of the need to meet the challenges with a balanced approach. Perhaps the most helpful key to restoring order to our society and our economy is found in your own Jaycee creed: "We believe . . . that economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise." If there is any lesson to be learned from our history, it is that we have reached a pinnacle of success through our system of free competitive enterprise.

This system represents the sinews and vitality of the Nation. Our productive assets, our machines, our money and plants are owned by private enterprise. It organizes the means by which we join with our fellow man to produce goods and services, to build fantastic transportation and communication systems, to bring food to our tables and clothes to our backs. It has built our cities and our vast nationwide industrial complex. And yet, the vast resources and potential of this unique social and economic system remain largely untapped in the effort to meet the urgent municipal and domestic needs of a Nation in deep trouble.

Two hundred years ago, Dr. Samuel Johnson wrote: "A merchant's desire is not of glory, but of gain; not of public wealth, but of private emolument; he is therefore rarely to be consulted on questions of war or peace, or any designs of wide extent and distant consequence."

Today, Dr. Johnson's self-centered merchant cannot afford to remain aloof from the world around him. His personal success or failure mean little in a world where human society itself is threatened. Today's businessman must accept his social responsibilities along with everyone else and increasingly involve himself in the solution of America's problems. This is the meaning of your organization's existence. It must clearly be the meaning of our society.

Business today can invest capital in programs to improve our urban way of life in the same way that it has invested in long-range research and development programs in the past. Pioneers of private enterprise have led the way:

Chad McClellan, a Los Angeles businessman, who was in General Eisenhower's administration, mobilized job opportunities within the business community for the unemployed of Watts. He began this chore following the disastrous Los Angeles riots of 1965 and his work has become a model for other communities throughout America.

Aerojet General Corporation established a subsidiary company in the Watts area to employ the residents of this area. This new subsidiary, called the Watts Manufacturing Company, employs more than 200 local residents.

Lockheed and McDonnell Douglas Companies have special training programs for the hard-core unemployed youths.

Equitable Life Assurance Company runs a training program in New York City for high school dropouts, mostly from slum areas.

Conrad Engineering has worked for a year with other firms developing new products to be utilized in an "instant rehabilitation" project on the Lower East Side of New York City.

Alcoa and Reynolds Metal Companies have invested in a considerable number of urban renewal projects throughout the country. Reynolds is now building over 10,000 low-cost homes in Philadelphia along with commercial and industrial facilities.

And the list goes on—Armstrong Cork, Hallmark Cards, Holiday Inns, New York Life, Sears Roebuck, Westinghouse and many others—all engaged in projects to rid our cities of urban blight, to provide additional housing and jobs, to bring the light of opportunity for the first time into the disadvantaged segments of our society.

These projects are working where Federal programs have failed. And with the heavy financial commitments we have abroad and the increasing evidence that Federal efforts alone are not enough, Congress is beginning to realize the urgent need to bring private enterprise into the battle against urban problems.

In the last two Congresses, some of us introduced the so-called Human Investment Act to provide tax incentives to corporations who would undertake job training programs for residents in low income areas, and build in those areas in their own programs of expansion.

During the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation to permit and encourage Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance in riot areas. Using Watts as an example, lending agencies were afraid to make loans for home purchases because the area was considered high risk. My proposal was approved by Congress though there were those who opposed it. And then it was difficult to get FHA to implement it. Today, well over a year from the date of enactment, hundreds of applications are being taken from riot areas all across the country under this proposal. Recently, some of our Nation's largest insurance companies banded together to commit one billion dollars to finance housing in urban poverty areas—something they could not have done without my legislation and the sharing of the risk provided by FHA mortgage insurance. This shows, it seems to me, that free competitive enterprise can and will participate in meeting the urban crisis, and that there are equally vital roles for both government and private business to play.

It is hoped that a new housing bill, encouraging private industry to invest in the construction of private housing will come to the floor of the Senate shortly for debate and approval. There is an urgent need to apply our orderly processes to improving the lot and the hopes of the disadvantaged, to bringing better opportunities for education and jobs for all who are able-bodied.

In the forthcoming months, Congressional hearings are expected on a number of additional proposals, some of which would provide tax and interest rate subsidies to induce large-scale private investment in low-cost housing. Another would provide loans to small businesses locating in low income areas. Still another would give tax credits to corporations relocating in urban poverty areas. These proposals indicate that private enterprise will be called upon with increasing frequency in coming months to play a larger role in urban problem solving. The issues involved are complex and varied. Intensive thought, planning and decisions at every level will be required to achieve an effective program designed for solving the most paramount of our urban challenges.

YOUR ROLE OF LEADERSHIP

But these positive steps to improve our society can never be taken in an atmosphere of violence and disrespect for the law. A citizen in a free society has a far greater role of responsibility to government and to his neighbor than his counterpart in a closed society. Our free and ordered form of government is both the pinnacle of man's struggle to date and the foundation for his future hope. There is an obligation on the part of every citizen to obey and respect the laws that govern the land. Abraham Lincoln once stated in these passionate words:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his prosperity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country. . . ."

Today, American society is being challenged not only by those who believe that violence is an alternative to equality but also by those who would contend that violence is the path to equality. The murder of a policeman during a riot in Detroit is just as wicked as the killing of a civil rights worker during a march in Selma, and the people of this country intend to tolerate neither. Heterogeneous nation, Buddhist—black, white.

This Nation was created to give expression, validity and purpose to a spiritual heritage—the supreme worth of the individual. In such a Nation—a Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal—racial discrimination has no place. Our fellow man ought to be judged on his worth, not on his skin. It cannot be reconciled with a Constitution that guarantees equal protection under law to all persons. But civil wrongs will not create civil rights. Every citizen, rich or poor, black or white, big or little, has a responsibility to his country and his neighbor, which runs concurrently with the rights that are his under our Constitution. Each of us ought to have a respect for man, regardless of race, color or creed, but an equal respect for the law and order that is so essential to the domestic health of our Nation.

This Nation cannot afford to sanction terror of any kind or for any reason in the streets of any American town or city. No man has the right to break the law in order to try to improve the law. No individual or group, at any time, for any reason, has the right to exact self-determined retribution. Usually, retaliation, taking the law into one's own hands, injures the innocent at random and provokes counter-retaliation against those equally innocent. It cannot be permitted or condoned. Our imperfections do not justify tearing down the structures which have given us our progress. That, my fellow citizen, is the way of anarchy.

The only means by which a lasting solution will come is by an abiding faith in the respect for the orderly processes of our free and open society. Where there is a wrong, there is a remedy. The law is both a guardian of freedom as well as an agent for freedom.

In the current session of the Congress, the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act is the heart of the national strategy against crime. It recognizes as the basic need the devotion of more resources in the control of crime. It would strengthen the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. The nation that spends $13.7 billion a year for liquor and $8.8 billion for tobacco, spends only $2.8 billion for all police, local, state and Federal, and only $4.2 billion for all criminal justice. I support the goals of this legislation and believe this program must be closely coordinated with state and local government. I am also hopeful that the so-called Law Enforcement Education Act of 1967, a bill which I have co-authored, will be enacted in the near future. It would provide valuable assistance to those seeking to pursue a law enforcement career.

Other major legislative proposals now pending before the Congress deal with such areas as organized crime, criminal court procedure, corrections reform, the use of electronic surveillance equipment, riot control, firearms control and police-community relations.

I do not believe that free travel across state lines for the purpose of committing a breach of the peace or violence should go unchecked, and I think this is a matter for close Congressional scrutiny. It is, of course, true that 41 of our states today provide effective laws against the incitement of riots. The concept of any Federal legislation in this field was brought forward to help law enforcement authorities to take action against clear instances of incitement, where the elements of fact are clearly established at law, and where interstate movement of persons bent on spreading destruction, whether or not part of an organized plan, cannot be countered by processes now available to the states. Certainly, any Federal anti-riot law should not abridge the basic rights of movement or of free speech. At the same time, we have a responsibility to protect our free society from those who would seek to destroy and violate the rights of others. The so-called Lindbergh kidnaping law is an example of what I have in mind.

Another controversial piece of legislation concerns the control of firearms. Much of the argument on this bill, it seems to me, has been emotional—on both sides of the issue. Of course, I believe that each individual state should have the responsibility for the regulation of guns. California requires a waiting period of five days for the purchase of a concealable weapon. This permits a thorough investigation of the buyer by the police. Our State wisely prohibits convicted felons and mental incompetents from possessing firearms.

But while California has some excellent firearms controls, some states have almost no regulation. That, of course, is their prerogative. It is between such differently regulated states, however, that Federal controls are needed in my view. Not regulation to inhibit the California hunter; not regulation to prevent the law-abiding citizen from keeping a gun in his home if he feels he needs it for protection. Surely, however, prevention of sales to minors, to felons, to feeble-minded. What we need is a Federal law to control, or to regulate, the flow of arms between one state and another. It is time now to pass such a law based on facts, on logic, and on need.

The indiscriminate flow of master keys across our state borders is another area requiring Federal attention. One of the leading causes of auto theft in America is the uncontrolled sale and misuse of the so-called master key. For a small, minimal price, any citizen—law-abiding and criminal alike—can obtain a key which will open the door of literally hundreds of cars. It is essential that interrelated Federal and state laws be enacted making it illegal to sell, possess or receive keys unless they are for legitimate users. I have introduced such a bill in the Senate which would require that no master key shall be shipped in interstate commerce to a person prohibited by state law from receiving or possessing such a key. Law enforcement agencies have endorsed this proposal.

Our grievances, whatever they might be, must be settled in the halls of Congress and in the courts, surely not in the streets. Manmade laws, with all its weaknesses, can be changed and improved by well-organized and well-directed persuasion and orderly process, better to assure fulfillment of the human needs and spiritual aspirations of all men—not only within nations but hopefully, some day among nations in the still woefully lawless areas of the globe we all inhabit. The comparatively peaceful, orderly transformation of the law of our own society during the last half century demonstrates that a law-abiding, orderly society may overcome ills and make progress for its people. And, in the next half century, and beyond, the American dream will remain constant, and freedom will remain our most precious commodity. Change is the law of life. Change will continue to come to America. Let it always be within the law of our American society.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATES AND REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Wednesday I had the honor to speak at a Republican meeting sponsored by the San Diego County Republican Central Committee, in San Diego, Calif.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if this speech was partisan?

Mr. KUCHEL. The speech was vigorously partisan, but not violently so. I pointed out what I believe are some of the flaws of this administration and the manner in which the administration has faced up to its public problems. As I am sure my able friend will understand, I attempted to give some of my views on public questions.

I know, without any hesitation whatsoever, that my able friend's reservation will be temporary in nature and that my remarks will be spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would not want to deny history the benefit of the Senator's remarks. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. KUCHEL. Both history and I thank my able friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The partial text of the address by Senator KUCHEL, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

MEETING LINCOLN'S CHALLENGE

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Republican Associates and Republican Central Committee of San Diego County, Calif., February 14, 1968)

This ceremony is devoted to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, savior of a nation, emancipator of a race. His entire lifetime personifies the cause of human liberty, a cause which human beings still fight for and die for all around this globe today. He gave the new Republican Party a breadth of vision. He gave it an inspiration to national purpose. That inspiration continues a century later to point the way for our country and our party to follow. It is a high road, and a difficult road. It is the road of duty.

Our country today is in the midst of a crisis, a crisis which demands the best that is in each of us. The American people yearn for and need new leadership, new vigor and new dedication, in the White House. I deeply believe that such leadership can come from one source alone, and that is the Republican Party.

In the 1860's Lincoln and the Republican Party were the man and the party of freedom. In the 1960's and beyond, the men and the Party of Lincoln must continue to champion the liberty of man at home and in the chaotic world which crowds in on us.

First, the Republican Party will not abandon the cause of freedom for all citizens to enjoy equal rights under the law. Dwight Eisenhower realized full well during his years in the White House that it is our party which has the historic record in this field, and that it is our party which must continue to make freedom real for all citizens, including the descendants of slaves. It was in President Eisenhower's term that the first Civil Rights bill in the Twentieth Century was passed—and enforced. Since then, Republican Congressional leadership has continued to play a vigorous role in the forward progress of equal justice under law.

When we say, "equal rights under law," we cannot escape the importance of the word "law". For it is law, respect for it and enforcement of it, which permits one man to enjoy his freedom without destroying the rights of his neighbor. A man must have the freedom to move through his city without fear, whether he is a white man or black. As I stated just last Saturday in Sacramento, the murder of a policeman during a riot in Detroit is just as wicked as the killing of a civil rights worker during a march in Selma, and the people of this country intend to tolerate neither.

Within our country, too, economic freedom is the way of Republicans as much today as a century ago. If it were a Republican leadership in the White House, the investment tax credit would not be made a plaything by whimsical politicians who profess to court business one month, destroy business incentives the next, and upset financial planning along the way. But this is precisely what the Lyndon Johnson Administration did.

With economic freedom comes responsibility, and fiscal responsibility is an historic, basic tenet of our party. Again, I am confident no Republican President would practice the budget jugglery which permitted this administration to magically reduce a possible 28 billion-dollar deficit to the misleading eight billion-dollar figure which hypocritically headlined the 1968 State of the Union Message.

Now, I believe we can make economic freedom appealing in this party, at the same time that we serve the interests of freedom of opportunity. It is our party which has stimulated business and industrial growth. So it is our party which can rally private industry to help our cities, to help our downtrodden, and still to prosper themselves.

If you will permit me, I will give you an example of legislation in which I participated. After the Watts riots, private lenders and real estate men came to me to say there would be little or no building of homes in South Central Los Angeles because there was no assurance—or insurance—that a lender's security would not go up in smoke. Now, I happen to believe that a man will participate more in his community when he has a stake in it. It is a basic tenet of private enterprise, and I think it is an incentive toward respect for one's own property and his neighbor's. I wanted to see homes built and see them owned where possible by their occupants. The Federal Housing Administration, which is as inflexible and fearful as any government bureaucracy, could apparently see no long range value in sharing the risk with business. I drafted legislation to permit the FHA to insure mortgages on homes in riot-prone or riot-threatened areas, over the heated objections of the FHA itself. The bill, I am pleased to say, became law. But it was many months and the nation's worst riots later before FHA implemented the law. Only last fall, with the incentive of FHA risk-sharing, which my bill specifies, the nation's leading insurance companies committed $1 billion to a private effort to rebuild our cities' low-cost housing. I prefer that approach to so-called public housing, and I am sure you do.

The list of Republican encouragement to business to participate in the broadening of opportunity goes on: The Human Investment Act, designed to prod business into training and hiring more of the unskilled; the Percy housing bill, designed to give private industry an incentive to build low cost housing which our poor citizens may buy. Some elements of our bills have been incorporated in administration proposals—hardly a sign of leadership, but surely a sign of sense.

As we turn our attention beyond our borders, we see change. We need not fear that change, if we maintain, as Lincoln did in his day, a steadfast commitment to freedom and an unbound confidence in the people of America to meet the challenges change brings.

Change is the irresistible law of life for any vital society. It means to less fortunate nations, the opportunity to grow, to prosper and to attain freedom. Many, in our day and before, have sought change only to find themselves cruelly misled by the misnamed catchword "revolution". The wake of bloodshed left by perversion of this once noble concept has underscored, by contrast, the value of our own American system. Peaceful exchange of power from one political party to another is one of the dynamic secrets of politics in the United States.

In 1957, President Eisenhower said in his Second Inaugural Address: "Across the globe there harshly blow the winds of change. And we—though fortunate be our lot—know that we can never turn our backs on them."

Eisenhower spoke with deep conviction. He knew from experience the terrible ravages of war and the bitter aftermath of peace-hopes unattained.

The bright promise of the United Nations, born in the blush of victory after World War II, was soon riven by dissension and indecision. America's reaction was shared by those independent western European nations who yearned for a common defense of freedom in the Atlantic Community. Under General Eisenhower, we undertook a broad range of defense and development agreements with those lands which had begun to fear, and had reason to fear.

America's new policy of collective security was, by and large, a bipartisan effort. Republicans played a role far beyond their minority powers. I recall with pride the name of the great Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan who brought to our nation a clear understanding that there must be an interdependence among free peoples in defending their freedoms, that the United States cannot "go-it-alone" as some kind of a world policeman. Vandenberg and the men of the 81st Congress laid to rest the lingering ghosts of isolationism which is outmoded and gone in today's world.

In the Eisenhower Administration, our policy of collective security was brought to fullest growth. Republican leadership brought our nation to a position of preeminent strength, a sticking place for the hopes of independent peoples throughout the world, an open-handed partner for those who yearned to move forward and prosper in freedom.

Our policy was geared in part to maintaining the strongest deterrent against a surprise nuclear attack. The Soviet know the peril of total war. They know that any sudden nuclear attack against us would bring unerringly a retaliatory, obliterating strike against her own homeland.

War had finally become a Frankenstein, in the words of the great MacArthur, and the victor was in the same mortal danger as the vanquished. But it was equally true that under the Eisenhower Administration, our government recognized that anything less than full national preparedness was an invitation to disaster. And we successfully maintained a preeminent military strength. Let it be remembered on this occasion that the Democrats' charges of "missile gap" in the 1960 campaign were false, and the Democratic administration, after gaining the White House, publicly confessed that they were false.

The bright hopes for the collective security of the 1950's are also fading. Today, even among the democracies, there are those nations no longer able to move with the times. In a fit of vengeance against his friends, our one-time ally, General de Gaulle, has isolated his people in a narrow policy of false pretenses. His treasury demeans our dollar, although his own economic system cannot do without dollar support. His battalions are withdrawn from NATO, even though France retains the protection of its nuclear umbrella. And his foreign minister cynically disclaims any interest in Asia, where legions of brave Frenchmen gave their lives at Dien Bien Phu.

Let us return to one historic moment, and read a cable that Robert Guillain, correspondent for Le Monde, cabled in May of 1954, as Dien Bien Phu fell and he reported the agonized and defiant spirit of the men who faced the enemy. The spirit was a "We'll show them" spirit, directed not only at the enemy and the Vietnamese, but at the people of France, too:

"We'll show the people of France, the people of France above all. They have to be shown. They have to be shown what their neglect, their incredible indifference, their illusions, their dirty politics, have led to. And how best may we show them? By dying, so that honor at least may be saved . . . Our dead of Dien Bien Phu died, I claim, protesting, appealing against today's France in the name of another France for which they had respect. The only victory that remains is the victory of our honor."

Ladies and gentlemen, let our fighting men never have occasion to say such a thing about the United States and her citizens at home.

The luxury of indifference holds no attraction for the people of America. We know that the current of history cannot flow backward. The course for our free and mighty people in the Twentieth Century is not an easy one. We move through dangerous waters.

The world was stunned by the reckless disregard of international law in the seizure of the *USS Pueblo*. We had come to believe that even Communist nations had sense enough to abide by minimum rules of safety against mischances which might trigger vast nuclear destruction.

The Communist cause of North Vietnam was well served in the act of piracy by North Korea, and it was not an isolated affront. Four days before the incident Communist infiltrators tried to assassinate the South Korean President. Over the last two months, North Korea has poured out a crescendo of propaganda and provocations—clear signs that it was looking for trouble with its free neighbor to the south.

Why did mighty America take so little heed of this coiling viper? We have much at stake in Asia, and much to sacrifice if war were to erupt out on a second front.

Last March in Los Angeles I warned: "The United States is today not only the most powerful military nation in the world, but the most powerful in the history of civilization, and yet, the supreme paradox—we are more vulnerable today than ever before."

Our duty now is not easy. We must learn the lessons, and the cost, of the kind of negligence that only the mighty can commit. As a Senator, I have called upon the President for a full inquiry—not simply to fix blame but to learn if we might take some protective measures so as to lessen the hazard of repetition.

But that investigation must await a far more urgent public business. Our first concern is the safety of the 83 men of the *Pueblo*, and our government has a duty to see that they are returned. Diplomacy, backed up by an effective disposition of force, must be given full opportunity to effect their release. We pray to God that our diplomatic efforts shall not fail, for the alternative is grim, indeed. For no doubt should be left in the minds of North Korean leaders that we have the ability, the flexibility and the determination to meet an act of piracy, to obtain release of our illegally held men, or to move swiftly against a nation which harms its prisoners. A correct North Korean estimate of our firm determination is the best guarantee of the success of our diplomacy.

Our South Korean allies have joined in the fight for the freedom of South Vietnam. South Korea deserves our support. I welcome the decision of the United States to increase Korea's military strength, particularly it is to be hoped, to the ROK Navy and Air Force.

Our major effort in Asia for the past four years has been concentrated on bringing security and independence to the people of Vietnam. America has a deep stake in the peace and stability of Asia. Three times in the past generation we have sent our men across the Far Pacific in defense of peoples who would resist aggression, subversion, and the latest Communist tactic, the so-called War of National Liberation. America must not throw away what our men have fought so valiantly to attain. Nor must we delude ourselves into ever accepting a false peace settlement masking only a hypocritical cease-fire.

There is some opinion at home, that the future of South Vietnam is unimportant to the United States. The argument runs that our defenses are not dependent on keeping Vietnam within the precincts of the Free World. It contends that the much abused domino theory has no relevance, that we can walk away from Vietnam leaving a few mere millions in Communist hands. That opinion seeks to reinstate the anachronisms of isolation, which, as I said earlier in these comments, is dead and gone.

The free nations of the Orient are dependent on the system of collective security to which we belong. Almost every free nation from Burma to the Philippines and from Laos to Indonesia has had to deal with a Communist insurgency in the past 20 years.

These nations want to grow, to leave behind the unproductive ways of lost centuries and to become part of the modern world. But they might be bullied into Communism if, in some misguided rush to end the fighting, America were forced out of Asia. The Prime Minister of Singapore, not always our flatterer, recently said: "The wrong kind of conclusion to the war in Vietnam can absolutely unscramble the whole lot of us in Southeast Asia."

Our men in Vietnam are courageously determined and undeniably able. They have been called, with justice, the finest armed force America has ever put in the field. They believe in what they do. We cannot desert them here at home.

Let there be no mistake. There is no simple answer. There is no easy out through negotiations—unless we wish to leave the defense of Asia in shambles. Nor is there a magic, overnight military solution. The bulk of the effort to cleanse their country has to be done by the Vietnamese themselves.

Our faith is in a world community of free peoples. Where there is will and determination to persevere, and to remain free, above all else.

Carl Sandburg said of the Great Emancipator: ". . . the most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there today, tomorrow and for a long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of the lovers of liberty, men and women, who understand that wherever there is freedom, there have been those who fought, toiled and sacrificed for it."

My fellow Republicans, the memory of Lincoln, and the challenge which it poses, shall not find us wanting.

FISHING FOR AGREEMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, international disputes over fish date back centuries. In the past, solutions to such disputes have run the gamut from the use of force to agreements dividing the catch between or among the disputing nations.

In a speech delivered at the recent 61st annual convention of the National Canners Association at Atlantic City, N.J., Donald L. McKernan, special assistant to the Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife, made a most persuasive case that in the days ahead the old ways will be inadequate to insure that a starving world makes the best use of the great renewable resources of the sea.

As the world's population continues to increase more rapidly than the world's production of food, competition for ocean resources will intensify.

Ambassador McKernan offered two principles on which fishing nations could build new apparatus for settling fishing disputes. He said:

> The first of these areas lies in a greater acceptance by all nations that ocean fishery resources should be harvested with due regard for the maintenance of the yield of the resource. This means that the biology, distribution, biological statistics and other vital statistics must be gathered by the nation or nations fishing the resource. It follows that regulation of the catch according to this scientific data must ultimately occur.
>
> The second area of importance is that of recognizing and accepting the special interest of the coastal state in resources lying off its coast and of further defining more clearly the limitation on the rights to freedom of the seas as they apply to fisheries.

The Ambassador then concluded:

> I would predict that if the nations of the world would accept these two conditions, 'fishing for agreement' would be more successful and the developing schism between distant water fishermen and coastal fishermen would be substantially reduced.

Mr. President, I believe these suggestions should be pursued not only by industry, but also by our Government. Certainly all the people of this Nation and, in fact, all the people of the world have an interest in seeing that the resources of the sea are harvested in such a way to encourage growth and to insure continuity of the resources.

Mr. McKernan's first principle means that this Nation should step up its research in the sea, a step which President Johnson announced in his state of the Union message.

In the second area of importance, the United States is involved in a dispute with certain South American nations over the definition of "the rights of the freedom of the seas as they apply to fisheries."

If there is to be an orderly development of such definitions, U.S. fishing vessels must be encouraged by our Government to exercise the rights of the freedom of the seas and fish within the 200-mile zone over which these nations claim jurisdiction. To do otherwise would be to encourage other nations to extend fishing jurisdictions haphazardly, resulting in fuzzier rather than clearer definitions of the rights of coastal fishing nations, resulting in more rather than fewer opportunities for disputes, leading to more ruthless rather than more intelligent use of ocean resources. That is why it is important that the Congress enact this session amendments to the Fishermen's Protective Act giving our fishermen the support they need to exercise an international right.

Mr. President, as much as I agree with Ambassador McKernan's two principles of fishing for agreement, I would be less than candid if I did not add that the United States will play an ever-diminishing role in the orderly development of world fishing resources if the United States does not reverse the current downward trend of its fishing industry. It seems quite clear to me that if we cease to be a fishing nation we will have as little to say about world fishing agreements as a landlocked country. It would be tragic indeed if such were to come to pass considering that this Nation has the most to gain from agreements defining the rights of coastal States in fishery matters, for indeed, the resources of our coastal waters are second to none.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador McKernan's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISHING FOR AGREEMENT

(Address by Donald L. McKernan, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife, January 23, 1968 at 61st Annual Convention, National Canners Association, Atlantic City, N.J.)

Many of us in this room have been concerned for years because the fish catch of United States fishermen has remained static. From 1940 to the present time the total domestic catch has varied between five and seven billions of pounds. The failure in the growth of United States fisheries is in sharp contrast to the three-fold increase in world fish catch from 1940 (Table 1) to the present and the very large increase of about 70 percent in the consumption of fishery products in the United States. The consumption of fishery products here at home has never been greater than at present with a per capita consumption rate of over 60 pounds per person. At a time when the use of fish is at an all-time high in this country, domestic production continues to lag; our demand for fishery products is supplied from abroad. In 1966, 65 percent of the available fish supply in this country came from imports, an all-time high.

TABLE 1.—WORLD FISH CATCH AND THE CATCH OF SOME IMPORTANT FISHING COUNTRIES[1]

[Millions of metric tons, live weight]

	1940	1950	1955	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
World catch	21	20.4	28.2	37.7	42.9	46.3	47.4	51.6	52.4	[2] 56.0
Peru	(3)	.1	.2	3.5	5.3	7.1	6.9	9.1	7.4	(3)
Japan	(3)	3.4	4.7	6.2	6.7	6.9	6.7	6.3	6.9	(3)
U.S.S.R.	(3)	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.0	4.6	5.0	(3)
United States	2.2	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.6
Norway	(3)	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.6	2.3	(3)
India	(3)	.8	.8	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	(3)
Canada	(3)	1.0	1.0	.9	.9	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.3	(3)

[1] Sources: FAO Yearbook of Fishery Statistics; USDI, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries statistical digests.
[2] Preliminary estimate, FAO.
[3] Not available.

One immediately wonders if the fishing grounds off the United States have become exhausted and the available supply for American fishermen has thus been reduced. This question can be answered by a resounding *no*. The waters above the broad continental shelves in both the Pacific and Atlantic off North America are among the most productive regions of the world ocean. And while it is true that United States fishermen take only about six billion pounds of fish annually and Canada another three billion, other nations, especially Japan and the USSR, catch an estimated six to eight billion pounds off the shores of North America.

The lack of growth of the United States fisheries and the failure of the American fishing industry to broaden its base of supply to include many abundant and little used species of fish that are available to it have encouraged in recent years the rapid growth of foreign fisheries in these waters. With the advent of these fleets, there has been inevitable conflict between them and our domestic fishermen over fishing grounds that heretofore had been exclusively fished by North Americans. Today, I should like to discuss these and other international fishery disputes that form the bases for United States diplomatic action in this field.

These conflicts seem to fall into four broad categories that are, to say the least, overlapping in nature and confusing in definition.

The Nature of the controversy

First, international fishing disputes arise because of the problem of ownership of the resources. This type of dispute is not new; it was one of the issues of the Anglo-Dutch herring controversy that continued to be argued intermittently for over one hundred years during the 17th and 18th centuries. Again, the basis for the current dispute between the United States and three Latin American countries, Chile, Ecuador and Peru, is primarily that of the ownership of the great and productive tuna resources that range over the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. In this case, Chile, Ecuador and Peru maintain that because the tuna are found at some periods of the year in the waters off their coasts, these resources are, during that time, subject to their exclusive jurisdiction. Of course, the bases for their claims are much more involved than I have just described; nevertheless, they clearly involve the concept of ownership of fishery resources lying off the coast of their countries.

The United States, on the other hand, views the tuna resource as a high seas resource under the ownership or control of no nation or group of nations.

The second major type of dispute among nations fishing common resources arises from the decline in production that often accompanies increased fishing by one or more nations. Most current international fishery conventions are based upon the joint efforts of nations to conserve fishery resources and to improve or maintain fish catches. The unprecedented depletion of North Pacific fur seal herds following years of unrestricted killing by Canadian, Japanese, Russian, and American sealers led to an international convention between these four parties in 1911 and the ultimate restoration of the fur seal. The International Halibut Commission is yet another example of the concern of countries, in this case the United States and Canada, for the conservation and rational utilization of a high seas fishery resource.

A third common type of fishing conflict between nations is occasioned by the introduction of new types of vessels or fishing gear on historic fishing grounds; gear or vessels that are not immediately compatible with kinds of gear or vessels that have traditionally fished the grounds. This type of dispute is not at all new but more than 80 years ago became the basis for a long-standing and famous policing convention[1] regulating the behavior of fishermen of various North European countries fishing the North Sea. This Convention has recently been renegotiated and brought up to date. It now awaits ratification before entering into effect.

More recently and of direct concern to United States fishermen, the large trawlers of Japan and the USSR, initiating a highly mobile trawl fishery in the Gulf of Alaska near Kodiak Island and the Alaskan peninsula, have interfered with and destroyed stationary king crab fishing gear of Alaskan fishermen. This conflict resulted in an executive agreement between the United States and USSR in 1964 and a similar type of agreement with Japan in 1967.

Yet a fourth type of disagreement between nations fishing common stocks of fish is becoming prevalent. Even when there is no dispute over national jurisdiction and where the vessels of the several nations fish in harmony with each other for the sustainable yield, intense competition for the catch has led to consideration of the allocation of the catch among the nations. The USSR–Japan Northwest Pacific Treaty and the tripartite treaty between the United States, Canada, and Japan have important elements of the principle of allocation of the catch as an intergal part of the Conventions. This problem is receiving greater attention as more and more nations seek to increase their share of the sustainable yield of the limited fishery resources available in various regions of the ocean.

RESOLVING THE PROBLEM

A number of solutions have been used in the past centuries to resolve international fishery disputes. These range from the use of force by one party or the other to agreements involving a direct division of the catch.

There is little question that international fishery treaties and regional fishery conventions have on the whole been useful in reducing friction between competing fishermen and nations. However, it is quite clear that in the 20th century and most assuredly in the 21st century—with the tremendous increase in competition for ocean food resources—past methods of dealing with fishery disputes between nations have become inadequate. All students of the problem agree that we must find some additional principles, as well as some new international mechanisms, to deal with ocean resource controversies.

There have been many attempts made to find the ideal solution to the problem. Two law of the sea conferences in 1958 and 1960 sought to fix the seaward limit of jurisdiction of a coastal state over waters adjacent to its coast; both conferences failed to reach agreement. The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas was approved at the 1958 Law of the Sea Conference. It is a useful convention but it has certain limitations. It has not yet received broad approval from important fishing or coastal nations. For example, neither Japan nor the USSR has accepted it. Its greatest drawback is that it provides a means for the resolution of strictly conservation problems, but it fails to provide adequate means for the legitimate protection of the interests of the coastal state and local fisheries. Thus, as I see it—even though the conservation convention may ultimately receive wide acceptance as a means of resolving disputes over conservation of fish stocks—some additional principle or rule must be developed to protect the special interest of the coastal fisherman in the stocks of fish in waters adjacent to the coast.

This broad subject of international fishery conflicts was recently discussed at a symposium on "International Fishery Problems" conducted by the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute in November 1967. At this meeting Dr. W. M. Chapman presented a paper that discussed the problem thoroughly and concluded that indeed the great increase in fishery effort throughout the world was getting out of hand and there were not effective international means of resolving fishery disputes. Dr. Chapman contends that what is needed is more research to gather facts on world fishery resources, using scientific data as a basis for resolving disputes.

Mr. Wilvan Van Campen and I sent a paper to this symposium which outlined what we believe to be the emerging pattern of international fishery agreements.

Mr. Edward Allen, a distinguished leader in United States fisheries for forty years or more and a strong and eloquent advocate of extended national jurisdiction over fisheries, recently writing in "Western Fisheries" in the September 1967 issue, again makes a strong case for the development of international rules that would provide special protection to coastal fisheries and fishermen.

Many of the leading fishing nations of the world today catch a major share of their fish on the high seas and off the coasts of other nations. These nations naturally seek the acceptance of rules providing for a very narrow national jurisdiction over coastal waters and a very broad interpretation of the high seas. On the other hand, those nations with large and rich coastal resources naturally enough seek extended national jurisdiction over these resources and a very restricted interpretation of the high seas and the principle of freedom of fishing on the high seas.

At present, most international fishery agreements in effect around the world ostensibly involve problems of conservation, and even when jurisdictional and economic matters are involved, these conventions cloak such considerations under the guise of conservation.

There are a number of additional suggestions for the resolution of international fishing disputes being put forward at the present time. Most of these involve incorporating economic principles into the search for international agreement of ocean fisheries conflicts. A part of the economists' argument for a more economical and rational use of the living resources of the sea is the proposal that the United Nations administer world ocean fisheries and allocate on some rational basis the privilege of fishing on the high seas.

I am not going to dwell long on the economists' thesis. Dr. Chapman, in his paper before the Gulf of Caribbean Institute, makes the argument that the reduction of excessive fishing effort and the resolution of other economic problems in international fishing disputes is a secondary problem and I agree. We have not been able to apply the principle of limited entry or other approaches to directly reduce fishing effort successfully to any of our domestic fisheries, although the political and economic differences among us are relatively simple. Therefore, it is not at all clear to me how we can apply such principles to multination high seas fisheries when we have so many and such serious unresolved problems of conservation, jurisdiction, standardization of terms, and national allocations of catch—all of which must be solved before serious considerations can be given to some form of international limitation of entry.

The advocates of such an approach often turn toward the United Nations as the vehicle for implementing such a scheme. However, it is impossible, at this time at least, for me to imagine the great fishing nations of the world, several of whom are greatly dependent upon their national fisheries for significant amounts of their food and others who depend upon their national fisheries to earn dollar exchange, turning over to an international body the awesome responsibility of allocating the food resources of the sea to some nations on a limited basis and not to others. It may be practicable some time in the future, but it is by no means the panacea at the present.

I do not agree with Dr. Chapman that scientific knowledge alone will provide a basis for resolving the great questions which arise in modern day international fishery disputes. Nor do I believe, as does Mr. Allen, that our problems can be solved by a simple extension of jurisdiction that would give absolute protection to the coastal fisherman. This is especially so if you assume, as I do, that in addition to the protection of the opportunities to fish for the coastal fishermen, our policy includes the determination by this Government to encourage a United States high seas fishery and, in addition, ensure maximum use of the food resources of the ocean. It is becoming more and more obvious that current international law, or the lack thereof, and generally accepted rule of conduct by nations fishing coastal and distant water fishing grounds favor the high seas, distant water fishing fleets. In my view this condition must be corrected if nations of the world are to be expected to overcome differences and agree on intermediate positions between excessive jurisdiction seaward over fisheries on one hand and a very narrow jurisdiction with unrestricted freedom of fishing on the other.

At the present time it would be possible—and many would say entirely legal—for a high seas fleet of vessels to initiate a fishery on the high seas off the coast of a country and preempt the sustainable catch from a long-standing coastal fishery. Such an action would be intolerable and no group of coastal nations can long accept rules of conduct that allow such a practice to continue.

It is quite logical to expect the development of rules of conduct for fishing fleets that provide for some specific limitation on the right of freedom of fishing on the high seas. Instead of drastically altering our concept of freedom of fishing on the high seas and attempting to divide the world ocean into a hodge-podge of nationally controlled lakes having no relationship either to the natural environment nor to the migratory habits of the fish stocks involved, it would seem far more appropriate to define precisely the generally accepted international principle of the freedom of the high seas as it applies to fishing. The Convention on the High Seas states in Article 2, "These freedoms (i.e., freedom of fishing, etc.) and others which are recognized by the general principles of international law, shall be exercised by all states with *reasonable regard to the interests of other states* in their exercise of the freedom of the high seas."

---

[1] The Convention for Regulating the Policing of the North Seas Fisheries, signed at The Hague, May 6, 1882.

Thus, if nations can agree that within explicitly defined limits there are special circumstances that give rise to special rights of coastal states in fishing the high seas off their coast, then a great many of the fears of the coastal states can be allayed. It goes without saying that in today's world, with the increasing fishing effort by so many nations, all nations have a responsibility to conduct studies on the fish stocks being taken so as to ensure the perpetuation of the catch. There is no doubt but that most nations are not carrying out adequate studies of the productivity of the fish stocks they catch nor do they know the effect of their fisheries on those stocks.

Thus, I see two important causes of current conflicts that if corrected would greatly facilitate agreement in most of the important international fishery controversies extant today.

The first of these areas lies in a greater acceptance by all nations that ocean fishery resources should be harvested with due regard for the maintenance of the yield of the resource. This means that the biology, distribution, biological statistics and other vital statistics must be gathered by the nation or nations fishing the resource. It follows that regulation of the catch according to this scientific data must ultimately occur.

The second area of importance is that of recognizing and accepting the special interest of the coastal state in resources lying off its coast and of further defining more clearly the limitation on the rights to freedom of the seas as they apply to fisheries.

I would predict that if the nations of the world would accept these two conditions, "fishing for agreement" would be more successful and the developing schism between distant water fishermen and coastal fishermen would be substantially reduced.

Now a word about the several recent fishing agreements reached between ourselves and several other countries, including Japan, the USSR and Mexico. Those agreements are in one sense the result of current problems to which pragmatic, perhaps even temporary, solutions have been found. But, if you will examine each of these agreements carefully, you will find that they all contain common elements that are consistent with the above remarks and lead to a developing fishery policy for our country for the future.

1. These agreements all recognize the importance of the widely accepted principle of freedom of fishing on the high seas. They do so within the context that the freedom to fish is not an unlimited freedom but must be exercised in a way that fully recognizes the rights of others to the same fishing grounds and fishery resources.

2. They all contain the concept that useful, renewable resources of the ocean should not go unharvested simply because of legal claims to jurisdiction, and therefore we have been willing to permit foreign fishermen to exploit resources we were not fully utilizing. We have also expected other countries to allow us access to like resources off their coasts and within their zones of jurisdiction.

3. We do not believe that the established interests of coastal fishermen should suffer an undue burden because of the incursions of foreign fleets, both into their long accustomed fishing grounds or because of these fleets applying undue fishing effort on those stocks of fish upon which the coastal state has long been dependent. Therefore, we have insisted that the operations of foreign fishermen be limited when they impinge seriously on the interests of our fishermen.

4. All of these international agreements provide for the conservation requirements of the resources of common concern, as revealed by the results of cooperative scientific research, and we have included provisions for such research in the agreements.

These concepts are the basic elements in our recent fishing agreements and, while they do not cover all of the problems of our fishermen, we believe they do provide the bases for a new and positive United States fishery policy that will lead to greater success in "fishing for agreement".

ATTENDANCE OF SENATOR BARTLETT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is noteworthy at this time to state to the Senate that we have with us again the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT. [Applause.]

We know that BOB has been undergoing a siege of sorts, but we are glad to see that he has recovered so magnificently. We are very happy, BOB, that you are back in the Senate Chamber where you will continue to perform in the future as effectively and efficiently as you have performed in the past.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his very kind remarks. I was "on the ropes" briefly for a few weeks, but now I have bounced back.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make this welcome nonpartisan, and say to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska: All of your friends in the U.S. Senate, Democrats and Republicans, thank God that you are recovered and have returned to the Senate. On this occasion we all join in offering every good wish.

We look forward to the distinguished Senator from Alaska once again raising his voice on behalf of freedom of the seas for our fellow citizens who sail in vessels flying the American flag.

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot thank the distinguished Senator from California sufficiently. My good friend from California, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I, and other Senators have a mutual interest in the tuna protective bill. I did not want to be absent from the Senate when that bill is taken up.

Mr. KUCHEL. God bless you, Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to express my pleasure in seeing our delightful, pleasant, and congenial friend, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], return to the Senate following a brief illness. I express even greater pleasure and delight in seeing that he has apparently returned to his usual state of vigorous health and that he has had a much deserved rest.

I may add that we in the Senate have missed BOB BARTLETT during the days that he has been absent from the Chamber this year.

I served with Senator BARTLETT in the House of Representatives. I came to know him there. I came to respect him there.

Since coming to the Senate almost 10 years ago, I have served with Senator BARTLETT on the Appropriations Committee. We serve together on several subcommittees of that committee. I am always impressed with the diligence that is displayed by BOB BARTLETT not only on behalf of his own constituents but also on behalf of the welfare of the country in general.

He is an effective member of the Appropriations Committee. He is an effective Senator. BOB BARTLETT is a man who approaches his duties at all times with the interest of the country at heart. He is a man who impresses those who serve with him as a warm and friendly individual.

The Scriptures say:

> A man that hath friends must show himself friendly.

BOB BARTLETT has many friends. Perhaps it is because he shows himself friendly. Even more so, it may be because others respect him for his patriotism and the diligence to which I have referred and for his great mind—but even more than that, his great heart.

We all join in expressing good wishes to Senator BARTLETT and a warm welcome back to his desk in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I join Senators in saying a few words of "welcome back" to our good friend and my good friend, BOB BARTLETT.

I was a Member of the Senate when BOB BARTLETT was representing, at that time, the Territory of Alaska, and I followed with great interest his efforts on behalf of statehood for Alaska.

I voted for statehood for Alaska and am convinced in my mind that he had much to do with my vote. I liked BOB so much that I thought it must be a great Territory and should be made a State so that he could become a Senator and represent Alaska. I have not been disappointed in that affection which I hold for BOB BARTLETT.

Of course, I was greatly distressed when he had the slight heart attack—I hope it was slight—and I followed his recovery all the time, when he was in the hospital and at home convalescing. I am delighted to welcome him today to the Halls of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, ordinarily this would be an occasion of unmixed rejoicing. However, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] looks so well and so vigorous that we can expect more from him—such as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has just cited—in terms of more persuasion, undue industry, more study, and more work. Such competition, therefore, will make the rest of us feel ill at ease. So this is not entirely an unmixed blessing.

But, I must say, I join Senators in offering the best of good wishes and heartiest congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. As I say, we are all glad to see the Senator from Alaska return to the Chamber today.

Mr. President, I know that Mrs. Bartlett is perhaps more grateful than anyone else for his return to good health. We must express our thanks to her, too, for the good attention and care she has given to her husband during his convalescence.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I, too, desire to manifest my affection and express my admiration for our good friend BOB BARTLETT, the senior Senator from our largest State, Alaska, upon his return to the Senate today. I associate myself with the congratulatory remarks of other Senators who have referred to him earlier today.

Senator BOB BARTLETT and I served together in the House of Representatives, so it was years ago that I first made his acquaintance. Through the years, from that time on to this, I have valued his friendship very, very highly.

There is an additional bond between us. He and I were first elected to the Senate in the same year, 1958. It happens that we were both reelected to our second terms.

I rejoice to see BOB BARTLETT in the Chamber today and to observe that he is now enjoying exceptionally good health.

We are so happy to have him back, and to know that he will be active in the Senate for many years to come on behalf of the citizens of his State and for all Americans as well.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Ohio in the remarks he made a few minutes ago concerning the return to our midst of Senator BOB BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT has been one of my closest friends and counselors in the Senate since he came here years ago. I know of no one who has rendered longer or finer service to his State than has Senator BARTLETT.

I must say that my wife, Bethine, and I have enjoyed a treasured and intimate friendship with BOB BARTLETT and his wife, Vide. I need not say we were terribly alarmed when Senator BARTLETT was first stricken, and we followed his recovery with mounting pleasure and relief. I add my welcome to Senator BARTLETT on his return.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the week of February 19 is starting in a particularly auspicious manner here in the Senate Chamber.

My colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] who has been my warm and close associate for many years is back with us, and those of us here with him can attest to the fact that he looks wonderfully well. That first alarm of a possible heart attack proved incorrect, thank heavens. As a man with a medical background, I can understand the nature of the illness. While it was a heart involvement, it produced no permanent damage.

BOB, welcome back to many, many more fruitful and productive years in the Senate of the United States.

THE MARINE WHO WOULD NOT GO ALONG

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tucked away in the newspaper, it was the headline that caught my eye. "Marines Lower Flag at Hue, Balk at Raising Vietnam's." Fascinated, I read the account:

> HUE, VIETNAM (UPI).—They took the U.S. Flag down from over Hue today.
>
> The Marines who raised the Stars and Stripes over Thua Thien Province headquarters yesterday had to lower the Flag and tuck it away and they are not very happy about it.
>
> It seems that raising the U.S. Flag over a South Vietnamese city is not a diplomatic thing to do. Capt. Ron Christmas' H. Company felt it earned a special right, fighting down the street, through the building and yanking down the Viet Cong flag that flew from the pole.
>
> Anyway, the U.S. Flag came down. The Marines did not put up a flag in Old Glory's place.
>
> "If we can't fly the American Flag, we aren't putting anyone's flag on that pole," a Marine officer said.

Whoever the officer was, I respect his indignation. It may be bad protocol to raise the Stars and Stripes over a South Vietnamese city, even one just rescued by American marines. But, at that moment, I do not suppose the officer much cared. He was probably thinking of the brave men who had been entrusted to his command, so many of whom had fallen to the enemy's withering fire. His mind, no doubt, reached back over the week's grueling battle waged at point blank range from house to house, from wall to wall, against savage resistance. No one knew better than he what guts it had taken to recapture, in the center of Hue, the seized headquarters of our South Vietnamese allies.

So when the Vietcong flag was finally torn down, he resolved that, in its place, no other flag would fly but ours.

If Capt. Ron Christmas, commander of H Company, felt anguish, I can understand that, too. It must be maddening to defend another country against a Communist takeover, that has so little stomach to defend itself, where the insurgent Vietnamese fight fiercely, while so many of those we help leave the hardest battles to us.

Nor is it easy to honor a government shot through by corruption, whose officials are engaged in the systematic looting of their own people, pocketing as much as they can, while they can, from the lavish American aid program.

Our marines, attending their wounded that day, must have loathed Saigon, where thousands of young men flash about the streets on their motorbikes, wearing cowboy hats and leather gloves, exempt from the war and oblivious to the sacrifices of others. Draft deferments are available—for a price—and fewer of their young men were drafted into service last year than we suffered in American casualties on their battlefields.

But, above all else, the marines must have scorned the rosy reports still emanating from our own officialdom. Only yesterday they had been assured that the cities were our strongholds and that the enemy was being driven "further and further into the jungle." As if in reply, the Vietcong surfaced in the very midst of the cities, adding humiliation to injury by actually taking temporary possession of our own Embassy grounds in the heart of the capital. We can pretend no longer that there are any "secure areas" in South Vietnam, immune from enemy penetration, where the insurgents cannot find local cover.

As long as the Vietcong remains primarily an indigenous force, honeycombed throughout every city and villege in South Vietnam, capable of such all-pervasive local operations, moving with relative impunity among the people, we shall find no magical answer to our dilemma there by striking out elsewhere. I pray, for the sake of our own fighting men, that we will not now compound their burden by enlarging the war still further. I listen, dismayed, to the foolish talk of "hot pursuit" into North Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, where, presumably, we shall deny the Communists their sanctuary, when all of mainland Asia behind them is their sanctuary. If we are seduced to pursue them inland, deeper and deeper into their continent, we will lose a whole generation of young Americans in the quicksands of an endless Asian morass. To President Johnson's credit, he has thus far resisted these mindless pressures for widening the war.

We have trouble enough on our hands with the limited war in which we are now engaged, to want a vastly bigger one. We have already shown the poor judgment of believing that a corrupt and ineffectual clique of generals in Saigon could somehow represent a sound investment for the United States. On their behalf, we have now lost 16,000 American dead, over 100,000 wounded, and by the end of this year, will have spent the incredible sum of a hundred billion dollars. Of course, as long as American boys are ordered to fight in Vietnam, I will continue to vote every dollar they need. Nonetheless, our massive intervention in that distant country, where we had no previous interest, has proved a tragic miscalculation.

Originally, it all started as a foreign aid program intended to help the anti-Communist Vietnamese help themselves. But when we decided to take over their fighting in their country, I could no longer support the policy. I began, nearly 4 years ago, to speak out against it, even though I was frequently told, "For your own sake, Senator, it would be safer to go along."

Well, sometimes a man just cannot go along—like the marine in Hue who hauled down the American flag, when ordered, but refused to raise Saigon's in its place.

NAVA AWARD TO THE NATIONAL MEDICAL AUDIOVISUAL CENTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, recently I became aware of a signal event portending great improvement in American medical teaching. On February 6 the National Audio-Visual Association—NAVA—presented its coveted award to the National Medical Audiovisual Center—NMAC—in Atlanta, Ga. The National Medical Audiovisual Center, formerly the Public Health Service Audiovisual Facility, is a component of the National Library of

Medicine in which I have had, together with the late President Kennedy, a special and historic interest. As you may know, NMAC is involved in carrying forth a national and international program in the use of communications technology for the advancement of education in medicine and health. The award was presented by Mr. Don White, executive vice president of NAVA. The award was accepted in behalf of the Center by Dr. James Lieberman, director of the National Medical Audiovisual Center and Associate Director for Audiovisual and Telecommunications of the National Library of Medicine. A previous year's award, you will recall, went to our Vice President for his contributions to legislation for the improvement of American education.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the entire text of Mr. White's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Mr. Don White, Executive Vice President, National Audio-Visual Association, Presented at the National Medical Audiovisual Center, Atlanta, Ga., February 6, 1968

I am indeed proud to be here today to make the presentation of the National Audio-Visual Association's annual award to Dr. James Lieberman, who is receiving it in behalf of the National Medical Audiovisual Center. I would like to read to you what is inscribed on this plaque and tell you why we feel so honored to present it. The plaque says:

"Whereas, the use of audio-visual communications tools in the medical field is making an increasingly important contribution to the solution of the critical problems of better medical communications; and

"Whereas, the development of medical audio-visual communications has been facilitated and encouraged by the Audio-Visual Facility of the United States Public Health Service; and

"Whereas, the Facility has demonstrated its ability to plan and produce high quality materials and programs, and to cooperate fully with commercial interests in the implementation of these programs; and

"Whereas, the leadership exercised by the Audio-Visual Facility of the U.S. Public Health Service has served as a pattern for better utilization of audio-visuals in subject areas other than medicine, and has aided in the general expansion of the audio-visual communications concept; therefore

"Be it resolved, that the National Audio-Visual Association hereby commends the Audio-Visual Facility of the United States Public Health Service for its great public service in the development and execution of its audio-visual communications program; and further

"Be it resolved, that we offer to the Audio-Visual Facility the full and complete cooperation of the audio-visual industry in any projects of mutual interest.

"National Audio-Visual Association."

If I may draw on famous words for a moment—Dante saves the lowest spot in his hell for those who take no stand in time of crisis. But certainly the essence of this award to the Public Health Service Audiovisual Facility, now the National Medical Audiovisual Center, is that in time of great need and great crisis, this installation took a definitive stand.

I can remember when the voice of the now Center's director was quite a singular one, in its persistent quest for the harnessing of communications resources to the health challenges of our time. It wasn't too long ago that communications was an unknown word in medical affairs. For some reason it has taken quite a while for the health community to take up the cause of employing the mass media in manpower training, in continuing education of health professionals, and in public health education.

There is an old saying that you can only spot an evergreen tree in the wintertime. And this Center, I must admit, has always been noticeable for its perseverance in the spring and summer, as well as in the fall and the long winter.

On this occasion I would but mention two of the many decisive activities of the Center, activities which in a direct sense were very instrumental in the National Audio-Visual Association's presentation of this award.

The first is the Community Medical Television System of Atlanta. This prototype system represents a unique application of communications technology to contemporary biomedicine. Utilizing the 2500 megahertzian bandwidth, the system involves a television linkage between the Emory University School of Medicine, Grady Memorial Hospital, one of the principal teaching centers of the medical school, the National Medical Audiovisual Center, the Veterans Administration Hospital, and eight other state, Federal and local health installations. This unique system is a good example of what can be done with modern communications techniques throughout the nation and the kind of thing the Center has done so well.

Another, among many, is the Graduate Degree Program in Biomedical Communications. As the health sciences became more aware of the incredible potential of communications technology to teaching and learning, concomitantly came the awareness of the dearth of professional people to head up communications programs at medical centers, nursing schools, etc. Fortunately, the leadership of the National Medical Audiovisual Center anticipated this need years ago. The result, as we know, is that at this very moment a cadre of highly motivated health professionals is participating in a Master's Degree Program in Biomedical Communications through a consortium of some of the leading colleges and universities in this Nation. This summer, the first group of successful candidates will receive a Master in Medical Science Degree from Tulane University in New Orleans.

Historically, very few words, I believe, have accurately captured the meaning of the award, which is well deserved and well earned. Perhaps Joseph Addison came closest in one of his works with the phrase, "Tis not in mortals to command success, but we'll do more, Sempronius; we'll deserve it . . ."

Thank you.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year, citizens of Baltic descent in the free world observe the 50th anniversary of the establishment of independence of the Baltic Republics. Lithuania, the largest and most populated of the three Baltic countries declared its independence on February 16, 1918. Estonia and Latvia made separate declarations later in that year.

Today I join the Lithuanian-Americans in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and those throughout the Nation in their celebration. Unfortunately, the privilege is denied those who live in their native land now occupied by Communist Russia.

Even though the Russian Government in 1918 formally conceded the right of all minority nations to secede from the Empire and to establish their own statehood, the Baltic Republics were invaded by Red armed forces at the end of that very year.

The Baltic nations were able to repel Red invaders and consolidate their sovereignty. Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia concluded peace treaties with Russia in 1920, according to which Russia "unreservedly, voluntarily, and forever" recognized the independence of the Baltic Republics and renounced sovereign rights over the Baltic peoples and territories which formerly belonged to Russia.

The 20-year period of independence that followed was one of the most progressive eras in the history of Lithuania and the neighboring Baltic States. Joseph Kajeckas of the Lithuanian Legation described the record of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia as "one of the most remarkable of modern times."

He said:

> During this period, spectacular strides were made in agriculture and land reform, industry, transportation, finance, social legislation, education and cultural progress. All of this went on without any kind of Communist influence. . . .

Lithuania flourished in its independence until June of 1940 when Soviet Russia occupied the country and established the Communist Party as the only legal party of Lithuania. Estonia and Latvia were similarily subjugated.

The suffering of the Baltic nations since then is inconsolable. The era of Stalin was marked by brutal mass deportation and murder of Baltic citizens. The attempt to destroy national identity of Lithuania and the Baltic nations continues unceasingly.

We in the United States can help by keeping the ideals of self-determination alive in the free world. In this year of the 50th anniversary of independence of all Baltic States we deplore the forcible and illegal absorption of the Baltics by the Soviet Union.

SYRIA, VIETNAM, AND THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the Washington Star of Saturday, February 17, is an interesting editorial which illustrates well the further troubles we can expect around the world as the result of first, the degree of our commitment in Vietnam, and, second, the way the military aspect of this war has been handled.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, "Syrian Story," be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Syrian Story

A curious report has come out of Moscow. Attributed to "high-ranking Soviet sources," it depicts the Kremlin as being worried that Syria might make a desperate attempt this spring—perhaps in April—to launch an all-out revenge-seeking attack on Israel.

The unnamed Russian informants are further reported to have indicated that the Brezhnev-Kosygin government wants very much to restrain the Syrians, but fears that it may not be able to do so because their leaders in Damascus are filled with irrational hate. One of the sources is quoted as saying of them: "When it comes to Israel, they don't listen to us."

This puts the Kremlin in a good light, of course, as a peace-loving force anxious to do its best to dissuade Syria from an attack that could lead to another full-scale war in the Middle East. In Israel, however, the Moscow report has been received with some uneasiness and suspicion. The basic feeling there has been summed up by Defense Minister Moshe Dayan in a pointed statement declaring that no Arab state is in a position at this stage to make war on Israel without the support of a major power.

That is unquestionably the fact of the matter, a fundamental Mideast reality. Moreover, in the opinion of knowledgeable Israelis, only the gullible would accept the idea that the Soviet Union—on which Syria is critically dependent politically, economically and militarily—does not really have enough leverage in Damascus to keep it from attacking. In the Israeli view, if such an attack occurs in the spring, it will occur only because the Kremlin tolerates or wants it.

It is for this reason that Israelis are inclined to feel that there may be sinister implications in the Syrian story from Moscow. They wonder whether Soviet-inspired trouble might not be on the way in the Middle East, as well as in Korea, as part of an overall strategy related to the Vietnam war.

THE YOUNGER GENERATION AND THE VISTA PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the tragic conflict in Vietnam and the continuing sickness of many of large urban areas has affected and challenged all of us, most especially, perhaps, America's youth. I am not one of those who despair in our young people, however. I believe that the optimism and idealism of our young people are remaining strong—and that they are constructively directing themselves to our own society's efforts against poverty and suffering. VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—is an Office of Economic Opportunity program which has attracted the energy and dedication of thousands of our young people.

The Battle Creek, Mich., News and Enquirer of December 14 contained an editorial about our younger generation and the VISTA program which I believe should be seriously considered by all of us. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Young Idealists Crusade at Home

Many idealistic young Americans seem to be adjusting their sights.

Applications for the Peace Corps dropped 30 per cent in the past year while applications for VISTA rose 34 per cent.

Peace Corps volunteers, of course, help uplift underdeveloped nations overseas, while workers in VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) have much the same mission in depressed areas of this country.

Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn isn't discouraged. He said, during a visit here this week, that the corps still gets 40,000 to 43,000 applicants a year—far more than it can accept.

Washington analysts say interest in the Peace Corps is declining because the Vietnam War and Rioting in American cities have made young people cynical about their ability to change world conditions.

The corresponding upswing in VISTA applications suggests a better explanation. Perhaps the problems now coming so dramatically to the fore in American cities are keeping the young idealists at home. Instead of turning sour over the possibilities of changing things, maybe young people see the urban ills as a new challenge—a challenge more real than the one in some distant land.

Congress and the administration in Washington aren't reordering their priorities, but many young Americans are.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence should remind all Americans of the blessings of our liberty. Lithuania's story shows us how fortunate we really are. In 1918, that nation set out on its own, possessing many of the same aspirations and ideals that our Founding Fathers held during this country's struggle for its independence. Indeed, the pronouncement of Woodrow Wilson that every nation has the right to determine its own destiny inspired Lithuania and its sister Baltic nations of Latvia and Estonia to throw off the shackles of Russian colonialism.

For 22 years, this gallant people lived in freedom's glow. Although times became difficult on more than one occasion, the nation never considered submerging itself into one of its larger neighbors. Lithuania did lose its freedom in 1940, but only because it fell into the vise created by the German Nazi hammer and the Russian Communist anvil. The German-Soviet nonaggression pact of August 22, 1939, amounted to a death sentence for the Baltic Republics. Within a year, the Red army had marched into Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, smashing freedom in its wake.

Since those dark days in 1940, the Lithuanian people have endured the cruelties that only a barbaric order can inflict. They have suffered through war, purges, mass deportations, and collectivization. Moscow has sought to suppress their centuries-old culture and destroy their strong religious heritage. So the struggle continues, as Lithuania fights to preserve its very nationhood against the pressures of Soviet conformity. From independence 50 years ago, Lithuania today seeks to maintain its very existence. We can only pray that this noble nation will one day emerge from the darkness and assume its rightful place among the family of nations.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA URGES SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most truly encouraging and meaningful letters that I have received since I began my efforts last year to win Senate ratification of the human rights conventions came to me this past week from Prof. Lev Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Professor Dobriansky, a respected scholar and nationally known teacher at Georgetown University, wrote eloquently of the 2½ million Ukrainian-Americans' support for U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions.

I think it is especially significant that the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which has been such an able spokesman in this country for its membership's relatives and countrymen who have been dispossessed of their native land support ratification. These men and women know so very well the true meaning of human rights because their own were so callously disregarded by Soviet aggression.

Because I believe that the position of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will be of interest and enlightenment to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the executive committee on February 2, 1968 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

In its complete support of U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions during this session of Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America expresses at the outset its highest admiration for the efforts of the Honorable William W. Proxmire of Wisconsin to effectuate this necessary ratification. Senator Proxmire's unremitting fight in behalf of the Genocide, Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, and Political Rights of Women Conventions has earned the superlative respect of every American concerned with the moral and political stature of our Nation.

Representing the basic views of 2.5 million Americans of Ukrainian background, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America urges all far-seeing national organizations to back up Senator Proxmire in this constructive endeavor. The ratification now of the four Conventions would highlight America's response in the International Human Rights Year and underscore further the dedication of the United States to the high moral and political principles enshrined in our own Declaration of Independence.

Since the days of close cooperation with the late Dr. Raphael Lemkin, this Committee has been in the forefront of the Genocide Convention's ratification, now some eighteen years. It has joined with others in the long, overdue ratification of the other conventions. The executive body of UCCA unanimously endorses the great efforts of Senator Proxmire and shall redouble its activity in this Human Rights Year to realize the ratification of all four conventions.

POSTAL PROBLEMS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting and constructive editorial, "The Way to the Mailbox," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 9, be inserted at this point in the Record.

This editorial is in itself a tribute to the constructive thinking of Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Way to the Mailbox

The panel drawing up proposals for modernization of the United States Post Office will in our opinion do best to act boldly and leave the political possibilities to be worked out by others. As David B. Bowes of our Washington staff has reported, the President's Commission on Postal Organization feels itself working under a "cloud of political acceptability." Its executive director, Murray Comarow, is quoted as saying the commission is weighed upon by the thought that if it proposes changes too far-reaching to gain public acceptance and support nothing whatever will be accomplished.

To the contrary, it is possible and perhaps even likely that inadequate reform would be worse than none at all, further entrenching an outmoded system and making its eventual replacement still more difficult. Postmaster General O'Brien's analyses have made it quite plain to any open-minded person who will take the trouble to read them that the time is past when patching up the present postal system would do any good. The old P.O. is strained to the limit to handle today's volume of mail and runs the risk of collapsing under the much larger volumes close ahead.

Mr. O'Brien suggests taking the Post Office out of the Executive branch and making it a Government corporation. Long experience in other fields has shown that the Government corporation is the best means yet devised for performing functions which unlike those of departments are not of governing, but rather of providing services, more similar to private business. Whether the President's commission recommends this plan, which we favor, or some other, it should we think be wholly new.

We do not underestimate the difficulties there will be in abandoning a postal system left over from the horse-and-buggy age and creating one fitted to serve an enormously more populous and active nation. But in this case we believe politics as the art of the possible must yield to politics as the art of the unavoidable. It will probably be necessary, and certainly is desirable, to carry out measures for informing the public and thus smoothing passage through Congress.

To do so is not the function of the President's Commission on Postal Organization, nor one for which it is the best fitted. We should like to see the formation of a citizens' committee for the purpose. The citizens' committee of some 20 years ago which worked for adoption of the improvements proposed by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission, was outstandingly successful. Its jurisdiction was furthermore over more numerous, esoteric and to our view more controversial matters than must be dealt with in the present instance. If that citizens' committee could do so well, surely another now could do at least well enough to give the United States as reliable, swift and economical a postal system as it requires and deserves.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania reminds us once again of the plight of the people whose freedom has been extinguished by the Soviet Union. The sordid history of Lithuania's conquest by the Soviets is one that no American should forget, nor must we ever cease to press for the return of freedom and self-determination for all of the Baltic peoples.

The deep feelings in this regard of Americans of Lithuanian descent are well expressed in resolutions adopted by two groups in my own State of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that these expressions by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden and the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 4, 1968, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH FOR COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent State by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin, commemorating this year the 50th anniversary of the establishment of a free and independent Lithuania, strongly emphasize the fact, that the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completely warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent hope that Lithuania, presently occupied by the communist Soviets, will again regain the rights of freedom and liberty as a sovereign nation; and

Whereas now, more than ever it has been indicated that no nation is secure from the ominous threat of a dictatorial communism, now bolstered by scientific technology which may be utilized for further harassment of world peace; therefore, be it

Resolved, that we Americans of Lithuanian descent are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence and liberation; and

Resolved that we declare, as in the past, our appreciation of the United States policy of non-recognition of the incorportaion by force of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; and

Resolved that it is our hope, that the representatives of our Government will firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberations regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, to the United States Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, to the Representatives of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Congressional Districts of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer and the Honorable Cornelius E. Gallagher and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,
President.
STASYS VAICIUNAS,
Secretary.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence;

Resolve—

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,
President.
A. S. TRECIOKAS,
Secretary.

NEWARK, N.J., *February 11, 1968.*

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY, AN ANSWER TO SURTAX ADVOCATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, both the administration and the economic establishment in this country have been so busy selling a surtax by insisting that demand is far outpacing the capacity of our economy to meet it that they have overlooked what is far and away the biggest economic fact in the world today: that is the immense increase in the capacity of this Nation and the other developed nations of the free world to produce.

This morning's Wall Street Journal contains an article that should be read and pondered by all Members of Congress. It tells the story of the explosion of productive capacity in this country and in the rest of the free world since 1950.

With our national tendency to overreact to current developments that are brought to our attention so vividly and powerfully, we forget that for most of the last 40 years the industrial countries of the world were plagued by unemployment and idle factories far more than excessive demand.

If this has been a problem in the past, hold on to your hats: As the song goes, "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

In spite of the great demands of the Vietnam war, in spite of a record-smashing nondefense spending by Federal, State, and local governments, in spite of huge consumer incomes and vast consumer spending—in spite of all this, our industrial plant is 15 percent idle right now, and our manpower is employed close to the fewest hours per week in 6 years, as of January. Demand may speed up, but we know that the capacity to meet that demand will race ahead, as it has in the past 18 years, at speeds that seem certain to outpace any likely increase in demand.

It is this fabulous productive explosion that the advocates of super restraint overlook. The 4½-percent growth of our economy during the last quarter of 1967 has been viewed by administration witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee during the past month as a breakneck pace. Actually, it is barely enough to keep us moving with our capacity to meet the demand, and the demand seems more likely to slow down than to speed up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," written by John O'Riley, and published in the Wall Street Journal of today, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

(By John O'Riley)

The factory, heart and symbol of the industrial revolution, is grinding out some staggering production figures these days. The magnitude of the spectacle is lost in month-to-month reports. But a stand-back look reveals some jolting comparisons. Output of this nation's industries is now more than twice as great as it was as recently as 1950. It has swollen an incredible 60% in the past decade alone. And what's happening here is pretty closely matched by the factories of Europe and Japan. The rising flood of fabrication promises both prosperity and problems in tomorrow's world.

The prosperity part has a brilliant sparkle indeed. The output of things for Americans to consume or use grows far more rapidly than the population. Comparable to the production doubling since 1950 is a population growth of only about a third. The production spurt of 60%-plus in a decade is matched by a gain of only 15% in the number of people to absorb it.

Official industrial output figures use the 1957–59 average as a base of 100. The table below shows the climb of the overall output index as well as that of some individual component indexes that have moved up much faster than the aggregate. Index figures are rounded.

Category	1957–59	Now	Up (percent)
All industry	100	161	61
Machinery	100	183	83
Instruments	100	188	88
Rubber and plastics	100	205	105
Chemicals	100	210	110
Electricity	100	199	99

It will be noted that the big gainers shown above spotlight the sophisticated elements of industry. This is the hallmark of today's growth. Old basic staples like iron and steel (up 37%) and lumber (up 21%) are not the leaders.

Production of such things as machines and instruments have the multiplier effect of speeding up the production of other things. They herald an even more accelerated flow from the industrial cornucopia.

But what of the problems whose seeds may sleep in this rich, productive soil? Could one be the potential of overproduction? Little has been heard of this spectre in a long time. And of course as long as demand keeps apace of the factories, not much is likely to be heard. But suppose the fecund factories get ahead?

Nobody can write off the possibility. And anybody pondering it must keep a sharp eye on Europe and Japan. In West Germany and France, industrial production is some 60% above the 1957–59 level. In Italy, the expansion is 116%. And in Japan, it is a roaring 247%. Even the United Kingdom, with its well publicized production problems, the gain has been 28%. North of the border, Canada shows a thumping 69% gain. The production flood applies to the whole industrialized world. And never have foreign wares clamored more eagerly for a share of America's rich market.

The sharpened international courtship of the consumer is reflected in a chorus of calls for producer protection from foreign wares. They have waxed louder of late. They will likely be louder still in the months ahead.

Thus while roaring production is great for buyers, it is not necessarily pure gold for producers. The competition it has engendered promises no fattening of profit margins. And profit margins thinned to a point can slow the wheels that make economies hum—sometimes rather suddenly.

It can be reasoned that non-manufacturing nations should buy the producers' bounty. This theory runs afoul of reality. The need of the non-producers is great, but their buying power is puny. And, in the marketplace, need without buying power is impotent.

Still another major problem, one of the most pressing for today and tomorrow, is closely linked to the pattern of production. It is that of what to do about jobs for the unskilled and uneducated. Factories offer almost no help at all. The gigantic rise in production of recent years has called for almost no increase in manpower—on the production line.

The table below tells the story beyond the need for explanation. It traces the number of production workers on the job in industry each year since 1950—parallel to the yearly index figures for industrial output.

Year	Workers	Output
1950	12, 523, 000	74. 9
1953	14, 055, 000	91. 3
1956	13, 436, 000	99. 9
1959	12, 603, 000	105. 6
1962	12, 488, 000	118. 3
1965	13, 434, 000	143. 4
1968	14, 363, 000	161. 2

Footnote: In the great boom of 1929, nearly forty years ago, it took 8,369,000 factory production workers to turn out a production index of 38.4. With the production efficiency of those days, it would take over 33 million workers to give us today's output.

This, of course, is the real miracle of modern industry—not just that it produces so much, but that it produces it with so little muscle power. It is the industrial revolution in crescendo.

For nearly two hundred years of mechanical invention, men have fretted constantly about the machine destroying jobs. That it decreases the total number of jobs in an evolving society has been disproved repeatedly and is being disproved today. Unemployment right now is the lowest in fourteen years. But that this giant mechanical power helps shrink the market for uneducated minds and unskilled hands is pretty much beyond debate.

The most dramatic demonstration of this has already taken place on the farms. Total farm employment today in this country—the biggest farm producer on earth—is just barely above four million. It was nearly double that twenty years ago. The day of mules and muscle power on the farm is just about gone.

And the impact, of course, has been passed on to the cities. Millions have trekked from the fields to the towns since World War II as machines moved among the rows of food and fiber to do the work of hands. Many a city father worrying about riots may not know it, but if all the cotton in the country were still picked and hoed ("chopped") by hand, his summer sleep would be more serene.

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK C. BELEN, DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the postal service binds together the economic, social, and business life of the Nation. It successfully processes more than 80 billion pieces of mail a year—almost as much as the mail volume of the rest of the world combined. Yet the Post Office Department receives recognition most frequently on those rare occasions when a piece of mail goes astray. Then the critic's voice is raised, and the Department gets the kind of recognition it earnestly seeks to avoid.

The Department deserves a vote of thanks for the tremendous daily job it does. And additionally I would like to mention one of the most remarkable efforts in the Department's history—an effort now speeding the mail with greater efficiency than ever before and bringing benefits to the Nation's business community and to every American. I refer to the cooperation in postal matters between the Nation's businessmen and the postal service.

A major architect of the mutual-help program participated in by some 20,000 businessmen representing the Department's largest customers is Frederick C. Belen, Deputy Postmaster General, a native of Lansing, Mich. Beginning in 1961, when he was Assistant Postmaster General for Operations, Mr. Belen pioneered the nationwide improved mail service, called NIMS. An integral part of the NIMS program were the Mail Users Councils, of which there are now 354 in cities all across the Nation—groups dedicated to better service through cooperation with the Post Office Department.

Mr. Belen, a persuasive advocate of business and government working together and an articulate spokesman for our Government, recently addressed a business and civic group at Grand Rapids, Mich. An excellent editorial on his address appeared in the January 6, 1968, issue of the Daily Tribune of Grand Haven, Mich., written by a former self-avowed critic of the postal service, now an interested supporter of postal programs.

After hearing Fred Belen's address, the author wrote:

> He is recognized as a man with the business approach to problems, a public official who wants to get things done. He is convincing.

This is praise well deserved. If there is a more responsible, more effective official in our Government than Fred Belen, I have not yet met him.

I ask unanimous consent that the Daily Tribune editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fresh Look at Our Postal System

It is easy and even tempting to criticize most anything when we don't know much about it.

Certainly this writer was among the ignorant as far as modern postal operations are concerned. He had voiced his share of criticism.

Our ignorance is still abysmal but we are a little less inclined to expose it by continuing outbursts of criticism.

Maybe Postmaster Roy Hierholzer and his associate, Robert Schmick, thought we needed a bit of education. Anyway we joined them recently in attending a briefing and Rotary luncheon in Grand Rapids where Deputy Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen of Washington was the featured speaker.

Things are happening in the Post Office Department. Belen describes the current "happenings" as another revolution.

Some people insist that Uncle Sam is losing the race in trying to keep the mails abreast of the accompanying industrial revolution. They point to examples here and there of deteriorating service. Mr. Belen will dispute some if not most of these accusations.

His strongest argument is based on the new rapport rapidly developing between the business community and his department. He for one is encouraging this trend. He is recognized as a man with the business approach to problems, a public official who wants to get things done. He is convincing.

The formation of Mail Users Councils in our large cities is one step that can prove useful, he believes. Part of the problem rests, as he says, with the user of the mails. Mail it before dispatch time and get hours' earlier delivery. Don't dump large amounts of mailing without giving the postal officials fair warning. Use the Zip Codes. When things do go wrong, protest to the proper officials. Remember that mailing is growing faster than the population. It will take every possible technological advance to keep up with the parade.

Some of the innovations, Belen acknowledged are still only in partial use. They have been delayed by some of the same pressures that have weighed upon business. He sees a great future for the national processing centers of which Grand Rapids is one.

One can assume that the stepped-up post office public relations program is designed to ease the criticism stemming from higher postal rates and higher department costs. We are sure that Belen would be the first to admit this. But he would be likely to add that better communications in his business, as in any other business, is ideally a year-round business, crisis or no crisis.

We don't write this as an apology. In the words of Mr. Belen, his recent trip to Michigan, his native Michigan, was not a "brainwashing" so much as a "snow job." He obviously put his best foot forward. But he has a lot more on the ball than many of the federal officials in high places who choose to make speeches. We certainly agree that more can be accomplished when business and government work together, and we believe he is seeking just that. Time will prove how effective this approach is.

Let us also repeat: If your postal service is lousy, complain. But don't complain to your neighbor, go straight to headquarters. That's what the postal officals want, and it will help.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President I call the attention of the Senate to a proposal which could mean progress in reaching a settlement of the nationwide copper strike that has now been on for almost 7 months.

A special three-member panel was appointed by President Johnson on January 24 to assist in finding a settlement. The panel has put forward a concrete proposal which would define three categories of related operations within which companywide settlements might be sought.

For many weeks, it has been recognized that it is the issue of so-called industrywide bargaining which has prevented a settlement, and, to a great degree, has stopped bargaining on any of the issues.

Just last week, I wrote to the four principal producing companies and to the United Steelworkers of America, leader of the 26-union coalition, urging that the companywide bargaining issue be made the subject of intensified negotiations along with all other issues.

In that letter I stated it as my opinion that questions as to whether different plants should have uniform wage rates, uniform benefits, and uniform contract expiration dates could be discussed at bargaining sessions along with all other issues.

The special mediation panel has now stated that the only way to break the impasse is for the parties to put aside their preconditions and open intensive bargaining within three groupings:

First, copper mining, smelting, and refining;

Second, units producing other nonferrous metals; and

Third, copper wire and cable and brass fabrication.

While I would not attempt to judge the merits of the mediation panel's suggestion, I commend that group for advancing a concrete proposal on which negotiation could go forward on the companywide bargaining issue. I urge both sides to begin intensive negotiations at once.

This strike has now idled some 60,000 workers for almost 7 months. Its economic impact upon Utah and other Western States has been very great, and, for some communities nearly devasting. It has brought misery to thousands of families. The serious economic problems of the Nation have been aggravated by a dollar outflow of more than $300,000,000 due to the copper strike alone.

The consequences will undoubtedly be felt by Utah's copper industry for a long time to come. With a work stoppage of this length, it is inevitable that fabricators will turn to other materials as substitutes for copper where this can be done.

It is also apparent from the economic statistics that many workers have found jobs elsewhere and will not be available to work in the copper industry again.

Moreover, such a prolonged work stoppage is certain to have an injurious effect on the collective bargaining process itself. The American public is becoming less tolerant of strikes as a way of settling disagreements in collective bargaining. Alternatives to collective bargaining are being seriously proposed. Such alternatives can mean only increased governmental authority in the labor relations field and an expanded role for government in the business affairs of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent for the inclusion in the RECORD of the following: my letter to Kennecott Copper Corp., Phelps Dodge Corp., Anaconda Co., American Smelting & Refining Co., and United Steelworkers, together with the joint statement of the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce concerning the report of the special mediation panel; and the report itself.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1968.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing both the producing companies and the labor unions involved in the nationwide copper strike to urge that collective bargaining be intensified on all issues, including that of so-called company-wide bargaining. It is recognized that this strike is said to be prolonged by one issue only—that of company-wide bargaining. According to press reports, one company official has urged the unions to begin by unconditionally withdrawing their demand on this issue. It seems to me that insisting that one side or the other "unconditionally" withdraw any proposal borders on a refusal to bargain. Certainly questions as to whether different plants should have uniform wage rates, uniform benefits, and uniform contract expiration dates, can be discussed at the conference table along with all other issues.

Also, according to press reports, it has been stated that a demand for company-wide bargaining is "illegal." This is a matter of law and it should not be in dispute between the parties to this strike. It should be determined by the proper tribunal. Perhaps it should be submitted to the Labor Relations Board and thence to the District Court if the Board's decision is not acceptable to both sides. In any case, determination of the legality of this question should facilitate bargaining on other issues.

This strike has now gone on for nearly seven months. Some 60,000 workers are involved. Its economic impact upon Utah and other western states has been very great, and, for some communities nearly devastating. It has brought misery to thousands of families. The very serious economic problems of the nation have been aggravated by a dollar outflow of more than $300,000,000 due to the copper strike alone.

This human suffering is the grimmest result of this work stoppage. But, in addition, there are two questions of particular concern to me.

The first is its effect on Utah's copper industry. Copper is a world commodity. Even with the present United States strike, copper continued to be available to consumers through October. The industry states that the loss of U.S. refined production as a result of the strike was approaching 500,000 tons at that time. With no settlement in sight, however, it is inevitable that fabricators will turn to other materials as substitutes for copper where they can do so. It is also apparent from the economic statistics that many workers have found jobs elsewhere, and, with a strike of this length, will not again be available as copper workers. Even should a settlement be reached soon, this strike could have a permanently debilitating effect on copper production in the state of Utah.

My second concern is the effect on the collective bargaining process itself. There can be no question but that the American public is becoming less tolerant of strikes as a means of settling disagreements in collective bargaining. Our people will not stand for unlimited work stoppages. Alternatives to collective bargaining are being seriously proposed. Such alternatives can mean only one thing—the substitution of a labor court or of a government administrative agency for free collective bargaining. Inevitably, such a change would greatly increase the role of government in the business affairs of the nation.

I am sure our citizens do not wish to see our copper industry injured in relation to foreign producers. On the other hand, we do not wish to see our copper workers discriminated against in relation to those in other industries. Last August, I urged that a fact-finding board be appointed by the President. Even though this has now been done, and we are hopeful that its work may help settle the strike, I believe it is the conviction of the American people that all labor disputes should be settled between the unions and the companies concerned.

I renew my plea that both sides in this strike begin at once intensive negotiations embracing all issues.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator.

JOINT STATEMENT ON COPPER PANEL REPORT BY SECRETARIES OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

We received today the report of the special three-member panel in the prolonged copper strike. We regret that the panel had to report to us that the parties have been unable to reach agreement. However, we appreciate the dedication with which the panel worked on this matter and share their view that a basis does exist for a prompt resolution of the dispute.

The public hearings and private meetings the panel conducted with the companies and unions brought out clearly that the issue of "company-wide bargaining" is blocking a settlement.

We agree with this distinguished panel that the only way to reach a fair and speedy solution to this dispute is for the parties to discard their rigid preconditions for settlement and to begin bargaining immediately on the basis of the panel's suggestions.

The panel stated that bargaining should concentrate on the economic issues but should also include discussion of uniform expiration dates and equality of treatment within these three categories:

(1) Copper mining, smelting and refining; (2) units producing other non-ferrous metals and (3) copper wire and cable and brass fabrication.

We feel the guidelines suggested by the panel members (Professor George W. Taylor, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins and George E. Reedy) provide a sound basis for ending the dispute which is causing severe economic hardship to the parties involved and to a number of areas of the country and is having a serious adverse impact on our Nation's balance of payments position. We strongly urge the parties to resume bargaining immediately within the framework of these suggestions. The national interest requires a prompt settlement of this dispute.

FEBRUARY 17, 1968.

Hon. ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARIES: Transmitted herewith is the Report of the Special Panel you appointed to assist in finding a settlement to the strike in the copper industry.

Sincerely,

DR. GEORGE W. TAYLOR, *Chairman.*
RT. REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS.
GEORGE E. REEDY.

REPORT TO THE SECRETARIES OF COMMERCE AND LABOR ON THE COPPER DISPUTE

On January 24, 1968 you appointed the undersigned to serve as a panel to assist in finding a settlement to the prolonged strike in the Nation's copper industry. In a joint statement announcing our appointment you requested the panel "to meet immediately with the companies and with the unions and to assist them and us in finding as quickly as possible a fair and equitable solution." We were further requested to advise you of our progress and of whatever other action might be appropriate.

At our initial meeting on January 26, 1968, following a briefing by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service on the history of this dispute and the collective bargaining and mediation efforts up to that time, the panel concluded that it should hold public hearings in an attempt to determine the parties' own views on the issues impeding settlement and their suggestions as to procedures to expedite agreement. Hearings were scheduled for the week of January 28 and telegrams were dispatched to each of the four major copper producers (Kennecott, Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge, and American Smelting and Refining) and representatives of the 26 unions involved asking them to address themselves at the hearings to the following matters:

"1. It has been stated that the issue of company-wide bargaining and related issues are impeding a resolution of this dispute. To what extent is this a factual statement and what is your attitude on this issue?

"2. What procedural steps should be taken to expedite the overall resolution of this dispute?"

The public hearings and a series of private meetings held with each of the companies and the unions amply demonstrated that the issue of "company-wide bargaining" is impeding settlement. However, these discussions also revealed a great variance among and between the various companies and the unions as to the meaning of this term. At the very least the hearings and our meetings were helpful in clarifying the elements of the issue. We must report to you, however, that up to the present time our explorations have not been successful in producing a settlement.

The issue which, to this date, has served as an effective deterrent to meaningful negotiations bears the label "company-wide bargaining." To both the Unions and the companies the phrase appeared to be self-explanatory. But on examination it developed into a complex question of bargaining structure which neither party, in the view of the panel, could define at first with precision or clarity.

This early inability to state the exact terms of the subject in contention, however, did not mitigate the adamant insistence of both the unions and the management of the companies that the other side capitulate totally on the issue. To each, the phrase has the character of a categorical imperative. As long as there is no flexibility, the question is not amenable to give-and-take resolution. The only possible outcome, if this line were to be pursued, would be the eventual exhaustion and surrender of one of the contenders.

The terms in which the demand was originally stated and rejected obscured an underlying issue which could have been explored more fruitfully. If the question is restated in terms of a search for the appropriate bargaining unit or units, progress becomes possible. It is obvious that there is a new labor-management situation in the copper industry arising from the merger of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers union with the United Steel Workers and the persistence of 26 diverse labor organizations in holding together on a common bargaining position. These represent not only new structural realities but new motivations on the part of the union members. Some accommodations to these changed conditions is essential for both sides.

At this writing, no great desire to achieve such an accommodation is evident. However, in the course of the hearings and exploratory conversations, certain specifics emerged.

The unions insist that whatever else companywide bargaining may mean, there are three basic ingredients which represent absolute preconditions for negotiations:

(a) Common expiration dates for all labor-management contracts within a company, including its subsidiaries in the non-ferrous metals industry.

(b) A companywide economic "package" to be applied equally to each unit within a company, making some minor allowances for local conditions.

(c) An accepted rule within each corporation that settlement must be achieved at all operations before any operations are resumed.

The companies, on the other hand, rejected these preconditions and said the present bargaining arrangements (perhaps with minor modifications) should be retained. They asserted that there must be separate economic treatment for the several "different businesses" within their corporate structures.

It appeared to the panel that these principles identified clearly as the "roadblock" issue the question of how viable bargaining units should be constituted in this industry. We sought—without avail—to persuade the parties to drop preconditions and seek a practical answer to this question as a basis for negotiations. The roadblock, at this moment, is still in existence.

It should be stressed that a determination of the units which would be appropriate for the consummation of collective bargaining agreements in this industry would still leave many perplexing and difficult questions to be resolved. An attack upon these questions, beginning immediately, could merge into a resolution of the structural problem itself.

In our judgment, the only way to break the impasse is for the parties to shelve their respective "preconditions" as presently stated and open intensive bargaining on the substantive issues within the following groupings:

1. Copper mining, smelting and refining.

2. Units producing other non-ferrous metals.

3. Copper wire and cable and brass fabrication.

This bargaining, of course, should concentrate on the economic issues but should also comprise discussion of uniform expiration dates and equality of treatment within these groupings. Collective bargaining on this basis could bring forth the facts upon which viable bargaining units could be built for the future.

THE NORTHERN RIO GRANDE RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the call for personal involvement is growing throughout America today. People want to have more say and a larger part in programs which have to do with their welfare.

This is a basic concept of the northern Rio Grande resource conservation and development project in New Mexico. Local people in this 8-million-acre area in the north-central part of the State are rediscovering the vast potential of their historic and scenic land. They are attacking unemployment, low income, lack of processing and marketing facilities, and land and water resource problems. Together, they have analyzed their needs and potentials, brought them into better focus, and planned a course of action. They now have an amazing redevelopment job underway.

Federal help for the northern Rio Grande resource conservation and development project is coordinated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. The SCS gives technical and financial assistance in resource development and provides coordination for other agencies and groups which are in a position to help in other ways. Help comes from many fields—from conservation, highway, health, employment, planning, engineering, historic, and economic opportunity agencies.

People of several racial origins are working shoulder to shoulder with local, State, and Federal agencies in the total development of the potential of their natural resources—and of their people. This is extremely significant in the northern Rio Grande area. The necessarily cooperative nature of their project is helping to pierce cultural and language barriers which for decades have hampered the growth of the area.

Pablo Roybal, chairman of the project's steering committee, put it this way:

> The Resource Conservation and Development program is people; people working together to better themselves, to improve their community—making it a better place in which to live, work and play—for themselves and for their children.

Among the sponsors of the project are 11 soil and water conservation districts; five county commissions; eight villages, towns, and cities; 12 State agencies, and a water-users association. And the list of others who are cooperating locally is a long and revealing one. I mention this because it is this local interest and support which is at the core of the project's success.

Local people have proposed about 200 project measures which they expect to carry out with their own funds and facilities and with technical, financial, and long-term credit assistance from available sources.

They are making consistent gains in getting things accomplished.

Some examples are:

First. A fine restaurant with lodging and recreational facilities has created new jobs for local people, created an outlet for locally grown specialty crops, and brought business to weaving shops, laundries, and other services in the area. The new enterprise has stimulated the community's economy by an estimated $100,000 annually.

Second. A new automated sawmill will produce 200 man-years of employment.

Third. A new processing facility which produces, processes, and markets posole, chicos, chile, harina de atole, havas, and other native foods, also provides an outlet for locally growing specialty crops. It will increase the community's income by $60,000 annually and provide additional employment.

Fourth. A woodland product cooperative, organized for processing and marketing wood products, will provide employment opportunities for 23 families.

Fifth. A new highway will provide access to the Red River and Taos ski areas and add 150 man-years of employment.

Sixth. Natural gaslines have been extended into some of the communities. More than 50 communities have completed initial phases of ditch improvement projects.

I could go on enumerating the varied activities that are taking place. Let me say that during 1967 about $2 million additional income was pumped into the area—income brought about by new, continuing jobs created by project measures and by activities generated by the installation of other measures during the year.

The northern Rio Grande resource conservation and development project in New Mexico is just one of 41 authorized for Federal help by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. It was one of the first authorized. The others are also showing what this kind of effort can do to stimulate an area to help itself when given the opportunity. Things are happening in these areas. The projects are not a panacea for all problems, but they are certainly moving the economy off dead center and pushing it ahead at a sound pace.

CASE FOR SURTAX NOT YET MADE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "A Mixed Economic Bag," published in this morning's Washington Post, hits right at the Achilles heel of the administration's argument for a tax increase. As the editorial states, the economic picture which administration witnesses have painted for the Joint Economic Committee just does not jive with the performance of many of the economic indicators.

We have been hearing that the economic boom forecast for last year was temporarily stalled during the fall by strikes. And that the substantial improvement of the November and December indicators more clearly reflected the strength of the economy.

How then do we interpret the worsening of some important indicators in January? The decline in the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production of 0.6 point in January, following monthly increases since September, hardly supports the prognosis of an accelerating economic boom. In the housing industry, the encouraging rebound in January starts was overshadowed by a 16-percent decline in permits for future projects.

On the plus side were increases in personal income and a decline in unemployment. Yet these improvements give only partial encouragement. The increase in personal income in January was smaller than in December. And the decline in unemployment to 3.5 percent was accompanied by a shortening of the workweek to a level as low as it has been in 6 months and a decline in the number of women in the labor force.

This "mixed bag of economic indicators" as the Post aptly terms it, is hardly a sound basis for declaring, as the Secretary of the Treasury did before the Joint Economic Committee last week, "that the economy is in grave danger of excessive overheating."

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

A Mixed Economic Bag

At the time when Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler was assuring the Joint Economic Committee that "the economy is in grave danger of excessive overheating," the Federal Reserve Board announced that industrial production declined in January. It requires more than a single month's statistic to determine changes in trend, and in any case it seems likely that advance of industrial production will resume in February. But the fact that it declined in January hardly squares with the Administration's forecast of demand pressures so strong as to require higher taxes.

The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production, which had been rising since September, fell by 0.6 point in January. Automobile assemblies accounted for a little more than a third of the decline in the total index and iron and steel production accounted for a little less than a third. Auto production was slowed down by wildcat strikes against General Motors and iron and steel production is now said to be expanding briskly. So it is possible that "special," nonrecurring factors may account for as much as two-thirds of the decline in total industrial production. But they do not explain the sharp decline in the output of radio and television sets or the smaller dips in the output of electrical machinery, textile and leather products and the entire category of consumer staples.

Other economic indicators are emitting mixed signals. Personal income in January rose but the gain was much smaller than in December, the month in which the lump sum, retroactive pay increases were accorded to the military and civilian employes of the Federal Government. Private housing starts, after declining sharply in December—from 1,590,000 to 1,243,000—recovered to 1,445,000 in January, the same level as in September.

What we have is a mixed bag of economic indicators which suggests that the recovery from last year's quasi recession is proceeding, but in a bumpy fashion. Over all, the economy is very likely to make a good showing in the first half of this year. It does not follow that there will be "excessive overheating." That prognosis, advanced by the Administration's economic doctors, is still unconvincing.

AARP–NRTA SUPPORT MONTOYA PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on February 6, I reintroduced in the Senate a bill (S. 2936) to provide a much-needed benefit to the aged of this country. I was pleased to have been joined at the outset by 32 Senators as cosponsors in this effort to extend the coverage of medicare to provide for the reimbursement of prescription drugs. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions before, the cost of prescription drugs has been a heavy and often unbearable burden on the elderly of this country who, while living on fixed and usually meager incomes, must expend hundreds of dollars a year on lifesaving prescription drugs.

I have been heartened by the response which I have had since reintroducing this measure. In addition to the original 33 sponsors, other Senators have since joined in cosponsoring this proposal. I have additionally received letters from all over the country from individuals expressing their support of this bill and outlining for me from firsthand experience the costly burden of prescription drugs on their small budgets.

State agencies involved with administering programs for the aged have also expressed their complete approval of S. 2936.

Perhaps most indicative, however, of the merits of S. 2936 has been the tremendous support which I have received from the national organizations which represent millions of elderly citizens throughout this Nation. One such organization is the American Association of Retired Persons-National Retired Teachers Association, with headquarters here in Washington, D.C. The AARP-NRTA is really two organizations in one which lends it even greater significance.

NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION (NRTA)

The NRTA is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization of retired school personnel dedicated to doing something about the problems facing retired teachers, administrators and others who have served in the Nation's education system.

In 1947, a small group of retired teachers banded together under the leadership of the late Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, to form the NRTA for the specific purpose of satisfying the requirements of retired teachers. The $2 annual dues entitle the 200,000 members to many exclusive services, including publications, legislative representation, drugs at substantial savings, travel, insurance, preretirement programs, religious activities and seminars, to mention only a few of the benefits.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS (AARP)

The larger of the two groups, the AARP, likewise is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization. The AARP is composed of retired persons dedicated to doing something about the problems facing older persons in the United States.

AARP was founded in 1958 by the founder of the NRTA, Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, in order to give all retired persons the privileges and services already available to the NRTA which Dr. Andrus had founded in 1947. By 1968 the membership of AARP has grown to over a million persons. Essentially the same benefits are available to AARP members as are NRTA members.

Mr. President, the AARP-NRTA has traditionally—much to its credit—been an extremely responsible organization. While always working for the welfare of its members, it has nonetheless been selective in the legislative proposals which it has supported. The AARP-NRTA realizes that realistically we cannot possibly provide the aged of this country with all the benefits that we should rightly provide. Thus, it does not advocate nor support impossible demands. With this thought in mind their support of S. 2936 becomes even more indicative of the merits of this measure.

I wholeheartedly welcome the support of the entire 1¼ million members of the AARP-NRTA, and I congratulate the members for the excellent leadership which they have in Miss Cecilia O'Neil, president of NRTA; Mr. George W. Schluderberg, president of AARP; Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield, executive director, national and international affairs; and their entire legislative council. In recent weeks I have been working closely with—and I commend highly—their very astute legislative representative, Mr. Ernest Giddings, and his fine assistant, Mr. Jim Reuben.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me, dated February 12, 1968, expressing the support of the 1¼ million members of the AARP-NRTA be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED
PERSONS-NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1968.

Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONTOYA: On behalf of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons, which represent over one and one-quarter million older Americans, I wish to thank you for your concern with the problems of the high drug expense that the retired people of this country face.

We join with other interested organizations in pledging our support to you and your cosponsors of S. 2936.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST GIDDINGS,
Legislative Representative.

CRIME REDUCED IN MIAMI

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news article from the February 19 New York Times reporting that Miami, Fla., has experienced a sharp reduction in crime since the police began their "get-tough" policy in that city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI POLICE SAY TOUGH POLICY HAS CUT CRIME IN NEGRO AREAS

MIAMI, February 17.—Police Department figures show a sharp drop in crime in Miami's Negro areas since Police Chief Walter E. Headley announced his get-tough policy more than six weeks ago.

However, a number of Negro spokesmen continue to express concern over its effect on the city's race relations.

Statistics released today by the Miami Police Department showed that 71 robberies were committed in the city's three Negro districts in January, compared with 188 in December. This represents a drop of 62 per cent.

Chief Headley announced on Dec. 28 that he would send patrols reinforced with police dogs and shotguns into the Negro districts with orders to crack down on young Negroes who the chief said were "taking advantage of civil rights."

The announcement met with sharp criticism from civil rights leaders in Miami and across the nation, but the Miami City Commission supported Chief Headley and the tough enforcement policy has continued.

ROBBERY STATISTICS

Police statistics for January, the first full month the new policy was in effect, show that robberies throughout the city declined by 45 per cent, from 299 in December to 163 in January. The same statistics show that whereas 62 per cent of the robberies took place in the Negro districts in December, the same districts accounted for only 43 per cent of the total in January.

Chief Headley expressed satisfaction with the results of the program so far and said it would be continued as long as it continues to show success.

He said he had received no complaints about the tougher policy from "any law-abiding citizen" in Miami. He said he had received about 8,000 letters and telegrams from people all over the country and that only 22 of these opposed his stand.

"The N.A.A.C.P. was going to come down here and fight the thing but they never showed up," Chief Headley said. "The Civil Liberties Union was going to get an injunction against me, but nothing happened."

Reaction within the Negro areas continued to be mixed, as it was immediately after the policy was announced.

Resentment is said to be strong among young adults, who are the announced target of the policy. Police patrols customarily enter pool rooms and bars and frisk the occupants for guns and other weapons.

SOME FAVOR POLICY

Negro spokesmen say older residents of the districts and small merchants who were the repeated victims of muggings and robberies, strongly favor the new policy.

The Rev. Theodore Gibson, a Negro Episcopal clergyman, said tempers were near the boiling point two weeks ago following an incident in which two police officers allegedly stripped a 17-year-old Negro to his underwear and dangled him by his heels from an expressway overpass.

The youth, Robert Owens, was said to have made a sarcastic remark to Patrolman Jerry Edwards and John Creekmore while the two were searching patrons in a pool hall.

As word of the incident sped through the Negro district, Chief Headley moved to avert an explosion by suspending the two officers and requesting inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Edwards resigned from the force.

"These officers abused their authority and I won't stand for that," Chief Headley said.

Father Gibson said "the Negro people feel the Chief encouraged this sort of thing with his 'get tough' talk."

"They feel he has licensed the men on the force to violate people's rights and the officers will have solace from the higher ups when they do," Father Gibson said.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] without losing my right to the floor; and further ask unanimous consent that I may proceed notwithstanding rule VIII in speaking out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 45 minutes, and the Senator from West Virginia may proceed out of order.

Now the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRUTH IN LENDING—NEEDED PROTECTION FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 382 to 4, passed the truth-in-lending bill, which greatly improved the bill passed in the Senate last year. While we in the Senate did pass what we considered at the time a very adequate truth-in-lending bill, the other body added important amendments to provide additional protection for American consumers, and this improved legislative proposal will very shortly be considered in the Senate. This is in great part due to the perseverance of the distinguished Representative from Missouri, Mrs. LEONORE K. SULLIVAN. This outstanding lady deserves the commendation of all Americans.

I urge the Senate conferees to accept the House amendments and am hopeful that this needed legislative proposal will be enacted into law without much further delay.

While most American families try to avoid personal debt, more and more Americans have become accustomed to making installment payments on practically every sort of purchase from home mortgages to department store revolving charge accounts. It is said that debts of the public generally now have reached an amazing total of $312 billion and the annual interest payments alone amount to $22 billion. Because of inadequate regulations, men and women, even those regarded as frugal and careful in the purchases they make, are frequently unaware of the amount they are paying in interest charges. One reason is that in sales contracts, chattel and real estate mortgages, or various installment purchases, such additional charges are often stated in confusing or misleading terms. For example, a customer may be told that the finance rate is 1½ percent per month when the actual yearly rate of interest may be as high as 40 percent. In many instances consumers involved in long-term installment plans end up paying more in accumulated interest payments than the original price of the product itself.

There is a growing communications gap between borrowers and lenders and consumers and sellers as a result of the multiple and sometime devious methods, imposed in stating or even failing to mention financial charges by those offering consumer credit.

The bill passed by the other body provides a workable solution to bridge this needless gap of misunderstanding between debtor and creditor. It will bring en end to longstanding practices by which credit terms have often been stated in misleading monthly percentage rates well below the true annual rate.

Unfortunately, it is not possible for every housewife and family breadwinner to be a financial expert or mathematical genius. Too frequently the public generally acts hastily and without computing the ultimate costs involved in connection with purchases or other transactions. Thus, most people are often at the mercy of experts who have spent long years devising means of confusing them. Consumers should not find it necessary to be actuaries or mathematicians or even have a high school education in order to understand the exact rates of interest they are charged for washing machines, television sets, air conditioners, or any other item. The cost of credit should be disclosed in writing or print fully, simply, and clearly.

The House of Representatives provided additional important safeguards in this proposed legislation. They would require retailers to state the annual rate of interest on revolving credit accounts at an annual rate and require first mortgage agreements to state interest costs over the life of the mortgage. Borrowers would be protected against hidden second mortgage deals, and there would be increased regulation of credit advertising. The House bill provides greater protection for unsuspecting borrowers from unlicensed lenders commonly known as loan sharks. Among other provisions which give teeth to this legislative proposal, the House bill contains stronger enforcement provisions. Furthermore, it would become effective 9 months following enactment into law, while the bill passed by the Senate would not become fully effective until July 1969.

The pending truth-in-lending legislative proposal does not in any way impose any Federal regulation on the amount of interest that can be charged by lenders; only that the true rate be disclosed to the consumer. It would permit the cost of credit to be freely determined by informed borrowers and responsible lenders. This legislative proposal will not in any way affect business firms or lenders who are presently being entirely fair and candid with purchasers and borrowers.

Its enactment into law will be a great victory in the battle to protect millions of Americans from unscrupulous lenders and salesmen. Businessmen are protected by antitrust laws and laws against unfair competition. Working men and women are protected by laws against unfair labor practices. It is high time that consumers receive a break.

This bill will also be of great benefit to the businessman who does not resort to deceptive credit practices. It will enable the small businessman to compete more effectively with his larger competitors who have available to them the talents of financial wizards to devise schemes for confusing consumers. The truth-in-lending bill will invigorate competition. As passed by the House, it will cover nearly 95 percent of all consumer credit transactions.

Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will also be a tribute to a great American and one of the great Senators of all time, former Senator Paul Douglas, from Illinois, who introduced the first truth-in-lending bill 9 years ago and in every succeeding Congress up to 1967. It is largely through his efforts that a meaningful bill will be passed this year, and it is another of his accomplishments for which all Americans can be grateful.

Mr. President, consumers have basic rights in the marketplace. President Johnson, in his Executive order to strengthen the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, outlined these rights as follows:

> The right to be informed about the products he buys; the right to choose between several varieties of those products; the right to be protected from unsafe products; and the right to be heard in the highest councils of government.

The President spoke for us all when he further said:

> The success of our competitive economic system depends on the furtherance of the consumer interest. And it is our free marketplace, working for the benefit of the individual, that has given to the American consumer the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

I again urge the Senate conferees to accept the amendments to the truth-in-lending bill passed by the other body. There is a crying need in behalf of the consuming public for this greatly needed legislative proposal to be made law without delay.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his consideration.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio, for his very correct plea that the Senate accept some of the improvements that were enacted in the truth-in-lending bill by the other body. I think the Senate achieved greatly needed legislation when it passed the bill in the first instance, after many years of resistance, demonstrating that even very good legislation sometimes takes a long time to achieve—medicine is another example—but I think the House is to be congratulated on further improving the truth-in-lending legislation. I am hopeful the Senate conferees will agree on the revised version of what I believe to be one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted. As my colleague says, it is truly a tribute to our former colleague, Senator Douglas, who persistently and devotedly sponsored this legislation, and now has seen it about to be achieved.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I thank our distinguished colleague from our largest State, who I think is truly one of our great U.S. Senators.

PROPOSED BLACK POWER TAKEOVER BODES ILL FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention of Senators to developments occurring in the public school system of the District of Columbia, and in other urban school systems, that hold considerable danger for the future.

I refer to recent announcements to the effect that black power radicals, led by Stokely Carmichael and leaders of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, are seeking to "take over" the Washington school system.

I recently inserted in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of February 14 in which Carmichael, who heads the black united front that is being formed here, was quoted as saying:

> We intend by any means necessary to take over the (school) system so that it will respond to black people's needs.

Just what is meant by a "takeover" of the school system is not clear from Carmichael's remarks and it is equally unclear as to just what distinction there is between "black people's needs" and the needs of any other people.

I call attention to another news article dealing with this situation, from the Washington Post of February 13, which was headlined "SNCC Seeks Broad Role in City Schools."

This article points out that three citywide organizations are now being formed to be affiliated with the black united front. They are the Black Students' Union, the African-American Teachers Association, and the United Parents Federation.

The aim, as the article states, is to create "an educational system relevant to the black community."

Mr. President, the schools of the District of Columbia are attended predominantly by Negro children—93 percent, in fact. Certainly they should serve the needs of these children as well as the needs of the remaining 7 percent.

The intelligent interest of all of Washington's Negro citizens in the schools is highly desirable. The same may be said for Washington's white citizens. The counsel of experienced, seriously-intentioned, capable Negro leaders who want to see these children educated toward good citizenship is needed. Again, the same need exists for the counsel of capable white leaders in the community.

But there is serious question in my mind, about the objectives, and certainly the credentials in the field of education, of such an organization as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

And there is even more serious question in my mind, Mr. President, about the aims and the intent of Stokely Carmichael and some of the others who are associated with him.

One of these men, according to the February 13 story in the Post, is William W. Hall, who is reported to be a leader in the organization effort here.

Mr. President, a few facts regarding William Hall may be relevant at this point.

Willim Hall is a field organizer for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Hall favors the concept of a "people's board of education" similar to the insurgent group that took over the New York City Board of Education Headquarters one day last year.

Hall was born September 2, 1936, in New York City and resides at 530 Manhattan Avenue, New York City.

He has been charged twice with resisting arrest in connection with demonstrations in New York City in 1966.

In 1966, Hall reportedly attended a conference in Tanzania, in East Africa. SNCC now has an overseas office in Tanzania, and numerous SNCC personnel have traveled there.

Tanzania is a prime target of the Chinese Communists who have a large diplomatic staff there and a great number of technicians.

In 1966, Hall was interviewed by the now defunct World Journal Tribune newspaper in New York City.

Hall discussed antidraft policy with a reporter, saying:

> The black people should resist the draft. It is illegal. We think the U.S. is over there (in Vietnam) murdering people.

Reportedly, Hall also attended the Seventh Congress of the World Federation of Democratic Youth as a representative of SNCC. The World Federation of Democratic Youth is an international Communist front group.

Mr. President, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—which it has been observed might more properly be called the Nonstudent Violent Coordinating Committee—has already given New York City a taste of what its infiltration into the public schools can mean. In one school where it has gained control, disorder bordering on chaos has resulted, based on news reports from the New York Times of February 3 and February 8.

Control of the schools, Mr. President, and indoctrination of the students can become a powerful weapon in the hands of those whose aims, however, they may be worded, are, in reality, the aims of black revolution.

Where better to plant the seeds of total racial hatred than in the pliable minds of children? Control of the schools by SNCC, by the Stokely Carmichaels, by the black power revolutionaries could end any hope of progressive racial cooperation between Negroes and whites for generations.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, I have been and am sincerely and deeply interested in improving the public schools for all children, Negro as well as white, and my efforts will attest to this interest. Education, in my judgment, offers the best and perhaps the only real hope for racial progress, because what must be provided is the opportunity for each individual child and each individual citizen to achieve his own independence and to develop whatever potential he may possess for his own improvement and success.

No one can give any citizen status, or equality, or education, or success. It is a fact of life that each individual, whatever his race, has to earn those things. They cannot be conferred upon any child or adult, black or white. But we have a duty to provide the opportunity through which they can be earned, and a school system inculcating black power racial intolerance and hatred—teaching racism in reverse—can never provide such an opportunity. That road will prove to be the road to frustration and futility for all who embark upon it.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the recent stories in the press indicate that that is the road upon which some have already embarked in the District of Columbia.

William W. Hall, to whom I referred a moment ago, is described as being "superintendent" of the New York City People's Board of Education, a shadow group that seeks what is euphemistically called community control of the schools.

Hall has been quoted as saying that the kind of "community control" hoped for here in Washington would be similar to that in effect at Intermediate School 201 in New York City, a Harlem school, of which SNCC appears to have taken control.

According to the New York Times of February 3, I.S. 201 is now being run by a "governing board" which was established as part of an experiment to test community control of local schools. The Times story dealt specifically with the resignation of a white teacher from the I.S. 201 faculty after an anti-white play had been presented to the students in the school's auditorium.

Among the lines from the play were these:

> Who murdered the black man?
> Whitey, whitey.
> Who should we lynch?
> Whitey, whitey.

The teacher who resigned stated that a Negro pupil sitting near him said:

> We're talking about you, but we'll let you live.

The paper quoted Herman B. Ferguson, whom it said was a "special adviser" to the governing board of I.S. 201, as saying the play was "another educational experience for the children." I quote further from the Times article in reference to this man:

> Mr. Ferguson, a licensed assistant principal, was suspended from his post in a Queens school last fall after being indicted for participating in an alleged Revolutionary Action Movement plot to murder moderate civil rights leaders. Mr. Ferguson has denied the charges, and has not yet come to trial.

Mr. President, I think we have the right to ask if this is the kind of leadership SNCC plans for the District of Columbia's schools.

The play that was presented to the children, incidentally, was written by LeRoi Jones, the Negro militant writer, who is now free on bond awaiting a hearing on his appeal from a weapons conviction.

He was sentenced last month to 2½ to 3 years in the New Jersey State Penitentiary and fined $1,000 for having two loaded revolvers in his car in Newark during last July's riots.

As for the school which presented this man's play to the children, the New York Times had this to say:

> The 18-month-old I.S. 201, at 127th Street and Madison Avenue, has been plagued from the first by problems of leadership, teacher turnover, and pupil behavior. Earlier this week a teacher described it as a "jungle."

Is this what is in prospect for Washington schools?

Mr. President, let me quote a few more paragraphs from another news story in the New York Times on February 8 relative to how so-called community control is working at this Harlem school:

> An exodus of pupils who say they have been assaulted, harassed, or robbed by their classmates has developed at Intermediate School 201 in East Harlem.
>
> Sixteen youngsters have been granted transfers in the last three days after their parents voiced concern over the children's safety at the school, which the Board of Education had intended to be "one of the best in the nation."
>
> In all, 40 of the school's 1,100 pupils have been transferred to other schools at their parents' request since last October. . . .
>
> I.S. 201 . . . has been wracked by controversy and troubles since it opened in September, 1966.
>
> The school is the hub of a planned decentralization project involving four nearby elementary schools, that is intended to test local school operations. . . .
>
> A New York Times reporter who visited the school 10 days ago found near-bedlam in the building. Pupils were observed pushing and fighting during class-changes and roaming the corridors when classes were in session. . . .

If such conditions prevail in a school which was designed to be one of the best in the Nation, one shudders to think what might happen here in the Nation's Capital or elsewhere, if SNCC leaders or other black power militants ever get the upper hand.

The picture is not bright, for, as I have pointed out, shocking events have been occurring in many other big city schools.

Another news story from the New York Times of February 3, headlined "Bedlam at Junior High School 258," described a near riot in these words:

> Hundreds of eighth grade pupils . . . surging through corridors, trading blows, barging into classrooms, shouting, jeering, and turning in a false fire alarm . . . created havoc yesterday in a Bedford-Stuyvesant junior high school after demonstrating to win better food, more freedom and more dances.
>
> Only when half a dozen policemen were rushed to the school was order restored and the children herded back to their classrooms, where there was no further instruction for the day.

The article went on to state that an assistant school superintendent, Henrietta B. Purcell, said that, although she could not document it, and I quote from the Times story:

> There were indications that the outbreak in the school, where more than 95 per cent of the 1,480 pupils are Negro or Puerto Rican, had been planned and the youngsters incited.

In a prelude to the mass disruption, students gathered outside the school before it opened for the day, shouting slogans and holding aloft placards with crayon scrawls listing their demands. One of the demands was that the principal of the school be removed.

Mr. President, a basic ingredient of education is discipline. Without discipline, no education is possible. Indeed, the fields of study themselves in higher education are known as scholarly disciplines.

Yet, we are witnessing the destruction of discipline in the classroom. These elementary children, of course, have learned their lesson well from older agitators. They march and demonstrate, wave their placards, and shout demands—and if their demands are not met, they riot.

Are America's schools to become the training ground for mob action and revolution? How the Communist enemies of this land, within and without, must gloat at that thought.

No one can deny that the problems which New York and Washington and other big city school systems face are difficult and complex.

These problems are well known and well documented. They include inadequate facilities, overcrowded classrooms, insufficient numbers of teachers, and so on.

But, the last thing in the world that is needed is for black power radicals to exacerbate and compound the problems which exist in large urban school systems. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

We read with growing amazement and outrage that Stokely Carmichael—whose words have made him a traitor to the United States of America and who has gone into much of the Communist world damning this country—has "lectured" in at least two District schools, and that he has made no effort to cloak the intentions of the revolutionaries.

I do not know what is happening to our country, Mr. President, and I fear for it, when an out-and-out revolutionary like Stokely Carmichael can be treated as a celebrity in the Nation's Capital, invited to "lecture" in the schools and to speak in the churches, and whose counsel is sought.

Let me refresh the memories of Senators about this man.

I shall present a representative sampling of inflammatory statements made by Carmichael during the past 18 months:

Carmichael gave an explanation of black power in speaking before a Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—rally in Cleveland on August 5, 1966:

> When you talk of black power, you talk of bringing this country to its knees.
>
> When you talk of black power, you talk of building a movement that will smash everything western civilization has created.
>
> When you talk of black power, you talk of picking up where Malcolm X left off.
>
> When you talk of black power, you talk of the black man doing whatever is necessary to get what he needs. . . . We are fighting for our lives.

Carmichael appeared on the television program "Meet the Press" on August 21, 1966. On this program Carmichael described Negro Americans fighting in Vietnam as "black mercenaries" because frequently the Armed Forces provided the only means of employment to the Negro in this country.

Carmichael commented:

> I would not fight in Vietnam, absolutely not. I would advise every black man not to fight in Vietnam.

Also during the program, Carmichael said he agreed "150 percent" with the statement of James Meredith that Negroes have the right to take the law into their own hands if a Negro is killed and his slayer escapes criminal prosecution.

Also on this date Carmichael spoke to about 75 people at a rally of the Free D.C. Movement, Washington, D.C. He told his listeners:

> I don't think black people ought to wait to get the vote, becaues you're waiting for the white man to give it to you and he's not about to do that. You oughta get together and tell the man that if you don't get the vote you're gonna burn down this city. Tell him, "If we don't get the vote you're not gonna have a Washington, D.C."

On August 29, 1966, Carmichael remarked to a Harlem rally of militant Negro leaders:

> In Cleveland, they's building stores with no windows—all brick. I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite.

Carmichael told reporters in New York City on October 28, 1966, that he would not serve in the Army if he is drafted.

> I'd rather go to Leavenworth—

He asserted.

> I'm not going to refuse on the grounds of a conscientious objector but on the grounds of my own conscience. There is a higher law than the law of Government. That's the law of conscience.

In a speech at the University of California at Berkeley on October 29, 1966, Carmichael told 5,000 students that SNCC is opposed to the draft and to all foreign intervention by the United States.

He called President Johnson a "buffoon," Secretary of State Rusk a "fool," and Secretary of Defense McNamara a "racist." The only way to stop the war in Vietnam, he claimed, is for young Americans to say "to hell with the draft and I am saying, 'To hell with the draft'."

In addressing 400 students at another predominantly Negro college, Morgan State College, in Baltimore, on January 16, 1967, Carmichael stated:

> There is a higher law than the law of Government. There is the law of each of us . . . And that is my law and I will not go to jail. To hell with this country.

Typical of Carmichael's bombastic and incendiary remarks are those he made on February 17, 1967, at a rally sponsored by the Citizens for Creative Welfare of Long Beach, Calif. The audience of 400 persons was about 60 percent Negro. Carmichael urged Negroes to work together as black people for the black community and turn their backs on America.

> We are going to fight for our liberation and we will use any means necessary—

He warned.

On April 11, 1967, Carmichael spoke before a student group at Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss. Carmichael attacked U.S. Government policy in Vietnam and stated:

> LBJ says violence never accomplishes anything, yet we continue violent bombing of North Vietnam. Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is against the draft and the draft is black urban removal. If you are drafted, tell them hell no, we ain't going. Don't travel 8,000 miles to fight a man that ain't never called you a Nigger.

The crowd responded with a chant of "Hell no, we ain't going" for about 10 minutes. Carmichael also commented:

> The Negro is not rioting in Nashville, Tennessee, but is rebelling against the white man. No more hunkie cops will beat Negroes and get away with it. Black people must fight back.

On April 24, 1967, Carmichael spoke at Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., before approximately 3,000 people. During his speech, Carmichael stressed civil disobedience and noncompliance with existing draft laws. He also said that male students should not participate in the Hampton Institute Reserve Officers Training Corps.

At this point, one Reserve Officers Training Corps student stood up and stated:

> If my commanding officer tells me to shoot you, I will do so.

The student was immediately ejected from the auditorium, and no other incidents occurred.

On the afternoon of May 14, 1967, Carmichael spoke at Waukegan Township High School, Waukegan, Ill., before approximately 270 individuals. The meeting was sponsored by the Whittier School Mothers, a Negro organization formed in Waukegan after racial disturbances in the summer of 1966 to promote better education for Negroes.

Carmichael spoke against the war in Vietnam, advising young men to refuse military service. He said:

> War is for the birds—Lynda Bird, Lady Bird.

Carmichael advised Negroes to strike back if struck by policemen.

He stated:

> If you have to burn cities to the ground to get equality, then they must be burned.

Carmichael also stated:

> Where there are injustices, we are going to turn those cities upside down. And if the whites don't want to get hurt, they can keep their filthy white hands off our beautiful black ones.

On May 18, 1967, Carmichael spoke at Southern University, Baton Rouge, La., to an audience of approximately 3,500 individuals, consisting primarily of Southern University students. Carmichael declared:

> Black power means fighting for one's freedom with every means necessary. If we have learned to use violence, it is because we've been good students. We're just doing what has been done to us for four hundred years in this country. We tried to civilize the white man and it didn't work. Now we're going to teach him to keep his hands off us.

Carmichael spoke at an international congress on the Dialectics of Liberation, London, England, on July 18, 1967, where he stated:

> We are out to smash American white supremacy.

In commenting on the war in Vietnam, he stated:

> We have initiated black resistance to the Vietnam draft.

He also said that over 700 Negroes had refused to go to Vietnam.

On August 1, 1967, Carmichael gave a 4-hour press conference in Havana, which excluded representatives of the U.S. news media. Based on information reported by Latin and European newsmen, Carmichael reportedly made the following remarks:

> Forty per cent of the troops in Vietnam are Negro, and some good may come of it because when they come back they will be trained to kill in the streets.

Carmichael also said Abraham Lincoln was "a white racist" and exhorted American Negroes to take arms to fight for their freedom "from New York to California, from Canada to Mexico."

Carmichael added that American Negroes should seek vengeance against Lyndon B. Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. He said Negroes want to "settle the score" and "we will kill first and we will aim for the head."

Carmichael was quoted by Havana radio as saying American Negroes "will have enough arms of all kinds to continue the fight for liberation."

In August 1967, Carmichael visited Hanoi, North Vietnam. Hanoi radio reported that Carmichael met with North Vietnam leaders and told them that American Negroes and North Vietnam have the same common enemy, "United States imperialism." Carmichael stressed the determination of the Negroes in the United States to unite closely with the North Vietnamese people. He described the United States as "the greatest destroyer of humanity."

Carmichael arrived in Algiers, Algeria, from Hanoi on September 6, 1967. Upon his arrivel in Algiers, Carmichael stated:

> Revolution is the only solution for the American Negroes.

He added that Africa is the "mother country" of all Afro-Americans.

The weekly news magazine Revolution Africaine, which is published in Algiers, carried a 3-page interview with Carmichael in its issue of September 11, 1967. Carmichael is quoted as stating that "urban guerrilla warfare" is a tactic he proposes to employ in the struggle against the United States. He said:

> The only means of destroying the United States will be the destruction of the internal economy and the external armed forces. The destruction of the technological base will lend to the loss of the wars.

According to Carmichael, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is based on resistance while other civil rights groups are based on protest. He called the United States "the slut of the world."

On December 7, 1967, Carmichael told 3,000 persons at an antiwar rally in Paris, France, that he would like to see America lose the Vietnam war. He said:

> We do not want peace, we want the Vietnamese to defeat the United States.

He referred to young Negroes as "African youth living in America" and said they "suffer most from this dirty war."

He urged them to "develop a resistance movement that will disrupt the entire United States."

It is highly pertinent, at this point, Mr. President, to ask who financed Carmichael's trips to the Communist countries. It is not unreasonable, I think, to assume that his Communist hosts paid for them, since he served the purposes of his Communist hosts so perfectly when he visited those countries.

On Saturday night, last week, at a rally in Oakland, Calif., Carmichael, according to press reports this morning, said:

> Communism and socialism speak to people who are exploited.

In that speech he called for black people to unite and "internationalize," which sounds very much like a Communist line to me.

Explaining his call for black unity, Carmichael said, and at this point I quote from the Washington Post article to which I have already alluded:

> . . . "unity is not a question of geographics. Unity is a question of color." Negroes, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans must join with "the third world—Latin America and Asia."
>
> He also said Negroes must prepare military forces like the Viet Cong.

Mr. President, the Washington Post story to which I have referred states that—

> The rally was sponsored by the Black Congress, an amalgamation of Black Nationalist organizations and the Black Panther Party for Defense.

Mr. President, I am not the only individual who has taken note of Carmichael's new overtones.

In this morning's Washington Post, columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak described Carmichael's "new Leninist phase."

I quote from the column, in which they discuss the frightening possibility that Carmichael may take over Martin Luther King's April march on Washington.

> King's ill-considered campaign exactly coincides with the new Leninists phase—in many ways the most dangerous phase—of Stokely Carmichael's swift ascent to the top.
>
> He has returned from travels in the Communist world no longer preaching revolution in the streets but quietly implementing V. I. Lenin's tactics of coalescing with non-revolutionary social reformers—such as King.

The column goes on to point out that the formation in Washington of the black united front "follows the Leninist line now followed by Carmichael."

At another meeting last night in Los Angeles, Carmichael, joined by H. Rap Brown and other black power radicals, said that Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans must unite with Latin America and Asia, and that Negroes must prepare military forces like the Vietcong.

This is incitement to revolution, Mr. President, pure and simple.

This is the man, Mr. President, who, speaking from the platform of a Washington school, Roosevelt High School, on February 13, said:

> We intend by any means necessary to take over the system so that it will respond to black people's needs.

I may say, however, Mr. President, that there was one small glimmer of hope in Carmichael's appearance at Roosevelt High.

According to Washington newspapers, many students razzed Carmichael during his talk.

Could it be that the students themselves are more perceptive than the school administrators who permit such performances to occur, and some of the faculty who sponsor the appearances?

According to the Washington Evening Star of February 16, 1968, Mr. John Koontz, a Washington, D.C., school official, was reported to have said:

> It is the school administration's policy to have controversial speakers at school forums.

Mr. President, it is one thing to have purely controversial speakers at school forums. Controversial speakers can be reputable, law-respecting citizens. But it is quite another thing to have at school forums an individual who preaches hate for America, who advocates draft evasion and revolution, whose present mission in the city is that of exacerbating racial tensions and organizing a so-called black united front, and who, in furtherance of such a mission, is actively seeking to enlist support from faculty members and students within the public school system.

I will cite a few more instances of what is happening in the District's schools.

At Western High School, a student boycott of a commercial restaurant across the street from the school was organized just a few days ago—early training for more serious demonstrating and boycotting to come later. Handbills urging the boycott were circulated. A SNCC handbill was also reportedly circulated throughout the school.

I have in my hand copies of both documents. The boycott handbill was directed against the Cafe A-Go-Go at 1659 35th Street NW. The antidraft handbill stated:

> Jan Bailey, a draft resister from SNCC here in Washington will be outside the school to tell you why he won't go to Vietnam and why you shouldn't go.

I read the handbill in full:

> Uptight with the draft?
>
> There are legal alternatives:
>
> Tomorrow [Friday, January 12], experienced draft counselors will be outside Western High School (Reservoir Road, Northwest, between 35th and 36th Streets) at 3 p.m. to tell you about deferments and other alternatives to the draft, and to give you information that may help save your life.
>
> Some men say, "Hell, No . . ."
>
> Jan Bailey, a draft resister from SNCC here in Washington, will be outside the school to tell you why he won't go to Vietnam and why you shouldn't go. There will be other speakers, too.
>
> Friday, January 12—3 p.m.
>
> Outside Western High School on Reservoir Road, Northwest (between 35th and 36th Streets)

At Eastern High School, a so-called student bill of rights was recently demanded:

STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

1. Students have the right to choose all their required courses. A group of students has the right to begin new and unusual nonrequired courses.
2. Students have the right of freedom of dress.
3. Students have the right of free expression. Specifically, students have an absolute right (1) to wear political buttons and other silent forms of expression. (2) to write, print, publish, such papers and other publications as they see fit, free from any censorship or similar interference. (3) to make a number of uncensored announcements daily using the school communications system. (4) to listen to classroom speakers free of any prior censorship by administration. (5) to use school facilities (when not in use for class purposes) for educational programs of their choice, free from any censorship as to speakers, guests, materials or other elements of the program.
4. Students have the right to join, and to organize freely into and to support, financially and otherwise, such groups and for such purposes as they may choose, consistent with the freedoms of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.
5. The Student Council has the right to control all social matters such that do not come under the specific control of a school club.
6. All students have the right to freely protest grievances. These grievances shall be brought up before a grievance board made up of five students and four teachers who will be elected by the student body. The decisions of the board, in all matters will be final.
7. Only students have the right to change the Student Bill of Rights. Any further addition to the Student Bill of Rights, which is approved by a majority vote of the student body, becomes effective after a two week period.

(Written by the Modern Strivers of Eastern High School, Nov. 25, 1967, Revised Dec. 14, 1967.)

It is axiomatic, Mr. President, that freedom without responsibility is license. Without a restoration of necessary discipline, conditions in the schools will deteriorate into chaos. Permissiveness is being carried too far. A demand for the sort of "rights" I have cited here is absurd.

Certainly, democracy and democratic processes should be taught in the schools. But it is one thing to hear what a student council or similar agency may have to say in an orderly fashion, and another thing entirely to let a situation get so out of hand that we can read in the newspapers, as we did last week, that students are complaining that they "have little voice in school policy decisions."

That is a direct quotation from a Washington Post news article of February 13, headlined "Students Sound Off on School Issues."

Is the school administration going to run the schools, or is it spinelessly going to turn them over to the kids, the demonstrators, to SNCC, to Stokely Carmichael and the troublemakers?

These are serious questions, Mr. President, and I am not alone in raising them.

I have had communications, Mr. President, from teachers and persons in the public school system of the District of Columbia, declaring that there will be anarchy in the schools unless the trend is reversed.

What may appear on the surface, or at first glance, to be relatively innocent occurrences, on closer inspection take on the character of calculated subversion of pupils.

One teacher, it has been reported to me, has stated that he sees no reason for teaching U.S. history, rejecting the concept that a proper function of the public schools is to turn out loyal and patriotic American citizens.

This is a shocking thing, Mr. President.

Children are required by law to go to school. They form a captive young audience for a Stokely Carmichael who advocates murder and destruction for white people and white society.

It will be a tragic thing for the Nation's Capital, Mr. President, if city and school administration officials and the community sit idly by while the school system becomes a vehicle for Communist-tainted black power militants who thirst for power for themselves and who seek to promote anarchy, subversion, and revolution in the city which is the seat of the government of the United States.

Under the Constitution, Mr. President, Congress "shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia, it being "the seat of the Government of the United States."

The Congress will not surrender the school system of this city to those who would "take over" and destroy the system and our country along with it.

We have ample warning of what can occur by the examples I have cited of what has taken place in two schools in New York City. And we have had ample warning of what is developing here. The time for the city and school officials of the District of Columbia to move against this menace is now. The community must not allow its school system to be rent asunder by apostles of anarchy and rebellion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the various newspaper articles to which I have alluded. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

CARMICHAEL BIDS NEGROES, LATINS IN UNITED STATES UNITE FOR THEIR SURVIVAL

Los Angeles, February 18.—Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, James Forman and Reies Tijerina said tonight that Negroes, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans must unite if they are to survive in the white world.

They spoke at a rally in behalf of the Huey P. Newton defense fund at Los Angeles Sports Arena. Newton is accused of kidnaping a motorist last year, killing one policeman and wounding another.

More than 4000 persons—about 10 per cent of them white—paid $3 to attend the rally. They were searched before entering by sponsor's of the rally and no one was permitted to bring in a camera or tape recorder.

The rally was sponsored by the Black Congress, an amalgamation of Black Nationalist organizations and the Black Panther Party for Defense. Present were Ron Karenga, chairman of the militant organization US, Corky Gonzales, an ex-prize fighter, and Bobby

Seale, the second in command of the Black Panthers.

At another rally in Oakland last night, 5000 persons heard Carmichael, former chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, say "communism and socialism are not ideologies suited for white people. Communism and socialism speak to people who are exploited" and do not deal with racism, he said.

Carmichael instead called for black people to "internationalize" because the white race has colonized the whole "third world."

Carmichael was named "prime minister of Afro-America" at the rally by Eldridge Cleaver, minister of information of the Black Panthers. Cleaver also named Brown "minister of justice" and Forman, another former SNCC chairman, "minister of international affairs."

Cleaver described the action as "the first step in bringing about operational unity" in black America.

Brown, who is under a Federal court order forbidding him to leave the New York City area, received a standing ovation when he said "America would have us believe that the biggest problem facing us today is not air pollution and bad breath, but black people."

He also said the two-party system was totally inadequate because "the only difference between LBJ and (former Alabama Gov. George) Wallace is one has a wife that's got cancer."

Radio and television stations decided not to cover the rally after its sponsors set a $1000 price for allowing them in.

Explaining his call for black unity, Carmichael said "unity is not a question of geographics. Unity is a question of color." Negroes, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans must join with "the third world—Latin America and Asia."

He also said Negroes must prepare military forces like the Vietcong.

Official Fears Grow That Carmichael Will Seize Dr. King's "March of Poor"

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Fear is growing among top officials in the White House and Justice Department that Dr. Martin Luther King's April "March of the Poor" on Washington will result in a stunning victory for Stokely Carmichael.

With only six weeks to go, little of the detailed and massive planning necessary for King's April campaign has been done. Thus, in the opinion of Administration strategists, there is a golden opportunity for Carmichael to step in and gain primacy among Negro leaders. Indeed, King in desperation may even invite him to take a leading role in the planning, with obvious implications for the future.

Moreover, King's ill-considered campaign exactly coincides with the new Leninist phase—in many ways the most dangerous phase—of Stokely Carmichael's swift ascent to the top. He has returned from travels in the Communist world no longer preaching revolution in the streets but quietly implementing V. I. Lenin's tactics of coalescing with nonrevolutionary social reformers—such as King.

What makes King particularly susceptible to Carmichael's embrace is his present desperate condition within the movement. Once the country's most prestigious Negro leader, he has been declining since the failure of his Chicago campaign of 1966.

Furthermore, as Justice Department officials well know, King has a history of surrendering control to the better organized extremist element in a critical situation. This was precisely what happened during the Selma, Ala., march in 1965 when the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) forced King to the wall and seized control.

Nor are Administration officials alone in their apprehension. King's more moderate lieutenants—such as the Rev. Walter Fauntroy, vice chairman of the new Washington City Council—have from the beginning feared that control of the April march would go to the extremists.

The decision by Carmichael's new Black United Front to endorse the "aims" of the King campaign has only fanned the fears. For Carmichael, it avoids all responsibility for a possible fiasco but positions him perfectly to take command if the opportunity arises.

Indeed, mere formation of the Black United Front follows the Leninist line now followed by Carmichael. Whether or not Carmichael himself actually read Lenin, during his long travels in the Red world last year, he returned to this country a changed man.

Moderate Negro leaders here have been uncertain about their reaction to Carmichael's overtures. Carl Moultrie of the NAACP and Sterling Tucker of the Urban League attended the first meetings of the Front more to keep an eye on Carmichael than anything else. In private conversation, Tucker told Carmichael he realized each was trying to hoodwink the other.

But the moderates came under heavy pressure not to consort with Carmichael. Moultrie was particularly chastised by national NAACP headquarters. When the Black United Front met again last Wednesday neither Moultrie nor Tucker were present.

Present or not, they fully appreciate Carmichael's tactics. He is explicitly following Lenin's famed 1920 injunction to the British Communist Party not to attack the Labor Party but to "support" the democratic Socialists "in the same way as the rope supports a hanged man."

It is in precisely this way that Stokely Carmichael may be able to "support" King six weeks hence.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1968]

Carmichael Lectures Two Classes at Western

(By Donald Fitzhugh)

Students in two classes at Western High School this week had a guest lecturer—Stokely Carmichael, the militant civil rights leader who has started a Black United Front coalition of Negro leaders here.

Carmichael was invited by two teachers with the permission of the principal, Sidney Zevin.

Zevin said, "Stokely is talking to kids outside the classroom. I'd prefer to have him talk to my students where some adults can be present and question and test his logic."

Zevin said one of his students told him recently he had been to a meeting to discuss the formation of a black student union and Carmichael was present.

Zevin added: "I want my students to feel free enough not to have to go underground and form some kind of union."

TAKING UP NEGRO HISTORY

Patrick Henisse, a teacher of one of the classes Carmichael spoke to, said his history class was about to study the Civil War and was taking up Negro history.

He said that he and Donald Leace, an English teacher, invited Carmichael through a teacher's aide at the high school who is now a Howard University student and knows the civil rights leader.

"I think there is a lot of unnecessary flack about bringing someone like this in," Henisse said. "Let the kids see him, stripped of all his tools in a classroom situation and they'll see him as he really is."

Henisse said about 35 students heard Carmichael in his class. Zevin said six other teachers brought their pupils to Leace's class, crowding about 75 students in the room.

Zevin believes it is part of the learning process for young people to meet controversial persons such as Carmichael.

Carmichael talked about the difference between the "street" language and English taught in the schools when he lectured Leace's class, Zevin said.

"The kids didn't buy everything he said," according to Zevin. "One girl said street language is dialect, which is different in every part of the country and standard English is a necessary common denominator."

Most of his students felt the same way about Carmichael after his talk as they did before, Henisse said.

Parent response to Carmichael's appearance was sparse. Only one mother called Zevin and although she was "upset at first," after he explained that he felt it was better to have adult supervision, she was convinced, he said. Of the four calls received by him, a teacher and the school system, two were favorable two were not.

Zevin said he feels there is a fairly active citywide student movement. He said he recently came across a mimeographed handout calling for the formation of black student union chapters.

Roger Newell, 17, vice president of the Modern Strivers, a student group which has boycotted the cafeteria at Eastern High School recently, said he was at the student meeting which Carmichael attended.

TELLS OF MEETING

Newell said the meeting was held on a Sunday three weeks ago and was called by several students at different District high schools to talk over common problems. The Strivers have asked for greater student rights, classes in Negro history and a student code of dress.

Carmichael, who could not be reached for comment, did not have much to say during the meeting, which brought together about 20 students from Eastern, Western, Cardozo and Ballou, according to Newell.

Newell said Carmichael left before the two-hour meeting was over to go to a steering committee meeting of the Black United Front, a coalition of Washington Negro leaders the black power leader called together Jan. 9.

SNCC Seeks Broad Role in City Schools

(By Robert C. Maynard)

Students, parents and teachers in the Washington school system are being organized by the local office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee with the goal of creating "an educational system relevant to the black community."

The effort is being organized by William W. Hall, who said the model will be New York City's People's Board of Education, a shadow group, of which he is "superintendent."

Hall, a field organizer for SNCC, said the kind of community control of schools hoped for here would be similar to I.S. 201 in New York, a school the Harlem community helps in running.

The three citywide organizations being formed are the Black Students Union, the African-American Teachers Association and the United Parents Federation.

Each is expected to seek affiliation with the Black United Front, the coalition of civil rights organizations brought together here in January by Stokely Carmichael.

The Black Students Union, in existence for about six weeks, is expected to ask to join the Front at a meeting tonight.

The first parents' meeting is scheduled for Wednesday and the first teachers' meeting is to be held Sunday. Times and places for the meetings could not be learned yesterday.

The issues around which the groups are being organized, Hall said in an interview yesterday, are what he describes as the low quality and "irrelevance" of what is being taught in the Washington schools.

The reason for this, he said, is that the system is not responsive to the community as it now exists. The voices of students, teachers, parents and the community in general are not being heard, he said.

And, he said, the curriculum gives the graduate none of the tools he needs either to cope with the system as it is "or have the knowledge of how to change the system."

Furthermore, Hall charged, "students are graduating without even knowing how to read."

He said this depicts the failure of the system to be responsible and responsive to the community.

The answer, Hall said, is to bring the community and the components of the schools—teachers, students and parents—into a closer working relationship.

The issue of integration, he said, is "irrelevant to a school system that is 93 per cent black."

"There's nothing wrong with the neighborhood school concept," Hall said. "It's just that in the black community such schools were so poorly run that our kids suffered."

Hall said reports of problems of disorder at community-run I.S. 201 are problems that predated community control.

Also, he said, "some disorder is creative disorder." But, as for problems of discipline, he said he sees this diminishing as parents, teachers and students all become involved in the process of education.

The curriculum of the community school would have a heavy emphasis of Negro culture and Negro history, Hall said.

[From the Congressional Record, Feb. 14, 1968]

CARMICHAEL RAZZED AT HIGH SCHOOL TALK—CATECHISM ON BLACK POWER DRAWS THE WRONG ANSWERS

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Stokely Carmichael got off to a rough start yesterday when he mispronounced Roosevelt High School as *Rooze-velt* and the students in the auditorium at 13th and Upshur streets nw. razzed him pretty hard about it.

He took it good naturedly and tried to continue his discussion of the Negro's problems.

The students, some 600 in all, though the numbers dwindled during his hour-long session, murmured busily among themselves and laughed or cheered sporadically when some attempted to engage Carmichael in debate.

"Who needs help—black people or white people?" Carmichael asked the overwhelmingly Negro crowd.

"Both," came the answer from a dozen different voices.

"Do you think white people know in the slightest way that they are doing us wrong?" he asked.

A scattering of "yeses" and "noes" answered. Most said nothing. Some were pulling on their coats and leaving.

"Does the white student or the black student get the better education in Washington?" Carmichael tried again.

"You get the education you want to get," snapped a youth.

Other students vied among themselves to ask Carmichael questions. The murmur of voices rose to a steady drone. A small group of pro-Carmichael students cheered piercing when Carmichael said, "Be black, be beautiful." Other students giggled. Carmichael's voice was drowned in the clatter.

He raised his hands beseeching. "We have got to be serious," he said, "because our people are at stake. We have got to be serious because our lives are at stake."

The students moved restlessly in the auditorium seats. The murmuring resumed.

Carmichael, invited by the Roosevelt student council to address the school as part of its regular Tuesday afternoon seminar program, jotted down a lot of words on a chalk board: poverty, segregation, unemployment, drugs, police (cheers from the auditorium), bad housing, crime.

"These are the problems black people face," he said. "Does *Rooze-velt* High School prepare you to cope with them?"

A thin scattering of yeas and nays was mixed with hisses and laughter at his pronunciation of Roosevelt. "Okay," he said, "*Rosevelt*. Okay?" Slight applause.

At the end of the session, Carmichael mentioned the plan announced Monday by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee here to create a "shadow" school board of persons to increase Negro influence in local education.

"This system is 93 per cent black," Carmichael said. "We intend by any means necessary to take over the system so that it will respond to black people's needs."

As he spoke, a school bell rang. The students rose from their seats. Few reacted to his last statement. Most streamed out of the building, while some clambered onto the stage to get a closer look at Stokely Carmichael.

"This was a bad session," he said. "Too many voices trying to get the floor at the same time. But I didn't want to lecture to you. I wanted to talk with you."

[From the Congressional Record, Feb. 14, 1968]

STUDENTS SOUND OFF ON SCHOOL ISSUES

(By Susan Jacoby)

More than 1000 Washington high school students accepted an unprecedented chance yesterday to tell a top public school official what they think is wrong with the city's educational system.

The students met at McKinley High School at the invitation of George R. Rhodes, new assistant superintendent in charge of junior and senior high schools. It is believed to have been the first time a high-level school administrator has publicly called together a group of students to ask for opinions on how the school should be run.

"The first comment which was made when I proposed having this meeting was 'There's going to be trouble when you get that many students together,'" Rhodes said, "I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone should assume there will be trouble when students get together to talk about anything."

FAMILIAR COMPLAINT

Rhodes, who was the principal of McKinley until his appointment last month, said "the one thing I have learned in my experience as a principal is that if you expect students to react in a favorable manner, they do. I have found it much easier to change the attitude of students than those of teachers and administrators."

Rhodes told the students, "I am giving myself three months to accomplish something in this job. If I can't accomplish anything for you in that time, I will be looking for another job."

Complaints voiced by students at the meeting had a familiar ring. They have been raised by activist students at demonstrations this year in several of the city's high schools.

The students' two major complaints are that they have little voice in school policy decisions and that the quality of academic instruction is poor.

POORLY PREPARED

"We know we are being poorly prepared," said Randolph Robinson, a senior at Anacostia High School. "Many of us do not read adequately or work problems in math accurately. We are not being prepared to compete.

"I speak as a black student, a representative of the 90 per cent majority in the schools. It is too late for those of us who are seniors, but it is time for us to group together. The children who are in the elementary and junior high schools must be taught pride and dignity before it is too late. By uniting, we can help accomplish this."

The students at the meeting made up a diverse group. One student from Coolidge made an unpopular request for a return to the track system, saying that "bright children are being deprived of the opportunity to be in classes with other children who want to learn."

QUESTIONS PREMISE

Replying from the stage, Rhodes questioned the premise that slow students have less desire to learn than faster ones. "I don't think there's a student here who doesn't want to learn," Rhodes said, and was loudly applauded.

Other students were members of the Black Student Union, new group being formed in several high schools. The Modern Strivers, a group from Eastern High School, wore African dress in observance of Negro History Week.

Rhodes requested the students to return to their schools and organize elections to select representatives for a council "which will serve as a kind of pipeline to me." He said he did not want to spell out the functions of the council "because that should be up to the students."

The entire meeting was orderly, although the influx from other high schools brought the total number of students at McKinley to more than 3500 during the morning.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1968]

HUNDREDS OF PUPILS RAMPAGE IN PROTEST AT BROOKLYN SCHOOL

BEDLAM AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 258

Hundreds of eighth grade pupils—surging through corridors, trading blows, barging into classes, shouting, jeering and turning in a false fire alarm—created havoc yesterday in a Bedford-Stuyvesant junior high school after demonstrating to win better food, more freedom, and more dances.

Only when half a dozen policemen were rushed to the school was order restored and the children herded back to their classrooms, where there was no further instruction for the day.

Assistant Superintendent Henrietta B. Purcell, who was summoned to Junior High School 258, at Marcy Avenue and Macon Street, said a complete investigation of the disorder would be made by the Board of Education.

She said there was indications that the outbreak in the school where more than 95 per cent of the 1,480 pupils are Negro or Puerto Rican, had been planned and the youngsters incited—"although I have no positive information now."

In a prelude to the mass disruption, 60 of the pupils gathered at 8:30 A.M. outside the school, shouting slogans and holding aloft placards with crayon scrawls listing their demands.

"We want McCassey Out," said one sign, in a reference to Miss Mary A. McCassey, who is white and has been the principal of the school for the last 18 months.

"We want Good Teachers Kept," said another sign in an apparent reference to the dismissal on Jan. 22 of George Fuccillo, who was popular with the youngsters, even though he allegedly struck one.

By 10:30, the crowd had swelled to a hundred—most of them eighth graders. Mrs. Joy Berry, executive assistant principal, persuaded the youngsters to enter the school to present their demands to Miss McCassey.

The demonstrators were led to the cafeteria, but they were joined by about 600 eighth-grade pupils who had been attending classes until they were disrupted.

With the throng overflowing the cafeteria, the pupils were taken to the auditorium, where Miss McCassey expressed her willingness to discuss the demands with class representatives if the pupils would return to their classrooms.

Without dissenting, the children were dismissed, but disorder erupted as they surged into the corridors.

Bedlam starts

Racing up and down hallways and stairways, breaking into classrooms, shoving, pushing, shouting down appeals and instructions from teachers who were jostled by their charges, the pupils roamed heedlessly and at will.

"Return to your class," shouted a teacher.

"What class?" retorted a youngster.

Fights among pupils flared, and on the third floor lights were switched off. In the midst of the turmoil, a fire alarm rang, but in an instant, loudspeakers were telling the pupils to ignore it.

Teachers said that during the past week 11 false fire alarms had been turned in and that three fires had been discovered in wastebaskets.

In a hallway, Miss McCassey was trying to calm the pupils. Most ignored her. But one girl came running to her, complaining that she had been "shoved" by a teacher. Miss McCassey took the girl in her arms and promised to look into the matter.

From the pupils, Miss McCassey heard reports of fights in classrooms to which she dispatched teachers. None of the scuffles was serious, but the constant shuttling of teachers on peacemaking missions seemed to heighten the air of disorder.

The one policeman normally assigned to the school—Patrolman Cecil Greenidge—hurried from one trouble spot to another, but could not restore calm.

Only at noon, when six patrolmen commanded by Capt. Norman Weiner came on the scene and fanned out through the building was relative peace attained. Only eighth-grade classes had been involved.

Promises made

With the students again in their classrooms, Miss McCassey visited them, offering to meet some of their demands after agreeing that the food was not up to par. She promised a cleaner cafeteria, French fried potatoes—instead of the usual potatoes boiled in their jackets, and more dances.

She also said the cafeteria would be provided with fresh vegetables and with pretzels, potato chips and candy that the pupils could purchase "instead of sneaking out to buy them."

As for release from school during lunch time, she said she would meet with their mothers, the teachers, the police and others involved to determine whether such a move would be feasible.

At a later meeting with about 75 student representatives, Miss McCassey repeated the promises, agreed that everything was not perfect and asked the pupils to tell her what was good about the school.

There was an embarrassing silence until one pupil cried, "Nothing!" The others laughed.

Teachers, who refused to be quoted, insisted there was too much permissiveness in the school and too little communication with the principal and her staff.

One pupil, who wanted the principal ousted, gave this explanation. "She doesn't keep promises. She promised us better food long ago and we still get slop."

Teacher Quits at 201

(By Leonard Buder)

A new teacher turned down his assignment to Intermediate School 201 as the result of an allegedly antiwhite play presented in the school auditorium Thursday by LeRoi Jones, the militant Negro writer.

Three other teachers reportedly "walked out in disgust" during the performance but did not quit and were at work yesterday.

The new teacher, after working one day—Thursday—at the East Harlem school, went to district headquarters and said: "Please take me out of there." The teacher was reassigned.

Martin W. Frey, the district superintendent, said yesterday that he had learned about the play after it had taken place and was looking into the situation. "I heard today that LeRoi Jones had been here," he said. "I don't know who invited him or who organized the assembly program."

Mr. Frey had been asked on Thursday to personally take charge of the troubled East Harlem school by Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, the Superintendent of Schools. The assembly program took place while Mr. Frey was attending a meeting at Board of Education headquarters in Brooklyn.

According to the account of the play given to the district office by the teacher who asked for reassignment, a major character posed questions that were answered by a chorus. The questions and responses supposedly went like this:

"Who murdered the black man?"

"Whitey, whitey."

"Who should we lynch?"

"Whitey, whitey."

The teacher said that a Negro pupil sitting nearby told him, "We're talking about you, but we'll let you live."

EDUCATION STRESSED

But Herman B. Ferguson, a special adviser to the I.S. 201 "governing board," said he did not recall hearing these lines. He said the presentation was intended as "another educational experience for the children" and to give them exposure to professional theater.

"There was nothing racial as far as I was concerned," Mr. Ferguson said. "It had a historical flavor."

Mr. Ferguson, a licensed assistant principal, was suspended from his post in a Queens school last fall after being indicted for participating in an alleged Revolutionary Action Movement plot to murder moderate civil rights leaders. Mr. Ferguson has denied the charges, and has not yet come to trial.

Mr. Jones could not be reached for comment yesterday. The 34-year-old poet and playwright is free in bail awaiting a hearing on his appeal from a weapons conviction.

He had been sentenced last month to two and a half to three years in the New Jersey State Penitentiary and fined $1,000 for having two loaded revolvers in his car in Newark during last July's riots.

The I.S. 201 governing board was established as part of an experiment to test community control of local schools.

SCHOOL 201 BESET BY TROUBLE

The governing board, which now has "semi-official status," according to the Board of Education, has not yet been given full operating control over the intermediate school and five nearby elementary schools in the project.

The 18-month-old I.S. 201, at 127th Street and Madison Avenue, has been plagued from the first by problems of leadership, teacher turnover and pupil behavior. Earlier this week a teacher described it as "a jungle."

When the new term began on Thursday, the school had no licensed supervisor in charge, Superintendent Donovan asked Mr. Frey to take charge until a permanent principal is appointed. The governing board has named its own principal, but the selection has not been recognized by the Board of Education.

A telephone call to I.S. 201 yesterday afternoon asking for "the principal of the school" caused a flustered response. After some hesitation and apparent consultation with others in the office, the woman who answered the call asked the caller: "Can you call back Monday?"

Violence in I.S. 201 Spurs Transfer—Parents Cite Fear for Safety of Pupils as Motive for Seeking New Schools

(By Leonard Buder)

An exodus of pupils who say they have been assaulted, harassed or robbed by their classmates as developed at Intermediate School 201 in East Harlem.

Sixteen youngsters have been granted transfers in the last three days after their parents voiced concern over the children's safety at the school, which the Board of Education had intended to be "one of the best in the nation."

In all, 40 of the school's 1,100 pupils have been transferred to other schools at their parents' request since last October. But the transfers had begun to level off until a flurry of requests were made in recent weeks.

Martin W. Frey, the district superintendent who has been personally overseeing I.S. 201 since the new school term began last Thursday, said that the number of special transfers from the school was "about four times the normal rate."

Although the majority of the school's pupils are Negroes, 30 of the 40 who have been transferred are Puerto Ricans.

However, Mr. Frey said that he had "no personal evidence" of any friction along ethnic lines between Negro and Puerto Rican pupils.

SENT TO 4 SCHOOLS

Although not all the requests from parents for transfers have been granted, enough have been approved to result in a stream of letters from Mr. Frey's office to principals of other schools, saying:

"Please accept the following children as transfers from I.S. 201. These children have been assaulted and the parents fear for their safety."

The pupils have been sent to I.S. 177 and Public Schools 80, 96 and 155.

Wracked by controversy

I.S. 201, at 127th Street and Madison Avenue, has been wracked by controversy and troubles since it opened in September, 1966.

The school is the hub of a planned decentralization project involving four nearby elementary schools, that is intended to test community control of local school operations.

A governing board of parent, community, and school representatives has been established, but has not been given control of the five schools by the city Board of Education. However, it is being consulted on school matters.

Mr. Frey would not discuss conditions at I.S. 201 yesterday. He also said that newsmen would not be permitted to inspect the school unil matters have "steadied."

A New York Times reporter who visited the school 10 days ago found near-bedlam in the building. Pupils were observed pushing and fighting during class-changes and roaming the corridors when classes were in session. One teacher brandished a yardstick to maintain order.

Mr. Frey said yesterday that five of the 80 teaching positions were vacant, as were two positions of assistant principal. Mr. Frey took over personal supervision of the school when the acting principal and two licensed assistant principals went on leave. This had left the school without a licensed supervisor.

The district superintendent said that seven persons who are on the eligibility list for appointment as junior high school principals had applied to head I.S. 201. He said that their names were being referred to the governing board. Berlin L. Kelly, chief consultant to the governing board, said later that these candidates would be given interviews.

However, the governing board had announced last week the selection of Ronald Evans, an experienced city teacher, as the new principal of I.S. 201. Mr. Evans is not on the eligibility list. Mr. Kelly said yesterday that the governing board was working with city school authorities "on procedures" for the appointment of a principal.

LET US GET RID OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AT LEAST TO THE EXTENT THAT IT CAN BE DONE BY LAW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his civil rights message to Congress on January 24, President Johnson stated carefully and concisely the reason for the fair housing amendment to H.R. 2516 which we are now considering and of which I am a cosponsor.

President Johnson said:

> Every American who wishes to buy a home, and can afford it, should be free to do so.

The President said he would initiate a 10-year campaign to build 6 million new decent housing units for low- and middle-income families. Then he correctly pointed out:

> But construction of new homes is not enough—unless every family is free to purchase and rent them.

Indeed, as he stated so well:

> Segregation in housing compounds the Nation's social and economic problems. When those who have the means to move out of the central city are denied the chance to do so, the result is a compression of population in the center. In that crowded ghetto, human tragedies—and crime—increase and multiply.
>
> Unemployment and education problems are compounded, because isolation in the central city prevents minority groups from reaching schools and available jobs in other areas.

We may agree with the President, I believe, when he frankly admits that a fair housing law is not a cure-all for the Nation's urban problems. We may praise his statement which points out that:

> Ending discrimination in the sale or rental of housing is essential for social justice and social progress.

The President is no newcomer to this battle. On April 28, 1966, he sent to Congress his message on the elimination of racial discrimination and said:

> We are engaged in a great adventure—as great as that of the last century, when our fathers marched to the western frontier. Our frontier today is of human beings, not of land.

He said that our task is to end discrimination in all housing, old and new—not simply in the new housing covered by an Executive order.

Regrettably, we have not found equitable solutions for our housing ills, and for our other domestic problems.

On September 14, 1966, I said:

> But extremism is, as we learn, sometimes inevitable, as part of a troubled heritage. True, voting bills are passed. The right to register and to vote is assured by law. But where are the jobs? The houses? The instant education? Without them extremism flourishes.

Yes, where are the houses?

Where are the jobs?

Where are the large-scale educational and manpower retraining programs we need if we are to enable all Americans to catch up?

I believe we can answer a part of these questions by insuring that the men and women who wish to buy or rent a home and can afford it are free to do so.

Our able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] introduced amendment No. 524 on February 6. Cosponsors of this fair housing amendment come from many States, some with sprawling, urban populations which are multiplying and have not only outgrown their existing, inadequate housing but have set up explosive conditions.

Some of us come from States having much smaller populations, such as my State of Alaska where, I am pleased to note, steps have been taken to make opportunity equal. When I was Governor of the Territory of Alaska I asked the territorial legislature to consider and pass legislation to penalize discrimination based on race. The year was 1945, and in my message to the territorial legislature that year, I stated:

> Let us live up, at home, to the principles for which American boys of every race, creed, and color are giving all they have. Let us get rid of the soul-searing race discrimination in our midst to the extent that we can do it by legislative action.

I had found then that there existed considerable discrimination against Alaskan natives—Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. The territorial legislature responded affirmatively. It passed antidiscrimination legislation which went far to rectify the previously existing discriminations in Alaska.

In Alaska we are proud of the progressive legislation which we have enacted in the field of human rights. In our State laws we have section 18.80.240 which includes not only open housing accommodations but unimproved property or as it was known at the time, the "open land provision." Our State act relating to the Commission on Human Rights also includes section 18.80.250 which places financial institutions under the act and specifically prohibits discrimination against persons seeking financial assistance because of race, religion, color, or national origin.

Many Alaskans worked to strengthen these just, humanitarian provisions. I believe it appropriate to ask unanimous consent that chapter 117 of the Laws of Alaska, 1965, relating to the Commission for Human Rights, be made a part of the debate at this point.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[C.S.H.B. 139]

LAWS OF ALASKA, 1965—CHAPTER 117

An act relating to the Commission for Human Rights; and providing for an effective date

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Section 1. AS 18.80.060 is repealed and reenacted to read:

"'Sec. 18.80.060. Powers and Duties of the Commission. (a) In addition to the other powers and duties prescribed by this chapter the commission shall

"'(1) appoint an executive director approved by the governor;

"'hire other administrative staff as may be necessary to the commission's function;

"'(3) exercise general supervision and direct the activities of the executive director and other administrative staff;

"'(4) accept complaints under sec. 100 of this chapter;

"'(5) study the problems of discrimination in all or specific fields of human relationships, and foster through community effort or goodwill, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the state, and publish results of investigations and research as in its judgment will tend to eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, or national ancestry.

"'(b) In addition to the other powers and duties prescribed by this chapter the commission may

"'(1) delegate to the executive director all powers and duties given it by this chapter except the duties and powers given it by secs. 120 and 130 of this chapter;

"'(2) call upon the departments and agencies of the state, with the approval of the governor, for cooperation and assistance in carrying out this chapter;

"'(3) hold hearings under sec. 120 of this chapter, subpoena witnesses, take the testimony of any person under oath, administer oaths, and in connection therewith, to require the production for examination of books or papers relating to a matter under investigation or in question before the commission.'

"Sec. 2. AS 18.80.100 is amended to read:

"'Sec. 18.80.100. Complaint. A person who believes he is aggrieved by any discriminatory conduct prohibited by this chapter may sign and file with the commission a written, verified complaint stating the name and address of the person alleged to have engaged in discriminatory conduct and the particulars of the discrimination. The executive director may file a complaint in like manner when an alleged discrimination comes to his attention.'

"Sec. 3. AS 18.80.120 is amended to read:

"'Sec. 18.80.120. Hearing. If the informal efforts to eliminate the alleged discrimination are unsuccessful, the executive director shall inform the commission of the failure, and the commission shall serve written notice together with a copy of the complaint, requiring the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency, charged in the complaint to answer the allegations of the complaint at a hearing before the commission. The hearing shall be held by the commission at the place where the unlawful conduct is alleged to have occurred unless the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency requests a change of venue for good cause shown. The case in support of the complaint shall be presented before the commission by the executive director or his designee who shall be a bona fide resident of the state. The executive director may request the assistance of the Department of Law in the preparation and presentation of any complaint before the commission. The person charged in the complaint may file a written answer to the complaint and may appear at the hearing in person or otherwise, with or without council, and submit testimony. The executive director has the power reasonably and fairly to amend the complaint, and the person charged has the power reasonably and fairly to amend his answer. The commission shall not be bound by the strict rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity. The testimony taken at the hearing shall be under oath and be transcribed.'

"Sec. 4. AS 18.80.130 is amended to read:

"'Sec. 18.80.130. Order. (a) At the completion of the hearing, if the commission finds that a person against whom a complaint was filed has engaged in the discriminatory conduct alleged in the complaint, it shall order him to refrain from engaging in the discriminatory conduct. The order shall include findings of fact, and may prescribe conditions on the accused's future conduct relevant to the type of discrimination. In a case involving discrimination in

" '(1) employment, the commission may order the hiring, reinstatement or upgrading of an employee with or without back pay, restoration to membership in a labor organization, or his admission to or participation in an apprenticeship training program, on-the-job training program or other retraining program;

" '(2) housing, the commission may order the sale, lease or rental of the housing accommodation to the aggrieved person if it is still available, or the sale, lease or rental of a like accommodation owned by the person against whom the complaint was filed if one is still available, or the sale, lease or rental of the next vacancy in a like accommodation, owned by the person against whom the complaint was filed.

" '(b) The order may require a report on the manner of compliance.

" '(c) If the commission finds that a person against whom a complaint was filed has not engaged in the discriminatory conduct alleged in the complaint, it shall issue and cause to be served on the complainant an order dismissing the complaint.

" '(d) A copy of the order shall be filed in all cases with the attorney general of Alaska.'

"Sec. 5. AS 18.80 is amended by adding a new section to read:

" 'Sec. 18.80.135. Judicial Review and Enforcement. (a) A complainant, or person against whom a complaint is filed or other person aggrieved by an order of the commission, may obtain judicial review of the order in accordance with AS 44.62.560–44.62.570.

" '(b) The commission may obtain a court order for the enforcement of any of its orders by filing a complaint with the superior court in the judicial district in which the unlawful conduct is alleged to have occurred.'

"Sec. 6. AS 18.80 is amended by adding a new section to read:

" 'ARTICLE 4—DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES PROHIBITED.

" 'Sec. 18.80.200 Purpose. (a) It is determined and declared as a matter of legislative finding that discrimination against an inhabitant, of the state because of race, religion, color, national origin, age or sex is a matter of public concern and that such discrimination not only threatens the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of the state but also menaces the institutions of the state and threatens peace, order, health, safety and general welfare of the state and its inhabitants.

" '(b) Therefore, it is the policy of the state and the purpose of this chapter to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment, in places of public accommodation, in housing accommodations and in the sale or lease of unimproved property because of race, religion, color, national origin, or in the case of employment, because of sex or age.

" 'Sec. 18.80.210 Civil Rights. The opportunity to obtain employment, public accommodations, housing accommodations and property without discrimination because of race, religion, color, or national origin is a civil right.

" 'Sec. 18.80.220. Unlawful Employment Practices. It is unlawful for

" '(1) an employer to refuse employment to a person, or to bar him from employment, or to discriminate against him in compensation or in a term, condition, or privilege of employment because of his race, religion, color or national origin, or because of his age when the reasonable demands of the position do not require age distinction;

" '(2) a labor organization, because of a person's age, race, religion, color or national origin, to exclude or to expel him from its membership, or to discriminate in any way against one of its members or an employer or an employee;

" '(3) an employer or employment agency to print or circulate or cause to be printed or circulated a statement, advertisement, or publication, or to use a form of application for employment or to make an inquiry in connection with prospective employment which expresses, directly or indirectly, a limitation, specification or discrimination as to age, race, creed, color or national origin, or an intent to make the limitation, unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification;

" '(4) an employer, labor organization or employment agency to discharge, expel or otherwise discriminate against a person because he has opposed any practices forbidden under secs. 200–280 of this chapter or because he has filed a complaint, testified or assisted in a proceeding under this chapter; or

" '(5) an employer to discriminate in the payment of wages as between the sexes, or to employ a female in an occupation in this state at a salary or wage rate less than that paid to a male employee for work of comparable character or work in the same operation, business or type of work in the same locality.

" 'Sec. 18.80.230 Unlawful Practices in Places of Public Accommodation. It is unlawful for the owner, leasee, manager, agent or employee of a public accommodation

" '(1) to refuse, withhold from or deny to a person any of its services, goods, facilities, advantages or privileges because of race, religion, color or national origin;

" '(2) to publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail a written or printed communication, notice or advertisement which states or implies that any of the services, goods, facilities, advantages or privileges of the public accommodation will be refused, withheld from or denied to a person of a certain race, religion, color or national origin or that the patronage of a person belonging to a particular race, creed, color or national origin is unwelcome, not desired or solicited.

" 'Sec. 18.80.240. Unlawful Practices in the Sale or Rental of Property or Housing Accommodations. It is unlawful for the owner, leasee, manager or other person having the right to sell, lease or rent a housing accommodation or unimproved property.

" '(1) to refuse to sell, lease or rent the housing accommodation or unimproved property to a person because of race, religion, color or national origin;

" '(2) to discriminate against a person because of race, religion, color or national origin in a term, condition or privilege relating to the use, sale, lease or rental of a housing accommodation or unimproved property; or

" '(3) to make a written or oral inquiry or record of the race, religion, color or national origin of a person seeking to buy, lease or rent a housing accommodation or unimproved property.

" 'Sec. 18.80.250. Unlawful Financing Practice. It is unlawful for a financial institution, upon receiving an application for financial assistance for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, repair or maintenance of a housing accommodation or the acquisition or improvement of unimproved property, to permit one of its officials or employees during the execution of his duties.

" '(1) to discriminate against the applicant because of race, religion, color or national origin in a term, condition or privilege relating to the obtainment or use of the institution's financial assistance; or

" '(2) to make or cause to be made a written or oral inquiry or record of the race, religion, color or national origin of a person seeking the institution's financial assistance.

" 'Sec. 18.80.260. Coercion. It is unlawful for a person to aid, abet, incite, compel or coerce the doing of an act forbidden under this chapter or to attempt to do so.

" 'Sec. 18.80.270. Penalty. A person, employer, labor organization or employment agency, who or which willfully engages in an unlawful discriminatory conduct prohibited by the chapter, or willfully resists, prevents, impedes or interferes with the commission or any of its authorized representatives in the performance of duty under this chapter, or who or which willfully violates an order of the commission, is guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction is punishable by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment in a jail for not more than 30 days, or by both.

" 'Sec. 18.80.280. Acquittal Bars Other Actions. The acquittal of a person by the commission or a court of competent jurisdiction of any alleged violation of this chapter is a bar to any other action, civil or criminal, based on the same act or ommission.

" 'ARTICLE 5. GENERAL PROVISIONS

" 'Sec. 18.80.300. Definitions. In this chapter

" '(1) "person" means one or more individuals, labor unions, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint-stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, employees, employers, employment agencies or labor organizations;

" '(2) "employee" means an individual employed by an employer but does not include an individual employed in the domestic service of any person;

" '(3) "employer" means an employer of one or more persons in the state but does not include a club that is exclusively social, or a fraternal, charitable, educational, or religious association or corporation, if the club, association or corporation is not organized for private profit;

" '(4) "employment agency" means a person undertaking to procure employees or opportunities to work;

" '(5) "labor organization" means an organization and an agent of the organization, for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining, dealing with employers concerning grievances, terms or conditions of employment, or of other mutual aid or protection of employees;

" '(6) "national origin" includes ancestry;

" '(7) "public accommodation" means a place which caters or offers its services, goods or facilities to the general public and includes a public inn, restaurant, eating house, hotel, motel, soda fountain, soft drink parlor, tavern, night club, roadhouse, place where food or spirituous or malt liquors are sold for consumption, trailer park, resort, campground, barber shop, beauty parlor, bathroom, resthouse, theater, swimming pool, skating rink, golf course, cafe, ice cream parlor, transportation company and all other public amusement and business establishments, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to all persons;

" '(8) "housing accommodation" means a building or portion of a building, whether constructed or to be constructed, which is or will be used as the sleeping quarters of its occupants;

" '(9) "financial institution" means a commercial bank, trust company, mutual savings bank, cooperative bank, homestead association, mutual savings and loan association or an insurance company.'

"Sec. 7. AS 23.10 is amended by adding a new section to read:

" 'ARTICLE 5. DISCRIMINATING IN EMPLOYMENT

" 'Sec. 23.10.192. Discrimination Prohibited. Discrimination in the employment of a person because of race, religion, color, national origin or age is prohibited as set out in AS 18.80.220.

" 'Sec. 8. AS 23.10.190–23.10.235, 23.10.240–23.10.320, 11.60.230 and 11.60.240 are repealed.

" 'Sec. 9. This Act takes effect on the day after its passage and approval or on the day it becomes law without such approval.'

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs'

Fair Housing Act of 1967, specifically on S. 1358, S. 2114, and S. 2280 relating to civil rights and housing contains a summary of State law provisions dealing with discrimination in private housing. This is what the Justice Department summary reports on Alaska:

> Alaska prohibits discrimination in all categories of housing through its public accommodations law. A State Commission for Human Rights is charged with administering the law. Either an aggrieved person or the Executive Director may file a complaint with the Commission, which then investigates the alleged discriminatory conduct. If substantial evidence is found which supports the complaint, the Commission attempts to eliminate the discrimination by conciliation. If this fails, a hearing is conducted. In the event that a violation is found, the Commission issues a cease and desist order and may require other affirmative action. Compliance with such an order is a bar to criminal prosecution for the particular instance of discriminatory conduct found by the Commission. Violation of this law is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days and/or a fine of not more than $500.

We have talked for many days in the Chamber of the reasons for fair housing. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] has spoken eloquently of the values accruing from open housing.

He reminded us that open housing is absolutely essential to the realistic achievement of such accepted goals as desegregated schools and equal opportunity.

He said:

> De facto segregation in schools and education is directly traceable to the existing patterns of racially segregated housing. We cannot afford to allow our efforts to provide the best education possible to all Americans to be thwarted by actions of private persons, actions which are antisocial, immoral, and which ultimately amount to contravention of our public policy in favor of equal education opportunity. Fair housing is therefore more than merely housing. It is part of an educational bill of rights for all citizens. Without it, the dream of full and fair social opportunities for all Americans is an illusion.

Yes; fair housing is part of an education bill of rights for all citizens.

The amendment we are considering is responsible.

It would gradually prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or rental of housing. Housing already subject to the President's order on equal opportunity in housing would be covered immediately. Housing held for sale or rent by someone other than its occupant and housing for five or more families would be covered from and after January 1, 1968. All housing other than exempted housing of religious institutions would be covered from and after January 1, 1969, with the exception of the "Mrs. Murphy" provision. And the homeowner could, as he always has, select a roomer on the basis of personal friendship or because he is a relative.

And, as has been pointed out, the act would also prohibit "blockbusting," discrimination in the financing of housing, discrimination in the provision of services or admission to membership by real estate organizations, and interference with or threats against persons enjoying or attempting to enjoy any of the rights which the act grants or protects.

Responsibility for administration and enforcement would rest with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Secretary would be required to seek a voluntary solution in every case. If this remedy fails then he would be authorized to issue a complaint, hold hearings, and, if the evidence disclosed that discriminatory acts had occurred, he would issue orders granting appropriate relief. All orders of the Secretary would be subject to judicial review.

The person who believed that he had been injured by a discriminatory housing practice could file a charge with the Secretary. The Secretary would not be required to conciliate or to issue a complaint on the basis of every charge so filed, but if he did not, the person filing the charge could commence an action himself in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The Attorney General would be empowered to initiate suits in U.S. district courts to eliminate patterns or practices of housing discrimination. The Secretary could cede his jurisdiction to State or local fair housing agencies in appropriate cases or cooperate with them without ceding his jurisdiction.

No single piece of legislation can solve our domestic crisis. We know that no single piece of legislation will erase our slums, build the new homes we need, or replace our already antiquated and inadequate public housing units. We also know that steps must be taken to reach the goals of the Great Society about which we speak and for which we yearn. Hopefully, voluntary compliance with a Federal fair housing law will speed the demise of racial ghettos in America.

Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, pointed out during the hearings on fair housing last session that while a great many Negroes live in slums, the fact is that the Negro did not create the slums.

In the words of George Meany:

> The Negroes did not create the slums; they inherited them from other ethnic groups that were lucky enough to escape. And what they inherited was bad housing made worse by time and by lack of maintenance by its absentee owners.

Our Nation has massive housing needs. As George Meany pointed out in the hearings, low-cost public housing was launched by the Housing Act of 1937. Then, in 1949, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill authorized the construction of 135,000 housing units a year. By 1966, all the units built over 30 years could house only 605,000 families. Yet at least 11 million urban families have incomes which are below the top limits for public housing tenants. We know, too, that today's problem will mushroom if more Americans move into our already overcrowded cities, as they undoubtedly will, and as our population multiplies.

As we fail to build and as we fail to make fair housing a reality, so shall we reap the grim harvest of these social injustices.

Equal housing opportunity for all Americans makes sense. Equal housing will require equal access, without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin, to every residential neighborhood in every American community. This prescription for long-overdue medicine to cure our Nation's ills was offered in more detail at the Sixth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO in December 1965.

More recently, Attorney General Ramsey Clark stated:

> Segregation cements the conditions that plague our cities as surely as the bricks and mortar that confine the slums.

Long before this, we should have seen to it that each and every person in the United States—regardless of race, color, sex, national origin, or religion—enjoyed the full measure of his or her constitutionally guaranteed rights.

I support the equal housing amendment and urge its adoption.

THE RECORDBREAKING COPPER STRIKE AND THE TRAVEL TAX—A GLARING INCONSISTENCY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the nationwide copper strike has achieved a most dubious distinction. In its 8th month, 31st week, and 220th day, it has now become the longest strike involving an entire industry in the history of the United States.

There will be no winners in this copper strike. Unfortunately it is now painfully obvious that the entire Nation is the loser. Regardless of how the strike is settled, and even assuming that one party will capitulate to the demands of the other, we cannot label any settlement a victory. There has been too much damage done to the employees, to the economies of certain States, including Utah, and to the Nation to assert that anything has been gained by anybody.

In Utah alone the strike has cost the State more than $82 million in lost revenues. Each employee has lost an average of more than $4,200 in wages while the cost in terms of lost opportunities and sacrifices—such as small business bankruptcies—cannot be measured.

The ramifications of this strike are far reaching and the damages are severe in all walks of the economy and in a great many areas.

For instance, the dollar, if not in serious trouble, is headed in that direction and over the past several months copper imports have contributed to its financial difficulties.

We are all aware of the very disturbing report published last week indicating the U.S. trade surplus had radically declined during the final quarter of 1967. I point to the December figures which showed that our trade surplus was a meager $79 million compared with $320 million in December 1966, and $444 million in December 1965. In those 2 years it lost about 85 percent of its surplus.

It had been estimated and hoped that our trade surplus would be a strong plus factor in the U.S. balance-of-payments crisis. With this diminishing trade surplus and a balance-of-payments deficit running at an annual rate of $3.57 billion, I find it very difficult to understand the indifference stemming from the White House as far as the copper strike is concerned.

Additional statistical data is equally disturbing.

When the strike began in July 1967, the price of domestic copper was about 38 cents a pound. As a result of the strike, domestic copper, when available, costs as much as 40 cents per pound. We have no assurance that a strike settlement will change this increase. In fact, we can safely assume that the fires of inflation will be further fanned by the strike and by any future settlement.

An even more critical factor is the price now being paid for copper imported from abroad. This price has increased approximately 10 cents per pound in the last 2 months and now stands at 70 cents per pound. Thus, all contracts now being entered into by domestic users for foreign copper are being made at this highly inflated price.

Needless to say, this fact is further contributing to our balance-of-payments problem. In terms of actual dollars paid out for foreign copper, I have seen figures which are somewhere between $330 to $400 million since the strike began on July 15. Taken at an annual rate this equals more than three-quarters of a billion dollars per year.

This is indeed an unfortunate situation when one considers the fact that sufficient capacity exists in this country to produce virtually all of the copper we need if the strike is settled.

We are now near the point when copper stockpiles will soon be gone. The industry has reached what is commonly called the "crunch point" and it will not be too many more weeks before copper users, including the automobile and electrical industry, will be on a very restricted diet. Some are already facing that situation.

Based on the import figure for December 1967, and projected on an annual basis, this country is importing between 550,000 and 600,000 tons of copper. In fiscal year 1967 our total consumption of copper was 3,345,000 tons. Thus, our imports equal something less than 20 percent of our annual domestic needs.

But we know that in domestic production the "crunch point" is indeed close at hand. What can be done about solving this strike? I have tried in the Senate, along with my colleagues from the Western States, to find a solution. I introduced a Senate resolution last summer calling upon the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley law. Later I cosponsored a bill that would allow the people that count, the copper employees, to vote on whether or not they wished to return to work. I have no fear of the secret ballot and would gladly grant the employees this basic right to vote on their right to return to work. It is unfortunate that this bill is no even being considered by the Senate.

The Governors of the five States most vitally involved have also called upon the Congress and the President to take action. Yet the President refuses to invoke the Taft-Hartley law and argues that the strike is not a national emergency. Therein lies a paradox.

The administration considers our balance-of-payments problems so serious that it has recommended to Congress that it take certain emergency measures to help halt the outflow of American dollars. These were outlined to us by the President on New Year's Day when, among other things, he proposed a curtailment of foreign investments and a cutback in American travel overseas. In an effort to put some teeth into the proposal to halt travel, the Johnson administration has now come forward with a tax which would be levied on persons spending more than $7 on any day while overseas.

Of course, the persons most seriously hit by this proposal will be the American tourist who can least afford it. Big businessmen can call their trips necessary business trips. The jet set can reach into its bank account and pay it with relative ease. But what about the schoolteacher who has saved for 2 or 3 years to go to Europe? What about the immigrant who has been in this country for years and years and is saving almost every penny so that he can return to his "old country" to see his friends and family?

One such person talked to me in Utah yesterday, expressing the hope that immigrants could be exempted.

What about the student who is faced with increased costs for education, yet is interested in broadening himself with a trip to a country or culture which he is studying, or has an opportunity to become an exchange student? I have heard from the parents of many of these people.

I have just returned from a week of speeches and visits throughout all parts of Utah, and these are the questions the people are asking, Mr. President. These are the people who will be hurt the most by the travel tax—those who can least afford it.

And what will the administration gain if the travel tax is passed? There is really no telling, but comparatively speaking the extra few dollars or so it expects to gain from a teacher or a student is meager indeed to what it could gain if the President stepped in, used the powers currently open to him and invoked the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to end the copper strike, or at least get the men back to work for another 80 days.

With the President's preoccupations with the war in Vietnam, with the *Pueblo* crisis in North Korea, with new programs that are coming to Congress, taxes and the like, I cannot understand why he shows no interest in stopping this hemorrhage of almost $1 billion a year in copper imports.

Mr. President, I find myself the only Member of the Senate who sits on both the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I understand that perhaps both of these bodies will have something to say about the travel tax and balance-of-payments legislation being proposed by the President.

I am going to find it very difficult indeed to support the President's proposal under the circumstances. In fact, I think the Senate should reject it in light of the President's inaction in this strike.

On those matters which will have a long-range national effect on our country, I try, of course, to take the side of national interest rather than reaching out for a partisan or parochial answer. This administration, however, is making it very difficult for me to go into the travel tax question with an open mind, while, at the same time it tries to pick up a dollar or two from an American tourist overseas it sits blandly by and allows more than $2 million a day in copper imports to come into this country. Mr. President, $2 million a day is what American industry is paying for overseas copper.

Where are the priorities and what is going on here?

Shortly after the President's dramatic announcement about the restrictions, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers outlining the impact of the copper strike on our balance-of-payments problem, and I urged them to use their good offices and to urge the President to act in the situation.

Not so much in reply to my request, but subsequently the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce announced the formation of a panel to study the situation. I emphasize that it was the Secretary of Labor and Secretary of Commerce who announced the panel, not the President of the United States. In other words, the panel did not even enjoy the prestige nor did it have the power of a Presidential panel. It did not report directly to the President. It was functioning only as a mediator in this dispute and had no power to arbitrate in any way.

It met for some 3 weeks, heard both parties, and, as I predicted when it was formed, it did not turn up any new facts since the issues involved had been carefully presented to the public and the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce long before the Panel was brought into being.

Over the weekend the Panel gave up in frustration and tossed the ball back to the unions and the copper companies.

So where do we stand today?

We stand at a point where the only person who can effectively influence this labor dispute is the President of the United States. I call upon him once again to use every power at his disposal to settle the strike and if he remains convinced that such powers do not exist, then it is time he submitted legislation which would deal with this strike and other national emergencies involving the public interest.

This dispute is now in its eighth month, as I stated earlier. It is no longer completely an economic dispute. As the Panel's report indicated, it is a question, finally, of whether the unions are going to be able to force on the companies a system of companywide or coalition bargaining. They are no longer interested in the economic issues; they are interested only in this power play.

In addition, it has boiled down to a battle of great power within the labor unions and Wall Street. Where do the copperworkers and the State of Utah fit into this question? They are mere pawns in the hands of a few eastern labor bosses who are trying to outdo each other in a huge power struggle for union supremacy.

Union politics are involved, complete with name calling and charges, as we have seen from the daily press.

I feel the copper strike—which involves the steelworkers union—started out to be a warmup for the potential steel strike that we may be facing after July 1 of this year. If a good rich settlement could have been achieved in the copper strike then the union would have a foot in the door to be used as a basis for a good rich steel settlement.

Some observers feel that I. W. Abel, the president of the Steelworkers, and Walter Reuther, the president of the United Auto Workers, are now locked in a battle, the prize for victory in which may be the presidency of the entire AFL-CIO, looking ahead to the time when George Meany, now 74 years old, will retire.

In order for Mr. Abel to move into a power position in his union political objective he has set out to make a record in this strike as well as in the coming steel settlement to compare with the record that Walter Reuther made in the automobile strike last year.

Sitting on the sidelines and reaping the backlash of these maneuverings are the people of the State of Utah and the other copper States, the copper workers, and the copper industry.

It is rather obvious that neither labor nor management is about to budge an inch in this labor crisis, and you would think that after 8 months the Johnson administration would have noticed this.

Mr. President, there can be no winner in this copper strike. No matter what happens the losses are already too heavy. Again I call upon the Senate to take immediate action on my Senate resolution expressing the sense of the Senate and urging the President to invoke the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act so that the workers can get back on the job. This strike has gone on far too long.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Now Apply Taft-Hartley Law in Copper Strike," and published in the Salt Lake Tribune for this morning, February 19, 1968, which touches on some of the items I have mentioned here today and also urges the President to move in and end the dispute.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW APPLY TAFT-HARTLEY LAW IN COPPER STRIKE

When the Federal panel began trying to settle the national copper strike four weeks ago it seemed obvious that the effort was doomed to failure. For the one issue that blocked agreement—company-wide bargaining—could not be settled by compromise. One side or the other would have to surrender and neither showed any signs of doing so.

Now the panel has admitted failure. The unions stood firm for company-wide bargaining. The copper industry was equally adamant in its refusal. Company-wide bargaining has never been used in the copper industry. Instead major companies and unions have negotiated contracts for different operations scattered over 22 states. This practice should be retained.

The copper industry is highly diversified, doing everything from mining the ore to turning out fabricated products. The copper workers are highly diversified too as is emphasized by the fact that 26 unions are involved in the current strike. In such circumstances bargaining should be on a regional basis covering local operations affecting local conditions. The unions in insisting on company-wide bargaining are simply bidding for greater power. In accepting the special panel report of failure Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge urged unions and management to resume negotiations immediately on issues under three main groupings suggested by the panel.

These included copper mining, smelting and refining; units producing other nonferrous metals; copper wire and cable and brass fabrication.

But would this procedure remove the chief obstacle to agreement—union insistence on company-wide bargaining. We do not think so. The strike has been prolonged for months because neither side would surrender and no amount of negotiation under special grouping is likely to bring a change in attitude. We fear that the panel has done no more than propose another exercise in futulity.

"The National interest requires a prompt settlement of this dispute," Wirtz and Trowbridge said. Then they emphasized the self-evident fact that the strike is causing "a severe economic hardship" in parts of the nation. Utahans are well aware of what the strike, now in its 220th day, has done to the economy of their state. So are the residents of other communities where the payrolls of the copper industry are a major economic factor.

And as long as the strike continues the situation will grow worse.

By appointing the special panel the White House belatedly recognized the national impact of the strike, but the panel foredoomed to failure from the beginning was no more than a delaying tactic. President Johnson has been frequently urged to invoke the Taft-Hartley Law. He has not done so, his advisors explain, because the strike has not created a threat to the national safety which T-H requires. But if that situation has not yet developed it certainly cannot be far in the future. The President should begin preparations for invoking the Taft-Hartley Law and sending the strikers back to work for 80 days. That would not necessarily solve the union-management dispute, though the effectiveness of Taft-Hartley in the past is cause for hope. It would however, bring the full force of the Federal Government into the copper strike.

The National interest certainly demands national action.

Mr. BENNETT. If the President does not begin to move soon, we may find the copper strike lapping over into the steel strike, and then we will really have a crisis in our productive capacity in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly without regard to the provisions of rule VIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNIST TROUBLES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Soviet Union the 50th anniversary of the revolution was celebrated in a magnificent manner in Moscow. It is noteworthy that of 14 Communist countries invited to send their leading governmental officials to represent them at this celebration, five nations failed or refused to send any delegates or officials whatever, Communist China did not deign to reply to the invitation.

These facts and others which I shall touch upon are somewhat significant when we consider that self-appointed vigilantes in the United States, those witch hunters who consider themselves superduper patriotic Americans, are always talking about a monolithic Communist conspiracy and about Communists infiltration of basic institutions in the United States. Yet, they could not name one Communist in the State Department. They could not name one Communist who is on the faculty of any university in my State of Ohio. They could not name one Communist in the clergy. Yet they talk about a monolithic Communist conspiracy.

It is somewhat significant that Communist China, one of the two great Communist powers in the world, did not even deign to reply to the invitation from the Soviets to celebrate the 50th anniversary of their revolution. Communist Albania rejected the invitation in scornful language. Then, Kremlin leaders were disturbed that both the North Vietnam and North Korean Governments sent minor functionaries to represent them instead of Cabinet members or top officials in their governments.

Yet, as I have said, some witch-hunting Americans still continue to talk of a monolithic Communist conspiracy which, of course, does not exist in the world, as these self-appointed vigilantes should know. The two great Communist powers, the Soviet Union and Red China are in fact bitterly hostile toward one another at this time. There has been fighting and bloodshed along their common border, consisting of nearly 6,500 miles. That disorder and violence has been increasing during recent months. Two Soviet divisions, in fact, were withdrawn from East Germany and Eastern Europe, and have been assigned to patrol the Chinese border. Soviet troops were recently stationed in Outer Mongolia as part of a general Soviet military buildup along the disputed Chinese border, apparently to provide protection for that Russian ally against Communist China.

Chinese Communist leaders have accused the Kremlin of "ganging up" with the United States against China and of "collaborating with U.S. imperialism."

Mr. President, Communist China appears torn by dissension, practically tantamount to a civil war. The Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation, but is now a have-nation. It is veering toward capitalism and, as a matter of fact, has not perpetrated any aggression whatsoever toward the free world during the past 15 years.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2402. An act to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955; and

S. 2447. An act to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the measure now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Presiding Officer. I propose to address the Senate very briefly on the pending amendment to H.R. 2516.

Mr. President, this amendment is so oppressive that I cannot believe it is being seriously urged on the Congress. I know that it has political implications. I know that certain extremist groups are in favor of it. However, at the same time, there is so much substance involved that pertains to the basic rights of all the people—not only the minority, but all the people—that I do not think it should pass, and I do not believe it can be taken in too serious vein. It is an example of how far reasonable men can go and sometimes do go when pushed by the growing pressure of extreme groups from one part of the country to another.

Certainly it is time to pause and consider where this trend is taking us. It is time to stop and get our bearings again, to see how far we have come, and where we are going. Under the pressure of demands, warnings, outright threats, Congress has been driven year after year to outdo its previous performance on civil rights, to top the previous year's legislation, and to come up with some sensational new bill to dazzle civil rights groups.

Each new bill goes further than the previous bill. Less and less attention is given to the basic rights of all Americans, and we, thereby, are getting closer and closer to a centralized police state which will regulate and supervise every detail of daily life in our great country.

The pending amendment is a perfect illustration of this trend. This amendment is by no means the same as the open housing bill that was considered by the Senate in 1966. It is far more sweeping, more arbitrary, and more oppressive. A comparison of a few of the main features of the pending amendment with the open housing provision of the civil rights bill of 1966, will show how far the fundamental rights of all Americans have been surrendered in order to appease the growing demands of civil rights extremists.

Although the pending amendment purports to contain, like the 1966 bill, the so-called Mrs. Murphy exception exempting operators of boardinghouses from the requirements of the bill, it in fact omits this provision. The original Mrs. Murphy exemption contained in the 1966 bill provided that—

> Nothing contained in this bill shall be construed to prohibit or affect the right of any person, or his authorized agent, to rent or refuse to rent, a room or rooms in his home for any reason, or for no reason; or to change his tenants as often as he may desire.

No similar provision is anywhere to be found in the pending amendment. The only exemption along this line in the present version of this bill is a provision that—

> Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner with respect to the sale, lease, or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

Mr. President, this provision is identical to the provision contained in the 1966 bill, and yet it was then thought necessary to include the additional language relating specifically to rooms to insure that boarding houses would be excluded.

It is claimed that this one provision will do the work of the two separate provisions in the earlier bill. On the contrary, the mere fact that the second provision has been omitted from this bill will later be used to argue that Congress intended that boarding houses should be covered by the bill, and guidelines will be issued requiring all boarding houses to take affirmative action to integrate their tenants.

Furthermore, the limited exemption relating to four-unit dwellings contained in the pending amendment applies only to owners. It would not protect a person who was himself renting or leasing his home and taking in boarders. A person in this category would still be compelled to meet all the burdensome requirements of the act and throw open his private home to anyone who wanted to move in with him.

Mr. President, if in this bill we are dealing with the claimed principle that it is a fact in our Government that even though a person owns a dwelling, he has no right to dispose of it to whom he may please, either by sale or rental, and that there should not be any exceptions to it, because the principle should apply across the board, and apply to everyone alike.

We who oppose the bill make the contention that there is a principle involved and that principle is that the private ownership of property, something as intimate and personal as a dwelling house, or a property that a person has rented as his own, is beyond the reach of the Government except as a matter of health, police, and related matters. Ownership carries that right and it is personal, inalienable, and it is not subject to legislation. We are fighting for that principle.

The other side is fighting for the principle, so they say, that there is no such right as I have described which exists for the individual; that he must be stripped of any pretense along that line; and that he should not be given the right to dispose of his property.

However, then, this amendment comes along by which they seek to straddle the situation and claim that there is a principle with an exception, and it eliminates the idea of standing on a principle at all.

I do not believe the measure will pass, because it does not have a proper foundation on which to stand. Those of us who noted this exemption in the bill 2 years ago and now, would have to face a situation where it would be easier to get more affirmative votes for the measure, and then, if it were to pass, the next step, and the unvarying course and practice would be and has always been to come in and close the door on this little fellow who is being excepted in the exceptions of the bill as now written. Over and over again it is the idea that we are going to stand on a principle, but in order to get more support and more votes we are going to make an exception.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the last analysis, is not the proposed amendment an assault upon the right of an individual to live among neighbors of his own choosing? After all, is it not true that throughout history most people and most families have tried to better themselves; have tried to move up in the world; have tried to find neighbors with whom they can be compatible, and move into neighborhoods where they will have community of interests and live with folks who are also striving to improve themselves? Does not the proposed open housing amendment strike at this right of compatibility? In effect, it says that even if they are living with neighbors who have common interests, that a neighbor could have no say as to the character of the person to whom he wishes to sell his property. Thus, by denying a neighbor his right, that neighbor loses the basic right to live among those whom he finds compatible?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has stated one of the major advantages involved in the American way of life—that is, to make those choices, for any reason, or for no reason, that the owner of property may see fit to make.

The same principle applies with reference to the rental of property. Yet it is going in here to take away from the individual that we have encouraged to have a home, encouraged to buy on credit, if necessary, encouraged to save and pay for it, making it necessary for him to deny himself other things he might like to have as the months and the years go by, and then, when he gets the house paid for, or even before, we come in and pass a law and say, "After all, you have got no rights here. We are going to supervise, or are going to direct you as to how and to whom you can sell your house. If you do not abide by what we say, you will have violated a court order and be subject to criminal law penalties."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator agree that by opposition to the proposed amendment does not imply that we seek to prevent any minority group from having good housing? We would be happy to support any reasonable legislation which would help any minority group to build good homes and find liberal financing and be able to have good facilities and good schools; in short, just anything that would help them to live better, but that we do not desire to support legislation that denies other persons basic individual rights which they have historically enjoyed, and are entitled to continue to enjoy.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is exactly right. We want to encourage everyone, and we are encouraging them. We have voted bills year after year containing liberal terms of credit and trying to do everything in the world to induce people to become homeowners and pull themselves up. I believe that is the only satisfaction anyone will ever get out of progress in the world, anyway, that they must work, try to earn, and save and plan to get ahead, and pass those ambitions on to their children. To me, that is what is at the heart of the spirit of the American way of life.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana very much for his contribution to this debate.

Now, Mr. President, it is by no means certain that even owners of boardinghouses are protected by this exemption in favor of four-unit dwellings. The exemption applies only where the families, which includes individuals, are "living independently of each other." If the boarder occupies a bedroom in the same part of the house as the owner, if he takes his meals with the family, uses the same bathroom, has his laundry done by the lady of the house, shares the living room with the family and watches TV with them, can there be any doubt that some Federal court or administrative official will rule that the boarder is not living independently and the exemption does not apply. The more intimate the relations between the owner and his tenants the more likely it is that he will have obnoxious strangers thrust into the bosom of his family by the Federal Government.

If this amendment really intends to exempt boardinghouses, why does it not spell it out clearly? Why leave so important a matter to later interpretation of questionable language and doubtful legislative history? All of the new rights created by the bill are meticulously defined in elaborate detail. If the right of a homeowner to say who shall enter his home is to be preserved, why not set it forth in the bill? Why not repeat the same language that appeared in the 1966 bill?

The obvious answer is that this amendment does not intend to exempt boardinghouses and roominghouses. It purposely omits the one provision considered necessary to protect them and the provision which is said to exclude them is really an invitation to close Federal regulation. The bill attempts merely to create an illusion that boardinghouses are exempt in order to silence opposition while leaving the way wide open for the courts and executive agencies to complete the dirty work of bringing them completely under the bill after it is safely passed.

Mr. President, during the course of a Senate session, I hear a great deal of testimony from various departments of the Government. I had a most refreshing experience, 2 or 3 weeks ago, in which one of the major officials operating under some of the broadest powers granted—or claimed to be granted—of any of the civil rights bills, said frankly that so far as they could, they pushed every possible phrase of every line on every page of every chapter of the civil rights bill to make it mean just as much as they could; that they pushed every syllable, every line, every paragraph of every court decision that might be in their favor that could mean just as much as it could. They pressed to the limit the meaning of everything stated in a committee report or on the legislative floors of both Houses in connection with the passage of a civil rights bill, seeking to find and use every ounce of power they possibly could in applying those sections of the law.

That is one of the first times I have ever heard it frankly admitted, although I knew it was done all the time.

Therefore, we have clearer knowledge and warning than ever, now that everything said, everything done, everything written, everything intimated, everything said by implication, will be pushed to the very utmost in the administration of civil rights bills.

It is a kind of crusade with many of the officials who say, "We know what we are doing here."

It means that if such a bill is passed by Congress, it will be exploited for every possible scintilla of evidence that can be found to extend, enlarge, and augment the power thereby conveyed by Congress.

I want to take this occasion to say again that there is not a thing in the world to the idea that we can cure a defect in language by legislative history by what someone says on the floor of the Senate. That should be the rule, that we cannot give an administrator any authority by what one Member says. One Member says one thing, another Member says another, and someone else chimes in with another version.

They have a right to make those arguments, of course, but the idea that only one Member can breathe the breath of life into a law and give it meaning, and that it does not carry what it is on its face in such a way as to be a notice to all, is ridiculous.

I know it has been argued here on the floor of the Senate that whoever was managing the bill could, by what he said on the floor, put limits on what the language meant. I have never believed in that doctrine, but anyone who did would wake up to his sorrow when he found that administrators had brushed that aside as if it had never been said. So I do not buy any of the idea that the legislative history shows such-and-such and so-and-so, because I know it is not binding on anyone and will be repudiated at the convenience or whim of whoever is administering the law.

If I remember correctly, I think we were taught in law school to draw a legal document so as to exclude every single possible meaning except the one intended; and that is about the only way we should follow here in enacting a law. Instead of that, we have rambled off with the idea of writing preambles to bills and thereby covering the whole waterfront. The courts have now said, "That is fine. We applaud the idea," to the extent that no one knows what the law is, but everyone presumes to know what it is.

I plead for clear-cut, positive, meaningful language being provided in every proposal offered to the Senate for enactment; and if it is not clear and fully understood and does not have an unmistakable meaning, it ought to be thrown out for that reason alone, if for none other.

In less than 2 years Congress apparently has become reconciled to abandoning the principle of the sanctity of the American home in the false hope that it will buy some relief from the constant pressures of civil rights extremists. A principle which has been sacred to generations of Americans, and which was widely supported and stoutly defended as recently as 1966, is quietly dropped in 1968 in an effort to come up with a bigger and better civil rights bill than the last one.

This is how far we have come in the mad stampede to pass new civil rights laws every session of Congress. Now we are on the verge of surrendering the basic right of privacy of the home prized by every citizen. Before this fatal step is taken, some consideration ought to be given to the question of what is to be accomplished by it all.

What good will come of taking away from all the Mrs. Murphy's of this country the right to admit or exclude whom they please from their boardinghouses? Who has the higher and better right to decide who shall have access to one's private home—the owner who shelters his family there or some itinerant stranger who comes in the night demanding a room? What is to be gained by driving thousands of widows and retired couples to abandoning this means of livelihood? Will our society benefit from sending a swarm of Federal investigators and enforcers over the land to break down the doors of private boardinghouses or close them down? The people did not think so 2 years ago, and while Congress may have wavered in the meantime, I believe the people are still firm in their conviction.

These words, which are so carefully put together, if passed, will become the basis for court injunctions that will have a devastating effect that will come right into the home and will be very effective, indeed, in totally severing the rights the individual has heretofore viewed as very sacred—the right to dispose of his property as he saw fit.

I thought of an illustration I gave 2 years ago, about the full application of these measures to my own home in my own home State. Mrs. Stennis and I built that home in 1930, and we have lived there ever since. It never has been involved in any kind of public place or never had any such function connected with it. A room has never been rented in that home. No Federal money or loan of any kind has ever been invested in it. None is invested now, and we do not expect any to be. It never has been anything except our own home. It is the only home we have ever had. Now, after more than 30 years, I am to be told that we cannot dispose of that home to whomever we might wish—to friends, or kinfolk, or whomever it might be—without checking with the Federal Government or State government or administrator of a certain government.

If we should very much want to sell it to a friend, or a special friend, or even a kinsman, we would have to more or less sell it at night and slip out of town to keep from violating the law. If that happens, Mr. President, do you think we will still have America? If that is going to be the law of the land, it will be another country, not the one we have now. I do not have any patience with the attempt to regulate our people to any such degree, or even halfway that far.

Another major difference between the pending amendment and the open housing bill considered by the Senate in 1966 is the scope of the two bills. The 1966 bill as it came to the Senate was limited to real estate brokers, lending institutions, and others engaged in the business of building, developing, buying, selling, renting, leasing, or financing residential housing. No such limitation is contained in the pending measure. It applies across the board to everyone from the biggest development company to the poorest individual, from the largest subdivision to the tiniest homestead.

Thus in 2 years we have moved from regulating the business practices of a well developed industry to regulating the personal decisions of individual homeowners with respect to their own private property. The main burden of this bill, therefore, will not rest on the business world, which has learned to bear Government controls and to cope with them. It will fall directly on the average citizen, who will be ensnared in complex regulations and guidelines and left to face alone and helpless an overbearing Federal bureaucracy. Not only will he be robbed of his ancient freedom to dispose of his private property according to his own judgment, he will be hampered, harassed, and inconvenienced in disposing of it at all.

The same considerations which dictated the exclusion of the individual homeowner from the bill in 1966 are equally valid today. This large scale invasion of the lives of millions of American citizens by the Federal Government is no more justified today than it was then. This gross violation of the right of private ownership is no more warranted today than it was in 1966. The only explanation for yielding the rights of these individuals now is the need to keep pace with the insatiable and unreasonable demands that have been handed down by civil rights extremists in the brief interim. To update the bill and put a new political face on it, another basic freedom heretofore enjoyed by all citizens is sacrificed, and the country moves one step nearer a police state.

The all-encompassing coverage of this amendment places a special importance on the procedure for enforcing it. Here again is found a dangerous and far-reaching difference between the pending amendment and the 1966 bill.

The earlier bill would have established a new independent Fair Housing Board to carry out the provisions of the act. The members of this Board would have been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The powers vested in the Board could be delegated to any three or more of the five members, but no further.

I emphasized that Mr. President. The powers vested in the board under the 1966 bill could have been delegated to any three or more of the five members, but no further.

By contrast, the pending bill places all administrative authority and responsibility in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The bill then provides that—

> The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, duties, and powers to employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to boards of such employees.

Mr. President, in the time I have been around here, I do not believe I have ever seen language so broad, especially when dealing with powers so great. Here, truly, is authority to delegate all the vast powers vested by this board in the Secretary even to the lowliest janitor employed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Some might say, "Well, of course, that will not be done," and I assume that such power would not be given to a janitor. But I have seen power delegated, under some of these far-reaching bills, that I thought could have been exercised better by the janitor than it was by the person to whom it was entrusted. I have searched the amendment for a word or phrase which would prevent it, and I find none. The authorization to delegate these powers is stated in the broadest possible terms, without any limitation whatever.

It is not inconceivable, either, that this authority will be exercised to its fullest extent. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has shown that there are no reasonable restraints on the delegation of authority in civil rights matters. A specific provision was included in the civil rights bill of 1964, requiring the President to approve the rules and regulations promulgated under the act. This provision was backed up by solemn assurances given by the managers of the bill, in debate, that any rules for carrying out the act would have to be approved by the President, and such authority could not and would not be delegated to some lesser official.

In spite of all these precautions, however, the authority for issuing rules and regulations under the 1964 act has been delegated to the lower levels of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to this day, the guidelines under which schools throughout the South are forced to operate have not been approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, that is in no uncertain language. There has never been any more positive, certain language written into any act than was the language in that act of 1964, wherein Congress said, "Before we pass this, we are going to put the responsibility for these far-reaching rules and regulations right on the President of the United States."

Everybody handling the bill here, and those in favor of it, applauded the provisions which sought to doubly guarantee that that was exactly what would be done; and still it has not been done.

I think I know what I am talking about on that subject. We had before us for consideration in early December the Elementary Education Act. At that time these matters were debated, and it was not denied then that the assertions I make now, as I made them then concerning that measure, were correct.

We had many conferences with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through their proper spokesmen, and they did not deny the points that I am making here about it. The rules and regulations were not approved by the President.

We passed that bill, too, with not one syllable in it to suggest that it was going to be applied only in the South; but we find now that that is the only place there has been any real effort made to apply it. None other than the Civil Rights Commission itself—and I am not standing here fabricating grievances, but stating facts—pointed out that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has not applied those regulations other than in the South, though the facts are that in other areas in the country, segregation in the schools is as bad if not worse, in many places, than in our area.

As I stated last fall during the debate on the elementary education bill, we had been assured by HEW in the fall of 1966 that these rules would be applied thereafter throughout the country in the same way, and would be extended to the East and the North; but a year later, nothing has been done toward carrying out that solemn promise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me finish this one statement.

The same promise was made to us again last year, when debate was being held on the bill, and it was reported to me the other day that they are making some plans now, that they have drawn up some rules and regulations, that it is going to be different, and that, some of these plans apply to other parts of the country.

My point is that we cannot take them at their word. When we pass these bills, the Departments apply them just about as they please.

I am happy to yield, now, to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, assuming that the enforcement of integration had merit to begin with, does it not seem strange that the members of the administration and of the other body who have spoken in such glowing terms of all the benefits of racial integration—even against the will of those involved would be reluctant to see some of those benefits conferred upon their own areas? If it is so good as alleged, should not the people of their own States be entitled to enjoy the benefits of it?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The trouble was that when they started to apply it—I am talking about the schools, now—they did make some effort, or start on it, at least, in Chicago. Some official in HEW thought the law meant what it said; he cut Chicago off, or gave them a warning order that he was going to cut off their school money, and Chicago wired the White House.

The White House took the matter under advisement. That was 2 years ago, and it is still under advisement, in effect. No money has been cut off there, whereas in our part of the country they cut it off right in the middle of the term.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is that not strange, when much of the leadership for mandatory racial integration was coming from areas such as Illinois, and in particular Chicago?

Mr. STENNIS. That is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We find that when these noble objectives all applied to the Chicago area, suddenly great protest springs from that area; and instead of enforcing the mandates, as has been the case with regard to the Southern States, the administration decided that that is not to be done.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The protests heard from the grassroots of Illinois and Chicago area insists that integration be withheld. Does that not amount to discrimination of the highest caliber?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is the way it works. I am not imputing bad faith to these people in the educational branch of HEW. There are many of them whom I have known—not all—but many of them who are doing the best they can in trying to deal with the situation, and who I think would uniformly apply these matters; but there is some higher authority that restrains them or curbs them, restricts them, and directs them geographically.

My warning is, to those who intend to vote for this bill: Look out. It is going to hit where it hurts back home. People are not going to like it, and unless they can obtain enforcement of it on a regional basis, they will be back here wanting us to repeal it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator familiar with some of the marches and protests that have occurred in the Chicago area during the last couple of years, since the legislation to which he has referred became law?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, unfortunately they did have some trouble there. I hope they will not have any more.

But I do not think we ought to be frightened, now, into passing another law just because somebody threatened to march this summer. If we must pass a law every time someone threatens to raise cain if we do not, we will not have a government very long. We will have passed all of the laws that everybody wants, and then we will not have any of our present form of government left.

I thank the Senator very much.

If all the positive safeguards against the delegation of power under the 1964 act failed—as they did—there is certainly no reason to expect any measure of restraint in this regard under a bill which grants blanket authority to delegate all functions, duties, and powers of administration to any employee. Thus, it it is not at all farfetched to suggest that perhaps some minor official or even a janitor in HUD will be exercising the powers created by this bill.

Mr. President, I call on the sponsors of the pending measure to explain the language concerning the granting of authority, which reads:

> The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, duties, and powers to employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to boards of such employees.

I call on the sponsors of the pending bill to explain that language and point out if it is different from what I have said or if what can be done under that language is different from what I have said. I call on the sponsors of the measure to explain how they can limit the application of that language. I wish they would explain it in debate on the Senate floor. It is the broadest, most extensive grant of power that I have ever seen in any major legislation.

Whether or not such authority is actually carried to this extreme, the mere fact that it is proposed to be granted by this amendment points up how careless Congress has become of the rights of the American people. Without any hesitation, every homeowner in the country is to be handed over to the supervision and control of some unnamed, unspecified employee in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Even if the Department were entirely staffed with the ablest, wisest, most judicious men in the Nation, there is no assurance that it will always be so. Administrations change but this bill, if it should become law, will continue indefinitely.

The powers available under this bill are so broad and undefined that the action taken under it will depend largely on the character and philosophy of the man that administers it. The safety and welfare of the people therefore requires that such general authority be located in, and confined to, the highest, most responsible officials.

It is not merely administrative authority but legislative power as well which this amendment confers on the Secretary of HUD to be delegated without limit. This is not some narrowly defined law to be carried out according to strict procedures. The bill simply marks out a wide area of individual activity, announces a few broad policy objectives, and leaves it to the Secretary and his employees to shape the specific laws which will be enforced on the people.

Mr. President, I am satisfied in my mind that we will continue to pass legislation containing such broad legislative grants of power to administrators who will establish behind closed doors their own regulations without any personal responsibility to even the head of the department, much less the President of the United States.

If we continue to whittle down the rights of the people in that way, there will be a rebellion at the ballot box. Someone will come along who will be able to effectively add up all of these things that have been done to the people and will be able to put the matter in such a graphic way as to let the people sense it all at one time. The people will react with scorn, I believe, and will be determined to run out of office those that are guilty of trespassing on their rights in any such way.

This matter piles up year after year to the point that it now requires volumes and volumes to contain the rules and regulations and restrictions that everyone has to operate under, not merely big business or little business, but every householder, every head of a family, and everyone that owns a little cottage is going to be regulated and controlled by this massive measure we are debating. And no one knows who will make the rules and regulations.

If the pending measure should be passed, not a single Senator could stand up here and look the rest of us in the face and give us any clear idea at all as to what will happen under this terrific grant of authority except that, as we all know, it will be used to the utmost, as I have already said.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as the Senator has pointed out, the pending bill gives HUD unlimited authority to delegate this authority not only to members of that Department itself, but also to organizations the Department might set up.

Is it not conceivable that this measure would permit the Department to appoint a whole army of employees, to the extent that it would be necessary to appoint one person for approximately every four blocks in every town in the United States, in order to make certain that the law was being enforced? That is a little farfetched, but it would take about that many employees to keep up with everybody. Numerous people could be put on the payroll in that way. In an election year, that might be a very fine way to take care of things.

Mr. STENNIS. It certainly would take an immense force.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is possible that the Department would be permitted to employ such a huge force of employees.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The only limitation on the hiring of the employees by the Department would be independent discretion. Of course, having the money appropriated would be another thing. However, according to the pattern of the past, they can get the money for anything if they holler long enough. That has been the rule on such bills in the past. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The committee voted to appropriate far more money than I think it should have done.

The Senator from North Carolina has raised a very important point; that subject to the action of Congress on appropriations bills, the sky is the limit with reference to what is authorized to be done under the bill.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The bill would not establish any salary range for the people who would be checking on the various homes.

As the Senator has said the amount of money available would be subject to the amount appropriated. However, the appropriation bill does not provide that the Department can pay so much money per person. We appropriate a certain amount of money for the Department to allocate as it wishes.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no such provision in an appropriation bill. However, there must be justifications for the appropriations. I do not know whether it reaches over to the report or the bill itself. Nevertheless, the Department is bound by what it says in its justifications as to the number of employees of a certain category it will be authorized to employ. There is some regulation on that. However, there is not a great deal of regulation.

The Senator from North Carolina is correct. This is blanket authorization and can only be checked by what Congress may do in a subsequent appropriations bill. History proves that the amounts of money appropriated climb and climb and soon reach proportions that were almost unbelievable in the beginning.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that what the American people are complaining about more and more is the violation by the Central Government of the basic rights of the people and of their local governments, which, under the Constitution, are regarded as the rights belonging to individuals and to their local governments—not to the Federal Government. Is it not true that people would like to have some of their rights restored rather than to have more and more Federal interference with the fundamental rights of everyday Americans?

Would not the Senator say that is also true with regard to this constant changing of guidelines? Every time someone tries to open up a school, he is confronted with a new set of Federal regulations? Every time anyone tries to open up the doors of a hospital, he is confronted with some new set of national regulations, or some Federal bureaucrat brings some new alleged charge of discrimination against him, when, in fact, as often as not, none really exists.

I ask the Senator if it has not come to the point that the people of this country generally resent the Federal Government needlessly interfering with their day-to-day lives and every activity thereof.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has stated it well. That is the American system. In other words, our people have had a system heretofore of which it could be said, yes, there may be some injustices, there may be some impediments, everything may be less than perfect; but we are willing to absorb those things in order to get the general freedom and the general liberty and the general rights that we have in a vast number of things; and we consider them personal, and we do not want our elected representatives to pass laws to take them away from us. That is the general American policy. No society is perfect; ours is not. But it is the best one we have been able to have, and we are gradually getting it better. These matters strike at the heart and soul of this personal liberty and freedom.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not generally true, also, that wherever people throughout the country, in all sections, have been offered the opportunity to express themselves on the matter by voting at the ballot box or in referendums, they have tended to vote down this type of proposal, which would permit the Government to deny an American citizen the right to sell his property to whomever he chose to sell it, on whatever terms he preferred to sell?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator is correct. That has been the pattern, and they have voted it down by a vote of two to one, three to one, or more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Notwithstanding that, have we not seen indications that the legislative body of some State or some city tend to bow down to the fervid feelings of some minority group, although it was very clear that to do so would be to impose the menacing minority upon the overwhelming majority of the people?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator has correctly stated the matter in a very clear way. I thank him for his further contribution to the debate.

Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate indefinitely, but I wish to complete my remarks. I should like to make a few more points with reference to the broad powers.

The bill begins with a general statement to the effect that it is the policy of the United States "to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, financing, and occupancy of housing throughout the United States."

A few broad categories of prohibited activity are specifically mentioned in the opening sections of the bill, giving the false and misleading impression of certainty and specificity. Buried down in the text of the section on administration, however, is a provision giving the Secretary as broad a legislative power as that granted by the Constitution to Congress itself. The Secretary is authorized to "establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, and prescribe such rules, regulations, and forms as in his judgment"—not in the judgment of Congress, but in his judgment—"are necessary or appropriate."

It does not stop with the word "necessary." It is anything that the Secretary thinks is appropriate to further the purposes. It does not state the specific grants of this bill—"to further the purposes of this act."

Mr. President, it is almost unthinkable that Congress would seriously consider passing such a grant of authority, which enters into every village, town, countryside, and city of the United States, and into the home, the most vital part of the private affairs of all its citizens.

If we are going to adopt this policy, the American people should say to Congress, in a loud voice, "Well, you adopt the standards, you pass on the criteria, you prescribe the procedures, and you prescribe the rules, the regulations, and the forms that in your judgment may be necessary or appropriate."

If we pass the bill with this language, we will be saying to the American people that we do not have the knowledge, the nerve, and the courage to write down these rules and regulations and policies ourselves; that we are not willing to try to face the facts of life in that way on the Senate floor; that we are not willing to face the American people with our name on such rules and regulations and procedures and criteria and standards which we think are necessary or appropriate; and that we do not have the political courage to do it. That is what I see about it. But we are going to grant the authority and then let someone else's judgment prescribe the biting part, the operating part, the demanding part of the law.

If ever a group in our form of government ran out on its own responsibility, it would occur by the passage of this bill.

This is not a matter of dealing with the sale of narcotics or some relatively small facet of our economy or of the affairs of the people. This applies across the board to everyone, everywhere, and digs down into the very vitals of our private affairs.

I denounce generally and specifically the approach to the bill. I am not referring to the authors' amendment. I do not know what opportunity they have had to fully analyze all this language themselves. But I denounce the approach by Congress to give this broad authority and power to someone else.

The bill says the Secretary is authorized to do this, and we have already said he can delegate all his authority to any employee.

Why, I believe that if this language is ever analyzed in the public forums of this country, before the people, they will turn with political wrath and indignation against being regulated in this fashion, and will turn with almost total disapproval to Congress for picking up a pattern of legislating away their rights in such haphazard fashion.

There is plenty of time to hold hearings on rules and regulations and forms and procedures and standards and everything else, to call the Secretary of HUD before us and ask him what he would put in these rules and regulations. We would at least know what one was going to say and do, and we could write such provisions into the bills ourselves. We pass bills every few days, some of them containing a hundred pages of rules and regulations. Do not say we cannot do it.

Let us just say that we will not do it. We do not want the responsibility.

Many precedents can be cited in which we have written such provisions in tax bills and others.

(At this point Mr. GRIFFIN assumed the chair.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator is aware that the legislative process applies to the large bills which we pass—for example H.R. 12080, the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act just recently enacted, which consisted of approximately 450 pages. In that measure we spelled out the standards by which the Administrator was to be guided in making his decisions. The purpose of that language was to protect the public, and also so that the Members of Congress would know what kind of laws were being made. They could look at it, they could analyze it, and they could offer amendments where they found something that did not appear to be correct. And they did just that. We had hundreds of amendments at the desk offered by Senators who did find something in some particular area that they thought might be an assault upon the basic rights of the medical profession, or that might discriminate against one group of practitioners and in favor of another group, or that might deny service that they felt should be made available to all citizens.

All of those detailed proposals were carefully studied, introduced, and written out—in line with proper and correct legislative process.

However, in the area of housing it is proposed just one man, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, would be permitted to appoint someone who would then, in turn, proceed to make so-called rules and regulations with which citizens must comply without Congress having any real knowledge whatever of the regulations to be imposed by the Administrator upon the public—or proper guidelines for the Administrator, himself.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I am trying to call to the attention of the public and every Member of Congress the broad sweeping powers that we are proposing to grant.

If the pending bill should become law the Secretary would call in his attorney, I suppose, and say, "What is my authority under this bill?" The attorney would read these provisions and say, "You have full and sweeping authority." The Secretary would then ask, "What are the limitations?" And the reply would be, "There are no limitations whatever." There would be no limitations and he could appoint or delegate as he saw fit. There would be no limitation whatever from the janitor down or up. I imagine the man would be aghast.

The Secretary, I assume, did not write this amendment. I do not think he did. He would have known better than to put in these sweeping powers. However, that is how the matter would work out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The authority granted would permit the Secretary to make regulations to go beyond what he thought necessary and permit him to make regulations he thought would be——

Mr. STENNIS. Appropriate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would permit him to make regulations he thought appropriate, even though not necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The language reads "In his judgment." It would not be the judgment of the courts or the judgment of Congress. It would be his judgment. Then, it says "or"—not "and"—"or appropriate to further the purposes." It does not say to carry out the purposes. Just push it along further; whatever he thinks is the law.

I remember a mayor in an eastern city a generation ago who said, "I am the law." He was panned all over the country, and became a symbol of "disrespect" —a symbol of disrespect during his day and age because he made that statement. Yet today, Congress is asked to say to the Secretary of HUD: "You are the law!"

In this measure we are saying, "Do whatever in your judgment is necessary or appropriate to further the purposes of this act." It is disheartening to me to see that we may be going so far down—d-o-w-n—the road of abusing our own obligations, and, even more important, abusing people's rights.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to a recent poster that was ordered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was determined that that poster should be placed on every postal truck in the United States, as authorized and directed, because one man, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, had an idea that it was something he should do. The poster said, in effect, "100,000 Doctors Have Quit Smoking. Maybe They Know Something You Do Not."

A good many questions were asked about that poster, as to who the 100,000 doctors were. The Department was asked, "Where is your list?" They finally said, "We do not have a list. That is our estimate."

That is a good example of an administrator taking into his hands and under his power the display of a sign because he had reason to believe that it was a good idea. However, he could not back it up with any facts, to save his life. That is an example of what can be done by an administrator or an agency. It frightens me when I think of the kind of authority we are giving to the agencies now. We have already given them too much authority. We should be pulling some of it back rather than issuing more.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. We are traveling in the wrong direction. We should reverse our course. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the debate.

Mr. President, such a sweeping grant of authority coupled with the broadly stated policy of the bill completely breaks down any limits on the Secretary's power which may have crept into the bill. Indeed, all other provisions of the bill are not only totally ineffective to restrain any action the Secretary may care to take, they are unnecessary to authorize it. I cannot conceive of anything authorized, required, or prohibited by a specific section of the bill which could not be covered by the Secretary's discretionary authority under this general provision. The bill could be much shortened without diminishing its effect one bit by striking all but this general provision and the statement of policy.

Mr. President, I believe the time is not too far off when someone should graphically present these matters to the people, to show how their rights are being infringed and how Congress is dodging its responsibility by delegating all its powers and authority. I believe there will be a lawful rebellion at the polls against such action by Congress. I think that the sooner that happens the better.

As a practical matter, Congress has delegated legislative authority over housing to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. It has given him a blank check and it is the people who will have to pay when the bills start coming in. Whatever rights they have, if any, will not be determined by Congress but by the Secretary or some other appointed official down in the lower levels of the Federal bureaucracy. Whatever protection the people will be given against arbitrary and unfair treatment, will depend on the Secretary or his delegates rather than the elected representatives of the people.

This bill is drawn from the point of view of a special interest and it will be enforced from that point of view.

We know from experience, regardless of who are appointed to enforce such measures, that a great percentage of them will be extremists, even zealots, as I stated a while ago. They will stretch to the very limit every word, every syllable, every line, and every paragraph of the law, the regulations, the reports, and even what was said by a Senator in his argument.

Any right or rule of law, any principle of fair play which stands in the way of the narrow objective of the bill, will be overridden. The rights of the individual, about which so much is heard whenever it is a question of punishing some vicious criminal, will be ignored in the case of an innocent homeowner trapped by some treacherous provision of this bill. This is already apparent in the bill itself. No effort has been made in the drafting of the bill to balance the rights of the homeowner against the rights of those for whose special protection the bill is drawn. Only the most meager procedural safeguards are provided and not one substantive right, so far as I can tell, is afforded him. No attempt has been made to protect the homeowner against baseless charges of discrimination. He is given no protection against frivolous enforcement proceedings which could tie up his property indefinitely in litigation. He must submit to all sorts of investigations and interrogations. He must bear all the bankruptcy costs of defending himself against the combined might of two giant departments of the Federal

Government which have nothing to do full time but investigate and prosecute.

Mr. President, this measure is sponsored largely by various groups. If we pass the bill into law and the executive department undertakes to enforce it, we will find that it will affect countless thousands, yes, millions of people. It will be sponsored by the full committee, but it will be finding its way into the homes and into the private, daily lives of countless thousands—yes, millions—of people who will be affected by it. They will not like it. In order to carry out the provisions of the bill, they will be hauled into court, all kinds of injunctions will have to be issued, regulations formulated, and general harassment carried out. Even though their resistance will be lawful, and not accomplished by marches or civil disobedience or anything like that, I do believe that opposition to its enforcement will be very strong and determined. After all the upsetting influence it will have, the people, one way or another, will right the wrongs which will be inflicted upon them by passage of the pending bill. The people will demand a return of that part of their liberties and freedom of choice in rightful ownership of their own property, which had heretofore been theirs as a result of their hard work, and saving their money to buy. In a lawful way, they will demand the return to their ownership of their property, and the rights which have been enjoyed by the American people in decade after decade of our fine American way of life.

Mr. President, I believe that the pending bill is overspoken, it is overwritten, and it is extreme. I do not know whether the provisions of the pending amendment have been passed upon by any committee. I am not certain as to what the history of the amendment is, but I do not believe that a majority of any committee which has studied the broad sweep of the provisions which I have mentioned would bring it out with a recommendation, under their responsibility, that the proposal become law. If it has been through the refining power of committee consideration and evaluation and has emerged in this form, then I do not believe it will ever pass the Senate, which has the opportunity to realize what might be in it, to study it thoroughly, and to recognize the far-reaching power and authority which would be granted by the bill. That is why I have tried to emphasize that feature today.

Not because I said these words but because of the truth of them and their meaning, I respectfully call these remarks to the attention of every Senator and hope that through the medium of the Congressional Record they will pursue the matter and obtain a grasp of the facts before the vote scheduled for tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m.

Mr. President, if a study of the provisions I have centered on in this brief time this afternoon is carefully made and understood, I have no doubt about the outcome of the vote on the amendment tomorrow. I believe that if Senators who subscribe to the amendment at this time would restudy it, there might be a change of heart, even on their part.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor the fair housing amendment now under consideration by the Senate. I do so because I believe fair housing is not only a moral imperative but a practical step that is long overdue.

Today I wish to share with Senators some materials describing a practical approach of a small group of Chicago businessmen who believe that Negro families can be welcomed and can adjust well to Chicago suburban life. Through their Home Investment Co. these men have already helped 45 qualified Negro families to purchase homes in suburban areas.

Forty-five families is a very small number of the thousands of families in Chicago alone who have the financial resources to make this move, but who have been unable to do so because of discriminatory sales restrictions. However, the success of Home Investment Co. is a positive indication of the ability of our society to open its doors and I am extremely proud that this fine project is being carried on in my home town of Chicago. I hope that the success of the Home Investment Co. will be noted and that similar projects will be attempted in other cities.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release of the Home Investment Co. be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Group Workers Quietly To Help Qualified Negroes Find Suburban Homes

For the past year, a small group of business, professional, and religious leaders have been working quietly to help financially qualified Negroes buy homes in predominantly white suburbs.

Now these men, organized as Home Investments, Inc., are ready to step up their efforts. During 1968, they hope to work with at least 100 Negro families who would like to move to the suburbs but hesitate to do so because they are uncertain about their acceptance and what it will be like living in a predominantly white community.

At the same time, the organization will seek additional financial support.

"Our experience indicates that the climate of public opinion has changed, and that Negro families can be welcomed and smoothly integrated into the life of many Chicago suburbs," stated Howard W. Smith, president of Home Investments, Inc., and also housing director of the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race.

To date, Home Investments has counseled and assisted 45 Negro families interested in obtaining housing in the suburbs. In the words of one of the families:

"The service was a tremendous help to us in making the move. If more Negro families knew about it, we're certain many more would take advantage of this much-needed assistance."

To encourage Negro families to move to the suburbs, Home Investments is using an unusual idea: It guarantees the family that if the move doesn't work out—if the family finds it uncomfortable or unpleasant living in the white suburb—Home Investments will guarantee the resale of the house at 98 per cent of the purchase price, plus a service charge of $25 per year.

Home Investments also provides cash for the down payment, but only if the family has collateral to back the loan.

"A Negro family using these services to buy a home in the suburbs often can obtain better mortgage financing than he could without them," Smith said. "The people who make the mortgage—the banks and savings and loan associations—feel that there is less of a risk because of the repurchase agreement."

However, these methods, while they're helpful, don't go as far as the sponsors of Home Investments would like.

"What we want to do, too, is buy desirable homes, and rent them to qualified Negroes with an option to buy within two years," Smith said. "This way we could get more families to apply who right now may not have the necessary down payment. We feel this approach frees these families to try suburban living and if it doesn't work out, they haven't lost any equity or money."

Home Investments estimates it needs $300,000 in capital to make this type of expanded operation possible.

"Our success during the past year indicates that we're on the right track," Smith said.

Among those associated with Smith in the organization are Marshall M. Holleb, of Yates, Holleb & Mickelson, Loop law firm; George Jones, vice president of the Joe Louis Milk Company and director of the Seaway National Bank; the Rev. Robert I. Christ, director of the Commission on Religion & Race, Presbytery of Chicago; Daniel E. Levin, partner in McHugh-Levin Associates, real estate developer; Anthony Downs, senior vice president of Real Estate Research Corp.; and Abner Mikva, of the law firm of Devoe, Shadur, Mikva, & Plotkin.

Smith reported that the idea for Home Investments grew out of the experience of the Housing Information Center of the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race. The Center works with local fair housing committees, and steers Negro families to housing opportunities in the suburbs.

Records of the Center show a steady increase in the numbers of Negro families moving to the suburbs.

"As recently as 1962, it was almost impossible for a Negro family to purchase a home in a white suburban neighborhood," Smith said. "Five Negro families lived in the suburbs in the Chicago area.

"This has changed. In 1963, 25 Negro families moved to white suburban communities. In 1965, the figure was 75. In 1966, 179 Negro families moved to 28 white suburban communities.

"So far, every Negro family we've counseled has been interested in moving to the suburbs for the same reasons as white families. They are looking for improved schools, more yard space, and, in some cases, they are moving to be closer to their place of employment."

While some Negro families have found suburban housing on their own, others temporarily lack the necessary down payment. Often they are in the process of selling a house in which they have equity. In other instances, they are hesitant to move among whites. In both instances, Home Investments tries to help.

Smith gave details of the placements of two Negro families to illustrate how the Home Investment program works:

Family #1—Both husband and wife were schoolteachers in Chicago. They lived with their three children in a South Side apartment.

Seeking better education for their children without having to pay the fees of private schools, they decided to inquire into the possibilities of moving to the North Shore. Before doing any home searching on their own, they came to Home Investments for guidance and were shown available housing in several suburbs.

During their search, the couple also decided to seek employment in the North Shore at the urging of friends. They found employment before finding a home. They finally chose a home on which they received an 80 per cent loan from Bell Savings & Loan Associates.

With the move successfully made, the couple applied for and was granted a Home Investments guarantee to repurchase the house at 98 per cent of the purchase price within 18 months, if the family decided to sell because of an unpleasant social situation. Nothing of this sort has occurred and the family is now a part of the community.

Family No. 2—The husband is a middle management executive for a large Chicago bank. The parents and children had lived for six years in a house on the South Side of Chicago.

A desire to live in a better environment was this couple's reason for considering the suburbs. They looked at housing in Morton Grove, Park Forest, Oak Park, Highland Park and Wilmette. The couple chose a northern suburb.

Home Investments then loaned the couple several thousand dollars at six per cent interest to make a down payment on the home, taking as collateral the equity in the home which the couple already had and which they were in the process of selling.

Again, the couple made a successful transfer to the community.

"In both cases, these families wanted to move to the suburbs for the same reason white families do—good schools, more space, and the like," Smith said.

"The problem was that both families had a very limited supply of houses available to them. They had to act quickly when a house was listed on a non-discriminatory basis. It might have taken months, even years before another house they liked in the same price range became available. Because of this, and because of the collateral they could offer, we felt justified in making the loans."

Smith noted that while Home Investments has directly assisted three Negro families, indirectly it has assisted 42 others who have come to it for help. The simple existence of the service has encouraged many of these families to move to the suburbs on their own. Some were referred to local fair housing groups. Still others were told to postpone the move until they were on a solid financial footing.

How does Home Investments avoid the trap of guaranteeing a house that is overpriced?

"That's not a real problem," Smith said. "We expect our clients to get mortgage commitments from reputable lending institutions, and we accept their appraisals."

However, Smith noted that guaranteeing home repurchases and offering second mortgages on collateral is a slow process.

He said that the corporation has to reach more potential home buyers who are undecided as well as find investors who want to see integrated housing move faster than a snail's pace.

"We need to publicize our work," he said, "but at the same time we must make it clear that we run our corporation on a business basis. There are two good reasons for this. In the first place, we don't want a family to get into something which is over their head financially. For example, if we were to purchase a $25,000 home and rent it to a family with the option to buy, we would expect them to have an income of $10,000 a year or more and 20 per cent cash ($5,000) for a down payment in the event they decided to purchase.

"I use these figures because the 'rule of thumb' is that a family should not spend more than 2½ times their annual income for a house, and they should have at least 20 per cent for a down payment.

"In the second place, we hope to pay our bondholders interest at not more than six per cent."

Bondholders are one source of capital available to Home Investments, which is authorized to raise $300,000 through bonds paying six per cent.

Investment objectives of the company are to yield sufficient gross income to pay interest on bonds, principal and interest on mortgages, management fees, maintenance reserves, and a modest (six per cent or less) return on invested capital. Officers and directors serve without compensation.

Traditionally, insurance companies, as well as savings and loan associations, make mortgage money available only for owner-occupied dwellings.

Whatever the sources of capital, Home Investments believes it is on the right track in obtaining better housing for Negroes, and thereby improving the residential climate throughout the Chicago area.

S. 2988—INTRODUCTION OF BILL ENTITLED "INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1968"

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a few days ago, I gave notice respecting a proposed new Internal Security Act of 1968, which I indicated would be introduced early in February. At the conclusion of my remarks today, I propose to introduce this bill on behalf of myself and a number of my colleagues who are joining with me in this effort to plug recognized gaps in our internal security laws.

Some of these gaps have resulted from actions by the Supreme Court of the United States, interpreting or limiting or invalidating legislation previously enacted by the Congress. However, neither this bill nor any of its provisions is intended to challenge the Court with respect to any of its decisions. A decision of the Supreme Court is determinative with respect to the case decided and binding upon the parties in that case. Where a decision of the Court has found an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, or has so construed an act of Congress, by way of limitation or otherwise, as to render it either wholly or partly ineffective to deal with the problem for which Congress intended the law to be a remedy, it is the obligation of the Congress to consider whether the problem with which it sought to deal in the first instance is still existing. If so, Congress has a further obligation to try to frame and enact further legislation for the purpose of dealing with the problem.

In attempting to discharge such an obligation, the Congress should not be regarded as seeking to overthrow a decision of the Court. Although I feel sure that charges of this nature will be made, by those who oppose enactment of any effective legislation for the protection of our national security, and perhaps by others, I reject and deny all such charges here and now. I say to my colleagues categorically, there is nothing in the bill which I shall introduce today, and which I hope will be enacted during the present session as the Internal Security Act of 1968, which is intended to overturn any particular decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, or any decision of any other court. There is nothing in this bill which is intended to be a challenge to the Supreme Court, or to any other court. There is nothing in this bill which is intended to chastise the Supreme Court, or any other court.

This bill deals with internal security problems of substantial magnitude, problems which currently exist, problems which require congressional action. This bill seeks to deal with these problems in the most effective way which can be devised. In numerous instances, this is a way which the Supreme Court itself has pointed out.

It may be that during the course of hearings on this bill, it will be found possible to devise even better means of dealing with some of these problems.

I am confident, however, that the hearings will not disclose that these problems do not exist. I am confident also that the hearings will not disclose any good reasons why the Congress should not deal with these problems in the best way which the collective wisdom of this body and of the other body can devise.

In substantial part, the provisions of this bill are intended to implement recommendations made by the Internal Security Subcommittee, based upon hearings during two different sessions of the Congress, preceding the present session, with respect to gaps in our internal security laws, and upon more than 3 years of hearings by that subcommittee with respect to security in the Department of State, and upon consideration by that subcommittee and its staff of a number of recent court decisions. However, it should be made clear that this is not a subcommittee bill. The subcommittee did not recommend specific legislative language. Though I have sought the best advice I could get with respect to the drafting of this bill, I take personal responsibility for the precise form of its provisions. I know that those of my colleagues who are joining with me in sponsorship of this proposed legislation, while they agree with the importance and necessity of trying to plug the gaps in our internal security laws which we know to exist, are neither wedded nor committed to any particular legislative language.

They all have the reserved right to offer amendments and, where they may see fit, to oppose particular provisions, either in committee or on the floor, if they feel that such provisions are not adequate or have been drafted in such a way that they may produce undesirable results. I make the same reservations for myself; because I want the Senate and the Congress to pass the best law that can be devised to meet the problems which we know exist. I stand ready to accept or to urge any amendment to this bill which may be devised or suggested, which will serve to improve it in any way.

If this bill is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as I anticipate it will be, I propose to have it referred to the Internal Security Subcommittee for hearings. These hearings should begin just as soon as possible, and I hope they can begin not later than March 1.

Perfection of this bill should be considered the primary task of the subcommittee until it has been reported to the full committee, and should be considered the primary task of the full committee until the bill has been reported to the Senate. I hope it may be possible to conclude hearings within 30 days or less, and I think this can be accomplished if the committee will press forward as rapidly as it can. I hope and believe that after the bill has been reported to the Senate, the leadership on both sides of the aisle will cooperate in bringing it before the Senate for action as speedily as possible.

We are now in the second session of the 90th Congress, and no matter what progress we make with this bill, if it does not proceed to enactment before the end of this session we shall have to start all over again in the next Congress. That would mean a delay of up to a year, perhaps even more, in the enactment of legislation to plug the gaps in our internal security laws; and I consider such legislation to be at least as important, and at least as necessary, as any other proposal now before us or which I can foresee as likely to come before us during the present session.

Complete and detailed analysis will be better timed if it comes after the bill has been reported to the Senate; but I feel that I should say enough today to give my colleagues, and those who will read the RECORD, a general understanding of what this bill encompasses.

All segments of this bill are of substantial importance. However, I shall not take the time to discuss every provision. Instead, I shall mention some of the areas covered by the bill and then discuss a little more fully some of the new ideas which it advances.

The bill starts out with provisions intended to restore effectiveness to provisions of the criminal code originally made law in the Smith Act of 1940, but which the Supreme Court has held invalid or unenforceable. These include prohibitions against teaching or advocating the forceful, violent overthrow of government, and against the activities of Communist organizers.

The bill would extend the statute of limitations in cases of treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities.

Section 105 of the bill would make it a criminal offense to commit acts which, if committed in time of war, would constitute treason under the Constitution.

This new offense would be defined as the giving of aid or comfort to an adversary of the United States by an overt act performed by a person owing allegiance to the United States; and the term "adversary" would be specifically defined to mean any foreign nation or armed group which is engaged in open hostilities against the United States or with which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in open hostilities.

Any person who owes allegiance to the United States and yet gives aid or comfort, knowingly and willfully, to the Vietcong or to North Vietnam or to any other nation or armed group engaged in open hostilities against the United States, hostilities in which American boys are fighting and dying, certainly should be punished. But so long as we remain in a state of cold war, where the constitutional crime of treason is virtually impossible to commit, there will be no way to reach persons who aid or who would aid adversaries of the United States, either by preventing such aid or by punishing the giving of it, unless legislation is enacted along the lines proposed in section 105 of the proposed new Internal Security Act of 1968.

Mr. President, in the course of my remarks today I do not propose to anticipate to any substantial degree objections which may be made to particular provisions of this bill. But in connection with section 105, there is one objection which I feel must be anticipated and made the subject of comment. Within a very short time after the text of this bill has been made public, objections will be raised, by members of the Communist Party, and perhaps by others, who may even include some persons who are anti-Communist but who have not thought the matter through. I anticipate that these objectors will argue that the offense proscribed by the new criminal code language proposed in section 105 is not defined with sufficient precision to meet the constitutional test under the due process of law clause.

The answer to this objection is very simple: The language proposed defines this offense, which I shall refer to as the giving of aid or comfort to a so-called cold war adversary, in exactly the same terms used in the Constitution in defining the crime of treason.

Surely, words by which the Constitution itself defines the most serious crime that can be committed by a person owing allegiance to the United States of America, the only crime which is defined in the Constitution itself, cannot be unconstitutional words.

This argument is given added force by the fact that these words as used in the Constitution in connection with the crime of treason, have been considered and defined and redefined in every case of treason ever tried in the courts of this country; and the whole of the judicial patina thus created is of necessity carried over into the meaning if the words as they will appear in the criminal code of section 105 of this bill is enacted into law.

Under this bill the authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board would be extended, and its effectiveness increased. The Board would be authorized to provide a forum in which any person claiming to be disadvantaged in efforts to secure employment with defense contractors, because of unevaluated adverse security information in the files of contractors or of the Government, could seek relief and get a chance to introduce evidence in his own behalf.

The bill contains both new provisions for prohibiting employment of known Communists by the Federal Government or in defense facilities, and proposed new congressional findings to support these provisions. Also included is a prohibition against employment of known Communists in educational institutions or systems supported wholly or chiefly by public funds.

Under this bill, registered foreign agents would be prohiibted from using the mails for political propaganda without marking it to indicate in each instance that the mailer is a registered foreign agent.

Collusion with a foreign government or foreign agents to evade passport laws and regulations would be prohibited, and refusal of any person holding a passport to surrender it upon proper demand by the State Department would be made a criminal offense. Any person seeking to enter the United States with diplomatic credentials would be required to submit a passport made out in his own true and full name.

The bill provides that no person who refuses to swear or affirm his allegiance to the United States shall be entitled to receive, hold, or use any credential issued under the authority of the United States which identifies him as a person bearing allegiance to the United States.

This bill contains a proposed new statute covering the granting of immunity, to witnesses before congressional committees, with respect to disclosures made in testimony which they are compelled to give after claiming the privilege against self-incrimination. The present statute covering this subject has been so construed as to make it unworkable in most instances.

The bill contains provisions setting up procedures for serving subpenas of congressional committees upon U.S. nationals abroad, and making failure to respond to such a subpena a misdemeanor punishable in any Federal court district to which the offender shall return, within a period of 5 years after being served.

Reprisals by Government agencies or officials against Government employees because of testimony given, or because of the fact of having testified, before a congressional committee are prohibited.

The bill provides for accelerated court procedures in criminal cases involving espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, and certain other subversive activities.

An especially important feature of this bill is title VI, which would create a centralized Security Administration for Executive Departments. This new agency would handle all investigations and all evaluations in Federal personnel security cases, except with respect to uniformed personnel of the armed services, cases from the Executive Office of the President, the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and cases involving persons under consideration for direct Presidential appointments.

Such Presidential appointment cases would be investigated by the FBI, as would any case found to involve alleged subversive activity. The new agency would not take any authority away from agency heads with respect to the hiring of personnel or the granting of security clearances.

The new agency would have authority to conduct conferences and training sessions with security officers in other agencies, to make surveys and inspections of security practices and procedures in other agencies, and to recommend changes in such practices and procedures, or in security regulations, with a view to achieving greater uniformity in this area, or otherwise strengthening Federal personnel security. The new agency would also compile statistical records with respect to loyalty and security programs, and make annual reports and recommendations to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations for any legislation, or for executive or administrative action considered desirable for the improvement of any loyalty or security program.

The new agency would take over the powers, duties and functions of the International Employees Loyalty Board established in 1953 by order of President Eisenhower; and U.S. citizens would be prohibited from accepting employment in the United Nations or any other multinational organization without having received a security clearance from the new Security Administration for Executive Departments.

Title VIII of this new bill is an improved version of the riot control bill already passed by the other body. These improved provisions with respect to riot control have grown out of testimony during the Internal Security Subcommittee's hearings on the House-passed antiriot bill.

Title IX of the Internal Security Act of 1968 is a proposed travel control bill which is substantially the same as a bill which I introduced, and on which hearings were held, during the 89th Congress. Enactment of this title would entirely divorce travel control from the subject of passports. It would give the Secretary of State, with Presidential approval, direct legislative authority to impose justifiable travel controls.

This is the theory adopted in the most recent recommendations of the State Department with respect to travel controls, although the Department opposed my bill at the hearings during the 89th Congress.

A few other provisions of the proposed Internal Security Act of 1968 deserve mention.

One is a provision for expediting the flow of intelligence direct to cabinet officers when the intelligence is highly important and of special concern to a particular department.

Another provision worthy of mention would require that the Office of Security of the Department of State be staffed entirely by civil service employees.

Still another provision meriting mention would deny tax exemption to alleged nonprofit organizations which knowingly make donations to subversive organizations.

Also meriting mention is a provision creating a board to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Directors of the FBI and the CIA, and the chiefs of intelligence of the Armed Forces, to make provisions respecting rights of entry and permanent residence in the United States, and guarantees of personal and financial security, in cases of defectors from Communist countries who provide information of value to the United States.

Mr. President, I now, out of order, send this bill forward for introduction and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2988) to strengthen the internal security of the United States, introduced by Mr. Eastland (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Thurmond), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] for his sustained interest and concern in the cause of our Nation's internal security. It is a pleasure to support the bill he has just introduced, of which I am one of the cosponsors.

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in United States against Robel on December 11, 1967, which overturned Federal legislation concerning the employment of a member of the Communist Party in a defense facility, has resulted in many complaints from persons across the Nation. I have received many letters from Nebraskans, as well as others, who have expressed anger, frustration, and fear of the possible consequences of this action.

This and other court decisions have caused certain gaps in the Nation's internal security laws. As a result, there has arisen a need to review, reconsider, and update the laws protecting our national security. The Congress must face up to this problem and we should do it now.

Although some misguided persons state that the threat to our security is more apparent than real, the answer to this allegation is that there is a definite threat, and it is more real than apparent. This same point recently was made crystal clear by J. Edgar Hoover, in an article entitled "Violence in American Society: A Problem of Critical Concern," published in the George Washington Law Review. Mr. Hoover stated:

> The whole problem of potential independent violence becomes more serious since the most potent organization, the Communist Party, has mastered the technique of camoflaging its advocacy of force and violence, providing a cover behind which it can develop new strength, both in membership and influence, which may enable it to attain sufficient potency to seize state power. In Communism this is called "Aesopian language," that is, the use of roundabout or elusive words to conceal the Party's real intention of violence.

The fact that this approach is used makes even more critical the necessity for Congress to inquire into, study, and determine what laws are necessary and constitutional for national protection. The subrosa efforts of those who intend to subvert our democratic system should not delude anyone into thinking that the problem does not exist. In this connection, Mr. Hoover further stated:

> We must make no mistake that the Communist Party, despite its "Aesopian language," depends ultimately on the use of force and violence to attain a qualitative change in our society. If ever the conditions of society, through internal chaos or disintegration, permitted the Communist Party freedom of action, it would move to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

A casual survey of the news media should convince the most skeptical that our society is rapidly headed toward the critical point of "internal chaos or disintegration." The danger has become more critical since 1950. At that time it was decided by the Congress that we should have a mechanism to combat subversive activity. I suggest that it would also be pertinent to refer to some of the recent debates in this Chamber on East-West trade, the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union, and others. In these debates the point was discussed in great detail that the essential basis and thrust of the Communist Party has not abated. It still continues, and the objective of the Communist Party has not changed.

It is regrettable that the administration has concentrated on efforts to build bridges to Communist countries and not shown more interest in protecting our national security against subversion. I hope that it will soon realize that there are actually "termites in the house."

It is well that the bill of the Senator from Mississippi has been introduced and that he has indicated early scheduling of hearings and consequent action on the subject before the Internal Security Subcommittee of which he is the chairman.

Mr. President, this bill is very comprehensive. It is well balanced, and it contains and covers a variety of situations which, because of changed circumstances and developments in the last decade or decade and a half, necessitate legislative consideration and action.

Statutory provisions in the internal security field need updating and modernizing. Not all of the provisions in the bill are necessarily acceptable or approved, because of my cosponsorship of it. However, I do express a judgment that in principle the areas with which each section of the bill deals do need legislative action of one kind or another.

When hearings are completed, the judgment of the members of the Internal Security Subcommittee, as well as of the members of the entire Judiciary Committee, will be focused with greater clarity and concentration upon those points which sorely need legislative treatment.

I again commend the Senator from Mississippi for the painstaking study he has taken in this field and for the bill which he has introduced as a result thereof. The Senator has had a sustained interest in this field throughout the years, and this bill is another indication of that attribute.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the omnibus internal security bill. It is always a pleasure to work with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], who is chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee. I am happy to take part in this historic moment. For many years now, it has been evident that legislation was needed to combat the loopholes in our internal security laws as well as the gaps blasted into the restraining dike of the internal security statutes by the Supreme Court.

For a long time, I have been pointing out that our Nation has been following a no-win policy against international communism abroad. I believe it is now time to point out that our officials are also conducting a no-win policy against communism at home. The attitude of the Supreme Court and the attitude of many of the officials in the executive branch have been that it is unconstitutional to protect ourselves in any practical way against organized conspiracy.

The hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and of the House Committee on Un-American Activities have demonstrated beyond doubt that communism at home is not a legitimate political party like the others in our political spectrum. Instead, the Communist Party of the United States is actually a "Communist front." Its purpose is not politics, but revolution. It is an organ set up to exploit our political machinery in order to destroy it. We can no longer accept the simple and unsophisticated view that the Communists in this country are merely dissenters from "the Establishment"—or, as it is sometimes called, the "power structure." The Communist threat differs not in degree but in kind from legitimate political activity. It is not just that the aim of the Communist Party is revolutionary. We have many radical groups, some of them given to political anarchy. The problem with the Communist Party of the United States is that it is controlled entirely by the Soviet Union.

We cannot accept the simplistic view that the Communist Party of the United States is an old fogey movement of tired radicals who have lost their steam and have surrendered the leadership of the radical movement. Such a view overlooks the fact that the secret of Bolshevism is not its ideology—which is simply a tool for controlling emotional ideologues. The secret of Bolshevism, which Lenin perfected, lies in ruthlessly controlled organization and an unprincipled technique of manipulating the radical movement by using its aberrations to destroy popular government.

It is interesting that radio Moscow has already attacked this bill, even before it has been introduced. Moscow has already laid down the Communist line to take in attacking the bill and to do so, radio Moscow once more raises the spectre of what it chooses to call McCarthyism. On February 1, radio Moscow commented on the proposed introduction of the omnibus internal security bill in this fashion:

> In fact the very spirit of McCarthyism is returning. The power structure is working to instill a fear of legal persecution. It is brainwashing the public to believe that nonconformity indicates a lack of patriotism and that any actions which do not meet with the official approval amount to conspiracy. The Voice of America on its foreign service would like to give the impression that such a man of convictions as Dr. Benjamin Spock is a conspirator. Joseph McCarthy's followers once pinned the same label on Charlie Chaplin, Paul Robeson, and Arthur Miller. Though Joseph McCarthy is long since dead, the spirit of his witch hunt has remained, because it is an element of domestic policy that the Administration resorts to again and again.

The Communists pretend not to understand that there is no such thing as officially approved opinions in the United States. We do not censor the expression of opinion in the Soviet manner. The habit of censorship is so strong that radio Moscow cannot think in any other terms but in those of total censorship. We believe in dissent in the United States. In fact, I have often dissented from governmental policies which I believe to be unconstitutional and imprudent and will not conduce to the general welfare. So it is not at dissent that this measure is aimed, but rather at actions which are promoted not for their own sake but for the total destruction of the right to dissent.

There are those in this country who object to any attempt to identify Communists, and who believe that Communists have the same right to political forums and machinery as any other citizen. No doubt such people will again be parroting the line that this bill is "a revival of McCarthyism." I do not know what such critics mean by "McCarthyism," but it appears to me that the text of this bill is simply an attempt to identify with precision the highly organized minority element whose actual and provable motive is to destroy the foundations of our society. The Communists are already taking up the scareword of "McCarthyism" in the hopes that it will blind people to the calm and moderate provisions of this legislation.

Mr. President, it is extremely important that this bill draw a clear line between honest dissent and organized conspiracy. I believe that my esteemed colleague from Mississippi, as well as the many distinguished cosponsors of this bill, all agree that the bill is not yet a perfected bill. It will take intensive hearings and much serious thought to perfect each of the many provisions it involves. Some of the ideas entailed in this bill have already been introduced in the form of other legislation; for example, the riot control title is similar to an amendment which I have pending in the current civil rights legislation. The approach here is basically the same, with slight differences in the definition of legal presumption. There is much thought being given to this problem by many esteemed legal philosophers, and there still remains disagreement on the best approach. I fully expect that there may be amendments or changes as this legislation develops. It is important that the bill be made fair. If this Nation is to persevere and to insure domestic tranquility, both for ourselves and our posterity, we must take a firm stance against those internal enemies who are seeking to destroy the Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the original coauthor of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill—which was incorporated as the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950—I am pleased to cosponsor the proposed Internal Security Act of 1968.

Let me say at the outset that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is the chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, as well as the parent Judiciary Committee, is to be commended for his action in introducing such a bill. Legislation of this type is badly needed. Even more vital is the need for a national and public discussion of the subjects encompassed in this bill and full-scale public hearings on the problems and perils it is designed to correct.

If enacted into law, the Internal Security Act of 1968 may well be one of the most significant pieces of legislation to clear the 90th Congress. Without a doubt, it will be one of the most controversial.

In my estimation, however, controversy and a "clearing of the air" is badly needed in this general area. It is my belief that the Congress and the executive branch have been so preoccupied in recent years with the obvious threat from without our boundaries that we have neglected our internal security. In the meantime, the third branch of our Government has undone much of our past efforts. It is time for a new look at what is needed and what can be done to protect our country here at home. We must delay no longer a start toward repairing some of the damage done by decisions of the Supreme Court in the areas covered by this legislation.

Few rational men will deny that times have changed. We are not the same self-secure nation we once were. We are instead living in a precarious and sometimes volatile world which knows no boundaries and provides no sanctuaries.

The emergence of our country into the position of a first-rate power and the leader of the free world has been complicated by the circumstances that dictate our reaction to a crisis. This far, far different world we live in with the ever-present threat of nuclear annihilation confronting not only our country but all of mankind forces us to meet measured force with measured counterforce, but it does not require anything less than the ultimate in our internal vigilance. It is our position as leaders of a free world menaced in many areas by conspiratorial and aggressive communism that complicates this.

Mr. President, I maintain, as I have in the past, that while freedom and security may not necessarily be mutual, they are by no means incompatible. This is our challenge, as I see it: to strike a balance between the two.

Congress has made this attempt before, most notably in the Mundt-Nixon Act which became a major part of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Some of our efforts have been invalidated by the Supreme Court. This does not mean that we can not strike this balance and that we should not try. On the contrary, it is our duty to do so. In some decisions, the Court has indicated new safeguards which we can erect.

In so saying, I do not wish to leave any misconceptions as to where I stand with regard to these decisions. I disagree with many of them. This is no secret. In my estimation, several of them have tended to jeopardize the security of this Nation. They are nevertheless now the adjudicated law of the land. It is the duty of Congress when one of its laws has been invalidated to write a better law. I accept this challenge and I believe the rest of the Congress feels likewise.

If we admit, therefore, that gaps may exist in our security laws and that it is incumbent upon Congress to close these gaps, the instant legislation provides the vehicle to do so. Whether or not the final bill is one that utilizes the exact language we have before us or, indeed, whether it will be this bill at all, can be determined by hearings, which I assume would be before the Senate Judiciary Committee or one of its subcommittees.

I have only one comment about such hearings. I hope, that to the fullest extent possible, these will be open hearings so that all sides of all controversies emanating from our past security precautions and our future expectations can be heard. Let no one be able to say that they did not have an opportunity to experience their day in court.

The Senator from Mississippi has mentioned most of the provisions in this legislation and consequently I see no reason to duplicate what has already been said. It is a broad bill, a wide-ranging one, encompassing many subjects. Its language may not be perfect, in some respects it may even be harsh, but as Senator Eastland has pointed out, this is not hard and fast language that cannot be changed as a result of the subsequent hearings. As he mentioned, none of the cosponsors necessarily must feel that by joining in the introduction of the Internal Security Act of 1968, they are wedded to the exact provisions and the exact language. I know that I am not. There are several changes in the context of the bill which I deem to be essential and desirable.

The fact remains, however, that the mere introduction of such legislation brings into focus the murky uncertainties that presently surround our constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and association in the context of the not so cold war. A case in point is the conflict in Vietnam, acknowledged as the policy of our duly elected Government, supported by the commitment of our military forces, and yet openly opposed and at times thwarted by citizens of that Government to the detriment of these same military forces.

Is this, or should this be, punishable as similar acts were punishable in other conflicts, or "wars" as they were formally called in less complicated and less explosive times? This is one of the questions this bill and these hearings attempt to answer.

Similarly, the matter of self-admitted and known Communists teaching in our tax-supported schools and colleges or working in our defense establishments has outraged our citizenry. Is it right? Is it necessary? Can we constitutionally prohibit it? I have no doubt in my own mind that it is not right and that it is not necessary. The hearings will answer the last question. I believe a great constitutional and free Republic such as ours can and should be able to evolve constitutional means and methods to provide for its security and its preservation.

Mr. President, included in this legislation is a section establishing a Central Security Division for our Federal Government. This is a step that is vitally needed and has been suggested in legislation by others, notably our minority leader, Senator Dirksen. His bill, S. 2778, has been assigned to the Government Operations Committee on which I have the honor to serve as the ranking Republican member. In my estimation, because the need for early action is so obvious, I hope that hearings will continue in both committees on both bills.

One final comment before closing, Mr. President. Included in the Internal Security Act of 1968 is a title that encompasses much of the House-passed version of the antiriot bill. Once again this touches the Government Operations Committee. As we all know, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee has been assigned the duty of investigating the civil disorders that occurred in several of our cities the last few summers. This investigation is still in progress. The antiriot section does not spell the necessary steps that must be taken to prevent further disruption among the populace nor does it try to identify the basic causes for such riots and so therefore it is not in competition or conflict with our hearings, but I want to point out that cosponsoring of the bill does not signify one way or the other my prejudgment of our hearings, which are so important to our country.

With this commentary and with the confidence that Congress will meet its obligation to both the people and the Constitution, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation.

PROPOSED FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, CANADA, AND BRITAIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very significant weekend conference which took place in New York on Saturday and Sunday, at the New York University's Center of International Studies, which was chaired by the head of that center, Prof. Thomas M. Franck. Attending the meeting was a very distinguished group consisting of Members of Parliament, academicians, economists, and businessmen from Great Britain and Canada, and a similar group from the United States.

This group considered a series of papers which had been developed by teams of economists in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States respecting the organization and development of a free trade association among the United States, Canada, and Britain.

In view of the now accepted fact that Britain has not gained admission to the European Common Market—and that it probably will not gain such admission within a future which is compatible with the time limitations in view of its tremendous financial problems and the great economic emergency it faces—these distinguished men, among them some whom I will mention, have developed the implementation of an idea which I first had the honor of launching in November of 1965 at a dinner given for me by Lord Thomson of Fleet, in London, which proposed an association of these three countries, by way of a free trade association.

It was emphasized that such free trade association would attract not only Britain, but perhaps other members of the European Free Trade Association as well, of which Britain is the leader, and probably countries such as Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland, with always the likelihood that even the European Economic Community itself could be induced to join.

Mr. President, this is a very grand design. It is an historic initiative. Those who were present included, for Britain, Members of Parliament, such as the Right Honorable Hugh Fraser, of the Conservative Party; a former president of the Board of Trade in the Labor Cabinet, Sir Douglas Jay; and Rt. Hon. Frank Cousins, who is one of the leading trade unionists in the United Kingdom.

Other Members of Parliament, distinguished economists, and Government leaders were present. From Canada a number of Members of Parliament attended including the Honorable Eric Kierans, who is one of the leading members of the Liberal Party; the Honorable Marcel Lambert, Member of Parliament and chairman of its Finance Committee; and the Honorable Mr. Justice N. T. Nemetz of British Columbia; and the president of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Mr. Fraser W. Bruce.

From our country there was in attendance a group of professors who prepared many of these papers. Also in attendance were Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, and I as the original author of the idea. There were other representatives including Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, who is an important intellectual figure in this country. It was announced that the ideas we were discussing had the support of Prof. Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard, and other distinguished thinkers in this country.

Mr. President, many great ideas like the European Economic Community, Latin America Common Market, NATO, OECD, and many other outstanding initiatives in the world, including the United Nations, have started in this way.

The issues at stake are nothing less than open international trade in industrial products, the economic standing of the dollar and the pound sterling, an effort to solve the world's tremendous monetary dilemmas, as well as the basic issue of security, in view of the withdrawal of Great Britain from responsibility east of Suez, and many other drastic changes that have taken place in the world.

Mr. President, this is the first time that the United States is being asked to consider seriously, an effort which is not a multilateral negotiation like the Kennedy round, which is magnificent in itself, but as time will show requires also supplementation and development by trade groupings of a kind which are beginning to characterize the world in the last third of the 20th century.

It is for this reason that I wish to announce to the Senate my association with this effort. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks the communique issued at the conclusion of these deliberations, the list of those who attended, and the text of my remarks at the opening of the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every effort will be made to bring about the publication of the papers that were discussed at the conference both in the United States and in the other two countries concerned. A number of them have already been published in Canada and the United Kingdom. We hope to publish the papers, which are still in draft form, including one examining the economic implications of a free trade area arrangement for the United States, so that the attention of the three governments can be focused on it and that it can be discussed in international circles and organizations, as well as in the committees of Congress.

Enterprise and initiative are eventually required in the economic and trade fields, as all of our experiences have shown. This is one of the most important initiatives of which I am aware, with tremendous possibilities.

Mr. President, I feel honored to be associated with this effort and I believe that Senators should begin to be informed about it.

EXHIBIT 1

THE FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION

A group of businessmen, writers, political and trade union leaders, economists and lawyers from Canada, Great Britain and the United States has met for two days, February 17–18, at the Center for International Studies of New York University. It has worked with five draft studies prepared by the N.Y.U. Center for publication in October 1968, and has held discussions with economists who have recently published "Atlantic Trade Studies" in Britain and the Montreal based research series "Canada in the Atlantic Economy." The group has reached the following general consensus:

1. The conclusion of the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations and the rejection of Britain's application and those of other countries to join the European Community create the need for new initiatives towards multilateral trade liberalization and the promotion of economic growth on a worldwide scale.

2. The discussions held at the N.Y.U. University Seminar and the draft studies here considered indicate that such a new initiative might well take the form of a free trade association in industrial products of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and other EFTA countries, to their mutual economic and political benefit.

3. A free trade association of the kind examined should be outward-looking and open to others to join. To this end further research is to be undertaken into the implications of including other industrial nations and groupings such as those of the European Free Trade Association, the European Community, Japan, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand, as well as of special beneficial relationships with the developing nations.

4. The conclusions of these discussions set out in the preceding paragraphs should be given the most earnest attention and consideration by governments, leaders of opinion, and the public in the countries represented at this seminar.

Participants in this conference were:

From Great Britain: Mr. Peter Bessell, M.P.; Prof. George S. G. Catlin; Right Honorable Frank Cousins; Mr. Harry Cowie; Prof. Stanley A. de Smith; Right Honorable Hugh Fraser, M.P.; Sir Roy Harrod; Right Honorable Douglas Jay, M.P.; Prof. Harry G. Johnson; Mr. Alfred Morris, M.P.; and Cmdr. Edward Whitehead, C.B.E.

From Canada: Mr. Fraser W. Bruce; Prof. H. Edward English; Mr. John W. Holmes; Hon. Eric Kiernans, M.L.A.; The Honorable Marcel Lambert, P.C., M.P.; and the Honorable Mr. Justice N.T. Nemetz.

From the United States: Hon. Theodore C. Achilles; James Baechle, Esq.; Congressman Johnathan B. Bingham, Prof. Gordan C. Bjork; Prof. Richard N. Cooper; Prof. Thomas M. Franck; Prof. Robert G. Hawkins; Mr. Andrew Hay; Senator Jacob K. Javits; Mr. Sperry Lea; Prof. Arthur Schlesinger; Mr. Kenneth Spang; Mr. Ralph I. Straus; and Prof. Edward Weisband.

CHANGES IN WORLD ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL BALANCE DEMAND STUDY OF INDUSTRIAL FREE TRADE AREA

(Keynote address of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, February 17, law school lounge, Vanderbilt Hall, New York University, Washington Square South, New York City, at weekend seminar on an industrial free trade area sponsored by the Center for International Studies)

As a trustee and member of the President's Council of New York University's Center for International Studies, I extend a warm welcome to the distinguished participants of this conference. As a United States citizen and Senator, I want to extend our heartfelt gratitude to the many distinguished political, academic and business leaders from the United Kingdom and Canada who have journeyed so far to participate in this conference which could have such a historical role in the future of our country and of the free world.

We are here to consider an Industrial Free Trade Area to include our three countries and such other industrialized and trading nations as choose to join. We meet under the auspices of a great university and draw upon the wisdom of academic experts. The issue, however, is of practical importance in consideration of urgent international economics and political questions—it is not academic at all.

When in 1965 I first addressed myself to the possibility of such an Industrial Free Trade Area, I was dealing with a theory. But time and events have caught up with us and changes in the structure of world economics and political power demand that we begin to test our theories against present realities and that we find answers to our problems before they overwhelm us.

Now what are the realities:

The nations of western Europe tend to believe that the United States has become preoccupied in Asia, and has been diverted from the maintenance of its European ties;

President de Gaulle continues to insist on French domination of the European Common Market, and shows no signs of wavering in his determination to keep Britain out of the EEC;

The pound sterling has been devalued and Britain has taken austerity measures which reduce the effectiveness of the pound as international reserve currency.

The harshest reality of all, as far as the western community of nations is concerned, is the present situation of Britain. How will its future role be affected as a leading factor in international security, diplomacy and finance? It is clear that unless some decisive steps are taken there is a real possibility of further drift and deterioration of Britain's overall economic position.

Well nigh stripped of empire, drained by two world wars, excluded from the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom cannot carry on a world role from a position of economic isolation. Because the United States, Canada and the entire western world need the strength, the wisdom and the leadership of the United Kingdom, we must work to overcome that enforced economic isolation. In my judgment, the Industrial Free Trade Area proposal is a practical and reasonable way to do it. It would not only throw the United Kingdom a lifeline in its time of distress but provide the United Kingdom government and people with a means of getting out of economic danger through their own efforts.

The IFTA concept is important for other reasons too, beyond the present plight of the United Kingdom. To me and to many others, the concept of an Industrial Free Trade Area represents the next step in the continuing effort to liberalize world trade.

Obviously, there is a great feeling of brotherhood and common heritage between the peoples of the United States, Canada and Britain. But we cannot—or should not—proceed on this basis. What we are talking about here is not philanthrophy; it is reality. The western world needs Britain as much as Britain needs the western world. This is an exercise in enlightened self-interest for all concerned.

I wish to emphasize that I favored—and continue to favor—the admission of the United Kingdom into the EEC, and that the free trade area idea was proposed by myself and others only as an alternative. With Britain facing no immediate prospect of EEC membership, however, I feel that the alternative of the IFTA must be considered now in more practical terms. Basic decisions designed to restore the economic health of Britain and the western world simply might be too long deferred if we await solution to the question of British membership in the EEC, or even associate membership.

Let us take the lead here today, so that it can be said in years to come that we saw an impending economic crisis in Europe and worked as valiantly as we could to head it off before it was too late. I, for one, consider it my duty to bring these studies to the attention of the highest authorities in my government and I respectfully urge those of you in a similar position to do likewise.

In assessing the situation which now confronts us, it is essential to bear in mind the fact that the postwar arrangements in Europe depend on Britain being a major power there. Should economic factors compel Britain to withdraw from its military and political commitments in Germany and Berlin, the most unsettling and dangerous consequences would ensue. Present arrangements, which provide at least some stability, could rapidly come undone and bring on a volatile and potentially explosive situation in central Europe.

This prospect is certainly one which should give pause to the leaders of France—on whom it seems to be making no impression—and to the leaders of all western European nations. A sober realization that nothing less than the stability of Europe is involved in Britain's well-being and financial situation should be the common platform from which the Atlantic community of nations—the entire western community of nations in fact—proceeds. Nor can central Europe and the U.S.S.R. be unconcerned: dislocation of the status quo in the Federal Republic of Germany and West Berlin abruptly and in response to financial stringency could create grave problems and tensions for them, too.

It would be altogether too tempting a target for opponents to resist. If they took advantage of it because of the inviting target, it would involve a crisis far greater than any which now faces the United States and its western allies.

Therefore, the concept of an Industrial Free Trade Area composed initially of Canada, Britain and the United States could be of vital importance.

What gives the IFTA concept relevance and importance? The five papers that will be discussed today and tomorrow examine this question in great detail but I would like to give you my beliefs, which were the basis originally for my proposal, and the reasons why in my judgment, IFTA is worthy of serious consideration.

1. IFTA could provide the economic base to support the capacity of the United Kingdom to continue to perform a significant economic and political role in the world.

2. IFTA could result in the harmonization of national economic policies of its members without encroaching upon essential national political sovereignty.

3. IFTA could meet this need described in Prof. Franck's paper ". . . Britain needs an association with other states which will preserve her freedom of initiative in the Afro-Asian part of the Commonwealth, while relating the British home market and defence establishment to much larger units to effect economies of scale and provide a growing home market for her industrial production."

4. IFTA could also be looked upon as a means to strengthen sterling and the U.S. dollar as international reserve currencies. Britain's membership in a large and viable industrial and trading community would strengthen world confidence in the viability of the sterling and take the pressure off the U.S. dollar. . . .

5. IFTA could well represent the next practical step after the Kennedy Round to liberalize world trade. We are now facing a situation where regional trade groupings will be a fact of life and where the unconditional most-favored nation principle will become applicable as between trading communities or associations rather than nations. The paper submitted by Theodore Geiger and Sperry Lea to the U.S. Congressional Joint Economic Committee's hearings on future U.S. trade policy last year conclude that the free trade area concept promises to be relevant for the United States in any eventuality. If the next attempt at trade negotiations by the traditional multilateral approach fails—or, even possibly, is insufficiently promising to be attempted—then we would shift to the only other approach that is sanctioned by GATT, establishing a free trade area among willing countries as the first move toward a more generalized agreement.

On the other hand, if another round of multilateral negotiations succeeds, then we would find ourselves so close to free trade that the GATT countries could commit themselves to full free trade at a fixed date and undertake other commitments as if they were in a formal free trade area.

6. The IFTA idea is also very relevant to the United States in its future relations to continental western Europe, which even after de Gaulle could very well be unwilling to accept our long cherished concept of an Atlantic Community unified economically and politically. IFTA could then be an excellent parallel grouping to the EEC, pursuing parallel goals.

I would be the last to deny that it would be easy to bring IFTA into being in view of prevailing opinion in the three countries involved or that it does not involve costs. You will find, however, that the three country studies show that the costs are acceptable, especially in view of the benefits to be shared, and in fact, preferable to those involved in permitting Britain to continue its drift and isolation.

I congratulate the participants of this conference for investing their time and energy in this exercise. I am confident that you will debate the studies presented to us in the most considered and practical terms. I hope you will be convinced as I am that the IFTA proposal deserves the same kind of consideration in Washington, Whitehall and Ottawa.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, history is an elusive thing to attempt to predict or out guess. Those who engage in it professionally are called fortune tellers. Sometimes they operate in violation of the law.

However, I make a tentative prediction about a particular verdict of history which, in my judgment, is nonetheless solid and assured; namely, that Lyndon B. Johnson will be reported to future generations as being the one President who, more than any other man who occupied that office, advanced the cause of civil rights in this country.

Mr. President, in fair weather and foul, his courage and effectiveness as President are a record that history will not avoid giving a glowing account of.

I make that rather broad suggestion as I rise to advise the Senate that a few minutes ago I received a letter from the President of the United States which with your leave, Mr. President, I should like to read in full. I shall make no further comment about it. The letter speaks eloquently for itself, and I hope that it will persuade many of us with respect to our attitude on the vote on the cloture motion tomorrow:

> Dear Phil: Again this week, the Senate of the United States is a crucial arena for human rights.
>
> The issue is whether we will continue to move toward equality as a fact, as well as an ideal, in America.
>
> We have made extraordinary progress in the past decade. Nevertheless equal justice is clearly not a reality for millions of Americans today. The civil rights legislation now pending before the Senate—about which you have asked my views—will not in itself achieve equality for every citizen; but it is a vital step along the way. Both conscience and reason insist that it be passed.
>
> In one title of the pending legislation, we seek new and clear authority to punish those who would use violence and intimidation to prevent others from exercising the rights of American citizenship: the right to vote, to go to school, to obtain a job, to serve as a juror, and to use public facilities.
>
> There should be no question about the exercise of these fundamental rights. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that their exercise is protected by law against those who would use force to deny them.
>
> Pending legislation before the Senate also seeks to ensure that every American has the opportunity to provide a decent home for his family. Segregation in housing—the product of long-standing discriminatory real estate practices—has compounded the Nation's urban problem. Minorities have been artificially compressed into ghettoes where unemployment and ignorance are rampant, where human tragedies and crime abound, and where city administrations are burdened with rising social costs and falling tax revenues. Fair housing practices—backed by meaningful Federal laws that apply to every section of the country—are essential if we are to relieve the crisis in our cities.
>
> From every moral and practical standpoint, these measures are necessary. The wrongs they address are urgently in need of redress. Together with the other measures I have recommended to combat discrimination—particularly in the fields of employment and jury selection—they respond to the elemental demands of equal justice in America. They should be adopted without delay.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for yielding to me to permit me to associate myself with his observations regarding the remarkable and very courageous role of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, on behalf of the objective of a nation in which race shall be irrelevant.

In the short period since I came to the Senate, I have seen his leadership in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and have observed his leadership earlier, before coming to the Senate, on the moving Civil Rights Act of 1964. I have seen, first hand, throughout my nearly 3 years in the Senate, the truth of what the Senator from Michigan has just observed; namely, that we have never had in the White House a President who has worked so hard, so creatively, and so courageously on behalf of the cause of human rights as our President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

In the letter which the Senator from Michigan has just read to the Senate, the President once again demonstrates his selfiessness and his devotion to this uncompromisable objective, if we are going to have a truly United States.

I join the Senator from Michigan in expressing the most profound appreciation to our President for his courage and his vision at this critical moment as we approach the vote on the cloture motion tomorrow afternoon.

I hope that the Senate will, by adopting the cloture motion, go on to express what is clearly the majority will of the Senate and achieve much higher ground in determining our future progress, for all the reasons which have been expressed by so many Senators during recent days of debate.

If I may say so, the Senator from Michigan has honored the President, an honor which the President deserves; but I think that the President, in dispatching his letter to the Senator from Michigan, also rightly honors the leadership which the Senator from Michigan has provided on the issue on which we are about to vote tomorrow.

For just as the President of the United States has established an unparalleled record in the executive branch, so has the Senator from Michigan established a similar record of selfless, creative devotion to the cause of human rights in the Senate.

I am proud to honor not only the President of the United States but also to join him in honoring the Senator from Michigan.

If I may make one further observation, I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke]. I think that one of the most exciting things about the civil rights movement is that it is a bipartisan effort. It is not a Democratic effort or a Republican effort, it is an effort by all decent men to erase the disgrace of racism from American society.

I am proud that they would join us and

work alongside us to achieve this great objective.

It occurred to me, as the Senator from Michigan was reading the President's letter, that it would be a remarkable demonstration of the same kind of bipartisanship, if the bipartisanship which has been shown in the Senate could be matched by expressions from the various candidates for the Presidency of both political parties as well, if we could show, as we approach the cloture vote tomorrow, that not only is the President in favor of the measure now pending before the Senate but also that we have the support of every other candidate for the office of President in the coming election.

This, I think, would give us the kind of bipartisanship that would be even more effective tomorrow as we approach this important matter.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the words of President Lyndon Johnson as expressed in his letter are most eloquent and most courageous. They come at an important time in the deliberations of the Senate. Tonight, when we are on the eve of one of the most important votes that will be taken in the Chamber during this session of the Senate, I think it is certainly befitting and appropriate that we have these words of wisdom from the President.

I have served as a member of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. It was a Commission that was appointed by the President at the height of the unrest and turmoil in our country in 1967. It was formulated as a result of the riots which were tearing the hearts of Americans in urban centers, at a time when racism was sweeping across the country.

The Commission has been deliberating day and night, trying to find the cause of those riots, why they happened, how they happened, and what can be done to prevent them from happening again.

One of the questions which took much time of the Commission, as to which much testimony was heard, was the question of housing in this country. The amendment which is presently before the Senate does not force housing on any one person or any one particular group, but it does say that a man can live in housing that is within his reach, regardless of his race or creed. That is what the amendment is for. It is certainly important, at this critical time in the history of the United States, that the Senate of the United States stand up and be counted on this important measure.

So when I say that we are on the eve of the most important vote which we shall probably take in this session, I say it with much forethought.

I am certainly proud to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and the distinguished senior Senator from New York on this important legislation.

Mr. President, at this time, as I stand on the Republican side of the aisle in an election year, I certainly want to commend the President for what he has done at this important time in sending this letter to the Senate. I pray that my distinguished colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, will heed the advice of our President at this time; that they will join together, Republicans and Democrats, in voting for cloture tomorrow afternoon.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota when he says that not only does the able Senator from Michigan honor the President in bringing forth his message to the Senate; the President honors him and those who are associated with him in this vital cause.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I wish to join Senators MONDALE and BROOKE in their commendation of the President of the United States. I subscribe to that commendation. It is very much in the spirit in which all of us have spoken here this afternoon in recognizing the important contribution to a successful result which the leader of the party of the President of the United States would give by way of impetus by this letter.

It is a fact that President Johnson, when he was majority leader of the Senate, and before and since, has been counted in the ranks of those who sincerely and deeply advocated legal measures to implement the constitutional guarantees of equal opportunity. This is a part of the history, as Senator HART has properly said, of that effort.

Mr. President, civil rights, as has been said time and time again, must be bipartisan. Neither party has the strength to enact civil rights laws by itself, even at the lowest ebb of one party. Notwithstanding that the count is now about 2 to 1, Democrats versus Republicans, it is still impossible to marshal every vote on the Democratic side. By the strange anomaly of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which has not been enacted—to wit, the rules of the U.S. Senate—two-thirds are required to do anything in the civil rights field, in view of the very deep feeling of our southern brethren on this subject, rather than a simple majority. Hence, the President knows, from his vast parliamentary experience, that this is the moment in which to intervene; and the President's perception and experience should not be lost on the country. Let those who would make our fellow citizens feel that they are strongly in favor of legislation to implement equal opportunity for all Americans understand that it is this cloture vote that counts, and that no matter how they may vote, pro or con, on amendments or various other procedural steps, what counts in the ability to actually get legislation passed is the cloture vote.

That unique situation obtains not only for one House of Congress, to wit, the Senate, but it obtains for the Congress, because we all know that the rules of the other body permit civil rights legislation to be passed—and, indeed, that is what happened in 1966—and then to be defeated and frustrated in the Senate, because cloture is unable to be effected.

So let the country note carefully that the President understands, and the people of the country should understand, what this means in terms of our ability to pass civil rights legislation.

Second, every American, I feel, in his heart is very worried about the situation domestically, especially since we have had the experience of rioting and disorder that we had last year. We pray that all of us will use our utmost devotion to avoid such an eventuality this year. But certainly the President understands—and if there is any lack of understanding on the part of others, Senator BROOKE certainly can enlighten them—that this is one answer to help to alleviate the grievances of Americans, legislation for the protection of individuals seeking to assert their civil rights, and the protection of those who would help each other to obtain the essential dignity of being able to get housing which a person desires. That is what counts. It is deeds that the minorities of the big cities want to see, not more words; and the passage of this law represents another one of those deeds which can be enormously effective in letting the great mass of the people feel that justice is being done and that extralegal means are unnecessary and are antisocial and should be dealt with as all antisocial movements should be dealt with, instead of being condoned because of the deep feelings of injustice which animates those actions.

So I join Senators in welcoming the President's letter, in noting its historic importance, in a completely bipartisan spirit, and in emphasizing the necessity for the action recommended, based on the President's perception of the needs of our country.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall try to obtain by tomorrow some expression of opinion from each of the Republican candidates. I think that is an entirely valid point. Just as the President has spoken, there is no reason why they should not speak. I shall make an effort on that score, and I know the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] will join me in that effort.

The important thing is to make the country feel that we are like minded in this effort, and also to emphasize that this is the breakoff, this is it, this is what counts.

I, too, took pleasure in noting that the President did address Senator HART personally; and there is no question about the fact that that is a tribute to his leadership as well as his deep understanding of the issues at stake.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New York for their most impressive and impartial observations as we near the hour of voting on this cloture motion.

I strongly commend the Senator from New York for his characteristic strength and courage on this question, and for his candor in expressing the hope that everyone who is now seeking the office of President of the United States might join the President to demonstrate that in that arena as well as in the arena of the U.S. Senate, men of good will join together in unison in urging that once and for all we remove the curse of racism from our country.

I commend the Senator from New York for the very clear and candid statement he has made.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I shall resist the temptation not to keep my word. I said I would add nothing. I do, however, wish to thank my very good friends for the kindness of their words and the appropriateness of the comments.

Let us all hope that tomorrow, as the Senator from New York has stated, is really the payoff day.

I remember, more than a year ago—though I can only paraphrase his words—that when we approached the rollcall on the question of whether we supported the action of the Vice President which would have enabled this body by majority action to write its rules, the Senator from New York, as I remember, just before that vote said, "Let everybody understand just exactly what we are about to do. The fate of civil rights legislation in this Congress will hinge largely on the outcome of this vote."

Unhappily, we did not prevail. The Vice President's action was not supported, and we are still stuck with rule XXII. Tomorrow, I suspect, will be a rather dramatic test of the proposition whether it continues to be true that the Senate, on an important national question, is not permitted to work its will.

That is not good, by anybody's standards. Let us demonstrate tomorrow that two-thirds of us here are willing that a majority of the Senate make the decision.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to address the Senate regarding the pitfalls and drawbacks of the pending proposed Civil Rights Act. At that time, I also sent to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending measure, to be entitled the "Civil Obedience Act of 1968."

My amendment would seek to recognize the fact that with rights go responsibilities.

This proposed amendment is designed to overcome the present misguided thinking of many militant forces that they will attain untold rewards by criminal acts or violence based upon their own hatred and ignorance. I can assure them that this is not the case. My proposal will insure that they are held responsible for their unjustified actions—just as any other citizen would be.

As I pointed out in my prior remarks, the basis for my proposal stems from the riotous conditions that have plagued the United States for the past 4 years, and which were predicted for the summer of 1967.

Unfortunately for all Americans, the prediction of racial violence for the summer of 1967 came true in full measure. In a total of 76 major incidents spread over practically every State of the Union, north, south, east, and west, wholesale Negro violence was an almost nightly affair in the streets of our cities. Nearly 100 persons were slain and nearly 2,000 injured. Police reported 4,289 cases of arson alone. Over 16,000 rioters were arrested. The estimated property loss was in the neighborhood of $160 million. The estimated economic loss to riot-torn businesses was over $504 million.

Mr. President, these riots occurred in spite of the civil rights bills that had been passed in 1964, 1965, and prior years. The riots tended to demonstrate that merely by passing civil rights bills you do not stop riots, and you do not stop lawlessness. Sometimes you merely encourage more of the same. Legislation is needed to prevent that type of thing for the future. We may very well need it badly here in the District of Columbia before the year is out.

What we once characterized as a national shame and tragedy has now evolved into a state of emergency which threatens the entire social and economic fabric of this great republic.

What lies ahead for the coming summer? We can turn again to the prediction of a very reliable, responsible publication, which was right last year, for its prediction for this year. I refer to U.S. News & World Report. On January 8, 1968, the magazine which accurately predicted last year's holocaust said this:

> A record year for riots has barely ended—and already Americans are hearing this warning: The next 12 months may be worse than the last.
>
> This is heard not only from militant Negro leaders who talk of "black revolution" and "guerrilla warfare," but also from public officials from positions to size up the outlook and from social scientists who study riots and their causes.
>
> Nearly all agree on these things:
>
> The conditions of poverty, unemployment and slum housing that disposed Negro masses toward rioting last summer still exist, almost unchanged.
>
> The mood of Negroes is becoming more angry and more belligerent.
>
> Organized groups of Negroes are plotting new tactics of violence.
>
> A group of "black nationalist" leaders has told President Johnson's Commission on Civil Disorders that the next riots will involve guerilla action.
>
> Targets, they say, will be public utilities, expressways and other key facilities. The avowed aim of this group is to destroy the "white system."
>
> A prediction of "violent and bloody revolution" has come from Harry Edwards, a militant Negro leader who teaches sociology at San Jose State College of California. Writing to police departments in northern California, Mr. Edwards said:
>
> "Battle lines are being drawn. A condition of open warfare between the police and the black community and certain white allies is developing.
>
> "Let there be no mistake, gentlemen. We are no longer talking about bricks and bottles. We are now talking about a state of total, hostile and aggressive guerilla warfare carried out on streets and highways of our communities."
>
> Stokely Carmichael, originator of the "black power" movement, says, "Our movement is progressing toward an urban guerilla war within the United States itself."
>
> Former Vice President Richard Nixon said in a recent speech: "Violence in our cities takes on more of the aspects of guerilla war."
>
> A sharp increase in gun sales has led U.S. Senate investigators of last summer's riots to believe that firearms are being stockpiled for use in next summer's riots.
>
> Past rioting has been concentrated in the "long, hot summer." But Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, now is warning whites to start worrying about a "long, cold winter."
>
> The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Negro head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, announced he will lead a massive campaign of civil disobedience next spring. A march on Washington is to be staged simultaneously with other demonstrations throughout the nation.
>
> If his campaign does not bring "positive" action by government officials, Dr. King says, "I would be the first to admit that this coming summer can be much worse than last summer."
>
> There are many who predict that Dr. King's demonstrations themselves will lead to violence.
>
> It is not only Negro radicals who talk of the possibility of racial strife in terms of revolution.
>
> The Sunday Star, of Washington, D.C., in a recent editorial, said this:
>
> "In the United States today, there exist all the ingredients that could combine to produce major civil strife on a nationwide scale."
>
> Richard H. Sanger, a former diplomat who has made on-the-spot studies of insurrections in other countries, says he sees signs of open revolt developing in this country.
>
> "I fear we have witnessed only a beginning," Mr. Sanger told U.S. News and World Report in a recent interview. "The demonstrations may well become more violent and the rioting get worse unless something drastic is done."
>
> Demands are growing for extraordinary efforts. Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City said in a recent speech:
>
> "To re-establish peace in our cities, we shall be obliged to concentrate the full powers of both the public and private worlds upon bringing constructive, positive change to . . . areas of our cities."
>
> "Unless this is done," Mayor Lindsay has warned, next summer "probably will be worse—more festering, more inflamed and infinitely more perilous."
>
> President Johnson's riot-study group has given a clear sign of how seriously it regards the situation. The commission announced in December that it will hurry up the final report on its months-long investigations. The report, with recommendations for action, is now scheduled to be presented before March.
>
> One member explained that the inquiries brought to light a "situation so critical we cannot afford to waste time."
>
> Along with demands for action to improve the status of Negroes come demands for stronger action to put down riots when they develop.
>
> President Johnson, in a December 19 news conference, said this:
>
> "We have more violence that we want, and more than we should have—more than we are going to be able to tolerate."

Thus, Mr. President, we see to our collective horror where what had part of its origins in a doctrine of civil disobedience has developed into violent attempts to tear down the existing social order and replace it with a form of jungle anarchy.

Put forth ostensibly to aid the quest of the Negro American to raise his station in life, this nihilist doctrine has not only stalled the tremendous progress this race has been making, but indeed has caused them to lose much precious ground.

Destruction will never bring progress, hate will never breed love, wanton, senseless violence has never been a precursor to true peace and harmony.

Led by false prophets, the Negro has in many cases become his own worst enemy and the greatest obstacle to his own progress.

Somehow, the Negro in this Nation must find it within himself to take full advantage of the great benefits which this Nation offers to all its citizens.

No nation, no people, have ever developed a society the equal of what Americans enjoy today.

We will continue to make progress unless those dissidents who seek to destroy, rather than build, gain the upper hand.

Mr. President, it is in that light that I intend to offer my amendment to the pending civil rights measures when the times becomes appropriate.

With respect to the open-housing proposal, those who argue for such legislation do so on the prediction that such a law would enable the Negro to leave the ghetto. This is hollow reasoning, for it fails to consider the economic realities surrounding the Negro in the ghetto. There is indeed a danger that a fair-housing law not only will fail to improve the lot of the Negro; I worry, frankly, that it will further damage this country's already precarious race relations by being nothing more than a empty, frustrating promise to the Negro. This sort of thing is almost certain to engender more criticism from those who hurl charges of white hypocrisy at those who claim to be giving the Negro equal rights.

Not discrimination, but lack of money, is what prevents our Negro citizens from owning good housing and enough property. I have no doubt that when the Negro has enough money to buy property and to pay for good housing, he will find that the right to own his property exclusively and to sell it to whomever he pleases is as precious a right to him as it has been to those citizens who have exercised that right since the beginning of American history.

I should hope all of my colleagues would see the wisdom of seeing to it that the Negro moved up to the enjoyment of such rights and privileges, rather than having him serve as the instrument by which such freedoms were removed from everyone. If we do not do it this way, the eventual result will be that others will have been lowered to his level, rather than he having been elevated to theirs.

It would be a sad travesty for the Negro to find that he had achieved the rights of so-called first-class citizenship, and then to discover that his new station was no better and little different than the second-class citizenship of a bygone day.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that I will be permitted to outline four basic reasons that compel me to offer my strong opposition to the measure before us today.

First. The right of a person to own and dispose of his property at his own discretion—and to choose his associates—is fundamental to liberty and freedom.

Second. The crying need for the Negro in America today is self-help. Most Negroes cannot afford the housing which this bill would make available. For this reason, the bill is unnecessary and would only give birth to more senseless Government regulation and redtape.

Third. If recent history is a guide, there is every reason to believe that enforcement of such a Federal law would be prejudicial, abusive and typically overzealous. We can assume that charged with the administration or execution of such a program would be a substantial number of liberal hotheads who would be prone to disregard practical problems in their blind quest for total integration and "social justice." Proponents can argue it would not happen, but past events support my concern. Similar abuses have already been witnessed with respect to the 1964 civil rights law and the 1965 voting rights law. And the letter and spirit of the law notwithstanding, these abuses have become official policy.

Fourth. There can be little doubt that so-called fair housing would be detrimental to property owners even on a purely practical basis, over and above the deprivation of the basic rights commensurate with property ownership. Out of malice or whatever, some troublemakers could claim racial bias and could cause preliminary injunctions to be issued against housing sales and rentals—without even any testimony or defense. A home might be off the market until the rendering of a final decision—which, because of crowded court dockets, might be as far away as 3 years.

Mr. President, I believe that every man, with respect to his own property, should have the right to act to encourage the development and maintenance of the kind of neighborhood in which he wants to live and raise his children. A man's feelings in this regard do not necessarily spring from prejudice. He simply may not wish for his children to absorb the values and attitudes of a culture different from his own. He may wish for his family not to endure traits and habits of others which he deems distasteful.

I fail to see the fault of a housing developer planning a neighborhood to appeal to people with certain opinions of what is best for their families. There is nothing wrong with people wanting to keep their neighborhoods as they are, free from influences which they feel are alien and undesirable. It may very well be that their beliefs are wrong, but it should be their prerogative to make up their own minds and to pursue what is best, as God gives them the light to see the right.

Negroes, just as all other men, will also want to perpetuate their neighborhoods as they believe they should be.

When they earn enough money, they will want to engage in the same practices as other people. If this housing proposal is enacted, however, they will discover their new status sadly lacking, for it will not offer all of the advantages that it otherwise would have.

Both whites and Negroes would benefit from the Negro's raising his standards to those of whites, rather than pulling the higher standards down to his level. At present, few Negroes can afford the housing which the proponents of this bill hope to make available to them, so its provisions will serve primarily to encourage needless governmental regulations, redtape, and, in many cases, harassment. It is far better to encourage self-help among Negroes. When they begin to develop the skills and abilities necessary to hold higher paying positions which will enable them to purchase such housing, the Negroes who have obtained these levels will want to establish their own residential patterns, just as various groups of whites have done.

It would appear to be the better part of wisdom for those who are striving so hard to push through this legislation to pause and take stock of the many genuine successes Negroes have achieved in past years—much, may I say, because of his own effort rather than theirs.

For example, in the past 15 years the number of Negroes enrolled in colleges has doubled. The number of Negro professional men has doubled in the past decade. Negro buying power has risen to $30 billion from only $3½ billion 25 years ago. Adjusting for differences in purchasing power, this represents an increase of nearly 300 percent.

These achievements did not grow out of mass marches and demonstrations. They did not come as the result of wanton violence in the streets. No Federal legislation brought about these successes. These are the achievements of old-fashioned initiative and hard work by individual American Negroes taking advantage of the great opportunities for self-improvement offered in our society.

The road to success is the same for the Negro as for the white man. It is not the self-defeating path of the protest march with its placards and songs, its fires and hurled stones. The achievement road is the uphill route where the climb is made only by those fueled with ambition and initiative and powered by hard work and tenacity.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST BE TOLD THE TRUTH ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, administration spokesmen, including a special assitant to the President, a high military authority and our Ambassador to South Vietnam, now contend that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong general assault of January 30–31 constituted not only a major defeat for the Communists but that this general offensive, attacking some 31 cities from the Mekong Delta to the DMZ, has left the South Vietnamese Government and its army in a stronger position than ever before.

Their reason follows the line that these attacks in violation of the Tet holiday and because of their intensity and brutality have created hatred and indignation on the part of the dwellers within the urban areas toward the Communists. These spokesmen contend that because of the assault, the South Vietnamese citizens "have come closer to a sense of nationhood than ever before" and that "the Government pulled itself together and did a magnificent job."

Mr. President, at the very same day, the news services were carrying reports that many people in South Vietnam believed that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese had scored political and psychological gains. It has been reported that the people of South Vietnam have a renewed respect for the Vietcong and, in fact, many were seeking to contact the Communists in advance of the anticipated second wave of assaults. Dissatisfaction with the Saigon government's performance was expressed because it was felt that Saigon was unprepared, lacked intelligence and sufficient manpower to meet the threat. Urban dwellers expressed their fears and frustrations by reciting that even during the French war 15 years ago the cities then were secure. The brutality of the Vietcong was acknowledged by all, but they cited brutality on the part of the armed services and the Government of South Vietnam in ordering artillery and aerial bombardments into the very cities we seek to save.

One is compelled to note also, Mr. President, that while many anti-Communist factions are banding together in this emergency, other political groups have refused to publicly condemn the Vietcong assaults and rumors are abroad that Viet President Ky, who is in charge of the recovery program, plans to regain prominence by placing his own men in powerful positions.

Thus the conditions are present, Mr. President, which could lead to the kind of internal instability which has plagued South Vietnam in recent years. And the American people need to understand this.

Our administration, together with many others, may view the present situation as an opportunity for the Saigon government to restore its prestige and gain support with a vigorous program to resettle some 500,000 refugees and to reconstruct the thousands of homes which have been demolished. That opportunity may also be an added burden upon a new government, and if they cannot achieve support in times of relative stability there is a serious question whether they can win the support of the people during this emergency while operating under martial law. And the American people also need to understand this.

Much has been made of the fact that the people did not join the "general uprising." The truth of the matter, if we believe the press, is that during the assaults, the people did not rally to the support of the Saigon government either. One truth seems apparent. It is that the pacification program is now in total disarray. This was the program which was to build support from the peasants in the hamlets and villages throughout South Vietnam and broaden the basis of support for the Saigon government. It was also the program which in the long run would permit our withdrawal. To recite, as the administration does, that people within the cities are now angry with the Communists and will, therefore, support the Saigon government, ignores the fear and lack of confidence and lack of security which must be felt by every peasant outside the urban areas.

These are not pleasant thoughts to express, and one is uncomfortable to recite discouraging conclusions, especially when we think of the gallantry of the American fighting men in a difficult and torturous war. Nor is it possible to forget that any criticism of the administration or expression of lack of confidence in each of our efforts may be of some comfort to Ho Chi Minh and perhaps help his cause because of the frustrations such comments as these may bring to the few who may read the same.

But, Mr. President, I am persuaded that an honest expression and the fairest statement of known facts and reasonable conclusions will not frustrate or weaken the will or resolution of the American people so much as the disappointment and concern which inevitably follows when people are, or think they have been, misled. No one would suggest that the Government in time of war should reveal all its plans and speak with a pessimistic tone. But, this administration, sooner or later, must understand, or commence to understand, that its lack of support is borne not out of a failure to do what we as a nation must do, but is created because the people no longer believe the administration.

My objection to these optimistic statements in the face of so many contrary facts could be supported by a long recital of optimistic expressions which have only led to disappointment. Little would be served by such a recital.

The point of all that I have said is simply that the administration must use greater care in advising the American people as to the course and conditions of the war in Vietnam. They can stand the truth. They will, I am persuaded, do what must be done.

No one doubts that Ho Chi Minh hopes to prevail in his aggression through the discouragement and disillusionment of the American people and the loss of faith in our cause. The statements by the administration rather than the statements of its critics can do more to bring that result.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there are no further statements to be made at this time, I move, in accordance with the order of Friday, February 16, 1968, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19, 1968:

Department of Commerce

C. R. Smith, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, vice Alexander B. Trowbridge.

Civil Aeronautics Board

John H. Crooker, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1968, vice Charles S. Murphy.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the terms indicated which shall begin on the date of incorporation:

For a term of 2 years:

Roscoe C. Carroll, of California.
Saul Haas, of Washington.
Erich Leinsdorf, of Massachusetts.
John D. Rockefeller III, of New York.
Frank E. Schooley, of Illinois.

For a term of 4 years:

Joseph A. Beirne, of Maryland.
Michael A. Gammino, of Rhode Island.
Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas.
Joseph D. Hughes, of Pennsylvania.
Carl E. Sanders, of Georgia.

For a term of 6 years:

Frank Pace, Jr., of Connecticut.
Robert S. Benjamin, of New York.
Jack J. Valenti, of the District of Columbia.
Milton S. Eisenhower, of Maryland.
James R. Killian, Jr., of Massachusetts.

In the Marine Corps

The following named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Charles F. Duchein.
Sidney S. McMath.

The following named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Leland W. Smith.
Arthur B. Hanson.

In the Air Force

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major (Dental)

Edwards, Jack, FV3074949.

To be captain (Dental)

Smith, Howard F., FV3113253.

To be first lieutenant (Dental)

Harrold, Charles Q., FV3187492.
Helfert, William H., FV3167319.
Henry, Donald W., FV3187493.
Post, Richens W., FV3187496.
Vitek, George L., Jr., FV3166970.

To be first lieutenant (Judge Advocate)

Blommers, James J., FR3134248.
Condon, Robert C., FR3206396.

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force precommissioned schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Alexander, Roger S., FV3221960.
Apgar, Fred M., FV3221909.
Ballard, Thomas R., FV3221768.
Bennett, Leland H., FV3215993.
Bethards, Kim L., FV3208895.
Blackshaw, Kenneth T., FV3204342.
Boyd, Raymond O., FV3204345.
Brady, Thomas R., FV3220147.
Brown, James L., FV3216060.
Bush, William L., III, FV3204352.
Catherman, Robert L., FV3204359.
Charles, Arthur R., FV3204360.
Coleman, James P., III, FV3221232.
Covarrubias, Francisco J., FV3216002.
Cramer, Charles E., Jr., FV3176615.
Daugherty, James D., FV3221562.
Delaney, John P., III., FV3204369.
Dennis, Harry S., III, FV3175211.
Despeaux, Frederick M., FV3171928.
Dirnberger, Kenneth R., FV3221729.
Dunlap, James J., FV3222056.
Elrod, Robert T., FV3204373.
Evans, James C., FV3220824.
Evans, Robert J., FV3222094.
Fairchild, Maclennan C., FV3220832.
Ferrarer, Joseph S., FV3216068.
Finch, David S., FV3222147.
Fowler, Donald R., FV3222163.
Fox, Charles L., FV3221565.
Freiley, Kenneth J., FV3220910.
Fuller, Terry W., FV3204381.
Gaiser, Richard E., FV3222766.
Gates, Brent A., FV3222223.
George, William L., FV3204388.
Gepson, John, E., FV3222125.
Goldey, James W., FV3216054.
Griffin, Larry D., FV3126014.
Haese, Wyndle R., Jr., FV3222240.
Chalfant, James F., FV3222860.
Harry, Larry E., FV3216071.
Hatchadorian, Matthew J., FV3221715.
Haywood, Ronald T., FV3204399.
Hempley, Roy B., FV3204401.
Hensel, William C., FV3221436.
Higbee, Edward J., FV3216021.

Hilmo, John A., FV3222370.
Hughen, Richard E., FV3204404.
Jones, Ronald B., FV3216022.
Kroboth, Thomas J., FV3215912.
Kruchek, Charles L., FV3175545.
Kugelmann, Robert, FV3222843.
Kuha, Donna M., FV3216079.
Langabeer, James R., FV3215913.
Lanier, Kenneth E., FV3222611.
Macaulay, Allan K., FV3221819.
Manning, Keith H., FV3222814.
Marks, Michael D., FV3222803.
McClure, Dennis S., FV3221136.
McLeish, Charles E., FV3221291.
Meyer, Scott K., FV3221199.
Milhiser, Charles L., Jr., FV3220991.
Miller, George K., FV3215927.
Miller, William E., FV3221801.
Monk, Homer L., FV3215928.
Oberdorf, John G., FV3222499.
O'Brien, James R., FV3222501.
Olsen, George W., Jr., FV3174645.
Olson, Walter J., Jr., FV3221622.
Ormsby, Richard J., FV3215937.
Oswald, Billie E., Jr., FV3215939.
Parsons, Robert N., FV3222848.
Pendergrass, Wesley L., FV3215944.
Pope, James A., III., FV3222327.
Porter, Philip M., FV3222863.
Pruett, Charles E., FV3215948.
Pyeatt, Robert J., FV3222395.
Rivera, Renaldo E., FV3175081.
Robley, Robert B., FV3215951.
Rosas, Robert, FV3215953.
Savage, Stephen J., FV3171153.
Scherrer, John D., FV3216037.
Shackson, Charles W., FV3175299.
Shanks, Robert W., FV3220342.
Snith, Cecil J., FV3215964.
Smith, Robert O., FV3221471.
Stones, Ernest H., Jr., FV3222266.
Strauss, Alan D., FV3172430.
Taylor, Anthony C., FV3160443.
Taylor, James W., Jr., FV3215970.
Thomas, Robert G., FV3216097.
Tobin, Frank T., FV3222014.
Wagner, Rodger D., Jr., FV3215976.
Weldon, James R., FV3215977.
Wenzel, Kenneth J., FV3221983.
West, Sheridan J., II, FV3215978.
Westover, George D., FV3222235.
Williams, Roger L., FV3215981.
Woolley, William H., Jr., FV3222845.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished graduates, the following students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 2106, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Albright, William A.
Alessandro, Charles
Alexander, Dean C.
Alexander, Robert W.
Altus, Roger W.
Ames, Richard L.
Anselmi, Michael S.
Antinone, Robert J.
Baird, Wayne J.
Bala, Walter A.
Barker, Raymond H., Jr.
Bassett, Kenneth W.
Baumgardner, John R.
Bell, Frank E., III
Bender, Steven R.
Berry, Alan, L.
Bethart, Edgar J., Jr.
Brandt, Stephen D.
Brauburger, George H., Jr.
Brauner, Lonnie, Jr.
Breuder, Andrew J.
Bridal, Donald D.
Broomall, Vernon H., Jr.
Buquor, Anthony F.
Burkhead, Charles E.
Caldwell, Hartley M., III
Campbell, John R., II
Carlson, Randall D.
Carroll, Gerard P.
Chatmon, Albert I.
Chema, Thomas V.
Clements, Donald P.
Cobb, William P.
Coneybeer, Thomas R.
Copeland, Larry J.
Cotney, Arnold D., III
Damiani, Aris E.
Davenport, George R.
Dayley, George W.
Deaton, Roland E., Jr.
Demaio, Dorian A.
Dmytryk, Edward C.
Dougherty, Thomas R.
Enderland, Terry W.
Engel, Richard L.
Evans, David G.
Evans, Howard E., II
Fisher, Wayne C.
Fitschen, Charles K.
Flansbaum, David A.
Foglesong, Robert H.
Franke, Robert R.
Fryer, Steven F.
Gordon, John A.
Greenwood, Darryl P.
Griffin, Calvin A.
Grimm, Andrew D.
Hagemann, Robert A.
Hahney, Thomas M.
Hansen, Richard L.
Hanushek, Kenneth P.
Harmon, Norman D.
Hays, Robert L.
Heeren, Jerome D.
Hengstenberg, James D.
Hiner, George E.
Hoff, Harlan F.
Hoffman, George H.
Inhofe, Douglas L.
Innes, Richard G.
Jackson, Charles H.
James, Daniel, III
James, Richard R.
Jessup, Edwin H.
Johnson, Hubert O., III
Jollie, William B.
Jones, Allen A.
Kelley, Chester T.
Kelly, John W., Jr.
Kihle, Lowell E.
Kipp, Ronald C.
Knod, Edward M., Jr.
Korn, Stephen C.
Kuebler, Daniel E.
Laakman, Henry E.
Lecroix, Charles D.
Loflin, Thomas G.
Lohr, Douglas D.
Lymburner, Francis C.
Makranczy, Theodore A.
Mallory, Lawrence H.
Martin, Marvin L.
Mateja, Alan P.
Matthews, William M.
McAtee, Edgar F., Jr.
McCabe, Scott P.
McGregor, Quentin J.
McManamy, Thomas J.
McNutt, James A.
Meadows, Robert J.
Melzer, Laurence S.
Merten, Donald H., Jr.
Metz, Alfred P.
Meyer, Robert J.
Miller, John F., Jr.
Miller, Kenneth C.
Mitzlaff, David E.
Moody, Gerald B.
Morrison, Patrick L.
Moss, Robert J., Jr.
Murray, James F.
Muskus, Brian F.
Myers, Charles R.
Myers, Jeffrey V.
Nazario, Alexis
Neff, Peter S.
Negro, James E.
Nelli, Lee V.
Noone, James J., Jr.
O'Brien, Michael J.
Orbin, Earl M., Jr.
Ouellette, William P.
Owendoff, James M.
Padgett, Garland W., Jr.
Parks, Roger E.
Payne, Rodney M.
Pinkovsky, Dennis D.
Pipes, Lloyd D.
Porter, Lynn W.
Porter, Murrell D.
Potts, Walter H.
Rainey, Ronald L.
Rasmussen, Ronald R.
Rheinberger, Michael L.
Rhoads, Harold S.
Riener, Kenneth D.
Riley, James L.
Roth, Paul W., Jr.
Rumple, Paul W.
Russell, Glenn B.
Savage, Donald M.
Sawyer, David A.
Schiefelbein, Lester W., Jr.
Schlegel, Mark O.
Schummers, John H.
Scoville, Paul A.
Sherer, Jack H.
Shore, John W.
Smith, Joe H.
Smith, Lawrence A.
Smith, Ronald L.
Potts, Walter H.
Sousley, Lester D.
Springer, Barry R.
Stevener, Ralph A.
Stirling, Charles F.
Stone, Edward E.
Stone, Robert L.
Stragand, William E.
Stump, Thomas K.
Swanson, Charles K.
Taylor, Richard C.
Theisen, George F.
Thomas, John C.
Thomson, Michael A.
Thrailkill, Larry T.
Turner, Philip R.
Turner, Ronald L.
Umemoto, Ernst M.
Vanhorn, James D.
Vankirk, James W.
Weber, Nelson J.
West, Virgil A., Jr.
Westbrook, James G., Jr.
Williams, Richard K.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wylie, Carl P., Jr.
Yoshida, Roland S.
Zimmerman, Carl T.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Gamblers Make a Gain

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. Supreme Court continues to hand down decisions which tend to protect known criminals at the expense of society. In an editorial published in the State, Columbia, S.C., on February 6, 1968, the editor expresses his desire that American businessmen would receive as good treatment from the Federal Government under the vast array of administrative laws and procedures as the criminal receives from the Supreme Court.

The editorial quotes from an article written by Mr. Lowell B. Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, and published in Nation's Business, in which he said:

> There is no doubt that the recent Supreme Court interpretations of our Bill of Rights inclined many thoughtful citizens to the growing opinion that rights of law-abiding citizens have been subordinated to those of criminals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAMBLERS MAKE A GAIN

By a 7-1 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court has invalidated laws requiring gamblers to register and to pay special taxes. Thus, again, organized crime has been given a bit of a boost.

Lowell B. Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, declares in *Nation's Business* that criminals are being given better breaks these days than ordinary businessmen.

"There is no doubt," he says, "that the recent Supreme Court interpretations of our Bill of Rights incline many thoughtful citizens to the growing opinion that the rights of law-abiding citizens have been subordinated to those of criminals."

Justice John M. Harlan maintains that if gamblers obey laws requiring them to register, they provide evidence that could lead to their own prosecution. Thus, in view of the Fifth Amendment guarantee against self-incrimination, gamblers need no longer register or pay special taxes imposed upon them by the Internal Revenue Service.

Lowell Mason asks: Why should those who take in $40 billion annually, legally or semilegally, pay no taxes on their take and get better treatment (generally) than businessmen who are the government's main source of income?

"The Government practices what it does not preach. It practices discrimination . . .

"For businessmen there is no freedom from inquisition, a presumption of innocence until they are proved guilty by a preponderance of evidence, a trial before an impartial judge and a jury . . .

"When a businessman comes to trial (before the commissioners of some federal agencies), it is not necessary to waste time proving his guilt by a greater weight of the evidence. The commissioners, having originally prepared the charges against him, apparently instinctively sense whether or not the man is guilty. All that the administrative law requires is for them to put some evidence in the record or, if there is no evidence, at least some inferences upon which guilt may rest, and the Supreme Court will not interfere with their judgment."

These are startling words from a man who has served in both the legislative and executive branches, and at national, state, and local levels of government. Mason merely wants to know if government will treat businessmen with the same consideration it gives to denizens of the underworld.

We tend to have our doubts.

Major Cities and Small Towns Participate in Vital Planning Programs of Department of Housing and Urban Development

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Housing and Urban Development in a recent report outlined the importance of its planning program to cities and communities of all sizes—including cities and towns of less than 50,000 population which received 680 of 874 planning grants approved in fiscal year 1967.

In dollar volume these 680 grants totaled $13.9 million of $31 million. This is certainly an excellent report and reflects growing recognition by HUD and Secretary Weaver of the importance of small town improvement and development to the solution of national problems—including urban problems.

Because of the significance of this report and its interest to my colleagues and the American people, I place it in the RECORD, as follows:

HUD GRANTS HELP COMMUNITIES PLAN FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

To help communities with intense planning needs but inadequate budgets, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development made 874 grants for comprehensive urban planning totaling more than $31 million during fiscal year 1967.

From assisting tornado-ravaged Belmond, Iowa, plan its rebirth, to increasing employment, health and educational opportunities in a 60-county area of the chronically depressed central Appalachia area, HUD's Urban Planning Assistance Program is providing a key factor in the sound development of the nation's urbanizing areas.

Popularly known as the "701 Program" because it is authorized by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, the Urban Planning Assistance Program is administered by HUD's Office of Metropolitan Development. Since its inception, the program has assisted over 3,390 planning projects with grants valued at $143.9 million.

Each State, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico participated in the program during the fiscal year just ended. Illinois received the greatest number of 701 grants—85; while New York was awarded the largest dollar amount—$3,052,886.

Small areas received the largest total dollar amount in "701" assistance in fiscal 1967. Cities and towns of under 50,000 population received 680 planning grants valued at $13.9 million out of the 874 grants approved.

Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, stresses the growing need for area-wide planning in rapidly expanding urban regions, including smaller communities.

"In the years just ahead urban growth will touch and change the lives of most of our citizens. Will it prove a change for the better?

"The choice facing our communities is clear—undirected urban sprawl or orderly growth and development; ugliness, waste, and decay, or constructive use of the land. By developing their own plans for the future, local agencies are taking the initiative in providing an urban environment that will expand rather than limit the horizons of the good life."

Mr. Haar noted that Congress has made the comprehensive planning approach a prerequisite to eligibility for grants under Federal programs for water and sewer facilities, open space and beautification, urban renewal, advances for public works planning, neighborhood facilities, public housing, and urban mass transit assistance.

Federal grants under the Urban Planning Assistance Program usually cover up to two-thirds of the total cost of projects. They are supplemented by funds from the localities, which are responsible for developing the plans.

SECTION 701 AIDS SMALL COMMUNITIES

Small towns and large metropolitan areas alike have received assistance under the program in the past fiscal year. For example, the 500 residents of tiny Seabrook, Texas, outside Houston, were concerned about uncontrolled growth after a NASA installation became a close neighbor. A $17,580 grant will enable Seabrook to make comprehensive plans for land use, traffic control, public facilities, and long-range capital improvements consistent with its expected future growth.

At the other end of the scale, the Tri-State Region of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut, with a population of 17 million, is jointly undertaking interstate comprehensive planning with specific emphasis on transportation planning. It received a $915,333 grant in 1967 to continue planning activities for a project which also is being funded jointly by HUD's Urban Mass Transportation Program and the Bureau of Public Roads.

More than $12.5 million went to 145 metropolitan and urban regional planning agencies, including such cities as Boston, Chicago, Tulsa, Kansas City, Mobile, San Diego, and the Houston-Galveston area.

AREAWIDE AND STATEWIDE PLANNING

An example of area-wide metropolitan planning assisted by the 701 program is the Puget Sound Governmental Conference Project, funded in part by a $60,520 grant from HUD. Land use problems have recently been magnified in the area due to a great increase in population. The project will comprise a four-county area, including the cities of Seattle and Tacoma. It will provide for integration of past and present regional planning efforts, particularly in the areas of transportation and water and sewer facilities provision.

Statewide planning was encouraged in 27 States by grants totaling $4.5 million. Among these grants was the first made to the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) to launch a planning program which will be a first step toward improving living standards, increasing employment opportunities, and bettering health and educational facilities in a 60-county area of chronically depressed central Appalachia.

With the help of $502,205 in HUD planning funds, the ARC will prepare a regional urban development plan and action program and special studies for individual States which will concentrate on relating the economic development of the region to the needs of its 1,534,565 residents.

The project, which in its final scope will encompass the 12-state Appalachian region, initially will affect an area extending along the Cumberland Plateau and including parts of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

OTHER 701 HELP

Also receiving 701 grants in the past fiscal year were officially designated disaster areas and Indian reservations.

Belmond, Iowa, population 2,500, was declared a disaster area after a tornado ripped through the town, claiming a number of lives, 85 percent of the business district, and more than 260 homes. A grant of $11,386 will help develop critically needed comprehensive plans for rebuilding the north central Iowa community.

Isleta Pueblo, an Indian reservation in New Mexico, with a population of approximately 850, will benefit from an Urban Planning Assistance grant of $23,754 made during the last fiscal year to help the tribe analyze the resources and population characteristics of their reservation. It will help finance preparation of plans for major land uses; new streets; community facilities, such as parks, schools and public buildings; and for a public improvements program and long-range fiscal plans for development. The study will consider the impact of the nearby and rapidly developing Albuquerque metropolitan area on Isleta's future.

PLANNING FOR 1970 CENSUS

The kind and quality of information about urban populations obtained in the census is of vital importance to planning agencies. "People-oriented" planning by the Metropolitan Washington, D.C. Council of Governments is being given a boost by a $32,338 grant which will partially fund advance preparation for the 1970 census. Other metropolitan areas receiving 701 assistance to lay the groundwork for the 1970 census are Minneapolis-St. Paul, Atlanta, Baltimore and Tampa-St. Petersburg.

URBAN PLANNING ASSISTANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1967

[Dollar amounts, by State, reserved on basis of total estimated project costs]

State	Number of projects	Federal grant
Alabama	17	$578,393
Alaska	6	78,775
Arizona	9	98,399
Arkansas	17	242,618
California	48	2,937,244
Colorado	13	477,891
Connecticut	16	782,285
Delaware	5	83,190
District of Columbia	2	551,831
Florida	17	359,096
Georgia	12	739,702
Hawaii	1	55,000
Idaho	3	89,312
Illinois	85	984,346
Indiana	23	775,245
Iowa	36	733,135
Kansas	20	422,164
Kentucky	12	503,618
Louisiana	15	216,879
Maine	8	73,629
Maryland	13	811,520
Massachusetts	19	847,799
Michigan	37	2,307,906
Minnesota	22	670,667
Mississippi	10	204,327
Missouri	26	1,081,983
Montana	8	147,215
Nebraska	14	136,875
Nevada	3	27,072
New Hampshire	6	151,268
New Jersey	13	524,419
New Mexico	17	315,007
New York	33	3,052,886
North Carolina	13	484,045
North Dakota	8	148,535
Ohio	47	1,758,464
Oklahoma	17	513,332
Oregon	23	484,239
Pennsylvania	27	1,541,630
Rhode Island	6	180,505
South Carolina	7	234,744
South Dakota	4	56,890
Tennessee	12	417,856
Texas	37	934,584
Utah	8	242,863
Vermont	4	101,458
Virginia	6	373,701
Washington	24	679,880
West Virginia	18	993,425
Wisconsin	21	713,585
Wyoming	1	16,000
Puerto Rico	4	214,327
Appalachia	1	502,205

Strip Mining in Kentucky

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I believe that Senators may have read the recent Life magazine article on strip mining in Kentucky. Unfortunately, the magazine failed to present a balanced picture of the situation by ignoring the progress being made in Kentucky's mined-land reclamation program.

Kentucky's new Governor, Hon. Louie B. Nunn, recently put the situation into better perspective during remarks at the Louisville conservation rally. I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. LOUIE B. NUNN, GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY, AT A CONSERVATION RALLY HONORING FORMER GOV. EDWARD T. BREATHITT, LOUISVILLE, KY., FEBRUARY 13, 1968

Governor Breathitt, Secretary Udall, editors of Outdoor Life, and fellow conservationists of Kentucky, I appreciate this opportunity to join in tribute to Gov. Breathitt for his outstanding contribution to the cause of land conservation in Kentucky.

Gov. Breathitt has certainly advanced this worthy cause. And let me assure you that under his successor's Administration in Frankfort, it will continue to be advanced in the years ahead.

A great deal has been done—and remains to be done—concerning land conservation in our state. Yet I know that Gov. Breathitt and I can concur in the bipartisan opinion that we Kentuckians have much to be proud of by way of natural resources and beautiful landscape.

Thus, despite the one-sided, distorted recent Life magazine article regarding strip mining in Kentucky, let me say that the Bluegrass State still lives up to its worldwide reputation as the Bluegrass State. In the future, as in the past, we intend to keep our state's landscape a source of beauty and enjoyment for native Kentuckians and for the many thousands of visitors who vacation here each year.

In this regard, I recently received a disturbing letter from a resident of the town of Republic, Missouri. The author of this letter, Mr. J. M. Kemp, wrote me as follows:

"REPUBLIC, MO.

"DEAR GOVERNOR: My family and I had intended to vacation in the Cumberland Mountains region of Kentucky this summer. However, after reading the Jan. 12 issue of Life magazine, I seriously doubt if we will be there.

"I have no intention of driving 700 miles to see a landscape destroyed forever by a few fast-buck operators. I fail to understand how you and your legislature can tolerate it.

"Sincerely,

"J. M. KEMP."

I can think of no better place or time for the Governor of Kentucky to respond to such a letter than here-and-now, on occasion when we are taking note of the mined-land reclamation progress being made in Kentucky. I am therefore framing my brief remarks tonight in terms of an open letter to Mr. Kemp.

This, then, is my reply to Mr. Kemp, mailed today:

"DEAR MR. KEMP: As Governor of Kentucky, I am deeply disturbed about the misleading impression you have been given by the LIFE magazine article on Kentucky strip mining. I am especially concerned that, as one result of this article, you and your family are cancelling plans to visit our state this summer.

"Having read the Life article, I can appreciate how someone who did not know about the progress our state is making in the field of mined-land reclamation might jump to a one-sided conclusion on the subject. For, indeed, although the Life article does present certain facts on Kentucky strip mine reclamation, the total picture it presented was that of the destructive exception rather than the constructive rule of the case.

"In its editorial preference for the sensational, Life did not emphasize the fact that last year, in 1967, although Kentucky strip miners disturbed 12,000 acres of land, they reclaimed 14,000.

"It did not adequately report that in the past 20 years, the Kentucky Reclamation Association has planted over 25 million trees and more than 700,000 game food and cover plants; and that during the past decade the Kentucky Reclamation Association has released over 6,000 game birds and 340,000 fish on strip mined land, lakes and ponds in the state.

"Moreover, under the new Kentucky strip mine reclamation law, responsible strip mine operators are cooperating in making long-range plans to reclaim disturbed mined lands.

"No, Mr. Kemp, Kentucky is not as Life would have you believe, 'a landscape destroyed forever by a few fast-buck operators.' The enclosed material, which has been specially prepared by the State Department of Natural Resources, will give you and your family a more balanced picture of the Kentucky strip land reclamation scene.

"Yet, coming as you do from the 'Show Me' State of Missouri, I appreciate the fact that you and your family would want to see for yourself what Life's writers and photographers omitted.

"Therefore, as Governor of Kentucky, I am extending you and your family my personal invitation to visit our state this summer as our guest, at our expense. I have instructed Commissioner of Public Information Jim Host to contact you to make suitable arrangements for such a visit.

"I sincerely hope that you will take advantage of this opportunity to see the other side of our scenic Kentucky story, in order to reach a more comprehensive understanding of our state's continuing concern and efforts in the field of land conservation and reclamation.

"With best regards, I am,

"Sincerely,

"LOUIS B. NUNN."

I hope the Kemp family of Republic, Missouri, accepts this invitation. We want the people of our country to see the accurate, complete and balanced picture of our state's landscape. The Department of Natural Resources material we have prepared will be widely disseminated to achieve this end.

Kentucky remains a beautiful place to live—and beautiful place to visit. And the award being given here this evening is proof of the fact that Governor Breathitt has played a significant role in keeping it that way.

"Our Nation's Deteriorating Cities"

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of our Nation's deteriorating cities is one that compels the attention of all citizens interested in maintaining our society. I do not believe I overstate the case when I suggest that the very structure of our free society is threatened as it never has been before, by the tragedy occurring in our great cities.

Many suggestions have been advanced as solutions to that problem. Among them is a new and exciting concept proposed by a constituent of mine, Mr. Daniel W. Cook, of Urban Development Analysts, entitled "New Metropolises." I include his proposal as a part of my remarks:

NEW METROPOLISES: BUILDING TOMORROW'S CITIES IN CALIFORNIA'S HINTERLANDS

(By Thor Nyman)

The American Dream is floundering amidst the uncertain foundations and the teetering skylines of our major cities. For most of these metropolises are rife with the manufactured pestilences of a contrived civilization that continue to infest and impoverish the mind, the streets, the landscape, the very breath of life—and the mad mobs spoiling to put it all to the torch.

California is scarcely the terminal point for this "Dream"; if anything, here's where it's beginning all over again every day. The California metropolis is a species by itself, and the exurbia it has spawned has a long way to go to get even a whiff of the wildernesses and hinterlands that still abound for hundreds of miles in practically every direction, as when the Dream was young and the West was wild.

And that's the Hope California can retrieve out of the Scourge that cities have become elsewhere. The Space Age reels off skyward, but California can spread out contrariwise, through thick and thin. There are in this state something like 11 million acres of vacant federal public domain land, aside from all privately-owned land, that conceivably could be used for urban land development.

The question is, are we going to wait for exurbia to gradually eat its way out into the back country and perpetuate the Scourge and its same old mistakes ad infinitum—or will we build—"Dream Cities" on the bedrock of that Hope, where horizons still bend with the sky?

If this seems utopian, so was California with the onslaught of the '49ers and in the ensuing land rush when the devil did not take the hindmost. The biggest land grabs naturally occurred at the confluence of rivers and/or natural seaports that stood in closest proximity to good farmland and natural mineral deposits. For many decades the economy was keyed to these prime centers and to the use of manual labor, with farm workers carrying much of the load. Today, the non-human share of the basic production industries bears the largest burden of that work load, with increasingly more people employed in government, trades, services or distribution, and only four percent of the work force in agriculture.

And now the plot thickens, for just as masses of people thicken in whorling spirals around and away from our central cities, so the basic machinery of the economy need no longer be fitted as before into the same old matrix of the city-suburban complex, and its dispersal automatically attracts the influx of humanly adapted (service-trade-government) industries in its wake, wherever it goes. The tremendous growth and dispersal of the (non-human) basic production industries has split up the complex into many separate self-contained economies that no longer function as a single, interdependent unit, though trapped in the same tightening and enveloping web of urban sprawl.

It's possible then to see how whole new

futures can result just from this shift in the underlying foundation of our lives. But are we ready to take the great pioneering leap out into the next—probably last—great American frontier, and build up a whole new kind of urbane culture on now-vacant hinterlands—make it work, pay for itself, and serve the common good?

That's just what is envisioned by Daniel W. Cook, a planner with Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall, in Redwood City. He has pinpointed 100 such hinterland sites throughout the country that could be used for building cities he calls "Cosmopolises," each housing anywhere from one to three million people on 100,000 acres of land. Twenty of these could be located in California; the first, according to his plan, would be built on a Tehama County site about 175 miles northeast of San Francisco in the Sacramento Valley.

In terms of our present-day perspectives, this all-embracing plan appears to have two main advantages.

(1) It would offer immense new economic growth opportunities while absorbing about half the projected 60-year U.S. population increase, and still allow for a healthy growth rate in existing cities. In so doing it would offer a whole new set of alternatives to urban regional planning policies—now being sought and programmed for the first time in California history on state-community levels—to relieve urban areas of some of their mutual problems, many of which are not likely to be satisfactorily resolved within the present limits of their financial and growth capabilities (and certainly much less so in the years ahead).

(2) As now proposed, it would allow masses of "common people" to personally involve themselves in, and contribute their share to, the development of such economic growth opportunities. This would be on a scale and in a manner that has not been envisioned in this country since implementation of the Homestead Act of 1870, which opened up the West and California to so many settlers and precipitated so much of its ensuing development and prosperity.

Cook's plan then ties in with the present-day momentum of forces moving the economy and affecting cities and their citizenry and governments; and it would seek to recapture what he calls the essence of the American Dream, which has enabled Americans to share much more individually in their country's opportunities.

How would he bring this about?

First, there would be enactment of a Federal Urban Policy to help facilitate formation of such new city developments, including eventual use in the West of 178 million acres of unused and vacant federal public domain land. Each Cosmopolis would be launched with the formation of a quasi-public Urban Development Corporation which would acquire the land. Cook proposes that a consortium of local, regional and (large) national business/industrial corporations could be organized to establish the necessary industries.

NEW TYPE OF HOMESTEADING FOR "COMMON FOLK"

A proposed new Urban Homestead Land-grant would offer something of the same opportunities included in the original Homestead Act which granted free 160-acre parcels of land to anyone who would settle and cultivate the same.

Under such an arrangement, free home and property sites would be offered to those Cosmopolites that build on such sites, with the requirement that they comply with the city's architectural and landscaping standards.

Homesite buyers would be entitled to certain tax advantages—and special financing-mortgage financing benefits. FHA-style—as would industries and businesses locating in cities.

Homesteaders could join in all sorts of joint housing ventures—in the form of condominiums or cooperatives, etc.—and cooperatively organized business ventures might also thrive well under the circumstances.

All this could create many more new property owners, jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities for people that may feel stymied by existing conditions in our urban environments.

Cook notes that Big Government and Big Business directly account for about 80 percent of all jobs, and that nearly 70 percent of all production activity of the U.S. is lodged in the top 500 corporations. He sees his plan as a means to restructure the economy, increase individual entrepreneurial participation in it down to lower income levels, change the geographical dispersion pattern of industry, population and transportation, and adapt production to market areas rather than keeping it tied to natural resource deposits or cheap transportation areas. It would also offer significant new opportunities for private developers and builders as well as for architects and planners to shape up whole new urban environments scarcely yet imagined.

The investment cost for a Cosmopolis of 1,000,000 persons would be something like $10 billion; for 100 such, the cost would still be from four to five times less than officially estimated to build or rebuild present cities up to the turn of the century, Cook said

Two U.S. senators—and various Californians in high professional positions—are backing his proposal while several top-notch planners throughout the U.S. have frequently endorsed the general idea of new city building outside existing urban environs. Senator Frank Moss, Utah, said he plans to discuss Cook's idea on the floor of the Senate and perhaps introduce a bill to expand Federal power to make public domain lands available for building of cities.

How would the Dream City look?

Cook sees it composed of village-sized communities, each separated from others by parks, gardens, groves and working farms. Automobile traffic would be completely separated from a network of neighborhood paths intended for strolling and cycling. Travel from these neighborhoods to the central city core could be done in 10 minutes, he said. Downtown buildings and high-rise apartments would be separated by parks and plazas with fountains and flowers. The periphery of (a circle-type) city would be composed of industrial parks.

It would be a city without congestion, smog, slums and ghettos. And it would more nearly put the American Dream and the U.S. metropolis into the context of the 21st Century.

Indian Culture—Indian Education

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. HANSEN. Many Senators, Mr. President, are increasingly concerned with the problems and inadequacies in the education which is provided for American Indians.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, has a direct interest in these difficult, often tragic problems.

The Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is now holding hearings both in Washington and in the field.

We in Wyoming are grappling with the serious problems encountered as we attempt to improve Indian education for those who live on the Wind River Reservation.

One of the most difficult problems, of course, is that faced by young Indians when they come face to face, in public schools, with a different and somewhat alien culture. As the Nevada Commission on Indian Affairs notes:

> The most important facts to take into account (about Indian education) are to be found in the cultural differences between the American way of life and the several Indian systems of living.

On New Year's Day the Arizona Republic published a sobering report on Indians attending high school in Phoenix. I believe this article vividly underscores the cultural strains which challenge all of those who seek to improve and expand Indian education.

I ask unanimous consent that this timely article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANS VARY IN REACTIONS TO HIGH SCHOOL INTEGRATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—About 975 young Indians are now living on a "reservation" in the heart of Phoenix where they are all but cut off from the white man's world about them. The youngsters attend the Phoenix Indian High School, operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Central and Indian School. They have integration of a sort there—14 different tribes from four states are represented—but the youngsters seldom have meaningful contact with young whites, Negroes or Mexican-Americans. Would these young Indians rather go to school with teenagers from other cultural groups? Why or why not? With the cooperation of school officials, The Arizona Republic sought to let them answer for themselves at a time when a Senate subcommittee is looking into the quality of Indian education. Here is a report on what they had to say.)

(By Robert J. Sarti)

Indian youngsters are optimistic and pessimistic; ambitious and directionless; open-minded and pre-disposed.

A few of them believe in "The American Dream;" many don't and still others are not sure what it is. Many feel the dominant white culture lacks integrity; still, some feel they should emulate it.

The more "anglicized" they are, the more do young Indians want integration. Their less accultured peers and friends couldn't care less.

These divergent elements in the thinking of teenage Southwestern Indians were given voice in a morning of random contacts at the Phoenix Indian High School. In a series of interviews and discussions, the youngsters showed themselves to be as many-faceted as their white counterparts.

"I would like to go to an integrated school," volunteered one 16-year old girl in a biology class, "then all cultures would get to learn about each other. We could learn about our differences and learn to respect them."

Most of the girl's classmates seemed to share this dream, but in speaking further she and they cast it in an unexpected light. Another girl said that integration could help Indians "learn how to express themselves better" and a boy explained that this meant that Indians could more successfully combat the "greediness" of the whites.

The youngsters, reputed to be reticent among adult Anglo strangers, spoke up readily once their principal, Noel D. Scott, and their teacher, Charles W. Viseur, had moved out of earshot. Some of their prime criticism was directed at the school's operation, which they believe reflects the paternalistic and restrictive philosophy of the white society.

Their views on integration reflected their conviction that, the white man had "stolen" America from the Indians. As one boy put it, in a slightly different context, "the only way to beautify America is to give it back to the Indians."

Similarly, the youngsters were quite cynical about the motives for the War on Poverty.

"They're just doing it so they won't have to support us," was one explanation, and "they want to get us off the reservation so they can get our minerals," was another.

Only a few college-bound students expressed an intention to leave the reservation permanently, however. Most said they planned to complete their educations and to return to "help our people" as nurses, teachers, architects and in other professions.

The students who didn't intend to go to college were not particularly interested in integration and, generally, they had far less definite plans about their future. They, too, said they would return to the reservation, but they had little notion of what they would do there.

This group came in for some blunt criticism from the elitist college-bound set.

"Some of them are just going to school because they have to," said one girl. "When they get back (to the reservation) they'll become bums—just loaf around."

A similarly candid view was expressed by many youngsters about social contacts with whites. A few said they would consider marrying a white person, but most ruled it out on racial, religious or family grounds.

"The tribes are as prejudiced as the white man," said a boy. A girl asserted that "an Indian might be disowned by his family for marrying a white person, and Indians care more about things like that than other people do."

Still, the students—and especially those who aspired to college—kept returning to the idea of integrated schools and more contacts with whites of their own age. Several had taken part in an "Upward Bound" tutorial program last summer at Arizona State University and they were fairly enthusiastic about the advantages of interracial communal living.

Mindful of the vast distances separating their reservation homes, they acknowledged the need for dormitories, but none of them saw much chance that significant numbers of white students would volunteer to leave home for dormitory life with them. More than one offered the same compromise solution:

Indian students would live in segregated dormitories—just as they do now—but these would be strategically located in large population areas to permit attendance at any of several nearby public schools. (A similar arrangement is in effect now on a limited scale in some towns—Flagstaff, Winslow, Holbrook and Gallup, N.M.— near reservation borders.)

The youngsters said this setup would help them get to know other students, yet would insure that their own culture would not become submerged. They all expressed a desire to retain the "old culture and traditions."

This desire was evidently strengthened by their not-altogether harmonious relationship with the students at Central High School, the public school next door. Many of the Indians complained bitterly that the Central High students call them names, throw eggs at them and attack them physically on the street.

"The kids at Central are mostly rich kids," said one boy. "All they care about is their social life and having a good time and not about their studies.

"They drag (race) down the street in their convertibles and they try to pick fights with us. When there are a lot of them, then they're brave."

New Appreciation for Marketing

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on December 12 and 13, 1967, the Second National Marketing Conference was held in Washington, D.C. The meeting was called by Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge to promote a better understanding of marketing between members of the business and academic communities and the Government. Highlight of the conference was the first meeting of the National Marketing Advisory Committee, a group of distinguished private citizens who will advise the Secretary of Commerce on questions having to do with the role of marketing in our growing national economy.

Vice President HUMPHREY sent a special message of greetings to the conference, and among the Government officials present were high-level representatives from the Department of Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, Small Business Administration, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. The keynote address was delivered by Miss Betty Furness, special assistant to President Johnson for consumer affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this meeting in Washington was an extremely significant event. It was significant, because, for the first time, Government officials representing many areas of interest and responsibility got together with the Nation's marketers in a spirit of mutual cooperation and good will. There was a clear consensus on all sides that marketing has a major contribution to make in improving the quality of our national life, in every section of the country, and at every economic level. In my opinion, the December meeting marks a new day for marketing, a new day for Government-business understanding, and a new day for applying all of our human resources to help solve the pressing problems facing the Nation today. The tone of the meeting was caught perfectly in the suggestion by Miss Furness that the National Marketing Advisory Committee and the President's Consumer Advisory Council get together and jointly explore business and consumer problems. This suggestion recognizes the fact that business and consumers have common interests and that the best solutions will be found by their working together.

I am very encouraged by the substantial beginnings made at the December meeting, because I believe that the Nation's marketing community, too long overlooked in some quarters, can now come into its own with well-deserved recognition for the skills it can bring to help advance the total national interest. I have no hesitation in predicting that real dividends will come out of this new appreciation for marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list those members of the National Marketing Advisory Committee who were present at this major meeting:

Dr. Jules Backman, Research Professor of Economics, School of Commerce, New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York 10003.

Ned W. Bandler, Jr., Director, Corporate Development, Lever Brothers Company, 390 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

William A. Bartel, Vice President, Communications, Celanese Corporation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10036.

Sidney R. Bernstein, Publisher, Advertising Age, 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

Hugh M. Belville, Jr., Vice President, Planning, National Broadcasting Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020.

Robert L. Bonaparte, Director of Marketing, Boise Cascade Corporation, 1718 S.W. Fourth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97201.

Hugh Britton, Manager, Systems Control, McGraw-Hill, Inc., Princeton Road, Hightstown, New Jersey 08520.

James W. Button, Vice President, Merchandising, Sears, Roebuck and Company, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60607.

Herbert M. Cleaves, Senior Vice President, General Foods Corporation, 250 North Street, White Plains, New York 10602.

Blaine Cooke, Vice President-Marketing Services, United Air Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Illinois 60666.

Dr. Arnold Corbin, Professor of Marketing, Graduate School of Business Admin., New York University, 100 Trinity Place, New York, New York 10006.

Dr. Reavis Cox, Professor of Marketing, 34th and Spruce, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104.

Nathan Cummings, Chairman of the Board, Consolidated Foods Corporation, 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

Alfred di Scipio, Groups Vice President, The Singer Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020.

Alfred Eisenpreis, Vice President, Allied Stores Corporation, 401 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10016.

Arthur C. Fatt, Chairman of the Board, Grey Advertising Inc., 777 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10027.

H. Naylor Fitzhugh, Vice President, Special Markets, Pepsi-Cola Company, 500 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

William P. Grayson, Vice President & Eastern Adv. Mgr., Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10020.

Dr. Richard H. Holton, Dean, School of Business Admin., University of California, 310 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, California 94720.

John B. Hunter, Jr., Vice President, Consumer Products Marketing, The B. F. Goodrich Company, 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44318.

Walter H. Johnson, Jr., Senior Vice President, Interpublic Inc., 1217 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10020.

Conrad Jones, Vice President, Managing Officer, Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

J. Emmet Judge, Vice President, Marketing, Indiana Head Inc., 111 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018.

Robert J. Lavidge, President, Elrick and Lavidge, Inc., 10 South Riverside Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

Robert H. Levi, Director and Vice President, May Department Stores Company, The Hecht Company, Seventh and F Streets, NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

John F. Magee, Senior Vice President, Management Services Division, Arthur D. Little, Inc., 35 Acorn Park, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140.

Dr. Jesse W. Markham, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Thomas B. McCabe, Jr., Vice President and Group Executive, Scott Paper Company, International Airport, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19113.

William S. McChesney, Vice President, Marketing Services, Aluminum Company of

Americas, 1501 Alcoa Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

Alexander N. McFarland, Chairman of the Board, Corn Products Company, 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Henry A. Montague, Chairman of The Board, Greyhound Food Management, Inc., 2301 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan 48216.

Arthur C. Nielsen, Jr., President, A. C. Nielsen Company, 2101 Howard Street, Chicago, Illinois 60645.

Steven L. Osterweis, President, Associated Merchandising Corporation, 1440 Broadway, New York, New York 10018.

Dr. Schuyler F. Otteson, Chairman, Doctor of Business Administration Program, School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

Duke J. Rose, Vice President, GENESCO, Inc., 111 Seventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Julius Sanditen, President, Oklahoma Tire and Supply Company, 6901 East Pine Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74115.

Lloyd E. Skinner, President, Skinner Macaroni Company, P. O. Box 75 Downtown Station, Omaha, Nebraska 68101.

Ben G. Wright, President and Chairman, This Week Magazine, 485 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Adm. Arleigh Burke's Assessment of the Vietnam War

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 14, 1968, issue of the News and Courier newspaper, Charleston, S.C., contains an article, entitled "Burke Assesses Status of Vietnam War," written by Elias Demetracopoulos.

In this interesting article Admiral Burke answers questions on the conduct of the Vietnam war, including a blockade, hot pursuit, amphibious landings, and the possible use of tactical nuclear weapons.

In view of the high repute of Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, and his ability to express himself on complicated matters with simple and penetrating statements, I commend this article to my colleagues. In this regard I consider it most pertinent to point out that the admiral believes that the war in Vietnam could be won in a relatively short time if the United States would use the necessary power to cut off the supplies to North Vietnamese.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURKE ASSESSES STATUS OF VIETNAM WAR

(By Elias Demetracopoulos)

WASHINGTON.—Question: How do you view the events of the last few days in Vietnam?

Answer: First, the North Vietnamese may have started this last attack, thinking that they could gain a military victory and drive us out of there by strictly military operations. If that is true, they are going to be seriously disappointed. They aren't going to be able to do it. Another possibility is that the North Vietnamese may have launched this attack at this time in order to create, in the minds of the United States people, doubt as to whether or not this war that we are fighting is worth the effort that it is going to take and that perhaps they could increase our concern enough to cause us to withdraw from South Vietnam. They would achieve their aims that way.

Or another possibility is that they wanted to influence the elections in the United States this year. They perhaps feel that if they attacked cities as well as our troops and caused us a lot of trouble, by combat, and sprung a lot of surprises in South Vietnam, that perhaps we would get disheartened and perhaps elect a president and a Congress who would want to withdraw or at least accept a stalemate there. This would give North Vietnam what they wanted in that area.

There is another possibility, perhaps, that all they wanted to do was to create an atmosphere so that they could gain what they want in subsequent negotiations. Perhaps they feel that if they had a great military upset in South Vietnam and then suggested negotiations they would gain effective control of South Vietnam by negotiations rather easily.

Nobody in this country knows exactly why they started this attack. It might be a combination of all three of the reasons I just gave. What might happen now is that, after this present attack is contained—when they are driven back, and after they have lost the tremendous number of men that they will have lost—they might fall back and regroup for another surprise attack. They may do what they did with the French years ago—regroup and gather new forces and start preparing for another attack two or three years from now. Or they might continue the present attack not, probably, at the present level, but continue harassment and heckling to make sure that we are always on the defensive. Or they might actually offer to negotiate, again in the belief that they could gain more at the negotiating table than they could gain on the battlefield.

They might actually offer to negotiate. I don't think that they will, but they might.

Question: What is the United States not doing, in your opinion, to win in a decisive and quick way?

Answer: Well, it is much more difficult to do this now, than it would have been a few years ago because the war has gradually escalated—slowly—so that the advantages we would have gained by striking hard with all our power have not been fully gained.

There are still things that we should do, I think, in order to keep the Communists from controlling all of Southeast Asia. The object of war is to convince the enemy that no matter what he does he cannot achieve his purposes. In this case this means that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have to be convinced that, no matter what they do, they cannot take over South Vietnam.

Now, we haven't been able to convince them, I think, because we have escalated gradually. We have reacted to each of the North Vietnamese aggressions, each one of their actions, with just about enough power to counter their action. We have replied to their initiative. We have not exercised much initiative on our own part. Our people have fought gallantly and very well on the battlefield but the enemy usually starts the battles. He determines the place, the timing. The whole business has been under the initiative of the enemy.

What can we do now? As I say, it is much more difficult now. We have instituted a great many self-restraints on our operations. I personally believe that we should blockade. I believe that we should knock out the docks at Haiphong. I believe that we should stop the supplies coming in to North Vietnam. I believe that we should not guarantee that we will not cause the overthrow of the North Vietnamese government. Indeed, I think that we should destroy the North Vietnamese government system.

I would not rule out invasion of North Vietnam in some places. We should not occupy the country but we should do everything we can to stop the supplies coming into North Vietnam and from there to South Vietnam. We should give them something to think about and make it necessary for them to react to our initiative.

I think, too, that we should exercise the right of hot pursuit which we have discussed with Cambodia for the last six months. I don't think much has come of those discussions. When enemy forces are based in a foreign land and attack our forces, we should go after them. This is necessary even though that land is presumably neutral. So far Cambodia, for example, has proclaimed neutrality but has permitted the Communists to conduct war operations against the United States from bases in Cambodia.

There is one question that is always brought up. That is, "Isn't it possible that this will bring the Red Chinese into the war." Of course that is possible. It's always possible. Anytime the Red Chinese want to enter this war, all they have to do is enter it. We haven't any control over that at all. But I think that the probability of their entering the war is much less if we demonstrate that we do not intend to let the North Vietnamese take control of South Vietnam.

I would be meticulous about not doing anything to attack the Red Chinese directly. I would not enter Red Chinese waters, I would not fly over their territory, I would stay out of Red China and let them make the decision as to whether they wanted to initiate a war against us. I don't think they will make the decision to do so but they might. If they make that decision, it will be on the basis that they intend to enter the war, at the time that it appears the North Vietnamese cannot win it by themselves. Now once they have made that decision we have only one of two courses of action open to us.

Either we succumb and let the North Vietnamese take over South Vietnam, or we prevent them from taking over, with the gamble that the Red Chinese intend to come in when they are convinced we will defeat the North Vietnamese. We will have to fight them anyway, sooner or later.

I don't think that there is a great possibility of the Red Chinese coming in. I think that there will be protests, of course.

Question: So, under the present circumstances, do you think that the invasion of North Vietnam will be to the best interest of the United States?

Answer: I wouldn't invade right now but I would send a landing force every once in awhile into North Vietnam to cut off the lines of supplies and then perhaps re-embark them. Perhaps I would stay in some places. Where, when, how and whether this should be done should be the decision of the military commander on the spot. I don't think it can be made back here. I would give the local commander authority to do so when and if he believes it desirable.

Question: In this connection, do you believe that the war in North Vietnam can be won, let us say, in a period of six weeks?

Answer: Well, it may be possible to win this war in a fairly short time but in order to do that we would have to do things that really convince the enemy we mean business. Our own people would have to be convinced of that, too. I think we should declare war. I think we should mobilize; that we should call up all our reserves. I think we should put our economic system on a wartime basis.

I also think we should not preclude the possibility of using nuclear tactical weapons. I think that we have to convince the North Vietnamese that they cannot take over all of Southeast Asia and that they will be prevented from doing so.

Question: So, do you believe that by formally declaring war against North Vietnam, that with a full mobilization of the American economy and the American war machine, the war in Vietnam can be won in a period of about six weeks?

Answer: Well, I think it could be done fairly fast. It might be a short time after we had mobilized and were ready. Nobody can predict exactly, particularly the end of a war. Predictions for the future are very difficult. But I think that after our forces were ready, that we should be able to convince the enemy in about six to eight weeks.

Question: Would you now advocate the use of nuclear weapons, either tactical or strategic, in Vietnam, or in other parts of Asia, including North Korea and Red China, to protect vital U.S. interests in that part of the world?

Answer: Certainly I would not preclude the use of either tactical or strategic nuclear weapons. I would never give to the enemy the advantage of being certain that we would not use nuclear weapons against him. But the use of nuclear weapons is a very grave decision and I wouldn't use them lightly. Neither would I hold them back until we were desperate and use them as weapons of last resort. I would not use them unless I felt—and my military advisers felt—that there was no other way of bringing the war to a successful conclusion, within a reasonable time.

Question: If today you were the U.S. commander in Vietnam, and in view of the events of the last few days, would you employ tactical nuclear weapons in dealing with the North Vietnamese forces?

Answer: No. I would not yet. I would instead shut off their supplies absolutely. I would do those things that I have mentioned a few minutes ago. But I would not state that I would never use atomic weapons under any circumstances because we might want to some time.

Question: Should the United States be prepared, and could fight, under the present circumstances other types of Vietnams in Southeast Asia and in places like Burma?

Answer: Well, certainly things that have happened in the last few years should have taught us that there are going to be incidents all over the world. The Communists are not concentrating just in Vietnam. They are creating incidents all over the world. So we should be prepared to handle those incidents. One of the things that we have to be careful of is becoming the policemen of the world. We do not want to enter into every fight that occurs. What we should be able and willing to do is protect the U.S. interests.

A Citizen Speaks

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a communication from a citizen of this Nation, and a resident of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, in which he advises me of the expression of grave concern he has directed to the President concerning the reported terms under which this Nation would consider a bombing pause.

We are all acutely aware of the divergence of opinion that surrounds the question of our participation in the Vietnam conflict, but I believe there is one attitude that is common with all of us and that is the feeling of frustration. Mr. George Cory of Montrose, Colo., has, in his letter to the President, expressed quite vividly some of the reasons for that frustration.

The letter follows:

MONTROSE, COLO.,
February 2, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There follows the exact wording of an urgent bulletin sent out on the United Press International radio teletype wire the morning of January 29:

(Washington)—The State Department says the United States would be willing to stop bombing North Vietnam and to allow Hanoi to continue infiltration and supply of its forces at the present level during peace talks. A department spokesman says President Johnson's conditions for peace talks would not require any reciprocal reduction of the communist military effort.

The sense of this bulletin was in several releases which followed throughout the day. I have read on several occasions that the bombing in North Vietnam was tying down several hundred thousand North Vietnamese troops and was holding infiltration of men and supplies to South Vietnamese. If that is true, how can we now relieve this bombing pressure without a terrible increase in the number of our men killed and wounded? If we do not need the bombing now why did we ever need it? Has the State Department released the Bulletin with your knowledge and approval?

Apparently the only objective of the Vietnamese war, and I believe such objectives to be worthwhile, are to prevent the exportation of the misery and degradation that goes with Communism and insure the long term safety of our own country and many small countries. Whatever the reasons may be, our long delay and continued delay in bombing certain targets, such as Haiphong, our lack of hot pursuit, our agreement to various bombing and ground action pauses—all this places in serious doubt our firm resolve.

I never did believe that escalation would bring in either the Red Chinese or the Russians. Communism sets its own timetables. certainly the escalation that we had brought about up to one year and was sufficient to prove this point. A sounder course would have been to back up our young men with all the strength we could muster and to take whatever means we must to get this thing over. For example, why don't we invade the North and tie them down?

In the first half of 1967 when the American rate of deaths and the casualties increased greatly we were serving a purpose that President Thieu later confirmed when he remarked that he saw the role of the Americans as more active in fighting and the role of the Vietnamese as pacification. His view of the matter was sharply in focus even before he became President, because at that time American deaths were exceeding the Vietnamese deaths substantially. President Thieu to make such a statement is either without logic or honor. The purpose of American parents in giving up sons to the Vietnamese war are not being served by Thieu's thinking.

In a copyrighted story by Raymond R. Coffey for the Denver Post and the Chicago Daily News in mid 1967 he makes the following statement: "In Saigon and any of the other larger cities there are more young men visible in pointed toe shoes and hippie haircuts than in combat boots and fatigues. There are battalions, literally battalions of able bodied pimps, blackmarket money changers, pornography peddlers and motor scooter cowboys roaming the streets."

It appears that we are fighting the war in Vietnam by two sets of rules: Those laid down by the Saigon Government and those laid down by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. And now North Korea is again dictating rules to us.

If our self imposed containment will not win this war then we should take whatever methods are necessary to win it or get off the field. The entire society must be willing to take risks when its actions send the sons of some to die in a foreign war.

I am opposed to any halt except a complete one in all hostilities on both sides.

The labels of Dove and Hawk are repugnant whimsical terms employed by the debaters, not the fighters, and obscure the fact that we are fighting on the enemies terms by not invading his homeland, by permitting him sanctuary, and otherwise pulling up short. There isn't much heart in a society that is not fighting to win, and if it isn't going to fight to win in the shortest possible time, it defeats its own purposes and should get out of the war. Surely communism will prevail as effectively against our policy of self-imposed containment as it will against a pull out.

I think strikes and profits on military needs should be curtailed. Government employment and expenditures can be cut greatly.

In closing, once again, I cannot believe that we were actually considering halting bombing without equal concessions, in light of our experience with the communists.

Very respectfully yours,
GEORGE CORY.

Imbalance of Power Between Legislative and Executive Branches of Government

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial captioned "Congress Tosses Its Powers Away," published in the Norfolk Ledger-Star of January 23, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Ledger-Star is William H. Fitzpatrick, who, prior to assuming editorship of the Norfolk newspaper, was an associate editor of the Wall Street Journal and, prior to that, editor of the New Orleans States.

The Norfolk Ledger-Star editorial makes an important point; namely, that Congress itself has had much to do with the imbalance of power now existing between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS TOSSES ITS POWERS AWAY

Federal legislation is usually presented, discussed and digested in terms of overall provisions or dollar signs. Or perhaps in terms of a catch phrase like antipoverty. And it is, understandably, of primary public importance that allocations and general provisions of a major federal law like, say, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments Act of 1967 be outlined and explained. But what is often lost in the aisles of the Capitol's chambers is the attention given to individual provisions buried deep in the wordiness of the legislation. This is a point that deserves emphasis as a new session of Congress gets into its legislative agenda.

All too frequently, it seems, it is not discovered until too late that small provisions can be far-reaching in their charting of new political philosophy or new patterns of government operation. The education bill offers an apt example, and one of particular interest in Virginia since a Virginia Senator, Mr. Byrd, was instrumental in getting a bad provision deleted from the bill.

Basically, the objectionable paragraph stated that any time a provision of funds for a new fiscal year is not made by May 15 of the preceding fiscal year, the Commissioner of Education can commit the government to grants for the coming year equal to the current year's grants.

Senator Byrd argued that through such a provision the Congress would be surrendering "a Constitutional responsibility that the only funds a department may expend are those funds which have been appropriated by the duly elected representatives of the people of the United States."

Senator Byrd's plea was not unlike one of similar merit that he made in the Senate in November with respect to the House bill on the federal pay raise. He attempted then to delete a provision setting up a commission to review and recommend salaries for members of Congress and other federal officials.

Senator Byrd's particular objection to this proposal was that once the recommendations were acted on by the President they would take effect within 30 days unless Congress acted to change matters. But Senator Byrd's view again was that Congress was surrendering responsibilities and powers that should remain with the Congress.

The Senate accepted Senator Byrd's amendment and the provision was deleted. Unfortunately, in a Senate-House conference the provision was restored and it remained in the bill finally sent to the President.

The interests of proper legislating were served somewhat better in the outcome of the Byrd amendment to the education bill. In this case, the amendment not only passed the Senate but survived in the final bill.

But the whole background of the provisions that Senator Byrd opposed shows the fuzzy thinking and the dangerous lack of regard for Constitutional provisions that seem to dominate some of the Congressmen's performance.

And it is just this kind of thinking that has chipped away at the powers of the Congress with the transfer of these powers to the executive branch.

As Senator Byrd said, there has indeed been created an imbalance of power between the legislative and the executive branches.

So before one reaches any conclusion about how much of the power the executive branch has jumped in and grabbed, it might be well to examine just how much the Congress, through just such proposals as these which Senator Byrd has opposed, has tossed away on its own.

Solid Waste Disposal: An Avalanche Overtaking Us

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, in recent days the whole Nation has become somewhat garbage conscious because of New York City's well-publicized problem.

But, as an article in the February 16 issue of the Wall Street Journal indicates, trash and what to do with it is not a problem only in New York. It is raising increasingly serious and expensive questions in urban and rural areas across the country.

Legislation in the field of solid waste disposal will be considered by the Committee on Public Works this year. This article underlies the urgency of the problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GARBAGE GLUT: DESPERATE CITIES SEEK NEW METHODS TO SOLVE GROWING WASTE PROBLEM—LAND FILL SPACE RUNNING OUT—REFUSE MAY BE COMPACTED, THEN REMOVED IN TRAINS—A SKI SLOPE MADE OF TRASH

(By Alan M. Adelson)

With 100,000 tons of uncollected garbage piled in the streets, New York City captured the limelight last week. But knowledgeable insiders in the trash field weren't impressed. Compared with what the future threatens nationwide, they say, this was a case of petty litter.

The headlong rush of the Affluent Society toward ever greater abundance apparently is generating so much garbage that it soon won't be possible to dispose of it without major technological innovations. "We're running in front of an avalanche, and it's already begun to bury us," warns Karl Wolf, a Chicago specialist.

Although the recent strike of New York sanitationmen caused a furor, day in and day out the average citizen around the country doesn't consider garbage a crucial problem, and it tends to get low priority in municipal budgets.

But the experts have compiled alarming statistics. One says the 7 million tons of refuse New York City produces annually would form a mile-high mountain in Yankee Stadium. Whereas the average American was responsible for 2.7 pounds of trash per day in 1920, the figure now is more than 4.5 pounds, and it is expected to reach 6 pounds within 10 years. Another curiosity: It costs more to dispose of the huge Sunday New York Times than the reader pays for it, one study claims.

SOLUTIONS ARE SUGGESTED

Existing systems for getting rid of trash are largely obsolete or inadequate. But waste disposal visionaries are toying with some ingenious new ideas. One is to compress garbage into bricks about one tenth the original volume, using heat and pressure to create a stable product that could be used for land fill or, when sheathed, as a building material. Another suggestion: Compost refuse into fertile humus for crops. Some city officials advocate transporting urban trash to rural areas to fill abandoned mining cavities. In Du Page County, Ill., near Chicago, a ski slope 188 feet high is being constructed by heaping up garbage and dirt and compacting it all with bulldozers.

The situation is challenging. In a study, one packaging trade association found that a typical mile of highway yielded three cubic feet of trash, including 2,665 items ranging from papers to bottles to pajamas. The association said it costs about 32 cents an item for disposal. President Johnson's Science Advisory Committee reported that the nation annually must dispose of 48 billion cans, 25 billion bottles and jars and 65 billion caps and tops.

A disconcerting thought for the future is the proliferation of "throwaway" products, from dresses and diapers to furniture and even houses (proposed by some planners as interim dwellings for ghetto residents between demolition of tenements and construction of new housing). And many of the new "disposables" aren't destructible; plastic and aluminum containers are examples.

SELF-INDICTMENT

"Convenience packaging, gentlemen, is rapidly becoming problem packaging, and we are all caught right in the middle," William F. May, chairman of American Can Co., told packaging executives at a conference last year.

Big cities are most troubled by the disposal problem. Incineration, a standard method, tends to create unhealthful air pollution while it disposes of garbage. At various times, municipal incinerators in New York City, which spew 17,233 tons of soot into the air yearly, have been shut down for several days so soot could dissipate.

"The air pollution people tell me, 'Don't burn it, dump it,'" says Maurice Feldman, New York's acting Sanitation Commissioner, "And the conservationists cry, 'Don't dump it there, that's a bird breeding area.' We're trying to figure out what to do with it."

Commissioner Feldman, an engineer who says, "I've been bouncing back and forth from garbage to sewage all my life," is embattled. He has investigated various new ideas for garbage disposal, but, he says, "No one's yet shown me the ideal solution."

FILLING UP

Sanitary land filling, one of the most common disposal procedures, has consumed nearly all the accessible open acreage around many major cities. Within five to ten years, the experts predict, a large city without a shortage of land-fill area will be a rarity.

Mr. Feldman says New York's land-fill space will run out in four to nine years. A new incinerator or other mechanical facility is in the offing, but that will take six or seven years to complete. In the meantime, the city will squeeze trash into odd corners of existing land-fill sites to get by. "It's a neck-and-neck race," Mr. Feldman says. "If we fall behind, it'll be a catastrophe."

A sanitation official's nightmare came to pass during New York City's nine-day strike of sanitationmen, dramatizing some possible problems of the future. Accumulating at the rate of 10,000 tons a day, the trash formed head-high piles in some tenement sections and even disfigured the swank precincts of Park Avenue.

"At least this will help people see the size of the job we have," Mr. Feldman sighed during the height of that crisis. Had it been summer, when food waste would have rotted quickly, stench and rats would have made many sections of the city unlivable. As it was, a health emergency was declared, and preparations were made for mass immunizations against typhoid fever. (One desperate New York husband churned up food waste in his electric blender and then flushed it down the toilet.)

New York's land-fill program uses up 200 acres of swampy lowlands a year. Chicago faces a problem comparable to New York's. A giant land fill on Chicago's South Side will be full in about two years, and planners are scrambling to find other means of disposal.

Bids solicited by Chicago on an ultramodern incinerator came in at $11 million, $4.5 million above the original estimates, and the city rejected them. One major source of the prospective increased cost, according to Streets and Sanitation Commissioner James V. Fitzpatrick, is high-efficiency electrostatic precipitators that take particles out of incinerator smoke. Distasteful as this kind of expense may be, the experts say municipalities are going to have to bear it.

The garbage problem also has reached crisis proportions in San Francisco. For decades it and surrounding communities dumped waste in marshlands situated along the edge of San Francisco Bay. But the once-blue bay turned an alarming olive-brown, and bay filling was banned several years ago. Among those protesting were conservationists who said the natural habitat of various birds and fish was being destroyed. San Francisco now is considering an elaborate incineration process in which steam produced by the burning might be sold to a utility.

The situation is getting equally sticky in San Mateo County outside San Francisco.

Recently the county settled on a new place to dump waste—Green Valley, a seaside canyon only a stone's throw from Coast Highway 1, recently designated a National Scenic Highway. Despite a hue and cry from conservationists, the county supervisors approved the site.

EVERYBODY'S PROBLEM

The story is the same around the nation. "Every large community is in a corner where it must do something about the garbage that threatens its very environment," says Mr. Wolf of Chicago, who is director of research on waste disposal for the American Public Works Association. "America is at the crossroads where it could do irreparable harm to itself."

Experts say a lasting solution is going to require cooperation between urban and rural areas. One notion being considered by Chicago planners involves a dust-to-dust concept. A city's waste comes from minerals, wood and other materials produced in rural areas, they say, so why not ship waste back to the hinterlands by rail and deposit it in scarred mining lands?

According to Mr. Wolf and other planners, the "rail-haul" system would have many benefits. It would aid railroads by employing entire freight trains to tote trash daily. It would be a boon to the cities. And it would help reclaim much of the land made useless by strip mining (the U.S. Bureau of Mines says strip mining takes about 100,000 acres out of use each year).

This notion also is being talked about in New York and Philadelphia. But rural sections that would be on the receiving end of the largess are bristling. Mr. Wolf concedes that an intense "education program" would be necessary to persuade the rural people that the garbage will assault neither eye nor nose.

CRUSH IT, SHIP IT

Some experts are suggesting a refinement of the rail-haul system: Crush the waste first with a compacting device. While this shrinks waste no more than incineration—to about one tenth the original volume—the compacting machine requires an initial investment only a fifth as large as for an incinerator.

Commissioner Fitzpatrick of Chicago has just returned from a trip to Tokyo to inspect a compacting machine made by Tezuka Kasan Co. (a "junk junket," political opponents on the city council charged), and the city is about to invest $1.5 million in a pilot project. One problem: What to do with potentially germ-breeding ooze squeezed out of the garbage in the mashing process.

Tezuka Kasan is using such a machine to produce building blocks from crushed garbage. The blocks are sheathed in steel.

The garbage specialists are mindful of a classic tenet of science, the Law of Conservation of Matter. While it is possible to change the nature of a substance, the law states, it isn't possible to make it disappear entirely. Thus, the ultimate solution for garbage would seem to be changing it into something useful.

Industry has begun to explore the challenge. A British engineering firm announced recently that it had developed a chemical composting process that converts all sorts of garbage ("even the kitchen sink") into a liquid peat for fertilizing crops.

Other companies are exploring similar processes. But such fertilizer isn't as rich in plant nutrients as inexpensive chemical fertilizers, and commercial demand for it has proved small. And there is another problem: One such plant, described as a "showcase," was shut down by the St. Petersburg, Fla., city council last week because it produced a horrific stench.

But, with garbage disposal and collection costs at $3 billion a year nationwide, and rising, Mr. Wolf is convinced that industry "will find a very fertile field for research and development" in trash.

Russia Still Intends To Win

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Capital emphasizes some stark facts of life with respect to United States-Soviet relations as brought out in Life magazine's interview with Russian Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin. I think the administration and the Congress should keep the basic intentions of the Communists in mind and be guided accordingly.

The editorial, "Russia Still Intends To Win," follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Capital, Feb. 11. 1968]

RUSSIA STILL INTENDS TO WIN

If the American public ever had the mistaken idea Russian-American relations were growing warmer, it is dispelled by an interview with Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin in Life Magazine.

In blunt and bristling talk, Kosygin calls the United States the aggressor in Vietnam and states flatly the Soviet Union "will do all we can so that the U.S. does not defeat (North) Vietnam."

"The U.S. wants to dictate its terms to Vietnam, but Vietnam is not a defeated country, and it will never be defeated," the premier said. "The U.S. cannot defeat Vietnam." It was then he added that Russia will see to that and continued, "American aggression will be met with growing rebuff. There are adequate forces in the world which will continue opposing American aggression."

Any hope that Russia might intercede to help end the war in Vietnam on any basis other than complete capitulation by the United States also was dealt a blow.

"So the key to peace in Vietnam is in the hands of the U.S.," Kosygin said, "and the responsibility for the continuation of the war rests fully with the U.S. If the U.S. thinks it wants to carry a responsibility which causes indignation throughout the whole world, then of course it is free to do so. But history will never forgive the U.S., and those responsible for the American policy should realize this full well. In a word, the longer the U.S. refrains from using the opportunities available for solving the problem, the greater the damage the U.S. will suffer both politically and in terms of its prestige among the peoples of the world.

"The Soviet Union, for its part, will be doing all it can for the Vietnam conflict to be ended as soon as possible, but not from your country's position of strength, not from the position of regarding Vietnam as a conquered and defeated country. We shall be doing everything possible for a political settlement to be reached on a basis proposed by our Vietnamese comrades."

If an enemy ever spoke plainer, it is difficult to recall. Gist of his remarks is that the Soviet Union will do everything within its power to defeat the United States in Vietnam and drive it out of that country.

The premier also blamed the U.S. for continuing troubles between Israel and Egypt and says we are "playing with fire."

"As a result, it is not to say that U.S. prestige in the Arab world has fallen," he said. "It is simply nonexistent."

Later in the interview, in which Life said he appeared "worried, alarmed and mad," Kosygin said:

"This policy of connivance with Israel's aggressive aspirations is inevitably creating another dangerous seat of tension. The U.S. bears responsibility for this before the Arab people and the world public at large . . . The conclusion suggests that this aggression corresponds to the general policy of the U.S. This puts the peoples of the world on guard."

At no time did Life interviewers attempt to answer Kosygin nor to defend U.S. policy.

Kosygin's attitude and statements show that Communist intentions are the same as they always have been: To bring the United States to its knees and to rule the world.

Joseph Alsop Brings Perspective to Recent Communist Attacks

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is an unconventional war in many respects, and our judgments on it must be based on uncoventional thinking in many cases.

Sometimes, however, a straightforward assessment based on conventional terms goes a long way toward bringing that war into perspective. Columnist Joseph Alsop has brought some perspective to the recent Communist offensive against the cities of South Vietnam in his column in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. Alsop has pointed out the fearful beating the enemy took during this offensive, and is still taking. Mr. Alsop's conclusions are based on hard facts of the kind understood by every American—enemy losses as compared with allied losses. The enemy paid dearly for this treacherous attack in terms of troops, supplies, and leadership.

We have heard many pronouncements about our losses in this Tet offensive. The plain truth is that we have won an outstanding victory. As Mr. Alsop puts it—

> The defeat-at-any-price people in this country are howling about American failure, when the main failure to date has been on the other side.

It was illuminating and informative to me to read this piece of factual, documented reporting, Mr. Speaker, and I include it in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 19, 1968]

MAJOR FAILURE IN CITY BATTLES WAS ENEMY'S, NOT THE ALLIES'

(By Joseph Alsop)

The known price paid by the Vietcong for their attacks on the cities continues to mount in a gruesome and almost awe-inspiring manner.

On the military side, the list already comprises at least one North Vietnamese general officer; at least two regimental commanders; and half a dozen battalion commanders with all their headquarters staffs, with at least one more regimental commander and two or three battalion commanders in the trap at Hue. In addition, the probable North Vietnamese commanding general in all of South Vietnam, Tran Do, may well have fallen in the Saigon fighting, although this is not confirmed.

On the civil side, the list already comprises a full member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee, Phung Van Cung, who was significantly in charge of Front activities and was killed in Saigon; the head of the "troop-proselytizing" staff section of Military Region IV, also killed in Saigon, and the majorities of at least three and probably four party committees in various provinces. There are hints, too, that other party committees have been decimated.

In addition, without counting local guerrillas and innocent bystanders, the regular troop units of the VC—the main and local forces—now appear to have lost close to 30,000 men, in killed and POWs, in this single series of attacks. This is proportionately equivalent to a loss by Gen. Westmoreland of more than a fifth of his entire force, or above 100,000 Americans.

Something has already been said in this space about the ludicrous double standard by which the war in Vientam is judged in this country and abroad. To see how truly ludicrous it is, you need only try to imagine what we would be saying here if Gen. Westmoreland had incurred comparable losses—and had incurred these fearful losses, moreover, without attaining his stated goal.

On this last point, too, the evidence from captured documents and POW interrogations also continues to mount. The goal of the attacks on the cities was to touch off the "general uprising" and to cause the collapse of the government in Saigon.

Besides the documents and interrogations, all sorts of details of actual VC military plans show that the enemy expected his forces to win control of the cities after entering them. For example, the 7th North Vietnamese Division and the 9th VC Division did not directly participate in the attack on Saigon; yet the movements of both were extremely revealing.

The 7th Division undertook harassment of our own 1st Division while the 9th VC Division moved into blocking position, with the stated mission of preventing an advance on Saigon by the men of Big Red One. In the outcome, both enemy divisions suffered severely, and the defenders of Saigon needed no help from Big Red One.

Finally, the clearest evidence that the enemy's plan went horribly wrong is the known Second Phase's conspicuous failure to develop. After the "general uprising" in the cities, big units not used in the actual attack on the cities were supposed to "descend from the hills to support the general uprising." This was the common enemy formula, and the preparations to act on the formula caused the American predictions of a "second round," which is now being rather desperately launched.

It must be emphasized that all this does not mean that everything on our side is just Jam Dandy in South Vietnam. In any war, one side can quite easily be disastrously defeated in a battle or a whole campaign, while simultaneously inflicting very heavy losses on the other side. That has certainly happened, too; and much still depends on how the South Vietnamese government deals with all the destruction and disruption.

Yet what has happened to the enemy deserves stressing, not just because it has been so widely understressed, but also for a more profound reason. Gen. Westmoreland has always very frankly said that he was fighting a "war of attrition." The premises of all his planning have now been upset by the other side's going for broke. But his planning premises have plainly been upset for a most encouraging reason—because the Hanoi leaders concluded they could not stand unending attrition.

Here, again, however, strong emphasis is needed for the fact that this going for broke by the enemy is exceedingly dangerous as well as exceedingly encouraging. The attack on the cities was on balance a disaster, but its sequel in the countryside is yet to be seen. So is the outcome at Khesanh and the DMZ, concerning which one must pray.

Nonetheless, the defeat-at-any-price people in this country are howling about American failure, when the main failure it dates has been on the other side.

Real Facts on Vietnam War

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the weekly radio news program "Comment" contains a release dated February 19, 1968, on the pressure behind news stories of success in Vietnam that were published during the month of January. The commentary, prepared by Mr. Felix Cotten, points out that American officials at almost all levels, both in Saigon and in the provinces, reported that they were under pressure from Washington to produce convincing evidence of progress in South Vietnam.

One civilian official told how he had been to a briefing where the audience had been reminded that this was an election year, and that the people that these employees worked for were in the business of reelecting President Johnson in November.

In some instances, the field representatives concerned glossed over the truth and reported significant progress in South Vietnam whether or not it were true.

Mr. President, it is well known how difficult it is to unseat a party in power. However, it appears to be in poor taste for the present administration to adopt a policy, such as the one described in this press release, that is self-seeking, and which works for perpetuation in office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL FACTS ON VIETNAM WAR

There has been a wave of protests recently to the general effect that optimistic official statements have not presented the real facts to the American people about the Vietnam war and conditions in the Far East.

Perhaps a news story published in The New York Times of January 1 will help to explain why:

The news story, carried out of Saigon, on December 31, a little more than a month ago, begin as follows:

"American officials at almost all levels, both in Saigon and in the provinces, say they are under steadily increasing pressure from Washington to produce convincing evidence of progress, especially by the South Vietnamese, in the next few months.

"The pressure began to increase about three months ago, the officials report, and became more intense in December. They expect no lessening, and probably a further increase, as the American elections approach."

The article then quoted a middle-level civilian official as making this statement:

"I was in a briefing the other day, and the man briefing us came out and said it:"

According to the official, this is what the man said:

"An election year is about to begin. And the people we work for are in the business of reelecting President Johnson in November."

The news story pointed to some results of this "Washington squeeze play," as it was called:

Certain middle-level officials had undertaken to head off newspaper articles reflecting adversely on the commitment of the South Vietnamese Government to the war.

While field representatives reported that they had been encouraged to be candid, as long as they did so through confidential official channels, some officials said they were afraid to tell Washington the truth for fear of losing their jobs.

Perhaps this situation explains why President Johnson said, in his state of the Union message to Congress January 17:

"The enemy has been defeated in battle after battle. The number of South Vietnamese living in areas under government protection tonight has grown by more than a million since January of last year. And these are all marks of progress."

This is Felix Cotten, Republican National Committee News, in Washington.

A Letter From Vietnam

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I received a letter from a young man in Vietnam. This young man is not in the Armed Forces. He is serving as a missionary of the Church of Christ. He can hardly be accused of having any "military bias." Nor can he be pictured as one who has some personal or selfish, but always unexplained, interest in the continuation of the war.

He is a country boy from central Texas who has a deep sense of dedication to the service of his fellow man, but he has the ability to see what is going on around him and he has the good judgment to try to put a reasonable interpretation on the events he has witnessed.

I believe his observations are not only interesting but worthy of the serious consideration of all of our people. I hope that our colleagues both in this and in the other body who want to throw in the sponge and run will read the letter, which is as follows:

SAIGON, VIETNAM,
February 10, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: Because of some of the statements that I have heard from both House and Senate members during the past ten days I feel that I must write to you. I'm afraid that there are a great number of people including a number of our leaders that don't understand beans about this war.

By the time you get this letter I'll have been here in Saigon for two years. I don't claim to be an expert but I have studied the history of Vietnam in depth and observed the current situation as best I could.

Ever since I've been in Vietnam, on the scene observers have been predicting two things. First, that as the war drew closer to an end, it would become more violent. Second, that the terrorist activity in the population centers would increase in a direct ratio to the defeat suffered by the enemy in the field. I think that the current situation is the first step in the fulfillment of that prediction.

For the first time since I've been here, I think I can see an end to the war. I think that another 12–18 months will see an end to most of the fighting here. I'm afraid it will prove to be the bloodiest period of the war. I am also afraid that it will see more if not most of that action taking place in the population centers. When North Vietnam gives up hope of winning and faces the alternative of negotiating, they will face a grave problem. As a loser they will have nothing to negotiate. I think they will strive to create as much havoc as possible in order that havoc in itself will become a face saving point of negotiation.

Someone there in Washington said recently that these Tet attacks proved that the Vietnamese Government was not in effective control of the country. I wonder if that man has forgotten about Detroit, Newark, and Watts. Did what happened in those cities mean that the U.S. Government was not in effective control of the Nation. I think not.

I wish some of your colleagues in the House and our Senators would be more responsible in their statements. No force has caused as much political havoc in this country or undermined the important relationship between this and our country as much as the asinine and often ridiculous statements made by a handful of our U.S. Representatives and Senators.

When the Communist violated the Tet holidays, they made a grave mistake. They not only insulted all the people of Vietnam who live but the millions of ancestors who most of these people worship. Tet is the most important national and spiritual holiday celebrated in this country. It has been celebrated since 200 years before the birth of Christ. As a result, the average Vietnamese citizen has lost his apathy which in itself has been one of the prime and most difficult factors in this complex situation. They are fighting mad. Groups of civilians in the Saigon-Cholon area have demanded the Government issue them arms so they can fight their own war. The last time this much spirit was in evidence was when they were fighting France for their independence.

And now a second note. I've been much too close to the fighting here in Saigon. A three-hour battle took place last Monday afternoon 2½ blocks from the building where I live. The enemy forces had Russian B-40 rockets and AK47 automatic rifles. The Government forces were using recoilless rifles and .50 and .30 caliber machine guns besides pistols and M-1 carbines. Before that there were a couple of battles about 8 blocks away and since then there was a sharp fire fight less than a block away with bullets whistling all around this place. Even though it has been quiet for a couple of days, reports say there are still approximately 1,000 VC still in the Saigon-Cholon area. But even with a reported kill ratio of 13-1 they can make more propaganda headlines fighting in Saigon than out somewhere in the jungle.

Sincerely yours,

GARY EWING.

William Allen White: Country Editor With National Influence

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in addition to observing, during the month of February, the birthdays of Lincoln, Washington, Edison, and other great Americans, Kansans also observe the birthday of one of their most famous native sons, William Allen White, the renowned editor of the Emporia Gazette. February 10 was the 100th anniversary of his birth, and there will be events to mark this observance throughout the year in Kansas.

An insight into the quality and character of this man can be gained from an article which Judy Corcoran wrote for Midway, the magazine of the Topeka, Kans., Capital-Journal. Her story indicates why the William Allen White legend grows through the years and enshrines him in the hearts of new generations of Americans.

The article follows:

(By Judy Corcoran)

Puttering around his office on Feb. 10, 1943, Will White was reminded the day was his 75th birthday.

"There must be some mistake," he muttered.

There is no mistaking why, 25 years later, men have paused this weekend to remember the 100th anniversary of the birth of William Allen White.

To himself, Will White was a country editor. He wore his shirtsleevs crumpled at the elbows as editors are wont to do. He cussed. He put his feet on top of his desk.

To millions of others, Will White was a statesman, a prophet, a poet, a sage, a humorist, a folk hero, a philosopher.

Because he was all of these, men have gathered this weekend in memory of William Allen White, editor and publisher of the Emporia Gazette.

Perhaps Will White would be a mite bemused and embarrassed by all the fuss, but he always liked a good party.

The idea that White should have the best birthday party the world could give him was born several years ago as the calendar began nearing 1968, 100th anniversary of his birth and the 24th year after his death.

Getting ready for this weekend has involved hundreds of persons, thousands of hours of preparation, months of historical research and even a major remodeling project.

So thoroughly does White's spirit permeate the preparations that it is as if he is present this weekend, sharing an anecdote about FDR, slapping a fellow Republican on the back, laughing over a talk of his youthful impudence, reminiscing about the early days on the Gazette.

White's spirit is present partly because there are many people today who knew him and partly because, for the people who didn't know him, he is easy to get to know in his writings.

One who knew him is Ted McDaniel, managing editor today of the Gazette, who worked under White for 20 years. McDaniel joined the Gazette in 1924 as a proofreader and later became wire editor until 1942 when he entered the Navy. He was in the service when White died in 1944.

"White was normally a gentle sort, helpful and understanding. But on occasion he had a nice way of taking the hide off you," McDaniel remembers. "He used to come to the door of his office and say in a gruff voice, 'Who wrote that story on page one?' When you got up the nerve to admit you'd done it, he'd say, 'Fine story. Damn fine story.' "

McDaniel recalls, "He always deprecated himself quite a bit, but he enjoyed his fame. I think he did anyway."

The editor thinks one of White's proudest moments came when Life magazine did a series on what Americans the German Nazis would execute first if they took over the U.S. It is a measure of White's influence that Life selected him as one of the Nazi targets.

"Life sent a photographer to Emporia and he took a picture of White with a rope around his neck by the lamppost out on the corner," McDaniels remembers. "He was so proud of that picture."

So highly thought of as an editor was White, McDaniel says, that during the Depression, White's friends in the East would send their sons to Emporia to work on the Gazette.

"They'd work for nothing just to be able to say they'd worked for William Allen White," McDaniel remembers. "He was a real great man to work for."

One who has gotten to know White solely through his writings and the writings about him is Gary Mason, a young Emporia State Teachers College teacher who has spent 22 months reading and cataloguing the most complete collection of White memorabilia in the world.

Mason jokes that he did not smoke and he did not wear glasses when he began work on the White collection to prepare for the anniversary observance. He is fond of citing the number of paper clips, file folders, note cards and bottles of ink he has used on the project.

But though the work has taken a costly toll in hours, eyesight and nerves, Mason admits it has given him an opportunity to know White as few have.

"White told an honest story. That is the thing that strikes me most about him," says Mason. "He always had something to say and he took a stand whether it was right or wrong. He made people think."

Mason also has gained a feeling of White's humility.

"He hated to see people mistreated, even in the smallest way. The story goes he was such a humble man, he never passed another person on the street without tipping his hat," Mason says.

His examination of more than 27,000 pages of hand and typewritten manuscript has left Mason with the impression, "White labored over everything he wrote."

Mason has come to know White as a man caught up in his times. The hundreds of books in White's personal library bear such titles as "Suez to Singapore," "Rumania Under the Soviet Yoke," "Socialists at Work" and "From Victory to Peace."

Mason has come to know White as sometimes absent-minded. In a copy of White's book, "A Certain Rich Man," Mason found an uncashed royalty check from the MacMillan Company for $6,756.85.

Mason has found in old issues of the Gazette an intensely political White. In one copy which lay open for cataloguing last week White sought to be a delegate to the 1920 Republican National Convention in Chicago.

In a front page box, complete with ballot, White gave his readers three reasons why he wanted to go. The first reason, which he said was the best, was "Because I want to go."

Mason has come to know White as a profound national influence through more than 2,000 letters, some bearing the signatures of Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, James Whitcomb Riley, Edna Ferber, H. L. Mencken, J. Edgar Hoover, Carl Sandburg, Justice Louis Brandeis and Walter Lippmann.

"The letters," Mason says, "tell much about the history of Kansas and the country most of us never have the chance to discover."

It has been Mason's goal in his 22 months of work that others may come to know White as he has.

That is the goal, too, of William Lindsay White, White's son and successor as publisher of the Emporia Gazette. White has made his father's memorabilia available to the college with the thought that anyone wanting to do serious study on William Allen White must visit Emporia.

For in Emporia it is almost as if White is at home in the big house on Exchange Street where William L. White now lives.

There are reminders of White's presence throughout the city.

A few blocks from the big house is the Emporia City Auditorium, a mammoth building which still looks modern even though it was built 30 years ago.

Ted McDaniel remembers the citizens of Emporia opposed it, but White kept fighting for it in the Gazette. Finally, because it was the Depression and men needed work, it was built. But chagrined Emporians called it the White Elephant, until it opened. It hasn't been empty since.

Forming the banks of the Cottonwood River are 42 acres known as Peter Pan Park which White deeded to the city of Emporia in 1926 in memory of Mary White, with the stipulation the name White was never to be used in connection with the park.

Running through Emporia is another reminder, William Allen White Memorial Drive, a series of streets which passes the buildings and monuments associated with White.

The most famous reminder of them all, of course, is the Gazette, a stone building now being restored to its appearance in 1900, five years after William Allen White purchased the newspaper with a borrowed $3,000.

The 24-inch Roman capitals spelling Emporia Gazette have been carved into the limestone front and embossed with gold. The iron plates under the front steps which read "Emporia Gazette, W. A. White 1900" have been cleaned.

Amidst the clutter of the interior remodeling, is White's famous roll top desk, still striking against a profusion of modern furniture and unfinished plywood partitions.

The roll top desk is where it all began and why men have paused this weekend in Emporia, El Dorado and Lawrence to honor White with a fuss that would have embarrassed him.

The roll top desk is where Will White sat down, pushed back his sleeves, lit a cigar, cussed a few times when the first sentence came hard and then wrote the words that went out to the world.

It is here he wrote words about the Populists, the Progressives, the New Dealers, the Supreme Court, railroad strikes, 10 presidents and hundreds of people and events that spanned his half century as editor.

William Allen White called himself a country editor. His country was America.

Violence Not Permissible

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, last Thursday I had occasion to speak in the Senate and express concern about predictions made by the President and others that summer riots are inevitable. If we take a resigned or permissive attitude toward violence, our society begins to crumble.

It was, therefore, with much interest that I read a speech given over the weekend by Daniel P. Moynihan, director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard. I commend Mr. Moynihan's thoughtful and blunt remarks to Senators, and ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "Expectation of Violence Denounced by Moynihan," published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 18, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPECTATION OF VIOLENCE DENOUNCED BY MOYNIHAN

(By John Mathews)

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—The assumption by many liberal Americans and even by President Johnson that violence is inevitable in American cities this summer "begins to erode the process of the American republic," a leading social critic said here yesterday.

"Violence is never inevitable; violence is never admissible in this society," said Daniel P. Moynihan, a former assistant secretary of labor during the Kennedy administration.

He said the fact that the "President himself lent credence to it (violence) the other day when he said there will be monstrous rioting next summer is just that—monstrous.

"There must be a stop to it and particularly an immediate and passionate objection" to the notion that gives "aid and comfort to an ever-rising tide of domestic violence," Moynihan added.

"SEVERAL BAD SUMMERS"

Johnson, during a question-and-answer session with a group of college students last week, said he expects "several bad summers before we can avert the deficiencies of centuries."

Moynihan urged liberals "to decry most especially any legitimization of it (violence) in terms that the failure of liberal efforts to maintain the pace of social change or to change the course of foreign policy, or to produce a sane and loving society, somehow makes violence inevitable . . ."

Moynihan, now director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, spoke to the opening session here of the 100th annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators.

To his audience of predominantly middle-aged school superintendents, administrators and school board members from throughout the country. Moynihan said the period of American dominance in the world began over 30 years ago and has now reached the "middle years."

"It is not the world that has changed, but America," he said. "The nation is no longer young. The ease and assurance of youth is gone."

"And," he added, "what hurts is that it has come too soon . . . that our time was too short."

Moynihan said that the promise of major social change at the time of the Kennedy administration has never been realized. He said the civil rights movement has become a "caricature of the movement it was fighting against" and foreign policy has "degenerated into the nightmare of Vietnam."

The nation appears to be overwhelmed by the "sheer effort to hold things together," Moynihan added.

Instead of despairing and seeing violence as inevitable and as a legitimate expression of protest, Moynihan said the country should turn to its greatest strength, "our capacity to govern ourselves."

Address of TVA Chairman A. J. Wagner

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, recently delivered a major address before the Community Development Conference of the Small Business Administration in Nashville, outlining progress achieved in the great Tennessee Valley area and ways in which TVA is assisting small towns in growth and progress.

Because of the interest to my colleagues and the Nation generally in this subject, I include Chairman Wagner's speech in the RECORD.

Excerpts from the address follow:

THE TVA APPROACH TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Address by A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Community Development Conference of Small Business Administration, Nashville, Tenn., February 13, 1968)

America has become fascinated with the idea of new towns. And well it might.

Urban growth in the United States proceeds at a phenomenal rate. When he called attention to this massive development in a special message in 1965, President Johnson said that our urban population by the end of the century will have doubled. This presents a tremendous problem of building, of planning, and—most important—of adjustment to human needs.

"The fact of growth is not arguable," said the President. "The quality of that growth must be of great concern."

On the national scene that concern is expressed on two different though closely related fronts. New towns like Reston and Columbia start from scratch to build new living space for population already bursting out the seams of overcrowded cities. And in the core sections of those cities gigantic rebuilding programs are essential to cure the corrosive and explosive problems of the ghetto.

But the clamor for new towns, the movement toward the establishment of better cities, represents more than a problem for administrators and planners. It represents a search by individuals in America for better ways of living together—a demand for decency and dignity and comfort. It is a search for a set of circumstances in which a family can live close to the things it needs and wants: where the father can live close to his work, the mother close to her shopping, the youngsters close to their schools, and the entire family close to the facilities of leisure that they enjoy—the library or a game of golf, the theater or a refreshing swim, a ball game or a mountain hike. Living in a dense society of concentrated urbanization is tiring and frustrating. People are looking for a way out. And our 20th century affluence certainly can provide it if we will.

In the Tennessee Valley we do not yet have the aggravated problems of urban density seen in so many of our northern cities. But we do face the same problems of growth. Wilma Dykeman, in a recent column in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, said it well in these words: "* * * We must awaken to the important fact that how we develop in this next decade or two will determine the quality of life in this region for generations to come."

The urgency of this problem and the controlling effect of its solution upon the region's future underscore the timeliness of your Community Development Conference today. No other subject more deserves the attention of the region's leaders. We must move affirmatively now to determine how we will grow, how our communities will develop. We must plan to shape our future.

In the last 35 years, we have seen immense changes in the physical characteristics of the Valley region. We had a wasted river. Today we have a harnessed river system, serving the region as fully as any river anywhere in the world. Floods are in check. Barges carry millions of tons of vital traffic. Water supplies are abundant for cities and industries. The lakes have added new beauty to the forest surroundings and new sources of recreation for the region and the Nation.

We had a region where electric power, an essential sinew of industrial growth, was both scarce and expensive, despite the great hydroelectric potential of the river, and extensive regional deposits of coal. Today power is both abundant and inexpensive, used to the hilt in economic development. The energy of the river and coal are both hard at work and we are beginning to tap the power of the atom.

We were an agricultural region but our farms were failing. Today we have an agriculture featuring lush, green pastures. Farm production is up and farm incomes have increased markedly. We had a region of rundown, cut-over, burned-over forests. Today the Valley's woodlands are a growing source of raw material for major Valley industries.

Nowhere in the Nation has the resource base of a region been transformed so extensively and so rapidly as in the Tennessee Valley.

* * * * *

The American-St. Gobain glass plant, where a solid sheet of glass a quarter of a mile long emerges from one great machine, sprouted from a cornfield in upper East Tennessee. Revere Copper & Brass is building a $300 million aluminum complex on Guntersville Lake, near the town of Scottsboro, Alabama. Goodrich Rubber Company chose Union City in western Tennessee as the site of a $100 million investment. The Carrier Company has decided to locate one of its large industries at Morrison in Middle Tennessee.

Each of these instances—and we could enumerate many more—is evidence of the growth we are experiencing. Each has a deep impact on the community concerned. They add opportunities for skilled employment for hundreds of workers, drawn from the surrounding countryside. They breed satellite industries. The total effect is an extensive change in the economic nature of the surrounding area, its housing patterns, its needs for streets and sewers and schools and recreation facilities. Here is the chance to build industrial parks with the room and beauty of the countryside instead of industrial slums. Here is the opportunity to plan for workers communities that cannot become ghettos.* * *

TVA's goal is to work with communities to examine all the problems of growth, to take advantage of all the opportunities for growth, and to work out solutions to the human and material problems as completely as human wisdom and foresight will permit.

The Tennessee Valley has been the location of some of the country's most successful models for completely new towns. Norris, Tennessee, was built in the mid-1930's in an idyllic wooded setting close to Norris Dam. The homes then erected, the layout of the streets and greenways, have stood the test of time and the town of Norris is today both beautiful and livable.

The town of Oak Ridge not far from Norris was built during World War II to house the workers and scientists who produced the Nation's first atomic energy. Oak Ridge also is today a thriving, well run, attractive community.

There will be more new towns, perhaps of this same sort, in the Tennessee Valley as the years go by.

But there must also be rebuilt towns, and the planners and community officials of the Tennessee Valley have had experience with this second type of community development, too.

Planning experience in the Valley had advanced sufficiently by 1960 when TVA began building Melton Hill Dam in eastern Tennessee that we were able to see the necessity of joint planning for the use of the entire reservoir shoreline before impoundment. * * * The cities of Oak Ridge and Clinton created port authorities under state law. Industries have shown increasing interest in the assets available here, and the communities are organized and staffed to accommodate themselves to the cultural and environmental changes that will occur as economic growth takes place.

By now I hope I have conveyed to you something of what I mean when I say that TVA takes a "broadside" approach to the problems of growing communities and their living environment. We seek to involve every natural resource, water and land, farm and forest.

We seek to involve the total community—the city and the county and their elected officials; the businessmen and workers and farmers and their voluntary organizations. We include in this category the facilities of the state government—its planning commission, its highway department, its park commission, its fish and game officials, its department of health, its department of education. And we also include every available assistance from other Federal agencies and their national programs of assistance in education and training, urban development, housing, street improvement, sewage treatment, and other fields.

We are now entering upon an endeavor in eastern Tennessee which epitomizes many of these techniques. It is taking place in the village of Oliver Springs, a small town typical of many in the Appalachian area, lying on the eastern fringe of the Cumberland Plateau in Morgan County. Until the last decade, its principal economic base was the mining of coal plus such additional limited economic activities as could be supported by the small farms and timber operations of the vicinity. But in the last ten years coal mine employment in the area has declined sharply. The area has not been able to compete successfully with other sections where thicker coal seams are more readily adaptable to the modern techniques of mechanized mining. Oliver Springs and its businesses have felt the impact of these changes.

Last July another disaster hit Oliver Springs. A torrential rain sent Indian Creek into flood. A major part of the town was under water. The school, many homes and most businesses were severely damaged. This small community faced a crisis; but it was a crisis that can be a turning point in its life and in the lives of its inhabitants.

Here was a community built to serve the needs of another day. Located in a narrow valley along the stream, as many of our Appalachian towns perforce were, it has been flooded often. The bases for its original establishment—to serve coal mining and timbering operations—no longer adequately support its businesses. Lacking many essential services of a modern town—with a municipal water supply of limited capacity and without a sewerage system, for example—it has been unable to attract industries or residential development to give it new vitality.

Some people have argued, in similar cases, that the best solution might be just to abandon such towns. But it is a pointless argument because the plain fact is that the town will not be abandoned. People's homes, businesses and personal roots are there and they do not intend to move.

The problem is that, in the past, things have been patched up after a flood, usually inadequately, and life has picked up where it left off. Gradual deterioration has been the inevitable result. But at Oliver Springs, we wondered if a new approach would work.

TVA felt that a "broadside" approach to restoration could create a viable and livable "new town" on the site of declining Oliver Springs. Fortunately, we found within the city an active leadership that felt the same way. It was already moving in the direction of improved housing by organizing a local housing authority. It had under consideration plans for a sewer system. And an important new element of opportunity lay in the town's nearness to Oak Ridge, five miles away. Oliver Springs could serve well as an outlying residential area with accompanying service businesses. TVA felt that, by taking advantage of this leadership and these opportunities, we might help breathe new life into Oliver Springs. If successful, it would be an example and demonstration for all similar towns in Appalachia—and there are many.

We seized the initiative at what we believed to be just the right time, even before the mud and debris from the July flood had been swept away, and while there was strong public support for action which would remove once and for all this ever-present danger. TVA has now surveyed the flood problem and engineered a plan of stream improvement. Planners have sketched out ways in which the stream improvement can be geared into a redevelopment of the downtown area, providing for new and safer housing sites and a small industrial park. Funds for a beginning are included in the President's budget request for the coming fiscal year.

The city moved quickly to activate its housing and sewer projects. The state highway department had projected a highway improvement program for some time in the future. Approaches have been made to the department to advance this work and coordinate the highway development with the flood control project so both can contribute the maximum to the rehabilitation of the community. A school construction program is being reexamined to fit into the total scheme. In the meantime, the economy has been substantially aided by 12 to 15 disaster loans from the Small Business Administration. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is helping with redevelopment plans.

The outlook for the Appalachian community of Oliver Springs today is much brighter than anyone could have supposed a year ago. The very fact that a "broadside" approach is being taken has lent energy and initiative to the participants. They see that by combining a number of programs, the expense of all can be reduced. The period of their accomplishment can be shortened and the effect of all can be greatly increased.

This is a summary of the "new town" approaches of the Tennessee Valley and we can see them at work in every part of the region.

* * * * *

Winchester, Tennessee, working with a Tributary Area Development organization is far along in its planning to take full advantage of the Tims Ford Dam and Reservoir, now under construction.

* * * * *

Columbia, Tennessee, with its great chemical complex based on the nearby phosphate deposits, now links its future, and that of the region, on the prospect of the Columbia dam on the Duck River and the improved water supplies, housing and recreation facilities it will provide.

The pattern of urban growth in the Tennessee Valley is just emerging. Its process is just beginning. But it is taking forms which promise not only a prosperous but a livable and comfortable environment. By using all our skills and all our resources and all our ingenuity, our communities can shape their total life as they grow. We can consciously and deliberately improve the quality of life in each of them. We can broaden the opportunities for both business and its employees. And in so doing we strengthen the fabric of the total society, enrich its cultural and intellectual quality, and deepen its spiritual contributions to the region and the Nation.

Weakness in Administration's Foreign Policy Leads Only to Further Crises

---

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, "It's time for America to stand up and be herself." With these words, the State newspaper summed up the feelings of many Americans who believe, as I do, that a policy of weakness leads only to further crises.

Those of us who believe in a strong response to Communist aggression are not motivated by emotional nationalism, as some suggest. Rather, we are concerned that the trend of events since the end of World War II suggest strongly that weak, indecisive action to Communist-initiated incidents only increases the likelihood that such incidents will increase—both in number and intensity.

"Continuing Crisis," an editorial in the State newspaper of February 13, reflects the frustration which many of us feel at the inconclusive action which has become the hallmark of the administration's foreign policy. It makes the point that the American people are willing to make sacrifices in order to successfully wage this protracted war provided they believe we intend to win this war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUING CRISIS

Washington sources are saying, quite plausibly, that America is edging closer and closer to full-scale wartime conditions.

Several thousand reservists have been called up and more may be ordered to active duty. Economic restrictions are escalating, as witness the controls being exercised (or sought) over foreign investment and travel abroad.

We do not question the necessity of these measures, we simply ask if they would be necessary now if the United States had shown determination and strength at the outset of the difficulties in Southeast (and Northeast) Asia. In the absence of decisiveness then, we have meandered through "crisis" after "crisis," even as today.

Why?

Why hasn't Saigon been secured against attack? Why are we talking of more ground troops almost *two decades* after the war there began? Why are we still "negotiating" with North Korea? And why is the USS Pueblo still in North Korean hands?

Columnist Henry J. Taylor often is repetitive: He says many of the same things over and over again. But one thing he's been saying for the past four years disturbs us. It's this:

"On January 13, 1964, heavy Communist units stood only 15 miles from Saigon. They are still there."

Taylor checks this with the Defense Department each time before he puts it into his column. And the tragedy, is, he's right every time. The Viet Cong still hold strong positions within 15 miles of Saigon.

Surely, in the face of this, we're entitled to ask: "What's going on?" Wartime restrictions we can stand; we've lived through them before. We'll grumble about restrictions on travel abroad, but if it comes to a pinch, we'll live with them.

But the Vietnam war has gone on long enough. Too many Americans have died. The soil of Vietnam is soaked with the blood of our boys. The cost to America thus far almost beggars belief.

There have been editorials and demonstrations and seminars and lectures and debates and analyses and reports enough. What the war is all about is clear to anyone with ears and eyes. What the Pueblo incident was about is similarly obvious.

Now, the people of this nation want an end to cowering and cringing. We're not prepared to accept the loss of Southeast Asia of the Pueblo or the men on board the Pueblo. We know the dangers of nuclear war; we know that in a world of atomic weapons, one must be careful. We know wartime conditions are hard on everybody.

But we also know that great powers are never loved; they're respected. They're respected for doing the right things at the right times for the right reasons.

Americans will make sacrifices for the sake of a continuing war in Vietnam, or for the sake of avoiding a renewed war with North Korea. They will not, however, make sacrifices for the sake of preserving Lyndon Johnson as President.

It's time to get our ship back. It's time to remove those heavy Communist units from within 15 miles of Saigon. It's time for America to stand up and be herself.

Employment of Handicapped Citizens Stressed by Senator Randolph—Handicapped Are Efficient and Loyal Workers

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, employment of the handicapped is a rewarding and stimulating experience for the employer as well as for the employee. Over the years, studies have shown that handicapped workers make excellent employees, eager to do their job well.

A third of a century ago, 200 mentally retarded teenagers with IQ's below 60 attended special "Opportunity Room" classes operated by the Lincoln, Nebr., public school system.

Recently 61 of these citizens were located by researchers on a project sponsored by the University of Nebraska and the Rehabilitation Services Administration. All were in their midfifties and were doing surprisingly well.

Mr. President, they are law-abiding citizens. Only four have been charged with civil infractions. Twenty-six percent have received traffic violations, compared with 45 percent of a control group of nonretarded persons. Also, nearly one-half of the group reported they voted regularly.

Eighty-eight percent of this group are either entirely or partly self-supporting. Only 15 percent of these individuals are on relief.

It is interesting to note that 79 percent of these handicapped citizens had worked regularly during the past 5 years. More than one-half of them had held the same jobs during this period.

Since the "Opportunity Room" sessions 33 years ago, the IQ of the group has risen dramatically from less than 60 to more than 80. Nearly one-fourth could no longer be considered retarded and one-half are borderline cases. It is therefore evident that with training, help, and and understanding, our retarded citizens can be trained to serve useful and productive lives, benefiting themselves and employers.

A Greek Tragedy, World of Trouble

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are so benumbed by the horror of events in Vietnam that little attention is being paid to the consolidation of a dictatorship in Europe. It is becoming quite clear that the Greek junta has no intention of returning the country to a parliamentary democracy, guided or unguided. They are systematically eliminating all opposition, left, right and center. The armed services have been purged of every officer suspected of being loyal to the King. Yet our conciliatory attitude toward Mr. Papadopoulos and his cohorts is based, we are told, on our need for their NATO support. Mr. Marquis Childs, the distinguished political commentator, pointed out in a recent column in the Washington Post, how faulty such reasoning has become, if it ever had any merit.

A GREEK TRAGEDY, WORLD OF TROUBLE

(By Marquis Childs)

The grim shadow of the disaster in Vietnam obscures the view of what is happening in the rest of the world. Yet events march relentlessly on and the power to influence or alter the course of those events is gravely impaired by the almost-total concentration on the Vietnam mess. Greece and the dictatorship of the colonels is a case in point. How small it seems against the towering flames of the Vietnam war. But the upheaval occurring there since the colonels overthrew the government and took power now nearly a year ago cannct be ignored.

Champions of the junta of the colonels talk the language of hard-boiled realism—Greece as the pivot of NATO in the Mediterranean, the vital point in an area, where newly acquired Russian strength threatens the Middle East. We cannot afford foolish quibbles, so the line of the realists goes, over democracy and the imprisonment of a few thousand troublemakers.

What the realists conveniently ignore is the way in which the Greek military position has swiftly deteriorated in the 10 months since the colonels took over. They have just fired 43 more high-ranking officers, most of them from the air force. That brings close to completion the destruction of the command that was the base for cooperation with NATO.

Long before this latest purge, however, the damage to the military structure had gone so far as to put in question Greek effectiveness in any military role. The purge began after the coup of April 21 with the downgrading and humiliation of many of the ablest commanders. The air force and the navy suffered serious erosion.

In mid-December, Richard Eder of *The New York Times*, one correspondent who from Athens has consistently tried to put the facts in perspective, reported that the long series of purges had quite undone the military structure. He quoted a senior western military officer concerned with the supply of the Greek military by the United States and NATO as saying with great sadness:

"What has happened is quite simple. A modern western army has been turned into something on the level of what was used in the Balkan wars at the turn of the century."

The latest purges followed the fumbling abortive coup that ended with King Constantine fleeing the country. The air force command, almost entirely loyal to the King, has been cut to bits. How much blame for Constantine's ill-timed, bungled misadventure rests on the United States has never been resolved. Like so many aspects of American policy the whole business is shrouded in timorous ambiguity.

But it is an important question. For the credo of the apostles of *real politik*—the philosophy of the German superman from Von Clausewitz on—is that power is the only criterion. Bleating about democracy, self-government, the right of dissent is irrelevant to the power game. It is in this context that Greece, having purged the exprienced military command, defies the realists.

It defies, too, the American conscience. A report to the 18-member Council of Europe by Amnesty International documents the extensive use of torture in the most revolting ways of political prisoners. The report was based on a month's study in Athens. With only one dissenting vote, presumably that of the Greek representative, the Council voted to expel or suspend Greece if it does not restore parliamentary rule by the year's end.

Curiously enough, the realists often want to have it both ways. The Truman Doctrine to save Greece and Turkey 20 years ago rested heavily on the protection of ancient freedoms from communism. To save those freedoms the United States has put close to $4 billion into economic and military aid.

The realists can hardly blame the troublemakers for the destruction of the Greek military. The most they can say is that if it hadn't been for the troublemakers the colonels would not have taken over. And that is a dusty answer implying a denial of all political dissent.

In the context of the American conscience posed against hard-boiled realism, the Greek tragedy is one with the American quagmire in Vietnam. For all the rhetoric about helping free peoples to choose their own form of government, the massive escalation of the ground war and the intensive bombing—killing thousands of civilians and destroying hundreds of villages—have made a mockery of the declared objective.

Address on Coal and Its Future in West Virginia by Howard Hardesty Praised by Senator Randolph—Potentials and Advantages of Coal Noted

---

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, addressing the mid-winter meeting of the West Virginia Industrial Development Association in Charleston, C. Howard Hardesty, senior vice president of Continental Oil Co., declared:

> We will not grow by building a wall of feudal isolationism around West Virginia. Conversely, if we make our state attractive to the industrial concerns of this nation, we can participate to a greater degree in the rapidly expanding economy of the nation.

Hardesty, a native West Virginian and a graduate of the West Virginia University College of Law, urged citizens to work together more positively and aggressively toward dramatizing the vast potentials and advantages of our State.

Speaking of the great potential of the coal industry, he said:

> The coal industry in this, the largest coal producing state, has the opportunity to grow.

The reason for this confidence and enthusiasm is the unprecedented growth of electricity generation, the reserves of low volatile coal for steelmaking, the improved technology of mining and transportation, and the exciting new uses for coal as a result of research.

Mr. Hardesty commented:

> The coal industry image is not what it should be. Instead of being seen as a vibrant, aggressive and imaginative industry that has survived all kinds of competitive pressures, it is painted in the minds of many as an industry of abandoned mining towns, decaying tipples, coal dust and polluted streams.

He continued:

> We must by our actions improve this image and somehow tell the story of the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on reclamation and water and air pollution control; the contributions of the economy to West Virginia such as $400 million in wages, $300 million paid for supplies and utilities, $390 million paid to railroads, and tax payments—excluding property taxes of more than $11 million; the productions of an asset with a sales value six times that of the State's farm crops, livestock sales, and farm subsidies; and an industry offering the prospects of steady, long-term growth with good, safe jobs.

Mr. Hardesty's speech is both timely and appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent to have his speech, as it appeared in the West Virginia Hillbilly, printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOWARD HARDESTY'S SPEECH ON COAL AND ITS FUTURE IN WEST VIRGINIA

I'm privileged to visit with my friends in Charleston, W. Va. I was fortunate to spend eighteen months in your midst as State Tax Commissioner, thanks to your Governor Barron and look back on those days as a most educational, interesting and active part of my life. The motto of this organization "Promoting the economic Development of West Virginia" is a goal which will command my attention for the rest of my days.

You have asked that I direct my comments to "Coal's Future in West Virginia." This will be done, but I ask your indulgence to make a few general observations about West Virginia and its future. These past few years have been intensely interesting. Coming from an active role with a corporation having annual sales of $250 million, it has been interesting to participate in the management of a corporation having annual revenues of $2¼ billion.

Indicative that Continental Oil Company is not sitting still is the fact that revenues passed the two-billion dollar mark only six years after reaching the one-billion dollar level! As a company, we are engaged in domestic and international oil and gas exploration, production, transportation and marketing, with active operations in 42 states in this country and more than 30 foreign nations. Capital expenditures in 1967 exceeded $396 million. In addition, we are in chemicals, plant foods, plastics, and carbon black (as I am informed here today), transportation, uranium and most importantly, at least to your speaker, and to West Virginia, coal.

In 1967, the coal industry in West Virginia produced more than 150 million tons of coal. Approximately 40,000 people were employed in the industry, with payrolls in this state exceeding $400 million. This is a massive volume—1,900,000 coal cars or more than 19,000 trains of 100 cars each—and one can easily accept the economics of West Virginia and the coal industry have a close relationship. This conclusion is inescapable when we realize that the state is blessed with abundant coal reserves, some 62 billion tons, of varying quality and mineability.

We in Consol feel that the future of the coal industry is generally good and that West Virginia can continue to occupy its role as the nation's largest producer. There are several reasons why we look to the future with confidence and enthusiasm.

1. The insatiable appetite of the American people for electricity affords a growing market for energy. By 1975, the generating capacity of our utilities will have to double and by the year 2000, we will need six times the generating capacity that exists today. This is an exciting market and now occupies some 60 percent of Consol's total business. This market demand will be awarded to the energy sources with proven reserves, a dependable means of supply and long range competitive costs. Coal, oil, gas and nuclear power all must be judged by these yardsticks. Considering the fact that some fuel supply contracts are now awarded for 30-year terms because of the massive capital investments required, and that 4 to 7 years are required to bring a generating station on line, the next 10 years will be the most important in our history. The moment of truth is now!

2. The low volatile coal fields of West Virginia are occupying an increasingly important role in the steel-making facilities of this and other countries. Today's sophisticated steel-making processes are dependent on a high quality metallurgical coal and this need provides good reason to be encouraged about economic conditions for Southern West Virginia.

3. Better mining machinery and new transportation developments will assist coal in remaining competitive. Coal would still be in its dark ages if the railroads of this country had not become aggressive partners in this competitive race for new and expanding markets. Recently, you read of Detroit Edison's announcement of a coal contract with Consol for four million tons annually for thirty years, to be delivered by trains containing more than 100 cars which are never uncoupled, are continuously loaded and unloaded and for that matter, rarely stop. This, coupled with safer and more efficient mining machinery, affords us the hope of better and safer operating conditions in the industry. All of us are proud of the great improvement of our industry's safety record for 1967. The accident frequency rate declined by almost fifty percent.

4. Exciting new uses for coal must be considered as a part of the framework of coal's future. Conversion of coal to liquids and gas has attracted substantial interest and research. Here in West Virginia, with the help of the Office of Coal Research, we are entering the second year of pilot plant testing of Consol's coal-to-gasoline process. We have had more than our share of mechanical problems in an effort to produce competitive economics, but each day becomes more encouraging. It is our conviction that future liquid energy demands of our society will come at least in part, from coal. As proven domestic reserves of oil decrease in relation to demand, coal conversion processes become of even greater importance to our nation's security.

Certainly these facts give us reason to look to the future with confidence. This prediction would fall short of any standard of accuracy if we did not realistically weigh in balance a few of our industry's problems.

1. Manpower requirements in a growing industry require us to develop the sort of sound programs and plans which will attract young, imaginative and energetic employees. We have moved from an industry having a

labor surplus to one facing a manpower shortage. We must stop the exodus of young people from West Virginia. Our industry must assist our educational institutions in tailoring courses to meet the challenges of our economy and provide the continuing education processes of the State.

Let me take a moment to praise the coal miner—1968 style. He is a skilled craftsman in every sense of the word. He is qualified to operate the most sophisticated and complicated machinery. He is well paid and is an economic force in the community where he lives. Today he owns his home and participates in community affairs. He is proud to be a part of this growing industry. One need only to go underground to become impressed by his abilities and skills.

This type of skilled worker will increase in number and become a stronger influence in the civic affairs and progress of West Virginia. Within the next five years he will have attended vocational schools, at all levels, designed to improve his skills and role in life. Let no one look down his nose at the 1968 coal miner. His image and role in life will become increasingly attractive to the work force of this nation.

2. Environmental Conservation is of paramount concern to every American, and bright hopes for the coal industry will become ashes of a declining enterprise if we do not bring increased efforts to this challenge.

Those who criticize the coal industry would do well to remember that not more than ten years ago the theme of American life was centered around becoming the strongest industrial nation in the world. Coal made a great contribution in producing cheap electricity and boiler fuel with which to expand and turn the demanding wheels of industry.

Throughout this entire period, the cost of coal declined and helped produce an affluent society which could afford to look around and set higher standards for the environment in which we live.

Today, we rightly expect and require that disturbed land be restored; that our waters be returned to their streams pure and clean, and that our air be as free of pollutants as possible. U.S. News and World Report has stated that more than $300 billion will be required in this century to cleanse the air and water of this nation. Industry will pay the greatest part of this program of environmental conservation and the coal industry, in particular, must accept a leading role. Our attention must be directed to our mine water discharges, our cleaning plants, and the air pollution problems of our customers, else we will be drowned in a tide of damning public opinion. The ultimate answer lies in a cooperative effort by government and industry to find the means, processes and methods of eliminating pollution and establish realistic time tables to bring into play the most effective tools to ameliorate, abate, and control contaminants. Unrealistic timetables can exert a crushing force on our industry and this State. So, also, will meager efforts by our industry produce harmful pressures.

3. If the coal industry is to prosper in this generation, and grow as it should, it must improve its image. Too few of our thought leaders picture us as vibrant, aggressive and imaginative industry that has survived all kinds of competitive pressures. Our picture too often is painted by abandoned mining towns, black coal dust, decaying tipples, iron and acid-stained streams. Leaders must tell the story of:

—Hundreds of millions of dollars, expended on reclamation, water and air pollution control devices.

—Economic contributions to the economy of West Virginia. Coal wages of $400 million, $150 million invested in food and housing, $300 million invested in supplies and utilities, $390 million paid to railroads. Tax payments, even excluding property taxes, of more than $11 million.

—Production of an asset with a sales value exceeding six times the value of the State's farm crops, livestock sales and farm subsidies.

—An industry with the prospect of steady, long-term growth and good, safe jobs.

These things we are! These things we must do! This story we must tell!

There is another cloud in the sky which can affect the future of West Virginia. I have heard or read such statements as these—"It is the foreign corporation that prevents progress in our State." "It is the wealthy giants from the East that take and do not put back." This attitude already has done irreparable harm to the State and, unless challenged, will continue to stifle growth to an increasing and alarming degree.

Whether or not a business entity is a so-called "foreign" corporation, depends entirely on the state of its incorporation. A corporation that has offices only in West Virginia employees only in West Virginia and sells only in West Virginia, is still a "foreign" corporation if incorporated in another state. Taxes are no less for so-called foreign corporations; in fact, in some instances, they are higher. So what, then, is the real truth? West Virginia could only stagnate and become a vast wasteland without so-called foreign corporations and "foreign" capital. Does anyone really believe that the operations of Union Carbide, DuPont, Owens Illinois, Consol, Westinghouse, Kaiser and Weirton Steel could have come about by the efforts of West Virginians alone? Where in West Virginia could we have raised the billions of dollars which have been invested by these companies in West Virginia? Where in West Virginia could we sell 150 million tons of coal, or the chemical, steel and glass products of these stable contributors of our economy?

This industrial might in West Virginia has come about because millions of shareholders scattered throughout the nation—and beyond—have chosen to entrust their savings with the management of publicly owned companies traded in the major stock exchanges of this nation. In exchange for their investment in the future of this state, they have a right to expect a return. In this regard, they are astonishingly similar to West Virginians, and, for that matter, to the far from impoverished treasuries of the labor unions in our midst, some of whom have been known to buy a share of stock or two in corporations that may operate in any one of the other 49 states of this great nation.

Look at Consolidation Coal Company. We have four operating divisions in the state—Mountaineer Coal Company, Christopher Coal Company, Pocohontas Fuel Company and the Ohio Valley division which recently opened near Wheeling. Each division has an operating President and staff in West Virginia supervising the activities of some 6000 employees. Literally, Consol's headquarters are in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, but we only have 85 people there including secretaries. In the next three years we will make new capital investments exceeding $70 million in West Virginia. This could not be done unless we could turn to customers, to shareholders and to banks located throughout the United States.

In all honesty, do you think managers of businesses would be influenced to locate a plant here in West Virginia when they read of unthinking and unreasoned attacks on corporations headquartered outside of West Virginia? We cannot progress by building a wall around the state and hoping to live in some sort of feudal isolationism. Realistically, one can only conclude that sound future growth of the State depends on just how management of foreign corporations appraise West Virginia as a place to invest their shareholders' money. This is true likewise of every other state in the union.

Concluding, I would like to offer this thought. Must we, in West Virginia, be so devisive? Must we dwell so long on parochial interests and so magnify our local problems? Can we not more profitably work together to tell the world of our accomplishments, our pride to be Mountaineers, our resources so needed by industry, our beauty, which is so apparent to all who visit us?

We do not need the unreal world of Pollyanna, for we must recognize, isolate and solve our problems. To solve these problems we need a high level clearinghouse composed of leaders from government, industry, labor and news media who will subordinate selfish interests to the common good.

At the same time, we must move positively and aggressively forward, and dramatize all the advantages this State possesses. Geographic jealousies must be subordinated to one thought—that as a State, West Virginia has much to offer. We will convince others only when we believe this ourselves.

A Job Being Done

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to read in the Sacramento Bee recently that OEO's Job Corps has had remarkable success. The article pointed out that corpsmen—all dropouts without hope until given new skills and hope by the Job Corps—increase their earning power tremendously. An average corpsmen enters with an average earning power of only 88 cents an hour, a rate that is increased to $2.25 an hour after the Job Corps experience. This is the kind of program which will lift youngsters out of the chronic poverty that afflicts too many American families. I know my colleagues will be interested in the full text on this encouraging column, which follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 31, 1968]

A JOB BEING DONE

Amid the mass of criticism of governmental programs the other, bright side of the coin sometimes turns up. Such is the case with the Job Corps, which, in Sacramento anyway, has had remarkable success.

Kerry Klegman of the State Department of Employment's Youth Opportunity Center recently disclosed more than 900 Sacramento area unemployed youths have been recruited into the Job Corps in the last two years. These are people who still might otherwise have been out of work had it not been for the Job Corps.

Not only do some of the youths become fitted for first-time employment but others are able to get better jobs than before. Overall, Klegman said, Job Corps trainees 16 to 22 years of age increase their income from an average of 88 cents an hour when they enter to an average of $2.55 an hour in jobs offered them after graduation.

Trainees are encouraged first to finish high school. They spend half their time in the classroom and half in on-the-job training in such specialties as chemistry and plastics as well as electronics and data processing.

This measure of the success of the program is that only 10 to 12 per cent become dropouts. Even this is not a black mark because many in this category are youths who join the armed forces.

In addition to the humanitarian aspects of the program, there is a financial advantage to society. Klegman pointed to this example: A family of four will draw from welfare much more than the $7,200 invested to train a youth in the Job Corps which will be repaid to government through taxes and general consuming in the economy within five years.

Praise for Those That Serve

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of all the publicity given to the relatively few individuals who choose to avoid their draft commitment, I was most proud to receive the following letter from members of the student body of Gull Lake Junior High. So often, the overwhelming majority, who accept their obligations, seem to be taken for granted and the well-deserved praise for those who serve their country willingly, is forgotten. It is for this reason that I felt that this letter from these students should be shared with my colleagues in the Congress, as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: We, the undersigned, students of the Gull Lake Junior High School, are becoming concerned at the growing problem of draft dodging in our country. Many of our more prominent citizens have committed themselves to the encouragement of draft dodging, and are sacrificing their good names and honor because of it. This is their American right; we understand this. However, we feel that it is also the right, and duty, of every American citizen to serve his country when called upon to do so.

Every American citizen has the privilege of using the rights in the Constitution and feels slighted when he feels these rights have been taken away. It is also a duty of his to uphold the Constitution by defending its good name. He can and must do this by making good the various treaties we have signed with other countries giving our word as Americans to come to their aid when they need us. This was a promise, a promise meant to be kept, and we're sure, a promise meant to be put to use.

In the Constitution of the United States in Article 1—section 8, its states over and over again that the congress has the right to raise armies and to call forth militia to execute the laws of the nation. These are rights of the congress, and a duty of the congress would be to make sure these rights are put to good use.

Frankly Congressman Brown, we feel that these attempts to avoid the draft are acts of treason and should be treated thusly. Undeclared war, or police action; call it what you will, but when thousands of American boys are being killed or wounded every year to maintain our stand in Viet Nam; when the government is spending millions of dollars every year to support this stand, we are at war. As in any war draft dodging should automatically become treason.

We are of an age where we can do nothing but come to you, an elected member of our congress, with our feelings and our plans to have something done about it.

Almost every high school student feels this way and is disturbed about the problem. Please, Please help us get the message across to our congress, our public, and the world, how we, the future leaders of America, are behind our country one hundred present, in our minds, our hearts, and our pride.

Thank you.

Chris Stuart, Sue Dingledine, John Hoogstraten, Dorothy Gilman, Janie Stuart, Mark Powell, Vickie Conyer, Julie Newberry, Gary Sprague, Jack Green, Tom Harrison, Kelli Reynolds, Kathy Owen, Wanda Cable, Lori Beth Miller, Marla Motzell, Jane Lyons, Joe Bosier, Steve East, Karen Bosier, Rick Wade, Debbie Everitt, Candy Coffield, Pam Crawford, Karen Forbes, Harry Snyder, Tim Gibbs, Melanie Barber, Sandy Doolittle.

Sharon Despins, Barb Despins, Sheryl Underwood, Martha Ayres, Scott Jeffrey, Amy Crookston, Kathy Gumper, Sharon Brock, Lisa Ross, Marcia Telfer, Becky Berry, Penny Bradstreet, Ed Beilby, Steve Field, Sherry Smith, Bunny Emery, Sue Tustin, Dave Owen, Beth Castetter, Tom Woodcock, Rick Korest, Randy Powlack, Jim Wendel, Brad Martens, Mike Malotte, Anita Sweet, David Rice, Steve Brummet, Greg Wagner, Mike Ballard, Leighton Kirby.

John Kendrick, Robin Bohlinger, Bob Wade, Charlie Bristol, Theresa Merica, Sally Good, Sue Rooney, James Dunnigan, Mary Hammond, Judy Sheaffer, Becky Ashley, Jane Frey, Cathy Williams, Mary Ijames, Carolyn Lake, Maria Gesmundo, Pam Ruth, Joan Frazier, Kris Hanson, Sue Owens, Debbie Field, Cindy Lawniczak, Steven Parker, Pam Harris, Terry Van Huysen, Charlie Crosse, Dianne Potter, Kerry Raymar, Jim Nuyen, Connie Williamson, Brenda Potts, Harold Crawford, Debbie Bradley.

From Washington to Johnson

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Atchison, Kans., Daily Globe has been prompted by George Washington's birthday this week to make some observations on Federal spending from the first President to the present Chief Executive. The observations are most pertinent. I commend them to my colleagues as follows:

FROM WASHINGTON TO JOHNSON

The American people should realize that the total ($186.1 billion budget) is as much money spent by one President in a single year as was spent by all 32 Presidents from George Washington, starting in 1789, through half of the third term of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1942. That's 153 years, and includes all the wars through the first year of World War II.

When you try to visualize all those dollars, you wonder where they come from. The answer is—if Mr. Johnson can get a tax increase—from the pockets of the American people and out of the treasuries of American business, except for 8 billions to be borrowed.

This all means that, in eight years under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, spending by the federal government will have risen—in total—from just under 100 billion dollars to 186 billion, a rise not far from 90 per cent.

This is an election year—and need we say more!

Medal of Honor Awarded Posthumously to Pfc. Lewis Albanese

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, out of the tragedy of war, sometimes come stories of exceptional valor. Such is the story of Pfc. Lewis Albanese, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Albanese of Seattle, Wash. Private First Class Albanese was born in Venice, Italy, in 1946; was inducted into the U.S. Army in Seattle, in 1965; and died on the battlefield in Vietnam, December 1, 1966. Last Friday, Mrs. Albanese was presented the Medal of Honor by the U.S. Army, in the name of Congress, for the exceptional heroism displayed by her son who was fighting communism in Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, in memory of Pfc. Lewis Albanese, who made the supreme sacrifice for his country, I include the citation of the Medal of Honor in the RECORD:

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION TO PFC. LEWIS ALBANESE BY HON. STANLEY R. RESOR, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, FEBRUARY 16, 1968

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to Private First Class Lewis Albanese, United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

Private First Class Lewis Albanese, Company B, 5th Battalion (Airmobile), 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous heroism in the Republic of Vietnam on 1 December 1966. Private Albanese's platoon, while advancing through densely covered terrain to establish a blocking position, received intense automatic weapons fire from close range. As other members maneuvered to assault the enemy position, Private Albanese was ordered to provide security for the left flank of the platoon. Suddenly, the left flank received fire from enemy located in a well-concealed ditch. Realizing the imminent danger to his comrades from this fire, Private Albanese fixed his bayonet and moved aggressively into the ditch. His action silenced the sniper fire, enabling the platoon to resume movements toward the main enemy position. As the platoon continued to advance, the sound of heavy firing emanated from the left flank from a pitched battle that ensued in the ditch which Private Albanese had entered. The ditch was actually a well-organized complex of enemy defenses designed to bring devastating flanking fire on forces attacking the main position. Private Albanese, disregarded the danger to himself, advanced 100 meters along the trench and killed six of the snipers, who were armed with automatic weapons. Having exhausted his ammunition, Private Albanese was mortally wounded when he engaged and killed two more enemy soldiers in fierce hand to hand combat. His unparalleled actions saved the lives of many members of his platoon who otherwise would have fallen to the sniper fire from the ditch, and enabled his platoon to successfully advance against an enemy force of overwhelming numerical superiority. Private Albanese's extraordinary heroism and supreme dedication to his comrades were commensurate with the finest traditions of the military service and remain a tribute to himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Cookeville Publisher, Coleman Harwell, Paints Picture of Progress for Upper Cumberland Area of Tennessee

---

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Cookeville, Tenn., Herald and Citizen, recently made a landmark address before the Nashville Rotary Club in which he outlined problems and progress in the great upper Cumberland area of Tennessee.

Mr. Harwell in his speech cited the increased industrial and financial growth in the upper Cumberland area and the growing tourist trade in the area.

He predicted that upper Cumberland will become a tourist mecca centering around the famed Cumberland Mountains.

Because of the significance of this speech and its interest to my colleagues and the Nation generally, I include his remarks in the RECORD.

An account of Mr. Harwell's address from the Cookeville Citizen follows:

OPPORTUNITY AND NEEDS HERE CITED IN NASHVILLE

Coleman A. Harwell, editor and publisher of the Herald and Citizen, extended an invitation and a challenge to the 300 members of the Nashville Rotary club Monday.

He spoke to the club's weekly meeting at Hotel Hermitage on the subject, "The Upper Cumberland, Frontier of Opportunity."

He cited the Upper Cumberland's great industrial and financial growth, as shown by Putnam County's increase in retail sales during the past 5 years from $27 million to approximately $45 million.

He also cited the growing tourist attractions of the area, including many projects now under construction or in final planning stages, and said:

"We can foresee a Gatlinburg in the Upper Cumberland, . . . but with more elbow room."

Harwell is a former president of the Nashville club and is now a member of the Cookeville Rotary club. He cited the long history of association between Nashville and the Upper Cumberland, going back to pioneer days.

His invitation to the group was to come and see the great progress being made and perhaps invest in it.

"You may find opportunity in one of our counties for expansion of your industry," he said. "In any event, you'll find it a delightful place to visit, to play golf, to fish, to hunt, to enjoy our growing recreation attractions and take in the beauty of our wooded hills and sparkling lakes."

His challenge to them and other Nashville leaders was to join with the Upper Cumberland in helping solve mutual economic problems.

He specifically urged them:

1. To help save the Tennessee Central Railway.

2. To support a federal tax credit for industries locating in non-metropolitan areas.

"You can well imagine what the loss of our only railroad would mean to the Upper Cumberland and its industrial expansion," he said. "You must also know it would be a great loss to Nashville which has such strong economic ties in the area.

He asked them to back the tax credit proposal being sponsored in Congress by Rep. Joe L. Evins which would encourage industry to provide jobs in rural areas and thereby retard the movement of 500,000 people every year from the countryside to already overcrowded cities.

"They do not leave the country because they want to . . . but they are forced to go where they can find work," he said.

Harwell gave an areawide picture of industrial progress being made, citing major plants by name and product. He noted that the most recent developments have been announcement by the Ethyl Corp. of a large plant between Carthage and Grodonsville, completion of the Fleetguard plant and enlargement of Oxco in Cookeville.

"One of the exciting stories of the Upper Cumberland has been the progress of Douglas Aircraft with its production," he said. "Douglas came to the Upper Cumberland in 1965 to make an experiment in Appalachia. It intended to employ about 250 in 4 plants. Instead, it now employs 850 in 5 plants and is so pleased with progress here that it has built plants in Arkansas and South Carolina."

BANK RESOURCES

He cited the tremendous growth of bank resources in the area in the past 25 years. In that time, he said, they advanced from $10 million in 1940 to $150 million in 1967, which means they multiplied 15 times. That exceeded the rate of growth for the whole state which was 9 times.

He also noted the growth of population in the towns, led by Cookesville's advance from 7,805 in 1960 to 13,227 in 1967, noting that some of this was due to annexation but much to growth, which is continuing. He said present estimates are 15,000 and forecasts are that Cookeville will reach 30,000 or more by 1980.

The biggest asset of the Upper Cumberland is Tennessee Tech, Harwell said. He noted that in 1965 it celebrated its 50th anniversary and in the same year Dr. Everett Derryberry marked his 25th year at the helm. Under Derryberry's leadership, Tech has advanced from its status as T. P. I. with 770 students to university status with nearly 6,000 students.

All of its 6 colleges and schools are strong, he said, but it is best known for its engineering school which in 1966 received one of the nation's top recognitions, accreditation by the Engineers Council for Professional Development. The only other schools having this recognition in Tennessee are Vanderbilt and UT.

Harwell noted that Tech has been of great importance in attracting industry as well as in other respects.

TOURISM GROWS

Of tourism, he said, "The Upper Cumberland is already getting its share of the $300 million spent by travelers in Tennessee each year. It is expanding this great industry rapidly and intends to share an even greater amount."

He pointed out that Cumberland county is leading the area in development of tourist attractions, citing Tansi resort, the new Holiday Hills and Renegade Resort, which will feature snow skiing in winter and a variety of sports all-year. He also mentioned Catoosa Wildlife area, where deer, wild boar and wild turkey may be hunted, and the new Four Seasons resort being developed in De Kalb county.

Entertainment and cultural attractions were also cited, including the Cumberland County Playhouse at Crossville, the Tech-Community Symphony orchestra, the Wesley players for which a $60,000 chapel-theatre is being built in Cookeville, the Tech Players, Cookeville Art Center, and the annual Upper Cumberland Arts and Crafts Assn. fair and the Benlee Art Show.

"There is also another state part in final planning stages for Center Hill lake, which will add to beautiful Standing Stone, Pickett and Cumberland Mountain parks," he said. "Our two lakes, Center Hill and Dale Hollow, have been compared with the beauties of Switzerland and Canada, and a new one is nearing completion, Cordell Hull.

"There are also many fine motels and restaurants, numerous golf courses, swimming pools and other attractions."

He said the area is among the most rapidly expanding in the state and offers great opportunity.

But, he added, it also has problems which must be faced and dealt with just as does Nashville.

"I know you are proud of Nashville, we are certainly proud of it as our state capital," he said. "You have reason to be proud of its towering skyscrapers, its spreading industries, its thriving commerce, expanding educational institutions, its cultural and social delights.

"But, as we all well know, this is not the complete picture. I am sure you are disturbed by your areas of poverty, your substandard housing, your uneducated, your dejected, angry and sometimes rebellious neighbors."

LOSS OF PEOPLE

He added: "It may surprise you to learn that this picture is as accurate of the Upper Cumberland as it is of Nashville."

He then noted that the migration of people from rural areas to cities had hit the Upper Cumberland a severe blow from 1950 to 1960, and it is continuing in three counties today.

"In the decade from 1950–60, the Upper Cumberland lost 9.2% of its population, which dropped from 160,000 to 147,000. Jackson county was the biggest loser, with 25%. Clay county was next, with 18%. Jackson, Clay and Pickett are still losing," he said.

They did not leave because they wanted to, but because there were no jobs for them at home. He pointed out that a survey made for the Appalachia program in 1963 showed that 5 of the 11 Upper Cumberland counties were among the 184 poorest in the nation. He said all these had less than $400 income per person.

"There's not a city slum with such a paltry record," he said.

He noted that in 1960, 21.6% of the people over 25 in the area were classified as functionally illiterate, those having less than 5 years in school.

"And in the past year," he said, "the 11 counties had one of the highest rates of rejection for military service in the country. Figures I obtained from State Selective Service headquarters Friday show that of all young men called for examination from the area last year, 58.4% were rejected for mental or physical shortcomings. Clay county had the highest rate of rejection, 85.7%."

He recalled that Cordell Hull was born in the Upper Cumberland and became a great U.S. Senator, Secretary of State and "Father of the United Nations." He also noted that Alvin York was born here, adding: "Our Country has had many heroes in the 20th Century but none has been more indellibly impressed in the hearts and minds of the American people than the rugged rifleman from the Three-Forks of the Wolf."

He posed the question whether boys now born in the hills from which Hull and York came, with the same natural abilities, might develop as they did.

"How many leaders are we losing today for want of a good education? What about the 85.7% of young men from Clay county rejected for military service? What city slums will these lost heroes help to populate?"

He told the Rotarians that the people of the Upper Cumberland are working together to help solve their problems as well as to make economic progress.

He cited the many groups cooperating for betterment, naming the Hull-York Resource

Development Assn., the Upper Cumberland Development Assn., LBJ & C Corp., the U. C. Technical Center and others.

"But we cannot solve our problems alone," he said. "Even our progress has created new problems. For instance, Cookeville needs more than $5 million of new streets, a new water system for the area, and enlargement of our hospital where patients must sometimes be placed in the corridors. Other communities have similar problems."

He urged support for state and federal programs that get to the point of education, health, resource development and job opportunities. He suggested that the state take action to upgrade education where needed, sending cadres of well-trained teachers to supplement those with less education, and supplements for transportation so that one and two-teacher schools may be consolidated.

And he especially urged support for the tax subsidy to industries locating in rural areas. This is needed not only in the Upper Cumberland but in many parts of the nation, he said.

"Give serious consideration to this before you decide it will hurt Nashville," he said. "Do you want the remnant of the jobless people of rural America to continue to pour into our cities, without education, without skill, to bring further discontent to already seething slums?

KEEP THEM HERE

"Suppose the 5 million who moved from rural areas into the cities in the past 10 years had stayed at home, had received good educations there, had found opportunities for jobs and good living . . . would not our countryside and our cities both be far better off?"

He said he was not suggesting diverting money from the city ghettos. "From what I understand, they need billions more. But I am suggesting that dealing with rural poverty will not only solve that problem but will keep it from adding further to the woes of our cities."

In concluding, he invited the Rotarians and other Nashville people to visit the Upper Cumberland, study its opportunities and enjoy its many advantages for better living.

The 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker—

Every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live.

These words, spoken by President Woodrow Wilson in 1916, express a belief which has long been cherished by mankind—the principle of self-determination, the inherent right of man to govern himself.

Today, the people of Lithuania are observing the 50th anniversary of their independence—a day on which they proclaimed their nation a free and sovereign state, and a day on which they chose to live under a government based on democratic principles. On this February 16, men of the free world pay tribute to a triumphant era in Lithuanian history. In 1918, free from threats of subjugation by imperialistic Russia and the conquering German Army, the Lithuanians asserted their nationalism and drew up a constitution to preserve for themselves for all time the principles of liberty which they held dear—freedom of speech, of assembly, of religion, and of communication.

For 20 years, the Lithuanian nation grew and prospered, reaping the benefits of political democracy. The inspired citizens worked fervently to make their nation great, promoting agricultural and industrial advances, initiating social legislation, and developing their educational system and their cultural heritage.

It is one of the most deplorable tragedies in the history of civilization that Lithuanian sovereignty came to be sacrificed on the altar of Communist tyranny. Today, Soviet propaganda portrays the successes of the Lithuanians under Communist rule. Reports from Moscow assert the progress and increased development of Lithuania under the careful supervision of Communist leaders. But this propaganda conveniently ignores the human factor—the inalienable right of mankind to choose his own government, to make his own laws, and to direct his own future.

The Communists will never win over the minds and the hearts of the Lithuanian people, for whom the memory of 20 years of freedom burns still brightly today. On this anniversary of their independence, we of the United States express our deepest admiration for the people, whose nationalist spirit has remained indomitable through 28 years of Soviet persecution and Communist enslavement. It is our sincere hope that their just aspirations for liberty and independence shall again be realized.

Resolution Adopted by South Carolina Legislature Calling for Enactment of S. 1401, Amending Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there has been and continues to be a great need for more parks and recreational facilities to accommodate our citizens during their hours set aside for recreation.

The South Carolina Legislature recently adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact S. 1401 which would amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide for additional revenues to accrue to this fund.

On behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas, outdoor recreation is necessary for physical development and is a re-creation of one's sense of purpose and a rejuvenation of one's awareness of himself and others around him; and

Whereas, the United States and South Carolina have an abundance of natural resources, effective federal, state and local action is necessary to assure the people of America a place in which to recreate; and

Whereas, it is evident that population will double in the United States by the year 2000 with demand for recreational opportunity tripling during the same period; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation lands and facilities are deficient in most urban areas; and

Whereas, high quality non-urban areas must be acquired and preserved now for recreational use by future generations; and

Whereas, we in South Carolina recognize that in our heritage our Country and State offer many recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, without proper planning for orderly acquisition and development there is no assurance that needs will be met; and

Whereas, local communities as well as some states do not presently have the fiscal resources to undertake a planning, acquisition or development program of the magnitude recreation requires; and

Whereas, we in South Carolina are using the resources of the land and water conservation fund as one of the federal programs which we believe will contribute in a large measure to meeting recreation needs; and

Whereas, the land and water conservation fund is inadequate in some areas to sufficiently fulfill its purpose of an incentive for recreational acquisition and development. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress be memorialized to enact, without delay Senate Bill 1401 which proposes to amend Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide for additional revenues to accrue to the fund.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator and member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, South Carolina, February 8th, 1968.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

Inez Watson,
Clerk of the House.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, when the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized in international waters January 23, the administration told us that such an action would not be tolerated.

This is the 28th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands. How long will this go on? When will we act?

So that America may be reminded, I will call each day that has elapsed since the seizure of the *Pueblo* to the attention of the House of Representatives.

San Jose Mercury & News Win Awards of Excellence

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last March I was proud to highlight the excellent press work of my hometown newspaper the San Jose Mercury & News by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a California State Senate resolution commending the newspaper's publisher, Mr. Joseph B. Ridder, and staff.

I was very pleased to see the Mercury-News has not let up on its successful efforts to maintain superior quality and fine journalistic performance. Again the San Jose paper took four top awards in the California-wide 1967 Better Newspapers Contest—including the very important first prize for general excellence. Additionally, the Mercury-News won first place for best typography—Mercury; best special issue—Mercury-News; and best women's interest—Mercury-News.

I am, of course, delighted to have such a fine newspaper serving the residents of the San Jose metropolitan area and I wish to add my own congratulatons to the publisher, Mr. Ridder, and his hardworking staff. I wish to insert at this point the newspaper account of the Better Newspaper Contest from the February 4 issue of the Mercury:

MERCURY, NEWS WIN FOUR TOP PAPER AWARDS

LOS ANGELES.—The San Jose Mercury and San Jose News continued their dominance of California dailies in the state-wide 1967 "Better Newspaper Contests" by taking four first places—including the top award for General Excellence.

The awards were presented Saturday by the California Newspaper Publishers Assn., now holding its 80th annual convention here.

First place for General Excellence was won by the San Jose News. Last year it was won by the Mercury. This is the seventh time in recent years that the honor has been won by the San Jose papers.

Other first places taken by the Mercury and News—all in the 300,000 daily circulation or "open" classes—were:

Best Typography (Mercury).

Best Special Issue (Mercury-News).

Best Women's Interest (Mercury and News).

The Mercury and News also placed second in the Best Newspaper Promotion category, the ninth time in the last 12 years the papers' public relations department has finished either first or second.

Presentation of the awards to the winning newspapers was made by Lt. Gov. Robert Finch.

The triumphs in the Best Typography and Best Women's Interest categories duplicated a similar accomplishment last year. And for the Mercury, it was the third time in four years that it was judged best in typography.

Last April's Plant Dedication issue was rated the top entry in the Best Special Issue class. Previously, the award had been won by the Mercury-News Centennial issue.

In the last two years alone, the Mercury and News have received nine firsts and two seconds, a feat unduplicated in the history of the Better Newspaper Contests.

"Naturally, we are proud of the record achieved by the Mercury and News and of the honors given them," said Publisher J. B. Ridder. "It is a tribute to our staffs from their contemporaries, but we are even more proud of being able to consistently produce quality newspapers for our readers. We intend to continue doing so."

The record shows that the Mercury and News have rolled up 47 first places in state competition since the Better Newspaper Contests were resumed about 20 years ago. These are in addition to a dozen national firsts plus many individual honors won by staff members.

Judging for the contests is handled by teams of experts from the Los Angeles area versed in journalism, public relations and advertising. Competition is divided into divisions for large and small dailies as well as for large and small weeklies.

Other county newspaper winners included:

Best Front Page, weeklies over 7,500 circulation—Los Altos News, second place.

Best Editorial Page, weeklies over 7,500 circulation—Cupertino Courier, first place.

Best Typography, weeklies over 7,500 circulation—Cupertino Courier, first place.

General Excellence, dailies 15,000–50,000 circulation—Palo Alto Times, second place.

Best Local Color Usage, dailies—Palo Alto Times, second place.

General Excellence, college papers over 6,000 circulation—San Jose State Spartan Daily, first place.

New Malaria Find

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, war, no matter its purpose or necessity, is devastatingly wasteful. Often, however, from the frenzied efforts which accompany it there are some developments which, though they may seem small at the time, over the long run become significant tools for bettering the lives of all of us.

In a converted warehouse at the University of Miami such a positive "spin-off" from our efforts in Vietnam has already begun. Under a Defense Department contract to conduct research into malaria Dr. Leo Rane and a staff of 44 have already developed a drug which has thus far saved thousands of lives that otherwise would have been lost. This, however, is only the beginning of this quiet yet dramatic story which was the subject of a very interesting article by Mr. Boyce Rensberger in the Coral Gables Times on February 5, 1968.

I am sure that this story which is in the best traditions of *The Microbe Hunters* will be of interest to many:

NEW MALARIA FIND—UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI DRUG SAVES GI'S IN VIETNAM

(By Boyce Rensberger)

Thousands of American troops in Vietnam are alive today because of research carried out in a converted warehouse by a University of Miami scientist.

He is Dr. Leo Rane whose massive project to find better drugs to treat deadly malaria is financed entirely by an annual grant of nearly $1 million from the Vietnam War appropriation.

Although the Defense Department will not release the figures, it is known that a significant proportion of American casualties in Vietnam are due not to Communist bullets but to malaria, the ancient disease transmitted by mosquitoes in virtually every part of the tropical world.

In the world today there are some 350 million cases of malaria.

To combat the death toll, the Defense Department has financed Dr. Rane's research since 1961 and has constructed a new building in northwest Miami to house the continuing project.

Over the years Dr. Rane, an associate professor of medicine, his wife Dora, and a staff that now numbers 44, have tested over 100,000 chemicals for their ability to fight malaria. It is the only known project of its kind in the world.

One of those chemicals—DDS, long used to treat leprosy—is now required to be taken daily by every American in Vietnam to ward off malaria.

Prior to the use of DDS, the relapse rate of the often fatal disease was 46 per cent. Today slightly over four per cent of the cases result in relapse.

For the military, however, that's not good enough. Just as the malaria parasite became resistant to quinine, long the drug of choice, it may also evolve to resist DDS. Already some strains of malaria do not succumb to DDS and more are sure to develop.

And, too, the Army would like to have a drug that is more effective in curing the first attack of malaria.

In the search for anti-malarial drugs Dr. Rane's team has tested all of the existing medical drugs and thousands of other chemicals from laboratories and manufacturers all over the Free World.

Along the way they have turned up compounds effective in a variety of other diseases.

For example, when one anti-malarial drug was tried in prisoners who volunteered, doctors noticed that it cleared up several cases of heart disease. The drug is now under study for use in persons with damaged tissue.

"The way we're going, we'll probably wind up with a new drug for leprosy," Dr. Rane said. "Out of all this mass production testing we'll probably come up with drugs for many other diseases too."

To test the drugs, research workers infect thousands of mice each week with malaria and then inject them with a chemical. If it cures the disease, the drug is given further tests on chicks.

Mouse malaria is different from chick malaria and both are different from human malaria but if a drug proves successful in one kind, there is a good chance it will work in another.

Not only must the compound cure the malaria. It must also produce no harmful side effects.

"We found one drug that was a fine antimalarial but it made the mice lose their hair. We had completely bald mice," Dr. Rane said. "You can't use a drug like that in humans."

If a drug looks good in the animal trials, it is tested on federal prisoners who volunteer to be infected with a form of malaria that can be combatted with an existing drug. If the new drug passes this test, it is ready for trials in Vietnam.

In addition to DDS, Dr. Rane's laboratory has produced several other drugs that are now being used on a limited scale in Vietnam.

To yield a handful of successful drugs, however, thousands must be tested. In a year's time, the testing requires over a million white mice—all of them bred and raised in Dr. Rane's laboratory in row stacked upon row of small cages containing a male, a female, and their litter of six to ten babies.

In any given week, technicians administer some 37,000 injections, either to infect or to treat the animals. As Dr. Rane points out, that's like lining up half the people who could fill the Orange Bowl and giving them all a shot in a week's time.

Every new chemical is tried in 15 mice.

The project requires a staggering amount of work but the result has already paid off in saved lives and shows promise of saving more from malaria and a number of other diseases.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Project

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the negative aspects of the war on poverty are constantly before us. The failures and frustrations of that program are discussed ad infinitum. One would think no successes ever occur or if they do, so rarely as to be of little consequence. I personally believe the successes far outweigh the failures and that, as is so often the case, there is little news value in success. We always read of the undisciplined elements of society, rarely of those who are trying and succeeding. I want you and my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to learn of just one case where a young woman received immeasurable benefits from one phase of the war on poverty. Can we ever measure the benefits young Mary Osborne has received and through her, our society has received, from the war on poverty? I believe the experience of Mary Osborne is far more typical of the war on poverty than are the stories of defeat and frustration that constantly besiege us in connection with this program.

I ask permission to include a letter I have received from the city manager of the city of Pittsburg as well as a memo to Mary Osborne's immediate supervisor, Marvin Anaya, the city engineer of Pittsburg, from Mary, herself. I am certain Mary Osborne's story can be best understood by reference to these documents.

DECEMBER 16, 1967.

Congressman JEROME R. WALDIE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: With all of the derogatory remarks which are made about the Economic Opportunity Program, I wanted to put in a good word about one aspect of it.

Enclosed is a completely unsolicited memorandum which our City Engineer just received from a little high school girl who has been working in his office a few hours each week after school and on Saturdays as a participant in our Neighborhood Youth Corps Project.

This little Negro girl had no skills and very little ability or aptitude when she started to work for us in the Fall of 1966. By diligent application to her assignments and by training in the Pittsburg High School, she gradually gained both competence and confidence.

We were delighted to have her with us as she was always cheerful and cooperative, even though she was not able to produce very much work during her first few months of employment.

We have provided over fifty part-time jobs in our city government for needy young people (both students and drop-outs) under our county-operated Neighborhood Youth Corps Project for the last two years. We have generally been very pleased with the results. The City is getting work done which would be impossible for us to accomplish otherwise. And our NYC workers are earning money and getting actual job experience which most of them could never have obtained without this Federal program.

Mary Osborne lives in our El Pueblo Public Housing Project. She and her family are very deserving of the NYC program, are appreciative of its opportunities and have used it to good advantage.

By her own efforts she found her new job in the Child Care Center, and now she has a career goal for which she is well suited. I have reports that she is doing well in this new, part-time job.

We have a good many other success stories like Mary's, but she is the only one who wrote a little memo to her boss, and that prompted me to write to you.

Very truly yours,

E. C. MARRINER,
City Manager.

NOVEMBER 30, 1967.

To: Marvin Anaya, city engineer.
From: Mary Osborne, Neighborhood Youth Corps worker.

Monday, December 4, 1967, I will begin working at the Child Care Center at El Pueblo Elementary School.

I would like to take this time to thank you and all the other men and women who work for the City of Pittsburg, for being so kind and understanding. Thank you for all the things I have learned from you and the others.

I know the next girl who will work here will learn to appreciate all the things I have learned. I haven't had but one job so far, but I can honestly say that "I had the best Supervisors anyone could have or ever will have."

My goal in life is to become a Nursery School Teacher and by me having this job I can have some of the experience that I'll need to make a good teacher.

I'll be working from 1:30 to 4:00 P.M. Monday thru Friday. The Center is very close to my home and I love to work with children.

So again I would like to thank you for everything you have done for me. And whenever you want any extra help or need something just call me and I would be more than glad to do whatever I can to help.

Thank you.

MARY OSBORNE,
Neighborhood Youth Corps Worker.

Eastport Marine Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Vernon Raymond Lipinski, a young marine from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I commend the courage of this young man and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

EASTPORT MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

A requiem mass for PFC Vernon Raymond Lipinski, 23, was offered this past Monday in St. Mildred's Church. Burial was in Baltimore National Cemetery.

The young Marine, who lived at 929 Dalton Avenue, Dundalk, was killed in Vietnam on December 27 while patrolling, the Defense Department announced.

PFC Lipinski left Dundalk Senior High School in his junior year in 1962 to join the Marine Corps. After 4½ years in the service, he left and worked as an auto mechanic for a year in Baltimore.

He rejoined that November and planned to make the Marine Corps his career.

The Marine is survived by his father, Howard F. Lipinski, Sr., of Mobile Drive, Dundalk; his mother, Emma Grob Lipinski; four sisters, Mrs. Marlene E. Higgins, Mrs. Beverly E. Gregory, Mrs. Emily T. Piechocki and Miss Sharon Lipinski; and two brothers Howard F. and Steven R. Lipinski.

Administrator Moot of Small Business Administration Stresses Role of SBA in Tennessee Valley Development

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Robert C. Moot, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently made a major address before the Community Development Conference sponsored by the Small Business Administration in Nashville, Tenn., under the capable leadership of Mr. J. C. Loring, Regional Director, Small Business Administration, Nashville.

This was an excellent conference, and Administrator Moot made a major contribution with his address which emphasized the growth and progress of Tennessee and the ways in which SBA has helped—and will continue to help—small businessmen, cities and communities with various programs of assistance.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in SBA and community development, I place excerpts of Administrator Moot's speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY ROBERT C. MOOT, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 13, 1968

We are very sorry that the distinguished Chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the Honorable Joe L. Evins, could not be with us today because of his extremely busy schedule. The free enterprise system has no greater friend than Chairman Evins. All of you are well aware that he has played a profound role in shaping the mission and policies of the Small Business Administration.

SBA's effort in conferences of this kind, to bring our programs closer and closer to the people is, we think, a natural extension of our legislative mandate, which Chairman Evins has been so instrumental in developing.

It is a special pleasure to visit the Tennessee Valley and to work with the Tennessee River Valley Association in a joint effort to help stimulate community and regional economic growth in concert with small business growth.

In the eyes of struggling peoples around the world—as well as in the eyes of many Americans—the Tennessee Valley Authority is perhaps the great landmark of technological and industrial progress our American system has produced.

I have heard my friends in the Department of State make the comment that often the first thing that official visitors from underdeveloped lands want to see in our country is not the Empire State Building, nor Washington, D.C., nor San Francisco. It is TVA.

Behind TVA are a lesson and a principle which are just as applicable to growth on Main Street America—to progress in your community and mine—as they have been to the harnessing of great rivers.

As you can guess, the lesson and the spirit I am talking about lie in the capacity of the private interests and the public agencies in this Country to work together—with each able to recognize the indispensible contribution of the other to the whole—and each able to blend the separate interest into the common interest.

In this kind of teamwork, our country has no equal.

Never has the evidence of such mingling of ideas—of such cooperation—been more abundant in the land than it is today. A prime example is the progress the national economy has made.

As of this month, our boom has now run to a full seven years. It is the longest cycle of uninterrupted expansion in our history. * * * Total employment has risen by nine million persons.

* * * * *

Steel Magazine reported recently that between the years 1962 and 1966 Tennessee added 146,937 new jobs to industrial payrolls, either by the attraction of new plants or the expansion of existing industries. Tennessee's total investment in new facilities and new equipment was placed at $1.5 billion.

Quite obviously, this Valley—like the Nation—already has achieved tremendous teamwork.

SBA's one desire in being here is to help. To bring more and more communities, and hopefully all communities, into the tide of growth.

How actually can SBA help?

* * * * *

You will have the opportunity to look at our programs in detail later today. I want to take just a few moments now to single out those that may have particular potency for moving your community, or your neighborhood, forward.

The 502 program has probably attracted the most publicity in recent years. While it will be treated extensively in the featured panel, to follow my remarks, I might point out that SBA now has local development companies going in all the States but one. They have produced 62,000 new jobs in 1,500 cities and towns.

I honestly believe the 502 formula will work for any community willing to make an all-out effort.

Every single State, here or anywhere else in the country, can benefit by doing a better job of getting its small producers and suppliers into the field of government procurement.

SBA is promoting the "buy from small business" approach with every Federal agency. Yet if small business were playing the same relative role in federal procurement that it plays in the economy as a whole, federal purchases from small sources would be $7 billion a year higher than they are right now. The Nation's five million small businesses account of about 40 percent of the GNP. Yet they handle only about 25 percent of the federal procurement—or about $15 billion of the $55 billion in goods and services the federal agencies buy at the current annual rate.

There is a still much larger horizon in procurement by State and local governments.

Right now, State and local agencies are buying goods and services on about the same annual scale as the Federal government. But the forecasts indicate that by 1975 State and local procurement will reach $75 billion a year, well ahead of the federal total.

* * * * *

An historic handicap to small business has been the high credit ratings required to compete for prime business locations. As a result, the best corners in town have usually gone to the big bidders.

We now have the tool that puts the little man on a par with the outfit boasting triple-A credit. It is the lease guarantee.

I wish I had time to go into our Economic Opportunity Loans, and the Test Cities program, in which SBA has a key role. But I am confident this information will come out in the afternoon panels, where you will have a full hour and a half to pump questions and problems at our resource people.

In your community, who is it that puts these tools to work?

You do. You and your community. The initiative has to start on the local level. Believe me, SBA is not a Washington agency coming in with a grand design to dominate your economic destiny. In fact, in almost all cases, the communities that are making the best progress today are working from a master plan. A plan they have made themselves.

Planning at its best always starts at the local level. Planning brings involvement. Involvement leads to unity, and to community pride. Spirit can be the biggest asset a community has. It sparks initiative, and initiative leads to action and growth. Pride and progress tend to feed each other.

Lack of incentive is a large part of the trouble in the ghettos. There is little involvement, and hence no stimulus to spirit, initiative, and growth. In the Test Cities program, the President is taking wise steps to help private industry put plants in decaying neighborhoods, and set up the job training to staff the plants with local talent. Let these people have a hand in setting up these programs, let them help make jobs for themselves—and the pride will follow.

Rural towns at a standstill have a parallel problem. Get something going for them, get the people involved, and growth will follow. The first step is planning.

* * * * *

By your action, and by your planning, you will also assure yourselves that you have made the fullest use of all available resources, including those of government at every level, and those of SBA.

As a parting note, I hope you will bear in mind that well-made plans have a way of being self-executing. Blueprints give the investor and the participating agency something precise to look at. They attract capital—where just words, or goodwill, may not.

This already has been a productive day for SBA. I hope it proves such for you. On behalf of the Agency, and the staff who are with me, I thank you again for the invitation to join you in this meaningful exchange.

Saigon War Set in Poetry

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Samuel Bakove, a prominent resident of Philadelphia, has captured the spirit of Saigon in a poignant poem which I should like to insert in the Record for all my colleagues to read:

Saigon

(By Samuel Bakove)

Sadly-smiling, beautiful Saigon,
Like a pretty one-armed girl's wan
Smile; a pale, papier-maché grimace
Of a wounded soldier in the market place;
A sultry dame's half-hearted pose,
As though la vie were still en rose!

A score of years or more of war have scarred
The city's face, by pain and degradation marred.
Fragrant flowers are flaunted in a street-stall
Near sandbags stacked head-high against Execution Wall,
Made ready for a white-clad captain of police soon to die!
Saigon, erratic and erotic, smiles and wries;
Rings the Angelus, and lets the VC bomb our guys.
An Indian shopkeeper sorrowfully laments a GI
Who was not "chalak" enough, neither suspicious nor sly.
"I make a suit for the boy," the storekeeper sighs,
"Before he can wear it, he dies!"

Like roosters crowding in an alley behind a plush hotel,
Our lonesome lads jam the vestibule of the Continental.
The perfume here and Scotch on the rocks
Beat the yeasty whiff of wet rice on the docks;
And no bombs will fall as long
As this hall pays tribute to the Vietcong,
A cancerous tentacle of Communism grasping
The arteries of civilization now left gasping.

Why are we there? Call it self-preservation.
We give of ourselves to preserve our Nation.

Russian Merchant Fleet

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the December 18, 1967, issue of Washington Report, a weekly report published by the American Security Council Press, Washington, D.C., deals with the striking growth and accomplishments of the Soviet merchant fleet.

Prepared by Dr. James D. Atkinson, professor of government at Georgetown University, the report highlights the comparative differences in the American and Russian merchant marine. American shipping has declined and has dropped from transporting a high of 70 percent of our foreign trade in 1947 to 7.3 percent of that trade in 1966. While our own capability on the high seas decreases, the Soviet Union has increased their merchant marine to the point where it now ranks No. 6 in the world's seafaring nations. This spectacular achievement will continue, as indicated by the Soviet merchant ship construction program. As of May 1967, the Russians had building or on order a total of 4.3 million tons of merchant shipping—526 ships. At that time the U.S. building program had only 6,000 tons—45 ships—building or on order.

Dr. Atkinson points out that Soviet shipping into North Vietnamese ports has shown a marked increase in 1967 over the previous year. As of June 1967, there was an average of 18 Soviet ships per month in North Vietnamese ports, and the Soviet press reported that Soviet ships left Odessa practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Red Flag on the High Seas

The Geo-Political Conflict

Within the memory of living men, Russia's merchant fleet was so insignificant a factor in world politics that it was scarcely worthy of comment. Thus the great authority on sea power, Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, dismissed Russia's merchant navy with the observation that "Russia has little maritime commerce . . . her merchant flag is rarely seen."

Today the world scene is strikingly different. The hammer and sickle flag of the Soviet Union is seen on all seas of the world and Soviet plans for the future are so ambitious that they have over 200,000 people enrolled in the Leningrad Institute of Transportation, the Odessa Maritime Academy, and other maritime institutes.

From an almost negligible figure of 1.6 million deadweight tons in 1939, Soviet merchant shipping expanded to 3.6 million deadweight tons in 1958. The really spectacular gains, however, have come in this decade of the 1960's. Thus from a figure of 4½ million deadweight tons in 1963, Soviet merchant shipping jumped to 8.9 million deadweight tons as of January 1, 1965. The latest figure, released by Lloyd's Register on October 10, 1967, indicates that the U.S.S.R. added 1,125,000 tons in the last year alone and the Soviet merchant marine now stands at 10,617,000 deadweight tons which places it in *sixth rank* in the world. What is significant about all this is the rate of growth, for *only five years ago,* the Soviet merchant fleet ranked *number twelve* in the world!

While important, the statistical data alone are insufficient as a guide to the future thrust of Soviet maritime programs. Some indication of burgeoning Soviet operations at sea is given by programs during 1966 and 1967 which are directed at our own Western Hemisphere. When the 19,860 ton Alexander Pushkin dropped anchor off Quebec City on April 27, 1966, it was an historic first. This was the first time in the history of maritime affairs that the Russians had entered the ocean liner traffic of the Western Hemisphere. In view of some of the optimistic predictions in some quarters in the West about future Soviet maritime plans, it is also worth noting that the Pushkin's maiden voyage came only eight months after Soviet Minister of Merchant Marine, Victor G. Bakayev, had said that the U.S.S.R. had no intention of establishing passenger lines across the oceans. As the British merchant marine continued to decline in 1967 and as the Cunard Line decided to give up the British-Canadian passenger traffic, the Soviets and their Polish partners prepared to take over the British passenger presence. The authoritative London *Daily Telegraph* stated November 11, 1967, that the U.S.S.R. might place "a second new ship on the London-Montreal run and the Poles plan extra sailings from Southampton to Canada next year."

Even the St. Lawrence Seaway, the entrance to the great agricultural-industrial heart of America, the Mid-West, was not immune to Soviet politico-economic penetration. The New York *Times* (November 12, 1967) reported that Peter M. McGavin, executive secretary-treasurer of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, stated that the Soviet Union made 19 voyages through the St. Lawrence Seaway this year and thus equalled the number of U.S. voyages made on that key waterway.

U.S. SHIPPING: DECLINING ASSET OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. McGavin's comment that "the Russians have caught up with us in our own back yard," that is, in the Great Lakes area, graphically illustrates the steady attrition of U.S. shipping since the end of World War II. Thus in 1947, the U.S. merchant marine carried 70% of our foreign trade while by 1960 it had dropped to 11.1%. Figures released in October, 1967 by the Foreign Trade Division of the Census Bureau are even more alarming. They indicate that for 1966, U.S. flag merchant ships carried only 7.3% of the nation's waterborne foreign trade. This is the lowest figure since 1921! The U.S. stake in the waterborne carriage of goods continues, however, to go up as our capability goes down. In 1965 our aggregate total of exports and imports in waterborne commerce was 427 million tons valued at $32.7 billion as compared to 1966 when it rose to 452 million tons valued at $36.9 billion. If present trends continue, by 1970 U.S. flag merchant ships may be carrying less than 5% of our exports and imports.

The American shipping decline is going on at the same time that Soviet shipping is forging ahead. Thus, as of May, 1967, the Soviet Union had building or on order a total of 4.3 million tons of merchant shipping (526 ships) while the United States had only 600,000 tons (45 ships) building or on order. Over the past several years, delivery of merchant ships flying the U.S. flag has been, on the average, only 15 per year while the Soviet Union has averaged over 100 per year. The U.S.-Soviet comparative situation is basically this: We have not embarked on a major effort to build merchant ships since the Second World War; they began a major effort almost ten years ago and are continuing to pursue it with undiminished vigor.

COLD WAR ESCALATION AT SEA

On November 16, 1967, the U.S. Maritime Administration released a strangely ambivalent pamphlet on the Soviet Merchant Marine. Taking cognizance of the nature of the Soviet state, the short study points out that the Soviet merchant fleet could be used "as a political instrument for economic purposes and an economic instrument for political purposes." But it then goes on (based on a January, 1967, statement of Soviet Minister of Merchant Marine, Victor G. Bakayev) to indicate that the U.S.S.R. will not upset the international maritime balance. One might agree that this may be true of 1967 or even of 1968. But what of the future? The U.S. merchant marine has been steadily deteriorating. And the British merchant marine—upon which many of our exporters and importers have placed reliance—now appears to be headed toward a sharp decline. Can we believe that the Soviet Union will be so conscientious that, in the future, it will refrain from taking advantage of what will be a geo-political fact of life? A recent pronouncement of Merchant Marine Minister Bakayev suggests that reliance on future Soviet good will on the high seas may be as futile as our past hopes that the U.S.S.R. would refrain from developing an orbital bombardment system. Minister Bakayev pointed out that (August 4, 1967): "You can see Soviet ships on all the waterways of the world. They visit more than 800 ports in 90 foreign countries, and the number of them on world sea routes increases year after year." And then he went on to say something that is cold comfort for those who would rely on Soviet promises instead of a strong, modern American merchant fleet. Said he: "Already today it (Soviet Merchant Marine) stands on a par with the fleets of traditional sea countries in all its indexes, and *in the near future it will have no equal competitors.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

Some indication of the future thrust of Soviet maritime power is given by the escalating Soviet effort at sea to build up the North Vietnamese. American Security Council's Washington Report for August 21, 1967, pointed out that Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports showed a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was eighteen ships per month with an additional 2 to 5 Soviet satellite ships per month and that a Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 had boasted that Soviet ships left Odessa "practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

Equally instructive as to the possibilities inherent in employing a merchant marine presence as a psycho-political and subversive warfare weapon is a statement made by the Cuban Communists. In discussing the policy of "maximum expansion of our merchant fleet," Havana Radio on November 1, 1967, stated that young Cubans in maritime training schools would be "taught the language, geography, and history of the countries they will visit." When this is viewed in the context of Soviet directed and assisted training for unconventional warfare in Cuba, it would appear that, far from declining, the Cold War will be intensified at sea during the coming decade.

The Struggle for America's Soul: Our Unfulfilled Ideals

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the Newark Evening News of February 10, 1968, there was published an extract from a most perceptive talk by Mr. Robert D. Lilley, discussing the unmet ideals which are today "at the heart of the modern American dilemma."

Robert Lilley is president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., and I consider him one of the leaders of industry who is acutely aware of the great gap between our ideals and our performance in fulfilling them. He has a firm conviction that industry cannot ignore its responsibilities to the communities of America and must work in cooperation with government and our citizenry to resolve the complex problems which beset our "unfinished society."

His outlook is directly pertinent to President Johnson's call, in the state of the Union message and in his special message on manpower, for a partnership between government and private industry to eliminate the hardcore unemployment which prevents attainment of all other goals. It is particularly heartening to me that a business leader of Mr. Lilley's stature has spoken out so forcefully against the "indifference and intolerance" which can frustrate this vital national undertaking. In Mr. Lilley's view, the struggle for America's soul can be won if we will rely upon our common humanity and work together with "practical tolerance."

I commend Mr. Lilley's eloquent statement to the attention of my colleagues, and I insert it in the Record at this point:

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 10, 1968]

Dissatisfaction an Asset: Unmet Ideals Called U.S. Dilemma

(Note.—The following has been extracted from a talk made by Robert D. Lilley, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and chairman of the Governor's Commission on Civil Disorder, in accepting the Americanism Award of the state regional advisory board, Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith.)

It's the relationship between the intense anticipation of high and uncompromising ideals and the spotty reality that makes both the ideals and our efforts to realize them stand out in bold and, sometimes, tragic juxtaposition.

In Gunnar Myrdal's beautiful and perceptive phrase:

"America is continuously struggling for its soul."

The soul, of course, is the American creed, the creed expressed in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

And sin, to us Americans—whether consciously or subconsciously experienced—is our failure to save our soul. . . .

HEART OF DILEMMA

The late Andre Maurois once said that "America is work in progress."

And this, it seems to me, is at the heart of the modern American dilemma: The acute frustration over our unfinished society.

Unlike Adam, who lost paradise because he sinned, we have sinned—at least in our own hearts—because we've yet to build the paradise we set out to create. . . .

It may sound strange, but I believe that our national sense of dissatisfaction, our realization that we have not matched performance with ideals, is perhaps our greatest national asset.

By an inspiring logic, our recognition of the evils in our society and our struggle against them is an expression of the pioneering spirit that has made the whole history of America the history of a unique migration, a migration toward a goal, rather than away from a past.

What characterizes our own age is that the tempo of the migration has been accelerated and its goal identified with the struggle of the American Negro for full and first-class citizenship.

ACTION NOW

In the vocabulary of civil rights activists, the most common word is now: "freedom now"; let my people go now"; "better schools now."

This shouldn't surprise us. What's made America work as a democracy has been the contagion of its creed. It has inspired each succeeding wave of immigrants, each ethnic group, with the same dedication, the same determination. . . .

It may be distressing to realize that our country has to be goaded forward in spurts and surges, and that each generation of Americans has to lead its own revolution for a saner and more humane America.

But we should take great pride in the knowledge that this nation of revolutionaries has never had to go beyond its own creed for inspiration and that, in one form or another, the American creed underpins the hopes and aspirations of newly emergent nations around the world.

We tend to lose sight of this, I'm afraid. We tend to forget that America was the birthplace of modern political revolution. . . .

When the traditional and revolutionary elements of our political life lose specific value and become unrecognizable for human comprehension and unusable for human purpose, we'll know that the initiative has passed to other hands and that history has begun to run against us.

I don't think this will happen, unless we allow indifference and intolerance to sap the vigor of our revolution and distort the meaning of our creed. . . .

I'm using the word "intolerance" to signify the absence of practical tolerance.

What do I mean by practical tolerance?

I mean the willingness to forgo the easy, ugly complacencies of intolerance for the difficult, frustrating business of working together to achieve that more perfect union which is at the heart of the American creed. . . .

The great failing of intolerance is that it's reflexive—its substitutes for thinking.

The great merit of practical tolerance is that it's reflective—its substitutes for habit and instinct.

It's easy to condemn our enemies to perdition, and our friends to the sad limbo of those who mean well but, who, because they are not Negroes or Jews or Irish, can't plumb the depth of our despair or share the horror of our history.

It's much more difficult to think, to reach out for the hand extended—perhaps awkwardly and ineptly—and to make the struggle for the American soul a truly national undertaking, not a parochial venture doomed to quixotic and dismal failure.

We are far from loving one another, we Americans. But before that millenium dawns, we must tolerate and respect one another and get on with the business of bringing our nation nearer the destiny promised in its creed.

There's a remarkable statement in Willie Morris' autobiography, "North Toward Home," that I'd like to paraphrase:

. . . In the end, our greatest hope against our own destructiveness lies not so much in our common nationality as in our common humanity.

Race Problem Solution Lies in Friendship

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in Washington, many of us are overcome by the complicated problems that are presented to the Congress to which there does not seem to be any simple solution.

Once in a while someone thinks these problems through with some clarity which results in a solution the average person can understand, accept, and act upon. That incisive commentator on life and politics in Washington, Walter Trohan, has come up with a simple but practical way for all of us to work in attempting to solve the problems between races. When he says, "the quickest way to understanding and respect is friendship," he has said something worth listening to. If everyone attempted to make this his own personal project of becoming acquainted with someone of another race and establish a going friendship, much could be accomplished.

A great deal of this emphasized in the Eisenhower administration. President Eisenhower desegregated Washington without a single word of publicity. What he did in those 4 years between 1953 and 1956 is largely what Walter Trohan is talking about in this article. I commend it to the reading of all of my colleagues:

RACE PROBLEM SOLUTION LIES IN FRIENDSHIP

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, February 11.—The solution of the major domestic problem in the United States is complicated by the most unfortunate and little recognized fact that in the north generally people love the black race but dislike the individual Negro, while in the south people love the individual Negro and dislike the race.

The result has been that the race problem has shifted from the south to the north. The grim threat of another long hot summer hangs over the cities of the north rather than below the Mason-Dixon line. What makes the problem particularly difficult is that few in the north really know the Negro.

Time after time when there have been meetings on the problem in the north, the root of the problem, the Negro himself, has been ignored. There have been meetings of chiefs of police on ways and means of meeting the problem without a single Negro being present to tell them what the Negro wants or how he feels.

Perhaps the most promising thing about the Presidential commission on the problem is that its members, headed by Gov. Kerner of Illinois, have sought the advice and assistance of prominent Negroes and heard the complaints and demands of the most critical Negro leaders.

It may be that history will find that responsibility for unrest may be the fault of northerners more than southerners, altho many would consider these fighting words. In their love and admiration for the race, many northerners have embraced such violent and ill-tempered spokesmen among the Negroes as Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown.

NEGRO HAS BEEN WRONGED

Not all Negroes, perhaps not nearly a majority, approve of what Carmichael and Brown are doing or advocating. However, they may approve of much of what the angry blacks are saying, because the Negro has been wronged, more in the north perhaps than in what so many like to regard as the dark south.

Too much attention and too much prominence have been given to the more violent Negro spokesmen and too little to the Negroes of stature and accomplishment. Even the more moderate Negroes have been driven to some extravagance in order to be heard. Otherwise they are dismissed as Uncle Toms.

It would seem to be imperative in our strained society that every white should get to know Negroes. The cultivation of one Negro friend might be a good beginning.

TOO MUCH SELF-CONGRATULATION

As it is, there is too much patronizing of the Negro and too much self-congratulation by whites when they move across the color line. In Washington, whites who entertain or honor Negroes seem to be more interested in rushing the fact into print than in true promotion of understanding.

Even where he is apparently like the best, one cannot help but feel that the Negro is ill at ease. Too often he knows that he is not being invited for himself or he would have been invited years ago, or more importantly he would have been invited again and again, which is rarely, if ever, so.

In ancient Egypt, it was the custom to pull a mummy thru a banquet hall at the height of festivities to remind the guests of death. At too many parties today Negroes are paraded to remind the guests that their hosts are for toleration as well as for drinking cocktails.

It is safe to say there can be no peace in the race war until the races come to understand and respect one another. The quickest way to understanding and respect is friendship.

Dissent Weakens American Policies Abroad

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in a very philosophical editorial, the Philadelphia Bulletin on January 30 speculated on the effect which dissent against foreign policy by Americans has on those who oppose us with force and violence abroad.

It is significant, said the Bulletin, that the North Korean general who violently castigated the late President Kennedy and President Johnson on the *Pueblo* incident, also referred favorably to protests here at home.

Acts of aggression abroad against free people are not dependent on acts of dissent here at home. But one must raise the question that perhaps attitudes abroad are hardened and buttressed by dissent at home.

The Bulletin editorial said:

> Those who give way to such (dissent) tactics here should consider whether their conduct might encourage further hostility rather than lead to peace.

I insert the Philadelphia Bulletin editorial entitled "A Lesson on Dissent," at this point in the Record:

A Lesson on Dissent

The importance that Hanoi and other enemies of the United States place upon extreme and irresponsible dissent against the war in Vietnam is illustrated through the abusive statements of North Korean Major General Park Choong-Kook in discussing the seizure of the USS Pueblo.

The Communist general, in rejecting U.S. demands that the vessel and its crew be returned, castigated President Johnson and the late President Kennedy in the vilest of terms and cited protests in the United States itself against the war in support of the strength of his position.

He spoke of American youths shouting "Hang Johnson," and told of the burning of American flags and other extreme demonstrations.

Not all who object to U.S. policies and involvement in Vietnam, as is their right, are guilty of irresponsible, violent or unlawful conduct. But there have been many such incidents involving extreme actions and statements, and a wanton disregard of the rights of all others.

Authorities have, in some instances, ignored such excesses. At times authorities were anxious not to give the demonstrators the martyr status they so obviously sought. On other occasions, though, authorities have failed to take action because they are reluctant to cope with the willingness of the protesters to engage in protracted street or even courtroom debate.

No one should suggest that the acts of aggression on the part of Hanoi—or North Korea—result from violent dissent in this country. But those who give way to such tactics here should consider whether their conduct might encourage further hostility rather than lead to peace.

Gun Education Necessary

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions made the point that adult Americans have a constitutional right to own and utilize firearms for sporting and home defense purposes. I am wholeheartedly opposed to legislative proposals which would unduly restrict this right.

However, I am also clearly on record in support of the concept that firearms must be used responsibly. Persons who possess firearms should be fully aware of the power of these devices and skilled in their maintenance and use.

On June 27, 1967, I introduced two pieces of legislation—H.R. 11190 and H.R. 11191—to provide assistance to the States in establishing target ranges and arms safety training programs. H.R. 11190 would make available half the revenues from the excise tax on pistols and revolvers to the States for target ranges and firearms safety training programs and make the other half of such revenues available to the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund. H.R. 11191 would impose a manufacturer's excise tax on component parts of ammunition and make the revenues therefrom available for the same purposes as those provided in H.R. 11190.

The need for legislation such as I have introduced was most succinctly pointed up in an editorial in the February 7, 1968, issue of the Trenton Times, a weekly newspaper published at Trenton, Mich. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the views expressed by the editors of the Trenton Times, I am inserting the text of this excellent editorial at this point in the Record:

Gun Education Necessary

Guns have the interesting quality of provoking, at times, no small amount of animosity between those who are gun buffs and those who have never held a gun in their hands. The cries of those who would ban all guns, an impossibility, are matched in intensity by the cries of those who feel that any governmental intrusion whatsoever on the right to keep and bear arms is treason. Compromises are ideas built by committee and "middle of the road" is a euphemism for sitting on a fence, but perhaps both sides of the gun controversy could learn from each other.

It would indeed be a violation of a historical right if any governmental agency made any attempt to bar weapons from any citizen on arbitrary grounds of "community standing," "citizenship qualities" or "character." It would be incorrect, in fact, for the government to deny any civil right on such flimsy grounds. When an Eagle Scout and ex-Marine climbed a U. of Texas tower and perpetrated the greatest mass murder spree in recent memory, it was clearly demonstrated that such restrictions would not only violate civil rights, but would also be futile in their practical effect.

On the other hand, it is nonsense to say that the vast numbers of firearms in this country don't pose a certain public safety hazard.

In one context, of course, the National Rifle Association's phrase that "Guns don't kill people; people kill people" is true. Automobiles are also a lethal weapon—statistically more so than guns—but rarely kill anyone without an errant driver behind the wheel.

But we have come to recognize that no one should keep and bear an automobile without passing certain formal requirements as to automobile education. Necessarily, the law is applied universally: the farm boy who drove a tractor at age 10 and the family pickup shortly thereafter still must successfully complete a driver training course.

If legislation on firearms must come, this is where it should be aimed: education. The NRA has recognized this. For years the nation's prime organization for gunmen has conducted massive and highly efficient training schools for young and old marksmen. Anyone who has taken such training is quite qualified to own a weapon, and is considerably less likely to harm himself or others thru careless use or storage of a weapon.

In normal times, most purchasers of weapons would obtain such training because, as sportsmen, they would wish to obtain utmost proficiency with their weapon. In normal times, the vast majority of gun purchasers would be sportsmen. The brisk business being done in our gun shops at the moment, however, is largely a result of persons buying out of fear, many times with total lack of knowledge about firearms.

They are required to be fingerprinted and checked for criminal records, a relatively useless maneuver which, among other things, probably precipitates several thousand burglaries annually whereby persons with criminal records obtain guns by theft from persons without criminal records.

More important, we feel, is the danger that many of these first-time gun purchasers do not know how to care for what they are buying, and that somebody, most likely themselves or someone in their family, is going to be hurt.

It might not be a bad idea if the government turned from the impossible direction of banning firearms to the practical task of seeing that no one is killed because of firearms ignorance.

The Incredible Journey of the Republican State of the Union

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed an incredible journey. I have read what purports to be a Republican response to President Johnson's state of the Union message.

It is incredible because the Republicans have had the audacity to propose a 47-point "positive Republican program" which is nothing more than a steal of existing and proposed Democratic programs, and, even worse, portrays Republicans as favoring every program they have voted against for the past 30 years.

Who will believe the incredible statement that the Republicans want a "100-percent tax deduction for medical expenses and drug costs incurred by our senior citizens," when 93 percent of the Republicans in the House voted against the Medicare Act in 1965 and 65 percent of the Senate Republicans called for a reduction in the increased social security benefits Democrats requested in 1967?

Who will believe Republicans when they propose "an Industry Youth Corps to assist our Nation's young people in finding employment in private productive jobs" when 145 Republicans voted against the war on poverty in 1964 and 85 percent voted to kill the entire economic opportunity program in 1967?

Who can believe Republican state of the Union makers when they call for a "clean elections law" and the reform of political machinery, when President Johnson is already on record with proposal after proposal to have elections more democratically financed, and with a clean elections proposal of his own?

And when Republicans send up a torrent of words on "veteran benefits" and greater cooperation between State, local, and Federal government, who is going to forget that Lyndon Johnson and his Democratic allies passed the greatest veterans benefit program in 20 years—the cold war GI bill, expanded to include all veterans of the Korean and Vietnam conflicts?

And when Republicans speak about helping children in the Headstart program, they speak with a forked tongue. I remind them and the Nation that the Republican Party almost succeeded in killing the Federal aid to education program under the guise of a "bloc grant" program and the infamous Quie amendment.

Will anyone forget that Republicans voted almost to a man against the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967? Almost to a man against the Teacher Corps which has helped more poor children get a better education than any Republican has ever dreamed?

Are we to swallow the incredible statement that the Republican Party favors aid to schoolchildren when their history and record tell us just the opposite?

I would not bore you with further Republican "positive programs."

I would only cite one more example of the political shell game the Republicans are playing. Point 39 of their Goodell manifesto of January 30 calls for immediate enactment of legislation to provide proper Federal assistance to State and local governments in strengthening their law enforcement capabilities.

Where were the Republicans when President Johnson proposed precisely that program in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967? Where will the Republicans be when the same act, which has been reintroduced by the President, again comes to a vote? That bill came out of the Hosue in 1967 mangled by those very Republicans who now shed crocodile tears about law enforcement and cirme waves and violence .

I will not dignify this Republican state of the Union stunt any further. I will content myself with a quotation from the New Republic magazine—certainly no friend of the administration—which commented:

> We listened to the Congressional Republican State of the Union reply to Mr. Johnson, and finally decided it was a plot to make us vote Democratic.

There is no plot. The Republicans are simply so bad, so backward, so lacking in understanding of what is happening in this Nation, and what has been done by the President, that they are their own worst enemies.

Centennial of Noted Author, Professor Dorsey

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that February 6, 1968, marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of Prof. George Amos Dorsey. Since he accomplished so much for American science and the progress of our country in general, I am pleased to publish a brief biography of his activities as written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist and great admirer of Professor Dorsey:

CENTENNIAL OF NOTED AUTHOR, PROFESSOR DORSEY

(By John C. Sciranka)

On February 6, 1968 the American Slovaks remembered the Centennial Birthday of Prof. George Amos Dorsey, who was born in Hebron, Ohio. In 1910 he visited Slovakia and other Slavonic nations in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Starting in September 1910 his articles appeared in the Chicago Tribune on his experiences and impressions about the Slovaks and the Slavs under the Hapsburg dynasty.

Prof. Dorsey was an anthropologist, who was affiliated with leading American Universities and Institutions, too many to mention in this brief article. He received his Ph. D. from Harvard University in 1894, where he later was professor of anthropology. He made special study of life in South America and collected material for Columbian Exposition held in Chicago in 1893. Later he was curator of Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago.

His experiences written for the Chicago Tribune were translated into various Slavonic languages and Sam Strobl of the Mally Press, located in 1911 at 1702 South Halstead St., Chicago, published some of them under the title "Pravda o Slovákoch a Slavianoch" (The Truth about the Slovaks and the Slavs) by Prof. Dr. George A. Dorsey, Ph. D., LL.D. It is a 152 page book which I treasure and which speaks highly of this great American educator and humanitarian. Dr. Dorsey was a personal friend of the well known Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, American anthropologist of Czech origin, who was curator of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C., and a friend of the Slovak people, admiring their rich culture.

I call this anniversary to the attention of Americans in general for he deserves our remembrance and gratitude.

Fast Deployment Logistic Ships

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the President's fiscal year 1969 budget is in many respects an austere budget. Close analysis shows that the budget calls for an overall increase in Defense spending but a retrenchment approach for most domestic spending. As one of the local newspapers reported "It melts some of the butter for guns."

In my review of the budget I notice that there is a request for the first four of a new series of fast deployment logistic—FDL—ships, at an estimated cost of $180 million. The overall FDL proposal provides for a fleet of 30 prepositioned warehouses which will not be operational because they will have no place to go. A fleet loaded with progressively obsolete military equipment that would be manned 24 hours a day with a combination military-civilian crew claiming overtime, hazard, and special duty pay.

In my opinion there are several reasons why the funds requested for the limited purpose FDL program could be better utilized if they were used to build a fast, modern, merchant fleet capable of meeting a variety of needs.

MULTIPURPOSE FLEET

It would be better to build a fleet with a function—a fleet that would contain all the latest equipment and modifications including a quick on-and-off loading capability; a true, modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense. It is my information that such a fleet could be constructed for private merchant marine operation and could be available on call to the Department of Defense. The Department would pay an annual rental for the preemptive rights which financial guarantee, I am informed, would be adequate for private financing and construction.

A sum of money comparable to that proposed for the FDL ships could be used to develop the required merchant fleet with the full FDL capability. This type of program has real merit. This work would be spread to all private shipyards or to one on a competitive bid. The U.S. Government would not get into the merchant shipping business. The ships would be fully operational maintaining perhaps a partial FDL capability at all times. Taxpayers money would be involved at a minimum. The base could be laid for a new, modern merchant fleet and the fleet operation would not be construed as a hostile act.

"PUEBLO" INCIDENTS

The Armed Services Committee considered the Department of Defense's request for FDL's at some length during the first session of the 90th Congress and stated its reservations concerning this program. In an almost prophetic statement their report recognized that such ships—ships offensively deployed around the world near potential trouble spots—would be highly vulnerable, unless adequately protected. I cannot help but wonder what the cost would be to protect 30 pre-positioned FDL's when in answer to inquiries concerning the *Pueblo* incident and the cost of protecting such vessels, Secretary McNamara indicated that to provide the necessary protection for surveillance ships would add a multibillion dollar expenditure to the Defense budget.

In arguing for the FDL concept the premise was put forth that pre-positioned ships of the FDL type could enable rapid response and prevent a minor incident from building into a major incident thereby saving thousands of lives. Conversely a pre-positioned—preconditioned—FDL near Wonsan, reacting to the *Pueblo* incident could have conceivably cost us thousands of American lives because of our rapid, preconditioned FDL reflex instead of our current more prudent and reasonable diplomatic response. I have reservations about prepositioning 30 FDL's with Pavlovian conditioned reflex ability in various areas around the world.

SHIPS, SKILL, AND MANPOWER NEEDS

During the hearings on the DOD authorization bill, H.R. 9240, last March and April the Department of the Navy indicated that although it has no direct responsibility for the merchant marine, it is concerned with the aging merchant fleet and the need for maintaining an adequate maritime industrial base including the need for skilled maritime labor in shipbuilding and repair.

I also am concerned. Since 1962 the Great Society has built but 87 ships averaging about $100 million annual Federal cost, whereas the Soviets built 502 merchant ships during the same period at nearly $1 billion cost per year. As a result 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old and 80 percent of the U.S. fleet is more than 20 years old. We have 935 ships less than 25 years old—the standard lifetime of a merchant ship; in 1972 we will have only 357. The fiscal year 1969 budget provides for only 10 new ships as part of our subsidized fleet and a cut in Maritime Administration personnel of 177—the organization that was established by statute to aid in the development, promotion, and operation of the U.S. merchant marine, so that it will be, and I quote from its charter:

> (a) adequate to carry the Nation's domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of its foreign commerce during peacetime; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under U.S. flag by citizens of the United States, so far as may be practicable; and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of ships manned by a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

This kind of replacement program and budgeting begins no place, ends no place, and will do little to abate block obsolescence.

I raise these points for a twofold purpose. First, if a program for a modern merchant fleet is approved, in lieu of an FDL program, a major assist can be given to solving the problems of block obsolescence and of a lack of skilled labor in the shipwork industry and secondly it could meet one of the major priorities in the President's state of the Union message—to identify and train in cooperation with private industry the disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed with the skills required in an increasingly complex economy.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Much is being said about our balance-of-payments problem. One of the biggest dollar drain loopholes relates to our inadequate merchant marine. The U.S. foreign commerce has increased by leaps and bounds since the end of World War II, but, unfortunately more and more of this tonnage travels aboard foreign flag vessels. Our merchant marine is now carring only 7 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. There is an obvious relationship between our maritime inadequacies and our balance-of-payment deficits.

Many of my colleagues have long been aware of this relationship and recently have proposed various measures that would encourage putting more of our cargo in the bottoms of U.S. vessels. I support their efforts as a temporary expedient, but I earnestly solicit their support for a modern U.S. merchant fleet that would recapture our rightful place on the world's sealanes.

ECONOMY

The fiscal 1969 overall budget has a programed deficit of $8 billion which anticipates an absorption of trust fund overages in the amount of $7.5 billion, a tax increase for 1969 in the amount of $12 billion and participation sales certificates in the amount of $4 billion, which means that it is possible that without taxes and the necessary authorizations, 1969 could experience a total deficit at the present time of $31 billion and this does not include anticipated further augmentation and budget expansion in the military sector.

For this and the other reasons I have mentioned it seems to me that one of the surest ways to economize and at the same time to meet both defense and domestic needs would be to utilize the funds requested for these ships of limited capability and instead to build a fast, modern merchant fleet capable of meeting a number of sealift needs, of assuring job opportunities for the disadvantaged and to replenish our ship industry skills bank.

The Vindication of MacArthur?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention that an objective review of history is essential if we are to understand the complications of the present. Therefore, I was especially pleased and impressed by the following editorial which appeared in the Polish American on February 10, and its penetrating commentary on the historic views expressed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

THE VINDICATION OF MACARTHUR?

The most important news to come from the Far East in recent days is not that the Viet Cong have launched a major military offensive in South Vietnam—but that the Korean War gives strong indication of resuming after a lull of fourteen years.

The seizure of the American ship Pueblo by North Korea should serve as a reminder that the Korean conflict has never been officially concluded, but merely stands at an uneasy truce. It should also remind us of the reason why the Korean situation has remained at a stalemate despite the passage of so many years: in 1951 President Harry S. Truman summarily fired General Douglas MacArthur from his position as Commander of the American forces in Korea because the general stubbornly adhered to the idea that the purpose of war is to achieve eventual victory over the enemy.

And thus, in the long interim since 1951, there has been neither victory nor defeat in Korea; a condition which, as Vietnam has proved as of late, can also prove costly both in men and national treasure.

What was the nature of the dispute between MacArthur and Truman—and why does it remain significant even today?

According to decisions reached at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, the United States after World War II occupied the southern half of Korea up to the 38th parallel, while the Soviet Union took over the northern half. In 1948 a United Nations Commission arrived in Seoul to supervise elections for a National Constituent Assembly. When it was refused admission to the Soviet zone—by then ruled by a Stalinist-type regime—the Committee recommended elections in South Korea which were thereupon held.

On June 25, 1950, North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel at 11 points in an invasion of the South. The U.N. Security Council branded the North Koreans an aggressor and asked members of the U.N. to furnish assistance to the Republic of South Korea. The United States immediately complied, and soon Gen. Douglas MacArthur was designated as commanding general of the U.N. forces in Korea.

After engineering the spectacular amphibious landing at Inchon—at a time when North Korea held all of the Korean peninsula except for the U.N. beachhead around Pusan in the southeast—Gen. MacArthur had soon driven back the aggressors to the Manchurian border. It was then that hordes of Red Chinese "volunteers" poured down into the South, resulting in MacArthur's call for reprisals against Manchuria, his dismissal from command, and the resulting stalemate that—continuing to this day—may still flare up into another conflict.

It is difficult to reflect upon these matters without coming to the conclusion that General MacArthur was indeed right, that in war there is no substitution for victory, and that it is an act of the highest folly to enter into a war when one is not determined to win.

In view of the Pueblo incident and America's mounting casualties in Vietnam, can anyone seriously doubt that MacArthur will not be vindicated in the eyes of history?

Cuba's Children in Exile

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, raw statistics about many Federal programs tell very little, if anything, about the vital human impact which these programs have us believe. I am grateful to Dean in order to correctly evaluate the effectiveness of a program. This is especially true about the Cuban refugee program operated under the very able direction of Mr. John Thomas in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Recently, the Children's Bureau published a booklet entitled "Cuba's Children in Exile" which illuminates a small portion of the great human drama which takes place behind the refugee programs' statistics which themselves are quite impressive. With the cooperation of State and local officials and the generous assistance of many private agencies, the Federal Governments' Cuban refugee program has assisted more than 275,000 of the 315,000 Cubans who have fled Communist Cuba.

A very small number, slightly over 8,300, of this large total were unaccompanied Cuban refugee children whose parents deliberately sent them into exile rather than take the chance of having them exposed to Castro's tyranny. Certainly, there is nothing as tragic as a child in disress and that, together with the generous response of the American people, is the theme of "Cuba's Children in Exile." I urge every Member of Congress to take a few minutes to read this story of one small, but tremendouly successful, Federal program in which all of us can take great pride.

CUBA'S CHILDREN IN EXILE

In November 1960, a Cuban mother brought her two children to Key West. She feared that they would be sent to Russia because she and her husband were actively opposed to the Castro regime. She asked the judge of the juvenile court to find homes for them. The judge assumed jurisdiction and placed her children in foster care. The mother returned to Cuba to be with her husband and to continue her work in the counterrevolutionary movement.

This incident marked the beginning of a rapid influx of Cuban children, many of whom would be unaccompanied by their parents and with no relatives here to care for them. The children came from all classes of Cuban society, although the majority were from well-to-do, middle-class families. Most of them were in their early teens, and nearly two-thirds were boys.

Voluntary agencies did what they could to provide care and shelter for these children, but it soon became apparent that they could not carry on without the help of the Federal Government.

In January 1961, President John F. Kennedy asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, to plan and administer a Federal program to deal with the needs of Cuban refugees while in the United States and to expedite their return to their homeland when conditions made it possible.

The Cuban Refugee Program—the most comprehensive program ever devised in this country to meet the needs of incoming refugees—was the first to entail the distribution of Federal financial assistance for maintenance outside of a refugee center. Provisions for the unaccompanied children were made part of the overall plan.

The Children's Bureau, through delegation, was made responsible for child welfare services, including the care and protection of these unaccompanied Cuban children. The Florida State Department of Public Welfare acted as agent for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in planning for these children and in the use of Federal funds for their care. The Florida State Department of Public Welfare, in turn, contracted with HIAS and the Miami voluntary children's agencies—the Catholic Welfare Bureau of the Diocese of Miami, the Children's Service Bureau, and the Jewish Family and Children's Service—for arranging for the placement of the children.

By April 30, 1967, the Federal Government had been responsible for the foster care of over 8,300 children.

Practical problems that would have discouraged those less convinced of the importance of what they were doing beset the agencies and organizations at every turn. But they persisted—and difficulties were finally overcome. It is this story that is told in Cuba's Children in Exile: The Story of the Unaccompanied Cuban Refugee Children's Program.

Law Professors Oppose War in Vietnam

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Dean Louis Pollak of the Yale University Law School announced that over 500 of this country's most distinguished professors of law and over 4,000 students of law have signed a statement of opposition to the war in Vietnam and calling upon their professional colleagues to join them in an effort to change the policy of mindless escalation.

This is further evidence of the widespread and deep concern over the disaster of this war, that professionals, moderates, leading citizens are feeling the compelling need to speak out and take political action to try to restore rationality and balance to our actions in Southeast Asia.

Dissent is not limited to hippies, leftists, or the disloyal, as too many would have us believe. I am grateful to Dean Pollak and his colleagues for once again demonstrating this fact. I include the statement and the article from the New York Times of February 15, 1968, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

A STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The undersigned are members of the faculties of Columbia Law School, New York University School of Law, and Yale Law School. A total of 585 students at the three law schools also support the statement.

We are opposed to the present policy of the United States in Viet Nam. We do not believe that our nation has any controlling commitments which require us to continue to pursue that policy.

We believe that the United States cannot by acceptable means succeed in its attempt to secure and maintain the control of the Saigon government over the territory of South Viet Nam by military force, and that the continuing expansion of our military involvement in the service of that end creates an unacceptable risk of world war.

We believe that the terrible violence the war is inflicting on the people of Viet Nam is destroying the society we seek to protect.

We believe that it is wrong and dangerous in these circumstances to continue to subordinate desperately needed domestic programs to the increasing demands this war is imposing on our nation's resources and moral energies.

We reject the suggestion that opposition to the present policy necessarily implies advocacy of a precipitate withrawal of United States forces or an abandonment of our supporters in South Viet Nam.

We do believe that political and military de-escalation are esssential steps towards ending the fighting in Viet Nam.

We believe that our country should take urgent steps, including a prompt reduction in the scope of land and air operations by American forces, to signify our intention to limit our political and military aims in South Viet Nam. We believe that such steps are an essential precondition for the release of those political forces, both within South Viet Nam and internationally, which seek peaceful compromise and could engage in genuine negotiations.

We believe that lawyers can play a particularly significant role in showing that opposition to the present policy is not limited to a few extremists but comes from many moderate citizens at all levels of society and of all political views. We therefore urge lawyers who share our concerns to work for a change in that policy in every legitimate way they can, including the support of candidates committed to such a change.

N.Y.U. Law School—McKay, Robert B., Christensen, Thomas G. S., Collins, Daniel G., Dorsen, Norman, Frampton, George T., Franck, Thomas M., Gottlieb, Gidon A. G., Gross, Hyman, Hellerstein, Jerome R., Hughes, Graham, Klein, Fannie J., Knapp, Charles L., Kripke, Homer, Kroner, Jack L., Mueller, Gerhard O. W., Peschel, John, Pitofsky, Robert, Taggart, John Y., Younger, Irving, Zeitlin, George E., Zimmerman, Stanley A.

Columbia Law School—Brown, Earl, Berger, Curtis J., Bernstein, Merton, Cooper, George, Dodyk, Paul M. Farer, Tom J. Farnsworth, Allan E., Friedmann, Wolfgang G., Gellhorn, Walter, Greenawalt, Kent R., Handler, Milton, Hill, Alfred, Jones, W. Kenneth, Kalodner, Howard, Lissitzyn, Oliver J., Lusky, Louis, Murphy, Arthur W. Bush, Julian S. Eisen, Sheldon H., Galston, Nina M., Grad, Frank P., Lipson, Jack, Mallamud, Jonathan, Schlosser, Alan L., Werner, Walter, Blake, Harlan M.

Yale Law School—Bickel, Alexander M., Bittker, Boris I., Brown, Ralph S., Calabresi, G., Charpentier, Arthur, Chirelstein, M. A., Deutsch, Jan, Emerson, Thomas I., Goldstein, Abraham, Goldstein, Joseph, Griffiths, John, Nudec, Robert, Ketz, Jay, Kessler, Friedrich, Peters, Ellen, Pollak, Louis H., Reich, C. A., Schwelb, Egon Simon, John G. Sparer, Edward, Sommers, Clyde W., Trubek, David, Wellington, Harry H.

FIVE HUNDRED LAW TEACHERS JOIN WAR PROTEST—URGE LEGAL MEN TO OPPOSE JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—More than 500 of the nation's law teachers have signed a statement calling upon the legal profession to oppose the Johnson Administration's Vietnam war policy.

The statement urges lawyers to become more active in supporting the candidates who oppose the current policy and to demonstrate that "opposition to the present policy is not limited to a few extremists but comes from many moderate citizens."

It asks lawyers to work "in every legitimate way they can" for a change from the present policy to one of "political and military de-escalation."

Dean Louis Pollak of the Yale Law School presided at a news conference at the National Press Building here, at which copies of the statement were distributed.

Also present at the conference were Paul M. Bator of Harvard, Wolfgang G. Friedmann of Columbia and Addison M. Bowman of Georgetown, all law professors.

DOUGLAS GROUP COUNTERED

Professor Bator explained that the idea originated last fall among teachers and students at Harvard who thought that a group formed last October under the leadership of former Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois was creating the mistaken impression that moderate elements in the country were solidly behind the present war policy.

The Douglas organization, called the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, included former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Professor Bator said no effort had been made to poll the nation's 2,500 to 3,000 law teachers, but that copies of the statement had been sent to about 50 law schools and that more than 500 faculty members had signed.

He said that this expression of dissent from a group he described as "moderate, conservative and cautious" disproved any implication that "the large body of moderate America backs the present policy in Vietnam."

Professor Bator said that more than 4,000 law students also signed, and that a number of others, had said they would have done so except for fear that they would lose their draft deferments if they did so.

He conceded that no students were known to have been drafted for voicing opposition to the war, but asserted that nonetheless the fear among students that they might be drafted if they spoke out "is very real and very deep."

LOYALTY NOT ASSAYED

Dean Pollack pointed out that the statement had not addressed itself to the legality of the war, but only to the professors' belief as citizens that it was risky and ill-advised. In part, the statement said:

"We are opposed to the present policy of the United States in Vietnam. We do not believe that our nation has any controlling commitments which require us to continue to pursue that policy.

"We believe that the United States cannot by acceptable means succeed in its attempt to secure and maintain the control of the Saigon Government over the territory of South Vietnam by military force, and that the continuing expansion of our military involvement in the service of that end creates an unacceptable risk of world war.

"We believe that the terrible violence the war is inflicting on the people of Vietnam is destroying the society we seek to protect.

"We believe that it is wrong and dangerous in these circumstances to continue to subordinate desperately needed domestic programs to the increasing demands this war is imposing on our nation's resources and moral energies.

"We therefore urge lawyers who share our concerns to work for a change in that policy in every legitimate way they can, including the support of candidates committed to such a change."

Dean Pollak said that four other law school deans had also signed: Elwood H. Hettrick of Boston University; Burnett Harvey of the University of Indiana; Francis A. Allen of the University of Michigan and Lehan Tunks for the University of Washington. Harvard's new law dean, Derek C. Bok, did not sign.

Health as an Instrument of Foreign Policy

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Herbert M. Singer, chairman of the board of the World Health Foundation, recently delivered an address on the use of health as an instrument of foreign policy.

I am certain you will find his remarks on this subject of considerable value and interest.

His remarks follow:

HEALTH AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY

Health in foreign lands has been a matter of interest to the United States over many years. However, in the light of forces operating in the world today, our support of health programs in foreign countries has assumed an increased importance thanks to its new potential as an instrument of foreign policy. It is the purpose of this memorandum to delineate this new potential and to urge that our support of such foreign aid health programs be given important recognition in the implementation of our foreign policy and in the making of supportive appropriations.

PAST BASIS OF AID FOR FOREIGN HEALTH

Foreign aid must find its justification in the self-interest of the aiding nation. Our support of health programs abroad, is no exception. In the past, our support of such programs appears to have been founded on one or more of the following self-interest motivations:

1. to protect or advance the health of our own citizens (such as smallpox eradication; or the use, in domestic health programs, of foreign health experience and experimentation);
2. to make possible certain projects in which our government has a specific political or economic interest (such as the construction of the Panama Canal and the prerequisite eradication of yellow fever);
3. to strengthen our ties generally with friendly countries by responding to their requests for aid; and
4. to advance our image as a nation motivated by humanitarian considerations.

OUR RELIANCE UPON OUR SYSTEM OF ALLIANCES

Health in foreign lands has, in recent years, assumed a new dimension for the United States for it possesses the potential of being an important stabilizer of government, particularly in developing countries. This stabilizing potential can be of profound importance to the posture of the United States in the world.

As the role of the United States in the world increases and our responsibilities grow, the maintenance of our posture in the world requires an ever increasing reliance upon our system of alliances with our friends; and upon our relationships of non-hostility with strategic countries outside of our alliance system.

This reliance upon our alliances is particularly critical with respect to the countries of Latin America because of the strategic importance of that area to the United States and because, since the rise of Castro, the drive to disrupt our alliances with Latin America, has been aided and abetted by foreign powers seeking a more dominant world position.

Our reliance on alliances and relationships of non-hostility is, however, seriously threatened by the instability of governments particularly in the developing countries. This instability and the consequent vulnerability of governments to guerrilla warfare and revolution, are a matter of profound importance to us for a violent change in government is, with rare exceptions, accompanied by a change of foreign policy orientation. In such event, what once was a source of strength to us becomes, after such change, not only a deprivation of strength but an accretion of power to those nations who seek to focus world power in their own hands.

PUBLIC DISAFFECTION FOR GOVERNMENT

Leading contemporary experts and exponents of revolution (Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh, Giap and Castro) have been pointing out for some time that no guerrilla warfare or revolution can be successful without a broad base of public disaffection for government; and that the fine art of revolution lies in generating and exploiting such public disaffecting. The developing countries are, by their very nature, subject to powerful forces for such disaffection. Among the salient of these forces are the extreme disparity and the lack of communication between rich and poor; the wide fluctuations in a narrow and essentially raw-material economy; and indigeneous racial and cultural conflicts. The public disaffection which these forces produce, can and do seriously weaken government and make it vulnerable to the philosophy of revolution, the techniques of guerrilla warfare, the leadership and the arms and supplies exported by foreign powers who seek aggressively to extend their control and, as a prelude, to weaken the United States where it is most vulnerable—in its system of alliances and patterns of non-hostility.

The programs initiated to counter these forces of disaffection are, by their very nature, slow in maturing and are even slower in trickling down to the disaffected masses. In a developing economy, a very substantial percentage of governmental aid must be given to economic and sociological infrastructure and to basic projects that do not yield substantial benefits to the public until long after their initiation. Education programs, essentially for the young, are also long range in its benefits to the public. Aid to housing can carry considerable effectiveness in combating public disaffection, but to make a realistic impact, large aggregations of capital are necessary and such capital, for a developing country, cannot be made available, or cannot be made available without serious effect upon other necessary programs. Thus, most of the programs initiated by government, with its own or foreign aid funds, are not geared to produce an immediately effective impact on the disaffected masses.

It is here that health and health programs can play a profound role as a ready counter weapon to combat the forces of disaffection and as a generator of loyalty of the people to their government. It is also health programs that can purchase the necessary time for other programs, slow moving in public benefits, to make themselves effective for the disadvantaged and the disaffected.

HEALTH AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO LOYALTY TO GOVERNMENT

It is submitted that, of all the services that government can render to its people in a developing country, health programs probably are the most effective in generating loyalty of the people to their government. Health programs can also be the most immediate in effect; and probably are the least demanding upon the resources of the country for the impact achieved in terms of loyalty to government.

Health and health programs have a unique capacity to touch the lives of individuals and families and to do so more acutely and more dramatically than perhaps any other service of government. A new well-being for children and mothers requires no knowledge of statistics to appreciate. The eradication or curtailment of certain diseases, previously deemed the inevitable fate of mankind, is profoundly understood. The bringing of sanitation to a village community generates, to a remarkable degree, a sense of pride and self dignity in addition to the broad comprehension of its health significance. But perhaps even greater impact is to be derived from prompt and sympathetic aid, on a personal level, for those in pain, in illness or in the throes of emergency. In these cases, a health program functioning on a personal level, will, if properly organized, engender a warmth of appreciation and loyalty to government, from the recipient and his family. Indeed, such a service will also enjoy the appreciation and respect of the many who are not then subject to such misfortunes, but who know full well that, at some uncertain time in the future, they will require such a service. The feeling of personal and family security arising from such a government health program could well earn for government such good will as to convert a large segment of a community from unfriendliness and antagonism.

Despite a lag or failure in programs to aid in economic or other areas of government service, a dramatic health program, particularly one which can bring prompt, personalized help (even if it does not give the ultimate in medical care), may very well produce a loyalty to government which will permit such government to survive its other failures or delayed achievement. Any disruption of government which would threaten the continuity of a vital personalized health program would be a matter of profound concern to the beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of such program.

It is interesting to note that where governments are on the firing line in the battle for a people's allegiance, they have found, empirically, the importance of health programs, particularly those that bring personal service to the individual and his family. In Vietnam, health services are increasingly playing a significant role in our pacification efforts, particularly in territories where the people's loyalty had been recently directed toward a different regime.

In Colombia where guerrilla warfare has had, for years, fertile territory, within which to function, health has recently taken on a new and significant role. A successful program is now in operation by the Colombian Navy who, in addition to their prime mission of policing the Magdalena River, have added a medical and dental service for an area previously deemed isolated and unfriendly to the military. This health program, built around the gun boat and rendering service to people living within range of the river, has changed the image of navy personnel in that territory from that of enemy to that of friend. It has produced vital intelligence of the hinterland of the river never before known or understood. In bringing the people of the area into league with the navy, it has generated an extraordinary loyalty to the government in a vast area previously deemed, at the very least, unfriendly. The program has been so successful that a new vessel is now being completed to bring the program to the head waters of the Amazon River on the other side of the Andes.

It is not accidental that the Feldsher system of medicine was incorporated in the Soviet health system in the very early days of their revolution and has been built upon vigorously ever since, to provide a broad and immediate base of medicine for the people of Russia. The Feldsher system provides medical coverage to a community, not through graduate doctors, but through specially trained personnel to deal, on a personal level, with a limited scope of medical needs. The system may not produce the highest quality of medicine, but it has permitted the Soviet government to give to the masses of its people, broad, immediate and effective health coverage. It is said that the Russian people consider their medical system one of the fundamentally important dividends from their government.

It is interesting to note that, at a recent conference of the Pan American Health Organization in Trinidad, the Cuban delegation wished to dramatize its health program (which follows the Russian system) and requested a comparative examination of health programs in Latin America. This request was for the obvious purpose of demonstrating Cuba's superior coverage of its peoples' health needs as against the relatively low health coverage of the "imperialistic" oriented governments of Latin America. Castro, very early in his regime, endeavored to dramatize to his people his concern for their health; and it is not at all surprising that Castro insisted on drugs and medical supplies as the consideration for his release of prisoners captured in the Bay of Pigs incident. It is particularly interesting to note that Castro is presently using the Cuban health structure and personnel as a means of communicating with his people on a political as well as health level.

Negatively, we have seen the strong reaction of people when a government health service is withdrawn or curtailed, as took place in England and in other countries in recent years.

The above are but few of the many examples that can be marshalled to establish the power of a health service to generate loyalty to a government.

Not only are health programs effective in combatting disaffection for government, but, in most instances they can be mobilized to generate tangible benefits to the public at a relatively early date. Health programs geared to broad coverage involve personnel, rather than brick and mortar or sophisticated equipment; and the necessary personnel can be trained in a relatively short period of time, if the programs are established so as to require only a limited scope of competence from its personnel.

Also, health programs probably are the least demanding of all government services, upon a developing country's vital and scarce resources of capital funds and of foreign exchange. Since buildings will not be immediately required, capital funds will not be needed. Since sophisticated and expensive equipment and personnel therefor will not be required, foreign exchange will, largely, not be a necessity for the program. Essentially, the basic element of such programs is native personnel, thus a great and early impact can be produced upon the public without absorbing scarce capital funds or foreign exchange.

CONCLUSION

Because the stability of friendly or nonhostile governments are of profound importance to the posture of the United States in the world, it is in the interest of the United States that the most effective instruments be used to aid and advance such stability. This is particularly true for the developing countries which have powerful disruptive forces inherent in their economy and social patterns; and it is of even greater validity for the developing countries of Latin America because of the special strategic importance of that region to the United States.

Health programs have an unusual potential to bring to government the allegiance of its people and therefore can act as a strong counter force to the disruptive elements working against government stability in a developing country. Health programs are not only effective in enlisting a people's loyalty to government, but, unlike most government services, can be relatively quick in their effectiveness and are largely free of heavy demand for scarce capital funds and foreign exchange.

Because health and health programs have this extraordinary capacity to stabilize friendly oriented governments and thereby strengthen our world position, it is urged that such programs be given a greater role in the implementation of our foreign policy and be given appropriations commensurate with its contributions to our security.

Church Was Built on Carroll's Land

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the historic churches in America is St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md. The present pastor, Father Joseph F. Thorning, enjoys the respect and friendship of many Members of the Congress and is one of the best known and beloved priests in the Western Hemisphere.

In the November 19, 1967, issue of the Catholic Review there appeared an excellent and informative article about this historic church, and Father Thorning, written by Constance Stapleton which I am pleased to include in my remarks, as follows:

HISTORY OF ST. JOSEPH'S RECOUNTED: CHURCH WAS BUILT ON CARROLL'S LAND

(By Constance Stapleton)

BUCKEYSTOWN.—To some, St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor is a contradiction.

It is the only placename on the Declaration of Independence. Yet, when Charles Carroll of Carrollton place its name in history, Catholics were not allowed to vote in Maryland.

Integrated since its inception, the altar was a gift of a Negro parishioner, John Belt. The magnificent painting of the crucifixion above was a gift of Emily Harper, a Protestant.

In the cemetery to the rear, gravestones bearing the names of distinguished Marylanders stand next to the unmarked graves of Irish laborers from the C & O Canal, victims of the cholera epidemic of 1832.

Land for St. Joseph's—together with a contribution to start building—was donated by Charles Carroll. Situated nearly at the geographical center of the original 10,000 acre estate, the first limestone church was completed in 1832 by Father Meleve, a Jesuit priest of Russian birth. It then faced the Catoctin Mountains to the west.

When Father Gaffney rebuilt it in 1861, preserving much of the original stone, its length became the present width, and now faces north toward Frederick. Five thousand of the $7,000 needed for the new building was donated by the great-granddaughter of Charles Carroll, the Marchioness of Wellesley.

Route 15, as it winds northward from the Virginia hunt country toward Frederick, trickles down into the village of Buckeystown.

There, proudly standing at attention for all to see is the marker proclaiming this to be Carrollton, patented by Charles and Daniel Carroll, Mary and Ellinor, in 1724. Daniel Carroll was brother to John Carroll, the first Archbishop of Baltimore.

Two miles west, on Manor Woods Road is St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor. Secure in its harbor of trees, the proud stone church with its majestic steeple seems to be from another time. One step inside the rectory door tells you differently.

Its unpretentious exterior belies its inner wealth. Crowding the walls are citations from the countries of the Western Hemisphere and Europe. Perched on tables are personal photos of world renowned celebrities. Neighbors on the mantel are pictures of Pope John and Charles Carroll.

The firm handclasp of the pastor brings one back to the present. The Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, known as the "friend of presidents," is known in Frederick County as a friend to all.

This Padre of the Americas has, since 1944, offered the invocation in Congress on official celebration of Pan American Day. Holder of degrees from five universities including Oxford, listed by *Who's Who* as educator, author, lecturer, Father Thorning was born in Milwaukee in 1896. His tall energetic frame and enthusiastic response deny his 71 years.

His writing and merit as historian came into prominence during the Spanish Civil War when as special correspondent, he reported for the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

His capabilities as linguist brought acclaim in *The New York Times* during the Eucharistic Congress in Budapest, 1938, when he made simultaneous translations from Latin to English.

He then translated the series of articles into Hungarian, German, French and Spanish.

He is also a scholar of Greek and Hebrew. In 1947, he helped with translations of the Polyglot Missal, forerunner of today's vernacular Mass text.

Author of the best-selling biography, *Miranda: World Citizen*, and numerous treatises on religion and social justice, Father Thorning writes book reivews for Fordham University and Georgetown, as well as discussing papal encyclicals on radio forums. Elected to the Gallery of Living American Authors, he contributes to Catholic journals and national newspapers.

He was the first priest to be appointed by the White House to serve on special diplomatic missions to South America, Central America and the Caribbean.

He was a member of the official delegation to the presidential inauguration in Brazil. In 1931, he became the first Jesuit to earn a doctorate at the Catholic University of America.

Former dean of the Graduate School at Georgetown and professor of Sociology and Social History at Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, this amazing priest is an internationally recognized freedom fighter.

In 1956, shortly after the Hungarian revolt, it was announced Tito would visit the U.S. Father Thorning, believing this was an affront to Cardinal Stepinac being held in a Yugoslav jail, contacted 92 of 96 Senators, asking the invitation be withdrawn. A resulting speech by Senator Kenneth B. Keating deploring the visit evoked such protest that Tito remained in Belgrade.

In his work at St. Joseph's, and his mission churches of Urbana and Point of Rocks, Father Thorning is assisted by Msgr. Don J. Reagan, Catholic University, and Joseph F. Curran, S. J.

The major parish money-maker after the royalties from Father Thorning's books, is the parish picnic held on the third Wednesday of July.

Father Thorning was recently chosen by the citizens of the community as spokesmen in their battle to preserve the historic values of the area. A proposed aluminum plant has optioned 1,400 acres completely surrounding the church's six acres.

Former pastors include the Rt. Rev. Monsignor John H. Eckenrode, Fr. Philip L. Farrell, Fr. William M. Canning, Fr. Michael J. Finnerty, Fr. Thaddeus I. Skrzynski, Fr. J. Gilbert Hann, Fr. Joseph L. Weidenhan, and Fr. John Czyz.

The 110 families of the church were the first parish outside metropolitan Baltimore to meet its quota in pledges to The Cardinal's Campaign.

SOKOL in the United States

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, more than a hundred years ago the Czechs and the Slovaks in this country established the physical education organization called SOKOL. This was done on February 15, 1865, and the aim of its founders was to train and educate the Czechs and the Slovaks in this country in the spirit that had motivated the founders of the parent organization in Prague a few years earlier. In particular the aims and ideals of SOKOL's founders, both in Prague and in the United States, were to educate the Czech and Slovak youth in the spirit of their fighting knights and heroes; that is why physical education and gymnastics have been high in the educational curriculum of SOKOL. Their leaders must have mastered the old idea that a sound mind needs a healthy physique, and then proceeded to develop their program in gymnastics accordingly.

The founding of the first SOKOL in this country was a landmark in the history of Czechoslovak settlements here. As these settlements grew and developed into large communities, in cities like Chicago, Cleveland, and other places, SOKOL became the center of community activities. At first it was something like a Boy Scout movement, except that SOKOL enlisted adults as well, and had its special program of gymnastic training for both men and women. Then, by the turn of the century, it was felt that local community schools in which Czech and Slovak youths were enrolled for the purpose of learning their language and something of their ancestral heritage could be brought under the over-all supervision of SOKOL. This was done quite effectively without ever losing sight of its primary aim of offering gymnastic training to all members.

SOKOL was and still remains a principal organization among the Czechs and Slovaks that keeps alive the Czechoslovak national ideals here, without alienating the loyalty of Czechoslovak youth for their adopted country. SOKOL's activities and accomplishments are widely publicized in the annual affairs held in many communities, and SOKOL festivals have become as well known as some Czechoslovak national holidays. In these festivals the big events consist of parading and gymnastics by highly trained and well-drilled youth and adults, sometimes by the thousands, one of the most spectacular one being that which was held in Madison Square Garden in New York City in 1936.

I wish to state that SOKOL is not just another organization promoting only physical education and gymnastics, though that has been its primary objective. It aims to improve men's and women's whole outlook on life through the training and development of their physical capabilities. Its constructive and invaluable services to Czechoslovak communities here deserve commendation, and I personally extend my wholehearted support to the SOKOL organization.

The U.S. Post Office has honored the American SOKOL's by issuing a special SOKOL centennial stamp in Washington, D.C., on February 15, 1965.

I am proud of the fact that one of the oldest units of the SOKOL organization is located in my congressional district, in Little Ferry, where it has a fine auditorium which is used very extensively to promote the goals of the SOKOL movement.

The Little Ferry organization has been in existence over 70 years, and it still continues to instill the spirit of its objectives into our community.

The SOKOL has a heritage which they pass on to the younger generation, and I feel confident that it will not fail in their endeavors to promote the ideals for which the SOKOL organization was founded.

Philosophy Leads to War, Death

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, while university students across the country are seething in protest against the war in Vietnam, it is encouraging to note that there are others who have not forgotten their debt to their forebearers.

Mrs. John J. Sevick said that her son John would never have picketed against the war, even though he was against war, yet John Francis Sevick dropped out of school to fight in Vietnam to defend others' rights to protest that war. He died defending those rights. I wish to commend the courage and honor the memory of John Francis Sevick by including the following article in the RECORD:

PHILOSOPHY LEADS TO WAR, DEATH

(By James J. Fisher)

Mr. and Mrs. John J. Sevick were at home yesterday at 2746 North Fifty-second street, Kansas City, Kansas.

They read the cards that had come in the morning mail. They received callers and talked. At times, their eyes would mist with tears, but they would shake their heads and go on, listening to the visitors and talking about their son, Lt. John Francis Sevick, 25 years old, who was killed February 1 in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, when mortar fragments struck him.

CRY A LITTLE

"It's hard," said Mrs. Frances Sevick. "We cry a little and then we think of some of the funny things that John did and we laugh. But, even when we're laughing about the memories, we still know he's never coming home again the way we remember him, so skinny and so full of life."

That is the way it was at the Sevick home yesterday—a time for memories, a time both bitter and sweet.

And it was that way at other Greater Kansas City homes where the bodies of young men named McTeer, Smith and Jackson would soon be arriving from Vietnam to be buried. The men were among the almost 700 Americans killed in the last week of fighting.

On the Sevicks' coffee table was a card from Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Smith, the parents of Lt. Kenneth Smith, 6819 Leavenworth road, Kansas City, Kansas. Lieutenant Smith, who was a year younger than Lieutenant Sevick, was killed by mortar fragments January 28. Sevick and Smith had been acquainted and had played basketball together.

NO ONE ALONE

"It seems like everyone who has lost a boy wants you to know you are not alone," said Mrs. Sevick.

Yet, with Lieutenant Sevick, there was a difference.

His parents recall that although their son had been a slender boy, he had also been smart and bullheaded—bullheaded enough to stuff his football pants with stones in order to make the 70-pound football team at Christ the King Catholic elementary school. At the time, he weighed 60 pounds.

"John made excellent grades," said Sevick, who is a combustion engineer at Owens-Corning Fiberglas corporation. "He also made the all-city teams in football and basketball, worked summers, and won a scholarship to Catholic university in Washington. He was just a regular, bright kid with a lot of spunk."

At C. U., John majored in philosophy—both the traditional offerings of Descartes, Spinoza and Kant, and the new philosophy of Teilhardde Chardin and other revolutionary thinkers, whose work propelled the Roman Catholic church into a re-assessment that burst forth as the Second Vatican council—the ecumenical movement within the church.

PHI BETA KAPPA

The youth graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1964 and did graduate work in philosophy at the University of Kansas until mid-1965.

"He'd talk about the students he knew—mostly philosophy students," Mrs. Sevick recalled. "Many of these boys were completely against the war in Vietnam.

"John would listen and argue with them and although he knew war was bad, he decided that it was his duty to serve his country. He dropped cut of school with just six hours to do on his master's degree and enlisted."

An honors man in basic training, Sevick was commisisoned in 1966.

He would come home on leave.

"We'd argue with him," the elder Sevick said. "We didn't want him to go to Vietnam. And then, he'd argue back, even get out the works of those philosophers, not a word of which I understand, to tell us why he was going."

"I guess he could have grown a beard and picketed," said Mrs. Sevick. "But I knew he never would have. He believed in what he was doing."

Suggested Travel Plans for Modern Day Marie Antoinettes—And Its Possible for $10 a Day

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, the Washington Post published a most provocative article entitled "Jet Setters Take Off on Travel Ban." This article reported on an interview with several ladies—or "jet setters," whichever they prefer—and their reactions to proposed travel taxes.

Offering no pretensions of being a historian, I must confess an inability, when reading this article, to resist an analogy to 18th century France. And specifically to the charming Marie Antoinette. Reportedly, upon being informed that the country people had no bread, she replied "Let them eat cake."

While not questioning the right of these ladies to express their opinions and reactions to the travel tax nor their right to travel, one is struck by the caliber of their remarks. Their remarks sound like a modern day version of "Let them eat cake."

To note but a few of the comments:

One said:

> There's nothing to see in this country . . . Its all the same, except for a few big cities. Its all little towns with front porches.

She continued—

> He's not going to curtail me one bit. Or get me to stop drinking French wine, either. I tried to drink American wine and I can't.

Another said:

> My passion is travel. I'd rather do that than anything else. How do you know what is going to be taken away from you next?

One, preparing to leave for Palm Beach, noted:

> It's not that I'm afraid of going abroad, because that's not where the war is.

Still another said:

> I could do what I did during the last war—go to White Sulphur Springs and play golf.

Finally, one queried:

> Where can you go for $10 a day?

Well, for these ladies, I might suggest some alternative travel plans—and believe me, this itinerary not only includes little towns, with little houses and little front porches.

First, I might suggest a visit with some of the 36 million Americans trapped in urban and rural slums—living in substandard, dilapidated, and overcrowded housing. They do not believe that this country is "all the same." Nor do they, living in an environment of rats, refuse, and neglect, believe that all Americans have little "front porches."

Alternatively trips might be arranged to the homes of some of the almost 8 million American citizens depending on public assistance for elemental needs; the 3.5 million children whose parents cannot support them; or the one-third of adult men in ghetto areas who are unemployed and cannot provide decent support for their families.

In those same neighborhoods they might talk with some of the poor, nonwhite Americans whose chances are that they will die 7 years sooner than the average American because of lack of adequate health facilities.

And the shops in these neighborhoods are "quaint"—circa, "Robber Barron" era. They will find markups on goods are extremely high, usually over 100 percent. Or they might just visit with a slum family and wait for the door-to-door salesman to come knocking on the door, offering those "buy-today, pay-tomorrow" bargains.

But such a trip need not be totally depressing. In those same neighborhoods they might meet some of the 4 million older Americans that have received hospital treatment under the medicare program; some of the 200,000 expectant mothers and their infants that have received special medical care in 54 low-income areas; the 2 million children that have been reached through Headstart; the 1.2 million young Americans that have benefited from Neighborhood Youth Corps; the 109,000 young men and women that have completed Job Corps training; or the 18.5 million children now receiving at least one hot meal a day through the school lunch program.

Yes, ladies, there are some things to see in America. Reservations are no problem since the range of choices is quite broad—New York or Los Angeles, Boston or Detroit, St. Louis or Chicago. And believe it or not, it can be seen for less than $10 a day.

So that my colleagues might read this interesting article from the Washington Post I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1968]

"JET SETTERS" TAKE OFF ON TRAVEL BAN

(By Judith Martin)

Not all of Washington's jet setters work for the Government. Therefore, they're not all exempt from the Administration's proposed travel taxes on the grounds that going abroad, when you're a Senator or a Cabinet minister, is United States Government business.

So they don't mind saying how they feel about attempts to curb Americans' foreign travel with a 5 per cent tax on fares and a tax on personal expenditures abroad over $10.

"There's nothing to see in this country," said Mrs. Robert McCormick. "It's all the same, except for a few big cities. It's all little towns with front porches.

"Don't ask me about that man. It's too awful. If he'd bring one division back from Germany, it would pay more than enough.

"He's not going to curtail me one bit. Or get me to stop drinking French wine, either. I tried to drink American wine, and I can't."

Mrs. McCormick, whose daughter lives in England, goes abroad "two or four times a year.

"My hotels never send me bills until I get home, anyway," she said, "so I'm not spending money there. If worse came to worst, I could stay with my daughter."

Rose Saul Zalles spends about half the year traveling. She says she's not going to worry about it yet, but added that "it's just about crushed me.

"My passion is travel. I'd rather do that than anything else. How do you know what's going to be taken away from you next?"

"I'm not going to worry about it now. My compass is set for South America, which is just lucky, because it doesn't count. I'm going to Easter Island for Easter. I'll worry when June rolls around. I'm planning to go to Scotland in June, and to Kashmir. I'll be very much tempted to go anyway."

Mrs. Arthur Gardner Sr. said it wouldn't affect her momentarily as it would "people who have saved. That's why I think the whole thing is so wrong.

"But if we're in terriby bad trouble, I wouldn't go whipping abroad." She has no plans now, but if she does go it will be to England for two or three weeks in the summer.

"It's not that I'm afraid of going abroad, because that's not where the war is," she said. (She left for Palm Beach last night.)

Mrs. Morris Cafritz said it wouldn't affect her because "I never really go anywhere anyway. If I go to Europe for two weeks, that's not worth talking about.

"I'm not particularly travel minded. My life is here. Washington, that's my life.

"I could do what I did during the last war—go to White Sulphur Springs and play golf."

Mrs. Jack Valenti, wife of the director of the Motion Picture Association, is relieved.

"It suits me fine," she said. "I like a little bit of traveling, but it sometimes gets too much for me. I like to keep it down to a week at a time. This will help me out."

Nevertheless, she plans to accompany her husband to England next month for a film command performance. It will be her first chance to meet the Queen.

"Where can you go for $10 a day?" asked Mrs. Sidney Zlotnick. "If you can't have the comfort and luxury you have at home, why go? If I know my husband, he ain't about to share a W.C. with anybody."

If the tax is rejected by Congress, the Zlotnicks will go to North Africa for the summer. If it is passed, they will go to South America.

"South America is nice and cool," said Mrs. Zlotnick. "I'll go Latin this summer."

Then she thought about her feelings and added, "I suppose there's a little patriotism in there, too."

San Jose City Manager A. P. Hamann Retires From City Service

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fantastic growth records of the post-World War II era has been the development of the San Jose metropolitan area and especially the city of San Jose itself. There is no question but that the significant progress in keeping up with the mushrooming population—in facilities, in services, in rational and broadminded planning efforts—has been in large part due to the hardheaded devotion and talent of our city manager, A. P. "Dutch" Hamann.

Dutch Hamann has announced his retirement from 17 years of public service to the city and people of San Jose. We are sorry to see him go—we know his value and he will be sorely missed. But more than this we are grateful for those 17 years he did struggle, and so successfully, with our growing pains. I want to add my own words of sincere tribute and thanks, therefore, to the editorial words of the San Jose Mercury of last Friday, February 9. Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SEVENTEEN YEARS OF SERVICE

San Jose's veteran city manager, A. P. (Dutch) Hamann, will be an exceedingly difficulty man to replace when he retires to private life at the end of this year.

The decision is his, and he has indicated that it is irrevocable. It would take something of a municipal crisis to cause him to change his mind, probably; Hamann is that kind of man.

Indeed, only his overriding devotion to duty has kept him on the job this long; 17 years is a veritable lifetime in the city manager trade, where the tensions between public and private interests are constantly focused on the man in the middle—the manager.

"Dutch" Hamann's 17 years as city manager have encompassed a period of almost unbelievable growth for San Jose. The city numbered barely 95,000 residents in 1950 when Hamann took his oath of office; today the city's population is in excess of 400,000. Under these circumstances it would be necessary to run at top speed just to stand still.

But it is to Hamann's great credit that San Jose has not just stood still. It has made measurable and significant progress in the past 17 years.

Police and fire protection have been extended rapidly and expertly to keep pace with the population growth; major streets and expressways are constanly in a process of upgrading and extension.

The city is involved in a massive sewage treatment program, and Municipal Airport has been developed into the third major air terminal in the Bay Area. It, as everything else about the city, is still growing.

Under Hamann's administration, the city has made significant strides in developing neighborhood parks, a top-notch recreation program and, in recent years, an activities program directed to the needs of the city's senior citizens as well. The St. James Community Center in downtown San Jose, for example, will open later this month.

The Park Center urban redevelopment project is approaching the construction stage, and the city's own contributions to a downtown cultural center are well on the way to realization. The new main library, across from Civic Auditorium, is already under construction.

All of this was planned and forwarded under the administration of City Manager A. P. (Dutch) Hamann.

As impressive as the record is, no one should be deceived into thinking that all of San Jose's problems have been solved. They have not, as "Dutch" Hamann would be the first to point out.

The city will continue to grow, perhaps as explosively as it has in the past 17 years; no one can say for sure. Certainly the growth will be steady and significant. It will continue to be necessary to run at top speed to keep pace with the community's needs.

For this reason, it is imperative that the City Council search diligently and wide for Hamann's successor. He will have to be a man of impressive credentials if the city is to make the most of the base for future growth laid down in the Hamann years.

The new manager should be a man of vision and of considerable experience in public administration. He must be able to work with people, and he must be a man who knows how and when to say "no."

The job pays $35,000 a year. It demands at least that much from any man who tackles it. The Council owes it to the people of San Jose—and to "Dutch" Hamann, for that matter—to ensure that Hamann's successor is the best possible public administrator that can be hired.

Legal Aspects of Forgery in Art

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Florence Perlow Shientag, my constituent and friend, is a well-known lawyer and former judge.

She has examined the legal problems of art forgeries in an intriguing article intitled "Some Legal Aspects of Art and Fake Art" in the winter, 1968 issue of the Women Lawyers Journal.

My colleagues whose tastes include artistic matters, will be interested in this article, which I commend to them, as follows:

SOME LEGAL ASPECTS OF ART AND FAKE ART

(By Florence Perlow Shientag)

Art is big business. Not alone because the Wall Street Journal said so in a lead article on January 3, 1967, not alone because in 1967 large corporations organized a "Business Committee for the Arts", to provide expert counselling service for corporate programs relating to the arts, headed by David Rockefeller, who has collected 500 paintings and sculptures for the Chase Manhattan Bank's headquarters; not only because more living artists and their coterie of dealers have become millionaires as never before in history; not alone because auction sales and news items have excited public attention to astronomical increases in art prices, if not in value, but art is big business because art is in great demand, everybody wants art and buys art, and for a variety of good reasons. Art is an exciting commodity. Possession entitles the old rich and the new rich to fame and visual proof of their success in business and provides tax benefits to boot. Hard-headed businessmen of quickly acquired wealth, such as J. Pierpont Morgan, William Randolph Hearst, Andrew Mellon, Henry Frick and Samuel Kress were the first of the obsessive United States collectors. Art allows the collector of more limited means satisfaction of his inner drive for accumulating, and occasionally the thrill of a bonanza. Art brings aesthetic gratification to the senses, or cultural satisfaction to the mind, or entry into the stream of the civilizing forces of world culture or a combination thereof.

Unlike other valuable commodities such as oil, diamonds and gold, the supply of genuine works of fine art is limited. The diminished supply is partly due to the ever-greater financial resources of museums, whose acquisitions thereafter rarely return to the market for sale. Prices for certain artists or periods fluctuate with the fashion. Painters of the Barbizon School, the early 19th Century and English Victorians are currently not in vogue. French Impressionists, Italian Renaissance and Dutch masterpieces are bringing astronomical prices. For example, a 100-year old Monet, "La Terrasse a Sainte Adresse", purchased by Dr. Pitcairn in 1926 for $11,000, realized $1,400,000 at a sale in Christies' in December, 1967. Monet is alleged to have been paid $80 for this work, now on exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The "Ginevra" by da Vinci was purchased by the National Gallery of Art for a reputed $2,000,000 in 1966. The Aristotle Rembrandt was bought for $2,300,000 by the Metropolitan Museum a couple of years ago. In 1924 Dr. W. H. Valentiner testified in *Youssoupoff v. Widener* (246 N.Y. 174) that he bought a Rembrandt at a New York auction for $500 and the next year sold it for $75,000. In 1966 the New York Times and Life magazine published illustrated stories about two paintings purchased 20 years ago by an art-loving New York lawyer for $400, which have been authenticated as Dürers worth $3,000,000.

Some art dealers employ methods like their counterparts in big business. They are international, with branch offices in several capitals, retain lawyers and accountants on an annual basis and are tax oriented, even to the point of donating to museums or founding them. A few business corporations have admitted to planting "bugging" devices in competitors' plants to spy on their business secrets, and so has at least one well-known art dealer. In the trial *People v. John Broady* in the Court of General Sessions in New York County in 1955 for illegally tapping telephone wires, there was the surprising revelation that a highly regarded New York art gallery hired Broady's telephone tapping services to spy on its competitors. In 1954 the Frick Collection had purchased a Van Eyck painting from the Knoedler Galleries and Dr. Rudolph Heinemann, jointly, for $750,000. Their telephone conversations relating to this sale had been illegally tapped by Broady and the tapes were delivered to their competitor who paid $125. in cash weekly for the illicit tapes. The stakes are high, and so are the risks!

With stakes so high, many forgeries of well-known, marketable artists find their way into private collections and museums. The art world uses the term "forgery" in its popular rather than legal meaning. Technically, forgery relates to a writing or signature; perhaps "faking" would be a more accurate term. Forging and faking of works of art is widespread and intercontinental. There are fakes by copying entire works of well-known artists, or by painting objects or elements typical of an artist and rearranging them, or in sculpture by making casts beyond the authorized number, usually six. Then there are fakes by fictitious attributions, histories and provenances. A painting falsely attributed may have been painted in good faith, a genuine work of its period. The uttering of that work with the attribution or added signature of a well-known artist is the more widespread vice, and according to experts, the more readily detected. Lloyd Goodrich, Director of the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York City, has said that he knew about 600 forgeries of Winslow Homer: that Albert Ryder and Ralph Blakelock were so extensively forged that the fakes out-number the genuine about five and three to one, respectively, and that the victims are not only inexperienced buyers, but leading collectors, dealers and museums.

Generally, important museums in the United States do not have spurious works of art imposed upon them. Museums can insist on provenance and rigid examination. But even their experts have been fooled. Barnett Hollander, an associate in London, is a noted international lawyer and distinguished author, and in his book, "The Law of International Art" he traces the works into several museums of an Italian stone cutter, Alceo Dossena from Cremona, who imitated ancient Greek to Renaissance sculptures in the 1920's. Dossena never copied, he worked "in the manner of", and his works in stone, marble, and wood were of great merit and were sold by two confederates who invented attributions and provenances. Mr. Hollander says among the sales or near-sales by this syndicate to American museums were a sarcophagus as the work of Mino da Fiesole, for $100,000 to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, a Grecian female statue, never put on exhibition; to the Cleveland Museum of fine Arts a Madonna and Child, by "Pisano" in 1925 for $18,000 (which was reimbursed to the Museum by the dealers from whom it was acquired) and the Frick Collection declined to purchase a statue after investigation.

In December 1967, the Metropolitan Museum of New York disclosed it had been duped for forty years in exhibiting a 15-inch high "ancient Greek" horse, considered to be the quintessence of the ancient Greek spirit and reproduced in every book on Greek art. This horse, acquired from a dealer on February 16, 1923, in Paris, was supposed to date from 470 B.C. The horse had been withdrawn from exhibition in 1961 when Joseph Noble of the Museum first suspected the fake on seeing a line down the horse's nose that neither he nor anyone else had noticed before. This was some evidence that the horse was cast in a process that did not exist before the 14th Century. There was additional visual evidence of fake, such as holes in the horse's head for a bridle and other equipment, but the clincher was a gamma ray shadowgraph showing an interior sand core, iron wire and iron points. No provenance had been acquired by the Museum for this fake, since presumably it had been found in the Greek countryside around the date of the purchase. Is it possible that this fake Greek horse was made by the same Alceo Dossena who excelled in this kind of art and whose fakes reached so many museums in the 1920's?

European museums, too, despite staffs of experts have often been duped. For example, the London National Gallery in 1955 admitted it had a fake Virgin and Child with Angel by "Francesco Francia", also a bust of Julius Caesar in that Museum was found to be a fake. The Boymans Museum in Rotterdam bought Christ at Emmaus by "Vermeer" for $174,000. The Berlin Museum in 1909 bought a bust of colored wax of Flora by "Leonardo da Vinci" for $40,000; the Louvre bought a fake "gold Tiara" by Saitapharnes of the 3rd Century B.C.

Occasionally, a museum curator vigorously defends his opinion and refuses to believe evidence he was duped. After Wilhelm Bode of the Berlin Museum acquired the alleged Flora by da Vinci, the son of the sculptor who made the fake came forward with a photograph of himself and the statue. Pages from the London Times were attached to the base, a hole was cut in the bust with a hot wire, and a Victorian quilt was found as stuffing in the core, but Bode was not convinced until the wax was found not to be beeswax, the medium of da Vinci's time. There was resistance, too, to the disclosures of the fake Vermeers, until Hans Van Meegeren, in jail for having traded with the enemy, Field Marshal Hermann Goering, (who in 1943 purchased a Van Meegeren Vermeer for $495,000) reproduced a Vermeer from materials supplied to him in jail. Hofstede de Groot expertised a forged Franz Hals and staked his reputation thereon. So, too, the Louvre defended its "Tiara", until the maker, one Rouchomowsky, took gold metal and produced another ancient work of art. He was never prosecuted.

Because of the high stakes, traffickers in art frauds are willing to assume the risk of detection, and unfortunately, successful prosecution against members of such rings have been rare. In the United States criminal sanctions have rarely been imposed. Forgery of art as such is not a distinct, separate crime in the Federal statutes nor in State penal codes. Prosecution in the Federal Courts may be under the mail fraud statutes, in the State courts for larceny by false pretenses or fraud.

There is a pending indictment in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against a ring charged to have flooded the market with fake Jackson Pollacks, Franz Klines and other American artists. Prosecution of art frauds presents problems. There is not much sympathy for the victim because the average man regards it as ridiculous for the victim to have paid inflated sums; there is more sympathy for the artist, not there to benefit. Often the victim is loathe to co-operate in a prosecution, since by doing so he labels himself as a dupe and his work of art as worthless for resale or gift. Moreover, the free interstate or international movement of art objects pose jurisdictional problems. In a criminal case the Government has the burden of establishing every element of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. Expert testimony in the art field is often contradictory. Moreover, art experts are loathe to give disparaging and forthright opinions for fear of being thereafter subjected to a law suit for slander of property.

Sensitive to outraged public feeling against wide-spread faking of works of art, the Attorney General of New York, Louis Lefkowitz, held hearings resulting in 1966 legislation (General Business Law, Secs. 220, et seq.). The law covers the artist's rights in respect of his dealer and to unauthorized reproduction (droit moral). The New York law also seeks to protect the purchaser and provides that a written agreement, identifying the work of fine art with a certain authorship, is deemed an express warranty of its genuineness, unless a contrary intention is expressed and conspicuously stated on the face of the writing. It is true that the Uniform Commercial Code (b) § 2-313(1)(a) covers works of art and in providing that any affirmation of fact made by the seller to the buyer creates an express warranty, suit could be predicted on the Uniform Commercial Code. While some maintain that the New York law is really a duplication, nonetheless, New York is in the forefront in moving toward codified protection of the artist and of the buyer. Although the New York laws will be corrected and amended in the 1968 session of the Legislature, the leadership of New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, himself a noted art collector, lecturer and connoisseur, his Attorney General and the Legislature, to spell out penal and protective legislation in this field, is commendable.

To encourage art experts to give opinions for would-be buyers, to the Internal Revenue Service and others, the proposed New York legislation provides that a disparaging statement as to a work of fine art offered for sale is presumed to be made in good faith and without malice, though false, if made to a private party, thus granting a qualified privilege. If made to a governmental agency or in a trial or if made by a museum, university or its employees, there would be absolute privilege even if malice exists. While the purpose is to give experts new freedom to disparage, the principles of this legislation are already embodied in the common law, and some claim it is not necessary.

The body of law that now exists protects the authenticist, but the new New York legislation will codify the principles. To review the present law: few recorded cases deal specifically with works of art and slander of property, but the cases as to opinion given in mercantile transactions are relevant. Slander of property is the ancient common law action on the case for special damages resulting from the falsity. There is no recovery for negligent conduct; there must be proof of wrongful intent or malice. In the situation of a counsel, party or witness giving testimony in a judicial proceeding there is absolute privilege so long as his testimony is material. *Rusiciano v. Mihalyfi* 165 Misc. 939 (1935). In the situation where the owner of the work of art requests an opinion, and the authenticist disparages the work as not genuine, the art expert's statements are privileged because the party claiming injury is barred by his request and consent. In the situation where a prospective purchaser requests the opinion of the art expert and the latter's disparaging statements prevent the sale, there is a qualified privilege and the would-be vendor has no action against the art expert unless the vendor can prove the art expert's statements are false, and also that the opinion was motivated by ill-will and malice. In the case of a gratuitous statement made by an art dealer on his own volition or at the request of a person with no economic interest in the work of art, the art expert has no privilege and may be sued for slander of property. In New York the plaintiff must prove that the statements were false, that they were made with intent to injure or in malice, with knowledge of the falsity or reckless disregard for the truth. This latter situation, gratuitous opinion, was the basis for the celebrated case of *Hahn v. Duveen*, 133 Misc. 81 (Sup. Ct. NY Co., 1929). Mrs. Hahn claimed that Duveen slandered her "La Belle Ferroniere," which Mrs. Hahn had purchased as a Leonardo da Vinci. Joseph Duveen, who had not seen the painting, commented to a reporter that the Hahn painting was a fake and that the original was in the Louvre. There was a lengthy trial resulting in a disagreement, but the charge to the jury indicated that Duveen would be subject to liability only if he were motivated by malice and gave a dishonest or reckless opinion with knowledge of the facts. The case was later settled. Parenthetically, in the course of the *Hahn v. Duveen* trial, several interesting facts as to experts appeared. For example, Bernard Berenson was Duveen's witness. Berenson changed his opinion as to the Louvre painting several times in the course of the trial and contradicted himself. In the course of Duveen's examination, he disclosed that he had paid Berenson 10% on the selling price of all paintings which Berenson had authenticated. This was tantamount to a 10% partnership on those works he certified as genuine, and it did not appear that this was ever disclosed to the buyers.

Is the proposed immunity grant necessary? Ralph F. Colin, Vice President of the Museum of Modern Art, lawyer, eminent art collector and counsel and Administrative Vice President of the respected Art Dealers' Association of America, says that art experts should not be treated differently from experts in, say, diamonds, that art dealers do not want favored treatment under the law and do not need immunity. Others argue that this immunity may open the door to abuses by employees of second-rate museums and serious economic frauds may arise. However, all man-made law can be misapplied. All we can expect is, that this well purposed attempt to protect the artist, the buying public and the art dealer from fakes and frauds will aid in restricting art fakes.

How does the expert recognize a fake? He starts from the accepted body of genuine works of the artist, recorded or acquired directly from the artist or his dealer. This is direct evidence and is not dependent upon opinion, but permits a basis for comparison whereby undocumented works can be judged. Then there is deductive reasoning; to the expert, the age of an artist at the time of his death and his life history are some clue. Style reveals much. The true work of art grows through various stages towards its final form. Where the original artist builds up his picture in underpainting, the forger tends to paint directly, disregarding the understructure. The forger proceeds from the final results, so that the forgery is only a facade. A fake painting lacks organic unity and balance and there is a discrepancy between the copied forms and the content or function.

One reason that experts are deceived is that the fake work corresponds to contemporary tendencies in style adopted by the viewer as the period of the faked masterpiece. After 15 or 20 years a discrepancy usually becomes apparent. It has been said that it is impossible for a man to escape from the historical laws which act upon him. Thus, a forger's concept of a work of art to be imitated corresponds with our own conception of the artist. The expert who falls victim to a contemporary fake is convinced of what he sees.

Dealers of unquestioned integrity have innocently sold works of art and experts have accepted them as genuine because the past ownership thereof was clothed with apparent verity. Sometimes a fake is planted in the home of a person whose ownership of a genuine work would be expected and normal, such as relatives of the artist or of the subject. Of course, if there were an intentional misrepresentation of provenance, the buyer could rescind and the statute of limitations runs from the time of the discovery of the fraud, which in the United States is ten years, in England five years and in France, thirty years. Damages for fraud also lie. But almost invariably a reputable dealer will go to great lengths to protect his buyer and make him whole without lawsuit.

Just as qualified individuals hesitate to give forthright opinions, for fear of a law suit, so museums also have been reluctant to give opinions. Since they are the chief source for authentication, with expert staffs and laboratory equipment for that purpose, their knowledge must be made available to the public. At a Seminar on Art Forgeries held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in December 1967, Dudley T. Easby, Jr., Secretary of the Metropolitan Museum, Ernest Fiedler, Secretary of the National Gallery of Art, David Solinger, President of the Whitney Museum and R. H. Koch of the Museum of Modern Art, lawyers all, and protective of their institutions agreed their museums do not encourage submissions for authenticity or valuation. Their position is that the Museum and its staff should avoid the distraction of defending a lawsuit, even though there is slight doubt but that the expert or museum could not be held liable in damages. Moreover, if an opinion is given, the Museum requires the owner of the art object to sign a waiver or disclaimer. Since it is the function of the museum to educate and to advance culture, and authentication, is in furtherance of those functions, and with the added protection of the codified immunity provisions, New York museums can be expected to enlarge this service and give expert opinions.

In sum, experts in art are fallible as are other experts. The business or profession of art will always attract fakers, as other businesses do when the stakes are high. Protective laws cannot cover every situation and there are loopholes in every law. The best course for a collector of art to follow is the same course he would adopt in his own business or in buying stocks or real estate, and that is, investigate, deal with people of good reputation and above all, don't expect something for nothing. Experienced confidence men never waste their time on a man who has no cupidity; when they meet a man who does not want to take advantage of his fellow man, they know he cannot be sold fake art.

The 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating a once-realized, now unfulfilled dream—a dream of independence. The people of Lithuania declared their independence 50 years ago, on February 16, 1918. That declaration marked the end of over a century of Russian domination and 3 years of German occupation. The Lithuanian people had long strived for the day when they could decide their own destiny and join with other nations in planning the future of the world.

During the Middle Ages, Lithuania was a powerful and independent state. Ironically, it was the Lithuanians who helped protect the peoples in what is today known as the Soviet Union from the continuous drive of the Germans. And, too, they became a forceful boundary, protecting Western Europe from the attacks of the Mongols and the Tartars.

In our own century, Mr. Speaker, an independent Lithuania, perpetrating a deeply rooted democratic tradition, took great strides in securing personal liberty for all of her citizens. Elections were held and a constitution that accorded freedom of speech, of assembly, of religion, and of communication, was adopted.

The hard-earned independence of these strong people was tragically short lived. The Red Army of the Soviet Union marched into the sovereign territory of Lithuania and in 1940 proclaimed this nation as its own. It is unfortunate that a people with a strong democratic heritage must now suffer under the domination of a regime that has smothered, but not extinguished a cultural imagination and a historical sense of freedom.

The American Flag: What It Means to Me

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of presenting an American flag, flown over the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., to Miss Elizabeth Betsy Garrett of Monett, Mo. Betsy was awared first prize for essay writing in a contest sponsored by the Dogwood Council of Girl Scouts of America. She is a ninth grade student at Monett High School and I believe her essay, which I insert at this point in the RECORD, illustrates the spirit of patriotism and pride of country which still abounds in the vast majority of young Americans today:

THE AMERICAN FLAG: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Betsy Garrett)

The loud bands and beautiful floats formed a splendid sight as the parade continued on its way. Amid the joy and gaiety, none noticed the passing of the American flag. Instead the bystanders craned their necks in an attempt to see what was coming next. But wait! There on a street corner, an old man sees the flag and instantly removes his hat. He gazes at the flag as tears trickle slowly down his cheeks. After the flag had passed out of sight, the old man put his hat on and turned to go home. Nothing in the whole parade could measure up to the intense pride and love he had felt when he saw his flag.

And it is his flag as it is the flag of every American citizen. Only to this man, his flag was something more than a scrap of cloth. He had fought under this flag and his son, whom he missed greatly, had died defending it.

I was standing near that old man, the morning of the parade, and his actions had set me to thinking. What does my flag really mean to me? My flag is a memorial to those countless men who have fought and even died for it. It reminds me of how lucky I am to live in a democracy. When I see my flag flying proudly atop some flagpole, my heart rejoices, for I also see a free country that is challenged daily in its work. A country that emerges victorious as it overcomes its obstacles and climbs ever nearer its goal of peace and brotherhood.

The next time you say the Pledge of Allegiance, think carefully about the words you are saying. I'm proud of my flag and of the fact that I am an American. Are you?

A Summary of the New Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Law in California

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the State Legislature of California in 1967 passed a law designed to give some relief to senior citizens for whom the property taxes on their homes are an ever-growing burden.

Because of the widespread interest in this problem, it is my desire to share with my colleagues a brief description of the law and how it is to be administered in California.

A SUMMARY OF THE NEW SENIOR CITIZENS PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE LAW IN CALIFORNIA

On July 29, 1967, the California State Legislature enacted a Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Law to provide property tax relief to certain residents of California who are 65 years of age or over. The new law provides that any qualified person may apply for a refund of a portion of the property taxes paid on his home.

DO YOU QUALIFY?

To qualify, an individual must meet *each* of the following requirements:

Must be 65 years of age or older as of January 1, 1968

Must be a resident of California as of January 1, 1968

Must have owned and occupied his home between July 1, 1967, and June 30, 1968

Must have paid the property taxes assessed on the home for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968

Must have a household income not in excess of $3,350 for the 1967 calendar year (January 1, 1967, to December 31, 1967).

WHO MAY FILE A CLAIM

Only one member of each household may file a claim. If more than one person in a household qualifies, such as both husband and wife, they must decide which one will file the claim. Only one claim may be filed for each individual home.

WHAT TO DO AND WHEN

If you meet all of the above qualifications, you should file a Property Tax Assistance claim with the Property Tax Assistance Division between May 16, 1968, and August 31, 1968. No claims may be filed prior to May 16, 1968, or after August 31, 1968.

Claim forms will be made generally available after April 15, 1968, or can be obtained at: Franchise Tax Board Office, 345 Larkin Street, San Francisco.

Claims Must be Filed Between May 16, 1968 and August 31, 1968.

WHAT DOES HOUSEHOLD INCOME INCLUDE

Household income includes all income received during calendar year 1967 by all members of the household. It includes almost all cash received, such as wages, salaries, bonuses, tips, the gross amount of any pension or annuity, social security payments, disability payments, railroad retirement benefits, cash public assistance and relief payments, life insurance benefits and proceeds, interest and realized capital gains.

AMOUNT OF PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE

The amount of property tax assistance will be a percentage of the property taxes paid by the claimant. The percentage is determined by the amount of household income. No claim for $5.00 or less will be allowed.

Property taxes paid means only those taxes assessed on the first $5,000 of assessed value of the homestead, and currently paid. The homestead cannot include more than one acre of land surrounding the home. Property taxes do not include special assessments, such as improvement bonds; interest or penalties; and charges for services such as weed burning.

HOW TO COMPUTE YOUR ASSISTANCE

An example of how to compute your assistance follows:

1. Total household income	$1, 575
2. Percentage of assistance available, from schedule below based upon household income (percent)	72
3. Amount of property taxes paid	$250
4. Amount of assistance, multiply the percent at line 2, times the amount of property taxes at 3 line	$180

If the claimant or any member of the household received a public assistance grant which contained specific allowances for property tax obligations, the property tax assistance payable will be reduced by the amount of the allowance for property tax obligations received during the fiscal year for which the assistance is claimed.

PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE SCHEDULE

Find your household income in Column 1 and the percentage of assistance will be shown in Column 2.

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 1	Col. 2
1, 000	95	1, 400	79	1, 800	63	2, 200	47	2, 600	31	3, 000	15
1, 025	94	1, 425	78	1, 825	62	2, 225	46	2, 625	30	3, 025	14
1, 050	93	1, 450	77	1, 850	61	2, 250	45	2, 650	29	3, 050	13
1, 075	92	1, 475	76	1, 875	60	2, 275	44	2, 675	28	3, 075	12
1, 100	91	1, 500	75	1, 900	59	2, 300	43	2, 700	27	3, 100	11
1, 125	90	1, 525	74	1, 925	58	2, 325	42	2, 725	26	3, 125	10
1, 150	89	1, 550	73	1, 950	57	2, 350	41	2, 750	25	3, 150	9
1, 175	88	1, 575	72	1, 975	56	2, 375	40	2, 775	24	3, 175	8
1, 200	87	1, 600	71	2, 000	55	2, 400	39	2, 800	23	3, 200	7
1, 225	86	1, 625	70	2, 025	54	2, 425	38	2, 825	22	3, 225	6
1, 250	85	1, 650	69	2, 050	53	2, 450	37	2, 850	21	3, 250	5
1, 275	84	1, 675	68	2, 075	52	2, 475	36	2, 875	20	3, 275	4
1, 300	83	1, 700	67	2, 100	51	2, 500	35	2, 900	19	3, 300	3
1, 325	82	1, 725	66	2, 125	50	2, 525	34	2, 925	18	3, 325	2
1, 350	81	1, 750	65	2, 150	49	2, 550	33	2, 950	17	3, 350	1
1, 375	80	1, 775	64	2, 175	48	2, 575	32	2, 975	16		

WHEN WILL THE REFUNDS BE MADE

Refund warrants will be processed and mailed beginning July 1 of each year and most will be completed by November 30 of each year. No refunds can be made prior to July.

Anniversary of The Gambia Independence

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 3 years ago today, the distinguished Prime Minister of The Gambia, Sir Dawda K. Jawara, heading the Government of Britain's oldest and smallest West African possession, received the instruments of sovereignty from the hands of the Duke of Kent representing Queen Elizabeth II, and thus assumed responsibility for his country's destiny.

The anniversary celebrated in Bathurst yesterday is a significant milestone for The Gambia's 340,000 people. Fully independent members of the Commonwealth of Nations, they have maintained close and productive bonds with Britain, and have established warm relations with the United States.

Keenly aware of the community of interests which links The Gambia with surrounding Senegal, the Governments at Bathurst and Dakar are committed to cooperate freely and to their mutual benefit in foreign affairs and defense.

Desiring to work in sovereign equality with other nations toward a world ruled by the principles set forth in the U.N. Charter, The Gambia has become an active member of the United Nations.

The United States has long enjoyed friendly relations with the Government and people of The Gambia.

It was there that President Roosevelt first set foot on African soil in 1943 while traveling to the Casablanca Conference. Some of our men served there during World War II, and young American Peace Corps volunteers are there today helping Gambians to promote their own development.

On this third anniversary of a small and democratic peoples independence, we in America offer them and their Government our congratulations for their achievements, and our warm good wishes for the future.

I recall fondly that afternoon in the fall of 1965, when as a delegate to the 20th session of the United Nations General Assembly, I watched as the flag of Gambia was raised in the presence of Prime Minister Jawara and Gambia took her proud place as a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

Red Monolith Changed, but Aims Are Same

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the failure to properly understand the continued efforts of the Communists to achieve their goal of world domination is reflected in a great deal of the debate in the United States over the collapse of foreign policy.

The Copley Press international news authority, Dimitru Danielopol, treats this subject in a very penetrating fashion in the following article which appeared in the February 2 edition of the Joliet, Ill., Hearld News:

RED MONOLITH CHANGED, BUT AIMS ARE SAME

(By Dimitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Why do so many influential Americans leap to the conclusion that communism is no longer dangerous just because Moscow no longer pulls every string on every Red marionette?

Certainly the Sino-Soviet split has forced Moscow to face the possibility of nationalist conflict inside the Communist bloc. The feuds between Moscow and Peking are far older than the Communist manifesto.

The satellites' efforts to protect their national identity recall old European hatreds and suspicions.

But these frictions do not change one overwhelming fact:

Communism is a sworn enemy of our way of life, our system of government. When a Khruschev threatens to "bury" us and a Lin Piao talks of worldwide class war against Western Europe and the United States, they are deadly earnest.

It's what they've been taught. It's what they believe. Peace, detente, coexistance are only weapons to be used until more aggressive methods are practical.

Moscow may no longer dictate every move made by her satellites in Europe, but since the Hungarian revolution and the nuclear stand-off, she no longer has to worry about American intervention on the side of "freedom fighters."

The Kremlin still controls the Warsaw Pact and all the Communist military power outside China.

And does anyone really think that Peking would turn against Moscow in a confrontation with the West?

It's far easier to imagine the two major Communist capitals making a new "marriage of convenience" against us.

Theodore C. Sorensen, former special counsel to President Kennedy, wrote from Red Bucharest recently that the terms "international communism" and "Communist bloc" are being misused to justify our course in Vietnam.

Romania "carved out a policy of independence from Moscow . . ." Sorensen said.

How much is true and how much is wishful thinking?

What if Romania used this "independence" to declare its neutrality in Vietnam or to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact?

Sorensen doesn't say, but one Romanian diplomat in Washington answers the question:

"The Russians would do to us what they did to Hungary in 1956."

Another point: what does the so-called "fragmentation" of the monolith mean to Communist aims to conquer the world?

"Our foreign policy is socialist and consistently revolutionary in its entire content," said Leonid I. Brezhnev, secretary general of the Communist party of the U.S.S.R. in his 50th anniversary speech last October.

"International reaction headed by U.S. imperialism had misled the peoples and knocked together NATO, SEATO and other military blocs.

"By creating these blocs they intended to encircle us, and thus prevent the consolidation of the world socialist system and the development of national liberation revolution of the oppressed peoples. . . . The position of socialism and its allies are strengthening from day to day . . ."

Does this sound like a renunciation of world conquest?

Do events in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East support such a view?

And closer to home—in Cuba—the slogan at the recent International Culture Congress was "Intellectuals of the world unite against the United States."

"North American imperialism is today the blood-stained representative of oppression, misery, economic backwardness and cultural genicide," said the Havana declaration ". . . revolutionary change . . . can only be achieved through armed struggle and revolutionary violence."

Still closer—right here in Washington—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned in his annual reports that Communists are deeply involved in many anti-Vietnam demonstrations and helped plan some of them.

At the United Nations in New York, Secretary-General U Thant says: "I have seen more crises and greater international tension in the past 12 months than I can recall at any time during the 11 years I have spent and been with the U.N.

Who is fomenting almost everyone of these crises?

Perhaps the Stalin-style monolith is gone, but the power and ambition to destroy us is still real.

Relief for Victims of Disaster in Italy

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have all been disturbed by the plight of the unfortunate people who have been left homeless by the recent earthquakes in Italy, and many of us have filed legislation which would enable thousands of these refugees to immigrate to the United States.

The Honorable Alfred Vellucci, presently a member of the City Council of Cambridge, an active and dedicated participant in the political life of Cambridge, has sponsored a resolution in the city council, expressing that body's support of the proposed legislation.

Councilor Vellucci has served as a member of the School Committee of Cambridge and has, throughout his career, been known as a champion of the downtrodden. The following resolution, which I am happy to include in the RECORD, is another example of his support of humanitarian causes, both at home and abroad:

Whereas: The disaster caused by the recent earthquakes in Italy has aroused the sympathy of millions throughout the world and prompted several of our Representatives in Congress to introduce legislation which, when enacted into law, would enable thousands of these homeless refugees to immigrate to the United States and rebuild their shattered lives; and

Whereas: This City Council is deeply interested in the alleviation of the sufferings of these unfortunate people and is in favor of any legislation which Congress may enact to give them an opportunity to start a new life within these United States, therefore be it

Resolved: That this City Council go on record endorsing the proposed legislation, and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators in Congress and to our Representatives in Congress urging them to vote in favor of the proposed legislation.

In City Council February 12, 1968.

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Attest:

THOMAS M. MCNAMARA,
City Clerk.

A true copy,
Attest:

THOMAS M. MCNAMARA,
City Clerk.

Three State Soldiers, Two Marines Killed in Vietnam Last Week

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. James D. Youngham, Sgt. Roy T. O'Keefe, Sfc. Ronnie R. Roush, Marine S. Sgt. Paul D. Tinson, and Marine L. Cpt. Arthur W. Lamorte, five young men from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I commend the courage of these young men and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE STATE SOLDIERS, TWO MARINES KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

Five Maryland men, three soldiers and two marines, were killed in Vietnam last week, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The men were identified as:

Cpl. James D. Youngham, son of Mrs. Herman R. Hintze, of Shoreland drive, Point Pleasant, Anne Arundel county.

Sgt. Roy T. O'Keefe, husband of Mrs. Michele B. O'Keefe, of 10117 Phoebe lane, Adelphi, Md.

Sgt. 1st Class Ronnie R. Roush, husband of Mrs. Winnie M. Roush 13153, Larchdale road, Laurel.

Marine S. Sgt. Paul D. Tinson, son of Mrs. Mary C. Tinson, of 2136 East Federal street, Baltimore.

Marine Lance Cpl. Arthur W. Lamorte, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. LaMorte, of 977 Hamilton place, White Marsh.

Corporal Youngham, 19, was killed last week, but his mother said last night she did not know the day or where he had been stationed. He was a paratrooper with just five weeks left in Vietnam.

"He never told me where he was," Mrs. Hintze, his mother, said. "He always wrote that things were fine and perfect and for me not to worry.

"But the chaplain who came here about his death said that he had been in constant combat from the time he went to Vietnam," she said.

Corporal Youngham had enlisted in the Army at the age of 17, about 1½ years ago. He left Glen Burnie High School in the midst of his senior year to enlist, Mrs. Hintze said.

WANTED ARMY CAREER

"He wanted to make a career of the Army and he wanted to volunteer for another year in Vietnam," she said.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his six brothers, Camillo, Louis, Gordon, William, Ronald and Patrick Youngham; a half-sister, Tina Hintze; his stepfather, Herman R. Hintze and his father, William L. Youngham, of Baltimore.

Sergeant Roush, 35, had volunteered for two extensions of duty in South Vietnam and had been there for the last twenty months, members of his family said yesterday.

A native of Pennsylvania who had made the Army his career, Sergeant Roush had been assigned to Fort Belvoir, Va., for about a year before he left for Vietnam. Previously, he had been assigned to Fort Meade.

DIED JANUARY 31

His family was notified Saturday that he was missing in action. A telegram Sunday stated he had died January 31 of wounds received from hostile enemy action, but failed to say where he had been killed, his children said.

Mrs. Winnie M. Roush, and five children, Pamela Compston, 17; James Compston, 15; Mark Compston, 11; Ronnie Rouse, Jr., 5, and Claire Roush, 18 months.

Staff Sergeant Tinson, 23 was a career marine who had been in Vietnam since May, his mother said yesterday.

VOLUNTEERED FOR VIET DUTY

Mrs. Tinson said her son, a 1962 graduate of City College, enlisted shortly after graduation and had voluteered for duty in Vietnam.

She said Sargeant Tinson died of wounds in the head and body received at Thun Thin, South Vietnam, but she did not know what day he had been killed. He had been a drill instructor at Parris Island, S.C., for two years before going to Vietnam.

Besides his mother, Sergeant Tinson is survived by two sisters, Mrs. Arletta Garnett and Mrs. Phyllis Witfall, and a brother, Lawrence R. Tinson, Jr., all of Baltimore.

PERRY HALL GRADUATE

Lance Corporal LaMorte, 19, also had volunteered for duty in Vietnam and intended to make the Marines his career, his mother said yesterday.

Mrs. LaMorte said her son, a 1966 graduate of Perry Hall Senior High School, was killed Thursday in the vicinity of Da Nang, South Vietnam. He had also been wounded in November, she said, and had only returned to his company January 7.

Corporal LaMorte ** * * had volunteered to return for another tour of duty there after his present one was complete in mid-March, Mrs. LaMorte said.

WITH CIVIL ACTION TEAM

She explained that her son was assigned to a Marine civil action team living in a Vietnamese village and wanted to continue working with the people there because "he thought that's where the battle was really being fought—helping them."

A former member of the Cowenton Volunteer fire company in Baltimore county, Corporal LaMorte hoped eventually to return to Parris Island as a drill instructor, his mother said.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a sister, Star LaMorte, and a brother, Brian LaMorte, both living at home.

Statement of Sherry Gale Johnston

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine statement by a young lady who is a student at Choctawhatchee High School at Fort Walton Beach, Fla. She is Sherry Gale Johnston and she is a candidate for State president-elect of the Future Homemakers of America. Her article, which appeared in the Playground News of February 11, 1968, follows:

Family environment is the most important influence in a person's way of life.

People of this and all other communities should give a moment of their busy day to family appreciation and meditation.

All families have their conflicts, complications compounded by both parent and child due, in most cases, to a lack of communication in the home.

Conversation between parent and child is an important factor in communication in the home but it is merely one facet in the complexity of family communication and successful relationship.

In addition there must be patience, understanding, love, trust and respect which, after all, is the master key to successful family relationship. From a teenager's viewpoint this is especially true.

Many parents demand respect and yet they give none to the teenagers, never acknowledge any of his achievements or give credit when it is due.

Parents, ask yourselves how many times you compliment or tell your child you love him? These and similar questions recently were answered when the writer conducted a survey of parents.

Most said they didn't compliment very often, and even though they did love their children, they did not show it as often as they should.

I would like the public to have an awarenes of the relationships and how the lack of communication in the home does affect the teenager, their entire outlook of life.

I am also conducting a survey through Jr. and Sr. High Schools. Through this survey I have received many interesting answers.

The chief function of our families is the development of strong, sturdy, wholesome persons, capable of withstanding the stresses and strains of modern life, and able to make constructive contributions to their times. This is imperative if our democracy is to survive. No other institution can fulfill this function as can the family.

A democracy rests upon its faith in the individual. Families are in the best position to encourage and develop individual growth. They can encourage personal talents and provide the opportunity for special aptitudes, and accept individual differences.

A father can don an apron without losing his masculinity. The mother may work at those things that are best for her and her family, without being bound to custom. A boy may paint and not be a sissy, just as a girl may play ball and not become a tomboy.

Respect for personality is the answer to the successful functioning of a family. The family is the security for its members. It is their place of refuge to which they can retreat from the stresses of the day.

Home is where a person can be natural and his experiences and his feelings pour out in the presence of people who care. It is the home where problems are discussed, troubles aired and confusions cleared.

As the family interprets life situations and encourages its members in them, personal security is assured. You belong to your family more than to any other group. No matter what you do, you are still theirs, and they of the family are yours.

Don't always wait for holidays to do something kind or say something nice to a member of your family. Some people would show kindness and respect to a perfect stranger and yet, at home, they show no respect for the parents that love them, or they are in constant conflict with a brother or sister.

Good family relationship is the way to develop personalities that preserve our democracy and the high standard in our American way of life.

So with just a little effort, please try to be more considerate of each member of your very own family. Remember, and let it be your slogan, too, "Good family relationship thru communications".

Mrs. Frances Clark Handler, an Eloquent Spokesman for National Poetry Day

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Dade County, Fla., are most fortunate to have in the community a dedicated woman furthering the cause of poetry in this country, as well as the world.

Mrs. Frances Clark Handler, daughter of the original founder of the National Poetry Day Committee, Inc., is also president of the Florida State Poetry Society, Inc., and resides in my district of Miami. She has been a dedicated and diligent worker, and has continued to seek enactment of my House Joint Resolution 200, to establish a National Poetry Day.

Mrs. Handler was recently honored by the President's Council on Youth Opportunities, and was awarded a certificate for her participation and that of her society's in helping young Americans. She also received a Greatness and Leadership Award from the Philippine Association of Doctors in Law, International Academy of Leadership, and United Poets Laureate International. This distinguished group made Mrs. Handler an honorary poet laureate and cited her as world champion of the poetry day movement.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include these two citations at this point in the RECORD following my remarks. I am sure all those who read this RECORD will be most interested in Mrs. Handler's recent achievements.

The citations follow:

President's Council on Youth Opportunity awarded in grateful recognition to Florida State Poetry Society, Inc., whose participation in the 1967 Youth Opportunity Campaign advanced the welfare of the Nation by helping young Americans help themselves.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States, Chairman.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States.

UNITED NATIONS DAY, PHILIPPINES, 1967

Philippine Association of Doctors in Law (PADIL), International Academy of Leadership (IAL), United Poets Laureate International (UPLI), Greatness and Leadership Award, Frances Clark Handler, honorary poet laureate and world champion of the Poetry Day movement, outstanding and dedicated envoy for universal peace, goodwill and understanding.

For sincere adherence and loyal dedication to the United Nations ideals of world peace and security, universal brotherhood and mutual respect, friendly relations and understanding, international cooperation and assistance, the rule of law and justice, self-determination and equality, fundamental freedoms and other basic human rights among men and nations without distinction.

Given in connection with the 1967 "United Nations Day" Philippine National Celebration featuring the UN Day World Brotherhood Congress (UNDWBC), UN Youth Congress of the World (UNYCOW), UN Day "Pathway to Greatness" Literary-Cultural Exhibits, UN Memorial and Dedicatory Marker, UN Day Cultural Session and Presentation of National and International Awards of Honor, sponsored by the above-named entities, held at the University of Manila, City of Manila, Republic of the Philippines, on October 24, 1967.

Quezon City, Philippines, October 24, 1967.

Dr. ORLANDO A. VARILLA,
Executive Vice President, IAL, AIM & PIPO; Vice-Chairman, 1967 UN Day National Celebration and World Brotherhood Congress; and Chairman for Operations, Board of Trustees, UNYCOW.

Dr. AMADO M. YUZON,
President, United Poets Laureate International (UFLI), Member, Exec. Com., 1967 UN Day National Celebration, Chairman for General Affairs, Board of Trustees, UNYCOW.

Dr. DOMINADOR S. LA MADRID,
President, Philippine Association of Doctors in Law (PADIL); International Academy of Leadership (IAL) and Affiliates; Chairman, 1967 UN Day National Celebration, Executive Committee and World Brotherhood Congress; General Chairman, Board of Trustees, UN Youth Congress of the World (UNYCOW).

FLORIDA STATE POETRY SOCIETY, INC., WITH FEBRUARY MUSELETTER, 1968

This poem was inspired by a rock castle which is near Miami, Florida and which was built by a lover for his sweetheart—thinking this would be a fitting home for her. She refused him and never lived in this stone castle—but the lover made his home where his heart was. The six ton rock mentioned in the poem was cut into the shape of a Valentine Heart and is inscribed with: "Will you be mine?" This poem appeared in one of my early books of poetry (now out of print) and has been requested so many times around Valentine's Day that I thought all members would like to see it.

FRANCES CLARK HANDLER.

BE MY LOVE

Valentine's Day is a heartbeat away—
The one day to say, I Love You.
Get your thoughts ready, prosaic or heady,
Others have done it—why not you?

Thousands of roses for Josephine,
Though Nappy said, "Not tonight."
And whole villages on the Volga,
Were Catherine The Great's lovely plight.

The Taj Mahal and the Hanging Gardens,
Were given by lovers of old,
And Diamond Jim Brady to his Lillian,
Presented a "bike" of pure gold.

One of the largest of all is the six ton rock
shaped into a Valentine,
And though he was jilted,
His love has not wilted—

For the rock still says, "Will you be mine?"

The Case Against Busing

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted the following statement to the Chicago Board of Education regarding the current busing controversy in that city.

The statement follows:

The present controversy in Chicago over the busing of school children was put into proper perspective recently by Mrs. Wendell Green, a member of the School Board, who said: "Dr. James Redmond has proposed the busing idea in order to stabilize Chicago's communities, but the last few days clearly indicate that his suggestion is the most disruptive force to hit Chicago in recent years."

I believe Mrs. Green's statement deserves more than just passing attention.

Dr. Redmond's proposal to initially bus only 1,035 children from the overcrowded May and Spencer schools on Chicago's West side to a group of Northwest and Southeast side schools, has brought strong resistance from residents in the areas of the proposed "receiving" schools.

They contend that because no plans have been made for supportive teaching, the quality of education will suffer and that such busing may ultimately lead to the kind of block-busting which has destroyed many of Chicago's finest communities.

They fear that while Dr. Redmond has abandoned for the time being his plan for compulsory two-way busing, such "out-busing" as well as "in-busing" will be his next step.

But most of all, they fear that this seemingly innocent plan to bus only 1,035 children is the beginning of the end of neighborhood schools in Chicago.

It has been estimated that if Dr. Redmond's long range program becomes a reality, more than 75% of all the children in Chicago Public Schools will be bused to and from various schools.

This comes as a shock to most people who haven't studied details of the "Redmond Plan", but Dr. Redmond himself has stated that when he completes his program of building magnet schools and educational parks in the next two decades—where he hopes to provide education from kindergarten to junior college for 20,000 students bused into each such park—he plans to shut down many neighborhood grade schools and high schools throughout Chicago.

On Page B–29 of the Redmond Report, we find the following: "Perhaps 75 percent of all students will require transportation in any event. There would, in effect, be no neighborhood schools to choose, and the difference between a 15 minute and a 25 minute ride is not so substantial as to constitute an unreasonable burden."

Many oppose Dr. Redmond's initial plan—even though it affects only 1,035 students—because they see it as a precedent for the immense busing operation of the future.

The average taxpayer wonders where all the money will come from for these elaborate plans. His fears are legitimate and have nothing to do with either racism or bigotry.

To some, the busing opponents' conclusions may seem incorrect or unfounded. But the fact remains that the bitterness of the attacks on their requests for full hearings at each school affected have obviously precluded any intelligent discussion of this entire subject.

I voted against busing of youngsters in 1964 when I supported an amendment which forbids the Federal government from demanding busing of students to overcome racial imbalance in order to qualify for Federal aid.

The amendment was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives because most Congressmen believed that busing of students to overcome racial imbalance created more problems than it solved.

I continue to believe that busing within the city is not the answer. It obscures the enormity of the over-all problem which faces Chicago.

It is a tragedy of our time that men cannot have honest disagreements without immediately being attacked as "racists" and "bigots," and even "un-American."

This argument over busing is going on all over America.

There are those who honestly and sincerely believe that busing is the only way to bring quality education to minority groups of America.

But there is an equally respectable school which believes that busing confined within the city limits will create new ghettos.

There is a third group which feels the way to provide quality education for *all* the children in a big city, and to discourage segregation in housing, is to improve all of the schools in that city. I believe this third group comes closest to the answer.

U.S. News & World Report, in its edition of December 25th, 1967, states: "New York and other cities have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, bused hundreds of thousands of youngsters trying to get more Negroes into school with Whites.

Yet, de facto segregation of Negroes in Northern cities has increased rather than declined and recent tests in New York and San Francisco indicate there has been little, if any improvement in the educational achievements of Negroes shifted to white classrooms."

The Chicago Board of Education recently ordered a study of the future population trends in the city and it hired the very highly respected real estate research corporation to do the study.

The study clearly states that busing within Chicago is not the answer to providing the stability of integrated communities that Dr. Redmond plans to achieve through his transfer of students from Negro communities to White communities.

Following is the quote taken from Page 13 of the School Board's own study which points out that busing within the city is not the answer:

"Unfortunately, most proposed approaches to achieving racial balance in public schools fail to take full account of the conclusion stated heretofore. As a result, policies are advanced which cannot achieve the intended long-run result of racial integration, although they may have significant short-run benefits.

"An example is the proposal to bus non-White students out of schools near the edge of the predominately non-White residential area so as to stabilize the White population near those schools.

"This effect might in fact occur in the individual areas concerned. It would do so if enough Whites not now living there would move in to occupy vacancies resulting when Whites now living there moved out for "normal turnover" reasons. But the stabilization of White population in this part of the city would probably just divert non-White population growth to one or more other parts of the city. In those other parts, racial transition would occur *faster* than if the busing policy had not been adopted. *For non-White population expansion must occur somewhere.*

"If the Board causes White stabilization—that is, a slowdown in non-White expansion—in one part of the city, it is necessarily also causing faster destabilization—that is, a speed-up in non-white expansion—elsewhere. Only if that faster growth is occurring outside the city limits can the Board's policies further over-all racial stabilization in the city as a whole."

It occurs to me that if the above conclusions are not correct, then the Board of Education owes it to the people of Chicago to hold public hearings and discredit the report.

On the other hand, if the conclusions are correct and if busing limited only within the city limits of Chicago will, indeed, increase the creation of new segregated ghettos and hasten the day when Chicago is totally segregated-nonwhite, then Dr. Redmond and the School Board should abandon their busing plan without delay.

The people of this city have the right to have the facts instead of being called "racists" and "bigots" because they have a sincere concern over the future of their communities.

There should be no question that all of us want to save Chicago. Nor should there be any doubt that we must do something; you can't let the matter ride and continue to see five blocks turn from white to non-white every week in Chicago.

Our disagreement is an honest difference of opinion on how best we can all save Chicago. It is an honest disagreement among honest men and has nothing to do with racism or bigotry.

Forty-eight months ago, the May School in Austin had 800 students; was all White; and had vacant classrooms. In 48 months the school increased its population to 1,522—with 76.5% non-White.

The people of Austin quite properly are concerned and they urgently need help, but I'm sure not at the expense of creating new ghettos in other parts of the city.

The School Board's own report states that the answer to saving Chicago from becoming segregated-nonwhite, is to find an outlet for the non-White population growth in the whole five-county area of Metropolitan Chicago instead of trying to find the answer in Chicago alone. This is not a problem for the people of Chicago alone to solve; nor will you find your answer by busing children to the Northwest or Southwest side of Chicago.

There are those who argue that busing 1,035 children will not create the dire consequences feared by many.

But the collapse of one community after another in Chicago in the last ten years, clearly shows that unfortunately, you don't have a "second chance" to save a community once the block-busters begin their work.

Those who defend busing for Chicago consistently fail to point out that whatever success there has been with busing in America, such success has occurred by busing children from inner-city schools to the suburbs where there is less chance for block busting, or by busing children within the suburbs where the non-White population in a particular suburb was relatively small.

There is no evidence that a single community has been stabilized by busing in any of the large cities of America.

Nor is there any evidence that Austin can be "stabilized" with the proposed busing scheme.

You need only look at the immense change which occurred in South Austin in 48 months and you see the enormity of the problem.

In White Plains, New York, a relatively small communtiy, racial balance was achieved by busing but it was done only after the people had an opportunity to be heard on the issue and approved it.

In neighboring Evanston, a human relations commission worked for one year answering all the questions and eliminating many fears before a busing program was instituted.

Contrast that to the treatment given the people of Chicago. This over-all plan was announced last August but without any details. On December 27th, the School Board agreed to implement it, but only after promising extensive hearings and assuring every community an opportunity to be heard.

Two weeks later our people were told that by January 29th, the plan would become operative.

White Plains' Superintendent of Schools, Carrol F. Johnson, in his first comprehensive report on the busing experiment in his city, says: "Any school program that does not have at least acceptance and, at best, support, is almost certain to fail."

This is why Mayor Daley has properly stated that if a community is not willing to accept busing, it should not be imposed on the community against its will.

Dr. Johnson states further that academic improvement cannot be expected without supportive services for youngsters being bused. He states in his report: "It has also been brought home to us very forcefully that teachers must have additional supportive services, and a variety of materials keyed to different ability levels, if they are to teach effectively in classrooms which are socially, economically, and racially heterogeneous."

Yet, in the resolution submitted by Dr. Redmond to the School Board in which he asked for permission to bus children from Austin to the Northwest side schools, not one word is said about providing supportive teaching for the host schools.

All that Dr. Redmond intends to provide is adult attendants on the bus and during lunch period.

Here is what Dr. Johnson reports on his experience in White Plains: "Frankly, we did not foresee the extent of the day-to-day problems that would arise in applying our normal disciplinary procedures to newly integrated situations. Many of our teachers were, for the first time, confronted with behavior patterns which differed markedly from the behavior of middle-class white youngsters. The vernacular speech of children from disadvantaged environments also came as a surprise to many teachers, whose orientation was primarily to middle-class White mores."

Dr. Redmond said that youngsters will be carefully selected for busing to meet the academic standards of the schools to which they are being bused. Yet, in the resolution submitted to the School Board, he has designated a series of square blocks and the children living in each of these square blocks will be bused to a receiving school designated for each such block, with no apparent regard for academic achievement.

If they live in the particular block, they will be bused to the school selected for that block, with or without their parents' consent and without any regard to the facilities of the host school.

This is the crux of the whole issue.

Dr. Redmond has taken ten square blocks on Chicago's West side and has assigned each of these square blocks to eight different schools as part of each of these school's district, even though each of the blocks is miles away from the school.

This is the end of neighborhood schools.

Make no mistake about that.

If he can do it to relieve overcrowding at May and Spencer Schools in the Austin area, he can do it to any school in Chicago. Children living in such a block must attend the school to which the block has been assigned.

The School Board's approval of this *non-contiguous* doctrine would place every child in this city in jeopardy of being bussed to the school to which his block has been assigned, no matter how far away it is from his home.

The Redmond Plan is compulsory and I'm surprised it hasn't brought a stronger reaction from the Negro community.

Much has been said about the congestion in the May School. When a suggestion was made that we can relieve it immediately by bringing in some mobile units, a howl of protest was raised.

Yet, Dr. Redmond has no objection to using mobile units to make room in receiving schools for the children being bussed. On Page B–21 of his report, he states:

"Where space does not now exist in such areas it should be created with additions and mobiles."

The fact of the matter is that in my District right now, there are 703 children attending daily classes in mobile units more than fifteen years old.

I believe Dr. Redmond can relieve the overcrowding at May and Spencer Schools very quickly by once and for all exploding the myth that mobile classrooms are bad. There is ample vacant land around the May School, not only to take care of its present needs with mobiles, but also to provide classroom space for continued expansion expected by next September.

It is most probable that many of the bussed children actually will be attending mobile classrooms under Dr. Redmond's present plan.

I recently conducted a survey of the public schools in my District and when I totaled up the needs of each of the schools as related to me by the administrators in these schools, I found that we need $10.5 million on Chicago's Northwest side to bring our public schools to a minimum code standard. This does not mean any elaborate improvements, but merely to bring them up to minimum safety standards required by the city code for public buildings.

In some of these schools the wiring is so bad that we cannot use two projectors at one time without blowing fuses. In many other schools, modern educational aids are a total stranger because they cannot be used for lack of adequate wiring.

Ventilation and washroom facilities are archaic.

Yet, all over Chicago, in federally financed Title One schools, in low-income areas, thousands of dollars worth of modern electrical equipment is made available to youngsters as educational aids.

I think we can make a strong case that busing of children into areas in my community will in some instances provide them with inferior education to what they are getting now even in their overcrowded classrooms.

It is significant to note that while Dr. Redmond will reduce the classroom size in the May School from 39.6 students to 30.6 under his proposed busing plan, each of the five receiving schools on the Northwest side will have an average classroom attendance rate of either 32 or 33 students per classroom. With no supportive teaching, I submit this will be a setback for all the children in those schools—White or Black.

In the case of the Spencer School, Dr. Redmond will reduce the per-classroom load from the present 36.5 to 29.0, but the three receiving schools will have 33; 34; and 35 students per classroom. These are hard facts and are not based on any racial or bigotted overtones.

These are questions that decent citizens have a right to ask. If there are answers to these questions which will remove doubts, these answers must be provided before any busing is attempted.

Our people have a right to ask what happens when under the busing plan every seat in a receiving school is occupied, and then 20 new children move into the immediate area of the receiving school. Do we reduce the number of children being bused by 20 to make room for these new neighborhood arrivals, or do we bus the new arrivals to another school?

What happens when the school-age population in a sending school block exceeds the number of students a receiving school can absorb? Is the block broken down into a smaller unit, and, if so, how do you determine which children in the block continue going to one receiving school and which students go to another school?

What happens when the school-age population in the immediate area of a receiving school increases and the school's capacity has been reached by busing?

It is an insult to my constituents to accuse them of racism or bigotry because they want answers to these perfectly valid questions.

There are those in this city who overlook the fact that these schools belong to the people and the people have a right to have some voice in the affairs of their children's education. As a matter of fact, there is a growing tendency throughout the country to give citizens a greater voice in the affairs of their schools.

In New York City, many prominent Negro civil rights leaders are turning away from racial integration in general and instead are demanding not only better schools in Negro neighborhoods, but more Negro control over their neighborhood schools.

They have tried in New York the very things that Dr. Redmond is now proposing for Chicago and have failed, so now the highly respected Ford foundation has recmended that the New York City School System be divided into 30—or more—neighboring school districts, each with its own Board and Superintendent, to chart the standards for its own neighborhood schools.

These questions must be answered because if ever this city needed full and sympathetic consideration for its schools from all of its people, we need it now.

If the citizens of this city fail to approve a 15c increase in the school levy in the June Primary, Dr. Redmond will have to lay off at least 20% of the teachers in Chicago, and our classroom load all over the city will go up to about 55 students per classroom or more.

Regardless of the outcome of this fight on busing, I intend to do everything I can to persuade my fellow citizens to support the increase in the levy because as a member of the Education and Labor Committee in Congress, I am deeply aware of the crisis in America's public schools and the crisis that faces ghettos.

I do not agree with those who threaten to cut off funds and bring all sorts of other retaliation against the Board of Education simply because we have an honest disagreement on how best to provide quality education for all of our children—Black or white.

But the fact remains that you cannot steamroller the emotions of our taxpaying citizens and then expect them to help in solving our educational needs.

Furthermore, we must ask the people of Chicago to also approve a $65 million bond issue for urgently needed school construction. I intend to work for passage of this important issue too, because it will be out of this money that we hope to get the $10.5 million for our own schools on the Northwest side of Chicago.

There has been criticism of those in public office for taking a voice in the affairs of our schools. I don't recall any criticism two years ago when the U.S. Office of Education arbitrarily and without warning cut $33 billion from Chicago. I was the one who got that money restored because the action by the Federal Government was totally indefensible, and I recall being praised at that time for my forceful action.

Dr. Redmond has tried to create the impression that somehow his busing plan is designed to meet Federal standards of integration in order to qualify for continued Federal funds. This is not so. The Federal government has set no standards for achieving integration in public schools.

All the Federal government wants is to assure that every American youngster benefitting from Federal aid gets quality education. But how this is done continues to be the responsibility of a local community. The Federal government does not consider de facto segregation caused by segregated communities as a bar to receiving Federal funds. It is obvious that the only way to eliminate segregated schooling is to eliminate segregated housing. I am certain that this will be done through better voluntary race relations than through forced busing.

It is indeed a sad day for America when honest citizens cannot ask honest questions without having their motives assailed and their sincerity challenged.

Dr. Redmond initially said he was going to bus youngsters from middle income families who are academically compatible to the receiving schools.

But now he admits that by annexing entire blocks to a receiving school district, he really doesn't know what kind of youngsters and what kind of problems he will bring to the receiving school.

In anticipation of these problems, he now says that "children with severe social adjustment or physical problems, or with mental handicap" will be provided special services. What special services when he doesn't have the money to provide those services at the May School itself?

I sincerely urge the Board to table the busing proposal. It has no guidelines, it has no provisions for voluntary participation, but instead is compulsory; it introduces a whole new concept of annexing non-contiguous areas to school districts, a doctrine that will destroy the whole concept of neighborhood schools in Chicago; it will create more problems than it will solve; and finally, it will neither help the white children nor the Negro children who are participants in this program.

I propose instead that the School Board proceed immediately to meet the problem at May and Spencer Schools by making both these schools models of educational excellence and make full use of mobiles to overcome crowding. Let us demonstrate that the way to stabilize a changing community is to give it such good schools that no one would think of moving away.

I also urge the Board to give its permissive transfer plan a chance to work on a voluntary basis. Schools see new students every week through the voluntary permissive transfer plan and there has been no adverse reaction because youngsters taking advantage of permissive transfers are academically compatible and there is no fear that educational standards will be impeded.

May I thank your committee for its courtesy in hearing us out. I hope the busing plan will be rejected for the good of all of the children in Chicago.

Illinois School Bell Media Awards

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the first annual Illinois School Bell Media Awards were presented to six mass communications media recently by Mary Alice Prindle, an Aurora East High School teacher and State chairman of the Illinois Education Association Public Relations Committee. Award presentations were made at the annual Illinois Education Association banquet during the association's 3-day convention.

I consider the group, which included three Illinois newspapers, two radio stations, and a television station, to be highly deserving of the recognition and honor extended to them. The awards were presented as follows:

For television: Mr. Don Wooten, public affairs director, WHBF-TV, Rock Island, Ill.

For metropolitan radio: Mr. Ed. Dorsey, education reporter, WIND radio, Chicago, Ill.

For local radio: Mr. Ralph Sherman, station manager, WLKB radio, De Kalb, Ill.

For metropolitan newspaper: Miss Ruth Dunbar, education writer, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill.

For local daily newspaper: Mr. Robert F. Greenaway, editor and vice president, De Kalb Daily Chronicle, De Kalb, Ill.

For weekly newspaper: Miss Mary Schlott, education writer, Arlington Heights Herald, Arlington Heights, Ill.

The 50th Anniversary of the Reestablishment of the Independence of Lithuania

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as part of the commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day in the House of Representatives, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a very moving statement of the Lithuanian American Council of Southern California entitled "An Appeal for Justice—The Question of Lithuania."

The statement follows:

AN APPEAL FOR JUSTICE: THE QUESTION OF LITHUANIA

Since its ancient settlement along the Baltic Sea coast, and particularly since its feudal states in 1251 became unified by King Mindaugas the Great into a kingdom, for centuries the Lithuanian Nation has played an important role in North-Eastern Europe. Especially that role became significant when Lithuania assumed the responsibility of protecting the Western culture from the Asiatic onslaughts.

The growing strength of Russian imperialistic power continually threatened Lithuanian lands, and finally at the end of the eighteenth century Russia invaded and occupied Lithuania. Foreign subjugation, however, failed to destroy the spirit of the people who, for 120 years continually objected to foreign domination by civil and cultural resistance, by numerous uprisings and revolutions against the invaders.

The intensive and determined struggle for freedom and independence from Czaristic Russia was climaxed on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of the Lithuanian National Council, proclaiming the restoration of the Independence to Lithuania.

The February Sixteenth Declaration was unanimously approved by the freely elected Constituent Assembly in 1920. Thus, following the will of the Lithuanian people, the reestablishment of an Independent State of Lithuania, with its capitol in the city of Vilnius was accomplished. A diplomatic recognition by many free countries followed. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was received as a *bona fide* member of the League of Nations, thereby Lithuania became a member of the international community of sovereign nations. A full diplomatic recognition by the United States of America on July 28, 1922, was followed soon, also with *de jure* recognition, by other world powers—Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

Soviet Russia recognized *de jure* the Independence of Lithuania in 1920, and on July 12th of the same year signed a peace treaty with Lithuania which stated that:

"The Soviet Union recognizes the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State with all the juridical rights associated with such a declaration, and forever renounces, in good faith, all Russian sovereign rights, which it previously had in regards to Lithuanian Nation and its territory."

The re-establishment of an Independent State of Lithuania and her return to the self-governing community of nations is the most significant historical event of the Twentieth Century for the Lithuanian Nation, whose political maturity, economic achievements and cultural creativity were manifested during the period of restored Independence (1918–1940).

During the Second World War, the Republic of Lithuania became a victim of Soviet Russia's and Nazi Germany's conspiracy and aggression, and as a result of secret agreements between those two powers of August 23rd and September 28th, 1939, became invaded and occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces on June 15, 1940.

Since the days of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanian people have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1944 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or driven to Siberia. Though that resistance movement was weakened and finally subdued due to a failure to get any material aid from the West, nevertheless, the Lithuanian people are continuing their passive resistance against Soviet Russian genocidal aggression to this very day.

About one million Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the re-establishment of the Independence of Lithuania, and remembering the numerous sacrifices of the Lithuanian people for freedom, acting through central Lithuanian American organizations, and cooperating with the Lithuanian Diplomatic and Consular Corps, have proclaimed 1968 as *The Lithuanian Fight for Freedom Year.*

The United States of America, mindful of its own struggle for freedom and independence, has remained sensitive to the aspirations of other people for self-determination. For this reason, Americans of Lithuanian descent are grateful of the Government of the United States for denouncing the Soviet Russian conquest and for refusing to recognize the alien subjugation of Lithuania since 1940. The United States continues recognizing the sovereignty of Lithuania. The Lithuanian Legation at Washington, D.C., Consulates General in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and a Consulate in Boston are recognized and are functioning.

Americans of Lithuanian descent are also grateful to the American people whose *Representatives and Senators in the 89th Congress unanimously* passed the *House Concurrent Resolution 416,* urging the President of the United States to take action in the United Nations and elsewhere for the restoration of self-determination rights to Lithuania and to the other two subjugated Baltic States.

Thus, on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the re-establishment of Independent Republic of Lithuania, the Lithuanian American Council of Southern California, representing all major Lithuanian-American organizations in Southern California, most fervently appeals to the representatives of the Federal, State and local governments, religious leaders, labor unions, civil, political and professional organizations, academic and cultural institutions, news media and to the people of good will, to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-determination and to national independence in their own country.

The free world can never rest in peace, knowing that in Lithuania under Soviet Russian rule, genocide and Russification are common place, religious persecution is prevalent, and basic human freedoms and rights are denied to the Lithuanian people.

Crank Calls Plague Area Residents

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the abusive, harassing, or obscene telephone call looms very large in the life of the single working girl, the housewife, and, in the ugliest instance, the wife or mother of a serviceman stationed in Vietnam.

In 1965 I first introduced a bill to raise the penalties for obscene phone calls made in the District of Columbia. There still now exists a wide disparity between the penalties in force in Maryland and Virginia and the usual $10 disorderly conduct fine in Washington. Considering the large number of single women living in the District, these penalties are woefully inadequate. I understand that there were over 14,000 obscene and harassing calls in the Washington metropolitan area in 1967. As will be recalled, that bill passed the House twice, but died in the Senate. In 1965 I also introduced legislation to stiffen the penalty for harassing calls made to families of servicemen in Vietnam. At the time I introduced that bill there had been a rash of instances of perverted calls to wives and families of servicemen either falsely reporting a man's death or openly gloating over an actual death in Vietnam. We can only imagine the horror of such an experience.

My bill, H.R. 611, which I introduced in the 89th Congress and again last year would raise the penalty for calls made within the District of Columbia and impose a similar penalty of a $500 fine and/or 6 months in jail for interstate calls.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should make it clear in the legislative history that we intend this legislation to cover those harassing calls directed to the families of servicemen, as I mentioned above. I might note here that the Defense Department informed me recently that reports of such instances have decreased during the last year.

I would like to suggest an additional amendment to this bill. Although many obscene and harassing calls originate from teenage pranksters, the hardcore obscene telephone callers suffer from perverted, sick minds. They are victims of mental illness. I suggest an amendment to allow the judge to substitute commitment to a mental hospital for treatment in the place of a fine or jail. We must look with compassion on those who cannot help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, one of the leading forces working to protect the citizen from obscene and harassing calls has been the telephone companies. Enforcement of laws dealing with these calls would be impossible without the assistance, time, and efforts of the telephone industry.

There is one aspect of the effort to track down these obscene telephone callers which I would like to discuss briefly this morning. As I mentioned, the communications industry has done an excellent job and contributed a great public service by research into new and more efficient ways of tracking down and prosecuting those who abuse the telephone. I have noticed in the testimony of telephone company officials and from other newspaper articles that among the devices used to trace these callers is the pen-register and the use of the central computer to record in a permanent record the caller number, called number, time and date for all calls, regardless of whether they are local or long distance.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that this raises in my mind is one with which I have been concerned since I first came to Congress. My concern is individual privacy.

Whenever the incident of a private conversation is recorded, there is a corresponding duty to protect the confidentiality of the information recorded. Should the practice of recording all calling and called numbers become widespread, these trails of old telephone calls could easily become another link in the continuous chain of interconnected personal information we leave behind us as we proceed through life. The danger, as I see it, is not the lone notation of telephone calls, but rather the blending of this information with other personal information—birth records, military records, tax records, social security records. There has been a great deal of discussion recently of compilations of this data by private industry, State, and local governments, and, perhaps best known, the Federal Government's proposed national data bank. My fear is that some day all of this information will become mixed together in a central bank, easily accessible through the magical mystique to the computer.

I am hopeful that use of these telephone number recording devices will be limited and that methods will be employed to protect confidentiality.

Mr. Speaker, the very highly regarded reporter of the Washington Post, William Raspberry, wrote a very revealing column on February 18. He points out many aspects of obscene and harassing telephone calls and describes in compelling terms the human damage they cause. I submit Mr. Raspberry's column is further evidence of the necessity to take prompt action to relieve needless suffering and to help make urban living a little less difficult. The column follows:

CRANK CALLS PLAGUE AREA RESIDENTS

(By William Raspberry)

Ever since someone broke into her home almost three weeks ago, the woman has been bothered by annoying, harassing, obscene telephone calls.

Since she has an unlisted number, she is certain that the calls are being made by the burglar—who is still at large.

Frightened almost out of her mind, she called the telephone company to request a device she had read about that "by the flick of a switch would alert the company to trace a call."

A company representative she said, told her that "unless I lived in the suburbs or a 'certain section' of Washington I was not eligible for such service.

"I, of course, asked which section of Washington was being served with this equipment—knowing the answer all the time. She stated that the facilities for using this equipment had been set up in the areas surrounding Georgetown, but that it was not available elsewhere in the city."

The woman, a Negro, is convinced that the telephone company is discriminating against Negroes in the matter of protection from harassing calls. Is it? I put the question to a spokesman for the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

"From her description, I'd say she's talking about what we call a line identifier," the official said. "This is a device that permits us to ground the victim's line and get a print-out of the time and frequency of incoming calls and the telephone number from which they are being made.

"Unfortunately, this only works in the newer offices—those that have gone up since 1953. It has nothing to do with whether a neighborhood is rich or poor, black or white."

He asked that the list of exchanges for which the line-identifying device is available not be made public lest it result in a flood of crank calls to those exchanges not on the list.

It turns out that the woman was at least partly correct. Most of the predominantly white areas of the city—downtown and west of Rock Creek Park—can use the device. Most of the predominantly Negro sections cannot. Of the 17 exchanges capable of using line identifiers, only four are in Negro areas.

But according to the company official, it has nothing to do with discrimination but rather with the way the city has grown and the resulting demand for new central offices. "We couldn't change the old offices over to take the device without ripping out the whole thing," he said.

He was quick to point out, however, that the line-identifier is just one weapon in the company's antiharassment arsenal.

"If you have a suspect, we have a thing we call a pen register that we can put on his line. This will confirm whether or not the calls are being made from that number." He also mentioned other complicated methods of tracing calls but declined to discuss them in detail. "We don't want the cranks to know all we know," he said.

Annoying, threatening and obscene calls have long been a problem for the telephone company, which has been getting an average of 1350 to 1400 complaints a month. And while that is a tiny percentage of the 50 million calls made here each month, it is still extremely bothersome.

Few of the crank calls are really serious, the officials said, and "the majority wash out quickly."

About a third of those the company catches are juveniles; another third are mentally unbalanced adults, and the remaining third stem from a mishmash of domestic, business and neighbor squabbles. Only three or four come to court each month.

Recent cases include a 54-year-old salesman who, posing as a psychiatrist, would tell a housewife that he was treating her husband and then get her to talk about her sex life. A 19-year-old youth admitted he had been making such calls since he was 12. A 10-year-old girl enjoyed making calls while her parents were out.

Most crank calls aren't sustained for long, and the officials' advice is just to ignore them and hang up quickly. Most crank callers soon lose interest when they find they don't have an audience. (After he discussed the problem on television recently, the official's wife received 11 crank calls in a single day).

"If there is a threat, the victim should call us and the police. We're working close together now. If the calls repeat for three or four times, they should call us. We'll stay with it until it's closed to their satisfaction."

When all else fails, the company can always change the victim's phone number, even temporarily.

One problem, the official said, is that in the District crank calls are only a misdemeanor, punishable by a $10 fine. In Virginia and Maryland, the penalties can run as high as $500 and a year in jail.

Legislation now pending in Congress would authorize similar penalties here.

The 50th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to join with others of this body in calling attention to the historic observance of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This cherished holiday which is observed so reverently by almost a million of our loyal American citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry has special meaning this year because it is the 50th anniversary of independence for a nation that had struggled for five generations of enslavement to gain its freedom. All Americans can take pride in the fact that because of the wisdom and statesmanship of our great President Woodrow Wilson, and the famous 14 points which he espoused, the independence of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States was materially aided.

This anniversary has deep significance for all of us for it reminds us of our unfulfilled commitment to take the necessary action to restore freedom to these people from whom the Soviet aggressors willfully and illegally wrested it a generation ago.

Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to meet with and address the leaders and members of the fine Lithuanian American Council of New York on their observance of the 50th anniversary of the independence of their beloved Lithuania. Under the permission heretofore granted me, I include a copy of the remarks I delivered to this patriotic gathering on last Sunday afternoon in New York City:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and my friends, just three years ago I had the privilege of addressing this fine organization. Two years ago I was privileged to speak to your group in Washington. Since my appearance here this afternoon is akin to a curtain call, I feel even more privileged to join you in commemorating this—the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Freedom.

I wish that I could come to you with a joyful heart and in a festive mood, but such is not possible. All of us here are deeply saddened by the untimely death of one of our dearest and most cherished friends. All of us feel the tremendous void which has resulted from the passing of our friend, Father Longinas Jankus. Each of us is soberly conscious of the fact that America has lost a great patriot and a noble citizen.

We know that the church has lost a good and dedicated servant—a stalwart soldier of the cross. The contribution which this beloved emissary of God has made during the ten years he served as executive director of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America will not be forgotten for generations to come. The thousands of refugees whom he helped to gain freedom and a new life will cherish his memory and bless his good works. The enrichment which he gave to the lives of all of us will go with us throughout all our days. We cannot be joyful at this moment when we are faced with the sad realization that Father Jankus is not sitting in this assembly radiating his benign smile to reach all of us.

My friends, I cannot be gay and festive on this occasion for quite another reason. In commemorating the passage of a half century of time since the valiant people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence. I am saddened by the tragic fate which befell these freedom-loving patriots. I share with all of you the heartaches and sorrow which derive from the unlawful and bestial acts of the Soviets in snatching away the precious and hardwon sovereignty of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States.

When I meditate on what Lithuania might be today, if its freedom and independence could have continued unhampered by the ruthless domination of Communist oppressors, I am saddened. I am sure that had Lithuania been permitted to pursue the political, economic, and cultural development which marked its emergence as a free state, America would today have a strong and powerful ally to whom it could turn for support and assistance in trying to meet its world peace obligations.

Some of you older people recall with pleasure and gratification the news proclaimed fifty years ago that Lithuania was free. How magnificent it was to read of the courageous stand the Lithuanian patriots took on February 16, 1918, in defiance of both German and Russian warlords. Your pride reached unknown heights when you heard that at long last all political ties had been severed with the powers that had for so long enslaved your dear ones. But you were not alone in your joy. Obtaining freedom for a proud people after 123 years of enslavement was indeed such a momentous event it was hearalded throughout the world. Free men everywhere rejoiced because the shackles of bondage which had bound five generations of Lithuanians were at last loosened.

Americans were particularly jubilant because this country had played a very important role in bringing that precious freedom to Lithuania. If we look in retrospect, it is clear that President Woodrow Wilson, in announcing and espousing his famous fourteen points and the principles of national self-determination, gave the necessary impetus and moral support to bring about the Lithuanian declaration of independence.

I am gratified to note that the extent to which Lithuanians even today continue to express their gratitude for the political, military and financial aid which American citizens made to the newly created Lithuanian nation in its struggle for independence.

Your adulation of Captain Samuel Harris for his advisory help to the young Lithuanian Army is gratifying to all Americans. We, too, consider this valiant U.S. Army officer worthy of the honors a grateful Lithuanian nation bestowed in memory of the hero's death he suffered at the hands of the Bolshevik organized mutiny at Kaunas.

How wonderful it would be if future anniversaries could be celebrated with the same joy and thanksgiving as in 1918. If the unlawful and inhuman violation of Lithuanian rights by the Soviets could be rectified, the whole world would join with you in singing paeans of praise. But until such a day the golden memories of a free, happy people are over-shadowed by the nightmares of the Soviet reign of terror. Until full freedom is restored our hearts will remain heavy in recalling the fate which befell a nation whose people loved and prized self-determination even as do all of us here today.

In these days when the leaders of Communist states continue to berate this country for what they call its "imperialistic" policies, it would be well for the whole world to fix its attention upon the USSR which demonstrated with crystal clear actions a vicious type of imperialism the like of which the world has seldom seen. It takes colossal gall for the Soviets and their henchmen to stand up in the Halls of Nations and accuse this country of imperialistic actions when their hands still drip with the blood of the innocent people killed, beaten, robbed and enslaved by their illegal theft of the freedom and independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic states. How can these self-labeled "saviours of mankind" and "protectors of democracy" dare to accuse others when their guilt is so indelibly written on the pages of history for all mankind to see.

The record is clear, but unfortunately all too few of those nations emerging into sovereignty have taken occasion to consult the record. Too often their leaders, as well as their unschooled and unguided young people, hearken to the siren songs of the world's master propagandists. But even so, the same type of enslavement visited upon Lithuania which the Communists hoped to expand on a world-wide basis, has had only limited success. But unfortunately even in the countries free of Communist domination, there is a tendency to forget or ignore the aggressive acts committed by the Soviets against your people and your homeland.

This country has never accepted the Soviet aggression as legal. It is significant that this Government continues to give full accreditation to the former representatives of the Republic of Lithuania. Even as the then Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, condemned the Soviet aggression in 1940, American statesmen have continued to be outspoken in their criticism of the ruthless acts of the Communists. President Lyndon B. Johnson, both as a U.S. Senator and since becoming President, has reaffirmed this Nation's policy of not recognizing Soviet aggression in the Baltic States.

My friends, this Nation must never let the passage of time dim its memory of the Soviet Union's dastardly acts toward all of the Baltic peoples. We must not let the soothing effects of overtures of friendship and peaceful co-existence diminish the repugnance which we have always felt toward the gangster acts of the Communists. Until your relatives and friends—the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations, are free of Soviet domination, until the puppets and stooges controlled by Moscow are replaced by leaders elected freely by the people; and until adequate reparations and restitutions have been made by the USSR, every American has the responsibility to do his utmost to return sovereignty to our friends who so avidly want and deserve it.

This week I am reminding my colleagues in the Congress that we should use this historic occasion to rededicate ourselves to the inescapable task of giving the people of Lithuania an early opportunity for celebrating a meaningful and happy independence day. In appreciation for what they have done for us and for the world, the least we can do—the least we should do—is to join them in their battle for the return of their coveted independence.

This battle will require vital and vigilant leadership. This leadership must come from the people who have the most to lose if the fight for Lithuania's independence and self-determination is given up or lessened. This leadership must come from the ranks of the people who have most to gain from the ending of all foreign controls imposed upon Lithuania and the ousting of all alien oppressors from its borders.

Thus it is that I remind you that from this council and the organizations of American Lithuanian people the requisite leadership must come.

Your pride in the blood which flows through your veins, your glory in the history of the country of your birth or the homeland of your forebears as well as your deep resentment of the inhuman acts of Communist aggressors must be kept alive and given constantly renewed stimulation. This you are doing through these organizations meeting here this afternoon. This you have done again and again over the years in helping the thousands of your countrymen to come to this country and become useful and loyal American citizens.

I commend you for your efforts and your accomplishments. For in seeking to regain independence for the land you love so dearly and for the people who mean so much to you, you have made yourselves even better Americans. No citizen of this country has a greater appreciation of the privileges which accompany independence and no citizen appreciates more the responsibilities which accompany full liberty than do you who meet today to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuanian independence. May all of you live to observe with joy and happiness an independence day which will connote true independence and liberty for the people of the land which remains so much a part of you.

Thank you and God be with you and with your loved ones overseas.

In Denmark and Sweden All Children Learn Crafts

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 20, the General Subcommittee on Education, Education and Labor Committee, opens hearings on H.R. 15066, the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968. An objective of this bill, the administration's proposal on vocational education, is "to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people who will not go on to college." I commend the administration for its fine proposal, but I think that H.R. 15066 should be used as a basis for a more extensive rejuvenation of vocational education.

The General Subcommittee on Education, of which I have the honor of being the chairman, will seek during a month of hearings to strengthen the administration's proposal in order to make vocational education an honorable alternative and supplement to a college education.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this point an article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 12. I hope that our hearings on H.R. 15066 will offer a forum for discussion of attempts, such as the one described in this article, to bridge the chasm which presently exists between academic and vocational education.

The above-mentioned article follows:

IN DENMARK AND SWEDEN ALL CHILDREN LEARN CRAFTS

(By Jeremy Hamand)

All school children in Sweden and Denmark up to age of 16 must now study manual training. The requirement was made in an attempt to reduce the distinction between "intellectual" and "practical" abilities.

Called "sloyd" in Sweden and "sloid" in Denmark, the work can be any form of handicrafts the youngsters choose, such as weaving, woodwork, metalwork, tailoring. All subjects are open to boys and girls alike: Girls can take woodcarving, boys can learn about textiles.

The children work very much on their own. The craft teacher—specially trained for the job—steps in only to help solve technical problems. In Denmark, pupils can keep what they have made in class—free. Each school workshop has a yearly grant of $550 to cover material costs.

Sweden has another scheme which incidentally helps to nip in the bud any feelings of class superiority. This is PRYO—a practical vocational training scheme first introduced in 1964 and gradually extended since. Under this scheme, all the eighth-graders (14-15-year-olds) in Sweden's nine-grade comprehensive schools spend three weeks in factories, offices or shops—as they choose—to get the "feel" of practical work before they leave school.

PRYO lasts three weeks—not necessarily all together—and it takes place in school time, not during vacations.

Of pupils quizzed in Malmö, Sweden's third largest city, nearly three-quarters thought the experience of PRYO was satisfactory and useful. Educators hope the 12 percent who said they did not like the experience may come to see its value later on.

Birch Society Describes Itself as First Truly Good Group in History—Denounces Gold Cover Removal as Communistic

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. R. E. Duhnke, of Appleton, Wis., has written to inform me that the John Birch Society opposes legislation to eliminate the gold cover for Federal Reserve notes—H.R. 14743.

He writes:

Please don't fall for the Communist line to make all the balance of our gold available to our enemies.

Don't let them remove the 25 percent gold backing from our currency.

During the troublesome times ahead, America will be very glad to have some gold to buy necessary foreign supplies in case of all out war.

McNamara and all the Communists in our government have disarmed America enough.

Don't let them take this final step. Stop paying out any more gold right now!

He also encloses a four-page document printed by the John Birch Society which describes the nature of the organization:

We are something new in history: A body of truly good men and women, of religious ideals and humane consciences, of all races and colors and creeds, who are welded together to work now, and in the years, decades, and even centuries to come, for the purposes and beliefs that we hold in common. Our goals have been summarized as: Less government, more responsibility, and a better world.

And we sound no uncertain trumpet. The John Birch Society is no place for weaklings or cowards; and there is no comfort in our ranks for the parlor patriot or the sunshine soldier. It is our intention to become the finest body of men and women in the world, and the greatest voluntary team that was ever put together.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Mr. Duhnke for sending me this material. With the state of the news as it is nowadays, it is very pleasant to have a little light relief.

The Outlook for Peace in Vietnam

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Outlook section of the Sunday, February 18 Washington Post carries a very perceptive and thought-provoking article by Philip Geyelin that has much to offer in terms of analysis of our options and opportunities for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. I commend this penetrating commentary to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1968]

ARE THERE PEACE SIGNS IN THE RUBBLE?

(By Philip Geyelin)

The fighting in Vietnam has never been as fierce as it has in the last three weeks, which ought logically to suggest that the prospects for a negotiated settlement have never been so remote. But there is no ordinary logic—indeed there is an Orwellian illogic—in the chain of events that would have to occur to bring about a diplomatic settlement of a "limited war."

So it would be foolish to dismiss out of hand the thesis now cautiously advanced by a number of authorities that we may actually be closer than ever to the magic moment when both sides in the struggle become ready to transfer the conflict to the bargaining table.

NO PUBLIC EVIDENCE

Evidence to support this thesis cannot be found in public utterances or public moves—in the mysterious peace-probing of U Thant or the chill reactions of President Johnson to the apparent intrasigence of Hanoi. Still less can it be found in military briefings on the course of the war.

In fact, without being able to read the minds of Hanoi's and Washington's leaders, conclusive evidence cannot be found at all. If peace breaks out, it will do so unpredictably, more in the manner of a happening. But it is possible to identify the kind of events that would encourage such a happening. It is possible to argue, for example, that the Vietcong offensive, if nothing else, did much to establish the limits of what either side can accomplish by the use of force.

To understand the crucial importance of a mutual recognition of the limits, it is necessary to consider the state of affairs that would have to exist in Vietnam, and the state of mind that would have to exist in Hanoi and Washington, before there could be productive talks.

To begin with, both sides must perceive, simultaneously, that each has more to gain by negotiating than fighting. Other wars have been settled by a victory at arms. But for the sake of rational discussion about negotiation—as distinct from ratification of surrender—it is necessary to assume that this won't happen in Vietnam.

Secondly, both sides must have some reason to hope that they can achieve through a negotiated settlement some considerable part of the objective—and ultimately the major part of the objective—that they had hoped to achieve by force. There is some reason to believe that this principle is winning wider acceptance within the Johnson Administration and in Congress. The United States has moved a long way since the day when Secretary Rusk was publicly insisting that there could be no settlement until the North Vietnamese agreed to leave their neighbors alone.

SENATOR MUSKIE'S TERMS

In a recent newsletter to his constituents, Sen. Muskie of Maine dealt with the most delicate aspect of a negotiated settlement in terms which at least some influential members of President Johnson's war council have indicated they would endorse.

"As we consider the possibility of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam," the Senator said, "realism dictates that we consider the following:

"1. Neither side can expect to achieve at the conference table what it might have hoped to achieve with a military victory;

"2. Each side will seek to incorporate in a negotiated settlement a nonviolent formula for achieving the objectives it might have achieved with a military victory; and

"3. Each party to the negotiated settlement will have to accept some risk, which it will seek to make minimal, that the nonviolent formula may not work out as planned."

Does this mean a coalition government—with a piece of the political action in Saigon awarded to the National Liberation Front? Does it mean taking a chance that in a post-settlement power struggle the Communists would come out on top? How much of a foot in the door would Hanoi have to have, and how much could we safely permit?

These are the incredibly complex questions that would have to be resolved in any bargaining. And this brings up yet a third prerequisite: Almost certainly both sides will have to have more than a vague inkling, before the serious talking gets under way, of what sort of settlement would emerge. And both sides will have to feel that the balance of force—the "situation on the ground"—offers neither side a decisive advantage but gives both a sense of strength to bargain from.

It is this need for a sense of bargaining strength which gives rise to the Dienbienphu psychology by which a diplomatic or political edge is sought by greatly intensified military activity. And this in turn is largely responsible for the Orwellian illogic that afflicts the whole affair; the link between greatly intensified violence and increased prospects for peace is not an easy one to grasp. Nor is the equally Orwellian question, posed succinctly by the State Department's Director of Intelligence, Thomas Hughes, some time ago when he noted how difficult it is for "both sides to engage at the same time in negotiations from strength."

On the face of it they can't. But strength, in these matters, cannot be determined in absolute terms. It is in large part a state of mind, theirs and ours—which is one reason why it is often so difficult for Americans to make much sense out of what their Government says about Vietnam. In the struggle for psychological advantage, Washington feels impelled to say things for Hanoi's consumption that a lot of people at home understandably find difficult to swallow.

For all these reasons, the magic moment is going to be very difficult to recognize. For the state of affairs which would bring it about is a contradiction in itself. It is a stalemate, as that word is defined by Webster's—"a drawn contest; a deadlock; a position from which neither contestant can derive a winning advantage."

Or as applied to chess, it is a position of "the king, when although not in check he cannot move without being placed in check." How better to define the military results of the recent Communist offensive? How better to describe the confrontation at Khesanh or the shattered state of the pacification program which is at the heart of the whole affair?

Yet, a stalemate is not consistent with the American desire for "progress." And neither side can publicly concede that a stalemate exists—thus admitting that it can do no more militarily. For in a sense, "negotiations" are always under way—the effort by each side to make the other believe he is losing and will lose it all if he doesn't move to the conference table quickly.

The notion of a stalemate is anathema to Secretary Rusk. He once dismissed the whole idea as something dreamed up by a reporter in Saigon. It is also anathema to many Congressmen, most generals and some civilian officials as well. It could not have been further removed from the calculations of Gen. Westmoreland when he gave his progress report to the Nation last November and spelled out a four-phase strategy for winning the war which took no account whatsoever of the possibility that diplomacy might play a part.

He may be right. Or he may be right, but Hanoi may not be convinced. Or Hanoi may be convinced, but also persuaded that the sensible response is not to capitulate or sue for peace talks but to make a greater effort to redress the balance of force in its favor.

Thus the issue of negotiations is invested with something of the characteristics of a seesaw. It is manifestly impossible for one side to go up without the other going down, for one to grow stronger without the other growing relatively weaker—and relatively less interested in a negotiated settlement without making an effort to strengthen its position.

Theoretically, there should come a moment of balance. But it would be without avail unless it was mutually recognized, with a reciprocal determination to hold the balance. For such are the forces at work, and the opportunities for missed signals and miscalculations so great, that the action of either side can quickly carry the conflict past the brief moment of balance.

THE FORCES AT WORK

The United States should be the first to appreciate the forces at work. It was, after all, the Johnson Administration's judgment that it was in no position to negotiate a reasonable settlement that led to the first great expansion of our combat effort and the bombing of North Vietnam in early 1965.

Many reasons have been offered for the decision to systematically bomb the North, including the need to interdict supply lines and the importance of giving the shaky Saigon government a morale strengthener. But not the least of the reasons was the simple conclusion that the North Vietnamese were doing something to our side that we wanted stopped; so the idea was to do something to North Vietnam that Hanoi would want us to stop.

"It was a matter of putting more chips on our side of the table," is the way one senior adviser to the President explains it. In other words, it was as much a diplomatic maneuver as a military escalation.

The same was said for our decision to land combat troops in March, 1965. Fully a year before they landed, when our fortunes were more promising, no less an advocate of a negotiated settlement than Sen. Fulbright, in a celebrated speech of March, 1964, entitled "Old Myths and New Realities," had this to say about the state of Vietnam's military-diplomatic seesaw:

"Other than withdrawal, which I do not think can be realistically considered under present circumstances, three options are open to us in Vietnam: First, continuation of the anti-guerrilla war within South Vietnam, along with renewed American efforts to increase the military effectiveness of the South Vietnamese army and the political effectiveness of the South Vietnamese government; second, an attempt to end the war, through negotiation for the neutralization of South Vietnam, or of both North and South Vietnam; and, finally, the expansion of the scale of the war, either by the direct commitment of large numbers of American troops or by equipping the South Vietnamese Army to attack North Vietnamese territory, possibly by means of commando-type operations from the sea or the air.

"It is difficult to see how a negotiation, under present military circumstances, could lead to termination of the war under conditions that would preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. It is extremely difficult for a party to a negotiation to achieve by diplomacy objectives which it has conspicuously failed to win by warfare. The hard fact of the matter is that our bargaining position is at present a weak one; and until the equation of advantages between the two sides has been substantially altered in our favor, there can be little prospect of a negotiated settlement which would secure the independence of a non-Communist South Vietnam."

DID WE GO TOO FAR?

In the years since Sen. Fulbright laid out this prescription for much of what was to follow, the United States has gone a long way toward changing the "equation of advantage." Some would even argue that we have gone too far—that by last fall, to pick one period, we were claiming a state of affairs which left Hanoi with little in the way of a position to bargain from.

The United States was saying, in the person of Gen. Westmoreland, that we were on the way toward becoming "progressively superfluous" to the war; that the South Vietnamese would in the end be able to root out the last of the insurgency; that the end was in view; and that, in effect, Hanoi would have nothing to show for its enormous pains.

There has been less of such talk of late. There has also been a dramatic demonstration of what the enemy can and cannot do. It cannot generate a public uprising or overrun the country militarily—not while U.S. troops are there. But it can cause havoc, spread terror, disrupt months of patient pacification effort and perhaps frustrate indefinitely our ultimate objective of creating a government and society in South Vietnam which can assume an increasingly large share of the burden of ensuring its own security and demonstrate an ability to determine its own affairs. And the enemy can divert, and pin down, large numbers of our troops in remote areas and force us to rush reinforcements from home.

How much more it can do, or not do, may be determined at Khesanh, either by a bloody clash or perhaps by a protracted war of nerves. Either way, it is possible to perceive at least the beginnings of the kind of balance of opposing forces and conflicting ambitions out of which there could conceivably come a reciprocal recognition of the kind of stalemate that might make negotiation mutually more appealing than continued war.

Communism on Trial

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today, and continuing through Wednesday, February 21, an international moot trial will be held before the Court of World Public Opinion at the Hall of Nations, Georgetown University here in Washington on the bloody record of international communism over the past 50 years. International communism on trial will bring together a distinguished array of

experts on and eyewitnesses to the activities of the Communist menace who are knowledgeable in this area. Witnesses include exiles from communism, professors, journalists, clergymen, and key diplomats. The purpose of the moot trial, sponsored by more than a dozen national and international organizations, is to provide an antidote to the masses of propaganda released by the Communists during the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution last year.

Some of the areas which will be explored include religious persecution in Yugoslavia, Soviet seizure of Eastern Europe, Communist invasion and takeover of Tibet, Soviet slave labor, communism in China and Vietnam, and communism in Latin America, to name a few. It is indeed unfortunate that those "experts" who are advocating a bridge-building policy with the Communist countries will probably avoid these sessions like the plague.

The New York Daily News, in its lead editorial for today, February 19, comments wisely, I think, on this novel educational device. I include the above-mentioned editorial in the RECORD at this point:

COMMUNISM IN THE DOCK

World Communism goes on trial today for its 50-year record of deceit, terrorism, repression, slaughter and enslavement. Its judge will be the Court of World Public Opinion.

This moot hearing is a project of the Young Americans for Freedom, and the three-day session is being held at Georgetown University in Washington.

Witnesses will include many experts who have made the evil doings of Communism a life study.

Men who learned through bitter first-hand experience to hate and fear the Red conquerors also will offer their testimony, as will a young American—Phillip Abbott Luce—who once served the revolutionary cause.

Until about two years ago, Luce was head of the Peking-loving Progressive Labor Party. His voice should be particularly valued because it is raised against the argument too often advanced these days that Communism has changed its ways or its ambitions.

The New Left and see-no-evil-where-Soviet-Russia-is-concerned liberals peddle the folk myth that "bad" Communism died when archtyrant and murderer Josef Stalin breathed his last in 1953.

These dupes have drugged themselves with dreams that the Kremlin gang longs to call off the cold war if we nastily suspicious Americans will just have faith in their good will.

The simple—but harder to bear—truth is that Communism has no new face; just a variety of masks that it wears depending on whether it is interested in wilting a foe with a frown or lulling him with a smile.

Wasn't it that dumpy, jovial old fellow, Nikita Khrushchev who ground the Hungarian Freedom Fighters into bloody fragments with Russian tanks in 1956? Isn't it bland little Premier A. Kosygin who makes war by remote control against the U.S. in Vietnam and arms the Arabs to keep the Mideast aboil?

Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito is supposed to be the very model of a housebroken, "nationalist" Red chieftain. But can anyone recall the last time that Tito didn't rush to join his Moscow and Peking buddies in shouting denunciations of the U.S. and all its works?

There also is a popular companion fairy tale that Communism has been rendered harmless by the jawbone war between Red China and Soviet Russia.

These two bands of thugs may be arguing about who will rule Marxism's foul nest. But their only difference as far as their intentions toward the Free World are concerned is whether it should be tortured to death slowly or felled with a bludgeon.

It will surprise no one if the anti-anti-Communists greet the YAF tribunal with sneers and jibes about windmill-tilting.

But the nation can thank itself that there still are organizations like YAF that care enough about truth to strip away the camouflage of tameness and reasonableness donned by the Reds with the help of their foolish apologists.

The trial may even enlighten those too young to remember—or those with all too short memories—about Communism's vicious past and its never-renounced vow to "bury" us.

A Message to America's Teachers From President Lyndon B. Johnson

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the masthead, "View From Capitol Hill," appears over a monthly column that I am pleased to write for Grade Teacher magazine.

In the February 1968 issue, however, my column, "View From Capitol Hill," yields the floor to "View From the White House."

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the President—a former schoolteacher himself—has given top priority to the advancement of education. Under his leadership, the Nation has made giant strides in education, and Congress has compiled an extraordinary record of legislation in support of education at every level.

Once asked how he would prefer to be remembered by history, President Johnson replied, "as the education President." I believe this article lends substance to this wish.

Mr. Speaker, I insert President Johnson's message to the schoolteachers of America at this point in the RECORD:

A PERSONAL MESSAGE TO AMERICA'S TEACHERS FROM PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Not long ago, a little boy in Iowa wrote: "Happiness is two teachers, so you can get help when you need it."

That perceptive young man is one of 40 million students in America benefitting from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the most significant and far-reaching education law in modern times.

He was re-stating one of the basic truths of education: that the key to the whole learning process is an earnest and dedicated teacher.

I believe that. So, as a teacher on a rather extended sabbatical from the Texas school system, I'm glad to communicate with the nation's teachers—the men and women who, perhaps more than anyone else, are responsible for the future of our people and their government.

One of my predecessors paid tribute to a great teacher at a New York banquet in 1871. "Give me a log hut," said President James Garfield, "with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him."

Today we do not live in so simple an age. We need great teachers—many of them. But even Mark Hopkins, to educate young Americans in the age of space and the atom, would ask for "buildings and apparatus and libraries"—new books, audio-visual aids, electronic devices, the most modern laboratory equipment.

Our rich nation can afford to have these things. Indeed, we cannot afford *not* to have them. For it is education—not our economy, not our military power, not even our political institutions—which is the real motive energy of our nation.

As a teacher and public servant, I hold that belief as part of my political faith. And for that reason, education today ranks near the top of our national agenda.

We have made some impressive beginnings, I believe, in the past four years:

Since 1963, we have tripled government-wide expenditures for education: from $4 billion to more than $12 billion.

Since 1965, when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act broke a 20-year deadlock, millions of children have benefited from special programs and new educational materials.

In higher education, we have raised the number of students assisted by federal programs from 500,000 in 1965 to 1,175,000.

Still, with all of our progress, we have only begun the long, long fight for quality education for all of our children and equality of opportunity for our teachers and their students.

Today, in the inner cities of our nation, millions of children find that their schools do not serve them well. We do not yet have adequate teachers and adequate services in every classroom in rural and ghetto schools.

Approximately one million boys and girls drop out of school every year. Most of those are from the ranks of poverty—from city and rural slums.

Each year, 700,000 children become delinquents—dropouts from society.

Millions of others are passed along from grade to grade without ever really learning to read or do simple arithmetic. They, too, drop out of society, lacking the skills they need to get a job.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a beginning in our long struggle to achieve equality of educational opportunity in this nation for all children.

But it has been only a beginning.

More—much more—must be done.

We must encourage more young men and women to work in poverty areas as thousands of Teacher Corpsmen and VISTA volunteers do.

We must make community centers out of our schools, opening them nights and weekends to involve parents and to provide a place of recreation and learning for everyone in the neighborhood.

We must bring children of the poor into school at age three or four and provide health, nutrition and other services. Only in this way can these boys and girls get a real head start toward overcoming the handicaps of poverty.

And we need to keep our schools open all year round, giving poor boys and girls the kind of summer experiences which expand their horizons and cultural development.

That is a tall order. But it is the *minimum* we must do if education in America is to serve the nation as it should.

Doing the job will require more than the efforts of the President and the Congress. Not even the work of every governor, every legislator, every mayor, school board member and parent will be enough. The focus of all our hopes for excellence in education is *you*—the grade teacher.

John Brademas has asked me to give a word of advice to teachers and educators in America. I would make just three appeals to you:

First, join the attack on poverty and discrimination and hopelessness—right in your classroom. Years ago, I interrupted my college education to teach in a tiny Mexican-American school in Cotulla, Texas. Most of the children were the poorest of the poor—their parents worked in the fields for bitterly small wages.

I learned then that for these eager youngsters, the school and the teacher were the greatest—and perhaps the only—hope.

In hundreds of city ghettoes and rural pockets of poverty today, that is still the case.

If we are to succeed in giving hope and help to the children of poverty, it will be in large part because teachers involve themselves with the most disadvantaged students—just as doctors work hardest to heal the sickest patients.

Second, give your active support and advice to public servants who are developing educational programs.

This is a period of unusual energy and activity in education. More new dollars and more new programs are being devoted to our schools than ever before. If these programs are to succeed—if the dollars are to be well-spent—we need the active advice and criticism of classroom teachers. Because you, in the final analysis, are the real expert on educational policy, we need your voice in forming that policy.

This leads me to my third appeal: Give your active participation and leadership to partisan politics—local, state, and national.

When I taught in Houston, one of my first really important duties was to represent the Houston Teachers Association. I went to the state capitol to urge the Texas Legislature to raise our pay as teachers; we lobbied for—and won—a tax on cigarettes to make that pay raise possible.

Teacher involvement in political affairs, I'm glad to say, is more common now in America.

Although only 69.3% of all eligible voters went to the polls in 1964, 89.2% of teachers voted—a striking demonstration of their concern for public issues.

But *concern* is not enough. Today, the challenges facing our nation call for intelligent, committed, *active* leadership. That means getting into politics—the arena in which so many crucial public decisions are made.

As a former teacher with a lifelong interest in public affairs. I'm glad to see teachers playing a growing role in our society.

I am convinced that the classroom teacher is the most important transmitter of what we call the American dream.

In years past, history has proven for millions who came to our shores that the American dream is full of hope and promise.

Now, I believe, it is time to prove anew to ourselves, and to millions who are denied hope, that history has not been wrong—that the American promise will be kept now and in the future.

I'm proud to be working with you in the effort to keep that promise fresh—and to make it a reality for our young citizens.

Uninspected Poultry in the School Lunch Program

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture began hearings this morning in the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains on the various bills now pending before the committee to amend and improve the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957. Several of the bills, including H.R. 15149, which I introduced, are administration-supported measures which would extend Federal inspection of poultry into the area of intrastate poultry under certain circumstances, just as the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 permits Federal inspection of the red meats in intrastate commerce.

I was shocked to learn last week that uninspected poultry can be purchased with the aid of Federal funds for use in the school lunch program. This was confirmed this morning by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren in his testimony before the subcommittee. Mr. Speaker, I said this was incomprehensible to me. It must be stopped.

Under unanimous consent, I submit herewith the statement I delivered this morning before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Commitee on Agriculture in support of my bill on poultry inspection, H.R. 15149, which contains a discussion of this serious problem of uninspected poultry getting into the school lunch program. Of course, this is only one part of the much broader problem of diseased and unwholesome poultry being sold to the public without effective controls—either Federal or State—if the poultry moves only in intrastate commerce.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Testimony by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan Before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, House Committee on Agriculture, on H.R. 15149, To Modernize and Improve the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, Including Requirements for Compulsory Inspection for Wholesomeness of Poultry Sold Only in Intrastate Commerce, February 19, 1968

I am deeply grateful for all of the attention now being given to the serious problem of diseased and unwholesome poultry moving freely onto consumers' dinner tables in intrastate commerce. The bills now before this Subcommittee, and the strong support of the Administration for action in this field, are very encouraging to me, after trying for nine or ten years to stir interest in the problem and having the lonely feeling that no one outside of St. Louis seemed to be overly concerned, or seemed to see any effective solution for it.

It was my feeling eleven years ago that we had solved the problem by providing machinery in the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 to authorize Federal inspection for wholesomeness of every pound of poultry sold in this country, including that processed and sold only within a state.

But the elaborate machinery in the 1957 Act to authorize Federal inspection of the poultry processed and sold within the states has never been put to use. Up until last December, the Department of Agriculture had maintained that the "major consuming area" machinery of the 1957 Act had some value in combatting the problem, but in December the Secretary advised me that the Department had concluded it was not a practical solution and would help me devise a new one based on the provisions of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

The problem of diseased poultry in intrastate commerce is no more and no less serious now than it has been during all of the past eleven years. I am just sorry that we have wasted eleven years without doing much about it. But the fact that there is now such widespread agreement on the need for action is, as I said, very encouraging to me, and I hope we can promptly proceed to pass effective legislation.

CHANGES IN CLIMATE SINCE LAST YEAR—BUT BAD POULTRY SITUATION REMAINS

The printed hearings of this same Subcommittee last year on the Meat Inspection bill contain many pages of documentation on the problem of bad poultry processed and sold within the same state, and on my long efforts to try to have such poultry coming into the St. Louis area from outstate Missouri made subject to compulsory Federal inspection under the 1957 law. The only things different now from the situation when I testified before you last year are:

First, the Congress has enacted a different type of machinery for combatting the equally serious problem of unfit beef, pork, lamb and other red meats being sold in intrastate commerce;

Second, the Department of Agriculture has changed its mind about the practicability of Section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 and no longer believes it can be used effectively in dealing with uninspected poultry in intrastate commerce; and

Third, the mood of the Congress and of the public has progressed to the point where the health and safety aspects of this issue of bad food in intrastate commerce are finally being recognized.

When I appeared before you on the Meat Inspection bills last year, I urged that we tackle the problems of bad meat and bad poultry simultaneously, applying the same solutions to both. I suggested that you investigate the usefulness of the "major consuming area" provision of the Poultry Act and if you found it workable, apply the same principle to meat inspection and then insist that the Department put this machinery to use immediately. However, I added, if you found that the Poultry Act machinery for intrastate inspection was not practical, you should recommend that Congress repeal it and replace it with a new approach for both meat and poultry—but the same approach in each case.

I have never seen any value in having separate Meat Inspection and Poultry Inspection laws. My original proposal in 1956, before we enacted the law for compulsory inspection of poultry in interstate commerce, was merely to amend the Meat Inspection law to include poultry. Apparently, that was much too simple a solution, and we proceeded, instead, to enact a separate law just for poultry. And then, last year, we revised the Meat Inspection law to get at the problem of the intrastate shipments, but did nothing about the companion problem in unwholesome uninspected poultry.

MORE THAN A SCORE OF POULTRY DISEASES TRANSMISSABLE TO HUMANS

Now, we are finally proceeding to a solution of the poultry problem, and, while we can take some solace in the thought "better late than never," the fact is that it is very late and lots of Americans, including children participating in the School Lunch Program, are the targets of at least 26 diseases which can be transmitted to man from unwholesome poulty. We have known about the dangers to humans from those diseases from poultry for at least a dozen years—since I brought to the attention of Congress in 1956 a report from the Food and Drug Administration which was instrumental in achieving the passage of the 1957 law.

The Wholesome Meat Act passed last year was good legislation, in the form in which it finally became law. I congratulate all of the Members of this Subcommittee who took part in drafting the final version of the bill. Since the poultry problem was left untouched, I said at the time that I would ask the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a draft of legislation which I could introduce this year to bring the Poultry Act into conformance with the Wholesome Meat Act as it relates to intrastate commerce. H.R. 15149 is the result of that request. Except for the title, which I changed, H.R. 15149 is exactly the same, I believe, as the bill introduced by Mr. Purcell, Mr. Dow, Mr. Smith of Iowa, and Mr. Foley, H.R. 15146. On the other hand, I think Mr. Poage's bill, H.R. 15154, depends upon voluntary cooperation by the states, similar to the Meat Inspection bill originally passed by the House last year prior to the development of a much stronger bill in Conference, and would not solve the serious problem of unwholesome poultry sold only in intrastate commerce.

UNFAIR COMPETITION FROM UNINSPECTED PLANTS

A letter I received just the other day from a poultry processor in out-state Missouri comments on one aspect of this problem—the unfair competition to inspected plants from uninspected poultry sold in the state of Missouri. The letter is as follows:

February 12, 1968.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: It is indeed a pleasure to read of your efforts concerning the federal inspection of all poultry consumed in the U.S. Having been in the broiler industry for quite a number of years in Southeast Missouri, I think I have accumulated quite a bit of knowledge of what you have been trying to get done. I have seen non-inspected poultry being sold in the St. Louis area for a number of years now and it is not only unwholesome, but creates a financial disadvantage to plants such as ours which comply with USDA standards price wise.

We have a non-inspected plant at Cape Girardeau, Missouri that has been selling chickens in our area not only to the public, but also to the college and schools as well. I believe two years is too long to allow these plants to keep supplying unwholesome products to the consumer.

Your efforts to apply the 1957 USDA law of making St. Louis area a major consuming area, should be commended and certainly not forgotten.

Again, let us offer our appreciation for your efforts.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS CAN SERVE UNINSPECTED POULTRY

When I read this letter I could not believe that schools participating in the School Lunch Program could be buying uninspected poultry. It just did not make sense. The poultry furnished by the Department of Agriculture under section 6 of the School Lunch Act is purchased only from Federally inspected plants but I have now learned that the schools themselves are free to purchase uninspected poultry with their own funds, or even with donated Federal funds. This is incomprehensible to me. The whole purpose of the School Lunch Program is to assure the children good, nutritious food. Yet here we have a situation where uninspected plants operating only in intrastate commerce can compete for the subsidized school lunch business with poultry not processed under minimum standards of sanitation or wholesomeness, and this poultry can then be comingled in the school cafeteria with the inspected poultry donated by the Department of Agriculture.

This fact alone calls for prompt action by the Congress to close the loopholes in the Poultry Act, as we did last year in the Meat Inspection Act. In the meantime, I think that this Committee should join me in insisting that the schools participating in the School Lunch Program buy only inspected meats or poultry pending the institution of an effective inspection system which would apply to all poultry.

St. Louis has been plagued repeatedly with bad poultry sent into our city from uninspected plants in Missouri. I am sure every city faces a similar problem. The danger of salmonella and other dread diseases getting into our food supply is real and serious. There is no excuse for this to happen in a country which can produce such an abundance of pure and wholesome food. Why should our school children be fed food which cannot pass minimum standards of wholesomeness or the consumers be deceived into buying it, not knowing it is probably unsafe?

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ARE MAIN CONCERN

The major firms in the poultry industry recognized, eleven years ago, that all sales of poultry were suffering from public lack of confidence in the wholesomeness of the products. After first having opposed compulsory Federal inspection, the industry then joined me in helping to pass the 1957 Act. They have never been sorry. But the processors who now comply with the Federal law are put at a great competitive disadvantage by plants operating only in intrastate commerce and thus generally free from any effective inspection or regulation, Federal or state.

Protecting legitimate industry from unfair competition is a proper function of the Congress, but there is a much more important interest involved here even than that of protecting the legitimate processor. That interest is the public health and safety.

I would be pleased and flattered if, because of my long identification with this issue and my sponsorship of the first poultry legislation introduced in the Congress, my bill, H.R. 15149, were approved by this Subcommittee and by the full Committee and reported to the House. But whichever bill is selected as the vehicle for House action, the important thing is that we pass the legislation as soon as possible. After the required waiting period of two years, we can then begin to have effective protection of consumers *in every state* from the dangers to our health and safety represented by more than a billion pounds of poultry being sold each year which you and I would never consent to eat if we knew that it had not been inspected by the Federal government or by state inspection programs at least comparable to the Federal inspection procedures. We are eating such poultry now without realizing it, particularly when we travel. And the children are eating it in the schools. How can we tolerate this?

ATTACHMENTS

December 11, 1967.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Orville: Can I involve you in another issue? I need your help.

If you have had a chance to read the debate in the House on the Meat Inspection bill, you probably noticed my references to the need for getting at the problem of bad poultry processed and sold in intrastate commerce. I am enclosing a copy of my remarks in case you missed them.

Please look them over. And, if you have the hearings of the House Agriculture Committee on the Meat Inspection bill, I hope you will turn to my testimony beginning on page 41 through page 63. It deals more with poultry than with meat.

I am writing to you rather than to the Consumer and Marketing Service people because they know all about this issue already and what I need is some guidance or assistance from you.

I have never been able to understand the need for separate Poultry and Meat Inspection laws. When I started on the poultry problem 11 years ago, my inclination was merely to amend the Meat Inspection law to include poultry. But I was talked out of that by some of the strategists who felt that we could have a better chance of getting help from Members of the Agriculture Committee from poultry-raising areas if they thought that whatever distinctive or unique aspects of poultry, compared to meat, could be taken care of in the legislation.

So for 10 years we have had two separate laws, even though now both are under the same administrative direction. I pleaded with the Agriculture Committee to handle the problem of intrastate inspection for both meat and poultry in the same way—either by adopting the "major consuming area" machinery of the Poultry Act for Meat Inspection or else amending the Poultry Act to conform to whatever setup was devised for Meat Inspection. As you know, the idea did not get very far in this session.

It is my intention to offer new legislation in the second session to provide authority for coverage of poultry in intrastate commerce. I would appreciate help from you on this, specifically:

(1) A draft of a suitable bill which I could introduce;

(2) The initiation by your Department of the kind of study into conditions in the non-inspected poultry plants similar to the surveys made by your meat inspectors into conditions in the uninspected meat packing plants.

The information developed by the meat inspectors was a prime factor in getting Congress to pass H.R. 12144.

In asking for this assistance, I perhaps should point out that I was the first Member of Congress to call for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry and, although it was not a bill with my name on it which became law, I feel I am justified in claiming the credit for its enactment in 1957. So I am not trying to jump on someone else's project. As a matter of fact, some of those who were most active in the fight for the Meat Inspection bill have indicated their desire to join me now in bringing the Poultry Act up to date and meeting the problems of intrastate poultry fitness. We have failed in implementing the machinery of the 1957 Act for intrastate use. If that Act is not practical, then I want something which I could introduce which would solve this problem.

I am sure there must be millions of pounds of poultry sold only in intrastate commerce and I would suspect that most of this comes from plants which could not possibly meet the requirements for Federal inspection.

Sincerely yours,
Leonor K. Sullivan,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

December 21, 1967.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I am glad to get your letter of December 11 requesting assistance in developing amendments which would strengthen the Poultry Products Inspection Act. We have been studying this problem for several months and we are concerned that substantial quantities of commercially produced poultry products do not receive adequate inspection to assure wholesomeness.

We have made a careful reexamination of Section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act and efforts have been made several times to use this provision to extend the Federal inspection program where consumers were not receiving adequate protection. We do not believe that this Section of the Act as presently written will produce the desired results. We are in the process of developing amendments that would provide adequate inspection using provisions similar to those contained in the new Wholesome Meat Act.

Just as soon as we have the language available, we will call you. We appreciate your continued interest and look forward to working with you on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Orville F. Freeman.

Problems of the Communist Party in Poland

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Free Trade Union News, published by the Department of International Affairs of the AFL–CIO, recently published two articles on Communist Poland by Mr. Stefan Korbonski.

Mr. Korbonski headed the underground resistance movement in Poland in World War II. Now in exile in the United States, he is chairman of the Polish Delegation to the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

I found both of Mr. Korbonski's articles extremely informative and well written. In the first, entitled "Polish Panorama: Communist Trends and Tussles," he discusses the problems the Communist Party faces in Poland today; and in the second, "Deep Discontent Among the Polish People," he explains the lack of function of the Marxist economic system.

The articles are as follows:

[From the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News, November 1967]

POLISH PANORAMA: COMMUNIST TRENDS AND TUSSLES

(By Stefan Korbonski)

The present-day Polish Communist Party reminds one of a lifeless robot. It exists as an immensely expanded appratus of authority which automatically fulfills certain defined functions, but no idea enlivens it and it lacks the enthusiasm, energy, and spirit of dedication of the first pioneers of Communism. Fatigue, apathy and cynicism, as well as the search for personal material benefits, prevail. Slowly, this party is changing into an organization of state officials, careerists, and persons who consider joining the party about as necessary as taking a school examination. The one and the other are necessary to obtain a position with the same employer—the state.

According to a February 1967 report of the Main Statistical Office, the state employs 8,582,000 persons (in 1967, the population of Poland was over 32,000,000). According to its own sources, the Communist Party had 1,894,895 members and candidates on January 1, 1967. The number of workers in the party is steadily decreasing and accounts for only 37.1 percent of the membership; however, the number of white-collar employees is constantly increasing and now accounts for 42.6 percent. These unhealthy relationships may be the chief reason for the paralysis of the party and for the atmosphere of suspicion, accusation, and internal terror that prevails in the party.

The party has not been able to win over the youth who, corroded with cynicism, can most painfully mock Communist ideology and its chief theoretician Lenin, in spite of the fact that the youths must belong to Communist youth organizations to gain material benefits, such as scholarships. If the party devotes much time to youth then, on the one hand, it is because of an atmosphere of rebellion and agitation which prevails at Polish universities and, on the other hand, because of the problem of hooliganism which is alarmingly spreading in cities owing to the lack of ideas and future prospects; hooliganism is a serious social problem.

The Communist Party is divided internally into several trends: There are, first of all, the young party intellectuals who form the internal, militant opposition in the Communist Party. They fight against the "old guard." Up to now, the old guard—led by Gomulka—has been victorious. However, numerous groups of educated, qualified, and frequently greatly talented technocrats from the economic sector, who belong to the party out of necessity and for their career's sake and who do not believe in Communism and are dissatisfied with the "ignoramuses" at the top of the party, create a potential opposition even though they now act passively and neutrally.

Another trend is represented by the leadership of the "Chinese" faction of the party—headed by Kazimierz Mijal. They escaped into Albania: from there, each day, four half-hour programs on Radio Tirana urge Poles to overthrow the "revisionist" and "traitor to the workers' cause"—Gomulka—and his clique. Former Deputy Premier Stanislaw Lopot and former chairman of the trade unions Victor Klosiewicz, two prominent Communists, belong to this faction, which has assumed the prewar name of Polish Communist Party. It has its own followers in Poland, particularly among the security police, which enables it to print and distribute anti-Gomulka brochures and pamphlets. Zenon Kliszko, closest co-worker of Gomulka, admitted this fact at the party congress in 1964.

Other trends are represented by the "partisans" faction grouping former members of Communist anti-German guerrilla warfare during the Second World War and headed by General Mieczyslaw Moczar, Minister of Internal Affairs and Chief of Security Police; a group of "Natolins," or orthodox Stalinists, with Zenon Nowak and Kazimierz Witaszewski as leaders; and "liberals," or revisionists, comprised mainly of prewar members of the anti-Communist Polish Socialist Party (PPS), headed by the present Premier Jozef Cyrankiewicz and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Adam Rapacki.

Of these, the most important one is the "partisans" faction, which has gained control of "ZBOWID," a veterans' union, and placed General Moczar at its head. Moczar, considered as a man of the future and as the eventual successor to Gomulka, reached the right conclusion that one cannot govern only with the help of the security police which, on the one hand, he greatly expanded, and which on the other hand, he curbed as compared, for example, with 1945–1950, the years of terror.

Because the party has become a lifeless apparatus, he considered it necessary for the Communists to seek support in an organization that lives, has prospects for expansion, and may even become popular. He recognized the monopolistic "ZBOWID" veterans' union as such an organization. The membership of this organization is comprised primarily of members of the small underground Communist People's Army and former soldiers of the Polish Army organized in Russia under the leadership of Polish General Zygmunt Berling, who was selected by the Soviets. Because disability or veteran payments may be received only through "ZBOWID," large numbers of former soldiers of the national and anti-Communist Underground Home Army, which numbered 300,000 soldiers and fought in the 1944 Warsaw uprising under the leadership of General Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, and also former soldiers who fought in the West in the 100,000-man army of General Wladyslaw Anders have joined the above organization out of necessity.

After becoming the chairman of "ZBOWID," Moczar began to flirt with recently persecuted soldiers of the Home Army and tried to infiltrate Polish emigre veterans' organizations in England, the United States and France, but up to now he has not succeeded. In his quietly whispered propaganda, Moczar plays on the patriotic feelings of all Poles, promising greater independence from Russia and rapprochement with the West along the lines of Yugoslavia, whose example many Poles would like to follow.

Moczar's propaganda promises discontinuation of the unnecessary struggle with the Church, official acknowledgment that the murder of 7,000 Polish officers in Katyn in 1942 was perpetrated not by the Germans but by the Soviets, which was confirmed by a Congressional Committee of the United States, and finally it promises consent to the unification of Germany, providing that she be neutralized.

On the other hand, it is known that during the period of Stalin's terror he was a high officer in the security police and that the blood of hundreds of Polish patriots is on his conscience. Moreover, he is an advocate of a get-tough administration within the country. Hence, his furtive whisperings are received with disbelief and fear.

What is the position of Gomulka and his trusted co-workers—Marian Spychalski, Marshall of the Polish Army, Zenon Kliszko, and Ignacy Loga-Sowinski—in the face of these trends within the Communist Party? The opinion prevails that Gomulka, who skillfully maneuvers among all factions, will continue to remain in power as long as he desires because, after October 1956, this narrow-minded fanatic gained the confidence of the Soviets and blindly follows all their recommendations. This confidence of the Soviets had, has and will have a decisive significance in Poland. Without the approval of the Soviets, no one in present-day Poland may govern nor will he. All other opinions slated in the West are "wishful thinking."

After the departure of Gomulka, that faction will take over the government which will gain the support of the Soviets. In this sphere, they play the role of a super-arbitrator. This, Moczar knows well, hence he does not move beyond the whispered propaganda, which may even have been silently approved by the Soviets. To the extent that the Soviets give Gomulka great internal autonomy, which unfortunately he does not fully utilize, to that extent they demand blind obedience from him in the field of international affairs of which the best example is the Polish policy in regards to Vietnam, the war in the Middle East, and West Germany.

Poland, being itself a poor country benefiting from the economic aid of the United States, on its part gives North Vietnam dollar loans, most likely nonrepayable, armaments, medicines, industrial commodities, food, and training in Poland of several hundreds of Vietnamese. After the recent visit in Hanoi of Zenon Kliszko, Gomulka's right arm, this aid will be increased.

All of this is done contrary to the will of the Polish people, for whom the matter of Vietnam is completely alien and remote. The Poles hate war, for they have suffered much from war, and truly desire peace. But if they wish anyone victory in Vietnam, then it is only that side on which the United States fights, a country which enjoys immense popularity in Poland, especially among the peasants. Hence, it is not strange that in factories, in which workers were taxed for the benefit of North Vietnam, strikes occurred, and that "voluntary aid" for North Vietnam was abandoned. However, the entire Polish policy as regards Vietnam is dictated by the Kremlin.

The conformity of Polish foreign policy with the Soviet position appeared even more glaringly during the war in the Middle East. The Polish people well remember the dreadful Hitler massacre of Jews in Poland during the Second World War. Poles see in Israel a peaceful haven for those who were rescued from Hitler's execution.

As far as the Communist Party is concerned, up to now anti-Semitism has been foreign to it, and Jews thus far have occupied important positions in it and in the administration. It is sufficient to add that

Gomulka's wife is Jewish, as was the first wife of Cyrankiewicz

Under these circumstances, Gomulka's break in diplomatic relations with Israel and his strong attack on the "Jewish aggressor" surprised the whole nation. These measures were extremely unpopular and even caused unrest in the party and among the military.

What is the reason that pro-Semite Gomulka came out so drastically against Israel in spite of established party tradition? There can be only one answer, and that is that the iron principle of conforming to the directives of Soviet international policy demanded it, from which thus far only Romania has been able to escape, and that only partially.

As far as Germany is concerned, the Gomulka regime demands not only that the Federal Republic recognize the Oder-Neisse line but also that Bonn recognize East Germany as a separate sovereign state. While all Poles, including anti-Communist Polish refugees, consider the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line a matter of vital interest to Poland, this is not the case in regard to the recognition of the "DDR" by the Federal Republic. Warsaw's support of the Ulbricht regime is based solely on Communist solidarity.

Polish Communist policy on Vietnam, Israel and West Germany is accompanied by violent attacks on the United States, which in the first case is accused of direct aggression, in the second, of the support of aggression, and in the third, of aiding German "revisionist demands," that is, potential aggression. This is the Communist reply to the American policy of "building bridges." The source of this hostility towards the United States is not difficult to uncover. To the Kremlin, any rapprochement of Poland with the United States is contrary to Soviet monopolistic interests.

[From the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News, December 1967]

DEEP DISCONTENT AMONG THE POLISH PEOPLE

(By Stefan Korbonski)

In Communist Poland, there exist 22 "trade unions," with more than 8 million members, at the head of which is the Central Council of Trade Unions. These "unions" are not engaged, as in the West, in the protection of workers' interests, but are a supervisory and policing organ of the Party to see to it that the Party recommendations on labor discipline and productivity are fulfilled and, above all, to prevent strikes, which in the "People's Democracies," where supposedly the factories belong to the people, are considered a crime. Nevertheless, strikes erupt spontaneously, but they are "wildcat" strikes immediately suppressed by the "trade unions."

NO DISCUSSIONS

The best evidence of this state of affairs was the sixth congress of the Polish "trade unions," held in June 1967, at which 1,135 delegates blindly fulfilled the Party recommendations, adopting without discussing a political resolution on Vietnam, Greece, and the Near East; approving a new five-year economic plan for 1966–1970; and re-electing Ignacy Loga-Sowinski, Gomulka's confidant, as the chairman.

According to the official Communist publication Przeglad Zwiazkowy of June 1967, the average monthly wage, that is, before deductions, was 2,081 zloty. Although the Communist statistics usually err in favor of the administration, let us accept this figure as correct and examine what standard of living this wage ensures with the following basic prices of food and clothing as announced in the 1966, No. 12 issue of Biuletyn Statystyczny, an official Communist publication.

The cost of one kilogram (2.25 pounds) of bread is 3–4 zloty; butter costs 70 zloty; cream, 22 zloty; cheese, 42 zloty; sausage (kielbasa), 36–70 zloty; bacon, 33 zloty; pork, 36 zloty; beef 26–30 zloty; veal 26–40 zloty; chicken, 47 zloty; goose, 34 zloty; salted herrings, 10–18 zloty; roasted coffee, 220 zloty; tea, 140 zloty; milk (1 liter), 2.70 zloty; and one egg costs 1.55–2.40 zloty.

The cheapest men's half boots, with rubber soles cost 120 zloty; better quality ones, 180–350 zloty. Men's half boots with leather soles cost 700 zloty. Men's suits cost from 1,200 zloty up; pure wool ones cost 3,500 zloty. The cheapest domestically-produced summer coat, not water-proofed, costs 750 zloty, and a better quality one 1,200 zloty; winter coats cost from 750–2,000 zloty.

In terms of dollars (not at the official exchange which is a ridiculous and unrealistic 24 zloty for one dollar, but at the rate of exchange paid by the official Postal Savings Bank (PKO—75 zloty for a dollar, or the exchange on the black market—about 100 zloty for a dollar), the wages amount to about $28, or $21; old age pension amounts to $9.33, or $7; and disability pension amounts to $12.13, or $9.

FORGOTTEN AND EXPLOITED

Hence, it is not unusual that workers consider themselves as the most forgotten and exploited class. The lack of incentives is the reason for the low productivity, the so-called "goofing off" ("bumelanctwo"), and absenteeism, which is explained by workers as follows: the administration pretends that it is paying us, therefore, we pretend that we are working.

According to the now famous "Open Letter to the Party" of young Communists Kuron and Modzelewski, the Polish worker annually produces 51,000 zloty worth of wealth, whereas in wages he receives 22,932 zloty. The difference is used to cover the luxurious life of the new ruling class.

The white-collar employees, who try to make both ends meet by combining the earnings of two or more jobs, are not much better off. This they call ironically the "Polish economic miracle."

In connection with this low standard of living, the Polish people have developed an obsession about the exploitation of Poland by Russia, which does exist and now consists mainly of Russia charging higher prices for exports and paying lower prices for imports, in comparison with prices in her trade with West Europe. According to the economist Aleksander Kutt, prices paid by Poland to Russia in 1964 were 65.1 percent higher than in other countries. In order to curtail these abuses, the Polish administration demanded in 1966 that mutual calculations be made in dollars, thereby escaping the fictional ruble exchange.

In comparison with workers and white-collar employees, the peasants are in the best material situation since the time the collectives were broken up (after October 1956) and 85 percent of the land went into the hands of the former owners, who may now sell the surplus over compulsory deliveries to the state on the open market at much higher prices.

CAMOUFLAGED COLLECTIVIZATION

But the threat of collectivization always hangs over them in the form of Agricultural Circles, a camouflaged introduction to collectivization, whose members are given various economic privileges. Another threat is the resolution passed in 1962 permitting the state to take over neglected and encumbered farmsteads; this definition speaks for itself. On the basis of this resolution, the state has already forcibly taken several hundred thousand hectares of land from the peasants.

Two major factors cause the low standard of living in Poland. The first is the expansion of heavy industry at the price of intensive exploitation of human labor and the neglect of consumer goods production. This development of the heavy industry could have been achieved wtihout such sacrifice if the Communist administration had not rejected the Marshall Plan in 1947 and if it had given Poland economic freedom, which brought West Europe unprecedented development and prosperity.

The other is that the Marxist economic system does not function. To make it more efficient, typically capitalist methods are now applied, for example, basing factory production on the principles of supply and demand, profit and loss, and—recently in Poland—leasing of unprofitable state restaurants to private persons. Poland's association with GATT will draw it away further from the antiquated Communist economic system in this atomic, automated, and computerized age.

The dissatisfaction running through the Polish people has found its best exponents among Polish authors. They are raising their voices with increasing boldness and are not terrorized by arrests and deprival of the means of earning a living. The classic example of this was the manifesto of the 34 authors in April 1964 demanding freedom of expression—and also the resolution of two meetings of writers in Warsaw, on March 29, 1965 and May 7, 1965, at which the overwhelming majority voted to demand abolition of the Stalinist "small penal code" which calls for the death sentence in a dozen or so categories of so-called "political offenses," abolition of the death sentence in general with the exception of genocide crimes, abolition of emergency courts, and appointment of a censorship commission.

CONFISCATED PUBLICATIONS

The government did not react to these resolutions at all. Finally, on June 2 and 3, 1967, at a meeting in Koszalin, a resolution by Stefan Kisielewski was passed demanding that censors be obliged to give reasons for confiscations of articles and books so that their decisions can be appealed.

Several less patient authors, not acting in accordance with censorship, chose other means, namely smuggling their articles and book manuscripts critical of conditions in Poland abroad, to the West, where they were published under pseudonyms. Melchior Wankowicz, Stanislaw Cat-Mackiewicz and Jan Nepomucen Miller were tried and given prison sentences for this.

Finally, a third category of authors is represented by those who have carried on the revolt against Polish reality outside of Poland, "choosing freedom" in the west. This action was, for instance, taken by Marek Hlasko, the young, talented author of "The Eighth Day of the Week." This intellectual ferment of Polish writers is part of the unrest that can be observed in all Soviet bloc countries.

Against this background, the struggle against Communist atheism which is being conducted by the Catholic Church, headed by Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, is fascinating to the observer of Polish affairs. The Cardinal is the winner up to this time, as shown by the fact that the churches are more overcrowded than before the war, and by the flourishing of religious life. Going to church has become not only a spiritual need but, at the same time, also a protest against the government.

ATTACKS REPULSED

While Cardinal Wyszynski has accepted the fact that there is a Communist government in Poland, he uncompromisingly repulses Communist attacks on religion, on the Church, on religious practices and rites, on the religious education of youth, and on the religious activities of the Catholic hierarchy. In these matters, the Cardinal gives the traditional, centuries-old response of the Catholic Church: "Non possumus" (we are not able).

In violation of the Communist regime's own Constitution and agreements concluded with the Church, religious instruction is banned from the schools, and the so-called catechetic centers—centers for teaching catechism—are subjected to many limitations and harassments. Priests are arrested, seminaries closed, monks and nuns expelled from convents, organized pilgrimages are banned, wayside chapels and crosses removed, parents who baptise their children fired from government jobs, exorbitant taxes are levied on churches, etc. There are instances where church equipment, such as portable organs and vestments, is sold at auctions by tax collectors. Catholic charitable organizations are closed, publications curbed, and Cardinal Wyszynski's books confiscated.

WORLDWIDE CAMPAIGN

Simultaneous with these anti-Church actions conducted at the parish level, a campaign is being directed against the Catholic hierarchy on a higher political level and a world-wide basis. Stages of this were the violent attacks on Polish bishops for their November 18, 1965 letter to German bishops which, in true Christian spirit, offered the German people forgiveness for their guilt during the war and in turn asked for forgiveness. It also invited them to Poland for the Millennium, or 1,000 years of Christianity, celebration. The German bishops answered this letter in writing on December 5 in the same conciliatory tone and accepted the invitation to Poland for May 3, 1966.

The Communist government then accused the Polish hierarchy of betraying Polish interests. It forbade Cardinal Wyszynski's trip to Rome which was planned for January 1966. In turn, the government refused entrance visas to Poland not only to German and Austrian bishops but also to American bishops of Polish descent. Finally, Pope Paul VI, who wanted to participate in the May 3 celebration, was refused permission to enter Poland. The last of these petty harassments was the refusal to grant Cardinal Wyszynski a visa for a two-month trip to the U.S., planned for August 1966.

In the millennium year of 1966, Poland became the scene of a strange duel between the Catholic hierarchy and the government and Communist Party. It was a matter of demonstrating who had power over the souls of the Polish people. In whatever town Cardinal Wyszynski and the bishops organized a mass religious Millennium celebration on a certain day, there, on the same day, the local Communist officials organized a public meeting, parade, athletic competition or a similar undertaking which was supposed to draw the inhabitants away from the religious celebration.

However, the government did not achieve its goal since crowds of many thousands took part in the religious celebrations, several times outnumbering those who arrived—frequently under supervision and coercion—at government events. The Catholic Church won this duel. This was the type of plebiscite in which the Poles voted with their feet.

The question arises whether this atmosphere of dissatisfaction and hostility toward the Communist government on a national scale can lead to an explosion and abrupt changes in the system of government. Excluding a cataclysm of a world scale, which no one in Poland desires, or a violent uprising in the Soviet Union, which is not likely—the answer to this question should be negative. The Poles well remember the Hungarian uprising. As long as Soviet divisions are present in East Germany, Soviet garrisons will be present on Polish territory, and in the final analysis, the Soviet Union will determine Poland's government.

However, the Poles count on the gradual disintegration of Communism, which they will endeavor to accelerate through their resistance, and on changes in the Soviet Union itself which must find their reflection in Poland. They count on the evolution of a system which is politically outdated and reactionary and does not meet the demands of the contemporary world.

In the meantime, the Poles will exploit, with talent and stubbornness, each periphery of freedom that the Communist system will allow. They will decide to arm themselves with patience and be guided by the conviction that Communism is a temporary phenomenon and the Polish nation is eternal. The Millennium celebrations raised the spirit of everyone. The Poles are saying to themselves: "We have lasted one thousand years, we will last a second!"

WHEN SOVIET WORKERS REVOLTED AGAINST BOLSHEVISM

Three years after the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia, the workers more strongly than ever clamored for freedom and protested against the Communist dictatorship. Petrograd, now Leningrad, was the center of working class discontent with the Bolshevik regime. To force the government to consider their demands, the workers went on strike in the Patronny Munition Works, the Laferm factory, and the Trubotchny and Baltiyski Mills.

In order to suppress the strikers, the Communists created a special Committee of Defense with Zinoviev as Chairman. The Bolshevik government locked out the striking workers, deprived them of their rations, and closed the Trubotchny factory. The strikers responded with an historic manifesto which they plastered on the walls of the city on February 27, 1921. This significant call for freedom in Communist Russia demanded in part:

"A complete change is necessary in the policies of the Government. First of all, the workers and peasants need freedom. They don't want to live by the decrees of the Bolshevicki; they want to control their own destinies.

"Comrades, preserve revolutionary order! Determinedly and in an organized manner demand:

"Liberation of all arrested socialists and non-partisan workingmen;

"Abolition of martial law; freedom of speech, press and assembly for all who labor;

"Free election of shop and factory committees (zahvkomi) of labor union and Soviet representatives.

"Call meetings, pass resolutions, send your delegates to the authorities and work for the realization of your demands."

Lenin answered the demands of the strikers with numerous arrests and the suppression of the workers' organizations. It is this suppression which aroused the Kronstadt sailors, who had been the spearhead of the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 and who now sympathized with the striking workers. This led to the famous Kronstadt Revolt which was finally crushed on March 18, 1921 by the Red Army.

Manpower Shortage

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the public service sector of our economy, particularly in the inner cores of our great cities, is sadly undermanned. Schools need teachers and administrators; police and fire departments need men; hospitals are unable to provide an even minimal level of service. The needs of the central cities and the needs of the people who live in our central cities are placing an unbearable strain on available manpower.

I am introducing today the Veterans in Public Service Act of 1968 which will hopefully encourage returning veterans to enter into public service and to direct his talents and energies to the places where they are most desperately needed.

Under this legislation the Federal Government will furnish special encouragement and economic support to veterans who are willing to devote a part of their lives to preparing for and pursuing teaching or other public service careers in deprived areas.

Mr. Speaker, the returning veterans will not be restricted to service in the central cities. The Administrator of the Veterans' Administration will be free to prescribe any area as "deprived" which has a high concentration of low-income families. I anticipate that many of these new veterans will want to go out into the rural pockets of poverty.

The incentives and encouragement offered by this bill would be in various forms and would come on top of the regular benefits offered by the regular GI bills. As an example, for each month in a public service job in a deprived area, an eligible veteran would receive entitlement to a month of educational benefits under the GI bill, up to a total of 24 additional months. As an alternative, an eligible veteran might elect to receive a monthly training assistance allowance for up to 2 years of teaching service in a deprived area. For a single veteran this allowance would total $80 per month for the first year of service and $60 per month for the second year. Similar allowances would be made for careers in public service jobs other than teaching.

The recent Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice found that "the Nation's police departments are encountering serious difficulty in maintaining their forces at authorized strength—50,000 new police officers will be needed in 1967 alone." I would hazard to guess that this need was not filled in 1967 and that a greater need exists in 1968. The Commission found that most police departments throughout the country were understrength by using even minimal standards and that this shortage comes from a lack of qualified applicants. This bill will act to rapidly fill out the sagging ability of the police to deal with crime in the streets. Veterans, experienced in discipline, understanding, and technical ability, will be welcome additions to urban and nonurban police and fire departments.

The need for qualified and dedicated classroom teachers in deprived areas has long been a subject of increasing concern at all levels of government. The Teacher Corps has been designed as a partial answer, but the real dearth of good, trained teachers in our core cities and in the outlying rural schools is only beginning to be understood.

The National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower underscored the obvious longstanding shortage of qualified health service personnel. Nurses, attendants, hospital administrators, and technicians are in short supply in the hospitals serving core cities. The tales of patients waiting days for rushed treatment are becoming too frequent to be ignored.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to channel the motivation, dedication, skill, and maturity of returning veterans to confront the crisis of poverty and deprivation. This bill aims at bringing a measure of equality to the services provided to those living in deprived areas. The shortages exist at all levels of government, but this lack is felt most strongly in the poor sections. My bill is aimed at easing this shortage.

The second bill I introduce today will remove an inequitable oversight that presently exists in the veterans vocational rehabilitation laws.

At the present time, veterans with service-connected disabilities must enter into a program of vocational rehabilitation full time in order to qualify. For the veterans with a disability that gets progressively worse, the law acts to cut him off from a vital avenue of protection for himself and his family. The veteran may hold a full-time job providing an adequate income for his family. The veteran may overlook the progressive nature of his disability. He may overlook the need for vocational rehabilitation. When the time comes when his disability forces him to give up his regular job, his eligibility for vocational rehabilitation may have run out.

The bill I am introducing today allows such veterans with service-connected disabilities to undertake vocational rehabilitation on a part-time basis, allowing retention of the regular job while undergoing the necessary training for a new vocation in the event that the existing disability forces the veteran to give up his regular job.

The present law—with a 9-year time limitation—often works to the detriment of many veterans. Many are reluctant to give up full-time employment for full-time vocational rehabilitation. Many would rather remain in full-time jobs rather than risk the insecurity of full-time vocational rehabilitation. This bill gives security where in the past there was uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, as the President said so well in his recent message on veterans benefits:

> Today, as in times past, it is on America's fighting men that this nation must depend. Their services honors us all.

I am hopeful that these bills will receive speedy and sympathetic consideration. Those who have stood in our defense deserve no less—and the complex problems that this country faces can receive no better answers.

Decade of the Oceans

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 7 Senator Claiborne Pell made a most significant speech before an oceanography symposium held by the Navy League of the United States.

Senator Pell has long been interested in the question of the control and development of the ocean floor, as have I. In the last session of the 90th Congress, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which I have the honor to chair, held extensive hearings on this subject.

Senator Pell sounds a timely warning that there is no time to be lost in pursuing our national purpose in oceanography, and I commend his speech to all our colleagues:

Remarks of Senator Claiborne Pell Before the Navy League of the United States, February 7, 1968—Decade of the Oceans

If this were 1890 instead of 1968 and the world-famous sea power advocate, Alfred Thayer Mahan, were standing before you today, I think I can say, without undue modesty, that you would prefer to hear him rather than any senator. Since it is 1968 and since the concept of sea power's importance to this nation has long been accepted and acted upon, I am not feeling competitive about Captain Mahan. But this country does need a Mahan in the field of oceanology. It needs not just one but many advocates who are knowledgeable, thoughtful, and imaginative.

To keep to our analogy, oceanology resembles today not just the age of changing from sail to steam, as in the days of Mahan, but rather the days of Portugal's Prince Henry the Navigator when no nation had the technology to go very far from shore, even on the *surface* of the seas. Oceanology is at the stage today that the world was on the eve of the great voyages of Columbus and Drake and Magellan. As in the 15th Century, man today *almost* has the technology to explore and exploit in the hitherto dark spaces beyond the continental shelves and territorial seas of all nations.

Most of us here have heard the "speech" that is being made in the country today about the riches that lie ripe for picking in Ocean Space. We have heard that the solution to man's hunger is the proper exploitation of fish protein concentrate, or the development of aquaculture, or fish husbandry. We have heard estimates of the fabulous quantities of minerals which can be extracted by insolution mining from the waters of the oceans or dug from the bottom of the world ocean.

Unfortunately, despite the exciting talk, this country is still moving at the measured rhythm of a minuet toward actually building a pathway to the pot of gold described in such rainbow colors.

One reason for our slow pace is the reluctance of the Federal government to rev up the rheostat of public expenditure. Let's look at the amount of money that the Administration has elected to spend on oceanology. Last year it was less than ½ billion dollars. This year the President asked for slightly over that figure. When you measure this against the many billions being spent for activity in Outer Space, where there is no immediate usufruct to be derived, it seems disproportionate from a logical standpoint. Even industry is spending only about $2 billion annually in this field. If you think of the defense budget that we are staggering under, nearly $80 billion this year, you may wonder, as I do, why we are so diffident about realizing a vast potential for national income when we are so profligate in the equally empty wastes of Outer Space and war.

Let's examine the structure of the Government as it is currently set up to go ahead in the vital field of oceanology. A total of 23 agencies and departments of the Executive Branch have varying programs with too little or no correlation among them.

True, we have taken a step forward to correct this messy situation through the Magnuson Act of 1966. This law set up the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, with Vice President Humphrey as its eloquent and hardworking chairman. The great prestige of his office has resulted in some additional coordination with the help of his skillful staff director, Dr. Edward Wenk.

The Magnuson Act also created the President's Commission on Marine Sciences, ably led by the Chairman of the Ford Foundation, Dr. Julius Stratton. The Commission's task is to look into the whole field of oceanology in this country to establish priorities among our many potential objectives, and also to offer a blueprint on how to achieve them. As part of its work, the Commission must inquire into the way the Government is organized at present in the field of oceanology.

Posing this question may be a little bit like the story of the centipede who was walking gaily through the forest one day when a bumblebee stopped him and asked: "My, how do you walk so gracefully with all those legs? As a matter of fact, how do you walk at all?"

At this point the centipede sat down and scratched his head and wondered indeed how he did manage, with the result that, when he got up to move on, he couldn't! So Dr. Stratton's Commission will have to go a lot further than to just ask questions. It will have to provide a useful and simplified alternative if the most efficient use is to be made of the current rambling network of oceanologic Government agencies.

One of the nation's most revered and respected oceanologists, Dr. Paul M. Fye of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, has recently announced his own position on what to do about the Governmental tangle of agencies. Dr. Fye suggests that the route to better organization would be to set up a new Government agency to concentrate on ocean engineering and resources development. He wisely cautions against sweeping all ocean-related activities into such an agency. He urges that it would be more proper to retain defense-related activities within the Navy, environmental missions with the Environmental Science Services Administration, basic research with the National Science Foundation, fisheries research with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. Dr. Fye explains that the new agency should coordinate the marine-oriented tasks of existing agencies through a single board on marine sciences. It should serve, says he, as a funding, not an operating agency and should work through existing laboratory facilities in the Government, private industry, universities, and non-profit institutions to carry out its mission.

I applaud Dr. Fye's reasonable approach to this matter, and I see some advantages in the plan he offers. I am particularly happy to note that he calls for a "few billion dollars annually" to keep the United States ahead in marine matters. I also like his concept of setting up opposite-number committees in Congress to provide the necessary legislative backstopping and oversight of his proposed mechanism.

I am not trying to straddle the fence in avoiding all-out acceptance of Dr. Fye's proposal! I would rather wait, like others in the oceanology community, to see the recommendation of Dr. Stratton's committee before making up my own mind. But organize our Government facilities and agencies we must, or we shall fatally weaken our national effort in oceanology.

Before dropping this topic, I should like to compliment those in the Government who are constantly doing their best to orchestrate the many-headed monster into some sort of harmony. For example, I am thinking particularly of Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Robert Frosch, and the Navy's Oceanographer, Rear Admiral O'Dale D. Waters. These 2 distinguished professionals have insisted that any findings in the Navy's anti-submarine warfare program, which might help the fishing industry, should be promulgated as quickly as possible through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. Directed by Secretary Frosch, the Committee on Marine Research, Education and Facilities attempts to make sure that new research and technology discoveries are in fact shared by as many agencies as possible.

Under this concept I am happy to say the national research effort is usefully extended by placing oceanographers on "ships of opportunity" from many agencies. A rather exciting instance of this policy was surfaced recently when the Navy announced that among the crew of the information ship "*Pueblo*" were carried 2 civilian oceanologists. "*Pueblo*," rated at only 12 knots speed, must be an ideal slow cruiser from which oceanologists can make continuing measurements of temperature and salinity, as well as samplings of seaweed and plankton and other micro-organisms that float in non-territorial coastal areas. It's too bad that the oceanologic efforts of these 2 civilians have been summarily interrupted for the time being.

So much for the Government's part in building up oceanologic muscle for the nation. As in all non-defense activities, I believe, like Abraham Lincoln, that the Government should only do for the people that which the people cannot do for themselves. The ultimate development of oceanology will, in my opinion, take place when our nation's industry finds it profitable to do more and more in this always inhospitable environment. In addition to its physical rigors, Ocean Space presents also the threat of anarchy to those who will venture into it before long. I'm talking about the sea areas beyond the territorial and continental shelf limits where there is little or no existing international law to protect those who may soon be trying to carry out commercial enterprises. For example, mining and oil well drilling will not be safe from piracy or vandalism. This is why I have recently tried to stimulate our Government to seek some sort of Ocean Space Treaty to be signed among underseafaring nations.

One sure method for providing industry with the technicians and engineers to build the undersea technology of tomorrow is to encourage education in oceanology. Charles Duchein, the Navy League's National President, deserves great credit for his excellent move in this direction. As you know, Mr. Duchein has included among the Navy League's "Seven Strategic Safeguards to preserve our maritime supremacy" the following plank: "Stress the educational importance of the oceans on the college campuses throughout the country. Regaining the posture and perspective to prevail in the world's maritime arena on into the 21st Century requires knowledge, understanding, and intellectual interest in the oceans."

Dr. Roger Revelle, long-time director of the famous Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California, would agree with this point of view. He says: "World order depends on the ability of the United States Navy to concentrate our forces in space and time at any point on the coastlines of the world. We can be completely sure that this ability will be diminished unless we regain and enhance our maritime pre-eminence in every aspect of use of the oceans. Such pre-eminence depends above all on educating young people to understand and enjoy working at sea, in fisheries, submerged operations, and engineering development. And this can be done only if our colleges and universities are enabled to develop broadly-based faculties and research staffs to study and teach about the oceans."

This, of course, is what the Sea Grant College Program is intended to do. It will encourage universities to provide practical training and education on a large scale for the first time. As Dr. Revelle says: "It's an excellent example of the ways in which the Federal Government can stimulate but not exercise undue control over industrial and educational enterprises directed toward the fuller utilization of marine resources."

So I hope that President Duchein and all members of the Navy League will continue to press for more education in this vital, new field of challenge. I hope that all of you will recall the tremendous job that Mahan did in helping people in this country to understand its potential in the sea and how to attain it. Mahan, like all top-flight promoters, not only wrote books. He made speeches and gave lectures. He wrote articles. In fact, he used all the communications media of his era. With today's vast growth of media, we can, of course, add radio, television, as well as the beautiful, sleek magazines printed on machine-coated paper stock, like the handsome periodical of your organization, "Navy." I hope that all of you who do not already do so may find the time to read and, if possible, to contribute to the excellent periodicals in oceanology: "Oceanology," brilliantly edited by Robert Niblock, who was raised in the Midwest but has become an eloquent partisan of the seas; "Under Sea Technology," edited by the skillful professional, Larry Booda. Another leading communicator on marine is Seabrook Hull, editor of "Ocean Science News." There are several more—they are all good allies in alerting this nation to the challenge of the seas.

Mahan, incidentally, demonstrated a key element of the perfect advocate; that is, subordination of one's self into the persuasive presentation of an idea. When Mahan, a professional Naval officer, finally upon retirement won a "tombstone" promotion to Rear Admiral, he was faced with a delicate dilemma in public relations. Until that moment he had grown famous as the great exponent of sea power with the author's signature of "Captain Mahan." Would a change to Admiral weaken the public recognition of his name, he mused. He decided it would and so elected to continue calling himself "Captain" Mahan, as he had for so long.

This is the kind of spirit and total concentration on his mission that helps to explain the genius of Mahan and how he sold his contemporaries, from Theodore Roosevelt down, on the importance of sea power to national greatness.

If we, and all those over whom we have influence, can start talking and writing now about the need to master the sea around us, we can make the 1970's memorable as the Decade of the Oceans.

I think that, despite the relative sloth of our nation's advance in oceanology, we at least can point to a definite commitment on the part of the Government to move ahead in this field. But if we fail to continue to accelerate our growing technology through more ocean engineering courses in colleges, more Federal programs in ocean engineering, and more involvement by American industry, America may well forfeit its leadership in mastering the marine environment.

Just about 10 years ago the United States stood poised to take the first step into Outer Space. We were so sure of ourselves that, in an International Geophysics Year exhibit at Munich, Germany, we put a model of the first American space vehicle on show for all to see. But before we could achieve the first orbit according to our plans thus openly advertised, we were suddenly embarrassed on a global scale; for another country, having completed its preparations in secret, managed to steal the spotlight from us.

Now the stage is set again, this time at the threshold of Ocean Space. Americans are publicly pointing to the riches of the sea and predicting their imminent success in tapping its resources. The Congress has also moved positively to implement two vital programs to position us properly for exploration and exploitation of the oceans. The Sea Grant College Act, which I had the honor of introducing, and Senator Magnuson's bill were melded to provide technical training, higher education, applied research, as well as a blueprint for America's course in the decade ahead. In his State of the Union speech, President Johnson invoked once again the spirit of the IGY by proposing that "we launch with other nations an exploration of the ocean depths to tap its wealth, energy, and abundance."

At this point we should pause and examine our national purpose in oceanology, remembering carefully what happened 10 years ago. Then we were overconfident and underprepared for man's greatest venture since the Wright Brothers ushered in the Air Age.

I don't say that America should conquer the undersea world any more than we should annex Outer Space. I think President Johnson is right in encouraging international cooperation in the seas.

I do say that we should concentrate our various national elements in oceanology and focus on the future. This will take ever increasing applied research, which must be funded. Private industry, spurred by the profit motive, must pay for some of the effort. Private academic institutions must also carry part of the load. And where the private sector needs help, the Government should step in.

In this connection I must tell you that I'm worried about the Sea Grant College Program, which has been assigned such a vital role in readying America for the Decade of the Oceans. Despite a country-wide enthusiasm for this Program, the Administration has found it necessary to cut its funds below what I consider to be the necessary rock bottom minimum. The excuse for this economy, of course, is that we have huge expenditures to meet in pursuing the war in Vietnam. I would like to emphasize that the Morrill Act, which stimulated the development of our agricultural resources, was passed in the midst of a proportionately much larger crisis in the national Treasury—the year of its enactment being 1862. The Land Grant Act continues even today to contribute to America's worldwide pre-eminence in the field of agriculture.

So we must not flag in our fledgling oceanologic program. Despite the commitments in Outer Space, Vietnam, and the Great Society, we must concentrate on seeking the best and most efficient means to exploit the potential of the seas. Indeed, we may well enrich the Great Society as we learn how to master the marine environment. Americans must know more about our national opportunity in the seas. Members of the Navy League, I entreat you to become eloquent spokesmen to this end. Make speeches. Write articles. Encourage more seminars like this excellent meeting of the League. Become, each one of you, the Alfred Thayer Mahan of Oceanology. Only with enthusiasm and constancy of purpose will our country manage to maintain its present worldwide lead as we approach the Decade of the Oceans.

New Haven, Conn., Community Progress, Inc.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing parts 7 and 8 of the series of articles written by William E. Keish and Donald Dallas, reporters for one of Connecticut's leading newspapers, the New Haven Register. The articles comprise a critical analysis of the operations of Community Progress, Inc., the OEO community action program in New Haven, Conn. Parts 1 and 2 appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1968, 3 and 4 in the RECORD of February 15, 1968, and 5 and 6 in the RECORD of February 16, 1968. These are the last two articles in the series:

CPI IN CONFLICT: "WE CANNOT DO WITHOUT CPI, BUT . . ."; EVEN BACKERS QUALIFY THEIR SUPPORT—VII

"Wealth maketh many friends." (Proverbs, XIX, 4.)

(By William E. Keish Jr.)

In spite of the many millions of dollars it has secured and distributed to persons and agencies involved in New Haven's battle against poverty, Community Progress, Inc., commands few total and unqualified backers in New Haven.

One of the most significant aspects of the past month's persistent criticism of CPI has been the fact that even those with the kindest words to say for CPI mixed their support with words of reservation and even of condemnation. What has been repeatedly offered to the community as a super-agency—with super-claims to super-achievements and super-access to dollars and know-how—emerges as another monument with feet of clay.

Agency after agency in New Haven has proclaimed: "We cannot do without CPI, but. . . ."

Even Mayor Richard C. Lee, who has reaped national publicity and political acclaim from the pioneering anti-poverty effort, gave what some considered only lukewarm support to CPI in the wake of U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo's blistering attack on the agency.

Lee's sole public utterance on Giaimo's claim that CPI has "wasted" $18 million in its effort to improve the lot of impoverished New Haveners was a brief two-paragraph statement in which he acknowledged that any new organization was bound to run into problems and criticism. He said further:

"I still believe in the principles of CPI and feel that as a society, if we are to survive, we must find answers to the very problems which CPI was designed to solve." With that statement, Lee then removed himself from the area of conflict over CPI.

Equally as reticent about getting involved in the dispute over whether CPI has operated in the best interests of the city's residents, particularly the poor, is the Ford Foundation—the money-rich organization which financed the initial phase of the anti-poverty program started here nearly six years ago.

A high-ranking Ford official, who asked not to be identified, told The Register that his organization regards it as simply "a local controversy between Giaimo and CPI." According to this same person Ford is generally quite satisfied with the programs developed by CPI, maintaining that some of them have served as pace-setters for the rest of the nation

Since CPI's inception in 1962, Ford has given the local antipoverty agency $5,075,000, according to the Ford official.

Asked whether he thought Ford had an obligation to comment in view of the storm stirred up by Giaimo, the Ford official said, "We have no obligation."

The disassociation is even more notable in view of the fact that Mitchell Sviridoff, CPI's first director, is now a $50,000 per year official of the Ford Foundation. Even he had no comment to make on the agency he created.

This attitude of detachment on the part of Ford as well as CPI is apparently one reason why the local organization has never been able to make many friends for itself. CPI came upon the New Haven scene as a know-it-all outfit, making it very clear that the existing social service agencies had failed in their assignments.

As one veteran social service worker, who was in on the ground floor when CPI was started, observed:

"For the first three years, CPI was arrogant as hell, although it did have a dedicated, good staff." While the CPI attitude toward existing agencies has mellowed over the years, it is still a long way from establishing a "close" partnership with other agencies.

In his criticism of CPI, Giaimo said, "The most serious indictment of CPI, however, is its attitude toward local existing agencies. Its attitude that these agencies had done nothing to solve the local problems is incorrect. Its attitude that if it could not control the local agency it would have little or nothing to do with it is wrong."

Agreeing with Giaimo's observation, although he concedes that CPI has "done some good," is John W. Nichols, executive director of Family Service of New Haven Inc. He feels that it was a "distortion" to portray the existing agencies as having been unsuccessful in their effort to cope with the poverty problem in New Haven.

"CONTRARY TO FACT"

This attitude, said Nichols, is "quite contrary to fact." He noted that his agency has one of the largest caseloads of any agency in the city. At one time, Family Service received financial aid—approximately $12,000—from CPI but it was discontinued because of congressional cutbacks in the anti-poverty program.

Nichols, who takes great pains not to offend or to minimize the CPI operation, nevertheless makes it plain that he is not at all pleased with the introduction of nonprofessionals into the social service field. This type of work, he explains, is "best done under the careful supervision of professionally trained persons."

Taking a somewhat different stance is Frank Harris, executive secretary of the Community Council of Greater New Haven, who has kept in touch with the CPI program ever since it was started. Harris feels that nonprofessionals should be recruited for social service work.

Commenting on CPI's efforts, in general, Harris said it has served a good purpose because it "has shaken up agencies and made them look at themselves." The self-examination of the existing agencies is regarded by Harris as one of the chief benefits of CPI. He also feels strongly that CPI's design for providing services on a neighborhood level is a point in its favor.

Harris' enthusiasm for CPI was not exactly upheld by the board of directors of the Community Council, which acknowledged that CPI had worked along with existing agencies but, at the same time, noted that Giaimo raised "serious and legitimate questions of whether CPI's existence in theory—let alone in practice—can be justified at all."

BLAST GIAIMO

To counteract the impression left by the council directors, Harris and other members of the conference of executives—a sub-division of the council itself—issued a much stronger statement blasting Giaimo for his criticism.

In the eyes of the executive conference, Giaimo's attack was "condemnatory and destructive, based upon limited analysis, and failed to transmit an accurate picture of the services to people over the last six years." The conference apparently was moved to rebut Giaimo because it felt "someone had to say something," according to one of its members.

While the board of directors of the Dixwell Community House landed on Giaimo for implying that CPI virtually ignored the existing agencies, the organization's director, Alphonso Tindall, is less sympathetic than his board in appraising CPI's efforts.

According to Tindall, CPI "could be and should be dealing more with existing agencies." Furthermore, claims Tindall, it was partly the fault of the agencies themselves. "I don't think the professional got as much done as he could. If they weren't invited to get involved, they should have kicked the door in."

Tindall recalls that his organization was intimately involved in some of CPI's early programs, such as Head Start, but he hardly sees any CPI personnel anymore.

In Tindall's opinion, "the unfortunate thing about CPI and the poverty program as a whole is that it is not a program to meet needs, but to sell programs. This year it's jobs, last year it was Head Start, whatever they can sell best."

A better approach, according to Tindall, would be to strengthen existing agencies by raising more money for the United Fund. Also, he feels, CPI should become more of a funding agency rather than a program agency.

The reaction among New Haven's Negro community to the attack on CPI by Giaimo has not been of too much comfort to CPI. For example, Joseph Harris, associate director of the Dixwell Legal Rights Association, contended that what Giaimo had said "was necessary for the citizens of New Haven to know regardless of his reasons for saying it. The report brought a lot of things to the attention of the black community that were not known before."

ASKS SPITZ OUSTER

Harris also called for a reorganization of CPI. One of the first steps that should be taken, asserted Harris, was to replace Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz, whom he labelled as "too dictatorial," with a black executive director.

The Black Coalition, a group of leaders in the black community, was preparing to launch a campaign to unseat Spitz when the wife of its head, Henry Parker, became embroiled in a public dispute with CPI. The move has been stymied by this incident. However, the fact that the black community was considering such an endeavor is indicative of the lack of acceptance of CPI among Negroes.

As Tindall points out, the staff is divided almost equally between whites and black, but the 50 per cent that is white makes 80 per cent of money paid out in salaries.

One of the strongest defenses of CPI from within the black community came from Harry Jeffreys, vice president of the agency's board of directors, who described Giaimo as a "member of a small group of people trying to use politics to degrade CPI as an organization, its programs, Mayor Lee, and the thousands of people served by CPI."

A somewhat different angle on the agency—CPI relationship surfaced in talks with staff members of the Residential Youth Center on George Street. This highly individualized service for "hard core" young men, between 16 and 22 years of age, clearly considers itself only a distant relation to CPI.

Its staff notes that CPI Director Lawrence Spitz has never visited the project center. And in a note of unusual candor its supervisors estimate that they could do the administration by themselves for about $10,000 annually—or half the cost of the administration as budgeted by CPI headquarters.

Giaimo's investigation into CPI's operation was promoted by falling out with Vincent Sirabella, president of the New Haven Central Labor Council, who is its paid liaison representative with CPI. Sirabella's salary comes from funds provided by CPI. And Sirabella has been noticeably silent on Giaimo's criticism of the operation.

There has been no outcry from organized labor on Giaimo's attack on CPI.

A long list of agencies with whom it has dealt can be reeled off by CPI. A quick spate of defenses against criticism was received from many of these agencies when the Giaimo attack began. The goose that laid the golden egg was obviously a bird with many protectors. But in many ways the local defenders of CPI have also produced some of the most pertinent criticism of the agency.

CPI IN CONFLICT: FROM A CHECKERED PAST, A BETTER FUTURE?—VIII

(NOTE.—If we made one major breakthrough in involving the "unemployable", then $18 million would be a success. Just that major change." (The Rev. Timothy A. Meehan, CPI Treasurer.))

(By Donald Dallas)

Community Progress Inc. (CPI), according to its treasurer, the Rev. Timothy A. Meehan, is today in the process of recovering from the frustrations of last summer, undergoing extensive criticism, attempting to pull the pieces together, reshaping, reforming and making new relationships in the community.

He admits CPI does not have immediate "answers" for the problems of the poor the community is attempting to treat. He feels, in fact, that it will take a "minimum of 10 years" for "real social change."

He agrees, too, with much of the recent criticism leveled at CPI. But he sees a major hope for the future in the "close" relationships that had already started—and are now perhaps accelerated—with business, social agencies, and Yale. On these relationships, he admits, depend the CPI programs for the future. And he feels the CPI relationship with all these fundamental New Haven community groups is now better than ever before in its up-and-down history.

Despite the current mood of criticism—and partially because of it—Father Meehan feels that social agencies, for example, are now ready to support and defend CPI. This attitude of mutual interest and backing, he believes, "would not have existed a year ago."

Noting the new CPI working ties with the Chamber of Commerce, he adds that real business involvement has become a phenomenon of the "last six months."

And the relationship with Yale, despite prior vagueness is now close.

The CPI treasurer's mood of optimism for the agency—and its goal—reflects more than a confidence that it can meet present community demands. It springs, he says, from an emerging new spirit by which, over the past several months, CPI has been "reaching out" to other agencies and institutions and people for assistance, guidance and shared concern. This represents a radical change from the attitude of the CPI early years—which was described by a major figure in the field of social services here as "arrogant as hell." It was this attitude, also, which U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo described as CPI's major shortcoming.

Without any particular CPI "chauvinism," Father Meehan predicts that—largely as a result of the current controversy and concern "in the old American tradition," CPI will "again emerge into that position of leadership where I feel most people really want it to be."

One area that has seriously hurt CPI—and which still hurts—Father Meehan admits—is the "brain drain."

This was a "key factor," he says, in the unfolding of an era of problems, difficulties and confusions for Community Progress, Inc.

And the absence of those many men, often "brilliant, capable" men who left CPI for bigger and better things, he says, is a continuing problem.

A "great deal of professional knowledge has to be incorporated into CPI," he flatly states. "We need these top-quality professionals either on a co-operative basis with existing agencies or as staff."

The "hard core" poor, CPI has frequently stated of late, is the local anti-poverty agency's "number one concern."

Father Meehan points out, however, that in this area—where the poorest people with the least skills and the lowest motivations are involved: "We haven't figured out the answers yet. Nobody's got the answers."

Thus a wide variety of approaches—based on a variety of views—must be attempted. Not all of these approaches will work—some will fail, and many will be criticized he believes.

The Opportunities Industrial Center, he says, seeks to make a worthwhile approach through "motivation." The Residential Youth Centers feels an answer may be "a home" and a stable living atmosphere for youth. Fred Harris of the Hill Parents Association feels positive results lie in the "self-identity of blackness." Vocational counselors feel the best approach may be a combination of careful counseling and a wide variety of psychological, and social service. The business community suggests a "job with dignity." Other Negro spokesmen feel, quite simply that the answer may be $3 an hour (as minimum pay for the "hard core").

"If we made one major breakthrough in involving the unemployable," says Father Meehan, measuring with perhaps some use of rhetoric his comparison of costs as against his view of the magnitude of the problem, "then the $18 million would be a success. Just that one major change."

Research, he says, is not wasted. It could lead to understanding and defining the "real problems of the hard core."

On this account he calls for a "great deal more, not less, research—both pure and practical."

The "major tragedy" of the poverty program, he asserts, has probably been its insufficient efforts in research.

"If we had spent $5 million of the $18 on research," he adds, again with a touch of rhetoric, "the accusations against CPI, those that ignore the major social changes we have been involved in, could not have been substantiated."

Responding to the recent claims that research was, or is, "in vain," Father Meehan maintains, on the other hand, that it is vitally necessary if CPI is to evaluate and learn from its programs, so that others including "future generations" will be able to do likewise.

He pointed to some of the problems involved in the nature of CPI research—problems in the nature of "action research" to which Dr. Ira Goldenberg of the Yale-Psycho-educational Clinic had also referred in prior discussions.

Research into the "culture of poverty" is a relatively unexplored field whose "dimensions" are not yet even known, Goldenberg had said.

In responding to questions about the practical value of "action research," both Father Meehan and Dr. Goldenberg pointed to significant "breakthroughs" in other sciences such as the isolation of the virus that led to a cure for polio. They feel a similar isolation of a variable, or key variables, may do the same for the "culture of poverty."

Goldenberg further feels, as apparently do many others, that the cost-employment criteria now employed as measures of the "success" of the "war on poverty" may in the "long run be the least valuable" measures. He illustrates with the simple example of a severely disturbed person who attained employment for one month after a particular training program as compared with a less disturbed person who became employed for a long time as the result of the same program.

The first person, who perhaps dropped out of employment and returned for further training, could be maintained—have received more benefit from the program, in terms of his own needs and problems, than the person who in terms of employment and placement statistics achieved greater "success."

Father Meehan made no excuses for the troubles, the delay and the confusion that have beset the CPI research program. He seemed frankly disappointed by many of the failures. Yet he repeated that cutbacks in Federal funding, and the nonavailability of other moneys, have also been instrumental in causing unfinished research in major areas.

For the future CPI has been and continues to be faced with two major difficulties in attempting to treat the "hard core" poor, says Father Meehan.

One springs from the cutbacks in federal funding that came in November, 1966, and the general lack of new money that has come since then. The other is the fact that federal regulations have "hamstrung" CPI from launching new programs which it feels would be more valuable than current ones.

"It is now obvious to the administration and the board," Father Meehan says, "that programs which involved community leaders in their formulation will produce the best results."

But CPI is fighting a "very difficult battle in attempting to fund ongoing programs and ongoing agencies which have been discredited." It faces the limitations of earmarked funds, and the limitations of unapproved social behavior—or living up to the letter of federal regulations. If imposed in their fullest sense, he maintains, the latest federal regulations "initiate frustration."

Nevertheless, with federal red-tape mounting and local criticism rife, Father Meehan—as one of the longest experienced appointees to the CPI board of directors—feels that the future will be stronger because of the present.

President Johnson's Pursuit of a Nuclear Free World

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the President of the United States on yet another significant accomplishment in his efforts to maintain a world free of the threat of nuclear warfare.

Last week, President Johnson announced that the United States will sign Protocol II of the treaty which makes Latin America a nuclear free zone.

This treaty, when ratified, will create a nuclear free zone in an area inhabitated by almost 200 million people, and will go a long way toward removing the threat of nuclear confrontation in our own hemisphere.

As the President noted in his remarks about this treaty:

> It is indeed fitting that this giant step forward should have its genesis in Latin America, an area which has come to be identified with regional cooperation.

I congratulate the President for adding another milestone in the pursuit of peace—a milestone which must stand as an equal to the Nonproliferation Treaty and the Outer Space Treaty.

I insert in the RECORD the Presidential announcement on the signing of Protocol II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco:

PRESIDENTIAL ANNOUNCEMENT ON PROTOCOL II TO THE TREATY OF TLATELOLCO

One year ago today, on February 14, 1967, the nations of Latin America gathered in Tlatelolco, Mexico, to sign a Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. Twenty-one nations of the region have now joined in this historic undertaking.

The United States considers this Treaty to be a realistic and effective arms control measure of unique significance—not only to the peoples of Latin America, but to all the peoples of the world.

Today I am pleased to announce that the United States will sign Protocol II to this Treaty which calls upon the powers possessing nuclear weapons to respect the status of denuclearization in Latin America and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Latin American states Party to the Treaty. I have appointed Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as my emissary to sign the Protocol in Mexico with an appropriate statement.

Upon ratification by the Senate, the United States will assume the obligations to those countries within the region which undertake and meet the Treaty's requirements. I am pleased to note that the drafters of this Treaty have indicated that transit by the United States within the Treaty zone will continue to be governed by the principles and rules of international law.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco has been closely related to the long effort to reach worldwide agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. It will create a nuclear free zone in an area of seven and a half million square miles, inhabited by nearly two hundred million people. Like the Non-Proliferation Treaty, this Treaty, in addition to prohibiting the acquisition of nuclear weapons, also prohibits the acquisition of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes. However, it has been drafted in such a way as to make it possible for Latin American Parties to the Treaty to obtain peaceful nuclear explosion services.

It indeed fitting that this giant step forward should have had its genesis in Latin America, an area which has come to be identified with regional cooperation. I particularly wish to congratulate our distinguished friend, President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico, for the initiative and leadership which his government has contributed to this Treaty and thereby to the peace of this region and of the world.

In signing this Protocol, the United States once again affirms its special and historic relationship with the peoples of Latin America and its stake in their future. The United States gives this affirmation gladly, in the conviction that the denuclearization of this region enhances the development of its peaceful nuclear potential.

Golden Jubilee of Lithuanian Independence

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked a momentous day in the history of the Lithuanian people, for it was the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

On February 11 it was my good fortune to join many good friends of Lithuanian heritage at a golden jubilee celebration sponsored by the Lithuanian-American Council of New Jersey. Participating in the inspiring meeting were Rev. Peter A. Totoraitis, Valentinas Melinis, Dr. Jack J. Stukas, Judge Charles Paulis, Jr., the Honorable Stasys Backis, and Rev. Joseph Barkus. Adding to the enjoyment of the occasion were performances of delightful Lithuanian songs and folk dances.

While it was a happy gathering, nevertheless it evoked mixed feelings in all of us.

We are proud to recall Lithuania's many important and valuable contributions to civilization and world culture through the long centuries of her existence.

Yet we are saddened that this nation—with her deep love of independence and her high esteem for personal freedom—finds herself at this late hour still struggling in the cruel shackles of Communist bondage.

The lamp of liberty burns low in Lithuania today.

But I need not remind you that Lithuania has triumphed over subjugation many times before. During the last generation she survived the truculence and tyranny of Hitler's Nazi troopers. And just as surely she will survive the ruthless oppression of Communist totalitarianism.

The dim glow of liberty's lamp, faint and flickering though it be, will never be extinguished.

History tells us that Lithuania had already emerged as a nation of small principalities more than 900 years ago. By the Middle Ages, the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe.

For centuries these brave people were able to check German drives to the east, and they protected Europe against Mongols and other would-be invaders. Yes, in the long ago of the Middle Ages, history informs us, the Lithuanians provided the power and the government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety, with a freedom that was unknown in next-door Russia.

One scholar, summarizing the contributions of the Lithuanian people during the Middle Ages, wrote:

> They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

And just as the Lithuanian people contributed to the rise of civilization in Europe, so too have they played an important role in the growth and development of the United States.

The first Lithuanians arrived in this country in 1688. They brought with them a rich heritage of culture and tradition, not the least of which was their strong love of freedom. They endured the hardships and dangers of day-to-day living in early colonial America. And their roots were firmly entwined to this Nation's destiny of greatness long before the Declaration of Independence proclaimed to the world the official birth of the United States.

As a New Jerseyan, I am pleased that Americans of Lithuanian descent favored this State as a choice place in which to settle down and make their homes, to raise their families, and enrich the community with civic pride and responsible citizenship.

And as the son of an immigrant, I can appreciate the sadness and sorrow felt by Americans of Lithuanian heritage because the land of their forefathers, the land of near and dear relatives, is once again choked off from freedom and suffering in the grip of foreign tyranny.

History, however is on the side of freedom.

The story of mankind is a stirring saga of civilization's irresistible march toward greater individual liberty for all. This is the undeniable direction. This is the unalterable goal. Aggression and chains can halt the pursuit of freedom, but only temporarily, and the march resumes.

Man is born to be free, yet no man can be completely free while others who people this earth remain unfree. But totalitarianism cannot crush man's faith in the future. Dictatorship cannot snuff out the candle of hope, for hope's candle is an eternal light that will continue to glow as long as man with soul inhabits earth.

It is true that the lamp of liberty burns low in Lithuania today, and this darkens our joy. But let us not despair. Let us, instead, commemorate this golden jubilee of Lithuanian independence with an affirmation of undying hope.

Let me reaffirm our faith in a better, brighter tomorrow—a tomorrow in which Lithuania will take her rightful place among the independent, freedom-loving nations of the world—and a brighter tomorrow in which the good people of Lithuania can glory once more in the joy of individual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey and the Knights of Lithuania, Council 29, have adopted resolutions on this historic anniversary, and I include them in the Record at this point:

Resolution of Lithuanian Council of New Jersey

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence; Resolve

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

Newark, N.J., February 11, 1968.

Valentinas Melinis,
President.

A. S. Treciokas,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, COUNCIL 29

On January 16, 1968, the Knights of Lithuania, Council 29, gathered at St. Georges Hall, 180 New York Ave., Newark, N.J., for their regular monthly meeting and the following Resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas February 16, 1968, will mark the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, the Lithuanians all over the Free World will commemorate this special event.

"Whereas Lithuania has never rested since 1940, when Russia overran the country. She has made it plain to the entire world that she wants to be free from Soviet Russia and that she will never rest until her freedom has been restored to her. Since 1940 she has sent out appeal after appeal to the free world asking that something of a concrete nature be done to restore her rightful place among the free and independent nations of the world.

"Whereas, during 22 years of independence, Lithuania proved itself capable of governing its own affairs and making progress in the economic, cultural, and scientific fields.

"Whereas, on June 14, 1939, the Soviet Government handed an ultimatum to the Lithuanian Government demanding the formation of a pro-Soviet Government and the admission into Lithuania of an unlimited number of Soviet troops. Before the deadline of the ultimatum had expired, a force of 300,000 Red soldiers, supported by armor and airplanes invaded Lithuania.

"Whereas, Americans of Lithuanian descent on this occasion of the 50th anniversary pledge to continue all efforts towards the restoration of a free and independent status for the Baltic countries and on this day we repeat to our brothers and sisters behind the Iron Curtain—that we have not forgotten you.

"Whereas, Lithuania's search for freedom, like her celebrations, will continue. Although her geographic outlines are blurred by the mighty shadow of Soviet Russia. Lithuania takes a place of honor among the ranks of those who continue their struggles for self-determination.

"Whereas, Lithuania, however, is unable to liberate herself. We therefore appeal to you for help. We ask you to urge your government to raise the issue of restoration of Lithuanian Independence at every appropriate occasion.

"*Be it resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Secretary of State, the Hon. Dean Rusk, to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, and to the Senators and Congressmen of New Jersey.

"CHARLES STROLIS,
President.
"JUDY STUKAS,
Secretary."

Aurora, Ill., Plays Vital Role in War on Poverty

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 24, page 32363, during House debate on the antipoverty program, I had inadvertently made a statement that the city of Aurora, Ill., had not been invited to participate in the development of an active poverty program in that city and that the mayor of the city had been excluded from participating in the administration of the poverty program.

I also made reference to the fact that a riot had occurred in that city and that the mayor was unable to improve the poverty program to help eliminate the conditions which led to the rioting because the nominating committee of the community action board in his community refused to have any public officials on the board.

I had inadvertently referred to Aurora when, in fact, it was another Illinois city that was experiencing this difficulty.

The mayor of Aurora, Ill., advises me that he has always been a part of the poverty program in that city and the program began with a target study to find the pockets of poverty and the needs to be met.

I am further told that the Kane County Council for Economic Opportunity, which is the community action program, has a neighborhood committee which operates the service center in Aurora. I am told this neighborhood committee works directly with all the elected officials of the city and county, and that the mayor of Aurora has always been a part of the program, indirectly now through his appointed chairman of the human relations commission.

It is obvious that I did not have Aurora, Ill., in mind at the time I made my remarks and I would like the RECORD to stand corrected, particularly since I am assured by the authorities in Aurora that this fine city did not have any riots and continues to develop a most effective program to deal with poverty in Illinois.

In my general debate on the poverty program I intended to identify the city which was having problems as Elgin, Ill., and it was the mayor of Elgin, Ill., Mayor E. C. Alft, that I had made reference to in discussing the fact that elected officials were not given sufficient voice in the planning of poverty programs.

While I am very happy to make this correction in the RECORD today and quickly admit that we had inadvertently used the name of Aurora instead of Elgin, I do want to place in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mayor Alft which has come to my attention.

Mayor Alft's letter follows:

CITY OF ELGIN,
Elgin, Ill., November 21, 1967.

My attention has been called to the November 14th issue of the Congressional Record in which Rep. Roman C. Pucinski uses Aurora, Illinois, as an example of a city beset by racial turmoil in which the Mayor had no voice in the local "War on Poverty" program.

I believe Rep. Pucinski is confusing Aurora with its sister city in Kane County, Elgin. Rep. Pucinski phoned me at home on Sunday morning, July 30th, following our first civil disturbance the previous evening. We agreed that the organizational structure of the local OEO councils was essentially irresponsible, and he expressed surprise that the Mayor of Elgin was never invited to be on either the Kane County Council for Economic Opportunity or to sit on the local Elgin advisory board.

The main office of the KCCEO has been located in Elgin since its inception in 1965, and Elgin has borne the main brunt of its activities. A center was not established in Aurora until the summer of 1967. Because of Rep. Pucinski's concern, I forwarded a complete statement of the Elgin City Council's attitude toward the local anti-poverty program on August 10th, and he acknowledged its receipt in a letter dated August 15th.

The City of Elgin supports all constructive programs aimed at the elimination of poverty and has high praise for the Head Start program and the activities of the Illinois Migrant Council. We do believe a 62-member Council containing only one popularly elected official simply has no real control over the policies and activities of the staff members, some of which are highly questionable and documented in our statement of August 10th.

As long as local OEO staff members regard the City of Elgin as "the enemy" instead of a common ally, participate in a suit against the city (since dismissed) which if successful would have brought anarchy to local government in Illinois, are ignorant of basic legal and political procedures in this state, and propagate untruths about city intentions toward disaffected minorities, there can only be an increase in racial tension in this community.

We appreciate your willingness to continue OEO appropriations, and we hope that its local administration will become more responsible.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ALFT,
Mayor.

SENATE—*Tuesday, February 20, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Rev. Ansas Trakis, pastor, Lithuanian Evangelical Lutheran Home Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who hast set free man for freedom through the sacrifice and the resurrection of Thy Son Jesus Christ, accept our deeply felt gratitude for having given the dawning day of freedom and independence for Lithuania, 50 years ago.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that in this honorable Senate and in all the United States of America, faith can be freely expressed in words and deeds for Thy glory, for the sake of our great country and for the whole freedom loving mankind.

Thou dost remind us by Thy word that, if one member of Thy body suffers, all suffer together.

Thou, our Lord, knowest there is no greater suffering for a man or a nation than the loss of freedom and independence.

We pray, O God, that Thy mighty spirit of freedom and love may grow exuberantly in all mankind. Inspired by Thy spirit we would fight with persistent courage to the day when Lithuania and other enslaved nations could enjoy creative freedom in their independent states.

God be with us. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONTOYA thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 19, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 223)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Civil Service Commission Annual Report for fiscal 1967 reflects the importance of the most vital element in democratic government—the people who administer it, particularly those who quietly dedicate their lives to public service in the Executive Branch.

The 90th Congress has demonstrated its appreciation of our career public servants. Today's Government is more responsive because of your response.

The Civil Service Commission Report shows that our emphasis has been on recruiting, developing, and fully using our civil servants to provide improved service to the public.

During fiscal year 1967—

An Executive Assignment System was instituted to insure that, at the top career levels, the right man is found for the right job at the right time.

The Federal recruiting and examining program—the foundation for good personnel management—was reorganized:

—to compete more effectively for the best available manpower and

—to provide improved service, information and job opportunities to every American.

The training and education of Government employees was modernized and expanded.

The Federal Government accelerated its drive for equal employment opportunities.

Last December the Congress responded fully to my proposals for equitable pay for Government workers. In moving to fulfill the earlier pay comparability promise, we have made Government jobs and public service careers substantially more attractive.

The record is one of significant progress.

At the same time, problems remain—some of which require legislative action.

As our society has grown more complex, so too has the administration of the public services which meet society's needs. Administrative weakness at any level of our Federal system—whether it be national, state or local—becomes a weakness at all levels. It deprives our citizens of adequate government machinery with which to meet their day-to-day and long-range needs. It cannot long be tolerated in a government of, by, and for the people.

We have become aware that state and local public agencies—too often inadequately staffed—are not always equipped to meet their expanding responsibilities to

—Rebuild our cities,

—Clean up our rivers and the air we breathe,

—Provide equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens,

—Plan and build better housing,

—Improve education and health services.

To do their share, state and local governments need help—primarily staffing and training assistance.

Last March 17, I submitted to the Congress two new legislative proposals to give them the help they need:

—*The Intergovernmental Manpower Act,* to assist state and local governments in meeting their critical manpower requirements. The Act would authorize the Federal Government to assist States and communities in recruiting, training, and developing a high quality corps of capable and responsive public employees. It would authorize the exchange of personnel between states and cities and the Federal Government. Through this exchange, all levels of government would understand each other's problems and work together more effectively to serve all the people.

—*The Education for Public Service Act,* to increase the number and quality of younger people preparing for careers in government. The Act would provide special fellowships for young men and women who will agree to embark on the great adventure of public service. It would assist colleges and universities in developing public service curricula to meet future governmental needs.

I urge prompt consideration and passage of this legislation to strengthen our Federal system and assure more efficient conduct of programs with shared administrative responsibilities.

Our mission—to meet the rapidly changing needs of our society—calls for our continued attention to excellence in the public service. I pledge you and the Nation mine.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1968.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2901. An act to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe;

H.R. 13315. An act to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia;

H.R. 14401. An act to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages;

H.R. 14934. An act to reduce from five to four the ratio of career substitute employees to regular employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14935. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 297. A joint resolution to change the name of Twin Buttes Dam and Twin Buttes Reservoir on the San Angelo project, Texas, to "Bryant Dam" and "Bryant Reservoir"; and

H.J. Res. 358. A joint resolution to change the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, to "Culbertson Deal Reservoir" project, Texas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2402. An act to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955; and

S. 2447. An act to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2901. An act to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13315. An act to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14401. An act to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 14934. An act to reduce from five to four the ratio of career substitute employees to regular employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14935. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 297. A joint resolution to change the name of Twin Buttes Dam and Twin Buttes Reservoir on the San Angelo project, Texas, to "Bryant Dam" and "Bryant Reservoir"; and

H.J. Res. 358. A joint resolution to change the name of San Angelo Reservoir project, Texas, to "Culbertson Deal Reservoir" project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 1 o'clock be divided equally between the majority and the minority leaders or whomever they may designate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the vote on the cloture motion, there be a period for the transaction of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time not to exceed 1 minute, and to be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] as he shall desire.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, overt racial discrimination remains in one major sector of American life—that of housing. Congress and the courts have acted to eliminate practices separating Negroes from whites in education, voting, public accommodations and employment, but a Negro is not free to live where he chooses.

During the past few days we have set out the case for fair housing. Let me summarize it.

First, fair housing is one more step toward achieving equality in opportunity and education for the Negro.

Open occupancy will have great practical psychological significance to the Negro who has "tried harder" and yet remains trapped in the ghetto for a lifetime. He can tell his child growing up in the ghetto that he can get out if he wants—if he is willing to study and to work.

Without fair housing legislation, however, it will become increasingly difficult for Negroes to obtain a decent education and to find employment. The Negro will not be able to escape the ghetto, nor will he be able to find jobs or integrated schools within the ghetto. In the first 5 years of this decade, one-half to two-thirds of all new factories and stores in all areas of the country except the South were located outside the central cities and metropolitan areas. This trend is expected to continue.

Jobs can move to the suburbs, but housing discrimination prevents Negroes from following. Eighty percent of the nonwhite population of metropolitan areas in 1967 lived in central cities. These persons, the least able to afford the high cost of transportation from the city to the suburbs, are left without work.

De facto segregation in schools is directly traceable to the existing patterns of racially segregated housing. No responsible American maintains any longer that it is possible to provide quality education—and in ghetto area schools in the Nation's largest cities, any education at all—to minority children as long as they are restricted to living in the old and congested parts of a city. The soundest, long-range way to attack segregated schools is to attack the segregated neighborhood.

Second, the fears of the integration voiced by some white property owners are not based on sound evidence.

Caucasians traditionally have owned the property in the United States, and it is no accident that they have been able to determine that Negroes live in the oldest and least-desirable housing. Old habits have perpetuated themselves into frozen rules to the extent that the opponents of fair housing legislation, by some obscure process of reasoning, can label it "forced" housing. This bill forces no one to sell—it simply removes from an economic transaction an irrelevant test based on color.

I believe, and testimony before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee reinforced this belief, that the great majority of real estate brokers, tract developers, and owners and operators of apartment houses feel compelled by business pressure to maintain the existing patterns of race and color in housing, no matter what they may personally believe.

They fear the loss of listings, of buyers or of tenants if they are known to sell or lease to Negroes; otherwise, they would sell to the first buyer who had the money and could meet the seller's terms.

The policy of the largest of the Nation's homebuilders, as stated by William J. Levitt, is to obey the open occupancy law where there is one and to follow local custom elsewhere. Mr. Levitt maintains that—

> Integration has certainly not hurt us . . . [but] any homebuilder who chooses to operate on an open occupancy basis, where it is not customary or required by law, runs the grave risk of losing business to his competitor who chooses to discriminate.

By requiring all who engage in housing transactions not to discriminate, the fair housing bill will relieve the pressure on each. When every seller or renter must by law treat his customers equally, there will be no risk of loss for those who do.

The pressure not to sell or rent to Negroes comes not from the occupant who is leaving the house or apartment—he is not forced to do anything—rather, it comes from those who remain in the neighborhood. They fear the appearance of one Negro family means property values plummet, to be followed by a mass immigration of Negroes.

The fear that property values will fall is a myth of the most pernicious sort. What is the truth? The best known study of the effect when nonwhites move into a previously all-white neighborhood shows property values do not decrease, and often increase in 85 percent of the cases.

Closely tied to the property value horror story is another myth—that fair housing legislation means a deluge of Negroes into white neighborhoods, creating new ghettos. Experience under the District of Columbia's fair housing ordinance demonstrates that the number of Negroes in previously all-white areas of the city is regulated strictly by their ability to pay.

Once again, Mr. President, I emphasize that the basic purpose of this legislation is to permit people who have the ability to do so to buy any house offered to the public if they can afford to buy it. It would not overcome the economic problem of those who could not afford to purchase the house of their choice.

Third, the question often arises: Can the Government regulate the disposal of private property? Government has regulated property in a variety of ways since the times of earliest English property law. Even fair housing is not new, I referred to the District of Columbia's fair housing ordinance; the District is not alone. Twenty-two States and 84 cities, villages, and counties have adopted fair housing laws. These measures, and many of them were passed in 1967, indicate an important shift in public understanding and acceptance of the issue.

I am proud to say that my State of Minnesota has one of the strongest, if not the strongest, fair housing statutes in the country. It has worked effectively, practically, and there is now great difficulty in finding anyone who would oppose a fair housing law in the State of Minnesota.

If there are those who fear voting for fair housing for political reasons, I hope they will take another look at the number of local communities which have recognized the need and desirability of taking a stand on fair housing.

Unfortunately, most of the State and local fair housing laws have serious shortcomings in coverage and enforcement. The act which we are considering remedies this, but it leaves existing State and local fair housing ordinances in effect, and in appropriate cases, the Department of Housing and Urban Development may cede its jurisdiction to State or local agencies, or cooperate with them in joint operations.

A Federal fair housing measure is within the Constitution, supportable under either the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment or the commerce clause. Congress power to enforce the equal protection clause by appropriate legislation includes a law to remove obstacles in the way of persons' securing the equal benefits of Government. Such a law is one preventing racial discrimination in housing because discrimination in housing forces persons to live in segregated areas where the benefits of Government are less available.

Discrimination in housing interferes with interstate commerce in several ways: the confinement of Negroes to older homes restricts the number of new homes built, which in turn reduces the amount of building materials and residential financing moving in interstate commerce; difficulty in finding housing retards the movement of Negroes across State lines in search of employment; and discrimination in housing contributes to violence in the cities which disrupts business and interstate commerce.

Fourth, the enactment of this fair housing amendment is important to the outcome of the struggle for leadership in the Negro community.

Passage of a national fair housing law will not stop those who are committed to violence in our cities this summer—but it will rob them of Negro support. We are really—in waging this fair housing battle—fighting for the minds and hearts of the vast middle ground of responsible Negroes, who have persevered in their commitment to progress through the courts and through the legislative process. The black racists are fighting to make these Negroes believe that white America is basically indecent, that white America never has and never will give full equality to Negroes. On the outcome of this crucial struggle hangs the future of this Nation.

If the racists and extremists win, we face a real possibility of guerrilla warfare in our major cities, lasting not just a few hot summer days, but for years—a Vietnam here at home. The Pentagon's battle plan for the cities—revealed in testimony before the Senate's Armed Services Committee a few days ago—creates special riot forces, trained to quell urban disruptions and equipped with armored cars, searchlights, chemical spray guns and tear gas dispensers.

We might well ask why fair housing comes to be portrayed as the key to preventing such a holocaust. We readily admit that fair housing by itself will not move a single Negro into the suburbs—the laws of economics will determine that. But we as readily must admit that the psychological importance to the Negro of available decent housing is very great.

It is impossible to gage the degradation and humiliation suffered by a man in the presence of his wife and children—when he is told that despite his university degrees, despite his income level, despite his profession, he is just not good enough to live in a white neighborhood.

In the case of one witness who appeared before our subcommittee, despite the fact that he was an impressive and effective officer in the Navy who served and protected this country for 8 years, he nevertheless was unable to purchase housing of his choice.

This person is forced to admit, in effect, to his family that he cannot provide for them, cannot provide a decent home in a decent neighborhood—and to that extent is less than a man. A white gangster or an American Nazi would have no questions asked other than his ability to pay.

Fifth, segregated housing is the simple rejection of one human being by another without any justification but superior power; we have closed our hearts to our fellow human beings to the extent that we have closed our neighborhoods to them.

The frustration to those of us who support this open occupancy legislation is that much of the housing discrimination is caused by the bigotry of fearful ignorance, and not by the bigotry of racial hatred. In some cases, rumors and fears and horror stories are peddled in white neighborhoods by those who seek to make a profit from this ignorance and fear.

We have learned many times over that in truly integrated neighborhoods people have been able to live in peace and harmony—and both Negroes and whites are the richer for the experience.

Thus, a large part of the job that lies ahead of us—that of overcoming ignorance, and teaching the truths of integration—can be assigned to the role of law as a teacher. The same ignorance and fear was present in the debates over public accommodations in the 1964 civil rights law, the same horror stories with a few changes were circulated then. But the law has, on the whole, operated smoothly and well, and both Negroes and whites have used the law in the spirit in which it was intended.

I believe the same will be true when we pass this measure. There will not be a great influx of all the Negroes in the ghettos into the suburbs—in fact, the laws of supply and demand will take care of who moves into what house in which neighborhood. There will, however, be the knowledge by Negroes that they are free—if they have the money and the desire—to move where they will; and there will be the knowledge by whites that the rapid, block-by-block expansion of the ghetto will be slowed and replaced by truly integrated and balanced living patterns.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders soon is expected to tell the American people that they are in deep trouble. Most Americans are not aware of the seriousness of our urban problems nor of the poverty and misery in which the urban minority poor must live.

I must say, relevant to that Commission, that two Members of this body served in the preparation of that important study, the most sweeping and fundamental ever undertaken concerning the social problems of this country. One Senator also served as the coauthor of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. The other Senator is a sponsor of the measure, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be added as a signer of the cloture motion filed by the majority leader on February 16.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we here in the Congress know. We do not have to wait for riot reports, or more riots, to act. We know what is wrong; we know what must be done.

America's goal must be that of an integrated society, a stable society free of the conditions which spawn riots, free of riots themselves. Yet trends of drift and civil disorder make the goals of integration and stability seem ever farther. If America is to escape apartheid we must begin now, and the best way for this Congress to start on the true road to integration is by enacting fair housing legislation.

I know of no single action we could take which would contribute more to understanding, to peace and justice within our country, and to the moral decency of all Americans than the simple matter of Congress declaring that we have had the last of segregation in the sale and rental of living quarters in the United States, and that once and for all we have decided, as a nation, to live together, not separately.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we reserve the remainder of our time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it should be made clear to the Senate—at least to those Senators who are now in the Chamber—that we are not voting cloture on the open occupancy amendment.

The cloture motion has been filed and directed to the pending bill, the Hart bill, which came from the Judiciary Committee which, of course, embraces everything offered in connection with it.

It should be made abundantly clear that the cloture motion goes to the bill itself.

I think that, only for record purposes, I should point out there was a House bill which, at long last, came to the Senate Judiciary Committee where hearings were held and where the bill was substantially modified. It was reported from the Judiciary Committee by a majority of only one vote. There were significant changes as between the Senate and the House bill.

What amazes me is that after the laboratory work done in committee, so many amendments seemed to incubate in the fecund brains of Senators. Even now, there are 23 amendments pending to the bill, including the so-called open occupancy amendment.

I have made it abundantly clear that I should like to see a civil rights bill.

I am still in that frame of mind. I trust that before the session of the 90th Congress concludes, there will be a civil rights bill.

I intend to continue my endeavors to find what I believe could be a moderate, equitable, and enforceable bill which will do pretty well what the Attorney General wanted done in the first instance, when he talked about those areas of aggravated assault motivated by race, creed, color, and national origin; and that there, he wanted rather specific and original enforcement powers.

Well, of course, that is the crux of the controversy to begin with, as to whether the State shall have the opportunity first to bring an offender to the bar of justice before the long arm of the Federal Government reaches in.

We are building such an enormous Federal Establishment today, with more than 3 million persons on the payroll, and more to be added, that I do not know where it is going to stop. When we get proposals to increase grants in aid to States and municipalities, we know very well that it will be clothing the Federal Government with additional powers. They must have monetary powers. They must have people to do it. Not one dollar goes out of the Federal Treasury that does not have a tag on it.

So, where is the end to the enormous Federal growth, and when are we going to bring it in line and have a proper regard for the functions of the States in our Federal-State system?

Mr. President, a very distinguished former Senator from my State, whose picture now hangs in the office of the majority leader—James Hamilton Lewis, and he was a distinguished Senator—said to me one night in the hotel where we lived, "My boy, I'll not live to see it, but you will live to see the day when State lines will be for the convenience of tourists and possibly for Rand McNally."

We are heading in that direction.

If the States have no powers and no functions and no authority, then those State governments become more and more remote from the people. On that day, we can say that the Federal-State system has weakened to the point it no longer functions as our Founding Fathers wanted it to do.

Now, in all this, here is a cloture motion. What, in effect, is a cloture motion? It says, "If it is approved, shut your mouth—hush your mouth—because debate is going to end except for the limitations imposed in the cloture rule."

We are saying, in effect, that we are going to gag ourselves. That is one of the most distasteful things I know of. I hope that when we do it—and God save the mark, I was a party to it once because I thought I had to, because I thought a case was to be made for the 1964 Civil Rights Act—let us no longer go around with the fancy cliche on the tips of our tongues when we refer to the Senate as "the world's greatest deliberative body."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I should like to say to him that in the case of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Senator from New Hampshire voted for cloture. I voted for cloture on the basis of certain assurances that one matter within the bill would be adjusted by amendment after cloture.

Those who made the assurances either could not or would not make that change. The result was that the Senator from New Hampshire found by voting for cloture in that instance he signed a blank check, and then was compelled to vote against the bill—a completely inconsistent position.

In this particular case, may I say to the Senator, if he will yield for just a few seconds longer, the Senator from New Hampshire felt, and has for some time, that the compromise entered into in the House, which resulted in passage of the bill by that body, was a very reasonable compromise. The Senator from New Hampshire has said he is prepared to vote for cloture and vote for the bill if the House compromise essentially was to be accepted, and has had some assurances from certain very sincere Senators, who are the soul of honor and have the best of intentions, that such would take place. But the Senator from New Hampshire, on consideration, does not think any Senator in this body can be sure of what might take place after cloture is adopted. When it is too late, when one is under the gun, a Senator is placed in the position of not being able to offer a new amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire had this experience in 1964, when he offered one and it was objected to.

I would like to ask my distinguished leader if, feeling as the Senator does, that the House compromise was reasonable, and not wishing—and I cannot help but believe that some want to go so far—to sacrifice a bill for an issue, the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senator who wants that compromise should not wait and see to it that it is definitely accepted before cloture, and not after. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the same course, I must say, because who shall say what will happen to the bill?

Now, Mr. President, we are all men and women of good will. There have been eight meetings in my office, seeking to strike a moderate course. I have inclined in this direction and that direction. I have given and I have taken, knowing the diversity of opinion with respect to this bill. And I still think we can work it out. I have not relented in that effort, and I do not propose to relent, because, somehow, somewhere, I want to see a civil rights bill enacted in this session.

Perhaps it would be best to just clear the air and make a fresh start. And we can do so. But the thing to do is to oppose the cloture vote now, for philosophic as well as other reasons.

You know, Mr. President, it is rather interesting that cloture is not anything new with our generation. They fiddled around with the matter of the previous question way back at the time the Government was founded. This is an adroit way of getting a vote. If the previous question is ordered, the legislative body goes back to the subject matter at hand and gets an immediate vote. They had that very problem in the British Parliament nearly 350 years ago.

And so, all through the years, there has been the question of trying to shut off talk and finally get around to a vote on a bill. Perhaps it did not bother us so much until about 1841. I have forgotten what the bill was, but the Senate was tied up for a period of 60 days. Back in 1922, when the ship subsidy bill was under consideration, those in opposition fought it for 75 days on the Senate floor. And thank goodness they had an opportunity to impose their will upon the legislation, because, interestingly enough, nearly all of the measures in which filibusters were involved finally, in a different form, found their way on the statute books. And in that respect we are no different.

I want to see the thing fully and very carefully discussed. There has not been sufficient attendance on the floor to say that that has been done, even though there have been speeches to occupy the time. And so I fervently hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will not gag itself. I do not want to go home and say, "I gagged myself by my vote." What an awful confession of weakness that would be for me as a Senator to ever make as a result of my vote.

There could be good reason for a continuance of the discussion—and the country knows it. The country today is filled with fever and controversy. For 8 days I have had a chance to find out, in meeting after meeting, in one community and another. And so we had better be precious careful about what goes on the books, and be pretty sure in what final form it is before we undertake to send it to conference, and then consider what is done in that conference.

I can only say that the question before the Senate is the cloture motion on the bill, and all that goes with it, and that bill in its present form is unsatisfactory to me. If it were not, I do not know that I would have given all the time to have this group and that group and the Attorney General in my office, trying to find a common denominator for a solution of this problem.

So that is it; and unless there is a request for time, I shall be prepared to yield back the time.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am going to violate Mark Twain's advice.

Mark Twain said "Truth is precious; use it sparingly."

This so-called open housing amendment is a proposal to bring about equality by robbing all Americans of their basic rights of private property. It is a proposal which is incompatible with liberty. When it comes to my making a choice between liberty and equality of this kind, I stand for liberty.

This bill would not only take away from every person in the United States the right to sell or lease his residential property to a person of his own race or his own religion, but it would make the exercise of anyone's right dependent upon the unbridled will of one Cabinet officer sitting on the banks of the Potomac.

Of course, it is possible to promote equality by robbing everybody of his rights, and when nobody has any rights left, all will be equal. We will do that in this case, if we vest this autocratic power in one Cabinet officer on the banks of the Potomac, under a procedure which constitutes as rank a prostitution of the judicial process as has ever been recommended in the United States.

The Mondale amendment would make a Cabinet officer or his designee the enforcer of the law; it would give him the power to receive and also the power to make complaints of violations of the law; it would give him the power to investigate the complaints; it would give him the power to prosecute the complaints; it would give him the power to find the facts as a jury, and the power to act as judge and enter a decree. Moreover, it would make all the courts in the land powerless to interfere with any finding of fact that he makes, if that finding of fact is supported by any testimony, no matter how contrary to the overwhelming mass of the testimony the finding of fact may be.

The amendment would establish a procedure which prostitutes the judicial process, and is alien to any land which reveres the due process of law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the Senator from North Carolina 1 additional minute

Mr. ERVIN. The President made a statement that the Hart bill is a bill to bring about equality. I offered a substitute that met the first requirement of any good and just law: It treated all men alike in like circumstances. Yet the administration insists on the Hart bill, which would afford protection to the people of one race and deny it to other Americans of other races. That is a peculiar way to give equal protection of the laws to the people—to give protection to some people and deny it to others.

The choice here is a choice between liberty and a law-coerced equality which robs all Americans of some of their most precious rights. I, for one, stand for liberty, and will resist to the end the efforts of those who would make Americans equal by making them the helpless subjects of a centralized Federal oligarchy operating on the banks of the Potomac.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend pending amendment No. 524 as follows:

> On page 5, line 6, to strike out the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Act".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ERVIN. Would the Senator from Minnesota restate his amendment?

Mr. MONDALE. I am asking unanimous consent to amend amendment No. 524, the so-called fair housing amendment, on page 5, line 6, by striking out the word "section" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Act".

In other words, the effect will be that the Mrs. Murphy provision will apply to the whole bill, and not to just this particular amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. MONDALE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The effect of the amendment the Senator has just made is, is it not, to copper-rivet into the amendment the so-called Mrs. Murphy exclusion?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator from New York is correct. I proposed this amendment with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and there was a technical drafting error. It was intended that that provision apply to the whole act. The Senator from Vermont properly observed that by its terms it was limited to a single section, and did not achieve that function. The committee adopted the amendment, and now the Mrs. Murphy section applies to approximately 2 million units out of a national housing supply of 65 million units.

Mr. JAVITS. It is completely excluded from the bill, regardless of phasing, either 1968, 1969, or any other time? It is completely excluded, without regard to phasing?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for an observation?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While the Senator is correcting his own amendment, he does not correct the Mrs. Murphy situation in the Hart bill. It is still in the Hart bill, as I read that language.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who is yielding time?

Mr. HART. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator from Illinois should be advised that the pending fair housing provision, the only one which is before us, excludes the so-called Mrs. Murphy situation, which is the situation in which an occupant of a house leases some part of that house or duplex, or any housing unit with four family units or less, to someone else. That is excluded. That provision involves about 2 million units out of 65 million. That is all this amendment applied to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The provision is excluded from the act?

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Which would include everything; it would include this amendment, if adopted, Senator HART's bill, and the whole business, would it not?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has 7 minutes; the Senator from Illinois, 4.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I am not sure how precise my arithmetic is, but, drawing a pencil line hastily through the calendar that each of us finds on his desk, I suggest that we would not be gagging ourselves if, today, two-thirds of us decided that a majority of us would be permitted now to act on some very important propositions that do concern every citizen of this country.

We have been talking about this matter for about 24 working days. We are into the fifth week. Except for the fellow who may be driving a bus past the Capitol at this moment, everybody knows how everybody is going to vote on the two propositions. So let us vote.

Let us vote. We made it very clear 10 days ago when we tabled the Ervin amendment that the so-called Hart bill is the desirable and desired method by which to respond to the very critical and tragic problem of force and violence being directed at American citizens merely because they want to exercise a constitutional right. It is high time that we make it a Federal crime for individuals to attempt to deprive American citizens of their constitutional rights by such means. We should do it with restraint and precision. We have made that clear.

The thing to be made clear this morning, in addition, is that no longer in this country is anybody going to have to run a litmus test if he wants to buy a home. It makes no difference in this country or should make no difference how one spells his name, which side of the railroad tracks he comes from, where he goes to church, or even if he does not go to church, or what color God gave him.

We were told when we were kids that if we would work hard and save our money, eventually we would be able to improve our station in life for ourselves and our children by moving into a better neighborhood. Today, tragically a man who has followed that admonition has to go back to his home and tell his children: "I do not know how it happened. I am sorry. Some place the train got off the rails. The theory is wrong. I cannot buy the home we wanted. They made their minds up when I was 50 feet away, and I cannot buy the home."

I do not know what effect it will have on his children. However, if they turn out to be barn burners, do not blame Stokely Carmichael. This is what we seek to resolve by this vote, and I hope very much—as the President of the United States urges us to do—that we vote without delay in favor of the pending proposal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally against both sides.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I withhold my request and yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Michigan and those Senators who have been supporting his position.

As far as I am concerned, the issue can be stated in a nutshell. I think we are about to make great legislative history and, in my judgment, unless a cloture motion is sustained we will rue the day that we did not vote in favor of the motion because of subsequent events. Increasing millions will then know that the Congress of the United States does not favor granting civil rights to millions of fellow Americans. Such action will, in my judgment, create very serious problems in this Republic until that wrong is righted.

I do not think we ought to be put in a position of having to pay the tremendous cost we will have to pay because of a failure to pass a civil rights bill promptly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am brought to my feet by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I testify to this from personal knowledge.

We are not going to placate, condone, or appease violence, and we are not going to yield to threats. At the same time, no Senator would wish to reproach himself in his own conscience with the fact that he did not do everything to give justice to all.

If we were to neglect to perform our duty under such circumstances, extreme actions performed by people who might be unbalanced would appear to be justified in their eyes merely because Congress did not act on something that it should have acted on.

The basic law on protecting civil rights workers, for instance with respect to voting rights, has been very much accepted. It has almost become an axiom, and nobody really takes great exception.

People want to have the situation involving discrimination in the case of housing dealt with. That, too, is almost axiomatic. We do have an Executive order. The real difficulty is that the Executive order has not been adequately enforced. Therefore, as the pending measure does not plow new ground, I think it will be a shocking disappointment to the millions of Americans who are watching our action if we do not vote favorably at this time. Whatever the papers may write or not write about the situation, if we are unable to act favorably at this time, our action will be injurious to the country. Cloture will enable us to act, and that is the only purpose of cloture.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my only purpose in rising is to point out that cloture would do nothing but free our hands to act. Amendments must be acted on. Even the Hart bill must be acted on. The housing measure must be tabled, or it can be amended. Of course, all amendments which are on the desk qualify. That limits the field very materially.

I can testify to my colleagues personally, as the Senator from Oregon has said, that if we do not act favorably at this time, our actions will have the most deleterious effect imaginable. We will be showing to the world that our hands are tied and we cannot act. Then zealot extremists can say: "What is the use? They cannot even act, let alone act fully and effectively."

I hope very much that cloture will be voted.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that, pending the disposition of the cloture motion, the Sergeant at Arms be directed to clear the floor of all staff personnel except those attached to the staffs of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the secretary for the majority, the secretary for the minority, and the two policy committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to clear the Chamber of all unnecessary personnel in conformity with the motion which has been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the pending question is whether there shall be a limitation placed upon debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto. It is not question, as some may think, of limiting debate upon the pending amendment. Thus, if the Senate votes "aye" by the required two-thirds vote, there will be absolutely no assurance of compromise by the proponents of not only the pending amendment, but of the bill itself. Nor has there been any significant indication by the proponents of a willingness to compromise.

There are some who will say that the bill and the pending amendment are sound measures not admitting of compromise. They are, of course, entitled to their views. No doubt some of them were the very ones who, in 1964, stated that the House-passed civil rights bill was a sound measure not admitting of any compromise. Nevertheless, history records that some 65 amendments were attached to the House-passed bill by the Senate before a majority of us deemed the measure to, indeed, be a sound and workable bill. Acceptability of these amendments provided the basis for a favorable vote on cloture in which I joined.

Those who understand the legislative process well know that compromise is the lifeblood of the legislative process, that no individual or group of individuals has a premium on what is right and what is sound, on what is constitutional and what is not constitutional, on what is timely and what is untimely. It is this recognition which makes for progress, and it is the unyielding refusal to accept such recognition which results in no progress.

There are aspects of the pending bill and pending amendment which are sound, constitutional, and timely. And, in the judgment of many of us and many of the people we represent, there are aspects which are unsound, unconstitutional, and untimely—or, at the very least, of very questionable soundness, constitutionality, and timeliness. For example, there is no definition of a "civil rights worker." A vote against cloture will, I would suggest, lay a foundation for the willingness to compromise on these points which will enable substantial progress to be made. A vote for cloture will destroy the foundation for compromise and may well result in not only an unsound piece of legislation being passed by the Senate, but an impasse in the House of Representatives and in any conference committee which eventually may have jurisdiction. Accordingly, I intend to vote against cloture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how stands the time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has 3 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reaffirm what I said earlier today, that I have not lost my interest in civil rights. I shall continue to do whatever I can for the development of a bill that is acceptable to the Senate, a bill that we will have a reasonable chance to pilot through conference.

I think I can say that I had much to do with piloting civil rights legislation through the Senate in 1957, 1959, 1961, and 1964, when we had the major civil rights bill.

I will not relent in that effort, but I want to make sure that what we do is sound and equitable and enforceable. And this matter has not had sufficient discussion. Therefore, cloture should not be voted, because we would be gagging ourselves. And I am not about to make that kind of a confession to the country or to my people back home.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 30 seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope that the pending cloture motion will be ratified by two-thirds of those Senators who are present and voting.

Every American should have the opportunity to freely choose the house which he desires. Every American should have the right to be protected in his exercise of guaranteed rights. That is what the Hart proposal and the Mondale amendment would do.

I am hopeful that when the vote is taken there will be a recognition on the part of the Senate of the difficulties that confront this country, and, with that in mind, that the Senate act accordingly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending motion, which will be stated by the clerk.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

MOTION FOR CLOTURE

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending business, H.R. 2516, an act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

(Signed by 31 Senators.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 6 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order if it is in reference to the vote.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on this vote, do I correctly understand that the votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting are required in order that the cloture motion prevail?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HART. Two-thirds present and voting must vote in the affirmative?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. HART. Would the Chair state the effect on the bill and the pending amendments if two-thirds of the Senators vote affirmatively on the cloture motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The cloture motion is directed to the bill, and that includes——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, rule XXII is so clear and so succinct, may I suggest that rule XXII be read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be pleased to do so.

The Chair would make note of the fact that the cloture motion is directed to the bill and all amendments that are in order and relevant thereto.

The clerk will read all of rule XXII.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS

1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

To take a recess.

To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

To lay on the table.

To postpone indefinitely.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the matter now being read is not germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator desired that rule XXII be read.

Mr. RUSSELL. I overlooked saying only the portion that is germane to the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read that portion of rule XXII that pertains to the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Mr. HART. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In further pursuance of rule XXII, the Chair now puts the question, which is as follows: Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 2516, interference with civil rights, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required by the rule; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who, if present, would vote "nay"; and also with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who, if present, along with me would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the negative). I have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whose position upon this subject is well known but who is unavoidably absent. I also have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If Mr. PASTORE and Mr. HARTKE were present, each would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Dominick
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hansen
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Russell
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Byrd of West Virginia, against.
Mansfield, for.

NOT VOTING—6

Cannon
Hartke
Magnuson
Monroney
Pastore
Smathers

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote there are 55 yeas and 37 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is lost.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while the motion for cloture failed, a clear majority of the Senate indicated that it was in favor of the Mondale proposal to give to the people of America a free choice in housing. Therefore, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent, on the basis of the expression of the will of the majority of this body, that there be a vote on the pending amendment, the Mondale amendment, at 3:30 this afternoon.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina objects.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assume that now, under the previous order, we shall have a period for the transaction of routine morning business. I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 20, 1968, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (S. 1124) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS FLIGHT INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program for the year ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INDEX TO LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, an index of the legislation enacted by the Legislature of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands from its establishment in 1952 through the 1966 term (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DISPOSAL IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES OF PROPERTY EXCESS TO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal in foreign countries of property excess to this Department, for the calendar year 1967; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected construction projects, Atomic Energy Commission, dated February 19, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT IN HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in the Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

IDAHO HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Legislature of the state of Idaho, in the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, respectfully represent that:

Whereas, there are now petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission by railroads serving Idaho to discontinue the Northern Pacific "Mainstreeter" passenger train operating between Fargo, North Dakota and Seattle, Washington, through northern Idaho, the Union Pacific "Portland Rose" passenger train between Kansas City, Missouri and Portland, Oregon, through southern Idaho and the Union Pacific "Butte Special" passenger train between Salt Lake City, Utah and Butte, Montana, through eastern Idaho; and

Whereas, the passenger trains referred to are either the only passenger trains through the communities or the only passenger trains that serve certain communities on the routes; and

Whereas, the railway post office cars and mail storage cars have been removed from the passenger trains with a very evident deterioration in the mail service; and

Whereas, this discontinuance of mail contracts has resulted in an evident loss of revenue which has made necessary a serious cutback in passenger service on the above mentioned trains; and

Whereas, the Railway Express Agency has found it necessary to seek means of transportation other than passenger trains, resulting in a serious disruption of service; and

Whereas, mail service and public transportation service in general is becoming noticeably deteriorated; and

Whereas, the citizens of the state of Idaho and the Pacific Northwest are entitled to reliable, efficient, convenient and economical passenger, mail and express service;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the state of Idaho, the Senate concurring therein, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed at the earliest possible date to conduct proper investigation of the need for rail passenger service, the need for coordination with other modes of transportation, and particularly, the return of an efficient mail and express service.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the state of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the President and Vice-President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States, the Chairman and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation of the United States.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—REMOVAL OF GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1007)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, S. 2857, entitled "Removal of Gold Reserve Requirements," and ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with minority and individual views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2992. A bill for the relief of Tammy Ying Lyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2993. A bill for the relief of Franco Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2994. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2995. A bill to promote the advancement of science and education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2996. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as a wilderness area the National Forest lands adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, known as the Minam River Canyon and adjoining area, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2997. A bill to authorize the waiver of certain fees in bankruptcy proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2998. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2999. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to administratively settle tort claims arising in foreign countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3000. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a supplemental patent to certain land in the State of Mississippi to Mrs. Christine H. Windham; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 3001. A bill to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. Proxmire) (by request):

S. 3002. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Luther D. Stull;

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Dr. Delfin S. Santos, and his wife, Mena A. Santos; and

S. 3005. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo C. Uy, his wife, Rosario Beringuel Uy, and their son, Arturo C. Uy, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3006. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact and related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3007. A bill to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining certain losses as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3008. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3009. A bill authorizing the issuance of 2,000 special immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. McClellan):

S. 3010. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3011. A bill for the relief of Tsang Kam Muk, Chau Yat Sang, Yam Lai Tsang, Cheung Hok Ming, Li Shui Yung, and AU Yeung Hon Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2994—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. Monroney] a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21, and for other purposes.

In support of this legislation I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from W. E. "Dode" McIntosh, principal chief of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma. In further explanation of the bill I ask that a letter from the Department of the Interior to the President, dated September 11, 1967, and a report on the social and economic conditions of the Creek Indians of Oklahoma be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters and report will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2994) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. Harris, (for himself and Mr. Monroney), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letters and report presented by Mr. Harris are as follows:

Creek Nation of Indian Territory,
Tulsa, Okla.

Dear Senator Harris: The proposed Creek payment to all the living Creeks to share and share alike in the monies in re the Bill requested, introduced, by the Secretary of the Interior is OK with me if no changes by them from the copy you sent me a short while back.

The total amount is, about $3,600,000.00+.

Will certainly appreciate your valued help in moving it through the Senate.

Always best to you.

Sincerely,

W. E. McIntosh,
Creek Chief.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Creek Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

On September 10, 1962, the Indian Claims Commission issued a final judgment awarding $3,913,000 on the claim in docket No. 21 to the Creek Nation of Oklahoma (hereinafter referred to as the Oklahoma Creeks), plaintiff, and the Creek Nation east of the Mississippi River (hereinafter referred to as the Eastern Creeks), plaintiff by intervention. The Indian Claims Commission stated that the judgment was "on behalf of and for the benefit of the members and descendants of the Creek Nation as it was constituted on August 9, 1814."

The award represents payment for 8,986,653 acres of land in Alabama and Georgia ceded under the Treaty of August 9, 1814 (7 Stat. 120). Funds in the amount of $3,913,000 to cover the award were appropriated by the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, and deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Creek Nation of Indians as constituted August 9, 1814. The funds, less attorney fees which have been paid, have drawn interest at 4 percent per annum. As of May 26, 1967, a total of $3,000,000 was withdrawn from the principal and interest accounts for short-term bank time deposits so that a higher rate of interest could be earned. During the investment period the funds retain their trust status. The balance remaining in the United States Treasury in the principal account as of June 5, 1967, was $715,054.51. The money withdrawn from the Treasury is deposited with:

Name of institution	*Amount*
Farmers & Merchants Bank & Trust Co. of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla	$1, 800, 000
The Liberty State Bank, Tahlequah, Okla	300, 000
The Delaware County Bank, Jay, Okla	100, 000
First State Bank, Idabel, Okla	200, 000
The First National Bank, Tahlequah, Okla	500, 000
The First National Bank of McAlester, McAlester, Okla	100, 000
Total	3, 000, 000

The history leading to the cession of the Creek land under the Treaty of August 9, 1814, which is the basis for this judgment, was presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 3, 1967, in this Department's report on H.R. 2423, H.R. 4460, H.R. 4464, and H.R. 5499, bills "For the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814."

In 1832 the United States desired that the Creeks should remove to the country west of the Mississippi River and join members of the tribe who had previously settled there. By the Treaty of March 24, 1932, the Creeks ceded all their remaining lands lying east of the Mississippi to the United States. The terms of that treaty did not compel the individual members to migrate west of the Mississippi River but stated "they shall be free to go or stay, as they please." The 1832 Treaty also provided for the patenting of lands east of the Mississippi in fee simple to those Creeks wishing to remain. Most of the Creeks chose to move to their new land in Indian Territory, the greater part emigrating between 1836 and 1838. No accurate figure on the number of Creeks who emigrated West and the number remaining in the East is available although Indian agents estimate that some 22,000 had moved West by 1852.

The Creeks who moved West to Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, formed a tribal organization and conducted business as a nation until Oklahoma became a State in 1907. A limited tribal organization with a Principal Chief as its executive head has continued and is functioning today. A roll listing the names of the persons who were members of the Creek Nation as of March 4, 1907, was compiled, closed, and made final as of that date pursuant to an Act of Congress. The roll contains 18,761 names. There is no current list of individuals who are descendants of the persons on the roll. However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that descendants by blood of the Oklahoma Creeks will be between 35,000 to 40,000.

Following the close of the Civil War, Creek Freedmen (former slaves and their descendants) were granted rights of citizenship in the Creek Nation in August 1866. Of the 18,761 names on the 1907 roll, 6,809 are Creek Freedmen. Since the rights of Creek Freedmen in the Creek Nation were acquired subsequent to 1814, their ancestors were not a part of the Creek Nation as it was constituted at the time the Nation ceded land under the Treaty of August 9, 1814, and were not wronged by the land taking. Therefore, no provision is made in the proposed bill for the Creek Freedmen or their descendants to share in the distribution of the judgment fund.

The Creeks who remained east of the Mississippi River became citizens of the United States. Many of the descendants make their homes in southern Alabama, principally in Baldwin, Escambia, and Monroe Counties. Some live in Escambia County, Florida, and others reside near Meridian, Mississippi. The Eastern Creeks maintained no tribal organization and are not known to be a cohesive group, except for their interest in Creek claims. It is not known how many descendants there are today of the Eastern Creeks. Representatives of the group estimate that today there are upwards of 10,000 persons who can trace their ancestry to Creeks who remained east of the Mississippi River. We have had information that some individuals have taken it upon themselves to prepare lists of descendants of the Creeks who remained east of the Mississippi. However, no enrollment criteria have been prescribed by the United States Government and no official sanction has been given by this Department to the preparation of the rolls.

The proposed bill enclosed provides for the preparation of a current roll of lineal descendants of members of the Creek Nation as it existed in 1814, and further provides that the funds shall be divided per capita among those persons whose names appear on this roll. Little difficulty is anticipated for those persons who can trace their Creek ancestry to the 1907 final roll of Oklahoma Creeks by blood. For those Creeks whose ancestors remained east of the Mississippi River, it has proven impossible to arrive at any one source document containing all of their names. No complete census of the Creek Indians was taken until the 1832 Treaty. This census was taken preliminary to the removal of the majority of the Creeks West and may be difficult to use in many cases because of the use of Indian names, the similarity of many of the Indian names, and the sheer lapse of time.

Copies of the Department's draft legislation have been made available to the two groups of Creeks for their review and comments.

On September 11, 1966, the Eastern Creeks met in a mass meeting, at which time they adopted a resolution recommending that section 1 of the proposal be amended to include as basic documents to trace Creek ancestry "State or county records in the Archives of the several states or counties therein or in the courthouses thereof or such other records admissible as evidence in the courts of the several states", as well as records of the Federal Government.

The several States were not dealing with the individual Creek Indians at any time before or after 1814, at least until the deeds conveying the allotments which were received under the 1832 Treaty were recorded in the counties, and it is believed that the State records could not be used conclusively to prove membership in the Creek Nation as of 1814. The Eastern Creeks' proposal would force the Secretary to consider as prima facie almost any record submitted. It would also require the services of an expert on the Law of Evidence to determine if certain records were admissible as evidence in the courts of the several States.

We believe only those records of the Federal Government which are known to be official and authentic should be named as basic documents in the judgment disposition Act. The phrase "or other records acceptable to the Secretary" in the proposed bill would enable the Eastern Creeks to submit any record which they believe might prove eligibility, but the Secretary would have the authority to determine its acceptability. It is doubtful the Secretary would have this discretion if the amendment proposed by the Eastern Creeks were enacted into law.

The Principal Chief of the Oklahoma Creeks took exception to the deduction of litigation expenses, referred to under section 2 of the proposed bill. He is of the opinion that the Eastern Creeks alone should pay the expenses of litigation since they were incurred in their behalf.

The Oklahoma Creeks filed the original claim in docket No. 21 in 1948. In January 1951 the Eastern Creeks petitioned to intervene. They contended that the original injury was to the Creek Nation as it was constituted in 1814 and that the unorganized descendants of that Nation who remained east of the Mississippi River had an interest in the claim equal to those who moved West and continued as a cohesive group.

The motion was denied by the Indian Claims Commission. However, in May 1952, the Court of Claims reversed the Commission's decision, holding that intervention was proper because any recovery should inure to the benefit of all descendants of members of the Creek Nation of 1814. While the intervention issue was before the Court, the Commission entered an interlocutory order in favor of the Oklahoma Creeks, awarding the sum of $1,679,940, less offsets, for 8,849,940 acres of ceded land. Following the Court's decision on the intervention issue, the Commission opened the case to consider supplemental findings of fact as to the value of the ceded land. The final award issued on September 10, 1962, stated that the Indians were entitled to recover the sum of $4,003,000, less the sum of $90,000 representing the stipulated amount of offsets, leaving a net balance to be recovered of $3,913,000. This award became final when the United State Supreme Court on October 16, 1964, denied a request for a review of the case.

An application for litigation expenses claimed by the attorney for the Eastern Creeks is presently pending before the Indian Claims Commission. We do not know how much the Commission will allow. A considerable amount of the expenses claimed by the attorney for the Eastern Creeks is for the services of three expert witnesses whose efforts contributed greatly to increasing the value given to the land, which resulted in the larger final award of $3,913,000.

We have evidence that the Eastern Creeks paid several thousand dollars of attorney expenses. Expenses of the attorney for the Oklahoma Creeks were paid by the Creek Tribe as the case progressed, and no further amount is being claimed.

We believe the expenses of both groups were properly incurred. We know of no reason for not deducting the proper litigation expenses of both groups before making the per capita distribution.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

REPORT ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE CREEK INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

GENERAL TRIBAL AND RESERVATION BACKGROUND

The majority of the Creek Indians in Oklahoma today are living interspersed with the general population, mainly in seven counties and parts of counties in eastern Oklahoma which comprised the Creek Nation from 1866 to Oklahoma statehood in 1907. There is no Creek Indian Reservation. The reservation boundaries were extinguished at the time of statehood. The original land area of the Creek Nation set aside by a Treaty of February 14, 1833 (7 Stat. 417), totaled over three million acres in the central part of Indian Territory. A considerable portion was allotted under the Act of June 28, 1898, later confirmed by agreements ratified by an Act of March 1, 1901 (31 Stat. 861), as amended June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 500). Land allotments totaling 2,997,114 acres were made to 18,761 Creek Indians and 65,622 acres were sold.

The largest Creek settlements today, in which fullblood Indians comprise the majority, are in McIntosh County in the vicinities of Eufaula, Checotah, and immediately west of these communities in Hughes County in the vicinities of Wetleetka and Okemah, and in all of Okmulgee County. These are rural communities. The people in many of them, especially in the hill country are poor. They make their living by daily labor and from farming and livestock raising. Many Creek Indians, mostly of mixedblood, are living in the larger cities and towns of this region; Tulsa, Sapulpa, Henryetta, Holdenville, Broken Arrow, and Coweta. Some of the city residents are engaged in the professions, others in the oil industry, and still others in various businesses.

By successive acts of Congress, the governmental functions of the Creek Tribe as a Nation, along with that of the other tribes of the Five Civilized Tribes, were gradually abolished to pave the way for statehood. Beginning in 1893, the United States Government, through the Dawes Commission, entered into agreements with the Indians to extinguish tribal title to their lands and to provide for allotments in severalty. Restricted deeds were issued to individual tribal members. Surplus lands were bought by the United States for opening to white settlement. Tribal rolls were closed as of March 4, 1907, and no Creek Indian born since that date has been enrolled or has received an allotment of land. The Act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), provided for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes. However, the act also provided for the continuation of the tribal government in a limited form until tribal affairs are settled.

Congress enacted legislation in 1908 (Act of May 27, 1908, (35 Stat. L., 312)), which removed trust restrictions from the lands of all enrolled persons of less than one-half degree Indian blood. By the Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 732), trust restrictions on allotments terminated upon the death of the original allottee. Heirs of restricted deceased Indians are determined in the county courts and heirs may dispose of their property by county court approvals. There is no complication due to an extended heirship problem. We do not know how many original Creek allottees still have their lands in trust status. The youngest allotted Indian today would be about 60 years old.

The Okmulgee Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs administers programs to the Creek Indians residing in Creek, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Tulsa, Muskogee, and McIntosh Counties; those in Wagoner County are under the Tahlequah Agency, and those in

Hughes County under the Wewoka Agency. All these agencies are under the administrative direction of the Muskogee Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with headquarters in Muskogee, Oklahoma.

LAND CLASSIFICATION AND ADMINISTRATION

As of July 1966, 197,812 acres of lands were in trust status, including 5,700 acres tribally owned. Approximately 171,000 acres were used by non-Indians, mostly as pasture and range lands; 16,922 acres were Indian-used. There is no irrigated land area; some 15,192 acres are classed as dry-farm land; another 1,690 acres are used for homesite, mineral and industrial development. There were 3.20 acres of Federal land under Bureau of Indian Affairs administration.

Under the provisions of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), three tracts of lands were purchased for the Creek Indians: In McIntosh County, 2,552.05 acres known as the Hanna project were acquired, with title in the name of the United States in trust for the Creek Tribe. In Hughes County, 878.25 acres known as the Wetumka project were acquired for the Alabama-Quassarte Band with title in the name of the United States for the band. In Okfuskee County, 1,914.96 acres known as the Okemah project were acquired for the Thlopthlocco Tribal Town with title in the name of the United States in trust for the band.

The Bureau has been maintaining a system of roads within the area of the former Creek Nation to serve the people and the Indian lands. As of August 30, 1966, this system totaled 38.3 miles. The Bureau has been expending approximately $9,000 per year on road maintenance.

During the past 5-year period $684,200 were expended to improve the Bureau's system by construction. A total of 49.1 miles were constructed of which 22.4 miles were then transferred to the local county government. The Bureau retains the 38.3 mile system at present. By continuing to improve and transfer roads we provide the Creek people with a much more adequate transportation facility than local government is able to do because of the nontaxable status of the land.

TRIBAL MANAGEMENT AND FINANCING

Although Congress in effect terminated the authority of the existing Creek government under the 1906 Act, section 6 of the act conferred upon the President authority to appoint a person as principal chief to perform ministerial functions relating to the remaining tribal property. While the statutory authority of the principal chief is limited to acts relating to the signing of documents concerning tribal property, the principal chief is recognized as the spokesman for the Creek Tribe as a whole. Under authority delegated by the President, the principal chief is now appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The term of office of the present chief expires on October 7, 1967.

The Creek Tribe is also served by the Creek Tribal Council, which holds regular meetings. Council members represent the old Creek tribal towns. The 1966–67 council consists of 58 members, including the principal chief.

There are three officially organized subgroups within the Creek Tribe, which were considered recognized bands of Indians for the purpose of organizing under the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967): The Thlopthlocco Tribal Town, with approximately 200 members, has a constitution approved by the Secretary on November 17, 1938, and ratified by the band on December 27, 1938. The Creek Indians of the Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town, with 125 members, has a constitution approved by the Secretary on November 17, 1938, and ratified by the band on January 10, 1939. The Kialegee Tribal Town, with approximately 50 members, has a constitution which was approved by the Secretary on April 14, 1941, and ratified by the band on June 12, 1941. These groups also have Federal corporate charters and have formed credit associations.

Each of the constitutions provides for organization along the lines of old Creek tribal town. The officers of the tribal town together with a designated number of council members constitute the governing body. Committee meetings are held at regular intervals.

There are several factional groups within the Creek Tribe; however, these groups are so small that they have exerted little influence in tribal elections or in the administration of tribal affairs.

Council members demonstrate considerable managerial ability in the conduct of their business. These same leaders are also successful in managing their own family affairs and actively participate in community life. Tribal leaders and members consider themselves a part of the community in which they live and look to the community for their individual opportunities and responsibilities.

The tribe does not engage in any business enterprise. Income to the tribe in fiscal year 1966 amounted to approximately $11,000 of which nearly $7,000 was interest earned from tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury. In the same fiscal year the tribal budget amounted to $20,750.

As of May 3, 1967, balances of Creek tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury were as follows:

14X7035 Judgment, Court of Claims, Creek Indian Nation__	$328.52
14X7535 Interest, above fund___	146.84
14X7151 Proceeds of lands, etc., Five Civilized Tribes (Creeks)_	30,758.86
14X7651 Interest, above fund___	2,744.61
14X7128 Creek Nation of Indians, judgment fund________________	105,167.65
14X7628 Interest, above fund___	3,211.92
Total_____________________	142,358.40

Traditionally, Indian trust funds have been kept in the United States Treasury drawing interest at four percent per annum. Recent increases on interest rates or yields in the general money market have led to the purchase of short-term bank time deposits and Treasury notes, bonds, and bills with Indian trust monies. The funds retain trust status during the investment period. Under Federal law (25 U.S.C. sec. 162a), the trust funds may be invested in securities or in bank certificates of deposit secured by collateral, which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. Through these investments bigger and faster returns of Indian capital have been realized. In qualifying a bank to receive Indian trust funds on deposit, the Treasury Department is required (1) to designate the bank as a depository of Indian trust funds, and (2) to assure that the bank pledges acceptable collateral in the amount of the deposit.

The principal chief of the Creek Tribe of Oklahoma requested that the Creek trust funds be invested by the Bureau. The Bureau has negotiated standard investment agreements for short-term bank time deposits with several Oklahoma banking institutions. In addition, the Bureau has obtained resolutions from the board of directors approving the signature of bank officers signing certificates of deposit and any other documents involved.

On December 30, 1966, $1,000,000 from the Creek trust funds listed below were invested in the Farmers and Merchants Bank and Trust Company of Tulsa for a one-year period.

14X7438	Indian Claims Commission award in docket No. 276______________	$933,673.16
14X7128	Creek Nation of Indians judgment fund______	55,733.78
14X7628	Interest and Accruals on interest on above account ____________	10,593.06

The fund will earn interest at 5½ percent per annum, compounded quarterly, and at maturity will provide over $16,000 more than the tribe would have received at the four percent Treasury rate.

Funds which were on deposit in the United States Treasury covering the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 21 for which legislation is being sought have also been withdrawn for investment purposes. As of May 26, 1967, a total of $3,000,000 has been placed in time certificates of deposit with six banking institutions in Oklahoma. A list of these institutions and information on the terms of deposit is enclosed with this report. These funds were withdrawn from the Treasury account 14X7109, Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Creek Nation of Indians as constituted August 9, 1814, and the interest account 14X7609. The additional interest at maturity through investment will provide $19,546.52 more for distribution to all the beneficiaries of the docket No. 21 award.

CLAIMS

The legislative proposal for the disposition of the $3,913,000 Creek award in docket No. 21 calls for a current roll of lineal descendants of the Creek Nation as it existed in 1814, and further provides that the funds shall be divided per capita among those persons whose names appear on the roll. The Area Director estimates that descendants of Oklahoma Creeks by blood on the 1907 final rolls would be from 35,000 to 40,000. The Creek Nation east of the Mississippi consisting of unorganized lineal descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814 who remained in the East or returned East to their homeland are also entitled to the benefits of this award. In 1966, representatives of this group indicated that descendancy of upwards of 10,000 people can probably be traced to Creek ancestors. As of May 26, 1967, a total of $3,000,000 of the trust funds have been withdrawn from the United States Treasury and have been invested in short-term bank time deposits (see Tribal Management and Financing).

On August 17, 1966, the Indian Claims Commission granted an award of $1,037,414.62 to the Creek Nation of Oklahoma in docket No. 276. The award represents additional payment for Oklahoma lands ceded under an 1856 Treaty. Funds were appropriated and deposited in the United States Treasury. On December 29, 1966, the funds were withdrawn for investment purposes, which are described under Tribal Management and Financing. The final disposition of this award will be the subject of a separate legislative proposal now under consideration by the Bureau.

There are still pending before the Indian Claims Commission eight other dockets in various stages of litigation. They are: Dockets Nos. 166, 167, 169, 272, 273, 274, 275, and 277.

The Loyal Creek Indians, who today represent only 3.6 percent of the Creek tribal membership, remained loyal to the United States during the Civil War, and were awarded $600,000 in 1951 in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 1. By an Act of August 1, 1955 (69 Stat. 431), funds were distributed to persons or their heirs or legatees, whose names appeared on the payroll prepared pursuant to the appropriation act of March 3, 1903.

There is now pending in Congress H.R. 2531, a two-fold proposal which includes the disposition of the balance remaining in the Loyal Creek judgment fund. The balance remaining in the Loyal Creek judgment fund amounts to $74,894.33, and represents the shares of persons entitled to receive payment whom the Bureau has been unable to locate. H.R. 2531 proposes the transfer of the residue fund on the books of the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Creek Nation of Indians of Oklahoma.

POPULATION AND MEMBERSHIP DATA

Membership rolls of the Creek Tribe were closed and made final as of March 4, 1907. A total of 18,671 persons were enrolled, including 3,396 persons of less than one-half degree of Creek blood and 6,809 Freedmen. It is estimated that about two-thirds of the enrollees are now deceased.

In 1964, there were 13,254 persons of Creek Indian descent enumerated in the reservation service area. These included 1907 enrollees and descendants of 1907 enrollees. An estimated breakdown by age of these Indians is as follows:

Age:	*Number*
1–17	4,500
18–35	2,500
36–45	2,254
45–57	2,000
58 and over	2,000

INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The major income sources of individual Creek Indians in 1966 were earnings from wages and salaries and income from mineral and agricultural leases. There were 3,063 males and 2,093 females employed in wage work. Data on the number who were self-employed or employed by the Federal Government are not available.

Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the 2,924 families reporting received an annual income of $3,000 or less:

	Families
Under $1,000	731
$1,000–$3,000	1,579
$3,000–$6,000	439
Over $6,000	175

Information on the average per capita individual income was not available. The Bureau's semiannual report on the Creek labor force on employment and unemployment (March 1967) shows approximately 15 percent of the labor force permanently unemployed and 38 percent underemployed:

Labor force (14 years and over)	6,312
Employed, total	5,315
Permanent (more than 12 months)	(2,912)
Temporary (including persons away on seasonal work)	(2,403)
Unemployed	997
Number actively seeking work	500
Percent unemployed	15

Employment opportunities in the Creek area are good. The same employment opportunities are open to the Indians as to non-Indians if the Indians meet the educational requirements and are willing to move to larger cities. Tribal members generally look with favor toward wage employment, but many are reluctant to accept employment too far from their home communities.

Seven manufacturing facilities with an estimated 1,223 jobs are planned throughout 29 counties in eastern Oklahoma. On the job training contracts have already been negotiated with three of the firms, and it is expected that employment opportunities will be available to 492 Indians.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Public assistance (Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled) is provided to Indians through county welfare departments on the same basis as to other citizens. The Bureau provides general assistance for needy Indians who do not meet the special requirements for the public assistance programs. The Bureau also provides assistance to needy Indians who apply for public assistance pending the State's approval of their application. The State handles the surplus food commodity programs, which are available to Indians on the same basis as to non-Indians.

The Bureau's average monthly caseload during fiscal years 1964–65 was 101. During late summer many cases are opened for one month to provide school clothing to children. Only a negligible amount of assistance is granted to the unemployed; the amount does not rise sharply in winter, for employment is fairly stable throughout the year.

EDUCATION

An estimated three percent of the Creek Indians do not speak English and approximately 50 to 80 percent have limited use of English. The average median grade level achieved by the parents of Creek children is the sixth grade. Ordinarily, children from educationally underprivileged homes have very limited English vocabularies and generally lack ability in written and oral English.

Approximately 90 percent of all Indian children in eastern Oklahoma attend public schools. Free textbooks and hot lunches provided in the public schools for indigent children and ADC have lessened the pressure for Federal boarding school enrollment because of financial need.

During the 1964–65 school year, 1,610 Creek children within the Creek area were enrolled in 67 public schools which received Johnson-O'Malley assistance funds. The average daily attendance was 1,463. There were 164 eighth grade graduates and 88 high school graduates.

Almost all the pupils enrolled in rural schools are in the elementary grades. Their attendance is significantly better than that of non-Indian pupils. School attendance problem develops in securing enrollment of all eligible students in the ninth grade and their remaining through the twelfth grade.

During 1964, there were 421 Creek children enrolled in boarding schools, including 396 children enrolled in five Bureau boarding schools in eastern Oklahoma administered by the Muskogee Area Office:

School	Number of Creeks enrolled	Total enrollment, 1965–66	Grades	Remarks
Sequoyah	124	395	9–12	Operates classroom facilities.
Seneca	76	220	1– 8	Operates classroom facilities.
Eufaula	35	65	1–12	Students attend Eufaula Public School.
Jones	151	279	1–12	Students attend Hartshorne Public School.
Carter	10	120	1–12	Students attend Ardmore Public School.

Some Creek families send their minor children to Oaks Mission in Oaks, near Tahlequah, which is church endowed. A few attend Murrow and Bacone in Muskogee, which are church schools.

A larger percentage of Indian graduates than of comparable non-Indian graduates have continued their education in trade schools or colleges which is due in part to financial assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the availability of state colleges in the area. During 1964, the Bureau assisted 83 Creek Indians with higher educational aid.

As of November 1966, 114 Creek Indians were enrolled in vocational courses, including 96 at Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, and 12 at Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma; four were attending the Santa Fe Institute of American Indian Arts, Santa Fe, New Mexico, and one the Albuquerque School of Practical Nursing in Albuquerque, New Mexico. One Creek student participated in a program sponsored by the Oklahoma State School of Technology, Okmulgee.

Under the Bureau's adult vocational training program, as of November 1966, 250 Creek Indians completed vocational training courses and 63 persons were in training; another 500 persons were waiting for openings and additional Bureau funds to the area for training.

In cooperation with the State Department of Education, the Bureau established several adult education units for the Creek Indians. There is much enthusiasm on the part of the Indians in this program. Their achievement levels range from beginning literacy through elementary and some high school. The age range is about 30 to 50 years.

Library facilities are available to Indians on the same basis as for the general public. Bureau schools and peripheral dormitories now share in Title II of Public Law 89–10 funds for library resources.

HOUSING

On June 18, 1965, the Oklahoma State Legislature passed the Oklahoma Housing Authorities Act. The act permits a housing authority for each Indian tribe, band, or nation in the State, and makes all communities, counties, and cities eligible to participate in the United States Housing Act of 1937. Although the program will reach a great number of Creek Indians, there still will be a considerable number of people in need who will not be eligible, as the act restricts participation to families with an annual gross income of $3,000 or less. Some families will be unable to participate in the mutual-help housing program due to some physical handicap or because of absence of a man to do the work required.

The Housing Assistance Administration has approved programs for 20 housing units for low-income families near Eufaula and 27 mutual-help housing units, with 12 units in the Yeager community, Hughes County, and 15 units in Burton and Hanna Townships. The tribe is negotiating for the purchase of approximately 15 acres of land for housing sites adjacent to Okmulgee.

HEALTH

There are three hospitals in the area and two health centers which are fully used by the Indians. These facilities are not adequate to meet the health problems of the Indians. Diabetes and hypertension are the major health problems of the Creek Indians.

Hospital care and outpatient treatment for those Indians who reside in Creek, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, and Tulsa Counties are provided by the United States Public Health Service Indian hospital located in Claremore, Oklahoma. Additional outpatient care may be obtained at the USPHS Indian health center at Okemah, where a physician is available under the contract medical care program. Indians in McIntosh County and Wagoner County are provided hospital and outpatient services by the USPHS Indian hospital located in Tahlequah. In Hughes County, outpatient medical care is furnished by the USPHS center located in Shawnee. Hospital care is furnished by the USPHS Indian hospital in Talihina.

The vast majority of urban Indians live in rented quarters, which are generally in a poor state of repair, but have minimal sanitation facility standards required by municipal law. Most of the rural homes are without facilities. The people who reside in rural areas are generally not as concerned about modern health and sanitation facilities as they should be. However, the USPHS is making progress in these areas with the projects currently under construction. Water supplies and sanitation facilities have been provided through these projects for approximately 80 rural Indian families in two Creek communities in McIntosh and Okmulgee Counties to date, and at present a third community project is being developed in western McIntosh County.

NON-BIA AND USPHS RELATIONSHIPS

All normal services provided non-Indian citizens by the counties and the State are available to the Creek Indians. Law and order and public education have been provided by the State and its governmental subdivisions since Oklahoma statehood in 1907. The Oklahoma State Employment Service in eastern Oklahoma gives excellent service to the Indians. The Indians, however, do not utilize the outside programs to the fullest extent. Many of them, particularly those in the rural areas, seek Bureau assistance and referral to the proper State or county office.

Two areas in which State services are not available are the care and education of children from broken homes and interim welfare services before persons become eligible for State welfare. When Indians reach advanced years, many of them are unable to use their land productively and wish to qualify for public assistance. In order to obtain such assistance, they must comply with the laws and regulations of the Department of Public Welfare which requires an account of their property.

Frequently, it is necessary to remove trust restrictions from the lands of the allotted Indians and permit the sale of it for the benefit of the old person. The present system is considered reasonably satisfactory to the Indians.

Community action programs and Head Start programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity are being carried on in some of the larger cities. Other governmental agencies also provide services to these Indians. Credit is provided by the Federal Housing Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, etc. Oil and gas production control and problems related thereto are reported to the U.S. Geological Survey. The U.S. Conservation Service assists in conservation practices. Fish stock for private and public water reservoirs are provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers.

ACCULTURATION INFLUENCES

The cultural status of the Creek Indians ranges from persons who are highly educated and possess culture comparable to the most advanced non-Indians of the area to those who are wholly uneducated and living at the lowest level of existence. The factors which have contributed most to the advancement of members of the Creek Tribe will be found in their relatively ready acceptance of educational opportunities, tendency to work their lands, formation of good work habits, seeking out industrial opportunities, and their general willingness to conform to practices about them. The Bureau established vocational schools, gave assistance in job placement, and maintained a type of adult education for leadership in economic matters. While the Creek Indians are an apt people, they most likely could not have made the progress they have without Federal assistance. Participation by the Creek Indians in Federal, State, and county elections is believed to be about equal to that of non-Indians.

Socially, some of the Creek Indians tend to segregate themselves. This is true primarily among the fullblood members and those with incomes less than $3,000. There are serious social problems among the Creek Indians, particularly in less progressive areas. This is evidenced by the fact that 350 Creek children are presently enrolled, for social reasons, in boarding schools.

READINESS OF INDIANS TO MANAGE THEIR OWN AFFAIRS

The remaining problems among the Creek Indians may be found to stem from the hard core of unresolved individual and family problems. These include self-isolation, crushing poverty due to impossible economic location, health and sanitation hazards, and tendency in some communities for the leaders to look back to an earlier time.

There is urgent need for jobs that will furnish permanent employment. Bureau assistance is needed to stimulate interest and to involve the Indian population of this area in the activities of the greater non-Indian community. We believe there is a continued need for assistance by the Federal Government in meeting the educational, health, sanitation, welfare, etc., needs of those Indian people who for one reason or another are living in substandard conditions. If left without our help, decline rather than progress would surely follow.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL FFA WEEK

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to the fact that vocational agriculture students in high schools across the Nation are observing National FFA Week.

This is the 24th annual observance of National Future Farmers of America Week and I would like to pay tribute to accomplishments of the Future Farmers of America program.

Today 450,000 young men in 9,000 FFA chapters throughout the United States are engaged in the study of agriculture. In North Dakota we have 65 chapters and I have always been proud of the fact that I am an honorary member of one of these—the David Lloyd chapter at La Moure, N. Dak.

The basic purpose of the FFA is to instruct young men in the science of agriculture. The training that has been given these young fellows over the years has contributed greatly to the great progress American agriculture has made.

Probably more important than this, however, is the work that is being done to develop leadership and character. I have always been impressed with the caliber of young men in this program and the ability they display in working with other people and groups. We can count as a great national asset the leaders developed through this program. Young fellows who have received this training have established tremendous records of leadership and accomplishment.

The Future Farmers of America program has always placed great emphasis on the importance of the development of good citizenship. Young men participating in the program learn the importance of active participation in community, State, and National affairs.

Mr. President, I join people all across the Nation in saluting the Future Farmers of America. I look forward to the continuing growth and progress of this fine organization.

S. 3001—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE SECURITY MEASURES FOR BANKS AND OTHER FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions.

This bill was proposed by the Justice Department.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the letter of transmittal from Attorney General Clark, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3001) to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3001

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Bank Protection Act of 1968".

Sec. 2. As used in this Act the term "Federal supervisory agency" means—

(1) The Comptroller of the Currency with respect to national banks and district banks,

(2) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with respect to Federal Reserve banks and State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System.

(3) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to State banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System but the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and

(4) The Federal Home Loan Bank Board with respect to Federal savings and loan associations, and institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Sec. 3. (a) Within six months from the date of this Act, each Federal supervisory agency shall promulgate rules establishing minimum standards with which each bank or savings and loan association must comply with respect to the installation, maintenance, and operation of security devices and procedures to discourage robberies, burglaries, and larcenies and to assist in the identification and apprehension of persons who commit such acts.

(b) The rules shall establish the time limits within which banks and savings and loan associations shall comply with the standards and shall require the submission of periodic reports with respect to the installation, maintenance, and operation of security devices and procedures.

Sec. 4. A bank or savings and loan association which violates a rule promulgated pursuant to this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty which shall not exceed $100 for each day of the violation.

The letter, presented by Mr. Sparkman, is as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1968.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: The President in his message to the Congress on crime control said: "We must bring modern crime detection and protective equipment into our banks." The enclosed legislative proposal is directed to this end.

The dramatic, continued increase in the number of bank robberies, burglaries and larcenies requires immediate action. In 1955 there were 526 such offenses committed against financial institutions protected by federal law. In 1966 the figure rose to 1,871—an increase of about 250%. New figures recently reported by the FBI indicate an increase beyond this previous all time high to

2,551 in 1967. The dollar losses are in the millions. The injuries and deaths which occur during the robberies exact a toll which is not measurable in dollars.

In its report on "Crimes Against Banking Institutions" submitted to the House of Representatives on February 20, 1964, the Committee on Government Operations recognized the need for the installation of more and better security devices and procedures. It found "incredible" the fact that a large percentage of financial institutions had no alarm system whatsoever.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has for several years mounted an educational campaign to assist in stemming the constant increase in offenses against banks and other financial institutions. However, the statistics which continue to be made daily reinforce his opinion that more must be done.

Investigation has disclosed that security devices and procedures adequate for the particular needs of institutions of varying size, location and other characteristics are relatively inexpensive. There is no doubt that the professional bank robber is less likely to attempt to burglarize or rob a bank which has an alarm system, a camera system, or other recognized security devices in operation.

Only recently, here in the District of Columbia, as a result of a silent alarm system a bank robber was met at the door as he left the institution. On September 5, in Hyattsville, Maryland, a number of suspects were developed as a result of photographs taken in the course of a bank robbery. Just two days later a concealed camera was activated during a robbery in the District of Columbia providing excellent photographs of the offender. These are just a few of many illustrations which the Department can supply the Congress in its consideration of the effectiveness of security devices and procedures.

The proposed legislation will direct the federal agencies which have responsibilities concerning banks and savings and loan institutions to promulgate rules requiring the installation, maintenance and operation of security devices and procedures to discourage robberies and burglaries and assist in the identification and apprehension of persons who commit such crimes.

In our judgment the enactment of this legislation is essential and I urge the Congress to consider it promptly.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposal is in accord with the Program of the President.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General.

S. 3007—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO PROTECTION AGAINST UNINSURED MOTORISTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a District of Columbia motor vehicle unsatisfied judgment fund to compensate victims of automobile accidents caused by insolvent and uninsured motorists. This fund would be available only to those victims who do not have insurance and have no ready means of obtaining it. The uninsured motorist who causes the harm must repay the fund for the damage that he caused or lose his license and registration.

The fund is needed because only 72 percent of District car owners have purchased automobile liability insurance. This gap of over one-fourth the District drivers remaining uninsured persists in spite of the Safety and Responsibility Act. The present law has failed to adequately protect the pedestrian in Washington from being harmed by an irresponsible driver. This bill places the burden of compensating innocent victims where it belongs: on uninsured motorists who cause the risk of accidents without liability protection and who support the fund by paying an annual fee. No insured motorists, or insurance company, or general taxpayer will pay any money into the fund.

The fund's solvency is protected by rigidly guarding payments to victims. Only medical expenses and lost income are compensated. The category of persons who can tap the fund is limited to those who have protected themselves from causing damage by purchasing liability insurance and to those who have no access to protecting against this contingency.

The fund operates in such a manner as to encourage car owners to purchase automobile insurance. First, all automobile liability policies in Washington are required to include an uninsured motorist clause; this protects the driver and his family from uninsured motorists. All insurance purchasers are thus protected and will not need the fund. For all District of Columbia motorists who do not purchase insurance, a fee of $40, is imposed merely for the privilege of driving in the District of Columbia because the uninsured creates a potential danger. Payment of this fee does not give the motorist any insurance coverage, however. Therefore, many motorists faced with the choice of a $40 fee with no protection or buying insurance with full protection will do the latter.

The fund's payment of damages in no way eases the burden of the negligent driver who must still pay the damages and provide proof of financial responsibility for the police as required by the Responsibility and Safety Act. Thus the operation of the uninsured motorist fund will both alleviate the uninsured motorist problem and prevent an expansion of its own existence.

THE PROBLEM

The present laws of the District do not protect the pedestrian from the irresponsible motorist who drives recklessly and does not provide protection against any damage that might result from this conduct. In 1966 only 72 percent of District of Columbia vehicles were insured; in 1965 the figure was 71 percent. In 1966 there were 61,742 uninsured. Obviously the penalties of the Safety and Responsibility Act are not a great enough deterrent to cause more than three out of four motorists to act responsibly and buy insurance. Thus one of every four District of Columbia drivers creates a potential danger to all other District of Columbia residents and District of Columbia visitors. This danger is very real. In 1966 16,443 accidents were caused by uninsured vehicles. Of those 6,806 persons had their licenses suspended because they were found at fault and could not produce adequate security to cover the damage they had caused.

What happens under present law to the innocent victim who was hit by one of those 6,806 drivers? The average victim is not insured: he cannot be because he does not own a car and therefore cannot purchase automobile liability insurance with the appropriate coverage. The victim cannot turn to the insurance of the driver, for there is no insurance. He can sue the driver. But what good is a suit against a driver who could not produce security for the accident damages under the Safety and Responsibility Act?

The harsh fact is that those irresponsible drivers who neglect to purchase insurance almost invariably have few if any assets. Today for a hundred or so dollars an old car can be purchased and turned to a weapon that can cause thousands of dollars of harm.

The present safety and responsibility law is inadequate in two ways:

First, its provisions requiring security and future proof of financial responsibility, which come into effect only after an accident, do little to help the victim. Thus each uninsured motorist is perfectly free to run down one pedestrian, cripple one person, or maim one child. Second, the knowledge of future penalty, that is both required future insurance and suspension of a license and registration under the Safety and Responsibility Act have failed to convince over one-fourth of our drivers that they should buy insurance. No increase of penalty in the present law will remedy their fundamental shortcomings.

The legislation I introduce today seeks to eliminate the problem of uncompensated automobile accident victims and its causes. To do this a three-pronged attack is launched against the irresponsible motorist.

1. REQUIRED UNINSURED MOTORIST CLAUSE

Every automobile liability policy that is sold within the District is required to have an uninsured motorist clause. This protects the insurance purchaser against any injuries that occur to him and his family caused by uninsured motorists. The cost of this coverage is minimal; the price is now $8, and when many are sold it will drop to about $4 or $5. In this manner, many of the accident victims will be covered, thereby decreasing the size of the problem. This does not relieve the uninsured motorist of any burden; he still must pay the damages and still must lose his license and registration if he fails to produce adequate security after the accident.

The required uninsured motorist clause serves another vital function: it protects the solvency of the fund. Only those persons who have no source of compensation from an accident can draw from the fund. Thus all those motorists who have an uninsured motorist clause, which will be all District of Columbia insured motorists, will not need or use the fund. Their insurance company seeks reimbursement from the driver who caused the accident.

It should be noted that under this bill, no District of Columbia motorist can recover from the fund. Either a District of Columbia resident chooses to purchase insurance, in which case he receives an uninsured motorist clause and is already covered, or the resident chooses to buy no insurance and is excluded automatically from the fund because he causes a risk to others.

It must be remembered that there is no compulsory insurance under this scheme. Any person who believes he has adequate financial resources or drives so carefully as not to require protection can do so without being forced to buy insurance or to stop driving.

2. UNINSURED MOTORIST FEE

The uninsured motorist creates a potential risk to all the drivers and pedestrians inside Washington. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate that these motorists should take the responsibility for mitigating the harshest results of that risk. Thus those that drive without buying insurance are required under this bill to pay a $40 fee into the uninsured motorist fund. This money is used to compensate victims of the uninsured motorists. All the expenses of administering the fund come from this fee. No taxpayer, no insurance company, and no insured motorist pays anything anytime to support the fund. The law itself forbids the use of General Treasury money for the fund.

This fee is in no way "public" insurance. It offers no protection to the payee. The fee is merely a price an uninsured District of Columbia resident must pay in order to drive in Washington, while creating a risk toward others. Since this fee is substantial it will encourage many drivers to purchase insurance. For perhaps twice the cost of the fee the driver will get full protection against liability and uninsured motorists. This yearly reminder is a much more potent incentive to purchase insurance than the remote prospect of losing driving privileges in the event of an accident which the present Safety and Responsibility Act provides.

3. UNINSURED MOTORIST FUND

The fund pays compensation to victims injured by uninsured motorists only after the negligence of the driver and innocence of the injured has been established in court and after damages have been proven. In fact, the whole trial process is engaged so that no huge bureaucratic claims board and investigation team need be used. The victim must prove his innocence and loss. After receiving a favorable verdict, the victim must demonstrate to the court that he cannot recover his judgment from the defendant. Then, and only then, does the fund compensate the victim.

To assure the solvency of the fund and because the fund seeks only to alleviate the worst effects of the uninsured motorist problem, the fund will not compensate for the entire judgment. Recovery is limited to medical expenses and lost income as found by special verdicts in the court. There is no payment for pain and suffering or for property damage.

Once the payment is made to the victim, the fund receives the subrogated claim against the uninsured motorist. The motorist loses his license and registration until he pays or agrees to an installment plan and meets the requirements for proof of future financial responsibility as provided in the Safety and Responsibility Act.

HOW THE FUND OPERATES

The fund is supplied money from the annual uninsured motorist fee. This fee is adjusted to insure solvency of the fund by projecting the claims for the coming year. All motorists who do not furnish proof of insurance to the Commissioner at the time they obtain an automobile registration must pay this fee. If at anytime after registration a motorist should end his insurance coverage for any reason, then the motorist is required to pay the fee. Insurance companies must notify the Commissioners whenever insurance lapses, so that the District of Columbia government can withdraw a registration if no fee is forthcoming. These enforcement provisions are identical to those now employed under the Safety and Responsibility Act to maintain the proof of financial responsibility.

Whenever a victim of an automobile accident desires to make a claim against the fund, that person must notify the Commissioner of such intention within 180 days after the accident. The victim must file with such notice proof showing that he qualifies to recover funds under the act, estimate the probable losses that would be compensable, and notify the Commissioner of any court action that is commenced for the recovery of losses from the uninsured motorist. This information is collected in conjunction with the data required by the Safety and Responsibility Act. Thus there is little new information or work involved.

The Commissioner is given authority to join in any defense of these original suits if the uninsured motorist fails to have counsel or to appear. This will protect the fund by limiting recoverers. However, since the defendant will be burdened with any judgment and will not be able to drive until it has been repaid, it is to his interest to defend vigorously. The Commissioner also has authority to appeal a verdict, if the defendant fails to do so.

In the case of hit-and-run accidents and default judgments there is no adversary proceeding in order to insure the recovery is proven. To provide for such a contingency, this bill allows the victim to sue the Commissioners directly, creating an adversary. Thus in all cases the fund's interests are protected.

After the verdict a hearing is held during which the victim must prove that all reasonable efforts have been made to obtain the judgment and that the defendant does not possess the resources to pay such judgment. Further the victim must show that he does not seek this judgment on behalf of an insurance company, that he is not in the same family as an insured motorist whose insurance would cover him, and that he does not have any collateral source of reimbursement of the judgment. When all this is done to the satisfaction of the court, the judge directs the fund to compensate the victim for medical expenses and lost income.

Immediately the claim for this amount is subrogated to the fund. The uninsured motorist is suspended from driving until he has repaid the fund and obeyed the provisions of the Safety and Responsibility Act.

In order to avoid needless litigation in cases where fault and damages are quite obvious, provisions are included in the act to allow for settlements out of the fund. The settlements work in this manner:

Section 408(a): After a filing of a complaint in court for an action suing the uninsured motorist, the plaintiff and defendant may enter into a written agreement for the amount to be paid. The Commissioner must be satisfied that there is adequate proof of the damages, that the plaintiff is qualified to draw from the fund, and that the defendant cannot pay the settlement. If the defendant signs a confession of judgment and agrees to pay the sum to the fund in installments, then the fund will compensate the victim. If the installment payments halt, all the Commissioner must do is take the confession of judgment to the clerk of the court to have it entered. Immediately the defaulting payee has his driving privileges revoked.

Section 408(c): If the settlement is for an amount below $2,500 there is no need to file a complaint, although all the other steps for settlement must be taken.

These provisions seek to reduce the need for unnecessary waste of time and resources with litigation when there is no question at issue. The settlement provisions are discretionary, no party—plaintiff, defendant, or Commissioner—is required to agree to any settlement.

Finally the act provides for certain penalties to give the Commissioner adequate enforcement authority. Any filing of a false statement with the Commissioner is punishable with a fine of $1,000 and a year's imprisonment. Operation of an uninsured motor vehicle without payment of the required fee causes immediate suspension of license and registration, makes the driver liable to $500 fine and 90 days in jail, and activates the proof of future financial security section of the Safety and Responsibility Act. A transfer of registration to willfully defeat the purpose of the act is also prohibited.

ELIGIBLE VICTIMS

It is necessary to limit those who can draw from the fund in order to maintain its solvency. However, the limitation upon the recovery available—designed below—make this problem less acute. The purpose of this act is to protect those whom the uninsured motorist endangers, those who have no readily available means to protect themselves.

Section 102(e) defines those who cannot draw from the fund as: first, an owner of an automobile who does not have coverage as required by the Safety and Responsibility Act; and second, any one covered by liability insurance.

Clause (1) of subsection (f) excludes all uninsured motorists. Anyone who creates a danger to others on the road should not be allowed to use the fund. Since an uninsured motorist can never recover from the fund, the payment of $40 fee cannot be construed as purchase of insurance. The requirement of an uninsured motorist clause to be added to insurance sold inside the District brings all insured drivers—their families, guests, and guest drivers—inside clause (2) of subsection (e).

Thus the only persons who can recover from the fund who reside in the District are noncar owners who cannot be covered by automobile insurance. This includes pedestrians and passengers in the uninsured car. The passengers in the insured car are already covered.

It should be noted, however, that although the coverage of the required uninsured motorist clause exempts the family of insured motorists from recovery because they will be compensated, the family of the uninsured motorist can recover from the fund. It would seem especially harsh that the irresponsibility of the parent by failure to purchase liability insurance should be visited upon a child or wife.

In order to recover, of course, the victim must be able to sue the uninsured motorist. In the District common law prevents a spouse from suing a spouse—*Tobin* v. *Hoffman*, 96 A. 2d 597—or child from suing a parent for tortious conduct so that there could never be a recovery from the fund when the uninsured motorist injured his own wife or child. The possibility of collusion to recover for self-caused accidents does not exist.

Due to strong suggestions last year that it would be unfair to exclude from protection those visitors to the District who travel to see their Nation's Capital and their elected representatives from the fund, visitors have been included. It follows logically that the uninsured motorists create for this group of people as much risk as for District of Columbia residents and should be required to protect them accordingly. As subsection (e) is written, it allows recovery of nonresident car owners only if they have insurance coverage, as required by the District of Columbia Safety and Responsibility Act—presently $10,000, $20,000, $5,000 coverage. This is what we require for District of Columbia residents, and it would be unfair to compensate those who do not protect our citizens from the risk they create. Non-car owning pedestrians and passengers can also recover. Uninsured motorists and those who have insurance against uninsured motorists cannot.

As a matter of fact the number of nonresidents who could recover from the fund is extremely low. First, few nonresidents are hurt by uninsured motorists. Second, the overwhelming majority of nonresidents injured in the District of Columbia would not be eligible to recover because they would be car owners who were uninsured or had uninsured motorist coverage—as required to be offered in 38 States—or were covered by the provisions of an uninsured motorist clause as a guest or member of a family.

SOLVENCY OF THE FUND

The solvency of the uninsured motorist fund is guaranteed by the severe restrictions upon those who can draw from it and upon the amount that can be drawn. As can be seen from the above discussion, no District of Columbia car owners and few nonresident car owners can draw from the fund. This fact alone will avoid difficulties other uninsured motorist funds have had. Not every victim of an accident caused by an uninsured motorist will collect from the fund. Even after demonstrating to the Commissioner that one was a potential claimant—having no insurance and a noncar owner—who could draw from the fund, the victim must further prove that he was not contributorily negligent; that the uninsured motorist was negligent; that he suffered damage here; and that this damage was not reimbursable through a valid judgment.

Claims are limited to a $10,000 maximum for any one person, $20,000 for any one accident.

The present motor vehicle statistics indicate that these requirements will narrow the number of claimants significantly. The number of accidents that involve nonproperty damage is very small. Of the 34,187 accidents reported in District of Columbia in 1966, 17,410 involved property damage only; 5,165 of the other accidents involved property and personal injury. Thus about only one in every four accidents involves damage compensible by the fund. Of these accidents, involving property and personal injury, 16,443 were caused by uninsured motorists. But because the damage in most cases was slight, only 6,086 had their licenses suspended because they could not produce the security to cover the damage they caused—property and personal—required by the Safety and Responsibility Act. This latter figure includes resident and nonresident uninsured motorists. Thus the fact that most accidents cause property damage and most uninsured motorist can pay the lower costs of this damage means that the fund will concentrate upon only a low number of claims. It is these claims, however, that are vital. It is not the ripped fender or smashed fence that this fund is aimed; rather it is the wage earning father in the hospital for 10 weeks, or the crippled mother unable to care for her family. The fund automatically screens out the less important and less disasterous claims.

An actual 60-day survey done in 1966 by the Motor Vehicle Department, was taken to ascertain the yearly cost of the fund. In this 60-day period, only 26 percent of the cars in accidents were uninsured. Of those 26 percent only two-thirds were at fault. Only one-third of the claims involved any personal injury claim. The average claim, using the $10,000 maximum of the fund, was only $1,300 for personal injury. During the 60 days, of the 180 persons injured by uninsured motorists at fault, only 72 victims—or less than half—were not themselves covered by insurance. This is assuming that all nonresidents were not insured—since 38 States require an uninsured motorist clause this is highly unlikely—and that the pedestrian fatalities during the period—four—were also uninsured.

Upon the basis of the above survey, the Motor Vehicle Department of the District government predicted a yearly total of $561,600 of claims from personal injury caused by uninsured motorists at fault where the victim was not insured. This figure includes the total of all claims from the personal injuries; the fund, however, only compensates for medical expenses and lost income. Pain and suffering, included in the above figure will not be paid for. It is difficult to estimate the proportion of personal injury claims that are for pain and suffering. Two-thirds of the judgment is probably most accurate. For the sake of a very conservative estimate, we shall assume pain and suffering is only one-third of these claims. Thus the fund will have to reimburse $374,400 per year at the very most. Assuming that the fund is administered by the same office as the Safety and Responsibility Act to avoid needless duplication of work, the Motor Vehicle Department has projected their needs to administer the fund as enacted by S. 3007. An estimate of the administrative cost including the salary of counsel was $180,000. Income from the $40 fee is projected at $800,000. The balance:

Income at $40 fee	$800,000
Claims	374,000
Administrative cost	180,000
Total cost	554,400
Balance (surplus)	245,600

As presently planned with its careful safeguards and including compensation for the District of Columbia and visiting victims of uninsured motorists the uninsured motorists fund is absolutely solvent. There are no estimates based upon any available data that can project a deficit in the fund. The limits upon the access to the fund were revised for this reason and because of the fund's basic aim: to compensate the victims of uninsured motorist irresponsibility when they incur serious and tragic harm. The argument that a change of the accessibility requirements might bankrupt the fund is irrelevant to this bill. It was proposed in this form to avoid that exact problem. It is hoped that those concerned solely with the fund's solvency will join in defeating any attempted amendments to weaken the fund.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3007) to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining certain losses as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2524) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1853 and S. 1854, which seek to amend the Federal Firearms Act of 1938 and the National Firearms Act of 1934, the following Senators be added as cosponsors: The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick].

I also ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of these remarks that portion of the testimony of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] before the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee consisting of the statement which he submitted and read there to the subcommittee on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and himself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The statement is as follows:

Statement of Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana, on Gun Control Legislation Before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, July 11, 1967

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate this opportunity once again to express my views on proposals relating to the interstate commerce in sporting firearms. I submitted a statement to this committee in 1965 when it was considering the subject at that time. On August 18th of last year, I inserted a statement in the Congressional Record concerning proposals under consideration at that time. I would like to add that statement to my testimony today. Senator Mansfield has gone over this statement and asked that it also be considered his.

My views on the misuse of firearms are based on my own understanding of the problem and the hundreds of suggestions I have received from Montanans for whom I speak. I am sure my experience in this matter is similar to that of other members of Congress who returned to their respective states after adjournment. I found Montanans vitally concerned with the kind of firearms legislation that may ultimately be enacted. As would be expected, their concern ranged over a broad front, extending from the individual right to possess and use firearms for legal purposes of all kinds, including defense of family, home, and property, to the continuance of the very substantial hunting and recreational service industry that the sporting use of firearms supports in Montana. There is concern, too, about the continuation of state wildlife management programs supported entirely by the license fees paid by hunters and by the federal excise taxes they pay on sporting arms and ammunition. In Montana, as in other states, hunters pay the bills for necessary wildlife management and restoration programs as well as maintain the food, transportation, equipment, and allied businesses that service their needs. Furthermore, Montanans want firearms restrictions to apply directly to criminals and the criminally inclined, rather than to the vastly greater number of law-abiding citizens.

I fully share the concerns of Montanans in this regard, Mr. Chairman. As they do, I support corrective amendments to the Federal Firearms Act and to the National Firearms Act that hold promise, with vigorous enforcement, of reducing the criminal misuse of sporting firearms and the so-called destructive devices. I question whether the existing Federal Firearms Act has been enforced with sufficient vigor, and I believe that many of the abuses the committee now hears about would not have taken place had this been done. Clearly, the Federal Government has been lax in discharging the responsibilities it assumed under that Act. Many of the complaints we hear can be attributed to this laxity. Nevertheless, it is clear, as experience has shown, that some additional amendments would help the states in preventing the interstate acquisition of firearms by persons in violation of state laws or regulations. It is this traffic, the record shows, that contributes largely to the criminal misuse of firearms. It is through this route that many criminals, alcoholics, addicts and juveniles circumvent state or local restrictions against their acquisition and possession of firearms.

The goal of any legislation that is considered should be to provide the utmost federal assistance to state and local government in curbing traffic in concealable weapons that is contrary to state and local law. These are the firearms that figure most prominently in crime. Because of their concealability and lack of bulk, handguns are the firearms favored by criminals and the criminally inclined. They are the firearms most used in premeditated crime. I believe that the flow of pistols and revolvers to certain individuals can be slowed by the enactment of appropriate legislation and by its subsequent vigorous enforcement. All interested persons should realize, however, that it would be unrealistic and inaccurate to assume that any legislation ever would end the misuse of firearms or, for that matter, of automobiles, narcotics, alcohol or kitchen knives.

Certainly, it is reasonable to expect that any state or local unit of government, experiencing difficulty with the misuse of firearms, should have enacted or should enact laws pertaining to the possession of firearms to meet its own specific purposes. What these units of government need now, because local laws are being circumvented by the out-of-state purchase of firearms, is a relatively uncomplicated and straightforward act to close this loophole.

Senator Mansfield and I believe that this would be done by the enactment of legislation along the lines of that (S. 1853) introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska). We believe that this proposal closes the loopholes that have been causing the most trouble, makes certain other needed corrections in the Federal Firearms Act, properly establishes restrictions on interstate traffic in the problem handguns, while at the same time assuring the least inconvenience to the millions of citizens who own and use firearms for lawful purposes. The committee will find, I am sure, that legislation of this kind, does have the support of all of the major sporting and shooting organizations as well as of individual sportsmen across the country.

Contrary to some of the statements that have appeared in the press, I find that sportsmen do believe that improvements can be made in the Federal Firearms Act. They do believe that some improvements are necessary and that the amendments that would be made by S. 1853 are workable, realistic and hold promise of effectiveness. They hold the promise of helping the state and local governments to enforce laws and regulations that respond to conditions as they exist in various sections of the country. They do not seek to invoke a broad national ban on firearms. Rather, the recommended amendments recognize that conditions vary widely through the country and that a ban or prohibition that may be desirable in one state or local area may not be in the best interest of another.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on another legislative matter that has the strong endorsement of sporting groups throughout the country. This is the control of destructive devices, automatic weapons and others that can only be used for war materiel. From letters I have received and from copies of resolutions that have passed over my desk, there can be no misunderstanding about the desire of all Americans to bring crew-served weapons and other of the destructive devices under prompt control.

Unfortunately, some persons prefer to persist in thinking that sportsmen object to such control. Nothing could be further from the truth. Sportsmen want destructive devices controlled, but they want the control to be accomplished by an amendment to the National Firearms Act, the so-called Machine Gun Act, rather than through the Federal Firearms Act, which applies solely to sporting firearms. There is a clear distinction between machine guns and weapons of that kind and sporting firearms. Machine guns, hand grenades, and the heavy ordnance of war have a use and a purpose separate and apart from sporting firearms. That is why we have a Federal and a National Firearms Act.

Personally, I doubt if we ever will see the day when sportsmen will agree to lumping sporting firearms and destructive devices into the same basic law. I am confident that a destructive device amendment to the National Firearms Act could have been enacted by now had it not been for the ill-advised persistence of some persons to link such weaponry with sporting firearms. Under an agreement discussed 24 May on the Senate floor, S. 1854, a bill to amend the National Firearms Act, has been referred to this committee. This is the first time that the committe has had an opportunity to consider the two facets of this problem together in this manner. Again, Senator Mansfield and I urge that this proposal receive prompt consideration and that destructive devices be included under the National Firearms Act.

I have sought in these brief remarks to show that there is positive support for certain corrective firearms legislation in Montana and throughout the Nation, Mr. Chairman. This support is based on the belief that Federal legislation should assist, rather than usurp, state and local authority to deal with the firearms problem as it may exist. There is no justification, in my opinion, in attempting to blanket the entire country with restrictive legislation when the criminal misuse of firearms is largely a local or regional problem.

Maximum, but realistic, effort should be made to restrict the interstate traffic in concealable weapons, the kind of firearms that are used most prevalently in the commission of armed crime. Much of the difficulty that has been encountered, especially in the centers of population where armed crime is most prevalent, would be overcome by more vigorous law enforcement and by greater attention in the courts. The failure to provide such enforcement and the laxity of some courts have contributed to the current problem.

Corrective legislation along the lines that I have discussed, plus better enforcement all the way from the streets to the courts, will do much to solve the problem with which all law-abiding persons are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my statement of last August 18th, and a resolution, adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Montana, at the convention in May of this year, be included at this point in the record.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 258); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 258

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document a compilation of materials entitled "History of the Committee on the Judiciary Together With

Chairmen and Members Assigned Thereto, 1816–1967", and that there be printed ten thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 530

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, and ask that the amendment be printed and referred for consideration to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This amendment would increase, by $91 million, fiscal year 1968 appropriations for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas and major disaster areas, as authorized under Public Law 81–874, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 530) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this Federal assistance program, familiarly known as Public Law 874, was enacted in 1950 and since that time has provided needed assistance to local school districts burdened by the obligation to provide educational services to the children of families employed by the Federal Government in local communities all over the Nation. Federal payments are made at rates determined by formulas in the legislation, and eligible school districts have a continuing expectation to receive these annual payments.

Unfortunately, this program was not excluded from mandatory budget reductions enacted on December 18, 1967, in Public Law 90–218. As a result, school districts all over the country find themselves without needed and anticipated revenues, and most of these districts have no way to replace funds which they had expected to receive from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under the payment formula in Public Law 81–874, schools districts in Arkansas have an entitlement in fiscal year 1968 of $2,435,933. Present appropriations for the program would permit an allocation to Arkansas of only $1,953,560—a deficit of $482,373. On a nationwide basis the aggregate deficit among all of the States is $90,965,000. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a summary of allocation and estimated need under Public Law 81–874 for fiscal year 1968.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ALLOCATION AND ESTIMATED NEED, PUBLIC LAW 874 AS AMENDED, FISCAL YEAR 1968

State or territory	1968 appropriation	1968 entitlement	Difference
Total	$395, 390, 000	$486, 355, 000	$90, 965, 000
Alabama	8, 955, 406	10, 888, 075	1, 932, 669
Alaska	9, 762, 046	12, 172, 490	2, 410, 444
Arizona	6, 285, 722	7, 837, 792	1, 552, 070
Arkansas	1, 953, 560	2, 435, 933	482, 373
California	60, 978, 019	76, 034, 711	15, 056, 692
Colorado	10, 290, 723	12, 831, 708	2, 540, 985
Connecticut	2, 616, 498	3, 262, 564	646, 066
Delaware	2, 350, 131	2, 671, 001	320, 870
District of Columbia	4, 618, 402	5, 758, 437	1, 140, 035
Florida	12, 953, 787	16, 030, 492	3, 076, 705
Georgia	12, 330, 086	14, 496, 199	2, 166, 113
Hawaii	6, 857, 193	8, 550, 371	1, 693, 178
Idaho	2, 418, 106	3, 015, 185	597, 079
Illinois	9, 983, 678	12, 448, 848	2, 465, 170
Indiana	3, 039, 259	3, 789, 713	750, 454
Iowa	1, 787, 388	2, 228, 730	441, 342
Kansas	6, 196, 140	7, 726, 091	1, 529, 951
Kentucky	6, 040, 371	6, 413, 502	373, 131
Louisiana	3, 001, 338	3, 713, 288	711, 950
Maine	2, 661, 479	3, 318, 651	657, 172
Maryland	18, 746, 284	23, 377, 258	4, 630, 974
Massachusetts	10, 412, 223	12, 812, 595	2, 400, 372
Michigan	4, 981, 623	6, 211, 685	1, 230, 062
Minnesota	1, 706, 172	2, 127, 460	421, 288
Mississippi	2, 478, 037	3, 089, 914	611, 877
Missouri	5, 221, 005	6, 510, 176	1, 289, 171
Montana	3, 228, 800	4, 026, 055	797, 255
Nebraska	3, 802, 700	4, 741, 663	938, 963
Nevada	2, 719, 033	3, 390, 417	671, 384
New Hampshire	1, 859, 828	2, 319, 057	459, 229
New Jersey	7, 904, 435	9, 856, 198	1, 951, 763
New Mexico	7, 912, 906	9, 866, 761	1, 953, 855
New York	21, 055, 954	26, 039, 763	4, 983, 809
North Carolina	9, 344, 737	10, 516, 563	1, 171, 826
North Dakota	2, 359, 730	2, 942, 395	582, 665
Ohio	9, 660, 120	12, 045, 397	2, 385, 277
Oklahoma	8, 932, 441	11, 138, 039	2, 205, 598
Oregon	1, 945, 923	2, 419, 913	473, 990
Pennsylvania	7, 313, 773	9, 018, 024	1, 704, 251
Rhode Island	2, 638, 017	3, 289, 396	651, 379
South Carolina	6, 682, 898	8, 041, 698	1, 358, 800
South Dakota	3, 446, 992	4, 296, 706	849, 714
Tennessee	4, 915, 534	6, 129, 278	1, 213, 744
Texas	20, 904, 631	26, 066, 402	5, 161, 771
Utah	4, 505, 686	5, 618, 230	1, 112, 544
Vermont	122, 508	152, 758	30, 250
Virginia	24, 455, 489	29, 794, 811	5, 339, 322
Washington	10, 549, 718	13, 154, 654	2, 604, 936
West Virginia	465, 327	580, 226	114, 899
Wisconsin	1, 669, 789	2, 082, 093	412, 304
Wyoming	1, 304, 017	1, 626, 005	321, 988
Guam	1, 307, 307	1, 630, 107	322, 800
Puerto Rico	5, 429, 002	5, 465, 710	36, 708
Virgin Islands	104, 419	130, 202	25, 783
Wake Island	223, 610	223, 610	------------------

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the deficits listed for each of the several States. Those most severely affected from the standpoint of total dollars are California, Virginia, Texas, New York, Maryland, and Florida. It is probable, however, that, from the standpoint of the relationship to the total educational expense of a particular State, other States which would lose less money would nevertheless be more severely handicapped in maintaining their educational services.

Mr. President, I am obtaining from the Arkansas Department of Education more detailed information about the Arkansas school districts presently affected, and I will supply this information for the RECORD at a later date. At this time, however, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the texts of letters which I have received from school officials in Greenwood, Ashdown, and Cabot, Ark.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEBASTIAN COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Greenwood, Ark., February 12, 1968.
Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator from Arkansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULBRIGHT: Thank you for notifying me of tentative entitlement and initial payment under Title I of Public Law 874 for Fiscal year 1968 for Lavaca and Mansfield school districts.

I have received a copy of Bulletin No. 25 from James F. Hortin, Acting Director, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which states that the entitlement for the fiscal year 1968 will probably have to be prorated to around 80 percent. This is brought about because estimated entitlement under the Act exceeds the current appropriation by some $90 to $100 million.

In setting up my budgets for the 1967–68 fiscal year I counted on receiving the 25% of Fiscal year 1967 entitlement that was still due at the close of our 1966–67 fiscal year on June 30, 1967 plus 75% of Fiscal Year 1968 entitlement. This is the procedure we have followed for years and I have come to look on it as a stable program. Unless we get a 100% payment of our 1968 entitlement and 75% of it before the end of our fiscal year on June 30, 1968, two or three of my districts are going to be in real trouble.

I shall appreciate your efforts in seeing that this program is fully financed.

Very truly yours,

O. E. ROBERTS.

ASHDOWN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Ashdown, Ark., February 6, 1968.
Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am greatly disturbed to find Public Law 874 will likely not pay the amount our school district budgeted and expected to receive from this source.

Senator, this is one of the most defensible federal school programs I know anything about. Therefore, I am at a loss to know what will happen to our budget this year, if the government fails to come through with the amount of money we were led to believe we would get.

You will find enclosed a copy of a bulletin recently sent to our schools. We do hope that you will do everything in your power to restore the percentage payoff of seventy five (75) per cent of the estimated entitlement.

Senator, your much needed help at this time will be greatly appreciated by me and your many friends here.

Yours very truly,

C. D. FRANKS,
Superintendent.

CABOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cabot, Ark., February 7, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing to secure your support in maintaining the Federal Aid to impacted schools such as Cabot. I am referring to Public Law 81–874 funds.

Since Cabot is located close to Little Rock and Jacksonville Air Base and is increasing in enrollment each year, any loss of these funds will be a blow to our school budget.

We are one of the schools in Arkansas suffering from the states minimum foundation program having been frozen at the 1966 level and the procedure for administering the remaining funds at $500.00 per teacher.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I received last week from the State Department of Education which explains our problem in part.

I plan to be in Washington for the Teacher Corp. Conference on February 22–24 and would be happy to talk with you further if you think it is necessary.

Sincerely,

DON ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that this program of Federal assistance is an obligation of the Federal Government which should be met, and local school districts entitled to this assistance have had every reason to believe that their entitlements would be met by Federal payments. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will accept this amendment and that these additional funds will be appropriated. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a description of this program prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS AND MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

Purpose: 1. To provide financial assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools of local education agencies which experience financial burdens when:

a. Sources of local revenue are reduced as the result of acquisition of real property by the United States.

b. Local education agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property or whose parents are employed on Federal property.

c. Federal activities carried on directly or through a contractor result in sudden and substantial increases in school attendance.

2. To arrange for the free education of children who live on Federal property when no State or local funds may be expended for that purpose or no local agency can provide these children with suitable free public education.

3. To provide financial assistance for current school expenditures in major disaster areas.

The original version of what became title I of Public Law 81–874 was enacted in 1950 with a terminal date of June 30, 1954. This legislation authorizing financial assistance for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas, has been amended as well as extended through the years. Initially, it was applicable to the major political subdivisions of the Nation with the exception of the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Wake Island, and Guam. Public Law 83–248 provided for extending it to Wake Island, section 10 of Public Law 84–896 made it applicable to Guam, Public Law 88–665 added the District of Columbia, and Public Law 89–10, American Samoa.

Public Law 85–620 made the program permanent insofar as it relates to children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. The Civil Rights Act of 1960 expanded provisions in the amended 1950 legislation relating to the education of children of members of the Armed Forces. An amendment by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided for extension of the temporary provisions through June 30, 1968.

That same Public Law 89–10 added a major new dimension to the authorization in the amended 1950 legislation and, in the process, divided the law into three titles. Title I is concerned with assistance for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas, title II authorizes the new program of assistance, and title III defines terms under the legislation as a whole. (For information on the program under title II, see "Educationally Deprived Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs," page 33).

In general, amendments to the law have tended to liberalize its provisions. Public Law 89–313 added another new dimension by providing for assistance for current expenditures in the event of major disaster in the Nation (including American Samoa) or in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which the Nation administers for the United Nations. Another amendment by the same law reduces eligibility requirements for large city school districts to the level required of other school districts. Public Law 89–750 further liberalized eligibility requirements, and broadened the definition of Federal property.

Financing:

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation	Net entitlements [1]	Federal expenditure
1951	([2])	[3] $29,080,788	$29,686,018	$13,771,739
1955	([2])	75,000,000	75,276,843	85,250,689
1963	([2])	282,322,000	264,373,333	264,337,330
1964	([2])	320,670,000	292,836,215	283,707,927
1965	([2])	332,000,000	[5] 319,845,875	311,481,068
1966 [4]	([2])	388,000,000	[5] 371,828,221	[5] 354,006,625
1967 [4]	([2])	416,200,000	[5] 433,400,000	[5] 373,428,301

[1] Sec. 5(c) of Public Law 81–874 as amended provides for prorating among eligible districts in proportion to their entitlements when funds appropriated for a fiscal year are insufficient to cover entitlements under the specified formulas. Net entitlements for fiscal year 1951 represent prorating at 96 percent while those for fiscal year 1955 represent prorating at 99.5 percent.

[2] Entitlement formulas are specified in the enabling legislation.

[3] Includes $380,788 made available from other Federal agencies.

[4] No estimates are included for the disaster area assistance program authorized on Nov. 1, 1965, by Public Law 89–313.

[5] Estimate.

Basis for Allocation: Federal payments are made at rates determined by formulas in the legislation. The rate for children living on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property, including such children whose parents are on active duty in the uniformed services is called the local contribution rate. It is the highest of the following: (a) the expenditure per child from local revenue sources in the second preceding year in comparable school districts, or beginning with fiscal year 1968 a group of comparable districts, in the State, (b) 50 percent of the national average per pupil cost in such second preceding year, but not exceeding the State average per pupil cost, or (c) 50 percent of the State average per pupil cost in such second preceding year. The rate for children who live on Federal property or live with a parent employed on Federal property, or have a parent on active duty in the uniformed services, is 50 percent of the highest local contribution rate.

To qualify for assistance for children living on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property, a district's average daily attendance for covered pupils must be 400 or must represent at least 3 percent of the total average daily attendance, whichever is lesser, and there must be at least 10 pupils. The average daily attendance of children in each category is combined to meet the 400 or 3 percent and 10 children rule. Entitlement also is computed for the number of children in each category at the rate specified for each category.

For the two fiscal years after one in which the local education agency meets the 3 percent, it may receive payments related to children covered by the legislation if at least 10 are involved even though they do not constitute at least 3 percent of the district's total average daily attendance. For the first such year, payment is made at the appropriate local contribution rate applicable for the actual number of such children in attendance. For the second year, entitlement is one-half of the product of the number of such children in attendance multiplied by the appropriate rate.

Other Federal payments which the Commissioner determines the school district received in a fiscal year are deducted to the extent they are made with respect to property on which children counted for entitlement live, or the parents work, and if the sum of the amounts is $1,000 or more. The value of transportation, custodial, and other maintenance services furnished the school by the Federal Government during the year is deductible.

Special payments are authorized for districts experiencing a sudden and substantial increase in average daily attendance because of Federal activities carried on directly or through a contractor. A payment intended to permit the district to provide a level of expenditure per pupil equivalent to that in generally comparable districts in the same State may be made if (a) the increase is at least 5 percent over the number of non-federally connected children in average daily attendance in the preceding year, (b) the increase places a substantial and continuing financial burden on the district, and (c) the district is making a reasonable tax effort, is "diligently" seeking to avail itself of State and other financial assistance, and still is unable to fund the increased education costs.

With some exceptions, a certification to the Department of the Treasury is made as soon as possible after receipt of a district's application to permit an initial partial payment to the district as early as possible in the school year. At the end of the school year, the district submits its final report showing actual data relating to pupils and costs and final payment then is made. Before an account is closed, a field staff member visits the district, reviews the documentation in support of the claim, and reports to the Office of Education which makes any appropriate adjustment required for conformity with the law.

For districts which have lost a substantial portion of the real property tax base because of Federal acquisition of property since 1938, the amount of payment is computed by estimating taxes the district would have received if the acquisition had not occurred.

When the President has declared an area to be a major disaster area, the U.S. Commissioner of Education may make financial assistance available in such amounts as may be deemed in the public interest provided (a) a reasonable tax effort is being made in the district, (b) "due diligence" is being exerted to obtain State and other financial assistance, and (c) funds available to the district are not sufficient to meet the cost of providing free public education. The Commissioner may expend existing funds subject to reimbursement after appropriations are made for needs in the particular disaster situation.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 20, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1124. An act to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes;

S. 2402. An act to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955; and

S. 2447. An act to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2766, A BILL AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO RESTRICT TRAVEL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Passport Legislation of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that there will be a public hearing on S. 2766, a bill "authorizing the Secretary of State to restrict the travel of citizens and nationals of the United States where unrestricted travel would seriously impair the conduct of foreign affairs." The hearing will begin at 9 a.m. on Friday, February 23, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

The other members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee are Senators GORE, PELL, CARLSON, and COOPER.

The Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State, will testify for the administration. Any persons wishing to present their views on S. 2766 should get in touch with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IN PRAISE OF AN AMERICAN SERVICEMAN KILLED IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday I attended the funeral of Donald Perkins, Jr., a marine lieutenant, who had been killed in Vietnam.

I want to say a few words on the floor of the Senate about Donald Perkins, in part because of the very deep affection I had for him, in part because, in paying tribute to this one American soldier who gave his life in Vietnam, I wish to pay tribute to all of them.

Young Don Perkins was the son of my very good friend, Mr. Donald Perkins of Winnetka, Ill.

He was the dearest friend of my son Chris, and he was a frequent visitor at our house. He won all of our hearts with his infectious warmth. Indeed, we almost came to regard him as one of the family, so that Mrs. Dodd and I mourn him as we would the loss of our own son.

Somehow, I find it still hard to believe that Don Perkins, a boy who exuded so much vitality and warmth, has had his life cut short at so young an age.

It is part of the larger tragedy of the times we live in that so many of our youth are called upon to face the supreme challenge in responding to the recurring threats against our national security.

In Donald's case, he accepted this challenge gladly, for he was not a boy to shirk his responsibility or to let others bear the burden.

He fought bravely, and he fought in a good cause. Don Perkins fought in Vietnam to protect the right of every nation, large or small, to determine its own future free from the threat of Communist aggression. He fought for the future freedom of mankind.

To me, young Don Perkins, in his courage, idealism, and willingness to sacrifice, somehow symbolized the best that is in American youth today.

And if he could speak to us today, I am sure that we would hear no lament for himself. He would, rather, speak in the words of the final stanza of John McCrae's immortal poem, "In Flanders Fields."

> Take up our quarrel with the foe:
> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders Fields.

He would appeal to us to continue the struggle to which we have committed ourselves, and to which so many young Americans have already given "the last full measure of devotion."

He would urge us to shun the clamor of the timid and the appeasers.

And he would call on us all to stand steadfast and unflinching, no matter what the cost and what the sacrifice, in this historic struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery.

For this was the kind of young man Don Perkins was.

In bidding him a personal farewell I can think of no words more appropriate than the words of young Horatio on the death of his friend, Hamlet:

> Farewell, sweet Prince,
> And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I wish to make some brief remarks, as I have done each year since I have been here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 4 days ago today, on February 16 the Lithuanian community in this country and throughout the free world observed the 50th anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian state.

In captive Lithuania, this anniversary was also observed. But there it was observed in secret and in small groups, by Lithuanian patriots who came together in defiance of the official Soviet prohibition of the observance, and in defiance of the dreaded secret police.

Only a few months separate this anniversary of freedom from the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. The two anniversaries stand in the starkest contrast.

February 16 is an anniversary dedicated not merely to the freedom of Lithuania, but to the freedom of all small nations and to the freedom of the individual.

The 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution conversely, was a monstrously hypocritical observance which sought to make the establishment of a totalitarian tyranny and the subjugation of other peoples a cause for rejoicing.

On this fateful day, the tragic fate of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia constitutes a challenge both to our conscience and to our political judgment. It cries out, against the misbegotten logic of those who today urge us to close the book on the past, to ignore the record of current history as well as the record of recent history, to turn the other cheek whenever the Soviets affront us or engage in new aggression and to seek to build bridges to the Communist world under the rigidly unilateral conditions which they have thus far imposed.

I would point out too that we observe Lithuanian Independence Day this year at a time when our country is engaged in a costly and bloody war to defend the right of self-determination of the people of South Vietnam against Communist aggression. The enemy we face in Vietnam is trained and supplied and encouraged by the selfsame oppressors of the Lithuanian people.

I propose to briefly retell the story of how the Soviet Union won its inglorious victory over Lithuania because it illustrates the nature of communism—the nature of the enemy we still confront—better than any story I know. It teaches us how much trust can be placed in treaties with the Kremlin, in its pledges of coexistence, in its off-and-on pretenses of friendship. It teaches us how inhuman international bolshevism is and how utterly without morality or restraint.

When the Lithuanian people, at the close of World War II, established their own government and proclaimed their independence, the Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state. There were many bitter battles but finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty—mark these words well—that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over in Lithuanian people and their territory."

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period, there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture.

But then came the Hitler-Stalin pact and the partition of Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union. Almost immediately, the Kremlin demanded permission to place 20,000 troops in Lithuania for the duration of the war. These troops, it was emphasized, would be removed at the end of the war. Prime Minister Stalin himself stated—and again mark these words well—"We respect the independence of the Lithuanian state. We are disposed to defend its territorial integrity."

History records no blacker or more perfidious lie by the head of a great state.

On October 10, 1939, only 2 weeks after the original demand was served on Lithuania, the Soviet Union concentrated its armed forces on the Lithuanian frontier. The government of this brave little nation had no alternative but to sign the pact of mutual assistance which the Kremlin placed before it. But at the point of signing, they discovered that the clause stipulating that Soviet bases would be maintained in Lithuania only for the duration of the war had been stricken from the agreement, on the personal instruction of Stalin.

This was only the beginning of the perfidy. Eight months later, on July 14, 1940, the Soviet Government demanded that the Lithuanian Minister of the Interior and Director of Security be brought to trial, that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red army be granted free entry in force into the territory of Lithuania. There was not even time to reply to this ultimatum. The very next day, on June 15, the Red army occupied Lithuania and the government was compelled to flee abroad.

The Communists had made their plans carefully, as they always do, and they moved rapidly. They had a quisling regime ready to install. They had their lists of names of Lithuanian patriots who were slated for arrest and execution. They had their plan of action.

On July 7, 3 weeks after the occupation, the quisling regime ordered the liquidation of all non-Communist parties and the arrest of their leaders. On July 14 and 15, the people were compelled to vote in national elections with only the Communist Party represented. The Lithuanian people resisted heroically, desperately. But they were fighting against hopeless odds. On July 17, the regime announced that 95.1 percent of the people had voted and that 99.19 percent of these had cast their ballot for the Communist Party.

Two days later, on July 21, the so-called People Diet convened for its first session. In less than 1 hour, without any debate, it voted unanimously to ask the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to admit Lithuania into the Soviet state as one of its federated Soviet Socialist Republics.

What an object lesson this should be to all those who insist that we must be trustful, who wish to believe that the world's difficulties can be resolved by signing another treaty of nonaggression and coexistence with the Kremlin.

Mr. President, in its last session Congress passed a resolution calling for the restoration of freedom to the Baltic States. To refresh our memories on this occasion, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed in the RECORD, together with the text of an appeal sent to all free world governments by the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian State.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

LITHUANIANS SEND APPEAL TO FREE WORLD GOVERNMENTS

(Memorandum on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian State)

On the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the re-establishment of the independence of Lithuania, the Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service and the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania have sent a detailed Memorandum to Free World Governments. The Memorandum draws the Attention of these Governments to the following:

"In 1940, after the Soviet Union commenced the military occupation of Lithuania, the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service was authorized by the then existing Lithuanian Government to continue to represent the sovereign Lithuanian State and to defend its interests abroad. The Lithuanian diplomatic and consular rerepresentatives, accredited to foreign goverments, continue to function and to assume the defense of the rights and interests of Lithuania and her citizens. Only the exercise of the sovereign rights of Lithuania is temporarily suspended in Lithuania by the the fact of military occupation.

"The Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania was created in Lithuania in 1943 as a result of the underground political activities of the various Lithuanian political parties, which felt the need for a supreme political organ to direct and coordinate all efforts for liberation of Lithuania. The Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania continues to coordinate the efforts of all the Lithuanians in the free world dedicated to the restoration of Lithuanian independence. The Supreme Committee will continue to lead the struggle for Lithuania's independence until this goal is achieved."

After a summary of Lithuania's history up to 1940, the Memorandum continues:

"At the start of the Second World War Lithuania fell victim to the conspiracy of the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, which exploited the uncertain international situation and imbalance of power on the European continent, by concluding secret agreements on August 23rd and September 28th, 1939 (the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact), which divided the Baltic Area into Soviet and Nazi spheres of influence. On the basis of this collusion the Soviet Union occupied the territory of the Republic of Lithuania on June 15, 1940. After the military occupation of the country, the special emissary of Moscow, Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Dekanozov, and the Soviet Minister Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Lithuania, Pozdniakov, with the aid of the Red Army, implemented Moscow's preconceived plan by imposing a pro-Soviet so-called Government and 'People's Diet' which supposedly was authorized to speak on behalf of Lithuanian Nation.

"This action by the Soviet Union was in direct violation of the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, which clearly recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and whereby Moscow renounced all claims of the former Russian Empire to Lithuania and her territory. Furthermore, the Soviet Union violated the Treaty of Non-Aggression of September 28, 1926 which reaffirmed this original peace treaty and the provisions of the Treaty for Mutual Assistance of October 10, 1939, whereby the Soviet Union promised to respect Lithuania's independence and not interfere in her internal affairs. The solemn promises of international agreements notwithstanding, the Soviet Union took advantage of the international situation to exercise its imperialistic designs and on June 14, 1940, after a number of premeditated provocations, presented the Lithuanian Government with an ultimatum which, in addition to a number of false accusations against the Lithuanian State, demanded that a government be immediately formed in Lithuania to the satisfaction of the Soviet Union and that free entry into the territory of Lithuania be immediately assured for an unlimited number of units of the Red Army. The following day, on June 15, 1940, large units of the Red Army poured into Lithuania and occupied its entire territory.

"The legal government having been dissolved, the top government posts were occupied by Communists and pro-Communists appointees selected by Moscow. 'Elections' were called for July 14, 1940, all political parties except the Communist Party were outlawed and voting by open ballots for the single list of Moscow-approved candidates was made compulsory. The outcome of the election was never in doubt. Meeting on July 21, 1940, under a heavy guard of Red Army and NKVD troops, the puppet parliament of Lithuania petitioned for the inclusion of its country into the Soviet Union. Disregarding the provision of the legal constitution of the state, requiring popular referendum on this petition, the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union pronounced the 'admission of Lithuania on August 3, 1940.' "

The Memorandum then goes on to recount Lithuania's losses during the foreign occupations:

"In the course of the Second World War the Soviet occupation of Lithuania was replaced by that of Nazi Germany in 1941. The Nazi occupation which lasted until the fall of 1944 took 300,000 lives. Ninety percent of Lithuania's Jewry was exterminated by the Nazis. In 1944 the Soviet military occupation was returned bringing in its wake the totalitarian system which had first been set up in 1940. The Soviet occupation has lasted to this day with its continuing police terror, Russification, and exploitation of the populace and natural resources of the country.

"As a result of Soviet extermination and deportation practices, the total Lithuanian population declined from 3.2 million in 1939 to 2.7 million in 1959. Under normal conditions, taking into consideration the normal annual population growth of 1.25%, the population of Lithuania in 1959 should have been 4 million. In other words, the Soviets through their genocidal practices were responsible for the loss of 940,000 inhabitants of Lithuania."

The Memorandum states:

"By the summer of 1944 well organized armed resistance groups merged into an anti-Soviet Lithuanian guerrilla movement. Armed Lithuanian partisan resistance . . . lasted between 1944 and 1952. . . .

"The activities of the Lithuanian freedom fighters were successful to such a degree that for several years after the Second World War Soviet colonialism in Lithuania was thwarted.

"The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Lithuanian resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus."

"Diplomatic action dealing with the Soviet Union in an attempt to normalize East-West relations through the liquidation of the unresolved problems of the Second World War," the Memorandum emphasizes, "must consider the question of Lithuania as an integral part of such deliberations. The Soviet occupation of Lithuania is a legacy of this war along with the question of Germany and Berlin and those of the other captive nations of East-Central Europe. The West should make clear to the Kremlin that the ending of Soviet occupation of Lithuania is an essential element for easing of East-West tension and a prerequisite for the establishment of a just and durable peace in Europe. Before and during the Second World War, Lithuania was a neighbor of Germany. Her frontiers with Germany were fixed in a special treaty signed by the governments of both states on January 29, 1928, in Berlin. The territory of Lithuania is contiguous to that of East Prussia, and especially to its northern part, now arbitrarily renamed by the occupying Soviet power as "Kaliningrad Region." Lithuania, therefore, cannot be by-passed while a peace treaty is concluded with Germany.

The Memorandum concludes with the following appeal: "We appeal to the United Nations Organization to investigate the aggression of the Soviet Union and to liquidate the results of this aggression by causing the withdrawal from Lithuania of the armed forces, police and administration of the Soviet Union in order to terminate Soviet colonialism.

"We appeal to the Governments of the Free world and their Delegations to the United Nations to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian Nation to regain her independence by raising the violations against Lithuanian sovereignty, perpetrated by the Soviet Union, in the institutions of the United Nations and during the proceedings of various international conferences.

"And we appeal to the parliaments of the free world to use every opportunity to urge their Governments to support the endeavors of the Lithuanian people to restore the independence of Lithuania."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am proud that our Government has to this day refused to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin. Thus far, however, our policy has been essentially a negative one. I would like to propose that we convert it into a positive policy.

The new Chancellor of Germany recently announced his readiness to invalidate Hitler's Munich agreements with regard to Czechoslovakia. I believe that Moscow should now be urged by our own Government to wipe out all the vestiges of this infamous period in history by repudiating the Ribbentrop-Molotov pacts of 1939 and restoring the sovereign rights of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

If our spokesmen could find the vision and the courage and the firmness to persuade the Soviet Union to do away with the vestiges of the Hitler-Stalin conspiracy, this action would do more than a thousand consular conventions to build bridges between East and West and to establish the basis for a genuine peace.

Mutual friendship with one's neighbors is the only true source of security. If the Soviet Union could be induced to undo the wrong she has done to her neighbors and to remove the causes of fear and distrust in Europe, this would open the way to a genuine and reciprocal process of building bridges and the Soviet Union itself would benefit enormously from this process in terms of increased friendship and increased security and increased trade and prosperity.

Let us all hope and pray and work to this end.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I believe that the vote that has just been completed on the cloture motion establishes beyond any doubt that, sooner or later—and probably sooner—a sweeping fair housing law will be passed by the U.S. Senate.

I say that because, beyond any doubt, this vote establishes that a clear majority of this body favors the strongest possible fair housing measure.

The pending fair housing amendment is the product of years of debate, and of many varying kinds of experiences at the State and local level. Where fair housing laws and ordinances exist, it has now resulted in a strong, unshakable majority of the Senate in favor of this concept.

The fact is that this measure covered all but 2 million units out of an estimated 65 million housing units in this country. We should place particular emphasis on the fact that the last cloture vote, in 1966, on a fair housing bill, resulted in a total of 52 to 41 in favor of cloture; but that 1966 fair housing bill covered only 40 percent of the Nation's 65 million housing units. This measure covers virtually all of the housing units. The cloture motion, in that instance, passed by only an 11-vote margin. The cloture motion voted upon a few minutes ago had the support of a margin of 18 Senators.

It is significant to note that at least three of the announced proponents, and probably four, could not be here, understandably and for various reasons, on this occasion. Thus, a bill providing nearly 97-percent coverage would have passed by an overwhelming majority—a margin of more than 18 votes, with at least three and possibly four votes necessarily missing.

This, in my opinion, represents a basic, deeply moving change in attitude by the American people and their Senators, and, if I may say so, a broad tribute to a bipartisan approach by decent Americans to see that this course of racism in the sale and rental of housing be banished once and for all from this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use 3 minutes, or whatever time I have remaining, at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the Senate's attention the fact that 18 Republicans voted with the majority on the Democratic side for cloture, and that this represents a material increase—almost double the strength we have ever had before in respect to housing. In 1966, the maximum Republican vote was 12; on the second vote that year, it was 10. We had two announced pairs.

On this vote, half of all the Republican Senators voted for cloture on what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] has properly described as certainly a very full coverage non-discrimination-in-housing bill.

Mr. President, it has often been argued against those of us who have sought to do something to modify rule XXII—which we claim is an amendment to the Constitution without being so qualified; and I think it is, without any question—that if a majority of the Senate really has its teeth in it, and wants something done, it will get it done.

Mr. President, a majority of the Senate does want it done, without any question. We calculate, as Senator MONDALE has said, at least 58 and probably 60 votes for this full measure. If we are frustrated now, Mr. President, the country had better take note, in such times of grave emergency, that a majority, after full, fair, and free debate, can be frustrated from doing what is elementary justice for the country. This could be a very, very dangerous thing at this time; and those who have not supported us, I think, had better think about that matter very, very seriously.

I am satisfied that we can contrive a housing measure which will get the necessary support, including cloture, by virtue of the showing we have made on this vote, which I consider to be a real victory, considering the nature of the coverage of the non-discrimination-in-housing amendment. I am prepared, with my colleagues, to move forward vigorously to effect the desired result.

As we said before, the cloture vote has been taken. We are not stiff necked. We are confident that we can find means of accommodating our proposal to satisfy those of reasonable view so that we may seek to effect some changes in the housing package to bring us within the required goal. However, more than anything else, let me emphasize that it has always been said, and it is again attested to, that if a majority of the Senate is really determined upon something, it can effect it, and we shall continue to try to do that now.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think

it ought to be made clear that the sponsors of this measure presented fair housing in its fullest possible coverage with one modest amendment that exempted but 2 million homes in the country.

We did so because we wanted to determine what the real and fundamental will of the Senate was. Now we know beyond any doubt that there is a strong majority in favor of this proposal, a margin of over 18 votes. And if all of the announced supporters had been present, we would have come very close to 60 votes on the strongest possible measure.

I think it is fair to say that we are now prepared to discuss possible modifications and believe we must pass some bill to implement the will of the Senate and of the people.

We have in the past 2 weeks proved the case for fair housing. And it remains to be challenged on the floor of the Senate.

I am most heartened by what I consider to be a victory today, although we have not had all the support we would have liked.

It now remains for us to discuss what form of bill will pass. I therefore urge all who supported us on the cloture motion today to assist us in a continuing fight for a modified version so that we might build on this impressive vote had today in terms of rendezvousing with our consciences and voting for the adoption of this measure in this session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, yesterday in this Chamber I said that we were on the eve of one of the most important votes that would be had in our body.

The vote has been taken. I take this opportunity to commend my colleagues in the Senate for the very strong support which was given to the cloture motion.

The amendment which was offered by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, and myself is an attempt to give to all Americans the opportunity to live in housing of their choice. It is a very important issue. Our Nation has been at war, both abroad and at home, and the most important thing before the Senate is to maintain domestic tranquillity.

I firmly believe that had we been able to get cloture today and agree to the amendment which has been well described by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, that it would have been a big step toward progress in racial relations and equal opportunity in our country. However, the Senate has seen fit on the first vote not to invoke cloture.

I hope that the Senator from Minnesota and I are able to modify our amendment, for we are not merely interested in an issue and in achieving some psychological victory, but we are also interested in obtaining legislation that will help our country. And we are agreeable to working further with our amendment with a view to presenting a modification thereon which will be acceptable to a sufficient number of our colleagues in the Senate so that we may invoke cloture.

Mr. President, we are gratified with the high percentage of votes obtained from both the Republican and Democratic sides. Eighteen Republicans voted in favor of cloture this time, and that is twice as many Republicans as have voted in favor of the same issue before. And we must remember that the present measure is a stronger provision than has ever been presented before.

That is certainly evidence that there is bipartisan support for this Federal legislation which has been presented to the Senate.

Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, and all other Members on the Democratic side as well as on the Republican side who saw fit to vote in favor of the cloture motion.

We hope that we will all be given another opportunity to vote.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it was my pleasure some years ago to observe and know the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as a fellow member of the National Association of Attorneys General, and in which association we each represented the legal offices of our respective States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for 3 additional minutes

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts and I had an opportunity to work together on similar matters in that association. And it has been one of the most fulfilling experiences to renew our friendship in the Senate and to have the opportunity to share in the leadership and foresight of the Senator from Massachusetts and to work with him once again on some of these measures that are basic and fundamental to the conscience of our country.

I have no doubt that we will succeed. One of the fundamental reasons for my belief is that the Senator from Massachusetts is providing great leadership and tireless devotion to this and to many other issues involving conscience which come before the Senate.

I am flattered by what the Senator said, but I think he is most modest. I believe that one of the unique reasons for the vote we have had and the strength that has been shown is the great contribution that has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind and generous words. He knows of the high esteem in which I hold him both in our past association as attorneys general and in our present association as Members of the Senate.

Although it would be immodest for me to agree with the Senator on everything he said, I certainly agree with the Senator in that portion of his remarks in which he said that he has great optimism for victory on the important measure we are sponsoring on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, I may be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is my intention, along with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], at that time to make a motion to table the pending Mondale amendment. I shall give my reasons tomorrow when I am recognized as to why I think it is the best course of action at this particular time.

It is then my intention, after the tabling motion has been disposed of, to file another cloture motion.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the 1 day but 1-day-and-1-hour rule, the vote on the second cloture motion take place not on Friday next, but on Monday next. I make that request because of the prior notice that was given to each Member of the Senate, stating that there would be no business on Washington's Birthday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a number of Senators on that day will be in Bermuda attending a parliamentary conference. I do not know who they are, but I ask the Senator if that will not make a difference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Any day we choose will cause an inconvenience to the prior schedules of some Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I personally express my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his graciousness and concern for the rights of those who sponsor the fair housing proposal.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not concur in the motion to table which the Senator from Montana will make tomorrow.

I believe that the vote which was just concluded shows remarkable strength for the fair housing proposal, a strong majority in favor of the strongest possible measure; and we are hopeful, in the next day or two, through a modified version, to develop the additional strength we need to invoke cloture and to adopt the worker protection proposal and a significant fair housing proposal.

Thus, I appeal to my colleagues to join with me and with Senator HART and others in defeating the motion when it comes before the Senate tomorrow. I do so reluctantly, because no Member of the Senate is more committed to the objective of fair housing and civil rights than the Senator from Montana. The difference between us is one of a practical appraisal of the possibilities of adoption of this measure. I believe the possibilities are strong, and I hope that situation will continue, through the support of the Senate, to carry on this battle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to clarify the unanimous-consent request, is it understood that on Monday next, 1 hour after the Senate convenes, after a quorum call, the Senate will vote on the petition for cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Church in the chair). Without objection, that is the understanding.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the President in submitting his 1969 budget referred to it as a "tight budget." Today I wish to discuss a specific example wherein this "tight budget" could be reduced by at least $200,000.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, with its 17 employees, has had absolutely no work to perform for the past 2 years, during which time its five executive officers each were drawing $26,000 a year. In the 1969 budget they are asking for an increase in appropriation of $130,000, from $295,000 in 1968 to $425,000 for 1969, for the stated purpose of hiring five more employees.

On numerous occasions I tried to suspend the salaries of these men on the basis that the American taxpayers could not afford $295,000 in salaries for five high-paid executives and their 12 assistants who frankly admitted they had no official duties. Each time I was defeated in this effort, and it was not until the latter part of 1967 that Congress finally enacted a law assigning some duties to this Board.

Now that work has been assigned to this previously inactive Board, they are asking for $130,000 additional appropriations, the purpose of which is to hire five more employees, apparently to perform the duties which have now been assigned to the Board under the above referred to legislation. Evidently, this will enable the other employees to keep on loafing.

A breakdown of the new employees requested and their salary scales is as follows:

They are asking for one additional employee grade GS–16, at a salary between $20,982 and $26,574; one additional GS–13, with a salary range of between $13,507 and $17,557; one GS–7, with a salary range of between $6,734 and $8,759; one extra GS–6, with a salary range of between $6,137 and $7,982; and one GS–5, with a salary range of between $5,565 and $7,239.

Mr. President, for 2 years these five Board members with their $26,000 salaries—now $28,000—drew their paychecks and performed absolutely no functions whatever. The same is true of their 12 assistants, two of whom have been drawing approximately $20,000 per year.

Now, after 2 years of doing nothing, when a few duties are assigned to this Board, they immediately ask for additional personnel to carry out the functions.

I most respectfully suggest that Congress in approving this part of the President's 1969 budget not only consider the complete rejection of the $130,000 for the five additional employees but also consider reducing last year's appropriation of $295,000 and thus eliminate some of the present excess personnel. This agency is obviously overstaffed with "chiefs" when what they really need are "working Indians."

AN APRIL FOOLS' JUNKET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the motto of President Johnson's Great Society must be "Do as I say and not as I do."

On January 1, 1968, the President in a belated display of concern over our loss of gold, called upon the American people to revise their 1968 travel plans in order to conserve dollars. At the same time he asked Congress to impose a drastic tax upon all foreign travel.

The President even went so far as to imply that it would be unpatriotic for Americans not to cooperate with the administration by changing their travel plans.

Apparently, in issuing this call for sacrifice, he was referring to the taxpayers in general and did not mean for it to apply to members of his official family.

Secretary Freeman is now sending out invitations to Members of Congress, congressional staff members, Governors, farm leaders, and wives to join him on a junket to the Far East. This junket is scheduled to leave Washington in the Presidential jet April 3 and return April 14. The excuse for this vacation to the Far East is that this will be a trade mission, but as the Chicago Tribune editor asked, "How many genuine foreign trade experts will there be among this plane load of Congressmen, Governors, and farm leaders, not to mention their wives?"

Mr. President, such a grandiose junket, sponsored by a member of the President's own Cabinet, in the face of his January first plea to all Americans, merely shows the contempt that this administration has for the American taxpayers.

I most respectfully suggest that this political junket be cancelled. If a trade mission is required, let it be confined strictly to those officials who will be conducting negotiations.

If not cancelled or revised, I suggest that Secretary Freeman schedule his departing date for April 1—April Fools' Day would be more appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that the recent editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune, criticizing this junket, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Junketing Politicians

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has invited a number of congressmen, governors, and farm leaders to bring their wives and accompany him in a Presidential jet plane on a "trade promotion and fact finding" tour of the far east. The invitation was issued hardly more than two weeks after President Johnson appealed to American citizens not to travel outside the western hemisphere in order to help reduce the serious balance of payments deficit.

The Presidential jet, which can accommodate about 100 passengers, will leave Washington April 3 and return April 14. The travelers are to participate in the opening of a United States food and agriculture exhibit in Tokyo and make one-day stops in South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. A 24-hour "rest stop" in Honolulu is scheduled on the return flight.

The invitations mention nothing about the guests paying their own expenses; so apparently the government is footing the entire bill. Regardless of that, in view of the President's appeal it is apropos to ask if the trip is necessary. How many genuine foreign trade experts will there be among this plane load of congressmen, governors, and farm leaders, not to mention their wives? How much serious effort can be devoted to trade promotion and fact finding in the short time alloted for each stop?

It makes more sense to view this as a junket designed to butter up certain politicians and farm leaders in preparation for the legislative and political battles ahead in an election year. Viewed in that light, it reflects the arrogance and cynicism of an administration which doesn't hesitate to send a planeload of V. I. P.s on a pleasure trip half way around the world, while telling the taxpayers who have to pay for it to stay home and see America first.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY PANEL ON INSURANCE IN RIOT-AFFECTED AREAS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just received a notice of some comments by Mr. T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, about the recommendation of the President's Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas.

I was pleased to note that Mr. Jones pointed out that only through Government-industry cooperation could the insurance needs of inner city property owners be properly met. This is the kind of approach, Mr. President, that the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Subcommittee on Small Business, under the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], have recommended.

Indeed, the subcommittee has already approved a bill along these lines to help assure the availability of adequate insurance against crime losses for small businesses located in the central cities.

I look forward to receiving the legislative proposals designed to implement the recommendations of the President's Insurance Panel. They, along with the subcommittee's work, will provide a sound basis upon which we may help to build an effective and workable program involving in appropriate ways the talent and resources of both Government and industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement entitled "Insurance Spokesman Commends Report of President's Insurance Study Panel," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Insurance Spokesman Commends Report of President's Insurance Study Panel

New York, January 29.—T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, today commended the President's

Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas "for making a thoughtful, thorough study, and for outlining an effective start toward maintaining an insurance market in the inner city."

"The Association is ready to provide every assistance in building on this foundation, and hereby offers all of its facilities toward the creation of a finished product from this valuable blueprint," Mr. Jones said.

Mr. Jones commented on the report issued by the presidential panel, which was created after last summer's rioting. The recommended approach would involve a federal reinsurance program to back up the efforts of the various states and the insurance industry to help meet urban area needs by making insurance readily available.

"We believe that an effective backup program can be accomplished through the proposed National Insurance Development Corporation, which the panel recommended in its report," Mr. Jones stated.

"Only through such cooperation can the insurance mechanism be made to operate effectively to meet the needs of property owners in inner city areas."

The American Insurance Association, Mr. Jones said, "believes that federal government participation in backup for riot coverage may require even more urgent action than the report indicates." The Association "believes that quick action in this vital area is essential and the committee report points the way," he added.

"While the Association may not agree fully with all the proposals outlined in the report," Mr. Jones said, "we note with satisfaction that all the sectors of society—the private insurance business, the state governments and the federal government—are being mobilized to deal with a serious social problem, involving the welfare of all. This is an approach long advocated by the Association."

The Association is "especially gratified," Mr. Jones said, that the heart of the panel's proposed program is based on an expanded Urban Areas Plan, which he called an "industry-developed device, arrived at to assist in providing insurance through voluntary industry action for those who need and want it."

Commenting on the proposed National Insurance Development Corporation, Mr. Jones said that in calling for such an agency, "the report lists in detail the precedents that exist for federal backup when a situation goes beyond the scope of the normal insurance mechanism."

"Thus, the report cites the field of foreign credit insurance, where an insurance business-federal partnership has permitted the healthy growth of overseas investment," Mr. Jones stated.

"Similarly, the report points to the nuclear energy field, where another partnership of government and the insurance business marshaled quickly, and in large amounts, the insurance protection which allowed today's civilian atomic energy plants to be built.

"The War Damage Corporation is cited as another example of how a risk beyond the scope of the insurance business alone is best handled by government and business working together. Other examples are presented, and the point that the riot risk requires similar treatment is well taken."

Mr. Jones added: "We commend the panel and its staff for their diligence and thoroughness. The problem is a serious one, and the panel and its staff demonstrated by their dedicated effort, prompt action and devotion to their task that they fully understood the seriousness of the problem and the importance of their work."

Concluded Mr. Jones: "Once again, government and the insurance industry, working in concert, are facing up to a problem. Once again, the solution will be found."

The Association is a trade organization with a membership of 170 property-liability insurance companies.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, pending before the Committee on the Judiciary are S. 470, a bill to grant the consent and approval of Congress to the Illinois-Indiana Air Pollution Control Compact; Senate Joint Resolution 95, to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; and S. 2350, to grant the consent and approval of Congress to the West Virginia-Ohio Air Pollution Control Compact.

The Committee on Public Works has expressed an interest in these bills since it has the basic jurisdiction of air pollution. That committee already has reported the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction to consider compacts generally, and particularly in pursuance to the requirement of the Constitution of the United States as contained in article I, clause 10.

In view of the interest of the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on the Judiciary has authorized that request be made that it be discharged from consideration of S. 470, Senate Joint Resolution 95, and S. 2350 at this time, with the understanding that within 60 days exclusive of any days in which the Senate is not in session the Committee on Public Works shall rerefer the bills, S. 470, Senate Joint Resolution 95, and S. 2350, to be again referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of carrying out its jurisdiction in compliance with the provisions of article I, clause 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of S. 470, Senate Joint Resolution 95, and S. 2350 at this time and that they be referred to the Committee on Public Works for a period of 60 days exclusive of any days in which the Senate is not in session and shall again be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purposes previously mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to express sincere appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for the request he has just made in reference to consideration by the Committee on Public Works of the three air pollution compacts to which he has made reference.

Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works as well as the Committee on the Judiciary wishes to give attention to these compacts. It is my belief that when individual States can join together in compacts to exercise effective control of environmental pollution, this is to be preferred to the establishment of broad Federal regulatory authority. This incentive for the States to come together and work out their problems in many areas, including air pollution, is a salutary one. I know the work that has gone into the creation of the compact between West Virginia and Ohio.

As the chairman of the Committee on Public Works I am very grateful to have this cooperation, which is given in full degree, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, giving to our Committee on Public Works the opportunity to work with the Committee on the Judiciary in these important matters of air pollution as affected by compacts between the States.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution will conduct hearings on these compacts during the last week of February and the first week of March, at which time we shall examine the compacts in relation to their consistency with the Air Quality Act of 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON WEDNESDAY AND FROM WEDNESDAY UNTIL NOON ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business today the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business tomorrow the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL TASK FORCE ON TRAVEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a very important report made by the industry-Government special task force on travel, headed by Ambassador McKinney which, in my judgment, makes some outstanding recommendations which should be dealt with before we enact any tax on travel, or otherwise inhibit it, except on grounds as stated by the President of a choice of Americans in the cooperative and patriotic tradition of our country; namely, to refrain from unnecessary travel.

Within 3 months after it was set up,

the task force, consisting of leaders in the travel industry and the Federal Government, put together a very significant package, one which is likely to result in major improvements in the ability of this country to attract large numbers of new visitors from abroad, and in significant immediate and long-term improvements in our travel deficit.

I call particular attention to the task force's recommendation that a national tourist office be established to coordinate and direct the entire U.S. travel effort. I am very pleased with this particular recommendation as I, along with 11 Senators from both parties, have sponsored legislation for over 2 years to do exactly that. Those of us who fought long and hard for an effective U.S. travel effort—frequently without administration support—can take satisfaction that, at last, this matter is receiving the high priority recognition it deserves.

I note that the task force believes that drafting of legislation establishing a National Travel Office can be completed in 90 to 120 days, during which an appropriate budget can also be drawn up.

I urge that every effort be made to live up to this schedule; that congressional leaders, including those who have a deep interest in this matter be consulted in the drafting of this legislation; and that hearings on this legislation as well as on the bill I introduced on February 1, with Senators BIBLE, BROOKE, CANNON, CLARK, HANSEN, HARTKE, LONG of Missouri, MCGEE, PERCY, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, be held immediately thereafter.

As one who has worked long and hard to get national recognition of the great desirability of a major national tourism effort, I wish to assure the task force that I will do all I can to press for favorable Senate action on a bill that would establish a national tourist office.

I am very pleased that the task force views the functions of the National Travel Office very broadly, covering all areas that sponsors of our bill believe to be essential—effective research, increased cooperation between State and local travel promotion organizations, concern with domestic travel programs, and coordination of the tourism-related activities of the Federal Government.

The idea that a National Travel Office, headed by a presidential appointee should have a board of directors with both public and private representation, and utilize both public and private funds and manpower, is an extremely good idea and should result in the type of imaginative and comprehensive effort that this country has been lacking to date.

The task force recommends that until legislation is drawn up and approved, the budget of the U.S. Travel Service be increased in this fiscal year—fiscal year 1968—to the authorized $4.7 million level, an increase of $1.7 million above what has been approved by Congress. I urge the administration to fight for this request—at least as hard as for travel restrictions—otherwise what I and others can do in Congress will surely fail. For fiscal year 1969, the task force recommends a budget authorization of $30 million for the USTS, to be appropriated as needed, with the funds to be transferred from the USTS to the National Travel Office once that is established.

The task force has done an excellent job and performed a great public service and I hope they will continue to do their job until Congress recognizes that this is the approach that is in the American tradition and in line with the principles we have been fighting for for the past 30 years. The House Ways and Means Committee should very carefully examine the task force's report, call the task force chairman and members before the committee and take its proposals into serious consideration in the committee's deliberations on the restrictions on travel asked for by the President. There is no question that travel restrictions—particularly the tax on travel expenditures—will lead to widespread evasion and to ill feeling in the countries which depend on income from American travel to buy our exports. I seriously doubt the wisdom and effectiveness of the President's proposals to restrict travel abroad and I urge my colleagues to look into this matter with the greatest care before we proceed on the road to folly.

Mr. President, I speak now only for the purpose of urging that the idea of stimulating tourism into the United States be first tried in order to deal with our balance-of-payments problem rather than immediately to jump into the highly dubious operation of imposing a travel tax or other method which tends only to discriminate in favor of the more well-to-do travelers against those of modest means.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the task force report, the text of my bill, S. 2907, along with my introductory remarks and a column by Marquis Childs on the impact of a travel tax overseas be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENT SPECIAL TASK FORCE ON TRAVEL

SUMMARY

Here we summarize the more important actions and recommendations which have emerged from the work of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel.

1. Actions to reduce the cost of travel by foreign visitors to the United States:

25% discount on round trip fares to the United States on tickets purchased in Europe.[1]

50% reductions in regular domestic airline fares, effective April 28, making these fares the lowest available anywhere in the world.[1]

25% discounts in railroad fares.[1]

10% discounts on charter coach rates on trips involving 400 miles per day, effective May 1.[1]

10% discounts in rates by the three largest United States car rental companies, effective immediately.

Reduced steamship fares to the United States.[1]

Up to 40% reductions in regular rates in seven major hotel-motel chains, effective immediately.

2. Actions to stimulate foreign travel to the United States:

U.S. flag transatlantic and domestic air carriers will spend $16.5 million outside the Western Hemisphere in 1968 to promote travel to the United States, a $5.5 million increase over 1967.

Foreign-flag air and sea carriers will take immediate steps to accelerate the development of European travel to the United States.

U.S. air carriers will bring more than 2,000 travel agents, tour operators, and travel editors to the United States for familiarization tours in 1968.

Other U.S. industries and news and entertainment media will significantly increase promotional efforts abroad to attract foreign visitors to the United States, effective immediately.

3. Recommendations which would—

Waive visas for tourists and businessmen.

Simplify and consolidate entry procedures; make possible one-stop inspection; enable the pre-clearance of visitors.

Issue special foreign visitor hospitality cards, evidencing eligibility for discounts and price reductions on a wide range of travel-related expenditures.

Coordinate price reductions providing package tours for group and individual travel; design tours for special activity travel.

Intensify travel advertising and promotion abroad through coordinated efforts of government and the private sector.

Vastly improve banking, insurance and credit facilities for foreign visitors.

Facilitate travel of non-English-speaking visitors by utilizing multilingual students in the United States; expanded reception centers; multilingual telephone service; and foreign language guidebooks.

Mount a nation-wide campaign to intensify hospitality towards visitors within the United States.

Work through governors, mayors, and other community leaders to promote foreign travel and improve services.

Improve the image of the United States as an attractive tourist destination area.

Intensify and broaden market research and tourist motivational studies in prime travel markets abroad.

4. Expanded role of the U.S. Government:

A new dynamic national travel policy.

A strong national tourist office to coordinate the U.S. foreign tourism effort by 1969, starting with an annual budget in the range of $30 million.

A national convention bureau.

A $1.7-million budget increase for the U.S. Travel Service for the remainder of fiscal year 1968.

CHAPTER 7—NATIONAL TOURIST OFFICE

The recommendations in this report should have an immediate favorable impact on the U.S. balance of payments. It is imperative, however, that these benefits be sustained and expanded over the long run. To accomplish this, an organization must be created to coordinate and direct the entire U.S. travel effort. It must have the backing of industry and government. It must be so strongly funded and constructed that it would have wide public and congressional support and then given the power to do the job.

The structure and power of this organization will determine, in the long run, how successful the United States will be in competing in the international travel market. To succeed, it cannot be merely as good as the travel development organizations of other countries. It must be better and more effective. At the same time, it has to be tailored to meet the needs of the United States and reflect U.S. traditions and attitudes. In this regard, the task force does not discount the past efforts of the U.S. Travel Service, working in close cooperation with the travel industry, to increase the number of visitors from abroad. The U.S. Travel Service has accomplished a great deal with its limited resources.

---

[1] Subject to approval by the appropriate regulatory body.

There has been a wide range of recommendations made to the Task Force on the form the organization should take:

(1) A private industry travel association.

(2) A joint Federal Government-industry corporation.

(3) A Federal Government corporation.

(4) A commission.

(5) An expanded version of the U.S. Travel Service with its director at assistant secretary level.

(6) A new independent government agency.

It has also been variously suggested that, if the organization remains a Government office, it remain in the Department of Commerce, or be shifted to the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Transportation.

Whatever the organization's structure, it should be responsible for the following type functions:

(1) Continuous market research: The United States needs to know much more about what markets should be promoted, in what sequence and why; what financial rationale should be followed; what U.S. areas and attractions appeal to which markets; the size and structure of inbound tourism, where it comes from, where it goes to, and what it spends. This information should be distributed regularly throughout the business community and government agencies.

(2) A vastly stepped-up balanced tourism promotion program pointed at the most promising markets, and concentrating on those U.S. points of interest and attractions that have special appeal to such markets.

(3) Cooperation with State and local organizations, banks, and Federal agencies concerned with, or involved in, the financing of transportation facilities, accommodations and special attractions.

(4) Improved handling of foreign travelers. This includes improving operations and services at points of entry and elsewhere, overcoming language barriers, and helping to develop additional and better things for foreign tourists to do, see, and buy.

(5) Assist in or sponsor training facilities for services needed at points visited by foreign tourists.

(6) Coordinate the widespread activities of the Federal Government affecting the international travel business. At the same time, the organization should work with and through State organizations, local or community groups, and trade associations.

In determining the structure of the organization the following should receive consideration:

(1) The travel development program must be based on an extremely close working relationship between Government and private business. The Government has authority over transportation facilities, controls immigration procedures, collects taxes on the travel industry, runs the national parks and forests, administers certain tourist sites, etc. Private industry owns and operates airlines, shipping companies, travel agencies, and hotels. Moreover, it has special skills in travel promotion. Therefore, blending of these facilities and operations, cohesion of public and private interests and a joint use of technical personnel have advantages.

(2) A format in which both the business community and the Government contribute funds and manpower to the overall travel program and organization. An organization with this structure could also generate income from market research and other travel-related studies, from advertising placed in its publications, and from other promotional services.

(3) An organization in which the board of directors would include both public and private representation. If desired, Government could exert control by having a majority on the board, or by controlling funds.

(4) An organization of maximum operational flexibility in which its director is given sufficient authority to run an effective program. His prestige must be great enough to command support in both Government and private industry.

(5) An organization whose head is a presidential appointee under the Civil Service System would be able to officially speak for the United States and would be privy of Government councils.

(6) The majority of countries have found it preferable that their travel organizations be governmental agencies. There are, however, outstanding examples of countries, among which the United Kingdom is preeminent for the size of its annual budget, that operate successful travel organizations as industry-government partnerships. Among others in this category are: Austria, Denmark, Netherlands, Switzerland, Hong Kong, and Thailand.

It is the view of the Task Force that analysis of the problem, testing of business community reactions, settlement on a specific organization, and drafting of legislation could be completed in 90 to 120 days. During this period, it would also be possible to draw up budget recommendations for the travel development program. We have received varied budget recommendations, but detailed backup material has not yet been developed on such basics as: the amount of funding necessary to permit the United States to compete effectively in selected travel markets; a rational priority system in promoting selected markets; the portion of the budget, if any, that might be obtained from private sources.

Because of the large scope of domestic travel business, and the diverse nature and characteristics of domestic and foreign travel, the Task Force believes that, at least initially, the work of the proposed organization should be limited to travel by foreign visitors.

The Task Force recognizes that it will take some months to carry out the work described above, and to set up the proposed travel development organization. Meanwhile, we recommend that the budget of the U.S. Travel Service be increased, and its functions be expanded to permit it to launch an immediate promotion program abroad and to strengthen its existing operation. If it is to play the needed role in carrying out an increased program to complement activities in the private sector described in earlier sections of this report, the Task Force believes that the U.S. Travel Service requires its full authorization of funds, necessitating a supplemental appropriation of $1.7 million before June 30, 1968, to complement the $3 million already appropriated. The money would be used for market surveys, research, promotion, advertising, and necessary expansion of offices and public relations activities abroad. The amount proposed is modest, but the period until June 30 is short and the funds are promptly needed to be effective before the summer travel season.

For fiscal year 1969, the Task Force recommends that the authorization for the U.S. Travel Service be increased to $30 million. Its appropriation should be developed within that limit as is needed. The appropriation should be transferred to the new tourist office if it becomes operational during fiscal year 1969. Timely availability of these funds is essential if the needed work for the 1969 travel season is to be undertaken and produce results. The increased promotional effort by the U.S. Travel Service should be concentrated in countries with the largest potential for increased travel to the United States.

When the new travel development organization is launched, we recommend that the USTS be incorporated into it.

S. 2907

A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121–2126) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purposes of this Act).

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.";

(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1968".

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 1, 1968]

INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC TRAVEL ACT OF 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 11 cosponsors, I introduce the International and Domestic Travel Act of 1968. The cosponsors of the measure are Senators BIBLE, BROOKE, CANNON, CLARK, HANSEN, HARTKE, LONG of Missouri, MCGEE, PERCY, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The proposal made in this bill is a positive approach to a solution of the U.S. travel deficit problem. Positive measures suggested to the administration for the last several years should, in our judgment, be given an opportunity to operate before Congress enacts any measures to restrict travel abroad by U.S. citizens. Travel restrictions as proposed by the administration would be self-defeating, difficult to administer, and would invoke retaliation by countries which depend on income received from American tourists.

Let us emphasize the positive before we go for the negative and restrict the freedom of our people to travel.

This bill, bipartisan in sponsorship, is designed to strengthen the capabilities of the U.S. Travel Service to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit. It would increase foreign travel to the United States and assist private industry and official travel organizations to encourage increased domestic travel by Americans.

Specifically, the bill provides:

First. New responsibilities for the U.S. Travel Service. These include development of a coherent national travel policy, coordination of present travel activities of various Federal agencies, encouragement and improvement of domestic travel facilities, and coordination of and acting as the Federal Government's liaison with State and private tourist organizations.

Mr. President, at the present time the United States Travel Service operates exclusively abroad and it has no domestic functions.

The proposed legislation further provides:

Second. A budget of $15 million to finance the Service's new activities and to strengthen its present activities abroad. Of this, $5 million would be used to start the proposed domestic travel program and $10 million would be used to promote foreign travel to the United States.

Third. A national inventory of our travel resources to lay the groundwork for a long-term national travel program. The bill calls for the establishment of a 15-member National Tourism Resources Review Commission, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce from among private citizens knowledgeable and experienced in the travel field.

For the past 7 years the country has been faced with a continuous balance-of-payments deficit, a significant element of which has been the much higher level of U.S. travel expenditures abroad than foreign travel expenditures in the United States.

This has given us the famous travel gap which, in round figures, was approximately $1.9 billion to $2 billion in 1967.

Except for the establishment of the U.S. Travel Service in 1961—in the legislation for which Senator MAGNUSON and I had joined—no action has been taken by this administration that dealt effectively with this problem. The administration has not been willing to fight for congressional approval of the USTS budget request in any year since it went into operation with the result that USTS has never been able to get appropriations even up to its authorized level of $4.7 million per year.

I stood on the floor of the Senate and fought for it time and again. They were knocked down in the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and by conference committees. No one seems to realize what we were up against. We would never have had travel restrictions proposed in panic if this proposal had been in effect. It could have cut our deficit nearly in half, or from substantially $4 billion to $2 billion. However, that is water over the dam and we are dealing with what can be done now.

The President is proposing very drastic restrictions on travel. Of all of the things the President is proposing to meet the balance-of-payments problems, this is the most unpopular and deservedly so, because especially in all of the years, this country, the greatest tourist attraction in the world, has not begun to be exploited.

In his Economic Report in January 1967, the President called for establishment of a special industry-Government task force to make specific recommendations by May 1 on how the U.S. Government can best stimulate foreign travel to the United States. It took 11 months to appoint this task force, which was not appointed until November 16, 1967, and which was to report by early summer.

On January 1, the President asked them to file their first report by February 15. Then in his state of the Union message the President gave strong hints that he will propose restrictions on travel to reduce the "travel deficit" by $500 million.

I deeply regret that the President is considering—and that Treasury witnesses may propose when they testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 5—restrictive measures on travel just 10 days before the President's Travel Task Force's first report is due to be sent to him and the Congress. This makes no sense to me.

Before restrictions are called for on travel—and freedom to travel is a most important right—every conceivable positive measure, my own bill, the proposals of the task force and others, should be tried.

Also, as the Senate heard discussed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and me yesterday, recommendations for some means of utilizing foreign currency by U.S. travelers abroad—either derived from U.S. counterpart holdings of certain foreign currencies such as rupees or Israeli pound or by long-term credit-swap arrangements with foreign countries interested in U.S. tourism—are reportedly being explored by the Travel Task Force itself, and should be given a chance to work before we undertake restrictions in this field.

I especially condemn such a discriminatory proposal as taxing every traveler $5 or $10 a day, or imposing a tax of 5 percent on airline tickets, which would only favor the rich over those in moderate circumstances. It would have no other effect.

Restrictions on travel are self defeating. Not only would they be difficult to administer but they will surely invoke retaliation by countries who depend on income received from American tourists. If exemptions are made for certain countries or certain type of traveler, cries of discrimination will be heard and with justification.

My own bill, the proposals of the Travel Task Force and other suggestions taking the positive approach are clearly workable alternatives to restrictive measures and I call on my colleagues in the Congress not to support any restrictive legislation before these positive measures have been tried. If they do not result in reducing the "travel deficit" substantially by $500 million within the next 12 to 18 months and it is clear that there is no hope to get better cooperation from foreign governments, then—and only then—would it be in order to draw up restrictive measures.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons and I respectfully submit that the proposals which have been made in this field are the most unpopular and deservedly so of the measures recommended by the President to deal with our balance of payments, I hope very much the administration will get behind a stimulation of foreign travel to the United States and begin to use brains and ingenuity to work out arrangements with foreign countries which would not inhibit travel but facilitate travel and postpone the impact on our balance of payments, and we could thereby use currencies we have in excess and counterpart currencies for similar purposes.

I think that with an application of ingenuity, brains, and the investment of a small amount of money, a great deal can be done in this field which will obviate the need for imposing harsh restrictions on the traditional right of Americans to travel anywhere in the world.

The Presiding Officer. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2907) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 12, 1968]

Impact Overseas of a Travel Tax

(By Marquis Childs)

Cumbersome, regressive, awkward, unenforceable—these are the more polite denunciations of President Johnson's proposed tax on travel. Whether Congress will adopt the levy in the form put forward by the Treasury is questionable.

In Western Europe this is not an academic question. For a half-dozen countries the tourist dollar supplies the margin of essential foreign exchange. What is more, if American travel outside the hemisphere is substantially cut back the recession that has slowed economic growth in Europe will in all probability be accentuated.

Economists are fearful that it will bring reprisals, hastening a trend already evident toward the kind of tariff walls and a struggle for national self-sufficiency that spelled disaster in the early '30's. In some instances—France is one—the United States has a favorable trade balance, offset in part by the spending of the American tourist.

Italy in 1966 had a favorable tourist balance $1.199 billion. This represents the total spent by foreign tourists over and above the amount of spending by Italian travelers abroad. For Austria the figure was $420,000,000; for Greece, $102,000,000; for Portugal, $178,000,000. The figures come from the report on tourism by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In each country the tourist supplies the difference between a favorable trade picture and the ability to import necessities and belt tightening checking the flow of imports.

A report based on the Department of Commerce figures shows the American tourist making a relatively small contribution to these favorable balances. For Italy, for example, Commerce puts American spending in 1966 at $153,000,000. The Italians put it at nearly twice that—$285,000,000.

Many European countries are putting a determined effort into increasing tourism from the United States. They have invested in advertising and various forms of promotion to attract not only Americans but West Germans and other inveterate travelers. The American travel ban—if it is effective—will slow if not halt this spending stream.

Greece has developed an impressive tourist boom with thousands of new hotel rooms available on the principal Greek islands. A decline in revenue from tourism would coincide with the return of many of the half-million Greeks working in Western Europe, notably West Germany, as a result of the recession there. The tourist trade began to hurt from the colonel's coup of nearly a year ago with Americans hesitating as a result of the initial harsh measures proposed by the dictatorship.

Spain with a market recession would be hard hit by a slowdown in travel, since 42 per cent of foreign exchange earnings come from tourism. A fantastic real estate and tourist boom on the Coasta Brava and on Majorca brings thousands of visitors and more or less permanent residents to Spain. It has meant thousands of jobs and, therefore, the aging Franco's problems in holding down the political lid have been eased.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler had hardly finished reading his lengthy statement on travel taxes to the House Ways and Means Committee before members of Congress were raising doubts about countries that should be exempted. What about Ireland? Thousands of Irish-Americans go back to the old sod each year. Ireland's favorable travel balance was $84,000,000 in 1966. And what of Israel? American Jews with a deep loyalty to what ardent Zionists consider the Jewish homeland make the pilgrimage year after year.

In 1966, according to Commerce Department figures, a trip to Europe cost American travelers on the average $1070. The average stay in Europe was 37 days. Since then prices have risen sharply. Fowler gave the example of a traveler abroad for 30 days spending $700 apart from the cost of air or steamship fare. He would be taxed $110, and if his round-trip fare was an additional $400 the transportation tax would be $20 for a total bill from Uncle Sam of $130.

The impact on those countries that rely on tourism will be not only in the travel tax. The Treasury package calls for reducing the present duty exemption of $100 to $10 and cutting the current $10 duty-free gift mailed back home to $1.

The threat as the last session of Congress ended was a wave of import quotas on major competitive imports. A gathering momentum for stay-at-home protectionism is hardly the way to solve the world's problems.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate, as other Senators have done, to the fact that today, Lithuanian Independence Day, is being commemorated and that we should do everything we can to sustain the hope for freedom of these people who have been so long submerged and held enslaved in the Communist bloc.

It has been 50 years since the declaration of Lithuanian independence. Subjugated by successive predatory neighbors, the Lithuanians retain the hope of self-determination. The history of their struggle in this century is one of a frustrated desire for freedom and self-determination in the face of overwhelming odds.

After 120 years of subjugation to Russia and occupation by the Germans during World War I, the Lithuanian people declared the "establishment of an independent Lithuania" on February 16, 1918. Yet, by the end of that year, the Soviet Union had invaded their territory. Lithuania fought back and, though stripped of part of its territory, succeeded in gaining recognition from the Soviet Union as a sovereign state in 1920.

The hard-won independence of Lithuanian people was short lived. In 1940, Soviet troops occupied the country and annexed it to the Soviet Union. When war broke out between Germany and the Soviet Union the following year, Lithuania fell under Nazi domination until in 1944 when Lithuania was again forcefully subjugated by the Soviet Army.

Mr. President for 7 years, the Lithuanian people struggled to liberate their land. During the struggle, 30,000 Lithuanians died for their cause, and hundreds of thousands were deported to the Soviet Union, where they died wholesale in forced labor camps.

But the Lithuanian people continue to yearn for freedom and the establishment of a truly independent Lithuanian state. Mr. President, we in the United States, who have consistently supported the principle of self-determination should also join our voices to commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, to demonstrate our sincere hope that the love of liberty, so long repressed in Lithuania, will surely prevail.

THE REVOLUTIONARY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post has performed a public service today in publishing its editorial entitled "The Revolutionary."

The editorial states that black power radical Stokely Carmichael "is summoning his followers to a revolution."

That is the point that I sought to make in my speech on the floor of the Senate on Monday. The Post's editorial puts the issue succinctly and in the proper focus.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Revolutionary

Reports from Los Angeles indicate that Stokely Carmichael has turned his coat inside out again. The lamb side has been out in Washington, but the wolf side is out on the West Coast. Once again, he is calling for violence, summoning black and brown people to a war against the white people and urging an American Vietcong to blow up police stations and power stations to check the "genocidal racist" white man.

Carmichael obviously does not speak for many people, Negro or white. The likelihood that he will mobilize any large number of violent followers to carry on his war is not great. But the trouble with this sort of inflammatory paranoic idiocy is not that it will attract Negro followers. The danger is that frightened and gullible white people will believe he does speak for large numbers and prepare themselves to resist. This is the way to begin violence and precipitate bloody racial clashes.

Those who hitherto have responded to Carmichael's more moderate line in Washington made an earnest effort to keep communication with the reckless radical element. It was worth trying and they ought not be condemned for that. But the violent Carmichael speech out West has destroyed the chance that moderate citizens can work with this firebrand. He is summoning his followers to a revolution. Those who associate with him hereafter have been put on notice that this is his purpose.

THE REVEREND DR. DANIEL A. POLING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, of New York, who was recognized as one of the great spiritual leaders of the Nation, died a few days ago at age 83. I first came to know him long years ago in connection with his activities and devotion to the work of the Christian Endeavor Society and his particular interest in Christian youth.

Almost to the day of his death, he continued very active and was in constant touch with people in all walks of life in connection with the work of the institutional church. I was delighted when he first manifested to me his interest in my efforts to restore prayer to the public schools of the country and offered his services in any way in which he could be helpful in the development and the adoption of the constitutional amendment which I submitted to the Senate on this subject.

It is a testimony indeed to Dr. Poling and to the profound influence which he exercised on so many people and particularly his own sons. The Nation will never forget that his one son, Clark Poling, was one of the four chaplains who went down to a watery grave on the ship *Dorchester* during World War II, because those chaplains gave their lifejackets to the men who had no jackets at all.

Dan Poling's services to the church, to the Nation, and to the world will be long remembered.

WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE FAVORS BILL TO STOP IMPORTS OF ENDANGERED SPECIES TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in an article published on Sunday, February 18, the Washington Post joined the national and international discussion forum, now in progress about the preservation of our disappearing wildlife. S. 2984, which I introduced last Friday, is identical to H.R. 11618, mentioned in this supporting article.

The article, written by Irston R. Barnes, chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society, explains the bill, which has been reported favorably to the House by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, proposing elimination of imports and interstate traffic in endangered species, and recommends its passage.

Noting that the bill would not only eliminate the United States as a major market for this traffic, but would also encourage other countries to do likewise, Mr. Barnes points out that—

> All nations must also take broad, effective action to maintain substantial areas of unspoiled natural habitats. For only if habitats can be preserved will it be possible to assure the survival of free wild population of all forms of life.

This is a comprehensive and knowledgeable article, written by one of the key figures in conservation of our endangered forms of life.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post article, entitled "Kill Status Symbols, Save Wildlife," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KILL STATUS SYMBOLS, SAVE WILDLIFE

(By Irston R. Barnes)

The Dingell bill (H.R. 11618) to extend protection to the endangered species of the world asserts essential American leadership in wildlife preservation. The American market and the flow of American dollars have been the chief stimulus to the commercial exploitation of wildlife around the world. Hence only an extension of the American conservation conscience to all nature's resources everywhere can meet the current threats to the spectacular wildlife of the developing countries of both hemispheres.

Introduced by Rep. John D. Dingell (D. Mich.), the bill was reported out favorably on Jan. 30 by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and is expected to come before the House on March 4. According to advance indications, the outlook for passage by both House and Senate is very good. Such action would comport with our historic leadership in wildlife conservation.

When the Audubon movement began some 70 years ago with the Audubon Society of the District of Columbia and the sister organizations in Massachusetts and Illinois, it was essentially a citizen-to-citizen movement. The first members were chiefly ladies who were determined to persuade other stylish ladies to reject the hats and accessories made of the plumes and plumages of egrets, terns, gulls and other birds. Many species had already disappeared over much of their range. The villains were those who thoughtlessly accepted the tastes and styles of the 1890s and the market hunters who catered to their tastes. The dangers to wildlife inherent in commercial exploitation had been amply demonstrated in the destruction of the great buffalo herds, in the extinction of the passenger pigeon, and in the decimation of the shorebird flocks.

Today, commercial exploitation of wildlife extends across international boundaries and to distant continents. People-to-people action would be too slow to be effective. The total number of endangered vertebrates approaches 1000, and each year sees another species pushed into extinction.

The danger again lies in the market-exploiters, the buyers who supply the dollars, and the poachers and commercial hunters who supply the luxury furs, specialty leathers of alligator and wild pig, ivory and trophy items (waste baskets of elephants' feet) and tropical fish and caged birds, as well as monkeys and other exotic animals for pets. Against the flow of dollars that activates the international game merchants and the native hunters and poachers, the laws of African, Asian and Latin American countries are of little avail.

The Dingell bill provides that there shall be no importation (except under license for scientific purposes) into the United States of any species (or part thereof) which the Secretary of the Interior determines to be threatened with extinction. No lengthy negotiations, no international treaties are required for action. The finding that a species is so threatened may be based on consultations with foreign countries or with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. The bill thus bypasses the enforcement obstacle of determining whether a particular leopard skin or zebra rug or set of horns has been illegally exported from a specific country.

The Dingell bill extends to mammals, birds, fish, reptiles (alligators), amphibians (frogs), mollusks (oysters) and crustaceans (lobsters) and to subspecies (geographic races) as well as full species.

The bill amends the Endangered Species Preservation Act to apply to the same broad range of wildlife. Thus it will extend the Federal prohibition with respect to interstate commerce to all wildlife species taken or transported in violation of Federal, state or foreign laws.

So, as with egret plumes, it may be hoped that leopard coats, tiger rugs, alligator bags and shoes, and the like will cease to be status symbols—not only in the United States, but around the world. In closing the largest single market to the commercial exploitation of endangered species, we shall surely encourage other nations and peoples to reject exotic furs, trophies, and specialty items where commerce in such things threatens the survival of a species. Only with such international support will the developing countries, with their limited resources for enforcement of game laws, be able to preserve their distinctive wildlife for future generations.

As the Dingell standard becomes world law, countries with wildlife resources will also be encouraged to pursue other measures to preserve endangered species. Commercial exploitation is only the most urgent part of the problem. All nations must also take broad, effective action to maintain substantial areas of unspoiled natural habitats. For only if habitats can be preserved will it be possible to assure the survival of free, wild populations of all forms of life.

We need to appreciate that a species, of whatever form of life, is a unique manifestation of life, the final product of eons of evolutionary development. Each species surely has important things to tell us about life and its evolution, when we are intelligent enough to ask the right questions. No extinguished species can ever be recreated, and the whole world is inevitably poorer when a species anywhere is lost. In recognizing this truth and the priceless value of the species, the Dingell bill establishes the first principle of conservation. It sets an example which every country can follow to the benefit of all future generations.

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Friday, the 16th of February, marked the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. Today has been designated as a day to commemorate Lithuanian independence. I am pleased to join in honoring this proud nation.

Two years ago, I strongly supported House Concurrent Resolution 416. On my urging, I believe I may say, the Senate agreed to its adoption on the final day of the 89th Congress. I called upon the President of the United States to urge action in support of the people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. I now urge the President to direct the attention of world opinion, at the United Nations and elsewhere, to the denial of self-determination for the peoples of the Baltic States. These people look to the United States of America to support the struggle for independence from Communist enslavement.

More than 100 million people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are subjects of Communist governments—the victims of tyranny denying them the basic human and political rights which America's founders declared the birthright of all men. In spite of the abject conditions in which they must continue to endure their subjugation, despite continuous indoctrination, vast numbers continue to resist in spirit, and often in action.

As free men, we must keep alive the aspirations of the people of the captive nations, to show our concern for their present plight and to strengthen our ties with them.

Consistent with our own national interest, the President should invoke the spirit of House Concurrent Resolution 416 to explore all avenues that might lead to widening the scope of liberty for the Baltic peoples.

Let the people of Lithuania, and of Estonia, and Latvia, know full well of our uncompromising support for their unquenchable thirst for freedom. Americans remain dedicated to freedom throughout the world.

THE ETHICAL AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF HEALTH RESEARCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 11, the Tulsa Tribune published an editorial entitled "Heart of the Matter," commenting favorably on the recent proposal by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] for the establishment of a Commission on the Ethical and Social Implications of Health Research.

Senator MONDALE is certainly deserving of praise for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. As the editorial states:

> His place in history may be that he is the first Congressman to articulate the political consequences of the heart transplant.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEART OF THE MATTER

U.S. Sen. Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota is a young man by senatorial standards, barely forty. He came to the Senate by appointment when Hubert Humphrey was suddenly elevated to the vice presidency in 1964, and thereafter earned a full term by election. He's a lawyer.

His place in history may be that he is the first Congressman to articulate the political consequences of the heart transplant.

He is not by any means the first to philosophize on this matter, but he is the first in Congress to publicly suggest that perhaps legislation may be necessary, to cope with the consequences. He says he plans to introduce a congressional resolution to set up a commission on the ethical and social implications of health research.

It is easy to scoff at this as a political pretension, but Sen. Mondale raises some intriguing questions. Most vivid is the question of a "black market" in human spare parts. A family desperate because a transplant could mean life or death might feel obliged to seek out a "Murder, Inc." kind of solution, he speculates. Shades of the eighteenth-century bodysnatchers!

That sounds melodramatic, but behind it lies the question of who shall live and who shall die. When operations with human "spare parts" became routine, who will control the supply and disposition of "living" parts. It is not easy to reconcile oneself to the idea of living organs "banked" indefinitely in some artificial hospital environment, but the time may come.

There is also the even knottier medical question of deciding when the donor of such a spare part is in fact dead. Technically, life is not extinct as long as there is a major organ of the body still functioning. The doctors so far involved in heart transplants have not found any insuperable problem yet in determining that the donors were for all practical purposes dead at the time of the donation.

But, again, it is not difficult to imagine cases of premature "donation" which would of themselves terminate life. Are these matters all to be left only to the on-the-spot judgment of the doctor and the wisdom of his medical society?

When we reach the point that human life can not merely be preserved indefinitely, but also in effect recreated, where should the decision-making lie?

These questions are as old as Aldous Huxley and his nightmare novel of the "Brave New World." The difference is that they now come closer to home.

Sen. Mondale is young enough that he may live to help legislate some of the answers.

ARIZONA RECOVERS GROWTH POTENTIAL

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor has a national reputation for its in-depth reporting and generally enriching the national journalistic scene. Mr. Erwin D. Canham, the Monitor's editor, deserves a great credit for the leadership of this great newspaper.

Recently, Mr. Richard A. Nenneman visited Arizona and wrote an excellent report of the business and financial conditions he found there. In spite of the economic hardships many of our people are suffering because of the callous disregard of union leadership for the welfare of those it purports to represent, and the resultant copper strike, we are making progress as a State. In the Monitor's words:

> Arizona stands poised for another takeoff in its economic growth.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nenneman's article on Arizona's growth potential be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO THE BOOM—ARIZONA RECOVERS GROWTH POTENTIAL

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Arizona stands poised for another takeoff in its economic growth that, with few interruptions, has continued for the past 20 years.

The excesses of the early '60's have largely been worked off, so a negative restraint on the state's economy is disappearing. At the same time, positive new forces in the form of steady increases in manufacturing employment have created a good base for overall growth.

The glamor growth areas of the United States—California, the Southwest, and in one way or another most of the southern tier of states all the way across to Florida—have one big thing going for them. An increasingly young, mobile, and prosperous population wants to live where the weather is pleasant at least a good part of the year and where there are ample leisure-time activities.

What was temporarily forgotten in Arizona, though, was that growth to some extent must be based on growth in a manufacturing base or some kind of export product vis-à-vis other states. (To the extent that a state is heavy in services such as tourism or education, its "exports" in goods can be somewhat less.)

OVERBUILT FOR YEARS

Thus, in the early '60's in Arizona, single-family housing continued at a pace that the actual incoming population could not absorb. This was followed by a boom in garden-type apartments, which was also overdone. Then, to top it off, over-ambitious developers got into high-rise office buildings far beyond the immediate needs of the area.

In Phoenix, for instance, in the 1964–65 period, some 1.5 million square feet of office building space came on stream. Yet, according to Gary Driggs, economist and vice-president of Western Savings & Loan Association, the largest savings and loan association in Arizona, the Phoenix area can absorb only about 200,000 square feet of office space in a normal year.

Three high-rise projects from those years have been in financial trouble. Two were major office buildings. But the dust is settling; the worst is over.

MANUFACTURING CAUGHT UP

What happened? Two things.

When it became apparent that the area was badly overbuilt, lending institutions put a lid on any large new projects until what was there could be worked into the economy.

Second, there has been a steady rise in basic manufacturing.

In the two-year period from November, 1965, to November, 1967, according to Valley National Bank figures, manufacturing employment in the entire state rose to 81,000. Each manufacturing job provides two or three others in the services, trade, etc.

It may sound strange to East Coast readers, but Arizona is in one sense an urban state. Roughly three-fourths of its population lives in the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. What happens there, plus some mining that takes place in other counties, very largely makes the Arizona story.

POPULATION TARGET MISSED

Valley National Bank, the largest bank in the state and the state's most prominent collector of statistical data had estimated in 1964 that Maricopa County (metropolitan Phoenix) would have 1.2 million people by 1970, and 900,000 by the next year, 1965. The 900,000 figure is just now being reached, some three years later than anticipated.

As for 1970, the bank's statistical department has each year scaled down its estimate of that figure. Now it stands at 1,010,000. Yet the bank's estimates were careful and were the best available at the time they were made.

In the three years from mid-1964 through mid-1967, construction employment decreased from 16,700 to 13,600. Builders of all kinds of structures—residential or commercial—were forced to cut back.

The gradual increase in other forms of employment, however, offset this. Total employment in metropolitan Phoenix grew from 221,000 to 260,000 during the same years.

BALANCE IMPROVING

What encourages the local economists now is that many new jobs in industry are being created at a time when the housing picture is again about back to normal. Thus, an increase in manufacturing in 1968 should be an assist to construction, wholesale and retail trade, and the service industries.

Motorola, Inc., the largest employer in Phoenix, is in the midst of another wave of expansion. A new Swift & Co. plant will hire 300 workers, all for new jobs. A new Western Electric Company plant about to go on stream making cable will bring in 1,100 new jobs this year.

Phoenix has had no major problems during the last three years, as it adjusted to its over-boom of the early 1960's. That evidences the strength of the underlying economic base.

TOURISTS NOT EVERYTHING

Although the economy of the Phoenix area, and even of the whole state, is small by large-state standards, it appears on the whole well-balanced. And important as tourism (or the "winter visitor" trade, as they like to call it) is, it is by no means the backbone of the Arizona of today.

During the relative weakness of the past few years, real estate prices have not changed substantially, further indication of widespread confidence in future growth here.

And what of the next boom? Boom may not be the right word. Some of the make-it-in-a-hurry millionaires have disappeared from the scene.

The real growth will continue, probably on a more sober base, without some of the hoopla that attended the earlier phases of Arizona's expansion. But 1968 may well be the year when Arizona growth again becomes more visible to non-Arizonans.

PROTECTING THE MILITARY CONSUMER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently a situation was brought to my attention which should be of interest to all those who seek better protection for the American consumer.

The situation was brought to light by the attorney general of Maryland, the Honorable Francis B. Burch, who long has taken an active interest in consumer affairs, and who has established a consumer protection division in his office.

Many of the complaints currently received in the consumer protection division come from military personnel stationed at Fort George G. Meade, and involve deceptive advertising and questionable business practices around that base.

In response to these complaints, the consumer protection division has established a regular service of sending investigators to Fort Meade once a month to investigate complaints from servicemen.

The service has been an overwhelming success. Many of the complaints have turned out to be valid—servicemen at Fort Meade have been proven justified in feeling that they and their families are often the victims of deceptive advertising and fraudulent practices.

In addition, legal assistance officers at Fort Meade now feel that they have an outlet for the many consumer complaints they receive. Through the consumer protection division, they now have a way to get action. In the words of one legal assistance officer, "We are beginning to feel more like lawyers and less like chaplains."

Mr. President, it seems to me that the consumer protection division of the Maryland attorney general's office has set an example that should be heeded by every State in the Union. It is important that servicemen, no matter what State they come from, be given protection against consumer frauds by some agency of the State in which they are stationed. Just like everyone else, servicemen and their families need someone to turn to for help with their consumer problems. Furthermore, servicemen need help fast, before they get transferred to another area.

It occurs to me that perhaps, until now, the serviceman stationed on a base outside his home State has been the forgotten man in the crusade to give better protection to the American consumer. I congratulate the attorney general of Maryland on the bold initiative he has taken to recognize the legitimate consumer protection needs of servicemen, and on his forthright approach to remedying those needs.

DYNAMIC POVERTY WORKERS IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled "Poverty Aides Help Around the Clock," published in the Washington Post last December.

The article describes the efforts of antipoverty neighborhood workers who have, as Post staff writer Carol Honsa describes it, "set up their own miniature around-the-clock war on poverty."

The poverty aides have formed a group which they call "the Dynamic Nine," which raises funds in the community to help their neighbors with small emergency expenses at times when other help is not readily available.

I highly commend the efforts of these fine people who work with the neighborhood development program at Southwest Community House in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY AIDES HELP AROUND THE CLOCK

(By Carol Honsa)

It's Friday night and the welfare office and the antipoverty offices are closed, and a family doesn't have a dime for food for the weekend.

If the family lives in Southwest Washington, it can get help from a group of antipoverty workers who have set up their own miniature around-the-clock war on poverty.

Called the Dynamic Nine, it was formed by antipoverty staff members who became dissatisfied when they saw that the resources of the Southwest Neighborhood Development Program didn't stretch far enough to meet all the problems of its low-income clients.

Working with a small fund it raised at a dinner, the group helps families with the small emergency expenses so that they are handled by the antipoverty program, which emphasizes community action instead of financial help.

"So many times we would go home worrying about a family's problem that would take only $10 or $15 to solve," said Lillie Whitehead, an officer of the Dynamic Nine.

"We can't give much, but it's enough to tide the family over and relieve their minds."

In one case, recalled Phyllis Martin, president of the group, a family's beds had been ruined in a small house fire. The neighborhood workers found a donor who would give the family new beds but could not supply either the men or the money to deliver them.

The Dynamic Nine—which actually has 11 members—dipped into its reserve fund and paid neighborhood men to move the beds to the family's home.

It has also given families money to buy food stamps, shoes for children, help with the rent and, in one case, to buy new clothing so a family could attend a funeral.

The consumer action component of the Southwest antipoverty program does maintain a small emergency food and clothing bank. But it is sometimes closed when a family needs it, or it may not have the particular food or clothing items a family needs.

The District Welfare Department and private social welfare agencies offer emergency as well as long-term help, but their offices may not be open nights or on weekends when a member of the Dynamic Nine learns of a pressing family problem.

Most members of the Dynamic Nine are long-term Southwest residents with strong ties in the low-income community there. Some, like Mrs. Martin and Altee Atkins, the group secretary, were long involved in volunteer community work before there was an antipoverty program. They feel they give as well as gain more because their "cases" are their friends and neighbors.

Members of the group say they are scrupulous about limiting their extracurricular help to their non-working hours. Although they come across most of the families they aid while working, they plan and extend their special help at night and on weekends.

Mrs. Martin, who is proud that she can visit as many homes and climb as many stairs with her one leg and crutches as any neighborhood worker, said the Dynamic Nine's special efforts have helped draw the Southwest antipoverty staff closer together for more effective work.

Called the "mother hen" by members of the group, she considers herself on call 24 hours a day to aid troubled families through the regular antipoverty program or the Dynamic Nine's special fund.

RESERVE DEPLETED

The group banks its funds at the Southwest Credit Union, an antipoverty unit, at 1251 Carrollsburg pl. sw. and hopes to replenish the reserve—badly dented during the Christmas season—through a January rummage sale.

Other Dynamic Nine members are Arthur Thorogood, Alice Thomas, Minetta Wheeler, Cynthia Blalock, Janie Johnson, Robert Oden, Ruth Mackell and Gloria Tyler.

GEORGE WASHINGTON HONOR MEDAL AWARD TO COLONEL JAMES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 22, Col. Daniel "Chappie" James will receive one of the top awards of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge. I take particular pride in Colonel James because he is not only an outstanding American, but a particularly outstanding serviceman formally stationed in the State of Arizona.

In a day when voices of irresponsibility sing out a siren song to youth that calls for upheaval and anarchy as solutions to today's problems, it is refreshing to find a man who not only has convictions about a person's responsibility to himself and society but is not afraid to voice them.

The Air Force colonel will receive the George Washington Honor Medal and a $100 cash prize for a letter he wrote on his "heritage of freedom" while serving as vice commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing in Southeast Asia. The presentation is set for Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22.

Presently assigned as vice commander of the Tactical Air Command's 33d TFW, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., James added 78 combat missions over Communist North Vietnam to his battle total that included 101 missions during the Korean War. The fighter pilot wrote in part:

> Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are: Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

Invited to the White House by President Lyndon B. Johnson upon his return from the battle area last December, James reported to the President that the morale of the men engaged in the air war was "great." He said:

> Fighter pilots have always had a great morale. It is the greatest fraternity in the world. They like the equipment, the challenge, and the job.

He explained to the Chief Executive and then to newsmen when questioned on the effects of the bombing:

> We like to keep up the pressure. It is having an effect in slowing down goods and supplies.

Support of American ground troops fighting in South Vietnam is one of the colonel's favorite themes:

> We must stop the flow of men and supplies to the South—

He said in an interview before leaving Thailand:

> The ground troopers in South Vietnam depend upon us for that and we can't let them down. The Marines at Con Thien and along the DMZ are catching hell. With air sup-

port hitting at the total length of the Communist supply lines, we can put a ceiling on the amount of fire power that can be brought against our troops.

Cramming his 6-foot-4-inch, 235-pound frame into the front seat of the F-4 Phantom, James led the Thai-based fighters on a myriad of missions over the Communist north.

Colonel James entered Aviation Cadets in January 1943. After earning his Air Force wings, he served as a flight leader for 4 years, flying P-47's at various stateside locations. He went overseas to Clark Air Base, Philippine Islands, in 1949 and was sent to Korea from that assignment.

Mr. President, in recognition of the award Colonel James is to receive, and so that other Senators may share the conviction he feels, I ask unanimous consent that the award-winning letter of Colonel "Chappie" James be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1967.

The strength of the United States of America lies in its unity. It lies in free men blessed and ordained with the rights of freedom working to provide, build, enjoy and grow. Those who would subvert us—or any free people—try to disrupt this unity by breaking the small parts from the whole—driving in the wedges of fear and discontent.

I am a Negro and therefore I am subject to their constant harangue. They say: "You James are a member of a minority—you are a black man." They say: "You should be disgusted with this American society—this so-called Democracy." They say: "You can only progress so far in any field that you choose before somebody puts his foot on your neck for no other reason than you are black." They say: "You are a second-class citizen."

My heritage of freedom provides my reply. To them I say: I am a citizen of the United States of America. I am not a second class citizen and no man here is unless he thinks like one, reasons like one or performs like one. This is my country, and I believe in her, and I believe in her flag, and I'll defend her, and I'll fight for her and serve her. If she has any ills, I'll stand by her and hold her hand until in God's given time, through her wisdom and her consideration for the welfare of the entire nation, things are made right again.

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other because of race, creed, religion, political party or social strata. We must stop using personal grievances as an excuse to break the laws of the land. We must not join with any lawless mob no matter what the provocation in disregard for law and order. A thief is a thief—I don't care what he gives as his reason for stealing. A mob is a mob—I don't care what the provocation is.

We can't afford it in this great country of ours. It is our responsibility to preserve our freedom and our unity. Good, thinking men must help unite those with whom they come in contact through hard work and participation. Our contributions to the total effort can be a by-product of what we achieve through excellence in our chosen fields. In our daily lives we must become a strong link in the chain of unity and freedom that has always been the strength of these United States of America.

I am an American. My heritage is bound by the tenets of freedom inherent in that simple statement. My responsibility is to allow my children to join a community of free people everywhere who have the right to say: "I am what I am. . . . because I have the freedom to say it."

DANIEL JAMES, Jr.,
Colonel, USAF, Vice Commander, 8th Tactical Fighter Wing.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the President in his message on crime has recognized that there is a vital need for a concentrated effort to free this country from fear of violence and losses from criminal activities. I support the President in his efforts to achieve this comprehensive program and I urge others to join me.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation stated in September of last year that in 1966 more citizens were killed or assaulted with guns in American streets and homes than were killed in battle during the entire Korean conflict. A national effort to alleviate this situation is necessary. Local and State efforts must me supported and augmented. This can be done if we will direct our efforts now to an early enactment of those important measures in the President's program.

Because I had the privilege of introducing S. 928, the Right to Privacy Act, I wish to call particular attention to the President's endorsement of this act. This bill is currently before the Committee on the Judiciary and I urge positive action upon it without delay. Privacy is eroding at a frightful rate and we need strong Federal and State action to preserve what is left of it.

THE TWO ASIAS—HUGH TREVOR-ROPER COLUMN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there has been much said, especially in the last few weeks, about America in Asia, about the trouble we are experiencing there, and about the hopelessness of the entire situation. In a recent column for the Sunday Times of London, Mr. Hugh Trevor-Roper, the Regius professor of modern history at Oxford University, examines the situation in Formosa and reveals the great progress that has been made there in the last 20 years. I want to commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be entered at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TWO ASIAS: GIVE AMERICA A CHANCE

(By Hugh Trevor-Roper)

(NOTE.—The Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford is one of the few recent observers who have visited both Formosa and China.)

The Far East is in ferment. While convulsion continues in China, there have been alarms in Singapore, new threats in Korea, new violence in Vietnam. The American hawks and doves have carried their controversy into the pages of the Sunday Times. How pleasant, we might think, to turn away from that inflamed Pacific coastline to an island of peace, Formosa.

Formosa is the one province of China where the thoughts of Chairman Mao are unread and the cultural revolution unknown. It is the last redoubt of the nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek. A wide strait severs it from the raging mainland. American arms protect it. Outwardly it seems irrelevant to the present struggles of which Red China is the real centre. In fact I believe that it is very relevant. For Formosa is, if not the real centre, at least the model of that alternative society which may yet be created in the Far East.

This is not how most of us imagine it. We imagine it, if at all, as a large, aging garrison of exiled anti-Communists camped, under American orders, in a passive island. But most of us, as Mr. Alsop has told us, are parochial. In this at least, I think, he is right and we are wrong. If we wish to understand American policy on the mainland, where it is at war, we should look also at what it is defending, in peace.

For Formosa is not an old garrison: it is a new society, solid, prosperous and self-confident. In that social laboratory the displaced Nationalist Government of China has solved, by rational, liberal methods, the problems which had defied it on the mainland; and it has solved them in a way which makes the Communist solution seem not only obscurantist but, in some ways, ineffective.

The crux of the whole Chinese problem, after the Japanese departed was the question of the land. On the mainland, the Communists tackled that problem in a drastic manner, by peasant communes. In the name of social equality they destroyed ownership and seriously damaged production. During the same years, the Nationalist Government in Formosa carried through a systematic land-reform which, within narrower limits, has been far more effective. It has achieved social justice while preserving peasant ownership and has led, incidentally, to a great increase in agricultural production.

The first step was the statutory limitation of rent. The high rural rents formerly charged by Formosan landlords were pegged at 37.5 per cent of the main crop, thus giving new incentives to the tenant. Large holdings (including Government holdings) were sold on easy terms. The peasants are now out of debt and their holdings are being rationalised. These changes have already produced a contented peasantry and a higher yield. At the same time, the landlords have not been expropriated: they have been compensated in Government bonds and shares in public enterprises. The effect has been to divert many of the old landlords into the new light industries which contribute so much to the island's new prosperity. The population was six million in 1945. It is now 14 million, of whom only two million are immigrants from the mainland.

This land reform is the key to all else. "If we had only done this ten years earlier," an official told me, "there would have been no Communism in China now." As it stands, the proposition is surely true. But could such reform have been carried out on the mainland? I rather doubt it. On the mainland the Government of Chiang Kai-shek was not a free agent: it depended largely on landlords and financiers who might well have obstructed such reform. In Formosa the position was very different. There the Government had *tabula rasa*. It also, by this time—under the impact of the Korean war of 1950—had effective American support which it lacked in the difficult years 1945–49.

However that may be, the errors of the past have now been repaired in this last outpost of the Kuomintang. Formosa has now, after Japan, the highest standard of living in Asia. Since 1965 its economy has dispensed with direct American aid. It has become, like Israel—another small social laboratory—the teacher of new nations, sending its technicians to advise the tropical societies of Africa which Red China has wooed in vain. It is now the shop-window of the new and more genuine Pacific "Co-Prosperity Sphere" which the Americans have built out of the ruins of the brief Japanese Empire and whose land-frontier is being defended, with such brutal tenacity, in Vietnam. I must admit that when I see the beneficent revolution which America has patronised in Formosa, I look a little more sympathetically on its struggle in Vietnam. Barbarous in itself, that struggle is part of a wider whole; the rough, inflamed edge of a great social as well as military undertaking.

The Americans have certainly been patrons in Fomosa, but the achievement there is largely Chinese. No doubt this is one reason for its solidity: Unlike some other societies on which American patronage has been imposed Chinese society has a historic vitality of its own, and this vitality has reasserted itself—not for the first time—in Formosa. One of the things which most impressed me there was the firm resolve to continue the essential Chinese culture, fortified but not submerged by Western methods. This after all, was the expressed aim of the founder of the Kuomintang, Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

The Communists also pay lip-service to Dr. Sun. But in fact, it seems to me, they look back to a remoter past. "Chairman Mao," for all his radicalism, assumes imperial attitudes. He looks back, over an interlude of forty years, to the Manchu Emperors. Chiang Kai-shek, the heir of Sun Yat-sen who repudiated the Manchus, continues in Formosa the best traditions of the original Republic of 1911.

Can these two Chinas, which have chosen such divergent roads, ever come together?

At present, short of war and conquest (which neither seems to seek), I doubt it. However disordered by the Cultural Revolution, Red China today has its own vested interests and the structural changes there will not be easily reversed or the indoctrination of a generation easily undone. On the other side, Nationalist China is a society reformed in depth, confident and prosperous, investing in itself both materially and spiritually. It is even less likely to be subverted or absorbed. The desire for reunion, however genuine, must take note of these facts. Between the two Chinas there is a structural divergence which time may attenuate but may also sharpen. The most interested observers will be the 18 million overseas Chinese, whose eyes now turn, increasingly, to Formosa as the new model of a Chinese State.

IN PRAISE OF MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the February 18, 1968, issue of State magazine of the Sunday Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail had a most interesting article by Mr. H. C. Gadd on Morris Harvey College, which is located in Charleston.

I am proud to state that I am a former student of Morris Harvey. I attended while serving as a member of the West Virginia State Legislature.

Morris Harvey College has a distinguished past and an even more promising future.

According to the article:

> From 1935 and a half-dozen classrooms on the third floor of the (Charleston) Public Library, to February, 1968, Morris Harvey has become the largest private four-year college in West Virginia in total number of students and also in the number of students from West Virginia. More teachers are graduated from Morris Harvey than from any other private college in the state.

Moreover, the college is in the midst of a tremendous growth campaign that will see a new library, a performing arts wing, and new dormitories built; upgrading of faculty and staff salaries; and expanded academic activities.

All those associated with Morris Harvey College deserve tremendous credit for the great work they have performed in the effort to assure West Virginia's young people of the availability of one of the finest 4-year colleges in the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from State magazine, entitled "The Continuing Vision," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Continuing Vision

(By H. C. Gadd)

Someone, someday is going to write a history of what happened to Morris Harvey College between the years 1935 and 1970—and no one will believe it.

I don't even believe it now and I've lived through most of it.

After-dinner speakers are wont to say that in 1935, Leonard Riggleman, Ashby C. Blackwell and Dr. W. H. "Muley" Walker got off C. & O.'s No. 14 up from Huntington with Morris Harvey in their pockets.

I don't know. I didn't meet the train. I do know that in September, 1935, I attended a student mix on the third floor of the old Kanawha County Public Library building. Just about the complete enrollments of both Morris Harvey and Kanawha College were there.

It wasn't crowded.

This "Old Fellar" preface is by way of introducing two shocks I have had this month.

The first was on Feb. 1, when I was invited to attend a city-council-sponsored tour of the new Civic Center facilities. Now any fool who has passed the Civic Center area as often as I have in my lifetime, certainly shouldn't be shocked at anything about it.

I would guess that 95 per cent of the adults living on the West Side have watched it emerge from a row of dilapidated houses—that were flooded with depressing regularity—to a landfill sort of dump to an airplane-hangar-size barn, to one of the finest facilities in the East.

It wasn't the Civic Center as it now stands that shocked me. It was something former Mayor John Shanklin said in the brief remarks he made on the occasion.

He was reporting how the site for the Civic Center happened to be picked:

"As chairman of the council committee to select a site, I came down to look over what was then a big, stinking garbage pile and a little lot for youngsters playing softball. I called up the mayor (the late John T. Copenhaver) and asked him to come down and look it over.

"He came immediately, glanced around, and standing beside me on a pile of refuse waved his arm toward downtown Charleston.

" 'This is the place,' he said. 'Someday you will be able to stand right here and see all the way to Summers Street.' "

The vision, of a man standing on a pile of garbage, was my first shock this month.

The second came while I was looking at the aerial photo being used on the cover of the Sunday Gazette-Mail's State Magazine today.

It is possible that all this has happened in just 33 years? What tremendous vision has brought this about? A vision shared literally by thousands and thousands of persons?

I remember the Christmas Season of 1942. I was home on furlough from the service and trying to get some last minute shopping done downtown. Salvation Army bell ringers there were, sure, but on practically every street corner and stretched up and down the blocks in between were Morris Harvey students shaking little paper cups.

They weren't begging. They were challenging.

"Help build Morris Harvey!"

Charleston helped! And helped! And helped! It's still helping. And the helping no longer is confined to Charleston. It has become statewide and to a degree, nationwide.

From 1901, when the name was changed, until 1934, when Morris Harvey closed its doors for the last time at Barboursville, the college went bankrupt.

From 1935 and a half-dozen classrooms on the third floor of the public library, to February, 1968, Morris Harvey has become the largest private four-year college in West Virginia, in total number of students and also in the number of students from West Virginia. More teachers are graduated from Morris Harvey than from any other private college in the state.

And the end of the vision is not yet.

Right now, Morris Harvey is in the middle of another campaign. It is called Phase One of the Morris Harvey Advancement Program. I would call it Phase One of the Continuing Morris Harvey Vision.

Phase one includes a new library building, a performing arts wing on Riggleman Hall, further development of the Blackwell Athletic Field, and enlargement of the King Physical Education Building.

Phase Two will seek to build two new dormitory units—one for men students and one for women students, plus purchase of adjacent land as it becomes available to insure adequate room for growth in later years.

Phase Three will seek to build up a substantial endowment fund to provide income for upgrading faculty and staff salaries, and strengthening other academic activities and programs of the college.

Impossible?

Twenty-five years ago—even twenty years ago—I would have said that anyone who hammered out those goals had to be smoking pot.

Not any more. I've just realized what vision can do when you turn it loose in Charleston.

RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last year Senator Dirksen and I introduced S. 924, a bill to amend section 9 of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 State. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to fair and impartial agency practices, and for other purposes.

The objective of this bill was to eliminate a widespread practice in government which we have labeled "trial by government publicity."

Shortly after our bill was introduced, the Federal Trade Commission instituted a change in their press release policy. When the FTC issues a press release announcing that a complaint has been filed, the press release contains the following statement:

> A complaint is issued whenever the Commission has found "reason to believe" that the law has been violated and that a proceeding is in the public interest. It is emphasized that the issuance of a complaint simply marks the initiation of a formal proceeding in which the charges in the complaint will be ruled upon after a hearing and on the record. The issuance of a complaint does not indicate or reflect any adjudication of the matters charged.

A recent issue of the Wall Street Journal contains an article commenting on an FTC complaint against Koppers Co. The merits of this case will be determined at a subsequent hearing before the Federal Trade Commission; neither the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure nor its chairman have any interest in its outcome. What is of interest to us, however, is the fairness with which this issue has been handled by the FTC. The third paragraph of the Journal article specifically states that "issuance by the FTC of a complaint means that the Commission, after an investigation by its staff, has found reason to believe that the law was violated." The Journal also reports that "the charges don't constitute a finding that Koppers violated the law."

The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to hold hearings on S. 924. In the meantime, we believe the FTC is to be commended for the lead it has taken in trying to present a fair and accurate picture in the releases which it issues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Journal article at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FTC CHARGES KOPPERS MONOPOLIZED OUTPUT OF IMPORTANT CHEMICAL: AGENCY STATES FIRM KEPT U.S. PIPE OUT OF RESORCINOL MARKET—COMPANY DENIES ALLEGATIONS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Trade Commission charged Koppers Co. with illegally monopolizing the manufacture and sale of resorcinol, a chemical compound with a variety of industrial uses.

The commission alleged that Koppers has used "persuasion, intimidation, threats, coercion, price cuts and long-term requirements contracts" to maintain its monopoly. A prime example, the FTC charged, was Koppers' use of "such acts and practices" to discourage U.S. Pipe & Foundry Co. from entering the resorcinol market.

The charges don't constitute a finding that Koppers violated the law. Issuance by the FTC of a complaint means that the commission, after an investigation by its staff, has found reason to believe that the law was violated.

Koppers said it believes the FTC accusations "don't state all of the pertinent facts and the company doesn't believe the allegations to be accurate representations of the action."

More than a year ago, Koppers said, after consulting with the commission's staff, the company voluntarily changed certain contracting practices referred to in the complaint. "This had the effect of insuring that the market is open to competition," the company said, so it believes the FTC action is "unjustified."

CHANCE TO ANSWER

Koppers has 30 days to file an answer after which the staff will present its evidence and Koppers its defense at a public hearing. The commission, on the basis of this public record will decide whether Koppers violated the law. If it finds the company guilty, it would issue a cease and desist order against the practices. Any such order could be appealed to the courts.

Koppers, based in Pittsburgh, is a large manufacturer of coal tar products, chemicals and other products. U.S. Pipe, based in Birmingham, Ala., is a major producer of pipe, castings and other items.

Resorcinol is an organic compound produced by the fusion of benzene, sulphuric acid and caustic soda. The FTC said resorcinol, or resins and adhesives produced from it, are important in the manufacture of rubber tires and belts, laminated wood products, certain dyes, pharmaceuticals and explosives.

The agency noted that Koppers, for the past 15 years, has monopolized commercial production of resorcinol in the U.S. This is in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which bans "unfair methods of competi tion and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce." The complaint asserted that other substantial competitors would be making resorcinol, "were it not for certain unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices" of Koppers.

Despite the alleged Koppers' effort, U.S. Pipe in April 1965 announced it would build a resorcinol plant.

The complaint said that two Koppers officials in March 1965 went to Birmingham "for the purpose of discouraging" U.S. Pipe from proceeding with plans to build a resorcinol plant. The complaint alleged that the Koppers officials, at a conference with U.S. Pipe officials expressed the hope U.S. Pipe wouldn't enter the resorcinol market and painted a gloomy picture of U.S. Pipe's prospects in the market.

Moreover, the Koppers officials threatened drastic price cuts if U.S. Pipe entered the market, the complaint alleged. Further, according to the complaint, the Koppers officials said that if U.S. Pipe abandoned its resorcinol plans Koppers would be interested in a joint venture to build a benzene purification plant to channel U.S. Pipe's benzene into the commercial benzene market instead of converting it into resorcinol.

KOPPERS PRICE CUTS

Thereafter, the FTC charged, Koppers offered price reductions of as much as 31% in certain grades of resorcinol. The reductions, however, were offered only to large purchasers who would contract to purchase between 80% and 100% of their resorcinol requirements from Koppers for three to five years, the complaint said. It charged that Koppers pressed its customers to sign such contracts and succeeded in signing up a major share of the market. The complaint also alleged that Koppers secured the agreement of two resorcinol sales agents that they wouldn't handle any competitive resorcinol for three years.

The complaint said that, "among the effects" of Koppers' attempts to discourage competition was "the failure of U.S. Pipe to establish itself in the commercial resorcinol market as an alternate producer and viable competitor."

The complaint asserted that Koppers' position as the sole commercial producer constitutes "a potential hazard to the health, safety and well-being of the American people." It noted that manufacture of resorcinol is dangerous due to the risk of explosion and that the resorcinol plant of Hayden Chemical Co. was accidentally destroyed in 1951, which left Koppers the only producer.

BAN ON IMPORTATION OF HAND GUNS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature, memorializing Congress to consider legislation necessary to ban the importation of hand guns with the exception of guns manufactured prior to 1900, which would be identified as antique firearms.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 665

Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider legislation necessary to ban the importation of hand guns with the exception of guns manufactured prior to 1900 which would be identified as antique firearms

Whereas, a dangerous increase in crime, violence and murder has developed in this country; and

Whereas, concurrent with this increase there has been a vast importation of foreign hand guns, official records showing that one million six hundred fifty thousand of these weapons were imported from 1962 to mid-1967; and

Whereas, the low prices and easy availability of these imported weapons have led to their wide distribution; and

Whereas, Captain Harry Snipes of the Columbia Police Department has reported that in a period of four months and thirteen days of last year one thousand nine hundred ninety-seven hand guns, the majority of which were imported, were sold within two blocks of the State Capitol; and

Whereas, many law enforcement officials are convinced that the wide distribution of foreign weapons is contributing substantially to our present increase in crime involving weapons. Now, therefore, Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of South Carolina does hereby memorialize the National Congress to take necessary steps to ban the importation of hand guns into this country and consider legislation leading thereto with the exception of guns manufactured prior to 1900 which would be identified as antique firearms.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT AND THE MORAL DEFICIT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, James Reston, in his always illuminating column, was particularly perceptive the other day when he discussed the Vietnam war and the case for a tax increase. He calls it the moral argument for raising taxes. I was most impressed by this article, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

We are engaged in a most important and at the same time costly war in Vietnam. Many of our young men are making the difficult sacrifice of fighting this war under the most unpleasant of circumstances. Others, tragically, have made the supreme sacrifice and their loved ones will never forget them or what they have done there.

Yesterday I delivered the eulogy at the funeral of a young marine who was recently killed in Vietnam. This boy meant a great deal to me. I will not soon forget the fact or significance of his great sacrifice, and it will surely live with his family forever.

Very few demands have been made upon the general population in connection with the war in Vietnam. Yet when it became known some time ago that a tax increase might be necessary this year to help defray the enormous expense of this war, a tremendous hue and cry went up which reverberated against all corners of our land.

Reston writes:

No nation ever fought such a vicious war in the midst of such sacrifice by some of its people and so little sacrifice by the rest. The American people are not indifferent to this spectacular contrast between the men at the front and the people at home, though they know the facts more than they feel the hurt in the heart.

I commend Mr. Reston for his brilliant analysis in the hope that more of us may gain the perspective that he has demonstrated in this column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article mentioned above be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington: The Budget Deficit and the Moral Deficit

(By James Reston)

Washington, February 15—The economic arguments for and against a tax increase are ending in a miserable stalemate, but the moral argument for raising taxes has scarcely been debated.

There is no such thing as an equal war, and the Vietnam war is more unequal than most. Over 800 Americans have been killed there in the last two recorded weeks. Another 10,500 men have been flown to the battlefield in the last few days, and General Westmoreland wants more.

Meanwhile, adding to the inequality of sacrifice, some of the reserves have been called up while others of the same age and experience have not. The military draft takes the poor and leaves the educated rich, and in order to meet some of the urgencies of the conflict, some men who have survived one year's tour of duty in Vietnam are being sent back for another.

JOHNSON AND MILLS

Yet the economists and politicians argue endlessly and fruitlessly about the tax rise as if the budget deficit were everything and the moral deficit nothing. The President negotiates with Wilbur Mills of the Ways and Means Committee as if Mills were the head of a foreign state. The argument between those who want to raise taxes and those who want to cut Federal spending, has gone on for months and it can go on indefinitely as long as it is left to the arguable mysteries of economics.

In this situation, the case for doing what is fair, what helps to share the burden, what is right deserves at least a hearing alongside what is best for the economy. The life of the nation goes on for most people as if there were no war. In fact, it has fired the boom and created another crop of industrial millionaires.

INFLATION AND DEFLATION

President Johnson has not asked for much in relation to the cost and startling inequality of the war. He is faced with a $33-billion deficit. His war tax, if passed, would reduce this by $13 billion. The Congress, which used to complain that the President exercised too much power in the legislative process, is now asking him to do its job of legislating the cuts; both sides are playing politics with the problem, and the economists are hopelessly tangled in a dispute about whether inflation or definition is the problem.

PLIGHT OF THE TRAVELERS

In economic terms, of course, it is a fair enough debate. Industrial production, according to the latest figures out this week, is down a bit, and this is taken by Senator Proxmire and his anti-tax faction as evidence that we may be headed for the skids. The arguments against taxes on travel are now drowning out the Administration's case for improving the international balance of payments—think of the terrible plight of the poor travelers in Europe this summer; consider the infringements on personal freedom and the inconveniences of the beleaguered tourists homeward bound and broke next August!

There is, of course, a point to all these arguments, though it is hard to make to a drafted "traveler" in Vietnam. The tax burden on the salaried middle class is high. The economy is a little uncertain. The proposed restrictions on foreign investment and foreign travel are awkward, but no nation ever fought such a vicious war in the midst of such sacrifice by some of its people and so little sacrifice by the rest.

The American people are not indifferent to this spectacular contrast between the men at the front and the people at home, though they know the facts more than they feel the hurt in the heart. This time the television cameras have shown them the unspeakable brutalities of war. And yet even the casualty lists have not moved the Congress to vote the funds needed to share the burden even a little bit.

THE PHILOSOPHIC QUESTION

The reason for this is that the larger philosophic questions of the war have somehow got lost in the technical debates over money. The dollar balance-of-payments question gets discussed. The budget deficit is debated ad infinitum. But there is also an unpaid human balance of payments and a human deficit in this war, and neither the Council of Economic Advisers nor the Ways and Means Committee has anything to say to us about them.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, this past weekend the President's special factfinding panel on the 7-month-long copper strike issued its report.

The mountain has struggled mightily and brought forth a molehill. We know little more than we knew more than 3 weeks ago when the President appointed this extralegal body. Now we have only a recommendation which is being studied by both sides. Meanwhile the idle workers in Arizona still are out of work. The small businessmen continue to suffer losses. And the Nation's war effort as well as its balance-of-payments problem continue to be imperiled all because the President is apparently afraid to offend his union boss cronies for the good of the Nation and of the American worker. The public is still the loser.

I have stated repeatedly that the President has the power to end the economic hardships and deprivations being suffered by the copper miners who are pawns in the hands of power-hungry union leaders. The President knows this. Still he refuses to act.

Now it has come to my attention that the copper ore to make up some of the deficiencies caused by the strike comes from Communist countries.

The President is calling for a travel tax reputed to recoup some half billion dollars while inconveniencing millions of Americans; but he refuses to end the copper strike that is costing us at least twice that much in the premium price domestic fabricators are forced to pay for imported copper.

Will the President let these damaging influences go unchecked until after the elections? If so, the damage done may never be repaired. Indeed, the present economic losses will never be recovered by the average copper miner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts from a letter relating to the seriousness of the copper strike. The writer is Mr. B. H. Gerwin, assistant to the director, State of Arizona Department of Mineral Resources. His thoughtful letter raises some points that are most pertinent to the problem.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Copper Strike

It is indeed very depressing and distressing, in view of the war going on in Vietnam to read in the U.S. News & World Report of January 15, 1968 (page 78) that while there are 259,000 tons of copper in the Government defense stockpile:

"Government stock not available. A Commerce Department official said the Government does not plan to release copper from its defense stockpile, because it wishes to avoid union complaints of 'strikebreaking' ".

It also is very depressing and distressing to note that Fabricators' Refined Stocks reported by the U.S. Copper Association as of December 31, 1967 amounted to 479,572 tons, a figure higher than at the end of any year traced back for at least 25 years, except for the end of 1966 when stocks were 558,599 tons. Fabricators' stocks started increasing in June 1966 when the stocks were 460,848 tons and reached an all-time high of 641,083 tons in June 1967. It is apparent that a considerable tonnage of Fabricators' Refined Stocks are in plants tied up by strikes and that for the government to arrange to move such stocks to unstruck plants would be accompanied by union complaints of "strikebreaking".

It was a fairly evident assumption—as the signs all pointed that way—that with the majority of the mining, smelting and refining labor contracts expiring during the latter part of 1967 (with many expiring on June 30, 1967) the fabricators started further building up of their inventories through the importation of increasing tonnages beginning with the Third Quarter of 1966. The Department of Mineral Resources releases of June 21, 1967, July 11, 1967, August 14, 1967, October 9, 1967 (with report of September 1967) and January 10, 1968 pointedly stressed the fact that imports from foreign countries were increasing steadily beginning with the Third Quarter of 1966 as reports of the fall-off in European economy made it plainly apparent that Europe's demand for copper had decreased; that it was diverting to the United States copper that it normally would have received from Canada, Australia, Africa and South America; and that it was reshipping to the United States tonnages received from those sources which it could not use due to its worsening industrial climate. Furthermore, the "Arizona Republic" on February 7, 1968 (page 25) reported an AP dispatch from London that "British and continental Europe operations have been buying substantial tonnages of copper from East Germany and the Soviet Union to replace supplies they have shipped to the United States to take advantage of high copper prices there during its seven month copper strike," and that "U.S. consumers are prohibited from buying metal directly from East European countries."

A very harmful effect upon our adverse dollar balances has been due not only to our making tremendous abnormal purchases abroad which are contributing greatly to our dollar exchange deficit, but both our economy and our government have to pay an augmented price for the consumer goods purchased because of the high cost to the fabricator for foreign copper. Copper that was purchased abroad by fabricators has been bought on the London Metal Exchange, through dealers and merchants, and through representatives abroad—and the price paid has not been the 38 to 39¼ cents a pound charged by the strikebound American mining companies but whatever price the traffic would bear.

During the last three months of 1966, copper purchased on the L.M.E. averaged 57.3 cents per pound. In 1967—the prices averaged:

	Cents per pound
1st quarter	53.9
2d quarter	46.1
3d quarter	46.9
4th quarter	52.6
On Feb. 7, 1968:	
Spot per Wall Street Journal	70.6
3 months per Wall Street Journal	62.1

The latest N.Y. Commodity Exchange Price available was 66.25 cents on February 7.

The latest N.Y. Merchant market price was a nominal 73.5 cents on February 7.

The American Metal Market of January 23, 1968, quotes Eduardo Simian, president of the Sociedad Minera El Teniente, S. A. as saying (page 10):

"Naturally I among my fellow-countrymen want to see an end of the Vietnam fighting. Of course Chile, within the bounds of propriety, is doing what it can 'to take advantage of the present copper prices in the interests of our economy'."

The "London Mining Journal" December 29, 1967 issue (page 491) states: "The outlook for copper changed dramatically in mid-1967.—Coincident with the improvement in supplies was a decline in the offtake of some consumer countries. At the period indications pointed to a world surplus for 1967 of about 147,000 tons. The L.M.E. price for copper which had opened the year at around L452 per l. ton (Note—equivalent to 56.5 cents per pound), fell by mid-June to L352 per ton (Note—equivalent to 44.0 cents per pound) for three months' metal—In the second half of 1967 the predicted surplus was soon more than eliminated by the strike in the U.S. which broke out on July 15 and at the time of writing has resulted in losses estimated at between 700,000 and 800,000 tons of refined copper.—Early in November the L.M.E. price for cash copper again touched L500 (Note—equivalent to 62.5 cents per pound) and after devaluation it moved up to L570 (Note—equivalent to 61.1 cents per pound)".

Through December and into January quite a few firms reported the ability to keep going because of inventory accumulation ahead of the strike plus continuing imports at a very high price, but there was a consensus to the effect that this could not keep on.

Dr. James Boyd, president of Copper Range was quoted in the January 22, 1968 issue of American Metal Market as saying in part:

"To make up for the loss in domestic refined metal output consumers sharply increased their imports and high prices brought copper-bearing scrap out into the marketplace. The cost of copper imports, in excess of normal imports is now running at an annual rate of a billion dollars."

The inception of the strikes, fortunately for the country, coincided with a time when world demand was on the downgrade and world production was very much on the upgrade. An exhaustive study by the American Metal Market reported January 11, 1968 that "shortages are concentrated on certain shapes and sizes for which there has been the greatest relative demand," and that the most recent government estimate of when to expect the crucial copper shortage places its arrival in Mid-March.

Exhibit A attached hereto analyzes the "New Mine Production Entering the U.S. Pipe Line" for the January-November 1967 period compared with the January-November 1966. All foreign "refined" copper imported is assumed to be new-mined, although some may have been refined from scrap. At any rate it qualifies under refined copper specifications.

It will be noted that through November 1967, the returnable copper content of exports of ores and concentrates amounted to 48,761 tons. These were tonnages shipped to Canada and Japan under the Government's program of aiding some nonstruck mines to dispose of their concentrates due to the fact that their usual smelter contacts are down because of the strikes. This supplies additional smelter, refinery, and fabrication labor earnings for Canada and Japan (with concentrates also shortly to go to Las Ventana smelter and refinery in Chile) while our own workers are forced to stand aside.

An analysis of the Monthly New Mine Production entering the U.S. Pipe Line for fabrication—(which would not include Stockpile Releases or Scrap Copper) (Exhibit B)—presents the following comparison:

[In percent]

	From U.S. mines	From imports
Prestrike:		
January–June 1966	90.2	9.8
July–September 1966	84.0	16.0
October–November 1966	72.2	27.8
January–June 1967	[1] 81.6	18.4
Strike conditions:		
July (strike started July 15)	75.5	24.3
August	43.3	56.7
September	9.9	90.1
October	14.9	85.1
November	11.1	88.9

[1] Due to increase in production at U.S. mines.

Exhibit C—details the continental shipments of unrefined and refined copper to the United States and presents a supplementary breakdown of the shipments from the various countries of Europe. While the copper from Belgium most probably originated in the Congo and was refined at Oolon, Belgium, no copper was produced in the United Kingdom and Netherlands; and very little in West Germany, Finland, France and Italy; and not enough in Sweden and Spain to spare shipments from their own needs. Only Yugoslavia has the mining capacity and November 1967 was the first month in which they shipped refined copper to the United States. It is very evident that the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden, West Germany and possibly France, Italy and Spain are shipping to the United States copper that they imported from other continents and possibly replaced with copper they purchased from East Germany and the Soviet Union.

The February 2, 1968 issue of the Mining Journal states:

"A market convulsion resulted from news that L.M.E. copper stocks had declined by 4,225 tons following the dispatch of 4,200 tons to the U.S. Total stocks are now down to 10,825 tons, of which 9,275 tons is held in Hamburg. Nearly all of this is comprised of East German metal and under existing U.S. Government rules, cannot be shipped to America. At the present time it is hard to see where significant amounts of copper to replenish the L.M.E. stock are to be found."

While our domestic economy is being sadly disjointed—The Department of Mineral Resources, based on data secured from the Employment Securities Commission, has computed that in Arizona alone we are losing 1,750 tons of copper per day and that there are an average of 9,989 men out of work losing $7,213,063 per month in wages—the curtailed copper production in the United States has resulted in the sustained production of copper at practically all of the copper mines, smelters, and refineries elsewhere in the world—beyond the point where it would have been necessary for them to reduce production because of surpluses. While this may have enabled us to procure adequate supplies to tide us over seven months for many of our industrial and war requirements, there have been shortages of a serious nature and they will be an ever-increasing problem which will affect the war effort in more and more ways.

A subject for most serious thought—especially for Arizona whose economy is so dependent upon copper—is the future of copper mining once the strikes are over and once the Vietnam crisis ceases to exist.

Encouragement and financial aid given by our government agencies to governments abroad to increase their copper production have increased our dollar deficit and have resulted in maximum production at foreign mines—which they will expect to continue after our strikes are over. In order to maintain their maximum production in the absence of a great European demand they will want to continue their shipments to the United States at whatever prices they can get. (In 1954 our government bailed out Chile under similar circumstances).

This is substantiated by a paragraph on page 76 of the January 26, 1968 issue of the "Mining Journal" reading:

"Sounding a timely word of warning about present price of copper, British Metal Corporation, in its latest 'Review of Non-Ferrous Metals', notes that once the U. S. strike is over prices must move appreciably lower. The rate of decline would however, be controlled by the need for U. S. consumers to rebuild inventories though probably not up to the high levels of mid-1967. The pace of the fall might also be regulated by such factors as consumer demand in 1968 and any renewal of U. S. national stockpiling. Currently this stockpile amounts to some 259,000 s. tons compared with the official objective of 775,000."

Also to be borne in mind is the fact that the suspension of the copper tariff terminates on June 30th but that the low 85/100 cents a pound tax will not stand in the way of the flow of foreign copper into the United States.

Since foreign producers have had their hey-day during the strike both in the quantity shipped and the excessive amounts they have charged for the copper, American producers should be protected after the strike from undue importation of copper (except that received in bond for processing and re-exportation) especially until the defense stockpile is restored to 775,000 tons and until the inventories of our fabricators are established at pre-strike levels. This, of course, cannot apply in the case of foreign mines owned by American capital, shipping to their own American fabricators. To the greatest extent possible, let us divert all economic advantages to American miners and not to foreign miners.

Also to be further considered is the need of "the item in President Johnson's $79,789 billion overall defense budget which contains an item for the Defense Department to spend $146 million in 1969 to expand defense production under DPA authority. Much of that sum—$124 million higher than this year's total—is directly related to efforts to assure adequate supplies of copper for contractors making the bullets and artillery shells and casings for the Vietnam war". (See American Metal Market—January 30, 1968). Will this be necessary?

It is believed that after the strikes are over and it becomes no longer necessary to be concerned about excessive inventories, the problem might not be one of continuing our own American copper mining operations at maximum level. Instead it might be a saddened problem of lower prices and men out of work. This, of course, will not happen the day after the strike ends—but it may be in the cards!

We shall be pleased to be called upon for any additional assistance we may render.

Very truly yours,

B. H. GERWIN,
Assistant to Director.

REPORT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in 1966, during the Foreign Relations Committee's consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of that year, I requested and received from the Secretary of State summaries of representative examples of the work that the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance had been doing to improve our foreign aid programs. This report was made a part of the record of the 1966 hearings.

Earlier this year, I had similar correspondence with the Secretary of State. In view of the general interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence, together with the enclosed listing of examples, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1968.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will remember that in the spring of 1966 you were kind enough to furnish me with unclassified summaries of representative examples of the work of The Inspector General of Foreign Assistance. These summaries proved helpful to the Committee in its consideration of foreign aid legislation.

I would now be most grateful if you could send me an updated list of additional examples of the work of The Inspector General's office.

With best wishes. I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

FEBRUARY 2, 1968.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of January 17 in which you requested updated summaries of recent examples of the work of the Office of The Inspector General of Foreign Assistance. These summaries are attached.

In our opinion, it continues to be the case that the combined efforts of The Inspector General and the operating agencies are saving many millions of dollars. The results produced have amply confirmed the wisdom of the Congress in sponsoring the establishment of this office.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

[From the Department of State]

SOME RECENT EXAMPLES OF THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (IGA)

AFGHANISTAN

In view of the United States balance-of-payments problem, IGA strongly recommended that the new P.L. 480 agreement with Afghanistan make provision for generating local currency for United States uses. Steps have now been taken toward this end, and the agreement will produce the equivalent of about $750,000 worth of afghanis.

ALGERIA

An IGA inspection team came upon sizable amounts of P.L. 480 foods—including 2,000 cases of cooking oil and 1,000 sacks of dry milk—which had never been distributed. Prompt corrective action was taken.

ARGENTINA

IGA inspectors walking through warehouses in the Buenos Aires port area found 18 large crates of tool kits which, although consigned to Paraguay under the military sales program, had been sitting on the docks in Buenos Aires for more than nine years. The kits were in good shape; they were still needed; and steps were taken to send them on to Paraguay.

BRAZIL

1. IGA invited the attention of the MILGROUP to large amounts of electronic gear which were going unused and which were excess to the needs of Brazil's armed forces. Some of this materiel had been in Brazil for as long as ten years, and issue rates were very low. The materiel thereupon redistributed included about 10,000 electronic tubes valued at over $150,000.

2. An IGA team visited a warehouse in Rio de Janeiro where, unbeknownst to the AID Mission, and contrary to what it had been told, U.S.-financed goods were being sold at auction. AID is now trying to find out just what has been auctioned, and to arrange with Brazilian authorities to get the proceeds deposited in the counterpart fund.

3. IGA inspectors visiting a highway project came upon design and construction practices which were threatening the structural integrity of the roadbed. New techniques were then adopted.

BURMA

An IGA audit revealed that AID had overlooked opportunities to deobligate monies on projects no longer supported by AID. About $14,500 were thereupon deobligated.

CHILE

IGA cited figures showing that Cooley Loan borrowers who had received Chilean escudos worth $685,000 were able to repay their loans with escudos worth less than $200,000. This was because the repayment terms of the loan agreements did not take sufficient account of the pace of inflation in Chile.

IGA said that borrowers were unduly favored by such arrangements. It urged that maintenance-of-value clauses, which compensated for depreciation of the escudo, be inserted in any future Cooley Loan agreements. Such clauses were then placed in new Cooley Loans which totaled the equivalent of about $360,000.

CHINA

When IGA examined the spare parts production schedule for Chinese Army vehicles, it found that many of the spares being made were either not needed or else that stocks sufficient to meet requirements for several years were already on hand. The production schedule was then revised to reflect real requirements.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

1. An IGA voucher analysis showed that AID money was being used to import large quantities of things which were either ineligible for AID-financing or else whose financing did not appear to be justified as a matter of prudent public policy. Among the items in question were champagne glasses, luxury foods, and other non-essentials. AID subsequently filed claims for more than $130,000 in refunds. Also, AID placed a number of new commodities on its list of items which are ineligible for AID-financing.

FRANCE AND GERMANY

IGA cooperated with the Pentagon in a review aimed at making sure that we were taking full advantage of opportunities to satisfy foreign assistance requirements with materiel which was made excess through the military closedown in France. An IGA visit to supply depots in France and Germany contributed to improved procedures for screening this materiel and putting it to the best use.

GUATEMALA

For months, the Peace Corps had been unsuccessfully seeking permission to transfer several jeeps it no longer needed to AID. IGA invited the attention of Peace Corps headquarters to this fact. The transfer was made promptly.

GUINEA

IGA noted that AID had an unspent balance of $130,000 on three projects which had been terminated sometime before. The monies were thereupon deobligated.

INDIA

1. IGA learned that CARE and other voluntary agencies needing rupees for the local administrative expenses of their food distribution programs were buying their rupees with dollars through normal banking channels, thus causing a balance-of-payments drain. IGA recommended that they instead buy excess U.S.-owned rupees from our Embassy. This was done. The contribution to the United States balance-of-payments exceeds $230,000 annually.

2. After visiting several power plants in Eastern India, IGA questioned the need for a proposed AID-financed $215,000 training program for power plant operators. AID thereupon reviewed the project and decided not to go forward with it.

3. IGA suggested that Title III foodstuffs be bagged with Indian-made bags, purchased with excess U.S.-owned rupees, rather than with bags purchased with dollars. AID developed a procedure for using rupees to buy bags made in India, and reported significant dollar savings as a result.

INDONESIA

IGA learned that dollars, rather than U.S.-owned near-excess Indonesia rupiahs, were being used to pay for transportation of Indonesian participants to the United States, for the local administrative expenses of voluntary agencies, and housing costs. Concerned with the U.S. balance-of-payments, IGA recommended that these expenses be met with U.S.-owned local currencies. This will be done.

KOREA

IGA suggested a course of action whereby, through an exchange of equipment, requirements for navigation aids at two Korean air fields could be met with equipment costing only $100,000—rather than a planned $1,000,000. The IGA recommendation was immediately adopted.

LAOS

1. Through an administrative oversight, some 150 tons of Bailey Bridge components to be used in Laos had been needlessly shipped by air from Tokyo to Bangkok. Additional air shipments were in prospect when IGA came upon the matter. The oversight was then corrected.

2. Inquiries initiated by IGA brought to light a $17,000 overpayment to a U.S. supplier which had come about because of a billing error. A refund claim is now being filed against the supplier.

3. IGA inspectors made detailed analyses of stock levels and orders of materiel in our AID program. They found several instances of where, although some commodity was going unused in one part of the program, identical commodities were being bought, and sometimes even airshipped, for other parts of the program. In a related matter, they observed that, although the AID Mission had on hand 800 five-gallon water bottles which had been purchased for $1.85 each through GSA, both the Embassy and USIS were buying similar bottles in Bangkok for $12.50 each. Corrective measures were speedily instituted.

LIBERIA

1. A $64,000 AID-financed purchase order for agricultural equipment was about to be signed when IGA questioned the need for

the equipment. A decision was then made not to issue the purchase order and the $64,000 was subsequently deobligated.

2. An IGA bookkeeping analysis brought to light $25,960 still obligated for a sawmill project—although the last expenditure on the project had been made in 1961. The money was deobligated.

MOROCCO

IGA commented favorably on country team efforts to make maximum use of U.S.-owned local currency, but found two AID contracts on which dollars, rather than U.S.-owned dirhams, were being used to pay for local expenses. This practice was immediately stopped. In the case of one contract alone, the U.S. balance-of-payments drain has thereby been reduced by about $170,000.

NIGERIA

1. Some $480,000 worth of Nigerian counterpart funds had been lying unused for three years, pending the outcome of discussions concerning possible use of the pounds for a scholarship program. At the same time, AID was using dollars to buy local currency needed for other projects. IGA urged that arrangements be worked out to permit these idle Nigerian pounds to be substituted for dollar expenditures in the AID program, thus reducing the drain on the United States balance-of-payments. AID agreed to do this.

2. IGA took exception to the practice of using petty cash funds to pay the salaries of large numbers of local AID employees. Steps were then taken to place the employees on regular AID payrolls or else to acquire their services through formal contractual arrangements.

PAKISTAN

IGA inspectors walking the docks in Weehawken, New Jersey, came upon 16 tons of chains which had been lost in transit to Pakistan and which had been sitting on a pier since 1965. The chains were sent to Pakistan after the matter was brought to the attention of AID.

PANAMA

1. An IGA team visited school buildings which exhibited numerous construction shortcomings. The AID Mission did not know that, in several instances, the time during which the builder was himself responsible for correcting these defects was about to expire. The USAID quickly adopted an IGA recommendation that the builder be asked to discharge his contractual responsibilities and make the necessary repairs.

2. IGA invited the attention of AID to several tens of thousands of dollars of laboratory equipment standing idle at health centers. Vigorous steps are underway to put this equipment to work.

PERU

1. IGA reviewed the construction plans for the La Molina Agricultural University and concluded that the proposed four-story student union building was needlessly lavish. The two top stories of the building were thereupon deleted from the plans, and will be built at a later date, if at all. AID estimated that the cost of the building will thereby be reduced by $1.25 million.

2. The AID Mission and IGA cooperated in a study of how contractor personnel were using motor vehicles. Corrective measures emerging from the study will enable transportation needs to be met with significantly fewer vehicles.

3. An IGA team visited a self-help housing project which had been dedicated some months before, and which had been regarded as finished. IGA found that the street lighting system had not been turned on since the dedication ceremonies and that, although the houses had been wired for electricity, no connections had ever been made between the houses and the electric lines in the streets. When it learned of these facts, AID suspended a final $16,000 payment to the project until the electricity problem was corrected.

PHILLIPINES

1. At a time when the United States was using dollars to buy Philippine pesos, thus contributing to the balance-of-payments drain, some $1.7 million of expired Cooley funds were going unused. IGA lent its support to Bureau of the Budget efforts to have these Cooley funds released for use in lieu of pesos purchased with dollars. This was done.

2. An IGA review of supply management practices in the military assistance program helped focus attention upon materiel which was going unused. Such things as tool sets, communications equipment, and electric generator sets were thereupon issued to military units; and such items as tire vulcanizers and space heaters were declared excess and made available for distribution elsewhere.

PORTUGAL

1. IGA inspectors reviewing the military assistance program in Portugal found a $14,700 degaussing machine for which the military mission had been searching for more than a year. Another search then undertaken by the mission brought to light a second degaussing machine, also costing $14,700.

2. IGA inspection pointed out that a C–54 mobile training unit, as well as a TACAN, were not being used by the Portuguese Air Force. Steps are now underway to put this equipment to use benefiting commercial as well as military air traffic.

SOMALIA

IGA studied the plans for an AID-financed agricultural training center near Mogadiscio and identified several design and construction features which appeared to be excessively costly. AID deleted these items from the plans.

THAILAND

IGA contributed to speeding the deobligation of some $500,000 which was no longer needed for the Accelerated Rural Development Program.

TUNISIA

1. IGA helped accelerate the deobligation of some $790,000 on a loan whose unspent balance was no longer needed.

2. The AID Mission moved vigorously to correct certain weaknesses in distribution controls over P.L. 480 Title III foodstuffs which had been identified in an IGA review.

TURKEY

1. IGA inspectors drew attention to about $700,000 worth of AID-financed commodities which had failed to clear customs. Corrective action was quickly taken.

2. The Peace Corps moved to tighten fiscal and supply controls in the Turkish program and to take greater advantage of Embassy support facilities after being invited to do so by IGA.

URUGUAY

There were plans for staffing a proposed educational television project with Peace Corps volunteers. It appeared to IGA that the station could not be completed by the time the volunteers were to arrive in Uruguay on the then existing schedule. Fearing that the volunteers might therefore have no work to do for several months, IGA suggested that the timing of the project be restudied. The Peace Corps then deferred the training of the volunteers and set a later date for their arrival in Uruguay.

VIETNAM

1. IGA made an intensive investigation of certain transactions in the AID-financed commercial import program involving an American supplier, Thomas Edison Higgins Enterprises, Inc., and a Vietnamese firm, Doanh Tin Cuoc. On the basis of facts developed by IGA, the head of the Vietnamese firm was jailed, the American supplier was suspended from further AID business, and the transactions are now under review by the Department of Justice.

2. During the fiscal year 1967, more than 80 percent of the import licenses issued under the AID-financed commercial import program were under $10,000 in value. Under the rules then prevailing, these licenses were not subject to normal AID procurement regulations concerning advertising and competitive bidding. IGA repeatedly maintained that these under $10,000 licenses showed a pattern of abuse, and urged that AID make them subject to normal procurement regulations. AID took steps to achieve the objectives sought by IGA.

3. AID suspended a United States supplier of steel products to Viet-Nam on the basis of information developed by IGA.

4. AID had spent about $100,000—at the rate of $490 a day—on a contract under which a barge was to take fresh water from the city of Saigon water system to ships berthed in the Saigon port area. However, because permission had never been obtained to make a connection from the municipal water system to the barge, no water had ever been delivered to the ships. Senior AID officials said they were unaware of this situation until IGA drew it to their attention. The contract was thereupon cancelled.

5. In one of its black-marketing investigations, IGA showed that a contractor employee had engaged in large-scale illegal currency transactions. The employee, who had in the meanwhile taken a job with another Defense contractor, was thereupon discharged.

6. IGA inspectors visiting the port of Qui Nhon invited the attention of AID to three barges which had been standing idle for almost a year. Steps were taken to send the barges to Saigon and put them to work.

7. IGA developed information showing that a Vietnamese businessman had been trying to buy howitzer tubes or anti-aircraft gun barrels under the commercial import program. Steps were taken to guard against the possibility of strengthening the military arsenals of the Viet Cong through the transactions in question.

8. AID-financed goods going to Viet-Nam under the commercial important program are supposed to be resold on the Vietnamese economy, through normal commercial outlets. Such goods have been marked with the standard AID emblem. Seeing the goods on sale in Vietnamese stores, many have thought—understandably but wrongly—that they were stolen or diverted. IGA recommended that goods intended to be resold commercially should be marked "May be resold in Viet-Nam." This is now being done.

9. An expensive synthetic yarn was entering Viet-Nam under the AID-financed commercial import program. IGA believed that the product was too expensive to merit AID-financing. Shortly thereafter, the price was substantially reduced by the manufacturer, and after representations from AID, reduced still further. Savings will approximate $200,000 per year.

10. IGA reported that $1 million worth of Dutch guilders, generated under early assistance programs to The Netherlands, were still earmarked for use in demagnetizing ships of the Dutch merchant marine. IGA recommended that we enter into negotiations with The Netherlands, toward the end of freeing these guilders for uses more in line with United States national policy objectives. An agreement was then reached with The Netherlands whereby these monies would be used to support a U.N. social studies project at Switzerland and whereby, in return, the Dutch would contribute, through the U.N., $1 million worth of guilders for social development projects in Viet-Nam.

USE OF EXCESS LOCAL CURRENCIES FOR AIR TRAVEL

IGA pointed out that an AID manual order requiring the use of excess or near-excess foreign currencies for buying airline tickets had overlooked dependents of AID contractor personnel. The order was thereupon amended to include them.

CHEAPER BAGS FOR FERTILIZER

Industry representatives collected data showing that specifications for AID-financed fertilizer bags resulted in unnecessarily expensive packaging. Congressional quarters credited the "speedy action" of IGA with contributing to a decision to buy less expensive bags. Savings to the taxpayer are expected to total over $1.3 million during the coming year.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED MACHINERY PROBE BEGINS TO PRODUCE RESULTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last fall the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, Senator PROXMIRE, looked into the efficacy of the controls exercised by the Pentagon over Government-owned machinery in the hands of private contractors. The amount of Federal dollars tied up in this machinery is a far from insignificant $15 billion. A General Accounting Office report had pointed up numerous instances of misuse of this equipment as well as inadequate controls over rental payments to the Government when the equipment was used for commercial work.

A recent article in Business Week indicates that the Defense Department is responding to criticisms of present machinery utilization policy by tightening up on its enforcement procedures. The ultimate beneficiary will be, of course, the American taxpayer.

As a member of the Economy in Government Subcommittee I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week article be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON LOCKS UP ITS TOOL SHED

The Pentagon is preparing tighter controls over government-owned machinery and tools on loan to defense contractors.

It plans to clear up confusion over how much such equipment may be used for commercial work without advance government approval. It also wants to re-examine the rentals it charges for such use.

The Pentagon is moving under pressure from the General Accounting Office (GAO), the auditing arm of Congress, and from the federal procurement subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.) heads both the subcommittee and full committee.

At the subcommittee's request, GAO checked into the handing of government-owned equipment at 21 defense plants and two university laboratories. The agency alleged:

Some contractors are using the machinery and tools in commercial operations without first obtaining "appropriate government approval" and without paying "equitable" rentals.

Records kept by some contractors on government equipment are not adequate to indicate the manner and the extent of use.

Some equipment sits idle for extended periods even though there are calls for similar machinery in other defense plants.

REVIEW

Initially, GAO reported its findings without naming the 23 contractors involved, because its main purpose was to review the adequacy of Pentagon equipment policies. Moreover, it checked only a small sample of the more than 5,000 contractors holding some $2.6-billion worth of government-owned machinery and tools.

But Proxmire called a news conference and named the involved contractors in order "to dramatize a bad situation." In doing so, however, he put most of the blame on the Pentagon—for laying down fuzzy regulations and laxly administering them.

As a result of Pentagon laxity, Proxmire charged, contractors have reaped windfalls by not paying adequate rentals and by overusing government equipment for commercial purposes, thereby gaining an advantage over competitors without such equipment.

Among the companies checked in the GAO inquiry were FMC Corp., Wyman-Gordon Co., Raytheon Co., Boeing Co., and TRW Inc. The University of Chicago and the University of Maryland also were involved.

Proxmire's statements touched off an immediate furor. The contractors denied wrongdoing and insisted they are operating properly within Pentagon regulations as they understand them. The Aerospace Industries Assn. (AIA) and Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris joined the contractors in a common complaint: Proxmire, they charged, had confused the public by not pointing out that the rental program—whatever faults may be found in its operation—is designed to save the taxpayers money.

SAVING CLAIMED

"By careful management of this equipment, assigning it to productive work rather than allowing it to remain idle, we have been saving the taxpayer well over $100-million per year in new equipment purchases during the past four years," Morris said.

Morris blasted Proxmire for portraying a "$60,000 case" as one of waste amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. Morris said that in only five of the 23 cases cited by the Senator did the Pentagon find that contractors owed small additional rentals—$60,000 in all.

Nevertheless, the Pentagon acknowledges that some of the GAO complaints are valid. It plans to require contractors to keep better utilization records on government equipment, perhaps on a machine-by-machine basis, showing the extent and manner of its use. Contractors will have to do a better job of reporting excess machinery to the government so it may be shifted to needs elsewhere.

CONFUSION

The Pentagon also plans to clear up confusion over a requirement that contractors first get approval before employing government equipment for "more than 25% non-government use." The Pentagon will clarify whether this means 25% of the actual production time, as GAO insists, or 25% of the time the equipment is available, as contractors now interpret the provision.

In addition, the Pentagon is considering revising the basis for determining rentals on government equipment. GAO complained that rates are not uniformly applied and are not computed on a machine-by-machine basis.

GAO also took the Pentagon to task for not vigorously following its own proclaimed policy of encouraging contractors to spend their own money to replace old, inefficient government-owned equipment. At the agency's suggestion, contractors will hereafter have to state specifically when they seek new government equipment that they are either unable or unwilling to finance the modernization themselves. Defense officials then check to see whether the contractors are justified in their claim.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this month citizens of Lithuanian descent observe two anniversaries of great significance.

Seven hundred and fifteen years ago the Lithuanians established an independent state which preserved its freedom for many centuries, despite the aggressive ambitions of powerful neighbors.

Finally, in 1795, Russia annexed Lithuania, and not until World War I had ended—not until the Lithuanian people had undergone a harrowing occupation by the Germans—could they again establish an independent state. The date was February 16, 1918, 50 years ago.

The period of independence that followed was a progressive era in Lithuania's history. There was advancement on many fronts: in agriculture and industry, transportation, finance, education, and culture. But this period came to an end in June 1940, when Soviet Russia occupied the Baltic States. Since that time, the deportations, the unnecessary loss of life, and curtailment of freedom in these states have been unconscionable.

Mr. President, in this month of February, it is fitting that we mark these two anniversaries by recognizing the hope of free men everywhere for liberty and self-government. May they become a reality for all the peoples of the world.

REPORT OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Arlen Specter, district attorney of Philadelphia, is one of the outstanding law-enforcement officers in American today. "The 1967 Report to the People of Philadelphia From the Office of the District Attorney" points out that while general major crime increased across the Nation by 11 percent in 1966, FBI statistics showed that the major crime rate in Philadelphia was reduced by 6.4 percent in that same year.

Preliminary figures for the first 9 months of 1967 indicate a further decrease of four-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. Specter's concluding chapter in his report speaks eloquently of the need for law enforcement and the protection of individual rights.

I ask unanimous consent that this chapter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ultimate goal of law enforcement is to stop crime. This objective is promoted by (1) certainty of apprehension; (2) prompt trials; (3) appropriate punishment; and (4) adequate rehabilitation.

REDUCING POLICE TIME IN COURT

The administration of criminal justice must seek new ways to minimize the time spent by the police officer in the courtroom, so that he may devote his time to fighting crime on the street. During the past year, the District Attorney's Office liberated thousands of hours of police time by drastically curtailing police appearances before the grand jury. It was concluded that sufficient evidence could be presented for grand jury purposes in most cases by having a single officer testify from police reports.

In addition, there were more than four thousand lesser offenses tried in the Minor Case Program on stipulated testimony without requiring police officers' appearance. The Police Court Appearance Control Section, initiated by the District Attorney's Detective Bureau in 1967, saved additional police time by eliminating court appearances when the cases were otherwise not triable.

As a corollary, this Office has counselled the police on how to comply with the complex decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Guidelines have been circulated on subjects such as search and seizure, confessions, line-ups and other decisions relating to gathering evidence. When there is a failure to execute a search warrant properly or obtain other evidence in conformity with the constitution, there are defense openings which create additional pre-trial proceedings or prolong the trial itself. Guidance on the law, so that the police officer knows how to acquire the evidence, reduces his time in court. And, more importantly, successful prosecutions are not jeopardized by the exclusion of important evidence.

Through constant cooperation and daily contact, this Office and the Police Department are working out new ways for better counselling of the police and for minimizing the time which the officer must spend in court.

PROMPT TRIAL

Prompt trials are a vitally important factor in combating crime. Except in cases of murder in the first degree, every defendant has the constitutional right to bail pending trial. Prolonged time between a charge and trial is obviously undesirable, from both the view of society in general and the defendant in particular. The constitution guarantees each defendant the right to a speedy trial. Similarly, the administration of criminal justice should guarantee the community that the guilty will be convicted and sentenced with appropriate dispatch.

To obtain prompt administration of criminal justice, Philadelphia is urgently in need of a new court structure. During the past decade criminal trials have become substantially more complex. New decisions have enormously increased pretrial litigation. Expanded procedural safeguards have protracted the trial process. Appellate matters have increased by 1600 per cent in the past ten years. Recent decisions have compelled this Office to re-try some cases older than the trial prosecutor.

Judicial reform is indispensable if the administration of criminal justice is to keep pace with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Philadelphia needs consolidation of trial courts, a senior judge bill, more judges and additional courtrooms. Similarly, a new minor judicial structure is urgently required to replace the corrupt and inefficient Magistrates' Courts of Philadelphia. With lawyers presiding in a new Minor Court of Record, many lesser offenses could be tried immediately in order to reduce the backlog on the Court of Quarter Sessions. The Court could then concentrate its efforts on prompt dispositions on the more serious charges.

TOUGH SENTENCES AND DETERRENCE

During the past two years, the courts have cooperated with police and prosecutor by imposing tough sentences where warranted by the facts. More can be done, in the opinion of this Office, but a decisive improvement has been noted. An atmosphere has been created which makes it known to would-be offenders that severe penalties are likely to follow conviction for crimes of violence.

Evidence of this atmosphere comes from a number of sources. There have been increased demands for jury trials with the knowledge that the prosecution will insist on a substantial sentence after conviction. The 1967 report from the District Attorney's Detective Bureau contains this observation:

"According to detectives assigned to return these fugitives and their conversations with these defendants, it was apparent that the increase of persons taking flight to avoid prosecution was the District Attorney's 'Get tough policy' on persons charged with criminal violations, especially those who may have had prior convictions."

Effective deterrence is further indicated by the reduction of the major crime rate in Philadelphia while it has increased in the rest of the nation. In 1966, the major crime rate rose eleven per cent around the nation. It declined 6.4 per cent in Philadelphia. The most recent Federal Bureau of Investigation figures show that in the first nine months of 1967, the major crime rate declined an additional .4 per cent in Philadelphia while it increased in the nation as a whole by sixteen per cent.

Rape offenses dropped significantly during April, May and June of 1966 while there was substantial public attention on that crime because the courts were imposing heavy sentences at the same time the General Assembly was considering a new law on penalty. During those three months, reported rape offenses totalled 114 compared with 155 for April, May and June of 1965. Continued emphasis on the prosecution of rape cases has been marked by an increase in the conviction rate and a reduction in the number of rape offenses.

REHABILITATION

Finally, to complete the picture of crime prevention, the community must devote appropriate resources to the rehabilitation process. Except in a relatively small number of cases, it is a reasonable expectation that those convicted will one day return to society. It is folly to spend so much time and effort to catch and convict and so little time to curing. Our rehabilitation facilities are far behind the times.

In a long-term effort to improve this situation, extensive legislative proposals have been suggested by this Office. The public spotlight was focused on the defective delinquents in 1966 when there were mass releases from the Correctional Institution at Dallas. A comprehensive plan has been proposed to deal with such defectives. Similarly, a rehabilitation program has been proposed for those exhibiting assaultive characteristics including the sex offenders.

A key aspect of crime prevention involves care and attention for the juvenile offenders. This Office has recommended extensive legislation to satisfy the legal requirements of *Gault* and to meet the equally-pressing problem of appropriate care for juveniles.

A substantial volume of crime is caused by the user of narcotics or other dangerous drugs. Efforts of the District Attorney's Citizens Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Addiction, coordinated with other civic agencies, may be on the brink of success in bringing a residential treatment center for drug addicts to eastern Pennsylvania.

Similarly, medical treatment rather than punishment is urgently required for alcoholics. By the time of publication of the next Annual Report by the District Attorney's Office, it is likely that the Supreme Court of the United States will have imposed new standards on the way law enforcement may deal with alcoholics. Through the efforts of a number of civic agencies, the Police Department and this Office, a program has been formulated to reverse the revolving door in order to provide appropriate medical care rather than the inappropriate tank of confinement for habitual alcoholics. When it is noted that almost half of the arrests in Philadelphia are for intoxication, it is obvious that such a program is needed not only in the name of humanity, but also to liberate the police officer to spend his time combating crimes of violence.

There is no more important problem facing our nation or our city than law enforcement. For society, it means law and order on the streets. For each man, it means protection of his individual rights. By looking forward to the goals of the future, as well as concentrating on the immediate problems of the present, the job can be done.

MONEY GOES ELECTRONIC IN THE 1970'S

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the January 13, 1968, issue of Business Week contains an extremely interesting article entitled "Money Goes Electronic in the 1970's." The article goes into great detail about the potential for arriving at an era which is commonly referred to as the checkless, cashless society."

My Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure held hearings last year on the subject of "Computer Privacy." Recently, we resumed hearings on this same subject, and began to explore this checkless, cashless society from the standpoint of the loss of individuality—or privacy—which will, no doubt, affect the American citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY GOES ELECTRONIC IN THE 1970's

Money, as Emerson once said, represents the prose rather than the poetry of life. Yet to many people, few things are more dearly personal: Knowledge of a man's bank account is like a thrust into his heart.

Consequently, even the business of banking manages to capture the public's imagination once every couple of generations. The last time was in the 1930s, when a device known as the "bank failure" attracted long lines of people.

Today, the banks are stirring public interest again, but in a different way. Cocktail party lawyers are arguing that if a mistaken bank computer denies an account holder's identity, a court may rule against him because the computer is more reliable. Elderly widows are writing to local newspaper columnists to ask how they will be able to live when banks abolish checks. And in the Midwest, some churches have staged credit card burnings on the ground that so much credit is sinful.

In reality, computers haven't been in court yet, checks will be around for many years and the churches may or may not be right. But if the public seems a bit madcap, so, in the late 1960s, do the banks.

Soul searching. Myriad credit cards have been flooding the mails. Consumer, corporate, and retailing services are proliferating. Computer programmers are working on scores of projects—all in relative ignorance of what the other fellow is up to. And banking's top management is immersed in orgies of soul searching.

The reason for all this is that the banking industry now faces profound change: It is poised on the edge of a futuristic era of superautomation and supercredit variously called "Moneyless Banking" or the "Checkless, Cashless Society."

Bankers have lately taken to calling it, more accurately, a "less-check, less-cash society." But by whatever name, what they mean is a nationwide electronic payment and bookkeeping network in which computer blips replace most checks and currency.

Shock waves. The topic is No. 1 on nearly every banker's lips. Even so, they are hardly aware of the shock waves they are setting in motion. Moreover, given banking's tendency to back into change like a confused centipede, the steps are halting, the mood uneasy.

Paperwork threatens to paralyze banking's present network for transferring funds. Radical alteration in this central nervous system will bring a thorough overhaul in bank operations and will precipitate deep changes in the nature of money itself. But the repercussions of an upheaval so vast among the nation's 14,000 banks, which hold more than $400-billion in deposits, won't stop there. Among the changes coming in the next two decades:

A single identification card will replace cash in all but a few minor transactions.

Credit will become more readily available, changing many buying and borrowing habits. Also, hidden interest rates, now masquerading as such things as cash discounts, will emerge, and people will be encouraged to play rates much as housewives play supermarket sales.

Banking's "float" will disappear. Common tactics to get free short-term loans, such as overdrawing checking accounts for two or three days, will vanish. Similarly, corporate cash managers will have to devise new investment strategies for their surpluses when the "time value" of all money will have its price tag and idle funds become an anachronism.

Economists will devise new indicators based on daily statistics from computers. And the Federal Reserve Board will find more specific and effective methods to steer the nation's credit.

Service fees will provide the banks with an increasingly larger share of their profits, including fees for services yet undreamed of. Asks Norman McClave, Jr., a senior vice-president of Chicago's Northern Trust Co.: "Are we a banking system or a communications system, or some weird combination of the two?"

Banks will move into collision courses with other industries. Battles have already been joined with the insurance industry, accountants, investment bankers, mutual funds, loan companies, retailers, and service bureaus. Soon banks may clash with communications and publishing companies, computer makers, and perhaps with the Federal Communications Commission. The stake: regional computer utilities of integrated finance, information, and time-sharing services.

Public and political outcries will arise over whether computerized credit ratings and data storage encroach on individual rights.

New concepts of banking regulation will evolve.

STEMMING THE FLOOD

The slogans, if catchy, are misleading. Money won't vanish in Moneyless Banking; coins, some currency, and probably some checks will persist in the Checkless, Cashless Society.

Cash will endure for two reasons. One, there will always be roasted chestnut vendors and people who hawk umbrellas in the rain; they just can't operate with charge cards and bank accounts. Two, people will pay cash for small items for the same reason they don't write checks to buy chewing gum: The bank service charge would double the price.

In a broad sense, however, money has become merely financial information. The change to come is in the transportation of it.

Money now travels almost exclusively by paper (dollar bills, checks, credit card slips, drafts). These billions of pieces of paper are in turn hauled by messengers, trucks, and airplanes all over the country. While passing through scores of hands, even more paper is generated (bills, invoices, notices of insufficient funds, loan applications, deposit slips, withdrawal slips, statements). Banking's pipeline is about to choke on paper.

Avalanche of checks. According to a study made for the Federal Reserve by the Stanford Research Institute, nearly 20-billion checks—just checks—moved through the banking pipeline last year. It cost the banks, account holders, and the Fed $3.7-billion to put these checks through some 20 different operations—from sorting and transporting them to stuffing them into envelopes along with monthly statements. Check volume will double in the next decade, and handling costs are likely to increase even faster as the system gets more jammed.

Computers are no newcomers to this scene; they have helped speed up the Great Paper Shuffle in banks' back rooms for the past decade. Testimony to this is the set of odd numbers on the bottom of checks—the Magnetic Ink Character Recognition (MICR) system which the Fed made obligatory for commercial banks last fall. But the computers haven't diminished the amount of paper a whit.

Pressures. Behind the paper flood is the shift in the industry's center of attention since World War II: It has moved away from wholesaling services for big, exclusive clients to retailing them for the public. The banks' courtship of consumers has been encouraged by continual pressure on the "spread" between what banks pay for money and what they charge to lend it. The pressures come from the increasingly competitive capital markets, and from the growing savvy of corporate money managers who hate to leave funds sitting in interest-free demand deposits. For their profits, the banks have had to move deeper into consumer loans, where rates run up to 18% a year.

The ordinary citizen has thus emerged as a major market for credit in a snowballing consumer economy. This means that banks are doing money puzzles with ever smaller and more numerous pieces—packaging minute savings balances into giant loans for corporations, and distributing fly-speck loans to thousands of John Does. It would be a slow, agonizing, and squinty-eyed game—without computers.

The vital link

Enter the third-generation computers. They are more than high-speed paper shufflers; they have huge memories and message-switching abilities that enable them to communicate. But systems designers feel it's not enough just to move the financial data called money from back to bank electronically. Paper originates during transactions, and the more people (writing checks, filling out deposit slips, keypunching data cards) get between the transaction and the computer, the greater is the chance for errors and breakdowns in the system.

The solution, argue the systems designers, is to bring the computer right into the transaction. Paper could be jettisoned entirely if terminals—all linked to bank computers—were installed in stores, homes, and offices. A transaction in the Checkless, Cashless Society would be merely an entry, tapped out in a twinkling, on, say, a Touch-Tone telephone device.

National hookup. On this concept, visionary bankers and computer experts want to build a nationwide electronic network of instantaneous bookkeeping and financial services that would be connected with everybody, much as the telephone network is now. The computer would become an omnipresent, indispensable "third man" in the exchange of money.

Such a system would cut 5¢ or more from the 13¢ it now costs to process a check, according to W. P. Livingston, a vice-president of New York's Bankers Trust Co. and chairman of the American Bankers Assn.'s committee on payment systems. Further, banks often extend credit in the course of transferring payments (for instance, when an account is overdrawn), and this can double the processing cost. All told, says John J. Clarke, a vice-president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and an authority on electronic banking, "A direct funds transfer system in 1975 could at best save 17½¢ per transaction on average."

MAKING A START

It's amazing how close the banking industry is to the Checkless Society now. "We've had parts of our business society operating on a checkless basis for some time," says Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.'s John P. LaWare, marketing vice-president. "So it's clear that we're not being driven into the Checkless Society by the computer, but that we're pushing the computer into delivering us that kind of society."

Numerous savings institutions already have computer terminals that enable tellers to process deposits, withdrawals, and mortgage payments automatically. The Bank of St. Louis has established an "on-line" empire of sorts: To update savings and mortgage accounts instantly, it has hooked to its computer 59 banks, savings & loan associations, and credit unions as far away as 250 miles.

Most large commercial banks have been doing payroll computations for companies for years. The banks still cut paychecks, but for about 4% of the population—mostly top executives—they will deposit the paycheck or send it to another bank. The step to crediting accounts automatically, without cutting a check, is an easy one.

Customer services. Since 1965, San Francisco's Wells Fargo Bank has been hooking branches to its computer center with a system for verifying customers' checks. The teller uses a Touch-Tone phone device made by Bell Telephone and gets a voice response from the computer. Now Wells Fargo is converting to printouts that will show a customer's entire bank relationship, including data on savings accounts, Christmas Club deposits, and loans. The bank hopes to have all of its 220 branches connected by Teletype by the end of the year. Similar projects are under way all over the country.

Some bankers have taken the next big step: pre-authorized payments, whereby customers give their banks standing instructions to pay recurring bills automatically. Banks in Philadelphia, Louisville, and Canton (Ohio) have started such programs with local electric utilities. The difficulty is enticing customers to participate without offering them some discount for paying instantly—a device many insurance companies have used for years.

Trial runs

An Opinion Research Corp. survey has found that telephone banking and automatic loan payments are particularly fertile areas for banks to explore. Beyond that, banks are still largely in the dark about customer incentives and preferences. Clarke of the New York Fed says that "no one really knows what he's talking about" when it comes to electronic bank services "until we run some pilots."

The American Bankers Assn. has been scouting communities all over the country to find sites where merchants and bankers will agree to a trial. Two possibilities: Waterbury, Conn., and Worcester, Mass.

The only real pilot project so far was an intriguing nine-month experiment by the Bank of Delaware. Though relatively small ($165-million in deposits), the bank was one of the first in the country to put all its accounts into a central computer.

Experiment. The bank connected five Wilmington shoe stores to its computer by specially-equipped telephones. It then selected 200 of its customers who frequented the stores and gave each a plastic card with coded holes that could be "read" by the phones.

The computer kept the books for the stores, but did no automatic transferring of funds; it merely billed the customers each month. Walter E. Trabbold, vice-president and comptroller, who instigated the program, hopes eventually to include additional shops and doctors and to verify credit, post transactions, compute salesmen's commissions, and the sales analyses and inventory control.

The plans of the American Bankers Assn., under the guidance of its director of automation, Dale L. Reistad, are more ambitious. Reistad, who epitomizes the industry's bright new breed, wants to try a Checkless Society in miniature—in effect, seal off an entire town as much as possible, tie it all together with electronics, start some services, and see what happens.

Lots of towns seem willing; so are computer hardware and software suppliers and Bell Telephone. But the ABA is stumbling on a familiar problem: money. ABA's Livingston estimates that a pilot will cost from $2-million to $5-million—or roughly the entire annual dues income of the association.

Death of a gimmick

An important victim of an electronic fund transfer system will be banking's "float"—the millions of dollars in transit among banks on any given day. Many people "play the float" regularly by writing checks for money that isn't in their accounts and covering the overdraft two or three days later. In effect, this creates an interest-free loan. Many merchants and small businesses survive on this.

As George W. Mitchell, one of the Fed's seven governors and a leading apostle of electronic banking, explains it, the game is to collect fast and pay slow. "Some people," he notes, "want their checks to go by dogsled."

Useful lag. Corporations use the time lag in the pipeline, too, though in more sophisticated ways. For example, a cash manager with accounts around the country might switch balances by depositing out-of-town checks—thereby doubling his money while the checks navigate the pipeline—and then invest in Treasury bills, say, over the weekend or even overnight. Such maneuvers account for a significant slice of net earnings for many companies.

In theory, this surreptitious borrowing costs banks a lot of money. In fact, from $1-billion to $2-billion of float is in the Fed's own pipeline each day, enabling the banks to play the same game with their Fed accounts.

It won't be easy for the public, business, or the banks themselves to give up the cherished institution of float. But computers will eliminate it by making payments instantly and keeping close tabs on deferred payments. Eventually, the time value of all money in an electronic economy will have its price: Every postponed payment will become a loan.

Unsettling. This will have some interesting repercussions. For instance, universal interest rates will put great pressure on banks to give bonuses on amounts left in demand deposits, or to drop the distinction between demand and savings accounts entirely. Interest on demand deposits, however, was banned by banking reforms of the 1930s: It was considered one of the many causes of that era's bank failures.

Obviously, the public must be educated in the ways of electronic money. On the one hand, is the vast majority of people who have bought the banks' 30-year sales pitch on the convenience and record-keeping value of checks. On the other are the people who staunchly avoid or misuse bank services: Those who keep their money in mattresses, or pay all bills in cash, or who are afraid of loans and charge accounts. Also in this group are the debt addicts; last year, 191,709 people filed for personal bankruptcy because their debts got out of hand.

Security problems

Because of bad debts and frauds, an automatic payment and loan network will require built-in protection that is both automatic and foolproof. The problem of verifying a cardholder's identity poses a major technological challenge to the Checkless Society.

A score or more companies are working on a variety of techniques. They include such giants as Polaroid, IBM, RCA, Control Data, and Addressograph-Multigraph, as well as smaller outfits such as Sibany Mfg. Co., Cybernetics Development, Inc., Iden Corp., ICV, Inc., Creative Patent & Licensing, R. D. Products, Inc., Dashew Business Machines, Rushell Systems (a joint venture of Sheller-Globe Corp. and Rusco Industries), and Sprague Electric Co.

The potential market is enormous: Besides the credit industry, everyone from airlines and Pinkerton's to a slew of government agencies, including the CIA, is interested in personal identification systems.

Checking credit. Another key security topic is personal credit ratings. These, too, will have to be computerized for quick and automatic access. Dark issues lurk here.

As a whole, the retail credit bureau industry—which is mostly controlled by local stores—has yet to come of age. In many cities, credit files are incomplete. There are few, if any, controls on who examines the files or how the data are interpreted.

To develop a model computer system for this largely backward field, the Associated Credit Bureaus of America is helping to underwrite a system at Dallas' Credit Bureau Services, one of a six-state chain of 45 bureaus owned by Dallas' Chilton family.

Another company is way out ahead, though, and frankly wants to build a nationwide empire. Los Angeles' Credit Data Corp., which is not owned by stores and has had computers for two years, serves banks, retailers, and oil and loan companies throughout California. It will soon automate in Detroit, and it has already put down roots in New York.

"The safe extension of credit, until now, has been limited by the ability to get accurate performance data," says Dr. Harry C. Jordan, president of Credit Data. "The credit bureau industry has not kept pace, with automation." In New York, Credit Data won the contract to design an on-line credit check system for banks serving some 19-million people in the metropolitan area. In the process it beat out some interesting competitors, including Ultronic Systems Corp., Dun & Bradstreet, and Western Union.

Squeeze. Some bankers feel the credit bureau business is a natural adjunct of their operations. Finance companies, for their part, are terrified: They fear that if banks take over the credit file and information exchange field, it will be the first step toward eliminating loan companies altogether. Finance companies are already getting pinched by the banks' moves into consumer credit. C.I.T. Financial Corp. was the first to start hedging its bets. In 1965, it bought New York's Meadow Brook National Bank, which in turn bought Bank of North America last year (and changed its own name to National Bank of North America).

Visions of 1984

Outside the credit industry there is considerable concern over the extent to which on-line computer systems will breach individual privacy. A storm is already brewing over the proposed National Data Center in Maryland, which would combine the files of all government agencies into one accessible memory core.

Certainly there are some serious questions still to be answered about the future of personal, computerized ratings. What, for instance, should go into an accurate measure of a man's financial responsibility: How much he drinks? Who is to have access to the data? Will a person be alerted whenever someone examines his file? Will he be told who is investigating him? What recourse will he have if there is an error in the system?

Controls. The solution to these problems lies, of course, in the computer itself. Complex controls of the most unbeatable sort can be programmed into an electronic network. By way of contrast, there are no controls over today's manual filing systems nor over the guesswork that goes into judging a man's credit worthiness. Indeed, the public is hardly aware that retail credit bureaus exists at all.

No one grasps the importance of controls better than Professor R. M. Fano, who heads Project MAC at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. MAC is the mammoth model-building effort that will eventually yield a prototype for regional computer utilities. Fano believes that the utilities' systems "may well have long-lasting effects on the character, composition, and intellectual life of a community." He warns: "Once a system starts evolving preferentially in certain particular directions, work in those directions will be favored."

Fano and others who share his concern thus feel that great care and foresight must go into building credit information networks. Many young systems designers tend to be exclusively interested in efficiency. The danger is not so much of evil, but of miscalculation.

CREDIT CARD MESS

All these problems, from consumer preferences to security measures, are enough to make many bankers yearn to retire. But then there's the credit card miasma.

A nationwide electronic bookkeeping network will require a standardized financial identification card and numbering system. Social Security cards might prove adaptable. But first the banking industry and its credit card competitors must sit down to hard talks on an imposing question: Can we get there from here?

Scars of competition. The credit card scene is now a nightmare. The rivalries are multidimensional—not only among banks, but between the banks and retailers, oil companies, car renters, airlines, and food stores. Either cataclysmic shakeouts or considerable compromises must come if the Checkless Society is to follow.

There's nothing new about retail credit cards; they have existed since the 1930s. Then early in the 1950s, several tiny but progressive banks took the industry's first plunge into "charge account" arrangements with small stores: Paterson, N.J.'s Paterson Savings & Trust Co., Franklin National Bank on Long Island, and Preston State Bank in Dallas.

Big banks moved later in the decade. Retail credit card plans designed by Philadelphia's Girard Trust Bank and New York's Chase Manhattan failed utterly. California's Bank of America, Georgia's Citizens & Southern, and New York's Marine Midland suffered staggering costs, large credit losses, and general operational chaos—but survived. This is the card game's traditional baptism of fire; those plans are now hip-deep in profits.

Bandwagon. In the last two years, everyone and his uncle started cards. By the Fed's last count, 627 banks were offering plans. The amount of credit outstanding under these cards is fast approaching $1-billion.

Every bank, of course, hopes its card will become the one everyone in the country will eventually carry. So far, the Bank of America, the world's largest bank, seems to have gotten a jump by franchising its BankAmericard to other banks. The card is now carried by more than 5-million people in 18 states, and BofA is heading overseas. Its card is now interchangeable with Britain's Barclaycard, run by Barclays Bank, and BofA agents are exploring the Continent.

The bank's head start has the rest of

the industry running scared. The threat, though, may be a blessing in disguise. "Banks are notorious for not working together," notes Franklin Stockbridge, senior vice-president for marketing of Los Angeles' Security-First National. Yet industry-wide cooperation is a basic prerequisite for any national electronics payment system. Until now, the MICR numbering system on checks was the only evidence that banks could agree on anything. But now some interesting alliances have sprung up.

In California, for example, 79 banks have banded together to issue their own Master Charge Card. Led by four majors—United California, Wells Fargo, Bank of California, and Crocker-Citizens—the group has formed a clearinghouse for their network, the California Bankcard Assn. Combined, their card carriers nearly equal BofA's 2.4-million card holders in California.

Chicago, too, has seen a measure of cooperation. Late in 1966, First National of Chicago, Harris Trust & Savings, and Central National—plus their correspondents in three states—organized an interchangeable card and clearinghouse system under the name Midwest Bank Card. Two others—Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. and the Pullman Bank & Trust Co. group—decided to stick with their own cards.

Big scramble. Just before Christmas, 1966, the big race started: All the banks hit the mails with 5-million cards. Armed with sheaves of mailing lists, many overlapping, they indiscriminately sent the cards all over the lot in an attempt to get a piece of the juicy holiday sales.

The ensuing tale is shattering. The postal system clogged; cards disappeared; frauds swept the city. Amateur swindlers teamed up and roamed the stores, buying goods under the $50 limit (above that price the stores checked with the banks). Banks' losses were huge: Harris Trust's second-quarter earnings in 1967 plunged 9.1%. By July, the partners in Midwest Bank Card had to recall all their cards, revamp their system, and send out new cards by registered mail.

New dimension. Still another alliance is developing, one that already has national dimensions and could ultimately dwarf BofA's licensing network. Marine Midland Corp., the Buffalo holding company that has 11 banks in New York State, has instigated a plan whereby many banks around the U.S. would honor each other's cards. All the cards bear an "I" for "Interbank Card."

The genie behind the scheme is Marine Midland Executive Vice-President Karl Hinke who presides over Interbank, Inc. So far the other banks include all 79 in California's Master Charge group, plus banks in Oregon, Wisconsin, Arizona, and Pittsburgh's Mellon National and rival Pittsburgh National. Others, such as the Midwest Card group, have been talking to Hinke. Banks in Boston, Baltimore, and Louisville, may join soon.

Challenge. Marine Midland still has a tough nut to crack: the New York City market, where the only bank charge card is First National City's Everything Card. Citibank learned from the Chicago debacle: It sent out only 1-million cards in August to its best credit risks, and limited the mailing to two to a customer. Still, the cards were unsolicited, and many New Yorkers faced the problem of whether to try to burn them or chop them up in the meatgrinder.

Marine Midland Grace Trust Co., one of Marine Midland's holdings, doesn't want to tackle a market as vast and complex as New York by itself. It has been studying a joint card plan, originally with four other banks. Two—Bankers Trust and Irving Trust—have since dropped out; they don't want to start a credit card under any circumstances. Manufacturers Hanover Trust and Chemical Bank New York Trust are still in, but the study is suspended while Chemical looks over another plan offered by Uni-Serv, Chase's old family-service card that American Express Co. eventually picked up in 1965.

Amexco has also tied its prestigious travel card into 217 bank schemes to give cardholders the option of postponing payments beyond Amexco's own 30-day limit. The banks print their own logos on the back of American Express' familiar gladiatorial vignette and offer revolving "Executive Credit" lines of $2,000 and up. That way the lenders get action in the travel and entertainment field, where Americans splurge $30-billion a year. American Express, meantime, stays out of the banking business, keeps its cash free, and avoids loan risks. Rival Diners' Club has failed to get a similar bank plan off the ground—though it services one Eastern bank card behind the scenes.

The travel card companies don't expect much bank card competition. They are betting that retail cards will stay in the hands of housewives, while their market is the bon vivant and expense account crowd. Even in an economy of universal electronic payments, where retail and travel cards could become interchangeable, the travel card companies feel they are invulnerable. One reason is that if banks try to offer worldwide services to low and middle income customers, they say, the banks will get smeared with bad debts.

Setting restrictions

Following the proliferation of bank cards, numerous states have passed or are considering credit card legislation, both criminal and civil, to protect consumers. After the Chicago fiasco, for instance, Illinois decided that a cardholder's liability was nil if he lost an unsolicited card, but that he was responsible for the first $75 worth of fraud if he had asked for the lost card. And in Washington, Representative Wright Patman (D-Tex.), a solitary but persistent banking gadfly who chairs the House Banking Committee, introduced a bill last August that would ban unsolicited cards and put ceilings on the debt that can be charged to them.

The public has devices of its own, besides the fire and meatgrinder. Groups in California and the Midwest have started "cash card" movements to pressure merchants into giving them discounts. If the merchant pays a bank 3% to 5% on a credit card sale, they argue, why can't cash customers get the same discount? They feel strongly that cash customers are subsidizing the advent of the Cashless Society.

ANOTHER APPROACH

The banking industry itself is split over credit cards. Another school, of which the leading adherents are Los Angeles' Security-First National and New York's Chase Manhattan, prefers to issue "check guarantee" cards in conjunction with personal lines of credit that allow a customer to overdraw his account—at, of course, the omnipresent interest rate of 1% to 1½% a month. A variation on this is First National Bank of Boston's Bancardchek, which works like traveler's checks with a bank identification card thrown in.

This approach, which has attracted several banks, including New York's Irving Trust and Bankers Trust, isn't necessarily anti-Checkless Society; it may well prove to be simply another road up the same mountain. Nevertheless, a feud is on.

Proponents of credit cards argue that banks may as well start weaning the public from checks now. And they feel that with a credit card they may be able to get to the 35% of the population that has never had a checking account. These people aren't all hobos and hippies; they include more than 3-million families with annual incomes over $7,000.

The check-guarantee school's philosophy is to build flexible new services on the checking system, rather than to replace checks themselves. They have some big arguments:

Banks make more money, points out Security-First National's Stockbridge, by not maintaining two parallel systems, one for checks and one for credit cards.

Credit cards don't eliminate paper—they increase it. And paradoxically, they increase check volume, too. Charles A. Agemian, executive vice-president of Chase and one of the most caustic critics of banks' credit card binges (which he marks down to "herd instinct"), argues that for the most part, credit card sales replace cash sales, and the bills are eventually paid by check. Of course, check-guarantee plans replace some cash sales, too.

Guaranteed checks and overdraft privileges make the step to pre-authorized payments an easier one, says Harold B. Hassinger, executive vice-president of Boston's First National. That's because the customer needn't have the cash in his account at the time.

Big department stores with their own cards have so far given no indication that they'll ever agree to join bank card plans.

Stumbling block. This last fact could prove an enormous stumbling block for the banks, and has played a large role in past failures of bank cards. For instance, when Minneapolis' two largest banks, Northwestern and First National, tried cards in 1958, "the experience was horrendous," remembers Philip B. Harris, Northwestern's executive vice-president. None of the city's "big five" merchants—Dayton's, Sears, Penney, Donaldson's and Wards—would participate. Yet the "big five" control a major chunk of the city's retail market. The banks, which could only sign up small stores, lost their shirts and finally sold off the card plans in 1960 to Economy Finance Corp. of Indianapolis.

The fact is, big department stores have a big banking business of their own going—which they aren't likely to relinquish easily.

Whether they make much direct profit on it is another matter. They clean up on revolving and installment accounts (on which they charge interest), and lose heavily on 30-day charge plans (on which they don't). Sums up Richard Sprague of Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, the accountants that specialize in the retailing industry: "Most retailers lose money over-all on their credit business." Two big exceptions: Sears and Penney.

TRB&S, along with Booz, Allen & Hamilton, are leading accountants to the banking industry, too. Some day, they may find themselves chief mediators between the two giants. But it will be a tough job.

The holdouts

Retailers know there's more to their card plans than just interest rates. For one, cards give them an identity and image in the shopper's pocketbook: A woman with a Macy's card goes to Macy's—and often comes back, in person, to pay the bill, which increases sales all the more. Secondly, retailers who care about customer relations don't want some cold, snobbish banker in the middle if something goes wrong. Thirdly, they consider the information in their customer files pure gold for sales analyses and mail promotions.

All this makes department stores less eager to join in a single system than other industries with cards—oil companies, for example. Mobil has begun accepting bank cards: Though Mobil must pay the banks' discount, the cards vastly increase its service station business. Shell accepts Bank-Americard in California.

Grocery chains are more stubborn holdouts—and are contemplating their own charge plans. Only St. Louis's Mercantile Trust Co. has gained a toehold in this field: It has tied some food stores to its computer to identify customers' credit and check-cashing cards. Meantime, some department stores with established cards are now eying their small specialty food departments and are considering a counter-offensive against the banks: expanding their food departments to supermarket size.

Some industries are vehemently against cards altogether, including vending machine makers, into whose products the public drops some 90-million coins a day. But even these ranks aren't solid. Canteen Corp. has come up with a machine that takes credit cards.

A LOOK AHEAD

Whatever happens with credit cards, other moves can definitely be plotted within the next decade. For one, the Fed will begin tying its computers to those of big-city banks. It's already considering a satellite for transmissions among its own regional offices. This project might well evolve into a Comsat-style company, with communications companies, hardware suppliers, and perhaps the public sharing ownership.

Meantime, commercial banks will plunge into pre-authorized payments, and many retail outlets will get terminal hookups with bank computers. Within 10 years, a few people will start getting bank data phones for their homes.

New patterns. Certainly, the shape of the banking industry could undergo great changes. If bank services are as convenient as the nearest telephone, branch banking could eventually wither; in states where laws prohibit branching and many independent neighborhood banks have sprung up—such as Florida, Illinois, and the Great Plains states—telephone banking may encourage many mergers.

The cost of sophisticated computer systems will encourage mergers, too, among medium-sized urban banks. No one who understands banking, though, seriously expects all 14,000 banks to coalesce into a monolith on the order of AT&T, at least not in the few centuries. As it is, the 1966 Bank Merger Act is currently under heavy fire from the Justice Dept., and any attempted merger may get mired for years.

As for rural banks, Fed Governor Mitchell, for one, doubts they will be swallowed up because of the industry's curiously lopsided shape: A full 82% of the nation's deposits are in only 15% of the banks. That means that small-town and country banks have markets too small to entice urban giants. The small banks can still get data processing through their correspondent relationships. In some areas where rural bankers especially distrust city slickers, computer co-ops are getting under way.

Wary S&Ls. Commercial banks' cousins (and rivals), the savings banks and savings and loan associations, will have to make sure they aren't left out of an electronic payments network. New York University's Dr. Paul S. Nadler, a leading adviser to and student of banking, raises the question: "Will a savings and loan association be given the right to generate savings through automatic movement of funds from individuals' demand deposits into its own checking account [at a commercial bank]? In practice, this is no different from the automatic payment of utility bills."

Nadler hypothesizes that commercial banks, like utilities, might be "forced to act as common carriers do in the transportation business—having to accept business from any and all comers."

Will the public ever do anything but talk to computers in a Checkless Society? One of the great themes of this century is that technologies should liberate people to become more human, but that they may be dehumanizing them on the way. Most bankers are aware that their industry must seek ways to promote personal contact in an electronic banking era. George Mitchell, for instance, wonders if bankers might not become living room financial consultants, a bit like the more tactful examples of insurance agents. Many in banking foresee their business becoming more and more an advisory one.

Electronic money could present many sociological opportunities. Fano at MIT speculates about the possibility of reducing punishments for tax evasion, for example, as the odds of getting caught increase. ABA's Dale Reistad, in quiet moments, has begun to ponder ways that the lower third of the population can be taught to manage personal finances more effectively—perhaps by bankers who might be recompensed from the savings the government stands to make in a checkless system by not printing, sending, receiving, and storing the 552-million checks it now issues each year.

Monumental task. The sheer complexities of designing an electronic money economy are more than most mortal brains can bear. A certain discouragement is inevitable. "It would take thousands of man-years to convert what everyone wants to computers," says Continental Illinois' Joseph B. Fitzer.

If the banking community wants to avoid an enormous duplication of effort as everyone tries to computerize the same services independently, it may have to make some quiet deals with the Justice Dept. For this reason, some outside the industry are considering sponsoring total bank systems, predesigned, that would be leased throughout the industry.

Most big banks are likely to resist this sort of intrusion, whether it's economical or not. Extemporizing on the future of the computer utilities, which would provide many services above and beyond banking, MIT's Fano says: "The system, on the surface, must appear to the customer to be a single national system; but underneath, technically and organizationally, it doesn't have to be." On the other hand, he feels that "having a specialized system isn't economical. The private computer system will disappear faster than companies' own power plants" when public electric utilities came into being.

Who'll take charge?

No one has any idea who will inherit such a huge new industry. Certainly, those who would like to design and lease bank systems intend to stay in the running. Western Union is one; at least one computer maker is studying the angles. So far AT&T has shown no sign that it wants to provide computer power for others, but it hopes to hold onto the communications lines and to claim a major portion of the rich computer terminal field. Even publishing giants have a stake in the future of the computer utility. The question that visionary bankers are chary of voicing, but that haunts them nonetheless: Why shouldn't the banks themselves be the heirs?

Two lawsuits, little publicized, but highly significant, give some glimpse of the future. In the Twin Cities, a Minneapolis service bureau, Data Systems, Inc., teamed up with the Assn. of Data Processing Service Organizations to bring suit against St. Paul's American National Bank & Trust Co. for selling "nonbanking" computer services. In Providence, R.I., another service bureau is suing Industrial National Bank for the same reason, after the bank took over the city's ailing data processing department. The Minneapolis action was also aimed at the Comptroller of the Currency, William B. Camp, who frankly feels banks should be able to provide new services related to banking, but who refuses to be drawn into discussing legal nuances. The court threw out the case on a technical point this week.

Fading boundaries. The key word is "related," and the courts will likely be a long time untangling its meanings once they come to grips with the issue. The problem is that in a world of high-speed information, "there is no boundary that you can set that is meaningful between one activity and another," says Fano. Traditional industry demarcations are breaking down. The fact is—legal opinions aside—everything is becoming interrelated.

Banks have been performing services peripheral to their saving-lending-fund transfer business for years. All across the country, banks do payroll computations for companies, inventories, accounts payable and receivable for stores, lockbox remittance services for oil and insurance companies, realty management for landlords, accounting for doctors and dentists, and mortgage servicing for corporations.

Philadelphia's Fidelity Bank has been running a computer service bureau since 1961, now collects $1-million a year in fees. Besides performing correspondent services, it does subscription fulfillment (for several Chilton Co. publications), stock transfer work, brokerage accounting, and golf handicapping for the 26,000 members of the Golf Assn. of Philadelphia at $2.50 a head.

In Dallas, Preston State Bank, in a stratagem to gain new accounts, operates a travel agency and a ticket agency for local theatrical productions. One result: When the Beatles appeared in Dallas last year, several thousand people stormed the bank.

Helping Hand. Continental Illinois' Joseph Fitzer says that "for a good customer, we'll entertain any situation that comes to us"—but he emphasizes that the service must be "related" to some normal banking function, no matter how loosely.

The limits are fuzzy indeed, and the frictions are becoming very real. The National Assn. of Insurance Agents sued to stop Georgia's Citizen & Southern from selling insurance. In Massachusetts, a group of travel agents is suing South Shore National Bank for buying a travel agency. In New York, First National City's mutual fund, a natural extension of consumer banking and investment trust operations, has been outlawed by the courts. But Citibank is maneuvering to tie a rider to a bill in Congress to get the law changed.

Meantime, another bill has been introduced to keep banks out of the accounting field; most big accounting firms would just as soon the banks took over the drudgery of accounting so they themselves can move more deeply into management consulting—but many small accountants feel their livelihoods are threatened.

Since the 1930s, banks have been able to underwrite only Treasury securities and municipal general-obligation bonds. At the urging of the industry, the Senate Banking & Currency Committee recently passed a bill that would allow banks to underwrite tax-exempt revenue bonds, too. The bill has now reached Patman's committee in the House, and Wall Street's investment bankers are fighting it tooth and nail.

Troubling questions

Two factors set banking apart from all other industries. It can get money, in huge quantities, more cheaply than anyone else—if only by creating credit. Thus, it exercises an undeniable influence over every other inindustry in the country. Banking also is privy, as financial fiduciary, to reams of crucial information about communities, companies, and individuals.

Just what banks might do with such resources, of course, has been a subject of speculation for centuries. Indeed, in a letter to Elbridge Gerry, the Massachusetts governor and U.S. Vice-President (under Madison) whose name survives in the word "gerrymander," Thomas Jefferson once wrote that "banking institutions are more dangerous than standing armies." They have also proved themselves, over the decades, to be responsible pillars of the nation.

"Theoretically," points out Robert Chaut, president of M. A. Schapiro & Co., the leading U.S. dealer in bank securities, "the banks can do anything." That they have stuck to banking is due mostly to their long-standing conviction that to own industries or to lead nations is to flirt blindly with that capricious wench, Dame Fortune: Kings and economies may rise and fall, but the lender and his spread presumably go on forever.

Whither now? Banks are now bidding to become, in Chaut's words, "the octopi of finance." Behind the bid is a new conscience in banking, the business that helps all other companies grow. That conscience is asking an understandable, and proper, question: "Why can't banks grow, too?

It may take 20 years for all the pieces of the so-called Checkless Society to be assembled and synchronized. It may take half a century. The process will bring Olympian struggles and Olympian misunderstandings that may kill the electronic economy when it's only half way home. But, as is usual for Americans, the excitement—and the opportunities—will lie in the dynamics of change itself.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in 1918, Lithuanian independence was reestablished. In 1940, that independence was desecrated.

What was done 50 years ago must not be forgotten. What was done 28 years ago must not be forgotten.

And free men will not forget, just as those who have lost their freedom cannot forget.

Today, as we recall the tragic recent history of Lithuania, let us who live in freedom draw strength from the perseverance and courage of the Lithuanian people who have kept alive their national spirit under the most trying and heartrending circumstances.

When I visited Lithuania just 2 years ago, I rejoiced to find that the national spirit was still strong. Let us pray that this spirit will one day be rewarded with a rebirth of freedom.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR PROGRAMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce the establishment of a special subcommittee under the Labor and Public Welfare Committee—the Special Subcommittee on International Health, Education, and Labor Programs. Serving on this new subcommittee with me will be the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, the senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, and the junior Senator from Vermont, Senator PROUTY. The formation of this subcommittee is the culmination of a year of active interest in America's role and responsibility in this area and I would like to thank especially the distinguished chairman from Alabama, Senator HILL, and the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, Senator MORSE, for their support and cooperation.

The first business of this subcommittee will be S. 1779, a bill which I have introduced to establish a quasi-governmental corporation to provide open support for private activities in health, education, labor, and related welfare fields. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have already heard from private organizations, and representatives of foundations and government programs expressing an interest in testifying at hearings.

We will be particularly interested in three areas: First, the nature, amount, and effectiveness of current international activities by private organizations; second, the need for governmental assistance; third, the role of an independent agency such as the Foundation proposed, in increasing both the quality and quantity of the private sector's effort.

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

Our vital national interest in this field is well established. For 15 years the Central Intelligence Agency, following National Security Council initiatives, contributed millions of dollars to private organizations involved in international affairs. Although this CIA funding, with all its negative implications, has rightly been stopped, no one can doubt our continuing national interest in seeing private involvement grow.

This interest was further affirmed by the special Presidential Committee established last year after revelations about CIA funding of private organizations. Their report, signed by HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, CIA Director Richard Helms, and Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, stated:

> It is of the greatest importance to our future and to the future of free institutions everywhere that other nations, especially their young people, know and understand American viewpoints. There is no better way to meet this need than through the activity of private American organizations.

WHO WILL MEET NEED?

The question is before us whether this national need will be met. Newspaper reports indicate that the Government has terminated its covert support but is undecided on any new way to meet the need. The New York Times of December 18, 1967, and the Washington Post of December 19, 1967, reported that after 1 year of study the Presidential Commission is deadlocked and will do nothing. I ask unanimous consent that those two articles be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amount of support that will be available from the private sector is also in doubt. When organizations 15 years ago were unable to obtain support from private sources, they turned to the Government and received CIA funds. Because the CIA used businessmen and foundations as conduits for their support, the private sector received credit. But now that support must be more than in name only, we must ascertain whether American industry and philanthropy will accept this responsibility. Several organizations have informed me that attempts to raise funds from our largest foundations and corporations have been difficult.

This subcommittee will be particularly interested in determining what existing Government agencies and others will do to support our private organizations' efforts because we are determined that their need will be met.

Only then will we be able to meet the world's real need for cooperation in constructive ventures with people in the developing areas. As Sargent Shriver has observed:

> There is a world election now under way on every continent. The "voting" takes place outside the election booths. The "returns" are measured in terms of people fed, jobs found, schools built, children educated, bodies cured, and economies growing.

There are those who believe we cannot win that election. But we must at least declare our candidacy. And I believe that we can win it.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1779

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) The Foundation shall be composed of a Director and an International Health, Education, and Labor Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(c) The purposes of the Foundation shall be to establish and conduct an international health, education, and labor program under which the Foundation shall provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields, designed—

(1) to promote a better knowledge of the United States among the peoples of the world;

(2) to increase friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world; and

(3) to strengthen the capacity of the other peoples of the world to develop and maintain free, independent societies in their own nations.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Foundation shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The person nominated for appointment as the Director shall be a distinguished citizen who has demonstrated exceptional qualities and abilities necessary to enable him to successfully perform the functions of the office of the Director.

(b) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of title 5, United States Code, and shall serve for a term of five years.

(c) The Director, with the advice of the Council, shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act and shall serve as chief executive officer of the Foundation.

COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) The Council shall consist of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Council (1) shall be eminent in the fields of education, student activities, youth activities, labor, health, scientific research, or other fields pertinent to the functions of the Foundation; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall not be officers or employees of the Government of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by leading private associations, institutions, and organizations concerned with private activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President, three at the end of two years, four at the end of four years, and four at the end of six years after the date of enactment of this Act; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. No member shall be eligible for reappointment during a two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The President shall call the first meeting of the Council and designate an Acting Chairman. The Board shall, from time to time thereafter, select one of its members to serve as Chairman of the Council.

(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than once every six months. Six members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(f) The Council (1) shall advise the Director with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and (2) shall review applications for financial support submitted pursuant to section 4 and make recommendations thereon to the Director. The Director shall not approve or disapprove any such application until he has received the recommendation of the Council thereon, unless the Council fails to make a recommendation on such application within a reasonable time.

(g) The Council shall, on or before the 31st day of January, of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress summarizing the activities of the Council during the preceding calendar year and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GRANTS IN SUPPORT OF PRIVATE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized, subject to section 3(f), to make grants to private, nonprofit agencies, associations, and organizations organized in the United States, to public or private nonprofit educational institutions located in the United States, and to individuals or groups of individuals who are citizens of the United States not employed by the Government of the United States, a State or political subdivision of a State or the District of Columbia, for the purpose of enabling them to assist, provide, or participate in international activities, conferences, meetings, and seminars in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. No portion of any funds granted under this section shall be paid by the Director, or by any recipient of a grant under this section, to support any intelligence-gathering activity on behalf of the United States or to support any activity carried on by any officer or employee of the United States.

(b) Each grant shall be made by the Director under this section only upon application therefor in such form and containing such information as may be required by the Director and only on condition that the recipient of such grant will conduct openly all activities supported by such grant and make such reports as the Director may require solely to determine that the funds so granted are applied to the purpose for which application is made.

(c) The Director shall develop procedures and rules with respect to the approval or disapproval of applications for grants under this section which will provide, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of grants among the various applicants for such grants and types of activities to be supported by such grants, but which will assure that grants will be made to those qualified recipients most capable of achieving a successful or significant contribution favorably related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. In making grants under this section, the Director shall not impose any requirements therefor or conditions thereon which impair the freedom of thought and expression of any recipients or other beneficiaries of such grants.

(d) The Director may (1) pay grants in such installments as he may deem appropriate and (2) provide for such adjustments of payments under this section as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, total withholding of payments.

PUBLIC REPORTS BY DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. The Director shall, on or before the 31st day of January of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress setting forth a summary of his activities under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such reports shall include a list of the grants made by the Director during the preceding calendar year; a statement of the use to which each recipient applied any grant received during the preceding calendar year; and any recommendations which the Director may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Director shall have the authority, within the limits of funds available under section 9, to—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the operations of the Foundation, and its organization and personnel;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Foundation to carry out its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: except that the salary of any person so employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) obtain the services of experts and consultants from private life, as may be required by the Director or the Council, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) accept and utilize on behalf of the Foundation the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel from private life and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, by private, nongovernmental sources, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for any of the purposes of the Foundation; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(6) make other expenditures necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this Act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST REQUIRING INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

SEC. 7. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall request or require any recipient or any other beneficiary of any grant made under this Act to obtain, furnish, or report, or cause to be obtained, furnished, or reported, any information relating, directly or indirectly, to any activity supported by such grant, except as is (1) provided by section 4(b) of this Act or (2) authorized under law in the case of any information directly relating to the violation of any criminal law of the United States by such recipient or beneficiary.

INDEPENDENCE FROM EXECUTIVE CONTROL

SEC. 8. (a) Determinations made by the Director and the Council in the discharge of their functions under this Act shall not be subject to review or control by the President or by any other department, agency, officer, or employee of the Government.

(b) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure), and of chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), shall not apply with respect to the exercise by the Director or the Council of their functions under this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that the aggregate of such sums appropriated prior to June 30, 1972, shall not exceed $100 million. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1967]

PANEL ON CIA SUBSIDIES DIVIDED OVER ALTERNATIVES

(By Robert H. Phelps)

WASHINGTON, December 17.—The committee set up to propose a plan for openly financing voluntary organizations once secretly supported by the Central Intelligence Agency is divided so sharply that it cannot meet the Dec. 31 deadline for reporting to the President.

The study panel, headed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, has narrowed its choice to four plans. These range from a stopgap appropriation that would help some of the organizations carry on their work next year to the establishment of a semi-public independent organization that would take over many of the overseas academic and cultural activities now under other agencies.

While the committee will meet again in January, the division among the 18 members is so deep that there is little hope of agreement. As a result, the problem is expected to be tossed back to the White House without a clear-cut decision.

Most Congressional members, feeling the need for economy, favor the least costly of the four plans. Under this proposal, known as Alternative I, up to $5 million would be appropriated, probably to the State Department, for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

BACKED BY REPRESENTATIVES

This money would be used to finance the neediest of the student, religious, union, cultural and other groups subsidized for years by the C.I.A. to counter Communist influence abroad.

At a recent meeting, the four House members of the panel gave their support to Alternative I. They were George Mahon, Democrat of Texas; L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat of South Carolina; Thomas Morgan, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and Frank Bow, Republican of Ohio.

After the House members announced their support, Senator Carl Hayden, Democrat for Arizona, said the Senate would go along with the House. However, not all the Senators on the committee agree.

Some of the Senators and many of the private members of the panel favor the most ambitious of the four plans. Under this proposal, known as Alternative IV, a quasi-public commission of 15 to 29 members would be set up. It would receive about $25-million to finance what the panel members call the "C.I.A. orphans"—the voluntary groups formerly subsidized in secret.

This proposed agency would also take over the State Department's academic and cultural exchange program, which supervises Fulbright scholarships, performances abroad of American orchestras and plays, seminars and courses in American studies, and other projects.

The agency would also assume control of the libraries now operated by the United States Information Agency and handle grants now made by the Agency for International Development to colleges and hospitals for projects abroad.

COST $50 MILLION A YEAR

The programs of these other agencies cost more than $50 million a year.

To protect the proposed commission from possible charges of being a tool of American foreign policy, the plan calls for the new agency to be operated independently of the Government. A majority of the members would be from private life and the commission would have a permanent staff abroad. But Congress would have to appropriate funds for the commission, although it could receive money from private foundations.

This plan is being vigorously pushed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, former president of the Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, and Paul R. Porter, a Washington lawyer and former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Porter commented in a telephone interview that the subsidization of voluntary organizations had accomplished so much for so little money that, in a way, it was "too bad the C.I.A. got caught." But, he said, the subsidy program should be strengthened and the best way of doing this is to put all the programs under a "single protective umbrella."

SUPPORTED BY FULBRIGHT

Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also favors Alternative IV, on the basis that detachment of the program from foreign policy concerns would improve the American image abroad.

Budget Director Charles Schultze, however, favors a gradual approach. Cattel Alternative III, his plan would set up a quasi-public commission but give it only authority to make grants to the "C.I.A. orphans." The other programs would continue under the State Department, U.S.I.A. and AID.

Dr. Frank A. Rose, president of the University of Alabama, commented that while he favored Alternative IV, he thought that the present need for economy in Government made Alternative III the wisest choice now. The other programs could be brought in later, he said.

But Dr. Eisenhower insisted, in a telephone interview, that if only the previous functions were going to be included, then "unfortunately the effort would be discredited before it began."

One fear is that there would be competition for funds between the proposed agency and the cultural unit of the State Department, the information agency and the aid agency.

"All the other outfits would have their knives out for the new commission," one foe of Alternative III commented.

The other proposal, Alternative II, would make the subsidization of the voluntary organizations a part of the foreign aid program. There has been little support for this idea, however.

President Johnson set up the Rusk committee last spring after directing the C.I.A. to end covert financing of private voluntary groups. He acted after disclosures that the intelligence agency was supporting private voluntary organizations engaged in overseas programs. The amount of yearly subsidies by the C.I.A. has never been disclosed, but one informed guess is $15 million a year.

With Dec. 31 as the cutoff date for such C.I.A. subsidies, the Rusk committee once considered asking Congress for a supplementary appropriation to help some of the voluntary organizations during the period when there will be no Federal program.

One of the organizations that is said to need assistance is the Asia Foundation, which provides technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, aids in the establishment of rice cooperatives and helped write the South Korean Constitution.

A strong supporter of the subsidy program said he believed that the C.I.A. had "thrown a little fat" into its grants in recent months to tide some voluntary organizations over.

The subsidies are difficult to trace because they are often hidden in grants from foundations to the voluntary group.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1967]

CIA Subsidies Study Reaches No Decision

(By Richard Harwood)

When the Central Intelligence Agency's secret philanthropies were discovered last spring, President Johnson's response was to appoint a study committee.

It was headed by Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and it recommended that still another study committee be appointed because of the "considerable complexity" of the problem.

The President agreed and the new committee was formed with Secretary of State Dean Rusk as its chairman. It was a "consensus" group that included Senators and Representatives, young men and old men, Democrats and Republicans, academicians and businessmen, thinkers and doers. Its assignment was to figure out how the government of the United States could do publicly what the CIA had been doing covertly, which was to subsidize the overseas activities of countless religious, cultural, labor, and scholarly organizations.

NOTHING DECIDED

In the nine months that have passed, the Committee had decided nothing except that there are at least four ways for the Government to hand out money to the CIA's former clients—through the State Department (Plan 1), through the foreign aid program (Plan 2), through a new "quasi-public" corporation with limited responsibilities (Plan 3), or through a "quasi-public" corporation with very broad responsibilities (Plan 4).

One reason for the Committee's failure to come to a decision is that it has spent very little time on the job. There have been only three meetings of substance since March. The last one, according to Dr. Milton Eisenhower of Johns Hopkins University, was held three months ago.

"We are all," said another committee member, Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama, "very busy men. The Secretary of State is very busy. So is the Budget Bureau (whose director, Charles Schultze, is a committee member, and whose international programs man, James Clark, is the committee's executive director.)"

NO SENSE OF URGENCY

Senator Milton R. Young, one of the congressional Republicans on the panel, has been so busy that he hasn't "been to a one of those meetings" and isn't sure what is going on.

Another reason for the inaction is the general feeling that, as Rose put it, "there's no sense of urgency about this. No deadline or anything of that kind." A State Department official on Rusk's staff used the phrase "no in-built deadline" which was interpreted by Clark at the Budget Bureau to mean no "external" deadline fixed by the President or by Rusk.

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) was under a different impression. He thought he and his fellow committeemen were expected to come up with a plan by Dec. 31, which is the date the CIA expects to cut off its covert subsidies. "But I guess," said Fulbright yesterday, "that deadline has been dropped."

DEADLOCK REPORTED

A third explanation for the position in which the committee finds itself at Christmastime is that it is hopelessly deadlocked over what should be done.

This is denied by Rose, Eisenhower and men in the Administration who prefer anonymity. Fulbright, however, reports that there are rather substantial disagreements and Young has heard rumors to the same effect.

One faction, "highly oriented toward the military," as Fulbright puts it, is represented by three House members on the committee—George Mahon (D-Texas), L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), and Frank Bow (R-Ohio). They favor the inexpensive Plan 1 (about $5 million a year) which would be administered by State.

Fulbright, Eisenhower and Rose favor the more ambitious Plan 4 which would involve new funds of about $25 million a year, would extend subsidies to groups presently unsubsidized, and would take over some of the cultural and information programs presently administered by State, USIA, and AID.

Schultze, presumably speaking for the President and Rusk, favors Plan 3, and does not favor taking any programs away from existing agencies.

Plan 3 would be cheaper than Plan 4 and for that reason Rose is willing to go along with it "in view of the budget squeeze."

In reply, the Administration says money is no problem.

The panel, in any case has come to no decision which means that some of the CIA's secret beneficiaries may begin the New Year with pinched budgets.

"But there's no real problem," says Dr. Rose. "All we have to do is sit down and come to a conclusion."

That effort will be made again in January.

THE FIVE OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN OF MARYLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, each year, junior chamber of commerce chapters throughout Maryland select the five outstanding young men of the year. Each of these men is the recipient of the outstanding young man or distinguished service award in his own community.

Selection is based on achievements in his business or profession as well as service to his community. The quality of these accomplishments is demonstrated in the sketches of each nominee contained in the program of the final awards banquet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the descriptive sketches of the five outstanding young men of Maryland be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the sketches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thomas E. Embree, Greater Elkton, age 21, Instructor, Service School Command, USNTC, Bainbridge. In addition to his military duties, this young man finds time to serve his community and state. He is currently President of the Cecil County Council of P.T.A.s and has served as a member of the State Board of Managers of the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers. He was a member of the Policy Advisory Committee for the Headstart Project of the Cecil County Board of Education. He is a former vice president and international director of the Maryland Jaycees and was selected for inclusion in the 1968 edition of "Outstanding Young Men of America."

Werner H. Fornos, Annapolis, Age 34, Management Consultant, Werner Fornos and Associates. This newly elected representative in the Maryland House of Delegates ended his freshman session as a guiding force in the General Assembly. His work in the Ways and Means Committee and his political knowledge led to his appointment to the Legislative Council's Committee on Legislative Organization. He was selected as a delegate to the Maryland Constitutional Convention from Anne Arundel County and was cited as being among the progressive leaders of the Convention. He is finance chairman for the Committee for a Beautiful Annapolis, Chairman of the Promotion's Committee of the Annapolis Fine Arts Festival and a member of the Board of Trustees of the Davidsonville Methodist Church. In 1966, he was awarded the Distinguished Citizen's Award by the Governor of Maryland.

Michael P. Goodrich, Severna Park, Age 32, General Agent, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company. The youngest general agent ever appointed by his company, Mike has many accomplishments to his credit in his young career. He is a member of the Million Dollar Roundtable for the fifth consecutive year and his company honors include the "Top Twenty" in production for the past two years. He received his CLU degree in 1967. Active in community life, he is the author of a five year development plan for the Pasadena Methodist Church. He holds a Local Minister designation in the Methodist Church. Mike is the president of the Folger McKinsey School P.T.A. and was the charter treasurer of the Severna Park Jaycees.

William D. Greene, Jr., Crescent Cities, Age 26, Supervisor, Program Planning Control Data Corporation. While keeping pace with his position and furthering his education, Bill is active in community service. He is a member of the Crescent City Jaycees and his performance has won for him every competitive award within the Jaycee organization. He is chairman of a building project to construct a 2½ million dollar sports park for the Boys' Clubs of Prince Georges County. The project won the Maryland Jaycee Community Development Award for 1967. Bill is president of the Prince George's Coordinating Council of Jaycee Chapters and in a short time has turned an almost defunct organization into an effective instrument of Jaycee activity. He is a supervisor of a group responsible for the Polaris training planning and has achieved status as one of the leaders in his career field.

Robert M. Lawrence, Salisbury, Age 35, President, Lawrence Volkswagen, Inc. A quiet, unassuming young man, Bob is one of the most active individuals in his community. In 1967, he conceived, coordinated, and underwrote the expense of a program to stimulate business in the community. Entitled "Business is Great in Salisbury," the program was very successful. It became a household phrase and boosted morale in the community. Bob was chairman of the 1967 Cancer Crusade in the county, chairman of the Industrial Development Committee of the Chamber of Commerce and a Director of the Delmarva YMCA. Active in the Faith Lutheran Church, Bob was chairman of the Building Fund Committee, and through his efforts and initiative, the church has a new building. He teaches in the Sunday School and is a member of the Church Council. In 1964, he purchased control of Lawrence Volkswagen, Inc. and was the youngest franchise operator in the United States.

FREE PRESS, FAIR TRIAL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday, the American Bar Association, meeting in Chicago, adopted new rules of conduct for lawyers and new procedures for judges designed to restrict the release of crime news to the press.

As a lawyer, and as a subcommittee chairman concerned not only with legal problems but also information problems, I feel compelled to urge a note of caution on this subject. The problem of balancing the first amendment—which guarantees a free press and free access to information—and the sixth amendment—which guarantees a fair trial—is certainly not an easy one. But neither is the problem a new one. The very same American Bar Association which yesterday adopted the new guidelines, many years earlier considered identical issues as a result of the famous Bruno Hauptmann-Lindbergh kidnaping case. Thus, as lawyers, we have lived with the delicate balance problem for a long time.

According to an article which appeared in this morning's New York Times, written by Fred P. Graham, the distinguished law editor of the Times:

> The impact of (the ABA's) action will not be immediately apparent to newspaper readers across the country, because it amended only the rules of ethics of the national bar group and not those of state bar associations, which handle most lawyer discipline matters.

But, Mr. Graham suggests that the ABA approval is "expected to touch off a wave of similar actions by State bar associations."

Mr. President, a strong plea was raised by responsible representatives of the newspaper industry at yesterday's ABA meeting, to delay any action for 1 year. This request for delay, in my opinion, was not a dilatory tactic. Rather, it was based on a number of factors.

First, this country is experiencing a tragic and increasing crime wave. The function of a free press to inform the public of such a crime wave not only alerts us to the many dangers, but also keeps the responsible law enforcement officers on their toes. Additionally, often the report of capture of a heinous criminal relieves community tensions and dispels community fears.

Second, the American Newspaper Publishers Association is presently conducting a study of the effects of publicity on juries, and it would have been desirable for the results of this study to be available to the bar association members considering the current action.

A third valid reason for delaying the ABA action, in my opinion, is the fact that voluntary agreements have been worked out in several States by bar and press groups on the subject of pretrial and trial publicity. From what I understand, these agreements have been successful.

Accordingly, I can only express the hope that the State bar associations across this country, including my own bar association of the State of Missouri, will heed the pleas of the newspaper profession, and will not jump on the bandwagon of arbitrarily curtailing crime news.

At the Federal level, we have yet another aspect to this problem. On July 4, 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Freedom of Information Act. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, charged with legislative oversight of this act, I intend to continue to encourage Federal Government agencies to abide both by the spirit and letter of this Freedom of Information Act. Accordingly, I do not feel that it would be in the best interests of the American public at this time to adopt the ABA guidelines as the policy of the Federal Government. The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold hearings shortly to review the operations of the FOI Act. At that time, we will also consider the American Bar Association guidelines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the article by Fred Graham.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BAR ADOPTS STANDARDS TO CURB RELEASE OF CRIME NEWS

(By Fred P. Graham)

CHICAGO, February 19.—The American Bar Association approved today new rules of conduct for lawyers and new procedures for judges designed to restrict the release of crime news to the press.

It acted over the objections of news media officials who had warned that the move would hinder nonprejudicial press coverage and could prevent full public discussion of rising crime patterns.

The action was taken by the bar association's policy-making body, the House of Delegates, which today opened its two-day midwinter meeting at the Palmer House here.

The House of Delegates voted overwhelmingly to adopt the recommendations of the controversial "Reardon Report."

The report is the product of a three-year study by the association's Advisory Commitee on Fair Trial and Free Press, headed by Justice Paul C. Reardon of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. It sets out detailed rules aimed at sharply curtailing the flow of information about arrested persons that is made available to the press in most communities.

The report was approved by a strong voice vote—only a few noes were heard—after the group voted 176 to 68 against a proposal by the news media to delay any action for a year.

The impact of today's action will not be immediately apparent to newspaper readers across the country, because it amended only the rules of ethics of the national bar group and not those of state bar organizations, which handle most lawyer discipline matters.

However, the approval is expected to touch off a wave of similar actions by state bar associations, which would mean that lawyers in these states could be disbarred if they gave the press more information than the new standards allow.

Also, much of the Reardon report consists of suggested rules for judges to follow in preventing the police and lawyers from giving what might be considered prejudicial information to the press, and in barring newsmen from certain hearings.

In most states, trial judges can adopt these rules on their own volition. Some have already done so, and now that the American Bar Association has given the rules its blessing, many more local judges are expected to put the news restrictions into effect despite opposition from local news media.

Today's action accomplishes four basic results.

First, it amends the Bar Association's canons of ethics, subject to the formality of drafting the exact wording, to declare it unethical for any prosecutor or defense lawyer to tell the press anything about a pending case except basic identifying facts about the defendant and the circumstances surrounding the arrest.

Lawyers are specifically forbidden to mention a defendant's prior record of arrests or convictions, to say whether he made a confession, to divulge the results of any tests or the identity of witnesses, or to make any other suggestions about the possible guilt of the accused.

THE POLICE EXHORTED

Second, the report urges police departments to impose similar restrictions on their members, and calls upon judges to use their contempt powers to enforce the restrictions on both lawyers and the police, if necessary.

Third, it calls upon courts to adopt the report's judicial standards, which would make it easier for defendants to get trial delays or transfers to other communities and to keep potentially prejudiced jurors off jury panels.

These standards would also bar the press and the public from pre-trial hearings and from any part of a trial held outside the presence of the jury, if the defense lawyer or the judge felt that coverage might prevent a fair trial.

Fourth, it gives judges the power to punish newsmen for contempt if they publish articles during the course of a trial that are willfully designed to affect the outcome.

In many communities now, the police disclose the conviction or arrest records of arrested persons and give such information as the apparant motive. This pattern of disclosure would not be permitted in any jurisdiction that adopts the new standards.

FINAL PLEAS HEARD

Before the vote today the bar delegates heard final pleas for a delay from D. Tennant Bryan, publisher of The Richmond Times-Dispatch and The Richmond News Leaders, who was a spokesman for the American Newspaper Publishers Association; Michael J. Ogden, executive director of The Providence Journal and The Providence Bulletin, who is president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors; and Theodore Koop, a vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who is chairman of a committee that represents eight more news media groups.

They said there was a need for full public scrutiny of the phenomenon of rising crime and added that voluntary agreements between bar and press groups in a half-dozen states had been successful.

They also pointed out that the American Newspaper Publishers Association was conducting a study of the effects of publicity on juries, and argued that the lawyers should not act on the Reardon report before all the evidence was in.

However, many leaders of the association spoke out for an immediate decision.

They included Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in New York, who heads the parent committee that sponsored the Reardon study; William T. Gossett of Detroit, the president-elect of the bar association; Earl F. Morris of Columbus, Ohio, the incumbent president; and two former bar presidents, Lewis F. Powell of Richmond and Ross L. Malone of New York.

OTHER REPORTS APPROVED

The 190-member House of Delegates also approved five other reports from subcommittees of Judge Lumbard's Special Committee on Minimum Standards for the Administration of Criminal Justice.

Four of these were approved with little debate. They urge states to adopt post-conviction review procedures as a normal part of the criminal process; endorse the theory of plea-bargaining between prosecutor and defense lawyers for guilty pleas, under proper safeguards; call for the outright dismissal of charges when a speedy trial is denied; and ask for free lawyers for poor defendants in all cases that might result in jail sentences.

The delegates voted to change a fifth report, which had urged that appellate judges be given the power to reduce harsh prison sentences. The delegates instead approved a rule that would permit appeal judges also to raise sentences that they found too lenient.

SENATOR ALBERT GORE ADDRESSES BORAH FOUNDATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] recently delivered an address of unusual importance at the University of Idaho, which was the climax of a 3-day conference on American foreign policy, conducted under the auspices of the Borah Foundation.

The address is an eloquent expression of the frustration and futility which inevitably accompanies the frantic effort we are now making to adapt the world to the realities of our current foreign policy, rather than adapting our foreign policy to the realities of the world.

I commend the address to the thoughtful consideration of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALBERT GORE, BORAH FOUNDATION SYMPOSIUM ON VIETNAM, UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW, IDAHO, FEBRUARY 17, 1968

The receipt of your invitation to participate in this symposium with such distinguished and eminent Americans on the subject of Vietnam was exhilarating. The moment of my participation is far more sobering than exhilarating. Indeed, I venture my views somewhat timidly, but in the hope that a searching public analysis and debate of the present, such as you have had, may possibly be of some assistance in shaping the momentous decisions in the days and months ahead.

It is with regret and disappointment that I note the absence of an incisive public dialogue between the President and the Senate, through their selected agents, in particular the Secretary of State and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The most vital thing to a democracy, without which a democracy cannot function or survive, is an informed, enlightened, alert, and interested public opinion. A nation, its government, and its policies can be only so wise, only so sound, only so progressive, and only so secure as the people are informed on and interested in public issues. Our form of self government, in my view, requires the maximum public dialogue between the executives of our government and the elected representatives of the people. The President and the Senate, in my view, share equally the responsibility to conduct an informed and incisive examination of foreign policy so that the people can understand our policies and the objectives of policy, form an opinion as to whether these objectives are reasonable and attainable at acceptable risks and costs, assess the probable consequences and possible alternatives. There is no justification for a lack of public dialogue at this crucial hour. Unless a policy can withstand the light of public examination, then a change in policy is indicated.

Free debate is necessary for a free society; for it is through debate that the truth is distilled and the truth shall make a nation free.

True, the President is our nation's leader in foreign policy, but he cannot lead very far where the elected representatives of the people will not follow. The Constitution places the Congress, more particularly the Senate, and the President in a position of limited partnership so to speak, for the formulation and conduct of the nation's foreign policy. Each has power and responsibility. The whole Congress has the power of the purse with respect to both revenue and expenditure. Moreover, it has the specific power to raise or not to raise, to support or not to support, an Army. In addition, the advise and consent clause of the Constitution places upon the Senate a special responsibility. All too many times, and with all too many people, assent after the fact is regarded as a sufficient discharge of the Senate's constitutional responsibility. I do not agree.

What is needed at this critical time is the best that can come from cooperative teamwork. And I am reminded of an old Idaho adage that two heads are better than one even though one be a sheep's head.

We have the word now from Secretary McNamara that the executive team unanimously recommended the Bay of Pigs operation to the late President Kennedy. There was, in fact, one and only one voice at the table of this crucial conference which firmly advised against it. This sole adverse advice came firmly but clearly from Senator Fulbright. Several Senators strongly and urgently advised against the commitment of combat troops to Vietnam.

A number of mistakes could have been averted had the advice of the Senate been heeded. This is not to say, nor do I mean in any respect to imply, that the advice of the Senate has always been correct. On the other hand, I do not wish to impute infallibility to the Executive Branch.

What is needed, I repeat, is the best that can come from the teamwork our forefathers, wisely in my view, ordained. Nothing less than this is justified by the criticality of our time.

In the course of this symposium, the relationship of Vietnam to United States security has been in question. That is now and should have always been the central issue. It is precisely on this level that our policies, particularly our future policies, should be examined.

In this connection, perhaps it should be said that there is some distinction between the interest of the United States and the security of the United States. Moreover, it might be well to note that the security of the United States cannot be measured alone by military stratagems or theories, material values, and political dogmas, but must be viewed in a broader context that includes geopolitical realities, human, cultural and moral values in the broad sweep of history.

The security of the United States with respect to our involvement in the Vietnam war is quite a different question today than it was at the time President Johnson decided to commit combat troops to the conflict. It was and still is my view that our vital interests were not involved in the outcome of the insurgency, the revolution, or the civil war, however one may wish to characterize the conflict, under way in Vietnam before our combat involvement. I think most experts on Vietnam would concur in the view that North Vietnam was then far from being an actual, let alone willing, Chinese puppet or satellite. Two thousand years of Vietnamese-Chinese relations had left the Vietnamese with feelings toward the Chinese which one eminent author has described as "like those of the Irish for the English of Oliver Cromwell's day."

I challenge the validity of the notion that somehow the United States was, or ever would have been, placed in mortal peril by the ultimate nature of the government of Vietnam, by the unification of Vietnam into one country or the severing of the country into two, or by the manner of government that may have ultimately prevailed in either one Vietnam or in both Vietnams.

Surely it is in our interest to have peace in the world everywhere. Surely it is in our interest to have a less militant brand of "Asian communism." Surely a government friendly to the United States in Vietnam, as elsewhere, is in the interest of the United States. But these statements are virtual tautologies.

However desirable our interest in a pro-Western government in South Vietnam, this interest falls far short of involving our national security. And yet it was precisely upon this premise that President Johnson sought to justify United States use of force in Vietnam in his San Antonio speech of September 29, 1967.

A portion of this speech has somehow come to be known as "The San Antonio Formula". One passage of this speech in which the President referred to conditions under which the United States would be willing to stop the bombing of North Vietnam has been most often quoted. In this passage he said,

"As we have told Hanoi time and time and time again, the heart of the matter really is this: The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

In the same speech, the President also said,

"But the key to all we have done is really our own security. At times of crisis, before asking Americans to fight and die to resist aggression in a foreign land, every American President has finally had to answer this question:

"Is the aggression a threat not only to the immediate victim but to the United States of America and to the peace and security of the entire world of which we in America are a very vital part?"

The President then proceeded in a variety of ways to answer this question in the affirmative, and he proceeded to quote former President Eisenhower, former President Kennedy, the President of the Phillipines, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, the Prime Minister of Australia, the President of South Korea, the Prime Minister of Malaysia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and the Prime Minister of Singapore, in remarks which the President interpreted as indicating they had reached the same conclusion.

I do not know whether the term "San Antonio Formula" refers to the entire speech of President Johnson in San Antonio or only to a part thereof. It would be interesting to know if the so-called domino theory is also a part of the "San Antonio Formula". I say this because in that speech the President clearly endorsed the domino theory by saying,

"I would rather stand in Vietnam in our time and by meeting this danger now and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren."

If the entire speech made in San Antonio on September 29, 1967, constitutes the "San Antonio Formula", then I must interpret that formula to be a pledge to resist, at whatever cost, the spread of communist influence in Southeast Asia. Apparently, it is a pledge to resist the spread of communist influence even though a majority of people in the area may prefer communism. It would appear to me that this would be the logical conclusion that one must reach if one follows the thesis stated by President Johnson in his San Antonio speech. He said,

"We cherish freedom—yes. We cherish self-determination for all people—yes. . . ."

"But the key to all we have done is really our own security. . . ."

So in my considered view, the "San Antonio Formula" is an Alamo complex in a nuclear age.

Though, as I have said, I did not then believe and do not now believe that the happenings in Vietnam before the commitment of combat troops in this ground war in Asia involved our vital national security, I have come to the firm conviction that our National security is now, in fact, involved.

The question is how will that national security be best served. Is it served or disserved by present policies in Vietnam?

We have stumbled into a morass in Vietnam. We must decide to negotiate ourselves out of it. This will truly serve our National security. We must decide—decide definitely and irrevocably—to negotiate disengagement from Vietnam, not from Asia but from Vietnam, honorably and honestly, which means, in my opinion, on condition that Vietnam be neutralized.

Having lost our innocence in Vietnam, can we retain our honor? I believe that we can because of the common interests—if we and they can but see them through the smoke and fire of war—that exists even between the North Vietnamese and the people of the United States. Even between antagonists there are common interests—common interests that are forgotten in the heat of war where the first casualty is always truth and the second might be said to be objectivity.

The first common interest we share is a desire and need to end the war. American lives are being lost and American treasure spent, but the North Vietnamese are losing far more. By ending the war, we could save our lives and our precious material resources. But they could save their country.

Of course, if our vital national security demands that South Vietnam be a U.S. satellite, we should not try to negotiate neutralization or anything else. But, in my view, such is not the case.

Even taking the administration's case at face value—which I do not, except for purposes of argument—if the war in Vietnam is a confrontation between "Asian communism" and the free world, a confrontation that will determine not only the future of Asia but also the future of the United States—the battle is being fought in the worst possible place and at a place and under conditions of the enemy's choosing. And to carry this argument to its logical conclusion, if our real enemy is Communist China why do we not strike at the root of the problem? Are we unwilling to face up to the logical consequences of our policy or do we suspect that there is a logical flaw in our argument?

I believe our leaders are mesmerized by mirages in Vietnam and that as a result they see national interests there where none exist. But this is only part of the tragedy of this quagmire war. The other part of the tragedy is that, mesmerized by mirages, we are unable to see where our real national interests lie.

It seems clear to me—it has for some time—that in the long run our real national interests lie in our present and future relations with the two other great powers in this world, the Soviet Union and China. What is the war in Vietnam doing to this fundamental national interest, to our relations with these two great powers?

Some believe that the war is bringing China and the Soviet Union closer together. The more sophisticated opinion is that the ideological differences between these two countries are so great that even an attack on a fellow Communist country has not been able to heal the breach—at least not yet, although I must say we seem to be working hard at it. But, unquestionably, the war in Vietnam is worsening our relations with both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and, I might add, with most of the rest of the world.

Let us debate our involvement in Vietnam, then, on a more rational basis than has thus far been the case, and perhaps we can then come to some national conclusion and true concensus as to just what we ought to do. Once we know what we ought to do and what we want to do, I, for one, believe our country has sufficient genius to find an honorable conclusion to this bloody war.

I have said that I am not persuaded that we have a "real" national interest in Vietnam; that the visions of containing Chinese expansion and deterring wars of national liberation are just that: visions, dreams. In any event, I do not believe we are containing Chinese military expansion in Vietnam. How could we be when we are fighting against 50,000 North Vietnamese and 250,000 South Vietnamese Vietcong—a task the 700,000 South Vietnamese forces are apparently unable to undertake. Are we teaching China a lesson for the future when 100,000 American boys have been killed or wounded but not one Chinese has been scratched? Will this inhibit China from any desire to "overrun" her neighbors, as Secretary Rusk has suggested? And, for that matter is China now "overrunning" her neighbor, North Vietnam?

We are destroying the country we profess to be saving. We are damaging our relations with most other nations of the world. We are destroying any basis for cooperation with the two other major powers upon which the future of world peace depends—the Soviet Union and China. We contaminate ourselves by embracing a corrupt regime in Saigon. And the further tragedy is that we are also seriously damaging, if we are not in danger of destroying, ourselves.

I say this not only because we are running our relations with the other nations which inhabit this rapidly shrinking globe, not only because of our identification with a corrupt governmental clique, not only because we are diverting resources so critically needed to preserve in America the traditional American way of life, not only because we are squandering this nation's resources including the most precious resource of all, the lives of our young men, and our country's position in the free world economy, but also because we risk transforming the American dream into a nightmare.

We have been the symbol of many admirable qualities for all mankind—liberty and justice, tolerance, restraint and wisdom, idealism and altruism. We are surely not perfect, and often we have fallen short in the practice of what we have preached, but we have remained generally true to our principles, which means that we have remained true to ourselves.

We have now become obsessed and driven not by idealism but by fear, not by righteousness but by self-righteousness; not by wisdom but by folly; not by altruism but by fancied self-interest.

These are strong words, I know. They are words that can be read often, yes, I know, abroad as well as at home, and words that can be heard often, not only abroad but at home. These are the words' of an American who is disturbed about what is happening to the American dream.

AMERICAN CIVILIAN FIELD REPRESENTATIVES—UNSUNG HEROES OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Post, in an editorial published on February 15 paid tribute to what it called the unsung American heroes of the war in Vietnam—the civilian field representatives of the U.S. Information Agency, AID, the State Department, and such voluntary groups as the International Voluntary Service. They live among the people of Vietnam. They know the people. They know the enemy. They are caught in the war. Indeed, as the Post editorial points out, not a few have been casualties of the recent enemy offensive, which is, at present, commanding so much of our attention.

As the Post editorial says, however:

> Sooner or later, it is all going to come down, once again, to the people and their security and to the question of how to counter terror with the appeal of a strong and active Saigon government. This is the part of the struggle nobody thinks enough about until the AID men and USIA officials and young Foreign Service Officers who are waging it, and trying to get the South Vietnamese to wage it more vigorously, are caught up in the conventional fighting and become casualties of war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial, entitled "The Unsung Americans," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNSUNG AMERICANS

It is one of the many anomalies of Vietnam that the richest lode of expertise and first-hand experience in all the complexities of a war against insurgency lies buried beneath layers of bureaucracy, beyond the reach of the men who make the policy. It is to be found in the far reaches of the countryside, among the hundreds of civilian field representatives of such assorted agencies as the USIA, AID, and the State Department. In other wars, those with the lowest rank could be faulted for seeing only a slice of the battlefront. In this war, the underlings, work among the people and see it all because the people, who are the same everywhere, are what the war is all about. The average "pacification" worker, whatever agency he works for, is likely to speak Vietnamese and to be as knowledgeable in stringing barbed wire defenses as in well-digging or dealing diplomatically with a hamlet chief. He is also likely to be living dangerously amidst an unseen enemy.

Just how dangerously is all too vividly dramatized in the latest casualty reports on the Vietcong offensive of the past two weeks. In that span, at least eight civilian officials were killed; two were captured, including the U.S. provincial representative in Hue; eleven are missing; and ten were wounded, six of them seriously. Five young members of the International Voluntary service, a private "Peace Corps" under contract to AID, are also missing. This is a small tally, all but lost alongside the military casualty reports, but it speaks volumes about the Vietnam war.

It tells of a struggle in which civilian officials are as much combatants as men in uniform—for these are only the worst, not the first civilian casualties. It offers a measure, too, of the damage inflicted by the latest Vietcong offensive, however impermanent the enemy's military gains. For if this many American "pacification" workers were caught up in the fighting, a much larger number of their South Vietnamese coworkers must be casualties, too. Whole programs, it is reckoned, must now be patiently reassembled and reinstalled.

Perhaps most important, these casualties among civilian workers are a sharp reminder of where the ultimate problem lies. Our attention now is riveted to the ebb and flow of military battle; official reassurances rest on "the best military advice"; by the body count, we are told, enemy forces are "failing" everywhere. Sooner or later, however, it is all going to come down, once again, to the people and their security and to the question of how to counter terror with the appeal of a strong and active Saigon government. This is the part of the struggle nobody thinks enough about until the AID men and USIA officials and young Foreign Service Officers who are waging it, and trying to get the South Vietnamese to wage it more vigorously, are caught up in the conventional fighting and become casualties of war.

"TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER"—POEM BY JAMES R. HOWARD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, James R. Howard was one of the two students from Utah who were chosen to come to Washington for the Senate Youth Conference sponsored by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation. Mr. Howard is a senior student at Granite High School and a finalist in the merit scholar competition. His leadership activities in high school have been very many. While James Howard was in Washington, he had the opportunity to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery. As a result of this experience he has written a poem, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The poem speaks for itself. In my opinion, the perception and depth of feeling of this young man and his ability to express it are both inspiring.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(By James R. Howard)

You lie in your cold grave—triumphant in death because you defeated tyranny, peaceful in death because you died a free man.
And I wonder what tribute can I pay to you—
A patriot who loved freedom and country enough to forfeit life and name on a foreign battle field?
I would thank you—but words of thanks cannot penetrate the grave.
I would weep for you—but tears can neither stir your silent body nor warm your still heart.
I would laugh for you but laughter would disintregate against the walls of your joyless tomb.
I would comfort you as a brother—but brotherhood cannot surmount the obstacle of eternity.
I would show you the free land you helped to save—but your vision is blocked by the curtain of death.
So I will offer you the one tribute which makes your death meaningful and my life worthwhile. I will honor your memory by pledging myself to the perpetuation of those ideals for which you fought and died—the defense of freedom, the love of liberty and a peaceful future.
Thus will your death enrich my life. Thus will my actions honor your unknown name.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, nearly 200 years ago the fires of freedom were ignited on this continent and have burned brightly ever since. In our brief history as a nation our freedom has been threatened from time to time but never demolished. It is perhaps the fortune of geography which has made this possible for us since 3,000 miles of water separate our shores from those whose greed and avarice might lead them to venture against us. It is also, unquestionably, our own vigorous defense of freedom here at home and our desire to maintain freedom for others abroad which have dampened the enthusiasm of any would-be tyrant for a military advanture our way.

There are many nations less fortunate than ours in that geography places them next to those who are more powerful and whose greed is unbounded. Europe has for many centuries been plagued by this mischance of geography which has placed small and vulnerable nations in such a position as to be easily victimized by their powerful neighbors.

This is the problem which in all of its existence has troubled the tiny country of Lithuania on the Baltic Sea. Throughout its history it has had powerful, greedy neighbors both to the east and west, and throughout most of its history its men have been under arms in an effort to protect themselves and their homes against the overwhelming odds of the powers against them.

Early in their history the Lithuanian people fought and eventually conquered invading forces of the Teutonic Knights. But there was no respite. Within a matter of years, the Golden Horde overran them and once again the men of Lithuania had to fight in the fields and the woods and even the city streets. They fought bravely and they fought well and were able to drive out the invaders.

The might of their Russian neighbor, however, was then poised against them and, although the people of Lithuania fought with all the bravery they possessed their tiny country was overwhelmed by the massive forces unleashed from Moscow. For over a century the Lithuanian people were the serfs and bound servants of the Russian empire. Nearly 30 years ago, once again the people of Lithuania were a free nation. It was in 1918 that the bells of their church towers rang out the good news. There for a brief space between the wars Lithuania lived as a sovereign and independent country able to guide its own destinies and to permit its people to build for its own future just as for 200 years the United States has so been blessed.

The tide of history, however, ran against them once again and their tiny land was swallowed up by the voracious and ruthless Soviet Union and all vestiges of independence were destroyed. When the armies of Nazi Germany rolled eastward the people of Lithuania were crushed under the wheels of this monstrous war machine and their land became a battleground between two giants.

In 1945 when the rest of Europe was freed from the power of Hitler's Germany, no such glorious event could be celebrated in Lithuania because an evil and malignant power was again controlling their land. Since that day Lithuania has been a part of the Soviet Union physically, but never a part of the Soviet Union in spirit.

Mr. President, the light of freedom has flickered in Lithuania but it has never gone out because in the hearts of the people it still glows.

As Americans we have been concerned for all our history with the freedom of all men everywhere. In more recent times, we have undertaken a mighty struggle to preserve freedom in another small country—Vietnam—where Americans have fought and died in an effort to stem the tide of aggression. At times I feel we are so concerned as a nation with the fate of this one people that we tend to overlook or to ignore the equally disastrous fate which has overtaken many other people in many other parts of the globe.

Such is the situation in Lithuania today. The people are not free. The people are subject to brutal and continuing tyranny. But their hopes for freedom live on. As long as they do hope for freedom we in the United States must dedicate ourselves to the proposition that their freedom is ours as well. As long as one man in this world is not free, no man is truly free. So long as one nation in this world must bow to another no nation is truly free.

Mr. President, every American, I am sure, shares my hope that within our lifetime freedom once again will ring out for this tiny and beleaguered nation, and that Lithuanians can once again stand tall, as proud in their freedom as we are in ours.

A POORLY BALANCED DIET OF JOURNALISM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 18, Howard K. Smith took leave of his newspaper column, at least for the time being, by saying he believed that a big contributing factor to the confusion and frustration now damaging the spirit of this Nation is, as he put it, "the poorly balanced diet of journalism it is getting."

Mr. Smith, I would observe, is a fortunate man. He is taking a sabbatical—time off to ask questions and study documents, to steep himself in the facts of the dispiriting sixties, and make sure that he has not been among the journalists who have been wrong. Would that we in the Senate could arrange time to do the same. It is, as you know, a fond dream of mine that, one day, the Congress will provide a mechanism for its Members to take time off and recharge their batteries and rethink their thoughts. Even if we cannot, however, it is encouraging when a columnist of Howard K. Smith's caliber does so. I, for one, shall miss his columns in the Evening Star. But I shall await his return to the printed medium with great interest.

For now, Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of Senators to his Sunday column in which he states his belief—and it is a belief I share—that—

> Too many reporters today are not rising to the demands of a time that calls for especially perceptive reporting and especially judicious interpretation of events.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Howard K. Smith column, entitled "A Poorly Balanced Diet of Journalism," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A POORLY BALANCED DIET OF JOURNALISM"

(By Howard K. Smith)

With regret I have decided to make this my last column for a while. The reason for interrupting this series may serve as a closing comment on the times.

In several past periods—notably in the years around our entry into World War II—I had the exhilarating feeling of being a tiny part in a great age of journalism. I miss that feeling now. Though there are many exceptions, I believe too many reporters today are not rising to the demands of a time that calls for especially perceptive reporting and especially judicious interpretation of events. I believe that a big contributing factor to the confusion and frustration now damaging the nation's spirit is the poorly balanced diet of journalism it is getting.

A ready example is the elevation of Stokely Carmichael into a real force in our nation. The similar elevation of Joe McCarthy a generation back was bad enough; but at least he was a U.S. Senator one could not ignore. Mr. Carmichael is basically a nobody who, before the press took notice of him, had achieved nothing and represented no one. He failed to win a following—except from us with our cameras and note pads—in the rural south and in the city ghettos. Exclusively due to the prominence given him by journalism he has now been promoted into a factor to be reckoned with.

"If I say no to Stokely," a rights leader told me recently, "you fellows won't print it in one sentence on the back page. My people think I am doing nothing. But if I go see him, it's on the front page and my people think I am in there pitching."

In the realm of government, the reporters' term "credibility gap" is one of the most distorting over-simplifications of the time. The President is dealing with unutterably complex situations in which the very facts on which to base judgment may not be in for weeks; yet we tend to call it calculated deception if he does not instantly provide conclusive facts and admit failure. He is dealing with situations subject to rapid and drastic change, calling for highly flexible response; but if he does not keep a frozen consistency, he is held to be lying. No government ever has been run that way and none ever will.

This writer finds the role of defending established authority, after a career made up mostly of dissent, uncomfortable. But the criticism of Mr. Johnson has long since burst the bounds of legitimacy and even often of decency. To cite a random example. I find it hard to adjust to the suggestion of a famous TV commentator the other day that it is becoming easier to believe an Oriental tyrant (Ho Chi Minh) than it is to believe the President of the U.S. That commentator has simply not kept up with the statements of the Oriental tyrant, who insists no North Vietnamese troops have ever been in South Vietnam and who states that 150,000 Americans have been killed in the war.

The Vietnam war itself offers a cluster of troubling examples. Consider as one tiny but typical example the space, attention and incitement to protest allowed the photo the other day of an overwrought South Vietnamese officer executing a Vietcong. The Vietcong had just murdered many of the officer's men, and was out of uniform and therefore subject to execution. Not even a perfunctory acknowledgement was made of the fact that such executions en masse, are the Vietcong way of war: my son witnessed the execution by the Communists of a dozen American soldiers—in uniform—in the same way. He was permitted to remain a witness because he was so bloody and paralyzed by his wounds that the Communists thought him dead and not worth a bullet.

Some journalists of the present time are dreadfully wrong. And the thought has not escaped me that I may be one of them. So, I have decided to take time off from regular comment, ask questions and study documents, steep myself in the facts of the dispiriting sixties, and make sure. I hope to put the conclusions into a book. I am very grateful to Publishers-Hall Syndicate and the newspapers that have carried this column. After a while I shall be knocking on their doors and asking space again.

"WHILE 6 MILLION DIED: A CHRONICLE OF AMERICAN APATHY"—STRONG ARGUMENT FOR RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a book has appeared that should be required reading for every Senator. It is called "While 6 Million Died: A Chronicle of American Apathy," and was written by Arthur D. Morse. The book is not comfortable reading, for it tells of American indifference to the Nazi atrocities against the Jews—indifference which assisted Hitler in carrying out his dreadful decision to kill millions of innocent people.

Balfour Brickner in reviewing the book said:

> Perhaps the best that can be said is that our nation was then not yet ready for the role history and human madness imposed upon it, and that surely we would not let such a horror reoccur. One certainly hopes this is the case, but reviewing the present scene, one wonders. It is hard not to be cynical these days.

Mr. President, it is indeed hard not to be cynical. Twenty-five years after the implementation of Hitler's final solution, the Senate has not ratified the Human Rights Convention on Genocide. Twenty years after we participated in the Nuremberg war trials, we have still not declared genocide an international crime. It is indeed hard not to be cynical.

I urge the Senate to act. Let us sit on the sidelines no longer. Let us join 71 other countries. Let us ratify the Genocide Convention.

MORIARTY, N. MEX.—NATIONAL CLEANEST TOWN TROPHY WINNER

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the old adage of "dynamite comes in little packages" is an apt description of a small but one of the most dynamic towns in New Mexico and probably in the entire United States. I speak of the town of Moriarty, N. Mex., which with a total population of approximately 1,200 citizens is proving that you do not have to be big to be heard.

Moriarty is blessed with a community spirit of cooperation which is unmatched anywhere. Led by its town mayor and city council, this small town which is located on U.S. Highway 66—the most traveled highway in New Mexico—just 30 miles east of Albuquerque, has won not only statewide but national recognition time and time again.

Once again, Moriarty has shown us all what local initiative and cooperation can accomplish. This year—for the second year in a row—the town of Moriarty has been awarded the distinction of the "national cleanest town" in the United States. Moriarty has conducted a yearlong cleanup campaign in competition with hundreds of other towns and cities nationwide, including our great metropolitan areas. But once again, as they did last year, the delegation from Moriarty will be taking home the trophy—the true mark of a winner.

This morning, in ceremonies sponsored by the National Cleanup-Paintup-

Fixup Bureau, the First Lady, who has been in the forefront of all recent beautification efforts, presented the National Cleanest Town trophy to the delegation from Moriarty, led by its mayor, Mr. Ray Johnston. Thus, Lady Bird Johnson officially bestowed the recognition upon the town of Moriarty that the citizens of that small community so well deserve.

Mr. President, seated in the Senate Gallery today are the representatives of Moriarty. Among them are Mayor and Mrs. Ray Johnston, State Senator and Town Councilman Ernest Hawkins, Town Clerk Mrs. Rita Davis, Town Marshal John Davis, Moriarty Chamber of Commerce Board Member and Mrs. J. T. Turner, and Chamber of Commerce President and Cochairman of the Town Cleanup Campaign Bob Durham. I take great pride in congratulating them, and the entire citizenry of Moriarty for this honor and recognition which they have brought not only to their town but to the entire State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report prepared by the Moriarty delegation outlining the efforts put forth by the community be inserted at this point in the RECORD. I believe it is interesting to note the part which the youth of the community played in this achievement. With such inspired youngsters, Moriarty can look forward to many, many years of growth, prosperity, and continued accomplishments.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF MORIARTY, N. MEX., CLEANUP CAMPAIGN, 1967

Attempting to single out a particular highlight of our campaign is a difficult thing to do. But it just has to be the well-organized work of the youth of our city.

Three years ago the Governor of New Mexico appointed a Governor's Youth Beautification Committee. This later became the "State Youth Committee to Keep New Mexico Beautiful". We were fortunate in having Miss Linda Dunn, a Junior in high school elected to this committee. And, she was truly a "live wire" in our campaign.

We decided that one way to really get things done was to get the youth enthused and involved in beautification and clean-up. This responsibility was given to Miss Dunn. Although her time was already completely occupied by many activities, we felt that she would be able to accomplish this tremendous task. She completely took over and the youth work was started. The "Youth Committee to Keep Moriarty Beautiful" was formed, composed of a representative of each youth organization in Moriarty. Members of the Youth Committee and the organizations they represent are:

Gene Williams, Future Farmers of America; Pamela Mooney, Future Homemakers of America; Nixie Williams, Moriarty Junior 4-H Club; Mary Ann Grissom, Moriarty Senior 4-H Club; Sylvia Ireland, Order of Rainbow for Girls; Max Cisneros, Order of Demolay for Boys; Cathy Chaney, Pegasus Horse Club; Steve Wilson, Moriarty Little League; Gayle Tillery, Moriarty Youth Council; Michaela Anaya, American Legion Junior Auxiliary; Larry Senter, Moriarty High School Student Council; and Betsy Clark, School Band.

These young people established what they called:

"A CHALLENGE TO THIS COMMITTEE

"We are the ones who have to decide
Whether we will do it or toss it aside.
We are the people who make up our minds
Whether we will lead or linger behind.
Whether we will try for a goal that is far
Or be contented to stay where we are.
Take it or leave it: Here's something to discuss,
Just think it over—it's all up to us."

They met frequently to plan, and follow-up these plans with progress reports. All of the youth organizations were active in the serious business of promoting and taking part in beautification and clean-up. Their participation in our campaign gained momentum day by day and also gained them several awards. They assisted in the preparation and planting of flowers for beautification, cleaning of property belonging to elderly people, who could not do this themselves, and collecting old tin cans from vacant lots and trash and litter from alleys.

They spread the word of beautification and clean-up—but not just locally. They promoted our state beautification organization by selling decals and printed sweatshirts to help in financing the state organization. Some gave talks and reports in other towns and successfully encouraged other youth to be aware of and promote beautification.

The trust we placed in the youth of Moriarty was certainly the rewarding highlight of our 1967 clean-up campaign. They are already working this year; as a matter of fact, they didn't quit last year.

To make a long story of praise short—don't sell the youth short. Give them a job to do and it will be done.

THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Dallas Times Herald, in an editorial entitled "A Time for Calmness," said that President Johnson "is acting wisely in his cautious, carefully calculated, though determined, moves through diplomatic channels to secure a bloodless settlement of the *Pueblo* crisis."

President Johnson and the members of his administration have displayed the highest degree of tact and intelligence in handling the *Pueblo* crisis. Rash or precipitous action that only would have inflamed an already critical situation has been avoided.

Instead, recognizing full well that the most important factor is the safe return of the members of the *Pueblo's* crew, the President has acted with determination but with restraint in his efforts to bring their return about.

The United States is doing all it can to resolve this situation. We cannot let North Korea's actions go unchallenged. But we must act wisely ourselves. That is the course the President is following, and he deserves commendation for it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of January 28, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Jan. 28, 1968]

A TIME FOR CALMNESS

In the sudden explosion of feeling set off in this country by the North Koreans' hijacking of the Pueblo, we must take care that the heated atmosphere here does not become overheated.

As in all times of crises, this is a time for calmness, a time for hard-headed, realistic appraisals by the citizenry of this nation. Secretary of State Dean Rusk Wednesday advised the North Korean people to "cool it." The same admonition for coolness could well be directed at our own people also.

Certainly, as Dean Rusk also declared, the seizure of the Pueblo and its crew is intolerable, and "there can be no satisfactory result short of prompt, immediate release of the ship." The ship and its crew must be returned. The Communists' arrogant challenge to our pride and our prestige precludes any other result. Just as compelling is the fact that if the Communists succeed in defeating us on this issue, they will be encouraged to go on to further acts of provocation, less deterred by fear and consideration of the consequences.

Nevertheless, hotheaded demands for immediate military retaliation, whether by congressmen or an excited public, are at this point premature.

The President is acting wisely in his cautious, carefully calculated, though determined, moves through diplomatic channels to secure a "bloodless settlement of the Pueblo crisis." A number of diplomatic paths are still open to this end, not the least of which is persuading the Russians to use their influence to convince the North Koreans that the ship and crew must be released.

Continued pressure must be, and undoubtedly will be, kept on Moscow to intercede with the North Koreans, even though initial efforts in that direction have failed. The Russians undoubtedly have their apprehensions about the possibilities of a war which could push the North Koreans into the embrace of their mortal enemy, Red China.

The gravest danger of precipitate military action now appears to be the implied threat by the North Koreans that they might try the captured Americans, the threat that the crewmen "must be punished by law."

The North Koreans must be solemnly warned that any such action would inflame the anger of the American people to the point where military reprisal would be almost inevitable. Surely the Communist government of North Korea will not choose to visit such a catastrophe on their people, and surely a "bloodless" settlement can be achieved.

PRIME MINISTER HAROLD WILSON OF GREAT BRITAIN APPEARS ON "FACE THE NATION"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the transcript of the CBS television network broadcast "Face the Nation" for February 11, 1968, the guest for that day having been the Right Honorable Harold Wilson, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

There being no objection the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACE THE NATION

(Broadcast over the CBS television network and the CBS radio network, Sunday, February 11, 1968)

Guest: The Right Honorable Harold Wilson, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

News correspondents: Martin Agronsky, CBS News; Marquis Childs, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Marvin Kalb, CBS News.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

Producers: Prentiss Childs and Sylvia Westerman.

ANNOUNCER. The following program was recorded on Friday.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mr. Prime Minister, would you say now, after your talks with President Johnson, what you said after your talks with Premier Kosygin in Moscow, that is, that only a very narrow bridge remains to be crossed to reach peace in Vietnam?

Prime Minister Wilson. I believe that, yes. But, of course, the events of the last ten days have made it a lot harder to cross that very narrow bridge.

Announcer. From CBS Washington, in color, "Face the Nation," a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain, who visited the United States this week for talks with President Johnson. Prime Minister Wilson will be questioned by CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb, Marquis Childs, Washington Bureau Chief of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky.

Mr. Agronsky. Mr. Prime Minister, in light of the fact that Premier Kosygin said very recently that he was not authorized to do anything about peace in Vietnam, aren't you giving perhaps a misleading impression when you indicate, as you did after your Moscow meeting, as you do now, that the prospects for peace have perhaps improved?

Prime Minister Wilson. Not at all a misleading impression. He has not been authorized by Hanoi to negotiate, that is what he has made clear on a number of occasions. Last year, in London, when he was there in February, he spent a great deal of time with me trying to work out exactly what the gap was to be bridged and how it could be bridged. And this year he made clear in the communique that the Soviet government would do everything in their power, either jointly with us, as Geneva co-chairmen, or separately, to try and achieve the kind of political settlement that at the end of the day must be reached in Vietnam.

Mr. Childs. But last year, in London, Mr. Prime Minister, the whole stress by both you and Premier Kosygin was on ending the bombing, and you gave every indication that if the bombing were ended there could be peace talks. Now you seem to have changed your viewpoint on that because you do not urge an end to the bombing.

Prime Minister Wilson. No, no. Last year all the emphasis—and it went on day after day and night after night—was to see what guarantees could be given by Hanoi that if the bombing were to stop there would be no undue military advantage taken of that position. And we made a lot of progress in trying to work out a basis on which there could be an assurance to the United States of the bombing stopped. At the end of the day the operation failed. This year we were talking much more, in Moscow, from the position laid down by the San Antonio formula, which I believe and which I said again in these past few days in Washington, is the road to peace, and to try to reconcile that with the statement of Foreign Minister Trinh of North Vietnam. And here the problem is how we can insure, if we can ever insure, that Hanoi would follow the bombing by going promptly to the conference table and that the talks will be meaningful and not just time-wasting or, shall we say, another Panmunjom.

Mr. Kalb. Mr. Prime Minister, a number of people in this country say that if the Soviet Union were so interested in bringing this to a peaceful settlement they could do it in one way by reducing their arms supplies to North Vietnam.

Prime Minister Wilson. This is not realistic, you know. The Soviet government has their own problems within the Communist world of their relations and their rivalry with China. This is a big problem in Hanoi, the struggle for power within Hanoi between China and Russian influence there. Of course, Russia could cut off arms supplies. I don't think that would increase their influence in Hanoi if they were to do it.

Mr. Childs. Mr. Prime Minister, in your toast to the President you put great stress on restraint and the importance of restraint. As you know, at the time of the Pueblo incident there was congressional clamor for the use of tactical nuclear weapons if a second front developed. Now something like that same pressure is growing in relation to the massive attack on Khe Sanh for the use of tactical nuclear weapons in South Vietnam. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on a world view of the United States if in the last resort we use such weapons?

Prime Minister Wilson. You realize, of course, I can't comment on internal political controversy in the United States or say anything about what is being said in Congress or the Senate. But to answer the direct question I think any attempt to escalate this war will be most dangerous, to escalate it either qualitatively or in an extent or in an area or—I think will be extremely dangerous. As for the proposal, whoever makes it, to use tactical nuclear weapons in that war, this would be lunacy.

Mr. Childs. You think this would be disastrous for America's position?

Prime Minister Wilson. It would not only be disastrous to America's position, it would run a very, very great risk of escalation for the world. It would be sheer lunacy.

Mr. Kalb. In what way, sir? What kind of scenario do you see?

Prime Minister Wilson. I don't knock out scenarios. A lot of other people can do that. But I think, in the first place, it would—when you talk about America's position, meaning America's image in the world, I think it would have a disastrous effect, certainly.

Mr. Kalb. What about that image right now, Mr. Prime Minister? You have traveled around the world a good deal. Do you find that that image has suffered in any way because of the war?

Prime Minister Wilson. Everybody has got their own mind made up about this one way or the other. I have found that at prime minister conferences, I get anti-Vietnam, which means anti-American, demonstrations almost everywhere I go. In Britain I get these things, especially in university towns. The only place I have been to recently where I didn't have any at all was Moscow, where they don't demonstrate about Vietnam. But most people have made up their minds about this. I believe that the American position, for example, in San Antonio, on the stopping of the bombing hasn't been thoroughly understood. I tried to help this week in this matter as indeed I have in the British House of Commons. And I think the other thing is that the scene on our television screens, some of the evidence of atrocities and barbarism, in the last ten days' fighting in Saigon, may have had some effect in bringing home to our own people what the issues are. Though, of course, there is barbarity and there is ferocity on both sides. That ghastly picture that the world saw of that execution in cold blood—now this has a very bad effect, but so I think do the effects of some of the Viet Cong activities.

Mr. Agronsky. Mr. Prime Minister, a recent public opinion poll in your country demonstrated that 66 per cent of the people of Great Britain are opposed to U.S. policy in Vietnam and, therefore, are opposed to your supporting American policy in Vietnam. Does that affect you in any way? Do you feel that they are wrong and that you speak rightly for Britain?

Prime Minister Wilson. I don't think a government can just follow a policy based on public opinion polls. If so, every country would abolish taxation and increase government expenditure. So far as this is concerned, I think our line is right. It is not an easy line to take. There is very great criticism of it in the House of Commons from my own friends and supporters. It is not easy. We believe this line is right, but, of course, as I have said and said again in Washington this week, if I thought that dissociation from the American policy would shorten the war by one day or make the chance of a durable peace that bit stronger, of course I would do it. It is because I don't think that that I haven't done it.

Mr. Childs. You have—excuse me.

Prime Minister Wilson. But escalation, if there were escalation of the kind that you said, of course, we should make our view known immediately.

Mr. Childs. You have much stronger party discipline in your country than we have here. A very large number of your majority in the House of Commons is opposed to your policy. Do you think you can hold that majority in spite of the deep, apparently emotional reaction to your support of our policy in Vietnam?

Prime Minister Wilson. We had these difficulties when I had a majority of three in the House of Commons. And I believe what is called party discipline must depend on freedom of expression of views, and I think it right that my colleagues in the parliamentary party express their great anxiety in any way to me or to my colleagues in the government. But at the end of the day it has got to be government's responsibility, particularly where major issues of world affairs are affected, and then our colleagues are going to decide their attitude to the action that we have taken.

Mr. Agronsky. Mr. Prime Minister, isn't your own influence and the impact of your whole position in Great Britain seriously endangered when you find yourself in the paradoxical position, as you now do, of finding Mr. Heath, the leader of the opposition, passing a resolution in the House, supported by the entire shadow cabinet of the Conservative Party, supporting your position on Vietnam, and you find something like 30 or 40 per cent of your party against it? You stand with the opposition and you stand against almost half of the position of your own party. How long can you continue that?

Prime Minister Wilson. Oh, any identification of particular groups, whether opposition or anything else in the British House of Commons, is purely coincidental. We do what is right. I will express my views on that particular motion when I get back to Britain. I am very much in favor of all possible exports to America except political controversy, which I would like to keep at home.

Mr. Kalb. Mr. Prime Minister, the implication of what you have said twice in this broadcast is that if the President were to decide to escalate the war in Vietnam, as a result of the current Communist offensive, that you then might be forced to disassociate Britain's support.

Prime Minister Wilson. We support the action taken by the United States when we think that this is the one most likely to bring the political settlement which, at the end of the day, must come. There will be no military imposed solution in this war. And we support any measures taken to that end, as long as we are satisfied, as we are satisfied about the sincerity of the proposals for peace negotiations.

Mr. Kalb. Do you think we're on the right track in Vietnam?

Prime Minister Wilson. This is a matter, of course, the American government must decide. I believe that you are on the right track for ending this ghastly situation, namely by putting forward proposals for peace negotiations, which I think are reasonable and which all of us must try and get the other side to accept.

Mr. Childs. Coming back to your relations with Premier Kosygin, do you have a continuing exchange with him, Mr. Prime Minister?

Prime Minister Wilson. Yes.

Mr. Childs. On Vietnam?

Prime Minister Wilson. On a number of questions, of course, including Vietnam, including problems of European security. We have this hot link now between Downing Street and the Kremlin which we can use. And also, of course, we keep in touch through ambassadors.

Mr. Childs. You use that not alone for emergency situations but for continuing dialogue, do you?

Prime Minister Wilson. It has not been installed very long. It has only been in three or four months, and so a regular pattern hasn't been established. But we would use it exactly as I do the similar link with the White House, for continuing dialogue, quite apart from emergency situations.

Mr. Agronsky. Mr. Prime Minister, did you raise with Premier Kosygin, with the Russians, the withdrawal of Britain from—all of its forces east of Suez, from Singapore and from the Persian Gulf, and did you raise with him the obvious concern throughout the free world that the Soviets may step into the vacuum that is created by the British withdrawal?

Prime Minister Wilson. No, I didn't raise it. I didn't need to raise it. He knew the facts exactly as every other country does, so I didn't raise it with him. We took our decision. We don't have to raise it with anybody. In fact, it came up in discussion. I think his anxiety was—he said he is afraid now that the Americans would move into these areas we're moving out of.

Mr. Kalb. Well do you yourself feel, sir, that there is the possibility of a Pax Americana?

Prime Minister Wilson. World peace must come from the United Nations. We're no longer living in a world where there can be a pax imposed by any nation, however strong, however specific in its intentions.

Mr. Agronsky. There is a very great concern in this country—I repeat, Mr. Prime Minister—as to who will replace Britain in the areas from which she has now removed herself. Did you raise that with the President when you spoke to him?

Prime Minister Wilson. A question of who replaces—you know, there was a song about the Road to Mandalay, which I very much enjoyed. It was beautifully sung. We got out of Mandalay twenty years ago. There has been no problem of replacement in Mandalay. What we have got to do is to help our good friends in Singapore and Malaysia to help themselves. We shall do all we can in the way of training. We shall leave equipment behind. We shall leave them in a position to become viable economically. And, really, the best answer is for our friends to be more capable of looking after themselves.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, suppose they cannot?

Prime Minister Wilson. We can't go on carrying on the policeman's role in the world.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, if that is your attitude in regard to Malaysia, many Americans are concerned that the South Vietnamese, for example, are not able to help themselves and that is the reason that we are there. Would you expect us to help those who can't help themselves in the other parts of the world because you have laid down the burden?

Prime Minister Wilson. So far as South Vietnam is concerned, I understand it to be American policy that as soon as the people get to the conference table and a political settlement, there will be no intention to maintain United States troops in that area but that the people of South Vietnam would then look after themselves. This is exactly our position. It has been our position in a whole generation of decolonialization, of moving out and leaving the people there with such help as we could give them to look after themselves. Certainly in the areas we are proposing to leave, in the Far East, I have no doubt at all about the vigor and virility and ability of Malaysia and Singapore to look after themselves. We have, of course, and shall have a general capability, based on Europe, based on Britain and on the Continent of Europe, and we would always be ready to consider coming to the help of our Commonwealth colleagues, our Commonwealth partners, if that were necessary. But there will be no prior obligation to do so, nor would there be any question of keeping a special capability in the area.

Mr. Childs. Mr. Prime Minister, in connection with your withdrawal from, in effect, a world role, why do you need nuclear power any more? Why do you need a nuclear card in this game?

Prime Minister Wilson. Why do we need it? Well, as I say, of course, this was something we inherited. It had gone past the point of no return. I have never exaggerated the importance of British nuclear power as British nuclear power and I have always, I think, dismissed the pretentions of those who talk about a genuinely independent British deterrent. It isn't. Nevertheless, having got the Polaris submarines and it having gone so far, we believe that we are right to commit this to NATO on a collective basis.

Mr. Childs. You aren't going to sell the Polaris submarines, as has been reported?

Prime Minister Wilson. Sell it?

Mr. Childs. This has been a rumor over here.

Prime Minister Wilson. Well, I haven't heard——

Mr. Childs. It came into print.

Prime Minister Wilson. I haven't had anybody in the market for Polaris submarines and shortly we will be, I hope, all of us, signing the nonproliferation treaty which will preclude the sale, transfer, gift, alienation of nuclear weapons. No, they are committed to NATO. Meanwhile, of course, the bomber deterrent is slowly over a period phasing out.

Mr. Kalb. Mr. Prime Minister, given the pending withdrawal of a good deal of British power from east of Suez, do you plan to use some of that power to bolster British forces on the Continent and perhaps to increase the British naval presence in the Mediterranean?

Prime Minister Wilson. It will, of course, be our intention to make a full contribution to NATO and to concentrate our military capability mainly on Europe, including, of course, Britain, which is in Europe. We don't envisage strengthening or increasing our contribution to Germany and there is still, of course, the problem of financing the foreign exchange burden, which we are now discussing with the Germans. I think as to the question of the Mediterranean, we had better sort all of these things out when we publish our new defense policy in July.

Mr. Agronsky. May we turn to the question of the Mediterranean? As you know, there is throughout the world a growing concern about the increase in Soviet strength in the Middle East. The Soviets have been arming the Arab states and since the June war with Israel they have re-armed the Arab states; did you raise that concern with Kosygin in Moscow?

Prime Minister Wilson. Yes, of course. We had a very full discussion about the Middle East, including a long talk about the problems of opening the canal. Now, their position and ours is different. Their position and that of America is different. This is well known. What we tried to do is to see what progress can be made within the ambit of the Security Council Resolution which our own representative, Lord Caradon, the British representative, introduced at the end of last year. And they fully support this resolution. We are going to need a lot more, I think, give and take on both sides before we can turn it into a reality. But we said, and they agreed, that the thing for the time being is to back up the Jarring Mission in fulfillment of that Security Council Resolution and that must be the next step in Middle East policy.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, did you discuss with them the inconsistency of their being for this resolution, at the same time going all out to re-arm the Arab world?

Prime Minister Wilson. Well, of course, the only answer to this—and we took an initiative in this last June—is arms control an arms control policy in the Middle East. That is not acceptable to the Soviet government, obviously. And I am not at all clear in the present situation what the attitude of France is to the question of arms supply in the Middle East. I don't think it will be generally acceptable, but this is the only way to get any progress. You won't do any good just by telling one country not to arm its friends, however much you may deplore what is going on.

Mr. Childs. Mr. Prime Minister, you have had some problems on foreign exchange. You devalued the pound. What is your opinion of the President's proposed travel tax that is intended to keep Americans out of Europe, particularly since I believe three per cent of your foreign exchange comes from the American dollar spent by travelers?

Prime Minister Wilson. Again, I must not get involved in an issue which is now on the floor of Congress. But as far as the general proposals are concerned, they will hit us considerably. They will hit other countries more. In view of the situation the United States was facing, I felt, when I got the message from the President informing me of what he was going to do, that his general package, tough though it was, was a fair and reasonable package. I mustn't comment on individual bits of it, and particularly the tourist tax. What I am worried about is the proposal for what will be a small export subsidy and for border taxes. I think this would not be helpful. It might continue what is already a rather dangerous pile of protectionism and, as we knew thirty years ago, once this begins it can be devastating. But I felt he was justified in taking action, even though it will hurt us a little.

Mr. Kalb. Mr. Prime Minister, I would like to get back to Vietnam. You have expressed your support of the President's position, but isn't that expression of support really a qualified expression? Were you just completely in tune with what the President is doing in Vietnam?

Prime Minister Wilson. Of course it is a qualified——

Mr. Kalb. Well, could you tell us what the qualifications are?

Prime Minister Wilson. We are a sovereign country, not a satellite. I don't say that whatever he may decide tomorrow or the day after we shall go along with. I say we will go along with it as long as we think it is right and the best way to peace. That is our position.

Mr. Agronsky. As of now you think it is right?

Prime Minister Wilson. As of now—and I have had many anxieties over the last three years and I have been living with this problem for three years. I have had anxieties sometimes about whether there was, in the early days, three years ago, a real willingness for negotiations. Since the Baltimore speech onward I have had no doubts about that. And I am supporting this line because I think that San Antonio interpreted, as I did interpret it to the Russians, obviously in accordance with the American interpretation, that this is the road to peace. That is why I support it.

Mr. Childs. You don't believe, then, as many critics of the President here believe, that certain peace overtures over the past year and a half or two years have been aborted by sudden unexpected bombing attacks, that there has been a failure to take advantage of peace overtures?

Prime Minister Wilson. This has been said, and I know that it is widely believed on the other side of the Iron Curtain. I have been into this at great length with the Russians, for example—and with others, particularly around about the time of December 1966. I think there were great misunderstandings at that time and sheer breakdowns in communication. But there have been long periods of no bombing. There has been this very long period of restraints starting last autumn in relation to Hanoi and Haiphong to which there has been no response. I think there have been cases, more of misunderstanding than of any wrong policy.

Mr. KALB. There has been a response, Mr. Prime Minister. The North Vietnamese have come around some ways from "could" to "will." They have said just this past week that the talks will start as soon as the bombing is stopped. There is some give on the other side.

Prime Minister WILSON. Yes, I thought the move from "could" to "will" was important and I don't think it was just an exercise in semantics. It certainly wasn't a problem of translation or interpretation. They are, I think, keen that the world should know that they meant "will" and not "could." But, in addition to that, I think they are probably taking on-board what I tried to tell Kosygin, that it must be a prompt start in negotiation, because you couldn't have them hanging about for six months intensifying the war and then continue with the bombing pause; Nor could they destroy the possibility of negotiations once begun by taking unfair military advantage. In those circumstances I am afraid all bets would be off. And I think they are coming to understand this.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mr. Prime Minister, would you feel that the last statement of the North Vietnamese Foreign Minister, Mr. Trinh, indicates any more give? We would assume that you discussed that with the President. Would you have gone further than the President has gone?

Prime Minister WILSON. I referred to it in the speech I made in the White House, at the dinner, the latest statement. I would like to know what he means. And sometimes it is what you can get from them in private that is more important than what they say in public. I think it is a further advance. I think it points the road to how to get onto the bridge. But, of course, I mean the sensible thing would be if somebody from North Vietnam would sit around with perhaps one or both of the Geneva co-chairmen and say exactly what it really means. To have these long-range exchanges in Vietnamese semantics when really the lives of thousands of people depends on it does suggest to me the right thing is—all right, if you have got something to say, let's go without prejudice, get around the table and see what these words "will," "could," and the rest mean. I believe the difference is very small if the will is there.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, one clear action you could have involved yourself in when you were talking with Kosygin was to call for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, which you co-chair with the Russians. Did you do that?

Prime Minister WILSON. Oh, we've done that about a hundred times.

Mr. AGRONSKY. This time?

Prime Minister WILSON. And they have not been willing—I raised it with them again—their view is that once there is a willingness by what they call the "parties" to the conflict to get around the table, then the co-chairmen can give any help the parties want, whether by convening this kind of conference or that kind of conference and the rest. I am not absolutely certain that a full-dress Geneva Conference, with all the same personnel who were there last time, would necessarily be the most helpful in securing peace. I think the Chinese were a little difficult on the last occasion in Geneva, in 1954, and I am not sure they are all that more helpful today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Mr. Prime Minister, I regret we have run out of time. Thank you very much for being here to Face the Nation.

ANNOUNCER. Today on Face the Nation, Prime Minister Harold Wilson, of Great Britain, was interviewed by CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb, Marquis Childs, Washington Bureau Chief of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky led the questioning. Next week another prominent figure in the news will Face the Nation. Face the Nation was recorded at CBS Washington.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is an amendment before us which extends the already long reach of the Federal Government even further into the private acts of American citizens. This amendment, if it should become law, would make it unlawful for the American citizen to sell his home to a purchaser of his choice. The stated purpose of this amendment is "to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, financing, and occupancy of housing throughout the United States."

When I last spoke on this proposed legislation, I addressed my remarks to the constitutional questions involved in this amendment. Operating on the premises that this great body has an obligation to refuse to pass legislation which we deem unconstitutional, I urged rejection of this amendment on the grounds that it is not authorized by proper interpretations of either the commerce clause or of the 14th amendment.

Today I should like to discuss another aspect of this proposal: Constitutional considerations aside, is this legislation wise? Does this legislation serve the best interests of a majority of Americans? In essence, would our Nation be better off for its passage, or would this proposal further aggravate an already irritated situation?

It is my contention that this would be a bad law. I believe it would be destructive of freedom, rather than an extension of it. I believe that it would destroy the sense of well-being that so many Americans have—a sense of knowing that great changes in their pattern of living will be made by their own decision—not by that of the Government.

We are concerned here with the environment in which people live and with the control of individual citizens over it. We are concerned here with changes in this environment and whether such changes shall be made by citizens voluntarily or by governmental decree. The issue, more specifically, is with the racial, religious, and ethnic aspects of housing patterns in the United States.

All of us are familiar with the great diversity of population patterns in housing in America. This diversity exists from section to section and within the States. It takes the form of an almost complete absence of any discernible pattern in rural areas in much of the South to strictly segregated suburbs surrounding major cities all over the Nation. This diversity is reflected in the existence of entire towns of one race in certain parts of the country, contrasted with small towns in the South with different neighborhoods existing side by side throughout the town.

This diversity is further shown in the tendency in many of our towns and cities for people of a particular religious faith to congregate in one section, or for people of a particular nationality to prefer a neighborhood which reflects the language or the customs of the "old country."

These patterns are not particularly static. In some places cosmopolitan neighborhoods representative of all races and religions and nationalities have developed. Some neighborhoods make an abrupt, and often disruptive, change from one group to another. More recently we have seen the phenomenon of areas of the inner city being occupied by the very people who a generation ago were moving to the suburbs.

It is apparent that the neighborhoods of America have only one thing in common. They are diverse. Some are segregated. Some are integrated. Some reflect an ethnic or religious heritage. Some are cosmopolitan. Some people may move freely into a neighborhood where a generation ago they would have been unwelcome. Some are welcome in some neighborhoods, but not in others.

The foundation of this diversity is the individual. He sustains or changes neighborhoods by his choice of how he disposes of his property, in conjunction with the choices of his neighbors, who are also individual citizens. When changes occur in residential patterns, it is usually the result of a significant change in the opinions of individuals. These changes in the feelings of people about what they want their neighborhood to be are made voluntarily—or perhaps changes are not made voluntarily. The decisions rest with the individuals involved—the decision of a purchaser to try to buy a home in a neighborhood, and the decision of the owner to sell or not to sell.

I believe these decisions should continue to rest with the individual. America boasts of her freedom, of her liberty, of the rights of her citizens and rightly so. If this forced housing legislation should pass, one more freedom will have been destroyed by an ever-grasping Federal Government. Decisions formerly made in the home or in the neighborhood will be made by Washington. This great diversity of living patterns—this heritage of different living patterns—will have been destroyed. The understandable desire of American families to choose a neighborhood which reflects their own ideas about how they want to live will have been made illegal.

I do not pretend that this system is perfect, but I do believe that it offers the greatest measure of freedom and of choice to American citizens than any other system suggested. This is because the decisions are made by the citizens themselves—without governmental interference. Changes which occur in housing patterns are the result of voluntary changes, reflecting the gradual changes in the customs of men—not governmentally imposed changes.

Mr. President, this Nation is in the midst of a racial crisis. In the last decade or so we have seen the growth of racial tension, or racial hatred, and of racial violence. Those who support this measure believe that this racial crisis will be solved by more legislation. We have had one court decision following another, and one new Federal law following another. What has been the result? More tension, more hatred, more violence.

I suggest there is a lesson here for us. We are attempting to legislate in areas where we should refrain from acting. The actions of the Supreme Court and of Congress have merely aggravated the situation. They have not and they cannot solve it.

This trend in legislation has been a mistake primarily for two reasons:

First, it has promised what cannot be delivered. People were led to believe that with the passage of various civil rights legislation, all their problems would be solved. The legislation has been passed, but the problems remain. And people become frustrated. We were told a new day would dawn, and it has—one of violence and disorder in which no one's rights are safeguarded.

Second, this trend in legislation is based on force. If people will not act as the Federal Government wishes, force them to. Write new laws. Create new crimes. Give the Federal Government new powers.

Mr. President, I do not claim to be an expert on solving this Nation's racial woes. The problems are indeed serious. But the course advocated by the proponents of this legislation has proven to be a failure. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. And Americans are fed up.

These are matters which have historically been handled by the State governments. Perhaps State solutions did not suit everyone, but racial peace prevailed, and unprecedented progress by citizens of all races took place. I am aware that such a view is not acceptable to many of my colleagues. But I suggest that all of us take a fresh look at this traditional theory. In my judgment, the problems we face admit to no simple solution—or perhaps no "solution" at all if we are convinced that they can or should be solved overnight. Allowing the States—where government is closer to the people—to decide on these questions provided domestic peace and progress. Perhaps that system was not perfect, but I suggest it was superior to the chaos which we face today.

Mr. President, a letter by Jack M. Messner to the editor of the McLean Providence Journal, in McLean, Va., dated February 2, 1968, is pertinent to the pending amendment, and I shall read the letter.

DICTATORIAL HOUSING

To the EDITOR:

Your last week edition publishing a letter on fair (forced) housing by Edward O. Mitchell leaves me greatly puzzled. He makes the point that racial discrimination does not exist in our area, but still, we need Fair Housing. Why?

A short review of history may remind us that under Franklin, the Rooseveltian impact of Keynesianism and deficit financing, with the innovation of curing unemployment by bureaucratic handouts, the scheme of federal housing was imported from European Marxist Valhallas.

It began, ironically, with the first housing project in Arthurdale, West Virginia (christened by the sainted Eleanor) from which negroes were firmly barred. The Federal Housing Administration followed by creating racial tension in Detroit, Chicago and elsewhere by constructing housing projects for special groups. Then after agitation and pressure put the Washington politicians in a corner, they would switch and assign the project to another group.

The time was not "ripe," however, to save the Negro. His escape from the parlous situation into which the government had euchered him was not to be facilitated until the passage of the Civil Rights Bill with its housing section (Title IV).

Title IV is a bald denial of right, vicious in both principle and practice because it cannot possibly be administered in accordance with due process of law, and because it adds materially to the forces already at work to introduce the police state into this country.

In opposing the housing provision of the Civil Rights Bill, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., stated:

"This is not civil rights legislation. This is plainly an attempt to circumvent our Constitution. It is a violation of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution which guarantees a man the right to have and to hold property and, obviously to do with it what he wishes within the bounds of decency.

"It is a violation of the basic Bill of Rights, which guarantees the right of individual privacy and individual action."

Of all the evil things that are being done in the name of civil rights, the attack on the right to buy, own, use and sell property is designed to shake the foundation of the American private ownership system. The so-called open housing section of the Civil Rights Bill is an attack on those small property owners who operate and live in their own apartment houses on which they usually depend for their living. The Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifically says, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated."

When the Federal Government attempts to prohibit a homeowner from exercising control over his own property, the government has, to all intents and purposes "seized" that property.

Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. of Virginia says that this law is a violation of the Bill of Rights. If you disobey this law and someone makes a complaint, the complainant has the full service, at no charge, of federal lawyers, whereas the homeowner is judged guilty until he proves himself innocent and he must provide his own attorneys.

The purpose of this fair (Open) (Forced) housing is not only to force a mixture of races in residential areas and apartments, but it will also have the effect of putting the small apartment owner out of business, making it easy for the big money boys to buy up thousands of apartments at distressed prices.

This Fair Housing in my opinion is dictatorial and unconstitutional.

It seems to me that Mr. Mitchell and his ecumenical Council of Churches had best reject their social gospel with its philosophical socialism, communism, humanitarianism and anarchism, and above all the constant promotion of discord among peaceful law abiding citizens, both black and white. They should return to the holy scriptures as contained in the King James Bible.

Perhaps Mr. Mitchell should turn to "Ecclesiastes, 10:2" in his Revised Standard Version, which reads: "A wise man's heart inclines him toward the right, but a fool's heart toward the left." Could it be possible that the proof reader was fired?

JACK M. MESSNER.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1968:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Leonard v. B. Sutton, of Colorado, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term of 3 years from October 22, 1966, vice Edward D. Re.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Reynold D. Hogle, U.S. Navy.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Horace H. Nation, Jr., Acmar, Ala., in place of N. L. Nation, retired.

Robert L. Ingram, Thomasville, Ala., in place of H. T. Forster, retired.

James B. Hill, Woodville, Ala., in place of R. E. Page, retired.

ARIZONA

Verna M. Spurlock, Navajo, Ariz., in place of G. M. Harris, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Laeta C. Fortney, Biggs, Calif., in place of J. C. Andes, resigned.

Joseph F. Aubin, Kernville, Calif., in place of W. I. Stewart, retired.

FLORIDA

Richard P. Briggs, Bradenton, Fla., in place of H. L. Evans, retired.

James J. Waller, Jr., Immokalee, Fla., in place of L. A. Crews, retired.

Clarence A. Siniard, Summerfield, Fla., in place of T. B. Mills, retired.

IDAHO

Charles L. Fitzsimons, New Plymouth, Idaho, in place of J. C. Newman, retired.

ILLINOIS

Ivan V. Crooks, Cisne, Ill., in place of Gordon Perry, retired.

Wesley L. Weston, Elburn, Ill., in place of H. J. Hall, retired.

Everett L. Shelton, Monee, Ill., in place of J. E. Gorman, retired.

Norlan E. Newmister, Normal, Ill., in place of T. B. Raycraft, retired.

KANSAS

Betty M. Traffas, Sharon, Kans., in place of R. A. Fetrow, retired.

KENTUCKY

John R. Anderson, Carlisle, Ky., in place of E. E. Pfanstiel, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John H. Pink, Randolph, Mass., in place of M. R. Brewster, retired.

MICHIGAN

Edward C. McNamara, Birch Run, Mich., in place of S. F. Close, deceased.

Doris E. Brady, Conway, Mich., in place of Erla Grigsby, retired.

Dorothy A. Wetzel, Munith, Mich., in place of G. P. Liebeck, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Dean N. Haycraft, Lewisville, Minn., in place of G. H. Dewar, retired.

NEBRASKA

Harry O. Schaffert, Maywood, Nebr., in place of F. E. Faling, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Vincent J. Yaede, Edison, N.J., in place of W. D. Hand, retired.

Leonard J. Conway, Freehold, N.J., in place of V. A. Statesir, retired.

Albert J. Fulkrod, Ho Ho Kus, N.J., in place of F. M. Letts, retired.

NEW YORK

Anthony Puzzo, Babylon, N.Y., in place of A. R. Clark, retired.

Bridget F. Stouter, Lebanon Springs, N.Y., in place of Eileen Bechmann, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George R. Connor, Zell, S. Dak., in place of P. J. Miesen, retired.

TEXAS

Wilmer W. Hewitt, Richmond, Tex., in place of A. C. Wendel, retired.

Richard D. Swanner, Scroggins, Tex., in place of Maud Swanner, retired.

WISCONSIN

Dena C. Hayden, Marshfield, Wis., in place of T. N. Hayden, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, February 20, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend Vincent Brizgys, auxiliary bishop of Kaunas in Lithuania, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we turn to Thee in the prayer as we begin the deliberations of this day.

Thou hast implanted into the hearts of all men the desire for freedom. Within Thy loving providence nations have been formed and, through freedom, have become creative of spiritual and material progress.

Thou hast taught man to love his neighbor as himself—to give to others what we treasure ourselves. May all men fulfill this command in respecting the rights and liberties of others, while securing them for themselves.

We pray for freedom of Lithuania. And we beg Thy blessings upon those persons and nations who teach men to respect and love one another and who dedicate themselves for the achievement of freedom and peace for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 15, 1968, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14563. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for increase in benefits, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND VINCENT BRIZGYS, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF KAUNAS, LITHUANIA

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in extending our thanks and appreciation for the honor and privilege of having His Excellency, the Most Reverend Vincent Brizgys, the auxiliary bishop of Kaunas, Lithuania, deliver the invocation today on this auspicious occasion when the House of Representatives observes the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

CRIME—PARAMOUNT DOMESTIC PROBLEM

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the paramount domestic problem confronting the American people today is crime. It has developed to such gigantic proportions that control is beyond the capabilities of unassisted local law enforcement agencies. While crime control is the primary responsibility of State and local governments, the vast resources of the Federal Government must be made available for a unified effort in combating this problem which transcends local jurisdictions.

The prospect of becoming a victim of serious crime has increased to the extent that many Americans are deprived of the basic attributes to our system of government. There is no justification for criminal activities. Grave social injustices may contribute to the incidence of lawlessness but criminal conduct must be eliminated.

The President is responding to overwhelming public interest in the enactment of effective measures to curb the rising tide of crime. I commend the President for his direct response to a problem requiring immediate action, and urge the prompt enactment of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, and other measures which he has proposed.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is now considering House Joint Resolution 1052, which proposes to set forth the sense of Congress that prompt and meaningful employment be made available to veterans who have served in Vietnam and in other areas in the Vietnam conflict. The purpose of this resolution is to impress upon employers, both government and industry, the fact that these men are leaving the military after honorable and courageous service and are seeking their place in the labor market.

It is truly the sense of Congress that these men be welcomed by employers everywhere. Their sacrifices on behalf of their Nation should not go unnoticed once their military service is completed.

I, for one, would recommend unhesitatingly these veterans to employers. In most cases an employer is obtaining a mature worker who is experienced under pressure and capable of making split-second decisions. He is young, healthy, and alert. He deserves every consideration because he was enough of an American to answer his country's call despite the fact that he might be asked to sacrifice his life.

It has been hoped that this resolution would be brought to the floor for consideration at a very early date. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings yesterday and, upon completion of hearings, met in executive session to consider House Joint Resolution 1052.

Unfortunately, however, due to the departure of a member of the minority party, the committee was left without a quorum and was unable, therefore, to express its will. I consider this pure and deliberate obstructionism on the part of that member. The minority had spent much of the hearing attacking—not so much the resolution—but the President's Executive order concerning the hiring of veterans; this subject was not under consideration.

I am very optimisitic this resolution will be reported from committee at its next executive session.

A TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to call the attention of the House to the recent death of a respected former member of this body, Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Omaha, Nebr. Mr. O'Sullivan, who passed away after a long illness, served as the Representative for the Second Congressional District in the 81st Congress. He was 84 years old when he died.

I am sure our colleagues who served in the 81st Congress will recall Mr. O'Sullivan who was widely known for his work as a defense attorney in criminal cases in addition to his service as a Representative.

He was a leader in the Democratic Party in Omaha, Nebr., for many years and had been a delegate to five Democratic National Conventions.

Mr. O'Sullivan was born on a cattle ranch near Kent, Reno County, Kans., on May 31, 1883. He attended the public schools of Kent, Kans., and was graduated from Christian Brothers College, St. Joseph, Mo., in 1903. Later he attended St. Benedict's College in Atchison, Kans. He graduated from Creighton University Law School in Omaha, Nebr., in 1910 and was admitted to the Nebraska bar in 1910. He ran as a Democratic candidate for the gubernatorial nomination in 1934 and was unsuccessful as a write-in candidate for election to the U.S. Senate in 1934. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1924, 1928, 1932, 1940, and 1944. He was elected as a Democrat to the 81st Congress in 1948 and made an unsuccessful bid for reelection in 1950.

Many Nebraskans and our colleagues who served in the 81st Congress will mourn the passing of Eugene O'Sullivan.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Eugene Daniel O'Sullivan and I were freshmen together in the 81st Congress. We had much in common and living at the Congressional Hotel as we did and being frequently together, a warm friendship developed. He was a remarkable man, eloquent and scholarly, of strong convictions from which he never strayed. We were about of the same age, he having been born in May of 1883, and I in April of 1882, some 11 months apart. He was a Democrat through and through, had been a delegate from Nebraska to five Democratic National Conventions and had been a Democratic candidate for Governor of Nebraska and U.S. Senator before his election to the House in 1948. In his home State of Nebraska he enjoyed an enviable reputation as defense counsel, seldom losing a case. In Washington he is remembered among other things for an address on St. Patrick's Day which oldtimers still talk about. Although I have not seen Gene O'Sullivan since he left the Congress our friendship has been kept fresh by frequent long-distance telephone calls. I shall miss, surely miss, the sound of his voice. Nebraska and our country have lost a great son.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members who were acquainted with the late Eugene D. O'Sullivan in the 81st Congress be allowed 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on his life, character, and service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD W. NICHOLSON

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of loss that I learned late Friday night of the passing of my predecessor, Donald W. Nicholson.

Like his old friend and our former Speaker, Joseph W. Martin, Billy Nick, as he was affectionately remembered by generations of Cape Codders and his former colleagues in this Chamber, was the son of a blacksmith. He held jobs as diverse as telephone operator, restaurant manager, and streetcar conductor. Then, for 37 years, he earned the unusual distinction of having served in town, State, and National Governments. He was a selectman in the town of Wareham, as well as its assessor, school committeeman, and member of the board of public welfare. Subsequently, he served in the State house of representatives and later in the State senate, where he was regarded as an expert in State taxation and revenue matters, as well as being well versed in legislative matters as they affected cities and towns. Then, from 1947 to 1958, he represented the former Ninth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

During World War I, Billy Nick served overseas with the U.S. Army. Yesterday, at his memorial service, an old Army buddy recalled that 50 years ago this winter, he and the former Congressman were shipped overseas together from Camp Devens. From the year of his return up through last Memorial Day, Billy Nick never missed a Memorial Day parade in the town of Wareham.

In 1956, when I challenged Congressman Nicholson in the primary, some of his advisers recommended that he stress his many accomplishments as Congressman. As the Reverend Roland E. Johnson, of the First Congregational Church of Wareham, recalled yesterday, Billy Nick retorted that he was as proud of the things he had stopped as he was of those he had done. In fact, he even ran an advertisement listing those proposals against which he had voted.

Billy Nick was a man whose career exemplified devotion to duty, love of country, and dedication to public service. When, in 1958 he decided not to run for reelection from the old Ninth Congressional District, he gave as his reason "surrender by Congress of its constitutional powers." For 12 years, this distinguished son of Wareham, recognized by legislators as an authority on the State and Federal constitutions, fought against heavy Federal spending and excessive power in the executive branch. In a speech on this floor in 1957, he summed up his philosophy of government:

> The Government in my day has got down to the proposition of trying to run every city and town, trying to take over all the laws and their execution that have been passed through the centuries. And I think it is about time that the Government did what the Constitution says it should do.

Mr. Speaker, the old Ninth District of Massachusetts was ably represented by Donald W. Nicholson. As his successor in what has now become the 12th District, I am honored today to pay tribute to him and extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Ethel, his daughter Mary of New York, and his sister, Mrs. Madge Keith, of Wareham.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to represent you and the other Members of this body at the funeral service yesterday. Former Senator Saltonstall and former Governor Furcolo were there, along with many members of the State legislature, to pay final tribute to Billy Nick.

I want to convey to this Chamber the gratitude with which Mrs. Nicholson expressed her appreciation for the many remembrances that Members of this House sent to her at this time of sadness.

Massachusetts will miss this stalwart spokesman for our people and our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD, two news stories about the late Honorable Donald W. Nicholson.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, February 17, 1968]

EX-CONGRESSMAN DIES; NICHOLSON HAD LONG SERVICE RECORD

WAREHAM—Donald W. Nicholson, 79, former Republican congressman from Wareham, died of natural causes at Tobey Hospital today where he had been a patient for the last two weeks. He was the husband of Mrs. Ethel (Patton) Nicholson.

Of Scottish ancestry, Nicholson was born in Wareham Aug. 11, 1888, son of Angus and Annie (McLeod) Nicholson. Grandparents on both sides were of Scottish birth. His parents, however, moved to Wareham from Cape Breton, N.S. Nicholson's father was for many years a Wareham blacksmith.

Congressman Nicholson did not seek reelection in 1958 because, he said, he objected to heavy federal spending and the "surrender by Congress of its constitutional powers."

He charged Congress was voting for things that were "bypassing the Constitution.

"I don't want to be a part of it," the veteran legislator said.

OPPOSED "NEW REPUBLICANISM"

Nicholson's decision not to run again indicated dissatisfaction not only with previous national Democratic administrations, but with that of former President Eisenhower.

An outspoken foe of the "new Republicanism" as espoused by Eisenhower, Nicholson was the only congressman in New England who opposed the President's Middle East doctrine. He said the doctrine gave the President the right to declare war, and "that is the right of Congress."

A former state legislator with a record of 23 years of service on Beacon Hill, Nicholson gained his first election to Congress on Nov. 18, 1947, when, as the Republican candidate in a special election held in the 9th Congressional District, he defeated State Representative Jacinto F. Dinis, D-New Bedford, 28,912 to 21,164. In that election, however, Nicholson lost New Bedford, the city voters giving Dinis 15,368 votes to 9,951 for Nicholson.

The special congressional election was caused by the death of the late Congressman Charles L. Gifford, R-Cotuit, at his Cape home Aug. 23, 1947. Gifford had served the district continuously for 25 years prior to his death.

Nicholson had the unusual experience of having served with distinction in town, state and national governments. He served the Town of Wareham as a selectman, assessor, school committeeman and as a member of the Board of Public Welfare.

ELECTED TO LEGISLATURE

With this background, he became a candidate for state representative in 1924 and gained election for a two-year term. In the following state election, two years later, he ran for state senator in the Cape and Plymouth District and was elected. He was reelected to that office through the succeeding years, often without opposition, until he aspired for the seat in the U.S. House of Representatives after the death of Gifford.

After completing his schooling in Wareham, Nicholson held various jobs, night telephone operator, grocery clerk, restaurant manager, salesman and conductor on the old New Bedford-Onset-Monument Beach trolley line, long since out of existence.

During World War I, Nicholson served overseas with the U.S. Army and when he returned in 1919 he went back to the job he had left as a streetcar conductor. Two years later, he was elected to his first office as selectman in Wareham and he continued to serve the town as one of its officers until he went to the state House.

In the state Senate, Nicholson was regarded as an expert on state taxation and revenue problems and also was well versed in legislative matters as they affected cities and towns. He had the reputation of meeting issues "with head-on frankness." When he made a decision he could be relied on to stay with it, his colleagues said.

ON MANY COMMITTEES

During his career in the State House, Nicholson also held the distinction of having served on more committees than any other member of the legislature. Ways and Means, Taxation, Banking and Insurance were among numerous committees to which he applied much of his energy.

Although New Bedford was not within the Cape and Plymouth Senatorial District which he represented Nicholson always came to the front of any instances where he felt he could aid New Bedford in legislative matters.

Nicholson was married to the former Miss Ethel Patton. They had two children, Malcolm, who died in 1955, and a daughter, Miss Mary Nicholson, who is a school teacher in this state. Both children served in the Navy.

[From the Cape Cod (Mass.) Standard Press, February 17, 1968]

DONALD NICHOLSON DIES IN WAREHAM

WAREHAM—Donald W. Nicholson, 79, better known to generations of Cape Codders as "Billy Nick," died Friday night in Tobey Hospital.

He spent 37 of those years in public service starting in 1921 as selectman of Wareham; ending in 1958 when he retired after six full terms as U.S. congressman for the 9th Congressional District (now incorporated in the 12th District).

Three years after "Billy Nick" became selectman of Wareham, he went to the Massachusetts State Legislature. Two years later he became state senator. For the next 21 years the highly-respected Republican was in the Senate ending up as its president.

6 TERMS IN HOUSE

After serving one year as Senate president, Nicholson resigned. He had been elected to the first of six full terms to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Nicholson was the son of a Scottish blacksmith. As a young man he worked as a waiter, salesman and street car conductor. He served in the U.S. Army in World War I.

When he decided to run for the congressional seat in 1946, after the death of the late Congressman Charles L. Gifford of Cotuit, he was almost 60.

He was known during his tenure at the State Legislature and in Washington as "a conservative Republican to be reckoned with."

One columnist writing about Nicholson in 1957 stated: "The only Legislature sessions he missed were while attending Wareham town meetings; he never . . . missed roll-calls in Congress. While a State senator he served on more committees than any member of the Legislature in its history.

THOUGHT OF NEIGHBOR

In speaking about the thousands of legislative bills he voted on during his public life, Nicholson once said: "I have tried to remember this principle on each one: You've got to think of your next-door neighbor as well as yourself when you pass a law."

In 1957 he summed up his philosophy of government in a House floor address.

"The government in my day," he said, "has got down to the proposition of trying to run every city and town, trying to take over all the laws and their execution that have been passed through the centuries. And I think it is about time that the Government did what the Constitution says it should do."

Nicholson's death at Tobey Hospital followed complications of pneumonia.

He is survived by his widow, Ethel; a daughter, Mary of Millbrook, N.Y.; and a sister, Mrs. Madge Keith of Wareham.

Funeral services are incomplete.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague, Bill Nicholson who was a very close personal friend of mine during his service in the House. He was a very fine Member of the House, a very popular and constructive Member of the House. I join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in this word of tribute to him on his passing, and I extend my own deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, our minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. I was very sorry to learn of the passing of our former colleague and good friend "Nick," as he was affectionately called by those of us who were privileged to serve with him during the time he was a Member of the House. During his years here in the House, we became good friends. I was proud to call him my friend.

"Nick" was an outstanding individual, a lovable character, and a devoted public servant. Many, many times it was my privilege to visit and talk with him and discuss the issues of the day, and to obtain his viewpoints as he so ably expressed them.

Nick was a devoted American. He served his district, his State, and his country well. I wish to extend to his loved ones my sincere sympathy.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me. I, too, wish to join with him in the remarks of tribute to our good friend "Nick," as he was called here on the floor of the House. His district, which the gentleman currently in the well now represents, and my district have many similarities in that we represented the major cranberry-growing areas of the United States.

I well remember the many pleasant conversations that we had about the problems of the cranberry growers.

"Nick" was a man of real courage when it came to casting his vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. But more importantly, he was a man of real insight into the feelings of the people whom he represented in Massachusetts. He was close to them. He loved them and they loved him.

It was my privilege to go to his district and speak at a dinner for him. I could see on that visit the great feeling of belief that the people in the district had for Congressman Nicholson. More importantly, I could see the feeling that he had for his constituents. He was a man who understood that he must live with his conscience longer than his constituents. He was willing to go back to his congressional district and explain in a very adequate and effective manner the reasons for his votes of conscience on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am pleased and happy to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in paying tribute to his memory and expressing to his family our deepest regrets and sympathy at this time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleague from Massachusetts in paying respect to a great American. Although "Billy Nick," as they called him down on the Cape, was involved in politics all his life, he was far from being political in the usual sense of the word. He was a distinguished American, a fundamentalist, a man who read the Constitution and knew what the Constitution said, a man who practiced both personally and professionally. I know the courage which he displayed here on the floor is something that all of us could emulate.

I think another characteristic was the way in which he endeared himself to all the Members of this House. I remember the day the cranberry growers of his district were in trouble, and when they heard it was "Billy Nick's" bill on the floor, the Members of the House did not need any more details concerning it. They were in favor of it because he espoused it. I do not recall this being done for any other Member.

It was in that high sense of affection that the Members of Congress held this man who was dear to us all. We shall continue to miss his presence here as we have since he retired from the Congress. Mrs. Bates and I extend to his devoted wife and gracious daughter, Mary, our deepest sympathy.

We have lost an outstanding American, Mr. Speaker, and I am honored and privileged to say a few words recalling our association with this distinguished patriot and a person we were pleased to call a friend.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we were all deeply saddened to learn of the death last Friday of former Congressman Donald Nicholson, of Massachusetts, better known to all of us as just plain "Nick."

We mourn today the passing of a man who devoted his entire life to public service, and who throughout his career merited the high respect and esteem of his colleagues for his devotion and unstinting efforts for our Nation, his State, and constituency.

He served some 23 years in the Massachusetts State Legislature, rising to president of the State senate before he began his 12-year tenure as a Member of this body.

He was a man of deep integrity and loyalty and was highly respected by all who knew him as a man who fought for and stood by his convictions.

It is with profound sorrow that I join my colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation in our common bereavement over his loss. However, it is with pride that I can pay tribute in this House which he served so well, to the memory of Congressman Nicholson and to recognize his many accomplishments. I join in extending my deepest sympathy to his family and multitude of friends.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the sentiments of the gentleman about the great Donald Nicholson. We have lost a great American.

I had the privilege of serving in Congress with Donald William Nicholson during all the period he served here from 1947 through 1958. A veteran of overseas service of World War I he carried his devotion to his country into a life of public service, holding many municipal offices in the hometown of Warehan, Mass., and serving in the Massachusetts State House for more than 20 years. At one time he was president of the State senate.

In more than 30 years of public service he epitomized Edmund Burke's prescription for the good representative:

> It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own.

We have lost a great friend and I join in extending my condolences to members of his family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of Donald William Nicholson, of Massachusetts, brings back many sweet memories of our association together on the Banking and Currency Committee in the 81st Congress. He was bottom man on the Republican side and mine on the Democratic side was a position of equal obscurity. Our friendship was the warmer, I think, because of this circumstance. He had a brilliant mind and a sense of humor that was refreshing as the breezes of his own Cape Cod.

Don Nicholson was a stanch Republican, a credit and an honor to his party and his State. He prided himself on his attendance record. On record rollcalls or quorum calls Don Nicholson was there. It now has been some 10 years since he left the Congress and I have thought of him often with tender affection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Donald W. Nicholson, of Massachusetts, a man whose integrity impressed and inspired us all during his 12 years in the House, died last Friday.

Son of a blacksmith, Congressman Nicholson had steel in his character comparable in strength to the steel he watched his father work at the forge. Nick, as he was known to a host of friends from the villages of Cape Cod to the Halls of Congress, held many jobs in his youth. He worked as a telephone operator, as a streetcar conductor, as a restaurant manager. He then made up his mind to serve his country.

Characteristically he dedicated himself wholly to this mission. For 37 years he brought his own remarkable brand of integrity and candor to the government of his hometown, to the government of his State, to the Government of his country. He was president of the Massachusetts Senate when he was first elected to Congress from his State's former Ninth Congressional District. During his 12 years in the House he became known for his exemplary sense of principle and purpose.

I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to this remarkable man and in extending sympathy to his family and friends.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have paid tribute to the memory of the late Honorable Donald W. Nicholson, to express my own deep sorrow over the loss of this former Congressman from my own State of Massachusetts.

Although I never had the privilege of serving in the Congress with him, I knew him during the days when I served as administrative assistant to Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

This outstanding man, the son of a blacksmith, will long be remembered as a dedicated, conscientious public servant. He had the unique and admirable record of having served with great distinction in almost every level of government. He was a selectman in the town of Wareham, its assessor, school committeeman, and a member of its board of public welfare. In 1924 he was elected as a State representative and then as State senator in the Cape Cod and Plymouth district, a position in which he came to be highly regarded as a tax and revenue expert. In 1947 he was elected to represent the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts in the U.S. House of Representatives, and he served in this capacity, with distinction and effectiveness for 12 years.

It is with profound sorrow that I join my colleagues in common bereavement over his loss, but it is a great honor, as a Member of this body, and a Representative from Massachusetts, to pay tribute to him now. My deepest sympathies are extended to his family and friends.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of former Congressman Donald W. Nicholson took from our midst one of my State's eminent and most respected elder statesmen, and I join with his many friends and former colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathies to his widow, Ethel, his daughter, Mary, and his sister, Mrs. Madge Keith.

It is a decade since Nick Nicholson completed his last year as a Member of the House and, therefore, I had not the pleasure of serving with him as a fellow Representative from Massachusetts. Nonetheless, his devotion to the cause of good representative government and particularly his fierce opposition to "big Government" are well-recalled.

I had met with him on various occasions, and he never ceased emphasizing his deep concern over what he sincerely felt were excesses in Government spending.

His philosophy undoubtedly had its roots in his birth and childhood, his early working days and his subsequent service in both the Massachusetts State Senate and House of Representatives, where he attained a reputation as an expert in fiscal matters. He was descended from Scots, and had worked as a streetcar conductor, restaurant manager and in other humble but honest endeavors. With this background, it was natural that he would regard each dollar spent with a wary eye.

The former Ninth Congressional District, now largely the 12th, contains a legion of his friends, all of whom recall with respect the many contributions of one whom they affectionately called Billy Nick. He was ever the typical Cape Codder—strong, defiant, and independent.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, with my fellow Members here, I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of our former colleague and my dear friend, Congressman Donald W. Nicholson, of Massachusetts.

Congressman Nicholson's entire mature life was spent in devoted public service to his home community, his country, and the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Few men in public life will ever equal his characteristically unselfish and remarkable contribution of personal integrity, intelligence, industry, and leadership, to the legislative progress of his beloved Nation and State.

When he held the very high responsibility of the office of president of the senate in the Massachusetts State Legislature it was universally proclaimed that the "word of Nicholson was as dependable as the Bible." He was esteemed for his integrity; he was respected for his extraordinary legislative knowledge and leadership; he was admired for his steadfast political convictions and he was recognized and acclaimed for his patriotic dedication. However above and beyond these virtues he was beloved for his humble attitude, his neighborly kindness, his patient tolerance, his compassionate understanding, his quiet humor and his generous heart.

"Bill" Nicholson, as we affectionately called him, was a great and good man. He will be sorely missed but he has left us, to follow, an inspiring legacy of example of unstinted devotion and loyalty in public service to his country and his constituents.

In this time of great loss and sorrow we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his most gracious wife Ethel and fine daughter Mary while we join in our prayers that the soul of our beloved friend rests in heavenly peace.

THE "SMELLY" LOAN TO NAPCO INDUSTRIES, INC., OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues are aware that on last Friday the Justice Department filed suit against NAPCO Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., to recover at least double the $2.3 million loan it received from the Agency for International Development by what the Department says was "deceit."

This loan was engineered, at least in part, by the office of the then Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and by his former aide and current advisers, Max M. Kampelman.

In covering the filing of this suit, the New York Times of last Saturday contained a most interesting sentence which I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and which reads as follows:

> It is a matter of record that friends of Vice President Humphrey in the Agency for International Development and the State Department, its parent, warned him to dissociate himself from the loan project because it was "beginning to look smelly."

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has spoken volumes here.

If this loan was so "smelly"—and there can be no doubt that it was all of that—why was the Vice President so involved in pushing it?

If it was so "smelly," why was it ever made?

I commend the Times reporter, Mr. Felix Belair, Jr., who obtained this information, especially since the AID repeatedly refused to let me inspect the files to determine just who was behind it. I hope he and the Justice Department will provide us all with the answers to quite a number of equally interesting questions on this matter.

GEORGE WALLACE'S OBJECTIVE

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in Chicago George Wallace disclosed some of his plans to throw sand into the gears of orderly electoral process in this country. He indicated at that time his desire to frustrate an electoral college decision by denying 270 votes to one or the other of the major party candidates for President, and outlined the terms of the deal he would seek to make with a candidate who would adopt his minority party views.

Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that Mr. Wallace expanded on this scheme in remarks made yesterday in Pennsylvania.

The article from the New York Times of this morning reads in part, as follows:

> While insisting that he expected to win the Presidency, Mr. Wallace also elaborated today more than he has before on details of "the covenant" he has said he would demand from a major party Presidential candidate should his own third-party effort produce a deadlock in the Electoral College.
>
> A deadlock could occur if neither of the Democratic nor the Republican Presidential candidate, nor Mr. Wallace, received the required majority of 270 electoral votes.

Mr. Speaker, not only could an electoral college deadlock occur, but also Mr. Wallace could precipitate a constitutional crisis in this country come next January if we in this Chamber are then so closely divided as to be unable to cast the votes of 26 State delegations for either the Democratic or the Republican candidate for President. The electoral will of our people could thus be wholly frustrated.

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the hour is late, but not too late. The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has advised me that they will shortly recommend a constitutional amendment calling for direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States by the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber, through our House Judiciary Committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], should give immediate attention to this problem so that we may act before indeed it becomes too late.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is North Dakota's largest and most important industry, producing 80 percent of our State's new wealth annually. Thus, as a Representative from North Dakota and, as a farmer myself, I am deeply interested in agriculture.

It has been my privilege to observe over the years the outstanding role the Future Farmers of America continues to play in assuring the future progress and prosperity of North Dakota, and I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress that February 17 through 24 has been designated Future Farmers of America Week.

The Future Farmers are young men 14 to 21 years of age who are preparing to take their places in American agriculture. They are studying modern methods of farming in high school vocational agriculture classes, and within a few years will be the leaders in agriculture throughout our Nation. Their training is essential if we are to have a plentiful supply of farm products for our ever increasing population, and it is equally important that we train those who will carry on the many necessary off-farm agricultural occupations.

Founded 40 years ago, the FFA today has a membership of 450,000 young men in nearly 9,000 chapters in every State in our Nation and in Puerto Rico. Aside from the important occupational training, the FFA has an outstanding record for the development of leadership, cooperation, character, patriotism, and citizenship among its members.

I know that many Members will join me this week in paying special tribute to the Future Farmers of America organization for the outstanding contribution it makes to our young men, to agriculture, and to our entire Nation.

ABOUT GEORGE WALLACE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a very able and efficient and dedicated member thereof. Anything he says must be taken seriously.

The Constitution has been described as the most remarkable document ever struck off by the wit of man. It has stood us in good stead since our beginnings. It has been like a shield of armor, strong and inflexible in war, and in peace like a flexible lounging jacket suitable and efficacious for all occasions. It should not be lightly amended. It should only be amended for the strongest possible reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota seeks to amend the Constitution by abolishing the electoral college, and to provide for direct election of the President and Vice President; and he is prompted to undertake to do that primarily because of the alleged disruptive force that might result from the candidacy of former Governor Wallace. The Wallace candidacy causes us concern, but we should not be overly disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who addressed the House said that there is danger of his making deals with the electors. Well, the gentleman might be well advised that in almost every State of the Union, except three, there are pledges that are exacted from the electors which compel them to vote for the candidate of the party that nominated them. Republican electors vote for the Republican candidates, while Democratic electors vote for Democratic candidates.

Only in two States, Mississippi and Alabama, I believe the electors are definitely unpledged. The question of pledges is frowned upon. There is a vagueness and a doubt as to South Carolina, so that in the matter——

Mr. RIVERS. Wait just one moment. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I shall yield to the gentleman from South Carolina in just one moment.

In the matter of electors and their pledge, I do not think any vital or dangerous deals can be made. Wallace cannot enter into the deals. Wallace cannot make the deals himself. They must be made by the electors and then they can be made, without doubt in only two States, Mississippi and Alabama.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Of course I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Do not worry about South Carolina. I say this because the great State of South Carolina will take care of itself.

Mr. CELLER. I am almost sure that the great State of South Carolina will take care of the situation. However, it is my opinion that the subject matter of the electoral college should be considered as an amendment to the Constitution. There are a great many bills which have been introduced and which have reference to amendments to the Constitution of the United States, bills relating to the electoral college.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that I shall appoint a subcommittee which shall have jurisdiction over that question, so that all views may be aired. I assure you there is a great diversity of views embodied in the bills which have been introduced. They provide for a variety of reforms. I have offered a bill to provide that each congressional district shall elect an elector. All votes of electors thus elected shall count. The candidate receiving a minority of these votes of the electors shall not lose them to the majority candidate. It shall not be as now—"Winner take all." The majority and minority votes shall be counted all over the country and tabulated for the minority and the majority candidate.

There are many other types of bills. They all shall be evaluated. I doubt, however, whether any amendment can be passed by Congress, let alone adopted by the States, before the next presidential election.

FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bilingual Education Act, of which I was an original cosponsor, was finally signed into law on January 3, 1968, as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. This program is of critical importance to Americans whose first language is not English. One million Spanish-speaking Americans reside in the New York City area alone. They are severely disadvantaged by their inability to speak English fluently. This disadvantage begins as soon as they enter schools where the language of instruction is English, and it extends to the employment market. Economic indicators, such as educational and income levels, demonstrate that Spanish-speaking Americans are severely handicapped by the language barrier.

It is essential that the full $30 million authorized for fiscal year 1969 bilingual education programs be appropriated, so that these programs may take effect. Yet, because of the cutbacks in domestic spending, President Johnson in his message on education announced that he would request only $5 million. This amount could easily be absorbed in New York City alone.

I have introduced H.R. 15349 to appropriate the full $30 million authorized for fiscal year 1969. This new program should be fully funded so that it will reach as many young people as possible not only in New York City but in other parts of the country. I hope the Congress will act to appropriate the full authorization so that this effort can move forward without delay.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest, as I always do, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, it is my further opinion that his committee also ought to look very hard at the situation as to what happens if the presidential election is thrown into the House of Representatives.

As I understand the situation at the present time, each State has one vote, and that vote is as a unit in the House of Representatives. So, let us say that a State has 15 Representatives, and the vote is 8 to 7 in favor of one candidate. That candidate gets the one unit vote, no matter how large or small the State may be.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this is certainly contrary to the one-man, one-vote theory.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe I understand the concern of the gentleman since the Republicans will undoubtedly control the next House of Representatives.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I say that blessed be the believer, and if the gentleman really believes that, he is a blessed man.

I hope that he lives happily in his delusions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 15414

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, February 23, to file a report on the bill H.R. 15414.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT FOR FISCAL 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 223)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Civil Service Commission Annual Report for fiscal 1967 reflects the importance of the most vital element in democratic government—the people who administer it, particularly those who quietly dedicate their lives to public service in the Executive Branch.

The 90th Congress has demonstrated its appreciation of our career public servants. Today's Government is more responsive because of your response.

The Civil Service Commission Report shows that our emphasis has been on recruiting, developing and fully using our civil servants to provide improved service to the public.

During fiscal year 1967—

An Executive Assignment System was instituted to insure that, at the top career levels, the right man is found for the right job at the right time.

The Federal recruiting and examining program—the foundation for good personnel management—was reorganized:

—to compete more effectively for the best available manpower and

—to provide improved service, information and job opportunities to every American.

The training and education of Government employees was modernized and expanded.

The Federal Government accelerated its drive for equal employment opportunities.

Last December the Congress responded fully to my proposals for equitable pay for Government workers. In moving to fulfill the earlier pay comparability promise, we have made Government jobs and public service careers substantially more attractive.

The record is one of significant progress.

At the same time, problems remain—some of which require legislative action.

As our society has grown more complex, so too has the administration of the public services which meet society's needs. Administrative weakness at any level of our Federal system—whether it be national, state or local—becomes a weakness at all levels. It deprives our citizens of adequate Government machinery with which to meet their day-to-day and long-range needs. It cannot long be tolerated in a government of, by, and for the people.

We have become aware that state and local public agencies—too often inadequately staffed—are not always equipped to meet their expanding responsibilities to

—Rebuild our cities,

—Clean up our rivers and the air we breathe,

—Provide equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens,

—Plan and build better housing,

—Improve education and health services.

To do their share, state and local governments need help—primarily staffing and training assistance.

Last March 17, I submitted to the Congress two new legislative proposals to give them the help they need:

—*The Intergovernmental Manpower Act,* to assist state and local governments in meeting their critical manpower requirements. The Act would authorize the Federal Government to assist States and communities in recruiting, training, and developing a high quality corps of capable and responsive public employees. It would authorize the exchange of personnel between states and cities and the Federal Government. Through this exchange, all levels of government would understand each other's problems and work together more effectively to serve all the people.

—*The Education for Public Service Act,* to increase the number and quality of younger people preparing for careers in government. The Act would provide special fellowships for young men and women who will agree to embark on the great adventure of public service. It would assist colleges and universities in developing public service curricula to meet future governmental needs.

I urge prompt consideration and passage of this legislation to strengthen our Federal system and assure more efficient conduct of programs with shared administrative responsibilities.

Our mission—to meet the rapidly changing needs of our society—calls for our continued attention to excellence in the public service. I pledge you and the Nation mine.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1968.*

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER.** This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. GROSS, and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. ANGEL REAUD, ALSO KNOWN AS ANGEL REAUD RAMOS IZQUIERDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 503) for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izquierdo.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHESTER E. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of John W. Rogers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CHARLES B. FRANKLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2288) for the relief of Charles B. Franklin.

Mr. CONTE and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4936) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

E. L. TOWNLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH M. HEPWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12119) for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7210) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

JE-IL BRICK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4058) for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING AN EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 558) to authorize an exchange of lands at Acadia National Park, Maine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 269, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 269

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, accept title to certain land in the town of Bar Harbor, Hancock County, Maine, held by the Jackson Laboratory, a nonprofit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maine, said land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound set in the ground in the southerly side of State Highway Numbered 3 leading from Bar Harbor to Seal Harbor, said stone bound also marking the northeasterly corner of land of the United States of America and the northwesterly corner of land of the Jackson Laboratory;

thence north 72 degrees 58 minutes east and following the southerly side of State Highway Numbered 3, 80 feet to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence south 32 degrees 13 minutes east 762.5 feet to an iron pin set in the ledge;

thence north 88 degrees 16 minutes east 270.54 feet to a stone bound set in the ground in the southerly side of the old Morrell Park Racetrack;

thence north 61 degrees 56 minutes east 673.2 feet to an iron pipe driven in the ground, said iron pipe also being in a northwesterly line of land of the United States of America;

thence south 24 degrees 30 minutes west and always following a northwesterly line of land of the United States of America, 149 feet to an iron pipe driven in the ground;

thence south 64 degrees 05 minutes west and always following a northwesterly line of land of the United States of America, 577 feet to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence south 78 degrees 50 minutes west and always following a northerly line of land of the United States of America, 115 feet to an iron pin in a large boulder;

thence north 84 degrees 00 minutes west and always following a northerly line of land of the United States of America, 357 feet to an iron pin in the ledge;

thence north 22 degrees 40 minutes west and always following a northeasterly line of land of the United States of America, 460 feet to an iron pin in the ledge;

thence north 14 degrees 05 minutes west and always following an easterly line of land of the United States of America, 281.7 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 4.828 acres.

Said land, upon acceptance of title thereto, shall become a part of the Acadia National Park.

SEC. 2. In exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the land described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may convey to the Jackson Laboratory all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described land in the town of Bar Harbor, Hancock County, Maine, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound set in the ground in the southeasterly side line of State Highway Numbered 3 leading from Bar Harbor to Seal Harbor, said stone bound marking the northeasterly corner of lot formerly belonging to the trustees of Louise D. Morrell, now owned by the Jackson Laboratory; said stone bound also marking the northwesterly corner of land belonging to the United States of America;

thence in a northeasterly direction but always following the southeasterly side line of State Highway Numbered 3, 31.0 feet to a point which marks the northwesterly corner of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory;

thence south 23 degrees 40 minutes east and always following a southwesterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 603 feet, more or less, to a point in the old road originally leading to the Bear Brook Campground;

thence south 71 degrees 04 minutes east 20 feet, more or less, to a stone bound set in the ground in a southwesterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory;

thence following the same course; namely, south 71 degrees 04 minutes east and always following a southwesterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 183.2 feet to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence north 84 degrees 46 minutes east and always following a southeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 89.9 feet to a stone bound set in the ground in the northwesterly side of an old crossroad leading from the old Campground Road to State Highway Numbered 3;

thence north 23 degrees 16 minutes east and following a southeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 160.0 feet to an angle in said line;

thence north 9 degrees 16 minutes east and following a southeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 79 feet to an angle point in said line;

thence north 20 degrees 31 minutes east and following a southeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 445 feet to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence following the same course; namely, north 20 degrees 31 minutes east and following a southeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, 888.38 feet to a stone bound set in the ground; said stone bound marking the northeasterly corner of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory and the southeasterly corner of a lot of land belonging to the United States of America;

thence in a general easterly direction 38 feet more or less to a point in the westerly side line of the Schooner Head Road so called;

thence in a general southerly direction and always following the westerly side line of the Schooner Head Road, 202 feet more or less to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence south 20 degrees 31 minutes west across the land of the United States of America, 1,164 feet to a point in said line, said last described line being 100 feet distant from and parallel with the southeasterly line of land of the Jackson Laboratory;

thence following the same course; namely, south 20 degrees 31 minutes west across the land belonging to the United States of America, 137.3 feet to a stone bound set in the ground;

thence south 61 degrees 56 minutes west across the land belonging to the United States of America, 617.6 feet to an iron pipe driven in the ground, said iron pipe being in a southeasterly line of land formerly belonging to the trustees of Louise D. Morrell and now belonging to the Jackson Laboratory;

thence north 24 degrees 30 minutes east and following a southeasterly line of last mentioned land, 277 feet to an iron pipe driven in the ground;

thence following an easterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory along a curve to the left, 111 feet, the radius of said curve being 373 feet;

thence north 23 degrees 40 minutes west and always following a northeasterly line of land belonging to the Jackson Laboratory, said land belonging formerly to the trustees of Louise D. Morrell, 492 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 4.632 acres.

The conveyance of title to the lands described in this section shall eliminate them from the Acadia National Park.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5558) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EXCHANGE CERTAIN PROPERTY AT ACADIA NATIONAL PARK IN MAINE WITH THE OWNER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY ADJACENT TO THE PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14463) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property at Acadia National Park in Maine with the owner of certain property adjacent to the park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14463

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may convey to one Maurice Rich, Senior, a portion of the Acadia National Park, comprising approximately one and eight-tenths acres in the town of Southwest Harbor, Maine, and in exchange therefor the Secretary may accept from said Maurice Rich, Senior, any property which in his judgment is suitable for addition to the park. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. Any cash payment received by the Secretary shall be credited to the land and water conservation fund in the Treasury of the United States. A conveyance of the federally owned lot shall eliminate it from the park.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "his" and insert "the Secretary's".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1821) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property at Acadia National Park in Maine with the owner of certain property adjacent to the park.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1821

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may convey to one Maurice Rich, Senior, a portion of the Acadia National Park, comprising approximately one and eight-tenths acres in the town of Southwest Harbor, Maine, and in exchange therefor the Secretary may accept from said Maurice Rich, Senior, any property which in his judgment is suitable for addition to the park. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. Any cash payment received by the Secretary shall be credited to the land and water conservation fund in the Treasury of the United States. A conveyance of the federally owned lot shall eliminate it from the park.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1821 and insert the provisions of H.R. 14463, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14463) was laid on the table.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Charles Bernstein.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 991) to refer the bill (H.R. 14109) entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris" to the Chief Commissioner, of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimost consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

STANISLAW AND JULIANNA SZYMONIK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1879) for the relief of Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1879

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik, lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, shall be held to be included in the class of applicants for naturalization exempted from the provisions of section 313(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as such class is specified in section 313 (c) of the said Act, and that Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik shall be considered to have met the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316(a) of the said Act, and their petitions for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CONCORD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Weapons Center, Concord, Calif.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NEW BEDFORD STORAGE WAREHOUSE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10851) for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10851

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Company of New Bedford, Massachusetts, the sum of $365.98 in full settlement of the claims of said company against the United States arising out of services performed for the United States Coast Guard, pursuant to Government bill of lading A–0022724, and interest on said sum at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date said claim arose to the date of payment not as interest but as compensation for damages caused said company by said delay in payment. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, through page 2, line 2, strike "A–0022724, and interest on said sum at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date said claim arose to the date of payment not as interest but as compensation for damages caused said company by said delay in payment." and insert "A-0022724."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10327) for the relief of Louis J. Falardeau, Irva G. Franger, Betty Klemcke, Wineta L. Welburn, and Emma L. McNeil, all individuals employed by the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF VESSEL "ANNIE B." IN THE COASTWISE TRADE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2191) to authorize the use of vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2191

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the vessel Annie B., owned by William F. Fifield of Stonington, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the vessel Annie B., owned by William M. Fifield of Stonington, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States and so long as it is used for the transportation of bait and supplies for the lobster and crab fisheries within the State of Maine."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1093) to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade, a similar Senate bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the vessel Annie B., owned by William M. Fifield of Stonington, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HATHAWAY

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HATHAWAY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1093 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2191, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2191) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE VESSEL "OCEAN DELIGHT" IN THE COASTWISE TRADE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2192) to authorize the use of the vessel *Ocean Delight* in the coastwise trade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2192

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the vessel Ocean Delight, built in Montega, Nova Scotia, and now owned by the Port Clyde Packing Company of Port Clyde, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall cause the vessel Ocean Delight, built in Meteghan, Nova Scotia, and now owned by Port Clyde Packing Company, Incorporated, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, to engage in the coastwise trade and the fisheries, so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from the further consideration of a similar Senate bill, (S. 10), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 10

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 11), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the vessel Ocean Delight, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, with the privilege of engaging in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HATHAWAY

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HATHAWAY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 10 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2192, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2192) was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Ashley
Bow
Cederberg
Clancy
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Gude
Hagan
Halleck
Holifield
Hungate
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
King, Calif.
Lipscomb
Macdonald, Mass.
Mailliard
Mayne
Moore
O'Konski
Passman
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Rooney, N.Y.
Roybal
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vigorito

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON COTTON, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommit-

tee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15399, with Mr. DORN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is no controversy at all about this bill. The members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle completely agree that it is necessary to provide the funds which are contained in the bill.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, the bill is limited to four urgent items, plus associated general provisions. The bill total for net new budget—obligating—authority, all in the form of "appropriations," is $1,214,780,863, a reduction of $1,240,000 from the $1,216,020,863 sought by the President in House Document No. 254, of February 8, 1968, as amended by House Document No. 258 of February 19, 1968.

All new amounts recommended in the bill are for payments fixed by law—and essentially mandatory at this point under terms of the applicable laws.

All of the new amounts meet the test for deficiency spending rates under the antideficiency law.

All the amounts were forecast in the new budget last month when the fiscal 1968 budget picture was updated, and thus the 1968 totals in that budget are not breached.

Two of the items are in the bill in the exact amounts as forecast in the 1969 budget. The claims and judgments item, by its nature, is not subject to accurate forecasting and is therefore chargeable to the contingency allowance. The one item for which all new funds are disallowed—$1,240,000 for State planning in connection with vocational rehabilitation services—was forecast in the new budget at $1,900,000. This is the only one of the four requests which as a practical matter at this point is subject to discretionary appropriation action.

URGENCY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, this is also the first appropriation bill of the session. It is urgent because in the absence of its prompt enactment, the departments—within a matter of days or a very few weeks at the most—will be unable to meet payments for unemployed ex-servicemen and Federal employees and to match the State-local programs of public assistance under established formulas prescribed by basic legislation. Some of the various claims and judgments were adjudicated months ago and a good case can be made that the payments ought to be provided promptly.

There is $1,135,000,000 in the bill for additional grants to States for public assistance.

There is $28,800,000 additional in the bill for payments for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

There is a transfer-of-existing-funds provision of $1,240,000, in lieu of new funds, for certain State planning costs in connection with vocational rehabilitation services and facilities.

Finally, there is $50,980,863 for claims and judgments already adjudicated.

SUPPLEMENTAL FOR GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—90 PERCENT OF THE BILL TOTAL

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, which I shall ask at the appropriate time, may I add for the record that the amount for the one item of appropriation for grants to States for public assistance, $1,135,000,000, represents about 90 percent of the bill total. It arises out of a set of circumstances that to some extent is unusual in relation to past experience of budgeting and appropriating for this appropriation.

As the committee report states, the committee was aware last year and the House was told that supplemental funds for fiscal 1968 would be needed. The precise amount was not, of course, known. According to the testimony, the present estimate was prepared after consultation with and information from certain States—State officials—representing a major share of the cost of the program.

Of the supplemental, $115,700,000 is due wholly to the fact that certain expiring authorizing legislation was not extended in time in the last session to be provided for before adjournment. There is nothing unusual about such occurrences.

The sum of $511,700,000 relates to the medicaid program where there was at the time of formulating the original budget request only a minimum of program experience to go on. Medical costs rose several times faster than was assumed. The printed hearings contain considerable testimony on this point.

Some $260,000,000, according to the evidence, is due primarily to an unprecedented rise in the number of recipients, that is, families with dependent children. This year saw the largest annual caseload increase in the history of that particular program—more than double the previous year; almost three times the average increase of the last 5 years.

But, Mr. Chairman, while the margin of miscalculation is greater than usual this year, miscalculations are nothing new to budgets and appropriations for grants to States for public assistance. Numerous budgetary miscalculations—for a variety of reasons—have been made by both Congress and the executive branch reaching back over a period of many years; original budget estimates of forward requirements for this appropriation, submitted during the administration of both parties, have been wide of the mark on many occasions. So have the original appropriations. The following table, covering all the fiscal years of the last three administrations, graphically capsules the picture:

ESTIMATES		APPROPRIATIONS	
1955	$1,200,000,000	1955	$1,200,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 88)	238,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 24)	238,000,000
1956	1,400,000,000	1956	1,400,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 330)	57,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 533)	47,000,000
1957	1,315,000,000	1957	1,300,000,000
Supp. (P.L. 19)	277,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 19)	275,000,000
1958	1,679,400,000	1958	1,600,000,000
Supp (H. Doc. 313)	170,600,000	Supp. (P.L. 85–352)	170,600,000
1958 (Pay Act trf.)	−3,423,136	1958 (Pay Act trf.)	−3,423,136
1959	1,806,400,000	1959	1,806,400,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 58)	168,400,000	Supp. (P.L. 30)	151,560,000
1960	2,033,500,000	1960	2,033,500,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 327)	10,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 424)	4,000,000
1961	2,083,000,000	1961	2,083,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 58 and S. Doc. 22)	107,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 14)	94,000,000
1962	2,501,200,000	1962	2,401,200,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 333)	85,000,000	Supp	------------
1963	2,688,300,000	1963	2,538,300,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 514)	299,300,000	Supp	------------
Supp. (H. Doc. 514)	*(97,900,000)*	Supp	------------
Supp. (H. Doc. 61)	210,000,000	Supp. (P.L. 88–25)	200,000,000
1964	2,900,000,000	1964	2,725,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 203)	159,600,000	Supp. (P.L. 88–317)	159,600,000

ESTIMATES—continued

1965	$2,980,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 80)	407,900,000
1966	3,242,100,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 278)	222,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 383)	381,000,000
1967	3,746,400,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 83)	470,000,000
1968	4,240,000,000
Supp. (H. Doc. 254)	1,135,000,000

APPROPRIATIONS—continued

1965	$2,780,000,000
Supp. (P.L. 89-16)	407,900,000
1966	3,000,000,000
Supp. (P.L. 89-309)	222,000,000
Supp. (P.L. 89-426)	381,000,000
1967	3,700,000,000
Supp. (P.L. 90-21)	470,000,000
1968	4,124,300,000
Supp. (the pending bill)	1,135,000,000

GENERAL BUDGET VARIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, a budget is a plan; in many instances, an educated guess. Times change; conditions change; requirements can and often do change. There are hundreds of individual appropriations and fund accounts in the budget, each with its own spending estimate. Many turn out more; many less—and for a variety of reasons.

But in the aggregate, in the last 4 fiscal years, 1964–1967, administrative budget revenues exceeded original budget estimates in each year. As to expenditures, in 2 years of the last 4, expenditures were less than originally projected in the budget; in 2 years, they were more—accounted for especially because of rising war costs.

But in total, the budget deficits turned out to be less than originally projected in the budgets in 3 out of those 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Mr. FLOOD] who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and HEW Appropriations, which considered the major items in the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas said, there was no controversy about the bill. Aside from the claims and judgments item, the bill comes in three parts. Payment under the first two parts is mandatory by law, by act of Congress, and there is nothing we can do but to talk about them for a few minutes.

The three things you should know about the request for additional public assistance money Mr. Chairman, are these: First, the dramatic rise in the number of people who have been placed on the public assistance rolls in 1967; second, the cost of the new medicaid program; third, the also dramatic rise in medical costs. The total amounts to $1.135 billion. The largest item in this amount is the medicaid cost, which is about $511,700,000, and the additional welfare payments for aid to dependent children amount to $259 million. With this supplemental appropriation the total appropriation for grants to States for public assistance for 1968 will be $5,259,300,000.

I might point out to you that in the year 1967 the number of recipients in the program for aid to families with dependent children went from 4,700,000 people to 5,400,000 people. Never before had we had a larger annual increase than 319,000. In the last 5 years it averaged only 220,000. So you can see how really dramatic and unexpected that increase was.

But, Mr. Chairman, the most startling aspect is that, despite what I have just said about the cost of this bill and its uncontrollable nature, we are advised by the people who know that only 50 percent of the people who are entitled to be on the public assistance rolls are actually on them today.

Did you hear what I said? Only 50 percent of the people entitled to be on the public assistance rolls are actually on them. So you can imagine what the total bill could be like.

The next item is unemployment compensation for Federal employees and returning servicemen, for which payment is necessary under an act of Congress. The money is to pay unemployment compensation, which, as I said, is self-determinative for Federal employees and for ex-servicemen.

The hearings revealed that they are still short about $13 million on this supplemental estimate for 1968. The ranking Republican member on the committee, Mr. LAIRD, will address himself to this problem. But the payments are fixed by law, and hence we approve them.

On the grants for public assistance, we knew last year this was understated. That point was made in the hearings last year. Another factor in the total underestimate is that we did not have all the authorization on public assistance when we considered the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill last year. It was subsequently authorized. A request for that purpose in the amount of $115,700,000 is included in the total of $1,135,000,000. Witnesses before the committee last year also suggested that a supplemental request should be delayed until they had time to consider the impact of the new amendments to the Social Security Act. A substantial portion of the underestimate is this rise in medical costs. We were first given to understand the rise would be about 5 percent. We are now advised that in the 12-month period ending June 30, 1967, hospital costs rose 21.9 percent. We are advised it can only go up. This is just so Members know. It, of course, produced this mandatory requirement for a supplemental appropriation.

The last item is the only controllable item we had, and we did not put any new money into it. It has to do with grants to the States for planning comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs. This was a 2-year program appropriated at a level of $5,250,000 for the 2 years. The States did not comply either in the time element or in the dollar amounts. As of right now, 38 of the 50 States are over a barrel as a result of this condition. They have done part of the job but do not have funds to complete it.

This Congress does not like to stand here with a gun at its head and hear, "Appropriate or else," but under the circumstances, there is nothing to do but provide the amount requested, $1,900,000, or waste at least some of the investment already made. The President in his message to Congress said this was a high priority item, so the committee says to the Department, "Very well, if this is such a high priority item, make it high priority. You have a lot of money we have already appropriated. Put this at the top of your priorities." We have arranged by our action here a transfer of funds under their jurisdiction, which they now have for the various other programs in this same general area.

We do not like waste. Money has to be provided. The States are over a barrel. Programs will be stopped. The Members know the reputation of this subcommittee, but under the circumstances, there was nothing to do, except provide the dollars. We chose, however—also under the circumstances—to provide the dollars by transfer from amounts already appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, every few days we get a verbal treatment in the House about the rocketing gross national product and how everything is so lovely and the goose hangs high in this country. Does the gentleman have anything to offer, if we are wallowing in the prosperity, as to why the welfare and poverty rolls are increasing, requiring these additional expenditures?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can tell the gentleman from Iowa I do not have even the goose, but this is the fact. I asked this same question the gentleman asked, because I knew the gentleman would ask me.

First of all, it is related to the increase in population which has been skyrocketing. Even the gentleman from Iowa cannot stop that, and does not want to, I am sure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not adding anything to it these days.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that.

Second, let me tell the gentleman what happened. Scores of the organizations of this country in the last 2 years—the chambers of commerce, the Rotary Clubs, the Knights of Columbus, all kinds of organizations, United Funds, American Legions—have engaged in a great drive to go out into the highways and byways and ghettos and rural areas and show the people what they were entitled to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FLOOD. The combination of those two things, we are advised by the people who know, has produced this result.

The thing which the gentleman should be concerned about, as I am—and this astounded me—is that only 50 percent who are entitled to be on these rolls are now on them.

Mr. GROSS. Would inflation have anything to do with this?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know. Does the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. It must have something to do with the costs the gentleman talks about.

Mr. FLOOD. Not in my opinion.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate we must consider this supplemental appropriation bill today under these emergency circumstances. If this bill is not approved the checks for returning servicemen and Federal employees under the unemployment compensation program will not be forthcoming within the next 10 days.

So far as the $1,135,000,000 for public assistance is concerned, State programs will come to a halt in about a month unless these funds are made available.

Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate thing about these estimates and about this supplemental request is that last May—and it was May 25 when we considered the Labor-HEW appropriation bill on the floor of the House—many of us knew that the administration's estimates, the executive branch estimates to the Congress, were in error. If the Members will read the RECORD for May 25 they will see that the estimates were discussed on that day, and it was pointed out that the executive branch had obviously underestimated the costs of public assistance for fiscal year 1968 by $500 million, before the fiscal year even started. They had also underestimated Federal employees' and veterans' unemployment compensation by at least 35 percent.

We can pretend to save all kinds of money by cutting back on uncontrollable appropriations and then make up the deficit in supplementals. This is an old trick that has been used. Yes, the Congress has used it a time or two. But now the executive branch has taken over and almost usurped the use of this technique entirely in the budgets it sends to the Congress.

The 1969 budget, which is being considered by our committee right now, is underestimated in the area of public assistance grants to the States by more than $350 million.

And, Mr. Chairman, this particular request for supplemental appropriations which was sent to us by the President on February 8, does not include enough money to carry the programs covered in this bill through this fiscal year.

I direct attention to the hearings before the subcommittee. If it had not been for the questioning of our subcommittee, Mr. Goodwin, from the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor, being a good soldier for the administration, would not have told the Congress that the request signed by the President on February 8 was out of date and underestimated the day it was sent to this House. The President and the Bureau of the Budget were informed in May that the 1968 figure would be off by at least the amount finally requested just 2 weeks ago. And now we know that that figure is $13 to $14 million too low.

It does not seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is proper for the executive branch not to level with the Congress as to the true costs of these programs. Already fiscal year 1969 is underestimated. Right now unemployment compensation to ex-servicemen is running at an average of 5¼ weeks for each eligible serviceman. In the 1969 budget, although the number of servicemen is going to be increased, I have it on good authority, they are estimating only 4 weeks for benefits in order to show a lower total cost in the budget. Mr. Chairman, that is just one example of a phony assumption merely to mislead the Congress and the American people as to the effect of this 1969 budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the budget of our Government as submitted by the President should be the fiscal guide of our Nation as to the expenditures and receipts and the obligational authority needed. We do not have a credible fiscal plan before this Congress yet for fiscal year 1969. This supplemental request as far as 1968 is concerned shows that we do not even yet have a credible fiscal plan for the current year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This supplemental request points this out. Insufficient funds are provided for the rest of fiscal year 1968 in this unemployment compensation area. They will eventually have to come back to the Congress for this money. It vindicates the position of the Congress in raising serious questions about the credibility of the original 1968 budget. This same credibility issue goes to the heart of the 1969 budget. I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that we will be back here again with further supplemental requests to make up the shortage for fiscal year 1969 even if we appropriate every dollar requested in the budget for these uncontrollable items.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. In our last supplemental appropriation last year there were several Indian claims that were not included because the Budget Bureau had not reported on them yet. I would like to make it crystal clear here on the floor today that these several claims of the Sioux Tribe of Indians are included on page 36 of House Document No. 254.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from North Dakota is absolutely correct. Those funds are included as cited in the report of the committee in this supplemental appropriation bill. I know of the gentleman's long interest in the Sioux Indians. Those claims and the money for them are included in this supplemental request.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that upon the request of the committee on yesterday, an additional budget estimate for Indian claims was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the President. The President submitted the request for them on yesterday, and we included those funds in the bill—in addition to the earlier request for other claims funds—in order to meet these claims which have already been adjudicated?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I am interested in the unemployment compensation for Federal employees. Is their backlog due to the increased load of returning ex-servicemen who are unemployed? Are they one of the reasons why the Department of Labor is so far behind in processing the regular Federal employees' compensation claims for sickness and injury on the job?

Mr. LAIRD. This is not the reason or should not be the reason for that. The claims of which you speak are handled by another division

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, only this past week I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Labor, which might well have been addressed to the gentleman's subcommittee; wherein an injury had occurred to an employee while serving on the job at this particular post office and had been pending for the period of over 3 years. There seemed to be absolutely no excuse for this, medically or otherwise, except the failure of the proper authorities to assume jurisdiction of the matter.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin and to the gentleman's committee—and I shall be glad to provide all information in support thereof, that there are a lot of such cases, while in the meantime the individual involved and his private—Aetna—casualty insurance cannot prevail so long as he is covered under employees' compensation while serving on the job. It is my opinion that this deficiency should be further discussed toward the end of updating our compensation laws.

Mr. LAIRD. None of the funds contained in this supplemental appropriations bill would be used for that purpose. The problem lies in another division of the Department of Labor. However, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri directing the committee's attention to this particular matter at this time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I might say this to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that last year this subcommittee looked into and conducted hearings upon that very point which the gentleman is raising and it shall look into the matter further in connection with consideration of the 1969 budget for the Department of Labor upon which we commenced hearings yesterday. I fully agree that something has to be done to cut down on the time it takes to handle many of these claims.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. **LAIRD**. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. **LAIRD**. Mr. Chairman, the funds involved here, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, must be used entirely for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to certain Federal employees and returning servicemen. The primary gap is in the area of returning servicemen. The other matter to which you refer comes within the jurisdiction of another division of the Department of Labor. We shall be getting into that problem within a very short time in the hearings which will be held before the subcommittee. I can assure the gentleman from Missouri that we shall be going into that question and see if we cannot correct the matter to which the gentleman has called our attention.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. **ST GERMAIN**. Mr. Chairman, I have risen on many occasions in an effort to gain the full funds needed to support the commitment made by the Congress to the school districts across the land in the form of Public Law 874.

Today, I rise not in an effort to gain the full funds, for I realize that this is impossible at this time; but I rise in an effort to gain funds necessary to operate this program at a reasonable level.

We have before us today an urgent supplemental appropriations bill to finance portions of several programs during fiscal year 1968. Much to my dismay, there is no mention of the impacted areas program and I would like to pose the question at this time: Why not?

Included in the supplemental appropriations bill is a $1.2 million request for vocational rehabilitation grants to the States which the Federal Government is not compelled to make under existing legislation. While I agree that this is indeed a program worthy of our support I also consider the obligation of the impacted school districts worthy of our urgent support.

Under the authorizing legislation, $486 million was authorized to meet all of the entitlements under Public Law 874 whereby the impacted school districts, charged with the responsibility and burden of educating children whose parents live and/or work at Federal installations located in the district, are compensated by the Federal Government. However, this Congress appropriated only $416 million.

On October 26, when commenting on this matter, I stated:

> If this figure [416 million dollars] is accepted, we will in effect be telling the school districts that we refuse to fully live up to our commitment and that they will have to water down their educational programs accordingly.
>
> I regard this as a disgrace and a tragedy—a disgrace because we, the Congress, have failed to live up to our commitment; and a tragedy because our school children shall have to pay for our irresponsibility in the form of watered-down programs.

Recently, to add salt to the wound, this Congress further reduced the amount of funds for this program by approximately 5 percent.

To total the amounts, Mr. Chairman, the funds for this program have been reduced 20 percent from what was needed to meet full entitlements.

The First Congressional District of Rhode Island, which I am privileged to represent, received $187,000 less than what it was entitled to prior to the recent 5-percent reduction. Needless to say, this has imposed a great burden upon my district and I feel it is disgraceful in view of the intent of the Congress as expressed in the originating legislation.

I consider this an urgent matter and again ask the question of why additional funds were not included in this supplemental appropriations bill for the vital impacted areas program?

Mr. **HANSEN** of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the bill before us. Among other things, it provides funds for the just payment of $15,700,000 to several Indian tribes for the loss of their aboriginal homeland.

In equity, Mr. Chairman, it is proper that these funds, so long denied to the Indians who were harmed, be approved at this time so that they may begin immediately to earn interest until such time as an equitable distribution of the funds has been agreed upon between the benefiting tribes.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the subcommittee, to the full Appropriations Committee, and to the Committee of the Whole the very serious problems caused by the recent cutbacks in funds to finance Public Law 874, the impacted school districts program.

For fiscal year 1968 the administration asked for $416.2 million, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1967. But due to the probably unwise expansion of the program—an expansion advocated by some impact supporters—to include many metropolitan city schools with relatively low percentages of impact pupils, this request for 1968 resulted in a distribution to each qualified school district of approximately 90 percent of their 1967 entitlement.

Last month the administration ordered additional cutbacks in Public Law 874 funds. These cutbacks were the administration's response to the economy resolution passed by the Congress in December 1967. This resolution required the reduction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's total overall appropriation by 10 percent. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could have fully funded the impact appropriation and made up for it in reductions among other programs. This method would require an evaluation of the priorities involved.

While I recognize this administrative decision to fully fund some programs and perhaps even eliminate others would have been difficult, surely some programs are more urgent than others and should not have been cut at all while others, less valuable, should have been reduced by more than 10 percent. I believe that the impacted school districts program belongs in the category which should have been funded up to full congressional appropriation—but it was not.

Impacted schools were placed in further difficulty this year by the expansion of personnel at many of our military installations and the normal growth of school populations.

To the metropolitan city schools, impact funds altogether amount to a relatively small share of their total income. So any 10-percent cutback in the new impact windfall would hardly be noticeable. To these new participants in the program, any new impact funds would be gravy. Contrasted with this situation in the metropolitan city schools are the truly impacted districts where as much as 18 percent of the school districts' funds come from the impact program.

Furthermore, the administration has recommended no increase next year over the 1967 and 1968 appropriation. Due to the growth of the student population in impacted districts, the distribution to each school will be still further below the full entitlement

The President's budget message calls for a $100 million cutback in fiscal year 1970. At the same time, the White House in the educational message entitled, "The Fifth Freedom," sent to the Congress on February 5, urged the Congress to fund elementary and secondary school programs "well in advance of the school year so that State and local school officials can make their plans with a clear idea of the resources that will be available."

How is an impacted school system to plan its educational program when the Federal Government in the middle of the school year orders a 10-percent cutback in certain Federal funds?

Listen to the problem this presents to just a few typical schools in my district. Representing the Seventh District of Ohio, which contains Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, my district not only contains the highest number of impacted school districts in the State—22 out of 67—but also receives the largest amount of impacted school funds in the State of Ohio. The total 20-percent cutback in Public Law 874 funds this year represents a loss of Federal moneys in just four school districts in my district of $314,000.

In many instances, this represents between 6 and 7 mills on their total tax duplicate. In one district, the Beavercreek School District, 25 percent of the pupils are children of Federal employees. In the Mad River Township School District, 18 percent of their funds come from Public Law 874. In the Fairborn School District, the cutback in Public Law 874 funds of $100,000 amounts to 7 mills on the tax duplicate.

The history of the funding of Public Law 815 providing construction funds in impacted school districts is similar to that of Public Law 874.

As a result of these cutbacks, school officials are presented with two choices.

They must either approach the voters with a large tax levy or order cutbacks in educational programs. If cutbacks are ordered in educational programs, sons and daughters of not only the local citizens, but our military personnel as well, will suffer. If, on the other hand, taxes are increased, the relationship in the community between the military families and the local citizens, who will know why they are being taxed more heavily, will be an unhappy one.

It is unfair to extract from our military personnel, already fighting bravely in Vietnam, as the price of the war and maintaining our national defense, either a second-rate education for their children or a second-rate citizenship in the community.

Aid to impacted school districts is really part of our national defense effort, part of the war in Vietnam. How will the military be able to keep qualified personnel, both in enlisted and officer ranks, if these men know that the price of staying in the service will be sending their children to educationally and financially poor school districts near the bases where they serve.

Certainly, our national economic situation warrants careful expenditure of our moneys, but why should we cut reliable and proven necessary programs to replace them with new untried programs. As the number of people in uniform continues to rise, the administration plans for continuing cutbacks in Public Law 874. But the President in his educational message I mentioned earlier, "The Fifth Freedom," sent to the Congress on February 5, proposes many new elementary and secondary education programs and does not mention Public Law 874. This may represent an attitude in HEW of preference for grant programs over formula programs such as Public Law 874—an attitude with which I do not agree.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS was granted permission to speak out of order.)

A TIME FOR HARD DECISIONS ON VIETNAM

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, six additional combat battalions are being deployed to Vietnam. Three are Marine battalion landing teams and three are Army airborne battalions.

While the number of men involved is not great, some 10,500, it is nevertheless an important addition to the number of troops that are already in Vietnam. Previous rules concerning second tours of duty in Vietnam have been drastically revised—young men with only a few months to serve are being sent to Vietnam, and young men are being sent back to fight in Vietnam after as little as 60 days in the United States.

No doubt there will be many repercussions coming from your constituents, which I can understand.

At the same time, the new deployment brings about a definite weakening of our strategic Active Forces in this country and this could well affect our ability to meet other contingencies.

The gap must be filled. I suggest that we have maintained and supported a Reserve structure for this very purpose. I maintain that Inactive Reserve units will have to be ordered to active duty to fill this dangerous gap in our defenses.

I say unequivocally that we must have a call up of the Reserves.

Marine Corps deployments in South Vietnam, for example, cannot be maintained without extending tours in Vietnam, unless they are authorized a reserve callup.

The President has authority to order inactive units to active duty under existing law, which expires June 30, 1968. I think it is time for the Department of Defense to ask Congress to extend this law and to request authority to order individual reservists to active duty. No such authority exists today.

You might be interested to learn that to date, however, I have not heard a word on this subject from the Department of Defense.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is time someone stood on the floor of this House and told the American people some plain hard facts—and that is what I am going to do.

Probably no war in our history has been more poorly managed from a civilian viewpoint than the conflict in which we are involved in South Vietnam.

General Westmoreland, good soldier that he is, has never publicly complained. He has functioned as a commander, with restraints and limitations that would have driven a lesser man to complete distraction.

He cannot select bombing targets outside of South Vietnam. He does not even have any control over the selection of targets in North Vietnam.

He was not given the number of men he and the Joint Chiefs, long ago, said were needed to achieve a military victory in South Vietnam. On the one hand, he has an Ambassador advising him what to do; and on the other hand, he has a Secretary of Defense ordering him what to do. And there is a long gap between Saigon and Washington.

And our allies—with rare and heartwarming exceptions—show little concern for our problems. Even the South Vietnamese are not being utilized to the extent they should be. Everyone knows that.

I do not have to point out that we are getting almost no help from our European allies in this crisis. The only contribution we have received from many of them—whom we saved in two World Wars—is criticism and gratuitous self-seeking, self-serving advice. And, Mr. Chairman, I am sure your blood boiled as did mine when I saw the Communist parade in Le Havre, France, on television last night where the people of the city of Le Havre loaded a Russian ship with supplies for North Vietnam. This is the same port liberated by American troops 25 years ago. These are the same people whom the Communists slaughtered in Vietnam a short decade ago at Dienbienphu.

I just want the American people to never forget that the fountainhead of ingratitude lies in De Gaulle's France. My Government should now demand payment of all obligations and forthwith stop any gold flow to this country—regardless of the repercussions.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little solace to be gained from the response we have received from our so-called friends. However, the courageous nations of South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, along with their enthusiastic vocal and material support, is a source of deep gratitude and should warm the hearts of every American.

When Prime Minister Holt died, America lost a voice and a true friend we could ill afford to lose during these tragic times.

What South Korea is doing is a matter of history, as well as Australia and New Zealand.

Nevertheless, the miracle of Vietnam is that we have not done more poorly.

The civilian strategists in Washington have tied Westmoreland's hands with the manacles of slow escalation. If a military leader proposed such a course of action, he would be court-martialed.

General Westmoreland needs no defense from me.

But I notice an increasing tendency on the part of the press and the Monday morning quarterbacks to build him up for the fall guy. They predict his removal. I can assure you that any reassignment involving General Westmoreland will be to a position of even higher importance. Yet, certain columnists are trying to place the blame for our lack of victory on General Westmoreland.

They blame him for the attack on Saigon; they blame him for the general uprising of the Vietcong in Vietnam.

The question is not whether we should remove General Westmoreland—the question is whether we will ever start listening to General Westmoreland and start taking his advice.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Westmoreland have, from the very beginning, recommended denying the port of Haiphong to the enemy. Yet, it is still an open port for Communist supplies.

To this date, there are targets in North Vietnam that cannot be touched, because striking them might involve civilian casualties.

How concerned were the Vietcong about the civilians who recently were massacred in Saigon?

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the strategy for fighting the war in Vietnam reflected to a far greater degree the advice of those men who have led this Nation to victory in other wars—men who have earned international respect for their performance in battle—and less advice from the uninformed, untried, and unproven invisible civilians hidden in a warm and comfortable foxhole in Washington, D.C.

We have a grave conflict on our hands.

Our Nation's image, in the eyes of the world, has never been fainter. I imagine that our status today, throughout the world, is probably lower than it was after our dismal winter at Valley Forge during the American Revolution.

Recently, a naval vessel was seized on the high seas by a Communist satellite. Now we are forced to listen to so-called confessions from members of her crew.

There is even the suggestion that we might possibly apologize for having invaded the territorial waters of North Korea, even though such an invasion was not true.

American prestige is at a new low.

It is time we developed a military plan and a timetable for winning the war in Vietnam. You might be surprised and shocked to learn we do not have one.

It is time this Congress gave serious thought to legislation that would put behind bars these irresponsible people traveling the length and breadth of America giving aid and comfort to the enemy and adding to the division which exists today in almost every nook and cranny of America.

Let us take a lesson from courageous little Israel. She gained world respect by a show of courage and she risked her existence on victory. She stands tall among the nations of the world—and respected.

If we are going to be concerned about what some country will say, or if we are afraid of Soviet or Chinese intervention, or world opinion, then Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we withdraw all our forces from all over the world, sit back, and wait for the inevitable atrophy that will happen to what once was a great and good nation.

America is at the crossroads in her march down the highway of history.

The peace-at-any-price press will condemn me—so be it.

The doves will flutter wildly and feathers will fly—so be it.

We were not allowed to win in Korea—and Vietnam was the penalty.

If we do not win in Vietnam, all of Asia will eventually go to the Communists.

But, if the people of Southeast Asia—regardless of nationality—are not willing to fight all out against communism, then our sacrifices have been in vain. It is time for a hard line against our enemies–and plain talk with our allies.

It is perfectly obvious that the South Vietnamese must do more for themselves if they are to win their war to preserve freedom and their survival as a young nation. But, I must hasten to add that American policy 2 years ago relegated half of the Vietnamese forces to a pacification role and our forces preempted most of the major combatant missions.

More assistance should come from the Philippines and by all means, we should discuss with Chiang Kai-shek the possible use of his highly trained forces in Taiwan.

The Philippine nation owes its existence to the United States and the American people; yet, we are denied the right to fly B–52's from our own bases to bomb targets in Vietnam.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I criticize our allies I must also say that those South Vietnamese who are truly dedicated to their nation and to freedom are, in the words of General Westmoreland, among the finest fighting troops in the world.

But this is not an all-American war in Southeast Asia. Our security is involved, no doubt, because if Southeast Asia eventually becomes another Communist satellite, democracy will never live again in that part of the world.

Furthermore, if this part of the world falls to the Communists, strategic materials necessary for our survival could be denied to us.

The time has come for a complete reappraisal of our treaty obligations, our commitments, and the direction and command structure of this war in Vietnam.

It is time that all leaders in Government were consulted before fateful decisions are made. It is time to seek the advice and counsel of men of maturity and experience, and who have demonstrated their love for America.

There is a division of opinion throughout America today that is frightening.

There is not a Member in this House who is not concerned about the future.

But I suggest to each and every one of you that we remember the words of Benjamin Franklin, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall hang separately."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DORN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 15399, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14743, REMOVAL OF GOLD COVER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1068 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1068

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14743) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1068 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14743 to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

H.R. 14743 would eliminate the present requirement that each Federal Reserve bank maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. In addition, the bill would also eliminate the $156 million gold reserve for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890. Removal of this gold cover is recommended in order to make it clear that the United States intends to continue its international financial commitments. The purpose of this policy is to provide liquidity for the maintenance and growth of international trade and to maintain this Nation's proper role therein. While our total gold reserves at yearend 1967 stood at slightly more than $12.1 billion, $10.7 billion of this is, under present law, frozen as reserves against outstanding Federal Reserve notes, U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890 in the total amount of $42.7 billion at yearend 1967. Enactment of this legislation would merely make these reserves available to support our position in international trade and finance, and would have absolutely no effect upon our domestic monetary system or the soundness of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this House, I am sure every Member of this Congress, and, indeed, every American citizen is determined that the American dollar shall stand firm in the markets of the world, today, and that whoever might attempt to destroy or impair that dollar being the medium of world trade today, is doomed to inevitable defeat.

Whatever is necessary to be done by this country to make safe and sure and to keep strong the American dollar in the markets of the world will be done.

Let those who are doubters, as well as those who would impair our financial strength and surreptitiously—sometimes by infidelity—attempt to destroy us, heed those words as coming from the Congress of a free people.

This is one of the steps which our President has recommended to our Congress that we make available to protect the dollar, more than $10 billion in gold. The speculators cannot succeed against that sort of strength.

When the Congress passes, as I hope it unanimously will, this resolution today, it will have a great effect in assuring those all over the world who believe in the American dollar that it not only is but shall be in every vicissitude, against every danger of hazard and against every foe, strong and stable and secure. This is a step toward the accomplishment of that end.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to remove the present requirement that the Federal Reserve System banks must maintain gold certificate reserves of at least 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes—dollars—in circulation.

Currently the total gold reserves of the United States stand at about $12,100,000,000. Of this total some $10,700,000,000 is required to be held as reserve currency backing for circulating dollars, leaving about $1,400,000,000 as "free gold" to be used to meet our international trade and financial obligations.

The Bretton Woods agreements, signed in 1944, require the United States to buy and sell gold at the price of $35 per ounce. Since that time the dollar has become the primary reserve currency of the trading world. Due to a multitude of pressures, our gold stock has dwindled from a peak of $24,600,000,000 in 1949 to its present level. As our economy expands and more dollars are put into circulation, the 25-percent reserve requirement continues to require that more of our gold stock be put aside as reserve currency backing. If we did not lose a single ounce of gold to foreign speculators for the next 2 years, our national economic expansion would require that all our gold stock now held become a part of our currency reserve, leaving nothing with which to settle international financial obligations.

The Government's response is to call for a removal of the reserve currency requirement, thus freeing all of our gold stock to meet these obligations. It is contended that such action will affirm to the world that our intention is to defend the dollar against speculators.

Minority views have been filed by 13 Members. They believe that this question is so tied to our overall balance-of-payments problem that the committee should hold off action until the Ways and Means Committee has completed its hearings on this bigger question. They fear that action now will remove all pressures to really come to grips with the balance-of-payments question which has steadily worsened over the last 7 years.

These members point out that over the last 21 years Government spending abroad shows a net deficit of $115 billion while the private sector shows a net surplus of $84 billion. Unless the Government policy can be reversed or modified, our position will continue to worsen. Freeing our gold reserves will weaken pressures to face this real problem of overseas Government expenditures.

These members point out that the January 1 program announced by the President can improve our shortrun position only at the expense of our long-term benefit. They also note that if the program is fully effective, the private sector will be cut back by $2,500,000,000 while the real culprit, the Federal Government will cut back only $500,000,000—hardly a realistic effort at solving the problem.

Finally, they note that even without passage of this legislation, current law gives the Federal Reserve Board authority to waive the 25-percent gold reserve requirement.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted supplemental views calling for an amendment creating a strategic gold reserve to insure that we would always have sufficient gold reserves to meet any emergency. It would work as follows: for every ounce of gold withdrawn by foreign governments or speculators another ounce would be withdrawn by the Government and placed in the strategic reserve. At least one-half of our gold would then be assured of staying under our control for our use.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD], has filed separate views in support of the bill. He notes that our own economic expansion will use all our "free gold" within 2 years, so that it is only a question of time before we take this step of removing the 25-percent currency reserve requirement.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN] has added supplemental views supporting the position taken by the minority. He believes that two steps should be taken: first, a reduction of the reserve currency requirement from 25 percent to 12½ percent, thus freeing about $6,000,000,000 in gold for use in settling international obligations and buying the United States time to fundamentally improve its balance-of-payments position; and, second, the imposition of import quotas to protect local production and cut down on imports.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have come to me and almost, I believe in an attitude of reproach, expressed some concern and regret at the fact that I joined with the majority in reporting out a rule on the bill which we are to consider today.

I have asked for this very brief time this afternoon merely to explain that I voted for a rule on this bill, and I will support this legislation, but I will do so out of a very deep feeling of regret.

To me it represents just another example of what we have come to witness all too frequently in recent years as simply another example of government by crisis. I have had Members come to me and say, "Well, why do we not cut out foreign aid? Let us cut out foreign aid. This will take care of the gold problem." I have had others come to me and say, "Let us demand the immediate payment of all our war debts both from World War I and World War II. That will take care of our problem."

The sad, sad fact of the matter is, if my understanding begins to approach the truth, that there is not time. There just is not time to take either of those actions, no matter how desirable they might be. This is because today is 1968. It is not 1961 when the late President Kennedy warned the Nation in a special message to this Congress on the subject of the balance of payments that we did not have to face the problem in any spirit of panic because he said we still have $17.5 billion in gold remaining.

Today, the fact of the matter is, we were told we have exactly $1.3 billion or $1.4 billion. In less than 2 years, just because of the normal requirements of some $160 million in industrial uses for gold and the $500 million that we set aside as backing for the $2 billion in new Federal Reserve notes that are issued annually to keep the wheels of commerce turning—just those two matters alone would exhaust our present free gold supply in less than 2 years even if we did not lose another dollar in the gold markets of Europe. Of course, everybody knows that some $950 million in gold message to this Congress on the subject went out in the month of December alone.

I repeat that we do not enjoy the luxury and the freedom of action this afternoon that we might have enjoyed back in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman were out in a boat on the river and the tide was going out to sea, would the gentleman pull up the anchor, throw it away and drift out to sea to certain death?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Certainly not. I respect the gentleman from Iowa and I appreciate the concern that he feels, even as I do at this hour, but this does not constitute any anchor any more. The anchor is gone. We are at sea. We have already been swept out. The fact of the matter is if we did not have any gold left to sustain our international trade and commerce, we would have a financial and international monetary collapse the likes of which we have never seen. I join the gentleman from Iowa in decrying the fact that we have to come before this House and stand in this Chamber and face the cold, brutal fact that this is exactly where we are. I heard the words of the gentleman from Florida who said that we will defend the dollar to the last man. They are fine words, and I agree with him in what he says, but it is a relatively easy thing to do, what we are doing today, to take away the gold cover.

When will we start to take some of the really tough action which is required, such as balancing our budget or cutting down the deficit to the point where people today who are demanding gold for our dollars no longer will feel compelled to ask for gold because they will have confidence restored in the dollar? When will we start to do the difficult and tough things which will restore international confidence in the American dollar?

This action we take today will not do it. It is just literally a case of the drowning man reaching out his hand for one straw to keep him afloat just a little bit longer. That is the sad position we are in today, but I did want to explain to the Members of the House that that is the attitude and the very painful attitude that I must take as we approach this matter this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12603, NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12603) to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GRAY, JONES of Alabama, KLUCZYNSKI, BLATNIK, WRIGHT, GROVER, SCHWENGEL, and CRAMER.

REMOVAL OF GOLD COVER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14743) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 14743, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. It is so important that I hope every member of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will give careful consideration to the amendments that are offered to the bill, as well as to the bill itself.

Mr. Chairman, this could be an earth-shaking bill. I know that if the bill were by chance to be defeated, it would be earth shaking and no one then could predict what would actually happen.

Mr. Chairman, we have had some bad depressions in this country. But we have never had a depression that would be equal to that worldwide depression that would happen upon the defeat of this bill in the U.S. Congress today, or tomorrow, or whenever it is finally voted upon, or crippling agreements reached in a conference upon the bill between the House of Representatives and the other body, or otherwise. It is just that important.

This bill is intended to provide a real anchor of gold for our money, providing more confidence for our dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I heard one of the Members state a while ago that there is only left about $1.3 billion in gold. I do not believe that is accurate. The accurate statement is we have $12.3 billion in gold, and that gold is ample, it is sufficient enough to support our money just as far down the road as we can see.

Certainly never in the foreseeable future will we have problems with our money and the soundness of our money if we provide this stockpile of gold equal to $12.3 billion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman is it not true that in 1949 we had some $24.5 billion in gold reserves, and that as of today we have exactly half of that?

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I cannot yield further at this time.

But we had probably too much gold. It is not in the interest of any country in the world to have all the gold, or practically all of it. We should have a proper distribution of gold where it is used universally. I believe at that time I mentioned the fact that we probably had too much gold, and a redistribution would probably be in the interest of all of the people of the world.

No nation should be required to hold too much gold. It is very expensive to hold. Take, for instance, France, it has enough gold now, over $6 billion upon which she gets absolutely no return. There is no way to invest it. It is a dead loss to the government that has it.

If France today were to transfer her gold into dollars and get dollars for it, France could invest those dollars and earn half a billion dollars a year, but right now she is not earning a penny on her gold, but just by buying our dollars and using them she could earn money on them. They are now providing 7 and 8 percent interest.

So, as I say, it is a foolish thing for any government to have a large quantity of gold that it is not likely to have a need for in the future. And it is not fair to compel any nation to have any large amount of gold, it is an imposition on them. What we as the United States need is a reasonable amount of gold. I believe $12.3 billion is a reasonable amount out of the $70 billion worth of available gold in the entire world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not insist on my yielding to him. However, if he does, I will yield to him on this particular point.

Mr. GROSS. No, I will try to wait until I can get some time.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The price that we want to maintain on this gold is $35 an ounce. With this abundance of gold—$12.3 billion—we can maintain that price. That will give all of our friends throughout the entire civilized world confidence in our dollar.

There is no reason to have a lack of confidence in the dollar and this $12 billion in gold will help provide that confidence. It will permit us to maintain the $35 price. There is no doubt about that. And being able to maintain that, we will have complete confidence in the dollar all over the world, internationally as well as locally.

Now I have heard it said that an effort would be made to recommit the bill with instructions to change the reserve requirement from 25 to 12½ percent. That would just be merely telling the outside world—everybody—that we just want you to have confidence in the dollar—we just want to give you half as much confidence as you should have.

There is only one way for us to go, and that is, the whole hog, as we often say—100 percent—making it possible for now and in the foreseeable future to have a sound dollar. This is a sound-dollar bill—and to have a dollar that the people of the world will have confidence in—and not have them to be required to take just half of the reserves. That looks like just minimizing the importance of it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I was wondering what the effect of moving the gold cover would have on the balance of payments.

Mr. PATMAN. It would have absolutely no effect at all on our balance of payments except to the extent that the worldwide confidence of the dollar is maintained. We will have, from now and as long as we can see in the future, we will have that confidence.

Of course, these questions can never be settled until the Vietnam war is over. We must win that war. We have a war going on 10,000 miles away, which if we were to lose it, and I do not think there is a reasonable chance we will lose it or any part of it—but if we were to lose it—what would that mean? It would mean, first, that Indonesia would fall right away.

The only reason Indonesia gained her independence and is willing to fight for it and keep it is because we are over there. That is the reason that some other countries nearby and even as far away as Australia and New Zealand and the Philippines. The security of this Nation is involved.

If we were to lose that war and the Communists take one country after the other—because the war would be fought not 3,000 miles away or 10,000 miles away, but it would be fought with guerrillas on the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the Rio Grande in Texas and Mexico. That is where the next war will be fought. We have a whole lot involved here. We cannot afford to run any risk on this.

If we had not had South America with us and Central America and Mexico in World War I, it is possible that the outcome could have been entirely different. Because the Germans could have come up through Mexico and we would have had a battle line in an entirely different place where probably we could have been more vulnerable.

Furthermore, if we had not had these countries with us in World War II, the Japanese could have come up through Central America and Mexico and we would have had the same situation.

It is by reason of the fact that we have been able to get along with these other nations of the world and we carry out our word and do what we have said that we would do—that is the reason we have had this confidence in the dollar and the reason we have won these wars and the reason we have never had a hostile bomb fall on the soil of the United States of America.

We have been very lucky and very fortunate indeed. So we want to stay in position where the people of this world will continue to have confidence in us and in the dollar.

This votes involves that and it involves the security of our Nation.

This bill, H.R. 14743, is the administration's bill to eliminate the 25-percent gold requirement for Federal Reserve notes and the gold reserve against the U.S. notes and the Treasury notes of 1890. In other words, there will be no gold directly behind them.

This bill was reported to the House February 9 after 5 days of public hearings and after all views had been heard.

When we went into the hearings, the minority properly expressed concern that an effort should not be made to shorten the hearings but that we should have full and complete hearings, and that all witnesses and all viewpoints should be considered. As chairman of the committee, I assured that every witness that they wanted to be heard, if they would present him, we would ask him to testify and we would hear him.

We carried out that promise. We heard every witness that made a request to be heard and every viewpoint that someone wanted to express.

President Johnson first suggested this legislation in his recent state of the Union message, with a full explanation of the situation presented in his Economic Report to the Congress. While we have $12 billion in gold, $10.7 billion of it is frozen as useless currency reserve, absolutely useless, just like the reserve requirement behind the deposits in the Federal Reserve banks, just that useless. When we took that gold requirement away in 1965, we should have taken this away at that time. Many of us suggested it, but it was thought that to do so might be too shocking. Gold was not generally understood, and we had better do it just one step at a time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am impressed beyond words that the gentleman now agrees 1,000 percent with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin. I am glad to be here this afternoon to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in total agreement with Mr. Martin.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin is right this time.

Mr. GROSS. And I disagree with both of you.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BARING. Will the chairman tell us how it can be said that we are strengthening the dollar by removing the very intrinsic value which gives it worth?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have more gold behind the dollar now with the law, if enacted, than we have had under the old law. More gold makes more security as far as maintaining confidence in the dollar.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to take too much time, but certainly I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can give an answer to the gentleman from Nevada: The intrinsic value, according to the gentleman from Texas, is the "Patman patented printing presses" to turn out printing press money.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I have never been a printing press money man. I have been a sound money man. They are taking the gold entirely out from under U.S. notes. Those are the Lincoln greenbacks. I am sure you heard about it during the Lincoln holiday when members of the minority were out making speeches. I am sure they bragged about President Lincoln having used such courageous judgment in defying Wall Street when Wall Street demanded 33⅓ percent interest. At that time he said, "We will issue our own money. Any country that can issue a dollar bond that is good can issue a dollar bill that is good." And Mr. Lincoln issued $346 million worth of currency, the "printing press" money you are talking about, and that currency is still in circulation. If we had paid 5 percent interest on that amount during that time, we would have paid $50 billion for the use of that $346 million. Is it not wonderful that President Lincoln saved the Nation $50 billion? I am sure you did not leave that point out of your Lincoln Day addresses.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I knew the gentleman was of ancient vintage, but I did not know he was a Civil War veteran.

Mr. PATMAN. I read history just as the gentleman does, and even though I am "as old as the hills," the hills are still around here yet.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would like to pose a serious question: What limitation will there be on the Federal Reserve System so far as the printing of money is concerned if we do remove the gold cover?

Mr. PATMAN. Basically, Congress will pass on that question. I have been here when we have had some pretty hard times. We had price control and wage control during World War II which involved 8 million different prices and wage rates, and there is hardly any way on earth to enforce them. Black markets grew up and everything else.

But every time it looked like there would be dangerous and ruinous inflation, Members of this House stood up against inflation and voted against it. There is more protection to the people of the United States against inflation, afforded by the elected Members of Congress, by the House and the Senate, and by the President of the United States, than is afforded by any other agency, including the Federal Reserve.

Now, I cannot yield any more time, and please do not ask me, because we have only 1 hour for this side. Other Members who have worked on this bill, as I have, are entitled to a little time. I just want to present the case and yield to them. Of course, the other side has an hour's time too. Then, there is the 5-minute rule, and any Member can get recognition under it and say a great deal in 5 minutes' time.

Hindsight tells us it would have been preferable to have removed the gold cover from the currency at the same time we removed the cover from the Federal Reserve bank deposit liabilities in 1965. In 1965 our payments balance was rapidly approaching equilibrium, but the deficit was only $1.1 billion. At that time it was not foreseen that our military obligations to friendly nations would dramatically increase our balance-of-payments deficit and subsequent gold outflow.

There is no doubt that the state of hostilities in South Vietnam and other security commitments are the reason we are here today considering the freeing up of more of our gold stocks. Such action is the alternative to abandoning to sure destruction the prosperous trade we have so painstakingly built up over a generation.

In 1944 the U.S. dollar became the cornerstone of the free world trade. The dollar, along with gold, in serving as the international monetary reserve, has made a reality of the slogan: "Trade, Not Aid." That is, "Trade, Not Aid." As a result, we have been able in good conscience to substantially reduce bilateral foreign aid and the adverse balance-of-payment impact of our present reduced AID program is virtually zero. In the meantime, the entire free world, including the United States, has greatly benefited from a liberal trade policy firmly based on the mutual convertibility of the dollar into gold at the fixed rate of $35 per ounce of gold, as provided by law.

In considering the President's recommendation to remove the gold cover requirements compelling Federal Reserve banks to hold in reserve gold certificates against circulating Federal Reserve notes, I would like to point out that there is a unanimity of intelligent opinion about the wisdom of this proposal.

Distinguished authorities in both fiscal and monetary areas of domestic and international finance have all favorably supported this proposal both in public statements and in testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This in itself is both unusual and refreshing to observe. It is unusual in that the unanimity of thought and action in these often mysterious areas of gold and currency is seldom heard, and it is refreshing because such agreements should enable us to operate with speed on this sensible suggestion, so that we can more quickly consider other correlated matters of importance before this House.

Before briefly discussing what this measure will accomplish and why it is imperative that such accomplishments materialize, I should like to present a brief synopsis of conditions that gave birth in the first place to the archaic law we are about to repeal.

There was a long period in our country's history when dollars were convertible into gold. Citizens had their choice. They could use one or the other, or both simultaneously, for both had the same value, a value whose intrinsic strength was nurtured by the health of our growing economy and the strength of our expanding country. During the 19th century and the early part of this, many efforts were made to insure this convertibility. We had a range of techniques which were employed on various occasions to maintain the dollar volume of our currency circulation at a fixed ratio to gold, and also to provide assured redemption facilities.

May I invite the attention of Members to the fact that our country is very strong. In fact, we do not know just exactly how strong we are, but we know that in this little country, representing one-sixth of the land area of the world, of the earth, and one-sixth or one-seventh of the population of the entire world, we are a democratic country, as Madison said, a "democracy in a republic."

That is the kind of government we have, one that is run by the people themselves.

We have been successful. The people have been so successful in operating their Government that our country and our people have more of the comforts and even luxuries and the necessities of life than all of the other people in the world—billions of people.

One could not have an example more convincing than that, yet it is true.

We have this great country here, and we want to keep it that way. Of course, we have lots of wealth and things we are proud of. One of the things of which we are most proud is that our money is accepted all over the world, just as good as gold, if not better, because it can be invested and interest made on the investment.

Here in the United States, why should it depreciate in value, when on every dollar bill and every piece of paper money we can read that the note, first, is legal tender.

What does "legal tender" mean? That if a person owes a debt or he owes taxes or he makes a purchase, and if he tenders these notes, this paper money, if you please, to the person to whom it is owed, and that person does not accept it, then the debt is paid. That is legal tender. The person has to take it, or the debt is paid.

One cannot have better money than that.

When we have a large volume of debts and taxes, and every one of these bills must be accepted for the payment of all debts and taxes, and if it is not accepted the debt and taxes are paid, that is good money.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that when all the economists have appeared before our committee invariably we ask them the question, "Which do you think is the stronger, the dollar or gold?" And they always respond by saying "The dollar."

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously it is, just like the example I gave about France.

France cannot use that gold to make any money. They are losing a half billion dollars a year just on having half as much gold as we have over here. If they had dollars instead, they could invest those dollars and make that much money.

That is a reason why it is not fair to compel any country to carry too much of this gold. It is all right to have somewhat of an equal distribution, if there is such a word as "equality" on the distribution of gold. Certainly no one country should be required to carry it, and it is in the interest of the whole world that there be some distribution of gold to the various countries of the world.

The Federal Reserve System was created in 1913 to eliminate these defects by providing the means whereby the supply of currency, deposits, and credit flexibility could easily and painlessly be adjusted to the variable needs of commerce and business. Since our currency remained convertible into gold, however, it was only natural to provide in the Federal Reserve Act the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain a certain minimum gold reserve requirement in relation to their liabilities. But in 1913 they fixed their gold requirement at 35 percent against deposits and 40 percent against the notes, the currency, the greenbacks we are talking about.

Gradually over the years the intimate relationship between gold and our money supply dissolved. It was a separation, it might be added, and since 1934, when we discontinued the domestic convertibility of gold, Federal Reserve notes have not been redeemed in gold.

In 1945 we reduced both reserves on deposits in Federal Reserve banks and against Federal Reserve notes to 25 percent.

Three years ago we eliminated altogether the reserve requirement against deposits.

Have any Members heard of anything that was disastrous or devastating to our country by reasoning of that?

You could not name one single instance because it did not happen. This will work the same way. It will not affect our domestic economy in the least nor affect our money in the least. It will give us greater confidence in dealing with the other countries of the world. Removing the gold reserve requirement is essential because we are about to reach an untenable position where there will be more money in circulation than existing gold to fulfill these reserve requirements. However, there is an even more important reason than this.

The problem which faces us on this measure is to let the world know, to let the world know, that our entire gold supply is available to insure the continued free international convertibility between the dollar and gold at the fixed price of $35 per ounce. Once we remove the gold reserve requirement we are saying to foreign owners of American dollars that our faith in the continued strength of our currency is so great that it needs neither gold nor silver nor any other special precious metal to support it. The strength of our currency rests wholly on the strength of our healthy economy which in turn is nurtured by an even greater strength; namely, the human resources of the American people, which is a true measure of the wealth of our Nation.

Unfortunately, there has been much leakage of gold from the international monetary reserves to gold speculators. Gold is in short supply. That is obvious. So people say we should double the price of gold. That is the cure and the alternative that they offer. Let us look at that briefly for a moment to see what would happen. Whom would it help? The greatest producer and potential producer outside of South Africa at this time of gold is Soviet Russia. They have the greatest potential gold supply of any nation on earth. Do you want to double their wealth? This would be a good way to do it. Just double the wealth of the Communists by doubling the price of gold. Of all the times when that should be considered, this is certainly not the time for consideration of it.

There is only one way to do this, and that is the way suggested by Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve and Mr. Fowler, the Secretary of the Treasury, and other people. I am convinced that it is the right course and it is in our interests and in our country's continued existence interest. We must do it in order to protect our Nation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman would not like to leave the impression, would he, that simply by doubling the value of gold we would double the entire wealth of the Soviet Union?

Mr. PATMAN. Not the entire wealth of the Soviet Union but the gold portion of their wealth we would.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman failed to say that earlier in his statement.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. Any gold that they have we would double the value of it by doing this.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Do I understand that the gentleman quoted Mr. Martin as an authority?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I quote a great many people that I do not agree with sometimes if they are right. I am willing always to go shoulder to shoulder down the road with someone in order to help my country.

Mr. HAYS. Is that the only time he has been right?

Mr. PATMAN. He has been right before but not every time. He has been wrong a lot of times, too, but he thinks he has been right. In the meantime, however, there is no reason for us to delay this legislation theoretically freeing all of the gold backing the dollar. Our Nation has been off the domestic gold standard for all practical purposes since the Federal Reserve Act was passed and signed by President Woodrow Wilson 2 days before Christmas 1913. In 1934 the Congress provided that our currency no longer will be redeemed in gold, and it even made it illegal for our citizens to hold gold. Just before the gold holiday, when the Congress was leaving here, Members of Congress went down by the Sergeant at Arms and picked up a lot of gold and carried it with them because they did not know what was going to happen.

And, they certainly wanted to get home and they wanted to get back. There was a lot of gold used at that time, the last time I have ever known gold to be used in a convertible way. But it was used during that particular holiday.

Mr. Chairman, removing the gold reserve will have no effect whatever upon our domestic economy and our monetary system, but this legislation will clearly demonstrate to the gold speculators that the price of gold will not rise and that our total gold stock is available to prevent this from happening.

At the same time, the great majority of people in the countries of the world over have confidence in the strength of the American dollar as the best international medium of exchange, because they have confidence in the American people's continued ability to maintain a strong, healthy, viable economy. Rescinding the gold cover requirement will make no enemies. On the contrary, it will instill even greater confidence among those who hold American dollars. It is also quite likely that it will restore confidence in those few people and those few countries who now doubt our strength and who now question our resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the proposal before us is to provide liquidity for the maintenance and growth of international trade and to maintain this Nation's proper role in this area by removing the gold cover requirements for Federal Reserve notes and U.S. and Treasury notes of 1890. Those who oppose this proposal do not state that such a policy on the part of our Government would be improper, they just would have us wait until hearings are completed on specific legislative proposals to cure our balance-of-payments situation.

The argument in opposition is that the balance-of-payments deficit, which gives rise to drains on our gold stock, results from the Government or public sector of expenditures abroad and not from the private sector which shows a net surplus in our balance of payments. They strongly urge that our Government alter its present international efforts. However, they do not indicate where the cuts should take place. Should cuts take place in our military and foreign aid efforts in Vietnam or Korea? Should we withdraw our military forces from Europe? Or, should we further cut our foreign aid, which appears now to be cut to the bone, to underdeveloped countries in other parts of the world? No direction is suggested.

The opposition to the proposal before us however, has taken this measure as a vehicle to condemn the balance-of-payments program announced by the President earlier this year. They would make this a political issue, when such is not the case.

While it is true that the private sector of U.S. international transactions, as a whole, are in balance or surplus, there are areas of the private sector running a balance-of-payments deficit.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the balance-of-payments deficit presents a problem for this Nation. It is not a matter of the private sector versus the public sector of our international transactions, and no useful purpose is served by pitting the public sector against the private sector. There is a need to look at all areas that show a deficit, not just the public sector alone, and to pull together to reach an equilibrium. If a cure to our balance-of-payments deficit is to be attained it will be by applying remedies where needed.

It must be recognized that the conditions which exist today for capital investment in foreign markets and the extent of that investment in Europe particularly, is due, in large measure, to our Government's investment in reconstructing the free world and encouraging bilateral trade.

The dollar has functioned as the world's primary reserve currency and along with gold, has furnished the necessary liquidity to finance a flourishing trade among the United States and her trading partners. Serving as a reserve currency to the world and the availability of the U.S. gold supply to convert dollars held by national monetary authorities at a fixed price makes the American dollar one cornerstone of our international monetary system.

Today, the strength of the dollar is not a function of this legal tie to gold—a tie which is only applicable to one portion of our total money supply; namely, Federal Reserve notes. The value of the dollar—whether it be in the form of a bank balance, a coin, or folding money—is dependent on the quantity and quality of goods and services which it can purchase. It is the strength and soundness of the American economy which stands behind the dollar.

There is no doubt that the recent outflow of gold as a result of the activities of speculators and France has hurt us. And, except for France and its partners, foreign central banks are holding dollars.

The removal of the gold cover requirement will not change this nor the balance-of-payments picture. It will, however, show to the rest of the world that the American Government has complete confidence in its economy and is prepared to uphold its commitment to exchange gold for dollars. The passage of this legislation will make it clear to the world that the Congress as well as the executive branch are committing our total gold stock to international use. Failure to enact this proposal just serves to delay what will of necessity be required as the demand for domestic use of gold continues and the demand for Federal Reserve notes continues to grow.

I must respectfully disagree with my colleagues, who signed the minority views in the report blaming the public sector for our present balance-of-payments situation.

Admittedly, removing the gold cover will not solve our balance-of-payments deficit nor relieve the gold drain.

Nor will blaming the Government for its actions, approved by the Congress over the years, stem the dollar and gold outflow.

What is needed—is not partisan sniping but affirmative action now to bring about a balance-of-payments equilibrium. Here is where the minority have failed to provide meaningful proposals to achieve an immediate solution to the problem.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago in February 1965 the House passed a bill removing the 25-percent gold requirement applicable to Federal Reserve deposits. Prior to that action a 25-percent gold-reserve requirement had been applicable to both Federal Reserve deposits and notes.

Gold holdings then approximated $15.1 billion and were in excess of reserve requirements by the amount of $1.4 billion. The gold reserve ratio stood at 27.5 percent. At last yearend, gold holdings approximated $12 million and were in excess of current gold reserve requirements by an amount of $1.3 billion. The gold reserve ratio was 27.5 percent. One could say this looks like where we came in 3 years ago.

On checking back on the remarks I made in connection with the 1965 legislation I find that the last paragraph of my statement fits the situation in which we find ourselves today. In my February 9, 1965, statement, I said:

> I am going to vote for this bill. I will do so reluctantly. I think we have a problem that must be met. This bill will buy time for us to get at the real cause of the problem, namely our continuing balance of payments deficits. This Administration and this Congress must face up to that problem, beginning now. We simply cannot go on spending, lending, investing, and giving away to the rest of the world, year after year, more than our receipts from the rest of the world.

That action 3 years ago did buy time for us to correct our continuing balance-of-payments deficits. We have not done so. Again we find ourselves in a position where we must buy time and I would hope, make a better effort in dealing with our basic balance-of-payments problems.

I am going to vote for this bill and again I say I am going to do so with extreme reluctance. My reluctance stems from the fact that neither the administration nor the Congress appears willing to face up to the hard decisions. We simply go on authorizing spending programs and creating new ones with little thought or concern as to whether the expenditures are within our capacity to pay. This is all too evident in a table prepared from Department of Commerce figures on our balance-of-payments position over the 21 years—1946 to 1966. The private sector of our economy over this period shows a net surplus of about $84 billion in balance-of-payments position while the Government sector shows a net deficit of about $115 billion.

The $31 billion deficit clearly indicates that we have been doing more than we could afford and furthermore that the deficit is due to excess expenditures on Government account. This huge deficit suggests the need for establishing a system of priorities in our Government overseas accounts as well as our Government accounts at home.

Repeated declarations have committed the United States to redeeming dollars for gold at the fixed price of $35 per ounce. Little has been said, however, of the other side of the equation; namely, the redemption of gold in dollars at the $35 per ounce price. Certain foreign official monetary institutions have been depleting our gold stock by surrendering dollars for gold. Other foreign hoarders and speculators likewise have been exchanging currencies, including the dollar, for gold in the gold markets abroad. Most of these gold takers undoubtedly are acquiring gold in the hopes that the buying price for gold will be increased by the United States. Once and for all we should make clear that this is not going to happen.

In testimony before our committee a very compelling case was made against the United States increasing the purchase price of gold. This testimony was presented by N. R. Danielian, president, International Economic Policy Association. Mr. Danielian pointed out that should the price of gold be doubled to $70 an ounce, as many had recommended, that the $30 billion or more of free world official gold holdings abroad would become worth $60 billion with a windfall profit of $30 billion which then could become a claim upon U.S. goods and services. The same would be true for the $15 billion-plus estimated to be held by speculators and hoarders as well as undisclosed stocks in Communist hands. An increase in the price of gold would give them, too, an unwarranted and unearned claim upon the resources of the people of the United States. These windfall profits could be used not alone to acquire U.S. goods and services, but also to invest in U.S. corporation securities, U.S. Government bonds, or real property. Mr. Danielian further pointed out:

> Europeans may use the windfall profits on gold revaluation to buy U.S.-owned investments in their own countries. Those investments have greatly contributed to their postwar economic growth; they are, in fact, the most enlightened expressions of international economic cooperation, and in the future, the most effective means of closing the technological or management gap with which the Europeans are so concerned.

Do you think this or any future Congress would create such huge and unearned windfall profits to accrue either to our friends or our enemies abroad? To me there is no question but what the answer would be a resounding "No." Neither this nor any other Congress is going to vote huge windfall profits to gold hoarders, be they governments or individuals, and speculators. Likewise the Congress is not going to vote gold bonanza profits for the principal producing areas of South Africa and Russia.

I do not delude myself, nor should the Congress delude itself, that passage of this legislation will in any way solve our balance-of-payments problem. Though making gold available to maintain the redemption of dollars in gold, at best it only is buying time for us to make fundamental corrections. In view of a $30 billion Vietnam war costing us $1½ billion a year loss in foreign exchange we simply must trim our commitments abroad to compensate for this very costly Vietnam operation. Likewise, we are not going to engender confidence in the dollar either at home or abroad with $20 billion a year deficits in our Federal budgets.

Again I repeat we must establish an effective system of priorities in our undertakings and expenditures so long as we are at war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Aspinall
Bates
Clancy
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Diggs
Dowdy
Dwyer
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Gude
Halleck
Holifield
Holland
Hungate
Irwin
Jarman
King, Calif.
McMillan
Martin
Moore
Moss
O'Konski
Passman
Pollock
Quillen
Rarick
Rosenthal
Roybal
St. Onge
Saylor
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Udall
Utt

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14743, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 388 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. The sole aim and purpose of this bill is to repeal the present statutory gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes and other U.S. currency. Ordinarily, I would not voice any objection but under present conditions—and I am referring specifically to the huge deficit in our budget, to our serious balance-of-payments problem, and to our current inflation—I do not believe we should expose our gold reserve to foreign official holders of American dollars. I say this because this administration's financial policy inspires apprehension and not confidence among foreign countries and bankers. I am afraid that if we expose this last part of our gold, it will soon be dissipated. We must remember that there are enough American dollars held in foreign countries to equal three times our present gold stock. If only one-third of these dollars are cashed in because of fear of this administration's fiscal policies, then we will lose our gold. For this reason, I oppose this attempt to remove the gold cover requirement at this time.

I would like to make it crystal clear that I do not believe that a nation must necessarily link its currency to gold—as a matter of fact, most countries do not. My objection is something else again. I would not mind ending the tie to gold if we had $24 billion worth of gold like we had back in 1952; and I would not mind ending the gold cover if we had a sound economic policy like we had back in the middle fifties. However, to remove the gold cover when our gold supply has fallen to $11 billion, and when the same fiscal policies which have done this still continue, is to risk the Nation's economic future. I ask the Members of this House to consider one question and to consider it well:

If you were a citizen of Switzerland and you held American dollars from Eisenhower and Kennedy days, would you want to hold them now as our deficit soars and our dollar droops?

Would you not rather have gold, which can only go up in value, instead of Johnson dollars which can only go down?

I think the answer to this question is important, and I urge you, the Members of this House, to put yourselves in the shoes of a European banker. If you do, I think you will share my doubts as to whether or not we can afford to expose our last remaining gold supplies.

As I have indicated, I do not believe in maintaining the gold currency reserves just for their own sake. I would be more than willing to vote to remove this cover except for the great threat that speculation against our weakening dollar could siphon away most of our gold. Let me ask: Who among you thinks that all of this gold is going to be left here? How can we expect foreigners to have confidence in this administration when our own people—and for very good reason—have little or no confidence in this administration's fiscal policy.

Now I realize that individual foreigners cannot cash in their American dollars for gold; only official dollar holders can. But as a matter of practicality, any run on the dollar will see those privately held dollars transferred to official holders who will then cash them in. If we take away the gold cover requirement without forcing this administration to take firm steps to rebuild dollar confidence, then our gold supplies are going to be raided by every smart central banker from Holland to Hong Kong. In 1967, we lost $1.2 billion worth of gold, and 2 weeks ago we lost another $100 million in a single week. If we do not change our policies, this outflow will increase. Let us make no mistakes about it.

This administration is undermining this Nation bit by bit, dollar by dollar, riot by riot, and war by war. Our budget is being tortured to support a war we are not winning or even trying to win. Furthermore, our budget is being twisted to support deceptive and unwise programs like the war on poverty, model cities, and rent subsidies, which do not really help the poor, but which foment so much false hope and expectation that we get riots. All of this is weakening the dollar with inflation; and yet we continue and persist to aggravate our balance of payments with foolishness like stationing a quarter of a million troops in Europe to protect countries which laugh at us.

Let me say to you, in all sincerity, that if I held large sums of another country's currency and that country was pursuing the incredible monetary policies of this administration, I would cash in that money as fast as I could, and I do not see how we can expect Europe's central bankers to take a different view. They think that the American dollar is going down the drain of Vietnam, and they may be right.

Let me get back to my one central point. In my judgment, it is not safe to take the gold cover off the dollar so long as we are pursuing economic policies which are distrusted abroad. We are not going to convince anybody that we are intelligent or that our policies have changed, all they will do is to take our gold while they can get it.

Let me ask: Who on earth is going to think that our economy is strong just because we expose our gold—just because we throw open the doors of Fort Knox to foreign raiders? Did the Japanese think we were strong because we left Pearl Harbor unprotected?

I urge this House to vote down this proposal, not permanently but until such time as this administration takes firm and affirmative steps to reduce domestic deficit spending and to end wasteful overseas spending on foreign aid and troops to protect rich Europe. And as a matter of fact, if we take these firm steps, then it may not be necessary to terminate the gold backing for Federal Reserve notes. If we do this, we would be doing it as a result of logic and not panic.

In closing, let me warn this House. If we repeal this gold cover requirement without forcing this administration to change its economic policies, we may lose so much of our gold that we will be forced to let the price of gold go up to save our remaining supply. Thus, if too much of our gold is lost, we will have to devalue the American dollar. It is that simple.

I urge the Members of this House not to repeal the gold cover until we are sure that our gold will be safe because of strong economic policies and a strong dollar. A vote to give this administration short-term relief today is probably a vote to devalue the dollar in a few years. I believe that the Congress and the American people have a right to expect fiscal sanity from the White House in return for this legislation. Without financial sanity, this bill is not a boon to our economy, but a dagger aimed at the heart of our economy and our prosperity.

Let us approach this serious problem with great caution—with great care. Let us not regret any hasty action on this legislation. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall use much less than the 10 minutes the Chairman has given me, because it may be there are questions Members may have about one or another of the effects of the bill before us, and I should surely like to try to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago March 1, I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 6428, a bill which eliminates an archaic requirement compelling Federal Reserve banks to maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. After being introduced, this bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14743, an almost identical bill, is now before us. It has the unanimous support of many distinguished monetary and fiscal authorities, both in and outside of Government, who have testified in its behalf.

Under the present law the Federal Reserve System is obligated to hold gold certificates—which represent gold held by the U.S. Treasury—equal to at least 25 percent of the Federal Reserve notes in circulation. In other words, the dollar amounts of Federal Reserve notes that may be outstanding at any one time is limited to four times the value of gold in the Treasury. This gold reserve requirement, I would like to emphasize, came into being back in 1913 when the Federal Reserve System was established. It was set at 35 percent against deposits and 40 percent against notes. In 1945, 23 years ago, the reserve requirements against both notes and deposits were reduced to 25 percent. Then 3 years ago, in early 1965, the Congress removed completely the requirement against deposits. Now, H.R. 14743 will remove completely the so-called gold reserve or cover requirement against Federal Reserve notes, and release a reserve of $156 million held against U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The gold reserve requirement is an anachronistic hangover from an age when dollars were completely convertible into gold. Prior to the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913, many efforts were made to protect this convertibility. A variety of devices was used at various times to maintain the note circulation in a fixed relationship to gold, and to provide assured redemption facilities. One unsatisfactory result of this system was that the currency supply was unresponsive to changing requirements of the economy. This inelasticity, combined with deficiencies in the entire banking structure, helped make the economy subject to recurrent periods of inflation and panic.

The Federal Reserve System was created to eliminate these defects by providing a means for adjusting the supply of currency, deposits, and credit flexibility to the needs of commerce and business. Since currency remained convertible into gold, it was entirely natural to write into law the provision that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain minimum reserves in gold in relation to note and deposit liabilities. This was done even though the Federal Reserve Act clearly recognized that the supply of money and credit should be adjusted to the needs of the economy rather than set in some fixed relationship to gold.

Since 1913 the link between gold and our money supply has increasingly diminished. In fact, since then gold has undergone a fundamental transformation from a domestic medium of exchange and a monetary store of value to its present position as an international reserve asset. In 1934 the domestic convertibility of gold was discontinued. Since then Federal Reserve notes have not been redeemable in gold.

Today, our Government owns $12 billion in gold—still the world's largest single repository. However, gold obligated as cover requirements for Federal Reserve notes now circulating amounts to $10.7 billion. This leaves free only $1.3 billion of our total gold supply—an amount that is totally inadequate to meet pressing demands at home and abroad.

By the end of this year, for instance, the normal increase in our economy's need for additional cash to transact business necessary and vital to the continuing economic growth of our Nation will obligate us to freeze between $500 and

$600 million of our free gold supply to fulfill legal requirements against Federal Reserve notes. This, as all recognize, is an intolerable situation.

In addition to freezing some $600 million of our free gold supply, the Treasury will have to release about $150 million to fulfill domestic industrial uses of gold. It is also possible that additional amounts of our free gold supply may be required to meet future foreign gold demands. This is a possibility we hope does not become a reality; nevertheless, it is only prudent and wise that we prepare ourselves for such contingencies.

Removing the gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes will also declare to other nations of the world that our entire gold supply of $12 billion is available to insure the continued free international convertibility between the dollar and gold at the fixed price of $35 an ounce.

Our policy of maintaining this fixed ratio between gold and the American dollar at $35 an ounce is one of the most important reasons people and nations throughout the world have such confidence in our currency. We know, and they know, that the convertibility of the American dollar into any other currency, and its ability to purchase goods and services, rests directly and fundamentally upon the health and strength of our economy. It certainly does not rest upon the archaic 25 percent reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes. It is now time that this fact be recognized by law. No other single act that we could possibly do at this time would be as effective in maintaining confidence in the American dollar throughout the world as the removal of the gold reserve requirement. For to the extent that foreign dollar owners are confident that the American dollar will remain strong, to that extent will purchases of Treasury gold diminish.

There is still a myth associated with the gold cover requirement, a myth that has lingered far too long in our monetary folklore. Now would be a good time, and here would be a good place, to end its ancient life. This myth holds that if the gold cover were removed, the Government would then print more and more paper money. This is absurd.

Actually there is no correlation between the restrictive gold cover clause and the printing of money. The Government does not and cannot pay its obligations simply by printing new bills. It has no authority to do so, and removal of the gold cover requirement in no way affects this limitation. Revenues received and spent by the Government come into the Treasury only in two ways—through taxation or through borrowing from the public.

The gold cover requirement applies only to specific currency issues now in circulation. It has no relationship to the overall money supply. The bulk of our money supply exists in the form of bank deposits, and when the public wishes hand-to-hand money in place of bank deposits to transact business, only then are new notes issued and placed in the stream of spending. Notes that are issued under such conditions are paid for by a corresponding reduction in deposits. The issuance of new notes affects only the composition—the structure—of the money supply. The total money supply remains unchanged. What does change the composition of the money supply—increasing or decreasing it in accordance with the desired beneficial effect to be achieved—are the monetary decisions of the Federal Reserve, not the movement of gold in and out of the country, and not the amount of gold that is free or the amount that is held in support of gold cover requirements of Federal Reserve notes.

The Federal Reserve, as you know, has the authority to suspend on a temporary basis the gold reserve requirement. Certainly it would use this authority at a time when the reserve requirement would impinge on our international commitments. However, this could only be a stop-gap measure which would require progressively larger increases in the discount rate as the gold supply moved below 25 percent of Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

The sensible solution to the problem we face lies in removing the archaic gold cover requirement. Once this is accomplished, those who have confidence in the dollar—by far the majority of people in the world—will be reassured. We can then get on with the business of bringing our balance of payments under control, and of developing the new special drawing rights of the International Monetary Fund as a means of insuring sufficient international liquidity.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentleman yielding for questions in order to answer some of the questions I have in my mind. I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for a very clear and explicit explanation of the bill. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin how much the gold outflow or the loss of gold was during the past 12 months.

What was the extent of the gold loss?

Mr. REUSS. Until the speculative flurries on gold in the immediate wake of the devaluation of sterling, our gold outflow was a very negligible one, a few scores of millions of dollars. But then in the November and December gold flurries in London, the gold outflow on the part of the United States was on the order of a billion dollars, and that, of course, is a very alarming figure.

Mr. ICHORD. Is that for the past 12 months?

Mr. REUSS. Yes.

Mr. ICHORD. I know at one time, after the expiration of World War II, we had about $24.9 billion worth of gold. Now we have only $12 billion worth.

Let me get to my point, regardless of what the amount of the loss has been.

The gentleman has stated that this is purely psychological. If this gold outflow continues, eventually the entire $12 billion of gold will be gone. I wonder what would be facing the country at that time? I am wondering whether it is purely psychological? Would we not have to devalue the dollar once the entire $12 billion of gold were depleted, if that condition were to occur?

Mr. REUSS. I am very glad to have that question asked.

Let me say, first, that in my judgment the removal of the gold cover and the other actions which I believe we must and will take, should prevent anything like the situation the gentleman has described, where all of our gold goes out of this country.

However, I want to be realistic; and it is certainly a technical possibility.

I want to say to the gentleman, if that happened, it would in no way be catastrophic. Let us suppose that all $15 billion worth of creditors of the United States, or almost all of them, claim their gold and take away the $12 billion, which is the situation the gentleman described.

Mr. ICHORD. That would give a $3 billion deficiency.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. Then we would do just what every other country in the free world does under the International Monetary Fund. We would support the dollar with our foreign exchange reserves, and with our International Monetary Fund drawings. Other countries would also support the dollar.

It is my belief that the dollar is not now overvalued. Indeed, the dollar is one of the best repositories of value anywhere in the world, and the best evidence of that is the fact that there is nowhere in the world, in the highways or byways, a black market in the dollar.

Therefore, I believe what would happen is that we would continue to support the dollar at its present parities; $2.40 for the British pound sterling, 20 cents for the hard French franc, 24 cents for the deutsche mark, and so on. We would be able to maintain the parity of the dollar.

If at such a time a foreign country came to us and said, "We believe that the dollar is overvalued and that you should devalue," then we would go to the International Monetary Fund and discuss it.

I very much doubt, frankly, that any foreign country, France or any other country, would want to undergo the extra competition from our exports, would want to undergo the diminution of their own imports to this country, would want to undergo the diminution of American travel to France or wherever, inherent in a devaluation of the dollar vis-a-vis the French franc.

I will answer the gentleman's question by saying we should get over the idea that it would be calamitous if gold vanished from the U.S. monetary reserves, because the ultimate strength of the dollar is the strength of the U.S. economy. If the gentleman from Missouri and other Members will work to keep a "maximum employment without inflation" economy in this country, then I believe we have nothing to fear from the future of the dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. The record discloses—and I made a good record on it, and the testimony is available on it—that only these countries have gold reserve requirements now: Belgium, Switzerland, and South Africa.

Mr. REUSS. All the other 103 members of the International Monetary Fund have no such requirement.

Mr. PATMAN. Among those countries that have repealed the requirement or do not have it are Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, and the United Kingdom. If they can suspend their reserve requirements, why can we not do so if we want to?

Mr. REUSS. That is the supreme irony—that gold-hungry President de Gaulle's country does not have a gold requirement.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would he not agree that the other nations of the world depend upon the dollar and in effect it is difficult to distinguish as to whether they are depending on the domestic dollar which is not backed by gold or the international dollar which is?

Mr. REUSS. That is entirely correct. That is why I say that the great economic strength of this country depends upon keeping our domestic economy moving forward, with a stable dollar. That is what we all have to do. We can do it, I believe, much more effectively if we remove the anachronism of the gold cover today.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would like to know whether or not you agree with the statement, which is made up of two sentences. The first is, if done in a favorable international monetary environment, action to remove the remaining reserve requirements would have passed largely unnoticed. Would you not agree with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON].

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, may I identify myself with the remarks of others who have spoken out here today to defend the gold stocks of this country. Certainly I agree with these comments and will not restate them. But Mr. Chairman, we know we are in trouble, we know we face a crisis and yet President Johnson is asking the Congress to lull the country back to sleep for a few more years of false confidence. What then, Mr. Chairman, what happens after our remaining reserve of gold is gone completely? Will we face a devaluation crisis, a rising gold price situation? Looking at the course of history we can say we most certainly will. If, Mr. Chairman, we will face the crisis then why not face it now while we have a position strength—$11 billion base—to deal from rather than to wait until we are in the position of a beggar pleading with the rest of the world to honor the value of the dollar. This is shortsighted expediency, Mr. Chairman—so typical of the L. B. J. administration. I urge all Members to demonstrate the courage of their constituents, and to ignore the arm twisting from the White House, and vote to retain the metallic backing of U.S. dollars.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, on October 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy campaigning for the Presidency of the United States and speaking on the balance-of-payments subject recited five major reasons which in his opinion were responsible for the reversal in our balance-of-payments positions. Time will not permit a review of these reasons. He said, however:

> What must we do? What would a new Democratic administration do to reverse the downward trend in our balance of payments?

He then immediately proposed six policy points for correcting this alarming situation and in substance said that "the soundness of the dollar" depended upon "halting the drain of our gold reserves."

Four and a half years later, on February 9, 1965, just 3 years ago, this House passed a bill to remove the gold cover from Federal Reserve deposits. It was predicted then that very shortly we would be asked to eliminate the gold backing from our currency. Only 3 years have elapsed since the same arguments by the same people were presented with the same reassurances of prompt and proper action to correct the outflow of gold. We have gone from crisis to crisis and panacea to panacea continually failing to meet the real issue head on. Many in this House accepted the reassurances 3 years ago, but history has proved that the necessary political courage to regain solvency by retrenching abroad and at home was not forthcoming. No evidence of such courage looms on the horizon today, and again, if this bill is passed, the error of 3 years ago will be compounded. To use the provisions of this legislation in an attempt to buy time on the faith of another empty promise will result in the dissipation of a valuable U.S. asset, and a loss of confidence in our monetary system.

During the hearings, witnesses frequently expressed opinions that the tie of gold to the dollar is no longer necessary— that monetary stability—the dollar stability—is directly tied to the strength of the economy and not gold. Secretary Fowler stated—page 5 of the hearings:

> Today, the strength of the dollar is not a function of this legal tie to gold—a tie which is only applicable to one portion of our total money supply, Federal Reserve notes. The value of the dollar—whether it be in the form of a bank balance, a coin, or folding money—is dependent on the quantity and quality of goods and services which it can purchase. It is the strength and soundness of the American economy which stands behind the dollar.

Mr. Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international economics. Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, stated—page 129 of the hearings:

> I feel that it is the dollar that supports gold, rather than the reverse. In other words, we are on a world dollar standard, not a gold standard.

On May 25, 1967, the chairman of our committee extended his remarks under the title, "The Dollar Is Stronger Than Gold."

It appears apparent that the sponsors and those who favor this legislation believe that gold is unnecessary as a currency backing—that gold is enveloped in an atmosphere or an aura of mystic and is an "obsolete fetish." If these opinions can be accepted from the experts, the failure to pass this legislation should not cause an international panic, not even a ripple of a problem, because the central banks and foreign governments would certainly prefer to hold dollars instead of gold. Who would want to start "a run on the bank" when the bank could only exchange a less valuable asset? If the faith and confidence of my colleagues in the dollar, backed only by the strength of the economy, is valid and not an empty faith, then surely they are prepared to test that opinion. That test can only come by defeat of this legislation.

On the other hand, if their theory is fallacious, then the legislation must not be passed because the gold backing is a necessary restraint and discipline upon our fiscal and monetary policies.

In neither case, then, is this legislative action required, whether gold is unnecessary as backing for our currency or whether it is necessary. My colleagues have talked of being responsible. Responsibility today demands the difficult decision of meeting the problem now—not postponing the crisis for a year, 2 years, 5 years, even 10 years. Most will admit the inevitability of facing up to the issue, so "buying time" is just delaying the inevitable. It takes real courage to decide to do the right thing. Responsible action today requires us to exert this courage and act in America's self-interest for our own country and our own constituency.

It is my understanding that we presently hold $2.345 billion in convertible foreign currencies. In addition to this we have $420 million in gold in the International Monetary Fund against which foreign currencies could be drawn. In the event this faith in the dollar without gold which has been so highly touted is lacking, then the first "run on the bank," to use the expression of the purveyors of threat and doom, would be toward the present free gold holdings that are available and second, the convertible foreign currencies could be used to the extent of $2.345 billion and then the IMF could be used by the administration in the amount described above.

This does not take into account the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to suspend for 30 days and thereafter for additional 15-day periods any reserve requirements including the gold cover requirement. These alternatives provide a built-in buffer available to the administration in the event of an increase in the redemption demand from central banks and foreign governments. Even a "run on the bank" to the extent of the above-quoted amounts would require some time, we would hope sufficient time to show to the world that immediate steps are now being taken to get our domestic fiscal house in order. However, if dollars are better than gold as those who support this legislation maintain, then no "run on the bank" will result.

A statement by the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy urges the Congress not to remove the gold certificate reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes. They stated:

> Such a removal would open the way to a practically unlimited expansion of Federal Reserve notes, to a removal of the proper restraining influence of a Reserve requirement, to a loss of all our gold stock, to thorough-going fiat money—the weakest money known to man—and to a decline and even collapse in the value of our currency.
>
> A gold reserve provides a nation with a war chest which if dissipated could lead to national destruction.

This statement was signed by 49 prominent economists from New York to California, Texas to Massachusetts, and Michigan to Florida.

One of these economists, Mr. Walter E. Spahr, of New York City, has made the statement:

> Money is the bloodstream of a nation and fiat money is the most diseased monetary bloodstream known to mankind. It is a means and invitation to national collapse.

Much was said during the hearings about faith and confidence of the people as necessary to monetary stability. In my humble opinion, this faith and confidence is generated and maintained by the monetary tie with gold rather than by its elimination.

Dr. Kemmerer, University of Illinois, president, Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy, stated in the Senate hearings—page 119:

> The prestige of the dollar depends on our willingness to defend it, and that willingness is best indicated by observing our own house rules, not by removing them when they seemed to be getting in the way.
>
> Removing the 25-percent rule will not breed confidence abroad in my opinion. It would be done as a result of the wrong pressures and at the wrong moment. It would I believe lead to further demand for our gold and to further hoarding of gold.

May I also quote from an article in a U.S. News & World Report of December 1967 written by Julien-Pierre Koszul, senior vice president for Europe, First City National Bank of New York:

> Last year, free-world production of gold was worth 1.5 billion dollars on the basis of $35 an ounce; Russian sales were nil, so the total supply of gold to the free world was 1.5 billion.
>
> The question is: Where did the gold go?
>
> Not into the vaults of central banks or international institutions. Actually official gold holdings decreased by some 95 million dollars according to the Bank for International Settlements figures—or by 40 million, according to the International Monetary Fund figures—meaning that in 1966 for the first time in history the total supply of gold in the free world was not enough to meet private demand.
>
> About half a billion dollars of this private demand was for industrial uses, including jewelry; out of the remaining billion-odd dollars, Communist China took an estimated 75 million, leaving 960 million for what is primely termed by the Bank for International Settlements in its annual report as "other private absorption," that is pure and simple private hoarding.
>
> Let's say that almost 1 billion dollars vanished into private coffers.
>
> If this were the case only in 1966, the inconveniences would not be too great, although such an outcome should at least be taken as a warning signal that something is amiss.
>
> But the story was the same in 1965, when free-world production, almost exactly as large as in 1966, was supplemented by a little more than half a billion dollars of Russian sales of gold, bringing the total free-world supply for 1965 to just short of 2 billion for 1965.
>
> Of this huge supply, a quarter billion dollars found its way into official gold holdings, while a little less than half a billion went into industrial uses. Out of the rest, Communist China bought 150 million, leaving $1,135,000,000 for mysterious "private absorption."
>
> Parenthetically, the amount of gold privately acquired in each of the last two years is roughly 50 percent higher than the amount hoarded in each of the five previous years, 1960–64, and more than double the amount hoarded in any year in the decade 1950 to 1960.
>
> For the period 1956 through 1966, the alarming total of almost 7.5 billion dollars disappeared. In order to grasp the real significance of such an enormous figure, one has to remember that for the whole free world, official gold holdings total 43 billion. In other words, had it not been for private hoarding, official holdings would now exceed 50 billion, and therefore the pressure on international liquidity would have been diminished.

He also observes that:

> I really can think of only two sets of circumstances in which the reign of gold as a monetary instrument, and as a means of hoarding, would be finished:
>
> 1. If mankind discovers some way of mass-producing gold at less than $35 an ounce; or
>
> 2. If people finally learn to trust the wisdom and ability of their governments for a reasoned and equitable, economic, political and monetary management.
>
> In the best assumption, a lot of time is likely to pass before either of these sets of circumstances presents itself.
>
> In the meantime, we must continue to live with gold and its discipline.

He further states:

> This indeed, brings up another question: Is it so desirable to depose gold as monarch?
>
> The answer is neither an easy nor an obvious one. George Bernard Shaw had ideas of his own on the matter. He once wrote that "the most important thing about money is to maintain its stability," and I quote, with paper money, this stability has to be maintained by the government.
>
> With a gold currency, it tends to maintain itself even when the natural supply of gold is increased by discoveries of new deposits, because of the curious fact that the demand for gold in the world is practically infinite.
>
> You have to choose—as a voter—between trusting to the natural stability of gold and the natural stability of the honesty and intelligence of the members of the government. And, with due respect for these gentlemen, I advise you, as long as the capitalist system lasts, to vote for gold.
>
> I leave to G.B.S. the responsibility for his pessimistic views on governments. Otherwise, he has a point. I don't think it is safe to gamble on an early demonetization of gold.

Mr. Chairman, the responsible action today is to vote against this proposal whether or not you believe in gold backing for our currency. A "no" vote is the responsible position.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the time has come when we must make realistic appraisal of the gold held in reserve against our outstanding currency. The hard evidence shows that foreigners hold about $30 billion against our "free gold" inventory of only $1.3 billion. Failure to pass this bill would undoubtedly cause a run which would wipe out that small remainder.

Our decision here is not one of choice, but one of necessity and I therefore support this bill. The other obvious alternatives are simply to place an embargo on gold outflow or to devalue the dollar by increasing the monetary price of gold upwards from $35 per ounce.

I also emphasize that our basic problem is our failure to eliminate continuing deficits in our balance of payments, and our failure substantially to reduce our budgetary deficits. I fully recognize that this legislation does not attack this basic weakness in policy and execution and that it may even increase the danger that in the temporary absence of the continuing pressure of the gold requirement we may relax our efforts to attack basic causes of growing doubts of the value of the dollar. My reasons for supporting this legislation are:

The 25-percent gold cover requirement relates only to Federal Reserve currency and minimal amounts of U.S. Treasury notes. There is no reserve held against checking accounts although the use of checks is about four times the volume of currency in use and is growing. To that extent, any value attributed to the present gold cover is groundless.

Demands of an expanding need for currency and industrial and dental uses will probably use all our "free gold" within 2 years even if the foreign gold withdrawal should cease, so that it is only a question of time when the present gold reserve requirement will have to be eliminated.

The gold reserve against currency has never had practical limiting effect, because there has always been an excess of gold. Neither does the gold reserve measure our currency in circulation. The Federal Reserve Board issues currency on purchase orders by commercial banks to accommodate the need to handle the credit created by the banks. There has never been a single occasion when the gold cover requirement influenced the Federal Reserve in its judgment on how much the money supply should increase.

If our gold cover is not released to be available for exchange with dollar holders abroad, our small supply of "free gold" will soon vanish. Should our gold stock become exhausted so that dollars could no longer be exchanged for gold, the value of the dollar, rather than being tied to a gold exchange at $35 per ounce would "float" and its value would fluctuate as it competes with other world currencies. The "float" may be slight, or it may flutter wildly. This is a gamble which this Nation should not take at this time, although we must plan appropriately for such a possibility in the future.

Another alternative which has been suggested to stem the outflow of gold is to raise the monetary value of gold from $35 per ounce to a much higher figure. If we did this, we would merely enrich foreign speculators in gold and at the same time create havoc in the world's financial markets. We would also be guilty of bad faith.

Except for a strategic supply for defense which we must set aside, and for an economic reserve which we should consider, it therefore becomes possible that our gold supply will disappear. If we can maintain confidence in the American dollar it may be some time off, particularly if we release our present gold reserve to demonstrate that we will maintain the dollar's value in gold as long as we have gold. In that case, it is possible, provided we can improve our fiscal management by the discipline demanded of us and also achieve a more favorable balance of payments, that our dollar will be more desirable than gold.

Inasmuch as it is obvious that removing the gold cover can be harmful to the extent that it may relax our insistence on correcting our balance-of-payments deficit, and may relax our diligence in reducing annual budget deficits, we have an added duty to be vigilant in our attack against basic ills, and we cannot relax in this duty to the American people. However, the balance-of-payments deficits piled up by the Johnson administration plus the increasing Federal deficits now make removal of the gold cover desirable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the good ship "USS Gold" is on the launching pad and the runway is greased, and it is about to set adrift in rough international waters. It is loaded with $12 billion worth of this shiny metal—gold—and on the ship is a sign, "Come and get it." And despite what might be said here today, with gold pegged at $35 an ounce since 1934, and worth very much more today, especially with rumors that gold will be pegged at $70 an ounce, you can be sure that when this " Come and get it" sign is lofted, that there will be a line formed with eager hands waiting to get their share of the metal. This whole procedure to remove the gold cover is being conducted on a soft sell, its grave importance has been played down, and we are told the action is more psychological than real, and we have nothing to fear. Why does it appear necessary today to the administration that we must take this drastic action? It is easy to explain.

At the Bretton Woods Conference on July 31, 1945, we, in effect, agreed that for every dollar held by a central bank abroad that we would buy it back in gold. At that time we had about $20 billion in gold on hand and the promise then was one which we felt we could readily make, in view of our large gold stock and the fact that our balance-of-payments situations was on the plus side, and Europe was flat on its back from severe war damage and we were sending huge exports abroad.

And, at that time, the law was that to protect our currency here at home the Federal Reserve Board was required to maintain a 25-percent gold backing for each Federal Reserve bank note outstanding. This, in 1945, was also a very easy requirement in view of our gold stock on hand, and the fact that we only had $28 billion in currency outstanding requiring a gold cover of $7 billion. But, alas, how this has changed.

Our gold stock is down below $12 billion. Our currency issued December 31, 1967, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin totaled the sum of $46.9 billion. Our balance-of-payments worldwide deficit according to a table Congressman MAHON put into the RECORD at the end of 1967 stood at $37.4 billion. And we are told that there are $16 billion in the hands of central banks that are eligible to be converted into gold at their request. If we free our own currency from the gold backing requirement it will make available less than $12 billion in gold to satisfy $16 billion in claims.

The speed with which the administration is proceeding in its drive to remove the 25-percent gold cover from our Federal Reserve notes—the dollar in your pocket—and the relatively minor resistance to the move that has been exhibited by the majority party in Congress and in view of the seriousness of the planned action as it affects our monetary system and the Nation causes me to have grave concern for the consequences as it affects our Nation.

Since I have been in Congress these 4 years I have seen the virtual disintegration of our monetary system as we have known it. The first move was to take the silver content from our coins—except 40 percent in the Kennedy half dollar—our coins are now a tin-type metal and not of themselves worth very much from their metal content.

The second move took place in February of 1965 when we were told by Douglas Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, that it was then necessary to remove the 25-percent gold backing of Federal Reserve bank deposits so that gold could be made freely available in order to be able to fulfill the promise that we would buy back our dollars held abroad with gold. At that time there was approximately $35.3 billion of currency outstanding, which required gold cover totalling $8.8 billion. Our gold supply was $15.1 billion, so there was left $6.1 billion in gold available for foreign demands provided we removed the required gold cover from Federal Reserve bank deposits. Congress dutifully did what Mr. Dillon and the administration requested, especially when Mr. Dillon stated:

> This bill will meet this problem for as long ahead as anyone can now foresee.

The problem was met for just a short time. Now according to the report of the majority only $1.4 billion in gold is free for foreign demands, a decline since February 1965 of $4.7 billion, and we are asked to go all the way and remove the gold reserve from our currency so as to respond to the demands from abroad.

The third move was to take the silver out of our silver certificates and soon they will be out of existence. And now, we are finally cutting off the dog's tail entirely and we will have currency without any gold backing, and with no restraint on the Federal Reserve Board in the inflation of our currency in the future.

I do not favor removing the gold coverage from our currency. It is not really absolutely necessary at this immediate moment because there remains a cushion in gold, and when we reach the point when this cushion has been exhausted the Federal Reserve Board has the power to suspend the gold requirement, initially for 30 days and then for 15-day intervals as long as needed.

There are several alternative things to do. One would be to reassemble the Bretton Woods Conference and put our cards on the table and try to arrive at a new international money unit. This is of course being done right now. The other is if you are determined to remove the gold cover, is to now set aside a gold reserve which I have discussed in minority views and I will discuss fully later during the amendment period on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14743. Our international monetary situation was the subject of an article in Time magazine on January 12 entitled "The Dollar Is Not as Bad as Gold." It discusses what measures the United States should take. It states:

> There are a number of practical steps that the U.S. can and should take now to strengthen its monetary position. The first of these is to quickly remove the mandatory 25 percent gold "cover" on the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, that is the legislation which is before us today, and this is the legislation we should enact.

The article in Time magazine goes on to state:

> Just about every economist views [the 25 percent gold cover] as an anachronistic hangover from the pre-1933 days when green dollars were completely convertible into $5 goldpieces.
>
> Says Otmar Emminger, head of West Germany's Bundesbank: "Free this bullion and many foreigners will regain confidence that the dollar will not be devalued."

In other words, if we act today on this legislation, there will be less speculation against the dollar, and the dollar, accordingly, will be stronger. Our enactment of this legislation tells the speculators we are willing to back the dollar to the hilt with gold, and that they cannot win.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I think the speculators would do well to note a sentence on page 6 of the report that accompanies this legislation. In our report we say:

> Further, there are many members of the committee who would not view with disfavor some future reduction in the price of gold.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are saying that we will absolutely use our gold to prop up the value of the dollar, but we also are cautioning the speculators that we may not use the dollar to prop up the value of gold.

Of course, it is not clear under present circumstances whether, if the speculators were removed from the market, the price of gold without the prop of the dollar would fall. But in recent testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, Prof. Fritz Machlup, of Princeton, said:

> If speculation on a rise in the price of gold were to stop, in the sense that no further speculative purchases would take place but that those who have bought gold for speculative reasons were (foolishly) holding on to their not so precious possession, the private demand for gold by industrial users and by traditional hoarders would fall substantially short of present gold production. Thus, the present price of $35 an ounce could be maintained only if the price support extended by the United States and other monetary authorities is continued.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of statement leads us to view gold in a better perspective and without the mysterious power it has held over our imaginations in the past.

The Time magazine article continues:

> Most bankers and economists believe that the major monetary trend of the future will be a shift away from gold and toward a truly international paper currency, supported by contributions of currencies from all major nations.

Mr. Chairman, we made a step in this direction in Rio last September, when the International Monetary Fund agreed to establish the special drawing rights.

Returning to the Time article, with which I will conclude:

> When that happens money will be regulated by men instead of metal, and the value of each nation's currency will more truly reflect its real economic strength.

This is to be devoutly sought for, Mr. Chairman, and I believe this legislation should be passed promptly.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today H.R. 14743, a bill to eliminate the gold cover requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for certain other currency, and I am unalterably opposed to this proposal by the administration.

What makes this move so imperative at this time? The answer to this question is that over a period of time the fiscal irresponsibility of the administration has continued policies which have resulted in unfavorable balance of payments each year.

This condition has been permitted to continue until over 30 billion U.S. dollars are held by foreign governments and interests abroad. Even though the United States went off the domestic gold standard in the early 1930's, the U.S. dollars held abroad are redeemable in gold at the rate of $35 per ounce.

At one time this country had a gold reserve of almost $24 billion. This gold reserve had shrunk to $17.8 billion in 1960 and today our gold reserve stands at less than $12 billion, a decrease of $6 billion in 7 years.

Of this less than $12 billion we have in gold today, $10.7 billion is the gold cover for Federal Reserve notes and some other currency. H.R. 14743 simply removes the $10.7 billion as gold cover for the currency and makes it available for redeeming U.S. dollars held abroad. In other words, this $10.7 billion will be freed to flow out of this country. Yes, this gold will be freed to flow to the very same countries that owe the United States debts of billions of dollars and who have been receiving from us billions of dollars in foreign aid. The countries which hold the most U.S. dollars are France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Canada.

If the unfavorable balance of payments continues for the next 7 years as it has during the last 7 years with the same effect on our gold reserve, the United States will be down to less than $6 billion in gold; while the amount of U.S. dollars held abroad and redeemable in gold will have increased to over $40 billion. With this diminished gold reserve there can be only one result and this result will be a rush to redeem dollars for gold.

Make no mistake about it, the U.S. dollar is the stabilizer, the fixed, focal point, for all world currency. This is true because the U.S. dollar is redeemable in gold. When our gold reserve is exhausted, and dollars can no longer be redeemed in gold, the U.S. dollar will become purely symbolic and nothing more than fiat, or Chinese, money. When this happens, domestic and international financial chaos can be the only result.

There is no question that H.R. 14743 is just one more device by the administration to help cover up their consistently inept and unwise handling of our fiscal policies in an effort to avoid facing the facts and taking proper corrective steps. In fact, the administration insists on treating the symptoms rather than treating the disease.

For example, in the President's January 1, 1968, balance-of-payments statement, we find him subjecting overseas investment by American firms to mandatory controls. This new program would restrict investments abroad by American corporations, yet the inflow from overseas investments now is about $4 billion as compared with an outflow of $2.5 to $3 billion. This means that our private sector is producing a favorable balance of payments of from $1 billion to $1.5 billion from only their private investments abroad.

Yet, the Honorable William Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, says:

> Since mid-year, our gold stock has declined by more than $1 billion, and it now amounts to about $12 billion. In order to arrest this decline, we must achieve a major improvement in our balance of payments. That is the objective of the program announced by the President on January 1.

Now, if the inflow from private investments abroad exceeds outflow, then why curtail private investments? Curtailing overseas investment is a good way to make the problem worse, not better

On the other hand, still keeping in mind the balance-of-payments problem, let us look at just one aspect of Government spending abroad. The total cost of foreign assistance, not including Defense Department, from 1946 to 1967, was $152,533,000,000 and this has a tremendously adverse affect on our balance of payments. But the administration has not proposed any substantial curtailing of this enormous foreign aid program.

In addition to this, we have hundreds of thousands of servicemen stationed all over the world, in places other than Vietnam, many of whom have their families with them as well as automobiles and home furnishings. I find it hard to understand how we can afford this kind of extravagant troop deployment in the light of our critical balance-of-payments problem. In fact, an analysis of the $1.3 billion trade deficit which occurred in 1966 would indicate the governmental sector created a $5.6 billion deficit, whereas the private sector generated a $4.3 billion trade surplus. What I am saying is that it is tremendous Government spending that is producing a deficit in our balance of payments, which, in turn, is undermining our economy and confidence in our dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that removal of the gold cover, as proposed in H.R. 14743, will not cure the ailment we have in this country, it will not result in a favorable balance of payments, and it will not encourage confidence in the dollar. The only thing which will do that is the resources and prosperity of our economy and that can only be achieved by reducing Government expenditures and returning this country to fiscal sanity.

Back in 1965, when Congress eliminated the gold cover requirements for Federal Reserve deposits, that administration said the move then would give time to the Government to take firm and effective action to solve our balance-of-payments problems and the problem could be faced and solved while we still have a large sack of gold, instead of postponing action until the gold has been lost, and our international financial condition has been weakened.

Obviously the administration has failed miserably to rectify the situation, since our gold supply is now less than $12 billion, and our international financial condition has obviously weakened. To correct the situation the administration now says we must free the approximately $10.7 billion in gold now being used to back up our Federal Reserve notes because this will automatically restore confidence in the dollar. Confidence is largely a matter of psychology. During hearings before the committee we heard the statement made that the only value of having a gold cover is a matter of psychology. Therefore, if the gold cover is removed from our currency, we cannot continue to maintain the same degree of confidence in the American dollar.

The time is long past when we should have taken corrective action to insure the soundness of the United States dollar and the soundness of the economy of the United States, but there is no excuse for not facing up to the facts and taking necessary corrective action now.

The first thing that we have to do is establish fiscal discipline here at home. We must stop constantly increasing inflation by reducing Government expenditures in order to effect a balanced budget. Yes, revolutionary though it may seem, we must start paying off the tremendous sum of money which this country owes.

We have to stop financing giveaway programs which are not producing the results they are supposed to achieve and we must have our cities, educational systems, and States do more to help themselves. Remember it is the same taxpayer who is paying local, State, and Federal taxes and more of the local and State tax dollar paid by the American taxpayer goes for the purpose for which it is intended than does the Federal tax dollar. Remember also that this country has developed the greatest educational system in the history of mankind. All that the so-called poor and deprived people have to do to take advantage of the great opportunities available in this country is to get the schooling which is offered to them free.

Further, inflation is actually pricing some American products out of the international market in spite of increased productivity on the part of American industry. This trend must stop or it will create a condition where even the private sector of our economy will be unable to maintain a favorable balance of payments.

Second, we must drastically reduce our foreign aid program. We have heard many times in this Chamber that we are the richest nation in the world and that it is our duty to help the less fortunate and emergent nations. The fact is that in terms of our debt, we are the poorest nation in the world and we owe more money than all of the other free nations of the world combined. We can no longer be the "Santa Claus" of the world with a foreign aid program that has not made us one friend among the nations of the world.

Third, we must stop trying to be the policeman of the world. As of February 1, 1968, we had approximately 345,000 American servicemen stationed in Europe, and this is not counting their dependents, and tens of thousands of servicemen deployed throughout the world in places other than Vietnam. We can no longer continue to unilaterally afford this program, which has made us suspect as to our intentions, and this program must be either sharply curtailed right now or our allies must start to pick up their fair share of the cost of this program.

These are just some of the things that must be done now in order to develop a favorable balance of payments which will immediately start to reduce the number of United States dollars held abroad and which will remove the pressures from our gold reserve. If we enact H.R. 14743 to remove this gold cover from our currency, so that our gold can be paid out abroad, we will be removing the urgency for taking the necessary steps to eliminate our unfavorable balance of payments and the necessary steps will not be taken. Therefore, I urge the defeat of H.R. 14743.

This great country of ours has always been a land of opportunity for all of its people and we must not permit this opportunity to be destroyed by fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the proposed legislation before us today. It is stupid philosophy, insideous and dangerous. Why are we being asked to remove the gold cover? Certainly it is not going to solve our balance-of-payments deficit. Administration spokesmen have admitted as much in committee hearings. As Treasury Secretary Fowler, appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee on January 22, 1968, stated:

> The keystone to this balance of payments program is the surcharge proposal you have before you.

Mr. Chairman, to dissipate our remaining gold would constitute one of the worst monetary blunders in history. For the life of me, I cannot see the headlong rush to destroy ourselves financially.

The removal of the gold cover would open the way to unlimited expansion of Federal Reserve notes—to the weakest money known to man—fiat money—and, in my judgment, a collapse in the value of our currency.

Secretary Fowler wants us to believe that the strength of the dollar depends upon the strength of the U.S. economy rather than upon a legal 25-percent reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes. Secretary Fowler says the world knows this as a fact.

Were we not so deep in debt, Secretary Fowler would be right.

But we are in debt. A fact of which the world is most cognizant. And the world also knows, as a fact, that the value of our dollar has been steadily depreciating, hence, they—our foreign creditors—would rather have our gold than our value-shrinking dollar.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that foreign nations do not hold our economic strength in very high esteem. It is not that these countries have complete disrespect for our economic strength. But they wonder how any government that seemingly refuses to put its financial house in order, both at home and abroad, can continue to remain economically strong.

The printing of more and more paper fiat money is not going to keep us economically strong no matter how much juggling of figures the administration goes through.

The administration would have us release our entire gold stock right down to the last gold bar—strip our Nation clean.

Now mark my words, Mr. Chairman. If such an event occurs—and it will if the House approves removing the gold backing of our dollar—the price of gold will go skyrocketing.

And this Nation of ours will be standing on the sidelines watching everyone making a profit.

Need I remind my colleagues of what happened when we removed the silver backing from our currency?

It is interesting to me, Mr. Chairman, that while the Treasury Department and the administration express great concern over our vanishing gold, they adamantly oppose the gold subsidy bills before Congress on the grounds that it would trigger a run on the dollar. What did the Treasury people think we have had for the past 7 years if it was not a run on the dollar.

By a stroke of a pen some 34 years ago, the price of gold was $35 an ounce. This action was taken as a depression measure when gold was selling at $20 an ounce. Since the depression days, costs of all commodities, including mining, have more than doubled, but the price of gold has remained the same. Ever since the end of World War II, many efforts have been made to increase the price of gold to its rightful height in the marketplace. Invariably these efforts were met by incantations by Government spokesmen, over and over again, that the currency of the free world would be tossed into chaos by any effort of the American Government to increase the price of gold for domestic producers.

Even efforts to appease the money managers through offers to have bills declared legislative that the official U.S. Government price for gold would remain at $35 an ounce and that any higher prices paid for mining domestic gold would be considered a subsidy by the American Government to its domestic gold producers have failed. Such efforts have been counteracted by charges that this action would create a two-price system for gold and would be very upsetting to foreign bankers.

Canada has for some time paid production bonuses to its gold mining industry. Australia has seen fit to provide incentives for gold production. Yet these acts have not stirred foreign bankers to view with apprehension the strength of the monetary systems of these two countries.

It would be most prudent at this time to take steps to increase our domestic gold production through the enactment of a realistic gold relief bill providing financial incentives to reactivate the production of gold. Such a subsidy would reveal to the world that our Government is aware of the importance of gold as money.

It does not seem logical, Mr. Chairman, that foreign nations or bankers would object to the United States paying an adequate price for domestically mined gold.

To me, Mr. Chairman, this would solve our gold problem. At least it would be one way. The other way, of course, is to cut our foreign aid program with its torrential outpour of U.S. dollars. Removing the gold backing from the dollar is opening the door for financial chaos. I repeat, it is stupid philosophy, insidious, and dangerous.

The foreigners can demand our gold but we in America cannot do this. I ask my colleagues to defeat this bill for the good of America and the generations of Americans to come.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield

5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much for yielding to me this time.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I plan to vote against removing the gold cover requirement because there is sufficient flexibility in the law as it now stands. Under section 11c of the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Reserve Board has the authority to waive the 25-percent gold reserve requirement. The gold reserve requirement can be suspended initially for 30 days and subsequently for intervals of 15 days if needed to make good in an emergency on our pledge to exchange gold for dollars.

Reserving the gold requirement will exert discipline on the administration to exert fiscal and monetary restraints which are sorely needed at this time.

Before removal of the gold cover should be considered, the U.S. balance-of-payments position must be improved. It seems to me the best way to relieve the pressure for American gold is to reduce the amount of dollars in foreign hands. The administration witnesses admitted that removing the gold cover would not cure the chronic balance-of-payments problem.

There is a psychological effect which cannot be discounted. We have heard the argument that the American dollar is as good as gold. It doesn't logically follow that the more valuable item would be turned in for a less valuable item. The nations and international financiers seeking our gold are not "nincompoops." They make their living through reasonable speculation. They think our gold is valuable. So do I. If the gold cover is removed, it could have serious psychological repercussions at a time when our economy is not strong anyhow. Whether the administration will admit it or not, gold has intrinsic value and is the one commodity which can be exchanged for things of value throughout the world. I see no reason why we should not say, if more demands are made than we are able to satisfy, that if you will be patient and wait awhile, we will obtain the necessary gold to meet our obligations. Meanwhile, we—as a nation—must go about improving our balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to further extend the debate or to harangue, but I would like to ask the Members of the committee a few questions—questions which in my opinion each one of us should ask himself.

Mr. Chairman, the first question is this: Why is this legislation now pending before this body? It has been adequately shown that the demands which are now being made for gold by those who have a lack of confidence in the dollar is the primary reason.

Second, there is a limited amount of free gold; that is, only $1.3 billion of our $12 billion in gold is available with which to meet the demands that might be made by the international community.

Mr. Chairman, the administration argues that by releasing the gold cover, there will be the additional sum of $10.7 billion available which will help to restore confidence in the dollar.

When we think of this we have to then ask ourselves the next question: Why is there a lack of confidence in the dollar?

Certainly inflation and fiscal irresponsibility of the Government are contributing to our balance-of-payments problems. This causes the holders of our dollars to be further concerned about devaluation, formal or by attrition.

I believe the next question we then should ask ourselves, if these things are true, Will passage of this legislation solve the problem? I believe it is obvious to all that it will not solve the problem. The very most it will do is to buy time. In that regard, I believe we should have the statement of a witness who appeared before the committee, and I am quoting Mr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association. He said:

> The United States is in danger, if it continues as it has for all but one of the past 18 years, to spend more on government account abroad than it can earn on private account, of losing the capacity to meet its international commitments. Lifting the gold cover will not correct this situation.

And I repeat:

> Lifting the gold cover will not correct this situation. At best—

He continues—

> it will only give us a limited amount of additional time to make fundamental adjustments.

If it will not solve the problem, and will only buy time, can it worsen the situation? I believe it is very possible that the passage of this legislation could even make the situation more critical than it presently is.

In that regard I would like to quote a witness who appeared before the committee, Mr. Roy L. Reierson, of the Bankers Trust Co. in New York. In his testimony he stated:

> If done in a favorable international monetary environment, action to remove the remaining reserve requirements would have passed largely unnoticed. Taken under present adverse conditions, such a step could weaken, not strengthen, the standing of the dollar internationally.

And continuing with his statement:

> The root cause of the problems of the dollar is the failure to come to grips with the American balance of payments problem, especially since 1958, when deficits have increased in size. The United States balance of payments has been in deficit in every year since 1949, except for 1957, the year of the Suez crisis. These deficits have contributed to large gold losses, to big increases in short-term liabilities owing to foreigners and to a serious deterioration in the international liquidity position of the United States.

Further on in his statement he says:

> Elimination of the gold certificate reserve requirements will do nothing to correct the basic problem—the large American payments deficit, and the resulting outpouring of dollars at a rate which is far greater than foreigners want or need to hold. Elimination of the reserve requirements at this time is, in fact, likely to encourage delay in taking effective action required to bring the American balance of payments into sustainable equilibrium, and would in all probability be interpreted abroad as an indication that we are content to continue down the road that has already cost us over $11 billion in gold during the past ten years.
>
> Consequently, if the American balance of payments continues in deficit, repeal of the reserve requirements would not prevent, but might even encourage further drains on our gold stock and bring closer the danger of an international monetary crisis.

Let me ask one further question: Are the proponents of this legislation even agreed upon its impact?

In this regard, Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that the reserve requirement does restrict the issuance of currency. In the committee hearings, on page 23, Mr. Martin said, in speaking of the reserve requirement:

> Some change in this requirement this year or next will be unavoidable as the volume of our currency grows in response to the demands of a growing economy.

J. L. Robertson, vice chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, however, says the reserve requirement does not restrain the issuance of currency. In practically the same hearing, Mr. Robertson said this, in answer to a question asked by Mr. Mize——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. In answer to a question from Mr. Mize in committee as follows:

> Now, Mr. Robertson, though you went over this matter previously yesterday, will you again explain what and how—what effective restrictions of the issuance of Federal Reserve notes will remain when we take the gold restriction off?

Mr. Robertson replied:

> Mr. Robertson. I would say none. And I don't think the gold cover is any restriction at all, as I said the day before yesterday.

Gentlemen, with the kind of academic schizophrenia which seems to prevail regarding this legislation, this Congress is in no position to pass it.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Whalen].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Whalen].

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 14743 and the bill H.R. 14783, a companion measure that I introduced on January 23.

I would like to make just four brief observations concerning these measures.

First of all, in my opinion the so-called gold cover is an anachronism. It is no longer applicable to today's monetary system. We know that as a result of actions taken in 1933, the United States went off the gold standard. Consequently, we no longer agreed as we did prior to this time, to convert domestically held dollars into gold when they are turned into the Treasury.

Thus, it seems to me to be futile to isolate over $10 billion in gold when this gold may not be exchanged for dollars returned by American citizens.

Further, I feel from a purely theoretical and academic standpoint that we should do away with the last remaining vestige of our old gold standard system.

Second, I do not think this action reduces the disciplines which exists in our monetary system.

Let me point out to you that the so-called "gold cover" applies only to Federal Reserve notes and a few other pieces of circulating currency now within the economy. This amounts to something over $40 billion or approximately 22 percent of the total money supply of the United States.

We certainly recognize that the Federal Reserve System does have powers which it can utilize to control the supply of money by expanding or contracting it, as economic conditions may dictate.

Third, there will be a distinct advantage if the gold cover is removed. That action certainly will indicate to the world that we stand willing to honor commitments that we have made to foreigners, that we will redeem any dollars they wish to convert for gold.

This will have a favorable psychological advantage abroad and result in a reduction of gold speculation which took place in December last year.

Fourth and finally, I would point out that if, indeed, these measures do become law, they will not solve our balance-of-payments problem.

Yet, as a Congress, we have the responsibility of developing solutions which will address themselves to the basic problem confronting the United States today; namely, the outflow of gold resulting from the accumulation of dollars abroad.

If we pass this bill, which I hope we do, I trust that we will not lose sight of our very basic responsibility, that of passing legislation designed to overcome the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. I just happen to be a country banker and I do not understand international finance, but the chairman this afternoon made a statement that reducing the restrictions to 12.5 percent might be a suggestion that we would be telling our friends abroad that we would not be supporting their dollars like we had before and that we would be supporting only half their dollars. Is this true? Is this what the chairman said?

Mr. WHALEN. I did not hear the remarks of the gentleman and I am in no position to answer that.

Mr. PATMAN. I said that we would not be in a position of going all out in support of the dollar and that we would be just going half way when we ought to go all the way.

Mr. MYERS. What you are saying is that we are going to withdraw our support for the domestic dollar of the taxpayers, but we are going to support the dollar internationally. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not proposing the amendment. I oppose the amendment. I think it would be terribly bad.

Mr. MYERS. Under the bill the 25-percent cover would be withdrawn domestically; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It is withdrawn now. We have no gold cover now domestically.

Mr. MYERS. What is the argument over, then? I thought that that is what you were discussing.

Mr. PATMAN. No. You see, instead of putting all of our gold in to maintain the dollar, to make sure it will always be maintained, we would set aside, at least the amendment that was suggested would set aside half of the amount, not all of it. We want to put all of it in.

Mr. MYERS. I am not talking about the recommitment you suggested. You said there was no gold cover now.

Mr. PATMAN. We have no gold cover in the United States. We are like France, the United Kingdom, and most of the other important countries of the world. We have no gold cover.

Mr. MYERS. Then what would this bill do?

Mr. PATMAN. It would release the gold, free the gold, to protect the dollar in the international markets.

Mr. MYERS. If we do not have anything, we are not releasing anything.

Mr. PATMAN. We have the gold, but we are not using it to protect the dollar. We do not need to. It is not payable in gold here. You cannot get gold for the dollar. It is that simple.

Mr. WHALEN. To repeat what the chairman has indicated, at the present time, as I pointed out before, the so-called gold clause is meaningless. It is an anachronism. An American citizen may not now convert his dollars into gold. Thus, as I have said, to isolate over $10 billion of gold—literally, to put it in a corner—has absolutely no validity with respect to today's monetary system.

Mr. MYERS. But you want to guarantee the dollar so that everyone else in the world can make a demand on our gold?

Mr. WHALEN. If they are in a position to do this. We already adhere to that principle. We are simply saying that by doing away with this needless gold cover, which has no applicability domestically, in effect we are guaranteeing the promise we made many, many years ago that we would convert foreign-held dollars into gold at any time we were called upon to exchange them.

Mr. PATMAN. Only central banks can apply.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not the situation this: There is no possibility of redeeming any gold on the part of any American citizen under the present system, but we are required to set aside a certain amount which cannot be used for the purchase of dollars abroad, and we are trying to get rid of that which is used for no purpose at the present time.

Mr. WHALEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So we can deliver it all to foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHALEN. My time has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, today we are being asked to take the most incredible gamble with the future of this country which has been suggested for some time. We are being asked to authorize the disposal of our last bar of gold. Make no mistake as to the ultimate effect of this proposed legislation. If it is passed, the outflow of gold will continue at an accelerated rate until all, or virtually all, of our gold is in the hands of foreign governments and citizens.

Officials of the Treasury Department say that gold is of no consequence—that it really does not matter—that all that really counts is the productive capacity of U.S. industry. If this is so, why do they feel it necessary to pass this measure? They say we must assure our friends that we will continue to support the price at $35 per ounce and that we must do this to protect our dollar. If foreign citizens and governments do not have faith in the U.S. dollar today, when we have gold reserves, how much less confidence will they have when our reserves are gone?

I urge you to remember that these same Treasury Department officials have been wrong on every statement and prediction which they have made in recent years with respect to silver. Despite warnings of the most knowledgeable people in the industry they continued to try to hold the price of silver at unrealistically low figures. First at 90.5 cents per ounce, then at $1.29 per ounce. Some industry experts suggested that the price of silver would exceed $2 per ounce and that the Government was powerless to hold it down. They were met with ridicule and scorn by our Government experts. History has provided the proof of the accuracy of their predictions. Government was unable to stabilize the price, and the price has risen to over $2 per ounce. Despite repeated assertions that the Government would have no interest in silver—outside of strategic reserves—after coinage requirements were met with the new sandwich coins, the Government has succeeded in driving prices downward by continued sales of Treasury stocks. Even so, prices are double what they were at the end of 1961. But this can be only temporary, until the Treasury runs out of those reserves, and this is not a reversible situation. Silver can reach stability only when the price rises enough to stimulate production so that supply is in balance with demand.

The parallel with gold is frightening. The same bland assurances are being given by the same officials in the face of the same set of facts that are leading to the total loss of Treasury silver. Only an increase in the supply of gold can ease the long-range problems and this can be obtained only by an increased price for gold.

The Treasury officials are willing to

gamble that demand can be reduced by removing gold from monetary systems and financial transactions. This was done in our domestic transactions to some degree by actions in 1933 and 1934, to a much lesser extent in 1945, and again in 1965. This proposal before us today would complete this action on the domestic scene, and the inexorable demands of international trade will accomplish the rest in a very short while. Remember Treasury's positive assurances of its ability to control silver? They hope we can completely eliminate gold from international trade, just as they have eliminated it from domestic finances. But they cannot assure us that they can succeed. The success in removing gold from domestic transactions and its discipline on our internal transactions had to rest on compulsion—the ability of our Government to confiscate all the gold in the country and to order its citizens to accept dollars at face value.

We simply do not have the authority to do this in international transactions. What happens when we run out of gold and can no longer hold the price down? The world will act whether we want it to or not. There will be a de facto devaluation of the dollar at that point, completely beyond our control and at the worst possible point for us. How much better it would be for us to act now, when we have the strongest possible position. In my opinion it could be done now by simultaneous action of all governments affected, and we would accomplish revaluation of gold without devaluation of the dollar in international trade.

The Treasury Department is willing to gamble that we can force the world to accept a completely managed currency. Why should we play Russian roulette with our future—and with only one empty chamber instead of one shell in the cyclinder?—and why should we gamble at all? Why not make our adjustments now instead of later? Why kid ourselves that this measure is the cure, when it just delays the day of reckoning to a worse day later?

And that day will come soon. The net outflow of gold last year was $1,168.7 million, almost $900 million of it in December alone—and we can expect this rate to accelerate as we fail to face up to our fiscal problems and other nations lose confidence in our stability. We now have foreign claims against our dollar of $33 billion. During the last quarter of 1967 it was increasing at the rate of nearly $9 billion per year. In a little over 3 years the claims against our gold will have doubled, and during the same period most of our gold will have vanished. It is simply not possible to forecast any degree of confidence with this as our outlook.

Regardless of what we do here today, there is a time in the not too distant future when gold will have to be revalued. It is inescapable.

As Franz Pick, publisher of Pick's World Currency Report, said in December, people just cannot accept the fact that while governments have tried to master gold for 60 centuries, gold always ends up mastering them.

In an attempt to get around a concept as old as man himself, the administration now proposes to tell us that gold does not really exist, that it is an illusion which hinders the effectiveness of the international monetary system, and that the system is in reality held together by worldwide confidence in our limitless domestic prosperity. Well, speaking of illusions, our domestic prosperity is certainly a good one.

Removal of the gold cover is an expediency that says let someone else solve the problem later on—perhaps at a time when some of us will not be around to worry about it. On the other hand, once the inevitable has arrived, it will not be long before none of us are around.

People all over the world doubt that the United States can continue to honor its pledge to maintain the price of gold at $35 an ounce. If they were absolutely certain that each dollar could be redeemed in gold and that the price would stay at $35 an ounce, there would be no sound reason for them to hold onto their hoard because of the costs of storage and the loss of interest.

Well, is it more responsible to maintain discipline on the dollar or to let foreign speculators make their profit?

Would there be any further speculation once the relationship between gold and the dollar were adjusted to a more realistic level?

I think the answers are obvious.

Removal of the gold cover is not the only alternative available to the administration, although it must be noted that the choices disappear the longer we wait to deal with the real causes of the situation—and they are our balance-of-payments deficit abroad and a healthy economy at home.

Among these alternatives are:

First, to change the 25-percent reserve requirement to a fixed figure, such as $10 billion;

Second, permit American citizens to purchase gold, remembering that private gold holdings act as a discipline against inflation;

Third, to those countries which owe us money, deny the conversion of dollars into gold until the debt is settled;

Fourth, increase the price of gold.

The first point has the fault of removing gold as a discipline on our currency and is offered only as an alternative to the pending proposal. The second suggested alternative would, in some measure, reestablish a discipline. The third point seems to me to be so obvious as to permit of little argument, and the fourth is necessary if we are to avoid disaster.

All of these steps seem to me preferable to passage of the measure before us today.

I think that commonsense dictates that we increase the price of gold immediately. It would have the immediate effect of increasing the value of our reserves. It would also stimulate the outflow of gold from private and public holdings as confidence in the dollar increased and further speculation is dampened. To do this, the price would have to be established at realistic levels. In terms of buying power, the dollar has already been devalued by inflation to little over one-third its 1934 value. Raising gold to $100 or $105 per ounce would simply reestablish the relationship of gold to commodity values which existed in 1934. There is a great misconception among many economists on this point. They feel that revaluing the price of gold is just another way of saying devaluation of the dollar. It is nothing of the kind.

A columnist for the Washington Post, Harold B. Dorsey, recently worried aloud that so many Americans fail to recognize the difference. Quoting a prominent French economist, Dorsey explains that by increasing the price of gold, he means "a simultaneous change in the price of gold in all countries with a convertible currency." Under such an arrangement there would be no change in the relationship of one currency with another. The price of imports as well as the price of American goods in the world markets would not be affected.

It is his contention that our balance-of-payments deficit would not be affected, because that is due to the export of investment capital as well as military and civilian expenditures abroad rather than just an unsatisfactory commercial trade balance.

Because of its pertinency to today's debate, I include with my remarks the full text of the article.

The article is as follows:

IS THE DOLLAR'S VALUE TIED TO THE WORLD PRICE OF GOLD?

"How can I protect myself against the devaluation of the dollar?" This is the most frequent question being directed to investment advisers these days.

The tenor of the question reveals a fear of sharply higher commodity prices and a failure to recognize the highly significant difference between an increase in the price of gold and devaluation of the dollar in relation to other currencies. Little wonder. Wide publicity is being given to articles written by "experts" who fail to recognize this difference.

The key point involved was recently emphasized by none other than Jacques Rueff, the French financial expert who is regarded as the source of President de Gaulle's ideas about gold. In an interview published in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, Rueff responded as follows to the question, "How close to devaluation is the dollar?":

"May I correct the word 'devaluation.' It's not a question of devaluation at all. I think there is no reason whatever why the dollar should be devalued. American goods are perfectly competitive in the world. If the dollar were devalued, there would be such pertubation in the world that other countries would follow without any doubt. So it would be a catastrophe and would be entirely useless. The devaluation of the dollar ought to be excluded. When I speak of an increase in the price of gold, I always mean a simultaneous change in the price of gold in all countries with a convertible currency, which means no change at all in the foreign-exchange parity."

If Congress should pass the legislation necessary to increase the price of gold, the other currencies would have to follow almost simultaneously. So there would be no change in the relationship of one currency with another. Hence, other things remaining unchanged the price of imports would not change and neither would the prices of American goods in world markets.

Furthermore, the U.S. international balance of payments deficit would not be affected one iota if the price of gold were to be increased. That deficit is not caused by an unsatisfactory commercial trade balance. It is being caused, primarily, by the export of investment capital, by expenditures abroad for military purposes and by tourist expenditures abroad.

Much of the confusion, I believe, is caused by a recollection of the experience in the early 1930's. At that time, exchange rate relationships fluctuated violently from day to day. An exporter did not know how much he would receive for his shipments in terms of his own currency. Hence, the volume of world trade was badly hurt.

In significant contrast, the important currencies are now tied together by agreement with the International Monetary Fund. Even if one wants to assume that this agreement would be abrogated, it is completely illogical to assume that one industrial country—let us say France—would permit its currency to be upvalued in relation to the others. If it did, it would be giving a tremendous advantage to the countries which compete with it in world markets. It would lose its export markets.

Assuming for the moment that arguments for a paper gold system are valid, would it not be better to undertake such an experiment while we still have our gold reserves to fall back on rather than afterwards? Is there not at least a measure of discipline in such a suggestion? If we must experiment, let us do it from a position of relative strength.

Mr. R. J. Bruning, the editor of the North Idaho Press in my district, asked recently: Which dollar are we trying to defend—the one in your pocket or the one someone has on the other side of the world?

This was but one of several telling arguments Mr. Bruning made in the course of a speech before the Northwest Mining Association last week. He concluded that "when we make the decision to revalue the price of gold, as we must, we do it not when the dollar is under severe attack and a run has developed on our gold, but at a time of our choosing when we can act without worsening the crisis."

Since Mr. Bruning is one of the foremost monetary authorities of our time, I include his speech in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

There are things that must be done immediately to stabilize both our domestic economy and our international position. Removal of the gold cover is not one of them.

Where we should proceed with caution we act in haste.

Where we should act in haste, we choose to ignore.

The link between gold and the dollar is already in the twilight zone and none of us can say with certainty what lies at the end of the road. But by proceeding swiftly, yet deliberately, a solution can be found. In the meantime, let us not take the step that would bring cheers from our enemies around the world by undermining our own currency.

I urge that this bill be defeated.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN?

(By R. J. Bruning, publisher, North Idaho Press, Wallace, Idaho, to Northwest Mining Association Luncheon, Spokane, Wash., February 12, 1968)

First off, let me extend my apologies to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. I know that on the anniversary of his birth it is traditional, in fact almost incumbent, upon every speaker to pay tribute to the Great Emancipator.

Instead, as you know, I have chosen as the title for my talk tonight "Whatever Happened to William Jennings Bryan?"

In my defense, I will turn to Abraham Lincoln himself.

In a letter he wrote to A. G. Hodges on April 4, 1864, Lincoln said: "I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me."

And so it is with me today.

I have been controlled by events—specifically, the fact that I was asked to speak on gold and silver.

To my mind at least, a discussion of these two metals brings up the memory of William Jennings Bryan; first, because of his crusade for free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to one with gold, and secondly, because of the Cross of Gold Speech that won him the Democratic nomination for President in 1896.

And I am led to wonder—What would Bryan say or think if by some miracle he could be returned today to this banquet hall?

For today, just as they were in the 1890's of Bryan's time, silver and gold are very much in the minds of men.

So much so, especially as regards gold, that I might have entitled my talk tonight "The Cross of Gold Revisited."

There are interesting comparisons to make between the situation that existed in the 1890's and the situation that exists three quarters of a century later.

So let's look at the 1890's through the eyes of William Jennings Bryan, and then imagine how he would look at the situation today if he were alive.

Bryan was a free silver man, and that is how most of us in the mining fraternity remember him. But it is important to remember that he was a product of his times—that, like Lincoln, he was controlled by events.

This nation had experienced an economic collapse in the early 1890's and this collapse was largely responsible for the formation of the People's Party, or the Populist Party as it was better known. This was largely an agrarian movement, whose followers believed the solution to the nation's economic ills lay in the creation of more money. Free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver was one of the methods by which the Populists sought to achieve this goal, but this was secondary to the party's inflationist ideas.

The Populists won a number of congressional victories in 1892 and 1894, and had a nominee for President in 1892.

But William Jennings Bryan stole their thunder in 1896, captured the Democratic nomination for President, and the Populists swung most of their support to him rather than enter their own candidate in the Presidential campaign.

Bryan achieved this coup by adopting many of the Populist programs, but principally through his advocacy of free coinage of silver.

The monetary issue was the big political issue of the 1896 campaign.

The Republican platform that year declared: "The Republican Party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of a law providing for the resumption of specie payments in 1879. Since then, every dollar has been as good as gold. We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country."

On the other hand, Bryan captured the Democratic nomination largely on the basis of his impassioned Cross of Gold speech, in which he declared:

"If they dare come out into the open field and defend the gold standard, as a good thing, we will fight them to the uttermost . . . We will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns—you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

The campaign was a bitter one that McKinley won. And even as the year 1896 was ending prosperity was returning to the country. Opening of new gold mines in the Klondike and on the Rand in South Africa, and invention of the cyanide process for extracting gold from low content ores, greatly increased the production of that metal and speeded the economic recovery.

The Currency Act of March 14, 1900, put the currency of the country on a gold standard, and the value of the dollar fixed in terms of gold by that act continued until the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, which fixed the value of the dollar at 49.06 per cent of the value placed upon it in 1900.

So much for the world as Bryan saw it.

Now, how would Bryan see the world today—the economic world—if he were by some miracle to return tonight and sit here at the head table with us.

First, before we engage in an imaginary conversation with him, let's set the background. The inflation that he and the Populists wanted so badly in the 1890's is a reality today, a creeping inflation that last year gave evidence of developing into a runaway inflation.

Despite this, I believe if we were able to ask Bryan to address us tonight, he would be more eloquent, more impassioned, and more determined than he was in the summer of 1896 that mankind "should not be crucified upon a cross of gold."

He would invoke the wrath of Heaven against such a crown of thorns; he would rail against the tyranny of the yellow metal. With William McChesney Martin, he would deplore this "barbarous metal." He would applaud Martin for saying the United States "must not bow down to the idol of gold."

But I am sure Bryan would say in an aside that Martin's phrase was not nearly as colorful as his own reference to the cross of gold.

I am sure Bryan today, as he did in 1896, would regard gold as the cause of economic problems and not the measurement of an economy.

He would take note of the efforts being made today by this nation to defend the dollar and he would have companions when he demanded that this nation cut the dollar loose from gold, abandon gold entirely, and step up spending for programs to benefit those people who would have been the Populists in the 1890's.

As for the free coinage of silver, that would be another matter. Bryan would need only to look at the daily Treasury statement to see how impossible that would be.

Bryan in his day could jingle gold and silver coins in his pocket.

He would be astounded today to know that possession of gold is a violation of federal law, and that silver coins are being replaced by clad base metal coins.

But if Bryan had a sense of humor, then imagine how he would laugh if we could try to explain to him the gold situation that exists today.

Imagine his reaction, for instance, if we told him we are so desperately in need of gold that government scientists have discovered that gold can be recovered by burning garbage and trash. Imagine his response, if we told him we are so desperate to protect what gold we have that we intend to levy a severe tax on tourists who spend more than $7 a day on travel outside the Western Hemisphere. And these, by the way, are 1968 mini-dollars, not healthy 1896 gold dollars.

Bryan's logical response, of course would be to mine more gold.

And we would have to tell him that few mines in this country today can mine gold for $35 an ounce.

Bryan's obvious answer to that, of course, would be to raise the price of gold.

And we would tell him that this is just

what the administration doesn't want to do; that it has vowed never to raise the price above $35 an ounce.

But before he would explode with a suitable phrase, we would hasten to assure him the administration is bending every effort to find deposits of cheaper gold, and is encouraging the search for such deposits by loaning up to 75 per cent of the money required for such exploration.

If he asked how much gold the Treasury has on hand, we would reply a little less than $12 billion worth.

But, we would have to qualify this by pointing out foreign claims against this gold amount to $31 billion.

While he was doing a little mental arithmetic on this, we would further qualify our answer by explaining that less than $2 billion of the $12 billion could be used to meet those $31 billion in claims.

And then, before he could tell us we didn't know enough to realize we were broke, we would explain to Bryan that in order to keep the foreigners from fighting to be first in line at the pay window, we intend to tell them that we will make all of our gold available to them by taking it away from ourselves.

And now I can see the great orator asking the next question:

"But why should foreign nations want our gold. I can remember back to the campaign of 1896, when the Republicans said that since specie payments were resumed in 1879, every dollar has been as good as gold. Isn't that true anymore?"

And what could we reply, except to say: "That's what they keep telling us in Washington."

"But," we would go on, "the foreign nations who have so many dollars, and who see so little gold in our vaults, are not quite that confident."

We would say that the gnomes of Zurich—and Bryan should like this colorful phrase—have been warning the United States for some time to stop spending more than they take in, and to stop sending more dollars overseas than they receive in other currencies.

A little bit wearily now, we believe, Bryan would ask how long a nation could spend more than it earns. And patiently we would explain that for most of the last 35 years the nation has been running a federal deficit, and that for 17 of the last 18 years we have had an imbalance of international payments.

Turning from the domestic situation momentarily in order to get his bearings, Bryan would take note of the tremendous growth in commerce and industry, and observe that there must be an equally tremendous growth in world monetary gold reserves to finance such a flourishing trade.

And we would have to admit that, to the contrary, in the last two years there has been an actual decrease in monetary gold reserves—but as an afterthought we would add the nations are trying to work out a paper gold system to make up for that deficiency.

Bryan saw the development of the Klondike and the Rand mines and great increase in gold production around the turn of the century. Naturally, then, he would ask if most of the world's gold deposits have been worked out.

We would be getting a little hesitant to reply now, because we can see our answers are confusing Bryan. But we would have to answer that the South African mines have expanded their production of gold tremendously since World War II—and that, as a matter of fact, one-third of the 2.3 billion ounces of gold mined in recorded history has been produced in the past 20 years.

Shaking his head, Bryan would insist upon knowing what happened to all this gold.

Our answer would be that for one thing use of gold in arts and industry is growing at the rate of about 12 per cent a year, and that in 1966 this use amounted to 18,290,000 ounces. Private hoarders took the remainder of new production, plus a little extra, in 1966 and 1967.

We had hoped that Bryan would forget our mention of paper gold, but he didn't. He wanted an explanation.

And here, I'm afraid, we'd lose poor old William Jennings Bryan.

Darwin's Theory of Evolution, which he fought to his death at the Scopes Trial in Tennessee, is a first grade primer compared with an explanation of paper gold.

But we'd try.

First, we would explain 125 or so nations got together to form the International Monetary Fund and pool part of their resources in order to promote international liquidity—in other words, to provide money for international trade.

But, we would continue, there seems to be a danger of a shortage of international money, or liquidity, so these nations got together last September in Rio de Janeiro and agreed on what they called Special Drawing Rights, a sort of credit plan that gives each nation the right to draw additional funds.

Bryan's face would light up then, because this is easy to understand. It is just the old Greenback plan of the 1870's widened to include the entire Free World.

But he would be disappointed, for we would have to explain that it isn't quite this simple for the credit base for the plan has its foundation on gold. Hence the term, paper gold.

To Bryan, the truth was simple. Black was black and white was white, paper was paper and gold was gold. Paper gold, he would explode, is a contradiction in terms.

To set him at ease, we'd tell him that a German economist explained how things sometimes can seem to be something they aren't.

This economist called the paper gold plan, the SDR's, a zebra plan—you can't tell whether a zebra is a white animal with black stripes or a black animal with white stripes.

But Bryan has been thinking, and his face brightens. With the wisdom of one who has known the past, he has the answer to the whole baffling mystery.

"A dollar," he asks, "is measured in terms of gold by value, is it not?"

We answer yes.

"So then, if the United States places a value of $70 an ounce on gold, it would take only half as much gold by weight to make a dollar, and then there would be twice as much gold as there is now for monetary purposes, isn't that right?"

We'd agree.

"And if you raised the price of gold to $105 an ounce, there'd be three times as much gold, right?"

We agree again, and Bryan would rise from his chair like one who has had a great burden lifted from his back. "Then there's your answer."

But how do you break an old man's heart by telling him that $35 is a magic figure, a fetish, a basic, fundamental, elemental and unalterable absolute of economics that goes back to 1934?

If he asks why, we can only answer because it is, that's why. The sun comes up in the east and sets in the west, the moon is full once a month, and the price of gold is $35 an ounce. You don't question the ways of nature or the folklore of man.

We would be happy to leave Bryan at this point, finding his questions, simple as they would be, too difficult to answer in the frame of reference of today's economic thinking.

But for all the questions we put into his mouth, remember that Bryan was a man who disliked the discipline of gold, and in that respect he has many companions who argue the point today.

These economists, like the hippies in the social world, cannot stand discipline.

The hippies, in their rebellion against discipline, turn to sex, drugs and flower power. The modern economists, in their rebellion, turn to the hallucinogenics of inflation and funny money.

Both groups justify throwing off discipline in the name of freedom. But what is the freedom they want? Free love, in the case of the hippies; and free money, in the case of the economists.

Not being kin to Marahishi Mahesh Yogi, I won't presume to preach to the hippies of the social world.

But the hippies of the economic world are another thing.

Those of today, the Keynesians, differ from their brothers of another century, the Greenback proponents, only in their degree of sophistication. The Greenbackers were, you might say, primitives who took the direct route—simply printing money. The Keynesians have devised a ritual that takes the the initiate along a devious route before coming in through the back door of the building where the printing presses hum.

The initiate is conditioned gradually. First he is told that deficits are not bad; that a nation must spend more than it takes in when the economy is faltering, in order to spur employment. After a decade or so of this, the initiate hardly realizes that the deficit spending continues whether the economy is faltering or not, with the excuse that employment must be kept high. Deficits by now have become a perpetual thing. They simply are larger in some years than in other years.

And after a while the deficits don't seem so bad, for the debit is monetized. The government issues bonds, the banks buy the bonds, the banks use the bonds as reserves and loan money against them, there is more money in circulation—not cheap greenbacks, mind you, but currency backed by monetized debt—and everyone is happy because he has more dollar bills in his pocket.

How much more money? Well, in 1910 the per capita circulation of money in the United States was $34.07. In 1940, it was $59.40. By 1965, it had grown to $204.14, and last November it was $232.20, or almost seven times what it was 57 years before.

The volume of money he is turning over helps him forget that prices are going up just as fast as wages.

He is like the storied businessman, who was asked by a friend what he charged for his merchandise. The answer was $10. The friend asked what the merchandise cost him, and he replied $10. The friend then asked how he managed to stay in business, and got the reply: "I have a large turnover."

But getting back to our initiate into Keynesian economics.

At first the dollar bills he tucked away in his wallet weren't just paper. Some were silver certificates that signified the Treasury had .77 of an ounce of silver in its vaults for every dollar printed on the bill, and that the holder of the bill could, if he wished, exchange the bill for silver.

And he knew, too, that the Federal Reserve Notes he had were backed 45 per cent by gold. This was reduced to 25 per cent shortly after World War II.

But the bills all looked alike, and our initiate didn't really pay any attention when Congress did away with the silver certificates.

I hasten to add, however, he is conscious of it now, because for the first time in history we have currency that is worth more than face value.

The one dollar silver certificate he has in his pocket actually is worth $1.46 if he redeems it for silver. That should be an object lesson in itself as to the relative merits of paper money and hard money.

In 1965 Congress took another step to wring the metal out of the paper money. In March of that year it eliminated the 25 percent gold reserve requirement against member bank deposits.

What happened?

In the following nine months this country lost $1.6 billion in gold.

Did that teach our man a lesson?

You bet it didn't.

Sometime in the next few weeks, Congress will remove the final 25 per cent gold cover from our currency.

If our initiate asks why, he is told this is being done to defend the dollar. And that sounds like a good enough flag waving, bugle sounding whistle blowing explanation. Every good American wants to defend the dollar from whatever—right?

So he doesn't ask which dollar is being defended—the one he has in his pocket or the one someone has on the other side of the world.

If he stepped out of the ritual march for a moment, he could ask himself whether this wasn't going to be another case of silver certificates—where the silver certificate he hasn't got is worth more than the dollar bill he has got. Is the dollar that someone has in France, which is worth one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold, to be worth more than the dollar bill he has in his pocket, which is just paper?

But the ritual march is going along so fast he hasn't time to step out of line. The high priest at the altar is chanting monotonously—"gold is barbarous, gold is an idol."

It is, of course, idolatry to bow down and worship the golden calf, as the Israelites did before the molten image made by Aaron.

But it is not idolatry—it is ludicrous—to draw a picture of a calf on a piece of paper and then tell the American people "paint me gold."

No one is calling for the worship of a golden idol.

But we must recognize gold for what it is, the discipline that gives substance and integrity to money—whether it be the American dollar, the British pound, the French franc or the German deutschmark.

If gold gives meaning to the American dollar that is held by a Frenchman in Paris, then why in the name of Adam Smith and all the prophets shouldn't it give meaning to the dollar held by an American in Spokane?

Our dollar is in need of defense today for one reason only—dollars have glutted the international markets because we export, in one way or another, more than we import. And this situation is worsened by the domestic inflation that makes our goods more expensive overseas and imports of foreign goods cheaper in terms of our dollar.

Our shortage of gold is a danger signal, it is a measurement of our crisis. It is not the cause of our crisis.

Making more of our gold available to overseas creditors by removing the gold cover from our currency only opens the door to inflation by removing the last currency discipline we have, and thus compounds the very cause of the problem.

The administration suggests no substitute for the discipline that gold provides—in fact, it ignores the situation by submitting a record federal budget for the new fiscal year—but it does suggest a discipline for the ills that are caused by the situation it creates.

It is as if you broke your arm, and your doctor refused to set it or put it in a cast, but suggested instead you move the arm as little as possible to keep the break from getting worse than it is.

The discipline the administration suggests is one of artificially contrived controls—a tax on travel, discouragement of foreign investments, perhaps even import controls. These should be abhorrent to a free society in the richest, most powerful government in history.

We are turning inward at the very time this administration has been encouraging world understanding through trade and travel—building bridges to the east, for example. On one hand we energetically pursue the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, designed to promote freer trade. On the other hand we threaten to impose import controls to protect the dollar.

It is a schizophrenic fantasy.

I think we can ask, with Dr. Jacques Reuff, the French monetary expert: "Is it not awkward to see the country of free enterprise favoring a policy that leads to authoritarian controls?"

The solution to our dollar crisis must come in two steps: First, revaluation of gold—and mind you, I said revaluation of gold, not devaluation of the dollar—to be followed by putting our own economic house in order. This means halting inflation by restoring a balanced budget and correcting the imbalance of payments, not by restricting world trade, but by permitting our industry to be more competitive and through reduction of those government programs that contribute so heavily to the imbalance of payments.

I suggest revaluation of gold rather than devaluation of the dollar, because the dollar already has been devalued, and is being devalued each year, in terms of purchasing power. But the price of gold has remained constant since 1934.

Today's dollar is worth 43 cents in purchasing power in relation to 1947, but we continue to measure the inconstant dollar in terms of a constant price of gold.

Revaluing the price of gold would only recognize a situation that exists.

Again, I would like to quote from Dr. Reuff, in an address he made to a New England conference of bankers in Boston on last October 20. Unfortunately, the talk, a most important one, was largely ignored by the press.

Dr. Reuff said:

"But many people consider that a change in the price of gold would be contrary to the honor and reputation of the United States. I want to pay respect and admiration to this scruple. But there is no kind of gold clause in the main part of the dollar balances. Accepting such a clause, even implicitly, would be a free gift, entirely unjustified, to foreign lenders at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

"Furthermore, the first duty of a debtor is to maintain the possibility of repaying his debt.

"Would it be less offensive to repay with a 'paper gold' that would soon be made of paper only, than to recognize the change in the purchasing power of the dollar resulting from the doubling of all prices since 1934?"

It is not logical, said Dr. Reuff, to ask for greater production of gold and to refuse to pay its price.

Reform will have to come, Reuff said, "the only question is to know whether it will be done before or after the crisis."

If the Treasury's handling of the silver situation is to be a precedent, then we know that revaluation of the price of gold will come after the crisis.

Most of us, I am sure, are familiar with what has happened in the case of silver.

In the last 10 years, the Treasury has lost about 84 per cent of its silver.

In 1958, it held 2.1 billion ounces of the white metal in its vaults. Today, it has less than 325 million ounces.

And still, the Treasury insists it will have enough silver to continue to sell to industry at the rate of two million ounces a week for three or four years.

But let's look at the facts.

Last month 20 million ounces of silver left the Treasury. If that rate continues for the next five months, that means another 100 million ounces will be withdrawn. In addition, by June 24 the Treasury must transfer 165 million ounces of silver to the strategic stockpile. Subtract 265 million ounces from 325 million, and you have 60 million ounces left on June 24.

June 24 is an important date, because after that day the Treasury will no longer redeem silver certificates with silver.

After the date, in other words, the United States repudiates a solemn promise.

All right, on June 24, let us say, the Treasury has 60 million ounces of silver remaining. If it continues to sell two million ounces a week at auction, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Wallace insists it will, that makes 50 million ounces that will be withdrawn from the Treasury in the last six months of this year, leaving 10 million ounces.

But if the Treasury continues to mint 40 per cent silver half dollars, that will take another 15 million ounces in the last six months. Basic arithmetic shows a deficit of 5 million ounces on December 31.

Wallace says the Treasury will be selling silver for three or four more years.

There has to be an explanation for the discrepancy.

You can't monetize a silver deficit, as you can a budgetary deficit, but if you will pardon a pun, in this instance Secretary Wallace does propose to "monetize" the silver deficit.

He intends to melt down money to get the silver the Treasury will need to continue its silver auction program—the money being the silver dimes and quarters.

Wallace says the Treasury now has on hand 210 million ounces of silver in the form of silver dimes and quarters, and expects to have 250 million ounces in this form by June 24.

However, the daily Treasury statements show that the coinage inventory held by the Treasury, which includes pennies and nickles as well as clad and silver dimes and quarters, declined by $83.3 million in the four months October through January, and that the coin inventory on February 1 now is back to where it stood on May 23. This would indicate hoarding of silver coins also is going on outside the Treasury.

However, let's take Wallace's figures at face value.

The old silver coins he intends to melt down were made of an alloy of 90 per cent silver and 10 per cent copper, so the metal obtained by melting them down would be .900 fine silver.

Commercial silver must be .999 fine, and this is the only silver that most industrial users, including all the large ones, can use.

So, if Wallace melts down the coins he has, or will have on June 24, he will have 250 million ounces of .900 silver that no one, except sterling silver manufacturers, can use.

Wallace has not explained whether he intends to re-refine this .900 fine silver, but if he does, then where?

The silver refinery capacity of the free world is 200 million ounces per year, and this capacity is being fully used.

So, Wallace is correct when he says there is no shortage of "ounces" of silver, but there does certainly appear to be a decided shortage of commercially pure silver.

The Treasury, as a matter of fact, is now nearing the end of its supply of .999 fine silver. Much of the silver it has left is .996 fine, and needs further refining.

So, it is the refining capacity that is the key to the silver situation today, and that indicates another silver crisis, for the silver coins that Wallace is squirreling away are useless if there is a lack of refining capacity.

The moment of truth is approaching.

It could be on March 1, when the Coinage Commission holds its next meeting.

The Commission may be forced to decide whether or not to transfer immediately to the strategic stockpile 165 million ounces of .999 fine silver, before further sales from the Treasury deplete that supply of commercially pure metal.

It may have to make a decision as to whether to continue the minting of 40 per cent half dollars.

It may have to make a decision on melting down the silver coins.

We had two moments of truth last year for the Coinage Commission. One came on May 17, when the Treasury was forced to halt the sale of silver at $1.29 an ounce to all but domestic industrial consumers. It insisted then it would continue to peg the price at $1.29, but on July 14 it had to admit this was impossible, and on that date it stopped the open market sale of silver at $1.29 and began auctioning two million ounces a week at a price approximating the world price.

By that time the Treasury had learned one important fact—that you can hold a ceiling price on a commodity only so long as you have an unlimited quantity of it to sell, and are willing to sell it.

The Treasury now is repeating with its gold the same mistake it made with its silver.

It says it will sell its gold at $35 an ounce down to the last ounce in order to hold the price at that level.

In 1966 the Treasury lost $574 million worth of gold by following this policy, in 1967 it lost $1,178,000,000, and so far this year, $100,800,000.

Are we to continue this policy until, as with the case of silver, a crisis point is reached? Are we to have crisis decisions with gold, as we have had with silver?

Let us hope not. Let us hope that when we make the decision to revalue the price of gold, as we must, we do it not when the dollar is under severe attack and a run has developed on our gold, but at a time of our choosing when we can act without worsening the crisis.

I spoke a moment ago of the "moment of truth."

That expression, you know, comes from the bull ring. At the moment of truth, there are two principals—the bull waiting for death, the matador ready to make the final thrust with his sword.

Let us hope we will be able to choose the role we will play when our moment of truth comes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the question of gold loss and debt repayment has been raised by some Members. These are the facts on this subject:

GOLD LOSSES AND DEBT REPAYMENT

REPAYMENT OF WORLD WARS I AND II DEBT

In its effort to halt the loss of gold the administration has given special attention to the potential contribution of debt repayment. Virtually all of the loan agreements and settlements made with foreign countries since the beginning of World War II established fixed amortization schedules which call for regular payments over a period of years. We expect both principal and interest on post-World War II obligations to be paid in accordance with these schedules, and with relatively few exceptions these payments are being made. Receipts from such scheduled debt repayments amounted to more than $800 million in 1966. Only in a few cases has it become impossible for debtor nations to meet scheduled payments, making it necessary to negotiate a rescheduling of the obligation. Some of the loan agreements provide for postponing payments under certain circumstances. Where disputes arise resulting in payment delays, efforts are made to reach agreement in order that payments may be resumed. There have been a few instances, notably in the case of the Republic of China and the U.S.S.R., where it has not yet been possible to reach agreement involving comprehensive settlement of World War II lend-lease and related accounts. The U.S.S.R. is making payments on lend-lease items which were in production or storage in the United States before V–J Day.

The United States has encouraged the governments of nations which are in a strong financial position to make payments in advance of the scheduled due dates and since 1959 advance repayments of nearly $3 billion have been collected. Several countries, among them Germany, Italy, and Sweden have now prepaid all or nearly all of their World War II and postwar debt obligations to the United States.

The situation is different with respect to World War I debts. Most governments fulfilled their commitments under their World War I debt agreements until the depression. Debtor governments stopped making payments in 1932, following the expiration of the 1-year moratorium on debts owed to the United States negotiated by President Hoover in an effort to mitigate the effect of these debt obligations on Europe's economic health. Although some countries made token payments until the beginning of World War II, Finland is the only country which is presently meeting its obligations in full.

While the countries which have large World War I obligations to the United States have never denied the juridical validity of their debts, there is a view widely accepted among them that the payment of these debts should be dependent on reparation payments by Germany. Resolution of the problem of governmental claims against Germany arising out of World War I was deferred "until a final general settlement of this matter" by the London agreement of 1953, to which the United States is a party.

The Government of the United States has never recognized that there was any connection between the World War I obligations of those countries and their reparations claims on Germany. While the London agreement would not prevent the United States from raising, on a bilateral basis, the question of payment of any of the debtor countries' World War I obligations—except in the case of Germany—it must be recognized that any effort on the part of the United States to collect these obligations would undoubtedly raise the problem of German World War I reparations. From the practical viewpoint, therefore, there does not seem to be any possibility of reaching an agreement on repayment in the absence of an overall settlement of the World War I reparations problem, with its wide-ranging political ramifications.

FRENCH DEBT

The French hold to the generally prevailing view with regard to their debts to the United States. They not only have been servicing debts incurred after World War II regularly but have paid more than $880 million in advance of the due date. As of June 30, 1967, France's obligations to the United States—excluding World War I debts—were roughly $300 million.

The World War I indebtedness of the Government of France due and unpaid as of June 30, 1967, was $5,077 million, including $2,091 million of the principal sum and $2,986 million on interest arrearages. Unmatured principal was $1,773 million. No payments have been made since 1931. The total obligation which might be said to have been outstanding on June 30, 1967, including both matured and unmatured principal and interest arrearages to that date, was $6,850 million.

The French Government has not contested the validity of its debt to the United States. The French have instead asserted that there is a direct connection between French payment of this debt and reparation payments by Germany to France. The Chamber of Deputies ratified the 1926 agreement funding the World War I debt with the reservation that the debt to the United States was to be paid "exclusively by the sums that Germany shall pay France." The Chamber of Deputies resolution at the end of 1932 declared that payments to the United States were deferred until the United States should agree to enter a conference for the purpose of adjusting all international obligations and of putting an end to all international transfers for which there was no compensating transaction.

U.S. GOLD POLICY

The established policy of the United States is to buy and sell gold to foreign governments and monetary authorities for legitimate monetary purposes at the fixed price of $35 per ounce. This policy provides the foundation for the international position of the dollar and the maintenance of its value in world markets. The stability of the dollar and its convertibility into gold at the fixed price has also resulted in its widespread use as a world trading currency and as the principal currency held along with gold in reserves of other countries. Any restriction on the convertibility of the dollar for monetary purposes or change in its value in terms of gold would create serious difficulties in world financial and exchange markets and consequently undermine the stability of the entire world monetary system.

If the United States placed conditions on its willingness to sell gold to a foreign monetary authority, however merited the condition might seem in an individual instance, the result would be to make the dollar only a partially convertible currency. This would inevitably shake confidence in its continued convertibility for other purposes at a fixed price, and it would no longer be considered, by the bulk of the world, to be "as good as gold." Thus the decision to convert dollars into gold has to remain that of the monetary authority concerned, each of which should be fully aware of the responsibility it shares in maintaining an effective and stable international payments system within the framework of international monetary cooperation.

The accumulation of dollar balances by foreigners and thus their ability to buy gold is a consequence of our balance-of-payments deficits. The best way to stop gold losses by the United States is, therefore, to have both deficit and surplus countries get back into balance-of-payments equilibrium. This is the course of action which the United States is pursuing, both in formulating its own policies and in the framework of international cooperation. President Johnson in his New Year's Day Message to the Nation on the balance of payments, made the position clear. He said:

> The time has come for decisive action designed to bring our balance of payments to—or close to—equilibrium in the year ahead.
>
> The need for action is a national and international responsibility of the highest priority.

His message outlined a comprehensive program, beginning with enactment of the anti-inflation tax proposals now pending before Congress, for the achievement of this objective.

Mr. Chairman, the President's message on balance of payments, delivered on January 1 of this year, should be read by all Members because it clearly points out that this problem is being given most serious consideration by the administration. The President's message follows:

MESSAGE TO THE NATION ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

I want to discuss with the American people a subject of vital concern to the economic health and well-being of this Nation and the Free World.

It is our international balance of payments position.

The strength of our dollar depends on the strength of that position.

The soundness of the Free World monetary system, which rests largely on the dollar, also depends on the strength of that position.

To the average citizen, the balance of payments, and the strength of the dollar and of the international monetary system, are meaningless phrases. They seem to have little relevance to our daily lives. Yet their consequences touch us all—consumer and captain of industry, worker, farmer, and financier.

More than ever before, the economy of each nation is today deeply intertwined with that of every other. A vast network of world trade and financial transactions ties us all together. The prosperity of every economy rests on that of every other.

More than ever before, this is one world—in economic affairs as in every other way.

Your job, the prosperity of your farm or business, depends directly or indirectly on what happens in Europe, Asia, Latin America, or Africa.

The health of the international economic system rests on a sound international money in the same way as the health of our domestic economy rests on a sound domestic money. Today, our domestic money—the U.S. dollar—is also the money most used in international transactions. That money can be sound at home—as it surely is—yet can be in trouble abroad—as it now threatens to become.

In the final analysis its strength abroad depends on our earning abroad about as many dollars as we send abroad.

U.S. dollars flow from these shores for many reasons—to pay for imports and travel, to finance loans and investments and to maintain our lines of defense around the world.

When that outflow is greater than our earnings and credits from foreign nations, a deficit results in our international accounts.

For 17 of the last 18 years we have had such deficits. For a time those deficits were needed to help the world recover from the ravages of World War II. They could be tolerated by the United States and welcomed by the rest of the world. They distributed more equitably the world's monetary gold reserves and supplemented them with dollars.

Once recovery was assured, however, large deficits were no longer needed and indeed began to threaten the strength of the dollar. Since 1961 your government has worked to reduce that deficit.

By the middle of the decade, we could see signs of success. Our annual deficit had been reduced two-thirds—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $1.3 billion in 1965.

In 1966, because of our increased responsibility to arm and supply our men in Southeast Asia, progress was interrupted, with the deficit remaining at the same level as 1965—about $1.3 billion.

In 1967, progress was reversed for a number of reasons:

Our costs for Vietnam increased further.

Private loans and investments abroad increased.

Our trade surplus, although larger than 1966, did not rise as much as we had expected.

Americans spent more on travel abroad.

Added to these factors was the uncertainty and unrest surrounding the devaluation of the British pound. This event strained the international monetary system. It sharply increased our balance of payments deficit and our gold sales in the last quarter of 1967.

THE PROBLEM

Preliminary reports indicate that these conditions may result in a 1967 balance of payments deficit in the area of $3.5 to $4 billion—the highest since 1960. Although some factors affecting our deficit will be more favorable in 1968, my advisors and I are convinced that we must act to bring about a decisive improvement.

We cannot tolerate a deficit that could threaten the stability of the international monetary system—of which the U.S. dollar is the bulwark.

We cannot tolerate a deficit that could endanger the strength of the entire Free World economy, and thereby threaten our unprecedented prosperity at home.

A TIME FOR ACTION

The time has now come for decisive action designed to bring our balance of payments to—or close to—equilibrium in the year ahead.

The need for action is a national and international responsibility of the highest priority.

I am proposing a program which will meet this critical need, and at the same time satisfy four essential conditions:

Sustain the growth, stength and prosperity of our own economy.

Allow us to continue to meet our international responsibilities in defense of freedom, in promoting world trade, and in encouraging economic growth in the developing countries.

Engage the cooperation of other free nations, whose stake in a sound international monetary system is no less compelling than our own.

Recognize the special obligation of those nations with balance of payments surpluses, to bring their payments into equilibrium.

THE FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

The first line of defense of the dollar is the strength of the American economy.

No business before the returning Congress will be more urgent than this: To enact the anti-inflation tax which I have sought for almost a year. Coupled with our expenditure controls and appropriate monetary policy, this will help to stem the inflationary pressures which now threaten our economic prosperity and our trade surplus.

No challenge before business and labor is more urgent than this: To exercise the utmost responsibility in their wage-price decisions, which affect so directly our competitive position at home and in world markets.

I have directed the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to work with leaders of business and labor to make more effective our voluntary program of wage-price restraint.

I have also instructed the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor to work with unions and companies to prevent our exports from being reduced or our imports increased by crippling work stoppages in the year ahead.

A sure way to instill confidence in our dollar—both here and abroad—is through these actions.

THE NEW PROGRAM

But we must go beyond this, and take action to deal directly with the balance of payments deficit.

Some of the elements in the program I propose will have a temporary but immediate effect. Others will be of longer range.

All are necessary to assure confidence in the American dollar.

1. Direct investment

Over the past three years, American business has cooperated with the government in a voluntary program to moderate the flow of U.S. dollars into foreign investments. Business leaders who have participated so wholeheartedly deserve the appreciation of their country.

But the savings now required in foreign investment outlays are clearly beyond the reach of any voluntary program. This is the unanimous view of all my economic and financial advisers and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

To reduce our balance of payments deficit by at least $1 billion in 1968 from the estimated 1967 level, I am invoking my authority under the Banking Laws to establish a mandatory program that will restrain direct investment abroad.

This program will be effective immediately. It will insure success and guarantee fairness among American business firms with overseas investments.

The program will be administered by the Department of Commerce, and will operate as follows:

As in the voluntary program, over-all and individual company targets will be set. Authorizations to exceed these targets will be issued only in exceptional circumstances.

New direct investment outflows to countries in continental western Europe and other developed nations not heavily dependent on our capital will be stopped in 1968. Problems arising from work already in process or commitments under binding contracts will receive special consideration.

New net investments in other developed countries will be limited to 110% of the 1965–66 average.

New net investments in the developing countries will be limited to 11% of the 1965–66 average.

This program also requires businesses to continue to bring back foreign earnings to the United States in line with their own 1964–66 practices.

In addition, I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to explore with the Chairmen of the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee legislative proposals to induce or encourage the repatriation of accumulated earnings by U.S.-owned foreign businesses.

2. Lending by financial institutions

To reduce the balance of payments deficit by at least another $500 million, I have requested and authorized the Federal Reserve Board to tighten its program restraining foreign lending by banks and other financial institutions.

Chairman Martin has assured me that this reduction can be achieved; without harming the financing of our exports; primarily out of credits to developed countries without jeopardizing the availability of funds to the rest of the world.

Chairman Martin believes that this objective can be met through continued cooperation by the financial community. At the request of the Chairman, however, I have given the Federal Reserve Board standby authority to invoke mandatory controls, should such controls become desirable or necessary.

3. Travel abroad

Our travel deficit this year will exceed $2 billion. To reduce this deficit by $500 million:

I am asking the American people to defer for the next two years all nonessential travel outside the Western Hemisphere.

I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to explore with the appropriate Congressional committees legislation to help achieve this objective.

4. Government expenditures overseas

We cannot forego our essential commitments abroad, on which America's security and survival depend.

Nevertheless, we must take every step to reduce their impact on our balance of payments without endangering our security.

Recently, we have reached important agreements with some of our NATO partners to lessen the balance of payments cost of deploying American forces on the Continent—troops necessarily stationed there for the common defense of all.

Over the past three years, a stringent program has saved billions of dollars in foreign exchange.

I am convinced that much more can be done. I believe we should set as our target avoiding a drain of another $500 million on our balance of payments.

To this end, I am taking three steps.

First, I have directed the Secretary of State to initiate prompt negotiations with our NATO allies to minimize the foreign exchange costs of keeping our troops in Europe. Our allies can help in a number of ways, including:

The purchase in the U.S. of more of their defense needs.

Investments in long-term United States securities.

I have also directed the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense to find similar ways of dealing with this problem in other parts of the world.

Second, I have instructed the Director of the Budget to find ways of reducing the numbers of American civilians working overseas.

Third, I have instructed the Secretary of Defense to find ways to reduce further the foreign exchange impact of personal spending by U.S. forces and their dependents in Europe.

LONG-TERM MEASURES

5. Export increases

American exports provide an important source of earnings for our businessmen and jobs for our workers.

They are the cornerstone of our balance of payments position.

Last year we sold abroad $30 billion worth of American goods.

What we now need is a long-range systematic program to stimulate the flow of the products of our factories and farms into overseas markets.

We must begin now.

Some of the steps require legislation:

I shall ask the Congress to support an intensified five year, $200 million Commerce Department program to promote the sale of American goods overseas.

I shall also ask the Congress to earmark $500 million of the Export-Import Bank authorization to:

Provide better export insurance.

Expand guarantees for export financing.

Broaden the scope of Government financing of our exports.

Other measures require no legislation.

I have today directed the Secretary of Commerce to begin a Joint Export Association program. Through these Associations, we will provide direct financial support to American corporations joining together to sell abroad.

And finally, the Export-Import Bank—through a more liberal rediscount system—will encourage banks across the Nation to help firms increase their exports.

6. Nontariff barriers

In the Kennedy Round, we climaxed three decades of intensive effort to achieve the greatest reduction in tariff barriers in all the history of trade negotiations. Trade liberalization remains the basic policy of the United States.

We must now look beyond the great success of the Kennedy Round to the problems of nontariff barriers that pose a continued threat to the growth of world trade and to our competitive position.

American commerce is at a disadvantage because of the tax systems of some of our trading partners. Some nations give across-the-board tax rebates on exports which leave their ports and impose special border tax charges on our goods entering their country.

International rules govern these special taxes under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. These rules must be adjusted to expand international trade further.

In keeping with the principles of cooperation and consultation on common problems, I have initiated discussions at a high level with our friends abroad on these critical matters—particularly those nations with balance of payments surpluses.

These discussions will examine proposals for prompt cooperative action among all parties to minimize the disadvantages to our trade which arise from differences among national tax systems.

We are also preparing legislative measures in this area whose scope and nature will depend upon the outcome of these consultations.

Through these means we are determined to achieve a substantial improvement in our trade surplus over the coming years. In the year immediately ahead, we expect to realize an improvement of $500 million.

7. Foreign investment and travel in the United States

We can encourage the flow of foreign funds to our shores in two other ways:

First, by an intensified program to attract greater foreign investment in U.S. Corporate securities, carrying out the principles of the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966.

Second, by a program to attract more visitors to this land. A Special Task Force headed by Robert McKinney of Santa Fe, New Mexico, is already at work on measures to accomplish this. I have directed the Task Force to report within 45 days on the immediate measures that can be taken, and to make its long-term recommendations within 90 days.

MEETING THE WORLD'S RESERVE NEEDS

Our movement toward balance will curb the flow of dollars into international reserves. It will therefore be vital to speed up plans for the creation of new reserves—the Special Drawing Rights—in the International Monetary Fund. These new reserves will be a welcome companion to gold and dollars, and will strengthen the gold exchange standard. The dollar will remain convertible into gold at $35 an ounce, and our full gold stock will back that commitment.

A TIME FOR RESPONSIBILITY

The program I have outlined is a program of action.

It is a program which will preserve confidence in the dollar, both at home and abroad.

The U.S. dollar has wrought the greatest economic miracles of modern times.

It stimulated the resurgence of a war-ruined Europe.

It has helped to bring new strength and life to the developing world.

It has underwritten unprecedented prosperity for the American people, who are now in the 83d month of sustained economic growth.

A strong dollar protects and preserves the prosperity of businessman and banker, worker and farmer—here and overseas.

The action program I have outlined in this message will keep the dollar strong. It will fulfill our responsibilities to the American people and to the Free World.

I appeal to all of our citizens to join me in this very necessary and laudable effort to preserve our country's financial strength.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support for H.R. 14743, a bill that would free almost $11 billion in gold now needlessly gathering dust as a reserve against Federal Reserve notes and minor paper currencies.

This bill, contrary to the claims of its critics, would put new strength into the U.S. dollar both at home and abroad. The past 30 years have provided copius and convincing evidence that the soundness of the dollar hinges on the soundness of the economy—not on legal reserve requirements.

Aimed at removing the 25-percent statutory gold cover established in 1945, H.R. 14743 is an integral part of the congressional program to clear away obstacles holding back productive enterprise and employment.

The bill would permit the American public to get the paper currency it needs without forcing the Government into using subterfuges such as new issues of the national bank notes in the process of retirement since 1935.

The bill, moreover, would breathe new life into the international monetary system by making it clear that the United States intends to stand behind its commitment to maintaining the price of gold at $35 an ounce. The convertibility of the dollar into gold at a fixed price—a keystone of the international monetary system—depends upon this bill to free our gold reserves.

H.R. 14743 is of critical significance within the United States as well as beyond its borders. The American public, of course, must have an ample supply of currency to make payments in the domestic marketplace.

The Congress cannot expect to put the Nation's consumers and businessmen on guard against excessive costs of credit, as it did in the recent Consumer Credit Protection Act, and then in effect require everyone to use credit on all occasions because currency is not available.

More fundamental than the necessity of having ample paper currency for day-to-day use is the need for productive enterprise and employment. Delay or refusal to pass this bill is proposed by its opponents because they want to see a dampening of inflationary spending. But failure to pass this bill would not result in mere removal of some excessive spending—it would set up a roadblock to economic growth which would become serious within a year and possibly disastrous very shortly thereafter.

To avoid issuing currency in excess of the amount permitted by the statutory gold reserve for a period of more than the next year or two, the rate of growth of employment and output would have to be reduced to a fraction of its present rate. The currency stock has increased at annual rates of 5 to 6 percent while gross national product has increased at rates of 6 to 8½ percent in the last 7 years. Even if gross national product were reduced to a growth rate of 3 or 4 percent, at which excess capacity of industry and unemployment would soon mount to intolerable levels, the need for currency probably would reach the limit of the gold reserve within about 4 years.

If the United States tried to retain the 25-percent statutory gold reserve and still find employment for its growing population and production to meet their expanding needs, it would have to obtain at least half a billion dollars more gold each year. That is, it would have to reverse the gold outflow and obtain at least one-third of the world's new gold production each year and put it in a vault to lie idle. That idle reserve would have to amount to at least one-quarter of the value of the Federal Reserve paper currency—$1, $5, $10 and $20 bills, and so forth, required by the public for daily transactions. This surely is a strange fate for a prized and useful metal. And it would be hard to accomplish. The United States, year after year, would have to add 30 or 40 million ounces to its gold reserve, increasing the amount each year as the Nation's population and trade increase. Compare that with what has happened to the gold reserves of all other central banks and governments in the last 2 years—not an ounce of net additions.

Failure to pass the present bill would require the United States to add to its gold stock every year. In any year when the South African gold mine production, the demands of other nations for monetary gold, and the demands of industry for gold, did not permit the United States to add a half billion dollars of new gold—or in any year when foreign nations suffered a recession and reduced their purchases of commodities from the United States purchases in those markets—then the monetary authorities of the United States would be compelled to induce a recession here in the United States. It would be a formidable task to convince several million young people and other unemployed that they cannot have jobs because the Congress likes to restrict the currency supply according to a 25-percent gold ratio.

Removal of the gold cover requirement puts the responsibility for monetary policy right where it has been for many decades—with the Federal Reserve authorities. The gold reserve requirement, according to Chairman Martin, has not guided their policy decisions in the past; and in most of the past, it hardly could have been a useful guide when the actual ratio of gold to currency has been 50 to 90 percent. It could become a policy guide now, and would point monetary policy in one direction—toward recession and depression.

The gold cover requirement did not start as a guide to monetary policy. It first became significant after a 1917 amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, which permitted gold to be counted as part of the collateral required to be held against Federal Reserve notes. Before that amendment, the banks had difficulty in finding acceptable collateral to offer in order to obtain notes from the Bureau of Engraving. They wanted paper currency because the public preferred it to gold. A way to get enough hand-to-hand currency was provided when the Federal Reserve banks were authorized to obtain notes by offering gold as collateral. Subsequently, gold was put beyond the reach of the public by legislation and administration actions in 1933 and 1934, and gold reserves were multiplied in the following decade and a half.

Gold then became, in practice, only a means to settle temporary differences between international payments and receipts of the United States and of other nations. The present bill to remove the requirement that most or all of the Nation's gold be hidden away in vaults in the proportion of $1 in gold for each $4 or less of Federal Reserve notes will make the whole gold stock by law what it is in fact, a means of redeeming excess dollars held abroad and a stock which is built when an excess of other currencies is paid to the United States.

This change in the statutory role of gold will strengthen international trade and production. Freeing the $12 billion gold stock from useless encumbrances will remove a factor which encourages speculation—that the United States will not redeem dollars but will raise the price of gold as its supply dwindles. With this added assurance by the Congress that the price of gold will not be raised, speculators will be discouraged from the hoarding which has drained all nations' gold reserves.

The gold cover bill is part of a whole range of measures for achieving better living standards throughout the world. Some of the other legislation will impose taxes to balance domestic and international receipts and expenditures. Some of it will provide new reserve assets for international payments.

The whole program to strengthen the dollar and other nations' means of payment has the approval and the cooperation of European governments. By stimulating their own economic systems and supporting relatively easy money policies as well as through participation in long-run improvements of the payments system, they will help to achieve the sort of balance of payments which is required for continuing expansion of trade, investment, production, employment, and living standards.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to my colleagues as they have discussed the provisions of H.R. 14743. This bill would eliminate the present requirement that each Federal Reserve bank maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. The bill would also eliminate the $156 million gold reserve for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The proponents tell us that the removal of this gold cover is recommended by them in order to make it clear that the United States intends to continue its international financial commitments.

I recognize that recurring deficits in our annual balance-of-payments picture for the past several years have created a situation which disturbs the international financial experts. This situation is not new, however, and could have been avoided by the exercise of sound judgment by our monetary experts during the past 20 years. They have not exercised such sound judgment and now ask that a step be taken which will remove all discipline from the handling of our international trade situation in the future.

It is interesting to note the testimony of Mr. Eugene Stewart, a spokesman for the Trade Relations Council of the United States when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee. He pointed out that the most effective way to meet the current situation and recapture our competitive position in the world market was to decrease imports of certain types of commodities which contributed to the balance-of-payments deficits in recent years.

He stated:

> Foremost among these other factors is the rapid worsening of the U.S. balance of trade in the products of a large number of manufacturing industries, including food products; textiles; apparel; wood products; leather products; primary metals; metal manufactures; machinery; electronics; stone, clay, and glass products; and miscellaneous manufactures.

He further pointed out that a study by his organization indicated that in 122 U.S. manufacturing industries there was experienced a net foreign trade deficit in 1966 of $7.5 billion and that this was a worsening by 153 percent of the annual average deficit of $3 billion experienced in the foreign trade of these industries during the base period 1958–60.

It seems clear that the most effective and instant remedy available to meet the problem which this legislation seeks to meet is to impose import quotas based upon some reasonable formula so as to avoid disrupting a normal international trade pattern.

I realize that we must have foreign trade. It is my conviction, however, that there should be some equity on the side of our Nation as we trade with other nations of the world. Such equity has been grossly lacking in recent years.

As I cast my vote in opposition to the bill now before us I would not have my vote construed by anyone as a failure to recognize that the United States does have a serious international monetary problem. The remedy proposed by this legislation will not, in my opinion, do the job which it is designed to do.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, today we have been called upon to consider H.R. 14743, a bill to eliminate the last remaining gold reserve requirements for U.S. currency.

I object to this proposal which, if enacted, would eliminate the last remaining link between gold and our domestic currency. With the passage of this legislation the domestic dollar would be completely reduced to fiat currency. Oddly enough, however, a U.S. dollar held by foreigners would still be convertible into gold and foreign institutions would be completely free to present dollar claims that far exceed our entire gold reserve. These paper dollar claims would be convertible into gold at the bargain price of $35 an ounce.

If the United States is looking for a method to quickly eliminate our already fast dwindling reserve of gold I know of no other proposal that would accelerate the outflow of gold as would approval of this legislation.

It is odd how history has a way of repeating itself. It was just 3 years ago this month that this body passed legislation removing the 25-percent gold requirement on Federal Reserve deposits. At that time, as I recall, we were advised that we faced an emergency, and that the elimination of the gold reserve on deposits was necessary. We were further assured that our balance-of-payments situation would be brought into line, that further outflow of gold could be eliminated and that confidence in the dollar would be restored. Now 3 short years later we are asked to completely remove our last restraint upon the unlimited printing of paper money. We are asked to remove the remaining 25-percent gold requirement upon Federal Reserve notes. This is nothing more than legislation from emergency to emergency. In the meantime, since 1965, our balance-of-payments situation has worsened, gold has continued to flow out of the United States at an increasing rate, and now we are again facing another emergency. We are not going to solve anything by passage of this legislation. We might buy some time in which to put our fiscal house in order but unless that time is used more profitably than the last 3 years it will be of little use to us.

I think there is an unfortunate parallel between the silver situation of the past few years and the gold situation of today. Repeatedly, we were assured by the Treasury that our silver supply was adequate to last for many years and that there could not be a silver crisis. Without going into the well-known history of silver we know that there was a silver crisis and we know that Treasury could not have been more incorrect in its assessment of the situation. The price of silver shot up from $1.29 an ounce to over $2 and is now selling at about $1.80 per ounce. If the United States loses control of its fast dwindling gold reserve, I see nothing to prevent the price of gold from increasing as did silver. This would be unfortunate because nations then holding U.S. gold would stand to reap the profit.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has held hearing after hearing concerning means to increase our domestic gold supply. The committee well recognizes that any measure it might recommend, be it a subsidy on domestic gold production, or any other proposal, would not correct the balance-of-payments situation. In fact the United States lost more gold in 1967, something over 1 billion, than could be produced domestically in many years. However, although the Treasury Department professes great concern over our dwindling gold reserves, it unalterably opposes any production subsidy to increase domestic gold production. At the present time the United States consumes about four times as much gold as it produces. About 6.6 million ounces is consumed and we produce only 1.4 million ounces. An increase in domestic production to the point where we could supply our own needs would, in my opinion, be a major step forward.

The concept, and the often repeated statements of the Treasury, that our dollar is as good as gold just does not square with Treasury actions. Confidence in the stability of the dollar has been weakened by the continuing and increasing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. This loss of confidence will not be restored by this proposal. At most H.R. 14743 may buy a little more time for us to put our fiscal affairs in order. I personally feel that rather than strengthening confidence in the dollar, removal of the gold cover may well be regarded in foreign circles as an admission of the dollar's weakness. These people are not so uninformed as not to realize this is only a temporary stop-gap measure. They may well be looking ahead 4 to 5 years and could be worried over whether claimants at the end of the line will be able to receive gold for the dollars held at that time.

I think we should ask ourselves these questions: To what point are we willing to permit our gold stocks to fall without imposing an embargo? To what low level can our gold reserve fall before it will endanger the security of our country in the event of war? Unfortunately, in time of war many nations may not agree with the Treasury Department's statement that the dollar is as good as gold. I am inclined to believe foreign nations would say you keep the dollars and we will take the gold.

I would like to point out the relationship between our gold reserves and our liabilities. In 1956 our gold reserves were $22.085 billion; our liabilities—foreign holdings, both official and private—were $14.38 billion. As of the end of last year our gold reserves were only $12 billion, but our liabilities had soared to over $31 billion. Thus, in only 11 years the United States moved from a position in which gold reserves exceeded liabilities by $7.7 billion to one where liabilities exceed reserves by $19 billion.

It is perfectly obvious that even with the enactment of H.R. 14743, and putting of our entire gold stock behind the dollar, liabilities far exceed our reserves. There just is not enough gold available to cover our continually increasing balance-of-payments problem.

I think it is time this body looked at the basic cause of our troubles and stopped enacting stop gap measures that only contribute to and encourage a continuation of our unfavorable balance-of-payments problem.

H.R. 14743 ignores the causes of our troubles. It can do nothing more than postpone the day of reckoning. For this reason I cannot support H.R. 14743.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14743

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)) is amended by striking both provisos, and by striking the last sentence, in such subsection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask that the Clerk read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if we are going on with this bill, I am going to make a point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14743) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 14743.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

A BRITISH VIEW ON THE "WHYS" OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to addres sthe House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence and the U.S. News & World Report are widely read and distinguished in expect and appreciate that there would their fields of journalism. Their views are special ones and, I think, sometimes narrow; but total concurrence, I am sure, is not their objective; and they would be those who would not agree with many of their stated positions, especially on domestic matters. This does not detract from their ability to say what needs to be said and to say it with a directness and clarity that is in the national interest, and for the common good.

The London Daily Mail article of February 1, 1968, by Bernard Levin, reprinted in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report in the space ordinarily utilized by Mr. Lawrence is in point. It is a clear statement of the "whys" of the Vietnam fighting; and, coming from a foreign source, it carries the objectivity we sometimes lose in our coverage here at home. Mr. Levin's article should be of interest to this House and to Americans everywhere; and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, place it at this point in the RECORD:

MAKE NO MISTAKE, AMERICA IS FIGHTING FOR US

(By Bernard Levin)

I spent yesterday evening at the opera (Wagner, of course). You, I dare say, spent it helping your children with their homework, or watching television, or learning the piano, or reading a book.

A lot of Americans and South Vietnamese, however, spent it dying. Strange to relate (and I imagine that many of them would find it as strange as anyone), they spent it dying so that you can go on watching television, learning the piano, reading books and helping the children with their homework and so that I can go on listening to Wagner.

I don't know about you, but I am grateful and will now say why. A battle was launched in Vietnam on Tuesday, in which bands of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong swept through South Vietnamese towns, killing and pillaging, while others launched a major offensive against the American base at Khe Sanh.

It is not, I believe, too fanciful to describe the battle as potentially one of the major turning-points of civilisation, and to think of General Westmoreland and his men in the way that, with the perspective of history to aid us, we think of Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae, John Sobieski facing the Turks at the gates of Vienna, or Lord Dowding and Fighter Command in the Battle of Britain. For each of those battles changed the face of the world for the better; or rather, prevented others from changing it for the worse.

And so it may be at this moment in Vietnam. The war there is confused and horrible; its aims blurred, its methods savage, its cost in innocent blood unaccountable.

But if it is lost, if the Americans finally get tired of doing the world's work for nothing but the world's abuse, if South Vietnam is left to its fate, then what will follow is not merely the piecemeal engulfing of the rest of South-East Asia. What will follow, as surely as Austria followed the Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia followed Austria, and Poland followed Czechoslovakia, and six years of world war followed Poland, is a nuclear confrontation on a global scale between the forces at present engaged in one tiny corner of the globe.

And that, in the end, is why my Wagner and your children are at stake this day in "a far-off country of which we know nothing." The Americans are not fighting the war there so that Saigon racketeers can grow fat on black market profits; indeed, they are only secondarily fighting it so that Saigon may stay free long enough for a society to grow up there that will be strong enough to dispense with the racketeers.

They are not even there because if they leave they will one day be digging gun emplacements in California, as the Australians will be digging them round Darwin.

They are there because they know that, where aggression is concerned, the appetite doth grow by what it feeds on; and because they therefore know that, however great the price of the war in Vietnam, it is still less than would be the price of the war we will all one day have to fight elsewhere if it is lost.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are not alone in knowing this. The Australians and New Zealanders know it; the Thailanders know it; the South Koreans know it; the Filipinos know it. But in this country, it seems, we do not know it.

Well, it is time we did. And the battle now going on in Vietnam is as good a time to find out as we shall ever have. On this battle, the Communist forces have staked a great deal; for some time now they have been promising their increasingly disillusioned troops that one last push will see victory—if not military victory, then "victory-by-coalition."

The Communist strategy in Vietnam is to inflict such a major reverse on the Americans and South Vietnamese that they will be desperate to make peace even at the price of an agreement that gives the Communists a share in the Government of South Vietnam, with the full take-over following a few months later.

I do not think that the American resolve will crack. But a word of thanks and admiration from Britain may help to show America that her resolve is recognized for what it is—a resolve to hold the front for civilisation, by convincing those who would destroy it that they are not going to succeed in doing so.

I would prefer our thanks to come from our Government. Unfortunately, it won't. Nor will it even come from our Opposition. So it has to come from us—from those of us who recognize the connection between what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam and what we like to do with our evenings in Britain.

We are not, I believe, all that few. But few or many, let me now say on behalf of us all to the Americans and South Vietnamese and their allies, even now fighting and dying in Vietnam:

"Our words may be useless, but they are all we have to offer. We understand why you are there, and know that your cause is ours too. And we thank you."

THE 31ST INFANTRY DIVISION PASSES INTO HISTORY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the 31st Infantry Division, standard of southern fighting men since 1917, passed into history last February 15. Serving as the National Guard Infantry division for Alabama and Mississippi since 1946, its units have been reorganized into units of the 30th Armored Division with headquarters in Nashville, Tenn.

The Dixie Division has a great and proud tradition. Jefferson Davis, a former U.S. Senator and President of the Confederate States, was commander of the 155th Infantry Regiment when it fought at Buena Vista and earned its motto born in the heat of battle: "Stand fast, Mississippi." Until last Thursday, this unit was part of the Dixie Division.

Mr. Speaker, the 31st Dixie Division was first commissioned in Georgia in 1917, the year the United States entered World War I, and saw action in Europe the following year. During World War II, it served with distinction, having fought under Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Philippines and the Pacific Theater.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a close personal attachment to the Dixie division because I had the honor of serving with the division as a National Guardsman and on active duty when several of its units were activated during the Korean war.

Since World War II the division has been under the capable leadership of three distinguished Mississippians who served at different times as commanding general: Lt. Gen. A. G. Paxton, Maj. Gen. Claude F. Clayton, and Brig. Gen. Victor L. McDearman.

As this proud division leaves the ranks, I would also like to pay tribute to the thousands of men from Alabama and Mississippi who have served under its crest and have built its reputation. The esprit de corps of a military unit like this one is directly attributable to the spirit and courage and determination of the individual soldier. It is the individual and collective pride of accomplishment of these men that has earned the 31st Dixie Division a reputation second to none in time of war and in peace.

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Reserve Board, as I understand it, has the authority to waive the 25-percent-gold-reserve requirement if the country's gold losses should continue to the point that it was impossible to comply with the 25-percent-statutory-reserve requirement.

So, to me, the bill to eliminate the reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, is simply an open invitation to foreign bankers who hold American dollars to come and trade in their U.S. dollars for gold.

Today, I keep thinking of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which the House passed to give President Johnson the authority to resist Communist attacks. At least that is what most of us thought. We did not know it would authorize bombing North Vietnam and the buildup of American forces to over half a million men.

I am fearful we might precipitate something today we do not know about. In other words, we are freeing our last supply of gold—$12 billion of gold.

Later on, when it may have dwindled to nothing, the people will say, "Why did you free it?"

Our job today is not to make our gold available. Our job is to make our dollars more attractive. That is the point. Eliminating the gold reserve does not curb inflation. We should be curbing inflation and protecting the buying power of the dollar.

The illness of the Nation's financial condition needs a major operation. It needs a balanced budget and an end to deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to say to foreign bankers, "Come and get our gold; all we have is yours if you want it?"

No. What the foreign bankers want to hear is that America will protect the value of her dollar and do it by sacrifice and restraint by the Government and the people of America. Let us pass some legislation to provide for austerity.

I intend to vote against H.R. 14743. If the gold drain goes on, the Federal Reserve Board already can waive the 25-percent reserve requirement. Meanwhile, Congress should correct the source of the trouble.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM QUESTIONED

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, millions of our older citizens now depend entirely on social security payments to maintain themselves in retirement. Almost every American who is now working is paying into the social security fund in the expectation that he is building retirement security for his later years. It is our sacred duty to protect these funds and to insure those who are taxed to maintain the fund that the money to pay their retirement will be there when it is needed.

In recent years increased demands are constantly being made on the social security fund. There are many who question the soundness of the system, and administration spokesmen have not encouraged faith in social security when, in order to force Congress to pass the appropriations it demands, have made statements to the effect that social security payments will have to be suspended unless certain bills are passed.

To point up the concern of people regarding social security I would like to call attention to the following article, "Security on Faith" which appeared in the AOI News Digest, a publication of Associated Oregon Industries, in the January issue. I think the questions raised by this article deserve serious study by Congress if we expect the people to continue their faith in the social security program.

The article follows:

SECURITY ON FAITH

Just one year ago, Treasury Secretary Fowler warned the Congress that if the national debt limit was not increased, the government would not be able to cover more than half the March social security checks. For this and other reasons, the debt limit was raised. Then, at the end of 1967, Congress approved the largest benefit hikes in the history of the 33-year-old social security program.

While there is much to be said for helping aged and infirm citizens, it should be pointed out that we have no social security kitty, no reserves. As Secretary Fowler's warning clearly shows, there is no insurance fund—there is an obligation on taxpayers to be met out of annual revenues.

Most people now under social security and those paying taxes to support the program, according to the Portland-published *Industrial News Review*, probably do not realize they are not buying an insurance policy. They probably do not realize they have no contract guaranteeing benefit payments of any certain amounts, that funds are not set aside and that current benefits are paid out of current taxes of borrowed funds.

If obligations to pay benefits outrun the willingness of working people to pay taxes and if budgetary limitations prevent other financing, Congress is free to change the law to re-distribute, withdraw or discontinue benefit payments. The fact is, says the publication, that the description of the program given in the official booklet "Your Social Security" to the effect that nine out of ten working people "are now building protection for themselves and their families" and that "the amount will depend on your average earnings" is just plain poppycock.

Charles Stevenson, a senior editor of *The Reader's Digest*, also has questioned the "security" of social security. Top amount paid into the government annually ten years ago for a covered employee was $189. In 1968, it will be $686.40 and presently-scheduled increases will raise this to $920.40 in 20 years if no additional changes are made. Past history would indicate that changes will come.

Social Security is of questionable benefit to younger workers who foot the growing bills. The National Assn. of Life Underwriters has calculated that the same schedule of payments would buy a life insurance policy which would pay greater dividends.

Finally, Mr. Stevenson notes, the chance of collecting social security benefits 30 or 40 years from now is becoming increasingly questionable—it will depend upon the mood of taxpayers at that time. Right now, it is estimated that the amount by which promised benefits of social security exceed what the "'insured' persons are supposedly to eventually pay toward meeting these costs—are $350 billion. That is a sum that exceeds the current national debt."

Social security, involving some 180 million Americans, is the largest social welfare program ever undertaken. It also has become one of the most used and abused. Every citizen should be fully aware of the facts above, if he is to fairly assess promises which too often are politically motivated, and the true security of a program subject to the mood of future generations.

INTERVIEW WITH ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE: COULD THE VIETNAM WAR BE WON IN 6 WEEKS?

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, several publications have printed an interview with Adm. Arleigh Burke, discussing such topics as the Vietnam war and the recent seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by North Korean forces.

I have found Admiral Burke's thoughts on these subjects to be very enlightened, and very informative.

This interview was conducted by Mr. Elias Demetracopoulos, and is copyrighted by the North American Newspaper Alliance, Inc.

Due to the timeliness of the subject matter, and the high esteem in which I hold Admiral Burke, I would like to commend this article to my colleagues for their consideration and information.

The article, including introduction follows:

SPECIAL INTERVIEW WITH ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE—COULD THE VIETNAM WAR BE WON IN 6 WEEKS?

(By Elias Demetracopoulos)

(Note.—In the following interview, one of America's most distinguished military experts, Adm. Arleigh Burke, gives his outspoken opinions on the Viet Nam war, the *Pueblo* incident and other vital matters. Adm. Burke was chief of Naval Operations for an unprecedented three terms, from 1955 to 1961. The questions were put to him by Elias Demetracopoulos, who was the foremost political editor in Greece until the junta seized power there. He has reported from Athens and from Washington for the North American Newspaper Alliance since 1950.)

Q. How do you view the events of the last few days in Viet Nam?

A. First, the North Vietnamese may have started this last attack, thinking that they could gain a military victory and drive us out of there by strictly military operations. If that is true, they are going to be seriously disappointed. They aren't going to be able to do it.

Another possibility is that the North Vietnamese may have launched this attack at this time in order to create, in the mind of the United States people, doubt as to whether or not this war that we are fighting is worth the effort that it is going to take and that perhaps they could increase our concern enough to cause us to withdraw from South Viet Nam. They would achieve their aims that way.

Or another possibility is that they wanted to influence the elections in the United States this year. They perhaps feel that if they attacked cities as well as our troops and caused us a lot of trouble, by combat, and sprung a lot of surprises in South Viet Nam, that perhaps we would get disheartened and perhaps elect a President and a Congress who would want to withdraw or at least accept a stalemate there. This would give North Viet Nam what they wanted in that area.

There is another possibility, perhaps, that all they wanted to do was to create an atmosphere so that they could gain what they want in subsequent negotiations. Perhaps they feel that if they had a great military upset in South Viet Nam and then suggested negotiations they would gain effective control of South Viet Nam by negotiations rather easily.

Nobody in this country knows exactly why they started this attack. It might be a combination of all three of the reasons I just gave. What might happen now is that, after this present attack is contained—when they are driven back, and after they have lost the tremendous number of men that they will have lost—they might fall back and regroup for another surprise attack.

They may do what they did with the French years ago—regroup and gather new forces and start preparing for another attack two or three years from now. Or they might continue the present attack, not, probably, at the present level, but continue harassment and heckling to make sure that we are always on the defensive. Or they might actually offer to negotiate, again in the belief that they could gain more at the negotiating table than they could gain on the battlefield.

They might actually offer to negotiate. I don't think that they will, but they might.

Q. Are you optimistic or pessimistic at this moment?

A. Neither.

Q. What is the United States not doing, in your opinion, to win in a decisive and quick way?

A. Well, it is much more difficult to do this now than it would have been a few years ago, because the war has gradually escalated—slowly—so that the advantages we would have gained by striking hard with all our power have not been fully gained.

There are still things that we should do, I think, in order to keep the Communists from controlling all of Southeast Asia. The object of war is to convince the enemy that no matter what he does he cannot achieve his purposes. In this case this means that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have to be convinced that, no matter what they do, they cannot take over South Viet Nam.

Now, we haven't been able to convince them, I think, because we have escalated gradually. We have reacted to each of the North Vietnamese aggressions, each one of their actions, with just about enough power to counter their action. We have replied to their initiative. We have not exercised much initiative on our own part.

Our people have fought gallantly and very well on the battlefield, but the enemy usually starts the battes. He determines the pace, the timing. The whole business has been under the initiative of the enemy.

What can we do now? As I say, it is much more difficult now. We have instituted a great many self-restraints on our operations. I personally believe that we should blockade. I believe that we should knock out the docks at Haiphong. I believe that we should stop the supplies coming in to North Viet Nam. I believe that we should not guarantee that we will not cause the overthrow of the North Vietnamese government. Indeed, I think that we should destroy the North Vietnamese government system.

I would not rule out invasion of North Viet Nam in some places. We should not occupy the country, but we should do everything we can to stop the supplies coming into North Viet Nam and from there to South Viet Nam. We should give them something to think about and make it necessary for them to react to our initiative.

I think, too, that we should exercise the right of hot pursuit which we have discussed with Cambodia for the last six months. I don't think much has come of those discussions. When enemy forces are based in a foreign land and attack our forces, we should go after them. This is necessary even though that land is presumably neutral. So far Cambodia, for example, has proclaimed neutrality but has permitted the Communists to conduct war operations against the United States from bases in Cambodia.

There is one question that is always brought up. That is, "Isn't it possible that this will bring the Red Chinese into the war?" Of course that is possible. It's always possible. Anytime the Red Chinese want to enter this war, all they have to do is enter it. We haven't any control over that at all. But I think that the probability of their entering the war is much less if we demonstrate that we do not intend to let the North Vietnamese take control of South Viet Nam.

I would be meticulous about not doing anything to attack the Red Chinese directly. I would not enter Red Chinese waters, I would not fly over their territory, I would stay out of Red China and let them make the decision as to whether they wanted to initiate a war against us. I don't think they will make the decision to do so, but they might. If they make that decision, it will be on the basis that they intend to enter the war at the time that it appears the North Vietnamese cannot win it by themselves. Now once they have made that decision we have only one of two courses of action open to us.

Either we succumb and let the North Vietnamese take over South Viet Nam, or we prevent them from taking over, with the gamble that the Red Chinese intend to come in when they are convinced we will defeat the North Vietnamese. We will have to fight them anyway, sooner or later.

I don't think that there is a great possibility of the Red Chinese coming in. I think that there will be protests, of course.

Q. So, under the present circumstances, do you think that the invasion of North Viet Nam will be to the best interests of the United States?

A. I wouldn't invade right now, but I would send a landing force every once in a while into North Viet Nam to cut off the lines of supplies and then perhaps re-embark them. Perhaps I would stay in some places. Where, when, how and whether this should be done should be the decision of the military commander on the spot. I don't think it can be made back here. I would give the local commander authority to do so when and if he believes it desirable.

Q. In this connection, do you believe that the war in North Viet Nam can be won, let us say, in a period of six weeks?

A. Well, it may be possible to win this war in a fairly short time, but in order to do that we would have to do things that really convince the enemy we mean business. Our own people would have to be convinced of that, too. I think we should declare war. I think we should mobilize, that we should call up all our reserves. I think we should put our economic system on a wartime basis.

I also think we should not preclude the possibility of using nuclear tactical weapons. I think that we have to convince the North Vietnamese that they cannot take over all of Southeast Asia and that they will be prevented from doing so.

Q. So, do you believe that by formally declaring war against North Viet Nam, that with a full mobilization of the American economy and the American war machine, the war in Viet Nam can be won in a period of about six weeks?

A. Well, I think it could be done fairly fast. It might be a short time after we had mobilized and were ready. Nobody can predict exactly, particularly the end of a war. Predictions for the future are very difficult. But I think that after our forces were ready, that we should be able to convince the enemy in about six to eight weeks.

Q. Should the U.S. be prepared, and could fight, under the present circumstances, other types of Viet Nams in Southeast Asia and in places like Burma?

A. Well, certainly things that have happened in the last few years should have taught us that there are going to be incidents all over the world. The Communists are not concentrating just in Viet Nam. They are creating incidents all over the world. So we should be prepared to handle those incidents. One of the things that we have to be careful of is becoming the policemen of the world. We do not want to enter into every fight that occurs. What we should be able and willing to do is protect U.S. interests.

Q. Would you now advocate the use of nuclear weapons, either tactical or strategic, in Viet Nam or in other parts of Asia, including North Korea and Red China, to protect vital U.S. interests in that part of the world?

A. Certainly I would not preclude the use of either tactical or strategic nuclear weapons. I would never give to the enemy the advantage of being certain that we would not use nuclear weapons against him. But the use of nuclear weapons is a very grave decision and I wouldn't use them lightly. Neither would I hold them back until we are desperate and use them as weapons of last resort. I would not use them unless I felt—and my military advisers felt—that there was no other way of bringing the war to a successful conclusion, within a reasonable time.

Q. If today you were the U.S. commander in Viet Nam, and in view of the events of the last few days, would you employ tactical nuclear weapons in dealing with the North Vietnamese forces?

A. No, I would not yet. I would instead shut off their supplies absolutely. I would do those things that I have mentioned a few minutes ago. But I would not state that I would never use atomic weapons under any circumstances because we might want to sometime.

Q. Can a policy of containment work in an area such as Southeast Asia, with its ill-defined borders, its Communist fifth-columns, and unparalleled poverty?

A. Well, every man's idea of containment is a little bit different. I personally think the general idea of containment doesn't work very well. And I think the reason is that the enemy must be convinced that if he aggresses, if he commits an aggression against other people in the world, and particularly those that involve U.S. interests, he is going to be punished quickly.

And so I think that anytime that the Russians or the Chinese make an aggression against the best interests of the U.S., they should be punished quickly and firmly. I don't mean eliminated. I mean quick, hard punishment. That means that we have to put enough force in these areas where the trouble arises to stop him quickly. He should be driven back, at the least, to where he was before he started.

Q. Do you agree with the Administration's handling of the *Pueblo* incident?

A. I don't really understand a lot about the *Pueblo* incident. All that I know, really, is what I have read in the papers. I don't understand why some actions were taken. It is a very distressing thing.

I don't understand how any captain could surrender his ship. That's against all the tradition that we were all brought up with. It must be that the captain had orders which forbade him from fighting. I think he would have fought otherwise, but, of course, I don't know this is true.

I don't know what orders he had, but I can't conceive of a captain of a U.S. commissioned ship not fighting when he is possibly boarded unless he was specifically told not to. I can't understand why he didn't destroy his ship when or after she was boarded.

I can't understand why some combat forces were not in position to protect the ship. These ships have been heckled before. I don't mean that these protective forces should be right next to the ship, but I don't understand why there weren't surface ships within a short steaming distance of the ship or aircraft cover which could come to the aid in a short while.

I don't understand why, when the *Pueblo* was taken into Wonsan, a small surface ship like a destroyer was not ordered to go get her. They could probably have gotten her if we had acted fast. This destroyer captain could have sent a dispatch to North Korean authorities in Wonsan or Pyongyang and told them, "I am coming in to get my ship." And when he goes into Wonsan—it's up to the North Koreans whether they open fire or not.

If they open fire on our ship, as they probably would, then the captain of the destroyer has a fight on his hands. He possibly could go in and take the ship back anyway, but he possibly might find that he doesn't have enough power to take her back.

That's the time for reinforcements to come in—and I don't mean tremendous task forces—but enough force to get that ship.

I don't understand the chain of command to the *Pueblo*. She must not have been under direct naval command. I don't mean that the captain and men were not in the Navy, but I don't think his next senior could have been in the Navy. If that ship was operating directly under some organization or agency other than the Navy, then I can understand why CINPAC (Commander-in-Chief, Pacific) or any other echelons of naval command didn't take action. Or maybe they had orders not to take action, too. I simply don't know.

There's an awful lot about this happening which I don't understand and which distresses me no end. It's a lot different from Decatur's action when he went after the *Philadelphia* in Tripoli more than 150 years ago. It's a lot different than action that would have been taken even a fairly few years ago. All naval officers are brought up to never let commissioned ships of the United States be surrendered. I just don't understand it.

Q. In view of your long and distinguished naval career, what would you have done if, first, you were the skipper of the *Pueblo*, second, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. forces in the Pacific, and third, President of the United States of America?

A. Well, nobody can put himself exactly in the position of another man. What I would have done as captain of that ship would have been dependent upon my orders, upon a lot of things. But I would have weighed very carefully, and I expect he did, whether or not—even though I had orders never to fight—whether to surrender the ship or whether to fight regardless of my instructions.

We are all taught when we first enter the Navy that an order has to be obeyed. At the same time, when a man believes he has received an order that is wrong, his first duty, if there is time, is to notify the commander who gave those orders that you think the orders are wrong and ask him to modify them, giving the reasons, of course.

That doesn't make the superior very happy, but if he actually is wrong and you can convince him, he will change his orders. This has happened in the past.

But if there isn't time, as there probably was not in this case, then the captain has the choice of disobeying his orders because he believes the best interests of the United States would be served by doing something else or by obeying them blindly. If he disobeys and he does something that his orders indicate that he should not do, that is a very grave action indeed. He had better be right. He had better be absolutely right. Because if he is not, he might embarrass the United States. He might endanger his crew and his people. He might do a lot of things.

But if he is right, maybe he will have done a great thing for the U.S.

Now, there is one point here: that if a commander takes a step that is embarrassing or even which the officials of the United States do not agree with, those officials can disavow his action. They can punish the commander who did it. That usually satisfies both our friends and our enemies, because it is the intent behind these actions which is most important.

Perhaps that is why the Communists created this incident. Our ship was certainly on the high seas. I think that she did not even violate the 12-mile limit, which, incidentally, is not accepted by the United States or many other nations. I think that this whole affair was created by the Communists to humiliate us, to make us appear in the eyes of the rest of the world as if we were not really able or willing to protect our own ships on the high seas, maybe cause us to lose a little respect throughout the world, including a little self-respect.

Q. Could you elaborate on how you felt about how the captain of the *Pueblo* could violate his orders if he felt he was right and what the connection is there?

A. Well, if he were ordered, for example, not to fight a ship and not to use his guns, the man who gave those orders would have given those orders with a certain set of circumstances in mind. Certainly the captain doesn't want to shoot anybody who is heckling—so the man who gave those orders may have thought "There is going to be a lot of Communist heckling exercises and we don't want our ships shooting at boats that come close." So he may have issued orders to the ship not to use guns at all.

Well, the captain might reason very well that these were circumstances which the other man had in mind when he gave those orders or he might reason, "things are a lot more serious than he thought. I've got to realize that these circumstances are different than he envisaged and I must shoot to save my ship. They are highjacking my ship and committing piracy, and I am going to protect my ship."

And then he notifies his boss, whoever he is, right away that he has opened fire, he is protecting his ship and if communications are as good as I think they are, he probably would have gotten his information back to his seniors very fast.

Q. So if you were the skipper of the *Pueblo* you personally would have fought and you would never have surrendered your ship?

A. I don't say that because I don't know the exact circumstances and it is impossible to ever put yourself in exactly the position of another man. I don't know the facts now and I don't want to make the statement that this captain is wrong. He may not have been. I don't want to criticize him nor do I want to say that I would have surely done it differently. I might have done exactly the same thing he did.

But from what I think happened I'm afraid I would not have done it that way.

Q. And what about if you were commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific?

A. As I understand it, the commander in chief in the Pacific was not in the chain of command to the ship. He apparently was not notified of the attack immediately, which bears this out. I suspect that probably what happened was that the ship reported to some organization in the United States which in turn forwarded the information to the commander in chief of the Pacific.

I would also suspect that, if this is true, that the commander in chief in the Pacific knew that he did not have any authority or control over that ship and he would be hesitant to take action himself because he wouldn't know what other action had been ordered by other people. He would think "I'll wait a little while to see what's going to be done by whoever is running this show."

All of this is on the basis that the ship probably was not in the chain of command under CINCPAC.

Q. You think that the CINCPAC should have full authority over all vessels, including the *Pueblo* operating in that area?

A. Well, yes I do. I think military forces should be commanded by military people and that the chain of command should be military. I think all naval ships should be operated under the naval chain of command because if this is done then you have a professional who knows a lot about the Navy and the chain of command, and the captains or the junior officers realize they have a man who understands their problems and knows what to do, that their commander has had a great deal of experience, and is not an amateur in a professional game.

Q. If you were President of the United States, how would you react in dealing with the *Pueblo* incident?

A. This is the most difficult question of all, because I think it would have been better if there had been an immediate reaction to this illegal highjacking. With the rapid communications that have been developed in the last few years and the enormous advances that have been made in electronics, it is very easy to send a message anyplace in the world very fast. The difficult part is in writing the message and in conveying the exact thought that the man has in mind to somebody else.

Now, because this communications system does make transmission of messages so quick and easy, there has been a tendency to concentrate all decision-making, or most of the decision-making in Washington and actually I suspect, in the office of the President. Well, that has a lot of very bad results.

In the first place, the President can't be knowledgeable of all the circumstances, no matter how hard he tries, and God knows any President works hard enough, including President Johnson, trying to keep knowledgeable on everything that happens.

In the second place, it takes time to wake him. Nobody wakes the President for minor matters. So what happens when an urgent message of high priority comes in over the communications systems? Somebody decodes it, looks at it, and then thinks: "Should I call the President or should I not? Should I first call somebody else?" So usually they call somebody else and ask "What do I do?" And the man whoever is called advises them and says, "You'd better call the President fast, young fellow."

And so they call the President, the President wakes up out of a cold sleep, and listens to a briefing over the telephone. He doesn't know the circumstances, he hasn't been awake very long, he has to make a decision. It is quite natural that when a man makes a decision under those circumstances, he is cautious.

Now, I don't mean that he shouldn't be cautious all the time, but under these circumstances anybody is super-cautious. It is a natural reaction—don't do anything right now. Call somebody—ask the advice of Mr. So-and-So, or get more information, or come over and bring all the charts and data over, or something like that. There is a tendency to delay.

This is, of course, the danger of making too many decisions in a central position, and this is true of the government or any other organization. As many decisions as possible should be made as far down the echelon of command as possible.

Now the reason against that is that decisions that are made these days are too grave, the consequences are possibly too great to leave in the hands of any subordinate. On the other hand, there is a limited number of decisions that the President can handle. There's not time enough for him to handle them all.

The more delegation of authority there is, usually, the better, providing policy is known down through the echelons of command so that the lad on the spot knows the policies under which the government is operating.

Your question was, what I would have done if I were President, and the answer is I think I would have reacted very fast to get this ship back right quickly.

LSD IS FAR MORE DANGEROUS THAN MARIHUANA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, testimony given Monday at a hearing of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce indicates beyond any doubt that we have been missing the boat in our handling of LSD and apparently we intend to continue doing so. Legislation proposed by the administration (H.R. 15355) and before our committee would make possession of LSD a misdemeanor and is thus entirely inadequate. The public and the Government have long since determined that marihuana is a clear and present danger to society and therefore warranted the imposition of stiff felony penalties for even having the stuff in possession.

LSD is far more dangerous than marihuana, not only to its misguided users but also to future generations because even a brief LSD "trip" can cause birth defects years later.

Now we have specific proof that LSD can and does cause genetic damage. Dr. Cecil B. Jacobson, instructor in the department of obstetrics and gynecology, George Washington University, and a leading researcher in the genetic effects of LSD, presented convincing proofs that the drug is highly dangerous even in small doses. A mother can be afflicted with leukemia and other forms of cancer and premature aging. The damage to her child may be immediate or it may be latent. It could result in malformations or in predilection for cancer and shortened life span. There are definite possibilities that the latent defects will not show up in the child but will produce handicapped children in later generations. The end results obviously cannot as yet be studied, but the real possibilities are horrible to contemplate.

Dr. Jacobson testified without hesitation that in this area of genetic damage marihuana does not present the same grim picture. Yet we have recognized that marihuana must be curbed with stiff penalties. We can do no less with LSD. Any legislation forthcoming should make possession of LSD a felony. It is not just another drug which causes annoyance to society when abused. It is a basic danger to the very existence of our society and must be controlled as such.

AGRICULTURE CENSUS

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census plans to require the farmers of this country to fill out a general, but far-reaching, questionnaire, phase I of the 1969 Census of Agriculture. From the data thus gathered, in January 1970, special surveys, phase II, will be compiled which will delve deeply into each type of farmer's individual practices. These inquiries will be made late in 1970 or in early 1971. All these questions, phase I and phase II, will require answers from each farmer under penalty of fine, imprisonment, or both, for refusal to do so.

Montana farmers have in the past objected to the number and nature of these questions. I am sure they will not sit idly by as they learn the proposed 1969 Agricultural Census is the most elaborate, the most inquisitive, the most prying census ever.

Their objections are sound. Form ATF–4B, a pretest, was mailed to farms with expected sales of $2,500 gross value. Of all the farms in the United States, 96.6 percent have sales of gross value $2,500 or over. In this test, there are 37 sections with better than 350 questions and over 725 possible blanks to fill. The farmer is even instructed that if he needs more room he should attach an extra sheet. This is the general questionnaire. What is the poor farmer supposed to do when they start getting specific? To give truly accurate answers to all these questions, a farmer would have to hire an accountant, surveyor, and marketing expert.

The problem is not just the length, however. These questions ask a farmer to do what no good businessman would ever consider; they ask him to reveal his trade secrets. Not only are many of the census enumerators hired from the same locality in which they work, but also, valuable estimates can be made by one familiar with the district by a process of elimination thus negating any confidentiality supposedly protected by the published census reports.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the Census Bureau is not only asking for information that the Government needs to know, but also information that bureaucrats want to know. Hidden away in their offices, insulated from the opinions and feelings of the American public, are hundreds of statisticians, professionals of intrusion, whose existence is justified by the quantity of information they can gather. Why does the Bureau of the Census need to know more than the most basic information? The information they are asking for is already available to those agencies that serve the farmer. It is gathered by the experts of the specific fields, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Agriculture itself through its own Economic Research Service, and the Statistical Reporting Service.

In order to stop this wasteful, unnecessary, and dangerous trend, I have introduced a bill today which will prohibit the Census' asking questions about production, acreage, operation, and finances. This legislation is necessary to forcefully bring the issue to the fore and to conclusively free the farmer from this unnecessary burden. The information really needed by the Government will still be available to the Government.

It is my hope that the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics will study this problem in depth as part of the overall problem of the use of private information by public agencies and will report out the sound legislation so desperately needed not only in the area of agriculture but in every area where the Bureau of Census is exceeding its proper function.

WE MOURN FOR A GREAT RABBI

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, an oak has fallen. On Wednesday, February 7, 1968, the city of Cincinnati and the entire Nation were saddened by the death of one of our greatest Americans and a longtime personal friend of my father, my grandfather, and myself, Rabbi Eliezer Silver. Throughout his eventful 87 years, Rabbi Silver was recognized as a leader and a dynamic national figure. He was a man dedicated to freedom, and worked mightily and selflessly to free thousands of refugees from the clutches of Nazi death camps.

A native of Lithuania, Rabbi Silver came to the United States in 1907. He held pulpits in Harrisburg, Pa.; Springfield, Mass., and, for nearly 40 years, was rabbi at Kneseth Israel, in Cincinnati. He was a member of the presidium of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, and was head of Vaad Hoir, Organization of Orthodox Congregations, in Cincinnati.

Known for his humanitarianism, Rabbi Silver organized rescue operations to save thousands of persons from Nazi death camps, and, following World War II, aided refugees in escaping from behind the Iron Curtain. In this work, I am proud to say that he worked closely with my late father and a warm friendship and deep mutual respect grew from the association.

Surviving Rabbi Silver are his widow, Mrs. Pearl Burkson Silver, two sons, two daughters, and a number of grandchildren. In his tradition, they are outstanding citizens of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, along with his family, his friends, and the members of his congregation, I am deeply saddened by his passing, and it seems most appropriate to take note of it on a day we note also the great contribution to this country of those of Lithuanian birth and descent. It is a time when we hope for the rebirth of freedom, both temporal and religious, for all who are under the domination of the Soviet Communists in Lithuania and elsewhere.

TO THE AMERICAN MOTHER

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, my friend, O. A. Brice, the publisher of one of the Nation's finest weekly newspapers, the Lake Wales News, is one of the best students of human nature that I have ever known. In his column, "Over in My Corner," which appeared in the February 15 issue of the Lake Wales News, he pays tribute to the American heroine, the American mother whose legacy to the world is the character and education she gives her children. Mr. Brice reminds us that there are greater riches than gold and silver.

His column is refreshing and, with permission, I include it here in the RECORD:

OVER IN MY CORNER

(By O. A. Brice)

I met one of the richest women in the world this week. She did not come to the office in a limousine nor was a chauffeur escorting her through the doorway. Instead she walked in, clad in a cotton dress and with a smile on her face that bespoke happiness.

She was just a plain country woman, tanned by Florida's sun and her appearance showed definitely that for many years she had toiled. And more than that some of her tasks had been difficult ones, out in the field as well as around the home. She had reared a family and the trials through which she had gone had left their mark.

But that defiant look in her eye showed me conclusively she had been successful and she was bubbling over with joy as she now looked back over the past at what she had accumulated.

SHE WAS RICH

Of course I knew from long acquaintance this woman probably didn't have a dime in the bank and that it was actually a problem right then as to how she would be able to take back to the little home the necessities which the weekend called for. But she was not worrying for she had seen worse times. In fact today she was just happy in the thought that the world had been kind to her in the rearing of youngsters who are now making their mark and who weekly show their appreciation for all of mother's toil, by writing regularly.

In her hand she held a couple letters just taken from the postoffice. I inquired about the girls and boys just in order to be polite and show my interest and it was then I realized the richness which was hers.

In my estimation there isn't enough money in the world to buy the happiness which that woman was enjoying. Her children are all doing well and the lessons taught them by this mother are already bearing fruit through happy homes and unselfish dispositions.

As I visited with this woman, my mind wandered off to other days when she experienced that period of womanhood through which her girls are now going. I wondered just how hard her parents had "slaved" to give her the education she possessed. It was not difficult to see that she had not gone through college, but nevertheless she had attained a knowledge of how to live and associate with neighbors, doing the things which make a good citizen and at the same time becoming thoroughly qualified to make a home.

"It has been a long, hard road over which I traveled, but I succeeded in giving my boys and girls that which I did not get—a good education," she declared as we visited, "and in them I now have a part of my life which I know will live on and on" she continued.

Riches? There are none which will compare with the satisfaction this mother has in her accomplishments.

Rather cruelly, I endeavored to paint before her the lonesomeness she would endure now that the home-nest is empty and I stressed the idea that she should now begin to do things for herself so as the years pile up she could enjoy more of the comforts of life. But I did not get very far, for she immediately countered with a recital of things she yet hoped to do for the "kids".

After this woman left the office, I pondered for a while on the things which make America the country over which people will fight and give their lives—a land of freedom and happy homes out of which comes just such characters as the one with whom I had been talking. I recalled other acquaintances I knew who had traveled much the same road as this woman and who today stand without any cold, hard money in their possession, but with invaluable memories and the satisfaction of having created and supported boys and girls until the world demanded their services to carry on.

Somehow it seemed to me this woman should be an inspiration to anyone who could meet her. If I had my way she would be the American heroine and to her I would erect a monument which would endure all time. From its utmost pinnacle I would place a light which would shine forward into coming generations as an example of womanhood. The kind of American womanhood, which knows sacrifices, and hard work, and yet while undergoing it all, develops deep within, a love and consciousness that she is rich above everything else and that she has left, as a heritage to her loved ones, a fortune of sweet memories which will be passed on from generation to generation.

Yes, I think I met the richest woman in the world and from that short visit, I profited by the bright outlook she was carrying on through life.

Some of these days when I am inclined to do my worst complaining or when I hear some friend bewailing the sad experiences he has gone through as crashes come and the stock markets wipe out profits, I expect to have that lady come back in my mind and I will recite her experiences as an example of what it takes to be rich and how her kind of riches have never yet known to be swept away.

Yes, piles of gold and silver are convenient to have, but without the richness which is exemplified in this woman's life, they mean very little.

I propose to sort of watch her journey on through the next dozen years and as the grandchildren begin arriving, I am predicting her riches will then make her stand out among the people as a saintly old-grandmother, who will continue to draw around her old rocking chair, representatives of several generations, and all will see that sparkle in her eye and that smile on her face which I witnessed the other day.

It pays to be rich if you accumulate the right sort of gold!

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACTS WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the public schools of our Nation are challenged today as never before. They have the tremendous problem of getting our children ready to face the realities of an ever-increasingly complex society. They have the natural problems of a burgeoning school-age population and the traditional problems of obtaining enough revenue to meet their many needs.

But, the biggest problem many of our educators and school administrators are confronted with is an agency of the U.S. Government. I refer to the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By the unnecesesary and unwarranted application of the dictatorial processes of bureaucracy, the Office of Civil Rights has, without any justification whatsoever, decided that the Federal school funds intended for use of the Greensboro, N.C., schools are in jeopardy because that school system has not achieved what the OCR believes to be satisfactory progress in the integration of its pupils. This decision was reached without an investigation into the matter and without any complaint lodged by any individual.

Without going into the matter further, I would like for two articles, published in the Greensboro Daily News, be inserted in the Record, so that others might see the absurdity of such action by the OCR.

The two articles follow:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Feb. 18, 1968]

HEW ZEROES IN ON GREENSBORO

(By William D. Snider)

Greensboro may be the ideal spot for a showdown between the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare and local officials over school desegregation.

HEW's new Office for Civil Rights has been poring over statistics lately and finds that all except 32 districts in North Carolina are making insufficient progress in eliminating "dual" school systems.

Among these delinquent districts, it appears, is Greensboro. And thereby hangs a tale fraught with ironic overtones.

Ten years ago, Greensboro, Charlotte and Winston-Salem became the first school districts in the South to begin voluntary desegregation. Little Rock's explosion in September 1957 completely overshadowed this good faith, affirmative action in North Carolina. Fearful segregationists, klansmen and other bigots subjected officials in these cities to gross harassment; but they stood their ground.

LESS DISRUPTION

North Carolina moved through a period of racial turbulence with less disruption than other Southern states, including neighboring Virginia where some public schools were closed. North Carolina's pupil assignment program (Pearsall Plan), although castigated from the right and left, nevertheless served well. As a safety valve it deterred violence and made further transition possible.

Many of the same Greensboro officials who endured that disagreeable backlash are still running the public schools. Today they find the foundation of their pioneering action threatened by uninformed, dogmatic HEW officials intent on playing the numbers game.

What is the numbers game?

It is an exercise that goes something like this: An official sitting in his Washington office looks at statistics in a certain school in City X, picks up his telephone and calls about it. "Why don't you have any integration in these two schools?" he asks a school official in City X. The answer may be perfectly obvious: City X has a "freedom of choice" policy; but no pupils from other areas have requested transfer to the unintegrated schools. "Then why don't you simply transfer pupils from another school" the Washington official asks. The answer to that question is obvious too: Either "freedom of choice" means "freedom of choice"—or it doesn't. If every school patron gets freedom of choice, except those whose children the school board arbitrarily reshuffles in order to achieve "racial balance," then freedom becomes slavery.

NOTHING IN WRITING

That is what has been happening lately as HEW applies the pressure. It is done carefully. No Washington official puts the numbers game in writing. Numbers, he usually insists, have nothing to do with his concern (for the very good reason that the 1964 Civil Rights Act forbids use of percentages, especially in areas where segregation stems from residential patterns).

Yet when the HEW official couches his memoranda in terms of eliminating the "dual school system"—a perfectly legitimate objective—he can only be referring to the number of pupils in integrated schools. Otherwise what is he talking about in a school system like Greensboro's?

The faculties and school administrative units here were long ago desegregated. Some 110 faculty members, both white and Negro are now teaching in schools where they are in the racial minority.

Out of 9,604 Negro students, 1,359 are now in predominantly white schools. During the last 10 years no child in Greensboro has been denied an integrated education, if he requested it. Since the "freedom of choice" system was inaugurated two years ago, movement across racial lines has increased. Greensboro School Board attorney Robert Moseley (who was also serving 10 years ago) said last week: "I favor following the free choice plan. Not a Negro child in Greensboro is being denied the right to go to an integrated school. We have had no complaints."

COMPLAINTS FROM AFAR

The only complaints are coming from faraway bureaucrats, who consult their statistics rather than people on the scene.

Greensboro is not, in any sense, operating a "dual" school system. It is not discriminating in terms of level of support, curricula, interest or concern. If anything, the intensity of "ghetto" school problems leads Greensboro officials to give them more time and attention.

Without visiting Greensboro or studying attitudes and conditions, HEW officials have threatened to cut off the city's federal funds unless, in the charmingly vague language of the day, "more progress is made."

What kind of progress, local officials are justified in asking. How much farther can these officials go without setting back the cause they have espoused for 10 years? Should a federal agency make a conscientiously-administered school system the whipping boy for ills and shortcomings of society in general? That seems to be happening. School patterns in many cases are based on residential patterns. Many parents (both Negro and white) are reluctant to expose their children to the difficulties of integration, especially if the integrated school is across town and they are in a minority. The results, they fear, could be emotional turmoil for the child and more ignorance than education. This may be tragic but it is true.

MEANS AND ENDS

Should a school board deny these parents freedom of choice, and yet extend it to other parents? What about their civil rights? Is it ethical to seek a moral objective by using unethical means?

These are some of the questions raised by HEW's latest threats. Greensboro Education Board Chairman Richard Hunter has correctly termed them attempted "blackmail."

The most disturbing aspect is that HEW officials make no bones about their single-minded determination to achieve racial balance no matter what they wreck in the process. They put integration first and education second. In well-intended zeal, they could set back Greensboro's carefully conceived desegregation program by 10 years.

No one doubts the need for "more progress" in racial desegregation, both north and south. Many problems cry out for attention. The greatest of these is upbuilding ghetto schools.

"CHRONIC BLACKTHINK"

In an article written for the Virginia Quarterly Review, Bob Smith, associate editor of The Charlotte News, described this situation with alarming clarity:

"Race has become a matter of obsessive preoccupation, with the consequence for our public life that true national goals are not clearly perceived and that illusory goals are pursued recklessly, for political or ideological satisfaction . . .

"This chronic blackthink is as dangerous as it is cruel. For one thing, it perpetuates the hyperconsciousness of race that has begun to assume plague proportions. If our goal eventually is to have a society in which one's race simply does not matter, is it too early to stop legislating and thinking as though race were all that mattered? Is it not worth considering that we may have become lost along the way from the original position of the Supreme Court in 1954–55, which forbade states to use race as a criterion in school assignments, to the present fetish for making race the criterion for assignment to school? Have we not arrived at a racism similar to the one we fled?"

Perhaps we have not arrived there yet. But we are on our way, if the philosophy HEW is trying to force on Greensboro wins the day.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Feb. 12, 1968]

A Threat to Free Choice

There should be no mistaking the gravity of warnings from officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Greensboro Board of Education and other North Carolina public school units that federal funds for local schools may be terminated. At issue is not only the degree and pace of racial integration, which is crucial enough in itself, but also whether white and Negro students can continue to be educated at all and whether local citizens of both races can choose to operate the schools in the best interests of their community.

The recent agitation for faster integration of the schools has come from HEW's new Office for Civil Rights, which a few months ago replaced the U.S. Office of Education and commissioner Harold Howe II as the enforcing agent for provisions of the 1964 Civil Right Act. After merely studying North Carolina statistics the officials decided that all but 32 of the state's 160 public school units are showing too little progress toward an OCR goal of eliminating dual school systems by September, 1969.

If the local units do not show sharp improvement, the OCR has warned in several ways, actions will begin to stop federal aid to the schools. The compliance schedules varied (Alamance County was given only 30 days to make substantial changes), and some units fear their expected funds may be deferred. Even temporary withholding is serious, for in all local systems federal tax dollars pay a growing portion of the school budgets.

Much can be said, of course, about the disservice to government and education (not to mention the patent absurdity) of having bureaucrats in Washington decide on the basis of population and school registration figures that local schools across the country are not serving the needs of their communities. However, the OCR attack on the Greensboro City Schools and our "freedom of choice" desegregation plan is particularly unreasonable.

GREENSBORO'S METHOD

The plan was established here according to federal guidelines issued in December, 1966. Each spring any student, Negro or white, may apply to any school in the city—no matter what his "home" district may be—for any reason or for no particular reason. If he arranges his own transportation (as nearly all city pupils must) the student may seek his education in whatever school he wishes to attend. Exclusive courses at some schools encourage this sort of voluntary desegregation, and school staffs are integrated. Transfers from any residential section to a different school district are routinely approved by following the guidelines. In some schools the degree of integration is not yet high, but Greensboro school officials say they have had no complaints from Negro citizens that the free choice plan is unfair. Evidently, integration is progressing at a rate determined by all Greensboro pupils and their families, which is as it should be.

This is not satisfactory for the Office for Civil Rights. Apparently because the most recent registration period did not show "enough" numerical increase over last year in Negro students attending predominantly white schools and vice versa, the OCR has warned the Greensboro Board of Education to try other methods. Instead, the board called the threatened termination of federal aid "strictly blackmail" and voted unanimously to continue the locally satisfactory free choice plan. Now a team of examiners from the regional HEW office will come to Greensboro for a first-hand look at progress in school desegregation.

The investigation should have come *before* the warning; and now that federal officials are coming here the responsibility will be theirs to demonstrate that the free choice plan is *not* working. We believe the school board's decision was right. We hope the visiting investigators will realize that because of present school locations, housing patterns, school bus shortages and varying curricula the free choice plan is Greensboro's best means to achieve school integration. If they think it is not, the onus will be on them to develop a truly better method.

While the officials are here they should be required to explain, if they are able, exactly what it is they *want* our school system to do. Director Peter Libassi of the OCR wrote in a December 27, 1967, memorandum: "The new policies are not expected to reflect any change in the department's present position that free choice procedures are an available means of eliminating a dual school structure if they lead to significant year-by-year progress toward the establishment of a single system of nonracial schools."

EXPLANATION REQUIRED

That would seem to mean that Greensboro displeased the OCR by not showing sufficient statistical improvement. But a few days ago the OCR's information director Michael Berla said that is not so because since last fall "the terms of negotiation have been different." Well, are the terms different or not? And if they have changed, *how* have they changed? No school system can achieve compliance unless it knows what to comply with.

Other fundamental questions are raised by the OCR's stated goal of abolishing "racially identifiable schools" by the 1969–70 school year. Certainly the dual systems must be eliminated eventually if full integration is to be achieved, but why the rush to do it all within the next year and a half? Is every local unit suddenly to follow the dramatic example of the Chapel Hill system by eliminating "predominantly white" and "predominantly Negro" schools and replacing them with one statistically integrated school? That method has not worked well in a small college community, and it could be disastrous in a city the size of Greensboro.

Aside from the political and social upheaval of immediately creating nonracial schools, the financial cost would be tremendous. Yet to "encourage" school systems in this task the OCR would withhold the federal share of their budgets. A more likely result would be the crippling of public education—and all by September, 1969.

Ultimately, the threat of denying federal funds is as self-defeating as it is unfair. It works against improving the education of all pupils, which is one of the things the Civil Rights Act sought to do. And the threat is not to be taken lightly. Although federal aid has not been formally terminated yet anywhere in North Carolina, some of our school systems have real cause for concern about next year's budget. When the local share of school revenue runs out, these units may be forced to increase their taxes or decrease their services to the community. Then all students of both races would suffer.

LESS LOCAL CONTROL

No doubt the federal education officials need to apply pressure for integration in many school systems, and it could be argued that the federal share in local budgets gives the government a right to make its influence

> felt. But to deny federal aid would be to deny education for many. What the Office for Civil Rights threatens—with or without the legal power to do so—is to restrict local control over local schools. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare apparently would have Greensboro schools operated by appointees in Washington instead of city representatives directed by state law.
>
> We do not oppose the principle of racial integration—in the schools or anywhere else. We most certainly do oppose the Office for Civil Rights' authoritarian means to a democratic end. Greensboro's progressive school integration plan still appears to be in keeping with the desires of our citizens. If we must end free choice in our schools we could lose free choice in governing our community.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MR. STARNES

Mr. **KAZEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KAZEN**. Mr. Speaker, to trace the growth and development of American small business over the years is to follow much of the history of our country.

America started as a small business. Our hardy, self-sufficient pioneers at Jamestown soon decided that they could not, and did not want to rely on shipments from England to supply them with manufactured articles. They started their own small businesses.

President Johnson has said:

> Small business is part of the American way of life; a man's desire to become his own boss has always been a part of the American dream. If we ever lose that, we lose a precious part of our heritage.

To answer the needs of the small businessmen of the country, the Small Business Administration, under the vigorous leadership of Administrator Robert C. Moot, provides many programs of assistance—and not just financial assistance. There is the SCORE program in which retired businessmen volunteer to advise small business owners in their day-to-day operations; the management training courses; the balanced economic growth conferences—to name a few. The Small Business Administration was created to help preserve a man's right to be his own boss if he chooses.

And one man who did choose to be his own boss is W. B. Starnes of Laredo, Tex., a veteran of 30 years' buying and selling fish.

Mr. Starnes started his own company in 1950. The Southern Fish Co. buys raw fresh-water fish, processes it, and produces frozen dressed fish. They manufacture fishmeal as a byproduct. The company sells to both the wholesale and retail markets.

During his first year of operation, Mr. Starnes' company had sales of approximately $50,000. Their progress was good, and by 1956 growth and increased demands of the customers led Starnes to incorporate his company. At this time sales had risen to $150,000 and there were four employees. Southern Fish Co. continued to grow, and at the end of 1962 their sales had passed the half-million mark.

In 1963 Mr. Starnes approached the Small Business Administration for a loan to buy a building at Zapata, Tex., for use as a pickup station for fish in the Falcon Lake area, a good source of supply. He also needed money to remodel the property and to purchase some new equipment. The decision was favorable and he received an SBA loan of $24,200 in 1963.

Because of the loan the Small Business Administration made to them, Southern Fish Co. was able to increase employment from 4 to 15 people. By March of 1967, there were 23 people on the payroll, and sales for the previous fiscal year reached $859,600. Starnes' company today employs 28 people, and sales for fiscal year 1967 were more than $1 million.

This company ships frozen fish and fish meal to wholesale and retail outlets all over the United States. It presently averages production of 1.5 million pounds of fish per year, and has the capacity to process up to 5 million pounds per year.

The market outlook for Southern Fish Co. is very good. The demand of the public for fresh water fish far exceeds the supply.

Laredo and Zapata, Tex., are certainly benefiting by the increased, permanent employment in the area. These two small towns are in an area where employment is desperately needed to help revitalize their economy.

Because of the Small Business Administration loan in 1963, 24 permanent jobs have been provided. In addition, the increased production resulted in increased employment for the commercial fishermen of the area. So the loan, while directly creating 24 jobs, had the indirect effect of boosting the commercial fishing industry. Since production increased considerably, one might also assume that the transport industry has profited as well.

The Small Business Administration during fiscal year 1967 extended financial help to small businessmen in all sections of Texas. During that time, 739 SBA loans were made, totaling $21,662,000.

Four hundred seven of these were regular business loans, such as the one Mr. Starnes received in 1963. These loans made up $17,700,000 of the total.

To assist disadvantaged people, SBA made 181 economic opportunity loans for a total of $1,662,000 to help the underprivileged make their own way.

Four businessmen displaced by federally assisted construction projects were helped to move to new locations with $135,000.

Disaster loans totaling $724,000 were made to 139 businesses and individuals, and eight local development companies received $1,441,000.

Since our first permanent settlement at Jamestown it has been the dream and ambition of enterprising individuals to own their own businesses—to be their own boss. The Small Business Administration is offering this chance to American businessmen—tools to build their future—to insure greater opportunities for all citizens to make a successful living through owning their own firms.

THE NORTH VIETNAMESE DECIDED TO ESCALATE THE WAR

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the going has gotten much tougher in Vietnam over the last 3 or 4 weeks.

The cries of the fainthearted grow increasingly loud as the enemy's drive for victory intensifies.

Many of our eminent citizens, including Professor Reischauer of Harvard, have mistakenly concluded, as a result of the last few weeks' events, that because the fighting is rougher the U.S. policy in Vietnam has proven to be a failure. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As Professor Reischauer himself says, one of our foremost objectives in supporting the South Vietnamese Government in its fight against aggression from North Vietnam was to prove that guerrilla wars of national liberation could not succeed. This we have done.

The North Vietnamese, faced with the realization that a guerrilla war could not win, had two alternatives. The first was to admit to themselves that they were defeated and either negotiate or withdraw from the battlefield. All Americans from President Johnson on down hoped that this would be the case.

Unfortunately, however, North Vietnam took the second alternative; the North Vietnamese, realizing the defeat of their guerrilla attack on South Vietnam, decided to escalate the war into a regular attack on South Vietnam and have systematically sent not guerrillas but regular North Vietnam Army divisions into the south complete with missiles, heavy artillery, large rockets, trucks, tanks, and other armored vehicles. It is even possible that they are now constructing air bases for Mig-21 aircraft in South Vietnam.

Thus, it can be seen that the objective of U.S. policy to prevent the success of wars of national liberation has been accomplished. The enemy has decided to expand the war instead of admitting defeat. There could be no greater proof of North Vietnam's aggressive and violent intentions than this expansion of the war.

As the Washington Evening Star said in an editorial of February 13, 1968 on recent statements by Professor Reischauer:

> The fact is that we are continuing to achieve exactly the degree of success we set out to achieve in Vietnam. The war of liberation has not succeeded despite the temporary and costly success of the Tet offensive. And the war of liberation will not succeed—provided the majority of the American people refrain from acting with the impatience, the impetuousness and the immaturity re-

cently displayed by the professor from Harvard.

The Evening Star's editorial is of considerable interest and I would like to read it in its entirety at this point.

THE IMPETUOUS PROFESSOR

Professor Edwin O. Reischauer of Harvard ranks among the nation's leading experts on Asia. We might, therefore, hesitate to take issue with his latest major pronouncement on Vietnam, to the effect that it is time for the administration "to realize that we have lost this war in terms of what was our original objective . . . to prove that so-called wars of national liberation do not pay and that we can stop them. We obviously cannot."

Even the stout opposition mounted by Senator Gale McGee during his televised confrontation with Reischauer might not have been enough by itself. Our faith in the basic soundness of the position we and a few million other Americans share with the Wyoming Democrat might have been severely shaken, were it not for one comforting fact. The most devastating rebuttal to the Reischauer view has been provided by, among others, that outstanding Asian scholar, Professor Edwin O. Reischauer of Harvard.

Not so very long ago, 14 leading scholars closeted themselves at Freedom House in Tuxedo, New York, to issue a lengthy and impressive statement setting forth the view of "the moderate segment of the academic community" on the administration's Asia policy. Reischauer was one of the group of 14 scholars who prepared the statement, which was released to the public less than two months ago.

A few excerpts should suffice:

"Our success—possibly our survival—may well depend upon our capacity to live calmly with problems that cannot be solved quickly. . . . Our opponents count on our impatience, our impetuousness, our immaturity. They must be proved wrong. . . .

"Can the technique of an externally aided 'national liberation movement' as perfected by the Communists succeed in Vietnam? . . . To accept a Communist victory in Vietnam would serve as a major encouragement to those forces in the world opposing peaceful coexistence, to those elements committed to the thesis that violence is the best means of effecting change. . . . .

"In the final analysis, the most basic challenge confronting us today is to learn how to live with insecurity without succumbing to panic or extremism."

Professor Reischauer of early 1968 seems to have forgotten the views subscribed to by Professor Reischauer of late 1967. He seems, in fact, to have succumbed to a panic worthy of Chicken Little in his espousing of the extremist view that all is lost.

The fact is that we are continuing to achieve exactly the degree of success we set out to achieve in Vietnam. The war of liberation has not succeeded despite the temporary and costly success of the Tet offensive. And the war of liberation will not succeed—provided the majority of the American people refrain from acting with the impatience, the impetuousness and the immaturity recently displayed by the professor from Harvard.

TO BREATHE OR NOT TO BREATHE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, previously I have expressed concern over the rampant pollution of our Nation's streams and skies. I urge my colleagues to adopt swift and incisive measures in combating this major problem. The Federal Government must take a strong role in dealing with the difficulty of pollution, which is reaching the stage of crisis.

At this point I include an editorial by William C. Midcap which appeared in the February 9 issue of the Enginemen's Press:

TO BREATHE OR NOT TO BREATHE

At a time when this nation faces some of the most critical problems of recent times—political unrest, economic upheaval, urban torment and open warfare in our streets—not to mention the crises of Viet Nam and North Korea—it might appear ludicrous to some to speak of air and water pollution as a critical national problem.

But on the contrary, there is probably no other single problem in the nation today which directly affects every man, woman and child so directly as the pollution of our atmosphere and our water. Nor, tragically, has there ever been a problem with such a life-or-death potential that has been so callously ignored by this nation.

You will die without sufficient clean air!

You will die without sufficient clean water!

It is as simple as that and yet with contamination reaching the crisis proportion, we as a nation have yet to face up to it.

The crisis has indeed been with us for years—growing worse in each of those succeeding years. As you read this, literally millions of tons of deadly wastes are being dumped into the air you breathe and the water you use.

The feeble efforts so far to reverse the trend have been obliterated by the myriad sources of pollution which not only continue, but in fact are increasing at an unbelievable rate.

We speak and argue over whether we can afford guns AND butter. Perhaps if we wait long enough those will be moot questions—dead people could hardly care less whether there are either guns or butter remaining on a planet where all life has suffocated.

For more than a decade, concerned persons have warned!

For several years a greater number of people, both within and outside government, have pushed totally inadequate relief measures, feeble plans that could never hope to solve the problem.

Now! Now is the time, to take whatever action is needed—and regardless of what conservatives may say, the Federal Government must take a strong lead to clean up our atmosphere, our streams, our lakes and our mighty rivers.

It will take nothing short of a national crash program to do the job that must be done. Here again the conservatives can be expected to balk. But if the nation is told, is made fully aware of the lethal potential of the present situation, I believe even the conservatives will join in this crusade . . . for you know, conservatives, too, must breathe!

A WAY TO FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY?

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, soon this body will be called upon to pass judgment on a bill which, if enacted, would seriously add to this country's current financial crisis.

I wish to outline some of my objections to the Arts and Humanities Authorization Act—H.R. 11308—which I and other members of the Education and Labor Committee opposed.

The committee bill not only asks for drastic increases over present expenditures but for an amount larger than the agency requested in the 1969 budget.

In 1965, the Congress authorized $5 million a year for 3 years for both the Arts and Humanities Councils. The committee bill now seeks $32 million a year for the arts and $40 million a year for the humanities. In addition, the States were authorized for each of the past 3 fiscal years up to $2.75 million per year for a State art program. The committee bill would authorize $8 million a year for this. The Congress also authorized appropriations up to $2.25 million to the Arts Council and $5 million to the Humanities Council in matching funds. Matching funds were set up to encourage private donations to the foundations. These funds would be matched by the Federal Government up to the fund ceiling. The committee recommends elimination of this fund. Thus the Foundation is now recommended by the committee to be financed 100 percent by Federal funds.

The committee majority report does not state why the fund has been eliminated. The facts are that private donations have not been as large as anticipated. The first year—fiscal 1966—the matching fund only raised $34,308.28 in donations by the Arts Council and no money by the Humanities Council. In fiscal 1967, the Humanities Council raised but $106,278.65 and the Arts Council $1,965,691.72 in matching fund donations. However, $1.3 million of the Arts Council donations came from a single foundation grant. The latest figures for the current fiscal year indicate that private donations are not producing the expected revenue. The Arts Council has raised but $220,119.68 and the Humanities Council a mere $50,000.

With the elimination—as recommended by the committee bill—of the matching fund, the Arts and Humanities Foundation will be completely funded by the Federal Government and no incentive will exist for private donations.

Another provision of the committee bill allows the Arts Council to spend any funds of the State art program that are not granted to the States. In effect this allows the Council to feather its own nest. If the State art programs have any merit, little reason can be found to allow this type of transfer to take place.

Perhaps the most amazing part of the committee bill is that it asks for more than President Johnson's budget recommends.

The Arts Council would receive over five times what the budget requested, the Humanities would be authorized to spend four times the budget request and the State art program would receive over four times the amount requested by the agency.

The committee bill calls for the expenditure of $80 million compared to the $18.05 million requested by President

Johnson for the same programs in fiscal 1969.

Even the administrative cost of operating the Foundation has almost doubled in 2 years. In fiscal year 1967, $1.09 million was appropriated for administrative purposes compared to a 1969 budget request of almost $2 million.

This country is now faced with a serious economic crisis. The President has urged a large tax increase, the country is rampant with inflation, and the national debt grows each month. This House must ask the question: Can we afford to sharply increase nonmilitary expenditures at this time?

Many more important domestic programs have been and will be cut below their budget request. The committee report prepared by the majority does not make a sound case for not cutting the budget or for its demands for exorbitant increases over the budget recommendation. This bill needs to be defeated and more hearings held to determine the proper role the Federal Government should play in financing the development of the arts and humanities.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

[In millions of dollars]

	Arts Council	Humanities Council	State arts programs	Arts matching funds	Humanities matching fund
Authorized by Congress for 1966, 1967, and 1968	$5.00	$5.00	$2.75	$2.25	$5.00
Appropriated fiscal 1966 (June 30)	2.50	2.50	0	2.00	3.00
Appropriation, fiscal 1967	4.00	2.00	2.00	0	0
Appropiation, fiscal 1968	4.50	3.50	2.00	.50	.50
President Johnson's 1969 budget	6.50	9.05	2.50	1.00	1.00
Committee recommendation, H.R. 11308	32.00	40.00	8.00		

USDA "PROPHESIES" AGAIN—A POOR RECORD

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a copy of a letter sent to Iowa feed grain producers by the Iowa ASC State Committee on February 15 urging them to sign up in the 1968 feed grain program. Without getting into the question of the merits of this program, I want to make some observations about the contents of the letter.

The letter pleads for signup for two reasons. The first reason involves the matter of potential continued overproduction of corn in 1968. As you will see, a whole series of statistical projections are used to "prove" that farmers have to sign up or they will be in worse trouble than they are in presently. It is very interesting to me that they can be so exact in their figures at this time, when only a year ago, they were pleading with farmers to produce more because we were going to run out of feed grain if they did not. The record shows that last year's Government-encouraged high level of production is primarily responsible for current low market prices. If USDA officials could not make any better projections than they did a year ago, why should we be expected to have faith in these figures?

Another interesting line in the letter reads as follows:

> Without a strategic reserve to isolate excess supplies from the market, the excess comes on the market as it did this year and sets the price for the entire crop.

Let me say first, excess supplies, particularly those in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, do not have to come on the market. The Secretary of Agriculture has the power to hold much of our excess supplies off the market at the present time by stopping CCC sales until prices rise to satisfactory levels. In addition, as many of my colleagues recognize, the concept of a strategic reserve is presently a highly controversial issue before Congress. It is incredible to me that the USDA would go to this extent to lobby Congress through a government-franked letter to farmers.

The second reason for a heavy signup mentioned in this letter involves future farm programs. The next to the last paragraph urges farmers to sign up in large numbers to show Congress that they like these programs and want them continued.

Again, without questioning the merits of the present program, let me warn my colleagues that the level of signup in the 1968 feed grain programs will be a poor indicator of what type of farm program we should adopt in the future. Economics of individual farm operations will dictate the level of 1968 signup and has nothing to do with farmers' attitude to long-range farm policy. Congress, after proper deliberation and consultation with farmers, their organizations, and others will have to finally make the decision as to whether to extend current programs or find new solutions. What happens in terms of signup in 1968 should have little or no bearing on that decision. To look at signup figures alone is to play politics and we have already had too much of that in the farm program field. We need to make future agricultural plans on a sound economical basis.

I imagine many of you will find that farmers in your States are receiving similar letters. As a farmer myself, I wanted to share with you my views on this type of letter so that you can judge accordingly the significance of its contents:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 15, 1968.

DEAR PRODUCER: We are pleased and encouraged at the optimistic reports we have received after the first week of the 1968 Feed Grain Program signup. We sincerely thank those of you who have already enrolled in the program. For those of you who are still considering the extent of your participation or whether or not to participate, we would like to share these thoughts:

We are becoming concerned that all of the publicity being given this early part of the signup may lull some farmers into a sense of complacency. A record signup is needed, both in numbers of farmers enrolled and in the number of acres diverted.

There are two equally important reasons why a record signup is vital to America's system of family-farm agriculture:

(1) The 1967 corn crop of 4.7 billion bushels plus a carryover of 817 million bushels old corn in all positions on October 1, 1967 equals a supply of 5.5 billion bushels. Total use through feeding, by industry and through exports, of this supply is officially estimated at 4.5 billion bushels. This practically guarantees that on October 1, 1968, before the 1968 crop is harvested, we will have a carryover of one billion bushels of old corn. Without a strategic reserve to isolate excess supplies from the market, the excess comes on the market as it did this year and sets the price for the entire crop. We have only one choice if farmers wish to avoid repeating the present supply-price situation. We must produce a small enough crop in 1968 to guarantee that the billion bushel carryover of next October will be needed.

National average corn yields have increased from 55 bushels per acre in 1960 to 77 bushels in 1967. The total corn base in the nation (average of 1959–60 acreage) is 81.5 million acres. If we divert a record 35 million acres under the 1968 Feed Grain Program, this will mean that about 28 million acres will be diverted from corn. Depending upon the extent of overplanting by nonparticipants, at least 53.5 million acres of corn will be grown, probably more. 53.5 million acres at a 75 bushel yield will produce a 4 billion bushel crop.

This crop plus the one billion bushel carryover on October 1, 1968 will make a total supply of 5 billion bushels. If total use remains about the same, a draw-down in future carryover will be made and prices should increase.

Look at the immense job we face to divert 35 million acres under the program, 28 of it from corn. This means that 34% of the nation's corn base must be diverted. For every three farms with equal sized bases, if one farmer stays out and plants all of his base, two farmers must divert a full 50% to bring the total diversion back near 34% of the total base on all three farms.

We dare not let early reports of a heavy signup lull us into thinking that our troubles are over. Nor can we afford to be kidded into thinking that a heavy signup is unnecessary.

Earlier in this letter we mentioned that there are two reasons why a large signup and large diversion are vital. The reason explained above pertains to corn prices and farm income in 1968. The following equally important consideration pertains to the future of farm programs:

(2) The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 will expire in 1969. Congress will then decide what kind of farm programs (if any) will be offered in the future. Large numbers of participating farmers will tell the Congress that farmers need and want farm programs. Participation similar to 1967 (only 43% nation-wide) will tell the Congress that the majority of farmers do not believe in or want farm programs.

Please contact your ASC committeemen or your county office if you have questions about how the program fits your farm. We need your help in bringing supplies in line with demand. Farmer participation in the 1968 Feed Grain Program is vital.

Very truly yours,
FRED R. MCVEIN,
Chairman, Iowa ASC State Committee.
HERMAN FENNEMA,
ROBERT J. SMITH,
Members.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague, HASTINGS KEITH, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Donald W. Nicholson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matter, resolutions, and documents on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be chairman of the program commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, for the 50th anniversary is a special anniversary, a golden anniversary. And surely the proclamation of Lithuania's independence on February 16, 1918, after more than a century of Russian rule, was a golden moment in the history of this steadfast and heroic people. The qualities of courage and faith displayed by the people of Lithuania is resisting Soviet domination for the better part of five decades will continue to be needed. Fortunately, neither quality is in short supply.

For Lithuania is a small country with a proud history, a history that bespeaks the dedication and determination of its people. At one time a vast area of Eastern Europe was under the protection of Lithuania. It was the Lithuanians who helped check the early thrusts of the German "Drang nach Osten," the drive to the east. Lithuanian power helped protect Europe against the advance of Mongols and Tatars. Most important of all, when Lithuania's star was in the ascendant the people living under Lithuanian rule lived with a degree of freedom remarkable for both the time and the place. This is a lesson lost to this day upon the rulers of Muscovy.

In 1795 Lithuania, which had been legally joined to Poland, passed under Russian domination. But its people never accepted heavyhanded foreign rule. They rose in revolt again and again, but all attempts to regain independence failed. Finally the Czar's government launched a policy of Russification. The Lithuanian language and culture were to give way to the Russian. But this policy, although vigorously pressed for almost three quarters of a century, never broke Lithuania's loyalty to its language, religion, or traditions.

During the First World War the Lithuanians suffered the depredations of both the Russians and the Germans. But that war presented them with the opportunity to press for independence, and to proclaim it. Having proclaimed it, they had to fight for it against the invading Red army. It was not until 1920 that the U.S.S.R. made peace with Lithuania, and renounced forever all rights of sovereignty. That pledge, like so many others to follow, was discarded when it stood in the way of Soviet ambition.

Once her independence and sovereignty had been established, Lithuania bent her energies to the works of peaceful progress. She was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and a Constitution which guaranteed those rights of political and religious freedom which Americans, like Lithuanians, hold dear, was adopted the next year. A land reform program which could be a model to the less developed nations today, transformed the country into a nation of sturdy, independent farmers. Industry grew steadily, progressive social legislation was adopted, and tremendous strides were made in reducing the illiteracy that was the legacy of foreign rule. In short, Lithuanian independence meant a political, social, and cultural renaissance for this patient, steadfast people.

But Lithuania's peaceful development was to be brutally and cruelly arrested. A small nation, rich with promise and achievement, she was victimized by her powerful neighbors as they maneuvered for position on the eve of World War II. First, Lithuania had to yield Klaipeda, or Memel, to the Nazis, after a German ultimatum. No Western finger was raised to help Lithuania, in that era of "peace in our time." Then, after the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, the U.S.S.R. forced Lithuania to admit Soviet troops, and to permit the construction of Soviet air bases on her territory. Once the Soviets had this foothold, they did not wait long to step up the pressure. In June of 1940 they demanded a "friendly" government, and occupied Lithuania to make sure they got it. In the best totalitarian fashion, they then forced a fixed election down the throats of the Lithuanian people, and obtained the puppet government they wanted. The new legislature, totally unrepresentative of the wishes of the Lithuanian people, requested the incorporation of their historic state into the Soviet Union. Ever happy to oblige, the Supreme Soviet in Moscow granted this request. Lithuania was absorbed into the Soviet Union, and ever since the Russians have been trying to spread the word that Lithuania is happy about it. The very fact that we are celebrating Lithuania's independence here today, however, is evidence that the Soviet propaganda has not succeeded. It has not succeeded because neither the Nazis, who overran Lithuania in 1941, nor the Soviet Union, which reconquered the country in 1944, have ever been able to quench the fires of Lithuanian patriotism.

The Russians have not failed for lack of trying. Indeed, they have employed all their vast arsenal of pressure and intimidation, but they have not stripped Lithuania of its sense of national identity, and national destiny. In Lithuania the Soviets have operated in low key, with low visibility. Soviet troops are inconspicuous, and in some cases they are based on offshore islands. The Lithuanian populace may even be permitted to use its own tongue, and maintain its native customs. But all this is so much show. For the school system, and the road to advancement, are subject to regulations designed to turn the younger generation away from the culture of their forefathers, and to remake them in the new Soviet mold. It is 19th century Russification all over again, except that it is more subtly applied. Moscow boasts of its cultural pluralism, but the truth of the matter is that no subject nationality in the Soviet Union is free to develop in its own way. National languages and national customs are permitted to exist only insofar as they do not clash with the interests of the Communist Party or the Soviet State. Let the Lithuanians dare to show their true feelings, and Moscow will show its iron fist.

It is ironic, truly ironic, that 50 years after their own revolution, the Communits are afraid of the national feelings of the people they have subjugated. For there can be no clearer evidence of communism's failure than its inability to win the hearts and minds of the people it holds in thrall.

That is the supreme lesson of Lithuania. That is the courage and fortitude we salute today.

THE 50TH COMMEMORATION OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 11, 1968

Miss BARBARA DARLYS. Our next speaker, as a young man in 1918 in Lithuania, witnessed many of the events which led to the signing of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

Later, in 1919, he was a member of the press in Paris, which covered the Versailles Peace Conference. When the Lithuania government was established, he became a member of Parliament. He is a professor of economics, publicist, a man of letters. He will discuss the circumstances leading to the signing of the Declaration, and the events immediately following.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dr. Juozas Pajaujis.

Dr. JUOZAS PAJAUJIS. Honorable Minister of Lithuania, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen.

In commemorating this year the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, it behooves to recall the events which had led to this action, to recall the very first 16th of February in Vilnius and the developments immediately thereafter. May I be allowed to reminisce as an eyewitness of those events. I resided in Vilnius at the time and took an active part in the events. It is true that I was fairly young at the time, having belatedly—due to the hostilities of war—passed the high school examinations, and my part was but secondary, of course. I was employed at the time on the editorial staff of the "Lietuvos Aidas"—"The Echo of Lithuania", the Lithuanian language newspaper published by the Council of Lithuania. I was the secretary of the editorial staff, in charge of relations with the German military censor's office, and it was my job to submit to the censors the text of the February 16th Act. The actual editor was Petras Klimas, member of the Council, the "Taryba".

Developments of World War I created favorable external circumstances for this action. The Russians had been pushed far to the east. The Germans occupied Lithuania in 1915 and did not feel quite at home in this country. What was to be done with the occupied Eastern areas after the anticipated

German victory? There was no unanimity among the Germans with regard to policy on this question. Some members of the Reichstag, the Parliament, associated with democratic parties, like the Social Democrats (Scheidemann, David) and the Catholic Zentrum (Groeber, Erzberger), were amenable to letting the areas liberated from Russia have self-government. Particularly friendly to Lithuanians and very active in their behalf was Mathias Erzberger. On the other hand, German nationalists and the so-called "war party", especially the top echelon of the German military government in Lithuania, frankly and determinedly championed annexationist designs. The official ruling circles in Berlin were looking for diplomatic means to cover the annexationist designs with the alleged will of the population—at least by exacting collaboration of the leading personalities. With this in mind, an attempt was made to create a certain advisory organ associated with the German military government, a so-called "Council of Trustees", a "Vertrauensrat". The Germans had approached Bishop Karevicius and Dr. Basanavicius and other prominent Lithuanians, yet no Lithuanian agreed to become a member of such a subservient Council.

Eventually the need for having an organized Lithuanian representation sharpened and acquired urgency, as a perspective of a separate peace with Russia loomed after the Russian revolution. It was deemed advantageous to possess during the peace negotiations some legitimate decisions by representative organs of the occupied areas to separate and secede from Russia. Therefore, in the fall of 1917, the German military authorities reluctantly allowed the Lithuanians to call a conference in Vilnius (September 18–22), which elected a twenty-member Council of Lithuania (Lietuvos Taryba). Of course, the Germans continued to nurse their designs to convert the Taryba into its subservient advisory body. However, the members of the Taryba, guided by the decisions of the Vilnius Conference, considered their main and specific task to proclaim the restitution of a Lithuanian State prior to general peace conference, and to secure the recognition of that State by Germany in the first place.

The road lying ahead of the Taryba was pitted with many pitfalls. To divorce Lithuania from Russia—yes, jawohl this was agreeable to Germany. But to let Lithuania slip from German stranglehold—Nein, nimmer, never. Therefore, the Taryba had to maneuver with skill.

It was clear that no support could be expected not only from the Kaiser's government, but from the friendly Reichstag circles, unless some concessions be promised by the Lithuanians regarding the future relations with Germany. Taryba members were also influenced in this conciliatory reasoning by their realization of the hard fact that the Western Entente powers showed no interest whatsoever in the problem of Lithuania.

Dr. Juozas Purickis who participated in the Vilnius Conference as the observer from Switzerland, confidentially pointed out that the Western Allies were preoccupied with their own worries, particularly because of the disruption of the Eastern Front by the revolution in Russia. Therefore, no concrete support can be counted on in the efforts to raise the cause of Lithuania into an international problem. The British and French press printed some scant accounts of the events in Lithuania, yet viewed the events as alleged German machinations rather than the true aspirations of the Lithuanians. Even the formation of the Council of Lithuania was viewed in that light. No concrete help could be expected during the war years from the United States of America, regardless of the strenuous efforts exerted by Lithuanian Americans. America was primarily concerned with winning the war and carefully shunned anything that might possibly hurt its great ally, the interests of "one and indivisible Russia", as was later amply demonstrated by Secretary of State Lansing's policy at the Versailles peace conference. No good could be expected by Lithuanians from the post-revolutionary Russian regimes, be they led by Lvov or Kerensky or the rapidly rising Bolsheviks—to whom the principle of national self-determination meant but a theoretic right to submit to the dictatorship of the Russian communist party.

Due to these various factors, Taryba's relations with the Germans were in a flux and oscillated like a pendulum according to barometric indication of the German successes or failures at the war fronts, and reflecting the strengthening or the weakening of the war party in the government of Berlin.

One positive development was the success, after many efforts, at gaining an audience for the Taryba Presidium with Reichskanzler Hertling in Berlin on December 1, 1917. A preliminary agreement was initialed in the form of a protocol which projected a formula for a declaration of Lithuania's independence, yet inescapably bound such a declaration with a clause for an "eternal and firm association tie" with Germany by negotiating four conventions: the military, communications, customs tariffs and monetary. This protocol provided the base for the so-called Declaration of December 11, 1917.

The question of conventions with Germany led to a split in the Taryba. When the peace negotiations with the Bolshevik government of Russia at Brest Litovsk were resumed after an extended recess or break, the Germans demanded that Taryba would accept the entire text of the December 11th declaration, but that only its first part, declaring Lithuania's secession from Russia, be communicated at Brest Litovsk. When the problem of this notification came to a vote in the Taryba on January 26, 1918, only eight members voted for it. Of the eight members voting against, four resigned from the Council (Birziska, Kairys, Narutavicius, Vileisis), and the other four opposing members remained in the Council (Stulginskis, Staugaitis, Smilgevicius, Vailokaitis).

The split vote was not deemed acceptable to the Germans and the delegation of the Taryba failed to get a permission to go to Brest Litovsk. Meanwhile the peace negotiations broke off, and the problem of Lithuania again lost its urgency in German affairs.

Internal negotiations among the Taryba members and with the former members continued throughout the first two weeks of February. The four oppositionists had submitted earlier their statement to the Taryba majority, including a declaration of independence omitting any reference to special ties with Germany. Should the majority accept their formula, they would return to the Taryba's fold.

The differences in views of the majority and the opposition could be defined as a conflict of two different reasonings. On the one hand there were the so-called realists, or more properly opportunists, who were inclined to defer to the moment's circumstances and placate the occupying power. On the other side were strongly principled men who refused to bow to circumstances and would make no unacceptable compromises. Soon enough the Taryba majority became likewise convinced that before the end of the war a declaration of Lithuania's independence could not be made without a conflict with the occupational authorities. This realization was the decisive motive which bound the Taryba to decide on February 15th, after prolonged mutual negotiations, to accept the formula proposed by the opposition, with inconsequential editorial changes—the formula originally drawn by Steponas Kairys and now edited by Petras Klimas. This formula was finally accepted by all members of the Taryba on February 16th, 1918, as the Declaration of Restoration of Lithuania's Independence.

It was a magnificent scene when all twenty members of the Council gathered in the modest premises of the Lithuanian Committee for the Relief of War Sufferers at No. 2 Grand (Didzioji) Street in Vilnius. Dr. Jonas Basanavicius read the text, and the Declaration of the Restoration of Lithuania's was adopted unanimously and subscribed manually by all members.

However, it was one thing to adopt a declaration within the Taryba's membership, and it was quite a different thing to proclaim it "urbi et orbi", to make it known inside Lithuania and to the world at large. It was obvious that the document must be published in the very next issue of the "Lietuvos Aidas." Nevertheless it was equally obvious that a revolutionary declaration enacted against the will of the military occupying government of the land, would not be allowed by the military censorship to be printed in a newspaper. There were optimists, like Dr. Jurgis Saulys, who reasoned that the censor's office "would not dare" to delete a document of such importance and, in fact, he handed the text that same evening to Herr Bonin, the representative of the German Foreign Office in Vilnius.

We at the editorial office headed by Petras Klimas were well aware of the censors' mentality. We had ample experience with the censorship office. For instance, whenever the censor encountered in any article the expression "independent Lithuania"—in translation: "Unabhaengiges Litauen", and everything had to be submitted in German translation,—he systematically crossed out the word "unabhaengiges" and would write in "selbstaendiges", or selfgoverning. The editors at all times had to deal with another problem. The permission to publish the newspaper was granted by the Germans on condition that it would contain no blank spaces and that the newspaper must be published regularly whenever less than one third of the text was penciled out, or the publisher will pay a 10,000 Mark fine. For this reason we had on hand a sizeable reserve of articles already approved by the censors in order to fill in blank spaces left by the censor's pencil. On the present occasion we had to strive in the opposite direction: we decided to set in type an issue that could not possibly be allowed by the censor—that more than one third of the text should be crossed out and the issue would not appear, yet would not draw the large fine. As long as we were not able to publish the Declaration of Independence, we did not want to come out with a regular issue as if nothing had happened.

February 16th that year was Saturday. The newspaper was due to come out Monday, and consequently we had enough time. The Declaration of Independence was set in type in large letters taking up the entire page one. To fill other pages we gave to typesetters a number of articles pulled from our desk drawers—articles of strictly censorable contents and correspondent reports from the provinces about the brutal requisitions, the depletion of timber forests, and the like. And I wrote a supplementary article—under a nom de guerre—about the Lithuanian struggle against the Teutonic Knights.

When the newspaper of this sort was set in type, I picked up proof sheets and around 10 p.m. arrived at the censor's office at the Deutsche Pressestelle. My visits there usually lasted from a half hour to one hour in the waiting room. That evening, however, I waited there about three hours. Handing in the proof sheets to the censor, I observed at once that this was "a hot potato" to him and he did not know what to do. Through the thin partition wall I heard him telephone to Kaunas to the Ob-Ost, the Supreme Command East, and most likely calls were made from there to Berlin, and occasionally I would overhear angrily voiced

"Donnerwetter". At long last, roughly three hours later, I was handed the censored-out newspaper. I looked at it: a red penciled cross covered the entire text of the Declaration of Independence—the entire page one. On the remaining pages—little was left without the red pencil marks. So I mused: all in order, the issue will not be out—legitimately, and I can peacefully go to bed.

However, Mr. Klimas had told me that he would wait for me at the editorial office for news about the censor's action. And so I returned to the office. Klimas had made arrangements in advance with the printing shop owner, a good Lithuanian Martynas Kukta. Klimas just looked at the censored copy, called up Kukta on the phone to say a code word, and then told me: "Let's go to the printer's." On the way there I learned from Klimas that—no matter what should happen—we were going to print several hundred copies of the abridged newspaper with the text of the Declaration of Independence and distribute them clandestinely.

At the printing shop we found only the owner Kuxta and his assistant Antanas Dirse. Other workmen were dismissed and told that no issue was to be reset and printed. The four of us locked the final plate forms and the machines began turning. We printed, as I recall, about five hundred copies of the newspaper. The very same night these copies were delivered to private residences of Lithuanians and Vilnius and then were distributed all over the country.

More secretive was the process of smuggling the Declaration out of the country. I remembered that Miss Jadvyga Chodokauskaite had played a significant part in this operation. She is now Mrs. Hubelis. In reply to my request for details she wrote as follows:

MIAMI,
January 8, 1968.

As you undoubtedly recall, the Germans were publishing their newspaper in Vilnius, the "Zeitnug der Zehnten Armee". One of the editors there was a great friend of Lithuania and the Lithuanians—he was the Alsacian writer Wöhrle. Having arrived in Vilnius with the German army, he became enchanted with Lithuanian history and the Lithuanian determination to reconstitute their country's independence. He learned the Lithuanian language and was ready to help us in whatever way he could. It is quite natural that Taryba people thought of him at once when the problem of transmission of the Independence Declaration to Germany arose. It was arranged with him that the text of the Declaration would be delivered to him clandestinely and that he would take it over to Germany. However, the Taryba people were well known to the Germans and were under observation by them. So I was requested one evening to meet Wöhrle in the building of the Lithuanian Society of Sciences and to hand him the said document. One key to the building was given Wöhrle, and I received another key. He was to go to the Society's office a little earlier and to wait for me, without switching the lights on and with the door locked. I entered the building using my own key. I handed him an envelope with the Declaration, in the darkness, and left the building again. He was to leave later. Of course, being a German soldier, he had exposed himself to a great risk. Several days later he notified us that he had accomplished his mission. I think it would be worthwhile to recall with gratitude the name of this sincere friend of Lithuania during the observance of the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

MRS. JADVYGA TUBELIS.

According to Dr. Jurgis Saulys, the text of the Declaration was sent out to Berlin to the Reichstag Deputy Erzberger that very night. The fact is that the "Vossische Zeitung", the "Taegliche Rundschau" and the "Kreuzzeitung" published the Lithuanian declaration of independence as early as on February 18th, and on that date Chairman Groeber of the Catholic Zentrum read the text in the plenary session of the Reichstag. But the German government looked very unfavorably at the matter and enjoined other German newspapers not to publish the text and to make no comment regarding this declaration.

The Ob-Ost chieftains in Lithuania were enraged by this turn of events. The Tenth Army Chief of Staff Hahnke intended to arrest all members of the Taryba, but he was restrained by the new head of the military government who reasoned that such detention would be harmful to Germany in the light of world public opinion. Thus the occupational regime was obliged to suffer the presence of the Taryba for a while longer.

The Taryba sought to improve somewhat its relations with the Germans. A delegation of three members—Dr. Saulys, Rev. Justinas Staugaitis and Jonas Vileisis—was authorized to proceed to Berlin and to make reassurances that the Act of February 16th has no bearing on future German-Lithuanian relations and does not cancel the provisions regarding such relations referred to in the statement of December 11, 1917. The Treaty of Brest Litovsk was then pending in the Reichstag for ratification, and before ratifying it—the Reichstag was pressing the government to normalize its relations with Lithuania. Pressed by the Reichstag majority, the Reichskanzler finally secured and handed to the Taryba delegation a Kaiser's writ dated March 23rd recognizing the independence of Lithuania—on the basis, however, of the December 11th declaration.

Before coming to address you here, I attempted to verify the time when the February 16th Declaration had become known in the West, and particularly in America and among the Lithuanian Americans. Dr. Julius J. Bielskis, presently the Honorary Consul General of Lithuania at Los Angeles, in 1917 and 1918 had been the President of the Lithuanian National Council in America and head of the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Washington. He informed me that it is difficult to fix a definite date inasmuch as news from German-occupied Lithuania seeped through to America slowly and irregularly, and the information was received with great reservations regarding the authenticity. It is a fact that no mention of the February 16th date was made at the Lithuanian General Assembly at New York of March 13–14, 1918, and evidently the declaration was not then known. On May 3, 1918, a fairly large Lithuanian American delegation was received by President Woodrow Wilson at the White House—and the declaration of February 16th was not mentioned in the memorandum presented to the President. Lithuanian Americans referred most commonly to the decisions adopted by the Lithuanian Conference in Vilnius in September 1917.

The conditions in German-occupied Lithuania were not at all ameliorated following the declaration of independence and the recognition of such independence by the Kaiser. The Ob-Ost paid no attention to the Kaiser's promise of "finding the necessary means for the reconstitution of a self-governing Lithuanian State". A collection of pertinent wartime documents—the correspondence between the Taryba Presidium and the German officials in Lithuania and at Berlin—was published by Petras Klimas. The bitter struggle between the Taryba and the Germans is graphically documented. The German military government sabotaged the efforts of the Taryba. Repeated requests by the Taryba to ease the inhuman burden of food requisitioning were ignored. A loud and shrill German "Nein!" blocked Taryba's political movements, viz., the decision to rename itself "Valstybes Taryba"—"The State Council", the decision to co-opt more members, even the decision to invite Prince Urach of Wuerttemberg to assume the royal Lithuanian throne.

These conditions persisted until the downfall of Germany's military effort. In September 1918 the German Western front reeled back along the entire front and Hindenburg himself urged the government to explore peace possibilities. This situation at once changed the political relations with regard to Lithuania. Chancellor Hertling was obliged to resign. The new Reichskanzler—Prince Max von Baden—on October 5, 1918 stated in the Reichstag for the first time that Germany leaves to the Lithuanian State itself to determine its relations with its neighbors. Consequently, the burdensome problem of "eternal conventions" with Germany was solved: Lithuania was free.

In Lithuania, however, the occupational German military regime would hear nothing of any changes in the situation. The requisitioning continued with full brutal force, denuding Lithuania of foodstocks. The Germans would not transfer any civilian administration to Lithuanians and would not allow formation of any military units, not even a native police force. And when on the Armistice Day—November 11, 1918—the first Lithuanian Government was formed with Prime Minister Augustinas Voldemaras at its head—this was but a nominal government with no actual powers of governing. The real foundations of the Lithuanian State were laid only in the last days of December and in January 1919 when the second Cabinet of Mykolas Slezevicius pushed the organization of local governing bodies and called volunteers, mobilized the officers and organized nuclear Lithuanian armed force. Had Lithuania been able to form a 20–30 thousand armed force in the last two-three months of 1918—history might have followed different paths. Most likely the Russian Red Army would not have occupied Vilnius and most of Lithuania, there might not have arisen the Vilnius problem to plague Lithuania's relations with Poland. Nevertheless, the period of independence to 1940 remains a bright period of great exertions and great achievements: in those two decades Lithuania achieved more in agricultural and industrial development, in educational and cultural progress—than during the long 120 years of barbaric oppression under Russian rule. The fight for freedom, progress and democracy must be continued. Lithuania must regain its sovereign independence free from the stranglehold of Moscow.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C., COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 11, 1968

PROGRAM

American National Anthem.

Invocation: Very Rev. Msgr. Peter P. Silvinskas Secretary, Apostolic Delegation.

Introduction of Guests: Barbara Darlys, President.

Luncheon.

Remarks by the Vice President: Joseph Zamites.

Address by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim, Lithuanian Legation.

Address by Hon. William T. Murphy (D.), 3rd Dist., Cook County, Chicago, Ill. U.S. House of Representatives.

Greetings by The Hon. Dr. Arnolds Spekke, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chargé d'Affaires, Latvian Legation.

Address by Dr. Joseph Pajaujis (in Lithuanian).

Reading of Resolution.

Benediction: Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

Ten Minute Intermission.

"When Lithuania Speaks": Reading from Lithuania's Lyric Poets Vince Jonuskaite and Henrikas Kacinskas.

Lithuanian National Anthem.

RESOLUTION

Citizens of the Metropolitan area gathered February 11, 1968, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Society, at the Washington Hotel to observe the Golden Anniversary of the Restoration of Independence of Lithuania, extend their fraternal greetings to the People of Lithuania. They urge the President of the United States to concern himself, in dealing with the Soviet Union and at the United Nations and at various international conferences, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe by counseling and actively promoting the restoration of sovereignty to the People of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Estonia. They also request the President to champion the rights of the Baltic Peoples to choose their own governments and to determine the form of such governments in free and universal elections by the indigenous populations without the presence of Soviet troops and officials of the occupational regimes installed there in consequence of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression, in violation of the treaties of peace and nonaggression freely negotiated by the Government of the Soviet Union and Governments of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

The assembled citizens also vote their grateful approval of the steadfast adherence by every Administration since 1940 to the policy of non-recognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet aggression, and their thanks to Members of Congress of the United States for their faithful dedication to the principles of freedom and self-determination so often urged by them in Congressional Joint Resolutions in behalf of the Peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1968.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Charge d'Affaires ad interim of the Legation of Lithuania, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHARGE D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I am very pleased to extend to you best wishes on behalf of the Government and people of the United States.

Throughout its long and proud history, the Lithuanian nation has endured with fortitude many periods of trial and alien rule. Unhappily, in our own time, Lithuania's reestablishment as an independent state was followed only twenty-two years later by its forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian people have responded to this situation through the years with unyielding courage and unfaltering hope for freedom and national independence. The firm purpose with which the Lithuanians both at home and abroad have struggled to preserve their national heritage is the best assurance of their survival as a nation.

Americans look with understanding and sympathy upon the just aspiration of the Lithuanian people to determine freely their own destiny. The United States Government, by its continued nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania, affirms its belief in Lithuania's right of self-determination.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

(Excerpts translated from an address in Lithuanian delivered by Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lithuanian, at a commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence held in Chicago, Ill., February 18, 1968:)

We have gathered to commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, an event of surpassing importance for our country.

We well remember how, immediately after the publication of that Declaration, it was necessary to pass the joyous news among our countrymen in an almost clandestine fashion, since Lithuania was at the time still in the throes of occupation. That Czarist occupation had lasted for over 120 years; and when the dawn of liberty finally came, the poet Maironis was prompted to write:

> "Why, O God, have we been blessed
> To live to see our country's freedom?
> So many others lived in grief,—
> Waiting, working, watching, weeping
> Who never lived to see this day!"

The Declaration of February 16 marked the resurrection of Lithuania, because as a consequence of that day, she joined the family of modern nations and began to fulfill the promise of her ancient destiny.

The work of countless patriots had reached its deserved fruition—the work of Daukantas, Valancius, Basanavicius, Kudirka. And the press of the national revival had triumphed: "Dawn" [Ausra], "The Nation's Guardian" [Tevynes Sargas], "Liberty Bell" [Varpas], and many other great efforts had flowered and grown to greatness.

The spiritual and moral treasure amassed during the relatively short period of Lithuania's free and independent life will last long in the consciousness of the Lithuanian people. It will be enough until Lithuania is free again.

A little bit of that treasure of Lithuania's independent life belongs to each one of us. For that we are in debt to Lithuania, and we must repay that debt through unceasing dedication to give back to our motherland that freedom which is rightfully hers. "Redde quod debes" was the inscription on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Kaunas. Let us, then, during this crucial time of cruel hardship for our country, give her our hearts and our hands and our prayers.

On this anniversary occasion Lithuania is still enslaved. For a long time, the Soviet occupation meant genocide for our nation in the form of arrests, executions and deportations. Although such atrocities have somewhat subsided in the present day, it is possible that they might recur; the recent fate of various Russian intellectuals indeed indicates that the curse of Stalinistic totalitarianism is not necessarily over.

But, though physical genocide has subsided in Lithuania, there are subtler forms of genocide still practiced by the Soviet captors. It is enough to recall all the Soviet attempts to falsify Lithuanian history, to ridicule her previously flourishing independent life, to undermine her cultural heritage, to justify the treacherous violation of her territorial sovereignty, and to impose an alien language and culture. All these Soviet attempts are manifestations of a spiritual genocide, or an attempt to suppress basic human dignity and human rights.

Despite this tragic situation in our homeland, however, it is paradoxical that Lithuania's situation is, in one sense, more hopeful than it was when Lithuania's modern independence was declared in 1918. At that time Lithuania was a relatively unknown country, hard pressed by powerful and predatory neighbors. Today Lithuania is an occupied country, but her forcible incorporation into the Soviet empire has not been recognized by the free world's major powers, with the United States in the first rank. The name of Lithuania is today known throughout the world, and she continues to exist *de jure*. In the free world her symbols—the legations and consulates—continue to function. Lithuania, together with the other Baltic states, continues to be a classic case of demonstrated Soviet aggression and duplicity; she thus continues to be a live issue in the conscience of all freedom-loving people.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk affirmed on this historic occasion, as he has done in the past, the moral support of his government and people for the aspirations of the Lithuanian nation. We are very grateful to him for his expression of support, and the reiteration of the United States policy of non-recognition of the Soviet aggression in the Baltic states. The same policy was reaffirmed by Vice President Humphrey on December 6 to a delegation of the American Lithuanian Council. We are also gratified that, on February 20, the United States Senate and House of Representatives will join in commemorating this anniversary. In this connection, we are especially grateful to Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana and Congressman William T. Murphy of Illinois, who have been instrumental in arranging this year's tribute to Lithuania in the United States Congress.

It is fitting that legislators from Indiana and Illinois are so deeply involved in this Lithuanian anniversary, because these states are the boyhood and adult homes, respectively, of Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrated last week. If there is any one man who captured the imagination of all freedom loving peoples in the late nineteenth century, it is Lincoln. His championing of human dignity, and his abhorrence of the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger, extended genuine hope to all the weak and subjugated. It was, in fact, prophetic of him to note that the American Declaration of Independence extended the hope of freedom to all peoples in all ages.

There are so many other leading figures of the past who played a part in shaping Lithuania's destiny that it is impossible to name them all. It would be fitting to mention, however, that just as Abraham Lincoln began a social revolution, it was Woodrow Wilson who began an international revolution. It was Wilson's espousal of a nation's right to self-determination that directly contributed, in early 1918, to the re-emergence of modern Lithuania as a free and independent state. And it was Wilson's further insight into the interdependence of free nations that laid the groundwork for the kind of international cooperation that today is seen as an indispensable condition of world peace.

In addition to such eminent American leaders, there were many Lithuanian patriots and statesmen who are eminently worthy of remembrance today. There are the vast numbers of volunteers who helped to defend the newly-won independence immediately after the declaration of 1918; there are also the analymous but heroic partisan fighters who, by the thousands, continued to manifest Lithuania's desire for liberty after the Communist aggression in 1940.

Among Lithuanian statesmen, there are numerous names that come to mind, especially those who became famous diplomatists for Lithuania in the twentieth century: Vileisis, Carneckis, Bizauskas, Zadeikis, Balutis. All of them, having expended their lives for their countrymen's welfare, have passed into history. I would ask you to remember them now in a moment of silence.

For those who live here in Chicago, the memory of the late Minister Balutis is especially revered, because it was in this city that for some years he labored so nobly for his countrymen and his country. It was he who helped to prepare the inscription on the Lithuanian liberty bell: "Ring through the ages to the sons of Lithuania, and tell them that he who is not willing to fight for freedom is not worthy of its blessings."

Finally, not long ago, we lost to death the beloved poet V. Mykolaitis-Putinas. In his memory, I will end these remarks by paraphrasing in prose some of his verse lines, in which he describes the words of a present-day Lithuanian to his country—words that we must take very much to our hearts today: "A Lithuanian newly born and sworn, I pledge that from my country's ancient glory I will not swerve; and with my outstretched arm, begging heaven's help, I say to you, my own dear land: 'O Lietuva, you who have been spat upon, reviled and torn, I hold you, as a mother, in my care. I will defend you from the savage hands of your enemies, with heaven's help, as long as my heart shall beat!' "

AN APPEAL TO THE FREE WORLD: CAPTIVE LITHUANIA MUST BE FREE!

Because the passage over twenty-seven years may have somewhat dimmed memory, the Lithuanians living in freedom remind the peoples of the free world that, in this enlightened age of sovereignty and independence for once foreign-ruled colonies, Lithuania is still suffering under Soviet Russian occupation and sovietization.

After regaining her independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania signed a treaty of peace with Soviet Russia in 1920, was recognized by the United States in 1922, and became a member of the League of Nations and other international organizations. Lithuania's twenty-two years of increasingly prosperous independent life was cut short abrutly when, as a direct result of the secret Soviet-Nazi agreement of August 23 and September 28, 1939 which sparked World War II, Lithuania was invaded and occupied by the Red Army on June 15, 1940, then quickly "incorporated" into the Soviet Union.

The usual Soviet communist exploitation followed, and deprivation of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as private properties, slave labor, pauperization, russification, terrorization by mass deportations and murder immediately marked this new Soviet communist modern-day colonialism.

Thus, while former colonies of Western nations have been given complete freedom and are exercising their self-determination, Lithuania and her sister Baltic republics of Latvia and Estonia have been forcibly made into foreign colonies of Soviet Russia.

As Western colonialism is coming to an end everywhere in the world, the end of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism should also be hastened. To this end a sustained effort must be maintained in the United Nations and all other international forums for application of the principle of self-determination and complete independence for all of the subjugated countries of central and eastern Europe.

An aroused world public opinion must convince the Soviet Union that it is in their own interest to abandon colonialism and violations of human and sovereign rights in favor of self-determination, adherence to international law and the existing treaties of peace, non-aggression and friendship concluded with Lithuania and other nations.

For its part, the Soviet Union must prove its avowed concern for self-determination of independent nations and her publicly proclaimed stand that military conquest cannot be the basis for continued occupation of foreign territories, by withdrawing its own military forces and puppet rulers from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and restoring liberty to the Baltic States. As long as the Soviet government does not demonstrate its sincerity and refuses to relinquish the foreign territories she seized and is holding by military force, its loud proclamations calling for freedom and independence for all nations, large and small, will have a hollow ring.

The free Lithuanians throughout the world and their major organizations appeal to the conscience of all the peoples of the free world, and ask for support of the cause of freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia from the continuing Soviet communist occupation and colonization. By this means we want to remind the world that the Lithuanian nation wants to be, and has every right to be, self-governing in its own sovereign homeland.

Lithuania must and will be free!

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, fate has not been kind to all peoples and nations. Some have been blessed in possessing the requisite power, and also had the good fortune, in shaping their own destiny. Others, especially the small nations, lacking the power for the mastery of their own fate, and finding that they are not among the fortunate ones, have often been victims of some untoward events, or have suffered under other powerful nations. During most of their modern history the Lithuanian people have shared the fate of the unlucky nations.

The Lithuanian people are rightly proud of their long and glorious history, as they are of their ceaseless struggle for freedom from their oppressors. Late in the middle ages and early in modern times theirs was a powerful kingdom, one of the largest in Eastern Europe. For several centuries they had not only succeeded in repelling some of the incursions of ferocious invaders from the East into northeastern Europe, but they were also gallant champions of Christianity, forming its advance guard in that part of Europe. Then late in the 16th century their kingdom was united with Poland and formed a dual monarchy. This voluntary union lasted about 200 years. Then late in the 18th century, when Poland was partitioned and most of it fell to Russia, Lithuania was also incorporated into the Russian Empire.

That event marked the loss of freedom for the Lithuanian people, but the loss of national independence did not mean the end of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. Throughout their trying years, lasting more than a full century, the Lithuanians learned that individual or group well-being cannot be achieved in full without national political independence. They learned that in order to have full title to the fruits of their labor, they must have freedom in their homeland. Consequently, they united and worked ceaselessly for the realization of their most cherished dream, for Lithuania's independence.

None of the repressive measures of czarist Russia's government, none of its harsh brutality, nor its proscription of the Lithuanian language and culture, none of these could prevent the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians from striving for the realization of their national goal. They worked for it; they fought for it secretly and in the open, but they had to await until World War I for the actual achievement of their national independence. Finally they did this in their proclamation of February 16, 1918, and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

Thereafter for more than two decades the Lithuanians lived in freedom under their chosen form of democratic government. Then early in the last war came the rude shock from the sudden unleashing of evil international forces. Hemmed in between two powerful totalitarism forces, and practically cut off from their friends in the West, they themselves alone could not hope to ward off the dangers to their free existence. Early in 1940 the country was attacked and overrun by the Red Army, and then incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended two decades of happiness for Lithuanians and thus disappeared the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania.

Since those fateful and tragic days unfortunate Lithuanians have been living under the worst tyrannies known in modern history. After being overwhelmed by Communist forces early in the war, for a short time they were fated to suffer under the Nazis. Towards the end of the war, however, the Nazis were evicted, and their place was once more taken by the heartless minions of the Kremlin. The Communist regime has been there since 1945 with all its attendant evils: its commissars and spy rings, its informers and executioners, its regimentation and horrors. But these cruel taskmasters have not been able to suppress and subdue the native spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people. That is the one bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence.

Today, on the observance of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we share their genuine patriotic fervor and their undying yearning for freedom. We join them in their prayer for the attainment of their national goal: freedom and independence.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and serves to remind us of the plight of that tiny country and her sister states, Latvia and Estonia. In 1918, the Lithuanian people found that they had to fight to attain and preserve their freedom. For over 2 years, they struggled against the armies of the Russian whites and Russian bolsheviks, who sought to restore Russian rule over the nation. By 1921, Lithuania had firmly established her independence.

For a time during the postwar period, it appeared as though Lithuania was assured of a separate national existence. She entered into diplomatic relations with the major European powers in the spirit of friendship and cooperation. Domestically, the country experienced economic difficulties but maintained relative political stability.

The rise of Nazi Germany in the 1930's once again spelled danger to Lithuania. Adolf Hitler had clear designs in Eastern Europe, including the Baltic States. In addition, the Soviet Union revived its hope of communizing that area. Lithuania was, indeed, caught between the hammer and the anvil.

The years 1939 and 1940 sealed the country's fate. In July of the former year, the Germans seized Memel. One month later, Germany and the Soviet Union entered into their infamous nonaggression pact. This agreement, as we now know, also contained a secret codicil of three points setting forth the spirit of influence of Germany and Russia in Eastern Europe. The first point was the spear of influence between the two nations designated by the south boundary of Latvia and the north line of Lithuania. The second point was the dividing line of the spear of influence of these two countries at the Narew-Vistula-San Rivers in Poland, and the third point was Russia's interest in Bessarabia.

Later Stalin was given a free hand to deal with the Baltic States which included Lithuania. The Soviet dictator soon proved himself fully capable of exercising his newly won privileges. Early in 1940, the Soviets put severe diplomatic pressure on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to allow the stationing of Red Army troops on their soil. Without hope of outside assistance, the tiny republics capitulated to Moscow's demands. Then in July 1940, when eyes of the world focused upon the fall of France, the Red Army invaded the Baltic States and blotted out 22 years of freedom.

Lithuania's struggle continued, however. When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the people of Kaunas, the capital city, rose up and drove out the Red occupation forces. Upon their arrival, the Germans found, to their amazement, a provisional Lithuanian Government exercising authority. Unfortunately, the Reich's policy differed only slightly from that of the Kremlin. Occupation officials immediately removed the provisional government, and 3 years of Nazi suppression began.

Late in 1944, the Red army reoccupied Lithuania, and the Communists resumed the reign of terror which they had initiated in 1940. News leaked out to the West in the postwar years, describing the mass deportation of Lithuanians from their homeland. Thousands of others managed to escape by boat across the Baltic Sea to safety in the West.

Lithuania's tragedy stands out as one of the darkest pages of World War II. If any nation is owed a debt by the world, it is Lithuania. By viewing the misery she has endured, we may gain a higher appreciation of our own freedom. In this spirit and in the hope that a new light of liberty will one day shine upon this valiant nation, I pay tribute to Lithuania on her independence day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today is both a proud and a sad day for people of Lithuanian ancestry. It was 50 years ago that the Republic of Lithuania was born. Centuries before, the Lithuanians were united into a kingdom under Mindaugas the Great. Lithuanian history is rich with national culture and individual achievement. Her government was established as a republic with freedom and liberty for all.

The tragedy of World War II and its aftermath saw Lithuania ravaged by war and then subjugated by Russia. This ruthless domination by a foreign power continues today. Soviet communism and Russian military might prevent the freedom loving people of Lithuania from governing themselves as they would be governed. They live in bondage under tyrants to whom they owe no allegiance.

We in the United States hold that all men of every nation have the right to be free. I urge the President of the United States to bring consideration of the plight of the Baltic States before the United Nations. House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging such action was unanimously passed by the House in 1965 and by the Senate in 1966. May we pledge ourselves anew to the return of self-determination for the brave peoples of these captive nations.

Today we solemnly honor the people of Lithuania and their nation. It is altogether fitting that we in this Nation, also born in a struggle for freedom and independence, pause and gratefully recognize this anniversary of Lithuanian independence. May we not forget them in their continuing struggle for freedom and liberty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 more than a million Americans of Lithuanian descent celebrated the 50th anniversary of that gallant nation's Independence Day. Unfortunately, 3 million of their countrymen still residing in Lithuania cannot celebrate, for they are under the iron heel of Communist domination and oppression.

After a century of Russian control, Lithuania proudly proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918, and for 22 glorious years took her rightful place among the free nations of the world. In that short period of time agrarian reforms were instituted and great strides were made in cultural and economic areas. But in 1940, the ever present threat of the Soviet Union surfaced. By the secret agreements of August 23 and September 28, 1939, the Soviet Russians and Nazis joined in a conspiracy against Poland and the Baltic States. In October 1939, the U.S.S.R. imposed on Lithuania the so-called mutual assistance pact, which was a fraud. Under the pact the U.S.S.R. established military bases and on June 14, 1940, the Russians presented an ultimatum to the Lithuanian Government, and on the next day the Red Army's military units began the occupation of Lithuania. Almost immediately after the occupation by the huge Russian Army, deportations to Siberia began. These marked just the beginning of a systemized but unsuccessful attempt to destroy Lithuanian nationalism and to Russify Lithuania.

This attempt has failed because the desire to be free and live in peace still burns fiercely in the hearts of all Lithuanians. Through the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, which was created as a result of underground activities, and other political organizations, the fight for freedom and independence has been kept alive in Lithuania.

Lithuania does not deserve the cruel fate imposed upon her by the predatory action of Stalin and Hitler. Lithuania is perfectly justified in continuing to resist the Soviet oppression and in demanding that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be honored. The Lithuanian people have earned liberation—and liberation must come ultimately.

The United States refused, and will continue to refuse, to recognize the sovereignty of the Russian Communists over the sacred soil of Lithuania.

Lithuania, like the other non-Russian nations occupied by the leaders of the Kremlin, sees in the United States the last great chance for civilization. We must do everything in our power to hasten the day when Lithuania, and the other countries cast in her oppressed situation, will be restored their independence and rightful position among the nations of the world.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the month of February offers Americans several opportunities to reflect on the liberty we enjoy. There are, of course, the celebrations surrounding the birthdates of our two great Presidents, Washington and Lincoln, whose memory we revere for their respective roles in establishing and preserving our democratic society. But, there are also the other historic dates that recall to mind that our system of government is not universally enjoyed; and, that there remains in this world too many oppressed nations who yearn for freedom.

One such nation is Lithuania whose short-lived independence we commemorate today.

Fifty years have passed since February 16, 1918, when Lithuania first declared herself a free and independent nation. The war had ended on the eastern front. Russia had declared an end to her participation in the war on February 8; the peace treaty signing at Brest-Litovsk was only a few days off. Seizing the advantage of a situation which found Russia humbled by external defeat and internal revolt, and Germany in haste to conclude hostilities in the east in order to strengthen her western front, Lithuania threw off two centuries of foreign domination and proclaimed the establishment of a new state based on democratic principles.

Twenty years were to elapse during which time this fledgling state was to make remarkable progress in agriculture, industrialization, and education. Well advanced for the times, Lithuania moved ahead in proposing progressive social legislation, such as the 8-hour working day, marking her as a healthy and vibrant state.

Then, disaster struck. World War II commenced and Lithuania was caught once again between the opposing forces of Russia and Germany. In the end, the Nazis were beaten, but the Red allies, instead of retreating to their own frontiers turned on their host and made Lithuania a hostage. The Soviet Union then declared Lithuania to be a constituent republic and incorporated her into the Soviet system along with the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia.

We in this country have never recognized that incorporation. Congress has gone on record over the years in opposition to this gross miscarriage of justice. The last Congress adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President to direct the United Nations and other forums of world opinion to force the Soviet Union to restore the rights of independent statehood to the three Baltic States. And I am pleased to say that our position is unchanged.

At a recent meeting of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, a resolution was adopted which calls upon the Government of the United States and the governments of free nations everywhere to renew their protest against the Soviet Union for usurping the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this resolution be inserted in the Congressional Record at this point as a gentle reminder to all of us that we must rededicate ourselves to the use of every legitimate means to bring pressure upon the Soviet Union to set free the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian peoples still held in bondage.

Resolution

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence; *Resolve*

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.
2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.
3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.
4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.
5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.
6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.
7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

Lithuanian Council of New Jersey,
Valentinas Melinis, *President*.
A. S. Treciokas, *Secretary*.
Newark, N.J., *February 11, 1968*.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The courageous, freedom-loving people of this proud nation have always been an inspiration to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. This is particularly true today.

Fifty years ago Lithuania won its independence and for a little more than two decades shared its rightful place with free men elsewhere in the world. But after 22 years, this freedom was suddenly and ruthlessly taken away by the tyranny of Joseph Stalin. Yet Lithuanian love of freedom has not been extinguished. And we who are fortunate enough to retain our freedom should pause to take special note of the courage of Lithuanians and of their high hopes for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress must not be content merely to speak out on this occasion. We must also take action. Many years ago I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] in introducing legislation to create a standing committee of this House on captive nations. I have long believed strongly that we need to make restoration of freedom to nations still held captive by Communist aggression one of our major objectives in this Congress. I believe we should act favorably on that legislation without further delay.

Each year in my hometown of Amsterdam, N.Y., Lithuanian Independence Day is observed in a moving and colorful ceremony. And almost every year I have had the privilege of attending these ceremonies. They always point up for me dramatically the very strong bonds that exist between Americans of Lithuanian descent here in the United States and their relatives in Lithuania. One can see the strong commitment and dedication to the common cause of Lithuanian independence which both share.

Surely these bonds must not be broken by Communist deception nor by the frustrations borne of years of denial of freedom to our Lithuanian friends. And so today we resolve to work even harder to bring freedom once again to Lithuania, and speed the day when men and women everywhere can be truly the masters of their own destinies—in Lithuania, in South Vietnam, and in South Korea, too.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that the Congress sets aside time, to remember the valiant Lithuanian nation, on this the 50th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence.

The Lithuanian people are possessed of a rich history and cultural heritage. Students of Baltic history know full well the interesting impact which this small nation-state had on the development of that region. A nation of innovators and adventurers, the Lithuanians are seafarers and traders as well as agriculturalists.

Today we commemorate the founding of the 20th century Lithuanian nation. In truth, the independence of this valiant people lasted only 22 years. But those 22 years were filled with development. Schools were built, agriculture was improved, a viable government was established, and most important, a people had found nationhood—an identity had been realized.

The vibrant life of independent Lithuania was snuffed out in 1940, when it was invaded by Soviet Russia and incorporated into that communistic police state. This unfortunate nation was then invaded by the Nazis, under whom there was much suffering and deprivation. As an aftermath of World War II, the Lithuanian people again became subject to the Soviet aggressors.

Today there are approximately 3 million Lithuanians living under the harsh rule of communism. However, the will to be free still lives in that oppressed nation. We in the Congress should recognize the aspirations of these freedom-loving peoples, who are, in effect, being held in bondage. Let us take heart and resolution from their example, and work to bring freedom to oppressed peoples.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the nation of Lithuania declared its independence; we are here today to celebrate that declaration. But while it has been 50 years since independence was declared, we do not join together today to celebrate 50 years of Lithuanian independence, because that independence has been smothered by the force of Communist domination for more than a quarter century.

From 1795 until the outbreak of World War I Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Union. During the war she was occupied by the German Army, which withdrew only when defeated by Russia in 1917. Following the war, with Germany defeated and Russia in the turmoil of a bloody revolution, Lithuania seized the opportunity to gain her freedom, and on February 16, 1918, declared her independence.

For the next 22 years the people of Lithuania basked in the light of freedom; constitutional guarantees of speech, assembly, religion, and others became part of every citizen's life; land reforms were instituted, industrial reorganization was begun, and a wide range of social programs were enacted. A strong Lithuanian culture, for so long dominated by Russia, flourished in the atmosphere of freedom.

Then, in 1940, the light of freedom was snuffed out once again by Russian communism. First Lithuania was forced to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; during World War II her land became a bloody battleground for Russian and German troops, and for 2 years German troops occupied her territory. Then, from 1944 until today, Lithuania was part of a number of nations forced to live under Russian domination.

Following the war, Russia crushed any Lithuanian opposition with a brutal campaign of terror and murder, with thousands of political opponents shipped to Siberia.

That was the end of freedom in Lithuania, but the yearning for freedom has no end. The people in this captive nation may be chained to the Communist yoke, but the light of freedom still burns in their hearts. We must never turn our back on these people, because when freedom is denied anywhere in the world, our own freedom is threatened here at home.

So today I join my colleagues in the Congress, the 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, and freedom-loving people everywhere, in celebrating the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, any national independence day, such as our own Fourth of July, should be a day of pride and rejoicing. Unfortunately, the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which is being marked today, while still a day of pride to freedom-loving Lithuanians, whether resident in their ancient homeland or elsewhere, cannot be one of rejoicing.

The continued Communist subjugation of the Lithuanian people is a shameful situation which, regrettably, seems to have been swept under the rug of international acceptance as "just one of those things." It is, in fact, just one of many things which, in the hard light of historical retrospect, dramatize the continuing fact of Communist aggression.

It might be suggested, Mr. Speaker, why I, as a Member of Congress representing a congressional district in Virginia which, I am sure, has a minimal residency of citizens of Lithuanian extraction, should be concerned, here and now, about the anniversary of the independence day of this small former nation.

I have not had much exposure, other than through limited reading, to the national heritage of Lithuania, but I have had a long and active interest in the efforts of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and, in this area, I have come into contact with proud Lithuanian patriots who, in exile, continue the effort to preserve that national heritage.

We are engaged today, Mr. Speaker, in a major war in support of a small country, the Republic of Vietnam, with respect to the national history and cultural achievements of which most Americans know little. Most of us know little, I am sure, about Lithuania, but I think it important that we not forget that its proud people were overrun by Soviet communism, many years ago and have had the benefit of small concern from the international community.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that, in our dealings with the Soviet Union, we might use any leverage available to assist the captive nations of Eastern Europe, whose national identities have been pressed, unfeelingly, into the Communist mold.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in saluting the brave people of Lithuania on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their independence, and to, once again, assure them they have not been forgotten by the American people.

Neither have we forgotten the awful circumstances of the Communist tyranny which has been imposed on them. We are ever conscious of the deep dedication to freedom that the Lithuanian people have demonstrated throughout their history as they expended so much of their treasure in men and material in their gallant fight for liberty.

The Lithuanians are a great and courageous people, endowed with a generous, independent, and freedom-loving spirit. They share our profound belief in the idea that all men have a right to be free and a right to freely determine their own destiny. While we have had to fight but once for our independence, the Lithuanian people have struggled for centuries against foreign domination, first from one quarter and then another.

From 1795 to 1915 Lithuania was subjected to the rule of czarist Russia. This domination met with great resistance from the Lithuanians who launched five major revolts against czarist rule. Although unsuccessful, these revolts showed that the Lithuanians would never give up the struggle for eventual freedom. Finally, the opportunity arrived to throw off the czarist yoke when czarist rule collapsed at the end of the First World War, and Lithuania, as many other nations of Eastern Europe, seized the chance to proclaim their national independence. Once again, they were their own masters and enjoyed peace, freedom, and prosperity for the next two decades.

However, World War II spelled the end of this brief period of freedom. Lithuania was forced by the larger and more powerful Soviet Union to accept a mutual assistance pact in 1939 which led to stationing Soviet troops on Lithuanian soil, and inevitably to total Soviet occupation.

Further catastrophe befell the beleaguered nation when the Nazis invaded and conquered it in 1941. Hopes that eventual defeat of the Nazis would bring liberation were dashed in 1944 when the Soviet Army reoccupied the country. Since that time Lithuania has been virtually closed to the outside world while the Russians work relentlessly to destroy the people's sense of nationality.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Lithuania, but rather has looked on this as a tyrannous suppression of the national aspirations of the Lithuanian people. We look forward to the day when, once again, these gallant and noble people join the brotherhood of free nations.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure and privilege to join with my colleagues here in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the independence of the gallant Lithuanian nation.

In celebrating, today, the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence we are not engaged in a futile exercise nor are we making any passing sentimental gesture.

Rather, we look confidently to the brighter future that must come to all courageous people who remain loyal to the principles of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

I believe that Lithuania cannot be forever held in Communist slavery. I believe we have a very deep obligation to encourage Lithuania and her people in these times of terrible trial and hardships.

I, therefore, introduced a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 183) in the U.S. Congress on February 8, 1967. This resolution provides that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America urge the President of the United States to present the Lithuanian and the Baltic States question before the United Nations. The resolution further urges the President to ask that the United Nations request Soviet Russia to withdraw all its troops and agents and controls from Lithuania; to return all Lithuanian exiles from Siberia, from prisons and slave labor camps; and calls for the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania and the other states.

It was and is my intention, through this resolution, to inspire the people of Lithuania to keep the bright flame of freedom burning in their hearts and to let them know that their friends have not abandoned them.

It is my earnest hope that through this and other resolutions in the Congress the people in Lithuania will be reassured that Lithuanian-Americans and all their American friends will continue to exert every moral and legal resource at our command to help Lithuania get back the independence for which she longs and which she so eminently deserves.

May I remind you and all my fellow Americans of the wise and warning words of William Allen White when he said:

> Whenever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America.

Therefore, in our own national interest let us pledge that we will persevere in our efforts until we achieve and joyously celebrate the glorious occasion when Lithuania will once more take her free, rightful and proud place in the family of civilized nations. Let us together pray that happy day will soon occur.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, these days mark the 50th anniversary of the establishment of free and independent Baltic States—Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia—in the closing days of World War I. These little nations retained their independence until the early days of the Second World War when the Soviet Union overran and occupied them. Following this seizure, the U.S.S.R. carried out a ruthless policy to destroy the identity of these states and their people by murder, deportation, and deprivation of basic rights.

Our Government has never recognized the forceful conquest of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union but we have not done enough to support the claims for self-determination of these little countries. In recent years we have urged freedom and independence for scores of small nations throughout the world and should be doing as much for the Baltic countries subjugated through force of arms by the Soviet Union.

In the 89th Congress House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted unanimously by both the House and Senate. This resolution declared "the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation." The resolution urged the President of the United States to bring the issue of freedom for the Baltic States before the United Nations and endeavor to "bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples." I hope in this 50th anniversary year of the independence of these little nations the administration will embrace the policy of this resolution and exert more positive efforts to restore the freedom of these peoples.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania. February 16 was the 50th anniversary of their declaration of independence. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day for Lithuanians, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

After 123 years of czarist Russian occupation, the Lithuanians declared their independence on February 16, 1918, and instituted a democratic republic. This government flourished for 22 years, but Lithuania was forcibly seized by the Soviet Union in 1940 and has been under Communist rule since that time.

In addition to commemorating these national days, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive people of communism. I again urge that a special House Committee on Captive Nations be established.

I reemphasize the point that I made several years ago, Mr. Speaker, and that is that I believe it is necessary that the Voice of America provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Lithuania. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Lithuanian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under present administration policy. However, the brave people of Lithuania deserve the truth. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we mark Lithuanian Independence Day, a dual anniversary.

It is the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state, when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one Kingdom in 1251.

It is also the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in February 1918.

This dual anniversary honors a proud people still seeking to regain the independence which they lost in the dark days of World War II.

In 1965, this House unanimously approved House Concurrent Resolution 416, urging that the Baltic States question be brought before the United Nations to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Despite the unanimous backing of both the House and the Senate, the Baltic States question still has not been brought before the United Nations. The need remains vital for action and we should not delay longer.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, which we commemorate today, gives reason for us to pause in memory of and in tribute to the cause of freedom.

On February 16, 1918, this small Baltic nation freed itself from the yoke of Russian rule. Since 1795, when Lithuania was annexed by Russia as part of the third partition of Poland, Lithuania has struggled under the weight of attempted Russification to maintain their sense of national identity. Freed at last, Lithuania during her two decades of independence created a nation in which a constitutional government improved the life of its people through social legislation and agricultural development.

The fateful onslaught of World War II put out the torch of Lithuanian freedom. In 1939, Klaipeda was yielded to Germany and on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union occupied the country. In hope that someday once again Lithuania will be free and so that we may be reminded that the freedom we enjoy is not to be taken for granted, we celebrate Lithuanian's independence day.

Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress, both Houses passed a concurrent resolution urging the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and to urge the Soviet Union to withdraw from these states. I submit the resolution for the Record and again call upon the President to use his office to carry out this congressional resolution.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the observance of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when King Mindaugas, the Great, unified all the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in the year 1251. It is also the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16 in 1918.

The desire for freedom by peaceful, tranquil Lithuania has been suppressed by the illegal occupation of the Soviets. But it has not been eradicated, by any means, by these many years of oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we, as Americans, are deeply moved and inspired by the undiminished patriotism that continues to live inside and outside of Lithuania. The injustice that has been done to Lithuania by the Soviet Union is unconscionable.

I would like to take this opportunity to urge the President of the United States to carry out the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 416, that was passed unanimously by the 89th Congress, by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding that the Soviets withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon the United States, as the leader of the free world, to press this just suit on behalf of those peoples who have been deprived of their democratic institutions and are unable to speak for themselves.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian independence. After centuries of Russian domination Lithuania, one of the three small but respected Baltic States, was occupied by Germany in 1915.

Finally on February 16, 1918 Lithuania achieved its long dreamed of independence. Soon thereafter the United States recognized the free, democratic and independent state of Lithuania. Lithuania was a proud and a free country prepared to fulfill its international responsibilities. Accordingly, Lithuania applied for and was granted membership in the League of Nations. Moreover a constitution providing for the basic freedoms of speech, religion, assembly and communication was adopted by Lithuania.

After functioning as a member of the world community for two decades, Lithuania was captured and placed under illegal Soviet control in 1939. The inhuman and illegal behavior and posture of the Soviet regime is epitomized by the deportation of some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941.

The United States rightfully refuses to recognize the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. We must not and will not legitimize an illegal regime.

While we cannot militarily free Lithuania we do work toward its ultimate liberation by keeping alive the memory of free Lithuania. Thus today, as many Members of the House of Representatives rise to honor Lithuanian independence, we say to the Soviet captors: Lithuania will be free; illegal Communist domination will be ended.

Moreover to approximately 1 million Americans of Lithuanian extraction I join my colleagues in pledging our vigilance and devotion to a free Lithuania. The dreams of man must be nutured if they are to lead to fruition and until the dream of a free Lithuania is fulfilled we shall not rest.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's reestablishment of independence which was proclaimed on February 16, 1918.

Although this valiant nation controlled their own modern destiny for a short 23 years, their desire and hopes for liberty once more have neither been diminished nor extinguished. Lithuania's tragedy was in essence embodied in the failure of the League of Nations and accompanied by the brutal madness of World War II and the events that led to her subjugation and suppression by the Kremlin.

It is some comfort, I am sure, to the Lithuanian people that the United States regards her present occupation by Russia as illegal as well as a denial of rightful self-determination.

The inherent patriotism and courage of Lithuania serves as a guiding light for those of us who are free to continue to champion the struggle for Lithuanian independence and freedom. It is my ardent hope and prayer that the free world will strive unceasingly to bring about the day when this brave country will stand once again as a free and liberated people.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in these ominous times the free world is witnessing a renewed threat to its liberty from Communist imperiocolonialism in practically every geographic area. It is, therefore, desirable to have clearly in mind the nature of this peril. This is especially pertinent since our country is often the subject of criticism by many of its own well-meaning citizens who somehow manage to confuse or identify the protection of self-determination with the very aggression we seek to deter.

The true character of Communist imperialism has nowhere been better demonstrated than in the case of Lithuania. This proud and ancient state has suffered enormously at the hands of totalitarian neighbors. At the outbreak of World War II Lithuania experienced aggression at the hands of both Germany and the Soviet Union. Although attempting to maintain absolute neutrality, the city of Memel was ceded to the Nazis as the result of an ultimatum backed up by the German armies.

The deliberate contempt for Lithuanian national integrity was compounded by the forced mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union on October 10, 1939. This event was followed by the demand for air bases, the admission of Soviet garrisons, and on June 15, 1940, the immediate formation of a "friendly" government. The Soviets then occupied the country, and in July 1940, a Communist-rigged election produced a legislative body which made the so-called request for incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The final step of Soviet subjugation took place on August 3, 1940, when this request was granted and Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

This action should be read in light of the Russian-Lithuanian peace treaty of 1920 in which the Soviet Union declared that—

> All peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they are a part—

And—

> Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridicial consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

It is hardly necessary to stress the obvious conclusion that Soviet treaties and the intent behind them are not worth the paper on which they are written.

The horrors of a Communist occupation may be seen from the fact that, following Soviet captivity, Lithuania lost 45,000 of her citizens. Many fled, others were arrested, and 30,000 of Lithuania's intelligentsia were deported to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941. When Soviet armies retreated before the German invaders 5,500 political prisoners were executed. Occupation by the Nazis brought only a continuation of the suffering with the colonialization by several thousand German families on Lithuanian soil, and the execution of almost all Lithuanian Jews.

When the Soviets reentered the country in 1944, 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany while another 60,000 were apprehended in Eastern Germany and transported to Siberia. An additional deportation took place in 1949, as a retaliatory measure for what was claimed to be resistance to the collectivization of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence, and it is thus a fitting occasion upon which to renew our resolve to work for the self-determination of all peoples. The indignities and suffering that this proud nation has endured must not have been in vain, and it is imperative that we do all we can to keep the hope for its future independence alive. By so doing we will be registering our protest against the crimes Lithuania has experienced in the past, and serve notice that our Nation will never rest until Lithuania and all other captive nations are given their freedom. Such resolve is truly worthy of the sacrifices of brave men, and nothing less will justify their noble deeds in the name of liberty.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today, I extend my warmest best wishes to our Lithuanian friends everywhere—in my own State of California, throughout this great land of ours, and throughout the world.

During this month of February, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of the country have marked two very important anniversaries: First, they have observed the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and second, they have marked the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

It is a real pleasure that I join with my colleagues today as we commemorate an outstanding event in the rich history of these proud and courageous people. We in America have not forgotten the plight of the Lithuanian people, and indeed of all captive peoples. I am proud to say that on June 21, 1965, I voted for House Concurrent Resolution 416, requesting the President of the United States to urge certain actions for relieving the deprived peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the esteemed Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California, at a mass meeting on February 11, 1968, in Los Angeles, commemorating this memorable event.

The text of the resolution follows in full:

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends, living in Southern California, sponsored by the Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California, held on Sunday, February 11, 1968, at 12:30 P.M. at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, California, in commemorating the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918:

"Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force of arms in June of 1940; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

"Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the Committee of the House of Representatives, created by *H. Res. 346* of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resolution 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and be it finally

"Resolved, That the copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg, United States Senators from California, Members of the U.S. Congress from California, Democratic and Republican leaders in the U.S. Congress, Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., and Lithuanian Consuls in New York City, Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles, Calif., and Boston, Mass., and the press.

JOHN CINGA,
President.
ALEX KULNYS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, wherever the flame of freedom flickers, whether it be a glowing ember or a roaring blaze, there is hope for a world of tranquility in which man can find his place in the sun in an atmosphere of human dignity and justice. So it is today that we, in this hall of democracy, must fan the glowing ember of liberty still burning brightly in the minds and hearts of the gallant people of Lithuania, who seek to regain their freedom from the web of tyranny that has strangled them these past 28 years.

On February 16, 50 years ago in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, the Constituent Assembly of Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of Lithuanian independence. This proclamation of national self-determination was the will and the spirit of courageous people dedicated to the common principles of liberty and justice for all, and the right to determine their national existence. It was the beginning of a new life for this tiny nation, whereby they could prosper from the fruits of their labors.

Lithuanian democratic existence was short lived for in 1940 they were again caught in the pincers of tyranny and have been squeezed to death ever since. First it was the juggernaut of Communist Soviet Russia that invaded their land only to be driven out by the power of Nazi Germany. When the Nazi war machine began to crumble, Communists returned under the guise of liberating Lithuania from Nazi terror. However, it was just another empty Communist gesture for they took over complete control of Lithuania and its people.

Tyranny still reigns in this tiny metropolis. The Soviet Union has exploited Lithuania in every way possible. Anyone resisting absorption by the Soviet Union was deported to slave camps or killed. The economy of the country is being bled white by the Kremlin through taxation and industrial domination. Workers receive slave wages and there is no hope for self-progress. Brutality is a common practice and it is the Lithuanian citizens who are the victims of arrogant Communist rulers.

Political oppression, social injustice, and degradation and exploitation of the people are Communist trademarks by which they seek to rule the world. Wherever communism gains a foothold these trademarks are prevalent. So the captive people's struggle for freedom, whether it be in Lithuania or any of the other suppressed nations, should be our struggle for there cannot be hope for the world as long as tyranny and injustice reign.

On this observance of the 50th anniversary of the declared independence of Lithuania let us reaffirm our denunciation of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union and seek effective ways of helping to restore Lithuania's independence.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with our colleagues in observing the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania. Although this valiant nation has succumbed to the forces of tyranny and oppression and has been denied the sovereign right of self-determination, the free world knows full well that the spirit of freedom and democracy beats strongly in the hearts of its people.

Not only do we observe the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence but its 715th anniversary of statehood as well. For centuries—long before the discovery of the North American Continent—Lithuania was a powerful and independent state which maintained the freedom and safety of millions of eastern Slavs. Unfortunately, however, independence was not to remain forever as Lithuania was annexed by Russia in 1795 and remained under its control until the German occupation during World War I. Nevertheless, the stoic Lithuanians were never defeated in spirit nor in their resolve to regain their independence and the nation was again free in 1918.

Once again, freedom and independence were wrested from Lithuania and during World War II it became a pawn in the massive struggle between warring nations. During this tragic period, thousands of Lithuanians fled their native land while thousands more were deported to the Siberian wastes and countless others were killed and injured. Since the end of the Second World War, Lithuania has not been permitted to breathe free and has lived under the oppressive fist of Soviet domination.

The Soviet powers have attempted a semblance of legitimacy by their typical ruse of proclaiming Lithuania as a dependent republic of the Soviet Union. The free world can easily see through this sham, however, and is fully cognizant of the deep and continuing desire of the Lithuanians to once again become a free and independent state and to take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, not only do we observe Lithuania's 50th anniversary of independence, but we should also rededicate ourselves to the principle of self-determination and to the validity of Lithuania's claim for independence. Let us reaffirm our resolve to work for that day when the Lithuanians—as well as all enslaved peoples in the other Baltic and Eastern European states, in Asia and Cuba—may throw off the yoke of tyranny and once again live as free men and women, enjoying the freedom which they so richly deserve and working side by side with all free nations to create a better, more prosperous and peaceful world.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, during this crucial period in history, when so much of our Nation's energy and attention is devoted to the struggle in Southeast Asia, we often tend to forget the courageous people of Eastern Europe who have been subjugated by an oppressive tyranny.

Included in this group of conquered nations are the gallant Lithuanians whose 50th anniversary of independence we are commemorating today.

This proud nation first emerged as a unified state in the early decades of the 13th century and became internationally recognized as the Kingdom of Lithuania in A.D. 1251. In 1795, Lithuania fell under the enslaving yoke of czarist Russian imperialism. The tiny country was invaded and conquered by Germany during the First World War. With the conclusion of that conflict, the Lithuanians succeeded in reestablishing their sovereignty. Unfortunately, this independence was short lived. In 1940, Red Russia occupied Lithuania by force of arms and has held these brave people in bondage ever since.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a tragic history. Lithuania is a small, peaceful nation whose people only desire to live in freedom and to pursue, once again, the process of nation building. They have not been allowed to do so. The Soviet aggressors have abolished all independent Lithuanian agencies and institutions, and dissolved political, religious, cultural, social, and economic organizations. This transformation was accomplished through the use of brutal force. Stalinist Russia resorted to terror, deportation, mass arrest, and execution. Resistance to the regime still exists, however, and will continue to exist until the restoration of independence has been achieved by the freedom-loving Lithuanians.

In our own great Nation, we have all witnessed this same dedication to lofty ideals by Americans of Lithuanian descent. They have contributed vastly to the enrichment of our American life while still preserving their own fine cultural heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with all Americans on this 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence in the hope that a truly free and independent Lithuania may soon be realized. The courage and dedication with which the Lithuanian people both at home and abroad have maintained their national identity in the face of great adversity is an inspiration to free men everywhere.

At this point, I insert a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey at a mass meeting held February 11, 1968, at Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, commemorating the 50th golden jubilee of the restoration of Lithuanian independence:

RESOLUTION OF THE LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence; resolve—

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be

included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

Newark, New Jersey, February 11, 1968.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,
President.
A. S. TRECIOKAS,
Secretary.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian Republic. We commemorate the liberation of a proud and independent people, and at the same time we renew our opposition to the aggression of the Soviet Union which has reduced the state of Lithuania to the role of a pawn in the diplomatic contest of Eastern Europe.

The anniversary which we observe today is particularly significant because it stands in stark contrast to the recently marked 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. For though the Bolsheviks promised freedom from czarist tyranny, they continued the expansionist policies of the Romanovs and the efforts of that dynasty to subject to Russian domination the historically and culturally distinct peoples of Eastern Europe. That we must observe Lithuania's Declaration of Independence this way demonstrates strikingly the complete hypocrisy that underlies the ritually incanted Communist condemnation of Western "imperialism and colonialism."

It is important to recognize that although Lithuanian freedom was restored only 50 years ago, the nation is an ancient one, established as an independent kingdom in 1251. For centuries Lithuania was an important European power. Then, she fell under the sway of foreign domination. But after many years of foreign rule, her sovereignty was once again established when Lithuanian patriots seized the opportunity afforded by Russia's internal dislocations and declared their independence on February 16, 1918.

Soviet relations with Lithuania since that time constitute a shocking record of deceit and duplicity that provides an instructive lesson for those who would put their trust in Bolshevism's pledges. In 1920, the Soviet Union relinquished by formal treaty all claims to Lithuanian territory. Respect for the country's territorial integrity was reaffirmed in a nonaggression Treaty of 1926. Then these solemn agreements were entirely disregarded by the terms of the Hitler-Stalin pact and the later occupation of Lithuania by Russian troops.

The sufferings of the Lithuanian people under Soviet rule are well known, and condemned, by all freedom-loving peoples. It is a privilege to salute them, to register support for their cause, and to express the hope that a future commemoration of their declaration of independence will celebrate freedom in fact.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to pay tribute to the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Under ordinary circumstances the 50th anniversary of such an event would be an occasion of rejoicing and celebration. Tragically, however, this is not the case today, for the harsh grim reality is that Lithuania is no longer independent and her people are no longer free. In point of truth Lithuania has been under the cold, stern yoke of Soviet imperialism since that fateful day of August 3, 1940, when Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Notwithstanding this situation, it is completely appropriate to pay tribute to Lithuania and the brave spirit of her people. Here is a country which for many years fell under the domination of larger and oppressive neighbors, but whose people on February 16, 1918, declared Lithuania to be an independent nation. Thus it appeared the hopes of the people of Lithuania who had remained steadfast to their principles, traditions, language and religion through many years of adversity were going to realize an age-old dream common to all men—the right to live in an independent state based on democratic principles where liberty and individual human dignity would prevail.

At the time Lithuania achieved her independence the signs were most encouraging. The nation of Lithuania adopted a constitution which accorded the people freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and a respected place among the community of nations. By 1922 all of the major powers of the world had recognized Lithuania as a sovereign state.

During its period of independence Lithuania made progress in many areas, such as agriculture, industry, social reform, and education. A firm basis for a free, independent and self-sufficient nation had been established. But at the end of Lithuania's second decade of independence, dark and ominous clouds hovered over all of Eastern Europe. Then misfortune struck Lithuania in 1939 and 1940 as this brave nation with her courageous people was gradually engulfed by the aggression of the Communist Soviet Union.

And so Lithuania was swallowed up in the grasping clutches of the Soviet Union along with her stouthearted Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Estonia. The fires of freedom which once burned so brightly were dampened. The story of Lithuania today is not a happy one; but though there is oppression, there is also hope. The torch of freedom may no longer be clearly visible, but we know the embers still burn in the hearts of the people.

Lithuanians and Americans alike look forward to the day when these people will again experience individual liberty and Lithuania will once again take her rightful place in the community of nations as a free and independent state.

During the 89th Congress the House and Senate approved a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 416, to help establish freedom for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The Baltic States resolution finds that the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia were forcibly deprived of their rights by the U.S.S.R. It calls on the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and other forums to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people.

Certainly it would serve the cause of freedom if everything reasonably possible were done to carry out the expression of Congress as contained in the resolution.

For the information of the House of Representatives I include the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416 at this point in my remarks.

I also submit for inclusion as part of my remarks at this time a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California urging that House Concurrent Resolution 416 be carried out.

The texts of House Concurrent Resolution 416 and the resolutions are as follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES: LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Whereas, the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic process; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas, the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the governments of the Free Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, the Committee of the House of Representatives, created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles respectfully urges the President of the United States to bring the question of liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union withdraw all of its troops and release its control of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from prison camps in the Soviet Union; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and United States Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg.

Adopted by order of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

FRANK G. BONELLI,
Chairman of the Board and Supervisor First District.
KENNETH HAHN,
Supervisor Second District.
ERNEST E. DEBS,
Supervisor Third District.
BURTON W. CHASE,
Supervisor Fourth District.
WARREN M. DORN,
Supervisor Fifth District.

RESOLUTION

Unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends, living in Southern California, sponsored by the Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California, held on Sunday, February 11, 1968, at 12:30 P.M. at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, California, in commemorating the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Geat unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force of arms in June 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Committee of the House of Representatives, created by *H. Res. 346* of the the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Lativia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resolution 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg, United States Senators from California, Members of the U.S. Congress from California, Democratic and Republican leaders in the U.S. Congress, Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., and Lithuanian Consuls in New York City, Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles, Calif., and Boston, Mass., and the press.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
JOHN CINGA, *President.*
ALEX KULNYS, *Executive Secretary.*

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in this House we are called upon to memorialize the national days of many countries, some of them independent, some of them under foreign totalitarian domination. Today we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I welcome this opportunity to join with my colleagues in calling to the attention of the American people the golden observance of Lithuanian Independence Day because no country is more worthy of our tribute.

It was 50 years ago, on February 16, 1918, that Lithuanian independence was proclaimed following subjugation for more than 120 years—1795–1915—by Russian domination and followed by German occupation during World War I.

After two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination when it was occupied by the Red Army in World War II. It was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since then it has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic. Though the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, it has never recognized the subsequent incorporation of that nation or the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia into the Soviet Union.

Like the other European states, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have had their sovereignty violated and their freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union. This is in direct opposition to the individual freedom on which the United States was founded and upon which it stands.

Today, we, as part of the free people in the world, face our biggest struggle in the history of mankind, in seeking to retain that individual freedom and our God-given right to self-determination. We are fully aware of the deceitful and aggressive tactics of Communist totalitarianism in its move to rule the world and its people. Unless we continue to meet each and every attack on that freedom, there can be no hope for a free world. The United States is the symbol of that hope and as the model of democracy we must continue to encourage the oppressed peoples of the world to work for their independence.

May this observance of Lithuanian Independence Day be the last one for them under Communist rule, and that next year the 51st celebration will be the first of a new era marking the true meaning for which it is intended; that is, independence.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago the people of Lithuania observed the birth of new freedom. For several hundred years they had endured oppression by the Russian Empire. They were proud to be free and eager to get on with the responsibilities of building a strong, productive nation. To meet the challenges of the 20th century they established an active government, schools at all levels to provide adequate education for their youth, and a variety of industries and public services. Their agricultural system was improved and extended.

For 22 years they achieved a bright record. Then the Bolshevik warlords returned and seized the small country, dragging it into the Soviet Union. Ostensibly this was to protect it from the Nazis, but in 1945, following the defeat of the Nazis, freedom was not restored to Lithuania. This small state is captive still.

In these 28 years of captivity the Russion invaders have tried every means at their disposal to break the morale and nationalistic spirit of Lithuanians. Through every possible channel the occupying force has tried to "russify" the population. Their efforts are concentrated especially on the young people—through education, through deportation of some to Russia and importation of young Russians, through promotion of atheism and lowered moral standards, through making literature and art from prewar Lithuania unavailable. In these 28 years the cost of living has soared while the availability of goods and services has declined. Workers now put in many more hours to earn the necessities of life than they did before 1940 and with far less incentive.

Several million Lithuanians remain behind the Iron Curtain, still longing for freedom. Lithuanians in the free world have never given up hope of recovering independence for their nation. Last year the Lithuanian World Political Conference, in planning a coordinated program of special observances to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the birth of their free nation, clearly stated their goal of restoring independence. It is fitting that all who are free should join them in the commemoration today of this 50th anniversary, which the captive Lithuanians cannot observe, and reaffirm our pursuit of freedom for all who are oppressed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1968, marked the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian people. It is a day of celebration for Lithuanians throughout the world, except in the beautiful country of Lithuania herself. There, it is a day of tearful recognition of the fact that that country along with her sister countries of Estonia and Latvia are still under the heavy heel of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the people of the Baltic States are not, and would never become, a part of Russia by choice. Lithuanians throughout the world have not given up hope that once again their nation will walk among the free countries of the world.

The history of Russian domination of Lithuania is well known, and I will not take the time to repeat it here today. But, let me add, that it is a familiar pattern, similar to the pattern followed in all Soviet occupation moves.

I welcome this opportunity of joining my colleagues in marking this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and of again expressing the hope that we can soon count the people of Lithuania among those who know freedom.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago the Lithuanian people seized upon the opportunity afforded by World War I and the Russian internal revolution to throw off the shackles of foreign domination and declare their independence. Today, Lithuania is a corporate part of the Soviet Union and its people live under a regime of Communist tyranny. Unfortunately, the throes of World War II left a devastated Lithuania prey to a more powerful Soviet Red army.

What immeasurable anguish must come to the hearts of the Lithuanian people on the anniversary of an independence which was to be forcibly wrested from them. During their period of independence, the Lithuanians instituted a Western-oriented democratic system. Their first permanent constitution guaranteed the freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and communication. Great progress was made with respect to an improved economy and in social legislation. After having enjoyed the manifestations of their aspirations for freedoms, the Lithuanians can only realize more acutely their deprivations under communism.

In these dark hours of their subjugation, it is the inextinguishable desire for the restoration of independence and the consciousness of national identity which sustains the Lithuanian people, a desire reinforced by the memory of their short period of independence. With the deepest respect for their continuing commitment to freedom, we Americans raise our voices in protest against the suppression the Lithuanian people are forced to endure at the will of the Soviet Communist regime. Although the Soviet Union can never recompense the Lithuanians for the suffering it has inflicted on them, we join with freedom-loving people throughout the world to call upon the Soviet Union to rectify the abominations it has committed by permitting the Lithuanian people to realize their national aspirations.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my many colleagues today in paying tribute to Lithuanian Independence Day, marking the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. Unfortunately, the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, do not enjoy the privileges of democracy and self-government which we here in the United States take so readily for granted. These nations have been subject to Kremlin captivity since 1940 when the Soviet Union moved into Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by force of arms.

Our Nation is today engaged in a bloody struggle against Communist aggression in Asia. I think it most appropriate that we pause to recall the unaided plight of the Baltic peoples.

In the 89th Congress the House and Senate passed House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls upon the President of the United States to direct the attention of the United Nations and other international organizations to the plight of the Balkan States in an effort to bring about a restoration of their rights. I today join my House colleagues in again urging the President to act on this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the ancient Lithuanian nation, a captive of Communist Russia since 1940, is deserving of all the support and encouragement we Americans can give in its efforts to regain its independence.

Today marks the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's reestablishment of independence, in 1918. But her history as a free and independent nation actually goes all the way back to the year 1251, when King Mindaugas the Great unified the feudal states along the Baltic Sea coast into a kingdom. But czarist Russia subjugated and occupied Lithuania at the end of the 18th century. Her intensive and determined struggle for freedom was climaxed in 1918, when her independence was restored.

Two years later, Soviet Russia recognized the independence of Lithuania in a peace treaty which stated that "The Soviet Union recognizes the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian nation with all the juridical rights associated with such a declaration, and forever renounces, in good faith, all Russian sovereign rights which it previously had in regards to the Lithuanian nation and its territory."

But this treaty was abrogated with the reinvasion and occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russian armed forces on June 15, 1940. This proud nation and people have been the victims of tyrannical Communist Russian rule ever since.

Our own country, mindful of its own struggle for freedom and independence, has always been sympathetic to the aspirations of other peoples for self-determination. I, therefore, join in urging the President of the United States to take action in the United Nations and elsewhere for the restoration of self-determination rights to Lithuania and the other two subjugated Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia. Such action would be in full accord with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was unanimously adopted by the 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the United States continues to recognize the sovereignty of Lithuania and her two sister Baltic states, and that it has never recognized the alien subjugation of these nations.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make note of the fact that today is the day on which Americans of Lithuanian descent as well as Lithuanians in all other parts of the free world mark as Lithuanian Independence Day. Specifically, February 20 is the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251. February 20 also marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in February of 1918.

Mr. Speaker, under conditions existing today, of course, a Lithuanian Independence Day is little more than a symbol, even though Lithuanians have never lost of thirst for freedom since the day of Russian occupation. Soviet oppression makes Lithuanian independence a goal greatly to be desired by all freedom-loving peoples of all nationalities.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I take this particular date in Lithuanian history to urge the President of the United States to pursue the cause of Lithuanian independence through channels which are open to him. In particular, I urge the President to carry out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in House Concurrent Resolution 416—unanimously passed by the House in 1965—by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and urging the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia so that these nations might enjoy the freedom which they deserve.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, stands as an important date in the history of freedom. On this day 50 years ago the people of Lithuania gained their long-sought independence. As we commemorate this golden anniversary today, we pause to honor those who led this small Baltic republic toward two distinguished decades of national freedom.

Known to history since 1009, Lithuania throughout the centuries had to struggle against the forces of aggression and foreign oppression. During the Middle Ages, Lithuania protected its national identity and independence in spite of German desires for eastward expansion. The forces of power politics, however, overcame Lithuania and she was annexed by Russia during the third partition of Poland in 1795. Caught between the advancing Russian and German armies during World War I, Lithuania rose from the shambles of war to seize the opportunity for independence offered by the chaos of war and the disruption of the Russian Revolution.

On July 20, 1920, Russia recognized Lithuania's independence and in the peace treaty between the two states pledged to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty over Lithuanian territory. During her two decades of independence, Lithuania adopted a constitutional government. In free Lithuania agriculture improved, social progress was made, and literature flourished.

Unfortunately the forces of aggression had only been temporarily put to rest. The historic threats to Lithuanian freedom, Germany and Russia, renewed their demands upon the small Baltic republic. On March 22, 1939, Klaipeda was yielded to Germany and on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union occupied the country.

Freedom's brief flourish in Lithuania will be well-marked on the pages of history. As we pay tribute today to Lithuanian independence it is in hopes that her rightful return to nationhood will someday once again be a cause for celebration.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and others in noting the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's reestablishment of independence.

It is good for us, as this Nation struggles with Communist aggression on many fronts, to remember Lithuania's loss of freedom and forced occupation by the Communist Government of Russia as a reminder of the continuing goals of that godless nation. Lithuania stands as a constant reminder of what would happen if Communist aggression was further extended.

Lithuania has been an independent nation since the year 1253 and had been forcefully occupied by Russia prior to her independence in 1918. But in 1940, the imperialistic power of Communist Russia again forced enslavement upon this small country.

The nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia is the official position of the U.S. Government, and it should continue to remain so. America must continue to champion the idea of sovereign equality of all nations, large and small, in an international system of law, order, and decency.

We must keep the hope of freedom alive for these enslaved people of Lithuania.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, many of our leaders, in a mood of wishful thinking, urge that we build bridges with the Communists, noting a "liberalization" of Soviet philosophy and thought.

We can ponder these proposals with particular irony today as we join together to pay tribute to the 50th anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Lithuania.

Having suffered foreign domination during black periods throughout her history, this country emerged from the First World War to proclaim herself a free republic. Her national independence was bitterly brief, as was the world's respite from war. As Hitler's armies began to march, Lithuania again became a battlefield, suffered German occupation, and in the wake of World War II, came the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, today, I urge instead of bridges, we build and strengthen our resolve to help Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors to self-determination.

Hopefully, we will meet one day to mark this occasion and will be able to extend our congratulations as representatives of a free people to similarly free people in the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a glorious anniversary and a time of sorrow. Within the last few days we have been reminded of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. February 16, 1918, marked the culmination of years of planning and hoping, of years of agitation and struggle.

History was kind to the Americans. The years following our liberation found us isolated from potential aggressors and free to direct our energies toward building a strong and unified nation. Unfortunately, the Lithuanians have constantly been suppressed by hostile neighbors. They simply exchanged one master for another.

After 120 years of subjugation to Russia, and the occupation by the Germans during the First World War, the Lithuanian people declared the establishment of an independent state. These people enjoyed a short but enthusiastic period of freedom. This span of time, though brief, was marked with noteworthy social progress. Lithuania implemented the first land reform program of modern Europe, and it developed an education program which reduced illiteracy among its people to 15 percent after generations of foreign rule had left two-thirds of them unable to read and write. The Soviet Union reconquered the country in 1944, and the world again realized that there was no freedom under the Communist flag.

Today, these courageous and brave people still cling to the hope and idea of freedom and independence. To help them to be heard throughout the world community we must keep our Nation as a source of light to those countries who have been placed in the shadows of unwanted Communist aggression.

Let us all hope and pray and work toward this end.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. But as the Lithuanian people pause to remember the beginning of Lithuania's freedom, they will also be saddened by the realization that Lithuania enjoyed her new-found freedom for little more than 20 years. During the Second World War, Lithuania was occupied by the Red Army. On August 3, 1940, it was forced to become a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. On June 27, 1941, the Germans replaced the Russians, only to be expelled by the Russians on July 13, 1944.

The Lithuanian people have not forgotten their years of freedom. They have never accepted the Soviet imperialist conquest of their homeland. In August of 1958 the Lithuanian World Congress met under the auspices of the American-Lithuanian community. The Congress adopted a resolution which declares that "Lithuanians continue fiercely resisting the alien rule" of the Soviet Union and which asserted that Lithuanians "have never accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution asked the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and national freedom." The resolution also asked that the free nations "not be party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign Lithuanian state."

Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Americans are one of the many freedom-loving peoples who have helped to build and preserve our own precious liberties, and it is their ardent wish and hope that these liberties may also prevail in their homeland.

We cannot abandon the cause of the Lithuanians, for it is the cause of freedom; the cause of free peoples everywhere. On this, the anniversary of their independence, may the Congress of these United States assure the Lithuanians throughout the world that every effort will continue to be made to gain independence for their homeland once again.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the Lithuanian people succeeded in reestablishing their independence. This anniversary commemorates a historic and continuing struggle for freedom. February 16 remains firmly impressed in the minds of these heroic people, since it was this day in 1918 that ended 123 years of foreign rule and domination. Located at the strategic southern end of the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea, its central geographical position has made this nation the object of conquest for centuries and a battleground for national conflicts of interest among the European military powers.

The story of the Lithuanian people is the story of a fight for freedom. Unfortunately, in the last two centuries this has been a goal which more often than not has eluded them, in spite of their great courage, their persistence, and their devotion to the cause of liberty. These proud people today, even in the face of overwhelming Soviet power, refuse to accede or capitulate in spirit to their captors. Theirs is a spirit of resistance which is one of the truly moving experiences of our time. I am sure this spirit will not be quenched.

In commemoration to Lithuanian Independence Day, I join with all Americans in praising this valiant struggle of the Lithuanian people and their descendants. I encourage them to maintain unabated their fight for freedom, looking to the happy day when the heel of the tyrant will be lifted from their native land.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 11 a resolution was passed at a Los Angeles meeting of Lithuanian-Americans and forwarded to me by the Lithuanian-

American Council of Southern California. Because the resolution so eloquently reaffirms all men's right to free self-determination, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues during today's observance of Lithuanian Independence Day:

RESOLUTION OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends, living in Southern California, sponsored by the Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California, held on Sunday, February 11, 1968, at 12:30 p.m. at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, California, in commemorating the 717th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918:

"Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force of arms in June of 1940; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

"Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the Committee of the House of Representatives, created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in House Concurrent Resolution 416 by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg, United States Senators from California, Members of the U.S. Congress from California, Democratic and Republican leaders in the U.S. Congress, Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., and Lithuanian Consuls in New York City, Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles, Calif., and Boston, Mass., and the press.

JOHN CINGA,
President.
ALEX KULNYS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the injustices dealt throughout history to the people of Lithuania are so extensive as to cause all free men of moral integrity to pause on the occasion of that nation's independence, and contemplate anew the demoralizing effects to the human spirit and character which accompany unlimited despotic control of governments upon a once free people.

For Lithuania has been an unwilling victim swept into the orbit of one oppressive regime after another. After 100 years of arbitrary Russian control, the Lithuanian nation achieved the goal to which it had aspired—the goal of independence which it declared on February 16, 1918.

It was 50 years ago that Lithuania, after gaining independence, began to make some of her most dramatic domestic advancements. Emphasis was placed on improved agricultural techniques and a program of rapid industrialization. At this time too, the exuberant, vital, and dynamic Lithuanian people embarked on a course of artistic and cultural expression. Substantial works of opera and music were written and literature flourished, and Lithuania was a land of free, self-governing people.

The sudden emergence of a powerful Hitler in Germany, and a no less ruthless Soviet state endangered Lithuanian independence. The Nazis began a period of occupation of part of Lithuania in March of 1939. Next came a mutual assistance treaty forced upon Lithuania by the Soviet Union in October of the same year. In July of 1940 a rigged election followed a demand by the Soviet Union that Lithuania form a "friendly" government. The result of this "election" was a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. At this request Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Lithuania had lost its freedom. The story of Lithuania and its people since 1940 has been one of subordination and tyrannical oppression and control which stand in opposition to the doctrine of freedom behind which the United States places its full and unceasing support.

Today, as in 1918, there remains a fiercely independent Lithuanian determination to achieve an existence outside the control of alien forces. It is this rugged determination, this "upward reach" of a captive people that I wish to recognize. I join with free people on the earth everywhere in wishing a speedy return to the free state of existence to which Lithuania is entitled.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join my colleagues again this year to salute the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Since this year marks the 50th anniversary of the achievement of the goal of the Lithuanian people, the nation's independence, declared on February 16, 1918, it is only fitting that special recognition be given to this event.

Unfortunately, after only 22 years of freedom, the Lithuanian nation was annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, and has since remained so. We in the United States, since recognizing the independent Lithuanian Government in July of 1922, continue to consider Lithuania a sovereign nation and we feel strongly that her sovereignty should be restored.

I take this occasion to congratulate my fellow Americans of Lithuanian heritage who have contributed so greatly to the growth and progress of our country. I hope we shall soon see the day when we can celebrate this Lithuanian Independence Day with the knowledge that freedom and self-determination have been returned to that valiant nation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today with my colleagues Mr. FLOOD and Mr. MURPHY in paying tribute to the Lithuanian people. Their unquenchable spirit of independence and freedom shall never be suppressed as long as there is a trace of Lithuanian heritage in this country or any other.

The 50th anniversary of Lithuania's reestablishment of independence provides an appropriate time for all Americans to closely reassess and to strongly reconfirm their commitment to that great goal set forth by President Woodrow Wilson in a comment on one of his "14 points," that—

> Peoples in provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever desecrated, of the balance of power.

The Lithuanian peoples have suffered from such bartering every since the world lost sight of President Wilson's preeminent principle.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I wish again to restate my feelings of sympathy that I have expressed previously here on the floor of the House not only for the courageous Lithuanians still under the thumb of Russian aggression, but for our own citizens of Lithuanian ancestry who feel so keenly the separation from their mother country because they can in no way communicate with their relatives and dear ones there.

Lithuanian-Americans as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the Iron Curtain will observe the day with fitting ceremonies, while Lithuanians in the homeland, completely shut off by the Iron Curtain, will silently and secretly join in observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the Two World Wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations. The cause of freedom was precious to her and her progress was remarkable. Today Lithuania as a nation is being exterminated. Lithuania together with other nations behind the Iron Curtain is waging a great struggle against world Communist expansion. Their freedom is not only for their own liberation but is a fight for freedom in the world.

Freedom loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit through which this small country had attained its independence and it is the hope and prayer of all of us that Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The Lithuanians comprise one of the oldest distinct national groups in Europe. They have their own cultural, social, and economic traditions which they yearn to follow as a free people. Even years of suffering will not succeed in quenching the Lithuanians' indomitable spirit or their longing for liberty.

We join today with the many fine Americans of Lithuanian descent who are celebrating their rich heritage from the past and expressing their hopes for the future freedom of their abused kinsmen. We look to the better time when the Lithuanians and all peoples everywhere can share with us the sweet air of freedom.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence is a momentous occasion for Americans of Lithuanian descent. It is also a time for all Americans to pay tribute to the Lithuanian community in the United States and to the ideals of Lithuanian independence.

When we recall the fate of the Lithuanian state, we learn once more the lesson of how precious our own national freedom is. We learn once more that our own freedom cannot be merely taken for granted.

The story of Lithuania in this century is the story of a small country that tried desperately to survive between two giant aggressors: Germany on the west and the Soviet Union on the east. World War I set the stage for Lithuania to declare her independence from the Soviet Union on February 16, 1918, but it was not until 1920 that the Red army was completely driven out of Lithuania.

Lithuania then proceeded as an independent land. She took her place in the League of Nations. She worked at home for progress in education, in land reform and in enlightened labor policies for its workers, such as the 8-hour day. But when World War II broke out, Lithuania once more became just a pawn on the European chessboard.

In 1940 the Red army took over the country once more. Ten months later the German Army seized control. In 1944 the Red army occupied Lithuania for the second time in the war, and thus began the iron grip that has not been loosened to this day.

The United States has always refused to recognize diplomatically the Soviet Union's reconquest of Lithuania. It recognizes only the independent Republic of Lithuania, which has a legation in Washington. The United States—and all other freedom-loving nations—can never forgive the Soviet Union for crushing the independence of a republic of 20 years' standing. Furthermore, the Soviets have run the affairs of Lithuania in the same totalitarian way that they have used to suppress other nationalities inside Soviet borders. A virtual wall of silence surrounds Lithuania today. Only one city, Vilnius, is open to visitors from the West. In culture, government, and religion, Lithuania has been trampled into submission by the Red masters.

We tend here in the United States to take our freedom for granted. We know nothing of the totalitarian rule that Lithuania has experienced—under the Germans and under the Soviets. The idea of mass deportations of political prisoners to Siberia is something we read about, but still cannot quite imagine. Yet Lithuania—the little country to which you feel deeply bound—has known this type of brutality first hand. If we truly love freedom in this country, if we believe in freedom for all men, and if we wish to safeguard our own freedom, we must remember the plight of Lithuania and realize that the Soviet Union is still holding Lithuania and other formerly independent states within its iron grip, in this year 1968.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that on this 50th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, the United States again denounces the Soviet Union for its wanton conquest of free Lithuania at the close of the Second World War.

I would further urge, Mr. Speaker, that the United States demand the restoration of political independence, cultural freedom and civil liberties to the people of Lithuania in accordance with the fundamental right of a people to determine their own sovereign destiny.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, after 120 years of czarist subjugation, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Friday commemorated the 50th anniversary of this proud moment in the history of Lithuania.

The Lithuanians are a valiant people, with the heritage of a long and persistent struggle for freedom. This 717-year-old nation has been overrun by conquerors since the 16th century, and has been buffeted between alien rulers during most of its modern history. Yet in its few years of independence, Lithuania made great strides in the social, economic, and political fields. In 1921, the country became a member of the League of Nations; by 1922, Lithuania had adopted a democratic constitution, and was recognized as a sovereign state by all the major powers of the world. This period has been marked not only by political stability, but also by social and economic reforms, cultural rebirth and educational improvement.

Lithuania has shown courageous resistance to occupation forces in the past and to compulsory Sovietization today. It is remarkable that the national spirit of Lithuania remains unbroken by centuries of oppression. Certainly we who possess our freedom should honor these stalwart people who have kept alive the determination to maintain their identity and to restore their independence—a determination which endures to inspire people of all nations.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked a significant date for Americans of Lithuanian descent, and for Lithuanians everywhere. On that date just 50 years ago, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence.

This action brought realization of a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving for many generations. Unfortunately, it was a short-lived achievement, which ended when Lithuania was occupied by the Russian Army during the Second World War. It was declared a republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940, although this action has never been recognized by the United States.

Lithuanians today, including many thousands living in the United States, look forward to the day when their homeland can again become a free and independent nation.

Lithuania has an ancient and interesting history. As early as the year 1009, Lithuania was recognized as an entity, although divided into many principalities. Threats from other nations resulted in these principalities uniting into a separate nation.

In 1252, a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas the King of a united Lithuania. Mindaugas had been baptized a Christian just 2 years earlier. Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state in 1387, following the marriage of Queen Jadwiga, of Poland, and Grand Duke Jagiello, of Lithuania.

Two centuries later, this unofficial union of Poland and Lithuania was made official and legal, and the two countries were unified until 1795, when Lithuania was annexed by Russia.

For many years, the Russian czars tried to replace Lithuanian language and culture with that of Russia, but the Lithuanians clung to their own religion, language, and traditions. The spirit of nationalism remained unquenched, as it does today.

On this milestone anniversary in Lithuanian history, we should pause to pay tribute to this liberty-loving people, whose dream of independence has remained alive through subjugation, invasion, repression, and occupation.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to associate myself once more with the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, who has championed the cause of oppressed Lithuania in the Congress for many years.

The United States has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia, nor can we condone conquest by force, total political control, alien domination, and economic exploitation anywhere else on the globe.

It is regrettable that on this occasion of their 50th anniversary of independence, we can only pay verbal tribute to a country of over 2 million proud, determined, and courageous people but to them and to the many Lithuanians who have come to our shores we do pledge, with hope, that we shall continue to strive for a world in which all men can pursue their idea of freedom.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the people of Lithuania observed the 50th anniversary of their independence. This anniversary is a significant date for the nearly one million American citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, as well as people dedicated to democratic principles throughout the world.

This occasion also has deep significance for all of us because it reminds us of our unfulfilled commitment to assist in restoring freedom to these people from whom it was illegally taken a generation ago.

The small nation of Lithuania achieved independence in 1918 after a long and arduous fight, and progressed greatly for the next 20 years. In 1940, however, the Red army of the Soviet Union proclaimed this nation as its own. They are still in possession, but the valiant people of Lithuania have not given up the hope of regaining their freedom. The hearts and minds of the Lithuanians have not and will not be conquered.

On this occasion, it is our sincere hope that independence and liberty will again be restored to Lithuania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under most circumstances the anniversary of a nation's independence is an occasion for joyous celebration. But in the tragic case of Lithuania this is not true. Although last Friday, February 16, marked the 50th anniversary of that day in 1918 when a council of 21 Lithuanian patriots declared their nation's independence, Lithuania today lies still beneath the bootheels of Russian domination.

The sad history of independent Lithuania is familiar to us all. The dream of Lithuanian sovereignty that rose from the ashes of World War I perished with the outbreak of World War II. In 1940, Lithuania was declared a "constituent republic" of the U.S.S.R., and 45,000 of her citizens were executed or deported under Stalin's orders. For the remainder of the war Lithuania was occupied and sacked by Russia, Nazi Germany, and finally by Russia again. Against her will, she has remained behind the Iron Curtain since the Russian Army "liberated" her from Nazi occupation in 1944.

This anniversary, then, celebrates the ideal of Lithuanian independence rather than the fact. Our mixed feelings on this day are perhaps best captured by the poet, T. E. Eliot:

> Between the idea
> And the reality
> Between the motion
> And the act
> Falls the shadow.

The shadow of Soviet domination has fallen between the idea of Lithuanian independence and the reality that her people deserve. A proud, strong, and noble people—a people who should be free—lie stifled at this moment beneath communism's shadow. On this bittersweet observance, then, we honor Lithuania's courage, we cry out in anger at her plight, and we affirm once again our faith that her dream of independence will some day be realized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1968, marked the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. But Lithuania has not had 50 uninterrupted years of the freedom for which it strived so long. On August 3, 1940, this independent land was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

For the short period of 22 years from February 16, 1918, Lithuania knew freedom. During this time, great progress was made—a land reform program was instituted, industrialization progressed, social legislation and education made great strides. These were the fruits that flourished until darkness came when Lithuania again became the victim of an aggressor nation. Lithuania has had its sovereignty violated and its freedom suppressed. Its domination has been carried even further than that of such nations as Czechoslovakia for it has been incorporated into the Soviet Union. The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union.

We commemorate today the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people who have not accepted enslavement by the Soviets. These brave people who 50 years ago triumphantly declared their independence, free of the tyranny of other nations, again fiercely resist alien rule and again seek their national independence.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in saluting our Lithuanian friends as they mark this historic anniversary and in reaffirming the inalienable right of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the proud 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. I am honored to take part in this observation day which is being marked and remembered by Lithuanians and friends of Lithuania everywhere.

Lithuania was a free and independent nation long before America was even discovered. She was one of Europe's courageous buffers against barbarians pressing inward on Western civilization before Western civilization was even established in the New World. For centuries Lithuania's empire extended clear across Eastern Europe and her influence was felt throughout the area.

But dark days fell on Lithuania when she was annexed to czarist Russia in the late 18th century. Yet her love of freedom and independence was kept alive and carried to other lands by emigrants from her Baltic shores. And her spirit of liberty reasserted itself 50 years ago, on February 16, 1918, when the Lithuanian Republic was born and Lithuania was restored to the roll of free nations. For 22 years the republic prospered and grew, until she was seized and annexed by Soviet Russia in the expanding World War in 1940. Her 20 years of freedom shine with the brightness of a guiding star, marking forever the hopes and aspirations of Lithuanians everywhere.

The spirit of freedom which is the heritage of Lithuania is the gift of all Lithuanian Americans to the United States. Lithuanian immigrants who have come to our shores over the last hundred years were welcomed with a spirit of brotherhood, fraternity, and equality which was more than returned by these new Americans. Drawing from the spirit of Lithuania, which we commemorate today, these Lithuanian Americans, many of whom live in the Greater Cleveland area, have contributed to the freedom, liberty, and equality of all Americans.

It is my earnest hope that the freedom which is the spirit of Lithuania will be restored to her.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the golden anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, but the golden rays of sunshine do not fall down upon a free and liberated Lithuanian people.

On this date, nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent turned their attention to the plight of their mother country, which was once a prosperous and vigorous industrial and agricultural nation. Today, Lithuania does not enjoy that freedom.

The United States can well be proud of the fact that it was one of the sponsors for the re-creation of a free and independent nation after the conclusion of World War I in 1918.

In the 20 years that followed, the people of Lithuania, through a progressive, liberal, and democratic government, and through its achievements in the field of education, social justice, and industry, have well established their right to a place in the family of free nations.

Unfortunately, Lithuania, like many other countries presently behind the Iron Curtain, became the victim of Nazi aggression in 1939. And, like these other countries, after the Nazi invaders were defeated, Lithuania was trampled under the equally cruel and ruthless foot of the Communist Soviet aggressor. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian victims have been brutally murdered or lost in concentration camps.

Mr. Speaker, it is a year since we last commemorated an anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For all of us the year has passed altogether too rapidly—vanished into history. But for the men and women and children of Lithuania, it was a lifetime, an eternity of continued domination under an alien government and rulers. There was a watchfulness for a break which would restore freedom and independence to Lithuania, but that break has not occurred and the Lithuanian nation looks to the United States for succor.

As they look for freedom, their spirit is kept alive by the hope that the day will not be too far off when this independence is restored to Lithuania. They continue to fight for it and for the freedom of other nations in like circumstances.

I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we pause on this day to consider the plight of these Lithuanian people and of the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain.

The history of this brave and gallant little nation is written in the blood of its valiant warriors and patriots whose only desire was for freedom and independence, never reaching out to grab or annex neighboring territories. Today the same spirit of sacrifice is a dominant characteristic of the Lithuanian people.

It is a proud privilege that I can freely stand before you in this House of Representatives and join with you in saluting the Lithuanian people on their national independence day, and I pray that it will not be too long before peace and freedom are restored to Lithuania and the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and we salute again the brave and courageous people of Lithuania and loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent for whom the flame of hope has not been extinguished but continues to burn with fervor and dedication.

Freedom and liberty are at the very core of Lithuanian history. For 900 years, she has fought wars for liberty and independence and the pages of her history are filled with heroic battles.

For several intervals in the 19th century, Lithuania enjoyed the opportunity to exist as a free and independent people. World War I gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to proclaim to the world that it was a free and independent nation. For more than 20 years, as a free country, no nation ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, enacted social legislation, and developed an educational program which reduced illiteracy among its people to 15 percent after generations of foreign rule had left two-thirds of them unable to read and write. For developing nations today who complain that they are losing the literacy battle, this program should stand as an excellent example of what can be done with enlightened leadership and determination. Great progress by a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of powerful aggressor nations and Russia succeeded in enslaving its people.

We must never forget the fight waged by the Lithuanian people to reestablish their complete independence. As Americans, we enjoy the blessings of freedom and we shall continue to strive for the same blessings for all men. I sincerely hope and pray that the day will soon come when Lithuanians will be, as we are, free men.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I join in today's commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence with mixed feelings.

The example of the Lithuanian people in reasserting their liberty in 1918, after hundreds of years of domination by her larger neighbors, must certainly be a source of encouragement to all who must fight to obtain and maintain their freedom. It came as a natural expression of the very special national culture of the people of Lithuania.

The maintenance of Lithuanian culture and nationality after centuries of attempts to subvert them, certainly shows the importance of the principle of national self-determination to which our country has been long committed.

The United States must salute this accomplishment of the people of Lithuania.

As I said, however, this important occasion provokes mixed emotions in me. My feelings of admiration for the fortitude of the Lithuanian people, and pride in their promotion of the same democratic aspirations to which this country is dedicated is dampened by the knowledge of the sad fate they have met.

The free Lithuanian Government which was established in 1918 was subjected to renewed aggression from her larger neighbors from the very beginning. She was plagued by threats of armed aggression from both Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia during the 1930's. Finally, having been accorded to the Soviet Union in the infamous Nazi Pact of 1939, she was taken over by the Red Army on June 17, 1939.

Terrible losses were inflicted on the Lithuanian people by the Russian invaders. By the time the country was ravaged by the German Army and recaptured by the Russians, the losses included over 2 million Lithuanian citizens.

The incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union which took place without any consultation with the Lithuanian people has only perpetuated their sorrows. The people of the free world cannot forget this ruthless subjugation of a free and democratic people. Our mindfulness of the fate of the Lithuanian people will encourage us in our own pursuit of freedom.

The people of the free world must maintain the democratic aspirations of these people for a national government of their own. If we here in America help to maintain the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, then their independence will be realized again in a repetition of the establishment of Lithuanian independence which we commemorate here today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues today in marking Lithuanian Independence Day.

It is a date which has a double significance both for the brave people of Lithuania, and for world history.

First, it is the 717th anniversary of the consolidation of the Lithuanian state in 1251, the beginning of a glorious tradition of nationhood. Second, today is the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania following World War I.

History has been shaped in large part by human values and human desires. While technological inventions and material progress may influence the shape and form of mankind's institutions, it is the human spirit which sparks the destiny of man.

In our age, a time when scientific achievement occupies much of our attention, we must not forget that age-old lesson. Despite the power and explosiveness of modern weapons, the human spirit remains the ultimate weapon in any conflict.

Men, not the mechanisms they create, will decide who shall triumph in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

For that reason, it is entirely fitting that we pause today in our legislative deliberations to pay tribute to the indomitable spirit of the people of Lithuania, a people whose courageous deeds give shining testimony to their devotion to liberty.

For almost three decades now the people of Lithuania have bravely resisted all Soviet attempts to convert them to the Communist outlook and way of life.

The Lithuanian people continue to hope for, and patiently await, the day when liberty and national independence will be restored to them. Their determination is of a quality and intensity which has often before changed the course of history.

Today, on this 50th anniversary of their declaration of independence, we join our hearts and voices with the people of Lithuania. Bound together by our love for freedom, we—with them—hope for a better, brighter day tomorrow when Lithuania once again proudly may take its rightful place in the world community of nations.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence, and their nation became a free and sovereign state. Only two decades later, their Government was forcibly taken over by the Soviet Union, and the Lithuanians, rendered helpless by Soviet power techniques, suffered the fate of complete incorporation into the Government of the U.S.S.R.

Why do we in the United States honor the independence of a people who have been oppressed by alien rule for the last 28 years? The answer rests in the fact that 50 years ago, the Lithuanian people made a commitment to the principles of democracy—the same commitment which the forefathers of our own Nation made and to which we as a nation continue to devote ourselves. Following their proclamation of independence, the Lithuanians adopted a constitution which preserved for all citizens the right of free speech, free assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of communication. In adopting these precepts to direct their Government, the Lithuanian people demonstrated to all the world their faith in the democratic way.

The seizure of the Lithuanian Government by the Soviet Union constitutes a blatant crime against humanity, a brutal negation of the inherent right of mankind to life and liberty, and to self-determination. For this reason, the U.S. Government has emphatically refused to recognize Lithuania's incorporation in the U.S.S.R., and stands firmly in support of the Lithuanian's just aspirations for freedom and independence.

On Lithuanian Independence Day, the citizens of the United States give expression to the warm and deep sympathy which they feel for the captive people of Lithuania—the precious freedoms which we have safeguarded throughout our history have been cruelly wrenched from their grasp. On that day, we pay tribute to the spirit of a people, to the path they chose in 1918, and to their unfaltering courage as yet, after three decades of Soviet tyranny, they fiercely hold fast their will to freedom.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who hold the joys of democratic freedom dear, February 16 holds a special meaning. This date marks the declaration of independence of Lithuania from long-endured influences of Germany and Russia.

Sadly, an independent government based on democratic principles and ideals was a short-lived reality for the people of Lithuania. After two decades of independence, Lithuania fell again under Russia when it was occupied by the Red Army in the Second World War. It was declared a constituent republic of the

U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since then, it has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania or the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia. The citizens of Miami, Fla., have further emphasized this policy with a resolution adopted at the February 14, 1965, meeting of the Lithuanian Council of Miami. I bring this resolution to the attention of our colleagues:

> RESOLUTION BY AMERICANS OF LITHUANIAN DESCENT IN THE MIAMI AREA
>
> Whereas this year is also the 25th year of Soviet occupation of Lithuania. During this past quarter of a century the Soviets have oppressed and subjugated the Lithuanian people, causing great suffering by their constant efforts to russify and sovietize them: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we again express our appreciation to our Government for refusing to recognize the illegal U.S.S.R. occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and trust the United States will continue to do so; and
>
> That we will continue our steadfast resolve to keep up our efforts to keep the cause of freedom and independence of Lithuania alive in the minds of the Government and the people of the United States, and also in the American press; and
>
> That we hereby urge the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to bring up the cause of the illegal Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, at every opportunity, and
>
> That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, our U.S. Senators, and Members of Congress, and to the press.
>
> LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI,
> DR. S. TAMOSAITIS,
> *President.*
> JENNIE BUKAVECKAS,
> *Secretary.*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, some 700 years ago the Lithuanian people founded an independent state in northeastern Europe, and for many centuries they enjoyed freedom there. From the 16th century the history of their country followed a declining course, leading to its eventual annexation by Russia late in the 18th century.

Thenceforth, for more than a full century, they lived as subjects of Russia's czars in their homeland, but they always hoped, prayed, and worked for their national freedom. They had their opportunity to regain their freedom in 1918, and they proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year. Soon they set up their own democratic government; it was recognized by other sovereign states, and in due time Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations. Then for about two decades the Lithuanian people worked hard and succeeded in making their war-ravaged country a happy haven for them. Then came World War II, bringing on a tragedy to the Lithuanian people.

In 1940 Lithuania was attacked by the Red Army, overwhelmed, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since those sad days Lithuanians have not known freedom in their homeland, for they are ruled by the Communists. For more than two decades, through war and postwar years, they have suffered much, but in the midst of misery and misfortune they still cling to their national ideal, that of regaining their lost freedom. On the observance of their independence day I hope and pray for the freedom of the Lithuanian people from Communist rule.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. With the defeat of Germany and the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolution at the end of World War I, Lithuania seized the opportunity to free herself from 120 years of czarist rule. After 2 more years of strife Lithuania secured a peace treaty from her powerful neighbor. The Soviet Union recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state in 1920, and 1921 Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations.

Lithuania's independence was brief. Yet in two decades much was accomplished by a legitimate, constitutional government, proving that Lithuania could well function as a modern nation. A bold land reform was initiated, industrialization progressed, and universal education was encouraged. Indeed, Lithuania witnessed a cultural renaissance, drawing on her rich heritage, which goes back to the 11th century.

However, Lithuania's ordeals are not over. World War II gave the Soviet Union the pretext, not only to occupy Lithuania once more, but to annex the unfortunate country. A systematized policy of Russification has resulted in mass deportations and suppression of basic freedoms. Despite the sorrow and tragedy caused by these hardships, Lithuanians persist in their struggle for national recognition. I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the courage and determination displayed by Lithuanians and to express my hope that their aspirations will soon be fulfilled.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, once again we observe the independence day of a nation once free but now enslaved by Communist colonialism.

Fifty years ago Lithuanian patriots established their independent Republic. The new nation was once of real promise and in a reasonable world it would continue today to be free and independent, offering its citizens the right to live their lives as God intended men to live. But geography had placed Lithuania on the borders of Communist Russia, and when it suited her purpose, Russia ruthlessly moved in and enslaved these people. It is certainly one of the most cruel and barbaric chapters in the history of the world.

Once again I call attention to my resolution which would provide for a Presidential proclamation calling upon all Americans to observe the independence days of the nations now enslaved by the Soviet Union. It is appropriate and proper that we honor the traditions of these nations and that we express our hope and belief that they will one day be free again.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1968, marks the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence as well as the 717th year since the crowning of King Mindaugas, the first king of Lithuania.

It is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, who has taken a special order in the House of Representatives today in order that we may appropriately commemorate this special anniversary.

It is a particular pleasure for me to participate in the ceremonies here today because I have many thousands of Lithuanian-Americans residing in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, and I know firsthand of the many fine qualities these outstanding citizens of the United States possess.

They are warmhearted, loyal, and dedicated. They are hard-working, conscientious, and courageous. The Lithuanian Americans reflect credit and honor on our country, and they have made outstanding contributions over the years to the development of our cultural traditions and to the advancement of civilization.

During the 89th Congress a concurrent resolution was adopted by both the House and Senate recognizing the rights of self-determination for Lithuania and the other Baltic States and urging the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples. I cosponsored and supported this legislation, and today on the occasion of this anniversary, I want to reiterate the sense of that resolution which urged the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania, as well as to the other Baltic States.

America has never recognized the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R., and further, has always assured the Lithuanians that they are not forgotten. The domination of the Lithuanians constitutes a flagrant denial of fundamental human rights.

As a Member of Congress, and as a member of the Chicago Honorary Committee of the 50th Anniversary Commemorating the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, I want to assure the courageous Lithuanians that our Nation continues to support their just aspirations for freedom and independence, and I want to express the fervent hope that the goal of Lithuanian self-determination shall soon be realized.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Lithuania, a small Baltic nation, gained its independence after almost two centuries of Russian rule. On February 16, 1918, Lithuanian nationalists took advantage of the long-awaited opportunity for independence which was offered by the unsettled conditions resulting from World War I and the Russian Revolution. Since Lithuania first fell victim to Russian imperialism in 1795, Lithuanians had struggled to preserve their sense of national identity in spite of the imposition of a rigorous program of Russification. On this date in 1918 the Lithuanian people finally fulfilled their fundamental right to self-determination.

For two decades Lithuania thrived under a democratic government, before its national freedom was once again trampled under the boots of foreign aggressors. Hoping to save its independence, Lithuania ceded Klaipeda to Germany in 1939, but Russian imperialism was less easily appeased. Under the guise of the 1939 Mutual Assistance Pact, the Soviet Union began its reconquest of Lithuania. By June 1940 Lithuania was reoccupied by Russian forces and by July it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. The promise of the 1920 treaty in which the Soviet Union recognized independent Lithuania and renounced forever all sovereignty over her territory had been cynically forgotten.

As we celebrate the golden anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we join with the 1 million Lithuanian Americans and Lithuanians everywhere in paying tribute to the valiant Lithuanian nationalists who fulfilled their country's dream of freedom. The dream still lives in the memory of the free world, and hopefully independence and freedom will someday once again become a reality in Lithuania.

It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with the Lithuanian delegation at the funeral of President Harding, whom the Lithuanian people of the United States held in appreciation and affection. The delegation was composed of representative Lithuanian Americans from North, South, East, and West. It will be of interest to many friends of Lithuania, I know, to learn that the floral offering brought by this delegation was placed at the head of President Harding's coffin.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of independence. Since the 18th century, the United States has experienced almost two centuries of independence and freedom, while the Lithuanians have experienced only two decades. The United States has never undergone mass destruction or occupation by foreign armies, while the Lithuanians suffered terrible destruction at the hands of the Germans in both World War I and II.

On February 16, 1918, an independent Lithuania was proclaimed. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations; on July 27, 1922, the United States recognized the independent state of Lithuania. A permanent constitution was adopted, and, in spite of internal difficulties which confronted this newly independent nation, great progress was made in agriculture and social legislation. In addition, literature and music, based upon Lithuania's cultural heritage, flourished.

With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania's attempts at neutrality proved unsuccessful, as she was caught up in the interplay between two giants, Germany and the Soviet Union. The loss of territory to Germany in March of 1939 and the forced acceptance of a mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union in October of the same year were only specters of what was to come. A Soviet-Lithuanian nonaggression treaty, notwithstanding, Russian demands and a rigged election coupled with the presence of Soviet troops resulted in the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union as a constituent republic on April 3, 1940. This was followed by German occupation, as in World War I—except that this time, after the Germans withdrew the Soviets remained. Indeed, they have remained to this day. It is instructive to note that the United States refused to recognize this incorporation and has not done so even today.

Because Lithuania is not free and independent, her day of independence must be a day of reaffirmation instead of a day of celebration. But there is no doubt that this nation which had an independent and progressive political life as early as the Middle Ages will once again be free. If ever there was a lesson to be learned from history, it would be that the culture and heritage of this proud people will never cease to exist. One need only to look at the period between 1831 and 1905, during which the Russians failed utterly to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with that of Russia.

It is therefore with honor that I salute all Lithuanians on their day of reaffirmation, and look forward to that time when they rejoin the family of nations as a free and independent state.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith present in full a resolution adopted on February 11, 1968, by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey:

RESOLUTION

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence;

RESOLVE

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

Newark, New Jersey, February 11, 1968.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELINIS,
President.
A. S. TRECIOKAS,
Secretary.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in the House commemorating the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. America has many friends among the Lithuanian people and this occasion has special meaning.

The struggle of the Lithuanian people against Communist oppression and their devotion to freedom and liberty are an inspiration to mankind. A tyranny of force never once has dimmed the will to national self-determination that was proclaimed in Vilnius on February 16, 1918.

At this time, I would like to read into the RECORD the proclamations of Lieutenant and Active Governor of the State of Michigan, William G. Milliken, and mayor of the city of Detroit, Jerome P. Cavanagh, proclaiming Republic of Lithuania Week. They are a fitting tribute to a courageous people.

[Proclamation of the mayor of the city of Detroit]

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA WEEK, FEBRUARY 11–17, 1968

Whereas The 50th Anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated on February 16th, marking that day in 1918 when Lithuania was re-established as a free and sovereign state, and

Whereas The history of the freedom-loving Lithuanian people is underscored by their heroic resistance to subjugation by Czarist Russia, by Nazi Germany and since 1940 by the Soviet Union, and

Whereas Despite 28 years of Communist domination, Lithuanian people throughout the world maintain the most fervent dedication to the cause of liberating their homeland, and

Whereas The United States has supported and encouraged this abiding love of freedom by the Lithuanian people by refusing to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union

Now, therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of the City of Detroit, do hereby proclaim the week of February 11–17, 1968 as "Republic of Lithuania Week" in Detroit and urge all citizens to join me in seeking a world in which the fervent desire for freedom becomes the reality of freedom for Lithuania and all peoples.

[Proclamation of Lieutenant and Acting Governor of the State of Michigan]

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA WEEK

The year 1918 will live forever in the minds and hearts of the great and courageous people of Lithuania, an ancient country which played such an important role in the development of modern Europe. On February 16, 1918 Lithuania became a free and independent nation. This freedom tragically lasted only 22 years. In June of 1940 the men, women and children in the little Baltic nation were swallowed up by the totalitarian tyranny of the Soviet Union.

Significantly, the United States has never recognized this ruthless take over and today the people of Michigan and the rest of the United States yearn with the free Lithuanians living here that freedom once again will come to their brothers and sisters now enslaved in their native land. Together we will work toward a rebirth of freedom with the knowledge that history teaches us that the spirit of self-determination is eternal.

Let the freedom enjoyed by the native Lithuanian sons and daughters in Michigan be the beacon to be followed by their friends everywhere. And let it be known how highly we respect our friendships with our Lithuanian neighbors.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Lieutenant and Acting Governor of the State of

> Michigan, do hereby proclaim Feburary 11–17, 1968 as "Republic of Lithuania Week" in Michigan, and ask all citizens to join with our good Lithuanian friends in a rededication to freedom for the captive nation's on this the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, an independence won after over 100 years of Russian domination which was supplanted by German occupation during World War I. However, the long-sought independence of the Lithuanian people was to be forcibly wrested from them during World War II, first by the Soviet Union, then by Nazi occupation, only to be followed by Soviet reoccupation in 1944. Since World War II, the Soviet Union has claimed Lithuania to be a component republic.

The Lithuanian people are not submissive by nature. In order to insure the continuation of its subjugation of the Lithuanian people, the Soviet Union found it necessary to adopt severely repressive policies—which included mass deportations, terrorization, and a superimposed political and economic structure permeating every level of Lithuanian society. Despite nearly 25 years of domination, the Soviet Union has not yet succeeded in erasing the consciousness of a separate national identity from the Lithuanians nor in extinguishing their desire for the restoration of their sovereignty. Sustaining the Lithuanian people through these dark decades is the legacy of a rich cultural and national heritage as well as the indelible memory of the freedoms they enjoyed while Lithuania existed as an independent nation.

The United States has never recognized Soviet incorporation of Lithuania. We will never recognize Soviet abolishment of the nation of Lithuania as irrevocable. Today we have anguish in our hearts for the Lithuanian people who are forced to endure abject suppression. May their liberation and the restoration of their rightful independence be hastened.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House once again in paying well-deserved tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

I think it most fitting that we here in the United States, and free peoples everywhere in the world, pause at this time to send warm greetings and words of encouragement to those in the Lithuanian homeland who cannot openly observe such a meaningful day of national pride and glory.

Independence day should be a joyous time in any nation. Yet, for still another year this anniversary is one of sadness, but not of resignation. As long as freedom exists anywhere, and as long as we in the free world continue to hold out hope, I am confident that the determined people of Lithuania will not abandon their dream of liberation.

On behalf of the people of my district many of whom are of Lithuanian ancestry, I wish to express the hope that soon this will again be truly a day of independence not only for them but for all the captive nations of the Baltic.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago the nation of Lithuania courageously threw off the yoke of Russian domination to enjoy a brief 22-year interval of freedom.

But in 1940 this proud land and her sister nations of Latvia and Estonia once again fell under the heel of Russian despotism, crushed by the sheer weight of Soviet military power. But the spirit of Lithuania—as in all the European captive nations—has survived and shines steadfastly in the dark night of Communist domination.

I am well acquainted with the incredible courage and perseverance of the Lithuanians and other groups who are closely involved in the struggle for freedom in the captive nations. I know many of their relatives and countrymen in my own Cleveland, Ohio, area. I urge the House to give more than lipservice to their desire for independence in their homelands.

I, and many of my colleagues, have introduced in this and many preceding Congresses legislation which would establish a special committee on the captive nations. Congress has been remiss, in my opinion, in bypassing my resolution, House Resolution 73. Eloquence and an expression of our support and goodwill are all well enough, but creation of a select committee would be a forward step which the entire world would understand.

For those who are inclined to take the view that there is a "softening of Soviet oppression" in the European captive nations, let me call to the attention of this House that statement of Vytautas Vaitiekunas of Lithuania last summer at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York when the 14th Plenary Session of the Assembly of Captive Nations convened.

He said:

> Indoctrination in schools (in Lithuania) has been strengthened of late. The intent is to "familiarize the students with the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and to expose bourgeois nationalism."

When the Lithuanian World Political Conference met in Washington, D.C., last October 21 and 22, it formulated a policy for future action which includes, in their words:

> In commemorating the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, the Lithuanian Nation:
>
> Accuses the Soviet Union of acts of aggression, destruction of Lithuania's independence, genocidal extermination and Russification of the Lithuanian people, colonial exploitation of Lithuania, denial of the basic human rights and freedoms to the Lithuanian people;
>
> Demands that the Soviet Union withdraw its army, police and administration from Lithuania;
>
> Asks the governments and parliaments of the free world to use all means at their disposal to restore the independence of Lithuania;
>
> Appeals to the United Nations for action to liquidate the Soviet aggression against Lithuania and to the conscience of mankind for support of Lithuanian efforts to restore her independence.

While we voice our earnest prayers that freedom will replace tyranny in all nations of the world, let us take action to advance the cause of Lithuania and all the captive nations.

I hope that the House leadership this year will grant consideration of legislation creating the special Committee on the Captive Nations and that it will be speedily enacted by the House.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in this commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, independence which its citizens cannot openly celebrate today because of its bondage under the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, after 120 years of Russian rule, was successful in reestablishing its independence at the end of World War I, but they were occupied again in 1940. To the credit of the United States, we have never recognized this occupation. To the credit of the people of Lithuania and her sons and daughters throughout the world, they have never accepted this bondage and given up their hopes of freedom. In reaffirming our support of their cause, we let them know that they are not forgotten and that we still champion the right of all people to self-determination.

The Lithuanians are a valiant people with a long history of will and determination. They waited 120 years for the opportunity to redeclare independence in 1918. It has been 28 years since they lost that freedom again, but with the help of the free world they will again be independent.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to join my colleagues today in this special program in observance of the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in arranging for this tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania whose fervent desire for freedom and the right of self-determination has never weakened despite its long history of oppression, trial, and adversity.

It is most fitting that the House observe this annual celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day, so that the Lithuanian nation may know of the friendship which America holds for the Lithuanian people and other oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Let us demonstrate anew this friendship and admiration for a courageous people whose struggles for freedom stand as a constant reminder of the precious gift we enjoy in this country and in the rest of the free world.

The Lithuanians are a gallant, heroic people. That they have survived in the face of the bloody oppression they have endured at the hands of Communist tyrants is a tribute to their courage, faith, and steadfastness.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people have suffered at the hands of the Red oppressors whose 300,000 troops overran this gallant little country following the Soviet-Nazi nonaggression pact. Mass jailings and executions were the order of the day and it is estimated that in 1 year alone, some 65,000 Lithuanians were massacred.

Countless others were shipped to the frozen wastelands of Siberia to die a horrible death in servitude and privation.

Let us raise the hope today in this tribute to Lithuania that the Soviet would see fit to serve its own best interests and those of its satellites by granting some measure of freedom and self-determination to the gallant people of Lithuania and the other oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain. Such a gesture on the part of the U.S.S.R. at this time would constitute an effective contribution toward world peace.

While the Soviets do not, of course, appear disposed toward any such righting of their wrongs against an oppressed people, let us renew in this House our pledge to the cause of a free Lithuania. Let us keep alive this quest for liberation in Lithuania so that it may serve as a beacon of hope to oppressed peoples everywhere.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to participate in the commemoration of Lithuania's February 16, 1918, declaration of independence. Of the 50 years which have passed since that day, Lithuania has enjoyed only two decades of national freedom and independence. Prior to 1918, this small but proud nation suffered Russian domination from 1795 to 1915, followed by German domination during World War I.

During the upheavals of World War II, it again fell under the heel of Russia, and on August 3, 1940 is was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Within 10 months Lithuania felt the full weight of the German armies, which was followed by Russian reoccupation in 1944—an oppressive domination that has lasted to this day.

In spite of an unfortunate history of foreign oppression, Lithuanian culture has not only survived, it has continued to grow. And it is upon this fact that belief in an eventual free and independent Lithuania can be based. I am proud to say that the United States recognized an independent Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and has steadfastly refused to recognize its incorporation into the Soviet Union.

On the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, we commemorate this people who know oppression but who maintain their belief in a national culture and their faith in eventual freedom. We Americans profoundly respect their belief and share their faith.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the 20th of February marks the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. During this year of International Human Rights, I think it appropriate that we pause for a moment to honor this important day in the history of a gallant people's struggle for freedom from the yoke of Communist oppression.

This small, but valiant nation has been swept into the web of communism. But the Lithuanian people have kept their identity and maintained their fervent commitment for freedom. We in the United States who enjoy freedom should take time to reflect upon the tragedy of the millions of Lithuanians and other brave people who are not so fortunate as we. We must keep the torch of freedom alive for them, looking toward the day when they may carry their freedom torch again.

The United Nations has declared 1968 as International Human Rights Year. In this connection I have introduced a resolution—House Resolution 1020—expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the four human rights treaties now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Among these treaties, is the Genocide Convention, ratified by 71 nations. Conspicuously absent from the list of signatories is the United States while conspicuous among those who have signed is the U.S.S.R. and other Iron Curtain nations.

There appears to be no question that the Soviet Union has as its policy the restriction of physical and cultural and religious freedom. This policy of national discrimination is particularly pronounced against the Lithuanians, the Ukranians, and Soviet Jews.

The United States has protested and will continue to protest this policy of spiritual and cultural genocide as violative of human rights and contrary to international law. But we are powerless to invoke the terms of the Genocide Convention as we are not a party to it.

Mr. Speaker, the Genocide Convention continues to languish on the shelves of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. No effort is made to extricate this treaty or the other important treaties from the shelves of oblivion. Indifference and inaction have not characterized American diplomacy in the past. Why should we in the United States be bound by the stubborn and inconsiderate acts of a few ill-advised men. The time for action on these important conventions is now.

On this anniversary day of Lithuanian independence, let us strive for the goals of human rights. The oppressed peoples of the world cry out for our help. To them I say "we shall not forget nor abandon them."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, history shows us that in early times Lithuania was a powerful country with progressive, liberal leadership. Its peoples were highly cultivated and enlightened and played an integral role in the growth of European civilization.

In 1795, czarist Russia annexed Lithuania. The repressive policies of Russia were matched by those practiced by Germany during World War I, when Lithuania was under Germany occupation.

The defeat of Germany and the chaos in Russia following the Bolshevik Revolution created a propitious moment for the Lithuanian people. On February 16, 1918, just 50 years ago, Lithuania declared itself an independent nation. During the period of independence, Lithuania again demonstrated its inherent progressive nature. Nationalism flourished within its borders while internationally Lithuania assumed the responsibility and status of being a member of the League of Nations. Educational and social reforms were abundant, and industrial and agricultural progress was rapid and significant.

With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania was again fated to be exploited and plundered, this time by the Nazi and Soviet empires surrounding her. In 1940, employing devious methods, the Soviet Union incorporated Lithuania as a constituent republic and instituted a policy of mass deportations, A year later, Nazi German armies overran and occupied Lithuania. When Nazi power declined, the aspirations of the Lithuanian people were not fulfilled. In 1944 the colonialist tendrils of the Soviet Union again wrapped themselves around Lithuania and choked the little resistance remaining after the debilitating treatment of waves of alien occupation troops.

Since that time, the Soviet Union has unrelentingly imposed repressive policies on the Lithuanians. This they have deemed necessary in order to prevent any sparks of nationalism from flaring up inside the Iron Curtain which encloses Lithuania.

Americans of all political persuasions have consistently denounced the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. We know that these people strongly desire the privilege to live according to their own determination. It is my fervent hope that someday we shall see Lithuania regain its indisputable rights of national independence and freedom.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the Second World War, the cries of anticolonialism have risen to a high pitch throughout most of the world. Yet, paradoxically, few of these voices speak out against Soviet suppression of the Baltic peoples. One constantly hears warnings at the United Nations and elsewhere of the danger of Western "neocolonialism" and "neoimperialism," but the same people who are so worried about this become deathly silent with respect to the most blatant form of colonialism in the 20th century: the snuffing out of the national existence of three independent and free nations that sought only to live in peace with their neighbors. Historians will surely regard this as paradoxical if not hypocritical.

Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, graphically illustrates the global double standard that so many apply to Western colonialism as compared with Soviet Communist imperialism. Imagine the outcry that would arise if France invaded Algeria and reimposed its rule over that nation. Yet, Algeria has been independent for less than 10 years. Lithuania lived in freedom for 22 years, from 1918 to 1940, and served to justify Woodrow Wilson's great doctrine of self-determination. Its death sentence came in the form of the infamous German-Soviet nonaggression pact of August 22, 1939, which gave Stalin a free hand in the Baltic States. The Soviet dictator soon demonstrated the ability to use his newly won privileges. Within a year, the Red army had marched into Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, smashing freedom in its wake.

Since those dark days, many new nations have emerged from the shackles of foreign rule. The Baltic States remain submerged. Many peoples have experienced a cultural flowering with independence. Lithuania's centuries-old culture and strong religious heritage remains suppressed, as Moscow attempts to destroy all sense of nationalism and turn the Lithuanian into its patented vision of the new "Soviet man." Other peoples still living under foreign or alien rule receive strong moral and sometimes material support from the outside world—few peoples and even fewer governments uphold the cause of the Baltic peoples.

Lithuania today stands as a mark of shame on the world, which will be erased only when that gallant nation receives the freedom for which it has struggled so long and hard.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my many colleagues who have spoken out on this, the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. One cannot be aware of the proud history of that subjected nation without relating it to what is going on in Vietnam today.

Achieving independence and freedom in 1918, Lithuania made great strides forward toward securing for its people stability and dignity as a nation. With the onset of World War II, however, Lithuania was overrun by both the Russians and the Nazis. It has remained since that time another innocent victim of Communist imperialism.

We have in this country a large number of both private and public citizens who maintain that communism is not a serious threat to freedom today. They urge us to "cooperate" with the Communists in Asia, to work out arrangements with them for some kind of joint captivity for formerly free nations.

We went down that road in Korea just 15 years ago and today have a divided nation under constant threat and pressure from North Korean Communists, now bold enough to seize a U.S. naval vessel and tell American authorities to like it or lump it.

We are being urged to take the same road over Vietnam, to invite the Communists to the conference table on their terms—no more bombing, but complete freedom for them to beef up their troops and supplies in North Vietnam for the day when they are strong enough to take over the entire nation.

Perhaps Lithuanian Independence Day offers little in the way of solid hope to its people, but it can serve to remind us what happens when communism grabs a nation, often under the pretext that it just wants to establish order and justice there.

The Lithuanians warded off Bolshevik subversion as long as it could, just as all free nations are now being forced to ward off the disaster of Soviet espionage and public displays of riot and disorder. Finally the Red army moved on to Lithuanian soil, followed by the triple blights of collectivization, purges and starvation.

The Lithuanian people battle on against all of it today, 50 years wiser and 50 years more experienced in what Soviet benevolence really means in day-to-day living. They cannot express national loyalty, personal religion, freedom to speak, travel and work where they please.

Wherever communism goes, away goes freedom. We hear that communism is not a menace in Cuba, that it will be a reasonable partner in Vietnam, a tame tiger in Korea. Such talk is rot, and the American people know it even if our leaders sometimes sound as though they had never heard of communism in action.

The Lithuanians are not Russians. They were an independent people, just as the Vietnamese and Koreans were an independent people. But communism now has all of them in its claws or is trying to grab them.

In acknowledging the proud history of the Lithuanian people on the day 50 years ago when they declared their independence, only to lose it a few years later, we are or should be pledging anew our determination to continue the battle for right and justice.

However you slice it, communism always comes out looking the same—terrorism, suppression, and total control. Let us keep it in mind when we think about and read about all the proposals to settle the various conflicts around the world. If we are as well equipped militarily as the McNamara computers in the Pentagon say we are, and the Defense Department budget indicates we are, then let us fear nothing, bow to no one, and help those who stand with us.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, we take this time today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. We should also take this occasion to remember the other East European nations which also gained their independence at about the same time. Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, the Ukrainian National Republic, and Finland all cast off the Russian yoke during the 1-year period from December 1917, to November 1918.

Today, of these five, only Finland is able to celebrate a truly golden 50th anniversary. The other four, caught in the death struggle of two titanic powers, unable to escape the events which were the result of decisions made in capitals not their own, these nations failed to reemerge from those dark years of World War II.

Lithuania's history in the 20th century is not unlike the history of its neighboring Baltic States and of the Ukraine. Under Russian domination since 1795, Lithuania saw its opportunity in 1918, when Russia was preoccupied by revolution and civil war. On February 16, 1918, independence was declared. For 3 years, Lithuania fought against a Communist tide, striving at the same time to build a stable, democratic government. Finally, in September 1921, the world recognized her achievement, and Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations.

The 17 years which followed were by no means easy ones for Lithuania. In 1926, President Antanas Smetona found it necessary to dissolve the Parliament and rule by decree until 1938. But at least it was Lithuania ruled by a Lithuanian. In 1938, a new constitution was written, and although it increased the powers of the President, it also reaffirmed the principles of freedom. During its 22 years of independence, the country underwent a major transformation in both the agricultural and industrial fields. Social progress was made, and Lithuanian art, literature, and music flourished.

But in 1939, the storm clouds which had been gathering on the horizon for 6 years, closed in upon this little nation. The mutual assistance pact forced upon her by Russia in October 1939, was only the first step toward total Soviet domination in August 1940. Those clouds have never lifted since that date.

Yet despite attempts at Russification of the nation, and despite a plan to break up and scatter the Lithuanian people, the dream and spirit of an independent Lithuania lives on today, both within that nation and without. This dream lives in the one million Lithuanians who live in the United States today, and who have made a significant contribution to our national heritage. It is to this spirit that we pay tribute today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my colleagues of House Resolution 395, which I introduced last March, proposing that the House of Representatives establish a Committee on Captive Nations to conduct a study of all captive non-Russian nations. This committee would inquire particularly into the means by which the United States could assist captive nations by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms.

The very existence of such a committee would reaffirm the commitment of the American people to the ultimate liberation of these captive nations, and would help kindle the spark which still burns so fiercely behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the American Lithuanians in the Calumet region of Indiana celebrated the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

Americans of all nationalities are continuing their fight to restore independence and free government to the Lithuanian nation. Great discontent, unemployment, and dissatisfaction exists among the vast majority of the people in Communist Lithuania, as well as other captive European nations who are looking forward to the day when internal uprisings will occur that will result in restoration of their liberty and freedom.

The following resolution was adopted unanimously at a mass meeting of the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Ind., on last Sunday.

I submit this resolution for the information of the Members of Congress:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Lithuania, the country of our fathers, has been, and still is, unlawfully occupied by Soviet military police forces, and

Whereas, the government of the United States, though recognizing the independence of Lithuania, has failed to condemn the unlawful acts of the Soviets in the occupied country;

Be it therefore resolved that we Americans of Lithuanian descent and ancestry shall continue to support the efforts of Lithuanian people to regain freedom and re-establish our Independent Republic.

Be it further resolved that we appeal to the government of the United States to denounce openly the Soviet policy of colonization of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and

Resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and copies thereof be sent to the Secretary of State, Senators and Representatives of Indiana and the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE,
ALBERT G. VINICK, *Chairman*.
PETER INDRIEKAS, *Secretary*.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to join with my colleagues in the Congress in calling attention to the historic observance of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

It is a holiday which is observed by loyal American citizens of Lithuanian descent. It has a special meaning this year because it is the 50th anniversary of independence for a nation that has a proud tradition in its dedication to the cause of freedom and democracy.

We commemorate the passage of a half century of time since the valiant people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence. We share the hope that the people of Lithuania will again gain their freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1968, a resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Lith's Club of Shenandoah, Pa.

With consent of the House, I include the resolution which follows:

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of the world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples. Be it further

Resolved that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, the Secretary of State, Honorable Dean Rusk, our Ambassador to the United Nations, The Honorable Arthur S. Goldberg, our United States Senators, The Honorable Joseph S. Clark and the Honorable Hugh Scott, our Congressman, the Honorable George M. Rhodes, and to our Governor of Pennsylvania, The Honorable Raymond P. Shafer and also to the press.

ANTHONY MATALAUAGE,
President.
EDWARD DERRINGE,
Secretary.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the concept of freedom as we who are privileged to participate in the democracy of the United States know it, is unheard of under the Communist banner.

In 1918, at the end of World War I, a battle weary Lithuania proclaimed its independence. During its brief but productive two decades of freedom, agriculture, industry, and education made important strides forward. Farming units increased 1,000-fold. Industrial establishments increased fourfold and progress was made in social legislation with the introduction of the 8-hour day. The combined increase in grammar and secondary schools was fivefold. From 1920 to the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Army on July 13, 1944, Lithuanian literature and music flourished.

Unfortunately, Lithuania's geographically vulnerable position forced it to become one of the first countries to be involved in World War II. Soon thereafter, it was illegally incorporated into the United Soviet Socialist Republic. As expected, the Communist press has claimed great achievements in industry, agriculture, education, and culture. In reality, there has been a lack of freedom and a imposition of Communist methods.

The unjust and tyrannical control of the Lithuanian people by the Soviet Government has always been opposed by the United States. We have never recognized Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union. In keeping with our foreign policy objective of a free and peaceful world, we will continue to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former independent government. In this way we can support the Lithuanian's innate aspirations for freedom and independence and encourage them until liberty is once again a reality for all peoples of the world.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence; let us pause briefly to reflect on the significance of this occasion.

Lithuania's history shows a constant desire for, and struggle toward freedom and democracy. Fate has not been kind to this small country, however, and it has been stripped of freedom, and bounced back and forth between Germany and the Soviet Union for many years.

After over a century of Russian domination, followed by German occupation during World War I, Lithuania declared her independence on February 16, 1918. After two decades of independence, she again fell to the Russians during occupation by the Red army in the Second World War. Ten months after being declared a constitutional republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940, Germany attacked the Soviet Union and regained Lithuania. In 1944, the last swap occurred. Since that time, Lithuania has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic.

The unquenchable hope for freedom was painfully apparent at the Lithuanian World Congress, which met in August of 1958 under the auspices of the American Lithuanian community. A unanimous resolution was adopted declaring that "Lithuanians continue fiercely resisting the alien rule" of the Soviet Union, and stating that Lithuanians "have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution called upon the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom."

On this date of commemoration, let us once more assure the people of Lithuania that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, at the southern end of the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea lies the little nation of Lithuania. Lithuania was first established as an independent country in A.D. 1251. Since that time, it has lost its self-governing, independent status twice and regained it once.

Lithuania was conquered by the Russians in 1795. Finally, in 1918, after more than 120 years of foreign domination, little Lithuania succeeded in reestablishing its independence. Sadly, for those staunch defenders of freedom, Lithuania was occupied again by the Russians in 1940. The courage and steadfastness shown by Lithuanians in their struggle to regain and maintain their freedom and independence should not be forgotten by the free peoples of the world.

Though held in Soviet bonds since the Russian occupation of 1940, little Lithuania celebrates this year, 1968, the 50th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence. Situated at the geographic center of the European Continent, Lithuania has fought valiantly to regain its freedom and independence from Soviet rule.

In signing a peace treaty with this country in July 1920, the Soviet Union relinquished all territorial claims on Lithuania. However, the Soviets did not observe these provisions of the treaty. Soviet aggression has not ceased, and the brave and determined resistance of the Lithuanian people to foreign rule has not slackened. The U.S. House of Representatives was not unaware of the plight of Lithuania in 1965, when it passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 by a unanimous vote of 298 yeas. The U.S. Senate took cognizance of the Baltic States when it unanimously adopted this resolution in October 1966.

I join with my colleagues today in recalling that resolution, and the spirit of freedom it expressed for peoples held in bondage. We cannot forget those enslaved by tyranny because of our other world problems. On the contrary, these other conflicts should serve to remind us all of the love and desire for freedom and independence of all people.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a 50th anniversary is usually considered an especially joyous occasion, and so it should be. However, this year, as Lithuanians observe the 50th anniversary of the restoration of their country's independence, it must be with a sad heart. This independence, lost again in 1940 when the country was forcefully taken over by Russia, must again be restored. While this anniversary is not a joyous one, it is an occasion to rededicate our efforts to the restortation of freedom and independence.

To help achieve this aim, Congress, in 1966, adopted a resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring before the United Nations, the Baltic question, with a view toward obtaining their independence. This year, special efforts are being made to have this resolution implemented.

On Saturday, the 17th, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, observed this 50th anniversary with a banquet. Many city, State and Federal officials, and most of the people of the Lithuanian community, residing in the area, were present, and it was my privilege to be with them.

The invocation was given by the Reverend Anthony Dranginis, assistant pastor of St. Alphonsus Roman Catholic Church, which I wish to insert at this point:

THE INVOCATION AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Almighty and Eternal God, through whose graces Thy faithful are able to serve Thee with dignity and joy bless all who are gathered here this evening: bless America and her leaders, that they may be constant in their efforts, fearless in their search, wise in their counsels, and under Thy Divine Guidance, bring forth freedom not only to Lithuania but also to all the enslaved peoples of the world.

Turn Thine eyes of Mercy upon the people of Lithuania and their beloved Country, held in the grip of tyranny and slavery. May the plight of Lithuania be not forgotten, but may it appeal to the hearts of all free men and in the cause of Justice gain their assistance to deliver Lithuania from the chains of slavery and restore Her among the free and independent nations of the World.

O Heavenly Father, please accept our humble and sincere prayer, Bless Lithuania, grant that her people may once again be allowed to praise Thee without restraint, serve Thee without fear, and love Thee without end. May this 50th anniversary commemorating Lithuania's Independence be effective in making actual what we celebrate today in hope, through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, the principal speaker on this occasion was Dr. Anthony Suziedelis, associate professor of psychology at the Catholic University of America, and because I know his remarks will be of interest to all Members of the Congress at this time, I am inserting them in the RECORD at this point.

LITHUANIA IN INTERNATIONAL LIFE TODAY

Last year, as every year on February the 16, in observance of the anniversary of the declaration of independence, the Lithuanian legation in Washington held a reception. There were a few eminent guests present and most of the people of the Lithuanian community. In the morning, the Washington Post described the event with this headline: Independence Gone, the Party Goes On. The brief article with the clever headline was written around the point that there really exists no such state of which charges d'affaires of the legation is a representative, that there exists no government to which he is accredited, and therefore—isn't it amazing that the people are still commemorating independence, as if oblivious of the reality, as if in some fantasy world. The levity of the headline hurt, it seemed unfair. Yet quite frequently on these occasions one is approached by a friend with just such a question: Aren't you people trying to resurrect something which is long gone and way past, something that is not real, not part of the current world? It is a shame about Lithuania, they say, and yet—what can we do about it? If we did indeed attempt to do something about it, wouldn't that be a threat to peace? Any talk about Captive Nations, or the Baltic question would only jeopardize the occasional thaw in the Cold War; perhaps we should leave well enough alone. After all, it isn't so bad over there any more—granted it was terrible in Stalin's day, now life is getting better over there, isn't it? They send to jail a few writers undeservedly, but then—don't we ourselves have societal ills as well?

These questions come from good friends and the younger of them, the students, often top them with one final query: Say, where is Lithuania anyhow?

They are questions which need to be answered. They cannot be simply dismissed as we are sometimes tempted to do, as ignorant or naive questions. They come from people who are neither ignorant nor naive, who are concerned about peace, who care about justice, who follow world developments and wonder and worry about them, who cherish their own freedom and wish it for others, who pain over violence, suffer over atrocities and over the inhumanity of man to man. In the context of the gripping concerns about the present world, these questions make a good deal of sense. *Are* we—who are observing the memory of independence—living in a world of fantasy? What can we do about it anyhow? If we did, wouldn't that be a threat to peace? And maybe things are getting better over there. And, say—where is Lithuania anyway? There is no Lithuania now, is there?

I would like to begin with the last question and answer: indeed so, there is a Lithuania. It is a surprise to many to learn that Lithuania was not simply created after the first World War by a secession, just as now new statehoods and sovereignties are created seemingly all at once. Lithuania as a state dates back over 700 years, and as a national unit for much longer than that, with its own language and culture, unique customs and traditions. For as long as history records, Lithuanians have inhabited the Baltic shore, worked its land, formed villages, built towns. There were times of political ascendancy and times of political decline; times of political unions as well as separations and divisions, but throughout such times the national identity, the national consciousness developed and grew stronger, so much so that over the previous century it was able to survive a most direct effort at national suppression by Czarist Russia. At the end of the 18th century, when Russia, Germany and Austria partitioned Eastern Europe, Lithuania was denied self-rule, and for 120 years endured an occupation—with books in native language forbidden and outlawed, religion persecuted, leaders deported, jailed and executed. In spite of this, the national awareness survived, and in the wake of the first World War the nation declared itself independent. It is this live spirit of national identity that we are celebrating today, not just the formal act of declaration. Indeed, unlike here in the United States, that act itself did not even found a nation, it only restored to the nation its rightful ownership of freedoms fostered, cherished and defended over the centuries. It is this dedication of a people to be free that we are commemorating today, and that is real, it is not fantasy.

True enough, the formal years of independence did not last very long. Twenty-two years later, in 1940, the same powers that had earlier by treaty relinquished for all time any claims against the sovereignty of Lithuania, returned again to enslave her. It was an enslavement unmatched in cruelty and terror, and even those of us who were too young then to comprehend it fully remember it well. In one week alone, before the German-Russian conflict erupted into a war 35,000 people were deported for slave labor in Siberia, some executed on the way, many others never to return. But once again the nation arose, free government was formed and led the nation for a brief time, until put down by the Nazis who imposed their own brand of sophisticated terror. And when the Soviets recuperated and the Nazi empire was being shattered, the nation once again resisted its fate. It is little known that during the first eight years of the present Soviet occupation, during 1944 to 1952, a guerrilla war was waged against the Soviets in Lithuania that was more costly and more destructive than the rebellion against the French in Algeria. The Algerians won their independence, but the rebellion in Lithuania was little even heard of in the West. The West was tired and weary of war, and Russia had been an ally—conditions which allowed the Soviets finally to suppress the people and to entrench their regime lasting to the present day.

It is here that the question is likely to be posed—But is it all that bad now? Look at the Soviet Constitution—it explicitly provides for "equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of nationality or race, in all spheres of governmental, cultural, political and other public activity." The Soviet criminal code also has specific provisions to protect races and nationalities from persecution.

What is done in practice, however, is quite another matter. It is true that since Stalin's death physical terror has subsided. During his reign, and sometime thereafter, approximately 700,000 people of the Baltic states were departed, or removed from the population by incarceration, or perished in armed resistance. Now the scourge of physical extermination on a massive scale has lifted, although no one wise in Soviet ways should take any bets for how long. What is not any less unrelenting, however, is a systematic and concerted program of annihilating national identity through social, economic and educational policies. While the Soviet constitution congratulates itself on protective measures for national cultures—all policies are aimed toward the goal of stamping out national consciousness by producing a managed generation of young people in the image of the complete Soviet man, with Moscow as Mecca and Russia as the super-nation. In secondary schools, for example, teaching history and geography of Lithuania is not permitted, but communism and Russian are required subjects. Half of all books published in Lithuania are either in Russian or translated from Russian. Every local administrator has a Russian deputy who monitors adherence and conformity to the Moscow directives. All religious education of persons under 18 is expressly forbidden by law, as are private gatherings for prayer or visits of the priest to the people. During the Czarist occupation, the churchmen had also served as national leaders, and this point is not missed by the Soviets.

What we see, then, happening in Lithuania today is not just an imposed totalitarian regime of communism, but a regime of occupation of one nation by another, a program of colonialism, with all its marks of economic exploitation, political suppression, and the final aim of absorbng completely the territory and the people.

Are such things all that bad? Isn't it still true that the conditions now are more livable than they were 10 or 15 years ago? To me, the situation isn't unlike that of a person condemned in death row, long tortured and abused, who now is told: Look, you will have it a lot better from now on, we won't torture you anymore.

He might then ask: Well then, can I see my family? And the answer would be: Certainly not. Can I see a priest? Certainly not. Can they send me some books to read? Certainly not, we'll tell you what you can read. Well, has my sentence been commuted? No, you will die as scheduled, but you will have it a lot better now—we won't torture you anymore.

Lithuania is under a death sentence, and things are not quite as bad anymore.

The analogy here, of course, is not entirely accurate. No analogy ever is. And the question can be raised quite meaningfully:

But isn't it realistic to expect that changes in the world will indeed occur? There always have been changes—nations are born and nations perish, and new constellations of peoples emerge. Perhaps now has come the time of Lithuania. Let us be realistic, the argument goes—Lithuania has always suffered, wedged as it is between great powers. Even the larger nations of Europe seem to be forming closer and tighter alliances, economic and military, perhaps soon also political. Is it therefore at all realistic to expect that Lithuania—a small nation—should ever regain independence—for what, only to lose it again after some 20 years?

The answer by analogy is of course again very simple: For as long as the death penalty is on the books of law, and our jury system is nothing perfect, some innocent men will be sent to the chair. Isn't it then realistic to simply accept that as a fact of life—after all, even as far as the innocent man is concerned, wouldn't he die one day anyhow? Don't we all?

Such a reduction to absurdity perhaps is not an altogether fair treatment of the question.

The point is (true), however, that if Lithuania is to perish in this century through the continuation of the course of events as they are taking place now—that would indeed be an execution, a genocide, a killing of a nation, and not a natural historical regrouping and adjustment of peoples. We can foresee a future world with boundaries between statehoods erased and a future mankind in which interdependence, of which President Kennedy once spoke, would transcend national sovereignties and identities. If such is a realistic view, one must still not lose sight of the basic difference between alliances freely entered, unions willingly formed, mergers mutually agreed to, and a forcible imposition of a colonial rule for the sole benefit of the larger nation. I do not agree that it is realistic, I rather think it is cynical to accept as an accomplished and irreversible fact the enslavement of the Baltic nations, and for that matter the rest of Easten Europe, simply because the Russian nation has an understandable fear of a strong Germany and therefore needs a buffer zone, or because the Soviets have an understandable interest in the Baltic Sea as a place to launch nuclear submarines. The fellow who attacks a woman also has an understandable desire and yet we would not stand idly by to see the attack consummated, or would we?

I rather think that realistic is not the resignation to the idea that fortunes of the present world are all bad, but a recognition that the fortunes are reversible. I see nothing more compelling in the proposition that the world is implacably going to the dogs than the belief that the world can right itself after all. It is only that we, in our understandable preoccupation with our own safety in this nuclear age, keep crossing our fingers for things to somehow remain still. I do not mean at all to suggest that the danger of nuclear holocaust is overrated. Such a catastrophe would indeed put an end to all commemorations and all talks of independence, of freedom and of justice. We all pray that that should never happen.

What I am saying is that the fear of this catastrophe is sometimes so great as to delude us into believing that the world will stay put and not budge simply because we wish it to. The world changes in spite of what we wish, and with the progress of mankind the changes will be more abrupt and more drastic than in the past. It used to take centuries for realignment of nations and peoples; the time now seems to have reduced to decades. In a world of instant communications, in a world of growing interaction of events where a happening in one part of the globe instantly affects all of the rest, I do not see how anything can remain still for long. Each year developments occur, some quite unanticipated, which command the attention and the watchful concern of the entire world. Nor are these developments all unfortunate—some junior dictatorships and tyrannies have suddenly fallen, as in Ghana and Indonesia, some have been seriously shaken, as in the Middle East. We have seen the upheaval and the potential for internal strife in China and we have seen the splintering of the monolith of the Communist Empire. Tyranny's hold on power is always precarious, especially when new conquests are denied to it. One wonders then, how long really the Iron or Bamboo curtains will stand. Another 10, or 20, 30 years? When we talk and read about matters of the international balance of power, the statistics of weapons and counter-weapons, missiles and anti-missiles, we hardly ever see anything mentioned beyond 1980. We hear it said that China has no capability to destroy us until 1985. By the measures of history, 10 or 20 years is not a long time. What about beyond 1985? Is the world going to destroy itself, or is there perhaps a chance that it will be a better world? And if there is such a chance, don't we then have an obligation to contribute to the probability of a better future, and not just acquiesce in the present, bemoaning its ills and sitting idly by while nations are prostrated on the execution block?

But what can we do about it? What can anyone do about the course of history? It is a philosophical point that could well be debated very interestingly—just how inexorable is the course of history?

But now a much more modest point comes to mind, again by way of analogy. When the jury has voted and the judge has pronounced the sentence and set the date of execution, and all normal appeals have been made, and all delays exhausted—what can anyone do about keeping the condemned man out of the electric chair, even if he should be innocent? What is the use of trying?

We all know instances where just one person or a few, made exactly the whole difference—the difference between life or death. When such rescue efforts are finally brought to successful conclusion, we usually see that it has taken a good many more people than just one or two to finally win the reprieve for a condemned man. But often at some point in time, the whole difference rests on some one who refused to forget and refuses to give up.

I wonder if at this point in history our obligation and responsibility is not precisely that—to see that the case of a condemned nation is not written off as a closed file. Perhaps those of us who have been formed or enriched by the heritage of the Lithuanian nationality, as well as those who are our friends, and who share in the vision of the better world—have precisely such a responsibilty. It takes many hands and many years to nurse an injured nation back to the fullness of life. But it takes only a few not to permit to die. What sustains a nation through the difficult periods of peril, strife and enslavement (is the same as sustains one man imprisoned and condemned). It is the presence of hope. From the accounts of the participants in the guerrilla war which lasted over eight years in Lithuania it is clear that the movement was maintained by the hope that at some point the West would come and help. The hope was in vain, it was ill-founded, but while it lasted it was the foundation of the resistance.

Hope is a very real and crucial commodity anywhere where misfortune befalls. In Lithuania, through these years of occupation, I am convinced that national identity, national consciousness will be maintained as long, and only as long, as there is hope of eventual restoration of freedom. The Soviets know this very well, and it is for that reason that nothing makes them more incensed than such seemingly innocuous and rather abstract acts as the Resolution on Captive Nations by the Congress. I recently read, I believe also in the Washington Post, an editorial ridiculing the whole idea of these resolutions, saying that the only captive here is the President who has to proclaim a Captive Nations week from year to year, while in the meantime the good relations with the Soviet Union are imperiled by this embarrassment. One is amazed at the short-sightedness of such a view. What would really imperil the world is not the embarrassment but the entrenchment of the totalitarian system. If the Soviets are touchy about Eastern Europe it is precisely because they do not feel safe there, and for as long as that is so, then we are safe, even in our short-sighted self-concern.

I say therefore—let us keep embarrassing the Soviet Union, through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, and at the U.N. whether or not there is anything immediate to gain in reducing the plight of the occupied countries. What there is always to gain is the nurturing of hope, a most precious gift to the condemned and in these times often a rare commodity.

Where is Lithuania, then, anyhow?

I'd like to answer that it is right in the middle of the state of affairs of the world. It is a barometer of how good or bad, just or wrong, how peaceful or warlike the world is. It is a country which attests to the world's poor state of health. If we are to be realistic, precisely realistic, then let us not forget Lithuania. Let us remember it precisely so that we do not wander off into the world of fantasy deceived as we can be by the attractive slogans of peaceful co-existence and neighborly relations.

In commemorating 50 years since the declaration of its independence—those of us who came from the Lithuanian nation—let us remember Lithuania for its own sake, and do all that we can to brighten the hope and to hasten the day when independence will once again be restored. To our treasured guests and friends we say—remember Lithuania for the sake of a better world.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Baltimore's best known Lithuanians, Nades Rastenis, composed a poem especially for this occasion, which is reprinted herewith:

LITHUANIA CRUCIFIED

(By Nadas Rastenis, honorary Lithuanian-American Poet laureate, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day)

O Lithuania, fair Baltic's pride!
Once a great realm, a free and happy state.
Alas, today heart-rending is her fate:
She is enslaved, denuded, crucified.
For no transgression of a pact or law,
Or expiation of a wrongful deed,
Ravished by cruel neighbor's beastly greed,
She moans and groans under the Red Bear's paw.
The World is mum about her sore ordeal,
And Heaven, too, is still and overcast.
Which feeble breath of hers will be her last,
Because of pressure of the ursine heel?
O Kindly West, o benevolent East:
Why, in the name of everflaming Sun,
Feed inculpable nations one by one,
To the wily and insatiable Moscow's beast?
O ye free nations, O ye righteous lands:
Lift up your voices ere it is too late!
A nation is a nation, small or great,
Must not be left to die in butcher's hands.
United Nations: Why ye stand aside
With fearful gaze and tacitly permit,
Without a charge and proof, decree and writ,
A guiltless nation to be crucified?

The feelings of all present at the banquet on the necessity for restoring the freedom of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations, was expressed in the resolution which was adopted unanimously and which I am inserting here for the consideration of all members:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's Independence we, the Representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of the State of Maryland, assembled here on Saturday, February 17, 1968, at Lithuanian Hall in the City of Baltimore, under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies to:

Commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence proclaimed on February 16, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State was restored which had antecedents in the Lithuanian Kingdom established in 1251;

To honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters who fought in 1812, 1831, 1863, 1905, 1941 and the Partisan War of 1944–1952 to defend Lithuania's national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors;

To recall with pride the political, cultural, economic and social achievements of the Lithuanian Republic during the Independence era of 1918–1940;

And to express our indignation over the interruption of Lithuania's sovereign function as a result of the military occupation of our homeland by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, as a result of which national traditions and values were trammeled, the personal freedoms of the people were suppressed and hundreds of thousands of people were liquidated by the Soviet genocidal practices.

Gravely concerned with the present plight of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and animated by a spirit of solidarity we, the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of the State of Maryland,

DO HEREBY PROTEST

Soviet Russia's aggression and the following crimes perpetrated by the Soviets in occupied Lithuania:

1. murder and deportations of more than 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor;
2. yearly systematic deportations, under various guises, of Lithuanian youths to forced labor in Soviet Russia and their unlawful conscription into the Soviet Russian army;
3. colonization of Lithuania by importation of Russians, most of whom are Communists or undesirables, who receive various privileges at the expense of the Lithuanian people;
4. pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, as well as exploitation of workers;
5. persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices, closing of houses of worship;
6. distortion of Lithuanian culture by efforts to transform it into a Soviet-Russian culture and continuous denial of creative freedom.

We demand that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw from Lithuania its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Communist "colons", letting the Lithuanian nation freely exercise the sovereign right to self-determination.

We request the Government of the United States of America to raise the issue of Lithuania in the United Nations and in international conferences as well as to support our just requests for the condemnation of Soviet aggression against Lithuania and for the abolition of Soviet colonial rule in the country.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES.
By THOMAS G. GRAY,
President.
L. LASKAUSKAS,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, all free peoples will be deeply concerned about the continued enslavement of the Baltic and other nations and must assume the responsibility for helping them to regain their freedom as soon as possible. Only when all nations are free and independent, can we have the peaceful world for which we all long and for which we pray.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to be able to join my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and my neighbor from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] in commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's reestablishment of independence. It was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania declared its independence, thus severing its bonds with Russia.

Lithuania had been a great and free nation as far back as 1253 but had been a part of the empire of czarist Russia since 1795, when the last of her territory was seized by her powerful neighbor. While the new republic was able to separate itself from Russia soon after the Bolshevik revolution of November 1917, its existence as a free nation was destined to be short.

On June 15, 1940, when World War II had been in progress for almost a year, troops of the Soviet Union occupied all of Lithuania. It was decreed by the invading army that a new parliamentary election would be held on July 14. Only one party, the Communist, was permitted to participate in the balloting. Every Lithuanian was forced to show his identity card, which was stamped to show that he had voted.

The new parliament that emerged as a result of this cruel farce declared on July 21 that the will of the people of Lithuania was for union with the Soviet empire. The Supreme Soviet in Moscow voted on August 3 to admit Lithuania to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In 1941 the subjugated people exchanged one tyranny for another when the Communists from Russia were replaced by the National Socialists from Germany. The Nazis were driven out in 1944 and 1945 and the Communists retook Lithuania.

During the years that have elapsed since Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet empire, hundreds of thousands of her inhabitants have been sent to Siberia. In spite of this mass deportation, the population of Lithuania has remained about the same, as many people have been transferred from other parts of Russia to the conquered territory. One of the results of this exchange of peoples has been a population of which less than half can speak Lithuanian.

It is to the credit of the Department of State that it has never, under the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations, recognized the conquest by the Soviet empire of Lithuania. I only wish that the Department would take positive measures to encourage the restoration of freedom to that unhappy nation and its fellow sufferers from Communist ruthlessness in Estonia and Latvia. We have repeatedly, during the past third of a century, made concessions to the rulers of the Soviet Union in our efforts to appease them. The next time we are asked to help the Soviet empire, the Johnson administration, or whichever other administration happens to be in power, should demand independence for the Baltic republics in return for whatever the Soviet desires from us, provided, of course, that the concession we are granting is one that we can honorably make.

A few years ago we were asked to provide the Soviet Union with wheat in order to bail out the Communists at a time when they were suffering from an agricultural crisis. Should a similar opportunity for bargining occur again, I hope our negotiators will seize it and demand the restoration of freedom for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

According to the census of 1960, the population of the United States included 403,000 people of Lithuanian stock, of whom 121,000 were foreign born. My own State of Illinois leads in the number of foreign-born Lithuanians, with 28,000, followed by New York with 17,800, Massachusetts with 13,400, and Pennsylvania with 13,300. Greater Chicago, which includes the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent, had almost 25,000 people of Lithuanian birth.

Mr. Speaker, Russia is the poorer because these fine people left their former country, regardless of whether they left it because of the czars or because of the commmissars. America is the richer because these people of Lithuanian birth chose to come to free America.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 125 years prior to World War I, the people of Lithuania suffered under the domination of czarist oppression.

But a half-century ago, on February 16, 1918, they shook themselves loose from these chains of oppression and declared themselves a free and independent nation.

Their span of freedom was relatively short lived, so far as the annals of history are concerned, for during World War II the Russians seized Lithuania in 1940, the Germans invaded in 1941 and the Soviets returned in 1944.

Ever since, the freedom-loving Lithuanians have been subdued by tragic enslavement by Soviet communism and have suffered undue hardship at the hands of their Red masters.

Here in the United States at this time, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry whether by descent or by birth are joining with all lovers of freedom to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence in 1918.

I am privileged to join with them as they are sorrowfully reminded of the enslavement of their homeland by Soviet communism, of the constant and rigorous communistic repression and exploitation.

Steadily, the people of Lithuania have been undergoing a gradual denationalization and annihilation at the hands of the Russian conquerors.

Our own country long ago adopted an unwavering policy of nonrecognition of the illegal invasion of Lithuania, of that nation's seizure, and occupation by the Communists.

We must not relax this policy but instead must intensify our efforts through our governmental agencies and through the United Nations to raise and pursue the question of the liberation not only of Lithuania but also of Latvia and Estonia, two other Baltic States subjugated by the Soviet Union.

We must continue our search for approaches that will end Soviet colonialism in these three nations and to restore their independence, sovereignty, and freedom.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my thoughts on the significance of Lithuanian Independence Day of those of my colleagues. I submit an address I made Sunday, February 18, 1968, at a rally held at St. George's Parish Hall in Rochester, N.Y., under the guidance of the Rochester Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

The rally was part of a daylong observance of the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, and was attended by 200 or 300 people from the Rochester area. Many in attendance were of Lithuanian ancestry. Others have no Lithuanian blood, but consider Lithuanian independence a symbol of man's eternal quest for liberty.

The principal speaker was Mr. A. J. Kasulaitis, of Cleveland, chairman of the Lithuanian Christian Democratic Union. Mr. Joseph Yurkus, chairman of the Rochester Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, and Peter Norkelunas, a longtime leader of the Lithuanian community in Rochester, also attended.

Other Rochester dignitaries participating in the rally were Mayor Frank Lamb, City Councilman Stephen May, Louis Lote, representing the Hungarian community, and William Andrushin, representing the Ukrainian community. Representing the Latvian community was Alfred Niedols.

There were delegations representing other Baltic and captive nations, symbolizing that Lithuanian Independence Day was celebrated in unity by those with ties to many nations who desire to be free.

The text of my address follows:

THE LESSON OF LITHUANIA: SURVIVAL OF THE DESIRE TO BE FREE

More than any other single idea, the history of the world since the time of Socrates proves the amazing strength of man's aspirations for liberty. From the Greek Republic of 4,000 years ago to this very day man has so strongly felt the need to be his own master that he has been willing to fight, to live, even to die for his belief.

Fifty years ago last Friday, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence. For a brief but brilliant period of some 22 years Lithuanians proved to the world that self-determination as an independent country is the proper way of life for a nation. During that period of independence great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted, resulting in Lithuania's becoming a nation of small farmers.

Social legislation progressed, with a labor control law, the 8-hour working day and other measures becoming realities.

A national culture flourished—the number of grammar and secondary schools doubled; university education became possible for thousands of students; literature, opera and music made great strides.

Lithuania as a modern nation enjoyed the fruits of independence for only the few years after World War I and before World War II. But what led up to that independence, and what has come since its freedom was stolen?

Lithuania has influenced civilization for over 900 years, since 1009. Clarence Manning has written:

"The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization."

In 1795 Lithuania came under a Russian domination that lasted until the German occupation of World War I. During that time tsarist Russia did everything at its disposal to destroy the sense of national identity held by Lithuanians—an attempt was made to force Russian culture and language on the people. This repressive policy continued and intensified following unsuccessful rebellions, but the Lithuanians remained faithful to their religion, their language and their culture until the forced policy of russification was abandoned in 1905.

After harsh treatment by both Russia and Germany during World War I, Lithuania declared its independence in 1918. Soviet Russia signed a peace treaty in 1920, recognizing Lithuania as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The peace treaty is a monument to promises made and broken by the Soviet Union:

"In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridicial consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia."

The Russian "renunciation forever" lasted until 1940. In Auguest of that year, after hostilities with Hitler had broken out, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Lithuania was once again caught in the middle of a war it did not want. It is estimated that during the first Soviet occupation Lithuania suffered the loss of about 45,000 people, as many more fled, and others were arrested or deported. For example, some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941, and 5,000 political prisoners were executed when the Soviet forces hastily retreated under German attack.

In a second phase, repeating the history of the first World War, German occupation replaced the Soviet. Almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis, and thousands of German families were settled in Lithuania under a German colonization policy.

When the tide of war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence, but to Soviet domination. What is life like since that time? Little is officially known—a wall of secrecy surrounds the Baltic states. This is often attributed to military reasons—observers note that the Baltic coast is well situated for missile bases.

In spite of glowing Communist claims for the quality of life in Lithuania and throughout the Baltic area, listen to the words of a man who has visited there and returned:

"These Baltic states demonstrate dramatically the extremely clever system evolved by the Kremlin to keep its numerous minorities under firm centralized control, while permitting them to use their ancient languages and to preserve some of their age-old customs. Moscow's controls are disguised. The Russian garrisons in Baltic states make themselves as inconspicuous as possible. I was told that the only large garrisons are confined to offshore islands, probably missile bases. The only uniformed soldiers I saw were alone or in pairs, and the local residents told me most of them are native born. Members of local minorities occupy most government offices having direct contact with the public. But ranking officeholders are also members of the Communist party—that's the key to the Kremlin domination. The Communist party tolerates no opposition party. Baltic Communists, like all others in the Soviet Union, are directly responsible to Moscow. Unless something goes wrong, Russian officials in Baltic countries are not publicly identified. This creates an impression of more independence than actually exists."

This, then, is the state of affairs in a proud, once-independent nation which has seen its aspirations of liberty crushed. Notice that during the course of these words the point of emphasis has shifted. I began by talking of Lithuania as a specific nation, and later shifted to show that Lithuania goes beyond its own nationhood, and becomes a symbol of many freedom loving peoples—an independent, proud but Captive Nation.

What can be done to keep the spirit of liberty burning in Lithuania and all the other Captive Nations. In my capacity as Chairman of the Board of the American

Citizen's Committee To Commemorate the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution, I have had the opportunity to give this question a great deal of thought. In appearances on Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America and Radio Liberty I have been able to give voice to some of my ideas. As a Congressman who is concerned about the condition of freedom throughout the world, I have been able to propose specific courses of action to the Congress. As an American citizen, I ask you to lend your support to these efforts.

On January 10, 1967, I introduced in the House a resolution to set up a Standing Committee on the Captive Nations. The purpose of the Committee would be to conduct an inquiry into the status of the Captive Nations, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms. I ask your endorsement of this measure.

Another thing we can do: through the efforts of the government, of individuals and of groups, we can give validity to the concepts of self-determination and give reason for the existence of independent nations. We can accomplish this by preserving the priceless heritage of the many ethnic groups and cultures which have so enriched the United States. I sponsored the Bilingual Education bill, and am happy to tell you that it has now been reported by the Education Subcommittee and may become law during this Session. The purpose of this bill is to "provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet" the special educational needs of large numbers of children in the United States who have limited English speaking ability. Part of the benefits of this bill would be to preserve the beautiful "old country" influences in America by encouraging education in many foreign tongues not taught in our schools today.

You as individuals can do much to preserve this priceless heritage. As parents, you can see to it that your children are aware of their own ethnic background, and its proud place in the history of the United States and the world.

As citizens, you already are doing something to contribute—your attendance here today attributes to this fact. Unless you are an American Indian, your own ancestors at some time in the past immigrated to the Western Hemisphere. Remain constantly aware of your own background, and be proud of it.

Lend your support to bi-lingual radio and television programs. I have been concerned over the dropping of some such programs from the broadcast schedule. These programs contribute much to the preservation of our rich heritage as a "melting pot" nation.

These are some of the things that can be done to keep alive the spirit of freedom and self-determination—for Lithuania and all the Captive Nations. This spirit was recognized officially by the United States as recently as last year. The Secretary of State said:

"United States support of the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of your country into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

"In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will be ultimately realized."

Lithuanian Independence Day is important for freedom-loving people everywhere. In a time of global super-powers the amazing aspect of Lithuania's history is not that her independence was lost. The amazing element is that, in spite of this loss, the spirit of liberty survives at all. This is the lesson Lithuania and all the Captive Nations hold out to the world: man's aspiration to liberty, in spite of all efforts to the contrary, will not die.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1968, the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, division of the Lithuanian American Council, held an observance of the 50th anniversity of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania at the Civic Opera House in Chicago, and it was my privilege to participate in this program as I have for the past 33 years.

I am including herewith a copy of a letter addressed to the President of the United States signed by the president, Mr. Julius Pakalka, and the executive secretary, Mr. Povilas Kilius, of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, presenting a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of Chicago on February 18, 1968, in Chicago, Ill., and I commend it to my colleagues and offer it for reproduction as follows:

Lithuanian Council of Chicago,
February 16, 1968.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: Enclosed is a Resolution adopted by the American Lithuanians and guests at a mass meeting held at the Civic Opera House under the auspices of The Lithuanian Council of Chicago for your attention and reference.

Very truly yours,

Julius Pakalka,
President.
P. Kilius,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution

Some 3,500 American Lithuanians and guests, gathered at a meeting held at the Civic Opera House, in Chicago, on February 18, 1968, to observe the 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of restoration of the Independence of Lithuania, sponsored by The Lithuanian Council of Chicago, adopted the following Resolution:

"Whereas, In the 13th century Lithuania was established as a kingdom and acted as the bulwark between the east and the west; and

"Whereas, Seized by the growing Russian empire in 1795, the peace-loving Lithuanian people endured 123 years of repression by the Tsarist rulers without wavering from their firm determination to be free and independent; and

"Whereas. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of independent Lithuania, then valiantly fought off would-be conquerors and won recognition as a free state from all the Great Powers, including Soviet Russia; and

"Whereas, During her independent existence Lithuania rightfully and proudly abided by all her undertakings and international obligations, including treaties of peace, nonaggression and mutual aid with Soviet Russia; and

"Whereas, The USSR, in collusion with Nazi Germany, in June 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania, in flagrant violation of international law and her solemn treaties and pledges, and continues to rule and oppress Lithuania and its people to this day, cutting that country off from the free world; Therefore, Be It

"Resolved—

"That We reaffirm our abhorrence of the Soviet Union's aggression against Lithuania and the subsequent communist policy of gradial annihilation of Lithuania as a nation;

"That We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Administration of our great country for its uncompromising refusal to recognize the Soviet seizure of Lithuania, and its recognition of Lithuania as an existing independent state with its recognized diplomatic and consular representatives;

"That We appeal to the Administration to utilize every opportunity, in the United Nations and elsewhere, to inform the world of its just stand on Lithuania and the other captive nations, and to give all possible aid for the restoration of freedom and independence to Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied countries;

"That We pledge ourselves to continue unceasingly to work and pray for Lithuania's liberation from the Soviet communist yoke, so that the land of our forefathers may once again take her rightful place among the free nations of the world;

"That This Resolution be delivered to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Illinois, and to the information media."

Adopted this 18th day of February, 1968.

Julius Pakalka,
Chairman.
Povilas Kilius,
Secretary.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of Lithuanian independence, today, following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL EXERCISES THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal is a national newspaper which enjoys a reputation as a responsible and authoritative publication. On January 25 this paper published an account of my recent trip to Vietnam which contained many inaccuracies and was highly prejudicial to my personal integrity and reputation.

After the article was published I wrote a detailed letter to the editor, Vermont Royster, on January 30, which was hand-delivered. My letter detailed a substantial number of errors, distortions, and omissions which resulted in a slanted, inaccurate article. I asked Mr. Royster to furnish equal newspaper space for this rebuttal, in the name of fair play. He refused.

I then offered to purchase a full-page advertisement in the Wall Street Journal for $6,588 to publish my letter. This is a lot of money, but a small price for a man to pay to defend his reputation. However, the ad was refused. It was considered "inappropriate," as expressed in the following telegram I received on February 9:

> We must decline to publish your letter of January 30 as an advertisement on the same grounds Mr. Royster declined to publish it as a letter to the editor. We deem portions of it inappropriate as an advertisement for the same reasons Mr. Royster deemed portions inappropriate as a letter to the editor. We wish to repeat the offer made by Mr. Royster earlier to consider for publication on our editorial page a letter from you which conforms to our general standards for publication.
>
> DOW JONES & CO., INC.,
> *Publishers, the Wall St. Journal.*

In other words, the Wall Street Journal has the power to malign anyone it wants to, and then to further abuse that power by denying the injured party the opportunity to defend himself—even if he is willing to pay for it.

Mr. Royster never explained what was "inappropriate" about an effort to correct the Journal's damaging mistakes. But he made it clear to me, in personal conversation, that a letter which "conforms" would be a rather brief letter which did not rebut in detail the Journal's article.

When such situations arise in the broadcasting industry, the station is obliged under the "fairness doctrine" to provide equal time for a reply. Newspapers are under no such obligation. The Wall Street Journal evidently feels that, in the absence of a legal obligation, it does not even have a moral obligation to print the whole truth, or to give a person it maligns the opportunity to reply. This attitude can hardly be justified in view of the fact that the Wall Street Journal receives $30 million of taxpayers' money annually in Government postal subsidies. While accepting millions of dollars in public funds, the Wall Street Journal feels free to thumb its nose at its public responsibilities. One can only demonstrate the extent of this arrogance by illustrating the extent of the bias in the Journal's article. Here is the letter the Wall Street Journal would not print, even as a paid ad:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1968.

Mr. VERMONT ROYSTER,
Editor, The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ROYSTER: I can hardly believe that the respected Wall Street Journal has allowed itself to be used as the vehicle for the publication of a false, malicious, and biased story such as the one written in Saigon by your correspondent Peter Kann. There is hardly a sentence in which this bias is not manifested, either through outright distortion, or—worse still—through the concealment of relevant facts. In short, this story was an outright attempt at character assassination. If Mr. Kann has not ended his usefulness to your paper, he has certainly destroyed whatever credibility he may have had as an honest and objective reporter.

In order to underscore these remarks, and demonstrate to your satisfaction that my outrage is fully justified, it is necessary for me to go through Mr. Kann's article paragraph by paragraph and insert appropriate remarks where they are called for.

Before doing so, however, let me address myself to an obvious question: Why would Mr. Kann do it. The answer provides the reason behind my belief that, while Mr. Kann may be a capable writer, he is unfit to call himself a "reporter," since he has used every device known to write a story reflecting his personal prejudices.

His personal prejudices are President Johnson and the Viet Nam war itself. In the four days we spent together, including a couple of late evening sessions, we had many discussions about the President, the war, and America's role in Southeast Asia. I am a firm supporter of the Administration and its Southeast Asian policy. Mr. Kann bitterly opposes them. We argued these issues for many hours, but never did I think that our differences would errupt into a prejudiced story whose obvious purpose is to discredit me in an attempt to ruin my political career. I do not intend to take this lying down.

With full knowledge that no explanation ever sounds as convincing as the original charge, I have no choice but to go through the entire story with you, point by point, to try to correct the false impressions created by Mr. Kann. Obviously, some points will be less important than others. But I want to cover them all to show how even in the smallest way, either by design or through carelessness, Mr. Kann wrote a story which not only maligned me, but which also attempted to discredit the efforts of our government in Viet Nam.

At the outset, let me state that I am in agreement on at least one point with your correspondent. Most tours and presentations are "canned" and tend to accentuate the positive while minimizing the negative. But, I resent being made Mr. Kann's fall-guy for an expose of the "briefing system" in Viet Nam. One can only marvel at Mr. Kann's arrogance in assuming that only he is clever enough to see through the canned briefings and staged tours. As a matter of fact, as we went along it was I who pointed out to Mr. Kann how formalized the briefings had become since my visits in 1965 and 1966.

Now, let us get into the story itself:

"SAIGON.—The Congressman, wearing a bright red cap emblazoned with five stars and the word BOSS, settled back in his chair, and a Navy officer launched into The Briefing—the 138th time he had given it in seven weeks."

The very first sentence in the story sets the pace for the many inaccuracies to follow. The briefing referred to must have occurred at a Naval PBR installation at Can Tho, since that was the *only* briefing we received from a Navy officer. Very few, if any, VIP's have ever been to this installation. The officer who gave me the briefing said he literally could not remember the last time he had seen a Congressman or Senator. These figures were manufactured by Mr. Kann.

"VIP season lasts year-round in Vietnam—more than 2,000 privileged visitors came here last year—but the influx of lawmakers and other dignitaries reaches invasion proportions during the Christmas-New Year's period. More than 50 U.S. Senators and Representatives either visited last month or are doing so this month."

The influx of VIP's reaches its peak every year in October. There is a bar graph in the office of Lt. Col. Hawley at "Pentagon East" in Saigon, with a month-by-month picture of visitors for the past five years clearly illustrating this point. As a matter of fact, the Christmas/New Year's period is a "slow season" for lawmakers who, understandably, would prefer to be home with their families. On this visit, which covered December 13 through December 19, I was the only Congressman in Viet Nam at the time. Senator Ribicoff and Senator Percy were the only Senators there in that same period. In 1965 and 1966, I was in Viet Nam during Christmas. In the first year, no other Congressman was there at the time. In 1966, only one other, Mrs. Albert Thomas of Texas, was present.

"The VIP's have various motives for making the journey. Pentagon brass and Congressional investigators come on official business. Legislators who sit on pertinent committees come to get better informed. Other politicians who come ostensibly to 'study' Vietnam are aware of the personal political profit they can garner from an on-the-spot look at the war."

This statement ignores the principal reason that most Congressmen (who are not on "pertinent" committees) go to Viet Nam. Because we are trying to understand this complex problem as best we can; because we are voting billions of dollars for military and civil action; and because we are constantly besieged by questions, in person and by mail, from people who expect us to know a little more about this war than they do, and who have every right to expect that the information we act upon goes beyond what we read in the newspapers or what we are told by the State Department. What Mr. Kann is saying, in effect, is that he and his colleagues can take care of telling Congressmen what they ought to know about the war, and that we don't have to come over to see for ourselves.

"A FREE RIDE

"Since Mr. Resnick wasn't traveling on House committee business, his trip was financed privately."

My trip which took me to 9 Southeast Asian countries in 4½ weeks, was not financed "privately", implying that friends or supporters had contributed to some kind of a fund. I paid for this trip myself. This included transportation and hotels. In Viet Nam I refused free accommodations at a U.S. owned hotel where visting officials are usually put up, and paid my own way at a regular hotel.

"But an Air Force T–39 jet was sent to Bangkok from Saigon to ferry the Resnick party here, with the approval of the American ambassadors in both capitals."

Here is a clear cut case of your reporter's withholding essential information for the sake of sensationalism that would provide a more honest picture. It is true, as stated, that the Air Force provided a T–39 jet to bring my party from Bangkok to Saigon. But Mr. Kann cancelled the reason for it. My schedule called for me to go from Bangkok to Vietiane (Laos), and then directly to Saigon. These flights were all booked on commercial airlines. The tickets were in our possession and had already been paid for. However, we arrived in Bangkok shortly after the reports in the American press had seriously aggravated relations between Thailand and the United States. These reports had disparaged, as "mercinaries", Thai soldiers sent to Viet Nam, and had imputed cowardice to the Thai king, saying he was afraid to go out and meet his people—although he had just completed a tour among his subjects around the country.

In that part of the world people read press reports as official government statements. The situation was most embarrassing and distressing for officials of the American embassy. At lunch one day we discussed ways of handling the problem. It was suggested that I, as a Congressman, could say things that a diplomat could not, and that it would be very helpful for the United States government if I tried to correct things with a news conference in Bangkok.

Because I was leaving early the next morning for Laos, it would be necessary for me to return to Bangkok for the conference instead of going directly to Saigon. This, of course, meant the cancellation of travel arrangements which had been made, and would have caused a two-day delay in my arrival at Saigon, upsetting the schedules already made there. In other words, things were getting very complicated. At this point an Embassy official said, "If you can do this for Uncle Sam, the least we can do is try to get you transportation to Saigon". And they did. I am proud of the service I had the opportunity to perform here.

Mr. Kann made much of this flight of 461 miles, but glossed over the more than 30,000 miles we travelled at personal expense. If I were interested in travelling at taxpayers' expense, I would have concentrated on the 30,000 miles, not the 461. Why didn't Mr. Kann mention that every reporter in Viet Nam can get a free ride anywhere he wants in the country—on jets, helicopters, or anything else he can find a seat on? As you well know, the Wall Street Journal didn't pay one cent for the 4 days of travel Mr. Kann enjoyed with me. While gathering material for his story. And I did not get any treatment anywhere beyond that accorded any other "V.I.P."—including newspaper editors and publishers.

"The party included Mr. Resnick, his administrative aide, his 10-year-old son and his 17-year-old daughter."

One might legitimately question the wisdom of bringing children to Saigon. But this was a carefully considered decision. I was there twice before. Terrorism in the Saigon area had virtually disappeared a long time ago. [Remember, all this was before the recent outbreak.] Furthermore, before taking my children on this trip, I carefully checked the advisability of the step with the State Department and the Defense Department. I told them that I thought it might be useful to have my children talk to their contemporaries on the high school and college level to find out what youngsters in other countries were thinking. We talked about the possibility of their writing a magazine article on Southeast Asia as seen through a student's eyes. Before leaving the States, my Administrative Assistant personally visited the Viet Nam Country Director at the State Department in Washington, advised him of our plans, and specifically asked if there would be any objection to bringing the teenagers to Viet Nam. He was told there would be no objection. He then asked whether it would be possible to give the teenagers an opportunity to meet with their contemporaries in Saigon and other places, and was told that the American authorities in Saigon would definitely make suitable arrangements along these lines, and provide the necessary transportation. The first leg of my trip took me to New Zealand and Australia, but my Administrative Assistant went directly to Saigon to help work-up a suitable schedule for the week of my visit. Once again, in speaking to the top authorities at AID and the Military Assistance Command who were setting up the schedule, he asked if there would be any objection to bringing the children. Again he was assured that it was perfectly O.K., and was advised that transportation to outlying villages would be arranged for them. He was not told that, because of security, this transportation would be by helicopter. As Peter Kann well knew, this was never intended to be a sight-seeing trip.

"A third grievance: His children weren't granted use of Government helicopters to visit outlying areas (escorted tours had been arranged for them in the Saigon area)."

When we arrived in Saigon, two written itineraries awaited us. One was for my aide and me. The other for the children. Travel on the latter was to be by helicopter. This was not my idea. This was how the military had set it up, in the interests of security. However, on the morning of December 15th we headed out to the airport where I was to depart for Bear Cat and then Tay Ninh. The youngsters were also present expecting to be taken to a nearby village as the itinerary had called for. At that point we were abruptly told that their trip had been cancelled. No reason was given. If I got angry, I reacted as any concerned father would have done under those circumstances—getting ready to leave the area while unexpectedly leaving his children behind, alone at the airport, without knowing what was going to happen to them. I cannot believe that your reporter innocently misunderstood these events which he witnessed. Conflicting reasons were subsequently furnished by AID and military authorities, although the real reason in retrospect appears to be the incident involving Senator Percy which had occurred a couple of days earlier. If at any point along the way while the involved details of this trip were being worked out, any one of the dozens of government personnel had even hinted that the children should not be brought along, I would have left them home. It would have been the only sensible thing to do. But, in fact, quite the opposite was the case. I was encouraged to bring them. As a result of this episode, I have since written both the State Department and the Defense Department suggesting, in the strongest possible language, that they flatly forbid future visitors of any kind—official or otherwise—from bringing civilian minors to Viet Nam, unless they are the families of civilian employees of private firms.

"Mr. Resnick's pique exploded into fury at the Saigon airport, where he berated a hapless colonel, a protocol officer, for the flawed arrangements. 'You've nearly ruined my entire trip,' the Congressman said. 'I specifically asked to see troops in the field. . . . I've seen pacification. . . . I've seen refugees. . . .' "

It was my intention to go where I wanted to, not where the military wanted to lead me. I was annoyed by what was apparently an attempt by the military to keep me from visiting certain areas. The United States has taken a lot of criticism because it has not received as much military support from friendly nations as some of our people would like to see. I was anxious to see contingents of different countries in order to acquaint myself with their activities, and at the same time, to "show the flag" by letting them see that American officials were aware of and appreciated their sacrifices. For these reasons, I told the military I wanted to visit an Australian base in Bear Cat, a region we would be visiting that day. However, I was told that there were no Australians anywhere in that area. This was not the truth and I knew it. Later in the week I did succeed in visiting the Australian base that "wasn't there" in Bear Cat. I was puzzled over the military's behavior on this point and went over it very carefully with Peter Kann. Significantly, not a word appears in his story.

"AN ETHNIC INTEREST

"The four days of field visits got underway with a revised itinerary. Rep. Resnick, who is Jewish, had expressed special interest in meeting New York GIs, and particularly Jewish New Yorkers. A Jewish chaplain, Rabbi Gary Rosenberg, was provided as Mr. Resnick's military escort at the Congressman's request."

This entire section under the heading "an ethnic interest" is as vicious and libelous a piece of writing as I have ever come across. To begin with, it should have been mentioned that a military escort is always provided for visitors. The Army doesn't want them wandering around on their own. On all my trips to Viet Nam I have always tried to meet as many Jewish soldiers as possible wherever they were from, because the National Jewish Welfare Board furnishes me with quantities of religious medals (Stars of David) on chains for distribution to the soldiers. I have found that, as you might expect, a Jewish Chaplain knows where to find the Jewish soldier, and I have considered it more appropriate for the Rabbi to assist in the distribution of these articles. The Chaplain's first name by the way is Gerry, not Gary, one additional small error by your reporter.

* * * * *

If, I expressed optimism about the course of the war, as Mr. Kann reports at the very end of his story, there had to logically be some reason for it. My conclusion was not the non-sequitur your writer made it appear to be. He was present as I asked Generals and noncoms the same series of questions about the state of the war and the enemy, everywhere we went, among the troops of four different nations.

"Certain field units visited by Mr. Resnick are regular stops on the VIP itinerary. A colonel at an Army base south of Saigon, complaining that he had to give 40 briefings a month, called his unit 'a real watering spot on the VIP circuit.' An officer at the Marine First Division explained that one of its units was 'the display battalion—close to Da Nang and safe.' "

Two weeks after our visit to this "safe" outpost, rockets whistled overhead, with 42 of them crashing into the base at Da Nang. The base itself and some others on the same defense perimeter, were attacked on the ground. This "safe" battalion takes from 20 to 30% casualties a year. Mr. Kann might also have mentioned the places we visited, at my insistence, where other Congressmen rarely, if ever, go. These included the special forces camp at Mai Da, the Riverine Boat Operation at Dong Tan and the base of the Thia Army. On the non-military side he might have mentioned the meetings with the Vietnamese civilian leaders, such as Representative Toung, the outspoken anti-government Buddhist leader recently elected to the lower house of the Parliament.

"The meetings with the troops followed a set format. In most units on the itinerary, lists of New Yorkers had been prepared in advance, and the men were rounded up to meet the VIP. These gatherings usually began with a short speech by the Congressman praising the men's contribution to their country and criticizing antiwar demonstrators 'anti-American kooks' at home."

One does not have to spend very much time with American troops to discover the most important thing on their minds—the number of days left before their tour of duty ends. Their second most important concern is the state of mind of Americans back home. Wherever I went I heard the very same questions: "What's going on back there? Do the American people support the war? What about the draft card burners and demonstrators? Do they represent a small minority or the main body of opinion?" In my remarks to the men I met, I addressed myself to these issues, expressing my sincere conviction that the great majority of the American people support the war and its objectives. I also discussed my trip to the other countries of Southeast Asia and the attitudes of the people in those countries, the great majority of whom also support our government's policy. With due respect to Mr. Kann, I did not make one "speech." We generally sat in an informal circle, or just stood around, and the conversation was always of an informal nature. It was my purpose to learn as much from the soldiers as they felt they might learn from me. Their comments and questions were invited, and—after a few moments of reserve—were generally offered freely and without embarrassment.

"Rabbi Rosenberg was given the task of toting the gifts. Initially he joked good-naturedly about 'feeling like Santa Claus,' but toward the end of the tour his patience wore thin. 'So for this I went to rabbinical school,' he muttered darkly, 'to schlepp (carry) knives for a Congressman.' "

This is an outright and malicious falsehood. Rabbi Rosenberg was not "given the task" of toting the gifts. I was born and raised a Jew, and I am President of a Hebrew

Day School. I do not order Rabbis around. I do not make them carry things for me. If Peter Kann saw the Chaplain carrying an airline flight bag containing a dozen or so hunting knives (not exactly a back-breaking load), he must have surely seen the Chaplain pick them up on his own. It is strange that no mention was made of my Administrative Assistant who actually did most of the carrying. And, the Rabbi's quotation (not "muttered darkly") would have been honestly reported if Mr. Kann had taken the care to mention that he had a smile on his face from ear to ear when he said it.

"A CIRCUMSPECT RESERVE

"But most New York GIs were reserved, listening politely but rarely asking questions. Mr. Resnick surmised that some might be 'awed' by meeting a Congressman, while others 'don't know me from a hole in the ground.' Possibly the troops were inhibited by the inevitable presence of senior officers. 'Look at all those bird colonels standing around,' one GI said. 'You think they're just here for their health or something?' "

High-ranking officers, aware of their inhibiting influence, generally "disappeared" when the soldiers and I sat around and talked. I particularly remember the very spirited discussion we had in Pleiku which lasted about 45 minutes. The highest ranking officer who stuck around was a Captain from New York who occupied a seat in the circle and participated in the conversation just like the enlisted men. I can understand a reporter's criticism of a VIP who spends all his time talking to Colonels and Generals. I completely fail to understand Mr. Kann's criticism of a Congressman who tried to spend as much time as he could talking to the lower echelon troops.

"At 9th Infantry Division headquarters, New York GIs were in short supply. An enterprising young captain solved the problem by herding a random group of GIs into a conference room to meet the VIP. 'Hey, what's going on?' one GI asked. 'I'm from Illinois.' 'Yeah, and I'm from Michigan,' said another. 'Shhhh,' said the nervous captain."

Another Kann "oversight." At the 9th Infantry Division Headquarters, at Bear Cat, I was given the privilege of pinning a medal on the chest of Captain Martin Anderson of Wawarsing, New York (Ulster County), who is not merely a constituent but a personal friend from boyhood days. The non-New Yorkers in the group were buddies of Captain Anderson and Jewish soldiers to whom religious medals were distributed. Perhaps they were not at first told why they were being brought into a room with a New York Congressman. But, why fault me for this oversight?

"The Philippine commanding general greeted the VIP helicopter, and a giant banner proclaimed 'Welcome Congressman Resnick.' The VIP party was treated to a display of civic action. Doctors and dentists treated patients. Glass-making and brick-making were demonstrated. A band played lively tunes. The VIP group got cake and a briefing before departing."

This is completely misleading description. This was not a "display" of civic action. It was civic action in progress, part of a regularly scheduled program of health, sanitation and other basics. The Philippine band played lively tunes for a serious purpose—to create a country-fair atmosphere in order to bring people in voluntarily for medical and dental attention. The glass making and brick making were demonstrated—not for the VIP party, as Mr. Kann suggests—but for the Vietnamese peasants who do not have these skills and are being taught by the Filipinos. ("Glass making" is also an inaccurate term. What the Philippine soldiers were doing was showing the Vietnamese how to use a heated iron to make drinking glasses out of beer bottles by cutting the necks off and smoothing the edges.) Nearby Philippine soldiers, equipped with large portable fresh water tanks, were washing children with soap as their mothers watched. It might also have been mentioned that this was the first Congressional party ever to visit the Philippine Civic Action Program, a model of its kind, and one which is providing many valuable lessons for Americans by a nation which has had tremendous experience in such activities.

"Two days later the Resnick party saw Edap Enang, a Montagnard refugee resettlement camp in the Central Highlands. Awaiting the visitors was another banner, plus about 500 Montagnards lined up behind warriors carrying ceremonial shields and spears."

I resent the implication that a visitor expects, is taken in by, or approves of such a theatrical greeting. I had never seen anything like this on my previous visits to Viet Nam, and remember telling Mr. Kann how things had changed. He knew my reaction, yet failed to report it in his story. However, I have since learned that such greetings are traditional among the mountain people of that area. I had seen similar receptions for visiting dignitaries in Laos. I dislike canned demonstrations because I find them discomforting and wasteful of time and personnel, and for this reason my party avoided trips of this type as much as possible. As Mr. Kann implies elsewhere, they were kept to a minimum.

"A. U.S. Army captain stationed at Edap Enang watched scornfully 'These Montagnards are really getting sick of this stuff, lining up and clapping every time some VIP comes in,' he said, 'They don't even know what's going on. It's just one big show.' "

It is not at all clear whether this is the opinion of Mr. Kann, the unidentified Army Captain, or an anonymous Montagnard. However, it must be stressed that *two* interpreters would have been needed in order for this Montagnard opinion to reach the typical Army officer. Very few Vietnamese speak both English and the Montagnard language. Therefore, for a Montagnard to communicate with an American, he would normally have to speak to a Montagnard-speaking Vietnamese who would then relay the message to an English-speaking Vietnamese, who in turn, would relay it to the American. Who knows what is added or subtracted during the translation?

"The captain pointed to the viewing stand. 'Look at all those Vietnamese officials,' he said, 'The only time they ever come around here is when a VIP is visiting. Ten minutes after your chopper takes off there's going to be one hell of an exodus of Vietnamese officials out of this place.' (Many Vietnamese consider the Montagnard tribesmen inferior savages.)"

This is another Kann mistake. There was only *one* Vietnamese official present. And your writer deliberately avoided mentioning the fact that one of the "Vietnamese officials present"—the Province Chief—was himself a Montagnard!

Mr. Kann's worst omission here, however, is his failure to report the important role of such demonstrations in South Viet Nam's nation-building process, particularly among such "alien" ethnic groups as the Montagnards. Indeed, a proper criticism might well be that there are *not enough* Vietnamese officials visiting Montagnard and other ethnic minorities. Efforts are being made to create a feeling of nationhood in every way, no matter how small. For example, the banners flying over the reception area were Viet Nam flags. The school children wore fresh, clean clothes, including yellow T-shirts with horizontal red stripes—again, the Viet Nam flag. Mr. Kann also failed to mention the fact that this resettlement community of 8,000 people has school rooms and a dispensary, benefits which the Montagnards have never enjoyed before. We saw, too, classes of school children, who at the age of 7 or 8 were already more literate than their most elevated village elders. I am sure Mr. Kann remembers how I contrasted these clean, healthy looking children with those I had seen a year earlier at a Montagnard village—unwashed children with matted hair, bodies covered with scabs and open sores. Conditions in Edap Enang, only six months old, had already advanced some of these primitive people many hundreds of years.

I did not invite Peter Kann or any other correspondent to travel with me in Viet Nam. Mr. Kann called me immediately after I arrived in Saigon and asked if he could accompany me. I gladly agreed, never dreaming that he planned such a tapestry of bias, distortion, and half-truths.

What started out as a criticism of "canned" briefings and receptions for VIP's was transformed somewhere along the line into a hatchet job on me. In doing this, Mr. Kann—presumably because of our intense disagreement over Administration policy in Viet Nam, and perhaps his own displeasure with the military—committed every sin of omission and distortion that a skilled writer is capable of.

Your correspondent has performed a grave disservice to me, your newspaper, and your readers. A reporter (unless he writes a signed column of opinion) is assumed by the reader to be reporting facts, fully and objectively. Certainly, some perceptive readers must have asked themselves why your correspondent's fire was not directed against those Congressmen who do *not* go to Viet Nam and see things for themselves. Is it because he resents our intrusion upon his "prerogatives"?

VIP's do not go to Viet Nam for fun and games—or to feel important. If anyone is looking for good times and recreation, Viet Nam is the last place he would go to. Viet Nam, even in peace time, is not the place I would recommend to my friends for a pleasure trip. It is a dull country which offers few pleasures, amusements, or sightseeing to titillate the tourist. The climate is uncomfortable. There is none of the exotic shopping that brings people to Bangkok or Hong Kong. There is no theatre, there is no night life, except for the rundown bars. A Congressman who makes a serious effort to find out what is going on is usually up at 7 a.m. and then begins a steady round of trips in noisy helicopters over enemy-held jungles, and endless discussions with the many people whose opinions are worth having. It is, at best, an exhausting experience. It would have been much more pleasant to sit around the family fireside in Washington, D.C.—and I would have saved a great deal of money in the bargain.

I have often wondered why there is so much confusion and lack of understanding among Americans about events in Viet Nam. My own experience suggests one possible reason for this. If this kind of slanted reporting I had the ill fortune to observe first hand is more widespread than I would like to believe it is, we may have a clue about why the American people may be having this problem.

We all grew up learning to believe in the integrity of the American press. It comes as rude shock to learn how deeply this integrity is sometimes compromised.

If the Wall Street Journal is sincerely interested in deciding whether the credibility gap is mine or Mr. Kann's, I would like to reiterate what I told you on the phone: I will pay for Mr. Kann's trip back to the United States in order to talk this over face to face in your office. At the very least, I believe I am completely justified in demanding that the Wall Street Journal publish the information in this letter, in its entirety, in space comparable to that given to Mr. Kann's story.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRAVEL TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING OUR TRAVEL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **REUSS.** Mr. Speaker, three cheers for the superb report of yesterday from the President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel. Its chairman, Ambassador Robert M. McKinney, its Executive Director, Robert G. Pelikan, and each of its 153 members deserve great credit for its timely and constructive recommendations. In a nutshell, the Task Force recommends the issuance of hospitality cards to European visitors to this country this year and next. The hospitality card will entitle the visitor to a once-in-a-lifetime set of travel discounts—25 percent on transatlantic flights, 50 percent on domestic air flights, 25 percent in railroad fares, 40 percent in major hotel-motel chains, and 10 percent on charter buses and car rentals. The hospitality card would entitle the visitor not only to these discounts but to free admission to local public transportation, museums, toll roads, and national parks and forests.

Properly advertised, the hospitality card could readily double the 700,000 European tourists who visited the United States last year. If so, this could improve our balance of payments on tourism account by $250 million annually.

The hospitality card proposal is closely akin to the travel certificate envisaged by H.R. 14607 introduced on January 15, 1968, by myself and cosponsored by Representatives **Ken W. Hechler, Jonathan B. Bingham, John Conyers, Jr., Don Edwards, Leonard Farbstein, Robert L. Leggett, Sam Gibbons, Morris K. Udall,** Mrs. **Edith Green, Frank Thompson, Jr., Richard T. Hanna, William D. Hathaway, Richard D. McCarthy, Lucien N. Nedzi, Paul Findley, Fred Schwengel, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Seymour Halpern, Frank Horton,** and **Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.**

Because of the promise of generous discounts that the Task Force has been able to obtain, no Federal matching subsidy would seem to be required. I am confident that Congress will respond affirmatively to the legislative recommendations of the Task Force—for a slightly expanded fiscal 1968 budget for the U.S. Travel Service, and for legislative authority to waive visa requirements of business and pleasure visits of up to 90 days.

The President on January 1, 1968, proposed a program to save $500 million annually on the tourism account. The specific proposals were unfurled before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 5. They include two parts, each aimed at improving the balance-of-payments tourism account by about $250 million: First, a combination of a Presidential request for voluntarily restricting travel to the Western Hemisphere, a diminution of the duty-free customs allowance, and a 5-percent tax of foreign air travel; second, a proposed tax on tourist expenditures.

With the first half of the package there can be little quarrel. The tourist expenditure tax, on the other hand, presents real difficulties. Besides seriously interfering with the concept of freedom of travel, it invites retaliation by the governments and people of Europe which could bring about the failure of the task force's hospitality card program. The task force in its report tactfully avoids comment upon the negative affect of the tourist expenditure tax:

> As might be expected, the Task Force has a diversity of opinion with respect to the administration's proposals to institute taxes on tickets and expenditures in certain foreign areas. In this report, we have avoided a systematic review of these measures or their effect on international cooperation as related to this program. Consequently, nothing said or unsaid in this report is intended to represent any departure from the views individual members may hold on this subject.

The administration would do well to drop its tourist expenditure tax proposal, and to substitute for it the task force's constructive hospitality card proposal, which would yield the same balance-of-payments benefit. Having frightened the Europeans and ourselves with the prospect of a travel expenditure tax, it is a good time to be constructive.

PLACING OF OUR ARMED FORCES IN THE HANDS OF THE MILITARY

Mr. **SCHADEBERG.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to addres the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHADEBERG.** Mr. Speaker, I am asking Congress to wrest control of the Vietnam war from the hands of the civilian warlords in the State Department and Pentagon and return its tactical conduct to the hands of the military where it belongs. I have introduced a resolution to accomplish this.

From the Bay of Pigs to the present moment, civilian meddlers have gone berserk in interpreting civilian control of the Nation's military forces to include orders and interference with combat units on the frontline.

The first steps that should be taken when the military regains control of the battlefield is to bomb Hanoi, Haiphong, Vietcong airfields, and communication centers.

The current bathos of Presidential image building around the heroics of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln is sickening to the American people and destructive to military morale.

The Constitution provides for civilian control of the Nation's military forces, but it does not provide for in depth, direction of those forces once the fighting men make contact with the foe. The military today is drowning in the doubletalk of meddling diplomacy.

At the present time, the pseudo-generals in the Pentagon and State Departments who got their combat training in Harvard yard pubs, have more say-so about day-to-day fighting than the military leaders who have been trained to do the job.

In introducing the resolution, I called for a joint House-Senate Vietnam War Investigation Committee, patterned after the Truman Investigating Committee of World War II.

I have received a floodtide of complaints from parents, wives, veterans, and Vietnam fighting men in recent days regarding the conditions under which American boys are being forced to fight in Vietnam.

These include complaints about locked up weapons, ammunitionless weapons, shortages of socks, razor blades, or parents forced to dye T-shirts green to send to their sons who are prime targets in the jungle wearing Army-issue whites; of a shortage of .45-caliber pistols; of pilots forced to waste $3,000-a-shot missiles on phony targets; of orders to GI's requiring them to radio higher headquarters for permission to shoot at snipers or other enemy troops; of unarmed helicopters, tanks, patrols, and camp guards.

From my mail, it is obvious that the American people support our fighting men in Vietnam, but not the political leaders in Washington who they obviously feel are inept, incompetent, and untruthful.

And this includes the mother who wrote me recently from Muskegon, Mich., about the Army's attempt to collect $70.21 from a Vietnam veteran.

She said:

> I am compelled to write you. I just last night kissed a young son perhaps for the last time, as he left to be shipped to Vietnam. Mothers are sentimental about a lot of little things—and I'd like first to have my son back. Could you bill the Army a couple of millions dollars and about 18 years of tender loving care for me?

This mother, like mothers all over America, are asking not why their sons have to go, but why we are not fighting to win once we commit their sons to battle.

In almost every message, there are expressions of great relief that at long last, maybe somebody in Washington is going to do something about the conditions under which their sons are fighting for their country.

These parents are not impressed with pronouncements or laments from Washington. They know the conditions under which their sons fight in Vietnam. Their sons and loved ones write them about the battlefield fiascoes. The only thing they do not understand is the political nonsense that handcuffs their fighting sons. They do not need to be told of the heroism and competence of a Washington, a Lincoln, or an Eisenhower. They would just like to see a little of the same thing displayed today.

The Joint House-Senate War Investigating Committee should.

First. Investigate why the limited war is turning into an unlimited disaster.

Second. What shortages in clothing, weapons, and equipment exist; why and how the shortages can be rectified.

Third. The extent and depth of civilian diplomatic shackles on battlefront military leaders.

I charge that the Nation's political leaders spend more time wet-nursing the peaceniks and draft dodgers than they do on the problems of the men in Vietnam.

Maybe they think the flower children will vote.

I have heard from parents in 30 States since I first revealed the Army's attempt to collect $70.21 from a Racine, Wis., veteran for a lost rifle.

A father from New York State wrote:

> I have one son, a West Point graduate who is in South Korea, and yesterday I saw a 20-year-old boy, my youngest son, off for Vietnam. He is a warrant officer helicopter pilot. My God knows I don't want it to happen, but if one of my sons loses his life in this thoughtless action, which has no true foundation, can I seek legal action against the Army of the United States? Since when has a $70 rifle been worth more than a man's life? Forgive me if I sound confused, but I thought I served in World War II to make the nation safe from tyranny, and—what other word can I use—safe from stupidity?

This father, like thousands of others, has sons overseas fighting a war he does not understand and unable to obtain the facts on which to base a patriotic judgment.

Just as he has, all of us have placed our faith in a paternalistic leadership for far too long. We have not demanded answers to the questions that concerned us. We have not exercised the power we hold as a people to make those leaders level with us on all aspects of the escalating conflict in which we are engaged.

The rising rate of dead and wounded in Vietnam is beginning to reach into the conscience of every American parent. It must reach into the conscience of every Member of Congress, stimulating the action that is needed to provide the Nation with the facts. We are not getting them now. The only truth we can be certain of is that those who are permitted to carry weapons in the defense of their lives in Vietnam are doing so bravely. At home, the tea-sipping civilian leaders, wearing their tailor-made togas of a Hannibal, feed us dribs and drabs of information—a few thousand American boys here, a few thousand there, a tax bill on Wednesday, a multibillion supplemental appropriation by the end of the week. If they do not know where they are going, how can the American people know?

It is up to Congress to find out and find out now.

PRESIDENT SIGNS SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson signed into law the savings and loan holding company bill of 1968 to strengthen the country's vital savings and loan industry.

This legislation is a big forward step in an industry that has done a magnificent job of furnishing the credit for the building and purchase of homes. This act, which provides for regulation of savings and loan holding companies, will protect and strengthen the savings and loan industry nationwide.

This act serves the broad public interest and gives the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the authority and jurisdiction to properly and adequately supervise the savings and loan holding companies.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will go down as one of the important acts of the 90th Congress. This bill has been the product of long and hard work by the President and by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the President's remarks at the signing of this bill.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SIGNING OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY BILL

> Members of Congress and distinguished guests, the bill I sign here today will strengthen and protect a cornerstone of American life—the savings and loan association.
>
> We think of these institutions as a part of hometown America. They are in every state; they are always close to where our people live. More than 40 million Americans put their savings there. These associations provide most of the mortgages that allow families to build or allow famileis to buy their homes.
>
> One of the most encouraging aspects of today's America is that nearly two-thirds of all the homes—37 million homes—are owned by the families who live in them.
>
> It is good to know that two-thirds of my countrymen do not have a landlord to worry about. I have a nice house here, but I am always conscious that I am only a tenant.
>
> My landlord is the people of the United States. Every morning—except Sunday and Monday—the landlord sends hundreds of delegates who tour through the downstairs part of the house—just to see if Mrs. Johnson and I are here and if we are keeping up the property well.
>
> I could go on, but I don't want to get into that business about renewing the lease! I will have something to say about them at at a later date.
>
> This legislation that I am approving today gives additional protection to the tens of millions of people who invest in, and who borrow from, the savings and loan associations. For the first time it enables the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate and supervise holding companies which own or control insured associations.
>
> It is a well-devised safeguard against possible abuses. It is designed to enhance the soundness of the entire industry. It should encourage even greater public saving in these associations.
>
> Public policy cannot be indifferent to the well-being of our savings and loan associations:
>
> They are too important to their millions of shareholders.
>
> They are too necessary to a healthy mortgage market.
>
> They are too vital to America's growing economy.
>
> The associations owned by holding companies are few. But if abuses in their operation should cause even one—even one—to become insolvent, public confidence in other savings and loan associations would be weakened. Thus, the problem of these associations under the control of holding companies is, I think, an important national problem.
>
> It is a problem that this legislation seeks and is designed, we hope, to correct and to prevent.
>
> I want to especially thank Senator Sparkman and Congressman Patman and their respective Committees, Chairman Horne, and all the others who have worked so diligently to bring this day about.
>
> I must frankly admit that I have been waiting for it some time. I have been concerned every day during that waiting period lest something happened that this legislation is designed to prevent.
>
> So it is with a great sense of satisfaction and some sense of accomplishment that we meet here in this room today where I will put my signature on a measure that I think is very much desired and needed.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO INCREASE CREDIT UNION LENDING LIMIT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation that would increase the amount of an unsecured loan that a Federal credit union can make to one of its members.

Under present law, Federal credit unions can make unsecured loan limits of no more than $750. The new legislation would increase the unsecured loan limit to $2,500.

When the original Federal Credit Union Act was introduced in 1934, it contained an unsecured loan limit of $50. In 1940, the amount was raised to $100 and in 1946 to $300. In 1949, the unsecured loan limit was increased to $400 and in 1959, it was brought up to its present level of $750. Thus, the loan limit has not been altered during the past 9 years, and there is clearly a precedent for increasing the amount.

As I have often stated before, there are more credit unions in this country, nearly 24,000, than all other financial institutions combined. And, there are more federally chartered credit unions, some 12,000, than all other federally chartered financial institutions. It should also be pointed out that credit unions, both State and Federal, have achieved a commendable loss record and over the years have had losses greatly below those of other financial institutions.

Based on the record of safety and service the credit unions have achieved, there is no reason why their lending authority should not be increased so that they can better serve their members. It must also be remembered that credit unions deal primarily with little people, people who do not have financial resources that would enable them to provide collateral for fairly large loans. But, credit union members do have a remarkable record for repaying their loans, a record that certainly should be considered as loan collateral.

Some financial institutions have adopted credit policies that are so restrictive that the only people who can obtain loans are the ones that are so well heeled that they do not need the money. Credit unions do not operate under this philosophy and, therefore, should not be bound by large collateral requirements.

If credit unions are to continue to help the little man in our ever-expanding economy, they must have the freedom to customize their loan requirements to the needs of the borrower.

THE PRESIDENT TRAVELS ACROSS COUNTRY TO PLEDGE SUPPORT OF OUR FIGHTING MEN

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson went from coast to coast last weekend to tell America's fighting men bound for Vietnam of our pride in their proven ability—and our determination to back their brave fight.

On the flight deck of the U.S.S. *Constellation,* at Fort Bragg, and at El Toro Marine Base, the President gave the men of three services one common message: We depend upon their courage to preserve freedom in Asia.

The cause of freedom is demanding, but Americans have never failed to rally to its defense when challenged by aggression. The demands of freedom have never been easy, but this generation of Americans—like their forefathers—will not be found wanting.

As President Johnson stated, we may debate, dissent, and disagree but the time has come for Americans to stand united together. We must all realize that peace will not come to the world merely by wishing for peace.

We face a ruthless and determined enemy. We have sought to secure from him a just end to the bloodshed—but his answer has been tragically clear. It is written in the wreck and ruin of lives and property, and in the wholesale assassination and calculated terror recently brought upon South Vietnam.

Our answer today must be as it has always been: Unswerving dedication to freedom in its hour of challenge.

I join with President Johnson in wishing our fighting men God's speed—and protection—in their just cause. We will support them all the way.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record President Johnson's remarks to our men at arms, as follows:

Remarks of the President at Fort Bragg, N.C.

General Seitz, General Johnson, General Walt, troopers, wherever you are, wherever you go, each of you knows that you have with you always the devotion, the concern, the prayers of all of those dear to you and to whom you are very dear.

As you depart once again to answer the call from afar, I come here today as your President to tell you that on your journey the hearts of this Nation and the hopes of men in many nations fly with you and will follow with you until this duty is done.

It is never easy for men to leave. It is never easy to ask men to leave home and happiness for duty far, far away.

But the duties of freedom have never been easy. For your Nation, for all of its people, those duties may become more demanding, the trials may become more difficult, the tests more challenging, before we or the world shall know, again, that peace on this planet is once more secure.

In every capital where there was a prospect, in every forum where there was a promise, your Nation and its leadership has sought peace.

The answer of the enemy in Vietnam has been pillage. The enemy has launched a major counter-offensive against the Government and the people of South Vietnam. He has marshaled his power around the cities of South Vietnam, in I Corps and elsewhere.

After 2½ years in which he has seen his grip on the people weaken, he has finally decided to try to win now—this year. His aim is to shake the Government of South Vietnam to its foundations, to shake the confidence of the South Vietnamese people—to destroy the will of your people, the American people—to see this struggle through.

In his first attempt three weeks ago, he failed. He did inflict terrible wounds on the people, and he took terrible losses himself. He did prove, again, what the world has long known—that terrorists can strike and can kill without warning before the forces of order can throw them back.

And now he has struck again. At this very hour, a second wave of terrorists is striking the cities. Our forces are ready. I know they will acquit themselves, as they always have, however tough the battle becomes, and wherever it comes.

There has never been a finer fighting force wearing the American uniform than you and the one that you are going to join.

We long to see this bloodshed come to an end. Month after month we sought to find an honorable solution to the struggle that has torn Vietnam for 20 years. The enemy's answer was clear. It is written in the towns and the cities that he struck three weeks ago—in the homeless thousands who fled the scenes of battle—in the army that he has massed in the North near the DMZ.

And our answer—your answer—must be just as clear: Unswerving resolution to resist these ruthless attacks, as we have resisted every other.

Now remember this: You, each of you, represent America's will—America's commitment—in a land where our own security, as well as South Vietnam's freedom, is now facing a deadly challenge. Men who have never been elected to anything are threatening an elected government and the painfully achieved institutions of democracy.

You—each of you—have a great role to play in this struggle. I believe—I know—that you will serve the cause of freedom just as your forefathers served it. You will serve it with bravery, you will serve it with skill, you will serve it with devotion.

We, all America, are proud of you. I came here to speak in behalf of all America, and to tell you that you are our finest because you are the Airborne.

(The troops responded with "All the way, sir.")

God bless you and keep you.

Remarks of the President at El Toro Marine Base, Calif.

General Walt, General Kyle, General Quilter, General Thrash, General Sawyer, troopers, tonight, I have come to bid you Godspeed as you leave—some of you for the second time—to defend your Nation's cause.

Your destination—I Corps in Vietnam—is torn and scarred tonight. More than any other stretch of territory, it is a place where the meaning of this war is clearly revealed.

The enemy, who set out nine years ago to conquer South Vietnam by force, is showing precisely what he intends in I Corps. He makes no pretense of talking about land reform, or of improving the lives of the people. He wants, instead, his neighbor's land. He believes the way to get it is at the point of a gun.

He is undertaking what he calls his "Route 9 Offensive." He plans to strike along that route and to plant his flag on the free soil of the Republic of Vietnam. Defeated in every other part of the country, he has concentrated his major effort there, with regular forces of the North Vietnamese Army. At Quang Tri—at Hue—at Danang—at Khesanh—tonight United States Marines stand squarely in the path of his plan.

Freedom's defense could not be in better hands.

The Marines in Vietnam have not only shown how bravely they can fight. They have also pioneered in an effort that has no precedent whatever in warfare. They have shown the Vietnamese people, whose lives and homes they defend, how to hope. Side by side with their allies, they have planted seeds of freedom in hundreds of villages. They have inspired new courage, new confidence, in all the people. And the people will not forget.

Now the enemy has brought new heartbreak to the land he has invaded. He has marked his path with flame and terror—and the time of testing is still not over.

This is a decisive time in Vietnam. The eyes of the Nation and the eyes of the entire world—the eyes of all of history itself—are on that little, brave band of defenders who hold the pass at Khesanh and the area that is around it.

We do not doubt the outcome.

General Walt, who is here with me tonight, who has flown across the land with me today, tells me that he has walked every mile of I Corps. And General Walt believes it can be defended.

I read that same message in your eyes.

The enemy's tide will be broken. The villages—and the treasured city of Hue—will be rebuilt. Freedom will survive—because brave men like you are going there to preserve it.

You—and the men of the Airborne to whom I spoke earlier today at Fort Bragg—are the sons of America's best years, the best years any nation, any people, have ever known. Whatever the station from which you come, you—and your families—are living a life that no others have ever lived.

If there is goodness in our American life, it flows from the reality that we live in peace—without fear of our neighbors—without threat from aggressors—without hating or knowing that we are hated by ancient foes.

Peace has been, and peace is, the great American blessing. It is peace that we seek to help others find so that they may live as we in America are privileged to live.

When men cry "Peace", do they not know that Americans cannot give peace to the world by ever abandoning it to aggressors? When men cry "Peace", do they not understand that we cannot keep peace for ourselves by withdrawing from the challenges that the enemies of peace present?

But nations—like men—are never privileged to know and never able to choose the precise moment when their destiny is determined. We can only know—and we can only strive to answer—the call of duty when that call comes, and the call has come tonight.

The men at Khesanh, in I Corps, need help. They have asked for it. If you were there and they were here, they would come to help you.

I have asked you to go and help them. I know you will do your duty and that you will get the job done. Our hearts and our hopes fly with you as you leave on this week end.

May God keep you safely and some day bring you—and all with whom you stand—

to live in a nation and to live in a world that is made peaceful by the duty that you now undertake.

May God bless and keep each of you. We are proud of you. Your Nation is proud of you. And we will be prouder when you come marching home after you have done the job.

Thank each of you, and good night.

Remarks of the President on the Flight Deck, U.S.S. "Constellation"

Admiral Roeder, Capt. Flanagan, men of the Constellation, it is good to be here this morning with all of you who are here.

When you see them next, please convey the regards of the Commander-in-Chief to those men who were not contacted and had to spend Saturday night ashore.

As an old Navy man myself, from an earlier day, I know how deeply they all regret not being here with us this morning.

I am very privileged to be in your company.

Three times this ship stood on Yankee Station—this last time flying 10,000 sorties, 110 major strikes, against the heaviest concentrations of air defenses in the entire history of war. I am very proud to say to you this morning, Captain, and to all the officers and all of the men of the Constellation: Well done.

I must depart shortly to the duties which always await. Having made this journey, I shall return with renewed gratitude and quickened pride for the men and women and the families of the services which keep my country secure.

It is a duty that no man should covet to decide that the sons of this Nation should be asked to go to the heart of the danger. But when, from where the danger lies, there comes a call for support, it is a source of abiding gratification to know that the Nation can, and the Nation will, answer in full.

The call has come. I have seen your comrades of the Army, of the Marines, and of the Air Force—all working together as a team in harness to answer with a sureness and with a swiftness never known, never possible, before. Many men to whom I bade God-speed only yesterday are giving the second measure, as many of you have already given, and are willing to give again. And to each of you givers, I salute you.

No money, no benefits, no privileges can compensate men for the duty which country asks and cause demands. In these times, as in all times past, the cause of freedom is a most demanding cause. It demands courage of those who must bear the battles. It demands constancy of those at home for whom the battles are borne.

Men may debate and men may dissent, men may disagree and God forbid that a time should come when men of this land may not—but there does come a time when men must stand. And for America, that time has now come.

In Vietnam today, the foes of freedom are making ready to test America's will.

Quite obviously, the enemy believes—he thinks—that our will is vulnerable.

Quite clearly, the enemy hopes that he can break that will.

And quite certainly, we know that the enemy is going to fail.

So we have taken our stand. We shall do all to stand—all that is asked—and all that may be required. The will of this generation of Americans will never be found wanting, abroad or at home.

You know—no men know better—that the tasks of war are tasks that all Americans abhor. But the tests of freedom are tests from which Americans will never turn.

Few of those tests are to be met by the tools or the tactics of war. The demanding cause that we champion never is more demanding than when it asks of us that we be a responsible nation—steadfast in our resolve, but no less steadfast in our restraint.

The past of nations, the past of powers, cannot guide or govern a nation whose power is greater than all the power of all nations past. Ours is such a power. We shall use it, as you have used it, with precision on the fronts of war, and with principle on the fronts of peace, praying always, as we prayed this morning, that our use will be wise and that the end will be just.

For you, for the Navy, Yankee Station is today. But the Navy that reaches out from there also has a mission for tomorrow. You are the picket ships in a line of freedom that stretches all the way around the world. All of you, the men who fly from these decks, the men who labor so faithfully and so competently, and so unselfishly on those decks and below them, have a vigil to keep for peace.

I came here to spend the night with you, to look you in the eye and to tell you on behalf of all Americans that we are grateful to you and thankful for you. Our hearts will be with you when you leave your loved ones to return by summer to the duties that only you know so well.

But until freedom stands tall and strong in Asia, until this vast Pacific is a great community of peace, until the gun and the knife are sheathed, and until neighbors fear neighbors no more, Americans cannot rest, and Americans cannot sleep, and you Americans cannot be idle.

I am grateful that you are safely back home for the moment. All the Nation is grateful for men like you.

As I prepare to leave you for the moment, as I greeted you yesterday, on behalf of all of your fellow countrymen, your Commander-in-Chief says God bless you and God keep you.

Each of you knows that there is a lot riding on you and that for you and your grandchildren, the kind of a world that they are going to live in is going to be determined by how well you do your job now and in the days ahead. The fact that you will do it well is not doubted by any.

Goodbye and thank each of you.

Now I am going to run along to see a President of yesteryear—President Eisenhower.

As we look back on today in the years to come, when this moment is just a memory of times gone by, and people ask you the question, "Where were you in the time of testing and when your country was challenged?" each of you, with great pride, can answer, "I was with the Constellation."

Thank you.

LET US NOT CUT HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads began hearings on the highway needs of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, today we face a highway crisis. This is a crisis that should be just as important in our thoughts and actions as Vietnam. Fifty-two thousand men, women, and children die each year on our public roads. That is over 140 persons each day. And in addition 10,000 persons are injured each day. What shocking statistics these are. Congress has approved a highway program that calls for 41,000 miles of interstate roads to be constructed. The target date for completion of these roads was 1970. Now some say it will be 1975. I am concerned, as should be every American. The interstate highways which are being built by better standards have a safety history which is twice as good as that of roads they replaced. Interstate roads are carrying more and more of the total volume of traffic.

One answer to reducing our traffic carnage is to increase the number of interstate miles on an accelerated basis. Instead the Department of Transportation is reducing the allocation of funds to the States for a total reduction for this fiscal year of 10 percent. In my State, Montana, this becomes a reduction of more than 33 percent. The reduction has been prorated on the basis of the obligational history of each State. This cutback in funding of these projects is alarming indeed. Transportation is one of the, if not the, most critical problems facing our society today.

Diversion of funds from the highway trust fund to the general fund is a very significant action. It is an action that merits close scrutiny by our committee. Because of the Vietnam war economy in Government is required but I submit that winning the highway war will have as great a lasting effect on our society as the Vietnam war. Whether people die in battle or on the highway they are still a tragic loss to our Nation.

Besides the immediate effect of slowing the battle for highway safety the cutback in funds is having a second immediate effect. Small highway construction firms are going bankrupt. When the spigot of highway funds is closed down a couple of turns, another score of highway construction firms bites the dust. These firms do not have the flexibility of most of the defense industry contractors, Mr. Speaker. They are tooled up to build highways; in many areas where the smaller firms operate, highway construction is the only construction there is. These firms in anticipation of a continuing highway construction program geared up for a program of several years duration. The current cutback will cause many to go bankrupt. The result will be higher costs when the reduced programs are once again expanded, an extended completion date of the Interstate System into the mid or late seventies, a resultant slow-down in commerce, a continuation of our horrifying death toll on the horse-and-buggy roads we continue to use as high-speed freeways.

STRATEGY TO FIGHT CRIME AND VIOLENCE

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed to us nothing less than a total strategy to control crime and violence in our country.

The 20-point program outlined in the President's message is clear and necessary. It touches every area of strife, crime, and disturbance in our society.

The President very clearly recognizes that there must be an adequate mix of control and reform measures if we are ever to get at the roots of the crime problem.

And so he has proposed a Safe Streets and Crime Control Act which would give local law enforcement officials new tools and resources to combat crime in the community.

The President has asked for an antiriot bill to prevent agitators from inciting riots. He has asked for tougher legislation against drug use and distribution.

But he is also interested in the reform of corrections methods; in a full-scale review of our corrections laws; in the need for new institutions for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders, and in research into new weapons and controls for police.

The President's proposals will afford a mosaic of protection for Americans in their homes, on their streets, and in their shops.

He has tailored strong penalties to curb drug abuse and proposed new legislation to improve alcoholic rehabilitation. The President also launched an all-out attack on organized crime—through an expanded strike force program, improved gambling laws, and more efficient means of prosecution.

He has boldly met—with new answers—the growing problems of automobile thefts, urban riots, and bank robberies. And he has taken urgent steps to strengthen local law enforcement agencies—for this is where crime prevention must begin.

This is the most intelligent approach to crime problems in years.

The President is not content just to make speeches against crime. He has presented a program to attack the roots and manifestations of crime. And the Congress ought to approve this Johnson anticrime strategy as soon as possible—and vote the needed funds to implement it.

The cost of crime to our Nation—and to our way of life—is incalculable. It is seen in the killed and injured, in the tremendous loss of property, in the fear instilled in our honest citizens, and in the depravity of those who choose its path.

President Johnson's anticrime message embarks this country on a new beginning—a real effort to eradicate crime from our midst. At stake is nothing less than the public security. We will not have a better America until we secure a safer America.

The President has put his dream of a safe and secure America into a blueprint for action. That dream can become a reality if we in Congress answer the Nation's call to action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of this country want this broad-sweeping legislation. I think it is encouraging to see an enthusiasm on the part of many of our young people who have made known their interest in working for a better nation. It is important that we work to channel their energies toward the necessary work that lies ahead. The America of tomorrow is theirs.

An article in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of February 18 reported the concern of today's young Americans. I am convinced that this article is much more a reflection of America's younger generation than the most sensational reports of dissention all of us have seen almost daily in the press. The concern of most young Americans is constructive rather than destructive in nature.

I place this impressive article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

STATE'S CONCERNED YOUNG PEOPLE ASK, "WHAT CAN WE DO?"

(By Wick Temple)

HELENA.—Montana's young people have a vigorous concern for the nation's problems, a well-developed social conscience, and an urge to ask "What can we do?"

That's the impression gathered by Lewis and Clark County Atty. Thomas J. Hanrahan on a recent speaking tour which took him to 18 Montana cities.

Hanrahan, who probably will run for the Democratic nomination for attorney general, is president of the Montana County Attorneys Association and chairman of the Montana Bar Association's Special Committee on Crime Prevention and Control.

His speeches to civic clubs and high school groups were on the crime prevention and control theme.

TREMENDOUSLY IMPRESSED

"I was tremendously impressed with the concern of not only the high school students but the young adults in service clubs," Hanrahan said. "They're much more humanitarian than my generation, and I've only been out of high school 20 years." Hanrahan is 37.

"They're tremendously concerned with the great social problems," he said. "They don't think we're doing enough in the fields of social change. They want their police to be better trained and they're interested in rehabilitation and crime prevention."

For instance, he said, after almost every speech he was asked about the case involving Larry Cheadle, the 26-year-old Montana State Prison inmate who died mysteriously in what prisoners called "the hole" in October 1966.

AFTER PRISON, WHAT?

"And they want to know what happens when a man gets out of the pen," Hanrahan said. "When you tell them that he gets $25, help in getting a job, and a visit to his parole officer once a month, they say, 'That's not enough.'"

Hanrahan talked about improved technology involved in police work, computers to catch criminals, and modern penal methods.

"One girl said it's tragic that we're in the process of putting a man on the moon but can't keep people from killing each other," Hanrahan said.

"They ask what they can do to help," he said. "Five girls at Cut Bank asked how they could volunteer for Head Start work or work on an Indian reservation."

"They don't have solutions but they have a lot of intelligent questions," he said.

CONCERNED OVER DRUGS

A recurring question dealt with the drug problem. "They ask about the effects, about the penalties," he said. "And they meant it. They weren't sitting there horsing around while I was talking."

Hanrahan said the youngsters are not intimidated by police, but he said this does not indicate a lack of respect.

"They treat each policeman on an individual basis," he said. "If an officer is willing to talk to them and establish communication, they're willing to give him all the cooperation and respect necessary.

"On the other hand, if the officer is aloof and antagonistic, they consider him irrelevant. They aren't hostile to him. He just isn't important to them."

"I considered it a healthy sign that I didn't get a single question on draft card burnings," Hanrahan said. "There were questions on civil disobedience, the racial situation, and especially on teen-aged voting. They don't understand why they should fight in Vietnam and not be allowed to vote."

His advice on how young people can improve the nation?

"Learn and teach respect for law, develop an inquiring mind, communicate with your government. It's not enough to sit back and criticize the system. Come up with ideas of your own."

REPRESENTATIVE LAURENCE J. BURTON WRITES ON LINCOLN DAY ACTIVITIES

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, and my good friend, the Honorable LAURENCE J. BURTON of Utah, took pen in hand and placed tongue in cheek last week and wrote to his constituents about the time-honored institution, the Republican Lincoln Day Dinner. His whimsical treatment of the subject evoked considerable attention in the press and chuckles from many, particularly those of us who practice the fine art of politics. Some of the Members may not have had the opportunity to read our colleague's report on Lincoln Day activities. I think it will add to their appreciation of the celebration, and hence am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 11, 1968

(By Representative LAURENCE J. BURTON, Republican, of Utah)

The Congress is observing a short recess. The breather comes as a result of Lincoln's birthday. Lincoln, of course, was born only on the one day, just like the rest of us. But Congress takes 10 days to celebrate it. The reason for this is because the Republicans in the Senate and House fan out all over the country and give speeches to gatherings of their Republican friends. Democrats, I presume, take this opportunity to fight more among themselves.

This is the GOP way of paying homage to Lincoln, who was the first and greatest Republican president. It also is the way the party raises money. Party faithful pay from $5 on up for tickets to these Lincoln Day events, depending on where they are held and who is the speaker. The tariff is higher if the speaker is an Eisenhower, a Romney or a Nixon; it is rather modest if he happens to be just a mere congressman. The higher price doesn't guarantee a better speech, though.

The higher up you are in the party hierarchical structure, the more prestigious are your Lincoln Day speaking assignments. Governor Reagan and Mayor Lindsay, for example, won't be speaking in Jackrabbit Flats, Nevada. Some freshman congressman will get to speak there. In fact, that's where I started out five years ago.

Now, due to the inexorable uplifting wrought by the seniority system, I'm up the level of really big cities, like Altoona, Pennsylvania and Bangor, Maine. It may be sometime yet before the New York Times headlines "Burton Is Lincoln Day Speaker at Waldorf-Astoria". But I don't care. I'd really rather do my Lincoln Day orating in Utah.

We may not have everything they've got in New York City, but at least we've got sense enough to keep our garbage from piling up in the streets.

And out here, unlike some places, we really appreciate a good speaker. This is something the GOP National Committee apparently doesn't understand. When I think of some of the turkeys that they have sent to Utah in times past . . . ! But we've had some darn good ones, too.

The Democrats also go out and give speeches. But they do theirs a little later in the season. They usually make more noise, simply because there are more of them. It depends on your partisan leanings, I guess, as to whether the Democrats make better speeches than the Republicans. A newspaper friend of mine who has to listen to speeches for both sides tells me there isn't much difference between the two. They're both pretty awful, says he.

The general format calls for the speaker to tell his audience, if it be a Republican gathering, how badly the Democrats are handling things and how much we need to return to the good old principles espoused by Abraham Lincoln, which the Democrats, so he says, somehow have never heard about. Conversely, if it is a Democratic meeting, the speaker tells his audience that they never had it so good and they would have it even better if there weren't so darn many Republicans holding office.

It would be great fun, I think, if sometime the speakers got their appointments mixed up so that a Democrat showed up at a Republican meeting, and vice versa. Can't you just hear the Republican howls when the speaker reverently intones the names of Franklin Roosevelt, Wilson and Grover Cleveland, when the only Democrats they expected to hear about were Bobby Baker, Harry Vaughan and Benedict Arnold? (All Republicans think Benedict Arnold was a Democrat.)

And the Democrats would no doubt choke on their rubber chicken (the standard fare at these political gatherings) at the astonishing things a Republican would have to tell them. On the other hand, maybe the audiences wouldn't know the difference. It has been my observation that most of the attendees go to sleep shortly after the Pledge of Allegiance, anyway.

The Democrats, of course, don't have Lincoln Day celebrations. At least they haven't had any so far. Democrats frequently say that if Lincoln were alive today he would be a Democrat. So they may end up stealing him from us.

The Democrats name their affairs after Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. Republicans, by the way, claim that if Jefferson were alive today he'd change over to the GOP. None of the dead is safe. It would be my guess that if Lincoln and Jefferson did come back they'd form a third party! Jefferson and Jackson, of course, were great men and I don't blame the Democrats for choosing them as their patron saints.

It would be simply great if all the Republicans were like Lincoln, and all the Democrats were in the mold of Jackson and Jefferson. Unfortunately, most of us are of less heroic proportions. But still, it wouldn't seem quite right for the Democrats to hold dinners in honor of Franklin Pierce, or for the Republicans to cause the Congress to adjourn so we could pay tribute to Ulysses S. Grant and Warren G. Harding. We need the higher standard of a Lincoln and a Jefferson and a Jackson to which we can repair.

LABOR COURTS?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the problems America faces include the expanding, uncontrolled power of unions to disrupt the Nation in areas which directly affect the public. Various measures have been tried in an attempt to find a solution. Nearly all have, at one time or another, been flaunted by organized labor.

One of the proposed approaches is that of a labor court. One thing is sure, a better way to achieve final solutions to critical labor problems must be found, lest we find ourselves even nearer the plight of Britain where labor runs roughshod over the interest of all to the detriment of all.

An editorial in the February 19 edition of the Chicago Tribune treats the matter of labor courts as the solution and comes up with some interesting past history. Unfortunately, the Tribune editors are in the same fix as the rest of us. Judging from past history, organized labor will accept only what it wants to accept and labor court decisions might face the same fate that has befallen previous court orders and even State law.

I include the Tribune article at this point:

LABOR COURTS

The New York garbage strike has renewed demands for some better way to settle labor disputes which threaten the health and safety of the public. One proposal is for a system of labor courts empowered to hold public trials and hand down decisions binding on both sides.

A New York backer of this plan is Samuel I. Rosenman, a former state Supreme court justice and a member of emergency strike boards set up by Presidents Truman and Kennedy. He thinks labor courts could prevent strikes by public employe unions and could settle disputes in such industries as transportation and communications.

The record in New York does not encourage hope that such courts would be any more effective than the present machinery for preventing strikes. New York has a new law, strongly supported by Gov. Rockefeller, which guarantees organizing and collective bargaining rights to public employes. It establishes a state board to provide mediation and fact-finding help in breaking deadlocks New York City has an office of collective bargaining established jointly by the city and most of the municipal unions.

These agencies were unable to stop the garbage strike, which did not end until Gov. Rockefeller capitulated to the union. Suppose a labor court handed down a decision unsatisfactory to the same union. Would the union accept the court's order, or would it go on strike?

The record in New York indicates that the union would strike. The transit workers, the school teachers, and the garbage workers all went on strike in violation of state laws and court orders.

In the transportation industry the record is much the same. Time and again the railroad unions have refused to accept the findings of "final" Presidential emergency boards. The air line mechanics rejected a strike settlement their leaders had accepted and rebuffed the President of the United States when he tried to intervene.

What reason is there for believing that a labor court would have any better success than Presidential commissions, governors, state laws, state judges, or the President himself in preventing a strike of one of the monopoly unions?

One of the labor-court bills before Congress was introduced by Sen. George A. Smathers [D., Fla.]. It calls for five judges who would serve for life and be paid $30,000 a year. The court would have power to fix rates of pay, hours, and conditions of work. The bill provides that "rates of pay must be within the employer's ability to pay." The unions strongly oppose this bill.

Another bill, introduced by Sen. Robert Griffin [R., Mich.], calls for the abolition of the National Labor Relations Board and the appointment in its place of a 15-judge labor court. The unions oppose this bill, too.

Probably nothing will be done by Congress until the public is aroused to the danger which the nation faces from unbridled union power. A few more garbage strikes and transportation strikes should do the trick.

DISSENT AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if I went out on the street here in Washington, or in any city, I would be hard-pressed to find one out of a hundred persons who did not have some major, legitimate criticism of the U.S. Department of State.

I am sure the criticisms would vary widely and would undoubtedly take in major blunders which we all can readily list. These, however, would be the results of other, usually unseen, errors which do not take the public spotlight.

These underlying policies and practices were the topic of recent columns by Edith Kermit Roosevelt which help to show the "why" of it all.

The most recent was her discussion of "Dissent and Foreign Policy" which relates the latest State Department success in gagging its critics within. Primarily pegged to David G. Nes, the article includes the blunt, truthful statement that:

> What this amounts to is that wrongdoers, if they are following State Department line, remain unpenalized, no matter how much their actions may conflict with actual law and the U.S. Constitution.

At the same time, men who speak up for sound policy and truth are forced under or out. This column recounts several of the tactics and examples:

DISSENT AND FOREIGN POLICY: STATE DEPARTMENT CAN MUFFLE ITS OWN

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON—Every serious student of the State Department must now realize that a fundamental reform of the department's staffing policies is long overdue. The inability of the United States to use its influence and power effectively in such international crises as the Pueblo incident and Vietnam is certainly related to an obvious paralysis of our diplomatic arm.

The State Department's inability to fully draw on and properly use the skills of its talented professionals is once more made plain in the case of David G. Nes. During the Arab-Israeli war, Nes, who was deputy chief of the U.S. mission in Cairo, returned to Washington and told Congress that the State Department had refused to heed his warnings for six months about the gravity of the Middle East situation.

Under State Department precedent, he would have been fired but to fire him at the time would have created nationwide publicity. So, the department stalled, giving him a "make work job" in its Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

Nes' views were not sought. The Baltimore Sun quoted Nes as saying that Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach did not want to see him when he came back from Cairo. Nes remained as long as he could but conscious-stricken over "sitting at taxpayers' expense and doing nothing," he has resigned.

AN OLD TACTIC

This chronology reveals a time-worn tactic of the State Department in dealing with those who criticize its self-paralyzing procedures. In the Middle East crisis, intelligence was subordinated to policy just as in Korea, Cuba and Berlin. Now we have the case of the intelligence ship Pueblo.

State refuses to learn from these setbacks. When policies are proved wrong, there are no post-mortems or analyses to discover how the agency can cope effectively with crises abroad or with what is really its duty, to prevent crises from developing.

KOCZAK AND OTEPKA

Other publicized examples of the State Department's curious personnel policies include the scandal involving alleged bribes to five employes of the Agency for International Development and the cases of Stephen A. Koczak and Otto F. Otepka.

Koczak, a former foreign service officer, was fired after warning his superiors of Soviet and East German plans to build the Berlin wall and reporting that his superiors had made unauthorized telephone calls from East Berlin to the Polish Foreign Ministry. Otepka, a former security chief, was demoted and downgraded for answering truthfully to senators about lax security procedures in the State Department.

What this amounts to is that wrongdoers, if they are following State Department line, remain unpenalized, no matter how much their actions may conflict with actual law and the U.S. Constitution.

NO "OUTSIDE" APPEALS

At the same time, there is no impartial outside appeals system free of political pressure that will ensure due process for the employe. As Ambassador-at-Large W. Averell Harriman admitted three years ago in congressional testimony:

"I have seen men's careers set back and, in fact, busted because they held the right views at the wrong time, or for reporting accurately facts which were not popular at the time, or at some later time."

The erosion of U.S. credibility abroad has its counterpart in the agency's lack of honest and fair dealings with its employes at home. As a result, the department's image has sunk to an all time low on Capitol Hill.

"HAYS BILL" REJECTED

Some months ago, despite all-out lobbying efforts by the White House and the department, Congress turned down the "Hays bill" designed to give the State Department exclusive control over all foreign policy personnel. Objections were voiced during the hearings to the so-called "secret development appraisal reports" which served as a basis for firing foreign service officers.

Diplomats still are unable to see dossiers on themselves unless they are able to leave their posts and come to Washington. By the time they do have an opportunity to see them, sufficient time may have elapsed for it to be impossible for them to confront their accusers.

Another column of December 23, 1967, titled "Laws Ignored," cites several occasions where the men of power in this never, never land of seemingly boundless autonomy have actually gone beyond shuffling men off to meaningless jobs to violations of the law. While the citations in the column primarily surround the case of Otto F. Otepka, the implications involve also the entire personnel system of the Federal Government, our foreign policy, and the increasing power of uncontrolled sections of the executive branch.

Congress must reverse this trend and regain its oversight functions before even more ground is lost.

I include the second column at this point:

LAWS IGNORED

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Specific example after specific example confirms the extraordinary degree to which plainly written laws are being disregarded and violated by the State Department under an apparent extension to itself of the premises as a "permissive society." The case of Otto F. Otepka, the security chief who has just been in effect squeezed out of the State Department, takes on its real importance against this background.

How can we expect law enforcement on our city streets when laws are broken in the highest echelons of government by the very persons charged with upholding them? For instance, the State Department is constantly breaking the provisions laid down by presidential executive order 10450 of April 27, 1953, setting up security standards for employment. Details are given in a brief by Otepka inserted into the Congressional Record of Dec. 14 by Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio).

In 1961 the State Department violated the provisions of this executive order by giving sensitive jobs to an amazing total of 152 persons without conducting the proper investigations into their backgrounds as spelled out by law. The requirement for a thorough investigation is necessary to ensure employment of competent, loyal personnel.

In the past questionable persons—and worse—maneuvered their way into key posts through personal friendships and were protected by bureaucrats already entrenched in their jobs. Under "the old school tie" system as it exists in policy-making echelons, persons associated with the so-called "Princeton pack," a term that embraces the whole Eastern Ivy League complex, have been permitted to enjoy virtual immunity from the consequences of security violations. This system, which has its counterpart in "the old boy network," of which "Kim" Philby is the most notorious example in Britain, provides the channel for the protection given espionage agents, homosexuals and other unsavory characters.

Another example of law being ignored is the State Department practice of allowing favored individuals to get away with not completing the questionnaires that are obligatory for applicants. In February of 1962, the State Department proposed an Advisory Committee on the Arts that would give guidance to our cultural exchange program that necessarily included trips behind the Iron Curtain. In a memorandum dated July 12, 1962, Otepka rejected his superior's proposal that two of the prominent individuals named for this committee need not fill out personal history questionnaires before appointments. In his memorandum, Otepka pointed out that a full investigation and an interview with each nominee were obviously necessary in view of their known associations with many Communist organizations. He concluded:

"If the present security rules are to be tempered to suit individuals rather than government, then I think someone in authority should change the rules so that those of us on the operating level who must follow rules may not be confused as to how and when to determine the reliability of the privileged non-conformists as compared to those who do not join or lend their support to Communist causes."

For upholding the regulations, Otepka was subjected to harassment ordered by State Department higher-ups that included bugging his telephone. Otepka also charges that material was planted in his trash basket in an attempt to compromise him.

Again, the law was ignored. In a decision handed down by Secretary of State Dean Rusk this month, the State Department has reprimanded Otepka for answering questions truthfully to a congressional committee regarding lax security procedures in the agency. Yet Otepka's actions were justified under a law passed by Congress in 1948 (5 United States Code 652 d), which provides:

"The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

Actually, Otepka testified before a congressional committee only after his appearance had been cleared through State Department channels and he was given permission to do so. The papers turned over by Otepka to Julien G. Sourwine, counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, only contained information in the public domain. They did not contain loyalty or security data. Nevertheless, Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his decision demoted Otepka and transferred him to a menial job outside the government's security program where his experience is so vitally needed.

By these violations of law, the department has placed every employe on notice that due process is subordinate to politics, favoritism or any whim. Certainly, the State Department's integrity in dealing with its own personnel is intimately related to the credibility of its diplomacy. This is the same agency which is asking the public to believe its pronouncements regarding the conduct of the Vietnam war, the Soviets' strategic posture and other foreign policy matters of paramount importance to our nation.

VIETNAM PROLONGATION NEEDLESS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, these days almost everyone has a view about our involvement in Vietnam. Many are unqualified, but self-appointed "experts" and some demonstrate and elucidate without logic or reason.

On the other hand, there are some dedicated, sincere, honest Americans who have a real stake in the conflict and are willing to come up with some suggestions that might result in proper answers to the questions everyone is seeking. Such a man is John H. Lattin, colonel, U.S. Army, retired.

Not only has he fought in three conflicts, but he indeed has an additional stake: Mrs. Lattin and the colonel lost their son, 1st Lt. John H. Lattin, Jr., in Vietnam.

The President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and all Members of Congress will do well by reading the following letter, written by Colonel Lattin on February 6, 1968. Perhaps his views may be helpful in future decisions.

Mrs. Lattin and myself want to express our warm appreciation for your kind letter following the loss of our son, 1st Lt. John H. Lattin, Jr., in Vietnam. It was, as you stated, much more meaningful to receive your letter at this time rather than immediately following the announcement, when we received so many messages.

In your letter you mentioned our obligations, of which I, having fought in three conflicts and now having sacrificed a son, am fully cognizant. Having followed your career very closely in Congress, I am assured that you are aware of your responsibilities as well.

I do, however, hope that you will be even mindful that the continued prolongation of this war is needless, and will result in an ever increasing loss of American life, as well as postponing the day when this Country can realize many of its worthwhile aims and objectives.

Since the Vietnam conflict became a war, for all intent and purposes, we have had the *means* with which to win a military victory. In past wars, we have brought the enemy to his knees and then proceeded to aid him in his rehabilitation. Prime examples are Germany, Italy, and Japan, all of whom are now enjoying unprecedented prosperity and are today among our allies. In all cases we sought the military victory *first*, and the political, sociological and economic measures followed. There is no clear case in recorded history where political and military aims were achieved simultaneously.

"World opinion" was aroused when we undertook the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but it brought a quick end to World War II, Japanese and American, and most Japanese today will tell you, as horrible as it seemed at the time, millions of lives were saved, both Japanese and American. Remember too, "World Opinion" has a short memory!

You must realize that this gradual escalation, matching gun for gun, man for man will never result in a victory for the United States, but will, and almost has, resulted in a situation with which we will soon be unable to cope. Further, we are now placed in a position where the Communists call the shots.

It then becomes more than ever incumbent upon you and other members of Congress to face the facts as they are, and use all means available to get our full strength behind the military, and reassure the world of our determination to halt aggression. In our vacillation over the "Pueblo" incident, rather than have taken some decisive action, we have lost the confidence of those remaining nations who *do* respect us.

Again, we both thank you for your kind letter of sympathy.

OAS COMES OF AGE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Council of the Organization of American States last week elected Galo Plaza Lasso, former President of Ecuador, as Secretary General of the OAS. He will succeed Jose A. Mora of Uruguay whose term expires May 18.

As a Miami, Fla., Representative with a keen interest in Inter-American relations, I would like to register my support for Mr. Plaza. He is an extremely capable man, a personable activist, informal but efficient. His experience and achievements serve as unquestionable testimony of his outstanding qualifications for this demanding position of worldwide importance.

Further, I wish to commend the manner in which Mr. Plaza was elected. In years past, the OAS has suffered from occasional internal conflict and mistrust. With this election, the OAS has "come of age." The diplomatic and pressure-free manner in which the U.S. Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz represented the U.S. support for Mr. Plaza deserves special recognition and praise.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials confirming OAS's latest commendable action:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE OAS COMES OF AGE

The Organization of American States has worked itself out of a leadership crisis in a way that opens exciting possibilities for a more active, more significnat future. In breaking a three-month stalemate over the election of a new Secretary-General, the O.A.S. Council opted simultaneously for several objectives.

It clearly reflected the long-held desire of a majority of the twenty-two active member governments for an expanded O.A.S. role in promoting hemispheric cooperation and solidarity. It did so by electing Ecuador's talented Galo Plaza Lasso, a man uniquely qualified to administer those greater O.A.S. responsibilities and to make the most of them.

In the process, the Council also served notice on recalcitrant Governments—the United States included—to get on with ratification of the amendments adopted a year ago by the American foreign ministers. These spell out an important part of that enlarged O.A.S. activity and responsibility.

Mr. Plaza, the ablest President in Ecuador's history and a seasoned United Nations mediator, survived handicaps and humiliations to win the O.A.S. post. He had been tagged—unfairly—as the United States candidate, and he also had to contend with the hopes of small Central-American and Caribbean countries that they would elect one of their own.

None of this should handicap or inhibit Mr. Plaza when he takes office in May, At 62, he is a ruggedly independent but sensitive statesman who sought the job only when convinced that most member nations wanted a "strong, dynamic, creative" organization with an executive to match. He understands the United States well but a more unlikely errand boy for the Johnson Administration would be hard to conceive.

The Central-American group has been satisfied by the designation of Salvador's able Miguel Rafael Urquia as Assistant Secretary-General. For giving up that number two post, the United States will be asked to name a new Assistant Secretary-General for Administration with a view to tightening up the whole O.A.S. operation and thus guarding against the financial irregularities that added to the Organization's crisis last November.

As things have turned out, Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was off base last week in accusing the United States of "inept diplomacy" in its support of Mr. Plaza. Instead, the quiet pressure-free diplomacy of Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz paid off in a way that seemed impossible two months ago.

The result was that the O.A.S. ambassadors themselves worked out the compromise solution that now seems to please most of them and that opens new vistas for the Organization. For once, as one observer put it, the United States played throughout the role of "partner of the enterprise rather than boss of the enterprise."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

OPPORTUNITY AT THE OAS

The election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is as important for the way it was done as for what it does. With enough effort of the right sort by all the members of the inter-American system, it may well turn out to be the best thing that's happened to the OAS and to political life in this hemisphere since the principle of multilateralism was first introduced.

What it does is place at the head of the OAS a man of stature and energy who has been President of his own country, Ambassador to this country and an effective United Nations trouble-shooter in Cyprus, the Congo and Lebanon. It is not too much to say that he is very probably the best man for the job—and therefore, by past practice, the last man likely to get it. He got it the hard way, on the sixth ballot, after three months of political and diplomatic tugging and hauling in as honest a demonstration of the democratic processes at work as the hemispheric system has ever seen.

What was different about the way it was done this time was the way the United States played its hand. The traditional approach (still very much accepted by some State Department professionals) has been for the United States Government to pretend publicly to have no preferences, while twisting arms unmercifully behind the scenes on behalf of a captive candidate. This time, thanks largely to the refreshing influence of an able amateur, Ambassador to the OAS Sol Linowitz, who is anything but a traditionalist, the United States made no big secret of its admiration for Galo Plaza, but employed persuasion rather than the familiar power play. The Latin American members of the OAS were given time and opportunity to exercise their own influence, individually and collectively, on the result. That it was a sensible result is no mark against the other leading candidates, Eduardo Ritter-Aislan of Panama, and former Foreign Minister Falcon Briceno of Argentina. Rather it is a mark of increased maturity for the system as a whole.

A strong Secretary General means a stronger inter-American system, and a brighter opportunity for all of the members to grapple together, to greater effect, with the momentous political and economic problems of the hemisphere. Above all, a stronger OAS opens opportunities for the Latin Americans, if they have the wit and the will, to work in their own interests and in the interests of the hemisphere as a whole on a more equal footing with the United States.

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 14, 1968]

A STRONG HAND TAKES REINS OF OAS

(By Peter Laine)

WASHINGTON.—The Organization of American States picked a strong activist Tuesday to lead it through the next 10 years—a critical make-or-break period for hemispheric development.

Former Ecuadoran President Galo Plaza Lasso said little while he was a candidate for the job of OAS secretary-general. But people who know him well say he is a practical, forceful leader who insists on making things work.

In a brief appearance here last summer,

Plaza said he wanted the OAS job—but not if it meant being "a fifth wheel" in a bureaucracy.

His declared intention of exerting the authority of the position to move Latin America forward led to opposition from interests that wanted no one rocking the OAS boat.

One of Plaza's first goals is likely to be strengthening the OAS image. Traditionally accused of indecision and inaction, the organization recently has had to face disclosures of financial irregularities in its overseas operations and of the need for sweeping procedural reforms at headquarters here.

Plaza, who will be 62 Saturday, is regarded as a take-charge type of administrator whose mixture of candor, bounce and informality will bring the OAS a needed infusion of fresh idea.

As the number-one spokesman for the hemisphere in world affairs, Plaza can be a powerful advocate for favorable treatment in terms of trade expansion and economic aid.

His personal prestige and apparent lack of enemies in the hemisphere will be of great assistance in delicate negotiations involving the need for sacrifices in establishing a common market and forbearance in the purchase of military supplies.

Plaza may also be in a good position to win support for the difficult undertaking of land and tax reform considered essential to hemispheric progress.

A contrast in style to the outgoing Jose Mora is expected to be immediately apparent.

Mora's critics have accused him of failing to use the full powers of his position to make the OAS a dynamic unit. His friends, however, have said that the OAS was not ready for forceful leadership and that Mora's task was to hold it together by diplomacy.

Plaza is described as having a friendly, informal personality that appeals to the elite and the masses alike.

He has provided land, modern housing and schooling for the workers on his farm high in the Andes. They "adore him and call him father," a high-ranking compatriot said Monday.

Plaza was born in New York when his father, twice president of Ecuador, was on a diplomatic mission here. His mother is a direct descendant of one of the founders of Quito, capital of Ecuador, in 1534.

He studied agriculture and economics at the Universities of Maryland and California and international law at Georgetown University.

Plaza became mayor of Quito in 1936 and ambassador to the U.S., in 1944.

In 1948, he was elected president of Ecuador. He was the first chief executive in 30 years to complete a full four-year term and hand over the government to a freely elected successor.

Plaza later took on a number of important U.N. missions which increased the respect felt for his ability in U.S. circles. He led the U.N. observers group in Lebanon in 1958 and the U.N. Committee in the Congo in 1960. He was U.N. mediator in Cyprus from 1964 to 1966.

In 1940, he founded the American School of Quito, the largest bilingual and bicultural institution in South America, with which he continues to keep in close touch.

His interest in farming has brought Plaza a first-hand knowledge of agriculture, an especially critical sector for a hemisphere whose population is expected to more than double by the end of the century to about 600 million people.

He breeds pure Holstein cattle and Rambouilliet sheep and has introduced new practices for increasing wheat, barley and potato yields.

Plaza's other interests include horseback riding, reading, travel, sports and bullfighting. He and his wife have six children and 11 grandchildren.

HUMAN RENEWAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Boston Record American pointed out very vividly the effort being made to preserve human dignity while rehabilitating the physical contours of our cities. The editorial praises a unique grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the city of Boston to assist some 900 families of the Dorchester-Roxbury rehabilitation area meet moving expenses and find suitable living quarters. It is the first time such relocation aid has been extended to residents in other than renewal areas and, as the Record points out, "without this assistance, the relocation prospects for most of the displaced families would have been bleak."

I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the House and include it at this point in the Record.

[From the Record American, Boston, Mass., Jan. 18, 1968]

HUMAN RENEWAL

A Federal grant from the Housing and Urban Development agency will assist about 900 families in the Dorchester-Roxbury rehabilitation program area in meeting moving expenses and finding new living quarters.

The grant, announced jointly by Mayor White and federal officials, marks the first time that relocation aid has been extended to residents in other than renewal areas. Without this assistance, the relocation prospects for most of the displaced families would have been bleak.

The cost of this grant has not been estimated. It will be considerable. In human terms, the value of this grant also is inestimable. Funds will be used both to meet moving expenses and to help pay any higher rentals involved.

The immediate goal of the North Dorchester-Roxbury program is to rehabilitate some 2700 apartments. The ultimate goal, of course, is to rehabilitate the people who will live there. It would have made small sense to evict people from their homes so as to provide better housing which they would not have been able to afford. That's why this grant is so all-important. It emphasizes human renewal, a factor too long ignored in too many renewal programs.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF LAFAYETTE, LA.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks as this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the bishop of the diocese of Lafayette, La., the Most Reverend Maurice Schexnayder, has advised me in a recent letter that the diocese of Lafayette, La., will observe its 50th anniversary on May 2.

This occasion will be marked by a Mass at 5 p.m. in the Cathedral of St. John the Evangelist, Lafayette, La., and a banquet at 7:30 p.m. in the Lafayette Municipal Auditorium. Mrs. Willis and I hope to attend, if the congressional calendar at that time permits my absence from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of representing a congressional district with one of the largest Catholic populations in the United States. My Catholic constituency includes a rather large Negro segment which is rather unusual among Southern States. Nearly all of my district lies within this diocese.

Therefore, I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to call this forthcoming anniversary to the attention of the House of Representatives. At a later date I will extend my remarks to include more information on this very significant occasion.

In this way, Mr. Speaker, both you and my colleagues can share with me the joy and pride that I feel for my diocese and its illustrious history.

H. RAP BROWN VIOLATES BOND

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Un-American Activities received information that H. Rap Brown was preparing to travel outside New York City and Atlanta, Ga., in violation of the conditions of his bond as established by U.S. District Court in New Orleans, La. I immediately took up the matter with the Department of Justice and requested that if such travel did occur that the Department of Justice take steps at once to revoke his bond. Over the weekend Rap Brown, in violation of his bond restrictions journeyed to Los Angeles to join Stokely Carmichael, a former chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and James Forman, its international affairs director. The gathering in California was to raise funds for Huey Newton, a black militant and leader of the Black Panther Party, who has been accused of killing an Oakland, Calif., policeman. The tenor of this gathering was clear when we find Stokely Carmichael stating that they would take the law into their own hands if Newton was convicted and executed, and that Forman called upon black militants to destroy war factories and blow up police stations and powerplants if black militant leadership came under attack. This is clearly advocacy of violent revolution and a call for the destruction of our Government. It is also clear that these activities are in violation of the laws of our land and should receive the immediate attention of our Government authorities, and, I hereby call upon them to take such steps as may be necessary to enforce the laws of the United States in this respect.

Alerted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Department of Justice moved expeditiously when Brown traveled in violation of the conditions of his bond. The Federal district court in New Orleans issued a bench warrant for the arrest and confinement of Brown and increased his bond to $100,000. Additionally, the Federal district court in Richmond, Va., will serve Rap Brown's attorney, William Kunstler, with a subpena ordering him to produce his client by Friday, February 23, 1968, in order to show cause why bond, pending extradition to Maryland, should not be revoked.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend the U.S. Department of Justice and the Attorney General, Mr. Clark, for their prompt action in this matter.

I would especially wish to congratulate New Orleans U.S. District Attorney Louis LaCour who was quick to initiate the bench warrant which will allow the law-enforcement authorities to take Rap Brown into immediate custody wherever he may be.

AARP–NRTA LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR 1968

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, representing a district which has one of the highest percentage of retired persons in this country, well over 110,000 strong—situated within a State with more than 700,000 persons 65 and over—I am well aware of the problems facing these people living on fixed incomes.

The National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons recently held their eighth annual legislative council meeting. Their legislative council consists of knowledgeable retired people from all areas of the country who meet yearly to plan the legislative objectives of the two associations representing over 1¼ million older Americans. I heartily recommend the study of those objectives by all who are concerned with the problems of the elderly. The objectives follow:

LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR 1968—AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS, NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

The Legislative Council of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons has identified the following urgent areas affecting older Americans, and pledges the Associations' support to work toward legislation on the Federal, State, and local levels to achieve the NRTA–AARP goals for older Americans.

I. Adequate Retirement Income.
II. Improved Social Security and Medicare Benefits.
III. Safety in the Streets and at Home.
IV. Protection Against Inflation.
V. Equitable Tax Treatment.
VI. Employment Opportunities.
VII. Consumer Protection.
VIII. Independence, Self-Respect and Dignity.

Under each of these headings, the NRTA–AARP Legislative Council has set forth the following Legislative Objectives:

(By Ernest Giddings, Legislative Representative, James S. Rubin, Legislative Counsel)

The NRTA–AARP Legislative Council, meeting in Washington, D.C. January 24–25, recommended the following Legislative Objectives.

ADEQUATE RETIREMENT INCOME

1. We urge the States to increase pension benefits of all retired teachers to at least a $2400 a year minimum based on 30 years of service, with proportional benefits for all service of shorter duration.

2. We urge adoption of a national policy of (a) the transferability of public and private retirement credits, and (b) five-year or earlier vesting of retirement benefits.

3. We urge the Congress to provide adequate pension increases for railroad retirees.

4. We urge the Congress to enact legislation immediately to protect veterans, their dependents, and all other older Americans in their benefits when an increase is voted in Social Security or pensions.

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS

5. We support legislation to increase the minimum Social Security benefit to at least $85 a month and provide corresponding increases at all Social Security benefit levels.

6. We recommend that the Social Security earnings limitation be amended to permit a monthly earned income of $200 without reduction in Social Security benefits.

7. We urge a bipartisan study of the whole Social Security system in relation to today's economy.

8. We support the principle of preventive care to promote the physical and mental health of the aged.

9. We urge the Congress to include prescription drug costs above $25 per year in Medicare.

10. We urge Congress to assure that all persons will be eligible for Medicare upon attaining age 65.

11. We favor legislation to establish minimum Social Security benefits for all persons age 70 or older who are not otherwise eligible for cash benefits under the Social Security program.

SAFETY IN THE STREETS AND AT HOME

12. We urge the Congress to enact effective criminal legislation to assist in making our streets and homes safe.

PROTECTION AGAINST INFLATION

13. We urge the Members of the Congress and the President to intensify all efforts to protect the purchasing power of persons on fixed retirement incomes.

14. We urge that all public and private pension programs be revised to provide automatic pension increases tied to a rise in the cost of living.

EQUITABLE TAX TREATMENT

15. We urge the Congress to permit persons age 65 and over to deduct all unreimbursed expenses for drugs and other medical expenditures from their Federal income taxes.

16. We believe that single persons over age 65 with incomes up to $3500 a year and married couples over age 65 with incomes up to $6000 a year should be exempt from paying a Federal personal income tax.

17. We support the efforts of our nation to reduce the balance of payments deficit by extending the present 5% ticket tax on domestic airline travel to cover all airline transportation, and by reducing the present $100 Customs duty-free exemption for returning residents to $10. We urge that, because of age and limited resources of older people, no tax be placed on the living expenditures of older Americans traveling abroad.

18. We favor replacing the retirement income tax credit with a retirement income tax exemption.

19. We urge that the several States develop and adopt a Uniform Probate Code.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

20. We urge additional Congressional action to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment on account of age.

21. We urge that the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and the Model Cities Act be implemented to take into consideration the problems of the elderly and the intent of Congress.

22. We urge immediate implementation of the National Community Senior Service Corps concept and the program of employment opportunities for older persons.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

23. We support legislation to expose and restrict all categories or misrepresentation and fraud to consumers.

24. We favor legislation to provide additional protection for the aged against high drug expenses.

25. We urge that all States establish organizations to study and promote the interest of people as consumers, encourage protective legislation, and further consumer education.

26. We favor legislation to require lenders and sellers to disclose all interest and other servicing charges as a true annual percentage and dollar rate.

INDEPENDENCE, SELF-RESPECT AND DIGNITY

27. We urge the Congress to enact bipartisan legislation calling for a White House Conference on Aging to be held in 1970.

28. We reconfirm our belief in the need for an independent Federal Commission on Aging and independent State Commissions on Aging.

29. We urge the Congress to support more dynamic educational programs for older persons.

30. We urge an appraisal of the effectiveness of the President's Council on Aging in coordinating the various federal agencies having jurisdiction over the problems of the elderly.

31. We favor definitive action by the Federal Government in providing preretirement and postretirement counseling for government employees.

THE 22D NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON AWARD DINNER

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the 22d Nils V. "Swede" Nelson Award Dinner sponsored by the Gridiron Club of Boston and held at the Sheraton-Plaza in that city on January 20, 1968.

This is always a very unusual occasion, and for me it is, not only a great honor, but a real privilege and pleasure to attend. Swede Nelson, my former Harvard teammate, is one of my very dearest friends, and many officers, members and friends of the Gridiron Club are warm friends of mine.

The Gridiron Club of Boston is one of the greatest organizations of its kind in the country. For many years it has done outstanding work to advance the cause of competitive athletics, clean sport, high-minded citizenship and lofty patriotism.

The Nelson Award for sportsmanship is recognized throughout the Nation for its exemplification of the highest values and standards in American athletics.

This famous award, known all over the world, is modeled after the great Swede Nelson himself—his ideals and the high standards he himself has followed, not only as a gridiron great at Harvard, but in his brilliant career in business, civic achievement, charitable, humane causes, and unselfish contributions in behalf of so many people and the Nation itself.

The language of the award speaks for itself. It reads:

> To the player who, by his conduct on or off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree.

Twenty-two of the most famous football players of our generation have received this cherished award that holds such a high place in American athletics and in the hearts of the American sportsminded people.

Nominations for this award have been received from every State in the Union, from college coaches, sportswriters, radio and television announcers, educators, and American leaders of highest stature. The award is by general consensus one of the most illustrious in the history of sports.

The occasion on which it is presented is always marked by an extraordinary spirit of fellowship, hospitality, and goodwill and by a very interesting, lively, special program, participated in by some of the outstanding religious, athletic, business, financial, professional, and public figures of Boston and the Nation, featured by speeches by the great Swede Nelson himself, who is widely hailed as the leading after-dinner speaker of our times.

Swede Nelson has no peer in this field and his postprandial remarks always blend athletics and football with philosophy, patriotism, wit, and humor in a manner that holds his audiences spellbound as he comes out with one uproarious bon mot after another until his audience is totally captivated and entranced.

I want to congratulate the winner of the Nelson Award this year, Mr. Brian Dowling, the extraordinary quarterback of the Yale football team, upon receiving this great honor and upon his outstanding performance throughout the year on the gridiron.

This young man certainly ranks as one of the greatest passing quarterbacks in college football today. He is a young man of extraordinary respect and feeling for his fellow players, for the standards of the game, for the high character of his patriotism and the depth and sweep of his fine personal values.

Brian Dowling is modest, yet supremely confident. He is humble, yet he has the ability to deliver.

He is a typical, young American college athlete—bright, resourceful, intelligent and loyal, well-mannered, well-poised and loaded with courage. He takes his education very seriously, stands high in his classes and has a great career ahead of him.

It might well be expected that, since he is a football enthusiast, and unquestionably one of the best passing quarterbacks in college ranks, he may aspire to professional football. In this event, he should be very successful, because he has good judgment, handles himself brilliantly on the field, can be real tough when the occasion requires it, and can throw the football as fast, as far, and as accurately as anyone in the college game.

I was very much impressed with Brian, having seen him play against Dartmouth, and having met him personally at the Nelson Award Dinner.

I was further impressed with his qualities as an outstanding young American, and can well understand the pride, which his gracious mother, who was in attendance at the award banquet, justifiably feels in the exploits, achievements and promise of her wonderfully talented son.

The Boston Gridiron Club is truly in a class by itself, and I do not suppose that anywhere could one find a finer group of former football players, coaches, and leaders, more successful people in their fields, more loyal, dedicated Americans than those who are ranked in the membership of this famous football organization.

There is truly outstanding leadership in this group, and I only wish that I had the time to mention some of the members because over a period of time they have been making tremendous contributions in many vital fields, and are continuing their effective work for the good of the community, State, and Nation in ways that are remarkable.

Surely the great inimitable, incomparable Swede Nelson and the Gridiron Club of Boston are great American institutions in the best sense, and we may well be proud of them and grateful for their innumerable contributions to our youth and to our times.

In fact, it is the values and the example like theirs that can well be emulated by all those interested in encouraging and building the strength, the spirit, the ideals, and high values that the future leaders of our country will need to preserve and enrich this free Nation and fulfill its mission, bequeathed to them by this generation, of sustaining the American heritage.

As part of my remarks, I include press accounts, the text of the program dedication to Brian, the remarks of Swede Nelson and his son-in-law, the brilliant young president of the Boston Gridiron Club, former Harvard great and outstanding football official and businessman, Mr. George H. Hill, and also a description of the Swede Nelson award written by the chairman of the award committee, the very able and distinguished Mr. Arthur J. Barry, former outstanding Princeton quarterback, renowned educator, and civic leader.

The roster of the Gridiron Club reads like some pages from "Who's Who in American Football" and, in addition, one thing is certain, that this group of good friends and fellow Americans eminently qualify to be ranked among the finest and most loyal of fellow citizens.

No wonder Swede Nelson thinks so much of them, and no wonder they, in turn, think so much of him, because together they represent that spirit of strength, resolution, intelligence and soundness in leadership that is one of the great needs of the country today.

I am proud indeed to congratulate Brian Dowling, his lovely mother, his family, his coach and Yale upon his highly merited Nelson Award, and wish for him and for them, continued good health, success, prosperity and happiness for many years to come.

And above all, I congratulate the distinguished president and members of the Gridiron Club and the great Swede Nelson, and Arthur Barry and his award committee, for making such a fine selection for this highly prized award.

The items referred to follow:

Dowling Handshake Won Nelson Award

(By Leigh Montville)

It took Brian Dowling a while to figure out what the Gridiron Club's Nils (Swede) Nelson Award was about, but Saturday he was glad he got it.

Dowling, accepting the 22d Nelson award for sportsmanship, told a Sheraton Plaza banquet audience, "An award for sportsmanship means much more to me than an award for accomplishments." The 20-year-old Eli junior meant what he said, but before he won the Nelson, he had never heard of it.

"They announced it during Christmas vacation when I was home," Dowling said. "Carmen Cozza, my coach, wrote me about it, but he only said that I had won 'the Nelson Award.' I read his letter and said, 'What's that?' "

When he returned to school however, Dowling found out about the award quickly.

"I found out about it four different ways," Dowling said. "Going into the dormitory, a friend congratulated me on it. Then, when I got inside I saw a clipping under glass at the check-in counter that told me about it.

"I also had a letter waiting for me from a New Haven newspaperman, which told me about the award. Carm's letter, of course, had been the first indication."

Dowling won the award primarily on his exploits in the Yale-Harvard game. As a finale to a season where he came back from the infirmary to lead Yale to the Ivy League championship, Dowling won the Harvard game on a 62-yard scoring pass in the last two minutes.

After the game he headed straight for Harvard quarterback Ric Zimmerman to congratulate the loser on a fine performance. That act stood out in the Nelson committee's collective mind.

He was an All-America quarterback at Cleveland's St. Ignatius High School and so heavily recruited that Jack Nicklaus tried to induce him to go to Ohio State over 18 holes of golf. Dowling, who had never played on the losing side in a football game, chose Yale instead.

"I decided I wanted an education first and football second," Dowling said at the time.

Teaming well with big fullback Calvin Hill and tall end Bruce Weinstein, Dowling led the Yale frosh to an undefeated season. One of his exploits out-did Frank Merriwell, fictional Eli immortal.

Against the Cornell frosh Dowling faked a punt and ran five yards for a first down, only to have the play called back because of a penalty.

Now it was fourth and 20. Dowling again faked the punt and made the first down, plus some extra yardage.

Dowling played basketball, tennis and baseball to finish his freshman year. As a sophomore, life suddenly turned sour.

In the second game of the season, on a muddy field against Rutgers, Dowling twisted his right knee in the first quarter. Within a week, cartilege had been removed from the knee and Dowling was out for the season.

He missed basketball, returned for baseball and was a sometimes-starter on the varsity. He returned to the football field as a junior.

The knee was all right, but after three weeks of practice Dowling broke his wrist.

The wrist—on his throwing hand—was broken in a tumbling drill, a simple warm-up. Dowling missed the first two games of the season and the Elis floundered, losing to Holy Cross and shading Connecticut.

They beat a battered Brown team in the third game of the season and Dowling returned for one play, a pass pattern from a flanker spot.

He played the next week against Columbia, and as Dowling felt better Yale felt better. The Elis careened through the rest of the schedule, meeting only the final opposition from Harvard

Yale's Dowling Gets Top Spot as Nelson Issues Final Ratings

(By Bob Monahan)

There's more to football than passing, running, blocking and coaching, according to Nils "Swede" Nelson.

Nelson went into the subject last night after it was announced Yale captain-elect and quarterback Brian Dowling was to be the 22d winner of the Nelson Award for Sportsmanship.

"Football is more than a game," said Nelson. "Brian Dowling proved this in many ways.

"A thing that impresses me more than anything about Dowling is his way of life. Football is important, but he takes time to consider his teammates and the opposition. He's a fine living kid, too.

"Just think of the other parts of football. Spirit, consideration, determination and sportsmanship in general.

"I think Dowling was an excellent choice because he is all these things. He's done so much for so many."

"Swede" will present Dowling his award Jan. 20 at the Sheraton Plaza.

Nelson went on, "Dowling did so many things that I admire.

"First of all it was that broken wrist. He broke it just before the season started. Still he missed only two games and he gave Yale the spark it needed to win the Ivy League title. He worked hard to get back in shape. He showed courage and determination.

"Then in that Harvard game. Things looked real bad for Yale and Brian pulled the game out with a long pass. They tell me that someone in that huddle said, 'Brian will pull us through.' I believe it.

"Then when that game was over one of the first things Brian did was congratulate Harvard quarterback Ric Zimmerman. He told Ric 'I thought you played a great game.' Now that's true sportsmanship.

"He received a lot of publicity, but he always managed to praise his teammates. He's just a great kid.

"I'll tell you this, if this country had more kids like Brian Dowling in it, we'd have fewer problems than we do have. He thinks good, lives good and acts good.

"I'm proud of Dowling and the Gridiron Club committee which selected him."

Nelson, former Harvard football great and former Crimson coach, still manages to get around pretty well with his cane.

"Swede" planted his portly frame into a chair at Pier Four. A friend asked what he thought of the numerous mini skirts which were fleeting by.

Nelson, quick and sharp as ever, answered, "They don't bother me at all . . . especially since Sophia Loren has shown an interest in me."

Getting back to Dowling he said, "He's the first one to tell you he played a poor game. He's the first one to boost a fellow player. He's the first to say something nice about an opponent."

Dowling is first in Nelson's ratings, too.

Dowling To Learn Forensics From Masters Firsthand

(By Jack McCarthy)

Brian Dowling, Yale's clutch quarterback, is about to go through the experience of a lifetime. There are those who may argue that beating Harvard in the last minutes at New Haven is enough, and that he should retire, although he still has a year to go. Since these people are predominantly from Harvard, we will ignore them.

Saturday night in the Sheraton Plaza, Dowling will receive the 22nd annual Nils V. "Swede" Nelson Award at the Gridiron Club's yearly fandango. Dowling, captain-elect of the Elis, was selected from 114 candidates throughout the country for the Nelson Award.

AWARD HIGHY REGARDED BY COLLEGIANS

Named for inimitable Swede, the perennial cherub, the award goes to the football player who best exemplifies the ideals of sportsmanship on the football field. The award went to Dowling for his congratulations to Harvard quarterback, Ric Zimmerman, as they passed on the field after Harvard's last drive had been thwarted. He also selected a senior halfback, Jim Fisher, to score Yale's first touchdown, "because he was a senior."

The award is highly regarded by collegians, but Dowling, who for the rest of his life, probably will be subjected to football banquets, will also get a chance to learn forensics firsthand from two masters.

What lies in store for Dowling, aside from the honor of the award, and the applause of a football-wise audience, is a P.G. in the after-dinner needle. I will not attempt to rate these two, but Swede himself will speak, and Tom Dowd, Red Sox traveling secretary, will be toastmaster. As a matter of fact, anyone who has ever dozed through banquet oratory should catch Dowd and Nelson to see how it is really done.

Dowling will be accompanied by his mother and Yale coach Carmen Cozza. Also on hand will be Harvard Coach John Yovicsin and Gov. John Volpe.

SWEDE CALLS HIM THE MAC ARTHUR TYPE

Swede is highly pleased at the selection of Dowling for his award. He said last night, "He's one of the best—great qualities of leadership and a great play-caller. Reminds you of Charlie O'Rourke in the Sugar Bowl. Comes through with the big play.

"You know these climax games bring out something in the kids. In some ways, I'd call him a MacArthur type of boy—nothing but victory. The team and the whole university believes in him—you know, 'I believe Brian will pull it out somehow.'

"Like at the Harvard game in the Bowl this year. After coming through like he did, then he deprecates his own performance. I think the leadership of a kid like this is important these days.

THERE'S ALWAYS SOMEONE READY TO LAUGH

Nelson himself is quite a clutch performer, and he will be going against a veteran in Dowd, the Holy Cross whiz, who will no doubt present the Swede with a set of military brushes for his glistening scalp.

Swede was asked if he had any new jokes in the play book, and he said, "My motto is, never go out there with unproven material. If things are going a little slow—tell 'em a little louder.

"There's always some girl from Swampscott out there who will start to laugh." Or Attleboro, or Hyannis, or maybe even Worcester.

Mr. Dowling is in for a treat.

There's No Substitute for Victory—Dowling

(By Jack Clary)

For Brian Dowling, there is no substitute for victory.

There is in this pursuit, however, room enough for the feelings of his fellow-man.

This philosophy helped earn him the Nils V. (Swede) Nelson Award for Sportsmanship, which he received last night at the Sheraton-Plaza. It helped his fellow players at Yale in their decision to elect him football captain for the coming season; and it is something that motivates him as he plans his future and contemplates his past.

One of the things that helped him get the award was selecting Jim Fisher, a senior, to carry the ball at Harvard's one-yard line last November. Dowling admitted it was not a good call at this juncture because the play did not develop quickly enough.

"But I knew that we had a great bunch of seniors and the juniors all would be back next year," he said. "The seniors were playing their last game and I wanted to give them a chance wherever possible. I was hoping we'd score a lot early so our seniors who were second-team backs would get in."

As it was, Fisher lost the ball going into the end zone but it was recovered by one of his mates for a TD.

His last minute heroics that helped the Eli beat Harvard kept alive an amazing string in which Dowling has not started and finished a losing football game since the seventh grade. Twice in his high school and Yale career he has been removed because of injuries and his team went on to lose.

"The philosophy of winning is the only one I know," the 6-2, 195-pounder said. "It helps the guys I play with because they start to believe it, too. We're lucky at Yale to have Calvin Hill, our fullback, who never played on a losing team, either, in high or prep school.

"When we came, there were a lot of good players but they'd win some and they'd lose some and I guess it got so that it really didn't matter to them. But our freshman team had fellas who had won with consistency and this was the feeling that took over. And don't forget," he added with a laugh, "it helps to have the talent to go along with this philosophy."

Dowling, an economics major who is only the second junior to win the Nelson Award, led the Eli to the Ivy League title the past season.

His pretty blonde mother, Eileen, was here from the family home in Cleveland for the award ceremony. His dad, Emmett, died in 1966. Brian has two other brothers in college, at Arizona State and Brigham Young, and a third that graduated in June from the Air Force Academy where he won six letters in tennis and basketball.

Brian and his dad always were close but in the summer between his freshman and sophomore year, the latter contracted leukemia.

"He never saw me play a varsity game though he watched all six of our freshman games," Dowling said. "Our opener in 1966 against Connecticut was piped into his hospital room in Cleveland and he died the following Saturday. We played Rutgers that day and I was injured in the first eight minutes and had to leave the game."

It cost him the remainder of his sophomore season, with a knee operation, and he also missed Yale's only loss, to Holy Cross, last season, because of a knee injury.

Actually, Dowling had 100 colleges seeking his football services before he finally chose Yale.

"I had narrowed the list to four, Yale, Northwestern, Michigan and Southern Cal. But my dad knew the value of an Ivy League education from his business contacts. He told me to give Yale a try for one year and if I didn't like it, he'd pay my way to another school.

"It was his having to pay for my edusation at Yale that really was the stumbling block in my mind, but when he said to go-ahead, I gave it a try. I'm not sorry, either."

Neither is Yale.

NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON 1967 SPORTSMANSHIP AWARD

Brian Dowling, Yale University, Captain-elect, 1968, whose athletic ability on the fields of play is equated by his academic achievements in the classroom and both are excelled by the admiration of his fellow players and the contemporary Yale student body.

Perhaps he received the ultimate in compliments when his coach Carmen Cozza wrote, "The entire University has come alive because of this young man and the Yale team."

After a brilliant freshman year, adversity afflicted him as a sophomore when he suffered a broken knee in the Rutgers game. Almost simultaneously his beloved father died.

His spirit and determination were indefatigable and during the past summer he passed many hours running in the sands to overcome his injury.

Misfortune continued to pursue him when this Fall he broke his wrist while partaking in calisthenics. The next day he reported for practice and shortly afterward he played against Columbia.

With his return, the Yale team started to march right on down the field to continual victories and the Ivy League championship.

His influence and inspiration were instantaneous and contagious and his fellow players recognized and responded to his admirable qualities of leadership.

To Brian, sportsmanship and success were synonymous. The former culminated in the annual game with their historic rival, Harvard.

In this game he displayed his consideration for senior halfback Jim Fisher whom he selected to score Yale's first touchdown from the one yard line.

An ensuing fumble and a fortunate pursuing recovery by end Walter Marting resulted in a Yale score. His related comment, "Actually I made a bad call" is indicative of his honesty and humility. Many would have exercised the prerogative of silence.

The Yale team's confidence in him is perhaps best expressed by teammate Rod Watson when he stated, "Even though we were losing we didn't give up on him. Brian has done so many amazing things for us all year we knew he would think of something."

He did when against insurmountable possibilities he threw the winning touchdown pass.

His subsequent comment to this play, "I was terrible. I was the goat of the game until this final touchdown pass. I just couldn't pass the ball, but don't ask me why," coming from a young man who led Yale to the Ivy League championship and was selected for many All Star teams proved him to be the epitome of humility, modesty and the essence of self-effacement.

Perhaps the climatic gesture of his sportsmanship came in the closing minutes of the game when a fumble insured Yale of victory. He subordinated his natural inclination for jubilation for the consideration of others less fortunate when he immediately rushed over to his rival quarterback, Ric Zimmerman, shook his hand and told him he played a great game. "I just had to do that, Brian said, "Because Ric did play a great game."

Thus he joins the long line of national recipients who exemplify the ideals of the man in whose honor this award is annually and rightfully given—

NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON.

THE AWARD BY HON. ARTHUR J. BARRY

"The Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship" is presented annually by the Gridiron Club of Boston on a basis of the following requirements:

"To the player who, by his conduct on or off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."

In selecting a committee to decide the winner of the "Nelson Award" great emphasis is placed on the knowledge and experience of its members with respect to the American game of football over the years. Numbered among our committee this year are men who have played in both college and professional ranks. Others are presently engaged in collegiate or professional officiating, coaching and physical education pursuits at the college level. The serious manner in which all nominations are studied, combined with the wealth of experience possessed by the individual members of the committee, insures a selection which may readily be accepted as the best.

The Nelson Award for Sportsmanship has aroused the interest of leaders in the World of Sports throughout the entire nation. Nominations for the Award have been received from every state in the Union, having been contributed by college coaches, sports writers, radio announcers and others. This widespread source of information and the enthusiasm expressed by the contributors points to the Nelson Trophy as being firmly established as one of the nation's outstanding football awards.

We of the Gridiron Club of Boston are confident that the objectives of the Award will ever serve as an inspiration for all that is praiseworthy and good wherever the game of football is played.

THE COMMITTEE,
ARTHUR J. BARRY, *Chairman.*

REMARKS IN PART OF N. V. "SWEDE" NELSON

We all have been thrilled by this flaming, competitive, wonderful, 1968 Yale captain, Brian Dowling.

This fine young man from Saint Ignatius High School in Cleveland to Yale—in New Haven has been completely outstanding in athletics—leadership and scholastic honors.

His leadership is truly inspirational and he is a complete success as a human being—Brian has tremendous command presence—believes like General MacArthur there is no substitute for victory—and he plays the game like a complete thoroughbred gentleman.

Brian—your prosperity has been tempered with adversity. You have tasted the bitter with the better—and you are a better man as a result of your experiences.

You come here tonight as a beloved son of a loving mother—your dear dad, of blessed memory, too, is certainly smiling his love and approbation for the kind of son you have truly been to your wonderful parents. You are a worthy son of Yale and although many times you have marched down the field fighting for Eli, it is not only your glamorous athletic achievements which endear you to us, rather it is your humility, your honesty, your consideration and your sportsmanship. You are a credit to Yale, your family, your team, coach and classmates.

You not only lead, but you inspire in such a way that your teammates have unbounded confidence in your ability and unlimited trust in your judgment.

Today when so many are prone to criticize, and so few reluctant to congratulate, you stand as a worthy symbol of young America, who in the years to come will preserve the integrity and reputation of this—our great nation.

This grand old land will never yield, will never retreat, will never perish as long as we have great young men like you.

May our maker continue to bless you and your family. Brian, we of the gridiron club are tremendously proud to proclaim that we think you are the outstanding sportsman in intercollegiate football for 1968.

Ladies and gentlemen—Brian Dowling.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE H. HILL, PRESIDENT, GRIDIRON CLUB

It is my distinct privilege and pleasure to welcome all of you to the 22nd annual Swede Nelson Award for Sportsmanship.

Like many of you here tonight I am attending my 22nd consecutive dinner.

A lot has transpired over those 22 years. When Perry Moss from Illinois received the first award in 1946 I was a freshman at Harvard going steady with a very pretty young Swede from Winthrop. At the next award I was engaged and the following dinner I had my bride with me. After that we needed baby sitters for Swede's grandchildren. Now, 22 years and six children later, Here I am fortunate enough to be presiding as president at this annual award.

As a member of Swede's family this award has a special meaning and it is my pleasure to present at this time a beautiful corsage to that pretty Swede from Winthrop who has been Swede's pride and joy and my patient and understanding wife.

My son Douglas will give this to his mother from the Gridiron Club. The other corsage is for Brian's mother, also sitting at our table.

You can see that he belongs to me!

One of my favorite daughters, Janet, is here tonight for the first time, and I would like you all to meet a real beautiful red head—Janet, stand up and take a bow!

You know, come to think of it, 22 years ago Swede's hair was the same color as it is today. And thank God, so is mine.

Being president of any organization can be a joy or a headache depending on whom you have on your various committees. These are the hard working, dedicated, behind-the-scenes members who are the real backbone and motivating force of any club.

Believe me when I say that we are blessed with the best!

John Kelleher, as general chairman, John Cavanagh, as treasurer, Arthur Barry and his selection committee, Joe Blumsack, secretary, ticket chairman and program coordinator, Murray Lewis and John Carver, special effects and publicity.

I want to thank each of you and your committees for your help in making this dinner such a great success this year and *every year!*

I also want to thank each and everyone of you sitting out there in front of me who buy the tickets each year and by your presence and enthusiasm here tonight support our club and help to make the Swede Nelson Award for Sportsmanship one of the most recognized awards, not only in New England, but in the whole U.S.A.

To you Brian Dowling, let me say that the Gridiron Club is proud of you and we welcome you to the long list of previous winners.

My first meeting with Brian was quite different as he may remember. It happened at this year's Yale-Princeton game at Princeton. I was head linesman and chased Brian into the end zone after he caught that forward pass from my southern cousin, Calvin Hill, for the first Yale score early in the game. Before I could ask him for the football he promptly threw it 50 yards right up into the middle of the Yale student body!

I gave him a verbal blast and told him that if he did that after every TD, we would have to finish the game with a tennis ball.

Brian apologized, but told me that at the pregame rally in New Haven he had promised the students that he would give them the first touchdown ball and, as you can see, he was a man of his word.

Seriously though, Brian is a great competitor, a real sportsman in every sense of the word, and is most deserving to be this year's recipient.

Brian is the Gridiron Club's answer to the modern-day hippie.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Pollock (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through February 26, on account of official business.

Mr. Gude (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Landrum), for Tuesday, February 20, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Brown of Michigan (at the request of Mr. Zwach), for 60 minutes, on February 27; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Resnick (at the request of Mr. Roberts), for 1 hour, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Roberts), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Patman in three instances in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bob Wilson and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin and to include a tabulation of his votes during the first session of the 90th Congress.

Mr. Bob Wilson to extend his remarks in connection with the special order on Lithuania today.

Mr. Whitener and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Mahon to revise and extend his remarks in connection with H.R. 15399 and include extraneous matter relating thereto.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois to extend his remarks during eulogies on the late Congressman Donald W. Nicholson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Zwach) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Burton of Utah in 10 instances.
Mr. Scherle in three instances.
Mr. Keith.
Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Bray in three instances.
Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Mize.
Mr. Berry.
Mr. Lukens in three instances.
Mr. Findley in two instances.
Mr. Morse of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Hosmer in two instances.
Mr. Taft in two instances.
Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Esch.
Mr. Schwengel in two instances.
Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Morton in two instances.
Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Derwinski in two instances.
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona in five instances.
Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Laird in three instances.
Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Bell.
Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Adair.
Mr. Miller of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Roberts) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Resnick in two instances.
Mr. Pucinski in 10 instances.
Mr. Moss in three instances.
Mr. Celler.
Mr. Annunzio.
Mr. Adams.
Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Garmatz in two instances.
Mr. Brasco in two instances.
Mr. Scheuer in four instances.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Pepper in three instances.
Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Long of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. Dent in five instances.
Mr. William D. Ford in three instances.
Mr. Kornegay.
Mr. Ryan in two instances.
Mr. Howard.
Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Fuqua in four instances.
Mr. Brinkley
Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Carey.
Mr. Wolff in three instances.
Mr. Fascell in three instances.
Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. White.
Mr. Holland.
Mr. Cohelan in three instances.
Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
Mr. Addabbo in two instances.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Roberts in two instances.
Mr. Rosenthal in four instances.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2402. An act to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955; and

S. 2447. An act to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1527. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for certain amendments to the 1969 budget (H. Doc. No. 259); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1528. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the annual report of operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–348 (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1529. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Navy Material (Procurement and Production), Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1530. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs), transmitting copies of the index covering additional legislation enacted by the Ryukyuan Legislature during 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1531. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program covering the period January 1, 1967, through December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1532. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1533. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Army Medical Service to the Army Medical Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1534. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 82d quarterly report covering the fourth quarter 1967, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1535. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the disposal in foreign countries of excess property, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1536. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the disposal of foreign excess property, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398 (40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1537. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property donated to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, during the semiannual period July 1 through December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1538. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available if shipping containers for military electronic equipment are reused, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1539 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1967 regular and special sessions, pursuant to the provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1540. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract under which Ozark Bath House Co. will be authorized to continue to operate bathing facilities for the public for a 5-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1972, pursuant to the provisions of 79 Stat. 969 (16 U.S.C. 20); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1541. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a proposed concession contract under which Quapaw Bath House Co. will continue to operate bathing facilities for the public for a 5-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1972, pursuant to the provisions of 79 Stat. 969 (16 U.S.C. 20); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1542. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Coal Research (OCR) for the calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1543. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of developments under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of November 3, 1966, for the fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–755; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1544. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of World Power Data, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1545. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for the fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 604(a)(4) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1546. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1547. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the advisory committees which assist in carrying out functions of the Secretary, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–543; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1548. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of selected construction projects, Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, and Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin):

H.R. 15414. A bill to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 15415. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act to delete the prohibition against peanut marketing orders applicable to more than one production area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 15416. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15417. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 15418. A bill to prohibit questions relating to production, acreage, operation, or finances of any farm or farmer in an agricultural census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 15419. A bill to establish rights for individuals in their relations with Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15420. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15421. A bill to enact the Interstate Agreement on Detainers into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 15422. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 15423. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15424. A bill to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15425. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more equitable method of computing the primary insurance amount of an individual with coverage between 1937 and 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15426. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 15427. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15428. A bill for the relief of Italian earthquake victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 15429. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a nationwide system of scenic rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 15430. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and related acts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 15431. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15432. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 15433. A bill authorizing modification of the existing projects for the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15434. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 15435. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15436. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 15437. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 15438. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15439. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to maintain the monthly premium under the supplementary medical insurance program at $3 (with any additional funds needed to finance the program being provided through increased Government contributions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 15440. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 15441. A bill to prohibit direct and indirect transfers of gold bullion from the United States to countries which permit speculation in gold bullion by private citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 15442. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15443. A bill to provide assistance for the improvement of State and local law-enforcement agencies through acquisition of equipment for those agencies and provision of educational opportunities to their personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15444. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15445. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15446. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. GILBERT):

H.R. 15447. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to revise certain provisions thereof relating to aid to families with dependent children and other public assistance programs which were enacted or amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15448. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 15449. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, in order to provide additional loan assistance under such act to farmers who have suffered severe production losses as the result of a natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15450. A bill to amend section 101(a)(27)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 15451. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 15452. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 15453. A bill to provide for the elimination of all grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 15454. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when the father, mother, brother, or sister of such member has been killed in such combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15455. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to provide for a more effective and economical utilization of the Nation's vocational training resources through arrangements with private vocational institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 15456. A bill to assist the States in raising revenues by making more uniform the incidence and rate of tax imposed by States on the severance of minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15457. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 1100. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H. J. Res. 1101. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 1102. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 1103. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1104. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.J. Res. 1107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing investigation and study of the conduct of the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 647. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 648. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States consider appropriate steps leading to the convening of an international conference for the purpose of establishing a uniformly recognized boundary for the territorial seas of all coastal nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Con. Res. 649. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to reexamine the objectives and nature of the foreign assistance programs and the relationship of such programs to vital U.S. interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 650. Concurrent resolution to require repayment of French World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 651. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 1070. Resolution providing for travel by members of the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

309. By Mr. BRASCO: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to enactment of H.R. 14857, authorizing entry of victims of the earthquake in Sicily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

310. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to collective bargaining for farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15458. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease 0313189 (State: Wyoming; County: Sublette); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15459. A bill for the relief of Ross T. Sage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15460. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Salvatore Surdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15461. A bill for the relief of Ionnis Legakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 15462. A bill for the relief of Lennart Gordon Langhorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15463. A bill for the relief of Norma T. Doronila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 15464. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. Battiste and George F. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 15465. A bill for the relief of Marcelo Joao Meiro Baeta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15466. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pappalardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15467. A bill for the relief of Anna Saltarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 15468. A bill for the relief of David F. McNutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15469. A bill for the relief of Tevfik Alp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15470. A bill for the relief of Wong Kwai Fat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15471. A bill for the relief of Michel G. Issa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15472. A bill for the relief of Simone Laboeuf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15473. A bill for the relief of Marina B. Profeta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15474. A bill for the relief of Juan Artavia Villarreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 15475. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Liakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 15476. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 15477. A bill for the relief of Peter William Craine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15478. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederick Sia Lim and his wife Chua Huay Ching Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15479. A bill for the relief of Bartolomo Burgos-Camilo and Ramona Ventura de Burgos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15480. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Linford Escalante, Yvonne Marie Escalante, and Jacqueline Elizabeth Escalante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15481. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bhupendrakumar Manibhai Patel, M.B., B.S.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15482. A bill for the relief of Ricardo V. Alberto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

245. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to a national petition day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Discontinuance of Union Pacific and Northern Pacific Passenger Trains—Joint Memorial of Idaho Legislature

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the second extraordinary session of the 39th Legislature of Idaho has adopted and forwarded to me a joint memorial to the U.S. Congress.

The memorial concerns petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission by the Northern Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads to discontinue several passenger trains now serving Idaho.

I agree that the arguments for such discontinuance should be thoroughly examined, as is currently planned by the ICC, and ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the joint memorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Legislature of the State of Idaho, second extraordinary session, 39th legislature]

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your Memorialists, the Legislature of the state of Idaho, in the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, respectfully represent that—

Whereas, there are now petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission by railroads serving Idaho to discontinue the Northern Pacific "Mainstreeter" passenger train operating between Fargo, North Dakota and Seattle, Washington, through northern Idaho, the Union Pacific "Portland Rose" passenger train between Kansas City, Missouri and Portland, Oregon, through southern Idaho and the Union Pacific "Butte Special" passenger train between Salt Lake City, Utah and Butte, Montana, through eastern Idaho; and

Whereas, the passenger trains referred to are either the only passenger trains through the communities or the only passenger trains that serve certain communities on the routes; and

Whereas, the railway post office cars and mail storage cars have been removed from the passenger trains with a very evident deterioration in the mail service; and

Whereas, this discontinuance of mail contracts has resulted in an evident loss of revenue which has made necessary a serious cutback in passenger service on the above mentioned trains; and

Whereas, the Railway Express Agency has found it necessary to seek means of transportation other than passenger trains, resulting in a serious disruption of service; and

Whereas, mail service and public transportation service in general is becoming noticeably deteriorated; and

Whereas, the citizens of the state of Idaho and the Pacific Northwest are entitled to reliable, efficient, convenient and economical passenger, mail and express service:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the state of Idaho, the Senate concurring therein, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed at the earliest possible date to conduct proper investigation of the need for rail passenger service, the need for coordination with other modes of transportation, and particularly, the return of an efficient mail and express service.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the state of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the President and Vice-President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United State, the Chairman and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation of the United States.

Lithuanian Independence Day

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today is a day filled with biting irony. We mark today an anniversary of Lithuania's independence; yet we cannot do so wholly in the spirit of celebration and honor. We can celebrate that day 717 years ago upon which Mindaugas the Great unified the disparate Lithuanian principalities into a single strong kingdom; but we can hardly celebrate the many times in these intervening years which have seen that kingdom pawed and torn by foreign power. We can honor that day in 1918 which saw the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania; but it is not with honor that we note how many of the 50 years since have seen that Republic's territorial and political rights abridged by the Soviet Union. We can, and we certainly should, praise the great courage and nearly uncanny resilience which have characterized the Lithuanian people; but we must also—to truly honor them—denounce the brutal circumstances on which they are presently held.

In October of 1966, the Senate unanimously adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416. We in the 90th Congress should reaffirm that resolve. That resolution recognized that—

> The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

We should again urge the President of the United States—

First, to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

Second, to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

The issues here are large. They concern the principles and priorities around which we must seek to build an international law and an international peace. They are large, also, in terms of the response which both our history and our heritage require of us.

The processes under which the Soviet Union annihilated the political independence and the territorial integrity of these Baltic States were both deliberate and devious. In 1926, and again in 1932, the Baltic Republics had signed nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union. They had, also, in the spring of 1939 concluded a similar pact with Nazi Germany. These proved to be of no avail.

The Soviets were secretly negotiating with Germany for special arrangements, or "guarantees," with regard to both Poland and the Baltic States. So the cudgels fell.

In 1939, the Soviet Union forced the Baltic States to permit Soviet military bases within their frontiers. Later that same year, the Russian State Security Service signed a secret instruction for the deportation of anti-Soviet elements to Siberia upon occupation of the Baltic States. Finally, in June of 1940, Molotov, then President of the Soviet Peoples Commissars, denounced the Baltic States for their aggressive intentions—a ludicrous charge—and issued an ultimatum. Within the terms of this ultimatum, the Soviet Army had occupied the Baltic States by June 17, 1940. This occupation continues today.

As a nation "under the law," and as a nation that has consistently held to its position that "all people have the right to determine the form of their national existence," the United States cannot condone this international crime, this denial of such basic rights. As a member of the United Nations, whose charter specifically commits it to the search for international peace and national self-determination, we will never accept without protest the lingering injustice suffered by the people of Lithuania.

Indianapolis Group Makes Self-Help Work

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are times when it must seem that the term self-help has become a forbidden word in our language. Not for Mrs. Mattie Coney, of Indianapolis, however, who has organized, guided, and directed the Indianapolis Citizens Forum.

The following article by Russell Kirk in the February 8, 1968, Indianapolis Star describes the work of the citizens forum:

INDIANAPOLIS GROUP MAKES SELF-HELP WORK

Congress has made rat-control a function of the national government—but presumably the rats don't know it. Rodents will continue to thrive, regardless of Federal appropriations, until people in the heart of our cities cease to scatter garbage about.

Similarly, criminals and fanatics and the reckless and the violent will do as they please, regardless of talk in Washington—until local people take action in their own communities. There is no Federal Pied Piper—and besides, the people of Hamelin paid a terrible price for letting someone else provide their rat-control.

So it is heartening that in some of our city centers intelligent people are beginning to act at the local level, without government direction or subsidy of any sort. One of the better examples is the Citizens Forum, in Indianapolis.

The prime mover and president of this voluntary organization is the energetic and humorous Mrs. Mattie Rice Coney, who has taken an extended leave of absence from her school-teaching to clean up, and restore order to, the heart of Indianapolis. You can read about her work in an interesting new book by M. Stanton Evans and Margaret Moore, "The Law Breakers: America's Number One Domestic Problem" (Arlington House).

Mr. and Mrs. Elmo Coney (for now her husband has joined her in this work, full time) have a simple office and a modest budget defrayed by an Indianapolis foundation, the Lilly Endowment. They take no governmental money. Recently I visited them, and I found them wondrously cheerful and hopeful, even though they are performing a labor of Hercules in trying to cleanse the Augean stables of urban decay and disintegration.

The Coneys begin by brightening the corner where they are. They have formed volunteer organizations, block by block—colored residents and white residents—to clean up a vast area of Indianapolis. Thousands of tons of disused refrigerators, old cars and miscellaneous junk have been carted away from city back yards, in cooperation with the municipal authorities. Once a neighborhood begins to look better, people begin to think better of themselves.

"There's no one so culturally deprived that he can't wash his own face," says Mrs. Coney. Elmo Coney, who also has the gift of sensible and witty talk, emphasizes the need for personal relationships in a neighborhood—knowing one's neighbors' names, for instance. "If you know a man's name, he won't wish to rob you, or won't dare."

Here are the practical slogans and recommendations which the Coneys post on buses, in shop windows and every place they can find:

"No loitering on street corners.
"No beer drinking in public.
"Put cans and bottles in containers.
"Don't be a loudmouth.
"Wrap garbage—put in covered can.
"Minimum noise in neighborhood.
"Front and side yard for beauty.
"Keep business to self on buses."

And more to the same general effect. Simple remedies? Yes—and effective: more effective than any amount of compulsion or bribery could be.

Remarks of M. G. O'Neil, President of the General Tire & Rubber Co., at Sacred Heart College

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Sacred Heart College, Belmont, N.C., is a very fine institution of higher education for young ladies. It has been operated by the Sisters of Mercy for the past 78 years as an academy and junior college. Recently the college entered the ranks of the senior colleges and will grant degrees commencing in 1970.

On the evening of February 15, 1968, Sacred Heart College entertained community leaders at a very splendid dinner on its Belmont campus. The principal speaker for the occasion was Mr. M. G. O'Neil, president, the General Tire & Rubber Co. Mr. O'Neill's remarks were very impressive as he dealt with the importance of the education of young women.

As one who has observed the excellent educational program of Sacred Heart College over a period of many years, I can attest to the contribution of the institution in providing the type of education for young ladies which will equip them to meet the challenges outlined by Mr. O'Neil.

There is no more dedicated staff at any college than one will find at Sacred Heart College, nor has any institution rendered greater service to a community than we have had in our community from the college. Mr. O'Neil's address is made a part of the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS TO SACRED HEART COLLEGE BY M. G. O'NEIL, PRESIDENT, THE GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER CO., BELMONT, N.C., FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Two years ago, I had the pleasure of being in Charlotte to speak at the United Appeal dinner.

It is pleasant to renew tonight the acquaintances I made then, and to meet more of you.

You represent an important part of the leadership segment of this area. You are largely responsible for the great progress that has been made by this region in recent years. Progress which is just beginning.

I know how effectively the advantages of this area can be put forth because our company is a new corporate citizen of Charlotte.

Obviously we share with you great faith in the present advantages and the future potential of the Piedmont Crescent.

Within the past three months, we formally opened here the fifth tire manufacturing facility in General Tire's domestic network.

This plant is, we believe, the most modern tire plant in the world. Currently, it is producing 7,000 passenger tires a day. Soon, production will be stepped up to 8,000—plus a daily output of 500 truck tires. The potential is 20,000 tires of all types per day.

I mention these facts not as a "commercial" for General Tire, but as the basis for some observations I think are appropriate.

Someone has said that the decision to locate a major plant in any city has "a terrible permanence."

This is true. You can't pick up and move a multimillion-dollar manufacturing plant after a few years.

If all the economic factors have been checked out properly, a company can't very easily make a mistake in its short-term expectations.

But the long-range future is the important thing . . . and is another matter.

Not how big—but how well will the community grow? Will its educational facilities, for instance, keep pace with its economic and population growth?

A community is most attractive to industry when it is attractive to highly motivated people as a place to live, to work, raise their children and educate them.

Let me quote just two sentences from a report by Thomas A. Vanderslice, of the General Electric Company, which was a part of a national symposium published last month to mark the 25th anniversary of the Committee for Economic Development:

"When a company contemplates moving into a community," Mr. Vanderslice wrote, "quite often the decisive factor is not taxes, not the labor supply, and not the nearness to markets. What really makes the difference is the quality of the schools."

Whether or not you believe this overstates the case for quality education, it is an authoritative opinion.

It expresses the view of many ambitious young parents who, in our mobile society today can choose to live and work where they feel their children will have good educational facilities available.

For reasons like this, the expansion plans of the administration of Sacred Heart College are of much greater community significance than they might have seemed to have been just a few years ago.

After 78 years as an academy and junior college, Sacred Heart College will grant its first Baccalaureate degrees in 1970—fully accredited by both the North Carolina State Board of Education and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

By that time, student enrollment is expected to reach 600. It will be the only Catholic women's college between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Florida, and it will open, of course, to students of all faiths.

This new four-year college is a needed cultural asset for this growing area. It is a tangible step toward assuring that your educational facilities here will keep pace with your economic development.

For undertaking to meet this need, I congratulate the administrators of the College, the Sisters of Mercy of North Carolina, who next year will celebrate the 100th anniversary of their educational work in the state.

The Charlotte area is blessed with four fine colleges. All of them deserve wholehearted community support. They will be vitally needed as this area grows. We at General will encourage our people to pursue higher education at the college of their choice here, and help finance them through our Tuition Refund Program.

Industry has found that it is no longer sound to contribute only to educational institutions which graduate engineers, scientists and business administration majors.

Our support of these universities which graduate industry's future leaders is necessary and will continue.

But one of the characteristics of a free society is that all worthwhile human effort is recognized as inter-related.

The economic, political and social aspects of our lives are so interwoven that the good influence of a well-educated woman is just as important in the community as the skill or technical knowledge of her husband.

I understand that most of the graduates of Sacred Heart College will go into the teaching field. There, they will have positions of community leadership immediately—wherever they teach. Their work will directly affect the future because they will be training the minds of the future generations.

We know that the highly publicized protesters, malcontents and down-graders of our way of life, who are in the teaching field, are a small minority. But the publicity they get—and its influence on the uninformed—makes all the more necessary teachers dedicated to sound ideals and to the principles of our free society.

The free enterprise system needs intelligent interpretation by those in the teaching field. It deserves this support, as well, from the college graduates who are going into government service.

A strong and growing economy is the basis of the strength of our government. The country cannot be strong militarily, provide the social service programs of the government, or furnish government aid to education, in a nation of 200-million people, without an adequate, healthy economy.

It is the economy which provides the taxes for all the billions of dollars of government expeditures.

Ironically, business and industry do not get credit for this. Instead, our economic well-being is generally thought of as an automatic by-product of our form of government.

The importance of a strong economy has become masked by its own success. A disturbing number of bright college graduates want careers in fields they think are more "*socially meaningful*" than business and industry.

What is more socially meaningful than providing millions of jobs? And paying—to mention just one tax bill of industry last year—more than $30 billion in federal corporate taxes alone?

What kind of career do many college graduates want, in order to make "meaningful" contributions to society?

Do they want to work for a company and help pay half the social security bill for hundreds—maybe thousands—of their fellowmen?

Do they want to help provide their company's pension for its retired employees?

Do they want to make a substantial contribution to education with a gift to their own college? (A gift which many companies will match.)

Or do they want to help build a new wing on the local hospital?

Do they want to help support the health and social service agencies in their community? The business they can work for does these things through contributions to United Fund campaigns and to other local agencies.

Without taxes and voluntary contributions of business, none of these things would be possible. So, what is the reaction of a growing number of our smartest college graduates?

A high percentage want to go into government service, join the Peace Corps, or do various kinds of social work. Now, I'm not belittling any of these. But I am mystified. It proves there is something terribly wrong with the image that is being projected of the social importance of business.

If enough of our educated young people come to feel that going into business will not let them fulfill their ambitions to do something worthwhile for their fellowmen, then all of us—not only business and industry—are in trouble. Industry must have a growing number of talented, educated young people to meet the exploding needs of a growing population, and to work with the complicated techniques of the new technologies.

Last year, for the first time in many years, a trend seems to have started toward a better attitude about business among college people. A national survey reported just last week that now a majority of men students, and a growing number of women, say they are primarily interested in business careers after college.

The trend is most evident among young women. This is undoubtedly because the opportunities for women in business have broadened so much in recent years.

There has been a lot of publicity about the many positions of high responsibility now being held by women.

The New York Stock Exchange admitted its first woman member in history, just last month. Our own company elected a woman to its finance committee for the first time. At least two leading New York department stores have women chief executives.

Many young women graduates are going into sophisticated computer fields—a vast, challenging area that did not exist a few years ago.

There are many more new opportunities for educated women in today's business world, as well as in the educational field where as teachers of tomorrow's citizens they have always been indispensable.

A school like Sacred Heart College graduates "Women of Influence"—in the best sense of that phrase.

With great influence on the home, on the community, on the nation and—most important of all, whether as a mother or teacher—on the future generations of American children.

To a very large extent, in the hands of Christian educated women lie the hopes, and the fulfillment of the best plans of you leaders of the Piedmont Crescent.

Federal Highway Trust Funds

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this distinguished body to the peculiar problems of highway construction in Minnesota. Because of our cold and snow-filled Minnesota winters, highway construction is feasible only 6 to 7 months of the year.

In order to get the needed work done in this period of time, long-range plans must be made. Because the employment is on a part-time basis, construction companies must know well in advance what contracts they will be awarded so that workers can be hired.

Because of the short work year, Minnesota traditionally finds itself in somewhat of a bind. The work must be done in the summertime and that is when our State is host to millions of tourists using our highways to drive to our more than 10,000 sparkling lakes.

Any general delay in Federal funding of aids to State highway programs is bad, but in Minnesota, because of the short construction season, they are doubly bad.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD a letter which I recently received from the Governor of Minnesota, Harold LeVander, dealing with the problems arising from the holdback of Federal highway trust funds:

The time has come when we must take a firm stand on the matter of highway programs in our nation. Since 1965, the Federal government has taken liberties with the Highway Trust Fund that have disrupted highway building in every state. Delays in quarterly payments were enough to upset the balance of our long-range programs, and the further aggravation of the cutback of November 1966 created unnecessary turmoil.

Now we are faced with an even more serious disruption of our plans by the unjustified, menacing cutting away of $600 million from the Highway Trust Fund allotments in 1968. This budget degradation would be bad enough, were it not for the fact that these funds are dedicated and collected only from road users. They should not be susceptible to the whims of the Administration.

The balance of the Highway Trust Fund at the end of fiscal 1967 was $725 million. An expected apportionment for the current fiscal year was reduced from $4.8 billion to $4.4 billion, and allotments are running far behind. As chief executive of a vigorous, progressive state, I must protest this manipulation of dedicated funds.

National economics may dictate tight money controls and restricted spending, but these adjustments must not be allowed to affect the flow of dedicated, self-supporting trust funds. Payments to the states should be based entirely upon the availability of these funds.

In Minnesota, the effects of the Administration's fiscal policies for highway programs has had a telling effect. Not only has the Minnesota Highway Department had its planning crippled by the regressive actions, but the effects have been felt in each of the 87 county highway departments through the funds which are reapportioned for use on Federal aid secondary highways.

On October 1, 1965, the Federal government was a full three months and $24 million behind schedule in releasing our Federal aid funds. As a result of the Administration's cutback of November 1966, the deficit has now reached $43.5 million and we are confronted with another cutback which could swell the deficit to approximately $51.5 million by the end of this fiscal year.

Of the $111 million apportioned to Minnesota at the beginning of fiscal 1968, we have so far received $40 million. We can look forward to just one more allotment before the end of the year, which was expected to amount to approximately $25.5 million. Now this, too, has been reduced, and we are now faced with the possibility of going into fiscal 1969 a full six months behind our anticipated programs.

As one of Minnesota's representatives in Congress, you are in a position to protect the sanctity of the Highway Trust Fund. It is in the best interests of your state and your nation that the revenues collected from road users be promptly put to their intended purpose. To insure this nation's burgeoning highway system for the safety and continued economic progress that the future requires, we must be confident of a consistent flow of highway funds to the limit of the availability of these funds.

The cost of highway construction is increasing. It is a fallacy to contend that delaying any of these programs will save money. In many cases, bonding programs are being used to speed up needed highway construction on the premise that the cost of interest is nearly parallel to the rising costs of construction. In addition, a much more urgent savings may be measured in terms of deaths, personal injuries and property damage caused by highway accidents.

There can be no doubt that this nation's highway programs are among the most important public programs ever undertaken by this or any other nation. It is more significant, however, that the funds for these programs are collected from those who use the highways, with the pledge that they will be used for that purpose.

For this reason, I am asking you, as a representative of the State of Minnesota, to urge action that will halt the manipulation of the Highway Trust Fund. Work for legislation, if necessary, to prevent further delays and reductions in the allocation of funds for highway programs. Stay the hand of the President and his Administration from diminishing the flow of this dedicated revenue. Keep the Highway Trust Fund inviolate by insuring the disbursement of funds as soon as they are available.

Sincerely,

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.

Comparisons of President Lyndon B. Johnson and President Abraham Lincoln in Conduct of Presidency in Face of Public Dissent

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators a most thoughtful letter, written by Patrick Riddleberger, professor of history at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Ill., to the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Professor Riddleberger analyzes comparisons that have been attempted between President Johnson and President Lincoln in the matter of the conduct of their high office in the face of public dissent. The letter helps to bring the historical record into sharper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON AND LINCOLN: PRESIDENT'S ANALOGY WITH CIVIL WAR QUESTIONED BY A HISTORIAN

In the current crisis which the United States faces in Vietnam, it is very tempting to resort to historical analogy. The complexity and the deep tragedy of our involvement in that unhappy land make it altogether understandable that we would search for explanations, or rationalizations, or perhaps illumination, in this way. The historical analogy, especially when it might convince us that we are not departing from American traditions, is one avenue to the satisfaction of these proclivities. It is, however, a precarious one and should be resorted to with wisdom and caution.

In fact, our Vietnam involvement is so unique that it defies analogy, in any one to one relationship, with our past experience, and undoubtedly too many of us have been unable to resist the temptation to engage in it.

Regrettably, the President has increasingly resorted to it, as our presence in Vietnam becomes more untenable. His efforts to draw an analogy between himself and the Civil War President on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday is only the most flagrant example. His speech on this, and some other occasions, verges on demogoguery.

Up to a point, the analogy President Johnson draws between himself and Lincoln is valid, just as it is valid to draw them between himself and other Presidents. Lincoln and Johnson both faced grave crises, and both faced strenuous opposition. At this point the analogy ends. Both the nature of the crises faced by these men and their methods of dealing with them defy any simple analogy.

Only those who are grossly uninformed, misinformed or sentimental could accept a comparison between Lincoln's preservation of the American Union with an American involvement on the mainland of Asia eight thousand miles away. But the very poignancy of this war—the insensate loss of life among military and civilians and the wanton destruction—are inducements to react to a sentimental appeal, especially when the most legendary figure in our history is brought into the equation.

The differences between Lincoln and Johnson are so far reaching that it would be impossible to deal with them adequately in the space allotted here, but let me suggest a few of them.

Lincoln's analysis of the state of the Union during the secession crisis, which he presented in his first inaugural address, was steeped in the history of the growing sectionalism and the constitutional development in the United States during the preceding half-century. There was little or no dissent by responsible persons in the North to this presentation of the case, and after the war many responsible Southerners came to accept it.

In fact, the most difficult opposition Lincoln had to face came from those Radicals within his own party who wanted him to pursue the war with more vigor. There was disagreement on some points, but with the Emancipation Proclamation, which was decided on by the summer of 1862, they were in substantial agreement. But the current opposition to Johnson's policies comes from responsible leaders in both parties, including the chairman and several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, from the clergy, from business, and from the academic community.

To be sure, there were dark days for the North from 1861 to 1865, but the North was not divided as the nation is today. If Americans must discover past experiences to justify our involvement in Vietnam, this one simply will not do. Lincoln kept around him, in Cabinet posts, men who were spokesmen of the Radical opposition. Although he was patient with generals who did not achieve immediate victory, in due time failure led to replacement. Lincoln was never beguiled by promises or by fatuous optimism on the part of his generals. Moreover, Lincoln never deviated from the principle that the ultimate authority rested with the civilian President. There was no erosion of the political administration, even during the bleakest and most heartrending setbacks. Can the same be said of the Johnson Administration?

The most profound difference between the two men is to be found in their view of the world, their sense of tragedy and their sense of history. Lincoln could never have asserted, as has Johnson, that he was not going to be the first American President to lose a war. Rather, he said to the departing South, and to the nation, "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen . . . is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend' it." Lincoln understood all the nuances of the situation confronting him and handled them with the delicacy of a virtuoso.

Despite his limited political experience and humble origins, Lincoln had enough self-confidence to be able to see the limitations of his power and to understand that he could not control all the forces of history. Hence he had that capacity for growth which all our great Presidents have had, and without which they are inevitably relegated to mediocrity.

Perhaps it is too early to make an assessment but these seem to be the very qualities that President Johnson lacks. This is not to accuse him of a lack of sincerity, or even a kind of courage, but it is hardly unfair to suggest that he suffers from a sort of obtuseness which compounds his difficulties.

The sort of demagoguery which the President resorts to in the misuse of history can be also found in his refusal to distinguish clearly between opposition to his policy and attitudes toward the fighting men in Vietnam. Time and again, in awarding Congressional Medals of Honor, the President uses the occasion to make speeches about policy and to impugn the motives of his critics. Those of us who oppose the current Vietnam policy are as much concerned about the American soldier as the most hawkish members of the Administration; in fact, we are so concerned that we want the impossible situation into which he has been thrown changed at the earliest feasible time.

Any sensitive member of the academic community is faced with the question of just what his role should be in times such as these. In fact, the academic community is divided on this question, and in the final analysis each member must decide for himself how active he should be and in what ways he can act. It does seem to this writer to be very proper, perhaps even imperative, that when information in an area in which he has some professional competency is being misused and distorted, he should move from the classroom to the public forum. It is in this spirit and on this premise that this letter is written.

PATRICK W. RIDDLEBERGER,
Professor of History, Southern Illinois University.
EDWARDSVILLE.

Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call my colleagues' attention to an editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 15, 1968. The editorial comments on Washington, D.C., Councilman and Vice Chairman Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy's choice to be a member of the board of convenors of the Black United Front, of which Stokely Carmichael is chairman.

The Black United Front, a new Negro civil rights coalition, announced February 15, 1968, that it backs the aims of the Reverend Martin Luther King's April job demonstration in the Nation's Capital. In regard to the so-called April "tent-in," Reverend King is quoted as saying "if there is no response, then we might go to disruptive protest" to achieve our demands. Just what Reverend King means by "disruptive protest" has not been spelled out but it is not outside the realm of reasonable men to presume that "disruptive protest" means that the orderly functioning of our Government and Nation's Capital will be disrupted.

When Reverend Fauntroy accepted his appointment by President Johnson as Vice Chairman of the Washington, D.C., City Council, he also accepted the responsibility to run the city efficiently and with due regard to the needs of all the people—not only the private citizens but the Federal Government itself.

However, by becoming a member of the board of convenors of the Black United Front, Reverend Fauntroy is attempting to wear two hats. On one side, he is pledged to work for the best interests of the Nation's Capital in his position as Vice Chairman of the City Council. On the other side, he has deliberately joined a group which pledges "disruptive protest" if their demands are not met. It is apparent that Reverend Fauntroy has placed himself in a contradictory position and a position which the city and the Government cannot tolerate. It is imperative that Reverend Fauntroy decide, and decide now, as to which organization he wishes to pledge his loyalty. If Reverend Fauntroy desires to be an active and leading member of a group which pledges "disruptive protest" against the very city that he represents as Vice Chairman of its City Council, then he should immediately resign his City Council position.

The editorial follows:

There were more than a few raised eyebrows around town last month when the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy attended a secret strategy conference at which, it was reported, formation of a "United Black Front" to include both civil rights moderates and militants was approved. Stokely Carmichael was among the militants who attended.

Certainly, the Rev. Fauntroy had every reason to attend the meeting. After all, he is Washington representative of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

What caused the raised eyebrows was the fact that the Rev. Fauntroy is also vice chairman of the new D.C. City Council.

At the time, not too much was said about the Rev. Fauntroy's attendance at the meeting. However, now that some of the "organizers" for Dr. King's April "tent in" here have arrived in town, we are pressed to consider the prospects for the Federal City and especially, to consider the Rev. Fauntroy's equivocal position.

Dr. King has said: "We will stay until we get a response" to demands upon Congress for "full employment" and a guaranteed income for those unable to work. He said that all this would be the "absolute minimum goal" for the April campaign. "If there is no response, then we might go to disruptive protest."

The operative word here is "disruptive." What does it imply?

Washingtonians, whether involved directly with the Federal government or not, must presume that "disruptive" means what it says—that the physical functioning of the city will be interfered with.

Dr. King indicates that his battle is with the Federal government, not the District government. We submit, however, that such a distinction cannot be drawn if "disruptive protest" becomes an actuality.

This, of course, is exactly where the Rev. Fauntroy's dual roles become involved.

The D.C. government—its mayor, deputy mayor and City Council—are charged by President Johnson, who appointed them, with responsibility for running the city efficiently and with due regard for the needs of all who live here—the private citizens themselves and the Federal government which functions here.

How, then, can a member of that city government—the vice chairman of its City Council, in fact—fulfill two antithetic roles, namely, as an important city official on the one hand and as the official representative of a possibly "disruptive" force on the other?

One might reply that it would be time enough for the Rev. Fauntroy to determine where his primary loyalty lies when, and if, the threatened disruption takes place. We do not agree. We believe that the Rev. Fauntroy should make his decision long before the die is cast—and take action on that decision to make his position clear now.

We make bold to suggest that in so doing the Rev. Fauntroy would also ease the manifold and increasing problems of the city's eminently able mayor, who has troubles enough as it is.

P.S.: Yesterday's official revelation that the Rev. Fauntroy is a member of the Board of Convenors of the Black United Front, of which Mr. Carmichael is chairman, simply reinforces our opinions expressed above.

Post Office Department Honors Texans

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Saturday, February 17, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien announced that 81 citations including $3,000 in cost awards would be presented at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the following day, February 18, in recognition of outstanding service to the mails during the emergency caused by Hurricane Beulah.

Assistant Postmaster General Richard J. Murphy, Chief of Personnel, made the presentation in the east ballroom of the Robert Driscoll Hotel.

Awards went to 22 postal employees as individuals, to employee complements of 50 post offices, and to nine private citizens. All were cited for their outstanding contributions to the postal service last September after the hurricane, floods, and tornadoes that devastated a large portion of southern Texas.

The ceremony was hosted by Dallas Regional Director B. M. Myers and Corpus Christi Postmaster Otis S. Bowers.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the remarks of Assistant Postmaster General Richard J. Murphy, delivered in Corpus Christi in presentation of the citations and awards, together with the names of all those receiving citations and awards, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL RICHARD J. MURPHY, BUREAU OF PERSONNEL, FEBRUARY 18, 1968, AT ROBERT DRISCOLL HOTEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be with you in Corpus Christi; I take great pride in the presentation of these awards.

Nowhere is dedication to the postal service so dramatically illustrated as in times of crisis. The hurricane that ravaged southern Texas last September caused millions of dollars worth of damage, destroyed homes and other property, disrupted postal service and for an uncertain time rendered thousands homeless.

It is no small tribute to note that the postal service was restored even before many hurricane victims, including postal employees had a chance to assess their losses and to tend to their own needs.

Such devotion, I might say, is no less than that with which postal employees in Texas and everywhere throughout the United States fulfill their responsibilities to the postal service and the American public.

That kind of devotion is not unusual; it only shows more brightly against the background of a crisis like Hurricane Beulah.

We saw the same kind of inspiration and determination among postal employees in Fairbanks, Alaska, just a month before Hurricane Beulah ravaged the Gulf Coast. In Alaska, it was a flood, but the disaster evoked the same kind of response from postal employees. The same dedication motivated postal employees in Anchorage after the Good Friday earthquake in 1964 and in New Orleans and Miami after the hurricane of 1965 and again in Florida after the 1966 hurricane.

The awards we present here today are most highly earned. But they could never tell the whole story. There was so much bravery during that storm, so many instances of self-sacrifice and heroism that we could never recount them all.

Beyond that, there is the courage of those who helped to rebuild and the contribution of others who were not involved at all but who sent food, supplies and funds to the disaster victims. It was the most generous kind of compassion.

That is why the presentation of these awards in the wake of Hurricane Beulah can be symbolic only, representative of the will and dedication of many individuals.

It is not too much to say that the postal service itself is a monument to all those who helped sustain it during that desperate crisis last September. And I am speaking of everyone, not postal employees alone.

Typical of the pitch-in-and-help attitude that prevailed in the aftermath of the hurricane was the contribution of Mr. Warren Whatley and Mr. Franklin Pagel, owners of Refugio-Calhoun Industries of Tivoli, Texas. At a time when the highway into Tivoli and Austwell was closed and the area was isolated by flood water, Mr. Whatley and Mr. Pagel agreed to use their crop-dusting plane to fly mail in to the towns. They landed and took off on the closed portion of highway 35 at either end of the trip.

They hauled all classes of mail, including parcel post, along with other supplies which they were carrying in to residents of the stricken area. Mr. Whatley and Mr. Pagel transported more than 600 pounds of mail, all at a very nominal cost, and I think we are very properly recognizing their contribution to the mail service here today.

Another example of the generosity and compassion we are honoring is in the action of Mr. Robert Kinsel, of Three Rivers, who took the postmaster into his own home, when hers was ruined, and then donated the use of his garage as an emergency post office.

For the postmaster, Miss Vaughn Price, too much cannot be said. She and her clerk, Charles E. Nichols, barely escaped from the flood with only the clothing they were wearing. Soon afterwards, Miss Price moved back into her post office again, but she had to live in temporary quarters for many weeks because of the extensive damage to her home.

Mr. Nichols demonstrated the highest kind of bravery and dedication to the safekeeping of the mails. He waded through deep water to reach a flooded post office and move several bags of mail to high shelves, away from the water. He then had to wade back through water which was still rising dangerously in order to reach high ground.

It was truly the act of a courageous man.

I'd like to give you another example of that kind of devotion. Mr. James Bradford, the postmaster from up at Pettus, refused to evacuate his post office, even as the waters rose steadily, until he had made certain that all mail was stored in a high place and that all equipment was protected.

Then, and only then, did Postmaster Bradford leave the post office, and he had to wade through knee deep water to do it. Instead of thinking of his own needs and comfort, Postmaster Bradford drove his automobile to high ground overlooking the post office and stayed in his car all night to make certain that there would be no looting.

That night, the water in the post office rose to five and a half feet. Just two days later, Postmaster Bradford was open for business. Here, again, is another outstanding example of dedication to the postal service.

The Rio Grande Valley took severe punishment from the hurricane itself. Beulah destroyed the post office at Port Isabel and caused heavy damage in Brownsville, which was the largest city struck by the hurricane.

The post office in Brownsville served as a shelter for evacuees; about 450 persons waited out that wild night in the sturdy old post office building. Postmaster Runyon has been proud to say—as have Postal Inspectors Lee Schmidt and R. L. McCoy who spent the night at the post office—that the unselfish, untiring efforts of three custodial employees were absolutely indispensible and upheld the finest traditions of the postal service.

Chester Edlund, Alfredo Pompa and Marciano Flores remained on duty continuously for almost two and a half days. During the storm, they went out into the wind and rain to assist old persons inside and to help mothers carrying babies and personal belongings.

During the crisis period, Mr. Edlund, Mr. Pompa and Mr. Flores were everywhere. They passed out water and food to the evacuees, set up lanterns when the lights failed and provided portable sanitary facilities.

As soon as the storm abated, these three men plowed right into the gigantic task of cleaning up the building and making it fit for the post office and the other agencies that occupy it.

The performance of Mr. Edlund, Mr. Pompa and Mr. Flores deserve the highest kind of admiration and praise, and I am proud to be making awards to them here today.

I would like also to mention the heroism and courage of two of our postal inspectors who rode herd on the situation in southern Texas during the hurricane and in the critical hours immediately afterward.

C. Lee Schmidt and R. L. McCoy deliberately placed themselves in the path of the oncoming storm. They took cots and lanterns and some cold food and canned water and settled down at the Brownsville post office. The full fury of the storm struck Brownsville; winds were up to 150 miles per hour. The storm battered the city for 13 hours.

The federal building itself became a shelter for evacuees and about 450 persons took refuge in the building, sharing the ordeal with the inspectors and with Mr. Pompa, Mr. Edlund and Mr. Flores whom I mentioned earlier.

After the storm had passed, the inspectors split up; one drove east and the other west to survey the damage done by the storm and to see what could be saved and what was necessary to get the mails moving again. Between them, they visited virtually all post offices in the path of the hurricane and brought order again to the chaos caused by the storm.

In Harlingen, the home of Postmaster Robert E. Gilbert had been severely damaged by flood water, and Inspector Schmidt took the postmaster into his own home and gave him shelter.

I am proud to say that the work of Inspectors Schmidt and McCoy earned them both a special citation and the $250 superior accomplishment award.

There are more stories like these—that of Mrs. Cassie Mae Harwood, clerk at Sweet Home, for example, who thought to seize postal valuables and dash outside minutes before a tornado destroyed her post office. There is the work of Mr. Harley Swanson, a postal mechanic, and Mr. Deward DeMoss, superintending engineer at Harlingen, and Clerk Jack Holland at Mercedes. And I'd like to mention also the exemplary performances of our postal service officers—Jennings Pitre, Napoleon Ballard, James Lusby, Joe Bruning and Blanks Dudley.

Each of the post offices whose employees we honor here today represents achievement of a similar nature; the same kind of courage and dedication is apparent throughout.

It is, as I said earlier, no more than the customary devotion with which postal employees safeguard the mails in the course of their everyday duties. I have always been impressed that our thousands of employees take their responsibilities so seriously; to them, the mails truly are a sacred trust.

In times of crisis, our people have responded magnificently, as they did here in Texas during the emergency caused by Hurricane Beulah. I take great pleasure in presenting these awards in official recognition of the spirit and determination and outright heroism that sustained the mails during a major natural disaster.

Special Citation and $250 Superior Accomplishment Award "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Chester V. Edlund, Engineman, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Alfredo Pompa, Mechanic Helper, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Marciano D. Flores, Jr., Janitor, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Jennings L. Pitre, Postal Service Officer, Dallas, Texas

Mr. Napoleon B. Ballard, Postal Service Officer, Houston, Texas

Mr. James V. Lusby, Postal Service Officer, Lake Charles, Louisiana

Miss Vaughn Price, Postmaster, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. James O. Bradford, Postmaster, Pettus, Texas

Mr. Charles E. Nichols, Clerk, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. Joe B. Bruning, Postal Service Officer, Corpus Christi, Texas

Special Citation and $100 Superior Accomplishment Award "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Jack C. Holland, Clerk, Mercedes, Texas

Mrs. Cassie Mae Harwood, Clerk, Sweet Home, Texas

Mr. Harley Swanson, Postal Mechanic, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Deward I. DeMoss, Superintendent Engineer, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Blanks L. Dudley, Postal Service Officer, McAllen, Texas

Special Citation "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. W. J. Treptow, Assistant Postmaster, Yoakum, Texas

Mr. O. P. Austin, Assistant Superintendent of Mails, Victoria, Texas

Mr. Ira Prindle, Assistant Postmaster, Palacios, Texas

Mr. R. E. M. Gilbert, Postmaster, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Robert A. Runyon, Postmaster, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. D. H. Bowling, Assistant Postmaster, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Ralph M. McHam, Postal Service Officer, Austin, Texas

Special Citation to the employees of the Falfurrias, Tex., Post Office "for exceptional devotion to duty and willing cooperation in the restoration of mail service following Hurricane Beulah in September 1967. This dedication to the public need, without regard to personal convenience or welfare, is in the highest tradition of the Federal Service."

Special Citations to the following nonpostal personnel "as an expression of appreciation for outstanding assistance to the Postal Service during the emergency conditions created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Thomas L. H. Jennings, Contractor, South Padre Island Rural Branch, Port Isabel, Texas

Mrs. Helen E. Renfrow, Contractor, Port Mansfield Rural Branch, Port Mansfield, Texas

Mr. Eddie Robinson, Contractor, Crystal Beach Rural Branch, Port Bolivar, Texas

Mr. Warren Whatley, Refugio-Calhoun Industries, Inc., Tivoli, Texas

Mr. Franklin Pagel, Refugio-Calhoun Industries, Inc., Tivoli, Texas

Mr. Robert Kinsel, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. J. W. Turcotte, Sarita, Texas

Mr. Joe E. Ward, Falfurrias, Texas

Mr. Owen McKinney, Falfurrias, Texas

Special Citations to the Employees of the following facilities "for their commendable response to the unusually adverse conditions and threat to the Postal Service posed by Hurricane Beulah which struck in September 1967:"

Rockport, Fulton, Olmito, Los Fresnos, Port Aransas, Port Isabel, Brownsville, San Perlita, La Feria, McAllen, Los Ebanos, Grulla, Elsa, La Blanca, Encino, Francitas, Long Mott, Bloomington, Vanderbilt, LaSalle, Point Comfort, Seadrift, McFaddin, Placedo, Fronton.

Sarita, Aransas Pass, Armstrong, Orange Grove, Sandia, Pettus, Three Rivers, Tivoli, Austwell, Sweet Home, Port Bolivar, Gilchrist, Kemah, Sabine Pass, Port O'Connor, Port Lavaca, La Ward, Lolita, Kingsville, Ingleside, Riviera, South Padre Island, Port Mansfield, and El Sauz.

Piedmont Airlines' 20th Anniversary

REMARKS
OF
HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to pay tribute to Piedmont Airlines on the memorable occasion of its 20th anniversary. This enterprising firm is located in Winston-Salem, N.C., which I am pleased to say is in my congressional district. Piedmont Airlines has experienced a rapid growth and continually sets the pace among local service carriers. This was emphasized in 1966 when Piedmont became the first regional airline to show a profit without benefit of Federal subsidy, heretofore an unprecedented achievement among the local service air transport industry. In fact, Piedmont Airlines is proud to acknowledge that it provides more service for more people with less Federal subsidy than any other regional airline. Piedmont has now grown to the point that it is authorized to operate in 10 States and the District of Columbia, serving 77 cities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we all recognize the vast contribution this North Carolina airline has made to the State and to the Nation, I include the history of Piedmont Airlines in the RECORD:

HISTORY OF PIEDMONT AIRLINES

Piedmont Airlines has grown rapidly since the days when its parent organization, Piedmont Aviation, Inc., was incorporated July 2, 1940, under North Carolina laws as an aircraft sales and service operation.

At that time, Piedmont obtained a lease to conduct its business at the Winston-Salem Municipal Airport, now known as the Smith Reynolds Airport, and received distributor franchises from Piper Aircraft Corporation and from Stinson Aircraft.

Until the outbreak of World War II, Piedmont was active in aircraft sales and service, flight training, and aircraft repair and engine overhaul. The company's primary and advanced flying schools were approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in 1940. The repair and overhaul facilities were approved by the same agency in 1941, making Piedmont's the only repair station between Washington, D.C., and Atlanta, Georgia.

During the war years, Piedmont devoted its entire efforts to the war program through government contracted flight training schools. After the ending of hostilities, Piedmont returned to its peacetime purpose—commercial aviation. And, seeing the need for air service to smaller communities, the company filed application June 6, 1944, with the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct scheduled local service airline operations in the Southeast. This application was included in a proceeding known as the Southeastern States Case, which in its outcome gave Piedmont authority to provide local air service over routes between Cincinnati and Louisville in the West and Norfolk, New Bern and Wilmington in the East.

Cities served on the routes between the terminal points included Southern Pines, Charlotte, Asheville, Goldsboro, Raleigh-Durham, Greensboro-High Point and Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Tri Cities (Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport), Tennessee; Lexington, Kentucky; Charleston, West Virginia; and Danville, Roanoke, Lynchburg and Richmond, Virginia.

The Airline Division of Piedmont Aviation, Inc., was formed January 1, 1948. Piedmont's first schedule was flown February 20, 1948, between Wilmington, North Carolina, and Cincinnati, Ohio, via intermediate cities. By May 14 of that year, all routes authorized by the CAB were being operated. At the end of 1948, Piedmont was providing air service to nineteen cities in the Southeast.

Piedmont, not resting on its laurels, continued looking to the future for better service to cities along and adjacent to its routes. By 1955, the airline, by government authorization, had added service to fourteen more cities.

On March 18, 1955, Piedmont began service to Columbus, Ohio, and the following August, service was begun to Washington, D.C., thus providing flights to two additional major cities, both excellent connecting points for its passengers.

The original certificate for Piedmont Airlines was for a three-year period. When application was made for its renewal, the CAB decided to renew the certificate for seven years—the longest such renewal given a local service carrier up to that time. The CAB, in reaching its decision, said, "The record achieved by Piedmont is so outstanding among local service carriers using DC-3 equipment as to merit special recognition." Piedmont was granted a permanent certificate December 6, 1955, effective February 2, 1956.

On June 10, 1956, Piedmont announced its order for eight new Fairchild F-27 prop jet transport planes at a cost of more than $6 million. Delivery of the 36-passenger, twin engine planes, powered by the famous Rolls Royce Dart prop jet engines, began in October, 1958. Piedmont's order was, up to that time, the largest ever placed by any of the nation's thirteen local service airlines.

The prop jet engines on the F-27 give the airplane a cruising speed of 280 miles per hour. Other advantages of the F-27 are weather radar equipment, automatic navigation and approach system, high wing configuration allowing a panoramic view from each cabin seat, pressurized and air-conditioned cabin, and a 2,250-mile range.

Scheduled operations with the new F-27 Pacemaker began November 14, 1958.

January 24, 1961, Piedmont received from the CAB authority to serve a route from Norfolk, Virginia, to Knoxville, Tennessee, including extensive additional service to many cities along Piedmont's system and two new communities being added. Rocky Mount and Elizabeth City, North Carolina, received Piedmont service for the first time.

Another milestone in Piedmont's progress was achieved when, on December 4, 1961, the company announced the purchase of seventeen Martin 404 aircraft and sale of fourteen of its seventeen Douglas DC-3 airplanes. The seventeen 404's and Piedmont's fleet of F-27 aircraft comprised the largest fleet of modern, pressurized aircraft in the local service air transport industry at that time.

The Martin 404, dubbed the "404 Pacemaker" by Piedmont, has a 44-passenger capacity as compared with the 24-passenger DC-3, which had been the backbone of the Piedmont fleet since the airline's beginning. Unlike the DC-3, the 404 is pressurized, air-conditioned, and equipped by Piedmont with airborne weather radar for detecting storms while the airplane is in flight and circumnavigating them. Pressurization within the cabin of the 404 permits rapid climbs and descents with no passenger discomfort. Powered by two Pratt Whitney 2400 horsepower engines, the 404 Pacemaker has a cruising speed of 265 miles an hour, double the horsepower and over a hundred miles per hour faster than the DC-3.

The purchase of other Martin 404 aircraft in subsequent months increased their number, and on February 20, 1963, the fifteenth anniversary of the airline, the last DC-3 airplane was retired after making its final scheduled run from Columbus, Ohio, to New Bern, North Carolina, via intermediate points. Aboard the "sentimental journey" were Piedmont President T. H. Davis and other company officials who were greeted by community leaders at each stop along the way.

Perhaps the most far-reaching single development in Piedmont's history up to that time came March 20, 1962, with a Civil Aeronautics Board order authorizing for the company a vast network of new North-South routes and new service authority. Included in the CAB order was authorization to serve eight new communities, including the major connecting points of Atlanta, Georgia, and Baltimore, Maryland, thus introducing two new states into Piedmont's system. Other new cities awarded Piedmont service for the first time were Pulaski-Radford-Blacksburg (New River Valley Airport), Virginia; Goldsboro, North Carolina; Jacksonville-Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; Florence, South Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; and Augusta, Georgia. The authorization of the new cities and the substantial increase in service to Piedmont's existing cities added about 2,000 more route miles to its system, representing an expansion of about fifty per cent over its former size. In the same Board order, the CAB gave Piedmont authority to operate year-'round at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina (heretofore a seasonal stop). Also highly significant was the fact that the CAB gave to Piedmont liberalized operating authority along the new and existing routes, which permitted more express-type service for its travelers and shippers. The new service began June 25, 1962.

Piedmont, heretofore primarily an East-West air carrier, became a North-South carrier as well and multiplied substantially its opportunities of wider service to the public.

On August 23, 1962, Piedmont filed with the CAB an application for authority to serve Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina, on a segment between Charlotte and Asheville. After a favorable recommendation by the CAB Examiner, the Board handed down its final decision January 25, 1967, providing service to these communities by Piedmont. Starting date for flights at the Greenville-Spartanburg jetport is April 1, 1967. The addition of Greenville and Spartanburg adds the seventy-first and seventy-second cities to the company's route system.

On March 18, 1963, Piedmont filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board applications for authority to serve four important cities to the South: Charleston, South Carolina, Savannah, Georgia, Brunswick-Sea Island, Georgia, and Jacksonville, Florida. The company has also applied for another segment from Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina, to Augusta, Savannah, Brunswick-Sea Island, and Jacksonville. These applications are now pending before the CAB.

Another highly significant CAB application was filed by Piedmont August 27, 1965, which asked for authorization to provide service between Roanoke, Virginia, and New York City, and including Lynchburg, Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, Hot Springs, Virginia, and Harrisonburg-Staunton-Waynesboro (Shenandoah Valley Airport), Virginia, with new service also provided to Washington, D.C., through Dulles International Airport.

In an unprecedented action the CAB on July 6, 1966, issued a "show cause" order tentatively approving Piedmont's application for New York service and affording any interested party twenty days within which to file objections. For perhaps the first time in history in such a situation, there were no airline objections to the New York service and the CAB issued the final order September 30, 1966, authorizing the service. The company began flights November 15, 1966, with five round trips daily into the LaGuardia Airport. Several of the flights were also scheduled to serve Dulles International Airport. The March 15, 1967, schedule revision increased the round trips provided New York to seven.

Cities provided direct one-plane service on the initial schedule were Roanoke, Lynchburg, Charlottesville, Shenandoah (Harrisonburg-Staunton-Waynesboro), all in Virginia, and Wilmington, Fayetteville-Fort Bragg, and Winston-Salem, in North Carolina. Other cities given single-plane service to New York include Charleston, Beckley and Bluefield-Princeton, all in West Virginia; Pulaski-Radford-Blacksburg (New River Valley Airport), Virginia; Asheville and Kinston, both in North Carolina; Augusta and Atlanta in Georgia; and Cincinnati, Ohio.

On December 16, 1964, Piedmont filed an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board for service beyond Knoxville, Tennessee, to Nashville, Tennessee. The application not only captured the interest of Nashville itself but also the support of communities in the two Carolinas and Virginia who saw the need for new and additional service to the Tennessee state capital.

As an outgrowth of that application, the CAB issued October 18, 1966, an order setting up a proceeding to determine whether Piedmont should be extended to both Nashville and Memphis, Tennessee. It is contemplated that a hearing will be held soon to determine whether Piedmont shall be granted this authority.

Other applications pending before the CAB include: A Huntington, West Virginia-Columbus, Ohio, extension via Portsmouth, Ohio; a route from Huntington to Lexington, Kentucky; and a route between Louisville, Kentucky, and Cincinnati, Ohio. Since the first year of airline operation, in which 39,370 passengers were carried 9,296,288 passenger miles, Piedmont Airlines has made rapid strides in traffic. The first millionth passenger was boarded in 1955, seven years after the airline began service. Two and one-half years later the second millionth passenger was boarded. And on December 7, 1964, Piedmont achieved its sales goal of a million passengers in a single year and wound up the year with 1,073,004. In 1965, the million-passenger mark was set as early as October and in 1966 the millionth passenger was boarded in August. The record for a single day in terms of passengers boarded is 6,064 passengers October 21, 1966, and July, 1966, thus far stands as the record month for passenger volume with 154,882 passengers using Piedmont's service.

A financial landmark was reached on October 21, 1964, when the Board of Directors declared a cash dividend of 10¢ per share on the company's common stock, the first cash dividend in Piedmont's history. It was also the first cash dividend to be paid by any publicly-owned local service airline in the nation. The Directors have declared a similar cash dividend of 10¢ per share, each six months since that time.

Anticipating even further increases in passenger, cargo and mail volume, Piedmont made two major aircraft purchases in the early months of 1966. In January the company placed an order for six Boeing 737 jetliners with an option for six more, representing the largest pure jet order and option agreement in the local service airline industry. The twin engine 737 is designed to operate over short-to-medium ranges at cruise speeds up to 580 miles per hour. The 737, featuring the same roomy cabin width and height as the largest intercontinental jet, will be arranged for a spacious 90-passenger first class seating configuration and will have built-in airstairs and a built-in power unit for starting the aircraft and for heating and cooling on the ground, thus contributing to ground time efficiency. Delivery of the 737 will begin in March of 1968 with one per month expected thereafter until all six have been put into service. The Boeing 737's will be used primarily in the major traffic markets on Piedmont's system.

In recognition of needs of the several moderate sized communities Piedmont is certificated to serve, the company in April 1966 ordered ten new Fairchild Hiller FH-227B twin prop jet airliners. The FH-227B, similar in appearance to and following in the tradition of the dependable F-27 operated by the company since 1958, is six feet longer than its predecessor and has a 44-passenger seating arrangement. It also has more powerful Rolls Royce engines, an advance cabin pressurization system, and cruises at 300 miles per hour. The first FH-227B was delivered to Piedmont in November of 1966. After installation of seating and other cabin appointments by Piedmont's maintenance department, it went into scheduled service in March. Other FH-227B's are to be added to the fleet at intervals of approximately thirty days until all ten are in service.

To provide pure jet service to its growing numbers of passengers and shippers during the interim until the Boeing 737's arrive in 1968. Piedmont has leased two Boeing 727 trijet airliners. The first three engine 727, familiar to airline passengers the world over, became a part of Piedmont's fleet March 15, 1967, serving primarily the major markets of New York, Washington and Atlanta, with intermediate stops. The second 727 had a scheduled delivery date of April 15. Containing many of the features to be included in the upcoming Boeing 737, the 727 is a medium range jet with built-in power unit and airstairs and roomy cabin interior. Piedmont is providing spacious first class seating in the 727 for 92 passengers.

According to the latest available CAB records, Piedmont is the only regional airline in the nation to have all its cities exceed the CAB's minimum "Use It or Lose It" standard of five boarding passengers per day at each point. The company, in announcing this industry "first", reiterated its policy of serving each airport on its system with a minimum of two daily round trips.

To test the market potential for "middle-of-the-night" airline service, Piedmont in September of 1966 inaugurated a new series of flights between Washington and Atlanta via Fayetteville and New Bern, all operating in the late-night and early-morning hours and labeled "Night Owl Pacemaker" flights. The flights are aimed at a market of passengers, especially military personnel, who prefer to travel later at night.

Piedmont now has a 9,000 route system over which its airplanes fly more than 53,000 miles a day. There are over 2,600 employees system-wide, and the annual payroll is over $17 million.

Piedmont now has the highest load factor of any of the nation's thirteen regional airlines and higher than many of the larger trunk airlines.

RECORD OF ANNUAL GROWTH, PIEDMONT AIRLINES

Year	Passenger[1]	Ton-Miles		
		Airmail	Air express	Air-freight
1948	39,370	18,785	18,832	15,548
1949	86,154	31,229	41,129	62,414
1950	123,762	51,835	84,454	134,346
1951	189,369	65,808	85,107	126,328
1952	224,206	85,823	95,688	147,652
1953	269,773	107,689	104,408	179,820
1954	308,194	109,868	107,381	153,356
1955	360,569	135,488	123,221	161,013
1956	403,784	172,230	153,487	144,474
1957	433,554	161,235	115,884	167,511
1958	445,261	170,815	145,056	153,422
1959	515,660	184,524	163,018	190,479
1960	494,541	166,610	170,399	234,539
1961	541,459	182 615	203,856	306,547
1962	721,683	368,334	381,915	525,891
1963	895,486	471,378	427,685	644,200
1964	1,073,004	617,648	478,042	855,068
1965	1,288,825	755,502	556,218	1,155,203
1966	1,606,772	1,058,227	670,559	1,452,895
1967	1,829 583	1,509,468	668,532	1,800,740

[1] Revenue passengers excluding charter.

PIEDMONT AIRLINES FACT SHEET

1. Piedmont Airlines began scheduled local service operations on February 20, 1948.

2. The number of employees has grown from 158 in 1948 to over 2,600 persons today.

3. Piedmont Airlines is authorized to operate into ten states and the District of Columbia, serving 77 cities in that area.

4. Piedmont Airlines presently has a fleet of 32 Martin 404 Pacemaker aircraft, 10 FH-227B prop jet aircraft, and a Boeing 727 jet airliner, for a total fleet of 43 airplanes.

5. Average miles flown exceed 53,000 daily, or over twice the distance around the world.

6. Piedmont Airlines has carried over 11.8 million passengers through 1966.

7. About 60% of the passengers who enjoy Piedmont service are "interline" or connecting passengers.

8. The total annual payroll system-wide of Piedmont is over $17 million.

9. There are approximately 9,000 people in the Piedmont "family," employees and dependents, or the equivalent of a moderate sized community.

10. There are over 7,000 shareholders in Piedmont Airlines parent organization Piedmont Aviation, Inc.

11. In 1967, Piedmont flights carried 1,829,583 passengers and 14,527,930 pounds of air freight, 6,089,790 pounds of air express, 8,866,838 pounds of air mail and 2,825,750 pounds of first class mail.

12. Piedmont Airlines in a recent year operated 175 charter trips.

13. Piedmont has recently purchased 10 YS-11A-200 turbo-prop jetliners from the Nihon Aeroplane Manufacturing Company of Japan.

14. Officers of Piedmont Airlines are: T. H. Davis, President and Treasurer; C. G. Brown, Jr., Vice President-Traffic and Sales; H. K. Saunders, Vice President-Operations; T. W. Morton, Secretary and Controller; W. W. Barber, Assistant Vice President-Purchasing; H. M. Cartwright, Assistant Vice President-Maintenance and Engineering; W. G. McGee, Assistant Vice President-Sales; and R. E. Turbiville, Assistant Vice President-Traffic.

Address by George D. Woods, President of the World Bank

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on February 9, 1968, at New Delhi, India, Mr. George D. Woods, president of the World Bank, made an interesting and illuminating address to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Mr. Woods' references to the urgent need of developing nations for funds and the advantages of multilateral organizations strike me as particularly interesting and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Woods' speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK, INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION, INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT, NEW DELHI, FEBRUARY 9, 1968

It is a special privilege and a special opportunity to address this second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The delegates here have traveled from the four corners of the earth, and the subjects they are to consider are of great import for the shape of the future. Quite apart from that, this Conference stands out as a symbol: it gives expression to the hopes of mankind that out of all the variegated and sometimes conflicting activities of peoples and nations there will emerge some kind of rational order. Our planet earth, with the moon within reach and a landing on Mars a possibility, seems smaller and smaller. Its peoples seem more and more dependent on each other. It is right to be here on this vast subcontinent, in India, to explore the stubborn problems of development and of trade.

It would be less than human not to admit that this occasion also has a particular meaning for me. In all probability, it is the last time that I will be speaking to an important intergovernmental conference as the President of the World Bank. And while I do not intend to use the occasion for reminiscence, perhaps you will permit me to give a somewhat personal and subjective view of the state of economic development two-thirds of the way through this Twentieth Century. While I shall not address myself to the Conference agenda items, the World Bank Group is deeply interested in them, and our representatives here will express our views on these matters.

The state of economic development must and can be improved. The Secretary-General and most of the delegates here know that by nature I am an optimist. I am not going to recant the views I have often expressed, that in many parts of the world development is succeeding, and that in many others it can begin to succeed. But so far, our accomplishments have fallen short of our aspirations.

We must be frank to say that in many parts of the world, the situation is discouraging, even disturbing. Here in our host country, the home of one-seventh of all the human race, after 20 years of independence many millions of people have yet to experience more than the feeblest manifestations of progress. Those who believe as I do that India is engaged in a task of deep meaning for all the developing countries, must be gravely concerned by the uncertainties that cloud her national life. India is an exceptionally dramatic case because of its size and its location on the troubled Asian continent; but it is by no means the only country where hope has dwindled toward despondency.

Why is this? Everyone in this hall, I am sure, agrees that the advance of the developing countries is of first importance to mankind. Delegates from the rich countries state this belief no less vehemently and frequently than those from the poor countries. But I am afraid that the record shows that the agreement still needs to be nurtured by decisions and deeds—by the rich and the poor—to give it reality and substance.

The basic reason may be that vast force in human affairs which is called inertia. Social values are slow to change; and the institutions that give them expression are slower still. Few institutions deliberately seek innovation; many, to say the least, shirk the ordeal of changing themselves in order to respond more quickly to changing human needs. And inertia, it seems to me, can only be overcome by perception: the leaders of both the prosperous and the poor countries must now grasp fully the nature of the situations that confront them.

For the less developed countries, it is earlier in their evolution, and there is much more to be done, than many of their governments are aware. On the face of our planet today, perhaps a billion people live in countries that have modern economies, in countries those societies are largely agreed on political forms and social objectives, in countries where, broadly speaking, progress toward those objectives is continuous. That leaves more than two billion people living in countries that are still facing the travail of economic and social transformation. Some of these countries are well along; and we can predict with some confidence that they will achieve stable societies and a relatively high standard of living within the next 30 or 20 years or even less. But other countries have scarcely begun the process: most important, some have still to achieve some semblance of political stability.

Every developing country, by definition, is still nation-building. Its main task is to become truly independent—not in a narrowly nationalistic sense, but in the sense that it is making the most of its resources for the good of its people, and that the nation itself, far from being dependent for direction and momentum on external forces, is a self-starting society in which the individual citizen has opportunity to develop his own creative and constructive possibilities.

Many countries fail to meet this ideal by the simplest possible test: they cannot feed themselves. I do not contend that any nation can or should achieve perfect, self-contained sufficiency in agriculture. But about 40 developing countries are net importers of food. The underdeveloped world imports 4½ billion dollars worth of food a year. So long as the poorer nations must continue to spend large amounts of precious foreign exchange on food imports, they are going to have to skimp on imports of the capital goods needed for development. It is abundantly clear that the underdeveloped countries must achieve much greater agricultural productivity if they are going to become modernized.

This is no less true for being trite; and trite as it is, it is a lesson that many of the less developed countries are just beginning to learn. But an increasing number at least are devoting to agriculture some of the attention that it deserves, in the form of investment, research, incentives and supports to production. Some have already learned how great are the dividends paid by a virile and healthy agricultural sector. For the future, important scientific advances are to be expected in agriculture; and the countries which now effect the necessary institutional and policy changes can be optimistic about the chances of beating back hunger and increasing their rate of economic growth.

If one hallmark of the less developed countries is that they are hungry, another is that they have the highest rates of population increase in the world. As an exercise in simple division, this depresses per capita income and standards of living. Even in countries not now overpeopled, the rapid growth in numbers works further damage to the dynamics of development: at the same time that it greatly increases a society's needs for the bare necessities of food, shelter and clothing, and for capital investment in schools, hospitals and elementary services, it seriously diminishes the ability to produce a surplus, to save and to invest in the expansion of production and the growth of income.

Of all the problems of the less developed, rapid population growth may be the most stubborn; it is certainly not easily within the reach of pressures and inducements of the kind that governments are able to provide. The experience of Japan immediately after the war, nevertheless, offers a remarkable demonstration of what can be done. Some underdeveloped countries now are beginning to show what they can do; the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea already have achieved a measurable reduction of birth rates, and the same trend is appearing in Ceylon. This is a start; if the problems can be met on a far wider scale, economic prospects of the less developed countries will become far more encouraging.

Another task is to conserve the capital that the underdeveloped countries already have. The apparently humdrum business of preventing the loss of capital already invested could greatly improve standards of living throughout the less developed world. Adequate maintenance of capital assets in the developed countries is planned and carried out as a matter of course. But in the poorer countries, the very concept is often lacking; and for want of maintenance, these countries must unnecessarily expend many millions of dollars annually to replace industrial machinery, buildings, power and transportation facilities that have been reduced to the point of uselessness or minimum efficiency through lack of care. To develop the concept and practice of maintenance, like many other things in the spectrum of economic progress, raises new and different problems, but few would be more worth solving.

Waste can be found in many sectors, but nowhere is it more serious than in agriculture. It is said that of all the crops produced in the world each year, about one-third—mostly in the hungry countries—is lost to spoilage, insects, vermin, fungus and plant diseases. If this loss could be prevented through better storage, herbicides and pesticides, the food crisis at least temporarily would disappear; and the problem of development finance in many countries would be considerably lightened. This is another unspectacular activity about which more should be done.

The developing countries must not only conserve the assets they have; they must also take measures to attract new investment—and particularly capital from abroad, with the technology, the experience in management and the links to world markets that international investment affords. Countries that adopt policies and take measures to make private capital welcome will find that such a course encourages the investment of public funds as well.

A task underlying all the other efforts is the improvement of human resources. "The foundation of every State," said Diogenes two thousand years ago, "is the education of its young." The spread of knowledge and useful skills is what led Europe out of the Dark Ages; it is the spread of knowledge that today will speed the developing countries into the last third of the Twentieth Century.

Despite the high value that the developing countries themselves have placed on schools, the educational effort has been tragically weakened by the expenditure of funds to no good purpose: on unplanned and unbalanced educational systems, on outmoded curricula and instruction not matched to the country's need for work and skills. A responsible and well-informed group of Latin American experts estimated a few years ago that half the expenditures on education in that part of the world has been wasted. Here is a sector in which development assistance must encourage and support a greatly improved effort.

The tasks of economic development place an exceptionally heavy burden on the leaders of the less developed countries. It is they, often in the most adverse and discouraging circumstances, who must stir the country's energies and wed them to the best use of resources, they who must create a sense of common purpose as the basis for orderly political evolution and change.

There are many leaders in the less developed countries today who are courageous, selfless and devoted; but unhappily there are some who are not. We see instances of personal aggrandizement; we witness waste through conspicuous and unproductive public expenditures; we see attempts to evade responsibility by blaming internal problems on other countries; we see failure to advocate and enforce necessary steps involving effort and a measure of sacrifice. And how to accomplish peaceful changes in the distribution of political power is a problem that in many of the less developed countries remains unsolved.

One of the serious liabilities of some poorer countries, in short, is leadership that does not lead. And one of the results is likely to be public apathy and cynicism instead of the ferment of enthusiasm and the hard work needed for economic progress.

The high-income countries, no less than the developing ones, stand in need of a new perspective. For them the time is *later* than they seem to think. The world is already well on the way to new extremes in the imbalance of population and income. The swift movement of these trends is not being adequately recognized in the priority accorded to development finance among the other claims on the energies and resources of the high-income countries.

Changes in population have been striking since the end of World War II and are proceeding at an accelerating speed. Only a little more than 30 years from now, for instance, Brazil will be as populous as the

United States or the Soviet Union is today, and at the same time, in the year 2000, the Philippines will be bigger than any country of Western Europe. The proportion of the world's population that lives in less developed countries, as compared with the number living in high-income countries, today is about two to one. Present trends would raise the ratio as high as three to one by the end of this century.

While the populous countries are rapidly becoming more populous, it is likely that the prosperous countries will go on becoming much more prosperous. On the basis of reasonable estimates, the gross national products of the high-income countries, which today total around $1,500 billion, will at least quadruple, to a figure of $6,000 billion or more by the end of the century.

The inescapable conclusion is that if we are to prevent an intolerable economic and political fission of the world, the development of the poorer countries requires a more effective and constructive participation of the developed nations on a high-priority basis.

Present policies of development assistance show too little recognition of this fact. The high-income countries do not seem to be thinking about tomorrow. Their aid policies have tended as much to mirror their own narrowest concerns as to focus effectively on the situation of the developing countries and its long-term meaning for the world as a whole. It is possible to overstate the case, but nevertheless it is true that up to now, bilateral programs of assistance have had as one of their primary objectives helping the high-income countries themselves; they have looked toward financing export sales, toward tactical support of diplomacy, toward holding military positions thought to be strategic.

These policies have not opened the window on a clear view of the tasks that ought to be undertaken in the less developed world. They have tended to distort assistance in favor of things rather than people. They have favored big construction which has required sales of big items of heavy equipment; they have delayed the attack on the fundamental problems of agriculture, of population growth and of education. They have obscured important differences in the developmental problems of different countries and different regions—between the tasks to be undertaken, for example, in Latin America and those in Africa south of the Sahara. Some aid has not only failed to be productive: by doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, by making the wrong use of the slender resources available, at times it may actually have retarded economic growth. Solutions to the problems of trade between the rich and the poor—most particularly with respect to prices of primary products—have not been devised.

It is time to consider basic changes. I would like to mention just three. Development assistance must, first of all, turn away from expediency and toward effectiveness. It must show a much greater skepticism about the extent to which the technology of the high-income countries can simply be transferred to the underdeveloped. It has been a long and painful experience to discover that the development of agriculture in the poorer countries requires different techniques from those used elsewhere. It is already evident that political institutions undergo a sea change when they travel from the countries which gave them birth; it may well be that forms of industrial and social organization, likewise, are not so transferable as we now suppose. Development finance must therefore demonstrate a greater regard for important national, cultural and regional differences that make the problems in each developing society unique. Development assistance must be much more concerned with helping the poorer countries evolve the technologies and build the institutions appropriate to their own circumstances.

The second change needed is toward a greater modesty and realism in expectations. There is no such thing as instant or painless development. Development requires deep-seated changes; these are not only going to take time, as more and more people are beginning to realize, but they no doubt will lead to continuing turbulence and even violence. For this, the nations providing assistance must realistically be prepared; they must not be easily discouraged or deterred.

The third and immediate change needed is improvement in the amounts and terms of capital transfers. As the members of this assembly are aware, the amount of these transfers, so far from keeping pace with what needs to be done, has tended to stagnate. Moreover, in many cases, capital is being transferred on terms that will eat heavily into the capacity of the receiving countries to finance future growth. The outstanding external public debt of the developing countries as a group is something over $40 billion. The problem is not only to alleviate the terms of future assistance for the ten or so developing countries that owe half this debt to 12 or 14 developed nations. There is equally urgent need to extend terms—amortization as well as interest—which will avoid similar problems in the future for the newer countries which are now at the point where they can use large sums for financing their development needs.

At the present time, some of the principal aid-giving countries are in the worst possible position: they are giving amounts of aid sufficiently large to irritate their own national legislatures, but too small to help accomplish real economic progress. No businessman would deliberately make less investment in an enterprise than was necessary for its success or on terms that would cloud its prospects; but that is what the developed countries, as a group, are doing today. If there is anything we should have learned by now, it is that we should make the most of our opportunities: the response to good performance in a developing country should be massive applications of development finance to multiply production and achieve lasting economic momentum.

There is evidence that the attitude of some high-income countries toward development assistance is beginning to change. Recently, the governments of half a dozen countries—Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands and Sweden— have reached decisions to increase their budgets for development assistance, in some cases by as much as 25% annually over the next few years. Another step now well advanced, I am happy to be able to report, is to increase the resources of the World Bank's affiliate, the International Development Association. This second replenishment is intended to enable IDA operations for a three-year period ending June 30, 1970, and will permit IDA to lift its commitments by an average of 60% annually over the level which the first replenishment was designed to achieve. I expect that negotiations will be completed in a matter of weeks and actions required by various legislative bodies will follow without undue delay.

But these are only thin streaks of light on a grey horizon. It is clear enough that the targets for development assistance often stated by the high-income countries, and thus far achieved only by France, cannot be reached until well after the end of this Development Decade of the 1960s, and then only if the tempo of increase quickens.

It is still my opinion that the developed countries would materially benefit their own interests if they could achieve a unified and consistent perspective of the problems of growth in the less developed countries and of the importance of that growth to their own well-being. For that reason, I have suggested that a group of leaders of intelligence, integrity and prestige be brought together for the purpose of studying the consequences of 20 years of development assistance, assessing the results, clarifying the errors and proposing the policies which will work better in the future. This proposal for a "grand assize" has been under consideration by governments and the reaction is generally favorable. I expect the group will be assembled and the study—in consultation with the countries of the Development Assistance Committee and the developing countries—will be started in the near future.

Embracing virtually all aspects of the development efforts and virtually all the nations engaged in it are the international organizations. Many of these are specialized agencies associated with the United Nations, but they also include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as well as the regional development banks. These entities have made significant contributions to economic development and the protection of peace. Their continuing participation in the world's everyday work is not the less useful because it is largely unhonored and unsung.

It would be unrealistic, nevertheless, not to recognize that the international organizations are in danger of disappointing the publics which support them. One reason may be that these organizations and their parliamentary bodies sometimes succumb to the risk of contributing more to the already worldwide surplus of oratory than to the stock of new ideas and useful activities. Another reason, unquestionably, is the continuing multiplication of new organizations. In the end, the sight of so many hands outstretched from so many different directions, in gestures either of help or of supplication, must lead to confusion and bewilderment.

It is time, I suggest, for us in the international organizations to take an anti-proliferation pledge: to reserve the creation of new entities for functions that clearly have no possible home among the many rooms offered by the international family; to allow the organizations to concentrate their attention on the improvement of existing efforts; and to permit them to work out a more effective coordination and distribution of labors among themselves. Looking at world and regional organizations directly concerned with development finance, it is easy to see, for instance, that we should go further in coordinating and centralizing functions of research, fact-gathering and reporting. That would reduce demands on the time and patience of our client countries and would increase our own efficiency. I am sure that other important opportunities for a better distribution of effort exist not only among the financial institutions but throughout the structure of international organizations.

I wish also to observe that international organizations, no less than national entities, must be alert to the necessity for new approaches. The tendency of any institution is to develop and apply standard formulas, a tendency from which I may say the World Bank Group is not immune. Working out new solutions and breaking old habits is not an easy task; but it will always be necessary for progress. In the World Bank Group, for instance, we have been slow to finance state-owned enterprises because of the problem in many countries of ensuring efficient management of undertakings that, for want of private savings, must operate under government sponsorship. We have only scratched the surface of financing projects to promote tourism, even though the results of such financing may be of first importance for economic development in a number of countries. No doubt other international organizations have barriers of thought which it would be equally useful to break down.

If there is one thing which all of us in the development business should remember, it is that we do live in a world of change. A world in which not only problems but opportunities are multiplying at increasing speed. The new opportunities being opened up by advances in technology, if we take advantage of them, could bring about important breakthroughs on some of the most difficult development problems, and could help bring about a spectacular transformation of the prospects of the developing countries. Let me mention a few possibilities:

One—Greatly increased yields in agriculture through the availability of large quantities of fertilizers at low cost. This can be achieved on the basis of new processes for producing cheap ammonia. A high degree of international cooperation is required to achieve the chain of primary materials, manufacturing facilities and financing and distribution organizations needed to serve individual countries. The problems which must be solved are formidable, but in my opinion not insoluble. Progress on this front would be of the greatest significance.

Two—A considerable fortification of nutrition, through the continuing development of plants producing high crop yields and containing high protein and caloric values. Advances already made in this respect are beginning to be widely applied here in India, for instance. Recent successes in the laboratory put us on a biological frontier which considerably increases the possibilities of developing products which will exceed in nutritional values anything now found in nature.

Three—Overcoming water shortages by making sea water usable for drinking, for industrial use and eventually for agricultural use. Processes for large-scale de-salting of sea water are soon to have their first trials; and the cost of making sea water suitable for drinking and for irrigation may in this generation approach levels which would make possible application on a wide scale.

Four—A worldwide slowing in rates of population growth, based on simple, inexpensive and reliable methods of birth control. Here the problem is not only further technical advance but also accelerated social action to see that the technology is used.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to this meeting as a banker, not as a diplomat, and I have not used the guarded phrases which international civil servants often employ. One of the great contributions which this meeting could make to the progress of human affairs would be to bring about a sharper feeling of urgency about the tasks of development. It therefore seemed to me that to indulge in an exercise of mere politeness would be a disservice to the Conference and would scarcely recognize the importance of its deliberations.

I have stated my opinion that up to now, performance in development and in development assistance has fallen short of our aspirations. The prosperous nations have been irresolute and to some extent even irrelevant in their efforts to assist the less developed countries. The underdeveloped world is very far from being in a position to say that it has done all it could to help itself. Among international organizations, a multiplicity sometimes verging on disarray is evident.

Despite this, much progress has been made and much more, I am convinced, is in prospect. Sheer physical achievement in the less developed world—the tens of millions of kilowatts of electric generating capacity, the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways and railways constructed or reconditioned, the multitude of industrial plants—has been tremendous.

Throughout many parts of the less developed world, an infrastructure has been put down on the basis of which other kinds of economic growth can and should proceed more rapidly. Even more portentous for the future is the growing number of people who are acquiring the skills and attitudes which will accelerate that growth. A number of countries have acquired the momentum that will carry them to satisfactory standards of living; and I think that in their forward movement, others will join in increasing numbers.

The speed at which development moves forward will depend much on the spirit in which the older and richer countries, the newer and poorer countries, and the international organizations all conduct their common efforts. *Imagination* will be indispensable to meet the many and almost infinitely diverse challenges of the situation of the developing nations. *Patience* is a quality which will be needed in plenty, because the way for many nations will be long; pauses and setbacks are bound to happen.

The tasks facing rich and poor countries alike—of reconciling rival political views, of relaxing social tensions, of refereeing intense competition for budgetary resources, of providing for internal order and external defense—these common tasks ought to engender mutual *respect* and *tolerance* between the countries giving aid and those receiving it. And in the face of the scale and seriousness of these responsibilities which national authorities are carrying, *humbly* is the way the international agencies, with their armies of initials, ought to conduct their business of trying to act as inspiration and guide to development.

Savants and scholars, Mr. Chairman, tell us that humanity is now passing through a revolutionary transformation more important than anything since the changes that followed on the invention of agriculture, perhaps ten thousand years ago. Advances in scientific discovery and technical application follow each other with more and more bewildering speed. The technological revolution greatly increases the potential of mankind, but increases it both for good and ill; we stand at a point where humanity literally has the power either to blow itself to bits or to achieve for the whole human race security and comfort of which kings of old never dreamed.

So far the world is only beginning to tap its new potential. The very coming together of this Conference, which provides a crossroads for discussion, is a hopeful sign that no one is satisfied with the present state of affairs. It gives reason to hope that at this particular turning in the road of human history, we will go in the right direction: that just as man turned long ago from savagery to civilization, he will now turn toward an increasingly better life on this planet.

Howard Ellis, Champion of Freedom of the Press

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Howard Ellis, one of Chicago's outstanding attorneys and a man internationally known for defending the freedom and rights of the press, died on Sunday, February 18.

Mr. Ellis was senior member of the law firm of Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, and served as general counsel for the Chicago Tribune, an outstanding Chicago newspaper.

This noted attorney was a man of integrity who was devoted to his country and lived according to the high ideals and principles which he never compromised.

Howard Ellis' untimely death leaves a tremendous gap among the ranks of those who have courageously championed the cause of freedom of the press.

Those who had the privilege of knowing Mr. Ellis intimately, as well as those who had the opportunity to associate with him occasionally, have suffered a great loss for he was a man highly respected and affectionately regarded by his community.

An editorial about Howard Ellis, which appeared in the February 20 edition of the Chicago Tribune, follows:

HOWARD ELLIS

Howard Ellis was one of the fortunate few to be able to do in his lifetime something which will be remembered. He was a lawyer, and a distinguished one, but his services transcended the routine of office and courtroom which affords so many lawyers a comfortable living.

The record he leaves behind provides an imperishable contribution in defense of the freedom of the press. Howard Ellis was a principal in some of the landmark cases of our time. He and his late associate, Weymouth Kirkland, were general counsel for the Tribune. Together they represented this newspaper in cases which gave added impregnability to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press.

Mr. Ellis was also an expert on the law of libel. In Henry Ford's suit against the Tribune, he enunciated the doctrine of "fair comment" which the courts have not only accepted but greatly extended.

In 1920 Mr. Ellis and Mr. Kirkland represented the Tribune before the Supreme court of Illinois in a suit in which the Chicago city administration of William Hale Thompson tried to reactivate the discredited doctrine of libel upon government. Chief Justice Floyd Thompson, in the decision holding for the Tribune, said, "If this action can be maintained against a newspaper it can be maintained against every private citizen who ventures to criticize the ministers who are temporarily conducting the affairs of his government."

When the Saturday Press of Minneapolis was suppressed by injunction in 1930, the Tribune intervened in behalf of the proprietor, J. M. Near. Ellis and Kirkland carried the case to the United States Supreme court, which held the Minnesota gag law unconstitutional. Chief Justice Hughes said that the Minnesota law was "the essence of censorship" and that previous restraints upon publication to protect public officers could not be countenanced.

Mr. Ellis was also of counsel in another action brought against the city of Chicago by the Tribune, attacking the payment of "expert fees" in land appraisals. This challenge did much to discourage the perpetuation of a political abuse.

We who knew him will miss Howard Ellis tremendously. He was a man of charm, of great intellectual capacity, and one of the most brilliant legal scholars in the bar. His abiding monument is the service he performed in the great cause of free and unfettered expression.

Statement in Support of H.R. 14935, 90th Congress, To Regulate the Mailing of Master Keys for Automobiles

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my congratulations to Chairman

NIX and his subcommittee for the work performed in drafting this fine legislation regulating the mailing of master keys for motor vehicles.

I think there is an imperative and growing need for this legislation. Each year the American public is burdened with increasing costs for automobile insurance. Without question, one of the factors contributing to increasing automobile insurance premiums is the mounting number of stolen automobiles. Each year we have a marked increase in the number of automobiles reported stolen. Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics indicate that the number of vehicles stolen has increased 71 percent in 5 years, from a total of 326,000 in 1961 to 557,000 in 1966. Furthermore, the FBI reports that for the first 9 months of 1967, January through September, the number of automobiles reported stolen had increased by 17 percent over the number for the comparable period of 1966. At the present rate one vehicle is stolen in the United States every minute around the clock throughout the year, and by 1970, if we continue at the present rate, we will surpass a million automobiles stolen per year reaching an average of one every 30 seconds.

Last year in testimony prepared for the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, Michael J. Murphy, president of the National Automobile Theft Bureau, called for a Federal law prohibiting "the indiscriminate sale of master keys in interstate commerce." Mr. Murphy said mail order firms solicit sales of master keys by direct mail and through advertisements in national magazines. He said:

> The ads state that the sets are for legitimate use only, but we have found that nearly anyone can obtain complete sets with ease.

Mr. Murphy explained that members of his staff using their home addresses purchased master keys without trouble.

Mr. Murphy further stated:

> We have no figures to support our contention that a growing number of thieves are also among the customers, but our agents and the police with whom we work point to a rising number of stolen cars recovered which show no signs of forcible entry, an increasing number of cars stolen from once comparatively safe parking lots and garages, and frequent arrest of persons in possession of master keys.

A particularly disturbing aspect of the indiscriminate sale of master keys is that to the extent that these keys are used for theft of automobiles, the United States Government is abetting this crime by allowing irresponsible operators to advertise, sell, and deliver master keys through the U.S. mail service.

Enactment of this legislation would be of benefit to local law enforcement officials by reducing the flow of master keys to juveniles and irresponsible members of society.

The proposed legislation will not preclude the sale and use of master keys for legitimate purposes. It is intended to restrict such sales to legitimate users only.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of the bill, H.R. 14935. I realize that even with enactment of the proposed legislation we cannot expect to keep master keys completely out of the hands of professional auto thieves, but, at the very least, we can eliminate the ready availability of them. I think that it is particularly important that we act to remove the temptation for youngsters to obtain master keys. We do not know to what extent this temptation contributes to juvenile delinquency, but with our increasing juvenile delinquency rate, we do know that we must seriously consider every means to reduce contributing factors. Again, may I say that I thank you for the occasion to express my views on this proposed legislation which our country needs.

Some Facts About the Draft System and the Man Who Directs It

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's action last week in removing draft deferments for almost all graduate students, effective this June, is of considerable importance to many people.

To contribute to the understanding of why this was done, by whom it was done, and, most important, the personal philosophy of the head of the Selective Service System who must put these rules into effect, the following articles will be helpful: "Draft Call of Oldest Laid to President," from the Washington, D.C., Post of February 18, 1968; "For the Long Haul, a Tougher Draft," from the New York Times of February 18, 1968; and "The Homespun Philosophy of Draft Director Hershey" from the Washington, D.C., Star of February 18, 1968:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 18, 1968]

DRAFT CALL OF OLDEST LAID TO PRESIDENT

(By Morton Mintz)

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey said yesterday that the controversial policy of calling up the oldest draft-eligible men first was continued Friday by order of the White House.

"The decision was made from the top," Hershey said in a telephone interview.

In a telegram Friday to all state directors of the Selective Service System, Hershey said, "A change in the order of call is not justified at this time. Fairness and equity . . . as well as the interest of the Nation, require that this long-standing practice be maintained."

This ran counter to President Johnson's message of March 6, 1967, on the Selective Service System. Three recent studies of the draft "reveal that the current order of call is undesirable from the point of view of everyone involved—and is actually the reverse of what it should be," the President said.

"I will issue an Executive Order directing that in the future, as other measures I am proposing are put into effect, men be drafted beginning at age 19," Mr. Johnson added.

The order was never issued. Last summer, Congress itself revised the Selective Service Act. It continued deferments for undergraduates and eliminated them, as of next June, for most graduate students. This laid the groundwork for the new draft uproar.

Friday's announcement that there would be no change in the order of call was coupled with another, which carried out the Congressional mandate by ending graduate deferments except for medical and dental students, who were singled out by the National Security Council.

The combined announcement produced a stream of angry protests from university spokesmen who foresaw a devastating impact on graduate school enrollments.

"The Council of Graduate Schools is appalled," said its president, Gustave Arlt, in one of the stronger reactions. "It is obvious that the decisions were based on purely political considerations."

In a telecast taped last Wednesday for use tonight, Vice President Humphrey recalled "the Burke Marshall Commission" and said, "I hope that the Congress will take note of the recommendations of that Commission and make a very substantial revision of Selective Service."

Marshall, former chief of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, headed President Johnson's National Advisory Committee on Selective Service. Its report preceded the President's 1967 message.

One of its disregarded recommendations was that 19-year-olds be drafted first.

In Bedford, N.Y., Marshall said in a telephone interview: "I don't understand . . . the reasoning that led them to the conclusion that they couldn't reverse the order of call."

Hershey said one suggested alternative, setting up several separate age groups for each draft call, would create a "bedlam" of administrative difficulties, although he "would not say we couldn't do it."

The educators' view is that the Government has created a bedlam in higher education by pursuing a policy that will mean fewer draft calls for groups who in large numbers do not go to college at all—Negroes and the poor.

Russell I. Thackrey, executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges said that the "prime target" of the draft now becomes the estimated 226,000 first-year graduate students and seniors graduating next June. The total is only 14,000 short of the expected draft call for the fiscal year beginning in July.

On "Face to Face" (WTTG) at 7 tonight, the Vice President takes a different tack. ". . . students have really less to complain about Selective Service than most other people," Humphrey says on the taped-in-advance program.

"It's the non-student that really gets rooked in this one and really gets hooked up, I should say, in this business."

Dean Colin S. Pittendrigh of Princeton University's graduate school said that an intake of graduate students will give the armed forces "older men, primarily intellectuals . . . not the most useful soldiers."

The most useful in the eyes of the Army are said to be 19-year-olds. Gen. Hershey hinted in the interview, however, that the Army's view is not necessarily that of the Defense Department. He remarked that his own son-in-law is an Army officer who "would like to have some men old enough to be non-coms."

Kingman Brewster, president of Yale University, is one of several educators who prefer no student deferments at all and a substitution of a system of random selection for the draft.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1968]

FOR THE LONG HAUL, A TOUGHER DRAFT

After several months of hesitation, President Johnson acted on Friday to remove one of the most criticized inequities in the draft system—deferments for graduate students.

The National Security Council—in effect Mr. Johnson, who is its chairman—made public a decision to abolish most graduate student deferments effective this June. The Council also suspended indefinitely the administrative basis for occupational deferments granted to about 170,000 men, another aspect of the draft system the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service had attacked as unnecessary and inequitable in its report to Mr. Johnson last winter.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

The Council made exceptions in both areas.

Graduate students in medicine and dentistry and those in the allied fields of osteopathy, optometry and veterinary medicine will continue to be deferred. About 50 per cent of these students will eventually be taken into service anyway through the special doctors draft.

Other graduate students who had completed a year of graduate study by last Oct. 1 toward a doctoral or an equivalent professional degree, or a combination of master's and doctoral degrees, will continue to be deferred for a total of five years, including any years of graduate study prior to Oct. 1, 1967.

But the rest, the great majority, will now be vulnerable to the draft.

Despite the suspension of the lists of critical occupations and essential activities by the N.S.C. the nation's 4,084 local draft boards will retain wide discretionary powers to continue such deferments to avoid hardships for their communities.

About half the 339,474 occupational deferments held by draft registrants are already based on this discretionary power. A board may, for example, defer the only electrician available at a local manufacturing plant if his induction would hamper the plant's ability to operate.

OLDEST FIRST

Mr. Johnson left intact the current draft process under which the oldest men are taken first in the chronological order of their birth dates.

His decision on graduate deferments in these circumstances aroused educators because of the serious effect on the graduate schools and it was expected to have wide political repercussions.

Beginning this June for the first time, the sons of the urban middle class will begin to feel the burden of the heavy draft calls that have been levied since 1965 to conscript soldiers for the battlefields in Vietnam.

Administration officials said they expected from 100,000 to 150,000 men to be drafted during fiscal year 1969, beginning July 1, as a result of the decision on graduate deferments. Another approximately 75,000 are expected to volunteer for service under the threat of the draft.

They will include the June graduates of four-year colleges, current first-year graduate students and men who will receive their master's degree this June. There are now approximately 350,000 four-year college seniors, 144,000 first year graduate students and 56,000 master's degree and Ph.D. candidates.

About 41 per cent of the roughly 550,000 men in these categories will thus either be drafted or induced to enlist by the threat of conscription if the higher combined official estimate of both groups, 225,000 men, is taken.

The magnitude of the effect can be ascertained when the major portion of these 225,000 men—the 150,000 who may not choose to enlist and are drafted outright by 1969—is compared to the 14,000 four-year college graduates who will be drafted during the current fiscal year.

To avoid this roughly 10-fold increase, educators had pressured Mr. Johnson to institute a new draft selection process whereby men would be taken in proportions from each age group from 19 through the cutoff age of 25 years.

REASONING GIVEN

White House sources said this proposal was rejected, however, on two grounds. First, it would have been unfair to the draft registrants by exposing them to repeated and growing jeopardy as they progressed through each age group; and second, it would have been administratively unworkable with the 4,084 local boards.

The sources pointed out that Congress had rejected last summer Mr. Johnson's attempt to create a random selection system, or draft lottery, which would have eased the impact on the graduate schools and was favored by educators.

[From the Washington (D.C. Sunday Star, Feb. 18, 1968]

THE HOMESPUN PHILOSOPHY OF DRAFT DIRECTOR HERSHEY

(By John Barbour)

The man who drafted 14 million young Americans for three disparate wars considers his critics regretfully, as a plowman considers an acre of marshland unfit for the plow.

He is 74 now, but still with a drawling sense of irony learned in boyhood on an Indiana farm where orphaned lambs were bottle-fed, calves were weaned early, and a boy at age 4 kept the woodbox full for seven days a week.

"Well," said Lewis Blaine Hershey, his voice rising and bending with age, "fortunately for the people who want to be against something, the draft is very easily personalized because it happens to have a director.

"And it's a lot easier to hate a guy than it is to hate an idea."

For some, this rough-speaking, heavily built man is both the idea and the guy. In 28 years, as director of Selective Service, he's been assailed before. But his critics are more vehement, angrier now.

They call for his resignation, a revision of the draft law, an end to the war in Vietnam. They accuse him of restricting free speech, of not being uniform in draft policy, of being too old to do his job. His headquarters has been picketed. Draft centers have been mobbed. Congressmen and senators, clergymen and professors, students and mothers have berated him in dramatic, emotional and erudite prose.

PEOPLE TOO SMART

But Hershey settles into the big brown leather chair next to his desk and remembers how as a young man in Indiana he took a prisoner unshackled to the state work farm for his father who was sheriff. They had a flat tire, and the prisoner worked voluntarily and feverishly to change it so they could catch the train in time.

"Well," Hershey drawled, "he had enough sense to know I had a duty. And, after all, if people aren't too smart, they generally understand. Sometimes people get too smart. They get so much knowledge it bothers them. They know how it happened in Rome, and how it happened in Greece, and how it happened several other places. And they kind of lose sight of how it's happening here.

"I do think," Hershey said, "that we got some people who have carried the ideas of building an ideal world to the place where they're quite a little remote from the world they find."

The world of Lewis Hershey is a down-to-earth world, and an imperfect one. Because of an old polo accident, he wears a glass eye, but he squints so tightly it is often hard to tell which eye is the bad one. His creased face has the look of a pioneer fort with rifle slits through which someone is watching.

From within, he measures his critics and their reasons.

"I get caught by all the people who are on the Hill who are raising hell," he said. He can appreciate, he added, a man who is running for office who attacks him to get his name in the papers. He can understand criticism from a senator who gets 300 letters from women whose sons have been inducted.

"Do I blame the mother for writing?" he asked. "Hell, no. But on the other hand, do I blame her for having lived pretty nicely in this country for a long time? You can't have one without the other."

THE BOUNTY JUMPERS

The criticism bothers him. But this day in his spacious office, surrounded by the flags of every state and territory that has a draft office, he was philosophical about it.

He talked of Civil War days, of the bounty jumpers, boys who took anywhere from $300 to $1,300 for volunteering, who'd then disappear and go elsewhere to take another name and volunteer again for another bounty.

"Well, of course," Hershey said, "they couldn't do that very long. So they started sending them under guard-volunteers, you see, under guard."

But even that didn't work. They'd still run off, jump on trains, kill each other to steal the bounty. Finally it got so bad, he said, the conscription officers had to take their volunteers off to war in handcuffs.

The specter of that kind of coercion and that kind of chaos haunts Hershey. It is the way armies are raised in primitive countries. The result, he said, is that you get only the men too poor to buy their way out, or not smart enough to talk their way out. In Hershey's turn-of-the-century rural Indiana, militia service was considered on a par with taxes, and a man could get credit for militia time by working on the roads. Hershey, whose father was once road supervisor, helped keep track of the time.

War by war, the U.S. Selective Service System was built out of chaos into the neighborhood-oriented draft that Hershey took over shortly before World War II. The idea was to leave the individual cases to local decisions while setting a national standard for registration.

"The thing you've got to have in a selective service system is one that produces people either by enlistment or by being inducted to the numbers that the armed forces want," Hershey said.

"And one of the things if I were the enemy, if I were a person who didn't like the United States, I would try to destroy the Selective Service System if I possibly could, because it's the one area in which people are more immediately participating in governing themselves by deciding on a local level who should go, and not to suit a lot of people."

RUGGED APPEAL

In his rambling way, Hershey shifts from folksy recollections to a sort of homespun eloquence. He spices his sentences with small, sardonic chuckles, often leaves them incomplete as if the ending should be understood, as if there were one possible conclusion inherent in his shrug or vocalized pause. His verbs and pronouns take on a farmer's indifference for singular or plural. Out of it all comes a gentle charm and rugged appeal.

Perhaps, he said, there is no way to make a draft system completely uniform. The British and the Turks, seeking ways, asked him how do you take some of the men, and leave some. And he told them he'd been at it for a long time, but he didn't have the answer yet, not one everyone would like. Too many things make for inequality.

"A physical examination that rejects 40 to 50 percent of the people?" Hershey said. "How are you going to tell the public that that's fair?

"We have been shouting around in the past, probably too much, about homosexuality. And yet, the armed forces, if they have any evidence, are going to reject them. Well, how is it that all you have to be is a homosexual to get out of doing your duty?

"I don't know the answer to the thing, and there isn't anything I can do about it. Because the Congress says who has to go, the armed forces says whom they'll take, and tell me how fast they'll take anybody. And all we got to do is figure how the individual fits into that pattern. We didn't give him the obligation."

Those who object to war on religious grounds are not new to the system. But even they vary. One, Hershey explained, may not like war but decide the only way to be rid of it is to fight it. Another may object to bearing arms, another to wearing the uniform. They do not object to some humanitarian service in the nation's interest.

THE OBJECTORS

But then you have some, he said, who will not tolerate any of it, not for religious beliefs, but as a matter of conscience.

"It does make a problem," Hershey said. "Because no matter what you tell them you're in trouble. If you say, 'I'm not gonig to ask you to scar up your conscience because you're going to have to live with your conscience a lot longer than you have to live with me or anybody else. And if your conscience prevents you from doing anything, the only honest thing is to go to the penitentiary."

"But that's a helluva thing to tell a kid. But what are you going to tell him, if in the first place he says, 'I'm not against all war. I'm just against this war. It's not for religious reasons. But I just can't participate in it. What shall I do?' You see, there's not much of anything to tell him. Yet, when you tell them to go to the penitentiary, they said the director of selective service went around advising young men to go to the penitentiary."

Hershey has served, but not fought, in two wars, one against a Mexican bandit, one against a German emperor. He has gathered men for three wars, against a Nazi dictator, against the Korean Communist, and this war in Vietnam. Much of the present trouble stems, he admits, from the confusion, the nonexistent fronts, the omnipresent guerrilla and the remoteness of the limited conflict. It's hard to get people to realize "exactly what the situation is, especially if you don't know what it is, and I don't pretend to.

"But I do know," he said, "that we've massacred distance to the point where we can't use it as I was brought up to use it. Now in the old days, if you cut the trees back far enough so you got two or three shots at the Indians as they came in toward the cabin, you figured you could defend it. But where you going to put your outposts now? And how?"

CONFUSED YOUNGSTERS

Ultimately, for this man with 13 grandchildren, the problem gets down to youngsters.

"In a way I am responsible that the boys between 19 and 26 are liable," Hershey said. "Of course, Congress passed the law. Just the same, so far as the boy is concerned, I'm the guy."

Yet today's youngsters, he feels, are not fundamentally different, and if he were younger, "I'd be quite challenged to take on some of these kids because I don't think there's any problem with them."

"I've had some discussions with these kids when they decided to quit fooling with the United States," Hershey said. "And I've said to them, 'Are you through with the United States? Is it all right for them to be through with you?' And they said, 'Well, that's fair enough.' So I said, 'All right, don't walk on the sidewalks, but don't get into the street either, because both of them are part of this thing.'"

During one demonstration, a young boy whose brother was flying in Vietnam came out of the crowd and asked to see Hershey alone. "He sat in this chair," Hershey remembered. "I think he came in to tell me that he tore up his card, and I think he had it in his pocket, but I never saw it. He said he was through with this country, but after we talked awhile he ended up saying, 'I guess I'm confused.'"

The youngsters he's met, he said, are surprisingly honest when you get them alone, but not always in a group. The circumstances of their growing up are different.

"Remember when I was a kid, kids didn't have a television set; they never heard a radio; until I was 8 or 9 years old, if they ever got their mail, they drove somewhere to get it, because we didn't even have rural routes."

LEARN MEANNESS

"And a kid," Hershey said, "living like I did, didn't have the opportunity to learn a lot of meanness. I had to do it more or less on a limited scale. You see I didn't have a chance to see how they could be mean everywhere: 'Let's get on the television at such a time of day because they're going to have the latest meanness. It's going to be demonstrated.'

"And so these kids," he went on, "haven't had the time to build up the immunity that you build up against measles or some sort of thing when you get exposed to it. And we were not angels either. I don't think I was any worse than most, but there were attempts to gain attention by deviltry when I was young. We didn't have the facilities. Even a fella on a bicycle—which I never had—couldn't have run over anybody near as hard as if he'd had a car.

"And not only that, I think there is a little tendency to delay adulthood in the more civilized your society," Hershey said, "because when you get out on the frontiers you better grow up. When my people went out to Indiana, the people who couldn't get up a tree very fast got eaten up by the wolves. And so you didn't have a problem. The guy who was a little slow, he wasn't around.

"But at the present time, we overprotect our young in the first place, and yet we push them into adulthood at the same time—which has the kid going forward and astern."

Of Hershey's two sons, one is in the Marine Corps and was wounded in Korea, and the other was a Naval officer in World War II. They too lived differently from the boy who grew up on an Indiana farm.

TREE-SITTERS

"I've seen a lot of these things before," Hershey said from the perspective of father. "I saw kids sit in trees, but they quit doing it. We got to worrying about it. Thought all the kids would go up in the trees. But they didn't. They came down pretty soon, and there wasn't anybody left sitting in the trees.

"I had a kid in the Marine Corps now that stayed 36 hours in a tree. Made some kind of a record. But we shouldn't have worried too much, because he came down. I don't believe he's been up in a tree since I don't know when."

In a sense, Lt. Gen. Hershey is a bridge between newborn America of today, struggling with the puzzles of its adulthood. His grandmother, wearing the black bonnet and black clothes in the custom of Mennonites, told him of seeing Lafayette when she was a child. He remembers starting the morning fire with corncobs soaked in kerosene oil and being taught that work "was good for you," and that the wealthy man who didn't work because he didn't have to was little better than the bum who wouldn't work at all.

He went to a one-room schoolhouse heated by stove, where "for better or for worse, I knew my teachers well." And he taught in a one-room schoolhouse, and was a part-time deputy when his father was sheriff because the job was "just a little more than one man could do, and quite a lot less than two could do." And with what his father paid him out of his own pocket, Hershey went to college.

In his present world, the general works with the Red Cross and the Boy Scouts, is frightened by the prospect of having nothing to do some day, and doesn't like to think of who will replace him.

"I'm probably shortsighted enough to think that in my lights I'm right," he said. "I have felt that to the best of my knowledge and ability I was doing what I thought was good for my country, and that was selfishness because I have some children and some grandchildren. They're going to have to live in this country, and if there isn't a country, I don't know where they will live.

"And I happen to believe from what I know of our history and what I've lived, I just don't know any country I like better than this one. Ah, what is it? 'England with all thy faults I love thee still,' said somebody. And I could say the same thing about America."

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XXI

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the first session of the 90th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes taken during the first session. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through 36,418 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bill which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the first session of the 80th Congress. This is the 21st report of my voting and attendance record. These 21 reports show how I voted on 2,897 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 93 percent.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 202 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls. I answered "present" to 193 quorum calls and I was absent for nine quorum calls.

The report follows:

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 10	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 246, Gerald Ford 186)	Ford.
		H. Res. 1, authorizing the seating of Adam Clayton Powell and providing for an investigation and report on his conduct within 60 days:	
3	Jan. 10	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 126 to 305)	Nay.
4	Jan. 10	On amendment denying the seating of Powell and providing for an investigation and report within 5 weeks. (Agreed to 364 to 64)	Yea.
		H. Res. 7, adopting the rules of the 89th Cong. as the rules of the 90th Cong.:	
5	Jan. 10	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 196 to 224)	Nay.
6	Jan. 10	On amendment eliminating 21-day rule which gave authority to Speaker to bypass Rules Committee and call up legislation. (Agreed to 232 to 185)	Yea.
		H. Res. 226, providing for consideration of H.R. 4573, increasing temporary national debt limit from $330,000,000,000 to $336,000,000,000:	
11	Feb. 8	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 223 to 184)	Nay.
12	Feb. 8	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to include participation sales certificates under debt limit. (Rejected 155 to 261)	Yea.
13	Feb. 8	On passage. (Passed 215 to 199)	Nay
		H.R. 2, barring merger of Army Reserve and National Guard:	
15	Feb. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 324 to 13)	Yea.
		H. Res. 83, authorizing Agriculture Committee to make various investigations:	
17	Feb. 21	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 231 to 85)	Not voting.
18	Feb. 21	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 304 to 18)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 278, ordering public censure and punishment of Adam Clayton Powell as recommended by special committee:	
22	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 202 to 222)	Yea.
23	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments) on substitute language excluding Adam Powell from Congress. (Ordered 263 to 161)	Yea.
24	Mar. 1	On substitute lanaguage excluding Adam Clayton Powell from Congress. (Agreed to 248 to 176)	Nay.
25	Mar. 1	On agreeing to resolution as amended. (Agreed to 307 to 116)	Yea.
26	Mar. 2	On ordering previous question on the preamble of resolution. (Ordered 307 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 4515 (later S. 665) authorizing supplemental appropriations of $4,500,000,000 for Vietnam war:	
28	Mar. 2	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar funds for North Vietnam bombing. (Rejected 18 to 372)	Not voting.[2]
		S. 665, authorizing supplemental appropriations of $4,500,000,000 for Vietnam war:	
30	Mar. 8	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 363 to 13)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 267, authorizing emergency food assistance to India:	
32	Mar. 9	On passage of joint resolution. (Passed 311 to 63)	Yea.
		H. Res. 376, authorizing special counsel to represent the House of Representatives in litigation filed by Adam Clayton Powell:	
33	Mar. 9	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 254 to 85)	Yea.
		H.R. 6098, extending tax on purchase of certain foreign securities (interest equalization bill):	
36	Mar. 15	On passage. (Passed 261 to 138)	Yea.
		H.R. 7123, appropriating $12,000,000,000 for Vietnam for fiscal 1967 (supplemental):	
38	Mar. 16	On passage. (Passed 385 to 11)	Yea.
		H.R. 6950, restoring investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation:	
39	Mar. 16	On passage. (Passed 386 to 2)	Yea.
		H.R. 2068, increasing certain veterans' benefits:	
40	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 359 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 2513, establishing Commission on National Observances and Holidays:	
41	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 35)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 5277, authorizing funds for Pacific Trust Territory civil government:	
43	Mar. 21	On passage. (Passed 371 to 15)	Yea.
		H.R. 7501, appropriating $7,500,000,000 for Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office for fiscal 1968:	
45	Mar. 22	On amendment eliminating 15 new positions authorized for Treasury. (Agreed to 210 to 175)	Yea.
46	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce total funds by 5 percent. (Rejected 168 to 217)	Yea.
47	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 371 to 7.)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 428, supporting increased aid to Latin America under Alliance for Progress:	
49	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to welcome the OAS meeting at Punta del Este, Uruguay, without promising aid ahead of time. (Rejected 147 to 210)	Yea.
50	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 234 to 118.)	Not voting.[2]
		H. Res. 364, authorizing $250,000 for House Committee on Science and Astronautics:	
52	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide minority staff. (Rejected 176 to 215.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 221, authorizing $350,000 for House Committee on Un-American Activities:	
53	Apr. 5	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Accepted 305 to 92.)	Yea.
54	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit with instructions that open hearings be held on the justification for funds. (Rejected 92 to 304.)	Nay.
55	Apr. 5	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 348 to 43.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
57	Apr. 6	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 347 to 42.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
60	Apr. 6	On motion to strike enacting clause (kill the bill). (Rejected 126 to 252)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 493, postponing railway strike for 20 days:	
62	Apr. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 396 to 8)	Yea.
		H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
63	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed 379 to 29)	Yea.
		H.R. 5404, expanding and improving National Science Foundation:	
65	Apr. 12	On passage. (Passed 391 to 22)	Yea.
		H. Res. 418, establishing a standing House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:	
68	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 400 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 443, expressing condolence over death of Konrad Adenauer:	
70	Apr. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 357 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 207, authorizing nuclear power and desalting plant in California:	
71	Apr. 20	On passage. (Passed 315 to 38)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 9029, appropriating $1,400,000,000 for Department of the Interior for fiscal 1968:	
73	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by 5 percent. (Rejected 158 to 231.)	Yea.
74	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 376 to 11.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 442, providing for consideration of H.R. 2508, setting population guidelines for the States in establishing congressional districts:	
75	Apr. 27	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 284 to 99.)	Not voting.[3]
		H.R. 2508, setting population guidelines for the States in establishing congressional districts:	
76	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete exemption allowing Representatives at Large from Hawaii and New Mexico until 1972. (Rejected 161 to 203.)	Not voting.[1]
77	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 289 to 63.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.J. Res. 543, postponing railway strike for 47 days:	
79	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 56.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9481, appropriating $2,000,000,000 for military and civilian pay (supplemental):	
81	May 3	On passage. (Passed 391 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9240, authorizing defense procurement, research, and development:	
84	May 9	On passage. (Passed 401 to 3)	Yea.
		H. Res. 161, providing additional $1,200 annually for Members' telephone expenses:	
86	May 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 189 to 157)	Nay.
		H. Res. 464, authorizing additional 78 members of Capitol Police:	
87	May 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 334 to 16)	Yea.
		H.R. 9960, appropriating $10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:	
92	May 17	On amendment to eliminate $10,000,000 for rent supplements. (Agreed to 232 to 171)	Yea.
93	May 17	On motion to recommit with instructions to omit all but planning funds for model cities program. (Rejected 193 to 213)	Yea.
94	May 17	On passage. (Passed 347 to 56)	Yea.
		H.R. 6431, extending community mental health center program:	
95	May 17	On passage. (Passed 353 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 7819, authorizing funds for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs:	
102	May 24	On amendment restoring formula giving greater emphasis to impoverished children in poorer States. (Accepted 221 to 195.)	Yea.
103	May 24	On amendment allowing States to participate in planning supplementary educational centers. (Accepted 230 to 185.)	Yea.
104	May 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to hold further hearings. (Rejected 180 to 236.)	Yea.
105	May 24	On passage. (Passed 294 to 122.)	Nay.
		S. 1432, extending and revising military draft:	
108	May 25	On passage. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10345, appropriating $2,200,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary:	
110	May 31	On amendment placing limit on sale of participation certificates. (Accepted 185 to 144.)	Yea.
111	May 31	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce all but FBI spending by 5 percent. (Accepted 171 to 156.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10226, extending free mailing privileges to overseas and hospitalized members of Armed Forces:	
116	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 0.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 10509, appropriating funds for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1968:	
119	June 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce spending by 5 percent except for school lunch and milk programs. (Rejected 175 to 222)	Yea.
120	June 6	On passage. (Passed 357 to 38)	Yea.
		H. Res. 504, providing for consideration of H.R. 10328, increasing national debt limit from $336,000,000,000 to $365,000,000,000:	
122	June 7	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 291 to 99)	Yea.
		H.R. 10328, increasing national debt limit from $336,000,000,000 to $365,000,000,000:	
123	June 7	On passage. (Rejected 197 to 210)	Nay.
		H.R. 9029, appropriating $1,400,000,000 for Department of the Interior for fiscal 1968:	
126	June 8	On agreeing to conference report ($34,338,000 above House bill). (Agreed to 321 to 49)	Nay.
		H.R. 1318, extending food stamp program:	
128	June 8	On amendment requiring States to pay 20 percent of program costs. (Rejected 173 to 191)	Yea.
129	June 8	On passage. (Passed 230 to 128)	Nay.
		H.R. 7476, establishing 1-year deadline for redemption of outstanding silver certificates in silver bullion:	
131	June 12	On passage. (Passed 234 to 109)	Yea.
		H.R. 10738, appropriating funds for Department of Defense for fiscal 1968:	
135	June 13	On passage. (Passed 407 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 6111, establishing Federal Judicial Center for research and planning:	
139	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 229 to 98)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 10730, extending grant programs of Older Americans Act:	
140	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 331 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 480, extending wetlands conservation program:	
141	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 328 to 8)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 482, increasing duck stamp fees for wetlands program:	
142	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 238 to 97)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 1432, extending and revising military draft:	
144	June 20	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 29)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 10840, providing penalties for desecration of the American flag:	
145	June 20	On passage. (Passed 385 to 16)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 10867, increasing permanent debt limit from $285,000,000,000 to $358,000,000,000 with authority to temporarily borrow additional $7,000,000,000 during the fiscal year:	
147	June 21	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to set permanent debt limit at $336,000,000,000. (Rejected 191 to 224)	Yea.
148	June 21	On passage. (Passed 217 to 196)	Nay.
		H.R. 8582, increasing number of associate judges on District of Columbia Court of Appeals from 2 to 5:	
153	June 26	On passage. (Passed 335 to 6)	Yea.
		H.R. 10783, strengthening District of Columbia crime laws:	
154	June 26	On passage. (Passed 355 to 14)	Yea.
		H.R. 10943, authorizing teacher education programs:	
156	June 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate Teachers Corps provisions. (Rejected 146 to 257)	Yea.
157	June 27	On passage. (Passed 311 to 88)	Yea.
		H.R. 10340, authorizing funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968:	
160	June 28	On motion to recommit with instructions to cut $136,400,000 and provide for Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. (Agreed to 238 to 157.)	Yea.
161	June 28	On passage. (Passed 342 to 53.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10805, extending U.S. Civil Rights Commission:	
163	July 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 283 to 89.)	Yea.
		S. 20, establishing National Water Commission to review water resource problems:	
165	July 12	On passage. (Passed 369 to 18.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10595, prohibiting banks and savings and loan associations from cooperating with States in selling State lottery tickets:	
167	July 13	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 135 to 257.)	Yea.
168	July 13	On passage. (Passed 271 to 111.)	Nay.
		S.J. Res. 81, providing for settlement of railroad labor dispute:	
170	July 17	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing for compulsory settlement after 90-day mediation period. (Agreed to 244 to 148.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11456, appropriating funds for Department of Transportation for fiscal 1968:	
173	July 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds by 5 percent. (Agreed to 213 to 189.)	Yea.
174	July 18	On passage. (Passed 393 to 5.)	Yea.
		H.R. 421, prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with intent to incite riots:	
176	July 19	On passage. (Passed 347 to 70.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 749, providing for consideration of H.R. 11000, providing additional rat control programs:	
178	July 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 176 to 207.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968:	
180	July 25	On amendment deleting Dickey-Lincoln Dam project. (Agreed to 233 to 169.)	Yea.
181	July 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce appropriation by 5 percent. (Rejected 166 to 239.)	Yea.
182	July 25	On passage. (Passed 375 to 26.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9547, increasing U.S. contribution to Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations:	
186	July 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit funds to present level. (Rejected 185 to 217)	Yea.
187	July 26	On passage. (Passed 275 to 122)	Nay.
		H.R. 8630, extending authority for exemptions from antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding U.S. balance of payments:	
189	July 27	On passage. (Passed 308 to 66.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6098, extending interest equalization tax on purchase of most foreign securities:	
190	July 31	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 223 to 83.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11722, authorizing military construction for fiscal 1968:	
192	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 394 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5037, authorizing $75,000,000 for local law-enforcement improvement:	
200	Aug. 8	On amendment providing law-enforcement assistance through block grants to States. (Agreed to 256 to 147)	Yea.
201	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 377 to 23.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 512, disapproving presidential plan to reorganize District of Columbia government:	
204	Aug. 9	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 160 to 244.)	Yea
		H.R. 7659, authorizing mid-decade censuses in addition to 10-year censuses:	
206	Aug. 10	On passage. (Passed 255 to 127.)	Nay.
		H.R. 43, authorizing $92,400,000 for San Felipe water project in California:	
208	Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 235 to 83.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6279, expanding standard reference data system of Bureau of Standards:	
209	Aug. 14	On amendment limiting funds and requiring annual congressional review. (Agreed to 319 to 2.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 856, providing for consideration of H.R. 2516, providing penalties for interference with the exercise of civil rights:	
214	Aug. 15	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 330 to 77.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2516, providing penalties for interference with the exercise of civil rights:	
220	Aug. 16	On passage. (Passed 326 to 93.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12080, Mills-Byrnes bill increasing social security benefits and improving public assistance programs:	
222	Aug. 17	On passage. (Passed 415 to 3.)	Yea.
		S. 16, increasing veterans' benefits:	
223	Aug. 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 404 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12257, expanding grants to States for vocational rehabilitation:	
224	Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 340 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11565, authorizing transfer of peanut acreage allotments:	
226	Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 208 to 146, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12474, appropriating $4,600,000,000 for National Aeroanutics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968:	
229	Aug. 22	On passage. (Passed 312 to 92.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12048, authorizing $2,800,000,000 in foreign aid in fiscal 1968:	
235	Aug. 24	On amendment deleting authority for arms credit sales. (Accepted 236 to 157.)	Yea.
236	Aug. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce technical assistance by $33,000,000. (Agreed to 234 to 163.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 24	On passage. (Passed 202 to 194.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8965, increasing Federal contribution to Dulles-Potomac sewer in Washington, D.C., area:	
239	Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 118 to 109.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11816, providing disability and death benefits for State or local police killed or injured while enforcing Federal laws:	
240	Sept. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 310 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 8654, permitting United States to appeal pretrial orders to suppress evidence:	
241	Sept. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 311 to 1.)	Not voting.[1]

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 8775, increasing authorization for reclamation projects in Missouri River Basin from $60,000,000 to $68,000,000:	
242	Sept. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 225 to 83.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 10738, appropriating funds for Department of Defense for fiscal 1968:	
244	Sept. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 365 to 4.)	Yea.
245	Sept. 12	On motion to recede from Byrnes amendment prohibiting use of funds in bill to construct naval vessels in foreign shipyards. (Rejected 144 to 233.)	Nay.
		S. 602, authorizing $886,700,000 for Appalachian development programs:	
253	Sept. 14	On amendment reducing nonhighway programs by $50,000,000. (Accepted 199 to 161.)	Yea.
254	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete channeling of funds through President, delete housing projects subsidy, and add $2,500,000 for Great Lakes fishery conservation. (Rejected 178 to 184.)	Yea.
255	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 189 to 168.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4451, guaranteeing reimbursement for U.S. fishing vessels seized by foreign countries:	
257	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 147 to 175.)	Nay.
		S. 1657, extending dairy indemnity payments for 1 year:	
258	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 320 to 7.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 838, authorizing Judiciary Committee investigation of certain refugee matters overseas:	
259	Sept. 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 262 to 52.)	Yea.
		S. 953, extending food stamp program:	
262	Sept. 19	On motion to agree to Senate amendments extending program 2 years. (Agreed to 196 to 154.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 9547, Inter-American Development Bank Act amendments:	
264	Sept. 20	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on retaining provision for auditing. (Agreed to 274 to 126.)	Yea
		H.R. 6418, increasing Federal grants for comprehensive health programs in the States:	
265	Sept. 20	On amendment providing $40,000,000 for special projects. (Accepted 227 to 173.)	Nay.
266	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 395 to 7.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6430, extending aid for mental retardation facilities:	
267	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6736, Public Broadcasting Act:	
270	Sept. 21	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide grants to educational broadcasting stations and eliminate establishment of Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (Rejected 167 to 194.)	Yea.
271	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed 265 to 91.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13042, providing for an elected school board for District of Columbia:	
273	Sept. 25	On passage. (Passed 324 to 3.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 13025, allowing District of Columbia government to issue rules for sale of alcoholic beverages:	
274	Sept. 25	On passage. (Rejected 153 to 182.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 12120, providing for juvenile delinquency control programs:	
277	Sept. 26	On amendment giving States authority to coordinate programs. (Agreed to 234 to 139.)	Yea.
278	Sept. 26	On amendment excluding programs already covered by poverty programs. (Agreed to 241 to 132.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 849, making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968:	
282	Sept. 27	On motion to recommit. (Agreed to 202 to 182.)	Yea.
		H.R. 478, requiring studies of impact on American workers of low-wage imports:	
285	Sept. 28	On passage. (Passed 340 to 29.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10673, clarifying stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities:	
287	Sept. 29	On passage. (Passed 234 to 6.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 4930, authorizing increase in annual aid to Ryukyu Islands from $12,000,000 to $25,000,000:	
289	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 284 to 80.)	Nay.
		S. 223, authorizing sale of certain Government communications facilities in Alaska:	
290	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 357 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9796, authorizing loans of certain naval vessels to foreign countries:	
291	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 321 to 42.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 853, making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968:	
293	Oct. 3	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments.) (Agreed to 213 to 205.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11722, authorizing military construction for fiscal 1968:	
294	Oct. 3	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 33.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10196, appropriating funds for Departments of Labor and HEW for fiscal 1968:	
296	Oct. 4	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to delete $20,700,000 not requested in budget. (Agreed to 226 to 173.)	Yea
		H.R. 1411, strengthening mail fraud laws:	
297	Oct. 4	On passage. (Passed 353 to 32.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10509, appropriating funds for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1968 (conference report):	
300	Oct. 10	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment authorizing funds for cropland adjustment program. (Agreed to 337 to 8.)	Yea.
301	Oct. 10	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment adding $25,000,000 over budget request for Farmers Home Administration loans. (Agreed to 362 to 24.)	Yea.
302	Oct. 10	On motion to insist on House disagreement to Senate amendment adding $1,600,000,000 over budget request for Commodity Credit Corporation. (Agreed to 391 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7977, increasing postal rates and Federal salaries:	
306	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision providing for pay increases in 1968 and 1969 without further congressional action. (Rejected 199 to 211.)	Yea.
307	Oct. 11	On passage. (Passed 318 to 89.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13048, extending Library Services and Construction Act:	
309	Oct. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 112, extending deadline for report of Commission on Urban Problems:	
310	Oct. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 343 to 10.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11456, making appropriations for Department of Transportation for fiscal 1968:	
313	Oct. 17	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate amendments which exceed budget requests. (Rejected 124 to 268.)	Yea.
314	Oct. 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 367 to 22.)	Yea.
315	Oct. 17	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing funds for Kelley Flats (Mont.) airport. (Rejected 161 to 222.)	Nay.
		H.R. 159, providing for independent Federal Maritime Administration:	
316	Oct. 17	On passage. (Passed 324 to 44.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 888, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968:	
319	Oct. 18	On amendment to limit certain spending to fiscal 1967 level. (Agreed to 239 to 164.)	Yea.
320	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 158 to 244.)	Nay.
321	Oct. 18	On passage. (Passed 253 to 143.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13178, strengthening present law protecting U.S. Capitol area:	
323	Oct. 19	On passage. (Passed 336 to 20.)	Yea.
		S. 676, prohibiting the obstruction of Federal criminal investigations:	
325	Oct. 19	On passage. (Passed 275 to 47.)	Yea.
		H.Res. 241, transferring legislative jurisdiction over national cemeteries to Veterans' Affairs Committee:	
327	Oct. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 227 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.Res. 947, providing for consideration of H.R. 10442, allowing Forest Service to sell land under 80 acres for public school sites:	
328	Oct. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 221 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10442, allowing Forest Service to sell land under 80 acres for public school sites:	
329	Oct. 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to include language providing that payments be deposited in U.S. Treasury. (Rejected 30 to 191.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11627, authorizing State of Maryland to construct and operate 4 bridges or tunnels across the Chesapeake Bay:	
333	Oct. 23	On passage. (Passed 342 to 9.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9960, appropriating $10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:	
335	Oct. 24	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on House limitation on the sales of participation certificates. (Rejected 184 to 208.)	Yea.
336	Oct. 24	On motion to concur in Senate language increasing House allotment for model cities program from $237,000,000 to $537,000,000. (Rejected 156 to 241.)	Nay.
337	Oct. 24	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing $40,000,000 for rent supplement contract authority. (Rejected 152 to 250.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13606, appropriating funds for military construction for fiscal 1968:	
338	Oct. 24	On passage. (Passed 362 to 26.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968:	
340	Oct. 25	On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 117 to 278.)	Yea.
341	Oct. 25	On motion that House agree to providing $875,000 for planning of Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine. (Rejected 162 to 236.)	Nay.
342	Oct. 25	On motion that House agree to amendment increasing the amount appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for construction and planning by $32,525,000 above the bill as passed by the House. (Agree to 283 to 111.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9960, appropriating $10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:	
343	Oct. 26	On motion to recommit 2d conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to funding rent supplement contract authority. (Rejected 184 to 198.)	Yea.
344	Oct. 26	On agreeing to 2d conference report. (Agreed to 296 to 88.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 13510, increasing basic pay of U.S. servicemen by an average of 4.5 percent:	
345	Oct. 26	On passage. (Passed 385 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2508, congressional redistricting bill:	
346	Oct. 26	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to restore House-passed standards for redistricting. (Rejected 82 to 283.)	Nay.
347	Oct. 26	On agreeing to conference report declaring that no State be required to redistrict or hold elections-at-large prior to 1970 census or special census. (Agreed to 241 to 105.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10915, ending importation of extra-long-staple cotton from Egypt and the Sudan after their severance of diplomatic relations with the United States:	
349	Oct. 30	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 101 to 244.)	Nay.
350	Oct. 30	On passage. (Passed 275 to 63.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection programs:	
354	Oct. 31	On passage. (Passed 403 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 780, Air Quality Act of 1967 authorizing action to curb air pollution:	
359	Nov. 2	On passage. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 966, providing for consideration of S. 2388, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967:	
361	Nov. 3	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 262 to 39.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11565, authorizing transfer of peanut acreage allotments:	
362	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 255 to 57.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 33, establishing a commission to study hazardous household products:	
363	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 206 to 102.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3639, consolidating existing laws regulating animal drugs and animal feeds:	
364	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13165, extending Secret Service protection to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and her children until March 1969:	
365	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 302 to 11.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 114, extending duration of copyright protection in certain cases:	
366	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 308 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3982, increasing reimbursement of servicemen for shipment of trailers and household goods:	
367	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 319 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13669, revising procedures for settlement of various military claims:	
368	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1552, increasing membership on National Highway Safety Advisory Committee:	
369	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 252 to 65.)	Nay.
		S. 423, authorizing additional funds for harbor construction at Manele Bay, Hawaii:	
370	Nov. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 291 to 25.)	Yea.
		S. 1872, authorizing foreign assistance for fiscal 1968:	
374	Nov. 8	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on language prohibiting the sale to or purchase of defense goods or services from any country which trades with or permits its ships to carry goods to North Vietnam. (Rejected 196 to 200.)	Nay.
375	Nov. 8	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 205 to 187.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968:	
378	Nov. 9	On motion that House agree to Senate amendment providing $875,000 for planning of Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine. (Rejected 118 to 263.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8569, appropriating funds for District of Columbia for fiscal 1968:	
380	Nov. 9	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 6.)	Yea.
		S. 2388, authorizing further funding of the Economic Opportunity Act:	
386	Nov. 15	On amendment prohibiting use of funds to defend persons involved in unlawful disturbances or riots. (Agreed to 332 to 79.)	Yea.
387	Nov. 15	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce total authorization by $460,000,000. (Agreed to 221 to 190.)	Yea.
388	Nov. 15	On passage. (Passed 283 to 129.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 978, providing for consideration of H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968:	
390	Nov. 16	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 200 to 190).	Yea.
		H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968:	
394	Nov. 17	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 135 to 177.)	Yea.
395	Nov. 17	On passage. (Passed 167 to 143.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of H.R. 8, imposing criminal punishment on those who support through contributions or goods any country in armed conflict with the United States:	
396	Nov. 17	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 211 to 37)	Yes.
		H.R. 13933, authorizing modifications in the Interstate Highway System:	
399	Nov. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 361 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 12010, granting consent of Congress to Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District:	
400	Nov. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 356 to 2)	Yea.
		H.R. 9063, providing for determination of certain war claims of American nationals:	
401	Nov. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 348 to 10)	Yea.
		H.R. 11527, amending rules on use of Federal land conveyed to the University of Maine:	
402	Nov. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 24)	Yea.
		H.R. 6430, extending aid for mental retardation facilities:	
404	Nov. 21	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 6418, increasing Federal grants for comprehensive health programs in the States:	
405	Nov. 21	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 347 to 3.)	Yea.
		S. 1031, authorizing funds for Peace Corps for fiscal 1968:	
406	Nov. 21	On motion to recommit with instructions to cut $10,700,000 and to prohibit use of funds for attempts to obtain draft deferments for Peace Corps volunteers. (Rejected 141 to 203.)	Yea.
407	Nov. 21	On passage. (Passed 312 to 32.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12603, authorizing establishment of a National Visitor Center in Washington, D.C.:	
410	Nov. 27	On passage. (Passed 316 to 34.)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 1003, increasing protection against flammable fabrics:	
411	Nov. 27	On passage. (Passed 325 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.J. Res. 936, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968:	
413	Nov. 28	On passage. (Passed 368 to 13.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 985, to agree to an amendment to bill H.R. 2275, which would prohibit at-large elections of Members of the House of Representatives except in the States of Hawaii and New Mexico:	
414	Nov. 28	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 201 to 179.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12601, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists:	
415	Nov. 28	On passage. (Passed 269 to 104.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection program:	
417	Nov. 29	On motion to instruct House conferees to agree to Senate amendments allowing Federal inspection of intrastate plants. (Rejected 166 to 207.)	Nay.
		H.R. 13706, removing the 6-percent interest limitation for farm credit system institutions:	
418	Nov. 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit provisions to 2 years. (Rejected 102 to 269.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11276, extending grants for adult education programs:	
421	Dec. 4	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 352 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13054, prohibiting discrimination in employment with respect to age:	
422	Dec. 4	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 344 to 13).	Yea.
		H.Res. 996, agreeing to conference on S. 2172, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists, and insisting on House amendments:	
423	Dec. 4	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 287 to 58.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6111, establishing Federal Judicial Center for research and planning:	
426	Dec. 6	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 230 to 126.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection programs:	
427	Dec. 6	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 336 to 28.)	Yea.
		S. 2388, authorizing further funding of the Economic Opportunity Act:	
429	Dec. 11	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 247 to 149.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 888, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968:	
430	Dec. 11	On ordering previous question on conference report (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 213 to 183.)	Nay.
431	Dec. 11	On motion that House concur in amendment requiring $9,000,000,000 reduction in budgeted fiscal 1968 obligations for executive agencies. (Agreed to 366 to 26.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7977, increasing postage and Federal salaries:	
433	Dec. 11	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 327 to 63.)	Nay.
		H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1968:	
435	Dec. 12	On passage. (Passed 307 to 77.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4765, relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act:	
436	Dec. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 274 to 104.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 10595, prohibiting banks and savings and loan associations from cooperating with States in selling State lottery tickets:	
437	Dec. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 289 to 74.)	Nay.
		H.R. 12080, Mills-Byrnes bill increasing social security benefits and improving public assistance programs:	
439	Dec. 13	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 390 to 3.)	Yea.
		S. 2171, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists:	
441	Dec. 13	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 276 to 114.)	Yea.
		H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968:	
443	Dec. 14	On motion to recommit 1st conference report ($119,000,000 over House-passed version). (Agreed to 196 to 185.)	Yea.
444	Dec. 15	On agreeing to 2d conference report reducing amount of funding. (Agreed to 198 to 158.)	Yea.
		H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1968:	
445	Dec. 15	On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 108 to 254.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7819, authorizing funds for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs:	
446	Dec. 15	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 286 to 73.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12555, protecting veterans from pension cuts resulting from social security benefit increases:	
447	Dec. 15	On passage. (Passed 353 to 0.)	Yea.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

It Is Easy To Rationalize

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. F. T. Fowler of the First Baptist Church, Topeka, Kans., has recently made a recommendation for "a way in which a Christian can live with his conscience and keep the peace." His thoughts merit consideration. I respectfully bring them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

IT IS EASY TO RATIONALIZE

(By Dr. F. T. Fowler)

In my ministry I have fluctuated between pacificism and the use of force as an approach to international problems. I have found Jesus' teaching to be anti-force, setting forth non-violent resistance.

For the first three hundred years of Christian history no Christian bore arms. Apparently the early Christian Church read Christ this way.

It is easy to rationalize. We must use force or be enslaved. We must use force to limit the spread of evil. Cogent arguments, these, when a Hitler appears or a "Vietnam" rears its ugly head. This rationalization is deadly if Einstein was right in asserting war would cease forever if two per cent of the population would resolutely refuse to fight.

The Vietnam situation is just another in a long line of (inevitable) conflicts. If you travel as I have in Thailand where the remote village boundaries are being transgressed and villagers are being coerced to accept Communism—you feel we must war to stop this enslavement; these violations of individual choice.

All too soon it will seem as though Communism represents the choice of the inhabitants. Maybe it will—but only after coerced indoctrination. What's right about that! So we kill to stop it! We square off and get involved in ideological or nationalistic conflict?

I have now come to another alternative—It will be a long while before we can live in an unarmed world. But the use of arms must be an international matter under the direction of the United Nations. The United Nations with full support from the great powers can and must police the world, guaranteeing boundaries and maintaining peace.

The transition from national intervention to international police action is the way in which a Christian can live with his conscience and keep the peace.

Our government, in concert with others, should move to this end as quickly as possible.

Good Pick for Commerce

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made an excellent choice in naming Mr. C. R. Smith to be Secretary of Commerce. Under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial contained in last Sunday's Nashville Tennessean:

GOOD PICK FOR COMMERCE

President Johnson has named Mr. C. R. Smith, chairman of the board of American Airlines, to his cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. He will become the fourth to hold the office under Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Smith is a familiar figure to Nashvillians. He has many friends here and has visited the city many times. He has spoken to various civic groups here in the past.

The airline executive succeeds Mr. Alexander Trowbridge, who has resigned for health reasons. Mr. Trowbridge suffered a heart attack in 1966 and was hospitalized in January of this year with a circulatory ailment. Doctors had advised him against continuing such an arduous job.

In Mr. Smith, the President is getting a dynamic, tough-minded man who has ideas and determination. He became head of American Airlines in 1934 at the age of 35 and under his guidance it became the second largest domestic airline. It would have become Number 1 had not United merged with Capital.

Mr. Smith was a key figure during World War II in the Air Force program which developed the Air Transport Command into a worldwide transportation network. He rose to a major general and won a number of decorations for his achievements. In 1961 he won the Billy Mitchell Award for contributions to aviation progress.

Mr. Smith's career has included such diversified jobs as banking, office manager of a cotton mill, state government, advertising and being assistant treasurer of the Texas-Louisiana Power Company. The new Commerce Secretary has also served on the Business Advisory Council, a private industry group, which works closely with the Commerce Department.

The new Secretary is a plain-spoken man who likes to cut to the heart of problems without delay. If the past is any indication, it won't take him long to thoroughly familiarize himself with all aspects of his new job.

Mr. Johnson has made a good choice.

Citizens for Public Prayer

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there are many good causes which reach the Congress. Most of them find their way to the floor of one or both Houses and are there decided. One such good cause, more than 5 years after it started, has still failed to reach the floor in either House for a normal vote. I refer to the effort to write a Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer into the Constitution. Hundreds of bills have been introduced in both Senate and House to reverse the tragic precedents of the two prayer-ban decisions. On the House side, despite hearings in the spring of 1964, the Judiciary Committee has still reported out no bill. On the Senate side, Senate Joint Resolution 1, introduced by 42 Senators in the very first day of the 1967 session, remains inactive in the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee. Meanwhile, polls continue to indicate that some 80 percent of the American people favor a return of prayer to their public classrooms. It is clear that the issue of eliminating the prayer-ban precedents—good as it is in itself—cannot win through unless and until the American people everywhere roll up their sleeves and fight it out with good, old-fashioned political savvy.

One of the major national organizations supporting a restorative prayer amendment is Citizens for Public Prayer. It is entirely nonsectarian and nonpartisan. Each year CPP publishes an Action Memorandum to assist Americans who may not understand the working of things political and may suppose that good causes triumph on their own merits. I am most happy to make this memorandum available to the Members and to the Nation. It pulls no punches. It talks straight. I hope that all who read it will be galvanized into the kind of action from which alone we can win in 1968 this great fight for public reverence. For my part, I pledge again my full and fighting support in the effort.

The memorandum follows:

CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER

Unless you act loud, long, strong now public reverence, already threatened, could be lost forever in these United States.

One way to start would be to have these pages mimeographed and then send them to *every name on your Christmas Card list.* If public reverence really matters to you, this is a wonderful way to prove it.

1. This is no panic button pushing. This is no extremism. These are the hard facts:

The two tragic prayer-ban decisions by the United States Supreme Court (1962, 1963) place a fatal equation which says that public reverence, even if free, non-denominational and non-institutional, is establishment. It is, therefore, subject to denial under the first clause of the First Amendment and no assertion of "free exercise" under the second clause can save it. With such an equation in place, as Mr. Lincoln remarked of the Dred Scott decision a century ago, "not even the shadow of a starved pigeon" can occupy the same place! In other words, the issue here is *not* one of Church and State, but one of religion in our public life. So long as these two decisions remain in force, every aspect of public reverence among us is adversely affected. As Rev. D. Elton Trueblood, professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, put it—"This is a ruling which affects deeply the whole of American life and represents a radical change in the cultural pattern in many parts of the Nation."

Despite continued evidence of massive public support, hundreds of bills and three committee hearings, nearly six years after the first prayer-ban decision, not one single *normal* floor vote on a prayer amendment proposal has been taken in either house. This is an almost *incredible, extremely serious reflection on the democratic process.*

Evidence multiplies that the prayer-ban decisions cloud the whole area of public reverence and are being used as precedents in other decisions and local actions in this area. *The fight is thus not for school prayer only, but for public reverence as such.*

2. What is involved here is not a tampering with the First Amendment, which has indeed served the nation well in terms of its original sense and traditional interpretation. Senate Joint Resolution #1, signed by 42 Senators from both parties, proposes addition in these words, to restore that sense and clarify that interpretation:

Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in non-denominational prayer.

3. Support for such an amendment has come, among others, from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, legislatures in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, Louisiana, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Conference of Governors, the National Conference of Mayors, the National Council of Catholic Youth. Dr. Billy Graham, Bishop Fulton Sheen, the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. In the spring of 1967, the "Good Housekeeping" poll showed upwards of 80% of the American people in favor of prayer in public schools.

4. Citizens for Public Prayer is an *entirely non-partisan, non-sectarian* association of citizens concerned for public reverence and supporting a clarifying prayer amendment. We have no other purpose of any kind. Nor do we have a formally staffed and funded national headquarters.

We will help you with advice and materials if you write us enclosing a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Mostly, you must go it alone. Organize a local chapter of Citizens for Public Prayer. Use your own initiative. Pile-drive this issue whenever and wherever you can. Do not be dissuaded by the voices of doubt and negativeness around you. There are many aspects to the issue of public reverence, but do not be confused. The central facts are clear. Here are the key addresses:

Rev. Robert G. Howes, Washington Representative, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20017.

Professor Charles E. Rice, New York Representative, Fordham University School of Law, Lincoln Center, New York, New York.

Mr. Chester Doyle, Middle Atlantic Representative, 5th Street, Berwick, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Carl Griffin, Jr., New England Representative, Box 1776, Rutland, Massachusetts.

Sheets of *"Back Public Prayer" stickers* for use on your correspondence are available from the D.C. and Massachusetts addresses at $.50 the sheet. Enclose with your order a large, self-addressed, stamped envelope. Sale of these stickers is our only source of income. Please help!

5. What you can do where you are to help in the prayer amendment drive:

a. Establish a local unit of Citizens for Public Prayer. Publicize this constantly.

b. Introduce formal resolutions backing a prayer amendment (see 2 above) into all civic, social, political, religious and veteran groups to which you belong. See that these resolutions are *publicized* and *communicated* to your local state and national political representatives. Demand a reply as to how the resolutions will or will not be activated.

c. Ask your religious leaders to back a clarifying prayer amendment and to give evidence of such backing in their sermons, church publications, etc.

d. Put the subject of a prayer amendment into all radio-TV talk programs you can reach.

e. Ask candidates for your vote (particularly in school board races) at all levels—local, state and national—to tell you explicity how they feel on the question of a clarifying prayer amendment.

6. What you can do in Washington to help in the prayer amendment drive:

a. Write your congressmen (and senators). Ask them to support, *explicitly,* a prayer amendment proposal. Remind them that what is sought here is not enactment of such an amendment by Congress (this is, in any case, impossible) but simply *congressional authorization for you to decide the issue through your state legislature.* A congressman who refuses to vote such an authorization is in fact thwarting the democratic process. Do not settle for an ambiguous form letter reply. If a congressman clearly disagrees with you, write again and argue. If a congressman says he agrees with you, then write again and ask for copies of his talks in Congress and outside backing school prayer. If a congressman is vague and gives you an indistinct answer, write again and respectfully request a *special answer* to your question.

b. Ask your congressman (and senators) to include a question on the prayer amendment issue in any poll he may take of his home district (or state). The response to such polls gives us important ammunition in our fight for amendment.

c. It is *particularly urgent* that all candidates for national office this fall, and all candidates in state and congressional elections, be placed *on record* for a prayer amendment. Remind them how the whole question of public reverence in pursuit of our good traditions in this republic is involved in the prayer amendment fight, plus the right of parents to determine the type of education they wish their tax dollars to provide for their children. If a candidate needs help in writing an address on this subject, give him our name and location—tell him that if he sends us a self-addressed, stamped envelope, we will furnish him with material he can use. If a candidate tells you he is for a prayer amendment, thank him but respectfully ask him to prove his support. And inform him that you would like to have a copy of his remarks on this subject to send to us, and for your own personal use. In other words, *do not settle for vague promises of support.* Be from Missouri—use the Show Me tactic!

Here, to sum it all up, is part of an address our Washington, D.C. Representative delivered in New York City a few months ago:

"Move out, Spread your wings, Bombard your relatives and friends everywhere. Duplicate our material. Build bonfires wherever you can under political and religious leaders who have not so far committed themselves or who have committed themselves against us. And not just with one match! A bonfire is a continuous, blazing, insistent thing that stops only when it has consumed the material in it totally. We must rest content only when our spokesmen in Washington a) agree with us and b) give evidence of such agreement by their repeated reference to our cause in their congressional and home addresses and reports. Remember—*ask your congressmen to include a question on school prayer in all their district polls.* We must rest content only when, by insistent correspondence and personal contact, we have convinced our religious leaders a) to agree with us and b) to give evidence of such agreement by their repeated reference to our cause in their sermons, news media and pastoral action. The key words are pile driver, bull dog. The key phrase is Keep Your Eye on the Ball. The key people are God and Us. The key comparison is that we must be as alive in our effort for this civil right as are our neighbors in their effort for other civil rights. What a tragedy it would be for America if the fight for human equality were won in the same generation which, by its apathy and astigmatism, lost the fight for God as a real presence in its public assembly. *What a tragedy if we attain the brotherhood of man and deny our children and ourselves the civil right to declare reverently the fatherhood of God in our public places!"*

Without your help, loud, long and strong, the fight to restore the civil right of public reverence will be lost. Shall we bring less zeal to our cause than Mrs. Madalyn Murray O'Hare brings to hers?

An Imaginative Approach to Local Businesses in Our Central Cities

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our central cities are vast and complex, and there is no single program which will cure all the ills arising in the field of housing, education, employment, and health services. However, one important element in any long-range solution to our urban problems is the development of viable business activity on the part of residents of our central cities, and particularly, of minority group members.

Some minority group members, however, have not been a part of the American industrial and economic revolution which has pushed our national business efficiency to record heights. Negro businessmen, for example, face a constant struggle to survive economically. There is a program underway in the District of Columbia aimed at helping minority group businesses to form trade associations in order to improve their business operations. Great benefits can be attained through group purchasing, insurance, credit procedures, and advertising. The project is operated by Howard University, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Already, a neighborhood drycleaning association has been formed, and group buying of garment hangers and plastic bags has resulted in savings to some members of as much as 60 percent. Meetings have been held with other businessmen to form similar trade associations for businessmen in auto repair, day nurseries, and restaurants. This program holds the promise of greater strength and stability in the economies of our central cities, as well as upgrading the business practices of minority group businessmen, through organization and cooperation for common economic goals. I am pleased to bring this program to the attention of all Members.

Reds in Defense Plants

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to include in the RECORD the following forthright editorial from the Arizona Farmer Ranchman, which is published in San Diego, Calif., by Elliott L. Cushman:

> REDS IN DEFENSE PLANTS
>
> So it's unlawful to refuse to hire Communists in U.S. factories, even in plants that are making highly secret weapons and materiel for the defense of the nation, our liberties, civilization itself. Our precious Supreme Court says so, in a recent decision that has generated more indignation than all its other atrocities put together.
>
> There used to be a quaint superstition that an employer had some discretion in the selection of his hired help, but that has gone the way of other outmoded theories under pressure from unions, Red agents, and the Supreme Court. He may not turn away an applicant just because he has no security clearance, even if there is FBI testimony that the job seeker is a spy. Even if he knows that Communism is criminal insanity, and certainly no one would want a criminal lunatic throwing monkey wrenches or sabots into the machinery and making nightly reports to Moscow or Peking. Nobody but the Supreme Court.
>
> Well, we have an idea. Surely there is no law naming the factory department to which a new employee shall be assigned. So, just assign him to an empty room with no reading matter except the works of Karl Marx and Mao Tse Tung. Let him spend his eight hours a day and his forty hours a week there, with a strict rule forbidding him to step outside during "working" hours.
>
> Yes, he will have to be paid a beginner's wages, whatever they may be at that plant. But Congress can pass an act authorizing the factory to add those wages to the contract price of any defense products then being fabricated. That will be only a trifling addition to the war's cost. Preservation of our military secrets from enemies bent on our destruction will be worth far more.
>
> And maybe those spies will get so bored and frustrated that they will leave America in disgust for the paradises of Russia and Red China. Maybe even the Supreme Court—but no, that would be hoping for the impossible.

Frank Mendell Retires

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Frank H. Mendell retired from his job of State conservationist of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Iowa on February 2, 1968. He has devoted 34 years of his very productive lifetime to conservation in its broadest sense. The landscape of Iowa bears widespread living evidence of the impact of the conservation program on the land under his direction. The beautifully curving terraced, stripcropped, and contoured fields with their green grassed waterways give the farmlands of Iowa a pleasing look. The wildlife areas, farm ponds, tree plantings, shelterbelts all help to bring about the state of harmony between man and the land.

As State conservationist for the past three decades, he directed a program carried out in Iowa by a statewide organization of dedicated and competent professional technicians trained in the fields of agronomy, soil science, civil and agricultural engineering, economics, and wildlife and forestry. He worked with, cooperated with, and enlisted the help of many agencies, groups, organizations, and individuals in making the progress that has been made in conservation in Iowa to date.

He has given untiringly of his knowledge, energy, and know-how to advance the cause of soil and water conservation and to stimulate and enlist the help and interest of rural and urban people in the importance of soil conservation. He organized the resources of the Soil Conservation Service to get conservation accomplishments on the land effectively and efficiently to secure the greatest possible return for the investments made in the soil and water conservation program.

In addition to his contributions to conservation in the normal course of his work, Mr. Mendell has devoted a considerable amount of his personal time and energy to the development and enhancement of the conservation program. He secured a public awareness of the needed conservation program through his tireless and devoted work with many organizations, conservation talks, and State conservation field days and plowing matches. He has been active in many organizations including the Iowa Farm Safety Council, the Men's Garden Club, Iowa Conservation Education Council, Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts of America, and the Izaak Walton League.

Mr. Mendell joined the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in May 1934 as an agronomist on the Tarkio Demonstration Project at Shenandoah, Iowa. In 1935 he became project manager of the Grand River watershed demonstration project at Greenfield, Iowa. in May 1937 he became State conservationist of Iowa to head all activities of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in the State and has held that position until his retirement.

Activities of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Iowa under Mr. Mendell's direction included the regular conservation operations program in cooperation with Iowa's 100 soil conservation districts, the Little Sioux flood prevention project, the 46 watershed protection projects now underway in the State, and technical responsibility of the Service for permanent type practices under which the Federal Government cost-shares with farmers under the agricultural conservation program. He also represented the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the coordinating committee for the Upper Mississippi River Basin comprehensive study now underway and nearing completion and served as chairman of the field advisory committee and agriculture advisory committee for the basin study.

Mr. Mendell is a charter member of the Soil Conservation Society of America and is serving as president of that organization this year.

Mr. Mendell was born at Dows, Iowa. He is a graduate of Iowa State University at Ames where he received a bachelor's degree in agronomy followed by a master's degree in soils.

He has been honored on many occasions for his work in his professional field. He received the superior service award of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, outstanding performance award from the Soil Conservation Service, elected fellow member of the Soil Conservation Society of America, president's citation from the society, recognition plaque from the Iowa Soil Conservation Committee, lifetime honorary member of the Iowa Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners, Gamma Sigma Delta certificate, award of merit from the Iowa Farm Safety Council, election to the Iowa Conservation Hall of Fame, 25-year service award from the National Farm Institute, and the honorary All-American Plowman award.

Frank Mendell is a pioneer in soil and water conservation in the truest sense.

Errors in OEO Report

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, a report of Federal program impact on the local community for fiscal year 1967, was released recently by the information center of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In an effort to communicate with my constituents, I have used the information contained in this report. It is shocking indeed, how much of it I have found inaccurate.

For example, the report shows that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration spent $41,267,711, for research and development in Calvert County, Md. In seeking confirmation of this information from the agency itself, we found that the agency did not spend any money in fiscal year 1967 in Calvert County. We have checked other reported expenditures of NASA in other counties of the First Congressional District of Maryland and found that in every case the figures reported by the information center of the Office of Economic Opportunity was substantially in error.

The question now is as to the validity of the whole report.

Obviously, it is impossible for one congressional office and staff to audit such a report. I do think this matter should be of concern to the Congress. If we are going to do a good job in the exercise of our responsibility for congressional oversight of the over 370 programs administered by the various agencies of the Federal Government, the very least we should have is accurate information.

Mr. Speaker, I call this matter to the attention of not only the Congress itself, but also to the Office of Economic Opportunity, who is responsible for the document containing these serious errors of reporting.

Mr. Speaker, this situation must be corrected.

Doctors and Medicare

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, since the adoption of the medicare program in 1965, great strides have been made in caring for our elderly citizens who had previously gone without adequate medical attention due to their lack of funds.

The February 24 issue of the Saturday Evening Post features an article by Dr. David Jay Scott of the Jersey Shore Medical Center, Neptune, N.J. Dr. Scott describes the great service being rendered by medicare. It is good to see that of those who originally opposed the plan, many have now realized how beneficial it can be to both the doctors and the patients they serve.

I insert Dr. Scott's frank and informative article in the Record at this time:

Speaking Out: We Doctors Were Wrong About Medicare

(By David Jay Scott, M.D.)

Not long ago I received a letter from a physicians' group exhorting me to join their organization against "evil schemes such as Medicare." Letters like this still arrive frequently, and they never fail to puzzle and upset me. I can't understand how anyone in his right mind can refer to Medicare *today* as "evil." To me, it has turned out to be about as evil as the Flying Nun.

Like most doctors, I was against Medicare when it was proposed, and I still have reservations about it. Before the measure was passed by Congress in 1965, I resisted it. I agreed with the great mass of literature published by the American Medical Association and other doctors' groups, all of which insisted that Medicare would mean socialized medicine and a fundamental loss of freedom not only for the doctors of America but also for the millions of citizens over the age of 65.

I anticipated Government fee-fixing and interference with free-enterprise medicine, a mountain of red tape and long delays in getting paid for my services, and a stampede of elderly patients demanding unnecessary treatment. I believed that Medicare would mean the end of effective medical teaching, because of the loss of elderly ward patients, and that postgraduate education would also suffer.

I still feel there are built-in hazards in Medicare, but I must say that after a year and a half of the program, my eyes have been opened and I view the results with both pleasure and surprise. From what I can see in my private practice, there is considerably more good than bad in Medicare. Few, if any, of the dire predictions have come to pass. I don't feel socialized, mechanized or victimized, and as far as I can tell, neither do any of my fellow physicians.

Most doctors, in fact, are happy as clams over Medicare, even though they won't admit it—or don't dare to admit it. Their incomes have increased because Medicare partially pays them for what used to be charity work. For practically all patients, too, it has been a boon. The average elderly person is now getting a level of care that previously was available only to the rich.

But most important of all, there are definite signs that Medicare is helping to improve the entire standard of health in the United States. Currently, for example, there are an estimated two million diabetics in this country, one half of them undiagnosed. With 20 million elderly citizens now able to avail themselves of regular medical attention, more and more diabetics are being discovered by routine tests and are being treated before the disease takes its toll. It's safe to predict that because of Medicare the number of undiagnosed diabetic people in the United States will soon be significantly reduced.

It's the same with the treatment of stroke. Previously, the average patient paralyzed by a cerebral hemorrhage or thrombosis was sent home to be cared for by his family after his initial treatment in a hospital. He could not normally afford the expensive special nursing care, physiotherapy and speech therapy necessary to restore crippled arms and legs and vocal cords to full use. The doctor lost track of the patient's day-to-day progress and had to rely on family reports for information. A frequent result of this lack of special attention was a dreadful condition known popularly as "claw hand." The muscles of an affected arm would contract the arm permanently into a grotesque hook-like position. The condition was irreparable, and it scarred the patient, both physically and psychologically, for the rest of his life.

Today, because of Medicare, we're seeing less and less of "claw hand." When a stroke victim leaves the hospital, he gets months of care and physiotherapy in a Government-approved convalescent center.

This sort of improved care for the elderly is yielding unexpected benefits, one of which is a boom in the study of geriatrics. Treating the aged has never been a popular specialty, but now, with Medicare, more doctors are being *forced* to become geriatricians, and scholarship in this once-limited field is bound to expand. And as doctors learn more about the long-term aspects of diseases—by studying the elderly—they are better able to treat these diseases when they strike the young.

Many doctors still refuse to acknowledge these benefits. Others now grudgingly admit that the program has been satisfactory medically, but they are still diehards about the economics of it. At a party recently, I listened to a phlysician proclaim that as long as he lived he would never involve himself in Medicare's "morass of red tape and delays." Instead, like most physicians, he continues to insist that his patients pay him directly and then collect from the Government on their own.

I must admit I had the same misgivings when Medicare went into effect on July 1, 1966, but with my comparatively new practice, in an area of New Jersey where there are many elderly people retired on small incomes, I soon found it more practical to bill the Government myself.

To my amazement I discovered that I get paid faster by Medicare (14 days) than I do by doctor-approved insurance programs (3–5 weeks). Even the forms are less complicated. I can fill out a Medicare form in half the time it takes me to struggle through that Blue Shield form. If someone asked me to devise a simpler form than Medicare's, just so doctors would stop complaining, I couldn't do it. The present form asks just seven essential questions.

The private insurance plans, particularly the Blue Cross–Blue Shield plans, seem to involve endless correspondence over "incorrect claim forms." Months go by with forms being returned, resubmitted, re-filed, etc., because of some silly oversight in form filling. I thought that similar confusions would occur with Medicare, but I have never had a form returned by them.

When I report this to the diehards, they refuse to believe me or even to look at the form, which they consider to be "an instrument of socialism." They also refuse to believe that a physician can benefit financially from the program. At a medical meeting, one doctor told me that he hasn't made a cent out of Medicare and doesn't intend to. Since he has what we call a "cream-puff practice." with only rich patients, I'm sure this is true.

To me, as a young doctor, however, Medicare has meant the difference between years of struggling and paid-up bills. In the past, physicians beginning practice all had to scrape out a living by taking other doctors' cast-off patients (which usually included non-paying deadbeats, hypochondriacs and pests), by working the emergency room or other part-time jobs in a hospital, by doing physical examinations for insurance companies and by running their butts off on house calls. My colleagues have told me they were in the red for years. Some say they couldn't take a day off for two years, and it was unheard of for a young doctor to be able to afford a vacation.

With Medicare all that struggle is history (except perhaps for the pediatrician). The young doctor almost immediately gets his share of patients formerly treated as charity cases, and his fees are partially guaranteed by the Government. In my first year Medicare patients made up more than 50 percent of my total practice. And my older colleagues are still shaking their heads in bewilderment over the fact that my wife and I were able to take a two-week vacation in the first year.

Most puzzling of all is the diehards' conviction that Medicare is also bad for the finances of their patients.

Part A of Medicare gives free hospital care (after the first $40) to all Americans over the age of 65. Part B pays 80 percent of doctors' bills (after the first $50) for all Americans over 65 who pay a $3-a-month premium to the Government. True, even these small payments required of the patient have worked occasional hardship in some instances, but generally the law has been a financial lifesaver not only for the patients but also for their families.

One case of mine, for example, involved a woman who had a severe abdominal illness. She and her husband were living on Social Security and on the small nest egg they had saved up for emergencies. When she became ill, she quickly ran up the following medical bills: hospital, $4,000; surgeon, $700; anesthetists, $200; internist, $500—for a total of $5,400. Were it not for Medicare (plus another small insurance policy that paid the 20 percent doctors' fees and the deductibles not covered by Medicare), their life savings would have been severely depleted. As it turned out, their entire expense for the illness was exactly four dollars—for renting a television set during the wife's last days in the hospital.

My most touching Medicare case was a 65-year-old woman who had lived in poverty and had been a clinic patient all her life. Recently, when she came to the Jersey Shore Medical Center and was admitted to my service, she entered a new world. Because she was now covered by Medicare, she was entitled to a semiprivate room, which she shared with the wife of a millionaire. She enjoyed the other woman's flowers, and she chatted happily with her roommate's visitors. She was tended by four top specialists and consultants whom I requested to assist me. When we first examined her, she did not recognize us as physicians because we were wearing business suits. A doctor to her meant an intern or a resident. "If you're *really* doctors," she said, "where are your white coats?"

One of the most widespread objections to Medicare before it was enacted was that the program would eliminate poor patients from the wards and thus reduce the teaching capabilities of hospitals, which use ward cases in the training of interns and medical students. The diehards still hammer at this point, and of all their arguments, I think it is the most fallacious.

For one thing, taking the elderly out of the wards has merely freed those beds for non-Medicare patients. The wards continue to be filled to capacity. But more important, rather than reducing medical teaching, Medicare actually has extended it—into doctors' offices and the smaller hospitals.

When I took my residency training at Metropolitan Hospital in New York City and at the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital, I was aware that the highest quality of medicine is practiced in academic institutions. We had the most expensive diagnostic equipment—and we were learning all the time. But I was told that the outside world was different—that the patients' finances would inhibit both the quality of the medicine I would practice and my continuing education.

But it hasn't worked out that way. With assured income from Medicare patients, smaller hospitals can now afford extended-care facilities and will soon be able to afford, for the first time, some of the same expensive equipment that only the big academic institutions could buy.

With the cost barrier removed by Medicare, we've already made new discoveries in our continued-learning process. Because we're no longer inhibited about ordering tests, we've found out, for example, that there's a considerable amount of thyroid heart disease among elderly people. They don't have the obvious thyroid symptoms. They just report that they're "a little nervous and draggy." Doctors used to tell them, "It's just age," and then the patient would go away and slip into heart failure. Now, because Medicare has promoted more widespread use of what we call the PBI test, we know that the textbooks, which say that thyroid heart disease is rare, are wrong. So we give the patient iodine and the symptoms clear up. Who knows how many heart problems we've averted?

These, then, are the major benefits of Medicare. What are its deficiencies? First, there is the distinct threat of Government control—laymen making judgments on medical issues, price-fixing, an unbending bureaucracy—which would inevitably lead to the decay of American medicine.

Secondly, Government's foot in the door can destroy a cherished tradition: the doctor-patient relationship. It is not generally appreciated, but when a patient signs a Medicare form, he is authorizing release of all information to those persons who will act on it. Many things are between doctor and patient and are not for public scrutiny. The patient loses this right of privacy with Medicare.

The third deficiency is the possibility of overuse of Medicare by the patient. The hypochondriac threat hasn't developed yet, but if it does, there is nothing in the law that can curb it. A patient, for example, can go to 50 different doctors for the same inconsequential complaint.

So Medicare dangles somewhere between heaven and hell (hell meaning socialization, to the medical profession). My own feeling is that we'll never be consigned to the demons. After all, we've survived many such crises before. In 1933 a medical-society president labeled another Government program "a major step toward communization and collectivization of American medicine." What he was talking about was the Veterans Administration.

Mr. Catastrophe

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, since the days of President Madison, the United States has maintained a policy of sending emergency assistance to disaster victims in foreign countries. In most cases, initial U.S. assistance reaches the stricken country within 24 to 72 hours after an appeal for help is received. This type of foreign aid is an open demonstration of American concern for the well-being of the people of all nations.

When disaster strikes, the U.S. Ambassador in the country is authorized to provide up to $25,000 from the contingency fund of the Agency for International Development for relief measures. If local resources are not adequate to meet the emergency situation, the AID disaster relief coordinator in Washington is asked to prepare a plan of assistance using the resources of U.S. Government agencies, the Red Cross and other voluntary agencies. He then acts as the control point for all assistance activities during the emergency.

Recently, when earthquakes shook the island of Sicily, the United States rushed to the aid of injured and homeless victims. Time magazine in its January 26, 1968 issue, reported on U.S. assistance during this crisis and the activities of the AID disaster relief coordinator, Stephen R. Tripp. I include that article, entitled "Mr. Catastrophe," for the benefit of our colleagues:

MR. CATASTROPHE

Sicily was still quaking last week as American relief planes lifted off for Palermo. Air Force and Navy transports carried tents, blankets, food, military trucks and antibiotics, a full 72,000 lbs of emergency supplies for the victims of the island's worst disaster since 1908 (*see* THE WORLD). Within hours of the first flights, U.S. television screens recorded glimpses of their handiwork: snug tent villages erected amidst the rubble, field kitchens turning out hot meals, doctors and medics ministering to the shocked and the injured. No one watched with greater concern than Stephen R. Tripp, 56, a dapper, cheerful State Department officer who has earned the ambivalent title of "Mr. Catastrophe."

Since 1964. Disaster Relief Coordinator Steve Tripp has coped coolly and shrewdly with 213 calamities, ranging from Hurricane Beulah's inundation of northeastern Mexico to the petrolific breakup of the tanker *Torrey Canyon* off Britain last summer. Most of his problems are caused by floods, though pestilence, famine, war and earthquake rank almost as high. Last year Tripp and his three-man staff (working from a minuscule suite near the White House) funneled $41.5 million worth of supplies and services to 39 countries—at a rate of nearly one disaster per week. Duplication is frequent, since some poor countries seem to be "disaster prone": last year, for example, India suffered both drought and smallpox, Nicaragua fire and famine.

Bureaucratic Bog-Down. "It's only going to get worse," predicts Tripp. "As the population increases, people are living closer to danger spots—closer to rivers that flood, the edges of islands on the hurricane path, spreading to places not suitable for building, like the *javelas* on the mountainsides of Rio de Janeiro." Because of Latin America's predilection for disaster, Tripp has stockpiled supplies in Panama for quick transit to the area. "We try to act within the first 24 to 72 hours," he says, realizing that the major diplomatic impact—not to mention the humanitarian aspects—of his coordinating function depends on speed in time of crisis. At that, some countries (including Algeria and Outer Mongolia) have chosen to reject American disaster aid out of ideological false pride.

Tripp's office was created only four years ago, after the Yugoslav earthquake at Skoplje, which killed 1,011 and revealed an arteriosclerotic lack of coordination in American relief response. Nonetheless, Mr. Catastrophe follows an honorable tradition. In 1812, President James Madison asked Congress for $50,000 to help Venezuelan earthquake victims, and U.S. aid to allies in distress has been consistent ever since. Tripp's main problem, predicably, is coping with "bureaucratic bog-down", he often negotiates personally with medical-supply stores to rent iron lungs, and last July he turned Sears, Roebuck & Co. into an Omar the Tentmaker to provide $1,800,000 worth of "Ted Williams Campers" for 100,000 Jordanians displaced by the Arab-Israeli war. Tripp is an avid outdoorsman and thus an aficionado of tent living by avocation.

Prime Concern. A California-born bureaucrat who spent most of his 35 years in Government employment as a Foreign Service officer (India, Colombia), Tripp is eminently qualified to manipulate the myriad agencies and offices that deal with distaster. In addition to the Pentagon, the Public Health Service, the Weather Bureau, oceanography office, Coast and Geodetic Survey, he also works with the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the International Red Cross and more than 100 other private agencies.

Last week, in his mild but unwavering way, Tripp wheedled the Air Force into computing the cost of its Sicilian airlift at the lowest possible rate; in the midst of a crisis, he often takes over the telephone headset himself for hours at a time to ensure that the job is completed as efficiently as possible. As for his clients, Tripp's prime concern is to keep them together as family units, thus speeding psychological recovery from cataclysm. "We want them to be comfortable," he says, but not too comfortable. We don't want them to stay permanently in the tents."

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 29th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

How May Congress Learn?

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report to my colleagues that there is a very real increase in interest on the part of Members of the House in adapting modern information-handling techniques to many of the problems which confront us as legislators. From time to time I have noted activity in this area, as it has taken place both in governmental and private sector circles, and have urged my farsighted associates to consider the value of computer technology and systems analysis as applied to the legislative and housekeeping functions of the House of Representatives specifically and the Congress as a whole.

Quite recently, I was honored to attend a special seminar conducted by the Brookings Institution for a bipartisan group of House Members on the subject of information support for the Congress. My distinguished colleagues ROBERT McCLORY, of Illinois, and WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, served as cohosts for the session. Much useful discussion was forthcoming as the result of interchange between the legislators in attendance and a group of resource persons: Prof. Martin Greenberger, of the Johns Hopkins University; Paul Armer, of the Rand Corp.; Robert Chartrand, the information sciences specialist of the Legislative Reference Service; Edward Mahoney, Associate Director for ADP, of GAO; Albert Abrams, secretary of the New York State Senate; and George Sadowsky, director of the Brookings computer center. I should particularly like to commend Stephen Horn of the Brookings Institution and a gentleman with extensive experience on Capitol Hill for the splendid way in which he served as moderator.

The importance of providing enhanced support to the individual Members and committees of the Congress cannot be overemphasized, in my opinion. We continue to generate thousands of inquiries on an incredible range of topics and expect the executive branch agencies, private organizations, and the Legislative Reference Service—LRS—to come up with the answers. Oftentimes, we require quick response information on bills which have been introduced, and this need causes the capable American Law Division of LRS to scrutinize a great deal of material that has been collected for publication in the "Digest of Public General Bills."

A heartening sign of progress in this connection is the series of new developments to place the synoptic information on congressional bills and resolutions in computerized form, using keyboard terminals located within the American Law Division. As a result of this activity, information on each bill can be entered into a remote computer, recalled for editing purposes, and eventually used in the preparation of the "Bill Digest." Having captured this information in machineable form, it then will be possible—although this will require a period of several months during which special retrieval programs are written—for many congressional inquiries to be answered by a computer review of selected machine-readable data.

Much is being written about the requirement for new ways and means of allowing Congress to study and solve the socioeconomic problems of our time. An article which recently appeared in Science magazine entitled "How May Congress Learn?" explores the needs of this body for improved information availability. The author, who is professor of sociology and a member of the institute of war and peace studies at Columbia University, believes that a critical question to be considered today centers about the "mechanisms available to the national legislature to update its knowledge." He further develops this line of exploration from the perspective that societal data inevitably is politically biased, and that dissemination criteria and procedures in large part determine who shall be aware of and benefit from available information.

I commend the contents of this piece to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

HOW MAY CONGRESS LEARN?

(By Amitai Etzioni)

An important question arose recently during a congressional hearing about "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" (S. 843), an act in which the United States is to review annually the "health" of American society. The question is: Who will be in charge of providing the data about the changing state of the society and how will it be made available to Congress? Stated more broadly, the issue concerns the mechanisms available to the national legislature to update its knowledge. In seeking an answer to this question, one must take into account: (i) the inevitability that knowledge about society will be politically "colored"; and (ii) that the slant of and the access to knowledge is affected by the distribution of resources used in its production and processing.

POLITICAL ELEMENTS OF KNOWLEDGE

The current debate among social scientists concerning the "objectivity" of social scientific knowledge is not central to our discussion. Even if it were shown that the social sciences could be completely free of value judgments, this would not mean that they are so at the present time. More importantly, the question of how a society (or its decision-making bodies) "learns" does not concern a "pure" scientific exploration but, rather, knowledge as it is applied to actual social situations. Here pragmatic considerations take priority, and these include political considerations.

Since the writings of Immanuel Kant, it has been clearly established that scientific knowledge is always incomplete and tentative. The gap that exists between what we are capable of learning and what we in fact know is unbreachable. And the knowledge we do have must be continually revised. Hence one can never rely on the information one receives as such, even when it is the best available; one must always add interpretations to attempt to close the gap between the knowledge available and that which a rational decision would require. Also, scientific knowledge tends to be contained within comparatively abstract and specialized disciplines; it thus provides a highly fragmented picture of reality. Decision-making, however, requires synthesized knowledge and an inter-disciplinary perspective. Thus, science per se provides only limited help for the decision-maker who must find connections among the facts of numerous disciplines, each incomplete in itself.

In short, the relationship between the social sciences and a societal decisionmaker is not very different from that between the natural sciences and a medical practitioner: Even if either practitioner had mastered all knowledge which the scientific discipline contains, he still would have to interpret, project, and make connections—on the basis of fragmented information and in accordance with the canons of the applied world.

The canons of the applied world, as in the case of medicine, begin with the question, "Does it help?" not, "Is it true?" The precise way in which medicine X works may be unknown, but this is of secondary concern to the practitioner if it cures the illness. Similarly, a societal decisionmaker may select a given course of action according to whether or not it will yield the desired results. His criteria for which action "works" has two elements: (i) Does it have the expected societal consequences? (that is, improve the quality of education); (ii) Is it a political asset or liability? As a rule, the decisionmaker judges new knowledge by both criteria simultaneously and he "trades" among them. He will tend to reject knowledge that improves the accuracy of his vision somewhat, if such revision (such as the view of China) will prove (or seem to prove) highly damaging politically. Hopefully, he accepts major items of new information even if they are somewhat politically damaging. The more difficult it is to evaluate validity (and it is usually quite difficult), the more important political considerations tend to become. This is a major root of the wide conservative bias against social science findings, the conclusions of which tend to point toward liberal policy.

It is in the interaction between knowledge producers and consumers, as between social sciences researchers and societal decision-makers, that the knowledge is selected and adapted politically. While experts do not deliberately slant their facts to make them acceptable, the variety of interpretations that can be given to the same set of data help the more acceptable ones to be more readily communicated. It is of secondary importance who actually prepares the more politically "digestible" interpretations—the expert himself, a popularizer colleague, a promoter, a staff aid, or the politician himself. Often it is done in collaboration and each provides a degree of interpretation which is then extended by the next one.

Although new knowledge generally filters into societal decision-making processes in this manner, there are significant differences in the degree to which new facts are interpreted and the extent to which politically undigestible facts are screened out. In part, this is a matter of how "hard" the science is, and hence, how demonstrable are its findings. In part, this depends on the nature of the relationship among knowledge producers and between knowledge producers and the decision-makers. This concerns us next.

Pluralism—the production of knowledge at many centers and the available support for this production at many sources—has often been cited as an important condition for increasing the validity of one's knowledge. Invalid theories are more likely to linger longer when one school of thought gains control of all major centers and sources. Similarly, when access to the decision-makers is limited, fewer interpretations (and facts) reach the decision-makers, who are then less aware of the tentative nature of the facts and theories which they have received and of the range of possible alternatives before them.

Pluralism alone is not sufficient; there also must be a roughly equal distribution of resources and access among the sources of information that compete as to who will be the supplier (or among the suppliers) of the decision-makers. If not, the contest may become similar to the confrontation between a young man from the Legal Aid Society and a battery of corporation lawyers. If the young lawyer's case is particularly good, he may prevail; it is more likely that his brief will be less adequate than that of his opponents. An imbalance of this nature becomes especially significant in societal decision-making where there are numerous "judges" and where the actor capable of presenting the most persuasive briefs to the greatest number of judges is more likely to gain an advantage.[1] [A recent study shows that when RAND made a major new finding of significant interest to the U.S. Air Force, it's own patron, it took 150 briefings, repeated "pulling of strings," circumventing of the lines of command, and a great deal of maneuvering before the finding made its way into the decision-making center.[2]] Such a strenuous and time-consuming effort could not be undertaken by a member of a university department or a representative of an unaffiliated research center.

At present, it is clear that resources and access in the United States (and many other nations) are far from evenly distributed. The inequities of this distribution reflect the priorities of society. For instance, about half of the federal budget and about half of its R&D expenditure are allotted to defense purposes, mirroring the country's present concern with national security and international military commitments. Other inequities have evolved over the years without having been deliberately planned or decided upon; the great discrepancy between the resources and facilities for the production of knowledge available to the executive and to the legislature, which is of particular importance here, is a case in point.

ENTER CONGRESS

The decline of legislatures in all Western democracies has been noted frequently by contemporary political scientists. This is the result of the rapid increase in the volume of the executive's activities without a concurrent increase in the legislature's capacity to oversee them. Thus, to put it somewhat dramatically, in 1955–6, 96 U.S. Senators had to oversee a 66.2 billion dollar enterprise, while in 1965–6, 100 Senators must oversee a 107 billion dollar enterprise, as well as two additional states.[3] A similarly striking example is provided by the knowledge explosion. The executive, by far the largest knowledge consumer in the United States, uses millions of dollars worth of information to guide its vast, intricate network of activities. If legislatures are to examine these operations, their efficiency, and their rationale, they will require manpower and resources far beyond their present supply. The basis of the problem is not, as it is sometimes said, that few members of Congress have scientific degrees; it would be neither practical nor desirable for Congress to rely for the evaluation of social programs and legislation on a member who, in his youth, gained a Ph.D., let us say, in sociology. Instead, the staffs attached to congressional committees are too small, insufficiently trained, and do not have adequate facilities to conduct independent analyses of the facts presented to Congress.

Legislatures, at the present time, rely primarily on three sources for their information: the executive, partisans (interest groups), and unaffiliated experts. Of these, the executive seems to provide by far the largest amounts of facts *and* interpretations. And for each fact and interpretation thus supplied which Congress is capable of challenging, scores of others (some of which often provide the context for the one challenged) go by unchallenged. Moreover, Congress has only a limited capacity to review the "inputted" data the executive presents in response to congressional queries. While some Congressmen have acquired a high degree of expertise and knowledge of the areas with which their committees deal (for example, several members of the Armed Services committee), most seem unable to keep pace with new developments and new knowledge. Similarly, while some staff members are experts, many others are lawyers by training and politicians by ambition; they have neither the time nor the facilities, especially computers, to keep abreast of new information.

Partisan groups are the second source of information. The information they supply to Congress is frequently aimed at contesting executive assertions. At the same time, however, this information is highly selective and slanted. The competition among interest groups with a variety of perspectives rarely yields a holistic view of society. And the adversary system allows its participants to determine which issue to focus on, and ignores those parts of the population not represented by interest groups; also, in many areas, interest groups are "specialized" and there are no countervailing groups.[4] Moreover, the process is not an automatic one; the synthesizing of a multiplicity of segmented and slanted reports into one encompassing and valid report is a far more demanding task than is often implied.

Representatives of universities, unaffiliated research centers, the press, and civic groups provide a third source of information. However, many of these experts are not "unaffiliated" in the full sense and often have special interests or ideologies to present. More importantly, there may be legitimate disagreement among them over facts, and above all, interpretations. But Congress has only a limited capacity to judge between the contested views provided by these various sources. For example, at the recent hearings about "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act," I argued for a separate facility attached to Congress (like the Library of Congress) that would provide for impartial analyses of societal data. My colleague, Philip Hauser, who testified after me, argued that this was not necessary since data provided by the executive was objective, reliable, and dependable.[5] In this situation, how could Chairman Fred R. Harris and his subcommittee members determine which proposition was valid? Ideally, Senator Harris could ask his staff to check a random set of data presented to congressional committees during the last year. But this would require at least a few men working for a few months, more than the total staff of the subcommittee, and more effort than was allowed for his review of this act. Hence, their judgment, as well as most others, was likely to be made on the basis of "informal" perusals of information already available, on intuition, and political considerations.

It should also be noted that unlike branches of the executive, Congress has few funds to "farm out" research. For example, when NASA sought to stress that its space program had considerable economic "spinoffs," it could grant funds to researchers to search for corroborative evidence. However, if, after the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had received the report, press reports had indicated that NASA had overstated its case, the committee could not, even if it desired, "farm out" a sample for independent review by a research organization.

ADAPTATION

The net result is the partial "blinding" of Congress and, in my judgment, the increasing exclusion of the executive's work from democratic supervision. It may be argued that in an age of mass information the "rule" of the expert is inevitable, and that it is just as well that politicians are kept from interfering in administrative processes. Making Congress more effective, it may be said, is making the conservative forces of society more powerful. However, the basis of the problem is that intensive and encompassing societal action requires societal backing (or "consensus") if it is not to be alienating or prohibitively expensive. In the past, the national legislature was a major source of this consensus. Now, since legislatures are provided with insufficient information (while the scope of societal activities is steadily augmenting), their capacity to act effectively is declining. Lack of consensus is a major barrier.

In France, where the legislature is even weaker than in most other Western democracies, an adaptation has evolved: The government experts deal directly with the various interest groups, sharing information with them, learning what their needs and preferences are, and influencing them to back the necessary societal action. The interaction of the experts and the representatives of interest groups generates a measure of extra-parliamentary consensus-formation. (This process is even more visible in the European Economic Community which, in effect, has no legislature, but does have an active bureaucracy.) But these are nondemocratic adaptations, which create an executive bias toward the interest groups and neglect other segments of the public.

CONCLUSION

If the capacity of the legislature to build consensus and oversee the executive is to be restored, a variety of new resources must be assigned to the legislature. Larger staffs are needed for congressmen and especially congressional committees; the additional staff members should have research training and should not be assignable to functions other than those of a congressional research assistant. A major congressional research unit is needed in which information (other than books and documents), especially statistics, IBM decks, and computer tapes could be stored. A unit of this type would be able to provide a congressman or congressional committee with a detailed analysis and evaluation of data submitted to him from other sources. (To some extent, the Library of Congress provides services of this kind, but we suggest that what is needed is a much more extensive, computer-operated and wholly research-oriented unit.) In addition, there should be sufficient funds for congressional committees to "farm out" research tasks. Finally, the informal hearing procedure should be replaced with a more rigorous one, so that witnesses will be more reluctant to give "stretched" interpretations, and more inclined to arm themselves with valid information.

---

[1] The relationship between equality of resources and knowledge is further explored in A. Etzioni, *The Active Society* (Free Press, New York, 1968), chap. 9.

[2] B. L. R. Smith, *The RAND Corporation; Case Study of a Nonprofit Advisory Corporation* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966), chap. 6.

[3] *The Budget of the U.S. Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1966* (GPO, Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 490, table 15; *The Budget . . . Ending June 30, 1967* (GPO, Washington, D.C., 1966), table 15.

[4] G. McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy* (Knopf, New York, 1966).

[5] Hearing of the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research, 90th Congress, July 1967.

WEMD Receives Associated Press Award

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, radio station WEMD in Easton, Md., was awarded a runner-up citation for newsstory contributions in the national competition held by the Associated Press. Though not a large station, WEMD is alert to newsworthy incidents and does an outstanding job in reporting the news.

WEMD has also received many awards from the Chesapeake Associated Press Broadcasting Association. In 1964 the station received two superior ratings for editorials and continuing coverage, and an excellent rating for spot news. In 1965 WEMD was awarded a plaque for outstanding news operation, and two first place ratings for sports reporting and in depth reporting. In 1966, the station again received a plaque for outstanding news operation, and three first place ratings for sports reporting, for reporting of the fire and blizzard, and for public affairs—editor's interview.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor WEMD today. The Associated Press awards were well deserved due to the fine news coverage and dedicated service with which that station has served Easton and the surrounding communities on the Eastern Shore.

Vietnam Is Dying

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's churchmen are increasingly speaking out with great courage against the war in Vietnam. A few days ago, a letter came to my office from some American Mennonite missionaries in South Vietnam. It is an open letter titled "Letter From Vietnam to American Christians," and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

These churchmen are not speaking from a position of noninvolvement, and they cannot be accused of demonstrating half a world away from what is happening. Since 1957 they have been involved in the Vietnam war. They speak with authority because of what they have seen while trying to relieve some of the suffering caused by the war.

They tell us what we already know is more and more evident: "Vietnam is dying."

For whatever justification that is being given for our presence there, these missionaries report that the "basic issues become overshadowed by the war itself and the way it is being conducted."

With unanimous consent, I put this letter before my colleagues hoping they will read it. I think we would all be wise to listen when churchmen of our country are speaking out so forcefully on this moral issue:

LETTER FROM VIETNAM TO AMERICAN CHRISTIANS

DECEMBER 1967.

DEAR AMERICAN CHRISTIANS: We, the Mennonite missionaries in Vietnam, have been engaged in church and service programs in the Saigon area since 1957. In recent years we have seen the suffering of the Vietnamese people increase incredibly. As Christians, we too feel compelled to declare our concern for the moral issues involved in our country's action here.

It is not our aim to speak as political commentators or final authorities. Even statistics often seem misleading in this divided, confused situation. We wish rather to share our impressions gathered from what we have seen and heard while working with Vietnamese people. For we sense that American Christians are not aware of the feelings and dilemma of the general population here.

THE NATURE OF THE CONFLICT

Perhaps the most crucial issue lies in understanding the nature of this struggle. To speak of supporting a free, independent people in their fight against external communist aggression does not describe the conflict we sense. The more we learn of its historical development and social dimensions, the more troubled we become with this assumption.

A century of Western colonialism, an eight-year battle for independence, a temporary partition of the country, a national election never permitted: these are but a few of the historical facts which lie in the background. From their perspective it is possible for the other side to feel they are fighting a second time for what they won from the French, but were denied through a treaty which was never carried out.

Another decisive factor is social reform for the peasant people, the 80 percent who have the least but suffer the most. They know that many who now are supporting U.S. policy also sided with the French earlier in the war. They associate the Saigon government with maintaining aristocratic and Western interests. And the United States is viewed as preserving the privileged minorities who attract little support.

Thus despite our government's stated intentions, most Vietnamese apparently see America as only replacing France; the feeling of being used still pervades their life and spirit. The growing presence and power of foreigners once more causes the spirit of nationalism to burn brighter among the opposition elements. Even many who earlier favored America's assistance are now fearful of domination and destruction, feeling the "medicine" is worse than the "disease."

THE MEANS TO THE END

But all these basic issues become overshadowed by the war itself and the way it is being conducted. Our leaders acknowledge that the key to victory is winning the loyalty of the country people; yet most of America's energy and resources is expended in massive destruction of their life, property, and social order. We believe that such primary reliance on military force is insuring defeat on the goals being sought.

It is obvious to the Vietnamese that U.S. and Allied forces are causing most of the devastation and disruption. This side has thousands of planes plus warships, tanks, etc., while the VC have none of these. Even most Americans have seen and heard enough of forced evacuations, bombed villages, defoliated fields, burned people, prostitution, inflation, corruption, etc., to sense the cumulative impact of all this in a country more populous than California yet not half as large. As a Vietnamese friend summarized it: "Vienam is dying."

We do not condone the atrocities and terror of the other side. But can these acts justify a multiplication of them many times over by the Western forces? For three years the U.S. military has capitalized on its overwhelming. superior firepower to destroy guerrilla fighters living among the people. Yet the most apparent result—besides the dead and maimed—is increasing hostility and resistance. As fast as they are killed, others rise up in their places. Victory for our leaders seems dependent on killing off enough people to crush all opposition.

According to the Saigon government, nearly one-fourth of the South Vietnamese people have been uprooted, many of them forced into inhumane existence. While this removes their support from the guerrillas and creates convenient free-bombing zones, it also is a mortal blow to the whole society. For today millions of Vietnamese are dependent on American handouts even for their daily rice. The assumption that one can build while destroying the very structure he must build upon appears fatal.

THE IMPACT ON OUR WORLD

We are also concerned because the country people being disregarded here represent the tragic plight of many Asians. What are the 250 million people of India who live in breadlines on four dollars a month concluding about America's concern? Our nation's expenditure of billions of dollars and thousands of young lives for destructive purposes will be judged in light of such appalling need. They are asking for justice and progress: we send troops and bombers. To whom will they turn?

Moreover, the world gets the impression that the Christians' God is behind our country's action in Vietnam. They see pictures of church leaders and chaplains with the U.S. troops and hear that our president prays God to bless "our pilots" on their missions of destruction. Since we are generally regarded as a Christian nation, Christianity itself is entangled in America's military ventures and political policies.

This is a call to all Christians to become aware of the image being given to our faith. We sense a continuing rejection of this religion of the wealthy, white, warring West, for which we all bear responsibility. We fear that nations may close their doors and multitudes will be deaf to God's call because of the American Christians' participation in and support of this war.

CONCLUSION

In light of these serious offenses against social justice, human life, and the Christian faith, we therefore plead for:

A true consideration for the interests and needs of the Vietnamese majority.

A change of heart which will not only admit but also accept the consequences of past failures and mistakes against these people.

A change of policy and tactics which will show them that our primary concern is for their own well-being, self-respect, and independence.

A tolerant spirit which would not force others to line up with us, but rather seek to understand their feelings and views.

A fresh demonstration of our confession that in Christ there is no East or West.

JAMES K. STAUFFER.
EVERETT G. METZLER.
LUKE S. MARTIN.
JAMES E. METZLER.
DON M. SENSENIG.
S. LUKE BEIDLER.

The men who signed above are Mennonite missionaries and before going to Vietnam lived at the following places:

James K. Stauffer: Harrisonburg, Virginia.
Everett Metzler: Manheim, Pennsylvania.
Luke Martin: New Holland, Pennsylvania.
James E. Metzler: Harrisonburg, Virginia.
Don M. Sensenig: Akron, Pennsylvania.
S. Luke Beidler: Quakertown, Pennsylvania.

Estonian Independence Day

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, Estonia's independence was the culmination of

200 years' struggle by its gallant people against the oppressive autocracy of Russia's czars. These stouthearted Estonians, numbering barely more than one million, had never bowed their heads to their powerful overlords after their forced subjugation to the Russians after 1710. During all that time they struggled hard for their freedom, but they had to await until 1918 for its attainment.

In 1917, when Russia's decrepit autocratic regime was overthrown, Estonians asserted their right and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918. They then set up their own democratic government and were remarkably successful in making their war-ravaged country a happy land of peace and prosperity. But they were allowed to enjoy their freedom in peace for only two decades, for at the very beginning of the last war they were attacked and overwhelmed by the Red Army, and in mid-1940 Estonia became part of the Soviet Union. From then on Estonians have not known freedom, and today they are not even allowed to observe their independence day. But we in the free world duly mark the observance of the 50th anniversary of that memorable event and echo their genuine patriotic sentiment.

Ware Bros. Co. Opens New Printing Plant in King of Prussia, Pa.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, in the Philadelphia area we residents are justly proud of the many business firms which have been in continuous operation for more than 100 years.

We are proud, also, that while these firms may be old in history and tradition, they do not hesitate to take bold new steps to keep pace with the business world of today. Such a firm is the Ware Bros. Co., a printing concern that was founded in 1865 and has just moved to an ultramodern new office and plant building in King of Prussia, Pa., built at a cost of over $1 million.

The Ware Bros. Co., under the leadership since 1944 of President Samuel L. Veitch, has become a leading manufacturer of books in the Delaware Valley and a prime supplier of lithographic and web offset printing services.

From 1944 to 1968 its sales have grown from $250,000 to $4 million annually; its employees from 15 to nearly 200. In its new plant, which has 70,000 square feet of space, Ware Bros. Co. expects to continue and accelerate this exceptional pattern of growth.

The new Ware Bros. Co. plant, Mr. Speaker, makes a fine addition to the booming modern industrial complex at King of Prussia. It will also mean a greater contribution to the economic vitality of the entire Delaware Valley region.

Topical Comment: Vanishing Gold—United States Must Solve the Outflow Problem

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD. I urge my colleagues of the House to seriously consider the establishment of a strategic stockpile reserve of gold.

As we debate the removal of gold as a backing to our currency, simultaneous action should recognize this urgent requirement as expertly detailed in the Los Angeles Times of February 8, 1968, in a column by Stefan T. Possony.

I commend this article to the Members:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 8, 1968]

TOPICAL COMMENT: VANISHING GOLD—UNITED STATES MUST SOLVE THE OUTFLOW PROBLEM

(By Stefan T. Possony)

(NOTE.—Dr. Stefan T. Possony is director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. His books include "A Century of Conflict" and "Lenin, the Compulsive Revolutionary.")

Money is the nerve of war. This fact was known to Cicero, Tacitus, Plutarch and Thucydides, and probably to the "operations analysts" of pre-historical times. An advisor told Louis XII of France that to make war he needed "money, more money, always money."

Machiavelli dissented and quoted Solon as saying to Croesus: "War is waged with iron and not with gold." Stalin agreed, According to him, war and revolution require "arms, arms, and arms again." But we are discovering that American world strategy, as presently conceived presupposes something like an inexhaustible gold treasure.

With a gross national product of nearly $800 billion, the United States should be able to finance its defense. Unfortunately, since 1949, when we adopted our present strategy and when our gold stock reached its maximum of $24.5 billion, we have lost more than $12 billion in gold. This happened despite our consistently favorable trade balance and $55 billion worth of military sales. Assuming the rules of the game remain unchanged, our last ounce of gold should pass into foreign hands by 1980, at the latest.

There are some who contend gold is no longer important. Yet the dollar is the main international currency. Our economic strength, which is the real foundation of our military power, presupposes interdependence with the rest of the world. This interdependence will work only as long as the dollar remains sound, and the dollar will remain a world currency only as long as foreigners are able to cash it for gold. Throughout history, gold has been the only real international money. This is still true today.

During 1967, the pound was devalued, primarily because of weaknesses in the British economy. But the closing of the Suez Canal in 1967 added the incremental pressure which made devaluation inevitable.

It always has been American policy to insist upon open international waterways. A temporary closing of the Suez Canal may have been unavoidable because of the Arab-Israel war, but we have obviously lacked the power (or the will) to ensure prompt reopening. As long as the Suez Canal remains closed and some of the oil-producing Arab states refuse to deposit their oil income in London, the pound will be under pressure. The attack on the pound is designed to "get" the dollar. It has already cost us a large amount of gold.

Economic decline is forcing the United Kingdom to withdraw its forces from the areas east of Suez. This withdrawal exposes such crucial positions as Malaysia, Singapore and possibly Hong Kong to Communist conquest and may vitiate our ultimate success in Vietnam.

More important still, the oil fields around the Persian Gulf, which are vital to the economy of Europe, will be undefended when the British withdraw. If these oil fields fall, the U.S.S.R. may achieve control over the major energy resource of the European economy, and may end up holding most of the world's gold. 'Hence the United States will have to assume the responsibilities of which Britain is divesting itself. This augmentation of our strategic tasks will accelerate the gold drain.

The British cancelled their $1 billion order for the F-111 which was to become the RAF's new bomber. Thus, we are losing important foreign income and probably must pay more for our own F-111 procurement. It is unlikely that we will compensate for the loss of British airpower.

Our gold shortage is forcing us to withdraw 35,000 soldiers from Germany, a 14% reduction of U.S. military strength at the world's most dangerous border. In case of trouble, the forces which will be returned home can be flown to Europe within two weeks. Whether the arrangement will work is highly questionable. In brief, NATO may cease to be an effective deterrent force.

We will have to place radars, and possibly ABM's, in the southern hemisphere to protect America against the new threat of the Soviet fractional orbital bombardment system.

As presently conducted, the Vietnamese war, which has already devoured substantial amounts of gold, probably will continue for some time. Each day is weakening our gold position further. Once the war is concluded, the rehabilitation of Vietnam will have to be paid for, partly in gold. If we are to make good on our promise to provide $1 billion to develop the Mekong River Valley, we will have to spend gold again.

Future limited wars, which are virtually inevitable, will make additional demands on our dwindling gold stock.

The brutal fact is that weapons are becoming more expensive and our strategic responsibilities are growing. Hence our gold expenditures will rise and not decline.

We cannot pay out gold till the last ounce, or else we will be helpless in emergencies. We cannot retrench economically without isolating ourselves and upsetting the European economy, thus opening the floodgates to a new world crisis. We cannot contract militarily without increasing the probability of war.

We have no choice but to adopt a substantially more effective strategy. But this calls for an early solution to the gold problem. The United States had better heed the poignant Turkish proverb which says: "If you have money you are wise, if you don't you are a fool."

Public Reverence

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for over 6 years now, participation in prayer in the public schools has been denied to our children. Since the first in the series of prayer decisions was handed down by the Supreme Court in 1962, more and more of our schools have been forced to discard the practice of asking for God's help and leadership at the beginning of each school day, even when such a practice would not be of a mandatory—but rather of a voluntary—nature.

But we who feel it is the right of every individual to pray anywhere at any time have not been still. I have joined with my Republican colleague in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, in sponsoring a bipartisan amendment to the Constitution to permit voluntary participation in nondenominational prayer in public schools. We are not alone in this fight. Surveys show that almost 80 percent of the American public would like to see this practice restored to our children. Many members of the clergy have been particularly active in the drive to see the right of prayer restored, or at least to give the American people a chance to express their feelings on this issue in a meaningful manner. One of the most diligent participants in this fight is the Reverend Robert G. Howes, associate professor and chairman of city and regional planning at the Catholic University of America, in Washington, D.C. In addition, he is the Washington representative of the Citizens for Public Prayer, a nationwide organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues a thought-provoking article on the subject of public prayer submitted by Reverend Howes to the February 1968 edition of the National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin. I am sure it will be found to be a clear, complete, and logical view of the public feeling on this issue.

The article follows:

Challenge to the Democracy—Public Reverence

(By Rev. Robert G. Howes)

(NOTE.—Father Howes is Associate Professor and Chairman of City and Regional Planning at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. He is the representative in Washington of Citizens for Public Prayer, a national federation of citizens' groups backing a restorative prayer amendment.)

When the U.S. Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution in a manner which radically contradicts the consistent practice of the majority of the states, it does no singular, minimal thing. Whatever the particular practice, that interpretation immediately becomes a precedent affecting the whole future of religion in our public life. As such it must deeply concern not only whose practice is denied but also those who are involved in any way with religion as subject to and supportive of public policy.

On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court interpreted the First Amendment as barring the following prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we ask Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The prayer had been composed by a committee of religious leaders. It was made available by the State of New York for an entirely voluntary recitation by pupils and teachers in its public schools. Justice Stewart, in dissent, noted: "The Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle . . . What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our government."

On June 17, 1963 the Supreme Court widened this interpretation to ban the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools of Maryland and Pennsylvania. Once again, no teacher had been required to lead prayer, no pupil to join in reciting it. Specific provision was made for abstention on the part of those who did not wish to participate. There are many pleasant phrases in the two majority decisions. Most of them are collateral remarks, *obiter dicta*, that is remarks incidental to the real deciding reason. One could, and some did, assemble such remarks and claim that the court had done nothing more serious than to rule out a residual unfairness, leaving public religion itself wholly intact.

There are, however, other *obiter dicta* which are less sanguine. For instance, in the first decision Justice Douglas enumerates various instances of government accommodation to religion. Bishop James Pike, appearing before a Senate committee in 1962, called such reasonable accommodation "the great American middle way." Justice Douglas says "our system at the federal and state levels is presently honeycombed" with accommodation. "Nevertheless," he continues, "I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." In fact, the deed of the decisions, what the then Harvard Law School Dean Erwin Griswold called "the absolute and . . . extreme" reasoning of the court, is dangerously basic. Henry P. Van Dusen, then President of Union Theological Seminary, wrote: "The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances."[1]

Fordham University Law School Professor Charles E. Rice said: "The school prayer decisions, if followed, predictably will have the effect of raising agnosticism to the rank of the official public religion of the United States. The Court has now cast aside the historical affirmation by government in this country of the essential truth of theism, has embarked upon a search for "neutrality,' a search incapable of success, and has substituted agnosticism for the theistic affirmation to which a small minority has objected so strongly. And for its action the Court can point to no durable justification beyond its own inflated rhetoric and a tortured historical interpretation."[2]

The *Boston Pilot* editorialized:

"ALL PUBLIC LIFE AFFECTED

"The Supreme Court in the Lord's prayer and Bible ruling has continued along a path unhappily familiar to all from its earlier decisions. The same tedious arguments emphasizing the 'establishment of religion' clause are brought forth to support a position which turns its back on the total American tradition and outlaws the present practices of 39 states . . . Let us suppose that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are excluded from the American public schools for precisely the reasons given by the Supreme Court. What is the next step? Clearly, all other expression of religion in public life must now be deleted . . ."[3]

To suggest that pleasant phrases en route to decision can override the deed of the decisions themselves is to ignore the heart of the matter. That heart clearly is the equation by the Supreme Court of "establishment" with public reverence, whether free or not, whether institutional and sectarian or not. Even to question such an equation, the court said in its second decision, is "of value only as academic exercises!" The situation is, in short, as it was a century ago when Abraham Lincoln commented on the Dred Scott decision: "When all the words, the collateral matter was cleared away from it, all the chaff was fanned out of it, is was a bare absurdity. . . . The Dred Scott decision covers the whole ground, and while it occupies it, there is no room for the shadow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same ground."[4]

Five years have passed since the first prayer ban. In those years, several significant things have happened.

(1) Literally hundreds of bills were introduced in both the House and Senate calling for a clarifying amendment to restore the First Amendment to its pre-ban interpretation and to forestall a further widening of the court's logic. There were 117 such bills on the House side alone in the spring of 1964. Senate Joint Resolution Number 1 of the 90th Congress was signed by 42 senators of both parties. It proposed a restorative constitutional amendment which would read:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer."

(2) Catholic response to the prayer bans was openly mixed, though there is no possible doubt that Catholics were in great numbers part of the massive pro-amendment majority across the nation. The National Council of Youth officially recorded itself as opposed to the prayer bans and called upon all of its local units to work for reversal. Otherwise, where Catholic apathy and even support of the decisions showed itself, it has been suggested that an underlying cause was self-interest: "It may be that some of it is motivated by the thought that if public education can be completely secularized (so that, as it has been said, 'religion' in such quarters becomes 'a dirty word'), then there will be an increased public demand for sectarian education which can combine religion with general education. This could then be an argument in favor of parochial schools, and as public schools decline, the argument for public support of parochial schools can be advanced in one guise or another."[5]

I hope this estimate is inaccurate. I fear it may be, in at least a partial sense, accurate. Our bishops wrote that "religion is our chief national asset," and as such what happens to it anywhere at law must affect it everywhere. I am afraid some of us have simply failed to make the vital connection between what occurred in the prayer ban decisions and those aspects of the First Amendment which preoccupy us more immediately. Too many Catholics have simply failed to appreciate that any fundamental interpretation of the First Amendment by the Supreme Court must over a period of time operate in all areas of religion and public policy, including the area of government aid to nonpublic schools under religious auspices.

(3) Eleven of the 13 justices who passed on the New York prayer issue prior to its arrival at the Supreme Court ruled it constitutional. The attorneys general of 19 states submitted a "friend of the court" brief to the Supreme Court, prior to the first decision, which said in part:

"Our founding fathers, together with the great and God-fearing leaders of the last century and a half, would be profoundly shocked were they to have been told in their day that in this year of our Lord . . . a voluntary nondenominational acknowledgment of a Supreme Being and a petition for His blessings recited by American children in their classrooms is being seriously attacked as a violation of the Constitution of the United States."[6]

---

[1] The New York Times, *July 7, 1963*.

[2] The Supreme Court and Public Prayer (*New York, 1964*), *p. 21*.

[3] *June 21, 1963*. The Boston Pilot *is the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.*

[4] *Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 16, 1859; Galesburg, Ill., Oct. 13, 1858.*

[5] *Griswold, Erwin N.* Utah Law Review, *Vol. 3, No. 8* (*Summer 1963*).

It was clear from Congressional reaction that a massive mail concurring with such judgments was hitting Capitol Hill. "King-size" was how Senator Dirksen described it. Resolutions endorsing what came to be called the Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer came from the National Conference of Governors, the National Conference of Mayors, legislatures of several states, the National Jaycees, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and from such men as Billy Graham, Cardinal Cushing, the late Cardinal Spellman and Bishop Fulton Sheen. Sampling after sampling confirmed the will of the nation. The Gallup Poll in September 1963 recorded a three-to-one majority for reversing the court in its prayer decisions. In October 1964 the Harris Poll put the figure at 82 percent for amendment. Congressional home district polls backed the national sampling. Again and again there was no subject on which more of a congressman's constituents were united than on the need for a prayer amendment, and no subject in which "don't know" ran lower, or majorities ran consistently higher. At each hearing on prayer amendment proposals, thousands of pro-amendment petitions were presented. About 40,000 petitions were introduced on the very first day of the House hearings (1964) by Congressman Fallon of Maryland. To the Senate hearings (1966), we introduced in behalf of amendment 35,000 petitions from Pennsylvania, 30,000 from New York and 50,000 from the Midwest. In the spring of 1967 *Good Housekeeping* magazine came up again with an 80-plus percentage for amendment.

(4) Despite all this, not one single normal floor vote has been held in five-and-a-half years in either house of Congress on even the technicality of proposing a prayer amendment to the nation. And hearings in this critical matter were forced in the House Judiciary Committee only after a discharge petition to bypass Chairman Emanuel Celler, who was bitterly negative, had nearly succeeded.

(5) In the wake of the prayer ban decisions, things have not stood still. A number of trends have developed. Two are of major importance. First, a trend toward a kind of fearful indecision on the part of public authority. School boards everywhere were from the start anxiously uncertain about whether and how religion was to survive in the public classroom. In some instances, boards have defied the court, but this is, patently, no solution to the problem. In a few instances, boards have tried to substitute various procedures, such as God sandwiched between Thoreau and Ben Franklin for morning assembly reading. These instances, however, remain so rare that each one is the subject of national notice. In most cases the net result has been one of the following: a) to rule religion out entirely; b) to emasculate religion before it is permitted in the school, thus reducing it to the merest art, history or literature; c) to decide any particular question involving religion in the classroom in favor of parents who might conceivably object to it along lines indicated in the prayer ban record. Secondly, there has been a trend toward enlargement of the prayer ban to affect other practices of public reverence. Courts and some attorneys general have relied on prayer ban decisions to strike down kindergarten prayers and such substitutes as the singing of patriotic anthems. In the fall of 1966 the Supreme Court relied significantly on the decisions to knock out aid for church-related colleges in Maryland.

Meanwhile, it was again and again made clear by such opponents of religion in public life as Madalyn Murray O'Haire that the prayer ban would be used as a launching pad for further attacks on all surviving instances of public reverence. It is, of course, impossible to predict with precision just how far the court will go toward accommodating these attacks, but its defenses against them must be seriously weakened by the majority reasoning in the prayer ban cases.

Of course, at the very base of the prayer amendment issue stands the issue of parental rights. There is no question that God belongs in the homes and the churches of America. There is no question that a serious re-examination of His presence there is imperative. But religion is not strengthened at the hearth and the sectarian altar by denying it entry to the public classroom. Religion is not strengthened in the heads and hearts of American youth by wiping it off their lips precisely where most of them prepare for citizenship in a reverent society. What is rather indicated is a joint activity, carefully respectful of the right of dissent, which involves church, home and school. In its 1951 Statement of Belief, which recommended school prayer, the New York State Board of Regents said:

"We believe that thus the school will fulfill its high function of supplementing the training of the home, even intensifying in the child that love for God, for parents and for home which is the mark of true character training and the sure guarantee of a country's welfare."

In its *Decree on Education* Vatican II underlined how the principle of subsidiarity applies in public education:

"The Church gives high praise to those civil authorities and civil societies that show regard for the pluralistic character of modern society and take into account the right of religious liberty, by helping families in such a way that in all schools the education of their children can be carried out according to the moral and religious convictions of each family."

It is suggested by those who oppose a prayer amendment that the court banned only "prescribed" prayer and that other types of religious presence in the public classroom stand unaffected, indeed encouraged. There is at the very base of the court's decisions a fatal, secularizing equation. Once this equation has been repealed, there is certainly place for reexamination of the entire gamut of that presence. Various approaches to religion as a force for morality and civic strength can and should be tested. Citizens for Public Prayer fully support such testing, but at the right time. So long as the prayer ban remains, however, there can be no compromise. Generally, those who ask substitutes for the brotherhood of prayer call for a moment of silent meditation, classes in comparative religion or the rendition of God strictly in paintings, dates and poetry. Each substitution has its weakness. Collectively, they are totally inadequate to the need of the situation.

Let's take meditation first. It is most significant that the same day the Massachusetts legislature sanctioned meditation in the public schools of the state it petitioned Congress in support of a prayer amendment. A quiet God is better than no God. But a quiet God cannot provide that experience in pluralism which a spoken God encourages. One great advantage of the brotherhood of prayer consists, precisely, in the fact that through it children from various religious backgrounds are taught that although they go freely to their separate churches and synagogues over the weekend, still they can freely find and pronounce together common words of uniting reverence each day during the week. Besides, meditation is extremely difficult even for adults. To suppose that grade school youngsters can meditate properly is a delusion.

As for classes in comparative religion, it may be that once the prayer ban is repealed we can move along these lines. But such classes will require teachers who have the wisdom of Solomon, and are objective enough to relate one religion to another without bias. And should these teachers fail even slightly, offended parents will rise to challenge them in the courts, just as parents who objected to the earlier prayer did.

In regard to religion as art, history and literature, it is true that under these aspects it belongs in many classes, so that children of a reverent people may review their inheritance. But what a tragedy it would be if God could come into school only as a footnote in classes otherwise preoccupied and minus any factor of reverence whatsoever! Religion is more than dates and pretty pictures and nice phrases. Religion is reverence. Any proposal which drains it of its prayerful blood is anemic to start with. In short, none of the suggested substitutes is, at least in its present state of refinement, adequate. None would in any way remove the tragic precedent of the two prayer ban decisions. Finally, the closer any one of them came to being a real collective reverence, the more likely it is that it would be challenged and struck down by courts under the compulsion of prayer ban logic.

MAJORITY-MINORITY PROBLEM

There is another item in the prayer amendment debate which must be pondered. This is the item of majority-minority relationships in a democracy. It has two facets. The first is: How should society accommodate in its practices a majority will against which there is marshaled a loud minority will? The second is: In the public classroom how should the dissent from prayer and the desire for prayer be handled with justice all around? In regard to the first question, it must at the outset be agreed that 50 percent plus one does not of itself make a thing right. Democracy must never be a matter of a bull-headed majority tyrannizing over a cowed minority. Neither must it ever be an oligarchy in which a miniscule elite, somehow wiser, forces its preference on an unwilling majority. This latter state becomes what *The Boston Pilot* has called a "tyranny of the few." One thing is clear: As in all such controversial situations, a dissenting minority must be assured to the maximum reasonable extent its right of silence and abstention. To permit a minority's preference to dominate public practice, however, thus denying to an overwhelming majority its will, is an intolerable travesty of democracy. In this case, a strong argument can be mounted in support of the traditional, pre-ban interpretation of the First Amendment. Even Justice Brennan, siding with the majority in the second prayer ban decision, concedes that its factual position is far from conclusive: "On our precise problem, the historical record is at best ambiguous, and statements can readily be found to support either side of the proposition."

But even if the court's reading of the history and the semantics were accurate, the case for a clarifying amendment would still stand. No people in a free society are required to be prisoners of words which, in that hypothesis, do not say what the people wish them to say and do not permit practices which the people overwhelmingly wish to provide for themselves and for their children. As in the flag salute situation, what is required of a wise judiciary is not a decision rendering the majority silent before an intolerant minority but one that allows the greatest prudential accommodation for dissent while the majority will prevails. The second facet of majority-minority relationships here can be expressed in a question: Is school prayer an unconscionable intrusion on the rights of the dissenting child and his parents? It must be repeated that in the three prayer ban states, school prayer had been entirely voluntary for both teacher and pupil. Tolerance is, and must continue to be, a two-way street. So long as he is respected in his right to be different, the dissenting child must learn to respect the right of the majority of his fellow students who wish to pray together. Dean Griswold's treatment of this critical matter is excellent:

---

[6] *United States Supreme Court, October term 1961,* Document #468.

"Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? . . . No compulsion is put upon him (i.e. the dissenting child). He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and respect what they feel is significant to them. Is not this a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the minority group?"[7]

A related question is often posed. Whose prayer? The answer is simple. Once the civil right of public reverence is restored in the public school, the American people again will select, with a minimum of mistakes and a maximum of good common sense, a reasonably nondenominational prayer. To suppose that any group of Americans with a sectarian majority would be so callous of its neighbors as to insist on a sectarian prayer in their public schools is to fly in the face of the great bulk of American experience. But even should, in a rare instance, such a prayer be proposed, recourse for remedy would still be open with the courts. What is clearly urgent in this entire issue of majority-minority rights is a reasonable pluralism, the kind of adjustment and prudential accommodation which mature men make with their neighbors in any complex matter in which a common decision is required. With such a responsible pluralism, the solution to difficulties such as wording a proper amendment and coming up with consensus prayers is easy. Without it, we become quickly a jungle of selfish predatory religious groups, careless of neighbors and haggling over every approach to that harmony which has so long been the major motif of our people.

A few words of prayer by children in a public place will not alone change the world. The brotherhood of prayer remains an important part of an important pattern. Clearly, however, much more than this is at stake in the fight to write a Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer. The whole matter of a reasonable and, reasoned pluralism is involved here. So is the survival intact of all practices of public reverence. So is every other controversial aspect of church-state relationship. So, finally, is the very workability of the democracy itself. It is simply incredible that there are still Catholics concerned with democracy, education and pluralism who cannot, or will not, understand these things. John Donne wrote that "no man is an island." It can be said with equal force that no decision of the U.S. Supreme Court fundamentally interpreting the First Amendment against the expressed will of the nation is an island—a minimal, a singular thing. Remedial action now, loud and long, is emphatically indicated. Seldom has the alternative to such action been put more strongly than by Father Joseph Costanzo, S.J., professor of historical jurisprudence at Fordham University:[8]

"American believers are losing by default. They have taken their spiritual heritage for granted. They have allowed a creeping gradualism of secularism, under one specious pretext or another, to take over their public schools. A vociferous and highly organized pressure group is exercising its own form of indirect coercive pressure upon the American community."

---

[7] *Op. cit.*

[8] This Nation Under God (*New York, 1964*), *pp. 131–32.*

A Continuing Need

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when some are questioning the need to maintain a strong and effective North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Christian Science Monitor has written an interesting editorial entitled "A Continuing Need." It refers to what it calls a "remarkable and succinct" statement of policy on NATO by a British officer, Gen. Sir John Hackett, Commander of NATO's Northern Army Group.

I include this timely reminder of the continuing importance of militarily strong NATO to the security of the Western World in the RECORD:

A CONTINUING NEED

A British general has made as remarkable and succinct a statement of policy on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as we have seen in a long time. It is, in fact, remarkable for more than its content. First, it comes from a serving British officer, Gen. Sir John Hackett, Commander of NATO's Northern Army Group. (As he explains, he exercises operational command from München-Gladbach in West Germany over "a Belgian, a Dutch, a German, and a British Corps and a Canadian Brigade Group.") And second, General Hackett's statement is in the form of a letter to The Times, of London.

In Britain, serving officers do not make public policy statements. A British commander in the field would not, for example, make public speeches such as those made by General Westmoreland when home from Vietnam for consultations in the United States last November. Obviously, then, General Hackett's unusual letter must have been prompted by unusual circumstances.

He says that he wrote it "with the knowledge and approval of the NATO command to which my own is subordinate." So perhaps it can be assumed that NATO's Supreme Command feels it necessary at this time to restate the case against permitting erosion of the organization either in the wake of France's defection, or consequent upon Britain's military retrenchment, or simply because 1969 is the year when the organization's initial span might be considered to lapse.

Briefly, General Hackett argues that what NATO is "engaged upon here in Europe is peace-keeping by military stabilization." He says that it is unfortunate that the stability in East-West relations in Europe—which is of course a direct consequence of the establishment of NATO—is so often described as "détente." His apparent concern is lest use of the word produce apathy and a facile assumption that a continued NATO presence on the Western side of the dividing line is no longer needed.

General Hackett maintains: (1) that "the present relatively low level of political stability in Central and Eastern Europe could diminish sufficiently far for a military emergency to develop"; (2) that the Soviet military purpose, understandably, is "to keep a military force in being in this area of sufficient size and capability to ensure that if a military emergency should develop the subsequent course of events would be guided in a manner solely to the interest of the U.S.S.R."; and (3) that the Western response to this must be (a) to maintain "suitably located" a force able to ensure that in case of military emergency the Soviet force be unable to guide events solely in the interest of the U.S.S.R., and (b) to guarantee that West Germany's legitimate defense needs be met in a military system in which West Germans do not themselves dominate.

It would be hard to put things better.

Important Tribunal

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, beginning today, the crimes of international communism will be placed on display in a unique patriotic exercise in Georgetown University's Hall of Nations.

The Georgetown exercise is a mock legal proceeding to place world communism on trial before a court of world public opinion. And this "trial" has drawn the cooperation of such organizations as the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba; the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; the Council Against Communist Aggression; Young Americans for Freedom; Twin Circle, the National Catholic Press; the National Captive Nations Committee; Citizens for Freedom, Inc.; and the Free Pacific Association.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, the event I have described has drawn considerable editorial approval throughout the country. And, at this time, I include three recent newspaper articles—one entitled "Important Tribunal," from the Arizona Republic; one entitled "Youth Group To Try Soviets for War Crimes," from the San Diego Tribune, and another entitled "World Reds Facing 'Trial' in February," from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 19, 1968]

IMPORTANT TRIBUNAL

For downright bad taste and paranoia, nothing surpassed last year's "war crimes trial" which the international leftist community put on in Stockholm.

The "trial," under the sponsorship of the senile Bertrand Russell, was a crude propaganda show with all the objectivity and dispassion of a lynching. Instead of causing revulsion against U.S. policy in Vietnam, the "trial" caused revulsion against Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, and the other participants.

But now a distinguished group of scholars is preparing to hold an international Tribunal to try communism for crimes against humanity. Only this Tribunal promises to respect those rules of jurisprudence which the Stockholm leftists so eagerly trampled under foot.

The tribunal, to be held in Washington Feb. 19–21, will be composed of eminent world jurists from Eastern Europe, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. Witnesses will include experts on communism as well as witnesses who have lived under communism (some of whom will submit depositions). Attorneys for the prosecution and defense will participate.

Among the witnesses will be Yeshiva University's Dr. Joseph Dunner, who will testify on the status of the Jewish community in Russia today . . . Dr. Herminio Portell-Vila, Cuban diplomat and journalist . . . Prof. Stefan T. Possony, academic authority on communism . . . journalist Eugene Lyons, longtime foreign correspondent in the U.S.S.R.

Among the prosecuting attorneys will be C. Dickerman Williams of New York City, who has written many distinguished treatises on the law (including a brilliant analysis of the Fifth Amendment), and Dr. William Roberts, director of Catholic University's Institute of International Law and Relations.

The Tribunal is of course merely a device for calling attention to the numerous crimes of communism. But it is an appropriate (and, hopefully, effective) way.

For too long the propaganda advantage has rested wholly with the Communists, who have agitated for and financed all the many crude propaganda efforts designed to prove that the U.S. is guilty of aggression. In most cases, the ball was carried by star-struck leftists. like Bertrand Russell, but there was never any question who owned the ball.

Now the propaganda pitch is being turned against the Communists. They will scream to high heavens, of course, and they will be joined by those liberals who don't like to hear anything nasty about Communists.

Nevertheless, the Tribunal is desirable if only to put into the record the story of Communist bestiality. And it is desirable that this record be compiled by a distinguished international group which, unlike the Stockholm mob, will respect the rules of jurisprudence.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 18, 1968]

YOUTH GROUP TO TRY SOVIETS FOR WAR CRIMES

(By Gordon C. Murray)

While the Free World has joined the Socialist camp in meting out punishment to Nazi criminals against humanity, it has been backward about flailing the Communists with the same whip.

This is strange because the crimes committed under the two philosophies differ mainly in degree, with the Reds outdoing the Nazis in every category.

Furthermore, the Communists are a clear and present danger that is not only huge but growing, and is not only external but also internal. The Nazis, for all the fuss raised about their current potential in Germany, can't qualify as even peanut-sized.

The American and British leftists perennially trekking to the Continent do not make obeisance before the corroded altars of national socialism in Munich. They seek the headier hop pervading spectacles like the mock trials of U.S. "war criminals" in Sweden.

In 1967 these featured the Kremlin's obliging if unaware front man, philosopher Bertrand Russell, who was backed ("propped up" might be a better term) by one Ralph Schoeneman. The latter has been described as a Princeton graduate in his early 30s whose hatred of his native land was never concealed.

But now we have a new twist. The Young Americans for Freedom, an anti-Communist organization, has handed a summons to the Soviet embassy to appear before a Court of Public Opinion in Washington, D.C., on Feb. 19 "to answer to the attached indictment for war crimes."

The YAF intends to "dramatize, in explicit detail, the unparalleled horrors committed by international communism during the past 50 years."

These included, the summons states, genocide of some 30 million people, 15 million slave laborers imprisoned annually, and religious persecution of all faiths. Also, the summons says, the Reds have violated every major agreement made with the Free World.

Fred Schlafly, a lawyer and authority on communism, will play the prosecutor. The highly regarded author, William Henry Chamberlain, will be a witness.

YAF's supporters include such distinguished Americans as California's Gov. Ronald Reagon, Texas Sen. John Tower, South Carolina's Sen. Strom Thurmond and actor John Wayne.

YAF's Red Trial should be a great show. The nation's press, TV and radio have been given advance notice. Let's hope the performance both merits and gets full coverage.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune]

WORLD REDS FACING "TRIAL" IN FEBRUARY

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—A group calling itself the World Court of Public Opinion said today that it will try international communism for crimes against humanity at a "historic trial" here next month.

The setting will be sort of a right wing version of Bertrand Russell's self-styled war crimes tribunals last month in Denmark and last year in Sweden that found the United States guilty of aggression and genocide in Viet Nam.

"A distinguished international tribunal, composed of eminent world purists from eastern Europe, southeast Asia, and Latin America, as well as the United States, will receive testimony of witnesses in the Hall of Nations at Georgetown university," said the announcement. "The trial will bring together some of the most knowledgeable and honored experts on communism in the world."

TESTIFY OR SUBMIT

"Witnesses who have lived under communism will also testify or submit depositions," the statement said.

The trial, which will be open to the public, will be held Feb. 19–21. The statement listed the coordinators as Young Americans for Freedom and Twin Circle-National Catholic Press.

Witnesses will include Joseph Dunner, of Yeshiva university, New York City, who will testify on the status of the Jewish community in Russia today; Herminio Portell-Villa, an anti-Castro Cuban; Stefan T. Possony, an authority on communism with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford university; The Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, a clergyman in Rumania until 1964; Phillip Abbot Luce, a former member of the Progressive party, the Peking-oriented branch of the Communist party in the United States; and Herbert Philbrick, former counterspy for the FBI.

NAME THREE PROSECUTERS

Prosecuting attorneys will include C. Dickerman Williams, New York City; William Roberts, director, Institute of International Law and Relations, Catholic university, Washington; and Fred Schlafly, Chicago.

A spokesman for the court said the indictment, which includes the Communist parties of Russia, Red China, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, North Viet Nam, Cuba, and the United States, was served collectively at the Russian embassy here last Nov. 7.

The Russell tribunal met at Roskilde near Copenhagen. It found the United States guilty on all charges, including genocide, the use of forbidden weapons, maltreatment and killing of prisoners, violence, and forced movement of prisoners. It also found the Americans guilty of aggression against Laos and Cambodia.

GUILTY OF AGGRESSION

At the Stockholm trial last May the tribunal, sponsored by the British philosopher, Bertrand Russell, found the United States guilty of aggression in Viet Nam.

The Russell tribunal had no official standing. Neither will the Court of Public Opinion. Among those aiding Russell were Jean-Paul Sartre, French philosopher; Vladmir Dedijer, Yugoslav historian, who was chairman; and Laurent Schwartz, a French professor.

To Smoke or Not To Smoke—That Is Still the Question

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the controversy surrounding the question of smoking and health continues to confuse the American public.

True magazine performed a distinct public service by publishing in its January issue a story which brings the smoking and health controversy into clearer focus. Written by an author of note, Stanley Frank, the article clears some of the smoke that has polluted or obscured many of the true facts concerning this burning question.

Stanley Frank, in his article, asks the question: "Are cigarettes really 'hazardous to your health?' " He then proceeds to answer his own question by asserting "nobody knows."

In summarizing an excellent article, Mr. Frank says:

> At the moment, all we can say for sure is that the cause of cancer is not known and that there is absolutely no proof that smoking causes human cancer.

For the benefit of all interested in the continuing dialog connecting smoking and health, I would like to have the article written by Stanley Frank for the January issue of True magazine printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

TO SMOKE OR NOT TO SMOKE—THAT IS STILL THE QUESTION

(By Stanley Frank)

If there is one fact about tobacco that has been more clearly established than any other over the past few years, it is this: Americans like to smoke cigarettes. When the Surgeon General of the United States issued his report in January, 1964, indicting cigarettes as the chief cause of lung cancer, it figured that smoking would decline, tobacco prices would drop and cigarette company stocks would do poorly on the exchanges.

Surprisingly, none of that occurred. As a matter of fact, what actually happened was the opposite of what one might have expected. Sales jumped from 497.4 billion cigarettes in 1964 to 522.5 billion in 1966. The price of flue-cured tobacco in the wholesale market rose from 58.5 cents a pound to 66.9 cents over the same period. And the per share price of American Tobacco Co., for example, a giant cigarette producer, around $28 in January, 1964, was up to $33 three years later.

Maybe cigarettes cause cancer and maybe they don't. In any case, it's clear that Americans were not convinced or, if they were, they were willing to take their chances. As a result, the tobacco business prospered.

Then, last summer, the industry received another shot in the arm. An obscure New Jersey chemist named Robert L. Strickman announced that he had developed a new filter material that would remove two-thirds of the tar and nicotine in cigarette smoke that current filters do not catch. His filter, he said, would not destroy the tobacco taste. And Strickman had some impressive sponsors for his claim. His partner in the filter enterprise is no less an institution than Columbia University.

Strickman's filter is not yet on the market so it's too early to make a final judgment on it. But a number of critics were clearly unimpressed by the original fanfare. Among these were spokesmen for the American Cancer Society and the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. They complained that Columbia's sponsorship of the new filter would undermine their efforts to keep people from smoking.

But it looks like Americans will go on smoking more and more cigarettes each year whatever the merits of the new filter may be. Which, of course, does not mean that smokers are not worried about possible dangers to health. What are these dangers? How real are they? The answer to that is that they may not be so real as we have been led to believe. There is, in fact, a good deal of scientific doubt about the Surgeon General's conclusion that smoking causes cancer.

"Acceptance of this theory is not only unscientific but dangerous, since it will lead to complacency concerning the etiology [cause] of this disease and might well prevent fruitful investigation along other lines," declared Dr. Thomas J. Moran, a pathologist for 26 years and a supervisor of training diagnosticians for the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society.

It was not only the conclusions but also the effects of the report that were criticized. "I am convinced that in our country a harmful psychological atmosphere has already been created by otherwise well-meaning warnings and advertisements," said Dr. Joseph Wolfe, a founder of the U.S. Committee of the World Medical Association. "As a result, a great many people, particularly those who are impressionable, have been traumatized with fear of disease which has resulted in a prevalence of unwarranted anxieties and neuroses. The effect is harmful and, in my opinion, does more damage than good."

Nevertheless, after Surgeon General Luther Terry's report asserted that "cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action," the Senate and House Committees on Commerce held hearings for 16 days in 1965 to consider proposed legislation. Surprisingly, 39 of the 49 medical authorities and statisticians who testified disagreed vigorously with the report and charged its findings were distorted. Only two of the dissenting experts were connected with the tobacco industry.

The purpose of the hearings was to determine whether the Federal Trade Commission should be given authority to regulate cigarette advertising. England restricted TV ads in 1962 and officers of the U.S. cancer, heart and tuberculosis associations urged Congress to impose a ban here and to tighten restrictions on newspaper and magazine ads.

Congress wouldn't go along. All it would agree to do was to require cigarette packages to be labeled with an ambiguous warning that "smoking may be hazardous." After the Surgeon General's strong indictment, this struck many as a very mild phrase.

Some people charged that political wheeling and dealing was responsible for Congress's seeming inadequate action. Tobacco growing states do, indeed, wield a good deal of power in Congress. More than 90 percent of the tobacco grown in this country is produced by six states, North Carolina, Kentucky, Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee and Georgia. But the fact is that only two of the Senate Committee's 18 members were from those states and only seven of the 33 members of the House Committee.

So, while political logrolling could have had something to do with the mild stand that Congress took, it seems more reasonable to assume that the Congressmen were simply unimpressed by the anti-cigarette testimony. This could be due to the fact that the overwhelming weight of expert testimony during the hearings underscored four salient points:

1. The cause of cancer is unknown. It is an established principle that a factor thought to be responsible for a disease must be found in all cases of it—and cancer strikes a dozen sites in the body not remotely associated with smoking (the stomach, prostate, urinary tract, etc.). It is suspected there may be 150 different causes of cancer.

2. Ten percent of all lung-cancer victims never have smoked, proof that tobacco is not the sole cause of the disease. Conversely, 95 percent of heavy cigarette smokers do not contract it.

3. Long exposure to concentrated cigarette smoke *never* has produced lung cancer in an experimental animal—and researchers have been trying for 35 years. Doctor Terry conceded that "the chronic toxicity of nicotine is very low and probably does not represent an important health hazard." The tars, or chemical compounds, in burning tobacco have caused skin cancers only on strains of mice so susceptible to the disease that the same effect has been obtained with sugar, beef and vegetable oil.

4. Statistics alone link cigarette with lung cancer, a correlation that is not accepted as scientific proof of cause and effect. This was admitted in the opening of the report by the Surgeon General's Committee: "The Committee was aware that the mere establishment of a statistical association between the use of tobacco and a disease is not enough. The casual significance of the use of tobacco in relation to the disease is the crucial question." Yet they disregarded their own ground rules and condemned cigarettes on the basis of seven statistical studies made by groups whose objectivity and sampling techniques were open to doubt.

The Committee's findings have been sharply criticized by Dr. Joseph Berkson of the Mayo Clinic. *The Cancer Bulletin*, an official publication of the American Cancer Society, has referred to him as "the acknowledged dean of American medical statisticians."

"All relevant available facts considered, I think it very doubtful that smoking causes lung cancer," Doctor Berkson says. "Since 1954, when the statistical investigations on smoking and lung cancer were proclaimed, the U.S. Public Health Service has allocated almost a billion dollars for cancer research. How much has been expended for the experimental investigation of this particular problem of smoking and lung cancer? So far as I know, little or none.

"Albert Einstein remarked that if you want to know what a scientist really believes, don't listen to what he says but observe what he is working on. I suspect the reason the scientists of the Public Health Institutes are not working on this problem is that they don't see any research gold in 'them thar hills.' Anyone who isolated from tobacco smoke a substance that could be shown, to the satisfaction of scientists generally, to be the cause of lung cancer, let alone all the other cancers that smoking is supposed to induce, would earn not one but a brace of Nobel prizes."

If there is one man in the field with a loftier reputation than Doctor Berkson he is England's Sir Ronald Fisher, a pioneer in developing statistical methods for biological research.

"The increase in lung cancer over recent decades gives not the least evidence of being due to increasing consumption of tobacco," he declares. Sir Ronald suggests that air pollution and genetic patterns—inherited physical characteristics—may be the prime causes of cancer. As we shall see presently, the statistical association between these factors and the disease is stronger than the connection with cigarettes, but the Surgeon General's report glossed over those important clues.

Since the argument against cigarettes rests largely on statistics, it is illuminating to examine some of the inconsistencies and contradictions in the figures. For example:

Lung cancer is rare in women. The male vs. female ratio today is 6:1; in 1930 it was 1.5:1. There has been a tremendous increase in women smokers during the last generation, but their death rate from lung cancer has remained almost steady. This clearly suggests a sexual factor that makes men more susceptible to the disease.

Cancer of the trachea—windpipe—is very rare. Yet this is the area that gets the greatest exposure to tobacco smoke.

When lung cancer appears, in the overwhelming majority of cases it is in the lower part of the lung which never is reached by smoke. A study made recently by the Los Angeles County Hospital, dating back to 1927, showed that cancer of the lung tubes, which get the heaviest dosage of smoke, has been stabilized in recent years.

If smoking causes lung cancer, heavy consumers of cigarettes should contract it earlier than nonsmokers. They don't. The peak for the onset of the disease is between 57 and 62—for chain smokers and people who never have used tobacco. Further, there is no proof that the chances of getting cancer are reduced by giving up smoking.

Inhaling should induce lung cancer if cigarettes are hazardous. Not a scrap of evidence has been found to corroborate the theory. A British survey actually showed there were fewer cancer victims among steady inhalers than nonsmokers.

British men smoke only half as many cigarettes per capita as Americans, but they have double the incidence of lung cancer—a differential of four to one. Why? More air pollution in England? A genetic factor?

The most potent cancer-inducing agent in tobacco smoke is believed to be benzopyrene. Although the amount of it is infinitesimal, there is four times as much in cigar smoke and 10 times as much in pipe smoke than in cigarettes. Yet cigars and pipes are said to be safer than cigarettes. According to the statistics, pipe smokers have lower mortality rates than men who gave up the habit. What does this prove—the danger of quitting?

Since 1914, cigarette consumption in the United States has increased 200-fold, but the incidence of lung cancer has not increased nearly that much in spite of better diagnostic methods and a greater awareness of the disease. The current mortality rate of 26.6 per 100,000 population would be vastly greater if cigarettes were guilty as charged.

Commenting on the discrepancies in the report, Prof. K. Alexander Brownlee of the University of Chicago told both Congressional committees it was "a splendid example of the technique of flatly denying the existence of an inconvenient fact if you cannot explain it away." Among other figures calculated to frighten the public, the report claimed the death rate for lung cancer is nearly 1,000 times higher for cigarette smokers than for nonsmokers. That assertion was refuted by Dr. Ferdinand C. Helwig, clinical professor of pathology at the University of Kansas who has studied 30,000 cancer cases. "I do not believe that cancer is caused by smoking cigarettes," he said. Dr. Thomas H. Burford, chief of chest surgery at the Washington University School of Medicine, was more emphatic: "I do not believe that lung cancer is caused by cigarette smoking and I do not believe that smoking is responsible for any shortening of life."

The Surgeon General's advisory committee had many reservations about the conclusions reached by Doctor Terry in the report. Shortly after it was published one member, Dr. John B. Hickam, told the North Carolina Heart Association: "The more we looked at the statistics, the more difficult it was to understand. The picture is not at all as clear as the numbers appear at first."

Doctor Terry was in a tough spot. Like a district attorney confronted with a shrill clamor to solve a scandalous murder, the heat was on him to bring in a suspect in the fight against cancer, the leading killer after heart disease in this country. People wanted some concrete results for the millions spent annually on research, and prominent laymen with a lot of political clout were on the executive boards of national health organizations which had pointed the finger at cigarettes.

Besides, Doctor Terry and his associates had a mass of material which did seem to indicate that cigarettes were a menace. The figures showed that the mortality rate for male cigarette smokers from *all* causes was 70 percent higher than for nonsmokers. It was 70 percent higher for heart diseases, 500 percent higher for chronic bronchitis and emphysema (deterioration of the air cells in the lungs) and that ominous 1,000 percent higher for lung cancer.

However, it is difficult to understand Doctor Terry's abrupt dismissal of other possible causes of lung cancer. Scores of surveys have shown that the mortality from the disease in rural areas is less than half the rate in urban communities, for smokers as well as nonsmokers. Many experts attribute this variation to air pollution in industrial centers, and it hardly is a new theory. In 1775 a London surgeon, Percival Potts, reported a high incidence of cancer among chimney sweeps. In recent years campaigns to reduce air pollution have been spurred by the strong suspicions that components in coal and gas fumes are cancer-inducing agents. Experiments with animals also suggest that the overcrowding typical of living conditions in cities produces stresses that contribute to cancer.

These important leads were mentioned only in one sentence buried in the report: "The least that can be said is that the intensity of urbanization or industrialization may have a residual influence on lung cancer mortality." But why was so much attention focused on cigarettes to the exclusion of other pertinent areas of investigation? Doctor Terry was like the surly waiter who snapped at a customer asking where the men's room was, "This is not my station."

Since the time tobacco was introduced to Europe from the American colonies 450 years ago, smoking has become an addiction throughout the world. The habit seems to satisfy a need and have some therapeutic value. There is no other explanation for the enormous popularity of smoking despite efforts to curb it. There never was a kid who didn't feel nauseated after sneaking the first forbidden puff on a cigarette, yet that unpleasant experience does not deter most adults from smoking eventually.

There is growing support among cancer specialists and psychologists for the genotype theory advanced 30 years ago by Sir Ronald Fisher. He maintains that an individual's peculiar constitution creates a craving for tobacco and the same chemistry makes him more susceptible to lung cancer than a nonsmoker. The kicker, though, is that a heavy smoker is more likely to get cancer if he is deprived of cigarettes which serve the important function of relieving his tensions. This revolutionary concept from a man of Fisher's stature merited attention, but the Surgeon General's report gave it the once-over-lightly treatment:

"The significant beneficial effects of smoking occur primarily in the area of mental health, and the habit originates in a search for contentment. Since no means of measuring the quality of these benefits is apparent, the Committee finds no basis for a judgment which would weigh benefits against hazards of smoking as it may apply to the general population." In other words, since the benefits could not be measured, they were not considered.

A similar situation came up when heart specialists testified on the relationship between smoking and coronary attacks. Dr. Henry Russek, former director of cardiovascular research and now a consultant at the U.S. Public Health Hospital on Staten Island, New York, told both Congressional committees: "After years of study it is my present belief that coronary disease is not caused by the consumption of tobacco. . . . Emotional stress associated with occupational activity appears far more significant than heredity, dietary fat, tobacco, obesity or physical inactivity in the development of heart attacks."

Such opinions have been published regularly in medical literature during the last decade. Again, the report overrode the experts: "Although the causative role of cigarette smoking in deaths from coronary disease is not proven, the Committee considers it more prudent from the public health viewpoint to assume that the established association has causative meaning than to suspend judgment until no uncertainty remains."

Psychiatrists who have studied the prevalence and persistence of the smoking habit are agreed it is a carry-over from the first pleasure of infancy, the oral satisfaction of sucking. After an infant is weaned he continues to test every new object by putting it in his mouth, then in childhood resorts to thumb-sucking when he is frustrated or tired. Pulling on tobacco serves much the same purpose for an adult. Everyone smokes more when he is under tension, and there is reason to suspect that emotional stress is a contributory factor in cancer.

Some clues to this approach were reviewed by Dr. Bernice C. Sachs, then president of the American Medical Women's Association and an authority on psychosomatic medicine. "With every emotion—and man has some kind of emotion every minute—changes take place in muscles, blood vessels, in the viscera, in the endocrine glands. . . . There seems to be a correlation between cancer and certain types of psychological situations." Many doctors here and abroad have reported that patients developed symptoms of cancer soon after a severe emotional shock such as the death of a close relative, sudden financial insecurity or divorce.

Everyone does not suffer a violent reaction to such crises, of course, but the mounting tensions of daily life can be compared to the tiles in a mosaic. Separately, each irritation is insignificant; put together, they form a pattern of constant stress. Although it seems farfetched, there may be a connection between the high divorce rate and cancer. Marriage is the normal condition for an adult. It is a fact that the mortality rates from all causes are much lower for married men and women than for single and divorced people, in that order. No sweeping conclusions can be drawn from this one detail, but it may be that the health of unattached and divorced adults is affected by frustrated sex drives and unhappiness stemming from a feeling of rejection.

The chemistry of stress is a young science, but there are tentative explanations of why some people are hooked on smoking while others never cultivate the habit. Some fascinating material corroborating Fisher's genotype theory that heavy smokers need tobacco to cope with nervous tension has been assembled by Dr. H. J. Eysenck, professor of psychiatry at Maudsley Hospital in London. He has found that smokers and nonsmokers tend to conform to distinct personality 'traits. There are more extroverts and neurotics among smokers, but they are more vigorous and aggressive. It is no coincidence that smoking is a symbol of virility and power. New father's pass out cigars; tycoons and political bosses usually are depicted puffing on big heaters. Smokers as a rule are bigger, heavier and more athletic than nonsmokers. They marry and have children earlier than the abstainers. They drink more coffee, whisky and beer than nonsmokers, who favor tea, wine and milk.

Practically every smoker tries at one time or another to break the habit. Some succeed; the majority suffer such acute discomfort that they go back to tobacco. Does this mean that those who stick it out have more will power? "Not at all," says Doctor Russek. "The man who cannot quit simply is unable to handle stress as well as the other fellow. They are two distinctly different types. It is not a scientific observation to say that a smoker is more liable to get lung cancer, a coronary or any other disease than a nonsmoker. There are too many variables involved in such a comparison."

One factor that may be decisive in lung cancer is the genetic pattern an individual inherits. It is not facetious to say that the best protection is to have parents who live to a ripe old age—and whose antecedents go back to a country with a low incidence of the disease. The mortality rates, especially for men, differ so sharply around the world and the variations crop up so consistently among descendants of emigrants that attention is focusing on heredity as the key to the mystery.

Americans are the heaviest cigarette smokers in the world partly because we can afford them. Despite the federal, state and local taxes slapped on our brands—without them a pack would cost 12 cents—smokes in foreign countries are usually much higher in price. Our per capita consumption is substantially greater than that of England, Finland and Holland, but we have a much lower mortality rate from lung cancer. The rate is the same as ours in Canada, Australia and Denmark although we smoke much more than the men in those countries.

Cigarettes obviously do not have the same effect—if any—on health in every country. For example, New Zealanders are very heavy smokers, but the death rate there from lung cancer for native-born men is half the rate for immigrants from England. Cigarette sales in Russia and Poland are increasing as fast as here, but Dr. A. B. Savittski of the USSR's Academy of Medical Science reported recently that the number of lung cancer cases is "astonishingly small and hardly changes from year to year." Cancer of the upper throat was a widespread problem in China and Formosa long before cigarettes were introduced. Three generations later, American-born Chinese still have a very high incidence of it despite their adoption of our food and health customs.

All this suggests that each individual inherits a genetic pattern which largely determines whether or not he will maintain an intricate balance between various tissues and organs. When that balance breaks down, cancer cells grow with such speed and tenacity that they quickly stifle vital organs. A dramatic example of the potential "immortality" of a cancer cell are the masses of cancerous tissue in laboratories throughout the world. They were taken from one mouse in Austria in 1900. The mouse could not have lived more than 45 months, but after 1,000 transplants its cancer cells are as young and vigorous biologically as ever.

Lung cancer is complicated by so many intangibles that it is almost impossible to attribute it solely to cigarettes or any other single cause. The Surgeon General's report was criticized on that score by Dr. Israel Rappaport, a man with impressive credentials as a physician and a former professor at Columbia University's School of Medicine. Among other achievements in 1928 he initiated at Bellevue Hospital in New York a research project in pulmonary diseases which brought Nobel prizes in 1956 to two younger associates who carried on his work.

"The often-used argument that preventive action may be justified before the cause of a disease is established hardly applies in this case," Doctor Rappaport declared. "The assumed possible link between cigarette smoking and chronic lung disease cannot be compared with the link which exists, say, between an infection, the agent of which still is unknown, and a definite disease. Where we are dealing with a definite disease clearly linked to an infection we need not wait for determination of the particular infectious agent. In chronic lung disease we have an ill-defined disease indefinitely linked to a number of undetermined agents. Action against any particular one of the possible agents is illogical, unjustified, unreasonable and purposeless."

The first statistical studies purporting to associate cigarettes with lung cancer appeared in the 1930's, prompting Congress to consider legislation to curb smoking. It was dropped in 1937 after medical authorities challenged the validity of the findings. In 1954 the tobacco industry set up a research council to investigate the relationship between smoking and health. As of 1964, the council had given 731 grants totaling $7,450,000 to independent scientists in medical schools and hospitals. Since then the industry has awarded another million for research, but no one working on these, or any other, projects throughout the world has isolated a substance in cigarettes or tobacco smoke that is a proven lung cancer-inducing agent.

The data that was the source of the conclusions in the Surgeon General's report was criticized by many competent witnesses. It was drawn from questionnaires sent to seven groups of men who, the advisory committee admitted, did not represent a true cross section of the population. Volunteers for the American Cancer Society polled two groups, who comprised more than half the 1,123,000 subjects in the study. Three surveys were made of American and Canadian war veterans who once passed physical exams a high percentage of the general population failed; they were, therefore, in better than average health. The remaining groups were British doctors and California workers in nine occupations suspected of high cancer risk.

The main difficulties in the studies was the large number of men (30 percent) who did not answer the questionnaires. Prof. Alexander Brownlee, a top statistician, asserted that the nonresponses were "seriously high" and added, "It is notorious that these defects can, and usually do, produce serious bias." Brownlee probably alluded to the American Cancer Society's volunteers who handpicked 10 subjects each and, in their crusading fervor, might have weighted the survey with known lung cancer victims.

The gravest distortion in the report was the assertion that deaths from lung cancer have been rising at an "extraordinary" rate since 1930. "Statistics showing a tremendous increase in lung cancer during the past 30 years are misleading," Dr. Milton R. Rosenblatt, chief of medical clinics in New York's Metropolitan Hospital, told the House Committee. "The increase is only apparent and is the result of greater skill in the detection of the disease. All the techniques currently used to diagnose lung cancer were either discovered or perfected during the past three decades.

"It must be emphasized that during the years when national mortality statistics showed a very low incidence of lung cancer there were physicians who challenged their accuracy. More than 50 years ago, the first American textbook on lung cancer ridiculed the low census figures. In 1930, when the official number of lung cancer deaths was reported at less than 3,000 for the entire United States, one doctor in Philadelphia specializing in bronchoscopic diagnosis" (the famous Chevalier Jackson) "had records of almost 500 cases."

After tracing the steady drop in the percentage of certified deaths during the last generation, Doctor Rosenblatt added: "The progressive decline in the increase of lung cancer in the United States occurred during the same period that cigarette consumption multiplied 200 times. If cigarette smoking produced lung cancer, directly or indirectly, the tremendous rise in cigarette consumption would have resulted in a sustained or greater rate of increase. The fact that the opposite has occurred indicates that there has been a relatively fixed prevalence of lung cancer in the population. The studies of an eminent statistician of the National Cancer Institute showed that the trend of the increase was not in the direction of an epidemic but toward stabilization similar to other cancers in which diagnostic procedures have been standardized for long periods of time."

An interesting hypothesis that a man who is a lung cancer victim at 60 might have lived on borrowed time for a half a century is advanced by Dr. Joseph Berkson. Tuberculosis once was a terrible scourge in this country. In 1900, the mortality rate per 100,000 was 201.9; now it is 3.9. "A significant proportion of those who would have died from tuberculosis in childhood or youth now die of cancer of the lung," Berkson speculates. "There has been, so to speak, a survival of unfit respiratory systems."

Some authorities argue that cancer is primarily a disease of aging. They say that anyone lucky enough to escape other maladies will eventually die of cancer if no cure is found for it. Thus, with the general life-span increasing, more and more people will succumb to it.

Others maintain that cancer is due to emotional stress, to genetic makeup, to air pollution or to personality factors. And certainly there is some evidence that lung cancer may be caused by cigarette smoking. But proof? It simply doesn't exist. Heavy and prolonged doses of tobacco smoke never have produced lung cancer in an experimental animal.

Maybe Doctor Strickman's new filter will solve the health problem, if it exists, for America's 70 million smokers. Maybe not. At the moment, all we can say for sure is that the cause of cancer is not known and that there is absolutely no proof that smoking causes human cancer.

Live Oak Womans Club Shares Concern Over Crime Rate

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the horrible specter of crime and disrespect for law and order in this land of ours is gnawing at the heart of America.

Never before in our history have we been faced with such tragic situations as we find when American citizens in many cities are afraid to walk along the sidewalks in front of their homes after dark.

This menace cannot be tolerated.

Recently, I received a very important resolution from the members of the Womans Club of Live Oak, Fla.

As I read this petition, I had the feeling that these were the Americans who really speak for our Nation.

Here is their resolution:

> We, the members of the Womans Club of Live Oak, Florida, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to have criminal laws amended and strengthened to give law enforcement officers more leeway and freedom in arresting and prosecuting criminals, or persons outside the law, since it is impossible for them to operate effectively and do their duty in protecting the people, under the recent restrictions imposed on them by the Supreme Court interpretations of the U.S. Constitution.

This bespeaks the concern of America for the crimes of violence perpetrated by vicious hoodlums released on bail for other horrible crimes.

Those in the law enforcement profession need help in enforcing the law. We seem intent in this Nation on making it more difficult to solve crime—rather than giving these men reasonable tools to work with.

I think it would be well if you gave more thought to what these ladies from one community have had to say.

Wave, Old Glory

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in every generation there are those whose lives are touched with the ability to inspire their fellow man. This talent may be great or small, but we are the richer for all of it.

Such a person is Mrs. L. B. Gregg, Box 8826, Jackson, Miss., whose comments and poem, "Wave, Old Glory" are deserving and timely, and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

> Recently, as we drove home to Jackson from Anniston, Alabama, I saw an American flag, waving proudly against a bright September sky. As I watched, my heart was stirred—not because it was a piece of sacred cloth. Far from it! I was reminded of what it has symbolized throughout this nation, since the time of its first existence. Woven deep into the colors of Old Glory is a "star-spangled" message of Freedom. When freedom meant more than marches, riots, and making demands. Freedom was the right to worship God as we please, the right to choose our own way of life. Freedom was the opportunity to work hard for what we expected to gain from this great nation of ours.
>
> Brave men took pride in defending this freedom. They would not have dared to burn a flag, nor desecrate its honor in any way.
>
> Oh! That more flags might be hoisted to remind us, to help bring this nation to its knees, and to its senses, before it is everlastingly too late.
>
> It was with these thoughts in mind, that I was inspired to write the following poem:
>
> "WAVE, OLD GLORY
>
> "Wave, Old Glory, proudly fly!
> O'er a dark and troubled land.
> Reaching toward a flawless sky,
> Wave thy colors—Oh, so grand!
>
> "You once meant freedom to our land,
> 'Twas for this cause you were made.
> Now, 'tis hard to understand,
> How this cause has been betrayed.
>
> "Valiant men have fought for thee,
> Thru many wars, hard and long.
> Across the land, from sea to sea,
> Remind the world of freedom's song.
>
> "We watch you wave, in admiration,
> May your message never die!
> Let freedom reign in our nation,
> Wave, Old Glory, proudly fly!"

Strength in the Air: The F-105 Thunderchief and the KC-135 Stratotanker

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to South Vietnam I was greatly impressed with the scale of our effort, the impact of the vast stores of American equipment and supplies, and the courage and determination of the young men who have been asked to fight. I found, however, that for all the skilled manpower and equipment at our command, insufficient public attention was given to the proficiency and guts of those who help maintain our strength in the air.

It is in this phase of the conflict more than in any other that we have fully risen to the challenge. This is due to the proven success of our weapons system and the teams of skilled men who operate and maintain them. If I may indulge the House for a moment, I should like to discuss two of the most successful of these aircraft.

I speak now of the F-105 Thunderchief fighter and the KC-135 Stratotanker.

Though neither of these planes are manfactured in my congressional district, as a conscientious member of the House Committee on Armed Services I cannot but help give due praise and recognition to the men who fly and maintain these aircraft and to the companies which have made this great contribution to our defense posture.

The F-105, manufactured by Republic Aviation Corp.—now a division of Fairchild-Hiller—is powered by a Pratt & Whitney J75-P-19W turbojet engine. Its speed, range, load capacity and functional—operational—ceiling make it one of the best tactical fighters operational in the world today.

The F-105 can deliver a maximum load of 12,000 pounds of conventional explosives, or a nuclear payload. This airplane is able to work as an interceptor, light to medium bomber, or to engage in close air support for ground forces.

Having sophisticated navigation and radar systems, it is also an all-weather fighter and has the ability to operate at very low altitudes. As a heavily armed 1,400 mile-per-hour aircraft it is, by its very nature, one of the most versatile weapons of its type to be found anywhere.

I certainly feel that we among the public-at-large have every reason to be grateful to the men of Republic Aviation and their subcontractors for doing such a fine job on our airplane. I know that the men who fly it, and those to whom they give air cover, appreciate this fact in a much more immediate sense than we.

The men of Republic, those of the 355th Tactical Fighter Wing, and others who fly and maintain this airplane have done an outstanding job.

The Boeing Co.'s KC-135 Stratotanker also plays a vital role in the air war, particularly in the north, refueling U.S. Air Force aircraft in dramatic strikes over North Vietnam, the KC-135 operates as a "flying filling station" for both jet bombers and fighters.

Its jet power gives it the capacity for high-speed, high-altitude refueling. Having a speed of over 600 miles-per-hour, it has a range of over 5,000 miles for refueling missions, and can deliver some 3 tons of fuel a minute to recipient aircraft.

This particular airplane has been proven as the workhorse of the American airfleet, enhancing the range and flexibility of our aircraft. Indeed, it has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars in aircraft which would have been lost for lack of fuel, in airbases we have not had to build, and in permitting aircraft task specialization because we have known that we could depend on the KC-135 to expand the range of specialty weapons systems.

Again, in my judgment, we must extend heartfelt congratulations to the Boeing Co., the producers of this airplane, to the men of Detachment I of the 4258th Strategic Wing, SAC, and to the others who fly and maintain it.

All those I have mentioned have excelled in their unified task. Because of them this Nation is more secure. Yet the fact that I have singled out only two aircraft here today merely means they are essential parts of our total military capability. It carries with it in no way the connotation that others should be relegated to a place of lesser honor in the public's mind. To the contrary, our support and specific recognition of these men embodies within it significant appreciation of all those who have been asked to serve our Nation, whether they be in civilian or military life.

The Stakes in Congress

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a large number of Americans, including many Members of this House, are disappointed with the record of the first session of this Congress. It is still possible that the record of the 90th Congress will show meaningful achievement and progress, but only if we meet national challenges that cannot wait, with responsible action. The people we have been elected to represent have every right to expect no less. An editorial published in a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News reminds us, as we should be reminded, that the stakes in the 90th Congress are mostly on the line in this second session. I recommend this editorial to all of our colleagues, and under unanimous consent I place it in the Record, as follows:

The Stakes in Congress

The second session of the 90th Congress shapes up as a new round in the battle by liberal-progressive forces to stave off the continuing attack by the Dixiecrat-GOP coalition to roll back the gains of earlier years.

The success of the coalition was the key factor in the first session and its victory in the House on 37 of 51 rollcalls does not indicate a slackening of its efforts in the second session.

The fight must be pressed, however, mobilizing all possible resources, for the stakes are too high to allow the conservative coalition to have its way by default.

The record of the 90th Congress will be a key factor in the 1968 elections. That record must be established as clearly and firmly as possible so that the voters in November are aware of those who voted to push forward to meet the domestic and foreign problems of our times.

The Draft—Time for Congressional Debate

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1966, I sponsored a student forum on the Selective Service Act at Lynbrook High School in my district. Many high school, college, and graduate school students participated and gave their views on proposed amendments to the present draft law. Other interested constituents and representatives of civic organizations also participated.

On April 11, 1968, Gen. Lewis Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, will address Long Island residents at Lawrence High School. The subject will be the "Impact of the Draft on Students." The public meeting is being sponsored by Temple Sinai of Lawrence, with numerous other religious, civic, and communal organizations invited to participate.

The meeting will provide an opportunity for citizens to become better acquainted with the Selective Service System and the recent regulations governing graduate school students. There will be no debate—members of the local draft board will be present to counsel and advise registrants on specific draft problems.

I have supported in the past the concept of a lottery system so that so far as possible, the draft would apply to all young men in an equitable manner. See Congressional Record, volume 113, part 1, page 144. Under a national lottery system, students would be deferred but such deferments would not be an exemption from service. Students whose numbers are selected would be required to serve upon graduation.

Recently, the Newsday, a Long Island daily, carried an interesting and thoughtful editorial on February 19, 1968, entitled: "Universal Public Service." The editorial proposes an alternative which merits the consideration of my colleagues. I insert the full text at this point in the Record:

[From Newsday, Feb. 19, 1968]

Universal Public Service

The youthful idealism that is part of the American character has been demonstrated in every era and in every corner of the world. By their enlistments in the Peace Corps and the armed forces, young American men and women continue to demonstrate how deeply the idea of service is ingrained in the nation's tradition. At a time when the U.S. needs the talents of all of its young people, this tradition should be strengthened and extended through the creation of a program of universal public service.

The call to the colors should be broadened. One good teacher can do more to prevent a riot than a platoon of men can do to quell it. But we know only how to mobilize the platoon, not the teacher. Duty is viewed narrowly. The draft applies only to military service because this is a traditional notion of duty, of service to country. In recent years, the young men and women who have served in the Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America and Teachers Corps have helped expand that notion. They, too, contribute to national defense.

Poverty is the No. 1 national problem. It persists, and the fruits of this persistence are bitter: burning cities and soaring crime rates. It represents a real threat to the security of the nation. Two years ago Defense Secretary McNamara said: "Poverty in America makes our nation less secure." And he advanced a fair and practical way to mobilize against this threat. He suggested having "every young person in the United States give two years of service to his country—whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer development work at home or abroad."

Why not? There is enough work to be done, and all of it has a direct bearing on the national security. Why continue to respond only to the military threat? Teachers and teachers' aides are desperately needed in city schools throughout the nation. By expanding the Teachers Corps through a national service draft, new talent could be funneled to these schools.

Other young men could aid in police work through a police cadet corps that would free the professional law enforcement officers from clerical chores and get them on the streets where they are most needed. Such a corps would also provide a pool of young men who might later be recruited into the ranks of city police forces. The Peace Corps abroad and its domestic counterpart, VISTA, could absorb thousands of draftees.

The present military draft rejects those who cannot meet the basic educational and physical requirements. Why not give these young people a second chance to enter the mainstream of American life by drafting them into a national job training corps? They could best serve the nation by spending two years equipping themselves to become self-supporting citizens.

The idea of asking some young men to contribute two years in the service of their country is well established in the military draft. To extend this principle to all young men—and perhaps women—is a natural step, especially since the purpose is essentially the same: the defense of the nation. Some would continue to serve in the military; for the others, the opportunities to serve in other ways are almost unlimited.

For all, there would be rewards. Anthropologist Margaret Mead is one of those who advocate a system of universal national service. Said Dr. Mead: "Universal, national service would provide an opportunity for young adults to establish an identity and a sense of self-respect and responsibility as individuals before making career choices or establishing homes . . . to experience the satisfaction of services performed on behalf of the nation and of other fellow citizens. . . ."

Defending the security of a nation is not wholly a military function. It is time we mobilized to give all young people the opportunity to serve in the defense of their country.

Mr. Speaker, also on February 19, 1968, the Long Island Press, the other daily newspaper with wide circulation in Nassau County, printed an editorial, "The Draft Hassle," which points up not an alternative to the draft but some of the inequities which have developed in its administration.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I include the full text of the editorial for the information of our colleagues:

[From the Long Island Press, Feb. 19, 1968]

THE DRAFT HASSLE

The administration's abolition of graduate school and occupational draft deferments is so unwise one might wonder if the President didn't do it to spur Congress into the reforms it so far refuses to enact.

The occupational deferments, for instance, are not actually ended. As Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts pointed out, "they are now subject to 4,000 separate acts or rules laid down by 4,000 separate draft boards."

Ending deferments for all graduate students, except those in medicine, dentistry and allied fields, removes one source of inequity—taking those students rich enough to use post-graduate work as a draft haven—but it also deals a severe, perhaps crippling, blow to the nation's educational system.

The new ruling—which does not change the practice of drafting the oldest eligible males ahead of younger eligibles—is a financial wallop to universities.

The graduate schools would also be rapidly drained of large numbers of advanced students, depleting the universities of the main source of their instructors. Furthermore, it drains highly trained personnel for our other long-range manpower needs, including teachers at all levels.

Harvard President Nathan Pusey warned that this approach would be "a disaster." He suggested a system whereby each group from 19 through 25 would provide a given proportion of men for the draft pool, to soften the impact on graduate schools. But this was regarded by the White House as unworkable.

The workable answer is still the same as it has been since last year, when the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommended sweeping reform of the entire system, including drafting 19-year-olds by lot.

There can never be a happy solution when some young men must serve while others do not. But it is time for Congress to realize that even if all the reforms of the President's commission are not adopted, the "oldest first" system must be replaced with some random selection method that would at least begin to approach equity—and would avert the grave damage to the nation's educational and manpower structure.

Mr. Speaker, another serious problem raised by the new draft regulations relates to the shortage of lawyers in all branches of the service. The long series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions starting with the opinion of the Court in *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), have not yet been applied to military courts martial.

The right to representation by counsel in military cases including special courts martial, remains a constitutional question for consideration by the Supreme Court of the United States and for action, if necessary, by the Congress.

Should the Supreme Court determine that the guarantees of the fifth and sixth amendments apply to military courts martial or should Congress determine that these rights should be extended to military cases, then the need for additional attorneys and an expansion of the Judge Advocate General Corps would be necessary. That is why consideration should be given to deferment for law school students—not exemptions—deferments so that they may be able to serve in a capacity in which they will be qualified upon graduation and admission to the bar. Such deferments can be conditioned upon entering the service upon admission if otherwise qualified.

This is an example of another inequity. I am sure there are others.

I want to stress that I believe Congress should review the draft status of all graduate students to determine whether all students in graduate school should be allowed to complete their studies on condition that they be required to serve immediately upon graduation, if otherwise qualified, or whether a form of lottery system should be applied to all who are eligible for the draft including graduate school students.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress last year extended the Selective Service Act without major changes. Now is the time for constructive congressional debate on the draft and for congressional action to assure an equitable system which does not discriminate against one class and give a preference to another. I urge my colleagues to join me in a call for such a debate at the earliest possible moment.

It is time for the Congress to act.

Miami's Civil Service Cadets

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the problems of employment and the effects of unemployment are serious threats to the efficiency of any government, city, State, or Federal. Much has been done to cut down these threats, but much is left to do. I am anxious to bring to the attention of my colleagues one attempt being made to relieve some of the pressures of unemployment and to encourage the growth of municipal responsibility.

Last year, a program called Miami's Civil Service Cadets was formulated by the city manager of Miami, Fla., Mr. M. L. Reese. Training and Safety Director Albert J. Sziarto administered the program. The results of this pilot summer career development program have been most heartening and significant. The following article from the publication Nation's Cities outlines the motives, goals, and results of this fine endeavor by Miamians to aid and improve their city and their citizens:

MIAMI'S CIVIL SERVICE CADETS—A DUAL-PURPOSE PROGRAM OF EMPLOYMENT AND CIVIC EDUCATION IS PAYING OFF

Take 110 school-age youths without jobs or money, expose them to detailed operations of modern municipal government, spend $34,450.83 on special education for them, and you have a picture of how Miami made solid manpower progress last summer.

Civil Service Cadets, a 1967 pilot summer career development program, was a new idea that worked well and helped Miami move ahead significantly in sensitive areas of municipal responsibility.

City Manager M. L. Reese formulated the program, then consulted community leaders from the Urban League, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Catholic Welfare Bureau, EOPI (the Federally-oriented anti-poverty program), Florida State Employment Service, and other groups directly concerned with employment and the primary effects of unemployment.

Training and Safety Director Albert J. Sziarto administered the program. The City Commission approved a budget of $47,148, of which he turned back $12,697.17. Main budget item was wages for 100 young men, 17½ to 20, for seven 40-hour weeks at $1.40 per hour.

Results pleased nearly everyone connected with the pilot program. Other Miami leaders became interested. In November, Mayor Stephen P. Clark met with local, state, and federal officials to map a community-wide "volunteer job training program for youth."

The objective is more part-time jobs for students, now, and an expanding program toward full-time summer jobs for thousands of high school and college youths, with simultaneous acceleration of Miami's overall employment.

"Exposure" was the key word in Reese's plan. The city manager insisted that cadets be regarded as prospective Civil Service employes, but without preferential treatment by reason of this "exposure" to essential services performed by the city. He emphasized to supervisors that they should show the cadets not only how city government works but also the "why" of operational details.

Outlining the pilot program, the city manager said: "This is not so much a training program as it is an introduction to city government. It is not our intent to get inexpensive labor, nor that these individuals are going to be given a holiday. They will be as busy as we can keep them, exposing them to a great variety of city jobs.

"We are not so naive as to think we can train people by this process for Civil Service jobs. The best we can hope to do is to expose them and give them an appetite for Civil Service."

City of Miami officials agree that this hope is being realized. Eleven per cent of those completing the cadet program immediately applied for permanent jobs and about the same number indicated their intentions toward Civil Service when they complete their education.

Sziarto tried to maintain cadet enrollment at 100, and 93 completed the program.

When 100 pre-screened candidates were sent to the inaugural meeting by the cooperating agencies, 48 were considered high school drop-outs. At the end, 85 expressed firm intentions of continuing their education, in high school and/or college. Only three who had not completed high school indicated they would not return to school.

Eleven registered at Miami-Dade Junior College during the final week of the pilot program.

Post-program interviews and a written questionnaire answered by the 93 "graduates" offer interesting observations on the cadets' own evaluation of the program.

Following, in descending order, are the "most impressive" department standings, as judged by the cadets: Sanitation 28, Fire 27, Police 16, Water and Sewers 10, Communications 7, Building 5, Property Maintenance 5, Public Works 5, Neighborhood Rehabilitation 4, Motor Pool and Garage 2, Operations (Streets, Bridges and Storm Sewers) 0.

Listing the departments with the least appeal, the cadets came up with the following composite rating: Police 24, Motor Pool and Garage 17, Operations 14, Public Works 8, Fire 8, Water and Sewers 6, Sanitation 4, Building 1, Property Maintenance 0, Communications 0.

Sziarto said one cadet remarked on his evaluation questionnaire: "I have learned things about my city that the average taxpayer does not know, and never will."

Among such volunteered comment, Sziarto gave the following "shortest and strongest" quotation: "It made us better citizens."

"That's good," said Mayor Clark, whose sentiment is being echoed figuratively in follow-up action throughout the area, led by the city of Miami.

Foreign Aid

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, after reviewing President Johnson's foreign aid message, I am well satisfied that the foreign assistance program which he proposes for fiscal year 1969 is cut to minimum requirements without sacrificing the effectiveness of the overall effort.

The foundations for the 1969 program are sound. First, U.S. assistance will supplement development programs, but the major effort must come from the countries themselves; second, every developed nation must contribute to the assistance effort, and this assistance must be efficiently coordinated; third, neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources; fourth, priority will be given to agriculture, health and education, the most critical areas of need in the developing countries; fifth, AID activities will make a positive contribution to the balance of payments situation; and, sixth, the aid program will be administered efficiently.

I believe that these guidelines will establish a foreign aid program which is worthy of the support of all Americans.

Analysis of the Federal Budget

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to and include as part of my remarks the annual analysis of the Federal budget prepared by Eugene F. Rinta for the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Mr. Rinta's analysis will be helpful to all who are sincerely interested in the reduction of Federal spending.

The analysis follows:

[Federal Spending Facts Bulletin No. 240, from the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D.C., Feb. 8, 1968]

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1969—A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF ITS HIGHLIGHTS

THE BUDGET PICTURE IN BRIEF—SELECTED YEARS, 1958-69

[In billions]

	Fiscal years					
	1958	1960	1965	1967	1968	1969
The unified budget:						
Receipts	$79.6	$92.5	$116.9	$149.6	$155.8	$178.1
Outlays	82.7	92.3	118.0	158.4	175.6	186.1
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−3.1	+.2	−1.1	−8.8	−19.8	−8.0
The administrative budget:						
Receipts	68.6	77.8	93.1	115.8	118.6	135.6
Expenditures	71.4	76.5	96.5	125.7	137.2	147.4
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−2.8	+1.2	−3.4	−9.9	−18.6	−11.8
Public debt at yearend	276.4	286.5	317.9	326.7	351.6	363.5

Among the more significant facts and conclusions that can be drawn from analysis of President Johnson's budget for the fiscal year 1969 are the following:

1. Despite the warnings by the President and other Administration leaders of the prevailing dangers of more inflation and even higher interest rates at home and a threat to the dollar abroad, the President has proposed yet another expansionary budget. Even with the inclusion of $10.5 billion of proposed new income tax and user charge revenues, there still remains a deficit of $8.0 billion in the new unified budget and $11.8 billion in the administrative budget.

2. While the Budget Message asserts the application of spending restraints and "rigorous screening of priorities", budget plans call for a spending increase of $10.4 billion in the unified budget and $10.2 billion in the administrative budget. Somewhat more than half of the increase in the latter budget is accounted for by a rise of $3.2 billion in defense, $0.9 billion in higher interest costs and a $1.3 billion decline in participation sales of loan assets which are reflected in the administrative budget as negative expenditures. The remaining $4.8 billion 1969 spending increase is accounted for by $1.6 billion Federal pay increases and $3.2 billion net increases in nondefense programs.

3. The spending plans in the budget point to significantly higher expenditures after 1969 although the rate of increase will be less than in recent years. With both new spending authority and obligations incurred substantially exceeding expenditures in each of the five years 1965 through 1969, further sizeable spending increases can be expected after 1969.

4. Unless peace is restored in Vietnam, budget balance is improbable before 1971 at the earliest, even with enactment of the proposed new taxes. While normal revenue growth by 1970 could equal the $8.0 billion 1969 unified budget deficit, the expenditure growth inherent in the budget plans will consume the revenue increase and thus preclude reduction of the deficit in 1970. The same applies to 1971 unless termination of war permits a reduction in the costs of defense.

5. As a result of a string of nine consecutive deficits in the administrative budget since 1960, the public debt has risen from $286.5 billion on June 30, 1960, to an estimated $363.5 billion by June 30, 1969. Without either the proposed new income tax and

user charge revenues or more rigorous expenditure restraints than have been applied in the budget, the public debt by the end of fiscal 1969 would be over $376 billion—an increase of $90 billion in nine years.

THE NEW UNIFIED BUDGET

In response to recommendations of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts, the new unified budget concept was adopted by the Administration for presentation of the 1969 budget. While there are a number of important differences in the unified budget and the old administrative budget, the principal differences affecting the budget surplus or deficit involve the treatment of trust funds and sales of participation certificates in loan assets held by the Government.

Receipts of the social security, highway, and other trust funds add $43.9 billion to receipts of the unified budget in 1969 as compared to the administrative budget. Similarly, expenditures from the trust funds add $36.6 billion to unified budget expenditures as compared to administrative budget expenditures. These figures for trust fund receipts and expenditures are after adjustment for intragovernmental transactions in both budget concepts.

Participation certificate sales are counted in the administrative budget concept as negative expenditures and thus reduce both expenditures and the deficit. In the unified budget these sales are more appropriately considered a means of financing, like other borrowing, and have no effect on expenditures or receipts.

In the unified budget lending outlays are separately identified from other outlays and are shown as net amounts for all lending programs. All outlays other than lending are characterized as expenditures and lending as net lending. The combination of the two are called outlays. In the administrative budget there is no differentiation between lending and other spending in the expenditure figures. Also, some loan activities are reflected in expenditures on a net basis while others are shown in gross amounts with interest and repayments recorded as receipts.

The unified budget is clearly an improvement over the administrative budget, particularly in its coverage. Its presentation could be improved, however, by a clear separation of trust fund transactions from regular Federal fund transactions as is done in the 1969 budget document between regular expenditures and lending outlays. The separation between Federal fund and trust fund programs is made in the detailed listing of agency and program funding but not in the various summary tables. Thus the data are not readily subject to separate analysis of spending changes in the two types of funds by functional categories.

COMPARISON OF SPENDING BY FUNCTION FOR 1969 AND PRIOR YEARS

The purposes for which President Johnson proposes to spend $186.1 billion in the 1969 fiscal year beginning next July 1 are shown in the table that follows. For comparative purposes the table shows the expenditures for the same functions in the current year and in 1965 and 1960. The table also shows by functions the new spending authority proposed for 1969.

UNIFIED BUDGET

[In millions]

	Outlays				Proposed new spending authority, 1969
	Actual, 1960	Actual, 1965	Estimated, 1968	Planned, 1969	
Expenditures:					
National defense	$45,848	$49,586	$76,491	$79,792	$82,317
International affairs and finance	3,310	4,196	4,330	4,478	4,700
Space research and technology	401	5,091	4,804	4,574	4,369
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,893	4,032	4,412	4,474	5,131
Natural resources	1,084	2,140	2,416	2,483	2,271
Commerce and transportation	4,643	7,043	7,695	7,996	8,776
Housing and community development	21	116	698	1,428	2,833
Health, labor, and welfare	19,105	28,143	46,396	51,945	60,413
Education	659	1,309	4,157	4,364	4,585
Veterans benefits and services	5,063	5,634	6,798	7,131	7,515
Interest	8,299	10,358	13,535	14,400	14,400
General government	1,332	2,231	2,618	2,827	2,690
Allowance for pay increases				1,600	1,600
Allowance for contingencies			100	350	550
Undistributed adjustments	−2,272	−3,164	−4,591	−5,049	−5,049
Total expenditures	90,385	116,715	169,856	182,797	197,105
Net lending:					
National defense	−7	−3	−2	−4	
International affairs and finance	−235	−21	716	675	608
Agriculture and agricultural resources	457	777	899	1,135	1,225
Natural resources	11	16	16	7	4
Commerce and transportation	27	275	158	125	232
Housing and community development	1,078	−147	3,257	1,355	2,135
Health, labor, and welfare		19	21	−538	−538
Education	204	229	384	335	687
Veterans benefits and services	363	88	370	211	302
General government	−15	16	−40	−37	−36
Total net lending	1,882	1,249	5,779	3,265	4,618
Total outlays	92,268	117,966	175,635	186,062	201,723

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR CHANGES IN SPENDING

A comparison of budgeted spending totals in 1969 with current estimates for 1968 shows a net overall increase of $10.4 billion in the unified budget. This total results from an increase of $12.9 billion in regular expenditures and a decrease of $2.5 billion in net lending. In comparison with 1965, which was the first full budget year of the Johnson Administration, total outlays are up $68.1 billion, or 57.7 percent. In relation to the 1960 spending total of $92.3 billion, the $186.1 billion 1969 total represents an increase of $93.8 billion, or 101.6 percent.

National defense spending rose moderately from $45.9 billion in 1960 to $49.6 billion in 1965. Since 1965, however, defense costs have risen sharply because of the Vietnam war. Outlays are estimated at $76.5 billion in 1968, with a further increase to $79.8 billion budgeted for 1969. The request of $82.3 billion new spending authority for 1969 indicates a further increase in defense outlays is ahead. Special Vietnam costs account for $5.8 billion in 1966, $20.1 billion in 1967, $24.5 billion in 1968, and $25.8 billion in 1969.

Interest costs have been rising substantially in recent years because of both a rapidly rising debt and unusually high interest rates. Net interest costs, after deducting interest received by the Treasury, are estimated at $14.4 billion in 1969 as compared to $13.5 billion in 1968, $10.4 billion in 1965 and $8.3 billion in 1960. Interest on the public debt will cost an estimated $15.2 billion in 1969. This compares with $14.35 billion in 1968, $11.3 billion in 1965, and $9.2 billion in 1960. From the end of fiscal 1965 to yearend 1969 the public debt is expected to rise $45.7 billion, or 14.4 percent. Over the same four-year period interest on the public debt will rise $3.9 billion and 34.5 percent.

International affairs, including net lending, is budgeted at $5.2 billion in 1969 for an increase of $0.1 billion over 1968. Direct economic assistance outlays are expected to rise to $2.3 billion in 1969 as compared to $2.2 billion in 1968; but a much larger increase in new spending authority is proposed, with the 1969 request being $2.5 billion as compared to $1.9 billion voted by Congress for 1968. In addition, the 1969 request includes $766 million new authority to help fund three international financial institutions for an increase of $362 million over 1968.

Domestic nondefense programs account for the remainder of the budget except for a portion of a $1.6 billion allowance covering pay increases effective July 1, 1968 for civilian and military personnel. Assuming that about $0.5 billion of the scheduled pay increases are applicable to domestic nondefense programs, the 1969 total of outlays for these programs will be $90.6 billion. This total includes $88.0 billion of regular expenditures and $2.6 billion of net lending.

The $90.6 billion 1969 total outlays for domestic nondefense programs (excluding interest) is an increase of $5.4 billion over 1968. This increase is the net result of an increase of $7.9 billion in regular expenditures and a decrease of $2.5 billion in net lending. In comparison with 1965, the outlays for domestic nondefense programs are up $33.6 billion, or 58.9 percent, in four years. The increase since 1960 is $53.3 billion and 142.9 percent.

(Note: The above comparisons of outlays by years do not include any estimated functional allocation of the amounts of undistributed adjustments shown in the table on page 3. These amounts include government contributions for employee retirement and interest received by trust funds which are deducted from program expenditures in determining net budget expenditures under the new unified budget concept.)

The growth of domestic nondefense spending in the major functional categories is shown in the table that follows. For comparative purposes the table also shows the growth in defense, interest, and international programs.

Outlays by function	Increase (billions)		Percentage increase	
	1960–65	1965–69	1960–65	1965–69
Space research and technology	$4.7	−$0.5	1,170	−10
Agriculture programs	1.5	.8	44	17
National resources	1.1	.3	97	15
Commerce and transportation	2.6	.8	57	11
Housing and community development	−1.1	2.8	−103	2,784
Health, labor, and welfare	9.1	23.2	47	83
Education	.7	3.2	78	206
Veterans programs	.3	1.6	5	28
General government	.9	.5	71	24
Total domestic nondefense	19.7	[1] 33.6	53	[1] 59
National defense	3.7	30.2	8	61
International programs	1.1	1.0	36	23
Interest, net	2.1	4.0	25	39

[1] Includes for 1969 allocated portion of allowance for pay increases and entire allowance for contingencies.

Following are examples of some of the more significant increases in individual nondefense programs from current estimates for 1968 to budgeted amounts for 1969:

[In millions]

	Increases in 1969 Expenditures	Increases in 1969 Appropriations
FEDERAL FUNDS		
Economic opportunity program	$144	$428
Domestic economic development	45	36
Social and Rehabilitation Service-welfare	749	808
Supplementary medical insurance	81	81
Urban renewal programs	211	400
Urban mass transportation	50	65
Model cities programs	225	288
Civil supersonic aircraft development	251	81
Total of above items	1,756	2,187
TRUST FUNDS		
Old-age and survivors insurance	2,917	3,183
Disability insurance	350	817
Hospital insurance	495	741
Supplementary medical insurance	211	336
Total of above trust fund items	3,973	5,077

BUDGET PROVIDES FURTHER EXPENDITURE GROWTH

The trend in Federal spending can be determined by comparing the annual amounts of new obligational authority and obligations incurred with actual expenditures. The new obligational authority provided by Congress (mainly appropriations) is the authority on which funds are committed for expenditure in carrying out the activities the Government has been authorized to perform. Obligations incurred are the commitments made for personnel costs, goods and services and construction to be acquired under contract, grants-in-aid, various benefits, etc. Expenditures are the actual payments made in liquidation of the obligations incurred.

A comparison of new obligational authority, obligations incurred, and expenditures in recent years shows that there has been a substantial lag in actual expenditure of funds as compared to the provision and commitment of appropriations for expenditure. This situation continues in the 1969 budget plans. The five-year record beginning with fiscal 1965 is shown in the table that follows. Since figures on obligational authority and obligations incurred under the unified budget are available only back to 1967, the figures for 1965 and 1966 are from the old administrative budget.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	New obligational authority	Obligations incurred	Expenditures or outlays
1965 actual	$106.6	$104.6	$96.5
1966 actual	126.4	120.5	107.0
1967 actual	182.6	168.2	159.4
1968 estimates	186.5	178.9	175.6
1969 estimates	201.7	194.6	186.1
Total	803.8	766.8	723.6

These figures clearly point to substantially higher expenditures in the period beyond 1969. In each of the five years new obligational authority exceeds obligations incurred for a cumulative difference of $37 billion. Thus the uncommitted spending authority has been built up by this amount less such amounts as may have expired. Also, in each of the five years obligations incurred exceed expenditures for a cumulative difference of over $43 billion. Assuming continuation of the Vietnam war and total defense expenditures at about the current or slightly higher levels, further annual expenditure increases in the $8–10 billion range can be expected. The only prospect for halting such further spending increases would be through rigorous cutting of new spending requests and recision of existing spending authority wherever feasible.

ECONOMIES IN PROPOSED PROGRAM REDUCTIONS AND REFORMS EXAGGERATED

In his Budget Message the President cites two kinds of measures for reduction of spending in 1969. One is the curtailment or stretch-out of certain programs to hold obligations below the 1968 "appropriated levels." The other involves modification of programs, many of which require legislation.

The program curtailments are applicable only to 1969 activities. They involve $1.6 billion of obligations and an unstated but obviously smaller reduction in 1969 expenditures. The Budget Message gives the impression on cursory reading that the program reductions in 1969 are from 1968 program levels. A careful reading, however, indicates that, in general, the reductions are from levels which would have been possible in 1968 on the basis of program appropriations provided by Congress, but without taking into account the effect of the special budget reduction measure, H.J. Res. 888, which Congress enacted in December.

When the 1969 program levels (obligations) are related to the 1968 levels now budgeted for the programs in which $1.6 billion reductions are claimed, the total reduction is much smaller. Following are a few examples of the reductions in 1969 as related to existing program levels·

The original 1968 budget proposed $300 million appropriations for farm operating loans, and obligations in that amount were planned. Congress approved the full $300 million request, but in compliance with H.J. Res. 888 planned obligations in 1968 have been reduced by the Administration to $275 million. A level of $250 million is budgeted for 1969 for a reduction of $25 million, but a reduction of $50 million is claimed in the Budget Message.

The 1968 budget planned an obligations level of $515 million for REA loans based on an appropriation request of $435 million plus unobligated funds from 1967. Congress approved the appropriation request, but 1968 obligations were cut by the Administration to $470 million to meet the requirements of H.J. Res. 888. Obligations in 1969 are budgeted at this same $470 million level, so there is no reduction planned in the existing program level. Yet a cut of $45 million ($515 million less $470 million) is claimed.

An obligations level of $440 million was planned in the 1968 budget for college facility construction grants. Congress approved $10 million more than the appropriation request of $390 million, so the obligations level could have been increased to $450 million except for reductions made under H.J. Res. 888 which reduced the level to $307 million. The planned obligations level for 1969 is $226 million for a cut of $81 million from the existing program level; however, a 1969 reduction of $224 million ($450 million less $226 million) is claimed.

An analysis of all the reductions of this type listed in the Budget Message indicates that the actual cuts in 1969 from the current program levels total less than $0.9 billion instead of $1.6 billion. About one-half of the total reduction is in the space program.

The "program reforms" listed in the Budget Message are estimated to reduce the "budgetary burden" by $1.2 billion in 1969 and by $1.4 billion in 1970. Included in the reforms are some which have been proposed repeatedly over the last decade or more, including proposals of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy as well as President Johnson. But Congress has not seen fit to approve them.

One reform calls for limiting the agricultural conservation program to practices with long-term benefits and a reduction of the program level from $220 million to $100 million for a budget cut of $120 million. Another would more strictly define the conditions under which school aid to federally impacted areas is granted. This would save $100 million a year beginning in 1970. While an excellent case can be made for these reforms, Congress has so far shown no inclination to adopt them.

New user charges in the form of excise taxes are proposed to provide revenues that would help to finance costs of Federal programs related to airway services, waterways, and highways. The new revenues amounting to about $0.3 billion a year would be recorded as receipts rather than offsets against expenditures. These user tax proposals have also been rejected a number of times in recent years.

One proposed reform from which no savings are expected in 1969 or 1970 could provide substantial long-term savings. This reform calls for an increase in the interest rate for evaluating water resources projects to take into account the real cost of long-term Treasury borrowing. With project evaluation being made at realistic interest rates, many projects which are now found economically feasible would not qualify under the new rates.

THE TAX PROPOSALS IN THE BUDGET

The principal new revenue measure in the budget is the temporary 10 percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes which the President proposed and Congress rejected last year. As now proposed, the surcharge would become effective January 1, 1968 for corporations and April 1, 1968 for individuals, and would expire June 30, 1969. The surcharge on corporations would produce $970 million additional revenues in 1968 and $2,880 million in 1969. New revenues from the surcharge on individuals are estimated at $930 million in 1968 and $6,920 million in 1969.

Two further accelerations in corporation tax payments, effective in fiscal 1968, are proposed. Corporations would be required to pay 80 percent of their finally determined annual tax liabilities in their payments of estimated tax instead of 70 percent as under existing law. This would provide a one-shot revenue increase of $400 million in 1968. The other acceleration would eliminate over a five-year period the present exemption of the first $100,000 of corporate tax liability from the requirement of current payment of estimated tax. This proposal would increase revenues by $400 million in both 1968 and 1969.

Extension until July 1, 1969 of the present excise tax rates of 7 percent on automobiles and 10 percent on telephone service is proposed. Under present law the automobile tax is scheduled to decline to 2 percent on April 1, 1968, and to 1 percent on January 1, 1969, while the telephone tax is scheduled to be reduced to 1 percent on April 1, 1968 and to be repealed on January 1, 1969. Added revenues from extension of the present rates of these excises are estimated at $306 million in fiscal 1968 and $2,660 million in 1969.

Proposed user charge excises effective in fiscal 1969 would add $40 million revenues in 1969 from aviation services, $7 million from inland waterways transportation, $239 million from higher taxes on diesel fuel and heavy trucks, and $11 million from other sources, for a total of $297 millions from new user excises.

DEFICITS AND DEBT

With estimated outlays of $186.1 billion and projected receipts of $178.1 billion, a deficit of $8.0 billion is expected in 1969 under the unified budget concept. This follows an anticipated deficit of $19.8 billion in 1968 under the same budget concept. Both deficits are based on the assumption that Congress will enact the surcharge and other new revenue measures as proposed. These deficits, however, do not measure the effect of fiscal operations on the public debt because of the inclusion of trust fund income and outgo in their computation. The excess of trust fund receipts over expenditures reduces the unified budget deficit but has no effect on the public debt as presently defined. The excess trust fund receipts are pledged for trust fund program purposes and cannot be used for reducing the debt.

Under the unified budget concept, the effect of fiscal operations on the public debt is reflected by the difference in net receipts and net outlays of Federal funds. Estimates for 1968 show net outlays of $139.4 billion and net receipts of $116.0 billion for a deficit of $23.4 billion in Federal fund operations. Net Federal fund outlays in 1969 are estimated at $148.3 billion and net Federal fund receipts at $133.3 billion for a deficit of $15.0 billion. These Federal fund deficits compare with estimated deficits under the old administrative budget concept of $18.6 billion in 1968 and $11.8 billion in 1969. The Federal fund deficits are much larger than the administrative budget deficits because proceeds from participation sales are recorded as negative expenditures in the administrative budget while being considered borrowing in the unified budget.

Further substantial deficits appear probable in 1970 and 1971, even with the proposed tax increases, unless peace is restored in Vietnam. The large excess of obligational authority and obligations incurred over expenditures under the 1969 budget plans, as well as in the prior four years, points to substantial spending increases in 1970 and 1971. At an annual rate of spending increase in the magnitude of $8–10 billion, additional revenues from economic growth will be consumed by spending and will not be available for deficit reduction.

Aside from a termination of war, the only hope of getting off the bleak treadmill of big deficits and rapidly growing debt is a far more rigorous application of spending priorities than has been made in the Johnson budget for 1969. It is up to both the Administration and the Congress if the fiscal outlook is to be significantly improved.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

A Summary of the First Session, 90th Congress

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud and feel privileged to have the honor of serving the Seventh Congressional District, Queens County, N.Y. I am forever thankful to the people of my district for having given me the privilege to represent them.

At the end of each session, since I came to Congress almost 8 years ago, I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each session has been a lengthy one, and my only regret has been that the lengthy sessions reduced the time I would have spent in my district personally discussing and obtaining the views and attending to the needs of my constituents. The mid-December adjournment of the first session of this Congress has necessitated my carrying this report into the early part of the second session.

While I cannot possibly include every bill, I do try to include those of widespread interest or importance in my district. The number of significant bills passed in the first session has been considerably less, and the number of hours lost from political maneuvering were more than in any Congress in recent years. A coalition formed a formidable enough block of votes to cause the unnecessary delay of almost any measure that came before the House. I do not complain about a Member's vote being different from mine on some measures and believe every Member should vote his conscience, but I deplore political maneuvering for the sole purpose of delaying the Congress in working its will.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Public Law 90–201 requires the 14,000 meatpacking and processing plants which are not now subject to Federal inspection to come up to Federal standards within 2 years, but an additional year can be given under certain circumstances; gives the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture authority to make periodic observations in nonfederally inspected plants and to put such a plant under Federal inspection if it is determined that the plant is endangering the public health; prohibits false labeling of meat and meat products containing nonmeat and inferior material; requires imported meat to meet U.S. Federal standards and without the 2-year delay given nonfederally inspected plants in the United States; and protects against meat rendering plants being used in human food.

Public Law 90–189 sets Federal safety standards to protect consumers in buying clothing, bedding, and other flammable fabrics which have been responsible for an estimated 3,000 deaths each year.

Public Law 90–146 creates a National Commission on Product Safety to study and recommend action to protect consumers from unsafe products for household use.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HEALTH

Public Law 90–248 provides increased social security benefits for 23.7 million persons now on social security. Minimum payments rise from $44 monthly to $55 and maximum payments from $142 to $160.50 for those individuals now on the rolls.

The effective date of these benefits will be reflected in checks received in early March. It also increases amount recipient can earn from $1,500 to $1,680 without reduction in benefits, and provides that $1 in benefits can be kept without a reduction for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 and $2,880. The limit on earnings without a dollar-for-dollar reduction formerly was $1,800. It also makes it easier for young totally disabled workers to qualify for benefits, and increases benefits for the dependents of deceased workers.

There are many inequities in the social security program which I hope the committee will consider and the Congress will correct in this second session of this Congress.

Public Law 90–31 extends and expands the Community Mental Health Center Act passed in the last Congress.

Public Law 90–99 extends for 2 years the authorization for Federal matching grants to States for vocational rehabilitation programs; establishes a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults; authorizes projects for rehabilitation services for children of migratory farm workers.

Public Law 90–174 amends the Public Health Service Act to authorize Federal assistance to State and local governments in planning and developing comprehensive health programs.

Public Law 90–170 extends for 2 years the authorization for Federal assistance in construction of centers for the mentally retarded; includes provision for 3-year program of research and training in physical education and recreation for mentally retarded children.

Public Law 90–91 extends the food stamp program for another 2 years.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Public Law 90–222 continues the antipoverty program for another 2 years with maximum authorization at about the same level as last year.

EDUCATION

Public Law 90–35 extends the Higher Education Act, passed in 1965, and authorizes $1.1 billion for 3 years. Grants are made to State commissions which distribute the money.

Public Law 90–247 extends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by the last Congress. The program provides funds to increase educational opportunities.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 90–198 extends the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for an additional 5 years.

Public Law 90–202 makes it unlawful to exclude applicants between 40 and 65 years of age from employment opportunities.

LABOR

Public Law 90–206 provides a 6-percent pay increase for postal workers and a 4.5-percent increase for other classified Federal employees, both retroactive to October 1, 1967, and is calculated, but does not, I believe, bring Federal employees up to salary level comparable to non-Federal employees in 1969; it also includes provisions to prohibit nepotism in Federal employment; provide free mailing privileges for members of Armed Forces in Vietnam.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Public Law 90–148 authorizes securing injunctions against polluting of the air according to certain air quality standards.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 90–104 increases the authorization for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund and fixes new minimum requirements for small business investment companies.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Public Law 90–7 authorizes the President to provide emergency food aid to India, including 3 million tons of grain.

Public Law 90–175 continues the authorization for the Peace Corps for another year.

Public Law 90–88 authorizes funds for the Inter-American Bank to assist in social and economic progress in Latin America.

ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS

Public Law 90–40 extends the draft for 4 years; puts 19- and 20-year-old group in highest priority for induction; provides that college students who are deferred will go into the high priority group upon graduation; retains almost complete authority in local draft boards to determine which men are selected. Currently, about one of each five eligible is needed to fill the draft.

Public Law 90–8 appropriates an additional $12.2 billion for support of U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam, making a total of about $25 billion for cost of Vietnam for fiscal year 1968. A proposal to prohibit bombing in North Vietnam was defeated in the House by a vote of 372 to 18.

Public Law 90–207 provides a 5.6-percent basic pay increase for servicemen and includes an expense-paid trip home for servicemen injured in Vietnam and on convalescent leave.

Public Law 90–77 provides compensation, pensions, and educational benefits to veterans of Vietnam, widows, and surviving children.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Critics continue to talk about the size of our national debt. They fail to mention in their pessimistic propaganda that our economy or gross national product has been advancing and improving over the last 20 years. They also fail to mention that our national debt in 1946 was $270 billion and today, in 1968, it is approximately $348.5 billion. In other words, our national debt in 22 years has increased approximately $78 billion while our gross national product, or our economy generally, has increased approximately $500 billion. This increase of gross national product means billions more in taxes coming into the Federal, State, and local treasuries. So when your neighbor talks about our Nation's fiscal policy "going to the dogs" you might quote figures of our great business, industrial, and employment expansion during the last 22 years.

Congress still spends most of its time working through money requests, and, since I am one of the Appropriations Committee members, I spend a large share of my time helping decide which requests are justified. The appropriations recap—or maximum that can be spent—for the fiscal year 1968 is as follows:

Total budget requests	$133,273,083,277
Total appropriated by Congress	127,466,380,457
Total reduction by Congress	5,806,702,820

APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

	President's request	Enacted
Bills for fiscal 1968:		
Treasury-Post Office	$7,615,148,000	$7,545,641,000
District of Columbia:		
Federal payments	73,499,000	67,478,200
Federal loan appropriation	89,700,000	79,200,000
Interior	1,458,218,000	1,382,848,350
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)
Independent Offices-HUD and NASA	15,920,513,700	14,728,373,900
Contract authorization (rent supplements)	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)
Labor-HEW	[1] 13,424,146,000	[1] 13,255,356,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	[1] 2,347,803,195	[1] 2,169,012,500
Legislative	276,005,210	275,699,035
Agriculture	[1] 5,021,097,400	[1] 4,952,945,700
Loan authorization	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)
Defense	71,584,000,000	69,936,620,000
Transportation	[2] 1,718,618,772	[2] 1,581,905,772
Public works	4,867,813,000	4,689,938,000
Military construction	2,937,000,000	2,093,362,000
Foreign assistance	3,818,736,000	[3] 2,950,000,000
Supplemental (poverty, Appalachia, etc.)	2,120,785,000	[3] 1,858,000,000
Total, 1968 bills	133,273,083,277	127,466,380,457

[1] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices-HUD, $3,235,000,000 in budget estimates, $881,000,000 in House bill, $3,235,000,000 in Senate bill, and $3,235,000,000 enacted; Labor-HEW, $15,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, and enacted; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, $150,000,000 in budget estimates. House bill, Senate bill, and enacted; Agriculture, $800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, $700,000,000 in Senate bill, and $750,000,000 enacted. Total authorizations requested in budget, $4,300,000,000; total in House bills, $1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, $4,085,000,000; total enacted, $4,250,000,000.

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget $75,000,000; House bill, $65,000,000; Senate bill, $75,000,000; enacted, $70,000,000).

[3] Estimated Dec. 13, 1967.

LOCAL ISSUES

When we think of local problems in the Seventh Congressional District of New York, we immediately think of noise from airplanes, especially jets, flying low over our homes as they land and depart John F. Kennedy International Airport. Since my last report, I have continued my contacts with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Port of New York Authority, and congressional committees having interest in and jurisdiction over legislation in this field. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commenced hearings on legislation to give the FAA authority to set noise criteria which the plane manufacturers would have to meet before the plane could be certificated. This is of great importance to all of us as plans go forward in the development of the supersonic plane. I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to give priority consideration to this legislation, of which I am a sponsor, and to report it to the House at the earliest possible date.

In a further effort to secure relief for my constituents who are plagued with jet noise, I have urged all involved agencies to work with utmost speed on the selection of a site and plans for a fourth jetport to serve the New York metropolitan area—Kennedy cannot accommodate the continued increase in air traffic, and I have opposed a suggestion that additional runways be built in Jamaica Bay to increase Kennedy's capacity.

The catastrophic gas explosion which occurred in my congressional district on January 13, 1967, brought to each of us a deep realization of the inherent anger in this Nation of gas pipelines which crisscross the country and run beneath every large city. I was pleased that the Senate passed the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Bill in the first session of this Congress—the Senate bill is very similar to my bill, H.R. 13936. Again, I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to proceed as speedily as possible on this legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

It has been, and continues to be, my desire to be readily available to any constituent who wishes to talk with me. Whenever time permits, I attend district civic, veterans, and fraternal organization meetings. For the convenience of my constituents, I maintain a full-time district office at 96–11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, N.Y. 11417; and my Washington office at 1727 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, is always available to my constituency.

A Prayer—A Poem

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every day each of us says or hears prayers, most of which are inspiring. Seldom, however, is a prayer so beautiful that it is, in truth, a poem.

On Friday, February 2, 1968, at a dinner of the New Jersey Democratic Party, held in Newark, the invocation was given by the Very Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Fleming, S.T.L., Ph. D., executive vice president, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. It is indeed a beautiful and inspiring poem. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

INVOCATION

We give you thanks, O Lord, for the thousand hands and hearts
That have gone into the making of this moment.
In this challenging hour of our nation's history,
Bless our courageous President, our beloved Governor,
Our distinguished Senator Kennedy, and all public servants.
May their statesmanship burst like comets across our firmament,
Transforming the weary embers of despair into meteors of incandescent hope.
As we come together tonight in a common effort,
May we never forget for a moment the great heart and spirit of him
Who right down to the crack of a rifle, lived these words:
"God's work must truly be our own—then we can change the world."
The brightest light of our time was snuffed out
And his voice was heard no more in the land.
We pray that the light of his reason, though temporarily extinguished,

Will never go out. To him the Presidency was not a crown
To be worn at twilight,
But the legacy of a man whose future was longer than his past.
May the eternal flame never cease to remind us that we do not stand alone.
If we all can persevere, if we can in every land and office,
Look beyond our own shores and ambitions.
Then surely the age will come in which the strong are just,
The weak secure, and the peace preserved.
Though there is a time to be born and a time to die,
May we never forget
That we have promises to keep
And miles to go before we sleep.
Then by your grace, may we behold that bright and shining hour,
When we stand on the threshold of the promised land to which he had led us.
With a good conscience our only sure reward,
With history the final judge of our deeds,
May we go forth to lead the land we love,
Praying your blessing and your help, but knowing
That here on earth God's work must truly be our own. Amen.

International Cooperation Between the United States and Brazil

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, an event which holds great promise for the people of Brazil, and which has part of its genesis in my congressional district in Wisconsin, has just come to my attention.

It is the opening of the first regional course in cooperative development at a new cooperative training center in Campinas, Brazil. This center is headed by a Brazilian, Dr. Antonio Gilberto T. Rebeiro, who studied at the International Cooperative Training Center at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. The director of the University of Wisconsin center is Prof. Adlowe L. Larson.

About 40 Brazilians are attending the first course which started February 5, 1968 and will continue until the end of April. They are employees of cooperatives needing technical training, representatives of Brazilian state organizations responsible for developing cooperatives, and staff of the National Government assigned the task of building effective cooperatives.

This new training center represents a productive partnership between the Governments of Brazil and the United States. I believe such joint efforts between the United States and the countries we are aiding is an imperative for success in our foreign aid programs.

Jointly responsible for the new center, both for its inception and as instructors, are representatives of Farmer Cooperative Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the staff of the National Institute of Agricultural Development, an arm of the Brazilian Government.

These specialists felt that specialized training in cooperative operations was a first essential for people who were just beginning to run their own cooperatives. Leaders and employees of existing or newly formed cooperatives often lack technical background. Government employees also need more indepth cooperative knowledge that they in turn can pass on to others.

This first course is, therefore, devoted to bookkeeping, what managers and directors should know and do, how to market, how to manage, and related subjects on the basics.

I understand this training school will hold continuing courses and that plans are to open similar centers in other parts of Brazil.

Both the United States and Brazilian cooperative specialists saw the need for some intensive cooperative training in Brazil, as it would be impossible to send all those who needed such training to the center in Madison. Furthermore, they felt it was better to do as much of the training in Brazil as possible, but at the same time drawing on the knowledge of Brazilians who had trained at the U.S. center whenever possible.

In addition to Dr. Rebeiro, a number of other Brazilians have also attended the Madison center, with good results from this training showing up. Credit for improvement of a new cooperative formed by 200 farmers to get agricultural supplies reportedly goes largely to a Brazilian Government employee who used knowledge gained at the Madison center to advise cooperative officials on changes needed for more effective operations. In effect, then, a chain reaction of cooperative knowledge is being activated in Brazil, as trainees teach other trainees.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Professor Larson and his staff for making such a valuable contribution to our foreign assistance program for Brazil.

Peace?—On Whose Side?

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Washington Star on Sunday, I came across this letter to the editor.

It is from an Episcopal minister, who in my judgment shows remarkable perception about one of the problems facing our country today.

Under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD for the additional enlightenment of people everywhere. I salute Father Rigg:

PEACE?—ON WHOSE SIDE?

SIR: The miserable exhibition of the 2000 "Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam" advocating peace at almost any price should remind us of the remark by Nikita Khrushchev (while a guest in this country) that they—the Communists—intend to bury us.

Evidently they are being aided and abetted by certain of the clergy—who are even supplying the "coffins" for our mass burial.

Also, we have the charming spectacle of that great peacemaker, Martin Luther King, who makes a career and a very good living attacking the very system that protects his absurd actions and statements.

As an Episcopal priest I am ashamed and embarrassed by the part some of our clergy are taking in this farce.

It is time that the clergy of this country understand that if we don't fight to protect our existence as free men, we will survive only as slaves.

REV. PHILIP RIGG.

CROOM, MD.

Small Business Administration Aids Los Angeles Firm

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I know that we are all aware of the rapid expansion in this country of computer technology. The computer has become an essential part of American life in almost every field of endeavor, from direct mail advertising to outer space; from quality control to our atomic submarines; from the payroll office to the schoolroom. And every day new vistas are being opened up in this fast-developing field.

The Small Business Administration is aware of the important role the computer plays in our society.

An outstanding example of SBA's help to the computer industry is the dramatic growth of a Los Angeles, Calif., firm—Logicon, Inc.

Logicon, founded in December 1960 and incorporated in the State of California in April of 1961, is a professional engineering organization composed of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and programer-analysts.

Due to the lively growth of the computer industry, Logicon's president, Claude F. King, realized that the company would need more working capital if they were to expand quickly enough to accommodate the demand for their services. Unable to obtain long-term financing from banks, King in 1964 approached the Small Business Administration.

SBA made Logicon a working capital loan of $100,000 during their expansion period.

When the company came to SBA in 1964, their employees numbered 39; their total sales for the previous fiscal year were $677,000.

In March of 1967, Claude King wrote to SBA in Los Angeles to tell them that as of the end of the fiscal year 1967, their work force had increased to 140—350 percent; sales had risen to $2,145,000—400 percent.

At that time, King in closing his letter said:

> We would like to express our appreciation to you and your associates at the SBA for your cooperation over the past two and one-half years and we are looking forward to continued good relations during the remaining term of the loan.

In June of this year, Logicon found their quarters in Redondo Beach too small and moved to their present location in San Pedro, where they have 20,000 square feet of office space—twice the space that they occupied at the Redondo Beach headquarters. They have opened an office in San Diego and an office in Washington, where they presently employ a staff of seven. Plans are being made to set up an operation in Boston.

Today, Logicon has increased to 174 employees, and projected sales for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, are in excess of $4,000,000.

On November 3, Logicon, Inc., made final payment on the 1964 SBA loan of $100,000—3 years before maturity.

Surely, this tremendously successful company is a credit to our American free enterprise system.

Just as surely, SBA's investment of faith and hard cash in this small business during a period of critical growth and expansion is a credit to our Federal Government. SBA has helped a company advance and expand to meet the current demands of our burgeoning computer industry. By doing so SBA has: created more jobs in Los Angeles County; contributed to the tax base of Los Angeles County; and, also, contributed to the national defense and aerospace programs.

Senator Karl Mundt To Support Richard Nixon

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the candidacy of former Vice President Richard Nixon received a substantial boost when Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, announced he would head a slate of delegates pledged to the candidacy of Nixon.

Senator MUNDT and Vice President Nixon have been close friends since many years ago. Both served in the House of Representatives before both went to the U.S. Senate.

I insert in the RECORD the announcement and the text of the statement of Senator KARL MUNDT:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D., today announced he had accepted an invitation from former Governor Archie Gubbrud of South Dakota to head a slate of delegates in the June Republican primary election of his state pledged to the candidacy of Richard M. Nixon.

Gubbrud is heading a South Dakota campaign committee supporting Nixon's candidacy and on February 9th wired Mundt asking him to be chairman of the Nixon delegation which will appear on the South Dakota primary ballot on June 4th in the last of the open primaries to be held before the Republican National Convention.

Following is text of telegram to Gubbrud:

"In response to your telegram of February 9th in behalf of the proposed slate of Republican Convention delegates pledged to Richard Nixon's candidacy, I am happy to accept the invitation you extended to serve as chairman of a South Dakota slate of delegates pledged to Dick Nixon in our Presidential primary on June 4th. While normally I have not sought a spot on our Republican delegations to our National Convention and have refrained from trying to influence the pre-convention decision of our voters, I take this action now for several reasons among which the following are determining factors:

"In my opinion our Presidential decision this year rates with the most important decisions ever made by an American electorate. In the first place, I believe Nixon gives our Country its best chance for achieving an early and enduring peace and a successful ending of the war in Vietnam. His long and intimate experience in foreign affairs, his steady and sturdy guiding hand if the war is not totally ended by next November, and his constructive suggestions for bringing into focus in this war the economic and diplomatic strength of the United States instead of relying almost entirely on our military capabilities are badly needed in this era of conflict and of international confusion and uncertainty.

"Next, while I personally know and respect all of the Republican leaders mentioned for the Presidency, I feel from my long personal and intimate friendship with Dick Nixon that he, more than any other candidate on either ticket, better understands the problems of rural America, of our small towns and small economic enterprises, and that he will approach their solution with the most sympathetic and constructive programs.

"Finally, I am not at all impressed by the inspired slogan that 'Nixon can't win' which has been utilized by opponents to confuse and divide Republicans. I believe he is an odds-on favorite to carry our ticket to victory and that he gives our party by far its best chance to score a meaningful success next November by winning not only the White House but also a greatly expanded Republican membership in both the House and the Senate. The facts of history, as well as the pertinent factors involved in this campaign, bear out this conclusion.

"It must be remembered that in 1960 against a very attractive and appealing candidate and the compelling TV personality possessed by Jack Kennedy, Nixon came within a hair's breadth of being elected President. His loss by less than 1% and a margin of a mere 111,803 votes out of a total of 68,329,895 ballots clearly indicate that against President Johnson or Eugene McCarthy, Nixon will roll up an inspiring Republican majority. After all, he has campaigned in every state and made friends in all of them while at the same time coming to know the interests and the ideals of every area of the country. He alone has had the highly helpful experience of having participated not only in his own nearly victorious campaign for the Presidency but the two highly successful campaigns won by the Eisenhower-Nixon team in 1952 and 1956. His candidacy will enlist strong components of enthusiastic friends in every area who know him, who respect him, and who want him to be President in order to restore the prestige, the peace, and the progress of our Country which many citizens recall with nostalgia during the peaceful, progressive, and successful 8 years of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration with its record of fiscal sanity.

"If our delegation wins in South Dakota next June, I shall seek a position on the Republican platform committee in which forum I would hope to have some influence in writing a constructive platform which will point the way toward returning to our great American success formula in meeting the current problems of our day and age while at the same time giving special emphasis to the correction of the serious economic problems confronting our farmers, our ranchers, and the small towns and cities of our land. By adding consideration of these problems to new proposals and constructive programs for meeting the serious problems of our urban communities. I believe the Republican Party can present an all-American approach to the over-all solution of those domestic economic and social problems which continue to plague our Country.

"KARL E. MUNDT,
"*U.S. Senator.*"

Legislation To Aid Italians

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 a series of devastating earthquakes wracked the southwestern tip of the tiny nation of Sicily, turning much of the region into heaps of rubble and leaving thousands of victims destitute and homeless. Since that time, in response to a request for assistance from the Italian Government, the United States has made available emergency supplies and services, in terms of food, equipment, medical personnel, and financial assistance.

But there is yet another way that we can aid these people—we can give them new hope and a new future here in the United States. I am today introducing a bill which would authorize special legislation to permit the immediate entry into the United States of 2,000 natives of Italy and their families who lost their homes and livelihoods as a result of the Sicilian earthquakes.

Use of existing immigration provisions to accomplish this would penalize Italians who have already applied for entry into this country because it would count the number of earthquake victim immigrants against the ceiling on Italian immigration.

My proposed legislation would permit special visas to be issued to these distressed aliens, and the number of immigrants entering under these provisions would not count against the Italian immigration quota.

Mr. Speaker, I know that a number of my colleagues have introduced similar bills, or have expressed interest in doing so. Because of the urgency of the situation, it is my hope that the entire body of the House will take action on this legislation as soon as possible.

The proposed bill follows:

H.R. 14808

A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby authorized to be issued two thousand special immigrant visas to aliens specified in section 2 of this Act seeking to enter the United States as immigrants. The spouse and children of any such alien, if accompanying or following to join, may be issued special immigrant visas notwithstanding such numerical limitation.

SEC. 2. Visas authorized to be issued under section 1 of this Act shall be issued only to natives of Italy who were uprooted by the earthquakes in Sicily subsequent to January 12, 1968, and are unable to return to their usual place of residence in Sicily and are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life.

SEC. 3. Visas authorized to be issued under this Act may be issued by consular officers as defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of that Act: *Provided*, That each such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That a visa is not immediately available to such alien at the time of his application for a visa.

SEC. 4. Aliens receiving visas under section 1 of this Act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply in the administration of this Act.

National FFA Week

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this is Future Farmers of America Week.

February 17–24 is set aside to emphasize the contributions this great organization of agricultural youth has made, and is making, to leadership training and sound agricultural practices.

I have often said that my own participation and membership in the Future Farmers of America is directly responsible for my having had the opportunity to serve in the Congress and the Florida Legislature.

No higher honor has come to me than being honored by my fellow Floridians in the FFA in having allowed me to serve as their State president. I started as a greenhand, as all of our members do, and became interested in governmental service through this experience.

The friends that I made during my active FFA career helped greatly in my campaigns for public office. I point this out to emphasize that thousands upon thousands of farm youths have had their horizons broadened by this participation which gives them an opportunity to meet their fellow members throughout the State and Nation.

Basic and fundamental to FFA since its founding in 1928 has been a new awareness of advanced technology in farming. The lives of those young men who have had this opportunity has been enriched financially because they have been able to translate this training into action.

FFA gives a young man a sense of values and confidence through the leadership training which is a vital part of its work.

Theme for the observance this year is "Challenging Youth in Agriculture."

Emphasis is being placed on the great opportunities in agribusiness for the youth of today. Agriculture is far more than simply the man who tills the soil. It is a vast enterprise encompassing manufacturing, marketing and the entire galaxy of this Nation's economy.

No nation can be sounder than its agriculture. Basic to every society is the need to feed its people—and American agriculture is able to do this in abundance.

Modern technology has freed the vast majority of Americans from the back breaking toil of wresting a living from the soil. It was only when we were able to solve this basic problem that America moved to the forefront among the nations of the world.

I like to think, as we observe this week, that the FFA is going to play a vital role in solving this problem for the peoples of the world. Poverty, hunger, and disease go hand in hand and these are the real enemies of mankind.

I would hope and pray that when the problem of providing food in abundance for all of the world is a reality, we will see other lands begin, a new life of peace, and aggression ended.

Few organizations have played as vital a role in the development of sound agriculture as has the FFA. The men who have guided this program are to be commended, for they have given to future farmers through the years a will to succeed.

In truth, they are "challenging youth in agriculture" and this Nation is richer for the FFA having existed.

Even Foreigners Are Cognizant of Need for Modern American Merchant Marine

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need to revitalize the American merchant marine has been emphasized by many of our Nation's most able statesmen, naval authorities and maritime experts. They have uttered countless words of warning on the danger of allowing our merchant fleet to continue its disgraceful decline. And yet, all these warnings seem to have fallen on deaf ears.

Maritime strength is recognized by all leading world powers—and so is maritime weakness.

How can the United States expect to maintain a position of world leadership if it must depend on other nations to carry 82 percent of its own world trade?

How can the United States expect to retain the respect of other great world powers, if it continues to allow foreign-flag ships to take over American trade?

And how can this Nation really expect to be the champion of the free world if it does not have enough ships to even defend its own vital interests?

These are some of the vital questions being asked every day by many knowledgeable Americans. But if what they feel and think does not matter, perhaps it would be more effective to emphasize what other nations think about us.

An excellent article on that very subject appeared in the February 17, 1968, issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun. Written by reporter Louis Granger, it is based on an interview with a German sea captain, who warns that America must revitalize its merchant marine—both for its economic health and its national defense.

It seems ironic that our foreign maritime competitors should point out our deficiencies and weaknesses, and even express concern over our decline as a maritime power.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this objective and expert foreign criticism will penetrate some of those deaf American ears, and I insert this revealing article into the Record. The article follows:

GERMAN URGES UNITED STATES TO REVITALIZE SHIPS

(By Louis Granger)

A German sea captain visiting Baltimore, voicing the same sentiments as nearly the entire United States maritime industry, said this nation must revitalize its merchant fleet.

Capt. Hans Viktor Schlegel who began his maritime career in 1939, said the United States was losing millions of dollars a year through the necessity of transporting American-made cargos in foreign-flag ships.

"America must have more merchant vessels if it wants to continue in its place as a leading maritime nation," he said.

"All you're doing," Captain Schlegel explained, "is paying American dollars to foreign companies to move your goods."

He said a large merchant fleet was important to national security and that "your government must do something soon."

Noting that the United States has approximately half a million men in Vietnam alone, the captain pointed out that during war the only effective way to transport men and weapons was by ship.

A modern national maritime program has been proposed for more than three years. The move to update and modernize the fleet was made to compete with other nations such as Russia and Japan which are building their merchant fleets at a much faster rate and taking trade the United States once had.

For example, 80 per cent of the Soviet Union's merchant fleet is less than ten years old. Approximately 70 per cent of all United States-flag cargo ships is more than twenty years old.

Also, according to the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, by the end of 1966, the Soviets expected to carry 75 per cent of their trade in Communist ships, while the United States in 1967 was carrying only about 8 per cent of its trade.

Captain Schlegel commands the M.V. Polar Argentina, one of Germany's largest and fastest reefer (refrigerated) merchant vessels.

The 7,600 deadweight-ton ship arrived from Hamburg and unloaded 523 automobiles at Dundalk Marine Terminal. The vessel would normally be used to transport fruit.

During World War II, the captain served on a German destroyer off Norway. He was a petty officer whose main job was to make underwater repairs to the ship.

Students Contribute to School Fund

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the students of Muzzey Junior High School in Lexington, Mass. Recently, these students contributed $865 to help fund a school in Huawi Bong, Tak

Province, Thailand, and $135 for a school in Ailuk Atoll, Marshall Islands, Micronesia. These funds, which were raised by the youngsters themselves, were sent to the Peace Corps as part of their school-to-school partnership program.

I think this is a tremendously valuable program. It makes possible the participation of American students in an effort to help build schools in developing countries around the world. In this case, the students' contribution will be used toward the purchase of construction materials. Citizens in the host countries will construct the school with a Peace Corps volunteer providing on-the-job assistance.

But, Mr. Speaker, these students are doing more than giving money and more than helping to build a school. They are making a worthwhile contribution to the building of foundations of understanding and bonds of friendship between the United States and peoples of other countries. I am proud to be able to salute them today.

Oakland County Skaters Shine at Grenoble

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding performance of the U.S. Olympic skating team at Grenoble, France, was an unexpected source of pride for every American.

But it was especially so for those of us who live in the 18th Congressional District of Michigan, the home of Mr. Terry McDermott and Mr. Timothy Wood, both Olympic silver medal winners.

The winning of a silver medal, signifying a second place finish in the Olympics, is by itself an accomplishment worthy of the praise and admiration of the entire world.

But the manner in which both Terry and Tim won those medals was even more impressive.

Neither man was rated a serious contender at the start of the games.

Terry, who won a gold medal in the men's 500 meter speed skating race at Innsbruck, Austria, in the 1964 Olympics, retired from competitive racing shortly afterward. He skated seldom during the 3 years and at 27 years old was given little chance for a comeback.

Tim, a 19-year-old university student, was untried in Olympic competition, although he is the current U.S. men's figure skating champion.

Both men, displaying rare amounts of skill and determination, proved the experts wrong.

Terry, who lives in Birmingham, Mich., mastered the elements as well as himself in winning his medal.

Given little chance of defending his title successfully, he was considered out of the running altogether when he drew last position among the 48 starters in the 500-meter race.

By the time his turn came, the hot sun had created pools of water over many sections of the rink. Everyone expected the three top medals were as good as won by those who already had completed their races.

But Terry, his head and arms flailing, crossed the finish line in 40.5 seconds to tie for second place.

Someone later asked his coach, Richard Somalski, to account for his miraculous performance. He replied: "It was sheer determination—that guy has more nerve than I ever saw."

The same determination and courage were displayed in Tim's performance.

For a month before the national championships, he trained for 7½ hours every day in addition to keeping up with his studies at John Carroll University. He intensified that schedule when school recessed.

Tim, who lives in Bloomfield Hills, Mich., has shown that kind of determination since he began skating at the age of 7. It earned him the national junior figure-skating championship in 1964, a 13th-place finish in the world figure-skating competition in 1965, and ninth place in 1967.

It is this kind of dedication and courage, Mr. Speaker, which speaks volumes about the character of young Americans and about the future of the Nation they are inheriting. These two fine young men deserve the applause and the appreciation of us all.

Some Help in the Fight Against Pornography

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have written recently complaining of receipt through the mails of unsolicited pornographic material. This is not the first time, of course, because the purveyors of this kind of trash have been active in operating through the mails for a number of years. But the type of material that has been forwarded to me in recent days is the most salacious yet brought to my attention. It has no place being sent into homes through the U.S. mails. In fact, it has no place any place. Where do we stop with the dissemination of this filth? Our courts seem to be saying, more and more every day, that anything goes. The court standard seemingly is that anything can be printed and distributed to the public that does not absolutely outrage our moral standards—and, apparently, nothing these days outrages our moral standards—at least as they are viewed by the courts.

I was heartened to read in yesterday's paper—the book world section of the Washington Post, February 18, 1968, to be exact—the report by William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled "Serious Proposals To Confront the Onslaught of Smut," which gives some hope that the long series of unfortunate court decisions in this area can be at least somewhat reversed. Mr. Buckley's review has to do with "Foolish Figleaves? Pornography In—and Out of—Court," a book by Richard H. Kuh.

I cannot help but agree, incidentally, with Mr. Buckley's observation that the book has "an unfortunate title." But title notwithstanding, the book apparently does contain some solid suggestions for drafting of laws that would both meet Supreme Court obscenity tests and still be effective in controlling dissemination of salacious material. The review is well worth reading—as is, hopefully, the book by Mr. Kuh—and I therefore insert it in the RECORD for my colleagues' consideration:

SERIOUS PROPOSALS TO CONFRONT THE ONSLAUGHT OF SMUT

"Foolish Figleaves? Pornography In—and Out of—Court." By Richard H. Kuh. Macmillan. 368 pp. $7.95.

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A few months ago I wrote to Mayor Yorty of Los Angeles to ask him whether he would do me the favor of imprisoning whoever it was who owned the pornography mill which was sending my 14-year-old son invitations to depravity or, failing that, would he be good enough to administer him a poke in the nose. I heard back from Captain H. A. Nelson of Los Angeles' vice division, informing me that the City of Los Angeles had done its best to cope with the squalid pornographer but that the Supreme Court had made the gentleman immune.

Captain Nelson invited me to visit his department on a trip to Los Angeles and I did so, and got a quick practical education in some of the problems of vice control. The climax of the visit—which I cannot wait to share with you—was a showing of The Film. A film called "O–12" which, the Captain and a legal aide explained to me, was showing in a Los Angeles arcade, 25¢ for three minutes of it, another 25¢ for a further three minutes, and so on, up to $1.75 by which time, presumably, the producer figured that if you had not attained a high, you weren't even worth taking money from.

Now this film, the official carefully explained, had been witnessed that spring by the members of the Supreme Court, a majority of whom, without rendering an opinion, had pronounced it as not obscene under the law, thus upsetting the lower courts' conviction. In order to be obscene, under the consolidated standards of the Court, it is required to demonstrate that a movie (or a book) meet all of three tests, to wit that it appeals to the prurient interest, that it is patently offensive by reference to community standards, and that it is utterly without redeeming social importance.

I went to the screening room braced to commit a little diplomatic cluck-cluck. I could not readily imagine five old men dismissing as other than obscene something that clearly was obscene, and so I found myself suspecting that the gentlemen of the vice squad had lost their judgment under the weight of their particular portfolio, and that I was about to see close-ups of *La Maja Desnuda* and a couple of Rodin statues. One dollar and seventy-five cents later, that is to say twenty-one minutes later, the lights having come on again, I found myself saying, "to hell with the obscenity problem—what we have is a communications problem." If that movie isn't of prurient interest; if it wasn't patently offensive by the standards of Nero's Rome, let alone Yorty's Los Angeles; if in it Thrasymachus himself could find a straw of social importance, then we had better rethink the laws of reason, beginning with the principle of contradiction.

The experience of seeing "O–12" makes all the more important the publication of a book squarely addressed to the dilemma of how, simultaneously, to retain the First Amendment, and to immobilize the pornographers of this world. Richard Kuh, the author of ***Foolish Figleaves,*** **is an experienced prosecutor, a graduate of Columbia and the Harvard Law School, and for many years the chief of the Criminal Courts Bureau under Frank Hogan of New York. Here are the special insights of Mr. Kuh:**

1) The Supreme Court has time and again said that it does not consider that the First Amendment protects obscenity.

2) The Court has, time and again, indicated that it is prepared to grant special recognition to efforts by the states directed at protecting children.

3) The acknowledged right of the parent to direct the training of his own children is rendered meaningless in the absence of the cooperation of the state.

4) The principal reason why, under the circumstances, the states have consistently failed either to sustain their laws or their laws' applicability in given situations, has been the loose-wordedness of said laws.

Whereupon Kuh accepts the breathtaking challenge of formulating exemplary laws governing children and governing adults, which he more or less guarantees would survive the scrutiny of the courts. If such laws were passed, he assures us, "Appellate tribunals would find their role in reviewing obscenity shrinking . . . Passing on whether an indecency crime has been committed would become only slightly more difficult than determining whether or not such crimes as robbery or assault have been established."

Kuh's laws are based on specificity of detail. Indeed, it is wryly amusing that passages in his proposed law might be classified as pornographic, rendering it illegal, perhaps for the first time in history, to publish the law. But that is an irrelevant objection, the point being that has got away completely from such phrases as "appealing to the prurient interest," "lustfully conceived," the kind of thing that invites eternal wrangling and such dreadful hypocrisy as persons of great probity maintaining with straight faces that *Candy* is other than pornographic.

There is no room here to condense the laws proposed by Kuh; there is room only to observe that they are sharply divergent insofar as they are addressed to the protection of children; that they are sharply consistent in that they could be waived by a child's parents; that they are greatly ingenious, for instance, on the vexing problem of what lawyers call scienter—how does the shipper know, for example, whether the person ordering this particular book is under 18? (Well, according to Mr. Kuh, he can protect himself by stamping in letters across the package: "This package contains material that, by law, may not be sold directly to a minor"); and that they intelligently distinguish between the exploitability of different media for the purpose of lascivious trade. What goes in books may not go in night clubs, what goes in night clubs may not go in movies; what goes in movies may not go in plays. The exceptions are explicit and reasonable, and if anyone truly fears that Kuh's laws would interrupt genuine efforts at self-expression, let him be reassured by the knowledge that under those laws nobody could touch *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, or even LeRoi Jones' *The Toilet*. Here, then, is an altogether serious set of proposals which will not appease the Comstockeans, nor satisfy the First Amendment fanatics, but which intelligently confront the dilemmas posed by the Supreme Court.

It is a dividend of Kuh's book that he passes along a lot of very interesting commentary. For instance, the disgust D. H. Lawrence felt for pornography. The wonderful evolution of the poet John Ciardi from against any censorship at all, even by the parent over the reading matter of his children, to the confession, a few years later, that he had written "pompously," a reversal to which he was driven upon reading *Last Exit to Brooklyn*. There are spicy quotations from Plato and Muggeridge, Aristotle and Katherine Anne Porter. He quotes people of reputation most permissive (for instance, Margaret Mead) against what is the existing situation: namely that anyone, of any age, can get anything, almost anywhere.

I believe that Kuh has made an important contribution to the thought on the subject, and I hope that very soon now his book (what an unfortunate title, by the way) will engage the attention of serious legislators. But whether it does or whether it doesn't, I intend to schedule a private showing. I shall rent myself a 16-millimeter projector, having sent off for a copy of "O-12." I shall then invite the head of the New York Civil Liberties Union, the editor of *Commentary*, and Dwight Macdonald, Max Lerner, and maybe three or four other worldly and permissive gentlemen, and will run through that 21-minute film. I shall not then ask them whether in their judgment the film should be available to children—I know what they are likely to answer, and would not go to such pains to contrive my having to hear them say it again. I shall merely ask them whether by the Supreme Court's own definitions, the film is obscene. Confident that they will agree with me that it is, I shall join my guests in sponsoring a Committee for a New Supreme Court, and will dispatch Mr. Macdonald to Washington, to picket the Justices' chambers.

Travel Tax Bad Plan

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, while no one would expect a call for new taxes to be met with wild enthusiasm, the administration's proposal for the avowed purpose of reducing nonessential travel by private citizens outside the Western Hemisphere has come in for widespread, and I believe justified, criticism, not only on the grounds of unfairness, but of the practicality and consequences of imposing such levies as well. On February 6, 1968, in this Chamber, I particularly sought to point out that the administration should, before adding new burdens on our citizens, attack our balance-of-payments problem more directly at its source, that is, with respect to unnecessary Federal overseas spending in our foreign aid programs.

In an editorial appearing in the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot on Wednesday, February 7, 1968, a number of very persuasive points have been raised in opposition to the President's proposal, which I commend to the attention of the House for their consideration:

TRAVEL TAX BAD PLAN

President Johnson's proposed travel tax on Americans abroad is, unfortunately, more a grandstand, hit-'em-where-it-hurts bit of raw politics than a meaningful attempt to accomplish its purported purpose.

The proposed tax would, according to the Johnsonian theory, help reduce our balance of payments deficit by making travel more expensive. Theoretically, it would deter many would-be travelers, or make them shell out part of their money to Uncle Sam instead of letting them spread it around Europe, Africa, Asia or Australia. (It would still be all right to travel around North, South and Central America without upsetting the government's red-ink-worriers.)

More appropriately, it should be called a bald tax aimed at enriching the nation's general fund under a smoke-screen.

It would not, for example, limit or restrict in any way the amount of money a traveler could take abroad for such spending as he desired.

Why it is less dangerous to spend all our national travel funds in one part of the world than another is an unfathomable mystery. It still flows out, without any increase in return.

The big problem is that there isn't enough coming back from other parts of the world, not in where it is spent, or whether the Treasury Department collects a spending tax on the outflow.

The only travelers who would really be hurt are those of limited resources, who have scrimped and saved for years to see their, or their parents', native lands or who just wish to make a low-budget tour.

Wealthier individuals can afford the tax without reducing their spending abroad.

The tax, then, is just more troublesome red tape aimed at the little guy who isn't a major campaign contributor.

If President Johnson had a mind to do something meaningful, he could see to it that the foreign aid laws are enforced. For example, the federal government is paying dock rental, stevedore and other labor costs, plus other charges for shipments of free food stuffs to needy nations.

The law forbids this practice, but the government closes its eyes while the Treasury Department illegally pays multi-million-dollar-a-year bills.

If the recipient nations can't offer free dock space and recruit some free labor to make it possible to accept free food, something is really wrong with those governments.

At the same time Johnson asks Congress to slap a tax on everything over $7 a day spent abroad by the general public, government officials are allowed $50 a day of tax money—tax-free, of course—for their junkets.

The natural reaction among the protectionist members of Congress is to enact trade tariffs of the type tried and found wanting a generation or two ago. That reaction is no less baldly political, aimed directly at benefiting some special-interest constituent without regard for true national interest.

The Johnson Administration and Congress have become too accustomed to collecting taxes with a large funnel. Individuals who attempt personal financing of this type can be found in bankruptcy court every day of the week, if they elude debtor's prison.

However, adopting the kind of travel tax proposed by Johnson does focus public attention on the balance of payments problem, but at the expense of the people of moderate or low income. The real theory appears to be to make those individuals hurt, and thus feel they're doing their bit for their country.

It is a shoddy, but much-used gambit played by every political entity from the township level to the White House.

The idea deserves to fall flat on its face until long after the government has instituted reforms in its own spending practices abroad.

Gen. Hanford MacNider

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute to the memory of Gen.

Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa, who died Saturday in Sarasota, Fla., at the age of 78.

General MacNider was one of the most respected men in Iowa. He was an acknowledged leader in commerce, civil affairs, and government.

His record as a war hero in World Wars I and II is well known to all Iowans. In the First World War, only Gen. John Pershing received more medals than General MacNider.

General MacNider was a cofounder of the American Legion, the Nation's largest and oldest veterans' organization, and in 1921, at the age of 31, became national commander.

From 1925 to 1928, he served as Assistant Secretary and Acting Secretary of War. Dwight D. Eisenhower was a member of his staff.

The State of Iowa and this Nation have lost a great leader with General MacNider's death. I only hope that many of the young people in this country will learn about the life of this prominent American. They could profit from his example of outstanding service and bravery to his country.

Ethics

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, as a portion of my remarks, I include for the RECORD a comparison of the provisions of the legislative reorganization bill passed by the Senate with those in similar bills introduced in the House. The following material deals only with provisions of the bills dealing with the subject of congressional ethics:

ETHICS

The supporting language of the Final Report (page 48) for the Joint Committee's recommendation that "The House of Representatives shall create a Committee on Standards and Conduct" says merely:

"The joint committee heard considerable testimony with respect to the problem of the ethical conduct of Members of Congress. It is the opinion of the joint committee that the House of Representatives should create a committee to be concerned with the standards and conduct of Members of the House. The Senate has already created a committee to examine problems in this area and the House might explore profitably the organization and procedures of the Senate Committee prior to implementing this recommendation."

Point 4 of the Supplemental Views of Reps. Curtis, Hall, and Cleveland proposes that the committee be bipartisan (see page 88).

S. 355 AND CURTIS BILL

S. 355 as passed by the Senate contains the language of the original reorganization bill as introduced in the 89th Congress by Senator Monroney and, with necessary technical changes,* reported in the 90th Congress.

The reorganization bill supported by the House Republican Policy Committee was the companion measure introduced in the 89th Congress by Mr. Curtis. The Curtis bill, with technical changes consistent with the Monroney bill, was re-introduced in the 90th Congress as H.R. 2595. *Previous to adoption by the Senate of amendments to S. 355, the Curtis and Monroney bills differed only with respect to the provisions for an ethics committee in the House.*

Both bills (S. 355—this provisions was not amended by the Senate—and Curtis) establish a standing, evenly bipartisan committee. The Senate bill provides that the chairman must be a member of the majority party; the vice chairman of the minority party. The Curtis bill provides simply that the committee "shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members."

Both bills give the committee subpoena power, authority to sit whether the House is in session, recessed, or adjourned, and jurisdiction as follows: "Ethical standards and conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives."

As to *duties*, the Senate bill provides that the committee shall: "(1) recommend to the House . . . by report or resolution, such rules and regulations as the committee determines necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the House and by officers and employees of the House, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities; and (2) report, by majority vote of its entire membership, violations of law to the proper Federal and State authorities."

The Curtis bill provides that the committee shall: "(1) investigate violations of law, violations of rules and regulations of the House, and improper conduct which may reflect upon the House, of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members of the House, or as officers or employees of the House; and, after according to the individuals concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing, to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto; and to report to the House by resolution or otherwise, by a two-thirds vote of the authorized membership of the committee, its recommendations for disciplinary action; and (2) report, by resolution or otherwise, such additional rules and regulations governing conduct by Members, officers, and employees of the House, as the committee deems advisable."

BOLLING

The Bolling bill contains no provision for any variety of ethics committee.

REID

Section 106 of the Reid bill would establish a "Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct." This approach differs markedly from the other bills. See below for more on Reid bill.

PRINT NO. 3

Print No. 3 would establish a standing "Committee on Standards of Official Conduct," composed of six members of the majority party and six members of the minority party, which "shall recommend, from time to time, to the House of Representatives such changes in laws, rules, and regulations as the committee deems necessary to establish and enforce standards of official conduct for Members, officers, and employees of the House. The committee may hold such hearings and take such testimony as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this clause."

In effect, Print No. 3 simply makes permanent the temporary committee established by and for the 90th Congress.

RE PROPOSAL OF MR. REID

Reid's bill provides for a "Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct" to be composed of 14 members—7 Senators appointed by the Vice President, and 7 Congressmen appointed by the Speaker. Contains the usual language re vacancies, number for quorum, etc. The committee shall adopt rules not inconsistent with rules of the Senate and House, have subpoena power, etc.

The *duty* of Reid's joint committee shall be: "to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which there may be assured the maintenance, by elected representatives in the Federal Government and the officers and employees of the legislative branch . . . of moral and ethical standards which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. In the conduct of such study and investigation, the joint committee shall, among other things, determine the extent to which existing conflict-of-interest statutes or regulations applicable to the legislative branch . . . or the rules and regulations of the Senate and House should be strengthened."

By August 1, 1968, the joint committee (proposed by Mr. Reid) is to report, together with such additional rules or regulations as it may have determined are necessary, a comprehensive code of ethics for the legislative branch. In formulating such a code, the joint committee is to have considered the following activities by Members, officers, or employees of Congress—

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity;

(2) Disclosures of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealings in their official capacities in matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust, and

(6) Other matters concerning propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members, etc., of Congress.

The Reid bill defines conflict of interest (see at page 19) and provides (subsection h) for adoption of these standards as part of the reorganization act. The joint committee is to enforce other provisions of the new code of ethics, new rules, etc., that Congress may have adopted.

The committee is authorized to hire one full-time staff member to serve as counsel—he must be a practicing member of the legal profession and have distinguished himself in public service. The committee is also authorized to employ consultants, clerical staff, etc., as needed.

The joint committee may investigate allegations of improper conduct either on its own motion or on the basis of charges filed by any Member, officer, or employee of the legislative branch or by any citizen of the U.S.

See also Final Report pages 82–83:

"SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. CASE

"I support the recommendations of this committee. If fully implemented, they should add significantly to the capacity of the Congress to deal effectively with the executive branch and to manage its own workload with increased efficiency.

"At the same time, I must state my regret that the committee largely passed over the problem of congressional ethics. . . .

"Instances of real or fancied betrayal of public trust reported by the press have given color to the view, held by too many Americans, that 'the same thing can be said about any Senator or Congressman.'

"There is a simple and effective way, I believe, in which Congress can rebut that view and protect the public interest in a manner consonant with its elective status. That is by applying the principle of public disclosure to the financial interests of Members and top staffs of the legislative branch and to their dealings with executive agencies at the behest of a party in interest.

"In 1957 Senator Richard Neuberger and I joined in introducing a disclosure bill. In succeeding Congresses Senator Maurine Neuberger, and subsequently, Senators Clark, Hart, and Tydings have joined me in reintroducing the bill. Our bill would, among other things, require each Member of Congress to make an annual report, to be open to the press and public, covering all his sources of income, including gifts of more than nominal value, his assets and liabilities and his transactions in real or personal property. . . .

---

*And less Senate Recommendations 1 and 2 under "Committee Jurisdiction."

"We concur in the supplemental views of Senator Case.—Thomas B. Curtis; James C. Cleveland."

President's Popularity Continues To Rise Despite Crises

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the American people fully support President Johnson during these difficult days.

As Mr. Robert Roth of the Philadelphia Bulletin correctly notes, the President's popularity continues to rise in spite of new crises.

Mr. Roth reports that supporters of President Johnson "have been vastly encouraged in recent weeks by signs that the country is beginning to rally around the President and is becoming increasingly inclined to defend him against his foes at home and overseas."

He notes also that those who have villified the President for so long, have created a countermood among the people that can be summarized by one word—revulsion.

But the fact remains that President Johnson, despite the haters and doubters in our midst, can meet his awesome responsibilities secure in the knowledge that the majority of Americans stand with him.

Under unanimous consent I insert this excellent article into the RECORD:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1968]

THE PRESIDENT NEVER HAD IT SO BAD, BUT JOHNSON'S POPULARITY RISES IN SPITE OF NEW CRISES

(By Robert Roth)

WASHINGTON.—It is accepted here as a political fact, sustained both by public opinion polls and the observation of experts, that the popularity of President Johnson is on the rise.

This turn of events is easier to observe than to explain. It is a long while since things have gone right for Mr. Johnson. The costs of the Vietnam war mount—in blood and dollars—and there is no end in sight. Fresh crises reveal new American vulnerability not only in Southeast Asia but everywhere. The dollar is weak. The gold supply is depleted. The balance of payments deficit is an unending headache. The economy is uncertain. The Congress is balky. The country is restless and faces the coming summer with uneasiness and fear.

In short, the President never had it so bad.

BACKERS ARE ENCOURAGED

In spite of all this, the political strategists who have allied themselves with the Johnson cause have been vastly encouraged in recent weeks by signs that the country is beginning to rally around the President and is becoming increasingly inclined to defend him against his foes both at home and overseas.

This may be due in part to the excesses of villification indulged in by the more extreme of Johnson enemies. There is a feeling in many places that there are limits of taste and decency beyond which an attack on an American President should not go. When those limits are passed, revulsion sets in.

SENTIMENT FOR UNDERDOG

There also is in the American psyche a deep devotion to the underdog. In politics, as in sports, sentiment rallies to the side of the man who appears to be getting a bad beating and it doesn't matter much whether he deserves it or not.

There also is pronounced conviction among most Americans that when the country has trouble ahead—as it now has so emphatically—both politics and personalities should be forgotten and patriots should stand by their President.

The President has exploited these sentiments with great subtlety and adroitness. Gone are the cockiness, the assertiveness, the braggadocio, the petulance that once characterized his public appearances.

MORE RESTRAINED ATTITUDE

He has of late foregone the luxury of sounding off, more or less in private, against those who differ with him. His stance has been that of a man too busy to bother with that sort of thing.

His speeches have been characterized by a new note of restraint, a de-emphasis of promises and a stress on problems to be faced, and shared. This especially was true of his messages to Congress on the State of the Union and the budget.

Earlier messages of this sort were full of praise for what the Johnson Administration had already done and bright forecasts of what it was about to do. But this time, and for the first time, the President told the country "we cannot do everything we would wish to do."

IMPRESSION OF SINCERITY

This contributed to an impression of sincerity, of believability which Mr. Johnson had hitherto found it almost impossible to achieve. This more than anything else may account for the new acceptance he seems to have found among the people.

The President may not be able to sustain this new posture all the way from now to November. And even if he can, it may avail him little if the Republican opposition can produce a candidate with a fresh vision and a new way out of old troubles. Such an opponent, however, has not yet been found.

A New Low in Abuse

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I reacted with shock and disgust when I saw the horrible caricature of President Johnson on the cover of a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

I suppose the shock value was enough to sell a few magazines, but there is no excuse, in my opinion, for a major magazine to use such poor taste to boost sales.

An editorial from the February 9 edition of the Wichita Falls, Tex., Times entitled "A New Low in Abuse" expresses my feelings in the matter very well. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

A NEW LOW IN ABUSE

Editorial cartoons that appear in newspapers, magazines and other printed publications have a historical background in caricature, satire, hyperbole and distortion, but a new low in gross exaggeration is reached on the cover of the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post with its sketched portrait of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Cartoonists are having a field day with President Johnson, more so, in the opinion of The Times, than with any President of the United States in the last half century. They are exaggerating his features, altering his appearance and changing his physical characteristics in a most grotesque manner. The ludicrousness has reached the point in many published instances of impropriety, of indecency, of unwarranted liberties not only with President Johnson as an individual but also with the high office of the presidency.

Editorial cartoons serve a good purpose in focusing attention upon personalities and crucial issues of people and events in the news. When they become vulgar and obnoxious to the extent that many cartoonists have portrayed President Johnson, however, they exceed the bounds of responsible journalism and can't even be dignified by the term "yellow journalism."

The magazine's disgraceful cover is an abuse of the freedom of the press, an affront to President Johnson, and degradation of the highest and most powerful office in not only the United States but also the world.

Community Action Programs

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and its many and varied programs, have had a tremendous impact on the lives of many Americans.

The extent of this impact was demonstrated to me recently when I received pleas from more than 500 of my constituents, urging me to continue trying to restore funds being cut from community action programs.

This great outpouring of mail was prompted by the announcement that many programs in my district were to be curtailed or eliminated due to a 15-percent cut ordered throughout the Great Lakes region.

This cut, of course, was made necessary by the action of this Congress in failing to approve sufficient funds to carry on existing programs, let alone begin new ones.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I argued and fought for a higher appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity, whose programs have come to mean so much to so many underprivileged Americans. I, and many of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have warned this Congress many times that failure to provide sufficient money would mean disappointment and heartbreak for millions of people now being assisted by such things as the community service centers in Wayne County, Mich.

Our warning was not heeded, and now we are seeing the results. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of Congress could read some of the letters I have received. They were from parents whose children, for the first time, had received proper medical and dental care. They were from people who, for the first time, had been given hope and encouragement to break loose from the bonds of poverty.

And now, Mr. Speaker, these hopes are being dashed. These people, who had been given a glimpse of a better life, have now been told that their dreams must wait.

I do not know what to tell these people. I do not know how to explain to them that this Congress did not consider their problem serious enough, or their dreams important enough, to deserve our attention.

Mr. Speaker, more than 500 of my constituents have expressed their dismay and disappointment to me. I am sure that this represents only a small percentage of those in my district who share this disappointment. And by multiplying this throughout the Nation, we get some idea of the heartbreak and letdown felt by millions of underprivileged Americans.

This Congress must not turn its back to these people, Mr. Speaker. We who have built up their hope cannot let that hope die. If we cannot reverse this action, it will forever mark the record of the 90th Congress as a failure in its ability to recognize clearly defined human needs as well as failing to seize this great opportunity to move our country ahead by helping our citizens escape the cycle of poverty and all of the crippling disabilities it carries with it.

What About Criminal Prosecution in the Napco Affair?

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn that the Justice Department last week initiated legal action against Napco Industries, Inc., to recover loans made to that organization in connection with a nearly $4 million foreign aid program for India. As Members of this this body now know, the Napco-India deal is a scandalous and sorry mess, with the Napco people having bilked the American taxpayers of huge sums of money, delivering to India tons of worthless junk that was represented to be usable machine parts. The Napco affair has hardly reflected credit upon the Agency for International Development, officials of which were certainly guilty of poor judgment in the first instance and failure to supervise and oversee in the second.

As for helping India's economy—which presumably was the purpose for the deal—a shipload of junk machinery is not much of a contribution toward that end. And the whole miserable affair is something less than a triumph in fostering Indian-American amity.

I particularly wish to salute our colleague, Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, for his dogged pursuit of the Napco affair. Without his determination to see the scandal uncovered to the light and thoroughly scrutinized, it might have been conveniently forgotten and filed away.

The move by the Justice Department occurs in an atmosphere of continuing scandal and mismanagement in foreign aid operations. The news media in the past several days have carried a number of stories detailing wrongdoings in the Agency for International Development, some of them of flagrant character. Top AID officials have recently been implicated in kickback operations involving Belgian firms. A detailed list of foreign aid abuses was released by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT last week, notably involving Vietnam operations.

It may be that, in an organization as large as the Agency for International Development, some small amount of scandal is inevitable. But the scandal uncovered in recent months is not a little, rather it is a lot. And it does not involve merely "second-stringers," it involves important people at top management and policymaking levels. It would appear that there is need for some thorough housecleaning at AID. I welcome the action commenced by the Justice Department against Napco.

I note, however, that the action is a civil one. There are obvious indications that more than civil wrongs are involved here and I trust that Justice is also pressing for criminal charges growing out of the Napco affair. I do not think that people who set about to bilk some several million dollars from the Government of the United States should be running around loose. More appropriately, they should be in jail. I have written a letter today to the Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, asking for a report of the activities of Justice to date in connection with the Napco affair, particularly insofar as those activities point toward possible criminal prosecutions.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the article which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, February 17, under the headline "AID Sues Napco Over India Loans." I recommend it to those of my colleagues who may not have seen accounts of the latest developments regarding the odoriferous Napco deal:

AID SUES NAPCO OVER INDIA LOANS

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The Justice Department, as lawyer for the embarrassed Agency for International Development, went to court yesterday and demanded refunds and damages for more than $3 million in defaulted foreign-aid loans that were supposed to have helped India's auto parts industry.

Charging deceit, false claims and conspiracy, the Government filed a civil suit in Detroit's Federal court against Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis.

The Napco case has caused political discomfort for prominent figures, including Vice President Humphrey, since it came to light last fall. Humphrey's former legislative counsel, Max M. Kampelman, signed the loan agreements for Napco. Kampelman, a Washington lawyer, declined a comment yesterday, saying it would be especially inappropriate for him "as an attorney for Napco."

A Napco spokesman in Minneapolis said he believed "the issue is now where it should be, in the courts and not in the political arena. We have no doubts that we will prevail in the courts."

Rep H. R. Gross (R-Iowa), who has sharply criticized AID and the Napco loans, said the suit "points up the lack of administration and loose administration of AID" of the sort that has plagued AID in recent days.

Misconduct charges have resulted in the resignation of four employes of AID's War on Hunger and its director, Herbert J. Waters. AID's Security Director, John G. Bradley, has been suspended after an inquiry into falsified travel vouchers.

Asked at his news conference yesterday about AID irregularities, President Johnson said the Justice Department has the issue under consideration. The State Department's inspector general also is making a "thorough study," the President said.

The civil suit was filed to recover from Napco Industries the proceeds of loans defaulted by Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., a firm established by Indian businessmen to buy Napco's reconditioned manufacturing equipment for an auto parts plant near New Delhi.

To finance the purchases, Napco negotiated a $2.3 million AID loan in 1962 on behalf of the Indian firm. The suit charged that Napco and its agents conspired to conceal the equipment's true value—near $909,000 than the $2.8 million claimed for it—from AID officials.

The suit said Napco suppressed a more accurate appraiser's report of the equipment's value and substituted "a different appraisal" which, the Government confessed, "was the sole such data upon which (AID) relied in approving the said loan."

Napco then "failed to deliver" the promised fully operational equipment and "flagrantly failed" to recondition it, the suit said, but instead "induced, persuaded and deluded the Indian investors" into accepting substandard deliveries.

However, AID advanced two more loans of $840,000 each in July, 1963, and August, 1964. These loans went directly to the Indian firm for the plant there. One of the Government's five claims against Napco is for $210,000 to recover Napco's 25 per cent guarantee of the last loan. The plant shut down last April.

Government lawyers did not specify the total refunds and damages they seek, saying the amounts depended upon evidence developed at trial.

Private Enterprise and Big Government: Friend or Foe?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged to read the text of remarks made by Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Special Programs of the Department of Transportation, at symposium for executives held at St. Mary's College in my district. The roles described for Government and for private enterprise in our system were provocatively and thoughtfully described. I include that speech as part of my remarks:

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, AT THE 11TH EXECUTIVES' SYMPOSIUM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA, MORAGA, CALIF., FEBRUARY 1, 1968

I'm going to begin today with a complaint, and my complaint is that our sponsors have rigged this program against me. Not only am I the only bad guy on the program—that is to say, the only full-time Government worker; even our topic is rigged.

I am reminded of what Thomas Reed Powell said: "I can win any argument if you will allow me to state the question." The question before us is, "Private Enterprise and Big Government: Friend or Foe?" What does it mean? Well, in the American tradition, "private enterprise" is a good thing and "big government" is, of course, a bad thing.

How about this for a topic? "Creative Government and Heartless Big Business: Friend or Foe?" You see, a lot depends on how you state the question.

For the last 35 years or so, we've been hearing a great deal in this country about the dangers of big government. I, for one, am deeply concerned about the danger of making government too big and the danger of giving government too much authority. For 15 of those years I have been watching the Federal monster ooze across our national landscape. In a minute or two, I want to articulate for you my conviction that government must never be called upon to do things that can be done effectively outside of government.

At the same time, I think that in any discussion such as this one, we should keep in mind that if government is big, so is the nation. We have more than 200 million citizens—citizens with needs, citizens who make demands. Our big government didn't simply spring forth fully developed, the realization of someone's bureaucratic dream. Our government grew with our nation, and it grew in response to the demands of the people.

I would point out, too, that on many occasions the spokesmen for private enterprise have been among the most demanding of the citizens. It was private enterprise, just as much as the consuming public, that needed regulatory agencies like the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission. It was private enterprise that needed the Small Business Administration. Most observers today would tell you it's private enterprise that needs urban renewal.

The airline industry was built with Federal nourishment and financial support. Many advances in technology (the supersonic transport and the high-speed train, for example) are made possible, and can be made profitable, only because of government—only because that same big government which we rightly fear is underwriting so many ventures.

And private enterprise thrives on Federal research money. One economist has pointed out that research and development in the United States has been undergoing a distinct process of nationalization—that three fourths of the money spent in this nation for research and development is spent by the Federal government. You don't often hear private enterprise complaining about that.

Friend or foe, then? I submit that the question is invalid because it assumes that private enterprise and government are either friends or enemies, but in any event, separate from and somewhat alien to each other. In our complex society, this simply is not the case. The edges are blurred—and sometimes not only the edges. Our concepts of private enterprise have changed and evolved right along with our concepts of government, and the result is a complicated mixture of roles and responsibilities.

One private entrepreneur will tell you that Congress ought to repeal most of the regulatory laws of the Federal Government, and the next private entrepreneur will tell you that without anti-trust laws, or without subsidies, or without import restrictions, or without even so-called "fair trade" laws, he couldn't stay in business.

I would ask also, exactly what is private enterprise? Is it the fellow who takes the family savings to open a hardware store on the corner? Or is it AT&T, whose annual revenues are in excess of the combined annual revenues of more than half the states? Is it really private enterprise when 90 percent of a company's gross income can be traced to contracts let by the government? And is it private enterprise—is it private enterprise in the traditional sense—when a corporation's assets are owned by millions of stockholders—stockholders who are known by their friends as citizens and voters and consumers, and whose primary concerns never are directed to the corporation whose stock they happen to hold?

AT&T now has more than three million share owners. France has some 50 million citizens—all share owners, you might say, in the French national corporations. Which is more private, AT&T or one of France's *Societes Nationales?* And where is the break-off point—at five million share owners, or 15, or 50?

And what of big government? I would suggest to you that American government today is what it was always intended to be: a system of checks and balances—and more than that, a system of built-in tensions. One of the first things the schoolboy learns about his government is the concept of separation of powers. But American government in the 20th Century has gone a step further. There has developed within the Executive Branch what might be called a concept of the separation of interests, or the separation of pursuits. I would no doubt make headlines tomorrow in somebody's newspaper if I stood here and whispered to you that a certain Federal agency in Washington is looking out for the welfare of a certain corporation. That would be wrong, and it would be news. But I would shock no one if I told you that the Department of Agriculture has been looking out for American farmers, or that the Department of Labor has been promoting the interests of American workers, or that the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Treasury are helping manufacturers increase their exports. We seldom say such things, and I think the reason is that they seem so obvious. Nevertheless, in a discussion of whether business and government are friends or enemies, the point is worth making.

In 1892 a man by the name of Charles E. Perkins was president of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Mr. Perkins was dissatisfied with the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and he happened to be a personal friend of Richard Olney, who was Attorney General under President Cleveland. So Mr. Perkins wrote the Attorney General and urged that he work in Washington for the abolition of the ICC. The Attorney General's reply is interesting. Let me read you part of the letter.

"My impression," said the Attorney General, "would be that looking at the matter from a railroad point of view exclusively, it would not be a wise thing to undertake. . . . The attempt would not be likely to succeed. If it naturally succeeded and was made on the grounds of the inefficiency and uselessness of the commission, the result would very probably be giving it the power it now lacks. The commission, as its function has now been limited by the courts, is, or can be made, of greater use to the railroads. It meets the popular clamor for a government supervisor of railroads at the same time that the supervision is almost entirely nominal. Further, the older such a commission gets to be, the more inclined it will be found to take the railroad view of things. . . . The part of wisdom is not to destroy the commission, but to utilize it."

I want to make a proposal today, and I'm going to direct my proposal to the Steering Committee for next year's Executives' Symposium here at Saint Mary's College. My proposal is that next year's topic for discussion be this: "Friend or Foe: The Public Interest vs. the Government-Industry Coalition." That is, government and industry on one side; the public interest on the other. I would like to hear a group of businessmen engage the question of whether their political power and their public relations and lobbying resources have been so strong as to weight the scales of government on the side of industry. I would like to hear your views as to whether the missions of private enterprise include a responsibility to let government serve the public interest undeflected by the vested interests.

So far I've said that I can't really define private enterprise and that I can't categorize very neatly all the elements of government. But I will state my own definition of the aims of the two. The primary goal of government is the well-being of its citizens—all its citizens. The primary goal of private enterprise is making money.

I start—as I'm sure you do—with the premise that a free enterprise system, or more accurately, a private enterprise system, is the best economic system to fulfill the needs of all the people of a community. One can construct all sorts of philosophical or sociological or even theological arguments to support that thesis. Today, I will plead only the historical argument—which is to say that a free enterprise system works. Heaven knows, it has worked for the United States.

Private enterprise built this country and helped unify the various sections of this country. Private enterprise helped make individual citizens physically and economically healthy. It helped us through a domestic war and through foreign wars. The world in the 20th Century is a sort of living laboratory of economic systems. Many theories have been tested. I think there is no question in the minds of any of us that the private enterprise way, the American way, has stood the test. And it will continue to do so.

Still, I think all of us would agree also that we could not have a healthy economic system if private enteprise were completely unchecked by government. Without the counter-balance of government, John D. Rockefeller might have had all the money; and all the rest of us would have been poor. I think it is clear, therefore, that one of the legitimate functions of government is to help private enterprise work—in a sense, to help protect free enterprise from self-destruction.

I said before that the primary goal of private enterprise is making money and that I believe this goal coincides, for the most part, with the government's goal of enhancing the well-being of the people. But now let's draw the contrast. While the people weren't paying attention—and thus while the government wasn't paying attention—private enterprise helped pollute our air and our rivers. It contributed to the decay of our cities. It spoiled large areas of scenic and recreational value. It helped solidify the divisions among the races. It shored up social systems which denied economic and educational opportunity to certain groups of citizens. It sold us unsafe automobiles and diseased meat

I am by no means indicting the private enterprise system; but I would ask you, should private enterprise set limits on its goals so that in its eagerness to expand assets and income, it does not trod upon the interests of the nation as a whole? Or should government set those limits?

And what of social stability? What is the responsibility of private enterprise to the worker whose talents are made unnecessary by new technology? In my office in the Department of Transportation, we talk about what has been called "the container revolution"—the use of large containers, or boxes, to ship quickly and efficiently the cargoes that traditionally have been moved laboriously, item by item, from rail to ship or from ship to truck. The container can be packaged at the factory and moved from one mode of transportation to another and never opened, never unpacked, until it reaches its final destination somewhere across the ocean. The container threatens to put thousands of longshoremen out of work. This is what we mean when we talk about technological unemployment. Now I ask you, whose job is it to look after these men?

Are they the responsibility of private enterprise—the same private enterprise which boasts so often that it provides jobs and good lives for so many Americans?

Or are they the responsibility of government? And if so, why is it, then, that when the government suggests a new program to solve the problems of unemployment, businessmen sometimes lead the attacks against the program?

I say that private industry can't have it both ways. Perhaps industry has no responsibility to the people displaced by its shiny new machines. But government can't take that narrow a view—not in our society; not, if you will, in a democratic society.

My own bias is that the maketplace ought to be allowed to operate at the lowest cost and price levels possible. I would like the marketplace to function without regard to a great many social problems. But the social problems must be met, and you're aware, I'm sure, of the overhead involved in running an operation out of Washington.

Where containerization is concerned, the shipping interests and the longshoremen's union here on the West Coast have reached an accommodation which is at least creative and which could set a pattern for other industries. In 1960, the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union signed a contract which anticipates that fewer and fewer longshoremen may be needed. The contract provides both lump-sum payments to the union and incentives for the early retirement of individuals. In this instance, the dynamics were such that private enterprise fashioned an agreement which appears to be working satisfactorily for most of those involved.

I don't know what is the long-term point of the story about the ILWU and containerization. But I would point out to you that it does contain a question of fundamental social and economic importance. To what extent should technological unemployment be viewed as the financial responsibility of the industry as in the case of the longshoremen? Is this problem more properly a responsibility of the society as a whole—of big government if you will, be it state or federal government?

Not long ago I read a heartening article by Victor H. Palmieri, the president of the Janss Investment Corporation. Mr. Palmieri suggests that one of the critical questions facing the nation is whether the business community is really willing to scrap its almost habitual opposition to government action, and whether business will join the effort to find new ways to meet public needs.

Let me quote Mr. Palmieri:

"The old principles, or rather the process in which they operate, can be stated this way: Politics expresses the public need. Govenment accepts the mandate to fill the need. The business community, following its traditional policy of containment, first denies the need, then seeks to limit the response of government. Two decades later both the particular need and the governmental response are accepted as legitimate and appropriate; a new administration comes to power with a new mandate for social action; and the whole melancholy process is repeated.

"The result," says M. Palmieri, "is not failure so much as it is a discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress as a nation and as a free people."

Now there are some people who would suggest that this "discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress" has served the nation well. They would argue that without foot-dragging by business and others, the nation would have gone too far too fast. Perhaps so.

I submit, however, that time is running short for the solution of some problems. Our cities were on fire in 1967. In that situation, can we afford a process in which needs are first denied and responses are then limited?

Last October, Paul Goodman spoke in Washington at a symposium sponsored by the National Security Industrial Association. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the views of Paul Goodman. It is a vast understatement to say that they are controversial, especially when Mr. Goodman is speaking to the leaders of large corporations. I'd like to quote something Mr. Goodman said.

He was talking about urban affairs, and about whether American business is equipped to assist in the vast urban clean-up and renovation which most Americans now agree is mandatory. This is Mr. Goodman speaking to the executives:

"Unfortunately, it is your companies who have oversold the planes and the cars, polluted the air and water, and balked at even trival remedies, so that I do not see how you can be morally trusted with the job."

And a little later, he said:

"Your thinking is never to simplify and retrench, but always to devise new equipment to alleviate the mess that you have helped to make with your previous equipment."

Let's assume for the sake of argument that Mr. Goodman's indictment has some validity. (Who would deny that it has at least *some* validity?) If so, then for at least a portion of the time, business and government *ought* to be enemies.

We hear quite a bit these days about how business has developed a conscience—how it's going to help clean up the slums and clean up the rivers and construct new bulwarks against urban sprawl. All you've got to do is turn on the television set to see a petroleum company telling that its refineries are so pollution-free that the fish and the waterfowl live in health and luxury and social welfare in the marshlands just outside the refinery doorway. All you've got to do is flip to the inside of a magazine to see a producer of tractors or fertilizers or pharmaceuticals telling how its products are going to help save the overpopulated and undernourished world.

Regardless of how much real substance there is behind the advertising campaigns, we entered a new era when we reached the point that business felt it had to try to convince the public that it has a conscience. We've come a long way. There is hardly anyone successful in business today who would think of uttering such a statement as "the public be damned."

But I think we've got to go somewhat deeper than the advertisements if we want to explore seriously the question of whether the corporation can be an institution, as someone said, "for good as well as gain."

I hope private enterprise can find ways to accomplish good things and still stay in business. I hope corporate managers are ingenious enough to do some of the things that must be done, and that they can do so without making the stockholders too angry. I hope that technology will provide us new tools for improving the lives of all our citizens at costs they and the nation can afford.

The reason for my hope is simple. I don't think governmental institutions as we know them are any better at getting things done than non-governmental institutions. Indeed, I'm convinced that institutions outside the government are generally better equipped for action than any governmental institutions which have yet been devised.

But I will say that private enterprise has usually lacked the motivation to work for good as well as for gain; and private managers have felt for good reason that they lacked the mandate to work for good as well as gain. If all that is changing, I rejoice in the prospect.

Just two weeks ago, President Johnson in his state of the Union address called for a partnership between government and industry to work for certain national goals such as full employment. The President was serious when he suggested this partnership. And I think I can say that the President, and all of us in government, will be delighted if private enterprise chooses to be the leading partner—if business decides to lead the way.

I think that today, more than ever before, businessmen know they have a stake in solving problems such as unemployment. This is made abundantly clear by a glance at the list of corporate participants in a group such as the Urban Coalition, which reported last summer on the plight of the nation's cities. The courageous nature of that group's proposals is evidence that businessmen can be as daring as any other group in the search for solutions to the nation's problems.

On the other hand, we would be naive in the extreme if we assumed that government can safely abdicate to industry the basic responsibility for those activities in which the profit motive is absent. What we must do is assure that private industry recognizes and encourages the need for government activity at the same time that private industry is maintaining relentless pressure on government in order to keep the bureaucracy's greedy tendencies under control.

That brings me to my final point. Anything as large and powerful as government represents a vast potential threat to that unit in our society which is of greater value than government or business; that is, the individual. I want to close this little sermon with an appeal, and my appeal is that private enterprise become the aggressive and untiring defender of the individual in American society.

If private enterprise can do this job—if private individuals working through private institutions can assume this role, then private enterprise will become in truth what its public relations people have always said it was and what it has always wanted to be.

Let me explain what I mean. This great nation is challenged today in ways no nation has been challenged before. It is challenged to prove, against increasing odds, what Americans have always felt to be true. It is challenged to demonstrate that a growing, wealthy, highly industrialized nation can provide plenty of privacy, plenty of breathing space, plenty of choice for the individual.

Let's examine the threat. We have come to a time in history when the problems of expanding population, on the one hand, and the possible answers offered by technology, on the other hand, tempt us to do thing which would not have occurred to previous generations.

Someone has said that the most awesome thing he ever saw was machines making machines. But that isn't nearly as awesome or as frightening as the possibility we now face—the possibility not that machines will make people, but that they will shape people and direct people's lives.

We're coming to a time, too, when machines can talk to machines—when your computer on the west coast can interrogate someone else's computer on the east coast and when, between the two of them, they can catalogue just about all there is to know about such-and-such an individual. What are the consequences going to be for the American individual when the computers have stored up, along with his Social Security number, every little bit and piece of his life—every time he got in trouble, every failure, every success?

At Columbia University, Zbigniew Brzezinski has described the period we are about to enter as "the Technetronic Age"—a time in which society is shaped by the impact of technology and electronics, especially computers and communications devices. Brzezinski asks these questions:

"Can the individual and science co-exist, or will the dynamic momentum of the latter fundamentally alter the former; can man, living in the scientific age, grow in intellectual depth and philosophical meaning, and thus in his personal liberty too; can the institutions of political democracy be adapted to the new conditions sufficiently quickly to meet the crises, yet without debasing their democratic character?"

Private enterprise has always pictured itself as the realm of opportunity for the individual in America. And it has pictured itself also as a protector of privacy—the institutional framework which allows the individual to make his own choices and select his own way.

Whether or not the Horatio Alger stories have had any real basis in fact, I suggest that private enterprise today can do a service for this country if it will establish itself as the defender of the traditions it has preached. Private enterprise can make itself the stalwart refuge for the individual—the place where promising new ideas are welcome; the place where any man, regardless of race or position, can prove himself on the strength of his intelligence and his ingenuity and his willingness to work.

I'd like to see private enterprise—great corporation and small business alike—lead the fight against racial discrimination. I'd like to see private enterprise lead the fight against the demeaning institutionalization which threatens our pride as human beings. I'd like to see private enterprise lead the fight against unnecessary invasions of our private lives.

In this context, I commend to you the work that has been done in Washington by such men as Senator Ervin of North Carolina and Representative Gallagher of New Jersey. They have seen technological snooping devices and information-storing computer systems as potential threats to our freedom. Senator Ervin has called upon American industry—upon private enterprise—to devise safeguards against the use of such devices to invade our privacy.

Traditionally, private enterprise has been the innovating and inventive force in the American society. I would like to see those talents used to make the promises of opportunity more meaningful to individual Americans. In our laws and in our public institutions we have eliminated much of the racial discrimination which has shamed us as a nation. Now private enterprise can lead the way in providing private opportunity. Look at what Aerojet-General has done in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Look at what Ford Motor Company is doing—going into the ghettos to recruit workers and offering them bus fare and lunch money until that first pay check arrives.

And look at Neiman-Marcus, the department store. It announced recently to its suppliers that in the future, the store—and I quote—"would rather do business with a company which is actively and sincerely pursuing a policy of equal opportunity than to continue to do business with one which is not." Stanley Marcus, the president of the store, noted that the federal government demands that its suppliers be equal opportunity employers. And he said: "We believe a private company should do no less."

I don't know whether the Neiman-Marcus plan or the Ford plan or any other specific private undertaking of this sort appeals to you as a businessman. But I do suggest that you as businessmen have the know-how and the tools to help make this nation continue to be a nation in which private, individual achievement is encouraged.

The strength of the United States has been found throughout our history in the riches of our diversity. I have had the uneasy feeling that our diversity is threatened by technology—not only by the machines, but by the technocrats who man them—"the systems systems people," I like to call them; the people whose formulas, if they aren't careful, will make no provision for a flash of brilliance or an admission of error. Our diversity—our heritage as a pluralistic society—may be at stake in the complex, technology-oriented world of today. I look to private enterprise as a fully appropriate guardian of that heritage.

Court Orders Disclosure of Selective Service Information

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to alert my colleagues that the Freedom of Information Act may well be the undoing of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's one-man, ill-conceived public information policy with which the selective service system has been afflicted for so many years.

Most of you are aware of the running battle my Information Subcommittee has been having with the good general about making public pertinent information about local draft board members. Time and again I have tried to impress on the Selective Service Director that the American people have a moral and lawful right to know the identity and full background of persons who serve on local draft boards and make decisions about the military service of the young men in their communities—decisions which, in many instances, literally deal with life and death.

But despite vigorous prodding, General Hershey has until now steadfastly refused to issue an unqualified directive making it mandatory to disclose a complete identification of local board members as a matter of public record.

However, as I suggested earlier, the Freedom of Information Act may force the Director to change his short-sighted policy because last week, pursuant to an action filed under the judicial review provision of the law, a U.S. district court in Pennsylvania ordered the clerk of a local draft board to disclose the names, residence address, date of birth, length of service with the Selective Service System and to give an indication of any military affiliation of the members of the local board. In addition the clerk was told to disclose the name and address of the adviser to registrants of the local board; the name and address and date of admission to the bar of the appeals agent of the local board, and to give the precise boundaries of the geographical jurisdiction of the local board. With the exception of revealing only the names of the board members, requests for the information had been previously rejected by Selective Service System officials.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. district court in Pennsylvania has rendered a milestone decision as it upholds the principle of the right of the people to be fully informed about the business of government; it puts General Hershey on notice that his archaic information policy must be revamped, and not least it points up the efficacy of the judicial review provision which I consider to be the keystone of the Freedom of Information Act.

The decision follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania]

DWIGHT AUBREY MARTIN, 434 S. 62ND STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA *v.* M. NEUSCHEL, CLERK, LOCAL BOARD NO. 136, 1421 CHERRY STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA—CIVIL ACTION NO. 68-301

ORDER

And now, this 13th day of February, 1968, upon consideration of the complaint filed in this action, and after argument by counsel for the parties, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Defendant M. Neuschel, Clerk of Local Board No. 136, is ordered to disclose the following information to plaintiff in accord with his request dated December 14, 1967:

1) The name, residence addresses, date of birth, length of service with the Selective System and indication of any military affiliation of the members of Local Board No. 136 as of December 14, 1967.

2) Name and address of the Adviser to Registrants of Local Board No. 136.

3) Name and address, and date of admission to the Bar of the Appeals Agent of Local Board No. 136.

4) The precise boundaries of the geographical jurisdiction of Local Board No. 136.

By the Court:

WOOD, J.

Foreign Farm Laborers

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, at the end of January, the Department of Labor once again held hearings on revising the criteria for importation of foreign farmworkers under Public Law 414.

At these hearings convincing arguments were once again presented for abolishing the importation of foreign farm laborers. Experience since the end of the bracero program has proven conclusively that American agriculture can get along well without the massive infusions of foreign laborers which were once claimed to be essential. The number of braceros admitted last year was only 6,100. There is strong evidence that even this number was unnecessary.

I am of the opinion that we should not have any imported farm laborers until we have assured all of our domestic workers of fair wages and adequate working conditions, something which we have not yet done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at the close of my remarks the statement of Mr. Michael Peevey of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, on behalf of Mr. Thomas Pitts and Mr. Cesar Chavez. These remarks were given to the Labor Department's so-called adverse effect hearings on January 31, 1968. In his remarks, Mr. Peevey announces again the position of the California Federation of

Labor opposing the importation of foreign farm laborers.

I commend this statement to the readers of this RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ON REVISING THE CRITERIA FOR IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN FARMWORKERS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 414, SAN FRANCISCO, JANUARY 31, 1968

My name is Michael Peevey and I am Research Director of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO. I am appearing on behalf of Thos. L. Pitts, Secretary-Treasurer of our Federation. I am also appearing on behalf of Cesar Chavez, Director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO.

The position of the California AFL–CIO regarding the importation of temporary foreign farm labor has not changed. We oppose importation of such workers, believing it unnecessary. We took this position at similar hearings in December, 1966 and December, 1964.

During the long years that Public Law 78 existed, we maintained that there was no real shortage of domestic farm workers. At every opportunity we pointed out that massive importation of foreign farm workers acted only to severely depress domestic farm worker earnings and to compound the serious problems facing the California farm labor force.

An inkling of the adverse impact foreign importation programs have had can be gained by recognizing that 25 years ago average hourly earnings of California farm workers were about two-thirds the average hourly earnings of the state's manufacturing work force. In recent years, despite the sharp decline in the number of imported farm workers, the comparable figure hovers around 50 percent. Thus, over the last 25 years, in a relative sense at least, California's domestic farm workers have fallen farther behind their industrial counterparts. The major cause has been foreign farm worker importation programs. The best way to change this situation is to cut off, now and forever, such importation.

At this late date it should be unnecessary to point out that all California agriculture has benefited by the termination of P.L. 78. The facts speak for themselves. While the number of "braceros" certified by the U.S. Department of Labor dropped from 20,300 in 1965 to 8,600 in 1966 and 6,100 in 1967, domestic farm worker employment greatly increased. In 1966 it was more than 16,000, on an average annual basis, above the 1964 level, even though farm productivity rose rapidly. Total domestic farm worker earnings, which were $616 million in 1964 (the last year of wholesale "bracero" importation), rose to $739 million in 1965, to $794 million in 1966, and will reach an estimated $815–$820 million in 1967. Gross farm income has also risen over the past few years. In 1964 it was below $3.7 billion; the 1967 estimate is $4 billion. Moreover, this nation's balance of payments position has benefited by over $50 million a year.

It is overwhelmingly clear that domestic farm workers, growers, and small merchants in rural communities have benefited from the end of massive foreign farm worker importation. Recognizing this, and for reasons of social equity and justice, it is our strong belief that no foreign farm workers should be imported into the United States this year or in subsequent years. We believe that Public Law 414 should be amended to bar foreign farm worker importation entirely.

There is surely enough unbiased empirical evidence of the benefits to the State of California resulting from the end of massive foreign worker importation to justify such a view.

It should be pointed out, however, that the California Labor Federation recognizes that our recommendation that no foreign farm workers be imported in 1968 and subsequent years may not prevail. For this reason, if new criteria are to be adopted, we urge they be revised to include at least the following:

1. An hourly "adverse effect" rate in California of at least $2.25 an hour. This rate should apply regardless of whether a grower uses a piece-rate or hourly pay system. Reasons why this figure is necessary are recent sharp rises in the cost-of-living, including recognition that the cost-of-living will again increase this year, and that such increases hit low income families disproportionately hard; major advances in farm output per man-hour of which events in the California processing tomato industry are but one example; a significant increase and extension of the federal minimum wage, and the adoption in California, effective February 1, 1968, of a state minimum wage for women and minors in agriculture of $1.65 an hour; the increases in domestic farm worker hourly earnings since the termination of P.L. 78; and last, but not least, the fact that the present adverse effect rate of $1.60 an hour is much too low.

It should be recognized that an hourly figure of $2.25 is more than $1.00 less than the gross hourly earnings of production workers in California's manufacturing industry last year. It is roughly equivalent to the hourly wage paid to workers in non-agricultural industries who were employed in occupations requiring relatively little training.

In no event should the hourly adverse effect rate be set below the highest hourly wage rate arrived at through collective bargaining between California growers and the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO. Moreover, the criteria should be expanded to include provisions for working conditions and fringe benefits that exist under union contracts in California agriculture and also exist in non-agricultural jobs where skill requirements are similar to those in agriculture.

2. In particular crops, such as asparagus, dates, and Brussels sprouts, where the work is more arduous than average and where the nature of the work places demands on workers that are not found in most other crops, the hourly rate set by the Department of Labor should be at least 125 percent of the standard "adverse effect" rate. The belief in "premium pay" for jobs that are particularly arduous has long been recognized as desirable by most labor economists and manpower experts. For California, therefore, we urge a figure of at least $2.81 be set in those crops where the work, by general recognition, is particularly arduous.

3. In addition to the establishment of a standard "adverse effect" hourly rate of $2.25, a weekly rate should be established. The weekly figure should be set at 40 times the hourly rate because 40 hours is the standard workweek. Moreover, it is anomalous, to say the least, that when foreign farm workers enter the United States for temporary work in agriculture they are guaranteed a certain number of working hours yet domestic workers have no such guarantee.

The basic reason why a weekly, as well as an hourly, wage payment should be established is obvious. A worker's needs continue around the clock, seven days a week.

4. We also urge that the revised criteria be made applicable to Basque sheepherders. For reasons that escape our comprehension, this has not been done in the past.

5. On September 12, 1967, an agreement was arrived at between the Department of Labor and California Rural Legal Assistance. Part of that agreement read as follows:

"1. An independent panel consisting of seven (7) members shall be expeditiously appointed by the undersigned regional administrator to study and examine the certification procedures and make recommendations for changes in such procedures. Three of the seven members shall be nominated by California Rural Legal Assistance."

This agreement has a direct and immediate bearing on the subject of this hearing. The California Labor Federation again urges the Department of Labor to establish this seven-member panel and have it begin deliberations. If this agreed upon panel had been appointed last September or October, this present hearing would probably be unnecessary.

We understand that the Department of Labor would also like to hear suggestions regarding a means of setting "adverse effect" wage rates by formula in order to avoid annual hearings. Hearings such as this, however, perform a number of valuable functions, including being of educational value. Therefore, we urge that the Department of Labor continue to hold such public hearings in order that all concerned parties can make their views known.

One formula which would have merit is to adopt, as policy, the position that the differential between the "adverse effect" rate and the average hourly wage in California manufacturing would disappear in time. Thus, the formula would be to set the "adverse effect" wage at approximately 70 percent of the average hourly wage in manufacturing in 1968. In 1969 it would automatically become 75 percent of the average manufacturing wage; in 1970 it would be set at 80 percent, and so forth until by 1974 the "adverse effect" wage would be equal to the average hourly wage in California manufacturing in 1974.

Another formula which might have some limited merit would be to increase the "adverse effect" wage rate each year by either 10 cents an hour (assuming a base of $2.25 per hour) or by the over-the-year percentage increase in average hourly earnings of factory workers over the past year, whichever is greater. Percentage increases in the cost-of-living could be incorporated into this formula.

To sum up, all objective observers must agree that tremendous forward progress has occurred in California agriculture since P.L. 78 ended on December 31, 1964. It is to note the obvious to say that the last three years have truly been ones of meaningful forward progress, when compared to the previous 20. However, as we observed earlier, the relative position of domestic farm workers in California's economy today is much poorer than it was 25 years ago.

In the California AFL–CIO's view, no foreign workers will be needed to harvest California crops in 1968. We hope that the U.S. Department of Labor will agree and consequently will take steps to insure that no foreign farm workers enter California under P.L. 414 this year.

The Department of Labor, following Congress' mandate, has gone more than 90 percent of the way towards eliminating foreign farm workers from California's fields. Yet three years have passed and the final step remains to be taken. We hope that in 1968 the final step is taken. If it is, the day when farm workers, not only in California but throughout the nation, join the mainstream of American social and economic life, will be much nearer.

What Price Priorities?

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, education is both a social and economic goal for this country. We will not be able to solve the complex problems of the 20th and 21st centuries without education.

Economic studies have demonstrated the importance of education for increased productivity.

Of the three traditional factors of economic growth—capital, labor, and land—labor has become the most important. For the most part, our economy has enough land and capital but it needs the skilled workers and trained managers that can make the modern industrial state perform efficiently.

Unfortunately, this country only gradually recognizes the importance of education for all. The country has yet to commit enough of its resources to the necessary task. America still spends more for liquor, tobacco, and cosmetics than it does for educating its children.

Shortages of teachers, school facilities, books, and modern educational tools exist throughout the country. In some of our larger cities, the educational systems are trying to compensate for environmental deficiency, requiring even greater allocations of funds.

States' and cities' historical source of revenue, the property tax, is inadequate to meet the financial demands of this modern commitment to education. Recognizing the inadequacy of local sources of revenue and that education is a national concern, Congress, in such legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act, provided for Federal assistance to education. Increased Federal assistance to education is essential.

The President's budget for fiscal 1969 is, therefore, particularly disturbing to me because it represents, at best, a holding operation for education. I recognize the problem facing the President. Even assuming legislative enactment of a surtax and a series of users taxes, there will be a deficit of $8 billion. I support the concept of users tax but since 1965 Congress has refused to authorize such taxes and may well do so again. I support tax reform in lieu of tax increase. Adding to the budgetary difficulty is the fact that there will undoubtedly be a request for a supplemental appropriation for defense.

Aware of these problems, I still question the priorities established by the budget for fiscal 1969. In terms of budget authority proposed for the major functions of the Federal Government, education rates 14th in a list of 15 major governmental functions. This is hardly the commitment to education that I think is necessary for our welfare and growth.

There is not only a slowdown on educational programs but in some cases funds originally allotted to educational programs have been reallocated to newer programs. The President plans to reallocate $143 million from the original poverty programs. This will necessitate cuts in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps will be able to help 170,000 fewer high-school-age youngsters than it did in the last fiscal year.

Sixteen centers of Job Corps will be closed and the Headstart program will be reduced. Enrollment for Headstart classes will be reduced by 13,000.

Because of the commitments already made in some cities for summer Headstart programs, these cities' Headstart funds will be reduced as much as 24 percent. I view the diminishing effect for Headstart programs as particularly tragic. Headstart has proven to be successful and has won the support of all.

While total outlays for education are placed at $4.7 billion, which is about $200 million over what was spent last year, this in no way indicates the reductions made in educational programs. Many educational programs were allocated funds far below their authorization. For example, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which had an authorization of $2.6 billion, was allocated only $1.2 billion in the President's budget. This is a little more than was spent last year under this title, but rising costs will result in less children than last year receiving benefits under this program.

Also, while $1 billion has been authorized for higher education facilities, only $75 million is allocated for such facilities in the budget. If cuts have to be made in the education allotment, then I approve of the priorities that were made within the educational programs. For the most part, the President has attempted to continue or increase funds for teachers training and direct aid to students while making heavy reductions in college facilities, library books, and classroom equipment. Our colleges are overcrowded and many schools have poor libraries, but the most important element of education is the student and the teacher. Hopefully, good teachers and alert students can overcome any physical inadequacy of the school.

The President proposes a reduction of about 57 percent for schoolbooks and equipment. While $202 million was spent this year, only $86 million will be spent in the coming fiscal year for purchases of schoolbooks, equipment, and for guidance and counseling services in college facilities. While $450 billion was appropriated for college facilities in the last fiscal year, only $75 million is recommended for this year.

The planned reduction of Federal impact funds will not be so grave, because of the availability of the carryover funds from last year's budget. It would seem that there has been a disproportionate reduction in educational programs. I think it is time to question overall priorities established by the 1969 budget.

We will of course spend whatever is necessary for defense but not everything spent for defense is necessary. The defense allocation for fiscal 1969 is about $79.8 billion of which $26.3 billion represents Vietnam expenditures. Defense appropriations should be subject to a careful scrutiny to see if they achieve their stated goal in the most economical way possible.

Some $1.1 billion is allocated for the "thin" sentinel anti-ballistic-missile system. I wonder if it is really designed or necessary to meet "the threat posed by the emerging Chinese nuclear capability." Also $525 million is allocated for grants and credit sales of military equipment abroad. While it is in our best interest that certain countries be supplied arms, some previous military assistance have been clearly unnecessary. The change in the political atmosphere in Europe and the emergence of strong European countries would seem to require a reconsideration of the extent of our troop commitment to Europe.

I particularly question many of the appropriations made for the Department of Transportation. While the country must undoubtedly improve its railroad system, I wonder about the necessity and urgency for increased funds for high speed railroads at this time. I also question the $351 million allocated for the supersonic transport which is $251 million more than was spent for this project in the last fiscal year. This was one of the biggest increases, in percentage, in the entire budget. The very need for this program is hotly debated and again, I see no need or urgency to speed up our efforts to construct this supersonic transport. I also wonder about the $85 million allocated for highway beautification projects for fiscal year 1969. While, undoubtedly this is a worthwhile program. I believe that many educational programs which have been cut, such as Headstart, would be of more immediate benefit to the country.

The President's budget also approves two manned space programs, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program—APP—Apollo application program, and the Air Force—MOL—manned orbiting laboratory. The fiscal 1969 budget earmarks $440 million for Apollo application program which is a 75-percent increase from last year and $600 million for the manned orbiting laboratory which is an increase of 40 percent from last fiscal year. I see no reason, except departmental rivalry, why one of these programs cannot be eliminated.

There are some minor allocations which I also seriously question: $425,000 allocated for the Subversive Activities Control Board which is a 33-percent increase. Considering that this Board has not done anything for many years, I hardly feel that it deserves to be rewarded with more funds.

The President also requested funds for 55,000 new civilian employees. With many Federal programs being curtailed or eliminated entirely, it would seem that Government personnel, or their salaries could be transferred to existing programs.

These are just a few of the areas and programs that I think should be carefully reviewed. It is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will subject the budget to such a review. The Appropriations Committee should hold extensive public hearings on priorities as well as on each budgetary item.

There should be a constant reevaluation of existing programs and a sustained effort to determine the effectiveness of, and the necessity for existing programs and the relation of their cost to the total budget.

Finally the entire appropriation should come to the floor of the House as one bill instead of piecemeal so that Members can make sensible choices between programs. It is ridiculous to be unable to vote funds for migrant workers because funds have already been spent for migratory birds.

Opportunity Has To Knock Hard To Get Into TWO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the very controversial Woodlawn Organization in Chicago, which has received some $970,000 from the Federal Government through the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry on its activities.

I have been strongly opposed to this allocation of Federal funds and have said repeatedly that if TWO has a real contribution to make it ought to present its program to the Chicago Council on Urban Opportunity—as do other such organizations in Chicago.

I believe Mr. Bob Terpstra of the Chicago's American has performed a notable public service in bringing to light the operations of TWO. It is my understanding that this organization's funds expire in May and it is my sincere hope that they will not be renewed.

Many citizens have written to ask about the expenditures of their funds when organizations such as TWO conduct themselves as he describes.

The article follows:

OPPORTUNITY HAS TO KNOCK HARD TO GET INTO TWO

(By Bob Terpstra)

Opportunity knocks but once, as the saying goes.

But it had better be prepared to knock very loud or send a business card in ahead if it wants to visit the Woodlawn Organization.

I arrived at T.W.O.'s anti-poverty program headquarters at 1204 E. 63d st. at 11:50 one morning last week and asked to watch a class of high school drop-outs receive instruction designed to help them get and keep jobs.

I was told by a receptionist in the bare but spacious ground floor office that classroom visits were only by appointment. But if I wanted, she said, I could return about 1 p.m. when a "Mr. Gibbs" could talk to me.

At 1 p.m., Gibbs was still not in, the receptionist told me. I asked if there were someone else I could see. Yes, she said, I could see a woman, but the woman wasn't in either—she "might" be back in a half hour, the receptionist added, turning back to the magazine lying on her desk.

A few minutes later, she told a young man who asked for Gibbs that he wouldn't be back until "late afternoon, about 5 p.m."

As I had, the young man asked if there were someone else he could see, and he was told he "might" be able to see a lady "about" 1:30 p.m.

SEVERAL UNDER INDICTMENTS

As we waited—I for the Gibbs due at 1 p.m., the young man for the Gibbs due at 5 p.m., both of us for the secretary who "might" arrive about 1:30—a middle-aged woman came in to see Gibbs. "Gang members" had been creating disturbances and damaging property in her neighborhood, she said, and she thought Gibbs might be interested in knowing, since she had reason to believe his teachers and/or students were involved.

The woman had a point. As director of T.W.O.'s Youth Project which employs Blackstone Rangers and Eastside Disciples gang leaders to instruct Negro youth, most of them members of the gangs, he might be expected to show an interest in whether his project is deterring his instructors and students from criminal activity—especially in light of recent reports showing several of them under indictment for crimes.

The woman was told Gibbs wasn't in and that he'd left no word about when he would return. She was told she could attend a meeting that night where she could air her complaint. The woman wasn't too happy with the suggestion since it is generally considered unhealthy to openly cross the gangs.

"CAN'T LET JUST ANYONE WALK IN"

Shortly after the woman left, a slim youth in skin-tight pants and a flambuoyant purple sweater walked out of an office at the back of the reception room. The receptionist hurried back to meet him and whispered something to him, nodding almost imperceptibly in my direction.

"What guy?" the youth asked. She nodded again in my direction, and he walked over to me.

This was Gibbs.

I explained I was a reporter for Chicago's American and wished to see a class in session. "I thought you were out," I added.

"We can't let just anybody walk in off the street and go into a classroom," Gibbs said.

I said I didn't feel I was just anybody since I was writing for a paper that was bought by a half a million persons who could be presumed to have an interest in the workings of his project.

He told me to make an appointment, that no one could visit a classroom without an appointment.

I said that would nullify the purpose of my story—to arrive unannounced at a classroom for a look at what went on during a normal classroom session. After all, close to a million dollars was being spent in one year by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity to school 230 students and to employ 20 instructors, all of them high school dropouts.

USED FOR CARD GAMES, SAY POLICE

Police have said the classrooms were being used for card games and craps sessions. A youth was seriously wounded by a shotgun blast in a T.W.O. center a month ago. Other charges pending on instructors in Gibbs' project include murder and rape.

I repeated that I felt the public had a right to see what its money was accomplishing at T.W.O.—without first notifying Gibbs so he could arrange the classroom situation to his advantage. If Gibbs had nothing to hide, he could show me a classroom, I said.

"You don't seem to understand," Gibbs said, fixing me with a stare that would make a Blackstone Ranger turn in his switchblade. "Nobody gets into our classrooms without making an appointment first."

Why?

"I've got to program somebody to go with you into the classroom," he said.

"Most people program computers," I said. "I'm curious. Do you really program people?"

INSTRUCTORS HEARD THE KNOCK

"I don't care what other people do," he said. "I program people."

I looked around the office—at the new IBM electric typewriters quietly resting on desks, at the receptionist who'd told me Gibbs wasn't in, at Gibbs, resplendent in his tan, high-gloss, buckle shoes, his skin-tight pants, his suede-paneled purple sweater, and left.,

Gibbs, the man who programs people, works for the Rev. Arthur Brazier, president of T. W. O. Brazier later defended Gibbs in his refusal to let me see a class in session. "What reporters write about this project is immaterial to me," he said.

"I let the O. E. O. worry about that," he said. "My job is to help these dropouts. Most of them are gang members, most have run afoul of the law—but studies show they respond better to instructions from their peers than from professional teachers," he said. "We're giving them that opportunity."

For 230 students being paid $45 a week [plus allotments for dependents] to attend class, opportunity has indeed knocked. The instructors—all of them high school dropouts—who are getting paid $5,200 a year, and assistant instructors, getting $3,840—have heard the knock, too.

Gibbs, who makes $12,000, pretty good for a high school graduate, is doing all right too.

A sign outside the office, in the shadow of the Jackson Park "L" tracks, says T. W. O. is operated "for the youth of Woodlawn."

Congressman Claude Pepper Introduces H.R. 15438 To Protect America's Shoreline From Beach Erosion

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to modify certain cost-sharing authorizations of Public Law 84–826, as amended, with respect to Federal participation in the solution of shoreline erosion problems.

Flying across this continent and viewing the heavy concentration of human settlements along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes, one cannot fail to grasp the significance and attraction our shoreline holds. Although we surely understand that this is one of our most valuable national assets, erosion continues to threaten existing and prospective uses that can be made of most shoreline areas.

The Senate Committee on Public Works recently published estimates which indicate that the yearly loss brought about by the normal day-to-day processes of coastal erosion is probably now costing the people of the United States well over $50 million. This estimate is very definitely on the conservative side for only 23,000 miles of the total 94,000 miles of national shoreline have been covered in data gathering studies by the Corps of Engineers. General Woodbury has stated that there are still approximately 33,000 miles of nonrocky shoreline where the amount and significance of erosion taking place are largely unknown and undocumented.

A recent report on water resources, prepared by the National Academy of Sciences, pointed out that water for heavy industry and air conditioning is due to become scarcer in the inland reaches of this country. Thus, it can be expected that population will increasingly cluster around the Great Lakes and especially the seaside as improvement in desalination techniques enable us to obtain unlimited supplies of potable water at low cost.

Nearly 75 percent of our population now live in States bordering the oceans and Great Lakes. As the shoreline becomes more urbanized, populous, and industrialized, we surely will have to spend greater and greater amounts in restoring and maintaining the coastal environment to prevent both the normal soil losses and excessive damage resulting from inclement weather.

This Nation's agricultural program of soil erosion control is one of our proudest conservation achievements. Established in the thirties when this country was still primarily rural in character, it was intended to fulfill the dire need of protecting our national soil bank.

In view of the major shift of population to urban areas, it is now clear that equally effective erosion controls are needed along our shoreline. Yet no national plan or coordinated program for such protection has so far been formulated.

The Corps of Engineers has revealed that the current slow pace of shore and beach protection is largely due to the lack of funding on the part of local agencies and private landowners. This defect must be remedied if we are to take advantage of the opportunity to prevent future erosion losses in advance of expanding shoreline developments. In order to move ahead as quickly as possible and with minimum bureaucratic delay, I believe the Federal Government must assume a greater share of leadership and bear a greater share of the costs involved.

At present, the costs allocated to restoration and protection of shoreline adjacent to Federal property are borne fully by the Federal Government. Federal cost participation may be up to one-half the cost of protecting shores owned by non-Federal public agencies. Protection of shores not publicly owned may be eligible for Federal cost sharing up to one-half provided there is significant public benefit arising from public use or from protection of nearby public facilities and provided such work is economically justified. The Federal participation is adjusted in accordance with the degree of such benefits.

The basic change that is necessary to launch a national shoreline protection program is contained in the bill I have introduced today. I propose that the Federal Government assume 90 percent of the cost of construction and related protection measures on all shoreline adjacent to lands held by non-Federal public agencies and private landowners.

El Paso Times Forecasts Texans for Johnson in 1968

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the El Paso Times forecasts that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968—despite Richard Nixon's recent protestations to the contrary.

As the Times recognizes:

> Texans have a tremendous amount of pride . . . to have a native son in the White House.

And well we should when he has performed as admirably as Lyndon Johnson.

President Johnson has combined a compassionate and imaginative program at home with a firm and vigorous policy abroad.

Domestically, the President has forged a program to meet the urgent needs of America. Unparalleled gains have been made in educating our children, providing health care for our elderly, rebuilding our cities, and securing the blessings of a remarkable prosperity for America.

Abroad, we have defended freedom in its hour of challenge, built bridges of friendship to the East, and extended a helping hand to the developing nations of the world.

This November when Texans go to the polls they will vote for a better tomorrow—and Lyndon Johnson.

I insert in the RECORD the El Paso Times editorial:

L. B. J. CARRY TEXAS?

Richard M. Nixon, barnstorming over Texas like a candidate, made an observation in Dallas that undoubtedly will cause considerable talk.

Nixon said that prior to coming to Texas he had been told the state "is in the bag for President Johnson in 1968 because this is his home state."

"After what I've seen and heard in San Antonio, Dallas and Houston, I'd say there is a good chance that when he opens the bag he is going to find it empty," Nixon said.

Between now and election day next November we are going to hear a great deal of speculation as to whether or not Lyndon Johnson will carry Texas.

When Sen. John Tower defeated Waggoner Carr there was talk that it really was a slap at the Johnson admininstration in Johnson's home state.

We don't pretend to know the answer to that. But we are of the opinion that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968. Texans have a tremendous amount of pride. It is a source of great pride to have a native son in the White House.

That fact alone will cause some Texans to vote for LBJ even though they may not approve of his conduct in office.

Nixon was talking while in Dallas. Apparently he didn't realize that Dallas does not speak for all Texas.

Two Maryland GI's Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Albert L. Betts and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, two young soldiers from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men, and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM MORTAR ATTACKS

Two Maryland soldiers, one from Baltimore and the other from Prince Georges County, have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

They were identified as Spec. 5 Albert L. Betts, son of Mrs. Ardelia Morgan, of 1901 East Lafayette avenue, Baltimore, and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, husband of Mrs. Sheila J. Roy, of 9403 Underwood street, Seabrook, Md.

Communications Specialist Betts was killed February 2 in a mortar attack on his base camp at Quang Tri. He was assigned to 545th Signal Detachment of the 362th Signal Company.

Corporal Roy was killed in a mortar attack on the same base which took place January 31. He was a truck driver attached to the 1st Cavalry Division.

Specialist Betts, who was 26, was a 1959 graduate of Dunbar High School. He enlisted in the Army in August, 1964, and was stationed at Fort Jackson, S.C.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Sill, Okla., and in Korea, before being assigned to Vietnam last August.

While in school, Specialist Betts worked at the Williams Pharmacy, 1300 North Caroline street. He also worked for a year at the Stadium Pharmacy, 1645 North Wolfe street.

Besides his mother, Specialist Betts is survived by his father, William Betts Sr., a half-sister, Miss Francine Wilkins; a brother, William E. Betts, and two half-brothers, Glen Morgan and David Morgan. All live in Baltimore.

Corporal Roy, who was 19, was born in Cheverly, Md., and grew up in Hyattsville, Md. He attended DuVal High School in Glendale, Md.

He enlisted in the Army last July and took basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. He had advanced training at Fort Lewis, Wash., before being assigned to Vietnam last November.

Before joining the Army, he worked several months for a glass company in Mount Rainier, Md.

In addition to his wife, Corporal Roy is survived by a son, James C. Roy; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence E. Roy, Jr., of Hyattsville; a sister, Miss Juanita Roy of Hyattsville, and a brother, Clarence E. Roy 3d of Hyattsville.

In Tribute to Our Boy Scouts

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of participating in two Boy Scout ceremonies in my district, one, the conference of an Eagle Scout badge to Craig Randall, a member of Troop 8 of St. Cassian's Church in Upper Montclair, and the other the 50th anniversary celebration of Troop 301, Wesley Methodist Church, in Belleville.

It was refreshing indeed to participate in these programs with young men who are truly a credit to our Nation; young men whose actions manifest their integrity, their dedication to justice and freedom for all, and their deep sense of civic responsibility.

Craig Randall, the 15-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Craig E. Randall of 14 Cornell Way, Upper Montclair, who themselves have long been active in scouting activities, is an excellent student, a fine athlete, and an accomplished outdoorsman and camper. Craig started his Scouting activities in Japan, where his father was stationed as a naval officer, and has been a member of Troop 8 for 3 years. In earning the 21 merit badges requisite for attainment of the rank of Eagle Scout, Craig stands out as one of our future leaders, a young man who is a source of pride to his parents and to his community.

Although from a neighboring town,

Craig is typical of the 15 Eagle Scouts who have come from the ranks of Troop 301 of Belleville during its 50 years of service. From selling war bonds and collecting scrap metal during World War I and II to serving at blood banks, working on "get out the vote" campaigns, helping to combat forest fires, and making food baskets for the needy, Troop 301 has proved again and again its great strength and value. In fact, Troop 301 can even point with pride to a diplomatic triumph. After the troop hosted Scouts from LaPaz, Bolivia, who were en route to the World Jamboree, the Minister of Finance of Bolivia personally stopped in Belleville to thank the boys for their hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, it is a truly gratifying experience to come in contact with young men interested in improving themselves and working toward improving the lot of others, and I am delighted to call their achievements to the attention of my colleagues.

Rising Consumer Expectations

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, "Consumer Protection and the Retailer" was the subject of an important article which appeared recently in Merchandising Week and which shows the possibilities and the problems as the retailer faces the consumer on one side and his suppliers on the other in this area of rising consumer expectations. The article follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND THE RETAILER

On her way to becoming business' long-anticipated New Consumer, today's shopper has met a snag. Her marketplace has grown up too fast around her, creating as many purchasing pitfalls as purchasable products, and—according to the recent wave of consumer protectionist sentiment—she just isn't ready for it.

Today's consumer, in her characteristic hurry to sample new aspects of convenience and luxury, has been met by an altogether eager system of business that has long been equipped to provide a product to suit every whim, a variation for every taste, and a payment procedure tailored for every budget. What used to be her personal means of self-protection and ammunition against fraud and deception, her right of choice, has become a weighty responsibility for a consumer who, say her champions, is too often ill-equipped to make valid marketing judgments.

Someone has to make the judgments, however. So shoppers are being unionized and led by a consumer protectionist movement that is not unique in concept (protectionism appears as part of a cycle at some time during each successive peacetime economy), but is most certainly unprecedented in scope and intensity. Since President Kennedy issued his Consumers' Bill of Rights in 1962, the government has concentrated with new zeal on promoting the general welfare of consumers. And since consumers—when not busy consuming—do vote, indications are that they will continue to register support of the movement and perpetuate the drive by reelecting its leaders.

Business has become alarmed by the new fervor, and has abandoned its "This too will pass" optimism. It now envisions a 1984 society in which "Big Brothers" might be making it pay not just for its own mistakes, but for the mistakes of its customers.

The government is indeed at it again, suggests the businessman with typical laissez-faire leanings, and though Theodore Roosevelt's big business-busting roar has been modulated over the years to Lyndon Johnson's consumer-oriented duet with Betty Furness, the message has remained the same: the American consumer needs all the help she can get to get all she can out of American business.

Three successive Congressional sessions have worked to develop the premise that the average consumer is too often led by deceptive advertising to buy a product which, though she will be making exorbitant payments on it for at least a decade, will break down in 10 days and, in the process, cause her some form of personal harm. Now, all that is left for the upcoming second session of the 90th Congress is to decide what in the name of the Great Society to do about it.

Much to the apprehension of the business community, consumer protection has itself become big business. And in the middle of the melee stands the retailer, who can expect increased pressure from those who see basic flaws in the system within which he works. If marketing must change its role to meet the economic problems that have evolved from leaving the consumer to her own devices, then the first changes will be made at the retail level.

However, the retailer has not yet been forced to work within bounds established for him by someone else. Consumer protection guidelines are only now being set, and governmental protectionists are alert to those areas that business desires to keep under its self-regulatory roof.

By supplying his customers with complete and honestly comparative product information, for example, the retailer is filling the communications void that government feels definitely exists. Too often left to her own selective devices, the consumer has been cast in the role of an expert on all phases of product selection, even though she needs the assistance that a trained salesman can offer her. When she gets that help, when she honestly knows what to expect from her purchase and for her money, she feels that business has done its job in serving her. And her champions agree.

Her champions—those who are leading today's consumer protectionist movement—do plan some legislative action, to fill the void they see between where business has left off and where they hope it will pick up again.

Changes in the Foreign Aid Program

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to evaluate and recommend changes in the foreign aid program. The group will consist of seven Senators and seven Representatives. Membership from the Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses would be limited to four each in order that there be a balance between specialized knowledge of existing foreign aid programs and new views as to evaluation and future course.

The resolution directs the joint committee to undertake and report a thorough reevaluation of U.S. foreign economic and military assistance programs. The study shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the objectives and nature of such programs and the extent to which they are related to and harmonious with vital interests of the United States. The committee is directed to study the interrelationship of the departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the United States dealing with such programs and their relationship with international organizations dealing with similar activities.

Most importantly, the committee would be asked to recommend how AID programs might be improved, altered, and/or supplemented so they may be operated and administered in an efficient, effective, and economically feasible manner. Special emphasis would be placed on determining ways and means by which such programs may aid the particular country in achieving self-sustaining economic growth. Consideration would be given to methods of alleviating the effect of the cultural gap between our highly developed technological society and the social structure of the developing nations.

Between the years 1946 and 1967, foreign assistance has cost the American taxpayer $152,533,000,000. The sums are staggering. They are incredible considering they are spent on programs about which many of us harbor substantial doubts.

I believe prompt and comprehensive action should be taken to direct our foreign aid goals to meaningful, workable, and obtainable accomplishments. A relationship must be shown between development assistance and U.S. national interests. I do not believe that Americans can continue to support aid to nations, such as that to Egypt, who are obviously antagonistic to the interests of the United States. I find unconvincing the direction to channel aid into the hands of unfriendly powers when the friendly power exists. Our foreign aid program is sorely in need of priorities.

It is sorely in need in other respects as well. I question whether AID programs are gaining the self-participation of the aided country in its own economic and governmental stability.

There is need for coordination between private and international participation in foreign aid programs and participation by our own Government organizations.

I am certain efficient procedure and programing is severely lacking. The American citizen must be assured that the channels and methods of disposition of AID funds are effective. He should not be asked to read, thus, that AID has paid $24,000 for the purchase of ordinary sea water. He should not have to find that U.S. officials are making improper payments to contracting firms.

Daily there occur more reasons to question the use of American-aid dollars in the types of programs that are being administered in Vietnam.

An Associated Press investigating team reported last year that 20 percent of U.S.

losses and excessive damage resulting from inclement weather.

This Nation's agricultural program of soil erosion control is one of our proudest conservation achievements. Established in the thirties when this country was still primarily rural in character, it was intended to fulfill the dire need of protecting our national soil bank.

In view of the major shift of population to urban areas, it is now clear that equally effective erosion controls are needed along our shoreline. Yet no national plan or coordinated program for such protection has so far been formulated.

The Corps of Engineers has revealed that the current slow pace of shore and beach protection is largely due to the lack of funding on the part of local agencies and private landowners. This defect must be remedied if we are to take advantage of the opportunity to prevent future erosion losses in advance of expanding shoreline developments. In order to move ahead as quickly as possible and with minimum bureaucratic delay, I believe the Federal Government must assume a greater share of leadership and bear a greater share of the costs involved.

At present, the costs allocated to restoration and protection of shoreline adjacent to Federal property are borne fully by the Federal Government. Federal cost participation may be up to one-half the cost of protecting shores owned by non-Federal public agencies. Protection of shores not publicly owned may be eligible for Federal cost sharing up to one-half provided there is significant public benefit arising from public use or from protection of nearby public facilities and provided such work is economically justified. The Federal participation is adjusted in accordance with the degree of such benefits.

The basic change that is necessary to launch a national shoreline protection program is contained in the bill I have introduced today. I propose that the Federal Government assume 90 percent of the cost of construction and related protection measures on all shoreline adjacent to lands held by non-Federal public agencies and private landowners.

El Paso Times Forecasts Texans for Johnson in 1968

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the El Paso Times forecasts that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968—despite Richard Nixon's recent protestations to the contrary.

As the Times recognizes:

> Texans have a tremendous amount of pride . . . to have a native son in the White House.

And well we should when he has performed as admirably as Lyndon Johnson. President Johnson has combined a compassionate and imaginative program at home with a firm and vigorous policy abroad.

Domestically, the President has forged a program to meet the urgent needs of America. Unparalleled gains have been made in educating our children, providing health care for our elderly, rebuilding our cities, and securing the blessings of a remarkable prosperity for America.

Abroad, we have defended freedom in its hour of challenge, built bridges of friendship to the East, and extended a helping hand to the developing nations of the world.

This November when Texans go to the polls they will vote for a better tomorrow—and Lyndon Johnson.

I insert in the RECORD the El Paso Times editorial:

L. B. J. CARRY TEXAS?

Richard M. Nixon, barnstorming over Texas like a candidate, made an observation in Dallas that undoubtedly will cause considerable talk.

Nixon said that prior to coming to Texas he had been told the state "is in the bag for President Johnson in 1968 because this is his home state."

"After what I've seen and heard in San Antonio, Dallas and Houston, I'd say there is a good chance that when he opens the bag he is going to find it empty," Nixon said.

Between now and election day next November we are going to hear a great deal of speculation as to whether or not Lyndon Johnson will carry Texas.

When Sen. John Tower defeated Waggoner Carr there was talk that it really was a slap at the Johnson admininstration in Johnson's home state.

We don't pretend to know the answer to that. But we are of the opinion that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968. Texans have a tremendous amount of pride. It is a source of great pride to have a native son in the White House.

That fact alone will cause some Texans to vote for LBJ even though they may not approve of his conduct in office.

Nixon was talking while in Dallas. Apparently he didn't realize that Dallas does not speak for all Texas.

Two Maryland GI's Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Albert L. Betts and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, two young soldiers from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men, and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM MORTAR ATTACKS

Two Maryland soldiers, one from Baltimore and the other from Prince Georges County, have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

They were identified as Spec. 5 Albert L. Betts, son of Mrs. Ardelia Morgan, of 1901 East Lafayette avenue, Baltimore, and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, husband of Mrs. Shelia J. Roy, of 9403 Underwood street, Seabrook, Md.

Communications Specialist Betts was killed February 2 in a mortar attack on his base camp at Quang Tri. He was assigned to 545th Signal Detachment of the 362th Signal Company.

Corporal Roy was killed in a mortar attack on the same base which took place January 31. He was a truck driver attached to the 1st Cavalry Division.

Specialist Betts, who was 26, was a 1959 graduate of Dunbar High School. He enlisted in the Army in August, 1964, and was stationed at Fort Jackson, S.C.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Sill, Okla., and in Korea, before being assigned to Vietnam last August.

While in school, Specialist Betts worked at the Williams Pharmacy, 1300 North Caroline street. He also worked for a year at the Stadium Pharmacy, 1645 North Wolfe street.

Besides his mother, Specialist Betts is survived by his father, William Betts Sr., a half-sister, Miss Francine Wilkins; a brother, William E. Betts, and two half-brothers, Glen Morgan and David Morgan. All live in Baltimore.

Corporal Roy, who was 19, was born in Cheverly, Md., and grew up in Hyattsville, Md. He attended DuVal High School in Glendale, Md.

He enlisted in the Army last July and took basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. He had advanced training at Fort Lewis, Wash., before being assigned to Vietnam last November.

Before joining the Army, he worked several months for a glass company in Mount Rainier, Md.

In addition to his wife, Corporal Roy is survived by a son, James C. Roy; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence E. Roy, Jr., of Hyattsville; a sister, Miss Juanita Roy of Hyattsville, and a brother, Clarence E. Roy 3d of Hyattsville.

In Tribute to Our Boy Scouts

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of participating in two Boy Scout ceremonies in my district, one, the conference of an Eagle Scout badge to Craig Randall, a member of Troop 8 of St. Cassian's Church in Upper Montclair, and the other the 50th anniversary celebration of Troop 301, Wesley Methodist Church, in Belleville.

It was refreshing indeed to participate in these programs with young men who are truly a credit to our Nation; young men whose actions manifest their integrity, their dedication to justice and freedom for all, and their deep sense of civic responsibility.

Craig Randall, the 15-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Craig E. Randall of 14 Cornell Way, Upper Montclair, who themselves have long been active in scouting activities, is an excellent student, a fine athlete, and an accomplished outdoorsman and camper. Craig started his Scouting activities in Japan, where his father was stationed as a naval officer, and has been a member of Troop 8 for 3 years. In earning the 21 merit badges requisite for attainment of the rank of Eagle Scout, Craig stands out as one of our future leaders, a young man who is a source of pride to his parents and to his community.

Although from a neighboring town,

Craig is typical of the 15 Eagle Scouts who have come from the ranks of Troop 301 of Belleville during its 50 years of service. From selling war bonds and collecting scrap metal during World War I and II to serving at blood banks, working on "get out the vote" campaigns, helping to combat forest fires, and making food baskets for the needy, Troop 301 has proved again and again its great strength and value. In fact, Troop 301 can even point with pride to a diplomatic triumph. After the troop hosted Scouts from La-Paz, Bolivia, who were en route to the World Jamboree, the Minister of Finance of Bolivia personally stopped in Belleville to thank the boys for their hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, it is a truly gratifying experience to come in contact with young men interested in improving themselves and working toward improving the lot of others, and I am delighted to call their achievements to the attention of my colleagues.

Rising Consumer Expectations

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, "Consumer Protection and the Retailer" was the subject of an important article which appeared recently in Merchandising Week and which shows the possibilities and the problems as the retailer faces the consumer on one side and his suppliers on the other in this area of rising consumer expectations. The article follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND THE RETAILER

On her way to becoming business' long-anticipated New Consumer, today's shopper has met a snag. Her marketplace has grown up too fast around her, creating as many purchasing pitfalls as purchasable products, and—according to the recent wave of consumer protectionist sentiment—she just isn't ready for it.

Today's consumer, in her characteristic hurry to sample new aspects of convenience and luxury, has been met by an altogether eager system of business that has long been equipped to provide a product to suit every whim, a variation for every taste, and a payment procedure tailored for every budget. What used to be her personal means of self-protection and ammunition against fraud and deception, her right of choice, has become a weighty responsibility for a consumer who, say her champions, is too often ill-equipped to make valid marketing judgments.

Someone has to make the judgments, however. So shoppers are being unionized and led by a consumer protectionist movement that is not unique in concept (protectionism appears as part of a cycle at some time during each successive peacetime economy), but is most certainly unprecedented in scope and intensity. Since President Kennedy issued his Consumers' Bill of Rights in 1962, the government has concentrated with new zeal on promoting the general welfare of consumers. And since consumers—when not busy consuming—do vote, indications are that they will continue to register support of the movement and perpetuate the drive by re-electing its leaders.

Business has become alarmed by the new fervor, and has abandoned its "This too will pass" optimism. It now envisions a 1984 society in which "Big Brothers" might be making it pay not just for its own mistakes, but for the mistakes of its customers.

The government is indeed at it again, suggests the businessman with typical laissez-faire leanings, and though Theodore Roosevelt's big business-busting roar has been modulated over the years to Lyndon Johnson's consumer-oriented duet with Betty Furness, the message has remained the same: the American consumer needs all the help she can get to get all she can out of American business.

Three successive Congressional sessions have worked to develop the premise that the average consumer is too often led by deceptive advertising to buy a product which, though she will be making exorbitant payments on it for at least a decade, will break down in 10 days and, in the process, cause her some form of personal harm. Now, all that is left for the upcoming second session of the 90th Congress is to decide what in the name of the Great Society to do about it.

Much to the apprehension of the business community, consumer protection has itself become big business. And in the middle of the melee stands the retailer, who can expect increased pressure from those who see basic flaws in the system within which he works. If marketing must change its role to meet the economic problems that have evolved from leaving the consumer to her own devices, then the first changes will be made at the retail level.

However, the retailer has not yet been forced to work within bounds established for him by someone else. Consumer protection guidelines are only now being set, and governmental protectionists are alert to those areas that business desires to keep under its self-regulatory roof.

By supplying his customers with complete and honestly comparative product information, for example, the retailer is filling the communications void that government feels definitely exists. Too often left to her own selective devices, the consumer has been cast in the role of an expert on all phases of product selection, even though she needs the assistance that a trained salesman can offer her. When she gets that help, when she honestly knows what to expect from her purchase and for her money, she feels that business has done its job in serving her. And her champions agree.

Her champions—those who are leading today's consumer protectionist movement—do plan some legislative action, to fill the void they see between where business has left off and where they hope it will pick up again.

Changes in the Foreign Aid Program

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to evaluate and recommend changes in the foreign aid program. The group will consist of seven Senators and seven Representatives. Membership from the Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses would be limited to four each in order that there be a balance between specialized knowledge of existing foreign aid programs and new views as to evaluation and future course.

The resolution directs the joint committee to undertake and report a thorough reevaluation of U.S. foreign economic and military assistance programs. The study shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the objectives and nature of such programs and the extent to which they are related to and harmonious with vital interests of the United States. The committee is directed to study the interrelationship of the departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the United States dealing with such programs and their relationship with international organizations dealing with similar activities.

Most importantly, the committee would be asked to recommend how AID programs might be improved, altered, and/or supplemented so they may be operated and administered in an efficient, effective, and economically feasible manner. Special emphasis would be placed on determining ways and means by which such programs may aid the particular country in achieving self-sustaining economic growth. Consideration would be given to methods of alleviating the effect of the cultural gap between our highly developed technological society and the social structure of the developing nations.

Between the years 1946 and 1967, foreign assistance has cost the American taxpayer $152,533,000,000. The sums are staggering. They are incredible considering they are spent on programs about which many of us harbor substantial doubts.

I believe prompt and comprehensive action should be taken to direct our foreign aid goals to meaningful, workable, and obtainable accomplishments. A relationship must be shown between development assistance and U.S. national interests. I do not believe that Americans can continue to support aid to nations, such as that to Egypt, who are obviously antagonistic to the interests of the United States. I find unconvincing the direction to channel aid into the hands of unfriendly powers when the friendly power exists. Our foreign aid program is sorely in need of priorities.

It is sorely in need in other respects as well. I question whether AID programs are gaining the self-participation of the aided country in its own economic and governmental stability.

There is need for coordination between private and international participation in foreign aid programs and participation by our own Government organizations.

I am certain efficient procedure and programing is severely lacking. The American citizen must be assured that the channels and methods of disposition of AID funds are effective. He should not be asked to read, thus, that AID has paid $24,000 for the purchase of ordinary sea water. He should not have to find that U.S. officials are making improper payments to contracting firms.

Daily there occur more reasons to question the use of American-aid dollars in the types of programs that are being administered in Vietnam.

An Associated Press investigating team reported last year that 20 percent of U.S.

civilian aid and Army store supplies were lost to corruption and theft in South Vietnam.

Washington sources thought the figure was too high, but conceded that losses might run 5 to 6 percent. One percent is too much.

A spokesman for AID said a recent sample audit covering $280 million worth of goods showed that less than 1.2 percent had been diverted from its intended destination.

The entire operation of the foreign-aid program raises serious doubts as to whether the United States, at a time of vast expenditures in Vietnam and increasing and costly burdens at home, can afford to direct money into projects of dubious value, countries of dubious friendship, governments of corruption.

I urge prompt initiation of my request.

Irwin Robinson and the Right of Americans To Travel

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Travel Weekly, an outstanding publication in my district, whose editor and publisher is my constituent and friend, Irwin Robinson, has made a pertinent, lucid, and intelligent analysis of the President's proposals for possible Government restrictions on foreign travel by U.S. citizens.

It has been reprinted in the New York Times of Monday, February 19, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

SHOULD AMERICANS TRAVEL ABROAD?

(By Irwin Robinson, editor and publisher, Travel Weekly)

(NOTE.—We have heard a great deal recently about the so-called "travel gap" and about possible government restrictions on foreign travel by U.S. citizens. The purpose of this message is to dispel some of the resulting confusion and let in a few shafts of light and reason.)

THE TRUTH ABOUT "GAPOSIS"

It is as illogical to speak of a "travel gap" as of a "whisky gap". We Americans spend several hundred million dollars more for Scotch than the British spend on Kentucky bourbon. But is this cause for hand-wringing? Perhaps we should consider taking steps to narrow the "petroleum gap", the "coffee gap", the "sugar gap", the "diamond gap", the "clothing gap" or the "furniture gap". These *unfavorable* balances add up to a whopping $4 billion a year.

The fact is that imbalances in specific commodities and services are inherent in—and essential to—international trade. If each country didn't have specialties in which it excelled, there wouldn't *be* any international trade. The whole system consists of interlocking surpluses and gaps among trading partners. You can't have the "surpluses" without the "gaps".

WE EXPORT MORE THAN WE IMPORT

Our dollar "deficits" have received so much publicity that most people believe the U.S. has an *unfavorable* balance of trade. This is not so. In 1967 the U.S. had a *favorable* overall foreign trade balance of nearly $4.5 billion. The balance was also in our favor in 1966, 1965—and, in fact, has been for many years.

A good part of the favorable balance comes from the very European countries that would be hardest hit by restrictions on American travel. Last year our exports to Western Europe alone exceeded our imports by more than $2 billion. We sold to France 50% more than France sold to us. Our exports to Holland were four times as great as our imports; to Greece, three and a half times as great; and the margin in our favor over Spain was three times.

WHAT TRAVEL DOLLAR ACCOMPLISH FOR US

These countries are important tourist destinations for Americans—and the dollars that American tourists spend there are used, in turn, to buy American goods. If we choke off their source of dollars, foreign countries will have to cut down their purchases of U.S. goods. Cutting off access to American tourist income would be an economic catastrophe for many of the very countries with which we have the closest ties.

The inevitable result would be that production here at home would slow down and jobs would disappear.

Latest Department of Commerce figures show that in machinery and transportation equipment U.S. exports exceeded imports by more than $6 billion. In electrical apparatus the surplus was $900 million; in power generating equipment, $650 million; in tractors and parts, $500 million; in metalworking machinery, $200 million. Isn't it crystal clear that without these tremendous export markets there would be fewer jobs in New York, Bridgeport, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis and countless other cities and towns from coast to coast?

Tourist dollars coming back to our shores to buy American products create jobs in New Brunswick and Rahway, N.J.—communities whose prosperity depends on several large chemical and medicinal plants. In 1966 the U.S. exported nearly $2 billion *more* in such products than it imported. Thousands of jobs in Rahway, New Brunswick and other communities have been sustained by the flow of U.S. tourist dollars abroad—dollars which make it possible for many countries to buy our chemical and medicinal products.

The story is the same in Moline, Ill., known for its production of farm implements and other machinery. In 1966 the U.S. exported $11 billion worth of machinery and transportation equipment. Tourist dollars helped make it possible for foreign countries to spend these huge amounts—and thousands of wage-earners in Moline and in many other cities and towns derived the benefit.

Take another example. Last year foreign airlines spent $1.7 billion for American-made aircraft, services and related equipment. Since 1959 Boeing alone has sold 274 jet planes to foreign carriers worth $1.5 billion. And right now Boeing has an export backlog of another $1.5 billion. Approximately 25 percent of Boeing's current sales are for export.

Tourist-generated dollars play a major role in enabling the foreign airlines to feed American manufactures this enormous volume of business. Isn't it reasonable to assume that severe curtailment of American tourist expenditures abroad would cause a decline in airline orders—to the economic detriment of large segments of such states as California and Washington?

AN UNREALISTIC APPRAISAL

The balance of payments problem is so complex that even our best economists cannot agree on its dimensions and implications. Washington believes that a sharp reduction in American travel abroad would ease pressure on the dollar. But, neither the travel nor any other portion of the dollar deficit can be treated in a vacuum, as the Administration is trying to do. Each is only one part of a tightly interwoven system—a system which has been thrown out of balance by our commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere. The danger is that, in seeking a solution by tinkering with just one component, the Administration will actually aggravate the problem.

In thinking about the current international travel situation we should note two things:

First, our Government has done very little to encourage more foreigners to visit the U.S.A. and thus help counteract the outflow of tourist dollars. Much could have been done during the past few years and, even now, should be done.

Second, it is a delusion to believe that the U.S. can succeed in stimulating tourist traffic *from* Europe and Asia while curtailing American travel *to* those crucial areas.

THE POSITIVE APPROACH

If a "travel gap" problem exists, the solution must be a *positive* one. The American travel industry—and its counterparts abroad—believe in two-way travel. They have already invested substantial sums in promoting travel to this country, with impressive results. But the effort must be expanded. Above all, it needs wholehearted, tangible U.S. government support.

Congress must provide the U.S. Travel Service with the resources it needs to do an effective job. In the years the "travel gap" has been widening, Western Europe has spent 15 times as much as the U.S. to promote incoming foreign travel. These countries have been eminently successful. Isn't it about time we joined in the competition?

One of the ironies of the "travel gap" problem is that this administration has consistently stressed America's economic stake in free trade. It has told Congress that protectionism is harmful to world prosperity, including our own, and warned that a single act of protectionism can trigger a vicious cycle of retaliation.

Are these principles now to be abandoned by an overt act of protectionism—a U.S. travel tariff? Are we to risk the hazards of widespread retaliation which can only damage the American economy?

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The travel industry recognizes the seriousness of the dollar imbalance and the outflow of gold. It wants to help. But it considers the proposed Treasury solution impractical, fraught with danger and unlikely to achieve the desired goal.

Congress can act in the public interest by rejecting travel restrictions and fostering the *positive* approach so earnestly endorsed by the people who know travel best.

The world has no need for another iron curtain—especially one "made in U.S.A.".

TRAVEL WEEKLY.

The Spirit and Soul of America

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1968, Richard M. Nixon made, in my view, a very significant address in Concord, N.H. He spoke of the spirit and soul of America. In this address Mr. Nixon points out that there is something wrong when a nation possessing the material resources of the United States finds itself beset on all sides by problems, yet seemingly incapable of effective leadership and lacking in purpose. Mr. Nixon has indeed pointed to the way out of our dilemma. Therefore, I commend his address to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY RICHARD M. NIXON, CONCORD, N.H., FEBRUARY 3, 1968

The finest hours in our nation's history have been triumphs of the American spirit.

We now are engaged in a great test of that spirit. Throughout the land, bitter conflicts are being waged between the races, between the generations, between ideologies, between advocates of lawful change and of chaotic violence.

When the leaders of a great nation lose the trust of its people, when they lose touch with its spirit, the soul of the nation is torn.

When Lyndon Johnson took office five years ago, he proclaimed the slogan: "Let us continue."

Today, five years later, President Johnson is saying to the American people: Let us continue what we have been doing for the last five years for another four years.

So the question the American people will be answering with their votes in 1968 is: Shall we continue?

The only answer is: When the strongest nation in the world can be tied down for four years in the war in Viet Nam, with no end in sight; when the richest nation in the world cannot manage its own economy; when the nation with the greatest tradition of respect for the rule of law is plagued by rampant lawlessness; when the nation that has been a symbol of human liberty is torn apart by racial strife; when the President of the United States cannot travel either at home or abroad without fear of a hostile demonstration—then it's time America had new leadership.

I don't think America can afford four more years of Lyndon Johnson in the White House.

This is not a time to continue what we have. It's a time for a new beginning.

When I say we need new leadership, I am speaking not simply of leadership able to deal with pragmatic problems like those of military strength and economic management, or of housing and jobs and education. This has to be done and it can be done. But I mean something more.

We need leadership that recognizes that the real crisis of America today is what it once had, but has lost: the lift of a driving dream.

Let us look at America now, at the start of this final third of the 20th Century. Whether peace and freedom survive in the world depends on the United States, and the great question is whether we can meet this challenge.

In a material sense, our assets are immense. Our economic strength is unquestioned, and our military strength can be whatever we choose to make it.

But in what should be our area of greatest strength, we have lost something. Back in the days when America was one of the weakest nations of the world, when this granite state was one of only thirteen, then America's ideals were more powerful than they are today. America meant more to the world. It was a symbol of liberty and hope. It was weak militarily, poor economically, but rich in its devotion to a new concept of freedom.

The tragedy is that somehow, while that concept has driven this nation higher, faster, than any nation at any time, the American idea has been losing its meaning for the world and for America.

There are two reasons: the world has changed, and America has changed.

Then we were a new nation in an old world. Now we are an old nation in a new world.

At home and abroad we must recapture the American dream.

America did not create freedom, but freedom did create America. The trouble is that we have let both the word and the concept grow stale. The word "freedom" has become a cliche, and the concept has too often been made an excuse for inaction.

If we are to restore the vitality of the American ideal, we have to bear in mind that freedom is not static. Like any other living thing, freedom has to grow to survive.

Today we live in a period of unprecedented change and growth in the world, a time when young people at home and new nations abroad are groping for new directions—and a static concept of freedom simply is not enough.

Let us dedicate ourselves not only to the preservation of freedom, but to the expansion of freedom.

The place to begin is here at home. We cannot provide an example abroad unless we set an example at home. None of the battlegrounds on which we are engaged, none of the places in which we are being tested, is more important than the ground we stand on here. For the ultimate testing-place of America is America itself.

And this is the time to begin. It's time to move on to a new freedom. The old negative freedoms—freedom from hunger, freedom from want, freedom from fear—are no longer enough. The new freedom has to mean freedom for the poor as well as the rich, freedom for black as well as for white; and it has to mean not only freedom from but freedom to. It means freedom to grow, freedom to choose, freedom to travel, freedom to create, freedom to work—and freedom to enjoy the fruits of our labors.

Let us recognize that rights have no meaning—freedom has no meaning—without the opportunity to exercise those rights and to use that freedom.

For most of us in America, the American Revolution has been won and the American dream achieved. But there are millions for whom the dream has been an unreachable vision.

The prophets of despair, the peddlers of hate, would have those millions believe that by taking up arms—whether literally or figuratively, or both—they can destroy a society that they see only in fragments, of which they see only the underside and not its promise or its glory.

They have to be persuaded, first, that they cannot—and they cannot.

But, second, they have to be shown the other side of that society, and they have to be shown it as a reality, which they can attain.

It has not been so. Let us begin by confessing that fact.

It must become so. Let us proceed by accepting that commitment.

How do we do this?

We do it, first, by turning the power of freedom to the uses of freedom.

The question today is not whether we provide food for the hungry, homes for the ill-housed, jobs for the jobless. The question is how.

And here we have one of the great, fundamental issues which the people will decide with their votes in November. The Johnson Administration's approach to every problem is to begin with government. Ours is to begin with people. The trouble with their approach is that it has failed. What they forget is that what has made America great as not been what government has done for people, but what people have done for themselves.

The choice we face today, very simply, is this: Do we continue down a road that leads to big government and little people? Or do we take a new road, one that taps the energies of the greatest engine of productivity the world has ever seen—the engine of American industry and American private enterprise?

I say we take this new road.

This means providing tax credit and other incentives for business to go where the need is, and to do efficiently what government now does so inefficiently.

Let me be very precise: I am not saying that government is the enemy. After all, it's our government; it belongs to the people. It has a role to play. But government alone simply is not capable of doing the job that needs to be done. And even more importantly, it's not capable of giving fire to the spirit and life to the dream.

Government would be capable if all we cared about were the old freedoms from. But it fails because it stunts the new freedoms to.

Whenever a new government program is proposed, there is one test that we should apply. Does it limit freedom? Or does it expand it?

There are those who say that there's nothing new about relying more on private enterprise. After all, American business is older than the American government. But what is new is both the capacity and the will of private enterprise to do the job. During this past third of a century, while we've been loading more and more onto the shoulders of government, private enterprise has been undergoing a quiet revolution. Its leaders have developed a social conscience far beyond anything the leaders of the 20's or the 30's would have recognized. And at the same time, technology has thrown wide the windows of the possible. It's private enterprise, not government, that has been turning the wonders of science to the service of man. The American system of private enterprise is the greatest instrument of change and of progress the world has ever known. And the skills and the resources it now commands are those that we need if the new freedoms are to be made a living reality for all of our people.

And it's use of free private enterprise that can provide for all of us an opportunity to participate in this great adventure.

There's another thing we need if we're to make our freedoms real. We need the civil order that makes freedom possible. We need the rule of law to sustain the light of hope, and the light of hope to sustain the rule of law.

This above all is itself a matter of the spirit—the spirit of justice, the spirit of law, the spirit of reconciliation. And this must come from our national leadership.

To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit.

To the young people of America today, I say this: it's true that you are inheriting a world you never made. But this was also true of every generation. The great, exciting difference is that you live in a world you can change.

Never has it mattered so much in the world what the people of one nation do—the choices they make—the vision they hold out.

It's our chance today, and your chance tomorrow, to give a new dimension to the American dream, a dimension which can change America to enable America to help change the world.

As we make the American ideal of freedom come true here at home, America will be able, by its example, to help bring a new freedom abroad—a freedom powered not by the force of arms, but by the power of ideas and the force of example.

The world is waiting for that kind of a message, for that kind of an idea, for that kind of action. For it has become a world of young nations, and young people, tired of the old isms, wanting the material things of life but also wanting something more.

That something more is what America has always meant to the world. And, if America is to heal its spirit and find its soul again, that something more is what America needs today.

Ramsey Clark—A Great Attorney General

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Quinn Tamm, one of the most respected names in law enforcement, is quoted by the Associated Press as saying Ramsey Clark "is more interested in helping local law enforcement than any Attorney General I have known."

This is an impressive tribute to Ramsey Clark. For Mr. Tamm, in 26 years with the FBI and 8 with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has known 18 Attorneys General.

The Associated Press story, carried in newspapers on February 18, reports on Mr. Clark's fight against crime. I include the entire article in the RECORD:

RAMSEY CLARK—A GREAT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the man President Johnson has chosen to direct the Federal effort against crime, warns that the growing number of acts of civil disobedience are irresponsible, intolerable "and cannot be permitted."

Clark made the remarks during an interview centering on questions concerning Dr. Martin Luther King's plan to bring thousands of impoverished Negroes to Washington in April to demonstrate for jobs.

It was probably Clark's toughest public statement, and comes from the man upon whose shoulders Johnson has placed two of his biggest and politically most dangerous burdens: an increasing crime rate and big city disturbances.

King has promised nonviolent, peaceful law-abiding demonstrations. But he has said they will "escalate to disruptive proportions if Congress doesn't help the needy."

In the interview, Clark said, "It's clear that any disruption of the activities of this city or any part of this city, or any office of this government, or any of its branches is intolerable and cannot be permitted."

Clark's role in crime fighting has brought him unusually close—at least for an Attorney General—to local police departments. He continually emphasizes that law enforcement primarily is a local responsibility, and the Administration's safe-streets bill is, in Clark's view, the principal Federal anticrime effort.

Clark would not place a priority for action against any particular type of crime, saying these priorities would vary from city to city. But at the Federal level where the Government can take direct action, he placed top emphasis on organized crime, and second, drugs.

"Organized crime tends to be interstate and therefore means the inability of local law enforcement to cope with it," he said.

Clark emphasized the need for drug control because "the major activity in drugs centers around youth attitudes and permissiveness. Kids don't distinguish, and if they're looking for kicks, maybe they'll try marijuana, maybe LSD, maybe something else."

He believes that if young people "are exposed to marijuana, they're probably exposed to dangerous drugs and society has a highly important stake in these drugs.

"If we've learned anything about drugs in the past few years, we've learned drugs can be very harmful."

Johnson for months has pushed Clark further into tougher, more sensitive areas. Last October it was Clark who organized Federal forces at the Pentagon during a massive antiwar demonstration in which about 35,000 persons took part.

Clark is chief Administration spokesman for the newly proposed antiriot law and for a variety of civil rights legislation.

One of the Johnson Cabinet's most liberal members, Clark is highly thought of by many of the officials with whom he most wants to work—the nation's police chiefs. Quinn Tamm, head of the influential International Association of Chiefs of Police, says Clark "is more interested in helping local law enforcement than any Attorney General I have known." Tamm says he has known eighteen.

But Clark's continued strong stand against wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping and his favorable views on recent Supreme Court decisions conflict with the views of most police officials.

H.R. 15439, a Bill To Freeze the Medicare Premiums

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, just last month Congress enacted a benefit increase for the almost 24 million Americans who receive a social security check each month. These increases ranged from 13 to 25 percent and they will show up in the checks for February which these people will receive about March 3. This increase is not enough, but it is desperately needed, especially by the millions of older people who depend primarily on their social security checks to meet their bills every day.

But what the older people of this country have not been told yet, Mr. Speaker, is the decrease which will be made in their checks which are sent out on April 3. The nearly 18 million aged who participate in the part B program of medicare will have an additional dollar deducted from their checks beginning with that month. This will bring the total deduction to $4 a month. This may sound like a small amount to some people, but to retired people trying to stretch fixed incomes eroded by inflation this is not a small amount.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this additional deduction reduces the increase we just passed by almost 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action now to avoid this situation. We should not expect the older people of this country to bear the burden of the runaway inflation in the medical services area. To meet this problem, I am, today, introducing a bill to freeze the social security pensioner's share of the part B premium at the present $3. I urge all Members of the House to support this important legislation and to take immediate action so that when the third of April comes around 18 million older people will not see the benefit increase which they received the month before, and which was delayed so long; decreased by a dollar.

Moreover, it is very likely that the premium will be increased again next year and that, too, will have to come out of the benefit increase which will be effective with the March checks. Let me point out, also, that older people have until April 1, 1968, to decide whether to sign up for this program, if they had not already signed up. Since the premium has gone up by one-third, and shows signs of going up further next year, many older people may come to the conclusion that they just cannot afford the program. To the extent that this is the case, medicare coverage of doctors' fees will be an empty promise.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I urge widespread and immediate support of my bill to freeze the present $3 figure. The aged of this country just cannot afford any more than that.

Task Force on Western Alliances

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 90th Congress just past, 15 Republican Congressmen supplemented their daily assigned legislative duties with the study of U.S. foreign policy on matters affecting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization of American States. These Congressmen, as members of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances, expressed their conclusions and recommendations in published statements. The committee was organized under the auspices of the House Republican Conference Committee on Planning and Research. In the future the committee will be called a Task Force.

In all, 14 statements were issued.

The studies revealed that the administration, at best, has been callous in its treatment of U.S. allies. In its dealings with NATO, the United States seems bent on sacrificing the needs and interests of its trusted friends in the hope of reaching an arrangement of dubious value with the Soviet Union.

All this generated a lack of confidence in the aims and aspirations of the United States, and because of it the administration has failed to inspire cooperation so that the resources of these allies could be used to strengthen the entire free world community.

A summary of our most significant statements follows:

On April 6, the committee traced the controversy over the Latin American resolution to the President's attempt to turn Congress into a rubberstamp by forcing hasty action on an ambiguous resolution overemphasizing money. This—not attitudes toward the Latin American allies—motivated dissent.

The committee expressed hope that Latin American economic integration and social achievement would progress. In this context, it suggested that the United States be prepared to encourage and assist the Latin American countries to set up a common market—without proposing or foreclosing U.S. participation. This could be done without altering hopes for broadening the world trade community.

It concluded by urging that a healthy

environment for private foreign investment be created in Latin America and that the channels and institutions for multilateral assistance be strengthened.

On April 21, the committee demanded congressional open hearings on questions raised by the proposed nuclear nonproliferation treaty. These hearings would seek answers and encourage debate on questions such as the foreclosing of NATO-wide cooperation in nuclear technology and defense, and the credibility of the U.S. commitment to NATO if also obligated to defend many other nations against nuclear attack. These matters would be difficult to explore after the treaty is presented for ratification.

On May 19 the committee urged President Johnson to reaffirm the United States' "NATO commitment to Greece" while at the same time expressing hope for an early return to constitutional processes there. This initiative would help repair the damage done by a qualification of our NATO commitment to Turkey during the Cyprus crisis of 1964.

Both of these episodes—the Turkish threat to invade Cyprus in 1964 to protect its former nationals, and the recent military takeover of the Greek Government—reveal an organic weakness in the structure of NATO. As so clearly stated in the official NATO handbook—1965 edition—"The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was not established to defend geographically homogeneous territory but was established primarily to defend a way of life."

The committee expressed hope that the group recently created by the North Atlantic Council to make a thorough study of the Alliance would give this its careful attention.

On June 11, the committee recommended immediate action to establish a North Atlantic Assembly and give it official status in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This would improve exchange of ideas and contribute to the solidarity of the Alliance. In so doing, the committee recounted the many efforts to accomplish this since 1953.

On June 29 the committee asserted that the United States must avoid a "Suez-like disaster in Central America" and must not, by hasty action on new treaties, allow subversive communism to flourish.

On July 5, after assessing the results of the nonproliferation treaty negotiations, our committee suggested that the best course of action might be to withdraw the treaty and start anew. This would strengthen NATO by utilizing it as the forum in which terms of the treaty would be determined before further consultation with the Soviets.

The committee also took this occasion to urge closing—in collaboration with the NATO allies—of the ABM gap.

On June 13, July 5, and August 14, the committee issued a series of statements that formed an in-depth examination of the NATO alliance. The committee explored attitudes, reviewed past action and then put forward a far-reaching program for revitalizing the alliance. The study showed that the alliance was rapidly deteriorating and that bold imaginative steps were needed to infuse it with new life.

In the June 13 statement, the committee noted that political realities have changed since NATO's inception. Europe has prospered and the Soviet military threat has taken a subtle form. The statement emphasized that the United States must reconcile the move toward detente and closer East-West relations with a strong, reliable NATO. This can be done only through joint discussion, decision and coordination of action. There must be a recognition by the United States that regardless of its commitments in other parts of the world, NATO is still paramount to the U.S. interest.

On July 5, we issued a statement documenting actions which contributed to the deterioration of NATO. The record included the unilateral and abrupt strategy change of the United States from "massive retaliation" to "flexible response"; the inability of the United States to harmonize Western policy toward Africa and Asia; the abortive Skybolt project; dislodgment of U.S. missiles in Turkey; and the MFL and other acts reflecting U.S. indifference to NATO.

On August 14, the committee presented constructive alternatives that could give new meaning to the alliance. These were—

To establish a NATO Strategy Council to give Europe a genuine role in determining NATO defense policy and nuclear deterrence.

To revitalize the NATO Council as the principal instrument for allied political decisionmaking.

To broaden the Council's responsibility to include more matters of common interest; for example, East-West trade, disarmament.

To revise NATO targets, quotas, and force levels.

To attempt to harmonize defense policies and budgets.

To consider more equitable distribution of NATO command positions.

To grant official status to the North Atlantic Assembly.

To set up machinery for the collection and review of intelligence material.

To clarify U.S. nuclear defense policy toward Europe.

The overall objective should be to make NATO a relevant instrument for inter-allied accommodation and decision.

On August 21 the Committee released a comprehensive analysis on the renegotiation of the Panama Canal Treaty concluding that approval of new treaties was premature.

The Committee deplored the secrecy surrounding the proposed treaties and recommended that before consideration be given to the treaty, the final report of the study commission should be issued with full public disclosure of all proposals of the negotiators. This would allow for intelligent public dialog on the issue.

The study included a history of the canal from 1850 to the present, excerpts from unofficial copies of the proposed treaties, and opinions of prominent leaders and groups.

On November 6, the committee recommended that the United States fully explore with NATO allies the possibility of a NATO ABM system, warning that pressing ahead with a "thin" system without NATO consultation could rupture the alliance. To prevent this calamity it is essential that the United States seek to share with its allies the development of a NATO ABM system serving the entire community on the basis of cooperative funding and construction.

In addition to the statements, the committee conferred with former President Eisenhower at Gettysburg and with Secretary Rusk at the Department of State. The chairman also served as a U.S. delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly.

Members of the committee were Representative Paul Findley, of Illinois, chairman, and Representatives E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; William O. Cowger, of Kentucky, William C. Cramer, of Florida, Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan, Seymour Halpern, of New York, Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah, William S. Mailliard, of California, Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland, Alexander Pirnie, of New York, Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota, William V. Roth, of Delaware, Herman Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio, and Larry Winn, Jr., of Kansas. The committee is indebted to the staff members of various congressional offices and committees who provided valuable research and other assistance. These include Everett Bierman, Harold Eberle, Robert Gaston, Stanley Langland, Pierre Purves, William Reisinger, Bill van den Toorn and Don Zahn. Col. John Mathews and Gail Werner served as the committee staff.

Grumman Leads the Way

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, much is said but too little is done to bring disadvantaged persons into the mainstream of our economy through the provision of good jobs.

Recently on Long Island lip service was traded for real service as Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., located in my district, took to the road. Grumman took to the road to recruit employees from predominately Negro communities. As is the pattern throughout the country the incidence of unemployment is higher in these communities than on the rest of Long Island.

I wish to commend Grumman for this fine program that demonstrates a sense of public responsibility combined with a committment to true equal opportunity.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the Record an editorial from the January 31 issue of Newsday commending Grumman for this giant step forward:

> Equal opportunity is a pleasant slogan, and the law requires it, but it takes more than a slogan to convince deprived Negroes that they can fill jobs in industry. Someone has to seek them out.
>
> In this area, the initiative has been shared by the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.

with Koppers Corp., a Farmingdale firm. Grumman on Saturday will send recruiters into Wyandanch and North Amityville, both predominantly Negro communities. The purpose is to provide unskilled workers and trainees with about 75 jobs starting at $2 per hour. Koppers already has undertaken a similar program.

The recruitment program of both firms is a hopeful sign. Other big companies should follow suit to draw in Negroes, Puerto Ricans and underprivileged whites who from lack of information draw back from applying for jobs.

Legislation To Aid Potato Growers

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, my district lies in California's San Joaquin Valley, one of the most fertile areas in the world. One of our most important crops is potatoes.

The potato growers of California have joined with their counterparts across the Nation in deciding that it is time to aggressively promote the virtues of their nutritious, low-calorie crop.

I have filed a bill, H.R. 15197, to enable the potato growers in every State to join together to finance a coordinated research and promotion program to expand their market. Such a voluntary program to improve the competitive position of the potato grower is in the best tradition of our free enterprise system. I hope that we will be able to give this matter our prompt consideration.

I insert this bill at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 15197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Potatoes are a basic food in the United States. They are produced by many individual potato growers in every State in the United States. In 1966, there were one million four hundred and ninety-seven thousand acres of cropland in the United States devoted to the production of potatoes. Approximately two hundred and seventy-five million hundredweight of potatoes have been produced annually during the past five years with an estimated sales value to the potato producers of $561,000,000.

Potatoes and potato products move, in a large part, in the channels of interstate commerce, and potatoes which do not move in such channels directly burden or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products. All potatoes produced in the United States are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products.

The maintenance and expansion of existing potato markets and the development of new or improved markets are vital to the welfare of potato growers and those concerned with marketing, using, and processing potatoes as well as the general economic welfare of the Nation.

Therefore, it is the declared policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act that it is essential in the public interest, through the exercise of the powers provided herein, to authorize the establishment of an orderly procedure for the financing, through adequate assessments on all potatoes harvested in the United States for commercial use, and the carrying out of an effective and continuous coordinated program of research and development, or advertising and promotion designed to strengthen potatoes' competitive position, and to maintain and expand domestic and foreign markets for potatoes produced in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other entity.

(c) The term "potatoes" means all varieties of Irish potatoes grown by producers in the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States.

(d) The term "handler" means any person who handles potatoes except a common or contract carrier of potatoes owned by another person.

(e) The term "handle" means to transport or sell potatoes or otherwise place potatoes in the current of commerce; except that the sale of unharvested potatoes and the transfer or delivery of potatoes from the farm on which they are produced to a temporary storage facility, packing shed, or processing plant shall not be considered handling.

(f) The term "producer" means any person engaged in the growing of five or more acres of potatoes.

(g) The term "promotion" means any action taken by the National Potato Promotion Board, pursuant to this Act, to present a favorable image for potatoes to the public with the express intent of improving their competitive positions and stimulating sales of potatoes and shall include, but shall not be limited to, paid advertising.

AUTHORITY TO ISSUE A PLAN

SEC. 4. to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, issue and from time to time amend, orders applicable to persons engaged in the handling of potatoes (hereinafter referred to as handlers) and shall have authority to issue orders authorizing the collection of assessments on potatoes handled under the provisions of this Act, and to authorize the use of such funds to provide research, development, advertising and promotion of potatoes in a manner prescribed in this Act. Any order issued by the Secretary under this Act shall hereinafter in this Act be referred to as a "plan". Any such plan shall be applicable to potatoes produced in the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States.

NOTICE AND HEARING

SEC. 5. When sufficient evidence is presented to the Secretary by potato producers, or whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that a plan will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, he shall give due notice and opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed plan. Such hearing may be requested by potato producers or by any other interested person or persons, including the Secretary, when the request for such hearing is accompanied by a proposal for a plan.

FINDING AND ISSUANCE OF A PLAN

SEC. 6. After notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue a plan if he finds, and sets forth in such plan, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing, that the issuance of such plan and all the terms and conditions or modifications thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to make such regulations with the force and effect of law, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and the powers vested in him by this Act.

REQUIRED TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 8. Any plan issued pursuant to this Act shall contain the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing for the establishment by the Secretary of a National Potato Promotion Board (hereinafter referred to as "the board") and for defining its powers and duties, which shall include powers—

(1) to administer such plan in accordance with its terms and conditions;

(2) to make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and conditions of such plan;

(3) to receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations of such plan; and

(4) to recommend to the Secretary amendments to such plan.

(b) Providing that the board shall be composed of representatives of producers selected by the Secretary from nominations made by producers in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. In the event producers fail to select nominees for appointment to the board, the Secretary shall appoint producers on the basis of representation provided for in such plan.

(c) Providing that board members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in performing their duties as members of the board.

(d) Providing that the board shall prepare and submit to the Secretary for his approval a budget, on a fiscal period basis, of its anticipated expenses and disbursements in the administration of the plan, including probable costs of research, development, advertising, and promotion.

(e) Providing that the board shall recommend to the Secretary and the Secretary shall fix the assessment rate required for such costs as may be incurred pursuant to subsection (d) of this section; but in no event shall the assessment rate exceed 1 cent per one hundred pounds of potatoes handled.

(f) Providing that—

(1) funds collected by the board shall be used for research, development, advertising, or promotion of potatoes and potato products and such other expenses for the administration, maintenance, and functioning of the board as may be authorized by the Secretary;

(2) no advertising or sales promotion program shall make any reference to private brand names or use false or unwarranted claims in behalf of potatoes of their products or false or unwarranted statements with respect to the attributes or use of any competing products; and

(3) no funds collected by the board shall in any manner be used for the purpose of influencing governmental policy or action.

(g) Providing that, nowithstanding any other provisions of this Act, any potato producer against whose potatoes any assessment is made and collected under authority of this Act and who is not in favor of supporting the promotion program as provided for under this Act shall have the right to demand and receive from the board a refund of such assessment: *Provided*, That such demand shall be made by such producer as prescribed by the board and approved by the Secretary, and upon proof satisfactory to the board that such assessment, for which refund is sought, was deducted from settlement on such producer's potatoes or was otherwise paid by him.

(h) Providing that the board shall, subject to the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of this section, develop and submit to the Secretary for his approval any advertising or sales promotion or research and development plans or projects, and that any such plan or project must be approved by the Secretary before becoming effective.

(i) Providing the board with authority to enter into contracts or agreements, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and carrying out of research and development projects or promotion and advertising activities and the payment of the cost thereof with funds collected pursuant to this Act.

(j) Providing that the board shall maintain books and records and prepare and submit to the Secretary such reports from time to time as may be prescribed for appropriate accounting with respect to the receipt and disbursement of funds entrusted to it and cause a complete audit report to be submitted to the Secretary at the end of each fiscal period.

(k) Providing that the board shall report to the Secretary unpaid assessments after diligent effort has been made by the board to collect such assessments.

PERMISSIVE TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 9. Any plan issued pursuant to this Act may contain one or more of the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing authority to exempt from the provisions of the plan potatoes used for nonfood uses, and authority for the board to require satisfactory safeguards against improper use of such exemptions.

(b) Providing for authority to designate different handler payment and reporting schedules to recognize differences in marketing practices and procedures utilized in different production areas.

(c) Providing for the establishment, issuance, effectuation, and administration of appropriate programs or projects for the advertising and sales promotion of potatoes and potato products and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes: *Provided, however*, That any such program or project shall be directed toward increasing the general demand for potatoes and potato products: *And provided further*, That such promotional activities shall comply with the provisions of section 6(f) of this Act.

(d) Providing for establishing and carrying on research and development projects and studies to the end that the marketing and utilization of potatoes may be encouraged, expanded, improved, or made more efficient, and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes.

(e) Providing for authority to accumulate reserve funds from assessments collected pursuant to this Act, to permit an effective and continuous coordinated program of research and development or advertising and promotion in years when the production and assessment income may be reduced: *Provided*, That the total reserve fund does not exceed the amount budgeted for two years' operation.

(f) Providing for authority to use funds collected herein, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and expansion of potato and potato product sales in foreign markets.

(g) Terms and conditions incidental to and not inconsistent with the terms and conditions specified in this Act and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such plan.

ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) The first handler of potatoes shall be responsible, under the provisions of this Act and any plan issued pursuant to it, for payment to the board of any assessments levied on potatoes; and such handler may collect from any producer or deduct from the proceeds paid to any producer, on whose potatoes such assessment is made, any such assessment required to be paid by such handler. Such handler shall maintain a separate record with respect to each producer for whom potatoes were handled, and such records shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes handled by him including those handled for producers and for himself, shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes handled by him which are included under the terms of a plan as well as those which are exempt under such plan, and shall indicate such other information as may be prescribed by the board.

(b) Handlers responsible for collection of assessments under subsection (a) of this section shall maintain and make available for inspection by the Secretary such books and records as required by the plan and file reports at the times, in the manner, and having the content prescribed by the plan, to the end that information and data shall be made available to the board and to the Secretary which is appropriate or necessary to the effectuation, administration, or enforcement of this Act or of any plan or regulation issued pursuant to this Act.

(c) All information obtained pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section and section 14 shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and of the board, and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary, or to which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the plan with reference to which the information to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit—

(1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of handlers subject to a plan if such statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or

(2) the publication by direction of the Secretary of the name of any person violating any plan together with a statement of the particular provisions of the plan violated by such person.

Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this subsection shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, and shall be removed from office.

PETITION AND REVIEW

SEC. 11. (a) Any person subject to a plan may file a written petition with the Secretary, stating that such plan or any provision of such plan or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition, in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final, if in accordance with law.

(b) The district courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction to review such ruling: *Provided*, That a complaint for that purpose is filed within twenty days from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in its opinion, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not impede, hinder, or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 12(a) of this Act.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 12. (a) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any plan or regulation made or issued pursuant to this Act.

(b) Any handler who willfully violates any provisions of any plan issued by the Secretary under this Act, or who willfully fails or refuses to remit any assessment or fee duly required of him thereunder shall be subject to criminal prosecution and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $1,000 for each such offense which shall accrue to the United States and in addition shall be subject to civil suit brought by the United States to collect any unpaid assessments levied under this Act.

INVESTIGATION AND POWER TO SUBPOENA

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary may make such investigations as he deems necessary for the effective carrying out of his responsibilities under this Act or to determine whether a handler or any other person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices, which constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued under this Act. For the purpose of any such investigation, the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, and documents which are relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to, any person, including a handler, the Secretary may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; and such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Secretary, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(b) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, and documents before the Secretary, or in obedience to the subpoena of the Secretary, or in any cause or proceeding, criminal or otherwise, based upon, or growing out of any alleged violation of this Act, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued thereunder on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that any individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of potatoes for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of a plan is approved or favored by producers. No plan issued pursuant to this Act shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such plan is approved or favored by not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in such referendum, or by the producers of not less than two-thirds of the potatoes produced during the representative period by producers voting in such referendum. The ballots and other information or reports which reveal or tend to reveal the vote of any producer or his production of potatoes shall be held strictly confidential and shall not be disclosed. Any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture violating the provisions hereof shall upon conviction be subject to the penalties provided in paragraph 10(c) above.

SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF PLANS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary shall, whenever he finds that a plan or any provision thereof, obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, terminate or suspend the operation of such plan or such provision thereof.

(b) The Secretary may conduct a referendum at any time and shall hold a referendum on request of the board or of 10 per centum or more of the potato producers to determine if potato producers favor the termination or suspension of the plan, and he shall terminate or suspend such plan at the end of the marketing year whenever he determines that such suspension or termination is favored by a majority of those voting in a referendum, and who produce more than 50 per centum of the volume of the potatoes produced by the potato producers voting in the referendum.

AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

SEC. 16. The provisions of this Act applicable to plans shall be applicable to amendments to plans.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 18. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; but no funds so appropriated shall be used for the payment of any expenses or expenditures of the board in administering any provision of any plan issued under authority of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 19. This Act shall take effect upon enactment and may be cited as the Potato Research and Promotion Act.

If This Is Victory

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Vietnam have raised serious questions regarding the effects our military efforts are having, the capacity and willingness of South Vietnam to defend herself, and the future of that nation once the fighting ceases.

These issues were analyzed in a penetrating and perceptive column in today's New York Times by Washington bureau chief Tom Wicker. I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues, for these questions are of burning importance to all of us in Congress and to the American people:

IN THE NATION: FIREPOWER VERSUS SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The sad truth of Vietnam has seldom been clearer than it is in the decision by the American military command to "use all the firepower needed" to root Communist forces out of Hue and other Vietnamese cities.

So, as The Associated Press describes the situation, "Heavy bombs, aircraft rockets, naval gunfire, napalm, tear gas and all the usual ground weapons from eight-inch howitzers to tank guns" are being used in heavily populated city areas and—in Hue—against the historic inner city Citadel, from which Vietnamese imperial governments once ruled.

MISERY COMPOUNDED

American military men are not happy about this; they know the result is bound to be thousands upon thousands of homeless refugees adding to the limitless weight of human misery in Vietnam, as well as rising totals of civilian dead and wounded.

"It is a terrible thing to have to do, but we have to do it," a marine officer said of the decision to use "all the firepower needed" against parts of Hue held by the North Vietnamese.

There appear to be two reasons why that officer and his superiors believe they "have to do it." The first is a shortage of manpower in the area around Hue and in the northern provinces generally, a shortage mostly due to the opposing concentrations of forces at Khesanh. This manpower shortage means that the Americans and South Vietnamese cannot root out the North Vietnamese and Vietcong invaders without heavy dependence upon the sheer destructive force of American firepower.

The second reason is that nothing less than victory, in these situations, is considered acceptable. "We could not permit them to believe that they could seize populated areas and escape our firepower," an American official explained. If they could do that, they would obviously take advantage of the opportunity.

This is not, therefore, a mindless unloosing of violence by American soldiers; it is what they see as a necessary evil, and one in which the drearily militaristic South Vietnamese Government concurs fully.

But if the situation is viewed in something other than military terms, it appears quite different. How is the Saigon Government, for instance, ever going to win the "hearts and minds" of its people if it not only approves the American destruction of South Vietnamese cities but—according to press reports—actually wants the Americans to do the job more quickly with even more firepower?

A SAD COMMENTARY

What kind of a commentary upon this extraordinary "Government," and upon the years of American assistance, is it if the insurgents not only can seize these urban areas by surprise, but can hold them with such desperate and deadly tenacity that the only alternative is to destroy the cities themselves?

Even if the destruction of their homes, businesses and treasured places fills South Vietnamese hearts with gratitude toward Saigon, have the authorities in that city or their American supporters shown any ability to cope with the thousands of refugees, the wounded, the sick and the helpless, who existed in South Vietnam even before the Vietcong winter offensive began in the cities?

The inescapable facts are that the South Vietnamese Government and its American ally were unable to protect the cities and their populations to begin with. When the attacks came, they proved unable to overcome them without the destruction of whole areas and the mass production of dead and homeless civilians. And when all the firepower has done its deadly work, neither Saigon nor Washington will be anywhere near able to take care of the human tide of misery and despair that will be the result.

IF THIS BE VICTORY

If this is a victory for Saigon, a defeat would be too terrible to behold. If this is what President Johnson demands that Americans stand and fight for, what heartbreaking tragedy must happen before he realizes that fighting alone cannot vindicate his policy?

The sad and terrible truth of the decision to blow up South Vietnam's cities in order to defend them is that neither Washington nor Saigon has anything to rely on but firepower. With that, they can destroy South Vietnam, but they can never save it from Communism, or anything else.

National Conference of Christians and Jews Honors H. E. S. Reeves

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, each year, the National Conference of Christians and Jews selects a citizen of Miami, Fla., to receive the Special Brotherhood Award for outstanding civic and humanitarian achievements. This year's award recipient is Mr. H. E. S. Reeves, editor of the Miami Times. The conference chose wisely indeed in recognizing such an exceptional citizen and fine individual.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following news article about Mr. Reeves and his accomplishments. I know that you will join with me in saluting the career of an outstanding civic leader:

BROTHERHOOD AWARD FOR EDITOR REEVES

A Special Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews will be made to Henry E. S. Reeves at the Annual Brotherhood Dinner February 20, at the Fontainebleau Hotel in Miami Beach, Co. Mitchell Wolfson, the Awards Chairman announced.

Previous recipients are Sister Dorothy, President of Barry College, Senator Harry P. Cain and Father Theodore M. Gibson.

It was nearly a half century ago that Mr. Reeves founded the first newspaper primarily devoted to the social, religious and business interests of the Dade County Negro Communities.

Today's resultant weekly, "The Miami Times," has never missed a publication date, despite all of the legendary emergencies of pioneer printing.

Mr. Reeves, at the age of (84) eighty-four has many years of dedicated service behind him. Now semi-retired, he serves in an advisory capacity every morning at the newspaper of which he is still publisher, and where his son, Garth, is Editor-in-Chief. He also serves as Assistant Minister at the Church of the Incarnation.

Mr. Reeves has received citations from many organizations including: The Florida Teachers' Association, the Dade County Community Chest, the American Cancer Society, the Advisory Board of Registration and the Ambassadors of Goodwill for the State of Florida.

In 1966 Variety Children's Hospital tendered Mr. Reeves a testimonial dinner and presented him with the Variety Children's Hospital Volunteer of Valor Award. At the same time the late Mayor of Miami, Robert King High, presented him with an award in "Recognition of two decades of untiring and devoted community service." Last year, Mr. Reeves received the Distinguished Editor

Award from the National Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Mr. Reeves has contributed his time and energy to many community and civic organizations including: Chairman of the Carver Branch of the YMCA, Vice-Chairman of the Greater Miami Urban League, Vice-Chairman of the local branch of the USO, District Chairman of the Community Chest, Chairman and Member of the Christian Hospital Board of Directors, Director of the Advisory Board of Registration and Director of the Senior Citizens' Clubs.

In addition to Garth, Mr. Reeves has four daughters: Hazel, Clarice, Doreen and Frances, all teachers in the Dade County Public School System.

Student Reporters in Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, no war in our national history has been better reported to the American people than has the present war in Vietnam. Perhaps because of this exhaustive general coverage, our interest in that war is aroused but often left unsatisfied.

It is in this sense that I especially value the journalistic contribution currently being made by the Queens College Phoenix which sent two student reporters to Vietnam. Readers of the Phoenix now have the rare opportunity to evaluate on-the-spot student views of the Vietnam conflict.

It is my hope that the reports of Mr. Lee Dembart and Mr. Ralph Palafino can probe beyond the official press releases which form much of the substance of what we read and hear about this war, and that they can bring to bear the very special perspectives of students on what they will see in Vietnam. If they can do these things, they will have performed a magnificent and most necessary service for all of us.

Their first dispatches from the Queens College Phoenix Vietnam bureau follow. Subsequent articles will be reprinted in the RECORD as they are received by my office:

(By Ralph Paladino)

SAIGON, February 4, 1968.—The Communist attack on the capital of South Vietnam began on the second day of the Chinese New Year. Simultaneously, dozens of major government and American installations in and around Saigon were attacked by small bands of well-armed Viet Cong with orders to capture and hold until relieved. The relief never came. Within 72 hours, two-thirds of the attackers were dead or captured, the rest routed.

Within seconds of one-another, troops attacking the Presidential Palace were spotted by Korean guards in front of the nearby Ambassador's home, a powerful explosion damaged the Philippine Embassy, a 19-man suicide squad breached the outer wall of the American Embassy and was able to capture a portion of the building, the Vietnamese radio station was destroyed, numerous police stations were attacked, and Tan Son Nhut Airbase, a few miles outside the city, was fired upon. Throughout the entire South, similar attacks were in progress with varying degrees of success.

It seems clear that there were three purposes in carrying out this concerted attack on most of the major population centers of the country: to score enough significant military victories as possible to force a coalition government on the South, to demonstrate to the people of the large cities, who are losing their fear of the Communists, that the Viet Cong are still around and powerful enough to strike anywhere, and to score as many propaganda points as possible against the U.S. at home and the rest of the world. They had some failures and some successes.

There is little doubt that the Viet Cong failed to achieve any significant military victories. In Saigon, only the attacks on the radio station and the American Embassy were successful. Captured areas of the city were retaken almost immediately. Military and police installations beat off the attackers without exception. Snipers were only a scattered inconvenience. In the remainder of Vietnam, captured areas of the provincial capitals were regained within hours, air bases continued to operate, with only one field damaged seriously. Over 12,000 Viet Cong were killed and 3,000 captured, a ratio of 12 to one over allied killed. Militarily, in fact, it was a complete rout.

It had been over six months since any of the major cities of the South have come under Viet Cong attack. Since the last major offensive, the government has strengthened its hold on the provincial capitals and through them, the people. It has legitimatized its rule through elections, and instituted some badly needed reforms throughout the country.

While only a small step, the people in the cities are for the first time being approached by government agents other than tax collectors. Some of the remoteness and apathy is breaking down, and the cities are not secure places for the Viet Cong. Suspected VC are regularly informed upon in the large cities today, while a year ago this was unheard of. And most important, the Viet Cong have not been able to retaliate in force against the informers.

The new radio and television nets that blanket Vietnam have played a large role in creating a sense of national identity—not as Vietnamese, but as South Vietnamese. For the first time, national heroes, popular actors and singers are creating some community in the South. The Viet Cong attack on the Saigon radio station and on a number of local radio stations in other parts of the country underline the fact that the Viet Cong realizes the threat the airwaves pose to them. American radio and TV, heard and watched by as many Vietnamese as Americans, are helping our national image and making more and more untenable the Viet Cong picture of Americans as imperialist oppressors.

Cholon in Saigon is populated by Vietnamese of Chinese extraction, and in an attempt to infiltrate successfully without fighting, the Viet Cong employed their members of similar ethnic background. Almost to a man they were identified by resident Chinese. When ARVN and American troops entered the city in force, the most fierce fighting in Saigon broke out. With the help of the local citizens, all the VC infiltraters were rooted out and hundreds killed in battle. Hundreds more attempted to exfiltrate in sampans and barges. Snipers in Saigon were captured or killed with the help of the Vietnamese who pointed out escape routes and building entrances to the police. General Weyand, Commander of the III Corps, estimated that ARVN carried 70% of the fighting load throughout the South, and accounted for 700 of 1,000 casualties.

The Viet Cong killed and wounded thousands of civilians in the three days of fighting. In Saigon there were two reported cases of Viet Cong using women and children as shields to make their escape out of the city. In Cholon they captured a children's hospital and used it as a stronghold. They overran a military compound outside of Saigon and executed the wives and children living in it. Snipers shot at civilians and soldiers alike.

Whatever else the Vietnamese feel about the Viet Cong, it is not fear. When the curfew was lifted for a few hours in the secure parts of the city, people and traffic cluttered the streets within minutes. While the Viet Cong may still be around, they seem to have lost their credibility. It is difficult to terrorize a people that simply does not take you seriously anymore.

Much has been made of the VC ability to attack and hold the American Embassy in Saigon, if only for a few hours. Banner headlines throughout the world press proclaim the lack of security that this indicates. Is it possible that with a half million troops in Vietnam, the United States cannot even protect its own Embassy from attack? The answer is that we did not try.

Only seven men guarded the Embassy on the night of the attack. The Viet Cong had no trouble approaching the grounds and blasting a hole in the wall surrounding the compound. The counterattack which occurred within minutes was slowed because of a lack of heavy weapons that might have destroyed valuable papers and buildings. But in a few hours, and without extensive damage (bullet holes in the walls and damage to the roof was the worst of it), the Embassy was recaptured and 19 enemy killed.

In the last six months American forces in Saigon have dropped from a high of 27,000 men to under 6,000, mostly administrative personnel. Protection of the city is almost entirely in the hands of municipal police. To protect Saigon totally from infiltration and attack would require an inordinate number of men, and even then could only be done by instituting police state methods of control. But if freedom is one of the issues of the war, then this is clearly not the solution. It is better to forego a degree of security. Security can only be attained by assuring the enemy that gains will be temporary and much too expensive.

Militarily, then, the attack on Saigon and the rest of the nation failed to meet its objective. The present government is still functioning and is in control as much as before the attack. What successes the Viet Cong did have were temporary and pyrrhic. The people have been reminded that the VC are still around but the attack is more likely to harden their opposition to the VC, and by default, strengthen the citizens' allegiance to the government. The only victory will be in the world press.

It is difficult to conceive that the United States can possibly be winning a war in which it cannot even protect its own Embassy from enemy attack. But it must be conceived, if the engagements of last week are any indication, the United States is winning. It should be more difficult to accept than the fact that at the height of the battle, planes were still using Tan Son Nuht Airbase, Americans and Vietnamese were walking the streets, Vietnam Radio stayed on the air from auxiliary transmitters, and the battles were watched from rooftops and windows. Vietnam was attacked, but it was never under siege.

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON, February 4, 1968.—We had thought that we would see some action during our three months in Vietnam. We didn't expect we would see it so quickly. The Viet Cong gave us a noisy, if not altogether receptive welcome less than 15 hours after our arrival here, as they began an all-out offensive in Saigon that included an attack on the Presidential Palace 100 yards from our hotel window.

Saigon is a sprawling city that shows both its French heritage and its rampant poverty. Well manicured parks and lawns offer a serene backdrop. Beggars, street urchins, and families living on cots in the middle of the sidewalk show that this is a destitute country. Barbed wire blockades show that it is a country at war.

The sun was hot and the air was dry as we stepped out of the plane at Tan Son Nhut International Airport. Less than 24 hours later, the field would be under constant mortar, artillery, and small arms fire, and hundreds of soldiers would lose their lives in the battle for the airbase. But all was quiet as we walked to the terminal and stood in line to clear immigration and customs.

It was Tet, the Oriental New Year, and flags, signs, and banners welcomed it. Firecrackers, sounding unnervingly like rifles, exploded around us as we walked through the downtown area to the U.S. and Vietnamese press offices.

Full-scale battles had erupted throughout the country except in the capital. Every major city from north to south was under attack. Signs in military installations warned that Charley was infiltrating Saigon, and that all personnel should take extreme caution. But on the streets it was Tet, and no one seemed concerned about an imminent onslaught.

At precisely 3 o'clock in the morning the celebration of Tet ended in Saigon. There were still fireworks, but now they were coming from grenades, rockets, bazookas, automatic weapons, and high-powered rifles. A tremendous explosion rocked the courtyard outside the hotel. Two more blasts and accompanying flashes brought us quickly from sleep to full consciousness.

The sharp cracks of rifles were answered by machine guns. Another explosion, closer to the hotel, and then quiet. But only long enough for us to think the worst. They were surely coming into the hotel, coming to blast down the doors, coming to machinegun us all.

And then more shooting outside. Mortar explosions. More automatic fire. Another brief pause.

For an hour the exchanges were broken only by the even more frightening quiet. Helicopters began dropping flares, casting an eerie glow over the scene, but not illuminating any of what was going on outside. Occasionally a close mortar explosion would cast dirt and debris against our fourth-floor window panes. Two of them would be broken by the gun battle the following day.

I tried sleeping. The firing continued outside. So did the explosions.

Daylight always has the advantage of making things seem more manageable. With the sun up, we had almost convinced ourselves that all the noise the night before had been nothing more than big firecrackers. We were still unaware of the extent of the fighting going on throughout the city. But the desk clerk warned us. "Be careful, sir," he said as we walked out. "There's shooting outside."

Only later in the day did we discover that the Viet Cong had attacked eight major areas in the city, including the American Embassy, and had taken over the Cholon section to the south. They were still firmly entrenched in the partially completed apartment building next to the hotel, having sought cover there when their attempt to storm the Palace met resistance during the night.

Four Viet Cong bodies lay in the street and were to remain there 36 hours until they began to rot in the heat. The apartment building was surrounded by Korean and ARVN troops who periodically exchanged machine gun fire with the Viet Cong fortress.

Reporters and amateur photographers swarmed over the area, taking cover behind walls and parked cars whenever the shooting resumed. Less courageous spectators took up positions on the roof and balconies of the hotel, occasionally peering over the barriers to see what was going on. Everyone took a periodic time-out to sit in the hotel bar, eat lunch, sip a beer, and discuss the progress outside.

Among the civilians on the scene, there was almost a picnic atmosphere, disrupted only by the necessity of walking past the corpses and the bombed out American jeep whose tires were still smoldering 12 hours after the vehicle had been hit by a Viet Cong grenade from the building. The driver had been killed instantly. The others escaped.

At nightfall, fighting continued heavy throughout the city, and marshal law and a 24-hour curfew had been imposed. The streets were completely deserted. And the Viet Cong still held the building despite the mortar and bazooka pounding it had sustained throughout the day.

Returning to our room with a view, we drew the curtains and prepared for a long night. Fortunately the heavy activity did not begin in earnest until 6 o'clock the following morning when the shelling and mortar attacks resumed. One fellow occupant of the hotel reported two bullets ricocheting into his room, but we escaped with two shattered windows.

Prices in the hotel restaurant began to soar with each meal. At lunch steak cost 300 piastres ($2.50). By dinner the price had climbed to 350 piastres ($3.00). Beer was now 90 piastres a can ($.75). A warm bottle of Coke was 50 piastres ($.40).

Reports from around the country said that the Viet Cong attack was being beaten back in all but a few northern cities. Enemy casualties were first held at 5,000 killed, later updated to 7,000, and finally put at near 13,000, "subject to adjustment when administrative reports are received."

Sniper fire was being felt throughout Saigon, so the curfew remained in effect. The few people whose jobs were considered essential received armed escorts to their offices. Everyone else stayed in or near their quarters, or risked being stopped by military or Saigon police. Rumors abounded, and the armed forces radio gave little or no concrete information beyond reminding everyone to stay inside and exercise caution.

By afternoon the last of the Viet Cong holding the neighboring apartment building had been killed, and civilians strolled casually through the area, taking pictures of the mangled corpses, inspecting the destroyed vehicles, and commenting among themselves about the daring or stupidity of soldiers willing to go into the place and try to hold it, knowing that they could not possibly get out.

Occasionally conversation focused on the Embassy attack. The Viet Cong had held the building for six hours before being killed, but had managed little significant damage. How important was it that they got in? Why weren't there more guards? Who was responsible? Are more troops needed? In the absence of facts, the answers were almost invariably based on what one already believed.

If the attack on Saigon had any purpose other than propaganda, it failed. If the Viet Cong hoped or expected a massive civilian uprising on their behalf, they were sorely disappointed. The fact that they flagrantly violated their own declared Tet cease fire to launch the campaign has hardened sentiment against them. Several acts of sheer terrorism were reported in the city. I saw pictures of one.

On the other hand, the publicity value of the strength and scope of the attacks will undoubtedly have widespread repurcussions. People are already talking about a greater commitment of U.S. troops in order to prevent such a campaign from being mounted in the future.

If these last few days were in fact the Big Effort by the Viet Cong, where they were willing to gamble everything in the hopes of another Dien Bien Phu, and there has been some talk that this was the case, then they have been defeated.

Military people here are predicting that the biggest blow is yet to come, and that it will come in the DNZ area in the not distant future.

If the casualty figures for the Viet Cong are anywhere near correct, and if they sustain similar losses in any "bigger" action yet to come, it would seem certain that they would have a difficult time rebuilding their forces, if in fact they could do it at all.

The U.S. command says it was taken by surprise by the intensity of this Viet Cong effort. But it responded quickly to the attack, and has been able thus far to push back the offensive. Militarily, the U.S. is not about to lose the war. From the looks of things, though, it seems that they're not about to win it either.

Private First Class Powell, 19, Killed in Viet by Rocket

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Larry K. Powell, a young man from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS POWELL, 19, KILLED IN VIET BY ROCKET

A Lexington Park marine was killed in Vietnam last week when an exploding rocket struck the Ontos recoilless-rifle carrier he was driving in Phua Thien province.

Pfc. Larry K. Powell, 19, was killed less than a month after returning to Vietnam after volunteering for a second tour of duty there.

He had spent eleven months there before returning home to Lexington Park for a month's leave December 8.

Mrs. Jessie D. Powell, his adoptive mother, said that fighting in Vietnam was "what he wanted to do—this was his life." Mrs. Powell is the wife of Walter R. Powell, Jr., a brother who reared Private Powell after his parents died.

Private Powell enlisted in the Marine Corps in July, 1966, and volunteered for Vietnam duty while still in boot camp. He had been planning to join the Marines since childhood and was looking forward to becoming a sergeant, Mrs. Powell said.

He told his brothers and sisters that he was fighting to protect them, she added.

It was after boot camp that he trained to drive an Ontos, a specialized vehicle that operates on tank-like tracks and carries six recoilless rifles. The vehicle's name comes from the Greek word for *thing*.

He was driving one as a member of a convoy when a rocket struck his column and he received head and stomach injuries, Mrs. Powell said.

Private Powell was born in Alma, Ark., and moved to Lexington Park when he was 9, attending schools there until he moved to Elwood, Ind., where he attended Elwood High School and was graduated.

He then worked for several months in a machine shop in Dallas before enlisting in the Marines.

Survivors include, besides Mr. and Mrs. Powell, two sisters, Deborah Lee Powell and Pamela Ann Powell, and another brother, Roger C. Powell, all of Lexington Park.

An Article by the Institute for American Democracy

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there are many private corporations in this country which are taking a greater interest in community and national affairs. I welcome that interest and believe it is of the utmost importance that it continue.

That interest and those community and national activities are quite different from the use of large amounts of corporate funds to put forth what is essentially a political point of view, which, in many instances, represents the radical right in this country—the antidemocratic forces which basically hope to subvert democracy. Such a program seems now to be undertaken by the Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies. Extensive use of funds for essentially political purposes by publicly held corporations is a serious danger. Company stockholders are not consulted in decisions to use funds in this manner. Moreover, these expenditures are tax-exempt. It is another loophole for the wealthy to avoid paying their share of taxes. Thus, all of us pay a little to propagate one man's views.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article printed by the Institute for American Democracy, a reputable organization:

SCHICK SETS MILLION DOLLAR PRECEDENT—DOUBLE-EDGED DOLLARS BUILD POLITICAL CLIMATE

Where does a publicly-held company draw the line in using its advertising dollars to advance the ideological viewpoint of its top executive?

So far as the stockholders in Patrick J. Frawley's Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies are concerned, that is a million-dollar question. By his own lights, Frawley sets a sterling example in using the tax-deductible advertising dollars to help mold the political climate.

Item—The newest entry in the super-conservative magazine field is *Twin Circle*. One of the editors is Father Daniel Lyons. The *Twin Circle* Publishing Company is a Schick subsidiary, and the first eight issues carried full page Schick ads. The page rate is $1,260. Promised circulation is 100,000.

Item—Father Lyons' daily 5-minute opinion radio program, aired over 20 stations, is Schick-sponsored. The program was launched last July. IAD's projection places the 1967 cost to Schick at about $53,092.

Item—Schick and/or Technicolor are running two full-page ads in each monthly issue of *Triumph*, appealing to approximately the same audience as *Twin Circle*. (See December Home-Front.) The cost for last year: approximately $13,400.

Item—*Rally*, the newest magazine aimed at youth (sworn circulation 4,200) has had three full-page ads from Frawley's companies in each of its twelve 1967 issues. Cost compiled from the rate card: $12,275.

Item—The rerun of the Ronald Reagan-narrated TV spectacular, "Freedom's Finest Hour" to a nationwide audience last December cost Schick approximately $300,000, according to IAD projections.

The program is well-done, and probably pulled a good audience, but since Frawley headed the Southern California committee which raised money going into the Reagan's 1966 TV campaign spots, a cynic might suspect that Frawley was killing two birds with one tax-deductible stone.

IAD's estimates, based on rate cards and information supplied by publishers, place the Schick-Technicolor expenditures in the conservative *National Review* at $36,732 and the Radical Right *Drake's Freedom Press* at $1,627, and *Wanderer* at $3,952. *Human Events* got about $1,000 in Schick ad money while YAF's *New Guard* received two full-page ads for 10 consecutive issues, a $10,613 item.

Senator Thomas Dodd and Congressman Walter Judd credit Frawley and Schick with the public service grant making possible their American Security Council "Washington Report" series, termed the largest daily radio program in the U.S. radio. The emphasis of this is on the international Communist threat. A 1966 *Wall Street Journal* story pegged the annual cost to Schick at $390,000 plus another $6,373 grant for Commentator Dodd's salary. No report on 1967 totals as yet available.

The same *Wall Street Journal* story listed Schick annual grants of $5,000 each to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation (star member: right wing author Phyllis Schlafly); Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Those touring moral re-armament "Up With People" teenage show troups got a Schick grant of $150,000 according to the *Journal*, and Frawley's picture appears on the cover of the "Up" record. The 36 full-page ads in MRA's *Pace* magazine in 1967 represent another $43,515, according to the rate card.

Schick also sponsored a 1967 $100,000 Business Citizenship Award essay contest beamed at advertising agencies with the top prize going to a member of Sen. Strom Thurmond's staff.

Some of the Schick advertising dollars and grants go to organizations and publications which are merely rather conservative, but some to operations considerably to the right. They reflect Frawley's preoccupation with Communism to the exclusion of other problems. They all have some impact on American attitudes.

If you are one viewing Paul Harvey's "Commentary" as helping create the mood which can lead to a big political shift, then the IAD-estimated $939,000 it takes for Schick to alternate sponsorship of Harvey's daily 5-minute commentary on 425 ABC stations also emerges as a double-edged investment. —C. R. B.

First 1968 Report to Congressman Wolff's Constituency

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, periodically I report to the residents of New York's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in Congress, on congressional actions and my position on major issues. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include my first report of 1968 in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 1968.

DEAR FRIEND: As the second session of the 90th Congress settles down to work, it is appropriate that as your elected representative I report to you on my work in Congress during the past year and comment on what we might expect this year.

Vietnam continues to be the all pervading issue here in Washington, as well as throughout the world. Everything that came before Congress during 1967 was considered in light of the extensive and expensive American presence in Vietnam. I will have more to say on this predominant issue later.

Government spending continued unabated last year. I have attempted to achieve a halt in non-essential federal spending. I am opposed to a tax increase because I believe we can eliminate the need for a surcharge.

However, there are urgent problems at home that cannot be overlooked nor postponed even while we are engaged in hostilities abroad.

In reflecting on the eleven and a half months first session of the 90th Congress, I see the visions and ideals of the 89th Congress were sorely lacking. There were serious backward steps on domestic programs. During the past year the effect of a negative coalition in Congress resulted in many problems, including the following:

Congress's very grave failure to reclaim its prerogatives regarding the war in Vietnam.

The House of Representative's failure to enact reasonable cuts in non-essential spending, proposed by a fiscally responsible, bipartisan membership. (For example the four billion dollar Public Works "Pork Barrel" Bill should have been cut substantially. There are many other projects that could be postponed while we attack other urgent problems here at home.)

Continuation of excessive farm subsidies, to the tune of almost three billion dollars, that place a double burden on you, the taxpayer. First you pay for the subsidy and then you are taxed by the inexcusably high price of food.

Congress failed to recognize that social and educational advancement are necessary to avoid the danger of a "welfare state" to which we are all opposed. There was too little, too late funding of educational programs thereby impeding the transition of many Americans from the welfare rolls to the tax rolls.

A severe and undue delay in major legislation and appropriations that left important programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs and impeded their effectiveness.

Duplicate funding for our military and civilian space programs. Since these programs are redundant, we must curtail the duplication and save billions of dollars.

Although generally disappointed by the first session of the 90th Congress, I did see some bright spots. I would cite:

Congressional determination in heading off a tax increase. (As I indicated in my newsletter last fall, I continue to oppose a tax increase and suggest non-essential spending cuts as an alternative.)

Reasonable and responsible cuts in the civilian space budget.

Positive strides in pollution control and conservation. (I am especially concerned about this since we must not permit Long Island to become a big ball of earth tied together by ribbons of concrete.)

Substantial increases in veterans' pensions and social security to protect our senior citizens with fixed incomes from being forced onto the welfare rolls as prices continue to climb.

These, then, are some of the highlights of the first session. Now I would like to comment on certain areas of concern to you and advise you of my actions in these areas.

FRENCH POLICY AND FRANCE'S WORLD WAR I DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES

It has been said that I am conducting a one-man war against deGaulle. I doubt that is so since I have had thousands of encouraging letters from across the country. Also more than 135 Members of Congress are co-rene backdrop. Beggars, street urchins, and families living on cots in the middle of the sidewalk show that this is a destitute country. Barbed wire blockades show that it is a country at war.

The sun was hot and the air was dry as we stepped out of the plane at Tan Son Nhut International Airport. Less than 24 hours later, the field would be under constant mortar, artillery, and small arms fire, and hundreds of soldiers would lose their lives in the battle for the airbase. But all was quiet as we walked to the terminal and stood in line to clear immigration and customs.

It was Tet, the Oriental New Year, and flags, signs, and banners welcomed it. Firecrackers, sounding unnervingly like rifles, exploded around us as we walked through the downtown area to the U.S. and Vietnamese press offices.

Full-scale battles had erupted throughout the country except in the capital. Every major city from north to south was under attack. Signs in military installations warned that Charley was infiltrating Saigon, and that all personnel should take extreme caution. But on the streets it was Tet, and no one seemed concerned about an imminent onslaught.

At precisely 3 o'clock in the morning the celebration of Tet ended in Saigon. There were still fireworks, but now they were coming from grenades, rockets, bazookas, automatic weapons, and high-powered rifles. A tremendous explosion rocked the courtyard outside the hotel. Two more blasts and accompanying flashes brought us quickly from sleep to full consciousness.

The sharp cracks of rifles were answered by machine guns. Another explosion, closer to the hotel, and then quiet. But only long enough for us to think the worst. They were surely coming into the hotel, coming to blast down the doors, coming to machinegun us all.

And then more shooting outside. Mortar explosions. More automatic fire. Another brief pause.

For an hour the exchanges were broken only by the even more frightening quiet. Helicopters began dropping flares, casting an eerie glow over the scene, but not illuminating any of what was going on outside. Occasionally a close mortar explosion would cast dirt and debris against our fourth-floor window panes. Two of them would be broken by the gun battle the following day.

I tried sleeping. The firing continued outside. So did the explosions.

Daylight always has the advantage of making things seem more manageable. With the sun up, we had almost convinced ourselves that all the noise the night before had been nothing more than big firecrackers. We were still unaware of the extent of the fighting going on throughout the city. But the desk clerk warned us. "Be careful, sir," he said as we walked out. "There's shooting outside."

Only later in the day did we discover that the Viet Cong had attacked eight major areas in the city, including the American Embassy, and had taken over the Cholon section to the south. They were still firmly entrenched in the partially completed apartment building next to the hotel, having sought cover there when their attempt to storm the Palace met resistance during the night.

Four Viet Cong bodies lay in the street and were to remain there 36 hours until they began to rot in the heat. The apartment building was surrounded by Korean and ARVN troops who periodically exchanged machine gun fire with the Viet Cong fortress.

Reporters and amateur photographers swarmed over the area, taking cover behind walls and parked cars whenever the shooting resumed. Less courageous spectators took up positions on the roof and balconies of the hotel, occasionally peering over the barriers to see what was going on. Everyone took a periodic time-out to sit in the hotel bar, eat lunch, sip a beer, and discuss the progress outside.

Among the civilians on the scene, there was almost a picnic atmosphere, disrupted only by the necessity of walking past the corpses and the bombed out American jeep whose tires were still smoldering 12 hours after the vehicle had been hit by a Viet Cong grenade from the building. The driver had been killed instantly. The others escaped.

At nightfall, fighting continued heavy throughout the city, and marshal law and a 24-hour curfew had been imposed. The streets were completely deserted. And the Viet Cong still held the building despite the mortar and bazooka pounding it had sustained throughout the day.

Returning to our room with a view, we drew the curtains and prepared for a long night. Fortunately the heavy activity did not begin in earnest until 6 o'clock the following morning when the shelling and mortar attacks resumed. One fellow occupant of the hotel reported two bullets ricocheting into his room, but we escaped with two shattered windows.

Prices in the hotel restaurant began to soar with each meal. At lunch steak cost 300 piastres ($2.50). By dinner the price had climbed to 350 piastres ($3.00). Beer was now 90 piastres a can ($.75). A warm bottle of Coke was 50 piastres ($.40).

Reports from around the country said that the Viet Cong attack was being beaten back in all but a few northern cities. Enemy casualties were first held at 5,000 killed, later updated to 7,000, and finally put at near 13,000, "subject to adjustment when administrative reports are received."

Sniper fire was being felt throughout Saigon, so the curfew remained in effect. The few people whose jobs were considered essential received armed escorts to their offices. Everyone else stayed in or near their quarters, or risked being stopped by military or Saigon police. Rumors abounded, and the armed forces radio gave little or no concrete information beyond reminding everyone to stay inside and exercise caution.

By afternoon the last of the Viet Cong holding the neighboring apartment building had been killed, and civilians strolled casually through the area, taking pictures of the mangled corpses, inspecting the destroyed vehicles, and commenting among themselves about the daring or stupidity of soldiers willing to go into the place and try to hold it, knowing that they could not possibly get out.

Occasionally conversation focused on the Embassy attack. The Viet Cong had held the building for six hours before being killed, but had managed little significant damage. How important was it that they got in? Why weren't there more guards? Who was responsible? Are more troops needed? In the absence of facts, the answers were almost invariably based on what one already believed.

If the attack on Saigon had any purpose other than propaganda, it failed. If the Viet Cong hoped or expected a massive civilian uprising on their behalf, they were sorely disappointed. The fact that they flagrantly violated their own declared Tet cease fire to launch the campaign has hardened sentiment against them. Several acts of sheer terrorism were reported in the city. I saw pictures of one.

On the other hand, the publicity value of the strength and scope of the attacks will undoubtedly have widespread repurcussions. People are already talking about a greater commitment of U.S. troops in order to prevent such a campaign from being mounted in the future.

If these last few days were in fact the Big Effort by the Viet Cong, where they were willing to gamble everything in the hopes of another Dien Bien Phu, and there has been some talk that this was the case, then they have been defeated.

Military people here are predicting that the biggest blow is yet to come, and that it will come in the DNZ area in the not distant future.

If the casualty figures for the Viet Cong are anywhere near correct, and if they sustain similar losses in any "bigger" action yet to come, it would seem certain that they would have a difficult time rebuilding their forces, if in fact they could do it at all.

The U.S. command says it was taken by surprise by the intensity of this Viet Cong effort. But it responded quickly to the attack, and has been able thus far to push back the offensive. Militarily, the U.S. is not about to lose the war. From the looks of things, though, it seems that they're not about to win it either.

Private First Class Powell, 19, Killed in Viet by Rocket

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Larry K. Powell, a young man from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the Record:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS POWELL, 19, KILLED IN VIET BY ROCKET

A Lexington Park marine was killed in Vietnam last week when an exploding rocket struck the Ontos recoilless-rifle carrier he was driving in Phua Thien province.

Pfc. Larry K. Powell, 19, was killed less than a month after returning to Vietnam after volunteering for a second tour of duty there.

He had spent eleven months there before returning home to Lexington Park for a month's leave December 8.

Mrs. Jessie D. Powell, his adoptive mother, said that fighting in Vietnam was "what he wanted to do—this was his life." Mrs. Powell is the wife of Walter R. Powell, Jr., a brother who reared Private Powell after his parents died.

Private Powell enlisted in the Marine Corps in July, 1966, and volunteered for Vietnam duty while still in boot camp. He had been planning to join the Marines since childhood and was looking forward to becoming a sergeant, Mrs. Powell said.

He told his brothers and sisters that he was fighting to protect them, she added.

It was after boot camp that he trained to drive an Ontos, a specialized vehicle that operates on tank-like tracks and carries six recoilless rifles. The vehicle's name comes from the Greek word for *thing*.

He was driving one as a member of a convoy when a rocket struck his column and he received head and stomach injuries, Mrs. Powell said.

Private Powell was born in Alma, Ark., and moved to Lexington Park when he was 9, attending schools there until he moved to Elwood, Ind., where he attended Elwood High School and was graduated.

He then worked for several months in a machine shop in Dallas before enlisting in the Marines.

Survivors include, besides Mr. and Mrs. Powell, two sisters, Deborah Lee Powell and Pamela Ann Powell, and another brother, Roger C. Powell, all of Lexington Park.

An Article by the Institute for American Democracy

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there are many private corporations in this country which are taking a greater interest in community and national affairs. I welcome that interest and believe it is of the utmost importance that it continue.

That interest and those community and national activities are quite different from the use of large amounts of corporate funds to put forth what is essentially a political point of view, which, in many instances, represents the radical right in this country—the antidemocratic forces which basically hope to subvert democracy. Such a program seems now to be undertaken by the Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies. Extensive use of funds for essentially political purposes by publicly held corporations is a serious danger. Company stockholders are not consulted in decisions to use funds in this manner. Moreover, these expenditures are tax-exempt. It is another loophole for the wealthy to avoid paying their share of taxes. Thus, all of us pay a little to propagate one man's views.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article printed by the Institute for American Democracy, a reputable organization:

SCHICK SETS MILLION DOLLAR PRECEDENT—DOUBLE-EDGED DOLLARS BUILD POLITICAL CLIMATE

Where does a publicly-held company draw the line in using its advertising dollars to advance the ideological viewpoint of its top executive?

So far as the stockholders in Patrick J. Frawley's Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies are concerned, that is a million-dollar question. By his own lights, Frawley sets a sterling example in using the tax-deductible advertising dollars to help mold the political climate.

Item—The newest entry in the super-conservative magazine field is *Twin Circle*. One of the editors is Father Daniel Lyons. The *Twin Circle* Publishing Company is a Schick subsidiary, and the first eight issues carried full page Schick ads. The page rate is $1,260. Promised circulation is 100,000.

Item—Father Lyons' daily 5-minute opinion radio program, aired over 20 stations, is Schick-sponsored. The program was launched last July. IAD's projection places the 1967 cost to Schick at about $53,092.

Item—Schick and/or Technicolor are running two full-page ads in each monthly issue of *Triumph*, appealing to approximately the same audience as *Twin Circle*. (See December Home-Front.) The cost for last year: approximately $13,400.

Item—*Rally*, the newest magazine aimed at youth (sworn circulation 4,200) has had three full-page ads from Frawley's companies in each of its twelve 1967 issues. Cost compiled from the rate card: $12,275.

Item—The rerun of the Ronald Reagan-narrated TV spectacular, "Freedom's Finest Hour" to a nationwide audience last December cost Schick approximately $300,000, according to IAD projections.

The program is well-done, and probably pulled a good audience, but since Frawley headed the Southern California committee which raised money going into the Reagan's 1966 TV campaign spots, a cynic might suspect that Frawley was killing two birds with one tax-deductible stone.

IAD's estimates, based on rate cards and information supplied by publishers, place the Schick-Technicolor expenditures in the conservative *National Review* at $36,732 and the Radical Right *Drake's Freedom Press* at $1,627, and *Wanderer* at $3,952. *Human Events* got about $1,000 in Schick ad money while YAF's *New Guard* received two full-page ads for 10 consecutive issues, a $10,613 item.

Senator Thomas Dodd and Congressman Walter Judd credit Frawley and Schick with the public service grant making possible their American Security Council "Washington Report" series, termed the largest daily radio program in the U.S. radio. The emphasis of this is on the international Communist threat. A 1966 *Wall Street Journal* story pegged the annual cost to Schick at $390,000 plus another $6,373 grant for Commentator Dodd's salary. No report on 1967 totals as yet available.

The same *Wall Street Journal* story listed Schick annual grants of $5,000 each to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation (star member: right wing author Phyllis Schlafly); Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Those touring moral re-armament "Up With People" teenage show troups got a Schick grant of $150,000 according to the *Journal*, and Frawley's picture appears on the cover of the "Up" record. The 36 full-page ads in MRA's *Pace* magazine in 1967 represent another $43,515, according to the rate card.

Schick also sponsored a 1967 $100,000 Business Citizenship Award essay contest beamed at advertising agencies with the top prize going to a member of Sen. Strom Thurmond's staff.

Some of the Schick advertising dollars and grants go to organizations and publications which are merely rather conservative, but some to operations considerably to the right. They reflect Frawley's preoccupation with Communism to the exclusion of other problems. They all have some impact on American attitudes.

If you are one viewing Paul Harvey's "Commentary" as helping create the mood which can lead to a big political shift, then the IAD-estimated $939,000 it takes for Schick to alternate sponsorship of Harvey's daily 5-minute commentary on 425 ABC stations also emerges as a double-edged investment.

—C. R. B.

First 1968 Report to Congressman Wolff's Constituency

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, periodically I report to the residents of New York's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in Congress, on congressional actions and my position on major issues. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include my first report of 1968 in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 1968.

DEAR FRIEND: As the second session of the 90th Congress settles down to work, it is appropriate that as your elected representative I report to you on my work in Congress during the past year and comment on what we might expect this year.

Vietnam continues to be the all pervading issue here in Washington, as well as throughout the world. Everything that came before Congress during 1967 was considered in light of the extensive and expensive American presence in Vietnam. I will have more to say on this predominant issue later.

Government spending continued unabated last year. I have attempted to achieve a halt in non-essential federal spending. I am opposed to a tax increase because I believe we can eliminate the need for a surcharge.

However, there are urgent problems at home that cannot be overlooked nor postponed even while we are engaged in hostilities abroad.

In reflecting on the eleven and a half months first session of the 90th Congress, I see the visions and ideals of the 89th Congress were sorely lacking. There were serious backward steps on domestic programs. During the past year the effect of a negative coalition in Congress resulted in many problems, including the following:

Congress's very grave failure to reclaim its prerogatives regarding the war in Vietnam.

The House of Representative's failure to enact reasonable cuts in non-essential spending, proposed by a fiscally responsible, bipartisan membership. (For example the four billion dollar Public Works "Pork Barrel" Bill should have been cut substantially. There are many other projects that could be postponed while we attack other urgent problems here at home.)

Continuation of excessive farm subsidies, to the tune of almost three billion dollars, that place a double burden on you, the taxpayer. First you pay for the subsidy and then you are taxed by the inexcusably high price of food.

Congress failed to recognize that social and educational advancement are necessary to avoid the danger of a "welfare state" to which we are all opposed. There was too little, too late funding of educational programs thereby impeding the transition of many Americans from the welfare rolls to the tax rolls.

A severe and undue delay in major legislation and appropriations that left important programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs and impeded their effectiveness.

Duplicate funding for our military and civilian space programs. Since these programs are redundant, we must curtail the duplication and save billions of dollars.

Although generally disappointed by the first session of the 90th Congress, I did see some bright spots. I would cite:

Congressional determination in heading off a tax increase. (As I indicated in my newsletter last fall, I continue to oppose a tax increase and suggest non-essential spending cuts as an alternative.)

Reasonable and responsible cuts in the civilian space budget.

Positive strides in pollution control and conservation. (I am especially concerned about this since we must not permit Long Island to become a big ball of earth tied together by ribbons of concrete.)

Substantial increases in veterans' pensions and social security to protect our senior citizens with fixed incomes from being forced onto the welfare rolls as prices continue to climb.

These, then, are some of the highlights of the first session. Now I would like to comment on certain areas of concern to you and advise you of my actions in these areas.

FRENCH POLICY AND FRANCE'S WORLD WAR I DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES

It has been said that I am conducting a one-man war against deGaulle. I doubt that is so since I have had thousands of encouraging letters from across the country. Also more than 135 Members of Congress are cosponsoring my resolution to collect France's seven billion dollar, World War I debt. In light of France's attempts to undermine the dollar and de Gaulle's anti-American policies, France should be required to pay this long overdue legal debt. I will continue to pursue this debt until it is paid in full.

FOREIGN AID AND TRADE

We must conduct a meaningful foreign aid program to build trading partners and develop new markets for American goods. In this vein, foreign aid must not be conducted as a giveaway, but rather as a productive investment. The dollar drain can and should be controlled by eliminating unnecessary government expenditures overseas and encouraging profitable private sector investments abroad.

TRAVEL TAX

I am concerned about our balance of payments deficit. However, this problem has been caused by our increasing commitments abroad (including Vietnam), not by our balance of trade which is favorable. I do not feel this problem can be solved by a travel tax and I oppose this proposed measure. I feel it will do harm to our relations abroad and bring with it retaliatory measures that would cause a deficit in our balance of trade.

MIDDLE EAST

I was severely distressed last summer to discover that we were continuing to train military personnel from Arab countries that had broken diplomatic relations with the United States. I was successful in adding an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill to prohibit this practice. Moreover, I have called upon our government, in the face of Soviet-inspired aggression to make clear our support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East.

"PUEBLO"

It would be a grave error of dire consequence for North Korea, or any other nation, to interpret the strong desire of the United States for peace as a sign of weakness. North Korea has committed an act of piracy on the high seas by boarding and capturing the USS *Pueblo*. We are all anxious for peace in the world. But we will not have peace if we do not defend the security of this nation and protect our international rights. Our main concern must be for the safety of the crew of the *Pueblo* and we must pursue the steps necessary to guarantee the safe return of the crew.

DOMESTIC EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Continuation of such programs as Head Start, the Job Corps and the Teachers Corps is vital to the growth of our nation. There can be no better investment in our future than the preparation of previously untrained persons to fill skilled jobs.

CRIME IN THE STREETS

We cannot tolerate lawlessness and must enact legislation to end violence and deal firmly with those who disregard the laws and lives and property of others. At the same time we must eliminate the root causes of violence by eliminating the poverty, joblessness, inadequate housing and substandard schools that exist as a continuing source of shame in our society.

CONSUMERS

Last year saw the enactment of important consumer legislation including the flammable fabrics act and a strong meat inspection law. Early in the current session we were successful in passing a very strong truth-in-lending bill which I actively supported.

JET NOISE AND AIR SAFETY

I place these two problems together since their solutions must be found together through the use of our advanced technology. Jet noise is an offensive health hazard and must be controlled. Last year to alleviate the jet noise problem that plagues sections of our district, I secured approval of new instrumentation at Kennedy Airport. Also I held investigatory meetings on air safety in New York and plan further efforts to protect those who fly and those on the ground.

LONG ISLAND INDUSTRY AND ECONOMY

Another growth year for Long Island's economy was 1967. Working to build our economy we have reached the point where 41 per cent of the largest employers on Long Island are in the Third Congressional District. I am pleased that my efforts to secure federal contracts for local businesses have helped to make this possible.

NORTH SHORE CONSERVATION

This year I hope the Town of Oyster Bay will complete the conservation plan I offered to the Town Board last year. Unfortunately the Town Board has dragged its feet on this matter. Time is running short and the Oyster Bay Town Board must act soon if we are to save the North Shore. Interior Secretary Udall has assured me the federal government will do all that it can to conserve the precious shore area that is threatened with destruction.

SERVICE TO YOU

Last year saw another increase in federal funds coming into the Third Congressional District. Also approval was voted for the creation of a federal court district in Mineola. My offices in Port Washington, Glen Cove and Jericho remained open to serve you. Many more district residents visited Washington and we were, as always, pleased to have them visit our office. I especially welcome visits to Washington since it gives me an opportunity to talk with you. Also in 1967 we held a number of Town Meetings in different areas on matters of interest to local residents. Also, I hope you will continue your welcome habit of writing to your Congressman regarding issues pending in Congress.

VIETNAM

I believe I speak for everyone when I say this nation desires a just and lasting peace in Vietnam. We hear many different ideas on how to reach that peace, but no one has yet offered a solution acceptable to all parties. For truly, no one has all the answers.

I have long been of the opinion that no amount of military successes will bring about an enduring peace. Such a peace will only come from an attendent political solution. This is because if we continue to escalate we only broaden the war and create a graver situation. Yet a unilateral pullout will not bring peace to Southeast Asia nor will it achieve our proper goal of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

While I do not believe in either of the extremes, I do not agree with the present course of American policy in Vietnam. We need new thinking, new initiatives to change the course of the war and create the climate for peace that will make a political solution possible.

To date the steadily increasing bombing of North Vietnam has not slowed the infiltration to the south nor driven the North Vietnamese to the conference table. At the same time, North Vietnam, U Thant and others close to the situation have made it clear that the bombing is an impediment to peace. Moreover, top military authorities, including Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, have made it clear we will not endanger our troops by halting the bombing. With this in mind I have called for a cessation in the bombing of North Vietnam to test the possibility that such a halt might lead to negotiations. Should the North Vietnamese take undue advantage of the bombing halt, we would not be precluded from resuming necessary bombing.

I have proposed to President Johnson a three-point program that I believe will go a long way toward achieving what I have called the climate for peace. First, we should secure civic action teams of civilian specialists from other Asian nations to administer the pacification program that is now being handled unsuccessfully by the South Vietnamese. Second, South Vietnamese military units now engaged in pacification and freed from that responsibility could then assume their rightful position filling whatever military role may be necessary. This is their war and if there is fighting to be done, they should do it. Third, American forces would be relieved of much of their present role and revert to their former position before escalation as a supply and advisory force. After offering these suggestions I sent my speech to South Vietnamese President Thieu, whom I met while in Vietnam. I am pleased to report that he has indicated his tacit approval of my recommendations. While many shout for peace, little if any concrete plans or suggestions are offered. This war cannot nor will it be ended abruptly. Therefore, our hope for peace will come through a reversal of the present escalation to one of deescalation. This then is a plan for deescalation that can bring about a just settlement, self determination and peace in Southeast Asia.

As the situation in Vietnam changes, I am constantly reevaluating my position. As you know, I use your thinking as a guide while exercising the leadership that is part of my responsibility as your elected Representative. If you would please take the time to answer and return the following questionnaire to my office at 156A Main Street, Port Washington, N.Y. 11050, I would greatly appreciate it. This way I can best represent you.

With the hope and prayer of peace and prosperity in 1968, I remain

Sincerely yours,
LESTER L. WOLFF,
Your Congressman.

Which of the following do you believe should be part of the United States policy in Vietnam? (You may check more than one.)

1. Send more troops to Vietnam.
2. Unilateral cease-fire by the United States.
3. Withdraw to enclaves.
4. Invade North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.
5. Remove retraints on hot pursuit by United States troops.
6. Recognize the National Liberation Front as a participant on negotiations.
7. Stop bombing of North Vietnam.
8. Bomb Hanoi and Haiphong harbor.
9. Exert greater effort to bring Vietnam problem before United Nations.
10. General deescalation.
11. Continue present course.
12. Use nuclear weapons.
13. Exert greater efforts to secure negotiations.

Town Destroyed To Save It

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1968, the Associated Press carried a report in many newspapers concerning the progress of the war in South Vietnam being waged on behalf of the Vietnamese people. According to the AP, a U.S. major said, in reference to a city 45 miles southwest of Saigon:

It became necessary to destroy the town to save it.

The AP report goes on to quote the commander of the U.S. Advisory Team 93:

"We will never know for sure" the number of civilians who died.

"Many families are buried permanently under the rubble," he said.

Another major added:

It is always a pity about the civilians.

Mr. Speaker, this dispatch raises anew very grave questions concerning the war in Vietnam. How can one rationalize a war in which we must destroy the people we have proposed to protect in order to save them?

Tom Wicker in a very perceptive article in the New York Times of February 20, comments upon similar tactics in the heavily populated city of Hue and other Vietnamese cities where massive firepower is being used to root out Vietcong forces from among civilian populations.

Mr. Wicker points out, in effect, the bankruptcy of the policy which relies on a military solution to a political problem.

Mr. Wicker's article of February 20 and the AP report of February 8 follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1968]

IN THE NATION: FIREPOWER VERSUS SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The sad truth of Vietnam has seldom been clearer than it is in the decision by the American military command to "use all the firepower needed" to root Communist forces out of Hue and other Vietnamese cities.

So, as The Associated Press describes the situation, "Heavy bombs, aircraft rockets, naval gunfire, napalm, tear gas and all the usual ground weapons from eight-inch howitzers to tank guns are being used in heavily populated city areas and—in Hue—against the historic inner city Citadel, from which Vietnamese imperial governments once ruled.

MISERY COMPOUNDED

American military men are not happy about this; they know the result is bound to be thousands upon thousands of homeless refugees adding to the limitless weight of human misery in Vietnam, as well as rising totals of civilian dead and wounded.

"It is a terrible thing to have to do, but we have to do it," a marine officer said of the decision to use "all the firepower needed" against parts of Hue held by the North Vietnamese.

There appear to be two reasons why that officer and his superiors believe they "have to do it." The first is a shortage of manpower in the area around Hue and in the northern provinces generally, a shortage mostly due to the opposing concentrations of forces at Khesanh. This manpower shortage means that the Americans and South Vietnamese cannot root out the North Vietnamese and Vietcong invaders without heavy dependence upon the sheer destructive force of American firepower.

The second reason is that nothing less than victory, in these situations, is considered acceptable. "We could not permit them to believe that they could seize populated areas and escape our firepower," an American official explained. If they could do that, they would obviously take advantage of the opportunity.

A NECESSARY EVIL

This is not, therefore, a mindless unloosing of violence by American soldiers; it is what they see as a necessary evil, and one in which the drearily militaristic South Vietnamese Government concurs fully.

But if the situation is viewed in something other than military terms, it appears quite different. How is the Saigon Government, for instance, ever going to win the "hearts and minds" of its people if it not only approves the American destruction of South Vietnamese cities but—according to press reports—actually wants the Americans to do the job more quickly with even more firepower?

What kind of a commentary upon this extraordinary "Government," and upon the years of American assistance, is it if the insurgents not only can seize these urban areas by surprise, but can hold them with such desperate and deadly tenacity that the only alternative is to destroy the cities themselves?

Even if the destruction of their homes, businesses and treasured places fills South Vietnamese hearts with gratitude toward Saigon, have the authorities in that city or their American supporters shown any ability to cope with the thousands of refugees, the wounded, the sick and the helpless, who existed in South Vietnam even before the Vietcong winter offensive began in the cities?

The inescapable facts are that the South Vietnamese Government and its American ally were unable to protect the cities and their populations to begin with. When the attacks came, they proved unable to overcome them without the destruction of whole areas and the mass production of dead and homeless civilians. And when all the firepower has done its deadly work, neither Saigon nor Washington will be anywhere near able to take care of the human tide of misery and despair that will be the result.

IF THIS BE VICTORY

If this is a victory for Saigon, a defeat would be too terrible to behold. If this is what President Johnson demands that Americans stand and fight for, what heartbreaking tragedy must happen before he realizes that fighting alone cannot vindicate his policy?

The sad and terrible truth of the decision to blow up South Vietnam's cities in order to defend them is that neither Washington nor Saigon has anything to rely on but firepower. With that, they can destroy South Vietnam, but they can never save it from Communism, or anything else.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 8, 1968]

ALLIES SAY TOWN DESTROYED TO SAVE IT

BEN TRE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"It became necessary to destroy the town to save it," a U.S. major said Wednesday.

He was talking about the grim decision that allied commanders made when Viet Cong attackers overran most of this Mekong Delta city 45 miles southwest of Saigon.

They decided that regardless of civilian casualties they must bomb and shell the once-placid river city of 35,000 to rout the Viet Cong.

Heavy guns were turned on the city's streets. Jet fighter-bombers carrying bombs, rockets and napalm were ordered into the attack.

The decision was not taken lightly, U.S. advisers said.

"They are our friends out there," said one American, pointing to the smoking city. "We waited until we had no choice. The Vietnamese chief of staff had to bring in an air strike on the house of his neighbor."

Ben Tre was one of the cities attacked by the Viet Cong at the height of last week's fighting. Details of its destruction in the three-day battle to oust the Viet Cong became known yesterday.

U.S. advisers said the heavy allied firepower hurled on the city to drive out the Viet Cong probably contributed largely to the deaths of at least 500 civilians and possibly 1,000.

South Vietnamese officials say the enemy dead totaled 451.

About 50 Vietnamese soldiers died, along with more than 20 Americans from the 9th Infantry Division.

Lt. Col. James Dare of Chicago, Ill., commander of U.S. Advisory Team 93, said, "We will never know for sure" the number of civilans who died.

"Many families are buried permanently under the rubble," he said.

Americans say 45 per cent of the city was destroyed. The Vietnamese province chief said that if the village environs are considered, Ben Tre was 85 per cent destroyed.

U.S. officials say that the firepower had to be used and that allied casualties would have been far higher without the heavy firepower.

The battle began when an enemy force of approximately 2,500 men invaded the city and the surrounding villages, U.S. advisers said. The decision to use jets and heavy guns was made early in the battle when the Viet Cong almost had control of the city.

U.S. advisers said the Viet Cong occupied the city so rapidly that it was not possible to warn civilians of the impending air strikes or the artillery barrages, particularly with the Viet Cong in control of the radio station.

Allied firepower included 500-pound bombs, napalm, rockets, various types of antipersonnel bombs and 105 and 155mm artillery.

"We had to argue with our corps headquarters at Can Tho," a U.S. captain said. "They didn't like the idea. But they were convinced when we explained that it was rockets and bombing or the end for us."

Fighter-bombers splashed napalm on a 3,000-yard long river bank opposite the U.S. military compound. Thatch-roofed homes went up in flames.

Armed helicopters made dozens of passes at the rambling market place in the center of the city. Squatter districts and poor people's housing at the northern and western sides of the city were leveled.

Maj. Chester L. Brown of Erie, Pa., spent hours over the city as an Air Force forward air controller directing helicopter and fighter-bomber attacks.

"It is always a pity about the civilians," he said. "In the mass confusion of this kind of thing, the people don't know where the lines are, they don't know where to hide. And some of the weapons we use are area weapons, spraying a general area instead of a specific target.

"That way, people get hurt."

Address of Congressman John Brademas at 100th Annual Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 19, 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 19, 1968, I had the privilege, together with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota with whom I serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE, of addressing the 100th annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N.J.

Congressman QUIE and I discussed the subject, "The Shape of Federal Funding for Tomorrow's Schools."

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of my address on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

I am honored to be invited to participate in this conference for several reasons.

First, it brings me together with my distinguished colleague and friend, Al Quie of Minnesota. Al and I have sat on the House Committee on Education and Labor for nearly ten years now and although we are not always in agreement on the legislation we consider—as our presence with you tonight indicates—there is no one on our Committee or, indeed, in Congress more deeply dedicated to bettter education for Americans than is he.

And I am glad also to reassure you that we have worked many times in support of the same legislation. For example, he made a decisive contribution to the passage of a bill of which I am the sponsor, the International Education Act of 1966.

I am glad to be here too, to meet with the administrators of America's schools.

My late grandfather was a school principal and superintendent for many years in the towns and rural areas of Central Indiana—and I learned from him that there is no nobler vocation than helping young people learn.

In today's America, in my view, no one plays a more significant role in determining the future of tomorrow's America than do you—the men and women who run our nation's schools.

The final reason I am glad to be with you is the opportunity it affords me to talk about the contribution that our Federal government can make to strengthening the schools of our country.

I say "contribution" deliberately because it must be obvious to many of you that so many and so complex are the challenges facing the American people today in the fields of jobs, housing, health, pollution—as well as education—that we need the intelligent and energetic commitment of all the resources we can muster, public and private, Federal, state and local, if we are to master these problems and not be overcome by them.

I share therefore the view of one of the great public servants of our time, John W. Gardner, who spoke recently of what he called "the value of President Johnson's assertion that the Federal government should operate more and more through mutually respecting partnerships with state and local governments, with the universities and corporations, and with the other great estates of the private sector. Such partnerships, rightly designed, can maintain the dispersion of power and initiative that we cherish. . ."

Indeed I believe that for our American Federal system to function properly, all levels of government must be strong, vigorous and effective.

NEED TO STRENGTHEN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

In particular, I believe we must strengthen both state and local government if they are to meet the responsibilities our changing society is thrusting upon them.

But let me make very clear at the outset of my remarks that though I believe there is a significant role for the Federal government in support of education, I draw the line at sanitation. Even if Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Lindsay look with yearning eyes to Washington, I am strongly opposed to Federal control of garbage—and you can quote me on that. Or does Al Quie have a block grant for garbage disposal proposal that he wants to advocate tonight?

But more seriously, let me give you just two examples of what I mean when I say that it is imperative that we strengthen state and local government in this country.

This week a Subcommittee on which Al and I sit will hear testimony on several bills, one of which I introduced, the Public Service Education Act, aimed at encouraging highly talented young men and women to enter state and local government by providing them with fellowships for graduate study.

Because I feel so strongly about improving state and local government, I have also been a militant supporter of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, as you know, is aimed at strengthening our state departments of education.

In fact, it was on my motion in the Education Committee that the Administration's original proposal in 1965 of $10 million for Title V was raised to $25 million—more than doubled—and in 1967 we increased still further the authorization to strengthen state education agencies.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Indeed, one can perhaps say that the chief importance of the Federal financial assistance we have been providing to our nation's schools, especially through ESEA, is that it can help state and local communities do a better job of teaching than they could do without these funds.

It is therefore significant that we no longer debate the legitimacy or wisdom of Federal aid but rather the question of the best way to provide and administer it.

More Federal money, not less, is the theme we in Congress hear from nearly all segments of the education community, including many groups formerly hostile to Federal assistance to schools.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers legislative chairman wrote me only last week in support of a program whereby the Federal government would subsidize 25 per cent of the cost of public schools.

The Legislative Commission of the National Education Association just last month called for a "major escalation of the nation's commitment to quality education," and pressed for a $6 billion Federal program to meet "urgent needs" in our elementary and secondary schools.

And I understand that your geat organization has under consideration here at Atlantic City a resolution urging Federal aid to guarantee a minimum per pupil expenditure throughout the country.

So we are no longer squeamish about accepting Federal funds. We must now draw our attention to the question of how best to administer Federal assistance to local and state school systems.

Some have framed this discussion in terms of two approaches:

Should Federal dollars be channeled in block grant form to the states or should Federal funds be provided to help meet pressing national needs in education which are not being met effectively from local, state and private sources?

My answer is that while general Federal aid to education—aid not targeted on critical needs—may be a desirable objective which I hope we can achieve in the long run, it is imperative that we maintain for the present the prevailing pattern of categorical aid aimed at such needs. To dismantle, for example, the programs initiated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and replace them with general unrestricted grants would seriously weaken our effort as a nation to get at our toughest educational problems.

THE MYTHS BEHIND GENERAL AID VIEW

Let me here list some of the myths upon which the case for so-called general aid to education has been developed.

The *first myth* is the notion that while categorical programs involve narrow categories of assistance encumbered with many restrictions, general aid offers flexibility and freedom from red tape.

In practice, no such clear distinction exists. Many Federal categorical programs incorporate fewer limitations and are nearly as broad as many state general support or foundation programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for example, though directed at particular needs, is nevertheless extremely flexible in application and allows wide discretion to state and local authorities. In fact, the ESEA contains some of the most permissive authorizations in American legislative history. I hear almost no complaints from school administrators in my state that Federal agents are roaming the state, commanding them what to do in their schools.

On the other hand, state general aid programs are often replete with detailed "strings" on curriculum, salaries, classroom size, and number of teachers.

My point is that general aid provides no sure escape from bureaucratic disorder and red tape. Mr. Quie's own block grant proposal offered as an amendment to the ESEA last year illustrates the problem; his substitute bill was a far cry from general aid freely to be expended by the states. In its final form, the bill was honeycombed with conditions and restrictions that would dazzle the imagination of the hardest-core bureaucrat.

Let me assure you that I am sympathetic to the need for simplifying Federal programs and I understand the problems you face in confronting an often untidy and confusing Federal aid structure. But the answer to the problem does not lie in a wholesale conversion to block grants.

WE MUST CONSOLIDATE AND STREAMLINE AID PROGRAMS

Instead, we must seek to broaden, consolidate, and streamline existing categorical programs where appropriate. Congress and the Administration are now moving in this direction. The Education Professions Development Act of 1967, for example, of which Al Quie and I were co-sponsors, has replaced a number of fragmented legislative authorities for training educational personnel with one comprehensive and flexible program. Right now, Congress is working on legislation to improve vocational education programs and to consolidate college student aid. These programs are aimed at providing local and state education authorities with greater flexibility and less red tape, not the reverse. But they remain categorical programs, targeted on meeting urgent needs in these two areas.

The *second myth* on which advocates of general aid frequently ground their case has to do with alleged "control" of education. The special purpose education programs passed by Congress in recent years, so goes the argument, must inevitably bring Federal control of our schools and colleges.

But you and I know that policy-making in education in the United States is so widely dispersed and so deeply imbedded in traditional American pluralism that effective control has never been—and never should be—concentrated in one institution or in one level of government.

After all, we do not really have a "system" of education in the United States at all, but rather a whole variety of systems each with substantial autonomy. That the Federal government or the Office of Education could exercise control over 25,000 school boards and 50 state education departments, even if it wished to do so, is highly unlikely.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE HAS ENHANCED OPTIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

Furthermore, it is important to note that the Federal aid programs enacted in the past few years, far from limiting the role of state and local education agencies, have considerably enhanced their options and responsibilities. Indeed, the effectiveness of Federal aid-to-education programs depends fundamentally on initiative and creativity from local school systems themselves and on the capacity for leadership and coordination of the state departments of education.

The ESEA in particular places heavy responsibility at the grassroots. Title I compensatory programs are conceived and designed entirely at the local level and approved by state education agencies.

Title II, the textbook title, gives both state and local school systems new and valuable resources for learning; it does not cripple state and local leadership.

Title III, aimed at encouraging innovation, also stimulates initiative by local schools. The states, which have played a reviewing and recommending role up to now, will soon, under the 1967 amendments, take over control of Title III projects. Let us all hope that State education agencies will respond to this new opportunity with imagination and vigor. Some of us in Congress have frankly been dubious but hope we are proved wrong, and I can cite to you more than one local school superintendent who prefers Federal red tape to the kind manufactured in his state capital!

I believe the enactment last year of the Education Professions Development Act is itself an excellent refutation of the contention that categorical aid leads to Federal control of education and should, therefore, be opposed.

It is true that the funds under this Act are not, as Commissioner Howe noted the other day, "a cornucopia showering Federal largess over the educators of the land for all good causes in general, but a carefully written and precisely focused law designed to improve education by increasing the supply of well-trained educators."

Can it be seriously contended that the passage of this legislation will—or is intended to—usurp or erode state and local prerogatives in education? The only programs that will be carried out under the Act will be those proposed to the Office of Education for preparing or upgrading educational personnel—and the proposals will be initiated by colleges and universities, state education departments and local school districts.

As Commissioner Howe has noted, "The act represents a decision by Congress that the shortage of educational manpower is a national problem of such scope and importance that it requires a national effort."

There are two other points that must be made in respect of the allegation of Federal control:

A NATIONWIDE MANDATE

First, the impetus for increased Federal support of education has not come from heavy-handed, anonymous bureaucrats in Washington. It has been the elected representatives of the people from every state and locality in the nation in Congress assembled who have considered and enacted the new education programs. Federal aid to education derives from a nation-wide mandate in Congress; it has not been ordained by Federal administrators in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Second, the states, by law and custom, have the primary responsibility for education, but historically the Federal government has shown an interest in helping the states improve their educational systems. From the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 through the Morill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and the G.I. Bill of World War II, the Federal government, while clearly a junior partner in the educational enterprise, has sought to identify national needs in education and to help the states to meet them. My point is that recent Federal education measures, though substantially increasing the Federal investment in education, are not a radical departure, viewed in this historical perspective. The Federal government is not seeking to take over state and local prerogatives; it is not making a power play to control education. Rather, the American people, acting through their President and Representatives in Congress, have again identified certain educational problems requiring attention on a nation-wide basis and have determined to direct Federal funds to help solve them.

SOME THORNY ISSUES RAISED BY GENERAL AID

So much for the myths which I think cloud the discussion of general versus categorical aid. As I have indicated, I would not be unsympathetic to some form of block grants at a later date. Given the mounting cost of education, the inadequate tax resources of local governments, and the unwillingness of some state politicians to support funds for education (here cite Governor Kirk of Florida), it may be essential for the Federal government to use its revenue capacity to underwrite the major expense of the nations educational system. But let me outline some of the serious questions which I think must be raised before we can move ahead with the general aid approach.

First is the simple fact that we are in a period of serious retrenchment in Federal expenditures. All the current education programs, from Head Start to college facility grants, are feeling the pinch. As long as education is on a tight budget, we clearly cannot afford both to continue financing categorical programs and to initiate general, across-the-board support. And as long as we cannot afford both, we must hold our focus on the programs already established to meet critical needs.

Consider the matter in these terms. In 1963–64, the Federal government provided 4 per cent of the costs of elementary and secondary education. In 1966–67, the Federal share, largely as a result of the passage of ESEA, nearly doubled, but nonetheless amounted to only 7.2 per cent of the total funds expended.

If the increased Federal investment of a little over 3 per cent were lumped into block grants, it would simply be reflected in a slight percentage increase of each school operating budget, and the impact on special education needs would be inconsequential.

The effect of converting categorical programs to general aid reminds me of Mark Twain's description of the Platte River: 6 miles wide and a half-inch deep.

As it is, we are now spending only a bare minimum to support the categorical programs under ESEA. Dean Theodore Sizer of the Harvard Graduate School of Education has recently pointed out that the major programs in education are still operating on a marginal basis. I quote from his just published annual report:

"The Federal government's entrance into educational reform, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was first seen as a modest start, a short step in anticipation of a longer one. The major provision was $1.2 billion directed at schooling for the children of poor families. While this sum sounds large, it averages out to $92 per "disadvantaged" child, a small increase, considering the need, above the $564 now being spent per American school child."

Dean Sizer notes that there have been few startling results, either positive or negative, to date—"an unsurprising fact," he says, "considering the small scale of the effort and the short span of the experiment."

The annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children made a similar point only a few days ago—that most projects for improving the education of poor children are spreading funds too thinly. Substantially more money is needed, said the Council. "The surface of this important work has been only lightly scratched."

To make general the Federal aid that we are already providing would therefore, in my view, only further reduce the possibility of achieving significant results.

Fiscal reality, then, requires that we postpone any move toward general aid in the immediate future. Only when Federal funds are running more freely—perhaps only after Vietnam—can we seriously consider a program of block grants to education. But even at the point where we might have sufficient resources to undertake both categorical and block grants, there are several other problems that would need to be resolved. Here are some of the thorniest issues:

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE

1. A renewal of strife over the church-state issue could pose a major dilemma. Controversies over this question contributed to the defeat of Federal school aid for many years. The ESEA broke the deadlock in 1965 with the provision that parochial school children should share in the benefits of a number of publicly operated programs.

Yet the constitutions of over 30 states explicitly prohibit the use of any state funds for the support, direct or indirect, of church-related schools. Block federal grants to the states, to be distributed not on a categorical basis but at the discretion of state agencies, could, therefore, raise anew the issue of religion. The result could be to create widespread discord and to vitiate the cooperative efforts between public and parochial schools that are now taking place under ESEA.

2. Second, the question of school integration is still, 13 years after Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka, the most sensitive problem, North as well as South, in American elementary and secondary education. It is no secret that some Members of Congress favor block grants to the states rather than categorical aid because they believe that the state-directed programs offer a more promising refuge from the school desegregation guidelines than do current programs.

Although compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act remains a condition of receiving Federal funds for a wide spectrum of programs, of which education is only one, there is surely little justification for arguing that turning Federal funds over to the states will make easier the effective implementation of either court decisions or legislative actions in resolving this most difficult dilemma in American life.

3. A third problem is that not all states have the capacity to administer effectively a substantial infusion of block grants. Testimony before Congressional committees has shown that many state education agencies are not yet sufficiently equipped with staff and other resources to take on such a major administrative responsibility. Some states do have this capacity and with the help of Title V of ESEA, the states are making significant efforts to strengthen their education departments. Nevertheless, serious personnel shortages and resistance to change still leave some state departments badly handicapped administratively.

4. Another point that, in my view, has received insufficient attention, is that many chief state school officers—22 to be exact—are, like Al Quie and me, elected politicians, and not solely professional educators. Turning over large sums of unrestricted Federal money to state education officials who do not bear the burden at the polls of having voted for the taxes poses certain questions about responsible and democratic government.

5. A fifth problem: how to insure that state and local governments do not substitute Federal block grant support for their own fiscal effort. If Federal dollars merely replace state and local dollars, general aid will achieve no purpose. Only this month a Federal court struck down as unconstitutional a law of the State of Virginia that reduced State assistance to school districts receiving Federal impacted area funds. Per-

haps Virginia was demonstrating its devotion to states' rights!

UNRESPONSIVENESS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS TO URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

6. But the most disturbing issue the general aid concept poses is the traditional unresponsiveness of state governments to the overwhelming needs of urban school districts. States support for local schools is typically riddled with disparities between rural and urban areas, city and suburb, and between suburbs themselves. Above all, distribution formulas for state aid have long been weighed against the cities, thereby shortchanging urban school children.

What hope, then can we find in block grants to education channeled through the states? The most likely prospect is that such general aid would only magnify the inequities that already exist within the states.

Inequitable treatment of the cities in programs of state aid historically reflects the influence of rurally dominated state legislatures. And reapportionment is bringing no remedy for this situation. In fact, the effect of reapportionment appears to be to strengthen the position of suburban interests rather than those of the inner cities. Many cities have actually lost some state representation as a result of the one man-one vote decision.

A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, covering 37 metropolitan areas, shows clearly the tendency of state financial aid to favor suburban schools over central city schools. The Commission's study found that schools serving low-income central city children are receiving less per pupil as well as less per capita than those serving the more affluent suburbs. A Carnegie Corporation survey in 1966 estimated that on the average suburbs receive $40 more per pupil in state aid than the cities.

Hardly any state has yet sought to revise its school aid formulas to account for the relative financial requirements for educating different kinds of children—for example, disadvantaged as distinguished from middle class children. Just as we spend a great deal extra for the education of physically handicapped children, so we need to spend much more to educate children with economic and cultural handicaps. A program like Head Start is an attempt to compensate for the needs of the poor child; to pay for special services and smaller classes, Head Start makes an average per pupil expenditure of $1200, compared with $600 or $700 for the suburban child. So far the states have made no such effort to gear their financial aid programs to the needs of different children.

The President-elect of the University of Chicago, Edward H. Levi, has recently posed the following question: Are the inequities in the operation of state educational systems "to be justified because this is the way the ball bounces; that is, this is how state action happens to collect and happens to allocate funds for the education it requires of all?" Dr. Levi suggests that there may be a strong argument to be made for the unconstitutionality of certain aspects of state and local educational financing.

THE DETROIT SCHOOL BOARD CASE

In fact, Levi's proposal is now being tested by the Detroit Board of Education, which has initiated what may be a landmark case concerning the issue of equity in the distribution of state school aid. The Detroit suit is aimed at compelling the state of Michigan to provide equal educational opportunity for all public school children in the state, even if this means unequal amounts of aid per child. The Detroit School Board, basing its case on the 14th Amendment provision that states grant equal protection of the laws to all citizens, maintains that equal opportunties in education require that state educational assistance be based upon the needs of each child and the costs of providing the required educational services.

The Detroit case could have an enormous impact upon traditional state practices in support of education.

In all of this discussion, I do not mean to say that there have been no stirrings within the states themselves for mending their ways. Indeed, I was encouraged by a report I saw recently of a Florida Commission for Quality Education, which has made some challenging recommendations for state action. The Commission recommends that the state of Florida take over 75 per cent of public school spending and that the tax burden for supporting the schools be equalized through state-wide, uniform assessment of property for tax purposes.

But we have a long way to go before such essential measures are fully implemented in all states. Until the states have developed the capacity and willingness to deal with today's critical problems in education, general aid to the states will not be a sound proposition.

When, however, general aid does come, it should clearly be in addition to, not in place of, effective programs of categorical assistance.

Again to quote Secretary Gardner:

"A strong Federal government . . . must create flexible partnerships with State and local government and the private sector that throw the challenge back to the people and their local institutions. They can and should rise to the occasion; they can and should contribute solutions in their own style. I don't think many Americans today understand the extent to which much of recent legislation dealing with health, education, poverty and the cities devolve initiative and operating responsibility to the grass roots."

For I return in conclusion to the theme with which I began my remarks. So manifold and difficult are the problems that beset Americans today that we need strong and imaginative leadership at every level—in education and elsewhere—from the grass roots, where you are, to our state and Federal units of government.

Working together, and not at cross purposes, we can make of American education what all of us want it to be—the foundation of our freedoms and the hope of our future.

Code of Ethics

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the decisive action taken by the Springfield Avenue Merchants Association of Newark, N.J., to protect customers against questionable business practices and improve community relations. A comprehensive code of ethics, adopted by the merchants, is enforced by the Springfield Avenue Complaint Bureau manned by volunteer businessmen and one paid assistant and director operating on a most modest budget.

The code reads as follows:

CODE OF ETHICS OF THE SPRINGFIELD AVENUE MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION

1. I will not advertise in the newspapers, on radio or through store window display any merchandise unless such merchandise is actually available for sale at the advertised price.

2. Any reduced price sale of merchandise will be a bona fide sale of regular merchandise that has actually been sold by me at a higher price and is now being reduced in price for legitimate business reasons. When I buy special merchandise to be sold at special prices, I will not misrepresent it as regular merchandise that has been marked down.

3. The price for all goods will be dictated by business cost plus reasonable profit. We will not raise prices on the first of the month because welfare checks are issued on the first of the month.

4. When a welfare client asks for an estimate on furniture or appliances, they will be shown the merchandise and will receive a written estimate on the merchandise they have seen that will bind me to sell them that merchandise at the estimated price. I will not charge a fee to give an estimate.

5. All time sales contracts will clearly identify all interest charges, fees and handling costs. Interest charges will be cited in annual percentages and in total dollars and cents cost over the life of the contract.

6. I will only charge 10% interest on any installment contract that is personally carried by this business establishment.

7. In so far as possible, where I cannot carry the contract myself, I will deal with that discount house which will give the consumer the lowest and fairest rate.

8. All contracts will be available in either the Spanish or English language.

9. If a customer does not understand a contract, I will refer him, if he meets income eligibility requirements, to the Newark Legal Services Corporation for aid.

10. Every customer will receive a copy of every legal document that he has signed.

11. Products will not be represented as to performance and quality unless I am prepared to back up every oral promise with a written guarantee. Nothing shall be represented as guaranteed or warrantied unless I intend to give the customer a written guaranty or warranty.

12. All goods will be legibly marked in dollars and cents as to their cost. No codes will be used.

13. All retail stores run on a cash only basis will give refunds cheerfully.

14. If a deposit is made pending approval of a credit agreement and the credit agreement is not approved, the deposit will be cheerfully refunded.

15. All complaints will be treated fairly and will be settled to the customer's satisfaction.

16. I will participate in meaningful, worthwhile community programs.

17. We will deal with each customer fairly, in good faith and without undue suspicion.

18. We offer the services of the Springfield Avenue Area Complaint Bureau, 382 Springfield Avenue, Newark, for the mediation of all problems which consumers shopping on Springfield Avenue have encountered.

19. For the protection of the consumer, we will maintain a continuing working relationship with the New Jersey Office of Consumer Protection, the Essex County Welfare Board and the Voice of the Ministers.

Hamilton Fish

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently published a letter from the Honorable Hamilton Fish, who was chairman of the first congressional committee to investigate Communist activities in 1930 and 1931. Mr. Fish offers some pertinent comments on our involvement in Vietnam, and although I do not agree with each of his criticisms, his analysis should be read carefully by each Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1968]

WAR OPPOSED

NEW YORK, *February 1, 1968.*

TO THE EDITOR: I admit utter confusion over the position of the Johnson Administration in South Vietnam. While President Johnson encourages trade and the creation of consulates with the Communists, he continues to send young Americans to defend Southeast Asia against Communism.

It is beginning to appear more and more that the original understanding of the Tonkin incident in 1964 was not correct. Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who steered the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution through, now claims that our ships had been spying on North Vietnam and had even violated the territorial waters of that country. The information regarding the Tonkin incident was apparently not only incorrect but was manipulated to secure the authorization from Congress for President Johnson to take whatever military action he deemed necessary.

FOR NEGOTIATED PEACE

The Republicans in Congress are right in supporting our armed forces once they are engaged in battle and for refusal to withdraw until a just and honorable peace has been negotiated. However, the Republican leadership in Congress errs in not making it perfectly plain that this was not Eisenhower's or Kennedy's war, but is and has been Johnson's war, and for not pressing harder for a negotiated peace. President Kennedy said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

It is my opinion that any of the Republican candidates mentioned will defeat President Johnson, if the war is still going on, by merely copying what President Eisenhower did in the Korean war: promising to end it immediately after he became President.

As a long-time anti-Communist leader, I am convinced that our involvement in Vietnam was unnecessary, illegal and unconstitutional, and the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Soviet Russia and Communist China, two dominating forces, want to keep our armed forces bogged down while Communism reaps the harvest of hatred as a result of their massive propaganda depicting our killing and napalming women and children. But, even more than that, Soviet Russia is quietly seizing economic and military control and rapidly increasing influence throughout the Middle East and along the coast of the Red Sea, free from interference from the United States, trapped in Vietnam.

HAMILTON FISH,
Chairman of the First Congressional Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930–31.

Stand Up, Squares

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary, which appeared in the editorial column of the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, presents one of the most thought-provoking messages I have read in a long time.

I believe my colleagues will agree that we would have far fewer problems in the world today if the population of "squares" were increased. The editorial follows:

STAND UP, SQUARES

In our mail is an attention-getting commentary captioned "All Squares Please Stand."

We don't know its origin. The copy we have came from a friend and is signed "compliments John S. Swift Co. Inc."

We believe you will enjoy it:

"Square," another of the good old words, has gone the way of "love" and "modesty" and "patriotism." Something to be snickered over or outright laughed at.

Once there was no higher compliment you could pay a man than to call him a "square-shooter." The adman's promise of a "square deal" was as binding as an oath on a Bible. One of those admen, Charles Brower, says he's fed up with this beat generation distorting and corrupting our time-honored vocabulary. He said most of this first, but we second the notion: Today's "square" volunteers when doesn't have to.

He's a guy who gets his kicks from trying to do a job better than anyone else.

He's a boob who gets so lost in his work he has to be reminded to go home.

A square doesn't want to stop at the bar and get all juiced up because he prefers to go to his own home, his own dinner table, his own bed.

He hasn't learned to cut corners or goof off.

This creep we call a "square" gets all choked up when he hears children singing, "My country, 'tis of thee . . ."

He even believes in God and says so—in public!

A square lives within his means whether the Joneses do or not, and thinks his Uncle Sam should too.

A square is likely to save some of his own money for a rainy day, rather than count on using yours.

A square gets his books out the library instead of the drugstore.

He tells his son it's more important to play fair than to win.

Imagine!!

A square reads scripture when nobody's watching, prays when nobody's listening.

A guy who thinks Christmas trees should be green and Christmas gifts should be hand-picked.

And he wants to see America first—in everything.

He believes in honoring father and mother and "do unto others," and that kind of stuff.

He thinks he knows more than his teenager about cars, freedom, and curfew.

. . . Will all gooney-birds answering this description please stand up. You misfits in this brave new age, you dismally disorganized improperly apologetic ghosts of the past, stand up! Stand up and be counted! You squares . . . who turn the wheels and dig the fields and move mountains and put rivets in our dreams. You squares . . . who dignify the human race . . . You squares who hold the thankless world in place.

Lerner Press Carries Excellent Series on Greece

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lerner publications in my district recently carried a three-part series on the current situation in Greece which I believe deserves the attention of my colleagues.

In a few days, Andrea Papandreou, one of the leading spokesmen in the opposition is expected to visit the United States and I am sure he will bring with him his own views on the current situation in Greece.

I do not agree with Mr. Papandreou's evaluation of the current situation. As a matter of fact, after having personally observed the situation in Greece, and after having talked to his distinguished father the former Prime Minister of Greece, George Papandreou, I am convinced that Andreau Papandreou has contributed more toward the turmoil in Greece which led to the present coup than any other single individual in Greece.

It is for this reason that I am pleased today to put into the RECORD the series which appeared in the Lerner Press because Miss Lily Venson, the reporter who wrote this series, has done a truly outstanding job in depicting the present situation in Greece.

Miss Venson demonstrates a penetrating journalistic mind and an exceptional gift for good writing.

I hope her excellent series will help to put into perspective the current situation in Greece, and I hope that those who might be tempted to shower any great praise on Andrea Papandreou will compare his observations to those so excellently described in the Lerner Press series.

The series by Miss Lily Venson follows:

PUCINSKI VIEWS "NEW" GREECE

(By Lily Venson)

All the world is watching as "the glory that is Greece" hangs in the balance. The birth place of democracy and freedom has been placed in a crucible—and the test is severe.

Many people in the United States have lashed out with sharp criticism of the new government imposed on the people of Greece following a military coup d'etat last April.

A great number of these critics, including some in the mass media, have been outspoken in spite of the fact that not all are fully informed about events and conditions leading up to the coup.

But one North Side Congressman, Roman Pucinski (D–11th), made it his business to become informed—during a personal 10-day inspection tour of Greece last month.

The opportunity arose when Chris Mitchell, president of the Pan Arcadian Federation, invited Pucinski to attend the organization's convention in Athens. Some 3,500 Greek-Americans participated.

During an interview with this newspaper, Pucinski spoke eloquently about the people of Greece and with a quiet reverence as he described his visit to the Acropolis.

And he was cooly realistic in his analysis of the military takeover. He was there to try and understand the entire complex condition and his appraisal of the situation was tempered by an unbiased attitude.

He relates that "a 10-day visit to Greece leaves one fully aware that the new government has not taken any overt acts to enforce many of their edicts.

"There are no soldiers in the streets, no armed guards in the hotels. Young women continue to wear mini-skirts, and fortunately," he said mirthfully, "the Greek women have the legs to go with the mini-skirts.

"Generally, the casual visitor to Greece would not be aware that a military junta is running the country.

"The military leaders themselves recognize that Greece depends heavily on tourism to sustain her economy and, if anything, the new government has gone to extreme means to assure visitors courteous treatment all along the way.

"The government has done nothing to disturb the traditional and world-renowned Greek hospitality."

Cong. Pucinski remarked that perhaps the most amazing thing that a visitor finds is that the people themselves, despite the fact that their own personal liberties have been severely restricted, appear to be the greatest defenders of this present regime.

"People are quick to tell you that a revolution was inevitable and that only a strong military government could have restored order out of complete disorder which reached chaotic proportions prior to April 21 when the junta took over," continued Pucinski.

"The Greek people tell you about what it was like in Greece prior to the revolution.

"They say that wildcat strikes were the order of the day and that when they left home in the morning, they never knew if they would arrive home at night because almost every day, some portion of the transit system underwent a wildcat strike, with bus drivers leaving buses in the middle of the street during rush hours."

The congressman was told that the press was in total disarray, with violent attacks upon all segments of Greek society.

A publisher who is now working under severe censorship and who is strongly opposed to the present system said to Pucinski:

"If you had asked me about the condition of the Greek press prior to the revolution, I would have to admit with great shame that I was a member of the journalistic fraternity."

The publisher said the state of the press was incredible before the coup, and had reached new heights of irresponsibility.

As he toured Greece, talking intimately with people at all levels of life, the congressman learned more about the state of the country up to the military takeover:

"The people told me that morality and graft among public officials became so intolerable that even the slightest service, such as signing an inconsequential document, required a payoff.

"George Papandreou, former prime minister who is now under house arrest and one of the strongest critics of the present regime, told me that members of parliament were being corrupted and bought and sold every day for their votes in parliament.

"The people of Greece tell you that this whole situation is what made the revolution inevitable, and when it finally occurred on the morning of April 21, the general reaction was—'what kept it so long in coming?' "

The North Side congressman had many discussions with the military leaders during his 10-day tour. These were the men who led the revolution.

One of them reported "this country was so ripe for a revolution that we didn't even have to stretch; we just yawned and 8½ million people rolled into our laps."

Pucinski emphasized again that the most amazing thing he encountered was the seeming acceptance of this revolution by the people, but he qualified the comment with the following opinion:

"This acceptance, it is quite clear to me, will be short-lived if the military junta fails to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government as quickly as possible.

"The military government has imposed severe limitations on the Greek people and while they are accepting these limitations today, there is every reason to believe—as anyone who has studied the history of Greece knows—that they will not tolerate this kind of repression indefinitely."

Pucinski then detailed some of the restrictions imposed by the new government:

The military leaders have passed a slander law. Any citizen who speaks out in criticism of the new government is arrested and tried and can be punished by imprisonment for up to five years.

They have imposed severe limitations on assembly and no more than five people can assemble at any one time without giving police the names and addresses of all those in excess of five. Prior permission for such a meeting is also required.

The junta has imposed a total censorship on the press and newspapers have to submit proofs to a censor before the presses can roll.

They have installed military courts in place of a judicial system. Tribunals are held for all crimes against the state—so that you are tried by court martial with no bond and no bail.

The military people have arrested more than 6,500 Greeks who have been, in some way or other, associated with communist activities.

"JUNTA MUST KEEP PLEDGE": PUCINSKI

(NOTE.—This is the second of a series on conditions in Greece since the military takeover last April, as viewed by Cong. Roman Puckinski (D–11th), who made a 10-day inspection tour of Greece last month.)

(By Lily Venson)

"There are no soldiers in the streets, no armed guards in the hotels and young women continue to wear mini-skirts." Pucinski told the Lerner Newspapers, "and the casual visitor to Greece would not be aware that a military junta is running the country."

But during his tour, which included discussions with persons at all levels of life, as well as the top military officials who led the coup d'etat April 21, Pucinski was told that the revolution was inevitable because of the "chaotic conditions" that prevailed throughout every facet of society.

The military junta has imposed severe limitations on the Greek people, Pucinski related, and although the people have seemingly accepted the revolution, the congressman feels strongly that this acceptance will be short-lived if the military junta fails to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government as quickly as possible.

He emphasized that anyone familiar with the history of Greece knows the people will not tolerate any repression of their freedom for very long.

Pucinski observed that some of the severe restrictions include: a slander law with imprisonment up to five years for anyone criticizing the new government; general assemblies restricted to five persons at any one time—names and addresses of more than five must be given to police and prior consent for the meeting is up to the police.

Total censorship of the press has been instituted, and a judicial system has been replaced by military tribunals with no bond or bail permitted.

The Congressman was informed that more than 6,500 Greeks who have been associated with Communist activities have been arrested.

"Approximately 2,500 of these prisoners are in custody on the island of Yaros, which is in the Aegean Sea, about one hour's helicopter flight from Athens," continued Pucinski.

"I am the only foreigner to ever visit the island and I was taken there by General Patakos, minister of the interior in charge of security.

"He led the tanks in the revolution and he is considered one of the strong men of the military government.

"During my visit to the island, I observed with amazement while Patakos told hundreds of prisoners that if they would either sign statements or make oral statements pledging not to conspire with the Communists to overthrow the government, they could go home immediately—and they all refused.

"One woman, the mother of three young children whose photos she had put up on her prison wall, listened as the general told her, 'you don't belong here—go back to your children who need you and be a mother. Leave the politics to us.'

"She answered politely, 'No, thank you. I am a leftist and I will stay a leftist and I will stay here.' "

Pucinski reports that the same ritual was repeated over and over during his visit on the island and while most of the prisoners protested their incarceration, none of them would sign the document pledging not to conspire with the Communists.

The general said that 4,000 of the 6,500 originally arrested did sign the document and were released. He insists that those left on Yaros are hard core Communists.

During his long discussions with the military leaders, Pucinski, was informed that the junta had to institute repressive measures throughout Greece to save the country from Communism.

As an aside, Pucinski said that these same leaders now readily admit they made a mistake in getting into a fight with Melina Mercouri, the Greek film actress of "Never on Sunday" fame whose citizenship was stripped because she criticized the new regime.

The government feels it can do nothing about it now and they wish to ignore her, Pucinski was told.

Under arrest, Pucinski learned, is the 22-year-old daughter of Constantinos Doxiadis, world famous city planner. She is accused of conspiring with the Communists.

Composer Theodorakis, who wrote the musical score for the film "Zorba the Greek," is also under arrest according to Pucinski, who reacted to all of this news with the following comment:

"My own feeling is that this kind of political prosecution is repugnant to Americans, but the Greek military leaders insist that these people must be tried.

"It is my hope that as the new regime establishes its own position and gets the government moving, the authorities are going to at least assure these people adequate defense counsel. If, indeed, they did conspire with the Communists, they should be tried in an open court.

"However, there is no question that the rough attitude of the government toward this whole business of court martial trials has brought Greece a much greater stability.

"But you feel, as you speak with people around the country, that while they are willing to accept these severe measures for a brief time, the trouble of this new administration will mount if they try to make these repressive measures permanent."

The North Side congressman said that in talking to leaders of the junta, he had the feeling that they are very much aware of this and all of them told him that they had given the king their pledge that they would return to a parliamentary government as quickly as possible through free elections.

"Only time will tell to what extent they intend to keep their word," Pucinski added.

"One of the former members of parliament, who is not part of the military junta but who is not under house arrest, admitted that a strong change was inevitable.

"He felt that this government will have to start easing up on some of the restrictions if it is to survive."

Former prime minister George Papandreou, who is under house arrest, informed Pucinski that there was no need for the military coup.

He argues that the elections, which had been scheduled for May 28, five weeks after the coup, would have cured most of the evils rampant in Greece.

"But the leaders of the coup say that the Communists would have elected 60 seats in the Greek parliament, which had 300 delegates, and with these 60 seats, the military people insist, the Communists could have forced a coalition government to draw Greece out of NATO and pull Greece away from her alliance with America," continued Pucinski.

"The military junta has strongly endorsed continued membership in NATO. Our own government has temporarily suspended sending any military aid to Greece but, in my own judgment, we should restore this aid because Greece is the keystone of our whole defense perimeter in Europe."

MUST KEEP GREECE IN NATO

(By Lily Venson)

"No matter how cynical one might feel about the present military regime in Greece, it is a truly inspiring experience to walk in the land which gave birth to democracy, to the ideas and to the philosophy that carved a new concept for the dignity of man.

"You cannot stand on the hallowed grounds of the Acropolis and rub elbows among those ancient rocks without feeling a surge of history all around you."

Describing his recent 10-day tour of Greece was Cong. Roman Pucinski (D-11th) who was there to gain insight into conditions of the country before and after the coup d'etat last April.

After what he calls an exhaustive study, long discussions with leaders of the military government, and in-depth interviews with the man on the street, Pucinski formulated the personal opinions he stated before Congress during a one-hour presentation after his return from Greece.

Following are some of the salient points in his long statement:

"It is in the interest of the United States for our country to resume shipment of important military aid to Greece as part of our NATO defense structure.

"It is in the interest of the United States to press for restoration of parliamentary government in Greece, and this can be done by giving the present government of Greece technical assistance to meet many of the civilian problems, which the generals, by the very nature of their military background, will find difficulty in solving.

"We should help this government develop a democratic base for restoration of constitutional government.

"It is important for the United States to help King Constantine press the present military regime to restore parliamentary government to Greece as quickly as possible.

"I do not want my observations or my remarks ever to be construed as condoning a government which would deny its people basic civil rights.

"But neither would I ever want to be blinded by the realities of life, and one of those realities is that the military regime presently is in control of Greece.

"Furthermore, this regime has stated publicly and unequivocally that it supports America's position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will keep Greece in NATO."

The Congressman then emphasized that our nation cannot, and must not, ignore the fact that the crisis in the Middle East is not over.

"The Soviet Union continues to have her evil designs for the destruction of Israel. We may need Greece as our most reliable base if the situation in the Middle East should worsen.

"During the recent crisis, Greece stood with us and helped relocate Americans from the Middle East."

Pucinski reported to Congress that, on the basis of his most honest and sincere studies, the military government has the popular support of the people of Greece at this time.

"There are those who would challenge this statement and I respect their views.

"But the fact remains that if an election were to be held in Greece today, responsible people in Greece—including the bitter critics of the present regime—told me that the present military government would be overwhelmingly elected because it has restored order out of chaos in the country.

"I know there are those who will seriously question this conclusion, but the fact of the matter is that the people in the streets of Athens and in the villages told me that conditions had become so intolerable in Greece prior to April 21 that a revolution was inevitable."

Referring again to the importance of U.S. military aid, Pucinski declared that it is easy enough for Americans, deeply set in traditions of democracy, to insist that the Greek government institute constitutional rule in Greece before any further assistance is given.

"I would subscribe to this doctrine," the congressman continued, "but I think it is important to know that in a country whose northern border has three nations under Communist rule—the fears of its leaders are justified.

"Greece has Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on her northern border. History has shown us there is no 'second chance' with communism.

"You do not have any time to be wrong when you have three neighbors who would like to plunge you into the Communist orbit at the first opportunity."

During his tour of Greece, Pucinski spent two hours with former prime minister George Papandreou, who is under house arrest in his villa.

Based on this interview, Pucinski told Congress, "It is very clear that Papandreou had nothing but contempt for the present government and this is certainly understandable.

"The senior Papandreou defends his son, Andreas Papandreou, who is now awaiting trial for treason.

"It will be recalled that the King had deposed George Papandreou as prime minister in 1965 when he tried to make his son Andreas minister of defense.

"It is a known fact that Andreas recommended pulling Greece out of NATO. This was one of the main subjects of dispute within the government and the reason King Constantine deposed his prime minister.

George Papandreou told Pucinski that he and his son were critical of NATO because the NATO command told them NATO would not help Greece if she was attacked by Turkey for trying to recapture Cyprus.

"NATO insisted it could help only when a non-member nation attacked Greece. Both Papandreous insisted they did not need NATO under those conditions, and threatened to pull Greece out of NATO, the former prime minister said."

George Papandreous told Pucinski that he would never have agreed to work with the Communists, that he would never have agreed to a coalition government if the coalition was with the Communists.

"But," Pucinski told Congress, "those within the present Greek government insist that after two years of being deposed as prime minister, Papandreou would have been willing to agree to form a coalition government with the help of the Communists, and the price of such a coalition would have been the withdrawal of Greece from NATO."

The Congressman reported further that there is a fear in Greece that if the present government should fail, civil war may very well ensue, forcing Greece out of NATO and throwing the nation to the Communists.

He stressed that he can think of nothing more disastrous to the interests of America than to see Greece forced out of NATO or for NATO to lose "this very important bastion on the Mediterranean.

"It would give the Soviet Union access to the Mediterranean and probably force our 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean.

"It would give the Soviet Union control over the Middle East and ultimately the gateway to Africa. This is a prize that the Communists have coveted for the last two decades."

Pucinski reminded Congress that the Greeks were the first ones in 1947 who, against great odds, stood up to the Communists, and suffered great losses to protect their country for freedom.

He said he will stake his hopes and confidence on the people of Greece, confident that they will force the military junta to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government.

"It is my hope that we will help King Constantine return Greece to its traditional role as the cradle of democracy.

"The indisputable fact of the day is that in this troubled world, with great trouble in the Middle East, with great trouble in Europe, with great trouble in Asia, I submit that America needs Greece today a great deal more than Greece needs us."

A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education Conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Bank Street College of Education has been conducting a 2-year study of auxiliary personnel—nonprofessionals—in education for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The first phase of the study during 1966–67 consisted primarily of developing, coordinating, and analyzing 15 demonstration training programs located throughout the country.

Trainees varied in ethnic background including Negroes, Caucasians, Orientals, and American Indians as well as Mexican Americans and Americans born in Puerto Rico. The trainees also varied in age and in extent of their previous training and experience. All were at or below the poverty level: some from depressed rural areas and some from the target areas in cities. The trainees were drawn from the neighborhoods served by the schools—many of them parents of pupils—hence they helped to provide a communication bridge between home and school in disadvantaged areas. All trainees had one trait in common: the ability to work well with children and youth. This was seen as the essential criterion in the selection process.

From the analysis of these 15 projects and from consultations with educators and community leaders throughout the country, some significant findings and recommendations emerged. They are summarized in a pamphlet which has provided guidelines to school administrators, deans of colleges of education, teachers, parents, community leaders and to the auxiliaries themselves as they plan and work together for the training and effective utilization of auxiliary personnel in the schools.

The recent amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requiring training for auxiliaries employed with ESEA funds, makes this pamphlet of particular relevance. I therefore shall take this opportunity of reading into the RECORD this pamphlet in its entirety. I believe we may derive some new insights from this document, as we survey a new phenomenon in education. It is our task to provide not only for the training of auxiliaries in the schools but the opportunity for upward mobility in this new career.

The pamphlet follows:

NEW PARTNERS IN THE AMERICAN SCHOOL: A STUDY OF AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

(By Bank Street College of Education for the Office of Economic Opportunity, November, 1967)

THE NEED

Have you ever heard pupils say: "I don't dig school. Man, they tell you how to talk, how to act, how to eat even. Then at home, they tell you just the opposite. Why don't they either get together on all that stuff or leave me alone. I want out."

Have you ever heard parents say: "School? Well, I don't know what goes on there but I do know that my children can't read. I can't get them to feel school is important the way they should."

Have you ever heard teachers ask: "How can I teach when I have to collect money, prepare bulletin board displays, check supplies, find missing books, prepare flash cards, supervise lunch hours, check attendance, and do all the other little things that eat up my time?

What can I do for a child who needs a little extra help at a crucial time for him, when all the other children need me at the same time?"

Have you ever heard school administrators ask: "How can I meet the increasing demands—and the very real need—for additional services, when I can't even find enough teachers and other professionals to do the job?"

AN ANSWER—NOT THE ONLY ANSWER

The rapidly changing social scene raises many complex and urgent questions, and demands many answers from the school.

One answer, and a good one, is the use of auxiliary personnel, such as teacher-aides, teacher-assistants, family workers, counselor-aides. These school employees have had little prior academic training when they start work. They learn from experience. They may study and grow on the job. Many have incomes at or below the poverty level. Often they are parents of children in the school they serve, but they do not work with their own children. They vary in age, racial and nationality background, and in the degree of skill, but they have one trait in common: the ability to work well with children and youth.

Auxiliaries who have had training help the learning-teaching process in two ways: first by relieving the teacher of many time-consuming duties and thus freeing him to teach; and second, by working directly with the children under the teacher's supervision, helping them to study, to play, to inquire, to think, to talk, in short—to learn.

RESULTS OF A NATIONWIDE STUDY

Fifteen demonstration training programs for auxiliary school personnel were studied by Bank Street College of Education for the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1966–67.

Trainees included: residents in target areas (predominantly Negro) of the cities of Berkeley, Detroit, Gary (Indiana), East St. Louis (Illinois), New York City, and Washington, D.C.; Navaho Indians in Arizona; rural poor in Appalachia, Maine, Mississippi; migrant workers in Florida; Puerto Ricans in San Juan and New York City; Mexican-Americans and others in Southern California; and a cross-class, cross-cultural group in Boston.

Some major findings are—

1. When carefully selected, continuously trained, and appropriately placed, low-income auxiliaries with minimum prior schooling seemed capable of assisting directly in the learning-teaching process with benefit to: pupils, teachers, administrators, home-school relations, and to the auxiliaries themselves as workers and persons.

2. Training—preferably team training of teachers and auxiliaries who would be or were working together—was seen as the essential to the effective use of auxiliaries.

3. Job definition was obviously necessary to set limits, but in the most successful programs such specifications were applied flexibly, to meet the needs of each learning situation.

4. Career development (assurance of stable employment, opportunity for advancement, and training at each step in the job sequence) was found to be least in evidence, although most crucial, in school systems throughout the country.

STUDY FINDINGS—EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Some special needs of disadvantaged children

1. Education which is geared to the need of each child is important for all pupils but crucial for the disadvantaged.

2. Free movement and varied activities are particularly helpful for children with a high anxiety level who consequently exhibit restlessness and short attention span.

3. Communication between middle-class teachers and lower-class pupils is frequently difficult because of language and cultural barriers, lack of common experiences, and frequent inability of the disadvantaged to express their real feelings appropriately and constructively.

4. Insecurity about his adequacy for coping with life is a block to learning for any child. It is a frequent problem for those who have been subjected to indignities and inequalities in all phases of living, from early childhood on through adulthood.

5. A parent who has, himself, failed in a school setting, sometimes tends to be hostile to the school and ridicule education. Home-school conflict then becomes one of the destructive influences in the child's learning.

How auxiliaries may help to meet these needs

1. Both teachers and auxiliaries may develop a different quality of relationship which is more pertinent to the child's needs when there are several concerned adults in the classroom instead of one.

2. More small groupings and a wider range of activities are feasible in an aided classroom than in a situation where one person is working all alone, often in an overcrowded classroom and with an overloaded schedule.

3. The auxiliary who lives in the child's own neighborhood often communicates with the child in a way that is neither threatening nor strange. He may help the child adjust to the unfamiliar world of the school and also interpret some aspects of his behavior to the teacher.

4. The low-income auxiliary who has faced up to and overcome some of the difficulties and frustrations the child now faces, says to the child by his very presence in the school: "It can be done. You, too, can succeed here."

5. Involvement of parents from the neighborhood in the classroom may help them support their children's learning. The parent who understands the school's goals may be the best interpreter of the school to the community. Further, parents-as-auxiliaries and teachers may alter each other's ideas and behavior and thus reduce the gulf between life styles of home and school.

POSSIBLE STAGES IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF AUXILIARIES

	Illustrative functions	Training suggested
(1) AIDE such as:		
General school aide	Clerical, monitorial, custodial duties	Brief orientation period (2 or 3 weeks) in human development, social relations, and the school's goals and procedures, as well as some basic skill training.
Lunchroom aide	Serving and preparation of food, monitorial duties.	
Teacher aide	Helping teacher in classroom, as needed	
Family worker or aide	Appointments, escorting, and related duties	
Counselor aide	Clerical, receptionist, and related duties	No specified preschooling required.
Library aide	Helping with cataloging and distribution of books.	
(2) Assistant such as:		
Teacher assistant	More relationship to instructional process	High school diploma or equivalent; 1 year's inservice training or 1 year in college with practicum.
Family assistant	Home visits and organizing parent meetings	
Counselor assistant	More work with records, listening to children sent from class to counselor's office because they are disrupting class.	Both can be on a workstudy basis while working as an aide.
Library assistant	More work with pupils in selecting books and reading to them.	
(3) Associate such as:		
Teacher associate	More responsibility with less supervision by the professional.	A.A. degree from 2-year college or 2-year special program in a 4-year college. Both can be on work-study basis while working as an assistant.
Home-School associate		
Counselor associate		
Library associate		
Social work associate		
(4) Teacher-intern such as:		
Student teacher	Duties very similar to those of associate but with more involvement in diagnosis and planning.	B.A. or B.S. degree and enrollment in a college of teacher education or other institution which offers a program leading to certification.
Student home-school coordinator		
Student counselor		
(5) Teacher.		

Note: An auxiliary can enter at any stage in the career ladder, depending upon his previous training and experience. He can cease training at the level at which he feels most comfortable. Upward mobility should be possible but not compulsory. The auxiliary's work should be treated with respect at each stage, so that he will have a sense of dignity and accomplishment, however far he may rise. Group and individual counseling should be available throughout both preservice and inservice training.

TYPES OF WORK AUXILIARIES CAN DO IN SCHOOLS WITH PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION

1. Examples of activities which directly support the learning-teaching process

The following activities were seen as particularly helpful in one project of the nationwide study which stressed listening, relating, supporting, inspiring, and serving as "trouble shooter":

(a) Taking charge of a small group which is working on a special project while the teacher works with another group

(b) Listening to a pupil tell a story

(c) Giving a pupil a chance to show he can do something well

(d) Encouraging pupils to help each other

(e) Interesting a restless pupil in some of the available activities

(f) Helping pupils learn how to settle arguments without fighting

(g) Talking quietly to a pupil who is upset

(h) Helping a pupil look up information in a book

(i) Helping pupils improve special skills (such as gym, sewing, or dancing).

These are merely illustrative of the wide range of activities that are possible and sometimes desirable, always depending on the particular needs of the pupils, the ability of the auxiliary, and the leadership skills of the teacher. Persons from a disadvantaged area are sometimes slow in reading books but seldom slow in reading people. They pick up cues of troubles or of promise with alacrity.

2. Examples of activities which help the teacher by relieving him of noninstructional duties

The following activities were seen as particularly helpful in several of the demonstration projects, where the dual role of the auxiliary was stressed—that is, (1) helping the teacher, and (2) relating directly to the pupils. The task-oriented activities deemed most helpful were:

(a) Preparing audio-visual materials such as charts, at request of the teacher

(b) Keeping health, attendance records

(c) Checking supplies

(d) Filing and cataloging materials

(f) Operating equipment such as movie projector, slide projector, tape recorder

(g) Taking charge of pupils on various occasions, such as during lunch period, in hallways, on bus

(h) Checking playground equipment for safety

(i) Getting the classroom ready for the next day

(j) Running a duplicating machine.

Some of these activities are regular assignments for which the auxiliary plans and takes initiative. Others are assigned at a given moment as the need arises. All are duties which may be delegated outright to the auxiliary, rather than duties which are supportive of instruction and carried out under the teacher's supervision. Most of them involve some contact with pupils, however, which the auxiliary may capitalize upon for pupil learning if he is sensitive to the opportunity.

3. Examples of activities which provide a link with home and community

The following activities are usually performed with the supervision of the school counselor or social worker. These activities were seen by the Study team as particularly helpful in the schools where auxiliaries were used in this manner:

(a) Visiting parents of children who are new to the school to welcome them to the school community

(b) Reporting to the counselor problems observed in home visits so that appropriate action may be taken

(c) Taking children to their homes when they become sick in school

(d) Talking with parents of children who have been absent or to such children and their parents together

(e) Working individually with a child who is too upset to remain in his own classroom and who is consequently sent to the counselor's office

(f) Helping to plan and organize parent meetings

(g) Talking with parents to find out how they feel about the school and reporting their reactions to a counselor

(h) Helping parents understand how children learn and grow, and relating this to the children's homework

(i) Helping recruit and register pupils in the preschool program

(j) Answering the calls of parents and giving them information and referring them to the proper source.

Of all the auxiliaries employed in a school, relatively few are usually assigned to the guidance department. For example, of the 24 auxiliaries working in each school in the Berkeley demonstration project, only four were counselor-assistants. They were selected from auxiliaries already working in the school who had shown most sensitivity to children's needs and had demonstrated their skills in working with pupils and communicating with parents.

The Study team observed that a cadre of counselor-assistants permitted the guidance counselor increased mobility, it guaranteed that there would be a concerned and knowledgeable adult in the office at all times, to talk with a child who had been sent to the guidance office, to receive visitors, and answer the telephone. Since there was always at least one person in the office, the counselor could be reached in moments of crisis, even though the other three counselor-assistants might be in the field, performing such functions as making home contacts, working with pupils in the "cooling off room," or escorting children to clinics.

Some auxiliaries have special skills which are valuable for use in the classroom or the school at large. For example, auxiliaries who speak another language as well as English often are asked to serve as interpreters for parents who do not feel comfortable talking in English.

Perhaps the most important skill of all is the ability to listen and understand what the child is trying to say. "No one ever listened to me before," one auxiliary in Puerto Rico said of her experiences in an assistant training program. This woman, understanding the need to be listened to, went into the classroom determined to listen to what children were really saying, and to work with their concerns.

An ultimate goal of education may be expressed as helping children learn how to cope effectively with life situations. Auxiliaries have demonstrated their skills in helping children become self-directed. One auxiliary in Berkeley, California, recounted an experience in her school:

"One day I went to a child as I had been doing every day for several weeks to give him help in reading certain words. The child gave me a beautiful smile—one I'll never forget—and said proudly, 'I don't need you any more.' He was on his own. He knew I would be there if he needed me, but he now felt sure enough to work by himself."

The auxiliary, having identified with the goals of the school, saw this episode, not as a rejection of herself, but as a tremendous personal achievement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

It is recommended—

That when a school system decides to utilize auxiliary personnel, the program be incorporated as an integral, permanent part of the system.

That goals be thought through carefully, stated clearly, and implemented by means of definite procedures.

That there be cooperative planning by school systems, local institutions of higher learning, and neighborhood representatives, both before and after the program has been instituted.

That job definitions set a floor and a ceiling on the auxiliaries' activities; but that within these limits the auxiliaries' role be flexible, accommodating to situational and individual requirements.

That career development be fostered in terms of job descriptions, salaries, increments, and fringe benefits, moving from primary routine functions at the entry level to more functions which are relatively responsible and directly related to the learning-teaching process with appropriate training available at each stage on a work-study basis.

That professional standards be preserved and that all tasks performed by nonprofessionals be supervised by a professional.

That recruitment and selection tap the wealth of previously undiscovered talent, particularly among males and underachievers, who appear to be capable of development in the specific role to be filled.

That there be orientation of both the administrators and the professionals with whom the auxiliaries will be working, including an opportunity for the expression of resistance where it may exist, and for resolution of conflicts, leading, hopefully, to acceptance of the new leadership role of the professionals.

That whenever possible, professionals be asked to volunteer, rather than having auxiliary personnel assigned to them without option.

That there be preservice training of auxiliaries to develop communication skills, other concrete skills, and basic understandings needed for success during their first work experience in a school situation.

That professionals and nonprofessionals who will be working together on the job receive preservice training on a team basis and intensified inservice training also as teams with competent supervision.

The inservice institutes be developed for the team training of administrators, other professionals, and auxiliaries, on a schoolwide basis.

That encouragement of those who desire to train and qualify for advancement be expressed in such a way that others who prefer to remain at the entry or any other level feel no lack of job satisfaction, status, or recognition.

That hiring precede training, so that trainees will be given orientation for an actual job, rather than for a job which, in the end, may not exist.

That feedback from trainees be encouraged and that their comments be received with openness and serious consideration.

That both group and individual counseling be available as an integral part of training.

That the use of auxiliaries be explored at various levels, secondary as well as elementary and preschool.

That time be scheduled during the school day or after school hours with extra compensation for teachers and auxiliaries and other professional-nonprofessional teams to review their team experience and plan together for the coming day.

That an advisory committee of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, auxiliaries, parents, community leaders, and university consultants be established to evaluate and improve the utilization of auxiliaries in each school where such a program is undertaken.

THE TASK AHEAD

The values derived from the utilization of auxiliary personnel in the 15 demonstration programs did not accrue automatically from the introduction of more adults into the classroom. Many complex but not insoluble problems arose as school people moved into new roles and relationships. This section deals with some of the more urgent problems that may be faced and coping strategies that may be employed as effective interaction is developed among professionals, auxiliaries, pupils, and parents in a community-centered school.

Reaching the unreached

In most of the demonstration programs studied there was a tendency to do a certain amount of "creaming"—that is, selecting persons who, though poor, were most similar in values, appearance, and behavior to middle-class professionals. This was understandable in view of the importance of demonstrating that people below the poverty level and with little prior schooling can, in fact, make a valuable contribution to the learning-teaching process.

It appears that the time has now come to recruit and select those with potential which is less obvious though very real. This practice does not mean that anyone should be selected to work in a school simply because he is poor. There is no magic in poverty which automatically makes its victims able to reach out to others in a way which helps children learn and teachers teach. However, experience has shown that it is possible to "screen in" low achievers who have been "screened out" even of poverty programs—and with dramatic results in terms of combatting the sense of frustration, resentment, and loss of identity that may lead to violence.

Action Needed

1. Recruitment patterns to reach those most victimized by poverty and discrimination, particularly men.

2. Selection criteria and procedures which attempt to ascertain the ability of candidates to work well with children.

3. Brief preservice programs which serve a double purpose: (a) to train, and (b) to explore and develop potential strengths before assignment of specific duties.

4. Vocational counseling to help place in other appropriate jobs those who do not qualify for work in schools.

Developing a team approach

Traditionally, many teachers have had an image of themselves as standing before pupils giving out information with the classroom door locked—figuratively and sometimes even literally. When a child did not respond to the information, as presented, he was usually written off as a failure. Seldom was there any question as to what was being taught or how it was being taught as possible causal factors for the child's inability to learn.

Today, a searching self-evaluation has been initiated by many teachers, administrators, and other professionals such as specialists in curriculum, mental health, and physical health. The aim is to discover how to reach every child. The introduction of auxiliary personnel into the schools has strengthened such self-analysis, since professionals find they have to clarify their own goals and practices for themselves before they can interpret them to their helpers.

A new leadership role is emerging for teachers as they learn to coordinate the contributions of other adults in the classroom, very much as an orchestra combines strings, brass, and woodwinds into harmony. The "teacher-leader" analyzes the learning and emotional needs of children. He utilizes all available resources—professional and nonprofessional, human and material—in a unified program designed to meet those needs. The teacher is the pivotal person, responsible and accountable for seeing that learning takes place in the classroom.

However, many teachers see this new role as a dilution rather than an enhancement of teaching. For one thing, they fear that they might lose personal contact with children, even though the help they receive in performing routine tasks may actually increase rather than lessen their opportunity for interaction with individual children.

Other professionals, such as counselors and social workers, also tend to resent any intrusion onto their particular turf. Many professionals look at their own small part of the child, without ever sharing their views and values as part of a team.

In essence, the team approach means that members of a working team do not ask: "How come I always wind up doing this kind of job?" or "How can untrained people do any part of my job?" but rather, "Which of us can learn how to perform this particular task in a way which will best help the pupil?"

Action Needed

1. Team training of administrators, teachers, other professionals, and nonprofessionals, so that the needs of children become more important than the needs of the adults for personal achievement and recognition.

2. Application of the team approach simultaneously to the school as a whole and to each class situation—in fact the development of "teams within a team," so to speak.

3. Emphasis upon and preparation for this new and expanded role of teachers in institutions of higher learning which prepare teachers for certification.

Involving the community

As parents and community leaders begin to make new demands upon the schools and seek a new role in decision-making, delicate negotiations are required. Two essentials of successful negotiation are a balance of power and a willingness to "give" a bit on both sides. Too often, in the past, parents have negotiated from weakness of several kinds—lack of status, lack of "know-how," lack of communication skills. And all too frequently, in the past, both sides have taken inflexible positions.

One sensitive and extremely complex problem has been discovered as low-income parents assume new responsibilities in the school, i.e., the effect of this shift in role upon their relationship with their neighbors. Sometimes, those who take on leadership roles are rejected by their peers as having "sold out" to the Establishment. Sometimes, the reverse is true; the new leaders adopt middle-class values and reject their own people.

Action Needed

1. Involvement of selected parents as auxiliaries in schools situated in both advantaged and disadvantaged areas, with emphasis upon educational goals in training.

2. Establishment of school-community advisory boards composed of persons with various viewpoints in both school and community, working together toward analyzing realistically the situation and toward maximizing the contribution each group can make toward quality education.

3. Case by case analysis of each situation with counseling to support and guide the adjustment.

Facing the administrative challenge

Administrators are not only chiefly responsible for establishing overall goals and policies, setting the tone, and identifying what functions need to be performed by whom; they are also responsible for implementing these decisions through fiscal operations and organizational procedures.

In the fiscal realm uncertainty as to continued federal funding is a major problem. This uncertainty inhibits career development with its concomitants of job sequence including graduated compensation, increments, and fringe benefits as well as work-study programs with remuneration for study and educational credit for work experience.

There are also many procedural matters to consider such as (1) matching the "right" kind of auxiliary with the "right" kind of teacher within an appropriate situation; (2) allowing teachers to volunteer to use auxiliaries, or at least to self-select them; (3) providing the opportunity to change partners with the minimum of sensitivity when the principal problem appears to be a clash of personality; and (4) scheduling time within the school day for the teacher-auxiliary teams to review their experiences in the classroom and plan together for the next day.

The role of the administrator as interpreter to board, parents, and staff may seem burdensome to one who is not, himself, convinced of the ultimate values of auxiliaries to the school, and who lacks assistance both within and outside the school in coping with the complexities of the challenge.

Action Needed

1. Assurance of continued funding by government, as is unquestioned for roads and the maritime industry.

2. Priority in school budget "hard funds" for the employment and training of auxiliary personnel.

3. Close cooperation and joint planning by schools and local institutions of higher learning to develop work-study programs.

4. Orientation of administrators through institutes and workshops involving professional associations, unions and community agencies at some point in the discussion.

5. Additional personnel in each school to provide for administration and supervision of special projects, made possible by federal funding, such as projects for the use of auxiliary personnel.

6. A plan for career development in each school system, along the lines of the model on pp. 8–9.

AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL DEMONSTRATION CENTERS: SPONSORS AND DIRECTORS

Columbus Elementary Laboratory School: Berkeley Unified School District, 2211 Seventh Avenue, Berkeley, California; Jerome Gilbert, Director, Tel. #415–841–1422.

Continuing Education Department: Detroit Public Schools, 5057 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan, Aileen Selick, Director, Tel. #313–833–7900.

New Careers Program: Howard University, D.C. Department of Public Health, College of Medicine, 1808 Adams Mill Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.; William H. Denham, Director, Tel. #202–629–4991.

School of Education: Morehead State University, Box 827, Morehead, Kentucky; Milan Dady, Director, Tel. #606–784–4181.

Department of Education: University of Maine, Orono, Maine; John Lindlof, Director, Tel. #207–866–7297.

CONSULTATION AND INFORMATION SERVICE

Offers assistance to school systems, institutions of higher learning, community action agencies, and to groups and individuals interested in developing programs for the training and utilization of auxiliary personnel.

Specific services offered: distribution of materials based on analysis of demonstration projects; free consultation service in New York office and throughout the country; arrangements made for visits to Demonstration Centers; recommendation of speakers who are leaders in the field of auxiliary personnel.

For assistance and information Telephone: 212–831–1200; or Write: Consultation and Information Service, A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education, 103 East 125th Street, New York, New York 10035.

STAFF

Gordon J. Klopf, Director.

Garda W. Bowman, Research and Program Coordinator.

Lodema Burrows, Editorial Associate.

Marion Armstrong, Administrative Assistant.

Barry Greenberg, Research Assistant.

Vera Weisz, Research Associate.

ABOUT BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Bank Street College of Education was founded in 1916 as an institute for educational research and school experimentation. Preparation of teachers has been a central function of the program for 30 years. Other major undertakings of the College are research in education and human development, experimental schools, field services to the public schools, and the publication of professional literature.

Television

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, television is unavoidably an integral part of today's American culture. A lot of what is on television is not very good. Educational television is pressing the commercial stations to upgrade their product. TV news, documentary and commentary are improving. Very clearly television has made and is continuing to make a major contribution to American life.

One of the most eloquent defenses of the quality of television broadcasting appeared recently in TV Guide by Mr. Eric Sevareid.

Mr. Sevareid says in part:

> It seems clear to me that what is bad on television—and too much still is—is rather innocuously bad, not evil. It seems clear that television gets better, just as do the films, the press, the magazines. And it is surely clear by now that TV has not debased American tastes, standards or habits. I suspect it has improved them, and I am certain that it has enormously stimulated intellectual curiosity.

Such is the state of television as Mr. Sevareid sees it. I commend his view to my colleagues, by including his article in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Television is a marvelous vehicle for education as well as entertainment. The challenge is for us to use it well. The article follows:

A LITTLE LESS HYPOCRISY, PLEASE

(By Eric Sevareid)

Until a few years ago every American assumed he possessed an equal and God-given expertise on three things: politics, religion and the weather. Now a fourth has been added—television. TV serves nicely as the national whipping boy, after LBJ, that is.

The most conspicuous critics of the medium, of course, are the professional intellectuals, because they are articulate and they have the access to newsprint. TV GUIDE has published a series of essays on the evils of television by world-known intellectuals. I have read six of these essays and I am baffled. With one and possibly two exceptions, these amount to complaints by fastidious intellectuals, addressed to other fastidious intellectuals. They are telling each other what they themselves like and dislike about TV. But they put on disguise. They pretend that their concern is with the great mass of the people.

They tempt me to agree with Eric Hoffer, who said on a recent broadcast that intellectuals must never be given power because they want people to get down on their knees and learn to love what they really hate and hate what they love.

When printing was invented, I suspect that much of the literati and other elites of Europe took fright, convinced it would diffuse easy and therefore dangerous knowledge and ideas amongst the ordinary people whose minds should be guided by their betters. When the typewriter was invented, the literati scorned it, convinced it was a debasement of the art of writing. When the first, flickering motion pictures appeared, only the "vulgar" watched them. The intellectuals said the flicks would never compete with the legitimate theater in either artistic or mercantile terms. When talking pictures began, many critics warned that they would destroy the art of film acting, which was pantomime, and ruin the whole illusion.

The lesson should be clear. There is, and always has been, a broad swatch of professional intellectuals who fear and detest anything new, particularly if it is adaptable to the pleasure of the great mass of ordinary people. This particular type of intellectual neither knows nor likes ordinary people. This is why they write about "humanity" and not about persons. They are like the English Puritans who hated bearbaiting, not because it gave pain to the bears but because it gave pleasure to the spectators.

Indeed, this kind of critic would deny the very premise, the uniqueness of America, which is that we are the first *mass* civilization, the *mass* culture in all history. For the first time, the effort is to educate *everyone* to the limit of his capacity. America, says Hoffer, is God's gift to the poor, who largely created this society. Of course intellectuals of the traditionalist type do not feel at home here; and of course they hate TV, which is simply the latest and most universal symbol of a culture of universality.

It seems clear to me that what is bad on television—and too much still is—is rather innocuously bad, not evil. It seems clear that television gets better, just as do the films, the press, the magazines. And it is surely clear by now that TV has *not* debased American tastes, standards or habits. I suspect it has improved them, and I am certain that it has enormously stimulated intellectual curiosity.

It is claimed that TV discourages reading. It does the contrary. Book reading in this country over the last 18 years, the approximate life span of general television, has increased far more than the increase in the population. The day after the Hoffer interview in September, his books sold out, all across the country. When the late classicist, Dr. Moses Hadas, in a program with me from the Roman Forum offered to send lists of recommended books about ancient Rome to listeners, requests poured in from some 20,000 persons who otherwise, very probably, would never have read any classical history at all. There have been hundreds of other such instances in TV's lifespan.

It is claimed that TV destroys conversation. This is surely bunk. Nonconversing families were nonconversing families before there was any TV or radio. Actually, thousands of specific TV programs have generated millions of specific conversations that otherwise would not have taken place.

It is claimed that TV debases the English language. More bunk. There are millions and millions of people living in slums and remote rural areas who almost never hear good diction *except* on TV and radio.

It is claimed that TV programs are much too commercialized, and I agree. But, believe it or not, TV content is not as heavily larded with advertisements as the daily newspapers, which give an average of 60 percent of their space to ads. The difference is that TV operates in linear time and the press in space, and TV commercials are, alas, unavoidable. Press advertisements are eminently avoidable.

It is objected that TV news programs and documentaries are not The New York Times. It may be a question who feels worse about this condition, inasmuch as every survey shows that a majority of people trust the accuracy and impartiality of broadcast news more than that of press news, and inasmuch as a far greater number of people follow TV news than read The Times or any other daily publication.

I have read hundreds of condescending pieces in the printed press about TV journalism, but I observe some strange phenomena: 1. The press covers TV and not vice versa. 2. The press accepts the TV system of projecting elections, not vice versa. 3. The movement of aspiring journalists is from the press to TV, far more than vice versa. 4. Newspaper salaries have risen in the direction of TV salaries, not vice versa.

I do not, by any means, regard TV journalism as generally superior to print journalism. I would have a very hard time without the daily papers and the magazines. The two media are not half so competitive as they are complementary.

But let us consider a few motes and beams. Press critics still accuse TV of cravenly avoiding controversial issues. This bewilders people in TV. We have dealt, graphically and explicitly, with race hatred, the cigaret menace, the insecticide menace, homosexuality, drug addiction, demagoguery, slumlords, the official illusions about Vietnam—you name it. Our trouble is not cowardice but shortage of raw material. As Mr. Jack Gould of The Times was nice enough to say recently, "TV is now at least as outspoken as the print media." Critics often hark back with nostalgia to the exposé programs done some 15 years ago by the Murrow-Friendly team. They forget that those programs were great because—besides Murrow's incomparable presence—they were the *first*. In technique, the same kind of thing is done even more effectively today.

Press critics still, sometimes, accuse TV of toadying to advertisers on program content. In truth, that battle was won by the networks long ago. Yet when a recent network documentary on advanced technology showed, by sheer happenstance, some gadgets manufactured by the sponsoring concern, some press critics made a big, alarming thing of it. Let them look at their own papers and take note of the whole sections of "puff copy" written to pad out pages of advertising on real estate or resorts or foreign investments. Let them search for editorial criticism of leading businessmen or society matrons in newspapers published in small or middle-sized cities. Let one of them, just for the fun of it, write a letter to the editor criticizing a specific make of automobile as a lemon and see if it gets printed.

While they compose columns and editorials deploring TV's "wasteland" of trivia, let them measure the column space devoted to astrology, moronic comics, advice to the lovelorn, liquor ads—none of which appears on TV. Let them, at the same time, see what TV programs and personalities are featured on the cover pages of the weekly TV supplements their own papers publish. In the six issues of TV GUIDE containing the six essays I read deploring the low cultural state of television, the cover featured characters from the following programs: *The FBI, Batman, Gidget, The Big Valley, Mona McCluskey, Laredo.*

Occasionally, in my bad moments, I harbor the dire suspicion that newspapers criticize TV so much because they long ago lost the guts to criticize each other in the lusty old American tradition of the press, and need a substitute.

Well, it's a nice day and I hate to sound waspish. My only point is that we need a little less hypocrisy and a lot more common sense in our evaluations of an all-pervasive (if not all-persuasive) medium for amusement, information, enlightenment, inspiration, boredom, irritation and anxiety—one that is already imbedded in the warp and woof of America, is going to be with us permanently, often reflects the mediocre in our society, rarely the worst and sometimes the finest.

Things Don't Just Happen

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a fine statement of the relationships between education, government, and industry made by Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before the National Industrial Association a few months ago.

Dr. Halperin's speech seems to me an altogether splendid presentation of the intricacies and problems involved in these relationships. I would like us all to have the benefit of his thinking:

THINGS DON'T JUST HAPPEN

(By Dr. Samuel Halperin)

Those who have a printed copy of my statement may wonder if they are attending the correct Task Group meeting. The uncertainty arises because I have titled my remarks "Things Don't Just Happen. . . ." At the same time, the former Program lists me as discussing "Future Legislation Involved Interface."

I have departed from the assigned Program title for two reasons: First, I don't understand it; second, I'm frightened by it. Despite Project Aristotle's gracious invitation to meet with you today, I have reluctantly concluded, in the words of an esteemed colleague with a talent for creating couplets, that

"The world would be a better place,
Minus words like interface!"

So this afternoon I intend to discuss, not "interface," but relationships—relationships among businessmen, educators and government administrators.

My trade, after all, is that of semantic and political bridge-building among educators, the Congress, the Executive Branch, and the public-at-large. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to several fairly simple propositions, and the kind of unencumbered language that bridge-builders must use if they seek to communicate with their highly diverse and frequently contentious constituents.

Proposition Number One—Education *is* the growth industry of America.

Although I am a good, professional, nonpartisan, non-political, loyal, liberal, Democrat, I nevertheless have little hesitation in commending your attention to a most stimulating document published by the Republican Policy Committee of the U.S. Senate, Entitled *Where the Votes Are* (Senate Document No. 106, 89th Congress, 2nd Session), the study informs GOP vote-seekers that "coming down the pike is an avalanche of schoolchildren like we've never experienced before." In 1985, there will be 100 million Americans aged 5–24. The occupation for most of them—perhaps ⅘—will be "student."

Already, almost a third of our population is enrolled in one kind of school or another. As popular demand simultaneously pushes Americans toward both preschool learning and graduate education, that proportion is certain to expand.

Teachers, supervisors, administrators and other educational personnel, now more than 3 million strong, will soon surpass the number of American farmers. Their influence on politics and American society at large—as well as on education—cannot be overstated.

Under present trends, expenditures for education will rise even faster than educational employment and student enrollments—from $50 billion today to a projected $66 billion in 1975 (in 1965–66 dollars).

In short, the impressive growth prospects of American education *are* worthy of your most serious attention.

Proposition Number Two—Although huge and growing rapidly, "it ain't necessarily so" that the education market is a lush and ready hunting ground for quick profits by enterprising businessmen.

Much of the corridor talk at this Symposium, as at other convocations of persons interested in encouraging business participation in the world of education, centers about the particular difficulties of this or that industry giant in locating the fiscal black ink of American education. While I cannot account for all of the difficulties which may have led corporate executives initially to misjudge the educational market, at least the following are contributing factors:

1—The hardware-software imbalance, which dominates so much of this Symposium's attention.

2—The deceptive composition of American educational expenditures. Simply stated, while education may be a $50 billion annual market, after the vast bulk of educational funds are committed to essential staff salaries, utilities, maintenance, and interest on bonded indebtedness, only a small percentage is available for spending on *things*—books, equipment and facilities. In short, educators generally lack much "free money" to buy the products which industry has to sell.

3—The difficulties of "getting a handle" on the sales market. As you may have discovered—to your great pain—American education has no centralized buying system. Instead, businessmen must learn to cope with a confusion of ways of tapping the educational market: through 70-plus Federal agencies supporting educational programs, 23,000 operating public school districts, 55 State and territorial departments of education, 2,300 colleges and universities—with 1–2 new colleges springing up every week. All of this is very baffling, indeed. Perhaps it makes some of you yearn for the relative simplicity of selling the TFX to the Pentagon?

4—The non-availability of Federal R&D funds for large-scale development by private industry of new systems, facilities, equipment, etc. Despite the Office of Education's authority, obtained in 1965, for contracts with private corporations to develop new educational systems, the Office never has had the significant funds required to do the job. Nor is there much prospect over the near-term that such funds will be forthcoming. Unlike the space race, the development of the SST, or new national commitments to deal with air pollution, the political as well as budgetary climate does not yet indicate that the Office of Education will be able to obtain large sums of money which, in turn, could be used to harness industrial R&D to the problems of educational development.

5—The hostility of some educators to the entry of big business into the new and growing educational markets. It cannot be denied that much of American education still regards business participation in the improvement of education with a jaundiced eye while many businessmen look askance at cooperation either with the Federal government or with the American educational system. It is to these gaps in understanding that some of my subsequent remarks will be addressed.

Proposition Number Three—The Administration genuinely seeks to enlist industry in the struggle to build a better America—in education and in every domestic arena.

Our President continuously exhorts the businessmen of America to pitch in with the great domestic challenges of our time. Only last Thursday, at the swearing-in of the new Under Secretary of Commerce, he detailed a depressing inventory of stubborn problems plaguing America. Then President Johnson reminded us that the real business of business is America:

"We do need help. Government just cannot do it alone. We need the energy, we need the genius, we need the imagination, and we need the initiative of the businessmen of America who have built this great, free enterprise system into the most powerful economy in all the world."

This, too, is the keen desire of Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II who, more than a year ago, invited American industry "to provide innovative and original contributions to the educational process itself." "American industry," he acknowledged, "has an unsurpassed history of effectiveness; yet one of our greatest industries—education—has not fully profited from the capacities of industry. Forty million consumers of education and their families await the product of our cooperation."

But rhetoric alone—no matter how genuine—cannot build the industry-education-government partnership. Some less felicitous examples of recent rhetoric lead us to the inescapable conclusion that a full and easy role for industry in education has yet to be earned, not enjoyed as a matter of right.

Proposition Number Four—Don't get hung up looking for the "Welcome Mat."

Despite the challenges of President Johnson, Commissioner Howe, and other Administration leaders, few educators are rushing out to embrace industry participation in the task of upgrading American schools and colleges. Communications between businessmen and educators still range largely from the non-existent to the hostile. Much of the Congress is still "on the fence."

As Exhibit One in what some businessmen termed an unmistakable "educational cold-shoulder," consider the following testimony given this August to the Education Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate by a major national educational association:

"Direct contracts between the U.S. Office of Education and profit-making agencies are inherently wrong . . . the constant effort on the part of the Office of Education to secure authority for the Commissioner to bypass the public and private nonprofit education agencies and deal with profit-makers is in our opinion, the most dangerous educational proposal ever to come before the Congress.

"This danger lies in the potentiality for federal control and direction of the entire education effort of this country, in direct violation of the American tradition of state control of public education. Profit-making agencies are in business primarily to make a profit. If the permission to contract with profit-making agencies is granted, nothing prohibits the Office of Education to hire persons to accomplish objectives and to conduct well financed Madison Avenue-type promotion campaigns to achieve purposes which the public education sector and the ethical private non-profit institutions would never consider becoming involved in. This seems to us not only a totally unnecessary practice, but indeed a frightening one."

Exhibit Two is of even more recent vintage: November 14, 1967, when the House of Representatives was debating private industry's contributions to the War on Poverty, in general, and to the Job Corps, in particular. The views of one intelligent Member of the Congress are food for thought for anyone who contemplates the current uncertain state of government-education-industry relations:

"What kind of a partnership do we have in the Job Corps between the Federal Government and private industry? Is this a partnership in which each is contributing of its talents and its resources? Of course it is not. This is totally federally funded. All private industry does is to contract with the Job Corps to furnish certain services. They are not furnishing, as a part of the partnership, any of the financing. They are not producing anything. They are merely competing for contracts that are available through the Job Corps."

Relationships among the Congress, the world of business, and the realm of education—as reflected in these statements—obviously leave much to be desired.

The need for better communications is all too apparent. It will avail us little to wonder who should take the initiative to bring about meaningful dialogue among the three potential partners. A more fruitful line of inquiry is perhaps to ask what have you, as industry leaders, done lately to express your commitment to quality education? What have you done lately to show others that industry has a constructive contribution to make which will be free of the fearsome consequences that some have predicted would accompany the entry of business into the educational marketplace? What are your various industry associations doing to dispel the fears, suspicions and misunderstanding that collectively impede a legitimate role for the genius of American industry about which the Commissioner of Education and the President have spoken?

* * * * *

My participation today would be less than satisfactory from my point of view if I did not add to my four general propositions several specific prescriptions for industrial action. So, here are a few thoughts of one observer about ways in which industry can begin to make its impact on the educational system.

1. When was the last time your corporate leadership sat down to talk with rank-and-file educators at the *local and State* levels about their needs and problems? Possibly it is more comfortable to consult with the eminent professors of our Nation's leading universities, to rub shoulders with the men who regularly offer their advice to the giant corporations and to the Government service—the men who live on commuter airplanes between Washington and their college campuses or between their university classrooms and corporate conference tables.

These authorities, more likely than not, are the ones who most welcome and understand the necessity for industry participation in educational improvement. My recommendation is that your industry associations find ways to communicate with the rank-and-file of our classroom professors and teachers and with the supervisors and curriculum specialists who daily bear the brunt of the educational hurricane. Any efforts you might make to learn more about the "nitty-gritty" of day-to-day educational operations will yield rich dividends in mutual understandings—the essential bedrock of the industry-education partnership which I take it is what we are all after.

2. Not every industry endeavor has to harness the great technological and scientific breakthroughs of our time. Indeed, I suspect that some of the most useful—and profitable—contributions which industry might make will be in the mundane service areas of American education.

Purely as an example, we know that each day well over 17 million children are transported to school, either at public expense or through parental contributions. Yet, how much attention has been given to the design of a truly *educational* vehicle for the movement of children to and from school? How much thought has been given to the utilization of the millions of hours per year that are spent by children on the road? How much study has been given to the problem of physical safety from the accidents which each year claim several thousand casualties among our children riding school buses? In short, what can be done to make the unglamorous and unheralded area of school transportation a safer, more meaningful, more effective, and more exciting part of the contemporary educational scene?

In similar vein, how much attention has been devoted by industry to cutting the costs of school purchasing, to lightening the administrative burdens of school managers and, indeed, of classroom teachers? Of reducing maintenance costs in our vast educational physical plant? For that matter, of designing a truly controlled physical environment which would maximize educational achievement while passing on to the taxpayer the benefits of new designs, new materials, etc.?

In short, not every corporation need look to great breakthroughs in computer-assisted instruction and dial-access retrieval to make a meaningful impact upon the American educational system. Many far simpler ideas are lying about for the asking—unglamorous but important, unheralded but potentially profitable.

3. Just as we must avoid exclusive focus upon the glamorous, so it seems to me we must avoid a common mistake in assuming that all the important opportunities for industry-education cooperation are tuned in from Washington, that Federal funds must flow into each and every corporate commitment, that Washington will somehow identify all of the areas of priority for industrial attention.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We in Washington have a sense of our responsibilities, but we also know the limits of our involvement. Today, we fund only 8 percent of total elementary and secondary expenditures. It is an important 8 percent, but a sobering indication of the dimensions of Federal power. Thus, we appreciate all the more the efforts of individual corporations to improve the particular educational systems of their community.

In this light, many of us were greatly enthused by a recent description of efforts undertaken by the Michigan Bell Telephone Company with a particular high school in the city of Detroit. I have attached a brief summary of the Michigan Bell project to my prepared statement. I commend it to your attention as a most promising example of some ways in which industry can enter the educational market, gradually learning more about itself while it contributes to the health of its surrounding community.

* * * * *

If it is true, as great Americans have often said, that nothing matters more in the life of the Nation than the quality of our educational system, then the hour is long overdue for the emergence of truly effective partnerships of educators, businessmen, and government administrators. This is what former Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel meant when he said: "Education is too important to be left *solely* to the educators." Education cannot flourish as the exclusive hunting ground of the professionals. All of us—as parents, as taxpayers, and as employers of the products of the schools—cheat ourselves if we yield to anyone a healthy concern for, and participation in, the affairs of the most critical domestic institutions in our lives—our schools and colleges.

Participation will not come easily. In the area of industry-education-business relations, there are no road maps, no blueprints. Moreover, as indicated earlier, business participation will be greeted neither with universal approval nor enthusiastic welcome by some segments of the educational community. In education, as in business, not everyone believes in "the competition of the marketplace." Businessmen who wait for engraved invitations presented on silver platters would be better advised to look elsewhere than to the promise and the importance of education.

* * * * *

Shortly before his assassination, President John F. Kennedy met with a group of educators at the White House. His visitors were deeply troubled by the continued defeat of Federal aid to education measures in the U.S. Congress. But Mr. Kennedy charged them with the facts of democratic social interaction in this classic statement: "Things don't just happen. They are *made* to happen."

In recent days, as we have seen, things have truly been made to happen. Almost 40 new education laws have been added to the statute book in the past 4 years. Federal funds for education have tripled in this period, while the budget of the Office of Education has climbed almost 700 percent. New relationships between education and the Federal Government are being forged on every front. Not all of these relationships are smooth and sunny. Some, undoubtedly, will have to be totally recast as we recognize false and possibly costly starts.

But one thing is clear to me beyond reasonable doubt: Federal aid to education is here to stay and it will grow arithmetically, and possibly geometrically, in the decades ahead. Education and government officials at every level will be defining and redefining their roles for years to come.

And what of *industry*-education-government relationships? That, ladies and gentlemen, depends on all of us, working together. "Things don't just happen. They are *made* to happen."

The Draft Constitution for Maryland

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, at my request the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations studied the proposed new constitution for the State of Maryland and commented on its content. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from William G. Colman, executive director of the A.C.I.R., and I wish to commend Mr. Colman for an excellent appraisal.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1968.

Hon. HERVEY G. MACHEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACHEN: This is in reply to your recent letter requesting reactions to the new draft constitution for the State of Maryland. As you know, the Commission and its staff have been most interested in current constitutional revision and reform efforts among the States. The Commission has been particularly concerned that the States and their local governments be strengthened so that they may better serve their appropriate role in the federal system. This concern has been reflected in recommendations by the Commission dealing not only with bolstering the executive and legislative branches of States but also with removing those constitutional restraints on both State and local governments that serve no useful purpose.

A recent House report, *Unshackling Local Governments,* summarizes a number of the Commission proposals dealing with the removal of restraints on local governments. With the thought that this may provide a perspective on some of the analysis which follows, I am enclosing a copy. In this analysis of the new Maryland draft constitution some of the comments reflect a general staff reaction and others relate to specific Commission recommendations. A few general observations should be made at the outset.

First, it would appear that the careful and thorough work of the Constitutional Convention Commission including the development of a complete draft was of particular value in focusing attention on key issues and facilitating the work of the Convention itself.

Second, generally speaking, the final draft approved by the Convention appears to be clear and concise, limited to matters of general policy and the provision of necessary mandates. In fact, part of its great value lies in the elimination of a number of lengthy and detailed restrictions accumulated over the years in response to specific historical situations. This particular feature may not be as apparent without a careful examination of the existing constitution.

Third, the broad objectives of strengthening the executive, legislative and judicial branches of State government and removing undue and unnecessary restrictions on local governments to permit them to deal with pressing contemporary problems is apparent in the draft.

Finally, while some of the provisions, particularly those dealing with local government, reflect Maryland's particular history, traditions, and practices, the draft constitution as a whole should serve as a significant point of departure and model for other States.

The remaining observations are presented in the order in which provisions appear in the draft. The provision requiring a shorter residence period for voting for President is a salutary recognition of the increased mobility of our population and of the need to avoid disenfranchising voters in Presidential elections. The legislative article incorporates several significant departures from existing practice in Maryland. The provisions dealing with the size of the legislature, districting, and redistricting provide necessary flexibility and lodge responsibility clearly with the legislature. Yet they include an alternative if the legislature fails to act, thus assuring that the basic requirement for representation based on population can be met. Removal of specific legislative salaries from the constitution and the provisions allowing the legislature to be called into special session on its own initiative are steps frequently recommended for strengthening the initiative and prestige of the legislative branch.

Several of the provisions dealing with the executive branch should serve to enhance the governor's position as chief administrator in the executive branch. The lieutenant governor is clearly identified as an assistant to the governor and is elected on the same ballot. The governor's authority to submit proposed reorganizations of the State's administrative structure subject to a veto by either House of the legislature; the clear statement of the governor's appointive authority; and the authority to reduce as well as eliminate items in the supplementary appropriation bills all serve to upgrade the governor's position. The removal of restrictions on the incurrence of State and local debt and the authorization, in effect, of revenue financing for the State should serve to provide necessary flexibility in State and local financial programs.

Among the most fundamental changes in the constitution are those dealing with local government. Given Maryland's limited number of independently incorporated municipalities, the emphasis on county governments will provide significant experience with the use of counties as areawide governmental units to provide urban services. The provision of residual home rule powers to counties along with the authority to transfer functions further emphasizes their key role. The removal of several local offices from the constitution should serve to further the objectives of flexibility and home rule. The sections allowing the General Assembly to merge, dissolve, or change the boundaries of counties and to establish multicounty governmental units permit experimentation with additional forms of regional government. The broad general intergovernmental cooperation provision also provides a constitutional basis for interlocal and areawide cooperation and agreements.

In conclusion, it can be said that the new Maryland draft constitution incorporates a number of significant innovations and eliminates considerable archaic, repetitious, and outmoded provisions thereby producing a truly modern draft State constitution reflecting some of the best current thinking.

I hope that these brief observations will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

WM. G. COLMAN,
Executive Director.

A Tribute to the Boys in Vietnam

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Howard Miller, one of this Nation's most beloved and highly respected radio commentators delivered an excellent tribute to our boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Miller has never hesitated to speak out on the burning issues of our time, and it was in keeping with his impeccable record as an American that he took to task those who would malign our great effort in Vietnam.

Mr. Miller and radio station WIND, which carries his broadcast, deserve the commendation of all of us for the stirring message which was delivered over these facilities. The Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., which owns WIND in Chicago, has every right to be proud of the excellent manner in which it has used the Nation's airwaves for the good of our country.

Howard Miller is radio at its very best. As a Chicagoan I am proud that he comes from my city.

Excerpts from Mr. Miller's excellent essay follow:

Now about those draft dodgers and dissenters . . . I know you've been reading about them . . . believe me when I tell you they are few in number They make a lot of noise and get all the publicity . . . but then freaks always do! Some day these gutless wonders will have to live with a conscience that will torment them to the end of their days. Some defend their cowardice by claiming it is heroism to say NO to a nation's call but as I remember, American heroes are born at places like Chateau Thierry, Iwo Jima, Pork Chop Hill and now Con Thien and Dak To, not at induction centers burning cards, fighting authority and breaking the law. These poor men have forgotten the words of John F. Kennedy when he said ". . . ask not what your Country can do for you, but what you can do for your Country . . .". You Haven't Forgotten!

There's no such thing as a nice war, or a moral war—all of it is hellish and rotten but not nearly so immoral or rotten as forgetting freedom's meaning or an honest obligation, or the little kids of a future generation. Khrushchev said the Commies would bury us. They're trying now, but guys like you are doing the digging! Thank God! You're there for a good and noble cause—you're there because your Country asked you to be—you're there because people everywhere deserve to be free!

The dissenters are a misguided minority. Granted, the motives of some are sincere, but too many seem to believe they have a right to protest in any way they choose, with faint respect for the law or elected authorities. They are being provided for in an orderly process of law. There is room, of course, for honest differences, but it is only by *your* action that we will heal this Nation's wounds and preserve the historic privilege of freedom for which others before you have fought.

And so today, like yesterday and tomorrow, we are humbly indebted to you who are fighting and dying in Viet Nam for Freedom and for us. We know, as you know, that the iron claw of communism is a spectre above the head of the free world. The blind hunger of our enemy for the complete subjugation of all peoples has made peace negotiations impossible up to now. You know, and we know, that your presence in Viet Nam is a guarantee to freedom loving people everywhere that the fighting man of the United States will forever be a bulwark against the tyranny of enslavement.

Americans will sleep tonight because you will be awake to dodge a sniper's bullet in a lousy rice paddy on a hunk of real estate that we really don't give a damn about—except that it has become a symbol of our integrity to a commitment. It's good that this nation has a conscience.

. . . and so it will soon be Christmas Day and, as the early morning sun slants its rays across the icy blue waters of Lake Michigan, and with reverence for the day we worship Him, there will be a special prayer for you, spoken from a heart filled with gratitude.

I join with an entire nation to say:

"God bless you, and thank you, American."

The Brain Drain: Home Grown

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this era of technological advancement and change, our society is constantly faced with the problems of space, defense, transportation, and environmental control. The task of solving such problems falls to those with the technical expertise of scientists and engineers—a group of professionals whose ranks are not increasing to match the needs of the day.

T. A. Burtis, immediate past president of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, in an article entitled "The Brain Drain: Home Grown," which appeared in the January 1968 issue of Chemical Engineer Progress, explains this diversion of talent from the fields of science and engineering and offers some constructive suggestions for solving this critical problem.

I am sure that my colleagues will find this article, which follows, of interest:

THE BRAIN DRAIN: HOME GROWN

(By T. A. Burtis)

Diversion of students into the social sciences in preference to engineering poses a real problem; the concept that they also serve who perform technological deeds must be promulgated to insure needed supply of engineers in coming years.

If you were a young engineer with a brand-new B.S. degree and could choose between a job near home which promised great security but little challenge or responsibility, and one far away with more risk but more compensation and challenge, which would you take?

Suppose you were a practicing engineer with a few years' experience, and you were offered three times the pay to work in a new field of technology—would you take it?

Or put yourself in the position of a new Ph.D. who could have a routine job close to home, or join an advanced research institution far away—what would you do?

THE DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE

In the last 10 or 15 years thousands of men faced with these decisions have made the choice which any self-respecting professional would make. This, then, is the "brain drain." For these thousands of scientists, engineers, and physicians have been foreign nationals who have chosen to come to the United States. Their migration has caused a storm abroad and now engages the concerned attention of our own government, as well as those of other Western countries. Ordinarily the migration of a few thousand people would cause no great alarm, but since this now becomes part of what popular jargon calls the technological gap, warning signals begin flashing all over the world.

Understanding the size, the shape or the impact of this migration is no easy task—not for lack of data or opinion but because of the volume and inconsistency of both. The best documentation seems to be that supplied by the National Science Foundation, which from the period of '57 through '64 kept track of the immigration of engineers, natural scientists, and social scientists to the United States. The social scientists, principally economists, make up a very small portion of the total—generally less than 5%. The NSF data indicate that the influx of foreign engineers and natural scientists declined from a high of about 6,000 in 1957 to about 4,200 in '61, then rose again to about 5,900 in 1963 and again declined to an estimated level in 1966 of 5,400. In the middle years of 1962 through '64, a total of 16,000 are estimated to have emigrated to the United States—a little over half of these from Europe, with the United Kingdom (3,200) being the greatest contributor.

Since 1960 there seems to have been a smaller proportion of engineers entering this country but more natural scientists, and there is a slow pick-up in the number of social scientists. If these numbers are reliable, there is a slow decrease in the number of foreign-born professionals entering this country, but no radical change is to be expected. Directly to the contrary, however, another government agency reports that in 1966 the immigration of "professional, technical, and kindred" people amounted to 30,000, out of a total immigration to this country of 323,000. No definition of "kindred" is supplied. They further report that this is an increase of 58% over 10 years ago. The House Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee published data which said that the influx of foreign scientists increased 77% in 1966 over '56 and 32% in '66 over '65.

WHY DO THEY LEAVE?

Perhaps of more import to us than the precision of the numbers is an understanding of what causes people to leave their countries to come here. On this there is fairly widespread agreement—that the principal lures are higher pay, better conditions of work, better social standings. But most important of all (according to a survey of English immigrants made by Professor Wilson of the University of Pittsburgh), are the greater professional opportunities. There is much evidence to support the validity of this conclusion. A prominent Indian biochemist now in this country has expressed his desire to return to his homeland, but remains, simply because there is no opportunity for him to carry on research in his country. My own limited experience leads me to believe that the lure of higher pay is much exaggerated and that the real reason for the departure of these men from their homes lies in the social and industrial attitudes there prevailing.

About 10 years ago, while sitting around a table having coffee with a dozen senior students at one of the great British universities, I was astonished to hear more than half of them say that they proposed to emigrate when their studies were finished. Not one said he was looking for more money; the overriding reason they all advanced (these were not all scientists by any means) was the fact that they could see no possibility of their having any important impact on the conduct of business or public affairs in their country for at least another 30 years. They simply were not prepared to wait that long and sought opportunities in other parts of the world, not necessarily the United States, where they could feel that their work would have some measurable meaning.

Whatever the causes, the meaning, or the impact, the whole issue of the "brain drain" and the technological gap is receiving widespread attention. In our own government there is an interagency committee headed by Dr. D. F. Hornig which includes representatives of State, Defense, Commerce, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Authority, and the Council of Economic Advisors who are studying the problem. A parallel study is being undertaken by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris. A number of political figures abroad have proposed various remedies. Among them a Technological Marshall Plan, a gift of U.S. science and technology; and unfortunately, recently repressive measures have been advocated.

THE HOME-GROWN DRAIN

My intent is not to add one more commentary to this international dispute. It is rather to point out another area that needs equal attention—and that is our own home-grown "brain drain." Between 1961 and 1965 the total number of bachelor's degrees granted to male graduates in the United States increased from 256,000 to 320,000, a compounded growth rate of 4.4%. Within the same period the number of bachelor's degrees in engineering increased only from 35,700 to 36,600—a growth rate to all intents and purposes of 0. The physical sciences fared somewhat better, with a growth rate of 2.8%; but this is still well below the rate for the college population as a whole. Surprisingly, education, which one would expect to have shown a healthy rate of growth, achieved only a 1.7% increase each year—only a little over a third the average. Where, then, has the new college generation turned? The answer is clear—to the humanities and social sciences.

In the same 1961–65 period, the number of social science degrees increased from 38,000 to 58,000, a compounded growth rate of 8.6%, nearly twice that of the college population as a whole. In terms of absolute numbers, the degrees granted in these areas account for something over a third of the total increase in the last five years. Here I think is an internal "brain drain" that merits some portion of the attention being given to that on the international scene. This is not to say that we do not need more bright and capable economists or political scientists or sociologists. To the contrary, the state of the world today would indicate that we need as much talent in these areas as we can find. On the other hand, however, if the technological and scientific strength of the United States is so great as to cause concern abroad, if it is so important that our own government relies on this capability for the solution of problems in space, defense, transportation, environmental control, and other public problems, if industry is relying on science and engineering for future growth, some steps must be taken to see that the talent necessary to meet these objectives becomes available. That it is not today is clearly evident. One need only look at the job opportunity ads in any of the journals, including our own. The accepted estimate is that as against the 75,000 job openings for engineers which appear every year, there is available in this country only a total addition of 45,000 trained men.

WHAT ARE THE REASONS?

We have figures to tell us problems, but we lack understanding of causes and thus we lack solutions. Why does engineering and science in the U.S. attract the skilled men from abroad, but not our own young brains. Can the reason be economic? Apparently not, because all of the figures available to us today show that engineers and scientists are paid well above the average of the general population and generally have the advantage of all the advanced programs in fringe benefits. Even more indicative of this is the fact that the medical profession, traditionally one of the best compensated in this country, is having increasing difficulty in attracting students to the medical schools.

Is it possible that lack of opportunity is preventing the bright young high school students from choosing science and engineering? This also seems hardly believable. The resources we devote to research and development are increasing at almost an exponential rate, and these depend almost entirely on technically trained people. One need only look at the rate of capital formation in this country, at the growth of the technically-oriented industry, and at the burgeoning technically-based institutions to understand that opportunities abound.

Can it be that science and engineering in the universities are just too difficult, too demanding of application, of discipline, of high individual performance to the young people? Hopefully not, because if this were the case it would be a great tragedy. As John Gardner wrote in his book *Excellence*, "When an institution, organization or nation loses its capacity to evoke high individual performance, its great days are over."

Or could it be that the challenge and the opportunities for personal growth and personal contribution through science and engineering are either absent or misunderstood? The latter I think is likely to be the case.

HOW SERVICE CAN BE RENDERED

It has become a platitude to say that young people today are impressed with the need to serve their neighbors, their community, and humanity itself, and hopefully this idealism is not strictly confined to the college generation. But is there really an understanding of how this service can be rendered? One must note that nursing, one of the most selfless of professions, is in desperate straits for new recruits.

Is it true, for example, that the government agency which distributes new seeds to the farmers of a developing country better serves humanity than the chemical company which through its research provides the pesticides that will insure that a crop is reaped from this seed? Does the diplomat who negotiates a tariff treaty make a greater contribution than the men who design and build the vessels in which international trade flows? I know it is almost like being against motherhood to offer any criticism of the Peace Corps, but does the Peace Corpsman who teaches an Asian peasant to use an iron plough do more for humanity than the engineers who in the last few years have halved the cost of agricultural nitrogen fertilizer? When the injection of an antibiotic saves a life, does all the virtue reside with the hand on the syringe, and none with the engineers who ran the fermentation plant? And can the teacher who saves a child from illiteracy have any confidence in his contribution unless someone produces the machinery, the paper, even something as prosaic as the ink and the distribution system to bring the written word to the literate child?

One could ask an endless list of such rhetorical questions and I think would have to conclude that both kinds of contributions are not only valuable but indispensable. Somehow, however, our values are skewed and only half the story is being told.

THE TIME IS NOW

Now is the time to start giving serious attention to our own "brain drain," the diversion from engineering and science of the talent we will sorely need in the future to maintain the growth of our economy and insure its security. When the Interagency Committee comes to some conclusion about the international "brain drain," perhaps it will turn its attention to the pressing matter of securing future scientists and engineers from our own plentiful resources. Perhaps industry in the face of the shortage of engineers will respond not only by bidding fiercely for the available talent, but also by carrying to the high schools the message of its needs, its challenges and opportunities. Let government agencies and our academic institutions turn some of their zeal to promoting a wider understanding of the physical and economic realities of the modern world, so that the challenges and opportunities of science and engineering are known to our most able youngsters. And we who are already engineers must individually and collectively make known our own pride in and dedication to this honorable profession.

Quoting once more from John Gardner, I suggest that we take these words to heart. . . . "No society can reach heights of greatness unless in all fields critical to its growth and creativity there is an ample supply of dedicated men and women. Whether any particular field will have enough such men and women depends partly on morale within the field itself and partly on how highly the society as a whole values dedication. If the society understands, expects and honors dedication, the incidence will be high, but if it assumes that dedicated men are exceedingly rare and probably a little foolish, then the incidence will be low."

Let us not permit society to come to this disastrous conclusion. *The foregoing was the Presidential Address presented on the AIChE 1967 Annual Meeting, New York, N.Y.*

Connecticut Loses a Stalwart Citizen

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut and the city of Stamford are in mourning this week for one of its most distinguished and stalwart citizens, Mr. Frederick M. Lione.

I am in wholehearted agreement with an editorial in the Stamford Advocate which declared that Mr. Lione "was the type of man of which good communities are made."

Fred Lione was a product of the community which he served so faithfully in so many ways. He contributed to the business, political, social, spiritual, and sports life of Stamford.

And he served for 27 years with understanding and compassion in the thankless job of chairman of the draft board. Mr. Lione likewise was a worthy public welfare commissioner.

The Stamford Advocate's editorial put it like this:

> Mr. Lione was a builder. The city is spotted with important structures which he built.
>
> It is possible to suggest that these monuments are not Fred Lione's most important contribution to his community.
>
> He was the personification of the home town boy who made good. He was an honest businessman, a dedicated public servant, a devoted family man and a fair-minded sportsman. It is on the characters of such men that a community distinguishes itself, not on the elegance of its buildings.

Our Nation can ill afford to lose men of the caliber of Fred Lione. They are the ones who made this country great.

The Importance of Border Taxes in International Trade

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, border taxes, not a new issue, have been a subject of recent concern because of their relationship to our aggravated balance-of-payments deficit position. Thus there has been a sudden urgency in dealing with a problem which is both difficult to understand, and which will be difficult to change quickly. Because of the importance of the border tax, I am placing in the RECORD an article prepared for the February 19 NAMA Reports magazine. This article discusses the theoretical and practical consideration inherent in the border tax problem and proposes several steps the United States might take in order to address the problem.

A clearer understanding of the border tax, both in Congress and in the business and economic communities is necessary particularly because the Treasury has been preparing a bill for an "Import Equalization Tax" which would establish a U.S. border surcharge on imports and rebate on exports of 1.95 percent. Treasury sources indicate that this is the weighted average of figures representing the indirect tax burdens of 61 product groups. In measuring the indirect tax burdens, Treasury is said to have included such taxes as Federal excise taxes, State sales taxes, license fees, personal property taxes, and other indirect tax charges.

The article referred to follows immediately:

BORDER TAXES: NEW URGENCY ON OLD ISSUE

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

Recent developments abroad and at home have made the border tax problem urgent. This is ironic. Border taxes have been in use, and under study and discussion, for years. It is only in the context of certain immediate problems and pressures that the border tax issue is now considered by some to be an "urgent" problem, that, in spite of its great complexity and considerable delicacy, "must" be solved quickly.

What factors have caused border taxes to be considered urgent and even critical by some U.S. government leaders and others?

The present concern about the effect of European border taxes on U.S. exports and imports derives from the U.S. balance of payments problem, and from this Administration's notions about how to solve it. But even this framework is not broad enough. The balance of payments deficit (and border taxes as they might affect U.S. payments through the balance of trade) is itself fundamentally the result of Administration expenditure policy.

The balance of payments can only suffer from the effects of a spending-stimulated domestic inflation which raises the prices of our exports, makes imports more attractive, and increases foreigners' doubts that dollars will retain their value and that dollars can thus safely be held instead of gold.

Administration expenditure policy affects the balance of payments in another way, U.S. expenditures abroad for the troops and their support, A.I.D., Public Law 480 and other commitments, are the immediate cause of the deficit in the balance of payments. Thus government perforce must rely on the private accounts (return on U.S. private foreign investments over repatriated returns on investments of foreign capital in the U.S., and the surplus of U.S. exports over imports) to create balance.

Though government spending is the root of the problem, the root problem has not been tackled. Government spending at home will be increased by the Administration rather than be diminished. Spending for foreign programs beyond our foreign earnings will continue with no apparent willingness to reexamine such issues as the need for continued widespread U.S. foreign troop commitments abroad, or the proper extent and nature of foreign "aid" and lending programs.

Americans have been asked to accept the government's claim that its self-defined objectives are so necessary that the private sector, including students as well as businessmen, bankers and tourists, housewives and American investors, should sacrifice their own objectives and best interests which collectively are some measure of what is best for our society, for those of the Federal government.

This discussion may seem far from the issue of border taxes, but it is closely related indeed. The Administration's "cure" for the payments deficit has been to restrict various sectors of our private transactions. Businessmen know much better than I just what these programs have been, and I will not cite them in detail here. Suffice it to say that the encroachment upon private initiative and a freely operating international market began in 1963 with the interest equalization tax and has continued since that time to the extent that, under the Administration's program as presented to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 5, all aspects of the private international transactions would be controlled except trade and what Dr. Kindleberger refers to in his Feb. 1 testimony in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee as the "foreign securities gap," the $14 billion of U.S. corporate, state and local securities owned by foreigners.

Some in the Administration, particularly in the Treasury, and some members of Congress are compelled by the hobgoblin of consistency for consistency's sake. They insist that, if measures are taken to manipulate all other private accounts, then measures must also be taken to manipulate the trade account. Such manipulation to increase the amount of the trade surplus should be taken, they argue, even though the trade account is now in surplus (though there is dispute about how the trade surplus should be measured) and has been since the late 19th century. They hold to this position even though the Administration's expenditure policy is making attainment of a greater trade surplus more difficult, by increasing price levels and damaging the competitive ability of exports and by failing to realize that exports themselves depend on U.S. foreign investment.

Now, the reasoning goes, in *what ways* can we manipulate the balance of trade? Several possibilities have been considered. One would have been to enact a tariff surcharge for balance of payments reasons, as the British did in 1965. Another would be to develop a U.S. border tax that would be "legal" under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and would in some measure tax imports and encourage exports by means of a subsidy or tax rebate. Both would be ways of raising U.S. tariffs without directly offending the rules of the GATT. These considerations, and others, were discussed in the days immediately prior to the President's January 1 emergency balance of payments statement, which did, at Treasury's insistence, contain a sort of Presidential commitment to do something about border taxes. Other devices considered are export subsidies, government-sponsored export cartels and reduced duty free allowances for tourists.

But when its representatives appeared before the Ways and Means on Monday, February 5, the Administration's proposals did not include action on the trade account. After a hard-fought internal struggle, the Administration view, as expressed by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, was that intensive international consultations on the border tax issue would be pursued on the base that had been laid by several years of study in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and by discussion of the border tax issue in the context of the Kennedy Round.

But at the conclusion of the two-day hearings the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Mills, expressed a view that "something" had to be done on border taxes. He indicated his wish to consider action on border taxes in the context of the Administration's travel package.

Chairman Mills' statement provides a major element of the now "urgent" situation. Then, two days later in his speech at the National Press Club, M. Jean Rey, President of the Commission of the European Economic Community (EEC) expressed the Common Market's view that the U.S. balance of payments problem was *not* a balance of trade matter but a matter of domestic economic policy. He said the EEC considers the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to be the correct measure of its conduct on the border tax issue, and he said that the adverse effects of border taxes on U.S. foreign trade had not yet been proven. He also said that Americans had for years known about the border tax system that was being formulated in the EEC, and had taken no action until the present "emergency."

These are the reasons why the border tax issue has suddenly become urgent. Congressman Mills' indications, very likely backed by the Treasury, are responsive to, and supported by, the view of some of American industry that the border tax does in fact disadvantage them and that an easy solution to the problem is in fact a unilaterally enacted U.S. border tax.

At the same time M. Rey's remarks indicate a stiff reluctance to change the EEC's newly-forged "TVA" (Taxe sur la Valuer Ajouté) system of border taxes, even though M. Rey indicated that the Community would be willing to discuss with us this and other problems.

THE GUTS OF THE BORDER TAX

A border tax is a tax on imports equal to the amount of internal "indirect" taxes on domestic products during the manufacturing process. It is accompanied by a rebate on exports of the same amount. This tax and rebate are permitted under the fair trade rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to allow for equalization of the cost of the imported product with the domestic product.

The principle on which the system rests is one of classical economic theory that has been seriously questioned only since the GATT was written in 1947. The theory is that all direct taxes are completely absorbed by the producer and are not reflected in higher prices, and that all "indirect" taxes, or taxes on products, are absorbed by the consumer.

In operation this would mean that a corporation would not reflect the cost of its direct (income) tax bill in the price of its widget, that it would take the cost of the tax primarily out of its profits, rather than calculate a higher price for the widget that would include the cost of the tax as well as a reasonable profit. In other words, the theory would have it there is no forward "shifting" of the tax to the consumer in a higher price. It would also mean that the corporation whose products were taxed indirectly would set a price for its product regardless of the cost of the tax, so that the final price of the product would be raised exactly by the amount of the tax, and thus be entirely absorbed, or "shifted" onto, the consumer.

These classical assumptions have been very strongly questioned. Dr. Milton Leontiades, former Director of Tax Analysis, National Association of Manufacturers, concludes:

"A review of American economists would probably now indicate general acceptance of partial forward shifting of the corporate income tax as well as some backward shifting of the excise tax. The extremes of full shifting in either direction are for the most part rejected."

What is the meaning of this theoretical flaw for the instant problem? It is this. To the extent that indirect taxes are even partially shifted backward, a border tax adjustment equivalent to the full internal indirect tax has the same effect on international trade as a subsidy for exports or an additional tariff on imports. To the extent that direct taxes are even partially shifted forward to the consumer, the lack of a border adjustment for direct taxes constitutes a form of discrimination in international trade against this form of taxation, and those countries that rely in major part upon it.

It is fair to conclude that the theory of taxation on which the GATT's border tax rules are written is faulty. If this is indeed true, then the GATT rules should be revised. In my view the requisite factual basis for a U.S. response to M. Rey's invitation to discussion based on fact does exist.

There is another reason for joint U.S.-EEC examination of the border tax rules in the GATT relating to a discrepancy between GATT's definition of direct and indirect taxes and their actual application. Theoretically, a direct tax is a tax on profits and is therefore taken out of profits, and an indirect tax is a tax purely on the cost of a product at point of sale. In practice these two taxes do not appear to work strictly as defined.

Take, for example, the value added tax (TVA) employed by the French and being adopted by the other five Common Market countries. The TVA is assessed on the difference between each firm's sales and its purchases. This difference is made up of the costs of transforming what it buys into what it sells, including a profit. From this "value added" in the course of production EEC producers are allowed to deduct the amount of the taxes that are paid on inputs at earlier stages of production.

According again to Dr. Leontiades:

"The important characteristic shared by the value-added tax and the corporate profits tax is that they are levied directly on producers. Although the tax base of the former is costs plus profits while the latter is profits only, they are both taxes on businesses rather than products." . . . "In the literal sense, the GATT articles for border price adjustments include only taxes which apply directly to goods or products and therefore would exclude the value added tax."

This pointed questioning of the application the value added tax indicates another area of uncertainty present in the accepted system. This is well pointed out by Helen Junz in her study published in the Joint Economic Committee's compendium of papers titled Issues and Objectives of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy (October, 1967):

"It could be argued that the distinction made in international practice between direct and indirect taxes may essentially be arbitrary and seem to be based more on prevailing practice than on theoretical reasoning. For example, it is not at all clear whether employer contributions to social security fall into the indirect or the direct tax category, although GATT practice specifically places them with direct taxes. Conversely, value added taxes, according to GATT classification, 'are considered to be indirect taxes.' However, value added taxes fall on both costs and profits of the producer . . . and to the extent that they fall on profits are not always clearly distinguishable from a profits tax in their effect. Nevertheless corporate profits taxes are classified as 'direct' and value added taxes as 'indirect' taxes."

In sum, there are apparently two valid grounds for questioning the continued applicability of the present taxation system. First, there is the apparently faulty theoretical basis which posits that direct taxes are not at all shifted forward, and that indirect taxes are entirely shifted forward. Second is the evidence that GATT's rules regarding indirect taxation are applied incorrectly in practice. In fact, it is argued that the only basis for establishing a border tax adjustment mechanism in *any* country depends on the extent to which its indirect taxes are actually shifted forward. There can apparently be no dogmatic assumptions about the extent of shifting, and shifting is itself difficult to measure, even if it is possible to agree on what types of taxes are indirect and direct.

If the system established under the GATT and followed by our major trading partners is incorrect, then a strong case exists for changing the system to be more equitable to the U.S. But a case can also be made that the international economy had already adjusted to the border tax system (as it existed prior to 1968) and thus action to correct past practice would be futile.

This argument is well-stated by Sidney Weintraub, former Chief of the Commercial Policy Division of the State Department, in a paper prepared for a symposium of the NAM on Taxes and International Business, in 1965.

"Since the present complex of exchange rates gradually emerged during the late 1940's and the 1950's when the present structure of taxes and corresponding border adjustments were in large measure already established, the latter must implicitly have been accounted for in the present structure of taxes and corresponding border adjustments in the exchange rates. In other words there is every reason to believe that if the system of border adjustments for indirect taxes had not been in effect during these years, the rates of exchange would be different from what they actually are."

Though the international trade system may indeed have already adjusted to the border tax, changes in border tax adjustment rates such as the Common Market is now undertaking cannot be adjusted by exchange rates under our present fixed exchange system. In fact, according to Helen Junz, "possible trade distorting effects of new border adjustments now are of much greater concern then they were in the past. . . ."

Action has in a sense been "commanded," and the revisions of the border tax system do give ample cause for well-considered U.S. corrective action.

WHAT DO WE DO ABOUT THE BORDER TAX PROBLEM?

1. The U.S. could impose a border tax that would reflect our domestic Federal manufacturers' excises, and other indirect taxes that become costs of business, such as state excise taxes, and perhaps property taxes. Summing up the cost of these taxes, which differ not only among states but among individual firms in separate industries, would be very difficult to do accurately and perhaps would be difficult to justify in terms of the existing GATT rules. Even if it were legally possible, estimates put such a tax merely at about 2 to 3%. If imposed at the border such a tax might give certain industries a slight margin of relief, but it might also distort supply relationships by increasing the cost of certain raw materials to industries already facing rising costs in an inflationary economy.

Another uncertainty in this course of action would be the response of our trading partners. Other countries, such as Canada and Japan, could justify a border tax equal to, or higher than our own, because their indirect internal tax burdens are said to be greater than ours. Canada is said to have indirect internal taxes that total more than do those of the U.S. Canada is reported, in fact, to have informed the U.S. that it could and would match any U.S. border tax "point-for-point." Thus any advantage we might gain in our trade with this major trading partner would be immediately removed.

2. The U.S. could obtain changes in the GATT rule so as to be able to reflect our direct taxes in border tax adjustments. Helen Junz indicates that, in her view, such a course "would meet with considerable administrative problems. Even if the degree of shifting, which to complicate matters may actually vary from product to product and from country to country as well as over time, can be accurately determined, it would be virtually impossible to determine the precise amount of tax embodied in the price of a specific product."

But there are other aspects to this possible course of action that are more sobering. The OECD has presented statistics to indicate that the total tax burden of the United States is lower than that of either the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, or the Netherlands in terms of general government expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product in 1965. Thus a case is made that, because Europeans rely as extensively as the U.S. on direct taxes on profits, they could be able to reflect their direct tax burdens in border tax adjustments also.

If the U.S. should not adopt either of these two courses of action, I would propose certain other approaches that might prove an acceptable way of addressing the problem. For, even though the new concern with the border tax issue may be stimulated by external matters such as the balance of payments and Administration expenditure policy, it is a very real problem for which workable solutions must be found. But these solutions must be responsibly selected, or we might find that we could actually damage our own position both in the short and the long term. For there seems to be no question that in an escalating retaliatory situation the U.S. could justify a smaller burden of taxation reflectable at the border than any of our major industrial trading partners.

Discussions with the EEC must be continued based on U.S. conviction that the rule and the practice on the border tax system have both theoretical and operational shortcomings. *Negotiations* imply that a quid pro quo, a balancing of interests and offers, must be undertaken. I would argue that, if the system is wrong, and if indeed it can be shown to be wrong, then a negotiation per se should not be required. The EEC's recent assurance in Washington that they are willing to reason with us in our attempts to solve our problems should be tested on this point particularly.

Initially, I suggest that the basis for assessing the border tax be changed. Presently the EEC levies its border taxes on the duty-paid (cost including freight) cif value of imports while the U.S. adjusts for its indirect taxes (our few remaining manufacturers, sumptuary and regulatory excise taxes), on the duty-paid fob (freight on board) basis. The U.S. should seek to have the EEC assess its border adjustment on the cif basis adjusted downward by 10% to represent an fob value, and the U.S. should also assess its border adjustments on the fob value.

Secondly, the U.S. should attempt to reach a standstill agreement with the Common Market until a resolution of the problem and an appropriate change in the system is obtained.

Thirdly, the U.S. should declare as its long term objective change in the GATT rule to take account of the practical shortcomings of the full-forward-shifting of the indirect tax. The shifting assumptions of GATT could be modified to reflect the different characteristics of different types of indirect taxes. Shiftability could be calculated according to the U.S. excise tax and the U.K. purchase tax, the cascade type of turnover tax, and the value added tax. Thus similar shifting assumption for similar taxes would be defined, even though the process of definition would still be difficult. A tighter definition of any "indirect tax" also appears necesssary.

What if the EEC were completely intransigent and refused in any way to alter the basis of its assessment of the border tax, or to slow the time table for its movement to a unified TVA, or to consider opening the GATT for a change of rules to reflect differences in shiftability?

U.S. options in this event are several. One would be to use the clause U.S. negotiators inserted in the memoranda accompanying final Kennedy Round protocols and demand a concession under GATT's nullification and impairment procedure, or unilaterally adjust its own tariff to effect compensation. In the Kennedy Round we reaffirmed our right to seek compensation if the proposed border tax changes in the Common Market impair the value of the tariff concessions we received in the Kennedy Round.

Proving impairment of concessions, however, would require that we demonstrate to the EEC in concrete trade terms how the increase of their border tax adversely affects U.S. exports. This could be a difficult burden of proof. Even if we could prove it, the EEC itself reaffirmed its adherence to the GATT's border taxation rules as the authority on which to justify any effect of the border tax, adverse to U.S. trade or not.

Another option suggested is use of the countervailing duty permitted by Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and permissible under GATT. But even this course is fraught with complications. One is that the U.S. countervailing duty has never been applied against the rebate of an indirect tax. However, the Treasury's interpretation of Section 303 could be changed by legislation which would simply require application of a countervailing duty to indirect taxes that are rebated, or that are "inequitably" applied on the basis of faulty forward shifting assumptions. This could mean than an Administration "travel package" could be amended to include such a provision. I must observe, however, that such an amendment would probably be contrary to GATT's countervailing duty rule, and would certainly run against the intent and the interpretation of GATT's border tax rule.

CONCLUSION

The above discussion should be adequate to demonstrate that this is a most complex, and even dangerous issue. If the U.S. were to act too hastily, we could in fact be confronted with foreign retaliation that would really hurt. The best solution is unquestionably to secure immediate European willingness to alter their system. In terms of proportion of GNP related to foreign trade the Europeans by and large have more to lose than we, though our present balance of payments problems would make very serious any European action sharply to affect our present favorable trade balance.

The Monetary Problem

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the weakness of the administration's program to bolster confidence in the dollar is reflected in the column of John Chamberlain as printed in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on January 13, 1968. As Representative Udall and I said in an appeal to the NATO governments on January 1:

> The international monetary system will continue to hang by the slender thread of national self-interest until some sort of federal governmental structure brings nations together. No one can accurately forecast the durability of that thread, nor predict with certainty the circumstances or hour when it will break.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Even a hopeful step toward the establishment of such a federal structure would in itself ease the worry and nervousness that now plagues international monetary affairs. It might retard or even halt the movement toward devaluation of currencies, and European demands for U.S. gold.

The Atlantic Union resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 232, now sponsored or supported publicly by 97 Members of this body, can be the means of initiating that hopeful step.

The text of the Chamberlain column follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Jan. 13, 1968]

Three Musketeers of Doom

This column should perhaps leave financial predictions to the wizards of the market pages, but it is disturbed by the judgments of some of its most respected friends that the administration's program for saving the dollar is a too-little, and-too-late business. The reason for worry is that the judgmatical critics were right all along in predicting the downfall of the British pound, and now see the dollar following along in a couple of years.

When George Schwartz, the London Sunday Times financial writer, concurs with Clarence Streit, the crusader for a true political union of the Atlantic nations, and when Eliot Janeway, the hard-boiled analyst who has just written "The Economics of Crisis," agrees with both of them that trouble can't be sidestepped by such things as cutting down on foreign travel allowances, then it is time to stop, look and listen.

Clarence Streit is the most willing prophet among the three musketeers of doom. Since 1963 he has been forecasting the downfall of the pound and the dollar (in that order) if something weren't done to bring about a more perfect union of the Western world. Mr. Streit has all along insisted that the Communists expect to win without a military fight, merely by waiting for a monetary crash and depression to undermine their victims from within.

Now Clarence Streit says, "I stick my neck out again, as regards 1968, despite the prevailing forecasts of the economists." Moscow, he reminds us, has not been as blatant as De Gaulle in its attack on the dollar. But "by rattling from time to time its armed power, it has kept the U.S. giving foreign aid that weakens the dollar," and "by backing North Vietnam and Egypt, it weakens the dollar still more, and adds to Atlantic disunion and distrust of the U.S." All this, says Streit, has made a monetary crash possible that would see the dollar following the pound within a year.

Janeway thinks that Johnson's "dollar gamble amounts to a bet on the bludgeon." The administration's idea is to frighten Europe into taking dollars without calling for gold. When De Gaulle sees his big summer take from U.S. tourists drying up, so the theory runs, he'll come to heel along with most of the European central banks. But

Janeway doubts that the private holders of the "Eurodollar" will cooperate. A new cycle of worldwide contraction is now in motion.

George Schwartz, the London Sunday Times financial man, was one of the participants in the Mont Pelerin Society economic policy discussions held last September in Vichy, France. As an observer in Vichy, I was particularly taken with his sweet way of phrasing the most gloomy prognostications. He points out that the U.S. shows no desire to learn from what has happened in Britain, and is therefore doomed to repeat all of the Labor government's mistakes.

The British have operated on the theory that anything can be afforded at home, since you pay for it in paper that is "owed to yourselves." And they have tried to stave off external insolvency by such dodges as the prohibition or limitation of foreign travel. The dodges didn't work, and the pound collapsed for the far more fundamental reason that British industry had become inefficient at home, thus making it difficult to export.

The dollar, so the three musketeers of doom that have been mentioned in this column agree in thinking, will hit the toboggan because of a combination of domestic and foreign reasons. A $2 or $3 billion annual deficit on our external balance of payments could be digested, but a $30 billion domestic budget deficit must cause every dollar holder abroad to distrust our financial sanity. We may owe it to ourselves," but why should the private holder of the "Eurodollar" be caught in the switches when gold is an available alternative?

Rationale for Areawide Hospital Planning

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, an extremely interesting article entitled "Conversations: The Rationale for Areawide Hospital Planning," appears in the February 1968 issue of Trustee, the journal for hospital governing boards. It is a transcript of a roundtable discussion of the past experiences, current problems, and future purposes of areawide hospital planning. The article is the second in a series of publications sponsored as a public service by Automatic Retailers of America, Inc., hospital food management division and appears in Trustee by permission of ARA.

The distinguished participants in the roundtable discussion are: Donald R. Newkirk, executive director, Ohio Hospital Association; Harald M. Graning, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Ray E. Brown, executive vice president, Affiliated Hospitals Center, Boston; Frank S. Groner, administrator, Baptist Memorial Hospital, Memphis; Leroy E. Burney, M.D., vice president for health services, Temple University, Philadelphia; and Harvey T. Stephens, executive vice president, ARA Services, and president, ARA-Slater School and College Services and ARA Hospital Food Management Divisions.

Mr. Speaker, since much of the impetus for areawide planning derives from legislation that has been developed in Congress during recent years, I feel that this interim and unofficial progress report will be of interest to my colleagues:

CONVERSATIONS: THE RATIONALE FOR AREAWIDE HOSPITAL PLANNING

Ray E. Brown: The purpose of our discussion is to point up some of the major reasons why so much attention is being directed to the need for communitywide hospital planning, and why results in this direction have not been as great as might be expected. To define our topic, communitywide hospital planning is concerned with the way hospitals fit into the total health care system of the community, as opposed to the way they are fitted together internally.

In recent years great progress has been made in internal hospital planning. The results are improved effectiveness and efficiency in the individual hospital's internal operations. This does not mean, however, that the hospital is doing the best job for the community. Doing a thing well is not the same as doing the best thing.

When is a hospital doing the best things for its community? The answer to that question should be about the same as a statment of the purposes and goals of communitywide hospital planning. Dr. Burney, could you lead off our examination of the aims and goals of this movement?

Leroy E. Burney, M.D.: The major responsibility of the hospital as a community health center rather than an isolated entity is the delivery of health care to the population. Under that concept, communitywide planning should be aimed at helping each of the hospitals, as part of the whole, to achieve its greatest potential in the delivery of high quality health care with the greatest economy in the use of resources and people.

Donald R. Newkirk: Mr. Brown implied in his opening remarks that the accomplishments of areawide hospital planning have not been to date as great as its promise. Perhaps what should precede this question is the motivation of the hospital. Is doing the best job for its community a part of its motivation? If the hospital board sits around the table and says, "We want to plan because we want to do a better community job," that's fine. But many times the planning process comes about when the hospital board says, "We need money and the only way we can get it is to cooperate with this planning organization which has been set up in our area."

Dr. Burney: I agree. Whether it's a hospital, a board of trustees, a medical staff, or a university, it's only human nature to resist coordination and integration. There is the fear of destroying the freedom, the security of what they've done in the past. However, we aren't actually performing our function as a part of the total health care system in the community unless we do overcome some of these traditional restraints and plan jointly. In this way we preserve the very freedom that we believe is threatened.

Mr. Brown: Before we discuss this very important factor of motivation, could we describe the individual hospital's role within its community, given the best sort of planning?

Frank S. Groner: We all know the hospital board does its best job when it fulfills the needs of that segment of the community for which it has accepted responsibility. But one of the difficulties a hospital board faces is having at its command the information necessary to know what truly are the needs of a community. Here is where a planning agency finds its role. One of the deficiencies in the voluntary hospital system is that we, administrators and boards of trustees, build up tremendous loyalties to a given institution. These loyalties very often become much greater than loyalties to community needs.

Mr. Brown: A common statement is that the hospital serves its role best when it fits into the overall system of medical care by providing resources at the proper level—at the proper time, in the proper place, at the proper cost. In this sense hospital planning is a systemization or rationalization of the total medical care picture and the role that the individual hospital plays in this rationalized system.

Why doesn't this occur automatically? What is inherent about the hospital system that calls for something beyond individual decisions by individual enterprises? For instance, the supermarkets have no formal planning mechanism. Why should the hospitals need a communitywide planning device?

You mentioned the interest each hospital has in its own affairs, its desire to grow—very great values we don't want to destroy. But, at the same time, you made the point, Frank, that these values led into a sort of ad hoc decision-making process by which the parts were responding without relationship to the whole.

Dr. Burney: Doesn't this relate also to planning bodies outside the health field? Most cities have well established city planning commissions. Their activities are largely confined to transportation, communication, location of certain cultural projects, and related functions. But they make a point to include community representation on their planning commission in addition to the professional representation with its vested interest, albeit enlightened. Isn't this part of our problem with regional planning bodies? So often we plan with the same people with whom we work all the time. We don't bring into the planning mechanism some of the community leaders who may have a broader perspective, a more enlightened view than some of us who forget occasionally that we are not an isolated entity but a part of the whole system.

Mr. Brown: At this point, perhaps Harald Graning, who deals with these matters daily, would review how far hospital planning has developed in this country, how it is set up, financed, staffed, controlled.

Harald M. Graning, M.D.: Since 1960 there has been a remarkable growth in the number of areawide planning groups throughout the country. Responding to public need, a great many hospital administrators, boards of trustees, practicing physicians and people in the community have created areawide planning groups whose boards of directors have been essentially made up of a power structure in the community. Supporting Lee's viewpoint, the involvement of people outside the health field does contribute a broader point of view.

At the present time there are some 60 areawide planning agencies that have received some assistance from the federal government and there are an additional 16 in the developmental stage without such support. They vary in size, ability, scope of service, and adequacy of staffing. Their interest has been largely limited to trying to adjudicate, between hospitals in the community, the points of view on expansion plans. Some have considered the adequacy of nursing home facilities. A very few are taking a look at hospital manpower needs in serving the community.

The more enlightened individual hospitals are supporting good areawide planning. They recognize that it is not prudent for each hospital in the community to try to cope individually with the rapid medical advances that make possible very high and specialized levels of care, and that decisions should be made on a community basis in terms of the patient's best interest. Thus we have begun to think about the sharing and purchase of services, the more adequate provision of laboratory and x-ray services to physicians, and the extent to which automation can contribute to better hospital practice.

Mr. Brown: Isn't it true, Harald, that though these planning agencies do receive governmental support in their initial stages, the control remains in the community?

Mr. Graning: Yes, in all instances where federal support has been given, the community itself has raised 50 per cent of the operating budget. The federal government makes financial allocation through the state agency and thus the relevance to the community planning of overall state need is assured.

Mr. Groner: Another facet I would like to introduce is timing, why we are sitting here today. The concept of regional planning of health facilities is gaining in popularity, even becoming a shibboleth among the more sophisticated hospital administrators. The interest has been created. Moral obligations on applications follow.

Why haven't we done anything more about it? On examination, this is natural. Our heritage has been to look to individual initiative, to believe in free enterprise, in competition, as the way to build the better mousetrap. The change toward group planning has been brought about by the developments in the last two decades, the tremendous demands on hospital care. No longer can a physician work solely out of his little black bag. Our streets couldn't carry the van necessary to take the equipment to the patient's home if he is to have access to everything he needs.

Another fact is the economic transformation in recent times. Hospitals have become tremendous businesses. The operating cost, just in short-term general hospitals, is $14 billion now and will increase to $20 billion by about 1970. The public has a $30 billion investment. All segments of our society consider health care as an inalienable native right. Having made such a large investment, the public is beginning to take a real hard look at hospitals. It is asking some searching questions of the hospital system. The whole phenomenon of areawide planning for health facilities emerges from this background.

Mr. Brown: Another way to look at it: what are the penalties that a community pays as a result of lack of planning?

Dr. Burney: Not to minimize the importance of the growing number and activities of areawide planning groups, my impression is that most of them are more concerned about the number of beds or modernization and not delving into the real health needs of the total community, the availability of health care, and how a hospital can join with other community agencies in meeting these needs. How many are doing research and evaluation in this planning process? Quality care is seriously affected by this lack of planning, by this isolation of the hospital from the whole area.

Mr. Brown: Regarding quality care, we could think of omissions. We hear so much about too many cobalt bombs, but little is being said within hospital administration and the medical profession about the numerous levels and types of care that are not available.

Mr. Newkirk: A good point. Has the public demand for planning created a crisis situation in many planning organizations which says we must cover our rear, or we must explain certain things, rather than venture into the larger planning aspects?

Mr. Groner: As Ray said, there are so many things bigger than cobalt bombs. Planning councils should look at consolidation of services. In many communities, especially metropolitan areas, there are institutions that should not even be in existence. We should look at who is rendering obstetrical service and who *should* render it. In towns with a multiplicity of hospitals, virtually all rendering this service, the personnel is spread thin, occupancy is low, costs are high. The same is true about pediatrics. It's unfortunate that some isolated specialty hospitals with a low occupancy have been encouraged to grow. We should take a look at the size of hospitals. The New York City planning agency has said that no metropolitan hospital can do a good job with under 400 beds.

Mr. Newkirk: Coming from an area where there are six planning agencies, I can say their effectiveness is, in a general sense, directly proportional to their age. The older ones that have successfully fought the brush fires and won the confidence of medical staffs and community are into these deeper problems and doing a very fine job. The newer ones are in on the basis of a crisis operation. They need money, the public is demanding explanations of costs, Congress is demanding justification as regards Medicare and other federal programs. Then the board of trustees, the medical staff still may not be convinced that this whole planning thing is needed because, after all, "we're in Wapakoneta, Ohio, in our opinion doing well for our community, and therefore unconcerned with overall planning."

Mr. Groner: The ultimate penalty to the community of inadequate or poor planning is in the present and future health of the people and the cost they are paying. One of our problems in selling community planning is our negative approach to it. There is a positive approach, for instance, in the modernization of existing facilities, and an all-out attack on the health manpower problem. Also, we have to hurl the challenge back to the public, not to use health service and hospital care unnecessarily.

Mr. Brown: Speaking as the public now, have you as an administrator provided my doctor and me with the range of alternatives? You accuse me of going to the hospital and crawling between the sheets of the acute hospital bed, but have we planned a system of hospital care that would allow the doctor to choose between making me a walking patient, bed patient or extended care patient?

Mr. Groner: In this area, how do you challenge the administrator of the future? The time is past when he or the board of trustees can truncate health care at any one point and say that the patient is no longer our obligation. There are the levels of care, the long-term patient, the intermediate patient and so on. Hospitals must reevaluate not only their outpatient services, but the emergency department which is more and more becoming the doctor's office in off hours. It probably results in a conservation of personnel and dollars. The hospital should look forward to home care programs and even go into construction programs to make it a complete health center, providing physicians' offices and other facilities.

Dr. Graning: We really haven't given the patient and the physician enough options in good patient care. Our insurance programs are not geared to give the physician the same option in getting diagnostic and x-ray work done on an out-patient basis. True, Option B in Medicare has provided this for people over 65 but the general public does not have it in subscribing to insurance programs. Therefore, there is a financial incentive in becoming an inpatient, whereas in many cases the physician could manage the patient on an outpatient basis. Here's where the hospital could make a significant contribution if insurance covered it.

Mr. Groner: I heartily agree. Hospitals should also join the medical profession in preventive medicine. The hospital more often than the physician has the tools, equipment, the personnel.

Dr. Burney: The concept that a hospital is a community health center doesn't mean that the hospital is the total resource in that particular area for all health services. We have to establish a preventive services relationship with health departments, with health and welfare councils and other groups in the area. This means planning with them. Also, to provide more effective and economical assistance for the delivery of health care systems requires research projects carried on and financed on top of ongoing programs.

We face here the problem of the multiplicity of funding sources in the federal government. If you want to carry out a total health care system project and go down to Washington with it, you have to see the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Labor Department, Social Security Administration, and so on. It's a little discouraging if one expects the federal government to furnish legislative action, comprehensive planning and a regional medical planning program, to have to spend a week in Washington trying to find someone who can say "We, in Washington, will jointly do some planning which will affect health bills in the local community." So maybe there ought to be a little areawide planning in the federal government.

Mr. Newkirk: Here is one of the fine functions of a planning agency, something that is readily saleable to the individual hospital and can be recognized as an immediate benefit—"grantsmanship." Nothing would be more valuable than to have somebody familiar with these hundreds of government programs. This person would interpret aid programs and translate them into action that would directly benefit the individual hospital and its patient.

Dr. Graning: Either Lee has overstated the complexity of the situation or he has underscored the unusual competence and intelligence of the group at Temple (Temple University Hospital Philadelphia), as witnessed by their success in being able to get federal grants!

Harvey Stephens: Well, Lee is an experienced visitor to Washington. Another aspect of the problem is what is the *stimulation* for areawide planning? Does it come from hospital administrators who recognize their responsibility to the community beyond their own parochial and historic traditions? Or from the community power structure, a group of concerned citizens, who say, "Before we invest any more community money or resources in individual institutions, we want something to say about what will be done to meet community needs. We want assurance that the delivery of high quality health care for the greatest number of people will be done with a real concern for the conservation of community resources, rather than for the glorification of each individual institution."

Dr. Graning: In a great many instances the creation of an areawide planning agency has stemmed from concern about anticipated growth of several hospitals in the community. The motivation has appeared to be an interest in conservation of community resources and regretfully, in some instances, when decisions have to be made as to the allocation of funds and which hospital will do what, the continuing involvement and success of the top power structure have not been sustained. These people have been sending their second echelon representatives to the board meetings. This is partly why you see the failure of some areawide planning agencies to face the gaps in service. I'm convinced that you can retain the interest and concern of the power structure where there is something really meaningful for them to work on.

The gaps in health service, the failure of all the hospitals collectively to develop programs that can reach all segments of society have undoubtedly made some contribution to the recent riots in several American cities.

Dr. Burney: Ray, you have for many years been in the forefront of health and hospital planning. Shouldn't we label our discussion areawide *health* planning instead of *hospital* planning? Then we would consider the role that the hospital has in the total provision of preventive, curative and restorative health. Shouldn't we emphasize planning in which a number of related groups would be concerned, not just in the health area, but certainly in economics, education, welfare, and others. Also, how, in areawide health planning, can hospitals improve their contributions to health manpower training?

Mr. Brown: Yes, hospital planning simply cannot occur in a vacuum. It must fit into total community planning. In its document on communitywide hospital planning, the Public Health Service felt that the complexity of getting hospitals into the total of the community medical care system was still such that at least now we should have institutional planning as a unit with specific purposes and that later in history we might move into a more generalized and inclusive arrangement. I share that opinion at this point in time. Admittedly, hospitals can do very little on their own to achieve the proper coordination in the total medical care system. For instance, Harald Graning implied that prepayment actuaries have actually been the architects of the hospital and medical care system.

The hospital has not gotten deeply into extended care because the prepayment mechanism, whether insurance, Blue Cross or government agencies, has not provided the funds for the quality care that hospitals can afford to be associated with.

Or maybe the architecture of our hospital system has been dominated by public relations considerations. In order to maintain public support, hospitals have had to do the most dramatic, the most obvious. You'll get a lot more support for an open heart surgery unit than for a well baby clinic, even though the clinic contributes more to the welfare of the community. So the problem is bigger than hospitals. Perhaps one reason that planning has not been effective to date is that hospitals can only plan as far as the controlling environment allows them to plan.

Dr. Burney: I would not disagree, but another example is the Regional Medical Program whose major objective is the delivery of health care on the basis of available knowledge. We also see medical schools taking the major initiative though I'm not sure they're the logical leaders. Fortunately, the legislation requires that there be substantial community consumer group representation on these Regional Medical Program organizations. I strongly suggest the inclusion of these consumer groups in hospital planning so we just don't talk to ourselves or plan in a vacuum. Consumer groups may be more objective and dispassionate in interpreting need and proposing action.

Mr. Newkirk: Unfortunately, I see too many planning agencies, also the Regional Medical Program organizations, being set up with consumer advisory groups which are not being used. In many cases they are window dressing but amount to absolutely nothing in direct and effective communication with this public that's demanding better planning.

Dr. Graning: We should also consider the training of manpower in total health planning. Individual hospitals have traditionally carried the load in terms of schools, x-ray technology, medical technicians, schools of nursing. We need to rethink the appropriateness of this and whether the cost involved should not be shared by others who ultimately will benefit.

We should consider the professional obsolescence problem. All of our acute care facilities should have more meaningful ties to the better educational institutions in the country through mechanisms such as Regional Medical Programs and ultimately through electronic communication devices. This will enable hospitals, or physicians practicing in community hospitals, to get the consultation services of people in distant cities.

We have not yet developed good administration and control mechanisms to assure that particular health care institutions can provide high quality care. Our statistics show that on this basis of comparing mortality rates in hospitals that have an extensive amount of open heart surgery as against those that have relatively little, the difference is as much as sevenfold. The people on the boards of the areawide planning agencies haven't got the leverage to make the kind of decision that would protect the public against the creation of an open heart surgical unit where, perhaps, there shouldn't be one.

Mr. Brown: What is the extent of the leverage now? How do you get the medical care system to systematize itself, to respond to planning?

Mr. Newkirk: The dilemma, it seems to me, is that planning people sell their system and often gain hospital and community acceptance on the basis that there will be no control of the individual hospital. Yet when they are set up, the first thing you hear is "the reason we can't be effective is we don't have the muscle, the control."

Dr. Burney: Because so often planning bodies plan *for* instead of *with* the institutions. There has not been enough participation and involvement in the whole planning process by the institutions.

Mr. Stephens: Another question is what contribution does the medical profession make to fill the need for continual involvement of topflight people in planning and coordination? Essentially the doctor is the provider of health care service in his office or in the hospital. Does some of the present inflexibility to "have muscle" reside in this area? Is there going to have to be more of a community of interest between the physician and the trustees?

Dr. Burney: The physician is one of the members of the total health care team, which includes dentists, pharmacists, nurses, and other allied health professions. This team concept is now and will become more important in the delivery of comprehensive health care.

Mr. Brown: How do we get the doctor involved in planning, to realize that a better distribution of medical care in this country must begin with the doctor? It is useless to talk of planning for a medical care system unless the key decision maker is in that system.

Dr. Graning: In a certain sense, physicians are clients of a hospital. Physicians' participation on the active staff on a particular hospital ensures the hospital that it is going to continue to have patients, so the hospital plans for this. But this system does not produce good utilization of the existing facilities. For instance, if you merge several OB units into one hospital, then you have the problem that the doctor has been on the staff of one hospital and you have to start considering his staff appointment at another hospital. If physicians had staff privileges in all hospitals in the community, then a surgeon, for instance, who develops proficiency in a certain surgical technique that needs certain kinds of equipment can bring his patient to the hospital that has it instead of pressing the hospital in which he is located to get this equipment.

Of course, the doctors on the active staff like the present staff privilege set up because it assures them preference in availability of beds and they can see all their patients in one hospital.

Mr. Stephens: Should openness of staff privileges in all of the institutions within a community or area be a goal of an areawide planning council?

Dr. Graning: I can cite a specific success story of an areawide planning agency that was confronted with the situation of a "popular" hospital with an expansion program attracting large numbers of people, thus creating a tight bed situation. The agency's analysis discovered that many of the physicians in that particular hospital also had staff privileges at another hospital where the bed situation was not at all tight. By appealing to the physicians to bring some cases to this hospital, they were able to relieve the pressures in one hospital and improve the situation in the other.

Mr. Brown: Don Newkirk stated a fact that must be recognized; that is, that any sort of planning is a matter of subordination. It's useless to plan unless it influences and guides the decisions of those for whom you are planning or for those involved in the effects of your planning. At the same time, we do have a voluntary system in which we are attempting to exploit all of the values of diversified producers, diversified decision making.

A properly conducted planning process could yield both. It could cause the individual hospital to subordinate its own planning to that of the total community and also produce results that make its progress better because of this subordination.

Mr. Groner: To review the advantages to the individual hospital in agreeing to fit into the total medical care system as opposed to going its own independent way: The individual hospital has to return to its original purpose—to render service to the community. Regardless of its ownership, the hospital is a public and social institution. Coordinating services produces higher quality care than if one hospital attempts to cover the whole spectrum. Hospitals as a group can make significant reductions or savings in cost. Coordination should relieve unnecessary waste of professional man of woman hours. This benefits the community and the individual hospital.

Dr. Graning: Good administration is not a popularity contest. There will be some pain in sublimating the hospital's current interest. But if one looks at the primary motive of a whole health care system as being better patient care this pain becomes more endurable.

Mr. Brown: In summary, areawide hospital planning offers a means by which hospitals can have the best of both worlds—growth and dynamic activity in behalf of the individual enterprise and, at the same time, effective linkage in the total system of health care in the community.

Church Statements on Vietnam

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in the national debate on American policy in Vietnam we have consistently heard wise, thoughtful statements from the clergy. International church groups have also provided some interesting comments on the situation in Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to place in the RECORD the following collection of church statements on Vietnam so that my colleagues and all Americans may have the opportunity to examine these important comments.

The statements follow:

CHURCH STATEMENTS ON VIETNAM

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, UNITED STATES

Resolution adopted May 1967

"All men, regardless of nationality, politics or ideology are equal objects of God's judgment and loving kindness in Jesus Christ and this must be recognized in our efforts to seek a just solution. Christians face many dilemmas in seeking such a peace which include:

"1. Whether the use of military means to seek political objectives is justified.

"2. Whether the assumption of authority to direct the government and military forces or another in order to establish a situation which fits it own.

"3. Whether the attainment of legitimate goals through destruction and human suffering is defensible, and

"4. Whether the assumption of authority to direct the government and military forces of another country in order to establish a situation which fits its own national security or way of living is acceptable."

BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, UNITED KINGDOM

Fiftieth meeting, April 1967

"We believe that justice cannot be furthered by the continued prosecution of the war in Vietnam, a war which neither side can reasonably hope to win. The volume of human suffering and the disintegration of social life are out of all proportion to whatever just ends either side purports to serve.

"We identify ourselves with those on both sides who counsel restraint in the conduct of the war and a readiness to end it by negotiation. We feel a particular bond with the many Christians in the United States of America who continue to plead for a more convincing demonstration on the part of their Government of its will to make peace. In this context we support the continuing efforts of the World Council of Churches and of Pope Paul VI to promote a settlement."

BRITISH METHODIST CONFERENCE, UNITED KINGDOM

Meeting at Wolverhampton, July 1966

"This Methodist Conference: Deplores the decisions already partially carried out by the armed forces of the U.S.A. to bomb installations at Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam.

Condemns the misguided policy pursued by the United States government, throughout this conflict of which this terrible extension of the war is an inevitable consequence.

Calls upon H. M. Government to disassociate completely from this policy so that Britain can play a positive and effective part in bringing about a peaceful solution."

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN, UNITED STATES

Annual Conference, June 1967

"We protest Government's expansion of bombing in North Vietnam, its widespread use of napalm, which reportedly causes more civilian casualties than military, its practice of land defoliation and food destruction, its continued increase in troops and material, its unwillingness to agree to direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front, its tendency to either 'use' or disregard other Asian countries in the pursuit of war."

DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH, NETHERLANDS

Letter from general synod to National Council of Churches, July 24, 1967

"We would earnestly entreat you to do all you possibly can to induce your people and your Government to create a basis for negotiations by discontinuing the air raids on North and South Vietnam and submitting proposals for a cease-fire. We feel justified in making a particularly urgent appeal to you, since it is upon the American people as one of the mightiest nations, nay perhaps the mightiest in the world, that great responsibility rests in the struggle for freedom, justice and humanity.

"We Dutchmen and Dutch Christians and Churches owe our liberation from the yoke of cruel, anti-Christian oppression partly to your nation's willingness to sacrifice lives and property. Since the war, too, the Dutch and other nations cherished great hopes of the United States contribution to the organization of a new community of nations. In view of this it is all the more regrettable that we are compelled to point out to you that your nation is losing the confidence placed in it, also because of a credibility gap we observe in its pleas for freedom and justice.

"For that reason alone the United States should stop the war in Vietnam without delay by taking new initiatives.

"We beseech you to exert yourselves to the utmost to achieve this end, but we do not do so to exculpate ourselves and put all the blame on your shoulders. We do so because we are deeply moved by the unspeakable sufferings of the millions who for years have lived in fear and tribulation, and because we are gravely concerned about the fate of our world with its many conflicts between classes, races and nations, all of whom live under the constant threat of destruction and death."

EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH, UNITED STATES

General conference, November 1966

"Regardless of the complexity of the problem and its solution we are agreed that this war is tragic and that a solution to the long-range problems in Vietnam must be found in the economic, political, social and spiritual realms, rather than through military struggle alone. The sooner the war is halted the more rapidly the world can begin to fashion the true security of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia."

LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, UNITED STATES

Third biennial convention, June 1966

"In facing the present situation in Vietnam, Christians must take cognizance of the fact that simplistic solutions are unrealistic. Attempts to bring easy answers to so complex a set of problems may only complicate them. Neither extended war nor immediate unilateral withdrawal by the United States seems to answer the problem. Continuance of the present limited war seems to be no solution. Consequently, it is important that every effort be made to bring all parties to the conflict toward a stance of openness and flexibility with a readiness to respond to whatever beginnings of solutions may emerge . . ."

THE METHODIST CHURCH, UNITED STATES

General Board of Christian Social Concerns, April 1967

"We urge the U.S. government immediately to initiate necessary steps leading to the withdrawal of all its forces from Vietnam in a manner to be determined by negotiation.

These steps should include an acceptance of U.N. Secretary General U Thant's proposals. Specifically, this means:

(a) An announcement by the United States and South Vietnam governments of a unilateral cease-fire and stand-fast upon a specific date.

(b) An announcement that the United States and South Vietnam are ready to negotiate with all parties including the National Liberation Front.

Board of missions, annual meeting, January 1967

"The Board of Missions believes that The Methodist Church as a member of the N.C.C. should, in cooperation with other member churches, work with great urgency at this time to bring an end to the war in Vietnam. Such united effort calls for widespread expanded study, debate and action by local churches based on the concerns and action suggestions interpreted in the "Appeal" . . .

This responsible action must include such urgent steps as the following: a) Christian sensibilities are offended by the high ratio of civilian to military casualties resulting from all phases of the conflict, but we are especially grieved by the recent disclosures of civilian casualties resulting from the bombing. b) Readiness on the part of the U. S. A. to support the United Nations in negotiations "for a cease-fire agreement (including cessation of terrorist activities) under United Nations supervision, among the governments of the U. S., of North and South Vietnam and other interested parties, including representatives from the National Liberation Front; such negotiations are imperative and may be possible on the basis of mutual interest of sparing the population further and frightful suffering." (Policy Statement of the General Board of the NCCUSA, Dec. 1965).

METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND, NEW ZEALAND

1966 conference

"Conference protests to the New Zealand Government and the United States Ambassador against the well-documented and increasing barbarism, terrorism, and disregard for international conventions now taking place in North and South Vietnam by combatants on both sides. We deplore the resultant inevitable debasement of character in the United States and Allied troops and peoples, and the deterioration of trust and respect by Asian peoples for Western nations. We are convinced that peace cannot come to Southeast Asia nor can the spread of Communism be prevented by action which increases the suffering and disruption of the Vietnamese people, and therefore request the Government to withdraw New Zealand troops from Vietnam so that New Zealand can play a positive and effective part in bringing about a peaceful settlement."

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, UNITED STATES

Pastoral statement, November 1966

"While we cannot resolve all the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict, it is clearly our duty to insist that they be kept under constant moral scrutiny. No one is free to evade his personal responsibility by leaving it entirely to others to make moral judgments. . . .

In the conduct of any war, there must be moral limits. Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation. Moveover, as the Council also reminded us, the fact that a war of self-defense has begun does not mean that any and all means may be employed by the warring parties . . .

There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may in time, diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils. Every means at our disposal, therefore, must be used to create a climate of peace . . ."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, UNITED STATES

General board, September 15, 1967

"We believe that measures designed to set in motion a process of peaceful settlement should be inaugurated at once. We fully recognize that heavy responsibility for the war and the present condition of Vietnam rests with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. Nevertheless, we believe that a solution achieved by military victory alone, if that were possible, would subvert the interests of security, justice and peace, and therefore would not serve the best interests of the USA. We believe, therefore, that the following steps should be taken:

(a) We ask that the U.S. make clear to the newly elected government in Saigon the necessity of large-scale, convincing efforts to establish social justice in South Vietnam, and the necessity of prompt efforts to secure a just peaceful settlement with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. It is essential, in our view, that the U.S. declare that the Government of Vietnam should take its own initiatives and make its own decisions to secure an early, peaceful settlement of the future of Vietnam. We urge that the U.S. pledge its support of all such efforts. In the absence of such efforts, we urge the U.S. Government to re-examine its commitments in Vietnam.

(b) As the General Assembly of the UN is about to convene, we ask that there be a shift in U.S. policy at two points. The first is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam for an unspecified period of time. The second is, simultaneously with the first, to request the UN (preferably the General Assembly) or other international agency to take up the question: What steps should be taken and procedures adopted to secure peaceful settlement in Vietnam? The newly introduced Senate resolution concerning reference of the Vietnam issue to the UN deserves popular support.

Such a change in policy, we believe would help create a situation on the world scene and in Vietnam that would assist in securing a peaceful settlement of the war. . . ."

PRIESTS AND PASTORS OF FRANCE, FRANCE

Letter to priests and pastors of the United States of America, June 20, 1967

"We know that we carry a share of responsibility in the present conflict; we know, because we have experienced war in Europe, in Asia and in Africa, how difficult it can be in such circumstances to see clearly the demands of our Christian vocation. Our own history prevents us from posing as models or examples. But we believe, nevertheless, that as priests and pastors we must write to you in the name of our common spiritual responsibility.

"Actually, the present American decision to impose peace on Vietnam through victory is embarking your country more and more every day in acts of war which are against conscience. It is leading your people and the world to the brink of disaster . . .

If it thinks it has the right to do this, it is not making a tragic mistake and should you not, your priests and pastors of America, make it publicly known in the name of Christ?

"And another question. The revolutionary war which the United States wants today to stop by force of arms, is the result to a very large extent of the world order whose inequalities violate individuals and peoples. Those of us who benefit from this world order cannot appeal to its maintenance to crush by violence the revolt of peoples. Does the United States have the right to stop this revolt by making manifest to the eyes of a terrified world the inhuman warning of the annihilation of a people? Should not you, your priests and pastors of America, also proclaim this publicity to your people in the name of Christ?

"May this witness of our anxiety strengthen you in your spiritual responsibility."

UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA, CANADA

Twenty-Second General Council, September 1966

"request our Canadian Government:

"(a) to continue its present policy of refusing to send military personnel to fight in Vietnam;

"(b) to again issue a statement expressing its opposition to further escalation of the war;

"(c) to use its membership in the International Control Commission to continue to seek reconvening of the Geneva Conference or a similar conference, supporting the proposals of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations as conditions for negotiations . . ."

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, UNITED STATES

Sixth General Synod, June 1967

"There has been a sacrifice of some of this nation's greatest assets, including much of its esteem as a humane and peaceloving people, its credibility as between aims and actions, and its will to achieve social justice at home and abroad.

"In sorrow and in moral anguish, we seek now to give voice to the church's witness to justice and peace in the present situation.

"We Believe that there has been an unrewarding and increasingly indiscriminate preoccupation with military assaults upon North Vietnam. There is no meaningful prospect for solving the most basic Vietnamese problems through the pursuit of military victory in the North.

We continue to support a negotiated settlement of the war consonant with justice and security for the people of Vietnam. Where formal negotiations may not prove feasible, we believe that deliberate acts of restraint and renunciation may serve to mitigate the violence on both sides and to encourage the beginnings of a minimal trust without which no political settlement can succeed. With regard to the United Nations and to other governments, we must affirm that 'a decent respect to the opinions of mankind' is surely as important as to national policy in 1967 as it was in 1776."

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

179th General Assembly, 1967

"There is no moral issue more urgently confronting our church and nation than the war in Vietnam. The hour is late; the church dare not remain silent. We must declare our conscience. . . ."

B. We realize that a decision to change national policy in the midst of military conflict is an agonizing one for the President and his advisors. Nevertheless, in the light of the increasing cost and peril of our present course of escalation we ask for ourselves and our nation:

1. The moral courage to acknowledge our obligation, as the stronger nation to act first taking initiatives that will create a climate of trust leading finally to the negotiating table;

2. The recognition that with such information and such insights as we now possess, it appears that the immediate need is an alternate to the bombing of North Vietnam.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES MEETING IN CRETE

Central Committee, August 24, 1967

"The situation today has changed to include still greater dangers but may also offer better prospects. The hardening of positions and the continued military escalation open an apparently endless vista of horror. By changes in the political situation, both within and outside Vietnam, new opportunities for negotiation may, however, be emerging. Impending danger and present opportunities combine to underscore the urgent need for immediate action. . . .

"This then is the heart of our appeal. Let each party, by its own initiatives and its response to those of others, demonstrate that it is committed to peaceful settlement and is ready to take reasonable risks."

(NOTE.—Statements collected and excerpts made by Vietnam Emphasis Joint Methodist Program, 777 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, February 21, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.—Psalms 121:1.

Our Heavenly Father, who art the source of truth and the giver of all good, lead us to the hills from whence cometh our help and where in steadiness of thought and stability of feeling we may be secure in mind and heart.

In these moments of prayer help us to receive Thy spirit that the life of this day may be different and this difference make a difference in the day for us.

Strengthen Thou our faith, increase our courage, and stimulate our high endeavors that we may never lose heart in the struggle for the reign of democracy and the right of people to determine their own destiny. In the spirit of Him who never lost faith we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NORTH KOREAN INTRANSIGENCE

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, for 4 weeks our Government has sought, through diplomatic channels, to extricate the crew of the *Pueblo*. Now North Korea has reacted—by threatening to try these men as war criminals.

North Korea thus reveals the massive contempt with which it regards the behavior expected of civilized nations. The time of reckoning is near. Whatever steps are necessary must be taken without delay to make it perfectly clear to the North Koreans that any punitive action against our men will bring appropriate reprisals.

The threat reported from Moscow yesterday—a threat of war if we take such reprisals—must not deter us. Our only consideration should be the safety and well being of those 82 sailors.

In my home district last week, I met with 17 different groups—students, businessmen, veterans, minority representatives—even a gathering of foreign born. Almost always, I invited questions and comments from the floor.

From the sentiments voiced at these meetings, I can assure President Johnson that his determined response to North Korea's threat will have the widest support in my community.

ARTHUR GEORGE KLEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce to you the death of former Congressman Arthur

G. Klein, who served this body long and well as a Representative from New York. It was my honor to succeed Congressman Klein after he resigned in 1956 to take a seat on the New York State Supreme Court. He set a high standard in service to his district, a standard which I have been challenged to equal. At 64, Arthur Klein died prematurely, depriving the United States and New York of many valuable years.

Arthur Klein came to this body in the 77th Congress, at which time he was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative M. Michael Edelstein. He left this body because of congressional redistricting, and was subsequently reelected to the 79th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Samuel Dickstein. He served thereafter until his resignation on December 31, 1956. During his tenure in office he had been a member of both the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He also served on the District of Columbia Committee.

Arthur Klein was known as a champion of civil rights and all liberal causes, including home rule for the District.

He was a graduate of the public schools of New York, lived on the Lower East Side of New York in the district which he represented and had firsthand knowledge of the problems of his constituency.

Arthur Klein was loved and respected in New York. He was honored when he sat in this Chamber and contributed the fruit of his fine mind and uncorruptible character to the needs of the Nation.

I am sure that the House of Representatives joins me in saluting the memory of Arthur Klein and extending condolences to the members of his family. The Nation was enriched by the many years of service which he rendered here in Washington and in New York.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am certainly delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I did not know until the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] took the well of the House that my friend of many years, and a distinguished former Member of this House, had departed this life.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Arthur Klein well. He was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He was loved and respected by all Members.

Mr. Speaker, the services of Arthur Klein here in this body will have a lasting effect on all who served with him and, more important, they will endure as a permanent contribution to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] in extending condolences to the loved ones of a very dear friend of mine and a former distinguished colleague.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind words which I am sure the family of the late Arthur Klein will deeply appreciate.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] yielding to me at this point so that I too may pay my respects to the late and beloved Arthur Klein.

Mr. Speaker, Arthur Klein was a friend of mine. I did not know him intimately. However, I share the sentiments as have been expressed by the distinguished majority leader and I express to the family of Arthur Klein the deepest condolences from me, my family, and all from this side of the aisle of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his kind remarks.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] who knew Arthur Klein very well.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in expressing condolences to the family of the late Arthur Klein.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Arthur Klein before he came to the Congress of the United States. I always had the greatest respect and admiration for him. He performed a splendid and outstanding job while serving here in the House of Representatives as a Member of the Congress of the United States, representing the congressional district which the distinguished gentleman now in the well of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is representing.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of Arthur Klein is not only a loss of tremendous proportions to his family, but to the people of the entire State of New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his kind remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of my dear friend, Arthur Klein, who served in this body with great distinction. He was possessed of firmness and dedication in the performance of his duties. But he had a sweet humility and humbleness about him that made a pronounced impression upon every one of us who had the honor and privilege of serving with him. He had a great public career, not only in this body but in other positions of responsibility to which the people of his district elected him. For many years he enjoyed the confidence and the deep respect of the people of his district and, in fact, the people of the entire State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, Arthur Klein made countless friends while he served in this body. Sweet, kind, understanding, possessed of a nobility of character that impressed every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and with the entire New York delegation in extending to Mrs. Klein and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I want to thank the distinguished Speaker for his kind words—words that I am certain the family will appreciate.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of loss that I listened this morning to the news of the passing of my friend and former colleague here in the House, the Honorable Arthur G. Klein.

Arthur was first elected to the House of Representatives in a special election to fill a vacancy in the 77th Congress and he was reelected to the 78th Congress. He did not seek renomination to the 79th Congress but in one of those oddities of history he did return to the 79th Congress. Arthur was at that time again elected to fill a vacancy. He was reelected to the 80th Congress and to the four succeeding Congresses, at which time he resigned, December 1956, to assume his place as a justice of the New York State Supreme Court, to which he had been elected.

One of the many pleasures of serving in the House of Representatives is the friendships one makes. I served with Arthur from the time I first entered the House of Representatives in June 1944, until he became a justice in 1956. To his loved ones, I offer my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, since I was away from Washington during the weeks of January 29 and February 5, on official leave of absence, I want to explain how I would have voted on the rollcall votes which occurred while I was gone.

Had I been present for the debate on the Consumer Credit Protection Act (H.R. 11601) I would have voted "yea" on the Poff amendment levying severe penalties on loan sharks who extort high interest rates by force, and I would have voted "yea" for final passage.

Had I been present for H.R. 6649, I would have voted "yea" on the motion to recommit, reducing the increase of lending authority of the Export-Import Bank from $4.5 billion to $3.5 billion. Since the House bill prohibited the Eximbank from extending credit to countries trading with North Vietnam, and also from financing arms sales to underdeveloped countries, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 6649.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H.R. 4282, because I believe that the cherry processors should have a voice in the marketing orders of cherries for canning or freezing.

I would have voted "yea" on S. 974, to

sell 20 acres of federally owned land to the city of Glendale, Ariz.

And finally, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act. With 115,000 lives lost and $16.7 billion of property destroyed by fire during the 10-year period from 1955 to 1965, the amount of money authorized by this bill is a small price to pay for efforts to minimize future losses to fire in the years to come.

OUR NEED IS A FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE RATHER THAN DEBASEMENT OF OUR MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of March 1965, an act of this Congress removed the 25-percent-gold-reserve requirement for the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks.

On July 23, 1965, the Coinage Act was passed, reducing the silver content of the half dollar to 40 percent and eliminating the silver content of the quarter and dime.

On the 24th of June 1967, an act was passed setting a 1-year limit on the redemption of silver certificates, that is, after June 24 of the year, silver certificates will no longer be redeemable in silver.

Today, we are asked to remove the gold backing of our Federal Reserve notes. This is the fourth successive action to debase our coinage and monetary system. This act does not eliminate the cause of our difficulty. Our foreign expenditures must be reduced.

Many distinguished men who have spoken on this subject say they are reluctant to further debase our monetary system. As it happens, not only am I reluctant—I refuse—and urge other Members to do likewise and to insist on such steps as will result in a favorable balance of trade for our Nation.

MAKE ILLEGAL POSSESSION OF DRUGS A FELONY

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a bill which I am introducing today to make the illegal manufacture, sale, traffic, and possession of illicit and hallucinogenic drugs, including LSD, a felony. The dangers of the use of such drugs are so extraordinary that the administration's bill making the possession of such drugs a misdemeanor is not adequate to cope with the problem. To effectively control the use of LSD you have to be able to successfully prosecute the illegal sales and traffic of the drugs. Because of the difficulties in the successful prosecution of the peddlers and pushers of these drugs, I consider it necessary and imperative to make mere possession of them a felony. The only way to adequately control the use of these drugs is to eliminate the illegal peddlers and pushers and this best can be done by making the mere possession of the drugs a felony.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that at the present time the possession of marihuana is a felony. Marihuana has not proved to be as harmful at least genetically as LSD, and certainly the use of LSD and possession of it too should be punishable at least to the same degree.

I urge you to give serious consideration to my bill which I earnestly believe will go a long way in abating a problem which is growing in propensity each day and should be alarming to each of us as lawmakers and as parents and responsible citizens.

FORECASTS AND NEW YORK ELECTION REVEAL THAT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WILL NOT HAVE TO DECIDE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit puzzled by all of the speeches about the election of the President being thrown into the House of Representatives. I just cannot quite figure out what concerns my Republican friends so much. If they really believe their own prognostications that they are going to control the House, they would not have any problem here. Maybe they do not believe their own predictions. There are a lot of "iffy" propositions thrown out.

I would like to throw out one of my own. If the Republican vote for the House of Representatives drops as drastically throughout the Nation as it did in the special election in New York yesterday, they will not need to worry about that either, because the Democrats will control the House overwhelmingly, and then if the election goes into the House, we will know what to do about it.

I should think it would be interesting to point out that in 1966 the Republican candidate in this particular district in New York got 18 percent of the vote. This time he got 5 percent. I hope that this is a proper forecast of what will happen throughout the Nation next November.

NOTHING WRONG WITH MAKING MONEY

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I grew up as a great fan of Horatio Alger. And I am sure that I am but one of many millions of Americans who admire the boy who traveled the road from rags-to-riches all on his own initiative. I have always believed that it is in the very best American tradition to go out and make some money, and I was very fortunate that, in this great land of ours I was able to do it.

When I was elected to Congress, I thought that having money would be an asset that would enable me to better serve my constituents. I certainly never thought it would be held against me.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have just learned, to my surprise, that one of my distinguished colleagues, who, I understand, might be running in a primary against me, thinks that there is something wrong with being a millionaire.

Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to speak for all millionaire Congressmen. If my record could serve as a guide, however, millionaire Congressmen can be just as dedicated to the underdog.

Some of the greatest humanitarians in the history of our Government have been millionaires—Herbert Lehman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy. If anything, their money helped these men become more effective fighters for the poor and underprivileged.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the time has now come for me to stand up in this wonderful House of ours, where we have stood to protect the rights of so many minorities, and to introduce legislation to protect the rights of yet another minority—the self-made millionaires?

GROWING UP IN A SCHOOL OF HUMILITY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have grown up in a school of humility. There is nothing wrong in itself about being a millionaire. It must be very comforting especially to one with a large family of children in a time of mounting costs of education. But I have always questioned the propriety of boasting about anything. Modesty becomes alike the poor man and the rich man.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Casey
Celler
Clancy
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dingell
Dowdy
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Flynt
Foley
Gude
Hagan
Halleck
Holland
Hungate
Jarman
King, Calif.
Kuykendall
Macdonald, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Moss
O'Konski
Passman
Pike
Pollock
Pool
Quillen
Reinecke
Rosenthal
Satterfield
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tunney
Udall

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1155) entitled "An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to change the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12603) entitled "An act to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE RIGHTS OF COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to amend section 13B of title 15 of the United States Code.

This proposed legislation is just one more step in the administration's objective to give the consumer a fair deal in the marketplace. It falls in the pattern of the meat inspection bill; it falls in the pattern of the truth-in-lending legislation, recently passed. Fundamentally, my bill seeks to do nothing more than to require cooperative associations to fully and completely disclose their transactions to the Securities and Exchange Commission and to its membership.

I cannot envision any cooperative complaining about this legislation. It does not place an undue burden on their doing business. It does not destroy the time-honored exemptions that they are the recipients of under our laws.

However, to clear the air on alleged abuses attributed to the many fine cooperative associations in the country, it is my humble belief that by requiring them to fully and completely disclose their activities, it will lay to rest many of these unfounded charges. I think this bill will benefit the cooperative associations and the many farmers throughout the land.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORY IN NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, some of us are highly gratified and also greatly amused at what happened on yesterday in the special election in the congressional district in Brooklyn, N.Y., formerly represented here by our distingushed former colleague the present supreme court justice, Hon. Abraham J. Multer. The people of that district decided on yesterday to send here to the House of Representatives a highly capable gentleman, Assemblyman Bertram Podell who has had 14 years of legislative experience in Albany, N.Y., in the New York State Legislature, and I am sure he will be—in fact, he already is—a splendid addition to the New York Democratic delegation here in the House of Representatives.

You may wonder why I said we were also greatly amused. We were amused because we had read in the press recently that the Republican congressional campaign committee had sent $10,000 up to Brooklyn, N.Y., to help elect the Republican candidate in yesterday's election. How many votes do you think the Republican candidate received on yesterday in this election? The Republican candidate received 4,909 votes out of a total of 72,686. That is what we think of Republicans in Brooklyn, N.Y. Incidentally, their candidate ran at the rate of over $2 a vote.

THE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION IN BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I were the gentleman from Brooklyn, N.Y., I would not be amused because the result showed that a person running as an independent Democrat in that district in Brooklyn, and who has no real relationship to the district, polled a tremendous vote which could only have meaning as opposition to this administration's foreign policy. I think that is the point that we should all take cognizance of. I grant that the Democrat who won is a well qualified State legislator with a good record in his community, and that in itself is what helped him to be elected. If he had run on the basis of this administration's foreign policy, he would have lost.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend very briefly yield?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it not the fact that the Republican candidate supported the President and the administration insofar as Vietnam is concerned, as did the winning Democrat?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican candidate said that the best choice is the Republican Party for the future, and I think the people of this country will concur next November.

REMOVAL OF GOLD COVER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14743) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14743, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on page 1, line 6 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, having debauched the silver currency of this Nation by issuing in its place Lyndon Johnson's Great Society scrap metal funny money, the mismanagers of this Government now seek to abandon the last vestige of precious metal support for our medium of exchange.

For 13 centuries, gold coinages of one kind or another have been the readily acceptable medium of exchange in almost every nook and corner of the world. Only a few of the nations of the world, including the United States, prohibit the private ownership of gold.

For some 300 years, during the halcyon period of the British Empire, the gold sovereign was sought and accepted in every climate—by the half civilized as well as the civilized. Came World War I and the degeneracy of British leadership. The career of the gold sovereign ended and there was the resort to fiat currency.

England has had three Socialist Prime Ministers and all have had to devalue the pound. The reason is the same as it has always been—the British have been living beyond their means. They cannot pay their bills yet they insist upon living as though they could.

The framers of the Constitution of the United States sought to provide for money and its minting for the purpose of furnishing all the people with a medium of exchange, a reliable standard of value, and the most dependable storehouse of value. Gold coinage in this country was originally interchangeable at will for other currency, dollar for dollar. Then came 1933 when, by Executive order, the right of citizens to own either gold coins or gold, except for industrial and other limited uses, was abolished.

That ended gold money in the wealthiest and probably the most powerful country in history. The first wall of the storehouse of value was ripped down and the beginning of the fiat money program in this country was launched.

The excuse for this action was the desire to raise farm prices, but the hidden reason was the opportunity to open the door to the socialist welfare program. It was the same cult of political and economic cripples that were at work in Britain.

Unlike medical quackery, there was no protection for citizens against monetary quackery.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, who the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. PATMAN, finds it so easy to support today, describes gold as "barbarous metal"—something evil to be disposed of to the rest of the world.

He pleads for prompt action to "reaffirm to the world the convertibility of the dollar."

Convertibility at $35 an ounce, he said, "is a keystone of the international monetary system and a fundamental reason why foreign monetary authorities are willing to hold dollar reserves."

Why does President Johnson, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board seek to knock the last gold prop from under our monetary system to indulge the world, other than the United States, with a convertible dollar?

Have they, and has this Congress the unmitigated gall to extend to foreign central banks—international bankers and their clients—a convertibility privilege denied to U.S. citizens—a privilege which was formerly held by Americans as an inalienable right?

Who owns what remains of our gold stock? Is it the American people or is it a President and Secretary of the Treasury who are here today and will be gone tomorrow? Or is it "Barbarous Metal" Martin, who says in effect "get rid of the last ounce of filthy gold. It is contaminating this country, but be sure to make it avaliable to the joyriders abroad, and leave the driving to us."

What does the Johnson-Fowler-Martin triumvirate propose to use to shore up and protect the integrity of the dollar when this last $10½ billion in gold is gone? Is it intended to rely on Mr. PATMAN's printing press money? For some 17 years we tried that and the result was ruinous. We returned to the gold standard, remember?

Incidentally, it is apparent that we have not been kept timely informed of all the monetary manipulations abroad. It was on November 21, 1967, that newspaper reporters cornered Secretary Fowler and obtained from him confirmation of widespread reports that France had abandoned the eight-nation gold pool several months previously.

Fowler is quoted as saying:

> I've known about it for a long time and have long since ceased to be disturbed.

Well, who is Fowler working for and what about keeping the people of the United States informed? It has apparently been the deliberate policy of this Government to keep the public as poorly informed as possible on the true meaning of gold, prudently used, as a disciplinary force on our medium of exchange.

What the people of this country do understand, despite all the fancy double-talk of Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin and others, is that for them gold is something evil and to be shunned while everywhere else in the world it is sought and coveted.

The fumbling money managers of this country may be able to hoodwink the American people, but they will never convince the people of foreign countries that a U.S. dollar, without gold backing and loaded with deficits, is "as good as gold." Nor will the issuance of "paper gold" and the establishment of special drawing rights accomplish anything but postpone the fatal day of reckoning.

This legislation ought to be overwhelmingly defeated and the American people should demand that their Government stop spending beyond its revenue. They should also demand that when our gold supply is restored that those who want to own and exchange it be permitted to do so. Only in this way will our dollars once again become "as good as gold."

Mr. Chairman, I say to you and to the Members of the House that if this bill is approved we ought, before hearing Washington's Farewell Address tomorrow, hang crepe on the doors of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is there an amendment before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offered a pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Texas has risen in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and the gentleman from Texas is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, about 3 years ago, almost at this exact time, we passed on a similar question. This is on all fours with the question before us now as far as logic and reasoning are concerned. Before that time we had gold requirements on deposits of the Federal Reserve banks, which, incidentally, support the commercial banks deposits which aggregate more than $200 billion. We are here dealing with a gold reserve backing in Federal Reserve notes of $40 billion. In comparison to the removal of gold behind deposits it is just one-fifth as much. We had, as I say, exactly the same issue involved on February 9, 1965. That issue was: Shall we take the gold as a requirement from under the deposits in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Now, reremember these reserves are the ones that are put in the Federal Reserve banks by the commercial banks who are members of the Federal Reserve System. Upon those reserves, as a fractional reserve, they are high-powered dollars. They can expand 10 times and more for every one of them they hold. If there was ever a need for gold as a reserve requirement, it was needed much worse there than it is needed today on the $40 billion in currency that we have. It was not needed then nor now.

May I invite your attention on that exact issue, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 2416, to the fact that 300 Members of the House voted to take the 25-percent reserve requirement from the deposits of the member banks and the 12 Federal Reserve banks. That was exactly the same question which was involved there, and only 82 Members voted against it. I have the record vote here if any of you would care to see it. It will be available here on this table.

But how can you insist that this particular bill, which is just one-fifth in size compared to that bill of 3 years ago, would be so devastating when we passed the other bill by a vote of 300 to 82?

Now I would like to ask any Member of this House to rise and ask me to yield if he knows a single ripple that was caused or a single problem that was caused in the United States or in the entire world by reason of the passage of that bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If you will state that you know of any problem that arose because of that, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield, I can properly answer the question, because I was one of the 82 who voted against that removal, almost 3 years ago. I would like to answer his question by asking him as to where the U.S. gold is now.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course the gentleman was one of the 82; 81 others voted with him. But 300 voted the other way. But the question I asked and I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. HALL. The question that you invited and which I asked is, where is the gold now?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we know where the gold is. We have a fair proportion of the gold of the world. There are only $70 billion of gold in all the world in reserves, and we have $12.3 billion of it. That is a pretty fair distribution of the gold. If any country happened to own or hold too much gold, it would be a detriment to the other countries of the world and it would not be fair. So I would like to ask this question of any Member of Congress——

Mr. HALL. The gentleman invited a question, I replied by asking one and he has not yet answered it.

Mr. PATMAN. I have answered the question. I just asked if any Member knew of any problem that had arisen from what we did then and caused even a ripple anywhere in the world.

Mr. HALL. The problem is that our gold is gone.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just one minute now. A problem that was caused by reason of the passage of that bill 3 years ago. Just 3 years ago. Do you know of anything, any harm that has come to our country because of it?

Mr. GROSS. Why, certainly; if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Do you know of any harm that has come to our country? If the gentleman says he does know of any harm, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Billions of dollars of our resource in gold have gone abroad. That is what has happened.

Mr. PATMAN. Not by reason of this bill, or the one——

Mr. GROSS. And, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. Not by reason of this.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that the gold has gone where the woodbine twineth and the whang doodle whangeth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PATMAN. The question is that we voted for that bill 300 to 82 and no problem has arisen by reason of our action thereon; no problem of any kind.

Now, the gentleman from Iowa is predicting devastation and everything else if we pass this bill. However, it involves the same principle exactly, but only one-fifth of the money—only 20 percent of the money involved. So how can one say that this bill will be so devastating, so disruptive to this country and the world, when we passed a bill involving five times as much 3 years ago involving the same principle, and the enactment of that bill has not caused any problem and no Member of this body can recall a single problem which it has caused.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Texas wants to be fair. Will the gentleman yield for 1 second?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do not ask Members of the House of Representatives, many of whom were not here 3 years ago, to compound the felony which was perpetrated 3 years ago.

Mr. PATMAN. You have to have felony committed before you can compound it.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked an honest question and I would like to give the gentleman my response.

Mr. PATMAN. All right, do it quickly.

Mr. BROCK. The question is "Has there been an adverse effect as a result of the action which we took 3 years ago?" The answer is, "Yes," and the adverse effect has occurred in this way: It gave the administration time in which to correct a basic problem. However, the administration refused to do so and the problem has now become exaggerated. That is the adverse effect.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked about irresponsibility and the credibility gap involved in the affairs of this Nation for the past 3 years. This has come about as a result of the irresponsibility of this Congress and its lack of will and ability to address itself to this problem.

Mr. PATMAN. That is another question which we shall not get into. But I am asking the question now: Two similar bills have been enacted along this line. One year ago we enacted legislation to take the gold requirement from under the deposits that could not be exported. Incidentally, the gold, gentlemen, could not be exported on that account, and it could not be exported at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with one-fifth of that much—just 20 percent. So, if the $200 million proposal was enacted into law and it caused no harm and if no Member can recall one bit of harm that it may have caused in this country or to other countries abroad, how can this proposal which involves just one-fifth or 20 percent of that amount cause any harm?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Three years ago we had $19 billion of deposits in our Federal Reserve banks. There was 25 percent in gold backing upon those deposits. In other words, the bankers knew that their deposits were backed or underwritten with 25 percent in gold. We were then told that to do away with that gold backing would make $6.7 billion available to answer our needs abroad; that if we would do this, it would answer our needs as far as they could see ahead.

Since then we have lost $3 billion out of the gold reserve and now the gentleman asks us to make available the last $12 billion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman's point. The gentleman has made that point all during the period of time during which this legislation has been under consideration. He is perfectly within his rights to do so. I just do not happen to agree with the gentleman. The gentleman indicated that it was unjust to take the gold out from under the deposits to which much reference has been made. The gentleman said that there was $19 billion involved.

But it did not shake any confidence because deposits have gone up to an enormous extent since that time—an enormous extent. So you can say that it affected deposits in a favorable way, not an unfavorable way. There was no harm that came to our country because of the passage of that bill 3 years ago—no harm to our country or any other country on earth. And it would be exactly the same thing if you pass this bill that is before us today. There will be no harm to our country, and there will be no harm to any country on earth.

If we do not pass this bill then it is possible for us to have the worst worldwide depression in all history. That is what is involved here—matters that are entirely too serious to trifle with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether anything that will be said at this hour will change the minds of those who have made up their minds on the very volatile question about gold, and it is predicated quite a bit upon one's feelings, as well as upon the facts. But let me say this: If you wish to establish your feelings of this country's strength in terms of gold in this country, let me suggest that you do this: turn your minds back to 1947. At that time we had the most gold that we ever had in this country, around $25 billion plus. At that time the gross national product of this country was about $289 billion, which was very near what we owed in national debt.

At that time we had the expense of maintaining all of this gold, which was our short-term reserve, liquid, immediately available, and it was ready to be utilized on debts that should require gold. At that time we had invested abroad something less than $30 billion. Was this our finest hour of strength?

Now, we come to 1966 or 1967, and we find that half of the gold that we had is gone. But what happened to the country? Now our gross national product is pushing $800 billion. Now our investments abroad are over $150 billion, and all of those investments are paying us a 10-percent return, on the average. And although they are long-term rather than short-term, their availability for liquidity I suggest to you is doing this country a lot more good than just having gold sitting in Fort Fnox. That is not to say it is not entirely proper and appropriate that short-term liquidity in terms of reserves be available for certain debts to the rest of the world. Are we not far stronger now? Was not the transfers of gold to others for short-term reserves to allow dynamic expansion a wise move. That expansion allowed for our increase of investment?

Let me suggest to you something else, if you are looking at money as if it was a deposit of value rather than a mechanism to turn over the goods and services of this country, then perhaps you want gold behind you because you want money to be your deposit of value. At one time we viewed money this way and much of our money was imbued with the necromatic aroma of mattresses and old tin cans. Now money is in our banks and saving institutions and the only smell is that of sweat as we put it to work. A lot of people do not want money to be their deposit of value because they can do better by getting into long-term returns such as stocks and bonds, and in real estate, or, they deposit their money in financial institutions where it will be put to work and pay them some of the return, and that is where people are looking for their deposit of value.

And I suggest to you that Congressman SHERMAN LLOYD, of Utah, made the best point that has been made in this House about why the gold does not build our domestic economy. At one time it was the restraint behind the issuance of money. But I suggest to you that last year we had over $6 trillion worth of transactions, and we had a little over $40 billion worth of currency. The currency did not turn over the goods and services of this country, the bank deposits did, the checks that were written did, they spread into transactions six and seven times more than did the money. So that the availability of money in a true sense in the United States is no more tied with gold than the man in the moon. It is tied, really, to bank deposits that handle the transactions of this country, and that is the credit in the banks against which checks are written. It does not have anything to do about gold; gold does not have any control on it whatsoever. The people are more sophisticated about money than the Congress is if the Congress does not see the sense in this particular legislation.

You do not need this cover on money. It is not doing you a bit of good.

The whole question is—will it do you some good by making it available in terms of our commitment made by every President in this century that we would stand behind gold in terms of the money of this country, and this is simply to provide in the international market, where the sophistications of transactions have not arrived at the point where you can rely upon the monetary systems of all the countries, in the way we have built reliance on our monetary system, so you have to have gold discipline, in the international trade and our gold would be an important part of establishing that discipline.

The more you see this, gentlemen, you will see why it makes good sense to pass the legislation that is before us. If you do not see this, then you are tied, it seems to me, simply to your emotional and symptomatic trauma on gold, because you want your money to be a deposit of value. But why convert money to gold. Even the chorus girl is wiser than that. Her motto is "a diamond is a girl's best friend."

I will tell you this. You are getting far more out of the system developed here in America to handle the turnover that is so vital to a great country of wealth and have the goods and services to turn over, which reaches out into the trillions of dollars per year, and that is going to be turned over in large part, either by checks or by the new sophistication of your credit cards. It is not going to be turned over by currency, although it will continue to play a minor role.

I suggest to you if gold should play a major role and it ought to be in the international market. This legislation will make clear our position on this use for gold. It will show the world that one very great and effective economy has freed itself from the fetters of gold. Further it will assure those outside our country that we are ready to perform without artificial restraint on our promise to support gold as the stabilizing and disciplinary mechanism in international trade.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, in the history of our civilization there has never been a substantial period of time during which the value of money in vogue was not sustained by the cover of precious metal. The desire for—and therefore, the value of gold—has always remained universal. Changes in the world's governments, be they revolutionary evolutionary—be they wrought by war or by philosophical innovation—have not undermined the value of gold in the human mind or deflected man's passion for it.

Through the years, the Government of the United States has recognized gold cover as essential to the value of our money during transitional times. Even at 25 percent, or any other fraction of gold cover, we have a built-in resistance to the tampering with money value under political duress or in periods of economic fluctuation. This very resistance in our monetary system against shocking changes in the value of our money has been the underpinning of worldwide faith in the American dollar.

The choice today to vote H.R. 14743 up or down presents this Congress with two sad alternatives. A basic question is, if we remove our 25-percent gold cover, what relationships will develop between our dollars, with no metal backing, and other hard currencies with gold behind them? The answer may be speculative; but it is unreasonable to argue that our dollars will not receive closer evaluation and more severe scrutiny in interntaional trade.

How will these gold-free dollars fair in this kind of competition? Replacing the traditional stability of the value of our money will be a new human element, an element of variance, an element of inevitable change, and an element of dark psychological impact among people of the world.

The proposal before us is remedial only to short-term ills. Arguments for this action are not clear from a long-term view. In the very words of the President, who said in his state of the Union message:

> I ask speedy action from the Congress because it will demonstrate to the world the determination of America to meet its international economic obligations.

We see the heart of our monetary system being carved out. We see a double standard for the American dollar, which protects the monetary contracts held by foreigners, but which lays open the fear of printing press inflation here at home.

The argument that the legislation is needed to "reaffirm to the world the convertibility of the dollar" is the best proof of fiscal mismanagement which has plagued this administration from its inception. A short term requirement to stem the tide of an immediate gold rush is obvious. This bill is supposed to meet this requirement; but for me it is not enough. Actions taken by governments to protect their monetary values must be part of a total policy thrust. It is untimely to remove the gold cover in isolation from many other necessary and, perhaps, more disciplined and unpopular actions, in order not only to preserve the dollar value, but also to restore a favorable balance of payments.

Before we approve this measure, Mr. Chairman, let us have a pledge from the administration for a total package, a series of actions, all of which must be concurrent. Let us defeat this bill so the administration will well understand the intent of Congress; so it will, without alternative, face the grim realities incurred by its own doing. Let us look at a total program for the cure, and not a package of band-aids.

If we are men of courage equal to that being demonstrated in Southeast Asia by our sons and those of our friends and neighbors, we will demand of this Government hard-line solutions far more comprehensive than the offerings to date.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, enacting this bill is a simple pronouncement by this great legislative body that we are unwilling to face the total problem of restoring fiscal soundness in our Government, but are willing to deal with it only in a piecemeal fashion which involves the least political risk.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I am voting to remove the gold cover on our currency. I resent having to do so. We move from crisis to crisis here in Washington, doing what is foolish for the long term solely because we have to survive in the short term. These are about the only discernible fruits of the widely heralded Great Society in its declining months. Next week we know we will have another crisis, perhaps not even identified yet, because our national leadership has not been willing to make the tough decisions required for sound policies, sound Government, and sound money. Social progress in the long run cannot be based on anything else, no matter how much we promise and how much we display our hearts on our sleeves.

As I see it, the gold cover has to be removed because we have no alternative. This action will buy only time. The short term corrective measures now being discussed, like the travel tax, the limitations on foreign investment, repatriation of foreign earnings, and so forth, also are counterproductive for the long term, and expressive of nothing but a crisis of neglected priorities and careless waste of the resources of our people. Unless we change our basic policies, such temporizing can result only in graver and graver crises in the future.

Gradually our options are being removed by this type of temporizing. We cannot throw away our future freedom of choice by failing to redirect our long term goals. If we wait until our gold is all gone before we make any long term adjustments, it will be too late to do anything but default in a manner that will be disastrous to not only the fortunes of our country abroad, but the entire free world.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to wait. If we remove the gold cover now, we have a moment to breathe but we do not have a moment to waste. The next gold crisis will not be avoidable except in terms of more sensible policies of foreign aid and troop levels abroad, and Government spending and priorities at home. But we cannot wait until next year to start, or next month; the administration must recognize that the need for improvement is immediate.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I came into this debate yesterday fully convinced that we had no option as a nation, and as a Congress, other than to remove the gold cover in order to avoid a major crisis in our gold situation because of a run on gold, with only $1,100,000,000 left in free reserves.

I have listened carefully to this debate. The more I listened to the arguments of those who are in favor of removing the gold cover, the more I came to question my own position in support of their arguments. They have been immaterial and irrelevant. They have refused to address themselves to the basic elements of the problem.

I have tried to find the real economic logic behind this gold cover removal. I have sought to hear fundamental evidence or statements by the proponents of the bill—and I do not hear them.

Rather, I hear someone stand on the floor of this House and say that we should remove the gold cover so that we can teach gold speculators a lesson. That is a lot of hogwash—and you know it. You are not going to teach any speculators a lesson by passing this bill. The only way we are going to teach speculators a lesson in this situation is to address ourselves to the basic problem, by being fiscally responsible for a change.

We are addressing ourselves in this bill to a symptom and not to a disease.

The movement of gold is nothing but a reflection of the economic reality, as it exists in the international and domestic economy. The fact that gold is going out has a very sound basis in fact.

There is less confidence in the dollar than there was in the past because of our policies both domestically and internationally. We have spent more than we have earned domestically. We have spent more in the public sector than we had available to spend, through troop commitments, foreign aid, and all kinds of Federal programs.

But what does this administration propose to do about the basic disease? The basic disease of excessive public spending abroad?

They come to us and they say, "We must increase our Federal budget domestically by billions of dollars this year. We must increase our foreign aid by $800 million. We can't cut our commitments. We must increase them."

We are going to continue to have a deficit in the range of $18 to $20 billion. They propose a balance-of-payments program which addresses itself to the very segment of the economy which is yielding a profit, our private sector. They talk nothing about the public sector whatsoever. I have not heard one Member on the majority side mentioning a reduction in our troop commitments in Europe. I have not heard one Member mention a reduction in foreign aid. I have heard them talk only about reducing our investments overseas, which is where we get our profits. I have heard them talk about, our positive trade balance. They always fail to mention the reason we have a positive trade balance today, because we subsidize our trade with buy-American policies under foreign aid and with Public Law 480. That is the only reason we have a surplus in our trade balance today.

Of greater concern is the fact that we will not have such luck at the end of this year because this administration does not have the political integrity to take a stand on the copper strike, and nothing will be done to stop a steel strike, nor will it exercise fiscal responsibility, nor will it insist upon wage and price restraint in an election year.

What are you asking us to do? You are asking us to save the administration from its own failures again. There are some of us who are willing to try to do that, to buy some more time to effect responsible measures of restraint. But what evidence have you shown us that you intend to take the hard political steps that are necessary, to address yourselves to the problem? Absolutely none. I do not hear any talk about fiscal responsibility. I do not hear any talk about reducing expenditures. I do not hear any talk about troop commitments or foreign aid. Give us some evidence, and then you can have your support.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the enactment of H.R. 14743 which would eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve notes be backed by 25 percent in gold certificates.

In mid-January our national gold reserves stood at $11.984 billion. The latest report last week indicated a further loss in gold reserves of $100 million. Our "free gold" noncommitted to the Federal Reserve System is less than $1.3 billion. As of yearend, $10.7 billion was frozen as reserves against outstanding Federal Reserve notes. With such a minimal amount of free gold on hand it is quite apparent that any further gold withdrawals, triggered by further lack of confidence in the dollar, will soon exhaust our supply of "free gold."

The administration now recommends removal of the gold cover. In the hope that such action will arrest the gold hemorrhage, which is rapidly sapping our economic strength, we are being told by the administration that removal of the gold cover is inevitable. In view of our perilously thin margin of free gold, I doubt if many Members of the body are aware of the fact that this is not the only action which can be taken.

The present Federal statute provides penalties if the Federal Reserve Board permits a decline below the 25 percent required statutory reserve. For example, if gold drops below 25 percent and not more than 20 percent there is a mandatory statutory requirement that the Federal Reserve charge a tax of not more than 1 percent against the Federal Reserve System and the Fed must add that percentage to its rediscount rate. Another much stiffer tax is mandatorily required if the gold reserve drops below 20 percent, in which event the applicable tax is for 1½ percent for each 2½-percent drop in the reserve below 20 percent, which likewise must be added to the rediscount rate.

Unless the pending bill is enacted, or unless the Federal Reserve submits to the discipline of gold as set forth in the present Federal statute by imposing penalties the only other alternative would in all probability be to impose an embargo on gold leaving our shores, followed inevitably by multilateral reevaluation of gold through an international monetary conference.

Despite the proposals of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury to take off the gold cover this is not the only remedial action open to the Government. The Federal Reserve Board could impose a minimal tax of any fraction of 1 percent if the reserve drops below 25 percent and less than 20 percent. It would not create too onerous a burden by an increase in the Federal discount rate. Such action would buy time to protect our gold reserves by the adoption of necessary measures to correct our balance-of-payments deficit and our internal Federal deficit, thereby relieving pressure on the national gold stockpile.

If H.R. 14743 is enacted the American citizen on the domestic scene will henceforth be required to accept completely fiat money. The American dollar is still backed by gold internationally although our citizens are forbidden to own gold at home and abroad. The brakes on the expansion of our money supply will be removed if this bill is passed. I know of no nation in past history that has been able to embark upon a program of unbridled and unrestricted printing-press paper money.

We cannot forever engulf, not only this Nation, but the world with an ever-growing flood of paper dollars, backed only by the illusion that this paper currency will be regarded abroad as true store of value, a mere promise to pay in paper I O U's.

The administration finds itself in the embarrasing position of asking the Congress, through the Treasury Department, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system to put our stamp of approval on removing the gold cover, thus giving our blessing to policies of fiscal irresponsibility which have led to our present plight.

If the administration had heeded the warnings of the minority party which have been repeatedly made over a period of years it would not now be in the position of asking the Members of this body to give their approval to the creation of fiat money. Nothing has been done in a realistic and positive way to correct our constant and growing balance-of-payments deficit—nothing has been done to drastically reduce our expenditures for foreign economic aid—nothing has been done to curb profligate spending in the ever-increasing plethora of expanding welfare programs.

Strong measures of austerity necessary to put our financial house in order have been completely ignored despite repeated warnings from foreign central bankers, indicative of their growing concern over the stability of the dollar. The temporary palliatives recommended by the President in early January to correct the balance-of-payments deficit came too little and too late.

The administration claims that by enactment of this measure we will stem the outflow of gold and strengthen confidence in the dollar. I take exactly the opposite view. Should the Congress enact this measure I predict that foreign interests will interpret such congressional action as but a further evidence of weakness in our fiscal establishment. Thus confidence in the stability of the dollar will be further weakened.

I would anticipate that when we announced in the past to the world that our gold reserve has been completely freed of restraint and in effect say "our gold is on the bargain counter at $35 per ounce—come and get it if you choose"—that the administration will be confounded and surprised by the extent of conversion of foreign claims into gold.

In spite of the frequent statements by the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, and the administration that the dollar will be defended to our last bar of gold, I cannot believe that the executive branch will be so shortsighted as to permit our national gold reserves to drop below a critical level. I say that point has now been reached. I do not believe the security of the Nation can be endangered by further substantial losses in our gold hoard.

I believe the time is at hand for the Congress to assert its authority by refusing to pass this gold cover measure and by taking positive and vigorous action to correct our balance-of-payments deficit, to drastically cut foreign spending, to severely curtail profligate domestic programs, in short, to adopt the austere measures necessary to return fiscal responsibility to our Government. When these steps are taken, and not until then, will we witness a reverse thrust with gold returning to this country.

In closing, I wish to point out that I am amazed that the Treasury Department still adamantly objects to a subsidization of our own domestic gold mining industry. Obviously any increment in our domestic gold reserves is decidedly in the national interest, yet Treasury plays the same old record with the same old needle in opposing gold subsidy bills on the ground that our enactment of such a bill would cause concern in foreign circles over the stability of the dollar. In view of the startling events of the past few weeks in international monetary circles—the devaluation of the pound—the drain on our gold stocks—such Treasury arguments appear quite ludicrous. Certainly we can increase our annual domestic gold production by a substantial amount and such addition to our reserves could have but one effect—that is, strengthen confidence in the dollar

A very realistic gold mining act, H.R. 3274, has been approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and a 2 hour open rule has been granted on this bill by the House Rules Committee. While the bill does not have as its purpose increasing the price of gold, nevertheless the incentives to domestic operators, based upon a cost formula, would undoubtedly revitalize the industry and lead to much greater production, thereby closing the gold gap in the United States which exists by reason of the fact that we consume gold for jewelry, dental, artistic, industrial, and space uses in this country four times our annual domestic production.

By way of concrete illustration we should take note of the tremendous surge in gold production which occurred in the period of 1933–40, following an increase in the price of gold in 1934. During the pre-World War II period Mexican production increased from 637,700 to 883,117 ounces, Canadian production from 2,949,300 to 5,322,857 ounces, and South American production from 931 to 1,927,000 ounces. By the same token, following World War II, the cost-squeeze of inflation operating against a fixed-price product dropped gold production in these areas by 1966 as follows: Mexico, 190,815 ounces, Canada, 3,273,905 ounces, and South America, 697,980 ounces; 1933, United States, 2,536,913 ounces; 1940, United States, 4,802,900 ounces; and 1966, United States, 1,700,000.

I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to the passage of H.R. 3274—the Gold Mining Assistance Act—and promptly enact this measure to strengthen confidence in the American dollar.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Yesterday the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], said that we needed to remove the so-called gold cover in an effort to strengthen the American dollar. He said that every economist who appeared before his committee during the course of these hearings said that people all over the world as a whole had more faith in the American dollar than they did in gold.

I submit to you simply that this is totally in error, because these foreigners who hold American dollars lack faith in the American dollar or else they would not be demanding, in this time of crisis, gold in its stead. And it is simply because of this lack of faith in the American dollar that foreign holders of American dollars are demanding something with intrinsic value, in this instance gold. So the premise that the dollar is more valuable and has more stability than does gold with its intrinsic value is totally wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee two or three questions.

Mr. PATMAN. Please do.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The first question is, What was the initial purpose in placing a so-called gold cover in reserve to support our currency?

Mr. PATMAN. Most countries in the world believe that gold is the best form of money. That tradition has been in the United States of America. Even silver at one time was looked upon as having a value equal with that of gold. But as we have developed and discovered it is impossible to operate on a limited amount of gold in the world, countries have gotten away from gold and offered other forms of money. Necessity, of course, is the mother of invention, and that was by reason of necessity.

Mr. WAGGONNER. How could the gentleman say all countries have gotten away from gold, when foreign sources and foreign governments own some $30 billion worth of gold now? In addition we can only estimate hoarded gold.

Mr. PATMAN. It is as backing for their currency, I was talking about. The United Kingdom does not have gold backing.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I do not speak specifically of the United Kingdom. I speak of countries the world over.

Mr. PATMAN. France is one. They do not have gold as a backing for their currency. The gentleman mentioned about countries claiming so much of our gold. Of course, France has been the one claiming so much of our gold, but France has not claimed any of our gold since October 1966. The gold that has been going out in the recent past, in recent months, has been going to London, to the gold market.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Let me ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. PATMAN. But it is going into monetary uses.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman take the position today we were totally in error years ago in ever placing a gold cover in support of our currency?

Mr. PATMAN. No. It was absolutely necessary then.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then why is it not still necessary?

Mr. PATMAN. People do not feel the same way about it. They have this $800 billion of gross national product, and it would be impossible today.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentleman say it is not necessary today at all?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentleman say it would not be desirable?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not desirable now, because we do not want our currency devalued. This will strengthen our currency. It will not devalue it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the gentleman make an estimate of how long this would add strength to our currency?

Mr. PATMAN. Beyond the foreseeable future.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman is knowledgeable with regard to banking matters. Would the gentleman advocate we take our banking systems, and the principle is the same, and remove the requirement for reserves against deposits by banks who hold individual deposits?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I do not advocate that, but we have done it in practice pretty well anyway.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then why, if the principle is good to give confidence to the banking systems, is it not good in the international arena in support of our currency?

Mr. PATMAN. The question is different.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The question is different, but the principle is the same.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not consider that it is the same.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman does not consider the principle the same?

Mr. PATMAN. The reserves behind our transactions in the banks is the dollar we use. It is a high-powered dollar.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentleman define a "high-powered dollar" for me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. A high-powered dollar is one like the gold standard used. They used it and expanded it 10 times. We have done that too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONNER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. We have not increased ours 10 times.

Mr. PATMAN. We have, too. We have gone way beyond the old gold standard. That is a high-powered dollar.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman say in our banking system we should not require reserves?

Mr. PATMAN. We should have reserves. I think we have got a good system, and I am for the fractional reserve, and I am for the high-powered dollars.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But the gentleman sees no relationship between the gold reserve internationally and reserves in our banking system to have good faith?

Mr. PATMAN. How can gold be of value to the people of the United States when there is no way for them to get it?

Mr. WAGGONNER. That is the reason the gentleman from California argued—the fallacious argument—when he said we—and he spoke about we Americans—want gold to support our dollar. No. We do not want it. We do not have the opportunity now. Only foreigners have that opportunity. We cannot cash our dollars into gold, but foreigners can.

Mr. PATMAN. It has not been possible to get gold for our dollars since 1934, and we have gotten along better. There is no occasion or need for it. When we have money issued by our Government that is legal tender and must be accepted as payment for all debts, we have the best money in the world.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a volatile but mighty important problem to the people of the United States. I feel deeply for those who must defend this bad and stopgap proposal, versus the feelings and desires of our people. The proponents of this legislation have put forth the argument that its passage will enable the United States to continue its international financial commitments and to provide liquidity for the maintenance and growth of international trade.

I seriously doubt that these objectives will be accomplished by this "stopgap" measure. The allegation that we can let it be dispersed and thereby strengthen our financial situation at home completely escapes me, and it is certainly against the historical tradition of our Nation, its money handling, its system of barter, and it is indeed a paradox.

This legislation can only provide "temporary relief" that we hear in the "Anacin" commercials on television. This country needs "antibiotic" relief that will permanently cure our international money ills.

If we now possess less than $12 billion in gold reserves but face $32 billion in claims against these reserves, what is to happen if all these claims are presented? What will the strength of the dollar be with no gold reserves? The question is not will it help business or affect check writing, but what will happen to our free gold reserves? Many of these were hard won.

In addition to these questions, what is to prevent the Government from speeding up the printing presses and inundating the country with "fiat funny money"? Nothing will prevent this, once the discipline of gold is eliminated. How strong will the dollar be after an inflationary binge of this type, without discipline? Will this not sanction more and more "printing press" money? Will not our last self-applied discipline be removed? To me this is the crux of the situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite aware that the dollar is the monetary standard of the world. I am quite aware that the standard for international transactions and trade hangs upon it. I further understand that the dollar is the only currency that will be redeemed in gold, when it is held by foreign governments and central banks. These are the facts of life of the international monetary system that we cannot change.

However, it is still not too late to implement far-reaching reforms that will restore healthy equilibrium to our balance-of-payments position and maintain our gold as well as the strength of the dollar.

First, and most important, is the putting of our own "fiscal house" in order. The piling of deficit on deficit by the Federal Government no doubt makes the foreign central bankers "shake in their boots." Their faith in the dollar is shaken when they see us through Government spending take more out of our economy than we put in. They must think that we are following Britain down the same road of economic disaster. Little wonder that they desire to exchange their dollars for gold.

Second, we can and should curtail Government spending abroad. This spending sustains and enlarges our gold drain. Foreign aid is a perfect example of this wasteful spending that benefits no one and saps the strength of the dollar. How hypocritical can the administration be; they ask that private investment and spending be curtailed, yet ask the Congress to expand governmental spending abroad.

Finally, another remedy would be to demand that countries that are currently converting gold should pay their "war debts." The country that I am obviously referring to is France which is presently ruled by the senile De Gaulle. This man is relentlessly pursuing a program of destroying the dollar by the depletion of our gold reserves. Yet he owes the United States over $12 billion for France's war debts, including interest. Why let this man get away with this? He must be stopped before he destroys the entire international monetary system. He must pay the debts or stop demanding gold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALL was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. HALL. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this stopgap measure before the House today will do little or nothing to solve our long-range balance-of-payments deficit. It will certainly aid and abet our outflow of hard-earned gold. Only through strong leadership and following the proposals suggested, can the strength of the dollar and of our economy be maintained. Let us forget this measure and get on with the job.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I wish to ask, if gold is not so valuable, why does every country in the world so want it at the present time?

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. This is a patent question which is obvious at least to the American people.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLACKBURN

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. BLACKBURN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"SECTION 1. The second proviso in subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)) is amended (1) by changing '25' to read '12½' and (2) by changing '20' to read '10' each place it appears therein.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413) is amended by changing '25' to read '12½'.

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 414) is amended by changing '25' to read '12½'.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have all heard the debate concerning the removal of our gold cover. We all recognize that we are faced with a genuine dilemma in our balance-of-payments problem, and no easy solution has been presented.

We are told that because of an international treaty entered into in 1945, this country has pledged itself to buy and sell gold at a fixed rate. We recognize that because of this international commitment, the entire free world, and I suspect the Communist nations, as well, have developed their own standards of international exchange in reliance upon this country's commitments.

This Nation, and indeed the world, is in a period of great uncertainty. Wars and threats of wars surround us, and all of us rightly fear the unknown and possibly devastating consequences which might follow if we should suddenly take away from the world the monetary standard to which international trade is adjusted.

My mail reveals the people of the Fourth District strongly against this administration move. I suspect your constituents have also expressed alarm. At the same time, faced with the objection to removing the 25-percent cover, we must still recognize that there exists an obligation to our citizens to protect the solvency and liquidity of our own country.

We face, with equal uncertainty, the very real and equally disastrous possibilities which exist if we should denude ourselves of all our gold reserves.

We are told by some among us, and I respect their opinions and their judgment even though I might disagree, that gold is an anachronism and it serves no useful purpose in modern economics. Yet, these same people stress with great vigor, the disastrous consequences which will follow if we do not enact this legislation, allowing the administration to continue to maintain the price of gold at $35 per ounce.

If gold serves no useful purpose as they tell us, then the failure of this country to protect its price should have no unsettling consequences. It seems to me that those who are most strongly urging the passage of this legislation have completely undercut their argument that gold has no value when they stress with such vigor the disastrous consequences which will follow if we do not protect its value.

But we are also told, in any event, we have an international treaty which is an obligation we cannot avoid.

There is another obligation which we all accepted when we assumed this office. That obligation is to protect the interests of the citizens of America. I have heard very little said of that obligation in recent months, and I fear it is one which is too easily ignored.

I recall the adage, "Be not the first to take up the new nor the last to lay down the old." This legislation, if passed as proposed, would have the effect of making this country the front runner in a new and untried experiment—an experiment to determine how well can any nation survive if it should completely deplete its stock of gold. I, for one, am unwilling to assume the risk if that experiment should prove unsuccessful. I feel too keenly my obligation to protect the interests of our citizens.

We are told that many Western powers have divorced their domestic currency from gold, and therefore, such a move on our part is not without precedent. What we are not told is that the citizens of these other countries have the right to buy, sell, own and deal with gold as any other commodity—a right not enjoyed by the citizens of our country. I am told these people are buying gold, in large quantities. So are some countries.

When the gold was taken from the pockets of our citizens as a matter of law, they were assured by the Congress that gold would remain in the country as a backing for the dollars in circulation. Initially, the percentage of gold backing was higher than it is today. But at least our citizens had an assurance that gold would remain within the confines our our country to meet the unpredictable demands of the future.

This legislation would breach this faith with our citizens in that it could, and will inevitably result in the complete displacement of gold from the confines of our country if present trends continue unchecked.

It is because of this conflict between our international obligations and the obligations we all felt to protect the interests of our own citizenry that I have prepared this amendment.

This amendment would reduce the amount of gold cover from the present legal requirement of 25 percent to a new and lower level of 12½ percent. This would have the immediate effect of freeing approximately $6 billion in gold to meet our international commitment which should be sufficient to permit our Government to adjust its policies so as to tip the scale in the near future of the balance-of-payments problem in the favor of our country.

This measure would also continue the disciplining effect of requiring some gold cover as a backing on our domestic currency and would assure a stock of gold for use by this country should an international crisis requiring gold develop.

We are also told that the nations of the free world are even now negotiating to develop a new standard of international monetary exchange. I will be the first to agree that such a new standard is very badly needed, and the sooner the nations of the world can agree upon its establishment, the better will be facilitated the exchange of international trade.

But, I must confess that in my discussions with persons far more knowledgeable than I on the subject, it is almost universally agreed that those nations which intend to participate in a new international exchange currency will be required to make an initial deposit in gold. This makes even more essential the necessity for continuing a stock of gold for the use of this country.

I recognize that my proposal is one which can only buy essential time, but it is time which we need if combined with unswerving and immediate action by the administration.

I urge the adoption of this amendment as a compromise between those who urge the complete rejection of the administration's proposal, and those who would have us completely accept it. Admittedly, either extreme could have disastrous consequences whereas a compromise might save us from the abyss on either side.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman stated that in certain countries the citizens thereof could acquire gold through the monetary process.

Would the gentleman care to give to me the names of these countries where a private citizen can get gold now?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Well, it is my understanding——

Mr. PATMAN. That is, without any obligation, except the currency of the country in which he lives?

Mr. BLACKBURN. It is my understanding that all of the citizens of other countries can purchase gold except in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is badly mistaken.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have looked into this matter and have found the following:

Many countries allow their citizens to own gold and trade this gold within that country. These countries are: Belgium, Luxembourg, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Surinam, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

In addition to these countries, there are 17 nations who allow their citizens to own gold, but they cannot trade it.

I have found that many countries allow their nationals to freely import and export gold which has led to a great deal of gold hoarding over the past few years. In fact, gold hoarding by private individuals is one of the main reasons for the world gold shortage.

However, I feel that we are exposing our citizens to a danger. It is my opinion that the citizens of this country are entitled to protection from the dangers of having lost all of the gold from our country.

Under the amendment which I have offered we would have $6.5 billion to $7 billion held in reserve with which to meet any contingency which might occur.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes; I yield further to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Would that not be encouraging to these countries that we might not support our currency and, therefore, to go in and get this $6.5 billion and get it right quick, while the getting is good, because they would be afraid as a result of the action which we might take to take it away from the money market?

Mr. BLACKBURN. On that question, Mr. Chairman, my response is this: If we are going to face that possibility; that is, being forced into an awkward position by other countries, I would rather face that position when we have a reserve of $7 billion in gold with which to bargain, than at a time when we have no gold at all with which to bargain.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would represent a disaster to this country. I say this for two reasons. It would violate the sacred pledge of our country. It would also violate our commonsense.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, this amendment says that $5.5 billion or $6 billion is to be taken out of the pool available to satisfy our obligations to foreign central banks. The fact is that former President Eisenhower, former President Kennedy, and President Johnson, have all proclaimed to the central bankers of the world that they may safely hold these dollars, because every bar of American gold is available to meet that obligation.

If the Congress of the United States, having remained silent when that pledge was made by three Presidents, is to repudiate that pledge, then this is going to be a dark day in the history of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House of Representatives will keep the word of honor of our Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us turn for a moment to the commonsense aspect of the matter. If there is any one way in which this House today could gratify the President of France, President de Gaulle, and to gratify all the people who have it in for the dollar, it would be to vote for this amendment. I say this because this amendment, if adopted, would tell the speculators and the bankers of the world, "Go and get that gold for your dollars while the getting is good," because the Congress of the United States on this day, February 21, 1968, is willing to break its pledge, that it is willing to abstract gold from the pile we have pledged to back the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this House want to make General de Gaulle happy, all they have to do is to tell him and the rest of the world that we are prepared to welch upon our commitments. Then the speculators will go to work, and I am sure they will.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be decisively and promptly voted down.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has indicated that President Eisenhower and others were willing to go down the trail of gold depletion and elimination in order to accommodate this situation? In other words, does the gentleman mean also that they were willing to use the very last ounce of gold which we have as a backing for our currency as the result of such an agreement or commitment?

Mr. REUSS. I shall undertake to answer the gentleman's question. It was very important in the minds and in the words of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson that every bar of gold was available, and that they meant that when the time came we would be willing to meet our commitments.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no question but what the gold is available now, without this legislation.

Mr. REUSS. There is no question that gold will be available if we now remove the gold cover in order to give validity to our obligation. This was expressly stated by three Presidents. The thought that we can today dishonor our commitment is a very shocking one. Therefore, I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania for the amendment offered by Mr. BLACKBURN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"SECTION 1. The second proviso in subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)) is amended (1) by changing '25' to read '18.75' and (2) by changing '20' to read '15' each place it appears therein.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413) is amended by changing '25' to read '18.75'.

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 414) is amended by changing '25' to read '18.75'."

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the amendment. I will explain it to the Members, since it is such a very simple amendment, and is just a slight change.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I asked to dispense with the reading of the substitute amendment was that, as you know, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN] preserves back of our currency 12.5 percent of gold cover, and many of the Members came to me and said, well, 12.5 percent is going down too far. Let us have an amendment which will go half way.

Therefore the amendment that I am offering, which is a substitute, says that 18.75 percent of gold will be back of our dollar, rather than 12.5 percent, as recommended by Mr. BLACKBURN in his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what is the effect of the amendment that I am offering? It will immediately free $3 billion worth of gold to answer claims abroad. Now, it will be said that this is an unconscionable thing to do because we are now showing to the people abroad that we are not willing to give them all of our gold. Mr. Chairman, there is precedent for this amendment. Two years ago, when we had the run on our gold, we just took the gold cover away from our Federal Reserve notes, which made available $6.7 billion worth of gold at that time to answer claims abroad.

Of course—and as I said earlier today—we were told do not worry about it at that time, "it is a trifling thing, it will answer all the needs for gold for demands abroad for the foreseeable future," and that is where we are today, with probably less than $300 million worth of gold available to answer claims from abroad.

Why should the amendment which I have offered today be accepted? It is for this reason: That never before in our history has our Nation been held in the disdain that it is now held abroad. Nearly every day something terrible happens which throws dishonor on this great country. North Korea yesterday in the headlines of the press said that they are going to try the American sailors who were on the *Pueblo* for high crimes and punish them.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, Charles de Gaulle was mentioned today. De Gaulle is of course taking all our gold he can get his hands on. He has kicked NATO out of France, and he is harming the United States of America every chance he gets.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, how about those who are trading with the enemy in North Vietnam? We have read in the last several weeks that England had some 68 ships last year land at the port of Haiphong to deliver supplies to the North Vietnamese, who are fighting our American boys.

Think of all the other nations all over the world who are furnishing supplies, ammunition, to the North Vietnamese. We hardly have no major allies in this fight. I want to say to the Members that I believe in Vietnam today we are in the worst predicament this Nation has ever been in anywhere in the world in all of our history. And here we are now being asked to disgorge and give up the last remaining financial vestige that this Nation has, $12 billion worth of gold, to give to these very nations abroad who are holding us in such disdain, and who are trading with the enemy, and who are trying to harm us every chance they get.

Someone said today, and I believe that it was an administrative spokesman, and I believe the question that was asked was "What will happen when that $12 billion is cut down to $8 billion or $6 billion?" The answer was that the administration would blow the whistle.

Well, if the administration will blow the whistle when they get down to about $6 billion, then why not blow the whistle today?

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering does blow the whistle; it says "We will give you $3 billion, and then let us see what happens. If you are good boys, everything will be fine. The dollar will remain strong. But if you take the $3 billion, then we will have to come back to this Congress and then we will decide what to do about it."

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that the responsible thing to do here today is to adopt the substitute amendment so that 18.75 percent will then be back of our currency. It would then be a restraint upon the Federal Reserve Board, so that they cannot issue fiat currency—the currency that the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. Hall, talked about.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who are opposing this bill, of course, have a perfect right to do so. I do not criticise them at all. In fact, I have never criticized any Member of the Congress for his vote or for his action as a Member of the Congress. I do not feel that I should. I never have and I never expect to. That is a prerogative that each Member of the House has.

But I am reminded, by these gentlemen who are trying to amend this bill that they are opposed to, of the old saying that "The surgeon who wields the knife should want the patient to live."

I am not sure that these surgeons are wanting this patient to live. I am not sure that what they propose would be any improvement, even from the standpoint of an opponent.

I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler; and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, which I would like to read:

> The Secretary of the Treasury,
> *Washington.*
>
> Hon. Wright Patman,
> *Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. Chairman: We understand that an amendment to H.R. 14743 may be offered that would reduce the gold cover requirement to 10 or 15 percent instead of eliminating it. We would like to state very strongly that to compromise in this manner instead of acting decisively to eliminate the gold cover could have serious repercussions on international confidence in the dollar.
>
> Reduction rather than elimination of the requirement would raise the question already posed in some quarters as to whether we really do mean it when we say our full gold stock stands behind our international commitments. It is far better to allay such fears once and for all. That is the basic purpose of the proposed legislation. We believe it would be a major mistake to include qualifying amendments that would detract from this purpose.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> Henry H. Fowler.
> Wm. McC. Martin, Jr.

Now then the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Blackburn] reduces the amount by 12½ percent. In other words, it cuts it in half.

That seems to be a pretty small difference when what is involved is the strengthening of our dollar, and is calculated to stop a worldwide depression that, of course, we do not want to run any risk of.

I have been through one serious depression myself and I know something about what it is likely to cost. We do not want to run the risk of a worldwide depression.

If we vote against this bill, or if we vote to trifle with it by just cutting the percentage in half or cutting the percentage by one-quarter, as the Johnson amendment provides, I do not think that is the way to strengthen the dollar in the eyes and in the minds of the people of the world.

You know we have a lot that is involved in this. There is too much involved. I know this is not a trifling amendment and it is not intended to be a trifling amendment. But if ever the people throughout the world believe that we are trifling with them, I do not know what the repercussions will be.

It is most important to run no such risk and we must vote for this bill as it is and have confidence in the dollar retained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman from Texas state that Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board signed the letter he just read?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the same Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board who the gentleman from Texas charges with misfeasance and malfeasance in office?

Mr. PATMAN. But he happens to be right on this and I commend him for it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill and, incidentally, probably to both of these amendments. But I think the two amendments do point up the actual facts here, which have, in the oratory that I have listened to, been lost sight of.

Actually, the $12 billion of gold is available right now and it can be used. But there is a discipline that is imposed. What the bill before us is—it is not to give the gold—or make it available—it is to remove the disciplines and the penalties that the banks that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] talks about, otherwise would have to pay.

This is like the situation where you blow a fuse and instead of looking to see what has blown the fuse and take a warning from that—instead you put a penny in the circuit to make it do.

At least the gentlemen who are proposing these amendments are putting some new fuses in in place of the one that has blown.

Frankly, the reason I am opposed to this bill is that if we are going to have the damage that the gentleman from Texas and others in the administration say is going to come, I would rather have it come while we still have $12 billion worth of gold, because unless we move onto the basic cause of this situation, it is going to blow at some stage or other, whether it is $10 billion, $9 billion, $8 billion, or whatever. While this administration talks about buying time, it is not doing one iota to move into the problems that are causing this.

I am glad that the majority included in their report on page 3 a quotation from the Economic Report of the President submitted to the Congress on February 1. I hope that every Member of the House and everyone in the Nation listens to this sentence of the President:

> The gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes is not needed to tell us what prudent monetary policy should be—that myth was destroyed long ago.

Let me say this: What in the name of heaven is going to be needed to demonstrate to this administration what a prudent monetary policy should be? We certainly do not have it, and we have not had it for some time; not the fault of the monetary authorities, but largely the fault of the fiscal policy of the Federal Government; namely, not the tax area—our revenues have been increasing in a very handsome way over a period of years—but continuing to spend more money than even this lush income would permit us to spend. It is overspending internationally and overspending domestically.

If we want to restore confidence in the dollar, there is only one way to go about it, and not this phony exercise we are going through here where I again say you are not opening up the $12 billion of gold to stand behind the dollar. That is available right now under the Federal Reserve Act, only there are some penalties. You are not opening up anything. And do not think the European bankers do not know it. So does anyone who cares to read. This is a sham.

Let us get to this thing. What we can do is to come forward and cut back on our expenditures, both foreign and domestic, to regain the confidence of people. This is the only way to restore confidence.

The Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee have been digging into this area of our expenditure policies as well as other aspects of our fiscal policies over the past 3 years. This administration has paid no attention to the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee last year when it came forward with a proposed expenditure of $135 billion, and we said no, the level should be $130 billion. Now we are spending at a rate of $142 billion. There has been no cutback in expenditures, in spite of the rhetoric of the administration. The arithmetic is there for anyone to see. We have increased expenditures, not decreased them, and our deficit will be still over $20 billion. In turn this deficit is creating the inflation which is bringing in more imports and hampering our exports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Curtis was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CURTIS. We saw the declining figures as to our trade balances last year. The balance of our exports over our imports, or the balance of trade, has been one of the pluses we have had in our international trade. The other plus has been the return on our private investment abroad.

The deficits are created in Government expenditure policies, just as the deficits in the domestic economy come from the same source, Government spending. Until we move into these basic areas to correct our fiscal stance, we are not going to improve the confidence of the people abroad in our dollar.

So my conclusions are that, bad as we are in our particular situation—and, believe me, I think we are just as bad as the administration has described it, and I mean the dangerousness of this situation—maybe voting this down would trigger something. All I would say again is that I would rather have it triggered now, with $12 billion of gold available, than to have it triggered with only $8 billion available, or whatever it will be, because this administration has not presented to the Congress either in its budget message or its economic program, anything to hit at the basic causes.

One thing I forgot to mention, even if we give the President the tax increase he has asked for, the Council of Economic Advisers has said inflation will be over 3 percent, and we cannot stand inflation of 3 percent, when we consider the relationship of imports coming in and exports going out, and other matters. So even if we took the President's fiscal package, and it did what the administration claims it would do, we are not hitting at the basic problems.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, does the able gentleman doubt the profound effect that the passage of this resolution would have upon the speculators and gold markets of the world?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, let me answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I have not finished my question, if the able gentleman will yield.

Does the able gentleman doubt the profound effect that the passage of this legislation would have upon the speculators and gold markets of the world and certain countries of the world who are determined to weaken the American dollar, if the Congress advises that another $10 billion in gold is available to support the dollar in the markets of the world?

Mr. CURTIS. The answer is clearly yes, I doubt it, and the gentleman did not pay attention to what I said. This is a sham bill. I am saying the law now provides we can use that $12 billion of gold to back the claims. The difference is that there is a penalty in the present law that the bankers have to pay.

Mr. PEPPER. That is not an act of Congress that says that to the world.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, it is an act of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some statements here today with which I most vigorously disagree. We have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that the Members who offered these amendments to this bill are like surgeons who do not care whether or not the patient lives.

Please keep in mind that the patient we are talking about here today is the U.S. dollar. It is my opinion that the Members who offered these amendments want the patient to live, and they want to face up to the problem right now of how to correct our unfavorable balance of payments, and they want the time in which to treat the patient properly.

If we simply pass this bill and remove all the gold cover from our currency, what we are doing is simply turning our back on the patient and walking away from him.

I have also heard the statement made here today that the U.S. dollar is stronger than gold, that the dollar may be supporting gold, and, of course, this is not true. If this were true, we would not have lost $6 billion of our gold reserve in the last 7 years.

I have also heard here today that many nations do not have a gold standard for their currency. The reason that the American dollar is a stabilizer, the fixed, focal point of all the world's currencies, is because it is backed with gold, and the other currencies are convertible into U.S. dollars, which, of course, then can be redeemed in gold.

We just heard a moment ago that, unless we free this $10.8 billion, there is going to be a great rush on the part of speculators to buy up this gold.

I submit that right now this country has approximately $1 billion in free gold only, and there does not seem to be any great rush on the part of the speculators in the past 2 months.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would not the gentleman agree with in the month of December approximately $925 million of gold left this country, whereas in the past 45 days it was approximately $100 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I do not believe the gentleman would suggest to the Congress that the possibility of passage of this legislation was the complete deterrent to the drain of gold?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. There is no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by saying that approximately 3 years ago this Chamber was told that removing the gold cover from Federal Reserve deposits would buy time to take corrective action. I believe at that time the statement was made that this would take care of the problem for the foreseeable future.

Today we have heard almost the same statement, that if we take all this gold reserve off it is going to solve the problem.

I do not believe it.

If we reduce the gold cover to 18.75 percent, what is that going to do? It will make available right now $3 billion of gold to add to the $1 billion we have already, and this will give us time to correct the unfavorable balance-of-payments situation this country is experiencing and which has created the deplorable situation we are in today.

Already it has been elaborated upon as to what has to be done, to a great extent. Mr. Joe Barr, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and said this country must get back to internal fiscal discipline. When he was asked the question, "Does this mean getting away from deficit financing?", his answer was "Yes." This is what we have got to do, and we have to do it now.

We have to stop trying to be the Santa Claus to the world in the foreign aid program. We have got to stop being the policeman of the world.

I do not believe this international situation is as serious as it has been painted here today and yesterday. I believe our domestic situation is far, far more serious.

As I said before, this country has always been a land of great opportunity for all its people, and what we really have been doing for the past few years is selling the birthright of this country. I believe it is about time we started to protect the opportunity that we have in this country.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman said that admittedly back in December there was a very serious gold flurry which resulted in a billion dollars worth of American gold being grabbed, but then the gentleman seemed to be saying that really there is no longer any problem because in the past 45 days there has not been another gold flurry.

I would ask the gentleman to ponder two points. First, does 45 days without a gold flurry really give all that security to the gentleman? Second, does not the gentleman believe that the President's announcement early in January that the gold cover should be removed helped to damp down a possible flurry?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. The reason the rush occurred in December was the devaluation of the British pound. There was quite a rush at that time, and almost a billion dollars was paid out in gold.

But in the remaining month or almost 2 months now, there has been no repitition of this. So I say that I do not believe, as long as we pass something making more gold available, we have to worry about another great rush on our gold by the international speculators.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I know the gentleman is very knowledgeable, and he is one of the outstanding members on the Banking and Currency Committee, but does he not believe that by removing the cover we will stop speculation in gold and keep its price stable?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Well, the price of gold is not being discussed here today, I say to the most distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. It is $35 an ounce.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. We are not talking about that today.

Mr. BARRETT. But we must enter

this into the discussion of the debate, to show the reason for the action to remove the gold cover.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. The price of gold at $35 per ounce is not involved in this bill. No change in this price of gold is being contemplated at this time. The reason for the stability is that fact that the U.S. dollar is backed with gold and we had just better not run out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAMS] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman who preceded the gentleman in the well at this time indicated that this was a runaway and that this bill is a sham. There is no sham here. We are protecting the soundness of the dollar. We are protecting the drain on the gold of the United States. That is all this bill does.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. That is just not correct. I would like to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. The speaker who spoke before me made a very factual statement when he said this bill is a sham. It does not attack the heart of the problem, he said, and this is the very same problem that produced $32 billion worth of dollars held abroad by foreign governments and interests. Those dollars must be redeemed in gold at any time they are presented for payment. To meet these obligations we have only $12 billion available and $10.7 billion of that is used to cover the Federal Reserve notes and other currencies.

The speaker before me was saying that it is a sham because we are not getting to the heart of the problem, and he is absolutely correct in that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAMS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. The proponents of this legislation have been saying all throughout the hearings and in the debate in the House that the gold reserves we have have only a phychological effect. Actually, it is the confidence in the American dollar that is the all-important factor. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FINO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question: Does he not feel that the only reason why there is this present confidence in the American dollar is because we do have this gold reserve?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. There is no question about that. Unless we do take corrective action to obtain a favorable balance of payments and start reducing the number of foreign dollars held abroad—unless we take this action, if the same condition exists in the next 7 years which have existed in the last 7 years, then we will find we will have a gold reserve of $6 billion with $40 billion held abroad. The only thing that I can see happening at that time is the same thing that happens when a housewife hears about a shortage occurring in some item. She panics and rushes out and starts buying that item.

The holders of this $40 billion will be rushing in to cash in their money for gold. When that happens the fixed, focal point of the world's monetary system, the dollar, will no longer be a fixed focal point and it will no longer be the basis for our monetary system. Thus, you will have domestic and international financial chaos.

Mr. FINO. Does the gentleman think that the same confidence in the American dollar will continue once we have dissipated our gold supply?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Of course not.

Mr. FINO. Thank you.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are overlooking what is essentially involved in what we have to determine here today. It is true under the present law the Federal Reserve Board has the authority from time to time at short intervals to waive the requirements that would be eliminated by this bill. However, that action by the Federal Reserve Board would require an increase in the rediscount rate which would raise the interest to be paid by the borrowers of this country. That is what you would have to do, in other words, to try to meet this problem if you do not adopt the legislation which is now before the House.

But, Mr. Chairman, the question really involved with respect to this amendment is this: Do we want to tell the world that we have a halfhearted confidence in the American dollar, do we have a halfhearted determination to support it, or a whole determination to support the American dollar?

Mr. Chairman, this is a "50-percent" support for the dollar amendment.

This is a psychological question. What is involved in a "run" on a bank is not the question as to how much money the bank has in the vault, how much gold they have in the vault, how much currency they have in the bank; it is a question of the confidence of the depositors in the soundness of the bank. What will stop a "run" on a bank? It is a manifestation that the bank has the money with which to pay the depositors or can quickly get it. Once they are satisfied that you have the money to pay them or can quickly get it, they will go home. They are then glad to have the bank to continue to retain their deposits.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the American dollar is under attack. As the able gentleman who preceded me said, "By whom?" Primarily by the speculators and by a certain insidious government with its infidelity thinking that it can destroy confidence in our country which has been their best friend.

Mr. Chairman, what are the speculators gambling upon? They are gambling upon the possibility that the Americans will devalue the dollar in the manner in which the British have devalued their pound?

What is necessary to meet their challenge is a manifestation of firm confidence in the dollar by the Government and the people of the United States. We are not going to devalue the American dollar. We have the means and we have the will to support the American dollar at the present price of gold in the markets of the world.

And, Mr. Chairman, let the winds of the speculators and our enemies blow fiercely as they will in the currency markets of the world yet will the dollar stand, strong, steady, and firm. And, what could be more effective than to manifest that determination of the American Government in a strong declaration—and I wish it might be a unanimous decision on the part of the Congress of the United States in respect to this particular part of the problem—that we are going to make available—it will never be used any more than the deposits in the banks will be used when the depositors are assumed that they have confidence fully in the bank—to our Government another $10 billion of gold if it may be necessary to answer the doubt of the speculators as to the soundness of the American dollar.

But, Mr. Chairman, suppose we take such unwarranted action as to defeat this bill? What encouragement would that give to the speculators? Well, it may be that the speculators would interpret this action as indicating that the Congress of the United States seemed reluctant to remove this gold coverage from its currency, and make another $10 billion available to support the dollar in the markets of the world? If this 50-percent amendment is adopted it might well be understood as indicating that there was a doubt in the minds of the Congress, as to whether our Government would go all out in support of the dollar.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with something very vital to the interests of our country. This bill does not affect or impair the soundness of the American currency or, else, do we have a currency that is just good to the extent of 25 percent coverage because it has only 75 percent gold coverage? Is this dollar which you have in your pocket just worth 25 cents, because behind it there is only 25 cents worth of gold support?

Mr. Chairman, who would doubt the dollar today? The people of the world and our own people know that the full faith and credit of the United States of America in the support for our currency. It is not the 25-percent gold backing that gives this dollar worth and value to our people and to the other nations and peoples of the world. That is not affected by this amendment.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are by this measure telling the speculators of the world, "Listen; America has the might and America has the will to support the American dollar and God helping us, you cannot destroy it or cheapen it. Let us not impair that confidence that we have given to the dollar."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(On request of Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Pepper was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that it seems to me as though we are trying to blame some foreign countries for a problem that we ourselves in this country have created. Taking the analogy the gentleman made of a bank wherein the depositors have confidence in the bank, so that there is not a run on that bank, if we were to apply that analogy to this case, we in effect have deposits or obligations of $32 billion in U.S. dollars held abroad, and to meet those obligations we have only $12 billion in gold. The gentleman states that the speculators are going to start a run on this gold, and that this is a reflection some foreign countries, and the gentleman does not want us to be in that position.

Incidentally, the gentleman says that we are going to make $10 billion available, and I say to the gentleman that those are the last $10 billion we can make available.

But I would ask the gentleman what objection does he have to saying to this administration and to this Government that they must take corrective actions and stop the practices which have put us into this very deplorable condition?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania that, when the depositors of a bank begin to hear rumors about the solvency of a bank, what they want to know is: Are their deposits safe?

They know that the bank does not have to keep 100 cents on the dollar in gold in the vaults of the bank. But what the depositors want to know is whether the bank is sound, or whether it is bankrupt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Right now we are insolvent.

Mr. PEPPER. But we are here telling the nations of the world, and the peoples of the world, and the speculators, particularly, of the world that the American dollar is sound. If a bank can convince its concerned depositors that the bank, in addition to the money that it has in its vaults, can get any more money that it may need from the local Federal Reserve bank on its paper and its paper is good then the depositors have no cause for concern.

So I do not believe that the gentleman needs to go into all these details he has mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania, and by unaninmous consent, Mr. Pepper was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that the insolvency we are talking about is the condition in which we find ourselves today. The question that I put to the gentleman is: What objection does the gentleman have to saying to this government and to this administration that we must reverse the policies that have created this insolvency?

Mr. PEPPER: The gentleman is talking about something totally irrelevant to the issue involved here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Just one moment.

I want to say to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania that a debtor who owes only one-half as much as he makes in a year—or to use the example of our country, where the total gross national product of America is over $800 billion a year, and our total debt is a little over $300 billion a year, it is absurd to suggest that the debtor is bankrupt. If you have a gross annual income of more than twice what your outstanding debt is, I would say to the distinguished gentleman that I would not consider that a doubtful risk, as a debtor.

Further, anybody who would suggest that America is bankrupt, I regret to say has little faith in our country, and in the strength of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

I wonder if we could not agree on a time to close the debate on these two amendments, the substitute amendment and the amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to ask for time to speak on this amendment, but the remarks which have just been made by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], precipitate an urge. Therefore, I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would withhold his unanimous consent request until after I have concluded with my remarks? If he would do so I would be most grateful.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened most of the day to the debate, and I have done a good bit of reading on the facts and the arguments concerning this legislation.

I cannot help but have the feeling that this administration proposal seeks to cure cancer with a band aid. I think we are in a cancerous economic predicament, if I can use the term and the administration is at fault because of the mismanagement of our Federal fiscal affairs.

I think some comparative figures might be helpful at this time to prove the point.

Just let me take some figures to illustrate what I have in mind.

The net public and private debt in December 1960 was $890.2 billion.

Seven years later—in December 1967—the net public and private debt was $1.430 trillion—or a 60.7 percent increase.

The U.S. Government debt in December 1960, the total $290.4 billion.

In December 1967—7 years later—the total U.S. Government debt was $345.2 billion—or 18.9 percent increase.

Incidentally, our population in that period of time went up about 10 percent.

Federal Government spending—the annual rate in December 1960—$93 billion.

In December 1967—or 7 years later—the annual rate of Federal expenditures was $167.5 billion, or an 80.1 percent increase in Federal Government spending.

The yearly interest on the Federal debt in December 1960 was $9.2 billion—that is the figure for the fiscal year 1960.

Seven years later in December 1967 the annual yearly interest rate on the Federal debt was $13.5 billion—or a 46 percent increase.

But let us consider the interest rates, and the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is always concerned about interest rates, or at least he alleges to have such an interest.

AAA corporate bonds, December 1960, the interest rate was 4.41 percent.

In December 1967, after 7 years of this Democratic administration, AAA corporate bonds interest rate had gone up to 6.19 percent—a 40.4-percent increase.

High grade municipal bonds—the interest rate in December 1960, was 3.73 percent.

In December 1967 the high grade municipal bond interest rate was 4.49 percent, a 20.4 percent increase in a 7-year span.

Taxable Federal bonds in December 1960, the last month of the Eisenhower administration, the interest rate was 4.02 percent.

After 7 years of this administration, in December 1967, the interest rate on taxable Federal bonds was 5.36 percent—a 33.3 percent increase in a 7-year period.

Now let us analyze 3-month Treasury bills. In December 1960 the interest rate was 2.928 percent.

Seven years later, the 3-month Treasury bill interest rate was 5.012 percent or a 71.2-percent increase. This is an amazing increase in those 7 short years.

But then if we go to the consumer price index—in December 1960, the last months of the Eisenhower administration—and we use that as 100 percent—we find that in the 7 years from December 1960 to December 1967 the consumer price index has gone up to 118.2 percent or 18.2-percent increase. Under this Democratic Administration the increases in the cost of living have been devastating to those least able to handle the problems of inflation.

If we take the foreign short-term dollar holdings—and here is where we get to the nub of the question—in December 1960 the foreign short-term dollar holdings; that is, of foreigners holding claims against the United States—in December 1960 that amounted to $21.3 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The foreign short-term dollar holdings in December of 1960 were $21.3 billion. Seven years later, December of 1967, those dollar holdings had gone up to $32.4 billion, or a 52.1-percent increase.

But the astounding, serious aspect of this increase is that gold reserves in December 1960 held by the United States were $17.8 billion, and in the 7-year span, to December 1967, those gold reserves held by the United States had fallen to approximately $12 billion, or a reduction of 32.6 percent. In other words, the claims against our gold reserves had gone up 52 percent, and the gold reserves available to pay those claims had gone down 32 percent.

We are in a mess, and this administration offers only a Band-Aid to attack the cancerous condition.

It seems to me and it seems to us on our side that we must attack the problem at the cause. You must attack the basic problem and not seek a stop-gap palliative, which this bill is.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Has the gentleman overlooked the median family income during that time?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman permit me to say at that point that you are asking for a removal of the gold cover because of the family income increase.

Mr. PATMAN. You are talking about differences between a time 7 years ago and now, and I wanted to invite your attention to the fact that when your administration came in, the median income was $4,762. Now it is $7,436, the median income in 1966.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the distinguished gentleman permit me to correct a statement that he has made. We are talking about real income and the gentleman is talking about statistical figures that do not relate to real income.

Mr. PATMAN. They are depended upon everywhere.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What is more important in comparing income a few years ago and income now is the question as to what a dollar will buy. What is the present market price of a dollar? What will it buy? That is what people are interested in, regardless of the fact that family income may have increased. Prices in the marketplace have increased also. Therefore, the purchasing power of the dollars that people have saved has gone down.

I say that to pass this kind of legislation in an effort to solve the problem, we will find that pretty soon people will be taking the American dollar and using it for good wallpaper.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure my good friend from Texas is not urging removal of the gold cover because of the statistics that he quoted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it came as a surprise to me that the distinguished minority leader, in replying to the distinguished chairman of the committee, would say that any issue, including the issue of median income, was not relevant in this debate. I say this particularly in view of the fact that in discussing this legislation my friend, the minority leader, has discussed about every issue in the book whether it touched this bill topside or bottom. The able gentleman from Michigan hardly touched upon the bill now under consideration—instead he made the usual Republican political blast at the efforts of the Democratic administration to meet its responsibilities to the people of our country in this troubled period of the world's history. The gentleman has used a metaphor to the effect that a Band-Aid is being used in the treatment of a cancer. Certainly such a statement is subject to challenge. What the committee is trying to do here is to apply the proper remedy to a situation which calls for a remedy.

It is my judgment that if the House reflects upon the problem before us, it will agree with the Committee on Banking and Currency that regardless of all the allegations which my friend has made, removal of the 25-percent gold cover is required in the interests of the United States.

The Congress has acted in many other areas dealing with some of the problems which the gentleman from Michigan has mentioned. We reduced the budget last year. With the help of the President we have reduced expenditures. The Congress has moved in many areas and will continue to do so. Does the gentleman from Michigan forget that we are at war? Does he forget that that war has increased our military expenditures by 50 percent? Does he forget that we face problems in many parts of the world which are going to continue to require the expenditure of dollars in other nations around the world in the defense of our own country?

Mr. Chairman, the real issue here is not one of preserving the solvency of the dollar at home. The issue here is whether we are going to keep the dollar solid in the credit markets of the world. Whenever we depart from a discussion of that issue we depart from the issue which is involved in this legislation. The faith and credit of the United States of America are involved in the action which the Congress takes here today. We are committed to redeem American dollars in gold at a rate of $35 per ounce. Our failure to remove the gold cover here today could be interpreted around the world as a breach of faith on the part of the United States of America. As the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and others—all far more knowledgeable in this field than I—have pointed out, if we fail to pass this legislation it will cause nations around the world to doubt the solvency of the American dollar. What could be more harmful to the United States than this? Regardless, therefore, of what the gentleman from Michigan might think about all the other issues which he raised in his argument, surely he will agree that it would be a mistake not to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON], for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACKBURN) there were—ayes 39, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 15 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 391) is amended by striking "and the funds provided in this Act for the redemption of Federal Reserve notes".

SEC. 3. That part of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413) which precedes the last two sentences of such paragraph is amended to read: "Federal Reserve notes shall bear upon their faces a distinctive letter and serial number which shall be assigned by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to each Federal Reserve bank."

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 414) is repealed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to germane amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) The sentence which, prior to the repeal made by this section, was the second sentence of such paragraph is amended by inserting immediately after "The Board" the following: "of Governors of the Federal Reserve System".

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this measure, but after listening to the debate I am constrained to speak on this measure.

This measure has caused me more difficulty in making up my mind as to the right and proper way to vote than any other measure during my 8 years in the Congress.

This is not a relatively minor step the Congress is being asked to take today, as has been stated previously. It is, I believe, one of the most momentous decisions to be made during this Congress.

May I state at the outset that I realize the necessity of the United States of America making it clear to the world that we will redeem dollar credits in gold if demanded, and I am perfectly willing to go on record in that regard, but I do not feel that I can act in the best interests of my country by voting for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my reason for voting against H.R. 14743 is that the Congress is already on record to make our gold available. It is available at the present time, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]—all $12 billion and not merely $1.3 billion.

Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act reads as follows:

> The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be authorized and empowered (c) to suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days.

It is true that there is a penalty, a discipline if the Board of Governors invokes that provision, but I feel that the committee has taken the wrong approach in solving this problem. Perhaps the penalty or the discipline is too strict, is too harsh, Mr. Chairman. If that is true, then the committee should have relaxed the discipline or the penalty, rather than to take this momentous step.

This proposed action will not cure any of our problems.

I hate to take the chance of sinking back into the same lackadaisical attitude that has brought this great problem to bear on us today. We do have some difficult decisions which should be made and this measure will lull the Nation into a false feeling of security.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman for pointing out this key factor. If we look at page 7 of the committee report, we see that what is taken out are the penalties. We are talking about removing the gold cover here. It still remains under the present law that you can use all $12 billion, but these penalties are imposed if you do. I will say further that the penalties are of a nature that would raise interest rates. This is true. But that is a measure which is a corrective for the troubles that we are in.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, we must reduce our foreign aid. We must consider reducing our troop strength in Europe and many other steps which can be taken to relieve our balance-of-payments situation. We need the discipline contained in the present law to compel us to take these steps regardless of how painful they may be.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Has the gentleman read Mr. Martin's testimony commencing on page 22 on the removal of the gold cover?

Mr. ICHORD. I have not read the hearings. I have only read the report of the committee. And I might say that I thought it could have been more explicit than it was in explaining this difficult problem.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin's testimony is explicit. He said it will not get the job done. It is not sufficient or effective and will not work now because that was done when money could be converted for gold in the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad we are getting this debate on what I think is the real track. Chairman Martin—and this should be borne in mind—objects to the fact that these penalties would impose certain kinds of restrictions on the Federal Reserve System in the manner in which it creates money, which is currency and credit in our society. I grant that it does create these kinds of restrictions.

One of the answers that the Fed gives is that we can get away from the penalties simply by increasing the amount of money through the Open Market Committee buying more Federal securities. This is the way in which to increase the amount of credit, that part of the money in our society, by having the Federal Reserve System buy up more Government bonds. The other way—and I am repeating now—is by increasing the amount of currency. This is a limitation on how you increase your currency. It requires a penalty to be imposed.

The reason why we have a penalty is that the banks pay a tax which must be converted into increased interest rates. Of course, interest rates are too high now, but, nonetheless, increasing them does bear on the basic problem of the flow of investments out of the country and it encourages investments to come into the country. At least the penalty and the wisdom of the people who wrote the first act should not be cast aside lightly. They were, through these penalties, imposing the kind of discipline which would be at least going in the direction of helping to correct our balance-of-payments problem.

I repeat, this bill as presented is a sham. The debate has not been on the useful question of what disciplines come into play as we remove the gold cover. I am telling you that under the present law you can use all $12 billion of the gold. It is used under this kind of a discipline, though. Congressman FORD certainly represented that fact correctly in talking about this, but what the debate had been centered on had little to do with the real causes of our flow of gold out of the country and the terrible fiscal condition that we are in.

This is no joke. The rhetoric of President Johnson in this area, believe me, is probably not strong enough. But the remedy as has been told to him by economists and by businessmen and by many of his own people and leaders in the Congress is to the effect that we have got to cut down Government spending and to live within our budget. In other words, we cannot have both guns and butter.

Mr. Chairman, we have brought about these cumulative deficits both domestically and in our international balance of payments to the extent until the great American economy can bear no more.

Mr. Chairman, if we wish to encourage confidence abroad in the U.S. dollar, there is only one way in which to do it, and that is to put our own fiscal house in order; do not try to do it through these sham laws.

Mr. Chairman, whatever action we take here insofar as the people who read this and understand it, it will make little difference.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But what we will have done is to have dissipated more of the country's resources?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, if I may respond to the question propounded by the gentleman from Iowa; it is my opinion that if this is going to create some problems, let us have them created while we still have $12 billion worth of gold, and not $10 billion, not $8 billion, and not $6 billion which this kind of palliative might encourage us to do.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite follow the gentleman on the last point which he has made. The gentleman has indicated the fact that other knowledgeable and sophisticated people realize that we should make the gold available under the existing situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. HANNA. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has said that we cannot, by voting for this, maintain this gold standard.

Mr. CURTIS. No; no.

Mr. HANNA. That does not make sense.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from California is making a good point, because it is true the only thing is that you remove the penalty. Then you encourage it to flow out. However, it is my opinion that by keeping the penalty here or at least having some discipline, this will teach the administration or make the administration proceed properly. However, it is my opinion that the gentleman's criticism is justified.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, the gentleman's point is that it will raise the interest rates, interest rates in our country which our people will have to pay. It is my opinion that this interest rate will go too high and, therefore, the wrong people will be forced to pay the penalty.

Mr. CURTIS. No, the gentleman is not making a sound point there, in my judgment.

What I have said is this: By having interest rates rise this will encourage our investments to stay here and it will also represent an incentive for foreign investments to come to this country. And, this is indeed so.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposing this legislation lifting the gold cover requirement for Federal Reserve notes. I oppose it, not because I think there is any value in the gold cover itself, but quite the contrary, because I think we should abandon the artificial tying of our currency to $35 per ounce gold while we still have $12 billion leverage over the market.

In the past few years, there has been a great deal of hoarding of gold, mostly acquired from the United States, particularly by the Arab countries, France, and Russia. I believe that, at the rate we have been losing gold, and in view of the inadequacy of the world's gold supply to support present international trade, we are going to have to terminate the ties between gold and the dollar in a relatively few years.

If we go off the gold standard now, we have about $12 billion of gold which we could feed into the market. The price of gold would plummet and the speculators and hoarders would be hurt, as I believe they should be.

On the other hand, if we follow the palliative the Treasury is now proposing, represented by the legislation before us, we will gradually lose our gold supply and the leverage it represents. This would mean that when we decide to go off the gold standards in a few years, we would no longer be able to prevent the speculators and hoarders from profiting.

I fully support the efforts of the Treasury to create a supplementary world currency to expand the supply of exchange to support international transactions. The conference agreement in Rio to establish "special drawing rights" is certainly a step in the right direction. There are two grave faults with it, however.

First, the price we had to pay to get agreement left France with a veto power over issuance of the new SDR's. With the present irresponsible attitude of the French Government toward maintaining the stability of international transactions, in particular the French attacks on the dollar as a reserve currency, and with the French accumulation of gold and insistence on maintenance of a gold standard, I find this veto power intolerable.

Second, the SDR system continues to maintain gold as the basis of all international transactions. While SDR's will expand the supply of international exchange, they too will be tied to gold. The system assumes that the United States will continue to offer to buy or sell gold in unlimited quantities at the artificial and unrealistic price of $35 per ounce and that this will be the fulcrum on which will turn the stability of all international currencies.

For the two above reasons, the SDR arrangement is not a solution at all but just another palliative giving the appearance of a solution and delaying the day of reckoning. The delay is much to our disadvantage.

We should not let the sheiks of Arabia, the French, or the Russians profit by their past miscreance. We should not continue to create problems for our trade and currency because of the artificial ties we have created to gold at $35 per ounce. We should let gold seek its level in the marketplace as a commodity and permit the value of all world currencies to fluctuate on the basis of their true strengths and weaknesses represented by production, buying power and credit.

The only way of forcing the administration to face up to this issue of which I know, is by not releasing more gold to be dissipated to hostile foreign powers. If we do not remove the cover, then the United States will have to face up to the real issues now while we still have leverage to achieve a satisfactory resolution.

I therefore will vote against the current legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I believe that the Treasury should explore a new form of international currency that would not be tied to gold at all, but to the real value of each national currency.

The Treasury, most bankers, and many economists will reply to my proposal that it is sound but that to embark on this course precipitously would cause grave disruptions in the international monetary markets. They say we should go along with the Treasury proposal and continue to work out a better system for the SDR's.

I doubt, however, that, with the present attitudes of France, Russia, and even other countries, the SDR's will become a useful instrument in anywhere near the time to alleviate the situation. I think negotiations will drag out until the U.S. gold supply is exhausted, which is what France and Russia would like to see.

On the other hand, if we were to announce our intention to go off the gold standard tomorrow and called an international monetary conference to work out arrangements, I guarantee you that we would succeed in short order in obtaining a new international currency which would then be a vital need to all the trading countries of the world and particularly to France and Russia with their big gold hoards at stake.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of taking the full 5 minutes.

There has been considerable discussion both yesterday and today about foreign investments, and in that connection I ran into an interesting advertisement which I believe I ought to share with the Members of the House. It deals with the statement of the President in which he told American businessmen that controls on foreign investments are temporary—merely temporary.

A Department of Commerce ad in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, February 14, 1968, reads as follows, in part:

> The newly created Office of Foreign Direct Investments offers excellent career opportunities in administering the recently instituted program concerned with overseas direct investments by U.S. corporations. This program forms a vital part of the government's balance of payments measures.

Then it goes on to offer employment to attorneys, accountants, economists, bankers and tax specialists with a pay range from $8,054 a year to $23,921 a year, and, lo and behold, these are described as career opportunities.

Now does the left hand of the White House know what the other hand is doing in the Commerce Department? If the cutback on foreign investments is something temporary why are they beefing up at the Commerce Department with career employees.

I wonder if anybody has anything to offer on this kind of business? Is this another credibility gap for which this administration is already notorious?

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] hit the nail on the head a while ago when he pointed out that the root cause problem we are discussing here is that this administration has failed to do a good job in managing our financial affairs both here in the United States and around the world.

This administration has refused to assign priorities and has tried to do everything at once. When you try to do that as we have tried to do for too many years, you end up doing nothing well. That is exactly where we stand today, around the world and across this country.

The fact is that people in other countries do not want to hold dollars. They do not care for that and they would rather trade them in and take our gold.

The reason they feel this way is that they do not feel they can safely hold on to dollars because we have a rate of inflation at this time in this country of 4 percent and it is getting worse. As the value of the dollar dwindles, they prefer to cash in their dollars and take away the gold.

We heard talk earlier about "high-powered dollars." I heard the chairman say that before—but if they are "high-powered" dollars why are foreigners rushing to cash them in.

Earlier the committee chairman mentioned how various other countries of the world have previously done what he has recommended here today, to remove the gold cover. The first example he cited was the United Kingdom. That is a great example and it is not the kind of example I want to follow. I do not want to go down the same drain that the British went down. That is what we are attempting with this legislation.

I have a question that I would like to address to the chairman, if I may have the gentleman's attention.

Let us say that this legislation passes today. Let us say that the people around the world continue to raid our gold and our $12 billion disappears over the next 3 or 4 years.

My question is this. What happens when our gold is gone? Then what happens to our dollar in the international economic system?

Mr. PATMAN. No one can raid our gold supply. They can get gold. They may use it to carry out our promise for monetary purposes only and not for any other purposes.

There has been no raiding of our gold supply unless you want to consider during the months of November and December when the pound was in trouble that there was a certain amount of gold taken from our stockpile. But it was not a raid.

It was in support of the gold market in London, England.

Of course, France has been accused of raiding our gold supply, but remember this—France has not taken any gold from us since October 19——

Mr. RIEGLE. My question is this.

Let us suppose that our gold is taken up. Let us just talk about what happens if we reach that stage of the game, if we pass this legislation, it exposes this Nation to that possibility. What would happen if all of our gold were demanded, that is the dollars were redeemed and the gold taken away?

Mr. PATMAN. Why would people exchange dollars?

Mr. RIEGLE. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. PATMAN. I am answering it. Why would they exchange dollars for gold? Dollars can be invested in Eurodollars and they can earn from 7 to 8 percent. But with gold there would be a loss with that. They have to pay for keeping it. They do not get anything for it. They cannot use it for anything and they cannot even invest it.

Why would people in the nations of the world want to do that. For instance, France had that lesson and she is in a bad way right now whereas if she had dollars instead she could make a half billion dollars a year.

Mr. RIEGLE. It strikes me that if your logic is that compelling, if gold is that useless and valueless, we do not really have a problem here today and we can dismiss this legislation and go on and take up something else.

The fact is, however, that these foreign countries prefer gold and they do not prefer dollars. That is true for very fundamental reasons. But if I cannot get an answer to my question, then I will offer my own answer.

I would say that if all our gold was finally drawn out, we will find ourselves having to finally discount our dollars in order to get foreign countries to accept them. That means devaluation.

That is the same road that the British followed and, as I say, I do not want to see the United States go down that drain.

I would much prefer to see us talk about the fundamental constructive actions that we need to take, rather than just ignore our problem with this expedient one more time and allow our gold to continue to flow out. That is what we are talking about. I have not heard today a plan, a broad program, to get at the root of this problem. I would like to hear one.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. We have a plan. It is the best plan of which we know. All the experts in the Nation, Republicans and Democrats, think it is the best plan. Why should we scuttle it, move back, and try to do something else? We have a plan that will do the job.

Mr. RIEGLE. I would just say this to the chairman: The people in my district prefer to take action before the fact, before the crisis. They prefer to operate with a sound plan before they take a step as chaotic as removing the gold cover.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I just desired to direct a question to the chairman. Was it not the unanimous testimony of even the administration witnesses that the administration's proposals did not constitute a long-term solution of the balance-of-payments problem? That is my memory of the testimony.

Mr. PATMAN. As to the balance of payments; yes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. We have other ways of approaching the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Their testimony was that the President's present proposals will not constitute a permanent solution; is that not true?

Mr. PATMAN. The gold part of the proposal is not a permanent solution, and I do not claim that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the question which was asked by the honorable gentleman from Michigan. I seriously doubt that if our present program to solve the balance-of-payments problem were successful, there would be a drawing down of the $12 billion of gold that we have. The balance-of-payments program is a short-time solution. This could be solved in the next year or two by making sure that we plug the current $3 billion a year leak.

But then you ask, What will be done in the future? You have to remember that the dollar right now is the equivalent of gold. We make the market. We agree to buy or sell gold for $35 an ounce. Therefore, I would say that of the total reserve we have in the world, about 40 percent consists of our dollars, because dollars are the equivalent of gold.

What the International Monetary Fund is trying to do now is to create a paper gold so that the world will not be dependent for liquidity upon adverse balance of payments of the U.S. dollar. Last September the International Monetary Fund met in Rio, and they made an agreement to create a paper gold. The name of this paper gold was a special drawing right, and the special drawing right that would be used by central banks would be the equivalent of gold. If the proposal, which was agreed to unanimously by all of the countries, is finally approved, it will mean that by 1974 approximately 25 percent of the total reserves will be the special drawing rights. This will mean that there will be less pressure on the dollar to provide liquidity. This is our long-term solution.

The problem we have had in this country in the past is that we have had to export dollars to provide liquidity. Now we find that there is somewhat of a surplus of dollars. It is now time for us to deal with the balance-of-payments question and take care of our own problem, so that we are not exporting the $3 billion we did last year.

Coming to help us in the long term is the prospect of the special drawing right, which, as I have said, was approved unanimously by all the member nations that were members of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that France, one of the largest single holders of gold abroad, walked out of the eight-nation gold pool months and months ago, has not returned, and apparently has no thought of returning?

Mr. REES. The French have approximately $5 billion of gold in their reserves. They do not have the largest gold reserve. If you want to give it to the gold speculators, if you want to have the Soviet Union and South Africa come along, because they do have the gold, both in their safes and in the ground, it would be a good thing to vote against this bill. If you want to help gold speculators in the London gold market, then vote against the bill. But if you want a measure that we have conceived for international finance, whereby the supply of reserves has something to do with international demand, then you vote for this bill.

And we do have some long-term solutions, with paper gold, and we do have a short-term solution, which is the President's program to take care of this $3 billion balance-of-payments deficit we now have.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, is it not available right now, without passage of a fact that today these gold reserves are any additional legislation? The question is the penalty being paid. So these reserves are available, are they not?

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the reserves are only available as the Federal Reserve Board makes them available on a month-to-month basis. I think that since the entire world is dependent on the dollar for liquidity, as the dollar equals gold, in terms of our pledge to buy and sell dollars as regards gold, that we have to pledge all our gold to this cause, especially as we do have a long-term and a short-term solution in the works.

Mr. RIEGLE. Would the gentleman agree they are our problems, and we need a sounder dollar, and we have to do a better job of retaining the integrity of the dollar and delay the degree of inflation?

Mr. REES. We do have two different dollars. We have the U.S. domestic dollar, which is the strongest monetary unit in the world. The dollar which is the international dollar is a reserve dollar which is the equivalent of gold. Therefore, the dollar we have today is the strongest internally and in international transactions. This is why we have a $15 billion free Eurodollar now. As gold cannot be used for private international transactions. The faith of the international community in the dollar in this case is evidence enough of the European dollar.

Mr. **RIEGLE**. Is the dollar stronger today than it was 2, 3, or 4 years ago, or is it weaker?

Mr. **REES**. I would say relative to all other currencies, it is stronger.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. The sixth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 415) is repealed.

Sec. 6. The fourth sentence of the paragraph which, prior to the amendments made by this Act, was the seventh paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 416) is repealed.

Sec. 7. The paragraph which, prior to the amendments made by this Act, was the eighteenth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 467) is repealed.

Sec. 8. Section 6 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 408a) is amended by striking in the second proviso the phrases "the reserve for United States notes and for Treasury notes of 1890, and" and ", and the reserve for Federal Reserve notes shall be maintained in gold certificates, or in credits payable in gold certificates maintained with the Treasurer of the United States under section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as heretofore and by this Act amended".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolff: On page 3, line 11, at the end of section 8, add the following phrase: "and no redemption in gold shall be made to France until a plan has been agreed to by both France and the United States for the payment of France's World War I debt to the United States."

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Chairman, on account of the time, if we do not get on here this afternoon, we may have to continue to meet on this on Friday or Monday, and I think the gentlemen would like to get through.

Of course, if the gentleman wants to speak on the amendment, I will reserve the point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from Texas reserves the point of order?

Mr. **PATMAN**. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Chairman, my amendment refers to the removal of the gold cover on the dollars held by France until she pays us what she owes us. The problem we face has been aggravated by a French-directed run on our bank. We must require that France pay its legal and long overdue World War I debt to the United States. Both the Treasury and State Departments have repeatedly reaffirmed that it is a legal and binding debt. The agreement under which France owes the United States, about $7 billion has never been vacated. There exist absolutely no conditions that release France from this legal and just obligation.

France has repeatedly determined to attack the dollar. We cannot accept this attack without responding and the proper response is to have France pay its World War I debt. Today, we propose to eliminate the domestic gold cover on the dollar to satisfy international obligations. We do this to protect the United States. France, Mr. Speaker, must be made to meet her international obligations.

The proposal that France pay her World War I debt stands on its own merits as evidenced by the support of more than 150 Members of the House. The very situation that required the prompt attention to the legislation before us today requires passage of this amendment.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I have received the following letter:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, February 20, 1968.
Hon. Wright Patman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: We understand that an amendment may be offered to H.R. 14743 which would provide that no gold of the United States may be transferred to (a) any nation which permits private citizens or nationals thereof to deal in gold bullion in any manner or (b) any nation which permits any gold held by it to be transferred directly or indirectly to nations described under (a).

We should like to state in the strongest possible terms that legislative provisions of this sort could do irreparable damage to the dollar and to the international monetary system as a whole. A cornerstone of that system is the United States pledge to convert dollars freely into gold at $35 per ounce for foreign central banks and monetary authorities. Any limitation on that pledge, even if applied to only one country, would call the basic validity of the pledge itself into question. It would make other countries nervous since they would feel that they might also be limited at some future time. The result of such uncertainties would very likely be a major loss of trust in the dollar and an increase in gold conversions by these countries.

We should also like to point out that an amendment of the type cited would in effect amount to a virtual embargo on United States gold sales. Most foreign nations at the present time do permit their individual citizens to deal in gold bullion in some manner, at least for industrial and artistic purposes. Indeed, even if a country had precisely the same internal regulations governing gold use as those which are in effect in the United States, it would apparently be ineligible to receive U.S. gold under the amendment. Thus, the effect of the amendment would be precisely the opposite from the one which the legislation for the removal of the gold cover is designed to achieve: namely, to convince the world that our gold stock stands fully behind our gold pledge.

Inclusion in the gold cover legislation of the kind of amendment cited above would seriously compromise the status of the dollar and of the international monetary system as a whole. We urge, therefore, that you do everything in your power to prevent the inclusion of the amendments cited in the gold cover legislation.

Sincerely yours,
Henry H. Fowler.
Wm. McC. Martin, Jr.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. **WOLFF**. No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. O'Hara of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The bill before the House, H.R. 14743, deals only with the question of eliminating reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, while put in the form of an amendment to the same section of the Gold Reserve Act amended by section 8 of the bill before the Committee, has to do with war debts, a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and a matter not involved in the subject before the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. There are hereby repealed the sentences of subsection (a) of section 43 of the Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31, 52; 31 U.S.C. 821(a)), which read: "No suspension of reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks, under the terms of section 11(c) of the Federal Reserve Act necessitated by reason of operations under this section, shall require the imposition of the graduated tax upon any deficiency in reserves as provided in said section 11(c). Nor shall it require any automatic increase in the rates of interest or discount charged by any Federal Reserve bank, as otherwise specified in that section."

Sec. 10. Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1890 (26 Stat. 289), as amended (31 U.S.C. 408), is hereby repealed.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, strike out line 24 and insert "Stat. 289; 31 U.S.C. 408), and section 2 of the Act of March 14, 1900 (31 Stat. 45), are repealed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 11. Section 7 of the Act of January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 341, 31 U.S.C. 408b), is amended by striking the phrase "and as a reserve for any United States notes and for Treasury notes of 1890" and also by striking the phrase "as a reserve for any United States notes and for Treasury notes of 1890, and".

Sec. 12. Section 14(c) of the Act of January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 344, 31 U.S.C. 405b), is amended by striking from the first sentence "except the gold fund held as a reserve for any United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania: On page 4 following line 12 add three new sections:

"Sec. 13. From the total gold reserve available for the payment of foreign claims following the effective date of this Act, there shall be established a Strategic Gold Reserve to be maintained by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"Sec. 14. Whenever for any reason any quantity of gold shall be removed from the Treasury for foreign shipment or for deposit to the credit of any foreign government, or

Central Bank, or international organization within the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately place an equal number of ounces of gold into the Strategic Gold Reserve.

"SEC. 15. Gold placed in the Strategic Gold Reserve shall no longer be a part of the monetary reserves of the United States, and may be removed from the Strategic Gold Reserve only by Act of Congress."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I am willing to reserve the point of order for the gentleman to make a statement, if he desires to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. This amendment is offered in, let us say, a desperate attempt to try to salvage some of the gold that we presently possess.

The effect of the amendment would be that we would go along with taking the 25-percent gold backing away from our dollar, because it seems very evident here today that we are destined to do that very thing and this action is despite the admonitions of everyone on this side of the aisle and elsewhere who have told us what a frightful thing it is to release all $12 billion worth of our gold for the demands of the gold hoarders abroad.

This amendment in effect says, "All right. We will free the $12 billion and take away the 25-percent gold backing, but for goodness sakes, let us save something for the United States." My amendment provides that for every single ounce of gold you send abroad on foreign claims you will put one ounce in a strategic gold fund. In other words, we have $12 billion in gold. If foreign banks get $6 billion worth of that gold, there will be $6 billion left here in the United States as a reserve.

Now, why is a reserve like this necessary? It is necessary because, yes, we are a great nation today and we are very prosperous, but suppose the time comes when we have a famine in this country and we need to buy food and other supplies from other nations and all we have to buy them with is our currency. The answer will come back to us, "Your currency is no good. We want gold for the food that you want to buy."

Well, you can see what an impossible situation we would be placed in if all the $12 billion in gold, as we predict, leaves this country. My amendment will say that for every ounce you send abroad put aside one ounce in this great United States.

Second, militarily, gold has a vital importance to our Nation. Those who were involved in World War II, who fought in the North African campaign and the Italian campaign know the tremendously great use that was made of gold in carrying our troops forward to victory in those battles. The only medium of exchange that had any value back of the enemy lines was gold. Here today we are putting ourselves in a position so that the United States can well lose all of its gold. Then, if we need the gold, we will not have it and we will be in a desperate situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Members vote for this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has made a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane to the bill under consideration. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully insist that my amendment is germane to the bill under consideration. This bill eliminates the gold-reserve requirements on currency by repealing in part several statutory requirements. My amendment would place certain conditions on the ultimate disposition of any gold reserve to be authorized by the bill under consideration. My amendment permits the payment of U.S. gold reserves to foreigners on the condition that an equal amount of gold be placed in the strategic reserve. We do not touch the repeal sections of this bill in my amendment. All we do is say that after this bill becomes law we set up standards as to what should be done with our gold. This amendment deals with gold and the subject matter of the bill is gold. Therefore I say that my amendment is germane.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The bill before the Committee deals with reserve requirements held as a backing for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to establish a strategic gold reserve and does not deal with the question of a gold backing for Federal Reserve notes and U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The Chair will call attention to clause 7 of rule XVI of the House, which states that no subject different from the subject under consideration may be admitted as an amendment. This is the so-called germaneness rule of the House. The Chair would hold that the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are not dealing with the sole question involved in H.R. 14743; that is, reserves behind Federal Reserve notes and U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890. Therefore, it is not germane to the bill before the Committee, and the Chair sustains the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 14743, which would remove the 25-percent gold cover now being used to back the American dollar. The administration contends that by releasing the bulk of this Nation's gold reserves, foreign investors and bankers will once again have "confidence" in the American dollar.

I am deeply concerned, as I am sure many Americans are, that the removal of our gold cover could be most damaging. This bill is being pushed through the House with but 2 hours of free debate and discussion. Surely such a critical issue deserves more investigation and deliberation.

The American dollar has been protected since 1913. Now this Chamber seems to be rushing helter-skelter to remove that protection.

I caution my colleagues to act slowly. Once this cover is removed, it may be too late.

There are questions that must be answered, not with evasions, but directly.

Will the administration's latest plan strengthen our foreign relations with foreign countries or will it hinder it? What will this plan do to control inflation here at home?

Is it possible that should H.R. 14743 be passed, the demands on the administration to cut Federal spending will be weakened?

Foreign central bankers are well aware that the United States has made a commitment to honor demands for gold, and if this commitment is to be met, it will be met whether the gold cover is removed or not.

What foreign central bankers would prefer to the removal of the gold cover is the assurance that the United States will never face the decision on whether or not it will suspend gold sales. The only way I can see to provide such an assurance is by reversing, if possible, the dollar outflow temporarily by measures to reduce inflation at home and Government spending abroad.

This does not mean controls which merely distort and impede healthy flows of trade and investment, but a better balance of trade, and curbs on the amount and types of foreign aid that literally pour into foreign countries.

This could mean less Government spending in American domestic spending programs which would cut inflation. Further, it could mean a gold boycott as I proposed in recent legislation calling for the prohibition of gold for the settlement of international balances with the government of any nation while such government is in arrears in the payment of its obligations to our country.

In short, I believe foreign central bankers are not interested in bookkeeping changes that do nothing to alter the underlying conditions that are weakening our dollar.

They are interested in real and meaningful measures to restore a healthy equilibrium in our payments position.

Removing the gold cover is merely a technical change that would not truly strengthen the American dollar. Indeed, it could have harmful effects. I call for extensive hearings to review the entire matter in the field of international monetary affairs. Many tests must be made and this does not require that the gold reserve requirement be changed with this kind of posthaste legislation.

Rather, it requires a dollar that maintains its purchasing power that is freely usable throughout the world for trade, investment, and travel.

The administration's policies do not meet the tests to remove the gold cover.

Nor is this simple question answered: Will such a severe move as the removal of the 25-percent gold cover strengthen foreign confidence in the American dollar or could it actually in the long run weaken the dollar?

I sincerely hope that I am wrong, but if H.R. 14743 is passed, I believe that the removal of the gold cover will weaken rather than strengthen the American dollar abroad.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, under general leave to extend my remarks, I include the House Republican policy committee statement on the gold cover and the balance of payments:

President Johnson's request that Congress remove the gold cover is a tragic confession of failure. Seven years of Democratic spendthrift policies have reduced this Country from a fiscal strongman into a hat-in-hand supplicant whose currency is dependent upon the restraint and forebearance of others. World confidence in the dollar has been shaken and the international monetary system is in serious trouble.

In this emergency, the stopgap measures and subterfuges of the Johnson Administration are inadequate and dangerous. Basic and fundamental changes—a complete redirection of our fiscal affairs—must be effected without further delay.

At the close of the Eisenhower Administration, this Country enjoyed cost-price stability, a federal budget surplus and a strong international economic position. The dollar reigned supreme. "Good as Gold" was an accurate as well as an apt description of our currency. Today, by every meaningful measure, the stability and the economic balance of that period have been dissipated by fiscal and monetary mismanagement. For example:

	December 1960	December 1967	Percent of increase
Net public and private debt	$890,200,000,000	$1,430,000,000,000	+60.7
U.S. Government debt	$290,400,000,000	$345,200,000,000	+18.9
Federal Government spending (annual rate)	$93,000,000,000	$167,500,000,000	+80.1
Yearly interest on Federal debt	[1] $9,200,000,000	[2] $13,500,000,000	+46.0
Interest rates (percent):			
AAA corporate bonds	4.41	6.19	+40.4
High grade municipal bonds	3.73	4.49	+20.4
Taxable Federal bonds	4.02	5.36	+33.3
3-month Treasury bills	2.928	5.012	+71.2
Consumer Price Index (1957–59)	100.0	118.2	+18.2
Foreign short-term dollar holdings	$21,300,000,000	$32,400,000,000	+52.1
Gold reserve	$17,800,000,000	$12,000,000,000	−32.6

[1] Fiscal year 1960.
[2] Fiscal year 1968.

The extent of our monetary problem is best illustrated by contrasting the situation as it existed in February 1961 with our present situation.

In his February 6, 1961 balance of payments message, President Kennedy stated:

Our gold reserve now stands at $17.5 billion. This is more than 1½ times foreign official dollar holdings and more than 90 percent of all foreign dollar holdings. It is some two-fifths of the gold stock of the entire free world.

Today, our gold reserve stands at $11.884 billion, only three-fourths of the foreign official dollar holdings of $16 billion and less than 40 percent of all foreign dollar holdings of $32 billion.

The steadily deteriorating monetary situation has been of growing concern to Republicans. On March 10, 1965 the Republican Coordinating Committee called attention to the fact that, "One of the most urgent matters of public business facing the United States was, and will continue to be, competent management of our balance of payments, gold outflow and international monetary problems . . . the present Administration is putting us in a position of dealing from weakness rather than strength."

On August 30, 1965, the Coordinating Committee recommended a nine point program that called for the responsible use of fiscal and monetary policies, the realistic reductions of government overseas economic and military programs and the implementation of steps to increase the return flow of dollars. Again in April 1967, the Coordinating Committee issued fourteen recommendations that would, if implemented, insure sound growth and economic stability. Republicans in Congress made repeated efforts to reduce nonessential spending and successfully led the fight to cut $5.8 billion from the President's 1968 appropriation requests.

Unfortunately, the Johnson Administration did not heed these warnings or implement a program of fiscal restraint at home or abroad. Since 1965 it has engaged in fiscal excesses that will increase the administrative budget expenditures from $96.5 billion to $147.3 billion in fiscal 1969. Nondefense spending will increase $24.2 billion (52 percent) and employment in the executive branch will increase by 454,747 (more than 20 percent). The budget deficit in fiscal 1968 will total at least $19.8 billion for an astounding total of more than $60 billion in just eight years.

The balance of payments problem was permitted to deteriorate until in the fourth quarter of 1967 the deficit was at a catastrophic annual rate of about $7.5 billion. The historic U.S. trade surplus declined until in the fourth quarter of 1967 imports almost equalled exports. In December alone, our Country lost $925 million in gold and our gold stock dropped to its lowest point in 31 years.

Now we are face to face with a monetary crisis of unknown proportions. The removal of the gold cover is at best but a stopgap measure. Fiscal stability and confidence in the dollar must be restored. The outflow of gold must be brought under control through the implementation of responsible economic policies. We reject the Johnson Administration's position that this Country can permit its gold supply to be siphoned off completely.

The balance of payments deficit must be eliminated. However, the Administration's proposed controls and restrictions on foreign investment and travel may be self-defeating. In recent years, receipts from direct investments abroad have been exceeding outflows by $1.5 to $2 billion. Restrictions on foreign travel are contrary to the basic right to travel, impose an additional financial burden on those who can afford it the least and invite serious retaliation by other governments.

We must adopt policies that will encourage a return by this Country to a trade surplus position that is both historic and absolutely essential. The adverse effect on the balance of payments of foreign aid and U.S. military expenditures in Western Europe must be mitigated. Exports and foreign tourism in the United States must be encouraged. International monetary arrangements must be strengthened. Recently, the Johnson Administration indicated that at long last it is ready to give more than lip service to these proposals. We hope so—action, not more words, is needed.

There must be a return to fiscal sanity at home. The Administration's expansionary budget for 1969 must be cut. Spending priorities must be established and then adhered to.

We recommend the immediate enactment of legislation that would impose a ceiling on government spending except for additional expenditures that might be necessary for Vietnam.

We are concerned that removing the gold cover may be construed by the Johnson Administration as sanctioning in advance the dissipation of our remaining gold supply, in lieu of making the hard decisions that are necessary to restore international confidence in the dollar. We believe that a program of domestic fiscal and monetary reform would do more than any other thing to bolster foreign confidence in the dollar and reduce pressures on our gold stock.

The removal of the gold cover without making fiscal and monetary reforms will simply paper over our basic problems, delay a return to fiscal responsibility and make the monetary crisis more severe and even harder to handle in the future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the learned speeches of my distinguished colleagues. I found much of value in them. And I found myself in basic agreement with the premise voiced here today—the premise that the soundness of the dollar derives from our total national wealth rather than from the pile of gold reposing at Fort Knox.

Having said this, I still part company with those of my colleagues who urge the repeal of the gold backing for our currency.

I do this because I firmly believe that the repeal of our existing reserve requirements will not cure the problem confronting us on the world arena but may, indeed, serve to aggravate it.

Mr. Chairman, we must not forget the reason why we are being asked to repeal the gold reserve requirements which apply to a good part of our currency. We are being asked to do this because demand claims against our gold amount to over $32 billion—and our entire stock of gold amounts to only about $13 billion.

What does this mean? It means, in brief, that we have issued more promises redeemable in gold than the gold which we possess.

It means that there has been a continuing, significant deficit in our balance of payments.

And it means that other countries and foreign private individuals are no longer willing to accept pieces of paper in place of gold.

Are we going to cure this chronic deficit, and our immediate indebtedness, by freeing the $13 billion of gold which we have at Fort Knox, by making that gold available to pay foreign claims?

I doubt that that will be the outcome.

In the first place, we do not have enough gold to cover the $32 billion in demand claims against it.

In the second place, the release of the gold which we have will simply encourage continuation of those very practices which got us into the position in which we are today: It will encourage continuing deficits in our balance of payments.

What I am trying to say is that our present gold reserve requirement acts as a brake on our own carelessness, our propensity to lay out more money than we should.

Once this restraint is gone, we may encounter bigger, more serious problems.

I would hope, therefore, that instead of attacking the symptoms of our problem, that we get down to business and try to cure the deficit in our balance of payments.

As a first step in that direction, I think that we ought to review our expenditures overseas, particularly in Europe—where the bulk of the claims against our gold is being held—and try to cut down.

And I think that we ought to take other steps to discourage foreign spending, wherever this can be done without damaging our national security and our other national interests.

Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the cause of our problems should be attacked directly, and because I believe that this bill before us offers only a temporary palliative and encourages procrastination which will compound our problems, I feel that I will have to vote against H.R. 14743.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 14743, legislation eliminating the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

I take this action for two basic reasons: First of all, I feel very strongly that the Nation is dependent upon a stable dollar which has something behind it rather than paper I O U's. Secondly, and equally important, I feel that if we approve this legislation, we will be guilty of taking hasty action without exploring completely the alternative avenues which are open to us.

I believe the Federal Reserve Board could take remedial action to stem this course by imposing a minimal tax of any fraction of 1 percent if the reserve drops below 25 percent and less than 20 percent. It would not create too onerous a burden by an increase in the Federal discount rate. Such action would buy time to protect our gold reserves by adoption of necessary measures to correct our balance-of-payments deficit and our internal Federal deficit, thereby relieving pressure on the national gold stockpile.

If H.R. 14743 is enacted, the American citizen on the domestic scene will henceforth be required to accept completely flat money. The American dollar is still backed by gold internationally although our citizens are forbidden to own gold at home and abroad. The brakes on the expansion of our money supply will be removed if this bill is passed.

I know of no nation in past history that has been able to embark upon a program of unbridled and unrestricted printing press paper money.

We cannot forever engulf, not only this Nation, but the world with an ever-growing flood of paper dollars, backed only by the illusion that this paper currency will be regarded abroad as true store of value, a mere promise to pay in paper I O U's.

It has been suggested also that the Federal Reserve Board has the authority to suspend the gold cover requirement initially for a period of 30 days and if necessary for 15-day intervals as long as needed.

Mr. Chairman, we have watched, we all know, the steady erosion of our gold reserves. The latest figures indicate that our reserves are down to an alltime low of $11.8 billion. We therefore have remaining a cushion of $1.1 billion before reaching the gold cover limit of $10.7 billion, which are frozen as reserves against outstanding Federal Reserve notes.

It seems to me the time has not yet come in which we must act impulsively, that we can and do have the time to meet the requirement that we explore all other alternative avenues. We cannot, I feel, weaken the stability and solidity of our dollar by converting it to paper money. We can, I am confident, through a variety of programs, including the major incentives to increase domestic gold production, reverse the downward trend of our gold reserves.

Let us take these alternative steps, one of the first of which would be, I say, the increased production of gold; and another would be to give the President's efforts to stem the balance of trade and outflow of gold a chance to work. For I am deeply fearful that action of this type which we are contemplating here today will not prove to be the remedy we seek but instead will escalate the demands now being made upon our gold reserves.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, irrespective of what this Congress in the end decides to do about the gold cover for our currency, the gold supply situation in its longer range aspects will be with the country and with the world for a long, long time. Most people are proceeding on the assumption that there is no prospect for any significant increase in domestic gold production without a very substantial increase in the price of gold.

A lot of speculators in Europe and elsewhere are banking on this. That is why we are faced with this legislation on gold cover. I want to state here and now that these speculators and a lot more people may be in for a very rude shock one of these days. They are talking about the present price of $35 per ounce inexorably having to go to $70 or more. They are licking their greedy chops over the prospect. The fact is that instead of gold going up in price, it could go down for reasons they never heard of. It may be possible that gold can be produced in the United States, domestically for less than $10 per ounce, perhaps considerably less. This possibility may occur not in the 21st century or beyond, but within a decade or less. Its anticipatory effect on gold prices would, of course, occur much sooner. The gold speculators may not be going to have it all their way. New technologies can play strange tricks with the values of old metals and gold is not necessarily exempted from this truism.

My story is, I believe, an interesting one. And it should be something of a warning to those people and those nations who are today playing fast and loose with the U.S. gold supply.

Bureau of Mines Information Circular 8331 reveals a potential of 407.8 million ounces of gold in U.S. soil. But at $35 per ounce only about 2 percent of it, around, 9.4 million ounces, is commercially producible. The reason the other 98 percent is not commercially producible is simply that combined mining and milling costs exceed $35 an ounce. The reason the 2 percent is producible is that it is relatively rich ore from which around an ounce of gold per ton of ore can be recovered. Rich ore means less ore has to be taken from the earth, hauled away and then run through a mill. The present state of our mining and milling technology and the costs associated with it, puts the cost of mining and milling a ton of ore just under $35 per ton. Thus that ton must yield at least an ounce of gold, priced at $35, to make the effort economically justifiable.

If technology can cut cost of production to $17.50 an ounce, then operations are economically justifiable to obtain one-half ounce of gold per ton. If costs can be cut in two again, to $8.75 per ton, then one-quarter ounce per ton will suffice.

The milling of gold is a chemical process subject to nature's laws. There simply does not seem to be a lot more chemists can do to cut costs of milling as it is carried on by today's procedures of extracting ore out of the ground and taking it to the mill. Thus any new technology must be directed, it seems, not at milling, but straight at the extraction and hauling side of the cost equation. In short, it must contemplate bringing the milling process to the ore, where it is, in the ground. Extracting and moving a ton of ore is costly business. Milling the ore right in the ground would bypass these heavy costs and revitalize the American gold industry.

And that is exactly the direction in which Atomic Energy Commission scientists are moving today in experiments at the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif. These experiments so far have received little or no public attention. They are directed at an estimated 302.2 million ounces of gold locked in 814 lode deposits, about three-quarters of the total 407.8 million ounces of domestic gold resources. The remaining 105.6 million ounces in 494 placer deposits apparently must wait for development of some other improved technology of recovery.

Now, what is it that the AEC believes may be possible?

Within the last 2 weeks I have been in touch with its experts at Livermore who are doing very interesting work on the feasibility of applying nuclear explosives and a leaching process to the recovery of gold metal from where it sits in the ground without ever moving a pound of ore anyplace. We know this program to apply nuclear explosives to peaceful applications as Plowshare. The program has been in existence for 10 years and has focused on such applications as digging a new sea-level canal across central America, recovering natural gas, and oil from shale, digging new harbors and a variety of other promising applications.

Now some of these Plowshare people have begun to seriously investigate the prospect of recovering gold ore in a manner similar to that already studied for recovering another metal currently in short supply, copper. They tell me that it is no major problem. There are, of course, still some procedures to be resolved, but these are chemical problems associated with finding the best leaching solution rather than any technical question about the nuclear application. A report to the AEC Division of Peaceful Nuclear Explosives on the prospects for the application to gold ore is being prepared for early submission.

The gold studies grew out of Plowshare copper recovery techniques soon to be tested. The Kennecott Copper Corp. has already proposed that the AEC join it in a project to demonstrate the feasibility of applying Plowshare explosives to copper recovery at a company site near Safford, Ariz. Kennecott is reasonably certain that this process will be economical for the recovery of copper, which is priced at so much less than gold, that it is quoted by the pound, not by the ounce.

The use of a nuclear explosive to free hidden gold reserves would be similar to the process which Kennecott has proposed for the copper experiment. The company hopes to detonate a 20-kiloton nuclear explosive about 1,200 feet below the surface of the ground. The explosion would result in a massive crushing and fracturing of ore for many hundreds of feet around, above, and below the device, but would not result in any venting of radioactivity.

To recover the copper, a leaching solution would be introduced into the fractured area, called the chimney, to dissolve copper contained in the deposit. This dissolved copper would flow to the bottom of the chimney, from where it would be pumped to the surface. A chemical processing plant at the site would extract the dissolved copper ore from the leaching solution. In gold lodes the process would work essentially the same way.

The Atomic Energy Commission has already published a projected pricelist for commercial Plowshare services. It shows costs of $350,000 for a 10-kiloton device to $600,000 for a 2-megaton device. Where else can you buy that kind of TNT explosive equivalent for a few cents a pound?

There appears to be no question that from the nuclear side, the concept is feasible, particularly if it is seen as feasible for copper, natural gas, and oil shale.

The remaining technological problems are chemical ones involving the proper leaching solution. The AEC experts tell me that different leaching solutions work better on different types of ore. The problem is to find a leaching agent that will work primarily on the gold ore instead of the host rock.

The experts at Lawrence Radiation Lab have performed tests on different leaching solutions and different types of gold ore. They say that a conventional chlorine leaching solution appears to work reasonably well with ore types common to the South Dakota and Nevada reserves.

Considering the short time which Plowshare people have studied this problem and the obvious advantages of Plowshare to other minerals, it appears that a similar application to gold may readily be developed and proven. So far has their work proceeded that steps are being taken to patent the techniques developed. These will be available for licensing to those who want to use them. All that is really required at this point is to have a known gold reserve made available, determine the proper leach for the ore and set up a recovery plant to prove out the process.

If but 100 million ounces of gold were added to our stocks by this means, its value at $35 per ounce would be $3.5 billion, about three times the $1,175 million gold loss to overseas buyers the Federal Reserve Board reported for 1967. With that kind of potential supply there would have been no trading of dollars for gold in 1967 at all. In fact, there would have been a trading of gold for dollars. The flow would have been reversed because dollars would be more valuable than gold—and a much better investment.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, for the past 17 years the United States has spent, lent, and given money away abroad to the point where foreigners hold over $26 billion in U.S. dollars. These dollars are convertible to gold—our gold—on demand of foreign central banks, foreign governments, or international agencies. Our gold stock today stands at around $12 billion. By law, around $10.7 billion must be held as a backing for our currency. This leaves only $1.3 billion to meet potential foreign claims. The bill before us would completely remove the gold-cover requirements for our own currency, and make our entire gold stock available to meet foreign claims. But even with the cover removed, there is not enough to handle half of the potential demand.

The argument for removing the gold cover says that this will show foreigners we will honor our obligations to exchange our gold for their dollars. This, it is claimed, will restore "confidence" in our international commitments. I find this rather shaky; we have a long and honorable history of honoring our obligations, financial and otherwise, and this is considerably more than can be said by some of the very countries now yelling the loudest for more signs of "confidence" such as this one.

What about "confidence"? And what about some other things, such as financial discipline and our own future gold needs?

First, the question of confidence. Is there anyone in this country or abroad really confident that we are doing all we can to halt our frightening balance-of-payments deficits? The deficit for 1967 was $3.57 billion; the deficit in the fourth quarter of 1967 alone was $1.83 billion, largest for any 3-month period since 1950.

How can there be confidence in the international financial policies and programs of this administration? On January 1, 1968, the President announced a series of orders and proposals supposedly aimed at reducing the outflow of dollars. Two days later, on January 3, the Vice President told some Ghanaian army officers that U.S. foreign aid—which has contributed heavily to the problem we now face—should be doubled or tripled. And the Vice President promised he and the President would carry the fight for more foreign aid to the American people.

As I pointed out 2 weeks ago, the first punch of the fight was aimed squarely at the many Americans who travel abroad, by the administration's request for a tourist tax. The tax, as I stated then, is not only unnecessary when many other measures are available but it also may very well be unconstitutional.

Second, the matter of financial discipline: Are we, through passage of this bill, going to sanction the removal of the very last vestige of at least some kind of control, and in so doing open the gates to printing-press money?

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has stated:

> Removing the gold cover is thus merely a technical change that would not strengthen the dollar. Indeed, it could have harmful effects. The gold reserve requirement also serves an important function as a warning signal. If too much gold is lost abroad, or if domestic monetary expansion proceeds too rapidly, the ratio of gold to outstanding Federal Reserve notes drops.
>
> The decline is widely reported in the press and acts as a warning that policies should be reversed. Removing the gold cover would thus mean the loss of one of our inflationary indicators.

In May 1967, the Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York said:

> In 1945, and also in 1965, the administration sought only to reduce the gold reserve requirement. This time, it will presumably have to recommend the removal of the gold cover altogether.
>
> Under the circumstances, it is obviously essential that the Federal Reserve be able to assure a normal expansion in note circulation. This does not, however, mean that the United States can, with impunity, inflate money supplies and disregard the consequences for domestic prices and for the balance of payments. The need for financial discipline will be all the greater since, in the absence of the gold reserve requirement, the strength of the dollar will depend even more than today on the broad base of confidence, in our country as well as throughout the world, in the conduct of our economic and financial policies.

In January 1968, the same publication warned of our future gold needs:

> In a sense, the removal of the legal gold cover to free gold for last-ditch selling to foreign governments appears to be a mechanical step. In practical reality, however it raises searching questions. Specifically, unless gold is demonetized by international agreement—something that the nations holding the bulk of their reserves in the form of gold in preference to dollars or claims on an international financial institution would obviously be unwilling to accept—the United States needs a gold reserve commensurate with its far-flung international responsibilities. It also needs gold for emergencies—at times and circumstances where no other money will do since gold alone is

universally acceptable. Beyond that, there is the importance of gold as a war chest.

On February 1, 1968, Mr. Leslie C. Peacock, senior vice president and economist of the Crocker-Citizens National Bank of San Francisco told the House Committee on Banking and Currency that:

> The fact that a full and unconditional commitment of U.S. gold to the satisfaction of international claims—as long as gold remains—would add significantly to this country's time and maneuverability in responding to international financial problems is not open to question.
>
> The question remains, however, whether this is the wisest course of action. The question cannot be answered categorically, but at least some observations can be offered. If the United States has the capacity and the willingness to bring about near-term and significant improvement in its balance of payments, if this progress can be sustained and built on, if it can be secured without exacting too high a price in terms of regimentation or inferior economic performance at home or a damaging withdrawal from international responsibilities, and if all this can be done while we are heavily committed in southeast Asia, then the strategic arguments which underlie this bill unquestionably are correct. If these possibilities could be held to be strong probabilities, there would be little risk in the removal of the gold cover requirement and little risk that our gold stock would be dissipated without the consideration of existing alternatives.
>
> If, on the other hand, Congress accepts the gold payment strategy underlying this bill and finds subsequently that balance-of-payment programs are inadequate to meet our urgent needs, it also is almost certain to find that it has chosen the worst alternative now open to the United States.

There are more "ifs" than in Rudyard Kipling's poem; based on the administration's past performance it is more than likely that these injunctions will not only never be fulfilled but will be cited by some future historian as "should have been."

"As good as gold," no one knows how old this phrase is, and it has no doubt appeared in every language and dialect of every nation, culture or tribe that had its currency tied to gold.

"All the gold in Fort Knox" is purely American; so, too, is "sound as a dollar."

If this bill passes and the gold cover is removed, we can forget the first two phrases completely. And we will have hastened towards the day when even the third will have become as obsolete as "divine right of kings" and the Burma Shave signs along the highways.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I join in opposition to the removal of the gold cover requirement on Federal Reserve notes. My position on this measure is based on many of the same reasons that prompted my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Currency to submit minority views.

I believe that the question of removal of the gold reserve requirement is so tied to our overall balance-of-payments problem that action should be deferred until the Ways and Means Committee has completed its hearings on this bigger problem. Action at this time will remove all pressures to really come to grips with the balance-of-payments question which has steadily worsened for the past 7 years.

As pointed out in the minority views, Government spending abroad for the last 21 years shows a net deficit of $115 billion while the private sector shows a net surplus of $84 billion. Unless the Government policy can be reversed or modified, our position will continue to worsen. Freeing our gold reserve will weaken pressures to face this real problem of overseas Government expenditures.

Since the Federal Reserve Board already has, under the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act, authority to waive the 25-percent gold reserve requirement, I see no necessity for the passage of this legislation. In fact, I believe very strongly that in order to maintain and strengthen confidence in the dollar throughout the world, we must not remove the 25-percent gold cover requirement.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it was 3 years ago this very month when I warned this House that "we're trying to treat the symptoms instead of the disease." The bill we were considering at that time was the measure to eliminate the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve deposits to free up to $5 billion in gold for use in dealing with foreign claims.

I further explained that postwar monetary expansion had produced a gradual increase in the amount of gold required as a legal reserve during the same period that U.S. gold holdings declined due to persistent balance-of-payments deficits. "We now see that the two trends are on a collision course," I said, "to eventually meet at a point where either law or folly must give way. Unfortunately, today we are considering letting the law give way without adequately considering what to do about the folly."

In that same 1965 speech, I called for prior consideration of proposals to reverse the balance-of-payments deficits before consideration was made to lower the gold reserve requirements. I said it was "inconceivable that the administration should push for passage" before balance-of-payments legislation was considered.

Mr. Chairman, I was tempted to make that same speech today, changing but a few words. But I doubt if it would have any more effect than it did 3 years ago. Only today the chickens have come home to roost and the situation is much more grave.

We certainly need to discuss the balance-of-payments problem as a prelude to the bill before us to remove the last semblance of gold protection left to the American people. We did not get the balance-of-payments action we needed when we demanded it 3 and more years ago, and the record since bears out our warnings. We would not be here talking about removing the gold cover if we had convinced the administration that realistic reforms were urgently needed. Now, again, we are being asked to act prematurely, at the very moment when the Ways and Means Committee is in the process of conducting hearings into the international imbalance.

We have still to act on the proposals to lessen that imbalance, and we should take a long, hard look at those proposals before taking the lid off our gold. I suggest that we need to look far beyond the President's proposals, which I consider meager and stopgap, and consider the overall picture and history of our international dealings that have resulted in the accelerating drain on gold.

The President's proposals center mainly on curtailing tourist travel to foreign nations and U.S. investments abroad. But, according to the minority views submitted in the report on the bill before us today, Under Secretary Barr submitted a table for the record showing that in the 21-year period, 1946–66, the private sector showed a net surplus in our balance-of-payments accounts of about $84 billion while for the same 21-year period the Government sector showed a net deficit of about $115 billion. That tells a great deal about the current problem and says very little for the President's proposals to put the burden of retrenchment on the private sector. It also suggests the need of other free world countries to assume more of the international burden that the United States cannot continue to carry virtually alone.

The President's balance-of-payments proposals would extract only $500 million from Government programs which have shown a persistent deficit of several billions of dollars. But the private sector would be expected to save $2.5 billion, although it has consistently shown large payments surpluses.

Great Britain's experience should show us the folly of such thinking. From 1958 through 1966, Britain had a cumulative surplus of 3.6 billion pounds earned overseas by the private sector. Virtually all of this came from cash inflow from private investments overseas. But the Government expenditures during the same period totaled 5.2 billion pounds, too much for the surplus in the private sector to overcome.

It is interesting to note that the U.S. Treasury Department has attempted to sell the President's balance-of-payments and gold proposals by listing the key resources which Treasury claims "give the United States the strength to deal with its underlying long-range payments problem constructively and sensibly." Two of the reasons listed in Treasury's "Maintaining the Strength of the U.S. Dollar in a Strong Free World Economy" report of January 1968, are: "A strong economy with a gross national product in excess of $800 billion, representing 40–50 percent of world output, a large stock of foreign assets with powerful earnings potential."

Mr. Chairman, that last one is intriguing when you consider the proposal to curtail U.S. investment abroad. But it is the $800 billion gross national product figure that becomes the most interesting of the reasons for the contention that we are in a strong economic position. That $800 billion GNP figure is completely misleading. After subtracting the Government sectors, the current GNP is only slightly over $600 billion, and this must be reduced by another $25 billion due to the inflationary factor this past year. In fact, inflation accounted for 60 percent of the gain in GNP from 1966 to 1967. It was the Government portion of the GNP that rose the most, the very segment that continues to create the balance-of-payments deficits. Stripped of its superficiality, the administration's bloated GNP figure represents tragically little real growth.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the fact that we are putting the cart before the horse, there are plenty of other reasons why we should not rush headlong into an unwise action today. For one thing, I cannot believe there is the urgency here that some have attempted to convince us. There is ample authority to waive the 25-percent gold reserve requirement should a crisis occur. Back in 1963, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin wrote:

> It seems reasonable to conclude that if this country's gold losses should continue to the point where the Reserve banks were unable to comply with the 25 percent statutory reserve requirement, there is ample authority under the present act to meet the situation without disrupting the economy or the international payments mechanism, and to provide time for Congress to consider legislative action.

Mr. Chairman, there is still time today. To act hastily now will produce no solutions, but might instead provide another round of waiting for remedial action, with a continuation of longstanding fiscal irresponsibility.

Our domestic gold reserve is important in a number of ways. It serves as a barrier to printing-press inflation by the executive branch, and it preserves our only national supply of gold. Once the 25-percent gold reserve requirement is repudiated, our entire remaining stock of gold could become the property of foreign speculators. We cannot pursue a policy whereby we could lose our last ounce of gold. There is a crucial need for gold as a strategic material, necessary to the survival of the Nation in time of war, famine, depression, or other national emergency.

In ordinary banking situations, there are defenses against a run on the bank. Each bank is backed by a national government and central bank, which have the power to print paper money. In the last resort they could use that power to provide banks with cash to meet panicky withdrawals. But on the international scene, we have no Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to protect our deposits. Instead, all we have is the shaky confidence that no run will be started by our world trading partners. To remove the gold cover is to rely completely on the intentions of foreign nations.

In 1958, the United States had such a wide margin of monetary-reserve assets over monetary-reserve liabilities that no holder of dollars had any cause for anxiety. We had $20.6 billion of the total world holdings of $38 billion in gold, over half and far greater than the amount of reserves foreigners held in dollars. But right now we have scarcely more than $11 billion out of a $40 billion-plus world gold supply. Therefore, an entirely different financial climate exists in the world today, and we cannot assume that anxious foreign nations will be so reassured by our release of the gold cover that they will leave our remaining gold supply untouched.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like again to quote from my remarks of 3 years ago. "Solutions to the payments problem must be met before we can even hope to achieve world confidence in the American dollar."

I urge my colleagues to reject completely or at least postpone action on this bill. The Congress needs to put the brakes on these so-called emergency measures that fail completely to even approach the real problems facing the financial posture of the Nation.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I plan to support this legislation, though with some reluctance. This is one more of those urgent, rather complex, and not very popular pieces of legislation which this session of Congress seems destined to be faced with in great numbers.

I recognize, of course, the serious international monetary situation which makes this legislation so urgent. With little less than $1 billion in gold now available to us to meet demands for gold on foreign dollar holdings totaling some $31 billion, we could soon find ourselves faced, as the British were recently faced, with some very painful economic decisions, possibly even the disruption of all those international economic exchange procedures that are so important a part of America's present world leadership role.

Indeed, if this legislation were to be defeated on this floor today, we might see such a run on America's remaining gold supply as would force us into an economic crisis almost overnight.

Yet, let us face it, there is still apprehension on the part of many of our citizens that if we do remove the last, remaining gold in our dollar this will lead to the kind of wild, printing press inflation that hit Germany after World War I, when you almost needed a wheelbarrow to carry enough paper money to buy a loaf of bread. The experts, of course, say no. They point out that, strictly speaking, the gold cover requirement does not work now anyway. We have $12 billion in gold. Yet our total money supply today is more than six times this sum or $181 billion, since money supply is measured not by paper currency alone—$45 billion—but by our total bank deposits. And the real restraining factor on bank deposits is not gold at all but the limits imposed by the Federal Reserve System on how much banks can lend; and also, inversely, by the size of the national debt, which can itself increase the total money supply very rapidly.

Personally, I would have preferred to see us remove only a portion of the remaining 25-percent gold cover rather than remove all of it. However, removing the full gold cover will still not really damage our currency and it will not cause inflation. On the other hand, we must be perfectly clear that this move is only a palliative. It does not itself solve any of the imbalances which have led to our present condition. It only buys us a little more time to try to set our house in order. If we are really to solve our international payments problem, then we need to bring those payments promptly back into balance. And even without the gold cover we still need—perhaps we will even need it more—to insist upon other restraints being firmly applied to prevent inflation. However stiff and unpopular these other remedies may prove to be they are still a whole lot better than having to buy a loaf of bread with a wheelbarrow full of paper money.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I came to this debate predisposed by my preliminary study to support this bill. No one can dispute the President's grim estimate of our fiscal situation and its impact on the world economy. No speaker thus far has underrated the urgency for remedial action.

The problem that has led me to reconsider is the nature of the remedy proposed by the bill and the doubt as to whether it is a cure or merely a shinplaster.

In the first place, the bill does not "remove the gold cover" in the sense that gold presently held will suddenly become available in international exchange. The same gold is available today, subject only to the discipline or penalty provided by the act of Congress. Thus the actual thrust of the bill is merely to abolish a fiscal restraint upon the administration.

I do not hold that this restraint might not properly be repealed if there were some prospect that another force or an equal discipline were to be brought to bear to solve not only the symptom, but the real malady. The mournful fact is that the entire debate had only illuminated the fact that the administration makes no such proposal, let alone discloses any specific plan or program. No word of encouragement has been offered that the public as well as the private sector will share in the burden of balancing our international payments.

Under the circumstances, I have concluded that it is better to retain the disciplines provided by an earlier Congress until we are prepared to replace them with a new and better regulation of our own devising. I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support H.R. 14743 in its present form. For my part, too many questions remain unanswered in the insufficient time that has been given to the consideration of this bill.

If the legislation is passed as reported, the decision will be final and irrevocable, for all practical purposes. An act of such irrevocability should be given the most thorough search and consideration. My greatest objection and the one I have been unable to reconcile is that the executive branch, aided and assisted by the Federal Reserve Board, is "passing the buck" to this Congress on the gold cover matter. Under the existing law of the Federal Reserve Act the Board has the authority to waive the 25 percent gold cover requirement for a period of 30 days, and thereafter 15-day waivers may be made. The Board has all the authority it needs to deal with any emergency that may now exist with respect to the requirement for gold to cover Federal Reserve notes.

We have heard arguments well cloaked in descriptions of urgency from those who seek its passage. If the bill passes and the judgments of those who support the bill prove to be wrong, there is little or no chance to restore requirements for gold backing of our currency. On the other hand, if the arguments of those who oppose this bill are invalid, there is still the opportunity to take some subsequent action.

There are some alternatives which should be tried, which will provide time to obtain some practical experience as to how our economy would operate without a gold cover. This measure is one of finality. If repeal is not the answer, we cannot reinstate gold backing. Our gold reserves may then be gone.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I intend to offer a straight motion to recommit this bill. Let me state my reasons for doing this.

As I explained in general debate, I do not favor retention of the gold cover because I believe that a country must tie its currency to gold. On the contrary, most countries do not have gold-backed currencies. What I am afraid of is this: First, that this administration will use gold cover repeal as a Band-Aid and forget about submitting to the necessary financial surgery, and second, that foreign bankers are not going to stop raiding our gold, so that if we expose it, we will lose it—and let us make no mistake about it.

I have heard it said that exposing our gold this way—taking reserves from behind our currency and exposing them to raiders—will bolster international faith in the dollar. As I understand it, the reasoning here is that everybody will figure that the dollar is strong because we are exposing our gold out of confidence in the dollar's strength. Frankly, I find this highly unrealistic. Did the Japanese think that we were strong because we left Pearl Harbor undefended?

Unless our Government takes strong and immediate measures to bolster the dollar—and this includes slashing wasteful domestic and foreign spending—foreign central bankers are going to continue to cash in their dollars for gold. What can we expect? Who would want to hold on to dollars earned under Kennedy and Eisenhower that are now worth less and less? I am afraid that repeal of the gold cover will only open the last of our gold reserves to international speculation, and that as long as present fiscal policies continue, speculation against the dollar—and resultant cashing in of dollars for gold—will continue.

I repeat that I do not care about the gold cover per se. What I care about is opening up these gold reserves to foreign raiders at a time when our policy is so dangerous, so reckless and wasteful, that foreign central bankers can be expected to cash in dollars for gold in ever-increasing quantities. When we lose our gold, where are we? I do not say that gold alone supports our dollar, but no country can lose her gold and have her currency remain strong and stable.

If you want an example of what global interventionism, domestic welfarism and generally wasteful spending can do to a rich and powerful nation, look at Great Britain, which is now "mini-England". The great British banks once dominated the world, and the pound sterling was the principal world currency. Now what do we see? The pound has been devaluated, and the British banks are merging with one another to stay alive in the face of international competition. Unless we want to face Britain's fate, we must try to rebuild the strength of the dollar.

We will not do that with a Band-Aid. We will not do that with a bill that only opens up our gold supply to raiders instead of trying to cure the problems of the dollar.

This preference for the superficial approach is somewhat of a contrast to the position the big spenders of the Great Society take on other issues. How often have we heard that the answer to our summer riots is not police or the National Guard, but all kinds of programs to cure the underlying problems of the slums? Now these same people are telling us to ignore the underlying problem of the international decline of the dollar, and to give gold raiders their chance as a show of "confidence." Maybe we should give guns to Stokely Carmichael as a gesture of confidence in the Great Society?

Now I do not have confidence in either the Great Society or its financial policy. I am afraid of what is going to happen if and when we repeal this gold cover and open the last vaults of Fort Knox to gold-hungry foreigners. I am afraid that they will speculate against the Great Society, its chief medicine man and its wasteful international financial policy—and against its dollar. If they are allowed to take all our gold in the process, it will be a sad day for generations of Americans yet unborn. I urge the defeat of this bill.

CONGRESSMAN ASHLEY AND THE GOLD COVER REQUIREMENT

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago the House Committee on Banking and Currency wisely voted to repeal the legal anachronism restricting the dollar amount of Federal Reserve notes in circulation at any one time to four times the value of gold in the Treasury. This law has existed since both the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve notes were created in 1913. Since 1934 when we decided that the Federal Reserve notes could not be converted into gold, the "gold cover" requirement has existed only to remind us of its archaic uselessness. If I may compare our dollar to a strong, healthy tree, and the gold cover requirement to a useless dead limb, then I should like to emphasize that it is time we did some judicious pruning.

Early in 1965 we pruned another dead limb when we rescinded the 25-percent gold cover requirement against bank deposits. This, like its twin, had also existed since 1913, although at that time and until 1945, the percent of gold reserve against deposits had been 35 percent. With the repeal of this requirement in 1965, we released $5 billion worth of gold to be used to meet foreign demands and domestic requirements on our gold supply. Since then, continued deficits in our international balance of payments have resulted in a continued outflow of gold to such an extent that little free gold remains in our supply to meet future demands.

Our gold supply now amounts to $12 billion. However, $10.7 of this is presently committed by law as a reserve against circulating Federal Reserve notes. The $1.3 billion that remains is all that is free to satisfy both domestic and foreign demands. Relative to domestic requirements, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in 2 years we will issue some $2 billion more in Federal Reserve notes to take care of the needs and requirements of business, commerce, and a growing population. The normal increase in notes, consequently, will absorb some $500 million annually in gold. In addition, we can anticipate releasing a further $150 million or more for domestic artistic and industrial purposes. Together, this means that $700 million or more a year of our free gold supply will be absorbed domestically. Although the position we face is not altogether intolerable, it certainly is not a tenable one in view of world problems and our position as leader of the free world.

Relative to foreign requirements against our gold supply, we cannot predict whether foreign demands for gold will continue at their present rate, increase even greater, or decrease in proportion to our ability to diminish or eliminate our international balance-of-payments deficit, and our ability to retain the confidence of the world in the strength of the American dollar. It is reasonable to assume, however, in light of the President's new balance-of-payments program for reducing our deficits, that foreign owners of American dollars will continue to hold them in greater value than they now hold gold, thus keeping their assets in American dollars where they can draw interest and quickly be put to constructive use in world trade and commerce.

The Federal Reserve System has the authority under the Federal Reserve Act to suspend on a temporary basis the gold reserve requirement of the Federal Reserve banks for a 30-day period, with unlimited 15-day extension privileges. It would certainly use this authority at a time when the reserve requirement would impinge on our international commitments. Such action, however, would only be a temporary measure which would require progressively larger increases in the discount rate as the gold supply moved below 25 percent of Federal Reserve notes in circulation. We must look elsewhere for the problem's solution—and that is to the complete removal of the gold requirement against circulating Federal Reserve notes.

When we sever this relationship between gold and the dollar we are, in effect, severing the umbilical cord that has connected the latter to the former for so many years. It is about time, however, that the dollar stood alone—unfettered by the heavy weight of gold. For it is the dollar that gives gold its value—and it is upon the dollar, not gold, that the free world depends. Legally we take 75 percent of the dollar on faith alone. Actually, however, we take 100 percent of the dollar on faith. By removing this archaic law, we are legally recognizing what we—and the world—have morally recognized for years.

The strength of our dollar in no way depends on the remaining legal tie it has to gold through the cover requirement on Federal Reserve notes—which are, actually, only a small portion of our total money supply. The value of the American dollar, regardless of the form it takes, depends upon the quantity of goods and services it can purchase. It is the strength and soundness of the American economy which stands behind the dollar, and it is the pursuit of policies which results in stable and balanced growth that give both the dollar and our economy their strength.

The primary function of gold since World War II has been international. With the American dollar it stands side by side as an international reserve asset. Together the two constitute the foundation of the system under which the world conducts its monetary affairs. It is a system, moreover, that has served mankind well. One reason why people the world over hold American dollars is their convertibility into gold. This continued confidence is vitally essential to the continued stability of the international monetary system. We are undermining the foundation of this confidence, however, by adhering to an archaic law that restricts at the moment some $10.7 billion of our $12 billion gold supply. For this has led some to question our ability to maintain our policy of free interconvertibility between gold and the American dollar at the fixed price of $35.

There is a general, almost unanimous, agreement among informed people in the monetary, fiscal and economic areas the world over that the United States should pledge its entire gold stock behind the dollar. This is essential, they believe, if we are to continue to maintain the position of economic eminence we hold as a nation in the free world, and if the dollar is to continue to retain the position of distinction it holds as an international asset of value in trade and commerce. Such an act, moreover, will have the beneficial effect of helping to diminish the sudden, sporadic, speculative runs on our gold supply by those who occasionally doubt our resolution to maintain at $35 an ounce the interconvertibility between gold and the dollar.

There undoubtedly may be some who will suffer a moment's memory of nostalgia when we sever this last link tying together gold and the dollar with the monetary past. There may even be some who will imagine that the removal of the gold cover requirement will signal an open season for the unlimited printing of notes. To the former, I can only offer my condolence. To the latter, I would like to emphasize that the supply of notes in circulation is in no way related to the 25-percent gold cover requirement.

This requirement applies only to specific currency issue now in circulation. It has no relationship to the overall money supply, the bulk of which exists in the form of bank deposits. New notes that are issued annually to keep pace with the growing requirements of business and demands of the public are paid for by a corresponding reduction in deposits. Only the composition of the money supply—and not the structure—is affected by the issuance of new notes.

The composition of the money supply is ultimately determined by the decisions of the Federal Reserve. It is decreased or increased in accordance with the desired beneficial effect to be achieved. In the future, as in the past, we can continue to rely, I believe, on the competence and ability of those in the Federal Reserve to manage properly the money supply to the mutual benefit of all Americans and the economic strength of our Nation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to inject myself into this debate because, as you know, it is not my practice to try to involve myself in the legislative responsibilities of other committees, but I cannot refrain from expressing some thoughts that I have in regard to the issue before us.

We can brush aside all of the emotional reasoning; we can brush aside, I believe, the arguments of whether, under different circumstances, we should or should not take this action. We must now face the fact, under existing circumstances, that we have before us this bill which would eliminate the 25-cent gold reserve under each of our dollars, and we must look to the future to determine, if we can, what the consequences might be if this bill is defeated. We must measure against those consequences what the damage might be, if any, by passing it.

Now what, if any, are the dangers if the bill is passed? Do we do anything to increase tight money, or to make it more difficult to borrow money? Do we do anything here to damage the value of the domestic dollar? Is the domestic dollar so frail that 25 cents of some metal gives it credibility that it would not have without that 25 cents? It is impossible for me to reach that conclusion.

On the other hand, what could be the consequences if the bill is not passed?

Mr. Chairman, I must frankly say that I am appalled as I think in terms of what might happen. Nobody knows what will happen. Put yourself in the position, however, of people in other parts of the world who view our action today, possessed as they are of a surplus of dollars that they have earned because of an imbalance of our balance of payments which we have permitted to go forward for many years. They have been told all along that they could have confidence in that dollar because if they wanted to they could swap it back to us for gold based upon a valuation of $35 an ounce. They have used our dollars in part for trade, they have used our dollars in part as a reserve for their own currencies, because of the confidence they have in our dollars and they have maintained confidence in those dollars. But if we say by our action of defeating this bill that we are going to preserve the gold that we have as a basis for the issuance of our own currency, they know that we do not have enough gold on the other hand to make good our promises of redeeming dollars for gold from the central banks abroad.

Now what is that going to do? Do not worry about your speculators, passing this bill is not going to help your speculators.

In my humble judgment, if you send out a message today from the House of Representatives that this bill is defeated, you could create the greatest run on our gold stocks that has ever occurred. Yes, we have had a run on it—but the fact that we have had a run does not of itself give rise to a further run, does it?

Should we not act in a manner that would instill that confidence in the dollar abroad that we want and maintain that confidence in the dollar here at home that we have?

Put yourself in the position of that individual abroad who gets this message from the House of Representatives that we are preserving our gold as a reserve against our currency, and who knows we do not have enough of it to exchange gold for his dollars. It is a fact, without this bill, that we do not have enough; just the way a bank operates—we do not have it.

What is that person to do? If he thinks that is what we are proposing to do by this action, and that is what we have in mind and that we will do that sometime down the road as a result of this action today, what is the natural reaction?

I will tell you what that reaction is: It is to exchange all of their surplus dollars for gold immediately before we put the clamps on. Is that not it?

I ask you to reason it out; I ask each of you to think it through. If you were over there, what would you do if you got this message today that this bill could not pass the House of Representatives because of some emotional feeling—perhaps existing throughout this country—that we were doing something to the dollar that is nothing more than a fiction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I want to instill confidence in the people of the United States in our monetary system.

Mr. MILLS. Then you vote for this bill, my friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, pursuant to House Resolution 1068, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the

engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **FINO**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **FINO**. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINO moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 14743, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 206, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—188

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lukens
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—206

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conable
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McCloskey
McFall
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
Whalen
White
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCulloch

NOT VOTING—36

Brown, Mich.
Casey
Clancy
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Dent
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Flynt
Gude
Hagan
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Jarman
King, Calif.
Kuykendall
McClory
Macdonald, Mass.
Moore
Moss
O'Konski
Passman
Pirnie
Pollock
Quillen
Rivers
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Udall

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Moss against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Casey for, with Mr. Hull against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Everett against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. King of California, against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia for, with Mr. Macdonald, of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Culver against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. **WILLIS** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **McCULLOCH**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. CORMAN. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 190, answered "present" 4, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—199

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal

Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
Whalen
White
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NAYS—190

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gardner
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lukens
McCloskey
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morton
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Hays
Jones, N.C.
McCulloch
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—38

Brown, Mich.
Casey
Clancy
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Daniels
Dent
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Flynt
Gude
Hagan
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Jarman
King, Calif.
Kuykendall
McClory
Macdonald, Mass.
Mink
Moore
Moss
O'Konski
Passman
Pirnie
Pollock
Quillen
Rivers
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Udall

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Daniels for, with Mr. Cowger against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Moore against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Thompson of Georgia against.

Mr. Udall for, with Mr. Casey against.

Mrs. Mink for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hagan with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Holland.

Mr. **JONES** of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RIVERS. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. Moss. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, have a live pair with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. CULVER. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **McCULLOCH**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. CORMAN. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1155) entitled "An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to change the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement of the managers on the part of the House on the bill S. 1155, the Export-Import Bank bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE UNITED STATES-CANADA INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATON

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following resignation from the United States-Canada Interparliamentary Delegation:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., February 19, 1968.*
>
> Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker of the House.*
>
> DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Last year you were kind enough to name me to the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary delegation, and I was proud both of the honor and the opportunity to serve. This year, you may have noted, I am deep in the race for the Senate nomination, and in fairness to someone else who will be able to give the meetings the attention they deserve, I feel obliged to submit my resignation from that delegation.
>
> May I thank you again for your kind thought of me.
>
> Cordially,
>
> OTIS G. PIKE.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. SLACK, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT MAY BE DETERMINED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE, RESPECTIVELY

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, the possibility that the 1968 presidential and vice-presidential elections might be thrown into the House and Senate respectively, is a matter of increasing interest and speculation throughout the country. Some of us have examined the present constitutional provisions on that score and they are extremely cumbersome.

There is no longer time to consider an abolition of the electoral college system prior to the elections, but there is time to update the procedures in the election of the President and Vice President in the two Houses of Congress, if the obligation to choose should devolve upon them.

I am introducing a proposal to make the following changes:

First. The Constitution would be clear that it would be the House elected in 1968 which would make the choice.

Second. Each Member of the newly elected House would have one vote. A quorum would be simple majority of the membership and the candidate receiving the greater number of votes in the House would be elected. The present provisions that the delegation from each State shall have but one vote and that a majority of States shall be necessary to elect are superseded.

Third. The choice shall be made from among the top two candidates in the electoral college rather than the top three. This change, in my opinion, would serve to strengthen our two-party system.

Fourth. The 12th amendment requires that the House shall choose, by ballot, a President. The proposal provides that the roll of the House shall be called and each Member shall announce his vote viva voce. This procedure would constitute a choice by ballot as required by the 12th amendment.

Fifth. In choosing a Vice President, the required quorum in the Senate would be a simple majority, and the candidate receiving the greater number of votes in the Senate would be elected. The Constitution already limits the Senate to the consideration of the top two candidates in the electoral college. The amendment would also make it clear that the choice would be made by the Senate as it is constituted after noon on January 3, 1969.

Mr. Speaker I insert at this point the text of the proposed amendment I am today introducing:

Article —

Section 1. When the right to choose a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives pursuant to the 12th amendment of the Constitution, the choice shall be made by that House whose term of office commences in the same calendar year as the presidential term to be filled, and each Representative present shall have one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall be a majority of the House, and the person receiving the greater number of votes in the House shall be elected. The House shall choose between the two persons receiving the highest numbers of electoral votes on the lists of those voted for as President. The roll of the House shall be called and each Member shall, as his name is called, announce the name of the person for whom he votes. This procedure shall constitute a choice by ballot as required by the 12th amendment.

Sec. 2. When the right to choose a Vice President shall devolve upon the Senate pursuant to the 12th amendment of the Constitution, the choice shall be made at a session of the Senate held in that Congress whose term of office commences in the same calendar year as the vice-presidential term to be filled. A quorum for this purpose shall be a majority of the whole number of Senators, and the person receiving the greater number of votes in the Senate shall be elected.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT MAY BE DETERMINED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE, RESPECTIVELY

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many people feel that the 1968 presidential election will be a very close one. It may even be closer than the presidential election of 1960. In that presidential election a little over 7 years ago, John F. Kennedy received 49.71 percent of the popular vote, and Richard M. Nixon received 49.55 percent of the popular vote.

When the electoral college met in mid-December of 1960 and cast its votes, 303 votes were cast for John F. Kennedy, and 219 votes were cast for Richard M. Nixon.

Let us consider, Mr. Speaker, if we had had in 1960 a third party candidacy such as that now posed by George Wallace—George Wallace claims he is going to win the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina—had he been in the 1960 presidential race and had he won those States, John F. Kennedy would not have had the requisite 270 votes in the electoral college. He would have received only 268, two short of an absolute majority.

And we in this body, Mr. Speaker, would have had the job of selecting the President of the United States who took office on January 20, 1961.

I would like to bring out one further point.

In 1961, 29 State delegations in this body were controlled by Democrats; 17 delegations were controlled by Republicans and four delegations were evenly divided.

The votes of 26 States are required to elect a President, and they will continue to be required if we do not adopt the constitutional amendment recommended by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hutchinson].

Had there been a George Wallace candidacy in 1961, in January, and had he received four State delegate votes in this body, we would have been hamstrung under the present Constitution. We could not have elected either John F. Kennedy or Richard Nixon as President of the United States without a deal being made with George Wallace.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we give attention at once to this problem. The proposal of the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hutchinson] is eminently sound. If we cannot now abolish or reform the electoral college, at least let us guarantee that George Wallace cannot throw sand into the gears of our electoral process in this country. Let us adopt the Hutchinson proposal, and thus insure that this body can honorably elect a President should we be called upon to do so.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is historically true that in the election of 1800 Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr got 73 votes apiece, running for President and Vice President on the Republican ticket. We did not have the 12th amendment at that time so the House of Representatives was forced to make a choice. After 36 ballots, the Members of the House did make a choice and they selected Thomas Jefferson over Aaron Burr. On the 36th ballot the choice was made.

Again in 1824, there was a situation that developed where no candidate for the Presidency got a majority of the electoral votes. In that election Andrew Jackson got the most popular vote and the most electoral votes, but not a majority of the electoral vote.

John Quincy Adams came in second, William H. Crawford came in third, and Henry Clay came in fourth.

So the election of the President was again thrown into the House of Representatives.

In that instance the decision was made in one ballot. But it would be interesting for all Members to read what transpired between the election in November and the decision which was made in the House in January of 1825. There were all kinds of vicious rumors. There were allegations of skulduggery and deals and the like.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to take action on this proposed constitutional amendment, or some variation of it as a constitutional amendment, because it is conceivable that the House of Representatives in January 1969, under the circumstances that we foresee, might be called upon to make a decision. I prefer the proposed procedure or something similar for many reasons.

I feel very strongly that it is better that the will of the people, as expressed in November, be the decision as to the individual who should be President rather than for the House of Representatives to be called upon to make that decision in January of next year, 1969.

COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the largest nonmilitary employer in the Federal Government, the Post Office Department has the obligation to pay its employees just and equitable wages. Congress through the years has become increasingly aware of the overall inequities of the postal pay system and has attempted to remedy the situation by enacting legislation that has provided better pay and fringe benefits for employees.

Unfortunately it is a fact that in dealing with a structure so complex and so large as the postal operation, some areas are often overlooked. When this happens it is necessary to take immediate steps to rectify such unintentional errors.

To do this, to correct an oversight, I am today introducing legislation that will effect two areas, overtime, and employees moving from one pay system to another.

The postal service was behind other Government agencies in formulating a standard policy on overtime compensation. Public Law 89–301 brought order to most of the system and Public Law 90–206 enhanced it. However, certain employees were neglected by both of these laws. I refer specifically to postal inspectors, postal service officers, and regional real estate officers. The reason for the exclusion of these employees was that they generally work odd hours, sometimes over night, as in the case of inspectors, and no formula was devised to cover them. The formula used in my bill is a standard of "no less than 10 percent and no more than 25 percent of an employees annual salary." This computation formula, I think, will allow fair compensation for overtime.

The provisions of my other bill will provide meaningful compensation for those who transfer from the Postal Field System to the General Schedule or vice-versa. At present such transfers, while in fact promotions in regard to responsibilities, often result in mere token salary increases or, in some instances, loss in pay. I feel that salaries should reflect promotions and that is my purpose in introducing this legislation.

Hearings were held this morning by the Subcommittee on Postal Operations on identical bills introduced by Chairman NIX. I would hope that this leads to prompt action on this legislation.

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT CONCERNING "PUEBLO" CREW

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and the rest of this body share with me great concern for the crewmen of the U.S.S. *Pueblo,* who have been held captive for almost a month now since the ship was seized on the high seas by the North Koreans.

The felony was compounded February 20 when the North Korean Government, through a spokesman in Moscow, stated that it intended to punish our 83 crewmen and that any reprisals on our part would result in war between the United States and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my other colleagues to support my plea for decisive action in getting immediate release of these men and our ship. I sent a telegram to the President this very day—February 21—urging him to deal with this grave international problem with all the force necessary. I thought the text of my telegram would be of interest to you, and I submit it in its entirety as follows:

> MR. PRESIDENT: According to the press releases late yesterday and today, the North Koreans have stated their intention to punish the officers and men aboard the *Pueblo,* and further stated that any reprisals on our part would bring about a war between North Korea and the United States.
>
> Mr. President, I respectfully urge you to serve clear and unmistakable notice upon the North Korean Government that if it does not immediately release our ship and return our crew unharmed, it is in danger of suffering the most dire consequences.
>
> I also urge you, Mr. President, to make it clear to the North Koreans that any effort on their part to punish our crewmen will be considered an illegal and hostile act of such international gravity that it would bring down upon them the full might of the United States.
>
> I believe that my convictions regarding this crisis, Mr. President, reflect not only the beliefs of the nearly half-million citizens of my Second Congressional District of Alabama but the national sentiment as well. The United States has shown great restraint in dealing with the *Pueblo* crisis. We have pursued the diplomatic course to a fault. But the patience and tolerance of the American people have been tried to the breaking point.
>
> A failure to take such actions as are appropriate and necessary to show the world that we are capable of defending our citizens and stand ready to do so will inevitably lead to further acts of aggression against the U.S. We must make it clear to the North Koreans that if our men and ship are not released immediately, they will suffer such severe consequences that never again will any nation attempt to seize an American ship and crew on the high seas.

ROCKEFELLER COATTAILS HAVE BEEN WEAK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the current ideas that is being sold to many Republicans throughout the country is that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller would be a strong presidential candidate who could sweep a Republican Congress into office. Aside from the many other shortcomings of Rockefeller for President, I hope my fellow Republicans are not deluded by this unfounded assertion.

Raymond Moley, veteran political observer and a great American, recently wrote a column which puts this whole matter in its proper perspective. Mr. Moley points out that when Rockefeller first ran for Governor there were 26 Republicans and 17 Democrats in the New York delegation to the House of Representatives. After 10 years of his "brand" of Republicanism, the GOP has 15 Republicans and the Democrats, 26. His coattails have been rather short.

During that period of time there have been bad Republican years and good Republican years and, like other States in the Nation, the party in New York should have fared as well at the polls as elsewhere. In my own State of Ohio our Governor has been very strong at the polls and this has helped all of our Republican congressional delegation. I would assume the same would be so in New York if Governor Rockefeller were all he is touted to be.

In pure point of fact, he has been extremely weak at the head of the ticket. In 1966, sizable gains were being scored by Republicans throughout the country in industrial States like Ohio, Michigan, and California. What about New York? Rockefeller was running that year and while we were gaining everywhere else in the country in similar situations, the GOP in New York made no gain in defeating incumbent Democrats. California, Ohio, and Michigan were averaging between four and five new seats but not that first one in New York. Mr. Rockefeller himself was only able to gain 44 percent of the vote at the head of the ticket.

As Mr. Moley concludes, in Rockefeller's hands the New York GOP has not only fared poorly, but to use his words "is dying." One State is enough. Republicans should not extend the "Rockefeller story" to the other 49 States.

That the New York Governor has labored for himself and not others in the GOP is also obvious to anyone who takes the time to look at the records. Dick Nixon traveled in more than 80 congressional districts in the last campaign. Governor Reagan helped Louie Nunn in Kentucky and has toured the country for Republican finance drives. Where has Rockefeller been all of this time? As Mr. Moley concludes:

> The record will show that Rockefeller, since he entered politics in 1955, has done precious little campaigning outside New York except in his own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear. Everyone should study the facts and not fall for the very questionable thesis that a Rockefeller candidacy in 1968 would add strength to the Republican Party. I include the Raymond Moley article at this point:

STRAWS IN WIND—CONGRESSIONAL POLL SHOWS HOW VANE OF FAVOR SHIFTS

(By Raymond Moley)

> The Congressional Quarterly has published the answers given to a questionnaire addressed to all members of Congress. It asked them to name the "strongest possible ticket their party would nominate for the 1968 election." Interest in the returns, of course, centers upon candidates for president.
>
> The replies were, the Congressional Quarterly says, anonymous. It is not surprising that 88.5 per cent of the 156 Democrats who replied named President Johnson. It is surprising that only 12 named Robert Kennedy and not a single one named Eugene McCarthy.
>
> Kennedy may elicit the squeal of the teenagers and the admiration of the disgruntled, but he enjoys little support from his colleagues in Congress, who know him better. And McCarthy must be regarded as one of

the Irishmen of whom it has been said, "they go forth to battle but they always fall."

Of the 130 Republicans who responded, 69 named Nelson Rockefeller, 49 Richard Nixon, four George Romney and three Ronald Reagan. I have a number of reflections upon these Republican replies. And they are somber comments upon politics and public opinion.

I have often noted over the years how fleeting and insubstantial is gratitude among already elected public officials. I say "elected" because in political life there is a great disparity between the memories of people who have won elections and of the professional workers who helped get them the votes.

The party leader who labors long and hard to mobilize the votes, often without hope of reward, is quick after election to thank the people who have helped. But a great majority of the men for whom all their efforts have been expended believe after they are elected that it was their virtues alone that won.

The record will show that Rockefeller, since he entered politics in 1955, has done precious little campaigning outside New York except in his own behalf.

And there is little evidence that Rockefeller as governor has made any real effort to increase the state's Republican representation in the House. Before his election as governor, New York sent 26 Republicans and 17 Democrats to Washington.

After eight years when Rockefeller has been the actual head of his party in New York, the state has 15 Republicans and 26 Democrats in the House of Representatives. Thus, the New York GOP is dying in his hands.

I have done a bit of investigating about the attitude of the 69 members who named Rockefeller. They would defend themselves against a charge of ingratitude by saying that their vote for Rockefeller did not express a personal preference.

They were merely saying that they believe that if Rockefeller were nominated he would be more likely to defeat LBJ.

My answer to that is that they are not novices in politics. The public believes they are experts. And they know when they predicted as they did that thousands would think as they do about the prospects. Their course would have been to abstain from responding to such a question. And apparently 93 members of Congress did just that—abstain.

The next question is how have they learned that Rockefeller would be more likely to succeed than Nixon. Presumably from the always unreliable polls. Thus, their opinion is no better than the opinion of the people who responded to the polls. The echoes of the inexpert people in the streets.

Instead of intelligently calculating all the pluses and minuses involved in a Rockefeller or Nixon candidacy, they merely put out a wet finger in the wind. They let this wet finger do their thinking. This is a sad commentary on representative government. Legislators more often follow than lead public opinion. They follow Pickwick's advice and join the biggest crowd.

LABOR LOOKS AT THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include with my remarks a speech made by Mr. Meany of the AFL–CIO in Miami.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the most powerful voice in shaping the programs and policies of the Nation is the voice of the people. We who serve in the Congress should be particularly aware of that. In the foreword to the pamphlet, "Labor Looks at Congress," a detailed review of the first session of the 90th Congress by the federation's Department of Legislation, AFL–CIO President George Meany emphasizes that point, and urges union members to make their voices heard on Capitol Hill. With unanimous consent, I now include Mr. Meany's statement in the RECORD, as follows:

This pamphlet tells the story of the first session of the 90th Congress.

Neither we in the AFL–CIO nor the American people as a whole can find much satisfaction in the record.

It is true that limited progress was made in a few directions. Consumer protection was strengthened, notably by the meat bill. Social Security benefits were increased, though inadequately and only at the cost of an incredible retrogression in the field of public welfare.

It is also true that the major new programs established by the 89th Congress survived, at least on paper, despite attempts by the conservative coalition to destroy them.

But in general the record of the 90th Congress to date can be summed up in five words—inadequate funding and unfinished business.

The price exacted by the conservative coalition for the survival of social progress was a drastic cut in the money provided to achieve it. Appropriations were inadequate in every case and pitiful in many. The obvious intent was to starve out programs which the conservatives could not, or did not dare, repeal.

None of the new programs escaped unscathed; among the hardest-hit were education at all levels; health measures of every kind; model cities and rent supplements; the poverty program.

The list of unfinished business is far too long to recite here; it is set forth at the end of this pamphlet. A shocking amount of it is not only unfinished, but not even started.

The whole matter of job creation for the hard core unemployed, so urgent in this time of urban crisis, can no longer be delayed.

Equally serious and brooking no further delay is the need for a massive housing program for low and middle income citizens.

Further steps toward the assurance of equal rights and equal opportunity for all, in particular open housing, must now be taken.

The long-overdue emancipation of agricultural workers, giving them the same legal status as other workers, finally became the subject of House and Senate hearings, but was not reported to the floor of either house.

Bills that can only be described as punitive and anti-labor in character are still pending in both houses. Situs picketing, a simple legislative measure which nearly everyone claims to endorse, still has not been enacted. Labor must and will fight all anti-labor legislation and must and will continue its campaign for situs picketing.

The 90th Congress is only at the halfway point. Although there is no realistic hope that it will approach the record of its predecessor, it can do better than it has done to date.

But it won't do better unless you, the people back home, do your part. What the 90th Congress does in its second session will be determined, not by lobbyists or by official spokesmen, but by constituents who make their voices heard.

In 1967 these voices rescued a good meat inspection bill from forces that would have fatally weakened it, and saved the whole complex of poverty and urban programs from what loomed as inevitable ruin.

In 1968 these voices must be stronger than ever. They must speak up for the unfinished, un-started and under-funded programs cited in these pages. They must make certain that the key education measures that will come up for renewal this year—the higher education and vocational education bills—are strengthened, not weakened.

Above all else, the people of America must insure that their legislators support their President and their armed services in Vietnam and that our defense of freedom in Vietnam is not used as a false excuse for halting progress at home.

The 90th Congress may not win a place in history but we cannot yet afford to write it off as hopeless. It is our job—your job—to make sure that the 90th Congress does its very best. Let us approach the second session in that spirit and with that resolve.

WALT W. ROSTOW PUTS VIETCONG TET OFFENSIVE INTO PROPER PERSPECTIVE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following the Communist attack on Saigon and various other cities in South Vietnam during the Tet holiday, Presidential Assistant Walt W. Rostow put into proper perspective the meaning of these attacks, and he pointed out quite properly that these attacks had actually helped strengthen the Government of Saigon, and alerted the people of South Vietnam to the terrorism of the Vietcong and the cruelty of the Communists.

Some of the papers in this country have taken issue with Mr. Rostow's interpretation of the Communist offensive. I would like to put in the RECORD today the text of Mr. Rostow's press conference held at Indian Wells, Calif., last weekend. I believe all of my colleagues will want to see Mr. Rostow's entire statement, and see how he arrived at his conclusion, and I am sure that we will all agree that indeed his conclusion is correct when we read his entire statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Walt W. Rostow:

Mr. ROSTOW. The cities have been hit hard. There is a great deal of human suffering. There are refugees. The people were frightened. That is a part of it.

The other part of it is that the cities of South Vietnam have, in the whole history of the war in Indo-China, especially the larger cities, been virtually untouched. People could live a relatively normal life in urban terms in a developing nation.

To many of them, the VC were rather abstract. They were not abstract in the villages of Vietnam, but in the cities people could think about them, be philosophical and discuss them. People could afford living in relative security to discuss the Government, its weaknesses.

As I read the cables, the effect of the first wave of attacks was to force people to take a clearer view of where they stood, vis-a-vis the VC on the one hand and the Government on the other.

As for the VC, the first and most primitive fact is that they came in proclaiming they were coming to take over the cities and they failed. They did great damage. They terrorized. They assassinated. But in terms of their own proclaimed objective, which was very widely circulated among the South Vietnamese people—namely, that they were going to overthrow the Government and establish their own rule—they failed.

They even circulated the rumor that the Americans were conniving with them to overthrow the Government.

Aside from the failure of the effort, as General Walt said, people were shocked by the reality of two things: The simple brutality of the VC, and their violation of Tet.

Third, I think that the people of Vietnam were moved by the courage of their soldiers and police and the Americans who fought side-by-side with them.

I think it was in Hue, General Walt, if I am not mistaken, that for the first time simple citizens came out to bring food to both the South Vietnamese and the Amercan soldiers when they were fighting. For the first time, the police stations have been flooded with telephone calls in Saigon, of people telling them where the VC were. The Government was put to a great test. People felt that perhaps the Government should have protected them, but they understood the surprise of attacking in Tet.

But the real measure of the Government was, A, whether it succeeded in throwing the VC out; B, whether it succeeded in feeding the people, which was not easy in some of those cities; C, whether they were capable of looking after the civilian wounded; D, whether they could get the garbage out, which carried with it the threat of plague; and then to begin to look after the refugees.

We are conscious that the Government of South Vietnam is in a kind of goldfish bowl in the world and is often criticized. But as a student of developing nations, and knowing something about the Governments, the weaknesses and strengths in developing nations all over the world, in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, I don't think one can judge the performance of the Government of South Vietnam in these weeks as anything but good, very good.

They pulled together all the elements of strength and executive energy. When I list these things, food, medicine, garbage, health, refugees, I am listing a series of anxieties that came through the cables, each of which represented fear of a mortal breakdown. And that didn't come.

Now something else. All manner of political groups outside the Government representing the sects, representing major political figures, like Dr. Suu and others, in the face of this rallied to the Government.

In these weeks, I would say that in the cities of South Vietnam, you come closer to a sense of nationhood than you ever have before.

You must understand the meaning of these attacks from the Communist point of view.

I believe it was in the Washington Post last week there was an article summarizing the views of a good many Frenchmen about the battle in Vietnam, whether Khe Sanh would be a Dien Bien Phu.

One of them, you may recall, cited a statement of General Giap, who said, "I am not a western general, You must not judge me by those standards. I am a Marxist. All my military operations have a purpose."

It is very clear what the political purpose of the first wave of attack was. We have it in documents; we have it in prisoners. They were trying to eliminate from the equation in Vietnam the two institutions, if you like, which distinguish their struggle with the Americans from their struggle with the French.

The two institutions are, first, a national army, the ARVN, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam; the other is this Constitutional Government. In all their propaganda, they never cease to refer to the Government as the Thieu-Ky clique. They never cease to refer to the ARVN except as a puppet force.

They are obsessed with their memories of 1954. What they were trying to do in the first wave of attacks was to eliminate from the equation the two elements that distinguish the United States from France. We are not there to maintain a colonial empire. We are there to help a nation find its feet and to make its decisions, relieved of aggression.

That is their greatest concern—the fact that a legitimate Government, supported by the people, might emerge; that a national army with a national spirit might emerge.

That is why he hit at Tet. They knew that the ARVN soldiers would, in substantial part, be home on leave. So they hit at the weakest point. And they knew that the Government would expect this. No man bred in Vietnamese culture would accept this. So it was an extraordinary event.

The Government did not fall. It pulled itself together and did its job. The ARVN, although under strength, did a magnificent job. One of the reasons for this pervasive new pride in the ARVN, to which General Walt referred, which all observers note, is that they took the full weight of the attack, rolling up a Sunday punch of 60,000 men, at perhaps half strength—and they did the job.

They took twice as many casualties as we in the American Armed Forces. They had to do the job. It was an urban job. It was an intimate job.

Let's be clear. You don't take a blow like this and not suffer. Human beings have been killed. People are frightened. Both forces came in from the countryside.

Certain, not all, of course, of the hamlets where work has been done have been overrun, but some have been. It is a mean and tragic circumstance in human terms.

But in terms of the ultimate objective of the VC in these attacks, which was written in their documents and then carried out in practice with almost a pedantic precision, they failed to do what they wanted to—which was to strip the United States of the symbols of what we stand for there, an independent national army and a Constitutional Government, and leave us naked to negotiate with them what they would call an "honorable defeat".

So it is a balance sheet. We are in the middle of a battle which is unresolved. As General Walt will tell you, you don't really count the end to a battle until it is fought.

But from their own documents, from their own interrogations after the attack, they failed to achieve their strategic objective, and may have left the ARVN and the Government stronger institutions than before they attacked.

Question. General Walt, with the speed-up of troops being sent to 10,000, the additional 10,000, do you feel there is enough men to handle the job in I Corps?

General Walt. I have been away from there too long to evaluate the situation. I want to say this, though, about I Corps and particularly Danang: I don't think it has been brought out very clearly. Danang is a city of nearly some 300,000 people. A lot of refugees are around there, too. That city has been secure from the first day that this started.

I think this is a great thing for the people who are responsible for the security of Danang in the job they have been doing there. The Viet Cong guerrilla and the main force were not able to get into that city and raise havoc.

I think this is a plus that we ought to talk about sometime.

Mr. Christian. Is there anything else?

Question. Is the President still with General Eisenhower?

Mr. Christian. The President still is with General Eisenhower.

The Press. Thank you.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks following mine on this subject today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Pucinski). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Estonians are a remarkable people in many ways: they are one of the oldest national groups in Northeastern Europe; though thoroughly Europeanized, they are of Asiatic origin, having arrived in their present homeland centuries before our era; and they are among the bravest of fighters for freedom and independence.

These gallant souls, seldom numbering more than one million throughout their history, have a long and turbulent past, but until their subjection to Russia's czars in 1710 they had succeeded in retaining their freedom, at least in part of their country. Then when they became subjects of the czars, they resented living under Russian autocracy and worked to free themselves. But as they themselves were not powerful enough to do this alone, they had to await until the overthrow of Russia's decrepit autocracy in 1917. In February 24 of 1918 they proclaimed their national independence. Thus came into being the Estonian Republic.

During the two decades between World Wars I and II they lived, worked and enjoyed their much-deserved freedom to the full under their own chosen democratic institutions. In that short period these hardy descendants of Asiatic migrants made their homeland a haven for themselves, and their government a model democracy. It was accepted internationally and took its place in the League of Nations.

This happy interlude was abruptly cut short by the events of the last war. As a matter of fact their independence was one of the early casualties of the war. In 1940 the Red army attacked Estonia and overran it, and it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Free and independent Estonia ceased to exist, and since then Estonians have not known freedom in their homeland.

Being rigidly regimented and held down by the agents of the Kremlin, the Estonian people who remain in their native land are not even allowed to celebrate the observance of their Independence Day. It is left to us, therefore—the people of free countries in general, and of the United States with its special heritage of hard-won freedom in particular—to observe the 50th anniversary of that memorable day.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks today I would like to include a highly interesting and informative factsheet on

Estonia, which briefly sets forth the history, the people, the culture, and the economy of Estonia:

REBIRTH OF A NATION

Fifty years ago, on February 24, 1918, the declaration of independence adopted by the Council of Elders of the democratically elected Estonian Diet was proclaimed as the Manifesto to all Peoples of Estonia whereby ". . . by virtue of the right of self-determination of nations . . . Estonia in her historical and ethnic boundaries is declared to be an independent democratic Republic".

At the restoration of independence, which the Estonians had lost centuries ago, the ambitions and future hopes of the founding fathers of the Republic were expressed in the final sentences of the Manifesto:

"Estonia! Thou standest on the threshold of a hopeful future in which thou will be free and independent in determining and directing thy fate. Start building a home of thy own, to be ruled by right and order, so as to be a worthy member of the family of civilized nations".

Facing a difficult challenge and struggle, the profoundly religious Estonian people prayed then, as they are doing now, in the words of their National Anthem "May God watch over thee, my dear homeland"—

"Su üle Jumal valvaku,
Mu armas isamaa!"

ESTONIA: COUNTRY, PEOPLE, CULTURE, ECONOMY

Location

Estonia is the northernmost of the Baltic countries, surrounded in the West and North by the Baltic Sea and the Gulf of Finland, in the East by Lake Peipus and Russia, and in the South by the Republic of Latvia.

Area

The area of Estonia totals 47,549 sq. km. or 18,370 sq. miles. Thus the territory of Estonia is larger than that of Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark or Albania; or about two and a half times the size of Israel.

In comparison there can also be mentioned that the area of Estonia is larger than each of the following States of the U.S.: Maryland, Massachusetts, Delaware, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, New Jersey or Hawaii, corresponding approximately to the combined areas of New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island.

People and language

The Estonians belong to the family of Finno-Ugric nations, of which group the most southern are the 10 million Hungarians and the most northern the 4.6 million Finns. Several millions of the Finno-Ugric group are spread in Northern Russia over the area from the Baltic Sea to the Ural mountains.

The Estonians, as well as the other Finno-Ugric nations have nothing in common with the Slavs or the Teutons, neither by race nor language.

According to the classification by Professor Sidney S. Culbert of the University of Washington, commonly used in American reference books, the Estonian language is listed as being one of the principal languages of the world.

The population of Estonia before World War II was homogeneous: out of the ca. 1.2 million inhabitants, 88.1 per cent were Estonians, whereas the minority groups of Russians, Germans, Jews, Swedes, etc., constituted altogether 11.9 per cent of the total population. The Republic of Estonia was the first in the world to have effectively solved its problems of minorities, by granting them a wide national and cultural autonomy with the Cultural Autonomy Act of 1925.

History

The Estonians have inhabited their present territory at the strategically important shores of the Baltic Sea for at least five to six millenniums, as substantiated by archaeological discoveries. Already the Roman historian Tacitus (A.D. 55–118) tells in his treatise "Germania" that at his time Estonia was an established "national area."

The attacks against Estonian independence began mainly in the course of the expansion of Western Christendom towards the East in the late twelfth century. The German Order of Fratres Militiae (Brothers of the Militia of Christ or also called Brothers of the Sword) was founded mainly for the crusade expeditions to the Baltic area. After a war of nearly three decades, when also the Danish King Waldemar II had invaded Northern Estonia, the Estonians were finally forced to surrender in 1227 and their territory was divided between the conquerors.

Having been an arena for several wars and finding itself under various shifts of supreme power, Estonia became a province of Russia in 1721.

After Estonia had proclaimed its independence in 1918 as a democratic republic, Soviet Russia attacked Estonia in the same year with the aim of conquering the country. During their War of Independence the Estonians repulsed the Red Army and in 1920 concluded a favorable peace treaty with Soviet Russia. Moreover, in the summer of 1919, a series of fierce battles had to be fought simultaneously in the South, where the German Landeswehr and Iron Division were defeated in their attempt to overrun Balticum.

Resurgence of subjugated people

When Russia two and a half centuries ago, after the Great Northern War, conquered Estonia, the "scorched earth" method of the Russians left the country completely devastated. As the Russian General Sheremetjev reported to the Czar: "There is nothing left to destory; not a cock crows from Lake Peipus to the Gulf of Riga."

But the laborious and tenacious Estonian people recovered again, as they had many times before, and once more Estonia became the outpost of Western culture in Eastern Europe. The history of Estonian literature is documented by the publication of the first book in the Estonian language in 1535. The University of Tartu (Dorpat) was founded in 1632. By comparison it may be mentioned that the first university in Russia, the University of Moscow, was founded only in 1755, and the oldest university in the United States, Harvard, was founded in Cambridge, Mass., in 1636.

Despite the fact that Estonia was forced to endure Czarist Russian reactionary rule for two centuries, the Estonian people achieved an exceptionally high educational level. As stated in the official publication of the Central Statistics Board of the Soviet Union, there were 70.4 per cent illiterates among the inhabitants of Russia proper in 1897, whereas illiteracy in the province of Estonia amounted to only 3.8 per cent.

At present time, while Estonia is under Soviet occupation, the latest Soviet data, show an overall percentage of illiteracy in the Soviet Union to be 1.5, whereas the respective figure for Estonia is only 0.4 per cent.

The Estonians can be particularly proud of their folklore which has won recognition for its originality, colorful variety and great artistic value. Its collections in the Folklore Archives in the university-city Tartu are by volume and arrangement among the richest in the world.

As a particular feature of Estonian national culture, gigantic singing festivals are held traditionally every five years since 1869. These unique concerts are performed by joint choirs ranging 20,000–25,000 singers, and massed brass bands of 5,000 players. The audience on these festivals frequently exceeds 100,000 people.

Estonians have also achieved noticeable results in almost every field of sports. International Grand Master Paul Keres is known as one of the strongest chessmen in the world and has won special fame as a chess theoretician. Track and field events, amateur wrestling and ball games proved to be the strongest points for Estonian athletes. Several world and European records of these sports were held by Estonian sportsmen, and the wrestler Kristjan Palusalu is in the history of modern Olympic Games the first and only one to obtain (1936 in Berlin) both a gold medal in heavyweight and the title of world champion in both Greco-Roman and Free styles.

One of the sports in which Estonians excelled was marksmanship. In this field, before the Soviet occupation of Estonia, the majority of world records and titles of world champions in sharpshooting belonged to Estonians. As the most notable achievement for Estonian marksmen was the winning of the famed Argentine Trophy in 1937 and in 1939, the Estonian team of marksmen being the first and since then the only one in the world to win that trophy in two consecutive competitions. The Communist occupants "confiscated" that trophy from Estonian marksmen and executed most of them by a shot in the neck.

Economy

Already before World War I Estonia had a remarkable position as an industrial country, especially in the fields of cellulose and textile industries. For instance, the Narva cotton mills with 50,000 spindles were at that time the largest in Europe. During the independence period Estonia exported electric motors, telephone apparatuses and other manufactured goods to various countries, as well as cellulose, canned food, candies, chocolate and liquors to the United States.

More than one half of the Estonian national production for export came from its highly developed agriculture. Estonian butter and bacon competed successfully on the world markets.

However, the greatest Estonian industrial achievement was the development of the oil shale industry which produced fuel oil, gasoline, asphalt and scores of other chemical products. In North-Eastern Estonia there exists a huge reserve of at least 5,500 million tons of oil shale which the Estonians started mining in 1918 for use as fuel in factories and for railroad engines. As there was no known process for distilling oil from oil shale, the Estonians became the pioneers in this field. Already in 1921 a newly developed cracking process was put into use and in a few years a large oil manufacture grew up. Next to Russia and Romania, Estonia became an important oil producing country in Europe, satisfying its own oil needs and exporting besides heavy oils and automobile gasoline also aviation gasoline of high quality.

(Since their occupation of Estonia, the Soviets have greatly expanded that industry, and are now predatorily exploiting those valuable treasures of the Estonian soil. Most of the products are being used in furthering Soviet economy, while Estonians themselves are generally deprived of those benefits of the natural resources of their own country.)

During its independence Estonia—due to its natural resources, its highly developed agriculture, its profitable industries and its hard-working people—was economically a very stable country. The best proof of this stable economical basis may be found in the Estonian currency, which was covered by 59 per cent in gold and foreign hard currencies, such as the U.S. dollar and the British pound sterling.

On account of the aforementioned, Estonians may feel much satisfaction and even pride in everything they had been able to attain in the prosperous climate of freedom and independence. However, at present time their lot is of the conquered and they can but pray to God that justice will prevail in the world, and their ancient native country shall enjoy freedom and independence soon again.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 50th anniversary of Estonia's independence. On that day, in 1918, these sturdy and stouthearted people, who had suffered more than 200 years under autocratic Russian czars and still had not given up their hope for freedom, attained their national goal by proclaiming their independence and founded the Estonian Republic.

That day marked a great turning point in their modern history. From then on they were free in their beautiful homeland, and in freedom set up their own democratic government. They worked hard, and were remarkably successful in making their homeland a model democracy. Under their dedicated leaders the importance of little Estonia grew, and in international affairs of Europe they played their role, especially in the maintenance of peace. For a while they were among the most happy and contented peoples in all Europe. Peace and prosperity were their goal, and they attained these in their homeland. Then suddenly all this was changed for the worse, ushering in tragedy to them.

The Second World War robbed the Estonians of their homeland and of their freedom, and made them subjects of totalitarian tyrannies. All this happened within 1 year and the Estonian Republic became a historic memory.

On August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed a treaty of nonaggression. This treaty was supplemented by a strictly secret protocol, according to which Estonia, Latvia, part of Lithuania, Finland, and certain other areas of Eastern Europe were placed under the Soviet sphere of influence.

Shortly thereafter the Soviet Union imposed a treaty of alliance upon Estonia, and by the end of August 1940, the tragic conversion of Estonia into a Soviet colony was completed. Since that fateful year these once free and gallant people have not known freedom. For nearly three decades they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny, maintained over them by the minions of the Kremlin.

Estonia, though oppressed and exploited, will never reconcile herself to the status of a Soviet colony.

This flagrant incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union has never been recognized by the United States, and never should be.

Fortunately, today their lot is somewhat better than it was a decade ago, and they are allowed to enjoy some "freedoms," but still theirs is an unenviable lot. On the observance of the 50th anniversary of their Independence Day we hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny.

As we commemorate the anniversary of Estonia's Independence Day, we must reaffirm the hopes of the people of Estonia for the return of self-determination—their zeal for independence must be kept alive by our support. We must use all the resources of diplomacy, morality, and world public opinion in a continued effort to free these captive people.

Living, as they are, under the brutal yoke of Soviet imperialism, it is more important than ever that they know of our continuing fidelity to the ideal of Estonian independence.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, lying on the southern shores of the Gulf of Finland and adjoined immediately on the east by the U.S.S.R. is the northernmost and smallest of the Baltic countries, Estonia. On February 24, Estonians throughout the free world will recognize the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Estonia's independence as a democratic republic.

In the few short years of her independence, Estonia advanced rapidly, adopting a democratic constitution, undertaking radical agrarian reforms, partitioning the large estates, and achieving economic and financial stability by 1925. Commercially, Estonia oriented herself toward Germany and England; politically, toward her Baltic neighbors and the Scandinavian nations. Necessitated by her tenuous geographical location, as her history of domination by other nations would readily testify, Estonia negotiated nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union and other powers.

Mr. Speaker, in September 1939, after slightly more than 20 years of relative freedom from outside intervention, Estonia was compelled by the U.S.S.R. to permit the establishment of military bases on her islands, and less than 1 year later, she was occupied by Soviet forces and forced to submit to Soviet rule. Save for 3 years of German occupation during World War II, Estonia has remained under the domination of the Communist Soviet regime.

Sovietization of the country was accompanied by a ruthless reign of terror to insure the entrenchment of the communist-style of government whose "success" depends upon the subservience of the individual and the suppression of dissent. While other countries under the sphere of Soviet influence have suffered this same fate during the last 50 years, the spirit and hope of those who once knew freedom remain alive.

This deep-seated reverence of the democratic way of life and the unrelenting quest for self-determination is aptly reflected by the Estonian World Council:

> Estonia thus oppressed and exploited will never reconcile herself to the status of a Soviet colony. Soviet colonialism is a strange oddity, especially at a time when the principles of freedom and self-determination for all peoples in the world have found universal recognition as the guiding idea of this century's international life and is being placed in practice in all parts of the world. The Estonian people are fighting for the recognition and application of these same principles in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, lest we forget these principles for which the American people have and will continue to stake their lives, let us honor this occasion as a reminder that freedom will never be guaranteed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24, throughout the world, people of Estonian ancestry are observing their Independence Day. Fifty years ago the people of Estonia declared themselves independent from Soviet Russia and created a democracy.

The freedom of the Estonians lasted but a few years between the two World Wars. In the 1940's this small country was ravaged by the Armies of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Estonia remains in bondage to Russia today—a military occupation which the United States has never recognized.

Today we pause to honor and recognize the freedom-loving people of Estonia. Their quest for liberty burns as a flame of hope to those who are enslaved and serves as an inspiration to all mankind.

It makes me proud to salute the brave people of Estonia. May those still in bondage realize new hope and courage because of this anniversary. I join those of Estonian ancestry in looking hopefully for the day when their country will again be numbered among the free nations of the world.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24, Americans of Estonian descent will observe the 50th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Unfortunately, the brave people of Estonia are now among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland because of the tyranny of their Red rulers.

We must rededicate ourselves, therefore, on this great historic day for the Estonians, to continued efforts to see that freedom is restored to these proud people and all the other captives of communism.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the tsarist government fell and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress.

Mr. Speaker, may I reemphasize that the Estonians are a distinct nationality who are at the present time being subjected to a most insidious form of genocide practiced by the dictators of the Soviet Union and that legitimate world opinion should rally behind these subjugated people of Estonia.

In addition to commemorating these national days we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive people of communism. I again urge that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established.

I also stress once more, Mr. Speaker, my belief that the Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Estonia. I believe the Estonian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering it to them to counteract the brainwashing of constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war known up to that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see the human carnage stop, and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some people 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them the reward for which they had been struggling for generations. In that year they regained their national independence, and the Estonians were among them.

These sturdy people had settled in their historic land long before the beginning of our era. There, in the northernmost output of Europe, they led a quiet and contented but hardy and strenuous life. They were—and still are—one of the smallest ethnic groups in all Europe, but they succeeded in maintaining their national identity and freedom.

Then in 1710 they were brought under the oppressive czars of Russia. For more than two centuries they endured that detested autocracy, and they fought against it for their freedom. Toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist regime in Russia was gone, they felt free and on February 24 of 1918, proclaimed their national independence.

That was half a centry ago, and today independent Estonia has ceased to exist. After the happy and joyful two decades of interwar years, Estonia became one of the early casualties of the last war, and unhappy Estonians were the helpless victims. Today for nearly three decades these stouthearted people have been suffering under despotic rule, during most of that time under Communist tyrants. However, they still cherish their national goal: their freedom. On the 50th anniversary observance of their independence day we friends and sympathizers join them in the attainment of their national goal, their independence.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Estonian heritage are justly and rightly proud of their past for their ceaseless struggle against their oppressors. These dauntless and hardy people lived under the autocracy of Russia's czars and were persecuted by their callous overlords for more than two centuries. During that time they suffered and sacrificed much in their homeland, but they steadfastly clung to their national goal: the attainment of national independence.

They had to await long before the realization of that goal. Finally, 50 years ago, on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and founded the Estonian Republic.

Then for about two decades, during the interwar years, they enjoyed their richly deserved and hard-won freedom. But this happy interlude was abruptly broken early in the last war. Russia again—not the czars this time, but Communist Russia—was the villain. The men in the Kremlin decided to put an end to an independent and free Estonia. The Red army invaded and overwhelmed Estonia in mid-1940; the Estonian people lost their freedom and were enslaved by their heartless conquerors.

Since the incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union, these freedom-loving people have not known freedom in their homeland. They still suffer Communist totalitarian tyranny. There cannot be any talk of observing their independence day there, but we here in this great Republic join hands with all Americans of Estonian heritage, solemnly observe the 50th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, and echo their genuine patriotic sentiment for freedom and independence.

THE OTEPKA CASE—A SYMPTOM OF STATE DEPARTMENT DECAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, not since the infamous Dreyfus case rocked high-level bureaucratic France has there been a case of coverup and duplicity by government to equal the Otto Otepka ordeal.

This courageous public servant has been subjected to official State Department intimidation, harassment, and character assassination. But in his indomitable fight for vindication he is bringing to light the sordid behind-the-scenes intrigue by those constitutionally mandated to conduct our foreign policy. And he is winning, slowly but surely.

His case gives a penetrating insight into questionable State Department policies which have found lax security, favoritism, subversion, immorality, and dishonesty tolerated if not fostered, while at the same time honest public servants are given the kangaroo court or official cold-shoulder treatment. When you study the Otto Otepka matter, you are inclined to exclaim, "No wonder we are losing."

In a Department as sensitive as the Department of State, the issue of security, needless to say, is of paramount importance. The Otepka case takes on added significance, for other abuses, as noted above, have multiplied the dangers to our national security in the present life and death struggle which now confronts us. In the area of security alone, one need only review recent history and the irreparable damage done to other free nations to appreciate the compelling necessity for ever-watchful practices here. We need men such as Otto Otepka, Harry Hite, and Edwin Burkhardt diligently guarding our security, and men of the strike of Stephen A. Koczak and David G. Nes implementing our foreign policy with our national interests uppermost in mind.

PHILBY, BURGESS, AND MACLEAN

The vital need for unbreachable security procedures has been pointed up during the past two decades by many cases of defections, disappearances, suicides, arrests, scandals, and the like, but nowhere, not even in the phenomenal Richard Sorge case, have there been situations to rival those of Harold "Kim" Philby, Guy Burgess, and Don Maclean.

These three men managed to accumulate well over 50 years of communism and aim their spying efforts at the heart of both British and American security. All three were members of the British Foreign Service and all three managed to defect to the Soviet Union, the land of their allegiance.

This traitorous trio had been won over to the Communist cause while at college at Cambridge in the 1930's. All three later served in the United States as representatives of Britain in various capacities and all were privy to highly sensitive information. Philby, for instance, was the liaison between the British Secret Intelligence Service and the CIA in the United States. Maclean served as secretary of the United States-British Combined Policy Committee on Atomic Development. This position gave him nearly unlimited access to the tightly guarded Atomic Energy Commission files in Washington. Burgess was at one time assistant private secretary to the Minister of State and in 1948 was transferred to the Far Eastern Department. In 1951, Burgess and Maclean fled from Great Britain and subsequently turned up in the Soviet Union. In the same year Philby was asked to resign from the Foreign Office, and 13 years later he too found his way to the Soviet Union. The records of Burgess and Maclean before their defection were such that former CIA Chief Allen Dulles stated:

> Neither a Burgess nor a Maclean should ever have been allowed to have anything to do with classified matters. Even a reasonably casual review of their activities during the years before their defection should have resulted in their dismissal, and Burgess never should have been hired in the first place.

Vladimir M. Petrov, a Soviet MVD agent in Australia who defected to the West on April 3, 1954, clarified the backgrounds and activities of the two spies in these excerpted statements of sworn testimony:

> Burgess and Maclean were long term agents who had each been independently recruited to work for Soviet intelligence in their student days at Cambridge University.
>
> Their flight was planned and directed from Moscow.
>
> (During a period in London after the War) Burgess was bringing out brief cases full of Foreign Office documents, which were photographed in the Soviet Embassy and quickly returned to him.

Petrov stated that he received this information directly from an assistant in the Embassy, Filipp Kislitsyn, who was involved with receiving the stolen documents. In fact, Kislitsyn was an MVD cipher clerk in the Soviet Embassy in London and, Petrov stated:

> Kislitsyn used to encipher the more urgent information and cable it to Moscow; the rest he prepared for despatch by courier in the diplomatic bag.

This same Kislitsyn was later recalled to Moscow and trained to handle a special one-man section of the top-secret archives.

Petrov continues:

> This section was devoted solely to the great quantity of material supplied by Maclean and Burgess. Much of it had not even been translated or distributed to the Ministries concerned, but Kislitsyn used to show particular files and documents to high-ranking officials who visited his section for the purpose.

The same congressional committee which received the testimony of defector Petrov also reported what might be a totally unpublicized area of Donald Maclean.

The committee reported that it heard in closed session a number of Americans who testified to the activities of Burgess and Maclean. These hearings were "designed to determine the possible involvement of our people here":

> [The investigators have] the identity of a long series of individuals who were intimates of the pair here. In this connection, we obtained the desk pad of Alger Hiss which re-

> vealed that Hiss had had a date at the British Embassy with Maclean on September 14, 1946.

Concerning Maclean, there is the possibility that the British authorities had been warned about his activities a number of years before the above-mentioned date with Hiss. Willard Edwards, the veteran reporter and columnist of the Chicago Tribune, in the sixth of a seven-part series on Soviet spies written by members of the Tribune staff, stated:

> General Walter Krivitsky, the former chief of Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe who had defected to the West, had already blown the whistle on one Soviet agent in the British foreign office who was secretly tried and imprisoned. He identified another, who turned out to be Donald D. Maclean, but the British just couldn't believe this information until Maclean fled to Russia in 1951 with Guy Burgess, another diplomat spy.

Edwards also states that—

> It would have been virtually impossible for Krivitsky not to have known of Philby's role.

After leaving Cambridge in 1933, Philby spent a year studying German in Vienna, where he was recruited, according to Edwards' account. He served as a courier to Hungary in his initial service for Russia. Moreover, Philby sealed his Communist affiliations on February 23, 1934, in Vienna by marrying an Austrian woman, Alice Friedmann, an avowed Communist. As previously stated, Krivitsky was in charge of military intelligence in Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy up until the time of his defection in 1937.

According to the Tribune article, Krivitsky had his trouble with both the British and Americans. The British ignored his tip on Maclean, and according to the article:

> After his first interview with State Department officers in Washington, he learned to his consternation that "everything I said got back to Moscow within 48 hours."

If other published accounts are true, we might still be experiencing the effects of the traitorous trio's efforts. The Government Employees Exchange, a reliable bi-weekly here in Washington, published an article on December 13, 1967, describing a 40-man team of British intelligence agents who 9 months ago scattered throughout the United States under a variety of "covers" seeking information. As the Exchange puts it:

> The Survey Team in the United States is part of a world-wide British Survey to root out any remaining members of the "tainted generation" of spies and traitors in the British Foreign Office and the secret services, such as the MI-5 (like the FBI in the U.S.) and MI-6 (like the CIA in the U.S.), the source revealed. This "tainted generation" produced the "notorious group of traitors which included Harold Adrian 'Kim' Philby, Donald D. Maclean, Guy Burgess and George Blake," the source revealed to The Exchange.

Willard Edwards in his February 11, 1968, article mentioned above stressed the same theme:

> Did Philby in that period also plant his own men in the CIA who may remain to this day, keeping Russia informed of American intelligence operations? Is data on American policy and military activity in Viet Nam flowing to the Kremlin? Experienced intelligence men assert that this possibility cannot be discounted and it is known that a review of all agents known to have been in contact with Philby has been undertaken since he ended his career as a master spy with flight to Russia in 1963.

Anyone who is tempted to scoff at reference of espionage in relation to the present Vietnam war should, in all prudence, review one experience we had during the Korean war.

MAC ARTHUR AND KOREA

It will be remembered that some months after the North Koreans had invaded South Korea in June 1950, the U.N. forces under MacArthur smashed the advance of the Communists with the brilliant Inchon maneuver. The invaders were chased back to the Yalu River in disarray and the end of the conflict was clearly in sight. Then the buildup of Chinese Communist troops north of the Yalu brought up the question of bombing the Yalu bridges if the Chinese Reds entered the fray. As history has recorded, MacArthur was denied by Washington the permission to bomb the Yalu bridges and the Chinese communication lines in Manchuria in case of necessity. General MacArthur in his book "Reminiscences," states on page 370:

> For the first time in military history, a commander has been denied the use of his military power to safeguard the lives of his soldiers and safety of his army. To me it clearly foreshadows a future tragic situation in the Far East and leaves me with a sense of inexpressible shock. It will cost the lives of thousands of American soldiers and place in jeopardy the entire army. By some means the enemy commander must have known of this decision to protect his lines of communication into North Korea, or he never would have dared to cross those bridges in force.

Again on page 374 MacArthur referred to the apparent leak in intelligence:

> That there was some leak in intelligence was evident to everyone. Walker continually complained to me that his operations were known to the enemy in advance through sources in Washington. I will always believe that if the United States had issued a warning to the effect that any entry of the Chinese Communists in force into Korea would be considered as an act of international war against the United States, that the Korean War would have terminated with our advance north. I feel that the Reds would have stayed on their side of the Yalu. Instead, information must have been relayed to them, assuring that the Yalu bridges would continue to enjoy sanctuary and that their bases would be left intact. They knew they could swarm down across the Yalu River without having to worry about bombers hitting their Manchurian supply lines.

On page 375 MacArthur quotes Chinese Communist Gen. Lin Piao as later stating in an official Chinese leaflet:

> I would never have made the attack and risked my men and military reputation if I had not been assured that Washington would restrain General MacArthur from taking adequate retaliatory measures against my lines of supply and communication.

With recent disclosures in the British press there can remain little doubt as to who was responsible for the intelligence leak in Washington which so benefited the Chinese Reds. Philby arrived in Washington as British liaison to the FBI and CIA and in November 1950, Maclean came to Washington as head of the Foreign Office's American department. The Washington Post of October 16, 1967, excerpted material from the London Sunday Times relating to Maclean's role in the Korean affair. It stated:

> The State Department account says that analysis of Maclean's role at the time which credits him with knowledge of the U.S.-Japanese treaty negotiations and the Korean War strategy.
>
> The State Department account says that Maclean was aware of the critical American decision to "localize" the Korean conflict.

Instead of the Korean war ending up as a short and ill-advised fiasco for the Reds, it turned into a long-drawn-out stalemate so costly in American lives. Because of our no-win policy in Korea and partly because of the invaluable information relayed to the Chinese Reds, the Korean war was extended to July of 1953 when the armistice was signed. American losses over the 3-year period amounted to 33,629 battle deaths, 20,617 other deaths, 103,284 nonmortal wounds suffered for a total of 157,530 American casualties.

U.S. INFILTRATION

In the academic, foreign affairs, and liberal community the credentials of George F. Kennan can hardly be questioned. In his recent book, "Memoirs, 1925–1950" (and keeping in mind that his present view toward the U.S.S.R. hews to the "mellowing" line) Kennan refers to the purge in mid-1937 in which the realistic "hardliners" in the State Department's Russian division were shunted aside by pro-Soviet replacements. He states:

> For here, if ever, was a point at which there was indeed the smell of Soviet influence, or strongly pro-Soviet influences somewhere in the higher reaches of the government.

Circumstances do not permit an extensive treatment of difficulties arising from lax security procedures in our own Government during the war years and into the fifties. Several references, however, should suffice to briefly outline the situation during this period. On August 28, 1953, the U.S. News & World Report carried the full text of a report by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning Soviet spy rings inside the U.S. Government. Here is what this highly respected national magazine stated in its preface to the text:

> A Senate subcommittee of eight—Republicans and Democrats—in a unanimous report declares that the Soviet Government "has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed."
>
> Giving details of two Soviet spy rings and intimating that there were two other rings, the subcommittee traces the whole web of espionage involving Alger Hiss and others.
>
> Pointing to a confidential memorandum from the FBI in 1945 which warned President Truman and other officials of the existence of these spy rings with names of persons involved, the committee says that despite the FBI reports "little was done by the executive branch to interrupt the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

One of the conclusions reached by the subcommittee stated:

> In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memoranda on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations—always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.

At another point the subcommittee observed:

> Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific, and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and other persons closely connected with the Communists.

In view of our past experiences in the field of internal security, it is only prudent that all necessary steps are taken to put into effect the strictest security measures. Security risks are not confined to Communist agents or sympathizers alone. In addition, questions concerning false statements, immoral conduct, homosexuality, intoxication, mental defects, and so forth, which are covered by Executive Order No. 10450, are criteria for security judgments. It is not just a question of loyalty but of suitability which is important in security evaluations. Although it is important to determine what degree of Communist infiltration there is in Government, it is equally imperative that we know who is doing what the Communists want done, for whatever reason.

Of course, the Burgess-Maclean-Philby case is just one of many examples here and abroad of the extensive intelligence and spy network which the Soviets have perfected over the years. The New York Times of November 10, 1967, carried an article, "Structure of Soviet Intelligence Unit Is Outlined," in which it is stated:

> The Soviet Union's State Security Committee, which is the nation's principal intelligence agency, employs 600,000 to 1 million people inside and outside the Soviet Union, according to Western estimates.

I do not wish to belabor the point, but it would seem prudent that all necessary measures would be effected to protect this Nation from the Soviet Union's efforts, and those of the other Communist regimes, to penetrate our security defenses. Unfortunately, indications are that such is not the case.

THE OTEPKA CASE

In September 1966, the American Legion passed resolution No. 150 which dealt with the Otto Otepka case. As is generally known, Otepka was, and still is, nominally the Chief of the Division of Evaluations, Department of State Office of Security. State accused Otepka of furnishing certain classified documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Otepka asked for a hearing and, almost 4 years later, the case has yet to be resolved.

The American Legion resolution stated:

> The American Legion deplores the treatment which Mr. Otto F. Otepka has received at the hands of his superiors in the U.S. Department of State, and commends the action of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its thorough investigation of the Otepka case and related matters, and in its bringing to the attention of the public the true circumstances surrounding Mr. Otepka's dismissal from his important position in the Department of State.

More recently, on November 12, 1967, Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism society, referred to the Otepka case in a report issued by its Advancement of Freedom of Information Committee. One passage from the report states:

> A study of this entire case makes it obvious that the State Department was misusing a claim of national security for purposes of hiding or obscuring the record. The record of this case discloses a disgraceful pattern of inaccurate and misleading testimony by high State Department officials. These officials gave inaccurate misleading testimony in connection with security cases. When Otepka gave testimony and produced records proving that superiors had lied under oath, the superiors used unauthorized eavesdropping and wiretapping as well as other police state methods to try to obtain grounds for firing Otepka.

The report went on to state that:

> For the four years that this case has been pending before the State Department, the Department press office has engaged in a broad pattern of inaccurate and misleading statements to reporters and interested citizens in an effort to smear Otepka. That outrageous pattern of deception has continued at least through August 1967.

The Otepka case is extremely important from the standpoint of national security. Otepka, an experienced officer in the field of security, firmly and consistently refused to give the OK on certain persons with questionable backgrounds. This is the crux of the Otepka case. In direct contrast to the British security officials in accepting Burgess and Maclean, Otepka placed our national security above possible recriminations from highly placed Government officials. In the face of the estimable danger presented by the Soviet intelligence network, the State Department, instead of strengthening our security forces, has gone to great length to try to remove an experienced and dedicated employee.

The statements by the two national organizations mentioned above are an indication of the resentment felt by many American citizens concerning the Otepka case. The American Defense Fund of Wood Dale, Ill., has been collecting contributions for some time now to help defray the costs of Otepka's defense. It is estimated that over $20,000 has been spent to date by Otto Otepka in defending himself which would not have been possible except for the help of the American Defense Fund. If the case finally goes to court, three times this amount will probably be needed. And who underwrites the expenses of the State Department? Why the American taxpayer, of course.

There are a number of aspects of the case which will eventually be drawn to public attention. The two State Department employees who resigned in the face of possible perjury charges, John Reilly and Elmer Hill, have not been brought to account for their possible perjurious testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. On August 8, 1967, the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, William Macomber, Jr., stated in a letter in answer to a congressional inquiry:

> I have been informed that the transcript of testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Messrs. John F. Reilly and Elmer Hill has been forwarded to the Department of Justice for review and recommendation on possible perjury charges against these witnesses.

When I inquired of the Department of Justice as to how the case was progressing, I received this reply from Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr.:

> In response to your letter of October 27, 1967, this is to advise you that no perjury charges against former State Department employees John Reilly and Elmer Hill have been referred to the Department of Justice for possible prosecution.

When I again asked the Justice Department for further clarification, I was informed that apparently the State Department was in error and that no transcript of the testimony had been referred to the Justice Department. To make matters worse, Dean Rusk, in a press conference on January 4 of this year, made this observation to Clark Mollenhoff of the Cowles publications concerning the perjury charges:

> I think this is a decision for the Department of Justice based on the record.

Furthermore, Mr. Rusk did not seem too concerned as to whether the press would get an answer on this issue. Mollenhoff asked:

> Will we get an answer on this later, or not?

The Secretary of State responded:

> I don't know whether you will or not.

Here is the pertinent passages from the exchange between Mollenhoff and Rusk:

> Q. Mr. Secretary?
>
> A. Yes, sir?
>
> Q. Why has the department failed to ask for prosecution for perjury of three people who were involved in giving misleading and false testimony under oath on this illegal wiretapping?
>
> A. I believe that is a matter for the—
>
> Q. And each of the things I have spoken of there are well thought out and if you want to go into any of the terms of illegality and so forth, I would be delighted to discuss those with you. Why haven't you taken action in four years?
>
> A. I think this is a decision for the Department of Justice based on the record.
>
> Q. Well, it has not been sent to the Department of Justice, and they were informed, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the criminal division in the last week or two has informed a member of Congress that it has not been referred to the Department of Justice.
>
> A. Well, this is not my recollection of it four years ago. But nevertheless . . .
>
> Q. Do you intend to do something about that, or let the Statute of Limitations run out, which I understand is a five-year statute?
>
> A. I will have to take that under advisement. I don't know.
>
> Q. Will we get an answer on this later, or not?
>
> A. I don't know whether you will or not.

Another aspect of the Otepka case which demands attention is the classification of the transcript of the hearings which the State Department claims is not a public record. I am still awaiting a reply as to what classification marking appears on the transcript and under what regulation the transcript classification falls.

Still another matter in the case calls for further clarification. The State Department originally levied 13 charges against Otepka, some of which concerned the mutilation of documents, a Federal offense. At the outset of the hearings, State dropped the mutilation charges against Otepka. One explanation of State's sudden change of mind was supplied by the Government Employees Exchange, a publication which has done excellent work on the Otepka case, in its May 31, 1967, issue:

> The informant added that the reason for the recommendation is Mr. Jaffe's fear that Mr. Otepka obtained positive information regarding the identity of the person actually involved in the "mutilations" and, in the event the charges are maintained in their present form, he will be able to expose the persons at the hearings. In this event, the Department of Justice will have no choice but to bring criminal proceedings against the persons so exposed.

The Exchange continues with its very interesting account:

> In turn, these persons have already indicated they will reveal the identities of the "top persons" in the Department of State who had instructed them to "mutilate" the documents and to "plant them" in Mr. Otepka's burn bags in such a way as to make it appear that Mr. Otepka had carried out the mutilations.

The question naturally arises as to who actually committed the mutilations. If Otepka is guilty of this Federal offense, then why has the case not been referred to the Justice Department? Or, if Otepka is innocent, why have charges not been preferred against the real culprits? Here again, this is another aspect of the case, which will bear exploring.

As the situation stands now, Otepka has appealed the State Department ruling which demoted him one grade, reprimanded him severely, and removed him from his position in the security field. His appeal to the Civil Service Commission asked that the mutilation charges which were dropped by State be investigated by the Commission. The CSC ruled that only the first three charges made by State could be a part of the appeal, thereby eliminating any consideration of the mutilation charges. In a second letter to the Commission Otepka again requested that the mutilation charges be made a part of the appeal.

Who was guilty of the mutilation of the documents? At the present time the issue remains unresolved. But we do know this: State has charged Otepka with being "responsible" for the mutilation, but suddenly dropped the charges just before the hearings began. Otepka insists that he is innocent of the charges and keeps insisting that the charges be investigated. Under the circumstances, and especially in view of State's sordid treatment of this case, I would not bet a devalued dime on State's version of the mutilations being true.

The most complete summary of the intricate details of the "get Otepka" movement, the harassment, threats, violations of law and Government regulations, security violations, and the involvement of high Department officials is contained in the Otepka brief. This lengthy document tells the story from Otepka's point of view and served as his summation at the State Department hearing of his case. I made it available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 14 of last year and since that time it has also been presented for public scrutiny by the editors of the weekly newspaper Human Events. It is an essential document for those who are deeply interested in Otepka's fight against the Department.

Of course the most complete treatment of the issue of State Department security and the Otepka case has been the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. On January 7, 1968, the first part of the report on these hearings was made public, with the other three sections being issued shortly thereafter. These reports are available from the subcommittee or can be purchased through the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office. For an at once depressing and infuriating account of the Otepka affair one should procure this complete report. Here is an example of the misinformation disseminated by State as it was summarized in the subcommittee's press release accompanying part 1:

> The Subcommittee's analysis of the hearings discloses that both the Subcommittee and members of the public, got both misinformation, as well as information from State Department officials. One of the highlights of this portion of Part I discusses how a State Department spokesman quoted out of context from the report of the Select Committee of the Senate (Watkins Committee) on its investigation of former Senator Joseph McCarthy. The sentence quoted out of context, the Subcommittee report shows, was intended to support the Department's handling of the Otepka case by stressing the President's power to prevent public dissemination of sensitive information. As quoted, the Watkins Committee appeared to be saying that a Presidential order would override the right of a Congressional Committee to obtain information.

The subcommittee then proceeds to point out the oversight:

> Omitted from the State Department quotation from the Watkins Committee statement was the very next sentence: "But the President, we think, cannot (nor do we believe he has sought by any order or directive called to our attention) deny to the Congress, or any duly organized committee or subcommittee thereof, and particularly the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, any information even though classified, if it discloses corruption or subversion in the executive branch."

This is but one illustration of the dismal record compiled by the State Department in the Otepka case.

The case of Otto Otepka is most important for another reason. As a civil service employee, Otepka is but one of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in the employ of the Federal Government. If Otepka can be subjected to such disgraceful treatment with impunity, what chance has any civil service worker for fair and honest treatment? How many Federal workers will be willing to endure the anguish of a possible 4-year contest with the Federal Government with the expenditure of thousands of dollars at their own expense?

In addition, what other atrocious vendettas will State Department people be encouraged to try on recalcitrant fellow employees, if the Otepka case is not accorded a fair and equitable solution? Plainly, the virtues of individual responsibility, integrity, and loyalty to the Nation will suffer inestimably.

Nor can one discount the Otepka case as an isolated affair. Publicity on three other cases suggests a pattern of State Department discrimination against those fallen from grace in that agency.

ON BECOMING A "NONPERSON"

The fate of those who dare to dissent from the mood set up by the inner circles was demonstrated dramatically in recent press accounts involving three men: David G. Nes and the two Otepka supporters, Hite and Burkhardt.

Harry Hite and Edwin Burkhardt were condemned to the State Department's Washington version of "Siberia" because they had not only worked under Otto Otepka in the security office of the Department but they defended him against the dismissal action of November 1963. There were six men who stood beside Otepka at this time. Hite and Burkhardt are the only two still in the Department today.

For their sin against the Department they were detailed to the "special projects staff of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs." Their office was the rat-infested, roach-filled, condemned, Annex No. 1 and they were alone—especially after their secretary demanded a transfer after finding a dead mouse in her wastebasket.

Even more disgraceful than the physical conditions was the fact that after the first few months they were given no work. The project was top secret, in fact, so secret that they were not told what to do and at times did not know who their superior was.

Hite and Burkhardt endured this isolation for 16 months, all the while sending memos to their superiors asking for meaningful work. Sometimes they got answers but they never received the work assignments. And they never gave up.

As 20-year employee Hite stated:

> We could take everything—the ostracism, the turning away of heads of fellow employees, the incarceration in a rat-infested building—but the strain of idleness was beginning to wear on us.
>
> We came to realize that this was the probable purpose of the treatment—to break us down mentally until we started shouting at each other. It didn't work but we don't know whether it might not have, eventually.
>
> Sometimes, during the last four years, we found it hard to believe that all this was happening in the United States. I guess it can't as long as Congress and the press are around to expose what is going on.

Only through Congress and the press, specifically Senators WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, and Congressman GROSS, of Iowa, and Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune, was enough heat put on the Department and enough words printed to force the officials at State to pull these two men out of Annex No. 1 and reassign them.

Until the press exposed the fate of these "nonpersons," and until these three Members of Congress acted, there was no chance of relief for them. We must now wait to see if the Department really does give them meaningful assignments and whether they are again placed in positions which require use of their special abilities in the field of security.

In placing the responsibility for the isolation of Hite and Burkhardt, the Washington Evening Star editorialized that—

> While it is unlikely that the Secretary of State had an active hand in this particular bit of shoddy business . . . he cannot be absolved of all responsibility.

The Star continues in its editorial, "Dean Rusk's Siberia":

> We are talking about the case of two men—Harry M. Hite and Edwin A. Burkhardt—who were exiled in the State Department after testifying truthfully before a Senate subcommittee in the Otto Otepka case. It is not our purpose at this time to argue the merits of the Otepka case. We think he got a raw deal, but his case is still going through the appeal process.
>
> Not so with Messrs. Hite and Burkhardt, whose respective yearly salaries, incidentally, are $15,304 and $12,989—all coming out of the pockets of those of us who pay federal taxes.
>
> In 1965, after testifying under oath in the Otepka case, and no one disputes their veracity, they were sent by some State Department mover and shaker to the department's version of Siberia. They were left there with nothing to do except to twiddle their thumbs. Presumably, the hope was that this would force them to resign.
>
> They did not resign, however, and Delaware's Republican Senator John J. Williams, who was the driving force behind the Senate's action in the Bobby Baker case, finally moved in.
>
> Senator Williams threatened to insist upon the removal from office of the superior of the exiled men unless they were given useful assignments. Not surprisingly, something happened at State, and the Hite-Burkhardt team now is at work on new jobs.
>
> This would not have happened except for the intervention of Senator Williams. And while we realize that Dean Rusk has other and more important matters on his hands, we think he should assign one of his aides to find out who makes the assignments to "Siberia" in his department, and that he should then take the action which the developments in this outrageous case so plainly indicate.

The problems encountered by State Department Foreign Service Officer (FSO) David G. Nes are more subtle, but strikingly similar.

Nes ran against the grain of the State Department clique, first in Saigon and later while Chargé d'Affairs at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, where he was stationed from June 1965 until he resigned effective January 31 of this year.

Regardless of the policy differences involved, the Nes resignation tends to show what happens when an FSO crosses the establishment.

The Baltimore Sun of February 7 stated:

> Disenchanted with "political leadership" of the State Department in handling Vietnam and the Middle East and his relegation to meaningless jobs since the Israeli-Arab war caused him to quit the Foreign Service after 26 years, David G. Nes said today. Nes . . . made clear in an interview today that Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and Nicholas Katzenbach, Under Secretary, were his principal targets, but his criticism extended to President Johnson.

Nes returned to Washington and soon realized that his career had virtually ended. He quit because, in his words:

> No one wants to sit at taxpayer's expense doing nothing.

It appeared that Nes might have become another Hite or Burkhardt and a possible reason can be. seen in another paragraph from the Sun.

Nes had criticized the appointment of Richard Nolte to the top post in Cairo. The Sun reveals:

> Nes feared his evaluation of Nolte as an amateur diplomat . . . earned him the hostility of Katzenbach, a Nolte roommate at Oxford. In any case, Katzenbach did not want to see Nes when he returned from Cairo.

The meaningless assignments followed, as they had for Otepka, Hite, and Burkhardt. Nes, with no appeals recourse to the Civil Service Commission, was in the same position as Koczak and got out.

THE KOCZAK CASE

It is not a secret that the challenge of "cleaning up the State Department" has been avoided by a long succession of Presidents. And it is equally disturbing that an equal number of Congresses have also shunned this needed job.

When it happens, and it must eventually, the housecleaning of the State Department must, of course, begin in personnel procedures. It is this area where the cliques infiltrate, control, and survive. It is here that dissenters can be excluded and followers promoted, mistakes covered up, and injustices hushed.

It is no mere coincidence that a British system that brought Burgess, Philby, and Maclean into its Foreign Service because they were of the right family, school, and club, also has a counterpart within the citadel of Foggy Bottom. Their purposes, too, are the same: to promote "insiders" and provide a firm basis of self-support.

The system is such that the heart of the State Department, the Foreign Service personnel, can be subjected to gross injustices, fired—State's term is "selected out"—and be excluded from their chosen job without recourse to any type of just appeal. The threat of such adverse action hangs daily over the heads of each FSO, and is undeniably more tenuously supported over the heads of conscientious, dedicated men who are, nevertheless, outside the ruling groups.

Right to appeal would seriously hinder the ruthless and unwarranted "selection out" weapon used in the State Department. Without appeal there is a deplorable tendency to "follow along," "not rock the boat," and, in effect, subordinate one's better judgment for the sake of one's position.

As stated by John F. Griner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, before the Pell subcommittee studying appeals procedures:

> There has always been a problem in the Foreign Service that individual foreign service officers subject to and threatened by "selection out", without any procedures for formal appeal, might conclude that for their own survival in the service it was more to their advantage to approve the policies indicated by their superiors rather than to make recommendations which are the result of trained investigation and careful analysis.

Mr. Griner also quoted Gov. W. Averell Harriman on "selection out" procedures:

> Here again, in the process of "selection out," the application of the system can be more fairly applied. I have noted that men have been given low ratings because they haven't gotten along with one individual when others have given them high ratings. If a man happens to be judged at a time when he has worked for a man who doesn't understand him or disagrees with his view he may be "selected out" for reasons which are not sound.
>
> As a matter of fact, I think more consideration should be given to who writes the efficiency reports on Foreign Service Officers. I went over some of them a while ago, and in one case, I found that in recent years, one man had been put in the lowest 25 percentile during two years, and in another two years, he had been put in the top 10 percentile. It was the same man, a man who had been in the Service a considerable period of time, and he had not changed his ways or his judgments, but he worked for a different boss.

Mr. Griner also quotes a report prepared by Yale professor, Chris Argyris, which must have bubbled the mire in Foggy Bottom. It is even more blunt.

The Argyris report, based on a series of conferences in 1965 with 60 senior Foreign Service officers—many of them Ambassadors or deputy chiefs of missions, that is, the "cream of the Foreign Service"—also confirms our views about the harmful professional impact which "selection out" without an appeals procedure has on Foreign Service officers. In his study, entitled "Some Causes of Organizational Ineffectiveness Within the Department of State," Professor Argyris stated that after officers had been in the Foreign Service for a few years, they "soon came to write careful and innocuous memos"; to "round the sharp corners off the telegrams"; they also "learn not to make waves"; they "minimize risk taking"; they "fear taking responsibility"; they "play the game."

One officer told Professor Argyris the following:

> All this talk on being open and leveling is nice—and I'm for motherhood, too. But, I can tell you, if you get the reputation of having lost some important battles—no one wants a loser. The word gets around and you have been ruled off the promotion lists. Soon you learn. If you want to get back on, be less open and less candid.

Pressures to fall into line, pressure from the top of the clique, will ultimately affect both foreign policy and security. The most well known, and, probably the most important from the standpoint of publicity and effect, is the case of Stephen A. Koczak. In selecting out Koczak the State Department uncovered a case of both loose security and poor policy management.

In outlining the Koczak case it will be helpful to work from the present into the past.

Stephen Koczak is today a "selected out" Foreign Service officer who knows he has been wronged, and is doing his level best to gain vindication. In other words, he is putting up a fight against the State Department Establishment.

One can only guess at how many good men do not fight.

Koczak was "selected out" of the State Department in 1966 after 19 years as a veteran FSO. An honor graduate of Harvard, Trenton-born Koczak gained a measure of international fame in 1949 when he was expelled from Hungary by the Communists after they charged that he served as the intermediary between Hungarian Cardinal Mindszenty and the U.S. Minister to Budapest.

Koczak began to have his $18,000-a-year job pulled out from under him while serving as head of the political section reporting on Communist East Germany in Berlin in 1960–61. Involved against Koczak are persons directly connected with the notorious "Warsaw sex and spy cases" including the celebrated Scarbeck-Discher scandal. Scarbeck, it will be remembered, was second secretary of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, Poland. After being surprised in bed with his mistress, Scarbeck agreed to collaborate with the Polish Government. It was here, too, that the Marine guard was compromised by female Communist intelligence officers and the Embassy thoroughly bugged by the Communists.

Koczak came to Berlin in 1960 following a promotion and assignment for the State Department after "brilliant" work in Israel where he was stationed during the Suez crisis of 1955. He was made head of the political section as well as Deputy Chief of Eastern Affairs at the U.S. mission in Berlin.

Koczak's immediate superior was Thomas A. Donovan, who was reportedly transferred to Berlin in September of 1960 because of allegations made by U.S. Marine guards who implicated him in illicit associations with Polish women suspected of being Polish agents. Ranking as head of the U.S. mission and the superior of both men was E. Allan Lightner, later Ambassador of Libya and now Deputy Commandant of the National War College. In between Lightner and Donovan was Howard Trivers.

Following his sudden transfer, Donovan still kept ties with Warsaw. Koczak frequently traveled from West Berlin into East Berlin on official trips. His boss, Donovan, would go with him. From East Berlin, Koczak discovered that Donovan would place calls to Communists in Warsaw. These calls were never reported by Donovan to colleagues in West Berlin, nor were they reported to Ambassador Jacob Beam in Warsaw, the receiving end.

Koczak's career as a Foreign Service officer started toward its end when, in addition to the phone calls, Donovan made an unauthorized trip to Warsaw at the exact time when Khrushchev, aided by the Polish Government, launched his drive to expel the United States from Berlin. This was too much for Koczak who reported the breaches of security and of orders to Howard Trivers, deputy chief of the mission in West Berlin and Donovan's superior.

By asking Trivers to bring to the attention of Ambassador Beam the phone calls and the unauthorized trip of Donovan, what Koczak termed the "exceptional circumstances of my superior's—Donovan's—telephone calls and his unauthorized trip to Warsaw," Koczak was rewarded with an exceptionally low efficiency rating.

Koczak has stated that he chose going over his boss' head with the problem after facing this dilemma: if he kept silent about the clandestine trip and phone calls, he might be party to a security risk; if he chose to talk with Trivers, he would be a "squealer." Ironically, nothing happened. There was no reaction from Trivers, so Koczak decided to go even one higher, to Lightner. But, to his dismay, both Trivers and Lightner advanced the argument that Donovan had taken advantage of lower telephone rates in East Berlin. Presumably, there was no justification advanced for the unauthorized trip and this item was merely suppressed.

Characteristically, Koczak learned that Trivers had not informed Ambassador Beam of Donovan's activities, and had even failed to inform Lightner.

Information compiled in the years since have indicated that Koczak was definitely up against one of the cliques within the State Department and it was probably futile to attempt to maintain good security if it meant danger to an "insider."

Although Koczak had been in the top 10 percent of the personnel, Donovan gave him the low rating in 1961 and an even lower rating in 1962. Koczak was told in March 1963 that he had been "selected out," in his case, retired. Although he fought for and gained reinstatement, the State Department came back in 1964 with another, and final, decree which even letters to the President could not overrule.

The security involved in Donovan's calls and visits to Warsaw, and the fact that nothing was done about the breach, indicates the overriding considerations which insiders can use to shore up the failings of one of their boys.

While Koczak was retired, Donovan was given a good assignment in the Department's Bureau of Intelligence Research, even in the face of serious charges that he was implicated in the Warsaw scandal—and therefore shipped to Berlin—and subsequently continued his contacts with the Polish Communists. It has been reported also that while in Warsaw, Donovan's apartment was "bugged" by Polish intelligence, Soviet intelligence, and even the CIA.

In addition to Donovan's continuation in State positions, Trivers and Lightner are also going their merry ways; Trivers is now the consul general in Zurich.

The reasons why Donovan was not fired after his Warsaw escapades, and why Trivers, Lightner, and Ambassador Beam run such similarly loose ships, can only be that they are a few of the insiders. It has been pointed out that Beam, Lightner, and Trivers all graduated from Princeton within a year of each other. In fact, common usage has come to identify one of the cliques in the State Department as the "Henderson-Princeton pack." The Henderson here is the former Under Secretary for Administration, Loy Henderson, who is supposed to have engineered the reassignment of Donovan from Warsaw to Berlin following a request to this effect from Trivers and Lightner.

Although Koczak has come up against the power of this inside group, he also appears to have caused another faction dire concern; this group having the title of the "Macy-Crockett camp."

The security problems posed by these self-promoting groups are obvious. Less obvious is the problem of poor policy judgments which can be fostered by excluding some officers or, at the least, disregarding their individual judgments. Again, the case of Stephen Koczak as an example.

Koczak, in his position as political officer, predicted that the Berlin wall was going to be built, and presumably passed his predictions—with justifications—on to his superiors. On August 12 Koczak was talking with a news correspondent and stated that he would not be surprised if the Communists began the wall the next day. It would seem that while the administration was shocked when the wall did go up the next day, Koczak's information and evaluation should have forewarned Washington of this possibility. Granted, luck was involved but there was also sound judgment and efficient, if not brilliant, work behind the statement. One can only assume that the clique did not approve in some way and the information was never passed on or properly examined.

Few will ever know what action might have been taken had the Berlin wall been planned for and an effective countermeasure readied.

At the center of the Koczak case is the misuse of the efficiency report system, now expanded to include the so-called development appraisal report. In the past it has been a secret item, and in Koczak's case he charges that his records were manipulated to such an extent—in attempts to justify his selection out after years of service in the top 10 percent—that its contents were in part destroyed, forgeries made and backdated and then substituted for originals. In addition, Koczak charges that his file contained a statement that he had read the full report when, in fact, he had not.

The new development appraisal report has been made available to the individual concerned only since June 1967, and this action by the State Department came only after pressure from the American Federation of Government Employees which stated more than a year and a half ago that the report was startling, dangerous, and secretive. But even now the report can be seen only in Washington and even at that, the writer cannot be confronted by the person who may be charged. For the Foreign Service officer overseas, it may be years before he even sees his report. This assumes that State will continue to allow officers to read the report even under these highly limited conditions.

Add to this the fact that the development appraisal report is today the principal criterion on which promotion or selection out is based. Here again are Mr. Griner's statements, this time on the report and the selection boards which pass judgment. As can be seen, not only is the report an atrocious weapon, but the horror is compounded by the built-in inadequacies of the selection board:

> We have also carefully examined the methods, procedures, and composition of the Selection Boards which rate officers for "selection out" as well as promotion. At the outset we wish to call attention to the fact that the Boards are primarily composed of Foreign Service Officers whose own future assignments, careers and promotions may very well depend on the way they perform on these Selection Panels. This alone is itself already a situation which needs safeguards through an appeals procedure to prevent bias and favoritism. Not only is the composition of the Panels a matter of criticism, but the Board's procedures are unsystematic, haphazard, and we believe, unenlightened. We are told that hundreds of efficiency records, each containing up to as many as twenty individual annual and other reports, are assembled for each Panel. To these are added further hundreds of so-called Development Appraisal Reports, whose illegal institution we have already condemned in the past. Moreover, none of the Development Appraisal Reports written in the past three years were seen, we wish to note, at the time of writing by the Officers; many have not been seen in the interval. Some may never be seen by the officers being rated.
>
> All this vast assemblage of unseen, unsystematic material is given to the respective Panel for each class; each of the five or six Panel members then proceeds to ⅕ or ⅙ of these heaps of records, sorting them into three piles—one pile, usually approximately ten per cent, is accumulated for persons tentatively considered for promotion; one pile, also usually approximately ten per cent, is for Officers tentatively considered for "selection out." And a third pile, usually seventy-five to eighty per cent, is put away not to be read again unless some special message comes from the personnel office suggesting the re-reading of certain files. These will be neither promoted nor "selected out" that year.
>
> Comments we have received from Panel members indicate that dreariness, boredom, and fatigue soon overtakes them. None of the persons being rated ever appears individually—the names thus are faceless. No one knows for sure whether the reports themselves are accurate or not. No one can even meaningfully ask whether the reports are authentic, or, as one person has publicly charged, whether they sometimes contain even forgeries.

It is important that Stephen Koczak have his day in court against his accuser but his case points up more than just one man fighting the establishment. It also reveals the "system." It is this system within the State Department which must be the target of Congress, and it is through elimination of this system that the Government and the people served will gain better foreign policy, tighter security, and surer personnel practices.

The Koczak case demonstrates very pointedly the urgent need for an administrative appeals procedure outside the Department of State similar to that given civil service personnel. As the situation now stands, Foreign Service officers who are fired or "selected out" have no alternative but to go to court to seek a redress of grievances. If an officer cannot pay the costs of court action, his final recourse is eliminated.

Obviously, an appeals procedure—designed to safeguard the reputation and personal integrity of FSO's while at the same time guarding the professionalism of the Foreign Service—is in order. This too, would serve as assurance to the public that the laws and regulations are being observed by the Department. All these are important in maintaining public confidence in our foreign establishment and in carrying out the public's mandate. Inasmuch as the State Department and the administration have not submitted any plans for setting up an adequate appeals procedure, I think it is necessary to submit legislation to this end, and I am now working on this approach.

OTHER U.S. CASES

If the State Department would expend as much energy in ridding its ranks of security risks as it has in the Otepka and Koczak cases, the Philbys and Macleans might not be of such importance. Clark Mollenhoff, the Pulitzer Prize winning reporter for the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, and one of America's most fearless reporters, listed 14 cases in the Register of October 4, 1967, wherein violations of security procedures were charged. Here again it must be stressed that security risks are not confined to Communist affiliations or sympathies alone. Issuing of false statements, immoral conduct, homosexuality, intoxication, and mental defects are bases for adverse security judgments. Among the violations mentioned by Mollenhoff are these:

> 1. A security officer stationed in Athens, Greece, who failed to report a large number of security violations yet was appointed deputy chief of the Division of Security Evaluations at the State Department.
>
> 2. A security officer who withheld information from his superiors concerning the loss of classified documents by an American ambassador. The officer was not censured and was promoted to be a top lieutenant of Reilly.
>
> 3. A security officer stationed in Moscow who permitted himself to be enticed into the apartment of a Russian woman, an agent for the secret police. The secret police used concealed cameras to photograph the American and his nude companion and tried to get him to spy for the Soviet Union. He never was criticized or disciplined.
>
> 4. A foreign service officer who admitted to security officers and State Department medical authorities that he had engaged in homosexual acts. The medical officers found him unfit to serve abroad because in their judgment his homosexual tendencies made him a potential security risk. He was sent abroad, however, and was assigned to a critical post behind the Iron Curtain.
>
> 5. A foreign service officer stationed in Mexico and Caracas, Venezuela, who was guilty of a series of incidents of sexual misconduct, including an affair with the wife of the ambassador of another nation. His conduct was excused by State Department politicians.
>
> 6. A man dismissed as a security risk by the Mutual Security Agency and characterized as having "a rotten file," who was appointed to a State Department position and given full security clearance.
>
> 7. A foreign service officer who admitted he furnished 18 documents, some of them classified "secret" to Philip Jaffe, the publisher of Amerasia magazine and on whom there was a considerable record of Communist activities and affiliation. The officer was permitted to take an honorable retirement and pension.

In two other cases mentioned by Mollenhoff the subjects are still with the State Department. In one case the Foreign Service officer concealed the fact that he had been a member of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party. In the other case a Foreign Service officer stationed in an eastern European post admitted homosexual tendencies and other personal misconduct but was given responsibility for supervising the Marine guard personnel and protecting all safe combinations at the American Embassy. His negligence permitted foreign agents to have access to classified reports at the Embassy. He was not disciplined, received normal promotions, and like the other case listed above, he is still with the State Department.

In connection with security risks at the State Department it is only fair to state that each year this subject is reviewed by the House Appropriations Subcommittee which reviews State's appropriations requests. Each year State provides the number of employees who have departed from the Department for security reasons of various types. However, the testimony before the subcommittee is briefly dealt with, as it must be, because of the very large volume of work handled by the subcommittee. The number of risks per year is not the prime consideration here, for how can one measure the value of one Philby or Maclean in terms of lesser security risks. What is important is the nature of the present security system with its downgrading of strict security precautions, the waiving of security checks for questionable persons, and the elimination of hardheaded employees who place national security above Department pressures.

Concerning the above-mentioned subcommittee and its annual inquiry into the security risks in the State Department, the Government Employees' Exchange reported in its issue of July 26 of this year that reference to one "admitted homosexual" was omitted in testimony before the subcommittee earlier this year. This officer was included on the 1967 Foreign Service promotion list and his promotion to a FSO–1 was confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

Another account of this case was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 3 by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman H. R. GROSS. This account by Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register, reports that the officer had admitted his deviations to security officers and that a State Department medical team warned that as a "latent homosexual" he should not be placed in any position where sensitive security matters are handled. In answer to a congressional inquiry State replied that the man had "a valid clearance, and is not currently under investigation." According to the Government Employees' Exchange, this case has been referred to the appropriate committee, and I am hopeful that the circumstances surrounding this case will be brought to public attention and corrective action taken.

THE ROSTOW CASE

Another case which has a direct bearing on security matters is that of Walt W. Rostow, now a special assistant to the President on national security affairs. According to various press accounts just recently, Rostow was refused a security clearance three times in the 1950's.

Rostow, in turn, stated, according to the Washington Post and Evening Star that:

> From 1951 onward, I had continuous security clearance from various agencies of the Federal Government.

Senator STROM THURMOND noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19 that Rostow's reply was not "responsive to the allegations presented by Mr. Otto Otepka in his brief filed recently before a State Department hearing." It is claimed that Rostow was initially rejected for a high-level clearance by the Department of the Air Force; and again in 1955 by Herbert Hoover, Jr., then Under Secretary of State; and again in 1957 by Roderick O'Connor, then Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security. Senator THURMOND pointed out:

> Anyone who knows anything about security clearances knows they are granted for various degrees of accessibility and by various agencies. The standards of each agency may be, and frequently are, entirely different; and they may be bypassed completely by high-level command.

Senator THURMOND further observed:

> Whatever level of clearance he may have had, the fact is that he has been denied strict high-level clearance on the three occasions mentioned. For example: under the Hoover action of 1955, Rostow was disapproved to attend meetings of a psychological warfare panel of the Operations Coordinating Board—OCB—which operates directly under the jurisdiction of the National Security Council. This is, of course, a very high level, critical clearance.

This is not the first time that Rostow's clearance has been questioned. In June 1962, Everett S. Allen, staff writer for the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times and winner of a National Headliners Award for outstanding achievement in journalism in 1959, had a series of eight articles, entitled "What's Wrong With the State Department?" published in the Standard-Times. The series was the result of 18 months of investigation and interview and was shortly thereafter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman HASTINGS KEITH. Concerning Rostow, Allen stated in article No. 7:

> A well-informed former State Department official, with more than a quarter-century's experience with the Federal Government, made certain statements to me regarding the professional qualifications of Walt W. Rostow.

Allen went to the State Department and placed these statements before them in the form of questions. The substance of State's reply was, in Allen's words:

> There is no record of any denial of security clearance by the State Department security office or by an undersecretary in a previous Administration. The department felt it was not appropriate to comment further on what happened in a previous Administration.

As was mentioned above, Herbert Hoover, Jr., was Under Secretary of State in 1955, and it was he, according to the Otepka brief, that denied to Rostow the high level security clearance to attend OCB meetings. It would appear then that if the charges of three security rejections against Rostow are true, then "an undersecretary in a previous administration" was definitely involved, contrary to the above statement by the State Department.

On December 4, 1967, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks on the Rostow case under the heading, "Walt Rostow's Security Clearance—Who Made the Evaluation?" Accompanying the remarks was an article by Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune, concerning an inquiry to the White House on Rostow's alleged turndowns of a high-level security clearance during the Eisenhower administration. The inquiry by James Stewart, of Wood Dale, Ill., was replied to by W. Marvin Watson, special assistant to the President. Here are the pertinent excerpts from his letter:

> With regard to the personnel security processing of members of the White House staff, the President insists upon a full field investigation by the FBI as a prerequisite to consideration of each appointee.

The letter went on to say:

> In this connection, the President thought that you would want to know that this requirement was strictly followed with respect to Mr. Walt Rostow. The last occasion on which a pre-employment investigation of Mr. Rostow was conducted by the FBI was in 1966 in connection with his current assignment as special assistant to the President.

As anyone familiar with the FBI knows, this agency gathers the facts but makes no evaluations on the information. In its pamphlet, "99 Facts About the FBI—Questions and Answers," the FBI states:

> The FBI does not render opinions on the facts it gathers. Being strictly an investigative agency, the FBI neither makes evaluations nor draws conclusions as to the integrity of any organization, publication or individual.

So Mr. Watson's reply to Mr. Stewart is obviously but half an answer.

Pertinent questions which still remain to be answered are: Who made the security evaluation in the case of Rostow? Were the standards of the U.S. Intelligence Board applied in the Rostow case?

The U.S. Intelligence Board consists of representatives of the 10 executive agencies which have dealings in the intelligence field. The USIB handles the highest type of intelligence we have, and its standards are the strictest in the intelligence field. There is no intention here to imply that Mr. Rostow's security status leaves something to be desired. My point is that, to date, an adequate explanation has not been given to the public as far as I know. Answers to the above-cited questions should lay this issue to rest.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE

It is quite evident that the task of enforcing strict security regulations on executive agencies is primarily one for Congress. By means of investigation and legislation changes can be made as in the case of the National Security Agency several years ago. It will be recalled that when two NSA employees, Bernon Mitchell and William Martin, turned up in Moscow as traitors, the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered evidence that far more was involved than just the fact that two NSA employees had defected to the U.S.S.R. With the purpose of strengthening security laws and in performance of its legislative oversight authority, the committee launched an investigation of NSA security practices which consumed 2,000 man-hours of its investigators' time, and which covered 15 States, resulting in a total of 16 separate executive hearings. The outcome of the committee's effort was the initiation of 22 corrective security steps on the part of NSA. Legislation was drawn up based on the committee's recommendations and is now Public Law 88–290. NSA's Director of Personnel, who had falsified information on his form 57 and then covered it up, resigned and the dismissal of 26 individuals because of sexual deviation was effected. The committee's annual report for 1961 stated in part:

> Former investigators for agencies which conduct background inquiries of NSA employees told of homosexuals and sex deviates within the Agency. They related how difficult it was to check on some NSA personnel because often the only references given by employees were personal friends or fellow employees.

The report then cited a condition which could well be applied to cases in the State Department:

> The most outspoken complaint against NSA by former investigators, however, was that occasionally, prior to the committee's investigation, when derogatory information was uncovered during background investigations, responsible officials in the Office of Security Services ignored it.

The similarity to the State Department lies in the fact that security precautions were ignored, both here and abroad. Worse still, some of those who undertook to enforce strict security procedures were subject to various devices calculated to remove them from their positions.

There can be no doubt that the Congress alone must act to improve security and personnel policies in Government agencies such as the Department of State. The need for congressional action exists but alongside this need are the duty and mandate deriving from the investigative and legislative functions. As in the NSA case mentioned above, Congress can do the job. The machinery for doing it exists through presently constituted committees and subcommittees of both the House and the Senate.

Concerning specific legislation, I introduced on November 21 of last year H.R. 14122, a proposal relating to the performance of certain investigative functions regarding the State Department. This bill was initially proposed by Senator EASTLAND, and is the product of the extensive hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on State Department security operations.

In addition, there are proposals in both the House and Senate to establish a Central Security Agency which would take from the jurisdiction of the State Department and other executive agencies many of the security responsibilities of those departments. This proposal stemmed from the voluminous report of the Commission on Government Security, a body established by Congress in 1955 to fill an urgent need for an objective, nonpolitical, and independent study of the innumerable laws, Executive Orders, regulations, programs, practices, and procedures intended for the protection of the national security.

S. 2988, entitled "Internal Security Act of 1968," was introduced by Senator EASTLAND and cosponsored by 19 other Senators. This proposal, which is an omnibus security bill, covers many aspects of security which have been in need of corrective action for a number of years. Also included in S. 2988 is a proposal for a Central Security Agency mentioned above, along with other sections pertinent to the Otepka case. This bill is the result of hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on gaps in internal security and State Department security procedures. Hearings on this bill will begin as soon as possible, and not later than March 1.

Clark Mollenhoff, in his excellent book, "Despoilers of Democracy," indicates the Otepka dilemma. The Government has many able and patriotic employees. In fact, I believe that most are. However, there has gradually developed a bureaucratic code of loyalty which rewards those who favor the department, the program, the "leader" and discredits or shunts aside those who put their country, the taxpayers and the law ahead of all other considerations.

As Mr. Mollenhoff pointed out, Jerry Jackis, vigilant employee of the Foreign Operations Administration, discovered U.S. aid being used by the Communists in Cambodia. Was he rewarded? No, he was pilloried and his superior who "upheld" the agency position was promoted. The man who blew the whistle on Billy Sol Estes met a like fate, and the superior who was his tormentor and upheld the Department of Agriculture was likewise promoted. The same thing happened to Otepka whose only "crime" was putting honesty and his country first.

Otto Otepka illustrates the torturous ordeal that good government employees must go through when they challenge the officialdom in Washington, particularly in the State Department. His case stands as an indictment of the State Department and its policies. The pages are not yet closed on this infamous American "Dreyfus" case.

A LIVING TRIBUTE TO FRANK S. LAND

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **RANDALL**. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning February 20th the annual Frank S. Land Memorial Breakfast was held at the Shoreham Hotel. This breakfast, each year, honors the man who founded the Order of DeMolay.

Forty-eight years ago—in 1919—Frank S. Land brought into being this magnificent youth organization in Kansas City, Mo.—a part of which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. More than 3 million young Americans have been taught the deeper meaning of "honor, integrity, trust, patriotism, and fidelity" by the Order of DeMolay.

Frank Sherman Land was born in Kansas City in 1890 and died there in 1960. While following careers as a merchant, banker, and educator, he found time to hold many high offices in Masonic and Shrine organizations. He also conceived the idea of the annual breakfast meeting in Washington for the purpose of bringing together the leaders in Masonry and the leaders in Government. After his passing these breakfast meetings have been continued as a memorial to Frank Land.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the address of my fellow Missourian, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, upon the occasion of this year's Frank S. Land Memorial Breakfast:

A Living Tribute to Frank S. Land

(Remarks of Senator STUART SYMINGTON at the Frank S. Land Memorial Breakfast, Shoreham Hotel, February 20, 1968)

Imperial Potentate Seay, most worshipful Grand Masters, Imperial Sirs, my Colleagues in Government and fellow Masons, this Frank Land Memorial Breakfast is sponsored each year during the Grand Masters Conference so as to present us all with an opportunity to pay tribute to the accomplishments and memory of a man who devoted his life to the principles and ideals of free Masonry.

Frank S. Land conceived the idea of this annual breakfast so as to bring together leaders in Masonry and leaders of Government; they together foster a better understanding of the Order of DeMolay.

As a Memorial to Frank Land, and as a tribute to this magnificent youth organization which he founded, back in 1919, upon his passing the Shrine of North America voted to continue this breakfast.

Today, as a Mason, and as one who, along with you, is deeply concerned about the future of our great democracy, I salute the leadership of the Shrine for their foresight, and continuing support of an open line of communication between the type of citizenship represented here this morning, and the youth of our country.

Never has such a relationship—adult to youth and youth to adult—been more important, or more needed, than it is right now, as we face so many complex problems, both here at home, and abroad.

To date, in DeMolay chapters which stretch all across the land, more than three million of our youth have been challenged to follow the principles of Honor, Integrity, Trust, Patriotism, and Fidelity, fostered by this superb organization; and it is my conviction that as Masons we must explore every means to increasingly lend our interest, our understanding, and our moral support to those young men who form such an important part of DeMolay.

With our dedicated support, the work started by that Mason whose memory we honor this morning, can furnish a major incentive for improving our membership figures in Masonry. Equally important, it can provide us with the type of leadership essential for this nation if we wish to look forward to "a better tomorrow."

One would compare DeMolay to Masonry as a Sunday School to a Church. Show me a strong and active Sunday School, and I will show you a strong and dedicated Church. Show me a strong and active DeMolay program in any community, and I will show you a strong program of free Masonry.

We of Missouri are mighty proud that Frank S. Land was a native son. Frank has now become a part of that heritage which great men have passed on to all America.

We, in turn, must strive to further the principles and ideals to which he gave his life, and upon which Masonry was founded; for what we do today will certainly be part of the heritage of those who follow tomorrow.

BILL TO STRENGTHEN RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that my bill to strengthen the Renegotiation Board now has bipartisan cosponsors, and cosponsors in the other body as well.

The Renegotiation Board is an independent agency of the administrative branch, whose sole function is to capture excessive profits on defense and certain other contracts. As a process, renegotiation dates back to 1942. In fiscal 1967, the Board caused $16 million in excessive profits to be returned to the Treasury and another $30.3 million to be returned to the procurement agencies. This $46.3 million was saved for the American taxpayer with only 178 employees. To visualize the need to revitalize this Board, compare these 178 employees with the 25,000 procurement people in the Department of Defense spending $125 million a day.

Since March of 1966, I have in this Chamber expounded on the need to eliminate war profiteering, and I have advocated strengthening the Renegotiation Board to this end. For 20 months, my speeches were met with silence, with an echo of acknowledgment, or support or concern from Congress.

However, I am pleased and very much encouraged by the interest that has developed recently in the Renegotiation Board. I am honored that Congressmen CHARLES VANIK and MICHAEL FEIGHAN last month introduced my legislation to strengthen the Board. More recently our distinguished colleague from across the aisle, Congressman WILLIAM MINSHALL, has also become a cosponsor.

I am also pleased that Senator STEPHEN YOUNG has also introduced my renegotiation legislation, and that Senator ERNEST GRUENING received unanimous consent to join him as a cosponsor. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, before whose joint Subcommittee on Economy in Government I submitted testimony on renegotiation, indicated support for strengthening the Board.

Despite many momentous issues before the Ways and Means Committee, I hope and trust that this distinguished committee will be able to schedule full and open hearings on my renegotiation legislation at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, I have permission to insert at this point several articles about supporters of my legislation, as well as an editorial from the Denver Post from the first of this month in support of a strong Renegotiation Board:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 28, 1968]

Ex-Arms Buyer Hits Profiteers

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Martha W. Griffiths, D-Mich., a former buyer for the Defense Department, announced yesterday she would support legislation to strengthen the Renegotiation Board.

"Why should some Americans give their lives in wartime, while others make a fortune by cheating the government?" Mrs. Griffiths demanded. "The Renegotiation Board is our best guarantee against excess profits by contractors."

Her own experience as a procurement officer has taught her to rely on the board rather than on the Defense Department itself to curb profiteering, the seven-term congresswoman said.

Mrs. Griffiths is a high-ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over bills to strengthen the board introduced by Reps. Henry B. Gonzalez, D-Tex., and Charles A. Vanik, D-21.

She told The Plain Dealer: "I've kept up my friendships since leaving the Defense Department in 1946, and I still know what goes on there. As soon as the government gets a good procurement officer and pays him his measly wage, industry will try to hire him away."

"You can imagine," she continued, "how a government official earning $10,000 a year and working in an office that he shares with 100 other employes—how overawed he must feel when he enters the plush offices of a major defense contractor and then sits down to negotiate with him."

At a congressional hearing last November, there was this exchange between Mrs. Griffiths and John M. Malloy, deputy assistant defense secretary in charge of procurement:

Q.—(By Mrs. Griffiths)—I would like to know the amount that these people that are paid $10,000—what is the top purchase they make?

A.—I think we'd have to do a little research to supply that to you.

Q. I will give you some research right now. I was a procurement officer. And $5,000 (in salary), I made purchases that amounted to more than $1 million at one time.

After Mrs. Griffiths spoke further about her experience, Malloy, trying gently to turn off the heat, said good-naturedly: "We wish we had you back in the department."

"I will tell you now," Mrs. Griffiths retorted. "We would save some money."

Her announcement of support for Vanik and Gonzalez followed introduction of still another bill by Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., Ways and Means chairman.

Mills bill would extend the life of the board for two more years after June 30. It does nothing to restore powers the agency has lost since the Korean War.

"I've spoken to the chairman about his bill, and it's not to be taken at face value," Vanik told the Plain Dealer. "It's merely the legislative vehicle on which

"My effort will to be to amend the Mills vehicle to incorporate the provisions of my bill. The chairman understands this and, as I've said before, I was very much encouraged after a conference with him."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 10, 1968]

MILLS JOINS FIGHT FOR PROFITS BOARD

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., put himself in the forefront yesterday of a congressional movement to strengthen the Renegotiation Board.

Mills' voice was the most powerful raised on behalf of the board since a number of lawmakers in both houses began siding with the agency, spurred on by Plain Dealer articles about war profiteering.

"I think the basic position of your newspaper is right," Mills said. "Our procurement policies for this war (in Vietnam) generally shouldn't be any different than they were for other wars."

In the Korean War, the board had wider authority to review defense contracts. Loopholes have been opened in the law since then.

Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-21, arranged the interview in Mills' office and participated in it. Mills' Ways and Means Committee, on which Vanik serves, initiates legislation for the Renegotiation Board.

Vanik has introduced a bill to recapture all the powers the board had when it was established in 1951.

[From the Denver Post, approximately Feb. 1, 1968]

RENEGOTIATION BOARD EARNS ITS KEEP

Any federal agency which brings in more money than it spends deserves to be kept alive and healthy by Congress. After all, you can hardly find that kind of agency in the vast jungle of Washington bureaucracies.

A case at point is that of the Renegotiation Board.

If you never heard of it, neither have most of the country's voters and taxpayers. It doesn't have vast armies of employes housed in sprawling architectural monuments covering scores of acres.

At last count it had only 178 persons on its staff. They work in a modest building near the White House.

The annual budget of the board runs about $2.5 million a year, but over the years since it was first established during the Korean War it has recovered for the government hundreds of millions of dollars in excess profits on government contracts.

Under present law, any company having more than $1 million in government contracts must submit financial statements to the board, which also has access to the company's income tax returns.

When the board believes excess profits have been made from the contracts, it requests refunds. In nearly 4,000 cases since the Korean war the companies have kicked back the excesses, 90 per cent of the time without going to court.

Of the cases that have gone to court, the board won far more decisions than it has lost.

Also, many companies make voluntary refunds without waiting for the Renegotiation Board to check up on them.

Refunds obtained by the board have varied from $15.9 million in fiscal 1967 to $150 million a year during the Korean War. In fiscal 1967 $30.3 million came in voluntarily.

However, there is considerable lag between the time when contracts are made and the appearance of excess profits on company financial statements. Present indications are that excess profits from Vietnam war contracts are just now beginning to show up and that recoveries will rise over the low fiscal 1967 figure if the board is kept on the job.

There is the rub. Under present law the board will go out of existence June 30, unless Congress extends its life. Various manufacturing associations with extensive lobbying forces would be glad to see the board expire.

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, D-Tex., last spring, introduced a bill to save the board, make it permanent and extend its authority to companies having $250,000 or more in government contracts. So far, the bill has been sleeping in the House Ways and Means Committee.

With defense costs rising and exceeding defense expenditures during the Vietnam war, it is almost inconceivable that Congress will not continue the Renegotiation Board and give it whatever money it needs to check war profiteering.

But in Washington anything can happen, particularly if a powerful lobby goes to work to get rid of an obscure agency.

One hope to save the board is to make the voters acquainted with its important function and that is what Representative Gonzalez is trying to do. More power to him!

CONFUSION COMPOUNDED—CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, I described to the House the state of "confusion compounded" in which some 50 agencies of the executive branch handle the water resources of this country. My remarks on that subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 15, page 20727. At that time, I laid out a detailed picture of the duplicating, overlapping, disordered, jumbled, and disjointed organization of bureaus, committees, commissions, offices, departments, and agencies that disgorge water resources programs in so many directions that no one knows what is actually happening, or whether the legislative decrees of the U.S. Congress are in actuality being carried out or by whom. In connection with that presentation, I submitted for the RECORD a compilation of the congeries of executive agencies dealing with water resources problems that was prepared at my request by Mr. Ted Schad, senior specialist in engineering and public works, and Mrs. Elizabeth Boswell, analyst in conservation and public works in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Parenthetically, I might point out that since my remarks on this subject made in August 1966, there have been added one new Cabinet-level department, at least one new commission, and a Cabinet-level council with responsibilities in the water field. The Department, Commission, and Council referred to are the Department of Transportation, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and the Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. The latter two, I say, with hope, but without much conviction, were set up as temporary agencies, but their lives have already been extended.

As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—a committee which has very substantial responsibilities in the field of water resources—I share with my chairman and the other members of the committee a deep and abiding concern over the management of the Nation's water resources. I am forced to ask myself, therefore, why have we permitted the situation in the executive branch to develop in the way that it has.

One of the inescapable facts that we must face is that each and every one of the multitudinous water resources agencies of the executive branch has been formed, or is continued, under legislative authorization or appropriation, the responsibility for which is shared by the House of Representatives. I myself have seen what might be considered some fine hair-splitting among the committees of this body over jurisdictional problems involved in water and water-related legislation. Here, we do have a responsibility and we must resolve it.

In an attempt to provide a factual basis for evaluating what is actually going on in the Congress and because I try to keep an open mind about any changes which might make the democratic process work more efficiently and effectively, I asked Mr. Schad, who has recently been made Deputy Director of the Legislative Reference Service, for a review of the facts surrounding congressional handling of water resources proposals, including detailed information on just what was done in both sessions of the 89th Congress. Mr. Schad and Mrs. Boswell have again done a fine piece of research for me, and have provided me with a report entitled, "Congressional Handling of Water Resources." It contains a description of present congressional committee structure for dealing with water related matters, a brief history of its evolution, and a detailed summary of how water and water-related legislative proposals in both sessions of the 89th Congress were, in fact, handled by the Congress in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest it will generate I would like to place the entire text of the report in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

On the basis of my reading of this report, I feel that I can say to you that the legislative branch has not cut the water resources programs into such fine and almost unmanageable pieces as the executive branch has done, but we have made a good start. In fact, I think that some of the findings of the study show certain tendencies that Members of the House might do well to watch more closely. Perhaps, with time, observation, and understanding, we may in the future want to alter some of them for more effective legislative action and oversight in the water resources field. I have no proposals to make at this time, but I suggest that it is just possible we may find some of the procedures within our own House tend in no small way to complicate the accomplishment of the work that we direct the executive branch to carry out.

I would like to draw attention to a few facts that are set forth in the report. In the 89th Congress almost 1,300 bills and joint resolutions were introduced that had a bearing on some aspect of water resources management and development, in either a direct or indirect way. About 1,000 of these were on the House side, and about 300 were in the other body. Thus, if we consider all legislative proposals, both public and private, that were introduced during the 89th Congress, we find that about 5¼ percent of them had some relationship to water resources. If we do not count the roughly 6,500 private bills considered by both Houses in 1965 and 1966, the percentage of water and water-related public measures rises to 7.2 percent, or one out of every 14 introduced as potential legislation. There is, I should note, a great deal of duplication of counting in the case of House bills, for the reason that in the 89th Congress our House Rules did not permit multiple sponsorship of legislation under any circumstances and, therefore, in a number of instances several Members introduced identical bills. Likewise, in many instances the same measure is introduced both in the House and in the Senate, however, the figures exclude House bills considered in the Senate, or Senate bills considered in the House, after passage in the house of introduction.

The nearly 1,000 water or water-related measures considered by the House were referred to a total of 13 standing committees. The nearly 300 Senate bills dealing with some aspect of water resources were referred to 10 standing committees, and, in addition, the House-passed appropriations bills were referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, making a total of 11 committees dealing with water resources legislation in that body.

The tabulations in the report show that the House Public Works Committee received for consideration the largest number of water or water-related measures in both sessions of the 89th Congress, with 394. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was in a close second place with 339. Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ranked third with the much smaller number of 68 bills. Agriculture, Appropriations, Banking and Currency, and Ways and Means Committees were next in rank with about an equal number of referrals. There was also a scattering of water measures referred to six other House committees.

The findings indicate that referrals to Senate committees were roughly parallel to those in the House of Representatives as far as the basic purposes of the proposals were concerned, but in several areas the jurisdiction between the two Houses was not identical.

The report also shows that ever since the Congress of the United States was activated in 1789, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have endeavored to work out most of the details of legislation through their standing committees. There have been complications from time to time. Sometimes the number of committees became so prolific as to make a reduction in their numbers an obvious improvement. At other times, there have been attempts to reorganize the jurisdictions of committees along the guidelines of responsibility in a certain area of public concern. Yet, through all the history of committee functioning, there has been constant recognition of the fact that committees and their work are closely related to the events of the times.

I commend the reading and study of this report, which follows, to the Members of this House, both for our information, and for any constructive ideas which it may suggest to us about congressional administration of its responsibilities in the field of water resources:

CONGRESSIONAL HANDLING OF WATER RESOURCES

(By Theodore M. Schad, senior specialist in engineering and public works, and Elizabeth Boswell, analyst in conservation and public works, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, December 15, 1967)

INTRODUCTION

Since the turn of the century, Americans have expressed concern over the state of the nation's water resources. Since the time of the conservation movement under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt, studies have been made, reports have been written, legislation has been enacted, and major Federal governmental programs have been carried out to deal with national water resources problems. A far greater effort has taken place in the non Federal segment of government.

Water problems and legislative proposals to improve governmental procedures for dealing with them are still with us. In the first session of the 90th Congress, legislation has been voted by the Senate and the House of Representatives to create a National Water Commission for a new review of national water resources problems and programs.[1] Another proposal has been made for the creation of a Department of National Resources as a means of increasing efficiency in Federal water resources and other conservation programs.[2]

These and other proposals bring to mind some complaints that have been made earlier to the effect that the basic root of the problem lies not so much in the organization of the executive branch of the Federal government, as in the organization of the Congress itself. For example, Dr. Arthur Maass, Professor of Government at Harvard, in discussing conflicts between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation wrote as follows:

"Lack of uniformity in consideration by Congress of authorizations and appropriations for projects recommended by the Corps and the Bureau has abetted the conflict between the two agencies and made interagency coordination more difficult. The programs of these two agencies are handled by separate Congressional committees. The Senate and House Public Works Committees handle Corps of Engineers legislation, while the House Committee on Public Lands and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs deal with the Bureau of Reclamation."[3]

More recently, Dr. James W. Fesler, Professor of Government at Yale University, writing on the subject of National Water Resources Administration, made the following statement:

"A recurrent theme in much of the official and professional literature of water resources administration is that the policies of Congress, as set forth in statutes, are inconsistent; the Congress has so organized its committee structure as to abet organizational confusion in the executive branch of the government; . . ."[4]

In hope of shedding some light on the complex procedures followed by the Congress in handling water resources legislation, a review was made of the more than 24,000 proposed legislative measures that were introduced in the two sessions of the 89th Congress. It was found that 1,289 were water resource related, and that they had been referred to no less than 13 of the standing Committees in the House of Representatives, and 11 in the Senate. Without intending to suggest that this would necessarily lead one to confirm the validity of the above quotations, it does suggest a fruitful field for exploration of what is being done in the water resources field. Accordingly, this report has been prepared to provide a factual description of the Congressional structure for dealing with water resources matters, in the hope that it will help in the solution of the problems which arise from time to time as Federal water resources policy evolves. The report describes briefly the present committee structure, discusses its evolution, and summarizes proposed water resources legislation in the 89th Congress in terms of its handling by committees.

---

[1] S. 20, 90th Congress, passed Senate Feb. 6, 1967, passed House of Representatives July 12, 1967.

[2] S. 886, 90th Congress, 1st session.

[3] Maass, Arthur, *Muddy Waters: The Army Engineers and the Nation's Rivers*, Harvard University Press, 1951, p. 258.

[4] Fesler, *National Water Resources Administration*, in Economics and Public Policy in Water Resources Development, Iowa State Univ. Press, 1964, p. 374.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION FOR WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION

The basic work of Congress is carried on in its committees. Woodrow Wilson, writing as a young political scientist in 1885, made the statement:

"It is not far from the truth to say that Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, while Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."[5]

The statment is as true today as it was at the time written, and the field of water resources is no exception. The vast scope of Congressional activity in the field of water resources could not be attempted without the careful attention to detail that can only be provided by thorough consideration of proposed legislation in Committee. The pervasiveness of water problems, touching on so many of the activities of man, results in the diffusion of the responsibility for water resources among many committees.

In each House of the Congress the primary responsibility for water resources rests largely with the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works. It is in these two committees (and their standing subcommittees) that most water resources legislation is considered. But, other committees are also involved in numerous specific aspects of water and water-related legislation, including some of major scope. These include the Committee on Agriculture in the House and Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate, Merchant Marine and Fisheries (House), Interstate and Foreign Commerce (House), Commerce (Senate), Foreign Relations (Senate), Foreign Affairs (House), and Banking and Currency (both Houses). The Appropriations Committees of both Houses, with their control over funds, have a considerable say in how water resources programs are effectuated, and the Government Operations Committees, with investigatory powers, may also exercise a significant role. In addition, several other committees in both Houses, plus the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, consider bills involving water resources from time to time. A brief description of the responsibilities of the various committees follows.

The Public Works Committees of the House and Senate are responsible for the navigation and flood control programs which are the heart of the water resources program of the Corps of Engineers. There are two major exceptions: the watershed protection programs of the Department of Agriculture, which come under the Agriculture/Agriculture and Forestry Committees, and the flood control projects on the United States-Mexican boundary which come under the purview of the Foreign Relations/Foreign Affairs Committees. The multiple-purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers are also considered by Public Works Committees, and in several instances substantial multiple-purpose authorizations for the Bureau of Reclamation have been included in omnibus flood control legislation handled by the Public Works Committees.[6]

The research and construction grant programs looking to the abatement of water pollution which are carried out by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, now located in the Interior Department, also come under the Public Works committees. Road and highway drainage, which forms a significant part of the Federal aid highway programs, comes under these committees, as do the dams, reservoirs, and power plants of TVA. Authorization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development was handled by the Public Works Committee in the House, but by Foreign Relations in the Senate.

In both Houses, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees are responsible for irrigation and reclamation projects, including multiple purpose hydroelectric power projects in the 18 western States, Alaska, and Hawaii. Other legislation reviewed by Interior and Insular Affairs Committees includes the desalting program, wildlife preservation and stream pollution control in the National Parks, water-based outdoor recreation, public water supply and irrigation for Indian lands, fish and wildlife preservation and watershed protection on public lands, collection of basic data on surface and ground water, and recent legislation dealing with comprehensive river basin planning and water resources research.

The merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate handle legislation or navigation aids to the Coast Guard, weather data and research on weather modification by the Weather Bureau. Legislation dealing with inland and marine fisheries, and the preservation of sport fish and wildlife in general come under these committees, despite the fact that the agencies which handle these programs were transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior several decades ago. Inland waterways legislation is referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House, and Commerce in the Senate. The Commerce Committee of the Senate would handle legislation dealing with hydraulic research in the Bureau of Standards, while in the House, this would go to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Proposed legislation affecting water quality work remaining in the Public Health Service would apparently be reviewed by Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The Committees on Agriculture and Agriculture and Forestry have responsibilities for land and water conservation work on agricultural lands. These responsibilities have been exercised through these committees and their predecessors since the 1930's. At the same time, beginning with the Flood Control Act of 1936, programs for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil erosion prevention on watersheds, under the Secretary of Agriculture, were authorized in omnibus flood control legislation emanating from the Public Works Committees and their predecessors. With the enlargement of the Watershed Program in 1954 (Public Law 566 of the 83rd Congress), it became obvious that flood control works sponsored by the Soil Conservation Service could reach a magnitude comparable to the smaller projects of the Corps of Engineers. Recognizing the similarity, the responsibility for approval of works plans prepared under authority of this legislation was divided arbitrarily by size of impoundment between Public Works Committees and the Agriculture Committees. Through their responsibilities for agriculture generally and the welfare of farmers, the Agriculture Committees have taken responsibility for legislation to provide irrigation, water supply, and sewerage facilities in rural areas, paralleling in many cases similar authorization provided by legislation reviewed by other committees. A similar situation arises in connection with legislation having to do with financial and technical assistance in disaster areas. Certain programs of the Forest Service involving water-based recreation likewise are considered by the Agriculture committees.

As alluded to earlier, water projects involving either the United States and Mexico, or the United States and Canada, on their common boundaries, generally come under the jurisdiction of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The need for Federal assistance to urban areas has resulted in programs for planning and construction of public water supply and sewerage facilities which stem from legislation under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses.

The Appropriations Committees of both Houses obviously play a significant role in water programs of all agencies because they review the budget requests submitted by the Administration, and make their own recommendations for funding. From time to time, under suspension of the rules, or agreement to waive points of order, there is "legislation in an appropriations bill" that may authorize a project or program without reference to the appropriate substantive committee. The Appropriations committees also include comments in their reports on appropriations legislation which may be followed by the Federal agencies to almost the same degree as if they were included in the statute. To handle its work load within the deadlines imposed by the Federal fiscal year, both Appropriations Committees have created subcommittees, each responsible for one of the major spending bills. The subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations in each body is responsible for water resources and other programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley authority, the Panama Canal, the power marketing agencies of the Interior Department, the Water Resources Council and its river basin commissions, and others. The Appropriations committees thus attempt to assure coordinated consideration of water resources matters. In the Senate, provision is made for ex officio membership on the Committee on Appropriations for consideration of the certain annual appropriations bills of three members of certain substantive legislative committees. As a result, the possibility of conflicting policies emanating from the Appropriations subcommittees and the substantive legislative committees should be minimized. For bills which might affect water resources, such ex officio membership includes members from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, from the Committee on Public Works for Rivers and Harbors appropriations, and from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the appropriations for development and utilization of atomic energy.

The Committees on Government Operations likewise have broad general authority over the way Federal programs are effectuated. Specifically, these Committees consider reorganization legislation involving water resources agencies among others, but probably their most significant effect on water resources programs stems from studies and reports made with a view to improvement of the efficiency and economy of government operations. There are several subcommittees under each of the Government Operations Committees, to which are delegated various functions involving water resources.

Interstate compacts that have to do with apportionment of water for irrigation purposes, are referred under the Rules to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs in both Houses. The Rules call for interstate compacts generally to be referred to the Judiciary Committees in both houses. This adds another committee to the list of those having responsibilities in water related fields, since many compacts among the eastern states involve flood control, pollution abatement, and other water resources matters. From time to time, however, consent legislation to these interstate compacts is referred to other committees.

---

[5] Wilson, Woodrow, *Congressional Government*, 1885. 1913 edition, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 79.

[6] For example: the Bureau's Missouri River Basin Project was authorized by language in the Flood Control Acts of Dec. 22, 1944, and July 26, 1946, and the Middle Rio Grande project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of Jan. 20, 1948. (P.L. 397, 80th Congress, 2nd session).

Still another set of committees, Ways and Means in the House and Finance in the Senate, come into the picture in connection with bills to authorize Federal tax incentives to industry for water pollution abatement works.

From this brief narrative it can be seen that there are many examples of potentially overlapping jurisdiction among the committees having responsibilities in the field of water resources. Sometimes these result in referral of proposed legislation to two or more committees. This happened in connection with the consent legislation for the Delaware River Basin Compact,[7] which was referred to and reported out by the Committees on Public Works, the Judiciary, and Interior and Insular Affairs in the Senate.

Occasionally, legislation to authorize a proposed water resources project is presented in two bills, each for referral to the appropriate committee. One recent example of a project which crossed committee lines and was handled in this way is the authorization for Federal participation in a huge combination desalting plant and electric generating plant to be built off the coast of Southern California. In recognition of the division of responsibility between two committees, the legislation for this project was introduced as two bills, one to authorize the Interior Department's participation, and the other that of the Atomic Energy Commission. These were referred, respectively, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The latter Committee being empowered to report concurrently to both Houses, the legislation for the Atomic Energy Commission participation was enacted in the 89th Congress,[8] while the Interior Department's authorization, after passing the Senate, reached the House too late for action and was held over until the 90th Congress.[9]

More frequently, however, it appears that each committee works independently. The subject of water pollution abatement is one in which several committees have apparently dealt independently with similar legislative matters. The Public Works Committees of both Houses through the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its amendments from year to year, have recommended substantial programs of grants to states and municipalities toward the construction of sewage treatment plants. These same committees provided for augmentation of these programs in economically distressed areas under the Economic Development Act. The Committees on Banking and Currency include under their aegis grant and loan programs to aid municipalities in the planning and construction of local public works, including sewerage and sewage treatment plants under Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and earlier housing acts. The more recent Model Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, also emanating from this committee, provided assistance for urban sewerage facilities under certain conditions as a part of the demonstrations projects.

Under legislation coming from the Agriculture Committees, the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture has been authorized to make grants of up to 50 percent of the construction costs of projects for sewage collection and treatment works in rural areas, as well as grants for planning such programs and loans to assist in financing the local share of such projects.

Appropriations for these similar programs are handled by separate subcommittees of the Appropriations committees, and other committees become involved in pollution abatement from time to time. The Subcommittee on Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has held hearings and published reports on the subject of the adequacy of technology for pollution abatement. Extensive hearings have been held and reports published dealing with pollution abatement by the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the House Committee on Government Operations.

While the latter two committees do not report legislation on this subject, their hearings and reports may well have a considerable influence on the formulation of the Federal programs. Thus, we have at least five committees in the House of Representatives taking a hand in the Federal effort at water pollution control.

Without fear of contradiction, one may conclude that there is no rigid pattern for handling water resources matters by Congress. A look at some of the early Congressional action in the field of water resources is of interest to show the origin of the present committee structure.

BEGINNINGS OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AFFECTING WATER RESOURCES

The history of Congressional activity affecting water resources goes back almost as far as Congress itself, although the first legislation in this field was concerned wholly with the use of waterways for interstate and foreign commerce, based on the commerce clause of the Constitution. The First Congress under the Constitution convened on March 4, 1789. Records of the proceedings in the House of Representatives are fragmentary, because there were no official reporters or stenographers, but the records show that on Monday, July 20, 1789, the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives saying that the House had passed a bill for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers which were "erected, placed, or sunk" at the entrance of, or within, any bay, inlet, harbor, or port of the United States. The House requested the concurrence of the Senate in this first piece of water-related legislation in Congressional history. The Senate acquiesced to the House bill for navigation aids and it became the Act of August 7, 1789. The appropriations for these navigation aids were written into the bill as passed: the costs were to be defrayed from the Treasury of the United States. The navigation aids legislation of 1789 was renewed in the sessions of 1790 and 1791 with a specific reference to a lighthouse for Portland Head, Maine, added to the authorization. An appropriation of $1,500 was written into the legislation to pay for the new lighthouse. The first Congress also acted to authorize financial aid to the several states for navigation aids, by permitting them to levy a duty on the tonnage of ships and vessels using the waterways.[10]

On a more scientific vein, desalting of ocean water was first considered in Congress in the session of 1791, when Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, sent a letter to the House of Representatives in late November describing a crude plan for converting salt water into fresh water aboard all American merchant vessels using the distillation process. No legislation emerged from his recommendation, but it may be assumed that the publication of this report led merchant ship operators to use the suggestion.

When the Ninth Congress convened in early December of 1805, the House and the Senate were concerned with laying out and making a National Road from Cumberland, Maryland, to the State of Ohio, and a canal linking Chesapeake and Delaware bays. Both of these were major public works undertakings proposed to be paid for from Federal monies and their consideration set off a long debate on the propriety of Federal expenditures for internal improvements. They led to the Gallatin report in 1808, the first comprehensive waterways improvement plan in the history of the United States, and eventually to the rivers and harbors improvement programs. This is an interesting history, and although relevant to a study of Congressional involvement in water resources, it has been partially documented elsewhere by the writer[11] and need not be repeated here. The methods of legislative procedure used in these early days of the United States Congress are of interest, however, and will be discussed briefly in the next section on the evolution of the committee system in Congress.

EVOLUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Many of the practises of the United States Congress were derived from those used in the English House of Commons, either directly, or indirectly through modifications evolved in the colonial legislatures and the Congress under the Confederation. In the First Congress, a system of ad hoc committees evolved for the consideration of legislation in the House of Representatives. The only standing committee appointed was for investigation of contested elections. It is not clear, in the absence of verbatim proceedings of the earlier Congresses, how effectively the ad hoc committee system for consideration of legislation worked. A study of the history of debates and proceedings in Congress[12] would suggest that the legislative decisions, at least those involving water resources, were hammered out in debate in the Committee of the Whole on the floor of the House.

It appears that some of the less substantive business of the House of Representatives in the First Congress was delegated to ad hoc committees, usually consisting of three persons appointed by the Speaker to bring in suggestions for such things as ceremonial procedures for receiving the President, the proper title of address for the President, a contested election, and so on. The committees thus appointed were dissolved when the specific task for which they were appointed was completed. Committees of three representatives were likewise frequently appointed to look into matters such as petitions from citizens. Besides these committees, there were a number of special joint committees appointed in the first session to work out procedures and protocol between the two Houses with regard to enrollment of bills, the preservation of the acts passed by the Congress, the mode of presenting messages to the President, and other matters.

As for the Senate committee system roots, they may well have been put down on the "lighthouse, beacon, and buoy" bill referred to earlier. On July 23, 1789, the President of the Senate committed the bill to Senators Morris of Pennsylvania, Langdon of New Hampshire, and Dalton of Massachusetts. They reported their amendments back the following day (a Friday) for printing and then requested a recess during which they might perfect their report. The report was ready the following Wednesday, the bill passed the Senate with amendments the following Monday, and passed the House, with the Senate amendments agreed to, on Tuesday, August 4, 1789, with no conference being held.[13]

---

[7] H.J. Res. 225, of the 87th Congress, 1st session, which became Public Law 87–328, approved Sept. 27, 1961.

[8] Public Law 89–648, approved *Oct. 13*, 1966.

[9] Finally enacted as Public Law 90–18, approved *May 19*, 1967.

[10] Act of August 11, 1790 (1 Stat 184) approves, among other things, an act of the state of Georgia, "for levying and appropriating a duty of tonnage, for the purpose of clearing the river Savannah, and removing the wrecks and other obstructions therein."

[11] Schad, Theodore M., *Perspective on Water Resources Planning,* in Journal of the Hydraulics Division, Proceedings, Am. Soc. Civil Engineers, July 1962, p. 17.

[12] Gales and Seaton, The debates and proceedings in the Congress of the United States . . . (Annals of the Congress of the United States) Washington, 1834.

During the Federalist and Jefferson periods it was the general custom of the House of Representatives to refer legislative subjects to a Committee of the Whole. There, through debate, the main principles of the legislation were developed. Afterward, they were committed to ad hoc committees to draft bills which would embody the principles laid down in the Whole House. Committees of those periods were indeed the agents of the House. Their authority and duties were specifically indicated and were therefore kept under the control of the whole body. The control measures consisted of (1) assigning precise tasks to ad hoc groups; (2) requiring them to report back favorably or unfavorably; (3) dissolving the committee when its work on a bill was completed; and (4) passing judgment on the committee reports in the Committee of the Whole. Further, a committee could not report any bill which had not previously been settled in principle by the House, usually after a full-dress floor debate. Individual members could not introduce a bill until granted leave to do so by the House.

The first standing committee to deal with any aspect of water resources was the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, created in 1795, which had jurisdiction over measures relating to navigation. The Public Lands Committee followed in 1805, just after the Louisiana Purchase. The standing committee system grew very slowly however, and did not come into full operation until 1816, when, with the creation of five standing Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, there were 19 standing committees. From 1816 on, the standing committee system grew, and the roles of the formerly authoritative Committee of the Whole and the individual standing committees appear to have been reversed. Dr. George Galloway in his *History of the House of Representatives* says, "With increasing frequency legislative subjects came to be referred initially to the smaller standing committees which grew in power and prestige. . . ."[14]

The Senate was even slower and more hesitant in delegating a large part of its work to standing committees, for the reason that in the early years, the Senate appeared to consider itself largely a House of revision, where the finishing touches were placed on measures initiated in the House of Representatives. More than this, the Senate was a much smaller body in comparison. The total membership of the first Senate was only little larger than the membership of several major standing committees of today. Also, it is possible that the longer term of Senators—6 years as against 2 in the House—lessened the need for prolonged committee consideration as there was a much closer working relationship developed among Senators. Until 1816, the Senate had made provision for only four standing committees and two of these were joint committees formed at the request of the House. The Joint Standing Committee on Enrolled Bills was established in 1789. The other standing committees were the Senate Committee on Engrossed Bills (1806), and the Senate Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate (1807). The Joint Standing Committee for the Library (whose main function was to purchase books) was set up in 1806. In a sense, the work of none of these committees involved the substance of legislation, but rather was administrative. Other than these four committees mentioned, the Senate depended on ad hoc committees, as in the House, and they were usually composed of 3 members, named as the occasion for their service arose. This method of appointing a committee for a specific task was so common that in the session of 1815–16, there were between 90 and 100 such committees designated in the Senate.

But the Senate apparently ran out of patience with the inconvenience of the frequent choice of select committees at about the same time that the Congress began to take a more important role in initiating legislation. Thus, in the second session of the 14th Congress (1816), a resolution was passed to provide that 11 additional standing committees were to be appointed at each session: Foreign Relations, Finance, Commerce and Manufacturers, Military Affairs, the Militia, Naval Affairs, Public Lands, Claims, Judiciary, Post Office and Post Roads, and Pensions. The close parallelism in committee development in the two Houses of Congress is well illustrated by the fact that 9 of the Senate standing committees appointed in the 14th Congress had counterparts in the House. As a matter of interest, through 1945, more than a century and a half of legislative activity, the House of Representatives set up 67 standing committees and the Senate number reached 72.

As Dr. Haynes points out in his *History of the Senate*[15] and Dr. Galloway in the *History of the House of Representatives*,[16] the country's history may be found epitomized or outlined in the names of Congressional standing committees arranged in the order of their establishment. Their proliferation illustrated the growth of the country in terms of domestic and foreign concerns and activities.

Galloway lists the chronology of formation of committees dealing with matters which might have a bearing on some specific aspects of water resources in the House of Representatives as follows:

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: 1795—3rd committee created.
Public Lands: 1805.
Railways and Canals: 1831.
Levees and Improvements of Mississippi River: 1875.
Rivers and Harbors: 1883.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries: 1887.
Irrigation and Reclamation: 1893.
Insular Affairs: 1899.
Flood Control: 1916.

In addition, committees which later developed responsibilities for certain water resources activities were created as follows:

Judiciary: 1813.
Expenditures in Executive Departments (5 committees): 1816.
Agriculture: 1820.
Indian Affairs: 1821.
Foreign Affairs: 1822.
Territories: 1825.
Expenditures in Interior Department: 1860.
Appropriations: 1865.
Expenditures in Department of Agriculture: 1889.
Science and Astronautics: 1958.

A similar but not identical pattern of proliferation of Committees occurred in the Senate, with, as indicated earlier, an even larger total number of committees by 1945.

With the vast increase in Congressional workload that accompanied the depression of the 1930's and World War II, the need for modification of the committee structure became evident. In 1945 Congress undertook a review of its own operations by a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which resulted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In that Act, the 33 standing committees of the Senate were consolidated into 15 new committees, and the 48 standing committees of the House were consolidated to 19 new standing committees.

In recommending enactment of legislation to effect this consolidation, the Senate Special Committee on the Organization of Congress stated:[17]

"Today there are more than twice as many standing committees in the Senate as there are principal provinces of public policy. Responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 little legislatures which go their own way at their own pace and cannot act in concert. Their jurisdictions are undefined in the Senate rules, and there are many committees functioning in the same areas. For example, three Senate committees deal with problems of commerce and industry, five deal with public land problems, and six with the rules and administration of the Senate. Furthermore, some committees are inactive and seldom or never meet."

Earlier, the Joint Committee had recommended consolidation of Senate standing committees recognized as having responsibilities in water related fields as follows:[18]

CONSOLIDATION OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES
(WATER-RELATED ONLY)

Existing committees	Reorganized committees
Agriculture and Forestry	Agriculture.
Appropriations	Appropriations.
Banking and Currency	Banking and Currency.
Commerce	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Indian Affairs	
Interoceanic Canals	
Irrigation and Reclamation	
Mines and Mining	
Public Lands and Surveys	
Territories and Insular Affairs	
Expenditures in Executive Departments.	Expenditures in Executive Departments.
Foreign Relations	Foreign Relations.
Interstate Commerce	Interstate Commerce.
Manufactures	
Judiciary	Judiciary.

The Senate refused to go along with the Joint Committee to the extent of merging the work contemplated under the broad heading of Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works, however, and divided this into two Committees, Public Works and Public Lands, the latter of which eventually became the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Senate also maintained the broader designation of Agriculture and Forestry in its committee structure.

On the House side, reorganization of the water resources committees was recommended by the Joint Committee as follows:

CONSOLIDATION OF HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES

Existing committees	Reorganized committees
Agriculture	Agriculture.
Appropriations	Appropriations.
Expenditures in Executive Departments.	Expenditures in Executive Departments.
Banking and Currency	Banking and Currency.
Flood Control	Public Works.
Public Buildings and Grounds	
Rivers and Harbors	
Roads	
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.	Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Judiciary	Judiciary.
Foreign Affairs	Foreign Affairs.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries.	Merchant Marine and Fisheries
Public Lands	Public Lands.
Territories	
Irrigation and Reclamation	
Mines and Mining	
Insular Affairs	
Indian Affairs	

---

[13] Act of August 7, 1789, An Act for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers. 1 Stat. 53.

[14] Galloway, George, *History of the House of Representatives,* Crowell, New York, 1961, p. 76.

[15] Haynes, George, *History of the Senate,* Russell and Russell, New York, 1960.

[16] Galloway, George B., *The History of the House of Representatives,* Crowell, New York, 1961.

[17] U.S. Congress, Senate, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, Senate Report No. 1400, 79th Congress, 2nd session, May 31, 1946, p. 2.

[18] U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Oranization of Congress, Senate Report No. 1011, 79th Congress, 2nd session, p. 3.

The Congress accepted the committee's recommendation for realignment of the House committees. Thus, with the changes made in the Joint Committee's recommendations for the Senate, there resulted a roughly parallel structure of the major committees involved with water resources in the two Houses, except for the division between Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House, the basic general functions of both of which were included in the Commerce Committee in the Senate. At about the same time, in legislation approved on August 2, 1946, a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created with legislative responsibilities in the field of nuclear energy, which by the 89th Congress had grown to include involvement in water desalting, a potential use of nuclear energy. Creation of this Joint Committee resulted essentially in the equivalent of a new standing committee in each House, since unlike most joint committees, it is empowered to report legislation.

The committee structure established in the 1946 Act has continued to the present date with the exception that in 1958, to meet problems arising from increased involvement in space activities, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee was created in the Senate and the Science and Astronautics Committee in the House of Representatives. The jurisdiction of the two committees is not fully parallel since the House Committee has jurisdiction over the Bureau of Standards and research, which may lead it into water related fields. Thus, at present there are a total of 16 standing committees in the Senate and 20 in the House of Representatives, of which 10 in the Senate and 12 in the House of Representatives appear to have responsibilities that touch on water resources.

Jurisdiction between committees in the Congress is spelled out in the Rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives respectively which were last substantially revised effective January 1947 to reflect the major changes in committee structure accomplished by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Jurisdiction of committees in the Senate is covered by Rule XXV. The provisions of the rule that appear to govern the jurisdiction of committees involved in one way or another with water resources are spelled out in Rule XXV as follows: [19]

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

* * * * *

(b) *Committee on Agriculture and Forestry* to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Agriculture generally.

* * * * *

6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

7. Agricultural economics and research.

* * * * *

12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

* * * * *

14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

15. Rural electrification.

* * * * *

17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

* * * * *

(c) *Committee on Appropriations,* to which commmittee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

* * * * *

(e) *Committee on Banking and Currency* . . . [etc.]

* * * * *

2. Financial aid to commerce and industry.

* * * * *

4. Public and private housing.

* * * * *

(f) *Committee on Commerce* . . . [etc.]

1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

* * * * *

5. Merchant marine generally.

6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

* * * * *

10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, life-saving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

* * * * *

14. Weather Bureau.

15. Except as provided in paragraph (d) [Armed Services], Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

16. Inland waterways.

17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

18. Bureau of Standards . . .

* * * * *

(h) *Committee on Finance* . . . [etc.]

1. Revenue measures generally.

* * * * *

(i) *Committee on Foreign Relations* . . . [etc.]

1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

2. Treaties.

3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

* * * * *

6. Internation conferences and congresses.

* * * * *

13. Foreign loans.

(j) (1) *Committee on Government Operations* . . . [etc.]

* * * * *

(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

(D) studying the intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, . . .

(k) *Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs* . . . [etc.]

1. Public lands generally, . . .

* * * * *

4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

* * * * *

7. Measures relating generally to the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

* * * * *

12. Geological survey.

* * * * *

16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands * * *

(1) *Committee on the Judiciary* * * * [etc.]

* * * * *

18. Interstate compacts generally.

* * * * *

(o) *Committee on Public Works* * * * [etc.]

1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

3. Water power.

4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

Jurisdiction of committees in the House of Representatives is determined by Rule XI, provisions of which suggest that twelve standing committees have responsibilities involving some aspect of water resources. The pertinent provisions of Rule XI are quoted hereinafter.[20]

"All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively:

1. *Committee on Agriculture*

* * * * *

(e) Agricultural economics and research.

* * * * *

(i) Crop insurance and soil conservation.

* * * * *

(l) Extension of farm credit and farm security.

(m) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

* * * * *

(q) Rural electrification.

2. *Committee on Appropriations.*

(a) Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

(b) The committee is authorized . . . to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive department or other executive agency .

* * * * *

4. *Committee on Banking and Currency.*

* * * * *

(h) Public and private housing.

* * * * *

7. *Committee on Foreign Affairs.*

(a) Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

* * * * *

(c) Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

* * * * *

(e) International conferences and congresses.

* * * * *

8. *Committee on Government Operations.*

* * * * *

(b) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

* * * * *

10. *Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.*

(a) Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

* * * * *

---

[19] U.S. Congress, Senate. *Senate Manual* . . . Washington, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1965 (Senate Document No. 1, 89th Congress, 1st sess.)

[20] U.S. Congress, House. *Constitution, Jefferson's Manual, Rules* . . . Washington, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1965 (House Document No. 374, 88th Congress, 2nd sess.) p. 328 ff.

(c) Geological Survey.

(d) Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

(e) Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

(f) Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(g) Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.

* * * * *

(o) Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

* * * * *

11. *Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.*

(c) Inland waterways.

* * * * *

(h) Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(i) Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.

* * * * *

(k) Weather Bureau.

12. *Committee on the Judiciary.*

* * * * *

(i) Interstate compacts generally.

* * * * *

13. *Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.*

(a) Merchant marine generally.

(b) Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(c) Coast Guard, including lifesaving services, lighthouses, and lightships, and ocean derelicts.

(d) Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

(e) Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water (except matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission) and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

* * * * *

(g) Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

(h) Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone; and interoceanic canals generally.

* * * * *

15. *Committee on Public Works.*

(a) Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

* * * * *

(f) Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

* * * * *

(i) Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

(j) Water power.

* * * * *

17. *Committee on Science and Astronautics.*

(b) Bureau of Standards.

* * * * *

(h) Scientific research and development.

* * * * *

20. *Committee on Ways and Means.*

* * * * *

(d) Revenue measures generally.

* * * * *

The purposeful generality of the rules appear to have been designed to permit some flexibility. Referral of bills under the rules are made by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, although in practice, this function is carried out by the parliamentarian in each House. The significance of the Committee referrals can be gathered from the following statement by Galloway in his discussions of the Committees in his *History of the House of Representatives.*[21]

"The standing committees of the House have acquired power over the years to receive legislative proposals, messages, petitions, and memorials on matters within their defined jurisdiction; to sit and act when and where they deem it advisable during sessions (by special leave), recesses, and adjourned periods; to send for persons and papers; to take testimony and make expenditures; to conduct authorized investigations and to report by bill or otherwise upon any matter within their jurisdiction; to oversee the execution of the laws; to certify contumacious witnesses for contempt; to adopt rules and appoint subcommittees; to report in certain cases at any time or not to report. Measures that the whole House might approve are sometimes "killed in committee" by a few members. Congressional committees usually report only those bills that a majority of their members favor, unlike some state legislatures and the English House of Commons where all referred bills are reported back one way or another" (p. 79).

"Subject to some limitations, the committees of Congress have thus come to play a leading role in lawmaking. Each composed of comparatively few members, each normally acting independently of the others, they have long determined the agenda of the House which has largely delegated to its standing committees the power to decide what matters shall be considered on the floor and to control the proceedings there, subject to the terms of the Rules Committee. They can amend or rewrite bills to suit themselves. They can report bills or pigeonhole them. They can initiate measures they desire and bury or emasculate those they dislike. They can proceed with dispatch or deliberate at length. Thus the real locus of the legislative power is not in the House or Senate; it is in their standing committees. The tendency is for the standing committees to frame policy that the whole legislature usually follows" (pp. 79–80).

"The autonomy of the committees gives rise in turn to the problem of coordination. Since the committees usually have a decisive voice in lawmaking, the committee system makes for the decentralization of legislative policy formation. Jealous of their jurisdictions and acting independently of each other, these little legislatures go their own way at their own pace" (p. 95–96).

Rules of the Senate permitting unlimited debate serve to reduce the autonomy of the Senate committees, but in the field of water resources they are seldom overruled.

The division of responsibility for water resources is further fragmented by the fact that the heavy workload of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Public Works Committees resulted in the establishment of the following subcommittees during the 89th Congress:

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (89th Congress)

Senate

Territories and Insular Affairs.
Indian Affairs.
Minerals, Materials, Fuels.
Public Lands.
Water and Power Resources.
Parks and Reclamation.
Legislative Oversight.

House

Territories and Insular Affairs.
Indian Affairs.
Mines and Mining.
Public Lands.
Irrigation and Reclamation.
National Parks and Reclamation.

Public Works (89th Congress)

Senate

Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors.
Roads.
Public Buildings and Grounds.
Air and Water Pollution.

House

Flood Control.
Rivers and Harbors.
Roads.
Public Buildings and Grounds.
Watershed Development.
Special Subcommittee on Federal Aid Highway Program.
Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs.
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia.

As indicated in the above tabulation, the water resources work of these committees in each case is divided among several subcommittees.

The heavy workload of the Appropriations Committees has also made it necessary to create a number of subcommittees. These parallel generally the organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. More than a decade ago, however, the Appropriations Committees of both Houses merged their consideration of the major water resources construction programs of the several departments into one subcommittee which reports the Public Works Appropriations each year. At present, there are 13 subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee and 14 on the Senate side, the one added committee on the Senate side being a Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplemental Appropriations which handles such bills instead of dividing them among the regular subcommittees as is done in the House Appropriations Committee. Water resources related appropriations thus are divided among subcommittees as shown in the following list:

Subcommittees of Appropriations Committees

Senate

Agriculture and Related Agencies.
Deficiencies and Supplementals.
Department of Commerce.
Independent Offices.
Interior and Related Agencies.
Labor, HEW, and Related Agencies.
Public Works.
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

House

Agriculture and Related Agencies.
Department of Commerce.
Independent Offices.
Interior and Related Agencies.
Labor, HEW, and Related Agencies.
Public Works.
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

Most of the other committees having functions related to water resources have also delegated responsibilities to subcommittees, thus, a very large number of different Congressional groups became involved in water resources.

A tabulation of the twenty-nine Federal agencies having water resource related programs, showing the legislative committees to which they report, follows. No attempt has been made to break this down by subcommittee. Each agency, of course, also reports annually to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles its annual and supplemental appropriations:

---

[21] Galloway, George, *History of the House of Representatives,* Crowell, New York, 1961.

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Department or agency	Water-related work	Committee having jurisdiction	
		House	Senate
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	Financial and technical assistance for conservation work and in disaster areas.	Agriculture	Agriculture and Forestry.
Farmers Home Administration	Financial and technical assistance for rural water supply and sewerage.	do	Do.
Forest Service	Watershed protection, recreation	Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs.	Agriculture and Forestry, Interior and Insular Affairs.
Soil Conservation Service	Watershed protection, irrigation, water supply, recreation, flood control.	Agriculture, Public Works	Agriculture and Forestry, Public Works.
Department of Commerce:			
Bureau of Public Roads	Road and highway drainage	Public Works	Public Works.
Environmental Science Services Administration	Hydrometeorological investigations, weather modification research.	Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Commerce.
Bureau of Standards	Hydraulics research	Science and Astronautics	Do.
Department of Defense: Corps of Engineers, civil functions	Navigation, flood control, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, and multiple-purpose projects.	Public Works	Public Works.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health	Water quality	Public Works, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.	Public Works, Labor and Public Welfare.
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
Land and Facilities Development Administration	Loans and grants for water and sewerage projects	Banking and Currency	Banking and Currency.
Office of Planning Standards and Coordination	Loans and grants for public works planning	do	Do.
Department of the Interior:			
Office of Water Resources Research	Grants and contracts for water resources research	Interior and Insular Affairs	Interior and Insular Affairs.
Office of Saline Water	Research and development on desalting	do	Do.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	Conservation of fish and wildlife	Interior and Insular Affairs, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.	Interior and Insular Affairs, Commerce.
Bureau of Indian Affairs	Indian water resource projects	Interior and Insular Affairs	Interior and Insular Affairs.
Geological Survey	Water resources basic data	do	Do.
Bureau of Land Management	Water resources management on public lands	do	Do.
National Park Service	Water resources management in national parks	do	Do.
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	Water-based recreation policies	do	Do.
Bureau of Reclamation	Irrigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, multiple purpose projects.	do	Do.
Bonneville Power Administration Southwestern Power Administration Southeastern Power Administration	Marketing of hydroelectric power	Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works.	Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works.
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration	Pollution abatement, research, and grants	Public Works	Public Works.
Department of State:			
International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico.	Water resource development	Foreign Affairs	Foreign Relations.
International Joint Commission—United States and Canada.	Studies of water resources matters	do	Do.
Treasury Department: U.S. Coast Guard	Aids to navigation	Merchant Marine and Fisheries	Commerce.
Independent agencies:			
Appalachian Regional Commission	Water resources investigations	Public Works	Public Works.
Atomic Energy Commission	Research and demonstration on desalting	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.
Delaware River Basin Commission	Water resources planning and management for all purposes	Judiciary	Judiciary, Public Works, Interior and Insular Affairs.
Federal Power Commission	Hydroelectric power studies	Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Commerce.
National Science Foundation	Water resources research	Science and Astronautics	Labor and Public Welfare.
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	Navigation on St. Lawrence River	Public Works	Public Works, Foreign Relations.
Tennessee Valley Authority	Multiple-purpose water resource development	do	Public Works.
Water Resources Council and River Basin Commissions	Water resources planning	Interior and Insular Affairs	Interior and Insular Affairs.

WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION IN THE 89TH CONGRESS

Referral of bills under the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate is not a simple matter, and requires a great deal of skill and knowledge of precedents. The task is not made easier by the volume of bills and resolutions introduced.[22] In order to see how water resources legislation was actually divided among the committees during a complete Congress, a cursory review was made of the titles and digests [23] of all the legislative measures introduced in the 89th Congress, which ran from January 4, 1965 to October 22, 1966. This covered 18,551 House bills, 1,322 House Joint Resolutions, 3,931 Senate bills and 198 Senate Joint Resolutions, a grand total of 24,002 potential legislative enactments. House and Senate Concurrent Resolutions, and simple House and Senate Resolutions were not considered, as they do not form the basis for public laws. The larger number of bills and joint resolutions in the House of Representatives does not indicate that the House considered more different legislative issues than the Senate. The number of bills and resolutions in each House appears to be roughly proportional to the number of Members, but the principal reason for the larger number of House measures is that multiple sponsorship of bills was not permitted in the House of Representatives during the 89th Congress. Thus, large numbers of identical bills were introduced in the House, building up the total count. Since the House, in the 90th Congress changed its rules to permit multiple sponsorship of bills to a limited extent, there may be a lesser number of House bills in the future.

Of the total number of bills scanned by title, 1,289 bills and resolutions had something to do with water resources development of one kind or another or had some other direct or indirect relationship to water resources. House bills and joint resolutions included in this category total 998 and Senate measures, 291. Thus, about 5¼ percent of all the proposed legislation introduced in the Congress in 1965 and 1966 had something to do with water resources. When consideration is given to the fact that about 6,500 of the bills in both Houses were private bills, the percentage of potential public measures involving water resources is much greater, about 7.2%, or one in 14.

The proposed water resource legislative measures were referred to a total of thirteen committees in the House and eleven committees in the Senate as indicated in the tabulation below. In addition to the bills originating in the Senate and referred to Senate committees, the appropriations bills, which must originate in the House of Representatives, were referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations after passage by the House. These do not show up in our account, as no attempt was made to tally House Acts referred to Senate committees, or Senate Acts, referred to House committees. Since these do not show up in our tally, this analysis should not be considered as covering the full workload of any committee on water related measures. The number of measures not counted, of course, is far more than offset by the identical bills introduced in the House to cover the same period.

Referral of water related measures in the 89th Congress—Number of bills

House committee:	
Agriculture	31
Appropriations	37
Armed Services	1
Banking and Currency	34
Foreign Affairs	14
Government Operations	20
Interior and Insular Affairs	339
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	11
Judiciary	10
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	68
Public Works	394
Science and Astronautics	4
Ways and Means	35
Total	998

Senate committee:	
Agriculture and Forestry	14
Appropriations	(1)
Banking and Currency	12
Commerce	25
Finance	4
Foreign Relations	3
Government Operations	4
Interior and Insular Affairs	113
Judiciary	3
Labor and Public Welfare	2
Public Works	111
Total	291

[1] House acts not counted in Senate.

---

[22] On January 4, 1965, opening day of the 89th Congress, 1,494 House bills, 111 House joint resolutions, 67 House concurrent resolutions, and 75 House resolutions were introduced and referred to committee.

[23] For the purposes of this report use was made of the Digest of Public General Bills and Selected Resolutions, 89th Congress, 1st and 2nd sessions, Final Issues, 1965 and 1966, and the Legislative Calendars of the several committees.

The tabulations show that the House Public Works Committee rceived for its consideration the largest number of water related bills in both sessions of the 89th Congress, with Interior and Insular Affairs Committee running a very close second place, followed by Merchant Marine and Fisheries with a much smaller number of bills. Agriculture, Appropriations, Banking and Currency, and Ways and Means ranked next, with about an equal number of referrals, and a scattering were referred to the other committees listed.

The largest number of individual water related bills referred to the House Public Works Committee pertained to authorization of flood control or navigation projects or of surveys which might lead to recommendations of projects. The total number of project and survey bills was 132. (In addition, a number of review reports were authorized by Committee resolution, where legislation was not required.) There were 51 bills having to do with pollution abatement, 49 relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway, and 41 on accelerated public works and regional development, including a number of Appalachia bills. There were 35 bills to authorize flood, hurricane, or other disaster relief. There were 41 bills of a general policy nature. The remainder of the bills referred to Public Works included a small number affecting TVA, the Arkansas River Compact, and bridges and dams on navigable rivers. Many of the bills referred to this committee were identical.

In the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs there were 117 bills relating to the authorization of proposed reclamation projects or of surveys leading to such projects. The largest number of bills referred to this committee involved water-based recreation, numbering 168 on such subjects as scenic rivers, national lakeshores, national recreation areas, parks, and wild rivers. Some 58 of these were identical proposals for Federal cooperation with the State of New York and New Jersey to preserve the resources of the Hudson River, and there were 34 bills to authorize establishment of a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway. There were about 50 bills dealing with general policy on such matters as water resources research and planning, weather modification to increase precipitation, small reclamation projects, extension of the desalting program, user fees in recreation areas, and similar matters. A few other bills referred to this committee covered miscellaneous subjects such as hydrologic surveys in the Delmarva Peninsula, Federal participation in a desalting plant, and other individual water matters not included in the reclamation program.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which had the third largest number of bills, received measures relating to anadromous fish, oceanography, inland waterway rules, interoceanic canals, pesticides, and pollution of navigable waters, as well as general bills relating to fish and wildlife.

The water related bills referred to Ways and Means all dealt with providing tax incentives for water pollution abatement works through rapid amortization or an investment credit. The House Appropriations Committee had referred to it a number of bills and joint resolutions pertaining to specific water projects or programs, as well as the major appropriation bills containing funds for water resources related programs. Banking and Currency had several bills proposing flood and other disaster loans, as well as legislation including loans and grants for water supply and sewerage facilities in connection with urban and suburban development or redevelopment.

The Committee on Agriculture had measures relating to the watershed program, recreation development in connection with watersheds and national forest lands, rural water supply, and sewerage facilities, as well as flood disaster and drought assistance for farmers.

The House Government Operations Committee handled bills involving reorganization of Federal agencies having water resources responsibilities, in addition to investigations in several water related areas of Federal agency operation. The water related bills referred to the Judiciary Committee were to proclaim various public observances of water awareness or water conservation week or month.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was concerned with solid waste disposal, jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over certain canals and waterways, and non-navigability of certain streams.

The Foreign Affairs Committee had measures relating to water resource development on the Rio Grande, as well as the legislation involved in the Water for Peace Conference. Some of the bills proposing establishment of national sea grant colleges, went to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, but the legislation which finally became law was reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The one water related bill that went to Armed Services Committee involved payment to a village for a water filtration plant alleged to be required as a result of operations of the Department of Defense.

A similar pattern could be traced for the referral of bills in the Senate, where eleven committees received bills, as indicated on the tabulation.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs received the largest number of bills, with Public Works having almost the same total, followed by Commerce, then Agriculture and Forestry some distance back.

The Senate Interior measures included 45 authorizations or modifications of reclamation projects, 33 involving water related recreation areas, and 21 covering various aspects of general water resources policy, including the bill which became the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 and modifications to the Water Resources Research Act. Other measures included six involving Indian irrigation, three for power marketing agencies, two interstate compact consent bills, and several miscellaneous items.

Senate Public Works had 53 bills authorizing projects, modification of projects, or surveys of potential projects. There were 17 pollution abatement bills, 10 involving bridges and dams or navigable waterways, and 10 for economic development and public works acceleration programs. In addition to the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill there were 10 other bills proposing changes in general policy for water resources related work. The balance of this committee's bills included 5 disaster relief proposals, consent legislation for an interstate compact, and modifications to TVA and St. Lawrence Seaway financing. The Calendar of the Senate Committee on Public Works also lists action on 69 resolutions approving small watershed plans of the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 566, and 103 resolutions requesting reviews of previous reports by the Department of the Army, thus giving an idea of the magnitude of the workload of these committees over and above the proposed legislative measures that are discussed in this report.

Bills referred to the Commerce Committee covered subjects ranging from research on weather modification to control of jelly fish, as well as more normal subjects such as enhancement of fisheries and wildlife resources, water for powerplants, and changes in navigable waterways. The smaller number of water related bills referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry dealt with such matters as rural water and sewerage facilities, recreation and fish and wildlife conservation on agricultural and forest lands, watershed development, loans to fish farmers, and control of pesticides.

Because of the number of bills dealing with urban problems and with flood disaster assistance, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was very close behind Agriculture and Forestry in numbers of bills handled. Bills referred to the Judiciary Committee in the Senate included consent legislation for an interstate compact, as well as the proposed payment for a water filtration plant which was referred to Armed Services in the House, and a proposed proclamation for a National Clean Water Week.

In the Senate, as in the House, water related bills dealing with tax matters involving water resources went to the Finance Committee, reorganization of executive branch agencies went to Government Operations, and bills dealing with water projects on national boundaries and a joint resolution on the Water for Peace conference went to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The two bills which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare involved grants for health and sanitation services, and the national sea-grant college proposal.

Thus it can be seen that, although the basic referrals are similar in the House and Senate, there are several areas in which the jurisdiction is not identical.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since its earliest days, the Congress has endeavored to develop its organization so that its lawmaking business may be accomplished as efficiently, expeditiously, and wisely as possible. The Congressional standing committees in both Houses have been given very important functions in the legislative process. It is in these committees that concerned parties may make their views heard, and proposed measures receive the most intensive consideration.

More than five percent of the proposed legislation introduced in the 89th Congress had something to do with water resources. The measures were referred to no less than 13 of the 20 standing committees in the House of Representatives, and 11 of the 16 in the Senate, and in addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considered and reported at least one bill affecting water resources development.

The present organization of Congressional committees concerned with water resources has evolved slowly over the years. Tradition has played a large role in this evolution, but the Congress has not hesitated to make changes when the need has arisen. The last major change in committee structure occurred as a result of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Minor changes have been made from time to time since then to handle specific situations. While to some observers, the present committee structure may appear confused, diffuse, too fluid for efficiency, and in some instances not particularly reasonable, there is a strong historical basis for the present organization. One committee chairman testified to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, created during the 89th Congress for the purpose of improving the organization of Congress, that there was a need for some formal procedure for coordination among committees of the House of Representatives on legislation involving the jurisdiction of more than one committee.[24] Water resources development was mentioned as an example of an area in which there were overlapping interests. The Joint Committee made no recommendations along these lines.

A number of recent legislative enactments shows that Congressional action tends to transcend boundaries set up by arbitrary divisions of responsibilities among several Congressional committees, or among the different agencies in the executive branch of the Federal government, that are engaged in the same type of work. Among the measures which can be mentioned are the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act,[25] which applies uniform standards for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife resources to all Federal agencies engaged in water resources development. This act was reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (predecessor of the present Senate Committee on Commerce) yet it has primary application to Federal Reclamation projects normally coming under the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the flood control and rivers and harbors projects coming under the Public Works Committees, and the small watershed programs coming under the Agriculture/Agriculture and Forestry Committees.

---

[24] U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 89th Congress, 1st session, Hearings on the Organization of Congress, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1965, Part 13, p. 2032.

Another example is the Water Supply Act of 1958,[26] produced by the Public Works Committees, to establish uniform standards for including municipal and industrial water supplies in water resources development projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. In the same vein, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961[27] set uniform standards for inclusion of storage or regulation of streamflow for the purpose of water quality control in reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, or any other Federal agency.

The Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs likewise report legislation of general applicability to projects and programs which come under the jurisdiction of other committees. Witness the Federal Water Project Recreation Act,[28] which applies to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in connection with any Federal navigation, flood control, reclamation, hydroelectric power or multiple-purpose water resource projects, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965[29] which provides among other things for the collection of user fees at recreation areas at reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission. The latter provision has generated considerable controversy, and the Public Works Committees are considering proposed legislation to amend it.

Occasionally one committee proposes legislation that might not be considered to be fully consistent with legislation reported by another committee. An instance that could be mentioned arose in connection with water supply planning in the northeastern States. Here the House Public Works Committee proposed authorizing the Corps of Engineers to prepare a regional plan for meeting the future water supply needs of the cities along the northeastern seaboard.[30] At the same time, the Water Resources Council, acting under authority of the Water Resources Planning Act,[31] had a proposal for setting up a Federal-State river basin commission to do similar water resources planning work in the same general area. To resolve the apparent conflict which would result if two entities were to undertake similar planning, the language authorizing the study was modified before final enactment to authorize the Chief of Engineers "to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80) to meet the long range water needs of the Northeastern United States."[32] From a legislative viewpoint, this resolved the conflict, however, it appears that both studies are now in progress, and it is too early to judge whether any duplication of effort is occurring.

Other potential conflicts might arise out of proposed authorizations for studies of estuarine or coastal zones by different Federal agencies, legislation for which is considered by different committees. In this instance, however, it appears that there has been informal consultation among members of the committees concerned, and compromises worked out to eliminate conflicting policies.

When necessary, special attention can be given to water resources outside of the standing committees. For example, in 1959, the Senate created a Select Committee on National Water Resources,[33] which made studies and reports[34] on all aspects of water resources before ceasing to exist on January 31, 1961. Similar action can be taken in the future by either House, if necessary, or a special joint committee could be created by concurrent resolution if it were desired to consider all aspects of water within a single Congressional committee. A certain measure of coordination in water resource related matters is provided also by the service of members on more than one of the committees dealing with water resources matters. Furthermore, the rules of the Senate result in liaison between its Appropriations Committee and certain legislative committees through ex officio memberships.

With its roots deep in the historical and evolutionary pattern that has developed over the years, the present committee structure may well provide almost the best possible organization of workload. There are so many facets of responsibility in the water field that if an attempt were made to develop a committee structure for consistency in dealing with this one field, consideration of other functional activities might be fractured. This review of the conduct of water related business in the 89th Congress serves primarily, therefore, to illustrate the widespread nature of the water problem itself and its complicated pervasiveness into almost every aspect of governmental policy.

THE INCREDIBLE, RIDICULOUS ARMS AID TO JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled by the administration's announcement last week that the United States would renew its policy of supplying arms and military equipment to Jordan. How incredible. It could only encourage Arab belligerence and intransigence at the very moment they were firing brutal barrages into Israel. It is a mockery to announce that this stupid new decision is deemed "essential to the stability of the area."

Mr. Speaker, the proper objective of the United States in the Middle East is the maintenance of peace, and the preservation of the national integrity of the countries which currently exist there. The war in June was a grave demonstration of the explosive forces at work in this region, forces which are dedicated to the destruction of the one progressive democratic state in the area, and which constitute a potential catalyst for a much wider conflict, one which could ultimately embroil the major countries of the world.

Against this background, only the military strength and superior strategy of the Israel forces prevented what might have developed into a major world catastrophe. Since the war's dramatic conclusion, rather than constructive negotiations to ease tensions in the area, we have seen a large-scale rebuilding of Arab military strength by means of massive Soviet aid.

What has been the reaction of the United States to this one-sided effort on the part of the Soviet Union? To "counterbalance" Soviet military aid to the Arabs, the State Department announced last Wednesday that we would resume arms shipments to Jordan. This move was made presumably to preserve American influence in that Arab country, to offset the appeal of Soviet military aid.

The persuasive powers that we have gained in the Middle East by virtue of our military aid to the Arabs were amply demonstrated in June: the only influence that brought a halt to Arab military activities was the superior force of the Israelis. Moreover, the recent clashes along the Israel-Jordan frontier give no indication that the hostility of the Arabs in general, or Jordan in particular, has in any way diminished. It is crystal clear that Jordan was an aggressor in the June conflict. Where was the much-advertised State Department influence then and where is the moderation and restraint of King Hussein today?

This ridiculous move last Wednesday convinces me that not only has there been a credibility gap in the administration's foreign policy, but there is a blatant incredibility gap as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the interests of preserving the democracy of Israel and maintaining the peace in the Middle East, I must vigorously insist that this is no time to be resuming military shipments to Jordan.

In this context, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, February 16:

ARMS FOR JORDAN?

The stated reason for resuming arms shipments to Jordan—that otherwise Moscow would gain the upper hand is—a bad reason which does not justify the decision. The American interest in Jordan is not that the United States have more influence than the Soviet Union but that Jordan pursue regional peace. There is no evidence that the purchase of American rather than Soviet arms would make Jordan a responsible, or more responsible, state, and there is the evidence of the June war to indicate contrarily that suppliers cannot control the use to which the recipients put their arms.

---

[25] Public Law 85–624, approved August 12, 1958, 72 Stat. 563.

[26] Public Law 85–500, Approved July 3, 1958, 72 Stat. 319.

[27] Public Law 87–88, Approved July 20, 1961, 75 Stat. 204.

[28] Public Law 89–72, Approved July 9, 1965, 79 Stat. 213

[29] Public Law 88–578, Approved September 3, 1964, 78 Stat. 897.

[30] U.S. Congress, House Report No. 973, 89th Congress, 1st session, Rivers and Harbors, Beach Erosion, Flood Control Propjects, and Water Supply, Report of the Committee on Public Works on S. 2300, U.S.G.P.O. Washington, September 9, 1965.

[31] Public Law 89–80, approved July 22, 1965, 79 Stat. 244

[32] Public Law 89–298, approved October 27, 1965, 79 Stat. 1073

[33] Senate Resolution 48, 86th Congress, 1st session, adopted April 20, 1959.

[34] See Senate Report No. 29, 87th Congress, 1st session, for a summary of this committee's work.

Jordan is weak but is it also in danger? Certainly not from Israel, which last June took from Jordan all it could possibly want. True, King Hussein is in danger from his fellow Arabs, particularly Iraq, which still keeps 15,000 troops in Jordan. But who will argue that the United States ought to be sorting out Arab quarrels, at the cost of increasing tension and accelerating an arms race between the Arabs and Israel?

There may be one plausible reason for selling Jordan arms: that for his personal pride and his national bargaining position, King Hussein needs the increment of independence they would provide. This is not a consideration to be dismissed. But it does not outweigh the embarrassment of supplying arms to countries which would be likely to use them against each other, or the danger of building up the level of arms in a region still so far from peace. The extent of that embarrassment and the depth of that danger are clearer than ever after yesterday's savage outbreaks on the Jordan-Israel frontier.

DANGEROUS DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee presently is considering legislation designed to limit the distribution and use of dangerous drugs.

As is usual, those opposed to the legislation attempt to confuse the issue by questioning the harmful effects of various drugs. Mr. Speaker, all drugs are dangerous. Some of them are used by physicians to alleviate bodily conditions which are still more dangerous. But they are not something to play with. In recent years a whole pharmacopoeia of pills and tablets and whatnots has been put on the market and made available to the public without prescription. Some of them are useful in proper administration. But others are used solely for their effects on the nervous system. Does anybody suppose we can stupefy the brain repeatedly without leaving some harmful effect? Other effects on reproductive cells have not yet been catalogued, but they are known to be horrifying. Relation of drugs to crime is demonstrated daily.

Other opposition to the proposed legislation quibbles over whether the seller or the buyer of illicit drugs should come under the ban of the law. If we are to stop the use of such drugs, both seller and buyer must be held responsible.

The job of stopping the spread of substances known to be injurious and having no practical usefulness, is a major project. It may demand the concentration of the attention of an independent department of the Executive.

Three editorials clipped from highly respected newspapers discuss various aspects of the situation in a clear and forceful manner. I place them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 8, 1968]

SUPPLY IS THE BIG KEY TO CURBING DOPE PROBLEM

In a special anti-crime message to Congress, President Johnson declared war on the drug traffic in this country. Encouragingly enough, the President put emphasis where emphasis has long been due—on the source.

The President plans to combine the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control into "a new and powerful Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs." He asked for an increase of more than 30% in the number of narcotics agents.

He asserted that the pusher and peddler are warned their criminal acts must stop. He noted that, "No matter how well organized they are, we will be better organized. No matter how well they have concealed their activities, we will root them out."

The President spoke of "a crazy-quilt of inconsistent approaches and widely disparate criminal sanctions" under federal law and said something must be done about it. "In no area of law enforcement is there a greater need for a concentrated drive than in dealing with the growing problem of narcotics and dangerous drugs," the chief executive said.

The unhappy experience of narcotic laws is that they have worked chiefly against the addict and sometimes the pusher, but not the major trafficker, who is the source of supply and is several layers removed from the last seller who deals with the consumer.

But the addict and the petty pusher are more easily apprehended and they are caught up by the law while the narcotics importer and wholesaler go untouched. They are scarcely alarmed by the arrest of a pusher who may himself be an addict, and the addict customer. Customers are plentiful and pushers can always be had for a small amount.

The importer and wholesaler are anonymous professionals with plenty of money, organization and are experts at not only evading the law but escaping its notice. These are the spiders at the center of the web and these are the ones who need to be flushed out.

It will not be an easy task and apparently the President is well aware of that. But the only way to cut down the dope traffic is to cut down supply before it can reach out to customers who will become addicts.

Even if all the known addicts were arrested and there was an institution large enough to house them all, the traffickers who are responsible for supply would simply find new generations of users and business would go on as usual.

Congress ought to support the President's plans for the war on drugs but while it is at it, it might review its laws dealing with narcotics, from the Boggs law of 1951 on, with an eye on the question of whether the laws and penalties are not mainly slanted at victims rather than the dope racketeers at whom they should be aimed.

It should be possible to get at the supplier and get at him hard under law, despite his organization, his secrecy and his political allies. He is the man with whom society must war. A roundup of all known addicts may make headlines, but it doesn't make headway against the dope traffic.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 8, 1968]

TIGHTER LSD LAWS ARE NEEDED

President Johnson's proposal to tighten the laws against the sale of LSD—and to punish possession also—is a wise and welcome one.

We do not know all that we ought to know about the effects of this drug, but we know enough to justify the government in keeping it an outlaw until more can be found out.

The indications that LSD causes brain and chromosome damage are too serious to be ignored. The drug, at the very least, has contributed to damaged lives, and we need not wait for any more evidence to know that it is dangerous.

The sale of LSD is now a misdemeanor, and the President has proposed that it be made a felony with a more severe penalty. The possession of LSD is not now unlawful at all, and the President has proposed that possession be made a misdemeanor.

We do not expect that the new penalties, in themselves, will bring any large victories in the war against LSD. Many who are willing to risk insanity by taking the drug will probably also be willing to risk long imprisonment.

But some people will be deterred; and when the danger of arrest is added to the growing stock of information about LSD's harmful effects, the use of the drug may steadily subside.

If President Johnson's call for more narcotics agents is heeded by Congress, the government will have better means of making new LSD laws effective.

That the threat of punishment cannot succeed completely in stamping out undesirable human behavior is not a reason to dispense with punishment altogether. Punishment for murder and robbery have never completely stopped murder and robbery, but they have cut down the incidence.

That is what new laws on the sale and possession of LSD would try to do. Even a small reduction in the use of this dangerous drug would be a very important gain for the country.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 9, 1968[

NARCOTICS AND CRIME

President Johnson's special message on crime gave appropriate emphasis to the need for a nationwide crackdown on dope peddlers and an effective campaign to curb the misuse of dangerous drugs.

Young people, especially, tend to underestimate the perils of experimentation with LSD, marijuana and the hard-core narcotics.

The President's proposal for creation of a Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs no doubt will get close scrutiny in Congress. Realistic legal deterrents to the manufacture, sale, distribution and possession of the full range of addictive and hallucinogenic drugs are urgently needed. Mr. Johnson's recommendations in this regard are commendable but could, perhaps, be strengthened.

In addition to the personal tragedy that dangerous drugs inflict upon their victims—ruined lives, broken health, sometimes death—there are direct relationships between narcotics and crime. Persons under the influence of drugs may commit criminal acts totally alien to their normal nature. Moreover, the compelling requirement of ever-increasing funds to buy narcotics often lures addicts into crime.

Suppliers and sellers of narcotics not only are criminals themselves but produce enormous profits in their evil traffic which are used to finance other underworld activity.

Aside from the drug menace, the President's message gave timely attention to the crime problem in broad scope, most notably to rioting and violence in the streets. An essential ingredient to the preservation of law and order—which government at every level can encourage but cannot provide on its own—is vigorous public support for local law-enforcement officers.

MARYLAND FIRM HUNG UP BY SBA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News today carries a story outlining a further involvement of

George Bookbinder with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Bookbinder, it will be remembered, is a former fundraiser for Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and is an officer of Rand Development Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, whose subsidiary, Universal Fiberglass Corp., defaulted on a Government contract for mail delivery carts.

It will also be remembered that Universal got this contract over the strong objections of experts in the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration—and got it only after great political pressure was applied, some of it by Mr. Bookbinder's friend, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

The newspaper story discloses that Mr. Bookbinder recognized, in the SBA, an apparent unlimited source of money. It also illustrates what can be done in Washington when you have the right friends in the right places.

Mr. Speaker, I include the newspaper article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

MARYLAND FIRM HUNG UP BY SBA—PRESIDENT IS CENTRAL FIGURE IN CONTROVERSIAL TRUCK CONTRACT

(By Dan Thomasson)

The Small Business Administration has suspended operations of a Maryland firm headed by George Bookbinder, a central figure in a controversial mail truck contract on which the Government lost at least $3 million.

The SBA suspended operations of Electronic Systems Investment Corp., of which Mr. Bookbinder is president, after that firm put funds into another company in which Mr. Bookbinder was involved without first receiving SBA approval.

Electronic Systems of College Park has been given 30 days either to divest itself of interests in Technical Animations, Inc., on whose board of directors Mr. Bookbinder serves, or appeal the case to Federal District Court or ask the SBA for a stay of execution.

NOT CRIMINAL

SBA officials emphasized there is no criminal violation involved in the case and called Electronic Systems' financial condition "sound."

The SBA loaned Mr. Bookbinder and several other persons $146,000 in 1964 to help set up the Electronics Systems Investment Corp., a Small Business Investment Company.

The Federal agency, however, discovered that in 1965 Electronics Systems had made two loans to and invested $66,000 in Technical Animations Inc. SBA regulations prohibit a small business investment company from making an investment in a firm in which its officers hold an interest unless prior approval is granted.

RULED IN FAVOR

SBA sought a cease-and-desist order that would require the firm to divest itself of interest in the other companies. An independent hearing examiner to whom the case was referred ruled in favor of the company, but on Feb. 5 SBA Administrator Robert C. Moot overturned the hearing examiner's ruling.

Under existing regulations, the SBA has the authority to halt business of an SBIC until such a matter is resolved.

Mr. Bookbinder is the vice president of Rand Development Corp. of Cleveland whose Minnesota subsidiary, Universal Fiberglass Corp., won two Federal loans totaling nearly $1 million and a $13.3 million Government contract to build three-wheel mail trucks.

It was disclosed recently that Universal had defaulted on the mail truck contract and the Government had paid out $2.1 million for vehicles that were never delivered.

The controversial contract was awarded Universal in January of 1965 after a former Humphrey aide, then SBA Director Eugene P. Foley, interceded over objections of experts from his own agency and the General Services Administration.

Involved in helping Universal was Neal D. Peterson, still a Humphrey aide who at the time was Mr. Humphrey's assistant on the Senate Small Business Committee. Mr. Peterson's brother, Roger, is attorney for Universal.

PROPOSALS FOR AN INCREASE IN FHA INTEREST RATES WOULD WIPE OUT HOUSING HOPES FOR MILLIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have received much mail in opposition to proposals to raise interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages.

The proposed increase in these interest rates will price millions of low-income and moderate-income families out of the housing market. Many of these families have saved for years to buy a home and are now faced with the prospect of the Federal Government legislating against their long-held hopes.

Mr. Speaker, a 1-percent increase in the interest rate on a $20,000 loan will cost the homebuyer $4,674 additional over the life of a 30-year mortgage. The Congress should consider this issue carefully before it decides to legislate this additional tax in the form of higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, indicative of the country's mood and deep concern about an increase in FHA and VA interest rates is the following letter which I recently received from a Louisiana resident. Her letter clearly and unmistakably illustrates the personal tragedies involved in raising interest rates on home mortgages.

SHREVEPORT, LA.,
February 9, 1968.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

THE HONORABLE MR. PATMAN: I have just read an article in The Shreveport Journal titled, *Patman Fights FHA Interest Rate Increase*. In this article you stated that a rate increase "would result in an overall increase in housing costs of at least 11 per cent" and that "this would price millions of families out of the housing market."

Mr. Patman, I would like to give you an example of how right you are. My husband and I have waited all our seven years of marriage for the time when we would be financially able to build a nice home in which to raise our two sons. We have great hopes of building that home this year—even though, with building costs up, we will still have to make sacrifices. But if interest rates go higher, we will have to cancel our plans and our hopes.

I really don't want to appear self-centered. I know that there are many people who have much less than we have now. But my husband is an honest, hard-working man. He, and many thousands like him, make up the backbone of our great country. The taxes these people pay finance all of the government "programs." I feel that it is grossly unfair to punish these people with higher interest rates and higher income taxes.

Please, please do everything you can to defeat these actions. Even though you are not our representative, we want to express our appreciation to you for speaking out against higher interest rates.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on H.R. 13217, a bill to authorize the appropriation of $200 million for a U.S. contribution to multilateral special funds of the Asian Development Bank, and H.R. 15364, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, beginning February 27, under the able chairmanship of HENRY S. REUSS. Administration witnesses from the Treasury and State Departments and Mr. Eugene Black, Special Adviser to the President on Southeast Asia, will appear first.

Anyone desiring to be heard on this legislation should contact the committee at extension No. 7057.

GEORGE CHAMPION, MAN-IN-MANAGEMENT OF THE YEAR

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the very capable George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, was honored as the 1967 "Man in Management."

With typical insight into our Nation's problems, he spoke on the great unrest that is eating into the United States, as well as the uneasiness that is growing abroad regarding the policies being pursued by our Government. Of course, he made special reference to the inept financial policies of the administration, policies which have already come home to roost in the legislation we are considering today—the bill to repeal the gold backing for Federal Reserve notes.

I commend his speech to those interested in a readable and general analysis of why the U.S. economy is weakening. But let me add that his speech is not mere criticism; it is also full of suggestions that the White House would do well to heed. I am particularly impressed by

the plan he suggested for trying to set up a multinational mechanism—pivoting on the United States, Australia, and Japan—whereby the burdens of military protection and economic development in the Far East would be more equitably distributed. Perhaps if we had been aided by such a mechanism some years ago, we would have avoided the mess we are now caught in over in Vietnam.

Hereinafter follows the text of Mr. Champion's speech at the annual Man-in-Management dinner, New York City, January 16, 1968:

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

(Address by George Champion, Chairman of the Board, the Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., at annual Man-in-Management Dinner, New York, January 16, 1968)

My reaction to this Man-in-Management Award is a blend of appreciation and awe: appreciation, that you consider me worthy of such an honor; awe, that you have the courage to honor anyone associated with banking, at a time when interest rates are up, sterling is down and the United States is going through a galling experience on gold!

The fact that previous award winners have included such good friends as Roger Blough, Fred Kappel, Jack Rathbone, Tom Watson and Henry Alexander adds a special dimension of personal pleasure for me.

Besides, having picked as many first-rate Men-in-Management as these five, the Selection Committee should be charitably excused for having made a mistake this time!

As you might suspect, my honors from the academic world have been both modest and infrequent. But there is one that deserves mention. It is a letter I received recently from my third grade teacher in Foosland, Illinois, who said he remembered me as the smartest student in the entire school—of four rooms!

Regretfully, I don't recall any report card of mine ever substantiating that claim!

So I am forced to the reluctant conclusion that I achieved the rank of standout student only *after* I had been elected Chairman of our friendly little loan company!

I tried but failed to get an affidavit of excellence from my alma mater. My strategy there was to take one of my science professors out to dinner with my boys. I gave him several opportunities to talk about what a fine scholar I had been some years before, but he showed an understandable reluctance to pursue the subject. Finally, as we finished dessert, he looked at me a little sadly and said: "George, don't you think it's about time you turned in your senior thesis?"

Tonight, I'd like to take advantage of the fact that we meet under the auspices of a distinguished educational institution to talk briefly about a recent educational experience of my own.

I have just returned from an extended business trip to the Far East that included visits to Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, Australia and Vietnam.

Time and again during the trip, I was forcefully reminded of the way other nations look to the United States for leadership.

They look to us to set an example.

They expect us to do a better job than anyone else in living up to our responsibilities.

The roots of these responsibilities stretch to the ends of the earth, and embrace political, economic, social and moral considerations of the greatest moment. They involve the capacity of our national conscience to distinguish right from wrong, and to guide our actions accordingly.

The people I met in the Far East, like those elsewhere around the globe, know full well what we *say* we stand for as a nation: peace with justice, freedom, equality of opportunity, the dignity and worth of the individual.

But, they ask, how well do we live up to our responsibilities of helping to achieve these goals for our own people and the rest of the free world? This insistent question takes on fresh urgency in a Presidential election year when the vocal conscience of responsible citizens is given an opportunity to manifest itself through our free institutions.

There are many reasons why other nations expect so much of us, but the most important by far is that we are the richest and most powerful nation on earth. By the simple maxim that responsibility is proportionate to power, the burdens of world leadership are inescapably ours.

American industry delivers nearly twice the volume of goods and services accounted for by the European Common Market countries plus Great Britain. A single state of ours—California—out produces all of Red China with its 750 million people and an area one-third larger than that of the continental United States. Thanks to motivation, education and high capital expenditures, worker productivity in the United States is 40 per cent above that of Sweden, 60 per cent above West Germany, 70 per cent above France and 80 per cent above Britain. Some of our largest companies, such as General Motors and American Telephone & Telegraph, have gross annual revenues greater than all but a few member countries of the United Nations.

Other people are, of course, fully aware of the realities of our strength and power, as starkly and irrefutably spelled out as they are in the statistics by which nations are rated. Yet foremost in their minds, as I found out anew on my recent trip, is not so much the *fact* of our material wealth and accomplishment, but rather the *implication* of this power. They want to know whether our growth as a people can keep pace with our materialistic gains; whether our national character and purpose can transcend mere economic projections; whether, indeed, we are up to the task of handling this great entity we have created—the most powerful state in all history.

Because they are interested in Americans as a people as much as they are concerned with us as a nation, the citizens of other countries are dismayed at the present disorder and violence within our society. They are concerned about our seeming confusion over moral standards, the existence of poverty amid plenty, unemployment amid job vacancies and the decline in the quality of our living environment.

They are shocked and confused by such appalling spectacles as the public flouting of the duties of citizenship; of draft cards being burned; of the American flag being torn and spat upon; of high officials of the Government being heckled and harassed to an extent that they cannot move freely among the citizenry; of representatives of law and order at all levels being beaten and shot; of businessmen and military officers recruiting on college campuses being threatened and abused by student mobs; of agitators who are permitted to speak freely, even when they advise people to "start shooting" and urge open rebellion against the Government.

That such things are taking place in a land that offers more legitimate avenues of dissent than any other nation on earth is a paradox that those abroad find difficult to comprehend.

"What's happening to your country?" they ask. "Are you headed toward anarchy?"

It is not surprising that they should question the trends they see and, beyond these trends, the basic moral tone of our whole society. Not when they see high government officials accused of dishonesty in office. Not when businessmen are convicted of flagrantly misusing stockholder funds. Not when the rackets thrive at our waterfront piers and airports. Not when crime has increased 60 per cent in the past six years, and serious crimes are now occurring at the rate of five every minute.

In view of developments like these, is it any wonder that our democratic premises are questioned abroad and our promises disbelieved? We can hardly expect to talk one way while acting another as a nation—and maintain any sort of world leadership.

As a banker, I was particularly concerned by the fact that there is much uneasiness overseas—and properly so—about the way we have been managing our financial affairs.

A very wise financier and a good friend of the United States said to me in the Far East: "Your country can't go on much longer the way it has been going."

We have seen in the recent devaluation of the British pound what can happen when a country persists in living beyond its means. While our own economy is a great deal stronger than Britain's, it cannot be abused indefinitely. The growing reality of inflation and the worsening of our balance-of-payments position are inevitably eroding confidence in the dollar.

Inflation is an especially serious problem because it is so closely interwoven with every aspect of our economy, and because there is little sign of improvement in the future.

Wage settlements averaged about 5 per cent on a straight-time basis for the year 1967, and toward year-end some ran higher than that. By contrast, they were about 4 per cent in 1966 and 3 per cent, on the average, during the period from 1960 to 1965.

Offsetting productivity gains have slowed down, reflecting slower economic growth. Output per man-hour in manufacturing gained only 2 per cent in 1966, compared with an average of better than 4 per cent in the 1960-to-1965 period. Costs per unit of output increased almost 5 per cent in the first nine months of last year. Consumer prices rose by 3 per cent.

Now 3 per cent inflation may strike you at first glance as a small figure, but it is far from that. If this country were to permit prices to rise 3 per cent every year, this would amount to 35 per cent on a compounded basis over the next decade. That's far more than any nation can afford and remain strong economically. With so much of the world trade and prosperity dependent on the dollar, we have an additional responsibility for combating inflation.

The Administration's new program to bring the payments situation under control is aimed almost entirely at the private sector—at the free movement of private capital and tourism. By sharply restraining direct overseas loans and investments by U.S. companies, it will unquestionably hurt their ability to compete effectively in foreign markets. Any restriction on the movement of funds impedes our drive for increased world trade.

While all of us recognize the need for drastic action to reduce the payments deficit, I feel it is a mistake to place the whole burden on one sector of our economy. The Federal Government must exercise restraint in its own spending, and there are many areas where this can be done without harm to domestic or international programs.

Clearly, we must pay what is necessary for Vietnam. But other industrial nations are well able to shoulder more of the cost of defending their own regions and aiding the world's developing countries. Indeed, a more equitable sharing of these burdens is long overdue.

An appropriate beginning might be made in Southeast Asia through a joint effort of the United States, Australia and Japan.

I am persuaded that such coordination is essential for real progress in these developing countries, both in terms of aid and direct investment. Some of these nations are not in a position to judge the merits of various investments or the feasibility of such ventures for their own country.

Over a period of time, they could incur liabilities which would be difficult for them to meet. For the most part, their economies individually will not support the large units needed for economical production. Yet it would be uneconomical to establish smaller high-cost units. Things like assembly plants for automobiles, fertilizer plants and the like require enormous capital investment, and will be competitive only if large units are involved. It would be a great drain on the economies of the developing nations if this type of investment were not properly programmed on a regional basis. After all, there is only a limited amount of aid and capital available to do the job properly, and an equitable sharing is necessary.

I believe it would be highly advisable for the governments of the United States, Australia and Japan—the three major non-Communist forces in the Pacific area—to appoint a committee of businessmen to work out an economic development program in which each country would participate on a relatively equal basis. In this way, self-defeating uneconomic ventures would be avoided and greater good would redound to the group as a whole.

Beyond such regional arrangements, I think it would be desirable for a multinational body such as the World Bank or its affiliates—or perhaps even a new World Aid Organization—to oversee the planning and administration of economic assistance contributed by all the industrial nations.

Such an organization could draw upon the best talent available anywhere in the free world. It would be relatively immune to political pressures. It could foster sound economic development because it would not have the compulsion to produce quick results and would be relatively impervious to nationalistic whims. Having no political or commercial interests of its own, it would be able to concentrate on obtaining the greatest possible return in economic and social developments for each dollar spent. It could limit its assistance to projects that were soundly conceived and executed, and tie the financing of such projects to appropriate economic performance.

Realistically, the United States cannot be the sole contributor to the world's economic welfare and military security. And those people overseas that I spoke with understand this; furthermore, they don't expect the United States to play such a role. What they do expect from us, though, is the kind of personal involvement that confirms that we as individuals recognize our responsibilities: first, as American citizens; and second, as world citizens.

I mean the kind of involvement that comes about when you or I say: "Look, this issue or that one is important to me and I'm going to do something about it."

I mean the kind of involvement we have when citizens from all walks of life, regardless of personal pressures, find the time to lend a hand in the day-to-day process of governing.

Doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, business-men—particularly businessmen. General Lucius Clay put his finger on a critical problem when he remarked: "Businessmen have protested too much against the caliber of government people, but have done too little about it."

Over the years, federal, state and local government units have approached the business community repeatedly for the names of top-flight men and women willing to serve in particular executive jobs. More often than not, they have come away empty-handed.

To find out some of the principal obstacles to getting more businessmen into government service, we at Chase Manhattan have a continuing study project under way. As part of this project, we have just conducted a nationwide survey, covering more than 1,000 corporations. Here are some of the things we found:

Although roughly half the corporations responding felt that an executive's government service would be an asset to the company in the long run, very few considered it enough of an asset to encourage such service.

Four out of ten respondents felt that their executives would not consider a government post, or would do so only in a national emergency.

The most frequently cited reasons for an executive's reluctance to serve were reduced income, possible loss of an opportunity for advancement in his company and disruption of family life.

Very few companies reported having a carefully defined corporate policy regarding government service by their executives, and even fewer would make any commitment about the position an individual would hold upon his return from the government.

Summing up the results, business by and large believes it has a responsibility to further the aims of good government at the national, state and local levels; but so far, with a few notable exceptions, it has been reluctant to take specific steps to carry out this responsibility.

If the business community is serious about providing leadership in this area, what it needs most of all are some new attitudes. There are two steps that would have a profoundly constructive impact in getting more good men into government service.

First, corporations should have a firm policy of encouraging executives to serve a stint in government, and they should make this policy known. At present, the initiative usually comes from the executive himself. I'd like to see more companies take the initiative in urging their people to serve, because I'm convinced that over the long run both the company and the government would benefit.

Second, corporations should give executives who are considering government service some assurance that if they return, their position in the company would be enhanced, not lessened, by their service. I realize how difficult it is to spell this out in detail, but it would be desirable to talk to the executive in concrete terms about the importance of experience in government.

Such actions would, in my view, go a long way toward overcoming some of the more formidable obstacles to government service by the business executive.

We cannot be mere bystanders in the serious business of self-rule. We must get "where the action is" and play a decisive part in determining the direction and purposes of that action.

This sense of individual responsibility is the key to healthy nationhood. Look around the world today. The nations that are prospering are the ones whose economic systems unleash the full measure of people's energy, ability, character and initiative, and provide them with the freedom they need to make the most of their opportunities.

Japan is a prime example. Having doubled its real per capita output in just the past seven years, that country expects to double again by 1977. What's the mysterious ingredient that enables Japan to lead the world in growth rate? Certainly not the land's natural wealth, for Japan now imports most of its industrial raw material and nearly three-fourths of its energy sources. The explanation, I'm convinced, lies in the character of the Japanese people, in their willingness to work and sacrifice and strive for improvement.

The sooner we, in this country, understand that we are dealing with people and not statistics and begin giving individuals genuine help and encouragement in advancing toward their personal aspirations, the nearer we will be to solving our national problems. We must see to it that all of our people have access to education, training and opportunity for meaningful work—rather than reducing millions of them to accepting life-long "handouts" from the Federal Government.

We need to abandon the parasitic philosophy that has choked off our vigor and ambition. We need to dedicate ourselves to human values and human goals and to making a contribution to better living for others.

This, I think, is the crux of our future relationship with the people of other countries. We are proud of our strength and our wealth and of the material benefits that these have brought. Out of our generosity as a people, we willingly share these benefits with others. Yet, at the same time, we tend to stress too often the materialistic side of our national wealth.

The impression I received on my trip is that what the people of other lands are looking for is not only additional shiploads of all the wonderful material things we produce. They are also looking for proof, through example, that the true spirit of America continues to exist and thrive, that we as people still possess the virtues that have built this nation: our energy, initiative and character; our love of freedom; our willingness to sacrifice when we have to; our conviction that every man must have his chance; our natural inclination to make the most of our resources; our inherent good sense; our compassion and courage; and our trust in God. These should be our major "exports" to other countries.

What the people abroad are asking, in essence, is: "Will the *real* America please stand up?" It is high time, I think, that we, as individuals, should stand up and show other nations—in word and deed—what we really are. When we do this, we will have taken an important step toward exercising true world leadership.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ELKDOM

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this year we are observing the 100th anniversary of Elkdom. The centennial anniversary fell on February 16, 1968. In most of the lodges across the land special observances have been planned for tomorrow, February 22, Washington's birthday. Because the House was not in session on February 16, and because our session tomorrow will be limited to a reading of Washington's Farewell Address, I have taken this time today to observe the centennial anniversary of the order of which I am proud to be a member, and to review briefly the history and the principles of our order.

In the century that has passed, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has progressed and prospered. An increase by almost 30,000 members this last year has been the largest growth since 1951. The order has grown from one lodge with 15 members to 2,100 lodges with 1,450,000 members. Its history has been the story of good fellowship, of fidelity to the principles of charity, justice, and brotherly love, and of practical patriotism shown by constructive service.

From Broadway to Main Street, U.S.A.: that is the story of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. Wandering up

Broadway one November day in 1867, Charles A. Vivian, the son of a clergyman, was a young Englishman who had just landed in New York City. He had been a singer in London, where he had been a success. He was to be successful in America, but his lasting fame was to be as the founder of the Order of Elks.

One evening in November 1867, he chanced to enter John Ireland's chop house on Lispenard Street in New York City. It was a place where voluntary performers frequently appeared. That evening his impromptu singing with his fine voice led to an engagement at the American Theater, where he received an enthusiastic reception.

The pleasant manner of young Vivian soon made him the center of a convivial group known as the Jolly Corks. Although their purpose was primarily for good fellowship, they did not neglect the assistance of fellow members who were the victims of illness or other misfortune. The group had a sense of brotherhood, and this feeling led some of the members to advocate a more formal organization, with regular membership dues, a ritual, and a deeper purpose than mere convivality. A committee was appointed to draft rules and a ritual, and to choose a name.

In searching for a name, the group wanted something that was particularly American. A magnificent mounted elk head in a museum captured the committee's imagination. The reason for their selection was that the elk was fleet of foot and reluctant to attack, but valiant in the defense of its own life and those of its females and young. The idea of an animal that preferred to live in peace but would fight to defend the sick and helpless appealed strongly to them.

The group concluded that the qualities of this animal were such as might be emulated by man himself. When the Jolly Corks met again on February 16, 1868, the committee recommended that the group be named the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. The name was adopted and thus Elkdom was born.

Charles A. Vivian was in a real sense the founder of the Elks. He was not only the first presiding officer, he was the spark that lit the flame. Another of our early leaders was George McDonald. To him goes the credit for introducing the 11 o'clock toast and the singing of "Auld Lang Syne." More important, McDonald was in the forefront of those who had the vision of a glorious future for this young organization, devoted to charity and brotherly love.

At first the going was not smooth. Some dissension threatened to destroy the order. This is mentioned only to remind us that we must avoid these problems and errors of the past.

Eventually harmony was restored and amends were made. It is to the credit of Elkdom that procedures were established to prevent the recurrence of tragic situations of those days.

A steady increase in membership forced the lodge to move to larger quarters. The initiation fee was raised to $20, a considerable sum in those days. But a benevolent society must have funds and the Elks were thinking in terms of future progress. Elkdom was becoming a solid organization of solid citizens.

On March 10, 1871, the New York Legislature passed an act of incorporation for the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. On the same date the grand lodge issued a charter to New York Lodge No. 1; 2 days later a charter was issued to a Philadelphia group which become No. 2. The order was in business as a national organization.

The third lodge was not installed until 1876, in San Francisco. This was followed by No. 4, Chicago, and No. 5, Cincinnati. Ten years after the founding, there were 10 lodges. Although the total membership was still less than 1,000, the base was built for solid expansion.

Beginning in 1880 the Elks experienced a tremendous surge of growth. By 1890 there were 158 lodges with 13,000 members. By the time of the golden anniversary, in 1918, there were 1,280 lodges with a membership of 493,000.

Elkdom, like other facets of our national life, was adversely affected by the economic depression of the 1930's. Membership declined and some lodges were closed. Since 1939, however, membership has increased each year.

But, while adapting to changing times, the Elks have never strayed from the cardinal virtues enunciated by Vivian and his associates a century ago. Charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity continue to guide its members, who cherish good fellowship as much as those Elks a century ago.

An appropriate question asked by nonmembers on this centennial year is, "What do Elks do?" The answer is, our order conducts a vast program of benevolent, educational, and patriotic works. More than $10 million is expended annually on these activities, and well over $200 million has been spent since 1880.

The order's primary concern is in the field of health, with emphasis upon diagnosis, treatment, and prevention. There has always been special emphasis on health for the handicapped children.

Elks have always engaged in youth activities. Thousands of dollars in annual awards go to young people who demonstrate outstanding qualities of leadership.

The Elks are deeply committed to the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, 4-H Clubs, Boys Clubs of America, and Little League Baseball.

Our order has never failed to emphasize patriotic activities. Shows and other entertainment on a year-round basis are provided for disabled veterans at all VA hospitals in the country. Since 1907, Elks lodges have paid special tribute to Old Glory each year on Flag Day, June 14, as a part of the order's efforts "to quicken the spark of American patriotism." Other patriotic observances include: Know Your America Week in November, Bill of Rights Day on December 15, and Freedom Week in January.

The record of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is engraved on the tablets of our country's history. Among our brothers have been leaders in the outstanding accomplishments of America. It is not strange that the order, through the years, has attracted men with innate qualities of leadership. It offers a wide field for useful activity. It brings out the best qualities in men of varied backgrounds. It provides the opportunity and inspiration for service to our fellow men.

The Order of Elks has drawn into its organization members from every walk of life. Statesmen, entertainers, artists, business executives, athletes, and educators are among the men who make up the fraternity today. Your next door neighbor may be an Elk. He may be the town banker, postman, or your clergy. Whoever he is, he may become an Elk only by subscribing to the order's principles as every member must. There are no honorary admissions to Elkdom.

The order counts among its members such famous names in show business as Irving Berlin, Jack Benny, Lawrence Welk, and many others.

Among this year's 90th Congress of the United States, 45 Members of the Senate and 186 Members of the House of Representatives including Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, are members. Elks are found in all fields of public life and are among the leaders of the Nation's business community.

In addition to former President Truman, three other Presidents were members: Warren G. Harding, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy. The late John Nance Garner, former Vice President, and the late Vice President Alben W. Barkley were members of the Elks.

One of the most inspiring chapters in Elk history is the order's services to the Nation in two World Wars. In World War I, the Elks War Relief Commission spent more than $1 million for hospitals and for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. It helped the Salvation Army, and afforded loans to 40,000 veterans, enabling them to receive rehabilitation training.

In World War II the grand lodge alone spent $1½ million on national defense programs under the direction of the Elks National Defense Commission and its successor, after Pearl Harbor, the Elks War Commission. Subordinate lodges poured out hundreds of thousands of dollars more in war work.

The Elks operated 135 fraternal centers adjacent to camps and stations where servicemen were given refreshments, recreation, and entertainment in the hospitable Elk tradition.

At the war's end, the Elks turned to the thousands of veterans in hospitals. Under the national service commission, the order carried on a program of entertainment in hospitals. Parties and variety shows were sponsored. Ambulatory patients were taken on picnics, on fishing trips, and to ball games. Elks collect and present to veterans' hospitals each year tons of leather, old clocks, watches, electrical appliances, and other materials for use in occupational therapy.

While remembering those GI's who had already given, the Elks did not forget those who were still giving. In 1965, the National Service Commission launched a "Letters From Home" campaign to assure our fighting men in Vietnam that Americans were behind them and appreciated their sacrifices.

Elks lodges compiled lists of names and APO addresses of local men in the Armed Forces, and encouraged Elks and non-Elks to write them personal letters of understanding and support.

The Elks give courtesy cards to a member's relatives who were under the age of 21 when inducted into the Armed Forces. These cards bespeak for them a fraternal welcome at Elks lodges.

The Elks are prepared with standby authority for a tax of a dollar a year per member in case of a national emergency. It would place $1,400,000 immediately at the disposal of the service commission for projects in the Nation's defense.

The Elks invest in excess of $2,000,000 yearly on youth programs that reach more than 1,500,000 boys and girls.

The Order of Elks offers no insurance benefits or other financial inducements for membership. While they have paid over $10 million yearly for benefits to nonmembers, the Elks do not neglect their own. The saying that "an Elk is never forgotten—never forsaken," reflects the strongly sentimental nature of Elkdom which is expressed in the establishment of the Elks National Home in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. There residents who can afford to pay their part of the cost, but the order pays for any resident who cannot assume the cost.

A major part of the order's support of higher educaton is provided by the Elks National Foundation, leading the way for the Elks scholarship activities. In the past 10 years alone, the foundation has upped its annual outlays for higher education from about $115,000 to nearly $500,000.

Other educational programs of the foundation include scholarships for children of deceased or incapacitated Elks. These now reach $70,000 a year. Another educational project provides advanced training in cerebral palsy rehabilitation for doctors, nurses, technicians, and therapists. The foundation now is spending $75,000 yearly on it.

Another example of the charitable works of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is under the direction of the order's permanent philanthropic trust, the Elks National Foundation.

The foundation, sometimes called the "great heart of Elkdom," annually expends some $600,000 primarily on health and educational services. The foundation has assets of more than $17 million, built up from contributions by individual Elks, Elk lodges, and Elk State associations. The foundation spends only income from its investments. Not a penny goes for fundraising or administrative expenses, which are absorbed by the Elks Grand Lodge.

A scholarship program for needy college students was and is still one of its major concerns. These scholarships have made possible higher education for more than 7,000 deserving youths. Today 500 students annually receive scholarships ranging from $600 to $2,000 at a total cost of more than $400,000.

It is generally recognized that in our own land and in the world at large we are today experiencing continuous crises and mounting tensions. Both our young people and our senior citizens suffer in terms of personal security and the opportunity to plan and lead meaningful and satisfying lives. More and more, the warm humanitarian role of the Elks is being recognized in its youth and old age programs that go beyond the social features of the organization.

Our order typifies Americanism at its best. On the altar of every lodge we find reverently spread the flag of our country. We believe in the dignity of man and the freedom of the individual. These are not mere words. We aim to translate into reality the cardinal principles of Elkdom. Resting firmly on the ideals of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity, it is the mission of our order to improve our country and ourselves.

Our accomplishments of the century that is past are evidence that the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is composed of those who want to share their lives with their fellow men. But we will never rest solely on our past record. As our order grows and expands, may we hope to implant in many minds the basic principles of Elkdom. We can wish for no more than that the elements of our American way of life, which our order represents, will spread, like the circular ripples on a pond, until they cover the entire area of understanding.

On this occasion may we rededicate ourselves to the principles of our order—to the principles of America.

BEE LOSSES FROM PESTICIDES

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I took part in an informal conference arranged by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER]. Congressman BELCHER, ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, called this meeting at the request of the American Beekeeping Federation to allow Members of Congress and representatives of the beekeeping industry an opportunity to discuss with representatives of USDA's Agricultural Research Service the very serious problem of bee poisoning from pesticides.

Because of the growing severity of this problem and its long-range implications to U.S. agriculture, it is important that we all be aware of this situation and the need for effective solutions. For this reason, I am including at this point in the RECORD the statements presented yesterday by the representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and by Mr. Clarence L. Benson of the American Beekeeping Federation.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to participate in this conference and want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Oklahoma for having arranged it.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE L. BENSON, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN BEEKEEPING FEDERATION COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION AND LIAISON

Never in history has there been such a barrage of chemicals aimed directly toward the destruction of the honey bee. Without question some will say this statement is not true. What then are the facts?

Federal law requires that insecticides be registered and there are specific requirements for labeling. If labels are not in violation of the law there will be a warning on the label indicating that the material is toxic to bees. Various wording is used, but something such as the following is on the label: "Do not apply to crops in bloom". Consequently, no one could logically plead ignorance relative to the effect of those materials on bees. In addition to this, there is much more information available to anyone concerned relative to the toxicity of various insecticides to bees. Contrary to such instructions on the label, the Federal Government in publication after publication recommends the use of these materials to "crops in bloom".

As an instance, Agricultural Handbook No. 331 on page 11 has this recommendation for cabbage luper: "Parathion on foliage as needed". Farmers Bulletin No. 2086 "Growing Pumpkins and Squash" devotes seven pages to the promotion of insecticides. In two small paragraphs there is some mention of bees. No instructions are given the grower relative to the pollination requirements of these crops in spite of the fact that it is known that these crops must have insect pollination to produce *any* crop It is also known that crops of pumpkins and squash have been produced without insecticides. We could list many examples like the above but it should suffice to say that there is no emphasis on the protection of bees.

In addition to the Federal Government's recommending that growers of various crops use insecticides contrary to instructions on the label, the Federal Government itself engages in various programs using insecticides contrary to instructions on the label. United States Department of Agriculture Plant Pest Control, for instance, in cooperation with the state and county in California and with the state in Arizona, was responsible for the destruction of thousands of colonies of bees. In addition to this direct promotion and use by the Federal Government, federal funds are used by the various land grant colleges and state extension services to promote the use of insecticides contrary to instructions on the label. Due to such promotion and usage, more than 500,000 colonies of bees were destroyed in the United States last year (1967). This is approximately 10% of the total colony population in the United States.

If something is not done to halt this destruction, then very shortly honey bees are going to disappear from certain areas in the United States. One such area is Arizona. Some 70,000 colonies of bees were destroyed there last year. It appears that Arizona beekeepers can look forward to a similar, if not greater deluge of insecticides this coming year. Similar situations exist in other parts of the country.

If the beekeeper is not compensated for his loss and this sort of thing continues then it may be expected that the production of certain crops in Arizona will be eliminated. The destruction of bees in Arizona was due primarily to the application of insecticides on cotton. The same was the case in Southern California. A total of 76,000 colonies were killed in California last year. Colonies in the state of Washington were killed due to the application of insecticides to sweet corn. In other areas of the country bees were killed from the application of toxic materials on various other crops. Bees in the southeastern part of the United States, for instance, were destroyed by the application of insecticides on soy beans.

For years we have been pleading with the

Department of Agriculture to recognize the problem they were instrumental in creating and to do something about it. It should be obvious that beekeepers must be compensated for the destruction of their livelihood due to the application of insecticides registered and recommended by the United States Department of Agriculture. It should also be obvious that something must be done immediately to halt the destruction of colonies of bees. Otherwise, there is going to be a serious decline in the production of those crops that require insect pollination.

Minimizing Bee Losses Through Use of Nonchemical and Specific Chemical Insect Control Methods

(Statement of C. H. Hoffmann, Associate Director, Entomology Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, presented at informal conference called by Congressman Page Belcher on February 20, 1968, to consider bee poisoning caused by insecticides and other problems facing the bee industry)

In the early 1950's it was recognized that the control of insects by conventional insecticides, though effective and economical, was not the best solution to most insect problems. Following the extensive use of large quantities of insecticides several real or potential problems became apparent. These include insects becoming resistant to insecticides, unwanted persistent residues on food and feed crops, adverse effects on fish and wildlife, and reductions in numbers of insect parasites, insect predators, and pollinating insects because of repeated use of insecticide sprays. A number of high level national committee studies, including those of the President's Science Advisory Committee, were undertaken to consider the overall problem of pesticide usage and many recommendations have been made. These advisory groups prepared extensive reports that stressed the need for undertaking research on specific chemical and non-chemical methods of pest control to avoid some of the above-mentioned problems. They also strongly recommended a replacement of persistent insecticides with non-persistent materials that would readily degrade in the environment. As a consequence, organophosphorus and carbamate insecticides have gradually replaced DDT and other organochlorine compounds for the control of many insect pests. These less persistent materials have been advantageous in that residues do not accumulate in the fat of animals. On the other hand, their use for control of many insects has required repetitive applications which have had a more serious effect on beneficial insects, including honey bees, than certain persistent materials. This past year there have been numerous heavy losses of honey bee colonies in different parts of the United States attributable to the use of organophosphorus and carbamate insecticides for the control of important insect pests of agricultural crops. At present we must depend heavily on conventional insecticides for meeting most insect problems. However, the long-range goal should be to develop nonchemical or highly selective chemical methods for controlling pests. This will be the most desirable and most acceptable way to solve hazard problems such as the pesticide bee poisoning problem.

Major changes in Entomology Research Division program. Briefly, by the mid-fifties about 65% of the Division's research program was devoted to the development of conventional insecticides for insect control. However, in efforts to resolve or minimize insecticide residue and other hazard problems, primary efforts in the research have been reoriented to the solution of insect problems by biological and specific chemical control methods. Currently, the work on conventional insecticides amounts to about 15% of our total research effort.

However, support for the Division's research program has virtually doubled in the past 10 years, therefore, the reduction on conventional insecticides in terms of actual expenditures are not as great as the percentage figures indicate. On the other hand, our program is strongly oriented to the development of alternate methods of insect control, about 51% being devoted to biological control, insect sterility, insect resistant varieties of crops, attractants, and cultural, physical and mechanical methods.

Biological control. One important phase of biological control is to discover, introduce, and establish insect parasites and predators that will become a part of our natural fauna and help control destructive insect pests. For example, several parasites of the alfalfa weevil have already been introduced into alfalfa fields in the East. It is hoped that the parasites will become firmly established and exert sufficient control to make it unnecessary to use insecticides to control the weevil. Although some introduced parasites have been very successful in controlling insect pests there have also been many failures. In an effort to utilize parasites and predators in a more dependable way, considerable effort is now being made to reexplore the possibilities of mass producing them and making releases on a sustained basis for the direct control of insect pests. For example, research is under way to explore the potential value of mass releases of *Trichogramma* parasites for control of the bollworm, surgarcane borer, and corn earworm, and chrysopid predators for control of the bollworm on cotton, each on a large area basis.

Another important phase of biological control is the use of insect viruses, bacteria, fungi, and other microorganisms for insect pest control. Many of these pathogens are quite specific in affecting insects and therefore are considered safe. The future of many of these known pathogens will depend upon the development of mass rearing procedures and ways of effectively using them if they are to be competitive with insecticides in practical insect control. However, even though these insect pathogens occur abundantly in nature, there is indication that safety tests will be as stringent or perhaps more so than chemicals before the pathogens can be registered for use on food crops and tolerances established or exemptions from tolerances obtained.

Laboratory tests to date show that none of the commercially available pathogens for insect control have an adverse effect on bees.

Insect sterility. Application of the sterility approach to insect control is by two ways: (1) rearing and releasing sterile insects to suppress reproduction in the natural population; and (2) applying chemical sterilants to suppress reproduction of insects in the natural population. The two methods are quite different when it comes to making practical applications.

Great advancements have been made on the sterility technique involving the release of sterilized insects. Ordinarily the technique is used in combination with other control measures, particularly in combination with methods that can be used to reduce the initial insect population to sufficiently low numbers to make it practical to release enough sterile insects to overcome the pest population. The technique, which has been used to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeast, and which is suppressing this insect in the Southwest almost to the point of elimination, has also proved effective experimentally in eradicating several tropical fruit flies from islands. The sterility method holds great promise for controlling the codling moth, the most important insect pest of apples, which is one of the important fruits dependent on bees for pollination. The sterility method also shows promise for controlling the pink bollworm when used in conjunction with good cultural practices. The use of insecticides on the pink bollworm in Arizona and California was responsible for many of the bee losses in these States in 1967. However, to fully develop the method for controlling these two insects it will be necessary to carry out pilot tests on an operational scale. The sterility method is also being investigated for the control of other important insects, including the boll weevil, corn earworm, tobacco budworm, cabbage looper, tobacco hornworm, and the fall armyworm. This sterility approach has no adverse side effects and therefore is an ideal way to control insect pests of crops that require pollination by bees and other insects.

Insect resistant plant varieties. Entomologists in cooperation with plant breeders, have made much progress in developing varieties of crops resistant to insect attacks. This method is undoubtedly one of the more effective, economical, and safer ways of controlling insect pests without adverse effects to other organisms. The greatest limitation of the method is the long time it takes to develop acceptable resistant varieties. The full utilization of resistant crop varieties by growers would avoid or curtail the use of insecticides and resultant damage to beneficial insects. Research is under way on the development of varieties of corn resistant to the European corn borer, corn earworm, and corn rootworm; varieties of cotton resistant to the boll weevil, bollworm, and cotton fleahopper; and varieties of alfalfa to the spotted afalfa aphid, pea aphid, alfalfa weevil, and lygus bugs. Honey bees visit all of these crops. As additional varieties of crops resistant to different economically important insects are developed for different regions of the country and become accepted by growers, there will be less need for using insecticides which may be inimical to bees.

Attractants. Insect attractants have been studied for a long time. In recent years some notable successes have been attained through the use of baits for control of several species of fruit flies, house flies, and the imported fire ant. A potent male lure, methyl eugenol, has been used to eradicate the oriental fruit fly from certain islands in the Pacific.

Much of our research effort is on chemical and biological investigations of insect pheromones. Many insects produce sex pheromones that are highly active in minute amounts and attract only specific insects. A special effort is being made to isolate, identify, and synthesize these sex pheromones. Chemical research is under way on pheromones produced by such insects as the pink bollworm, codling moth, fall armyworm, tobacco budworm, corn earworm, peach tree borer, and boll weevil. Experiments are in progress or planned to determine if attraction to live insects or to extracts of the sex attractants can be utilized in a practical way for the control of the above-mentioned insect pests.

Cultural, physical, and mechanical methods. Cultural control methods have been used for many years by growers of agricultural crops to help control different insect pests. For example, where there is community effort in using recommended cultural control practices involving early planting and harvest, as well as shredding and deep plowing to bury waste cotton immediately after harvest, the pink bollworm is not an important problem. Similarly, in certain areas, boll weevil populations can be kept to uneconomic levels. Cultural practices, particularly prompt destruction of old stalks after harvest are important in the suppression of tobacco hornworms and tobacco budworms. The suppression of wild host plants of the green peach aphid is being studied for control of this important pest of several crops. Recent studies have shown that the destruction of weed hosts of the green peach aphid by flaming the plants in drainage ditches throughout an extensive sugarbeet-growing area provides good control of virus yellows of sugarbeets which is transmitted by this pest. In Maine, a large scale test is under way to determine if the destruction of wild Canada plum, the chief host plant of the green peach aphid will control this vector of the virus net necrosis of potatoes sufficiently to prevent heavy losses of seed potatoes.

Entomologists and agricultural engineers are cooperating in tests to determine the value of black light traps used on a large area basis for the control of insect pests such as the tobacco hornworm and corn earworm. In a partially isolated area, large numbers of light traps in combination with the synthetic sex lure of the cabbage looper are being tested for control of the cabbage looper on lettuce and cotton.

General comments on new approaches to insect control. Much of the above discussion involves research on the control of major insect pests by new nonchemical or specific approaches on an area-wide basis. Those control methods involving sterility, mass release of biological control organisms, and attractants, will require mass rearing facilities for the production of millions or billions of insects. To be successful the techniques must be applied over large or isolated areas, therefore, the cost of research is high. For example, initial research led to the testing of the sterility approach for codling moth control on a 93-acre commercial orchard. The final test to determine the practicality of the method on a commercial basis is estimated to require a study on 5,000 acres and this will be costly. The development of these area-wide types of insect suppression techniques will have to be undertaken through organized grower support or by public supported agencies in cooperation with growers. The situation is very different from the development of an insecticide which may have a wide spectrum of usage and be developed by industry in cooperation with Federal and State organizations. Industry to date has shown little interest in becoming a part of the development of these new approaches to insect control. Perhaps after the techniques are fully proved to be effective and economical by public agencies, industry will find areas in which it will be profitable to pursue. Substantial research is needed to demonstrate that these new approaches to insect control are effective on a practical basis if they are to be adopted by growers. Once developed, however, these selective control methods will eliminate the need for insecticides for the pests against which they are effective.

The Relation of Our Beekeeping Industry to Our Agricultural Economy

(Statement of S. E. McGregor, Chief, Apiculture Research Branch, Entomology Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, presented at informal conference called by Congressman PAGE BELCHER, February 20, 1968, to consider bee poisoning caused by insecticides and other problems facing the bee industry)

In the United States about 300,000,000 acres are devoted to agricultural crops. About 3,000,000 acres, or 1 percent, are devoted to crops that are dependent on insect pollination. Approximately 63,000,000 acres are devoted to crops that are benefited by insect pollination. The 1966 farm value of the two groups of crops amounts to about $5,000,000,000.

There are less than 5,000,000 colonies of honey bees in the United States now and the number has been decreasing steadily at the rate of one percent a year for the last 20 years. Many crops require two or more colonies of honey bees per acre for adequate pollination. Less than 1,000,000 are currently rented to growers for pollination purposes. This means that about 20 times as many colonies could be used profitably now for pollination service to agriculture.

During the last twenty years the price of honey, the beekeeper's primary source of income, has remained unchanged while his operating costs have greatly increased. Income for pollination service has increased but still amounts to less than ⅕ his gross income. During the same period his operating expenses have doubled. The beekeeper has partially offset this by increasing production per colony. But, added to this cost-production squeeze, various bee diseases are taking their toll by weakening or destroying many colonies. Bee pasturage has been reduced by our expanding population and changing agricultural practices. These last two factors also tend to decrease the number or the efficiency of the wild bee population, particularly in areas where one crop is grown on a large scale. This increases the need for pollination by honey bees.

The most serious threat to the beekeeping industry today is the damage that is being caused by pesticides, particularly insecticides. An estimated 500,000 colonies were killed or seriously damaged by pesticides in 1967. This represents about 10% of the bee colonies in this country. The damage occurred in all parts of the country and was caused by applications on various crops, on forests, and for mosquito control.

This complex pesticide-pollination problem is of great concern to the Agricultural Research Service. We feel that a thorough Nation-wide study should be made of the total impact of the use of pesticides on the beekeeping industry and on agricultural production. Ways of resolving the problems created to assure a profitable beekeeping industry that in turn will adequately serve agriculture's pollination needs should be the objective of such a study. The Department of Agriculture is studying the problem of bee poisoning as the result of the use of insecticides employed in its regulatory programs carried out in cooperation with State regulatory agencies. However, the problem for beekeepers is a much broader one. Private growers employ most of the pesticides used in agricultural production. This extensive use of insecticides and other pesticides is responsible for most of the bee losses.

When bee colonies are killed outright due to insecticide exposure this loss can be readily assessed. However, the extent to which the efficiency of bee colonies has been reduced when not killed outright is more difficult to assess. Growers now renting bees often complain that the colonies are weak. The beekeeper states that he is unable to build strong colonies because of pesticide damage and lack of safe locations where the colonies can develop. We are hopeful that scientists will soon develop an artificial diet so that colonies can be made strong regardless of the foraging range.

The grower also needs more exact information on the pollination requirements of crops than is currently available. On many of the crops we have only general pollination knowledge or fragments of information. For example, most agronomy and horticulture textbooks cover culture and harvesting of the crop but do not give the crop's pollination requirements. Fairly complete information is available on only two or three of the more than 90 crops that are benefited by bee pollination. Several man-years are required to obtain the desired information on the pollination needs of a single variety. In addition, we are constantly obtaining new crops and developing new cultural conditions that alter the pollination requirement of the crop. For example, the new method of mechanical harvesting of cucumbers requires a much higher concentration of pollinating insects than was required when the crop was hand harvested. On the other hand the development of our so-called "tailor-made" bee may permit a reduction in the number of colonies required by some crops for pollination.

To summarize then, we feel that the agricultural economy is, to a large extent, dependent upon a strong and profitable beekeeping industry. This industry is now in a depressed condition when it should be increased possibly by 20-fold. A primary factor affecting this condition is the pesticide program. We feel that there is urgent need for a thorough economic study of the bee industry. This study should reveal the relationship of the industry to agriculture, the impact of pesticides on the industry, and dependable measurements for evaluating pesticide damage to a colony. We also feel that much more information is needed on the pollination requirements of most of the 90 crops now grown in the United States that are dependent on or benefited by bee pollination so that maximum utility can be made of honey bees and other pollinating insects for maintaining or increasing our agricultural production.

Regulation of Insecticides in Relation to the Prevention of Bee Losses

(By S. C. Billings, chief staff officer, insecticides evaluation staff, pesticides regulation division, ARS, USDA)

This Division enforces the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act which requires that all insecticides and other pesticides that are marketed in interstate commerce shall be property labeled and registered. Proper labeling includes directions for pesticidal use that are adequate for the protection of the public and warnings or precautions that are necessary and, if followed, adequate for prevention of injury to persons and property. Sec. 2.z.2(d) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act provides that a product is misbranded if its labeling does not contain warnings or precautions necessary to prevent injury to useful invertebrate animals, which would include honey bees.

This Division has been for many years recognizing bee injury in labeling. Warnings of bee toxicity are quite common and are related to the actual toxicity of the pesticide to bees. However, bee hazard is only one of many factors that must be considered in reviewing pesticidal products and their labeling for compliance with the law. This Division has no responsibility for research in pest control or the development of new pesticides. Our only responsibility relates to the registration and labeling of products that are submitted for our consideration. So far as possible, we seek to encourage the development of products and pest control techniques that minimize bee losses and accomplish the desired pest control with a maximum degree of safety.

We have recently been giving consideration to the development of label warnings that would more clearly and urgently relate to bee toxicity problems. These warnings or cautions would be separately stated from those relating to humans, pets, and livestock. However, they would be considered along with those relating to the protection of fish and wildlife. We believe that labeling has an important part to play in the protection of the legitimate use of pesticides and in the prevention of injury to bees and other beneficial wildlife. While labeling should be used to the maximum extent possible, the problems are so complex and diversified that warnings relating to one region of the country may be totally inapplicable in some other regions. Since pesticides are frequently sold on a national basis, it may often be impossible for us to specify all of the individual warnings that may be needed in one or more regions of the country. The most effective solution to these special problems lies in improved communication between the bee industry and the agricultural industry using pesticides. However, we are at all times anxious to receive full information regarding the nature and extent of these problems and to encourage the development of better and safer pest control techniques and pesticides.

THE INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Southwestern Miller points up some problems associated with the proposed International Grains Arrangement which carry serious implications for our export trade in wheat and flour.

I feel the editors of the Southwestern Miller have performed a real service in calling attention to these problems and the vital need to get them resolved as rapidly as possible.

The article follows:

[From the Southwestern Miller, Feb. 13, 1968]

I.G.A. TRANSITION HURDLES

Two problems inherent in the implementation of the proposed International Grains Arrangement that have received relatively little attention from either government or trade sources promise to make the transition from the 1967–68 to the 1968–69 crop year most difficult for the wheat and flour industries. One of the problems is that the Department of Agriculture for the moment at least is apparently unwilling to permit sales of wheat or flour for export beginning July 1, 1968, effective date for the proposed I.G.A., until a decision is reached by the Senate on the immediate question of whether or not it should give its advice and consent to ratification. The second involves the impact that may be exerted on markets in the event the Senate does approve U.S. participation. Based on current market levels, an export certificate cost will have to be imposed on a substantial share of export wheat sales to permit this country, even initially, to comply with the minimum prices spelled out in the controversial pact.

At present, no wheat or flour may be sold for export from the United States for shipment after June 30, 1968. This contrasts with the situation at this time last year when sales into August were being permitted on most wheat and flour, although so-called new crop subsidy rates on hard winter and soft red from the Gulf and East coast were not announced until early April. In other words, even if an American exporter had a firm bid from a foreign customer, no sale could be made for clearance beyond the end of the current crop season. This is brought about by the fact that, at least so far as hard winters and soft red for Gulf clearance are concerned, present market price indications, although highly nominal, are below the minimums in the I.G.A. To be in compliance with the pact provisions, No. 2 hard winters, f.o.b. Gulf, must not be sold below $1.73, and No. 1 soft red no lower than $1.60. Hard winter for July shipment from the Gulf is presently quoted about two cents a bushel below that minimum, while soft red is indicated as available at a discount of almost seven cents.

While it is too early to claim that such a brake on post-June 30 exports is preventing sales abroad, the prospective schedule for Senate consideration of the I.G.A. means that a final decision on ratification may not be reached for several months, or at a time when such a sales bar would pose the loss of highly desirable business abroad. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to which the I.G.A. has been referred for hearings, has an extremely heavy schedule in light of the crises that are breaking out in Asia and other parts of the world. It now is hinted that hearings on the pact may not be scheduled by this committee until sometime in March, which would probably hold back final decision until April or later. Such a delay, with all of its attendant problems, is particularly the prospect, owing to the strong export trade objections to the new arrangement, which will necessitate careful consideration by both the Foreign Relations Committee and the full Senate. The I.G.A. has just been referred to a six-man subcommittee of the Senate committee headed by Senator John Sparkman of Alabama.

This situation raises the highly important question of whether U.S. exporters will be prohibited from making sales of wheat abroad for shipment after June 30 at a time when competing countries may not be paying the same heed to the new minimums. As far as can be ascertained, Canada is not imposing any similar restriction on its export sales. In fact, private exporters are now offering Manitobas in Europe for shipment after July 1 at prices that are about five cents a bushel below the minimum equivalents. This matter requires a decision soon by the International Wheat Council, which is administering the pact, on a knotty problem that already has been placed on its agenda. This is whether or not the new minimums apply only to sales made beginning July 1, 1968, or to wheat shipped after that date, no matter when sold. Based on the present subsidy policy of the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. position is interpreted as being that the minimums apply to wheat shipped beginning with the effective date of the I.G.A.

Top officials of the Department of Agriculture have made it clear that export certificates, authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, will be charged on export wheat sales if necessary to assure compliance with the I.G.A. minimums. In the event of Senate ratification, this raises the possibility of prices to importers of U.S. wheat for post-June 30 shipment that are higher than the levels prevailing on wheat clearance before this date. A parallel to this occurred in mid-1965 when the cost of the domestic processing certificate was being raised effective July 1 from 70 cents a bushel in 1964–65 to 75 cents in 1965–66. In the month or more before July 1, 1965, flour mills throughout the country operated at full capacity and bakers absorbed all the flour possible to avoid the impact of the rise in the certificate cost, with grind in July sharply curtailed. A similar situation in the export market could mean intensive foreign demand in May and June to fill all possible pipelines abroad and then a sharp falling off in takings just at the time of the peak new harvest movement, all, of course, depending on price relationships.

From an administrative, as well as a market viewpoint, the possibilities envisioned by these two problems in connection with the I.G.A. loom as nightmares. For the trade opposing U.S. ratification of the arrangement, with its long-term threats to American export business in wheat, the best solution would be persuading the Senate not to approve the pact by the required two-thirds vote. For Department of Agriculture officials working intensively to secure Senate approval, the way out of this labyrinth is being sought through every possible action that will raise both current and new crop prices above the proposed pact's minimums. By achieving such a strengthening in prices, the Department would be able to permit sales for shipment after June 30 at least down to the pact minimums and would avoid the necessity of imposing "inverse subsidies," a step that in itself could well accentuate weakness in the market. Besides the basic aim of improving grower income, the price improvement steps being taken by the Department, including espousal of a reserve program, undoubtedly reflect a desire to ease what already promises to be a difficult and even embarrassing transition to the I.G.A.

NO GUNS IN THIS HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent treatise by Charles F. Zimmerman, of Williamsburg, Va., includes this observation:

> In spite of the lack of police protection in rural areas, it is not here, but in the policed but unarmed houses and apartments in suburbs and cities that the violent criminal strikes. There he knows he need only be bigger or quicker or braver to work his will on his victim. In the rural areas he might be met with a gun. If the anti-firearms proponents succeed in disarming rural America, the criminals can have a field day.

The passage in the Zimmerman paper is recalled by an article appearing in the Pittsburgh Press of February 4 in which outdoors editor, Roger Latham, concludes that a sign on your front door reading "There Are No Guns in This House" would be "an open invitation informing degenerates that you and your family are defenseless."

Mr. Latham's comment comes in a very frank and forceful review of gun law proposals and treatment of criminals.

Mr. Latham recommends:

> The way to stop the criminal from using guns is to throw the book at him when he does.

The Latham contribution hits the bull's-eye. It merits wide circulation. I recommend it to my colleagues. The article follows:

CONGRESS FIRES EMPTY TALK—MISSES GUN LAW TARGET

(By Roger Latham)

It's time to talk about gun legislation again and to speculate about why Congress refuses to pass any bills concerning the subject.

President Johnson calls for Federal gun legislation each time he gives his annual "State of the Union" message to Congress. The pollsters claim the bulk of Americans want stricter gun controls. The National Rifle Assn. favors control on all kinds of dangerous weapons and the shooting fraternity backs the NRA.

Just recently, Franklin L. Orth, executive vice president of the NRA, expressed disappointment that Congress had adjourned without taking action on responsible firearms legislation.

Warren Page, president of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, spoke for more than 100 companies in the gun and shooting industries when he recently urged a prompt and sincere effort to adopt realistic legislation, such as the bills introduced last year by Sen. Roman L. Hruska of Nebraska.

One session of Congress after another convenes and then adjourns and nothing happens. Except that a hundred more hearings are held during which those who speak

against unjust restrictions on sporting arms are verbally insulted and abused, particularly by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut.

While this is going on in Washington, Sen. Robert Kennedy of New York, who would evidently do away with all guns if he could, is misquoting the facts about gun legislation in speeches.

Recently in Buffalo, Sen. Kennedy stated: "I think it is a terrible indictment of the National Rifle Assn. that they haven't supported any legislation to try and control the misuse of rifles and pistols in this country."

If Sen. Kennedy had investigated a little, he would have found that the organization has worked for good gun laws since it was created in 1871. During the past 10 years, the NRA has been constantly assisting Congressional committees and individual Congressmen to write good gun control and crime control bills.

President Johnson, who consistently urges control legislation as a part of the nation's crime-reduction campaign, vetoed a bill to "get tough with criminals" back in 1965.

The administration and many members of Congress claim that society, not the criminal, is to blame for crime. These people contend that punishment of criminals treats the symptoms of crime and does nothing to cure the causes. They insist that the emphasis must be on the rehabilitation of lawbreakers and the removal of the social, economic and educational imbalances that breed crime.

But these same people do a complete about-face when it comes to gun legislation. They think crime can be reduced by putting ridiculous restrictions upon the sale and possession of firearms. Yet there's no reason to believe that their proposals will keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

At the same time, they continue to ignore the NRA's plea to place harsh penalties on the use of guns in crime.

I believe that harsh punishment for the misuse of guns has a thousand times more value in the control of crime than such things as gun registration, affidavits and other foolishness which criminals would completely ignore anyway.

This doesn't mean that I oppose laws which would help keep guns out of the hands of juveniles, drug addicts and other mentally and morally irresponsible persons. But I still say without reservation that if a criminal wants a gun, no law is going to prevent him from getting it.

The way to stop the criminal from using guns is to throw the book at him when he does.

We might also ask Congress why bazookas, cannons and other dangerous surplus military weapons still can be bought on the open market. The NRA and the sportsmen can hardly be accused of opposing legislation to keep these destructive devices out of the hands of irresponsible people!

And I'd like to finish with one more thought which is being knocked about lately. To those who are so determined to get rid of guns, the shooting fraternity suggests you hang a sign on your front door reading:

"There Are No Guns In This House."

Naturally this would be an open invitation informing degenerates that you and your family are defenseless.

But just keep in mind that the gun laws that Sen. Dodd and some others have been advocating would, for all practical purposes, put such a sign on your front door!

SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM AND MIDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to the students of Midwood High School in the 12th Congressional District, Brooklyn, N.Y., who are participants in the Peace Corps' school partnership program. The students of Midwood High School sent the Peace Corps a check for $821.61 to help fund a school in Balou-Ativeme, Togo, Africa.

The students' contribution will be used for the purchase of additional construction materials for a sixth-grade elementary school which was begun in June of 1967 and which is scheduled for completion early this year.

Balou-Ativeme is a farming village whose inhabitants total 700. It is located 29 miles from the capital city of Lome. The villagers who 5 years ago constructed a one-room school house with a thatched roof and wooden benches have laid the foundation for a new three-room school house and have made one third of the necessary number of cement blocks. Before Midwood High School's contribution, the villagers felt that two or three more harvests would be required before they could have enough money to complete the school.

However, the three-room elementary school is nearing completion, and I should like to express my gratitude to the students of Midwood High School, through whose efforts the construction program at Balou-Ativeme, Togo, was shortened from 3 years to 1 year.

AMERICANISM AWARD

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1968, I was privileged and highly honored to receive the Americanism Award from the Kings County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A. This was presented to me at the opening reception of the 32d Annual County Convention, Kings County Catholic War Veterans, which was held at the Hotel Granada, Brooklyn, N.Y.

The Americanism Award came as a wonderful and most appreciated surprise. The award bestowed upon me was not the only honor presented that evening. Others included the award for the Christmas program. The recipients were: The Moore McCormick Steamship Co., pier 4 Bush Docks; Mr. Anthony Scarpetta, 1928 East First Street; Miss Margaret Dixon, 89 Deeley Street; Mr. James Noble, 177 Dahill Road; Plaza Memorial Post No. 470; Holy Cross Post No. 295; Costello Post No. 837; CWV Memorial Hall; Russo De Marco Post No. 1702; Father Stedman Post No. 816; St. Vincent Ferrer Post No. 649; and Lt. David L. Schnaars Post No. 1831.

Awards for welfare programs went to: Russo DeMarco Post No. 1702; VAVS Program Plaza Memorial No. 470; VAVS Program St. Catherine of Geona No. 1599; VAVS Program Lorraine Hemmings; VAVS Program Charles Curran; VAVS Program Bette Connelly; and VAVS Program Joseph C. Anderson.

The Russo De Marco Post No. 1702 and Lt. David L. Schaars Post No. 1831 respectively received the first and second place Historian's Award, while St. Catherine of Geona Post No. 1599 received the Award for Perpetual Care, and Emanuel Abbate, the Award for Distinguished Service.

Mr. Raymond W. Gimmler, Past Nassau County Americanism Officer of the American Legion, gave the opening address, and I insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY RAYMOND W. GIMMLER, PAST NASSAU COUNTY AMERICANISM OFFICER, AMERICAN LEGION, ON JANUARY 19, 1968, TO THE KINGS COUNTY CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, AND ON JANUARY 20, 1968, TO THE QUEENS COUNTY WAR VETERANS

Reverend Clergy, honored guests on the dais and members of the Catholic War Vets. It is an honor to be here with you today and gives me the opportunity of thanking all of you that supported our last two programs. The Catholic War Veterans played an important role last year in supplying leadership to support our men in Viet Nam. All of you should be proud of men like your State Commander, Al Zebrowski, James McQuigan, N.Y. County Commander, Past State Commander Martin O'Reilly, National Executive Committeeman Henry Whalen who believed in our programs and more important went out and helped make them successful. Again, my thanks to them.

The preamble of the American Legion starts with "For God and Country we associate ourselves together". The meaning of God and Country to each of us should be synonymous. Love of Country, like love of God is a total and enduring personal commitment. Faith in God, Love of Country, these are the fortresses of free men. Everything that I am about to state will not be out of hate or sorrow, but from truth and if you detect a bitter tone in my voice, believe me that I am far from bitter about what I've been involved with. For you read and hear it everywhere "to support our boys in Viet Nam". Our committee received recognition from hundreds of organizations, Fifteen thousand letters of support from all over the Country, Fourteen thousand dollars in contributions to pay for our events, letters from V.P. Humphrey, former V.P. Nixon, Gen. Eisenhower, Gen. Westmoreland, the late Cardinal Spellman, Governor Rockefeller, former Gov. Dewey, thirty two Governors, and Three Hundred and Fifty Congressmen, Senators and other public officials. More important we received fifteen hundred letters of thanks from our servicemen in Viet Nam.

Let me start with our first press release which stated our position from the beginning and has never changed. "Peace is not the issue. All sane men are for peace. Our purpose is to support our Armed Forces who are carrying out the struggle for their Country, the U.S. The committee takes no position on the administration's policy, nor does it dispute the right of dissent. It only opposes attacks on our Nation and the impression given to the world, of a people who oppose their own Country. Above all we are striving to assure our fighting men in Viet Nam, that they have the full respect, love and prayers of the American people." (end release)

At the beginning of a New Year, let us look back to WWI, WWII, and the Korean

War and think of how our servicemen in that day were praised and honored; how our Flag and Country were respected and then look to the situation today that our servicemen and Country have to contend with. Imagine yourself being the fighting man of today and reading one story after another of draft card burners, Flag desecrations, sending blood and supplies to our enemy, calling our G.I.'s murderers, refusing to fight, while in many cases receiving a free education, the attacks on our government buildings, and last but not least, the carrying of enemy colors in their demonstrations.

Never once have these demonstrators or their leaders condemned the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals; never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Viet Nam; never once do they condemn the inhuman treatment of American prisoners. These persons weep only for the enemy. Maybe some of you here today have sons in Viet Nam, or other relations and friends in the Armed Forces. This is the reason for the type of talk I am giving here today. It further deals with apathy, motivation, dissent, publicity and patriotism and how these words are affecting us today.

I picked these subjects purposely because there is no doubt in my mind that these five words are playing an important role in establishing the policies of our government today. About two years ago in Hewlett High School, Long Island, N.Y. several left winged Ministers, teachers, and Rabbis staged an Anti Viet Nam rally and with very little advanced publicity were able to fill the school auditorium with over nine hundred persons.

As Nassau County American Legion Americanism Chairman last year, I attended several Americanism rallies and ceremonies in Nassau County and after adequate advanced publicity, fewer than one hundred persons turned out. This would probably have been the results in most of our communities today throughout the Country. What motivated the people of Hewlett to come out and why the apathy of the patriotic Americans? What also brought out fifty to one hundred peace marchers to Lynbrook, N.Y. each Sunday, to demonstrate against our policies in Viet Nam or Eleven hundred people to East Meadow High School, N.Y. to pay good American dollars to hear Pete Seeger, who sings anti American songs while in Europe and Russia, criticizes our government policies, and then refuses to answer questions before the House un-American Committee. I certainly do not have the answers to these questions, but I have observed one thing; whether they be peaceniks, beatniks, pacifists or Communists, they are all dedicated to a cause and are willing to devote a great deal of their time to gain their objectives.

Some of the Press, TV, and Radio give a platform and an authority to the protests of a small minority as though it was the voice of the majority and then this group is able to control the entire communications media, thus leading other countries and populations to believe that a majority of the citizens here disagree with our government's policies.

About six months ago, Senator Brooke of Mass. stated quote; "Those more familiar with East Asian mentality are convinced that the enemy still waits, still aspires to victory through collapse of the American will". end quote. They believe that pressure from within will cause us eventually NOT to keep our commitments to South Viet Nam. Would the enemy be so confident if we all stood together behind our government?

Why is the majority in most cases silent? Because it is easier to shout a protest, than demonstrate an answer? Because it is pleasanter to go one's comfortable way and leave responsibility to someone else? Because it is safe to suffer and complain, than to act and create? Because society has been so complex, it is tempting to say, the devil with it all, and then end up in a Communist hell.

Even with our efforts in Nassau County of counter demonstrating, we were hamstrung by the Press and TV with inaccurate reports and half truths. Articles and editorials appeared in major newspapers condemning "Our Right" to demonstrate. Where were the editorials on freedom when right wing organizations spoke in this same High School and people demonstrated against them? Who wrote on righteousness when about a year ago King Faisal of Saudi Arabia came to N.Y. and because of pressure was denied any courtesies and had his luncheon cancelled? Yet a month later a Russian diplomat was given the red carpet treatment while his country is supplying Eighty Percent of the arms and supplies to North Viet Nam that are killing and wounding our boys.

Who is condemning books on how to beat the draft? It is suggested that draft evasion can be achieved by students who pretend to be homosexuals. How do you like that for real "red blooded" American patriotism? Where are the articles on fairness when certain members of the clergy use their Church and facilities for their own political gains? Can you imagine what would happen if any Veteran's Post used their tax-free building for a particular candidate?

Where were the articles in the Press that the man tarred and feathered in the Support Our Boys Parade of May 13 in NYC was soon after placed in Queens County jail charged with breaking, entering and possession of narcotics?

Before and after our great May 13th parade, I was constantly questioned as to who was backing the parade, what kind of organizations I belong to, and where was the money coming from? Why did it take this same Press till October 19th to ask the so called peace organization the same questions? Yes, I admitted to belonging to the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Fire Department Unions, and the Holy Name Society way back in April. Now we finally find out by his own admission that their leader is an American Communist. When will they ask where they obtained the monies for the Ten Thousand Dollar ads in the N.Y. Times and elsewhere? When will our representatives find a means to protect our Constitutional freedoms against the subversive attacks of the Communists?

Unless we can find a way to protect our society from those who would destroy it, the destroyers are certain to succeed, and certainly an absolute requirement to achieve protection from our enemies is to know who our enemies are.

Let's also consider some of these facts: No arrests were made for burning our Flag in Central Park, nor was any attempt made to stop this degrading act, or the carrying of enemy colors in their demonstrations, while three attempts were successfully made in our parade to stop Americans from burning the enemy flag.

Two sky divers were given summons for landing with Flags in Central Park, while nothing was done to the airplane pilot hired by the peaceniks, that dropped litter and messages all over Manhattan the day of the parade. Two men were arrested for tar and feathering a peacenik while no arrests were made at their demonstration, even after a Sanitation man received stab wounds requiring ten stitches over the eye inflicted by the peaceable peaceniks. This violent act was committed after he dared them to try and burn the American Flag he was carrying. For the first time, reporters with clickers were sent by some newspapers to count our marchers, and to say the least, they suffered from aggravated subtraction instead of addition.

Our committee is in possession of the film sent to Viet Nam, One hundred and seven minutes long, and we defy anyone to be able to count the masses of people that day. Why wasn't the same treatment afforded the peaceniks? NYC Police gave estimates of One Hundred Thousand peace marchers on April 15th and gave our parade figure at One Quarter million, but later, under orders, retracted their statement and stated that estimates would no longer be made by the Police. They marched for Three Hours and Fifteen minutes, while our march, curb to curb, lasted Eight Hours and Thirty-Seven minutes, the longest parade in Twenty years in the entire Nation.

Newspapers like the N.Y. Post and Newsday, a Long Island paper, were given press releases weeks before the parade, reported on the parade on Page Fifty-Nine one day before the event. Even Moscow radio reported two days before and in Nigeria, Africa, a newspaper reported it ten days before. These two N.Y. papers did report on the parade the day after, and there is a remarkable similarity in their reporting and that of the Hanoi News, who downgraded the amount of people in the parade, and used almost the entire article to deal with the few minor disturbances. What were they trying to prove??? "That there are more people who do not support the boys in Viet Nam"? Thank God for the AP and UP and many other papers that reported One Quarter Million to the rest of the Country and world.

As many times as we stated that the May 13th parade and the October 21–22 Patriotic Weekend were for building up the morale of our fighting men and to counteract the un-American demonstrations in this Country, some papers, Channel 2 and 4 called us Pro War or Support War parade. Who in heaven's name is for War? Not the Veteran, who gave of his life, limbs and youth to protect freedom. For one solid week the entire news media advertised their unlawful, un-American acts to the world and gave top priority to their upcoming Washington, D.C., demonstration, while we had to be content with a few seconds of distorted news for our side. This is what made our victory even greater.

Huntley and Brinkley, for example, gave thirteen minutes to the Washington demonstration with Thirty-Five thousand people there, while they did not even choose to mention the Two-Hundred and thirty-nine thousand patriotic Americans who marched in the Metropolitan area. Another remarkable statistic is that we had no arrests, and did not need one paratrooper to protect anyone, or anything.

Isn't it about time people in the news media gave us some responsible reporting? Bitter screams of those who represent only their own tiny cliques are allowed to advertise to the world the ideas of violence, anti God, beatnik morals and non patriotisms as though these were responsible held American opinions.

We the majority must dissent against the minority, and make our voices heard, before it is too late to act. Veteran organizations and other patriotic groups must take the lead in combating this degradation, and all must join in this one common cause. The days of fighting among ourselves, or exerting power because one organization is larger than the other, must end. Commanders, one and all, should put aside self interest, political ambitions, petty grievances, replace apathy with leadership and fulfill the obligation they have taken on. Then enemy is united.

Whether they be intellectuals or ultra liberals, who cannot think like the common people, Communists, degenerates, or anti American organizations who are out to destroy our form of government, make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic, that we will not stand idly by, but that we will fight. Believe me, they are not going to just fade away.

Let me take a few more minutes of your time to quote the following statement: quote "The Communists are hoping to exploit situations of unrest in the U.S. such as the current protests against American policy in Viet Nam. We can expect the Communist Party to keep hammering for peace, while trying to enlarge the Party's immediate and long range influence. By allegedly standing for peace, the Communists hope to make contact with other groups, such as, pacifists, Church organizations and students" end quote. These statements were made by J. Edgar Hoover over two years ago, and just last week he stated that the anti war groups were organized by the Communist Party.

If we yield to the pressure of these Communist groups we will open the way for an end of freedom. The situation is getting worse every day and yet, too many Americans are still emulating Rip Van Winkle. Unless we can find a way to wake them up, there might be no stopping the downward course of America.

What can we as patriotic Americans do to change our course and protect all that we have fought for and some died for. May I offer these suggestions;

1. More than ever before we should help organize and attend patriotic rallies, talks, parades and meetings and demand action against those who participate in unlawful and unpatriotic acts. Stop enduring this dissent. Be cured from the Nations worst illness—Tolerance.

2. Take a sincere interest in your own children and others that you're near. Work each day to instill in them, Love of God and Country.

3. Do not tolerate student uprisings. Make your feelings known to the Director of the school and for those who say "Hell no, we won't go," why doesn't someone remind them of the words of Ben Franklin who stated: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." Or of the great words of Daniel Webster when he spoke: "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to defend it."

4. Write to your representatives, newspapers and other forms of communications giving your comments, especially where you disagree with them on patriotic principles.

5. Support your local police. More important demand that your public officials maintain law and order and take proper action against those who fail to comply, and more so against those who advocate breaking the law.

6. Vote only for candidates that support the American Traditions, and are willing to uphold them.

7. Write and encourage the Servicemen you know, especially if they are in Viet Nam fighting for us.

8. Fly your Flag, demand proper respect of it and Federal legislation that will prevent further desecrations.

9. Be a loyal American and contribute something to your Country. Freedom requires responsibility, and this cannot be delegated. Our responsibility is to see and make this an even greater America.

Last, each of us should stop acting as neutral observers. It is time, that responsible, loyal Americans directed the public indignation into lawful channels. The dissenters must be stopped, but not in the manner advocated by some organizations, with guns or axes. This is not the way to solve our problems. An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order, none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded for radicals, liberals, conservatives or moderates. History has demonstrated that once society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follows.

The time for sitting back is over if we are to retain our freedom. In every city and community, citizen's committees must be organized to consider ways and means to place our house back in order. We started the ball rolling with a counter attack on May 13th, a simultaneous demonstration with our Patriotic Weekend and "Lights On" program of October 21, 22. Both our events produced many more Americans and in some small way helped defeat Communism in our Country, and may even lead to putting the hippies, beatniks, and peaceniks back to string their guitars, making love and carrying flowers, instead of denouncing this great Country.

Remember, first a counter-attack, second a simultaneous demonstration, and now with the help of God, I can promise you in the very near future "An Attack" organized by the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, with a new and even more meaningful program. Naturally, we will be looking for your support to make our next event even more successful.

In conclusion, let us leave here today knowing that our Nation stands for Freedom and not Aggression and with a promise to act on your duty as a citizen of this beloved Country, by dedicating yourself in letters, words, and deeds, so that we may see a rebirth of sanity in this Nation for the sake of our children and our children's children. We dare not do otherwise, so help us God.

I salute and thank each of you.

THREAT OF PUNISHMENT TO "PUEBLO" CREW

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked and disturbed by the recent news of North Korea's intention to punish the 82 captive crewmen of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. Twenty-eight days ago, when the *Pueblo* was illegally seized, I asked the President to take immediate action to recover the ship and the men. When the President failed to take immediate action, the initiative for prompt recovery was lost.

The situation has now progressed to another point where a decision must be made.

I believe the United States must now issue the Government of North Korea an ultimatum with a time deadline for the release of the crew.

If that deadline is not met, it should be made clear that the United States will initiate military action against the Government of North Korea. As President Kennedy said at his inauguration:

> The price of freedom has always been high, but Americans have always paid the price.

I am asking other Members of Congress to join me in a resolution expressing our strong feelings about the return of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. These men were prepared to give their all for our country. This country must do all it can for them. Loyalty is a two-way street.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), for today, on account of official business.

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK, today, for 60 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, 10 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 60 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ZWACH) for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ZWACH) for 10 minutes, February 22.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. ICHORD), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution.

Mr. ASHLEY to follow the remarks of Mr. FINO on the bill H.R. 14743.

Mr. ICHORD (on behalf of Mr. FARBSTEIN) obtained permission for all Members to have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks with reference to the late Honorable Arthur Klein, a former Member of the House.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ZWACH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. REINECKE.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in two instances.

Mr. GURNEY

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland in five instances.

Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Buchanan in two instances.

Mr. Wyman in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Ichord) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Long of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. Corman.

Mr. Pool.

Mr. Resnick in three instances.

Mr. Wright.

Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Purcell in two instances.

Mr. Fascell in three instances.

Mr. Vanik.

Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Pepper in four instances.

Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico in three instances.

Mr. Cohelan in two instances.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Boland.

Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Monagan in two instances.

Mr. Gathings.

Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Rarick in four instances.

Mr. Tunney in two instances.

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Staggers.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 269. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Acadia National Park, Maine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1549. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the 1967 crop year, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1550. A letter from the Commissioner, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1551. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1552. A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to dockets Nos. 326–D, 326–E, 326–F, 326–G, *Shoshone Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho;* docket No. 326–H, *Shoshone Tribe, represented by the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho;* docket No. 366, *the Bannock Tribe, on relation of and represented by Russell Pokibro, a member of said Bannock Tribe;* docket No. 367, *Shoshone Nation or Tribe of Indians, on relation of and represented by Edward Queep Boyer, Joseph "Frank" Thorpe, Jr., and Jeanette Pocatello Lewis, members of the Shoshone Nation or Tribe of Indians, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on District of Columbia. H.R. 15131. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11618. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. S. 1155. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance, and guarantees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1103). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 15483. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15484. A bill to modernize and improve the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 to assure the wholesomeness of poultry sold only in intrastate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15485. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15486. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 15487. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 15488. A bill to enable baby chicks, started pullet, laying hen, and table egg producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain, and develop orderly marketing conditions at prices reasonable to the consumers and producers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15489. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 15490. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H.R. 15491. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1968; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 15492. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a more equitable standard under which indebtedness incurred by veterans with respect to loans acquired under chapter 37 of such title may be waived; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 15493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude reenlistment bonuses from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 15494. A bill to assist the States in raising revenues by making more uniform the incidence and rate of tax imposed by States on the severance of minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 15495. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of credit information by insured banks and institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15496. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 15497. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 15498. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15499. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for disciplinary action against employees in the postal field service who assault other employees in such service in the performance of official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 15500. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 15501. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for disciplinary action against employees in the postal field service who assault other employees in such service in the performance of official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 15502. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a felony to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15503. A bill to amend the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 15504. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15505. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 15506. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15507. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nedzi, and Mr. Ottinger):

H.R. 15508. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. Garmatz, and Mr. Friedel):

H.R. 15509. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of every grade crossing along the high-speed rail line between Washington, D.C., and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15510. A bill to amend section 13B of title 15 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15511. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois (for herself, Mr. Arends, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Skubitz, Mr. Dole, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Winn, Mr. Utt, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, and Mr. Smith of New York):

H.R. 15512. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING (for himself, Mr. Hull, Mr. Mize, Mr. Randall, and Mr. Winn):

H.J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority by the States of Kansas and Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 1112. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 1113. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 1114. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as Afro-American History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 1116. Joint resolution to reserve to the Congress the exclusive power to impose mandatory wage and price controls so long as no declared state of war exists between the United States and any nation or nations and the Congress is able to exercise its constitutional powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 652. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 1071. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 1072. Resolution concerning investigation of cooperative associations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

311. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to an investigation of the need for rail passenger service, the need for coordination with other modes of transportation, and the return of an efficient mail and express service, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15513. A bill for the relief of Filippo and Lilla Galletta and minor child, Antonina Galletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15514. A bill for the relief of Bruno Domenico Mazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15515. A bill for the relief of Elvira and Salvatore Guardi and minor children, Raffrele and Giusella Guardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15516. A bill for the relief of Andrea Brusca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rigoberto Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15518. A bill for the relief of Giancomo Bianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15519. A bill for the relief of Mario Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 15520. A bill for the relief of Cuan Chiao Wen, also known as Alberto Lee Cuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 15521. A bill for the relief of Sister Consolata (Licia Bianconi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15522. A bill for the relief of Sister Innocenza (Natalina Zerlotin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15523. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kee Po Fu Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15524. A bill for the relief of Maremma H. Unite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15525. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agueda C. Monserrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shaul G. Massry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15527. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Prima C. Ruivivar and her minor son, Francisco C. Ruivivar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15528. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pao Ro Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15529. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Finocchiaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

246. Mr. MONAGAN presented a petition of the Knights of Lithuania, Council 135, Ansonia, Conn., relative to commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence and honoring the memory of generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—*Wednesday, February 21, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, keeper of our destiny, we pray Thy blessing upon our country, especially our President and these leaders who seek guidance. May there be fresh winds of Thy power blow upon them for the tasks of this day.

Teach Thy people the arts of peace and service. Deepen our understanding of the righteousness that exalteth a nation. So incline us to do Thy will that this Nation may be a blessing to all mankind.

We pray for the people of all lands who are today suffering and dying because of the failure to find solutions to war, poverty, and ignorance. Forgive us, O Lord, and show us the way to sane living. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 20, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 269) to authorize an exchange of lands at Acadia National Park, Maine.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 10. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; and

S. 1821. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property at Acadia National Park in Maine with the owner of certain property adjacent to the park.

The message further announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12603) to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Gray, Mr. Jones of Alabama, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Wright, Mr. Grover, Mr. Schwengel, and Mr. Cramer were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1879. An act for the relief of Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik;

H.R. 10851. An act for the relief of New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.; and

H.R. 15399. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1879. An act for the relief of Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik; and

H.R. 10851. An act for the relief of New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15399. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 53D ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 53d annual report of the Federal Trade Commission, covering its accomplishments during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S.J. Res. 30

A joint resolution relating to the Continental Shelf fisheries

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the United States presently has a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone which is not adequate for the conservation of the stock of fish which this country will need to utilize fully in order to remain a major fishing nation; and

Whereas the United States has slipped to sixth place in world fisheries behind such nations as the Soviet Union and Communist China, who intend to expand their fishing efforts in the North Pacific; and

Whereas the commercial fishermen of the Pacific Northwest, as well as the economy of the United States as a whole, are being detrimentally affected by the heavy flow of imports of foreign seafood products, gear conflicts and other competition from the massive foreign fleets on the fishing grounds, and the depletion of precious resources because of over-fishing and destructive fishing practices of foreign fleets; and

Whereas the United States has failed to implement fully two provisions from Geneva Conventions which would give our nation valuable bargaining tools in fisheries negotiations with other nations, the first of which states that sedentary species of fish on the Continental Shelf are part of the Shelf and are considered to be the exclusive property of the coastal nation and the second of which provides for conservation of the living resources of the high seas and allows the United States to designate conservation areas and promulgate conservation measures to protect these resources;

Be it resolved that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact legislation declaring the Continental Shelf of the United States to be this nation's exclusive fisheries zone.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to The Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to The Honorable Carl Hayden, President Pro Tempore of the U.S. Senate; and The Honorable E. L. Bartlett and The Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and The Honorable Howard W. Pollock, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Passed by the Senate February 1, 1968.

John Butrovich,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Emylou Lloyd,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed by the House February 7, 1968.

William K. Boardman,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

Patricia R. Symonds,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Walter J. Hickel,
Governor of Alaska.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3012. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Fernandez-Dominguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Percy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 3013. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits and Mr. Yarborough when Mr. Javits introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 3014. A bill for the relief of Maria Giuseppa Bario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3015. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating

accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom;

S. 3016. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; and

S. 3017. A bill to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the statements of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of Hortensia Elena Viso; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 3019. A bill to amend section 6(h) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to clarify the deferment status of persons pursuing full-time courses of training at junior or community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Griffin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for Mr. Pastore and himself):

S. 3020. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. Symington, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Pearson):

S.J. Res. 146. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority by the States of Kansas and Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3015—INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR RECREATIONAL BOAT SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, at the request of the Secretary of Transportation, a bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom.

The need for such legislation is buttressed by the fact that in 1966 alone 1,318 deaths resulted from boating mishaps. In that year alone over $7.3 million in property damage was attributed to boating accidents. While the activities of the Coast Guard and the various State and local governmental entities in promoting boating safety are well known and appreciated, it is clear that there is a necessity for additional and stronger safety programs.

The bill proposed would create a working partnership between the Federal Government and the various States by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to establish safety standards applicable to the manufacture of recreational boats and associated equipment, approve State boating safety programs that comply with Federal requirements and make grants-in-aid to States to assist in carrying on boating safety programs

There is much that can be done in the area of boating safety which does not require legislation and this bill is merely part of an overall Federal program to reduce boating accidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record following my remarks the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Transportation to the President of the Senate, the text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3015) to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby declares that the purpose of this Act is to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting from such accidents. Therefore, Congress determines that it is necessary to authorize the establishment of standards for boats and associated equipment moving in interstate commerce, and to assist the States in carrying out safety programs.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) "Boat" means any vessel not more than sixty-five feet in length manufactured primarily for non-commercial use.

(2) "Associated equipment" means (A) any system, part, or component of a boat as originally manufactured or any similar part or component manufactured or sold for replacement, repair, or improvement of such system, part, or component, or (B) any accessory or equipment for or appurtenance to a boat.

(3) "Manufacturer" means any person engaged in (A) the manufacture, construction, or assembly of boats or associated equipment, or (B) the manufacture or construction of components for boats and associated equipment to be sold for subsequent assembly by the retail purchaser, or (C) the importation into the United States for sale of boats, associated equipment, or components thereof.

(4) "Secretary" means Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(5) "State" means a State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

BOAT SAFETY REGULATIONS

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations establishing safety standards for the design, construction, materials, and performance of boats and associated equipment; establishing the procedures and tests required to measure conformance with standards; requiring the installation of associated equipment; and requiring or permitting the display of seals, labels, plates, insignia, and other devices for the purpose of certifying or evidencing compliance with boat safety regulations.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations requiring associated equipment, or labels or other devices evidencing compliance with regulations issued under this Act with respect to associated equipment, to be used or carried on boats used on the navigable waters of the United States.

(c) In establishing boat safety standards, testing procedures and examinations, the Secretary may consider standards, procedures, and examinations recommended by qualified public or private agencies and organizations. The Secretary may, if he considers that boating safety will not be substantially affected, issue exemptions from the requirements of the regulations established under this section, on such terms and conditions as he may impose.

(d) Whenever a Federal boat safety standard established under section 3(a) of this Act is in effect, no State or political subdivision thereof shall have any authority either to establish or to continue in effect, with respect to any boat or associated equipment, any safety standard applicable to the same aspect of performance of such boat or associated equipment which is not identical to the Federal standard. The Secretary may waive the applicability of this section where exceptional circumstances existing within a State warrant the establishment by that State of a safety standard higher than one established by the Secretary.

PROHIBITED ACTS AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 4. (a) No manufacturer shall manufacture for sale, sell, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States, any boat, or associated equipment, or components thereof to be sold for subsequent assembly by the retail purchaser, on or after the date any applicable regulation issued under section 3(a) of this Act takes effect, unless it complies with such regulation.

(b) No person shall use on the navigable waters of the United States any boat or associated equipment manufactured on or after the effective date of regulations issued under section 3(a) of this Act which does not conform with such regulations.

(c) No person shall use any boat on the navigable waters of the United States in violation of regulations issued under section 3(b) of this Act.

(d) If any boat or associated equipment is used on the navigable waters of the United States in violation of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the Secretary may direct the operator to terminate operation of the boat until the condition creating the violation is corrected.

(e) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this Act, or to restrain the sale, offer for sale, or the introduction or delivery for introduction, in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, of any boat or associated equipment which is determined, prior to the first purchase of such boat in good faith for purposes other than resale, not to conform to applicable Federal boat safety standards, upon petition by the appropriate United States attorney or the Attorney General on behalf of the United States. Whenever practicable, the Secretary shall give notice to any person against whom an action for injunctive relief is contemplated and afford him an opportunity to present his views, and, except in the case of a knowing and willful violation, shall afford him reasonable opportunity to achieve compliance. The failure to give such notice and afford such opportunity shall not preclude the granting of appropriate relief.

(f) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of a boat or associated equipment intended solely for export, and so labeled or tagged on the boat or associated equipment and on the outside of the container, if any, which is exported.

INSPECTION AND INVESTIGATION

Sec. 5. (a) Every manufacturer subject to the provisions of this Act shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this Act, or the regulations issued pursuant thereto. A manufacturer shall, upon request of an officer, employee, or agent authorized by the Secretary, permit such officer, employee, or agent to inspect at reasonable times factories or other facilities, books, papers, records, and documents relevant to determining whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this Act and the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

(b) All information reported to or otherwise obtained by the Secretary or his representatives pursuant to subsection (a) containing or relating to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers, employees, or agents concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act. Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Secretary or any officer or employee under his control, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. (a) Any person who violates section 4(a) of this Act shall be liable to a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 for each violation, except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed $100,000 for any related series of violations. If such violation is willful, such person shall also be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Any person (1) who uses a boat or associated equipment on the navigable waters of the United States in violation of sections 4(b), 4(c), or 4(d) of this Act, or (2) who fails to comply with regulations issued pursuant to section 5(a) of this Act shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be liable to a civil penalty not to exceed $500 for each violation. For any penalty incurred under this subsection, the boat shall be liable and may be proceeded against by way of maritime action in rem in the district court of any district in which the boat may be found

(c) The Secretary may compromise any civil penalty for an amount to be determined by him.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 7. The Secretary may, subject to such regulations, supervision, and review as he may prescribe, delegate to any qualified private person, or private or public agency, or to any employee under the supervision of such person or agency, any work, business, or function respecting the examination, inspection, and testing necessary to carry out his responsibilities under section 3 of this Act.

STATE BOATING SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 8. (a) In order to enhance boating safety and encourage consistency in State regulation, the Secretary is authorized to approve State boating safety programs designed to reduce boating accidents, and the deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom. Such approval shall be a condition to Federal financial assistance under this Act. In order to be approved, a State boating safety program must comply with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Such regulations may include, but need not be limited to, requirements for boat operator education, safety and enforcement patrols, safety inspections, testing and examination of boats, boat operating zones, operator licensing programs, boating accident investigation and analysis, hazardous debris removal, and emergency services. The Secretary is authorized to waive or amend for a reasonable period of time any regulation prescribed under this subsection to permit the evaluation of new or different boating safety programs which are suggested on an experimental, pilot, or demonstration basis by one or more States if he finds that the public interest would be served by the waiver or amendment.

(b) The Secretary shall not approve any boating safety program under this section which does not—

(1) designate the State authority or agency which will administer the boating safety program; and

(2) provide that the designated State authority or agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall apportion funds appropriated under this Act to the several States as soon as practicable after July 1 of each fiscal year for which funds are available. The apportionment shall be made on the following basis:

(1) 50 per centum of the amount available shall be apportioned among the several eligible States according to percentages to be determined by dividing the number of motor boats registered in each eligible State by the total of motor boats registered in all eligible States.

(2) 50 per centum of the amount available shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the eligible States in amounts to be determined by him, taking into account such factors as the extent to which the waters of a State are used by boats from without that State, the need to undertake innovative State programs which might offer significant advancements in the effectiveness of boat safety programs, and the financial need of the States.

(b) The term "eligible State" as used in this section means a State which has an approved boating safety program in existence or has submitted a boating safety program for approval under section 8 of this Act.

(c) Amounts apportioned to an eligible State shall be available for expenditure by that State for a period of two years following the date of apportionment. Funds unobligated by the State at the expiration of the two-year period shall be withdrawn by the Secretary and reapportioned at his discretion.

(d) The amount apportioned to any State for any fiscal year may not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of carrying out the State's approved boating safety program for that year, including the cost of training personnel for State and local boating safety work and the cost of administering the State program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) Amounts apportioned under section 9 shall be computed and made available to the States as follows:

(1) The Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be expended by each State during the period, the estimate to be based on such records and information pertaining to the State program as the Secretary may require. Where the Secretary finds that his estimate of the amount to be made available to a State for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been made available to that State for such prior period, the amount for the current period may be increased or decreased, as the case may be, by the appropriate amount.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall schedule the payment of funds consistent with program purposes and applicable Treasury regulations, so as to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of such funds from the United States Treasury and the subsequent disbursement thereof by a State.

(b) Whenever the Secretary's after reasonable notice to the designated State authority or agency, finds that—

(1) the boating safety program submitted by the State and approved by the Secretary has been so changed that it no longer complies with the standards established by regulations; or

(2) in the administration of the boating safety program, there has been a failure to comply substantially with the standards established by regulations; or

(3) the aggregate expenditure of funds of the State and political subdivisions thereof, exclusive of Federal funds, for boating safety programs will be maintained at a level which falls below the average level of such expenditures for the preceding two full fiscal years; the Secretary shall notify the State authority or agency that no further payments will be made to the State until he is satisfied that the program conforms to the established standards, the failure is corrected, or the level of State effort is increased.

(c) The Secretary shall, by regulation, provide for such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures as are necessary and reasonable for the proper and efficient administration of this section.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 11. (a) For grants to States to assist in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining boating safety programs, there is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and such amounts as may be necessary for each of the succeeding fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, such appropriations to remain available until expended when so specified in an appropriation act.

(b) Amounts appropriated under subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the necessary costs of administering sections 8, 9, and 10 of this Act.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out other sections of this Act.

CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION

SEC. 12. (a) In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act, the Secretary shall consult with existing committees and organizations having an interest in boating and boating safety and he may establish representative boating safety advisory committees.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to assist and cooperate with State and local governments, private industry, and other interested parties to increase boating safety.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the "Recreational Boat Safety Act of 1968".

The letter and section-by-section analysis of the bill presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "To provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom."

The proposed bill would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to:

1. Establish safety standards applicable to the manufacture of recreational boats and associated equipment, and to regulate as necessary items of equipment carried on board recreational boats;

2. Approve State boating safety programs designed to reduce boating accidents if they comply with certain Federal requirements; and

3. Make grants-in-aid to the States to assist in carrying out their boating safety programs.

This bill is part of a comprehensive program which the Department is undertaking at the direction of the President to improve boating safety. Other features of the program, which do not require authorizing legislation, including a stepped-up research effort to develop safer boat designs and improved lifesaving equipment; an enlarged educational and an informational program aimed specifically at small boat owners and operators; a more effective system for collecting and analyzing data concerning the circumstances and causes of recreational boating accidents; and a thorough reappraisal of the existing waterway marker systems, weather and hazard warning devices, and operational rules to insure they meet the special requirements and operational experience of small recreational boat users.

This comprehensive approach to improved boating safety is necessary, and the time to act is now. Paralleling the increase in family incomes and in the amount of leisure time, millions of Americans have turned to boating as a major form of sport and recreation. Currently there are more than eight million small boats in use in the United States and their number increases at the rate of 4,000 a week. This sharp and continuing rise in the level of small boat activity, however, has brought with it an increase in boating accidents and deaths.

In 1966, 1,318 deaths occurred in boating accidents. This is an increase in fatalities of 34 percent in the last five years. The boating fatality rate is equal to about 16 deaths per 100,000 boats. The result is that today almost as many persons are killed in boating mishaps as in all types of aviation accidents combined. According to such statistics as are available, there were more than 4,300 boating accidents in 1966 in excess of 1,500 reported injuries, and more than $7.3 million in property damage. Available data show an increasing ratio of accidents and injuries to boat population.

Despite significant activity by the Coast Guard and the preventive efforts of State and local government, small boat safety calls for a greater Federal effort, in cooperation with the States, local governments, and industry, to reduce the risk of accident, injury, and death in recreational boating. Efforts to increase recreational boat safety have been severely hampered in the past for many reasons. Because most boats operate on non-Federal waters, Federal involvement has been limited in scope and in character. Though much of the responsibility has been left with the States and with local governments, there has been no Federal assistance or incentive for the development of meaningful boat safety programs. Further, there has been no significant private or governmental research effort to develop safer boat design and better lifesaving equipment. And where equipment has been devised that could help prevent accidents and save lives, Federal authority has not been sufficient to induce or compel industry and other segments of the boating community to provide for its installation and use. Moreover, while most small boat accidents appear to be attributable to operator fault, there has not been an education and training program sufficient to meet the needs of eight million small boat owners.

To sum up, the special problem of small boat safety demands new programs and policies that are truly sufficient, in scale and type, to meet the challenge. The proposed bill will authorize regulatory action to be taken when necessary, and will permit the Secretary to offer some incentive to more effective State action. The recommended appropriation authorization of $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1969 for a grant-in-aid program is sufficient to help some States improve existing programs and to encourage others to make a start. On the basis of this experience, we can assess the long-run requirements for an effective, nationwide approach to boating safety.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this proposed legislation is in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A COORDINATED NATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAM TO REDUCE BOATING ACCIDENTS, AND DEATHS AND INJURIES RESULTING THEREFROM

Section 1 contains the declaration of purpose.

Section 2 defines the following terms used in the Act.

(1) "Associated equipment" would include any item or system installed in or attached to a boat which may affect the safety of a boat or its occupants.

(2) "Boat" would include all vessels whether or not mechanically propelled.

(3) "Manufacturer" would include persons manufacturing not only finished products, but also component parts for assembly by the ultimate purchaser-user.

(4) "Secretary" would mean the Secretary of Transportation but would also provide for the case where the Coast Guard may operate as a service in the Department of the Navy.

(5) "State" would include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

Section 3 provides broad authority to the Secretary to permit, as necessary, the safety regulation of the design, construction, and performance of boats and associated equipment, and the use of associated equipment. Additionally, the Secretary would be authorized to issue regulations requiring or permitting the display of labels or other devices evidencing compliance, to exempt any boat or associated equipment when boating safety is not endangered so as to accommodate special use boats such as powered racing boats, and to consider the standards, testing procedures and examinations recommended by the qualified public or private agencies and organizations in establishing his boating safety standards. Finally, the section would provide that once a Federal boat safety standard was established, a State or local standard touching upon the same aspect of performance could not be established or continued in effect unless it was identical to the Federal standard, except where the Secretary found exceptional circumstances to exist warranting a waiver.

Section 4 prohibits the manufacture for introduction into interstate commerce, or the importation of any boat or associated equipment unless it complies with applicable standards. It would also prohibit the use of any boat or associated equipment on the navigable waters of the United States unless it complied with applicable regulations. The Secretary would be authorized to stop the operation of any boat being used in violation, of the prohibitions until the discrepancy was corrected. U.S. district courts would have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the Act.

Section 5 provides authority to make inspections and investigations necessary to determine compliance with the provisions of the Act. Trade secrets and similar matter furnished to or discovered by the Secretary in the course of such inspections and investigations would be protected.

Section 6 provides penalties for violations of the Act or regulations issued thereunder. Manufacturers would be subject to a civil penalty of $1,000 with a maximum of $100,000 for a related series of violations. If the violation was willful, the manufacturer would be subject to a criminal penalty of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year or both. Other persons violating provisions of the Act or the regulations would be subject to a civil penalty of $500. The Secretary would be authorized to compromise any civil penalty for an amount to be determined by him.

Section 7 provides broad authority for the Secretary to make use of qualified public or private agencies or organizations in exercising his responsibilities under section 3 of the Act.

Section 8 provides broad authority to the Secretary to issue regulations containing standards for State boating safety programs and to approve State boating safety programs complying with the standards. The section would permit the Secretary to waive his standards for a reasonable time for innovative State programs if boating safety would be enhanced by the waiver. A State boating safety program submitted for approval under this section would be required to designate the State authority or agency which will administer the program and to indicate that such information and reports as the Secretary might require would be furnished.

Section 9 provides the basis upon which funds would be apportioned to eligible States under a grant-in-aid program. Fifty percent of the funds available would be apportioned on the basis of motorboat registration. The remaining fifty percent would be apportioned after taking into account the extent to which waters of a State are used by boats from outside the State, the need to undertake innovative State programs, and the financial needs of the States. Additional provisions of the section would (1) define eligible States as those which have an approved State boating safety program or have submitted such a program for approval, (2) permit funds apportioned to a State to be available for two years, and (3) set the maximum of the Federal amount apportioned to a State at seventy-five percent of the cost of the State boating safety program.

Section 10 provides for the payment of apportioned funds to the eligible States. The Secretary must estimate for each calendar quarter the amount to be expended by the State for that quarter and pay that amount adjusted for any differences resulting from previous estimates. The section also sets forth circumstances under which the Secretary may stop payments to a State. Finally, the section authorizes the Secretary to establish by regulation such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures as may be necessary.

Section 11 authorizes an appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1969, and such amounts as necessary for future fiscal years, for the purpose of making grants to States to meet part of the costs of State boating safety programs.

Section 12 authorizes the Secretary to consult with existing committees and organizations interested in boating and boating safety and to establish representative boating safety committees. It also authorizes the Secretary to cooperate with and assist other Federal departments and agencies, State and local governments, and private industry, and other interested persons to increase boating safety.

Section 13 cites the Act as the "Recreational Boat Safety Act of 1968".

S. 3016—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARITIME PROGRAMS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1969. Last year, Congress enacted legislation requiring annual authorization of the program of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, and this

bill is the first such authorization bill required under the new legislation.

The annual authorization legislation enacted last year arose because we believed that this would enhance the concern and attention that must be paid to our present maritime difficulties. We must undertake a vastly expanded effort in the maritime field if we are to preserve our defense posture, protect our economy, and correct our balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD together with the letter of transmittal from the Acting Secretary of Commerce to the President of the Senate, and a statement of the purposes and provisions of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement of purposes and provisions of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3016) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the appropriation act may provide for the use of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1969, as follows:

(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, $119,800,000;

(b) payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy, $206,000,000;

(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities (including reimbursement of the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations), $6,700,000;

(d) reserve fleet expenses, $5,279,000;

(e) Maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, $5,177,000; and

(f) financial assistance to State Marine Schools, $1,900,000.

The letter and statement of purposes and provisions of the bill, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce," and four copies of a Statement of Purpose and Need in support thereof.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program and that enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD J. SAMUELS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSES AND PROVISIONS OF THE BILL TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN MARITIME PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

On September 5, 1967, P.L. 90–81 was signed by the President. That public law provided that after December 31, 1967 there were authorized to be appropriated for certain maritime activities of the Department of Commerce only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law.

The bill authorizes specific amounts for those activities listed in P.L. 90–81 for which the Department of Commerce proposes to seek appropriations during fiscal year 1969. The bill authorizes appropriations in the amounts contained in the Department's budget submission for fiscal year 1969. A short justification for the various items in the draft bill follows:

SHIP CONSTRUCTION, CONSTRUCTION-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY, AND COST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE FEATURES

Funds authorized to be appropriated under this heading would provide for the payment of construction-differential subsidy and national defense allowances on replacement vessels constructed for service on essential foreign trade routes by subsidized United States operators. In addition, these funds will provide for the acquisition of ships replaced by and traded in on newly constructed vessels and for the expenses associated with placing these replaced vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Finally, funds for the administration of the ship construction program are included.

The total authorization under this heading is $119,800,000 and the budget will propose transfer to the "Salaries and Expenses" appropriation for administrative support of not to exceed $3,150,000 and for transfer to the appropriation for reserve fleet expenses of not to exceed $700,000. This latter transfer would be in addition to the sum authorized in the bill for reserve fleet expenses which is discussed below.

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

The appropriation authorized under this heading would provide for liquidation of subsidy obligations incurred under permanent contract authority to ship operators in order to maintain a United States merchant fleet in support of United States foreign commerce and capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in event of a national emergency. The program is designed to pay the difference between the fair and reasonable cost of certain expenses (wages and subsistence of crew, insurance, vessel maintenance and repair) and the estimated cost of the same items if the ships were operated under foreign registry. The amount authorized to be appropriated for this item is $206,000,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Funds authorized to be appropriated under this heading are intended to finance MarAd projects designed to improve the competitive position of the American merchant marine while reducing the Government's share of the costs of its construction, operation, and maintenance. Major categories within the appropriation are: directed research, dealing with the adaptation of known technology concepts to problems of the marine industry; advanced concepts, providing for long-range research into new merchant marine concepts. In addition, the appropriation under this heading will finance the operation of the N.S. *Savannah* as well as reimbursement to the "Salaries and Expenses" appropriation for expenses applicable to Research and Development activities. The authorization for this appropriation is $6,700,000 of which the budget will propose $3,400,000 for operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah* and $931,000 for transfer to the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses" to cover administrative expenses. Further, transfers from this appropriation are authorized to the "Vessel Operations Revolving Fund" to cover losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations.

RESERVE FLEET EXPENSES

Funds are provided under this activity for the preservation and security of priority merchant ships maintained for national defense purposes. Additionally, security is provided for those ships not of a high priority nature awaiting sale.

This activity is one of three limitations under the "Salaries and Expenses" appropriation. $5,279,000 are authorized to be appropriated for this purpose. In addition, as noted above under the heading Ship Construction, Construction-Differential Subsidy, and Cost of National Defense Features not to exceed $700,000 may be transferred from funds appropriated thereunder.

MARITIME TRAINING

Funds under this appropriation heading provide for a program of training of cadets for service as officers in the United States Merchant Marine. A four-year training course, including one year of sea-duty is designed to qualify graduates for licenses as merchant marine deck or engine officers.

The authorization for appropriations under this heading is $5,177,000 of which the budget will propose that $2500 be available for contingencies for the Superintendent of the Academy. In addition, the budget will propose a limitation on the average yearly cost per cadet of uniform and text book allowances of $475. The budget further will propose that this appropriation may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in support of activities financed from other appropriations.

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

Funds under this appropriation are intended to provide Federal assistance to participating States for the training of cadets as officers in the merchant marine. The assistance is in the form of direct grants to the States; allowances to cadets for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence; and for repairs to Federal training ships on loan to the schools.

The authorization for this purpose is $1,900,000. The budget will propose that $625,000 be earmarked for maintenance and repairs of Federal training ships on loan to the schools and $1,275,000 be earmarked for direct grants and allowances to cadets.

S. 3017—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO CHANGE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON LOANS INSURED UNDER TITLE XI OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD together with the letter of transmittal from the Acting Secretary of Commerce to the President of the Senate, and a statement of the provisions of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement of provisions will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3017) to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1104(a)(5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Shall secure bonds, notes, or other obligations bearing interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance, and service charges, if any) at rates not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary of Commerce determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the Department of Commerce."

The letter and statement of provisions presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith are four copies of a draft bill "To change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936." The accompanying statement of purposes and provisions explains the changes the bill would make in existing law and the need for enactment of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSES AND PROVISIONS OF THE BILL TO CHANGE THE PROVISION WITH RESPECT TO THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST PERMITTED ON LOANS AND MORTGAGES INSURED UNDER TITLE XI OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Section 1104(a)(5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that to be eligible for mortgage insurance a ship mortgage must, among other requirements, secure bonds, notes or other obligations bearing interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at a rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance or not to exceed 6 per centum per annum on such balance if the Secretary of Commerce finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage or leading market demands it.

By reference to section 1104(a)(5), section 1104(b)(6) places the same requirement on loans with respect to the maximum interest rate if they are to be eligible for insurance. This refers to loans which are made to finance construction of the ship and which precede the mortgage which is placed on the ship after the ship is completed.

The bill would amend section 1104(a)(5) to substitute for the 5 and 6 percent maximums a provision that the interest rate shall not exceed a rate determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the Department of Commerce. Under this language, there could be circumstances under which the rate determined by the Secretary to be reasonable would exceed 6 percent.

Since November 1966, the Department has approved interest rates under the terms of the existing law as follows:

Interest rate:	Date Approved
5.75 percent	November 17, 1966
5.10 percent	February 1, 1967
5.50 percent	March 20, 1967
5.50 percent	April 21, 1967
5.40 percent	May 25, 1967
6.00 percent	June 28, 1967
6.00 percent	August 10, 1967

At the present time the Department has applications for mortgage and loan insurance totaling $252,002,000 for 45 ships and 691 barges which are to be built by private owners with privately generated funds to upgrade and modernize the American merchant marine. Under existing law, if the market should require a rate of interest higher than 6 percent, the Department could not insure these loans and mortgages and the vessels therefore could not be built.

Companies with plans to build ships do not want to take the risk that the Department will be unable to provide title XI insurance because of the demand for rates in excess of 6%. If the ceiling were removed, the Department could negotiate freely without the restraint caused by the ceiling and the pressure on the operator, who is willing to pay the price of high rates for assurance that financing will be available when needed.

S. 3019—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING A FAIR DRAFT POLICY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to clarify the military draft status of students who attend community and junior colleges.

This measure would accord impartial treatment to those full-time students at such institutions who are pursuing a course which does not lead to a bachelor's degree.

Corrective legislation of this nature is needed, Mr. President, particularly in view of a ruling issued by the Director of the Selective Service System last August 9. At that time, General Hershey declared that only students who are enrolled in programs leading to a bachelor's degree can qualify for the standard student—II–S—deferment.

Under his new policy, thousands of nondegree 2-year college students across the Nation have been barred from student deferment.

By segregating bachelor's degree students from other full-time students whose courses do not lead to a bachelor, the new regulation raises serious questions of equity; and it threatens to undermine the role of the 2-year college in American education.

Mr. President, let me outline the problem in greater detail.

The present precarious draft position of the nondegree student at a community college results from two recent administrative actions.

On August 9, 1967, the Selective Service System issued a bulletin declaring that:

> Local boards may consider for Class II-A those registrants who are pursuing a full-time course of study that will not lead to a baccalaureate degree. This will place such registrants in the same category as apprentices and other trainees.

Under the new policy, the student deferment is made applicable only to individuals enrolled in programs leading to the baccalaureate degree. Generally speaking, under this policy, only liberal arts candidates at community colleges are eligible for student draft deferment. Other students may be considered for class II–A, which is an occupational deferment.

But, because of more recent changes in the regulations which control occupational deferments, the class II–A category has now emerged as a local option with no link to coherent national standards. On February 16, General Hershey recommended, upon the advice of the National Security Council, that only graduate students in the health professions be automatically classified II–A on a national policy basis. As a result, local draft boards have almost total discretion in determining who, in addition to the medical students, may be eligible for occupational deferment. The judgment of the local draft board is supposed to be based on a showing of "essential community need."

In the process of revising the regulations, the long-established lists of essential activities and critical occupations have been abolished. Except for persons in the fields of medicine, local draft boards are no longer guided by a uniform set of recommendations on granting occupational deferments.

The effect of the two announcements is to place the nondegree student in double jeopardy. In contrast to the liberal arts candidate, who receives the standard II–S student deferment, the vocational student may or may not be classified II–A—and even in the latter case, his status is at best tenuous.

Even prior to the elimination of the occupational lists, local boards were applying General Hershey's August 9 regulation differently from State to State and from city to city. Such variations underscore the uncertainties and potential hazards for students classified as II–A, as distinguished from II–S.

Mr. President, it is by no means certain that a liberal arts student who enrolls at a 2-year community college will go on to earn a bachelor's degree. Yet, under present regulations, his student deferment depends on such an assumption.

Mr. President, it should be understood that, prior to the August ruling, nondegree students were normally granted the regular student deferment by the Nation's 4,000 draft boards.

The Director of the Selective Service System has chosen to base his discriminatory August regulation on an interpretation of the 1967 Military Draft Act. In attempting to justify the order, General Hershey wrote me as follows:

> With respect to the interpretation of PL 90–40, . . . the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 and its legislative history clearly discloses that in writing section 6(h)(1), the Congress intended only degree candidates to be deferred under that section.

Mr. President, a review of the legislative history on this point does not support such a conclusion.

Indeed, the record reveals no clear intent of the Congress to exclude nondegree students from receiving the student deferment. There was no specific reference to the draft status of students attending community and junior colleges, either in the committee reports or in the floor debate.

The House report came closest to clarifying the draft position of 2-year students, by specifying that the undergraduate student deferment should continue to apply until an individual achieves his "first professional degree." Because an associate professional degree is attainable after 2 years of college, the relevant sections of the House report actually support an interpretation of student deferment policy embracing the 2-year student, rather than excluding him as General Hershey has directed.

The Senate report is silent on this issue. In contrast to the Senate, the House appeared to be insistent upon setting forth a firm, statutory policy on undergraduate student deferments. However, certain implications can be drawn from the Senate report, particularly as the report relates student deferments to deferments for apprentices. The Senate Armed Services Committee went so far as to declare that:

> If student deferments are to be continued, the Committee believes that apprentices should be permitted to qualify for deferment under conditions no more restrictive than those applicable to undergraduate college deferments.

Obviously, the committee considered apprentices as important to the national interest as college students. That being the case, there is no reason to believe the committee considered nondegree, vocational students any less essential. It is significant that the Senate report did not distinguish between the bachelor's degree candidate and the nondegree 2-year student—preferring, like the House, to settle for the all-embracing term, undergraduate college student.

The language of the statute itself does not justify the distinction which General Hershey has drawn in his directive. The relevant provision reads as follows:

> The President shall, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning . . . A deferment granted to any person under authority of the preceding sentence shall continue until such person completes the requirements for his baccalaureate degree, fails to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction, or attains the twenty-fourth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs.

Under his interpretation, General Hershey seems to be saying that community and junior colleges are not "colleges" or "similar institutions of learning." Yet, such an interpretation is hardly logical, and makes no sense. If community and junior colleges are not "colleges," under the terms of the act, then certainly they must fall within the category of "similar institutions of learning." Otherwise, the latter phrase is a meaningless, verbal indulgence.

Furthermore, the second sentence—the so-called throwback provision—does not exclude the non-degree student from entitlement to a student deferment. And, yet, that is the inference which the Selective Service System insists upon weaning from the provision.

Mr. President, I have dwelt upon the legislative history because it clearly refutes the argument of the Selective Service System that Congress intended the discriminatory application of the draft law decreed by General Hershey. Instead, I am convinced that his new policy is based upon a faulty interpretation of the law and the legislative history.

Mr. President, the rapid development of the 2-year institution is due in no small measure to funds made available by the Federal Government under the Vocational Education Act. In 1967 alone, 75 new community colleges were opened. Since 1965, they have been started at a rate of more than one a week.

The phenomenal growth of the 2-year college has helped to meet the educational needs of many thousands of young people who do not wish, or who are unable, to embark upon a 4-year BA degree program. To treat such individuals as nonstudents under our draft laws is degrading and inequitable.

Moreover, the new draft ruling contradicts the whole thrust of Federal and State policy in this field during the past several years. It is a step backward in our endeavor to upgrade and expand the role of vocational education.

One might even say that, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, the right hand does not seem to know what the left hand is doing. The administration is expending funds to expand 2-year colleges—and at the same time it proclaims a policy which discriminates against students who enroll in their courses.

In his recent message on education, President Johnson said:

> A high school diploma should not be a ticket to frustration.
>
> We must do more to improve vocational education programs. We must help high schools, vocational schools, technical institutes and community colleges to modernize their programs, to experiment with new approaches to job training.

I endorse the President's emphasis on education at the community college level. But, unfortunately, the Selective Service System takes a different view.

The manpower crisis in America today is a harrowing paradox: jobs go unfilled everywhere, but there are 3 million Americans unemployed. For the first time in history it is possible to speak of a manpower shortage in the midst of an overabundant labor pool.

One answer to the problem is to expand the opportunity for post-high-school training. I believe that young people who are being educated to acquire a needed skill are just as important to the Nation as many who are pursuing a liberal arts degree. Their claim to student status is as sound and valid from the standpoint of the national interest as is the claim of the liberal arts candidate.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a recent article by Dr. James B. Conant which appeared in the Saturday Review of January 13, 1968. Dr. Conant, describing what he termed "The End of Orthodoxy," wrote:

> Today, unlike twenty years ago, the words "college student" do not necessarily mean a youth enrolled in a four year institution. . . .
>
> I raise here an old question: why four years? why not two?
>
> I suggest that all who are responsible for employment policy consider . . . de-emphasizing the B.A.

Mr. President, the legislation I have introduced today recognizes an already established fact: the great variety of postsecondary education in America today has blurred the traditional significance of the baccalaureate program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Conant to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with copies of several letters, and the text of the bill which has been introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, article, and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3019) to amend section 6(h) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to clarify the deferment status of persons pursuing full-time courses of training at junior or community colleges, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3019

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6(h)(1) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (50 App. U.S.C. 456(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out in the second sentence "baccalaureate degree," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "baccalaureate degree (or, in the case of a person not a candidate for a baccalaureate degree who is enrolled in a program which is normally completed in less than four years, until such person completes the requirements of such program),";

(2) by striking out in the last sentence "As used in this subsection," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "As used in this subsection (1) the term 'similar institution' includes junior and community colleges, and (2)"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The President shall determine whether or not persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a professional, scientific, or technical institution which furnishes education or training at or above the secondary school level should be granted deferments from training and service in the Armed Forces; and he is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment under this paragraph of any category or categories of such persons he determines should be granted deferments."

The article and letters, presented by Mr. GRIFFIN, are as follows:

THE END OF ORTHODOXY

(By James B. Conant)

Dr. Vanderslice has pointed out a number of important ways in which industry can help educational institutions, and vice versa. I am sure all university presidents, either active or in emeritus status as I am, must have cheered his opening remarks about money. Certainly the private colleges desperately need increased financial support from companies. Certainly those concerned with publicly supported schools, colleges, and universities must welcome Dr. Vanderslice's statement that industry should support a broadening of the tax base for education in the United States.

In commenting on his reference to higher taxes, I cannot resist the temptation to insert a word in favor of a bit of heresy. A year ago, in a second report of interested citizens on the "Comprehensive High School," I presented data which show the startling lack of equality of educational opportunity between one school district and another. Few people realize the almost accidental way our public schools are financed. Adjacent districts may differ in their taxable resources by several fold. As long as local real estate taxes carry a large share of the cost, such differences are reflected in the expenditures per pupil.

I have slowly arrived at the conclusion that a radical rethinking of the financing of our public elementary and secondary schools is overdue, and that in each state the entire financial responsibility should be that of the state and not the local school district. My conclusion would be the same in regard to the rapidly expanding two-year community or junior college.

On his second point—the way in which industry can advise state and local school systems about the kind of graduates it can use—I will skip over the vexing but all important question of jobs for the disadvantaged in our large cities and address myself to industry's relation to college students. Today, unlike twenty years ago, the words "college student" do not necessarily mean a youth enrolled in a four-year institution. In many states, the expansion of the local two-year college has been phenomenal. By 1974, nearly a third of all college freshmen will be enrolled in two-year institutions.

Before World War I, many a member of the academic community—professor or administrator—felt impelled to do his or her part to impress on employers the importance of a college education. As a consequence, we find a half century later that the phrases "well educated" and "the holder of a bachelor's degree" are treated as synonymous. Four years' exposure to full-time formal education has come to be accepted by the business community as a prerequisite for many types of employment. I raise here an old question: Why four years; why not two?

I challenge the validity of the widely accepted premise about post-high school education for two reasons. First, because the pattern of public higher education is in process of rapid and drastic change. And secondly, because some, at least, among the present college generation are thoroughly dissatisfied with their lot.

Not long ago I attended, as a guest—a Rip Van Winkle from the distant past—a series of panel discussions on "Goals for American Higher Education." Two of the speakers represented college student organizations. If their evidence has any validity, they and their contemporaries were far from certain as to why they had entered college. One said that all his contemporaries agreed that the education they were pursuing was "without purpose." Could not such a situation have arisen at least in part because the length of a span of years has come to be the measure of a liberal education? Does not our present pattern, which involves a high-prestige value for the bachelor's degree, postpone too long entry into a significant career for many youths? I suggest that all who are responsible for employment policy consider emphasizing the two-year associate of arts degree and deemphasizing the B.A.

I call attention to the role of industry in influencing young people in the community college who have to decide what they should do on completion of the two-year course. The role of guidance and counseling is now shifting from the high school to the community college. The leaders of business can help the two-year colleges by sympathetic understanding and friendly counsel. This is not a new job, but one whose importance gains with every year.

FLINT COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Flint, Mich., January 2, 1968.
Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: I am sure that you are aware of General Hershey's ruling covering occupational and non-transfer students at community colleges. He has indicated that these students should not be classified II–S. This is a discriminatory action for it means that so-called transfer students at a community college can be classified as II–S and occupational students at the same college taking the same courses cannot be classified II–S. Any support that you can give us in having this ruling changed would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
CHARLES DONNELLY,
President.

MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Monroe, Mich., December 22, 1967.
Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: I am writing to enlist your support in changing a discriminatory practice in the draft classification of college students.

Junior-Community college students enrolled in career programs are presently being classified as II–A rather than the customary II–S. This practice does not seem to be based on the sound judgment when we consider the critical need for trained technicians.

It is my firm conviction that students enrolled in career programs should receive the same consideration presently being given to students enrolled on a four-year program.

Sincerely,
JACK R. MCDONALD,
Area Chairman Science-Math.

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Bloomfield Hills, Mich., December 12, 1967.
Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: The recent administrative ruling by General Hershey blatantly discriminates against the thousands of young students—most of whom are from low- and middle-income families, disadvantaged urban and rural areas, and members of minority groups—who are enrolled in occupational programs which terminate at the end of one or two years and do not necessarily lead to a baccalaureate degree.

The Administration and the Congress have both indicated their awareness of the importance of the training of skilled occupational personnel as evidenced by the passing of the Allied Health Professions Act of 1966, for example.

I urge you to look carefully into the implications of General Hershey's ruling and do all you can to remedy this injustice by permitting appropriate 2–S classifications for students enrolled in occupational programs which do not lead to a baccalaureate degree.

I will be happy to provide you with any additional data in this regard you feel might be helpful.

Very truly yours,
JOHN E. TIRRELL,
President.

LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Lansing, Mich., January 10, 1968.
Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: Enclosed is a letter to President Johnson concerning the recent administrative ruling that does not permit students at Lansing Community College to be classified as "College Students" with II–S Selective Service classification.

It is President Gannon's and my desire that you have a copy of this letter in your files. As indicated in the letter to President Johnson, we would also appreciate any efforts on your part to bring about clarification of Lt. Gen. Hershey's ruling or to have it completely voided.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
KENNETH H. SPROULL,
Dean, Student Personnel Services.
PHILIP J. GANNON,
President.

MONTCALM COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Sidney, Mich., December 11, 1967.
Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: You perhaps have already become acquainted with the problems for community college students which have grown out of the Selective Service Extension Act passed by Congress earlier this year.

As you know, the difficulties seem to arise out of General Hershey's interpretation of the wording of the act rather than out of any intent expressed by Congress in the law. The approximate wording reads, in effect, "until he has completed the Bachelor's Degree". It is General Hershey's feeling that this means that only students pursuing a baccalaureate degree are eligible to be given a II–S deferment on the basis of college attendance. Accordingly, draft boards from all over the United States are considerably confused as to the deferment rights of students enrolled in various technical/vocational programs of study in community colleges. Some are granting II–A occupational deferments while others are automatically throwing these students into the draft-eligible pool and are drawing upon them without further consideration of deferment.

We have conducted a continuous dialogue with the Montcalm County Selective Service Board and fully believe that the conscientious members of that body are considering each youngster individually. However, it is my guess that they feel a certain lack of direction in granting deferments to our occupational students. For one specific example, a young man was recently drafted while enrolled as a second year student in Automotive Mechanics. Others failed to enroll last fall because they were notified that the Automotive Mechanics program did not entitle them to draft deferment and they would be subject to call in any particular month regardless of the fact that they were attending Montcalm Community College.

Throughout the entire situation, the officials of Montcalm Community College have not overlooked the obligation of each young man to assist in the defense of his country. However, if deferments are being granted to college students, it is our feeling that all young men enrolled at our institution should be treated on an equal footing.

Last week the American Association of Junior Colleges released a policy statement on selective service. I have enclosed that statement against the possibility that you have not yet received one. It describes the situation much better than I have done in this letter.

We appreciate your interest in this problem and would be grateful for any effort on your part to help clarify the intent of Congress to the Selective Service officials.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD D. FINK,
President.

S. 3020—INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISTRESSED ALIENS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I join my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE, in introducing a bill for the relief of the distressed families of Sicily—homeless and in dire straits as a result of the earthquake that destroyed their communities and evoked the sympathies of the entire world.

From the first news of the disaster we have been in close touch with the situation—in contact with the governments of Italy and with our own Government—and with the public relief efforts to mitigate the suffering.

Notwithstanding the relief assistance that has been given and may be afforded them, they are still without homes. Because of the conditions existing there, they have no place to go.

We believe America can find a place for some of them. We have arrived at our decision not in haste but in reasoned consultation with all parties concerned.

Ten years ago—before my own service in the Senate—Senator PASTORE reacted to a similar situation—the earthquakes in the Azores in 1958.

Senator PASTORE sponsored a bill which culminated in Public Law 85–892, the act of September 2, 1958, for the purpose of permitting the admission to the United States of the Portguese nationals distressed by that calamity in the Azores.

The present bill which we are introducing is patterned on that excellent public law.

It would provide for the issuance of 3,000 special immigrant visas to persons in Sicily who are out of their usual place of abode because of natural calamity, are unable to return thereto, and are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life.

Such visas may also be issued to their spouses and children accompanying them, without regard to the numerical limitation.

No visa would be issued under this bill if a regular visa number was available. The aliens encompassed by this bill would be exempted from the payment of visa fees.

The bill provides for a termination date 2 years from now; that is, January 31, 1970.

Mr. President, it is the sincere hope of Senator PASTORE and myself that this bill will be promptly enacted.

Time is of the essence—and it is the propitious hour for our United States again to demonstrate its true humanity—its helping hand to those who are in need of refuge, relief, and the very essentials of life.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3020) for the relief of certain distressed aliens, introduced by Mr. PELL (for Mr. PASTORE and himself), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 146—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION GRANTING CERTAIN POWERS TO THE KANSAS CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would grant the consent of Congress to certain amendments to the Missouri-Kansas bi-state compact.

This compact was agreed to by the two States with the consent of Congress for the purpose of establishing the Kansas City Area Transportation District and Kansas City Area Transportation Authority. The authority was established to provide public transit within the district.

Because questions have arisen as to certain powers of the authority, the two States have adopted needed amendments and congressional consent has been requested.

Representative BOLLING is introducing for himself and other affected Representatives an identical resolution. Our resolution would remove any legal questions as to the right and power of the authority to recognize unions representing its employees, to deal with representatives of employees, to enter into labor contracts, and to provide for pensions and other employee benefits.

It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly on this resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 146) granting the consent of Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority by the States of Kansas and Missouri, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ENTITLED "FEDERAL ARCTIC RESEARCH"

Mr. BARTLETT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 259); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 259

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Federal Arctic Research", prepared according to the instructions of Senator E. L. Bartlett, chairman, Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, by George A. Doumani, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

COMPENSATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 260) providing for compensation for investigating subcommittee employees, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS—UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Mr. CHURCH. As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will hold public hearings on March 27 and 28 on Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, which relates to the establishment of a United Nations Peacekeeping Force.

The concurrent resolution was introduced by Senator CLARK on October 10, 1967, and to date has 20 cosponsors, including myself.

Persons interested in testifying on the resolution are requested to get in touch with the chief clerk of the committee, Mr. Arthur Kuhl, as soon as possible.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING: NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been authorized to conduct hearings on March 5 and 6 in room 6222, New Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 117.

That resolution, introduced on October 18, 1967, proposes that a White House Conference on Aging be called in 1970, approximately one decade after the historic conference of January 1961. The resolution also provides funds to encourage States to call individual conferences in preparation for the national conference.

If the Congress acts early this year on Senate Joint Resolution 117, it would be following approximately the same time pattern that led to the conference in 1961. The late Representative John F. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, introduced legislation for that conference on January 8, 1958, because he anticipated that careful preparations would be necessary for a successful national conference.

The March 5 and 6 hearings will be open. Statements from knowledgeable individuals will be welcome for our hearing record. I will also note that the hearing will take place as the National Council on the Aging conducts a regional conference in Washington, D.C. I am sure that at least several of the participants in that conference will also be able to address the subcommittee, and I will look forward to their testimony.

MONTANAN DRAWS PRAISE AT OLYMPICS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague who is now presiding over the Senate, and myself, I wish to say that, while the United States did not do as well at the Olympics as we may have wished, we did offer several of the highlights of these winter games. We did especially well in the area of skating, and I am especially pleased that a young Montanan was a member of the Olympic figure-skating team from the United States. Young John Misha Petkevich, of Great Falls, Mont., has done extremely well, since he is relatively new to the international aspect of this competitive sport. He performed extraordinarily well in Grenoble, France, where he had an enthusiastic reception. Although there were several mishaps, he did end up in sixth place in the figure skating. Montana is proud of John Misha Petkevich.

We are also proud of the other Montanans who participated in the Olympics, all members of the U.S. luge team. These included 21-year-old Jim Murray, a resident of Avon, a graduate of the Deer Lodge High School, and a student at the University of Montana; 20-year-old Sheila Johansen, of Billings, a graduate of Terry High School, and a University of Montana student; and 16-year-old Kathleen Roberts, of Miles City. Miss Roberts, incidentally, is one of the youngest members of the U.S. delegation.

Mr. President, the Great Falls Tribune carried a series of articles on John Misha Petkevich which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a feature which appeared in the January 29, 1968, edition of Sports Illustrated.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 9, 1968]

PETKEVICH IS NOT ALONE

(By Mayo Ashley)

In all the recent excitement about Great Falls' entry in the Winter Olympics, John Misha Petkevich, we tend to overlook three other Treasure Staters on the Olympic team. Granted their method of getting to Grenoble was not as spectacular as Petkevich's and their sport is not as well known, but their accomplishment is just as praiseworthy.

The trio are all members of the U.S. luge team that has yet to begin competition. Luge team members include 21-year-old Jim Murray, a resident of Avon, graduate of Deer Lodge High School and student at the University of Montana; 20-year-old Sheila Johansen of Billings, a graduate of Terry High School and also a U of M student; and 16-year-old Kathleen Roberts, Miles City. Miss Roberts, incidentally, is one of the youngest members of the U.S. delegation.

The luge team is managed by Dave Rivens of Miles City, Capt. Bruce Medley of the ROTC unit at UM is head coach. Truly the luge is an event Montana should be watching with interest.

Luge racing is done down a chute, similar to that used by bobsleds on a sled much like the ones your children use to slide down hill. However, luge is not a children's sport—far from it. It is one of the most dangerous and taxing events on the Olympic program. The U.S. team is not expected to win any medals this year but the Montanans will gain experience that should stand them in good stead in 1972.

While on the subject of the 1968 Winter Olympics it would seem an appropriate time to mention one Montanan who isn't there—Terry Casey. Casey, killed last summer in an auto wreck, would have been on the U.S. hockey team at Grenoble. U.S. coach Murray Williamson said some time ago, right after the team for Grenoble was first firmed up, that Casey was a steadying influence on the club. He claimed the Americans settled down and played better hockey when the colorful Great Falls rinksman was in action. Had Casey lived to participate in the Olympics he probably wouldn't have improved the team a great deal but perhaps he could have kept them from taking the lumps they have been taking so far. The performance of the 1968 team is far below that of the 1960 gold medal crew and Casey might have made it better.

While on the subject of Casey, we learned this week, from Lee Bohnet, sports information director at University of North Dakota, that Casey's old jersey (No. 12) has been retired. Such an honor is only right for an All American of Casey's caliber. The university is also starting a memorial fund in Casey's honor. The money will be placed in a trust fund for the education of Casey's daughter, Terry Lee, who was born Oct. 15. UND coach Bill Selman, in praising his longtime star said his biggest ambition was to play in the Olympic Games. Williamson, at ceremonies retiring Casey's jersey, remarked "In my estimation he was the best American center in amateur hockey."

Selman called Casey "the most popular hockey player I've ever been associated with and certainly the first Montanan ever to make it in big time hockey."

Casey, survived by his wife Nancy and his daughter, scored 57 goals and had 61 assists in three years with the Sioux. Testimony to his sportsmanship is the fact that he was assessed only seven minor penalties, amounting to 14 minutes, in 88 college games.

Bohnet and Sioux athletic director L. R. Marti are still collecting money for the memorial fund at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Casey's sister, Kathy, a fine skater in her own right is currently acting as a pro for the Lakewood Figure Skating Club in Tacoma. She had several fine performers in the recent Northwest Pacific Championships at the Civic Center.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 21, 1968]

J. M. PETKEVICH WINS OLYMPIC SKATING BERTH

PHILADELPHIA.—John Misha Petkevich, a philosophy student at the College of Great Falls in Montana, wowed a crowd of some 7,000 with a spectacular free-skating performance Saturday to carry him from fourth place to third over Scott Allen, the 17-year-old Harvard University freshman who won this title in 1964 and 1966 and was runnerup in the alternate years.

Petkevich, a 5-foot-8 150-pounder who may seek the priesthood, received a standing ovation.

Third place automatically qualified Petkevich a berth on the 1968 U.S. Olympic team. The winter Olympics begin Feb. 6 in Grenoble, France.

The men's singles title of the U.S. Figure Skating Championships at the Spectrum, a new arena, went to Tim Wood, a John Carroll University pre-law student.

Runnerup went to Gary Visconti, a teammate of Wood from the Detroit Figure Skating Club.

Wood, a 5-foot-10 political science major, who lives in Bloomfield Hills, north of Detroit, said Thursday after he took the lead in the compulsory school figures, that he came here, "feeling I was better than Visconti and Scott Allen," the No. 1 and No. 2 ranked U.S. men's singles skaters.

The slim-built Midwesterner, who proved a man of his word, wasn't the best free skater on the ice Saturday. That was Petkevich.

Wood's over-all performance including the school figures carried him to the title over defending champion Visconti.

Wood credited his stunning upset of the two top-ranking American figure skaters to his coach, Ron Baker.

"Ron is responsible for getting me to where I am," the winner said.

Baker said his protege was 50 per cent better than last year when Wood finished third to Visconti and Allen at the Nationals in Omaha, Neb. The coach credited it to maturity, hard-training and experience.

Along with Visconti and Petkovich, Wood also automatically made Uncle Sam's World Team for the championships starting Feb. 27 in Switzerland.

In over-all points, Wood tallied 132.48 to 130.29 for Visconti, who was given an assignment to skate in the Nationals by the Navy in which he has 21 months to serve. Visconti is stationed at the Grosse Ile Point (Mich.) Naval Air Station.

Wood, Visconti and Petkevich thus joined the three pairs teams which made the Olympics and World teams Friday night: Ron and Cynthia Kauffman, the pairs champions from Seattle, Wash., and the second and third place finishers, Sandi Sweitzer and Roy Wagelain of California and Jo Jo Starbuck and Kenneth Shelley of Arctic Blades Skating Club, Paramount, Calif.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 21, 1968]

"IT WAS JUST WONDERFUL," MOTHER SAYS

PHILADELPHIA.—"It was just wonderful," Mrs. Frank Petkevich, mother of Great Falls figure skater John Misha Petkevich described the winning performance of her son Saturday in the free-style division of the United States Figure Skating championships.

The victory, which lifted John Misha into third place in the over-all standings after a fourth-place finish in the compulsory figures, gave him a certain berth on the U.S. Olympic team for the 1968 games in Grenoble next month.

In skating composition and style, he scored a perfect 6.0 mark on the card of one of the five judges. He also had three 5.9s and one 5.7.

In technical merit, the scores were two 5.9s and three 5.8s.

A perfect score would have been 60 points. John's total score was 58.6.

Telegrams to Petkevich poured into the "City of Brotherly Love" from throughout Montana, congratulating him on record breaking performance which drew a standing ovation from 7,000 persons in Philadelphia's new Spectrum arena and was carried on nationwide television.

However, Mrs. Petkevich said she hadn't even had a chance to congratulate John, who was immediately taken to a news conference and from there proceeded to prepare for a special guest performance Saturday night, a feat usually reserved for over-all division winners.

Mrs. Petkevich, who called back to Great Falls from the Spectrum after a telephone blackout had occurred in their motel located 10 miles from the stadium, said John had been worried Friday night about his performance Saturday upon which his Olympic hopes rode.

She said his spirits rose Saturday morning and told her "I'll certainly go out and do my best" just prior to departing for his winning effort.

Petkevich was to attend a skaters' meeting after Saturday night's finals at which the U.S. Olympic team was to be officially named.

The team is to travel to New York Monday for uniform measurements and continue from there to Grenoble for practice for the Olympics which open Feb. 2 in the French city.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 28, 1968]

JOHN MISHA WOWS 'EM IN PHILADELPHIA TOO—NATIONAL ACCLAIM FOR PETKEVICH LOUD, LONG

"It's like catching and passing Jim Ryun in the homestretch. He had to stage an impossible performance. And he did."

Those were the words Bob Ottum, Sports Illustrated writer, used to describe John Misha Petkevich's freestyle performance in last week's U.S. Figure Skating Championships in Philadelphia.

The quote was typical of national praise for the Great Falls skating wonder who won an Olympic berth with a spectacular come-from-behind performance at the Spectrum on his first place finish in freestyle.

"Petkevich Wows 'em In Great Falls—and Spectrum" screamed an eight-column banner head in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin following conclusion of the championships Saturday night.

SOME ARE YUM-YUMS

A lady close to the skating scene noted, "The skaters work as hard as concert pianists, and they're tougher than they look. They have a lot of ego. Some are yo-yo's and some are yum-yum's. That Petkevich—ah, he's a yum-yum. If he asked you to dance, a gal would turn over two tables getting on the floor."

"Ice skaters aren't exactly Tony Galento types," said Bulletin sports writer Sandy Grady. "They are slim-hipped, smiling and polite as ushers at a Main Line wedding. They must have Arnold Palmer's nerves, Bart Starr's dedication, and Oscar Robertson's cool grace."

On the other hand, former world champion and this year's runnerup Gary Visconti defended his flamboyant style to Ottum, "What the h— else can I do? Anyone who says we're not athletes ought to try it one time. It takes strength and coordination." The 120-pound Visconti, who says he is trying to be a male version of Peggy Fleming. says, "It's tough."

PETKEVICH STOLE SHOW

Though Tim Wood and Visconti, both from the Detroit Skating Club, walked off with top over-all honors, it was Petkevich who stole the show in front of the record 54,678 people who watched the four days of competition.

"Few skaters jump as high as this boy," said Jim Grogan, the Ardmore expert who teaches at Squaw Valley. "He's capable of a triple Lutz and a triple Salschow (three aerial spins). He has conditioning to finish strong—something the judges like." Grady compared him to the Damascus—the great racing horse known for his come-from-behind finishes.

"And the crowd was knowing," Grady described the free-style performances. Visconti, small and serious in a green suit and red bow tie, was applauded politely by the experts in the pressbox: "nice double Lutz . . . three wally mumps very nice . . . good flying axel . . . a bit jerky though." They applauded Pat Lalor, whose father laid down the Spectrum ice. Pat didn't have much luck—he is coming back from a hurt leg. He fell once, and had a dangling boot lace, but skated with style. Tim Wood, angular and agile in a blue turtleneck, obviously had the class—a clean, economical poise, like Musial at bat. But it was Petkevich who brought the crowd up to a standing ovation with his beer-barrel-polka power."

HANG UP THE STICKS

"Like high jumpers," Grady continued, "skaters rarely watch each other's acts. But when Petkevich lifted the mob off its feet, the other 10 guys were like pool shooters who'd run into a hot hustler. They could hang up the sticks."

"The crowd applauded as if he'd run the 3.58 mile," said Grady. "His cheeks were flushed, more from the kissing and handshaking than the triple Salchows." Petkevich autographed programs for 30 minutes.

"I was nervous all day, until the music began," said Petkevich. "Then in the middle, I thought, 'thank God, I'm doing all right.' The crowd makes you feel—go, go, go."

Petkevich, who entered the meet relatively unknown despite a fourth place finish in the 1967 Nationals and a winning performance in freestyle in the Grenoble Games, had been dubbed an also-ran by national observers.

READY FOR BIG TIME

"He did some obligatory work on the compulsory stuff and rebuilt his free-skating routine around 'Espana Cani'—bullfight music filled with rhythmic, staccato guitars and castanets," noted Ottum, "combined with secret jumps, it made him ready for the big time."

Petkevich, however, held some reservations on his performance, admitting a leg injury had kept him from executing his triple jump, but "that goes back in for Grenoble."

For a place known better for its battles between Custer and the Indians, an 18-year-old Montana boy whose name is so long its frequently misspelled, John Misha Petkevich is putting frosting on the cake for his family, state and nation.

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Feb. 6, 1968]

TRIPLE FLIP? PETKEVICH'L SEE HOW FAR BEHIND HE IS

GRENOBLE, FRANCE.—Should he or shouldn't he. That's the question which John Misha Petkevich will have to answer by Feb. 16 when the Olympic men's free figure skating will be held at the ice stadium here.

The question, of course, is whether he should try his triple flip, which has never before been done in figure-skating competition, according to Petkevich's coach, Arthur Bourke.

John Misha, however, successfully has executed it several times in practice, and only a strained tendon in his right leg prevented him from including it in his spectacular exhibition of free skating during the National Championships at Philadelphia last month.

It was in Philadelphia that he came from behind following the required-figures portion of the program to overtake Scott Allen and move into third place and a berth on the U.S. Olympic team.

"I would like to try the triple flip here," Petkevich said Monday. "But I'm not sure yet whether I will, because if I should strain my leg doing it, my other jumps might be affected, too."

CAN'T TAKE A CHANCE

"On the triple flip," Bourke said, "John pulls with his right leg. But on most of his other jumps he lands on his right leg. So he can't afford to weaken it or take a chance on straining it further."

The 18-year-old native of Great Falls, Mont., is possibly the most exciting free skater here, but his past weakness in required figures, which are held first and count 60 per cent of the scoring, usually meant he was far behind the leader before the free figures were conducted.

WORKING HARD ON FIGURES

Petkevich has worked hard on his required figures since arriving 10 days ago, and he said hopefully Monday, "One of the Olympic judges, who saw me skate in the Nationals, came by today and said my figures look much improved."

The wiry, blond youngster flashed a shy smile and added, "Since I'm competing against a double world champion (Austrian Emmerich Danzer), I really hope I can do my triple flip.

"But also, I'm actually competing more against myself, and I want to make each routine better than the one before."

Petkevich indicated he probably won't decide until after the required figures are run off on Feb. 13–14.

Then he'll see how far behind he is and take it from there.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 9, 1968]

WORLD'S GREATEST FREESTYLER—PETKEVICH'S FIGURES WILL DETERMINE PLACING

(By Bob Lochner)

GRENOBLE, FRANCE.—Dick Button, two-time Olympic figure-skating champion and a TV commentator for the 1968 Games, calls John Misha Petkevich "the greatest free-skater here," but that doesn't mean the Great Falls native is a cinch for the gold medal.

There's a little matter of compulsory figures.

They're both dull to watch and dull to practice, but they count as 60 per cent of the total scoring, and it's pretty tough to beat those odds even though you are the world's best in free-skating, which makes up the other 40 per cent.

"I've been working very hard on my compulsory figures since arriving in Grenoble," Petkevich said Thursday. "And what really encouraged me was a couple of days before the Games opened, this Olympic judge who saw me skate in the Nationals at Philadelphia came by and said they look much improved since then."

ICE A FACTOR

He flashed a quick, half-shy grin and added, "A number of skaters have said the ice in the Stade de Glace (Ice Stadium) is too white, and this might hurt some of the ones who are very good at compulsory figures, because the tracings don't show up very well."

The good ones might not look much different from the bad ones, in other words.

However, John Misha made it clear he intends to cut the best possible compulsory figures regardless of the condition or color of the ice.

WILL HE JUMP?

What he's not so sure of is whether he will attempt his incredible "triple-flip" as part of his free-skating performance on Friday night, February 16. This little maneuver is just what the name implies—not one, not two, but three flips in quick succession. According to his coach, Arthur Bourke, double-flips are relatively common, but a triple-flip has never been done in competition.

Triple-flip or not, Petkevich still has a barrel of spectacular tricks to throw at the 15.000 people and the judges who will grade him on the climatic night. One of them is called the "Bourkey," after his coach, and it was described in a recent issue of Sports Illustrated as "a jump in which he kicks sideways, whirls, arches and generally hangs around up in the air long enough to wash out a pair of sweat-socks."

Asked about it, the slender, blond-haired Petkevich laughed and said, "That's about it. Boy, I just saw that story. Wasn't that something?"

The story played Petkevich, who came from behind to make the Olympic team because of his great free-skating performance, ahead of the 1-2 finishers at Philadelphia, Tim Wood and Gary Visconti, both of whom are obviously better at compulsory figures. These will be skated Tuesday and Wednesday, February 13–14.

If John Misha should happen to crack the first three—or perhaps even the first five—those two days, watch out, world!

He takes two breaks in a rigorous training routine that finds him on the ice for five or six hours a day, seven days a week. These are from mid-May to mid-June, and mid-August to mid-September.

ADMITS ROMANCE

"That's when I date," John Misha said. Asked if there was any one girl he liked back home, he blushed slightly and said, "Yes, but don't mention her name. I don't want her to know it."

It's about 5,000 miles from Gibson Lake and the Civic Center Ice Arena to the Stade de Glace, but John Misha Petkevich made it—and without any triple-flips en route.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

JOHN PETKEVICH BEGINS QUEST TODAY FOR OLYMPIC GOLD MEDAL

(By Ralph Thornton)

GRENOBLE, FRANCE.—The mistral blew chill, cutting through the thin practice jersey of John Misha Petkevich as he skated on the outdoor rink at the Olympic Ice Center.

A mistral is a cold, dry, violent wind that whistles out of the north through the valleys in southeastern France and pierces to the bone at 40 degrees.

John Petkevich, on the other hand, is an exciting young American skater who blew in from Great Falls, Mont., like a breath of fresh air onto the figure skating scene.

He will begin his quest for an Olympic medal today when the first three of six compulsory figures are skated. The final three compulsory figures are scheduled for Wednesday.

"Being from Great Falls is my greatest asset," he said after his practice session. "It's not a well-known skating center, but the people are wonderful." Before his appearance in the U.S. Nationals last month in Philadelphia, he received telegrams from 310 residents of his home town wishing him luck.

PRESSURE TO MOVE

"National skating bigwigs put a lot of pressure on us to move," said John's coach, Art Bourke, a former Canadian who teaches the 300-member Great Falls Figure Skating Club. "They said he wouldn't get anywhere being from Great Falls."

"And," John said, "they implied I wouldn't learn my figures properly from Mr. Bourke. But we showed them."

"Mish," as his friends know him, is the son of a Great Falls radiologist, Dr. Frank Petkevich.

John, 18, is a freshman at College of Great Falls and hopes to attend Harvard in the fall, where he plans to major in philosophy.

On the ice the 5-foot, 7-inch lad looks taller than he is, perhaps because of his athletic leaps. His normal 147-pound weight has jumped to 150 here because "he cannot pass up a single pastry shop in Grenoble—and there are hundreds," his coach said.

At the Olympic Village, where the athletes live, he does not eat any of the ethnic food offered.

"The U.S. teams have been warned not to," he said. "Some of our skaters became ill after eating Oriental food. Something about the way they cook chicken, and the cheese isn't pasteurized."

The grandson of Lithuanian immigrants, John is no 90-day wonder in U.S. skating, though he has come up fast the past three years. He has been skating 11 years, his first big win being the national junior title in Berkeley, Calif., in 1966.

BOURKEY JUMP

John's free-style skating, which brought a Philadelphia audience to its feet last month, features a closing jump invented and named a "Bourkey" for his coach.

It is a reverse side stag with a full revolution coming out of it—actually two maneuvers in one, done in mid-air.

He is undecided whether to do his "triple flip" in the finals here Friday.

In that flip he takes off from a left inside edge, goes into the air for three complete revolutions and lands on a right back outside edge.

"I've done it about 50 times in practice," John said, "but lately I've noticed it pulls the ligaments of my right leg when I land and it bothers me on other figures. So I stopped."

He may use the flip only during his final Olympic performance. If he does, the audience, too, may flip. For it has never been done in international skating circles.

John practices on the ice here three or four hours a day along with Japanese and Korean skaters, so he has not studied his European rivals.

What is the secret to his special agility—at times he appears to hang in the air as if suspended on wires?

"Some people know," he confided, "but I think I'll keep it quiet for at least another four years. Then I'll tell everyone, so it will help other skaters."

SECRET WEAPON

"Right now it's my secret weapon—like a football play."

Another secret is his music.

"We tried to create something unusual," said Bourke, who made a special trip to California last year to scout for music and stumbled on an obscure recording entitled "Espana Cani" in a record shop.

"When I first heard it I thought, 'That it.'

"No one had ever used Spanish music before, and we weren't sure how the judges would like it. But the first time we tried it at Los Angeles they loved it. The place went wild.

"Many coaches pick heavy music their young skaters don't understand. The result is they don't get involved with the music. They must feel it."

Lately John has been reading the "Story of Philosophy" by Will Durant—"I'm already up to Schopenhauer"—and he enjoys the writing of Bertrand Russell. His own philosophy?

"I don't know yet. Nothing extreme, sort of middle-of-the-road approach."

Who does he think he has to beat for a medal?

"I don't know. I never watch the other competitors and couldn't if I wanted to."

He may, in fact, never see their performances except in movies long after the Olympics. But it will not affect his own performance.

"I'll go out there and do my best—that's what I'm here for," he said. "I'm just proud to represent the people of Montana and Great Falls."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 14, 1968]

DISASTER ONCE AGAIN HITS U.S. SKIERS; PETKEVICH 13TH

GRENOBLE, FRANCE.—For one fleeting moment Tuesday, a youthful band of American girls stood on top of the ski world. But disaster again overtook them and dealt the United States another heart-breaking blow in the Winter Olympics.

The U.S. girls—Judy Nagel, 16; Wendy Allen, 23; Rosie Fortna, 21, and Kiki Cutter, 18—stunned onlookers by grabbing four of the top six places in the first run of the slalom.

But France's Marielle Goitschel came along and snatched the gold medal as the Americans were shut out when three of them were disqualified for missing gates on the first run and Miss Nagel fell on the second.

Miss Goitschel, giving France its third Alpine victory in the Games, had a combined time of 85.86 seconds, .19 ahead of runnerup Nancy Greene of Canada. Another French girl, Annie Famose, got the bronze in 87.19.

Americans also got off to a poor start in the men's figure skating as expected winner Emmerich Danzer of Austria took a narrow lead over countryman Wolfgang Schwarz after two of the five compulsory figures.

Tim Wood of Bloomfield Hills, Mich., was fourth, Gary Visconti of Detroit sixth and John Petkevich of Great Falls, Mont., 13th.

Toini Gustafsson of Sweden captured her second gold medal, winning the women's five kilometer cross-country ski race ahead of two Russians. No Americans were entered.

Russia's undefeated defending champions took over undisputed possession of first place in the hockey tournament by defeating Sweden in a battle of unbeatens 3–2 as Canada edged previously unbeaten Czechoslovakia 3–2

When the times went up for the first run of the slalom—through the 56 gates—it looked like an incredible day for the U.S. Alpine team, seeking its first medal after a series of injuries.

Miss Allen of San Pedro, Calif., had a spectacular 39.25, followed by Miss Nagel's 40.19. Miss Goitschel was third at 40.27, Miss Fortna of Warren, Vt., next at 41.31, then Miss Greene at 41.45 and Miss Cutter of Bend, Ore., at 41.46.

"We just never have been able to get a break," said U.S. Coach Bob Beattie with tears in his eyes after watching Miss Nagel fall. "Everything has gone against us, but the kids have never quit fighting."

Danzer and Schwarz, who have finished 1–2 in every world and European figure skating championship since 1966, appeared on their way to duplicating that finish in these Olympics as they are expected to do.

Schwarz held a slight lead after the first figure, a "back outside three-change three," but Danzer moved ahead on the more difficult "forward outside rocker" for a two-tenths of a point edge on his countryman. Danzer had 352.5 points and Schwarz 352.3.

Patrick Pera of France was third with 342.2 followed by Wood, the U.S. champion, with 334.5. Visconti had 324.7 and Petkevich, one of the better free skaters who is weak on compulsory figures, 300.4.

Erica Lechner of Italy was the new leader in the revised women's luge competition on completion of three of the four runs, after Ortrun Enderlein and Anna Maria Mueller were disqualified after finishing 1–2. Miss Lechner's combined time was 2:28.66.

Officials said an unidentified judge and three witnesses reported seeing the East German girls, along with teammate Angela Knoesel who held fourth place, warming their sled runners at the starting ramp for the third run. This is illegal.

Christa Schmuck and Angelika Duenhaupt, both of West Germany, took second and third. Kathy Roberts, 16 of Miles City, Mont., was 14th in 2:33.60, Ellen Williams of Old Tappan, N.J., 16th, and Sheila Johansen of Billings, Mont., 17th, in the field of 21.

Manfred Schmid of Austria led the men's luge singles after three heats with Kim Layton of Tahoe City, Calif., six seconds behind in 26th place with a combined time of 2:58.64. Jim Murray of Avon, Mont., was 28th, Mike Hessel of Eugene, Ore., 30th, and Robin Partch of St. Cloud, Minn., 46th, among the 47 racers.

The luge jury was to meet early Wednesday morning to determine if the weather-plagued event can be completed on the 1,000-meter ice course, softened by high temperatures.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 15, 1968]

PETKEVICH DRAWS ONLY HIGH PRAISE

(By Ralph Thornton)

GRENOBLE, FRANCE.—The international crowd which turns out daily to watch the Olympic figure skating trials has nothing but praise for the slender lad from Great Falls. And John Misha Petkevich isn't out of medal position yet, though the compulsory figures became more difficult as the week wore on.

"Here is where age and experience begin to tell," said Carl Gram, New York, chairman of the U.S. Figure Skating Committee.

Going into Wednesday's difficult figures Petkevich was ranked 13th. He finished the compulsory figures in 8th place.

"We're glad he's on the team." Gram said "He's a quiet boy, but everyone on the team likes him."

"We've been rained out of several practices," he continued, "but John works like the devil to make it up. He's always the last one to leave the ice."

Petkevich, whose father, Dr. Frank Petkevich, arrived Monday and whose mother has been at rinkside since these soggy Olympics began, had a quiet dinner in town with his parents before the final day of figures.

If freestyle skating counted more than 40 per cent of the score, he would have little to worry about.

"Believe me, they know his name here in Grenoble," Gram said. "And after Saturday the world will know it."

"His freestyle skating performance to Spanish music is an exciting one, and when we were here in November for the Olympic preview he shook the house down.

"They couldn't wait to get him back."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 16, 1968]

Medal Possible for Petkevich

Grenoble, France.—Montana figure skater John Misha Petkevich of Great Falls still has a chance at a medal in the Winter Olympics here. But the chance is a slim one.

Petkevich made a big move on Wednesday from 13th to eighth place in the compulsory figures. He is expected to move further up during today's free skating, where he is considered one of the world's best. However, the move may not be enough to get him into the top three.

Petkevich is expected to please the audience as much as any other skater today, but figure skating judges here are not as influenced by crowd reaction as are the hockey referees, who seem to blow their whistles on command of the fans. Carl Gram, assistant manager of the U.S. team, said "The judges are used to being booed and having eggs thrown at them over here and they remain unmoved through it all."

Gram, in speaking of Petkevich's skating Wednesday, said "He skated very well. He has confidence and poise and works hard. Normally we don't expect as much change in position as he gained yesterday."

Mrs. Frank Petkevich, his mother, was so excited she could hardly speak after the scores were announced but her husband remained calm. Their son is not talking to reporters until the event is over because of the intense mental and physical preparation he is undergoing.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 17, 1968]

In Skating at Grenoble Petkevich Finishes in Sixth Place

(By Will Grimsley)

Grenoble, France.—Tim Wood's comeback bid for an Olympic gold medal fell short Friday night, but the tenacious teenager from Bloomfield Hills, Mich., finished close on the heels of Austrian figure skating king Wolfgang Schwarz to earn a silver award and bolster sagging U.S. fortunes at the 1968 Winter Games.

Gary Visconti of Detroit finished fifth and John Petkevich of Great Falls, Mont., sixth.

Wood, 19, who trailed the 20-year-old Vienna language student by 14.2 points after Wednesday compulsory figures, which counted 60 per cent of the final score, closed the gap slightly with a brilliant free-skating performance, then watches Schwarz nail the gold medal with an equally stirring final effort.

Patrick Pera of France protected his third-place edge and picked up the bronze medal in the free-skating finale at the Stade de Glace.

Wood's brilliant performance broke a two-day medal famine for the U.S. Oympic contingent after Italy's Eugenio Monti shot within reach of a second bobsledding gold medal and heavy fog helped super-skier Jean-Claude Killy move a step forward in his bid for the Alpine Triple Crown.

In boosting the U.S. medal total to seven—one more than its accumulation in the 1964 Games at Innsbruck—Wood led a trio of young American skaters who cracked the top six places in the men's event.

Petkevich, an 18-year-old new-comer to the U.S. squad, skated immediately after Wood. He captivated the crowd with his whirl-wind acrobatics—only to lose all hope for a medal by falling twice.

Petkevich, who excels in free skating, tumbled first during a simple turn, then fell again at the end of a difficult triple spin leap. "I've never fallen on that particular part of my routine before and I probably never will again," he said afterward.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 17, 1968]

Grenoble, France.—Final standings in the men's figure skating competition in the Winter Olympic Games Friday, with ordinals and place points:

Name	Ord.	Pts.
1. Wolfgang Schwarz, Austria	13	1,904.1
2. Timothy Wood, Bloomfield Hills, Mich	17	1,891.6
3. Patrick Pera, France	31	1,864.5
4. Emmerich Danzer, Austria	29	1,873.0
5. Gary Visconti, Detroit	52	1,810.2
6. John Petkevich, Great Falls, Mont	56	1,806.2
7. Jay Humphrey, Canada	63	1,795.0
8. Ondrej Nepela, Czechoslovakia	70	1,772.8
9. Jsergei Tchetveroukhine, Russia	93	1,737.0
10. Marian Filc, Czechoslovakia	97	1,734.2

[From Sports Illustrated, Jan. 29, 1968]

Bold Bourkey for John Misha

(By Bob Ottum)

A little bit of Vince Lombardi is all right, but what this country really needs now and then is a culturally jazzy event like the U.S. Figure Skating Championships, which were held last weekend in Philadelphia. The best of America's most esoteric group of athletes got together and fought it out on the far fringes of sport, and after a season full of the crack of helmets against kidney pads it was a refreshing change. Let's hear it for competitors with guts enough to take on all comers to the tune of something like the *Grand Pas Classique*.

There they were, bounding around, whirling, slashing, flying off the ice into the rafters of the Spectrum, maybe the only athletes in the world who suit up in sequins, spangles and stretch suits. When it was all over on Sunday night 12 survivors of the 138 in the competition got their reward: the chance to represent the U.S. in Olympic figure skating at Grenoble next month.

Beyond that, after the last Lutz had been Lutzed and the final triple Salchow attempted, the championships had produced an astonishing variety of happenings: 1) an Olympic veteran had been forcefully retired by a cyclonic young skater, just like in those old Sonja Henie movies; 2) a record total of 54,678 people whooped it up during the four days of competition—there was a nearly packed house of 14,216 on Saturday night; and 3) the U.S. team suddenly found itself with surprising depth it had never had before.

"The thing is," said Gary Visconti, the defending national champion, who fell to second place in Philadelphia but still won a ticket to France, "that now the Europeans won't know who to watch out for. We've been sending teams with only one or two strong members, but now, boy, we've got a crew where they'll have to watch all of us, because any one of us could sneak off with the whole thing."

Visconti is right. The U.S. has put together an all-star team that will bear close watching. The women will be headed by Peggy Fleming, and anyone who wouldn't watch Peggy is out of his mind, anyway. Behind Peggy are Albertina Noyes and a 14-year-old sprite from Rockford, Ill. named Janet Lynn, and either of them could stop the Olympic show. As for the men, Visconti was edged out of his championship by a supple youngster named Tim Wood, who has been after him for years. And in the struggle for the third and last spot in the men's group, former Olympian and National Champion Scott Ethan Allen was sent down to the farm team—which means the anticlimatic world championships to be held after the Olympics—by a kid from Montana who was the hit of the show. He is a blond 18-year-old who skates with three names and all the cool of a guy who *knows* he is not going to fall down and shatter. John Misha Petkevich moved up from the fourth-place ranking he had held after the school figures to dominate the free skating, win a surprising third overall and beat out Allen for a place on the Olympic squad. Lest you are not properly impressed, what he did was roughly equivalent to catching and passing Jim Ryun in the homestretch.

Why? Well, figure skating operates on a competitive point system. Under the system, before a gifted skater can haul off and take his competitors apart he must first go through a compulsory series of skating maneuvers known as school figures, which seem designed to prove that he can distinguish the inside edge of a skate blade from the outside edge. Figure skating places an inordinate amount of emphasis on this sort of silly warmup—it counts 60% toward the final score—and it takes precedence over skating freestyle, even though freestyle is what the game is really all about, no matter what the purists tell you. The result of this archaic system is that a good free skater who is bored by the school figures can come out of the preliminaries hopelessly behind, while a fair free skater who is good at compulsory routines can rack up a fierce lead before the finals.

Which brings us back to John Misha Petkevich. Going into Saturday afternoon he had finished his school figures with 70.72 points, 22 ordinals and no chances, a score to which you need pay no attention. The only thing you should know is that Petkevich was fourth. To move past the talented Scott Allen into third place, he had to stage an impossible performance. And he did.

Petkevich is 5′ 8″ and 150 pounds of spring steel and surprises. "I was nervous about this thing all day," he said. "I had planned to try this triple flip about midway in my routine, see? But then I pulled a muscle in my leg, and I decided I better not go for it. So I gave them everything else I had. And suddenly, about three quarters of the way through, I knew I had them, and I just sort of said, 'Thanks, God, for letting me win,' and went right on skating."

Who needs triple flips? Petkevich came off the ice in one flying thing he calls the Bourkey, after his coach—a jump in which he kicks sideways, whirls, arches and generally hangs around up in the air long enough to wash out a pair of sweat socks. He added some snazzy Salchows, lots of Lutz jumps and a flying split jump that covered half the distance to Pittsburgh. His performance left the old figure skating pros in tears, though old figure-skating pros have a marked tendency to cry pretty easily. Even so, when it was all over, the audience—not completely sure what it had seen but positive that whatever it was it was historic—gave him a standing ovation. Figure-skating judges make up the far-right wing of sports, but for all their tendencies to be conservative they went slightly wild, too. Four of the judges gave Petkevich 5.9 points, and one gave him a perfect 6, which no American man has received since 1964. Coach Arthur Bourke (whose jump now will become the most widely copied move in figure skating) gave John Misha a bear hug that was harder than anything else the kid had been through all day.

Petkevich has been coming on unnoticed for years. He won the free-skating event at the pre-Olympics last year in Grenoble (after placing 14th in the school figures), but everyone made the mistake of assuming that it meant little, because not all of skating's hot shots were entered. Petkevich, who has been at this game since he was 2 years old, figured it was time to attack. He did some obligatory work on the compulsory stuff and rebuilt his free-skating routine around *España Cañi*—bullfightish music filled with rhythmic, staccato guitars and castanets. He began to work on the secret jumps and, he adds, "that triple flip goes back in for Grenoble."

He was a tough act to follow. Tim Wood, who is more of a perfectionist than a dazzling performer, had come into the finals well up on school points and moved calmly through his free-skating routine to take first place overall. Visconti, who specializes in grandstand finishes, staged the next-best show of the meet with his free-skating routine, including one triple something that started out as a Salchow and ended up in a three-turns-and-a-flashing-smile, as though he had planned it that way all along. Visconti is the Fran Tarkenton of skating. He brings an element of unpasteurized excitement to the sport. For one thing, he has courage to claim that he weighs 120 pounds, which is patently impossible; he is so small that if he were a sports car his roll center would be three feet underground. Yet he shrugs off his flamboyant style. "What the hell else can I do?" he says. "I always have to come from behind, so I always give them everything I've got when I'm out there. But that's what this sport is all about. It may sound funny, but this sport is tougher than anything else I can think of. Anyone who says we're not athletes ought to try it one time. It takes strength and coordination, but you know what I'm really trying to do? I'm trying to bring some grace to it. I'm trying to be—well—a *boy* Peggy Fleming. It's tough."

And nobody laughed when he said it.

Champ Fleming, who has similar ideas about skating, has never been stronger or more graceful than she was in Philadelphia. She skated—floated actually—to an easy victory on Saturday night, a 109-pound wisp in an orange costume, and she made it look easy.

"Well, that's the idea," she said. "We have to make it look easy. Yet you have to make like a track star just to get through a number. Listen, all runners have to do is run around the track. We have to work much harder—and do it all in time to music. I don't know, maybe I should start grunting and grinding a little to make this thing look tougher and get more sympathy."

There is no need. Peggy got five 5.9 votes on the technical merit of her program and three 5.9s and two perfect 6s on composition and style, further contributing to skating scoring history. How symathetic can judges be?

After the girls had finished, Petkevich came back on the ice for an exhibition round. On one flying Russian split jump he took off to what had to be a new height-and-distance record for figure skaters, finally came back down to the ice and brought the crowd roaring to its feet all over again. "The crowd really turns me on," he chortled afterwards. "Before today's events I was all set not to get to see Grenoble. But now I'm ready. I'm really ready to go."

And he won't need a plane. He could *jump* that far.

PRESERVATION OF GLOVER-ARCHBOLD PARK

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Anne Archbold, which I should like to read to the Senate. The letter is addressed to the Honorable Walter E. Washington, Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

> DEAR COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: As a memorial to my father, John Dustin Archbold, I dedicated to the United States in 1924 some 27 acres in the Foundry Branch Valley as part of the District of Columbia's park system. With the donation of Charles Carroll Glover, Sr., this created what is now known as the Glover-Archbold Park.
>
> It was my purpose that this beautiful wooded valley be preserved perpetually for the benefit and pleasure of the public. Over the years my family and I, together with the Glovers, have had to resist efforts to convert the valley for other than the original purpose. It should remain and be enjoyed by all as a natural sanctuary.
>
> I am told that the Department of Highways is anxious that a Three Sisters Islands Bridge be constructed at the bottom of the Park. I am told that any such construction would lead to a highway project within the Park, which would destroy the purpose for which the land was given. I urge most strongly that the bridge proposal be disapproved, and ask your support to this end.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MRS. ANNE ARCHBOLD.

Mr. President, I hope that the wishes of Mrs. Archbold will be observed and adhered to, because after all, without the Glover-Archbold gift there would be no parkway, no beautiful valley in that part of Washington at this time. I would not like to see it destroyed.

COMMUNIST ENSLAVED NATIONS

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, commemorating the proclamation of the independence of a nation is a magnificent event. We know how the Americans cherish the annual Fourth of July celebration. Among nations that have fallen to the onslaught of the Soviet Communist Union, there is a strong passion for commemorating their independence days and it grows stronger in each succeeding year that these people must remain slave rather than free.

Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle speak in the Halls of Congress extolling the gigantic struggles for freedom from Soviet communism. The world knows of the gallant fight of the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Hungarians, Rumanians, Poles, and the peoples of other nations behind the Iron Curtain in trying to break away from the chains of slavery, even though that gallant fight ended in further destruction to these people behind the Iron Curtain. Despite killings, the shedding of blood, and untold sacrifices, these people still dream, hope, and pray for national independence.

Mr. President, January 22, February 16, and February 24 are the independence days of the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and the Estonians, respectively. The independence days of other peoples behind the Iron Curtain will follow during the year. Speeches in the Halls of Congress give strength and hope to the people behind the Iron Curtain, but their quest for freedom cannot live on speeches alone. For a number of years I submitted to the Senate concurrent resolutions similar to House Concurrent Resolution 416, adopted by Congress. This law calls upon the President to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States Republics into the Soviet Union. Mr. President, I ask that the United Nations be requested to enlarge the resolution to include bringing before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of all nations that are now within the orbit of the Soviet Union against their free will. Many of my colleagues in both Houses have spoken on the great issue of liberating these people, but I believe we should generate these words into an effective resolution passed by the Congress of the United States. Only then will the Lithuanians on February 16, the Estonians on February 24, and all other peoples of formerly free nations who are now behind the Iron Curtain truly commemorate their respective independence days.

Mr. President, these are anniversaries well to be remembered when we stop to consider the fortitude of the Baltic and nations of all captive peoples, and the tenacity with which they have clung to the ideal of freedom. The days should be remembered. While the statement I make comes a little belatedly, I still wish to salute the fortitude, the stamina, and the fidelity to freedom of the Baltic people and the people of all other nations who are still numbered among the captive groups.

NATIONAL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, our Nation is now observing National FFA Week in honor of the Future Farmers of America, an organization of young men who believe in, and work for, self-dependence so they, in turn, can contribute to the welfare of others and our Nation.

I think it is most appropriate that in this week we also honor and pay tribute to the father of our country, for George Washington was not only a great national leader but an outstanding and proud farmer as well.

George Washington's legacy of example and a proud heritage and the goals of the Future Farmers are inseparable. FFA chapters use the bust of Washington as the symbol of the chapter treasurer, and the treasurer opens each meeting with these important words:

> I keep a record of receipts and disbursements just as Washington kept his farm accounts—carefully and accurately. I encourage thrift among the members and strive to build up our financial standing through savings and investments. George Washington was better able to serve his country because he was finacially independent.

Mr. President, the members of the Future Farmers of America have taken this great example of citizenship and assumed the responsibility of serving this generation just as Washington served his.

Today, the spotlight of publicity and attention unfortunately falls on a small minority of our youth who choose to defy and dissent. This week, let us recognize and pay tribute to this great organization of young people who make positive contributions to our society—who believe in and set the example for rugged individualism so that they may serve others.

The Future Farmers Creed explains this organization's purpose well:

> I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so for others as well as for myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

Mr. President, during my years of public service I have considered my association with these young men both inspirational and challenging; an inspiration to see the experiment of democracy born anew in our coming generations and a challenge to join with them in their work, and to do as well.

I am proud to say that I was among those who sponsored and supported the public law which granted the Congressional Charter of Incorporation to the Future Farmers of America. My pride in this organization and my faith in young people is rekindled every opportunity I have to enjoy meeting and talking with these fine young men.

It has been my pleasure to visit the annual convention of the FFA held each year in Kansas City. All who come into contact with the Future Farmers are richer from the experience.

Mr. President, during National Future Farmers Week, let us all join with these young people in their quest for the goals we all share—life's abundance, honest wealth, less need for charity, and more of it when needed. I commend the Future Farmers of America and their leaders for their efforts in continuing to make the American dream come true, and I pledge them my continued help and support.

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1155) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to change the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes, which was strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended—

(a) By changing "Export-Import Bank of Washington", wherever that name refers to the legal entity created by the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to "Export-Import Bank of the United States."

(b) By inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)" in section 2(b) of that Act, and by adding the following at the end of section 2(b):

"(2) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product, technical data or other information by a national or agency of any nation.

"(A) which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of the United States; or

(B) which furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing, or sales by non-wholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance, or advisers to a nation described in subparagraph (A):

nor shall the Bank guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase by any nation (or national or agency thereof) of any product, technical data or other information which is to be used principally by or in a nation described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

"(3) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in an extension of credit in connection with any credit sale of defense articles and defense services to any country designated under section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as an economically less developed country for purposes of the tax imposed by section 4911 of that Code. The prohibitions set forth in this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any transaction the consummation of which the President determines would be in the national interest and reports such determination (within thirty days after making the same) to the Senate and House of Representatives. In making any such determination the President shall take into account, among other considerations, the national interest in avoiding arms races among countries not directly menaced by the Soviet Union or by Communist China; in avoiding arming military dictators who are denying social progress to their own people; and in avoiding expenditures by developing countries of scarce foreign exchange needed for peaceful economic progress.

"(4) In no event shall the Bank have outstanding at any time in excess of 7½ per centum of the limitation imposed by section 7 of this Act for such guarantees, insurance credits or participation in credits with respect to exports of defense articles and services to countries which, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Bank, are less developed."

(c) By changing in section 2(c) of that Act, "$2,000,000,000" to read "$3,500,000,000".

(d) By changing the last sentence in section 3(d) of that Act to read: "Members, not otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the United States, may be compensated at rates not exceeding the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the General schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) for each day spent in travel or attendance at meetings of the Committee, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government service employed intermittently."

(e) By changing, in section 7 of that Act, "$9,000,000,000" to read "$13,500,000,000".

(f) By changing, in section 8 of that Act, "June 30, 1968" to read "June 30, 1973".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

S. 3013—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO MAKE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO CARRY OUT THE PROGRAMS UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15399

AMENDMENT NO. 531

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the Senate has been gagged for the last month on the civil rights debate, a desperate situation has been continuing in the slums and depressed rural areas around the country. Because of inadequate congressional funding and because the administration decided to attempt to build up its concentrated employment program within the scope of existing appropriations, valuable full-year antipoverty programs have been undergoing major cuts. Moreover, it has become increasingly clear that funds for needed summer programs, made available last year through a special supplemental appropriation bill, will be largely unavailable this year.

Mr. President, we must move to correct this situation, which promises but to feed the fires of frustration and resentment. To that end Senator YARBOROUGH and I introduce a bill to provide $150 million in supplemental funds for summer jobs and antipoverty programs. We are joined in this bipartisan endeavor by 19 Senators; Senators BREWSTER, BROOKE, CASE, CHURCH, CLARK, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HATFIELD, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, MOSS, NELSON, PERCY, RANDOLPH, TYDINGS, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

I would like to review for my colleagues the background on why such a supplemental bill is needed.

Recognizing that special problems arise in the Nation's cities during the summer, due to high youth unemployment and poor living conditions, exacerbated by high temperatures, the Federal Government has in recent years conducted special antipoverty programs during these months. These programs have been essential in terms of supplying needed services and providing a constructive outlet for the energies of slumdwellers; they have been consistently supported by mayors throughout the country. Such programs are especially needed for the coming summer, in view of the expectations which have been created through efforts in previous years and to provide a constructive alternative to the exhortations of the militants.

But while the need is even greater this year, less money will be available from the Federal Government. Last summer, about $600 million went into summer programs for youth, including portions of full-year programs which applied to summer months. This year, the comparable figure is $560 million. But even that figure is illusory, for it includes programs such as title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and college work study which do not zero in on the geographic areas or the youth populations which most need attention.

The heart of the summer program last year was the $75 million appropriated for special community action and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. These are the funds which are relatively unrestricted and which mayors can wheel into action in the sectors that most need it, according to variances in local conditions. Under the Green amendment, these funds will most likely be under the control of local officials. Yet this year the administration plans no summer supplemental.

Rather, it is planning to squeeze out limited summer funds by cutting back and closing down full-year programs—an approach which may create more resentment than the summer programs could ever overcome. For example, this robbing Peter to pay Paul for summer programs, coupled with a similar operation to fund the concentrated employment program in fiscal year 1968, has forced the reduction of Headstart by $14 million, legal services for the poor by one-seventh, and neighborhood health centers by over one-fifth. The Job Corps has been forced to cut back by $10 million—a penny-wise reduction which requires it to mothball some $20 million in capital investment.

This squeeze will produce about the same amount of funds for summer community action programs as was available for this purpose last year—$35 million; but the $47 million provided by the supplemental appropriation last year for special summer job programs under the Neighborhood Youth Corps will not be available. The result will be a loss of over 70,000 jobs—and the figure is kept that low only by reducing other summer Youth Corps programs from 12 to 10 weeks.

In this manner, Mr. President, by cutting back on the number of weeks involved in the program, the administration is trying to minimize the reduction in the number of slots between last year and this year and make it appear less than it is. But the simple fact of the matter is that the money is not there.

We need go no further than the administration's own stated positions to know that this money is needed and can be usefully spent. In its budget presentations for fiscal year 1968 the administration asked for substantially more antipoverty funds than it ultimately got. By his own budget requests, we know the President needed more antipoverty funds. For example, $2.06 billion was requested for the war on poverty, and only $1.77 billion was appropriated. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, $401 million was requested, but only $385 million was appropriated, and within that figure, the $20 million request for title I experimentation and demonstration programs was cut to $15 million—those funds were particularly useful last summer and produced such efforts as Project Pride in Washington, D.C.

I do not think there is any doubt in the administration that this extra money is needed. Rather, I believe that the President has determined that the surtax is his first priority and that he cannot afford to compromise his chances on that measure by introducing a supplemental bill. I think this is a situation where the Senate can and should take the initiative.

I think that the impact of these cutbacks in full-year and summer programs can best be understood by citing specific examples of what is going on around the country. For example:

In Dallas, full-year versatile CAP is being reduced by 10 percent and summer Neighborhood Youth Corps from 1,454 to 600;

In New York City, there were 24,000 federally funded summer Youth Corps slots, to be reduced to 8,000 this year, and versatile CAP is being reduced by 10 percent;

In Chicago, summer Youth Corps is going from 20,000 slots last year to 9,000 this year, and there is a cut of 15 percent in versatile CAP and 10 percent in Headstart;

In Miami, the versatile CAP has been cut over 27 percent, with Headstart cut by 24 to 30 percent—the Assistant Director there commented, "we're just dead";

In Detroit, summer Neighborhood Youth Corps will probably drop from 2,750 and 2,000, and

In Atlanta, versatile CAP is being cut by 32 percent and Headstart by 25 percent.

This supplemental money is absolutely crucial from any practical or moral point of view. We know the situation in our cities and depressed rural areas to be just as serious as it was in 1967 yet, less summer money is being made available this year than last and the administration refuses to submit a summer appropriation bill.

This is just another example of sadly distorted priorities. Failing to provide this relatively small amount of summer money and cutting back widely accepted full-year programs would escalate the level of frustration and discontent in the slums. You cannot raise justified expectations in the ghettos by providing needed programs, and then cut back those programs and leave anything but futility and frustration. This provides ammunition to the militants, who assert that peaceful progress is not possible.

I note that the administration demonstrates a firm sense of priorities and an ability to act quickly when an additional $100 million is needed for military assistance to South Korea, but that it does not show anything like that sense of priority for the crisis in the cities.

Mr. President, let me summarize. A summer supplemental appropriation is badly needed in view of the fact that—

First. There is a high probability that our cities will be in worse shape this summer, with increased levels of frustration and disappointment with summer programs;

Second. There will be less summer money available this year than last, with a crucial reduction in the kind of flexible money most needed, especially for youth jobs; and

Third. Some summer funds are being produced by cutbacks of valuable full year programs, causing increased resentment.

The bill we are offering would make $150 million available for special summer programs. There is a proviso that 25 percent of the funds appropriated could be allocated to full-year programs which have been cut back below present program levels, including Headstart, Job Corps and Health Services. The bill places a preference upon the funding of programs providing jobs and upon projects whose results will be visible within the poverty areas themselves. In this manner a double impact is achieved—not only are the unemployed given jobs, but the work will produce visible and psychologically important effects in the ghettos themselves. An important and successful model in this respect is the summer program conducted last year in Washington, D.C., by Pride, Inc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill we are offering be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3013) to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3013

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Economic opportunity program

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, $150,000,000 to be available for expenditure for programs under such Act focusing on the summer of 1968: *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall reserve not to exceed 25 per centum of the sums appropriated by this Act for the purpose of carrying out full year programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 whose funding levels would otherwise be reduced below amounts needed to sustain such programs at their operating levels in effect prior to December 1, 1967, as determined by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given in expending the remainder of this appropriation to summer projects providing work and training opportunities which (1) are developed and conducted with participation by residents of the areas and members of the groups served, and (2) are located in and will contribute to the physical or other improvement of areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons. Sums appropriated by this Act shall remain available until expended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the need for this summer money is well recognized throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed after the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of February 1 and an editorial appearing on January 28 and an article appearing on February 13 from the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. I would point out, Mr. President, that one of these articles reports that the delegates called together for the President's Youth Opportunity Council meeting on January 29 overwhelmingly supported a supplemental summer appropriation in the amount of $275 million, almost twice the amount we are requesting today.

I would also like unanimous consent to have printed at the end of these remarks two telegrams which I have already received from the mayors of Dayton, Ohio, and Dade County, Fla., supporting this supplemental bill. My colleagues should know, Mr. President, that the Executive Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors has itself already called for a summer supplemental in the amount of $250 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

AMENDMENT NO. 531

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also submit for myself alone—since our cosponsors were not solicited concerning introduction of this bill as an amendment, although they were informed that it might be so handled in the Appropriations Committee—this same measure in the form of an amendment to H.R. 15399 passed by the House yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 531) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1968]

Youth Council Assails Cuts in Job Programs

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Delegates called together by President Johnson's Youth Opportunity Council said yesterday that they were "appalled" at his cutbacks in "already inadequate" Federal funds for job programs in the long, hot summer ahead.

Vice President Humphrey sent them home with a pep talk insisting that the proposed new Federal budget wasn't that bad, but promising to "present" their demands for more money to the President and Congressional leaders.

"I was already on the ball team," he told the conference. "But now I want to make a home run."

The conference began awkwardly Monday when mayors and representatives of the Nation's 50 largest cities were told that the Johnson Administration had decided not to seek the $75 million extra that it won last year to round off its $600 million summertime youth budget.

Complaints bounced back and forth until yesterday morning when a band of youthful delegates—representing, as they put it, "Black power, Jewish power, Spanish power and Indian power, all equal to youth power"—submitted a resolution of protest.

The conferees put the Administration on the spot by approving it, informally but overwhelmingly. Besides rapping the cutback, it called for a supplemental appropriation of $275 million to augment the summer youth program funds in the budget made public Monday.

The youths who drafted the proposal met with Humphrey in the Capitol later in the day to press their case.

Meanwhile, Administration officials acknowledged that even by their calculations the funds proposed for job programs this summer fall $40 million short of what Congress approved last year. They said the other $35 million that appeared to be missing in Neighborhood Youth Corps and Community Action money was made up by increases in other job programs tucked away in the budget.

Anxious to counter impressions of stinginess, the officials also contended at a press briefing that another $50 million could be secured for the summer out of elementary and secondary education funds to be spent at the option of local school officials.

The school officials plan to spend the money during the regular school year, not the summer.

In his windup talk to the Conference, Humphrey urged the delegates to go home and lobby their school boards to use the funds for the summer instead. He avoided a clear public endorsement of higher appropriations than the President has proposed.

But the young delegates who met with him in the Capitol said the Vice President promised to do all he could to get more money from Congress, too.

"It was a gentlemen's agreement that he would pursue this," said Jesse James of San Francisco's "Mission Rebels." As Humphrey told the Conference later, however, the Vice Presidency "has very little authority."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1968]

Squeeze on the Poor

Vice President Humphrey is meeting in Washington this week with the mayors of the nation's principal cities to plan youth employment programs for the long, hot summer that is sure to come. Mr. Humphrey is unquestionably right in his analysis of the problem: worthwhile jobs and good recreation programs, rather than nightsticks and tear gas, are the best form of riot control.

But Congress and the Administration are sending Vice President Humphrey into this summer campaign without the means to accomplish his mission. Last year, on an emergency basis, Congress passed a special appropriation of $75 million to finance summer programs. But this year President Johnson is asking the Office of Economic Opportunity to reserve $35 million of the money authorized for the community action program to pay for these emergency summer operations.

This means that New York and other cities will get that much less in Federal money for their year-round community action programs, forcing a cutback of upward of 10 per cent. Even worse, the Administration is apparently counting on the cities and private employers to take over more of the financial burden of the summer programs. The contribution that private employers make to solving these problems is obviously elastic and impossible to forecast precisely; but no gift of prophecy is needed to foretell that the cities, most of them financially strapped, will not be able to take the place of the Federal Government. There will have to be additional Federal money or it will be a very hot summer indeed.

President Johnson meanwhile is reallocating about $134 million in poverty funds for the fiscal year ending this June 30. His objective is to shift more money into programs to train and provide jobs for adults who have been out of work for long periods. Again, this additional help for the "hard core" unemployed is desirable and needed, but the money for it is coming out of the hide of other programs just as meritorious. Thus Head Start classes will accommodate 13,000 fewer children. Sixteen Job Corps centers are to be closed. The Neighborhood Youth Corps will be able to help 170,000 fewer high-school-age youngsters from low-income families. New programs to help the aged, encourage family planning, and aid the rural poor will not be possible.

Congress is ultimately to blame for this policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul. If there are to be special summer projects to prevent riots and new programs to help unemployed adults, Congress has to approve a supplemental appropriation to pay for them. And it is up to President Johnson to ask for it. The poor have been squeezed enough.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1968]

City Poverty Program Overspent by $4 Million—Big Youth-Job Program and U.S. Cuts Cause Deficit—Freeze on Hiring Is Ordered as Problem Increases

(By John Kiener)

The city's antipoverty program has overspent its budget by more than $4-million because of a huge drive to employ poor teenagers last summer and Federal cutbacks of funds, according to estimates by city officials.

The Human Resources Administration is sharply cutting back programs, has imposed a freeze on hiring and promotion and is forgoing plans for expanding services to the poor. It hopes thus to make up the deficit of $2.1-million in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and about $2-million lost because of Federal action.

"There is no question that we are in a financial jam," Mitchell I. Ginsberg, administrator of the agency, said yesterday in confirming the deficit.

Officials from the Mayor's office, the Budget Bureau and the Human Resources Administration have been meeting to discuss the problem.

Their calculations are complicated by the fact that the city does not yet know how much Federal money it will get and because funds are allocated on different periods—the fiscal year, which ends June 30, and the antipoverty effort's program year, which ends Oct. 31.

Last summer Mayor Lindsay ordered the Human Resources Administration to put as many slum youngsters as possible on the payroll of the Youth Corps, in hopes of cutting down the possibility of racial violence.

The program, designed to help keep youths in school by giving them vacation and part-time work in public-service jobs, enrolled more than 43,000 youngsters—more than any other city in the country.

But that program ran over its budget by $5.2-million.

City officials had hoped to pay for the extra jobs by picking up unused Youth Corps allotments from other cities, or by getting additional funds from the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity or the Labor Department, the Youth Corps' co-sponsors. This money, however, did not materialize.

The city has made up about $3.1-million of its Neighborhood Youth Corps deficit out of accruals—money budgeted, but not used, in other programs.

City antipoverty officials are grim about the cutbacks, but they do not question the wisdom of the Mayor's order to expand the job rolls for youths.

"When you put 43,000 kids on the payroll, there's no question it helps keep the city cool," said one official. "Now we're going to have to tighten our belts."

The city is faced with an additional problem because of Congressional cutbacks and the Presidential transfer of Federal antipoverty funds.

While the antipoverty legislation was going through Congress last fall, the Office of Economic Opportunity authorized the city to spend money at the same rate—about $1.7-million of community action funds—on a month-to-month basis.

The assumption was that at least enough money would be appropriated to keep programs operating at the same strength as last year. But Congress appropriated $1.77-billion instead of the $2.06-billion requested by the President.

The President announced he would set up job-training programs for adults. He transferred $134-million for this purpose from the funds authorized for Head Start, the preschool education program, Legal Services, Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps and other community action projects.

Federal antipoverty officials still do not know exactly how much money New York is to get this year.

But Federal and city officials estimate that the Congressional cutbacks and Presidential action means that the city has spent at a rate that will go more than $2-million over its allotment.

City officials note with some irony that two years ago they "lost" $10-million in antipoverty money because of inability to get programs operating, but that the current fiscal crisis comes at a time when many programs have begun to operate with relative efficiency.

The problem, they add, is partly a result of the city's ability to use money effectively for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

"Congress complains about the way the program is administered," Mr. Ginsberg said bitterly, "but how can you run a meaningful program when you don't know from month to month how much money you have?"

EXHIBIT 2

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 21, 1968.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Dade County's Youth Opportunity Executive Committee met February 20, 1968. And strongly supports proposed supplemental appropriation for summer anti-poverty and jobs program community urgently needs continuous funding for successful anti-poverty programs as basis for summer planning now going on. Funds for jobs and training programs for hard core youth and adults desperately needed.

CHUCK HALL,
Mayor of Metropolitan Dade County.

DAYTON, OHIO,
February 20, 1968.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As mayor of a city that can measure some real and important benefits from the special funds made available for special summer programs last year, I have been distressed at the prospect of less for this summer when all measurables indicate a dire need for more. I believe that all segments of my community agree with my evaluation. We in Dayton are heartened to learn of the proposed supplemental appropriation legislation to be introduced by Senators Yarborough and Javits. We urge you strongly to give your support to the measure. Making it possible for cities like ours to increase rather than diminish our special summer programs and at least maintain the level of full-year programs is critically important. Copy of wire being sent to Senators Lausche and Young.

DAVE HALL,
Mayor, City of Dayton.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in 1959 there were 39 million Americans living below the poverty level. In 1966, this figure had decreased to 30 million. The reason for this 23-percent decrease in 7 years is that this Nation, under the capable and determined leadership of two compassionate Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, made a commitment to come to the assistance of those living in the shadows of American affluence.

Many of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate today played major roles in the development of that commitment. We mobilized imaginative thinking, bold plans, and adequate funds to launch what was termed a war on poverty. Our pledge to these millions of Americans—people whom Michael Harrington called "the other America"—took the form of a Headstart program; a Neighborhood Youth program; a legal aid service; a Job Corps; and many other programs that touched the very poverty pockets and ghettos of the land.

The commitment we have developed since 1961 can demonstrate success in terms of hard facts: Jobs obtained, education completed, income raised, and so forth. But its real success cannot be so easily demonstrated. Poverty is, of course, more than a lack of income. It is primarily a spiritual concept—it is a way of life. It is less the absence of sustenance than it is the absence of hope.

Above all, the commitment that I feel, and the commitment that John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson have spoken of so eloquently, is a commitment of national concern. It is the President, the Senate, the Congress, and concerned Americans everywhere saying to those trapped in the ghettos and barrios of misery and despair that someone cares. The success of this commitment can be measured only in terms of hope restored and promise extended.

It is for this reason that I join in sponsorship of the $150 million supplemental appropriation for programs to aid the urban poor. This is a reaffirmation of our pledge of concern; a demonstration of our good faith.

Due to heavy financial burdens in other parts of the world, there have been cuts in programs that form a vital part of our commitment to the poor. The Headstart program has been reduced by $14 million, Job Corps has suffered a $10 million cutback, and funds for neighborhood health centers have been squeezed by one-fifth.

In addition to this cutback, there is no request for funds to develop vital summer programs in the cities. In late May and June of this year, some 3.8 million youth will step from schools into the streets. The huge majority of these young people will be idle, with no productive outlet for their energies. The appropriations bill we introduce today will help provide that outlet.

Some will undoubtedly assail this measure as an attempt to appease rioters. Such is not the case. These people would have us employ the heavy hand of force against urban restlessness. No one can deny that rioters and looters must be dealt with, but merely to say that is to ignore the causes of restlessness. As an outstanding rural newspaper in my State, the Pleasanton Express, commented in a most thoughtful editorial last week:

> The problems of the ghettoes have to be met. We who live in small towns simply aren't equipped to comprehend the misery and hopelessness that exists there.
>
> This is a problem that isn't going to go away. It can't be ignored and those who say, "Shoot 'em all," aren't being much more helpful than the rioters themselves.

On the other hand, some will assail this attempt to deal with the problem as mere tokenism. Again, such is not the case. No one pretends that this supplemental appropriation is going to solve the problem, nor does anyone pretend to know for sure what the solution is. But this measure is a sincere attempt by men of good will to cope with the myriad of problems faced daily by those who live in the ghettos. At the very least, this measure would help reaffirm our commitment to these people.

During the past few years we have worked hard to build hope and extend promise. It is wrong to cut off both hope and promise to conserve dollars. We cannot now abandon our commitment—indeed, it is essential at this critical time to reaffirm that commitment.

This appropriation is submitted irrespective of the prospects of summer violence in the cities. Congress is not so naive as to think that $150 million can quell militancy. Rather this supplemental is offered to help meet the needs of the employable unemployed.

SUMMER JOB PROGRAM DESPERATELY NEEDED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I support the bill to provide a supplemental appropriation for summer job programs proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] which I am cosponsoring.

The reduced appropriation for the poverty program has forced cuts all along the line. I have previously voiced my feeling that we are being penny wise and pound foolish in making reductions in the year-round poverty programs.

But the reductions which are now projected in the summer programs contain the seeds of disaster.

The two critical summer programs are Community Action and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. These have been used to provide emergency summer jobs for unemployed young people and to involve ghetto dwellers in solving the problems of their own environment.

So far as I am able to determine, the community action programs will be funded this summer at approximately the same level as last year—although the funding will be accomplished by robbing other programs, including Headstart, legal services for the poor, neighborhood health centers, and the Job Corps. I might note that these, and particularly Headstart, are among the most successful of the OEO projects.

But, according to the information I am able to obtain, the Neighborhood Youth Corps—the program which provides jobs for the most flammable segment of the ghetto, the young unemployed men—is going to be cut sharply.

Although no final decisions have been made, the present indication is that jobs under this program will be cut back in Jersey City, N.J., from 750 last summer to approximately 410 this summer and, in Newark, N.J., from 2,610 last summer to 1,870 this summer. In addition, the Neighborhood Youth Corps job program is being cut from 12 weeks to 10. Similar reductions are projected in cities all across the country.

I need not recite the litany of horror which engulfed Newark last summer. I will only point out that the Governor's Commission on Civil Disorder, which reported less than 2 weeks ago, cited unemployment and under-employment as one of the chief causes of unrest in the ghettos.

Last year, with a substantially larger sum of money available for the poverty programs, we enacted a $75 million supplementary appropriation.

The supplementary appropriation requested in this bill is $150 million.

That money will be spent to provide useful employment within the ghettos for those with no jobs and no serious hope of jobs without this program.

The record of last summer shows all too clearly how desperately these jobs are needed and I urge the members of the Committee on Appropriations to keep that record in mind as they consider this bill.

FUTURE AMERICAN LEADERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, unless the fighting in Southeast Asia is tremendously escalated, expanded, and prolonged, about 70,000 Negro Vietnam veterans will be finishing their military service in Vietnam during this year and early next year. They will return to civilian life. What will be the impact of these Negro war veterans on the ghettos and slums of our cities? I predict they will not join up with Stokely Carmichael, "Rap" Brown, and other extremist advocates of violence.

True, many of these Negro soldiers have lived through days and nights in combat when they thought that the last vestige of decency, kindness, and humanity had disappeared altogether from the face of the earth. Perhaps for this and other reasons we may safely predict these Negro veterans following their discharge from our Armed Forces will become tomorrow's Negro leaders and become highly respected and regarded citizens in their respective communities. Furthermore, this summer and next summer there is likely to be much less violence in our cities because of these fine and highly trained young men who recently took off their fatigue uniforms, returned home, and again became civilians.

In Vietnam many of these 60,000 or 70,000 young Negroes for the first time in their lives had the opportunity to do important work. They performed their duties well. They responded to discipline. They acquired self-confidence. They received their pay regularly and sent much of it home to their families. Practically every one of these men made a first-class war record. Many acquired a better education than before and a better education than many of their neighbors back in the cities and towns in the United States.

Our Government is not neglecting and will not neglect these returning veterans. For example, officials of our Labor Department are already making studies to learn of employment needs of Negro veterans and to furnish further job and skill training to meet any additional requirements of these returning veterans. Then, there is the GI bill of rights and provision for higher education at Government expense. Also Project Transition has been organized to provide job training for GI's in Vietnam and in cities in this country for Negro and white veterans nearing the end of their period of service. Preference will be given to hiring these men as teachers in ghetto and other schools and as policemen and firemen in our cities. Of course, some lunatic extremist Negro groups headed by the Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichaels and their like may urge these new civilians to join noisily disturbing and violent agitation programs. I predict they will be soundly rebuffed by the great majority of returning Vietnam veterans.

These 60,000 to 70,000 former GI's have every reason to hold their heads high. They performed very important duties and received official and unofficial commendation for their services. They acquired self-assurance, confidence. Carefree youth became men almost overnight under fire. They are the "cream of the crop" among Negroes of 18 to 30 years of age. It is more than likely they will continue to be the "cream of the crop" 20 and 40 years from now—become American leaders of tomorrow.

PROPERTY RIGHTS CONSTITUTE A BASIC HUMAN RIGHT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall vote to table the so-called fair housing amendment because, in my judgment, it is not a fair housing amendment. It is a forced housing amendment. It would constitute discrimination in reverse, in that it would discriminate against the owner of property as against the prospective purchaser. It is also discriminatory, in that, under the amendment, a property owner may refuse to sell, rent, or lease to a prospective purchaser of his own race or color for whatever reason he may wish, and there is nothing that the prospective purchaser could then do about it.

On the other hand, if the prospective purchaser were of a different race or color than that of the property owner, the aspect of Government compulsion would immediately be brought into the situation if this amendment were to prevail.

The amendment would accord rights to the prospective buyer which would be superior to the rights of the owner of property. In other words, the prospective buyer, who has no constitutional, legal, or natural rights in the property whatsoever would, under this amendment, be given superior rights, in instances where color or race became a factor, over the rights of the property owner.

Mr. President, I will not be a party to compelling the property owner to rent, sell, or lease his property against his own wishes to another individual who has absolutely no legal, constitutional, or natural claim thereto whatsoever.

The right to use, manage, or dispose of his possessions cannot be separated from the physical property itself, if property is to have any real value to the individual owner, for insofar as the owner is denied such rights, he is thereby stripped of his full and unrestricted ownership of property.

Property rights constitute a basic human right and have existed long before the Constitution of the United States was ever written.

Property rights are given clear recognition repeatedly in the U.S. Constitution and are given status approaching that, indeed, if not equal thereto, of life and liberty.

The eighth Commandment recognizes the rights of true ownership of property.

Mr. President, I want to see every family have a decent and good house in which to live, but this does not necessitate destroying the rights of the property owner, whether he be white or nonwhite, to refuse to sell, rent, or lease, except in cases of eminent domain, as he thinks best.

Decent housing does not necessarily have to be integrated housing. I have no objection to those who wish to convert their neighborhoods into interracial neighborhoods. But, I recognize the equal right of those who take a different view and who wish to be selective in the managament, use, and disposition of the property which is the product of their own sweat and industry.

If the time-honored rights of property are ever destroyed in America, all citizens, white and nonwhite, will have surrendered a vast portion of their liberty and their freedom.

Why should a Negro property owner be forced, against his wishes, to rent to a white person, and vice versa?

Let him do so if he so wishes, but let us not permit government, at any level, to intervene and compel him to do so, not only against his wishes, but also perhaps against his own good judgment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there has been much discussion, in the course of debate over fair housing, as to where the people of this country stand on the question. Despite the fact that several States have strong fair housing laws, over 80 municipalities have adopted fair housing ordinances. With each passing year, the number not only increases but also does so at an accelerating rate.

This morning, we have another example of where a community has had deep and profound debate on this issue and finally, after its citizens understood the issue, voted to support the principle of fair housing.

This morning's AP ticker indicates that the voters of Flint, Mich., where a very serious debate over fair housing occurred, approved by public referendum a fair housing ordinance. That fair housing ordinance stood up under the referendum. It did so by a vote of 20,172 to 20,129.

The petition to remove was brought by Mr. Gerald Spencer, who is a section leader of the ultraconservative John

Birch Society. This was a case where the forces of hatred and the forces of segregation decided that the people of Flint, Mich., did not want fair housing. They tried to remove it through a plebiscite. The voters of Flint decided that they in fact, after long debate, wanted the measure.

I think this is a further evidence of growing public support for the concept that discrimination in the sale and rental of housing should be removed in our country, and arrives at a time just moments before the motion to table will be presented, and shows additional reason why public support exists for this measure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a little while we shall undoubtedly be acting—may I have the attention of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. In a little while we shall undoubtedly be acting, as the majority leader has already given notice, on a motion to table the housing amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke].

It should be clear to every Senator precisely what we are voting on, and precisely what support this issue has.

First, let us remember, Mr. President, that a fair housing bill has passed the House of Representatives, which we never acted on; so the argument that it will not get by the other body is not valid.

Second, let us understand very clearly that the terms of the particular housing amendment before us, as every Senator knows—and rightly—will not be the terms upon which we finally vote. The housing amendment before us will, I have no doubt, be shaped and guided by what is felt in conscience to be correct, and by whatever is necessary in order to win the necessary support in the Senate.

The important thing, therefore, to bear in mind in voting on the motion to table, is that this is an expression of the sentiment of the Senate as to whether it wants any fair housing provision in this civil rights bill. Let us understand that very clearly. Does the Senate want any fair housing provision in the bill?

I strongly urge that the Senate should express itself as desiring some fair housing provision, for this reason: As one who, I believe, has a right to speak not only with feeling but with some degree of experience of slums and ghettos, I remind the Senate that the concept we are trying to get across before the long hot summer is that we are endeavoring to do, in every way open to us, justice, which has too long been deferred, more than a century in this country, in terms of equal opportunity.

It is obvious to anyone who sets foot in Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, or Watts, or any such area one chooses to visit: The first thing that assails us is the dilapidation of the housing; and that is likewise the first thing that assails the Negro or member of any other minority group who lives there. This is what he suffers under. This is one of his priority gripes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. By permitting him to move elsewhere, we set a premium upon dignity, and drive home the lesson that if you show initiative, are lively, do a job well, and learn a trade, you get something for it. And one coin that is universally understandable is the ability to get out from under dilapidation, away from the houses with empty eyes or broken windows, which is what they are, and away from the littered courtyards, the littered streets, and the general air of depreciation which, unhappily for all of us, except where it has been broken here and there by urban renewal, by public housing, or by middle-income housing, represents the total antithesis of living which one sees in the slums.

So I ask the Senate, in voting, to bear in mind that we are voting on the principle, Shall there be something on fair housing included in this bill?

In that regard, Mr. President, I think we all ought to be aware of some very high-level endorsements. The AFL-CIO executive council, meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., has written a very eloquent resolution, signed by George Meany, its president, urging that we give favorable attention to the fair housing provision, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Miami Beach, Fla.,
February 19, 1968.

Senator Jacob K. Javits,
Washington, D.C.:

The AFL-CIO executive council today adopted the following resolution and instructed me to send it to you.

"We urge every Member of the Senate to vote for cloture to halt the filibuster against H.R. 2516, the bill that would grant Federal protection to citizens exercising their civil rights and the amendment that would establish a fair housing law that would give equal access to all housing to all persons everywhere in America.

"There are irreducible rights in this Nation and the Congress must guarantee them. Therefore, it is vital that all Members of the Senate be allowed to vote on these issues and that the undemocratic device of the filibuster be defeated."

George Meany,
President, AFL-CIO.

Mr. JAVITS. It will be remembered that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale] and I had a colloquy on the Senate floor recently about the President's letter, and I said I would appeal to the declared Republican candidates for expressions of their views.

I have done so, and at this time I shall read into the Record a telegram from George Romney, one of the leading candidates, who says:

> It is important to do all possible to demonstrate to those still suffering from social and racial injustice that needed changes can be made without lawlessness violence and civil guerrilla warfare I urge you and all Republican Senators to support cloture as a meaningful step in that direction. National, State, local, and private action is necessary if we are to defeat the effort of those organizing for racial revolution in America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this time the telegram from George Romney, and also a telegram from Roy Wilkins, chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Madison, Wis.,
February 20, 1968.

Senator Jacob Javits,
Washington, D.C.:

It is important to do all possible to demonstrate to those still suffering from social and racial injustice that needed changes can be made without lawlessness, violence, and civil guerrilla warfare. I urge you and all Republican Senators to support cloture as a meaningful step in that direction. National, State, local, and private action is necessary if we are to defeat the effort of those organizing for racial revolution in America.

George Romney.

Washington, D.C.,
February 16, 1968.

Senator Jacob K. Javits,
Washington, D.C.:

The cloture vote this Tuesday is clearly the critical vote on civil rights in this session of Congress. On behalf of the 115 national organizations in the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights—and more importantly—on behalf of millions of Americans whose rights are involved in the pending bill, we urge you to be on the Senate floor Tuesday at 1:00 p.m. and to vote to shut off debate.

Roy Wilkins,
Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mr. JAVITS. As to former Vice President Nixon, unhappily he has been traveling, and I have not actually been able to get to him; but I wish to state for the information of the Senate that his office this morning has transmitted a message to us, which sounds reasonable enough, stating that when he was here as Vice President, his rulings on the various civil rights bills and on cloture would certainly most eloquently indicate his support for civil rights measures, and for use of the instrument of cloture in order to pass them.

That is my report to the Senate in that situation.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from New York for his most important comments at this moment, a few moments before the motion to table is presented.

I should like to repeat some of the colloquy which we had yesterday concerning our efforts to revise and reduce the scope of the fair housing proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent

that I may have 3 additional minutes, so that the colloquy may be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. The revised proposal will be presented to the Senate as a part of the cloture motion which is to be voted upon on Monday next.

We recognized, in presenting the strong fair housing proposal which was the subject of the vote on yesterday, that we were putting the fair housing issue in its strongest terms, involving some 96 percent of the housing in this country, and very strong enforcement and procedural powers as well.

We did so even though we knew there were many Senators who opposed us on cloture in that instance, but who might support us on a reduced version of a fair housing proposal.

I believe I am fair in saying that we are in the process of developing such an alternative proposal at this time, and intend to present it within the next day or so, but that the time element is such that we are not in a position to place before the Senate, prior to the motion to table, the exact terms of that altered and reduced version.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator from Minnesota, as one of the authors of the amendment, is it fair to say that the altered and reduced version will be a substantial alteration and reduction, that we have in mind coming to an approximation with the House bill, which has already passed the House, and that what we are hoping for, from our fellow Senators today, is a favorable vote on the principle that there shall be something in this bill with relation to open housing, rather than that the amendment as originally offered should stand or fall solely as a work of perfection on the fair housing issue?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. What this motion to table today involves is the question of whether, as the Senator from New York put it, there will be some fair housing measure voted upon by the U.S. Senate, and we hope passed by the Senate, with the further understanding that the sponsors of this measure, Senator BROOKE, myself, and others, fully intend to offer at the earliest possible moment, and before the cloture vote on Monday, a much reduced version of our fair housing proposal than that which was involved in the vote on the cloture motion yesterday.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

DOWRIES ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR LIBERTIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times of February 14, 1968, contained an article written by Richard Eder entitled "Greek Government Will Provide Dowries for Working Girls."

I do not know if the Greek Government is aware of the fact that this report of its efforts in support of cupid were brought to the attention of the American public on Valentine's Day. The coincidence, I am sure, cannot have escaped the attention of the alert editors of the New York Times.

But if the junta believes that by this kind of action they can delude either the people of Greece or the friends of democracy in this country into accepting the continuing denial of constitutional government to what was the world's oldest democracy, they are wrong.

Dowries are no substitute for liberties; and the love of freedom and democratic government among the Greek people is surely still strong.

I have continually urged our Government to keep at arm's length from the present illegal government in Greece, and in particular to refrain from extending any form of military assistance to it, at least in the absence of firm guarantees that constitutional government and free and honest elections will be reinstituted, on a strict and speedy timetable. We must not permit ourselves to be drawn by degrees into so-called normalized relations with what is plainly an abnormal and illegitimate regime.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK GOVERNMENT WILL PROVIDE DOWRIES FOR WORKING GIRLS

(By Richard Eder)

ATHENS, February 13.—The ruling junta extended the Greek revolution today to one of this country's most persistent—and for many families, most troublesome—traditions.

Henceforth, an official announcement said, the Government will provide dowries to marriageable working girls.

The announcement was the latest of a series of measures taken by the junta to accentuate its portrayal of itself as the patron of the poorer classes and the enemy of the privileged.

Another measure was announced today that conveys even more sharply the sense of resentment felt by many junta officers, most of whom are of humble backgrounds, toward the wealthy classes of Athens.

This was a ruling that low-priced theater tickets, formerly available to workers only for Wednesday performances, will now be good any day of the week. Under the previous practice, the announcement indicated, wealthier patrons tended to stay away from the theater on Wednesdays.

Other measures announced today include free trips abroad for workers and free expeditions to points of interest in Greece. In addition, clubs for dock workers will be built in 17 port towns and day nurseries for working mothers will be opened.

The announcements did not indicate how many workers would actually benefit from the free trips, the dowries and the nurseries, nor how the hard-pressed budget would be expanded to pay for them.

There were indications, however, that employers would be pressed to support the dowry fund, at least. A $600,000 dowry fund, already set up by the Government, would seek employers' contributions, it was announced, and those who contributed would be given a special Labor Ministry merit flag.

The dowries given to factory and office girls would range up to the equivalent of $1,000. It was not clear on what basis higher or lower dowries would be assigned. Possibly a system akin to that used in the Greek Army will be adopted.

Under a joint contribution plan, the army provides dowries for the daughters of officers. These vary according to the fathers' rank, starting with a few hundred dollars for a lieutenant and ranging upward.

Some light was recently cast on this by Vice Premier Stylianos Patakos, who retired from the army with the rank of brigadier. When his daughter was married shortly afterward, Mr. Patakos, who is by far the chattiest member of the junta, revealed that he had made a financial sacrifice by retiring. As a brigadier, the dowry assigned to his daughter was $3,500. But if he had stayed in the army an imminent promotion to major general would have made it higher.

The dowry is obligatory at all levels of Greek society. The lack of one will make even a beautiful girl unmarriageable unless she emigrates and most working girls in shops and offices put aside part of their wages for their dowry.

The prevalence of the dowry was brought home sharply to one British diplomat at a farewell party just before he left Athens for another post. A Greek friend came up and told him that by leaving he was losing £5,000.

Why was that? the diplomat asked?

"As a British First Secretary, that is what you are worth if you marry into one of our families," his friend told him.

The diplomat was too tactful to ask what a French or Italian First Secretary was worth—they are, in fact, worth somewhat less—but he told a friend afterward that it was one of the more tangible satisfactions of his career.

LEADER IN GREECE SOLIDIFIES POWER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call attention to an article entitled "Leader in Greece Solidifies Power," written by Richard Eder, and published in the New York Times on February 16, 1968.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADER IN GREECE SOLIDIFIES POWER—PAPADOPOULOS'S ROLE BIGGER SINCE CONSTANTINE'S FLIGHT

(By Richard Eder)

ATHENS, February 15.—Some years ago, a visitor to a remote garrison in western Thrace was invited to join the officer's mess for dinner. As the conversation proceeded, an undercurrent of amiable mockery developed at the expense of one stocky officer.

"That's our Nasser," the visitor was told, amid general hilarity.

"The man sat there while this was going on," the visitor recalled later, "obviously aware that he was being ragged, but looking extraordinarily pleased at the same time."

The officer, who had been banished to the garrison from Athens because the Government suspected him of intrigue, was George Papadopoulos. Mr. Papadopoulos—he recently gave up his rank as colonel—led the coup of last April, became Premier in December after King Constantine had tried and failed to lead a countercoup, and appears likely to remain Greece's ruler for as long as anyone can foresee.

Many observers believe that before he has finished, Mr. Papadopoulos will have moved Greece on a course strikingly similar to that followed by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

There have been a number of changes in the position of the junta since the King fled to Rome Dec. 13, bringing down with his failure the remaining antijunta structure in the armed forces, and collapsing the hopes of the politicians that something would come along to put them back in power.

A SHIFT IN EMPHASIS

For one thing, the previous emphasis on the transitory nature of the junta's mission has been dropped. It became unnecessary once the junta no longer had to deal with the King and the moderate groups who wanted a rapid transition to a constitutional democracy.

A constitution is being prepared, but it is not expected to contain anything that would seriously hamper the exercise of power by the Government. There are signs that the junta is working to mobilize popular support as a first step toward holding elections that it can be certain of winning.

But its decision on elections—whether to hold them in the next year or so, as some officials are hinting, or to defer them for several years, as most observers expect it to do—is expected to be subordinated to the junta's determination to stay in power at all costs.

A second change has been in the junta's relations with the outside world. Although it has not turned neutralist, as some observers believe it will eventually, it has begun to play effectively on Western fears of such a shift.

As the weeks passed after the King's flight, and the Western countries continued to suspend their relations in the hope of getting him back, the junta let it be known that if recognition did not come soon, Premier Papadopoulos would be forced to make a statement reappraising Greece's foreign policy.

RELATIONS RESUMED

The rumored direction of this shift was toward France rather than the Soviet Union, but it was enough to convince Washington and London to resume normal relations. Western policy-makers, citing the case of President Nasser, contended that continued pressure on Greece would simply drive her in the wrong direction.

Two events this week demonstrated the new American attitude. Today Premier Papadopoulous, Deputy Premier Stylianos Patakos and Coordination Minister Nicholas Makarezos, along with several other leading members of the junta, spent the day aboard the United States carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt cruising in the Aegean Sea. They were the guests of the United States Ambassador Phillips Talbot, at lunch aboard the ship, and the atmosphere was one of cordiality.

Two days ago Ambassador Talbot gave a less elaborate reception aboard the carrier, which is paying a courtesy visit to Athens. The guests then were several powerful, though less prominent, members of the junta.

A third striking change has been in the public position of Mr. Papadopoulos. Until the King's attempted countercoup, everyone associated with the junta had insisted that its members were equals.

"Can you separate a drop of water?" Mr. Patakos once demanded of a reporter who asked him if some were more equal than others. It is now apparent that Mr. Papadopoulos is no longer being pictured as first among equals but simply as first.

The change was dramatized at a recent ceremony at the University of Athens. Always before, at public occasions, the triumvirate of officers at the head of the junta had made their entry together.

This time, Mr. Patakos and Mr. Makarezos entered the hall first, without causing too much stir. There was a pause, a rush of photographers, and then, to a rhythmic chant of "Papadopoulos!" the Premier came in.

But even though Mr. Papadopoulos continues to be the strongest figure in Greece and has undoubtedly strengthened his position since December, it is believed that important decisions are still reached only after discussion and agreement among the 30-odd officers of the Revolutionary Council.

The fact that the junta has vacillated in many policy decisions indicates that Mr. Papadopoulos cannot, or will not, impose his views against heavy opposition. Nor is he believed to have the power to purge other members of the junta who may disagree with him.

For four days in January, for example, a dispute over Mr. Papdopoulos's efforts to get other junta members holding Government posts to resign from the army rocked the council. While tanks maneuvered on the outskirts of Athens and newspapers received contradictory orders two and three times a night to print or not print photographs of Mr. Papadopoulos and his rivals, the argument continued.

It still is not clear whether all the officers have, in fact, complied.

A WORDY SPEAKER

In the light of all this, there is some question whether the public build-up of Mr. Papadopoulos represents his climb to supremacy or whether it is a junta decision that a leadership image is necessary if a firm popular following is to develop.

It is not certain that Mr. Papadopoulos, who all but winces when he meets an applauding crowd, will be able to fill the role of popular leader. His speeches are considered wordy, diffuse and full of obscure 19th-century turns of phrase not quite correctly rendered. He notably fails to stir audiences.

"He has always been a schemer and maneuverer," one Western military expert said recently. "In the army he was never really popular. He had a small group of devoted associates, men who now figure in the junta, and with these he was able to manage and trick larger and more important figures, often without their realizing it."

As for the junta's policies, the trend, despite many hesitations, appears to be away from an early emphasis on anti-Communism to a stress on the denunciation of corruption in the Greek ruling classes and upper bourgeoisie.

THE DOMINANT TONE

"We are no longer afraid of the Communists," Col. Ioannis Ladas said recently. The de facto head of the Ministry of Public Order and the security police, and one of the most powerful men in the junta, Colonel Ladas was talking to a journalist whom he had just released after having held him for 19 days without charges. It was not the Communists but the "corrupt national ruling classes we are fighting now," he said.

It is becoming clear that the dominant tone of the junta is not that of a right-wing officers' clique seeking to support the privileged as some thought in its early days. It is that of a deprived lower middle class whose instinctive anti-Communism is accompanied by a far more profound resentment of the rich.

Colonel Ladas's discussions with former political prisoners have not shown the inhibitions that make the junta's public speeches seem wordy and obscure. In a conversation with a jailed political leader, Colonel Ladas, recently gave voice to the radical undercurrent in the junta's thinking.

"Do not be deceived," he told him. "You think Papadopolous represents the lower classes in the army. Why, he is one of the elite. His father was a schoolteacher, after all. When I was a child I hardly had shoes, and there were times my breath stank with hunger. Do not think we are going to let the rich people keep their yachts."

This kind of sentiment is only part of the key to what may be expected of the junta. It must be contrasted, as must all of its more radical expressions, with the far more cautious character of its actions to date.

PROTEST MAY MODIFY REFORM

Of the popular measures it has taken—payment of pensions to farmers, dowries to working girls, limiting of worker discharges—none is particularly extreme. It has passed some harsh regulations about tax collection, but a wave of protest may well modify them. It has consistently proclaimed its determination to encourage and protect private enterprise, although some of its adherents want to break up the big banking establishments.

Its talk of pruning the bureaucracy is still little more than that, and one official estimated that in some departments as much as 80 per cent of the staff was excess.

It is only the junta's power that is growing steadily. The uses to which it will be put remain obscure, and if there is any principal conclusion among observers, it is that those who hold power are still timid about using it and uncertain what they want to do with it.

"If there is one factor that will bring down this Government," a diplomat observed recently, "it is not foreign hostility or internal opposition. It is its own inability to know its objectives or how much it wants to pay for them."

His point was that the conflict between the radical instincts and conservative ideology of the junta is apt, in time, to lead to desruptive internal conflict.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out a striking similarity between former colonel, now mister, Papadopoulos, the Premier of Greece, and Mr. Nasser, the dictator of Egypt. I think the similarity is very strong indeed.

I would like to note that the so-called constitution for Greece drawn by a number of eminent Greek jurists and lawyers has been rejected by the Greek junta which intends to form a constitution of its own, no doubt of a totalitarian nature.

Mr. President, I urge our Government not to give the Greek Government the benefit of our assistance. We have recognized them. Perhaps we had to as a matter of diplomacy, but I urge that the American people stand firm against this totalitarian junta which is destroying democracy in its land of birth.

INTERFERENCES WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will vote to sustain the majority leader on his motion to lay on the table the pending amendment on open housing.

I am a little bit impressed this morning with the evangelical spirit that seems to dominate the efforts of those who are trying to push that kind of amendment down the throats of millions of American people who do not want such an amendment.

I heard my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, a few minutes ago ask to have placed in the RECORD a news article to the effect that the citizens of Flint, Mich., in a referendum held yesterday had approved an open housing provision by a vote of 21,000 and something to a vote of 21,000 and something. I think there was a difference of some 27 votes between the majority, which favored open housing, and the minority, which did not.

There could not be a clearer showing on the floor that there is a great difference of opinion on the subject even in that community. I suspect that there is a great showing that the majority of the non-Negro people do not want open housing in Flint and that the time has come when the non-Negro population of this Nation cannot be heard and is not entitled to have its strong feelings felt.

I recall that in similar referenda held in Seattle, Tacoma, and in the State of California—now our greatest State in population—the people by sizable majorities went on record as being against open housing.

I remember that only recently in several suburbs of the great city of Chicago it was shown very clearly that the great majority of the white people there do not want open housing.

I recall that in the city of Milwaukee the same situation has been rather clearly shown through the news articles in recent months.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that it is not the proper function of Congress to ram down the throats of the majority of our people in many of our communities legislation in the social field which they do not believe in and do not support.

Mr. President, believing that, I shall, of course, vote for the motion to lay on the table the pending open-housing amendment, and I hope that it will be eliminated from the bill.

When the time comes that the elected representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the people of this Nation are not willing to use persuasion and the development of commonsense in affairs of this kind or advise them as to what their votes will be, it will be a sorry day in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Throughout the history of this Nation, it has always been one of our cardinal principles that persuasion rather than compulsion is the sound method to follow in legislation of this kind.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be laid on the table, and I do hope that my friends—and I see on his feet my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan—realize that such a vote as the Senator from Minnesota has had placed in the RECORD—supporting, he said, the feeling that there was a great wave of support for the adoption of open housing in this country—is based on a thin, attenuated margin of some 27 votes in a vote of over 42,000, which does not present to us a wise course to adopt and follow in this matter.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think we could argue for some months on the question of where the citizens of this country stand. The vote we have been discussing which occurred yesterday in Flint, Mich., followed several months of bitter and searching debate. The vote represents a decision on a matter involving strong feelings of the citizens in that community. However, the fact is that that is not the only evidence we have.

Nearly 20 States now have adopted strong fair-housing laws. My own State is one. These have been adopted after searching debate. They were adopted by the elected representatives.

Over 80 communities have such ordinances, and more and more communities every day are adopting fair-housing ordinances.

In relation to this issue, perhaps the most significant fact with relation to the support for fair housing is that even with the strongest fair housing proposal that has ever been presented in the U.S. Senate, 55 Senators, representing their States, voted to invoke cloture. There were 18 more Senators who voted aye than no. It was a clear and overwhelming majority. In addition, there were five other Senators who had announced pro fair-housing support who, because of absence or pairs, did not have the opportunity to vote. Thus, we have an expression of overwhelming support across this Nation for the principle of fair housing represented yesterday in the vote on the cloture motion.

If we are going to talk about what people want, as expressed through their elected representatives, in order to determine where people stand on the issue of fair housing, it is very clear that the majority favor fair housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, if I correctly quoted the article from which he read. I understood the Senator to say that 21,000-odd people had voted in favor of the proposal and that 21,000-odd people had voted against the proposal and that there was a difference between the majority and minority of less than 100 votes. I think the difference was 27 votes. Am I correct or incorrect?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. As I said, this followed on the heels of months of bitter debate. I think one should be surprised in such a poisoned environment to have such a referendum, filed in the way in which it was.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not think the city of Flint, Mich., is a poisoned environment. I think it consists of a very fine group of citizens, and I think that the quoted figures show very clearly that the great majority of non-Negro population of Flint, Mich., do not favor open housing.

I do not see how we could come to any other conclusion.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think more of the citizens of Flint today than I did yesterday, because they did, in fact, vote by a majority vote, however close, in favor of the fair housing principle.

I merely saw the Associated Press story. I could not tell how many Negroes voted one way or the other or how many white people voted one way or the other.

I do not believe such information is available to any of us. But I presented this as further evidence that there is growing support in this Nation for the principle of fair housing.

When you have nearly 20 States which, after long debate and discussion, have adopted fair-housing laws, when in each successive legislative session throughout the country more States adopt fair-housing laws—and they have improved upon the laws they did have—and when we saw yesterday a substantial and remarkable improvement in support of fair housing and an overwhelming vote in support of fair housing, I do not know how anyone can argue that the trend is not decidedly in favor of fair housing, and the forces in support of it are growing stronger as the facts are becoming known.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I say that 30 States of the 50 have not voted for open housing. I believe every one of them has had the opportunity to vote to do so in its legislature. My State has had the opportunity to do so, and has declined to do so. Many other States have had the opportunity and have declined to do so.

The fact is that where we have had referendums, the rule has been the other way—people have voted against open housing.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he will not debate the matter further. He feels that any effort that strives to push down people's throats a social measure of this nature, which is opposed by large groups of people and majorities in many States, is wrong and is not in accord with sound American principles.

PROPOSED TAX ON TRAVEL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 25, 1967, the International Union of Travel Organizations met in Tokyo, Japan. My attention has been called to a most interesting message which was sent to this organization by President Johnson wherein at that time he urged an expansion of world travel in order to promote international good will.

Three months later, on January 1, President Johnson had completely reversed this position and was asking the American people to stop international travel on the basis that it was resulting in a drain on our gold.

I read the President's message of September 25, 1967:

> As International Tourist year draws to a close it is fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the important task of promoting international goodwill through travel.
>
> This is no small undertaking. And it is worthy of our highest efforts and the unqualified cooperation of all nations. International travel helps satisfy a basic urge in man to learn more about his neighbor in a world which the jet age is making increasingly smaller.
>
> For the first time in history, millions of people have the opportunity to visit distant lands and examine other societies and cultures. World travel lights the way to world understanding. As we advance toward a new decade in which once-distant travel becomes commonplace, let us always hope that our journeys to faraway lands are journeys to a more peaceful, friendly world.
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
>
> THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 25, 1967*.

What concerns me is not so much this complete reversal of positions on the part of the Johnson administration—I am becoming accustomed to these yo-yo tactics—but what does concern me is this question:

Can it be possible that as late as September 25, 1967, the President of the United States had not been told of the alarming rate at which our gold was disappearing?

I am sure that Secretary Fowler will be anxious to explain this contradiction which he testifies before the Committee on Finance.

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH CHOSEN WOMAN OF THE YEAR BY CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES CLUB

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am sure it would be of interest to all Senators and the country that the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith] has been selected for another honor, this one of particular significance because it comes from employees on Capitol Hill.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith has been elected Woman of the Year by the Congressional Secretaries Club. The award will be appropriately presented to the Senator at dinner ceremonies on March 23. The senior Senator from Maine, the only lady Senator in the Nation, also has enjoyed the honor of being selected in past polls as one of the 10 most admired women in the world. The Senator is the first lady ever to be elected chairman, or should I say chairwoman, of her party's senatorial conference, or caucus. And I also might add that at the start of this week, the senior Senator from Maine has cast 2,716 rollcall votes in the Senate without a miss, an alltime Senate record.

NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER FACILITIES ACT OF 1967

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 12603.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12603) to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Randolph, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Boggs conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 6, the Senate voted to table the pending Ervin amendment. Before the vote was taken, I stated that I would vote against tabling. I stated that I was not sold on the Ervin amendment; and that if the motion to table should not prevail, I would join other Senators in seeking to perfect it.

I also expressed my uneasy feeling that if the motion should prevail, the work of the Senate leadership in trying to devise a compromise would go down the drain, or at least would be much more inhibited than would otherwise be the case.

Unfortunately, the motion to table did prevail. And my uneasy feeling has been well borne out. We are much farther from a compromise now than we were at that time.

I have the same feeling toward the pending amendment as I had toward the Ervin amendment. I cannot support it as it stands, but I would be willing to continue to do what I can to perfect it so that it would be something for which most of my colleagues could, in good conscience, vote.

The vote for cloture yesterday did not, by any means, indicate a vote in favor of the pending amendment; and it ill serves the cause of open housing to claim that it does, just as it ill serves that cause to superficially conclude that a vote against cloture yesterday was a vote against reasonable civil rights legislation.

I shall vote against tabling for the same reason that prompted me to vote against tabling the Ervin amendment. But I must at the same time make the harsh observation that there seems to have been a continuation of the unwillingness to compromise in order to make progress on the part of some of the proponents of both the bill and the pending amendment which has already done much damage and which, as I said yesterday, precludes those who wish to make progress and at the same time do so on a sound and workable basis from voting to close off debate.

I deeply regret that the Ervin amendment was tabled by a majority of my colleagues, because this action has only served to set back the possibility of compromise which is so necessary to the cause of progress in civil rights legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mrs. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator had been in the Chamber this morning when the colloquy between Senator Mondale and myself—he is the author of the amendment, together with Senator Brooke—made very clear that the sponsors intended to lay down before the cloture vote on Monday a different and what Senator Mondale called a reduced version of this housing amendment.

I would say to the Senator from Iowa that I am sure that the authors of the amendment would be very pleased to have this consultation and the Senator's views as to how he feels it should be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we should conclude this matter, because some Senators must leave.

I ask unanimous consent that 2 additional minutes be allowed, and no more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I never make moral judgments about votes. My colleague is fully entitled to vote as his conscience sees fit, for the benefit of his State. I believe that what he is expressing now is eminently reasonable, and I will pledge myself to do everything I can, as one of the Senators working on this measure, to hear his views and to endeavor to accommodate him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I was not directing my comments toward any particular proponent of either the pending amendment or the bill.

I wish to point out to the Senator from New York that while I am indeed looking after the best interests of the people I represent from my State, at the same time we do have an open housing statute on the books which was legislated in the last session of our Iowa Legislature; and so from that standpoint the people in Iowa, I think, are amply protected.

However, like all of us, we have to take a look at the Nation as a whole on some occasions, and that is what this is all about.

I wish to make one point clear. It is getting awfully late for compromise, and I think we are farther from the compromise than we were at the time the Ervin amendment was so unfortunately tabled.

I shall vote against tabling for the same reason I voted against tabling the Ervin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is the coauthor of the pending amendment, certainly oversimplifies the vote that was taken yesterday on cloture. That cloture petition was not filed against the amendment. It was filed against the bill, and so it takes with it everything that hinges on the bill. That amendment has been before the Senate for nearly 2 weeks. I have an idea that irritation and desire to get settled this business has as much to do with it as anything, rather than the merits or demerits of the amendment.

With respect to the amendment, what a colossal confession it is to take 2 weeks and come in here this afternoon and say that the author and his associates are now going to provide a very substantial modification in the amendment that is pending. If that is not a confession of weakness in their case, I do not know what it is. But it is a classic example of what happens when you try to write sensitive legislation on this floor before it has been adequately considered in a committee.

Mr. President, I made a list of what the purport is of all these other amendments. If they were written into this bill it would look like a Christmas tree, for sure.

And so, Mr. President, this ought to be tabled, and as a matter of fact the slate ought to be wiped clean so that we can make a fresh start. I want a bill, I want a good bill, a fair bill, an equitable bill, and an honest bill. I think it can still be done. It will take a lot of time, of course, but here the authors of this amendment today now confess that they are on bad ground and they want to give way and make a substantial modification as a lure for some votes. Mr. President, let us not be deluded as to the reason for what is happening here.

I had a visit with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] this morning. I assured him I would be glad to work with him and his associates to get something worked out that would be palatable and that we can sell to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the Senator speaks about luring votes I hope, as my leader, he is not beneath that himself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, not.

Mr. JAVITS. Indeed, I hope we will be successful in luring some. But I say to the Senator, apart from the fact I do not agree with him on this tabling motion, I welcome as most refreshing and promising his feeling that we should try to work something out. The Senator from Illinois, after all, was "Mr. Architect" in 1964. I think I have a right to hope he may be in 1968.

PROPOSED STUDY OF AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message; President Johnson proposed "a major study of automobile insurance." This support is welcomed by those of us who have been concerned with this national problem for some time. Following a year of preliminary and exploratory analysis of automobile insurance questions by the Committee on Commerce, I introduced, on December 14, 1967, a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) which would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses. Ten other Senators joined me in cosponsoring the joint resolution. They are: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. PASTORE. The Committee on Commerce will hold hearings on the joint resolution early this spring.

In this connection, the January 26, 1968, issue of Time magazine contains an excellent article entitled "The Business With 103 Million Unsatisfied Customers." The article gives a summary of the ills besetting the automobile insurance industry and of some of the cures that have been suggested. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESS WITH 103 MILLION UNSATISFIED CUSTOMERS

The grim statistics of highway travel in the world's most motorized society add up to an irresistible sales pitch for auto insurance. Cars have killed more Americans since 1900 than the death toll of all U.S. wars since 1775. Roughly 24 million cars crashed in 1966 alone, injuring 4,000,000 people, disabling 1,900,000 and killing 53,000.

The economic loss caused by this carnage is well over $12 billion a year, and there is no question that the U.S. desperately needs a highly effective auto-insurance system that would compensate traffic victims rapidly, fairly and at reasonable cost to policyholders. But there is no question, either, that the U.S. auto-insurance system is a model of expensive inefficiency. The country's 103 million drivers have every reason to complain.

In ten years, the average premium has soared 55%. Car owners who take out a standard 50/100/5 liability policy (on which the company will pay up to $50,000 to one injured person, a total of up to $100,000 to all persons injured in one accident, and up to $5,000 for property damage) are also likely to include comprehensive protection (fire, theft, etc.), plus a collision policy requiring them to pay the first $100 in repairs. In Los Angeles five years ago, that package cost $279 a year for a couple with an 18-year-old son, even though his high school driving course got them a 10% discount and he used their low-priced car for pleasure only. Today the cost is $342—up 23%. In Houston, the rate has risen 49%, to $284.40. Boston tops the U.S. with a yearly premium of $711—up 71%.

The price of auto insurance is so high that most people would like to find a way of passing it up. But even though New York, Massachusetts and North Carolina are the only states that make liability coverage compulsory, it is virtually unavoidable everywhere. An uninsured driver must buy it or post equivalent financial security as soon as he is involved in a serious accident or gets convicted of a serious driving offense. And whichever alternative he chooses, he is in trouble. With a damage claim hanging over his head, few if any insurers will accept him as a future risk. If he posts personal security, he may lose his home or savings.

PAINT IT RED

Insurance companies say they are losing their savings, too. Despite the steep rise in premiums, the industry colors itself a bright red. In ten years, physicians' fees have gone up 39% and hospital costs 92%. Weekly factory wages have risen 42%, boosting lost-income settlements. Typical repair bills have climbed more than 50%. As a result, the average bodily-injury claim is up 31%, the average property-damage claim 46%.

What such arithmetic means, say insurance men, is that from 1956 to 1966 the industry paid out $1.6 billion more in liability claims than it received in premiums. Critics answer that this "underwriting loss" actually stems from the unusual accounting used in seeking higher rates. For one thing, the companies put aside a large portion of their premiums as "unearned reserves," count them as a nontaxed liability—then invest them along with other reserves. And when it comes to setting rates, critics add, the companies refuse to consider their investment profits. Still the industry's overall profits are less than 6%—just about the lowest in any major U.S. business. It is only by dipping into investment income that many auto insurers stay in the black.

Chief source of their trouble is the widely misunderstood liability coverage—which is quite unlike other forms of insurance. When a person buys fire, medical or collision insurance, his company pays him directly for his losses. But a liability policy does not protect driver against the cost of injury to himself; it protects him against the possibility of having to pay for someone else's injuries in the event that a court finds him at fault. Once that happens, the driver's company must pay the judgment against him. And with its own money at stake, the company usually tries to beat down the victim's claims, however just. As damage awards mount, the industry compensates for its losses by raising everyone's premiums. But even when a company wins in court and does not have to pay a claim, it may still retaliate against its policyholder by canceling his insurance, a fate that makes other companies regard him as such a poor risk that he finds it very hard to buy a new policy.

PREFERRED RISKS

Compounding this recipe for hostility between all parties is the difficulty of assessing the legal responsibility for auto accidents. In the six states* that have "comparative negligence" laws, a victim who is partly responsible for a crash can recover a proportionate percentage of his losses. In the other 44 states, unless the victim can prove that the policyholder was entirely at fault—and that he himself was utterly blameless—the company need not pay him a cent. Indeed, the worse the accident—a ten-car chain collision, for example—the more difficult it is to pin sole blame on one driver and reimburse anyone. If a driver has a heart attack and his car mounts a curb, hitting ten pedestrians, who is at fault? No one. Who gets paid? No one.

Almost inevitably, the fault system results in wildly erratic settlements. Insurance companies are notorious for overpaying small "nuisance" claims because it would cost more to fight them than to settle. At the same time, the seriously injured victim with high economic losses is often unable to wait for his case to come to trial and is forced to settle for whatever the company offers. If he does gamble on going to court, he may lose the case and get nothing. On the other hand, if he wins he may hit the jackpot.

So much money is involved that it seems to nourish corruption. There are adjusters who take bribes to settle cases, plaintiffs who file inflated claims, witnesses who remember the unrememberable, doctors who commit perjury, and lawyers who squander their talents working for contingent fees (30% of what they win for their clients), which now provide roughly one-third of the U.S. bar's total income.

So great is the cost of lawyers' fees and overhead that it takes an estimated $2.20 in premiums and taxes to get $1 to an accident victim. (Blue Cross delivers $1 in benefits for $1.07.) Nor is inefficiency the only drawback of the ponderous system. Although only 5% of auto cases ever reach trial, they still pre-empt about 65% of the nation's civil-court calendars. It now takes 2½ years to get a civil case tried in most cities.

The fault system also forces insurers to compete almost entirely for "preferred risks"—drivers who seldom drive and people most likely to impress juries if they do get into trouble. As a result, thousands of unpreferred motorists have been unceremoniously stripped of their policies or forced to pay sky-high surcharges, not only because of accidents, but sometimes because they happen to live in "red line" (claim-prone) areas or belong to supposedly risky groups—a category that includes the young, the old, Negroes, actors, barbers, bartenders, sailors, soldiers and men with frivolous nicknames like "Shorty." Divorcees are often blackballed because they might irk women jurors; doctors and clergymen are frowned upon as "preoccupied" drivers. A Manhattan lawyer was banned after someone hit his car in his apartment-house parking lot while he was upstairs asleep; a California housewife with a perfect driving record lost her policy because her husband was a Navy medic—driving an ambulance in Viet-Nam.

---

*Arkansas, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

All states have "assigned-risk" plans, requiring every insurance company to accept a quota of castoffs, whom they sometimes charge 150% above standard rates for minimum coverage. For some accident-prone drivers, even that price may be a bargain, but insurance companies have been so fast and loose about canceling policies that many of those dumped into the assigned-risk pool do not deserve it. In 1964–65, for example, almost 70% of New York's assigned-risk drivers had clean driving records.

PAINLESS FINANCE

Problems have proliferated so rapidly that soon only the Government may be able to handle the financial hazards of auto insurance. But how? In 1869, the Supreme Court ruled that "insurance is not commerce," thus exempting it from federal antitrust laws and congressional regulation of interstate commerce. In 1945, after the court had reversed itself, the McCarran-Ferguson Act put all insurance under state supervision. But many Congressmen now believe that the states are flunking the auto-insurance part of their job. A Senate subcommittee has called for a "root and branch" investigation of the entire industry. President Johnson echoed the request in his State of the Union message last week, and Senate hearings are due this spring. One likely result is that the McCarran-Ferguson Act may be amended to impose federal standards on lax state insurance commissions.

As if to ward off that result, more state commissions are holding public rate hearings, denying premium boosts and ordering insurers to specify their reasons for cancellations and nonrenewals. But none of this will lower the price of insurance. As cancellations decrease, the industry will find itself handling more high-risk drivers and paying out more in damages. To reduce their losses, they will be forced to raise premiums still higher.

Somehow the industry must be helped to cut its costs. One obvious step is tighter state driver-licensing—or even a federal license for all U.S. drivers. If 20% of the country's drivers lost their licenses, says the Stanford Research Institute, the accident rate would go down 80%.

Some critics urge the Federal Government to do the insurance industry a favor and take over the auto-accident business entirely. Urban Specialist Daniel P. Moynihan, who chairs a federal auto-safety advisory committee, suggests a federal insurance system modeled on workmen's compensation, with awards made strictly on the basis of loss rather than fault. "Financing such a system," he argues, "might be the easiest part of all." Some $3.4 billion a year in gasoline taxes is already being spent to build the Interstate Highway System. When the system is finished in 1973, Moynihan would simply raise the gas tax a penny or so a gallon and switch the revenue to insurance, for which motorists would pay no other premium.

There are serious objections to Moynihan's nonfault Government insurance scheme, however tidy it sounds. For one thing, it would be fought hard by the oil industry, which aches to repeal the present gas tax. For another, it might be so financially painless that U.S. drivers would tend to worry less about their liability for accidents. And Government insurance might become a political football as legislators vied to curb needed rate raises.

Most experts still feel that private enterprise, with all its built-in advantages of business competition, should be given a second chance rather than a death sentence. They argue that the way to cut auto-insurance costs is to design a system that automatically compensates most victims regardless of fault, and still gives them the option of going to court to ask for more. Such mixed systems are already operating in several other countries, notably in Canada's Saskatchewan Province, where auto insurance costs two-thirds as much as identical coverage in adjoining North Dakota.

A much discussed mixed system geared to the U.S. is now being advocated by Law Professors Robert E. Keeton of Harvard and Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois. In their book *After Cars Crash*, they propose a novel form of auto insurance called "Basic Protection," which would pay benefits more widely and efficiently, yet preserve both private enterprise and the right to file lawsuits for severe injury and economic loss.

Under B.P., all motorists would carry compulsory insurance that started paying victims immediately, regardless of who was at fault. The injured motorist, his passengers and any pedestrians he hit would be paid directly by his own insurance company—not the other fellow's—up to $10,000 per person and $100,000 per accident, mainly for medical expenses and wage losses up to $750 a month. Collateral benefits from Blue Cross and other sources, which juries are not permitted to consider when setting awards, would be deducted from B.P. payments; but such collateral coverage would entitle motorists to lower premiums. B.P. would also exclude property damage and payment for pain and suffering, which the authors consider a boondoggle in most cases. Even so, motorists could insure themselves and their families at extra cost against pain, inconvenience and "catastrophe" losses above $100,000.

OUT OF BUSINESS

If a victim's losses exceeded B.P. limits, he could still go to court and sue for damages above $10,000, plus pain and suffering, if it amounted to more than $5,000. In turn, a B.P.-insured motorist would be personally liable for paying judgments exceeding those amounts.

Some experts claim that B.P. would cut insurance costs as much as 25%, while compensating 25% more victims. A few top companies favor parts of the plan; Insurance Company of North America has run newspaper ads supporting it. Pessimistic insurance men, however, foresee costlier, slower claim procedures, rising payments to now uncompensated victims—and no letup in accident suits because claims above B.P. would still attract swarms of contingent-fee lawyers. The American Trial Lawyers Association (the negligence bar) does not agree. It seems to fear that B.P. would put them out of business. In fact, after the scheme won the support of 250 Boston lawyers last summer and unexpectedly swept past the lower house of the Massachusetts legislature, a lobby of panicked negligence lawyers killed it in the state senate. The plan is pending or soon to be introduced in the legislatures of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Wisconsin—in all of which negligence lawyers are fighting it.

Whatever the outcome, debate over the Keeton-O'Connell plan ought to spur auto insurers to self-reform. Some big companies have already moved toward nonfault by using an "advance payments" plan: if their policyholder is clearly liable, the victim is immediately paid for his out-of-pocket losses—without being asked to waive his right to any future settlement. The companies report that such claimants seldom sue later on. Other companies, notably State Farm Mutual and Allstate, have cut overhead by using computerized billing and their own low-commission salesmen rather than outside agents. Auto insurers might also save the public millions by selling group policies to companies and unions. Beyond that, they could swing their weight behind safer car design. If auto insurers offered big discounts for cars with easily repaired fenders or sturdy bumpers of uniform height, Detroit might soon find that it would pay to provide them.

The trouble is that many of these ideas are still just that—ideas. With bright exceptions, too many auto insurers refuse to believe that sweeping reform is needed, that exasperated motorists across the land are awakening to the suggestion that far better coverage is possible.

Two courses are open. One is Government auto insurance, which the industry dreads as a door-opener to further Government intervention in the insurance business. The other is fast industry action proving that private enterprise can best serve the motoring public. In every state legislature, the industry can and should unite to pit its great lobbying power against the negligence lawyers and in favor of a nonfault system—the Keeton-O'Connell plan, perhaps or an even better one, if insurance experts can devise it.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on January 31 of this year, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations submitted its Ninth Annual Report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members will recall that the Commission was established by Congress in 1959 "to give continuing attention to intergovernmental problems in Federal-State, Federal-local, and State-local, as well as interstate and interlocal relations."

The Advisory Commission is composed of representatives of the public and from each level of government. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I have served on the Commission since its establishment. On the House side, Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, and Representative DWYER, of New Jersey, are also charter members. The other House member is Representative ULLMAN, of Oregon.

In addition to the six members of the Congress, the Commission has three members from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders, and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members, one of whom is the Commission's Chairman.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's Eighth Annual Report. It is appropriate then that the Senate be apprised of the Commission's activities during the last 12 months. The Honorable Farris Bryant of Florida was appointed Chairman of the Commission last year and is providing outstanding leadership—initially as a representative of the Federal executive branch and presently as a public member. Mr. William G. Colman, the Commission's Executive Director, continues his capable handling of the Commission's staff work.

During 1967, general meetings of the Commission were held in April, July, and October; and this year in February. Two major reports requiring implementation were adopted during the course of the 1967 sessions: the first deals with "State and Local Taxation and Industrial Location." The second is a far-reaching study of "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System" and explores the size, shape, and significant features of fiscal federalism; the history, development, and present operation of the Federal grant-in-aid system; fiscal disparities among local governmental jurisdictions within metropolitan areas; and in-depth case studies of central city-suburban disparities in 12 selected metropolitan areas. The latter report will be published in the very near future. Information reports issued by the Commission last year included: "A Handbook for Interlocal Agreements and Contracts," "1968 State Legislative Program," and "Proceedings: National Conference on Legislative Leadership, October 13–14, 1967."

Senators will be interested in what has occurred as a result of these and earlier reports, as well as of other Commission activities. Since it is a continuing body, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations does more than simply draft studies and make recommendations. Its members are desirous to see their recommendations put into effect and have devoted a significant share of their energies to encouraging adoption of Commission proposals at the relevant levels of government. In this respect, I strongly urge my colleagues to review pages 25 through 35 of the report.

Finally, Mr. President, the Ninth Annual Report of the ACIR sets forth "Highlights in Intergovernmental Relations in 1967" which already have received considerable attention in various quarters and serve as a succinct chronicle of the challenges that confronted American federalism during the past year. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the report be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SOME HIGHLIGHTS IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN 1967

In 1967, the American political system—and in turn, federalism and the federal system—was on trial as never before in the Nation's history with the sole exception of the Civil War. The major crisis threatening the political system and, indeed, the whole fabric of American society, was in the Nation's cities. The crisis was characterized by serious rioting, the breakdown of law and order, and in a number of areas, the disappearance of any meaningful sense of community among the residents of blighted neighborhoods.

URBAN AMERICA: CITIES IN DISTRESS

Racial unrest and civil disorder

During 1967 some of the worst racial disturbances in the Nation's history broke out in many cities of the country: Newark, Detroit, Omaha, Minneapolis, Wichita, Rochester, and many other places, large and small, across the country suffered outbreaks of violence, burning, and looting. The National Guard was called out in a number of States to suppress the rioting, and Federal troops were sent into Detroit.

The immediate response generally was one of bewilderment and often outrage coupled with uncertainty as to what could be done to restore social health to the stricken cities. Contributing most to this uncertainty was the apparent lack of a clear link of cause and effect. A history of neglect and disregard for the welfare of minority groups in Newark contrasted with Detroit's record of continued concern with, and steady improvement in race relations over a period of several years. Yet both suffered greatly from the rioters and looters. There was concern at all levels of government lest accelerated action on programs for central city rebuilding be construed by some as "rewarding the rioters." In general, the effect of the riots upon Federal, State and local governmental action was to weaken "welfare" measures and to toughen "police" measures.

From the standpoint of federalism, a significant feature of the racial unrest and civil disorder was the tendency of local officials and news media to speak almost entirely in terms of remedial action by the Federal Government, occasioned perhaps by the feeling that only through access to Federal financing could sufficient resources be mobilized. Paradoxically, the apparent reason for much of the dissatisfaction of minority groups in the cities was and is rooted in local government structure and fiscal arrangements—including the "white noose" of the suburbs, under-financing of central city schools, inadequate housing, unbalanced patterns of State aid, and repressive restrictions upon the administration of public welfare. These and other sources of unrest stem primarily from State constitutions and statutes and are not directly controllable by Federal law or regulation.

Economic and fiscal crisis of central cities

During 1967, subjective and statistical evidence piled high to dramatize the fact that many central cities of the Nation are facing not only a desperate social and political crisis, but dire economic and fiscal difficulties as well. Few could ignore that elementary and secondary education in the central city ghettos would have to be strengthened greatly in fiscal resources and in quality of teachers if Negroes and other minority group children were to have an even break upon graduation from high school.

Yet, a study of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, covering the 37 largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the country, showed that State financial aid to local schools tended to favor suburban schools over central city schools. Hardly any States have revised their school aid formulas to recognize specifically the much higher financial investment required to educate disadvantaged children. Added cost accrue for smaller classes to assure more individualized attention, for keeping school open longer hours, for offering additional recreational opportunities and for measures required to compensate for an inadequate home environment. The Commission's studies show that the schools serving low income central city children are receiving less per pupil as well as per capita than those serving the more affluent suburbs. *It is the paradox of education in metropolitan America that where the needs are greatest, the resources are scarcest; the children needing education the most are receiving the least!*

Need for a new look at urban-rural population balance

The year 1967 witnessed a growing consensus on the need for re-examining Federal, State and local policies—as well as activities in the private sector—that tend to influence the distribution of population in the United States. There was growing recognition of the tremendous future costs involved in the inmigration to large central cities of low income, nonwhite populations from small towns and rural counties across the country. A number of people, including the Secretary of Agriculture, began to underscore the long-range benefits both from a social and fiscal viewpoint of retaining and attracting an increasing share of the future population to small town and rural America.

In a similar vein, recognition was being given to the diseconomies of congestion—transportation costs, environmental pollution and higher living costs incident to further concentration of population in large metropolitan centers. As the year drew to a close, however, new questions were being asked about a theory of population redeployment. Some contended that the problem of the hour was to meet present urban needs and that "keeping people down on the farm" would not cover the great fiscal and social deficits arising from the masses of underprivileged urban in-migrants who are already in the large metropolitan centers and are likely to remain there regardless of how much progress is made in industrializing the countryside. Others contended that alternative migration patterns can and must be encouraged, but that public policy and funds should be directed only toward "natural growth centers." Still others argued that to achieve balanced rural growth, private and public efforts must reach first into the hard core rural pockets of poverty.

Rising crime and juvenile delinquency

As the year progressed, there was growing concern about the continued increase in the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency. This increase occurs not only in the urban centers, but continuing a trend of several years, is found in the suburbs and rural areas as well.

Early in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice delivered an impressive report backed by a considerable number of in-depth studies of particular areas of this vital subject. Many recommendations were submitted; those dealing with Federal action were couched in fairly specific terms while those dealing with State and local action were somewhat more general. As the year progressed, however, the question of how to improve State-local relations in this field began to receive attention comparable to that focused on improving Federal-State relations. Questions arose in connection with the Administration's Crime Control and Safe Streets bill as to whether Federal grants for assistance to law enforcement activities should go to the States or directly to localities. Part of the argument advanced against using State government as an intermediary in this process was the fact that only a limited number of States possessed an overall police and law enforcement capability.

State Attorneys General, in addition to concerning themselves with the impact of court decisions upon law enforcement and with other means of attacking the growth of crime and juvenile delinquency, have become increasingly concerned with the relationship between the State Attorney General and local prosecutors and police. Similarly, the relationship of the State police to county sheriffs and municipal police officers has come in for increasing attention. There is little doubt that the field of law enforcement and administration of justice offers one of the most difficult and challenging areas of intergovernmental cooperation in the United States today.

Increasing involvement of private enterprise in urban problems

The urban riots of 1967 produced wide disagreement on many points. One point of consensus, however, did emerge—the restoration of vitality in the Nation's urban areas is an assignment surpassing the present capabilities of any one level of government and even of all levels acting collectively. It was increasingly agreed that private enterprise must become more deeply involved in urban problems if these problems are to become manageable and if the metropolitan areas themselves are to remain governable.

At year's end signs were appearing of a dedication on the part of many large business and financial institutions to the amelioration of the problems rending the political and social fabric of the Nation's cities. The decision of a number of insurance companies to assist in financing low income housing through rent supplements and other devices, and the active involvement of a large number of businessmen in the "Urban Coalition" formed at the height of the summer's rioting were decidedly encouraging developments.

A possible barrier to private enterprise cooperation in the solution of urban problems, however, was identified during the course of the year. A number of State constitutions forbid any commingling of public and private funds for public purposes. These constitutional restrictions date back to the railroad scandals of the middle and late 1800's. The New York Constitutional Convention proposed in the document placed before the voters of the State (which was rejected for other reasons) that the State give positive authorization and encouragement to public-private participation in programs designed to serve a public purpose.

Rent supplements come of age

The first session of the 90th Congress again saw a "Perils of Pauline" drama in regard to rent supplements. As in both sessions of the 89th Congress, the question repeatedly before each House was: "Shall this program survive?"

The Rent Supplement Program is one of the most crucial—and controversial—weapons in the attack on the so-called "metropolitan problem." One of the major elements in the problem is the increasing disparity—economic, social and fiscal—between the central city and many of its surrounding suburbs. Housing in many suburban communities is priced at a figure completely out of reach of low income families. In effect a fiscal and economic wall is constructed around the central city which reserves the suburbs for the middle and higher income portions of the urban population.

During its first session, the 89th Congress enacted a rent supplement plan making possible the housing of low income people in the more prosperous communities without risking the fierce emotional opposition that public housing projects often arouse. The program encourages private nonprofit organizations to provide housing rather than expanding the role of government in the construction and management of additional public housing facilities. Because the rent supplement program can have the effect of dispersing low income families throughout the metropolitan area, the program itself faces continued opposition from suburban constituencies. Some of the opposition seems to be racist in motivation. In 1967, however, following a summer of rioting, there came a growing recognition that someday, somehow the "white noose" around the central city ghettos would have to be cut.

A crucial factor in the battle for new appropriations for the rent supplement program was the decision of a number of large insurance companies to make use of the program and to pool resources in a cooperative effort to provide over $1 billion worth of low income housing for central city neighborhoods.

While it is too early to predict success for the rent supplement program, the participation of large business enterprises in the program and the provision of sufficient appropriations to finance the housing of a sizeable number of people should begin to remove the program from those "infant mortality" risks which beset any new and innovative endeavor—public or private.

Growth of metropolitan councils of government

1967 witnessed the formation of a large number of regional councils of elected officials in the Nation's larger metropolitan areas. These bodies commonly known as "councils of government" or COG's owe their establishment to two major factors: First, there was and is a growing recognition on the part of metropolitan and suburban residents alike of the necessity of cooperation in the carrying out of a number of highly complex and interrelated governmental programs in the large metropolitan areas. It has come to be recognized that the right hand must know with reasonable assurance what the left hand is doing as multitudes of local governments function side by side in the large metropolitan centers.

Second, a provision incorporated in the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1965—Section 204—required, beginning July 1, 1967, the review and comment by an areawide body upon certain Federal grant-in-aid applications from political subdivisions of metropolitan areas. The activation of Section 204 in mid-year required that where no such body was in existence, an appropriate body had to come into existence lest all political subdivisions in the metropolitan area find themselves cut off from possible Federal aid for a variety of physical development projects in the future.

The general tendency in a number of areas was to turn to a body of elected officials as the new instrumentality rather than an appointive body of city planners. However, in some instances it was impossible to obtain interlocal agreement on a body prior to the July 1 deadline. In these cases existing or new bodies were designated by the Governors as the agencies to exercise the review and comment functions under the Act. All told, however, only 33 COG's were so designated out of a total of 203 designees. It is too early to forecast whether in time COG's or independent planning agencies will emerge as the "chosen instrument" to perform the review and comment function.

In April, with the assistance of a grant from the Ford Foundation, a conference of representatives of Councils of Government from over the country was held in Washington. At this conference the potentialities and limitations of COG's were explored frankly. It was agreed generally that these bodies had a number of potentialities, with each metropolitan community deciding for itself how strong or how passive it desired the COG to be. As was stated on one occasion a COG can be "anything from an Elk's lodge to a metropolitan government."

Manning the ramparts of local government

Throughout the year, principal attention from the news media and the public was directed to the cities that happened to be in trouble that day or that week. Naturally, but regrettably, attention passed over the continuing evidences of able and responsible government in the midst of adversity. Much more was written about why things went wrong in Cavanagh's Detroit than why they did not go badly wrong in Lindsay's New York or Tate's Philadelphia, or Daley's Chicago, or countless other places. Excepting only the Presidency, the position of big city mayor was the toughest around in 1967, for in many cases the ultimate in effort, dedication and ability failed to stem a rising tide of disaffection. The ordeal of the mayors and of the officials of the large urban counties merited—and generally received—an understanding response from other levels of government.

STATE GOVERNMENT—A NEW FRONTIER

It is becoming increasingly apparent that a considerable portion of the "infrastructure" of metropolitan problems is soluble only by State action. Restrictions upon the debt carrying and taxing capacities of local governments; criteria for annexation of unincorporated areas; standards for the exercise of zoning powers; machinery for adoption and enforcement of building and housing codes; the ease or difficulty with which small suburban communities may be incorporated; the independence or dependence provided in the inherent powers of local governments in metropolitan areas—all of these very crucial determinants of the social, political, and economic fate of central cities is a matter of State constitutions or statute.

Gubernatorial concern

Indicative of the extremely broad range of needed State action in dealing with the problems of the cities, were the recommendations advanced in a report prepared for the Committee on State-Urban Relations of the National Governors' Conference, headed by Governor Richard Hughes of New Jersey. The report offered eighty-five specific proposals for State government action ranging from studies and reappraisals of local governmental structure to State financing of rent supplements, to revision of condemnation policies and procedures. The report constituted a highly useful checklist for concerned Governors, State legislative leaders and local officials. In addition, the Federal-State Relations Committee of the National Governors' Conference prepared a special report entitled "Call and Commitment," which listed a long series of steps desirable for consideration by governments at all levels.

In a related development last summer, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York initiated the establishment of a State-Urban Action Center to be responsible for developing tools and providing technical assistance to Governors and State legislative leaders seeking solutions to urgent urban problems. The Center is being financed initially with private foundation support and is established under a bipartisan board of trustees. The cochairmen are former New York City Mayor Robert Wagner and former Minnesota Governor Elmer L. Anderson. The Center has opened offices in both New York City and Washington.

Institutes for excellence in State government

Under the leadership of former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford, and with financial support from the Ford and Carnegie Foundations, the first of what eventually will be a series of institutes for State government was established at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill—an institute for State planning. Each institute is to be a center for research and the developer of tools and techniques for improving State government. Each is to be university based, to have a small professional staff, and to be governed by a board of trustees including ex-Governors and other prominent persons. Each institute, after completing its research and preparing recommendations for consideration by the States will go out of operation; the maximum life of an institute is to be five years. Through this process it is hoped that the best minds and resources can be brought to bear upon critical problems of State government and the best of experience of each State made available to the others.

Governor Sanford's unique "Institute for State Programming in the Seventies" was only one aspect of his broader "Study of American States." He also was a prime mover in the establishment of the "Education Commission of the States" of which 45 States now are members. Set up by interstate compact, the Commission provides machinery for the States to pool information and resources and share experiences in the field of education. In addition, Governor Sanford's well received book *Storm Over the States* was released in October 1967. It presents a perceptive analysis of the role of State government in the federal system and offers politically practical recommendations for buttressing federalism by strengthening the States.

Establishment of Washington office of National Governors' Conference

In March the National Governors' Conference opened a Washington office. The office was charged with following closely developments at the Federal level affecting the States, and with serving as the staff arm of the National Governors' Conference in the area of Federal-State relations. The office immediately launched an aggressive program of action.

Through the Federal Office of Emergency Planning and the new Governors' Conference office, States were urged to designate "Federal-State Coordinators." Significantly, the number of States with designated "Coordinators" increased from fewer than a dozen at the beginning of 1967 to 46 at the end of the year. During 1967, two conferences of these coordinators were held. The two conferences served as forums within which Federal agencies described their programs and representatives of States raised questions and voiced criticisms and suggestions.

The new office initiated a weekly newsletter to the Governors alerting them to upcoming hearings, Congressional votes and prospective administrative actions. Through the efforts of the Office, views of Governors on pending issues were assembled and presented to the Executive and Legislative branches of the National Government.

Rapidly increasing taxes and expenditures of State governments

The year 1967 saw greater receptivity on the part of citizens with respect to bond issues and new taxes:

Record tax increases were voted in a number of States.

Borrowings to assist local government also reached record proportions.

California's Governor Reagan proposed and the legislature approved tax increases of around $1 billion a year, the largest State tax increase in the Nation's history.

New York State voters approved a $2.5 billion bond issue to be used for a variety of State and local purposes in the field of transportation, including sizeable amounts for urban mass transportation. This was the largest State government bond issue in the Nation's history.

Approximately 85 percent of the bond issues placed before the people in 1967 were approved in contrast to 1966 when barely half of the bond issues were approved. (There were exceptions to the 1967 trend—in California, nearly 60 percent of the issues were rejected.)

New financing and new programs authorized by the legislatures of the various States in 1967 were in striking contrast to the "hold the line" stance of the first session of the 90th Congress. Many new programs in the field of domestic government in the United States were undertaken by the States and the local governments, in contrast to a relative *status quo* situation at the National level.

Increased concern of business organizations with State and local government problems

A new force in the modernization of State and local government emerged in 1967. The business community displayed active support for an increased role in the federal system for State and local government, especially the latter. Often in the past, business organizations have objected to new Federal programs on the grounds that they represented an unwarranted intrusion into what was more properly a sphere of State government activity. All too often, however, the same organizations or their State counterparts would go before State legislative committees and oppose State government programs directed to the same general objectives on the ground that the best government was the least government.

The year just closed, however, saw a "crossing of the Rubicon." The Committee for Economic Development, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers took important steps to marshal support in the business community for grass root efforts to strengthen and modernize State and local government and to utilize the fiscal resources needed at those levels to deal effectively with emerging problems.

The Committee for Economic Development for several years had been concerned with the antiquated structure of State and local government. Its 1966 report on the *Modernization of Local Government* received extremely wide notice throughout the United States. A second report offering *A Fiscal Program For A Balanced Federalism* was issued in June 1967. In it, CED urged Congress to strengthen State tax capabilities by giving taxpayers partial Federal income tax credits for State income tax payments.

A month later, in July 1967, CED released its report on the *Modernization of State Government*, which called for the general reforms that political scientists have urged for several decades—shortening the ballot; strengthening the power of the Governor to budget, to appoint, and to reorganize; and most importantly, rejuvenating the State legislature as an important force in the American federal system.

Later in the year the Chamber of Commerce of the United States adopted a policy statement favoring structural improvements in State government similar to those enunciated in the CED report. The Chamber had earlier established a unit within its organizational structure responsible for State and local government modernization and had conducted small conferences in nearly all States with State and local Chamber executives, municipal league and county association directors and others for the purpose of explaining and developing support for the new program.

1967 also marked a growing concern on the part of the National Association of Manufacturers with regard to problems of federalism, particularly the strengthening of State and local government. An intergovernmental relations newsletter was initiated and a person responsible for following problems of federalism and of State and local government modernization was added to the Washington office of the Association.

State constitutional revision

In terms of State constitutional revision, 1967 was a "mixed bag." The greatest disappointment of the year came with the performance of the New York State Constitutional Convention. Dogged at the outset by partisan bickering and presented at the end with a "take it or leave it" package of very controversial proposals, the new constitution went down to a resounding defeat at the polls. On a lesser scale and despite three years of labor the initial draft of the proposed Rhode Island constitution was referred back to the Constitutional Convention for revision—since it faced near certain defeat at the polls. A vote now has been scheduled for April 1968. On the more hopeful side, several States adopted individual constitutional amendments which called for general constitutional revision or adopted piecemeal revisions of their constitutions. At the end of the year, 22 States were engaged in either overall or limited constitutional revision activity.

State legislatures began to assume a role of increased significance in the federal system during 1967. This was occasioned partly by the influx of new, younger members as a result of "one man-one vote" reapportionment. Partly it reflected a growing recognition on the part of the American business community that strong State legislatures are essential to responsive State government and that responsive State government is essential to a strong America.

The activities of the Citizens Conference for State Legislatures, and the "self-starting" efforts of many legislatures for a self-appraisal all began to bear fruit. An improvement in public climate could be detected in terms of a desire to unshackle the State legislatures—at least to some extent—and to permit them to operate as strong and effective lawmaking bodies.

Increasing State financial assistance to urban areas

The Commission stated in its *Eighth Annual Report* that the "wholesale involvement and participation by the State in the functions of urban government continued to be the exception rather than the rule. At year's end in 1966 only eight States were assisting financially in the construction of local sewage treatment plants." At year's end in 1967, 20 States were rendering such financial assistance. It is true that the dramatic increase in State financial participation in municipal water pollution abatement could be traced at least partially to a special incentive provision for State government participation contained in the Water Quality Act of 1965. Nevertheless, it was apparent that State governments were showing willingness to issue bonds and to raise taxes in order to begin to fulfill one of the long neglected functional responsibilities of State government. In one area—Chicago—Mayor Richard Daley was one of the principal catalyzing forces hurrying along a lagging interstate effort needed to begin cleaning up lower Lake Michigan.

In other fields as well, the number of States participating in a meaningful financial way in areas previously dominated by Federal-local relationships was encouraging. Eight States were giving financial assistance to urban mass transportation, and eleven States were giving similar assistance in the field of urban renewal. (See Appendix B.)

So by the end of 1967, while "wholesale involvement and participation by the State in the functions of urban government" continued to be the exception rather than the rule, the pattern seemed to be changing. In another year or two such participation may become the rule rather than the exception. When States involve themselves in large-scale programs of financial assistance to urban communities many of the arguments of political scientists, State officials, and others against the so-called "bypassing" of the States in Federal-local programs will become academic. When the States become financially involved, they will begin to control the channeling of Federal aid funds to urban areas.

Meanwhile, many State leaders continued to assert that the States should be the "prime contractor" for all Federal grants—including grants to localities—regardless of whether they provide some of the matching funds. In Washington this view had more support in the House than in the Senate or the Administration—as witnessed by the passage by the House of the Cahill Amendment to the "crime control" bill and the near-passage of the Quie Amendment to the elementary and secondary education bill.

However, there seemed little likelihood that the Administration would countenance a "State's rights" policy on Federal grants, and votes to spare in the Senate were available to block such an approach. On the other hand, the Administration was showing signs of agreeing to a policy of State channeling if particular States would "buy in" to the particular programs.

Establishment of State departments of urban affairs and community development

In 1967 the trend continued toward the establishment of more State agencies concerned with local government and urban affairs. The principal newcomers were: (1) Missouri which established a full-fledged State Department of Community Development; (2) Washington which set up a similar department; (3) Ohio which created a State Bureau of Urban Affairs; and (4) Connecticut which launched a well financed Department of Community Development. Several States in addition to those mentioned made organizational arrangements during 1967 for increased attention to problems of urban and local government. In Michigan, Governor Romney repeatedly called for creation of a Department of Urban Affairs but has not yet received legislative approval of the proposal.

The preference in 1967 seemed to be for full-fledged "line" departments with substantive and financial responsibilities, in contrast to the strictly technical assistance and advisory functions performed by the so-called "offices of local affairs" typified by the Office of Local Government in the State of New York—one of the pioneers in this field. (A tabulation of State agencies showing the functions exercised is contained in Appendix C.)

Stalemate on State taxation of interstate commerce

Turning now to more negative aspects of the evolution of the concept of "States' responsibilities as well as States' rights," a near-stalemate continued in the very difficult and controversial question of State taxation of corporations doing business in more than one State. H.R. 2158 by Representative Willis of Louisiana based upon a study conducted by a special subcommittee on the House Judiciary Committee was pending in the House Rules Committee from late July on to the end of the year. Opposition to any further Federal enactments in this field was led by the Council of State Governments. It offered instead an interstate compact designed to facilitate the adoption of a uniform formula for the appointment for tax purposes of corporate multistate income and to provide machinery to resolve interstate disputes over jurisdiction. The development of the compact which was adopted by 14 States in 1967, and the other steps taken by the States during the year were prompted in large measure by the threat of Congressional action.

Industrial development bonds: A growing problem

During the year industrial development bonds continued to be issued by local governments throughout the country in increasing numbers. The use of these bonds began to have a new effect as the year drew to a close—strong competition with the "legitimate" issuances of State and local governments for strictly governmental purposes. The tight money situation combined with the increasing volume of the industrial bond offerings were forcing up the interest rates on both kinds of issues. It was also becoming apparent that the industrial bond problem was not confined to revenue bonds as distinguished from general obligation bonds. In late November, Mississippi marketed over $100 million of general obligation industrial bonds.

An increasing number of State and local officials began to be convinced that strong action by the Congress was necessary if the whole edifice of tax exempt State and municipal securities was not to collapse. Sentiment was increasing that Congress should in some way curb the issuance of industrial development bonds with tax exemption privileges. The great difficulty involved in framing such legislation was the fear that curbing the tax exempt status of this type of issue might be considered in later years a precedent for curbing the tax exemption privileges of general purpose State and local government securities.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS—UNCERTAINTY, CONTROVERSY, AND PROGRESS

The welfare problem

Throughout the year increasing concern was expressed about the shortcomings of existing Federal-State welfare policies and programs. Many contended that public welfare policies initiated in 1935 had the effect of discouraging the transfer of individuals from welfare rolls to a self-supporting status. This situation stems from the fact that most outside earnings have been taken into account in determining how much aid the individual will be given, and outside earnings reduce the welfare entitlement by an equal amount. There also was concern about the lack of incentive in existing welfare policies and programs for the recipient to undertake adult education courses and work training that would qualify him for a self-supporting job. The House of Representatives endeavored, in reporting out the Social Security Amendments for 1967, to remedy some of these deficiencies. The House bill required most welfare recipients to accept work training programs or be denied benefits, permitted recipients to earn some money without a commensurate reduction in the welfare allotment, and limited future ADC-roll expansion. The limitation on ADC-roll expansion was considered by many to be too punitive in nature, but generally the House version prevailed in the bill sent to the President.

Coupled with dissatisfaction over current welfare policies and programs is the strong belief on the part of many that (1) responsibility for financing public assistance is incorrectly allocated among the various levels of government, and (2) a "guaranteed annual income" or a "negative" income tax would be a more effective means of meeting the public assistance needs of the Nation. Others, however, believe that such approaches would tend to remove all motivation whatever for welfare recipients to move off the welfare rolls into productive employment. With regard to intergovernmental responsibilities in the field of welfare, some States are beginning to assume an increased share of welfare costs. Massachusetts is scheduled to take over all financial responsibility for welfare in 1968, joining the ranks of eleven other States that require little or no local financial participation in categorical or general assistance.

Widespread disarray in Federal categorical grant system

The enactment by Congress of more than 200 grant programs during the 1963–66 period produced dissatisfaction on the part of the recipients with the way the programs were operating and dissatisfaction in Congress as to the degree of coordination among the various Federal agencies concerned. More and more during the year, the need was expressed for consolidation of separate grant programs and for some kind of "computerized" system of information about the Federal programs that would facilitate participation by smaller units of government.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress early in the year dealing with the "quality of Government," called for efforts to consolidate grant programs into a smaller number of categories and to simplify requirements for application, funding, and fiscal reporting. The Bureau of the Budget developed proposed legislation to authorize the use of several appropriations for closely related or "packaged" local or State programs. As the first session drew to a close, however, the legislation was not yet moving.

Increasing representation of State and local governments in Washington

A corollary of the proliferation of categorical grants and the increasing difficulty of penetrating the Federal "jungle" was the establishment by State and local governments of Washington offices. At year's end 17 States, 24 cities and four counties had taken steps to provide themselves with "on the ground' representation in the Nation's capitol beyond that provided by their representatives in Congress. (See Appendix D)

Poverty program: Whither community action?

Throughout much of the year the future of the Poverty Program was in doubt. Its authorization was due to expire June 30, 1968, and legislation was before the Congress to extend the program for an additional year or two. For some time it seemed doubtful that any kind of poverty bill would pass the House of Representatives.

However, with the support of a coalition of Southern conservatives and Northern "moderates" a bill fashioned by the House Educa- achieve a comfortable majority in the House tion and Labor Committee managed to when it finally came to a vote in November 1967. The provision that saved the bill was the so-called "city hall amendment" which placed control over community action programs essentially with units of general local government—cities or counties—with a "bypass" provision operative in those cases where the local government chose not to initiate a community action program or chose to initiate it along lines not compatible with requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act. Only in those cases would the Director of Economic Opportunity be empowered to establish direct Federal relationships with private, nonprofit organizations to operate community action programs in these particular localities. The "city hall amendment" alleviated the concern expressed by some mayors and many county officials about the "bypassing" of general local government which had taken place under the Community Action title.

Improved communications between State governments and the Federal executive branch

During 1967 former Florida Governor Farris Bryant, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, led teams of Federal officials to 40 State capitals for day-long visits with Governors and other State administrators for the purpose of exchanging views and airing problems of Federal-State relations. A large number of problems were identified; a considerable number were solved or mitigated; others were left for remedial action through legislation.

The Bryant trips clearly improved the attitudes on the part of both Federal and State administrators, and increased understanding at each level of the problems faced at the other level. In addition to disclosing inadequacies in Federal organization and procedures, the visits also disclosed serious shortcomings in the constitutional, legal, and fiscal structure of State governments. At year's end both Governors and Federal administrators were arming themselves to cope with the weaknesses and shortcomings that had been identified in their respective systems during the course of the year.

Also during the year Vice President Humphrey continued his vigorous program of consultations and "trouble-shooting" with mayors, county officers and other local government officials. At his encouragement a Washington meeting was convened of a cross section of school board members from across the country for the purpose of discussing and questioning new Federal programs and policies.

The Heller plan

At the opening of the 90th Congress nearly 100 separate bills were introduced in the

House and Senate to provide Federal-State-local revenue sharing along the general lines of the original "Heller-Pechman plan" under which a designated percentage of Federal income tax collections would be set aside for distribution to the States (and/or localities) with few strings attached. As these measures were introduced studies were made by the National Governors' Conference, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the National League of Cities, and others. It became increasingly apparent that many questions would have to be resolved before a satisfactory formula for sharing of Federal revenues with States and localities could be devised. The proponents of revenue sharing began to concede that "some" strings would need to be attached to Federal bloc grants. Similarly, opponents of the plan began to concede that some form of general fiscal support would be necessary in the years ahead, other than that which could be accommodated within the framework of the categorical aid system.

In October 1967, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, after more than a year's study of "fiscal federalism" adopted a recommendation calling for a "middle of the road" approach to the question of revenue sharing. The Commission urged broadening the "fiscal mix" of Federal grants-in-aid to include not only (1) categorical grants for purposes of stimulation and demonstration but also (2) functional bloc grants for the purpose of continuing support within designated functional fields of significant National interest and (3) general support funds alloted on the basis of population with variations in tax effort taken into account. The Commission went on to say that if the Congress should decide to distribute general support funds directly to localities as well as to the States, safeguards would be required to insure that local spending of Federal general support funds in no way conflicts with existing comprehensive State plans.

FEDFRALISM AT THE CROSSROADS

America's federal system is on trial today as never before in this century of crisis and change. Hopeful signs can be found at all levels of government and within the perspective of the past three decades some suggest drastic changes—for the better. Yet, when measured against present and prospective needs and expectations, progress seems discouragingly slow.

Throughout the Nation's history a distinguishing feature of the federal system has been its remarkable capacity—with but one failure—to adapt to changing circumstances and shifting demands. But now the rate at which circumstances and demands shift and change is of a totally different magnitude and imposes a new dimension.

Despite this new dimension, many States and localities still cling to policies and practices that hardly satisfied the modest requirements of a bygone era and are grossly unsuited to cope with today's urgent challenges. Despite this new dimension, some policies and attitudes of the Federal establishment continue more attuned to the problems and solutions of the thirties and forties, than to the horizon of the seventies and eighties.

The challenges of today are cast in seething racial unrest and civil disorder, burgeoning crime and delinquency, alarming differences in individual opportunity for education, housing and employment. Historically, these constitute one more—albeit a highly dramatic—chapter in the age-old American struggle to fulfill the mighty promise of Jefferson's Declaration within and through the balanced, constitutional system framed by the Founders in the Great Charter of 1789.

The manner of meeting these challenges will largely determine the fate of the American political system; it will determine if we can maintain a form of government marked by partnership and wholesome competition among National, State and local levels, or if instead—in the fact of threatened anarchy—we must sacrifice political diversity as the price of the authoritative action required for the Nation's survival.

FARM BARGAINING

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 15, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and nine cosponsors introduced S. 2973, the National Agricultural Bargaining Act of 1968. Our bill would create a national collective bargaining system for determining fair farm prices. On Tuesday, February 20, the Washington Post, in an editorial, termed the bill an "ingenious effort to give farmers powers comparable to those possessed by labor unions." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ### FARM BARGAINING
>
> The National Agricultural Bargaining Act proposed by Senator Mondale of Minnesota and several colleagues is an ingenious effort to give farmers powers comparable to those possessed by labor unions.
>
> It would provide for a National Agricultural Relations Board which would conduct referenda by the producers of farm commodities suffering from unreasonably low prices. The farmers would then elect representatives who would bargain with processors for a fair price.
>
> The sale or purchase of the affected commodity at less than the established price would be prohibited by law. For all the terminology of labor relations involved, this is basically a price fixing bill. Instead of fixing the price at "fair market value" or "the cost of production plus a reasonable profit" as did farm plans in the twenties, the level would be negotiated. To that extent, it is an improvement on arbitrary pricing.
>
> Secretary of Agriculture Freeman wondered in a recent address if "farm bargaining power is an idea whose time has come." The progress of the Mondale bill will be one measure of the truth or falsity of that conjecture. The general assumption in the past has been that farmers are too dispersed, too disunited and too diversified in interest to get together on bargaining methods. That assumption has been reinforced by sporadic efforts at "farm strikes" like those of the thirties, which frequently ended in violence ineffectually employed to stop the non-strikers. The Mondale bill would interpose the law where the earlier efforts relied on voluntary withholding. The enforcement problems do not seem as formidable today as they did a generation ago but they might still be considerable.
>
> The disparity between the returns of an unorganized agriculture and those of organized labor and industry is such that any proposal holding out some promise of diminishing it deserves hearing and study. The farmer has found that he cannot rely on the generosity of processors and consumers.

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON—TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE FRANCES BOLTON, OF OHIO

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, with the celebration of George Washington's Birthday, I invite attention to what one of our colleagues has done to preserve the view from Mount Vernon.

Tomorrow, the Secretary of the Interior will create Piscataway Park. This park will save for all time, for the people of the Nation, the magnificent view from Mount Vernon which meant so much to our first President.

The creation of the park carries out an act passed by Congress in 1960.

But the passage of that act, was in itself a tribute to FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio.

As the vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, which has preserved Mount Vernon itself, she has worked for years to save this view. Starting in 1955, she began to use her own funds to buy up the farms along the Maryland shore of the Potomac opposite Mount Vernon to keep them from being converted into sewage plants, oil tank farms, and other commercial uses.

Let me tell the Senate about it in her own modest words:

> Many years ago, we set out to protect the visual environment of Mount Vernon, America's number one historical shrine.
>
> Up to that time, preservation was primarily in private hands. For example, a century ago, Mount Vernon itself was offered to both the Federal government and the State of Virginia.
>
> Both refused.
>
> A frail woman, Ann Pamela Cunningham undertook the task, and created the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union. This private group purchased and still preserves this national shrine.
>
> Miss Cunningham's parting injunction was, "Let one spot in this grand country of ours be saved from change. Upon you rests this duty."
>
> In 1955, an oil tank farm was projected for this spot where we stand in the center of the view that thrills millions of visitors each year.
>
> As Vice Regent from Ohio of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, I used some funds which had come to me by inheritance, to acquire the property to preserve it.
>
> This was just the beginning. During the next few years, additional land was acquired by the Accokeek Foundation.
>
> Then an unthinking local agency determined to condemn the land we sought to preserve to use for a sewage treatment plant. The Moyaone Association and the Alice Ferguson Foundation joined with us to seek a solution to this catastrophe.
>
> No private entity could withstand that threat.
>
> No help was available from local or state governments. This forced the Congress to counter the local threat. In 1961, the area was delineated as a National Park, based on lands to be donated by the Foundations along the river front, and donations by private owners of scenic easements on a much greater area.
>
> Skeptics in government predicted freely that no scenic easements by the average citizen would ever be donated. They stated outright that government purchase was the only solution which had ever worked.
>
> In this day of big government and big corporations, it sometimes seems that the individual has become superfluous, and the great engines of government and corporations will replace him. But our project created a place for the individual.
>
> This resulted in the greatest joining together of private, Foundation and governmental effort in such an undertaking.
>
> Our task is far from finished. But over these challenging years, we have explored some exciting new roads. The officials of the executive departments, who jeered at our efforts, now cheerfully follow the path. Many states and municipalities have passed similar legislation and are using the tools we helped forge to preserve their environments.

> I have often felt there will never be enough money in the public treasury to do all that is necessary for preservation and conservation of natural beauty. But there is no limit to what an imaginative program utilizing new approaches to public and private cooperation can do. Through such an effort, we can, and will, evolve new and better tools for preservation and conservation, on a much broader base.
>
> We of the Accokeek Foundation are proud of what everyone has done here for George Washington and Mount Vernon and we are ready to help to the best of our ability.

The press throughout the Nation has recognized what our beloved colleague from Ohio has done. Editorials, appearing over the past decade, praise not only the action which Congress has taken, but also what was required to make it possible for Congress to act. Apparently not content with that, the Accokeek Foundation, which Frances Bolton heads, undertook studies which developed and refined the new concept of scenic easements. As a result, the State of Maryland enacted pioneer tax reform legislation recognizing public purposes of these donations, and in Prince Georges County passing the first local scenic space laws in the land, giving tax credits to the donors.

This project is being widely copied throughout the 50 States and many local jurisdictions.

The machinery developed at Piscataway Park is well on the way to becoming a model for future use elsewhere.

Our colleague from Ohio has done something about natural beauty, and cleaning up the Potomac River. She has created a model which can be followed in all of our jurisdictions.

In her work, she has been aided locally by hundreds, as well as thousands of conservationists throughout the country. She has created something which may not be duplicated again in our lifetime.

This has been in addition to the work that Representative Frances Bolton has done for her constituents in Ohio, and her work on foreign affairs and for nursing and her many other interests. We in Congress are grateful to Mrs. Bolton's people in Ohio for giving us such an energetic and forceful leader. All of us here in the Congress know how hard Frances Bolton has worked on all of the projects in which she is interested.

We in the Senate and House of Representatives cannot let this Washington's Birthday pass without recognizing what she has done for George Washington, for all of us, and for all of the people throughout the Nation.

In keeping with the decade of time and effort she has given to leadership in this work, and the generous use of her own personal funds, I believe that the park itself or some feature of it should be named for Representative Frances Bolton. It is the least we can do to show our appreciation.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Nation is now in its seventh consecutive year of economic expansion—an unparalled achievement. But, as a recent AFL–CIO News editorial points out, unemployment during 1967 stood at just about the same level reached a year earlier.

I agree with the editorial's conclusion:

> An unemployment rate stuck at 3.8 percent is not good enough.

I also agree with the conclusion that future progress in achieving the goal of full employment rests on congressional determination to enact public policies which assure continuing progress in reducing unemployment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Job Standstill" be reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> THE JOB STANDSTILL
>
> In terms of jobs the economy marked time in 1967. There was no progress in terms of reducing unemployment, and total employment gains were the smallest since 1963.
>
> The Labor Dept.'s year-end review of the employment situation discloses that the actual number of unemployed was up slightly from a year earlier and that the rate at 3.8 percent of the labor force was unchanged from 1966.
>
> Non-farm payroll employment showed a smaller increase than either 1966 or 1965 with nearly all of the rise concentrated in government, trade and miscellaneous services.
>
> Manufacturing employment remained practically unchanged, with an increase of 150,000 compared to 1.1 million in 1966.
>
> Hourly earnings also reflected the state of the economy—up 12 cents, but only 4 cents over 1966 in terms of real purchasing power.
>
> The 1967 workweek was below the 1966 and 1965 levels, adding further to the problems of earnings and purchasing power.
>
> The no-progress year of 1967 brought to a standstill, then, a six-year trend in reduction of the unemployment rate. In 1961 the rate stood at 6.7 percent; two years later it was 5.7; in 1965 it dropped to 4.5 and the following year to 3.8.
>
> The failure to improve on the 1966 performance stems primarily from the failure of Congress to adopt the necessary public policies and programs to assure continuing progress in reducing unemployment.
>
> The second session of the 90th Congress will have the opportunity to redress this situation and vote up policies and programs that will give every American, the opportunity of a decent job at a decent rate of pay. An unemployment rate stuck at 3.8 percent is not good enough.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, today I join Senators in saluting the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. History records an independent nation of Lithuania reaching hundreds of years back into time and encompassing a strong, proud people. We all know of the ruthless termination of that sovereignty under the heel of Soviet Russia. We also know that the flame of freedom is still nurtured by Lithuanians whether they be in their captive land or in exile around the world.

Despite overwhelming pressure, the people of Lithuania have never allowed their hope for freedom to fail. They have offered one of the most courageous examples of steadfastness in Eastern Europe, and the desire to determine their own course in history is still the uppermost ambition of its citizens. Never has the hope for national independence nor the dedication to the ideals of freedom been suffocated.

As we celebrate the spirit of Lithuanian independence, we must rededicate our efforts in seeking the return of freedom to this oppressed nation. Let us reassert our position that all men should have the right to live as free men; to govern themselves; to maintain their human dignity.

At the same time, let us stop accommodating communism in the hope that this will somehow advance freedom. As I have said many times in the past, whenever we trade with the Communists, we should demand concessions that would bring a greater degree of freedom to the enslaved people suffering under the domination of communism. It is time to start making demands that will spread freedom, not restrict it.

The inspiration of Lithuania, not only to the other captive nations but to free nations as well, serves as a guidepost to all of us who cherish freedom. We in America must show the people of Lithuania our determination and support for their struggle to regain their freedom. We pledge ourselves to the redemption of independence and sovereignty in Lithuania. I salute the Lithuanian people and pledge that their struggle will not be in vain.

A CHALLENGE TO STATE LEGISLATURES: SENATOR MUSKIE'S ADDRESS TO THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week Johns Hopkins University, in Baltimore, was host to the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. That conference had as its principal speaker the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], who, as all of us in the Senate know, is an expert in the problems our States and the federal system face. Senator Muskie, a former Governor of Maine and chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has achieved national recognition for his study of the problems of the Federal system. His keen analysis of those problems and sound proposals for their solution are well known.

In his address at Johns Hopkins, Senator Muskie stressed the key role and responsibility of State legislatures in rejuvenating the States place in the Federal system. He pinpointed the crucial burden State legislatures must bear in redressing the balance of power which State inaction has upset. Senator Muskie stressed the State revenue problems and the imbalance in State fiscal policies, particularly overreliance on the property tax base and inadequate equalization of funds between urban areas and rural areas and between central cities and the suburbs. In that regard he cited the nationally acclaimed fiscal reform enacted by the reapportioned legislature of my own State of Maryland last year.

Senator Muskie's address at the citizens conference is a comprehensive review of some of the major problems facing State legislatures. It emphasizes the key role that State legislatures must play if a healthy Federal-State partnership is to be restored and preserved. I commend that address to all the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE TO THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON STATE LEGISLATURES, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD., FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Almost a century ago, Lord Bryce in his American Commonwealth looked synically on the role of States as he observed them at that time. He found a style of corruption and ineptitude which happily does not exist today. Nevertheless, he was one of the first to point out that the State—as a level of government—could have a special value for the future of American government. He said:

"Federalism enables a people to try experiments in legislation and administration which could not be safely tried in a large centralized country. A comparatively small commonwealth like an American State easily makes and unmakes its laws; mistakes are not serious, for they are soon corrected; other States profit by the experience of a law or a method which has worked well or ill in the State that has tried it."

This statement is relevant today. Indeed, the concept of the States as laboratories can be even more meaningful today. Why must they wait for the Federal Congress to show them the way? Why cannot they move ahead with broad and progressive new programs, particularly at a time when the national government is so preoccupied with international problems?

The challenge, I believe, rests inevitably with the legislatures of our 50 States. With reapportionment taking hold, they can become the true representatives of the citizens of their States, and in this role, they are basically responsible for the domestic future of this country.

Yet in recent years probably no part of our Federal system of Government has been more maligned, criticized or condemned than our 50 State legislatures.

This attitude has considerable justification in their performance, but it does not solve the problem, and it could discourage us from considering effective reforms. It could tempt us to embrace the conclusion that State government is a "lost cause," an anachronism which has no further utility in the solution of the complex domestic problems of today and tomorrow.

For we are involved in the basic question as to whether the States can survive as viable partners in the Federal system. And at the heart of State government lies the State legislature.

Governors, however strong their hold over their agencies and budgets, must eventually come before their legislatures for approval. State administrators, however progressive their ideas and programs, must subject themselves to the scrutiny of State legislators. Local leaders, however much they cherish home rule of local government reorganization, in general must obtain State legislative support.

And, the individual citizen, concerned with reforming the elective powers, with modernizing his State constitution, with strengthening human rights and improving social welfare, must turn eventually to the State legislature for initiative and action.

If our State legislatures do not face up to the public problems of our time—and the anticipated escalation of these problems as we move toward the 21st century—then we can only expect a greater incursion of Federal control and a by-passing of State authority. The history of our Federal system is dramatic evidence that the American people expect it to be an instrument for dealing with problems and the inadequacies of State and local government will not be permitted to stand in the way.

This would result in a new federalism that the vast majority of Americans do not want.

The will to preserve State government is strong, and in fact, growing among many responsible political leaders. But the citadel for the preservation and progress of statism—the State legislature—has too long been one of negativism and indifference. My abiding fear is that change in this critical sector of American government is not taking place fast enough to cope with the oncoming demands of a rapidly rising population, particularly in our urban areas.

Legislative reform requires attention to the mechanics of modernizing State legislatures: annual sessions of longer duration; better salaries, staff and office space; reduction of the number of committees; removal of constitutional restrictions and the like. I might even get into the mysterious world of programing-planning-budgeting, of the post audit review, of computerized informational systems and legislative reference services.

Such housekeeping reforms are already under way in a number of State legislatures and should be pressed in others.

Tonight I would like to talk about more substantive reforms. We must now convert our State legislatures into responsible and responsive participants in our Federal system. In my opinion, this must take place in four basic areas.

First. State executive reorganization: In structure; in management; and in personnel.

In too many States, the executive branch is a labyrinth of departments, boards, agencies and commissions with their own bosses and bureaucratic kingdoms, not under the budgetary or operational control of the State's chief executive.

How can we face the future of a growing government in every State, urban or rural, without more unified leadership in planning and programming, and more centralized responsibility for the carrying out of statewide social and economic development programs?

As Federal assistance to the States develops in the direction of broader grants, comprehensive planning assistance, regional development programs, Governors must be given and must utilize all the tools of modern management, and State legislatures will have to provide the oversight to see that such management is effective.

Similarly, the State legislatures must have the responsibility to create programs which will upgrade the administrative, professional and technical employees responsible for State and local services. This includes a realistic State merit system, modern personnel management, training opportunities, and most important, higher salaries for quality people.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act, which passed the Senate last year, and which hopefully is proceeding toward final enactment in this session, is a Federal incentive toward improving State and local administration. But the giant step must be taken by the State legislatures themselves. If the States are to remain senior partners in our Federal system, the State legislatures must put administrative quality above politics.

Second. State tax and financial reform: At this time of great prosperity and economic growth, when income and profits are soaring, when we are reaching a gross national product of over $800 billion, the States must tap this prosperity for their own social and economic development programs. They cannot depend upon increased Federal financial support, when our Federal fiscal commitments are so concentrated on military, space, and other national and international commitments.

If the States are to play a role in the decentralization of domestic responsibility in a time of national stress, they must obtain the maximum revenues possible from their own sources on a fair and equitable basis. They must apply these revenues to meet the priorities which the Federal Government cannot reach.

Unfortunately, until recently, the history of State constitutional and legislative action in this area has been far too sluggish. Much more must be done to meet the growing critical need for State resources.

State legislatures can help in working on two fronts. First, they can develop a fair and balanced package of broad based taxes, including increased taxes on income and sales, blended with an increased State borrowing capacity, in order to provide a major State fund for State-sponsored programs.

Second and more important, they should examine the local property tax which currently provides 87 percent of local revenues and correct the inequities, abuses and administrative incompetence rampant at this level of government. In particular, the legislatures must curb the mounting madness of thousands of separate taxing authorities which has sharpened economic and social hostilities and has produced widening variations of tax responsibility.

Third. The distribution of State and local resources: Merely improving the marshalling of State resources is not enough. How these resources are allocated—where the money goes—makes the critical difference between good and bad State and local government. Here is the area where State legislatures have abdicated their responsibilities to the greatest degree.

Testimony before my Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and a comprehensive study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member, have highlighted some serious patterns of imbalance in the distribution of funds and the implementation of programs and planning between the suburban areas and the core cities.

For instance, an analysis of the 37 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas in the country showed that State financial aid to local schools favored suburban schools over central city schools where the cost of educating disadvantaged students was far higher than educating suburban students. Hardly any States have revised their school aid formulas to recognize this higher financial need of the central city.

"It is a paradox of education in metropolitan America," said the Advisory Commission's report, "that where the needs are greatest, the resources are the scarcest; the children needing education the most are receiving the least."

The Advisory Commission has uncovered other areas of fiscal disparity in per capita local highway expenditures, in police and fire expenditures, in public welfare expenditures, and in per capita State and Federal aid in general.

The central cities are the victims of these fiscal imbalances and have to shoulder the burden of providing governmental services to millions of people who move into their areas during the day and abandon them in the evening. These same cities have the highest costs of governmental services, the greatest problems of poverty, crime and urban unrest, the largest amount of dilapidated buildings, the most serious problems of health. Yet they are not being permitted to tap sufficiently the expanding metropolitan tax bases which surround them, or the overall State aid available to local communities.

Thus, the real challenge for State legislatures is (1) to develop methods for equalizing metropolitan tax resources to help the cities, and (2) to develop effective equalization formulas for State aid to cope with increasing urban demands.

I should like to say here, particularly because it involves this very State and city which host us this evening, that the Maryland State Legislature deserves a great deal of credit for recognizing this problem by developing methods of equalization of special benefit to Baltimore and other priority areas. California and New York have also moved in this direction. But by and large, the State legislatures have not taken substantial steps in this vital area.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and as a member of the McClellan Subcommittee investigating riots in this country, I have had an inside view of the tensions and disillusion of the poor in our cities. In the past this disillusion has bordered on violence, but nobody listened. Now, that violence, and hatred, and even rebellion, are manifest throughout the Nation. It involves many thousands of people. It involves the future of our allies.

This is essentially a state problem. Are our state legislatures listening, or will they again abdicate their responsibility for urban unrest to the Federal Government?

Fourth. The structure and management of local government.

The results of the studies of both my subcommittee and the advisory commission indicate that as population increases, near chaos in governmental coordination at the local level is developing.

The sad results are haphazard development, waste, and inequity. We now have over 92,000 local governing units, most with independent powers of taxation, planning, financing, and operation. Some of these are general purpose governments such as counties, cities, boroughs, towns, and villages whose boundaries and powers, rooted in the past, are often not consistent with modern public needs. Others are "special purpose" districts which have been allowed by state legislatures to take over basic programs such as education, water, sewage, transportation, urban renewal, and real estate planning.

Whatever the reason for these special governments, their recent growth poses a major three States. At present there is no effective derly development. They overlap and conflict with general purpose governments. Their independent powers put them beyond the control of local elected officials, and often beyond public scrutiny. And too often they have become "little single-function empires," bent on protecting their own sovereignty rather than integrating with other units of government.

The New York metropolitan area is a terrifying thicket of general and special purpose governments. It is made up of 17 counties, 551 municipalities, and 1,400 other local districts and authorities located in three States. At present there is no effective means for achieving an all-round approach to critical regional problems.

New York City is not unique. Variations of its problem exist in most urban areas throughout the country. Indeed, it is meaningless to talk about comprehensive public development when political structures remain so fragmented and competitive at the local level.

The role of existing local units of government should be completely reassessed to reduce special purpose districts and to consolidate taxing, financing and operating responsibilities in the hands of viable general-purpose governments. To be effective, greater power over the coordination of services must bring with it the strengthening of local management and greater freedom of action at the local level to plan, finance, and implement public programs. At the same time, the States should reserve sufficient authority to step in when local "home rule" is not serving the interests of all its people.

The role of metropolitan and other area-wide planning agencies must be developed, particularly as machinery for resolving inter-local disputes and providing for more efficiency in local spending. Federal aid already exists for such agencies, and more is provided under legislation presently before Congress.

And finally, the States might well consider the wisdom of assuming direct financial responsibility for the programs of welfare, education, manpower training, poverty, and housing which so long have placed an extraordinary burden on the fiscal capacity of our local communities. This could free the local units of government to be more effective in providing basic local services such as fire, police, street maintenance and other custodial functions.

In conclusion, I would like to leave one thought with you—that decentralization of government in this country is healthy and necessary for freedom and competition.

Despite their differences in population and geography, the States are the best present mechanism to promote that decentralization. In time, I would hope that some of them—notably those in New England—would move closer together to form a more creative regional unity.

One of the more obvious challenges to the Federal system is the following:

1. People problems spill over the boundaries of political jurisdictions—local and State—thus inhibiting single jurisdictions from taking effective action to deal with them.

2. Resources—e.g., air and water—in the same way, are increasingly beyond the capacity of single jurisdictions to protect and conserve.

Thus the concept of regionalism emerges as the level at which we ought—more and more—to deal with such problems.

But the Federal system does not provide for regional government, and so we have

1. Ungoverned and ungovernable metropolitan areas.

2. Improperly managed air and water resources.

3. An accelerating deterioration in the quality of opportunity, of environment, and of life itself for too many people in such areas.

As *Max Ways* pointed out in the January issue of *Fortune* magazine:

"Trust is the cornerstone of civic order, but few of us, white or black, really trust the communities in which we live . . . the whole world knows the condition of U.S. cities—and has known it for decades. The billions we have poured out for foreign aid and propaganda, the more numerous billions we spend for military support of our foreign policy, are half cancelled by the damage that is done to U.S. prestige by our long-standing inability to deal effectively with gangsterism, poor, traffic jams, junkyards, billboards, and all the rest of the noxious mess. What, much of the world asks, is the point of being the richest and most powerful nation, if such problems can't be handled better? What is the point of capitalism? Of democracy?"

POST OFFICE TO CONTINUE SERVICE AFTER ENEMY ATTACK

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for years it has been comforting to all of us to know that through wind, rain, sleet, and snow, the mail will be delivered. According to Art Buchwald, writing in the Washington Post on February 1, the Post Office expects to deliver not only through wind, rain, sleet, and snow, but also through nuclear attack.

It is heartening indeed to know that even after a nuclear holocaust we can climb out of the rubble drop our mail in the corner mailbox, return to the rubble from whence we came, and rest assured that our mail will proceed happily along to its destination.

For those who missed Mr. Buchwald's article, entitled "Nothing Can Change the Post Office, Not Even an Enemy Attack," I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1968]

NOTHING CAN CHANGE THE POST OFFICE, NOT EVEN AN ENEMY ATTACK

(By Art Buchwald)

Anyone who doubts that the Federal Government is prepared for World War III just doesn't know how organized Washington really is. The other day someone who works for the Treasury Department received his instructions in writing on what he was to do in case of enemy attack.

They read as follows, and I haven't made a word of it up:

". . . All National Office Employes with or without emergency assignments should follow this procedure. If you are prevented from going to your regular place of work because of an enemy attack—keep this instruction in mind—go to the nearest post office, ask the postmaster for a Federal employe registration card (sample shown on reverse side), fill it out and return it to him. He will see that it is forwarded to the office of the Civil Service Commission which will maintain the registration file for your area. When the Civil Service Commission receives your card, we will be notified. We can then decide where and when you should report for work . . . You should obtain and complete your registration card as soon after enemy attack as possible, but not until "you are reasonably sure where you will be staying for a few days . . ."

Nobody believes it will ever happen, but let us suppose that Robert Smiley (a fictitious person working for the Treasury Department) has just crawled out of the rubble after an enemy attack and remembers the instructions concerning civil defense for Federal employes.

After walking for four days and 350 miles, Smiley finally finds a Post Office that is still standing. He staggers up to a window, but just as he gets there, the man behind it says, "Sorry, this window is closed," and slams it down.

Smiley stumbles to the next window and is told to get in line behind 20 other people. Two hours later he gets to the head of the line and croaks, "I want to register . . ."

"I'm sorry," says the Post Office clerk. "This window is just for stamps. Registered mail is at the next window."

"No, no," says Smiley. "I want a Federal Employe registration card."

"We don't sell those. Now do you want any stamps or don't you?"

"You see," says Smiley, holding onto the window, "I was instructed after the enemy attack to find the nearest Post Office and fill out a card."

"You better try the Parcel Post window," the clerk suggests.

Smiley goes over to the Parcel Post window and gets in line with 30 people. Four hours later he is informed that the Post Office has **run out of Federal employe registration cards.** They suggest he try another Post Office.

Smiley staggers out into the road and starts walking again. Four hundred miles up the highway he finds another Post Office. After catching his breath, he takes the card shakingly to the counter and starts to fill it out. But the pen won't work. He informs the Postmaster of this and the Postmaster replies, "We know it, but there's nothing we can do about it. There's a war on."

"But I've got to register," says Smiley, "or the Civil Service Commission won't know where I am in case the United States Treasury wants to start up again. Couldn't I borrow your pen?"

"What? And ruin the point? Listen, why don't you go over to the Smithtown Post Office. I hear their pens are still in working order."

Clutching the card, Smiley walks 60 miles to Smithtown where he fills it out. He mails it that very day.

Years later, Smiley is still waiting for a reply. For in his haste and fatigue, Smiley had forgotten to write down his return zip code.

SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURE BARGAINING ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in keeping with my continuing efforts to help the American farmer receive a fairer price for the products he sells, I add my support to the bill recently introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and entitled "The National Agriculture Bargaining Act of 1968." This legislation is designed to supplement the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and will give the American farmer an additional means of bringing about the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities.

Agriculture has not kept pace with our rapidly advancing economy in the past few years. Farm prices have continually declined, while costs of production have continually increased. Farmers now find themselves in a cost-price squeeze which, if not corrected, will surely force many more of them to cease operations. The farmers are not to blame for this situation. They have cooperated with the Government, for the most part, in controlling their production, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, has made every effort to strengthen farm prices and income. Regrettably, however, these efforts have not been sufficient, and it is now necessary to take further steps toward strengthening farm prices. Collective bargaining for farmers, I feel, will provide the supplement we need to enable the present farm program to operate more beneficially.

The Wagner Act of 1935 gave to the working people of this country the right to bargain and receive a fair price in return for their labor. The Farm Bargaining Act of 1968 would extend this same right to the farmer. I realize, Mr. President, that this is a highly complicated measure, and that it will require a great deal of careful study and consideration. But the principle is sound, and the need for legislative action is a pressing one. Therefore, I have requested that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 2973, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will initiate action on the bill at the earliest possible date.

THE PRESIDENT LOWERS THE PRIORITY OF THE SST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for the decision reported in this morning's New York Times to slow down the supersonic transport development program.

When the announcement of the President's decision is made later in the week, as the Times story indicates it will be, I hope it will spell out a truly substantial reduction in expenditures on the SST in fiscal 1969 from the $351 million figure written into the budget message sent to Congress last month.

If the President makes a big cut in SST spending, this will constitute the best evidence we have had to date that the President is making a determined effort to slow the pace of Government spending and concentrate cutbacks on programs that are least essential at this time.

I would be pleased if this decision presaged a further decision by the Administration to take an entirely new look at the Government's role in development of the SST giving adequate assessment to the enormous social and economic costs involved as well as to the benefits.

I would be even more pleased if a similar slowdown were also announced in the area of public works expenditures where even more substantial cuts are possible.

As I have said often, I believe a cut in Federal spending is the surest and most effective way of blunting the kind of inflation we are now experiencing without putting a damper on the still less than vigorous growth of the economy. A tax increase would be just the wrong medicine. And spending cuts combined with a tax increase would be too much an overkill. Spending cuts alone would do the job—cuts concentrated on such programs as the SST, space and public works.

I am hopeful that slowing down of the SST program is a good omen—a signal of future White House intentions with respect to Government spending.

I have repeatedly criticized the SST program on the floor of the Senate on the ground that it occupied far too lofty a place on our list of national priorities. I have criticized it on many other grounds as well but the priorities question has always been uppermost.

The administration's budget for fiscal 1969 was a big disappointment to me because it gave the SST a higher priority than it has ever had before at the most inappropriate time conceivable. While the budget called for cutbacks in some vital domestic programs, budget expenditures for the SST were conspicuously increased from $100 million in the present fiscal year to $351 million in fiscal 1969.

If the President cuts this figure back substantially, he deserves to be applauded. He has made the wise decision, in any case the Times reports, to "lower the priority of the project rather than risk losing it altogether."

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SUPERSONIC PLANE WILL BE DELAYED—ADMINISTRATION TO SLOW PACE OF PROJECT FOR AIRLINER—POLITICAL REASONS SEEN

(By Evert Clark)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—The Administration has decided to slow further its program to develop a supersonic airliner.

An announcement is expected this week, probably tomorrow.

Industry sources said that although technical reasons would be given as the cause, the real reason was chiefly political—an attempt to reduce the request for funds for the supersonic plane for the fiscal year 1969 to a level acceptable to Congressional critics of the program.

While the program has enjoyed strong support from a majority of Congress, it has also been a prime target for a highly critical minority. The argument most often used against the plane is that it is not necessary at a time when war in Vietnam and social needs at home are forcing high Government spending that encourages inflation.

In effect, the Administration has decided to lower the priority of the project rather than risk losing it altogether in the kind of bitter floor fight that has occasionally threatened it in the past, these sources said.

The Administration has already asked Congress for less money for the 1969 fiscal year than it had once planned, this was because design work did not move as fast last year as had been expected and because recent new orders for the planes made more airline money available to the program, which lessened the need for Government funds.

The Boeing company won a Government-sponsored design contest at the end of 1966. But in the final stages of that contest the company proposed last-minute changes that would further improve the design. The company spent most of last year incorporating these changes, finally completing the design for two flight test models last November.

Less than a month ago, the target date for the first flight of a prototype was still late 1970. But Administration leaders, briefing newsmen on the President's proposed budget, said the probability of meeting that date had decreased. They said contractors could have been moved at a faster pace in 1967, but that the slower pace would produce a better plane.

That same argument is expected to be used again to justify the new slowdown.

The demands of the Vietnamese war on the superjet contractors, most of whom are also producing military equipment, may also be offered as a reason.

It is understood that William M. Allen, Boeing's president, telephoned word of the new slowdown to the presidents of airlines that have ordered the plane.

The new delay was apparently discussed with Boeing officials yesterday by Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd and three members of the Senate Commerce Committee who were visiting Boeing's plants in the Seattle area.

REQUEST CRITICIZED

The visitors included Senator Warren G. Magnuson, the Washington Democrat who heads the committee; Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat of Oklahoma who heads its aviation subcommittee, and Senator Howard W. Cannon, Democrat of Nevada.

The four men are on a tour of airports and aircraft plants.

In his budget proposals for the 1969 fiscal year less than a month ago, the President asked Congress to approve $223-million in new funds for the supersonic transport. He said spending for the same fiscal year would reach $351-million. Since that time, critics of the program have again raised the question of the project's priority.

The first prototype of the British-French Concorde superjet has been built and is expected to fly this spring—at least three years ahead of the American plane. The Concorde is expected to begin carrying passengers within three years.

Airlines throughout the world have ordered about 125 of the Boeing planes and about 75 Concordes. The Boeing plane, 318 feet long, will carry about 300 passengers at speeds up to 1,800 miles an hour. The Concorde will carry about half that number at a speed of about 1,500 miles an hour.

POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last session I introduced a bill calling for the creation of a Council of Social Advisers. The aim of the council would be to provide the Nation as a whole, and policymakers in particular, with a better notion as to where we are socially in order that we be able to make more rational decisions about where we ought to be heading.

Bertram M. Gross, director of the national planning studies program at Syracuse University, spoke at the seminar-hearings which were conducted on this bill. His concern was and is with helping public policymakers deal with the increasing complexities that confront them. At a recent policy conference of the Conservative Party in Canada, he again discussed the "intelligence gap," and the great difficulty policymakers have in finding out what the "status quo" really is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Gross' address titled "Political Accountability in a World of Confusing Change" as an indication that the subject of social accounting is being seriously considered by Canadian Conservatives as well as by public officials of both persuasions in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN A WORLD OF CONFUSING CHANGE

(Special address by Bertram M. Gross,[1] at the Progressive-Conservative Policy Advisory Conference, Montmorency, Quebec, August 10, 1967)

Mr. Chairman (I was about to say "Fellow Conservatives" but I must restrain myself), it's very exciting to visit the colossus of the North and to see that political leaders here are also conducting a cautious flirtation with eggheads. Down below the border where I come from we also have a Conservative Party. They're called Republicans. And the Democrats have a saying, "The Republicans are really a grand old party—the only trouble with them is, they should stay out of politics". Now from what I've learned after being here two hours, you have not been following that admonition and neither shall I. I came here to talk politics, to talk on an academic plane about the politics of power, the winning of power and the use of power constructively in this world of baffling change.

Now in this century any government in power in any political system must make some form of accounting regularly to the people. But there is no international law requiring honesty or even completeness in political accounting. The older forms of accountability are found in budget messages, annual reports, political conventions, political campaigning and the like.

In the last third of this century new forms of accountability are being initiated. National plans, plan evaluation, annual economic and social reports, systems analysis and program budgeting (spin-offs in part from the new weaponry of defence and offence) are leading to unprecedented new ways of harnessing our data processing potentials to the needs of people to know and politicians to inform or misinform.

In the United States, for example, work has already been started on the first of a new series of annual social reports of the President.

Long-range preparations are being made to convert our historic, antiquated State of the Union Message into an up-to-date, professionally grounded, popularly understandable review of the changing state of the nation. And a few farsighted Mayors and Governors are beginning to plan for annual reports on the state of the city, the state of the metropolis and (this sounds better in French, I am sure) the state of the State. I give credit to a fellow New Yorker, another Conservative, Nelson Rockefeller, for that last phrase.

In developing our reporting to the people and in the professional assistance which political leaders are demanding on the provision of reliable system state information, we find something called a "credibility gap." I am sure you don't have anything like that here, but below the border it is said that political leaders who know what's happening, don't tell the public. That's the credibility gap. Yet there's also an intelligence gap. The intelligence gap occurs when people don't withhold information that they have because they don't have the information in the first place; they have too little to withhold. This we have found in doing the professional work for the first Social report of the President of the United States; this we have found is our predicament below the border.

Our first great Republican leader had a phrase which is often quoted, and I'll try to embellish it a little bit. He said "You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time." Let me add that political leaders have proved their capacity to fool themselves most of the time. I might say in passing this is a very important function of government—fooling one's self. It provides that element of stability without which confusing change could not be tolerated.

Now in the rest of my remarks it may look as though I'm telling you something. That's a rhetorical form designed to ease the pain of the additional confusions, Mr. Chairman, that I shall bring to this session. I'm speaking in the spirit of the great American movie producer, Sam Goldwyn, who is reputed to have said, "For your information, let me ask you a question." I am going to do him one or two better and, instead of telling you things, I'm going to ask three questions.

The first should not, of course, be addressed to the Liberal Party or any other party. It's strictly *your* kind of question. It is, "*What is the status quo?*" Conservatives, I'm told, at least where I come from, are supposed to be for it. I haven't met one yet who knows what it is but he's for it anyway. The second question is, "How do political leaders react to change?" and the third is, "What *should be* the status quo?" and if I remembered my Latin better it would be "the status quo erabit" instead of "est". I must warn you I will use certain strange words in English not Latin, as I proceed, such as "mega-expectancy" and "circular mosaic" and "idealistics." That's the way that "technopols" such as myself talk about the problem of getting and using political (forgive the expression) power.

WHERE ARE WE?

What is the status quo?

That's the question that Rip Van Winkle asked on waking up after a long nap in the Catskills. When he went to sleep we were a British colony. When he woke up he heard about George Washington, who has then the President of the United States. There had been a change in the system. And many of us today should really confess that our name is probably Van Winkle because we've dug ourselves into so many esoteric specialized caves, polished up the intricacies of so many old issues of a previous century or the beginning of this, that we've lost track of where we really are today and are not quite aware that there has been a system change. This applies to what I might vaguely refer to as the West, or North America as part of the West.

The most obvious aspect of system change can be described in terms of science and technology. I will not bore you by going through the tremendous "advances"—I use that word tentatively—in the techniques of information processing the movement of people and things through space and many other things. Let me merely say in passing that if there is one thing which is inconstant and continuously varying, it is the direction, rate and nature of scientific and technological change. We can send machines around to photograph the back side of the moon but we can't develop a transportation plant that integrates air and ground transportation in New York City, or any other city of America or of the North American continent. Also, if we talk too much about science and technology we lose track of many more important social changes that really are at the heart of the systemic revolution, the shift from advanced industrialism to the first stages of the emerging post-industrial society. I will mention a few of these very quickly.

First, we are becoming a service society. We don't need so many people any more to produce goods. Manufacturing is beginning to fade off in terms of employment in the same way that agricultural employment with increased agricultural productivity has always faded off with the industrial revolution. Second, we have gone beyond the stage of large scale organizations, of big business, big government, big labour. By now, the growth of integrated social action has transcended the boundaries of formal organizations. So, if we now look at the social reality of our post-industrial world, it is found in the macro-system, in the organizational complex, in the family of organizations that constitute the banking system or subsidized agriculture or civil air transport or the defence-space complex or any other of the huge systems that are often made up of combinations of government, private groups and universities and technical laboratories. Third, the talk about the white collar class taking over, with the decline of blue collar workers, is outrageously out of date. It is not white-collarism that has come to the fore but professionalism, professionalism that has extended to every form of activity; and extended professionalism and specialization that goes far beyond the concept of the professions as composed of the doctors, lawyers, engineers and teachers. Every science, every sub-science, every sub-profession, has its new meritocracy, ladder, channels of advancement, forms of barriers to advancement until certain proficiencies are proved.

This extended professionalism has meant a multi-linguistic development which guarantees that at any faculty meeting the members of an Economics Department or a Mathematics Department or a Sociology Department cannot understand each other any more—if they're any good. When you really *get there* in terms of specialization, the divisions multiply at such a rate that serious communication in the specialized jargons upon which scientific progress depends is made almost impossible. Fourth, despite the statistical lies that have been made readily available in our country at least, on divorce and family breakdown and things like that, we have seen an extension of family life unprecedented in history, characterized not only by early marriages but by longer life expectancies which mean that for the first time, men and women live together in nuclear family units for truly long periods after children leave home.

---

[1] Professor of Political Science, Maxwell School, Syracuse University; Director, National Planning Studies Program.

While this is a fantastic social phenomenon, it is rooted upon a major shift of investment from the business sphere to the household. The National Bureau of Economic Research in America, which helped invent the GNP as a statistical series (with some help from Marshall), has come to the conclusion that we must now talk about the "factory in the home." In the United States at least, for every five dollars of business investment every year there are seven dollars of hard-goods investment in the house, that's apart from the investment of family funds outside the house. What I'm saying about the role of the family, I might say, does not at all comport with popular impressions that all you have is family breakdown in the modern world.

Fifth, the geographical spread of employment, population and human activity, the new pattern of urban settlement throughout the world, has obsolesced to an important degree the concept of the metropolitan area. And in the most dynamic, powerful and influential portions of the world we now have the metropolitan family or the aggregate of metropolitan areas which constitute, in that horrible Greek word, the megalopolis. We are now in a world situation where the largest bulk of the political influence culture, science and administration of the world is concentrated in a dozen megalopolitan areas.

I wish I could put on a screen here the insulting map which Barbara Ward published in the Economist only three weeks ago. She shows the outlines of "nor-meg" that's the northeastern megalopolis in the United States from Washington up to Boston, and then she has a little spur here and she calls this the "Canadian extension."

The growth of the megalopolitan world is merely one aspect, however, of the emergence for the first time in world history of a truly world society, a world society of increasingly inter-dependent organizations and inter-dependent nations. A world society not of good neighbours (and I cannot recollect ever living in a neighbourhood of them) but a world of neighbours and increasingly closer neighbours. This is a world society in which the bi-polar simplifications of the immediate post-war II world, of the divisions of the world into something called "here-and-there", East and West and a third force in between has utterly dissolved, leaving all sorts of people hanging on to old shibboleths, among them some of the funniest being the people who are still trying to believe in themselves as a third force.

Now these social changes have given rise to a whole host of new expectations. We hear about the revolution of rising expectations in the under-developed world. This is nonsense. Anybody who has travelled in the under-developed world finds that the expectors there are the small handful of elites that were educated in the west, and their big complaint is the apathy, the low level of expectations of their people. The real revolution in terms of expectations is in those countries that are moving into post-industrialism. And there we find that people expect not only longer life, which they're getting, but greater activity expectancy. Not merely vegetation after the age of 60 but a new job, a new career after 65 and even after 70. Not only greater earning expectancy but greater learning expectancy as new opportunities are provided for education, re-tooling and re-thinking at all stages in life.

This is consistent with the new concept in post-industrialism of education as a continuing part of life. It even gets to the point where they expect professors, full professors, to learn. Of course, the spinster rate has gone down tremendously. That, of course, means that greater marriage expectancy is the birthright of every young girl and every infant boy. This marriage expectancy is rising very quickly, but, as I stated a little while ago, this also means a great expectancy of moving into the new phenomenon (not known in the past), of the post-child family. "God bless" the kids, now that they're gone, let's enjoy life. Let's even find an architect who can design a house for a couple who, in the "P.C." period, can learn how to live together without having to rely on children to resolve their conflicts for them. The democratic revolution of the early twentieth century of course led the people to expect more participation in decision-making, but now the last of our mega-expectancies is the urge to enjoy, to participate in beauty. And this in a sense is the deepest meaning behind the phrase which Lyndon Johnson has been using, the effort to orient the United States toward the quality of life rather than merely the quantity of goods and services. These mega-expectancies, in turn, are continuously churned up by the now ideology of post-industrialism.

One of my colleagues, Daniel Bell, wrote a book proclaiming—this is the title—"The End of Ideology"—but as the inventor of the phrase has been very active in bringing into the new ideology of post-industrialism which I will call R.- and D.-ology: Research and Development-ology. Its principle, which is a restatement of the conviction of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson and the other successful rebels against the British, of the basic principle that any problem can be solved briefly, given enough investment of high quality R and D hours and appropriate provision, not only for research and development but for testing and evaluation. This R- and D-ology spreads from hard goods systems to soft systems in social science and it is part of our conviction that, by God, there's no problem we can't solve if we put our best brains to it. . . .

This in turn, of course, leads to expectancies for solutions to new problems that people cannot solve. And I might say in this connection, if you are searching for solutions, my own observation in this context is that *solutions create problems, good solutions create big problems, and excellent solutions create fantastic problems*. And in this kind of a world of galloping, uneven change with people moving off in all directions (even women wanting political posts) I heard a psychiatrist say a few days ago, "What is the world coming to? First they wanted to own property, then they wanted to vote, then they wanted jobs, now they want to enjoy sex. Where are we going?" All those things were not accepted at the beginning of the century. It's in this sense that I try to see the various things that are happening. But really I cannot so I appropriate from my Canadian colleague, (who wrote his splendid book on "The Vertical Mosaic") and I talk instead about the circular or revolving mosaic, a kaleidoscopic revolving world in which it's difficult to get your bearings, in which the centre may not hold and things may fall apart.

HOW DO POLITICAL LEADERS REACT TO CHANGE?

The issue here is not simply that political leaders bury their heads in the sand, or, carefully place both ears to the ground at the same time, in trying to sense what is going on. That is not the main problem. The main problem is that in the face of change, political leaders react. *That is what makes so many of them reactionaries.*

It would be a very dangerous thing to live in a world or country where all political leaders tried to lead. You need stability in a system. You cannot afford too many people who know what the *status quo* is. But we need some political leaders who try to lead. I am much more sanguine than the Canadian commentator who sees a decline in the proportion of politicians who are really political animals. Now, I am just wondering how he counted the politicians; whether he knew one when he saw one. When I look for politicians, the first place I look is at the bureaucracy. Next I ask, "Where's the fellow who can understand campus politics?" In the world of the political animal we may be seeing a strange mutation. I mean a real mutation, not what happens in California when Class B actor becomes a Class B governor. I mean the kind of situation you have (and I can prove my objectivity by referring only to Republicans) when you have in office people like Rockefeller and Lindsay in my state, Percy in Illinois and Hatfield from Oregon, all of whom are men who could not only review a book without a ghost writer, but, if given enough time, could write a fair one. But these are also men who, having this intellectual capacity, are also capable of organizing strong, varied, widely dispersed "ghost stables." This means that as part of the new mutancy in political conservative leadership, they have fond out that it is not enough to steal ideas from third parties. Of course, we don't have any third parties around in the United States that you can really steal an idea from. The last person to do that was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who annihilated the socialist party by appropriating all their ideas. Norman Thomas gave up and decided there was no use running for office any more. The Communist Party was thoroughly subverted by the reform ideas the New Deal took from the Socialists.

I am not familiar with the Canadian scene. I do not know how much further you have to go in stealing either the ideas or the idealogues from your minor parties. But the essence of the new political mutation which brings forth people capable of leading a little is the ability to work with the intellectuals of the country. Our Republicans are very good at that. They have been working with the intellectuals for a long time. They only have one rule: park your brains in the vestibule before you come into the parlour. The trouble in working with intellectuals is that they are bound to bring into your party deliberations and ideas which will lead to international party conflict.

As a university professor, I am more skeptical of professors than any non-academic could possibly be. In fact, I would even coin a phrase that Confucius should have written—"Don't trust a braintrust till it is tested," and it takes time to test "technipol" brains. Yet to grapple with the new facts of life, with the new dynamics of the real status quo, means that internal conflict must be faced, must be kept in its place, but must be welcomed within a party.

WHAT SHOULD THE STATUS QUO BECOME?

Above all, the price of political leadership, in a world of utterly baffling change, is to take the tremendously difficult risk of setting forth ideals for the future *status quo*—for the evolving future state of your nation.

In this connection, I would like to tell you the name of a game and start it. The name is "Idealistics." This is a special version of the easier game which is called "Futuribles," invented and led off by my esteemed colleague, Bertrand de Jouvenel in Paris. Conjecturing about the future is "futuribles," Idealistics is conjecturing about that future towards which you are willing to risk your political face and life. In this connection, by the way, I might step back a moment and say that a very good test of the political leader of the future is whether or not he tries to save face or issues. I have come to think that the man who tries to save his face doesn't have one worth saving. You can only cope with confusing change by learning, and the kind of information processing machine that man is can learn only through some version of trial and error. The recognition of error is rather difficult. Idealistics is a special game of error, of taking a flyer on the future to portray the kinds of system states that really meet deep-felt needs of your people, or even futures that may meet needs that they are not at all aware of, and may not thank you for when you talk about them.

The first rule of idealistics is that you are out of the game if you start by mentioning anything which is straight, hard-goods technology. That is too easy. Let us not think of a future in which I can get back to New York City or to Syracuse in a half an hour; I am perfectly willing to take a longer period of time. I would suggest for reflection, with your fingers crossed, such idealistics as the following:

1. *A United Nations with financial resources of its own.* A very capable group of international lawyers has done a service to political leaders of all countries by developing a step-by-step program of international treaties and declarations, whereby the non-national two-thirds of the world (because after all the nation-states claim only the one-third of the earth's surface) would be fully internationalized. They have developed a specific program whereby the United Nations could, in keeping with the highest concepts of international law and order, take claim to the mineral and fishing resources of the high seas, and through leasing rights and provisions, develop in the course of the next decade, sufficient resources to guarantee its own sustenance and activities. The Antarctic, I am told, is a tremendous source of wealth. It happens to be one of the few areas of the world in which the Russians and the United States are cooperating on a scientific venture of unprecedented proportions in an unprecedented manner. That is a land area. The arctic circle is a sea area and could only be claimed, by our historical concepts of international law, by an international body. Perhaps Canada has some special role to play in the future of the Arctic regions.

2. *Creative regionalism.* As part of idealistics, creative regionalism is a form of social organization designed to utterly baffle and confuse anybody who tries to explain things in terms of simple hierarchy—that is, distinctions between, above and below, and who is boss and who is subordinate. In a world of declining hierarchy, I believe that our forms of living together throughout the world must call for vast new experiments in both federalism and regionalism. In a period of relative stagnation in the United States of ideas to back up President Johnson's slogan of "creative federalism" perhaps we might turn to the north for examples of how to do better in creative regionalism.

3. *Organization individualists.* In the world of the macro-system, of the large-scale complex of interrelated, intersecting organizations, I think we should aim to bid goodbye to what William White called the "organization man" and begin to talk about the "organization individualist." He is the person who sees a challenge to his creativity and his innovational capacities in the resources and in the confusions that are unrivalled in large scale complex macro-systems. The government's systems advisers, civil servants and civil service reformers have a great contribution to make to the promotion of organizational individualism.

4. *Female power.* At a time when the term "black power" is uppermost in the minds of many people in the United States, I would like to turn attention away from our oppressed minority to talk about the subservient majority, and use the term "female power." I am very serious on this. I think a mark of maturity in the post-industrial world will be when more opportunities in all walks of life are opened up for women. I'm including the opportunity not only to be a man in a man's world, but to be a woman in a world of men and women, an opportunity to be recognized for working in child care and housework. I must say I find nothing more fantastically humiliating than the question, which pervades a lot of questionnaires and census questions in our countries: "Are you a housewife or do you work?"

A Dutch psychoanalyst has written a book called "The Male Myth" in which he suggests the the problems that men face, and that young men face in adjusting to the modern world, can never be solved until greater opportunities are provided for women to develop free from our heritage of myth and taboo as to what is expected from a girl, what is expected from a wife, what is expected from a woman. And I have no hesitation whatsoever in predicting that before 1984, in less than twenty years, the recognition of female power, the untapped, the unleashed potentialities of women to be creative in their own way, the recognition of this potential in our society will be the acid test in the success of any major political party in the post-industrial world.

We, in the United States, have been rapidly progressing backward in this subject. The figures on jobs for women and married women completely gloss over the nature of the jobs and the salaries and the career opportunities provided. In fact, at a time when forward-looking people throughout the world know that part-time jobs are the only feasible things to add (and it's really moonlighting) to the work of the housewife, we still in our economic analysis of the labour force, regard part-time employment as something which indicates a weakness in the labour market and economic structure. We are still not directly oriented in any of our bureaucracies, whether municipal government, or state government, or universities, or hospitals, or schools, to the obvious mathematical fact that three part-time women may often do more work than two full-time ones.

5. A fifth idealistic proposition that I would offer for your attention is disguised under the technical term "interface." Interface is what the engineers talk about when they concern themselves with communication between many levels of two cooperating systems. Instead of layering you can have an interface at many levels, so that people can talk to each other freely. The interface which we must work on, because it cannot come automatically, is the interface between people in different roles in life, in different sciences and professions who cannot speak with each other. Then there is that tremendously difficult interface between "professionals" and those people who have not yet entered the professional ladder of modern meritocracy.

Here is an increasingly important role for the politician. He must find a common language. He must be able to communicate the wisdom of the *avant garde* scientist who depends on increasingly specialized jargon: *he must communicate this in some way to his electorate.* You talk in simplistic terms here about bilingualism. There is a bilingual problem, yes; but again without knowing enough about Canada, I know that in the United States we have *a multi-lingual problem in English.* We have to develop multilinguistic skills in English. I could have presented my lecture thus far in terms that only three persons in the room would have understood; maybe I would not have understood it myself. We need training in multilingual skills and perhaps if you must face up to talking various versions of French as well as various versions of English. I suppose this is a good training ground for the more difficult problem of living in the multilinguistic, hyperspecialized, hyperprofessional world of this post-industrial society.

WHAT SHOULD PEOPLE BE TOLD?

And so, having reflected in public on the questions of where are we, and how do political leaders react and where should we go, I come back to the question of political accountability. This can be formulated in a question also: What should the people be told?"

Now, I believe Canadians probably are in the delightful position of standing between two myths, both of them rather ridiculous. The British myth is embodied in the Official Secrets Act is, "Don't tell anybody anything." It is a gentlemen's world and gentlemen know. They don't have to be told, and they don't tell.

The American myth, which is just as silly, is the myth of the goldfish bowl, "Open agreements openly arrived at and tell the people everything." Well, we are not going to go very far in politics if you say you are going to tell it all. Who would listen?

But underlying both of these outdated attitudes, of course, is the gnawing question "Do we know enough to tell? What is our capacity to deal with the intelligence gap?" I must say that in our task force operations on the first Social Report of the President in the United States, we have all learned very great humility. The intelligentsia, to the extent that it is represented in these operations in Washington seems to be the very first to confess that they lack intelligence—intelligence in the information-gathering sense.

I am tempted to conclude my remarks on the problem of accounting to the people in a situation where you may not be sure what *has* happened (let alone what should happen) by quoting a marvellous story by Sir Geoffrey Vickers in a radio talk over B.B.C. called "The End of Free Fall." This is the story of the man who jumped off the Empire State Building, and after he got to the twentieth floor said, "I'm doing alright so far." Sir Geoffrey commented upon this saying: "So far, so good, but maybe its time to think about building a parachute into the system." My particular kind of parachute—the one I am helping design at this moment and have been bringing to your attention—is the development of some form of national, regional, and state systems accounting which will help us know the *status quo,* the state at which we have been, and help give us a better idea as to where we might and should be going.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this month's bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors contains an article entitled "FOI Cleanup Hitters With Good Followthrough," written by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD.

Representative RUMSFELD is a knowledgeable and articulate spokesman in the freedom of information field. I believe his article should be read by all Senators. The American Society of Newspaper Editors is to be commended for its continuous interest in obtaining a truly effective freedom of information law.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOL CLEANUP HITTERS WITH GOOD FOLLOWTHROUGH

(By DONALD RUMSFELD, Member of Congress, 13th District, Illinois)

When the new Federal Public Records Law (5 U.S.C. 552) became effective on July 4, 1967, some Freedom of Information advocates hailed it as the long-sought panacea for bureaucratic secrecy. Others condemned it as nothing more than "an open invitation to withhold legitimate information from the American people."

It is my view that experience with the new law will demonstrate that while it is certainly not an immediate cure-all, it is nevertheless far from a wholly meaningless instrument. The answer will prove to be somewhere in between the extremes.

The "Freedom of Information Act" was the result of a 12-year effort on the part of the press, the Bar and the Congress to begin to deal with decades of unwarranted secrecy in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Certainly, no single piece of legislation can be expected to erase instantly years and years of administrative habit. Those who framed the law did not envision it as an overnight answer for a problem as complicated and as diverse as that of a secretive bureaucracy.

Events since the law's inception have shown that, far from being useless, it has already had a salutary effect on the Executive Branch. Most federal officials have recognized and accepted the inevitability of conforming to the law, and nearly all federal agencies and departments have rewritten their information regulations in keeping with the law's goal of disclosure.

It is important to understand then that the FoI law was drawn up by two Congressional committees after some 200 hearings and investigations and after publication of 17 volumes of hearing transcripts and 14 volumes of reports.

It is the product of the collective judgments of many experts—editorial, legal, academic and political. It is a product of the deliberative process of our system of government, which, while not perfect, is the most nearly perfect system of government yet devised by man.

Thus, while the law is not perfect, it represents a most important step in the direction of the public's right to know about its government, and it is a foundation upon which further progress can be based.

The FoI law amends Section 3 of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946. Section 3 had been used for years by the Executive Branch as authority for withholding various types of information including that which might prove to be embarrassing or harmful politically. This section included such "useful" phrases as "requiring secrecy *in the public interest*," "except those required *for good cause* to be held confidential" and "persons *properly and directly* concerned." The new law closed these loopholes.

Another significant accomplishment of the new law is its provision for a judicial remedy if a Government agency or employe refuses access to records not excepted by statute. Under this provision, upon complaint, the United States District Court is empowered to enjoin the agency from withholding the records and order it to produce "any records improperly withheld from the complainant." The burden for proving that records can legally be kept secret is on the agency.

Theodore Sky, a Washington lawyer who heads a special public information subcommittee of the American Bar Association, commented recently: "The new mood this law creates may well be the most important result." Philip Elman, a member of the Federal Trade Commission, has said the most significant thing about the law is that it legislates a basic change in Government policy and establishes a new policy reflecting dissatisfaction with the status quo. One thing, Elman noted, is clear: When in doubt, Government officials should disclose.

Whether or not the law will work as its advocates hope will depend not merely upon court enforcement and intelligent administration by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, but, even more important, on the degree of followthrough that the nation's news media is willing to provide. To date, the press role in assuring proper implementation of the law has been spotty.

While newspaper editors, publishers and broadcasters whose testimony helped Congress pass the law might not be expected to rush to court to enforce the people's right to know, they can be expected to push the Government agencies as hard as possible. Yet, thus far, very few of the appeals against administrative secrecy have been filed by the press.

The files of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information (Moss Subcommittee) show that only 26 per cent of the government information problems handled by the Subcommittee in the six-month period since the law has been in effect were brought to its attention by newspapers, magazines or broadcasters. Lawyers, businessmen and other citizens with a special interest in particular government records accounted for 64 per cent of the Subcommittee's information work. Members of Congress accounted for the other 10 per cent.

The same pattern is apparent in appeals filed directly with Federal agencies.

A spot check of major agencies by the Washington office of the University of Missouri Freedom of Information Center indicates that fewer than 25 per cent of the appeals against initial refusals of public records were filed by the press. And the FoI Center reports that the major enforcement provision of the new law is used even less by the press. Of a dozen court cases filed in the last six months, not a single one was based on press attempts to enforce the people's right to know.

Do these figures indict the press for failure to carry out a responsibility as champion of the democratic right of access to government information, or do they merely prove what some editors and Washington correspondents have been arguing for many years—that the competent reporter backed up by a responsible newspaper can dig out the facts of government without help from congressional committees, new laws or the FoI unit of a journalism society?

The failure of the press to use fully the new FoI law and the appeal procedures resulting from it focuses on a "yes" answer to both questions. The press needs little help in ferreting out facts which secrecy-minded bureaucrats want to hide. If a government document is not put on the public record, the substance of the document can almost always be uncovered by the inquiring reporter.

But, and much more important, it should be remembered that the FoI law is not a law to provide easier access by the press to government information. The law is based on the public's, not the press', right to know. The press serves as a channel for transmission of government information. If the press is to be fully effective in its transmission, it must do more than use the routine techniques for digging out the truth about government plans and policies.

Under the pressure of deadlines, overworked reporters attempt to dig out the news of the moment. It seems that too few are permitted the time to dig deeper for the government records which may make a good story better or which may make a future story. This situation partly explains the failure of the general press to use the FoI law as a weapon to guard the public's right to know. But it does not justify that failure.

As a case in point, a number of reporters in Washington, D.C., had been aware for some time that the Agency for International Development (AID) was refusing to make available upon request details of millions of dollars of contracts it had entered into around the world. This matter came to my attention in late October, 1967, and, seeing no press challenges to the withholding, I presented the facts of the case in a speech on November 3 before the Chicago Chapter of the Federal Bar Association. Press coverage of the speech was slight.

Then, in late December, after we pursued this matter with AID, the agency agreed to adopt a policy of disclosure.

However, to my knowledge, the story of AID's reversal of its position in favor of disclosure was carried only by the Chicago Daily News Wire Service and one or two other newspapers.

The point is that the press did not in this instance recognize the opportunity to urge this major governmental agency to stop withholding information involving the expenditure of millions of taxpayers' dollars. Further, the press did not treat either the story that the withholding was taking place or the story that AID had properly reversed its previous policy of withholding.

This is but one isolated example. Unfortunately, there are others occurring every day both in and out of Washington, D.C.

How many editors and publishers are sufficiently familiar with the details of the FoI law?

How many editors have embarked on a program of informing their reporters on the uses of the law as a tool in gaining access to information?

How many reporters have had the time to study and consider the uses of the law?

How many newspapers and radio and television stations have developed plans to challenge the unwarranted withholding of information by Government agencies?

The answers to these questions would seem to provide evidence that the press has not yet begun fulfilling its responsibility to guarantee that the law is made to work.

When the FoI crusade began in the early 1950's, there were a dozen or so editors and publishers who devoted a great deal of time and energy to attempts to reduce secrecy in government. They were joined by Harold L. Cross and Jacob Scher, both eminent lawyers and both devout believers in the FoI cause.

Today most of these early FoI crusaders are no longer active in the profession. There have been too few to take their places. The need is there.

The stake of the press in the FoI movement is greater than ever before. If the FoI law is not made to work effectively, it will wither and die and further legislative remedies may expire with it.

In short, the press has a job facing it. It is the job of making a success of one of the most important laws to be passed by the Congress in the past 20 years.

As Thomas Paine said: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERALLY AFFECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] submitted Amendment No. 530 to H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, increasing by $91 million fiscal year 1968 appropriations for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas and major disaster areas, as authorized under Public Law 81-874, as amended. I give my wholehearted support to this amendment.

Senator FULBRIGHT is to be commended for introducing this measure. It would bring appropriations up to the level of 1968 entitlement for Federal aid to local school districts which are burdened by the obligation to provide educational services to the children of families employed by the Federal Government in local communities all over the Nation. The effect of cuts made in this program under mandatory budget reductions enacted on December 18, 1967, in Public Law 90–218, is especially drastic for school districts near military bases where increased military personnel assignments have been necessitated by the demands of the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, Oklahoma is one of the States to which the junior Senator from Arkansas referred when he said:

> It is probable, however, that, from the standpoint of the relationship to the total educational expense of a particular State, other States which would lose less money would nevertheless be more severely handicapped in maintaining their educational services.

The Lawton Public School District, near Fort Sill, is a case in point. The steady increase in military personnel assigned there would have brought the level of impact funding to $1,500,000 during this fiscal year. The cut now scheduled will mean a loss of $300,000 which is an equivalent of removing 50 teachers from the payroll. This is a school district which is furnishing the maximum amount of local support permitted by law, and the families of men now fighting in Vietnam are among those who will suffer most because of this drastic cutback. I have received a letter from Superintendent Hugh Bish, of the Lawton public schools, which explains what this cut means to the children in his school district. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LAWTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Lawton, Okla., February 14, 1968.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: The school administration here in Lawton is deeply concerned about the Congressional and Presidential directive to reduce already-approved appropriations for the current fiscal year. This is especially true in light of the effect a cut in 874 funds will have on our ability to offer a quality program to the students of the Lawton Public Schools. The cutback of funds will result in a serious decrease in educational services within our total program and will be detrimental to all our students, including the sons and daughters of military personnel. Considering the contributions of our military personnel to our national defense effort, it appears unfortunate that this would be the time chosen to weaken the quality of the educational program we offer their children. It would appear that we should be doing more, and not less, for those who are doing so much.

During American Education Week I received a letter from the Commanding General at Fort Sill complimenting the Lawton Public Schools for our efforts to offer a good school program to the children of military personnel. I would consider this letter to be not only a compliment to the local system but also to our Congressional delegation which has fought hard to make funds available to schools in impact areas. It is only through such funds that school systems like Lawton are able to offer our students at least a comparable educational program.

In the wake of the recent governmental action the Lawton Public Schools will lose approximately 20% of our 874 money. Since Lawton receives approximately $1,500,000, this loss will be almost $300,000. This is equivalent to the loss of 50 teachers from our payroll and will seriously hamper our total program. Lawton, like most impact areas, has had a steady increase of impact students due to the Vietnam War and our world commitments, and the present governmental action will seriously dilute our effort to maintain a program even closely comparable to our past efforts. The local support of our schools is at its maximum with our local citizens voting the legal maximum of funds for buildings, maintenance and operation.

We would urge that the $20,810,000 now withheld from the 1968 appropriation be released for allocation prior to the close of the fiscal year. Also, we request your support in obtaining a supplemental appropriation for 1968 sufficient to pay 100% of the entitlements as soon as reasonable estimates indicate the amount needed.

Any action which you can take to encourage the above appropriations would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HUGH BISH,
Supertintendent.

U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL GIVE NEEDED BOOST TO U.N.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I feel strongly that the need for Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Genocide, Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, and Freedom of Association, is greater than ever.

This continued inactivity on the human rights conventions constitutes an unpardonable disservice to the United Nations which was founded in San Francisco more than 22 years ago.

I am fully in accord with the idea that the United Nations is the "last best hope of mankind." There is support for this thought in the fact that the U.N. has received the full endorsement of the last five American Presidents.

Furthermore, the U.N. has been permanently located in this country since 1950. The people of this country, too, have backed the U.N. for the past two decades because they realize it serves the cause of world peace.

I feel that a strong United Nations can be a great factor in our search for world peace. Our procrastination is a cruel answer to the needs of mankind because the United States does care deeply about the rights of man.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment—No. 530—to H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968. My amendment would increase, by $91 million, fiscal year 1968 appropriations for payments to local school districts in federally affected areas and major disaster areas, as authorized under Public Law 81–874, as amended.

This morning, I received from the Arkansas Department of Education a report regarding the impact upon Arkansas school districts if these funds are not appropriated. Mr. Fay Bohannon, director of school plant service for the department, advised me:

> There is no way for the school districts to offset the twenty percent loss in Public Law 874 funds. It is too late to place a proposed tax rate increase on the ballot for the next school election.

I understand that local school districts all over the Nation are in similar circumstances, and I believe that the Federal Government is obligated to provide funds sufficient to meet entitlements under Public Law 81–874. Therefore, this supplemental appropriation should be approved by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from the Arkansas Department of Education together with statistical information contained in that letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Little Rock, Ark., February 19, 1968.

Hon. J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This letter is to provide you the information concerning Public Law 874 funds as they affect Arkansas public schools which was requested by Mr. James Cash, Administrative Assistant.

We have prepared a table for you which shows very clearly what the proposed twenty percent reduction will mean in the loss of maintenance and operations funds for each school district. In this table we also show the tax rate for each school district that is in effect at the present time. Some of these districts have proposed tax increases for the coming school election which is March 12. The average school millage voted in 1967 was M & O, 23.3; D.S., 19.5; Total, 42.8.

There is no way for the school districts to offset the twenty percent loss in Public Law 874 funds. It is too late to place a proposed tax rate increase on the ballot for the next school election. If a school district could vote extra taxes this year, under existing laws no extra funds would be available for this fiscal year and only forty percent could be expected for the 1968–69 school year. So you see that once these federal funds become a part of the school's operating budget, it is very difficult to make immediate adjustments that will not prove harmful to the school's educational program.

The proposed reduction in Public Law 874 funds will cause serious problems in several school districts. Gosnell School District, for example, will be affected seriously. The proposed expenditures for current expense items for 1967–68 is $585,610, compared to an entitlement in Public Law 874 funds of $284,427. A loss of $56,886 will cause a serious hardship on that school district since a check of this school district's budget shows an estimated ending balance of $28,473, provided that all assistance programs are funded one hundred percent. I am sure you are acquainted with some of the problems of Pulaski County Special School District. This school district cannot afford a loss of $181,093 with problems it has that relate primarily to rapidly increasing enrollments. The table reflects that other districts will probably curtail some phases of its school program if the proposed cut in funds is carried out.

Please keep in mind that Title I funds of Public Law 89–10 do not offset deficiencies in maintenance and operations costs. Title I funds are directed mainly toward providing and improving educational opportunities for the disadvantaged and cannot be channeled to cover general maintenance and operations costs. It appears that some leaders in government confuse the purposes and intent of both laws and results in considerable misinformation.

We are pleased to provide you with this information. We trust that it will be of some value to you in helping the school districts that are affected by the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 funds. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

FAY BOHANNON,
Director, School Plant Service.

Name of school district	1967-68 entitlement	50 percent (1st payment)	30 percent (final payment)	Balance of entitlement (not to be funded)
Arkadelphia	$23,659	$11,829	$7,097	$4,733
Altus Denning[1]	3,096	1,548	928	620
Ashdown	3,890	1,945	1,167	778
Beebe	6,138	3,069	1,841	1,228
Bismarck	9,847	4,923	2,954	1,970
Blytheville[1]	65,745	32,872	19,723	13,150
Cabot	34,786	17,393	10,435	6,958
Charleston	4,348	2,174	1,304	870
Coal Hill	3,325	1,662	997	666
Conway	23,659	11,829	7,097	4,733
County Line[2]	2,557	1,278	767	512
Dardanelle	5,627	2,813	1,688	1,126
De Queen	6,522	2,261	1,956	1,305
De Witt[1]	13,295	6,647	3,988	2,660
Dollarway	54,353	27,176	16,305	10,872
Dover[1]	3,454	1,727	1,036	691
Dumas	3,069	1,534	920	615
Fayetteville[1]	23,225	11,612	6,967	4,646
Fort Smith	88,244	44,122	26,473	17,649
Fouke	12,533	6,266	3,759	2,508
Gillett	3,454	1,727	1,036	691
Gillham[2]	2,059	1,029	617	413
Gosnell	284,427	142,213	85,328	56,886
Greenbrier	3,708	1,854	1,112	742
Greenwood[1]	27,422	13,711	8,226	5,485
Hartford[2]	1,534	767	460	307
Heber Springs	5,359	2,679	1,607	1,073
Horatio[2]	2,941	1,470	882	589
Jefferson County[2]	$1,790	$895	$573	$322
Lake Hamilton[2]	3,378	1,689	1,013	676
Lavaca	3,197	1,598	959	640
Little Rock	220,701	110,350	66,210	44,141
Lockesburg	4,604	2,302	1,381	921
Mansfield	5,115	2,557	1,534	1,024
Mineral Springs	4,092	2,046	1,227	819
Morrilton[2]	14,067	7,033	4,220	2,814
Murfreesboro	4,731	2,365	1,419	947
North Little Rock	167,024	83,512	50,107	33,405
Ozark[2]	16,625	8,312	4,987	3,326
Paris[2]	4,732	2,366	1,419	947
Pine Bluff	122,007	61,003	36,602	24,402
Plum Bayou Tucker	4,604	2,302	1,381	921
Pulaski County Special	905,461	452,730	271,638	181,093
Quitman	2,557	1,278	767	512
Rison	5,371	2,685	1,611	1,075
Russellville[2]	23,831	11,915	7,149	4,767
Saratoga	11,076	5,538	3,322	2,216
Sheridan	10,614	5,307	3,184	2,123
Texarkana[2]	201,548	100,774	60,464	40,310
Van Buren	12,789	6,394	3,836	2,559
Vilonia	5,499	2,749	1,649	1,101
Watson Chapel	42,715	21,357	12,814	8,544
White Hall	43,994	21,997	13,198	8,799
Woodlawn[2]	1,534	767	460	307
Total	2,565,932	1,282,951	769,794	513,187

[1] Estimate based upon 1966–67 application (1967–68 application has not been received).

[2] Estimate based upon 1967–68 application.

THE WISDOM OF ARTHUR HOLLY COMPTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the late Arthur Holly Compton was one of the greatest scientists, humanitarians, and educators of the 20th century. In addition, he was my valued friend.

It was Dr. Compton who directed the key program of the wartime development of nuclear energy. Later he was to become Chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis.

It is fortunate that his writings and a biography are now presented in a book entitled "The Cosmos of Arthur Holly Compton." This excellent book edited by Marjorie Johnston and an editorial advisory committee with an introduction by Vannevar Bush, I believe, will be of interest to Members of the Senate.

The Chicago Sun Times published an interesting review of the book on January 21. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANY WORLDS OF DR. COMPTON

(By Norman Hilberry, educator and consultant, participated in the construction and operation of the world's first nuclear chain-reacting pile at the University of Chicago in 1942. Professor in the department of nuclear engineering at the University of Arizona)

("The Cosmos of Arthur Holly Compton." Edited by Marjorie Johnston, with an introduction by Vannevar Bush; John J. Compton, Edward N. Condon, Thomas S. Hall and Howard Lowry, editorial advisory committee. Knopf. $10.)

Few individuals ever gain such a thorough understanding of themselves and, with that understanding, achieve such a depth of personal motivation as did the late Arthur Holly Compton, once a physicist at the University of Chicago. Nor have many of us ever been able, or perhaps even willing, to develop our personal philosophies of living with that firmness of foundation and that definiteness of detail that was characteristic of his own adjustment both to that world of nature in which he resided and that much more complex realm of the human mind in which he actually lived.

The excellence of his adjustment to the physical world is attested by his acknowledged eminence as a scientist; the worldwide respect for his accomplishments in the world of human relationships is a measure of his stature as a humanist. In both regions of human endeavor his guiding principle was the search for truth. In science (the study of the body of natural law), he was devoted to the objective search for new, experimentally verifiable knowledge, to the achievement of an understanding of the place of that knowledge within the physical system as a whole, and to a conscientious attempt to make it of use to main in his everyday life. In religion (the body of principles that obtain in the objectively unverifiable domain of the abstract which is characterized by the phenomena of personal awareness and of the human spirit), he was an equally ardent student and applied, as best the human mind can in this area of its own existence, the same cóntinual search for new insight into human behavior, new comprehension of the laws of cultural change, and the same dedicated effort to make these advances in social science effective in the betterment of man's day to day relationships with man.

His physical world extended from familiarity with those tiniest of elementary units of matter and energy of which our universe is composed to a continuing concern with those rapidly receding galaxies of stars that at present mark the fantastically remote outer boundaries of that universe. His human world encompassed with a truly sympathetic concern every segment of this earthly globe and embraced within that concern every human being, whatever his rank or race. Of few individuals, indeed, who have inhabited this planet Earth can it be said with such justice as it can be said of him, "He was proud to be a citizen of the United States but he felt almost equally at home in every corner of the cosmos as we know it."

The present volume constitutes an example of that most difficult of all literary enterprises, the preparation of a posthumous autobiography. Marjorie Johnston and her editorial advisory committee are to be congratulated on the excellence of their product. They have selected from Compton's writings with such skill that they have depicted his intellectual growth from teen-age initiate in science to Nobel Laureate in physics, from youthful idealist to world renowned humanist, in a manner that I am sure would win his most sincere approval. Indeed, had he attempted the task himself, objective as he was concerning his own place in the history of our times, I am not sure that he would have achieved as complete and illuminating a critique of that place as does this perceptive selection from the broad range of his writings.

The volume starts with a foreword by Vannevar Bush and introduction by Marjorie Johnston and the editorial advisory committee. The Bush foreword constitutes a personal tribute to Arthur Compton, the scientist, the scientific administrator, and the scientific humanist, by one of his close associates whom he most admired. I am sure that in Compton's own estimation this evaluation of himself would rank high amongst the multitude of high honors bestowed upon him by illustrious organizations throughout the world. As an aside, it would be a fine thing if Bush's brief essay could be read, then studied and eventually understood in the fullness of its implications by every youth aspiring to a career in science.

The introduction also constitutes a significant biological contribution in itself. It not only outlines the editorial philosophy upon which the book is designed and presents an excellent biographical brief but it pictures with clarity one of Arthur Compton's most basic approaches to life which might otherwise have received less than adequate emphasis. The writings selected for the book depict him as a research scientist and as an ever exploring humanist and they do so effectively. They do not do full justice, however, to his role as educator. Clearly implicit at every point throughout this exposition is his awareness that increase of knowledge and understanding in any phase of human affairs is significant only to the extent that it is broadly and understandably transmitted to others. The selections presented attest this truth, for I believe that in every case they reflect his recognition of the urgent need for cogent communication between men as man's best if not indeed his almost solitary tool by which to achieve his continuing survival.

Education was far more to Compton than a profession; to him it represented man's sole avenue to the achievement of his ultimate humanity. Compton was the scientist and the humanist, but far and beyond that, he was the teacher. This the introduction makes explicit in a sense that of necessity the text leaves largely implicit.

Space does not permit a detailed discussion of each of the 10 sections into which the editorial matter of the volume is divided. To quote from the introduction:

"The plan of the book is simple. It opens with brief personal reminiscences, followed by a section on the general relevance of science to human affairs. After an examination of several aspects of the philosophical background of science, there follow examples of the intellectual adventure of scientific pursuits, as seen in the author's work and in that of other scientists. The last half of the book is devoted to specific social and political issues in which science plays a role."

Nor am I about to attempt the impossible and try to present the impact of the text in some sort of easily swallowable literary pill. The book must be read in order to be appreciated; it must be read with attention and then reread with critical care to be fully understood.

Compton's writings are all notoriously devoid of verbal padding. If a word appears, it has a purpose and that purpose will not be revealed by speed reading. But the values one gains and the insights into our world and its problems that one achieves by a diligent perusal of this volume will far more than justify the effort. It should be required reading for every young would-be scientist and for those in each succeeding stage of scientific metamorphosis. It should be studied attentively by every humanist concerned about the trends our culture is taking and who is seeking pathways toward a more secure and sane future. It should be on the *must* book list for every intelligent layman, for it provides in a uniquely useful way a picture of the ever-increasing importance of the role which science and technology are destined to play not only in bettering his creature comforts but even more in the shaping of his whole philosophy of life.

Our society owes gratitude to Marjorie Johnston and her editorial advisory committee for a major educational task accomplished with exceptional success. I only hope that the readership achieved will not only be comparable with the thought and effort expended in the editorial enterprise itself, but, perhaps even more, that it will be commensurate with the potential benefits to our society that could attend an ever-broadening understanding of the truths proclaimed in the Compton writings it presents.

OEO'S GREEN AMENDMENT GUIDELINES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the past few weeks reports have appeared in the press and statements have been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD criticizing the guidelines developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity to implement the so-called Green amendment.

The Green amendment continues to be the subject of controversy both in and out of Congress.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, and as chairman of the House-Senate conference committee on the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, I would like to make it quite clear that so far as I am concerned, OEO has done a good job in an extremely short time in fashioning guidelines to implement the Green amendment.

The painstaking process by which OEO's guidelines have been drawn up has included consultations with interested groups both in and out of Congress, and at the Federal, State, and local levels.

The guidelines as far as they have been developed are, in my judgment, in accord with the spirit and intent as well as the letter of the provisions of the Green amendment as reported by the conference committee and enacted into law.

They have been carefully drawn, and are still being revised, to assure that the cardinal principals of community action are preserved—to assure that there will continue to be effective and full representation and participation of the poor in all decisions affecting their interests, and to assure the effective mobilization of all community resources in a comprehensive, coordinated attack on poverty.

The Green amendment was, throughout its consideration in the House and in conference, to say the least, controversial. It was subject to varying interpretations both by Members of Congress and others interested in its outcome. Because the meaning of the provisions of the Green amendment were far from clear to the members of the conference committee last year, the committee made many changes in the language of the Green amendment—changes which were both clarifying and substantive—changes which strengthened the bypass provisions and changes which preserved the concept of resident participation.

The committees of Congress will have another good hard look at OEO and its programs next year. Meanwhile, I hope that OEO will be permitted without undue interference to work out the obvious and very serious administrative problems involved in implementing the Green amendment. Let us let OEO run a poverty program for a change without its having to continually justify its very existence, and without its being subjected to perpetual harassment.

FREEDOM WEEK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, tomorrow our Nation will celebrate a national holiday to pay honor and homage to our first President, George Washington. Since a prior speaking engagement will take me away from Washington, I regret that I will not be here to hear the annual reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. However, I take this opportunity to invite attention to Senate Joint Resolution 140, which I introduced on February 7, to authorize the President to issue an annual proclamation designating the Sunday of each year which occurs immediately preceding February 22 as Freedom Sunday and the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs as Freedom Week.

This joint resolution is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 110 which I introduced in the 89th Congress and which was cosponsored by 21 Senators.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to give more dignity and respect to this national holiday in honor of our first President. A Presidential proclamation would also act as a reminder to all of us of the cherished freedom which we have under our constitutional form of government.

The Freedom Week program originated with the Sertoma Clubs of America. I am informed that Sertoma now has more than 450 clubs throughout the United States which annually hold special programs during the week in which Washington's birthday is celebrated. As a part of their program, the Sertoma Clubs distribute copies of the Declaration of Independence to schools and libraries and to municipal, county, and State offices. Local Sertoma Clubs also sponsor speech and essay contests and give awards to students who present the best speech or essay on the subject of freedom and responsible citizenship.

Freedom Week has been very successful in Utah because the Sertoma Clubs have been most active in encouraging our youth to learn more about our American Government and the responsibility which each of us has in being a good citizen. It is quite obvious to anyone who reads today's newspapers or listens to radio and television broadcasts that there is a need for concerted action by all responsible citizens to exert themselves to inculcate in our youth the spirit of responsible citizenship. It is for this reason that the Sertoma Clubs International has asked for the approval of Senate Joint Resolution 140. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations might favorably report Senate Joint Resolution 140 at an early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Utah proclaiming Freedom Sunday and Freedom Week in the State of Utah.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE STATE OF UTAH

Whereas, this Nation was conceived by a people filled with the spirit of freedom, responsibility and self-reliance. The birth of the United States of America was attended by men and women who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their honor that this Nation might have freedom; and

Whereas, if we are to reap the fruits of freedom, we must keep the laws! We must preserve our Constitution! We must construct new laws in accordance with truth. These laws must be honored, respected, revered and obeyed! Our lives, and the lives of all generations, depend on our concern for our fellow men. We must build, not destroy. We must provide enlightenment and hopeful opportunity for all. We must infuse dignity, the joy of work and brotherhood throughout the land; and

Whereas, Americans can and will solve their own problems with new ideas equal to the challenges before them . . . but, with the courage, integrity, industry and honor of our Founding Fathers . . . as embodied in the Constitution of the United States;

Now, therefore, I, Calvin L. Rampton, Governor, of the State of Utah, do hereby proclaim February 18, 1968, as Freedom Sunday, and urge all Utah citizens to join with me in attending the church of their choice to express gratitude for our bounteous blessings, and the week of February 18 through 24, 1968, as Freedom Week, and February 22, 1968, to be proclaimed as Patriot's Day in honor of George Washington.

CALVIN L. RAMPTON,
Governor.

Attest:

CLYDE L. MILLER,
Secretary of State.

AN URGENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations and the Senate itself will consider soon H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year.

I am in complete agreement with the use of the adjective "urgent" to describe the items included in the bill. However, the bill does not include funds for what I consider an equally urgent program—the program of Federal aid to school districts affected by Federal employment.

A combination of cutbacks has put the funding for this program at only 80 percent of its authorization for fiscal year 1968.

This reduction, particularly because it comes when the school year is more than half over, has created chaos in many local and State school budgets.

This reduction, because of the relatively large number of children of Federal employees attending schools in Alaska, hits my State particularly hard. If the program had been fully funded, Alaska State and local school boards would have received $12,172,490. Because of the cutback, the State will receive $9,762,046, a reduction of $2,410,444.

Before outlining my understanding of how the cutback came about, I want to put to rest a charge that has been raised that this reduction was "a vicious attack upon Alaska alone."

Of course, the charge is absolutely incorrect. The act authorizing Federal aid to impacted school areas clearly states that in those years appropriations do not meet the full authorization, payments to all States will be cut back the same percentage. While I admit that Alaska may be as hard hit or harder hit than any other State by this approach because of the large percentage of federally connected students in our schools, that is the law, and as fair a way as I know to carry out such reductions. Nine States, including Texas, suffered greater reductions than Alaska. So much for that charge.

However, many Alaska school districts, as well as districts elsewhere in the Nation, are facing serious budgetary problems because of this cutback.

I ask unanimous consent that letters from school officials in Alaska expressing concern about this reduction be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. While I do not agree with all the observations made in these letters, I think they do point out the hardship this reduction will have on public education in Alaska.

I will call attention to just one of the letters. In the small town of Hoonah, about 90 percent of the public school students live on Federal lands. As a result of the reduction, Hoonah will receive $15,000 less than its full entitlement under the program. The superintendent of Hoonah public schools, D. L. MacKinnon, Jr., reports that because there "is no fat" in his budget, the only way he can balance his budget is to dismiss four of his 18 teachers who serve a student body of almost 300 students.

Mr. President, our priorities are indeed out of adjustment if the education of our youth must suffer in order to save less than $100 million.

This most unfortunate cutback occurred in this manner:

The House of Representatives initially approved the administration's budget request of $416,200,000 for this program, some $60 million less than was needed to fund the full authorization.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, of which I am a member, increased the appropriation to $450 million, a figure which would have permitted payments in excess of 90 percent of entitlements. The full Committee on Appropriations and then the Senate approved this increase.

Unfortunately, the House would not yield in conference, and $416.2 million was the final figure.

The figure was cut back in House Joint Resolution 888, to $39,390,000 after Congress instructed the executive branch to reduce expenditures.

That is how we arrived at the present state of affairs.

The question now is what we can do to correct the situation.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, I intend to urge that an appropriation for the Public Law 874 program be added to H.R. 15399. The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday submitted an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill to add $91 million in order to fund the Public Law 874 program to its full authorization. I know that this amendment will be given ample consideration by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals Appropriations. I intend to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOONAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Hoonah, Alaska, February 5, 1968.

Senator BOB BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: Our school district has just received a very serious financial setback for the school year 1967–1968. In the remainder of this letter I would like to emphasize the importance of PL 874 funds to our schools.

I would like to comment in detail on the PL 874 cutback and the tremendous impact it will have on our district operation between now and June 30, 1968. At the present time, 90% of our students live in federally affected areas, with about 70% of the parents working on federal lands. Therefore, we receive the highest percentage of PL 874 funds of any locally operated school district in Alaska. This amounts to about $65,000 on a $220,000 budget for the 1967–1968 school year.

We have now been informed that we are to receive only 50% of our initial estimated entitlement. This would have originally been about $47,000, which we would receive in March. Now this has been reduced to around $32,000, which will leave my district with a deficit of $15,000 to finish the present school year. We do not have that extra $15,000 in the bank. We have no slush fund or extra fat in our present budget. That money is a must to make our *payroll* at the end of this school year. Like other school districts, we were working towards a zero balance and we can see ourselves going in the hole by $15,000.

As you know, all textbooks, supplies and basic commodities have been purchased and paid for; therefore, there is no chance to save money here. Perhaps we could turn off the heat or lights, but it is cold out and we are still on the shorter dark days so I can see no way to save in this area. Maybe we should let the janitor or maintenance man go, but this would be most costly in the long run. Therefore, we come back to the teachers. Our school has 18 teachers for almost 300 students. In order to save $15,000 at this stage of the year, I would have to reduce the staff by four teachers.

In an economically deprived area where we are working to improve the educational level and reduce poverty, and then be forced to cut back on the educational program in the community seems to me to be fundamentally unsound. Our children are being robbed of good teaching.

The City of Hoonah is without a tax base in which to raise revenue to replace federal impact funds. Due to the tremendous amount of federally-owned land in our city, it has been necessary for us to make use of PL 874.

We need help from somewhere to supplement our loss of revenue in the initial payment. In the 1968–1969 budget, we would have had a chance to work some of this deficit out. But I can see no way out of this problem for this year without special help from the legislature.

The other possibility would be to get a change back to making the initial payment at 75% and making the 20% cut in the final payment. This would at least allow us time to make some adjustment on next year's budget.

Any help that you could lend us would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

D. L. MACKINNON, Jr.,
Superintendent.

HOONAH, ALASKA,
February 9, 1968.

E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

The proposed reduction of Public Law 874 moneys will have disastrous effects on Hoonah's schools. We will have to reduce our professional staff by four this year and two the coming year. Our high school is not accredited and this reduction will delay accreditation by several years. Our native children are receiving substandard education now and need additional help if they are to take their place in society and not be forced to live in these poverished conditions as adults. Ninety percent of Hoonah's land is federally restricted and not taxable. One-third of our budget is dependent on Public Law 874 moneys.

We urge you to do all you can to have this reduction changed

DAN SHARCLANE,
President, Hoonah Board of Education.

GREATER JUNEAU BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Juneau, Alaska, February 7, 1968.
Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: We have just been advised that our revenues from Public Law 874 will be prorated, and that we may expect to receive only 80% of the funds from this source to which we are entitled for the current year. This amounts to approximately a $30,000 shortfall in revenue, and the information is provided at a time when the school year is over half completed and we are committed to the expenditures as budgeted.

Somewhat earlier we had been advised by the Alaska Department of Education of a 40% reduction in the funds available through the state-administered but federally-funded Vocational Education Program. I do not know whether this was a consequence of a federal proration of funds or not, but I do know this will result in an additional revenue shortfall of approximately $15,000 for this school district.

It is my understanding that the Administration's proposed budget for the 1968–69 school year is such that we can expect a reduction of approximately 10% in our Public Law 874 revenues. We must also expect a further reduction in our federal support of Vocational Education programs. In addition, it is my understanding that the appropriation designed to cover the costs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been reduced so that we may expect a decrease of over 50% in the funds available under Title II (library materials). I note that provision is made for new programs such as dropout prevention, bilingual education and special education for the handicapped. I do not as yet have any indication of how these programs might effect the Juneau School System, but frankly I am fearful of making a serious obligation under these programs, laudatory as they are, in view of the Federal Government's continuing history of leaving school districts holding the bag, so to speak, after a commitment is made. You will recall that we received 8¢ per type "A" lunch served when that program was started, and we now receive 3.5¢ per meal.

I know that you are sympathetic to our problems and will work diligently to bring about a more sensible solution to them. If there is any way in which I could be of assistance to you, please feel free to advise me.

Sincerely,
W. D. OVERSTREET,
Superintendent of Schools.

KENAI PENINSULA BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Kenai, Alaska, February 12, 1968.
Hon. ROBERT BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: We have been advised by the State Department of Education that there will be a drastic cut in Public Law 874 Funds appropriated for Alaska, and consequently in the amount to be received by the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District.

The District has counted on the use of these funds for a number of years and failure to receive them would mean a reduction in the school program. It is urged that you make every effort to reinstate this loss of funds in Public Law 874.

Sincerely yours,
STERLING S. SEARS,
Superintendent of Schools.

PETERSBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Petersburg, Alaska, February 15, 1968.
Hon. ROBERT BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: We of the Petersburg School District would like to call your attention to the funding cut of P.L. 874 monies, and ask your assistance in getting the full amount of these funds restored. The loss of these funds will work a definite hardship on the Petersburg District as well as all districts of Alaska. Also, we anticipate further impact due to expanded logging operations in our area.

Your attention on this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
T. F. SMITH,
President,
Petersburg School Board.

NOME, ALASKA,
February 19, 1968.
Senator BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

We are writing in regard to the Federal cut backs involved with Public Law 874. We are sure that you are aware of and sympathetic to our needs in this respect. Locally the Nome School District is dependent on this revenue, which represents a major part of our school district budget. In a district where unemployment may run as high as 90 per cent, local revenue just cannot make up the difference. The Nome School District would loose 20 to 50 per cent of its P.L. 874 $30,000.00 entitlement. This cut in current operating income would * * * to provide $70,000.00 in local effort. We certainly will appreciate your interest and consideration of this situation.

JAMES A. CASH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee,
Nome Education Association.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA,
February 19, 1968.
Senator BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please register our protest against cutting of Federal education funds for Alaska. We need more school buildings for a growing population and an expanded curriculum for our school system. A cutback would be detrimental to our educational system here.

HENRY S. LITTLEFIELD,
Mayor, Metlakatla Indian Community.

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Fairbanks, Alaska, February 5, 1968.
Senator E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I am greatly disturbed by the prospective 20% reduction in the P.L. 874 entitlement for 1967–1968. The Fairbanks North Star Borough School District cannot provide a quality educational program for its youngsters if it is to lose over $80,000, of an estimated $6,240,000, General Fund income. Impact aid is vital to the operation of our schools.

In spite of its pleas for reductions in current spending, the administration continues to propose new federal programs which will require funding from current revenues. Is P.L. 874 impact aid to suffer in order to support the administration's pet political programs?

I believe that P.L. 874, as presently written, is a just and equitable law. It provides for the disbursement of public funds to federally impacted school districts on a sound basis which is free of political influence. I am in favor of its continuation and full financial support. It should not be abandoned to support new federal programs which have more political influence.

Please offer your support in providing 100% funding for P.L. 874 in 1967–1968 and future years. Don't allow "pork barrel" politics to rob us of the funds it provides.

Respectfully,
W. W. VANCE,
Business Manager.

INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this week marks the 50th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The anniversary has a special significance, not only for the thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent but also for Americans of every ethnic origin, because it was the fundamental belief in liberty and freedom which created our own Nation.

There could be no more appropriate time than the present to salute the perseverance with which the Lithuanian people have pursued man's most noble goal—freedom and national independence.

In the face of bitter and sometimes harsh opposition, the Lithuanian people have refused to relinquish hope or lose faith in their objective. Their love of liberty remains undiminished. Their yearning for national independence lives on. Such faith and dedication to the principles upon which America was founded should be an inspiration to us all.

I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent, who have never wavered in their commitment to their rich national heritage.

ALL OF US ARE CONSUMERS—BETTY FURNESS SPEAKS IN WACO, TEX., ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last week the President's special assistant for Consumer Affairs, Betty Furness, spoke to the Democratic Women of McLennon County in Waco, Tex. Her message is important because information is what consumers vitally need and all of us are consumers.

For consumers to have freedom of choice, and for us to have a truly free marketplace, the consumer must have adequate information. This means he must not be deceived by clever packaging, or misleading advertising, or unintelligible interest rates, or fraudulent contracts.

Those who oppose the consumer legislation proposed by the President will have to show that busines has an inherent right to deceive which is greater than the consumer's right to information.

The array of bills pending before Congress meets many of our known abuses. But legislation does not offer us a whole remedy. Unsuspecting consumers can still be abused if they do not know that the law protects them. As we legislate cures to current abuses, we must devise effective means for vigorous programs of education.

With education we can begin to fight the real war against persons like the door-to-door salesman that defraud the elderly, and the blind, and the illiterate. These salesmen will sell goods at an attractive price and then produce a contract that secures the purchase with a mortgage that creates for the unsuspecting homeowner a debt hundreds of times the original purchase price. Some unscrupulous finance companies more interested in money than in morals handle millions of dollars of such mortgages each year.

This is the type of abuse we must stop, for as long as it is legal, we cannot expect the poor consumer to have any respect for the law.

The fight against consumer abuse has a great spokesman in Miss Furness. She continues to show not only her concern for consumers and her grasp of their problems, but also has ability to reach them in a way that can be understood.

I commend her remarks to the Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY BETTY FURNESS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC WOMEN OF MCLENNAN COUNTY, WACO, TEX., FEBRUARY 15, 1968

(NOTE—Although this text is the basis of Miss Furness' oral remarks it should be used with the understanding that sentences or paragraphs of it may be omitted in the oral presentation or that other remarks may be included that do not appear in the text.)

It's a pleasure to be in Waco, especially to meet with a group of Democratic women.

Democrats in McLennan County have much to be proud of: your Congressman is chairman of one of the most important committees in the Congress, particularly important when it comes to consumer issues.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Bob Poage is in a unique position to aid and advance the American consumer. His record on consumer issues is among the best in the Texas delegation.

And Ralph W. Yarborough, your senior United States Senator, has supported *all* the consumer bills that have been considered by the Senate and has been a sponsor of most of them. I think the American consumer has no closer friend on Capitol Hill.

These are good times on Capitol Hill for the consumer because the Congress—and I don't need to point out that it's a Democratic Congress—is responding with energy and concern to the growing needs of the little man in the marketplace.

President Johnson has proposed the broadest and most comprehensive consumer program ever offered by an American Administration and we have every reason to believe that most—if not all—of his consumer bills will be enacted in this session of Congress.

The goal of this program, as the President has said, is to "assure every American a fair and honest exchange for his hard earned dollar."

The legislation he has proposed is designed to correct abuses in the marketplace that prevent fair and honest exchange.

Our marketplace has become so vast, so complicated, the consumer needs more protection and more information than we would ever have dreamed of only a generation ago.

There was a time in this country—a short time ago, as a matter of fact—that the family produced almost everything it needed right at home.

Our grandmothers baked their own bread, knitted our sweaters, crocheted bedspreads and braided rugs.

Their husbands grew the crops, built the houses and the sheds and went no further than the barn for a bucket of milk.

Anything that couldn't be produced at home, usually was produced nearby or at least it was sold by somebody who knew what he was selling and could be counted on to tell *you* what you were getting for your dollar.

The local storekeeper was a neighbor down the street, not the agent of a giant corporation in New York.

Well, times have changed.

The American marketplace is now a vast complex of conglomerates, computers and clever advertising.

The market is national and sometimes international in scale and the man with the least amount of information and the least protection is the man who shoulders the whole thing, the consumer himself.

We have become consumers of countless goods that were beyond imagination only a decade or so ago.

Dishwashers and radios, electric refrigerators and permanent press fabrics, nylons, plastics and instant foods, were miracles to no few of us here tonight and I guess all of us watched television happen before our very eyes.

But the miracles of the marketplace, the abundance and variety of our marketplace, are not without their drawbacks.

Miracles can be complicated matters you know, and what could be more complicated than the inside of the television set or the wording of the guarantee on that television set or the credit contract that got the television set in your home in the first place.

And I can tell you for sure, that a consumer without adequate information is a likely victim for fraud.

That's why the President has set a consumer goal for his Administration, a fair and honest exchange in the marketplace.

I think he has already constructed a broad and firm foundation for that goal.

In the last three years, a Democratic Congress has enacted bills he has asked for that will protect the consumer against impure and unwholesome meat, death and destruction on our highways, misleading labels and packages, fire-prone fabrics, hazardous appliances and home products, dangerous toys, substandard clinical laboratories, and unsafe tires.

That's the foundation and we're already hard at work on the superstructure.

The Congress is now considering a Truth-in-Lending bill which will go a long way in curbing despicable abuses in the American credit system.

I don't need to tell you how many Americans—especially poor and elderly Americans—have been bilked beyond belief because they signed contracts or notes or mortgages without being told what the cost of those deals would be.

Both the Senate and the House have passed Truth-in-Lending bills and are now in the process of deciding which of the two to enact.

We hope it will be the House bill because the Senate version is not as strong a bill as we need.

Both bills require businesses offering credit—loan shops, banks, stores or whatever—to tell the consumer exactly what he's paying in interest charges. The Senate bill, however, exempts revolving charge accounts and loans with charges under $10.

Revolving charge accounts are an important part of the credit business and more and more stores are turning to that system.

A store will tell you you're only paying one and a half percent in interest. What they mean is one and a half percent per month and when you multiply that times twelve months you come up with 18% which is no small interest charge.

A store manager once told me it's too difficult to figure out annual rates on revolving charge accounts because they're not always for the whole year.

That reminds me of the lady who was stopped for speeding and when told she was doing seventy miles an hour said: "How can that be? I've only been out for 15 minutes."

The House bill includes all forms of credit and credit advertising and that's what we need.

I don't think the consumer should be put on a merry-go-round of revolving credit without the slightest chance of catching the brass ring.

This bill isn't regulating credit, after all, it's merely providing the consumer with more information.

The Congress is also considering now the eight-point consumer program the President has proposed for 1968.

The program will benefit the consumer in an amazingly broad area of the marketplace.

It covers fraud and deception in sales and abuses and death and accidents on our waterways.

It will launch a major study of automobile insurance and bring new standards of inspection of fish and poultry.

It will protect Americans against dangerous radiation from television sets and other electronic equipment.

It will insure that warranties and guarantees are not misleading and begin an effort to improve repairs and service of consumer products.

And a Consumer Counsel will be appointed to serve as a lawyer for the American consumer, to represent the interests of the little guy before courts and regulatory commissions.

That's a good program, a broad and sound program, and obviously the program of a Democratic Administration.

But let's make it clear now that it's also a pro-business program. Its intent is to bring an informed and confident consumer into a stable and honest market.

What could be better for business than that?

I think people will eat more fish and more poultry if they're sure that what they are buying for their families is clean.

We've passed a bill which will insure a high standard of inspection for meat. It's only fair that we do the same for the competitors of the beef people, the fish and fowl industries.

And this is no minor problem.

Millions of pounds of uninspected fish and poultry are consumed at American tables every year. This is a threat to health that must be eliminated.

The Deceptive Sales Act that the President has asked for as one of his eight points will also be pro-business as well as pro-consumer.

Honest business is hurt just as the consumer is hurt by misleading or fraudulent business practices.

Sales racketeering is fast becoming a national scandal.

The stories of door-to-door robbery are countless and overwhelmingly sad.

Not long ago there was a woman living in a poor Washington neighborhood who was paid a visit by a door-to-door salesman who talked her into having a hot water heater and radiator installed.

The woman, who is partially blind, lived in a small house with her 76-year-old mother. She needed the hot water heater and the radiator and didn't know that the $900 the salesman quoted was well above the market value for what she was getting.

Nor did she know when she and her mother made their marks on the contract she signed that she had put a second mortgage on her home for $7,500 plus 7% interest!

Unable to afford a lawyer, she and her mother are now paying $50 a month on the mortgage in addition to what she owes on the first.

I don't know how much she owes but when I heard this story she had already made 15 payments and still owed more than $7,400 on the principal.

This is not an isolated incident. The cases of misleading or downright fraudulent sales are becoming common in every quarter of the country.

We intend to do something about that.

The President is also greatly concerned about abuses in automobile insurance.

He has asked the Congress to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make a major new study of automobile insurance which is easily one of the greatest consumer frustrations of them all.

The consumer has too often been the victim of arbitrary cancellations, premiums that are too high, settlements that are too little or too late.

A man sleeping in his apartment has his premiums jacked up when someone runs into his car which is sitting quietly in his duly authorized parking space downstairs.

A divorcee is told she can't have insurance at anything but the highest rate because she is "preoccupied."

So are clergymen and so are doctors, insurancemen tell us.

A man who's never had an accident or committed a moving violation gets a 30% surcharge tacked on his premium because he inadvertently runs a stop sign, though no damage is done.

A Vietnam veteran is turned away by an insurance company because he's been out of the country for more than a year.

These stories may seem novel but they're not—problems with automobile insurance have become a first class consumer frustration.

The President's proposed study will examine these problems carefully and give us some guidelines for solving them.

The new consumer program will also take up the problem of repairs and warranties and guarantees and I can tell you for certain that no problem is bothering the consumer more than this one area.

The home appliance people are saying that I've singled them out for a special attack.

Well, that's not the case, as a matter of fact, but I *have* raised this issue, and will keep raising it, because I've received more complaints about it than any other single consumer problem, without exception.

I think the complaints are best summed up by the lady who once told me, "I wish I could buy an appliance that would last until I finished paying for it."

Not only are our appliances and automobiles too complicated to fix ourselves, the warranties on them are too confusing for us to understand and qualified repairmen are too few and far between for us to get our hands on them.

I sometimes think that the cost of repairs goes up at the same pace that the abilities of repairmen go down.

Something has to be done about this—it's one thing to get these miraculous new gadgets into our kitchens but it's quite another to get our money's worth out of them.

The President has directed me, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor to begin work immediately to encourage improvement in the quality of service and repairs, assure that warranties and guarantees mean what they say and say what they mean, let the consumer know how long he may expect a product to last if he uses it properly, and determine whether Federal legislation is needed.

We think we're going to work hard at finding ways to get young people interested in the repair and service trades.

Most of the points in the President's consumer program will require legislation and there's a lot of work to be done on Capitol Hill if we're going to build on the foundation we've already got.

The Congress is considering eight bills proposed by the President last year and six more he asked for in his Consumer Message last week.

We hope to get them all passed because we do, after all, have Democratic majorities in both Houses. But it won't be easy.

The Republicans have made it clear that as a group they're not exactly interested in consumer issues.

Sixty-eight percent of the Senate Republicans voted to delay action on the Fair Labeling and Packaging Bill, an important measure that was designed to let consumers know what and how much is in those boxes they buy.

In the House, more than half the Republicans voted against the establishment of a Product Safety Commission which the President wanted to establish so we could get dangerous products out of the home.

House Republicans voted four to one against the strong meat inspection bill passed by the Senate.

The Republican position on consumer issues was made clear in their 1964 platform when they pledged "an end to power-grabbing regulatory actions . . . and the ceaseless pressing by the White House, the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission to dominate consumer decisions in the marketplace."

Is it power-grabbing to want flammable fabrics, dangerous electric devices, and diseased meat removed from the marketplace?

I don't happen to think so. It think it's a classic case of government's basic responsibility to protect its citizens from danger, death and disease.

Are we trying to dominate consumer decisions in the marketplace by asking for laws that would give consumers more information to make their own decisions?

I think it's just the reverse: we want *consumers* to dominate consumer decisions in the marketplace.

The President has built a program that will do that and I've come to Waco today to urge you to get behind him and his program.

Consumers are the deepest grass roots we have. After all, everybody is a consumer, all 200 million of us.

We must let the Congress know, both now and in November, that the country wants and demands more protection, more information and more service for the consumer.

And the country's consumers need to know who their friends are, and who they aren't. I hardly need to tell a group of Democratic women in Texas the answer to that.

Thank you.

THE PROBLEMS AND HOPES OF OAS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the problems of the hemisphere are no longer isolated from the long-range interests of the United States. What affects our friends to the south eventually affects every citizen of the United States.

It behooves us to work through existing organizations to see to it that the people of Latin America attain a standard of living that is in keeping with their legitimate expectations. The Organization of American States is such an institution, embodying all that is hopeful for the future.

The problems of the underdeveloped world are all present in full measure in Latin America. The OAS is working effectively and diligently at solving and alleviating them. Much of its work is relatively unpublicized.

Yet such work by such an organization will solve the problems, uplift the people and channel their energies in positive directions. The OAS recognizes, as others do not, what is happening. It is in the field daily in an unceasing struggle against huge odds to win a battle we cannot afford to lose.

Sol M. Linowitz, our Ambassador and representative to the OAS, summed up the problems and hopes of the OAS in a significant address delivered just the other evening. It is well worth noting by the membership of this Chamber. I offer it for inclusion in the Congressional Record for the benefit and enlightenment of other Members.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz, U.S. Representative, Organization of American States, at the Closing Banquet, Second International Conference on War on Hunger, Washington, D.C., February 20, 1968

I want to begin my remarks here tonight by congratulating you—the participants in this Second International Conference on the War on Hunger. I congratulate you because from what I have learned about your proceedings I believe I say with complete accuracy that rarely has any international conference—on any subject—had the unanimity that marked yours today.

But rather than speak about "you", I want to speak about "us" for I am both honored and delighted to be a part of this conference. I am gratified, then, that we have made considerable progress in the War on Hunger here today, if only by sharpening our focus on the many problems involved in the long-range food and population battle.

We have made appreciable progress in demonstrating that we actually *care* about the deprivations suffered by two-thirds of the human race. We have examined some of the facets of the problem; we have discussed ways of using the wealth and the talent and the ingenuity of the American people—and indeed, of *all* people—to prevent hunger and suffering in the less developed world.

We have charted a course for future action without sacrificing the need for flexibility in planning, or for contingencies which are bound to arise.

And, perhaps most important of all, we have spoken with a single voice.

It is apparent that this audience does not need to be convinced. We all know what the problems are, and we know the terrible penalty that our country—and the whole world—will pay if we fail to apply ourselves unstintingly to the problems of the War on Hunger.

Our task now is to convince others and this is no easy assignment. The trials and the concerns of 1968 are pressing and immediate. How do you convince someone to worry about what may happen in the year 2000 when he feels he will be lucky if he makes it through 1968?

Yet we *must* convince others to act on the knowledge that we possess. We must do so by sharing with them the knowledge that was so evident here today. It is true that more and more people are becoming aware of the long-range battle to stem human hunger. But this mere awareness must be transformed into a resolve to do something about it in this time of paradox in which we live—a time when we have learned to achieve most and to fear most, when we seem to know more about how to make war than how to make peace, more about killing than we do about living, a time when great achievements in science and technology are overshadowed by incredible advances in instruments of destruction.

It is a time when we recall the observation of the late Justice Robert Jackson that we fear not the primitive and ignorant man but the educated and technically competent who has it in his power to destroy the earth. We are at a time when we can send men aloft to walk the sky yet recall Santayana's frighteningly timely words that men have come to power who "having no stomach for the ultimate burrow themselves downward toward the primitive."

In such a world and at such a time, we must determine what we can do to move mankind toward peace and plenty, how we can both attain and share in the great social opportunities of our lifetime. There is no escape from facing front and asking the hard questions. We can only choose where we can best take our stand—a stand that becomes increasingly urgent as the chasm steadily widens between the "haves" and the hundreds of millions of "have-nots" in the developing world.

The gap between the so-called "developed north" and the "underdeveloped south", has been described by Barbara Ward as "inevitably the most tragic and urgent problem of our day." The tragedy is in the economic despair and emptiness that marks the lives of all too many in the developing countries; the urgency is in preventing a political reaction—a reaction that has already begun—that could be, and is, damaging international peace and security.

Our nation learned a century ago that it could not live half slave and half free. We are learning today that our world cannot live on any such basis either—more than half hungry and only the minority nourished. There is no security for anyone in such a world of injustice and resentment, a world in which the future balance of power will ultimately be decided by men and women who now go to bed hungry, and awaken to a new day of malnutrition and the pangs of slow starvation.

Not so long ago we could talk about them in comfort as a sociological phenomenon, people who required our sympathy and even our charity; but they were far away—and lacked the immediacy of proximity. They lack it no longer. Science and technology have stripped away our comfort now as surely as they have stripped away the mysteries and the defenses of time and distance.

They are no longer far off in some godforsaken jungle or even more godforsaken slum of civilization; they are a transistor's length away right down the runway. They know that we all share this planet—yet while we of the developed world share its benefits and rich years they share its deprivations and lean years.

Let's take a moment to look at them—not in millions or billions, but in microcosm. Here they are:

During the next 60 seconds 200 human beings will be born on this earth. 160 of them will be colored—black, brown, yellow, red. About half will be dead before they are a year old. Of those who survive, approximately half will be dead before they reach their sixteenth birthday. The survivors who live past 16 will have a life expectancy of about 30 years. They will be hungry, tired, sick most of their lives. Only a few of them, if that many, will learn to read or write. They will till the soil, working for landlords, living in tents or mud huts. They—as their fathers before them—will lie naked under the open skies of Asia, Africa and Latin America—waiting, watching, hoping—starving.

These are our fellow human beings, our neighbors, if you will. Is it any wonder that despair and revolt at hunger, envy and even anger over the inequality of life is the most urgent political and economic fact of our day?

If one thing is clear, it is that we must find answers, not by denying their existence, or by permitting our interest in them and their problems to swing from too much to too little and back again. For that is the way to disaster, and if we would avoid it we must master our ambivalence or it will master us.

We have now learned there is no such thing any longer as a separated or isolated area of concern; that what threatens peace and stability in one part of the world, in Latin America, the Middle East or Southeast Asia, threatens peace and stability everywhere.

Above all perhaps we have learned that hunger is a threat to the peace

—the hunger caused by insufficient food;
—the hunger of insufficient opportunity;
—the hunger of insufficient development;
—the hunger of insufficient hopes.

Knowing this, don't we have to ask ourselves again: "What is our proper role?" Don't we have to take another hard look at our foreign aid program? Can we afford the luxury of turning away from a program that has shown itself to be the most effective public policy yet devised not only to help conquer world hunger but to encourage economic growth and sufficiency in the recipient nations?

I ask this question because, with all its obvious urgency, Americans have always suffered a dichotomy on the subject of foreign aid. You may remember that at the time our founding fathers were putting together the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin asked that the sessions of the Constitutional Convention be started with a prayer each day, invoking divine guidance upon the deliberations; but Alexander Hamilton protested. The Constitutional Convention, he insisted, was not in need of "foreign aid."

This spirit of Alexander Hamilton is very much with us in 1968. For nearly two centuries later, foreign aid is still suspect in all too many quarters.

Yet for every impediment and criticism tossed at it, there is also an appreciation and understanding of its importance. In 1946, a time when the world was still emerging from the carnage of World War II, and before the inauguration of the Marshall Plan, Pope Pius XII foresaw the direction this country would take toward rebuilding world society. "The American people," the Pope declared, "have a genius for splendid and unselfish action, and into the hands of America God has placed the destinies of afflicted humanity."

And our last four Presidents—of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—have all vigorously supported foreign aid. Every Secretary of State has backed foreign aid. Every Congress since the end of the Second World War has approved a foreign aid program—although, unfortunately, in steadily lessening amounts. So despite all the outcries against wastefulness and inefficiency—and there is need for concern and most careful scrutiny—there must be a good reason for foreign aid; despite repeated attempts to stifle the program in its entirety, it must be doing something right.

For example, that remarkable experiment, the Marshall Plan, not only set Europe back on its feet, but it was the first step in the long process of proving to the Russians the overriding and exemplary strength of the market economy. It was a process which, incidentally, has now not only stabilized Western Europe but is carrying the consumer goods revolution right into Russia itself. And Europe, which not too long ago was on the receiving end of aid, now is a source of aid itself to the less developed world, an international Horatio Alger story with a moral that points up both the value and the success of our aid policy in raising the living standards through economic development.

Yet, there is still too much confusion and misunderstanding about just how much of the United States tax dollar goes into foreign aid. Let me clarify some facts: We devote only one-half of one percent of our gross national product to foreign assistance. By comparison, the United States allocated twice as much for foreign aid—$7.2 billion—in 1949, *despite the fact that our gross national product then was one-third of what it is today.*

To a very large extent, these funds are available in the form of loans which recipient nations repay with interest. In Fiscal Year 1967, for example, 49 percent of all foreign aid funds went for loans. And not to be overlooked is another factor—that our assistance also takes the form of technical cooperation, by which we send skilled professionals overseas to share their knowledge and experience with their counterparts in developing nations. If this technical assistance is to be regarded as giving, then clearly it is the giving of a helping hand, literally. And the dollars spent are, in most cases, paid to American citizens.

Obviously the United States cannot and should not do the whole foreign aid job alone. We cannot be "the stacker of wheat or the hog butcher for the whole world". Neither can we be the head banker, the chief engineer, the solitary policeman, the lonely Sir Galahad out to save civilization. We cannot, we dare not, undertake to play God. But we can continue doing what is right and necessary for us to do—our just part to assure that the prisoners of hunger, of poverty, of discrimination come out of the long shadow of social and economic injustice, that they share in the benefits of modern medicine, that they get better schooling, that they get enough to eat and become full partners in progress and full citizens of the world.

Even under the best of conditions, however, and as the needs of the developing world keep mushrooming, we can no longer fail to face up to the fact that we must reach more fundamental decisions than just how many billions of dollars worth of assistance we are prepared to make available.

Indeed, no matter how much or how little money is appropriated by Congress from year to year for our foreign aid commitments, it is still far too little to accomplish the overall desirable objective of helping the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America help themselves to achieve full economic self-support. If this objective is to be realized, I believe, private capital must join hands with our Federal Government to make the impact of foreign aid more meaningful and more realistic.

Former President Dwight Eisenhower once said that the main problem of our foreign aid program is that it "lacked a constituency". I believe this is no longer entirely true. I think that the problem today is that the constituency is incomplete. Since the orientation of the foreign aid program under the Marshall Plan, it has moved toward economic development rather than reconstruction and rearmament, and this requires a much greater degree of long term investment.

It requires, I believe, the deeper involvement of America's business and labor communities, and those who have confidence in them, to act on the conviction that the economic growth of developing nations is a necessity to the United States, and therefore to them. Their added support is vital if foreign aid is to achieve a primary goal of encouraging international free enterprise in which the developing nations take their rightful places in the world's markets.

In evaluating foreign aid it is important that we also understand its limitations. It is not a means of buying allies or lifelong friendships for the United States; nor is it an effort to create a universal Pax Americana. Critics who claim that it does not purchase the friendship of the recipient nations therefore are exactly right. It was never intended that it should. The loyalty and gratitude of sovereign nations is not for sale—or purchase.

What are we purchasing with our aid dollars, then?

President Johnson answered that question in his Budget Message last month when he requested the Congress to appropriate $2.5 billion in new obligational authority during Fiscal Year 1969 for economic assistance to the needy world. "Through its international programs," he said, "the United States seeks to promote a peaceful world community in which all nations can devote their energies toward improving the lives of their citizens. We share with all governments, particularly those of the developed nations, responsibility for making progress toward these goals."

In the light of the work to be done, I can but hope the Congress will heed the President's request. It is a minimal request. It is an urgent request. At stake is the bettering of the human condition. At stake is the long range security of the United States—a security that no less than the security of democracy itself depends upon a viable community of free developing nations with strong, independent economies.

But if we would speed the growth of this community, we must also speed changes in our own ways of thinking, changes perhaps, in our traditional methods of diplomacy.

Our thinking must recognize that, even in a day of "wonder drugs", "instant relief" and "miracle cures" we are dealing with nations which, economically speaking, are still centuries behind the times.

It must recognize that foreign aid, as we know, is not limited to development alone. There are the immediate problems which concern us deeply here—the problems of food and population.

And if we are to survive the population-food crisis, we must think, not in traditional diplomatic terms of influence and power, but in terms of fertilizer, new seed varieties, irrigation, pesticides, family planning, protein enrichment of diets, improved health and hygiene, farm-to-market roads, improved crop yields, bigger and better catches of fish. We must think in terms of education for the illiterate, credit for farmers so they can purchase needed farm inputs, vastly enlarged child feeding programs.

Every 10 to 15 years, our store of scientific and technological knowledge doubles. Unfortunately, we cannot say the same thing for human wisdom. And the difference between what is technologically feasible and what is politically possible may spell the difference between world plenty and mass starvation.

As of now, in 1968, the United States and the other developed nations possess the knowledge, and the technology, to solve the food-population gap. They can, at some sacrifice, amass the capital required to solve it.

But the big question remains: Have we—and the other developed and affluent nations—the will and the tenacity and the courage it will take to do so?

Are we up to waging this War on Hunger in the knowledge that it will be long and costly? Do we understand there is no guarantee that it will win friends or influence people; that it may very well, in fact, win us short term criticism and rancor? And do we understand that if the War on Hunger can be won, the human race can survive on this planet—and that is a goal worth striving for?

Happily, the prospects for averting serious famine and human tragedy are brighter than they were even a year ago. As you have heard here, new food products of high protein content have been developed. New strains of rice, wheat and corn have greatly increased the food-producing ability of land in several of the emerging nations. Intensive family planning programs have been inaugurated in 26 developing nations, and 30 more are prepared to start similar programs or have them under serious consideration. Worldwide grain forecasts indicate that the United States and the other food abundant nations will have the capacity for preventing widespread hunger at least until 1980.

We are, furthermore, on the right track. We have learned much in the past 20 years. We know what works—and, equally important—we know what won't work. We have seen the exciting progress made by countries which have "graduated" from the need for assistance from the United States, and are now well on the road to economic self-sufficiency. Above all, in the last 20 years, we have learned patience.

We have something else, too. Call it freedom, call it capitalism, call it the American way, call it the profit motive the name isn't important. What is important is that it *works*.

We have wrought something of an economic miracle in this country over the last century in agricultural production. We feed 200 million Americans and 700 million other people around the world from the abundance of our farmlands, with a mere six percent of our people. The world has never seen its like.

Alfred North Whitehead has observed that "the vigor of civilized societies is preserved by the widespread sense that high aims are worthwhile. Vigorous societies harbor a certain extravagance of objectives, so that men wander beyond the safe provisions of personal gratifications."

In our concentration on the War on Hunger, in all our foreign aid programs, we *do* have high aims. And, possibly, when we say that our task is to revolutionize agriculture throughout the developing world, and to help the effort to deal with rapidly growing population rates, we are being "extravagant in our objectives."

For we are faced with the biggest management job in history. Economic management on a global scale is the problem of channelling capital into plants to make fertilizer to exploit the newly developed strains of rice and wheat and corn. It means tailoring research to fit local situations. And it is the problem of containing human fertility within the framework of orderly growth.

We must therefore continue our programs of food aid to the underdeveloped nations until their economies become stronger. We must press forward diligently in modernizing agricultural practices in the needy nations. We must help in the effort to attain wider acceptance of family planning programs in those countries where population growth overwhelms every advance in the economy.

And, most importantly, we must demonstrate our dedication, our willingness to support—unstintingly and unceasingly—the battle against mankind's ancient enemies: hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance and despair—the battle against the starvation, the lack of opportunity, the brute conditions of life that we know must be changed for the sake of us all. For in this miniworld of giant extremes in living standards, we dare not forget that "the poorest he hath a life to live as the greatest he."

That we have done so in the past, spontaneously, as a natural reaction to the needs of our neighbors, is not only recorded history, it is a living policy—a basic philosophy that has guided the United States since World War II. It is philosophy that speaks clearly and unmistakably of America's desire for a peaceful world, one governed by the rule of law, one in which every man can live in dignity. It is this desire—one that has shaped American foreign policy for a quarter of a century—that now motivates President Johnson's policy in helping the underdeveloped world catch up with the 20th century.

And this fact adds, I believe, an essential ingredient to all the dissent and debate we hear today about American foreign policy. It tells us truly and accurately the kind of nation we are and what we are about—a nation possessed with a sense of political and social justice unmatched in human history.

And I would go further, too, and say that United States policy in fighting the War on Hunger—in every aspect of our foreign aid—is nothing less than an expression of national dissent and protest—dissent with the inequalities of the status quo and protest against the harsh cruelties of underdevelopment—a protest that will affirm and indeed utilize the tools, the procedures, and the resources we possess to help abolish poverty and injustice in all their forms. It is a protest in which I would ask all Americans to join their government.

I ask them to protest as individuals properly dissatisfied with the human conditions and seeking to improve it.

I ask them to protest against having two-thirds of humanity lead lives that are "nasty, brutish, and short".

I ask them to protest against the disease and illiteracy that affect the overwhelming mass of people.

I ask them to protest against the hovels in which millions of human beings are compelled to live.

I ask them to protest against the lack of opportunity and hope which confronts the millions on this earth.

I ask them to protest against the malnutrition that is slowly starving at least one-fourth of humanity—against babies being born retarded because mothers were starving during their pregnancy.

I ask them to protest against life as usual in the face of unspeakable human tragedy.

There is no simple answer, no magic formula that will, in a blazing flash, right all wrongs. But if we can spark a constructive program for the future—if you will, assert a protest that will build creatively for the future—then we may help prevent any future Viet-Nams and, indeed, make them anachronisms of history. For our success will show that peaceful revolution, peaceful change—*can* be the key to the future.

It can also be our answer to all the preachers of hate and violence—to all who fear becoming a good neighbor to the man in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia—or in Harlem, Watts, Newark or Detroit—to all who blindly seek shelter in a world that no longer exists. In short, it is our answer to all who want to stop the world and get off. It is our answer that we want to stay on; and that we know the best way of doing so is to become a vital part of the world and add our own contribution toward making it a little better, toward showing that we really mean what we say when we talk about the importance of democratic institutions as the answer to the challenge of our age.

This way we can prove our willingness to accept the charge of history and meet our responsibilities with the imagination and compassion befitting the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth.

And we can do it.

INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION SOCIETY ENDORSES LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT IMPORTATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Friday, February 16, I introduced S. 2984. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States and the interstate shipping of endangered species. As I mentioned in my introduction of the bill, the measure is supported by conservationists all over the world. An example of this support came to my attention in the December 1967 issue of Oryx, official publication of the Fauna Preservation Society, which notes that Britain has already instituted such restraints on its own fashion market.

Sponsored by the Queen of England, and numbering among its vice presidents Prof. J. G. Baer, of Switzerland, the Maharajah of Mysore, in India, and American naturalist, author, and editor, Dr. Fairfield Osborn, the Fauna Preservation Society has as its object the saving of world wildlife—from tigers in India to whooping cranes in Texas.

This valuable support for S. 2984 is another indication of the world's attention to the real intentions of America in the field of conservation. For this proposed legislation is one of the first proofs of our country's real attitude toward preserving world wildlife—that we are sincere enough to take these furs and hides off of our own domestic markets, in order to save them. It is an indication to the world that our international policies are determined by something higher in principle than commercial interest—and the dictates of fashion.

As the magazine Oryx notes:

> It is essential that all importing countries should have such an Act if the objects (of conservation) are to be achieved.

Our country, one of the major markets for traffic in endangered species, must act now, by passing this legislation, before such species as the leopard, tiger—even the rhesus monkey—are too far gone to be saved.

Furthermore, as Oryx notes, the act would insure the safety of one of America's distinctive species—the alligator. Now caught in "the inevitable vicious circle—increased poaching, fewer animals, increased prices for skins, more poaching"—this species needs immediate protection if it is not altogether to disappear in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Rare Animals Bill for the United States of America," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RARE ANIMALS BILL FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A bill to control the importation of endangered species of wildlife into the USA was introduced into Congress in the summer, by Representative John D. Dingell of Michigan, and has the enthusiastic support of all conservationists. If it is passed it will give the USA an Act similar to the British Act passed in 1964, which was promoted by the FPS and is proving a valuable tool in the control of traffic in endangered species. But obviously it is essential that all importing countries should have such an Act if the objects are to be achieved. The British Act works through a Government Committee, on which the FPS Hon. Secretary sits, which vets all applications from zoos, dealers and others to import any animal listed in the schedules to the Act. In the same way the American bill seeks to give the Secretary of the Interior power to prohibit the importation, dead or alive, of any species or subspecies, or parts of them, which he considers to be threatened with extinction after consultation with the exporting country and, when appropriate, with IUCN; exceptions for educational, zoological and scientific purposes would be allowed. The American bill also seeks to extend the present prohibition of inter-state traffic in illegally-taken wild mammals and birds to cover amphibians and reptiles and other categories; this would enable the states to stop the present very considerable traffic in the hides of poached alligators in the southern states. Hides taken illegally are smuggled into a neighbouring state from which shipment is not illegal. As a result of this widespread poaching and law evasion the American alligator has decreased to such an extent that it is now on the danger list. The inevitable vicious circle—increased poaching, fewer animals, increased prices for skins, more poaching—is now in full swing, and nothing but a well enforced legal prohibition can stop it. The price of alligator hide is now $6.50 per foot.

EXPANDING RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in frequent speeches both in the Senate and across the country, I have expressed my concern regarding the critical great need for State governments, and especially the State legislatures, to modernize their operations and begin to face up to the expanding responsibilities of the States, if our federal system is to be preserved. I have been very proud of the significant leadership the legislature of my own State of Maryland has demonstrated in facing up to modern State problems.

It is always heartening to report encouraging developments in this field. The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, under the leadership of former Postmaster General Edward Day; former Kansas Governor, John Anderson; and the executive director, Larry Margolis, is beginning to make its efforts felt in various States over the country. The Council of State Governments is beginning to urge upon its constituents the necessity of intensive attention to urban affairs. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its recurring reports, points out various areas of needed improvement in Federal-State and State-local relations.

One of the principal areas of State inactivity has been in the field of long-range economic analysis and planning. In one of the first such steps taken anywhere, Jesse M. Unruh, the distinguished speaker of the California Assembly, with bipartisan assistance, has introduced legislation calling for the establishment in the legislature in that State of a joint economic committee. The bill states the following as its basic purpose:

> The Legislature finds and declares that the maintenance of the policy of the State of California for full employment, maximum economic productivity and continued economic growth requires that the Legislature have available accurate and independent resources for the collection and analysis of economic information and forecasts. The Legislature further finds that provision of such economic studies and forecasts can best be achieved through the establishment of a joint legislative committee, adequately staffed with economists and other professional personnel, rather than through continued sole reliance upon the executive agencies of state government for such economic information and advice, and to that end this chapter is enacted.

I hope that the legislation in California is successful, and I hope that other States will take note of this additional major step down the road toward responsive and responsible government on the part of the legislature of our largest State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of assembly bill 265 and introductory remarks by Speaker Unruh be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ASSEMBLY SPEAKER JESSE M. UNRUH CONCERNING ASSEMBLY BILL 265, CREATING THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For a number of years, during both Democratic and Republican administrations, I have been extremely concerned over the effects on the Legislature's decision-making capabilities of the way in which the Department of Finance operates and is used by the executive. For some time legislators of both parties have expressed concern over the failure of this important agency to formulate valid revenue and expenditure estimates. I am sure you recall my objections to this failure during Governor Brown's Administration. I have seen little improvement during the present Administration.

Let me give you a few examples of the difficulties which we in the Legislature have in dealing with, or trusting, the Department of Finance exclusively for fiscal data. In 1965 the Petris-Unruh tax reform bill was pending before the Assembly. On the morning of the day that bill was scheduled to be heard in the Ways and Means Committee, the then Director of Finance—by sleight of hand, or other unknown means—came up with a sudden General Fund surplus of more than $100 million which he claimed obviated the necessity for our tax reform measure. It was clear to most of us in the Legislature at that time that this new revenue "find" was designed to kill off the support which AB 2270 had generated among members of both parties.

Again, last fall, in a five-month period we saw a vaunted $210 million deficit in our Medi-Cal program evaporate inexplicably and turn into a $31 million surplus. I am sure we were all chagrined to find that we had spent the final two weeks of our four week special session talking about a program which, at that time, the Administration knew full well was fiscally sound.

Finally, several months ago the present Director of Finance called a news conference to announce that the Governor's Budget would show a $194 million surplus; in the next breath he "warned" that this was only a "paper surplus," none of which could be spent. His explanation was so clear that after 45 minutes of it, when he asked the assembled newsmen if they had any questions, the room—according to one newspaper report I saw—"erupted in laughter."

I think I need not describe more of these instances. Whatever our partisan political affiliation, we are all familiar with them.

I believe that the fiscal affairs of California are too important to be left to political manipulation by the executive branch of government. Assemblyman Veneman's Revenue and Taxation Committee took the first step toward making revenue estimating non-partisan when it insisted on an amendment in last year's tax bill requiring the Controller to audit the cash-flow information presented in the executive budget. I believe this bill is the next logical step.

Assembly Bill 265 creates a new and influential joint committee of the Legislature, called the "Joint Economic Committee". It transfers to that body all duties, functions, and staff presently under control of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. It adds, however, numerous other important duties which are not exercised by any legislative agency.

The bill constitutes the Joint Economic Committee with the leadership of both parties in both Houses of the Legislature. It is a ten-man committee, the Assembly contingent to be composed of the Speaker, the Minority Leader, the chairmen of the Ways and Means and the Revenue and Taxation committees, and one additional member appointed by the Speaker. Under the present organization of this House, this would lead to a politically balanced Assembly contingent. The Senate half of the committee would be composed of the President pro Tempore, the Minority Leader, the chairmen of the Finance and the Revenue and Taxation committees, and one appointment by the Senate Rules Committee.

This would be a powerful committee, capable of exerting considerable legislative influence over expenditure and revenue policies. I think everyone will concede that as effective as Alan Post's office now is—and I have always been one of the Legislative Analyst's strong defenders—the Joint Budget Committee has not been active as a committee recently.

We propose to transfer the Legislative Analyst's present duties of line-item, and program-by-program budget review to the Joint Economic Committee. I think we all agree that in this field Mr. Post and his staff have done an outstanding job. Further, the functions of that office of providing confidential fiscal information to Members of the Legislature on request, and of analyzing appropriation bills would remain unchanged.

However, this bill creates new duties within that office, duties which have never been performed and which I believe are most important to the Legislature. A principal new duty is for the committee and its staff to analyze the annual economic report of the Governor, required by law to be rendered by him to the Legislature, and to hold hearings and make a report on it. This is identical to present legislation which created the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress in 1946. It has proven most successful at the federal level in allowing Congress to gain a broad overview of the economic outlook of the country. We need to do the same thing in California. Only by knowing what the economic indicators are—what are expenditure policies of governments at local and federal levels—can we intelligently make long-term, valid expenditure and taxation decisions in the Legislature. The Governor's annual economic report now gathers dust on our shelves; I doubt if many of us have ever looked at it. This new committee duty will provide legislative scrutiny of that important report.

Other duties of the new committee and its staff include:

1. Monitoring federal fiscal policies which may have an effect upon California's economy, and the Legislature's fiscal decisions;
2. The preparation of economic forecasts, and a comparison of these independently prepared data with similar data developed by the Governor's Department of Finance;
3. Inclusion in the annual budget analysis of an evaluation by the committee staff of the accuracy of Department of Finance revenue and expenditure estimates;
4. Other vital duties of long-range expenditure projections, the development of priorities among state programs competing for funds, continuing studies of performance and program budgeting, to include cost-effectiveness studies of state programs and agencies, and a number of other specialized studies.

Let me make it very clear that in offering this legislation I do not want in any way to be interpreted as being critical of the present Legislative Analyst or his staff. I believe Mr. Post has done an excellent job. But I believe that as a responsible legislative body—and an independent one—we must do more.

Mr. Post has worked with my staff in developing AB 265 and his assistance has been invaluable. We have also consulted with other Assembly committee staff, with noted economists at our universities and out-of-state, and with the staff of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. We have their overwhelming approval of the concept of this bill.

This is not a Democratic or a Republican bill, as the coauthors on AB 265 demonstrate. Rather, it is a measure which seeks to maintain and strengthen the independence of the Legislature to make informed policy decisions in the fiscal area. With a state budget of five and one-half billion dollars a year, we simply cannot afford—the taxpayers cannot afford—to limp along on partial information any longer. I believe this legislation will go a long way toward a responsible solution of this problem.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—1968 REGULAR SESSION ASSEMBLY BILL 265, INTRODUCED BY ASSEMBLYMEN UNRUH, VENEMAN, CROWN, AND BAGLEY, JANUARY 29, 1968—REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

An act to amend Section 15901 of, to add Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 10650) to Part 2, Division 2, Title 2 of, and to repeal Article 7 (commencing with Section 9140), Chapter 1, Part 1, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code, relating to aides to the Legislature

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 7 (commencing with Section 9140), Chapter 1, Part 1, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code is repealed.

SEC. 2. Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 10650) is added to Part 2, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code, to read:

CHAPTER 6. JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

10650. The Legislature finds and declares that the maintenance of the policy of the State of California for full employment, maximum economic productivity and continued economic growth requires that the Legislature have available accurate and independent resources for the collection and analysis of economic information and forecasts. The Legislature further finds that provision of such economic studies and forecasts can best be achieved through the establishment of a joint legislative committee, adequately staffed with economists and other professional personnel, rather than through continued sole reliance upon the executive agencies of state government for such economic information and advice, and to that end this chapter is enacted.

10651. There is hereby created a permanent joint committee of the Legislature, to be known as the Joint Economic Committee. The committee shall be composed of ten members, five of whom shall be Members of the Assembly and five of whom shall be Members of the Senate. The Assembly members shall consist of the following: the Speaker of the Assembly, the Chairman of the Asembly Committee on Ways and Means, the Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation, the Minority Leader of the Assembly, and one Member of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker. The Senate members shall consist of the following: the President pro Tempore of the Senate, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Revenue and Taxation, the Minority Leader of the Senate, and one Member of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules. The chairman of the committee shall be elected biennially from among the membership of the committee by a majority vote of each house's delegation on the committee.

10652. The Joint Economic Committee shall, on the effective date of this chapter succeed to all powers, duties, and functions of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

10653. The Joint Economic Committee shall by a majority vote of its members from each house, appoint an executive director and fix his compensation. The executive director shall, on the effective date of this chapter, succeed to all powers, duties, and functions of the Legislative Analyst.

10654. The executive director shall, subject to approval by the committee, appoint technical and clerical staff necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties. At least two members of the staff thus appointed shall be professional economists, experienced in economic forecasting.

10655. The Joint Economic Committee shall have the following general duties and responsibilities:

(a) The committee shall analyze the annual economic report of the Governor, employing public hearings and staff analysis, and shall submit a report on the economic report as provided in Section 15901. The committee shall include in its report any recommendations for legislative action at both the state and federal levels which it may deem necessary for the continued economic health of the state.

(b) The committee shall monitor federal legislation and federal executive decisions which may have an effect upon the state's economy, and its growth and development. The committee may arrange for representation by the California Legislature before federal agencies and the Congress, where it deems appropriate.

(c) The committee shall prepare economic forecasts and related data, and shall compare such data with similar information prepared by executive agencies of state government and contained in the Governor's Budget and economic report. The committee's annual analysis of the Governor's Budget shall contain an evaluation by the executive director and his staff of the accuracy and adequacy of the revenue estimates and forecasts of state economic activity and other pertinent information contained in the Governor's Budget.

(d) The committee shall ascertain facts and make recommendations to the Legislature and to the houses thereof concerning the state budget, the revenues and expenditures of the state, the organization and functions of the state, its departments, subdivisions, and such other matters as may be provided for in the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly.

(e) The committee shall study and periodically report on the subjects of long-range expenditure and revenue planning and policies.

(f) The committee shall present appropriate economic and budgetary data on the various state programs, such that the Legislature may develop priorities among programs competing for state funds.

(g) The committee shall conduct continuing studies of program and performance budgeting systems, and shall undertake periodically to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of state programs and agencies.

(h) The committee may undertake other special studies, including but not limited to:

(1) Studies of state, debt management

(2) Studies of state-federal-local fiscal relations

(3) Studies of state economic growth, where it can be influenced by the decisions of state government

(4) Studies of the efficiency of state government operations within the several agencies.

(i) The committee shall, in its deliberations and investigations, give particular attention to the impact of scientific and technological advances upon the conduct of state programs and upon the state's economy.

10656. The Joint Economic Committee shall have the power to appoint subcommittees from among its membership to be composed equally of members from each house of the Legislature; to conduct hearings within the state on problems within its jurisdiction; to issue subpenas where necessary to compel the attendance of witnesses; and to compel the cooperation of state executive agencies in conducting its business.

10657. The committee has a continuing existence and may meet, act, and conduct its business at any place within this state, during sessions of the Legislature or any recess thereof, and in the interim period between sessions.

10658. The provisions of the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly relating to investigating committees shall apply to the committee and it shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly shall from time to time prescribe, and all the powers conferred on committees under Section 11, Article IV, of the Constitution.

SEC. 3. Section 15901 of the Government Code is amended to read:

15901. (a) The Governor, utilizing his staff and the resources of state agencies responsible to him in preparation thereof, shall transmit to the Legislature not later than the 30th calendar day of each regular session an economic report setting forth:

(1) The rates and levels of employment, production, income and purchasing power obtaining in the state and needed to carry out the policy of full employment;

(2) Current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, income, and purchasing power;

(3) A review of the economic program of the state and its political subdivisions, as affected by economic decisions and policies of the federal government, and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the state or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, income, and purchasing power;

(4) A program for carrying out the policy of full employment, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable;

(5) A statement of economic forecasting data designed to indicate future state revenue needs, assuming existing expenditure levels of state government, and a similar statement, assuming any proposed increases in expenditures recommended by him.

(b) The Governor may transmit from time to time to the Legislature reports supplementary to the economic report, each of which shall include supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy of full employment.

(c) Upon receipt of the annual economic report of the Governor, the Joint Economic Committee shall conduct public hearings on the substance of the report, and no later than 45 days after receipt of the Governor's report the Joint Economic Committee shall issue a report on the economic report of the Governor. Such report shall include recommendations concerning the accuracy of the economic information contained in the Governor's report, together with any recommendations concerning the Governor's report which the committee may wish to make.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 265, as introduced, Unruh (G.O.). Joint Economic Committee.

Amends Sec. 15901, adds Ch. 6 (commencing with Sec. 10650), Pt. 2, Div. 2, Title 2, and repeals Art. 7 (commencing with Sec. 9140), Ch. 1, Pt. 1, Div. 2, Title 2, Gov. C.

Creates Joint Economic Committee of Legislature to, among other things, analyze the economic annual report of the Governor, monitor federal legislation and executive decisions affecting the state's economy and growth and development, prepare economic forecasts and related data, evaluate accuracy and adequacy of the revenue estimates and forecasts contained in the Governor's Budget, evaluate cost effectiveness of state programs, study impact of scientific and technological advances on state programs and its economy, and conduct various other kinds of studies.

Abolishes Joint Legislative Budget Committee and transfers its functions to Joint Economic Committee.

Vote—Majority; Appropriation—No; Fiscal Committee—Yes.

ESTONIA COMMEMORATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE DECLARATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 24, Estonia commemorates the 50th anniversary of its declaration of independence.

This day is of importance to Estonians everywhere, but especially to those still living in their homeland, which is now controlled by the Soviet Union.

In years past we have often heard the United States and other Western nations criticized by Communist countries for practicing colonialism. Soviet Russia overlooks its occupation of Estonia, which is certainly colonialism of the most obvious sort.

Not only Estonia, but Latvia and Lithuania, as well, were occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have talked about the principle of self-determination. But we have given and are giving evidence of our belief in the principle. Russia has an opportunity to do so, but has not acted.

Hopefully, the focus of world attention on Russia's occupation of Estonia and her small sister countries will help bring about the day when these countries can again assume their rightful roles as independent nations.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY SPEECH

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we pause today to commemorate an anniversary which represents an important moment in the history of self-determination for all peoples. Fifty years ago today, February 24, 1918, the Baltic Republic of Estonia proclaimed its independence after almost two centuries of Russian rule.

Estonia refused to see its national identity erased from international memory. Seizing the opportunity for freedom offered by the unstable situation which resulted from World War I and the Russian Revolution, the valiant Estonians declared their independence. For two decades the flame of freedom burned brightly in Estonia. Under a democratic republican government the country flourished. Economically, culturally, and socially this small Baltic land prospered and advanced.

The forces of aggression which have been so unkind to Estonia unfortunately did not remain dormant. In 1939 the flame of Estonian freedom began to flicker as the Soviet Union once again encroached upon Estonian sovereignty using the Mutual Resistance Pact as a pretext. A year later the torch of liberty was snuffed out and Estonia became a Soviet Socialist Republic.

To this day, the American Republic has not forgotten the grand years of Estonian independence. The tragedy of Estonia will be remembered as long as the cause of freedom and the principle of national self-determination stand as the cornerstones of the international community.

OVERLOOKED ASPECTS OF CRIME PROBLEM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the distinguished president of the County Council of Montgomery County, Md., Mr. William Greenhalgh, recently gave a speech about crime before a unit of the Health and Welfare Council of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Greenhalgh's remarks deserve attention. They bring to light a number of aspects of the crime problem in this area that are largely overlooked.

Among other things, Mr. Greenhalgh recommends that the Council on Law Enforcement of the District of Columbia be reactivated. Congress created this Council in 1953 "to make a continuing study and appraisal of crime and law enforcement in the District" and to "make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives at the beginning of each regular session of Congress."

As Mr. Greenhalgh points out, the Council performed well, for a time. It served as the mechanism for coordinating crime control and prevention activities within the District of Columbia.

In recent years, however, as Mr. Greenhalgh says, the Council has confined its activities to occasional comments on legislation pending before the Congress.

I agree with Mr. Greenhalgh that the Council on Law Enforcement should be reactivated and that similar councils should be established in the major suburban jurisdictions.

Mr. Greenhalgh is well qualified to speak on this subject for several reasons. Besides serving as president of the Montgomery County Council, he is a distinguished lawyer and codirector of the legal internship program of the Georgetown University Law Center. I ask unanimous consent that his speech before the Health and Welfare Council be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I doubt that I will surprise you when I begin by stating my belief that the United States is now facing one of the most serious threats to its existence since the Civil War.

Crime and delinquency have become a nationwide sociological epidemic. The cancer's history has been well documented by every major newspaper and in most leading periodicals. Take, as an example, some of the story titles in last Sunday's *Washington Post:* "$600 Stolen From Fuel Firm," "Alexandrian Shot During Argument," "Chief, Officer Beaten in Brawl Outside Bar," "Police Seek Slaying Lead."

On a national basis, the rates for crime and delinquency are growing over six times faster than the population rate. To bring the problem a bit closer to home, several years ago the F.B.I. conducted an extensive survey of crime in seven similar metropolitan areas located in the northeastern portion of the country. The Washington, D.C. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area topped the list with an annual rate of 2,073 major offenses per 100,000 inhabitants. In the same survey, the Pittsburgh metropolitan area registered only 1,101 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants;

the Baltimore area, 1,589. Only the urban complex which includes Newark, New Jersey came close to challenging our region for the lead.

Many conditions can be cited as factors contributing to the high crime rate of the Washington area. The density and size of our population is one factor. The population's age composition, its economic status, its high degree of mobility and its percentage of unemployed all exert upward influences.

As citizens who live and work in the National Capital Region, we are all, naturally, concerned about our crime and delinquency dilemma. But concern alone is not an acceptable response from the people in this room. You, as representatives of the Health and Welfare Council and as officials of the organizations represented on the Council, and I, as a local elected official, have the responsibility for doing something about this problem.

In short, we who form the Crime Control and Prevention Establishment are at a major crossroad. The challenge has been well defined; the need for a bold, imaginative new offensive against disorder and lawlessness cannot be questioned; the responsibility for this action is ours.

In February of 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice released its report, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society." This report and the thousands of pages of task force studies that go with the basic document form the most comprehensive catalogue of this nation's crime and delinquency problems and possible solutions that has ever been produced.

In December of 1966, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia submitted its report, one of the most complete, in-depth studies of crime ever prepared for a single city.

To our collective credit, most of us have read these reports; many of us have made an effort to evaluate our individual areas of responsibility in the light of these reports; some of us have made conscientious efforts to implement recommendations contained in these reports in the agencies that we direct.

To our collective discredit, most of us have conducted our activities in a vacuum, without regard for what other segments of the crime prevention and control system were doing; some of us have participated in the noble rhetoric, but have not let our words affect the status quo of our organizations.

Many different types of agencies have a role in the process of crime prevention and control. The National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice pointed out that, "The prevention of crime covers a wide range of activities: eliminating social conditions closely associated with crime; improving the ability of the criminal justice system to detect, apprehend, judge and reintegrate into their communities those who commit crimes; and reducing the situations in which crimes are most likely to be committed."

The overall effectiveness of the whole crime prevention and control system depends on the effectiveness of its individual components—the police forces, the courts, the correctional institutions, the poverty and welfare programs. The effectiveness of the individual components depends, at least partially, on the ability of that component's staff and directors to understand their role in the whole system.

In other words, there must be communication and coordination among the police, the judges, the prosecutors, the public and private social agencies, the corrections people and most importantly, between these agencies and the general public in each of our local governmental jurisdictions.

In 1953 Congress created the Council on Law Enforcement of the District of Columbia. The Council had a statutory composition of 15 persons: President of the D.C. Board of Commissioners, Chief of Police, United States Attorney, Corporation Counsel, representatives from the areas of corrections and parole, designees of the District Court, Court of General Sessions and Juvenile Court, other public officials, and representatives of the District of Columbia Bar Association, Washington Bar Association, and Washington Criminal Justice Association. Congress instructed the Council to "make a continuing study and appraisal of crime and law enforcement in the District," and to "make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the beginning of each regular session of Congress."

For a time the Council performed its duties well. It served as the mechanism for coordinating crime control and prevention activities within the District of Columbia.

In recent years, however, the Council has confined its activities to occasional comments on legislation pending before the Congress.

The Council on Law Enforcement should be reactivated. It should be given adequate staff, and it should be recharged with the responsibility for coordinating the activities of the crime control and prevention system in the District of Columbia. Similar Councils should be established in the major suburban jurisdictions.

I have been pleased with the success of Montgomery County's Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Commission which is the coordinating mechanism in our area. This type of intergroup exchange is absolutely essential to any effective local crime prevention and control effort.

I would like to comment briefly on one other aspect of the crime and delinquency situation—the regional aspect.

Approximately 15% of all persons arrested by area law enforcement officers for all criminal acts, excluding traffic, are nonresidents of the communities in which they were arrested. Of this 15%, two-thirds were resident within the Washington Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, but in a community other than the one in which they were arrested.

Criminals operate on an interjurisdictional basis because there is less of a chance of apprehension. It is extremely difficult to trace a stolen color television set from Montgomery County that is found in a District outlet store to a Northern Virginia thief.

The Public Safety Policy Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, that I chair, has the responsibility for developing programs at the regional level for dealing with this type of problem.

Again, as at the local level, the problem is one of communications and of coordination of efforts. Again, many different types of agencies have interests and responsibilities in the solution of the problem.

The Council of Governments is a voluntary association of the 15 major local governments which collectively comprise the Washington Metropolitan Area. My Public Safety Policy Committee is composed of one elected official from each of the 14 member suburban governments in the Council and one of the Presidentially appointed District of Columbia city councilmen.

Under the Policy Committee's guidance, a number of significant regional crime control and prevention programs have been initiated:

The Council has formed a Regional Police Chiefs' Committee which has, in turn, formed standing subcommittees concerned with such problems as interjurisdictional communications, intelligence exchange and investigative activities.

The Police Chiefs' Committee has initiated regional police teletype and radio systems which make possible the rapid exchange of information among law enforcement units.

The Council of Governments is now working with the Metropolitan Police Department (D.C.) to develop an area-wide computerized police information system.

The Council has asked the U.S. Congress and the Maryland and Virginia General Assemblies to adopt enabling legislation which would allow area local governments to enter into police mutual aid agreements.

So far, the Council of Governments' crime prevention and control activities have been confined, primarily, to the law enforcement field. We hope to soon receive a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development which will allow us to explore the desirability and feasibility of developing the same type of voluntary cooperative arrangements in the criminal justice and correctional areas.

I mentioned earlier that we of the Crime Control and Prevention Establishment have reached a major crossroad, have had the challenge well defined for us and have the responsibility for finding solutions to these problems.

I believe that our local institutions—public and private—will master these challenges. If I did not, I would not be here today.

A BRISK MARKET IN DIRT?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Kansas City Times of Thursday, January 25, 1968, contains an editorial entitled "A Brisk Market in Dirt?" The editorial tells of a new company which will begin operating in Britain next month. This company, called Records Research Index, intends to accumulate data on employees of companies subscribing to the Index; and will include statements of their loyalty, integrity, and the reasons for any past dismissals. According to the Kansas City Times:

> The Index will be especially interested in any suspicion of dishonesty—however, circumstantial—and whether or not the employee ever was prosecuted.

The Kansas City Times editorial draws the analogy between this new company and the proposed National Data Center, where all the available information on every living American could be stored in the memory bank of a computer "ready to leap forth at the touch of a button."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRISK MARKET IN DIRT?

There's a nasty sound to it—this new company which will begin operating in Britain next month. Its name, Records Research Index, is an innocuous cover for the service the firm intends to provide.

In effect, the Index will hire out as a sort of co-op private detective for subscribing employers, accumulating data on employees in the member firms, including their loyalty, integrity and the reasons for past dismissals. The Index will be especially interested in any suspicion of dishonesty—however circumstantial—and *whether or not the employee ever was prosecuted.*

Should an employee fired by one Index subscriber turn up later in the personnel office of another subscriber, the Index will produce a dossier on the fellow for a mere 10 shillings, or about $1.20. Since the exchange presumably would be confidential, the luckless applicant would have little opportunity to prove wrongful damage, or even to defend himself against questionable allegations. Other basic questions are raised. What, for example, are the objective yardsticks of "loyalty" and "integrity"? What is to prevent a spiteful employer, angered by a man's resignation, from declaring that he "suspects" the worker had been stealing?

In theory, there is a neatness and efficiency about the plant. It calls to mind that recurring proposal in this country for establishment of a national information center, where all the available information on every living American could be stored in the memory bank of a computer, ready to leap forth at the touch of a button. Handy? The bureaucrats might find it so. So might anyone with access to that button and a reason to manipulate the masses.

There is, beyond doubt, a dehumanizing effect in the growing numbers and complexity of our society. And unquestionably this would be a better world if man knew more about himself and about his fellows. But not the kind of things that the Records Research Index is prepared to sell.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as might be expected, I view the progress agencies have made in implementing the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act like a father watching his son take his first step—the impatience is great for the day he will be running with the touchdown pass.

But, even allowing for my personal bias, I would sum up progress in the 14 months since Congress approved the law as good to fair.

Friday many of us were happy to hear from the Department of Commerce that two industries thus far have agreed to cut the number of sizes in which their products are packaged. Consumers can look forward soon to finding salad oil and instant coffee in half the number of sizes now on supermarket shelves.

While I expect this to be of great help in price comparisons, I think the industry and Commerce have managed to agree on sizes which will fit the convenience and needs of consumers. This is indeed good news.

We grew very familiar during the hearings on truth in packaging with the 6-ounce jar of instant coffee which shrank to 5 but still looked like 6—and sold for the same price. The shift to 2-ounce graduations should rid the marketplace of that problem.

Also the Department of Commerce tells us that about 50 other industries are considering new size standards so consumers can hope that now the pipeline has been primed we can expect a gush of standards instead of the trickle thus far apparent.

The Food and Drug Administration also has been doing a good job with the law—especially considering the obstacles Congress put in its way. This was the only one of the three agencies charged with administering the law which received no funds for the work last year.

As a matter of fact, the House Committee on Appropriations cut the FDA request and instructed the agency to give low priority to work on packaging standards.

But Commissioner James L. Goddard—and greatly to his credit—managed to shift a handful of men from other duties and thus work has been done.

With the cooperation of the food industry, FDA has worked out the kinks for labeling all food products in conformity with the law and those labels should be on most items before the end of the year.

The road does not look so smooth for labeling of drugs and cosmetics. Unfortunately, I understand these industries have filed many objections to proposed labeling regulations and show less desire to be cooperative. If these industries insist on exploiting all legal avenues open to them as a means of frustrating regulations, they may well escape coverage of the bill for years.

This would be most unfortunate.

Also the outlook is dim for FDA to proceed to what are really gut sections of the law—establishing regulations governing slack fill of packages and cents-off offers.

A request for $43,000 to handle this work has been filed by FDA this year. Without it, they report they could not proceed with the next steps.

Indeed, it would be a great disservice to the consumers we serve if Congress denies FDA these funds.

The progress report from the Federal Trade Commission is less encouraging. Progress has been slow—painfully slow—and while I understand some of the problems involved, I hope they can soon be overcome.

As this body knows, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act contains a provision preempting State laws which are "less stringent than or require information different from" this law. This preemption—especially for FTC actions which do not have the history of food labeling could hinder State enforcement. The preemption clause was not in my original proposal but it was approved by Congress.

Fortunately, the FTC and its chairman have blueprinted a program which offers promise of a solution to the potential enforcement gap.

Under the leadership of Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, FTC has initiated a program of active cooperation with State officials in the development of required regulations and in the establishment of enforcement procedures under Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Proposed regulations—drafted in cooperation with the States—were published last June with comments accepted until September. Unfortunately, the final regulations have not yet been published. It is my understanding that State officials will confer with the FTC next month. Hopefully, after that meeting we can get the final regulations so this agency can catch up.

There are some other regulations I had hoped for—those governing cents-off offers. Although the Packaging and Labeling Act gives regulation of these offers on food products to the FDA, considering previous work by FTC under its traditional authority, I had hoped we would have regulations by now. But they have not yet appeared.

In summary, Mr. President: truth in packaging is taking its first hesitant steps. Hopefully, soon it will be going top speed. This has been a long 7 years.

Congress can do its part by approving the appropriations needed for agency implemenation. Certainly the Nation's consumers are hoping we will all bear this in mind at the proper time.

REMARKABLE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DR. SAM MUKAIDA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the good works accomplished in foreign lands by American citizens often go unheralded and unnoticed.

I am, therefore, pleased to share with you an article published by the Mainichi Daily News, the leading Japanese newspaper, telling of the remarkable accomplishments of Dr. Sam Mukaida.

Dr. Mukaida is a former resident of the State of Hawaii and a graduate of the University of Hawaii. He is currently employed as the chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Public Affairs Department of the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mainichi Daily News, Nov. 26, 1967]

DR. SAMUEL MUKAIDA

(By Stuart Friffin)

There was a time when this modest, soft-spoken little man was mistaken for other than who and what he was, and is. This was at a party when, responding to those who encouraged him, the small Hawaiian donned kimono and, without too much difficulty, stepped into another role, a convincing personification of Japan's Emperor Hirohito.

Before that, and after that bit of histrionics, he was and is, just Sam Mukaida, Dr. Sam Mukaida, the very much beloved, simple and dedicated gentleman who is Chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Public Affairs Department of USCAR, the US Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

Dr. Sam, for all his good works and unbending efforts, is known to many, Okinawans and Americans alike, as "Mister Okinawa."

His has been a life of lights and shadows, of much success, of bitter tragedy, an uphill life, lived resolutely, effortlessly, quietly, and with strength.

He was born in Kona, Hawaii, and attended the University of Hawaii before journeying on to continue his education in New York, working his way through Columbia University. Sam majored in curriculum and teaching, and specialized in audio-visual and fine arts education. His Ph. D. was earned at Columbia.

He was in Truk, in the Trust Territories with his wife, Marietta, toward the end of a two-and-a-half-year stint there, when tragedy struck. His wife, mother of the two boys, Allen (now 17) and Donald (now 16) gave birth to Nathan (now 13). She died during that last birth and plunged Sam and his family into grief. Twelve years ago he found himself in Japan, for two years. He was active in independent research on higher education and he was, also, as he says frankly, "on the lookout for a job." He found one, in

Okinawa. Doctor Sam had been active on Truk as an education specialist. There he had taught the mid-Pacific natives how to utilize the by-products of copra, making coconut ukuleles, spear fishing with hinged barbs, casting lead sinkers and furniture from coconut logs. He was to give fuller vent to his unique artistic energy in his work with the Ryukyuans on Okinawa. His fluency in Japanese, too, was to stand him in excellent stead. A singer in his own youthful days, a cellist in his school orchestra, Dr. Sam quite naturally became immediately interested in developing Okinawa's talents musically, chorally, orchestrally. He developed the Okinawa Children's Junior Chorus, the Women & Home Life Chorus and the Naha Philharmonic Chorus that took fifth place in a Japan-wide contest, held in Wakayama, in 1966.

Sam developed the concept of national centers—at Koza, at Kadena, on Zamami Island, and at Itoman, this just recently completed. The museum at Shuri, the government of the Ryukyus Museum, is a cherished project initiated by this big little man, and so was the development of community libraries, as he calls a "new concept of library as a community center."

Sam Mukaida also organized the Okinawan Women's Advisory Committee to his various Cultural Centers, and he was first and foremost, too, in developing the Ryukyuan American Friendship League, with its year-round program of basketball, baseball, track and field, swimming, and soccer introduced five years ago—and with gymnastics starting up next year. "This League," explains the little gentleman whose Ph. D. thesis was on a solid "Plan for Establishment of an Audio-Visual Productions Center in the Hawaiian Islands," "is now restricted to the high school level, but we want to broaden it to include elementary and junior high school levels, as well."

The man whose name translates into English as, "Over the Rice Paddies," has now rounded out 10 years on Okinawa, as he explained on this latest of many official trips to Japan. He is the only non-Ryukyuan in his entire vast program that relies on a total of 66 Okinawan men and women—30% veterans of training and orientation in the U.S.—for its overwhelming success.

There are five Cultural Centers in the Ryukyus—at Naha, at Ishikawa, at Nago, and on the major offshore Ryukyuan Islands, Miyako and Yaeyama. The man who established the Ryukyuan International Art League, the Okinawan Symphony Orchestra, the Okinawa Library Association, says what he does as a Public Information Office with USCAR. "I work with the cultural centers; with guiding and assisting those individuals and organizations interested in literary work, museum work, music, cultural properties, arts and handicrafts, youth's and woman's activities, and Ryukyuan-American community relations programs; with intercultural exchange activities, and, generally speaking, with planning, directing and supervising those activities which accomplish the objectives of the Office of the High Commissioner." I try to promote, he adds—and surely the success of his efforts can be viewed on all sides—"a knowledge, understanding and appreciation among Americans stationed in the Ryukyu Islands of the Ryukyuan people, their culture and their way of life. I also try to promote the Ryukyuan people's knowledge of, and pride in, their own culture." His is a world of libraries, film service libraries, adult education programs, exhibits, recreational and musical and sports programs, Japanese and English language teaching programs, drama groups, lectures, film shows, book deposits, mobile Cultural Center activities, discussion groups and, above all, hard, concentrated, effective work. The man, who, with his second wife, Yoshi, from Okinawa, has added two boys to the family in Frank (18 month) and William (3 months) builds his own home in Okinawa today, in the Ameku area of Naha.

"Well over 3.1 million people participated in our cultural affairs programs last year," says Dr. Sam, known far and wide as "Mister Okinawa" because of his many articulate TV appearance explaining the multi-faceted Ryukyuan culture, "and as they say, why change a winning game? Why not stay and see the number rise year by year, especially when my idea of a multipurpose cultural center is taking such broad effective shape as it is."

LEWIS WOODS BAILEY GAVE DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I know that Senators share my sorrow in the recent death of Mr. Lewis Woods Bailey.

Bill Bailey, as he was known to many of us, served with great distinction as an employee of this body for more than four decades.

He came here as a messenger on December 7, 1916, and, with a few breaks in service, served until his retirement in 1961. From December 29, 1929, until 1961, a period of more than 30 years, he served as the executive clerk of the Senate.

Bill Bailey was a loyal and dedicated public servant. He was careful, methodical, and meticulous. He was invariably the first to arrive at his office in the morning and the last to leave at night. He retired from the Senate only when failing health precluded his continued devotion to duty. His service was always deeply appreciated by Senators.

Many of us have known Bill's wife, Frances Thibedeau, who was a Capitol guide for many years. I knew her when I first served in the House of Representatives, and I feel that many of us in this Chamber remember her very affectionately. I extend to her my sincere sympathy.

THE NUMISMATIC NEWS ENDORSES MOUNT RUSHMORE DOLLAR BILL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I recently introduced S. 2823, a bill which would direct the Treasury Department to include on the back of the U.S. $1 bill a reproduction of Mount Rushmore. Numismatic News, in its February 20 edition, has given strong endorsement to this proposal.

Numismatic News is published every other week at Iola, Wis., by Krause Publications, Inc. Chester Krause is the publisher. The publication refers to Iola as "the Coin Collectors' Capital."

Numismatic News is a widely circulated and highly respected publication among numismatists and its editorial comments about Mount Rushmore are, I believe, significant in presenting an important and valued opinion on the proposed legislation from a particular group of our citizens who have a great interest in this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the editorial from Numismatic News and also an interesting editorial from the Devils Lake, N. Dak., Journal.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Numismatic News, Feb. 20, 1968]

Carried on the news pages in our last issue was the report of a pair of bills being introduced in Congress which would command the Treasury Department to adopt a depiction of Mount Rushmore as the central device on the back of our $1 notes. This bill represents the most worthy currency proposal we have seen offered on the Hill in many a moon.

While the primary function of any currency is to serve as a media of exchange, it also can and should perform as an image projector. This is especially true in the case of American currency, the most widely respected, circulated and accepted media of this or any other age. Unfortunately, our one dollar bill, our most widely recognized and used unit, is performing a less than complete job in this regard.

Although the portrait of Washington on the face of the note is known to every citizen, and to millions who are not citizens and know little of our history, such is not the case with the back. When you turn the bill over the American image goes flat; the Great Seal and the word "one" evoke neither patriotic impulse nor national pride.

Is there a valid reason why this situation should not be rectified immediately? We think not. First off, the proposal as presented does not call for the abandonment of anything, rather it calls for an addition to. It is not proposed that Mount Rushmore replace the present Great Seal devices, instead it is offered that it be used in conjunction therewith.

So much for the traditional consideration. What would be the value of change to the numismatist? Perhaps the average collector of paper money could not immediately answer this question, as instead of being accustomed to the beautiful vignette presented on many higher denomination notes he has been restricted to one dollar bills. From the time this denomination was introduced in 1862, its treatment has been rather bland, with a few exceptions . . .

A change of the substantial significance proposed would undoubtedly have a solid and lasting effect on the collecting of paper money, and this would be good for all hobbyists, not just "rag pickers." For many years the collecting of paper was pretty much struggling along on one cylinder. Today it is steadily gaining momentum. How is it that a much greater following has been developed almost overnight? While there can be no doubt that there are many factors which have influenced the situation, there is little question that the most important were two relatively slight changes in our currency. The introduction of one dollar notes from each of the 12 Federal Reserve Districts, and the addition of the motto to all denominations.

If one dollar bills can be beautified they will be more appealing to the collector, many converts thus will be added to the roll of "rag pickers," and the entire hobby will benefit. Accordingly, it is the duty of every collector to write his Representative, Senators and the chairmen of the Senate and House committees on Banking and Currency, urging them to favor Senator Mundt's bill (S. 2823) and a companion measure offered by Representative Berry (H. Con. Res. 607), calling for the depiction of Mount Rushmore on the back of our $1 notes.

[From the Devils Lake, (N. Dak.) Journal, Feb. 15, 1968]

BOLSTERING DOLLAR?

Sen. Karl Mundt of South Dakota wants to put a picture of his State's prize tourist attraction, the Mt. Rushmore memorial, on the back of the U.S. dollar bill.

Certainly nothing could be wrong in having the faces of four presidents grace the dollar. It does seem quite a comedown, however, for President's Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt.

Determined worthy to have their faces hewn in living rock, is it fair now to imprint them on something as impermanent and unreliable as the $1 greenback?

But is is said the dollar needs more solid backing. And nothing is more solid than the four gentlemen at Mt. Rushmore. Mundt seems to have a point.

THE PROBLEM OF UNION VIOLENCE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, columnist Victor Riesel is one of the outstanding observers and reporters in the labor field today. He recently wrote a column which puts the finger squarely on the problem of union violence.

Mr. Riesel himself is a victim of union recrimination tactics, having lost his sight in an acid-throwing incident some years ago sparked by his incisive reporting of hoodlums in the labor movement. Needless to say, he still places himself in jeopardy every time he points to the flaws of big labor. Still, his courage does not flag and he continues to "call 'em as he sees 'em."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Riesel's column relating to the present and growing problem of labor violence be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Record of Labor Violence in United States Older but as Bloody as Race Riots

(By Victor Riesel)

Washington, D.C.—Sometimes this home front is as raw and violent as far-off firing lines.

These are uncivil disorders, deliberately planned, and have no relation to the passionate violence of our inner cities. The violence started long before the urban explosions and has continued long since the last urban burnings.

It is the violence, the shootings, the beatings of men which occur with fantastic coincidence during strikes and "labor disputes" on a wide front, stretching from coal and steel country into the heart of such megalopolises as New York, St. Louis and the San Francisco Bay area.

So much property has been damaged, so many men have been beaten (one even killed), so many homes have been given the Molotov cocktail treatment, so many hundreds of other instances of strike-time violence are in Justice Department files and so many national labor and civic leaders are unaware of local violence, that it's most certainly time to turn on the spotlight and the heat.

The other day, on returning from Pittsburgh, I crossed territory that appears never to have lifted litself out of the roaring, dynamite-laden '20s.

Meaning no disrespect to the lonely 88-year-old John Lewis, the report nonetheless is that his miners still rove in packs of hundreds. Their picketing and demonstrating still are paralleled by violence.

No one knows who starts anything. But on Jan. 30 one opposition union hall in Clymer, Pa., burned during the latest coal diggers upheaval. One opposition union official was dragged from his car, which the assailants had the forethought to tip over first.

There was also some mysterious burning of mine operators' property. Not too long ago in the same area, four opposition miners were pulled out of their car and mauled.

Yet, this is 1968—not 1928. But this era of moon landings appears not to have left any civilized touch on many areas outside the coal fields.

In New York and California, for example, there have been 17 "incidents" involving officials of the Radio Corporation of America (RCA). By some weird coincidence, RCA has had difficulty with a division of the Teamsters' new labor federation.

No one knows who did what. But that does not comfort the RCA supervisor whose home was fire-bombed while he was at work.

So overshadowed by civil disorders is violence on this front that it is barely reported and scarcely noticed outside the neighborhood in which it occurs.

Those to whom the record and files are available can put a finger on any calendar or U.S. map and hit a mess and mass of such violence.

From Aug. 15, 1966, to Jan. 7, 1967, the Alabama Power Co. was hit by at least 50 acts of sabotage which hit the company's power transmission facilities.

Oil was drained from transformers. Chains were dragged across power lines. Guy wires on transmission line poles were cut.

Gunfire destroyed power equipment. Power line poles were cut and burned. Expensive equipment was tampered with and destroyed. Some employes' homes were burned. They were men who did not strike.

Or, between Nov. 3, 1966, and Dec. 4, 1966, at least 26 natural gas pipelines were dynamited in West Virginia and Kentucky. Explosions destroyed an outlet line and valve operator.

Dynamite sticks, fuses and blasting caps were found adjacent to gas lines. There were gunfire and sawing of gas pipe valve stems.

Since then, in other parts of the country, men and machines were hammered and destroyed.

The Illinois Consolidated Telephone Co. in Litchfield, Ill., was hit by 100 costly incidents. Fuses were pulled from terminal boxes. Steel wool and water were thrust in to kill the service.

Wires and cables were cut in the Litchfield toll center. Steel wool was inserted between the cut ends of cables. Elsewhere switches were heavily damaged.

And just a few months ago, steel haulers revolted throughout the Midwest. There were 50 violent incidents—including the death of a driver whose truck careened after his windshield was hit by a thrown rock.

So it goes. Bloody incident after incident. Fire bombing after fire bombing. Bullet after bullet. But the public doesn't seem to mind.

Apparently if the other fellow is hit, it's an incident. Should it come close to home, it's a wave of violence.

PUBLIC SAFETY THREAT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, more and more people across the land are asking the question: "Who is protecting the public's rights in labor disputes that involve public safety and well-being?"

It is only right that this question be raised. Too long has a handful of union leaders held a stranglehold on not only the public's pocketbook, but their very health and safety. Now this rapacious attitude begins to infect union members themselves when some, finding themselves in a situation where their services are vital to the public good, choose the withholding of that service to see how much they can extract from the public's pocketbook.

The garbagemen's strike in New York City has an odor that extends far beyond the streets of Gotham. It begins to grow rank in the nostrils of people all over the Nation.

Someone has said: "Your liberty ends where my nose begins."

Union leaders, and particularly employees in public services and public-regulated industries, must come to realize the burden for responsible action they bear. They must realize that the right to strike is bounded by the larger rights of the public not to be damaged.

I say that they must come to this realization either voluntarily and take such action to discipline themselves as may be appropriate; otherwise, they will have to come to the realization through the legislative process, whereby the public realizes the danger and instructs, or elects, those who will enact legislation to protect the public rights.

Mr. President, there is a strong precedent in the Nation's legal structure to protect the public from abuses heaped upon it by private means. While unions may, at present, be exempt from such legislation as, say, the antitrust laws, public opinion will stand only so many outrages, and then it will react. Oftentimes this reaction is slow in coming; but I have observed that for its slowness it seems to be all the more sure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three editorials bearing on this problem vital to the public interest be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 12, 1968]

Garbage Strike

Nobody knows how the New York garbage strike will finally turn out but it is already clear that it summarizes in rococo terms certain steps we have taken in the last thirty years to this denouement. We started, remember, with the premise that a trade union was a legally accountable entity, just like a corporation. We started with the premise that corporations were apt to tyrannize and that industrial democracy required an equal employee voice in fixing the terms of employment. Much of the record since is good, but by no means all.

Thus in New York we have the familiar union monopoly control of labor in a basic service. Here is the union leader who bargains with the employer and brings out what he thinks is a satisfactory contract. Here are the union followers who repudiate the leader and his contract. Here is the repudiated leader sprinting to catch up with his followers in an illegal—but preclusive—strike, and going back to the employer for more.

Here is the employer at the end of his means in his own best judgment, who says he can't give more. Here is the higher public executive who steps in at this point with a certified "neutral" mediation board. Here is the award by the mediators which exceeds what the employer has already insisted is all he can offer. Here is the plan of the higher public executive to seize the struck enterprise and the return to work of the illegal strikers on the terms they extorted from the mediators by the illegal strike.

Up to here, as we say, Americans have seen each phase over and over again, not always, as now, wrapped up in one lurid package, but long since encysted into our way of industrial life. Now, however, a grotesque new element is added. The employer here is no tyrannous capitalist grinding the face of the poor. It is the city of New York, which is not anti-labor and might, indeed, be called the main capital of the political philosophy prevailing for three decades in the Anglo-American world.

If the employer is the city of New York, then the plea of democracy works against, rather than in behalf of the union. The Mayor of New York is a popularly elected official. The funds at his disposal are fixed by popularly elected officials. The budget which disburses those funds is collated by elected officials and their agents. The law which the strikers breached was enacted by a people's legislature at the request, indeed, of the very executive who now undercuts its due processes to seize not a capitalist but a social enterprise.

Much of the world is watching the New York garbage strike, but three groups of watchers will have special interest. The first is angry young men in poor neighborhoods all over America who want to see how far direct action by minuscule minorities can force public officers away from their pledged word to maintain constitutional order. The second is leaders of friendly nations who have been persuaded to hold American dollars by American assurances that we can discipline the productive processes on which dollar integrity rests. The third is our adversaries in the cold, hot and middle wars whose domestic discipline is among their formidable strengths and who premise policy on their hunch that we are Achilles and that domestic *in*discipline is our heel.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 13, 1968]

THE WHEEL TURNS

Years ago, judges applied the Sherman antitrust law not only to big business but also to unions. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, which Scripps-Howard Newspapers supported, exempted unions from the antitrust laws. The Wagner Act later strengthened unions' right to organize and represent workers. Scripps-Howard Newspapers supported the Wagner Act. We're proud of that. The unions were weak. Strengthening their bargaining power was in the public welfare.

But, the wheel long since has gone full circle.

It is long past time to put on labor the same controls put on business. And for the same reason.

Public be damned is a policy which must be controlled, no matter who utters it.

UNION RIGHTS VERSUS PUBLIC RIGHTS

(By Lawrence Fertig)

In his recent column in *Newsweek* magazine, Prof. Henry C. Wallich does not think the time is ripe "to curb the right to strike." Anyway, he asserts, strikes aren't that serious. Automation has a strike-breaking effect, since many industries can be run with fewer employes.

Wallich's nonchalance about shutting down an industry which transports 740 *billion* revenue ton-miles of freight, most of it heavy stuff that cannot be transported any other way, is incomprehensible. Maybe the nation wouldn't be completely destroyed by such a strike, merely brought to its knees.

Most people will vigorously disagree with Mr. Wallich's conclusion about the importance of strikes and their effect on the country. But leaving this discussion aside for the moment, it is important to note that Mr. Wallich has created a straw man and tried to knock him down. He has completely evaded the main issue involved in strikes.

A thousand, or 10,000 men do not strike as individuals. They strike under the auspices of a labor union. The union has been accorded monopoly privileges under the law. Under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, court injunctions in labor disputes were outlawed. It is practically impossible to sue a union for damages.

The Wagner Act gave certified labor unions exclusive power to bargain for workers in an entire industry; it frowned on labor union competition. In effect, it granted monopoly power to unions. Rulings of the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have confirmed the crushing power of labor unions over the public and over their own members.

Now, all other monopolies are subject to government regulations. The theory goes that where there is no competition the government must protect the public interest. Why then is it illogical to subject labor unions to some regulation when the functioning of the economy, and at times the safety of the nation, is at stake?

Says Mr. Wallich, "Labor rightly or wrongly views it (the strike) as a pearl in its claim of human rights." What about the human rights of the American public—is that to receive no consideration whatever in discussions of strikes? If labor unions insist on the right of monopoly privileges, shouldn't they be subject to restraint when the public safety is involved?

But there is one aspect of this problem which some believe to be even more important than labor union privileges under present laws. That is the use of force and violence to enforce a strike. It is common knowledge that the most powerful corporations dare not continue production once a strike is called. Why? Because they know by experience that those who want to work will be prevented from doing so by physical violence.

Mass picketing, which is permitted and encouraged under the law, often intimidates those who want to work. Strikers often attack and maim innocent workers, automobiles are overturned and sabotage is quite common. All of this has nothing to do with the *legal* rights of unions. It has to do with the anarchy which prevails when a company exercises its rights to produce goods even if there is a strike.

The right of individuals to leave their work when not satisfied with their employment is not an issue. Do workers, organized as a union, have the right physically to prevent others from working? To avert one's gaze from union violence and complete disregard of the law is hardly a way to honestly face the issue.

Does a worker have an inherent right to his job? That is the main question—not the right of the worker to walk off his job and strike. There is no law now on the statute books which guarantees the right of anyone to hold his job under all conditions. It is only by extra-legal means this right is enforced by organized labor. The hearings of the McClellan Committee are eloquent on this point. The evidence is abundant that violence has become a major weapon of union power. What has this to do with the *right* to strike?

Compulsory arbitration is, indeed, a bad way to run a free enterprise system. But it must be remembered that compulsory arbitration is called into being by the overweening power of labor unions. To avoid compulsory arbitration it is necessary to curb the monopoly power which has been granted to labor unions.

PROMOTION OF PRIVATE COMMERCIAL TRADE WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am confident that many of my constituents are interested in the promotion of private commercial trade with developing countries.

Therefore, I think Senators will be interested in a report entitled "Impact of Foreign Aid on U.S. Exports," published in the January-February 1968 Harvard Business Review. Its statistical analyses reveals the beneficial effect of economic assistance on private commercial trade with developing countries.

The article was written by Mr. Charles D. Hyson, Special Assistant for Economics and Trade in the Office of Private Resources, and Mr. Alan M. Strout, Chief of the Program Policy Division in the Office of Program and Policy Coordination.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACT OF FOREIGN AID ON U.S. EXPORTS

(By Charles D. Hyson and Alan M. Strout)

During fiscal 1966 the Agency for International Development (AID) spent $1.1 billion *in the United States* procuring commodities for shipment to developing countries as a part of the U.S. foreign assistance program. As a result, U.S. businessmen are keenly concerned with the question: *"How much impact does direct government procurement of U.S. goods for export to developing countries have on U.S. trade and, in particular, on commercial exports by private businessmen?"*

The question has aroused considerable debate. Among businessmen whose overseas markets have expanded because of foreign assistance, the aid program has received very strong support. For example, Charles B. Baker, administrative vice president of the U.S. Steel Corporation, has pointed out that:

> ". . . it is largely due to the operation of our foreign aid program that the steel industry has managed to escape the full effects of the forces at work in the world market place. We estimate that AID procurement in the United States of steel mill products currently accounts for some 30 percent of the value of our steel exports, and for an even higher percent of the tonnage shipped—perhaps as much as 40 percent. Without this AID support it is highly probable that the deficit in steel trade might have been 1 million tons larger." [1]

The question of the impact of foreign aid on U.S. exports has become particularly important since 1959 because of the difficulties that the United States has experienced in maintaining equilibrium in its balance of payments. As a result of these difficulties, a major goal of the foreign assistance program in recent years has been to minimize negative effects of aid on the U.S. balance of payments. To achieve this goal, the federal government has adopted the policy of maximizing the procurement of goods in the United States for all projects financed with its assistance and thus of reducing, insofar as possible, the balance-of-payments cost of the foreign aid program. In applying this key instrument of AID tying, practically all new dollar commitments for procurement "offshore" have been limited to a few selected countries which have agreed to spend the dollars on commodities in the United States.

---

[1] See "International Trade in a One Market World," an address delivered at the National Foreign Trade Convention, New York, November 18, 1964.

By fiscal 1966 the full impact of these AID-tying policies to safeguard the U.S. balance-of-payments position became apparent. In that year $9 out of every $10 of foreign commodity expenditures financed by AID went to U.S. suppliers; this contrasted with $4 to $5 out of every $10 prior to the commencement of tying. In general, the overwhelming proportion of commodity and other expenditures now financed by AID is tied to procurement in the United States. (See the Appendix for statistical tables which summarize AID-financed commodity procurement by industry, both in absolute terms and in relation to total U.S. exports.) For many commodities the absolute volume of expenditures in the United States financed by foreign assistance has increased dramatically in the past few years. In addition, for some commodities AID-financed exports currently form a strikingly high proportion of total U.S. exports to the developing countries.

The purpose of this article is twofold:

1. *To summarize the results of recent statistical investigations into the impact of U.S. foreign economic assistance on U.S. exports.*
2. *To discuss the policy implications of the close link between U.S. aid and U.S. trade.*

While our focus here is limited to a consideration of the interaction of foreign aid and trade in merchandise exports only, it is obvious that a number of other U.S. activities abroad also contribute to an environment favorable to the expansion of U.S. exports. Examples of this are found in the various project activities performed by service contractors such as consulting engineering firms, management consultants, universities and other educational institutions, and cooperative groups and individual specialists supplying technical or other expertise to the developing countries.

In the first part of this article, we will discuss the results of quantitative analyses of the impact of foreign aid on U.S. exports, giving special attention to the effects of the introduction of tying clauses into assistance agreements since 1959. Then we will summarize the evolution of AID policies affecting exports and consider the policy implications of current federal measures to help the U.S. balance-of-payments position through the foreign-aid program.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

An estimation of the quantitative impact of foreign aid on U.S. exports requires (1) an appraisal of the effectiveness of the aid program in inducing economic development, (2) an estimate of the additional demand for imports typically generated by income growth, and (3) an evaluation of the share of the United States in the increased demand. Finally, to determine the net effect of aid on exports, it is necessary to take account of the extent to which the formal U.S. AID-tying policies introduced since 1959 have led to any decline (or failure to increase) in its private commercial exports. The following sections treat the extent of substitution of foreign assistance-financed exports for private commercial exports, the typical effectiveness of aid in inducting economic growth, and the resultant overall effect on U.S. exports.

It should be noted that throughout this article foreign assistance or aid (in contrast to AID) includes that provided under the Agency for International Development, Public Law 480, and the Export-Import Bank.

COMMERCIAL DISPLACEMENT

An examination of U.S. market shares in recent years is useful both in contributing to a broad statistical analysis and in estimating the extent to which increased government procurement for shipment abroad may have substituted for private commercial exports to developing countries. *Exhibit I* [Not printed in the RECORD] shows recent trends of U.S. exports to the developing countries, and *Exhibit II* summarizes the data on the U.S. share in the total imports of noncommunist developing countries.

As can clearly be seen in *Exhibit II*, the U.S. market share declined rather steadily between 1948 and 1955 (from 30% to 23%, largely as a result of the postwar recovery of competitive suppliers in Europe and Japan); between the low point in 1955 and 1965, the U.S. share showed a net rise of about three percentage points. Also obvious in both exhibits is the marked increase between 1955 and 1965 in the proportion of exports to developing countries paid for by foreign assistance—from 8% in 1955 to 18% in 1960, when formal AID-tying policies first began to be effective, to 28% in 1965.

What cannot, of course, be observed from these figures is what the U.S. market share would have been in the absence of foreign aid financing. To shed some light on this question, a second line has been drawn on *Exhibit II* to show the U.S. share of less developed countries' "commercial" import market. In this exhibit the commercial market is defined as total less developed country imports minus those U.S. imports financed by U.S. aid. The commercial U.S. share shown equals U.S. non-assistance-financed commodities as a portion of total commercial imports.

The commercial market share of U.S. suppliers fell sharply in 1958 and then leveled off at about 20% after AID tying became an effective policy in 1960–1961. However, because of the likelihood of some substitution of AID-financed exports for U.S. commercial exports, it would be a mistake to suggest that the 20% commercial share shown in *Exhibit II* is the same as that which would have been expected in the absence of an assistance program.

While some studies have been made of the effect of AID financing on U.S. private commercial exports, they are suggestive rather than conclusive. A 1966 study at Yale University by Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. intensively examined country-to-country and year-to-year differences in U.S. exports to 43 developing countries in the years prior to the effective establishment of AID-tying policies (1958 to 1960).[2]

When Lynn's results were applied by AID to a slightly larger sample of 51 assistance-receiving countries, the AID study indicated that even before formal tying began there may have been a small displacement of commercial U.S. exports because of foreign assistance financing.

After AID tying began in 1959 and 1960, this displacement apparently mounted, and in 1961 $1.00 of AID-financed exports may have typically generated only $0.48 in additional direct U.S. exports to the recipient country. The export-increasing effect of aid appears to have risen each year thereafter, however, as more extensive and effective AID tying has reduced the scope for substituting AID-financed—for commercial—imports. According to AID calculations based on Lynn's statistical analysis, the net export increase in 1962 was on the order of $0.51 on the AID commodity dollar; in 1963, it was $0.56; in 1964, it was $0.78.

These calculations ignore additional exports resulting from respending the foreign exchange income made available when $1.00 of aid generates less than $1.00 of additional U.S. exports to a particular country. Taking these respending effects into account might raise the 1961 figure from $0.48 to $0.70 or $0.80 of additional U.S. exports throughout the world, and the 1964 figure from $0.78 to perhaps $0.90.

The AID calculations are far from conclusive, but they do illustrate the difficulty which the agency has had in ensuring that AID-financed goods will be truly "additional" to U.S. normal commercial exports—i.e., that the provision of $100 of AID-financed goods will increase U.S. exports throughout the world by $100—and so increase U.S. market shares above what they otherwise would have been. The Lynn-based estimates suggest that commercial export displacement has been relatively minor in terms of the worldwide U.S. commercial market share and that taking the displacement into account might raise the 1961–1964 commercial market share by about one percentage point from the 20% figure cited earlier and shown in *Exhibit II*.

AID AND GROWTH

A recent AID study of 33 noncommunist developing countries over the period 1960–1965 gives a picture of the average productivity of the foreign assistance dollar measured in terms of the income generated in countries receiving aid. On the average, $1.00 of foreign exchange provided by the United States during these years, together with the increased use of domestic resources made possible by the greater availability of imported equipment, induced by the end of the period almost $1.00 of additional annual gross domestic product in countries receiving aid. The study estimated that, generally speaking, domestic resources were employed to match foreign resources at an average ratio as high as 3 to 1. The effectiveness with which the *combined* domestic and foreign savings were applied in generating income was reflected in an estimated capital-output ratio averaging between 3 and 4—that is, on the average, in order to produce $1.00 of additional output (income) each year, it was necessary for the countries receiving aid to invest between $3.00 and $4.00 in new productive capacity.

Thus, in general over the period 1960–1965, because foreign assistance permitted the fuller use of domestic resources by relieving critical bottlenecks in equipment and other goods, there was a 1 to 1 relationship between the assistance dollars provided and the additional dollars of gross domestic product in the countries the United States was aiding.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

The preceding statistical analyses of aid and growth, and of recent U.S. trade with developing countries, lead to the suggestion that approximately 60% of the total increase of $2,160 million in U.S. commodity exports to these countries over the period 1960–1965 was directly or indirectly the outcome of U.S. economic assistance.

How did this come about? The studies of the probable origins of the increase in commodity exports over this period indicate that, broadly speaking:

$380 million was the result of increases in income generated by U.S. foreign aid.

$900 million was due to income growth unrelated to U.S. aid.

$880 million was the outcome of U.S. foreign assistance-tying policies.

Of these, the sum of the first and last figures, $1,260 million, represents the estimated amount by which U.S. exports were higher in 1965 than they would have been in the absence of the U.S. foreign economic aid program. Again, only the direct effects and immediate indirect effects of aid on exports to developing countries are estimated, and no allowance is made for secondary multiplier and "dollar respending" effects on U.S. exports elsewhere in the world. Let us summarize the bases for these estimates.

Aid-generated income: During the seven years 1959–1965, the United States contributed or loaned $14.5 billion of net economic assistance to non-European developing countries. This assistance, which included surplus agricultural commodities, made up 28% of total U.S. commodity exports to the developing countries. About one half of the foreign assistance-financed commodities for the 1959–1965 period were surplus agricultural commodities shipped under Public Law 480 ("Food for Peace"). Some 35% was provided by AID and its predecessors, while 14% of the total was financed by the Export-Import Bank.

---

[2] Unpublished doctoral dissertation, "An Empirical Analysis of U.S. Foreign Economic Aid and the U.S. Balance of Payments, 1954–1963."

If we assume on the basis of the 33-country study referred to earlier that $1.00 of U.S. assistance induces a $1.00 increment in GNP, then the GNP of these countries increased by about $14 billion as a result of U.S. aid. At the 1960 import/GNP ratio of .14, a worldwide ratio which has held remarkably constant for the developing countries during the past 15 years, this increase in GNP in turn gave rise to an increase of $2 billion in their demand for imports. In the absence of a foreign assistance program, the U.S. share of these additional imports would very likely have been about 21% (i.e., $420 million c.i.f., or $380 million f.o.b.).

Independent income: In addition to the $14 billion increase in GNP associated with U.S. assistance, the gross national product of developing countries increased by about $33 billion as a result of other causes. (The total increase in GNP was $47 billion, or $14 billion and $33 billion.) This additional growth in income may have augmented U.S. exports in 1965 by a further $900 million on the same assumptions as those cited regarding the average import/GNP ratio and the U.S. market share in the absence of foreign assistance.

Additional commodity-tying income: On top of the rise in U.S. exports associated with the maintenance of the share of expanding markets which the United States would have had in the absence of a foreign assistance program, commodity-tying policies apparently served to increase further U.S. exports. Since the combined income effects previously estimated may have accounted for about $1,280 million ($380 million and $900 million), the residual of perhaps $680 million is probably attributable to the additional effects of tying in 1965. Alternatively, if the U.S. market share in the absence of a foreign assistance program were assumed to be 20% rather than 21%, the increase in exports attributable to commodity tying would be an estimated $940 million. Similarly, given a no-aid market share of 22%, the estimated contribution of tying would be cut to $820 million.

In summary, quantitative investigation of recent patterns of change in trade and income suggest strongly that the U.S. program of foreign economic assistance has had a major impact on U.S. trade with developing countries, accounting for as much as three fifths of the increment in U.S. exports from 1960 to 1965.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Increased awareness in recent years of the close connection between the U.S. foreign aid program and the volume of U.S. exports has led to a serious reconsideration by the federal government of the proper place of long-term U.S. trade and commercial goals among the objectives of the economic aid program. This reconsideration has been motivated by two main concurrent concerns. First, there has been an increasing consensus that all government programs should support the national drive to solve the current U.S. balance-of-payments problem insofar as is consistent with their special objectives. Second, as the phasing out of the economic assistance program in important parts of the world approaches, there has been increased concern that U.S. private trade and investment continue on a healthy basis after the termination of the aid program.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Recognizing the need for a continuing and systematic coordination of government policies designed to promote and expand U.S. exports, President Johnson established the Cabinet Committee on Export Expansion in December 1963. The functions of the committee were to provide advice on "(1) means for developing and stimulating more effective export expansion programs; (2) changes in existing policies and programs of the Federal Agencies which relate to improving export promotion and expansion; and (3) related areas upon which the chairman may request advice."[3]

As part of an effort to mobilize all government programs in support of the national drive to solve the balance-of-payments problem, the committee recommended guidelines for the foreign assistance program. These stressed the selection of capital projects and the financing of commodities which promote export expansion. In implementing the recommendations of the committee, AID modified its financing policies in early 1965 by including longer term export promotions as one important factor in selecting capital projects and commodities for AID financing insofar as this could be accomplished in a manner compatible with AID's primary objective of promoting development. (More recently, a second committee has also been increasingly concerned with the effect of AID expenditures on the U.S. payments deficit. This Cabinet Committee on the Balance of Payments set up a subcommittee in the spring of 1967 to focus explicitly on measuring AID's balance of payments costs and the effectiveness of its programs to secure improved aid "additionality.")

BUSINESS FOLLOW-UP

In February 1966 the National Export Expansion Council established an Action Committee on Aid, Trade and Investment in Developing Countries. This committee has underlined the need for U.S. private business to move more vigorously in taking advantage of opportunities for trade created primarily by foreign economic assistance. In the words of the committee, what is needed is an "astute use of the facilities and leverage provided by the aid program and cooperative efforts between AID and the business community. . . ."[4]

In other words, given the availability of convertible foreign exchange provided by the aid program and local preferences for U.S. goods in less developed countries, private U.S. businesses can increase their share of imports by those countries through a strong effort to meet foreign competition and to capture the potential benefits of expanding markets.

Thus, in general, changing the temporary "hot house" markets created by tying policies into permanent ones will depend primarily on an effective follow-up by U.S. businessmen of the opportunities initially provided by AID. By shipping first-class goods to the developing countries under the foreign assistance program, by pricing competitively and following up with stocks of spare parts and supplies, and by establishing marketing and service arrangements—in short, by applying the same vigorous competitive practices used in the United States—businessmen can look forward to solid and growing markets abroad.

U.S. traders, however, probably will be disappointed if they merely sit back and wait for follow-on orders to arrive. This is especially true of AID-financed exports to the "transitional" countries which are approaching economic self-support. To ensure maintenance and improvement of trade with these countries, the U.S. private sector must be vigorous and increasingly competitive.

INDIRECT SUBSIDIES

Although AID is not involved in direct subsidization of exports, U.S. procurement policies do in effect provide indirect subsidies to U.S. exporters. This is because some of our tied exports would simply not occur if it were not for foreign assistance financing. This is most easily seen in the case of a number of U.S. commodities that are priced above world levels but which are nevertheless exported because AID funds are restricted for purposes of their purchase. The cost of some commodities we finance may run considerably above world market prices.

From the viewpoint of AID's development objectives, the financing of higher cost noncompetitive exports is seldom an efficient use of the foreign assistance dollar. Although higher importer costs can be compensated for by higher levels of assistance or by softer lending terms, financing noncompetitive exports reduces the real value of assistance to the recipient countries. Higher costs also cause importer resentment and may give U.S. exports a black eye for the future.

The effect of higher cost, noncompetitive exports is not always limited to the period in which procurement takes place; reduced competition among suppliers may result in the purchase of equipment with a higher operating and maintenance cost. Also, financing noncompetitive items may, under certain conditions, distort the development plans of the recipient countries, since they tend to tailor the aid requirements to the availabilities of assistance. (It should be noted, however, that under soft loan terms, with maturities up to 40 years and extended grace periods as long as 10 years, much, if indeed not all, of the higher cost procurement is offset.)

CONCLUSION

Since two thirds of the world consist of peoples in the developing countries, the growing markets of today and tomorrow lie with them. Therefore, the problem of increasing world purchasing power becomes in fact the problem of increasing the living standards of the developing countries.

Over the long term, economic development is the basis for expanded commercial trade. As economists have been preaching since the days of Adam Smith, economic growth depends on a progressive widening of the market, efficiency, and specialization.

The evidence strongly indicates that U.S. aid on the whole has had a beneficial effect on the development of our commercial trade with the countries receiving aid. U.S. exports to these countries and to other parts of the world have generally grown.

The future for U.S. exports to the developing countries looks bright. Businessmen who seek new opportunities through imaginative market research matched by modern, competitive technology can be confident of their ability to operate successfully in an expanding world economy. Moreover, the efforts of U.S. exporters and investors to advance their own competitive interests by providing better values in the marketplace are an integral part of the process of international development on which our own future depends so heavily.

APPENDIX: STATISTICAL TABLES

This appendix is included for those readers interested in a statistical elaboration of the point made earlier in this article that, in general, the overwhelming proportion of commodity and other expenditures financed by AID now is tied to procurement in the United States. The five tables (A through E) which follow summarize AID-financed commodity procurement by industry, both in absolute terms and in relation to U.S. exports. (The source for the tables is Agency for International Development, Statistics and Reports Division.)

---

[3] Executive Order No. 11132, dated December 12, 1963.

[4] Memorandum from the Chairman to members of the Action Committee, May 23, 1966.

TABLE A.—TREND OF AID COMMODITY EXPENDITURES BY SOURCE OF PROCUREMENT

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Total commodity expenditures	Source of purchase							
		United States		Offshore					
				Total		19 developed countries		Developing countries	
		Value	Percent	Value	Percent	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
Total AID:									
1959	$1,002.1	$475.0	47	$527.1	53	$422.3	42	$104.8	11
1960	1,040.2	422.7	41	617.5	59	513.9	49	103.6	10
1961	1,054.6	465.7	44	588.9	56	496.4	47	92.4	9
1962	883.9	586.4	66	297.5	34	139.0	16	158.5	18
1963	1,145.9	905.1	79	240.8	21	78.0	7	162.7	14
1964	1,165.2	1,008.5	87	156.7	13	38.7	3	118.1	10
1965	1,287.8	1,185.8	92	102.0	8	22.5	2	79.5	6
1966	1,231.6	1,110.5	90	121.1	10	11.2	1	109.9	9
1966 by quarters:									
1st	298.9	266.8	92	32.1	11	5.1	2	27.0	9
2d	329.6	298.3	90	31.3	10	3.0	1	28.3	9
3d	301.2	268.3	89	33.0	11	2.4	1	30.6	10
4th	301.9	277.1	92	24.7	8	.7	[1]	24.0	8

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

TABLE B.—TOTAL U.S. MERCHANDISE EXPORTS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Calendar year	Total merchandise exports [1]	AID commodity expenditures in the United States	
		Value	Percent of total exports
1960	[2] $19,800	$436	2.2
1965	26,240	1,140	4.3

[1] Excluding special category commodities.

[2] 1960 includes a partial estimate in order to place special category exports on the same definitional basis as those for 1965. Exports excluding special category items, as the lattter were defined prior to changes in 1965, were $18,905,000,000.

TABLE C.—U.S. MERCHANDISE EXPORTS TO DEVELOPING (FREE WORLD) COUNTRIES

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Calendar year	Total merchandise exports [1]	AID commodity expenditures in the United States	
		Value	Percent of total exports
1960	$6,535	$342	5.2
1965	8,775	1,140	13.0

[1] Exports (excluding special category commodities) to Africa, Near East, South Asia, Far East, Latin America, and Oceania except for the following countries: Cuba, South Africa, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.

TABLE D.—CHANGES IN U.S. PROCUREMENT OF AID-FINANCED COMMODITIES

[Fiscal years; dollars in millions]

Commodity group	AID expenditures in United States			United States as a percent of worldwide AID procurement		
	1960	1965	1966	1960	1965	1966
Total AID-financed commodities	$423	$1,186	$1,111	21	92	90
Total selected commodities	177	927	964	29	93	92
Machinery and equipment	64	310	373	35	92	94
Iron and steel mill products	14	216	133	11	93	82
Chemicals and related products	18	91	127	30	91	91
Motor vehicles, engines, and parts	$41	$91	$92	52	99	98
Fertilizer	9	65	87	17	89	93
Nonferrous metals and products	1	60	67	11	91	93
Basic textiles	5	32	29	10	98	96
Pulp and paper (including newsprint)	3	28	26	21	90	84
Railroad transportation equipment	22	34	30	64	99	99

TABLE E.—U.S. EXPORTS AND PERCENT AID FINANCED

[Calendar years; dollar amounts in millions]

Commodity group	To all areas						To less developed countries					
	1962		1965		Percent AID financed		1962		1965		Percent AID financed	
	Exports	AID financed	Exports	AID financed	1962	1965	Exports	AID financed	Exports	AID financed	1962	1965
Total exports, excluding special category, f.o.b.[1]	$19,548	$663	$26,240	$1,140	3.4	4.3	$7,304	$663	$8,775	$1,140	9.1	13.0
Total selected commodities [2]	10,620	635	13,399	990	6.0	7.4	4,765	635	4,744	990	13.3	20.9
Machinery and equipment	5,066	248	6,302	333	4.9	5.3	2,294	248	2,198	333	10.8	15.2
Iron and steel mill products	589	123	689	168	20.9	24.4	333	123	331	168	36.9	50.8
Chemicals	1,533	42	2,037	112	2.7	5.5	593	42	630	112	7.1	17.8
Motor vehicles, engines. and parts	1,217	39	1,972	91	3.2	4.6	650	39	732	91	6.0	12.4
Fertilizer	145	48	230	70	33.1	30.4	74	48	126	70	64.9	55.6
Nonferrous metals	532	31	625	72	5.8	11.5	132	31	141	72	23.5	51.1
Rubber and products	338	11	344	33	3.3	9.6	130	11	120	33	8.5	27.5
Petroleum and products, excluding gas	484	22	483	36	4.5	7.5	192	22	188	36	11.5	19.1
Basic textiles	541	29	571	31	5.4	5.4	226	29	192	31	12.8	16.1
Railroad transportation equipment	175	42	146	43	24.0	29.5	141	42	86	43	29.8	50.0
Other commodities, including adjustments	8,908	28	12,841	150	0.3	1.2	2,539	28	4,031	150	1.1	3.7

[1] The special category list was redefined beginning with 1965. When 1962 data become available for the items declassified in 1965, it is estimated that exports excluding special category may increase by about $1,000,000,000 for 1962. It is impossible to estimate the probable distribution of this additional $1,000,000,000 by commodity group, or the effect on exports to less-developed countries.

[2] Commodity groupings, as shown by the Bureau of the Census, were adjusted in order to achieve comparability with AID commodity groupings.

DEAN RUSK'S "SIBERIA"

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has earned the gratitude of his country for more than a score of years of dedicated service in the U.S. Senate. His efforts to protect the value of our dollar by resolutely insisting upon a fiscally responsible course for our Federal Government are only part of the important contribution he has made.

Recently he struck a telling blow for all dedicated, honest Government employees who constitute an overwhelming majority of our public servants when he called attention to the undeserved humiliating treatment accorded two State Department career men.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAN RUSK'S "SIBERIA"

It is unlikely that the Secretary of State had an active hand in this particular bit of shoddy business. Still, Mr. Rusk is head of his department, and he cannot be absolved of all responsibility.

We are talking about the case of two men—Harry M. Hite and Edwin A. Burkhardt—who were exiled in the State Department after testifying truthfully before a Senate subcommittee in the Otto Otepka case. It is not our purpose at this time to argue the merits of the Otepka case. We think he got a raw deal, but his case is still going through the appeal process.

Not so with Messrs. Hite and Burkhardt, whose respective yearly salaries, incidentally, are $15,304 and $12,989—all coming out of the pockets of those of us who pay federal taxes.

In 1965, after testifying under oath in the Otepka case, and no one disputes their veracity, they were sent by some State Department mover and shaker to the department's version of Siberia. They were left there with nothing to do except to twiddle their thumbs. Presumably, the hope was that this would force them to resign.

They did not resign, however, and Delaware's Republican Senator John J. Williams, who was the driving force behind the Senate's action in the Bobby Baker case, finally moved in.

Senator Williams threatened to insist upon the removal from office of the superior of the exiled men unless they were given useful assignments. Not surprisingly, something happened at State, and the Hite-Burkhardt team now is at work on new jobs.

This would not have happened except for the intervention of Senator Williams. And while we realize that Dean Rusk has other and more important matters on his hands, we think he should assign one of his aides to find out who makes the assignments to "Siberia" in his department, and that he should then take the action which the developments in this outrageous case so plainly indicate.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SPEAKS FOR THE POLICEMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the policeman "is the most important man in the United States today."

He was so described yesterday by Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

The Attorney General, calling for new and massive support for police, rightfully observed:

It is both ironic and tragic that we have given so little to the support of those on whom so much depends.

The address, before the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington, was a thoughtful and penetrating look at the crucial role of the policeman today and his need for community support.

Attorney General Clark's remarks reflect his great sensitivity to the problems our country and our law enforcement officers face and his extraordinary commitment to firm, effective, vigorous enforcement of the law throughout our country. His remarks merit study by all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL RAMSEY CLARK TO THE WOMEN'S FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1968

"We suffer most of the crime, vice, disease, ignorance, poverty, hopelessness and misery of the whole city. Every advantage and opportunity, like all leadership and power, is absentee. Our landlords don't live here. Store managers and clerks and others who work here drive back and forth from their homes. Even politicians and preachers are absentee. They don't live in our part of town. When the sun goes down, there ain't nobody here but us and the police."

This was the voice from Watts in 1965. This is why the policeman is the most important man in the United States today. It is not because he caused, or is responsible for the conditions that exist, but because, like the mountain, he is there. Performance of the police during this and the next several years will vitally affect the course of this nation, for better or for worse, for decades to come.

To the policeman falls the duty of maintaining social order under law in isolated environments of fear and hatred. He must work daily in the midst of ferment, frequently the only symbol of a law thought foreign.

The poor, the young, the minorities are alienated in this house of ours and none more than the poor, young Negro.

In a nation where only 3.5 percent are unemployed—3.2 percent among whites and 6.8 percent among Negroes—one-fourth of the Negro boys and one-third of the Negro girls cannot find jobs and, for many who do, there is low pay and little chance to advance.

The poor, young Negro lives in physical segregation and psychological loneliness. He is cut off from his chance. Fulfillment, the flower of freedom, is denied him. A small disadvantaged and segregated minority in a mighty and prosperous nation, he is frustrated and angry.

Riots are as old as mankind. They are the antithesis of humaneness, intelligence, faith and charity which are the hope of civilization.

We fear them more than most because our lives have been more comfortable and secure than most. Our fear exaggerates what we have experienced and can anticipate.

Our very constitution was written in the shadow of riot and rebellion. Perhaps ten times more people were killed in four days of draft and racial rioting in New York City in July, 1863 than in the four years 1964 through 1967—and that at the height of the Civil War, only a week after Gettysburg. The 1930's, 40's and 50's all witnessed rioting.

Nor are we alone today among nations: China and Japan, Indonesia, Spain and Italy, the continents of Africa, Asia, Europe and North and South America are all experiencing rioting.

The causes are many, but foremost among them is change. Change is the fundamental fact of our time. Chief among the dynamics of this change is vast population increase, more than 2½ fold in our country this century with more people to be added in the last one-third than in the first two-thirds. Urbanization: a people largely rural in 1900 is now 80 percent resident in urban centers of 50,000 or more.

Scientific advance doubles our knowledge of the physical world each decade. Who among the 76 million Americans in 1900 dreamed of television, much less the 70 million sets we now have; or 80 million automobiles? Not even Wilbur and Orville Wright conjured a supersonic air transport which is nearly upon us.

No one has experienced greater change than the Negro. More rural in 1900 than our people as a whole, he is more urban today. Among the most mobile people who ever lived, he is the most migrant and anonymous. Eric Hoffer has said, ". . . When a population undergoing drastic change is without abundant opportunities for individual action and self-advancement, it develops a hunger for faith, pride and unity . . . We are told that revolutions are set in motion to realize radical changes. Actually it is drastic change which sets the stage for revolution . . ."

The tensions and frustrations arising from change most affect the poor. A French cleric, Lamennais, who lived through Napoleon's time and the revolution of 1848, observed that every stable government in history has depended on the resignation of the poor to being poor. When in history has there been turbulence within a nation that the poor were not in turmoil? The poor have been the great majority throughout history. Today, finally, the poor are a small minority in our country. It may be more difficult than ever for the poor to be resigned both because they are a minority, and because they know of their poverty as have none before. Television and magazines portray the affluence which surrounds them in the very midst of the poverty and misery in which they live.

But for all the change we have experienced and the frustrations and anger generated, the overwhelming majority of our people in all sections of the country and all parts of every city, of all ages and races and religions, believe in these United States, believe in order under law, know our purposes are just and have faith that we will attain equal justice.

Riots can be prevented. If we are to realize the American dream, riots must be prevented.

Every effort must be made to prevent riots. We are eliminating injustice as few people have ever done within the framework of social order under law. Legal rights are largely, though not entirely, secure. Open housing, fair employment, protection against the violation of individual rights, indiscriminate jury selection—these are the chief remaining areas of imperfection in the law.

Now we must create the opportunity to exercise, to fulfill, those rights. An immense and growing economic effort is underway: to rebuild cities, to educate all our people, to give every American the chance to live where he wants, to do whatever his abilities and energies make possible for him. We are only beginning in these last several years, but we can clearly succeed. We can succeed, if we have time, and in terms of history a very little time.

Whether we have the time needed will depend more on the policeman than on anyone else. This is why he is the most important American in 1968. He works in a highly flammable environment. A spark can cause an explosion. He must maintain order without provocation which will cause combustion.

The need is for balance; firmness without fear; a careful control with minimum friction. He must be fair. He cannot be repressive.

If he overacts he can cause a riot. If he underacts, he can permit a riot.

He is a man on a tightrope. Powerful forces from both sides would push him off. Some would taunt him to overact, to be excessive. Others would urge him to underact—to wait too long. Either can bring disaster. Some would purposely anger him, provoke him; seeking violence. He must be a professional, a firm and fair enforcer: a man in the middle who will not yield to pressure.

As never before, he needs full community support just as never before the community needs him. Police-community relations is the most important law enforcement problem of today and the years ahead.

Every officer must be a community relations expert. He must serve the public and the public must respect, support and compensate him for the vital role he plays.

Open communications with the entire community must be developed. He must reach the unreachables. He must know the man whose name nobody knows. He must make another country, our country. In the final analysis police-community relations measures the difference between an authoritarian government executing its will by force and fear and a free society protecting the lives, the property and the liberty of its citizens through public service.

Police-community relations is a two-way street. The community must work for it as hard as the police. It is both ironic and tragic that we have given so little to the support of those on whom so much depends. Underpaid, undertrained, and overworked, they are called on to perform hard, unpleasant and dangerous work, all too frequently midst suspicion and hostility.

It is imperative that we strive now to professionalize all our local police. Substantial salary increases are essential; higher standards and vigorous and continuing training a must. Our best research and development must be applied to police needs. Most of all we must integrate the policeman into our total community life and give him that respect and status deserved by him on whom both liberty and safety chiefly depend.

If the policeman succeeds in his assignment, we shall have a chance in ours.

For us the essential things are to create ways for the exchange of views that are still possible to prevent disorder. Governments and people must keep repression from further dividing us. Our law, our purpose as a people, must have a clear and generous meaning of equality for all. We must strive to fulfill the obligations of a great nation; to achieve the needed reforms; to bind the nation's wounds.

Strong Negro leadership must help relieve despair and anger which leads to violence, riots and death; to disorders we know can be prevented. For these divide the nation more than all else. Suicidal for the small Negro minority, they can destroy the American dream. A few precious years to build and this nation finally united, perhaps truly indivisible, will offer liberty and justice for all.

Nor can we forget that when this is over, as it will be someday, whatever the terror of the storm through which we pass, as Camus observed of Algeria a dozen years ago, "We shall still have to go on living together forever on the same soil." Nothing else is possible.

PROPOSED TRAVEL TAX

Mr. **PEARSON.** Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion regarding the administration's efforts to discourage Americans from traveling aboard by proposing a tax on spending.

The American public appears to be very much in opposition to this proposal as a means to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit. They would far prefer alternatives such as encouraging more foreign visitors to come to the United States or perhaps withdrawing a major proportion of our contingent of military forces stationed in Western Europe, particularly in view of the fact that these countries are now capable of shouldering more of the NATO defense burden.

The Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans., has recently published two editorials on this subject which are most relevant.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope,
Jan. 25, 1968]

Ban on Travel

President Johnson's proposed restriction on European travel is meeting the resistance it should from the American public and other countries.

If the administration wants to balance U.S. funds with countries in the Eastern Hemisphere it would be well to first start by cleaning up its own seemingly unnecessary expenses overseas, such as our maintaining large military forces located in many foreign countries.

The President's travel ban is a "step backward" in world progress. To gain understanding and knowledge is to gain familiarity. The travel ban only causes ill-feeling on the part of the countries where travel is restricted, and it can be expected that they will retaliate, if a "fine" is placed on U.S. travelers, by assessing visitors from their country to America a similar fee.

We have been saying for years that America has been pricing itself out of world dominance by the constant inflation brought about by wage raise demands. Now the President's latest doctrine of "no travel abroad" will even reduce American sales in foreign countries.

U.S. travel agencies are reporting "more than usual" requests for travel since the President's ban. It is obvious that the American public does not like to be told what to do.

[From the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope,
Feb. 8, 1968]

Taxing Travel

President Johnson now has proposed an expenditure tax to limit to seven dollars a day the amount an American could spend traveling outside this hemisphere. The proposal is intended to curb travel. Again it appears our President has spoken without too serious aforethought. The right to travel is one of the privileges of free men. Such a proposal affects world commerce, world industry, world travel and world understanding. What has happened to President Kennedy's "one world"? Certainly a tax on Americans that wish to visit other countries would only bring about a tax by other countries on peoples that would visit America. There was never a time when world travel was more needed, for better understanding between peoples. We fervently hope that Congress smashes this proposal along with other proposals that restrict personal rights.

VOLUNTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President, the medicare program shaped by the 89th Congress was a big step toward easing the health problems of elderly Americans. But, the recently announced 33⅓ percent increase in the monthly fee 18 million Americans pay for voluntary medical insurance under the program puts an extra burden on those who can least afford it. A recent AFL–CIO News editorial, and a consumer advisory column by Sidney Margolis in the same issue, pinpoint fast-rising doctors' fees as the major factor in the medicare premium hike. This, perhaps, should be a signal that steps are needed to safeguard the right of elderly Americans to comprehensive health care within their means. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and Mr. Margolis' article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Doctor-Bill Gouge

Nearly 18-million Americans will have their medical insurance costs increased by 33⅓ percent on April 1, 1968, to take care of the unconscionable and unprecedented increase in doctors' fees over the past two years.

The hike to $4 per month for the voluntary medical insurance program under medicare means that those over 65 with limited incomes will have an annual out-of-pocket cost of nearly $100 a year before they get any reimbursement on their medical bills.

The single largest factor for the increase lies at the doorstep of the medical profession. The rapidly rising cost of medical care has been widely publicized. Not so widely known is that physicians' fees went up more than three times as much as the overall Consumer Price Index and the average weekly earnings of factory workers for the 12 months ending June 1967.

The higher fees are helping augment physicians' incomes, currently averaging $35,000 to $40,000 a year, and moving upward as they add to their income full fees from medicare and medicaid patients who previously were treated at reduced rates.

There is a great and obvious need for some control of fee schedules. The AFL–CIO has proposed that physicians abide by the "reasonable and customary fee" requirement of the medicare program; that doctors' fees be kept in line with the increase in the overall price index; that any major changes in the fee schedule should be reviewed by an advisory board with consumer representation as well as by the secretary of HEW.

Whatever the method, the right of elderly Americans to comprehensive health care within their means must be protected and assured. There must be an end to physicians' fees set on a "what-ever-the-traffic-will-bear" philosophy.

How to Buy: Rise in Part B Medicare Cost Laid to Fee-Jumping Doctors

(By Sidney Margolius)

The doctors who raised fees with the advent of medicare have got in their licks. As a result of the hikes, the cost of Part B of medicare is being raised to $4 a month from the present $3.

Part B is the voluntary section of medicare which pays most of an old person's doctor bills (80 percent after the first $50 of total annual bills). Unlike Part A, which automatically provides hospital insurance for people 65 or older with no extra fee, those who also want Part B must pay a monthly charge deducted from their social security checks.

It had been expected that the Part B fee would be increased to $3.50. About 27 cents of the $1 rise finally found necessary is due to increased doctor fees.

When doctors started to raise fees in 1966 for older people especially, many claimed that they were merely eliminating a special cut rate they previously gave moderate-income older patients. They felt the raises now were justified with medicare helping to pay the bills.

The doctors' increases, however, wiped out some of the anticipated benefits of the Part B medical insurance. This has been especially true in the case of doctors who refuse to take an "assignment," which means that they collect from the government and accept what is considered to be a "fair and reasonable" charge.

But only about 50 percent of doctors accept such assignments. (The choice is up to the doctor.) The others insist that the patient himself collect from the government. Thus, many elderly patients have found that they must pay the difference between the charge the insurance carrier representing the government considers reasonable and what the doctor actually charges. Too, the patient gets back just 80 percent of the "reasonable" charge in any case.

For example, for an operation with a "fair and reasonable" price tag of $300, for which the doctor charged $400, the patient would have to pay the "deductible" of 20 percent of the $300, plus the extra $100, or a total of $160.

Even for an office visit, if the doctor charged $15, as specialists often do, but the insurance carrier considered the charge should be $12, the patient would have to pay $5.40 of the $15 bill.

Recent rises in medical fees have hit younger families as well as the oldsters. In general, doctor fees have risen 13 percent in a little less than two years.

These hikes, together with increased charges for hospitalization and other health services, have caused a growing crisis in health-care expenses. On the average, you now have to pay about 15 percent more than two years ago for such care.

Actually, medicare has aided younger families to some extent. Several Blue Cross plans have reported that the fact they no longer need to insure older people, who require most hospital care, has kept rates from rising even more.

Even at the new $4 rate, Part B is still a good value and safeguard, especially for any older person who expects to have over $98 of medical bills a year. Besides paying for most of an elderly patient's doctor bills, Part B also pays for additional home nursing visits, diagnostic tests, prosthetic devices and a number of other medical expenses.

One change in medicare provisions just enacted by Congress in the latest revision of the social security law may be of some help to older people who have the Part B doctor-bill insurance. The patient no longer will need a receipted bill from the doctor to collect from the government. Either an itemized or receipted bill will do. This change will solve the problem of laying out the money beforehand.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, a relatively small and cold country by the Baltic Sea has been almost totally ignored in the public prints lately as larger events have crowded the newspapers and airwaves. Nevertheless, I would like to take just a couple of minutes here today to speak of Estonia and to remind citizens of our Nation that Americans of Estonian descent will observe the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia this Saturday, February 24, 1968.

Estonia was a province of Russia for almost 200 years. Then it achieved independence in 1918. It became the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1940. Today it is a land of more than 18,000 square miles peopled by more than 1 million men, women, and children. Kinfolk of these present-day Estonians reside in the United States and some of these kinfolk belong to the Estonian National Committee in the United States, a committee which maintains an office at "Estonian House," 243 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y. This committee seeks to keep alive the hope and prospect of a free and independent Estonia. I wish the committee well.

I know that Americans will salute those who wrote the Estonian declaration of independence and also their heirs today who honor that declaration. This 50th anniversary gives all of us in the United States one more opportunity to offer friendship and encouragement to those who seek to be free and to govern themselves on this earth of ours. This 50th anniversary also gives us an opportunity to quote—to translate—from the Estonian declaration of independence which urged Estonians "to be ruled by right and order, so as to be a worthy member of the family of civilized nations."

TO DREAM THE IMPOSSIBLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the summer months have long since passed, but the memory of their violence cannot fade as quickly. Nor can we look to the coming summer with anything but trepidation. We have no choice as to the season. The earth's path in space is already charted. Perhaps then, we must look to ourselves to change the course of the summer.

Several years ago, President Kennedy spoke of the barriers that confronted this generation of Americans. It was a speech that sought an end to the currents of hate, indolence and bigotry. His optimism was cautious, however. "Let us begin," he said. And so we have.

We have looked to our cities and seen their plight with shame. I call on the conclusions of the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for documentation.

> Despite its declared goal of providing decent homes in a suitable living environment for all American families, the Federal Government has not met the housing needs of the great majority of low and moderate income families and has often acquiesced in the decisions of local authorities to locate publicly assisted housing only in tightly restricted areas of the ghetto.

The present administration has grappled with this problem. It has viewed the result of programs which "promise but do not deliver"—the shattering destructiveness of recent urban riots. And so, it has proposed a program for the city of tomorrow. It will cost money and it will require much effort—the price is anything but cheap. But then, the result will be invaluable.

The Honorable Hubert Humphrey, in a recent speech, discussed the goals of the model cities program. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Record. Let us begin to make the commitment that will fulfill this promise of tomorrow.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Model Cities Tour Luncheon, Rochester, N.Y., December 4, 1967

I want to talk to you today about your city and our country and what we as citizens can do to make this a better country.

The simplest way of putting it is to say that you make a better country by making yourself a little better, by having a sense of pride, a sense of belonging and a willingness to accept your share of the burdens as well as to claim your share of the rights. Rights and responsibilities go hand in hand.

Americans are a concerned people, and we ought to be. We live in a troubled world. We live in a troubled nation. We live in a troubled period of time, and we are going through fantastic changes.

All of us who are users of modern air transportation know that whenever you pass out of one weather system into another, you go through a period of turbulence. You bounce around, you are buffeted from one direction to another, and you hope and pray that the pilot is competent and that the machine is strong.

Well, my fellow Americans, that's what we are doing right now. We are going out of a social system in which there has been segregation, bigotry and intolerance into a system in which people will be recognized for their individual worth—a system in which there will be clear skies and clear thoughts.

NO EASY ANSWERS

We don't see any easy answers to our difficult problems. We are concerned about war, and I hope we always will be. We are concerned about the prospects for peace, and I pray that we always will be. We are deeply concerned about the realization of human dignity and self-respect, and I trust that this will always be our mission.

And, today we are concerned about our cities—and we ought to be, because most of our people live there. Seventy per cent of our people live on one per cent of our land in the cities, and a hundred million more Americans yet to be born will be asking for a place to live between now and the year two thousand.

Where are we going to put them? What kind of places will these cities be? What kind of an environment will this generation yet unborn come into?

Every one of us has a responsibility to look to that future.

Maybe we've learned a little bit from the troubles and the violence and the riots of last summer. They're now off the front pages, but the poverty, overcrowding, poor housing, poor schools, unemployment—the frustration and the agitation—are still there.

A SENSE OF URGENCY

There must be a sense of urgency about these conditions because time is running out. People are impatient—and rightly so. But if they have hope, if they have reason to believe that things are changing for the better, then I believe we will weather the storm and come through, into the clear skies of a better day.

There is a new publication that I want to call to your attention that should be required reading for all of us who are interested in these matters. It is a publication by the Civil Rights Commission entitled, "A Time to Listen . . . A Time to Act." Get it, and read it. I suggest that anyone who wants to know the dimensions of the task ahead in urban America understand the message of that publication.

I know people get a little weary of being studied. I think we have some slow learners. But now is the time to act on what we have learned from the studies we have made.

This is the time to act because America's cities ought to be the best of our culture—the flowering of our intellect, of our spirit and of our material goods. Cities ought to have everything with which to liberate man's capacities and permit him to make the most of his life.

The Model Cities program that we are talking about here today is the beginning of concerted action against urban blight in America.

SLUMISM

Our cities are not all bad. They are the manifestation of both the best that mankind can achieve and the worst. But they are infected with what I have called, for lack of a better word, "slumism."

This slumism is more than broken-down buildings. That's the easiest thing to repair, and if our problem were only broken-down physical structures it would be manageable right now. But we're talking about what to do about broken-down people—people who feel hopeless, desperate, helpless, unneeded, unwanted, shoved aside.

When you deal with the human spirit, you run into the most difficult problems. So let us not underestimate our task.

But I believe we are starting on a program—Model Cities—that can remake our cities and, even more important, rescue people who lack the income to do more than struggle for survival.

People deserve more than simply to survive. The Declaration of Independence didn't talk about life, liberty and survival. It talked about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Some ideologies say survival is enough. For us it is not.

We seek genuine happiness for people who now live in housing that is unfit for human use, people who are deprived of health and educational opportunities that a decent and productive life requires.

ISOLATED VICTORIES

For years the federal government has, through a whole range of grant-in-aid programs, attacked single problems with single weapons. But we have found that this is not enough. These programs, to be sure, have produced some significant results. But the results have been limited, isolated, and fragmented victories. The war against slumism, poverty and blight has at best been a stalemate, and on many fronts, the battle is being lost.

So we simply had to face up to the facts. We have had to revise our strategy, change our tactics and apply new methods.

Model Cities is an interesting phrase. I don't know if we really understand just what it means. I think the full understanding will come as we learn from doing.

It is a new endeavor, and I believe at the most it can be described as a catalyst—as a burr under the saddle, so to speak—designed to encourage comprehensive, not isolated mobilization of human and material resources to produce comprehensive, not isolated, results.

The key word in all of this is partnership. The day of the federal government doing these things by itself is over—if it ever was a fact. There isn't a single problem that you have today in Rochester that can be managed alone by any one group.

PARTNERSHIP

We need each other. And this is the best thing about it. Then everybody becomes important—the federal government, the state government, the local government, the private sector.

This concept of partnership is what Model Cities is all about, plus a long-term commitment to meet long-term problems—a commitment at the government level and at the private level.

The comprehensive input for Model Cities consists of all the existing programs—local, federal and private—and the unused resources which can be brought to bear on any aspect of urban decay or poverty.

The comprehensive output must be not just jobs, important as they are, not just houses, not just transport, not just schools, but a whole new urban society—a society of full opportunity and a full dose of humanity for all.

Now, this is a pretty big order. I suppose some might say that it's more than we can fulfill. But I say that what seems to be impossible is what needs to be done. The greatness of this country—the greatness of any organization—rests on its capacity to dream the impossible and then to do it.

RESULTS EXPECTED

We expect at lot from this coordinated and concentrated use of government and private initiative—this partnership for progress in urban America:

We ought to expect to develop neighborhoods where every family can earn a decent living by its own efforts.

We ought to expect to see health services brought up to national standards, schools that provide training and education commensurate with the ability and potential of the youngsters in them, recreation, transportation, public services fully comparable with those in the best neighborhoods.

As a matter of fact, in many ways our present society is upside down. The people who have the most in private resources generally live in the communities that have the most in public resources, but in a society like ours, which says that it believes in democratic ideals, those who have the least privately ought to be the beneficiaries of the most that the total community can offer.

I'm not asking that we do less for those who have much. I'm simply asking that we do more for those who have too little.

OPEN HOUSING

We also expect to see from this Model Cities program a substantial increase in the supply of decent low cost housing—open housing.

We expect full participation by inner city leaders and residents themselves. The Model Cities program must be community action, not just city hall.

I know that this program is off to a modest start considering the size of the task before us. But at least we got a program.

I know we're not doing as much as many people think we should do—or as I want to do—but we're doing more than we did last year and we're doing much more than we did five years ago. For a while it was doubtful that Congress would pass any program at all. Then the President's request for appropriations was cut in half. But let me tell you, it took a lot of doing to get what we have.

I think that by mobilizing existing resources and consolidating programs that are already under way, the Model Cities program can mean solid progress.

ROCHESTER

If you succeed here in Rochester, it will be the best public relations this program can have. I think it very appropriate, therefore, that this week's tour of Model Cities areas should begin here.

New York State has a wonderful record of experimentation and innovation in meeting human needs and urban needs.

New York was first with low-rent and low-cost public housing, first with labor-union-sponsored housing projects, first with tenement housing laws which were the beginnings of today's housing codes.

Rochester's successful Model Cities application reveals both the needs and the opportunities that exist in urban America today. You have the typical urban ills right here.

But so are the critical positive ingredients—a good city administration, responsible and active leadership in the inner-city communities, industries like Kodak, Xerox, Graflex, Rochester Telephone Company and a host of others which are ready and willing to cooperate in job training and employment efforts.

I'm delighted to see the new awareness on the part of the business community of their responsibilities for social action and civic leadership. It's one of the really heartening developments in America, and I'm especially pleased with what is happening in what we call the Urban Coalition.

PRIVATE GROUPS

Here in Rochester we see private groups already active in the assault on slum housing. Many of their names—such as Rochester Neighbors Incorporated, Better Rochester Living, Metropolitan Rochester Foundation, Rochester United Settlement House Corporation, Rochester Area Council of Churches Development, Community Interests—were unheard of five years ago. Today they spell public concern and private commitment to public problems and mobilization for urban progress.

I am pleased to see that there is a record of public and private cooperation.

The Midtown Plaza, where we are having lunch today, is the result of a partnership between business and government. So is the Genesee Crossroads Urban Renewal Project, not far from here.

Rochester has what it takes to do the job. That's why you are the first in Model Cities. You are a leader, but you are not unique. The Model Cities applications received this year all have reported similar efforts underway, and all the applications reflected the beginnings of a constructive dialogue between City Hall and the residents of depressed neighborhoods.

To those of you who think that dialogue isn't loud enough may I say this is only the beginning.

TIME TO ACT

All of these applications also reflect soul-searching and a new awareness that now is the time to act, and all have reflected a determination to seek solutions and not just to recite the problems—solutions that mean real opportunity to those who have been excluded from the mainstream of American life. The key word for the last third of the Twentieth Century is opportunity. Not welfare, not handouts, but opportunity.

Rochester and the sixty-two other cities which received Model Cities planning grants are now entering a third and critical phase in the development of the Model Cities attack on slumism.

Phase One was mobilizing public support and passing the legislation. It wasn't easy, but it was done.

Phase Two was the intensive preparation—both at the local and the federal levels—that went into the first Model Cities proposals, which I believe have been in the main imaginative and well conceived.

In Phase Three, our task will be to find the resources which we all believe are there, to mobilize the energies that we presume to exist, and to embark on programs which will provide visible evidence of progress.

Permanent results—a prospering, peaceful urban America—will be Phase Four, and it will not come overnight. But that does not mean that we should not work for it. It can be achieved.

Every American, every inner-city leader, every slum resident, must recognize that the neglect of a hundred years cannot be overcome in a year.

PROTEST TO PROGRESS

The nation has been shaken. The consciousness of the American people has been aroused. Now from protest we move to progress.

"Are we moving?" is the question, not "Are we finished?"

The task will not be finished in your life time. What is important are the beginnings.

Permanent results may come slowly because the despair in some neighborhoods is so deep, the legacy of deprivation is so heavy, even though the people involved are a small minority of Americans.

Permanent results may come slowly because rebuilding will be costly, even for a country that is as rich as ours and growing richer.

Permanent results may come slowly because too many Americans still tolerate prejudice in their housing codes, in their employment and promotion practices, in their hearts—even though this nation professes to be the land of the free.

I do not counsel only patience—although we will need patience. "Patience" has for too long served as an excuse for inaction.

What I counsel is diligence, courage, responsibility and faith that we can do the job.

My feelings were beautifully summarized by a poet of the Depression, Thomas Wolfe. He said:

"To every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity. To every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever things his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This is the promise of America."

Working together, we can fulfill that promise.

MEANING OF WORDS "VICTORY" AND "DEFEAT" IN WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Brian Crozier, a distinguished British journalist and a person well acquainted with the situation in Southeast Asia, has commented upon the meaning of the words "victory" and "defeat" in the war in Vietnam. The words, he says, take on new meaning because of the aims of Ho Chi Minh to, first of all, conquer South Vietnam and impose a Communist government upon it, and secondly, to exercise hegemony over the remaining countries of France's former Indochina empire—Cambodia and Laos, as well as Thailand.

Mr. Crozier also listed, in an article in the *Los Angeles Times* recently, other consequences of an American defeat—a defeat that would, in effect, concede that Ho Chi Minh's dreams are realistic. Those consequences, Mr. Crozier says, include a general loss of confidence in Washington abroad, a revitalization of "revolutionary" war in Latin America, a disastrous return to a neoisolationist spirit here in America and the threatened loss of all of Thailand—in addition to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—to the aggressors from Hanoi.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crozier's article from the Los Angeles Times be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOPICAL COMMENT: A BRITISH VIEW—THE UNITED STATES MUST NOT LEAVE VIETNAM

(NOTE.—Brian Crozier has had extensive experience in Southeast Asia, including Vietnam, as a correspondent for Reuters and several American publications. For 10 years he was the Southeast Asian affairs specialist for the Economist of London. He has lectured at St. Antony's College, Oxford, and the London School of Oriental and Asian Studies, and is the author of "Southeast Asia in Turmoil.")

(By Brian Crozier)

LONDON.—The outsider offering advice in a fight must not be surprised if he is asked to mind his own business. This is perhaps particularly true if the outsider is the citizen of a country that is busy reducing its commitments in the area of conflict. Having publicly expressed my dissent from the British policy of "withdrawal East of Suez," however, I feel emboldened to make an outsider's contribution to the great debate now shaking the United States on its military involvement in Vietnam.

One hears a great deal about the moral imperatives of talks with Hanoi or the Viet Cong, and remarkably little about the consequences of an American defeat in the Vietnam war. It may, of course, be objected that this is no ordinary war, that defeat, in the military sense, is unlikely anyway, and that I ought therefore to define "defeat" in the very special context of Vietnam.

Since America's aims are *negative*—i.e., preventing a Communist take-over of South Vietnam—it is more apposite to consider North Vietnam's aims. For these are very positive.

One of them is obvious and more or less explicit: to unify divided Vietnam under Communist rule, in other words to extend Hanoi's control over South Vietnam. The other principal aim, though not overtly stated, emerges beyond doubt from a careful study of Ho Chi Minh's long career as a revolutionary and from the many documents intended for internal Vietnamese Communist use and captured, first by the French during *their* war (1946–54) and more recently by the Americans.

This second aim is simply to exercise some hegemony over the remaining countries of France's former Indochina empire—Cambodia and Laos. In other words, to reconstitute the French Indochina empire under Vietnamese Communist control. This imperialist ambition also extends to part of Thailand—the northeastern provinces—where there is an important Vietnamese minority.

Against this background, "victory" and "defeat" take on a new meaning. From Hanoi's standpoint, "victory" would mean the chance of fulfilling the domestic and irredentist ambitions I have outlined, unhindered by American power. And "defeat" would mean conceding that such policy aims are unrealistic, and abandoning them. Conversely, defeat for the United States would come if Hanoi were enabled to pursue its ambitions unchecked.

There was a time, in the first half of 1965, when a "second Dien Bien Phu," with the Americans in the situation of the defeated French, looked painfully possible. This has no longer been true since the great build-up of American power later that year. If the Americans are defeated, it is far more likely to be through a negotiated settlement than through a military reverse.

This prospect does not escape the North Vietnamese Communist Lao Dong party, which has specifically instructed its political arm in South Vietnam—the National Liberation Front—to combine negotiations, when conditions are ripe, with expanded military activity. Similar tactics paid off during the two Geneva conferences—that of 1954 which halted the first Indochina war, and that of 1961–62, which purported to have solved the Laotian problem.

Hanoi's current *military* strategy serves the ultimate end of an American diplomatic defeat. Le Duan, boss of the Lao Dong party, and creator of the Viet Cong war machine, is behind it. Large regular units are sent to fight in South Vietnam. This diverts America's attention from the *real* war—the terrorist insurgency in the countryside—it involves more and more American troops in Vietnam, leading to a rising spiral of military expenditure.

Thus President Johnson is increasingly exposed to criticism and abuse, both from the well-organized international protest movement, and from well-meaning and intelligent but insufficiently well-informed American critics. If this pressure forces Washington to negotiate *on Hanoi's terms*, then defeat, as I have defined it, will be around the corner.

What would happen in that event? President Eisenhower's "domino" theory, as it originally stood, was perhaps simplistic. But there was much truth in it. Neither Cambodia nor Laos would stand the slightest chance of preserving its independence against a united Communist Vietnam. Already, North Vietnamese troops, with or without their local satellites of the Pathet Lao, come and go at will on Laotian territory; and Cambodia is a military sanctuary, however unwilling, for the Viet Cong.

"Neutralization" cannot, unfortunately, be taken seriously as the basis of a settlement in continental South-East Asia, should the Americans pull out. All it produced in Laos in 1962 was a marriage of incompatibles between Communists and anti-Communists leading to *de facto* partition and renewed hostilities. Indeed, neutralization is a nonsense unless accompanied by the demilitarization of Vietnam—that is, primarily, the disarming of North Vietnam. But who would disarm North Vietnam and keep it disarmed? Surely not another troika body like the International Supervisory Commissions set up in 1954.

And now, for some other consequences of an American defeat. Here is a short list:

A general loss of confidence in Washington's will or ability to honor commitments.

"Revolutionary" war, which was discredited in Latin America by Che Guevara's failure in Bolivia, would be revitalized, with imitations of the Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban examples in many places.

A neo-isolationist, "fortress America" spirit would be fostered in the United States, with disastrous long-term consequences for the non-Communist world.

Thailand, already a victim of subversive violence, partly from terrorists trained in North Vietnam, would be acutely threatened. Indeed the enormous American investment in security in that country would be in jeopardy.

Let those who advocate negotiations ponder the consequences.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 18, moving and impressive ceremonies were held in Detroit, commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Under the leadership of the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Centre and its president, Ralph J. Valatka, Sunday afternoon saw several hundred persons assembled on the beautiful campus of Mercy College.

The principal address in Lithuanian was delivered by Msgr. Jonal Balkunas, a courageous and nationally recognized spokesman for Americans of Lithuanian descent and a pastor in Queens, N.Y. The principal address in English was my privilege to make.

The significant contributions made by Americans of Lithuanian descent in Michigan were reflected vividly by the proclamations which were issued by the mayor of the city of Detroit, Jerome Cavanagh, the Lieutenant and Acting Governor of Michigan, William G. Milliken, and the senate resolution offered by Senators Raymond Dzendzel and Stanley Novak, adopted by the senate of the State of Michigan. A similar resolution was adopted also by the Michigan house of representatives. Each was read at the meeting, the resolution from the Michigan house being read by State Representative Anthony Licata, of Detroit, and the proclamation by Mayor Cavanagh being read by Mrs. Mary Ball.

At the conclusion of the meeting, there was adopted unanimously a resolution which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks. It reflects the deep conviction of the meeting and voices eloquently its concern.

I ask unanimous consent also that the several resolutions and my remarks be printed following the resolution adopted at the meeting. All of this I do in the belief that both the honor paid the Michigan Lithuanian community and the concerns reflected in the resolution be given the fullest possible notice, not alone to my colleagues in the Congress but to the people of the country as well. Detroit and Michigan are proud of those American citizens who assembled on Sunday and who, with others of Lithuanian descent, have contributed so much to this country.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIETUVOS LAISVES KOVOS METAI, 1918–68

We, Lithuanian Americans, gathered at Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan on Sunday, February 18, 1968, in observance of the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence proclaimed on Feb. 16, 1918, in Vilnius and the establishment of Lithuania as a unified state in 1251, this being the 717th anniversary of that occasion; and to disparage the 28th year of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the USSR, unanimously adopt the following:

"RESOLUTION

"Because, the U.S. of America is a leading advocate of independence and the right of self-determination for all peoples; and

"Because, Lithuania and her Baltic sister states of Latvia and Estonia are denied these basic rights by the tyrant usurper, Russia; and

"Because, world opinon demands an end to colonialism and imperialism; it is

"*Resolved*, That we express our appreciation to the government of the United States of America for its policy of resistance to communist aggression and for its continued non-recognition of the illegal seizure and present occupation and colonialization of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by imperialist Russia; and

"That we request the United States government to raise before the United Nations and at all levels of discussions with the government of the Soviet Union and other nations the issue of the denial of self-determination and independence of the peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania; and

"That we urge the United States government to provide for increased Lithuanian language radio broadcasts into Lithuania; and

"That we urge the State Department section for Lithuanian affairs to increase its activity and liaison with the Lithuanian American community; and

"That, by copy of this resolution, we thank the President of the United States, the Vice-President, the Secretary of State, the United States ambassador to the United Nations, the United States Senate and House of Representatives and members of their foreign affairs committees, the Governor of the State of Michigan, the Lieutenant Governor, the Michigan State legislature, the Mayor of the City of Detroit, its Common Council and the press, radio and television media for their continuing sympathy, understanding, support and numerous contributions to the cause of freedom and independence for Lithuania."

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS CENTER.
RALPH J. VALATKA, *Chairman*.
ALFONSAS JUSKA, *Secretary*.
DETROIT, MICH.

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA WEEK

FEBRUARY 11–17, 1968

(Proclamation of the City of Detroit, Executive Office)

Whereas the 50th Anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated on February 16th, marking that day in 1918 when Lithuania was reestablished as a free and soverign state, and

Whereas the history of the freedom-loving Lithuanian people is underscored by their heroic resistance to subjugation by Czarist Russia, by Nazi Germany and since 1940 by the Soviet Union, and

Whereas despite 28 years of Communist domination, Lithuanian people throughout the world maintain the most fervent dedication to the cause of liberating their homeland, and

Whereas the United States has supported and encouraged this abiding love of freedom by the Lithuanian people by refusing to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union

Now, therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of the City of Detroit, do hereby proclaim the week of February 11–17, 1968 as Republic of Lithuania Week in Detroit and urge all citizens to join me in seeking a world in which the fervent desire for freedom becomes the reality of freedom for Lithuania and all peoples.

Given under my hand and seal this 29th day of January, 1968.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA WEEK

(Proclamation of the State of Michigan, Executive Office, Lansing)

The year 1918 will live forever in the minds and hearts of the great and courageous people of Lithuania, an ancient country which played such an important role in the development of modern Europe. On February 16, 1918 Lithuania became a free and independent nation. This freedom tragically lasted only 22 years. In June of 1940 the men, women and children in the little Baltic nation were swallowed up by the totalitarian tyranny of the Soviet Union.

Significantly, the United States has never recognized this ruthless take over and today the people of Michigan and the rest of the United States yearn with the free Lithuanians living here that freedom once again will come to their brothers and sisters now enslaved in their native land. Together we will work toward a rebirth of freedom with the knowledge that history teaches us that the spirit of self-determination is eternal.

Let the freedom enjoyed by the native Lithuanian sons and daughters in Michigan be the beacon to be followed by their friends everywhere. And let it be known how highly we respect our friendships with our Lithuanian neighbors.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Lieutenant and Acting Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim February 11–17, 1968, as Republic of Lithuania Week in Michigan, and ask all citizens to join with our good Lithuanian friends in a rededication to freedom for the captive nations on this the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan, this ninth day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-eight and of the commonwealth one hundred thirty-second.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
Lieutenant and Acting Governor.

By the Lieutenant and Acting Governor:

JAMES M. HORN,
Secretary of State.

MICHIGAN SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 161

(Offered by Senators Raymond Dzendzel and Stanley Novak)

Resolution commemorating the golden jubilee of Lithuania's declaration of independence

Whereas, The Golden Jubilee of the Declaration of Independence by Lithuania, issued February 16, 1918, is celebrated this year and marks a significant event in mankind's emergence throughout history to attain the freedoms of self-government; and

Whereas, Lithuanians of earliest historical record emerged from pagan antiquity in the Second Century, A.D. and succeeded in establishing a strong, unified state in 1251 A.D., becoming one of the largest states of medieval Europe; and

Whereas, For nearly two hundred years the Lithuanians flourished, but by the mid-sixteenth century, hard-pressed by Russians, they fully merged with Poland. At the close of the eighteen century after successive partitions of Poland, the Lithuanian territory passed to the Russians, who ceaselessly attempted without success to eradicate Lithuanian national identity—so vital and fierce was the Lithuanian concept of freedom; and

Whereas, February 16, 1918 after much historical turbulence, the independent state of Lithuania was proclaimed and in November 1918 became the Independent Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, Despite Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1940 and the U.S.S.R.'s forced elections incorporating her government as part of the Soviet Union, the United States of America continued to recognize Lithuania as an independent republic, as it does to this day. In the United States of America, Lithuania's Republic is honored for her political, cultural, economic and social achievements, and American citizens cherish the successive *generations of Lithuanians in this country* who so contribute to society and who are proven patriots in this country's defense of freedom; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the week proclaimed in Michigan February 11–17, 1968 shall be honored as the Golden Jubilee of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, venerating the memory of generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters in world history and as the loyal, valiant citizens of these United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this tribute be presented to the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center for dissemination among their member organizations, in testimony of the esteem of The Michigan Senate.

Adopted by the Senate, February 14, 1968.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILLIP A. HART BEFORE THE DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION CENTRE

I know this is a sad occasion. We commemorate today an Independence Day that brought no independence, a dream that brought no fulfillment, a nationalism that did not manage to create a nation.

My knowledge of Lithuanian history, I should confess at the outset, is sketchy indeed. I know that Lithuania was a strong power as early as 1300, strong enough to hold off the Mongols on one side and the Teutons on the other.

And the pattern of its history has not changed much since then.

Native Lithuanians, through what can only be described as one of geography's most unfortunate accidents, have struggled for survival like a tiny yacht nightmarishly caught between two battling pirate ships . . . finding itself in the path of boarding parties from first one vessel and then the other.

It has alternately been a province of Russia or Germany ever since, achieving independence only in those brief periods when the giants were temporarily exhausted from their struggles.

Saddest of all, the Independence Day that we observe here did not inaugurate a period of democratic tranquility.

Even during the period of independence, Russia and Germany continued to meddle in the internal affairs of Lithuania, thus blocking the kind of stability that would have allowed a democratic government.

What saddens all of us, of course, is the feeling that after all this suffering, all the pillage and destruction from first one great power and then another, Lithuania somehow deserved to come out intact and free at the end.

And yet the end has not arrived.

It is tempting to look back over this long history of anguish and death and deprivation and say "What a shame, it was all so futile because no one really benefited."

Well, one nation did benefit from those troubled times—and I'm not thinking of Russia, even though it certainly still enjoys certain strategic benefits from its continued occupation of Lithuania.

I'm thinking of the United States. Because the United States now number some one million citizens of Lithuanian descent—earnest, hard-working people who have contributed mightily to our development.

Lithuanians, I think, have always been particularly devoted to their tiny land. They have left it only reluctantly and only when sorely pressed. During the period of independence, some 30 or 40 thousand immigrants returned home. Most of them, unfortunatey, were bitterly disappointed that true freedom could not be achieved and most returned to America.

Certainly, the fact that you are gathered here today is one measure of the affection that Lithuanian-Americans always continue to hold for that small and lovely land.

It is especially sad to know that on the anniversary of an independence day, the observances are held outside the country that once achieved independence. I have no sure knowledge on the subject—perhaps you have—but it is my guess that public commemorations of the event are not encouraged in Lithuania.

But we should find some comfort, too, in the fact that Lithuania now appears to be enjoying at least some measure of peaceful tranquility. At least the ancient languages are not being stamped out and some of the old customs are being preserved.

And why? I would guess simply because Lithuania is no longer at a critical crossroads between Russia and her principal adversary. The principal adversary is no longer Germany, but the United States.

So, hopefully, Russia can afford to continue to relax her grip, since Lithuania's strategic importance is greatly diminished.

Thus, by assuming the role of Russia's main adversary, the United States has been able to take the pressure off Lithuania and perhaps in a small measure repay that country for the many sturdy immigrants she has sent to our shores.

We can certainly all be grateful for Lithuanian culture . . . for the Lithuanian Opera . . . for Lithuanian-American contributions in literature . . . in art . . . and in the folkdancing so brilliantly demonstrated here today.

And we can all continue to hope for the day when all three of those small lovely Baltic states can achieve complete control of their own destinies . . . the day when these lost cultures can emerge to join us.

TRAGEDY IN ORANGEBURG, S.C.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as I am sure every Senator is aware, the city of Orangeburg, in my home State of South Carolina, recently experienced a tragic occurrence. I think that the Members of this body might be interested in the views of the hometown newspaper concerning this tragic event. I ask unanimous consent that several articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times & Democrat, Feb. 12, 1968]

ORANGEBURG CHURCHES PREACH RESTRAINT AND LOVE

The churches of Orangeburg exercised their great influence in the community on Sunday morning by preaching restraint, concern, the necessity for being doers of the Word, "not just hearers" and the need for Christian love around the world, not only in their home community.

Expressing their desire to have their congregations fulfill their duties as good citizens and Christians, several clergymen of both races said they hoped that all their members would practice restraint.

The Rev. Lester Branham, pastor of the First Baptist Church, said he referred directly to the disturbances this past week and the problems that have arisen to face the community. He said he preached on the ministry of Christ as being one of reconciliation and redemption. The need to translate spiritual things into positive action in the community was stressed, and he said he tried to emphasize this by using Christ's reference to light and salt in the New Testament.

"Light is needed," he said, "but before we can redeem the world, we first have to live it."

"We must also encourage people," said Mr. Branham, "to leave the keeping of law and order to those who are responsible for it and who are trained for it. We must use our personal influence as Christians to try to work out a peaceful and permanent solution to these problems."

The Rev. E. Armand Shealy of the Orangeburg Lutheran Church said he used the Gospel of the Laborers in the Vineyard, stressing the fact that we are all workers in the Lord's vineyard, but somehow we have not done enough and we need to do more to bring the reconciling love of Christ, not only to our community, but to the whole world.

"The scars we bear," he said, "are indicative of the need of Christ to bring the impact of God's love on all of our activities. We must bring this into all facets of our lives . . . our jobs, our homes, our club meetings and in every relationship.

"We deplore violence in any form and we believe in the rights and dignity of all men made of God."

At Antioch Baptist Church of Bowman on Sunday the Rev. Jack DeLong Dash spoke of the situation of last week to his congregation. Since this past Sunday was Race Relations Week, the program was geared to this, and the Rev. Dash spoke to the members of his church in terms of trying to bridge the gap and establish better relations, in the spirit of the Lord.

"It did seem a little ironic," he admitted, "that this happened just at this time."

The question came to mind, he said, as to what should be the Christian attitude and the Christian role in these times. . . .

"We concluded that we could only follow the admonition, 'Blessed are the peacemakers,' "

Mr. Dash said, "violence is not the answer. We must move toward a better relationship among all people."

He was pleased, he said, to note that the authorities have put forth some effort to "remove the evil that caused most of the trouble. The bowling alley is a public menace, and I am happy that the authorities are taking steps."

In the absence of Father Clement Tackney, Mass was said on Sunday by Father John Jerlinski at Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Orangeburg.

Prayers were said for racial justice and harmony, but no direct reference was made in the sermon. One priest said he was directly very much concerned as he was a chaplain on the South Carolina State College campus and he was present in the emergency room of the Orangeburg Regional Hospital when the wounded were being treated. The Rev. Claude Harper of St. Andrew's Methodist Church said that the situation was referred to in his sermon, and also that there was a mention of Claflin College in the bulletin for the day.

He said he had called on the people of his congregation to practice restraint in the area of making harsh statements or using harsh language. He urged them to be "doers of the Word, rather than hearers."

"A couple of our members," said Mr. Harper, "are on the new Board that has been formed to assist in this matter and we urged that all our members would support them.

"We are mindful of the fact that we ought to be concerned for both sides in this struggle and I stressed the need for more reliable lines of communication so this situation could not recur."

The Episcopal Chucrh of the Redeemer's pastor, the Rev. William J. Snow II, urged that the people of the city not let go of what they have gained.

"We have made great advances," he said, "and there are three ways we can hold onto what we have gained. First, speak the truth. Second, speak the truth only when it is necessary to speak at all and third, a combination of the two, remember that God listens to every word we speak."

Mr. Snow emphasized that rumors and stories, no matter whether true or not, can only cause more hate and confusion. "Many things," he said, "even though they may be true, are better left unsaid if they cannot do anything but cause more damage."

The Rev. Harold Roland of Mt. Zion Baptist Church, said he had already planned to preach on spiritual healing, on this Sunday devoted to race relations.

"I just followed through with what I had already prepared," he said.

"I brought the congregation up to date on new developments before the sermon, such as the meetings of the ministers, the forming of the human relations council, and then moved on into the message for the day."

He said he felt that the congregation had heard the message and understood what he meant, "Maybe, as much as possible, under the circumstances."

Church members from other congregations said that their churches also emphasized the need for more cooperation among the races and better lines of communication. They were also urged to leave the problem to those in authority and to those trained to handle it.

The great authority of the churches was

brought to bear in Orangeburg on Sunday for the furtherance of peace, harmony and good-will among all the people of the community.

FLOYD AND BLACK POWER WERE ON A COLLISION COURSE

(By Dean B. Livingston)

Harry Floyd and his All-Star Bowling Lanes were on a collision course with Negro Black Power dating back to the summer of 1966.

Floyd became a prime target for Negro agitation when he refused to admit into his bowling alley colored players who were in the city with the California team participating in the American Legion World Series here.

Since then the name Harry Floyd has been a rallying cry for Black Power elements in the city.

Until early fall 1967 Floyd remained the "target in waiting" for a show of violence. He was the ace in the hole for either a case in court or a showdown of violence.

Last fall local leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People detected an extreme restlessness among the S.C. State College students to bring the Harry Floyd situation to a head.

The NAACP saw the bowling alley as a vehicle by which Black Power could make a strong bid for power on the campus. In other words the Black Power leadership basically said we can do for you what the NAACP can't.

The Rev. J. Herbert Nelson and others in the high NAACP ranks, upon learning that a small group of State students had been denied entry into the All-Star Lanes, turned to the white community for assistance in dealing with Floyd. Nelson looked upon Black Power as the common enemy.

Nelson told this writer at that time: "If the students have to resort to Black Power to solve the bowling alley situation, there will be a race riot."

Police Chief Roger Poston and City Administrator Robert T. Stevenson also were told of the dangerous condition possible if Black Power made the move against Floyd.

Chief Poston and Stevenson were alarmed. So were many others in official Orangeburg. They knew the All-Star Bowling Lanes was the racial powder keg of Orangeburg.

Many community leaders were made aware of the situation. So were the industries which sponsor bowling teams. It later ensued that one industry withdrew its sponsorship of a team because of the adamant segregation stand.

Floyd claimed his establishment was operated as a private club. That claim did not hold water for one second. This writer has bowled there, has eaten there, but does not remember joining the club.

The bowling alley affair went into the talking stages. Businessmen and others feared the consequences if Floyd did not at least make a token offer of settlement with the Negroes.

It was learned that the State College bowling team asked Floyd to allow it to bowl there. Floyd could set the times and dates at which the State bowlers were to be at the alley. Floyd refused.

Stevenson and Chief Poston devoted extensive time explaining to Floyd the explosive situation that was brewing over the bowling alley.

They realized the entire City of Orangeburg could be endangered if Floyd and Black Power continued on the collision path.

Neither advocating integration nor segregation. Poston and Stevenson took emphatic stands in safeguarding Orangeburg from a race riot. Stevenson said the decision was made long ago to close the establishment.

Last Monday night Chief Poston put that decision into effect when he ordered the bowling lanes closed when Negroes tried to integrate it.

The following day Floyd launched a strong protest before City Council against Poston's action. Stevenson said at that meeting that the decision to close the establishment had been made to protect lives and property.

While Chief Poston and Stevenson were plotting their course of action if the crisis did explode, concerned people in Orangeburg were working to come up with a solution.

One industry, Fabric Services Inc., said it would consider sponsoring a team if Floyd would allow Negroes to participate. Fabric Services does not now sponsor a team because of its adherence to federal employment regulations.

A group of downtown businessmen sought to compromise the impending crisis by persuading Floyd to integrate on the offer of financial assistance through sponsorship of teams and other means. Floyd refused this, too.

Floyd concluded that integration of the All-Star Lanes would destroy his business, a business which Harry Floyd and his brother, E. C., have worked long and hard to build.

Before the crisis hit, Floyd had turned the All-Star Lanes into a successful operation. It has been said that he operated one of the best bowling operations in South Carolina.

But Floyd was convinced that integration would wreck him. There could be no compromise. He felt he had the law on his side.

Now that the Justice Department has filed suit against the All-Star Lanes Floyds' position with the law will be learned.

LEST WE FORGET

The time has come when the responsible people of Orangeburg, white and colored, should re-examine, in detail, what has taken place in the city in recent days.

The result, so far as we see it, is that some demands have been made and that certain steps have been taken—steps with which we do not believe that the average resident of the city will approve—in an attempt to "restore racial peace" in Orangeburg. We, like all of the residents of Orangeburg, hope that peace will be restored, but not at any price.

The Negroes who are apparently leading the white people to the bargaining table must realize that before anything can be accomplished they, themselves and their people, must agree to obey and uphold law and order while aiding in the apprehension and prosecution of law violators.

We have seen and read the demands made by the Negroes in their "Orangeburg Declaration." While some are just and equitable, others are impossible and it is hoped that whatever group negotiates the individual items, be it white, Negro, or integrated, realizes it.

As to the stipulation that State Highway Patrolmen who, not of their own volition, took part in the exchange of gunshots which left three fatally injured and 37 wounded in varying degrees, be suspended, that is a matter for action by the State Highway Patrol and should be based on the findings of an impartial investigation.

Apparently many have lost sight of the fact that the highway patrolmen were protecting the lives of city firemen who risked bodily harm in entering the State College the night of the gunshot exchange to extinguish a blaze set by rioting students who threw Molotov cocktails against a frame house, setting it ablaze. And the highway patrolmen protecting the firemen themselves faced the same sniper fire that harassed the firemen. Both the firemen and the patrolmen were acting in line of duty and only the foolish or those unfamiliar with what went on would deny that the latter fired in self defense.

We regret the deaths of the three young men. We offer our sympathy to their parents and friends. But we do not think that they died in a quest for civil rights. They were participating in a riot, a riot that endangered the entire city and its black and white residents.

As to the charge that the patrolmen would not have fired had the students been white, that is ridiculous. Highway patrolmen have been forced to use their weapons against blacks and whites in the past in carrying out their duties. And in last Thursday night's confrontation, surely no man would have given a thought to the color of the finger about to pull the trigger of a weapon aimed at him.

Should those who hope to make peace in Orangeburg fail in any respect to uphold the actions of and support our law enforcement officers, the city will indeed be in for a "hot summer." All arguments then could be setteld only at gunpoint.

So far, all of the demands have been made by Dr. Charles H. Thomas and the NAACP. What has Mayor E. O. Pendarvis had to say? Has he demanded that the NAACP produce the students who illegally broke plate glass windows on East Russell St. and severely damaged automobiles in the showroom of the East End Motor Co. Tuesday night, February 6? Certainly they are liable to prosecution. Has he asked that the NAACP investigate and produce those students who carried on sporadic sniper fire for more than an hour from the State College and Claflin College campuses Thursday night, February 8?

We ask these questions because Mayor Pendarvis is the elected representative of all of the people of Orangeburg as its mayor. It is he to whom both the white people and the Negroes will be looking to restore normal community life in this city.

And where has Gov. Robert E. McNair been since violence and discord broke out in our city? He has not added the prestige of his office in seeking a halt to discord and the restoration of harmony. We wonder what, in Columbia, could be of such vital importance that he is unable to leave to help soothe a troubled spot in his state. The calling out of the National Guard, the sending out of South Carolina Law Enforcement Division agents and the highway patrolmen has done much to put a temporary halt to violence, but they have done little to ease tensions, to bring divided people together.

We have nothing but commendation for Police Chief Roger E. Poston, Sheriff R. F. (Bob) Dukes, Captain Carl Fairey of the State Highway Patrol and SLED Chief J. P. (Pete) Strom. They and their men have done an outstanding job, along with the Guardsmen, in putting down strife. Their duty was to enforce the law. That, they did. Now, we hope and pray that you all are given the support and backing that you deserve and should have.

And to those engaged in working to restore peace in Orangeburg, we urge that you keep in mind the sequence of events last week. We review them for you:

First, on Monday night, February 5, Negro students attempting to integrate the All-Star Bowling Lanes were turned away by Harry K. Floyd, owner and operator. His business was ordered closed for the night by Police Chief Roger E. Poston in the interest of public safety. The Negroes left and, during their return to the college campuses, broke windows in business establishments on East Russell St. and severely damaged automobiles in the showroom of the East End Motor Co. They vented their rage on the owners of properties who had nothing to do with Harry Floyd or his actions. Was this provocation?

Tuesday night, February 6, Floyd reopened his bowling lanes, assured of his right to do so, according to state laws, by C. Walker Limehouse, city attorney. Again the students assembled and attempted to enter the bowling alleys. A city policeman, William Long, was injured during the incident, requiring hospitalization. Was this provocation?

The following night, Wednesday, law enforcement officers protecting lives and property at the A&P Shopping Center, where All-Star Lanes is located, were called away to U.S. Highway 601 adjacent to the State College campus where a barrage of bricks and rocks were being thrown at passing vehicles, their place at the shopping center being taken by National Guardsmen who had been on an "alert" basis. Was this brick and rock throwing provocation?

Thursday night, February 8, sporadic sniper firing began from both the State College and Claflin campuses and State Highway Patrolmen, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division agents, deputy sheriffs, city policemen and National Guardsmen were ordered in.

Shortly before 11 p.m. Negroes from the State College campus set a bonfire on city property just outside the entrance to the property and a Molotov cocktail was hurled against the side of the frame residence of Miss Jennie Brunson, just to the south of the campus. The city firemen responded and went on the campus to extinguish the blaze in short order. State Highway Patrolmen accompanied the firemen on the college property to protect the firemen who were targets for the snipers. The sound of gunfire was heard by newspaper reporters and law enforcement officers, alike.

The fusillade of shots that ended in deaths and woundings came after a highway patrolman was felled by a heavy missile which struck him in the face. The patrolmen, ordered not to fire their weapons unless endangered or for self protection, believing their comrade shot, and with good reason, and believing themselves endangered, fired into the group of Negroes in self protection. They had provocation.

The patrolmen did not enter the college property to halt rioting or to calm a disturbance. They had orders not to do so. They went on the college to protect unarmed firemen, doing their duty, from armed snipers. They did what they should have done, under the circumstances.

They All Want To Know Who Fired First Shot

(Editor's Note.—Dean B. Livingston, editor and publisher of The Times and Democrat, was a direct eyewitness to the exchange of gunfire between Negro rioters and state patrolmen which killed three Negroes and wounded more than 30 others. In this article Livingston deals with the events of Thursday night and what has followed in the aftermath.)

(By Dean B. Livingston)

Who fired first? Nor for what reason. Nor did my questioners want to know the direct circumstances surround the exchange of fire between the state patrolmen and Negro rioters.

Since it was learned that I was one of the newsmen who moved near the S.C. State College entrance with armed S.C. State Highway Patrolmen and members of the Orangeburg Fire Department who were there to extinguish a blaze started by the rioters, from all over the nation the question has come forth: "Who fired first?"

Not once have I been asked: "Why did they fire?" One New York newsman became rather irritated with me when I questioned his intelligence for asking me the question: "How could you be sure the Negroes fired first if you didn't see the bullets?" A few short words explained to him that the human eye can not see bullets sailing through the night air.

Dozens of times I have attempted to recall the exact sequence of events leading to the deaths of the three young Negroes. Not being blessed either with eyes which allow me to see in darkness or a mental composure to keep a detailed chronicle of events in my brain when guns are being fired less than 10 feet from me, I will try again:

Early in the night, Dozier Mobley of the Associated Press and I went to the intersection of Russell and Boulevard.

The students were gathered to the right of the college entrance on U.S. 601. Gunfire occasionally rang out and fire-bombs were tossed in the direction of the W. A. Livingston Wholesale Co. warehouse.

It was quite obvious that the situation was taking a turn for the worse.

At about 10 o'clock the Negroes started a large fire on the street. They fed the blaze with road signs and other such signs standing near the college entrance.

The grass was dry and the fire spread fast. As the fire was spreading I heard one of the law enforcement officials say, "We're going to send a fire truck in to put out the fire and we're going to send the patrolmen in to protect those firemen."

Then I heard and saw the fire truck. I followed the fire truck in and upon arriving on the scene began taking pictures of the fire (these and other pictures were published in Friday morning T&D). I didn't see the Negroes but the first picture I took showed the Negroes were still on the bank. Measuring the perspective of the photograph I guess I was some 50 feet from the Negroes.

The patrolmen on the front line were trained to handle themselves under fire. I observed they faced the Negroes with a high degree of steadfastness and concentration. They were not edgy. It was obvious they were taking a defensive position.

Seeing their composure no doubt prompted me to relax somewhat in my picture taking.

Had they gone into the area determined to fire first they could have fired upon arriving with the firetruck. They could have fired at near point-blank range. Had this been the case the death toll probably would have been in the hundreds.

But instead they took the more dangerous route for themselves attempting to make physical apprehensions. Patrolman D. I. Shealy's face injury was evidence of this.

After snapping four photos of the fire scene I ran to the embankment where the State Patrolmen had taken up a firing line position to protect the firemen. I shot one picture here and just before, or maybe after, shooting the second it suddenly dawned on me that there was gunfire in front of me.

I guess I froze for a fraction of a second and then responded to a yell of "hit the ground" from Police Chief Roger Poston.

Crashing to the ground on top of camera and electric strobe light, I then fully realized where I was and what was going on around me, I began to crawl.

I crawled over whiskey bottles and beer cans whose contents presumably had helped inflame the rioters.

Reaching an area somewhere between the National Guard men and the highway patrolmen, I began taking pictures from a flat-on-the-ground position.

Close by was a television crew and other newsmen. A second or so later lights came from somewhere. The entire scene of highway patrolmen and National Guardsmen was well illuminated.

I concluded the light came from one of the television crews. One of the law enforcement officials thought it came from my strobe light. I didn't think it the proper time to explain to him that the duration of light from an electric strobe was less than one thousandth of a second.

A minute or so later all firing had stopped and SLED Chief J.P. Strom and Orangeburg Police Chief Roger Poston were evaluating the situation.

It was then that the two fatally wounded Negroes—Delano Middleton and Henry Smith—were brought down to our area and then taken to the rescue truck.

About this time it filtered in that a highway patrolman had been shot. His condition or exactly what had happened to him was not learned until about 15 minutes later.

Meanwhile National Guardsmen were taking position across the street. They had not fired a shot.

At first it appeared that only two Negroes had been wounded, but within minutes cars began speeding off of the campus in the direction of the hospital. I did not hear an appeal or a notification that there were more wounded.

Before concluding this first person article I would like to explain the question so emphatically put to me by my wife: "What in the world were you doing there?"

Law enforcement officials I am sure, extended such outstanding cooperation with the press and television Wednesday night (as well as other days and nights last week) because of the explosiveness of the situation outside witnesses who would relate the truth would be needed. This, along with the firm belief of most S.C. law enforcement officials that the public needs to know what is taking place, allowed the newsmen and photographers to move into the area.

Chief J. P. Strom of SLED, Lt. Carl Fairey of S.C. Highway Department and Roger Poston of the Orangeburg Police Department were willing to let us newsmen be direct witnesses to their actions. They were willing to let the facts speak for themselves.

With about one hour's sleep I got up Friday morning to watch the early morning news. It was here that I heard a television newsman say: "Newsmen at the scene in Orangeburg said the state troopers fired first."

It would be interesting to know the identification of the newsmen, if they do exist, who made this comment. He or they are extremely well qualified to help in the United States in positions other than in news reporting.

To reach the positive conclusion that the troopers fired first, he or they would have to have eyes which can penetrate darkness and ears which can distinguish the great differences of most all sounds.

Personally, I would pose this question to him or they: Did you (or all of you) go to the front line where the highway patrolmen were in position and focus your eyes, ears and brains only upon the backs of the patrolmen in front of you and have your facilities so in tune that you could conclude anything other that somebody was firing at somebody?

Were you there concentrating as were the highway patrolmen on that area of darkness which contained the rioters?

I do not recall seeing any photographers or newsmen, nor have my photographs revealed any one on the firing line other than highway patrolmen.

This man, or these men, could not have been photographers because it would have been impossible to think only about that space of darkness when there were so many great photographic opportunities surrounding him or they.

I doubt if it was a reporter because a good reporter would have been concentrating on the sequence of events.

Now the big question: Who are the newsman who said the state troopers fired first?

The Racial Crisis

The seven days—February 6 through February 13—have brought to the City of Orangeburg events which will take both the white and Negro races years to forget—if ever.

The Times and Democrat, as a responsible newspaper has reported these events as accurately—and as objectively—as possible. T&D staff writers have covered many of the events and thousands and thousands of words have been written about them. These stories were written in a "let the chips fall where they may" attitude. Other events have been covered by press association writers who, too, have also been eyewitnesses and have reported the facts as they saw them, not as they wished they saw them. No more can be expected of a newspaperman.

But The Times and Democrat has refrained from discussing the situation editorally until today. The situation has been fluid; there has been emotionalism and tenseness. Editorial comments seemed superfluous until it became resolved and some measure of composure returned to the community.

Out of the series of events two things become apparent. A thorough investigation of all phases of the shooting of the three teenage Negroes last Thursday night by the Federal Bureau of Investigation would be welcomed not only by this newspaper but, we are sure by the State Highway Patrol. Second, a thorough investigation of South Carolina State College by the state, initiated by the General Assembly, to determine whether the college is, and will remain, an institution of higher education and learning of what, it seems, is a hotbed of black extremism. This The Times and Democrat would welcome as would we are sure, the Orangeburg community, white and black.

An FBI investigation should not be confined to the actual shootings themselves. There are too many other fields of interest in which such an investigation should be concerned:

1. How deeply is the Black Power movement rooted on the State College campus?

2. Was the All-Star Bowling Lanes a target of integration or an excuse for violence?

3. Were the students who were fatally shot last Thursday night Black Power advocates, or were they three young people led to the firing line by outside agitators?

4. Was sniper firing done from the State College or Claflin College campus for more than an hour before the confrontation between the highway patrolmen and the students that led to the three deaths as reported by responsible newspapermen and law enforcement officers? (In this The Times and Democrat had two reporters on the scene who were eyewitnesses to the shooting and who offer full cooperation in this phase of an investigation.)

As to State College, we do not believe that Black Power is deeply rooted. But the institution now is challenged. A legislative investigation, a thorough investigation, is desired to clear the atmosphere there. If it is found to be a Black Power cell, then it should be closed—and no one, white or Negro, wants that. But on the other hand, if it is cleared then the administration could continue along its way of providing a comprehensive and quality educational program for the young people of the state for which it was created.

For that reason, we ask the Orangeburg County delegation to the General Assembly to introduce necessary legislation and take other steps to provide an objective calm and sober look at State College and to follow through with the proper actions based on the results of the investigation's findings.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the disposition of the tabling motion, the Sergeant at Arms be directed to clear the floor of all staff personnel except those on the staff of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the secretary for the majority, the secretary for the minority, and the two policy committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to clear the Chamber in accordance with the rules.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

The Senate will be in order.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CHURCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a unanimous-consent request was granted some days ago by means of which the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] would have been recognized at this time. In view of the developments which have occurred since that time, I ask unanimous consent that on the disposition of any business connected with the present bill after I have completed my remarks, that the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] will be recognized at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to make one reservation. I want to ask for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment when the Senator gets through.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, indeed; but——

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask for them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no motion before the Senate. The unfinished business has not yet been laid down.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the pending business; is it not?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays before the tabling motion.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from North Carolina that the unfinished business has not yet been laid down.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator from North Carolina for that purpose at this moment.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think that the author of the amendment, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], should have some notice of this. I am sure that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would like that to happen. So, in the meantime, I should like to get on with my remarks and then I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not quite understand the agreement or the arrangement concerning the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. MANSFIELD. He was supposed to be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour today, for 1 hour; but, because of this development, I asked that the unanimous-consent agreement be honored after I get through with my remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to determine——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I was going to reserve the right to object to the unanimous-consent request concerning the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]—which objection I would not make, however—if the majority leader would agree to modify it——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. ERVIN. And say that I will be recognized immediately before the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. That is a fair request.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand what time is being reserved for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. MANSFIELD. As soon as we have disposed of the business connected with the bill and the votes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That might be next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no. It will be this afternoon. It pertains to the votes. There will not be that many votes today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh. Votes. I understand it now. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was going to ask, at the conclusion of what?—pertaining to the pending business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. Having to do with votes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the vote yesterday on the cloture motion fell several votes short of the required two-thirds. A majority decided that the debate on H.R. 2516 has been adequate. A majority of this body said that the issues have been fully developed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will suspend.

Let us have order in the Chamber. We have cleared the Chamber of attachés and we must have order in order to hear the Senator from Montana.

The Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a majority favors a vote on the merits but that vote cannot take place. Whenever a cloture motion receives more than a constitutional majority—as it did yesterday—the question extends understandably to the relative merits of the present provisions of rule XXII. However, the Senate had a clear opportunity to express itself on the merits of rule XXII at the beginning of the 90th Congress. At that time, the issue was resolved overwhelmingly. The present rules were unchanged. I think it is best now to face the realities of considering the present bill under the present rules.

In my judgment, at this time, the necessary two-thirds cannot be obtained on H.R. 2516 with the Mondale amendment attached. I say that as one who, as a Senator from Montana and as the majority leader, voted for the cloture motion and strongly favors the freedom-of-choice concept for all Americans in housing. Shortly, the distinguished minority leader and I shall propose a motion to the Senate that shall be most difficult for me because of my attitude toward the provisions of the amendment. I do so, however, after seriously weighing the possible ramifications of pressing for the amendment on the bill at this time.

Many reasons have been cited for deferring action on the Mondale amendment—reasons which, valid or not, could affect the outcome. There has been serious question, for instance, that the amendment is not germane to the present bill; that it properly should be placed on a more relevant matter if, but only if, such a measure cannot be reported by the committee. What is clear is that if the action I propose is successful it will not end the effort to obtain for all Americans the freedom of choice for a home anywhere in the Nation. I think, however, it is extremely important at this time that the Senate pass a needed and meaningful civil rights bill. H.R. 2516 as reported from committee is such a bill. In essence it protects the rights granted by the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 and, more fundamentally, by the Constitution itself. Those rights must not be frustrated. They must not be made the prey of violence or intimidation. Under H.R. 2516, if interference of this kind should occur, the trial for assault or murder or intimidation may—let me repeat that word "may"—take place in the Federal courthouse in the community of the crime rather than in the county courthouse; but even then only if the Attorney General determines that such a forum is necessary to effectuate substantial justice. This is what the so-called Hart bill does. Its reasonableness is attested to by the overwhelming support of the concept in the House of Representatives. I would hate to see that overwhelming bipartisan support gained in the House now be sacrificed in an effort—in my opinion futile at this time—to obtain the provisions of the Mondale amendment.

The merits of the bill reported by the committee are modest and necessary, but I think the bill has great importance. The experience in the past two summers which has seen some of our greatest cities torn apart, has generated fear and tension throughout the land.

The great Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965—of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was the architect, as has been stated on this floor, because his was the decisive influence—renewed the hope of many Americans. The passage of those acts also emphasized the viability of the institutions of our Government in recognizing and responding to the needs of all of the people. The Senate of the United States played a most critical role in initiating and formulating those great acts of 1964 and 1965. I hope the Senate will act now to preserve the notion that the institutions of this Government are responsive to the just causes of the people.

In 1968, a new dimension has been added to the issue. There are being preached in our society doctrines of separatism, of racism, and divisiveness as potent as anything in our history. This venom is spewed out with the contention that the institutions of government are unable or unwilling to provide an effective forum for the legitimate grievances of the people.

I do not believe that the Federal Government, and particularly the Congress, will turn its back on legitimate demands. But each of us knows that in an atmosphere of fear, the type of distrust generated by violence, threats of violence and riots, does not present an optimum climate for considering any legislation. Nevertheless, we must continue to try to reach for remedies for just grievances even though they may be regarded as less than total.

The spring and summer of 1964 and 1965 are gone, but our duty is no less clear. It is a matter of telling the people of this country that the Congress of the United States has not turned its back on a just grievance. It is a matter of telling all responsible Americans that the institutions of this Government will continue to judge every proposal by its merits. It is a matter of telling the preachers of racism and riot that the Senate of the United States will not aid and abet their actions by its own inertia. It is a matter of making clear that much more remains to be done before the promise of the Constitution is fulfilled for all Americans and that the Senate will continue to do its part in moving toward that goal.

I shall, along with the distinguished minority leader, under these circumstances, move to table the Mondale amendment in the hope of improving the chances of passing H.R. 2516. I do so with regret, but I do so because in my considered judgment the procedural situation created by the defeat of the cloture petition has made this course necessary. The efforts to obtain a bill or legal basis for freedom of choice in housing should and will continue, but I think it is unrealistic to hope for success on this bill. To pursue them further at this time will destroy the chance the Congress has for making any progress in the field of civil rights during this session.

We have spent 5 weeks on H.R. 2516—the worker protection bill. It is a modest proposal. I think the Senate should be given the opportunity to vote on its merits. The votes are there—Republican and Democrat alike. Ultimately I hope it passes by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] first, before I make the motion on behalf of the leadership. I yield to the able Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a point of order. As I understand, the Senator did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It was not for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I stated no purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this cannot be done without the unanimous consent of the Senate, unless the Senator gets the floor independently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana wishes to retain the floor; is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina. I have already yielded.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is it not a fact that for the purpose of making an independent motion, which the Senator from North Carolina proposes to do, there must be unanimous consent? Otherwise, the Senator from Montana must surrender the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order of the Senator from New York is well taken. If the Senator from Montana yielded for that purpose, he would lose the floor. The Chair inquired whether or not the Senator from Montana wished to retain the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the Senator from Montana yielded for a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can yield for a motion only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from North Carolina without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in a peculiar position here. I am prepared to file a tabling motion. However, I believe, not understanding fully the merits of the proposal to be made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, that he should have his say; and, Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from North Carolina for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the consequences of obtaining an order for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment, as I understand, would be that that amendment, bearing that number, thereafter would be subject to modification only by unanimous-consent. The modification of that amendment thereafter could not occur unless there was unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. HART. This is the point we ought to understand in order to eliminate the momentary tension.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. Even if the yeas and nays are ordered on that amendment, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Massachusetts, or any of us could offer thereafter, and prior to cloture, an amendment with respect to fair housing which could be in any variety or sweep or reach.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Carolina. I understand the Senator from New York has withdrawn his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding and also the Senator from New York for withdrawing his objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it the understanding of the Chair that when the votes on the pending business are concluded, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] will be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I shall make, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, a motion to table the pending amendment, but I now do so. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If presenting and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" any the Senator from California would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hansen
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
Mundt
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Dominick
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Metcalf, against.

NOT VOTING—7

Cannon
McCarthy
Monroney
Murphy
Pastore
Russell
Smathers

So Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to lay Mr. MONDALE's amendment on the table was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the overwhelming majority of the Senators who have just voted against tabling the Mondale amendment—which I think expresses the overwhelming will of the Senate—I think it is incumbent upon me at this time to make another motion in an attempt to bring this matter to a decisive head.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, take place at 2 o'clock today.

Mr. ERVIN. I object.

Mr. THURMOND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

MOTION FOR CLOTURE

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending business, H.R. 2516, an act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

DANIEL K. INOUYE, JACOB K. JAVITS, P. A. HART, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, MARK O. HATFIELD, HUGH SCOTT, HARRISON WILLIAMS, CHARLES H. PERCY, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, WALTER F. MONDALE, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, GEORGE D. AIKEN, WARREN MAGNUSON, GALE W. MCGEE, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, BIRCH BAYH, MIKE MANSFIELD, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, FRANK CHURCH, JOSEPH S. CLARK, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, STUART SYMINGTON, LEE METCALF, ERNEST GRUENING, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, CLIFFORD P. CASE, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, HENRY M. JACKSON, THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, FRED R. HARRIS, FRANK E. MOSS, WAYNE MORSE, JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, GEORGE MCGOVERN, CLAIBORNE PELL, THOMAS J. DODD, GAYLORD NELSON, DANIEL BREWSTER, VANCE HARTKE, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, HIRAM L. FONG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many Members, by reason of the holiday occasion following George Washington's Birthday, will be leaving tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order so that we can hear the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, what I have to say, I think, must be on the minds of each of us. The institutions of a free society, history tells us, sometimes have failed because of their inability to respond to national needs.

The people of this country in the last several years, have asked themselves the question more frequently than ever before: "Has in our evolution time and events begun somehow to run faster than our institutions can react?"

I do not pretend that all who voted a moment ago against tabling will turn up on Monday and vote for the Mondale-Brooke amendment, but I think an obvious, fair analysis of several votes we have had; the tabling vote on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin]; the vote on cloture yesterday, and the vote refusing to table the Housing amendment of today, demonstrates that a majority of the Senate of the United States, in February 1968, seek to put on the Federal statute books the proposition in form reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, the so-called Hart bill, as a means of responding to an identified need, and, second, that a majority of the Senate seek to put on the Federal statute books the proposition that one's religion and race and place of origin, is not to be a test when a man goes out to seek or to buy a home for his family. Nothing could be more clear than these votes.

If history records that this institution thereafter failed to do those two things because of something called rule XXII, it will be a pretty severe verdict on all of us. I would hope that history would not record our failure. All the learned parliamentarians would never be able to explain to the people of this country why, after 5 weeks of debate and these votes, the majority was prevented from acting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On behalf of the minority leader and myself, we can confirm for the Senate the fact that the vote under the unanimous-consent agreement will take place 1 hour after the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Monday next. So all Senators should be on notice and should be in attendance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Muskie in the chair). The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I recognize the importance of this subject. I desire to accommodate Senators, but I have a speech to deliver, and the Committee on Foreign Relations will meet at 2:30 p.m. for a very important executive session, some part of which I hope to attend. I hope Senators will keep that in mind and foreshorten their remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to adopt the views of Senator Hart as my own, and to add that it is not history, but that the verdict will be recorded this year in the major American cities of the United States, exactly as he has said.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on tomorrow we will celebrate the anniversary of a great American hero, George Washington, who fought for 7 years to make Americans free. The Mondale amendment proposes to rob all Americans of the substance of their right of private property and to centralize the control of that private property in one Cabinet member in Washington.

I, for one, will continue the fight George Washington made to keep Americans free and to prevent the passage of an amendment which would convert all Americans from the status of free men into helpless puppets on a string to be pulled by one bureaucrat in Washington.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be appended to the motion for cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statement made by the Senator from Michigan. I agree with what he has said, and I underscore the seriousness of the problem.

I believe that what we have failed to do here will sound resoundingly throughout the cities of America this summer, and our task has been made the more difficult by reason of the difficulties we have experienced in this body. I am sorry that the functioning of our system has prevented the will of the majority from prevailing.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

THE TORMENT IN THE LAND

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam enters its fourth year since we commenced the bombing of the north, its fury intensified, and no end in sight. As though fascinated by the baited trap, we are poised to plunge still deeper into Asia, where vast populations wait to engulf us and legions of young Americans are being beckoned to their graves.

Confounding our construction of the Vietnamese war as an aggression from the north, the Vietcong remains primarily an indigenous force of the south, honeycombed through every city and village, capable of striking from nowhere, moving with relative impunity among the people. Without a single area immune from enemy penetration, where he cannot obtain local cover, it should be obvious that we can find no magical answer to our dilemma in South Vietnam by striking out elsewhere. I listen, dismayed, to the reckless talk of "hot pursuit" into North Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, where, presumably, we shall deny the Communists their "sanctuary," when all of Asia behind them is their sanctuary.

The involvement of the United States in Vietnamese affairs, we should remember, began as just another foreign aid program. Our purpose was to help certain anti-Communist elements in South Vietnam strengthen themselves. But when we commenced to take over their fight in their country, converting their political struggle into an American war, I could no longer support the policy. As early as September 1964, I began to speak out against it.

In the intervening years, I have seen my worst fears confirmed. Step by step, we have been caught fast in a precarious Asian bog. Into its quicksands, we can readily stray farther and sink deeper, but out of it there is no quick or easy path of extrication.

Can unheeded warnings over many years now be used to unmake a war? Clearly, they cannot; the questions must be reframed. The victims of events, we must now ask if the premises of 1958, which have brought us to the realities of 1968, will be relevant in the world of 1978.

As America now ponders the price of its policy in Asia—

Writes Emmet John Hughes—

> the quest for any healing wisdom must begin with the facing of one truth; the reckoning has been inevitable, for the policy was forever fatally flawed. Such a truth is almost too bitter to bear. For many, it will be so much easier to explain away the Vietnam tragedy in terms of cruel misfortunes or chance misjudgments. But this kind of history has not been decreed by blunders—but by premises. It has not been ruled by anguishing circumstance but by avowed purpose. And its full warning is not to be read as a matter of what America *failed* to do but what America *tried* to do.

It is with what we have tried to do, not only in Asia but in the world at large, that I would speak today. I am deeply concerned about our concept of the world around us and the proper role that we should play in it. It is my belief that the time has come to search our souls—to ask what, indeed, is the true condition of our country, and how that condition relates to the course we are embarked upon abroad.

There is a story making the rounds of an airline pilot who announced to his passengers that he had two pieces of news for them, one bad and the other good. The bad news, he said, "is that we are lost. The good news is that we are traveling at a recordbreaking rate of speed."

The United States, without doubt, is traveling at a recordbreaking rate of speed. Our gross national product now exceeds an annual rate of $800 billion; for an unprecedented 84 months we have enjoyed a steady, upward trend of growth. More Americans are living better than ever before.

Yet, something is seriously wrong. Many of our thoughtful citizens sense that we are somehow off course, that we may have even lost our way.

For the first time, in my memory, a sizable segment of our young people have actually repudiated the country. The "hippies" have simply withdrawn from our society, seeking psychedelic escape by drug-induced hallucinations. We can deplore them but we cannot dismiss them—for they are there.

The activists among the angry rebels vent their contempt in public displays of brazen insolence. They defiantly tear up their draft cards; they shout, as the President passes by, "Hey, hey, L. B. J., how many kids did you kill today." They have gone so far as to mutilate the flag.

I recognize, of course, that these extremists do not typify American youth as a whole. Still, we deceive ourselves if we fail to acknowledge that a multitude of bright and sensitive college students—young men and women who refuse to participate in the abusive conduct I have just described—nonetheless feel profoundly disturbed about their country.

They question our course abroad. They resent the spreading mantle of militarism at home. They have, I must say quite frankly, greater sympathy for Dr. Spock and the ministers now under indictment, than for the Government prosecuting them. And they are skeptical about the condition of freedom in our land.

These students, though numerous, are probably not yet in the majority. But they do not care. Nor do they believe they can convince a country which will not listen. So their method is not to persuade but to obstruct, not to debate but to demonstrate. A kind of organized coercion seems to be their evolving technique, picket lines, massive sit-ins, rude resistance to established authority.

These anguished young people, in my opinion, are mistaken in the way they have chosen to conduct themselves. Disrespect for authority is disapproved by most Americans. No argument can be won by bad manners. The more shrill the shouting, the less inclined the country will be to listen.

Still, we are left confronted with the indisputable fact that a substantial proportion of our college students are estranged; they portray a poignant, visceral sense of alienation toward the "establishment," by which they mean all authority that stands for, or somehow represents, the government.

And this is a serious symptom of the torment in the land.

Another symptom, even more alarming, is the relentless growth of crime and violence in the streets. Our cities have become time bombs. We ask ourselves, in muted voices, which will be the next to explode. What horror does the coming summer hold?

For reassurance, we repeat truisms to one another. We earnestly agree that this country cannot tolerate mob rule; that riots, arson, and looting are the tools of anarchy and revolution; that the maintenance of liberty depends, first of all, upon the maintenance of order; that in a free country, anyone has the right to try and change the law, but no one has the right to break the law.

On all this we concur. More money will be given the municipal police for better instruction in riot control. Federal funds will be made available to finance special training programs for the National Guard. When the time comes, we know that many arrests will be made, and even now we demand swift punishment for the guilty.

Yet, deep down we also know that, though the police and guardsmen may suppress the violence, they cannot prevent it from occurring. And so we wait for the hot summer.

And this is another symptom of the torment in the land.

What has gone wrong? What is the reason for the dissension on our college campuses? Why, with rising affluence, are we faced with a rising tide of violence in America?

Finding the answers to these questions is the most urgent item on our national agenda. President Johnson, in his recent state of the Union message, took note of "a certain restlessness" in the country, explaining that—

> When a great ship cuts through the sea, the waters are always stirred and troubled.

But, with all deference to the President, our troubles are not stirring in the wake of the ship; our troubles are aboard. The ferment works amidst the crew, and the anxiety relates to the course charted for the ship itself.

Many aspects of that course may have contributed to the deterioration of public morality, to the spreading disregard for law and order, but none, I submit, has had a greater impact than this country's marathon dance with war.

We bear the imprint of war prolonged and unending. The draft has become a permanent fixture in our national life. Our youngsters grow up with war, listening to their fathers' stories of excitement and adventure on a hundred battlefronts. Where is the little boy whose favorite toys are not miniature replicas of our country's vaunted weaponry?

Violence begets violence; incessant warfare becomes, at last, the accepted companion of normalcy. Every night we watch on television the gory spectacle of the jungle war in Vietnam, the latest film, in color, flown to us directly from the battlefront. Year in, year out, the brutal drama penetrates every home, until burning villages, screaming children, and flowing blood become a routine part of the typical family scene.

Each morning our newspapers carry the latest body count of enemy dead, together with pictures of our own fighting men, bandaged and mangled. The brand of war pervades and brutalizes our culture. Funny strips give way to fury strips. Violence not only dominates the entertainment we are offered on the ubiquitous tube; it is exalted there. Our video spies kill with a ruthlessness indistinguishable from that of their adversaries. One cannot really separate, on any ethical basis, the good from the bad. Nor does it seem to matter. For it is the "action" itself which is glorified, and apparently all that matters is that our side wins by the end of the program.

So it has happened that the American people, long gathered about the arena, have been steeped in violence. The President expresses the hope that hardened veterans, returning from the fighting in Vietnam, will join the police forces in our cities to help keep order. But even as he issues his appeal, he knows that other veterans, equally seasoned in the black arts of guerrilla warfare, are returning each day to the slums and ghettos. As whole blocks were burning in Detroit last summer, one such veteran turned to his buddy and said: "It's here, man, that the real war is."

To deal with that "real war," the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States has left us ill equipped. Since the end of World War II, our attention has been largely diverted away from the problems at home and riveted instead on distant shores. So, too, have our resources. Today, we are much more a warfare, than a welfare state. Of the $157 billion voted by Congress in 1967, an astonishing 74.7 percent went for war or war-related programs, while only 12.2 percent went for health, education, and welfare. The breakdown of last year's budget follows:

	Percent
Military forces (includes present war)	55.7
Veterans (includes past wars)	4.4
National debt (over 80 percent war incurred)	9.1
Foreign relations (mainly foreign aid)	2.6
Space race	2.9
Post Office and roads	5.7
Agriculture and natural resources	3.9
Commerce and Labor	1.6
Health, Education, and Welfare	12.2
General Government	1.9
Total	100.0

The most perfunctory examination of this budget reveals the staggering cost of war, past and present, but even these percentages fail to describe the mammoth extent of our involvement abroad.

Since the end of the Second World War, we have wrapped our arms around the world as if it were our oyster. American fleets patrol not only our home waters, but the oceans of the earth, from the Mediterranean to the China Sea. Over 2 million of our military personnel, including their dependents, are stationed abroad. We maintain no less than 132 major military bases overseas.

The cost of this unprecedented military array defies comprehension, approaching a trillion dollars since the end of World War II. Our nuclear arsenal has grown to such awesome proportions that if it were ever detonated in anger, its destructive power would be the equivalent of a thousand pounds of TNT against the head of every living inhabitant on earth.

However, even this is not the whole story. From the beginning of World War II onward, virtually every country in the world has received some form of loan or subsidy from the United States. In the postwar period alone, we have distributed more than $90 billion in economic aid to no less than 124 foreign governments, plus $38 billion in weapons, ammunition, and military equipment. Our arsenal diplomacy encompasses the globe. We are the world's largest munitions supplier, having disbursed over six times as much armament as our nearest rival, the Soviet Union.

But even this lavish gift of arms is not intended as a substitute for the use of our own. The United States has formally pledged itself, in advance, to the defense of 42 foreign countries, a commitment without example in history.

All of this we have solemnly done in the name of living up to our responsibilities as a great power. State Department strategists patiently explain that no other Western nation retains the capability of filling the vacuum created by the sudden collapse of the European empires. The good order they once maintained throughout the colonial world, we are told, it is now up to the United States to furnish—by subsidy wherever possible, through direct military intervention where lesser measures fail. Thus do we inherit the burden of the broken empires, assured that we shall be welcome since our motives are pure.

As a blueprint for American foreign policy, this doctrine of universal intervention is nothing less than a prescription for disaster. It rests, in the first instance, on a presumptuous misconstruction of modern history.

> Let China sleep—

Napoleon warned—

> for when she awakes the world will tremble.

Nineteenth century colonialism awakened Africa and Asia from ancient slumbers, sewed indignation thick and deep, and reaped a bitter harvest of virulent nationalism. The resulting ferment can never be stilled by new intervention from without, least of all by another rich and powerful Western nation. The notion that we can restore stability to that half of the world which has just thrown off colonial rule, or, worse still, that it has fallen to us to act as a rearguard for the shrinking empires of a bygone day, is not even worthy of being called a policy. It is a grandiose dream of men who suffer from the dangerous delusion of American omnipotence.

Today that dream lies shattered before our present agony in Vietnam. Whatever the eventual terms of settlement there, we have learned the chastening lesson others learned before us, that there are limits to what outsiders can accomplish by force of arms. The presence of a huge American expeditionary force in this small Asian country has reduced to puppetry, in the eyes of its own people, the very government we sought to bolster. Predictably, the banner of nationalism has passed to the Vietcong.

Moreover, as the *Pueblo* seizure demonstrates, we lack the manpower to extend to the rest of Asia the policy we pursue in Vietnam. For if Americans must fight Asians on a spreading Asian front, we shall soon run out of both men and money.

A general reassessment of American foreign policy is urgently needed. If we could only overcome our obsessive preoccupation with other people's ideologies, we could start asking some practical questions. What, for instance, have we bought with armaments unlimited and foreign aid dished out on a global platter?

We have not bought security.

After 20 years of the nuclear arms race, the Russian and American people are not the most secure, but the most imperiled people in the world. If the funeral pyre each government has set for the other is ever ignited, both peoples will be laid out upon it. A hundred million will die, it is estimated, in the initial blast, while untold millions more—wretched victims of the insidious fallout—will vomit their lives away in the hideous aftermath.

"The survivors would envy the dead," said Nikita Khrushchev.

"The last insanity," said Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Whatever could be salvaged, the mainstream of civilization would shift, for centuries to come, to the nonnuclear lands beyond the outer limits of the holocaust.

No, we have not bought security.

If not security, have we bought peace? Again, the answer is "No." Our policy of global intervention has meant war, not peace. During the past 25 years, the United States has engaged in more warfare than any other major power.

Then, at least, have we not bought favor? Once more the honest answer is "No." Our insistent involvement in the internal affairs of so many foreign countries meets with rising resentment and suspicion. As a delegate to the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations, I was a reluctant witness to the growing cynicism.

If I draw a bleak picture of the American predicament abroad, it is to underscore my conviction that the time is ripe for what John Foster Dulles once called an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy. I say this after 9 years of service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a lengthy and intensive course. I say it after extended travel into many parts of the world, where I have met and questioned hundreds of prominent foreigners, journalists, businessmen, educators, and political leaders, from Harold Wilson to Nikita Khrushchev, from Chiang Kai-shek to Charles de Gaulle. Finally, I say it as one who firmly believes that the United States must continue to play a very prominent role in world affairs.

I do not propose swinging the pendulum back to ostrich-like isolationism. One extreme need not call for the other. I propose, rather, that we seek out the rational middle ground, where the limits of our intervention are drawn to correspond with the limits of our resources, and where we reserve direct military measures for those occasions that actually pose a clear and present threat to the security of the American people.

If we were to do this, I think our perspective would return again. No great calamity would occur. Instead, we would begin to see the folly of intercession without restraint. We would lift a dread burden from our shoulders and stand taller before the world.

Indeed, we would soon discover that, even as the United States cannot cap or control the endemic eruptions in the emerging world, neither can any other nation. Five thousand years of human history bear witness: it is a stubborn world, much too large and tough to be subjugated by any one country, or any one ideology or political or economic system.

What we once conceived to be monolithic communism is already cracking up under the hammer blows of national rivalry. The systems differ, one from another, Russia and China engage in bitter controversy, while the "satellite" countries assert a growing measure of independence. Slowly we have come to acknowledge, then to applaud, the disintegration of Communist solidarity in Eastern Europe. Yet we refuse to either recognize or respond to the same phenomenon in Asia.

Fear blinds us; fear of communism which transcends faith in freedom; fear of a future that we cannot shape with our own hands; fear of sudden devastation hurling down from the skies. The nuclear monster we ourselves unleashed returns, like Frankenstein's, to haunt our lives. Psychologists testify that a frightened man strikes out in all directions, a characteristic conspicuous in our foreign policy of recent years.

In the face of all this, I wish I could express some confidence that, by an act of our own volition, we might soon commence to alter this country's foreign policy from one of general, to one of selective, involvement. But I have no such confidence. Like other nations before us that drank deeply from the cup of foreign adventure, we are too enamored with the nobility of our mission to disenthrall ourselves. Besides, powerful vested interests now encrust and sanctify the policy. Were we to wait for the hierarchy of either political party to advocate a change of course, I fear we would wait indefinitely.

But events are transpiring that may force a change of course upon us. If a widening war in Asia is averted, 1968 may well prove a year of reckoning for the United States. Our lengthy binge of extravagant spending abroad is catching up with us, for the laws of economics are immune to national ambition. Half the gold has been drained from our Treasury. Less than $2 billion in unfettered bullion remains to meet some $30 billion in foreign obligations, all of which are redeemable in gold.

The emergency measures proposed by

President Johnson are palliatives, at most. He asks for the removal of the gold cover, which contributes nothing to the correction of our adverse balance of payments, but merely throws open to foreign creditors those remaining vaults to which their access is now denied. The gold drain, constant and unrelenting, is much too large to be checked by a dubious tourist tax or by limited restrictions on the investment of private capital abroad. Retrenchment of Government spending abroad is inescapable, if the calamity of the dollar's devaluation is to be avoided. But the solution will not be found in further manipulation of our foreign aid program, salutary as that may be; the solution lies where the gold toll is heaviest, in the redeployment homeward from Europe of large numbers of American troops.

Mounting pressure on the dollar, deaf to the trumpet call, will thus force a pullback. The question is not whether, but when. Congress could face up to a reckoning this year, if it had the fortitude to retain the gold cover, the removal of which merely buys a little extra time.

The stern, unavoidable requirement, made all the more urgent by the necessity of meeting the heavy gold drain costs in Vietnam, is to drastically cut back our foreign spending elsewhere. Would it not be wiser to do so now, while we still retain the last half of our gold as insurance for the dollar, than to wait until no gold remains? Why should Senators, long since convinced that the United States is overextended and overcommitted abroad, who have seen their repeated warnings repeatedly ignored, vote now to relieve the one pressure within our control that could compel a retrenchment?

I, for one, will not do it. I refuse to vote for the removal of the gold cover. I cannot support a measure designed to give globalism, our current foreign policy, an extended lease on life. All that Congress has left, with which to influence our course abroad, is the power of the purse. If we shrink from using it, we abdicate our role, and obtain nothing in return but temporary postponement of the inevitable day when the ledger must be balanced on our international payments.

So I shall vote to keep the pressure on, knowing full well that this is the only feasible means by which Congress can force a change in American foreign policy. The advice that Congress offers will continue to go unheeded, as long as Congress keeps giving its consent.

For the same reason, and other considerations as well, I have decided to vote against the proposed tourist tax. Apart from its impact on our adverse balance of payments, this tax strikes me as being grossly unfair. It will be borne by students, teachers, and other citizens of modest means, who have skimped and saved for a trip abroad, while our cosmopolites, the rich and well positioned with foreign bank accounts, will easily escape its reach. Moreover, the tax represents still another harassment of our citizenry by a Government increasingly immersed in a foolhardy endeavor to bestow liberty abroad instead of insuring its blessings here at home.

Nothing in the Constitution suggests that the Federal Government was established for the purpose of restructuring the world.

Again, however, I confess to no optimism that the Congress will hold fast. Our habit is to yield and I expect that the gold cover will be removed. The day of reckoning for the dollar will be deferred for a few more years, while the rest of our gold is transferred into foreign hands.

But what of the human pressures, the pressures which cannot be postponed. The pressures surging up from the slums, the pressures that cannot be postponed? The hot summer looms ahead, taunting us with the paradox of squandering, on the opposite side of the world, huge sums to suppress an insurrection in Vietnam, when insurrection smoulders in every major city in America.

Must it come to guerrilla warfare on our own streets before we begin to put first things first? How long do we wait before the men who occupy the seats of power finally see, that though the responsibilities of the United States Government are far reaching, there are none so important as those owed the American people?

Out of such an awakening, a new age would dawn. We would begin to find spiritual satisfaction again. We would regain our composure. Turning our primary attention to the problems afflicting our own society, confident our strength is such that no other nation can ever overcome us, we might even rediscover the guidance bequeathed to us by our earliest statesmen, men who understood, from the first, that our capacity to influence other lands depends upon our moral leadership, not our military might; upon the force of our example, not the force of our arms.

Listen to the wise words of John Quincy Adams, spoken on July 4, 1821:

> Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. But she goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force * * *. She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit.

These words were uttered in the days of our infancy. Now, in the days of our maturity and in the fullness of our power, we see the dire prophecy of John Quincy Adams fulfilled.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have sat here and listened with great interest to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I commend him for his very thoughtful and very perceptive evaluation of our situation, both on the domestic scene and in the field of foreign affairs; and without necessarily agreeing with every detail of his speech, I certainly agree with it in general.

The Senator consistently offers to Congress and to the country very penetrating analyses of the problems that confront us, and I believe this is one of the most thoughtful speeches I have heard in a good long time. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his kind words.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Once again, it is my privilege to associate myself with a great foreign policy speech, made by the Senator from Idaho. As he knows, I share the views that he has expressed on the folly of our war in Vietnam, as I have ever since we started slaughtering American boys in an unconstitutional, illegal, and immoral war in that country.

I shall continue to protest that war as long as we fight it on the basis that we are now fighting it, for I am satisfied that history will record that it did not produce peace, and could not produce peace—only more war for future generations of Americans to inherit as the legacy from our generation.

I think that is a very sad thing, and I want the Senator to know that I know that he knows how difficult it is, and how unpleasant, to stand up against the mistaken foreign policy of the United States; but I rise to commend him for his courage and his foresight, because he, too, will be sustained by history for the position that he has taken. I wish to associate myself with the objectives and the general tenor of his speech.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

There are two Senators present who were the first Members of this body to object to the tragic course of our policy in Southeast Asia. It was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] who were the first to sound the warning, when no one else was listening.

As I have mentioned, in my address, my own protest goes back to September of 1964. A few months later, in February of 1965, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and I joined, one afternoon here in the Senate Chamber, to urge a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, at a time when "negotiation" was an ugly word here in Washington.

Others have since joined in the growing dissent. But I simply want the record to be clear that the first to speak up against the present policy were two men who sit here this afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr.

MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], to whom I am now happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say first to my able colleague from Idaho that this was one of the great speeches of all time. I believe it ranks with the classics, with the addresses of Daniel Webster and other distinguished orators of the past. I cannot conceive of a more eloquent, searching, and comprehensive analysis of our foreign policy.

It is a tragic thing for those of us who love the United States, who revere its great past, who want to see its noblest professions adhered to, to see our Nation violating those professions and engaging in practices which nullify our noble traditions and our great past.

The tragedy about all this is that we do not know what we can do about it?

As Senator CHURCH has pointed out, there is a great rising tide of discontent, frustration, bewilderment, sorrow, and indignation in this country. The American people are deeply confused. They wish they knew some way out. Their protests seem to have fallen upon deaf ears.

It is not merely the commitment in Southeast Asia which is so tragic but its effects at home. The question is, How do we get out of this morass? The administration has taken the position that unless you have a solution, you should not criticize. Solutions have been proposed, with which not all are in agreement, but I would give my own view that while it is generally accepted that we must have an honorable way out, we have first to define that word "honorable."

An honorable way out would require a good face-saving formula. If we could go to the negotiating table and end the killing that way, that would be fine. But I think there is very little chance of negotiation, for the reason that our U.S. approaches have not been realistic.

My able colleague from Idaho may not agree, but I feel that unless we view this issue as not—as presented by the administration—an effort to stop aggression and help a friendly country which allegedly asked us to come in and save it from aggression, or as a method of stopping communism—all of which premises I consider are completely unwarranted—we shall not get very far.

After careful study of the record, it seemed to me—and as I have stated many times—that we barged into Vietnam unilaterally, unasked, into a country where only Vietnamese then were; that our entry was accompanied by the installation of a puppet whom we brought from the United States; that our refusal, with him, to abide by the agreement reached through the Geneva Accords precipitated a civil war; and that in that civil war we took the part of a succession of unpopular, coup-imposed corrupt generals, whose tenure recently have been reaffirmed in a rigged election, who have no popular support, and who would not last 24 hours without our military and financial aid.

I believe that until we face that situation realistically, and confess error, there will be no settlement.

This is a hard revelation for the American people to take; namely, that we are the aggressors there. That is difficult for the American people to believe, when they have been told from on high for so many years that we are fighting aggression. The facts, as I see them, are quite otherwise. I have tried to demonstrate that objectively in a book just published, entitled "Vietnam Folly."

Until we face the situation realistically, the opposition will never come to the conference table. That is our dilemma. I wonder if my colleague from Idaho does agree that if negotiation is not attainable it would be better to withdraw on almost any basis, than to stay and continue what we are doing. I know that is difficult to face. Such a policy has been stigmatized with the words "scuttle and run."

But actually, if we continue to do what we are now doing, we will merely aggravate the disaster. To date, we have lost in action some 16,000 fine young Americans and suffered more than 100,000 wounded—some of them crippled for life.

I have seen some of those poor 18- and 19-year-old kids. I saw one of them who is blinded for life and armless. When a man loses his sight, we try to train him to develop his tactile sense through his fingers. This poor kid has no fingers, hands, or arms. Others, through brain injury, have lost their minds. Another 19-year-old is paralyzed from the neck down.

Those kids who have been killed have been giving their lives not for the safety of our country. They will have died in vain.

We like to believe in the word of Lincoln, that these men will not have died in vain. However, we are fighting a war that we cannot win. We are defending a crooked bunch of grafters. Every knowledgeable observer who goes there reports on the flagrant corruption. David Halberstam, the Pulitzer Prize winner, reporting in Harpers gave a horrifying picture of every official being corrupt.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has confirmed this. Yet, we are sacrificing our young men in a cause for which that country's own young men ought to fight. We were not attacked. No vital interest of the United States was in jeopardy.

I fear there is only one way out—although I do not see it coming at the present time—and that is to confess our error and make plans to phase out our occupation, leaving the Vietnamese to settle their problems. If we can find a face-saving means of doing this, fine.

I think that our ever-deepening Asian involvement is the most tragic thing that has happened to our Nation in its history. We have forfeited the good will of much of mankind. We cannot attain our declared objectives. Not only are we not stopping communism but actually aiding communism. While we are sending our young men there to fight a primitive peasant people, neither the Chinese nor Russian Communists have committed a single soldier to combat in that struggle. I am hopeful that my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, has a solution for our dilemma. He has discussed the problem most vividly and eloquently, but what is his way out? How will he lend his efforts as a U.S. Senator in helping us to bring to an end this terrible mess?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first let me say that no one has discussed the war in Vietnam with greater vehemence than has the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

He knows of the efforts that we have made together, over the years, to avoid the escalation of the war which has nonetheless occurred.

He knows of the plea that we have made from time to time against the further enlargement of the bombing, after it had become apparent that the bombing had failed.

He knows of the attempts we continue to make to keep the perimeters of the war from being enlarged still further.

As I said at the commencement of my address, we are caught fast in an Asian bog. Into it, we can readily stray farther and sink deeper, but out of it, there is no easy path of extrication.

I have no magical solution for the present dilemma. If there were one, I am sure the President would long since have found it. The reason I originally objected to the policy was because I felt it would lead us to the very dilemma with which we are now, in truth, confronted.

The purpose of my address today is to draw the lessons from this nightmare in Vietnam which should shape American foreign policy from now on. If we do not learn these lessons, the same premises that led us into Vietnam are going to lead us further into other Asian lands. The front is going to be extended indefinitely, and young Americans are going to die by the millions in unmarked Asian graves.

Mr. GRUENING. And for what?

Mr. CHURCH. For nothing, because the history of this period should make it clear that the days of effective Western intervention in Asia are over.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. All the other Western nations have fled. Only we remain.

The lesson is that virulent nationalism, the product of the colonial period, giving birth to 50 new nations in Asia and Africa, has created a state of mind in these lands that covets independence.

We are talking about a region of the world where most people do not regard communism as an ugly word. They are more inclined to regard capitalism as an ugly word.

Mr. GRUENING. Or what they term "Western imperialism."

Mr. CHURCH. They relate capitalism to the old colonial period.

We make a grave mistake if we continue to believe that the successful way for resisting Communist expansion in Asia is through massive interjection of American expeditionary forces.

The lesson we need to draw from Vietnam is that the presence of an enormous American Army there, half a million strong, so conspicuously foreign to Vietnam, plus the tremendous input of billions of American dollars into a country in which the per capita income was only about $80 a year cannot help but corrupt the fragile economy and traditional life of the people. Inevitably, the government we sustain by force of our own arms, soon takes on the appearance of a puppet government, in the eyes of its own people. And then what happens? Then the banner of nationalism falls to the insurgents, and with the banner goes the sympathy and secret allegiance of most of the people.

Why is it, in Vietnam today, that the insurgents fight so fiercely, while those on whom we have lavished such tremendous aid are so inclined to leave the hardest battles to us?

Mr. GRUENING. The answer is that the other people are fighting for their independence, and we ought to be sympathetic to that objective.

Mr. CHURCH. No, I do not think we should be on their side; I do not think we should have sent an American Army to fight on either side, thus converting a Vietnamese political struggle into an American war.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. This was a Vietnamese war to start with. We are the foreigners there today, and as a result the indigenous effort, the cause of nationalism, the continuing struggle by the Vietnamese to drive out the foreigners has simply been transferred from the French to us. And though our motives may differ, we sleep in the same bed today in Vietnam that the French occupied in years past.

And that is the lesson that has to be drawn from this agony in Vietnam. If we were resisting the expansion of communism in Asia intelligently and effectively, then we would deal with these newly independent governments at arm's length, remaining ever sensitive to their national pride; and the thing we would avoid is occupying one of these small Asian countries in such a way as to condemn its government in the eyes of its own people. That is the surest way to throw the banner of nationalism to the Communists, giving them a momentum they otherwise lack.

Mr. President, I lived in Asia for nearly 2 years during the Second World War, principally in India and China. I came away firmly convinced that the old era of Western intervention in Asia had run its course, and that Western nations would have to adjust to that new reality and accept it. There is no reason why the United States should not accept it. We are not in Vietnam today because we were attacked.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. CHURCH. It does not matter whether the war in Vietnam is construed as an agression from the North or as a civil war. Either way, it is a political struggle among the Vietnamese. The two halves of Vietnam were not separate and independent entities in any traditional or historic sense. The division was made temporarily by the Geneva accords of 1954, and it was expressly provided in those agreements that the division was not to be regarded as a permanent political boundary and further, that the people of Vietnam were to be given a chance to vote on the reunification of the country.

So it is only a myth that aggression occurred in Vietnam which can be compared with aggressions elsewhere. It is a myth that we have developed for our own convenience in order to rationalize our own policy.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. It is a myth that we must maintain in order to justify our being there.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator.

So the plea I make today is that the time has come to reassess American foreign policy, in Asia in particular, and in the world at large. We must recognize that, in this period of ferment, revolution cannot be bought off and stability can not be imposed from without.

If we keep trying, we will exhaust ourselves—exhaust ourselves against the current of history. That is being demonstrated painfully day after day in Vietnam.

So let us learn these lessons. Let us begin a revaluation of the policy that both parties have supported, a policy, as I have described in my address, of unlimited intervention without restraint. Let us begin to establish goals that are practical, within our means, and commensurate with our resources. We can do this and preserve our security.

We must bring an end to this period of incessant foreign warfare, because it is brutalizing the land. That is the appeal I make today.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that the role of the United States should be to show, by example, what a free society, a self-governing society, can do for its people: get rid of poverty, get rid of crime, get rid of hunger, get rid of disease; and show to the rest of the world that such a free, self-governing society is more productive of human happiness and, therefore, more enduring than any totalitarian system?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is eminently correct—he states a proposition so simple that most of the country is blind to its truth. All we need do is go back to the period of our own national birth, when we established the first republican form of government in modern times, asserting that its purpose was to assure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for our own people. That is why the Federal Government was established. Out of that set of ideas we ignited a flame that spread throughout the world. Within the century that followed, not by the force of our armadas or the might of our arms, these ideas brought down or modified all the great reigning monarchies of Europe.

What better example is there of the truth of what the Senator from Alaska has said? Build a free society that the world can honor and respect and admire; then you will influence the shape of events in other lands.

But now that we possess great wealth and power, I must say to the Senator from Alaska, we are taking the course of other powerful countries of the past which drank deeply from the cup of foreign adventure, and that course has always led, in the end, to disaster. Why we think there is going to be some sort of historic exception for the United States escapes me.

So I say to the Senator from Alaska that I honor the courageous service he has rendered his country over the years, sometimes as a very lonely voice, and I appreciate the contribution he has made this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA'S APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and to set the record straight in regard to some of his misrepresentations.

In a statement that he released yesterday to the public, which is published in this morning's New York Times, he states:

> Senator [Wayne] Morse, at the hearing on Aug. 6, specifically raised the question of a connection between our patrol and the South Vietnamese islands which had occurred some 2½ days prior to the attack on Maddox, and I responded that there was no connection. The two operations were separate and distinct. I informed you that our destroyers took no part whatsoever in the South Vietnamese operations. They did not convoy, support or back up the South Vietnamese boats in any way. As I stated during the hearing:
>
> "As I reported to you earlier this week, we understand that the South Vietnamese sea force carried out patrol action around these islands and actually shelled the points they felt were associated with this infiltration.
>
> "Our ships had absolutely no knowledge of it, were not connected with it; in no sense of the word can be considered to have backstopped the effort."
>
> That statement remains entirely accurate. I can confirm today that neither the ship commanders nor the embarked task group commander had any knowledge of the South Vietnamese action against the two islands or of any other specific South Vietnamese operations against the North.

Since his testimony on August 6, 1964, he apparently has come to realize that some of the facts were known as to what did happen. So, yesterday, we heard a coverup statement, or an attempted coverup statement, on the part of the Secretary of Defense, when he said in his statement:

> Higher naval commands were made aware of the operations by Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, in order to avoid mutual interference or confusion between our patrols and those operations.

I want to say in general comment first, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Defense's testimony before the committee on October 6, 1964, was inaccurate in many respects and it was inaccurate yesterday in many respects.

Mr. President, on August 5, 1964, I spoke on the floor of the Senate against the Tonkin Bay resolution. I spoke also on August 6 against the resolution. The Senator from Alaska and I were the only two Members in the entire Congress who voted against it, and I am perfectly willing to let history be the judge of the soundness of the vote we cast.

But today I want to say I have no intention of letting the Secretary of Defense go out of office on the assumption that the testimony he gave either on August 6, 1964, or yesterday represents accurate testimony in many particulars. I want to say that I speak with great sadness for I have exceedingly high regard for the Secretary of Defense. I think he is one of the most brilliant men in public life that I have ever known.

I do not question his dedication to the policies of the administration. In that respect, he is one of the most dedicated public servants we have, but he has been dedicated in carrying out wrong policies, and policies that are going to rise to the discredit of the history of the Republic.

Mr. President, on August 6, 1964, the Secretary of Defense said before the Committee on Foreign Relations:

> Our Navy played absolutely no part in, was not associated with, was not aware of, any South Vietnam actions, if there were any.

I digress to ask, Did he mean to imply there that the Secretary of Defense was not aware of them? He was aware of them and had been aware of them days before he testified on August 6, 1964, and the record of his own Department convicts him of that awareness.

He went on with his testimony, as follows:

> The *Maddox* was operating in international waters, was carrying out a routine patrol . . .

Mr. President, before I complete my remarks, I will point out that that was a misstatement. He calls it a "routine patrol." The *Maddox* was a spy ship at that time under instruction to stimulate the electronic instruments of North Vietnam to carry out a spying activity. That is not a routine patrol for a destroyer. That is the activity of a *Pueblo* or a *Liberty* or other spy ship.

May I say under the facts and circumstances that existed in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 3, the time of the incidents with the patrol boats of the North Vietnamese, we were in a position where, as I said in my speech on August 5, and repeat today, the United States was a provocateur in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 4, 1964, and history will so record. We were far beyond acting on a routine patrol with the *Maddox* on August 4, 1964.

Going back to his statement of August 6, 1964:

> The *Maddox* was operating in international waters, was carrying out a routine patrol of the type we carry out all over the world at all times—

Mr. President, not with destroyers, and the Secretary knows it—

> It was not informed of, was not aware of, **had no evidence of, and so far as I know today** has no knowledge of any South Vietnamese actions in connection with the two islands that Senator Morse referred to.

He is dead wrong. He cannot explain it either on the basis of a lack of knowledge, for the records of his own Department of Defense at the time showed contrary evidence. What do the facts show?

With respect to the Navy's knowledge or South Vietnam's operation against North Vietnam, first, on July 15, 1964, in approving the patrol of the *Maddox*, the Joint Chiefs cautioned the naval commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet that "activity in 34-A operations has increased."

Keep in mind that "34-A operations" is the identification mark for the South Vietnamese bombing boats fully equipped by the United States, with a staff trained by the U.S. Navy. Our Navy was not only well aware of the fact that those boats were going up to bomb those two islands 3 to 6 miles from the coast of North Vietnam, but our Navy was in constant contact with the operation and knew what was taking place step by step.

There is this message, for example, sent out to the naval commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet:

> Activity in 34-A operations has increased. These 34-A operations consisted of South Vietnamese patrol craft (the crafts supplied by the United States, and with United States trained crews) bombarding for the first time North Vietnamese shore installations.

This clearly shows the Navy had knowledge of the South Vietnamese operation as early as July 15, 1964, and the Chief of Staff sent this message to the commander in chief in the Pacific. The Pentagon did not know about it? The Secretary of Defense did not know about it? Of course they did, step by step.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield until I finish my documentation.

On July 10, the commander in chief of the U.S. forces in the Pacific authorized fleet units involved in the DeSoto patrol—and the DeSoto patrol is the name of the patrol of the *Maddox* at that time—to contact the U.S. military assistance group in Vietnam "for any additional intelligence required for prevention of mutual interference with 34-A operations—South Vietnamese bombardments of North Vietnam—and such communications arrangements as may be desired."

There is not one word of that by the Secretary of Defense in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on August 6, 1964. I respectfully say he had no right to testify at all if he was going to give us this kind of fragmentary testimony that itself was honeycombed with inaccuracy.

We were entitled to know the facts. This message also shows the Navy had knowledge of the South Vietnamese operations, which Secretary McNamara, in his testimony of August 6, denied to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Third, early in the morning of August 4, 1964, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet cabled the *Maddox* and in that cable pointed out:

> The above patrol will: (a) clearly demonstrate our determination to continue these operations; (b) possibly draw NVN (North Vietnamese Navy) PGMS (Patrol Boats) to northward away from area of 34-A ops; (c) eliminate DeSoto patrol interference with 34-A ops.

Why, it was a decoy operation. That is what that message means. You follow the course that will draw the North Vietnamese Navy northward and eastward away from the direction of the bombing of the islands of North Vietnam by the South Vietnamese boats equipped by the United States and a crew trained by the United States.

History will record in regard to our involvement in the shoddy performance in the Gulf of Tonkin, where our officers in the Pentagon building apparently think it was proper to wave that flag that stands behind the Presiding Officer's desk into tatters and give the impression that because we were on the high seas we had a right to do what we want to do. Do not forget that we can commit an act of aggression on the high seas. Do not forget that we can be provocateurs on the high seas. Being on the high seas does not justify a course of action that involves ourselves in the kind of operations that this course of action got us into on the Gulf of Tonkin incident which led to the unfortunate resolution voted for by many sincere men in the Senate who believed—contrary to the views of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon at the time—that our hands were lily white. Our country's hands were not lily white at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

Again this message shows that while the patrol at this time, consisting of both the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy*, was ordered not to interfere directly—watch them for their semantics—was ordered not to interfere directly with the operations of the South Vietnamese, it might possibly assist by drawing patrol vessels of the North Vietnamese forces away from the South Vietnamese operations. This again shows that the Navy knew of the operations contrary to the testimony of Secretary McNamara.

With respect to Secretary McNamara's statement that the *Maddox* was operating in international waters and "carrying out a routine patrol of the type we carry out all over the world at all times," the facts show, as revealed in the official communications that, at that time, that destroyer was assigned to do what spy ships do, not what destroyers do; namely, she was to stimulate the electronic instruments of the North Vietnamese and attract attention to this operation and away from the other operations. Furthermore, in regard to point of time, the Secretary yesterday says that the torpedo attacks were some 2 days after the bombing of the islands. What would cause anyone to believe that the North Vietnamese knew what any terminal dates for our operations were? The ships were still in the area. Why should she think there were not going to be further bombardments? The fact is that the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy* were used as decoys to take those North Vietnamese naval boats to the north and east. A message from our own naval officers shows that was the objective, to get away from the bombardments and continue to stimulate the electronic instruments of the North Vietnamese and draw them by decoy away, so the operation 34-A could go on.

We still do not know whether the plan was just to bomb those two islands or continue other bombardments. I do not think we will ever know.

On August 2 and August 4, U.S. vessels were in international waters when the alleged incidents occurred. Patrol instructions issued in January 1964, in part were as follows: "The closest approach to the Chicom coast is 15 nautical miles. The closest point of approach to the North Vietnamese coast is 8 miles. CPA to the north"—that is, the closest point of approach—"to the North Vietnamese islands is 4 miles."

If we hold to the point of view that we were bound only by a 3-mile limit, our ships were always in international waters. But, do not forget that there is another point of view of the enemy, namely they do not recognize the 3-mile limit. They take the position—the Secretary of Defense disputed it yesterday, but I think the record is perfectly clear—that North Vietnam along with China insist on a 12-mile limit. There is no question about the fact that we were within that 12-mile limit from time to time during the operation of the so-called routine patrol of the destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. But, giving them all the benefit of the doubt, Secretary McNamara was accurate in stating that the *Maddox* was operating in international waters based upon a 3-mile limit, because that is viewed as being international waters by the United States but not so viewed by China, North Vietnam, North Korea, and many other countries.

If technically accurate, the Secretary's statement was, nevertheless, misleading, not only in the reference to international waters but also in his testimony that the patrol was routine and nonprovocative.

Second, in performing this intelligence mission, the *Maddox* was authorized, during the mission, to stimulate a North Vietnamese electronic reaction. I will say that under the circumstances, with the shelling taking place on North Vietnamese islands, with this kind of activity on the part of our destroyer, which was not a routine patrol, that that constituted an act of constructive aggression on the part of the United States. It constituted picking a fight, it constituted a hostile action, it constituted an action on the part of the United States seeking to try to get the North Vietnamese to involve themselves in a dispute with us, entirely uncalled for, if peace was what we wanted, entirely uncalled for, if what we were trying to do was to find a way to bring an end to the very unfortunate holocaust we got ourselves involved in.

TONKIN GULF INCIDENT MARKED START OF ESCALATION

That was really the beginning of the escalation into North Vietnam. I would have the American people remember that, as I said back in my speech of August 5, 1964, and August 6, 1964—which I shall place in the RECORD later—that prior to the Gulf of Tonkin incident the administration did not produce witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations who testified about any infiltration of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam. That infiltration began after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. We are going to have to take note of the date of the Gulf of Tonkin incident because, in my judgment, history will also record that our action in the Gulf of Tonkin made perfectly clear to the North Vietnamese that they would have to "go for broke."

It is following the Gulf of Tonkin that we get the large infiltration of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam. Prior to that time, there was some infiltration but not any organized infiltration of the military, according to the administration's own testimony. I have called upon the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to produce the digest now of all the testimony of the Pentagon people and the State Department people in regard to infiltrations prior to the Gulf of Tonkin incident. We will find that that infiltration is not infiltration of North Vietnamese troops. There were a great many South Vietnamese that had gone up to North Vietnam as part of the Geneva accord. They were trained. They went back as they were also entitled to do under the accord. Of course we would be the last to have any right to raise any objectionable question about that, in view of the training of foreign soldiers that we have been guilty of for a great many years. We do not have a leg to stand on by way of criticism of infiltration from the North to the South of North Vietnamese troops. They still do not have 525,000 of them there. But we do have 525,000 of our men there.

We never had the right to put a single one there, under international law. We have violated the Geneva treaty time and time again, for every soldier we have ever put there, for every tank we have ever put there, for every airplane we have ever sent there.

What does the treaty say? It literally forbids sending in Vietnamese—either one—or foreign soldiery or foreign military aides. We are not the only ones violating it in regard to shipments of arms. So is Russia. So is China. That does not make their wrong our right. It only makes us a wrongdoer along with them. But we have outdone them by sending in over 525,000 American troops to engage in an illegal war, an undeclared war, a war we do not dare to declare. For 4 years I have stood on the floor of the Senate and dared my President to send a war message up to Congress.

I dare him again today: "Mr. President, send up your war message. Let the American people and the Congress respond to it."

Mr. President, you know why we do not dare declare war. It is because a declaration of war must be enforced under international law against noncombatants, too. If they do not respect that declaration of war, then it must be enforced against them. With the United States standing at this hour with no major power in the world supporting us in our war in Vietnam, our Government will think a long time before it declares war. And, of course, our Government recognizes very well that we would have to get the British to lower their flag to an American blockade. We would have to get the Scandinavian flags lowered to an American blockade—and that is something the Scandinavian countries do not do; they do not pull down their flag to a blockade of another country if they do not approve of the blockade—and, of course, as I have said in my remarks here, we would certainly have a lot of difficulty with the French flag. But let us assume that the French flag would be lowered to the blockade, you know the answer, Mr. President—the Russian flag and the Chinese flag would never be lowered. That means a declaration of war, and the attempt to enforce a declaration of war means world war III.

That is the precipice we have put mankind on, and we are driving mankind closer and closer to falling off that precipice into world war III by the escalation policies we are following in Vietnam.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has pleaded and pleaded, and will continue to plead, before it is too late, that we must seek a multilateral settlement over there. We can never order a settlement. We have lost the opportunity and the right to do it. We can always get a surrender, if we continue to kill enough people and destroy enough property. But that will not bring peace. It will bring a truce, but we would not be able to bring any troops home from there. They will have to be left there to enforce the truce, while Asians dig in deeper and deeper, in hatred of the United States and our venture, until eventually they drive us out.

Someone has to be willing to stand up and warn the American people, as the Senator from Alaska and I have been doing for 4 years. Continue this course of action, and eventually, no matter how many decades it will take, the United States will be driven out of Asia. I do not intend to leave that legacy, by my vote, to future generations of American boys and girls. I do not intend to put that blood on my record in the Senate of the United States. For I have never adopted the fallacious policy "My country, right or wrong." When our country is wrong, we have the patriotic duty to right the wrong, not to perpetuate it.

Therefore, I just cannot let the Secretary of Defense get by with these further misrepresentations of the Tonkin Gulf record, because the record itself does not support him.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for one question.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the burden of the Senator's eloquent and well documented statement that Secretary McNamara in August of 1964 and again yesterday, on either or both of those occasions, lied?

Mr. MORSE. Well, that is motivation, and I am not talking about people's motivations. I am simply talking about a lapse of good judgment, and a failure on the part of the Secretary of State to accurately inform the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both on August 6, 1964, and yesterday, when he testified before the committee.

In regard to the argument of the Secretary that the *Maddox* was operating in international waters, if technically accurate, the Secretary's statement, as I have said, was misleading, because it was not a routine patrol. It was not a nonprovocative patrol. It was a highly provocative patrol.

Here you are with islands 3 to 6 miles away, being bombarded by the South Vietnamese, and then you look out and you see two U.S. destroyers not too far away, stimulating the electronic instruments of North Vietnam, causing great alarm and concern on their part; moving to the east and north away from the area of the bombardment. If one is a North Vietnamese, what would he think? He would not think that those boats were on a pleasure tour in their waters. This was no pleasure tour. This was a provocative patrol, and the North Vietnamese knew it.

Well, in performing its intelligence mission, as I say, the instructions were to the *Maddox* to stimulate the electronic instruments of North Vietnam. The ship was authorized not only to listen but to provoke the electronic systems of North Vietnam. It might be added that the *Maddox* had ample warning that the North Vietnamese were stirred up by the *Maddox's* mission into North Vietnamese waters, and could have broken off the patrol long before it did.

After the attack on the *Maddox* on August 2, the Navy was authorized to continue "routine patrols" in the Gulf of Tonkin and to double the force by adding an additional destroyer—the *Turner Joy*—to the patrol. At the same time, the State Department delivered a note of protest to the North Vietnamese Government. The note concluded with the statement that the North Vietnamese should be under no misapprehension "as to the grave consequences which would inevitably result from any further unprovoked offensive military action against the U.S. forces."

Well, that is not a peace message. Why did they not send it to the Security Council of the United Nations? Why did not the State Department and the White House act within the scope and responsibilities and duties of international law? Why did we not give the Security Council at least the responsibility of moving in there to prevent what subsequently happened? "Oh," says the Secretary of State, "we are satisfied the Security Council would do nothing about it." That is an easy answer, but you ought to make the record first. One thing you can be sure of—if you had submitted it to the Security Council, then you would have been out of court for proceeding to bomb the PT bases of North Vietnam to carry out the threat of the message I have just cited. Let me read it again: The North Vietnamese should be under no misapprehension "as to the grave consequences which would inevitably result from any further unprovoked military action against U.S. military forces."

Two destroyers were involved in a highly provocative sea. It was a highly provocative sea by this time. We did not go to the Security Council. We did not keep faith with the pledge we made when we signed the charter of the United Nations that we would not resort to hostile action except in accordance with the provisions of the charter, after we had gotten approval. We would not have gotten it, of course.

Mr. President, eventually they will try us. Remember what the senior Senator from Oregon says on the floor of the Senate today when, in the years ahead, we get tried in international tribunals for our own course of action in Vietnam. We will be found guilty for that course of action in bombing those PT bases without ever attempting to get the incidents settled by way of international law.

After the incident of August 4, Secretary McNamara told the committee that the destroyers had come under continuous torpedo attack and that they had sunk two of the attacking craft.

He gave us no information that there was any doubt about it. He gave us no information as to the conflicting points of view even in the military, to say nothing about conflicting points of view elsewhere.

Secretary McNamara testified that—

> Deliberate and unprovoked nature of the attacks at locations that were indisputably in international waters compelled the President and his principal advisers to conclude that prompt and firm military response was required.

The attacks were all over, whatever they were, whatever their type. The *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy* were in no danger then. And, of course, what would reason and dedication to peaceful pursuit of the settlement of disputes have called upon the administration to do at that time?

Well, to move further out into international waters, until we got the matter before a tribunal that would have the jurisdiction and the authority to adjudicate it. That was the duty.

Instead, we had a visceral reaction. We bombed. The greatest military power on earth, the greatest firepower on earth, the greatest Navy, the greatest Air Force, the greatest ground force—we just had to show this little upstart, North Vietnam, that we were going to knock out some of their patrol boat bases.

Well, we did, and lost millions and millions of friends around the world. We stirred up fear and criticism within the precincts of the United Nations. That has been our course of action. It is not difficult, when you are the big boy on the playground, to whip the little boy on the playground. But you know what you are called when you do; and that is what we are being called in many places in the world today.

Mr. President, the facts of the matter of the second incident reveal that many other naval communications were sent out. To paraphrase, but accurately, the two ships were under orders to approach within 8 nautical miles of the North Vietnam coast, and 4 nautical miles of the North Vietnam islands.

Although the original plan called for the termination after 2 days of the runs of the ships into the Vietnam coast, the commander in chief of the Pacific ordered an extension of the patrol telling the ships that a termination after only 2 days "does not in my view adequately demonstrate the United States' resolve to assert our legitimate rights in these international waters."

The patrol of the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* was coordinated with operations of the South Vietnamese against North Vietnam. These operations took place on the night of August 3–4. The operation included the bombardment of North Vietnamese radar sites and a security post. The U.S. commanders knew, moreover, that the North Vietnamese considered the patrol of the two ships as part of this South Vietnamese operation. Nevertheless, despite this knowledge that North Vietnam considered the U.S. patrol as part of an attack on North Vietnam the patrol continued.

As for the second incident itself, Mr. McNamara told the committee that there was no doubt that the attack on the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy* had taken place as described. He even told the committee that two North Vietnamese PT boats had been destroyed. His testimony gave no indication that there was any doubt as to what had occurred. The reports, however, show that as the hours went by after the second incident there was increasing concern that the attack may not have taken place at all. I think it did, but there was such little objective evidence immediately available that there was doubt.

On August 4 the destroyers reported that they were under continuous attack. Within the next few hours messages came from the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* describing the attack. For example, at 11:15 a.m. the *Turner Joy* reported that five torpedos had been fired and the ship was planning to ram one of the PT boats.

Do not forget that PT boats carry only two torpedoes. In fact, there is great doubt in the record as to whether they can pin down more than one, although some of the information given us was that allegedly 22 torpedoes had been fired.

Another report was transmitted that seven torpedoes had already been fired at the destroyers, and two were in the water. The *Turner Joy* reported "We think a PT boat sunk one of its own boats."

Then a message arrived that the ships had counted 22 torpedoes fired. North Vietnamese patrol boats, as I have said, carried but two. They did not have a flotilla of PT boats, at best.

It was primarily on the basis of this information that the administration set in motion the process that would lead to the attack on North Vietnam some 10 hours later. It should be noted that 2 days later, on August 6, when Secretary McNamara brought the account of the second incident to the committee he gave no indication that there were second thoughts as to what really happened in the Gulf of Tonkin. He was positive and unequivocal.

Nevertheless, within a few hours after the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* had reported that the attacks had broken off, doubts began to grow about the incident. The first reaction of skepticism about the incidents came from the naval communications center in the Philippines. This center had monitored the entire action and received all of the communications from the two ships, including voice transmissions. On the basis of reviewing this information, this naval center in the Philippines—it may have been a relayed message, perhaps from the operational commander of the two destroyers, but nevertheless the instructions went out:

> Review of action makes many reported contacts and torpedos fired appear doubtful. Freak weather effects and overeager sonarmen may have accounted for many reports. No actual visual sightings by *Maddox, suggest complete evaluation before any further action.*

Subsequently, further doubts came from the ships themselves. The operational commander of the two ships aboard the *Maddox* cabled that "entire action leaves many doubts except for apparent ambush at beginning. Suggest thorough reconnaissance by aircraft at daylight."

Then another message came in from the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, asking the *Maddox* to confirm "absolutely" that the ships were attacked.

Then, in another message, the operational commander aboard the *Maddox* reported that the *Maddox* itself had scored no known hits and never positively identified a boat as such. He reported that "the first boat to close the *Maddox* probably fired a torpedo at the *Maddox* which was heard but not seen. All subsequent *Maddox* torpedo reports are doubtful in that it is suspected that sonar man was hearing ship's own propeller beat."

No, in spite of all this reported attacking, there was still doubt whether there had been an attack, as I have said in the first instance, Mr. President.

The commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, only a few hours before the retaliatory airstrike on North Vietnam, sent a telegram to the operational commander of the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* as follows:

> (1) Can you confirm absolutely that you were attacked?
>
> (2) Can you confirm sinking of PT boats?
>
> (3) Desire reply directly supporting evidence.

Over the next few hours the demands for confirming information and evidence mounted. Finally, the commander of the 7th Fleet asked the *Turner Joy* to amplify urgently its reports. The following is from the cable:

> Who were witnesses, what is witness reliability?—Most important that present evidence substantiating type and number of attacking forces be gathered and disseminated.

Then they called upon the *Turner Joy* to search for debris; for, of course, if planes had been knocked down, or if PT boats had been sunk, when daylight came, it would be difficult not to find even an oil skim.

Well, after the message of the commander of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Moorer, urgently asking for the information, the President appeared on television to announce that the strikes against North Vietnam had commenced.

As I have already said, I do not think the strikes can ever be justified. I do not think that at that time there was any need to go to the self-defense of the Republic. There was a need to meet with the Security Council, and fast.

So, when we take the whole record—and I have only given a few incidents, but I have given enough which, under the doctrine of personal privilege, I am entitled to do, to answer the Secretary of Defense's reference to me—I want to say that in my judgment the Secretary of Defense misled the committee in August 1964. We might have had an entirely different attitude in the Senate if we had been told all of the facts then about the background of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

As I said yesterday in the committee meeting in the presence of the Secretary of Defense, I did not speak on the floor of the Senate on August 5 and August 6 without having some information to justify my making some of the comments I made.

I served on the Armed Services Committee for years. I still have very close contact with highly reliable people. I had a call from the Pentagon Building before I made that first speech, suggesting that I ask for the logs. And I asked for them in the speech.

The call also suggested that I seek to find out what the *Maddox* was doing, because she was not on a routine patrol mission, but was acting as a spy ship.

I want to say that the Secretary of Defense and the administration, including the President of the United States, owed it to Congress and to the people of this country to tell us much more about what preceded the alleged—and I think it happened, in the first incident at least—attack on the *Maddox*.

Had they done it, I just have a feeling in my bones that the Tonkin Gulf joint resolution would not have passed. Do not forget, there is a very interesting other chapter to that resolution which I will not take the time to go into today. It was drafted before the incident.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my speech of August 5, 1964, in which I gave warnings in regard to the Tonkin incident, and also my speech of August 6, 1964.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 5, 1964]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the joint resolution. I do so with a very sad heart. But I consider the resolution, as I considered the resolution of 1955, known as the Formosa resolution, and the subsequent resolution, known as the Middle East resolution, to be naught but a resolution which embodies a predated declaration of war.

Article I, section 8 of our Constitution does not permit the President to make war at his discretion. Therefore I stand on this issue as I have stood before in the Senate, perfectly willing to take the judgment of history as to the merits of my cause. I note in passing that the warnings which the Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, and the senior Senator from Oregon uttered in 1955 in opposition to the Formosa Resolution have been proved to be correct by history. I am satisfied that history will render a final verdict in opposition to the joint resolution introduced today.

Mr. President, I shall not yield during the course of my speech, although I shall be very glad to yield to respond to questions afterward.

The senior Senator from Oregon has no illusions as to the reactions which will be aroused in some quarters in this Republic. However, I make the speech because it represents the convictions of my conscience and because I consider it essential to make it in keeping the sworn trust that I undertook when I came into this body on four different occasions and was sworn in as a Senator from the State of Oregon, pledging myself to uphold the Constitution.

I have one other remark by way of preface, not contained in the manuscript. I yield to no other Senator, or to anyone else in this country in my opposition to communism and all that communism stands for.

In our time a great struggle, which may very well be a deathlock struggle, is going on in the world between freedom on the one hand and the totalitarianism of communism on the other.

However, I am satisfied that that struggle can never be settled by war. I am satisfied that if the hope of anyone is that the struggle between freedom and communism can be settled by war, and that course is followed, both freedom and communism will lose, for there will be no victory in that war.

Because of our own deep interest in the struggle against communism, we in the United States are inclined to overlook some of the other struggles which are occupying others. We try to force every issue into the context of freedom versus communism. That is one of our great mistakes in Asia. There is much communism there, and much totalitarianism in other forms. We say we are opposing communism there, but that does not mean we are advancing freedom, because we are not.

Senators will note as I proceed in the presentation of my case in opposition to the resolution that I believe the only hope for the establishment of a permanent peace in the world is to practice our oft-repeated American professing that we believe in the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military force as a means of settling disputes which threaten the peace of the world.

The difficulty with that professing or preaching by the United States is that the United States, like some Communist nations, does not practice it.

I wish to make one last introductory remark in the hope that more will understand the message of this speech, although we sometimes deplore the possibility of understanding on a subject matter that stirs so much emotion, so much feeling, and so much passion in the minds of so-called superpatriots, who seem to feel that if one raises any question or expresses any criticism of the policies of our country in the field of foreign policy, one's very patriotism is subject to question.

In the hope that there may be those who may wish to understand the basic tenet of the foreign policy philosophy of the senior Senator from Oregon, I wish to repeat what some of my colleagues have heard me say before.

My foreign policy philosophy is based on a great teaching of a great teacher in this body, one who undoubtedly exercised more influence on me in the field of foreign policy than any other person; a great Republican, who became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; who was one of the architects of the San Francisco Charter; who joined with Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the announcement of that great statement in the field of foreign policy, that politics should stop at the water's edge. I refer, of course, to the incomparable Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan.

Senators within my hearing have heard me say before that I was deeply moved by that dramatic account of Arthur Vandenberg, in which he told, so many times, how he ceased being the leading isolationist in the Senate and became the leading internationalist. It was before the atomic bomb was finally perfected, but after it was known that the atomic bomb would be successful in its perfection.

Franklin Roosevelt called to the White House late one night the leaders of Congress, the leading scientists of the country, who were working on the bomb at that time, and the military leaders of our Defense Establishment who were still stationed in Washington. As Arthur Vandenberg used to say, "We were briefed, and the conference continued until the wee hours of the morning. The scientists convinced all that there was no question that the bomb would work. Then the discussion turned to the implications of this great discovery of science."

Senator Vandenberg used to say to us, "When I came out of the White House in the wee hours of that morning, I knew that while I had been in there that night, the world had so shrunken that there no longer was any place in American politics for an isolationist."

It was then that the great record of internationalism was begun to be made by the incomparable Vandenberg. I paraphrase him, but accurately, for my speech today rests upon this tenet, this unanswerable teaching of Vandenberg. This speech is my challenge today to the members of our Government and the people of my country to follow that teaching, for I do not believe that there is an implementation of any other teaching that can offer mankind any hope for peace. Unless mankind proceeds to adopt the procedures that will make possible permanent peace, both Western civilization and Communist civilization are headed for annihilation. In my judgment, we cannot find reputable scientists who will testify that either civilization could survive a nuclear war.

That tenet of Vandenberg's is as follows: There is no hope for permanent peace in the world until all the nations—not merely some, not merely those we like, not merely those we think are friendly—but until all the nations are willing to establish a system of international justice through law, to the procedures of which will be submitted each and every international dispute that threatens the peace of the world, anywhere in the world, for final and binding determination, to be enforced by an international organization, such as the United Nations.

I am aware of all the criticisms of that tenet. But I have yet to hear a criticism that either destroys or weakens the tenet. One of the almost pro forma criticisms is that it is idealistic, it is impractical, unrealistic. The fact is that only ideals are practical. The only practicality we shall experience in the field of foreign policy or any other field of human behavior is an ideal put to work.

Vandenberg left us this great ideal. It will take years to implement it. But we must always move forward, not backward. We are moving in Asia today, but the movement of the United States in Asia is not in the direction of Vandenberg's principle.

It makes no difference who says that our objective is peace, even if he be the President of the United States. Our actions speak louder than words; and our actions in Asia today are the actions of warmaking.

As I speak on the floor of the Senate at this moment, the United States is making war in Asia.

I shall never give up, short of the actual passage of a declaration of war, my prayerful hope for peace and my prayerful hope that we will substitute the ideal of the rule of law through the only international organization that exists and that has any hope, in my judgment, of applying the rule—the United Nations.

ASIA POLICY IS CATCHING UP WITH US

Thus I say that the incident that has inspired the joint resolution we have just heard read is as much the doing of the United States as it is the doing of North Vietnam. For 10 years, the role of the United States in South Vietnam has been that of a provocateur, every bit as much as North Vietnam has been a provocateur. For 10 years, the United States, in South Vietnam, has violated the Geneva agreement of 1954. For 10 years, our military policies in South Vietnam have sought to impose a military solution upon a political and economic problem. For 10 years the Communist nations of that part of the world have also violated the Geneva accord of 1954.

Not only do two wrongs not make one right, but also I care not how many wrongs we add together, we still do not come out with a summation except a summation of wrong—never a right.

The American effort to impose by force of arms a government of our own choosing upon a segment of the old colony of Indochina has caught up with us.

Our violations of the Geneva accord have caught up with us. Our violations of the United Nations Charter have caught up with us.

Our failure to apply the provisions of the Southeast Asia Treaty have caught up with us. We have been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time, instead of seeking to keep the peace. It was inevitable and inexorable that sooner or later we would have to engage in overt acts of war in pursuance of that policy, and we are now doing so.

There never was a time when it was possible for us to impose a government upon the people of South Vietnam without constant fighting to keep it in power. There never was a time when it would be possible to "bring the boys home by 1965,"—as was once promised—or on any other date. There never was a time when the war could be fought and won in South Vietnam alone, because the Khanh junta—and any of its successors and predecessors—could not survive without massive and direct American military backing that was possible only if the war were expanded.

So the war has at last been expanded—as the Senator from Alaska and I for the last 5 months, in speech after speech on the floor of the Senate, have forewarned was inevitable if we continued our course of action. That course of action, of unilateral military action on the part of the United States, is irreconcilable with our professings as to the application of the rule of law for the settlement of disputes which threaten the peace of the world or any region thereof.

Whether the choice of expanding it was that of North Vietnam or South Vietnam is still in doubt. But I am satisfied that the present rules of South Vietnam could not long continue their civil war unless the war were expanded.

The United States is, of course, a full partner in the Government of South Vietnam. I am satisfied that ever since 1954, when the United States did not sign the Geneva accords but instead started down the road of unilateral military action in South Vietnam, we have become a provocateur of military conflict in southeast Asia and marched in the opposite direction from fulfilling our obligations under the United Nations Charter. I am satisfied, further, that officials of both the Pentagon and the State Department during those years have ill advised the White House in respect to what our course of action should be in southeast Asia from the standpoint of a second foreign policy.

In recent months, evidence has been mounting that both the Pentagon and the State Department were preparing to escalate the war into North Vietnam. Many of the policies they have initiated and the statements they have made in public have been highly provocative of military conflict beyond the borders of South Vietnam.

When the high emotionalism of the present crisis has passed, and historians of the future will disclose some of the provocative things that have occurred, I have no doubt that they will disclose that for quite some time past, there have been violations of the North Vietnamese border and the Cambodian border by South Vietnam, as well as vice versa.

I am also satisfied that they will disclose that the United States was not an innocent bystander. We will not receive a verdict of innocence from the jury box of history on several counts.

Our extensive military aid to South Vietnam was a violation of the Geneva accords in the first instance. Our sending troops into South Vietnam, even under the semantic camouflage of designation as military advisers, was a violation of the Geneva accords. In fact, both of those two counts were also a clear violation of the spirit and intent of the peaceful purposes of the United Nations Charter itself.

Any violations of the borders of Cambodia and North Vietnam by the South Vietnamese were not conducted in a vacuum so far as U.S. assistance was concerned.

We assisted not only with materiel, but we advised on war plans, and our military presence in South Vietnam served as an ever-present strong back-stop to the South Vietnamese. I doubt if their military leaders acted at any time without the tacit approval of their American advisers.

TONKIN BAY INCIDENT PROVOKED BY SOUTH VIETNAM

In a very recent incident which was the forerunner to the attacks on American destroyers in the Tonkin Bay, it is known that South Vietnamese naval vessels bombarded two North Vietnamese islands within 3 to 5 or 6 miles of the main coast of North Vietnam. Of course, the national waters of North Vietnam extend according to our international claims 3 miles seaward from the eastern extremity of those islands and 12 miles seaward under national water boundary claims of North Vietnam. While the South Vietnamese vessels were attacking the North Vietnamese islands, the newspapers tell us that U.S. vessels of war were patrolling Tonkin Bay, presumably some 6 to 11 miles off the shore of North Vietnam.

Was the U.S. Navy standing guard while vessels of South Vietnam shelled North Vietnam? That is the clear implication of the incident.

In regard to international waters, a subject which is one of the highly disputed and still unsettled questions of international law, I believe that the position of the United States is the sounder position. I believe that the 3-mile limit has the better support under international law principles. But we have neighbors to the south of us in Latin America who do not accept that principle and insist on a 12-mile limit—in one instance, as I recall, a longer limit. Time and time again international incidents arise between the United States and Latin American countries, when American fishing boats get within the limits of the claimed national waters of our South American neighbors and are towed into port. Then begins the exchange of notes and conferences in an effort to have those men released.

The U.S. Government knew that the matter of national and international waters was a controversial issue in Tonkin Bay. The United States also knew that the South Vietnamese vessels planned to bomb, and did bomb, two North Vietnamese islands within 3 to 6 miles of the coast of North Vietnam. Yet, these war vessels of the United States were in the vicinity of that bombing, some miles removed.

Can anyone question that even their presence was a matter of great moral value to South Vietnam? Or the propaganda value to the military totalitarian tyrant and despot who rules South Vietnam as an American puppet—General Khanh, who is really, when all is said and done, the leader whom we have put in charge of an American protectorate called South Vietnam?

It should be unnecessary to point out either to the Senate or to the American people what the position of the United States and its people would be if the tables were reversed and Soviet warships or submarines were to patrol 5 to 11 miles at sea while Cuban naval vessels bombarded Key West.

It is no accident or coincidence that today's press and radio reports tell of the rumors rife in Saigon yesterday of a coup against the Khanh regime, rumors which are said to have been quelled by the expansion of the fighting.

Today's New York Times carries on its front page a story headlined "Khanh, Warned of Plots, Seeks To Bolster Regime." It is written by Seymour Topping, and it says in part:

"Once again, rumors of a coup d'etat were circulating in Saigon. There was no visible evidence that a coup against the Khanh government was imminent, but the currency of the rumors tended to undermine the authority of the regime and confidence in it.

"U.S. officials believe another coup after that of January 30, which brought Premier Khanh to power, and that of last November 1, which brought down the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem, would be seriously detrimental to the war against the Vietcong."

This story also relates the efforts by General Khanh to rouse support by carrying the war into North Vietnam, and the subsequent "lift" given his regime by the involvements of the *Maddox* with the North Vietnamese PT boats.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full story printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"KHANH, WARNED OF PLOTS, SEEKS TO BOLSTER REGIME

("By Seymour Topping)

"SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, August 4.—Premier Nguyen Khanh struggled today to strengthen the political stability of his government as his aids privately warned of plots to drive him from office. U.S. officials were concerned about the political deterioration in Saigon.

"The malaise in the capital was attributed more to a clash of rival political and military personalities than to pressure from the Vietcong insurgents.

"U.S. sources said reports from provinces indicated that conditions there were generally better than in Saigon.

"Once again rumors of a coup d'etat were circulating in Saigon. There was no visible evidence that a coup against the Khanh government was imminent, but the currency of the rumors tended to undermine the authority of the regime and confidence in it.

"Threat to war is seen

"Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the U.S. Ambassador, was informed of the rumors, which emanated in part from responsible Government sources.

"U.S. officials believe another coup after that of January 30, which brought Premier Khanh to power, and that of last November 1, which brought down the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem, would be seriously detrimental to the war against the Vietcong.

"General Khanh scheduled a Cabinet meeting for tomorrow during which he may deal with some of the reported threats to his administration. Vietnamese Government officials said General Khanh was considering a proposal to appoint military officers as deputy ministers to strengthen his authority.

"Associates of General Khanh were privately accusing Dr. Nguyen Ton Hoan, leader of the nationalists Dai Viet party, of involvement in plans to force the Premier from office.

"General Khanh brought Dr. Hoan to Saigon from Paris, where he had spent about a decade in exile, after the Premier had seized power. The Dai Viet leader is said to have been disappointed when he was not appointed Premier as expected, but was made one of three Vice Premiers and put in charge of the pacification program.

"The Dai Viet, which has lacked a base of popular support, is reported to have been active recently in recruiting new members, especially army officers.

"Some of Premier Khanh's supporters accused Dr. Hoan of having tried to recruit Maj. Gen. Tran Thien Khiem, the Minister of National Defense, who was instrumental in bringing the Premier to power.

"Officers linked to party

"Reports reaching Western embassies here and well-informed Vietnamese sources also linked the Dai Viet to Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, the Chief of Staff, and Col. Nguyen Van Ton, commander of the 7th Division.

"General Khanh has relied on all officers named in the past and there was no certainty by independent observers, despite persistent reports, that any of them had become disaffected.

"The Premier, who has come to look upon plotting by discontented politicians and military officers as a chronic expression of the unstable political situation in Saigon, has been devoting much of his time to dissolving political groupings directed against him.

"General Khanh, bitter about his inability to muster Saigon politicians and some officers in the war effort, has recently hinted that he might forgo the premiership.

"The Premier has spoken of his desire to go to the United States. Ostensibly the visit would be to tell Americans more about South Vietnam's cause.

"In a fit of frustration at one private Government meeting, the Premier is reported to have offered to turn over the office to Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh, the chief of state, if he would pledge dynamic leadership in the war.

"General Minh, leader of the military junta that was toppled in the coup last January, was retained as chief of state at the suggestion of the United States. He is said to have declined the offer.

"The chief of state is a fairly popular figure, more so than General Khanh in some regions of the country. However, he has balked at throwing his full influence behind the younger officer who overthrew his government.

"Political observers here view the demands made by General Khanh last month for a 'march to the north' as an articulation of his political frustrations. The Premier aware that his forces were too limited for such an operation against North Vietnam, apparently sounded the slogan in an effort to rouse nationalist support.

"Last week Ambassador Taylor was instructed to inform Premier Khanh that his call for an extension of the war to the north was against present U.S. policy. Information about policy differences leaked to the press, embarrassing the Premier.

"General Khanh protested for a time about his government's independence of action, but on Friday publicly modified his statements to fit in with Washington policy. The retreat was noted by his political enemies.

"General Khanh has been given a political lift by the attack made by North Vietnamese PT boats on the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* last Sunday. The general has pointed to the attack as vindication of his view that stronger measures are necessary to counter Communist aggression.

"A spokesman for the Premier today welcomed President Johnson's decision to strengthen U.S. naval patrols in the Gulf of Tonkin, where the attack on the *Maddox* took place."

Mr. MORSE. These facts are as well known to the world as they are to officials of the U.S. Government. They mean that our charges of aggression against North Vietnam will be greeted by considerable snickering abroad.

So, too, will the pious phrases of the resolution about defending freedom in South Vietnam. There is no freedom in South Vietnam. I think even the American people know that to say we are defending freedom in South Vietnam is a travesty upon the word. We are defending General Khanh from being overthrown; that is all. We are defending a clique of military generals and their merchant friends who live well in Saigon, and who need a constantly increasing American military force to protect their privileged position.

Repetitious as these remarks may seem to those who have heard me speaking on Asian policy over the last 5 months, nevertheless, the facts of our obligations under international law, and the stupidity of our policy in southeast Asia remain the same. I am aware that my words will not be popular with many, and will be unacceptable to some. But the times demand wisdom more than they demand popularity.

If war is really too important to be left to the generals, then the American people are going to have to make themselves heard soon on U.S. policy in Asia. The only hope that remains for diplomatic action in our activities in the former Indochinese peninsula is the vague hope that a large enough military buildup and a forceful enough threat to expand the war will cause Red China and North Vietnam to retreat from Laos and to cease their support of the rebels in South Vietnam.

When this retreat and this cessation of support to the Vietcong has occurred, then and only then, say our diplomatic spokesmen, might the United States consider a United Nations action in the area, or a new 14-power conference.

Such an American foreign policy is in direct violation of our international legal obligations, including our obligations under the United Nations Charter. What is worse, we have threatened war where no direct threat to American security is at stake. Many journalists who reflect this Government policy in their writings have resorted to fear arguments, seeking to create the impression that unless the United States uses its military might in South Vietnam and other parts of Asia, the security of the United States will be threatened and communism will run rampant over all of Asia. They are men of little faith in the strength of joint efforts of peaceful nations, who by solemn treaty have bound themselves together to enforce the peace through the application of the procedures of international law. They would take the United States outside the framework of international law, and that is exactly where we are today, along with North Vietnam, Red China, South Vietnam, the Pathet Lao in Laos, and possibly others.

Likewise, there are many congressional politicians who would evade their responsibilities as to American foreign policy in Asia by use of the specious argument that "foreign policy is a matter for the executive branch of the Government. That branch has information no Congressman has access to." Of course, such an alibi for evading congressional responsibility in the field of foreign policy may be based on lack of understanding, or a convenient forgetting of our system of checks and balances that exists and should be exercised in the relationships between and among our three coordinate and coequal branches of government.

Granted that there are many in Congress who would prefer to pass the buck to the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon Building in respect to our unilateral American military action in Asia. And this resolution gives them the vehicle. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that once the American people come to understand the facts involved in the ill-fated military operations in Asia, they will hold to an accounting those Members of Congress who abdicate their responsibilities in the field of foreign policy.

It is an elementary principle of constitutional law that the executive branch of government cannot spend taxpayers' money in the field of foreign policy, or for any other purpose except when the appropriations are passed by law.

Article I, section 9, of the Constitution reads:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

It is also elementary that before an appropriation law can be passed, an authorization bill approving of the policy requested by the President must be passed.

These legal requirements under our constitutional system give the Congress a check and voice in determining American foreign policy. Likewise, the Constitution in several other respects places checks upon the executive branch of Government in the field of foreign policy.

Under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, the power to declare war is vested in the Congress. No President has the legal authority under the Constitution to send American boys to their death on a battlefield in the absence of a declaration of war, and in the absence of a prior treaty commitment calling for that action in prescribed circumstances.

There has been a tendency in the historic debate that is taking place on United States-Asian policy for those who favor American unilateral military action in Asia to substitute the waving of the flag into tatters for a reasoned discussion of our international law obligations. Of course, that is no way to pay respect to the flag. If we are to go to war in Asia we should at least stay within the provisions of the Constitution. But a war in Asia should be recognized as being unthinkable, and every effort within reason and honor should be made to avoid it. That is why I have urged that as a substitute for American unilateral military action in South Vietnam we should appeal to the SEATO organization, and to the United Nations, for joint action on the part of the members thereof, in accordance with the provisions of those two charters, in an endeavor to substitute a keeping of the peace, for the making of war in Asia.

ORIGINS OF PRESENT CONFLICT

The sad truth is that the threats by leading American officials to make war on China and the present war crisis, are the logical end of the dismal road in Indochina that John Foster Dulles set us upon in 1954. After failing in his efforts to keep the French fighting on in Indochina, despite American aid to their war effort and the promise of direct U.S. military action. Dulles refused to put the signature of the United States on the Geneva Agreement of 1954 which marked the end of French rule there. South Vietnam also declined to sign. The most the United States said about the 1954 agreement was that we would recognize it as international law and regard violations with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

Among the provisions of the 1954 accords was article 16: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

Except for rotation of personnel, meaning French, already there.

Article 17: "(a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions, and other war material, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines, and jet weapons and armored vehicles is prohibited."

Again, an exception was made for replacement on the basis of piece for piece of the same type and with similar characteristics.

Article 18: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the establishment of new military bases is prohibited through Vietnam territory."

There is no way to escape the fact that for years the United States stood in violation of article 16, article 17, and article 18 of the Geneva accords of 1954, and yet we have the audacity to say to the world that we are helping South Vietnam because North Vietnam, and probably others, are violating the Geneva accords. I do not know what international jury box we could sell that argument to, for our duty and our obligation were, and our course of action should have been to take to the United Nations our allegation of the violation of the Geneva accords. We should ask the United Nations to put into force and effect the procedures of international law encompassed in that charter, which we, along with all the other signatories thereto committed ourselves and pledged ourselves to respect and obey.

Part of the 1954 agreement established an International Control Commission of Poland, India, and Canada to investigate complaints of violations. As early as its report covering 1956, this Commission found both North and South Vietnam had violated the accords of 1954, the latter in conjunction with the U.S. military aid activities.

The independent Commission, consisting of Poland, India, and Canada, found as early as 1956, that both North Vietnam and South Vietnam were in violation of the accords, and that the United States was in violation with them, because of the military aid that we have supplied in direct violation of the articles of the accord which I have previously read.

Immediately upon the signing of the 1954 agreement, the United States began to support the new Government of South Vietnam in a big way. In the letter President Eisenhower wrote President Diem, a letter still serving as the basis for our policy in 1964, aid was pledged to Diem, and in turn, "the Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

NO FREEDOM OR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In 1964, President Johnson refers to that letter as the basis for our aid, but the part about reforms has long since been forgotten.

Viewed objectively, the conclusion cannot be escaped that in the decade following 1954, the United States for all practical purposes made a protectorate out of South Vietnam. Its new government immediately became financially dependent upon us; as rebellion against it grew, our level of aid was stepped up. By 1961, we had to send 15,000 American troops as "advisers" to the local military forces.

Do not forget the population figures we are dealing with in South Vietnam. There is a population in South Vietnam of approximately 15 million, and a South Vietnam military establishment of some 400,000 to 450,000 armed forces, pitted against South Vietnamese Vietcong. Undoubtedly they are South Vietnamese Communists, but they are South Vietnamese.

Mr. President, I have been briefed many times, as have the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee; and all this time witness after witness from the State Department and from the Pentagon have admitted under examination that they had no evidence of any foreign troops in South Vietnam from North Vietnam, Red China, Cambodia, or anywhere else.

The sad fact is that the only foreign troops that have been in South Vietnam in any numbers have been American troops. In the past couple of weeks, we have been told, but without specifications, that there is some reason to believe that there may be some congeries here and there of North Vietnamese—a captured soldier here and there who might have come from North Vietnam. Mr. President, it has been admitted, by and large, that this has been a war between South Vietnamese Vietcong, who are Communist led, and the forces of the military government of South Vietnam.

Does anyone mean to tell me that with a population of 15 million, and military forces consisting of 400,000 to 450,000 South Vietnamese troops, of various types and various services, they are incapacitated, and that we must send American boys over there to die in what amounts basically to a civil war?

Mr. President, criticism has not prevented, and will not prevent me from saying that, in my judgment, we cannot justify the shedding of American blood in that kind of war in southeast Asia. France learned that lesson. France tried to fight it for 8 years, and with 240,000 casualties. The French people finally pulled down the French Government and said they had had enough.

I do not believe that any number of American conventional forces in South Vietnam, or in Asia generally, can win a war, if the test of winning a war is establishing peace. We can win military victories. We can kill millions of people, but not without losses of our own. Then, at the end of that blood march, we shall end with the same job to perform; namely, establishing peace, but in a war-wracked world, if we survive.

Mr. President, the formula is archaic. The formula will no longer work. The nuclear age has outmoded war as an instrument for establishing and maintaining peace. The issues and problems of southeast Asia cannot be solved by military force.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon pleads again that we return to the basic tenet of foreign policy which I cited at the beginning of this speech, taught to me by that great Republican, Arthur Vandenberg.

By 1961, we had sent 15,000 American troops as advisers to a South Vietnamese military establishment with 400,000 to 450,000 troops who seemed to be unable to defeat 25,000 to 35,000 Vietcong.

Let the record be clear—the maximum figure that any official of the executive department of government has ever given us in any briefing as to the numerical strength of the Vietcong is 35,000. More frequently it is said the number is probably nearer the neighborhood of 25,000.

Four hundred thousand to four hundred fifty thousand South Vietnamese military forces have been unable to defeat 25,000 to 35,000—to use their top figure—Vietcong.

We had to send in 15,000 American boys—at first—and we do not know with certainty how many were in the last allotment, but probably another 4,000 or 5,000 or more. And the way things are going over there today, the American people had better get ready for thousands more to be sent.

I view with great concern the danger that thousands of them will be bogged down in Asia for a long time to come. If that happens, there will be one place in the world where there will be no regrets, and that will be Moscow.

Mr. President, when the Diem government diverted itself from fighting rebels to fighting Buddhists, a coup by military proteges of the United States overthrew it. Within a few weeks, another coup replaced the Minh junta with what the American military advisers considered a more efficient military junta under General Khanh.

At no time has South Vietnam had a government of its own choosing. In fact, the Khanh junta justified its coup with the excuse that some Minh officers were pro-French, and might seek some way of neutralizing the country. What the people of South Vietnam, even those the government still controls, might want has never been given a passing thought.

Just how the present Khanh government differs from the old Bao Dai government which served as the French puppet, I have never been able to see.

Yet American leaders talk piously of "defending freedom" in South Vietnam. A Republican Member of the House of Representatives wrote me recently—and I quote from this letter: "So far as I can tell, the governments of North Vietnam and South Vietnam are just about Tweedledum and Tweedledee and neither the people nor the governments on either side would recognize democracy if they should meet it in broad daylight and on the main street of Saigon, their main interest being in another bowl of rice."

These were the origins of our present policy in Vietnam that has led us to talk openly of war with China, and now to overt warfare with North Vietnam. Many people are saying these days that getting into South Vietnam was a terrible mistake, but now that we are there, there is no point in looking back and rehashing the wisdom of it all. How wrong they are. Surely when a nation goes as far down the road toward war as we have, it must know why it is there, what objective it is seeking, and whether the objective sought could possibly be achieved by any other means.

We say that one of our objectives is the enforcement of the 1954 agreement, which we charge has been violated by North Vietnam and China. Why we believe we have a right to enforce by force of arms an international agreement to which we are not a party has never been explained.

Nor is it explained why the massive violations of articles 16, 17, and 18 which we have engaged in especially since 1961 are the only means of calling other violators to account.

In the case of Laos, we did sign the Geneva accord of 1962, which tried to neutralize that territory. Hence, we claim that the violations we have committed ourselves were only undertaken after North Vietnam had violated the accord first. Our violations have taken the form of sending armed planes flown by American pilots over Laos. The 1962 agreement permits military equipment to be brought into the country at the request of the Laotian Government, but it forbids "the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations and foreign military personnel into Laos."

In addition, we have sent at least five shiploads of military equipment to Thailand against the day when it becomes necessary to use American troops in Laos to halt the Pathet Lao.

Like the Communist neighbors who are helping the Pathet Lao, we are not enforcing the 1962 accord; we are only helping them to destroy it.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Most disturbing of all have been our violations of the United Nations Charter. If our signature on that Charter means anything at all, it requires us to observe article 2, section 4:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Other charter provisions are specific as to the duty of nations when they find themselves involved in a dispute.

Article 33 states: "SECTION 1. the parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Some of the peaceful means that have been advanced but brushed aside by the United States have been the 14-power conference advocated by France, and the introduction of a peace force from the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Article 37 of the charter provides: "Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council."

Notice that the controlling verb is "shall." This is not an option but a directive. So far it has been ignored by the United States.

ALL ACTION IN SELF-DEFENSE MUST BE REPORTED TO U.N.

Even the self-defense article does not sanction what we are doing in the name of defense in South Vietnam. Article 51 states:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

There is nothing permissive about that. That may not be used as a rationalization for the United States making war instead of joining in keeping the peace in South Vietnam.

It is commonly said both in and out of government that the United Nations is a waste of time and that the Communists understand nothing but force. However, the line continues, maybe at some future date we may find it to our interest to go to the U.N.

This supposedly sophisticated argument ignores several points.

First. It may not be left to us to decide whether the issue should go to the United Nations. Article 35 provides that "any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly." The disputes referred to in article 34 are those which are likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Cambodia dragged us before the United Nations, charging violations of her border. We apologized, and suggested a U.N. border patrol to guard against future violations. But we brazened it out so far as the Vietnam war was concerned, and served notice that we would do whatever we desired there, irrespective of the provisions of the charter.

How long we can proceed in this manner in Laos and Vietnam without being called to account at the United Nations is anyone's guess. But if we wait for another country to invoke article 35, we can be sure it will not be on grounds and under conditions most favorable to the United States.

Second. The very assumption by administration spokesmen that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek U.N. action is an admission that the issue is really one of U.N. jurisdiction. What they are saying is only that they do not think that to adhere now to the U.N. Charter would serve American interests. Their theory is that the time to negotiate is when we have first dominated the battlefield.

This amounts to saying that any treaty obligation that does not serve our national interest is just a scrap of paper. These officials take the view that we may one day resurrect the U.N. Charter from the wastebasket, but not until we think it serves our interest. Perhaps now that we can level a charge against North Vietnam, they think it serves our interest.

If that is to be our policy, then we are helping to destroy the United Nations, too, and all the advances in the rule of law in world affairs which it represents. Our moral position, which we claim as leader of the free world, will be undermined and our capacity for calling others to account for breaches of the peace will be seriously compromised.

Third. The "fight now, negotiate later" line is based on the wholly illusory assumption that Red China and North Vietnam will do what we refuse to do—negotiate when they are losing. Can we really expect that when China is faced with the same condition she was faced with in Korea, she will negotiate instead of pouring her hordes into the fray, as she did in Korea? Do we really think these two countries will go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against them, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances? One might as well ask whether the United States would have done so in October of 1962 had the Soviet Union come to dominate the Caribbean.

As I have said in several speeches, and repeat now, we had better face the realization of the desperado that we are dealing with in Red China. This despicable Communist leader has demonstrated time and time again, as was demonstrated in the Korean war, that he places no value on human life. Only in the past 2 or 3 years headlines blazed forth the statement that the Communist leader of Red China has said in effect that in case of war with Western imperialism they could sacrifice 400 million people and have a stronger China at the end.

I know of no reason that should justify anyone engaging in the wishful thinking or in the head-in-the-sand attitude that if we kill enough and bomb enough, North Vietnam and Red China will yield.

We need the world with us. By that I mean we need with us the nations of the world which believe in the resort to the rule of law in the settlement of disputes.

We shall not take these nations with us if we follow a unilateral military course of action in Asia that may result in the despicable Communist Chinese leader starting to send his hordes of human bodies against American military force.

I reject the premise, which I believe is clearly imbedded in the joint resolution which was introduced in the Senate today: "Fight now and negotiate later."

That is risky business. It would jeopardize the continuation of existing procedures for the peaceful settlement through negotiations of disputes which threaten the peace of the world.

A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva Accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter.

We have violated these accords and the U.N. Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in southeast Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military dictatorship over the people of South Vietnam, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the fighting or not. We cannot hide behind the alibis that others violated these agreements first, although they did. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or to a 14 nation conference, or seek to bring SEATO in to exercise peacekeeping policies until the U.N. can take jurisdiction.

FOLLY OF WAR IN ASIA

All the foregoing is important to the United States, but none of it is as important as the folly of our getting involved in a war in Asia, irrespective of legal or moral obligations. No American spokesman has ever given the American people a single reason why an American war on the Chinese mainland would be justified.

The day of the Westerner is finished in Asia, just as much as in Africa. And it no longer matters whether the Westerner is French, Dutch, British, or American. The pressure will always be against us and against our front in South Vietnam.

That is why the pious apologies for our present policy which deplore expansion of the war into North Vietnam or China, but insist that we cannot leave under pressure, have been so futile.

There will never be anything but pressure against us there so long as the local government is dependent upon us for its existence. There is no reason to think the rebellion against Khanh will ever die out. Although it may recede somewhat in the face of our overwhelming military might, it will rebound whenever we try to reduce the level of American participation.

Our best prospect for us in South Vietnam was for stalemate; but the longer the stalemate continued, the more inevitable it was the war would be escalated. And it has been escalated, and how much further it will be escalated no one can say.

The public statements by Secretary McNamara, Secretary Rusk, Admiral Felt, and General Harkins required that the United States expand the war if the Communist-led forces did not retreat from their gains in Laos and Vietnam, and American forces from nearby bases in the Philippines and Okinawa have been poised for air attacks in Laos and North Vietnam and for the entry of ground forces through Thailand into Laos.

In my opinion, our leaders counted on bluffing Communist China; but she was not bluffed in Korea when the whole United Nations was with us, and this time we have not one single ally. The faltering General Khanh has arranged for us to carry out those threats so far as North Vietnam is concerned. We may find that someone else will arrange for us to carry them out against China, too. If that times comes, we will have no choice but to resort to nuclear weapons with all the hideous consequences that entails.

Yet, the fact remains that nothing we set out to do in 1954 justifies what we are doing today, much less what we are threatening to do. We set out in 1954 to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again when we tried to establish an American foothold in southeast Asia out of the destruction of European colonialism.

Five and one half billion dollars worth of aid to South Vietnam, 18,000 American "advisers," and now the threat of war with China has not put Humpty-Dumpty back together—and never will. Out of this $5½ billion, $1¼ billion went to France to help her in the Indochina war prior to her withdrawing in 1954. Today we are spending better than $1½ million per day and will reach $2 million shortly, just as aid to Vietnam, not covering the cost of our own military force in southeast Asia. Unless the American people make their voices herd very soon, they are going to spend even more in this fruitless and unavailing task.

What this war in the last 36 hours has cost the American taxpayers and how much it will amount to as that war continues defies imagination.

HOPE FOR PEACE LIES WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF UNITED NATIONS

The stark reality is that North and South Vietnam, China, and the United States are in this hour endangering the peace of the world. We have said we will make charges against North Vietnam before the United Nations Security Council.

Why in the world we did not make those charges against North Vietnam several years ago, I shall never understand. We are going to make charges now because we are in open conflict with North Vietnam. But we have had evidence for years that North Vietnam was undoubtedly a violator of the Geneva Accords of 1954. But instead of taking our charges and our proof to the United Nations, we sent 15,000 military personnel to South Vietnam to engage in unilateral military action in South Vietnam, in violation of three articles of the Geneva Accord that I have already cited in this speech, and have violated, time and time again, article after article of the United Nations Charter. That is our sorry record.

What about the infiltration of North Vietnamese into South Vietnam to advise the Vietcong?

What about the 21,000 American troops in South Vietnam advising the Government?

What about the American air attack on North Vietnam naval bases?

What about the shelling of the islands in Tonkin Bay by South Vietnamese vessels? These were all clear acts of war.

Why is not Ambassador Stevenson going to lay these incidents, too, before the Security Council?

The best hope for peace would seem to be that the noncombatant members of the United Nations will see to it that all of the provocative activities in the Indochina peninsula are brought before the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, in accordance with the procedures of the Charter. They should invoke all—I repeat: all—the applicable provisions of the United Nations Charter irrespective of which country initiates charges or must be called to account.

They should call upon South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, China, and the United States to stop their fighting and proceed to the conference table, where there can be applied the rules of reason rather than the fortunes of war for the settlement of the conflict.

The U.N. members not involved in the conflict must face up to one of the great challenges in all history. If they do not, they will see the United Nations Charter consumed as a casualty in the war flames of the struggle. They must enforce the Charter against all who are fighting in Asia. That is the issue—the issue of peace or war—that is facing them as well as us.

I close by pleading that my country, and its people, not forsake the moral principles and values which cry out to be saved in this hour. I plead with them not to commit themselves to a unilateral war in Asia for purposes which many of their own political leaders were ill advised in the first place. There is still no answer to the Biblical injunction: "He shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks."

The United States has everything to gain and little to lose by seeking to implement that teaching at an international conference table.

The United States has much to lose and little to gain by continuing our unilateral military action in southeast Asia, unsanctioned by the United Nations and unaccompanied by allies.

No nation in history has had such a great opportunity as this one now has to strike a blow for peace at an international conference table.

I shall not support any substitute which takes the form of a predated declaration of war. In my judgment, that is what the pending joint resolution is.

I shall not support any delegation of the duty of Congress—of Congress, not the President—to determine an issue of war or peace.

I shall not support any substitute which takes the form of military action to expand the war or that encourages our puppets in Saigon to expand the war.

Adherence to the United Nations Charter is the only policy that affords the hope of leading the American people out of this jam without a war. I shall continue to plead for such a policy as long as time remains.

If war overtakes us first, then we will have no choice but to unite behind its prosecution.

But, first, that calls for a declaration of war and not a resolution that seeks to authorize the President to make war without our declaring war. That was the position I took in 1955; and I incorporate by reference every argument I used in opposition to a preventive war resolution of that date.

But I see no more chance of conventional military victory in North Vietnam and China than in South Vietnam, and I therefore plead that the SEATO treaty and the United Nations Charter, rather than solitary force of arms, guide our actions in southeast Asia.

I am convinced that a continuation of the U.S. unilateral military action in southeast Asia, which has now taken on the aspects of open aggressive fighting, endangers the peace of the world.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 6, 1964]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the record of the Senate already shows, the majority leader and I had a conference a few moments ago, in which a unanimous-consent agreement was reached that the Senate would resume tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, that we would vote at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, that the senior Senator from Oregon would be allowed 2 hours of that time, and that the other hour would be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders.

I shall make my major rebuttal speech at that time, but for just a few moments tonight there are certain facts I want to put into the RECORD, so that they will be in the RECORD tomorrow.

Yesterday I made a major speech in opposition to the pending resolution. I now incorporate that speech by reference and stand on every word I uttered.

In that speech I said the United States was a provocateur, along with South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Red China, and the Pathet Lao in Laos, and possibly on some occasions, Cambodia, and that the United States must assume and be charged with its share of responsibility for a series of provocations that have led to the crisis which now exists in southeast Asia.

I repeat it tonight. I am satisfied that there is no question about it.

Mr. President, we have stood in violation of the United Nations Charter for years in South Vietnam. Even the neutral commission composed of representatives from India, Canada, and Poland found North Vietnam and South Vietnam in violation of the articles of the Geneva accords. The South Vietnam violation was due to the military operations of the United States in South Vietnam. That is our provocation.

As will be seen before I finish these brief remarks tonight, we have not reported our military buildup in South Vietnam to the United Nations under article 51, which is a clear treaty obligation of the United States. We have never done it, Mr. President.

So the senior Senator from Oregon does not modify in one iota his charge that contrary to its treaty obligations, the United States has been a provocateur in southeast Asia along with South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Red China, the Pathet Lao in Laos, and possibly Cambodia.

No one can possibly justify the attack on American ships in Tonkin Bay off North Vietnam. The senior Senator from Oregon, from the very beginning, has been highly critical of it and has condemned it.

As in domestic criminal law, crimes are committed, but they are sometimes committed under provocation. The provocation is taken into account by a wise judge in imposing sentence.

Some provocative factors were involved, which I mentioned yesterday, but I want to mention them again tonight for the record. On Friday, July 31, South Vietnamese naval vessels—not junks but armed vessels of the PT boat type made available to South Vietnam by way of our aid program—had bombed two North Vietnamese islands. One island is approximately 3 miles and one approximately 5 miles from the main coast of North Vietnam.

As I made clear this morning in the committee meeting, the United States did not act in a vacuum with respect to that bombing. The United States knew that the bombing was going to take place. The United States has been in close advisory relationship with the military dictatorship we have been supporting as a military protectorate in South Vietnam for quite some time. We knew for quite some time that the dictator of South Vietnam has wanted to go north. We know that recently there was a big demonstration in Saigon, staged pretty much by students, but there were others, and in response to a speech made by Dictator Khanh, the cry was, "Go north, go north go north," which meant that the cry was for escalating the war into North Vietnam.

We also know that as a result of that incident, which ended in an incident of some riot proportions, in that the rioters pulled down some memorials which had been erected to the French dead in Saigon, General Khanh and Ambassador Taylor had some diplomatic conversations. Most Senators have read that the latest diplomatic conversation had taken place at a party out in the country, at an estate, which Khanh and the Ambassador had attended. The stories which came out of that meeting were to the effect that they had resolved their differences and that there was a recognition on the part of the general that the United States would not favor an extension and expansion of the war to the north.

On Friday, July 31, the war was escalated to the north. That is not a matter of infiltration. That is not a matter of junks seeking to bring in supplies. That is not a matter of South Vietnamese intelligence people being slipped into North Vietnam or of North Vietnamese intelligence agents being slipped into South Vietnam. This was a well thought out military operation. These islands were bombed.

When these islands were bombed, American destroyers were on patrol in Tonkin Bay, and they were not 60 or 65 miles away. What I am about to say I can say without revealing the source and without violating any secrecy.

It is undeniable that in the patrolling operations of our destroyers in Tonkin Bay the destroyers have patrolled within 11 miles and not more than 3 miles off the coast of North Vietnam. The reason that these are the figures is that there is a conflict between the United States and North Vietnam. North Vietnam claims that her national waters go out to 12 miles. She is not the only country in the world that claims it. The United States takes the position that national waters extend only 3 miles. I believe our position is absolutely right. I believe the weight of international law is in favor of us. I think the so-called exceptions which are often cited in international law cases, which certain proponents seek to use to throw doubt over the whole principle, are exceptions which apply in geographic locations in the world and are special in their nature. Some Latin American neighbors claim not only 12 miles, but, in some instances, more than 12 miles, particularly when they think extending the national waters beyond 12 miles may give them great commercial advantages in respect to fishing rights.

I only mention it in passing to show that this fact is a point of international law which is frequently under considerable dispute and controversy.

I repeat my premise. There is no question about the fact American naval vessels, in their legitimate rights of patrol in Tonkin Bay, patrolled within an area of 3 miles to 11 miles in extent.

They patrolled under 12 miles to demonstrate that we did not recognize any 12-mile limit, and stayed beyond 3 miles to make it clear that we respected and abided by what we thought was the international law right of North Vietnam.

We had the international right to do that. The senior Senator from Oregon has never taken the position that we have no right to patrol in Tonkin Bay in international waters. It ought to be done with discretion. If we wish to argue in one breath that we are against escalating the war, we have a little difficulty in the next breath justifying, in my judgment, the course of action that we followed in respect to South Vietnamese bombing of the two islands 3 to 5 miles off the coast of North Vietnam, and then having American naval vessels, a part of our Navy, so close to the North Vietnamese coast, although in international waters, as they were on Friday, July 31, when the bombing took place.

Oh, Mr. President, the Pentagon and the State Department throw up their hands in aggrievement if anyone suggests, as I did in my speech yesterday, that their very presence there is subject to the interpretation that they were a backstop. All the protestations on the part of the State Department and the Pentagon cannot change a physical fact. The presence of those ships in that proximity to the North Vietnamese coast, while an act of war was being committed against North Vietnamese coast by the bombings of those islands, was bound to implicate us. We are implicated.

One can deny, deny, and deny, but the fact that the ships were that close while the bombing took place is bound to be interpreted as a provocation, and also must be considered when we look at the matter of the reaction to it as an extenuating fact.

Mr. President, I do not know exactly the mileage location of the American naval vessels while the bombing took place. I do not know whether it was 4 miles, 11 miles, or 20 miles. But the very fact that these ships were in that general area of Tonkin Bay, where they could have given, if it became necessary, protection, in my judgment implicates the United States.

It is bound to be looked upon by our enemies as an act of provocation; and it makes us a provocateur under the circumstances.

It is difficult to find out exactly what happened in regard to the ultimate attack on the *Maddox* on Sunday. The bombing took place on Friday. But I think I violate no privilege or no secrecy if I say that subsequent to the bombing, and apparently because there was some concern about some intelligence that we are getting, our ships took out to sea; that is, they changed their course, instead of remaining close to the mainland of North Vietnam, as they had a perfect right under international law to do. But as a result of the concern that was caused by the bombardment by the South Vietnamese—our ships went a considerably greater distance from the shores of North Vietnam. Approximately 60 miles offshore was the point at which the attack by the North Vietnamese PT boats took place.

That was an act of aggression on their part against the United States. There is no question that we were clearly within our rights in replying with force and sinking their ships, if we could. Apparently we did sink one of their ships. That closed that incident.

* * * * *

The resolution will pass, and Senators who vote for it will live to regret it.

Mr. President, to pick up where I left off, the point I am making is that I believe that when the United States became aware of the fact that South Vietnamese planned to bomb the two islands, the United States should have moved in and done everything it could to prevent an escalation of the war.

In my judgment, that act constituted a major escalation of this war. The escalation has been speeding up at an increased tempo ever since. I had made the point that there were naval boats in Tonkin Bay in much closer proximity to the two islands, 3 to 5 miles from Vietnam, than the 60- to 65-mile locaton which the *Maddox* had reached on Sunday when the attack took place, the bombardment taking place on Friday.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that it is quite irrelevant and immaterial whether the captain of the *Maddox* knew anything about the bombardment of the island. He was not conducting a war. He was under orders. I am taking the criticism that, in my judgment, American armed vessels should not have been as close to the islands as they were on Friday, July 31. In my judgment, that gave cause for the North Vietnamese to assume that there was a cause-and-effect relationship between the bombardment by the South Vietnamese vessels and the presence of the American naval patrol boats in Tonkin Bay at the location where they then were.

I repeat that I believe we not only had every right, but we had the clear obligation to protect our men aboard, to protect the vessels, and proceed with the military action by way of the response that our vessels gave to the PT boats of the North Vietnamese who were attempting to torpedo them.

On Tuesday, the next incident occurred. I agree with those who have expressed perplexity as to why the North Vietnamese on Tuesday night in a storm, after 9 o'clock, apparently at night, attempted another armed attack on our vessels.

It certainly was within our right, and I believe our clear duty in order to protect the men aboard and the vessels, to respond with military action designed to sink the attacking vessels.

Mr. President, that action on both Sunday and Saturday night was completely within the realm of international law. We were completely engaged in acts of self-defense. We had every right to respond with force.

I now come to the delicate question. I come to the one, Mr. President—and I make the statement respectfully—about which many people wave the flag into tatters. That is the subsequent action, when our ships were not under fire, in which the United States escalated the war to the mainland of North Vietnam, and the United States selected for itself targets on the mainland of North Vietnam to bomb. We know that that was substantial bombing. We know that that involved the bombing of the areas where their naval vessels were harbored, and that it involved the bombing of ammunition dumps and oil locations.

I do not care how one tries to spell it. I do not care with how much political fervor by way of semantics we attempt to describe it. The fact is that the United States was not protecting any ships at that time.

Mr. President, we either believe in settling international disputes by resort to the procedures of international law or by resort to war. We cannot cut this one both ways. After the second attack in defense of our ships in which we engaged, unless we expect to be charged with engaging in acts of aggression, we should have immediately laid our case under the United Nations Charter before the Security Council of the United Nations. In my judgment, we were dead wrong in proceeding to bomb the establishments on the mainland of North Vietnam and then out of the corners of our mouths saying, "Well, we are not seeking to expand the war. We do not want to widen the war. We are just going to defend ourselves."

Mr. President, bombing those sites was not necessary for self-defense at that point. At that point the United States was guilty of an act of aggression. The United States could no longer after that say that the war was being escalated only by South Vietnam, for the United States then escalated the war into North Vietnam. It is my judgment that it violated its obligations under the United Nations Charter, for there is nothing in the United Nations Charter that justifies such an act of aggression under those circumstances.

What a much stronger position we would be in in keeping with our oft-repeated professing that we believe in the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle war of military might as a means of settling disputes between nations.

Mr. President, we should have resorted to the United Nations then.

Oh, say some in their patriotic speeches, that would have been putting our tail between our legs and running.

What nonsense. I should like to use an argument by analogy in the field of domestic law. We lawyers know that there are few controversies between people that can be more heated than a dispute over a boundary line between property owners. The lawbooks are full of remarkable accounts of what human frailties cause people to do sometimes over a dispute involving boundary lines. So let us take my farmers A and B. They have one rough argument over a boundary line. The disputes took place for some time. Finally one day A and B met in the area of the disputed boundary. A pulled a gun on B, shot at him, and missed him. B, exercising his right to defense, knocks him down, takes the gun away from him and beats him up, and B goes back home. On his way back home he says, "I have more guns."

Now, A was in the right and B was in the wrong. B was the aggressor; A was the aggressed upon, and he had a just cause for assault or a more serious crime—assault with intent to kill. Instead of taking his charge to the courts, going down and getting the sheriff to take jurisdiction and proceeding to take the course of judicial process, suppose A decided he would invade B's home and destroy the guns that he might have in his home. We know what would happen under domestic law to Mr. B under those circumstances. In the second case he would now be the aggressor.

I use the analogy, but I do not apply it beyond the point that I now make, and that is that after the second attack, there is no question that we had North Vietnam dead to rights in any charge we might bring before the United Nations. And that is where we should have gone. Let us face the foreign policy that we decided to follow. That is what I meant yesterday when I pointed out that apparently the line of American foreign policy in southeast Asia is the line that we shall demonstrate to them that we shall use force, and that there will be more force to come if they do not desist from violations of their international obligations. When I say "they," I mean North Vietnam, Red China, the Pathet Lao, and others on that side of this war.

That is the policy that the United States apparently has been trying to get away with. It is a policy that asserts that if we merely use enough force, and make clear by way of enough threats that it will be pretty bad and hard on them if they do not fold and yield to our threats—if we follow that course of action, we shall avert the danger of war. Under that policy we greatly increase the risk of a full-scale war in Asia. But whether we did or not, that policy cannot be justified as a matter of principle, because that policy cannot be reconciled with our obligations under the United Nations Charter. In my judgment, we ought to abide by our treaty obligations.

Although I know the point I have just made is highly unpopular with those who think we ought to do just as we please under the circumstances and then, after we dominate the battelfield, go to the United Nations, and that is the policy of my Government. It is dead wrong. It is wrong in principle. It is wrong in morality. It is wrong also because it cannot be reconciled with our professing that we do not believe in the use of military might as the weapon to be used to settle disputes that threaten the peace of the world. To the contrary, we claim a belief in a resort to the rules of reason as they are embodied in treaties we have signed, such as the United Nations Charter.

So I say we are a provocateur. My colleagues become excited and seem to think I am guilty of some heinous accusation without any substantiation in fact. We would have been in a stronger position before the eyes of the world tonight if, after we had responded, as we had a right to respond Tuesday night, to the attack on our ships, we had on Wednesday laid that issue before the United Nations and asked the United Nations to proceed to take action encompassed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Oh, no. We had to proceed to bomb the mainland of North Vietnam on the basis that we had the right to do it in self-defense because they had attacked our ships on the high seas.

We have a right to do it if we want to make war, but then we should not deny that we have a policy of war when we say we are seeking peace. It is hypocrisy to say out of one side of one's month, "We only want peace," but to say from the other side of the mouth, "But we are justified in committing acts of war."

Issues of international litigation are involved in this case. There would not be a system of justice on the domestic front if we allowed people to shoot each other up while a trial was being conducted to determine whether the shooting of A by B was justified.

Mr. President, other arguments were made today. Several Senators think they help their case by voting for the joint resolution if they make statements in the Record such as were made today, to the effect "We want it understood that, although we are going to vote for this resolution, it is very important that we make clear to our allies that they come in under the SEATO Treaty and be of help to us."

They asked questions as to whether or not the resolution gives assurance of it. There is not a word of it in the resolution. There is not a word in the resolution that involves any commitment by anybody that there is going to be any help under the SEATO Treaty. All we say is that, because of the SEATO Treaty, we are going to do certain things.

It was said by one of my good colleagues that Great Britain was involved elsewhere, and that Pakistan and India are involved elsewhere. With hundreds of millions of dollars of American military aid under the foreign aid of past years, they are maneuvering themselves into a position where they can conduct a war against each other—with American equipment—if somebody pulls the trigger and a battle starts over Kashmir.

As I have been heard to say on the floor in recent weeks, even the foreign minister of Pakistan stood up in the Press Club in Washington, D.C., and publicly stated that they had no intention of helping us in South Vietnam. As the Congressional Record will show, I made the statement that we should make it clear that we are cutting off military assistance. That would be a good thing, anyway, from the standpoint of maintaining peace between India and Pakistan, because they could not carry on a war very long if the United States did not continue to pour millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money into those countries by way of foreign aid.

We were told that Australia is stepping up its assistance and that she is going to increase the number of men she has sent there. He forgot to say that the offer of Australia was to increase the manpower contribution to the war in Vietnam from 30 to 60. Mr. President, do not think you misunderstood me. That is the figure—from 30 to 60 men.

As I said to the Secretary of State when he made the announcement some weeks ago, he insulted my intelligence and the intelligence of the American people.

There was one other condition in that great offer on the part of Australia to expand its contribution and help in South Vietnam. Perhaps, in 4 months, they may be able to have six cargo planes available.

Of course, if there is one thing we can get along without, it is cargo planes. We have our own surplus of them.

Mr. President, when we run down the list of allies, we find none of them offering to send boys to do any of the dying in South Vietnam. The dying will have to be done by American boys and South Vietnamese boys.

If any Senator thinks he is a face saver, in connection with a vote from this joint resolution, on the basis that the resolution is going to help increase the cooperation of our allies under SEATO in the conduct of the operations in South Vietnam, I say there is not a word in the resolution that would justify any such hope or implication.

Another Senator thought, in the early part of the debate, that this course would not broaden the power of the President to engage in a land war if he decided that he wanted to apply the resolution in that way.

That Senator was taking great consolation in the then held belief that, if he voted for the resolution, it would give no authority to the President to send many troops into Asia.

I am sure he was quite disappointed to finally learn, because it took a little time to get the matter cleared, that the resolution places no restriction on the President in that respect. If he is still in doubt, let him read the language on page 2, lines 3 to 6, and page 2, lines 11 to 17. The first reads:

"The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

It does not say he is limited in regard to the sending of ground forces. It does not limit that authority. That is why I have called it a predated declaration of war, in clear violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which vests the power to declare war in the Congress, and not in the President.

What is proposed is to authorize the President of the United States, without a declaration of war, to commit acts of war.

It is not a new position for the senior Senator from Oregon. I opposed the Formosa resolution in 1955. I opposed the Middle East resolution in 1957. I will say something about those resolutions in a moment.

Let us go to section 2 of the pending joint resolution. Line 9 reads: "Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force."—It does not say "excluding the use of the Army." It does not say "including the use only of the Navy." It does not say "including the use of the Air Force." It says, "including the use of armed force." That is all branches of the Military Establishment, and nuclear as well as conventional weapons—"to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Mr. President, it is as broad as the Military Establishment. A Senator cannot get any consolation out of that by hoping that, if he votes for it, the President cannot send out large numbers of ground forces.

U.S. FORCES TO BE COVERED INCLUDE THOSE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

I was very much interested in the comments of several Senators in the debate this afternoon in regard to the SEATO Treaty. I say most respectfully that the SEATO Treaty will not help any Senator, either. The resolution supports "all necessary measures to repeal any armed attack against the forces of the United States."

We have forces of the United States in South Vietnam. I should like to ask the proponents of the joint resolution, before the debate is over, to tell us whether the language "all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" includes our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, which now include troops, vehicles, tanks, and aircraft. Apparently we are pouring more in. There is no question that we have more than 20,000 troops there tonight. Does this language mean an authorization to become full combatants in the civil war if there is an attack on any segment of our forces in South Vietnam?

Let us face the issue. I do not believe there is any doubt that we are being engaged, in an increasing tempo, in escalating this war into North Vietnam. I am not sure that we shall be able to stop there. We may take it into Red China before we are through. I am also satisfied that we shall become combatants along with the South Vietnamese in the civil war. That is exactly what they would like.

They have done a very poor job settling their own civil war.

Here is a country, as I stated in my speech last night, of 15 million population. Here is a country, with its armed forces of 400,000 to 450,000 men, engaged in a civil war with a group of Vietcongs—South Vietnamese, too—of not more than 35,000. The testimony before our committee is that it is probably in the neighborhood of 25,000. Fifteen million people, with an armed force of 400,000 to 450,000 soldiers, cannot bring under subjugation a dissident group of 25,000 or 35,000 people, in spite of the fact that the American taxpayer has poured \$3½ billion into South Vietnam. Whom do they think they are fooling? They will not fool the American people indefinitely.

The French Government tried that. For 8 long bloody years they did a pretty good job of fooling the French people. But after 240,000 casualtes, including 90,000 killed, and thousands upon thousands badly wounded, the French people pulled down the government. They said, "We have had enough. We are not going to sacrifice any more French manhood."

Unpopular as it is, I am perfectly willing to make the statement for history that if we follow a course of action that bogs down thousands of American boys in Asia, the administration responsible for it will be rejected and repudiated by the American people. It should be.

Mr. President, this problem in Asia cannot be settled by war. The problem in Asia requires a political and economic settlement. It requires a negotiated settlement. It requires a conference table settlement. It requires the application of reason, not bullets.

I cannot understand what is happening to my country. I cannot understand what makes people think that way. There are not many at the grassroots of America who think that way. People in positions in Government think that we can entrench ourselves as a military power in Asia and bring about a peaceful solution of the problem. The result will be that the yellow race will hate us more than it hates us already. If the yellow race has not made clear to the white man that Asia is not his fort, I do not know what the white man has to learn by way of an additional lesson.

The place to settle this controversy is not by way of the proposed predated declaration of war, giving to the President the power to make war without a declaration of war. The place to settle it is around the conference tables, the only hope mankind has for peace; namely, the United Nations.

With all its shortcomings, if we destroy it—and we would destroy it with a war—not much hope will be left.

NO LIMITS ON WORDS "FURTHER AGGRESSION"

Before the debate is over tomorrow I should like to have the proponents of the resolution comment on the fact that the resolution continues with the words "and to prevent further aggression."

I should like to have the proponents spell that out. Further aggression against whom? Further aggression by whom?

I should like to have them spell out the provisions of the SEATO Treaty and the United Nations Charter with which our actions are consonant. If we are engaged in helping South Vietnam repel an armed attack, we are obliged under the SEATO Treaty and under article 51 of the U.N. Charter to report it to the Security Council. We have not done that through all the years.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate object to my calling the United States a provocateur. Our constant, repetitious violation of our treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter, which I set out by documentation yesterday in my speech on the floor of the Senate, is clear provocation. We have said to our potential enemies, "We are going to do what we want to do, and you can like it or not." Not so many weeks ago Adlai Stevenson lent his lips in the Security Council to say, in effect—in my judgment to his historic discredit, and it would have been better if he had resigned as Ambassador—as the representative of the United States at the United Nations that the United States was going to do what it wanted to do in Asia, and they could like it or not.

That is not the world statesman for whom I campaigned in 1952. No, Mr. President; we are a provocateur nation. We have provoked trouble because we have not even kept our commitments, either under SEATO or article 51 of the United Nations Charter, by carrying out the requirement of the reports that we are pledged to make, and by placing the issue before the U.N.

Yet we are saying to the world, "All we want is peace." Our Secretary of State says that we will have peace if the countries of North and South Vietnam will do exactly what we want them to do. In essence, that is what the position of the Secretary of State adds up to. There would not be lawsuits, either, if one of the parties would do what the other wanted him to do. That is what the controversy is all about.

FIRST OBLIGATION IS TO FOLLOW U.N. CHARTER

I do not agree with the North Vietnamese. I do not agree with the Vietcong. But we must face up to the fact that they, too, have their international rights; and the place to settle the controversy over international rights and obligations in this modern day is not on a battlefield, but around the conference table, where the procedures or authorities that set forth the rules of international adjudication will prevail.

The great Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in his speech this afternoon, cited that important article of the United Nations Charter that places upon every signatory thereto the obligation, first—that is spelled "f-i-r-s-t"—to seek to resolve disputes by way of adjudication or mediation or arbitration or conciliation or negotiation. In that great speech, the Senator from Alaska cited the disputes, and then, in one rhetorical question after another, asked: Have we taken it to arbitration? Have we taken it to conciliation? Have we taken it to mediation? Have we taken it to negotiation? Have we taken it to conference? The answer is that the United States has a grade of zero on that examination. We have flunked the course.

To Senators who object to my suggesting that the United States is a provocateur nation, I say we have a dismal record—so dismal that it spells out the word "provocateur." I listened to a couple of my colleagues on television last night. They had heard the senior Senator from Oregon charge that we are a provocateur nation. So I was all ears. I thought I was going to hear the case that we are not. But there was no case.

It is so easy to say that these things should not be said; that they create disunity and misunderstanding. So long as there is any hope to win a peace and stop a war, the senior Senator from Oregon will state the facts as he honestly believes them to be. When those facts involve misdoings of my own country, it is all the more important that they be stated.

Mr. President, we have a great historic opportunity to strengthen the cause of the rule of law in the world. But we cannot strengthen it and make war at the same time.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] said again today, as he said a few weeks ago, that what is needed is an agreement to enter into a cease-fire order. Why have we not proposed it? That is the kind of speech Adlai Stevenson should be making at the United Nations. I am greatly disappointed that the other signatories to the United Nations Charter have not been proposing it.

Are we so powerful that they dare not bring up a case to which we are party without our consent? I am exceedingly disappointed that North Vietnam, South Vietnam, the Pathet Lao, the United States, and Red China have not had the rules applied to them in connection with the war in southeast Asia, because that war cannot be reconciled with the United Nations Charter and the obligations in respect thereto by the signatories thereof.

But, say Senators, Red China is not a member of the United Nations. Red China does not have to be a member of the United Nations for the signatories thereto to take jurisdiction over a threat to the peace of the world. Where do Senators get the idea that the United Nations does not go into action unless all the countries involved in a threat to the peace of the world are members of the United Nations? Senators should re-read the Charter of the United Nations. I have read it for the benefit of the Senate. It has occurred time and time again during the last 5 months.

I say with great sadness in my heart that many of the signatories to the United Charter have failed mankind by not having brought before the United Nations this threat to the peace of the world in Asia, in all of its aspects.

Some Senators said to me today, "What is the matter with you, Wayne? Don't you know that we now have this situation in Tonkin Bay before the Security Council?"

Certainly. We had another one before the Security Council a while back, when the little prince in Cambodia kicked us out of Cambodia, and said, "We have had enough of you. Get out. We don't want any more of your aid." Then he filed charges against us for violating his borders, after we had been caught redhanded and had a helicopter shot down after it had dropped a fire bomb and burned a village killing 16 civilians. Unfortunately, the American boy who was flying that helicopter was sacrificed. We quickly apologized. But, as I have said, does anyone think that that apology would have been forthcoming if we had not been caught? We would not have heard about the incident. I am satisfied that that was not the only violation of Cambodia's borders by both South Vietnam and the United States. We heard about this one only because we got caught.

What about all the threats and actions and incidents that preceded that in the Gulf of Tonkin? Why have they never been submitted to the Security Council?

Here we are about to authorize the President of the United States to do whatever he wishes and use any armed force he likes, not in the Gulf of Tonkin, but anywhere in southeast Asia. But there is no "southeast Asia" question before the U.N.

Why not? If there is not a breach of the peace and a threat to international peace and security there, I do not know what is.

All of South Vietnam for the last 3 years has been a threat to the peace. Why is not that situation placed before the U.N.?

We do not get much consolation out of our sorry record of not having reported our courses of action under article 51 of the United Nations Charter. I hope some Senators tomorrow will have something to say about that. I have a long list of interesting fallacious arguments and exhibitions of wishful thinking that were expressed in the debate this afternoon; but I shall reserve them for tomorrow.

Mr. President (Mr. Hart in the chair), I close my commenting only on previous resolutions passed in the Senate: Formosa, the Middle East, and Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record in parallel column form, as shown in the paper which I hold in my hand, a comparison of those resolutions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record:

"Vietnam	*"Cuba*
"Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace;	"Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers 'to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety'; and
"Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom;	"Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that 'an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations'; and
"Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area but desires only that they should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way; now, therefore, be it	
	"Whereas the Foreign Minister of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from contracontinental Communist powers, including the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union'; and
	"Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it
"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.	*"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States is determined— "(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; "(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and
"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any protocol or member state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.	"(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.
"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress, except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses."	

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, in connection with these resolutions, several Senators stated this afternoon that the United States was not asking for any more in the resolution now before the Senate than has already been asked for in the past, as though that were a sound argument. What has that to do with whether or not we pass the pending joint resolution? If we make mistakes in the past—as we have done, in my judgment—we should not make another one now.

I did not make those mistakes. With that great liberal, the former Senator from New York, Herbert Lehman, who in my 20 years

"Formosa	*"Middle East*
"Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and	
"Whereas certain territories in the west Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparation for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores,	
"Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the west Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and	
"Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the Western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and	
"Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the west Pacific area directed against territories, therein described, in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore be it	
"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.	*"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.
	"SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace and preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed force to assist any nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided,* That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States.
"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."	"This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress."

of service in the Senate has had no peer, I joined in 1955 in opposition to the Formosa resolution. At that time, I pointed out, as I have done in the course of this debate, that it, too, was a preventive war resolution. By a preventive war resolution at that time, we meant that it was a resolution that, first, sought to give the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the authority to make a strike against the mainland of China before an act of aggression had been committed by China against the United States.

As a result of the argument in committee over that statement, Mr. President, the Senate will remember that we received the famous Eisenhower White House statement, in the course of that debate, to the effect that the President, and he alone, would make the decision as to what course of action would be followed under the resolution.

I stated that that was not good enough for me. I do not intend to give to any President the power to make war by way of a predated declaration of war. I argued then, as I have argued in this historic debate, that the power to make war is vested in the Congress and not in the President. I voted against it.

With reference to the Formosa resolution there was a reference to the President, and I quote from it:

"That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

The same principle is embodied in the pending joint resolution.

The Middle East resolution was another predated or undated declaration of war resolution, giving to President Eisenhower predated declaration of war power in the Middle East. That will be found in the Middle East resolution:

"Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism."

Clear authorization of what I stated at the time, and repeat tonight, was an unconstitutional power to be vested in the President of the United States.

CUBAN RESOLUTION DELEGATED NO POWER TO PRESIDENT

Now we come to the Cuban resolution. The interesting thing is that the Cuban resolution was not a resolution designed to vest any power in the President. That fact has been lost sight of in debate this afternoon. Senators have stated that we did this in the Cuban resolution. The answer is that we did not.

I voted for the Cuban resolution. I voted for the Cuban resolution because that constitutional power of Congress was not delegated to the President in that resolution.

In a statement I wrote to my constituents on October 2, 1962, discussing my vote on that Cuban resolution, I stated:

"On September 21, I joined 85 other Senators in voting for the following resolution on our relations with Cuba: 'The United States is determined (a) by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, to prevent the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; (b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and (c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.'

"Earlier, I had joined in signing a unanimous joint report from the Foreign Relations and Armed Service Committees, recommending adoption of this resolution. The report was made following hearings at which we heard from Secretary of State Rusk and William P. Bundy, Director of the Office of International Security Affairs of the Defense Department.

"They described in some detail, in closed session, the nature and techniques of the sea and air surveillance we maintain over Cuba, and over activities on this narrow island. It was from this observation that they were able to say that the military activities in Cuba are still of a defensive nature and not now an offensive threat to the United States.

"The resolution, unlike the Formosa and Middle East resolutions, is not a delegation of warmaking power to the President. It is a statement of U.S. foreign policy. It is one I heartily endorse, and one which should be read carefully and with sober consideration in both Havana and Moscow."

Mr. President, I close by reading the full language of the Cuban resolution. I have just made a distinction between the Cuban resolution, the Formosa and the Middle East resolutions—and now the southeast Asia resolution, which is as different as night from day.

The Cuban resolution provided:

"Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers 'to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety'; and

"Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that 'an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations'; and

"Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: 'The present Governmnet of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist power, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union'; and

"Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States is determined—

"(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

"(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

"(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

Mr. President, there is not one word authorizing any power to be vested in the President of the United States.

Senators have forgotten the record made when we debated in connection with the Cuban resolution, what is proposed under the southeast Asian resolution. That question was debated on the floor of the Senate.

I say with sadness, in view of the situation in the Senate tonight, that when the Cuban resolution was being considered, a substantial number of Senators served clear notice that they would not vote for it if it sought to authorize any power in the President of the United States.

Out of deep affection and great love for President Kennedy, I say that President Kennedy did not ask to have any authority authorized in that resolution as far as the Presidency was concerned. I have no quarrel with that statement of foreign policy. I would have no quarrel with that statement of foreign policy applied to southeast Asia.

Under that statement of policy, doors are left open and the obligations remain clear, to resort to the peaceful procedures set forth in the United Nations treaty, and set forth in our other treaty obligations.

I close, Mr. President, by saying, sad as I find it to be to have to say it, that in my judgment there is no course of action that I could possibly follow in keeping with my conscience and my convictions in regard to my constitutional obligation under the oath that I took four times when I came into this body, but to vote against the joint resolution tomorrow. In my judgment, this resolution, no matter what semantics are used, spells out the ugly words: "Undated declaration of war power to be vested in the President of the United States."

Congress has no constitutional power to grant such authority to the President of the United States. The only difficulty is that under our constitutional system, I know of no way that we can get it before the Supreme Court for a constitutional determination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say for the benefit of the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States that I stand on every word of both of those speeches, and I stand on every word of my speech today.

I repeat that I think we ought to seek now, as fast as possible, to get a multilateral negotiation table set up with the United States and our allies on one side of that table, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong on the other. And I think one can make a case for having China there, too, for I think she has been in this war underneath from the beginning, but at the head of the table we should have the representatives of the noncombatant nations of the world. They have a vital stake in the peace of Southeast Asia and all of Asia. They should conduct the negotiations and make equitable and fair proposals for settlement and give careful consideration to the proposals of the combatants, but leave mankind to peace in Asia before it is too late.

With the unfortunate remark of the Secretary of State in his press conference of 5 or 6 weeks ago, for the first time we had it said by the administration that one of the reasons for our being in Asia was the containment of China. In the Foreign Relations Committee we knew it was the policy, but we were not free to say so because of matters of privilege.

Mr. President, in that statement the Secretary of State said, when pressed by the press—and it was one of his latest public hearings before the press—to make an explanation of the reasons for our being in Asia, that one of them was the containment of China.

Let the American people be told that we cannot contain China with American military might without eventually going to war with China. And that means the beginning of World War III, out of which no victors will emerge.

Mr. President, as we move further into this critical stage, let us pray to our God tonight that judgment and reason will be restored to our minds and that we will seek a multilateral settlement of this dispute and that the United States will stop insisting upon bilateral negotiations or a surrender to settle the war in Vietnam, for the war will never be settled in that manner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION FOR COMPENSATION FOR INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority and minority leaders, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 260) providing for compensation for Investigating Subcommittee employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 260) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, the compensation of employees of Senate Committees which would have been payable on February 20 if Senate Resolutions presently on the Senate Calendar had been agreed to by that date, such payments to be charged to the aforesaid resolutions, if and when agreed to by the Senate. If any such resolution fails to be agreed to, payments made to employees under this resolution shall be charged to this resolution.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN THE INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am happy to be associated with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who is also chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, in cosponsoring the bill he introduced Monday, directed to the urgent task of bolstering our internal security law.

At a dinner just 1 month ago today in New York, John J. Abt, the chief counsel for the Communist Party, boasted of the fact that the Communists have been able to "knock out" eight entire sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Mr. Abt's boasts were amply justified.

The fact is that the Internal Security Act now on the books has been seriously vitiated by a whole series of Supreme Court decisions; and these decisions have also served to vitiate State security laws which were intended to operate in support of the Internal Security Act.

As early as 1956 the Supreme Court, in Slochower against Board of Education of New York, held that a New York law which permitted the summary discharge of any employee who invoked the fifth amendment before an investigating committee of the United States was in violation of due process. As a result of this decision, no public employee may now be discharged because of having invoked the fifth amendment in reply to a question that has to do with fraud, or embezzlement, or Communist associations, or espionage, or indeed, anything else.

This situation, of course, is patently ridiculous. It is tantamount to preventing a bank president from dismissing a teller who refused to say whether he was stealing bank funds.

In 1957, in Yates against the United States—the second Yates case—the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of 14 known members of the Communist Party under the Smith Act. The Smith Act, among other things, prohibited the advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force of violence. The Court concluded, however, that the law could not prohibit advocacy in the abstract, but that its prohibition could only be directed to advocacy which results in unlawful action.

In layman's language, this is tantamount to saying that the mere advocacy of the forceful overthrow of our Government cannot be considered a crime unless it leads either to the overthrow, or attempted overthrow, or the overthrow in part, of this Government.

In 1961, in the case of Noto against the United States, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of another known Communist who had been indicted under the Smith Act as a member of a group advocating overthrow of the Government. The decision spoke of the lack of substantial evidence of illegal activity on the part of the Communist Party, and of the need to demonstrate not only that the party engaged in such activity, but that the person indicted was himself involved in this activity. Mere membership in the party, it ruled, was not enough to warrant conviction.

There have, in fact, been an entire series of cases in which the Supreme Court has ruled that mere membership in the party cannot, by itself be considered proof of participation in the Communist conspiracy. In the case of Nowak against the United States in 1957, the ruling was carried to the point of the absurd because the petitioner in this case had been educational director of the Communist Party of Illinois for many years.

The Supreme Court has handed down these decisions not merely in the face of its own recognition that the Communist Party is a conspiracy and not a party like other parties, but in the face of the very substantial body of law which holds that mere membership in a conspiracy makes one liable for the crimes committed by the conspiracy.

The Communists scored one of their most astounding legal victories, however, when the Supreme Court, in the so-called Robel case, which was decided last December, held unconstitutional an act of Congress designed to bar Communists from employment in our defense facilities.

There have been at least a half dozen other decisions handed down which have served to emasculate other sections of the Internal Security Act and of the Smith Act in various ways.

If our Government is to remain a government of laws, we must all, whether we agree or do not agree with them, accept the decisions of the Supreme Court as the law of the land. Having said this much, however, I also feel constrained to say that I am one of the many people who has found it difficult to understand the reasoning behind some of the Supreme Court decisions in the field of internal security, especially their reasoning in the so-called Robel case.

In the face of repeated findings by congressional committees, by the FBI and by the Department of Justice that the Communist Party is a foreign-dominated conspiratorial organization committed to the subversion of our Government, the Supreme Court persists in arguing that the mere fact of membership in the Communist Party does not necessarily involve knowing participation in the Communist conspiracy.

There is today, however, no such thing as innocent membership in the Communist Party. There is a mountain of evidence that every member of the Communist Party works under rigid discipline in support of the party's objectives. Party members in defense plants can be used by the Communists for purposes of espionage or sabotage, to organize work stoppages directed against the national security, and to subvert responsible trade union leadership.

In submitting this new internal security legislation, it is the belief of the sponsors that it meets the objections raised by the Supreme Court, at the same time that it plugs the gaping holes left in our security structure by the series of Supreme Court decisions to which I referred in my previous remarks.

In sponsoring this legislation, we do not seek to challenge the decisions of the Supreme Court nor to override them. We are simply trying to deal in a responsible manner with some of the more vital problems that confront us in the realm of internal security. We have therefore sought to frame our legislation in a manner that avoids the objections the Supreme Court has raised to prior legislation in this field.

I want to call attention to a few specific features of the proposed act.

Title V of the proposed law provides immunity for congressional witnesses for the purpose of compelling their testimony on matters that are of interest to congressional committees. The privilege of the fifth amendment is intended only as a protection against self-incrimination. Once a witness is legally assured of immunity he cannot then claim the right to refuse to testify, on the grounds that his testimony, if he gave it, would tend to be self-incriminating.

Title V therefore provides that when a person has invoked the fifth amendment with respect to any testimony required of him, he may nevertheless be ordered to give such testimony by a vote of a majority of the committee, supported by a written statement from the Attorney General stating that he approves the order; and it further provides that a person who has invoked the fifth amendment and who has testified pursuant to such an order shall be immune from any penalty or forfeiture in consequence of this testimony—unless, of course, he perjures himself or commits contempt.

I would also like to call attention to title VII, section 703, which I think goes very far to protect the rights of the individual and to assure a forum of appeal to all those who may in future feel that they have been unjustly denied the opportunity to work in defense industry because of unevaluated information in their files.

Under this section, the Subversive Activities Control Board will entertain petitions from persons who claims that they have been thus disadvantaged. The clause requires the Board to disclose to the petitioner, so far as possible consonant with security, the nature of any adverse evidence against him, and it permits the petitioner to testify or permit the testimony of others in his behalf.

Section 612 of the proposed law is specifically designed to provide a maximum of protection for those employees whose personal habits or weaknesses make them security risks, but about whose loyalty there is no question. This section makes it possible to transfer such an employee to a nonsensitive position in the same agency or in some other Government agency, provided the head of the agency is satisfied that the transfer is consistent with national security.

The section also provides, that where an individual has been separated from his position for reasons of security, and where the question of loyalty is not at issue, "the agency from which he is to be removed shall avoid to the maximum extent practicable the public release of information which would tend to subject the individual to disgrace or stigma."

These provisions, in my opinion, bend over backwards to protect the individual. At the same time, I believe that they will help to make it possible to enforce a stronger and more rational security program by reducing the penalties and stigmatization that previously used to be associated with being declared a "security risk."

I believe we are all agreed that there are certain situations in which it is contrary to the national interest or to the national security to permit the unrestricted travel of American citizens to certain parts of the world. The methods used to regulate travel heretofore are clearly ineffective. Under the proposed law, the Secretary of State, subject to the approval of the President, would be given statutory authority to prohibit travel to any country, in the absence of special permission, if it is determined that such suspension is essential to the national interest or the national security.

However, section 903 also contains an important safeguard against any arbitrary or unreasonable limitation. Specifically, it provides that no regulation restricting travel shall go into effect "until the Secretary has caused to be compiled and published the findings of fact which provide the basis for his determination."

The provisions to which I have referred as well as the many other provisions of this remarkably comprehensive legislation, combine to make it a measure of the greatest importance to the national security.

It is my earnest hope that my colleagues will give this measure the careful attention it merits and that Congress will enact it before the close of the current session.

Finally, I desire to pay tribute particularly to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, who is also chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for his leadership in offering this measure. I believe he has done a remarkable job, and I am happy to cosponsor the bill.

I am one of those who believe that we are in a death struggle. I do not have many supporters. That does not bother me much. I have been in that plight before. Until our people recognize that we are in a death struggle, we will not do any better than we are doing now. Some day there will have to be an awakening. I believe that one way is by Congress seriously considering and passing this measure. I hope it does so.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW, FEBRUARY 22, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, which business is to be confined to the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the adjournment of the Senate tomorrow until noon on Monday next, the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to receive messages from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs continued to hold hearings on legislation designed to augment the land and water conservation fund. I am an author of one bill on the subject, S. 531. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in coauthoring another, S. 1401.

Each bill seeks to allocate to the fund revenues accruing from petroleum leases on the outer Continental Shelf. I regret that some—not very many—oppose our proposed legislation, for the land and water conservation fund has served a useful and a noble purpose. It needs more revenues; and when it has them, as I am sure it shall, it will facilitate the acquisition and development by the Government of the United States and by State and local governments across the Nation of additional recreational areas and parks for the benefit of all the people.

This morning I made a statement to the committee. The statement included the very excellent presentation on behalf of the Governor of my State, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, made by the Honorable William Penn Mott, the California director of parks and recreation, unequivocally urging enactment of the Jackson-Kuchel bill.

The Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources has also communicated its views on this legislation to the Interior Committee. This conservation organization, led by such distinguished men as Ira N. Gabrielson, Charles Callison, Spencer M. Smith, Jr., and Dewey Anderson, shares my view that to link S. 1401 and a reopening of the dispute settled in 1953 by enactment of the tidelands legislation would endanger our efforts to put America's conservation program on a sound financial basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made, the statement of Mr. Mott, a statistical table indicating the scope of activity of the land and water conservation fund program in California, and the text of a telegram which I have received from the Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

With an increasing awareness of the blight of sprawling cities and the recreational needs of America over the coming decades, Congress in the last few years has authorized dozens of new recreation areas, parks, and seashores. The same acceleration of conservation activity has taken place at the state and local level.

To finance these programs, Congress, in 1964, created the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is comprised of entrance and user fees at Federal recreation areas, the unclaimed Federal tax on pleasure boat fuel, and proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property. The fund is distributed 40 per cent to Federal projects, and 60 per cent to state and local governments on a 50–50 matching basis.

Unfortunately, the sources of revenue available to the fund have been inadequate to meet the needs of authorized projects. Only about $100 million per year is raised from those sources, and a ten year need of $2.7 billion is seen.

Governor Reagan's Director of Parks and Recreation, William Penn Mott, testified in support of S. 1401 before this committee saying that California alone needs six times the amount of money that has been available to it from the fund.

Recognizing the needs of which Mr. Mott so eloquently spoke, Senator Jackson and I, and fifteen of our colleagues in the Senate have sponsored legislation to make Federal revenues from leases on the outer continental shelf available to augment the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This legislation has the support of all responsible conservation organizations in the United States. It is essential if we are to meet the commitment to conservation made in the authorization of dozens of new national parks and recreation areas over the last few years. Without this legislation there may be no money to pay for a Redwood National Park, or to complete the job which we have started at Point Reyes.

Nor will there be adequate money to meet the spiraling needs of the towns and cities of California for recreational areas. To show the broad impact which the Land and Water Conservation Fund has had on California during the first three years of its life.

Any discussion of the use of Federal offshore leasing revenues eventually turns to a perennial proposal to give the coastal states a preferential right, not afforded the other states of the Union, to a portion of these revenues. Fifteen years ago the proposal was stated in the Minority Views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to this Committee's Report on the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. (S. Rep. 411, 83d Cong., 1st Sess., p. 65). Most recently this proposal has taken the form of S. 1826 which is pending before this Committee.

Although this stale idea may be new to some, the problem of the coastal states' rights in the adjoining outer continental shelf first became critically important to California over twenty years ago when I was State Controller. In the case of *United States v. California*, 332 U.S. 19 (1947), at page 38, the United States Supreme Court said:

"The question of who owned the bed of the sea only became of great potential importance at the beginning of this century when oil was discovered there. As a consequence of this discovery, California passed an Act in 1921 authorizing the granting of permits to California residents to prospect for oil and gas on blocks of land off its coast under the ocean. Cal. Stats. 1921, c. 303. This state statute, and others which followed it, together with the leasing practices under them, have precipitated this extremely important controversy, and pointedly raised this state-federal conflict for the first time. Now that the question is here, we decide for the reasons we have stated that *California is not the owner of the three-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the state has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.*" (Emphasis added.)

In the ensuing years a great debate raged over the coastal states' rights to offshore leasing revenues. Finally, in 1953, during my first year in the Senate and on this Committee, we considered and passed the Submerged Lands Act (P.L. 83–31, 67 Stat. 29 (1953)). That act was a great victory for California and other coastal states. The coastal states were granted title to the natural resources beneath navigable waters within their state boundaries. This act gave my state ownership of all subsurface minerals from the beaches seaward to the three mile limit. In the case of California, we obtained a valuable privilege which has brought $318,557,484 into the State Treasury over the last 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the applicable provisions of the Submerged Lands Act into the record:

"SEC. 3. RIGHTS OF THE STATES.—(a) It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

SEC. 4. SEAWARD BOUNDARIES.—The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line or, in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries."

Later in 1953 this Committee, and the Congress approved the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (P.L. 83–212, 67 Stat. 462 (1953)), which provided the method for federal leasing of the federal portion of the outer continental shelf seaward of state boundaries. No part of the outer continental shelf which is under federal control by the terms of these two acts is within the exterior boundaries of any state. The federal leasing revenues are derived from a part of the outer continental shelf which legally is no more a part of the state of Louisiana or California, than it is a part of the state of Iowa.

This Committee inserted an amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act as a caveat to the states, providing that the division of revenues established by these two bills is a final settlement of the interests of the two sovereigns. Let me read that language:

"SEC. 4. LAWS APPLICABLE TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—(a)(3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom."

I might observe that two of the strongest supporters of that language in Executive Session in 1953 still serve on this Committee: our Chairman, Senator Jackson, and our former Chairman, Senator Anderson.

I have heard it argued that the proposal embodied in S. 1826, namely to give coastal states 37½ per cent of federal leasing revenues, is merely an application of the Mineral Leasing Act to the Outer Continental Shelf. That argument was made in 1953 and rejected. The Mineral Leasing Act applies to Federal lands within the boundaries of states. The Submerged Lands Act established that the Federal outer continental shelf lands are by no stretch of the imagination within the boundaries of the individual coastal states.

Fifteen years ago, our colleague, Senator Price Daniel of Texas, was the leading proponent of improving the decisive victory won by the coastal states in the enactment of the Submerged Lands Act by slicing up federal offshore oil leasing revenues for the benefit of the coastal states. He failed. There was so little support for such a proposal that Senator Daniel didn't even offer a formal amendment to the bill to implement his plan.

The proposal has no more support today than it did fifteen years ago. One might as well propose that coastal states get 37½ per cent of all Federal income tax revenues for all the good it will do.

I believe that reopening the decades old dispute which was compromised and settled fifteen years ago would jeopardize the future of conservation in America. Strenuous support for any revenue-splitting scheme between the Federal government and the coastal states would be specious in view of the certainty of its defeat in this Committee, in both houses of Congress, and the assured veto of the President. A crusade for this long discredited idea could, however, kill S. 1401, and with it the Redwood National Park and other conservation legislation pending before Congress.

I refuse to participate in the dismemberment of America's conservation program, and accordingly I will oppose any foredoomed effort to disrupt the time-honored compromise of state and Federal interests which was reached in this Committee, and in the Congress, fifteen years ago. I think it is fair to say that my views are shared by the Chairman, who represents another great coastal state, Washington.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is before your committee two bills pertaining to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, Senate bill 1401, introduced by Senator Henry M. Jackson, and Senate bill S. 531, introduced by Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

I wish to speak in support of the concept which these two bills present, namely providing additional funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. July 1, 1967, marked the third year in which applications have been accepted in California for consideration under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. During this period in which $11 million was available as California's share of this fund, we received applications far in excess of $70 million worth of projects. In other words, the demand for funds exceeded the money available by more than 600 percent.

This demand for funds for land acquisition and capital improvement to meet the recreation demands in California is directly related to the rapid growth being experienced by the State. The California State Department of Finance estimated that the population of California as of January 1, 1968, was 19,774,000, an increase of more than 2 percent over the January 1, 1967, figure of 19,380,000. California's population has increased more than 4 percent during the period of its participation in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program; however, during this same period our annual apportionment has actually decreased. Based upon an average increase in population of 2 percent a year, it is estimated that California's population will increase more than 20 percent in the next 10 years.

We find that even at the present time, our population is continuing to increase at the rate of approximately 1,000 people per month. With this growth rate, which is one of the fastest in the Nation, we are confident that the demand for land and water conservation funds will continue to outstrip the supply of these funds. Statistics gathered in California indicate that the local cities, counties, and special districts are capable of matching funds from the land and water conservation fund to at least four times the amount now being received by California from the fund, which is approximately $3½ million.

California is proud of its record in the distribution of these funds. Of the $11 million received, we have distributed this money to 57 separate projects; $6,400,000, or 59 percent, has been obligated to 25 acquisition projects, 4 of them State and 21 local; $4,500,000, or 40 percent, has been for 31 development projects, 7 State projects and 24 local; and $100,000, or 1 percent, has been obligated for one planning project. It should be noted that the percentage distribution of acquisition projects over development projects is consistent with that suggested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Of the 57 funded projects, 43 are local projects sponsored by 33 separate local jurisdictions; 15 counties, 15 cities and 3 recreation and park districts represent the local jurisdictions. These are distributed quite evenly throughout the entire State. Twelve State projects have been funded. Six of these projects are the responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation and six of them are the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Board.

Of the $11 million received in California, $3,200,000 has been requested or paid out by the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1968, and before the end of this fiscal year, an additional $2 million will be either requested from the Federal Government or disbursed to participants. California has received, in addition to the $11 million, approval for $3,500,000 from the Secretary's special contingency fund; $2 million of this has been received and disbursed for the acquisition of the Pepperwood Grove project in the Humbolt Redwoods State Park. The additional $1,500,000 will be received by the end of the current fiscal year. This will complete the contingency fund project.

The Department held during the month of January 1968, four public hearings to discuss the rules and regulations for the disbursement of Federal funds to State agencies and local jurisdictions. Although land acquisition remains critical, particularly for the larger metropolitan areas, the rural areas of the State feel that there must be greater emphasis placed on development in order for them to continue with land acquisition. There appears to be considerable feeling in the rural and suburban areas that allowing open space to remain undeveloped may prohibit further acquisition or make it impossible to hold open space for park and recreation purposes.

The department of parks and recreation for the State of California now owns, operates, and maintains in excess of 800,000 acres of land comprised of 200 units which make up the State park system. Although there are critical needs for land acquisition, such as the beaches, rounding out existing State parks, and eliminating inholdings within State parks, and the acquisition of State parks which will serve the major metropolitrary to the national interest or to the national security to permit the unrestricted travel of American citizens to certain parts of the world. The methods used to regulate travel heretofore are clearly ineffective. Under the proposed law, the Secretary of State, subject to the approval of the President, would be given statutory authority to prohibit travel to any country, in the absence of special permission, if it is determined that such suspension is essential to the national interest or the national security.

However, section 903 also contains an important safeguard against any arbitrary or unreasonable limitation. Specifically, it provides that no regulation restricting travel shall go into effect "until the Secretary has caused to be compiled and published the findings of fact which provide the basis for his determination."

The provisions to which I have referred as well as the many other provisions of this remarkably comprehensive legislation, combine to make it a measure of the greatest importance to the national security.

It is my earnest hope that my colleagues will give this measure the careful attention it merits and that Congress will enact it before the close of the current session.

Finally, I desire to pay tribute particularly to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, who is also chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for his leadership in offering this measure. I believe he has done a remarkable job, and I am happy to cosponsor the bill.

I am one of those who believe that we are in a death struggle. I do not have many supporters. That does not bother me much. I have been in that plight before. Until our people recognize that we are in a death struggle, we will not do any better than we are doing now. Some day there will have to be an awakening. I believe that one way is by Congress seriously considering and passing this measure. I hope it does so.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW, FEBRUARY 22, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, which business is to be confined to the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the adjournment of the Senate tomorrow until noon on Monday next, the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to receive messages from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs continued to hold hearings on legislation designed to augment the land and water conservation fund. I am an author of one bill on the subject, S. 531. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in coauthoring another, S. 1401.

Each bill seeks to allocate to the fund revenues accruing from petroleum leases on the outer Continental Shelf. I regret that some—not very many—oppose our proposed legislation, for the land and water conservation fund has served a useful and a noble purpose. It needs more revenues; and when it has them, as I am sure it shall, it will facilitate the acquisition and development by the Government of the United States and by State and local governments across the Nation of additional recreational areas and parks for the benefit of all the people.

This morning I made a statement to the committee. The statement included the very excellent presentation on behalf of the Governor of my State, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, made by the Honorable William Penn Mott, the California director of parks and recreation, unequivocally urging enactment of the Jackson-Kuchel bill.

The Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources has also communicated its views on this legislation to the Interior Committee. This conservation organization, led by such distinguished men as Ira N. Gabrielson, Charles Callison, Spencer M. Smith, Jr., and Dewey Anderson, shares my view that to link S. 1401 and a reopening of the dispute settled in 1953 by enactment of the tidelands legislation would endanger our efforts to put America's conservation program on a sound financial basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made, the statement of Mr. Mott, a statistical table indicating the scope of activity of the land and water conservation fund program in California, and the text of a telegram which I have received from the Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

With an increasing awareness of the blight of sprawling cities and the recreational needs of America over the coming decades, Congress in the last few years has authorized dozens of new recreation areas, parks, and seashores. The same acceleration of conservation activity has taken place at the state and local level.

To finance these programs, Congress, in 1964, created the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is comprised of entrance and user fees at Federal recreation areas, the unclaimed Federal tax on pleasure boat fuel, and proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property. The fund is distributed 40 per cent to Federal projects, and 60 per cent to state and local governments on a 50–50 matching basis.

Unfortunately, the sources of revenue available to the fund have been inadequate to meet the needs of authorized projects. Only about $100 million per year is raised from those sources, and a ten year need of $2.7 billion is seen.

Governor Reagan's Director of Parks and Recreation, William Penn Mott, testified in support of S. 1401 before this committee saying that California alone needs six times the amount of money that has been available to it from the fund.

Recognizing the needs of which Mr. Mott so eloquently spoke, Senator Jackson and I, and fifteen of our colleagues in the Senate have sponsored legislation to make Federal revenues from leases on the outer continental shelf available to augment the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This legislation has the support of all responsible conservation organizations in the United States. It is essential if we are to meet the commitment to conservation made in the authorization of dozens of new national parks and recreation areas over the last few years. Without this legislation there may be no money to pay for a Redwood National Park, or to complete the job which we have started at Point Reyes.

Nor will there be adequate money to meet the spiraling needs of the towns and cities of California for recreational areas. To show the broad impact which the Land and Water Conservation Fund has had on California during the first three years of its life.

Any discussion of the use of Federal offshore leasing revenues eventually turns to a perennial proposal to give the coastal states a preferential right, not afforded the other states of the Union, to a portion of these revenues. Fifteen years ago the proposal was stated in the Minority Views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to this Committee's Report on the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. (S. Rep. 411, 83d Cong., 1st Sess., p. 65). Most recently this proposal has taken the form of S. 1826 which is pending before this Committee.

Although this stale idea may be new to some, the problem of the coastal states' rights in the adjoining outer continental shelf first became critically important to California over twenty years ago when I was State Controller. In the case of *United States v. California,* 332 U.S. 19 (1947), at page 38, the United States Supreme Court said:

"The question of who owned the bed of the sea only became of great potential importance at the beginning of this century when oil was discovered there. As a consequence of this discovery, California passed an Act in 1921 authorizing the granting of permits to California residents to prospect for oil and gas on blocks of land off its coast under the ocean. Cal. Stats. 1921, c. 303. This state statute, and others which followed it, together with the leasing practices under them, have precipitated this extremely important controversy, and pointedly raised this state-federal conflict for the first time. Now that the question is here, we decide for the reasons we have stated that *California is not the owner of the three-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the state has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.*" (Emphasis added.)

In the ensuing years a great debate raged over the coastal states' rights to offshore leasing revenues. Finally, in 1953, during my first year in the Senate and on this Committee, we considered and passed the Submerged Lands Act (P.L. 83-31, 67 Stat. 29 (1953)). That act was a great victory for California and other coastal states. The coastal states were granted title to the natural resources beneath navigable waters within their state boundaries. This act gave my state ownership of all subsurface minerals from the beaches seaward to the three mile limit. In the case of California, we obtained a valuable privilege which has brought $318,557,484 into the State Treasury over the last 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the applicable provisions of the Submerged Lands Act into the record:

"Sec. 3. Rights of the States.—(a) It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof..

Sec. 4. Seaward Boundaries.—The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line or, in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries."

Later in 1953 this Committee, and the Congress approved the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (P.L. 83-212, 67 Stat. 462 (1953)), which provided the method for federal leasing of the federal portion of the outer continental shelf seaward of state boundaries. No part of the outer continental shelf which is under federal control by the terms of these two acts is within the exterior boundaries of any state. The federal leasing revenues are derived from a part of the outer continental shelf which legally is no more a part of the state of Louisiana or California, than it is a part of the state of Iowa.

This Committee inserted an amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act as a caveat to the states, providing that the division of revenues established by these two bills is a final settlement of the interests of the two sovereigns. Let me read that language:

"Sec. 4. Laws Applicable to Outer Continental Shelf.—(a) (3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom."

I might observe that two of the strongest supporters of that language in Executive Session in 1953 still serve on this Committee: our Chairman, Senator Jackson, and our former Chairman, Senator Anderson.

I have heard it argued that the proposal embodied in S. 1826, namely to give coastal states 37½ per cent of federal leasing revenues, is merely an application of the Mineral Leasing Act to the Outer Continental Shelf. That argument was made in 1953 and rejected. The Mineral Leasing Act applies to Federal lands within the boundaries of states. The Submerged Lands Act established that the Federal outer continental shelf lands are by no stretch of the imagination within the boundaries of the individual coastal states.

Fifteen years ago, our colleague, Senator Price Daniel of Texas, was the leading proponent of improving the decisive victory won by the coastal states in the enactment of the Submerged Lands Act by slicing up federal offshore oil leasing revenues for the benefit of the coastal states. He failed. There was so little support for such a proposal that Senator Daniel didn't even offer a formal amendment to the bill to implement his plan.

The proposal has no more support today than it did fifteen years ago. One might as well propose that coastal states get 37½ per cent of all Federal income tax revenues for all the good it will do.

I believe that reopening the decades old dispute which was compromised and settled fifteen years ago would jeopardize the future of conservation in America. Strenuous support for any revenue-splitting scheme between the Federal government and the coastal states would be specious in view of the certainty of its defeat in this Committee, in both houses of Congress, and the assured veto of the President. A crusade for this long discredited idea could, however, kill S. 1401, and with it the Redwood National Park and other conservation legislation pending before Congress.

I refuse to participate in the dismemberment of America's conservation program, and accordingly I will oppose any foredoomed effort to disrupt the time-honored compromise of state and Federal interests which was reached in this Committee, and in the Congress, fifteen years ago. I think it is fair to say that my views are shared by the Chairman, who represents another great coastal state, Washington.

Statement of William Penn Mott, Jr., Director of Parks and Recreation, State of California

Mr. Mott. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is before your committee two bills pertaining to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, Senate bill 1401, introduced by Senator Henry M. Jackson, and Senate bill S. 531, introduced by Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

I wish to speak in support of the concept which these two bills present, namely providing additional funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. July 1, 1967, marked the third year in which applications have been accepted in California for consideration under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. During this period in which $11 million was available as California's share of this fund, we received applications far in excess of $70 million worth of projects. In other words, the demand for funds exceeded the money available by more than 600 percent.

This demand for funds for land acquisition and capital improvement to meet the recreation demands in California is directly related to the rapid growth being experienced by the State. The California State Department of Finance estimated that the population of California as of January 1, 1968, was 19,774,000, an increase of more than 2 percent over the January 1, 1967, figure of 19,380,000. California's population has increased more than 4 percent during the period of its participation in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program; however, during this same period our annual apportionment has actually decreased. Based upon an average increase in population of 2 percent a year, it is estimated that California's population will increase more than 20 percent in the next 10 years.

We find that even at the present time, our population is continuing to increase at the rate of approximately 1,000 people per month. With this growth rate, which is one of the fastest in the Nation, we are confident that the demand for land and water conservation funds will continue to outstrip the supply of these funds. Statistics gathered in California indicate that the local cities, counties, and special districts are capable of matching funds from the land and water conservation fund to at least four times the amount now being received by California from the fund, which is approximately $3½ million.

California is proud of its record in the distribution of these funds. Of the $11 million received, we have distributed this money to 57 separate projects; $6,400,000, or 59 percent, has been obligated to 25 acquisition projects, 4 of them State and 21 local; $4,500,000, or 40 percent, has been for 31 development projects, 7 State projects and 24 local; and $100,000, or 1 percent, has been obligated for one planning project. It should be noted that the percentage distribution of acquisition projects over development projects is consistent with that suggested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Of the 57 funded projects, 43 are local projects sponsored by 33 separate local jurisdictions; 15 counties, 15 cities and 3 recreation and park districts represent the local jurisdictions. These are distributed quite evenly throughout the entire State. Twelve State projects have been funded. Six of these projects are the responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation and six of them are the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Board.

Of the $11 million received in California, $3,200,000 has been requested or paid out by the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1968, and before the end of this fiscal year, an additional $2 million will be either requested from the Federal Government or disbursed to participants. California has received, in addition to the $11 million, approval for $3,500,000 from the Secretary's special contingency fund; $2 million of this has been received and disbursed for the acquisition of the Pepperwood Grove project in the Humbolt Redwoods State Park. The additional $1,500,000 will be received by the end of the current fiscal year. This will complete the contingency fund project.

The Department held during the month of January 1968, four public hearings to discuss the rules and regulations for the disbursement of Federal funds to State agencies and local jurisdictions. Although land acquisition remains critical, particularly for the larger metropolitan areas, the rural areas of the State feel that there must be greater emphasis placed on development in order for them to continue with land acquisition. There appears to be considerable feeling in the rural and suburban areas that allowing open space to remain undeveloped may prohibit further acquisition or make it impossible to hold open space for park and recreation purposes.

The department of parks and recreation for the State of California now owns, operates, and maintains in excess of 800,000 acres of land comprised of 200 units which make up the State park system. Although there are critical needs for land acquisition, such as the beaches, rounding out existing State parks, and eliminating inholdings within State parks, and the acquisition of State parks which will serve the major metropolitan areas, the greater emphasis should be placed on developing existing State parks.

Mr. Chairman, the above information should provide your committee with ample evidence that additional funds are desperately needed during the next several years to meet, in California, the demand for funds from the land and water conservation fund and it is for this reason that I strongly recommend your approving either Senate bill 1401 or S. 531.

Thank you.

Sponsor	Nearest city or town	Project purpose
Division of Beaches and Parks	Morro Bay	Assist the State in acquiring 4,441 acres ocean frontage and uplands for a new State park (Montana de Oro State Park).
Department of Parks and Recreation	Statewide	Maintain, strengthen, and update California's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan.
County of Orange	Anaheim	Acquire 18 acres to serve as nucleus of a new 300-acre regional park.
Do	do	Develop roads, water system, comfort station, and other facilities at Sycamore Flat Regional Park.
City of Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	Develop parking and picnic facilities, comfort stations, and other facilities at Shoreline Park.
City of San Diego	San Diego	Develop parking lot, restrooms, access road, landscaping at Mission Beach Aquatic Park.
City of Mountain View	Mountain View	Acquire approximately 440 acres of tideland for development of regional park.
Do	do	Develop land and water area at Shoreline Park, including sailing lake with facilities.
Kings County	Layton	Acquire 52 acres for development of Laton-Kingston Regional Park, including picnic, parking, and sanitary facilities.
County of Merced	Merced	Acquire 119 acres for expansion of Lake Yosemite Park.
Do	do	Develop Lake Yosemite Park, including access roads, parking area, picnic and sanitary facilities.
City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Develop camping, picnic, and boating facilities at Harbor Regional Park.
City of Berkeley	Berkeley	Develop public access, roadway, boat ramp, parking, and other facilities at Marine Park.
City of Long Beach	Long Beach	Install irrigation system to permit further development of El Dorado Park.
City of San Jose	San Jose	Develop picnic units, restroom, water, parking, trails, and other facilities at Kelley Park.
City of Santa Clara	Santa Clara	Develop camping, picnic, and play areas and other facilities at Central Park.
East Bay Regional Park District	Fremont	Acquire 671 acres of land on San Francisco Bay for development as a park.
City of San Clemente	San Clemente	Acquire 2.7 acres privately owned parcels of land along beach within the city limits.
City of Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	Acquire 14 acres of beach-line property along Pacific Ocean to be developed into a community park.
City of San Diego	San Diego	Acquire 0.05 acre of land at the southern tip of Mission Beach.
San Mateo County	Belmont	Develop 2 feeder trails for access to State and county trail system, including clearing, grading, fencing, trail signs.
Los Angeles Board of Recreation and Park	Los Angeles	Acquire 70 acres for an addition to Chatsworth Regional Park.
Resources Agency	Eureka	Acquire 1,600 acres of redwood forest area as an addition to Humboldt Redwoods State Park.
City of San Clemente	San Clemente	Develop public restroom on beach property in San Clemente.
County of Tulare	Porterville	Develop Bartlett Park, including a well and related water system, restrooms, road system, play equipment, 3 arbors.
Wildlife Conservation Board	San Pedro	Construct public fishing pier in San Pedro urban area.
City of Los Angeles	Sunland, San Fernando	Develop Hansen Dam Recreation Area, including picnic units, walking trails, access roads, parking lot, landscaping.
Resources Agency	San Diego	Develop Ocean Beach Park, including access road, parking, irrigation system, landscaping.
Ventura County	Santa Rosa	Acquire 50 acres of land for development of a regional park.
Resources Agency	Sacramento	Acquire 1,265 acres of land and water for development of Delta Meadows State Park.
County of Stanislaus	Modesto	Acquire 818.5 acres of land to add to existing Modesto Reservoir Park.
Los Angeles County	Torrance	Acquire 2.41 acres of beach property at South Torrance Beach
County of Monterey	San Jose, Salinas	Acquire 122 acres for Royal Oaks Park.
Fair Oaks Recreation and Park District	Sacramento	Develop Sailor Bar Park, including access roads, parking, riding and hiking trails, boat launching area, lakes.
City and County of San Francisco	San Francisco	Develop John McLaren Regional Park, including day camp, trails, archery range, tennis courts, lake shoreline.
County of San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	Develop Lopez Reservoir, including camp sites, trailer sites, picinic sites, swimming, boating water-skiing facilities.
Resources Agency	Lake Tahoe	Develop Sugar Pine Point State Park, including campground units, picnic areas, access roads, entrance facilities.
San Bernardino County	San Bernardino	Develop Glen Helen Regional Park, including camp and picnic units, restrooms, activity pavillion and center, boat dock area.
Resources Agency	Redding	Develop Keswick Lake, including access roads, boat launching ramp, parking area, sanitary facilities, signs.
Orange County	Orange County	Develop Sycamore Flat Regional Park, including camp and picnic units, restrooms, playfield, lagoon, road, parking.
City of Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill	Acquire 20 acres of land to develop Paso Nogal Park.
Wildlife Conservation Board	Alturas	Develop angling access area at West Valley Reservoir.
Santa Barbara County	Santa Barbara	Develop Carpinteria Valley Park, including road, water and electric lines, restroom.
Tehama County	Tehama	Develop Mill Creek Recreation Area, including road, picnic units, boat ramp, landscaping, restrooms, lighting.
Wildlife Conservation Board	Modesto	Develop Fox Grove angling access, including boat ramp, restrooms, parking area, signs, well and water supply system.
City of Sacramento	Sacramento County	Acquire 43 acres of land on Sacramento River for boating, camping, fishing.
City of Eureka	Humboldt County	Acquire 6.3 acres of land as addition to Cooper Gulch Recreation Area.
Los Angeles County	Pomona	Acquire 77 acres of land contiguous to Puddingstone State Park.
Department of Parks and Recreation	Kern County	Develop State park, including road, camping, picnic, and play areas.
City of San Diego	San Diego County	Develop swimming pool, picnic and play areas, roads, parking, and landscaping.
Department of Parks and Recreation	Sacramento County	Acquire 238 acres on the American River.
Resources Agency	El Dorado County	Acquire 1,975 acres at Sugar Pine Point in Lake Tahoe for outdoor recreation.
Department of Parks and Recreation	City of Tulare	Acquire 58 acres for new park.
Do	Tulare County	Acquire 74 acres on Kings River for picnicking and water sports facilities.
Do	Butte County	Develop Thermalito Forebay State Park, including roads, parking and picnic area.
Do	Orange County	Develop Sycamore Flat Regional Park for outdoor recreation purposes.
Do	Ventura County	Acquire 50.2 acres of Oxnard small craft harbor.
Do	County of San Bernardino	Acquire 763 acres Kemper-Campbell Ranch on the Mojave River.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 20, 1968.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

An amendment to S. 1401 would remove the new sources of revenue for the land and water conservation fund provided in S. 1401. The amendment would substitute for the loss of these new revenue sources authorizations to be appropriated at a level of $200 million from the general fund. We oppose this amendment. The fund was established originally because of the failure in obtaining necessary appropriations from the general fund and the advanced appropriations authorized by the land and water conservation fund from the general fund have not been appropriated. A so-called compromise amendment would allocate 37½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing revenues to the States which are contiguous to the water areas where leases are established. The remaining 62½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf lease revenues would be credited to the land and water conservation fund. We oppose this compromise amendment since it would unnecessarily ally land and water conservation fund revenues with a special privilege to a few States and if accepted make passage of S. 1401 highly questionable.

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.,
Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

A PROFESSIONAL LOOK AT USIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the very able and distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who is necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Kenneth Youel at the 1968 Florida Public Relations Conference held at Florida State University on February 1, 1968, entitled "A Professional Look at USIA," together with introductory remarks that Senator SMATHERS had prepared for delivery in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the 1968 Florida Public Relations Conference, which was held on the campus of Florida State University at Tallahassee on February 1, featured addresses by public relations leaders of my own state as well as nationally known practitioners of this important profession. One of the most significant speeches, in the opinion of many who attended the Conference, was an appraisal of the work of the United States Information Agency by Kenneth Youel, a past president of the Public Relations Society of America. Mr. Youel, now a Washington consultant, as a volunteer consultant serving without pay has for the past six years provided the official liaison between the Public Relations Society and the USIA. He and his talented artist wife, known professionally as Jan DiMarco, maintain a year-round residence in Palm Beach, and are widely known in Florida.

Because of the continuing interest of all members of the Senate in the program of the United States Information Agency, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address of Mr. Kenneth Youel, entitled "A Professional Look at USIA."

The address by Kenneth Youel, entitled "A Professional Look at USIA," is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROFESSIONAL LOOK AT USIA

(By Kenneth Youel,* 1968 Florida Public Relations Conference, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., February 1, 1968)

Ladies and Gentlemen: As I think of the United States Information Agency I am reminded of the fable of the blind men of

---

*Kenneth Youel is a partner in Youel, Phillips & Associates, Washington, D.C. consulting firm. He has served for six years as official liaison between the Public Relations Society of America and the United States Information Agency, and as consultant to the Agency. He is a past president of the Public Relations Society of America.

India and the elephant. One felt the elephant's side and said: "Ali, the elephant is like a wall"; another touched the animal's leg and said: "The elephant is like a tree." Another touched the trunk and said he thought the elephant was like a snake.

Different people see the USIA in different ways. Editors think of it as a news distribution organization and some of them wonder why newspapers overseas can't use the AP or the UPI. Radio men think of it as the Voice of America. Some advertising men wonder why American hard sell methods are not used more liberally. Those who believe the mass mind can be manipulated—and there are some who do—express their impatience with USIA's slower techniques.

And since the Agency's efforts are directed overseas many people in the United States hardly know what the USIA is and think of it—if they think of it at all—as just another government alphabetical agency.

These misunderstandings and this apathy are unfortunate. It may not be urgently necessary for the USIA to be understood by all of our 200 million Americans, but it is highly desirable for it to be not only understood, but supported, by professionals in communications including public relations people, editors, commentators, educators, historians and other leaders of thought—leaders whose opinions are valued by government officials who have the final responsibility for approving USIA programs and budgets.

My impressions are based on some six years as the Public Relations Society of America's official liaison officer and as a volunteer consultant to the Agency. During that time I have been familiar with many of its problems. In this capacity and as a public member of the State Department's Foreign Service Inspection Corps, I have visited many of the posts in Europe and Latin America, and have also spent some time in Iron Curtain countries.

The role of the Agency, briefly stated, is to support the foreign policy of the United States by explaining it to people in other countries; to build overseas understanding of United States institutions and culture; and to advise the U.S. government on public opinion abroad and its implications.

Now let me give you a quick review of what the USIA is and what it does. It operates in 104 countries. The number was a little larger before some posts were closed during the Israeli-Arab war last June. The posts are known overseas as USIS. In the capital cities, the director of the post is known as the Country Public Affairs Officer. In addition to directing informational activities, he serves as a member of the Embassy's "country team" and as a public affairs adviser to the Ambassador or Chief of Mission.

USIA employes more than 10,000 people. About 3000 are Americans and over 7000 are employes hired locally in foreign countries. Nearly 9000 work overseas. The Agency's 1967 fiscal year budget was $162 million. Its principal activities are its press, magazine and periodical service; radio, including the Voice of America, books, research, motion pictures and television, exhibits and overseas handling of the cultural affairs-cultural exchange programs.

The press service transmits about 12,000 words daily by radioteletype for placement in foreign newspapers and magazines. This consists of texts of major speeches and statements of general interest by US leaders plus items of regional importance.

A number of magazines are printed in many languages for world-wide distribution. One of the most interesting is America Illustrated, printed in Russian for distribution in the USSR under the terms of an agreement between the two governments. About 60,000 copies are sent to the Soviet each month and the same number of copies of Soviet Life, published by the Russians in English, are sent to this country. America Illustrated sells like hot cakes. On my trips to the Soviet Union I have asked for it at newsstands many times, always unsuccessfully. Copies are passed from person to person until they are worn out. Yet frequently the Soviet government returns substantial numbers of America Illustrated saying they were unsold. It is quite evident they permit the sale of only the same number as the quantity of copies of Soviet Life sold in the United States.

The Agency prints a similar type magazine for distribution in Poland.

With the wide sale of transistor receivers, radio has become tremendously effective in communicating across the national borders. The VOA, a part of the USIA, has 92 transmitters here and abroad. It broadcasts more than 800 hours a week in 38 languages and has an estimated worldwide audience of 42 million people. USIS posts also place some 15,000 hours of taped and recorded programming on 3000 local standard broadcast stations around the world.

Other countries also attach great importance to radio. You may be interested to know that in program hours of international short wave broadcast the VOA is exceeded by the USSR—Radio Moscow—with 1684 hours weekly and by Communist China with about 1300 hours. Having read translations of some of the Russian and Chinese material, however, I would say that the VOA approach is vastly more effective.

The Agency produces more than 1000 motion pictures and television programs yearly. The film audience is estimated at more than 700 million people each year, and more than 2000 TV stations in 80 countries use USIA programs.

USIA maintains 227 information centers and reading rooms. As you may recall, a number of USIA libraries have been damaged or destroyed by rioting mobs. Libraries are usually highly visible and normally are not provided with military guards. The library at Cairo was destroyed in 1965. Later their government made full restitution and a substantial book contribution. In the emergency last year, the Cairo library escaped but the Alexandria library was destroyed. Rioters are not very discriminating. As an example, some months ago a mob demonstrating against the devaluation of the British pound sterling vented its anger by destroying the USIA library at Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia.

The Agency plays a role in improving cultural relations with other countries, both through its own programs and through its responsibility for administering abroad the educational and cultural programs of the Department of State. Time will not permit a full description of these activities but they are tremendously important. They include exchange programs, cultural presentations, trade fairs and exhibitions. The USIA helps to support some 130 binational centers, most of which are in Latin America. Each normally includes library facilities, a reading room, meeting rooms and classrooms. These centers help to nurture understanding between people of the host country and the United States through such activities as seminars, cultural programs and English lessons. (For which the students pay a fee.) The thousands who learn English are thus enabled to read our books and to understand English-language broadcasts thus breaking down barriers. Binational centers are often near universities and have proved to be an effective means of communicating with students and intellectuals, including those of radical inclinations.

The USIA keeps about 150 small exhibits circulating at all times, and many USIA posts prepare their own exhibits locally. Major exhibits have been especially effective in reaching audiences in the USSR and countries of Eastern Europe. The "Hand Tools, U.S.A." exhibit, for example, was visited by more than 2½ million Hungarians, Poles, Russians, Bulgarians, and Yugoslavs.

The Agency welcomes activities on the part of Americans abroad which contribute to a better understanding of the United States and its institutions. An excellent example of this is the work of the Council for Latin America. The Council, headed by David Rockefeller, has a membership of 250 companies and an active program, carefully planned and ably executed.

With that review of USIA activities, let us look as professional communicators at some of the policy questions that must be answered, such as:

"But do we need it?"

"Why not let our country's record speak for itself?"

"Can't people in other countries get the news from their own newspapers, radio and television?"

"If they don't understand us, what difference does it make?"

Our country's record does speak for itself—when we put it in a language that people understand, and bring it to their attention. But for scores of reasons—among them, illiteracy, scarcity of newsprint, poverty, government restrictions—many of the people of the world cannot get the news from their newspapers, radio and television in the normal course of events.

If they do not understand us, it makes all the difference in the world—the world, incidentally, which we must inhabit with them. We cannot close our eyes to the existence of an historic struggle in the world today: between the system typified by free choice and that represented by communism.

The more than 100 developing nations want desperately to reach the twentieth century. And humanly, they are attracted by the system which seems to them to offer the shortest road to their goal. They do not always see the detours ahead and are often blind to the tolls they will have to pay—in the coin of freedom and individual dignity—if they choose the communist road. The communists' pitch is often appealing. "Look at us," they say. "See what we have accomplished, under our system, in just fifty years. Look, for example, at what our socialist technology is doing in outer space. All in just fifty years. Capitalism may be all right for Americans. But our way is better for us—and for you."

If the developing nations ever were to make the mistake of opting for the communist system, we—along with them—will have to pay for that mistake in today's shrinking, interdependent world. Before they make a choice, we must make certain they understand what we are and what we stand for. That is the challenge the USIA must meet every day around the world.

Another question by a letter-writer:

"Why in heaven's name do you have to use taxpayers' money to tell foreigners about our shortcomings? Why don't you just tell them the good things?" People who agree with that questioner say that the communists do not broadcast their shortcomings to the world, but present only what they believe to be their good side. Why, they ask, don't we fight fire with fire?

As professional communicators, I am sure you will agree with me that the test is credibility. To the extent that the audience does not find propaganda, or advertising credible, it is going to be ineffective. And when that same source sets a pattern for non-credibility, that source—be it the Voice of America, Radio Moscow or any manufacturer of goods—that source will find eventually that its messages are ineffective and finally self-defeating. In this connection it might be well to remember the admonition of Abraham Lincoln: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Leonard H. Marks, Director of the Agency, states it in five words: "Truth is our best propaganda."

The same answer goes to those who wonder why we can't apply our superior advertising methods and sell our system of government and way of life as effectively "as we sell cars or soap." We want people in other countries to believe what we say not just once but day in and day out year after year. Some people perhaps visualize a contest in which the world will decide whether it favors America or some other system, much as one of our elections. This is not the way it is. Interpreting U.S. policies and actions, and promoting a better understanding of American philosophy, ideas and ideals goes on and on. The battle for world opinion is long and frustrating. There is no band, no half-time, no decisive score and no trophies.

There are some who search for sureshot ideas to score a bullseye. "If only the Russians could see a Sears, Roebuck catalogue!" "If only the Egyptians could meet some of our fine youngsters!" Bright ideas are always needed. Let us not disparage them. But the backbone of the effort must be day to day activities of a less spectacular nature. Incidentally, through the exchange programs, people in other lands are seeing some of our fine youngsters. And the results are excellent.

No appraisal of the value of the USIA would be complete without discussing what the press might describe as "editorial policy." This, as you recall, divides itself into the two areas: one to support the foreign policy of the United States; and the other to build an understanding of our institutions. As to the first area, let me give you one example. Last June, at the height of the hostilities in the Arab-Israeli conflict, Radio Cairo suddenly blasted to the world with the charge that American and British aircraft were aiding Israel. Agency officials did not know whether this charge was based on a genuine belief that American Sixth Fleet aircraft were involved because the Israeli air attacks came in from the west, or whether it was simply fabricated by some Arab leaders as a face-saving device. Agency officials used radio as a primary means to broadcast US official denials and there is every evidence that the barrage of facts convinced those with open minds.

No one will deny that there are many misunderstandings about the United States and that this is an extremely dangerous situation. For instance, research shows seven basic negative stereotypes shared by many university students in Latin America. They are: Economic imperialism, Wall Street domination of the US, US support of rightist dictatorships, US mistreatment of Latin America, US neglect of Latin America, Fraudulence of US democracy and liberty, and Uncultured and materialistic US society.

The Agency's program to present to the world a true picture of America, to offset these and other misbeliefs, is in line with the international responsibilities our country has begun to assume in the last half century, as evidenced by the Marshall Plan, which helped to put Europe back on its feet after World War II, and more recently, the Alliance for Progress to stimulate the economic progress of Latin America. While there were many years in American history in which isolationist sentiment prevailed, the basic policy goes back to the beginnings of our nation. The authors of the Federalist Papers said: "It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country by their conduct and example to show the way to political freedom."

The story the Agency is telling to the best of its ability day after day offers continuing testimony to that American ideal of freedom. The material benefits that have come from free enterprise, the spiritual values of freedom of religion, the inherent strength of the U.S. political system, and all of the things that go to make our society an open society. As a matter of fact, U.S. traditions of freedom of speech, which permit ugly news to go out with good news, are themselves proof of confidence and maturity.

Not everyone has forgotten that our country was founded and has been strengthened by those who came to seek liberty. I hope school children are still taught that inscription on the Statue of Liberty which greets shipboard immigrants entering New York harbor, which says in part:

> "Give me your tired, your poor—
> Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free."

There are perhaps some who may wonder why a U.S. government agency to provide information for world opinion seems now to be suddenly so important. The answer is apparent if we consider the rapidly changing world in which we live and the terrible dangers that have come with these changes. Another world war would bring disaster to the world. The only long range alternative is international understanding. Recognizing this, many countries are raising their voices to be heard. The United States is not alone in explaining its positions to the rest of the world. So the question is not: "So we need it?" but rather: "How well are we doing the job?" and "How can we do it better?"

As a public relations man, it occurs to me that the USIA's task is perhaps one of the most difficult public relations jobs in the world. There are few precedents. There is no book to follow. Established private media of communications are often inadequate and usually unavailable. People in remote lands are not as interested in the United States as we sometimes naively imagine. In many parts of the world there are racial and national hatreds that go back hundreds of years. Adding to this is the communist effort to discredit us by every means fair and foul. It has been said that one third of the world is being told that the United States is the enemy that must be destroyed. While there is some evidence in Russia of what public affairs scholars refer to as "erosion of revolutionary zeal," the Soviets are in no discernible way slackening their propaganda efforts.

Much depends on the ability of the men in the field. What will work in one country will not work in another. Changing situations require new approaches. As time passes, there are always new generations asking questions, forming their own opinions. A foreign service assignment in the USIA mean hard work, making meaningful contacts with people in the host country's government, in communications, in education and in other fields to provide them with information.

It is understandable that some people are impatient with USIA's progress if they fail to recognize the realities of the situation. Its role to "support U.S. foreign policy, build understanding, and advise the government" puts USIA into the broader frame of reference in which it belongs. It shifts the spotlight from communications as a thing apart to the bigger question of how Americans as a people and as a government conduct themselves to help bring understanding and peace to the world.

It seems to me the important thing is that we as Americans are beginning to get "management experience" in this international role. We are not only improving our techniques of communication but we are acquiring, perhaps gradually, managerial expertise in relating activities to objectives and in coordinating the efforts of many people in a more effective way.

Those of us outside the Agency who are professionals in communications can be of assistance. We can help, and the first step is to inform ourselves about the Agency, and to understand its problems. It needs strong public support to enable it to proceed with sound long range planning, and we professionals can help to enlist that support.

Furthermore, its activities will be doubly effective if, instead of working alone, it has allies in the private sector working in their own fields to promote a better understanding of the United States. Americans with international interests can make a great contribution—and many of them have—by formulating programs of their own as the "other member of the team" working toward "a better understanding of the United States, its institutions, culture and policies."

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is my appraisal of the United States Information Agency.

A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC LAW 874 PROGRAMS IS AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of amendment 530 to H.R. 15399, providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968, the name of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in connection therewith, I read the following statement on behalf of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

Mr. GRUENING. Amendment No. 530 to H.R. 15399, providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968, was submitted by the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], would increase by $91 million fiscal year 1968 appropriations for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas and major disaster areas, as authorized by Public Law 81–874, as amended.

School districts in Alaska were scheduled to receive approximately $12.2 million in fiscal year 1968 under Public Law 874, but the level of present appropriations has reduced this amount by $2.4 million. As a result, many school districts in Alaska will find it impossible to provide quality education for their students.

A supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1968 for programs under Public Law 874 is an absolute necessity. It will permit school districts which depend upon the program to maintain the educational standards which the children of Alaska and of the Nation deserve.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1155) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1155) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to change the name of the Bank, to extend for five years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, to restrict the financing by the Bank of certain transactions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SECTION 1. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended—

"(a) By changing 'Export-Import Bank of Washington', wherever that name refers to the legal entity created by the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to 'Export-Import Bank of the United States'.

"(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended by striking subsection (b) thereof and by substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(b)(1) It is the policy of the Congress that the Bank in the exercise of its functions should supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital; that loans, so far as possible consistently with carrying out the purposes of subsection (a), shall generally be for specific purposes, and, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, offer reasonable assurance of repayment; and that in authorizing such loans the Board of Directors should take into account the possible adverse effects upon the United States economy.'

"(c) Section 2(b) of such Act is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"'(2) The Bank in the exercise of its functions shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in any extension of credit

"'(A) in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by a Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended), or agency or national thereof, or

"'(B) in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any other foreign country, or agency, or national thereof, if the product to be purchased or leased by such other country, agency, or national is, to the knowledge of the Bank, principally for use in, or sale or lease to, a Communist country (as so defined)

except that the prohibitions contained in this paragraph shall not apply in the case of any transaction which the President determines would be in the national interest if he reports that determination to the Senate and House of Representatives within thirty days after making the same.

"'(3) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product, technical data, or other information by a national or agency of any nation

"'(A) which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with armed forces of the United States; or

"'(B) which furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing, or sales by non-wholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance, or adviser to a nation, described in subparagraph (A);

nor shall the Bank guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase by any nation (or national or agency thereof) of any product, technical data, or other information which is to be used principally by or in a nation described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

"'(4) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in an extension of credit in connection with any credit sale of defense articles and defense services to any country designated under section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as an economically less developed country for purposes of the tax imposed by section 4911 of that Code. The prohibitions set forth in this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any transaction the consummation of which the President determines would be in the national interest and reports such determination (within thirty days after making the same) to the Senate and House of Representatives. In making any such determination the President shall take into account, among other considerations, the national interest in avoiding arms races among countries not directly menaced by the Soviet Union or by Communist China; in avoiding arming military dictators who are denying social progress to their own peoples; and in avoiding expenditures by developing countries of scarce foreign exchange needed for peaceful economic progress.

"'(5) In no event shall the Bank have outstanding at any time in excess of 7½ per centum of the limitation imposed by section 7 of this Act for such guarantees, insurance, credits or participation in credits with respect to exports of defense articles and services to countries which, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Bank, are less developed.'

"(c) By changing in section 2(c) of that Act, '$2,000,000,000 to read $3,500,000,000'.

"(d) By changing the last sentence in section 3(d) of that Act to read: 'Members, not otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the United States, may be compensated at rates not exceeding the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) for each day spent in travel or attendance at meetings of the Committee, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government service employed intermittently.'

"(e) By changing, in section 7 of that Act, '$9,000,000,000' to read '$13,500,000,000'.

"(f) By changing, in section 8 of that Act, 'June 30, 1968' to read 'June 30, 1973'."

And the House agree to the same.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
JOHN TOWER,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
PAUL A. FINO,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, S. 1155 was passed by the Senate on August 11, 1967. On February 7 the House passed H.R. 6649, the companion bill to S. 1155, and then moved to strike all after the enacting clause in the Senate bill and substitute the House language.

Almost a year ago, identical companion bills were introduced in the House and Senate. The provisions of the bills as introduced were passed by both bodies virtually intact. It is in the restrictive amendments added by the Senate and the House that we find the relatively minor differences between the two versions of S. 1155 which the conference report now reconciles. It does so by accepting the House version of limitations on Eximbank support of arms sales to developing countries and support of exports to countries whose governments furnish goods or supplies to our adversaries, and by accepting the Senate amendments on exports to Communist countries and on the possible effect of Eximbank loans on the domestic economy and our balance of payments.

Both bills extend the life of the Bank by 5 years to June 30, 1973; increase its lending authority by $4.5 billion, to a total of $13.5 billion; raise by $1.5 billion, to a total of $3.5 billion, the ceiling on guarantees and insurance which can be done on a 25 percent fractional reserve basis; permit the Bank to compensate its Advisory Committee members at a higher rate; and change the name of the Bank to Export-Import Bank of the United States.

These are the provisions which were contained in the bills as originally introduced.

You will recall that the Senate added amendments which—in the order they appear in the bill—require Eximbank to consider possible effects of its loans on the domestic economy and the balance of payments; restrict the Bank's support of U.S. exports to Communist countries; limit the Bank's financing of arms sales to developing countries; prohibit support of exports to countries with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict, or to other countries whose governments furnish goods or supplies to our adversaries; and prohibit Eximbank support of exports for use in a Soviet automobile plant.

The House bill contained only two amendments, one relating to arms sales, which is substantially similar to the Senate provision, and one relating to exports to or for use in countries with which we are engaged in conflict or countries supplying them, which is also substantially similar to the comparable Senate amendment. However, the latter House amendment is comprehensive enough in its language and practical application to preclude Eximbank financing of exports for a Soviet automobile factory.

With respect to arms sales, section (3) of the Senate version of the bill states as the policy of the Congress that the Bank shall not assist in financing, under a Department of Defense guarantee, credit sales of defense articles and services by the Government or by U.S. exporters, except when the President determines such participation would be in the national security interest and reports such determination to both the Senate and House within 30 days. The comparable House provision states that the Bank shall not participate in any credit sale of defense articles or services to any country designated as economically less developed for purposes of the interest equalization tax, except when the President determines such participation would be in the national interest and, as in the Senate version, so reports to the Congress within 30 days. The House provision, however, further requires that in making any such determination the President must take into account, "among other considerations, the national interest in avoiding arms races among countries not directly menaced by the Soviet Union or Communist China; in avoiding arming military dictators who are denying social progress to their own peoples; and in avoiding expenditures by developing countries of scarce foreign exchange needed for peaceful economic progress."

Both the Senate and House versions of the arms credit limitation place a ceiling, equal to 7½ percent of the Bank's total lending authority, on the amount of financing which may be outstanding at any one time in connection with such credit sale of arms. The House version of this amendment, adopted by the conference, thus covers the same ground as the Senate version, but is somewhat stronger in that it adds additional criteria which must be taken into account before the transaction can be consummated.

The Senate provision on arms sales, passed in August, would have to be revised in any event, since it refers to arms credits which are "guaranteed under section 503(e) and section 509(b)" of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. When Congress subsequently passed the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 last November, those sections were not only renumbered but the Defense Department's guaranty authority itself was terminated effective June 30, 1968.

Turning to the amendments relating to Communist countries or countries trading with our enemies, you will recall that it is the Byrd amendment which prohibits Eximbank support of the export of any product to first, any nation with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict; or, second, any nation the government of which is furnishing goods or supplies to a nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict. It is the Mundt amendment which expressly prohibits the Bank from assisting exports to or for use in the construction of an automobile plant in the Soviet Union—which of course means the proposed Fiat loan.

On the House side, the Fino amendment prohibits the Bank from supporting the export of "any product, technical data, or other information" to or for use in first, any nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict, or second, any nation which furnishes by direct governmental action (not including chartering, licensing, or sales by nonwholly-owned business enterprises) goods, supplies, military assistance or advisers" to any nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict. Since this version applies to exports which are "to be used principally by or in" the proscribed recipient countries, it covers the Fiat case.

The House amendment thus in effect incorporates the provisions of both the Byrd and the Mundt amendments in the Senate bill. It also clarifies the kinds of government involvement in the furnishing of goods or assistance to our adversaries which are intended to be covered by the amendment. Members will recall that this was an area of some concern during debate on the Byrd amendment last year. As I have said, the House version clearly covers such transactions as the Fiat case, but in my opinion would not include, for example, countries in which the governmental involvement is limited to such matters as the issuance of export licenses, sales by business enterprises not wholly owned by the government, or the use of privately owned vessels registered under its laws to transport nongovernment cargoes. The restriction would cease to have effect after hostilities cease, or after a particular government stops sending goods or assistance to our adversaries.

The conferees have adopted the House version of this restriction.

Section (c) of the Senate bill prohibits the Bank from supporting U.S. exports to or for use in any Communist country, except when the President determines such support to be in the national interest and reports such determination to Congress within 30 days. Although there was no identical provision in the House version, the Fino amendment outlined above clearly prohibits Eximbank support of exports to or for use in all Communist countries, except Yugoslavia, for the duration of the Vietnamese conflict or, in the case of individual Communist countries, until the government stops supplying North Vietnam. Nevertheless the conferees have written into the conference bill section (c) from the Senate bill. We did so because we believe that after the termination of hostilities, when the Fino restriction would cease to be operative, the extension of Eximbank support of exports to Communist countries should be subject to a Presidential policy decision. This amendment, of course, is patterned after a similar limitation which has been included annually for the past 5 years in the Export-Import Bank portion of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act.

There is only one other difference between the Senate and House versions of S. 1155, and that is that the House version contains no provision comparable to the so-called Holland amendment in the Senate bill. This provision expresses as the policy of the Congress that in making loans the Bank's "Board of Directors should take into account the possible adverse effects upon the U.S. economy and the desirability of safeguarding the international balance-of-payments position of the United States."

The conferees have included an amendment which provides that in making loans the Bank's "Board of Directors should take into account the possible adverse effects upon the U.S. economy." The Senate conferees did not insist upon the reference to the international balance-of-payments position in view of the assurances received in a letter dated February 16 from Mr. Harold F. Linder to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1968.
Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that last August when the Senate passed S. 1155, an act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, it adopted an amendment which states as the policy of the Congress that in authorizing loans Eximbank's "Board of Directors should take into account the possible adverse effects upon the United States economy and the desirability of safeguarding the international balance of payments position of the United States". No comparable provision was adopted by the House in its consideration last week of the companion bill to S. 1155.

I understand that in the interest of expediting final enactment of the bill you may propose that the Senate adopt the House-passed version of S. 1155, which would result in the omission of this amendment from the bill as finally passed. I wish to assure you, on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Bank, that if this should happen the Board would nevertheless adhere to the policy expressed in this amendment.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD F. LINDER.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the provisions of S. 1155 as recommended by the committee of conference include the substance of all of the provisions contained in the legislation as it passed both the Senate and the House. The provisions in the conference bill clarify the language and intent of the restrictions adopted by the Senate and otherwise strengthen the bill.

For these reasons, I move that the Senate adopt the conference report on S. 1155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HANSEN'S APPEAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Evening Star entitled "Hansen's Appeal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANSEN'S APPEAL

Judge J. Skelly Wright's reluctant ruling this week finally clears the way for the United States Court of Appeals to determine whether Wright's decision of last summer in the District school case is to be accorded its needed judicial review.

For this procedural advance, at least, we may be thankful. There have been occasions during the past half-year when it seemed that the process of appeal would not even progress this far.

The decision by which Judge Wright assumed control of the District school system, based on his far-ranging theories of de facto racial and economic segregation, was handed down last June 19. Within a month of that date, former District School Superintendent Carl Hansen, among others, filed motions seeking to appeal. And for the unconscionably long period of five months after that they cooled their heels. Finally, in response to a December 18 order of the Court of Appeals, Wright has heard and granted a motion of the appellants to intervene—"in order," he said, "to give the Court of Appeals an opportunity to pass on the . . . questions . . ."

In one sense it is an oddly contradictory ruling, for Judge Wright clearly feels that the appellants have no legal standing whatever. Indeed his 19-page ruling consists almost wholly of a repudiation of their claims. Viewed against this background, Wright's refusal to stay the effects of his 1967 decision pending the outcome of the appeal comes, of course, as no surprise.

We hope that Judge Wright's views are not those of the Court of Appeals as a whole, and that the standing of the appellants to appeal will be upheld. We think that all of the appellate judges should take a look—a hard look—at this decision by a judge whose prejudices in at least some instances have overwhelmed his judgment.

THIEU'S PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Evening Star entitled "Thieu's Program."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIEU'S PROGRAM

President Nguyen Van Thieu, in his address the other day to the National Assembly, spoke with deep and understandable emotion of the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong in their savage campaign against South Vietnam's cities. Among the grim examples cited by him: the systematic cold-blooded killing of the wives and children of 1,000 government militiamen.

To cope with this Hanoi-directed strategy of terror, and to strengthen the overall defense effort against the Communist North, Thieu has announced to the Assembly—as a plan to be set in motion at once—a revised series of mobilization measures. The measures, designed to add substantially to the size and flexibility of the armed forces, include the drafting of 18-year-olds on a faster schedule; the recall of veterans who have served fewer than five years; a halt in discharges except for medical reasons; and special military training for all over 17 in school and for civil servants under 45.

In proclaiming this program—and in asking the Assembly for authority to rule by decree in economic matters during the coming year—Thieu has embarked on an unpopular course and is likely to meet with very strong opposition. But he has acted with admirable firmness on the basis of hard facts and urgent conditions that his political foes can neither dispute nor belittle. Not the least of the conditions is what the South Vietnamese people have suffered as a result of the fighting unleashed by the enemy's Lunar New Year offensive—in the first nine days, over 3,000 civilians killed, nearly 8,000 wounded, and 196,000 made homeless.

As Thieu has put it, the offensive has "proved that the Communists also regard the people as their enemies." That is why he has called upon his countrymen to take on new defense burdens: "These measures may infringe somewhat on democratic rights, but without them the situation may get out of control. We must first defend our nation; if we cannot defend our nation, our democratic rights will become meaningless." To the South Vietnamese, so weary of war, this sort of talk might be wholly unappealing under ordinary circumstances. But they have suffered cruelly at the hands of the enemy, and they may well react by rallying behind the Thieu government and its program.

It is a program, in any event, that merits the American support promised by United States Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. Saigon, under the leadership of Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky, is plainly striving to do better in an exceedingly difficult and dangerous situation. Its critics would do well to hold their fire at a crucial time when attacks upon it can serve only to please and help the enemy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of yesterday, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

St. Louis Engineers Addressed by Senator Randolph, of West Virginia, on Expanding Role of the Engineer in Modern Society

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this is the 18th annual National Engineers' Week, sponsored by 66,000 members of the National Society of Professional Engineers, including the 1,100-member St. Louis chapter of the Missouri Society of Professional Engineers.

Traditionally, it is an event of the week of George Washington's birthday, so chosen because the first President of the United States was a notable civil and military engineer.

National Engineer Week brings to the attention of the American people the role of the professional engineer in today's society, and his vital function and contribution in furthering safety, technical progress, and public welfare. And, of course, the engineer is vital in helping to solve problems to improve world health.

Each year the theme of the week fits the overall mission of the members of this great profession, and this year it is appropriate that the theme is "Engineering—Design for World Health."

And, Mr. President, it was appropriate that the St. Louis chapter of the Missouri Society of Professional Engineers, in joint meeting last night with the Engineers Club of St. Louis, and the St. Louis section of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, had as their speaker our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. Chairman of the Public Works Committee and ranking member of its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Senator RANDOLPH is a competent speaker on engineering as it relates to the public health.

In reporting on the speech of the senior Senator from West Virginia, this morning's issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat headlined it in terms of the Senator having challenged the engineers on the pollution crisis.

The Globe-Democrat report featured Senator RANDOLPH's admonition that engineers should concern themselves with the social consequences of some of the technologies they devise, and quoted the speaker's comment that engineers have been problem solvers in industry who, along with other government, civic, and professional groups, must solve the problems of air and water pollution and those relating to solid waste disposal.

The annual St. Louis National Engineers' Week dinner, held at Stan Musial and Biggie's well-known establishment with more than 300 attending, had as its toastmaster A. Carl Weber, vice president of the Laclede Steel Corp., of St. Louis. The address of welcome was given by St. Louis Chapter President Conway B. Briscoe, who is president of the board of public service of the city of St. Louis, and the invocation was by Father Victor J. Blum, S.J., of St. Louis University.

The Past President Award was made to Willard W. Given, of the consulting engineer firm of Belt & Given. And the St Louis chapter presented the Engineer of the Year Award to Peter F. Mattei, executive director of the St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District. The award appropriately was presented to Mr. Mattei in recognition of outstanding professional leadership in engineering, direction of the MSD, and for his initiative in promoting a legislative program to strengthen the engineering registration law.

Composing the St. Louis Engineers' Week Committee were Walter G. Shifrin, chairman; James R. Fair; Frank D. Field; Clarence M. Hartung; Henry F. Houser; Robert E. Lenz; Jack Y. Kiburz; Michael C. Manion; John L. Nolte; and Charles J. Schukai, all registered professional engineers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], "The Expanding Role of the Engineer in Modern Society," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPANDING ROLE OF THE ENGINEER IN MODERN SOCIETY

(Address by U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of Committee on Public Works, to the Missouri Society of Professional Engineers, banquet session, St. Louis, Mo., February 20, 1968)

The productive power of industry and the variety of goods and services produced in our economy attest to the achievements of the engineering profession in America. These are achievements in which your profession can take justifiable pride.

The engineer has been the problem solver in industry. It has been your function to develop new methods and new processes for producing goods. It has not been your concern to think of the social consequences of some of the technologies you have devised. Today, however, the quality of our life is seriously threatened by the waste products of the same productive system that has made possible the marvels of modern civilization. We are fouling the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land on which we live.

According to estimates of the United States Public Health Service, approximately 7,300 communities are affected by air pollution, but only 130 cities, counties or regions have established air pollution programs, and many of these are grossly inadequate.

More than 2,000 communities pour untreated sewage into our lakes, rivers, and other streams. An additional 700 municipalities have sewage systems with inadequate treatment facilities. And the problems of how to dispose of solid waste in most of our cities are equally neglected, despite the fact that solid waste disposal actions make for the third largest budget item in municipal costs—exceeded only by the costs of schools and highways.

These are the conditions of today, and projections for the future are more ominous unless new solutions are developed.

In the field of air pollution, for example, the most conservative projections of population increase, energy demands, and urban growth show that whatever the injury to health and property from present conditions, the hazard tomorrow will be real and serious. Only effective planning and energetic action will prevent a catastrophe.

Even those of us who have seen and studied, with some degree of expertise, the shrinking of living space and the consequent loss of some measure of personal freedom, have difficulty in visualizing the conditions of dwelling in a country with more than half again our present numbers—or double them, which is a likelihood for most persons living at this time.

Today's United States population of 200 million probably will grow to 250 million by 1980, and likely will grow to 320 million or more by the year 2000. With the continuing trend of urbanization, our present 145 million urban residents probably will increase to nearly 200 million by 1980. And, unless trends are radically altered there will be perhaps as many as 270 million persons on little more than one percent of our land area only 30 years hence.

Speaking of only one of the many important facets of the future of the American society, in order to meet the energy demands of the population as projected, and to meet the requirements of an expanding technology, electric power generation, for example, must triple by 1980 and double again by the end of the century. Even if nuclear sources of power generation expand to provide half of the generating capacity, we still will have a three-fold increase in the combustion of fossil fuels.

Notwithstanding current debate and discussions concerning the relative seriousness of the health hazard of present exposures to sulfur dioxide, one of the polluting gases, we know that the emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels must be controlled rigorously if we are to prevent serious threats to health and property in the future.

Last year, the Congress moved to mitigate and hopefully prevent such a threat through enactment of the Clean Air Act of 1967. This law requires the United States Public Health Service to publish ambient air quality criteria for individual pollutants and for combinations of pollutants. These criteria will describe the effects on human and animal health and vegetation, as well as the effects on inanimate objects, of given concentrations of pollutants for specified exposure times.

But the Congress also placed in the law a requirement on the Public Health Service that, in conjunction with the publication of criteria, it publish also specific technological control information. This, in effect, would be a setting forth of the various control methods and processes necessary to achieve the degree of control indicated by the criteria to be the end objective.

From some sources, objection was heard to the requirement that specific technological control information must be provided by the Public Health Service at the time it develops air quality criteria. But there was overwhelming awareness in the Congress that the desire—and even the demand—to cleanse the air of the most offensive and most dangerous impurities exceeded the technological ability to accomplish it.

So, in drafting and enacting the Clean Air Act of 1967, those of us who had leadership responsibilities in the Congress for the shaping of pollution control legislation insisted that there must be a very real and heavily underscored emphasis on research to develop new technology and vastly improve the state of the art of pollution abatement. We felt that it would be unrealistic to shape criteria as the basis for regulation that would be far in front of the technical know-how.

The research authorized in the 1967 Clean Air Act was and continues to be extensive—in excess of the funds to finance it, but well-funded in the light of prevailing conditions in this country and throughout the world. We seek, therefore, and we shall strive harder and harder to narrow the gap between air quality criteria (objectives) and the technical means to accomplish the best end results obtainable in terms of air quality.

Consistent with the Clean Air Act as updated in 1967, on the basis of the published criteria and control technology information, as well as the new data coming from research and development to augment the body of technologic information, the States and interstate agencies will then publish ambient air quality standards. These standards, which will be the actual basis for pollution control regulations, are to take into consideration such local factors as population density and atmospheric conditions of the individual air quality control regions.

It is anticipated that within five years of the effective date of the Clean Air Act of 1967—even if all the delays for hearings provided under the Act are utilized—we shall have air quality standards all over the nation. I do not imply that we will thus have national uniform standards; rather, I mean that within five years we will have state and interstate standards on a nationwide basis.

You gentlemen of the engineering profession would be the first to recognize that the mere publication of standards does not guarantee clean air. First of all, the technology of pollution abatement must be vastly improved beyond what we know it to be today. Then there must be rigorous enforcement of the standards and close cooperation between government at all levels and with industry and civic associations. Here, I emphasize that the engineering profession has unique contributions to make in this regard, individually and collectively.

In a few of the cities where the problem of air pollution has been most critical, determined citizens have gathered together to provide a base of support for control efforts. The need for a sustained and organized effort was recognized by the National Tuberculosis Association with the establishment of the National Air Conservation Commission. Here is an opportunity for individual engineers to become involved in more than one thousand local affiliates situated in every State, to help focus community education and action on ways to eliminate the apathy which has characterized most communities in the intervals between air pollution crises.

As a profession, you can also serve at the State and national levels in helping to develop quantitative guidelines. I imply no criticism of the Public Health Service when I suggest that our present system of developing air quality criteria may not be ideal. On the contrary, I think that the dedicated and competent people in the National Center for Air Pollution Control, under the highly capable leadership of Dr. John Middleton, are proceeding well with a difficult and complicated task. But the system itself tends to develop an adversary relationship between the government and industry which must be overcome.

As a substitute for this system, it has been suggested by Dr. James H. Sterner, former Medical Director for Eastman Kodak Company, and soon-to-be-chairman of the Department of Environmental Health at the University of Texas, that we establish a National Council for Hazardous Physical and Chemical Agents. This would be an independent body of scientist-professionals, modeled after the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, whose responsibility it would be to arrive at scientific judgments as the basis for establishing acceptable criteria.

Like the Council on Radiation, it would be chartered by the Congress and supported financially by government, industry, foundations and professional societies, and its membership would be drawn only from the scientific and professional community. There is, in my opinion, much merit to this proposal, and it is one I intend to bring before our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during our consideration of criteria and standards this year.

Perhaps the aspect of environmental pollution in which the engineer can make the greatest contribution is to strengthen the preventive effort through more concerted and effective planning. Nearly all of the important and critical environmental health problems—air pollution, water pollution, the growing pervasiveness of pesticides, the effects of cigarette smoking—have emerged as health problems only after a series of crises focussed public awareness. And each of these problems is an undesired and unforeseen by-product of goods or services which society has wanted. It has been our habit to take action only after crises develop, rather than to prevent their occurrence.

From a technological point of view, we are still looking at the problems after the fact, so to speak. It is this orientation which accounts for the staggering costs projected for industrial water pollution abatement facilities in the next decade or two. Industry has focussed on the problems of water pollution, for example, in terms of end-of-process treatment facilities, rather than in-process changes which will prevent pollution.

In this regard we note that new methods of steel-making have greatly reduced the amount of water required, and thereby reduced water pollution in this particular aspect of the industry—but the new methods were developed largely in response to an inadequate water supply, rather than as an effort to decrease water pollution.

I am urging, therefore, that with an enhanced awareness of the problems of environmental quality within the engineering profession, we should apply the same resources and ingenuity to the development of pollution preventive processes that have heretofore been applied to the production of more and better goods and services. Of course, each industry and each process would have to be examined individually.

It is quite possible, however, that in many instances, in-process changes would be less expensive than would end-of-process treatment facilities. In this respect, our Committee on Public Works has encountered a number of individual instances wherein the need to comply with water pollution standards resulted in the tightening of plant operations and consequent savings in operational costs. Thus, good citizenship on the part of industry was also good business in the strictest sense of the word.

Engineers, as consultants and as members of the management team, can do more than you are now doing, I believe, to help shape management decisions toward an environmental protection approach. It will require asking new questions during plant and process design, but as society places higher priorities on the values of our physical environment, these priorities must be incorporated in the technology that serves society.

The world will not stand still for us now. Whether we speak of military or civilian problems, we can agree with Abraham Lincoln that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

Uniform National Building Code

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable speculation of late about the possibility of the Federal Government attempting to draft a uniform national building code. The desirability for such a code is open to serious question. A uniform national building code drafted by the Federal Government represents another unwarranted attempt by the Central Government to usurp functions that are more properly left to the several States and localities. In addition, a Federal building code appears unnecessary under present conditions.

There is general agreement that the States are now the source of legal authority for the imposition of building codes. Most States, by this time, have promulgated some form of building code applicable to the entire State. In the attempt to adopt the statewide codes to meet unique local conditions, insofar as possible, most States permit the localities to modify the State codes, or even draft their own local codes where appropriate. Many of our large cities have taken advantage of these provisions to draft their own codes specifically tailored to meet their own needs.

Since the States are now the recognized and appropriate authority for the imposition of building codes, I have grave doubt as to the propriety of Federal action in this area. While State laws permit localities to modify codes to meet local conditions, a mandatory Federal code would almost certainly fail to permit this frequently desirable flexibility.

If a model, as distinct from a mandatory Federal code is proposed, the need for such a code is even harder to demonstrate. There are already four well-known model codes that have been promulgated by various organizations with expertise in the building codes field. These are: The National Building Code of the American Insurance Association; the Uniform Building Code of the International Conference of Building Officials; the Southern Standard Building Code of the Southern Building Code Congress; and the Basic Building Code of the Building Officials Conference of America. In States where it is permitted, many localities have adopted one of these model codes rather than attempt to draft a code of their own; and made specific modification to the model code to make it applicable to special local conditions.

In addition to the comprehensive building codes noted above, innumerable engineering and safety standards have been developed that are applicable to specific building components and systems. Most of these engineering and safety standards for specific materials have been incorporated in the various States codes and the four model codes. This means that there already exist nationally recognized standards for building components that have been incorporated in many building codes and are available for use by other communities.

In this situation, with four widely known reputable model building codes already in existence, as well as a host of widely recognized standards for building components, the need for another model building code drafted by the Federal Government seems dubious at best. If a single standard model code is desired—which may be open to some serious doubt—it seems likely that the most fruitful way to achieve it would be for the Federal Government to initiate a move to bring the present model code drafting organizations together to harmonize the existing model codes. This approach would appear to be far superior to an attempt to draft yet another model building code.

It should be clear that the building code system in the United States is far from simple. Nevertheless, the diversity of codes has not apparently worked any marked hardship on the construction industry, as evidenced by the simple fact that we have been constructing an average of about 1½ million new housing units per year since the early 1950's. In fact, it can be argued that the large number of building codes in existence provides some positive advantages. For example, code variations represent one way of permitting building standards to vary depending on regional differences in structural requirements.

We should also recall that, while in recent years a great number of localities have patterned their building codes upon State codes or upon one of the four model codes described above, these codes tend to cite national standards for building material and components. Thus, there is considerably more uniformity in building codes than would appear to be the case at first glance.

The most frequently heard objection to a multiplicity of building codes is that numerous different codes make it difficult to standardize construction materials and techniques, and thereby tend to increase construction costs. This argument can be criticized on a number of grounds. In the first place, as indicated above, the diversity of building codes is probably much more apparent than real since many localities have adopted existing model codes, or utilize existing national standards.

Probably of considerably more importance than code diversity is the state of administration of the codes that are presently on the books. A number of groups, including the prestigious Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, have noted that building code administration is in considerable need of improvement in most localities. The delays caused by the typical undertrained and understaffed code enforcement agency are probably doing far more to increase building costs than building code variations ever could.

In this situation the energies of the Federal Government should be directed toward assisting localities to upgrade their code enforcement practices, rather than attempting to draft an additional model code, or imposing a mandatory code from the top. A program to strengthen local code enforcement agencies would be far preferable to imposition of a Federal building code.

We know that there are many areas of construction technology where there is insufficient knowledge to enable code drafters to write generally accepted code standards. This is particularly true in the areas of the demands of occupancy and service on building structures. Thus, instead of attempting to draft a national building code, we should support a well organized and directed research program to fill in the present gaps in building knowledge.

The Federal Government can assist in this effort by sponsoring and conducting basic research in those areas not now being investigated by private industry. An important ancillary function should be the creation of machinery for the publication and wide dissemination of the results of research presently being carried on, and that to be undertaken in the future.

For all the reasons outlined above, I urge that any effort to draft a Federal building code be dropped at this time. There are far more useful things that the Federal Government can do in the building code field, notably the sponsorship of increased research into building science. This effort could yield benefits both in terms of ability to draft meaningful code standards, and even more important in finding ways to reduce construction costs. The other major effort that needs to be made is that of improving local code enforcement. Here, too, there seems to be a logical role for the Federal Government to play. It seems to me that it makes considerably more sense for the Federal Government to take actions in these critical areas rather than attempting to draft a uniform national building code.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Approach to Community Development Is Theme of Significant Address by Chairman A. J. Wagner

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am an advocate of regional development and was one of the original supporters of the validity of the Tennessee Valley Authority in Congress 35 years ago. Through the years I have also had a real interest in and concern for the conditions growing out of the population explosion and overcrowding of our urban areas. There is much that is comforting as well as informative in a recent speech by the energetic and capable Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Honorable A. J. Wagner.

Too few of the problems of our country can be approached within the framework of a time-tested, and proven superstructure such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, but the Chairman of the Board of that great instrumentality, speaking on "The TVA Approach to Community Development," before the Community Development Conference of the Small Business Administration on February 13, 1968, at Nashville, Tenn., spoke wisely when he declared:

> In the Tennessee Valley we do not yet have the aggravated problems of urban density seen in so many of our northern cities. But we do face the same problem of growth. . . . We must move affirmatively now to determine how we will grow; how our communities will develop. We must plan to shape our future.

The TVA Board Chairman's approach to the subject of community development is thorough; it is based on experience; and it is an excellent melding of analysis of the past and foresight.

Mr. President, Mr. Wagner's speech merits the attention of many more persons in public and private life than the audience privileged to hear it there on February 13, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TVA APPROACH TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Address by A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Community Development Conference of Small Business Administration, Nashville, Tenn., February 13, 1968)

America has become fascinated with the idea of new towns. And well it might.

Urban growth in the United States proceeds at a phenomenal rate. When he called attention to this massive development in a special message in 1965, President Johnson said that our urban population by the end of the century will have doubled. This presents a tremendous problem of building, of planning, and—most important—of adjustment to human needs.

"The fact of growth is not arguable," said the President. "The quality of that growth must be of great concern."

On the national scene that concern is expressed on two different though closely related fronts. New towns like Reston and Columbia start from scratch to build new living space for population already bursting out the seams of overcrowded cities. And in the core sections of those cities gigantic rebuilding programs are essential to cure the corrosive and explosive problems of the ghetto.

But the clamor for new towns, the movement toward the establishment of better cities, represent more than a problem for administrators and planners. It represents a search by individuals in America for better ways of living together—a demand for decency and dignity and comfort. It is a search for a set of circumstances in which a family can live close to the things it needs and wants: where the father can live close to his work, the mother close to her shopping, the youngsters close to their schools, and the entire family close to the facilities of leisure that they enjoy—the library or a game of golf, the theater or a refreshing swim, a ball game or a mountain hike. Living in a dense society of concentrated urbanization is tiring and frustrating. People are looking for a way out. And our 20th century affluence certainly can provide it if we will.

In the Tennessee Valley we do not yet have the aggravated problems of urban density seen in so many of our northern cities. But we do face the same problems of growth. Wilma Dykeman, in a recent column in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, said it well. "If we can assume then that this locality is going to attract more visitors, more industry, more growth, the next logical question is: how will it grow? The two propositions are closely allied. HOW we grow will determine, decisively in many places, IF we grow." She concludes, "We must awaken to the important fact that how we develop in this next decade or two will determine the quality of life in this region for generations to come."

The urgency of this problem and the controlling effect of its solution upon the region's future underscore the timeliness of your Community Development Conference today. No other subject more deserves the attention of the region's leaders. We must move affirmatively now to determine how we will grow, how our communities will develop. We must plan to shape our future.

As we approach this task, it is important to consider the base from which we start. Because we are industrializing later than most other regions, our problems are fewer and our opportunities greater. We have fewer huge mistakes to correct; we can profit from past experience of others as we build our industries and communities of the future. Moreover, we are blessed with a multitude of opportunities provided during a generation in which new resources have been placed at the disposal of the people. In the Tennessee Valley there is a whole new approach to the problems of environment arising from economic growth and population increase.

In the last 35 years, we have seen immense changes in the physical characteristics of the Valley region. We had a wasted river. Today we have a harnessed river system, serving the region as fully as any river anywhere in the world. Floods are in check. Barges carry millions of tons of vital traffic. Water supplies are abundant for cities and industries. The lakes have added new beauty to the forest surroundings and new sources of recreation for the region and the Nation.

We had a region where electric power, an essential sinew of industrial growth, was both scarce and expensive, despite the great hydroelectric potential of the river, and extensive regional deposits of coal. Today power is both abundant and inexpensive, used to the hilt in economic development. The energy of the river and coal are both hard at work and we are beginning to tap the power of the atom.

We were an agricultural region but our farms were failing. Today we have an agriculture featuring lush, green pastures. Farm production is up and farm incomes have increased markedly. We had a region of rundown, cut-over, burned-over forests. Today the Valley's woodlands are a growing source of raw material for major Valley industries.

Nowhere in the Nation has the resource base of a region been transformed so extensively and so rapidly as in the Tennessee Valley.

What we are witnessing, therefore, in the growth of our own urban areas is the response by industry and commerce to this new resource base. Our cities are, as elsewhere, becoming larger cities. But, perhaps of even greater import, our villages are growing into towns and our towns are becoming cities of considerable size.

Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis all have gained in population and income. But in addition, we have many situations like Calvert City, Kentucky, which 20 years ago was a rural crossroads. Lying near the mouth of the Tennessee waterway and at the hub of our inland navigation system, it is today the location of one of the Nation's important chemical industry complexes. Its 34 plants, representing an investment of $240 million, provide some 2,800 new jobs.

There are many more locations like Calvert City. At Calhoun, Tennessee, near the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains is the largest newsprint mill in the United States with a supporting chemical complex.

The American-St. Gobain glass plant, where a solid sheet of glass a quarter of a mile long emerges from one great machine, sprouted from a cornfield in upper East Tennessee. Revere Copper & Brass is building a $300 million aluminum complex on Guntersville Lake, near the town of Scottsboro, Alabama. Goodrich Rubber Company chose Union City in western Tennessee as the site of a $100 million investment. The Carrier Company has decided to locate one of its large industries at Morrison in central Tennessee.

Each of these instances—and we could enumerate many more—is evidence of the growth we are experiencing. Each has a deep impact on the community concerned. They add opportunities for skilled employment for hundreds of workers, drawn from the surrounding countryside. They breed satellite industries. The total effect is an extensive change in the economic nature of the surrounding area, its housing patterns, its needs for streets and sewers and schools and recreation facilities. Here is the chance to build industrial parks with the room and beauty of the countryside instead of industrial slums. Here is the opportunity to plan for workers communities that cannot become ghettos. Here is the place and now is the time when we will, as Wilma Dykeman says, "determine the quality of life in this region for generations to come."

As I say, the resources are here. Industry is seeking them out with great eagerness. And because this process is just beginning, we must look at it as an unusual opportunity to avoid the pitfalls of industrialization elsewhere. The Tennessee Valley communities and their states now have a long background of planning experience and expert knowledge. TVA's goal is to work with them to examine all the problems of growth, to take advantage of all the opportunities for growth, and to work out solutions to the human and material problems as completely as human wisdom and foresight will permit.

The Tennessee Valley has been the location of some of the country's most successful models for completely new towns. Norris, Tennessee, was built in the mid-1930's in an idyllic wooded setting close to Norris Dam. The homes then erected, the layout of the streets and greenways, have stood the test of time and the town of Norris is today both beautiful and livable.

The town of Oak Ridge not far from Norris was built during World War II to house the workers and scientists who produced the Nation's first atomic energy. Oak Ridge also is today a thriving, well run, attractive community.

There will be more new towns, perhaps of this same sort, in the Tennessee Valley as the years go by.

But there must also be rebuilt towns, and the planners and community officials of the Tennessee Valley have had experience with this second type of community development, too.

An example is Guntersville, Alabama. When TVA began building Guntersville Dam in the middle 1930's, it was a small agricultural community relying chiefly on the fertile bottomlands of the nearby Tennessee River for its commercial life. The city officials thought its economic base would be destroyed. But, with help from TVA, the Alabama Planning Commission, and a planning commission of its own, Guntersville found ways to make use of the lake facilities and the shoreline that was created. By zoning action it reserved land adjacent to the deep water of the lake for commercial harbor. It designated other lakeshore lands for recreation purposes. Because of a series of wise decisions and farsighted planning, Guntersville has grown into a thriving small river port and a recreation center for much of northern Alabama.

An even more dramatic story could be told of Decatur, Alabama, on the shores of Wheeler Reservoir. Here the community has so organized and used its available resources that it is in the midst of a true "avenue of industry" lining the shoreline for several miles. Widely diverse in nature, attractively built and generously spaced, these countryside industries are the mainstay of a redeveloped, vigorous and pleasant community.

Planning experience in the Valley had advanced sufficiently by 1960 when TVA began building Melton Hill Dam in eastern Tennessee that we were able to see the necessity of joint planning for the use of the entire reservoir shoreline before impoundment. TVA, the Tennessee State Planning Commission and a local regional planning body, all working together, examined maps of the area, studied its roads and railroads, picked out areas suitable for parks, boat docks, and commercial barge terminals, and identified land suitable for industrial establishments. Where possible, TVA purchased these strategic lands and by official action by the local bodies they were set aside for these special purposes. The cities of Oak Ridge and Clinton created port authorities under state law. Industries have shown increasing interest in the assets available here, and the communities are organized and staffed to accommodate themselves to the cultural and environmental changes that will occur as economic growth takes place.

A third type of community development is taking place in the northwestern corner of the Tennessee Valley where TVA is establishing the Land Between the Lakes. Here, on a 170,000-acre tract between Kentucky and Barkley Reservoirs, TVA is creating a multipurpose outdoor study and recreation area. It is destined to attract literally millions of campers, fishermen, hikers, hunters, bird watchers, amateur photographers, Boy Scouts, school and church groups, farm and city youth clubs—in fact, virtually every type of outdoor enthusiast.

Perhaps the most significant economic aspect of the area is the fact that it will have no commercial facilities—no motels or restaurants, no filling stations or accommodations for servicing boats. All such establishments must be provided by private interests or public parks in areas across the lakes from the TVA area. When you realize that Land Between the Lakes lies within 500 miles of some 80 million people, you can get a feel for the very considerable business demand that is bound to take place in this area of western Kentucky and Tennessee.

It must not be a helter-skelter growth and planning is advancing well toward this end. The community at the northern gateway to the area is already feeling the economic consequences and the most intensive advance work is under way there in conjunction with private landowners, the city of Grand Rivers and the State of Kentucky. Again, the strategic areas have been identified—those suitable for commercial businesses, shoreline facilities, resorts and motels, schools and homes. Highway realignment is being worked out by the state. A model of the future community has been built and the townspeople are in the process of adopting the planning regulations designed to bring it about. We think it can be one of the most attractive entrances in the country to a major recreation area. At the same time, it can give a sizable boost to the local economy.

By now I hope I have conveyed to you something of what I mean when I say that TVA takes a "broadside" approach to the problems of growing communities and their living environment. We seek to involve every natural resource, water and land, farm and forest.

We seek to involve the total community—the city and the county and their elected officials; the businessmen and workers and farmers and their voluntary organizations. We include in this category the facilities of the state government—its planning commission, its highway department, its park commission, its fish and game officials, its department of health, its department of education. And we also include every available assistance from other Federal agencies and their national programs of assistance in education and training, urban development, housing, street improvement, sewage treatment, and other fields.

We are now entering upon an endeavor in eastern Tennessee which epitomizes many of these techniques. It is taking place in the village of Oliver Springs, a small town typical of many in the Appalachian area, lying on the eastern fringe of the Cumberland Plateau in Morgan County. Until the last decade, its principal economic base was the mining of coal plus such additional limited economic activities as could be supported by the small farms and timber operations of the vicinity. But in the last ten years coal mine employment in the area has declined sharply. The area has not been able to compete successfully with other sections where thicker coal seams are more readily adaptable to the modern techniques of mechanized mining. Oliver Springs and its businesses have felt the impact of these changes.

Last July another disaster hit Oliver Springs. A torrential rain sent Indian Creek into flood. A major part of the town was under water. The school, many homes and most businesses were severely damaged. This small community faced a crisis; but it was a crisis that can be a turning point in its life and in the lives of its inhabitants.

Here was a community built to serve the needs of another day. Located in a narrow valley along the stream, as many of our Appalachian towns perforce were, it has been flooded often. The bases for its original establishment—to serve coal mining and timbering operations—no longer adequately support its businesses. Lacking many essential services of a modern town—with a municipal water supply of limited capacity and without a sewerage system, for example—it has been unable to attract industries or residential development to give it new vitality.

Some people have argued, in similar cases, that the best solution might be just to abandon such towns. But it is a pointless argument because the plain fact is that the town will not be abandoned. People's homes, businesses and personal roots are there and they do not intend to move.

The problem is that, in the past, things have been patched up after a flood, usually inadequately, and life has picked up where it left off. Gradual deterioration has been the inevitable result. But at Oliver Springs, we wondered if a new approach would work.

TVA felt that a "broadside" approach to restoration could create a viable and livable "new town" on the site of declining Oliver Springs. Fortunately, we found within the city an active leadership that felt the same way. It was already moving in the direction of improved housing by organizing a local housing authority. It had under consideration plans for a sewer system. And an important new element of opportunity lay in the town's nearness to Oak Ridge, five miles away. Oliver Springs could serve well as an outlying residential area with accompanying service businesses. TVA felt that, by taking advantage of this leadership and these opportunities, we might help breathe new life into Oliver Springs. If successful, it would be an example and demonstration for all similar towns in Appalachia—and there are many.

We seized the initiative at what we believed to be just the right time, even before the mud and debris from the July flood had been swept away, and while there was strong public support for action which would remove once and for all this ever-present danger. TVA has now surveyed the flood problem and engineered a plan of stream improvement. Planners have sketched out ways in which the stream improvement can be geared into a redevelopment of the downtown area, providing for new and safer housing sites and a small industrial park. Funds for a beginning are included in the President's budget request for the coming fiscal year.

The city moved quickly to activate its housing and sewer projects. The state highway department had projected a highway improvement program for some time in the future. Approaches have been made to the department to advance this work and coordinate the highway development with the flood control project so both can contribute the maximum to the rehabilitation of the community. A school construction program is being reexamined to fit into the total scheme. In the meantime, the economy has been substantially aided by 12 to 15 disaster loans from the Small Business Administration. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is helping with redevelopment plans.

The outlook for the Appalachian community of Oliver Springs today is much brighter than anyone could have supposed a year ago. The very fact that a "broadside" approach is being taken has lent energy and initiative to the participants. They see that by combining a number of programs, the expense of all can be reduced. The period of their accomplishment can be shortened and the effect of all can be greatly increased.

This is a summary of the "new town" approaches of the Tennessee Valley and we can see them at work in every part of the region.

Coeburn, Virginia, has turned a flood disaster into a basis for solid future growth. TVA stream improvement for flood control through the new town has created a new park area, new parking for shoppers, and given new beauty to the area.

Sevierville in eastern Tennessee, similarly plagued by floods, has seen TVA's flood protection measures create new land for its business district. It is proceeding with a plan to use this land to make the community a more attractive gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Winchester, Tennessee, working with a Tributary Area Development organization is far along in its planning to take full advantage of the Tims Ford Dam and Reservoir, now under construction.

In northwestern Alabama where the Bear Creek watershed development is under way, communities centering about Russellville are similarly at work.

Iuka, Mississippi, and its leaders are seeking to stimulate industrial development along Pickwick Reservoir.

Columbia, Tennessee, which its great chemical complex based on the nearby phosphate deposits, now links its future, and that of the region, on the prospect of the Columbia dam on the Duck River and the improved water supplies, housing and recreation facilities it will provide.

The pattern of urban growth in the Tennessee Valley is just emerging. Its process is just beginning. But it is taking forms which promise not only a prosperous but a livable and comfortable environment. By using all our skills and all our resources and all our ingenuity, our communities can shape their total life as they grow. We can consciously and deliberately improve the quality of life in each of them. We can broaden the opportunities for both business and its employees. And in so doing we strengthen the fabric of the total society, enrich its cultural and intellectual quality, and deepen its spiritual contribution to the region and the Nation.

How S. Prestley Blake, Longmeadow, Mass., Plans To Preserve His 1967 Automobile

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the November 27, 1967, issue of Automotive News described the plans of Mr. S. Prestley Blake, of Longmeadow, Mass., to preserve his 1967 automobile. I ask unanimous consent that this item be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO HOBBYIST PLANS TO STORE COUGAR 10 YEARS

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.—S. Prestley Blake of Longmeadow, who makes a hobby of preserving cars, has bought a 1967 Mercury Cougar XR–7 and intends to store it for 10 years.

"I've been a bug on automobiles for all these years," he said, "and I've owned quite a few cars and preserved many of them. But this is the first time I've started a preservation project with a brand-new car."

Blake already has the blue Cougar on jackstands. He plans to deflate the tires to half tire pressures, add a special solution to the engine to preserve it from rust, cover the interior with neats-foot oil, and bathe the exterior with a preservative.

The preservation idea for the Cougar began three months ago, when Blake bought his daughter a yellow Cougar XR–7 with a black vinyl top.

"It was her car, but I drove it quite a bit and really liked it," said Blake. "To me it is the finest car ever built in this country.

"After Nancy had her car for about two weeks, I went back to the Springfield dealer and ordered another one for me—to keep for a long time."

Once the owner of two highly desirable Lincolns—a 1936 and a 1937 KB—Blake still has a 1925 Rolls-Royce.

"The Rolls was made right here in Springfield at the Duesenberg body works and I've had it for several years now," he said. "Look at the Rolls and look at the Cougar. I think the Cougar will look better than the Rolls when I take it out of mothballs."

The Need for Strong Local Law Enforcement

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to give Senators the opportunity to read an editorial published in the State, Columbia, S.C., on February 6, 1968. The editorial emphasizes the need for strong local law enforcement and quotes from comments by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the current FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

Mr. President, the rabble-rousers, hatemongers, and do-gooders who try to justify their criminal acts with slogans about civil disobedience would like to see a total breakdown of local law enforcement. At the time when our Nation's Capital is being threatened by groups and so-called leaders who advocate violating many of our laws, we need nationwide awareness of the necessity for having strong local law enforcement and we need effective nonpartisan, nonpolitical enforcement of our laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the State and the entire statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GESTAPO NEEDED

There have been some moves recently to have federal courts take over certain local police departments and supervise their operations. It has been suggested that federal courts ought to place a police department in receivership and appoint a "master" with full administrative powers over its affairs.

Once, when Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was the Attorney General, he toured Europe asking officials in various cities if they could advise him concerning the feasibility of creating a national police force in the U.S. In one German city he asked, "Do you have a national police force here?" "No, not now," replied the official. "We had one a few years ago, but it wasn't popular; it was called the Gestapo."

America has no place for, nor does it need, a national police force, writes FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the current *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.*

"It should be abundantly clear by now that in a democracy such as ours effective law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. In the great area of self-government reserved for states, counties, and cities, the enforcement of the laws is not only their duty but also their right. Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose concerted attacks against law enforcement and the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with federal police power."

Amen to that. Local law enforcement represents the first line of defense of our social order. We need no Gestapo here, nor any KBG.

[From FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin]

FEBRUARY 1, 1968.

Man cannot live in our complex society today without a system of laws. The system is doomed unless the laws are enforced, and the enforcement officer is ineffective unless his efforts to maintain the peace and protect life and property are supported by the government and the people.

The destruction of law enforcement, particularly at the local level, appears to be a prime objective of some dissident groups and individuals in our country. While they have made no appreciable headway, they are creating such a smokescreen of harassment and intimidation that enforcement of the law is becoming an overwhelming burden for many agencies.

In some areas, the doctrine of dissent is bordering on a doctrine of nihilism. Since local law enforcement represents the first line of defense of our social order, it becomes a primary target of those who challenge established authority. Regardless of the cause they support, many groups seek altercations with local police to gain publicity and sympathy. Consequently, in this rebellious climate, law enforcement must not only cope with an alarming and increasing crime problem but must also defend its very existence.

Currently, there is a move to have Federal courts take over certain local police departments and supervise their operations. According to this ridiculous plan, the courts would place a police department in receivership and appoint a special "master" with full administrative powers over its affairs. The courts could do this country a great service if they would promptly, and with finality, slap down such schemes to undermine and destroy local law enforcement.

Over the years, the FBI has consistently championed the cause of progressive State and local law enforcement. While extending full cooperative services to police agencies and assisting in the training of many thousands of State, county, and city policement, this Bureau has meticulously kept within the scope of its own authority and avoided any encroachment in areas of responsibility belonging to State and local police.

America has no place for, nor does it need, a national police force. It should be abundantly clear by now that in a democracy such as ours effective law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. In the great area of self-government reserved for States, counties, and cities, the enforcement of the laws is not only their duty but also their right. Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose concerted attacks against law enforcement and the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with Federal police power.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

RMS "Queen Mary"

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Long Beach, Calif., is justifiably proud of its recent acquisition of the RMS *Queen Mary*, and the city has come forth with a bold and imaginative plan to develop a major educational and recreational facility around her berth. And all of this, I might point out, is being accomplished by the city itself without assistance from the Federal Government.

To the many people from all over the world who cherish the memories of their trips aboard this great ship, I think they will be delighted to learn that her future in the Port of Long Beach will be as glamorous as her past.

A consulting firm retained by the city of Long Beach forecasts that the *Queen Mary* will become the nucleus of a water-oriented total recreational development at Long Beach Harbor which will attract more than 4.5 million visitors annually.

The preliminary report prepared by the firm of Linesch & Reynolds includes a developmental plan linking the huge recreational complex.

Planned developments on the large new pier J where the *Queen Mary* will be located include a 4,000-boat marina and a commercial international village.

Across an arm of the harbor to the downtown Long Beach shoreline is the proposed Pacific Terrace development which includes the present Long Beach Arena, a hotel and a proposed exhibit hall and convention center, as well as boating and swimming lagoons. Also planned is the remodeling of the Long Beach Memorial Auditorium adjacent to the arena.

The firm's report states:

> Development plans for the *Queen Mary* will afford the city an unequalled opportunity to create one of the most dynamic, integrated complexes in the world, as well as educational, recreational and commercial activities of the highest order.

The report also points to the possibility of conducting ocean cruise ship operations from pier J and the operation of excursion boats between the Pacific Terrace and pier J developments.

The report also advances a unique "theme satellite" concept as a possibility for parking and other purposes adjacent to the *Queen Mary*.

The "theme satellites," not more than three stories tall, would house 1,500 cars each. The number of satellites would be determined on the basis of parking demands.

Besides accommodating vehicles, the satellites would serve as major holding areas for museum and tour visitors. The satellites, the report states, might contain previews of future museum exhibits, a pictorial history of the *Queen Mary* and a pictorial description of the tour and museum. These "support activities" would be placed on the top deck of each of the satellites.

When the scheduled tour is announced the visitors would then be transported from the satellite over an interconnecting structure to a dockside facility adjacent to the vessel.

> Trams, moving sidewalks, mini-rails, etc., could be utilized for this movement of groups of visitors—

The report declares, and concludes:

> In our opinion the city's acquisition of this great ship represents one of the most challenging programs ever undertaken by a community.

An annual attendance of 3 million visitors to the Museum of the Sea was predicted by Les H. Cohen, museum director, in an address before members of the board of trustees, affiliated organizations, and their guests on January 30.

A luncheon at the Reef Restaurant in Long Beach followed guided tours of the *Queen Mary* for more than 150, including members of the board of trustees of the California Museum Foundation, the Muses, the advisory board, the Coronets, and their guests.

The museum director, principal speaker at the luncheon, was introduced by J. Howard Edgerton, chairman of the board of trustees.

Others at the head table included Mrs. Edgerton; Mr. and Mrs. G. E. Kinsey, president of the foundation; Don M. Muchmore, chairman of the Museum of the Sea Committee; John R. Mansell, city manager of Long Beach; Adm. and Mrs. John Fee, *Queen Mary* project director; Mr. and Mrs. William McCann, director of the California Museum of Science and Industry; and Robert J. Reardon, associate director, Museum of the Sea.

Cohen predicted that the *Queen*, which made 1,000 transatlantic crossings before her retirement from seagoing service, "is scheduled to become the crown jewel of the multimillion-dollar aquatic, recreational and education pier J complex being planned for the near future by the city of Long Beach."

The director declared that the largest portion of ship space—more than two-thirds—will be devoted to the museum and the guided tour program, which also will be conducted by the museum. This will encompass what is now C and D decks and much of the area below those decks, including the engine and boiler rooms.

Cohen said that the museum's main exhibit hall will encompass more than 50,000 square feet, a larger area than a football field. The tour program will cover such key points as the bow, the bridge, the wheelhouse, the captain's quarters, the magnificent main lounge and main dining room, and luxurious staterooms.

The director indicated that it will take about a year to convert the great ship into a combination museum of the sea, hotel-convention center and complex of restaurants, shops, and offices. All this is to be accomplished, he stressed, "while maintaining the integrity and dignity of this historic luxury liner."

At the present time, he said, a cleanup crew is at work on the ship at pier E in Long Beach and engineers are making cost-conversion estimates. Within weeks, the ship will go into drydock for major renovation of her hull. Design and engineering projects relating to the adaptation of the exhibit-display areas have started. When the ship comes out of drydock, the construction of exhibit-display areas will start.

Cohen said that the museum staff presently is engaged with a design firm in the development of the master plan and the story line for the total museum complex. He said that this preliminary research and design work is expected to be completed in April.

"It is planned," Cohen said, "that the first increment of the exhibits will be completed by January 1969 to permit the museum to participate in the grand public opening of the *Queen Mary*." Cohen estimated that at least 4 years will be required to complete the museum, "but even then, because of the nature and significance of man's knowledge of the sea, we expect that this museum will change, grow, and develop each year with man's increasing knowledge of the world's oceans."

The Perils of Pollution

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Evening Journal, of Wilmington, Del., last week published a series of five articles on the various ways in which man is polluting the planet earth and imperiling his present and future health.

The articles were written by Alton Blakeslee, Associated Press science writer, and serve to summarize just how serious pollution control now is in our Nation.

I believe the series of articles will be a great help in increasing public awareness of the need to meet effectively the challenge which pollution in all forms presents to life in our Nation and the world today.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN, DESPOILER OF A PLANET: MESSY CREW PERILS LIFE ON SPACESHIP EARTH—I

(By Alton Blakeslee)

Three men, buttoned inside an Apollo spacecraft, are destined in coming months to leave earth and go exploring the moon.

They know of course that they will die should anything go seriously wrong with their supply of air, water or heat—in short, with their environment aboard the tiny spacecraft.

But mankind at home on earth is threatening ominously to destroy his own planet, by actions as careless as astronauts deliberately tampering with their life-support system. Man on earth is even running out of places to throw away his garbage and trash.

The earth is actually only one huge spaceship. It spins at 1,000 miles an hour; it wheels around the sun once a year at 66,960 mph; it is one captive planet of the sun whirling within the Milky Way galaxy at 630,000 mph on the sun's unknown cosmic mission.

Every human being thus is a member of a space crew.

Planet earth keeps them alive with one total environment, only one, to supply the air, water, heat, food, all the materials to support all of its 3.3 billion passengers. By some predictions, within 30 more years there will be 5 to 7 billion passengers, all dependent upon and in turn influencing the earth's self-contained environment.

At accelerating pace, man is poisoning, polluting and abusing his earthship environment.

"We are exploiting the earth the way a parasite exploits its host. But if our host earth is killed, we have nowhere else to go," says Dr. Harold G. Cassidy, Yale University chemist.

Air in city and country alike is becoming increasingly polluted, at rising risk to human health and life. Water in streams, lakes, ocean shores is becoming more contaminated, smelly, dangerous to health and aquatic life.

Man in his tenure has caused the extinction of at least 300 species of animals, has destroyed forests and grasslands, and created dust bowls.

Uncontrolled noise impairs hearing, and "most urban Americans have forgotten what tranquility is," one conservationist observes.

Human populations explode around the world, and implode into cities. Slums erode human life and dignity. New tensions rise from crowding, from traffic jams, from loss of human privacy.

Of the 3.3 billion people on earth, at least 2 billion live "like steerage passengers or worse," assailed by hunger and disease, says Dr. Roger Revelle, director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University.

More people migrate to new or expanding suburbs, paving land with more asphalt, concrete and buildings, thereby affecting local weather and climate, adding new contaminations.

An Associated Press survey finds scientists, specialists, and various government and health officials stressing these urgent themes:

Man has assumed, and behaved willy nilly, as though the atmosphere, rivers and lakes, the soil, all had unlimited ability to cleanse and repair themselves. Now he finds this is simply not so. Nor are the oceans an infinite sink for waste disposal.

The earth's environment must be treated as an integrated whole. Air, water and land are intimately related; they affect one another. Man affects his environment; the changed environment affects him.

Needed now is action "looking at total man in his total environment rather than taking a crisis or piecemeal approach to solving problems," declares a special report to the government entitled, "A Strategy for a Livable Environment."

Man must try to anticipate the consequences from new things he does. Great changes in rainfall, weather, bodies of water, may be triggered off inadvertently by seemingly innocuous man-made influences. Jet contrails and exhausts, man-made heat, might be such triggers.

Environmental pollution is very serious, and growing worse. And little is known yet about the potential hazards from 500,000 to 600,000 synthetic chemicals and other compounds in use today.

Critical problems call for new attitudes and ways of thinking. One example is contained in a report from a specialist committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council:

As the earth becomes more crowded, there is no longer an "away" in which to throw things away, it says, adding:

"Our whole economy is based on taking natural resources, converting them into things that are consumer products, selling them to the consumer, and then forgetting about them.

"But there are no consumers—only users. The user employs the product, sometimes changes it in form, but does not consume it—he just discards it."

Closing the loop from user back to resource to remake the discards could be an answer, and "a product such as an automobile could be designed in the first place with return to the factory for remaking and reuse in mind," the report says.

"We have accepted noise, foul air, dirty rivers as inevitable consequences of industrialization. This has been our psychology," says Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

"But now we are changing our basic assumptions. We have been a filthy generation. What will become of our grandchildren if we don't change our approach?"

Nature, one scientist remarks, now is presenting her bills for man's reckless exploitation of his earthly environment.

Men in an Apollo spacecraft must all be responsible for their limited and crucial environment.

Says Dr. Cassidy: "We, capable of thought, must be the stewards of this spaceship earth. The goal is not only the survival of man, but survival with maintenance of quality."

Man, Despoiler of a Planet: Rocket Exhaust Dust Could Alter Climate—II

(By Alton Blakeslee)

Rockets, spewing out exhausts, are launching men and instrumented laboratories out to explore space. Inevitably, many more will soar up.

And the future promises fleets of supersonic transport—SST—airplanes, flying so high and fast they shrink the world in time for their passengers, also releasing clouds of exhaust particles at extremely high altitudes.

A consequent cost from both might be:

The partial drowning of New York, London, Tokyo, and other cities and land on low-lying coastal areas around the world—because the earth's climate warms up and all the ice caps melt.

Or the freezing grip of a new Ice Age creeping over the world—because the earth's climate cools down.

Serious scientists are speculating and making calculations about both possibilities that might result from long-lingering exhaust particles thrust up into the high thin atmosphere.

They are not predicting that either of these man-caused disasters will happen. Remedial steps could be taken if they threatened.

The great significance of their concern is that now—after past bitter experiences—men are taking a new kind of prudent and protective look at the earth's environment, before the act, rather than after.

The scientists have reason to believe that a relatively small concentration of gaseous or solid particles, only thousandths of an inch in size, could alter the earth's climate.

If they were mostly of one given size, they would reflect more of the sun's incoming heat back into space, while allowing more of the earth's heat—the earth is always radiating heat outward—to escape into space. Result: a cooling of the earth, and in time a new Ice Age.

If of a different size, the particle umbrella would allow more of the sun's heat to reach the earth's surface, while holding in more of the earth's outgoing radiation. Result: a warming up that could melt the polar icecaps, thus raising ocean levels by 200 to 250 feet, by some calculations.

Scientists interviewed on this subject say they are not yet agreed on what concentration of exhaust particles would affect world climate, and in just which direction. They are using computers to help check out the theories.

They do agree that there would be no danger except through a combination of exhaust particles from both Space Age rockets, and many SST or supersonic jet flights.

The reassurance is that if a potential threat began occurring, and could be recognized, the rocket of jet flights could be limited in numbers until some of the particles fell to the ground.

Among atmospheric scientists, there is increasing awareness that small alterations affecting the intricate mechanisms controlling climate and weather might trigger great and perhaps undesirable effects.

Daily, for example, hundreds of jet planes crisscross the nation or great parts of it, often leaving fluffy contrails of water vapor, manmade clouds, as signature of their passage.

Some contrails soon dissipate. Others turn into or are soon followed by high cirrus clouds that can and do influence the earth's heat balance with the sun.

Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., is one who wonders whether these manmade clouds may trigger changes in local or distant weather.

Depending on circumstances, the cirrus clouds might warm or cool the earth below by one to a few degrees.

Natural cirrus clouds apparently can deflect the jet stream at times, which can vastly affect weather elsewhere.

The sun pours forth enough ultraviolet light to be murderous to human life. But much of it is blocked by ozone in the atmosphere. The vertical distribution of ozone varies by day and season, latitude and longitude. But at times the maximum layer is at an altitude of 70,000 to 80,000 feet.

In a few years, supersonic jets will be flying at this altitude, Dr. Walter D. Komhyr of the Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—in Boulder, Colo., points out. Their exhausts throw out carbon, which is an efficient catalyst or agent to destroy ozone.

"This could become a real problem when there are many such flights," Dr. Komhyr says. Jets might destroy enough ozone to permit a harmful increase in ultraviolet light reaching earth, or cause other effects.

ESSA and other organizations, therefore, are seeking "benchmark" measurements of normal levels and fluctuations of ozone. These could serve as a warning system if human activities began to produce adverse effects, Dr. Komhyr explains.

Natural mechanisms that determine weather and climate are intricate and complex, but vigorous research here and abroad is beginning to unravel some mysteries. Much of the knowledge still is speculative, Dr. Roberts says, but in time the human effects on weather and the natural mechanisms will become clear.

Such understandings might allow man to alter his weather artificially.

But scientists are wary about rushing into experiments yet. Producing the rain desired in one area might produce devastating drought elsewhere.

So meanwhile their goal is to seek facts, to check theories, and use computers to create simulated models of the weather. And also to ask the computer's mysterious chain-reaction weather box if they put one influence in, or took one out.

This is insurance against creating inadvertently, a crisis or disaster in the world's climate and weather, such as is happening with the air that humans breathe.

The Choice: Clean Air or Live Like Mole—III

(By Alton Blakeslee)

To breathe enough oxygen to stay alive, you must draw about 1,600 quarts of air into your lungs every day.

But civilized man is making a sewer out of his sky and air. Too much of our daily air is polluted, containing increasing quotients of noxious, offensive and poisonous gases and solid particles.

Health officials say they can only guess at the real cost to health both from killer smogs and from chronic exposure to carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, lead, dust, soot, and a host of new chemical compounds.

The national bill for air pollution damage to clothing, metals, buildings, crops, paints and fabrics is estimated at $12 billion a year—about $60 for every man, woman and child.

But to control or reduce air pollution, the federal, state and local governments until this year were spending only $84 million a year—42 cents for every man, woman and child. Federal funds were increased in legislation passed last year, but some experts say it's not enough.

"Americans have a choice: Clean up the air and live like human beings, or stay indoors and live like moles," warns John W. Gardner who recently resigned as secretary of health.

The earth is a spaceship whose outer "walls" are only its atmosphere hugged to the planet by gravity.

Each day into this atmosphere, 90 million motor vehicles are pouring 180,000 tons of carbon monoxide, 33,000 tons of hydrocarbons, and 17,500 tons of nitrogen oxide.

Each day, factories, homes, and power plans using fuel oil and coal belch up 100,000 tons or more of sulfur dioxide.

Damage to agriculture and livestock from polluted air is estimated at $500 million annually.

Much of about 800 million pounds of trash, garbage, leaves and the like is burned daily in incinerators, many of low efficiency, pouring more pollutants into the air.

About 7,300 U.S. communities suffer from varying degrees of air pollution, says the U.S. Public Health Service.

During smogs, daily death rates soar above average as polluted air takes a toll of people with weakened respiratory systems and hearts.

A London smog was blamed for 4,000 excess deaths in 1952; one in Donora, Pa., for 20 dead in 1948; a Thanksgiving week smog in New York City in 1966 was blamed indirectly for prematurely snuffing out 168 lives.

Polluted air is blamed by some medical authorities for causing some lung cancers, for exacerbating asthma, the lung disease emphysema, tuberculosis and congestive heart failure. Years of chronic, low-level exposure presumably take some toll.

"When people just don't feel well from air pollution, how do you fix a price?" asks Dr. John T. Middleton, director of the Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control in Washington.

"The auto driver consuming carbon monoxide for an hour or so daily may become a highway hazard from monoxide effects on his nervous system," he declares.

An initial step has been taken to choke off some of air pollution from motor vehicles, which some experts say contributes 60 per cent or more of all air pollution.

By federal law, all new cars starting with 1968 models must be equipped with devices that reduce the usual exhaust emissions of hydrocarbons by about two thirds, and carbon monoxide by a half.

It costs the new car buyer about $50. There is no legal requirement that the new efficiency be maintained as cars age, nor do older cars have to be similarly equipped. The government has proposed more stringent controls for 1970 models, cutting by one-third the amount of exhaust pollutants permitted in 1968 autos.

Some cities have pioneered clean air programs, notably Los Angeles, Pittsburgh and St. Louis.

But as yet, says Dr. Middleton, most state programs lack adequate authority and resources to clean up what is everyone's air. And regional programs have been virtually nonexistent.

The federal government is putting more muscle into the struggle for cleaner air.

Under the Clean Air Act of 1963 and subsequent amendments, Congress supplied increasing funds for air pollution abatement programs, matching grants to states, research, training of personnel, and pilot programs to demonstrate specific means of reducing air pollution.

The budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last year for all such efforts was $64 million. State and local governments were spending another $20 million.

The Air Quality Act, of 1967 increases spending to $428.3 million, over three years. This includes $125 million for research over a two-year period.

HEW will set standards, designate air quality regions, and enforce the standards. The new act has been praised as a great step forward, and criticized as too complicated and as slowing down needed efforts to control air pollution.

No one denies that the problem is urgent, and complicated.

"There is little or no political mileage to be won yet in working for cleaner air," says Ron M. Linton, chairman of Urban America, Inc., a nonprofit organization, in Washington, concerned with urban needs. "The pressure groups fighting for it are not in the political mainstream."

"You wonder," he adds, "whether we have to wait for real disaster, the loss of many lives in a smog, before we begin all-out efforts to control air pollution."

Nation's Lakes Fast Becoming Cesspools—IV

(By Alton Blakeslee)

A lovely lake is one ironic casualty of the space age.

Clear Lake bore a well-merited name before housing developments mushroomed around it after Houston, Tex., became the headquarters for manned space flight in 1961.

Now Clear Lake is well on its way toward becoming a cesspool because of lack of integrated planning and control of such matters as sewage disposal, says Dr. Jack Bregman, a water scientist.

Ironically, some Clear Lake residents are scientists and technicians working to make sure that U.S. astronauts going to the moon have pure water.

Of all planets in the solar system only Earth possesses so much water—covering 70 per cent of its surface. Viewed from space, it sparkles as a blue planet.

But earth water is becoming increasingly befouled, smelly, and repulsive through man's carelessness, disdain, greed, or innocence of consequences of his actions upon the balances of nature.

"Just about every stream in this country is polluted to some degree," says Bregman, assistant deputy for water pollution control in the Department of Interior. "Some now are beyond their capacity to handle wastes. And so are numerous lakes."

"To fly over Lake Erie and look down into the cloudy mess of murderous pollution is like reading the flyleaf of a book on the end of civilization," Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has remarked.

Some sources of water pollution are long familiar—raw or poorly treated human sewage and industrial wastes pouring into streams and lakes; oil from ship spillage or sinkings fouling harbors and beaches and killing wildlife.

Man's civilization is adding more, often to his shocked surprise. But nature's law of physics—that for every action there is a reaction—applies as well to man's deeds and his total environment.

And so:

Pesticides boost food production. But they wash from farms into rivers, sometimes killing fish, and into the oceans.

At sea, some scientists believe, pesticide residues become concentrated in tiny organisms, diatoms, which fish then consume, and birds receive a larger load of the chemicals by eating fish.

Diatoms produce oxygen, and replenish Earth's supply of atmospheric oxygen every 2,000 years as it is used up, the late Dr. Lloyd Berkner, a geophysicist, estimated. But if pesticides, as poisons, reduce the supply of diatoms, or make them less efficient in producing oxygen, "we might find ourselves running out of atmospheric oxygen."

Housewives welcomed detergents to clean dishes and clothes. But the ensuing river of detergents foamed into troublesome bubble baths in rivers and sewage treatment plants. The detergent industry resolved the problem by developing "soft" detergents which bacteria could break down.

But detergents still contain phosphates which can be nourishment for plant life in lakes. So can phosphates and other chemicals from sewage, from fertilizers spread upon farms and suburban lawns, from livestock and poultry wastes that wash into rivers and lakes.

Lakes are born, they live and die a natural death, scientists point out. But overfertilization by man speeds their death. Algae and other plants grow at prodigious rate. They die, and more of the dissolved oxygen in the water is consumed in their decay. Fish and other life suffocates.

Dirt silting off from farms, or the heaped scars of soil at town and city construction sites, muddies and clogs waterways.

A newly recognized culprit in "polluting" water is heat. Rivers are a fine source of water to cool atomic reactors producing electricity, or other industrial operations. The water is returned to the stream unchanged except that it can be five to 20 degrees warmer.

This warmth can change the whole biology of a river, reducing its oxygen content and killing off game fish, for example, that are very sensitive to temperature changes.

"The heat problem is here and it's big, big as hell, particularly with the blossoming of nuclear utilities," one scientist cautions. It can be avoided, but not cheaply, as through building storage towers or ponds to let the water cool down.

Countermeasures are increasing to control or halt pollution, and clean up the states' and nation's water.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 established the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and started up a program for states to set, or else have set for them, water quality standards for interstate waters within their borders. All 50 states now have submitted standards proposals, and 10 or more have been approved by the secretary of the interior.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 authorized $3.9 billion for construction grants to help build sewage treatment plants, for research, and grants to state water pollution control programs.

It should be possible, says Udall, to correct most of the most flagrant pollution situations within a few years. More time will be required for the total task.

It will be costly. A new official estimate is

$26 billion to $29 billion over the next five years for collection and adequate treatment of industrial and municipal wastes.

Another estimate is that the cost of remedying all the sicknesses of the nation's waters—spread over a number of years—may reach $100 billion.

NO CRASH PROGRAM WILL UNFOUL OUR NEST—V

(By Alton Blakeslee)

"The American style seems to be to allow problems to grow to menacing proportions before tackling them," a scientist-editor remarks.

"Then the action takes the form of ill-considered 'crash' programs" for quick-fix remedies.

No such casual style is permitted planners of American or Soviet manned space missions. Men aboard spaceships must depend upon a closed system to assure them oxygen, food, safe water and safe waste disposal.

But planet earth is also essentially just one spaceship with one closed environmental system, albeit on huge scale.

Its crew of life is assailed by increasingly menacing problems of polluted air, water, and land, of mammoth waste and trash disposal headaches, and hunger in many nations or "cabins" of the spaceship.

Remedies are being employed, or proposed. Some are bold. Some involve the need to know more about what man really is doing to his complicated environment.

"Man is becoming a geological and biological agent who through his technology cannot only change the world, but destroy large parts of it without realizing that he is doing so," says Dr. Roger Revelle of Harvard University.

Revelle was the first U.S. chairman of the five-year International Biological Program, IBP, which began last July 1, and which involves cooperative studies by scientists of 50 nations.

Understanding man's effects upon his environment is one general goal of the long-planned IBP effort.

Exact knowledge of what man is doing, what the consequences of any actions may be, is hard to come by. But a good deal is known, and more is being learned to help citizens make wiser choices of what roads to follow.

Congressmen have proposed setting up special "watch-dog" committees or councils which would be charged with assessing the consequences of new technological steps. Then the public and government might be alerted in time to help avoid to minimize undesirable results of advances that at first blush appear entirely beneficial.

Citizens groups of scientists and other specialists are acting, here and there, with similar purpose.

The time has come, says Dr. Douglas Brooks, president of the Travelers Research Center, Inc., in Hartford, Conn., for "environmental management, an unprecedented management, an unprecedented collaboration or partnerships among many fields of science, the life sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences."

Bold, quick action to curb and cure pollution is urged in a report, "A Strategy for A Livable Environment," issued in mid-1967. It recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spend $2.5 billion over the next five years on both specific and general targets.

The report was prepared by a task force, created by recently resigned HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, and headed by Ron M. Linton, chairman of Urban American, Inc.

"American affluence today contaminates the nation's air, water and land faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse them," the report warns.

But man can correct the contamination he creates, and "the nation's industrial and technological genius needs to be brought to bear on this problem. Action cannot be delayed until all the answers or even better answers are available."

Among the 10 immediate action goals recommended by the "Strategy" report:

By 1970, an air quality restoration effort to start, in 75 interstate areas, abatement plans to reduce plant stack emissions by 90 per cent, and to set national standards to reduce vehicle exhaust emissions by 90 per cent from 1967 levels.

By 1973, a waste disposal and research to integrate solid and liquid waste and air-quality control.

By 1973, an urban improvement effort to develop basic data "sufficient to establish human levels of tolerance for crowding, congestion, noise, odor, and specific human endurance data for general stress and accident threats."

By 1970, an effort to set human safety levels for synthetic materials, trace metals and chemicals now in use, and to prohibit use of any new ones until approved by HEW.

By 1970, a radiation control effort to protect workers.

By 1970, an occupational-disease and safety-protection effort to extend to all employes.

By 1969, a governmental compliance effort to ensure that standards for physical and mental health for housing, urban development and transportation will be used by federal agencies administering such programs.

All of these are "not ends in themselves, just the first steps," Linton says.

"We cannot engage in biological and chemical warfare against ourselves," the Strategy specialists say, because of inertia, apathy, the voting down of bond issues for new sewage control or other plants and facilities, and bickering among political jurisdictions.

But there are optimists that man will not destroy himself through pollution.

As Revelle puts it: "Humans act in their own best interest, if they know what it is."

Tucumcari Can "Do It Yourself" With Plan

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today, when more and more communities are seeking funds from the Federal Government for a multitude of projects, it is refreshing to find a city or town that proposes improvement through its own efforts without the assistance of Federal money. One such community is my own hometown of Tucumcari, N. Mex. For the benefit of my colleagues I wish to enter an article from the Albuquerque Journal of February 16, 1968, which describes the proposed Tucumcari improvement project:

TUCUMCARI CAN "DO IT YOURSELF" WITH PLAN

(By Martha Buddecke)

TUCUMCARI.—A do-it-yourself plan for Tucumcari was presented Thursday night to downtown property owners and city officials by the Albuquerque firm of Atrium One.

The plan, which can be carried out without the use of federal funds, would have as its goal the development of Tucumcari as a regional shopping center for Quay County.

Street improvement, more parking and more landscaping are features of the plan, which is divided into four phases.

The project, costing $731,092, can be financed through property assessments and sales tax revenue bonds, the planners said. Street and sidewalk improvements are estimated at $178,139, with parking lot improvements pegged at $119,453. Landscaping will come to $27,500.

Land for seven parking lot sites and city facilities will make up the largest cost of $406,000. The land will be financed through sales tax revenue bonds.

Assessment districts will pay for street and sidewalk improvements, with property owners assessed at an amount per front foot.

Funds for landscaping can come from the federal government, if the city wishes to apply for beautification money.

Phase I, to be completed in a year would include:

A truck bypass to reroute heavy traffic around Main Street.

Construction of three new parking lots.

Development of a downtown park.

Construction of new sidewalks and plaza on Main Street.

The Main Street Plaza will feature two-way one lane traffic, with a landscaped divider and sidewalks designed in a serpentine pattern. Paving brick will be used to designate pedestrian walkways and intersections.

Since Second Street will be closed for a block on either side of Main, the intersection of Main and Second will feature a sculpture or fountain.

"This is a project all Tucumcari can do," said urban designer Gene Bebermeyer. "All the people in town can get together and take up a collection to hire a sculptor or build a fountain."

The city also plans to complete the development of city buildings now started one block west of downtown. Fourth Street will be closed between Center Street and Railroad Avenue to create a triangle of land where city maintenance buildings will be expanded.

A new city hall is also planned in an area west of the present city hall, which will be expanded and linked with the Tucumcari Library to accommodate a larger library.

Phase II of the plan begins in 1970 and calls for the construction of new buildings in the downtown area where dilapidated buildings or vacant lots now exist.

The plan also suggests a common project for three Tucumcari churches. Each church has a building on one side of a central block. The plan suggests the churches buy this block in common and build a complex of educational buildings, with perhaps one structure which can be used by all three.

Phase II includes a park development behind the county courthouse, designed to help stimulate residential development in that area, said Bebermeyer. "Now there is rundown, slum housing there. It would make a good site for low income housing."

Another park is planned to screen the railroad tracks north of the downtown area.

In phase III, beginning in 1975, another park is planned for the west end of Main Street, where planners hope an office building complex could be built.

This phase would also include the opening of a truck bypass around Tucumcari to the north. City officials also feel a new police building and jail will be needed by that time, to be built near city hall.

Phase IV of the plan which would begin in 1980, would include widening of the present railroad overpass and construction of the seventh downtown parking lot.

Officials and property owners were furnished a breakdown of the projects cost, including assessment cost to the property owner for the various improvements.

Total annual cost to the property owners will be $54,580 assessed at a rate per front foot. The rate will differ according to the amount of work done on the street or adjacent property.

The cost will be spread over a 10-year period, with property owners making a $27,290 payment every six months.

Admiral Burke's Views on the "Pueblo" and Other Military Problems

---

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 19 I placed in the RECORD the first of three articles about Adm. Arleigh Burke and current military problems. The first article appeared in the February 14 edition of the News and Courier newspaper, Charleston, S.C. The second and third appeared in the February 15 and 16 editions.

These later interviews, prepared by Mr. Elias P. Demetracopoulos, are equally as interesting as Admiral Burke's analysis of the war in Vietnam, which I discussed last Monday.

Mr. President, I commend these articles about the *Pueblo*, the Soviet Navy, and other miscellaneous military subjects to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Feb. 15, 1968]

ADMIRAL BURKE GIVES VIEWS OF "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the second of three articles in which Adm. Arleigh Burke, former chief of naval operations, gives his exclusive views on the crises facing the United States. In this article he discusses all aspects of the Pueblo incident.)

(By Elias Demetracopoulos)

WASHINGTON.—Question: Do you agree with the administration's handling of the Pueblo incident?

Answer: I don't really understand a lot about the Pueblo incident. All that I know, really, is what I have read in the papers. I don't understand why some actions were taken. It is a very distressing thing.

I don't understand how any captain could surrender his ship. That's against all the tradition that we were all brought up with. It must be that the captain had orders which forbade him from fighting. I think he would have fought otherwise, but, of course, I don't know this is true.

I don't know what orders he had, but I can't conceive of a captain of a U.S. commissioned ship not fighting when he is possibly boarded unless he was specifically told not to. I can't understand why he didn't destroy his ship when or after she was boarded.

I can't understand why some combat forces were not in position to protect the ship. These ships have been heckled before. I don't mean that these protective forces should be right next to the ship but I don't understand why there weren't surface ships within a short steaming distance of the ship or aircraft cover which could come to the aid in a short while.

I don't understand why, when the Pueblo was taken into Wonsan, a small surface ship like a destroyer was not ordered to go get her. They could probably have gotten her if we had acted fast. This destroyer captain could have sent a dispatch to North Korean authorities in Wonsan or Pyongyand and told them, "I am coming in to get my ship." And when he goes into Wonsan—it's up to the North Koreans whether they open fire or not.

If they open fire on our ship, as they probably would, then the captain of the destroyer has a fight on his hands. He possibly could go in and take the ship back anyway but he possibly might find that he doesn't have enough power to take her back.

That's the time for reinforcements to come in—and I don't mean tremendous task forces—but enough force to get that ship.

I don't understand the chain of command to the Pueblo. She must not have been under direct naval command. I don't mean that the captain and men were not in the Navy, but I don't think his next senior could have been in the Navy.

If that ship was operating directly under some organization of agency other than the Navy, then I can understand why CINCPAC (Commander-in-Chief, Pacific) or any other echelons of naval command didn't take action. Or maybe they had orders not to take action too. I simply don't know.

There's an awful lot about this happening which I don't understand and which distresses me no end. It's a lot different from Decatur's action when he went after the Philadelphia in Tripoli more than 150 years ago. It's a lot different than action that would have been taken even a fairly few years ago. All naval officers are brought up never to let commissioned ships of the United States be surrendered. I just don't understand it.

Question: In view of your long and distinguished naval career, what would you have done if, first, you were the skipper of the Pueblo, second, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific, and third, President of the United States of America?

Answer: Well, nobody can put himself exactly in the position of another man. What I would have done as captain of that ship would have been dependent upon my orders, upon a lot of things. But I would have weighed very carefully, and I expect he did, whether or not—even though I had orders never to fight—whether to fight regardless of my instructions.

We are all taught when we first enter the Navy that an order has to be obeyed. At the same time when a man believes he has received an order that is wrong, his first duty, if there is time, is to notify the commander who gave those orders that you think the orders are wrong and ask him to modify them, giving the reasons, of course. That doesn't make the superior very happy but if he actually is wrong and you can convince him, he will change his orders. This has happened in the past.

But if there isn't time, as there probably was not in this case, then the captain has the choice of disobeying his orders because he believes the best interests of the United States would be served by doing something else or by obeying them blindly. If he disobeys and he does something that his orders indicate that he should not do, that is a very grave action indeed. He had better be right. He had better be absolutely right. Because if he is not, he might embarrass the United States. He might endanger his crew and his people. He might do a lot of things.

But if he is right, maybe he will have done a great thing for the U.S.

Now, there is one point here: That if a commander takes a step that is embarrassing or even which the officials of the United States do not agree with, those officials can disavow his action. They can punish the commander who did it. That usually satisfies both our friends and our enemies because it is the intent behind these actions which is most important.

Perhaps that is why the Communists created this incident. Our ship was certainly on the high seas. I think that she did not even violate the 12-mile limit, which, incidentally, is not accepted by the United States or many other nations. I think that this whole affair was created by the Communists to humiliate us, to make us appear in the eyes of the rest of the world as if we were not really able or willing to protect our own ships on the high seas; maybe cause us to lose a little respect throughout the world, including a little self-respect.

Question: Could you elaborate on how you felt about how the captain of the Pueblo could violate his orders if he felt he was right and what the connection is there?

Answer: Well, if he were ordered, for example, not to fight a ship and not to use his guns, the man who gave those orders would have given those orders with a certain set of circumstances in mind. Certainly the captain doesn't want to shoot anybody who is heckling—so the man who gave those orders may have thought "there is going to be a lot of Communist heckling exercises and we don't want our ships shooting at boats that come close." So he may have issued orders to the ship not to use guns at all.

Well, the captain might reason very well that these were circumstances which the other man had in mind when he gave those orders or he might reason, "Things are a lot more serious than he thought. I've got to realize that these circumstances are different than he envisaged and I must shoot to save my ship. These people attacking have no moral or any other right boarding my ship. They are highjacking my ship and committing piracy, and I am going to protect my ship."

And then he notifies his boss, whoever he is, right away that he has opened fire, he is protecting his ship, and if communications are as good as I think they are, he probably would have gotten his information back to his seniors very fast.

Question: So if you were the skipper of the Pueblo you personally would have fought and you would never have surrendered your ship?

Answer: I don't say that, because I don't know the exact circumstances and it is impossible to ever put yourself in exactly the position of another man. I don't know the facts now and I don't want to make the statement that this captain is wrong. He may not have been. I don't want to criticize him nor do I want to say that I would have surely done it differently. I might have done exactly the same thing he did.

But from what I think happened I'm afraid I would not have done it that way.

Question: And what about if you were Commander in Chief of U.S. Forces in the Pacific?

Answer: As I understand it, the Commander-in-Chief, the Pacific was not in the chain of command to the ship. He apparently was not notified of the attack immediately, which bears this out. I suspect that probably what happened was that the ship reported to some organization in the United States which in turn forwarded the information to the Commander-In-Chief. Pacific, who knew that he did not have any authority or control over that ship and he would be hesitant to take action himself because he would not know what other action had been ordered by other people. He would think "I'll wait a little while to see what's going to be done by whoever is running this show."

All of this is on the basis that in the ship probably was not in the chain of command under CINCPAC.

Question: You think that the CINCPAC should have full authority over all vessels including the Pueblo operating in that area?

Answer: Well, yes I do. I think military forces should be commanded by military people and that the chain of command should be military. I think all naval ships should be operated under the naval chain of command because if this is done then you have a professional who knows a lot about the Navy and the chain of command, and the captains or the junior officers realize they have a man who understands their problems and knows what to do, that their commander has had a great deal of experience, and is not an amateur in a professional game.

Question: If you were President of the United States, how would you react in dealing with the Pueblo incident?

Answer: This is the most difficult question of all because I think it would have been better if there had been an immediate reaction to this illegal highjacking. With the rapid communications that have been developed in the last few years and the enormous advances that have been made in electronics, it is very easy to send a message anyplace in the world very fast. The difficult part is in writing the message and in conveying the exact thought that the man has in mind to somebody else. Now because this communications system does make transmission of messages so quick and easy, there has been a tendency to concentrate all decisionmaking, or most of the decisionmaking, in Washington and actually, I suspect, in the office of the President. Well, that has a lot of very bad results.

In the first place, the President can't be knowledgeable of all the circumstances, no matter how hard he tries, and God knows any President works hard enough, including President Johnson, trying to keep knowledgeable on everything that happens.

In the second place, it takes time to wake him. Nobody wakes the President for minor matters. So what happens when an urgent message of high priority comes in over the communications systems? Somebody decodes it, looks at it, and then thinks: "Should I call the President or should I not? Should I first call somebody else." So usually they call somebody else and ask "What do I do?" And the man whoever is called, advises them and says, "You'd better call the President fast, young fellow."

And so they call the President, the President wakes up out of a cold sleep, and listens to a briefing over the telephone. He doesn't know the circumstances, he hasn't been awake very long, he has to make a decision. It is quite natural that when a man makes a decision under those circumstances, he is cautious.

Now I don't mean that he shouldn't be cautious all the time, but under these circumstances anybody is super-cautious. It is a natural reaction—don't do anything right now. Call somebody—ask the advice of Mr. So-and-So, or get more information, or come over and bring all the charts and data over, or something like that. There is a tendency to delay.

This is, of course, the danger of making too many decisions in a central position, and this is true of the government or any other organization. As many decisions as possible should be made as far down the echelon of command as possible.

Now the reason against that is that decisions that are made these days are too grave, the consequences are possibly too great to leave in the hands of any subordinate. On the other hand, there is a limited number of decisions that the President can handle. There's not time enough for him to handle them all.

The more delegation of authority there is, usually, the better, providing policy is known through the echelons of command so that the lad on the spot knows the policies under which the government is operating.

Your question was what I would have done if I were President, and the answer is I think I would have reacted very fast to get this ship back right quickly.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Feb. 16, 1968]

BURKE SEES NECESSITY FOR CONTINUING DRAFT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the last of three articles in which Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, gives his exclusive views on current crises facing America.)

(By E. Demetracopoulos)

WASHINGTON.—Question: How do you feel about the Republican presidential candidate, Richard Nixon's proposal for the creation of a professional army of volunteers, highly trained and paid, and capable of fighting nuclear wars?

Answer: Well, of course, that's the most desirable kind of an army to have. Then the nation would have a fully professional army, highly skilled, highly trained, without a great turnover. It would be a very fine situation to try to achieve. However, our armed forces are so big that I doubt we could get enough volunteers to do away with the draft. I think, the draft will be necessary for some time.

Now I notice that you said that Mr. Nixon stated that they would be highly paid. Pay is one of the important elements of military service but it isn't always the most important. There are a lot of other things that cause people to choose a military career. One of them is a sense of achievement. Another is respect for the profession. People have to have good respect for their own profession. A man is a good lawyer if he has a feeling that law is a great profession, and that as he gains professional competence, he will be able to exercise his professional ability. There are still other reasons why people want to become a member of the military service, such as the spirit of adventure. But in general I think Mr. Nixon is right, although it would be very difficult to achieve at this time.

Question: What is your attitude toward the psychological, military and moral aspects of the draft-card burnings and do you agree with Gen. Hershey's recommendation on this issue?

Answer: I certainly agree with Gen. Hershey's thoughts—that the burning of draft cards is a disgrace, that no young man should be permitted to neglect his duty to the United States, and every young man in every country has a duty to the country in which he is born, a duty to his society. I think that when the United States is in a conflict, as we are now, that it is extremely bad for some young men to defy now, that it is extremely bad for morale, not just for the morale of young people, but for everybody. So they should be punished for this.

Now the question of who should do the punishment is another thing. I think that probably the punishment should be done by civil authorities because these young men are civilians violating a civil law. But they should be punished, and if they can't be punished by civil authorities, then perhaps other steps should be taken.

Question: Are you satisfied with the way the U.S. Navy converts to nuclear ships?

Answer: No, I don't suppose any naval officer is satisfied with that. Nuclear power has some tremendous advantages over conventional power. What I think should be done is that all big ships should be powered with nuclear engines. I think there should be built every year a small ship with an experimental lightweight nuclear power plant—an experimental unit to improve nuclear power for small ships. There have been great improvements recently. A good power plant can be made for ships the size of a cruiser. I think we should continue that improvement and get power plants for even smaller ships. We have been too long in converting to nuclear power.

Question: As early as January 12, 1961, as Chief of Naval Operations, speaking to this correspondent, you predicted the creation of a Soviet Mediterranean fleet operating along the same lines as the U.S. Sixth Fleet. How do you feel today on this issue, now that your warnings have become a hard reality? And, generally, what is your current assessment of the Soviet naval power?

Answer: Right after World War II the Soviets made extensive studies as to what happened during the war. One of the things they realized from their analysis was the importance of seapower. They knew they couldn't become a naval power all at once, so they very carefully developed a submarine force—a tremendously large submarine force, because with submarines they thought they could deny the Allies control of the seas. They couldn't have ships on the seas themselves, but could prevent our ships from operating at sea.

But also they started work on the four basic elements of sea power. One of them was their Navy. Another was the merchant marine and another fisheries (fishing vessels) and the fourth one was ocean science—knowledge of the sea.

The first thing that they built up on a big scale was a fishing fleet because that had immediate economic possibilities. Today the Russian fishing fleet may be the largest in the world.

Some of their trawlers have "elint" (electronic intelligence) capability, and operate off our coasts all the time. They are off Cape Kennedy now. They are off New York—all over, gathering information.

The next thing that they did was develop a merchant marine. They didn't have very many shipyards at first so they bought ships from foreign yards, from Scandinavian countries, Japan and Italy. One time, I think as recently as 1965, the Soviets had on order in Japan more tonnage for the USSR merchant marine than the United States had in the United States. This is remarkable. By buying abroad, they also learned foreign ship-building design and knowhow.

Today, all goods that are of Soviet origin are shipped in Soviet bottoms. In contrast, most U.S. goods are shipped in foreign bottoms.

In the third area, the Soviets have built a large number of hydrographic and oceanographic vessels, and they have more research ships now, I understand, than we do. They have been intensively studying the ocean bottoms, the currents and all the things that pertain to the sea for the last 20 years.

For their Navy, they initially, in 1950, built conventional cruisers and destroyers, not too many of them but quite enough, they thought. They still concentrated on their submarines and they studied the other navies of the world. They have developed some very good missile ships, both submarines somewhat similar to our Polaris craft and surface vessels like the Komar, the Egyptian PT boat that sank the Israeli destroyer with a Styx missile. They made a lot of other developments. They have increased the number of new destroyers, PT boats, and frigates until they have a pretty good-sized Navy. Now they are developing their amphibious capability. They have increased their naval infantry force (which corresponds to our marines). They are building two or three helicopter carriers. They have various other types of amphibious ships under construction.

In addition, they have started to expand their operational areas. The first move was in the Mediterranean. For the last couple of years they had a few ships there, but when the Israeli-Arab crisis came along, they put a sizeable fleet into the Mediterranean—cruisers, destroyers and submarines. Then, when the Israelis pushed down toward the Suez Canal, some of these ships went into Suez and showed the flag and the Israelis stopped. What effect these Soviet ships really had nobody knows, but it was a show of power.

The Soviets have been heckling and harassing our ships by steaming into our formations, trying to get in our way as much as possible to do two things. First, to see what we would do, but also to make our operations difficult.

I expect in the future that they will continue to create incidents at sea; they will make a show of force in various parts of the world. They will call at foreign ports, particularly in the Mediterranean; they will try to establish bases, perhaps in Algeria, perhaps Malta. Certainly they have bases already in Egypt and will obtain more bases in Yemen, Aden and other places.

They will have a show of force in areas other than the Mediterranean, particularly true in areas where they have economic ties. If any difficulty arises in any of those areas, I am sure Soviet Navy vessels will show up in those ports and may have a considerable influence on what eventually happens. Chances are that the Soviets are going to move into the Indian Ocean, now that Britain has withdrawn from east of Suez. The U.S. Navy is spread pretty thin now but certainly we should have some sort of Indian Ocean fleet.

Question: Are you satisfied with parting Secretary of Defense McNamara's antimissile program or do you think that it is a waste of money?

Answer: I think we should conduct research and development to a very heavy extent on anti-missile defense. I don't know whether or not our present anti-missile system is good enough to warrant going into maximum production. I doubt if it is, but I think it is good enough to put some missiles in some areas. I think development should continue and, as progress is made, more and more anti-missile systems should be erected in various places. I don't think you can run a war with wholly offensive systems.

Question: Do you agree with Sen. John McClellan's recently expressed views on the controversial F–111 plane, and what do you think should be the U.S. Navy approach to this issue?

Answer: The F–111 should be very carefully evaluated by the Navy to determine whether or not it can fulfill the required missions. If it can, fine. If it cannot, then can that plane be modified so that it will fulfill the missions? If it cannot, then the plane should not be purchased. There is another question, and that is the cost of the airplane. It is a very expensive plane. If another airplane can be built to do the same thing cheaper, why then of course that should be done. In general I agree with Sen. McClellan's views.

Question: As a member of the three-member official investigating committee on the disaster of the Bay of Pigs operation, set up by President Kennedy, can you comment on Secretary McNamara's televised admission, for the first time, on the program "Meet the Press" on his personal responsibility for that fiasco?

Answer: President Kennedy took all the responsibility for what happened in the Bay of Pigs. Maybe Mr. McNamara does feel a great sense of responsibility for advising Mr. Kennedy. I don't know. However, I was a member of that committee and one of the things we were asked not to do was to discuss that report.

Question: Admiral, in August 1966, in an interview with this correspondent, you stated "I am concerned about reports that the establishment of dictatorship in Greece is being contemplated as an effective solution to Greece's present difficulties. Like Chairman L. Mendel Rivers and other distinguished American in high positions, I am opposed to the establishment of dictatorship in Greece of any kind, under whatever pretext, which the Communists will use to start their drive once again to conquer Greece and to create a new Vietnam in Southern Europe." In view of the April 21, 1967 military coup in Greece, last December's effort by King Constantine to oust the military junta in Athens, and your long and close association with the Greek royal family, could you state whether you still hold the same views as expressed in the above-mentioned interview?

Answer: Now, first I would like to say that I have great admiration for Greeks in general. I have known a lot of Greeks and have admired a lot of Greeks. I have seen them fight. I have great admiration for them. I also have great admiration for the royal family. I appreciate their position and the positions that they have taken and I know they have worked very hard to do what they thought was the very best for Greece.

I still hope that, as soon as possible, a democratic solution can be worked out in order that Greece does not fall into the hands of the Communists and that once again Athens will be the cradle of democracy.

Rural Telephone Bank Bill

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a knowledgeable treatise or synopsis of the rural telephone bank bill, H.R. 12066, is contained in a letter from the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Hon. W. R. POAGE, to Mr. H. R. Woodburn, Jr., vice president and general manager of the United Telephone Co. of Iowa. The letter was written in reply to one received by Chairman POAGE from Mr. Woodburn.

This rural telephone bill is now before the Rules Committee of the House. It would make available supplemental non-Federal capital for rural telephone systems. The need for updating telephone service in rural America is becoming an urgent and acute problem. The average number of extensions of rural telephone lines is about five to six subscribers. The companies, both private and REA, require considerable financing to reduce the number of party-line extensions.

Mr. POAGE's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1968.

Mr. H. R. WOODBURN, Jr.,
Vice President and General Manager, United Telephone Co. of Iowa, Newton, Iowa.

DEAR MR. WOODBURN: Thank you for your letter of February 7th reiterating the often expressed opposition of the United Utilities, Inc. to H.R. 12066. I recognize that it is extremely logical for your telephone company, a portion of this utility group, to express similar views.

First, I would like to correct a misunderstanding in your letter concerning the amount of savings which this bill would achieve. The budget request for fiscal 1969 for REA telephone loans is $125 million with an automatic reduction of $50 million upon passage of H.R. 12066. The maximum amount that could be appropriated in fiscal 1969 for the bank under the terms of this bill is $30 million. This represents an immediate savings of $20 million in the budget request for *next* year rather than three years, as you suggest.

That there may be no misunderstanding as to the provisions of this legislation I am enclosing a copy of the reported bill and committee report.

This is, however, not the major point that I wanted to raise in connection with your comments. What I would like to take issue with is your suggestion that there is no need for further financing of the REA systems because of the willingness and ability of private companies to accomplish the job. In my judgment, your statement reflects a basic misconception of the whole program. The great majority of these REA-financed systems are *themselves* private companies just as you are a private company, but because of their already existing mortgage obligations to REA, they are not now free to go into the private money market for supplemental funds. Subsidized loans are granted to these companies regardless of the nature of their organizational structure to provide telephone service to the sparsely populated areas—not to benefit either the companies or cooperatives as such. The REA program has traditionally been a program for people and not companies and the rural people of this country have reaped the benefits, first, in obtaining a telephone of any type and second, by the continual improvement on the part of the REA-financed systems to update their quality of service.

Frankly, I have often suggested that I did not care what company provides rural telephone service as long as they attempt to provide service on a par with the city subscribers. The original REA Act permits any company to borrow (including the Bell System and United Utilities, Inc.) who is willing to undertake the obligations of these stated service concepts which include complete area coverage. My main purpose in introducing the 1949 amendment permitting rural telephone systems to borrow on the same terms as the rural electric systems was to provide good telephone service for the rural people of our country. This is still my goal in introducing and urging passage of H.R. 12066. The 600 plus privately owned companies who have demonstrated their willingness to provide this kind of service are now in a desperate dilemma for additional capital to meet the demands of their existing subscribers for quality telephone service.

I agree with your suggestion that many of these companies do not require continued 2% financing and this is certainly one of the basic purposes of the bank bill: to allow such companies, through a mixture of government and private capital, at appropriate rates of interest, to provide their own financing. As I previously pointed out, the REA-financed companies do not presently have any choice. The only loan authority under the existing statute is for 2% loans. The pending bill would change this to permit more realistic rates of interest for those companies who could afford to pay more. The property of these companies which now have REA loans is mortgaged in such a way that they cannot seek private financing of any kind simply because they have no unmortgaged collateral. The bank, however, would be free to obtain private capital through issuance of debentures and re-lend it to the rural systems at reasonable rates of interest.

You complain of what you call "the abuse of the REA Act" by the Continental Telephone Company because of that company's assumption of existing REA loans outstanding on the property of companies acquired by it. I cannot agree with your conclusion. Frankly, I cannot see how Continental's acquisition of REA companies in any way abuses the use of REA funds since the assumption of such financing carries with it the obligation of the service concepts, which I previously mentioned, which are established by the original REA Act. As I also stated previously, I do not care what company provides the service as long as they provide quality telephone service but at this point let me add one reservation. I cannot help but conclude that the long-standing practice of the United system to pay off these 2% loans on systems purchased by United subsidiaries suggests a desire to avoid the obligation to provide these standards of service. The Continental Company would at least appear to have no such compunction about providing the type of service demanded by the REA Act.

You also suggest that many private companies such as your own now stand ready and willing to provide "Bell Standard service" to those rural areas but I wonder where these companies were in 1949 when most of our nation's farms needed telephone service of any type. In view of your company's unwillingness to provide this initial service to the rural areas of our country and your continuing avoidance of any commitment to maintain the standards set by the REA Act, I am sure you will understand my reservation in connection with your suggestion that you are now willing, along with other unspecified companies, to provide the rural areas of our country with "Bell Standard service." On the other hand, it would seem to be a rather natural desire on your part to see these companies fail in their effort to secure adequate private capital to continue their operation and growth since you and one or two other companies now provide the sole market for these systems. I have personally studied the tremendous acquisition rate of the United Holding Company of the past 5 years and that record, standing alone, would seem to support such a conclusion.

It is not difficult for a Congressman, or anyone else for that matter, to see that buying up existing telephone companies on a wholesale basis, often at speculative prices, is a lucrative business venture particularly when the cost can be passed on to the consumer. When any company fails to secure adequate capital financing they are immediately subject to such offers, and are generally forced to accept one of them. Obviously, the passage of this bill would remove a large part of the pressure you can now exert on these unfortunate small systems.

In conclusion, I must again disagree with your position and suggest that I hope we can look forward to the earliest possible passage of the Telephone Bill. It seems to me that for the reasons I have detailed at length herein the inescapable conclusion is that if our rural people are to have good telephone service, in both good *and* bad times, a high degree of *local ownership and control* must be maintained. Without this legislation, it seems clear that the "capital squeeze" will force the nation's rural telephone systems to sell out to concentrations of financial power which have no direct interest in the rural areas of this country—a situation which I sincerely hope can be avoided.

Please give my regards to Mr. Bollinger of your company who testified before our Committee last October in support of this legislation. Our Committee did not see fit to adopt all of the amendments he suggested but each of them was given thorough consideration as he requested.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
W. R. Poage, *Congressman.*

"This Is a Stickup"

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, several times recently I have spoken out on the tremendous increase in bank robberies, and the necessity for the Federal banking supervisory agencies to require banking institutions to better protect themselves against robberies.

In 1963, the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations began its study of the rise in banking crimes, and what should be done to lessen them. Since that time, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have prodded the bank agencies to more fully realize their responsibilities for having banks and savings and loan associations better protect themselves against crimes. They have taken some steps in that direction, principally educational measures to make bankers more aware of the facilities that are available for making their institutions safer against external crimes. However, one thing that they have not done, and which the subcommittee recommended should be done, is to develop and prescribe the basic security requirements of the various kinds and sizes of banking institutions.

Because bank robberies have been increasing, I strongly support the administration's legislative proposal which would require the Federal banking supervisory agencies to promulgate minimum standards of security devices and procedures to discourage robberies, burglaries, and larcenies and to assist in the identification and apprehension of persons who commit such acts.

There are many kinds of devices, such as cameras, alarm systems, and instructional features that were pointed out in our committee report that are available to the banking institutions. Obviously the employment of any or all of these might not be enough to discourage some robbers. On the other hand, as the Attorney General pointed out in sending the administration's bill to the House, our committee 4 years ago found it incredible that a large percentage of financial institutions had no alarm system whatsoever.

A very timely article in today's Wall Street Journal points up the need for greater bank security in the face of ever-rising bank robberies. The rate across the country is now at seven a day, six times greater than it was 10 years ago. The 1,730 robberies of banks and other savings institutions means not only financial losses to banks and their insurers. Those can be measured in dollars. Of incalculable loss, however, are the killings and the jeopardy inflicted on bank employees and their customers who are caught in the institutions during robberies.

There is another consideration: Thousands of hours of valuable manpower and the hundreds of thousands of dollars that must be expended by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in tracking down bank robbers. A large part of this could be saved by all banking institutions better protecting themselves against external crimes.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal should be read by everyone in the Congress and by bankers and licensed lenders everywhere:

"This Is a StickUp": Bank Robberies Jump to Seven-a-Day Rate Despite New Detection Methods—Total Is Six Times the Level of 1957—Bank Insurers Say They May Increase Charges—One Bank, Hit Six Times, Closes

(By Edward P. Foldessy)

Maybe it's all due to Bonnie and Clyde. Nobody seems to have any more convincing explanation for a fantastic rise in bank robberies across the country. Some blame it on bank architecture that makes robberies easier, some blame it on the spread of branch banking to rural areas where get-aways are quicker, and some simply cite the population boom, figuring the more people there are the more bank robbers there are.

One enforcement official sneers and says: "It's the easy-living generation. Everyone's living high off the hog. By the time a bum's 35, if he hasn't earned it, he'll try to steal it."

Whatever the reason, the situation is almost getting out of hand. The Federal Bureau of Investigation says there were 1,730 robberies of banks and other savings institutions in 1967—about 7 each banking day—up 50% from 1,164 in 1966 and a six-fold jump from the 278 of 1957. The latest year-to-year increase was by far the biggest jump in any category of crime.

One bank, an Oxon Hill, Md., branch of the Southern Maryland Bank & Trust Co., was hit six times in less than 2½ years. The modern brick structure recently closed permanently because employes refused to work there any longer. It was the first time since the 1940s that a bank has closed because of robberies, according to the American Bankers Association.

"YE SHALL ALL PERISH"

It's not that banks are trying to make things easier for the crooks. In fact, there are all kinds of new methods to discourage attempts at bank robbing, ranging from "loaded" bills that discharge tear gas as the robber escapes to window decals that warn "except ye repent, ye shall all perish."

But the robbers aren't deterred. The closed Oxon Hill bank had a silent alarm system and surveillance cameras, among other sophisticated devices, yet the perpetrators of only one of the six heists have been caught. "The robbers apparently were coming from Washington. They would knock us off and go back and get lost," says George M. Sullivan, senior vice president of Southern Maryland Bank & Trust.

The six hauls cost the bank less than $50,000—"We were very fortunate," says Mr. Sullivan—but they caused the bank a lot of grief. "Our employees were abused and pistol whipped. They refused to work any longer," he says. A woman customer, making her first visit to the bank, was thrown to the floor, robbed and held at gunpoint. Frightened customers began withdrawing their deposits. Eventually, the bond that covered losses was canceled by the insurance company.

NO MORE CREAMPUFFS

The FBI doesn't announce figures for losses from bank robberies, but the American Bankers Association says banks lost $3,323,000 to robbers in the first half of last year, up from $1,900,000 a year earlier.

Insurance companies, not the banks, generally are stuck with the robbery losses, and they're not happy about the increase. "Banks aren't generally regarded as creampuff risks anymore," says one insurance man. A spokesman for Insurance Co. of North America says the "bank insurance business has been generally unprofitable over the past few years." And an officer of Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. says, "We've become a little numb, we've been hit so badly."

As a result, insurers are pressing for industry-wide increases in premiums on bankers' blanket bonds, which cover robbery, burglary and embezzlement losses. An increase would be the first since 1961. For years prior to that, the rates had been declining. The extent of any increase hasn't been worked out yet, but one insurance official says that "bankers might be considerably surprised."

Bankers say they're doing all they can to stop the hold-ups. Many banks are forming special security departments, often headed by former FBI agents. The FBI itself has stepped up its program of briefing bankers on how to prevent—and handle—bank robberies. And the Justice Department, concerned by the trend, is drafting legislation that would require banks to have some robbery-prevention equipment.

QUIET COOPERATION—OR ELSE!

Most larger banks conduct special training sessions for tellers and managers, telling them what to do when they're slipped a note that says "This is a stick-up." Generally, tellers are told to cooperate and to keep quiet; a White Plains, N.Y., teller was shot in the stomach when she told a robber, "You must be kidding."

William Barry, chief of security for Bankers Trust Co. in New York, stresses the importance of getting an accurate description of the hold-up men. During training sessions, Mr. Barry has someone stage a mock hold-up. Afterwards, he asks for descriptions. "Usually they're hilarious," he says. One example: "He had a married man's stomach."

It wouldn't be hard to identify a hold-up man if he happened to steal a packet of bills supplied by Property Protection Service of America. The bills contain two vials that, when broken, release a strong scent that clings to the bandit.

The Decatur, Ga., firm also keeps three dogs that are trained to follow the scent, but so far they haven't been needed because there has been only one hold-up at a bank using the packets. That bank didn't ask for the dogs. (Nor did that bank have the warning decal—with the Biblical quotation—that the Georgia company provides its clients.)

Bills timed to release tear gas have proven effective, according to Walter A. Williamson, president of U.S. Currency Protection Corp. of Scottsdale, Ariz. He says one bandit, who unknowingly placed a "loaded" roll in his shirt, was found later in a basement, cowering behind a boiler. The exploding money had torn a hole in his shirt and sent him into shock.

The Great Society

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for 20 consecutive years Charlie Gebhard has written a column twice each week for the Waverly, Iowa, newspapers. It has to be a record equaled by few weekly columnists in Iowa.

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of his column, "Nowadaze," he summed up his feelings about politics and the Great Society with the following bit of verse:

This is the great society;
We boast of our propriety.
No graft or vice shall we admit;
Our great white chief would throw a fit!

With Bobby Baker for a friend;
Our Lyndon learned fast ways to spend.
He cooked up programs by the score;
Each week he asks for billions more.

To "Help the poor" there's OEO.
It pays a few some fancy dough.
But lots of cash has disappeared
In ways mysterious and weird.

To "help the rich" there's money too.
Big hush-hush loans for select few.
All sorts of deals to loot the till
Are finalized on Capitol Hill.

For farmers there's another theme;
They're really shook by Freeman's scheme.
Buy high, sell low, is his refrain;
"If you object, I'll dump the grain!"

We dole our money left and right;
The end, my friends, is not in sight.
We spend it faster than it's made;
More billions go for foreign aid.

Our nation now is filled with crime
And riots threaten all the time.
We're in a war without an end;
Abroad we scarcely have a friend!

The dollar shrinks each passing day;
True silver coins have passed away!
The interest rates are now sky high;
Inflation's "coming through the rye."

The workingman and old folks too
Find that their income just won't do!
Each time they get a raise in pay
Inflation takes it all away.

But Lyndon says, "Please vote for me
To keep all this prosperity."
And then he adds with piety:
"This is My great society."

Apprenticeship Opportunities for Minority Group Youngsters

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the record of American trade unions in fighting to end every racial barrier, both on the job and off the job, should be known by every citizen. Unfortunately, it is not.

In a recent interview on the Mutual Radio Network, AFL–CIO, Civil Rights Director Donald Slaiman discussed the expanding efforts of unions to recruit and prepare minority group workers for apprenticeship programs so that they may be brought into the skilled trades.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the transcript of that Labor News Conference program at this point in the RECORD and recommend it to all of the Members of this House:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE—MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, JANUARY 9, 1968

Subject: Apprenticeship Opportunities for Minority Group Youngsters.

Guest: Donald Slaiman, Director, AFL–CIO Department of Civil Rights.

Panel: Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine; Stanley Levey, labor correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Donald Slaiman, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Civil Rights.

The apprenticeship system—both on-the-job experience and classroom study—has long been the traditional avenue for young workers into the skilled trades. The department Mr. Slaiman heads works closely with unions, employers and other community groups to help minority group youngsters enter apprenticeship programs. Here to question Mr. Slaiman about apprenticeship opportunities today, are Stanley Levey, labor correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Levey, I believe you have the first question.

LEVEY. Thanks, Mr. Harden.

Mr. Slaiman, what are the facts about Negroes in the construction trades? Are they or aren't they getting into unions, and, are they or aren't they getting jobs?

SLAIMAN. Well, the fact is, there are large numbers of Negroes who have jobs in the construction industry—especially in many of the union construction jobs.

The problem is, that as in all industries in the United States, Negroes and other minorities tend not to be in certain jobs—that is, the highest-paid jobs in the industry. This is due to patterns of discrimination that existed in the past. It is also due to the fact that when the discrimination is ended, few Negroes have the experience or training to enter the higher-skilled jobs.

Now, in the construction industry, because of the nature of unionism, especially, most of the jobs are skilled jobs, so there are more Negroes in skilled jobs in the construction industry than in most other industries.

This leaves us with the fact that although they are in skilled jobs as bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, roofers, etc., they have entered some of the trades in any numbers, only very, very recently.

But, even in those cases, the percentages may be higher than in some other industries. Overall in the construction industry, the Negroes' penetration into skilled trades is far higher in almost every part of the country than it is into white collar jobs.

ADAMS. Well, Mr. Slaiman, there are some three million skilled tradesmen in the industry. Do you have any idea of the number of Negroes—the percentage of Negroes—among them?

SLAIMAN. No, we don't have that kind of figures. We should get them shortly after the EEO 2 and EEO 3 forms are filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

But, I can give you some figures which are some indication—figures compiled from the employer forms submitted by construction industry employers with government contracts. I don't know how accurate the figures are, but the first figures they got for contractors throughout the country with government contracts and 100 or more employees, showed 466,800 workers last year.

In the white collar section of the industry, 8 percent were Negro—those are all non-union jobs. In the blue collar section of the industry, they had 16.6 percent Negro. This is a fairly good percentage. Naturally, a good part of these were laborers, carpenters, bricklayers and so forth. But, even so, you will note that in the construction industry, union laborers make at least $3.50 an hour. Carpenters' and bricklayers' wages tend to be much higher. So, among these contractors, a good percentage of the blue collar work force was Negroes working at good-paying jobs, even though they may not have been heavily concentrated in the best-paying jobs.

ADAMS. Well, if the picture is as favorable as you say, Mr. Slaiman, why are the construction unions being singled out on the subject of civil rights? I know that at last month's AFL–CIO Convention, a civil rights leader ran down a list of local unions that he said had no Negroes, and had had none in their apprenticeship programs for years.

SLAIMAN. Well, you see, what's picked out are the five highest-paid of 20 different trades. These do have a small percentage of minority group workers.

Now, we are working to see that the percentages increase there. Thirty or 40 years ago, you could find, in many of the local unions, barriers or simply no Negroes. But, that is not the situation today.

Today, we have to deal with a situation in which, aside from isolated cases of discrimination, the real problem is insuring that even when there is non-discrimination, there are qualified applicants. In many cases, this means somebody to recruit, and motivate, and train, and prep minority group youngsters and older workers—and to get them to come through the doors when the doors are open. That is, when there is not discrimination.

Take some of the things cited at the Convention. It was mentioned that in five trades, there were only about six Negro apprentices as of some date—April 1966, I believe. Well, the Workers Defense League has gone into Cleveland, with the cooperation of the trades, and in the last three months, has placed 17 Negro apprentices—10 ironworkers and seven electricians—which is four times the number mentioned in 1966

Now, let's take it on a national basis. In that same speech, Mr. Wilkins, (Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) said that from 1950 to 1960, the number of Negro apprentices in all trades—not only building trades, but in all trades in the United States—increased by only one. But, from 1960 to 1967, these out-reach programs of the Workers Defense League, and the Urban League, that have been recruiting youngsters, have placed—within the last three years, by themselves, in just the construction industry, in just 16 cities—more than 1,000 Negro and Puerto Rican apprentices. So, while the number of jobs in these trades is still small, when we work on insuring nondiscrimination, plus insuring that there will be qualified applicants, we are beginning to get significant movement.

Levey. Mr. Slaiman, who can take credit for the changes that you cite? Can the construction unions in question take that credit? Isn't it a fact that these changes you speak of—and they are good—isn't it a fact that they have been literally forced upon the major construction unions by a variety of sources?

Slaiman. Well, the programs I am talking about have produced results—and they have produced more results, as Mr. Wilkins has pointed out, than the demonstrations, and compliance cases, and whatnot. He pointed out that after many years of demonstrations and compliance cases, there was very little movement. The programs that have brought significant results have all had the cooperation of the unions involved. There has been an occasional friction point, such as the early problems of Local 28 of the Sheet Metal Workers in New York, but even these have been taken care of. A recent New York Times piece mentions that Local 28 is cooperating with the Workers Defense League program. And, I might mention that there are now 54 Negro and Puerto Rican sheet metal apprentices in Local 28 in New York City.

Adams. If I could go back to the speech at the Convention, which I thought was highly critical of the AFL–CIO, Mr. Wilkins said he felt that the voluntary approach wasn't working effectively among the craft locals, and that he felt the government would have to do something more drastic to succeed. Do you think this is right? What is your approach?

Slaiman. Well, I think the question is really incorrectly posed. To just wait in any civil rights area, for voluntary approaches, has always proved inadequate.

That is why we, as well as Mr. Wilkins, have supported legislation and have agreed that sound implementation of the legislation must have support and cooperation.

But we found, especially in the apprenticeship skilled trade areas, as Mr. Wilkins has found, that individual cases—and even court cases—take a long time and produce limited results. Only when you have a massive effort among all parties—that is, communities, employers and unions cooperating—will you get significant results in skilled jobs, as opposed to just opening up the door to semi-skilled jobs, which require only limited ability.

Levey. Didn't the threat, Mr. Slaiman—didn't the threat of court action in Cleveland very largely help produce the results you cited just a few minutes ago?

Slaiman. The threat of court action, as well as negotiations at the same time, had an impact on one local union—the one case in which apprentices were recruited and passed. There was a question of whether they were fairly treated. But, the activities of the Workers Defense League and the unions cooperating with them, I don't think primarily came from that threat.

I think the results came from the fact that when the Workers Defense League went in, other building trades leaders assured the local building trades people that they had a constructive program. They gave it a chance and saw good results. As a result, in each case where a Joint Apprenticeship Council has announced a test, Ernest Green, director of the Joint Apprenticeship Committee of the Workers Defense League, has obtained the information on the time and place of the test and how to apply—and has also got the applicants prepared and ready, and found very little problem in any of the trades, so far.

Levey. Mr. Slaiman, just how realistic are these standards that the construction trades insist upon as requirements for apprenticeships? I notice that at the Building Trades Department meeting in Miami, preceding the AFL–CIO Convention, Neil Haggerty, the president of the Department, and AFL–CIO President George Meany, both said that they favor improved conditions for Negroes, but not at the cost of relaxing standards. Now, just the other day, President Johnson said, that in order to fight massive unemployment, we've got to go out and find jobs—and, if necessary, the government has to be the employer of last resort for Negroes. Isn't it up to the unions in the construction industry, at this critical point, to adopt a similar philosophy of emergency, take another look at these standards of theirs, and ask themselves honestly, whether they are really standards for young men coming into the trade, or whether they are really barriers to the young men?

Slaiman. Well, you have raised a number of problems, Mr. Levey.

The problem of providing jobs for completely unskilled people—some are those thought to be unemployable—some have no real job experience—means that the government has to be the employer of last resort, to provide unskilled jobs that are socially necessary. That means work that cities should be doing, but can't afford. Jobs as nurses' aides and educational aides—or repairing and fixing up parks.

Private industry is asked to find suitable jobs for these people, too, and when necessary, give them some minimal training.

But, you are not going to take somebody with no work experience, and very little educational background, and make them a highly-skilled person very easily.

Now, in some cases, the trades have met this problem. The Carpenters Union, the Operating Engineers Union, the Bricklayers Union, the Painters Union, have set up free apprenticeship programs, in which they take under-qualified people who normally wouldn't qualify, not only as a journeyman, but wouldn't meet the minimum requirements for apprenticeship, because they don't have enough to take the academic work and learn. They have set up programs to raise the background levels of these people, so that they will be able to enter as first-year apprentices after some pre-work—both school and practical work.

But, generally speaking, as to skilled and technical jobs—and this is not limited to the construction industry—there are tool makers, in the auto industry, highly skilled steel workers and draftsmen—by-and-large, there are many minority group people—youngsters and otherwise—who are underemployed now, who are not the hard-core unemployed, who should be moving up into these trades. It is no advantage to reduce the standards, if those who come in are unable to do the jobs. The fact is, that the requirements—both educational background and actual mechanical skill requirements—in most of these trades, is rising not falling. It is just an illusion to think that the hard-core unemployed can be taken care of in the highly-skilled trades.

We have to upgrade the educational backgrounds of people, so that they can go into the highly-skilled trades. And while the hard-core unemployed are getting their standards raised, provide them with meaningful work now, even if it is not of the most highly-skilled variety. Then, those who make it—those who get jobs—those who get some skills—those who are making a living now—if they take extra training and extra education, may move up the ladder into more highly-skilled jobs.

As I say, this is a general problem. It is not confined to just the construction industry. When the automobile industry in Detroit agrees to hire thousands of hard-core unemployed, they are not agreeing to hire them as tool makers; they are putting them in at the lower levels. Now, I said lower levels, but they are putting them into better jobs than they ever thought of getting. But, they are not starting at the skilled journeyman jobs.

Adams. On that point, Mr. Slaiman, these unskilled people going into auto industry jobs—are they going into the union—into the United Auto Workers?

Slaiman. Yes. Sure.

Adams. Well, would they, in the case of construction, go into the construction unions, even at lower level jobs that take less skills?

Slaiman. Of course. When a man goes into the Laborers Union at $3.50 or more an hour, he is going into the type of job that is semi-skilled in industry, with equivalent pay—maybe higher.

When you speak of a laborer in the construction industry, you are not speaking of an unskilled sweeper. They do many types of work. Now, when a man goes in as an apprentice—as an apprentice carpenter, for instance, starting maybe at $2.00 or $2.25 an hour—he joins the union long before he is a full-fledged journeyman. Even those youngsters who go into pre-apprenticeship programs at a lower level than the first-year bricklayer are in the union.

Levey. I wanted to get on to another point. One of the biggest problems, and apparently, one of the biggest programs of the Administration, will be in rebuilding the nation's cities—the Model Cities Program. This should mean thousands—perhaps, millions of jobs for construction workers. Now, are the construction unions taking part in these programs, or, what solutions do you have for these people?

Slaiman. Well, most of these programs are still on the drawing board. The construction unions are aware of both the problems and potentialities of these programs. They are beginning to look for ways they can get some of this work as union, and, at the same time, provide union membership for increasing numbers of minority group workers who will undoubtedly be on a lot of this work.

Now, the details of how this is to be done are not simple. No blueprints have been laid out by the government, by the unions or by the employers, as yet. I think this will be an important aspect of the work, providing far more job opportunities than the limited number of apprenticeships. The blueprints aren't fully laid out. All I can say at this time is that there is an interest. There was an expressed determination at the Building Trades Convention by both the government and the construction unions, to find the best way to meet this program.

Levey. Mr. Slaiman, doesn't that Model Cities Program provide a very strong whip for the government to push recalcitrant construction trades unions into a more responsible position with respect to Negroes?

Slaiman. Well, I don't think the unions are recalcitrant on this. Not only Mr. Haggerty of the Building Trades Department, but many other union leaders expressed; one a firm policy of non-discrimination; two, an interest in more than just a non-discrimination policy—affirmative action to assure entry; and three, numerous expressions of the importance of exploring the Model Cities and Rehabilitation Programs, and finding ways to see that these are well-paid and unionized jobs, rather than cheap jobs.

Adams. One of the points Mr. Haggerty raised at the Convention, Mr. Slaiman, was that he felt that the construction unions should seek out young Negroes and other minorities in the ghetto areas for pre-apprenticeship training. How would that work?

Slaiman. Well, one of the reasons why we support programs like those of the Workers Defense League, the Urban League, and other groups that are recruiting, is that we have found that it isn't easy to recruit applicants for jobs—especially jobs that have some requirements and some history that shows youngsters have stayed away from these jobs—that they had a disincentive, because they thought it was no use.

The business agent of a small local might not be very productive in finding people. Therefore, in those programs, you have full-time people who know the ghetto, who know the community, who know where the youngsters are—people who know what's in the schools—go out and do the recruiting, preparing and motivating needed. You get a much better flow of applicants that way.

Levey. Mr. Slaiman, how long do you think it is going to be until Negroes represent a substantial part of the three million skilled craftsmen in the United States?

Slaiman. It's very hard to estimate. I think that if we do the kind of job we are doing in apprenticeships on a broad scale across the country—in all industries and in all parts of the country—that the pace will be rather rapid. But, that is also, if we have a high level of employment, and, if our school and ghetto problems are generally eased. Under such circumstances, it won't take long. But, if these other things aren't taken care of, we're in trouble.

Harden. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Donald Slaiman, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Civil Rights. Representing the press were Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Stanley Levey, labor correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

Educate Our Kids at Home, Lee Urges

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are very much concerned with assimilating the many and diverse cultures which contribute to making our country so unique in the history of nations, I feel that the remarks of Mr. Tom Lee, a distinguished New Mexico State senator are especially appropriate. For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the Record at this time an article about his remarks which appeared in the Santa Fe New Mexican on February 12, 1968:

EDUCATE OUR KIDS AT HOME, LEE URGES

(By Harold Cousland)

Los Alamos.—State Sen. Tom Lee, a Navajo from McKinley County, yesterday criticized the Bureau of Indian Affairs for retarding education on the reservation.

Navajos want their children to go to public schools close to home, but the BIA prevents this by continuing to send the Indians to far-away boarding schools, Lee charged.

He spoke to 40 people at the weekly adult forum of the First Unitarian Church in Los Alamos. Lee, who is a rancher and owns a trading post 13 miles north of Gallup, is the first Navajo in the Senate.

He said that in the Navajos' first 100 years on the reservation, despite the great amounts of money the federal government has spent on Indian education, "we are still 75 years behind you folks."

He blamed much of the lack of progress on BIA boarding schools. He said that even when the Navajos want their children to attend public schools, the BIA claims jurisdiction over Indian children who live more than 1½ miles from a public school.

These children are often transported away from their families to attend a boarding school in Arizona, California or Nevada for nine months, said Lee, adding:

"Sometimes we (Indians) don't feel like studying because of the lack of love from father or mothers, sisters and brothers. Kids are running off from these boarding schools right and left because they are homesick."

He said that even during heavy pre-Christmas snows this winter, older Indians spent time outdoors hunting for runaway children from boarding schools.

From New Mexico, 17,465 Indian youngsters are going to BIA school. Lee said public school attendance is growing. Of 10,134 children in the 22 schools of McKinley County, 5,873 are Indians.

He said his own children attend public school and then come home and talk about their classes and teachers, unlike the boarding school isolation from parents.

In education and other Navajo needs Lee cited, he said the Navajos were learning to stop relying on the BIA and to develop their own political power by getting more Indians to vote.

He said one goal is to bring more of the tribe's children back to New Mexico to be educated in the hope that they will stay and help the tribe.

Lee said younger leaders of the Navajos had acquired an outside view of the reservation through military service.

Lee's own military service included 3½ years as a prisoner, working in a copper mine in Japan.

During this time, scientists in Los Alamos were helping develop the first atomic bomb.

Lee said that while in prison, he felt the shock of the first bomb dropped on Japan. After the second, he and the other surviving prisoners were released.

Soviet Watch Production Competes in United States

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American clock and watch industry, which has long been a valuable and important component of this country's economy, and a leading enterprise in Connecticut, is seriously threatened by the expansion of the Soviet Union into this specialized area.

The Soviets are now second among the watchmaking countries of the world with only the Swiss ahead of them, and with Japan and the United States in third and fourth places, respectively. And with increasing Soviet production, their watches are pouring into the United States—in many cases without tariffs.

An explanation of the Soviet Union's threat to America's clock and watch industry appeared in a New York Times article on February 19, 1968, and I commend this to the attention of my colleagues:

WATCHES MADE BY SOVIET WORRY THE U.S. INDUSTRY

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

The Soviet Union's clock and watch industry has quietly ticked into second place behind Switzerland's. And the ticking is slowly fraying the nerves of United States watch companies.

The United States Tariff Commission and leading watch-industry sources place Swiss output at about 70 million pieces, the Soviet's at 40 million, Japan 16 million, and American domestic output at 15 million a year.

"There are Americans who wouldn't touch a Russian watch who are wearing them without knowing it," a lawyer representing several of the more disgruntled American watch importers said last week.

"Being No. 2 doesn't bother the Russians. After all, cost factors are less important to them than getting dollars and driving what's left of our watch manufacturers to the wall. Besides, the Soviet watches, along with those of other countries, can now pour in without the penalties of tariffs."

The bitter words were spoken by Milton M. Jacobs, whose clients have been trying, unsuccessfully thus far, to keep Soviet watch movements outside the American market.

"Let's face it," he said, "the Soviet timepieces are as good as any in the popular-price range. They are entering this country through St. Croix, in the Virgin Islands, and from Guam, largely duty-free."

One of his clients, Allen V. Tornek, a watch importer, explained that a typical 10½ ligne 17-jewel lever movement from Switzerland costing $3.25, or one from Japan priced at $2.85, would face a duty of $1.80. A Soviet movement of that class would cost $1.90 and be subject to a tariff of $3.05 each because the Soviet Union is not a "most-favored" nation, unlike Japan, Switzerland and other countries in that customs category.

Lever watches are mostly jeweled movements and carry a higher duty here than pin-lever movements, which are cheaper. The Swiss make both kinds, while the Soviet Union and Japan produce only lever movements. Watches assembled in the Virgin Islands are mostly lever. Mainland lever output is about 1.5 million pieces of the total of 15 million, the rest being pin-lever varieties.

POWER UPHELD

They noted that under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, products of the Virgin Islands, for example, which do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 50 per cent, may be admitted to the United States duty-free.

Moreover, the Governor of the United States Virgin Islands has the power to grant tax exemption. This was confirmed Jan. 15, when the United States Time Company (Timex) subsidiary there challenged Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky. A Federal Court ruled that the Governor could grant exemption arbitrarily.

Meanwhile, Mr. Jacobs went on, there are three watch manufacturers at work in the United States today. They are Bulova, Hamilton and United States Time. All have units in the Virgin Islands, and all are importers of movements as well. The Elgin Watch Company gave up making timepieces on the mainland last September.

"SITUATION CHANGED"

Sol E. Flick, executive vice president of Bulova, said:

"Originally, we were opposed to the whole business after the tariff law was changed in 1959 to set up operations in the islands. We thought it was merely a vehicle for duty-free imports of movements. But the situation changed.

"We went to the islands in 1965. Governor Paiewonsky set quotas on shipments to the mainland a year later at one-ninth of the United States watch market, or about five million pieces. Bulova now assembles movements on St. Croix. I believe that 90 per cent of the parts come from Japan. The Swiss only permit the export of whole movements, except for parts to be used for repairs.

"As for Soviet movements, some smaller outfits used to bring them in, but I don't think many Russian works come in now. Of course, one can't tell a Russian movement from any other. Who knows? The law does not require the marking of a movement from the islands. That is why we have been pressing the Federal Trade Commission to have every movement marked with the country of origin. We are still to hear from them."

The Department of Commerce's latest figures show that imports of Soviet movements to the Virgin Islands alone rose from about 12,000 pieces valued at $25,668 in January, 1967, to 111,000 units valued at $224,313 last November.

Some in the watch industry conceded that marking would not eliminate the question of origin. As one importer put it, "Suppose an air shipment arrives from Russia to, say, Amsterdam. It is put in a different carton and sent to the islands in parts. A local girl, making $1.60 an hour, puts a few screws in place and it becomes an American watch."

OTHER SOURCES SOUGHT

The vice president of another well-known watch concern observed, "When the President reduced tariffs last year, Swiss movements became competitive, about $1 less per piece. But the Swiss won't send parts to the Virgin Islands or anywhere. So some operators turned to other sources."

Most "vertical" watchmakers, he continued, do not import much. But those who depend on foreign parts do. A vertical maker produces the entire, or almost all, of his watch, he explained.

"We would like to see the assembly plants shut down in the islands," he added. "If people should discover that they are wearing watches from Soviet lands, particularly in these times, it could damage the industry as well as the stores selling them. And many stores don't know it, but they are selling Russian watches."

With the watch industry here highly competitive in a growing market—sales rose from 27.2 million in 1964 to 45 million last year—the pressure is on many companies to find the least expensive source of movements. Wages in Europe have been rising, many importers report.

RISE TO $30-MILLION

The value of watches brought in from the Virgin Islands alone has, consequently, soared from $361,000 in 1960 to about $30-million at present. The industry has provided almost 500 islanders with work in assembly plants.

The following are some of the Virgin Island subsidiaries (in italics) and the United States watch companies they belong to:

Standard Time Corporation—Hamilton Watch Company.

Atlantic Time Products Corporation—Bulova Watch Company.

Master Time Company, Ltd.—Elgin National Watch Company.

Virgo Corporation—United States Time Company (parent company of Virgo is Timex, Bermuda).

Antilles Industries, Inc.—General Time Corporation (United States maker of clocks and pocket watches, but not wristwatches).

Quality Products, Inc.—Benrus Watch Company, Inc. (United States manufacturer of cases, not watches; subsidiary makes other timing devices).

In addition, other United States and foreign concerns have watch subsidiaries in the Virgin Islands, but there appears to be some doubt in the industry as to the parent concern.

National FFA Week

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in Alabama, and throughout the Nation, the Future Farmers of America are celebrating February 17–24 as National FFA Week. More than half a million Future Farmers are rededicating themselves to the purposes of their organization and are doing their best to let their friends and neighbors know what FFA is, what it does, and why it is important to everyone.

The Future Farmers of America's main goal is to provide practical agricultural experiences, develop leadership and promote good citizenship among its members, thereby encouraging them to participate in community affairs, and to contribute significantly to the success and progress of the agricultural economy of our State and Nation.

It is vital to our well-being that we train skilled farmers and ranchers to provide a plentiful supply of food products in years to come and to train those who will provide services to the farmer and process and distribute farm products.

Agriculture is more than farming. It includes agricultural production, processing, marketing and supplies.

Vocational agriculture and the FFA constitute the most effective program yet developed for training boys to be good farmers and helping them to become established in farming and other agribusiness occupations of their choice.

This country needs many thousands of replacement in farming and other agribusiness occupations every year if we are to keep up with food and fiber needs of our expanding population. One of the most effective training organizations for farm boys is the Future Farmers of America. Its members are students of vocational agriculture in our public high schools. There are some 450,000 Future Farmers in the Nation, with 9,000 local chapters in the 50 States and Puerto Rico. The Alabama FFA Association has nearly 24,000 members.

In view of the Nation's need for new farmers and agribusiness workers, agriculture is training less than half enough to fill these needs. It is fitting that recognition be given those young men who are preparing for these careers. Encouragement at this time will do much to stimulate them to harder work and greater achievement.

"Challenging Youth in Agriculture" is this year's FFA Week theme. The message that these young agriculturalists are trying to impart to the Nation is simple. They seek to inform the public of the importance of the agricultural industry to America and to the world, the value of good citizenship development, and the role of Future Farmers of America in helping meet the challenges in world food production that faces America today.

The week of George Washington's Birthday is chosen each year for the observance of National FFA Week. Although usually recognized as a Revolutionary War general and our first President, Washington's first love was the farm. He was one of the first in the Nation to practice contour planting, crop rotations, fertilization, and other soil conservation and improvement methods.

Through study of vocational agriculture in high school, and participation in activities of the Future Farmers of America organization, many farm boys are preparing themselves for promising careers in farming and rural leadership or in one of the many nonfarm agricultural occupations. During this National Future Farmers of America Week, we salute these hard-working farm boys and extend best wishes to each of them for success and happiness in the agricultural occupation of his choice.

American Airlines Congratulated

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the other day when I left Washington National Airport for a flight to Nashville on an American Airlines plane I made the usual walk down a long flight of stairs to the departure gate. From the gate I had to walk outside some distance to board the aircraft. Since it is winter the temperatures were not of the mildest. Had it been raining or snowing I would have been subject to precipitation.

But American Airlines has done something about the facilities at Washington's National Airport. When I returned on Sunday evening I found myself accommodated in gleaming, new, uncongested terminal facilities built by American at a cost of approximately $3 million.

Their planes now taxi directly to a covered jetway which connects the plane with the departure and arrival lounge. The arriving or departing passenger is fully protected from the elements. Every facilitiy in this new terminal is on one level. Passengers no longer have to climb up stairs or descend them when using a flight. The use of special acoustical material makes the terminal very quiet. The lounges are carpeted and paneled in an attractive manner. I can check my baggage at the door and go directly to the plane. New improved fast transmission belts bring the baggage into the new lobby quickly. When the project was announced in July 1966 by George A. Spater, then executive vice president and now American's president, he pointed out that there had been virtually no increase in passenger facilities at Washington National Airport in the 15 preceding years, and that they had reached saturation point. American and other airlines, he noted, had committed themselves to substantial capital improvements to relieve congestion, even though the facilities would be replaced by an entire new terminal in a few years.

In my opinion, American Airlines and its officials are to be congratulated for their initiative and efforts in constructing a facility which contributes so much to the comfort and convenience of passengers using National Airport which includes most of my colleagues here.

Mr. Spater has fulfilled the promise he made in 1966.

Economic Problem Facing Nation Today

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the other day when Secretary Fowler appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to discuss the proposed travel taxes, I told him that I was not satisfied with the President's budget and did not think that many Members were. However, I pointed out that whether the President gets what he wants in the way of a budget is up to Congress and that it was our responsibility to exercise frugality. I said that I was greatly concerned about the increasing gap between revenues and expenditures and that to reduce this gap I would be willing to vote for a tax increase as well as for reduced appropriations.

Subsequently, during his appearance before the Joint Economic Committee, the Secretary referred to our colloquy and indicated that he himself favored a tight budget, together with a tax increase, in order to reduce the deficit to a manageable size, to discourage inflation and to assist our balance-of-payments situation.

Secretary Fowler on February 14 addressed the Business Council and in this speech further discussed the economic problems facing this Nation today. I commend this speech to you and include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HON. HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT DINNER MEETING OF THE BUSINESS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 14, 1968

It is always a pleasure to meet with the members of the Business Council, and to have the opportunity to present to you my views on the nation's fiscal and economic position and to obtain and benefit from yours.

I believe that this meeting of the Council is exceptionally timely and important. It comes at another point in our history when the American people must take hard decisions to meet sharp and inescapable challenges—not avoiding the difficult choices—not ducking the disagreeable measures—not waiting for the problems to become unmanageable.

I refer to the type of decision President Johnson made in his New Year's Day message to the nation on the Balance of Payments.

The manner in which we respond to the challenges facing us—the choices we make—will bear heavily not only upon our own security and economic strength but on the security and strength of the entire Free World for many years to come.

In the international security affairs, we and our allies are being tested severely in various parts of Asia by open Communist aggression and subversion backed by the threat of aggression. I know this is on all of our hearts and minds every day and night, as our young men fight on—some never to return.

But tonight let us focus primarily on moves now pending in the field of national and international finance—hardly less important than those in the field of war.

To a considerable extent the problems of war in Southeast Asia and the financial challenges facing us are interrelated. The war, without question, is a contributing factor to some of our financial strains. We need a tax increase to finance a portion of the costs of that war without an excessive budget deficit or excessive Federal borrowing in the capital markets. And a failure on the financial front could have serious impact on our ability, capacity and will to maintain our national security.

But the war in Vietnam is by no means the sole cause of our economic and financial problems. We had a balance of payments deficit long before Vietnam. And the problem of reconciling price stability, healthy and sustainable economic growth, and full employment has been with us for decades.

In the past twenty years, fueled by a strong U.S. economy and a strong U.S. dollar in a viable international monetary system, the Free World has made the greatest strides in trade and development in recorded history. For the past seven years the U.S. economy has enjoyed the longest, the strongest, and the most stable expansion in our history.

The decisions the nation is taking in the early months of this new year will have much to do with the preservation of that viable international monetary system and that expanding, stable U.S. economy on which it depends. If we make the right decisions we could preserve for many years a healthy prosperity and the social and economic progress it makes possible.

Of course, the preservation of anything worthwhile is not glamorous or exciting. But the issues are clear.

In domestic affairs we are being challenged to act in a financially responsible manner.

The record-breaking, relatively stable expansion we have experienced during the last seven years has not occurred by accident. It has been made possible by taking decisions to promote the kind of environment in which it can thrive.

This is not a one-way street. When unemployment is high and production low, the environment must be one of encouragement to greater economic activity—such as the tax reductions of 1962, 1964 and 1965. But prosperity, like many other enjoyable experiences, can develop its own excesses.

The principal excess is running at a rate of speed which puts pressure on resources of labor, materials and plant and results in inflation, imbalances in various sectors of the economy and, if unrestrained, leads to the inevitable bust of the old familiar boom and bust cycle.

Thus, when economic activity threatens to accelerate too fast, we must have the courage to hold down public expenditures and raise taxes temporarily—to use appropriate monetary restrain in the creation of money and credit—to exercise the utmost responsibility in wage and price decisions which add cost-push inflation to that induced by demand—to take whatever action is required to preserve the stability of the economy.

Moreover, the right decisions at home on our internal economy are basic and fundamental to the right answers in international financial affairs, where we face the challenge of maintaining a strong dollar as the bulwark of the international monetary systems.

The future of our economy and of the international monetary system which is so heavily dependent on it can be preserved if we have the will to act promptly and decisively against the present threats to our economic strength—against the need for massive Federal debt financing, against the deterioration in our balance of payments, against the inflationary forces that are reducing the value of the dollar at home and weakening confidence in it abroad.

The tax program the President has recommended to the Congress, primarily a temporary increase in personal and corporate income taxes, is a key part of our fiscal response to the major challenges facing the nation.

Let there be no mistake about it—the prompt enactment of a temporary tax increase is the single most decisive and important action we can take to—

Reverse sharply and decisively the trend toward increased deficit financing which began with our increased participation in hostilities in Southeast Asia in fiscal year 1966.

Reduce the budget deficits for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 by as much as $16 billion.

Reduce appreciably the most important source of pressure on our credit markets: the huge overhang of Federal borrowing which steadily ups interest rates.

Remove the threat to our housing industry, which is in the process of a needed recovery.

Remove the risk of a credit crunch that will deprive States and local governments and small business of ready access to credit.

Reverse the trend from a creeping to an accelerating inflation and turn the economy back toward price stability and wage changes more closely related to increased productivity.

Halt movement toward another disruptive inventory cycle.

Prevent our returning to the old pattern of "boom and bust."

Protect, maintain and expand our trade surplus, which is the mainstay of our balance of payments position and which is vitally important to the preservation of international confidence in the dollar and the stability of the international monetary system.

Demonstrate to the world our determination to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary for the maintenance of our economic strength, and through it, the strength of the dollar.

Looking ahead to the days of peace, when we shall need to put to work the men, materials and facilities used in the war effort, the enactment of a tax increase now, specifically related to pay for part of the cost of war, will provide a ready means for a smoother post-Vietnam adjustment through its quick removal.

When a tax increase was recommended by the President last August, there were those who doubted the economic forecasts on which it was based, contrary to the unanimous views of the President's advisers and the near-unanimous forecasts of business and academic economists.

But what is the economic picture today, six months later? It is a picture of an economy that is buoyant, that is already running at excessive speed, and that is still gaining momentum. Because the first half of 1967 was relatively weak, the full extent of the economy's resurgence tends to be concealed in statistics for the full year.

In the second half of 1967, and especially during the closing months of the year following the settlement of major strikes, economic activity advanced at a pace that cannot be sustained without intolerable strains on our resources:

Gross national product rose by $32½ billion in the second half of the year, in contrast with a rise of only $13 billion in the first half.

Real output grew at an annual rate of 4½ percent from June to December—at a rate faster than the growth of productive capacity—and would have been even higher except for major strikes.

Manufacturing activity, rebounding from the inventory adjustment that had slowed the economy in the first half, advanced at an annual rate of 8½ percent in the second half.

Payroll employment in nonfarm industry rose 1.2 million in the last 6 months of the year, considerably higher than the sustainable rate of advance under present circumstances.

Personal income grew $25½ billion from June to December. By comparison, the largest full-year increase ever registered was $46 billion between 1965 and 1966.

In each of the last four months construction contracts exceeded any prior month in history.

There is another and disturbing part of the picture, however, and it is a marked speed-up in inflation—a speed-up that gives new urgency to the request for early enactment of a tax increase.

In the last quarter of 1967, as in the third quarter, nearly half of the rise in our gross national product was accounted for by inflated prices rather than real growth. Further, the pace of price increases has been accelerating. Wholesale industrial prices, which rose at an annual rate of less than 1 percent in the first half of the year, advanced by more than 2½ percent in the second half.

Consumer prices, rising at an annual rate of 2.3 percent in the first half of 1967, jumped to a rate of nearly 4 percent in the second, and would have been still higher except for a decline in food prices.

Wage increases also were relatively high in 1967, with some very large settlements being reached in the last months of the year.

Thus, we have entered 1968 with a strong and increasing inflationary trend. And if we permit it to continue unchecked, if we fail to restrain demand through a tax increase, then we will clearly risk much—imbalances in the economy, still higher interest rates and greater credit stringency, and eventually, perhaps, recession. In short, a failure to act will mean risking the future of our economy.

Aside from domestic considerations, we must also be concerned with the international consequences of inaction or delay. Our trade surplus is the most important and most favorable factor in the national balance of payments. We must look to it to finance an increasingly large portion of our other expenditures abroad. And if an increasing price and wage spiral makes it difficult for our products to compete with imports and in export markets, the trade surplus will diminish, not increase, and our balance of payments will suffer. Already, in the fourth quarter of 1967, there was a very disturbing absolute and percentage increase in imports by an economy that has an increasing propensity to import when growth in money terms exceeds 8 percent.

Given the present state of the economy—expansionary and accompanied by unacceptable inflationary trends—a highly stimulative Federal budget deficit is inappropriate and even dangerous. The economy needs to be held to a sustainable rate of advance, not propelled by huge Federal deficit financing to still greater speed.

The tax increase the President has again requested, as an essential part of the budget for fiscal 1969, would produce an additional $16 billion in revenue over the next 18 months. It would reduce the deficit for the current fiscal year from $22.8 billion to $19.8 billion, and would sharply reduce the deficit in fiscal 1969, from $20.9 billion to $8 billion.

There are those—and I have been one of them—who have urged, as did the President in his August 3 Tax Message, that along with a temporary tax increase the Congress and the Administration should control and reduce Federal expenditures, civilian and military, to the maximum degree that is consistent with the nation's security and economic soundness. Let us look at the record.

Through a combination of Congressional and Administration actions culminating in the enactment in December of Public Law 90–218, the so-called continuing Appropriations Act, obligations in this fiscal year were reduced by $10 billion. These reductions will cut back specific expenditures in non-Vietnam defense programs and controllable civilian programs in fiscal year 1968 by $4.3 billion, and will bring additional savings in fiscal 1969 and later years. These program and expenditure reductions included such items as—

Cutting back farm operating loans and sewer and water loans;

Reducing REA loans;

Canceling some agricultural research projects;

Closing some agricultural research stations;

Cutting payments to States for agricultural experiment stations;

Reducing the small watershed construction projects;

Cutting agricultural conservation payments to farmers;

Spreading all of the Corps of Engineers' new construction starts voted for 1968 by the Congress over the two years, 1968 and 1969, and holding back on the rate of construction for on-going projects;

Sharply reducing the higher education facilities grant program;

Cutting back Hill-Burton hospital grants;

Cutting back the construction programs for medical schools and other health facilities;

Reducing the NIH regional medical program by more than one-third;

Curtailing the impacted area school program;

Cutting back two major reactor development programs;

Reducing the Plowshare nuclear excavation experiment;

Reducing the program for controlled thermonuclear fission.

These reductions provided a reduced base for many of the budget projections for the fiscal year 1969 reported to Congress on January 29.

The increase in the budget expenditures for fiscal 1969—$10.5 billion—should be compared with increases of $24 billion and $17 billion in fiscal years 1967 and 1968, respectively.

This increase in projected expenditures in fiscal 1969 is almost completely accounted for by higher expenditures required for national defense, increased interest payments on the public debt, and mandatory payments required by recently enacted laws dealing with Social Security, public assistance, veterans benefits and Federal pay increases.

The increase in expenditures will be more than offset by the expected normal growth in Federal revenues resulting from increased economic activity in the next fiscal year.

In a few instances, the budget does provide for expansion of a new controllable civilian programs which meet urgent needs—for example, for job training and urban renewal. But in every case, these increases have been offset by reductions or modifications in other desirable but less essential and urgent government programs.

For example, the President's Budget Message provides on pages 20 through 22 a table of proposed program reductions and reforms which I am appending to the text of my remarks. They touch nearly every major agency in the Federal Government. Affected are Federal construction and construction grant programs, the space program, health, education and welfare grants, agriculture and small business loans, and many other activities that can be deferred in a period when we must relieve inflationary pressures by reducing the deficit. The budget also proposes reforms and modifications to reduce government outlays and increase the effectiveness of certain programs—in housing, agriculture, transportation and other areas—and reduce their cost to the taxpayer over time.

These budget reductions and reforms would reduce 1969 obligations and contracts in the affected programs by almost $3 billion below the levels appropriated for 1968. The reforms would reduce the budget in 1970 by an estimated $1.4 billion.

I share the general concern that the totals of budget expenditures are increasing. But I must point out that this fact does not diminish the desirability of a tax increase to help finance the war in Vietnam out of current revenues rather than borrowed money.

Our annual expenditures for our efforts in Vietnam amount to about 3 percent of our gross national product. Other outlays, exclusive of social insurance trust funds, have been declining as a share of the nation's income and output in recent years. In 1969 they stand at 13.9 percent. In the last three years of the 1950's they were 16 percent. In 1965 they were 14.6 percent. It is not the rise in regular budget outlays which requires a tax increase but the cost of Vietnam.

Of course, one can debate at length whether the budget outlays in the 1969 budget for controllable civilian programs should be substantially reduced. But we must remember as we keep debating that time is still running, and every day that passes without the tax increase adds about $33 million to the deficit.

The tax program now comes to $16 billion over the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 and will reduce the deficit by that amount. It should be passed promptly regardless of the outcome of the long-drawn-out debate on expenditures now beginning. No amount of debate or budget-cutting that is likely to emerge is a realistic alternative to a tax increase for meeting our obligations at home and abroad in that amount.

To sum up on the budget for fiscal 1969—it is a responsible financial plan placed on a base of expenditures for fiscal 1968 rigidly scaled down by joint Executive and Congressional action as recently as December 1967. It represents a hold-down in controllable expenditures in 1969; the revenues from the requested tax increase will contribute to the reduction in the deficit, not to rising expenditures; and it does give assurance that the tax increase will be temporary and can and will be removed when hostilities in Vietnam come to an end.

Just as the tax increase is an indispensable element in our domestic financial plan for the year ahead, it is also the keystone of the balance of payments program announced by the President on January 1.

As the President said in his message to the nation that day—and sometimes this is conveniently overlooked by those who say the direct measures are palliatives:

"The first line of defense of the dollar is the strength of the American economy.

"No business before the returning Congress will be more urgent than this: To enact the anti-inflation tax which I have sought for more than a year. Coupled with expenditure controls and appropriate monetary policy, this will help to stem the inflationary pressures which now threaten our economic prosperity and our trade surplus."

The direct measures announced by the President to achieve a $3 billion reduction in our balance of payments deficit this year—the restrictions upon outflows of funds for direct investments abroad by American business, a reduction in foreign lending by our banks and other financial institutions, actions to reduce our foreign travel expenditure deficit, actions to reduce or neutralize the foreign exchange costs of our government expenditures abroad, actions to encourage increased foreign tourism and investment in the United States—are necessary and important. Yet they are like the four fingers of the hand. They cannot be effective in dealing with the problem without internal measures, including the tax proposal, which is the thumb that will enable us to get a firm grip on the problem.

For all our efforts, direct and otherwise, short- and long-term, to improve our balance of payments position, run the risk of failure unless we reduce a highly stimulative budget deficit and seek to avoid the kind of excessive growth and inflationary pressures that reduce our trade surplus—unless we take the course of financial responsibility consonant with continued confidence in the dollar.

Some of the measures the President has proposed to correct the balance of payments deficit, though temporary, are not welcome and are not pleasant—for the American people or for their government.

We do not like to ask our citizens to forgo nonessential travel or to pay additional taxes when their travel expenditures outside the Western Hemisphere exceed very modest proportions.

We do not like to ask American business to curb its outflows for direct investments abroad, and the nation's banks and other financial institutions to reduce their volume of foreign lending.

We ask these measures only because they are essential at this time to deal with an emergency. As a matter of the highest national priority, we must bring our balance of payments to—or close to—equilibrium, and place the dollar in an impregnable position.

You know well the reasons for adoption of the stringent new program: the loss of confidence in currencies all over the world following devaluation of the British pound in November; the speculative buying of gold that cost the United States more than $1 billion of its gold reserve, threatening not only the dollar but the international monetary system as a whole; the serious decline in our balance of payments in the last quarter of 1967, resulting in a deficit of approximately $3.6 billion for the year.

These developments made immediate action by the government, and sacrifices by the American people and American business, imperative.

I can assure you that the restrictive elements in the balance of payments program—like the tax increase that is so important to it—are of a temporary nature and will be quickly removed when they are no longer needed.

Restrictive measures are not consistent with the long-term foreign economic policy of the United States. We support—will continue to support—and will return to as soon as possible—the unrestricted flow of goods, services, persons and capital under a stable international monetary system.

Moreover, the only appropriate long-range solution to our balance of payments problem lies, not in restrictive masures, but in long-range measures such as those designed to achieve a growing trade surplus, promote foreign investment and travel in the United States, and reduce or neutralize the foreign exchange impact of government expenditures abroad for security and development.

In respect to trade, a principal goal of the new program is to encourage a greater flow of exports through improved programs of export financing, export promotion and fair treatment for our trade in the field of nontariff barriers.

There is another important aspect of the program, one that is also of particular concern to the members of this Council and to their fellow businessmen. It is the President's request that leaders of business and labor work with the appropriate members of the Administration to make more effective our voluntary program of wage-price restraint and to prevent our exports from being reduced or our imports increased by crippling work stoppages in the year ahead.

While the success of the program will depend largely on the cooperation and support of the American people, it will also be influenced, to a substantial degree, by the cooperation and support of our trading partners, and especially those in Western Europe who have enjoyed chronic balance of payments surpluses which have been the reverse side of the coin of our deficits.

I believe that we should and will have their cooperation and support, for the achievement of equilibrium in our payments is in their own interests as well as ours. Our economies are so interwoven, and the role of the dollar as a reserve and transactions currency so important, that the solution of our payments problem is a common enterprise.

Nor is it surprising or illogical for us to ask and expect assistance in the adjustment process from other countries. International financial authorities clearly recognize that the adjustment process carries responsibilities for both surplus and deficit countries.

Only recently, in a review of the U.S. balance of payments, the 20 member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development stated:

"The balance of payments deficit is not only a U.S. problem. The deficit has as its counterpart a surplus in Continental Europe and the responsibility for adjustment must fall on both surplus and deficit countries."

The adjustments we are seeking will not be easy or pleasant—particularly for the surplus countries in Western Europe where the impact will be sharpest. It will be far easier for them to make these adjustments and not retaliate against our actions, if they know that they are not carrying the whole burden themselves—but that we, too, are undertaking difficult measures at home.

To the officials of these other countries, the most immediate measure needed is a tax increase to avoid an excessive growth in demand, which would strengthen cost-price pressures and aggravate the balance of payments problem. This viewpoint has been communicated to the United States again and again, and the tax increase has become in fact a symbol of the sincerity of our determination to defend the dollar.

The challenges to the United States—the commitment we are honoring in Southeast Asia, the responsibility to conduct our financial affairs in a manner that will maintain our economic stability, the safeguarding of the strength of the dollar and of the international monetary system—are indeed formidable.

The outcome of the test in Vietnam is inevitable—if we as a nation have the will to remain firm.

The outcome of the test in the field of national and international finance—hardly less important if less dramatic—is also inevitable, if we as a nation have the will to act decisively and responsibly.

The decisions are ours. If we make them firmly and responsibly, we will assure our continued security and prosperity and that of the Free World.

TABLE FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969

BUDGET PROGRAM REDUCTIONS AND REFORMS

[Fiscal years. In millions of dollars]

Agency and program	Cuts below 1968 program level, as funded, 1969
BUDGET REDUCTIONS	
Agriculture:	
Farm operating loans	−50
Rural electrification loans	−45
Forest roads and trails	−29
Sewer and water loans	−22
Water and sewer grants	−3
Watershed protection program	−17
Flood prevention program	−11
Agricultural research	−15
Forest protection and utilization	−2
Great Plains conservation program	−2
Other	−1
Subtotal, Agriculture	−197
Commerce:	
Ship construction	−156
Research, Maritime Administration	−7
Subtotal, Commerce	−163
Health, Education, and Welfare:	
College facility grants	−224
Books, equipment, guidance, and testing grants	−120
Health research facilities construction	−29
School aid to federally impacted areas	−17
Medical library construction grants	−10
Subtotal, Health, Education, and Welfare	−400
Housing and Urban Development:	
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	−25
Public facility loans	−10
Special assistance for market rate mortgages, Federal National Mortgage Association	−27
Subtotal, Housing and Urban Development	−62
Interior:	
Reclamation program	−27
Indian construction programs	−22
Road programs	−6
Sport fisheries construction	−5
Commercial fisheries construction	−1
Subtotal, Interior	−61
Justice: Elimination of new prison construction	−1
State: Educational exchange	−1
Atomic Energy Commission:	
Production of special nuclear materials	−12
Nuclear rocket program	−10
Space electric power	−8
Civilian application of nuclear explosives (Plowshare)	−6
Subtotal, Atomic Energy Commission	−36
General Services Administration: Construction	−143
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Manned and unmanned exploration and other programs	−447
National Science Foundation: Institutional science programs	−31
Small Business Administration:	
Business loans	−40
Economic opportunity loans	−25
Investment company loans	−25
Subtotal, Small Business Administration	−90
Total, budget reductions	−1,632

	1969	1970
PROGRAM REFORMS		
Agriculture: Agricultural conservation program—limit to practices with long-term benefits	−120	−120
Health, Education, and Welfare: School aid to federally impacted areas—tie payments more closely to Federal burden		−100
Housing and Urban Development: Private housing—place greater reliance on the private market (requiring change in statutory interest rate ceilings)	−669	−669
Labor: Institute user charges to recover expenses under Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act	−3	−3

TABLE FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

BUDGET PROGRAM REDUCTIONS AND REFORMS—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions of dollars]

	1969	1970
PROGRAM REFORMS—Continued		
Transportation:		
Airway services—increase taxes on users	−40	−55
Waterways—impose tax on users	−7	−14
Highway trucking—increase tax on diesel fuels and apply graduated use tax by weight	−239	−250
Subtotal, Transportation	−286	−319
Veterans' Administration:		
Compensation—eliminate statutory payments for cases of arrested tuberculosis	−54	−54
Burial benefits—eliminate duplication with social security	−46	−46
Pensions—count railroad retirement benefits as part of income in setting amount of veterans pension	−7	−7
Subtotal, Veterans' Administration	−107	−107
Small Business Administration: Disaster loans—employ more equitable and rigorous criteria	−50	−50
Water resources projects of several agencies—raise the interest rate used for evaluating projects	(1)	(1)
Total, program reforms	−1,235	−1,368
Grand total, budget program reductions and reforms, 1969	−2,867	

[1] While no immediate savings are realized, the long-term effect could be substantial.

Robert C. Moot, Administrator, Small Business Administration, Addresses Community Development Conference in Nashville, Tenn.

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last week to participate in a conference of business leaders in my district of Nashville, Tenn., in which the Small Business Administration helped Tennessee look at ways in which closer economic cooperation can be achieved on the community level.

Through such conferences, SBA is trying to encourage private and public agencies alike to work in closer harmony on the local level, so that they pull together to help the community grow and prosper. We share the SBA's conviction that such harmony is the key to progress. We were particularly impressed with the remarks of SBA Administrator Robert C. Moot on this theme. He has a message every community should share, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY ROBERT C. MOOT, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 13, 1968

We are very sorry that the distinguished Chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the Honorable Joe L. Evins, could not be with us today because of his extremely busy schedule. The free enterprise system has no greater friend than Chairman Evins. All of you are well aware that he has played a profound role in shaping the mission and policies of the Small Business Administration.

SBA's effort in conferences of this kind, to bring our programs closer and closer to the people is, we think, a natural extension of our legislative mandate, which Chairman Evins has been so instrumental in developing.

It is a special pleasure to visit the Tennessee Valley and to work with the Tennessee River Valley Association in a joint effort to help stimulate community and regional economic growth in concert with small business growth.

In the eyes of struggling peoples around the world—as well as in the eyes of many Americans—the Tennessee Valley Authority is perhaps the great landmark of technological and industrial progress our American system has produced.

I have heard my friends in the Department of State make the comment that often the first thing that official visitors from underdeveloped lands want to see in our country is not the Empire State Building, nor Washington, D.C., nor San Francisco. It is TVA.

Behind TVA are a lesson and a principle which are just as applicable to growth on Main Street America—to progress in your community and mine—as they have been to the harnessing of great rivers.

As you can guess, the lesson and the spirit I am talking about lie in the capacity of the private interests and the public agencies in this Country to work together—with each able to recognize the indispensable contribution of the other to the whole—and each able to blend the separate interest into the common interest.

In this kind of teamwork, our country has no equal.

Never has the evidence of such mingling of ideas—of such cooperation—been more abundant in the land than it is today. A prime example is the progress the national economy has made.

As of this month, our boom has now run to a full seven years. It is the longest cycle of uninterrupted expansion in our history. It has produced, for most of us, living standards that have no parallel in all the history of the world. I for one don't think this story can be told too often. If success teaches us anything, it is that it cannot be taken for granted.

Between the first quarter of 1961 and the last quarter of 1967, our Gross National Product climbed 60 percent. If we eliminate the rise in average prices, the gain equals about $\frac{1}{6}$ of the total production of the rest of the world in 1966, or roughly $\frac{4}{5}$ of the entire national product of the Soviet Union in 1966. The increase is larger than our own total national product of just thirty years ago.

Total employment has risen by nine million persons, as much as today's combined employment of the New York and Chicago labor markets. In simpler terms, for 84 consecutive months, each and every working day has seen 5,000 more people going to work than went to work the day before.

My point is still more graphically made for us right here in the TVA region.

Perhaps you saw, as did I, the recent survey in Steel Magazine ranking the States on their development of new employment in industry, between the years 1962 and 1966. Two TVA States are right up there among the top three—Tennessee and North Carolina.

In the period mentioned, Tennessee added 146,937 new jobs to industrial payrolls, either by the attraction of new plants or the expansion of existing industries. Tennessee's total investment in new facilities and new equipment was placed at $1.5 billion.

Quite obviously, this Valley—like the Nation—already has achieved tremendous teamwork.

SBA's one desire in being here is to help. To bring more and more communities, and hopefully all communities, into the tide of growth.

How actually can SBA help?

In the original Small Business Act, by which the SBA was established in 1953, Congress gave to a small Agency a truly awesome mission, the essence of which has never been altered. The Act puts our mission into these words:

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition . . . It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts or subcontracts for property and services for the Government (including but not limited to contracts or subcontracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

With nearly 15 years of operation under our belts, we now translate our mission into five objectives. These five objectives are:

First, to help maintain balanced economic growth on a national basis;

second, to aid in maintaining a healthy competitive environment;

third, to assure that opportunity in the market place is open to all qualified individuals;

fourth, to help expand employment; and

fifth, to help bring about the above four objectives on the State and local levels.

SBA today is pursuing the objectives with combinations of custom-made tools. All of them are designed to make small firms stronger, and to encourage economic growth, directly or indirectly.

You will have the opportunity to look at our programs in detail, and to ask questions in the several panels later today. I want to take just a few moments now to single out those that may have particular potency for moving your community, or your neighborhood, forward.

The 502 program has probably attracted the most publicity in recent years. While it will be treated extensively in the featured panel, to follow my remarks, I might point out that SBA now has local development companies going in all the States but one. They have produced 62,000 new jobs in 1,500 cities and towns.

I honestly believe the 502 formula will work for any community willing to make an all-out effort.

Every single State, here or anywhere else in the country, can benefit by doing a better job of getting its small producers and suppliers into the field of government procurement.

SBA is promoting the "buy from small business" approach with every Federal agency. Yet if small business were playing the same relative role in federal procurement that it plays in the economy as a whole, federal purchases from small sources would be $7 billion a year higher than they are right now. The Nation's five million small businesses account for about 40 percent of the GNP. Yet they handle only about 25 percent of the federal procurement—or about $15 billion of the $55 billion in goods and services the federal agencies buy at the current annual rate.

There is a still much larger horizon in procurement that small business has only barely begun to tap on an organized basis. This is the procurement of State and local governments. SBA is now emphasizing this potential but the States themselves ought to be alert to the opportunity of helping their own small businesses grow with the aid of contracts for goods and services needed within the states.

Right now, State and local agencies are

buying goods and services on about the same annual scale as the Federal Government. But the forecasts indicate that by 1975 State and local procurement will reach $75 billion a year, well ahead of the Federal total.

Every community represented here today should be asking its business leaders: how much business are we doing with governmental units, and why aren't we doing more?

An historic handicap to small business has been the high credit ratings required to compete for prime business locations. As a result, the best corners in town have usually gone to the big bidders.

We now have the tool that puts the little man on a par with the outfit boasting triple-A credit. It is the lease guarantee. You can ask Mrs. Knight of our General Counsel's staff about the details this afternoon in Panel IV. She had a lead hand in building this tool.

I wish I had time to go into our Economic Opportunity Loans, and the Test Cities program, in which SBA has a key role. But I am confident this information will come out in the afternoon panels, where you will have a full hour and a half to pump questions and problems at our resource people.

In your community, who is it that puts these tools to work?

You do. You and your community. The initiative has to start on the local level. Believe me, SBA is not a Washington agency coming in with a grand design to dominate your economic destiny. We are not planners. We do not want—nor should we have—that role.

We do believe that planning *is* very necessary, in the kind of complex, intricately balanced, highly technical, and highly competitive day in which we now live. In fact, in almost all cases, the communities that are making the best progress today are working from a master plan. A plan they have made themselves.

Planning at its best always starts at the local level. Planning brings involvement. Involvement leads to unity, and to community pride. Spirit can be the biggest asset a community has. It sparks initiative, and initiative leads to action and growth. Pride and progress tend to feed each other.

Lack of incentive is a large part of the trouble in the ghettos. There is little involvement, and hence no stimulus to spirit, initiative, and growth. In the Test Cities program, the President is taking wise steps to help private industry put plants in decaying neighborhoods, and set up the job training to staff the plants with local talent. Let these people have a hand in setting up these programs, let them help make jobs for themselves—and the pride will follow.

Rural towns at a standstill have a parallel problem. Get something going for them, get the people involved, and growth will follow. The first step is planning.

What I am trying to say has, I think, been most aptly said by your good neighbor and great champion of small business, Senator John J. Sparkman. In recent comments in our SBA newsletter, Enterprise, Chairman Sparkman said, and I quote:

"This has always been our pattern. A man has an idea. He takes it into the market place. He starts a plant of his own. He makes jobs for others.

"His success supplies a momentum both to him and to his community.

"He has economic strength to share, and experience in running things, and often new energy to share. People like this give vitality and drive to a town—and things get done, without government always doing them."

If you as individuals will supply this kind of momentum in your own communities, and help your communities rally around a central blueprint for action of your own making, neither you nor the country will ever have to worry about the role government plays in your lives. Because government will always play the support role. The subordinate role.

Yet by your action, and by your planning, you will also assure yourselves that you have made the fullest use of all available resources, including those of government at every level, and those of SBA.

As a parting note, I hope you will bear in mind that well-made plans have a way of being self-executing. Blueprints give the investor and the participating agency something precise to look at. They attract capital—where just words, or goodwill, may not.

This already has been a productive day for SBA. I hope it proves such for you. On behalf of the Agency, and the staff who are with me, I thank you again for the invitation to join you in this meaningful exchange.

Nixon Takes Commanding Lead Among Republicans

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the latest Gallup poll finds Richard N. Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over other contenders and is now the favorite presidential candidate of 51 percent of rank-and-file Republicans. This morning's New York Times carries the story and I include it in the RECORD:

POLL FINDS NIXON WIDENS LEAD WITH BACKING OF 51 PERCENT IN GOP

PRINCETON, N.J., February 20.—Richard M. Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over seven other leading G.O.P. contenders as the top choice of Republican voters for the 1968 Presidential nomination.

The former Vice President is the favorite of half (51 per cent) of rank-and-file Republicans in the latest (early February) Gallup Poll survey and now leads his closest rival, Governor Rockefeller of New York, by the wide margin of 26 percentage points.

Mr. Rockefeller's standing has shown little change since the previous survey, in early January, while Mr. Nixon has gained 9 percentage points.

Governor Rockefeller's surge in popularity with Republican voters came between the November and January surveys, when he nearly doubled his share of the vote from 15 per cent to 27 per cent.

Mr. Nixon has led the field in all but one of the 23 tests of G.O.P. candidate strength conducted since the 1964 Presidential election. The exception came in November 1966, when the newly re-elected Gov. George Romney of Michigan briefly moved into the lead.

Governor Romney, the only other announced candidate on the list, continues to lose favor with Republicans. Firmly in second place before his "brainwash" statement in early September (with 24 per cent of the vote to Nixon's 35 per cent), Mr. Romney now has only 7 per cent of the vote and is in fourth place behind Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Interviewing for the current survey was completed Feb. 7, immediately following Mr. Nixon's announcement of his candidacy and just prior to the clash between Mayor Lindsay of New York and Governor Rockefeller over the recent sanitation strike in that city.

Other potential candidates listed in the survey were Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon and retired Lieut. Gen. James H. Gavin.

Here is the question asked:

"Here is a list of men (card lists 8) who have been mentioned as possible Presidential candidates for the Republican party in 1968. Which ONE would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate for President in 1968?"

Here are the latest choices of Republicans, compared with those from surveys in January and September:

[In percent]

	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon	51	42	40	35
Rockefeller	25	27	17	14
Reagan	8	8	16	11
Romney	7	12	14	24
Percy	3	5	9	6
Hatfield	2	2	1	2
Lindsay	2	1	1	2
Gavin	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference	1	2	2	6

[1] Not included on earlier list.

The results in today's report are based on a national sample of Republicans and cannot be applied to any one region or state.

Mr. Nixon has also registered gains with independents, voters who do not align themselves with either major party. Governor Rockefeller in January had drawn even with Mr. Nixon, but the latter has now moved into a 34 to 26 per cent lead among these voters.

The choices of independents are important since numerically they represent a voting group as large as Republicans. In order to do well in a Presidential election, a Republican nominee must make a good showing with this group.

The choices of independents, and the comparison:

[In percent]

	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon	34	27	29	23
Rockefeller	26	27	20	16
Reagan	13	14	15	17
Romney	11	13	17	20
Percy	5	7	5	6
Lindsay	2	3	5	6
Hatfield	2	2	1	1
Gavin	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference	6	6	8	11

[1] Not included on earlier list.

Fiscal Responsibility

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail contained a letter which at first glance we considered referring to "Dear Abby." Reading it over, though, so touched was I by its universal human appeal that I have chosen the more unusual recourse of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter from Mr. Peter J. Phethean of Bellflower, Calif., is hereby commended to the attention of my colleagues with confidence that it will strike a sympathetic chord, as follows:

BELLFLOWER, CALIF.,
February 18, 1968.

Hon. DEL CLAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I hate to tell you my troubles, but I have tried everything else I know. I feel that only you can help me.

I have a dependent relative staying with me who has very little fiscal responsibility. He is very good natured and means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me and our two children. He charges those presents to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we need he buys it for us.

Many of these things are not needed by us and in very few cases are they exactly what we would have bought if we had bought these things ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean too much to him and he tends to buy the first thing he sees and doesn't shop around like I would do if I were purchasing items. He is also quite generous to the poor and needy, but often gives to those he doesn't know are just feeding him a soft line.

I just received a bill for his last spending spree and it gives me a sick, hopeless feeling. I keep thinking how much better off I would be if I could just spend that money for the things I want and could give to the people and charities I think are needy.

He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you because he respects you. Please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

Respectfully yours,
PETER J. PHETHEAN.

The Brain Pickers

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, since my remarks in the RECORD, volume 113, part 26, page 36001, "Sensitivity Training: The Brain Benders"—more and more evidence of the unholy art of psychological warfare against the minds of our people is being surfaced.

It must be recognized as an organized plan to neutralize society by warping the thoughts and morals of our people as the prelude to inverted reasoning—upside down thinking.

There's nothing fair, honest, or decent involved. But the frightening feature is the attempt to dignify the gimmick by the use of the news media, churches, and forums.

I place the article, "Church-Goers 'Not Aware': How Reds Use Churches," from Tactics for February 20, at this point in my remarks:

CHURCHGOERS "NOT AWARE": HOW REDS USE CHURCHES

Churches more and more are being used nowadays for panel discussions, lectures and meetings on political matters, and sermons are increasingly becoming disguised political harangues. Somehow, there seems to be a pattern in this, and it is "new left" and anti-Viet Nam war. The churches appear to be a forum for dissent generally, not only in expression but in its planning, dissent meaning a demand for revolutionary change in the American form of society and government.

Disagreement seems over the extent of what is called "change," a word that subtly has been given a Marxist connotation, excluding from consideration the retention of our Constitutional system of checks and balances. We are given the choice, it appears, between Moscow and Peking, or something vaguer, that reminds one of the anarchists. This is "dialogue," not discussion. The difference is that a socialist or Marxist premise has to be accepted in dialogue, whereas all points of view can be considered in discussion. This is sheer dialectical maternalism, without the term being used.

This, anyway, is the impression given by the press. But it is not how people talk and react normally, so the question arises, how representative are these church affairs, even of their own congregations? How can the viewpoints expressed and the actions taken be so out of variance with those of the American people generally? Something obviously is phony about it. Yet those who arrange these affairs, and the ministers who lend their facilities and buildings, and often their material as well as moral support, insist that everything is perfectly proper, democratic and aboveboard. The newspapers accept this, if we go by their coverage, in the women's and religious sections, and on the news pages.

CASE HISTORY OF ONE CHURCHGOER'S EXPERIENCE

So Tactics is presenting the case history of one churchgoer's experience. Untold thousands of others must have gone through the same experience, ending up by feeling isolated and frustrated, leaving the camp to the enemy. This is the booby trap that can and must be avoided; it is needless surrender.

Mrs. Dorothy Coffman, of 3916 Pineland St., Fairfax, Va. 22030, is the mother of three sons, Larry, James and Roger, the first-named at Fairleigh Dickinson University at Madison, N.J., the other two at Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pa. Larry has done his basic training for the Marines, and will be commissioned in June as an aviator. James also will be commissioned in June, in the Air Force, and Roger is in the R.O.T.C. Air Force. Their father, Burton, was an Army pilot in World War II. The parents were school chums.

Mrs. Coffman served as an Army nurse between 1942 and 1945, 23 months of which were in Iran, in camps throughout this Persian land, as part of the lend-lease program for the U.S.S.R. Russian soldiers were among her patients. In Kazvin near the Caspian Sea, a hundred miles north of Teheran, she watched Russian soldiers take over American trucks loaded with supplies for the Soviet Union. The Russians sang as spiritedly as they drilled, and in unison.

The family moved to Fairfax in 1960, and joined the Fairfax Unitarian Church at Oakton. The couple taught Sunday school, and were active in church socials. Until last summer, Mrs. Coffman participated without question, although more and more frequently feeling a disquiet. Something obviously had gone wrong, and she could not put her finger on it. She felt the need for some basic knowledge in red practice, and attended the course in communism given by Dr. Fred Schwarz last July 3 to 7 in the national capital. As a result, instead of retiring into apathy, she kept plugging away, while reading selectively and studying.

Her case history is of a panel discussion at All Souls Unitarian Church in Washington, D.C., which her Fairfax church helped arrange. Its national significance lies in the fact that there was a pattern to it that is being duplicated throughout the nation, providing a one-sided presentation, heavily weighted toward the enemy, but in the name of "objectivity." An Orwellian twist had been given to the word.

"The Fairfax Unitarian," her church bulletin, in its issue of Aug. 30, 1967, announced "a panel discussion to clarify the position of the conscientious objector," to be held at All Souls. The notice, that said the Fairfax church was supporting the affair, declared that "the problems of conscientious objection" would be discussed. Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service director, would speak, but "a panel is being organized from among such organizations as" the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Service Board for Religious Objectors, and the Liberal Religious Youth of the Unitarian churches.

She was puzzled both by her church's participation and the one-sidedness of the panel. She discovered that her minister, the Rev. Rudolph W. Nemser, along with several other clergymen of the area, had organized something called Citizens Concerned for Peace in Viet Nam, with a McLean, Va. address. She phoned, and was given a pro-Ho Chiminh, anti-Chiang Kai-shek spiel. Nemser also is a board member of the Washington, D.C. branch of the American Civil Liberties Union. He was in the march at Selma, Ala.

A notice in the church bulletin said that Edgar Brown, of the social action committee, would provide information on the panel. He is an attorney with the criminal division of the Justice Department. She phoned him at his home, suggesting that others be added to the panel to provide balance. Just adding one, such as the retired Gen. Thomas A. Lane, would not be sufficient, she said, and he inquired why. When she pointed out there were to be at least five of one viewpoint on the panel, he agreed this was "a good point," and said he would take it up with the whole committee.

IT TURNS OUT TO BE ONE-SIDED, ANYWAY

When Mrs. Coffman inquired later, she was informed that no convenient date could be found for Gen. Lane, and that nobody else was available. Nobody, in all the District of Columbia, could be found to defend the draft laws, and American policy; at least, this is what she was told. "Of course, you'll postpone it until you get a balanced panel, won't you?" she asked. "Oh, no!" was the reply. "There's really no need to make any change, as it'll only be a discussion of the status of the conscientious objector."

They were not Quakers, Mrs. Coffman pointed out, so the panel's opposition would not be based on pacifism. Questions of morality and the legality of the war would come up. When told there was no reason for this, she declared that obvious pro-communist influences were involved. In reply, she was accused of cooperating with two anti-communists who were known to be her friends. "We'll take precautions that Gen. Hershey will not be embarrassed, so there's nothing for you to worry about," she was promised.

This conversation left her depressed over the obvious naivete where there was no excuse not to be knowledgeable. A number of high government people are members of the church, and many are members of other churches in the area. Far from providing guidance and help in combating pro-red manipulations seeking to soften up the American people, conduct guerrilla warfare on our streets, and destroy the United States, they either are apathetic, inconceivably naive, or sympathetic to the reds. Our educational system either has neglected to alert our intellectual class to the tactics of the enemy, or have glamorized them, much as has the press. Some observers use the term, death wish. Rather, it is scientifically planned, enemy war strategy.

The affair took place in Pierce Hall in All Souls on Sept. 23. The program was divided into two parts. First, General Hershey spoke. This was supposed to give it objectivity. Thereafter, the panel took over, with audience participation. In the afternoon, this became a clinic for draft dodgers. Sam Donaldson, a television news man, moderated for the General, and then Robert W. Chambers, pathologist, moderated.

PANEL OF "ANTIS" AND "ULTRA-ANTIS"

Others on the panel were Gerald Norton, Washington lawyer, A.C.L.U.; Mrs. Joseph C. Chandler, Jr., Women Strike for Peace; the Rev. Harold Oliver, Unitarian minister of Silver Spring, Md.; Lance Gurel, 18, a bearded lad, counselor for conscientious objectors at a

Unitarian-Universalist "draft information center," son of a psychologist; **Frank Speltz**, bearded columnist for the obscene and treasonable, so-called underground weekly, the Washington Free Press, and Miss Anita Martin, introduced as a member of a selective service advisory group.

Speltz frankly referred to communism as "a very helpful and attractive philosophy" in a letter to Mrs. Coffman, replying to a round-robin letter she later wrote to area ministers and panel members.

A question period followed Gen. Hershey's talk. All questions were similarly loaded, asking whether he did not agree that the Viet Nam war was an immoral war, and that therefore a person had the right to opt out.

A brief intermission followed, and then the panel began with a 5-minute talk by each member. Speltz began. His theme was that one should not be drafted into a war in which one did not agree politically. Gurel, the next speaker, pounded the table, calling for organized resistence, accusing the United States of war barbarities, as in the use of napalm.

Rev. Oliver restricted himself to the question of love, declaring that no matter what the issue, if love were demonstrated, everything would come out all right. Mrs. Chandler emotionally recalled her previous few days of picketing the White House and engaging in other demonstrations and activities. She stressed the police brutality line, declaring her freedom of expression was violated when police rudely interfered with her group when it sat down on the middle of the street alongside the White House. She declared the Nuremberg war trials set the precedent for similar prosecution of Americans for war atrocities.

Norton, who followed her, declared that as a lawyer, "I personally am going to see to it that every one of those policemen who were so cruel to those women is arrested." He said he felt an obligation to give legal assistance to any young man who wanted to resist military service.

Miss Martin, when she spoke, pointed out that there was a lack of opportunity for a meaningful discussion because of the lack of an opposing point of view, and said this was disappointing. She said she spoke from a religious point of view alone.

Half of the audience of less than a hundred were of draft age. A number of girls were there in miniskirts, and beards were plentiful. The boys for the most part did not seem of the beatnik type, but neither did they appear right. They look aimless rather than objectionable, pathetic. She felt a lack of character.

The question and answer period that followed was concerned entirely with avoidance of the draft, each young man going through the ritual of painting the war as immoral, as the reason for his attitude. Apparently, wars waged by communists are not immoral, but to defend one's nation against them is immoral. Not a word was uttered concerning the crimes and atrocities committed by the enemy as a policy of terror. Mrs. Coffman attempted to bring up the subject.

PENTAGON PHOTO OF A BEHEADED SOLDIER

She walked to the front with two photos, and addressing the Rev. Oliver, held them up and asked how much love he thought these indicated that the Viet Cong possessed for their own or any other people. One showed a beheaded American soldier, the other a Viet Namese with his hands tied behind him, and his throat slashed. The minister and the panel member at each side of him looked at the pictures with revulsion. When told they came from the Pentagon, one exclaimed, "They're frauds," and the other cried out, "We can produce just as many from our side." Nobody asked him to elaborate on what he meant by "our side."

How many of this type have been conditioned, or have conditioned themselves, into regarding the enemy, or the reds generally, as "our side," is impossible to tell, and only a psychiatrist could explain this attitude.

When she returned to her seat, a man stood up, introduced himself as Brian Paddock, a Washington attorney, and in courtroom posture, pointed his finger toward first one part of the audience and then the other, asking, "Where were you in 1963 when I tried to organize resistance to the draft?" He said the time had come now to organize it, and offered his legal assistance to anyone who wanted it.

Noonday recess was called. On her way out, two women approached Mrs. Coffman. One congratulated her for speaking up, but added that she disagreed with her. The other asked, "What do you read?" Mrs. Coffman mentioned U.S. News & World Report, the Congressional Record and Reader's Digest. At this, the questioner expressed disgust, saying: "Oh, Reader's Digest! You should read Ramparts."

Mrs. Coffman chatted with some of the young men and was shocked by the distortions and the untruths that had been fed and taught. One politely insisted that Ho Chi-minh was no communist, only a nationalist. One can well understand this from the tone of the letters in the N.Y. Times, for instance, from professors who belong to some of our most hallowed colleges and universities. This is what our youth is being taught in many institutions of higher learning. Of course, there is treason in this, and there is conspiracy, too.

CLINIC FOR DRAFT DODGERS IN THE AFTERNOON

The afternoon turned out to be a workshop for instructions in draft dodging. The panel was reduced to three, and the audience was smaller, too, mostly young men of draft age. They sat close to the stage in what operated as a clinic. An older, heavier man had joined the panel, and appeared to be in charge as instructor. He was referred to as a minister.

The questions were practical ones, on methods to adopt to evade selective service. Thus, the affair had edged, Illuminati-style, from its original description as a forum for an objective study of conscientious objection, step by step, to a clinic with ministerial guidance and support on how to circumvent the draft and resist American policy. Of course, there was psychological warfare planning to this behind the scenes.

Participants did not have to be fully informed regarding the national pattern to this. All they had to do was to fulfill the specific roles alloted, and all they had to know were the cliches and pat answers. Certainly, the F.B.I. knows the red technique involved, but that the Justice Department does, or will admit it, is most unlikely. The anti-anticommunist policy facilitates enemy strategy, and blocks opposition to it.

The person who allows himself to become frustrated or defeatist because of this also smooths the way for enemy strategy, and hinders opposition to it. Mrs. Coffman decided that although the affair at All Souls, with the backing of her Fairfax Unitarian church, was a fait accompli, she would not let it drop. She had a dual purpose. Firstly, she wanted to correct what she felt was a critical blunder in her church. Secondly, she wanted to help prevent more men from being encouraged or seduced into disloyalty or treason.

She had been shocked into this determination by something she read in the Sept. 20 issue of the Fairfax Unitarian, the church bulletin, a few days before the panel met. A church notice actually boasted, in nice language, that members of the church did not know of the revolutionary program being put into effect in their name. The item announced that the pulpit was being turned over to chapters of Liberal Religious Youth from throughout the nation, who had just held a convention to discuss war, civil rights, drugs, crime and the like. It stated: "Student Religious Liberals believe that Unitarian-Universalists are not aware of the vast role their churches have played in creating the political ferment so obvious on college—and some high school campuses."

"Vast role" . . . "creating the political ferment" . . . in our high schools and institutions of higher learning, without the knowledge of the church members! In the name of the democratic traditions of the church, too! That a congregation can be told in its own church bulletin that its own denomination was being thus used for ends destructive of its traditions and principles, against the interests of the nation, is a commentary on the arrogance and over-confidence of the plotters.

SUGGESTS LECTURES TO ALERT OUR PEOPLE

Mrs. Coffman wrote a letter to Edgar Brown as head of the church's social action committee, and sent a copy of it to the Rev. Nemser, other area Unitarian ministers, the panel members, and some church folk. She wrote:

"In regards to the panel discussion on 'conscientious objectors' which was held Saturday, Sept. 23 at All Souls Unitarian Church, I take little pleasure in saying, 'I told you so,' but I am sure that you agree that I was right when I warned that the topic concerning the morality of the war in Viet Nam would enter into the discussion and the stacked panel against the war was therefore inappropriate. It was not only unfair to those in the audience who might have shared opposing opinion, but it is unfortunate for the Unitarian Church in regards to a topic concerning our national security, particularly since the Unitarian Church espouses free and unbiased, open discussions. It was a disservice to the church, the youth and the country. I will forgive you, though, because I feel you worked very hard to alter the situation, but I can hardly forgive those who set up the panel in the first place.

"It was a great surprise to me to see Mr. Speltz, a columnist for the Washington Free Press, and Mrs. Chandler, a member of Women's Strike for Peace, on the panel. These groups were not mentioned in the original announcement. Mrs. Chandler is a mother of sons who do not wish to serve. I, by contrast, am also a mother of three sons who I hold in adoration and who are proud that they are serving. In view of this, I was disappointed that I wasn't asked to speak, since my feelings were known to you in advance.

"One cannot discuss honestly and intelligently the morality of the war in Viet Nam without some advanced schooling on the subject of communism, the Communist Party in America, what it is and how it is working. I found nothing to indicate this in the speeches given Saturday. As a matter of fact, communism was never mentioned although the war in Viet Nam is being fought to prevent a communist take-over in the south. Ironically, the last sentence in the announcement in the church bulletin of Sept. 6 read, 'Knowledgeable persons with different points of view will form a panel for discussion.' How deceiving!

"In order to rectify the matter, I offer my services to formulate a lecture series on communism, not to indoctrinate, but to inform. Never have I seen or heard of anything of this nature done by the Unitarian Church which exposes its members to studies of many religions and seemingly embraces nothing but the so-called liberal political philosophy."

"I QUESTION THE INTEGRITY AND INTENTIONS"

She suggested possible speakers and lecture topics, and then wrote:

"I believe that only after a program such as this can the youth make a fair evaluation on whether or not to resist the draft, as was promoted by the panel. The panel not only promoted organized resistance to the draft, but the afternoon session was devoted to instruction as to how to proceed as a conscientious objector. This part of the program was not published in the church bulletin. I question the integrity and intentions of the whole program.

"Will you assist me in arranging the days and rooms for such a program in the church? I thank you sincerely for your previous help. I look forward to more of the same in the future."

She waited vainly for a reply. But on Sept. 27, she was upset to find a notice in the church bulletin asking for overnight sleeping facilities for the participants in the forthcoming Oct. 21 Pentagon demonstrations. In the next week's bulletin, Oct. 4, she read that the propaganda film, "War Games," was being shown in her church and in a number of others nearby, principally Methodist, by the Citizens for Peace group, which her minister had helped to organize.

She was encouraged by the sincere groupings of a church member, Arthur Hughes, of the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.), who after a trip to Viet Nam spoke on the subject, "Is the Dove Position Tenable?" About 40 showed up, and heard him say that what he had seen and learned at the spot convinced him that our cause was just. Anxious to spread what he had found out among the church members, he gave the talk a second time, to the women's alliance, but only eight came, including Mrs. Coffman.

He obviously felt frustrated. While eager to express his stand, when it came to probing what was behind the situation, he seemed almost in agony. He said, in reply to questioning, that he had worked where there were communists years ago, but never realized the danger, as the whole spotlight was focussed on the danger in what was called "McCarthyism." Here once more was evidence, in capsule form, of the enormous psychological success of an enduring nature that the red complex has achieved in diverting attention from its own activities to those of the investigators themselves, making the latter appear to be the sinners, and itself the sinned against.

Those who see the light on such matters, to the degree that they had been indoctrinated in the very alluring premises of Marxism in its various interpretations, from the disguised to the violent, go through a very painful experience. People do not like pain, and so we have countless numbers who remain with what has become very much a faith for them, although a materialist, political faith, after they no longer really believe, rather than go through this torment.

"M'CARTHYISM" INDOCTRINATED AS DOGMA NOWADAYS

Precepts, such as the American role in Viet Nam being immoral, are manifestations of this red doctrine, although those who repeat them more often than not are anything but communists. They have been indoctrinated by their environment. The psychological warfare planners who created this anti-anti-communist propaganda climate are out of their sight and hearing.

"McCarthyism" is now dogma in this environment, and the dogma has been simplified. No longer are smears, guilt by association, or character assassination associated with it in the mind of the believers, for these tactics have become the everyday weapons of those who call themselves "liberals" nowadays. What is called "McCarthyism" is any criticism of communism, no matter how warranted, no matter what crimes or aggressions are committed by the communists. The reaction is sheer conditioning, Pavlovian. A nation can be so softened up by it that its destruction and conquest become simple. This is the peril in it.

The communist apparatus requires for its operations a working front of stubbornly naive individuals with good educations who have been conditioned into a pat state of mind in which what they call "liberalism" represents the good guys, and what they call "McCarthyism" represents the bad guys. Old-time theology is replaced by this new concept of deity and devil.

PENTAGON RIOTERS CALLED JUST PACIFISTS

Mrs. Coffman read that a deal was being made giving permission for a massive, red-manipulated, antiwar rally at the reflecting pool in front of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, that was to march across a Potomac River bridge for a demonstration on Pentagon grounds in Virginia. The permit was being signed by Harry Van Cleve, director of the General Services Administration, who is an active church member, along with his wife, Ruth, director of the department of territories of the Department of Interior.

Her letter simply was being ignored. She phoned various church officials about it, including Robert Gowell, president of the board of trustees. She was told she was exaggerating the danger of the approaching Pentagon demonstrations, and that the participants were just pacifists. Mrs. Coffman insisted there was communist leadership, and cited Dave Dellinger. "Is he still a communist?" she was asked casually. "I knew him 20 years ago, when he said he was a non-Soviet type of communist." He still says so.

Mrs. Coffman's husband, Burton, was on the social action committee of the church, with Ruth, who is an attorney by profession. So Mrs. Coffman wrote Mr. Van Cleve, declaring: "If any deal must be made with these groups who wish to demonstrate Oct. 21, let it be this: Tell them that if they are against the war, they must be against communism, against Moscow and Peking, and the guerrilla warfare that they are supporting in South Viet Nam. "Any such deal, she protested, would be "an act of betrayal to U.S. servicemen in Viet Nam."

The line that the Kennedys enforced while in power, and that the Johnson Administration is continuing, that the communists are a danger abroad, but not in the United States, was repeated as if a form of absolution for anything they did in our country. She was told there were much more important things for the church to do than to provide a forum for lectures on the realities in communism.

The Rev. Nemser gave her the silent treatment, simply not replying to any of her inquiries, although she sent him documentation obtained from Congressional committees and the Congressional Record. Certain that the fast approaching Pentagon demonstrations had riotous and revolutionary overtones, when no replies had yet come, she phoned to find out why. Among those she phoned was Mrs. Brown. They talked about the church's involvement, and then Mrs. Brown promised to remind her husband about the letter.

After the Pentagon had been symbolically occupied and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the indicted author of books on baby care, had boasted about it on nationwide television, Mr. Brown replied. She was given a brush-off, "for the record," as the saying goes. Her suggestion for a lecture series to alert people to communist aims was rejected. What, at best, was token representation for the non-subversive viewpoint, was presented as proof of a policy of objectivity by the church and at the anti-draft panel meeting. Mr. Brown wrote:

"This refers to your letter and enclosure of Sept. 24, 1967, concerning the panel discussion on the subject of conscientious objection sponsored by the social action committee of the Greater Washington Area Unitarian-Universalist Association. In your view the panel was 'stacked' against the war in Viet Nam, and by way of overcoming this imbalance you are proposing a lecture series at the Fairfax Unitarian Church on the subject of communism.

CURIOUS INABILITY TO FIND A PRO-U.S. PANEL MEMBER

"I am sorry that you were dissatisfied with the panel. The committee invited representatives from the Justice Department and the House Armed Services Committee, but their participation could not be obtained. The committee voted to invite Gen. Thomas Lane when you and Mr. Ed Sloane indicated that he represented your viewpoint. I would also remind you that the chairman gave you the same amount of time to express your views as he gave to Mr. William Higgs, who spoke immediately before you at the program. I felt that your direct participation in the program, together with the committee's efforts to accommodate you and Mr. Sloane in choosing a panel, reflected credit upon the committee, and absolved it from any motive to control the point of view to be presented. I think you will agree that Dr. Robert Chambers accorded you and all others who were present an equal opportunity to be heard.

"It is not my office to review programs for the Fairfax Unitarian Church; I cannot grant or deny its facilities for the lecture series you are proposing on the subject of communism. As a member, however, I would remind you that as recently as July 30 and Oct. 5 of this year, Mr. Arthur M. Hughes of our church defended the Administration's position on the war in Viet Nam. As an A.I.D. official who had been to Viet Nam, Mr. Hughes was in a good position to lead an informative discussion on this important subject. In view of this, I felt that your lecture series would be, as lawyers say, cumulative."

"FLOWER POWER" NOT JUST FLOWERS

A particularly nasty tactic employed against the Pentagon on the Oct. 21 weekend was a hippie, flower maneuver, that sought to provoke the young soldiers by taunting them with flowers. A girl would walk as if in ecstacy up to one in a row of soldiers, and in teasingly slow time, try to balance a flower on his outstretched bayonet. Reporters stood about with open notebooks, and television cameras focussed on the scene. Meanwhile, others among the demonstrators would sneer and laugh, alternating appeals to desert with obscenities. Suddenly, at one point or another, there would be an effort to sneak around the troops. This was provocation of a most cunning nature. Its propaganda effect could be immense.

Not a word, not a hint of this was heard when the church staged a "Flower Power Sunday" the week afterwards. The minister gave a "flower power" sermon, and respectability was given to the so-called "flower power movement," an obvious facet of the anti-Viet Nam war movement. The church bulletin of Nov. 1 reported that the church was "packed to the doors" twice, and that the past weekend had been "probably the most dramatically active in the history of the Fairfax Church." About 250 members of the youth group held "a well structured program of workshops on topics relating to 'Love and Personal Responsibility.'" There was dancing and the tossing of flowers. The adults were told that the youth had a message that must be taken seriously. But the message never was spelled out; it was left to inferences. That anyone would connect it with the flower provocations at the Pentagon would have been boorish in this pretty setting. But of course they were related, part of the broader scene. As was boasted in the Sept. 20 issue of the church bulletin, "Student Religious Liberals believe" that the church-goers "are not aware" of their "vast role" in creating ferment.

Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleagues doubtless know, the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—known as UNCTAD II—is meeting now in New Delhi. It is a highly significant meeting. Gathered in that city are representatives from about all the United Nations, assembled to consider most of the basic problems of world trade and economic development that confront the world today.

The delegates at the Conference are discussing ways to increase the trade of the developing countries and thus help them accelerate their economic growth. One major specific problem commanding attention at UNCTAD II is how to avert what could be a catastrophic crisis in the world's food supply.

The issues before UNCTAD are complex and difficult. They clearly merit the attention they are receiving at this world conference. I am pleased to be able to report here that our Government has given and continues to give serious consideration to these problems. Our representatives have approached the present conference with earnest intent, and with good hopes for its satisfactory outcome. The U.S. ministerial representative to the Conference, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Eugene V. Rostow, presented the U.S. views in an address to the Conference on February 5. His remarks clearly convey the deep concern of the United States for the problems under discussion there, and he offers many useful avenues of approach to them. His remarks, which deserve thoughtful consideration by all Americans, were as follows:

FROM AID TO COOPERATION: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE NEXT DECADE

(Statement by the Honorable Eugene V. Rostow, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, New Delhi, India, Feb. 5, 1968)

I

Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to add my congratulations to the tributes of our colleagues who have already spoken. It is singularly appropriate that this second session of UNCTAD is meeting in New Delhi, and that you have been elected as our President to succeed the distinguished and effective representative of the United Arab Republic, His Excellency Dr. Kaissouni.

Mr. President, your enlightened country and your proud and cultured people face an economic challenge which recapitulates the difficulties and the promise of the development process. It is a hopeful augury that we meet at a time when India's economic programs have accomplished an historic breakthrough in agricultural production. That achievement rests above all on the plans and efforts of the Indian Government and the Indian people. In preparing and revising its economic plans, the Government of India has had the courage to learn from experience through procedures of study and public discussion which are a tribute to the strength of Indian democracy. The programs of the Indian Government have been supported by a far reaching process of international cooperation. India has intelligently used the resources of world science, and those of governments, private business and private foundations representing every branch of the human family. To us, this pattern—this vision—of human solidarity in overcoming the curse of poverty and ignorance is the right framework for dealing with the problem we now call economic development. In our view, all governments, and all peoples, whatever their social systems, should work together in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter to end the specter of poverty which haunts the world. This principle is the basis of American policy, and I can assure you that it will remain the source of our policy.

The moral climate of the world has changed since President Roosevelt issued his famous call for freedom from want, and President Truman announced his Point Four Program. Through one of the mysterious leaps of the human spirit, mankind in our generation has resolved to abolish conditions of poverty and ignorance which have been accepted for millennia as the order of nature. New and persistent hopes have seized the mind of man. Those hopes have become aspirations, and then programs. The theory of economic growth is as old as economic history. What is new, as our Secretary-General remarked in his opening statement on Friday, is man's determination to accelerate the pace of economic progress in the developing world. We have determined to make long-run economic growth a task for the short-run. Governments and private groups have sought to find means to reach this goal. Some of these means have failed, as we all know. Others have shown promise, a few have succeeded.

Scholars, bureaucrats, and politicians have all made a contribution to this search for effective ways to accelerate the process of development and to have it include all of mankind. Many reasons have been advanced to explain our preoccupation with this task: reasons of prudence, reasons of self-interest or the quest for political influence. In the end, however, there is only one acceptable premise for our common endeavor: we must act, and act together, simply because we have come finally to believe that poverty is wrong, and that for the first time in human history science makes it possible to right this wrong. The poor, we are convinced, need not always be with us. The United States is proud to have been a leader in the laborious development efforts of the last twenty years. Our policy rests on the broad principles of the United Nations Charter—on "respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," and on the practice of "international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character." We believe in a world order of diversity, in which each country is free to pursue its own concept of social progress in peace, assured of the support and cooperation of the world community to which it has a right to belong.

On Thursday, we all heard the stimulating and eloquent address of the Prime Minister of India. The United States agrees with her solemn words: "The United Nations was established twenty-three years ago to keep world peace and promote human prosperity. The juxtaposition of peace and prosperity is not a contrivance for stating moral precepts. The two are indissolubly linked together. Without peace there can be no prosperity for any people, rich or poor. And yet, there can be no peace without erasing the harshness of the growing contrast between the rich and the poor." In this spirit, President Johnson recently said: "For two decades, America has committed itself against the tyranny of want and ignorance in the world that threatens the peace. We shall sustain that commitment."

II

The main outlines of the development problem as we face it today are magisterially presented in the report of our Secretary-General, Dr. Prebisch, and were magisterially summed up in his speech on Friday. We concur in his sense of urgency; in his thesis of shared responsibility, a responsibility that is shared by the developed and the developing countries; and in his stress on the necessity for a global strategy. An adequate rhythm of growth, he points out, requires an international harmonization of economic policies, the discipline of development plans, changes in structure and attitude both in the developed and in developing countries, and access to the capital resources of the developed world for developing countries which are pursuing realistic development policies.

The panorama we face is far from satisfactory. We all know that the rate of economic progress in the developing world as a whole has been spotty, and generally too slow. Still, there are instances of success, and they should be carefully taken into account. The Secretary-General's report lists 18 developing countries with compound growth rates of real product ranging from 6.1 percent to 10 percent annually during the period 1960–65. But many more people than live in these eighteen countries live in countries which experienced growth rates between 4 percent and 6 percent during this period; and many more still live in fifteen countries with a growth rate below 4 percent.

This record of growth is meaningless unless it is considered in relation to the rate of growth of population. Per capita growth rates are the curves of greatest concern to us. There is no need in this room to stress the fact that policy must bear equally on both sides of the development equation—on economic growth and on family planning—if success in the development process is to become a reality. In per capita terms, the record is indeed somber. The Secretariat reports per capita real product in the developing countries grew at an annual rate of 2.2 per cent in the period 1955–60, that this annual rate fell to 2 percent in the next five years and was still at that low level in 1966. These depressing aggregates, moreover, mask even grimmer statistics for certain areas of the developing world.

These bleak figures define the problem before us. It is a challenge to the energy and intelligence of man: a challenge we can and must accept as a duty whose claim upon us is the inescapable predictate of our obligation to preserve the peace. We cannot conceive of a stable and peaceful world order without progress, any more than we can expect progress without peace.

As we see it, this session of UNCTAD can and must give a fresh impulse to the process of development. That impulse should flow naturally from the agreement of our governments to harmonize their policies in a number of areas which experience and analysis have identified as critical. The United States believes that agreement among us on these critical issues is not only possible, but indispensable. We pledge our most earnest efforts, and our full support, to that constructive end.

The work of this conference has been unusually well prepared. We have the advantage of the Secretary-General's useful report, the documents prepared by the Secretariat, and the studies made by the OECD and the countries which met together to draft the Algiers Charter. We were encouraged and impressed by the message we received from the goodwill mission which came to the United States to present and discuss the Algiers Charter. We welcome, and we reciprocate, the spirit of reality and cooperation which dominated their statement. The developing nations which met in Algiers, we were told, wish this conference to avoid polemics, and to concentrate on economic issues. They recognize the primary responsibility of the developing nations for their own development plans, and for the disciplined efforts in many realms required to make those plans effective. They wish to move away from the concept of aid, and to substitute for it that of cooperation. They fully recognize the contribution which private investment and private entrepreneurship can and should make to the next stage of the development process.

Our own preparations for this conference, and those of the OECD countries, have been carried out in the same spirit. We know that our agenda contains many items on which positions are now far apart. They raise policy problems of inherent difficulty. But the spirit of realism, and the desire of constructive cooperation, should find ways to reconcile most of these difficulties. I am confident that in an atmosphere of goodwill, and with a willingness on all sides to examine reasonable compromises, we should be able to reach agreement on a number of positive and constructive programs of action.

We have no illusions that the task will be easy. We shall be dealing here with a series of problems of trade and investment in the developing world. These problems cannot be examined in isolation. The main lesson of success in the development plans aims at the integration of their economies into the world economy as a whole. That is the key to the fundamental problem which Dr. Prebisch so felicitously identifies as "dynamic insufficiency." The dynamic pressure of world economic forces should help guide the transformation of attitudes and structures within the developing countries, a process of change which Dr. Prebisch rightly characterized as a fundamental condition for rapid progress in development. The same forces are transforming structures and attitudes in the developed countries. We should define our goal, therefore, as the acceleration of development within the framework of a growing and progressive world economy, governed by the principles of the international division of labor. We should avoid solutions which would isolate the developing countries from the world economy.

As we all know, the world economy is not perfect, and its basic machinery needs further reform. Balance of payments difficulties, and a growing shortage of reserves, have created temporary problems for the world monetary system which, for the moment, limit the availability of investment funds, and require care in the provision of aid. In this realm, cooperation is being organized in managing the balance of payments adjustment process, in accordance with the recent resolution of the OECD. This step, and the prospective implementation of the agreement reached at the Rio meeting of the International Monetary Fund, should strengthen the world monetary system, the essential foundation of an open and growing world economy of equal benefit to developed and developing nations alike.

In the field of trade, too, the horizon is hardly without clouds. The successful completion of the Kennedy Round negotiations was a remarkable achievement of economic cooperation, and it has created many opportunities for growth in every economy of the world. At this conference, we shall be considering proposals for a new system of generalized tariff preferences for the developing countries in the markets of the more industrialized parts of the world. This, in our view, should be a major advance, promising a contribution to the economic welfare of the developing countries going beyond the Kennedy Round. If we can agree on the essential bases through which this idea can become a policy, we shall have opened important new opportunities for investment and expansion in the economies of the developing nations.

At the same time, however, we should not lose sight of the hazards in the field of trade policy, hazards old and new. The protectionist impulse is always strong, and is supported always by plausible arguments. We should examine the problems before us with care, in order to avoid trade policies which depart from the principle of comparative advantage, as we open up vast markets to competitive opportunities.

III

With these general principles in mind, let me turn to some of the more particular items on our agenda. I propose to begin with the problem of food supply, a basic task of the world economy, and of each national economy. A recent report on the world food problem of President Johnson's Science Advisory Committee concludes that "total food consumption in the developing countries must approximately double during the period between 1965 and 1985 if the critical physiological needs of rapidly expanding populations are to be met." But, the report points out, "increases in food production and consumption are not stimulated by physiological need alone. They are determined by economic forces as well. The rate of production of food is governed by demand, which in turn is governed by the development of the economy as a whole. There is a strong interdependence," the report points out, "between agricultural output and the total output (GNP) of a national economy."

The food problem, fundamental as it is, cannot be considered except as part of the problem of development in its totality. Only a growing and productive economy can produce or purchase the food it needs for its people. And only a people adequately fed will have the vitality to engage in the hard and demanding work of economic progress. These same themes dominate the Secretary-General's report on "Developing Countries and the Food Problem." Food is not a problem apart, but an aspect of the task of most effectively improving the use of available resources. The urgency of the food problem does not imply that every country must seek to become self-sufficient in food. We are not here to repeal the principles of rationality in economics. Unless rapid progress is made in family planning—progress at a higher rate than we can now observe—a large share of the gains of economic development, however rapid, will be absorbed in a Malthusian race. The problem of food sufficiency cuts across many areas of concern to UNCTAD. It is necessarily a first item of realistic development programs. In the developing nations, every government must decide how much food to grow, and how much to buy. It must make these decisions in terms of its best estimates of future trends.

It is natural that my government has a strong interest in problems of food and agricultural development. For some years concessional shipments of American food surpluses have tended to obscure the significance of lagging per capita food output as a major problem in many developing countries. We have been among the first to recognize the need for an urgent, concerted effort to modernize and accelerate agricultural development in developing regions.

I am sure we are all agreed that food aid, however essential, cannot be regarded as anything but an interim solution. For one thing, the vacuum filled by food aid results from a lag in the development of the agricultural sector in many countries, which pulls down rates of overall growth. It has sometimes had a negative effect on food production in the recipient country. Increased per capita output of food is essential, at least in those regions where it is economically rational to allocate increased resources to agriculture. We are now in a period when food aid shipments will depend in large part on production programmed for this purpose. The era of vast food surpluses is over. It is in no one's interest that this anomalous situation in world production and trade in food be perpetuated any longer than necessary. The point is often made that the food problem is not a general one, but one affecting only a few countries. This may be true today, but the problem could easily become more widespread and serious, if appropriate steps are not taken promptly. Many countries which used to be food exporters now import food. And others are near that margin. What we need is a well-thought-out, comprehensive program of preventive medicine. Our purpose should be to invalidate today's projections of sharply rising food deficits by altering present trends in food production and population.

We feel that this conference can make its own contribution to the solution of the world's food problem. UNCTAD's special concern, and special expertness, is the problem of trade and development seen as a whole. I hope we shall endorse as policy objectives of high priority, the modernization of the agricultural sector of those developing countries where agricultural expansion makes economic sense; the associated build-up of industries allied to agriculture; the application of improved technology; effective public and private assistance to further these aims; and appropriate domestic policies to create the necessary infrastructure and provide the necessary incentives for agriculture.

It will be important to have UNCTAD study the positive opportunities associated with an all-out attack on the agricultural development problem—the opportunities for diversification, for expanding export availabilities, for new industries and for new initiatives in trade and economic cooperation. The excellent documentation which has been provided for this item of our agenda sets the stage for what can, we feel, be a constructive discussion, resulting in the articulation of constructive initiatives.

I mention these prospects only to illustrate the scope of the problem. It would be fatuous to suggest that because new techniques are available, they will automatically be put to effective use in solving the world's food problem. Much more is needed. Along with improvements in technology, there must be corresponding innovations in education, in economic organization, in management, and in the application of research. The principal lesson to be learned from successful agricultural programs in the developing world is the importance of economic incentives in inducing the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and better methods of water control. I hope this session of UNCTAD will draw out, express and focus the political will that is needed to push these programs to that level among the competing priorities which, in our view, they deserve to have.

IV

Next, I should like to comment on certain issues of trade policy, and particularly on trade in manufactured and semi-manufactured goods, the growing edge of many developing economies, and one of crucial importance to their evolution as diversified and resourceful economic systems, capable of adaptation to the changing tides of world trade.

We are pleased that the Secretariat singled out the record of the United States in this respect as "one of the most striking features of the trend during the period 1961–65." Today the United States purchases 35 percent of all the exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from the developing countries. Our imports of these goods grew at the annual rate of 19 percent in the 1961–65 period, and increased to more than $2 billion in 1966—a 35 percent increase over the 1965 level. We take satisfaction in these developments which have not taken place without strain as our markets become adjusted to new sources of supply. The import needs of developing countries are increasing rapidly, and the long-term market outlook is not good for a number of primary commodities which are important to the developing nations. We know, therefore, that there must be no faltering of export growth in the field of manufactured and semimanufactured goods from the developing countries. Some recent steps give grounds for cautious optimism. Perhaps this conference can lead to others. Certainly there are export possibilities which have not received the attention they deserve.

I mentioned the Kennedy Round in another connection a few moments ago. As a result of these unprecedented negotiations, the average tariff level in the industrialized countries will drop by 37 percent, to a level of less than 9 percent. These cuts will open new trade opportunities in all the industrialized countries. Tariff cuts do not, of course, in themselves lead to increased trade. But they do create opportunities that can be realized through improved marketing and cost consciousness. Developing countries with a good industrial base already are in a better position than the majority of developing countries to take advantage of these possibilities. But no country should neglect the opportunities the Kennedy Round has created for improved access to world markets. Certainly, none need be discouraged. In this regard, it is instructive to study the extraordinary export progress of Mexico, Korea and the Republic of China, which made extraordinary advances even at pre-Kennedy Round tariff levels.

The decision to establish a joint GATT–UNCTAD Trade Center is another promising recent development. One of its major functions will be to help developing countries exploit the trade opportunities of the Kennedy Round. The techniques of export promotion must be better understood and applied if lower trade barriers are to have their intended effect. This kind of practical cooperation between the GATT and UNCTAD augers well for the future.

Turning to the immediate business of this conference, I should like to comment on the important issues of tariff preferences. We have before us the OECD paper, the Charter of Algiers, and several UNCTAD Secretariat documents which help define the issues we shall have to deal with in this connection.

My government welcomes the fact that while differences of scope and of principle remain, we start our examination of this question on the footing of broad and important agreement. There seems to be general acceptance of the concept of a generalized system of tariff preferences to be extended by all developed countries to all developing countries, a system, moreover, that does not involve the granting of reciprocal special advantages to the developed countries. The idea of tariff preferences for the developing nations has a high potential. It involves a series of issues which will be carefully examined during this conference. I can assure you that the United States stands ready to cooperate in the effort to resolve these problems. We are convinced that a temporary system of generalized preferences for the developing countries should help accelerate their rate of growth. Such a system would also avoid the adverse effects of special preferential trading arrangements between certain developed and developing countries, agreements which could divide the world into trading blocs. Such a development of world trade, could, in our opinion, have unfortunate political and economic effects. This concern also underlies the call in the Charter of Algiers for a generalized system of preferences.

It may be useful to draw the attention of the conference to one issue which the United States and a number of other countries consider particularly important. This is the issue of reverse preferences—preferences granted by particular developing countries to particular developed countries.

Such preferences often burden developing countries by increasing the costs of their imports. While we recognize that there are reasons for these preferences, reasons of history in some cases, or as compensation for aid programs in others, they have become an anachronism. The recipients of reverse preferences have often stated that they do not insist on these preferences, and that it is up to the developing countries themselves to decide whether they should be continued. For its part, the United States has already agreed with the one country which grants reverse preferences to us, the Republic of the Philippines, that the reverse preferences will not be extended when the present agreement expires. For us there is an element of equity in this issue: Is it reasonable that the United States should give a preferred position in the American market to the products of countries which discriminate against American goods? I believe the question answers itself.

Improved market access, greater attention to export promotion, and tariff preferences will all aid the exports of developing countries. But there is need for other actions as well. We hope this conference will wish to give a new impetus to the movement for regional integration. Today in many areas the efficient application of modern industrial technology to production requires large industrial plants, long production runs and a high degree of specialization. In consequence, modern industries need a large market. In many developing countries, such a market does not exist. As we in the United States know from our own history, it is too much to expect that some new producers can immediately confront the world market and the competition of established producers. But if developing enterprises are exposed to more tolerable competition within regional markets, it should accelerate their ability to reach a competitive position in wider international markets. There are lessons for the developing world in the outstanding achievements of the European economic community. Regional economic cooperation has also made commendable progress in Central America and in other developing areas. But the regional movement faces stubborn economic, political and psychological barriers. The autarchic policies of many governments have strong roots in the fears of businessmen and government leaders—fears of change and of the unknown.

For our part, we are prepared, now as in the past, to assist meaningful progress in the direction of regional economic cooperation. Our support of such movements in the past has not been limited to verbal endorsements, nor will it be in the future. For a number of years, we have given economic and technical aid to the Central American Common Market. We have undertaken to contribute toward easing the transitional difficulties in forming the Latin American Common Market. We are also prepared to support multinational projects for building infrastructure through the Inter-American Development Bank. We have contributed $200 million to the Asian Development Bank and asked the Congress to authorize an additional $200 million for the Bank's special funds. We are also prepared to give assistance to regional economic cooperation in Africa, and in the Middle East.

We believe that regional cooperation has much to contribute in the years ahead to the progress and stability of many parts of the developing world. We are, therefore, favorably disposed toward the interesting proposal on our agenda from the UNCTAD Secretariat suggesting that specific regional undertakings by the developing countries be matched by a declaration of support by the industrialized countries. We look forward during the coming weeks to exploring the content of such a common effort.

Now I should like to say a few words on the much mooted subject of commodity problems. It is natural that the state of the basic commodity markets should loom large on our agenda. Commodity production is, after all, the foundation of the economies of many developing countries and their major source of export earnings.

Commodity trade is plagued by a variety of problems; by persistent overproduction in some key products; by wide and destabilizing price swings in other key products; by severe competition from both natural and synthetic products; and by import restrictions and preferential arrangements. We meet at a time of difficulty in the markets for several raw materials and other primary products. In some cases, these difficulties reflect cyclical conditions, and should be relieved by higher growth rates in the industrialized world. In others, supply has proved unresponsive, for a variety of reasons, to market signals. In certain cases, there are structural problems which have been the object of concerted international effort.

There is no one solution for this range of problems. Policy must be tailored to the problems of specific commodity markets. There is no alternative to the process of getting at the roots and then developing and evaluating possible courses of action which might be usefully taken to meet individual commodity problems. The special contribution which UNCTAD can make is in helping governments to understand the possibilities and limitations of particular types of action as applied to particular types of products.

We know that in certain cases, such as those of some tropical products, commodity agreements may be practicable and helpful. In the case of coffee the agreement is playing an increasingly constructive role in stabilizing prices and promoting an attack on the problem of oversupply. On the other hand, for temperate products and commodities subject to replacement by synthetics, commodities which provide a substantial percentage of the export earnings of developing countries, it is generally accepted that other approaches should be emphasized. Diversification, more efficient production, improved market access, development of new markets, careful domestic management in the developed countries so as to avoid excessive production and allow developing countries a share of market growth, are some of the general lines being advanced for consideration. We are weighing and testing policy approaches to these problems. We believe the conference should give desirable impetus to the consideration of these alternative approaches.

In this connection one particularly promising avenue the conference will be specifically exploring is the role of diversification in commodity policy. For a number of commodities, diversification, it seems to us, offers the best hope for a long-term improvement of market conditions. We all know that when a country has substantial resources invested in producing commodities in structural surplus there is a double cost; the surplus depresses prices; the resources used to produce them would normally bring higher returns if they were invested in manufacturing, in commodity exports with better growth potential, or in foodstuffs for rising local needs. To agree in principle on the need for diversification in certain commodities is relatively easy. To translate this agreement into specific courses of action is much harder, and often requires investment. A promising start was recently made in coffee. Producing countries have agreed in principle to use some of the extra resources made available by the coffee agreement to finance practical projects for shifting resources out of coffee. We have offered to participate actively in this new venture, and to contribute resources to its success. We hope other countries will join us.

Before leaving this subject, let me also say a few words on some commodity matters we are all keenly aware of, the current state of negotiations for a cocoa agreement and renewal of the international coffee agreement. The United States, for its part, is convinced that real progress has been made and that we can confidently look forward to success in both instances in the near future. We note that a conference to negotiate a new sugar agreement is also being planned. The United States will cooperate in such a conference.

VI

Preferences, regional cooperation, and commodity problems are three of UNCTAD's main concerns. Financial assistance to developing countries is a fourth.

The growing sense of interdependence among the nations of the world is one of the most promising international developments since 1945. One manifestation of this idea has been the flow of aid from developed to developing countries. The acceptance of this responsibility, for all its complexities, is a bright page of modern history.

The most important recent development in this field is the international coordination of many programs of economic assistance. The World Bank has taken the lead in organizing and staffing several successful international groups which have devoted themselves to the economic development problems of particular developing countries. And both the bank and the International Monetary Fund have assisted in the negotiation of agreements for rescheduling the debts of certain developing countries. By the middle fifties the International Finance Corporation had been added to the World Bank family, and shortly afterwards the International Development Association. In the years since, a major institution for financing development has been established in each continent of the developing world. Gradually substantial additional resources have been made available to developing countries by enlarging quotas in the Fund and, following a recommendation of the first conference, by expanding the Fund's compensatory facility.

In this connection, the replenishment of the funds of the International Development Association is one of the most important issues now before the world community. The United States, as you know, proposed a plan last March for reaching the target of $1 billion a year in IDA funds within three years. Negotiations for the replenishment of IDA are well advanced, and we are hopeful that final agreement on this vital issue will be reached soon. We shall, of course, do our share in whatever program commands general support.

In addition, other parts of the U.N. system are engaged in helping the developing nations to progress economically and socially. Close to 80 percent of the total resources of these agencies is being devoted to economic and social programs. There has been a striking increase in these resources and in their concentration on development. During the past eight years, 1960–1967 inclusive, the U.N. and the specialized agencies, not including the World Bank complex, have spend almost $3 billion, mainly on activities related to the development and welfare of the developing countries. United States contributions accounted for over 40 percent. Bilateral aid programs have also been enlarged during recent years.

Because of the volume of our international responsibilities, we have been unable to meet our aid targets in recent years. But the nature of our own bilateral programs is such that we have a large pipeline, large enough we hope to carry us over our present difficult years. We have, of course, a balance of payments problem which affects our aid program. We are doing our best to minimize the effects on developing countries of the measures we have been obliged to take in recent weeks.

VII

It is increasingly apparent, as we study the cases of success and failure in the growth process, that private investment and private entrepreneurship are factors crucial to the possibility of accelerated growth. The job of achieving rapid economic growth is too large for most governments to undertake alone. Few can afford not to make full use of this important international resource.

I should like to call attention to a paragraph relating to private investment in the Secretary-General's overall review of recent trends in trade development, paragraph 14 of TD/5. In reviewing the flow of public and private capital during the period 1961–65, the Secretary-General observes that the more rapidly growing countries receive an average of $2.8 per capita annually in net private long-term investment compared to an average of only 23 cents per capita flowing to low-growth developing countries—that is, less than one-tenth of the amount received by the first group.

High rates of growth bear more than a casual relationship to high rates of net private long-term investment. We are met here in UNCTAD to promote higher rates of growth. Developing countries, quite properly, look to the United States and other industrialized countries to help this process. But most of the productive resources of the United States are in private hands, not government hands, and the same situation prevails in most of the industrialized countries. Some experts in the field of development concentrate on the resources available to the United States and other like governments for development assistance. By doing so, they direct attention to the peak of the iceberg, not to the larger resources which support it. We should devote a considerable part of our energies here to finding practical ways to attract larger flows of private resources from the industrialized countries to the task of development.

Private investment is also related to another item on the agenda—technology. So far as the U.S. and other private enterprise economies are concerned, technology is available primarily from the private sector. Private investment brings not only technology, but the management and technical skills required to make effective use of the technology. In TD/35 Supplement I, there are a number of useful suggestions. I trust they will receive the attention they deserve during the coming weeks.

We believe that one of the most important achievements of this conference could be to launch an inquiry into the legal and policy framework within which private investment and private entrepreneurship are drawn into the development process. Such an effort could make these indispensable factors of growth more readily available to the developing countries. Such a study might lead to widespread agreement on a fair code defining the rights and the obligations of foreign business enterprise in the developing countries—a balanced and agreed code, which could simplify and speed up the process of investment.

We realize that this is a vast and many-sided subject, and that some important progress in the field has been achieved in recent years. But my government believes that much remains to be done, and that the United Nations is the forum in which such an effort should be made. We have no desire to impose our own particular economic system on others. Every country, we recognize, must evolve its own economic system, according to its own needs, its traditions and the realities that it faces. But we do believe that the time has come for a new look at the problem as a whole. We believe that it should be possible through international agreement to bring about a basic improvement in the legal environment for private investment in the developing countries, which could quicken the flow of private resourecs into development. We are willing to do our full part in such an effort.

Mr. President, our agenda deals with issues to which my government attaches great importance. We felt it necessary to indicate our basic approach to the problems of this conference, and to comment on some of the principal issues before us. All of us here know that the nations represented here are divided on many problems, and represent different ideologies, different educational experiences, different interests. We are united, however, in our loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations, and in our determination to assist the developing countries in their drive for more rapid economic growth. If our deliberations are guided by these two central facts, if we pursue our work in a spirit of cooperation and realism, my government believes we can make a major contribution to the welfare of the developing countries, and therefore of the world community as a whole.

To this end, Mr. President, I have the privilege of pledging the best efforts of the Government of the United States.

Nixon Gains

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington, D.C., Post of February 19, 1968:

THE HARRIS SURVEY: NIXON GAINS

(By Louis Harris)

Since fighting intensified in Vietnam, Richard M. Nixon has gained and Nelson A. Rockefeller has lost ground with voters in separate national tests against President Johnson. Rockefeller has slipped from a 43-to-43 per cent tie in December to 41 to 46 per cent. Nixon has reduced his deficit in December, 41 to 50 per cent, to 43 to 48 per cent.

In direct pairings among Republican voters alone, Nixon has widened the lead he held over Rockefeller in December. The former Vice President has moved from a 52-to-34 per cent margin over the New York Governor two months ago to a 61-to-31 per cent edge today.

Against his declared primary opponent, George Romney, Nixon has extended his lead nationally with the GOP rank and file from 63 to 24 per cent in December to 68 to 21 per cent now.

These results clearly indicate that Nixon's hard-line position on Vietnam, coupled with his long-standing reputation for experience in dealing with the Communists in foreign affairs, seems to be paying political dividends.

Gov. Romney would seem to be caught by his conciliatory position on the war at a moment when the public seems more determined than ever to stand fast in the face of adversity. Rockefeller appears to be suffering from not having taken a clear-cut position on Vietnam. The poll was taken before Gov. Rockefeller's controversy with Mayor John V. Lindsay over the New York city garbage strike.

The significance of this latest Harris survey is that Nixon now is the clear-cut choice of the rank and file of the GOP for the nomination. However, he has not demonstrated in the polls that he is capable of defeating the President.

Here is the trend in the presidential pairings drawn from a survey of a cross section of the national electorate, after the recent heavy fighting in the Vietnamese provincial capitals:

NIXON, ROCKEFELLER VERSUS L.B.J.

[In percent]

	February	December
Nixon versus L. B. J.:		
Nixon	43	41
Johnson	48	50
Not sure	9	9
Rockefeller versus L. B. J.:		
Rockefeller	41	43
Johnson	46	43
Not sure	13	14

Although still behind Mr. Johnson among all voters, Nixon appears to have a commanding lead over both Rockefeller and Romney among Republicans:

NIXON VERSUS ROCKEFELLER, ROMNEY

(GOP VOTERS ONLY)

[In percent]

	February	December
Nixon versus Rockefeller:		
Nixon	61	52
Rockefeller	31	34
Not sure	8	14
Nixon versus Romney:		
Nixon	68	63
Romney	21	24
Not sure	11	13

Day Care: More Than Just "Minding the Baby"

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the past decade there has been a virtual revolution in Federal assistance to American education, and in the Federal response to many problems of children and youth. But far too little has been done for one critical age group: the preschool children, particularly those with working mothers. It is time for the Congress to give full attention to necessary services for the very young.

Although notable improvement has been made in the quality and scope of preschool programs and services, public policies still lag behind the desperate need. Statutory and administrative distinctions separate, for example, kindergarten, day care, and Headstart. Demonstration projects have been funded in large numbers, but their results have not been adequately learned or publicized. The activities of many Federal, State, and local agencies have not been orchestrated. Funding remains inadequate for the job which should be done.

One of the most encouraging signs is the leadership being exerted by private groups who recognize the importance of good day care facilities to young children and their families. One such pioneer is the Amalagamated Clothing Workers' Union, which broke ground in Baltimore last fall for its first day care center to serve the children of union members. According to Mr. Sam Nocella, vice president and manager of the Baltimore region of ACWU, the union plans to open centers in 15 areas to serve some 2,000 children of working mothers.

The initiatives of such organizations as the ACWU and the National Committee for the Day Care of Children were outlined recently in an informative and challenging article by Maya Pines in the New York Times Magazine of January 7, 1968. She clearly points out the need not simply for "someone to mind the baby," but for day care which will provide the guidance, services and opportunities essential to a child's healthy mental and physical growth. Emphasizing the new awareness that a child's first 4 years are critical ones for his development, she concludes that all partners in preschool programs "have a chance to set a new pattern for such services."

The 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act should spur a tremendous expansion of day care facilities and services. It is the task of the Congress to insure the highest quality in these programs. Toward this end, I believe it is time for us to review the many programs and projects which have been funded by the Federal Government under so many different laws and agencies, and to take concrete steps to coordinate our scattered efforts into a comprehensive, effective program in partnership with State and local agencies and private organizations.

I am seeking the advice of many individuals active and experienced in preschool education and care, both at all levels of government, and in private organizations. In the coming weeks, I intend to solicit specific recommendations for immediate and long-range Federal action to insure the finest programs for all young children who need them.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD the article, "Someone To Mind the Baby," and commend it to my colleagues:

SOMEONE TO MIND THE BABY

(By Maya Pines)

"I know a lot of people say that mothers shouldn't work," Vice President Humphrey stated recently. "But I have been brought up to believe that what is, is." He called the lack of adequate day-care facilities for young children one of the greatest problems of tomorrow's America.

The trend is clear: more and more women are going to work. One out of every four mothers of children under the age of 6 is in the labor force; the number of such mothers has doubled since 1950. More than 4 million preschoolers have mothers who work, including 1,600,000 children under the age of 3.

Yet the nation has resolutely ignored the problem. American women remain almost totally deprived of opportunities to make satisfactory arrangements for the care of their children while they are working. As a result, millions of youngsters are being damaged emotionally, intellectually and sometimes physically during their most formative years.

Behind the paucity of services for young children lies the fear that providing good day-care facilities might encourage even more women to go to work—a fear entertained by male workers who wish to avoid competition and by moralists of both sexes who believe woman's place is in the home.

There are a few signs that this atmosphere may be changing. In Cambridge, Mass., for example, a manufacture of hi-fi equipment has just set up a demonstration day-care center for the children of its employes in cooperation with the U.S. Children's Bureau and the employes themselves.

The KLH Child Development Center, Inc., will be owned and operated by the children's parents. When it opens on Feb. 1 it will run from 7 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. to coincide with the parents' work day. It will take children between the ages of 2 and 6. Mothers will be free to come eat with their children during their own lunch hours. The center plans to offer all the educational advantages of a good nursery school, at a price the parents can pay, since the company will provide about 15 per cent of the cost and the Children's Bureau two thirds. It is meant as a replicable project—one that could be copied in many different kinds of industries.

"This is the beginning, we hope, of a trend," declares Mrs. Richard Lansburgh, president of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children. "A tremendous acceleration will take place in the coming years. We'll need money for training, for personnel, so that these programs are constructive for children—not just baby-sitting!"

While management started the KLH center, in Baltimore a union is taking the lead. Not surprisingly, it is a union largely dominated by women—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union, makers of men's clothing, which plans to open centers for some 2,000 children in 15 areas of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware and North Carolina.

"We're the originators of this plan, because we operate in small towns where the membership is 100 per cent female," explains Samuel Nocella, vice-president of the ACWU and manager of its Baltimore region. "We've experienced some acute problems—absenteeism on the part of women, and nervous breakdowns, which are very frequent among them. And we've found that at the bottom of it there is always a child. The mother becomes anxious, worried about her child, she calls home or stays away from work, and unless she has parents or somebody close to her to take care of her child, the child may really be in bad condition. So why not do what people have been doing for a long time in Europe, for example in Sweden, and provide child-care centers?"

The Amalgamated is now supporting a bill in Congress to include child care among the benefits that can be negotiated for in union agreements, and day-care centers may become a standard item in collective bargaining next year.

In the long run, however, this is a problem that can only be met by the government on a nationwide scale, declares Jacob Potofsky, president of the ACWU. "This step, creating day-care centers for working mothers, is the first taken by any union—and it is long overdue," he says. Just as his union pioneered in unemployment insurance in the twenties, and saw it included in the first Social Security Act 12 years later, "today we have the same hope that government will assume the responsibility throughout the land of creating proper facilities for the young children of working mothers, for they are the future of our country."

The government's role in day care was prominent only during World War II when it became not merely acceptable, but positively patriotic for mothers to work. Suddenly enough nurseries and day-care centers blossomed, with government aid, to care for about 1,600,000 children. But nearly all these centers were closed at the end of the war. Today, when the number of working women exceeds the World War II total by 6 million, licensed public and voluntary day-care centers have shrunk to one-sixth their wartime capacity. They have also changed their orientation. Instead of opening their doors to all, they tend to concentrate on families with serious emotional or social problems. Their waiting lists are staggering.

State and Federal authorities will soon be forced to enter the day-care field on a large scale for the first time since World War II. A new amendment to the Social Security Act will compel thousands of mothers on welfare to enter work training or take jobs, and some facilities will have to be set up for their children while they work. However, since its goal is not to provide services to children but to cut welfare costs, the new law may lead to cheap custodial arrangements in many states. The law makes no provision for the children's education. As the National Committee for the Day Care of Children puts it, "Our country will then be in the anomalous position of giving some children a headstart, while giving others a push backward."

Day care must be recognized as a public utility for all children, some experts believe. "The new law again puts the emphasis on the underprivileged, on the welfare population, on troubled families," worries Professor Florence Ruderman, a Brooklyn College sociologist who recently completed a large-scale survey of day care for the Child Welfare League of America.

"Day care is needed on all levels of society—by the most normal families and by the middle class, as well as by others," she declares. "It should be available to the entire society, just like our public schools, parks, playgrounds and libraries."

Accordingly to Mrs. Lansburgh of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, there is still tremendous resistance to the idea of day care. "Did Planned Parenthood have a more difficult selling job? We think not," she says. "Their resistances are verbalized and conscious; ours are not. Day care is threatening to many people—it says mother isn't in the home and there's nobody to make life nice and secure. Therefore, forget it, ignore it, pretend there's no need for it. Also, few people know the massive size of the problem or the serious consequences of neglect.

"I don't believe that all women should go to work," she adds. "But I do feel that in 1968 women should have the choice, the freedom to choose whether they wish to use their intelligence, ability, training and education without penalizing their families." She points out that in Maryland alone, 400 nurses would be working today if they could find day-care services that they would trust for their children. Meanwhile hospital patients suffer from the critical shortage of nurses.

Just as professional women who want to work should not be made to stay home, women who are on welfare should not be made to go to work, Mrs. Lansburgh declares. "There should be a free choice for both," she says. "This choice does not exist in this country today."

Altogether the nation's public and private licensed day-care facilities—many of them beyond the means of poor people—can accommodate only 450,000 children. Mothers, thus, are forced into all kinds of informal or "black market" arrangements.

Millions of "latchkey" children, for instance, find nobody at home when they get home from school in the afternoon. Carrying their house keys around their neck or in their pockets, they wander about or play without supervision, until their parents come back from work. Sometimes a neighbor or an aunt is supposed to look in on them.

Few families can afford to hire a private nursemaid. In New York City, the going rate for a competent nanny is anywhere from $60 to $90 a week, if she can be found. Even middle-class parents often leave their children with untrained and irresponsible household help who may do the child great harm.

An estimated 38,000 children under the age of 6 are left without any care at all while their mothers work, according to Katherine Oettinger, former chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau; many of them are just locked up in their own homes. Twice as many preschoolers are looked after by a brother or sister not much older than they are.

Children under 3 are generally not admitted into the licensed day-care centers because they are considered too young. For many working mothers, the only alternative that remains is "family day care." In theory this does not sound too bad: The mother leaves her child with a woman who takes in several other children at the same time, for a small fee.

But a recent study in New York City showed what family day care is really like. Though the city has an established licensing procedure for family day-care homes, only 25 such homes have been licensed in the entire city. By contrast, 25,000 children—more than half of them under the age of 6—are parked in a variety of unlicensed homes.

One of the interviewers for the Medical and Health Research Association of N.Y.C., which did this study, still has nightmares about some of the places she visited. Many of the day-care "mothers" were physically ill, she reports—and their illness was the very reason for their doing this kind of work. Several were drunkards.

She recalls a harassed 20-year-old girl who had previously worked as a salesgirl but had lost her job because of a severe anemia which left her always tired. The girl lived in a crowded home with many relatives, including three small children, and took in three other children for day care. She hated what she was doing. She had lost control over the six children to the extent that she did not even bother to find out what part of the house they were in. One youngster, aged 4, did nothing but cry all day long, sitting alone on the top step of the porch. The girl said he was "spoiled."

In most of the family day-care homes the children's routine was breakfast, TV, lunch, nap, and TV. One third of the homes had no play materials of any kind. In 25 per cent of the homes the children were never taken out-of-doors. As many as 84 per cent of the homes were rated inadequate because they violated the Health Code, or because the children were severely neglected.

Throughout their study, the interviewers were assailed by desperate women who begged them to help find good day-care services for their children. They would try any trick to attract the interviewers' attention, hoping it might somehow lead them to space in a day-care center. The study's associate director, Milton Willner, a social worker with long experience in day care, concluded that two kind of programs were urgently needed: a training program for women who would run licensed family day care for up to five children in their homes, bolstered by periodic inspections to make sure they provided enough play materials, nap facilities and fresh air; and many, many more day-care centers, including some for children under the age of 3.

The years from birth to 6 offer a unique opportunity to break the cycle of failure that awaits America's poor children. The first four years of life are the most important time of all—the crucial years that determine a child's later personality and intelligence, according to modern psychologists. During these years, a child's environment plays a decisive role.

Now that private companies, unions and the Government are becoming more aware of the urgent need for day care, they have a chance to set a new pattern for such services. Until now, education has never been day-care's forte. "If there are qualified teachers, it's a nursery school; if it's custodial, it's day-care," has all too often been the working definition of the difference between the two. Unless the new day-care centers offer a truly effective educational program, they will waste their opportunity to make a major improvement in the lives of millions of children.

District of Columbia Teachers Salary Bill

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill (H.R. 15511) which will increase the salaries of teachers and other educational personnel in the District of Columbia.

The bill is identical to one previously introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, who is chairman of the other body's District of Columbia Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety. The other body last week held hearings on this and other pay bills, and I hope the House Committee on the District of Columbia will soon be able to do the same.

This bill is supported by the Washington Teachers Union, which last year was designated as the official bargaining agent for the District of Columbia teachers as a result of winning the representational election by a 2-to-1 majority. It is unfortunate that our committee was not able to take up the teachers pay bills last year, and I want to commend the Washington Teachers Union for the restraint they have shown during the delay of getting a new pay bill. Teachers in many other cities around the country have not been as patient and have gone on strike for better pay and working conditions—Detroit, New York City, and neighboring Montgomery County are among the many school systems which have been hit by strikes this year. I am including an article from the Washington Post on this subject at the end of my remarks.

The effect of my bill, briefly, will be to raise the annual salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree to a minimum of $7,000 and a maximum of $12,040. A teacher with a master's degree will receive $7,700 to $12,740.

This bill will provide a substantial jump in salary for District of Columbia teachers. However, if Washington hopes to remain competitive with other school systems in competing for teachers, large salary increases are needed this year and in future years.

There are two different types of school systems with whom Washington vies for teachers. One is the surrounding Washington metropolitan area schools, and the other is the large central city school systems across the Nation.

My bill will make District of Columbia teachers salaries roughly comparable to the Washington suburban areas in the upper salary limits and approximately 10 percent higher in the starting salary. The District of Columbia has a more difficult time in attracting new teachers than the suburban areas because of an inadequate plant and facilities, the greater difficulty of teaching deprived children, and the poor reputation of the District of Columbia school system. One indication of this competitive disadvantage with the suburbs is a poll of the 1964 college graduates of teacher education institutions in the Washington metropolitan area on the school system in which they would least like to teach. More than half of the graduates indicated the District of Columbia was the system in which they would least like to teach. None of the other school systems received as much as a fourth of the unfavorable choices as the District of Columbia.

Besides the Washington suburban area, the District of Columbia must also compete for teachers with other central cities across the Nation. As the Passow report has indicated, it takes special skills to teach in Washington and other central cities. Therefore, Washington must compete with New York and Detroit and other major cities for the highly motivated and skilled teachers capable of doing a good job in the central city. The bill I am introducing will make Washington teachers salaries roughly comparable to the salaries in Detroit, New York City, Chicago, and the other major cities offering high salaries.

Adequate salaries are only one of the factors needed to be able to recruit and hold the most able teachers. We also need to provide better physical plant and equipment, eliminate some of the clerical load of teachers, provide better recruiting procedures, and in general carry out the recommendations of the Passow report. One "solution" that must be avoided in paying for high teachers salaries is shortchanging the other needs of the school system.

It will take a great deal of money to provide the teacher salaries and other factors needed to give Washington a good school system. But the quality of schools in our Nation's Capital is of such prime importance that we should be willing to pay the price, and I think that other Congressmen who are concerned about the District of Columbia will agree with me on this point. We cannot make our Nation's Capital the model city we all desire unless we first provide a model school system, a school system that will be an example for the rest of the Nation on how a central city can provide quality education for all its children.

The article mentioned above follows:

STRIKE PRESSURES OTHER AREA SCHOOLS

(By J. W. Anderson)

The teachers' strike in Montgomery County has already exerted a sharp upward pressure on salaries in other school systems throughout the metropolitan area.

The strike settlement would set a base pay of $6340 next year, the highest figure that any suburban Washington school system has offered. In Washington, school officials are talking about an even higher salary scale, but any increase there requires congressional legislation.

In Fairfax County, the teacher's organization has announced that it wants further salary negotiations with the School Board after the public hearing on Feb. 22.

A touch of irony lies in this demand. Last December, Fairfax School Superintendent Earl C. Funderburk's proposal of a $6300 base salary next year—compared with Montgomery's original offer of $6100—helped fuel the revolt in Montgomery.

The Washington city schools, with the lowest salaries in the metropolitan area, are far below Baltimore, the nearest comparable city.

Washington's teachers are represented by the militant Washington Teachers Union (AFL–CIO), which led them to the brink of a strike over working conditions two months ago.

That dispute did not reach salaries, because salary bills are now before Congress.

The widening gap between city and suburban teachers' pay is turning into an increasingly urgent issue for Mayor Walter Washington's new city government.

Last fall, both the School Board and the city endorsed a bill setting a base salary of $6400.

Now the School Board is expected to swing its support to a bill introduced by Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) that would raise the base pay to $7000. It is now $5840.

Washington school officials say that suburban salaries have been rising so fast that last fall's bill is already obsolete.

In this metropolitan area the top salaries—those going to teachers with long experience and doctors' degrees—this year range from a high of $13,759 in Montgomery to a low of $9960 in Washington.

But Washington has to pay higher salaries to get teachers of the same quality as the suburbs', city school officials say. The reason is the strain of teaching in deprived neighborhoods.

In Prince George's County, school authorities negotiated the new salary scale, beginning at $6200, in four days of talks with the Classroom Teachers Association just before Christmas. Both the Association and the School Board have adopted the scale.

Arlington has settled the issue as quietly as Prince George's.

Under the surface there are hints of tension.

Arlington, like Montgomery, recently has seen its school system under the fiscal control of a County government dominated by men pledged to stringent economy.

In both Arlington and Montgomery, even traditional supporters of expansive school budgets have urged school officials to keep their new requests down. Both counties will have to raise taxes substantially this year in any event, and the schools' political supporters fear another taxpayers' rebellion that would return the economizers to power.

In both counties, teachers are restive at finding their pay scales, in the past comparatively very high, now lower than some of their neighbors'.

The difference between the two is, of course, that the Arlington Education Association was willing to accept a relatively modest gain.

The Arlington Association said, when the proposal was announced, that it would make the County schools competitive, although not in first place within the metropolis.

The raises in Arlington next year will range from 4 per cent to 7 per cent, the lowest granted by any of the area's large systems.

By contrast the striking Montgomery teachers won a Board offer that amounts to a raise of about 7.8 per cent. The increases in Fairfax range from 7 per cent to 12 per cent.

Teachers sometimes forgo salary claims to get improvements in teaching conditions.

In Fairfax, teachers currently are pushing hard for improving instruction in the elementary schools, explained Paul Peter, executive secretary of the Fairfax Education Association.

When the Fairfax Association talks to the School Board later this month, Peter suggested, it may modify its salary demands if it gets what it asks in program improvement.

The situation in Alexandria remains, as usual, indescribable. The whole school budget is being kept secret until it goes to the City Council.

Currently Alexandria has, at $6000, the highest base pay in the metropolitan area. The Alexandria Education Association is seeking $6300.

PROPOSED TEACHERS' SALARIES, 1968-69

	Beginning teacher, bachelor's degree	Fully experienced teacher, master's degree	Comments
Montgomery County	$6,340	$12,870	Strike settlement, not yet ratified.
Fairfax County	6,300	13,230	School superintendent's proposal; teachers want further negotiations.
Washington, D.C.:			
S. 2651	6,400	11,430	Bill endorsed by school board and city government last fall.
S. 2679	7,000	12,740	Senator Morse's bill; school board support expected.
Prince Georges County	6,200	12,524	Backed by school board, teachers; awaits county action.
Arlington	6,200	12,462	Do.
Alexandria			Budget kept secret until it goes to city council. This year's beginning salary, $6,000, is Washington area's highest. Teachers asking $6,300 next year.
Detroit	7,500	11,700	Adopted, after a major strike last fall.
Chicago	7,000	11,250	
New York City	6.900	12,800	Effective Mar. 1, 1969.
Milwaukee	6,800	11,326	

The pay for a fully experienced teacher with a master's degree is not the top of the scale. All school systems have a scale for teachers with training beyond a master's; some have a further scale for teachers with doctorates. And some, like Montgomery, have longevity increments beyond the scale. "Fully experienced" usually means 14 to 17 years' service. All salaries shown are for a 10-month school year. Montgomery is now beginning to move some teachers onto a 12-month year; that automatically raises their salaries 20 per cent. Montgomery and Fairfax are the only school systems in the metropolitan area with 12-month contracts for teachers, although most of the others hire some teachers each summer for summer schools and curriculum development. The Montgomery strike settlement represents a salary increase of 7.8 per cent. This year's pay scale is $5880 for a beginner with a bachelor's degree, $11,936 for a teacher with a master's degree and 14 years' experience.

Assistance for Spanish-Speaking Children

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress last year incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a little publicized but highly significant and important provision. Title III of the law provides for the establishment of bilingual education programs which will be of particular benefit to Spanish-speaking children. I was proud to have been one of the sponsors of this amendment which is designed to meet the special educational needs of large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability. The new program will provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

These programs would be designed to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages and will hopefully establish closer cooperation between the school and the home. Efforts will be made to improve the potential for profitable learning activities by children and also to provide adult education programs for their parents.

My congressional district consists of Riverside and Imperial Counties and a portion of San Bernardino County. A large number of residents of my district are Mexican-American. The State of California has close historical and cultural ties with Mexico. There are over 1,500,000 Mexican-Americans in California. Many lag seriously behind in education, jobs, and income. They have been displaced from their farming and laboring occupations of the past and are among the hard core unemployed in many areas. They are not adequately prepared, through no fault of their own, to move into new employment occupations. Automation and technological change is having a particularly severe effect on our Mexican-American population. Statistics show that over 50 percent have not gone beyond the eighth grade.

California and the entire Southwest has the responsibility to provide within its educational systems opportunities for Mexican-American graduates to enter the field of education as teachers and administrators. The bilingual education program will help to reduce the number of Mexican-American children who are actual or potential dropouts. The program will hopefully give children who speak a foreign language an equal opportunity for advancement.

The most promising method of insuring the economic and social progress of the Mexican-American community is adequate education. With education comes the hope of new and better opportunities for self-improvement. The bilingual education program will hasten the day when all Americans have an equal opportunity to help themselves.

Private First Class Johnson Dies in Action

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. David R. Johnson, a young Marine from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOHNSON DIES IN ACTION—MARINE CASUALTY HAS WIFE AND PARENTS HERE

A Marine Corps infantryman from Baltimore was killed in action in Vietnam February 7, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

He was identified as Pfc. David R. Johnson, husband of Mrs. Donna Johnson, of 1813 East Baltimore street.

Private Johnson, who was 20, was killed by hostile rifle fire at Quang Tri, South Vietnam, the Department of Defense said in a telegram to his wife.

He was attached to the 3d Regiment of the 3d Marine Division.

GREW UP IN BROOKLYN AREA

Born in Anawalt, W. Va., Private Johnson came to Baltimore as a young boy and grew up in the Brooklyn area.

He was a 1967 graduate of Andover High School, Linthicum Heights, and is the first graduate of the school to be killed in Vietnam.

While in school, he served as captain of the safety patrol and worked in the supply storeroom.

Private Johnson enlisted in the Marine Corps a month after graduation and took recruit training at Parris Island, S.C. He later took advanced infantry training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., before he was assigned to Vietnam last December.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH

Described by his family as a deeply religious person, Private Johnson had been active in the East Baltimore Church of God, and the South Baltimore Church of God.

He said in a letter which his wife received Tuesday that he was planning to start a Bible study group in his company.

In addition to his wife, Private Johnson is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marvin S. Johnson, of Brooklyn; a sister, Mrs. Brenda White, of Kansas City, and three brothers, Larry R. Johnson, Ray A. Johnson, and Stewart P. T. Johnson, all of Brooklyn.

Who Are the Deprived?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, emotional phrases such as "deprived" and "exploited" are being sympathetically applied to arouse a so-called guilt feeling offense against our people to explain away moral values and social standards which for centuries have been the backbone of Western civilization.

If, in the United States today, there are those who are deprived and exploited, they are the law-abiding, God-fearing people themselves—not the criminals, the crackpots, and the revolutionists who, by subverting proper reasoning, are the exploiters—not the exploited.

A well-reasoned editorial from the St. Tammany Farmer, of Covington, La., for February 2, does a commendable job of identifying the deprived and the responsible parties. I include this editorial following my comments:

THE DEPRIVED

In a Christian nation such as ours concern for the deprived is proper and expected. Indeed, it is the history of our people that concern for the deprived has prompted generosity admired by the entire civilized world.

Within our own borders. however, concern for some deprived has waned. And those deprived are grievously in need. Federal funds and projects have not been enough. Appropriations and budgeted bounties have not done the job. There have been commissions and authorities. Experts have been empanelled. Yet the plight of these deprived in our country grows worse, not better.

Who are these deprived?

The woman whose purse is snatched from her hand in the street.

The merchant whose cash register is emptied while he is held at bay or shot.

The teenage daughter of a neighbor who is deprived of her virginity by force of rape.

The homeowner who returns to a house from which the TV, the radio, the silverware and the piggybank have been stolen.

The taxpayer whose family automobile has been stolen.

The jobholder who has had a knife or a gun jammed into his ribs a block from home, is mugged, beaten and robbed, perhaps slain.

The vacationing family who returns to find the house stripped even of furniture.

These are the deprived in our land. The really deprived. They outnumber the deadbeats on welfare, the poverty program spongers and the black-power marchers by ten to one.

Our police have been cowed into docility toward those who deprive us. Our courts have pampered those who deprive us. Our politicians have been nauseating in their pandering to pressures—and votes.

We are the deprived—we who pay the taxes, we who suffer pain and loss—of property and even life.

And the time has come to tell the judges, the police, the politicians, and Washington, that you don't aim to be deprived any longer.

If you are one of the deprived, start making noises Loud. You'll be heard.

Consumer Credit Legislation

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for far too many years, consumers have had to grapple in the dark with respect to interest charges on credit purchases.

Fortunately, because of the legislative action taken in this Congress, and particularly by this House, this will no longer be so in the very near future.

As the conferees continue in their further consideration of the consumer credit legislation, it would do well to take notice of an editorial pertaining to this matter which appeared in the February 7 edition of the Providence Journal. I, therefore, insert this article into the RECORD.

I believe that this House has good cause to be proud of its courageous action on this legislation and I hope with every ounce of my being that the conferees will favor the stronger version of this legislation as passed by this House.

As the editorial points out—

> An eight-year struggle against powerful lobbies and wholesale congressional intransigence is nearing an end.

Let us now come forth with the greatest victory possible.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Feb. 7, 1968]

NEW LEASE FOR LENDERS

The warmth of feeling for consumers these days by legislators at both the federal and state levels has rocketed truth-in-lending legislation to the very brink of enactment.

In Washington, the House has outdone the Senate in adopting strong measures to curb deceptive practices in the multi-billion-dollar credit and loan business. An eight-year struggle against powerful lobbies and wholesale congressional intransigence is nearing an end as a conference committee prepares to settle differences. Retail merchants who extend credit and lending institutions of all kinds will be required to disclose clearly the terms of their consumer transactions. Credit and loan advertising will be subject to new requirements and limitations. Loan-shark operations will be in for real trouble. Still at issue are garnishment and revolving fund provisions.

In Rhode Island, similar truth-in-lending bills have been introduced in both chambers of the General Assembly. In many respects they overlap the federal measures under consideration but go beyond to protect consumers against installment plans that may involve the so-called "holder in due course." Such plans require the purchaser to sign a promissory note which the creditor in turn can sell to a holder in due course who under present law cannot be held liable for defective merchandise. Both bills would provide recourse for the consumer in such cases and require sellers of consumer promissory notes to warn prospective purchasers of their liability.

That Rhode Island will get some truth-in-lending legislation this year seems almost certain. Even if it should not, the pending federal statute will apply at the state level and cover most areas of major concern. This is good news for the American consumer. For too long a time, the money market and retail credit field have been permitted to function without adequate regulation. For too long a time, those in greatest need and least able to detect the hallmarks of a shady deal have been at the mercy of a few unscrupulous profiteers. The new laws may not be perfect in every respect. They may not prevent all possibility of exploitation, but they are sure to put powerful curbs in areas where they are needed most.

Operation Haylift II

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the period December 17 through 26, 1967, Air Force Reserve aircrews flew 161 missions and airdropped 858 tons of hay to 540,000 head of stranded livestock in Arizona and New Mexico on various Indian reservations, primarily the Hopi and Navajo, at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior. This request resulted from a natural disaster that endangered the livestock, the economic mainstay of the Hopi and Navajo Indians, with snow ranging from 3 to 8 feet in depth. These reservations covered 16 million acres of land. Surface transportation was totally cut off subjecting the livestock to starvation unless successful airdrops of hay could be accomplished.

Air Force reservists from the 452d Military Airlift Wing—Reserve—March Air Force Base, Calif., were assigned all on-the-scene command responsibility for Operation Haylift including mission control, planning, implementation, execution, flying safety, maintenance, and administrative support. Col. Merle E. Larson, a 452d group commander, was appointed mission commander for Operation Haylift. In addition to mission responsibility, 452d reservists performed over 50 percent of the actual hay drop missions—flying 81 sorties and airdropping 432 tons of hay. The 452d aircrews were the first to respond to the call for aid necessitated by the natural disaster. The 452d aircrews formed the majority of the Reserve Force which volunteered to, and did, perform missions on Christmas Day.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has credited the efforts of the Air Force reservists with safeguarding the livelihood of thousands of Arizona Indians by saving their livestock valued at $28 million.

The missions themselves were flown in C-119 Flying Boxcars at altitudes of 100 to 200 feet above the terrain—low enough for pinpoint accuracy but high enough to break the wire retainers of the hay upon impact. One bundle of hay was dropped for each two head of cattle. For sheep, the hay was dropped in a heavy concentration adjacent to the sheep bins, gathered by the Indian sheepherders and taken to the pens. Each aircraft departed Luke Air Force Base, Arizona—the staging base—with approximately 5 to 5½ tons of hay. Because of the small amount dropped on each pass, 15 to 25 passes were required per mission to offload the hay.

This hay drop operation varied from previous ones in that the terrain was mountainous. This terrain, coupled with the low-level flight operations, combined to challenge the flying skill and proficiency of our reservists.

The completion of Operation Haylift II without a major or minor aircraft accident is a tribute to all the Air Force reservists involved and to the 452d maintenance personnel who maintained the aircraft in a safe and proficient manner.

It is significant that Operation Haylift was performed voluntarily by Air Force reservists who left their civilian jobs and families during the holiday season, including Christmas. This example of the dedication and readiness of the crews is another testimonial to the contribution that can be made by citizen-airmen during peacetime or in a national emergency.

The 452d Military Airlift Wing—Reserve—is commanded by Brig. Gen. Earl O. Anderson. The wing is composed of 2,500 southern California reservists, plus an additional 1,000 reservists in Utah.

Progress Under the Truth-in-Packaging Law

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, although the fair packaging and labeling law has been in effect less than 1 year, significant progress has already been made in reducing undue proliferation of package sizes. Furthermore, this progress has resulted from the voluntary action of American business, working in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce. A statement on the status of the truth-in-packaging law was released last Friday by Under Secretary of Commerce Howard J. Samuels, and was carried in the February 19 issue of the magazine Advertising Age. I insert the article in the RECORD.

FOOD GROUPS REDUCING VARIETY OF PACKAGES

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The Commerce Department reported today that two food groups are voluntarily reducing the number of containers in their line, and that fully 50 others are exploring similar voluntary action.

The department identified soluble coffee and salad and cooking oil as the categories where cutbacks were already under way. It listed potato chips, toothpaste and detergents as classifications where studies are under way.

The disclosures were made as part of an interim report on the progress of the voluntary program under the 1966 "truth in packaging" law to curb the proliferation of unnecessary package sizes. The department's efforts to stimulate voluntary industry action was recently supported by a resolution of the National Marketing Advisory Committee, which urged manufacturers to take advantage of the opportunity to develop voluntary standards.

Under the "truth in packaging" law, the Department of Commerce is required to determine whether the package sizes in which a given commodity is offered for sale have "proliferated to the extent that consumers have trouble making comparisons and value judgments." Industry can draft standards on its own or in cooperation with the Commerce Department, but the law specifies that the department must report to Congress if industry fails to act.

An interim report issued by acting Secretary Howard J. Samuels today disclosed that the National Coffee Manufacturers Assn. has reported that packagers of soluble coffee will eliminate all quantities except even ounces between two and 16. Fractional ounce packages of soluble coffee were on the list of complaints which were mentioned when Congress was considering the packaging law. Mr. Samuels reported the Institute of Shortening & Edible Oils has reported producers of salad and cooking oils will cut the number of containers from 15 to seven.

His report disclosed that the Soap & Detergent Assn. has requested the development of a voluntary standard covering the quantities in which heavy duty synthetic detergents are marketed. He said the association is studying the marketing of liquid detergents and liquid household cleaners "to determine their future course of action"

Also on his list was a request from the Toilet Goods Assn. for the National Bureau of Standards—which administers the voluntary standards program for the department—to develop a voluntary product standard covering the quantities in which toothpaste in tubes is offered for sale. Recently, Betty Furness, the President's adviser on consumer affairs, has stated that toothpaste is currently available in 57 different container sizes.

Other projects at the National Bureau of Standards include: A request from the Instant Potato Institute for the development of a voluntary standard, and a study in cooperation with the American Paper Institute to define a standard for paper towels in rolls.

His report showed that the department has taken the initiative in pushing some product groups toward a standard. According to his report the National Preservers Assn. is conducting a nationwide survey of jellies and jams sizes at the request of the department. Similarly, the department has requested a study by the Mayonnaise & Salad Dressing Institute.

In other instances he has received assurances that industry groups are in the process of deciding on how to proceed. The Cereal Institute has reported it is determining whether to proceed through the department or on its own to reduce the quantities in which breakfast cereals are offered, and the Potato Chip Institute says it has employed a national marketing research company to develop recommendations on potato chip package standards. Others which have formed committees for preliminary studies include the Macaroni Manufacturers Assn., the National Cheese Institute and representatives of the peanut butter industry.

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events—March 1968

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art for the month of March 1968.

The National Gallery has again scheduled an outstanding set of programs which I am glad to call to the attention of my colleagues and the American people.

The calendar follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—MARCH 1968

The A. W. Mellon lectures in the Fine Arts: *Stephen Spender,* English poet and critic, will give the seventeenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, commencing Sunday, March 3. Subject of the six consecutive lectures is *Imaginative Literature and Painting.*

Continuing exhibition: *Painting in France 1900–1967.* A major loan exhibition organized under the patronage of the French Ministry of Cultural Affairs with the cooperation of the Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris. Ground Floor Galleries. Through March 17.

Exhibition publication: Catalogue. *Painting in France 1900–1967.* Foreword by Charles Lucet, Ambassador of France, preface by Pierre Moinot, introduction by Bernard Anthonioz. 128 pages, 11 color plates, 116 black-and-white illustrations, 11″ x 8½″. $4.00 postpaid.

Recorded tours: *The Director's Tour.* A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. The portable units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries. A discussion of the works of art exhibited in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last about 15 minutes. The small receiving sets are rented for 25¢.

New reproductions: *Color Postcards:* Leonardo da Vinci, *Ginevra de'Benci;* Studio of Andrea della Robbia, *Madonna and Child with Cherubim;* Luca della Robbia, *Madonna and Child;* Index of American Design, *Sleigh.* 5¢ each postpaid.

Gallery hours: The Gallery is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on Sundays from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. The cafeteria is open on weekdays from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. and on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 3

Painting of the week: Fra Angelico. *The Healing of Palladia by Saint Cosmas and Saint Damian* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 4. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *Painting in France 1900–1967* (I). Central Lobby. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Imaginative Literature and Painting* (I). *Guest Speaker:* Stephen Spender. A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday concert: William Read, *Harpsichordist.* East Garden Court 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 10

Painting of the week: Rubens. *Isabella Brant* (Andrew Mellon Collection). Gallery 42. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:30.

Tour of the week: *Painting in France 1900–1967* (II). Central Lobby. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Imaginative Literature and Painting* (II). *Guest Speaker:* Stephen Spender. A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday concert: Robert Gartside, *Tenor;* Richard Corbett, *Pianist.* East Garden Court 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 17

Painting of the week: Renoir. *Girl with a Hoop* (Chester Dale Collection). Gallery 90. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *El Greco and Picasso.* Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Imaginative Literature and Painting* (III). *Guest Speaker:* Stephen Spender. A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday concert: Louise Parker, *Contralto;* Donal Nold, *Pianist.* East Garden Court 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 18, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 24

Sculpture of the week: Verrocchio. *Lorenzo de'Medici* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 2, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *Hobbema and Corot.* Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Imaginative Literature and Painting* (IV). *Guest Speaker:* Stephen Spender. A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday concert: Nancy Ellsworth, *Violinist;* George Manos, *Pianist.* East Garden Court 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 25, THROUGH SUNDAY MARCH 31

Painting of the week: Henner. *Alsatian Girl* (Chester Dale Collection). Gallery 88. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *Hals and Manet.* Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Imaginative Literature and Painting* (V). *Guest Speaker:* Stephen Spender. A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday concert: The Lucktenberg Duo; *Violin and Harpsichord.* East Garden Court 8:00.

Three Hundred Negro Clergymen Lead 100,000 Members in a Psychological War on Crime

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in this day of violence and crime, a rational law-abiding act of great importance occurred 2 weeks ago in this city. Yet this action went almost wholly ignored and unnoticed by the press, as being "not newsworthy."

If a troublemaker comes to the Nation's Capital threatening to make its streets even more unsafe for decent local citizens, he makes the headlines, getting column after column of free publicity. His every word and several pictures are repeated in every edition of the leading newspapers. That is news.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5 a meeting of great importance was held at the Trinidad Baptist Church at 1611 Benning Road NE., in this city. At the Baptist Ministers Conference of Washington, 300 Negro ministers, representing 100,000 members, struck a blow for law and order which, if followed up, could be the greatest single step yet taken in the interest of safer streets in the Nation's Capital.

I believe these courageous and public-minded ministers deserve the support and applause of good citizens everywhere. I welcome the opportunity to report to the Congress on their meeting.

THREE HUNDRED NEGRO CLERGYMEN JOIN "FIGHT CRIME" GROUP IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Baptist Ministers Conference of Washington, D.C., has unanimously voted to join forces with "Help Your Police Fight Crime" cooperative in an effort to boost local police morale, and help reduce crime in the District.

> The public image of equating crime with race is a false concept—

Stated Rev. Andrew J. Allen, president of the ministers' conference and pastor of Deanwood First Baptist Church.

Reverend Allen said:

> All members of the community, both black and white, must stand up together to support law and order, and help to reduce the opportunities for crime in the community.

He pointed out that just 2 weeks prior, these 300 ministers had called upon all persons and groups in the community to refuse support for any demonstrations this year, no matter how noble the stated aims.

> The Conference action today reaffirms our previous stand for and with the police.

Said the conference president.

"Bill" W. H. M. Stover, one of the founders and president of the crime-fighting group, told the convention delegates before whom he spoke on February 5, that already over 150,000 citizens in the District of Columbia were displaying "Help Your Police Fight Crime" stickers and banners on their cars, and on windows and doors, both at home and

and at their stores and shops. He said thousands of pieces of mail now carry the slogan's message daily.

Stover congratulated the 300 Negro ministers for their courageous and rational stand in opposing tension packed, violence producing demonstrations and challenged them to lead their 100,000 members to join the psychological war on crime and proudly display a "Help Your Police Fight Crime" sticker as a badge of good citizenship. Most of the ministers left the meeting carrying two stickers for their own cars.

"Crime is a psychological matter of attitudes," he said. "Wrong—instead of right ones. Fortunately, since all attitudes are learned, wrong ones can be unlearned, then replaced with right ones. Get this total community united in a concerted effort to develop a better psychological climate of respect, restraint, and civic responsibility, and the first battle in our war on crime will be won," is the theme of Stover's approach.

"Help Your Police Fight Crime" is a banner under which all might rally, for no man of intelligence can seriously oppose its realistic, positive philosophy, he believes. Crime is not a race issue, he points out:

> More often, the Negro is the victim. Crime should not be a political issue, but unless soon corrected, it will become the key issue in '68. Crime is neither a divine right, nor a desirable privilege. It is an ugly, cancerous growth which threatens to destroy both the criminal and the victim and, with them, the American way of life.

Stover said:

> *Our 3-fold goal* is: (1) To equip a million cars, buses and trucks in the area with bumper stickers, front and rear, reading "Help Your Police Fight Crime"; (2) a million letters daily carrying the same message through the mails; (3) and free distribution of a million "Safer Community" folders to our people; all within the next 90 days with merchant cooperation.

Rev. Robert Harrison, chairman of the Baptist Ministers Conference program committee, and Reverend Allen, its president, are planning their annual "Law and Order" Day soon, the date to be announced. It is the tentative plan of the two organization presidents, if at all possible, to make this annual affair a "Help Your Police Fight Crime Day."

Dr. Harold Taylor and World Teacher Education

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my constitutent, Dr. Harold Taylor, whose background in the education field is outstanding, gave the opening address at the Conference on World Education last year and then edited the conference proceedings.

Sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the final report by Dr. Taylor, director of the AACTE project, is supported by a U.S. Office of Education grant and is now available.

I commend to my colleagues the information, which follows, concerning the conference proceedings:

Report Urges International Dimension for Teacher Education—AACTE Publication Presents Proposals and Issues in World Education in Special Conference Proceedings

"To be truly educated as an American it is now necessary to be educated as a citizen of the world," asserts Harold Taylor in his opening address at a Conference on World Education attended by ranking government and university spokesmen last year. The Conference, sponsored by The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Kettering Foundation, was convened to discuss the problems of adding an international dimension to the education of teachers. The Conference Proceedings were edited by Dr. Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College and director of the AACTE study of "The Preparation of Teachers in the Field of World Affairs."

The publication contains the speeches and discussion of the Conference, whose main theme called for a new look at the entire American educational system to bring it in touch with contemporary world society. A range of speakers—from Congressman John Brademas of Indiana and Paul Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to faculty members and students from leading universities and student organizations—pointed out that during the years in which the United States has been thrust into a position of world leadership American education has not kept pace with the need to educate its teachers and citizens in the global demands and complexities of that leadership.

Robert Byrnes of Indiana University, chairman of the Conference, highlights America's educational limitations in this field by pointing out that of some 65,000 students in higher education in Indiana in 1958, only 300 had taken a course which dealt substantively with the non-Western world. Harold Enarson, president of Cleveland State University, suggests that "it is as if we were sending individual CARE package of Post Toasties to the hungry masses in India." Applying the deficiencies in the field of international education to the problems of America's "back yard," he continues: "I do not believe the answer is more and more slightly better programs. . . . The key word is immersion in the life around you. If the world is our laboratory, let us begin with our immediate environment."

The euphoric vacuum from which our middle-class, white, suburban citizens view the rest of the world is the same vacuum from which they view their own less fortunate brothers living in rural and urban slums—the cultures of poverty, as Enarson describes them. "I find it troublesome to realize that. . . . it is easier to deal with the problems of rural development in Brazil than to improve education in the Southern part of the United States," he observes. "The critical question is how one relates a concern for the world's affairs to a concern for our neighbors who live a mile away."

"The universities have ruined the study of international affairs by making it dull," states Richard Stearns, former vice-president for international affairs of the National Student Association. Among suggestions for change, Stearns argues for student-initiated projects in which foreign students can teach in American schools and colleges and work with their American counterparts in community welfare projects; for student-run seminars with foreign students here and abroad, supported openly by government and foundation funds; and for closer relations between student organizations in the United States and similar organizations abroad.

Edward Schwartz, current NSA president, says that the current university programs are not giving the student a chance to "come to grips with himself and his own culture. Nor can he use his academic curriculum to answer the questions he has. . . . How can we expect college students to think in a world perspective," asks Schwartz, "when they have not been taught to think even in a national one?"

In many ways, the delegates agree, thousands of American citizens, because of their economic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds, are as foreign to most other Americans as are the most primitive natives of New Guinea. To bridge the cavern that yawns between nations, and between affluent and deprived America, the delegates present several approaches that could be put into effect immediately.

Harris Wofford, president of the State University of New York in Old Westbury, and formerly an associate director of the Peace Corps, urges that teacher colleges base their world education courses on the same patterns as those followed by the Peace Corps. "In the Peace Corps you have to learn by doing, and it is not only learning by doing, but learning by going. . . . I might also mention learning by loving." Claude A. Eggertsen, professor of education at the University of Michigan, suggests that a dramatic expansion of study tours, seminars, and research projects abroad which involve faculty and junior year and graduate students would assist in the internationalization of American education.

Discussing the role of educators in utilizing the opportunities provided by the new governmental emphasis on international education, Jacob Canter, deputy assistant secretary of state for educational and cultural affairs, states that "International education . . . used wisely in our schools . . . is one of the most helpful instruments to make *we* and *they* become, for rising generations, simply *we* . . . humanity as a whole." Congressman John Brademas and Dr. Paul Miller encourage educators to exploit existing governmental and institutional resources for international education. They suggest an all-university, interdisciplinary attack on the problems of institutional change in this field and extend the concept to include wide networks of inter-institutional cooperation, whereby major universities "share their increasing competence in the international field with other institutions, with elementary and secondary schools, and with the public at large through adult education. . . ."

Other delegates, including Harold Taylor, urge variations of the Teacher Corps, the Peace Corps, and VISTA for the involvement of prospective and certified teachers in intercultural and international activities.

Conference on World Education appears as one of a series of AACTE documents devoted to an analysis of the preparation of American teachers in world affairs. The final report by Harold Taylor, director of the AACTE project which is supported by a U.S. Office of Education grant, will appear in Spring 1968.

Copies of *Conference on World Education* may be obtained for $1.50 from AACTE, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

GI Loans

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide a more equitable standard under which indebtedness incurred by veterans with respect to GI loans may be waived.

There is a great need for this kind of action.

The law as it now stands states that severe hardship is a requisite for waiver of indebtedness charged to a veteran, following VA-connected loan default, often on the part of a subsequent purchaser, and loss of property.

Almost every week I receive in my office letters in that regard. Many of these persons writing are in the gravest need. Yet, their request to the VA for waiver has been denied. Statements such as the following are not untypical:

> I transferred to Patrick in 10 days in May and checked with Base Attorney and they advised me to appeal which the VA said I could do. The VA sent me a financial statement which they lost and I had to fill out another and a waiver while in California and I never got answers to them. They confirmed not to waive it in June. I went to St. Petersburg which is over 150 miles to see Mr. ——— who was sending all the mail to us. But I was not allowed to see him. They said all papers were in Jacksonville. They told me to write a letter and say I wanted to appeal and then someone would send me appeal papers. They told me to offer ½ the amount if the appeal was turned down. I write for the appeal but not ½ amount. They used the letter as an appeal instead of sending me any papers.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In the latter part of 1966, I received a letter from the VA, Regional Office, Muskogee, Oklahoma, informing me that the VA had reclaimed said property and that I owed the VA $845.49 plus interest of $7.71. This was the first communication of any kind I had received from VA. I did not and have not received any communication from the mortgage company. Had I been informed before the foreclosure, it is possible I could have arranged to start making payment and resell or rent this property . . . My total income is only $365.63 a month which is dispensed with as follows: house payment (FHA) $99.44, utilities (average) $38.00, food $130.00, all insurance $49.73—Total $317.19. This leaves me only $48 for clothing, medical, transportation, other incidentals, including any emergency that might arise. There are times when I have to put off purchasing some needed item from one month to another.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Sir, the financial statement I submitted to the board, along with the appeal, clearly indicates that after living expenses and current bills paid, I would have exactly $60.67 left per month. The financial statement I submitted had to be accomplished prior to reductions. After income taxes and social security, I would have a total of $24.04 per month to take care of savings and unexpected expenses . . . Sir, I simply cannot repay this money, even at the risk of ruining a 17 year military career. I cannot do it and properly maintain my family.

In 1967, only eight-tenths of 1 percent of requests for waiver before the Veterans' Administration offices of original jurisdiction were granted. Of the 70.3 percent of the cases referred by those offices to the Board of Veterans' Appeals, only 6.1 percent were allowed.

Under my bill, waiver of liability could be granted to a veteran, for indebtedness established because of loan default, if he were without fault and collection of indebtedness would work a hardship upon him.

While the Government has provided easy credit for veterans, it has not been so diligent in providing safeguards necessary for a mobile society.

My concern is directed especially to veterans whose indebtedness is caused by the default of second, third, and fourth parties to whom his house has been subsequently sold. The scope of the problem can be seen when it is noted that over one-half of requested waivers involve transferee owners.

The original veteran, of whom payment is required under the obligation of his VA-insured loan, has often been transferred or moved to another State. Frequent complaints are that the veteran is not found by the VA before his house is sold and indebtedness instituted, although he is easily found when the indebtedness amount is determined. There are also frequent complaints that the Veterans' Administration often pays more to repair the veteran's house after loan default, and before the Administration sells the house to another party, than the veteran would have, had he known that default had taken place. There are many statements made to the effect that had the veteran known of default, he would have made arrangements for taking care of that default. Yet, by the time he hears of it, sale of his home has occurred.

The scope of the problem in Florida is overwhelming. VA-connected loan claims settled from April to September 1967 in the State of Florida included net claims of about $618,350 to take care of defaults caused by subsequent purchasers. Of VA direct and insured loan claims settled in Florida during that same period of time, 59.4 percent were caused by defaults of second parties. Fifty-six percent of all referrals to the Justice Department for handling of mortgage foreclosures during the period March 1, 1965, through November 30, 1966, involved Florida activity.

The problems caused by default of second parties extend further. The present law makes it too simple for irresponsible persons to assume mortgages upon property insured by the VA, intending to receive rentals and profits, but without intending to make many or any mortgage payments.

Under the GI loan, the Government has attempted to aid the veteran. Yet, in requiring cases of severe hardship for waiver of indebtedness, it has only helped an extremely small percentage of those in need.

I would urge favorable action on my request to broaden coverage of the Veterans' Administration waiver procedure.

Three From State War Victims

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Warrant Officer Gary W. Hanna, Army Sp4c. Thomas W. Moore, and Marine Pfc. Jehu J. Cox, Jr., three young servicemen from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE FROM STATE WAR VICTIMS—TWO ELLICOTT CITY GI'S AND A BALTIMORE MARINE DIE

Three Maryland servicemen—two of them from Ellicott City and the other from Baltimore—have died in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

They were identified as:

Army Warrant Officer Gary W. Hanna, 19, son of Mr. and Mrs. William S. Hanna, of 703 South St. John's lane, Ellicott City.

Army Spec. 4 Thomas W. Moore, 20, husband of Mrs. Carol Thomson Moore, formerly of Savage, Md., and now of Oahu, Hawaii, and son of Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow W. Moore, of 179 Montgomery road, Ellicott City.

Marine Pfc. Jehu J. Cox, Jr., 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jehu J. Cox, Sr., of 731 Dolphin street, Baltimore.

Mr. Hanna was killed January 31 in Thua Thien province when a helicopter he was flying crashed after it was damaged by small arms fire. He was attached to "B" Troop, 1st Squadron, 9th Cavalry.

MORTAR ATTACK

Specialist Moore was killed January 31 during a mortar attack on his base camp at Vinh Long. He was a helicopter mechanic with the 150th Transport Division.

Private Cox died Wednesday in a Vietnam military hospital from bullet wounds received January 9 in combat action near Quang Nam. One of his legs was amputed while he was in the hospital.

Mr. Hanna, a 1966 graduate of Howard County Senior High School, was a member of the school's lacrosse team. While in school, he worked part-time as a clerk in a hardware store. Also while a student, he took flying lessons and received a pilot's license.

He was a member of St. John's Episcopal Church, Ellicott City, and sang in the church choir for six years.

He enlisted in the Army four months after graduation and took his basic training at Fort Polk, La. He later took helicopter training at Fort Walters, Texas, and at Fort Rucker, Ala.

Mr. Hanna's father was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates from 1963 until 1967.

Besides his parents, Mr. Hanna is survived by a brother, Edwin F. Hanna, of Ellicott City .

Specialist Moore enlisted in the Army in September, 1966, three months after he was graduated from Howard County Senior High School.

He took basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and received advanced training at Fort Eustis, Va., before he was assigned to Vietnam last August.

While in high school, Specialist Moore was a member of the school football team.

Funeral services for Specialist Moore will be held in Hawaii. He will be buried in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific, which is on the island of Oahu.

OTHER SURVIVORS

In addition to his wife and his parents, Specialist Moore is survived by two sisters, Mrs. Elizabeth Snyder, of Baltimore, and Mrs. Mildred Stewart, of Arbutus, and a brother, Robert L. Moore, of Ellicott City.

Private Cox attended School No. 128, Harlem Park Junior High School and Carver Vocational-Technical Senior High School.

MARINE CAREER PLANNED

He was a member of the school safety patrol at School No. 128, and played junior varsity football at Carver. He also played football with the Methodist Athletic League.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps last July and took his recruit training at Parris Island, S.C. He took advanced training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and at Camp Pendleton, Cal., before being sent to Vietnam last December. According to his parents, he was planning a career in the Marine Corps.

Shortly after he was wounded, his father flew to Vietnam to visit him in the hospital.

Besides his parents, Private Cox is survived by ten sisters, Miss Aletha O. Cox, Miss Emma J. Cox, Miss Paula M. Cox, Miss Cassandra S. Cox, Miss Linda D. Cox, Miss Verna C. Cox, Miss Yvonne D. Cox, Miss Sharon K. Cox, and Mrs. Rose M. Wharton, all of Baltimore, and Mrs. Evelyn Orr, of Winston Salem, N.C.; and three brothers, Joseph L. Cox, Rahue I. Cox and Sheldon J. Cox, all of Baltimore.

The Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, basketball—a sport played in sandlots and stadiums throughout the world—was born 77 years ago in my home city of Springfield, Mass.

This week the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, a striking new $650,000 museum planned for the past 30 years, opened on the campus of Springfield College. The hall is named after Dr. James Naismith, the man who invented basketball in 1891 at Springfield's YMCA School for Christian Workers. Dr. Naismith, one bleak winter day, was seeking a way of helping his young charges work off energy. Struck by an idea, he set up a few peach baskets in a gymnasium, borrowed a soccer ball, jotted down a few rules and let loose a group of enthusiastic boys. Since that time the YMCA School has grown into Springfield College and basketball has grown into the most widely known sport in the world.

Lee Williams, director of the new Hall of Fame, points out that it is a museum dedicated to all basketball—to the game's awkward beginnings, to its slow spread into amateur and college sports, to its remarkable leap into multimillion-dollar professional leagues.

This Hall of Fame is different from any other—

He stressed.

This has to be the most authentic Hall of Fame in sports.

The hall's main floor honor court—its most impressive display area—pays tribute to the 66 men and four teams elected to the hall of fame to date. Panels running from floor to ceiling, colored and lighted, depict the men basketball will never forget. Nearby is the main floor museum—a replica of the first basketball court where Dr. Naismith launched the game. Here is the original manuscript of 13 rules, a history of the game's equipment, a pictorial and literary history of the game itself and a collection of priceless basketball memorabilia. The founder's wall, just a few paces away from the museum, is a display dedicated to the 1,590 individuals, groups and companies that have contributed $100 or more to building the hall of fame. Upstairs, in the second floor display area, is a library housing the world's largest collection of written and filmed material on basketball. Next door is a display honoring the groups and institutions that have developed and maintained the game.

A column published by the Springfield Daily News and an editorial published by the Springfield Union both outline the significance of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame and the history behind it. I include these articles in the RECORD at this point:

FOX TALES: PEACH BASKET DAYS

(By Jim Fox)

"This is just the start," the man said. "A humble start at that."

Lee Williams was standing in the middle of the new Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame, giving a sneak preview to some friends. The show opens Sunday and it is expected to have a long run.

Williams was surrounded by the clutter of a huge enterprise about to get off the ground.

Williams used to be basketball coach at Colby. He came to Springfield in September of 1966 to accept the challenge as director of the Hall. Sunday his own impossible dream comes to fruition.

That's the day the handsome $650,000 shrine on Alden Street opens to the public. Lee would like to have 100,000 visitors the first year and is prepared to show most of them around himself.

The Hall of Fame isn't complete—yet, of course. It never will be, really. Somehow that added to the fascination of this week's preview. Both the accomplishment and the promise were there to see. Sometimes it was just little things:

On a shelf the envelope filled with pictures of Oscar Robertson sent by the University of Cincinnati; an empty display case designated for Maurice Stokes memorabilia; an original of a Peanuts cartoon on basketball; a picture of Stretch Murphy; a basketball magazine from China.

Downstairs in the Honors Court, the workmen were still putting in the glass windows that are sure to become the trademark and major point of interest in the Hall.

"Baseball had its plaques and football its busts on pedestals," explained Williams. "We didn't want to copy. And we also had to utilize the windows. Frankly, I think it's tremendous."

Likenesses of the 66 men already enshrined are on those glass panels, a little like stained-glass windows in a cathedral but capturing a unique quality all their own. Lit from behind, the windows are the Hall's most striking feature.

Up there in glass are Oswald Tower and Ed Hickox and all the others already enshrined. And, of course, Dr. James Naismith, the McGill grad who started it all in 1891 at the School for Christian Workers, later known as Springfield College.

Site of the Winchester Y where they first played the game is a shopping center now. The Valley Bank is said to be over the original location. But the Hall has a replica of that first basketball floor and the full gamut of peach baskets and hoops, with and without bottoms, all resting under the little Y running track.

The janitor didn't have much to do back in '91. He was the guy who plucked the ball out of the hoop after a basket. That was before a clever chap thought to cut a hole in the bottom of the basket. He remains the game's undiscovered hero.

Naismith decreed the basket would be 10 feet above the floor, established 13 rules and threw out a ball borrowed from the soccer team.

Naismith, was a pretty smart chap, no doubt. But we'll wager he never envisioned those bloodthirsty nights in the Conway, Mass., town hall where the hot stove was in play, or the equally red hot Indiana state school tournaments, or the Original Celtics, or the Boston Celtics, or the Globetrotters, Bob Cousy, the 24-second rule, Wilt Chamberlain or Lew Alcindor.

Basketball has become the most widely known game in the world, played competitively in 130 countries.

Some kids we know would rather shoot baskets in the wintertime than go to movies with girls. They jump shoot and dribble behind their back and play on a thousand teams from the park league to the pros.

Yes, basketball has arrived in the years since 1891.

The Naismith Hall of Fame proves it by crystalizing its past and charting its future.

Move over Cooperstown. Move over Canton. You now have a big brother.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 17, 1968]

THE FAME OF THE GAME

It was high time somebody built a hall of fame for a game that has developed in 77 years from a peach basket at the old Winchester Square YMCA in Springfield to the major winter sport in most schools and colleges across the country—and the multi-million dollar business done by the professional leagues.

The Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, which opens for public viewing tomorrow, and for a preview today by press and donors, embodies an idea first expressed by the inventor of the game himself, Dr. James Naismith. The first fund drive ran afoul of World War II; afterward, it stayed alive but didn't shift into high gear until 1963. Now basketball has a $650,000 home of its own, Western Massachusetts donors having paid more than a third of the cost.

That the goal was reached as early as it was is in large measure the doing of the late Dr. Edward J. Hickox, first executive secretary of the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame, who kept the fund project on the move, right into its final stage, before he died in 1966.

For Springfield, there will be the prominence that Cooperstown, N.Y., enjoys as the home of baseball's Hall of Fame—and more, in a sense, because basketball's institution covers every aspect of the sport, not merely the professional.

More important is the testimony that the Hall of Fame bears to the feeling of Americans for wholesome sport. Keeping this heritage alive is another part of the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame's contribution.

I feel sure my colleagues in the House join me in wishing every success to basketball's new Hall of Fame.

Minnesota Representative Concerned About Defense Highway System

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, State Representative August B. Mueller, of Sibley County, Minn., serves as chairman of the highway committee of the Minnesota House of Representatives and as vice chairman of the highway interim commission. He has written me to express concern about problems of our Defense Highway System, and especially the dangers of increased loads on such roads without thorough study. Enclosed with his letter was a special study dealing with bridges on principal routes in Minnesota prepared by R. E. Livingston, consulting engineer, of Denver, Colo.

I include the letter, report, and Mr. Livingston's credentials at this point in my remarks:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: I have followed with interest your support for our developing state and federal highway program and your effort to free highway trust funds for immediate use in presently allocated highway programs. This type of effort by you is tremendously important to state highway programs.

It is also important that we protect our investment in these new modern highways. As you may know, I am Chairman of the Highway Committee of the Minnesota House of Representatives. I am also Vice-Chairman of the Highway Interim Commission. This is a regular statutory commission of the Minnesota Legislature with certain assigned duties. As part of our assigned duties, we are studying the load carrying capacity of our highways and bridges, the question of highway needs, improvements of existing highways and the development of new highways as well as farm-to-market roads. As part of this study, we had presented to us a report taken from the official records of the Minnesota Highway Department which indicates a serious problem on our defense highway system.

As you know, a defense highway system is that part of the state highway system, county roads and city streets designated as necessary for national defense requirements and a report as to the status of this system must be filed annually with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads.

An investigation, in 1966, of the bridges on this system in Minnesota indicated that 77.4% of the bridges were not designed or constructed to carry an H20-S16 load. An H20-S16 load is the maximum now permitted on the interstate system and relates to a tractor semi-trailer combination with two 32,000 lbs. tandem axles and 8,000 lbs. on the front, or steering, axle. This is the type of maximum load and vehicle about which our highways and our bridges are programmed.

Our Highway Department representatives testified at a recent meeting of our Commission that our entire Minnesota interstate and state trunk highway system is programmed to carry a maximum H20-S16 load or what is now the maximum equivalent load allowed on the interstate system of 73,280 lbs.

It would seem that, before axle loads are increased or other sizes increased on our interstate system, we should have a "go slow" period and a moratorium on any increases until a full study can be made of the impact of these changes on our roads and on our economy. If increased loads on our highway system will shorten the life of our bridges and highways, then it is poor policy to permit them. We should not endanger the investment or the life expectancy of our highways and bridges by legislative act, in my opinion. It seems to me that our legislative policy should be coordinated around sound engineering standards.

In order to call this matter to the attention of others on the appropriate committees in Congress, will you please place the report and the credentials of the author in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it might be reviewed by other public officials. I am enclosing a copy of the report herewith.

As Chairman of the Highway Committee of the Minnesota House of Representatives, we are most concerned about the trend in all of these areas, both state and federal.

Sincerely yours,
AUGUST B. MUELLER.

BRIDGES ON THE PRINCIPAL ROUTES OF MINNESOTA

(By R. E. Livingston)

There are 124,910 miles of public thoroughfares in Minnesota, 11,993 miles of which constitute the State Highway System. The State system includes 952 miles of Federal Aid Interstate, 7,882 miles of Federal Aid Primary, 3,013 miles of Federal Aid Secondary and 146 miles of Non-Federal Aid State roads. The construction of the Federal Aid roads is jointly financed with Federal and State funds, and they are maintained by the State alone.

Although the State Highway System is composed of a total of 11,993 miles, there are 7,789 miles of such system designated as necessary for national defense requirements. As to this system of routes the Minnesota Highway Department has a bridge record, or log, which is required by Federal memoranda to be kept on a current basis and in detail. By continuous field examination and evaluation, the load-carrying capacity of each of these bridges is checked and if deterioration or damage has occurred since its construction, an appropriate change in its design loading is determined and the bridge thereafter carries the new value in the record.

There is no such consistent bridge record information available for the structures on municipal roads or streets which are not a part of the State system, the remaining 4,204 miles of the State Highway System, nor for the local county systems. For this reason, this report will deal only with the 1,503 bridge structures on the 7,789 miles of defense requirement routes of the State Highway System.

The report is confined to an analysis of the load-carrying characteristics of existing bridges. While it is recognized that there are many structures which are deficient in width or overhead clearance, deficiencies in these elements are not associated with wheel and axle loadings nor does a change in vehicle weight alter width or clearance.

Minnesota classifies and rates bridges in conformity with standards and procedures of the American Association of State Highway Officials, approved by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads.

An H20 design standard means that the bridges on the highway have been engineered to carry in each lane a single unit truck weighing 20 tons, measuring 14 feet between the front and rear axles, carrying 4 tons on its front axle, and 16 tons on its rear axle assembly. It is further assumed in the design that this 20-ton truck unit is preceded and followed by trucks of ¾ the weight of the design unit (15 tons each) with the center of their nearest axles 30 feet removed from the nearest axle of the design unit.[1] Each of these preceding and following trucks is presumed to be preceded and followed by a succession of 15-ton units spaced so that their axles are 30 feet from the nearest axle of the following or preceding unit. This arrangement of truck units in a lane is assumed in order to produce the maximum bridge stress.

Bridge designs to handle the H20-S16 unit are prepared in a similar manner. The H20-S16 key unit is composed of a 20-ton truck tractor pulling a 16-ton semi-trailer. The truck is assumed to have the center of its steering axle 14 feet in front of the center of the driving assembly. The distance from the center of the driving axle assembly on the tractor to the center of the trailer unit axle assembly is variable from 14 feet to 30 feet in any dimensional arrangement which will produce the greatest stress in the bridge. The spacing of preceding and following units is the same as for the H20 unit with such preceding and following units presumed to weigh ¾ as much as the key unit (54,000 lbs.).

The Minnesota Department of Highways currently prepares its design for new highways on the basis of H20 and H20-S16 bridge loadings. The above-mentioned bridge record was examined to determine what proportion of the existing bridges are deficient and, when deficient, to what extent.

The appended tabulation (B-1) was produced as a summation and a comparison of the structures on a system-by-system basis. The bridges were tabulated in loading increments of 5-ton groupings to get a better picture of the extent of deficiency as well as the number of deficient structures.

The analysis of the appended table (B-1) shows that 1,163 structures or 77.4% of all the structures on the defense routes are rated below H20-S16. The cumulative breakdown by 5-ton groupings is as follows:

Structures (60.6 percent) rated as H10 to H15	911
Structures (16.8 percent) rated as H16 to H20	252
Total structures (77.4 percent) rated as other than H20-S16	1,163

The analysis by systems indicates that of 364 structures on the defense requirements routes which are a part of the Interstate System, 180 or 49% fail to meet the H20-S16 design loading requirements. Of 840 bridges on the defense requirement routes which are a part of the Federal Aid Primary System, 770 or 69% are rated below both the H20 and H20-S16 loading requirements. Of 20 structures on the defense requirement routes which are a part of the limited Federal Aid Secondary System mileage, 20 or 100% are rated below H20-S16 loading category.

---

[1] The description of the placement of the truck train is converted by bridge engineers to a uniform design load of 640 lbs. per linear foot of 10 ft. traffic lane.

TABLE B-1.—MINNESOTA

TABULATION OF LOADING DATA ON MAJOR STRUCTURES[1] ON THE PRINCIPAL ROUTES[2] IN MINNESOTA

System	Total number of bridges on system	Design load: H10 to H15, Number	H10 to H15, Percent of total	H16 to H20, Number	H16 to H20, Percent of total	H20-S16 or greater, Number	H20-S16 or greater, Percent of total	Total number of bridges on system less than H20-S16	Percent of bridges less than H20-S16	Log mileage of system
Federal-aid interstate	364	126	34.6	54	14.9	184	50.5	180	49.5	946.0
Federal-aid primary	1,119	770	68.8	193	17.3	156	13.9	963	86.1	6,777.4
Federal-aid secondary[2]	20	15	75.0	5	25.0			20	100.0	65.8
Total	1,503	911	60.6	252	16.8	340	22.6	1,163	77.4	7,789.2

[1] By definition, major structures are 20 feet or more between abutments.

[2] Principal routes covered in the detail data of the Minnesota Highway Department report of Dec. 31, 1966, include all Federal-aid interstate, 6,778 miles of Federal-aid primary highways of a total of 7,882 miles, but include only 66 miles out of a total of 4,102 miles of State administered Federal-aid secondary system. These roads are those referred to as national defense routes.

An examination of the foregoing table of loading data on (B–1) leads to the following observations and conclusions:

1. This report relates to the bridge structures on only 7,789 miles of essential defense routes out of a total of 124,910 miles of public roads in Minnesota. The routes analyzed are, generally speaking, the most modern roads in the State, built to the highest standards. It must follow that if records were available to permit an analysis to be made of the structures on the remaining 117,121 miles which have not been considered in this report, the conclusions would be less favorable than those reached as to the structures on the aforesaid defense routes.

2. The findings as to the bridge structures on these defense routes, composed as they are of 7,789 miles of the best highways in the State, are a warning as to the insufficiency of the bridge structures on the remaining 4,204 miles of the State Highway System and all of the local roads and city streets. There is no way to make an accurate assessment of the capacity of the bridges on this vast network without a comprehensive inventory. Until and unless such an inventory shows otherwise, it is a valid assumption that such bridges are less adequate than those of the studied routes.

3. Recognizing that traffic has a tendency to move from origin to destination by the most expeditious route, it is obvious that any unit can, and many units do, move on a combination of segments of all systems. As an example, a load of farm produce will often start its trip to market on a county road, proceed to the Federal Aid Secondary System in the area, move from there to the Federal Aid Primary System and before reaching market transfer to and use a portion of the Interstate System.

Such a unit when operated over the studied routes and when loaded to the maximum weight permissible on Interstate highways under present law would not only exceed the design load on 49.5% of the bridges on that portion of the system which is part of the Interstate System but would also exceed the Interstate design load on 86.1% of the bridges of that part of the system which is part of the Federal Aid Primary System and 100.0% of the bridges on the limited portion of Federal Aid Secondary System covered in this report.

4. The B–1 table shows that 1,163 of the 1,503 structures on the studied routes were rated below H20–S16. Of the 1,163 structures so rated, 911 were rated at or below H15 (15-ton).

By the terms of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Secretary of Commerce was directed to report to the Congress on a number of items of vital concern in the field of Federal highway legislation. One such required report deals with "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal Aid Systems". The Secretary's report on this matter was published as House Document No. 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, dated August 19, 1964. On page 6 of that report footnote 2 is significant. It reads: "The following loaded vehicles must not operate over H15 bridges: 3–S2 (5 axles) with wheelbase less than 38 feet; S–S1–2 (5 axles) with wheelbase less than 45 feet; and 7-, 8-, and 9-axle vehicles regardless of wheelbase." It is noted that the restrictions described in the Secretary's report apply to all of the 911 H15 bridges tabulated above which are in excess of 60% of all the structures on the essential defense routes of the Minnesota State Highway System.

5. The fact that Federal Aid financing has been aimed at the completion of the Interstate System in 1972 or soon thereafter while making no provision for completion of the Federal Aid Primary and Federal Aid Secondary Systems at any given date, is apparent in the percentages of structures rated below H20–S16 on the different systems. Actually, 180 bridges or about 49.5% of the structures on those studied routes which are part of the Interstate System were rated below H20–S16. Comparable figures for the Federal Aid Primary System indicated 963 structures or 86.1% of the bridges of that system which are included in the studied routes and 20 structures on the Federal Aid Secondary System portion or 100.0% all rated below the critical H20–S16 loading.

6. The large number of bridges on the State Highway System which have capacity below the critical loading for bridges on the Federal Aid Interstate System is a matter of prime and continuing concern. The fact that existing funding programs do not make provision for the orderly replacement of the deficient structures with a definite target date adds to this concern. It would appear to be inappropriate to consider any relaxation of the present legal limits on weight of motor vehicles until adequate provision has been made for the orderly and complete modernization of the present backlog of deficient structures.

7. No consideration has been given in this report to the effect on pavements of unit loadings or tire pressures. Bridges and pavements do not lend themselves to analysis by the same basic criteria or methods. For bridges the analysis is based on concentrated and gross load. Pavements, on the other hand, are best analyzed by distributed or unit stress analysis and the frequency of load applications. A separate report would be required to cover the load-carrying capacity of the pavements within the State.

Robert E. Livingston, Consulting Engineer, Colorado License No. PE1286

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Registered Professional Engineer.

Member, American Society of Civil Engineers, Colorado Society of Professional Engineers.

Full member, Institute of Traffic Engineers.

Active member, Joint (American Association of State Highway Engineers, National League of Cities, National Association of County Officials) Committee on Urban Transportation Planning.

Member, Highway Research Board committees: Flexible Pavement Design; Design; Highway Economics; Composite Pavement.

AASHO—Illinois Road Test committees: General; Operations (chairman); Highway Ratings; Reviewing and Editing; Executive Committee.

Executive Committee, Western Association of State Highway Officials road test.

Committee on Highways and Transportation, National League of Cities.

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

1930–33, Instrument Man, Draftsman, Inspector, Colorado Department of Highways.

1933–36, Highway Designer & Design Squad Boss, Colorado Department of Highways.

1936–41, Assistant Design Engineer, Colorado Department of Highways.

1941–45, U.S. Army Engineer, Private to Captain (Brevet Major).

1945–46, Design Engineer, Colorado Department of Highways.

1946–48, Special Assistant to Colorado Highway Engineer for department reorganization.

1948–63, Planning and Research Engineer and Secretary of Colorado Highway Commission.

1963–66, Deputy Manager of Public Works (chief of operations), City and County of Denver.

Presently, self-employed consulting engineer.

False Economy

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a colleague of ours delivered a talk last week which I would like to bring to the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. The Member was Jim Wright of Texas. He is chairman of the Watershed Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works. I have the privilege of serving on this same subcommittee.

The occasion was the 22d annual meeting of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts at Dallas, Tex. The subject of his talk was soil and water conservation.

He measured the progress that is being made in America today. He underlined the problems of water pollution from sediment. He labeled the proposed cuts in appropriations for soil and water conservation as "terribly shortsighted and false economy."

The total cost of upstream soil and sediment damage comes to at least $1 billion a year in the United States. Two weeks ago, the President submitted to the Congress a budget for fiscal 1969, and I am deeply troubled by what I see in proposed cuts in our national soil and water conservation program. To fight this $1 billion annual loss, it is proposed that we spend only $196 million—one-fifth our annual cost of inaction—on our entire national effort in the coming year.

This represents a cutback to Soil Conservation Districts of more than $5 million from last year. It represents a reduction of more than $18 million from our flood prevention efforts, and a cut of nearly $3½ million in the Great Plains Program.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of this talk in the Record, as follows:

No Time To Spare: Remarks of Congressman Jim Wright at the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts Annual Convention, Dallas, Tex., February 6, 1968

Man's most impelling problem in this final one-third of the Twentieth Century may be famine, an enemy older and more devastating than the nuclear bomb.

The basic question of our time may be whether we on Earth can summon the collective wisdom and humanity to husband our planet's resources in such a way as to accommodate the world's growing population.

Here in America, the problem may be learning to live graciously in an ever more crowded and ever more cluttered environment.

This organization has something to say to both problems.

Historians may record the movement you began 31 years ago as one of the most remarkable in the history of our land. The Soil Conservation Districts started with only an idea. But it was an idea whose time had come.

Already, in 1937, the rapacious hand of man had despoiled countless thousands of acres of our most priceless heritage. The frontier was gone. Overgrazing was denuding our pastures. Lumbering was laying waste our forests. Our growing appetite for minerals was disfiguring great hunks of countryside. Our topsoil, exposed to wind and rain, was flowing with our rivers to the ocean.

YOUR PHENOMENAL SUCCESS

Your organization set out with a single-minded purpose to save what was left for future generations. Although your job is far from done, your success has been phenomenal!

In three short decades, you have made soil and water conservation household words. You have organized 3,000 formal Districts with specific local work plans in 1,370 separate watersheds, embracing perhaps 10,000 agricultural communities of America.

You have inspired more than 2 million individual farmers to attack the problem of their own land with terraces, ponds, cover crops and contour planting. You have brought the benefits of enlightened agricultural practice to 97 million acres of American soil, stimulated the building of some 4,300 upstream dams and some 4,000 miles of stream channel improvements.

As evidence of the momentum your movement has gained, every state in the union has passed enabling legislation, and the Federal government at your urging has launched an entire range of programs to augment your work.

As Chairman of a committee that investigates and authorizes the larger individual Upstream Watershed projects, I can report emphatically to you that there is no representative of the Federal administrative establishment who speaks with greater conviction or who enjoys greater respect in the Congress than Hollis Williams of the Soil Conservation Service.

But your work is in no sense finished. In the broader context, your mission today is bigger than ever, and your message more vitally needed.

A HUNGRY WORLD: A DANGEROUS WORLD

Today the statistics of population growth forecast a prophecy of world famine—unless we can cultivate an entirely new relationship between man and earth. It took 3,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people. We are doubling that in 30 years!

In one more generation—if the present trend continues—the same amount of land and air and water and mineral resources will have to serve twice as many people as today.

This reality cannot be considered apart from our other problems, because it is central to all of them. Since recorded history began, wars have been fought and freedoms sacrificed when the overtaxed patrimony of the land could no longer support its burden of people.

If there were no such things as Christian charity, intelligent self-interest alone would dictate a grave concern for this problem. For a world in want is a dangerous world. This is not just a theory; it's a provable fact.

In the past 10 years, there have been some 200 internationally significant outbreaks of violence. All but 15 have begun as internal upheavals. Only one of these 200 has occurred on the soil of any of the 27 best-fed nations—those with a per capita income of $750 a year or more. But among the 38 poorest and most needy nations of the earth, no less than 32 of them have suffered significant violent upheavals—most of them prolonged and repeated, on an average of once every four years.

Do you see what I mean? A world in want is a dangerous world!

NO MORE SURPLUSES

In this country, so bounteously blessed, our population grows at the rate of a new state of Maryland each year. In one more decade, we shall have here—on only seven percent of the world's land surface—as many people as dwelt on the entire Earth at the time of Christ.

Agricultural surpluses will be a thing of the past. Barring dramatic new scientific discoveries in per acre yield, most of us will see the time when the United States shall need millions of additional acres in production merely to feed our own people—let alone the famine-bent billions of a hungry world.

This is why the work of your association is so desperately important. Every drop of water that can be conserved, every inch of topsoil that can be saved, every field and forest we can renew, every ore and mineral we can develop and conserve, every stream we can cleanse of pollution, every technique we can devise to protect the environment—and each of these techniques that we can share with other lands—will be our greatest possible gifts to future generations.

NEW AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

Let's take a quick look at the changing face of America. Thirty years ago, ours was predominantly a rural nation. Today, three-fourths of our people live in cities—and almost all of the cities are growing.

Thirty years ago, the cry for pure air, pure water, noise abatement, open spaces and scenic preservation might have sounded a little silly to the average American. Today that cry is an insistent popular clamor. In a few years it will be imperative public demand.

During the past thirty years, we have made some remarkable strides in conservation. Fourteen million acres of badlands have been claimed for cultivating. But in the process, 48 million acres—almost four times as much—which formerly grew crops for the nation have been retired from the cultivator's blade. This represents a withdrawal from crop harvesting of a total area larger than the state of Oklahoma.

Much of this withdrawn land now is in pasture. Presumably we are wise enough to prevent its progression in the historic cycle from pasture to overgrazing to desert. Let us hope so. But today a motorist traveling along highways of our southwestern states can witness, in countless square miles of mesquite groves, a tragic modern re-enactment of an often-performed drama.

The mesquite is an unmistakable monument to overgrazing. It yields a whiskered berry which will reseed only on barren ground which has been stripped of its grass cover. Many of the mesquite groves stand on land which was cultivated by the Pueblo and Hohokan Indian civilizations before a 23-year drought utterly destroyed their form of society. Only two generations ago the land provided lush pasture. Today miles of mesquite give silent indictment to our folly of overgrazing.

OTHER CIVILIZATIONS

History holds stark lessons of other civilization which found—too late—that they could not halt the cycle which plagued the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, killed off the great Maya civilization that reached its cultural stride about 1000 A.D., spelled eventual doom to the Egyptians and Babylonians and the Pueblo Indians of the American Southwest.

Shelley tells of the statue of the tyrant Ozymandias, which stands crumbling in the desert, with its boastful inscription: "Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair." Even for Ozymandias, the water ran out:

"Round the Decay
Of the colossal wreck, boundless and bare,
The lone and level sands stretch far away."

URBAN TRANSFORMATION

A real part of our problem is the transformation that has taken place in our country since World War II. Today only about 15 million people, or less than 8 percent of our population, actually live "on the land."

As the farm population decreases, the amount of arable land also decreases. On the outskirts of every city in the United States, trees are being felled and meadows are being leveled to accommodate new housing developments, new industrial complexes, new shopping centers. With each new development the water balance of the nation shifts a little.

There is no turning back. The civilization we have set in motion roils over the land at an ever-accelerating pace. There are, altogether, 1,903,800,000 acres in the United States. Already a full one-tenth—194 million acres—strains under the weight of cities, towns and highways. This figure is increasing daily. Nearly 2 million more acres annually are absorbed into urban-uses as the concrete and blacktop invasion pours across America. In the next forty years, an additional 80 million acres will be cut from woodland and pasture to make way for homes and factories to serve our mushrooming population.

SEDIMENTATIONS

Not the least of the problems of this urban transformation is the growing problem of sedimentation. Around our sprawling cities literally millions of tons of silt run off the scraped-clean countryside, where the sound of building-project hammers never ceases, into our rivers and reservoirs.

Each year more than 380 million cubic yards of sediment—eroded earth—must be dredged out of our nation's harbors and waterways simply to keep them from choking to death. This is more than was excavated to build the Panama Canal.

It costs about $125 million a year simply to dredge out the sediment, but this represents only a small part of the financial loss. Every cubic yard that is dug up was usable elsewhere upstream; it is soil that was torn from its original location by flood waters and then sent careening on its downhill course, causing damage every foot of the way to its ultimate destination.

The long-range effects of sedimentation on precious storage space in our reservoirs was too long overlooked. We are becoming increasingly dependent on these reservoirs for hydroelectric power, and for our agricultural, municipal and industrial water supply. This dependency is growing so swiftly that the nation shall need an estimated additional 228 million acre-feet of water storage in reservoirs to meet our ordinary requirements in 1980.

In a country that must produce two million new jobs in the private economy each year, water storage capacity for industry and municipal needs is absolutely vital.

We don't know exactly how much our total reservoir capacity is being robbed by sediment each year, but the most conservative estimates place that loss in the neighborhood of 1½ billion cubic yards. If we put the average cost of developing reservoir storage at a hundred dollars per acre-foot (a not excessive estimate), the cost of this largely preventable depreciation comes to $100 million a year.

This, in turn, poses a still thornier problem. All the best sites for our major reservoirs already are being utilized. If these reservoirs continue to fill up with silt until they become useless, we shall have to build new ones. Where will we build the new dams?

UPSTREAM WATERSHEDS

The pity of it is that most of this could be prevented. But we must attack the problem at the source—in the upstream watersheds, where 70 percent of the sediment damage occurs and an even higher percentage of the flood damage.

The problem is urgent. The next fifteen years could be decisive. Our population is growing at an accelerating pace and our rate of urban expansion is approaching fantastic proportions. The cost of reservoir construction is growing with each passing year.

We have completed projects in 827 watersheds. But there are 8,000 more that require protective action. We have developed conservation work plans for 97 million acres. But there are almost 1 billion acres—ten times as many—that remain untreated.

We should attack the upstream watershed problem boldly and with vision now, before it is too late. If we do this, we shall be able to preserve enough water to keep many acres of the country secure from drought, and we shall be able to save billions of dollars in unnecessary waste throughout the country.

THE ECONOMICS

The total cost of upstream soil and sediment damage comes to at least $1 billion a year in the United States. Two weeks ago, the President submitted to the Congress a budget for fiscal 1969, and I am deeply troubled by what I see in proposed cuts in our national soil and water conservation program. To fight this $1 billion annual loss, it is proposed that we spend only $196 million—one-fifth our annual cost of inaction—on our entire national effort in the coming year.

This represents a cutback to Soil Conservation Districts of more than $5 million from last year. It represents a reduction of more than $18 million from our flood prevention efforts, and a cut of nearly $3½ million in the Great Plains Program.

In view of the impelling needs that face us, this strikes me as terribly short-sighted and false economy. Soil and air and water are the most basic and indispensable wealth of any civilization. They are the three things without which life cannot exist and the three commodities for which man has never 'developed a substitute.

We are spending $100 million a day to fight the war in Viet Nam. At the present rate, that effort could come to $35 billion this year. Certainly I have no criticism for our struggle in the defense of freedom on earth. I support that effort. But a nation that can afford $100 million a day to fight such a war can easily afford much more than $200 million year—the cost of just two days of fighting—to preserve the basic wealth without which our international commitments would be impossible.

This price tag comes to just a little less than one dollar per year, per American—less than 2¢ a week—to preserve and develop the nation's most fundamental and indispensable wealth.

In face of the staggering tasks ahead, we need to do much more. We need an expanded program to cope with sedimentation flowing from our roadsides, our stream banks and our surface mines—long-neglected areas in which practically nothing has been done. I have introduced legislation, and a similar bill has been introduced in the Senate, to make a coordinated and effective attack on this problem.

This legislation would extend Federal assistance in works to control and prevent damages resulting from erosion of roadbeds and rights-of-way, the unprotected banks of rivers and streams, and from unrestored and unrehabilitated strip mined lands.

Another bill, which I introduced yesterday, would allow long-term contracting in these areas to be based on a conservation plan approved by the Soil Conservation Districts in the areas affected.

These bills need your help!

URBAN PROBLEMS

The urban problems of America are truly great. I shall make no effort to minimize them. The riots in several large cities last summer—in the midst of the nation's unprecedented prosperity—brought sharply into focus an entire new range of problems in our increasingly industrial and increasingly urban society.

As our cities grow bigger, a subtle change comes over the quality of life itself. There is a decline in the sense of community involvement.

Neighborliness becomes a lost art. Few indeed of our seething urban centers could be described as Sam Rayburn described Bonham—"A place where people know it when you are sick and they care when you die."

Our work itself becomes more impersonal. Few of us have even met the people who are the end users of whatever product of service we produce. The society is increasingly mobile. Nationally, one-fifth of the American people move in any given year, and in some urban areas the figure is as high as 50%.

This is not altogether a new problem. The Greek philosophers were concerned about it in the 4th Century B.C. Aristotle believed that the small city-state was the largest political unit capable of being a community worthy of civilized men. And to Plato it seemed obvious that when any city reached a population of 100,000 it was no longer a community except in the most barbarian sense.

At the zenith of its world influence and leadership, Athens had only some 40,000 free male citizens—and its entire population was only a little more than 200,000 when it lead and inspired the entire world in commerce, culture and political ideology.

Today, one high-density section of modern high rise apartments in the Washington metropolitan area houses this many people in a little over one square mile. Of course, they are really not a community in the political or cultural sense. More than 95% of them do not belong to any local church, and more than 80% of them are not registered to vote in local elections. They are adrift on the moving tide of American life, and there is an important void in their lives.

The tide of change cannot be rolled back. We would be foolish to try. But it does seem to me that America needs to find ways to infuse some spirit of community identification, community cooperation and community pride into the fabric of our ever more mobile and ever more complex pattern of living.

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

Perhaps your plan of organization can show the way. The Soil and Water Conservation District has become a model instrument of community involvement. Every resident of the area is brought into the activities and your supervisors dedicate their time and energy freely for the public good.

Perhaps there may be a pattern, even for the ghettos. Perhaps the future lies in Neighborhood Conservation and Improvement Districts, in which each resident can have a part in developing the work plan and in feeling a sense of identification and pride with what is done to solve the problems of their particular slice of America.

Undoubtedly we need a program to invite industry, by means of some tax incentive, to begin enterprises which can provide jobs for the hard core unemployed of the cities.

But perhaps equally important for the future would be such a program of inducement for industry to decentralize, to open plants in the small cities and towns of America, so that an infrastructure of employment potential and opportunity might serve to permit succeeding generations to sink their roots in the home soil of their local communities and thus slow down the tidal wave of mass migration from the individualistic rural communities of America to the ever-growing megalopolis.

NO TIME TO SPARE

It may be too late to restructure American society with an orientation of opportunity at the grassroots. I do not know. I know that it is not too early—and we must not allow it to become too late—to organize this nation in an allout effort to preserve and develop the most essential wealth of our land.

The amount of soil and water in the world is constant—unvarying and abundant. The total quantity has been precisely the same since the very beginning when, as the book of Genesis relates:

"God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; And darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the water."

An unending cosmic rotation steadily moves man's lifegiving liquid by gravity through the gentle and incessant flow of streams to the great reservoirs of our oceans. draws it skyward by the sun's attraction to be purified anew, conveys it by cloud and wind, and returns it by rain to refresh the thirsty earth and renew man's lease on life . . . *ad infinitum*. It is an ever-recurring miracle, the most wondrous natural marvel of a wondrous universe.

Science can comprehend it, but never quite duplicate it. Man cannot change it. He can locally and temporarily befoul the process, and bring death. Or he can form a sort of divine partnership with nature, help it along—and preserve life. This is his choice.

Twentieth-century America, like the prodigal son, has drawn heavily upon the bank account of its native endowment and squandered the substance in riotous misuse. More bountifully endowed than any nation in history, we've adopted the rather casual assumption that Providence protects America. We've extracted the riches of our natural legacy, exploited them to build a shining society, and wasted them in copious quantities.

Wasted! How this word runs like a refrain through the course of our national history—just a few seconds in the day of mankind, mere inches on the yardstick of Western civilization. In this brief span we've thrown away and destroyed more resources than most nations ever had. Most nations could live quite well on what we daily discard.

We recall that other civilizations, also blessed with a spark of greatness, have strutted across the stage of world eminence only to fade and wane, their brief, bright promise unfulfilled. In the uncomprehending sand and heat of arid desert waste, their monuments lie buried.

Let no future archaeologist tell the story for us. We have the knowledge to tell it ourselves—if we have the wisdom. There is enough soil and water to serve our needs for future time, if we learn to use and re-use them well. And there is enough time to do what we must. But there's not much of either to spare.

Dr. Fred M. Lange

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Fred M. Lange is well known around the world for his contributions to the field of education and his interest and dedication in improving social welfare. On February 4, 1968, Bishop College in Dallas, Tex., honored Dr. Lange by giving a new men's residence hall his name. Many appropriate compliments were paid Dr. Lange on the occasion of the dedication of Fred M. Lange Hall.

I hereby include this material in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP COLLEGE, DALLAS, TEX., DEDICATORY AND OPENING CEREMONIES FOR THE FRED M. LANGE HALL, FEBRUARY 4, 1968

Fred M. Lange Hall, erected in 1966, is the senior mens' residence hall. It is being dedicated and opened today with formal ceremonies honoring the man for whom it was named.

When the history of Bishop College is written, chances are that Dr. Fred M. Lange's name—like Abou Ben Adam's of old—will lead all the rest. Dr. Lange has been associated with Bishop College since 1957. He visited the campus in Marshall, Texas, where the college was established in 1881 as the guest of Dr. Pearl C. Anderson, speaker for a special occasion there. With concepts of change everywhere about him, Dr. Lange decided to assist the college, and he was instrumental in helping Bishop move from Marshall to Dallas.

As an experienced, successful, internationally famous expert in social welfare and philanthropic administration, he provided the contacts and created the interests which made it possible for Bishop to open its Dallas campus permanently in 1961. He has served as a member of the Bishop College Board of Trustees since that date.

He takes a personal pride in the development of the campus. He is a major influence in fund-raising efforts, but his interest is primarily in people. He encourages students, staff and faculty members to strive for excellence in all of their pursuits.

Dr. Lange is many things to many people. He serves on the boards of development for Taylor University, Upland, Indiana, and of Dallas Baptist College. He is a member of the board of Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas, and Greenhill School of Dallas. He sits on the advisory board of the University of Dallas, and he is the Southwest board member of the United Negro College Fund, of which Bishop is a member. He has been an executive of the United Fund (formerly the Dallas County Community Chest) since 1941.

Dr. Lange received the doctor of laws degree from Hardin-Simmons, the doctor of humanities from Taylor University, and the doctor of civil laws from Atlanta Law School.

He is married to the former Miss Blanche Swanzey for whom Blanche Lange Hall at Hardin-Simmons is named.

Plaque inscription: "The Board of Trustees named this building in honor of Frederick M. Lange, who was instrumental in bringing Bishop College to Dallas and who has given unselfishly of his time and interest to insure its continued development."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1968.

Dr. M. K. CURRY, Jr.,
President, Bishop College,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR DR. CURRY: How I wish I could be with you on this significant day for Bishop College and most especially to pay tribute to Mr. Fred Lange.

His efforts have been a challenge and an inspiration toward the rapid growth of your fine institution and, I know, there are many who join the President and me in saluting the spirit and determination that are inherent in all his wonderful endeavors. Your new dormitory will be a lasting tribute to the admiration and respect he has earned from his fellow Americans.

Please know you are all in my thoughts, and, that you have my encouragement, high hopes and very best wishes for continued progress in Bishop's development.

Sincerely,
MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Feb. 7, 1968]

SALUTE TO LANGE

Dedication of Bishop College's new men's dormitory to Fred M. Lange is an honor which Mr. Lange has richly earned. The Dallas community services leader and internationally known expert in social welfare and philanthropic administration has worked long and tirelessly for Bishop College.

He was one of those most instrumental in moving the predominantly Negro college to Dallas, convinced that the school could, in this larger population center, perform a much greater service. Since the college's establishment here, he has served on its board of trustees, has contributed enormous amounts of his time, energy and unique talents to the ever-increasingly successful development of the college.

His work for Bishop, however, is only a small part of the tremendous effort which Fred Lange has unselfishly devoted to the welfare of the Dallas community. He has served as executive director of the Community Chest and in that capacity was a prime mover in establishing the pattern of success of, first the chest, and then of Dallas' present United Fund. He now is executive vice president of the Dallas Community Chest trust fund.

In addition to these "official" services, Mr. Lange has privately aided in raising funds for innumerable worthy causes here. In fact, few, if any, other individuals in Dallas, have played so major a role as has Fred Lange in improving the lot of his fellow citizens. For all the myriad services he has rendered his community, we, along with Bishop College, salute Fred Lange.

The Man With an Alibi

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an address by Rabbi Levi A. Olan of the Temple Emanu-El Brotherhood, Dallas, Tex.

It is an inspiration to me as I believe it will be to the other Members of Congress and people all over the United States.

The address follows:

THE MAN WITH AN ALIBI

(Address of Rabbi Levi A. Olan)

There is nothing swifter than a man with an alibi. It began with the first man in history. Adam, confronted with his failure to heed God's command not to eat the fruit from the tree of knowledge, is ready with his alibi. "The woman thou gavest to me she gave me of the tree and I did eat." When God confronts Eve, she blames the serpent. "The serpent beguiled me and I did eat." It is a favorite trick when we won't face our responsibilities. A President of a university said recently that the college degree, B.A., stands not so much for Bachelor of Arts as for Builder of Alibis. Moses himself, when called to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, tried to alibi his way out of it. He claimed to be inadequate for the task. "Who am I?" he asks God. When that fails, he argues "People won't believe me." He probably meant it but he was escaping from responsibility. In a child, we call it an alibi. In a mature person, we dignify it by the psychological term—rationalization.

To be human is to be personally responsible for a good measure of one's life. Heredity and environment do play a role in determining it. The Rabbinic sage, Akiba, saw this two thousand years ago. "All is foreseen," he wrote, "yet free will is given." Some people escape responsibility by blaming fate or bad luck. They leave no room for personal response. They use fatalism as an alibi. These are dramatically contradicted by a Helen Keller, who made a great career although she was severely handicapped by blindness. The young man who was stricken with polio when a child and refused to be crushed by it is today a good graduate student at a university. He is planning his professional career while painfully moving about on crutches. He refused to alibi his way out of his responsibility.

It is noteworthy that the word "responsibility" is a form of the word "response." Man is not an automaton. Animals move largely by instinct. Man is unique in this quality of freedom to respond to life. When a person shows love, a good part of it is feeling responsible for another's needs. When Cain cynically protested, "Am I my brother's keeper?" he was rejecting the essential demand of brotherly relations. It is human to feel responsible for a brother. A mother will respond to a child's physical needs. As adults, men respond to the psychic needs of others. The late Martin Buber told us that "real living is meeting." The essence of life is in the response we make to others, a mate, a child, a friend, neighbor, or God. In fact to be a real person one must respond to others. This means feel responsible in freedom for life itself. Real people do not abili or rationalize.

One of the most natural of human desires is to be free of all restraints, obligations, and duties. There are times when we would like to get out from under and just go somewhere and do as we please. The mood is much in the air today. Young people especially want to be free of all codes and restraint in their behavior. Man has a native resistance to tyranny whether over his personal life or in his political and social organization. We want to be free, however, without the accompanying responsibility which goes with it. Erich Fromm in his book 'Escape From Freedom' suggests that men easily give up their freedom rather than face its responsibility. Moses confounded Pharoah when he demanded "Let my people go that they may serve me, saith the Lord God." It sounded ridiculous to the King. What sense is there in being free from Pharoah only to be a slave to a God! Yet, this is the crux of the matter. Freedom without responsibility is anarchy. The legend carved on a courthouse in New England reads 'Obedience to law is liberty.' Dictatorships relieve men of all responsibility and at the same time take from them their liberties.

Much of modern sickness both personal and social comes from a desperate attempt to separate freedom from responsibility. Freud recognized the human problem in terms which are now household words. Human beings are basically animals which he called the 'id'. They are restrained by a 'super ego' which is the conscience, or by responsibility toward society. In the tension between these two drives, the id and the super ego, lies the sickness of our lives. The fact is that there is a large portion of human existence which drives man to resist all restraint. He just wants to be free as an animal. He does not want to be human. But human we are and we cannot escape from it. We must be free and we must be responsible. A good deal of personal agony and of social upheaval is due to this conflict.

Let us think of this as it relates to our ethical life. There is a part of us which resents moral constraint. We want to be free to do whatever we please without anyone telling us "you must" or "don't." The expression of this unrestrained freedom is common in our day. It is true that much of Puritanism was repressive as it constrained life by a plethora of "don'ts." You must not drink, smoke, be seen on the street without gloves if you are a lady. A good part of the rebellion today derives from the narrow view of responsibility which an older generation imposed. In protest, there is often a tendency to reject all constraint. Yet, we know that the freedom to do as we please morally without any restraint is disastrous.

Whether we like it or not, being human we are possessed of a conscience, of a superego which just will not let us alone. Doing as we please will at some point hurt others and arouse in us a feeling of guilt. Many sorry lives which a counsellor deals with are basically made sick by the attempt to reject the responsibility of moral freedom. In passion, when he gives way to his strong desire and acts faithlessly, he is bedevilled with a sense of wrong doing which will not give him any peace. A man is not just an animal. He is related to others by bonds from which he cannot escape. If he tries to live only by freedom without responsibility, he cannot avoid the suffering which is inevitable. We often resent the dictates of the church, of parents, or of the State when they impose their will upon us. But we cannot run away from that human quality which inside of us insists that we are responsible.

It is axiomatic that when two people get married they take on responsibility. This was made ludicrous once by a college friend who declared that he would never get married because he was not going to buy two tickets every time he went to the movies. If this were the only responsibility we take on in marriage, it would be simple enough. We enter into a union where we must care for the welfare of another, respond to and be responsible for another, suffer painfully when another is troubled and suffering. Let no one underestimate the responsibility which goes with marriage. We do give up some, perhaps, very much of our freedom of action. Yet, never to have loved is, of course, never to have lived. To be sure there are passing moments when freedom from marital responsibility intrigues us. But only for a fleeting moment. Who really wants to be free of love. The mother who lost her child is now free of all the burdens she complained about. She can do as she pleases. No, the best things in life are not free. Freedom without responsibility is anarchy. When it is tried in our personal lives it induces a sickness which crushes our existence. We cannot escape from Pharaoh without binding ourselves voluntarily to serve God.

If we examine our loyalty to democracy, we are again confronted with the inseparable role of freedom and responsibility. We, as a nation, prefer self-government to dictatorship whether beneficent or evil. The founding fathers decided that they did not want George the Third to tell them how to live and what to do. They fought a war, as Patrick Henry put it, because they believed in "give me liberty or give me death." The development of America is the story of gaining rights and freedoms for the individual. The story of women's rights, labor's rights, civil rights, indeed the last hundred years in this land are marked by a steady growth in human liberty.

What frightens some of us is that a corresponding sense of responsibility does not always accompany the achievement of freedom. Both capital and labor want to be free to get all they can for themselves regardless of what is good for the country. Both support lobbies in the Congress to get laws passed which will favor their interests. When the nation faces an imbalance in foreign expenditures, many people resent the appeal of the President that we discipline ourselves in our plans for vacations and holidays outside the country. Only too often we want to be free to do anything we please as citizens of America without sharing in the responsibilities of free democratic life. This is anarchy! We manufacture all kinds of alibis and transform them into passionate rationalizations. But the fact is that we are self-interested and only self-interested. The threats to our democracy are not so much the communist powers abroad nor the few radical agitators at home. If we decline as a nation, it will be because we have tried to exercise freedom without responsibility.

Religion, too, is plagued by the attempt to divorce freedom from responsibility. Most Americans would fight anyone who would deny them the right to worship God as they please. They point with anger to and denounce with passion the enforced atheism in Russia. But we do have the freedom to worship as we please; so, many, very many, choose not to worship at all. As far as they are concerned, religion can disappear. They do not feel responsible. The religious liberal is in a particularly embarrassing situation. He has won freedom from superstitions of the past and from dogmas which are inconsistent with his intelligence. He is free to seek the truth about God. Instead he uses his freedom to live with God, to disregard the meaning of God in human existence. The consequences of his irresponsibility do not trouble him.

If there is no God, then we face a serious issue of morality. In a universe where there is no meaning to anything, where a human life is no more signficant to it than a cockroach or a flint, why should men do good and not evil. To be sure we may opportunistically or pragmatically live by rules we call good or ethical. But if tomorrow it pays to be dishonest, then dishonesty becomes the rule we choose. The point is that the acceptance of a view of life in which God is either dead or does not exist can end nowhere but anarchy. If God is not, then we are free of Him, free to do as we please, free to do as we please not to do. Let the trend go as it is now going and in time a generation will grow up which will be altogether free of God. Men will be their own gods. Here truly is the most frightful prospect of all. Men who act like gods and free to do as they please without any responsibility.

There is great need for us to dethrone Pharaoh wherever he exists. We must achieve more personal freedom, more social liberty, more religious independence. Being human, we are born to be free. Being human, however, we are born with a need to respond, to be responsible for our freedom. We cannot be whole and healthy unless we face realistically both our freedom and our responsibility.

Admit Victims of Earthquake in Sicily Into the United States

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today the Immigration Subcommittee, chaired by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, opened hearings on legislation to permit the immediate admission into the United States of victims of the recent earthquake disaster in Sicily. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this important legislation to grant refuge relief to these homeless and impoverished people.

Heart-stirring testimony was submitted to the committee by Mr. Domenic V. Florio, speaking for Mr. Fortune Pope, editor of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, America's leading Italian daily; Mr. Michael Rivisto, deputy supreme venerable, Order of Sons of Italy in America; and by Rev. Joseph A. Cogo, executive secretary of the American Committee on Italian Migration.

Following is the statement of Mr. Fortune Pope, which Mr. Florio presented to the committee:

STATEMENT BY FORTUNE R. POPE, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER, IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO, FEBRUARY 21, 1968

(Represented and submitted by Mr. Domenic V. Florio, assistant to the publisher)

On February 8, 1968, the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Chairman of the Sub-Committee, wrote to me and asked me to voice an appraisal of the situation in Sicily as it relates to the legislation presently being considered by this Sub-Committee, which is primarily designed to furnish some relief to the unfortunate refugees who have been displaced in Sicily, Italy, as a result of a natural calamity which took its form in the shape of an earthquake.

In response to the Chairman's invitation, I am pleased to present my views, which I would have preferred to do in person but will not be able to, much to my regret. However, I am confident that you will consider my statement in the course of your deliberation as representing the sentiments of the vast majority of the American Community of Italian Ancestry in the United States.

I wish to support the proposed bills because they are in the highest tradition of our great country which has always stretched out a helping hand to the unfortunate victims of natural calamity which have uprooted them and caused them untold suffering.

I am sure that the Chairman knows that there is precedent for this type of legislation born of the compassionate understanding of our people and our lawmakers. The Congress expressing the will of the people rose to the occasion in 1958 when a similar disaster struck the Azores Islands and enacted legislation to permit 1500 Portuguese citizens and their children displaced by an earthquake to enter the United States on special non-quota visas.

We applauded that tangible act of mercy which brought some measure of relief to those stricken people underscoring once more the humanitarian spirit of the American people.

Again, a volcanic calamity has fallen upon a people bound to us by time-tested and time-honored friendship.

It has taken 129 lives in the Province of Trapani, 105 in the Province of Agrigento and one in the Province of Palermo making a total of 235 known dead;

It has left in its wake 419 people wounded in the Province of Trapani, 197 in the Province of Agrigento and 15 in the Province of Palermo for a total of 625 wounded people;

It has made 45 orphans in the Province of Trapani, 10 in the Province of Agrigento and 2 in the Province of Palermo for a total of 57 orphaned children;

It has left homeless 33,850 in the Province of Trapani, 13,213 in the Province of Agrigento and 16,075 in the Province of Palermo for a total of 63,138 homeless people;

It has destroyed 7,918 homes in the Province of Trapani, 884 in the Province of Agrigento and 78 in the Province of Palermo for a total of 8,880 crushed homes;

It has left dangerously damaged 10,960 homes in the Province of Trapani, 994 in the Province of Agrigento and 1,971 in the Province of Palermo for a total of 13,931 damaged homes;

And it has destroyed factories and other industries as a result of which it has left unemployed 4,000 in the Province of Trapani, 5,161 in the Province of Agrigento and 5,250 in the Province of Palermo for a total of unemployed men of 14,311.

The damage in the Province of Trapani is approximately $265,000,000;

The damage in the Province of Agrigento is approximately $130,000,000;

The damage in the Province of Palermo is approximately $43,000,000;

Making a total in excess of $435,000,000.

Obviously, their plight is heartbreaking and their need of assistance great and impelling.

I am certain that I voice the feelings and hopes of all Americans of Italian origin in their appeal for aid to their friends and relatives across the sea.

We have received thousands of letters from readers of Il Progresso Italo-Americano—the largest and only daily newspaper in the

Italian language in the United States—supporting the passage of this legislation proposed by your distinguished Chairman and several other outstanding members of your honorable body.

As I understand it, this proposed legislation when enacted into law will permit the issuance of special visas to these distressed aliens outside any ceiling on immigration with the understanding that prospective immigrants benefiting from this proposed legislation will still have to fulfill the eligibility qualifications for entry in the United States under the present law as to health, good character and so forth.

Since this is the ultimate objective of the proposed legislation, I should like to suggest that a preference be given to the natives of Sicily for whom visa petitions already have been filed but have not been admitted to the United States because of the numerical limitations due to a backlog under the 5th preference of about 60,000 people of whom at least 27,000 live on the area affected by the earthquake.

May I point out that many of these 27,000 people are also close relatives of United States citizens and, therefore, the proposed legislation not only will bring immediate assistance to the victims of the quake but will reunite families, thus, reaffirming one of the objectives of the immigration reforms enacted into law by President Johnson at the foot of the Statue of Liberty on October 3, 1965.

I respectfully urge this Committee to put its authoritative stamp of approval on this most urgently needed legislation, which in effect, will be to voice the compassionate and humanitarian feelings which the American people have traditionally had for victims and unfortunate persons, when suffering has come through an act of God.

I also invite the attention of the House to the splendid statement submitted by Mr. Michael Rivisto, as follows:

AID SICILIAN EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

(Testimony of Michael A. Rivisto, the Supreme National Deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America, February 21, 1968)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Michael A. Rivisto, the Supreme National Deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America. I speak here today in behalf of the International head of the Order Sons of Italy in America Supreme Venerable Peter J. Bertoglio. We recommend to this Honorable Committee the enactment into law of House Bill 14808 as proposed by Congressman Peter Rodino which provides for the issuance of 2,000 special immigrant visas to Italian citizens whose homes were destroyed and their means of livelihood torn from them by the tragic earthquake which convulsed Sicily in January of this year.

The heart of America was touched by the stories of destruction which struck Gibellina, Montevago, Santa Ninfa, and Darpanna, plus many villages and part of the city of Palermo, and I have every reason to believe that America wishes to assist in any manner it can those who have suffered and continue to suffer as the result of the earthquake.

The Order Sons of Italy in America is convinced that all Americans would approve of this legislation which would accomplish much in alleviating the terrible suffering which still goes on in the devastated areas of Sicily. Not only have populations been deprived of their homes, but the cruel workings of the earthquake have wrested from thousands the means whereby they could help to restore what has been taken away. Many of these victims are men with great skill as artisans and therefore would fit excellently into the American industrial program which includes construction and agricultural enterprises.

The admittance into the United States of these Italian immigrants with their families could in no way adversely affect the economy of America, but, on the contrary, would advance that economy because Italian workmen are universally known for their dedication to toil, their eagerness to work, and their natural pride in work well done. And, I am sure that the members of this Committee know, from their own observation and experience that Italian workmen adapt easily to their environment and become excellent American citizens.

Approval of this bill would be another indication of the great humanity of America, ever ready to assist, where it can, those who, through no fault of their own, have been subjected to suffering, depradation and want.

We have opened our doors to victims of political persecution. We should be willing to provide asylum for those who have been victimized by natural calamity which can at times be as cruel and devastating as political despotism.

If and when passed, House Bill 14808 could be so administered that priority could be given to those persons who have already been processed and are beneficiaries of preference petitions. This would help to lessen some of the pressure built up by the backlog of those seeking visas.

It is the desire of America to build up good will in all parts of the world. We are spending billions to accomplish that end, all looking toward that kind of understanding among all peoples and among all nations, which will lead eventually to a world of peace. Nothing makes the world kin more than kindness. The world knows of the Sicilian earthquake, the world knows also of the vast suffering in the devastated areas, let the world know that America has not been appealed to in vain in behalf of suffering humanity. The passage of this bill will be a good deed, the excellent results of which will be appreciated and applauded wherever men of good will meet to discuss the state of the world with the advancement of mankind.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of appearing before this Honorable Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Congress will act with dispatch to meet this critical need.

Howard K. Smith—Responsible Columnist

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, February 18, the Washington Evening Star carried what will be the distinguished columnist Howard K. Smith's last article for some time.

Mr. Smith has been known for many years as a political gadfly. His ideas and opinions have often sought to destroy "sacred cows" and in the process have upset many an applecart.

Many of us have been disturbed from time to time by Mr. Smith's articles and television commentaries either because we discovered a troubling truth or wholly disagreed with his conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smith's last column needs no comment. It is the powerful and persuasive statement of a man who, above all else, has always been a courageous seeker of truth. The column from the Sunday Star follows:

A POORLY BALANCED DIET OF JOURNALISM

(By Howard K. Smith)

With regret I have decided to make this my last column for a while. The reason for interrupting this series may serve as a closing comment on the times.

In several past periods—notably in the years around our entry into World War II—I had the exhilarating feeling of being a tiny part in a great age of journalism. I miss that feeling now. Though there are many exceptions, I believe too many reporters today are not rising to the demands of a time that calls for the especially perceptive reporting and especially judicious interpretation of events. I believe that a big contributing factor to the confusion and frustration now damaging the nation's spirit is the poorly balanced diet of journalism it is getting.

A ready example is the elevation of Stokely Carmichael into a real force in our nation. The similar elevation of Joe McCarthy a generation back was bad enough; but at least he was a U.S. Senator one could not ignore. Mr. Carmichael is basically a nobody who, before the press took notice of him, had achieved nothing and represented no one. He failed to win a following—except from us with our cameras and note pads—in the rural south and in the city ghettos. Exclusively due to the prominence given him by journalism he has now been promoted into a factor to be reckoned with.

"If I say no to Stokely," a rights leader told me recently, "you fellows won't print it in one sentence on the back page. My people think I am doing nothing. But if I go see him, it's on the front page and my people think I am in there pitching."

In the realm of government, the reporters' term "credibility gap" is one of the most distorting over-simplifications of the time. The President is dealing with unutterably complex situations in which the very fact on which to base judgment may not be in for weeks; yet we tend to call it calculated deception if he does not instantly provide conclusive facts and admit failure. He is dealing with situations subject to rapid and drastic change, calling for highly flexible response; but if he does not keep a frozen consistency, he is held to be lying. No government ever has been run that way and none ever will.

This writer finds the role of defending established authority, after a career made up mostly of dissent, uncomfortable. But the criticism of Mr. Johnson has long since burst the bounds of legitimacy and even often of decency. To cite a random example, I find it hard to adjust to the suggestion of a famous TV commentator the other day that it is becoming easier to believe an Oriental tyrant (Ho Chi Minh) than it is to believe the President of the U.S. That commenator has simply not kept up with the statements of the Oriental tyrant, who insists no North Vietnamese troops have ever been in South Vietnam and who states that 150,000 Americans have been killed in the war.

The Vietnam war itself offers a cluster of troubling examples. Consider as one tiny but typical example the space, attention and incitement to protest allowed the photo the other day of an overwrought South Vietnamese officer executing a Vietcong. The Vietcong had just murdered many of the officer's men, and was out of uniform and therefore subject to execution. Not even a perfunctory acknowledgment was made of the fact that such executions, en masse, are the Vietcong way of war: my son witnessed the execution by the Communists of a dozen American soldiers—in uniform—in the same way. He was permitted to remain a witness because he was so bloody and paralyzed by his wounds that the Communists thought him dead and not worth a bullet.

Some journalists of the present time are dreadfully wrong. And the thought has not escaped me that I may be one of them. So, I have decided to take time off from regular comment, ask questions and study documents, steep myself in the facts of the dispiriting sixties, and make sure. I hope to put the conclusions into a book. I am very grateful to Publishers-Hall Syndicate and the newspapers that have carried this column. After a while I shall be knocking on their doors and asking space again.

Senator Birch Bayh Sponsors Third Annual Indiana High School Government Leadership Conference

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1968, Senator BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, sponsored his third annual Indiana High School Government Leadership Conference. The conference, involving about 1,500 students and teachers from all over the State of Indiana was held at Ben Davis High School in Indianapolis.

Panel members included Mrs. Marietta Tree, America's first woman Ambassador to the United Nations; Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Lewis W. Walt; retiring Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner; and Mr. Fern C. Stukenbroeker, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I was fortunate in having the opportunity to visit Senator BAYH's conference not only because I found it educational, but because of the enthusiastic and nonpartisan participation of the huge throng of idealistic high school students, I found the experience refreshingly inspirational.

If anybody wants to be reminded of what there is to live for in America, he should attend one of Senator BAYH's High School Government Leadership Conferences.

Also inspiring were the words of Senator BAYH as he opened the conference. He said:

> We are living in a time when technological advance is challenging our ability to maintain a moral and ethical balance.
>
> While man has lived with the cruelty and tragedy of war since time began, he now watches war every night on his television screen.
>
> We are living in a time when there is violence abroad and violence in our cities. We are witnessing a divisiveness in the world and a divisiveness among our own people.
>
> Our problems will not disappear by wishing them away. It will take imagination, effort and money—not only by your parents, but also by you who are students in high school today.
>
> Poverty is no more or less tragic today because we are able to observe it firsthand. Observing it should make even deeper our commitment to abolish it. But, we must never forget that in our heritage, the means used to attack a problem are not necessarily justified by the ends to be achieved. Violence, looting and burning cannot be justified. Indeed, they cannot be helpful to anybody or any problem. But neither can we turn away from the root problems that caused a misguided few to resort to such drastic action. The problems remain, and they must be solved.
>
> Like all generations before, we are trying to leave with the next generation—with each of you—a world that is better than it was when we found it. History will be the judge of our success or failure. But in order for there to be any hope of our success, you must resolve now that the American dream will not die; you must resolve now that you will devote at least a portion of your lives to serving your fellow man; you must resolve now that you will do what you can to strengthen freedom, eliminate want, provide challenging opportunity, and search for the answer to the eternal problem of neighbor living with neighbor in harmony and mutual respect.

News Molders

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Meir Kahane's column, "A Small Voice," from the February 2 Jewish Press presents a concise argument of what has happened to far too much of our news media today.

To follow a premise that a government of men destroys its credibility because of errors of a few is the height of intellectual inferiority. Perhaps, best shown by vengeance in placing any believability in another government that has a record of never having uttered a completely true statement.

Mr. Kempton stands judged by his own admission.

I include Mr. Kahane's column as follows:

A SMALL VOICE

(By Meir Kahane)

> Murray Kempton is a syndicated columnist who has, for years, substituted quips for honesty; cynical digs for responsible and sober journalism and emotional broadsides for rational thinking. One has suffered him in silence but every man has his breaking point. Vis-a-vis Kempton, mine has arrived.
>
> On January 24, Kempton wrote of his pain and embarrassment in having to state that "I cannot believe anything my government says about the Pueblo." One is, of course, tempted to rejoin that such a statement coming from the government concerning Kempton might be more acceptable to a great many people. In any event, Kempton continued and declared that, since the government "lied" to the people about the Gary Powers U2 incident and about the use of American planes to aid the Cuban rebels in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and about the Tonkin Gulf incident—he must assume that it also lies about the Pueblo being outside the territorial waters of North Korea. In his best Kemptonism, he ends by stating: "Thus, on the Pueblo, I believe North Korea. I don't remember it having lied to me lately."
>
> I do not know what Kempton means by "lately." He may of course go as far back as June 25, 1950 when, at 1335 hours, Premier Kim Il Sung of North Korea (in the manner of most Communist despots he still rules that unhappy land today) broadcast a declaration that South Korea "having rejected every Northern proposal for peaceful reunification, has crowned its iniquity by launching an invasion force across the (38th) parallel," thus starting the Korean war.
>
> Kempton may indeed believe that the South Koreans began that war despite overwhelming United Nations evidence to the contrary. He may indeed, since North Korea has not "lied to me lately."
>
> Or perhaps Kempton concedes that the Communists were liars then. If so, perhaps "lately" refers to 1951 when the famous North Korean and Chinese charges of United States germ warfare began to sprout daily from Pyongyang. On May 8, these paragons of honesty who would not lie to Kempton sent a message to the U.N. General Assembly protesting against "the use of bacteriological weapons by the U.S. forces to spread smallpox." A reasonable charge.
>
> Indeed, Kempton may even acknowledge such well-known North Korean truths as the cable sent from Pyongyang to the UN on June 29 of that year protesting the "criminal United States and South Korean acts" in "abducting large numbers" of Koreans and "slaughtering these people."
>
> On the other hand, the court jester for the New York Post may concede certain exaggerations during the Korean War period. "Later," may, therefore, mean "much later." In 1964 the North Korean government issued a pamphlet called "South Of The Military Demarcation Line." One doubts if Kempton ever saw it. In it, the men from North Korea for whom Diogenes searched so valiantly, wrote: "In South Korea everything has come under the thumb of the Americans and the popular masses have been condemned to slavery, their misery defying all description."
>
> One is moved to question how such a colony demanded that American soldiers, stationed in Korea, be tried by Korean law and forced the United States to acquiesce or how United States government officials went hat in hand to Korea to plead for more help in Vietnam. But these questions may be irrelevant or naive. Kempton may have his own answers in defense of the truth of the above statement.
>
> Or did Kempton refer to the past year, 1967, when nearly 600 acts of terror, sabotage and infiltration took place according to United States and South Korean forces and which culminated in an attack on the Presidential palace in Seoul. All the attacks were denied by the North or were excused as "self defense measures," and on the very day of the attempted assassination of South Korean President Chung Hee Park, North Korea was busily denouncing President Johnson as a "war maniac" and a "murderer" who planned to set off a new Korean war.
>
> Finally, Kempton may choose to believe the "confession" of Comdr. Lloyd Bucher, noted for its Annapolis English and its obviously correct description of the Central Intelligence Agency promise that "a lot of dollars would be offered to the whole crew of my ship."
>
> Kempton may believe all this. Who knows? He has proven his assininity in the past. Never before quite as baldly, it is true, but clearly. From Pyongyang and other Communist points, East and West, they are—between belly laughs—saluting Murray Kempton today.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 30th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Strengthening Counties in the Empire State

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, some of the most thoughtful observers of the American scene today are giving serious consideration to the problems of our cities and our rural areas, especially to intergovernmental relationships within each State. As our cities grow older and our suburbs expand, our problems have been brought into sharp relief. Consequently, it is heartening to see open, serious discussions of these problems take place. In my own State of New York, as in most other dynamic States, traditional roles and relationships of political subdivisions are being questioned and challenged, in an effort to make local government more efficient and more responsive to the needs of the people.

One commentary which deserves the attention of every citizen, regardless of his views, is the thought-provoking article in the February 1968, issue of Metropolitan Viewpoints, published by the Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York.

The commentary follows:

STRENGTHENING COUNTIES IN THE EMPIRE STATE

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, National Association of Counties)

During the past two decades since the end of World War II, it seems to us that in our passionate quest to form the necessary machinery to solve our urban and rural problems we have been wasting our time chasing movie queens and glamour girls such as metropolitan government, special authorities, and jet age imagery of some new superstructure for megalopolis.

We should have been pursuing the grand old county. We who love her know that she has many shortcomings. We also know that she has been around for a great long time and that in sickness and in health, she is a steady performer. Given some decent care and attention and respect, she is, by all odds, the hottest prospect for long range governmental bliss.

VIRTUES OF THE COUNTY

The county offers five major governmental virtues that are indispensable to long life in the new atomic age:

I. Broad tax base. The county obviously has the broadest tax base of any general purpose subdivision of the state. This means that a new business or industry is taxable by the county whether it is located in the central city slum, the suburban area, or in a rural setting. By the same token a welfare recipient is eligible for help by the county welfare department regardless of where in the county he lives. This virtue of financial stability will become more and more valuable as we proceed into more complex, and hence more costly, local government programs such as mental health, urban and rural renewal, and jet age transportation systems. All of us are painfully aware of the enormous financial disparities between our downtown central city areas—peopled increasingly by minority groups, the aged, and the desperately poor—and the suburban areas peopled increasingly by the more well-to-do, the more highly educated, and those with larger incomes. All of us have been alarmed by the long range prospects for democratic government inherent in the present situation of having the central city resident alienated from his suburban cousin and looking to a direct central city-federal relation as a solution to his problems. We need to put America back together again at the local government level, and the county structure which encompasses all of the people of the area is the logical place to accomplish this.

II. Area-wide Jurisdiction. The county has jurisdiction in rural, suburban, and central city areas. This virtue is going to be increasingly important as we progress into the area of stricter public regulation. The county is quite obviously the logical unit to enact, administer, and enforce regulatory functions such as building and housing codes, sanitation codes, control of junk yards and billboards, and the all-important programs of regulating waste disposal including air, water, and solid waste control programs.

III. Economy of Scale. One observer put it very succinctly when he said "the county was designed to handle those problems which are too big for the smaller cities and townships and too small for state administration and too dangerous to democracy to be administered directly by the federal government." We might call this virtue the "economy of scale." In this highly technological age, we are going to have to turn increasingly to the county as the unit large enough to provide data processing, mental health out-patient programs, technical schools and community colleges, urban and rural renewal programs, public health programs, and other programs that are beyond the capacity of the welter of smaller jurisdictions to manage.

IV. Closer Ties with the State and Federal Government. Historically the county was created as a local administrative office for the day to day management of state-wide programs such as record keeping, administration of justice, elections, law enforcement, local road administration, and other governmental functions. The federal government, too, has made very extensive use of the county as a local administrative unit for federal-state-local partnership programs. Thus, the county has been a principal administrative unit for the nation's agricultural program, large portions of the national public welfare program, and, to a very significant degree, the nation's federal-aid highway program.

We have witnessed a really spectacular increase in the number of national partnership programs with states and localities. Depending upon whose enumeration you wish to use, there are in existence up to four hundred federal grant-in-aid programs available to states and localities. In addition, progressive states such as New York have added a great number of state aid programs for their localities.

There seems to be no immediate prospects of any diminution of federal or state grant-in-aid programs; in point of fact, they appear to be increasing. Therefore, the county with its long history of these federal-state program relations offers a very fine vehicle indeed to administer and coordinate these programs at the local level.

In point of fact, the federal government, as a matter of policy, has encouraged wider use of the county by offering incentive grants for county-wide or area-wide solutions to problems such as open space development. It also has used the stick approach to force wider use of the area-wide or county-wide approach in such programs as mass transit, highway transportation, and planning.

It is obviously much easier for the federal government and the states to deal administratively with our three thousand and forty-three counties than it is to deal separately with the welter of more than ninety-five thousand cities, towns, villages, and special taxing districts. It is also obviously easier to coordinate a federal-state-local program such as highway construction at the area-wide or county-wide level.

V. Political Accountability. The county is the basic unit of the two major American political parties. In every state except Alaska, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, each citizen regardless of his economic status, his residence within the country, or his other allegiance to smaller jurisdictions still elects representatives to the county governing body, pays taxes to the county government, and is in all respects served by and governed by his county government. Therefore, if administration of a hospital, for example, is transferred from the city within the county to the county proper, the local citizen does not lose his local control over this function. In point of fact, while it has received much less attention than the more spectacular county reorganization such as in Dade and Davidson counties, the spectacular growth of county government in the United States has come about on the basis of this function-by-function transfer of authority and responsibility from the smaller units of government to the county. Since these transfers do not involve changing political arrangements or traditional patterns or relationships, they have by and large been well received by the public and have in many instances solved metropolitan problems without a lot of fuss and fanfare.

Americans are very justly proud of their deep-seated distrust of any interference with their political control over government, and there seems to be relatively little opposition to the expansion of county services that become too costly and complex for the smaller units of government. A service such as airport development which is provided for all of the people in the area quite logically should be administered by the county which represents all of the people in the area and also taxes all of the people in the area.

COUNTY REORGANIZATION

The general advantages of county government in dealing with urban and rural problems as just enumerated apply in full measure to county government in New York State. Being a native New Yorker, I have always been proud that county government in the Empire State always has been among the most progressive of county governments in the whole country. In all candor, however, it must be admitted that county government must have some redirection and reemphasis if it is to reach its full usefulness for present and future generations of New Yorkers.

What follows is, for the most part, an enumeration of the policies of the National Association of Counties with respect to ways and means of strengthening county government generally. The specific observations and comments relative to these areas of general, national, county policy are the author's.

I. Residual Powers. Counties should have home rule. By this we mean that county governments within the framework of reasonable state-wide standards should have the authority and responsibility to undertake and finance those programs and services that are desired by the voters of the county or their representatives.

The National Association of Counties strongly has supported the idea of "residual home rule powers." By this we mean that the constitution should allow counties to undertake any function not specifically prohibited by the state legislature. The constitutions of Alaska and Massachusetts have provisions for residual home rule.

The draft constitution for the state of Maryland now under review by the delegates to the Maryland Constitutional Convention expresses the doctrine this way:

"Section 707. Powers of Counties.

"A county may exercise any power, other than judicial power, or perform any function which is not denied to it by this constitution, by its charter or by a public general law which in its terms and in its effects is applicable to all counties or to all counties of the county's class, and which has not been transferred exclusively to another governmental unit."

This type of home rule in the New York constitution would vastly simplify the complex arrangement by which counties now have to appeal piecemeal to the Legislature for enabling legislation to undertake to perform services or administer functions desired by their citizens. It is the hope of those who support this approach to home rule that the vast amount of special legislation which so absorbs the time of state legislators at each session can be avoided.

II. Remove Constitutional Debt Limits. Strict constitutional debt limits imposed upon the states and their political subdivisions, in the opinion of many observers of the government scene, have caused infinitely more harm than benefit. The plain fact is that these ham-stringing restrictions have forced local officials to improvise a vast host of ingenious devices to avoid these limitations, not the least of which is the revenue bond financed authority.

In some states, though not in New York State, these authorities were created to avoid the constitutional debt limit. In some areas, they are created to perform an administrative chore when the general structure of county government is in such disarray that the new function cannot reasonably be placed within the framework of existing county government. Generally speaking, these authorities are coterminous with an existing city, county, or other general-purpose unit of government. They have a separate governing body that is not directly accountable to the public through the election process. They inevitably have separate taxing and bonding authority which for a whole host of reasons escapes effective control by the citizens and the duly constituted elected city and county officials. By and large, these authorities carry on a single-purpose function with little or no regard whatsoever for its relationship with other functional areas that are affected by their activity.

As of this writing, there are in the United States some 18,323 special authorities, a number which exceeds the total number of municipalities—17,997 municipalities.

III. Subordinate Taxing Areas. It has long been a fundamental tenet of county government that it could not provide other than a uniform level of services for all of the people in the county. If the county is to respond to the problems of its citizens, it must have authority to create subordinate taxing areas. In other words, if the county is to respond to a problem such as water pollution control, it should have the authority to create a special taxing district in an area where people need sewage collection and treatment.

Perhaps the best known, and in many respects the most effective, application of the idea of a subordinate taxing area is in Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee. Here everyone who lives in Davidson County is taxed at a basic rate to provide county-wide services such as education, administration of justice, record keeping, and similar general government services. Those who live in a highly urbanized area, however, are included in what is called an *urban service district* and in exchange for an additional tax levied on top of the general tax they receive special services such as street lighting, fire protection, increased police protection, and other urban services.

In many places throughout the counties the rash of incorporations of units that are really too small to enjoy vigorous long life was caused by the fact that the county did not have the authority, or did not want the authority in some cases, to provide basic services at a differential tax rate.

IV. Inter-Local Agreements. New York State has been a leader in providing its cities, counties, and townships with the authority to make interlocal agreements or transfer of functions. This very progressive idea should certainly be incorporated in the constitution of the State.

It would seem to us that the goal for a constitution should be to allow maximum local discretion for political subdivisions to solve their own problems in a sensible and businesslike way. In my native County of Onondaga, for example, we have witnessed over the years gradual expansion of the role of the County to meet the needs of all its citizens. Starting during the depression days, the County assumed responsibility for public welfare. The next function that was made county-wide was civil service. During the war period, the County assumed responsibility for civil defense and in the post-war era took over responsibility for major portions of water pollution control. Recently, there was a consolidation of the health function into an Onondaga County public health program.

The idea is to create a system of government which will allow cities, counties, towns, and other units of government to enter into agreements, make contracts for services, jointly finance projects, lend each other technical assistance and equipment, exchange land, provide services under joint exercise of power, and in general to have the same kinds of leeway in dealing with other units of government that businesses presently enjoy in dealing with other businesses in the field of private activity.

Wider use of this approach to government could help in attacking such controversial problems as police protection. There certainly is a great deal of resistance and nervousness on the part of the citizen to any idea of consolidating police departments. There are, however, a great number of things short of consolidation that can be done to help correct the problems of fragmented police effort in urban and rural areas. For example, in communities with twenty or thirty separate police departments the wider use of the types of authority we have just discussed would permit the establishment of a central communication system, central training facilities, common record keeping, uniform central crime laboratory, and even such specialized services as metropolitan detective squads and similar multi-jurisdictional programs.

Again, it is in these areas of cooperation that we have seen the greatest expanse of activity at the county government level. In point of fact, the counties since 1957 have added more than three hundred and fifty-thousand new employees, and the greatest number of these are engaged in performing services in functions that have been shifted to the county or mandated to the county by the state legislature in the past decade.

V. Counties and Townships. It would appear to many of us that regardless of its early advantages the present system of having the township supervisor sit on the county government governing body now has outlived its usefulness. This is in no way to downgrade the ability, dedication, or conscientiousness of township supervisors. Likewise, it is in no way a criticism of township government per se.

In our association we deal daily with township supervisors on county government problems, and they are very hardworking and dedicated men. The fault is not in the men or in townships per se, but in the idea of having the fulltime township executive serving on the governing body of the county. The county must have its own separate governing body over and above the governing of the township supervisors. Increasingly the county must provide the leadership in housing, urban renewal, poverty programs, park and recreation activities, water pollution control, and other highly complex and involved programs. It deserves a governing body of its own.

Unfortunately, for a whole lot of very logical and honorable reasons, the township supervisors consider that one of their functions on the county governing body is to protect their town citizens from activities by the county government. Their principal concern, very properly, is the affairs of their own township. They do not have the time to devote to county-wide problems, and they should be freed from them.

Parallel to this, it is wonderfully encouraging to report the exciting new trend for charter counties in New York State to turn to the elective county executive for overall executive leadership. This absence of central executive authority at the county government level probably has been responsible for more misunderstanding of the county government on the part of the citizen than anything else. Whether we believe this is desirable or not, the plain fact is that at the city level, citizens tend to identify with the mayor, at the state level with the governor, and at the national level with the President. In the past the absence of a comparable single executive head at the county government level has caused many people to be needlessly confused about the operation of their county government. They have not really understood how vital the county is to their own future.

Once these elected county executives are in office, then I think we are going to find that many of the other administrative reforms associated with progressive government will fall quickly into place.

VI. County Planning. One of the very difficult problems that must be met is the allocation of responsibility for planning. The new laws in the State of New York expanding the role of county government as a planning unit are certainly a step in the right direction. It is becoming more and more apparent that planning is going to have to be a local-state-federal partnership. Increasingly, we are going to ask the federal government to establish standards and make overall plans for multi-state problems such as air pollution and water pollution control. These plans in turn must mesh with regional plans at the state level and, finally, they must fit into some area-wide concept at the county level. The State of New York is progressing in the right direction in its recent moves to strengthen the county as the coordination agency for local planning and control.

VII. Councils of Governments. New York State is fortunate in that, with the exceptions of the Erie County region and the New York City region, most of the metropolitan areas of the State are encompassed in a single county. This may not always be the case, and it may be desirable to include in the Constitution provisions which will facilitate cities, counties, and other units of government banding together in a voluntary council of governments (COG). The council of governments could serve area-wide needs when the area spills across more than a single county. Here the important thing is that the council be voluntary, that it be controlled by elected municipal and county officials, and that its authority and responsibility be carefully prescribed in the framework of the duties and responsibilities of its constituent local governments.

Abraham Lincoln—The Workingman President

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this Nation last week observed the birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, one of our greatest Presidents, and one of the most outstanding persons in the history of mankind.

In recent years there has been a growing tendency to equate the memory of Abraham Lincoln with conservatism and all the things that word has come to signify.

The truth is that Abraham Lincoln was a liberal, in philosophy and in action. For example, he was one of the first major public figures in American history to speak out for the rights of organized labor.

This little-known fact was featured in the February edition of the Boilermakers-Blacksmiths Record, monthly publication of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers—AFL-CIO.

I include this interesting and timely article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—THE WORKINGMAN PRESIDENT

After listening to the annual Lincoln Birthday orations, it becomes a patriotic duty once more to join in rescuing the spirit of the Great Emancipator from the crusade to enshrine him as the patron saint of conservatism.

One of the best ways a labor paper can aid in this rescue, it seems to us, is to recall a big point so regularly overlooked in all the oratory that so piously invokes Lincoln's name so largely for the wrong purposes.

That point—and it's not exacty one of history's secrets—is that Abraham Lincoln was one of the nation's first major public figures to take a positive stand in support of organized labor.

High on the "Fact Sheet" we'd like to give to orators for their Lincoln Day speeches is the fact that one of Lincoln's first stands behind labor was taken during a newspaper strike. In his great biography of Lincoln, Carl Sandburg says of it:

"In St. Louis, when newspaper printers went on strike, General Rosecrans detailed soldiers to take the place of the strikers. The union printers sent a note to Lincoln on their side of the case. And . . . the President sent word that the servants of the federal government should not interfere with the legitimate demands of labor—and the strike-breaking soldiers were withdrawn."

And why don't the birthday orators recall these words of Lincoln, uttered on another occasion:

"Thank God we live in a country where the workingman has the right to strike!"

And how come the eminent speakers don't ever remember to quote these memorable lines of the Rail Splitter:

"Capital is the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not existed first."

"Workingmen are the basis of all governments."

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds."

More Catholic Priests Against the War

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, daily more clergymen are speaking out against the Vietnam war. Recently 174 Catholic priests, including two seminary directors, published a statement in the Chicago Daily News asking for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam and immediate peace negotiations in the war. It is believed that this is the first time the priests of a single diocese in the country have tried to stimulate a local stand against our national policy toward Southeast Asia.

The statement was sponsored by a peace subcommittee of the Association of the Chicago Priests, a professional organization which represents the 3,000 clergymen in the Nation's largest Catholic congregation. The ACP negotiates directly with John Cardinal Cody on policies. These priests are planning a spring seminar on the question of the war for the Chicago clergy where the ethical and moral implications of peace and war will be taken up.

We ought to pay attention to what the spiritual leaders of our country are saying. They will caution the American people about being led down a trail that is blazed with immoral action.

We of this Congress should make every effort to steer our country's policies away from those which earn the condemnation of our own citizens for doing what is immoral.

With unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the statement by the 174 Catholic priests:

PRIESTS FOR BOMBING HALT

". . . Many voices come to us asking us to urge one belligerent to suspend the bombings. We have done this and we will do it again in the name of those unarmed persons who, however involuntarily, are victims of such military actions. But at the same time we again invite the other belligerent also . . . to give a sign of serious desire for peace. . . . Let violence of whatever shape cease. We are certain that the final goal to be pursued should not be an oppressive victory but safety, peace and freedom for all. Frank and sincere negotiation is in fact the only constructive path toward a real peace. . . ." (12/28/67 Address of Pope Paul VI to Cardinals in Rome)

In support of this recent statement of Pope Paul VI, we, the undersigned Roman Catholic priests in the Chicago Archdiocese and citizens of the United States:

1. Urge President Lyndon Johnson to order an immediate suspension of bombing in North Vietnam, in hopes of encouraging a similar step towards peace by the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese.

2. Urge both sides to pursue sincere negotiations rather than oppressive military victory.

Rev. Eugene C. Ahern, SVD, Rev. Michael J. Adams, Rev. William Alerding, SS, Rev. Joseph Antonik, Rev. Benedict M. Ashley, OP, Rev. Richard Athey, OP, Rev. Joseph E. Auer, Rev. Robert Banzin, Rev. John F. Barlow, Rev. August Belauskas, Rev. Paul J. Beno, Rev. E. Francis Bertrand, MM, Rev. Robert Brodfuehrer, Rt. Rev. Thomas A. Canty, Rev. R. E. Carroll, Rev. William Carroll, Rev. Nicholas A. Carsello, Rev. Francis A. Cimarrusti, Rev. Philip C. Clark, Rev. William Clark, Rev. George Clements, Rev. Robert Chrupka, OSA, Rev. James Corrigan, OSA, Rev. Robert A. Cross, Rev. Daniel J. Daley, Rev. Jay A. Dolan, Rev. Jerome Ducharme, Rev. John Duda, Rev. James J. Duffy, Rev. Gerard Egan, Very Rev. John J. Egan, Rev. Arthur Fagan, Rev. John F. Fahey, Rev. William P. Farrell, OP, Rev. Eugene Faucher, Rev. Joseph Fitzharris, Rev. George Fleming, Rev. Robert J. Fox, SJ, Rev. William E. Foy, Rev. Harold Freyermuth, OSA, Rev. Robert G. Gallie, Rev. Dennis J. Geaney, OSA, Rev. John Gilligan, Rev. Charles Girsch, Rev. Patrick Farrell.

Rev. Raymond Goedert, Rt. Rev. John R. Corman, Rev. George Griskenas, Rev. Edward Hamel, OSA, Rev. Jerome J. Hartmann, Rev. James Hartnett, Rt. Rev. John B. Hayes, Rev. Thomas Heaney, Rev. John E. Hefferan, Rev. James Heffernan, Rev. Martin J. Hegarty, Rev. William Hegerty, SVD, Rev. Donald E. Heidkamp, Rev. Richard H. Heidkamp, Rev. John Hennessey, Very Rev. Geo. A. Herdegen, Rt. Rev. George G. Higgins, Rev. John J. Higgins, Rev. John Hill, Rt. Rev. James D. Hishen, Rev. Michael Hogan, OSA, Rev. William E. Hogan, Rev. Laurence Hoge, CMF, Rev. Ronald Holloway, Rev. John F. Hotchkin, Rev. Donald J. Hughes, Rev. Stephen S. Infantino, Rev. Willard F. Jabusch, Rev. George Kane, Rev. Ted Kawzynski, Rev. Robert Kearns, SSJ, Rev. Laurence Kelly, Rev. William G. Kenneally, Rev. Gerald Kicanas, Rev. James J. Killgallon, Rev. J. T. Knoll, OSA, Rt. Rev. Harry C. Koenig, Rev. Herbert J. Kushne, CSC, Rev. Kilian J. Knittel, Rev. Richard A. Laurick, CSC, Rev. Michael Leach, Rev. Carl Lezak, Rev. F. C. L'Orange, Rev. John A. Sewell, Rev. Peter O'Reilly.

Rev. John R. Lynch, Very Rev. Eugene F. Lyons, Rev. James N. Lyons, Rev. Robert J. Macnamara, Rev. Laurence F. Maddock, Rev. Robert Mahoney, Rev. Daniel Mallette, Rev. Edward Maloney, Rev. Francis J. Maloney, Rev. Christe A. Melone, Rev. Stanley F. Michor, Rev. Thomas V. Millea, Rev. Robert J. Miller, OP, Rev. James L. Mollohan, Rt. Rev. P. J. Molloy, Rev. Edmond J. Moroney, Rev. Richard Morrisroe, Rev. James P. Murphy, Rev. Daniel McCarthy, Rev. James H. McCarthy, Rev. Francis J. McGrath, Rev. John P. McHenry, SVD, Rev. Robert E. McLaughlin, Rev. Francis A. Nickels, Rev. Edward J. Niess, Rev. Charles J. Obie, Rev. Gerald T. O'Brien, Very Rev. Thomas S. Obrycki, Rev. Joseph F. Ognibene, Rev. Geo. L. O'Keefe, O Carm, Rev. Patrick J. O'Malley, Rev. William T. O'Mara, Rev. Charles Osweiler, Rev. William O'Shea, Rev. Paul L. O'Toole, Rev. Eugene Parker, Rev. Francis J. Phelan, Rev. Pius Poff, OFM Conv, Rev. Lawrence Puchalski, OSA, Rt. Rev. John S. Quinn, Very Rev. William J. Quinn, Rev. James A. Quirk, Rev. Thomas J. Raftery, Rev. John C. Rosemeyr, Rev. Alexander J. Rakowski.

Rev. Patrick G. Reardon, Rev. Emmett T. Regan, Rev. Robert A. Reicher, Rev. Jerome Riordan, Rev. John D. Ring, Rev. E. Michael Rochford, Rev. Gerald E. Rogala, Rev. Paul Rosemeyer, Rev. Joseph B. Ruiz, Rev. Edward P. Salmon, Rev. Martin C. Schmidt, Rev. Richard Schoenherr, Rev. John Seidel, Rev. Thomas R. Seitz, Rev. Edmund Siedheckl, Rev. James Singer, OSA, Rev. Jerome S. Siwek, Rev. Edward J. Slattery, Rev. Francis J. Slobig, Rev. Leo M. Spizzirri, Rev. Gregory Sulgit, Rev. Raymond B. Sullivan, Rev. Gail Stahl, OFM, Rev. Robert Swade, Rev. John Szura, OSA, Rev. Joseph S. Thomas, Rev. John E. Tilford, Rev. Thomas A. Tivv, Rev. Charles K. Iodin, Rev. Howard A. Tuite, Rev. Anthony J. Vader, Rev. Andrew T. Valcicak, Rev. William E. Vanecko, Rev. Thomas F. Ventura, Rev. Thaddeus J. Walenga, Rev. David J. Walker, Rev. John Wall, Rev. Raymond J. Webb, Rev. Richard Wheatley, Rev. Richard J. Wojcik, Rev. Raymond Vadron, Rev. Henry Zuba, Rev. Joseph A. Kelly.

Pointing the Way

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the people of Palatka, Fla., have reason to take pride in the fact that they have won recognition in the National Cleanest City Achievement Contest for the fifth year.

I take pride in the local efforts of the citizens of this community in concert with government, civic clubs, and business to improve their city themselves. I think that Palatka points the way for other cities to remove much of the blight from our cities and communities.

The Palatka Daily News presented an editorial January 31, 1968, in which the paper urged the community to continue. It would be well if more communities and their citizens would start.

The editorial follows:

PALATKA'S ACHIEVEMENT

Again Palatka has won recognition in the National Cleanest City Achievement Contest. For the fifth year, this city has gained the distinction of being one of those selected from hundreds of cities all over the country for its effort toward civic beautification, clean-up and improvement.

The importance of this award, which will be presented Feb. 20 in Washington, is not to be treated lightly. Only cities that have shown real achievement in the contest which draws hundreds of entries are singled out for awards.

There are those who might consider this year's award as routine because of past selections; however, Palatkans can be assured that the National Cleanest City Achievement awards are not handed out lightly. Also, hasn't Palatka really been trying seriously for the past five years to improve its appearance? The long list of beautification projects carried out by many clubs, schools and civic groups, and the Civic Beautification Committee, with the help of the City, the County and the State Road Department, are indicative of the desire that the people of Palatka have for a cleaner and more attractive community.

Despite the many efforts of those who have worked throughout any or all of the past five years to improve and beautify Palatka, there is still so much work to be done that no one can afford to rest on whatever laurels the city may receive from the National Cleanest City Achievement Award. Immediately ahead is the annual Azalea Festival, March 8–10, and it is necessary for everyone who cares about our city to begin now to rake, water and tidy up his premises so that visitors can see that Palatka is striving to become a more attractive city.

Land of Opportunity

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, if one listens to some of the black power advocates and other similar extremists, the impression could be received that Negro citizens are making no progress in the struggle for equal rights, greater education and improved economic status. A recent issue of Fortune magazine contains valuable factual information demonstrating that the black power message is false and that the progress of the Negro is both accelerating and encouraging.

The Chicago Tribune issue of February 17, 1968, contains an editorial, based in part on the Fortune magazine article. The Tribune reviews the subject of the Negro citizens' progress. I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and offer it for reproduction as follows:

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

"More Dollars and More Diplomas" is the catchy title of an article in a recent issue of Fortune magazine. In a clear-eyed, fact-filled essay, Edmund K. Faltermayer develops the proposition that American Negroes are making visible economic and social progress more than many people realize.

Faltermayer and nearly everyone else know there is still a long way to go. Census figures show that Negro family incomes are rising significantly—but that the distance below white family incomes has been almost constant in recent years. A gratifying high percentage of Negroes are getting professional and skilled jobs; but Negroes are still concentrated in unskilled occupations.

In terms of general awareness, it is the positive aspect that needs emphasis. The public needs telling that 30 per cent of all Negro families in the country earn more than $7,000 a year, that only about 3 per cent of married Negro men over 20 are unemployed, that among Americans now in the upper 20s Negroes have completed almost as many years of schooling as whites. This is good news that is both good and, for many people, news indeed.

In the same issue, Fortune explores "The New Negro Mood"—"hope mixed with anger, and very aggressive." It reports an attitude-research study made by a New York firm in 13 cities. Findings include such positive results as these: three out of four Negroes feel their condition is better than it was a few years ago; 8 out of 10 think chances of getting good jobs have improved; 7 out of 10 think that their housing prospects are better than they used to be.

Dissatisfaction with the old life and determination that the children should have widened opportunities are as American as any state of mind can be. Not so American was the unlamented servility incompatible with "the new Negro mood" and no longer expected by reasonable men. A small but significant minority of Negroes have become so infected with despair and hatred that they have lost confidence in the possibilities of orderly and peaceful change. The rest of us, both black and otherwise, share the assignment of demonstrating that these Negro extremists are wrong.

American ideals and the health of the American economy alike require that opportunities be open for a constantly increasing proportion of American Negroes to earn still "more dollars and more diplomas" than now.

Latin America's Foundation for Stability

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, no area of the world spends less on armaments than does Latin America. Pride in this enviable achievement cannot, however, be allowed to blind us to a very real threat to the peace and security of the Americas.

Communist Cuba and its allies are today as determined as ever before to sow the seeds of violent revolution throughout our hemisphere. Subversive actions against the free governments of this hemisphere continue to be encouraged and often originated in Havana.

The most effective way to combat the threat of Communist subversion is of course to continue the strong record of achievement compiled by Latin Americans in recent years in the building of stable societies with increasing political freedom and economic strength. The Alliance for Progress testifies to the intentions of the United States and the Latin American governments to continue this record of achievement.

While political and economic progress must be the foundation of our hemisphere's defenses against communism, it is also necessary that the countries of our hemisphere be militarily prepared. The United States must supply what assistance it can, both in arms and training, to the free countries of Latin America if they are to be able to defend themselves against external aggression and internal subversion. To do less would be to invite Communist attacks which could then be effectively countered only by direct intervention of the military forces of other American states including the United States.

The realistic, efficient, effective, and above all proper way to prevent the Communists enlarging their foothold in our hemisphere is to encourage each nation in the hemisphere to develop the political, economic, social, and military viability needed to maintain its own security. In addition, we must continue the strong record of cooperation on the part of all our countries in providing hemispherewide defense against external aggressors through the Organization of American States.

Mr. Speaker, the chief military organ of our hemispherewide mutual security organization is the Inter-American Defense Board. Recently the Ambassador of Argentina to the Organization of American States addressed the Inter-American Defense Board on the occasion of the presentation of a bust of Gen. José de San Martín to the Board.

At the Defense Board's assembly, February 6, the Ambassador, Eduardo Alejandro Roca, delivered an address which underlines the need for continuing military alertness on the part of the American states. I am certain that the Ambassador's speech, which follows, will be of interest to all who are concerned with the security and well-being of our hemisphere:

ADDRESS OF DR. EDUARDO ALEJANDRO ROCA, AMBASSADOR OF ARGENTINA TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, UPON OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE BOARD OF A BUST OF GEN. JOSE DE SAN MARTIN AS A GIFT FROM THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE ARGENTINE ARMED FORCES

So appropriate is this event that there remains little for me to say about the meaning that attaches to the placing of a bust of San Martin—a gift from the highest military organization of the Argentine Republic—in the Conference Room of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Nothing more could appropriately be added to this exact description of this ceremony. Superfluous would be any comment on the symbolism of the act, or the worth of the hero whoce memory we evoke or his mysterious, intriguing historical correlation with the great hero of Venezuela, also memorialized in this room in bronze, or the way in which the Board to which you belong represents the military aspect of our nations' lives.

Accordingly, I shall add to the act of presentation only brief observations suggested by the nature of the event.

Firstly, finding ourselves in quarters that belong to the American nations, and speaking as we are of two of its great military leaders, justice demands that today we recall how much this Continent owes to its armed forces.

It was in the devoted struggle to put an end to colonial subjection, the passion of which still colors our temperaments, that the nations and the armed forces together were born.

The mere memory of Bolivar recalls to us that the War of Independence from its very beginnings, was waged in the full understanding that it was being done not on behalf of a utopian Ibero-American nation, nonexistent as the realistic political unity, but rather of all the complete nations that underlay the structure of Spanish America. The mere memory of San Martin recalls a sense of honor and conscious discipline which the profession of arms requires and which was inculcated into our armed forces from the moment of their creation, as one of their essential characteristics.

Perhaps the mere memory of both suffices to recall the sense of integration that our armed forces had and do have in both the national and inter-American contexts.

Few remember the positive progress that has been achieved by the Latin American countries in the matter of internal coexistance of heterogeneous groups. Because of this choice, the so frequently berated catholic spirit of the conquest later came to be respected and zealously supported in the egalatarian democratic stand of our forefathers. This has brought us to the verge of social integration among the group of nations which are truly mature in their social harmony, a value which to a high degree compensates for our economic deficiencies. I repeat: Our armed forces, recruited from every area of our societies, must be given credit for a good part of this.

Let us turn now to look at our economic deficiencies, which originate in a constantly increasing population and in the need to meet new problems with technical solutions which are also new and very complex. The armies of Latin America have responded with the spirit of modernity that has very often exceeded the response from other sectors of our societies. But their national spirit, their cultivation of moral values, the democratic character of their recruitment, the modern nature of their functional organization would all come to nothing if the armed forces ceased to be just that—if they were deprived of what makes of a man a soldier: weapons.

Weapons have always been costly. Their manufacture or acquisition has meant the sacrifice of other needs. To decide on the time and the extent of such a sacrifice is the privilege of free people. If, in 1817, San Martin had chosen to devote his genius and authority to the development of the economic resources of Cuyo instead of creating the army of the Andes, the kind of respect that we Argentines feel for ourselves would be quite different.

The current military situation of Latin America causes one to reflect. I quote the words of one who is considered in the United States to be an authority on Latin American armed forces:

"In terms of both force levels and military expenditures Latin America has the smallest defense establishment of any region in the world. . . . By any objective modern standard, Latin America's armed forces are badly trained and ill equipped. Short term conscripts, who never develop much in the way of military skills, make up most of the troop strength in the larger countries, while an assortment of obsolete hand-me-downs, white elephants, and heirlooms still make up the bulk of the heavy naval, army, and air force equipment. The manpower and equipment of the Latin American States count for practically nothing in the contemporary world. Their defense establishment is not capable of defending against invasion by even a medium sized military power."

This emergency has taken on truly dramatic overtones, because one of the great military powers of the world already has a foothold in the hemisphere and is threatening to inflame our countries. The presidents of the American states issued a dispassionate and responsible declaration in a meeting held less than a year ago, which states:

"The Presidents of the Latin American Republics, conscious of the importance of the armed forces to the maintenance of security, recognize at the same time that the demands of economic development and social progress make it necessary to devote to those purposes the maximum resources available in Latin America.

"Therefore, they express their intention to limit military expense in proportion to the actual demands of national security in accordance with each country's constitutional provisions, avoiding those expenditures that are not indispensable for the performance of the specific duties of the armed forces and, where pertinent, of international commitments that obligate their respective governments."

From that time to this there cannot be the slightest suspicion that the minimum expenditures incurred in order to give the officers of our armed forces at least the possibility of learning to handle the real weapons of today can be considered a failure to meet the obligation undertaken in Punta del Este. On the contrary, the sombre aspect assumed by the world that surrounds the Americas leads us to the sad conclusion that thus far very little has been done, and that the privilege of being the regional group, of all the world, that dedicates the smallest percentage of its gross national product to military expenditures may become a senseless luxury that compromises our very raison d'etre as nations.

This problem of equipment, national or collective, therefore embraces an eminently political problem in the truest sense of the word.

Everything which causes the Inter-American agencies, which were created with great effort and the sacrifice of very important values in our national sovereignty, to deal with these problems is equivalent to forcing them to act in fields foreign to the purposes for which they were created and to some extent to ignore the principle of non-intervention. Likewise, anything that makes the problem of modernizing our armed forces an intellectuel topic or the subject of an internal political struggle in one of our member states is a grave failure to give the full consideration that each of our peoples owes the others.

Now I come to the end of these considerations suggested by the fine example that the hero we honor represents for our armed forces. I shall add only that I want to place on record my gratitude to the officer who, until a few days ago, headed the Argentine Delegation, General Jorge Shaw, and to the present Chief, Vice Admiral George Boffi, for having conferred upon me the honor which, as an Argentine, as a citizen of the Americas, as an Ambassador of my country to the OAS, and as a grandson of one of the youngest officers of the Sierra Division, I now feel in presenting this figure of General José de San Martin to the highest collective military institution of the Americas.

Exit Britannia—What Next?

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by Britain that her military presence East of Suez will end by 1971 must give us pause when we contemplate the future of diplomatic and military relations in that troubled area.

The State Department reply that "we have no plans to move in where the British forces pull out" may at first be reassuring to those who would wish the United States to remain free of further entangling alliances and commitments. But when considered in broader historical perspective, what are the options left open to us?

First, we could refuse to exercise any responsibility in this area, on the premise that we have had enough of the troubles of the world and that our postwar commitments are overextended.

Second, we could in theory use increased troops and money on the theory that this whole area is vital to U.S. security and world stability. This we are now in no position to do even if we wanted to.

These are obviously two extremes and the pursuit of either, absolutely, would lead to untenable results. In order to avoid the excesses of these two positions, then, clearly an increasingly flexible attitude must be assumed to steer the course between the roles of isolationist and world policeman. Obviously the importance of the Persian Gulf from the point of view of U.S. investment and the essentiality of its oil for the sustenance and functioning of Western Europe are beyond calculation.

A reaffirmation of the present and future significance of the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the Central Treaty Organization—CENTO—is a logical, and vital, first step. As with the current economic and political discussions beginning in NATO, the member nations of SEATO and CENTO must strive to develop all aspects of their alliances, with the challenges and dangers of the future firmly and realistically in mind.

More importantly we should encourage the nations of the area—particularly Iran and Saudi Arabia—to sink their differences over territory and reach an agreement on the Persian Gulf center line—and thus leave themselves free to work in unison for a confederation of the Persian Gulf states and joint action for defense against subversion or external aggression.

Encouragement for the possibility of new accords has come this weekend with the announcement that two of the Trucial States, Dubai and Abu Dhabi, plan to federate under one flag, sharing a joint foreign policy, defense, and citizenship. These states are currently protected under a defense treaty with the United Kingdom. When making the announcement, the two states, the largest and richest of the seven tiny territories along the southeastern end of the Qatar Peninsula, invited the others to join the federation. Such constructive action holds positive promise for stability in this area, and should be encouraged.

Nineteen hundred and seventy-one is now less than 3 years off—if we assume the departure will not be hastened—and much can happen in Southeast Asia and the Near East—and elsewhere in the world—in that time. But unless the problems of the future are confronted now, it may be found too late that if alliances are not flexible enough to be adapted to changing conditions they may limit, rather than enhance, protection for their participants.

The prospect of British withdrawal from East of Suez is a serious threat to stability in that area. Without proper preparatory action now it could be disastrous.

Pollution of Lake Michigan

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we who represent the Great Lakes States, especially those bordering on Lake Michigan, have been concerned with complications that have arisen in maintaining a pollution-free lake. Radio station WIND, Chicago, has consistently given this matter special attention. Its editorial commentary of February 5, placed timely emphasis on a possible solution to one of the complications plaguing Lake Michigan. The editorial follows:

ALEWIVES

You remember the alewives—those fish who littered our beaches last summer. They'll be back this coming summer to stink up our shoreline again. The alewives problem comes from an overabundance of this variety of fish, one of nature's imbalances which are plaguing Lake Michigan. By one estimate, last year's alewives problem cost states bordering Lake Michigan more than 55 million dollars.

Three United States Senators have submitted a proposal which may help. Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin and Illinois' Everett M. Dirksen and Charles H. Percy have suggested a way to harvest the alewives crop. At present, there are only eighteen trawlers available to American fishermen for alewife fighting. But there are about forty Canadian built trawlers which have not been fully utilized in their home waters. At present, there are restrictions against American fishermen using foreign ships. The proposal of Proxmire, Percy and Dirksen is to permit use of Canadian trawlers in American waters for a three-year period.

Alewives are a problem at the present time, but they have an important commercial value. They are used to produce fish meal as animal food. If Congress approves, the added trawlers will not only increase the facilities available for the commercial catch but they can also skim off the dead alewives before they pollute the beaches.

This seems to us a workable solution to a major pollution problem with value not only to the public generally, but to the commercial interests as well. WIND Radio suggests that those interested in curbing this pollution nuisance write their senators and back this effort.

The Future of Aeronautics

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a significant contribution to our understanding of the role of aeronautics in the Nation is contained in the lecture by Charles W. Harper, Deputy Associate Administrator for Aeronautics, Office of Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This lecture, entitled "Prospects in Aeronautics Research and Development," was delivered as the 31st Wright Brothers Lecture at the February 12–14 meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics in Washington, D.C.

The lecture referred to follows:

PROSPECTS IN AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(By Charles W. Harper, Deputy Associate Administrator for Aeronautics, Office of Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.)

ABSTRACT

Transportation has become an increasingly important ingredient to societies in achieving success in a modern technological world. Many of the transportation problems appear solvable only through full exploitation of air transport. Although this mode of transportation has made tremendous strides in the last two decades it seems to have fallen far short of what is required or of what might be expected.

The question is raised as to whether aeronautical research and development has been fully effective in providing the base for a rapid and successful development of necessary air transportation. To answer this question a gross review is made of the growth of aeronautical R&D. It is concluded that an imbalance exists between experimental and theoretical effort and that a great need exists to refine and extend the scientific theories of importance to aeronautics. It is concluded also that aeronautics R&D has neglected to examine the socioeconomic impact of its activities and to account for these in developing its programs.

On the basis of these conclusions, some future aeronautical R&D activities are highlighted as examples. A coordinated effort by economists, social scientists and aeronautical scientists should be undertaken to define long range objectives for air transport; this will enable major efforts of aeronautical R&D to be focussed in the most promising directions. A substantial effort must be made by aeronautical R&D groups to refine and extend the theoretical understanding of the basic sciences of importance to aeronautics; this will enable a broader and more thorough study of the many potential capabilities in air transport without requiring an inordinate increase in costly experimentation. Finally, it is evident that the successful integration of subsystems into a satisfactory whole has become a problem equal to or greater than achievement of satisfactory subsystems. Because no experience exists in many areas and little guidance from theory is available, experimental R&D must direct increased attention to this problem. The cost of this type of experimentation can easily become very high, the experimentalist must devise new and ingenuous techniques to carry out system integration techniques successfully.

It is concluded that the potential applications and requirements not yet realized for air transportation are very broad. Therefore, it follows that aeronautical R&D has before it an important future. To meet these challenges it must develop a more orderly and directed program containing a better balance between theory and experiment. With this as a basis, those groups responsible for final air transport system development can proceed to exploit these capabilities with maximum confidence.

INTRODUCTION

It is a very great honor to be asked to commemorate the achievements of the Wright Brothers which led, amongst many notable things, to the existence of this professional society. Under today's circumstances it is easy to look back with considerable self satisfaction on the accomplishments of the aeronautical sciences which include fathering the space flight program; it is also natural to project this image forward, see only a rosy future and talk at length about it. As Ray Bisplinghoff has pointed out, however, one must be careful about this self adulation. It is probable that the Association of Thatched Hut Constructors was celebrating, with coconut milk and dancing girls, a thousand years of success at the very time a knocked down Hilton Hotel was coming by freighter to their island to take over both the business and the dancing girls.

Today I would like to turn a somewhat critical eye on aeronautics R&D which claims credit for much of the success apparent in aviation. Particular attention will be given the relation of R&D to civil aviation. The intent is to see what level of self satisfaction is justified and, if not so high, what might be done about it. In so complex a field, the case is not clear, of course. To try and clarify a position, I have drawn sharp lines to separate gray areas into black and white. Oversimplification has been used to emphasizes points. Hence many subtleties are ignored.

There seems little question that by now the last "doubting Thomas" has stopped arguing the importance of air transportation. This transportation mode has become a major factor in world development and likely has or will reach the point where its continuing availability is absolutely necessary.

Air transportation is rapidly eating into service provided by other modes and this can be expected to increase as larger and hungrier aircraft come into service.

It is heartening to recall that not too many years ago, old aircraft were being turned into highway hamburger stands while today we see air transportation turning ocean liners into hotels; more recent events show that this trend will continue. Studies which have examined the potential of air transportation show we are far from realizing full exploitation of air transportation and that to do so will require development in years ahead far greater than anything yet realized. They show also that aeronautics has reached a new status—that of being a major factor in the future socioeconomic development of the world.

This will represent a major change in a field which reached its present position more by the tenacity of its supporters than through explicit recognition by society of its importance. Now that society has recognized the importance of air transportation, it is also questioning whether or not the direction and pace of development of air transportation has been guided properly.

A recent study made for the U.S. Senate described aeronautics as being overly concerned with the narrow aspect of its own survival as a separate element of society and insufficiently concerned with its present major role in socioeconomic development.

The study emphasized that aeronautics research and development (R&D) required a carefully organized group of objectives to achieve the essential capabilities in air transportation in the shortest possible time. Although perhaps broadest in scope, this study is just one of many which have arrived at generally similar conclusions. Invariably at some point in these studies, R&D comes under scrutiny and the question is raised as to whether it is measuring up to the challenge confronting it. The purpose here is to examine aeronautics R&D and see if the criticism is merited and if so—what could be done about it. In attempting to do this it was useful to trace briefly the growth of aeronautical science to its present stage. With this in mind, current weaknesses and omissions became more apparent and, hence, requirements and scope for the future more obvious.

GROWTH OF AERONAUTICS R. & D.

Although starting as a largely experimental activity, aeronautics quickly developed a good theoretical base. Prandtl, Glauert, Lanchester, Bairstow, Joukowsky and others laid the theoretical ground work in the early 1900's that led to orderly experimental verification of theory and subsequent continued refinement of aircraft.

Betz was conducting carefully controlled wind tunnel experiments in 1915 to verify Joukowsky's theoretical predictions of chordwise pressure distribution. These theories were expanded and refined in the 20's and 30's by such people as Theodorsen, Allen and Jones, for example, to account for the subtler aspects of the fundamental theories laid down earlier by others. Experimentation was continued at an expanding rate to provide information on the variation of important parameters involving higher order effects.

By 1940 aeronautics as a science was considered by many to be rather completely exploited. The aeronautical engineer lived in a comfortable world where science had set ultimate limits which appeared very close at hand. He looked forward to a continued refinement of existing designs through experimental tailoring of details.

The generally accepted operating range for aircraft in the 1930's was relatively confined. Theory had thrown up the sonic barrier as a limit to maximum speed. Experiment had driven performance closer to this limit but speed increases were coming in small increments. The single major departure from continued evolutionary development of conventional aircraft was found among the helicopter enthusiasts.

The coming of the second world war with its demands for many types of specialized aircraft provided the impetus to expand experimental development in order to wring the last shred of performance out of each design.

One consequence of this demand for experimental capability for development was a very rapid buildup in national experimental facilities.

However, during this same period, a new era of aeronautics began. Several imaginative individuals were about to blow this comfortable world apart, like John Stack who didn't believe that the sonic barrier of theory really existed and Frank Whittle who didn't believe the automobile engine should power an aircraft.

Within a few years after the war the aeronautics horizon had enlarged enormously. The X series of aircraft had shown the sonic barrier to be only a penetrable annoyance. Turbojet engines gave increasing thrust with speed, enabled much greater excess thrust at low speed and offered high reliability. The aeronautical engineers world was no longer constrained but extended from zero speed up to some undefined limit.

Analysis of the potential of atmospheric flight had defined possible flight corridors, as illustrated in figure 8, showing the relation of speed and altitude as bounded by too little lift, too high dynamic pressure and unacceptable aerodynamic heating. Although sufficient experimental evidence existed to prove that these flight capabilities did indeed exist, no adequate theories existed to guide research and development toward practical and useful vehicles.

In an effort to obtain earliest possible realization of these new flight capabilities, a second vast expansion in experimental facilities occurred. In stark contrast to the war time expansion, which was to enable further refinement of existing aircraft, these new facilities enabled study of whole new flight capabilities.

Although a number of aircraft were built on this largely experimental base, for example, the early X series of aircraft, the lack of an adequate theoretical understanding left a number of them with deficiencies which prevented full realization of their potential performance.

In part, the lack of an adequate theoretical base can be traced to a limitation in available analytic capabilities. While the equations presumably describing any physical process could be written, their solution in many cases was so tedious that only infrequently could an experiment be designed to test the validity. Even less often did the more advanced theoretical analysis find its way into applications. A close coupling between theory and experiment is necessary, of course, if either is to advance on a solid basis.

The engineers, however, required solutions to real world problems. To supply these, aeronautical R&D activities were asked to produce vast amounts of experimental data. From some of this it was possible to correct older theories. Other parts were used to establish semi-empirical limits.

From a large number of experiments on swept wings it was possible to define the relation between wing sweep and wing aspect ratio which separated those wings exhibiting pitch down or stability at high lift from those showing pitch up or instability. But there were many cases for which no adequate theory eixsted and aeronautics R&D was asked to produce sufficient data that the engineer could find within it the answer to his problem. One only needs to recall the vast amounts of data collected on various wing and airfoil combinations.

A serious consequence of this demand for experimental data was breakdown in good communication between theoretical and experimental research. Often the theoretican did not recognize the full implication of his analysis. Often the experimentalist solved problems by trial and error when an answer existed in theory had he been aware of it. The disastrous roll-yaw coupling problem experienced in flight was foretold theoretically but not recognized by the designer. A well known case is that of the area rule. Hayes' theories had predicted this effect in 1946 but its significance was not recognized by the designer because no speical attention was drawn to this important aspect of a rather complex theory. Whitcomb demonstrated the area rule experimentally but was led to this point by physical reasoning, not by Hayes' analyses. Connection between the two was not made clear for several years.

All the fault did not lie with the experimentalist. In removing the limitations in theory, which resulted from oversimplification to allow easy use, the theorist presented an increasingly complex picture to the designer. The latter tended to be frightened away simply through computational difficulty and turned toward "back-of-the-envelop" empiricism. Sporadic attempts were made to bridge this gap. Falkner, Weissinger and DeYoung's work on span loading, for example, were efforts to reduce awkward theories to a form amenable to everyday use.

Relief from these computational difficulties appeared with the electronic computer whose use expanded rapidly in post war years. The computer greatly extended the capabilities of the theoretician and provided the designer with the tool necessary to apply the most complex theories to the solution of his problem. However, before aeronautics could begin to exploit this new potential, space flight appeared. In the absence of any real experience in space it was necessary to turn to theoretical analysis to solve almost every problem. The complexity of these problems left no alternative but to use the computer as a primary tool. The direct relation between aeronautics and space flight sciences in many areas served to take from aeronautics a very large proportion of its strength in theoretical analyses and devote it to space. From the standpoint of achievements in space flight, these events must be considered an outstanding success. However, in aeronautics the effect was to slow the development of technology. Full advantage was not taken by aeronautics of this explosion in analytic capability. The theorists who remained in the field were few and not well coupled with the experimentalist. Only infrequently were graduates trained in these new analytic capabilities attracted into aeronautics. Consequently, the experimentalist remained to dominate the field.

At the same time aeronautics had arrived at a point where these analytic capabilities were sorely needed. A bewildering range of possibilities were available in flight vehicles. The turbine engine with its high thrust-weight ratio made possible a multitude of V/STOL types. The SST seemed possible in various forms. The hydrogen fueled hypersonic aircraft showed potential. Because these possibilities could not be analyzed adequately to identify the critical problems the only approach was to examine as many as possible through experiment, in wind tunnel and in flight. Under these circumstances it should be no surprise that some of the effort was wasted on unsound ideas, some critical problems were overlooked and some effort wasted on trivia. Consequently, progress towards achieving these new capabilities has been slow.

Those advanced concepts which did reach flight status showed that a problem, once minor in nature, had reached major proportions. In the past it had been possible to assume that a vehicle assembled from satisfactory elements would integrate to form a satisfactory whole. Experience with these new vehicles of the interaction between external aerodynamics and propulsion, between structural deformation and external aerodynamics showed that a combination of satisfactory elements no longer assured a satisfactory whole.

The pilot-airplane integration problem became increasingly difficult; a design which appeared clearly defined and satisfactory to the engineer often became less defined and unsatisfactory when the characteristics of the pilot were introduced into the system. Successful integration of aircraft elements presented a new and major challenge for aeronautics R&D; only limited guidance from theory existed and experimental research entailed high cost and high technical risk since a complete system was involved. This dilemma had a major inhibiting effect on the pace of air transport development.

While aeronautics R&D was struggling with the technical problems of advanced aircraft, a tremendous and unpredicted growth of air transport took place along evolutionary lines. Instead of the light plane in every garage and the V/STOL transport hopping around the megalopoli, increasing numbers of conventional jet transports were waiting to take off or land at every major airport. Criticism was directed at aeronautics R&D for having failed to recognize the full socioeconomic impact of air transportation and to take account of this in defining R&D goals. It was argued that air transport goals were simply higher, faster and further without any special consideration of its interaction with many socioeconomic factors and in turn their effect on R&D requirements. Even such an obvious problem as that of aircraft noise was given scant attention by aeronautics R&D before it became an unacceptable nuisance. Certainly it is clear that air transportation is having many major socioeconomic effects. Airports, initially placed far from the cities, have grown enormously and have become the hub of business activities.

The growth of Los Angeles International Airport from 1950 to 1967 is representative of that of many major airports throughout the world. Air transportation has had a major impact on automobile rental business. Industrial, scientific and professional conventions are now a continuous and major source of income for larger cities and are totally dependent on rapid air travel. Due to air travel, tourism has become the world's largest international business, as well as adding a new word to every language. International industrial investments have flourished because of air travel. International politics have undergone a major change due to air travel. It is clear that air freight is changing inventory requirements in a major way. Whether any of these or other similar factors would have a significant effect on aeronautics R&D was not carefully examined. Obviously such an impact should have been examined if the maximum benefit was to be expected from research and development expenditures.

From this review of aeronautics R&D growth it is possible to identify several conditions which should be the object of corrective action in the future.

(a) The growth of the theoretical base for aeronautics R&D has fallen short of that required. New capabilities in theoretical analysis have not been exploited fully.

(b) Because it lacked a strong theoretical base, aeronautics R&D has become overly involved in data acquisition and problem solving for specific designs.

(c) Sufficient recognition has not been given the fact that air transportation is having a major socioeconomic impact and consequently the latter should have a major influence on aeronautics R&D.

If the above criticisms are valid and the object is to remove them, it becomes possible to speculate on the future of aeronautics R&D.

THE BASIC GOAL FOR R. & D.

In making such speculations it is necessary to establish a long range goal for aeronautics R&D as a basis for making decisions regarding the elements of current R&D programs.

R&D, including aeronautics, should have as a goal that of providing all information required for a designer to go from paper designs to production with complete confidence of success. No experimental development would be required. Obviously this is a distant goal. In losing sight of it R&D often becomes a series of short term exercises in specific problem solving. When this occurs, problems similar in their fundamental nature but differing in detail are solved over and over. Experimental opportunities are lost which could provide a basic understanding leading to solutions for a whole class of problems and important extensions of theory. If the above goal is taken as an objective it is clear that a great deal of ignorance exists in the aeronautical sciences and it will be many years before the aeronautical research engineer works himself out of a job.

Some of the areas of ignorance in aeronautics which are subjects for R&D were described in Schairer's Wright Brothers Lecture of 1964. In concentrating just on areas for potential aircraft performance increase, some 38 separate opportunities were identified. Very few of these opportunities have been realized in practice in the four years since that lecture. It would seem that the R&D goal of providing the designer with information required to convert concept to practice with confidence is not being approached rapidly.

The very number of promising ideas available for study presents a dilemma to aeronautics R&D. Obviously it is not possible to pursue all of them with a major effort. Some rational basis for making a choice must be established which is more valid than the interest or intuition of the individual research man.

REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

The obvious basis for making a choice is a measure of the effect any given technological advance will have in satisfying requirements for future air transportation. A starting point to define an aeronautics R&D future, then, would seem to be an examination of the role air transportation could play in the potential socio-economic development of the world.

Clearly, there is no current lack of transportation system studies; they are appearing in every form of publication. From the standpoint of aeronautics R&D, however, these have not been particularly useful. Many are limited to an examination of wider application of state-of-the-art technology. Many assume solutions to technical problems whose achievement is not at all evident. Only a few represent the combined efforts of technical and transportation experts to bring together possible advances in technology with key transportation requirements. Rather, in air transportation the pattern of progress has been more one of expediency. A new technological capability surfaces from R&D and a search is made for an application. Or alternatively an existing operation highlights a problem, usually one which could have been foretold, such as aircraft noise annoyance, and a frantic R&D effort is generated to solve the problem. Efforts to establish future air transport requirements are seen in the formation of the Department of Transportation and in the many recent studies by states, cities and economically interdependent areas. Because of the many nontechnical factors involved, aeronautical R&D groups alone cannot make such studies but their participation is invaluable in assuring that the conclusions are based on sound physical reasoning and not science fiction fantasy. Without these transportation system studies it is impossible to be definitive in choosing fruitful R&D programs but even qualitative analysis brings to light some interesting possibilities. Some examples will be considered next.

Megalopolis

It seems fair to assume that one major factor in the development of megalopolis was that heads of industry and/or government required frequent face-to-face contact and they therefore settled along existing modes of transportation. Quite naturally the labor force that required management settled with it; population concentration was an inevitable result. Saturation of the original land or water transport systems has been a major factor in promoting air transport.

This gave good communication between distant cities and probably aided growth of megalopolis around these cities. By 1980, population growth will create new centers which can be expected to coalesce into new cities using long range air transport but hampered by local transport problems.

It has been suggested that a fine network of air transport could be overlaid megalopolis to solve its transportation problems. It is not difficult to generate counter-arguments showing that, while some specific transportation problems can be solved this way, the major problems of megalopolis will not be affected. One solution could be to dissolve megalopolis by spreading out the population. This could be done by enabling the management to separate in distance, but not in time, and take their support with them. Here a local air transport system properly developed could have a profound and beneficial effect on future development. But the kind of analysis that will define in detail the technological advances required to produce the necessary vehicles, does not yet exist.

Underdeveloped areas

Proper economic development of underdeveloped areas in the world is certainly fundamental to the continued well being and development of the remainder. History shows that adequate transportation is a requirement for development; in fact, a lack of existing water transport or difficult-to-develop land transport can almost always be associated with lack of economic development. Air transportation could put all areas of the world on an equal transportation basis if proper vehicles existed.

In some areas of the world, for example, in South America, where modern ground transport is only partially developed, air transport already is providing major communication links and, if properly exploited, could circumvent permanently the need for widespread, expensive, inflexible ground systems. It would appear from the figure that the opportunity exists to achieve just such a circumstance in South America. While not many years ago it was absurd to think of air freight as anything but maximum value items such as passengers or mail, this is no longer true. Scarcity of raw or semi processed materials has raised their value to a point where lost time in transit becomes important and air transport makes sense. Certainly this point has been reached in many processed goods where a large inventory in a slow delivery system pipe line is unacceptable. Again, the analysis does not exist which would define clearly what these vehicles should be.

High speed transport

While the advantages of speed have been a prime selling point for air transportation it is not apparent that the full implication has been realized as yet. High speed makes possible frequent interchanges over long distances. But the value of speed does not increase progressively with distance. Because man lives by a metabolic cyclic, it is important to avoid overnight stops in widely separated time zones.

Suppose a six hour work period is required and a 14 hour day is acceptable where travel is involved; then the traveler has eight hours for a round trip. At 50 miles per hour, the traveler is confined to 200 mile radius; at 600 miles per hour his potentially useful daily work range has reached 2400 miles; at speeds of 1800 miles per hour he can reach 7200 miles. With such high speed air transport capabilities, ground transit times become of critical importance. It is easy to see why our airports are becoming centers for management meetings. The ground time problem becomes more critical, of course, as useful working ranges increase since a requirement for over night stay causes serious disruption of the traveler's metabolic cycle. Clearly, studies of the extent to which very high speed transport will develop one-day long distance trips in the manner the present subsonic jets have done for short distances, would provide aeronautics R&D with strong guidance for some elements of its technical program.

These examples serve to indicate only the kind of questions to be answered if aeronautics R&D is to apply its efforts most profitably. Before the questions can be answered properly, thorough transportation systems analysis must be made. These must include consideration of the ultimate use of the system as a transportation element, and hence, of all of the socioeconomic factors of travel habits and requirements as projected for the future. As anyone knows who has tried to collect such information for use in projecting short haul aircraft requirements, very little information exists.

These systems analyses, to be valid, depend heavily on what can be done in a technical sense to meet travel requirements and it is in this regard that the R&D man must work closely with the socioeconomists. At the same time these studies will highlight for the research man the most profitable lines of endeavor. They prevent R&D from overlooking a technological requirement which must be satisfied to make a new capability of value.

The frustrating failure to move V/STOL transport off dead center is a good illustration of this. First efforts to develop such vehicles pursued vigorously the VTOL performance capability in a multitude of ways. Despite the fact that some 20 odd of these were built and flown it was only recently that the critical importance of having also a rapid and easily controllable descent capability was recognized in a quantitative sense. Results of one systems analysis show the difference in D.O.C. resulting from increased cruise speed and reduced descent time, that is, from cruise to unloading.

At ranges of 100 miles direct operating cost is more sensitive to reductions in terminal maneuvering time than to increases in cruise speed. It is clear that research on requirements for short descent times should have had as much attention as that on performance. Only recently have the dynamic flight studies been undertaken which will define those aircraft characteristics having major control over flight descent times. With all these analyses finally being available to guide R&D, the research programs can be directed with maximum effectiveness.

A very close interplay and interaction between economists, social scientists and physical scientists will be necessary to define the R&D program required for each to produce the data that will make these analysis valid.

REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AERONAUTICAL THEORIES

Critical as these transportation systems analyses are to the orderly progress of R&D, even in their most sophisticated form they are meaningless unless based on scientific facts. However, given well established technical theories for the physical processes involved, the systems analyses can be kept confined to the real world and still explore beyond the limits of experimentally demonstrated capability.

The value of developing broadly applicable theories for the scientific disciplines in aeronautics is becoming of critical importance to the aeronautical experimentalist as well. In the past, where adequate theoretical treatment of a problem was lacking, it was possible to provide ground test facilities or flight research programs which enabled an ad hoc solution to be found.

It appears unlikely this principle can be followed to the same degree in the future since the wind tunnel test time devoted to development of an early aircraft is far less than that devoted to a modern one. Further, the wide scope of flight possibilities of interest would require a very great increase in the number of ground or flight facilities. Considering the nature of the problems, for example, airframe-engine integration for V/STOL or for hypersonic aircraft, the cost of facilities for ad hoc experimentation can be anticipated to be very high. Therefore, to the maximum extent possible, experimentation must be viewed as a means to verify and extend the necessary theories; as will be noted later, even the best progress to be expected leaves a very great challenge for the experimentalist.

The lack of adequate theoretical treatment can be found in any of the scientific disciplines underlying aeronautics technology, aerodynamics, materials, structures, flight environment, flight dynamics and etc. A closer look at aerodynamics and flight dynamics is taken here simply to illustrate the nature of the requirements future R&D must satisfy.

One aspect of existing aerodynamic theories which should present a challenge to the scientist is the very large number of theories required to describe basically the same process, namely, fluid mechanics. Theories exist for flow around 2-dimensional airfoils, 3-dimensional wings, bodies of revolution, propellers, rotors and so on ad infinitum. Many of the theories involve empirical constants which simply lump together areas of ignorance. Some "theories" should be considered little more than curve fitting of experimental data glorified through the inclusion of obvious aerodynamic parameters such as Mach numbers or dynamic pressure. To study a range of aircraft geometries and operating conditions, then, the aerodynamicists must use a succession of theories properly adjusted by a large number of empirical "constants."

For example, if it is desired to calculate the power required to create a fixed level of thrust, the theory used depends on the disc loading, that is, whether a rotor, propeller or high disc loading fan is involved; no single theory exists for the whole range which gives equivalent accuracy. As noted earlier, this situation was excusable when applied analysis was limited by hand computation. But with modern computational capabilities progress can be made towards achieving unified theories. Some indication of the potential of the modern computer to extend analytic capabilities in aeronautics has already been demonstrated sucessfully.

Just recently the computer has enabled analysis of non-equilibrium flow conditions, such as temperature and density variation, behind a normal shock-wave. Prior to this, calculations were limited to regions just behind the shock-wave and at the body surface. Other examples were found in supersonic aircraft aerodynamics, in hypersonic boundary layer theory, in airfoil design and even in flow analysis involving the Karman vortex street; however, much remains to be done in both extending the application and bringing it into widespread use.

For many desired advances in aeronautics, however no, proper theory exists. In only some of the cases discussed by Schairer in 1964 was it possible to provide a theoretical target performance and compare this with practical experience. In other cases it was possible only to present experimental data and speculate on the possibility of attaining improved performance. His discussion of maximum lift and the effect of wing sweep on this are good examples. In the first instance he points out we do not yet know the upper limits we should be striving to reach; this is despite the fact that probably more ad hoc research has been devoted to maximum lift than to any other single aerodynamic parameter. In the second instance be points out that C/L max of swept wings has already exceeded predictions made by existing theories and again it is not known what a realistic upper limit should be.

It is even easier to identify the need for advances in theoretical flight dynamics than in theoretical aerodynamics. The term flight dynamics is used here to denote control of an aircraft about its desired flight path. Thus, it is concerned largely with short period motions of the aircraft. These could be imposed by the pilot to change the desired flight path or result from the pilot holding the aircraft on course against external disturbances. It is evident that these two conditions create conflicting requirements. To change course the aircraft should respond quickly and positively to the pilot-imposed disturbances. On the other hand, to prevent constant pilot attention the aircraft should resist course changes resulting from external disturbances. This becomes particularly critical in the landing maneuver where the aircraft should not respond to low altitude gusts yet must be capable of rapid maneuvers required for traffic control, collision avoidance or ILS misplacement, for example. The impossibility of achieving all the desired characteristics inherently in a single design is demonstrated by the steady progression toward automatic flight control.

It can be expected that fully automatic control will be available to the pilot in the future and he will be able to choose any degree of it that makes his overall task easiest.

As implied in the last statement, these pilot aids have developed in the past largely to increase safety by easing the pilot's tasks. However, experience with some recent designs implies that pilot aids will be required not just to make the flight task easier but to make it possible; this is a consequence of a direct conflict between those design features giving maximum performance and those giving ease of flight. It is not difficult to predict that proper pilot aids will become as vital to safe, efficient operation of many future aircraft as is the primary structure. This situation is creating new problems for the designer and hence for aeronautic R&D. As the pilot aids become increasingly important they must become a fundamental part of the design and not just an add-on feature; thus dynamic analyses of the total system must be made, including the pilot, who will represent just one of the controlling elements but who interacts with the others. Further, whether justified or not, past experience has led to a reluctance to relieve the pilot any more than necessary from the control functions; thus the designer needs to know the limits of capability of the pilot in performing various tasks singly and in combination which is indeed a relatively unexplored area of aeronautics R&D.

Even without considering the human element, the theoretical study of flight dynamics is exceedingly complex because of the many degrees of freedom involved in an aircraft system and the many interactions between them. The experimentalist has had only the grossest guidance from theory to aid in planning definitive experiments. Fortunately, the mathematical tools required to undertake these analyses have been developing in response to analytic requirements of spacecraft design. Techniques for stability and control analysis developed particularly for the unmanned spacecraft, would seem to have much promise for analyzing the dynamics of aircraft flight. Such analyses would highlight very quickly the critical factors in aircraft flight dynamics and provide the experimentalist the focus necessary to carry out definitive experiments.

Analysis of the aircraft system with the inclusion of the pilot as one servo-mechanism element has been successful to date in only a very limited degree. It is quite evident that while the analytic principles are sound, the aeronautical engineer does not have available all the information necessary to define quantitatively the human as a servo-mechanism.

Most of the information that does exist is related to the capability of the highly trained pilot to operate under high physical stress. Information of this type has proved extremely useful in guiding the design of military and research aircraft and space vehicles. However, the aeronautical engineer must also design vehicles for a different class of operators. These will include the non-professional pilot whose level of training may be no more than that of the average automobile operator; they will include the professional transport pilot who does not have the opportunity to fly critical maneuvers constantly for practice as does the military pilot and whose operating stresses may likely be more psychological than physical; they will include pilots whose tasks involve repeated take-off and landing only a few minutes apart; they will include pilots whose tasks involve long-range high-speed flight where major stresses arise from complete distortion of the circadian rhythm. The task of defining the limit of capabilities of this wide variety of human and conditions is obviously a formidable one. It will require the closest cooperation between the subject, psychologists, physiologists and the aeronautics R&D man.

THE ROLE OF EXPERIMENT

Up to this point attention of the future of aero R&D has been focused on the need to begin transportation systems analyses in depth to provide aeronautics R&D with proper objectives and to revitalize and extend the theoretical analysis of the basic scientific disciplines important to aeronautics. Experimental aeronautics R&D has been viewed in a somewhat critical sense as having become too involved in the gathering of data and in the solution of specific development problems.

It has been suggested that one primary goal for experimental R&D would be that of supporting development of theoretical analyses. This does not mean a less important role for the experimentalist. As was noted earlier, the rapidly growing problem of integrating satisfactory elements of an aircraft into a satisfactory whole should provide ample challenge for the experimentalist.

As aircraft become more sophisticated the interaction between the various elements increases and the identification of a successful design more difficult. The engine-airframe integration problem of supersonic aircraft is a current problem of this type. Through the development of the subsonic jets it was possible for the buyer to make independent choices of airframe and engine without serious concern over the effects of interaction between the two on performance. Thus, we see similar models of Boeing or Douglas transport aircraft powered with different engines. In the case of the SST, however, the airframe designer found it expedient to design a slightly different aircraft for each of the competing engine designs in part because of significant aerodynamic interactions. Another example is that of aerodynamic heating and consequent structural deformation. Until recently the structures man was given a shape and some loads and his job was to find the lightest structure to hold that shape under the given loads. For speeds above mach 3 structures must be designed to assume the desired aerodynamic shape when distorted due to heating; the heating in turn depends on the shape assumed. Thus, a strong interaction exists between structures and aerodynamics.

The challenge referred to arises from the very great difficulty of obtaining definitive knowledge about the important subsystem interactions without building a complete system. Development of any new turbojet engine presents a classic example of being unable to meet this challenge.

Almost any significant design departure from an existing engine results in an R&D program leading to prototype construction and operation before confidence is had that the new system will operate.

It is clear that not enough is being learned about successful integration of engine elements from past experience to outweigh the greater costs of increased sophistication in the engines. The cost of one of these programs reaches the tens of millions of dollars. The implications are obvious. New aircraft designs must be compromised to utilize existing engines until the cost of compromise is sufficiently great to justify the major expenditure of a new engine development.

The case of engine noise illustrates this. Although the knowledge that engines could be made quieter has existed for many years, the design changes from current military-based engines were recognized to be so great that a whole new engine system development program was involved; support for such a program became available only after aircraft noise was recognized as a national problem and one which was seriously inhibiting further growth in a critical air transport capability. Aeronautics R&D must show how to avoid these very costly experimental programs in system integration if rapid development in air transport is to be realized.

The challenge to the experimentalist of obtaining definitive information on the interaction between the various elements of a system is no small one. First, to devise an experiment such that information on the interaction between two elements can be used to predict interaction in other generally similar cases is extremely difficult; the interaction between supersonic inlets and engines is a good example of the difficulty. Yet, if this cannot be accomplished, the permutations become hopelessly large and research degenerates into specific problem solving. Second, to devise an experiment which does not require construction of a complete operating system is also extremely difficult. It is here that the ingenuity of the experimentalist finds its premium. If he can find inexpensive means to show the nature of the interaction problem and obvious paths to its solution, aeronautics can move ahead rapidly; if each new revolutionary step requires the high risk and high cost of a complete experimental system then progress will be retarded.

At least two paths appear open to the experimentalist to accomplish this which have not yet been exploited fully. The first of these is the principle of modifying an existing system, to incorporate an advanced concept, solely for the purpose of obtaining confirmation of prior analysis. Although this is often proposed and occasionally supported by research groups, too frequently the program evolves into one of solving the developmental problems of a new concept, a very costly and unnecessary activity for research. If aeronautics R&D is to exploit this principle it must avoid the developmental aspects or costs will severely restrict the exploitation. The second approach involves use of the flight simulator as a research tool. The simulator is well established as a training tool. It is achieving increasing use as a developmental tool. Its use as a research tool to study inexpensively the systems integration problem, particularly where the human is involved, is not yet widespread; however, enough research work has been done to establish the very great potential of the technique. It is hardly necessary to point out that success in simulator research depends critically on sound analytic understanding of the physical principles involved; without this the whole process reduces to nonsense.

In the areonautics R&D program of the future, then, the experimentalist should play two principal roles:

(a) First, to provide the information and guidance required to develop adequate theories in the basic sciences involved in aeronautics.

(b) Second, until adequate theory can be developed, to carry out those experiments necessary to define the interaction between various elements of the aircraft which as yet remain beyond the scope of any analysis and yet whose compatibility is essential to success.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Perhaps the principal conclusion to be drawn from this look at the future to aeronautics R&D is that very much remains to be done. To accomplish this it appears that the level of scientific sophistication must be measurably increased over that existing during recent years. To realize the full potential of air transportation within desirability or necessary time spans will require a more organized and in depth attack than has been typical heretofore. Because of the very wide range of possibilities it will be necessary to achieve the capability of eliminating unpromising avenues through analyses, retaining only those most promising for increasingly expensive hardware research and development. It is not too difficult to conclude that aeronautics R&D has not met fully the challenges facing it and so has been in part responsible for the failure of air transport to realize its full potential.

To meet these challenges, aeronautics R&D must take positive action along the following lines:

(a) The aeronautics research man must take his knowledge with regard to physical possibilities of air transport and join with the socioeconomist in analyzing what kinds of possible air transportation are of most importance, nationally and internationally, in terms of continued world development. These studies should provide the basis for developing the most effective R&D program in aeronautics.

(b) The emphasis placed on theoretical analysis in all sciences of concern to aeronautics must be increased greatly; in particular, full advantage must be taken of modern computational techniques to rid aeronautics of the multitude of disconnected, approximate and semiempirical theories which have been the heritage of earlier theoretical analyses. A much closer tie between theory and experiment is required with increased effort in experiment directed explicitly at validating new and extended theoretical treatments.

(c) An increased experimental effort must be directed at the difficult problem of system integration. Methods must be found to attack this problem successfully which do not require construction of complete new aircraft systems and which ultimately will enable complete synthesis of the problem.

Air transportation has assumed today a position of great importance in world development. It has achieved this principally through exploitation of long-range high-speed transport; but many important air transport capabilities have been exploited only slightly, or remain unexploited. The reason seems clear, high costs that are associated with high technical risks. The solution to this problem lies in the activities of aeronautical research and development. It will require a well organized, aggressively pursued R&D program, taking full advantage of all new technology, to reduce the technical risks to a financially acceptable level. This challenge is a large one but, if met, major contributions to continued world development can be expected. Aeronautical research and development has within its reach the capability of meeting this challenge; there remains only the problem of exercising it fully and effectively.

(NOTE.—The author considered at length the question of references to related material. The usual reference list was abandoned for two reasons. First, the various aspects of problem have been the subject of so much discussion recently that even a representative cross-section of views produced an unacceptably long list. Second, the author did not wish to imply, by any particular reference or references, that any one of the views expressed had been accepted or even had majority support. Many conflicting views remain to be resolved; it is hoped that this discussion will contribute towards attracting the increased attention necessary to arrive at a proper definition for the future role of aeronautics R&D.)

Insurance Industry Promotes Positive Program

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the American Mutual Insurance Alliance is promoting a positive program to attack the auto insurance cancellation problem. Two of the outstanding members of the American Mutual Insurance Alliance are located in my congressional district. I refer to Employers Mutuals of Wausau and the Sentry Insurance Co., of Stevens Point. At a time when some Members of Congress are attacking this industry, I think it is well for all Members to read over the release which was issued by the American Mutual Insurance Alliance on February 15, in Chicago. The release follows:

INSURANCE INDUSTRY PROMOTES POSITIVE PROGRAM

CHICAGO, February 15.—A group of 124 insurance companies proposed today that car owners be protected by law against arbitrary cancellation of their auto insurance policies.

Nonpayment of premium or loss of driving privileges should be the only allowable reasons for cancellation, said the American Mutual Insurance Alliance. Paul S. Wise, general manager of the association, said the Alliance will "propose and support" legislation to establish this requirement in states lacking adequate cancellation laws.

Wise said the proposed law will apply to all private passenger automobile coverages, including bodily injury and property damage liability, collision, comprehensive physical damage, uninsured motorist and medical payment coverages.

"We feel the public interest demands that all companies writing automobile insurance be required to meet these minimum standards," said Wise.

Under the Alliance proposal, insurance companies would have 60 days to check out new applications for auto insurance. Coverage would be provided on a provisional basis during this period, but the company would have the right to turn down the applicant if its investigation disclosed misrepresentation, a poor driving record or other valid underwriting reasons.

After this underwriting period the company would be obligated to provide coverage for the full term of the policy so long as the policyholder paid his premiums, members of his household retained their driver's licenses, and the vehicle registration was not suspended or revoked.

This legislation is similar to voluntary cancellation restrictions adopted January 1 by insurance companies using the services of the Mutual Insurance Rating Bureau and the Insurance Rating Board. At that time, they liberalized the voluntary program which had been in effect for more than five years.

The Alliance said its decision to seek legislation grew out of its concern over "sporadic lapses" on the part of a few companies which had not adopted the voluntary restrictions on their cancellation practices. Wise said these lapses have been limited to a few companies, but that they have brought criticism upon the entire insurance industry and out of all proportion to the actual problem.

"Although insurance companies are bound to make some mistakes in judgment, every study of the cancellation issue so far indicates that the overwhelming majority of auto insurers already exercise restraint in their cancellation practices, and do not cancel policies without just cause," said Wise.

The Alliance pointed to one recent study, conducted by Wisconsin Insurance Commissioner Robert D. Haase, which showed that fewer than six-tenths of 1 per cent of auto insurance policies in force in Wisconsin were canceled in midterm during 1966 for reasons other than nonpayment of premium. A survey in Washington State, covering a five-year period, revealed that, annually, only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the state's 1,600,000 drivers had their auto insurance policies canceled. This study was conducted by Professor James A. Wickman, associate professor of risk and insurance at the University of Washington.

In Maryland, a study conducted by the state insurance department in 1964 showed that only 1.4 percent of 663,518 auto insurance policies surveyed had been canceled by companies or agents during a one-year period. And in Virginia, an official survey by the Virginia State Corporation Commission in 1966 showed that only 1.8 per cent of all auto policies in force were canceled for reasons other than nonpayment. This survey also covered nonrenewals, and indicated that only 1.4 per cent of the policies offered for renewal were not renewed. Both figures include some policy terminations not initiated by companies and agents, such as cancellations because policyholders died, sold their cars, or moved out of the state.

Working Together

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, after many months of concerted effort, the city of Palatka, Fla., in my district, has received a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to construct a neighborhood facility. I am proud to have been part of this effort and I join with the Palatka News in the sentiment expressed in their editorial of January 10.

The News stated:

In a way, the $508,000 building to be constructed next to Central Academy High School should become a permanent reminder that when a community works together there are no obstacles too great to overcome.

I think the editorial will prove of interest:

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITY

The announcement from Washington that a Neighborhood Facility for the northwest section had been approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development was long awaited here.

For nearly two years the application had been in process and the word that it had received final approval should prompt considerable satisfaction, especially on the part of those who worked so diligently for it.

The Neighborhood Facility represents the earnest effort on the part of numerous governmental agencies and organizations and individuals, White and Negro. The City of Palatka, the Palatka Housing Authority, the School Board, the County Commission, State Department of Education and Rep. Don Fuqua all had a part in ironing out the problems that necessarily arose when different governmental subdivisions attempted to plan a joint project. The Bi-Racial Committee and the Community Action Committee lent much needed support.

There could never be a record of the number of hours spent by the local agencies and individuals and representatives of HUD and Health, Education and Welfare in Atlanta and Washington on the smoothing out the problems that went along with the application for the Neighborhood Facility. In a way, the $508,000 building to be constructed next to Central Academy High School could become a permanent reminder that when a community works together there are no obstacles too great to overcome.

The Neighborhood Facility is still many months away, because time is required for final plans and construction, but the people of Palatka can feel that they have gained already. The Facility has been approved and will be built.

Foreign Policy

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing complications facing this Nation as a result of the Johnson administration's inept foreign policy was once again demonstrated when a U.S. Navy aircraft was shot down near Hainan Island and the complete story was revealed only after administration spokesmen at the Pentagon had to acknowledge the accuracy of the story first carried through the facilities of the Copley Press. A penetrating sober editorial commentary in the San Diego Union on February 17, followed this story and I insert it in the RECORD feeling it deserves widespread review:

MEN IN MUFTI HAVE COMMAND—MILITARY STEEL MADE PAPER TIGER

Oriental Communists could not be more wrong if they call the shackled uniformed military forces of the United States of America "paper tigers."

However, even the most loyal American must be wondering now if the Communists do not have a point if they attach the label to the men invisible in mufti who command the military.

The decision of the invisible men not to rescue an American pilot ruthlessly shot down by Communist Chinese MIGs five miles from the island of Hainan is infuriating, outrageous and disgraceful.

It does not matter whether Lt. (j.g.) Joseph Dunn was five miles from the coast of Hainan Island or on the beach itself. He was a Navy pilot on a peaceful Navy mission and should have been rescued immediately. The Navy fully intended to do this until its mission was countermanded by civilians.

Lt. Dunn was flying a slow, propeller driven, unarmed aircraft. He obviously was not a part of an attack squadron and had no hostile intent. He may have strayed closer to Hainan Island than he intended.

At the most, however, the MIGs should have "buzzed" him to turn Lt. Dunn back toward the open sea. Ironically, this apparently is what American aircraft did to Russian bombers that recently strayed too close to Greenland, an important base of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The fact that Lt. Dunn apparently was left bobbing in the water for seven hours to die or to be captured by Communist China is unconscionable.

The decision to abandon our pilot will have an incalculably detrimental effect on the morale of all our military men facing the enemy. It will intensify Communist propaganda and lend credence to Red claims that we are a "paper tiger." It will increase the potential for more so-called "wars of liberation" by the Communists. Can the enemy now believe us when we say that we are "determined" and will act resolutely? Our acts belie our words.

And our failure to rescue Lt. Dunn, or at least to make the best possible effort, will make infinitely more difficult the rescue of the USS *Pueblo* and her men. Can North Korea now believe us when we say return the men and ship "or else"? What is else?

The underlying gall of the entire episode is that it occurred even as an enterprising reporter forced the Administration to admit Soviet Union bombers had flown by Greenland. Only the Administration knows whether the bombers violated Greenland's territorial rights and it isn't speaking.

But isn't it strange that the Administration should hide this fact? When an American B-52 crashed at Greenland, the Soviet Union was quick to propagandize that our B-52 flights posed a nuclear danger to the world!

The military forces of the United States—the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard in Vietnam—are the greatest in the great tradition of our nation. They are of the finest steel.

But can steel hold fast if it is backed by paper?

Amherst Chamber of Commerce Finds "Corky" an Energetic President

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the growth and development of western New York has had a great many contributors. We are indeed fortunate that many of these have been women.

One of the most prominent professional women in Buffalo, Mr. Speaker, is Mrs. Marie Corcoran.

Since the death of her husband, Frank B. Corcoran, a distinguished local attorney, Mrs. Corcoran has turned a part-time interest in real estate into a thriving full-time business.

Mrs. Corcoran has also mixed into her busy schedule a significant dosage of public service. She was rewarded for these efforts by last year being elected Woman of the Year in Amherst, N.Y. And this year, in recognition of her business achievements and high spirit of public service she was elected president of the Amherst Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, so that we too may give recognition to Mrs. Corcoran's success in business and in public life, I insert the following article from the Buffalo Evening News of Thursday, February 15, 1968, in today's RECORD:

AMHERST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FINDS "CORKY" AN ENERGETIC PRESIDENT—MRS. MARIE CORCORAN, REAL ESTATE BROKER, IS FIRST WOMAN LEADER IN GROUP'S HISTORY

"Some of the fellows might have been a little hesitant about electing a woman president, but then Corky is no ordinary woman. She's already moving this club into high gear."

That is the way one male member of the Amherst Chamber of Commerce summed up the club's feeling about Mrs. Marie Corcoran—recently elected the first woman president in the club's history and the only woman president of a Chamber unit in Western New York and possibly in New York State.

Mrs. Corcoran, a strikingly attractive, silver-haired real estate executive, was the only distaff member active in the Chamber when she was elected to the top post, but she hopes to attract more women.

Despite her "minority of one" she had been a director for five years, second vice president for a year and first vice president for two years before being elected president.

STARTED AS SECRETARY

She is a charter member of the Amherst Chamber and was instrumental in its expansion from the former Williamsville Chamber of Commerce. In this and several other civic and professional organizations, Mrs. Corcoran earned the reputation of a member who "takes every membership, every committee seriously and really works at whatever job she takes on."

The same is true in her professional career.

Widowed only two years after her marriage to the late Buffalo attorney, Frank B. Corcoran, and left with a six-month-old daughter and her elderly mother to support, Mrs. Corcoran went to work as a secretary.

She later was secretary and employment counselor to the Army Corps of Engineers and, while helping members of the corps buy or sell their homes, became interested in real estate.

GRANDMOTHER OF SEVEN

She became a licensed salesman and soon was earning more in her part-time real estate work than in her full-time job.

In 1952, Mrs. Corcoran obtained her broker's license, quit her job and moved with her daughter and sister from Buffalo to a remodeled, 75-year-old farm cottage at 4201 Main St., Eggertsville, her present home and office.

Only recently have three men joined the all-women Corcoran Real Estate Inc., which has sold up to $5-million a year in residential real estate.

A grandmother of seven, Mrs. Corcoran was selected Amherst Woman of the Year in 1967 by the Quota Club of Amherst.

She is charter president of the Amherst Zonta Club, the only woman on the Board of Directors of the American Chapter of the International Federation of Real Estate Brokers, past vice president and a director of the Greater Buffalo Board of Realtors and a member of the license law and legislation committees of the New York State Association of Real Estate Boards.

PLEDGES TO INCREASE MEMBERSHIP

At a recent convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in Dallas, Mrs. Corcoran was appointed to the national public relations committee.

Her activities with the international federation have taken her to conferences in Japan, Holland, Belgium and Denmark, and in March she will attend the convention in Mexico City.

Despite all this, Mrs. Corcoran has pledged to "work day and night to increase the active membership of the Amherst Chamber and to place the Chamber in an active, effective role in the community."

She is preparing, for presentation to the membership in a few weeks, "a very ambitious, comprehensive program of work for 1968 but it is only what is necessary if the Chamber is to carry out its rightful role in the future of Amherst."

HAVE TO GET HOUSE IN ORDER

"With the advent of the university campus, the possible construction of a sports stadium here and the sesquicentennial this summer, 1968 promises to be a very big year for Amherst and for the Chamber," Mrs. Corcoran said.

"We have to get our house in order, to modernize, invigorate so that we don't just have more of the same," she said with characteristic determination.

"If we don't become a responsible force, representing the Amherst business community and the citizenry, we have no purpose and we should disband," she exhorted members in a recent speech.

"I always say, why fool around and take up everyone's time if you're not going to be effective?"

The dust hasn't settled as yet within the Amherst Chamber, but the members already can see that when they elected Marie Corcoran, they latched onto a whirlwind.

Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in an editorial on February 17, 1968, presented a cogent statement of the issues involved in the question of negotiations in Vietnam. It points out that, while a bombing halt will involve some risk, the risks of continuing to escalate the war are even greater. I commend the following to my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1968]

A BOMBING PAUSE, NOW

The Johnson Administration this week has once again demonstrated a greater tenacity and willingness to take risks in the conduct of war in Vietnam than in the pursuit of peace.

Vowing no retreat from Khesanh or the embattled South Vietnamese cities, the Administration is rushing over 10,000 additional troops into the fray, further weakening this nation's capacity to react to emergencies elsewhere. At the same time, the Administration has withdrawn abruptly in the face of a Communist diplomatic offensive which, while unquestionably loaded with risks, presents an opportunity for a fresh bid to end this increasingly costly, dangerous and senseless conflict.

According to Secretary General Thant, who has just conferred with North Vietnamese representatives and others, Hanoi is prepared to enter into prompt and meaningful negotiations if the United States unconditionally stops bombing North Vietnam. Mr. Thant's view is reinforced by recent statements from Hanoi and Moscow and by Prime Minister Wilson's report that the gap between North Vietnam and the United States on negotiations is "very narrow."

The principal remaining obstacle appears to be White House insistence on assurances from Hanoi that the North Vietnamese will not take advantage of a bombing halt to increase the flow of men and supplies into South Vietnam. This is the so-called San Antonio Formula which is not unreasonable in view of the massive buildup of North Vietnamese troops and supplies now threatening American forces at Khesanh.

Actions necessary to provide immediate support for American troops in the area just below the demilitarized zone do not rule out a more flexible American initiative to test the negotiating formula advanced by Hanoi. This initiative could, and in our view should, involve cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, excluding only such tactical air support in the vicinity of the DMZ as may be appropriate for defense of Khesanh and the other threatened garrisons in that region.

As we have long maintained and believe more strongly than ever, the bombing of North Vietnam does not on balance contribute to the security of American forces in the South. The strategic aerial campaign has conspicuously failed to achieve any of its stated objectives. It has not forced Hanoi to the peace table; rather, it has stiffened the North Vietnamese will to resist and helped prolong the war, thus increasing American and allied casualties. It has not significantly reduced the flow of men and supplies to the South; instead, that flow has increased with acceleration of the air war, as is amply demonstrated by the present predicament of allied forces.

At the same time, American bombing attacks on the North have alienated world and domestic opinion, increased the danger of direct conflict with the Soviet Union and China, forced North Vietnam into greater dependence on its Communist allies and exacted a heavy toll of American airmen and aircraft.

There is no compelling reason why the strategic air campaign against the North should not be stopped on even the slimmest chance that such restraint could lead to talks—and perhaps forestall the bloody battle now facing American forces at Khesanh. As long as Khesanh is threatened, of course, continuing tactical air strikes against enemy concentrations and supply lines in the immediate area will remain a matter of inescapable military necessity. But in calling a halt to strategic strikes against the North, the President could offer to reduce such tactical attacks as quickly as the pressure on Khesanh is eased.

Hanoi may and probably will rebuff such a qualified offer, however reasonable. But it is the duty of American diplomacy to persist in every possible effort to bring this horrible war to an honorably negotiated conclusion. It would be difficult to challenge the sincerity of a United States diplomatic initiative based on the practical conditions we have suggested.

If Administration spokesmen appear to discourage further diplomatic efforts, however, and if United States planes persist in pounding Hanoi and other targets far from the battle area, many will continue to question American intentions and Hanoi will retain the diplomatic as well as the military initiative. President Johnson's comment at his press conference last evening that Hanoi is not ready to negotiate may be perfectly true; but without a halt in the bombing the President fails to make it clear to many Americans and to much of the world that he is ready on his part.

The Republican Wrecking Crew Is At It Again

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the Republican wrecking crew is at it again. The latest object of their destruction is this year's civil rights legislation. Yesterday, those familiar cronies, the Republicans and the Southern Democrats, teamed up to defeat a move in the Senate to halt the month-long civil rights debate and bring the measure to the floor for a vote.

This reactionary coalition is proving once again—as if any further proof were needed—that when the chips are down, it is the Republican Party that is the party of obstruction. It is the Republican Party that is totally indifferent to the needs of our Nation's minorities. And it is the Republican Party that is interested in preventing American Negroes and other minority groups from achieving their rightful place in society.

On one hand the Republicans are wringing their hands over riots and crime in the streets, and on the other hand, they show no inclination to attack the problems that cause these results.

They are very clever, this Republican wrecking crew. They hide their destruction behind a cloak of righteous tradition. Yesterday's antics were a perfect example of their deceit—the Republicans would certainly not want to endanger that historical prerogative, the right to maintain endless debate, so in all good conscience they could not possibly vote to help the Negroes.

Remember the "Pueblo"

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, many words have been written concerning the *Pueblo* crisis. Varied explanations have been offered the American public by Government officials in high places. In my judgment, however, the following editorial from the Birmingham News on February 7 has well stated the dilemma which now confronts the United States. I commend it to my colleagues.

THE "PUEBLO" BOTCH

There may have been other ways in which we could have mishandled the *Pueblo* affair, but offhand they don't occur to us.

In a matter of days we've managed to have ourselves humiliated by a fourth-rate power; to lose a ship jampacked with secret equipment and materials, not to mention its crew; to botch up relations with one of our firmest allies, and one of the few with men fighting beside our own in South Vietnam; and to widen the credibility gap almost beyond bridging with a widely inconsistent version of the facts.

It's easy to go back to the beginning and ask simple questions: Why was the *Pueblo* operating in a hostile neighborhood with no protection near at hand? If we had sunk the menacing North Korean gunboats before the *Pueblo* was boarded, there would have been a grave crisis, without question. But it would have been an easier one to handle than the one we're in now.

It wouldn't have been likely to set off a renewal of the Korean hot war, or to bring the U.S. into a nuclear showdown with Russia or China. Once the ship was in enemy hands, this was changed. An attack on North Korea to reclaim the vessel would be something quite different from an act of self-defense on the high seas.

Even if it didn't lead to a nuclear exchange between Russia and the U.S., it could easily bring on the kind of renewed fighting in Korea which would involve us in a two-front Asian war leading no one knows where.

If "Remember the *Pueblo*" became another "Remember the *Maine*," what followed would not likely be called "a splendid little war" at its successful conclusion three months later, as the Spanish-American War was by U.S. Ambassador to London John Hay.

That's why the administration has resisted the cries of congressmen for military action against North Korea, why it has chosen to take the steam out of the crisis with diplomacy, knowing full well that to do so subjects this country to further loss of face in face-conscious Asia.

And that's one reason why our friends in South Korea are so incensed over our secret talks with North Korea seeking a return of the *Pueblo's* crew. They don't really believe we're unconcerned about other truce violations, especially the attempt to assassinate their president, or that we are about to sell them out; but they do feel that the appearance is one of greater concern for our own interests than for South Korea's and that our talks with the north with Seoul excluded give the Communist government in Pyongyang more international stature.

If anti-American feeling runs higher—and it could—there could be repercussions not only in South Korea but in Vietnam.

Through all of this, "official spokesmen" for the U.S. government have carried the ball like a broken-field runner with no idea where the goal line is.

The *Pueblo* absolutely was in international waters, Ambassador Goldberg says at the U.N. Well, we can't be 1,000 per cent certain that it hadn't been in North Korea's territorial waters at one time or another, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara say a few days later on national television.

One time we are told all classified papers and equipment aboard the *Pueblo* were detroyed; later we are told they were not. South Korean and Japanese news sources say that we have made a deal with North Korea to admit we were in their territorial waters in exchange for release of the crew; Washington (at last report) calls the stories unfounded.

The fact is that Americans by now don't know what to believe. And that's an even greater tragedy than the highjacking of an American ship.

All of the dramatics and elocution coaching he receives won't enable the President to gloss over the fact that the *Pueblo* affair was botched from start to finish.

"Somebody is going to lose his head over this one," a government source was quoted as saying last week.

The head might not roll until November. The American people have been more deeply disturbed by this affair than it might seem.

Student Reporters in Vietnam—II

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two news dispatches written by Queens College students, currently acting as Vietnam correspondents for the college paper, the Phoenix. These dispatches represent a valuable and almost unique source of information, since they are firsthand student impressions of the war in Vietnam.

With permission, I insert additional articles by these student reporters:

(By Ralph Paladino)

SAIGON.—There is no dearth of opinion concerning the Vietnamese people here in American-dominated Saigon. Most of that opinion is critical, and much of it disdainful. An MP on patrol in the city stated it succinctly: "I wouldn't give you a wooden piastre for the whole stinking country." A captain beginning his second year in Vietnam suggested that "we oughta plow the place under and go home." A major acting as liaison officer between the U.S. Army and the Vietnamese Army referred to the Vietnamese in the course of a conversation as "totally useless."

It is in many cases the basic style of life that come under particular criticism. "It takes three of them to stand around and do nothing, and even then they'll do it backwards," says a civilian construction engineer. "We could bring over Americans to do the whole job, and in the long run it would be cheaper than having the Vietnamese work on it." This is a sentiment not peculiar to Americans. In speaking to a number of Indian merchants in Saigon, I often heard the words "dishonesty," "lazy," and "stupid." A Chinese tailor with many Vietnamese working for him told me, "Everytime I go on vacation, my business drops 70 per cent. Then my clerk buys a new car."

But there is sentiment in favor of the Vietnamese. In an MP company that works closely with the ARVN in the Saigon area, only two men out of 30 were critical of the Vietnamese Army. The most repeated comment in answer to the question, "What do you think of the Vietnamese troops?" was "They do their job, sir."

Yet it is the charge of cowardice that comes up most often in discussions of the Vietnamese military. Singled out in particular are the Saigon police (affectionately known to Americans as "white mice") who have the responsibility for defending Saigon against attack. "They're all cowards" says a naval lieutenant whose hotel is next to a police station that recently came under attack. "As soon as the VC started shooting, they disappeared." A marine who arrived at the Embassy minutes after it came under attack told me that the police were nowhere to be seen. "There are supposed to be five guards at the Embassy, and the police station is right around the corner. I didn't see one policeman all night."

A marine captain who spent a year as an adviser to an ARVN unit called them "gutsy little guys" and blames bad units on the officers who command them. In contrast, a Korean sergeant whose men foiled the attack on the Presidential Palace just sneered when I pointed to the Vietnamese soldiers on the Palace grounds.

Civilian opinion is equally divided. An ex-GI who returned to Vietnam as a member of the Agency for International Development told me he came back because he liked the people and wanted to help them. Another AID employee on his way home called the entire program "a waste of time."

From an American point of view, many of the criticisms are obviously justified. Vietnamese seldom hurry unless they are gunning a motorcycle. The waiting that dealing with any Vietnamese entails can be a frustrating experience for a man in a hurry. Even using the phones where circuits have to be broken by hand can mean ten or 15 wasted minutes between calls.

This nonchalant attitude towards life and the war is particularly infuriating to the military. As much as 50 per cent of some units were home on Tet leave when the VC struck. Yet the attack had been expected for many days. American billets even had notices posted on their bulletin boards 24 hours before the onslaught. There is a general feeling among the military that this unpreparedness cost the lives of American soldiers, and is bitterly resented.

The bitterest criticism is reserved for the government of South Vietnam. Saigon is a city on wheels, mostly two wheels. Traffic is worse than the peak of Friday afternoon rush hour in New York. Motorcycles and scooters weave in and out of jeeps, military vehicles, and an occasional civilian car. No traffic lights and very few traffic police add to the havoc. And for all practical purposes, the drivers of the cycles are of draft age.

These young men are the students, the privileged class in Vietnam; as in the United States, the class that knows it will stay alive no matter what the outcome. A man of draft age can register for a university and never attend classes and still continue his enrollment. And if that's too much trouble, a Certificate of Attendance can be bought for almost nothing—about $25 on the black market.

Virtually the same criticisms are leveled against student deferments in the United States, and they are answered with virtually the same rebuttals. "It is unjust," claims the *Saigon Daily News*, "that the well-off should be able to go to school unmolested while the rest of the nation fights for its survival." It is unlikely that the system will be changed, even in view of the considerable pressure the United States is applying to the government. A naval petty officer commented sarcastically, "If they'd draft these hippies on motorbikes, I just might think they give a damn."

Government corruption is hardly criticized by most Americans here. There is little evidence of it on the lower levels, and that's where Americans deal. None of the correspondents I spoke to could give me a concrete example of corruption in government. Most people seem to assume that the president and vice-president both have their planes fueled and their Swiss bank accounts bursting.

The black market is the most flourishing business in all of Saigon. On any block in the business district of the city there will be three or four small stands containing five or six cartons of cigarettes, some assorted tobacco, chewing gum, sunglasses, and whatever else was in this week's shipment to the PX. I am told that often when the PX has run out of something, it will appear on the stands a day or two before the exchange stocks it on its shelves.

Black market prices are high. The Vietnamese pay 45 cents or more for a pack of cigarettes which cost twelve cents at the PX. It is difficult to tell whether it is the high prices or the existence of the market that angers the average soldier more, but most think that the government should just confiscate the whole thing. A few look on it more philosophically, saying, "If they didn't get their money to feed their families from the black market, they'd probably slit our throats for it instead."

The Vietnamese attitude towards Americans is more difficult to discern. They are a polite people and answer only with polite phrases if they are asked what they think of Americans. Frequent editorials in the *Saigon Daily News* and *Saigon Post*, English language newspapers, criticize the Americans regularly for conducting themselves like an "occupation army." While no Vietnamese I spoke to would give a candid answer to a question concerning American behavior in the city, one has only to watch an American jeep speeding through traffic without regard to police or signals to understand this criticism.

One illustrative incident occurred when an Army truck and a Vietnamese truck loaded with sacks of grain passed in a narrow street, with contact between them knocking some of the sacks onto the street. An American Army private got out to check his own cargo, got into his truck, and drove off. American impatience often becomes rudeness, and in this country it is easy to become impatient.

Some of the other ethnic elements in the city were more candid. The French look on us sympathetically as bumbling idiots. A French consular official's wife complained that her husband had been in Vietnam for 30 years and had never been consulted or asked for advice by the Americans. Others expected the same feeling—that they would be able to help us if we'd only ask. But unlike Charles de Gaulle, all expressed a certain amount of appreciation for our presence.

The Indians and Chinese have little personal loyalty to Vietnam, and if they feel any hostility to the American presence here they do not display it. As an Indian businessman told me, "If the Viet Cong takes over, we will just go somewhere else." Even President Johnson could not sum it up better than that.

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—The aftermath of the battle can be more horrifying than the battle itself.

At least those who take up arms to fight know what they are letting themselves in for. The innocent civilians who emerge homeless and propertyless are not given the choice. They do not go to the battlefield; the battlefield comes to them.

There are now nearly 350,000 people in this country who have become refugees as a result of the week-long Viet Cong assault. Almost one-third of them are in Saigon.

The government, through its Ministry of Health, has been trying to meet the problem. Seventy-three refugee stations are now operating here; for the most part, they testify to the misery rather than assuage it.

The largest of the refugee centers, located in the Ba Trieu Prime School in the Cholon section of the city, has been servicing as many as 6,000 people. They live in squalor, have barely enough food, and look at visitors with a hopeless gaze that has already marked itself as the face of Vietnam.

Saigon health teams are trying to improve the situation. They circulate among the centers, assist in providing sanitary quarters, supply potable water, and inoculate the refugees against cholera and plague. Their efforts are more well-intentioned than effective.

A family lives in a home all of its life, and often for several generations. It is a small place, containing little furniture, primitive cooking apparatus, woven sleeping mats, and a Buddhist altar in memory of the ancestors. Here, as in all of Asia, the family is the key social institution.

War puts an end to it. Block upon block upon block here has been burned to the ground. Many areas were reduced to little more than rubble. People sift through the ashes, hunting for objects they can identify as their own.

Children are separated from parents, parents from children, husbands from wives. In the centers, refugees pester visitors for news of their families. None is available.

Outside, a curfew has been imposed. Vietnamese are not allowed on the streets after 2 p.m.; Americans after 7 p.m. By 1:30 p.m., roads and sidewalks are nearly deserted. One walks through them as through a Hollywood set. Leaflets, dropped from American planes, blow across the street. Rats rummage for food through piles of garbage collecting on the sidewalks.

An American is approached by a beggar on every block; frequently more often. Old women, carrying naked children in their arms, hold out their hands and point to their mouths. However often it happens, one never becomes calloused. Human misery never manages to become matter of fact. The intensity of its effect never diminishes.

One block is completely lined with groups of people living on cots in the street. Huge flies swarm above them and settle on sleeping babies. There are no men around.

Two blocks away a convoy of tanks and personnel carriers makes its way southward out of the city. They are off to fight the battles that will save the nation. The government has appealed to countries throughout the world to send food to meet the current emergency. It doesn't have enough money to buy its own.

On a single day last week, 506 tons of rice were delivered to 28 distribution points throughout the city. There the rice was sold at the pre-Tet price of 22 piastres a kilo (about $.18). In the refugee centers, it was distributed free along with milk, canned fish, and meat.

The people in the centers take their meals, talk quietly among themselves, and think of what they have lost and how they will rebuild. There is nothing else for them to do. This is a war which they didn't make and which, for the most part, they don't understand. It doesn't make much difference to them which side wins.

The United States Agency for International Development works with the Vietnamese government in trying to alleviate the suffering of the refugees. Its doctors and health experts make periodic trips to the largest of the refugee centers. But no one has yet made any long-range plans for these people, or else they're just not talking about them.

So far, all programs to treat the refugees have been set up on an ad hoc basis. Officials seem to be hoping that everyone who is now homeless will be able to find a relative with whom to stay. To some extent their hopes have been borne out. But for tens of thousands of people, such relief is not yet in sight.

There is ample evidence that the government and AID will be able to care for them for a good while longer. Emergency shipments of food are beginning to arrive in the country. But hospitals and school buildings cannot be used indefinitely to house people whose homes and possessions have been destroyed. If the fighting continues in heavily populated areas, the number of refugees will soar, thereby putting a tremendous strain on public facilities.

As yet, whatever plans officials may have to deal with the problem have not been made public. But even if adequate housing can be found and food supplies hold out, some effort must be made to revitalize these people who have become innocent victims of the war.

It is often said here and in the United States that there can be no purely military solution to the Vietnam problem. For those who want to attempt political or economic solutions, the refugees offer a place to begin.

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—In the wake of last week's Viet Cong assault on South Vietnam, the most puzzling question concerns how they were able to bring it off.

For more than three years, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps pilots have been bombing strategic targets in North Vietnam, and have been achieving moderate success. It would seem reasonable by now that all bridges have been destroyed, roads gutted, oil burned, railroads cut, airfields decimated, and electric generators knocked out.

But, like the Sorcerer's Apprentice, the enemy gathers more strength with each setback.

Military leaders here are openly expressing their surprise at the size and scope of the enemy's offensive. "It's been a week of surprises," said Brig. Gen. John Chaisson, director of MACV's Combat Operations Center.

"The VC surprised us with their attacks. We have been faced this past week with a real battle, and there's no sense of ducking it and no sense of hiding it.

"When you look at figures that are of the magnitude of 1,000 friendly killed in less than five days of fighting, and something of the magnitude of 12,000 of the enemy killed in the same period, you're talking about real fighting."

And when you spread it across the map from the DMZ down to the tip of IV Corps (the Mekong Delta), it increases the difficulties of the battle.

"The enemy engineered and planned a very successful offensive—in its initial phases. It was surprisingly intensive, and I think in conducting it he showed a surprising amount of audacity, because he has put an awful lot of his goods up on the table in this battle."

Officials have yet to speculate about how and when the Viet Cong were able to mass their forces for the attack. Estimates of the number of enemy actively engaged in the battle center around 60,000, with 2,500 in Saigon. But the logistics problem of outfitting 60,000 troops for a major battle has not been discussed. Nor has the question of how that many soldiers can be armed and supplied and fed without anybody knowing it.

Intelligence officers claim that from captured documents and prisoner interrogation they were able to piece together a good deal of what was going to happen. They say they knew a country-wide offensive was in the offing, its approximate date, and the size of the enemy forces.

If that is the case, they obviously never picked up the phone to tell Gen. Chaisson about it.

But more important is the problem of how the Viet Cong is able to move and supply itself with such ease. It is true that out of uniform it is impossible to distinguish a VC from a civilian Vietnamese, and that undoubtedly lessens the travel burden.

It is also true that a good part of the Viet Cong's heavy equipment, rocket launchers, and other crew-served weapons, are broken down and moved in parts in order to avoid detection.

But in contrast with the United States' tremendous logistic support, airplanes, ships, trucks, road building, and complete freedom of movement, it becomes almost Kafkaesque to compare the two forces and realize that the stronger has so far been unable to defeat or even demoralize the weaker.

In Saigon alone, nine Viet Cong battalions were able to infiltrate into the city, pick up their weapons and enough food for one and one-half days, secure their positions, and open fire before they were detected. Urgent messages in military installations the day before indicated that the city was being infiltrated, but these were based on intelligence assumptions rather than actual sightings.

And in the provinces of the II Corps Tactical Zone, military spokesmen are admitting that "the enemy came through various secure sectors. We did not detect the approach of as many units as we should have."

From all indications, this pattern was repeated throughout the country. The Viet Cong took definite advantage of the noise and confusion caused by the Tet celebration to move into their attacking positions. So claims the military.

But that explanation cannot completely account for the overwhelming success of the initial surprise attacks that were launched on January 30 and 31. It does not seem unfair to conclude that the Viet Cong received more assistance from civilian Vietnamese than the United States is pleased to admit.

Whether that assistance came as a result of coercion or actual support for the NLF cause is a matter more of conjecture than of fact. The several reported Viet Cong attempts to create grass-roots uprisings all failed, raising questions about how much of the assistance was based on support.

It is now certain that the Viet Cong hoped to instigate such uprisings as part of their Tet offensive. A captured training document aimed at low-level VC cadres, released here by the U.S. Mission, states that the third immediate fighting objective was to "arouse the masses in the cities and rural areas temporarily under enemy control."

Though attempts were made to carry out this objective, none were successful. Yet at the same time that American leaders here are buoyed by the failure of the VC to create a groundswell of support, they must also take into account the fact that despite the presence of half a million U.S. troops and the military expenditure of $25 billion a year, the people are assisting the Viet Cong in striking whenever and wherever they please.

If it is a matter of coercion, then the United States must ask why it is unable to provide the security that the Viet Cong apparently can.

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—Care to make an extra buck during curfew?

Ingenious Americans, never at a loss for ways to kill time and make money, have added a little side interest to the mighty war-watching activities atop the city's hotels.

Every evening a crowd gathers on the roofs to take in the unfolding action. One pulls up a soft chair, orders a drink from the roof-top bar, and settles back to watch the air strikes, explosions, tracers, and artillery fire on the horizon.

Since there's no baseball or football, and the VC has taken over the race track, one group at the Embassy Hotel makes book on what time the first flare will be dropped, signaling the official opening of the hunting season.

For a quarter the sporting man can pick any time, with the minutes just before 7:30 p.m. offering the best hope of winning the pot. One man chooses 7:22, another 7:24, a third 7:26, while side bets add excitement for those who have not joined in the pool.

As each time approaches, eyes scan the darkening sky. "I just saw two flashes," one contestant shouts. "Two flashes equals one flare."

"Not a chance," respond the others, as they mount chairs to get a better view of the heavens.

And then come the flare dances. "Oh, God of Flares, drop one now. Let's start burning the taxpayers' money. Look how dark it's getting. The VC will be infiltrating the area." All this accompanied by breast beating and hopping on one foot.

It didn't work for the Indians either.

Samuels Earns Growing Respect

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as the then Senator John F. Kennedy once remarked in 1959, "we in Western New York are the heirs of Grover Cleveland."

One of the most distinguished of Cleveland's heirs is a man whom we are now fortunate enough to have here in Washington in the Federal service, Howard J. Samuels, Under Secretary of Commerce.

One of Cleveland's most remembered remarks was: "I would rather be right than President." This well describes the attitude of Howard Samuels. Throughout his career in New York State politics he has never been blemished by comprising his principles or what he thought was right.

Mr. Speaker, Howard Samuels' integrity and determination are already being felt here in Washington in many quarters, although he has only been here 3 months. In recognition of this, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following article about Mr. Samuels by the distinguished columnist Lucian C. Warren which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on Sunday, February 18, 1968, be included in today's RECORD.

The article follows:

SAMUELS EARNS GROWING RESPECT

(By Lucian C. Warren)

WASHINGTON.—Upstate New York industrialist Howard J. Samuels, a loser in politics, may become one of the more successful subcabinet members of the Johnson administration.

The Canandaigua businessman, who built a small fortune on his MIT thesis about a plastic clothes line, was sworn in as under secretary of commerce on Nov. 30. After nearly three months in office, he is marked as one of the more imaginative innovators of government policies.

He is also regarded with awe as one of the few men in the Johnson administration who can talk turkey to business, labor, minority groups, and even President Johnson, and get away with it.

ARGUED AGAINST TRAVEL TAX

When other presidential advisers sold Johnson on a travel tax for Americans abroad, Samuels reportedly argued against it as a negative and unworkable approach toward the balance of payments problem.

Samuels lost, but mounting troubles in Congress on the tax proposal may some day confirm his judgment.

The Upstate New Yorker has learned to take his defeats philosophically and wait for the time when he has a perfect right to say "I told you so."

He was one of the great promoters for a New York State constitutional convention, but lost in his bid to make selection of the delegates on a nonpartisan basis. As a result the proposed amendments reaped a hornet's nest of opposition.

WON SECOND SPOT IN CONVENTION REVOLT

Democratic leaders in New York State snuffed out his bid to become the party's gubernatorial nominee in 1966, but the Buffalo convention revolted after he lost for the top spot and named him the candidate for lieutenant governor over the leadership's opposition.

Samuels was in the forefront in the upstate fight against the original New York State medical assistance plan and lost, only to have his viewpoint subsequently confirmed both in Washington and Albany.

When Howard Samuels was sworn in as the No. 2 man in the Commerce Department in impressive White House ceremonies, President Johnson said he wanted to challenge Samuels to do something about "solving the stubborn problems that plague our country."

ORIGINAL SOLUTIONS OFFERED BY SAMUELS

Among the challenges, the President said, was to do something about "Slum America" and about hiring and training 500,000 hard-core unemployed."

Samuels took the President at his word and has come up with some highly original solutions to such problems.

In the heart of urban ghetto country, Samuels in a speech on Jan. 22 to the Downtown Brooklyn Association suggested that the ghetto problems won't be solved until something is done about the uneconomic migrations of the rural poor into the heart of central cities.

"The cores of our cities," Samuels declared, "are crying out for economic relief and new economic development."

The Samuels prescription: Low-cost loans or relocation allowances to encourage people to move where the jobs are; open-housing to permit ghetto residents to live in decent homes where the jobs are; a restructuring of the welfare system to provide more uniform welfare benefits throughout the country; improved schooling facilities; a larger concentration of federal investment in smaller cities to increase their job attraction to migrants.

SOME IN GHETTO OPPOSE FORMULA

Some strident voices of self-appointed spokesmen for the ghettos have denounced the Samuels formula as infringing on people's desires to move as they see fit.

Samuels has also taken off his gloves in dealing with the business community.

"You are faced, gentlemen, with no less than a social revolution, a social upheaval that threatens to rend this nation and fragment our cities into black and white"—these were his words in another January speech to the annual midwinter conference of New York State Chamber of Commerce executives.

CITES DISTORTIONS IN PERSPECTIVE

The government official from the ranks of business told the group he was disappointed that the chamber "has allowed its economic achievements to distort its perspective of social problems that cannot be solved in the old traditional ways, with fund drives, checks and social workers."

The Samuels formula for business progress on the social front: Greater investment in "human resources"; initiative in promoting fair housing legislation; community-wide efforts by business in major cities to hire hard-core unemployed; rewriting of personnel policies to include the disadvantaged and unskilled; coordination of vocational school training with needed industrial skills; support for a national standard of welfare payments; a drive against "regressive personnel policies and enfeebling practices" in local governments.

Again there were grumblings that "one of our own" could speak out with candor on problems that are taboo to some businessmen.

LABOR COMMUNITY TIED TO INFLATION

The labor community gets its lumps from Samuels when he discusses the causes of inflation. The Canandaigua businessman feels that some of the policies of organized labor are among the major root causes for the ever increasing threat of inflation.

In a thoughtful discourse before the congressional Joint Economic Committee on Feb. 7, Samuels suggested that rising labor costs have exceeded productivity gains.

"Collective bargaining settlements in 1967 averaged about 5.5 per cent while in the manufacturing sector the rise in output per man hour was only 1 per cent," he said. "If we conclude, as I have, that such settlements can't generally be absorbed by U.S. industry, we face a dangerous inflationary pattern."

TAX SURCHARGE WINS BACKING

The Samuels, antiinflation formula: "Wage-price restraint" plus enactment of the temporary income tax surcharge and achievement of increases in productivity.

There have been no huzzahs heard in labor circles over the Samuels' analysis.

Nevertheless, the under secretary will continue to speak out for what he feels is best for his country. Perhaps his influence will widen, possibly through an appointment to an even higher office or to run in the future again for some statewide political office.

Although such political advancement cannot be charted with certainty, Samuels can be relied on not to budge from his carefully thought-out programs, no matter how much opposition they may incur.

Increasing Power of the Federal Revenue

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished attorney general of the State of Texas, the Honorable Crawford Martin, recently addressed a meeting of the Federal-State Tax Problems Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General in Washington.

Attorney General Martin's remarks concern a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court which could affect the disposition of thousands of estates. I believe every Member can find some food for thought in the Attorney General's warning. Here is the text of his address:

THE BOSCH CASE AND THE INCREASING POWER OF THE FEDERAL REVENUE

(Remarks by the Attorney General of Texas before the National Association of Attorneys General, Washington, D.C., before the Federal-State Tax Problems Committee, January 31, 1968)

There is now pending before the Internal Revenue Service here in Washington a policy question which will have serious consequences upon the jurisdiction of all of the members of this Association. Texas, like practically all other States, has both constitutional and statutory responsibilities with respect to public charities. For example, no law suit can be filed in Texas affecting a charity without joining the Attorney General as a party and no dispute or controversy of any character affecting a charity, whether in or out of court, may be settled or compromised without the approval of the Attorney General. We are charged to protect the public interest and there is no area of our responsibility which receives more attention. I feel certain that each of you deal with any number of cases each year involving the same problems.

Historically our office has been instrumental in bringing about settlements with respect to various kinds of litigation and disputes involving charities, particularly in estate cases. One such suit was filed in Fort Worth in 1964 where if the plaintiff had finally prevailed (and she had an excellent chance of doing so), it would have wiped out all of the assets which would have gone to the public charity. The case was complex and bitterly contested and involved innumerable parties. One ancillary suit was tried on the merits and numerous accounting hearings were heard before the case was eventually set for trial some two years after it had been filed. By that time, accounting fees alone had amounted to $150,000 and the attorney fees and court costs were mounting at an alarming rate. Because of the efforts of our office, we were finally successful in bringing the case to settlement. While the settlement was not completely satisfactory to any of the litigants, it was in our opinion a fair settlement and in the public interest. We were successful in preserving a substantial sum of money for the charitable foundation involved.

The Settlement Agreement was submitted to the State District Trial Court and was approved by him after a hearing. The District Court throughout the litigation had been as anxious as the Attorney General to bring the litigation to an end because the estate involved was being dissipated by the enormous expenses of litigation. No appeal was taken from the Trial Court's judgment and the judgment became final. The issues involved were solely concerned with questions of State law; the case was not filed for tax purposes and appeared to have no federal tax consequences.

About one year later, in June of 1967, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its opinion in the case of *Commissioner v. Estate of Bosch,* 387 U.S. 456, which appears to adopt a sweeping new rule governing the effect of State court decisions and discarding a large body of law including many prior decisions by the United States Supreme Court. In a 6 to 3 opinion, the Court held that where federal tax liability turns on the character of a property interest determined under State law, federal authorities are not bound by a judgment of a lower State court. Heretofore the Revenue Service has been held to be bound by lower State court determinations resulting from bona fide controversies. In *Bosch,* the Supreme Court holds that in the absence of a statute or decision by the highest court in the State, the federal courts may make their own independent determinations of State property law.

While this case is disturbing enough in that it apparently confers upon the Revenue

Service the unbridled discretion to look behind any lower State court judgment with which it does not agree, the Revenue Service in Dallas has now construed *Bosch* to also mean that the federal government is not required to honor any kind of settlement of adversary litigation.

In the Fort Worth estate case to which I have referred, the District Director has ruled that the Settlement Agreement which was brought about by the Attorney General should be disregarded and the case relitigated in Federal Court for tax purposes. The case is now pending on appeal in the National Office of the Revenue Service here in Washington and if the National Office affirms the Dallas District Director, it will virtually do away with the jurisdiction of the members of this Association to ever bring to settlement a dispute involving a public charity. What litigant would ever be willing to settle a controversy which the Revenue Service can require to be tried again? Since the Federal Government cannot be legally joined as a party to a State court proceeding, neither res judicata nor collateral estoppel would bar the Revenue Service from forcing retrials of the same cause.

If the Revenue Service construes *Bosch* to mean that it can look behind all judgments of our State courts and behind settlements of bona fide disputes, then I believe we are in serious trouble. We may very well need to ask for Congressional relief to limit the impact of this Supreme Court decision. The Revenue Service is already powerful enough but if they can disregard our State courts and State Attorneys General, then we are going to have absolute chaos in the administration of justice.

Because of the seriousness of this matter, I have taken the liberty of reproducing both a letter and a brief that I filed with the Internal Revenue Service urging them to establish a standard which despite *Bosch* would permit Attorneys General to carry out their statutory and constitutional authority. To those of you who are interested, I hope you will pick up copies and if you regard the problem as I do, I hope you will make your position known to the National Revenue Service before it is too late. In any event, if you have not already done so, I urge you to read the *Bosch* case without delay.

How Not To Respond

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is responding to the prospect of future disorders in our cities with little understanding. From the local police chief to the Justice Department, there is too much emphasis on more police and too little emphasis on the redress of legitimate grievances. Unfortunately, less attention is being paid to improving police-community relations than was the case a few years ago.

The press is full of reports of quasi-military preparations to squash any renewed rioting. Nothing like the same energy is being directed toward restoring the confidence of minority groups in the police and providing equality of opportunity in jobs, education, and housing.

A recent article in the New York Times described the Army's preparation for possible riots. It also notes the new Los Angeles riot squad, "Special Weapons and Tactics," which just happens to spell SWAT. This name is not coincidental. I am afraid that it is indicative of the attitude of too many officials and police toward the ghetto.

The article, from the New York Times of February 16, 1968, follows:

ARMY STOCKPILING RIOT EQUIPMENT—AIRLIFT TO ANY CITY PLANNED FOR DISORDERS IN SUMMER

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Army is stockpiling riot control equipment in strategically located depots across the country, officials said today, and is ready to airlift it to any city if civil disorders break out next summer.

Army and National Guard officials said their planning had been extensive as well as diverse, ranging from obtaining maps of subway, sewer, water and electrical systems in potential trouble spots to preparing menus for mobilized national guardsmen.

The North Carolina Guard, for example, will have fish with tartar sauce for dinner on the third day if called out.

Strategy sessions have involved thousands of individuals from the Pentagon's top officials to policemen on the beat.

"I personally feel assured the planning is adequate," said Maj. Gen. Francis Greenlief, deputy chief of the National Guard Bureau. General Greenlief and the Guard chief, Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, will tour 40 states this spring, reviewing state and local preparations.

STOCKPILE CENTERS SECRET

From interviews with Pentagon, National Guard and other officials, these major points emerged:

The Army is stockpiling special equipment in a half-dozen or so depots, but officials refused to give the exact number or say where they were. "That's classified," one officer said.

General Greenlief said, "The Army has developed a plan for providing very, very rapidly any additional communications equipment required by the states." He also said that stockpiled equipment included search lights and riot-control agents such as tear gas. Another source said that M–79 grenade launchers were among the stockpiled equipment.

There has also been "preplanning for air delivery" of the equipment, General Greenlief said. Local National Guard commanders know, he said, that "all they have to do is pick up the phone" to request special equipment.

Training has been broadened. Several hundred Army, National Guard and police officials are taking week-long special courses in riot control at Fort Gordon, Ga., home of the Army's military policemen.

LESSONS FROM LAST YEAR

In addition, the Army has supplied Guard units with detailed riot training plans. These include lessons learned last summer in Detroit, Newark and other cities.

Before summer, Army inspectors will personally review units "in critical areas"—these where the potential for violence is greatest.

The Army established at the Pentagon last December a 13-member Special Civil Disturbance Board. The National Guard Bureau strengthened one of its sections and renamed it. The Special Office for Military Support to Civil Authority. This office has 227 full-time staffers scattered throughout the nation.

Besides maps and menus, detailed tactical planning includes selection of routes into urban slums, assembly points and buildings where troops can be housed.

LOS ANGELES POLICE PLAN

A new concept called SWAT is included in a comprehensive antiriot plan developed by the Los Angeles Police Department, which had to cope with the riots in Watts in 1965.

The plan is in a 150-page outline disclosed today but prepared and published last month at request of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

"We have a SWAT team," said Police Inspector Merton W. Howe, commander of tactical operations planning for the department. "That's our Special Weapons and Tactics team, which breaks into four-man groups—a rifleman whose weapon has telescopic sights, a spotter and two officers with shotguns and hand guns to provide cover fire."

Fifteen SWAT teams are available for such duty as protecting police stations, firemen and equipment that become objects of snipers. Thirty more such teams are being developed.

Miss Mae C. Hawes, 81-Year-Old VISTA Volunteer

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading magazines in this Nation, Ebony, featured an excellent article about VISTA in the February issue. VISTA, as part of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has created among the poor, genuine progress in lifting themselves out of poverty. Dedicated VISTA volunteers are working throughout the land to bring America's promise to all of our citizens. Mr. Speaker, Ebony describes the fine work one of the VISTA volunteers is doing in New York City. Miss Mae C. Hawes is 81 years old and has been working with those in poverty for the past 3 years as a VISTA volunteer. I know my colleagues will find the following story of Miss Hawes work to be truly important and inspiring:

HER WORK INCLUDES SOCIAL PROBLEMS

In a society where retirement at 65 is as automatic as sunset, the determination of anyone to be still working at age 81 is a minor miracle. One such person is Miss Mae C. Hawes who is the oldest worker in the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. VISTA has given her a chance to remain active, to fill out her remaining years with service, in short, to remain a retirement dropout. Teaching illiterate people reading and mathematics and foreigners the English language, she has been a beacon of hope for three years at the Henry Street Settlement House on New York's poverty-ridden Lower East Side. Her students include dozens of men and women of all ages and races. "She was sent to me from Heaven," says one. "I was walking my little boy to nursery school when I saw Mae and started talking to her. She was the kind of person you could say anything to. But I was embarrassed to tell her I could hardly read or write. I told Mae my secret and she helped me to accept it and not be ashamed. I've learned so much. Just the other day my son asked me a word and I was able to look it up in the dictionary."

Such results are priceless rewards for Miss Hawes who receives only the barest living expenses and $50 a month. In 1951 she had decided to retire in Los Angeles after years of work as a lecturer at the Atlanta University School of Social Work, a dean of women at Cheyney State College, a mathematics instructor, a mathematics department head at Tennessee State University, a YWCA field secretary and a world traveler. The retirement was short-lived. "I just got tired of sitting around Los Angeles doing odds and ends of volunteer work," recalls Miss Hawes. "I've worked all my life and I guess I can't stop."

"I've been with Miss Hawes over a year," says one student of the 81-year-old teacher. "When I first came I couldn't even read the sign telling the name of the street on which I had lived for 15 years. Now because of her interest and help, I not only read, I also speak better. I really appreciate what she has done for me."

Miss Hawes' students are mostly housewives who come to class as often as they can, sometimes with toddlers and baby carriages. She will use a religious song, a soul food recipe, a street sign, just about anything out of students' familiar experiences to teach reading and advance them toward their ultimate goal of passing a high school equivalency examination. But counseling her students on their personal problems takes up as much of her time as tutoring, since she believes her job involves helping them in their total lives. If the students' personal problems are too big for her to solve, she refers them to social agencies that can help.

Miss Hawes is convinced that students "must learn to trust you before they spread out their inadequacies before you. This is why so many are never reached by public classes. After a certain age, an adult is embarrassed to go back to the fourth grade. Once started, however, they are more eager to learn than their children. They know what it's like to be without an education."

Miss Hawes has spent a long lifetime helping satisfy the hunger for education in others, yet she says: "I wish I had 100 more years to live because there is so much to be done."

Address of Hon. Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey, at Seminar on "The Problems of Obscenity: Its National and Local Implications," University of Notre Dame, February 15, 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1968, on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, in my congressional district, there was conducted a seminar on the problem of obscenity, with particular attention to its national and local implications.

Among the outstanding speakers who addressed the seminar on this problem were our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable DOMINICK V. DANIELS, who is chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and is principal sponsor in the House of the legislation establishing a National Commission on Pornography and Obscenity.

Another outstanding speaker at the seminar was the distinguished General Counsel for the U.S. Post Office Department, the Honorable Timothy J. May.

Community leaders, educators, law-enforcement officials, and persons from the publishing industry and the medical profession took part in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like here to list the outstanding community leaders who constituted the committee which organized this conference. They are: Stuart M. Place, chairman; Thomas P. Bergin; Charles M. Boynton; John L. Carey; Gerald G. Hammes; Joseph E. Hickey; Jerome B. Kearns; Louis S. LaPierre III; Arthur E. Russell; Anthony O. Simon; William H. Voll; and James L. Hesburgh.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the address delivered on this occasion by Congressman DANIELS:

ADDRESS BY HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, CONGRESSMAN FROM NEW JERSEY, AT THE CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IND., DURING A SEMINAR ON, "THE PROBLEMS OF OBSCENITY: ITS NATIONAL AND LOCAL IMPLICATIONS," FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Mr. Chairman Stuart Place, Father John Walsh, my worthy Colleague, Congressman John Brademas, Dean Thomas P. Bergin, Counsellor Timothy J. May, Mr. Raymond P. Gauer and distinguished guests:

It is a great privilege and a high honor for me to be with you today. At this point, I would like to thank all of those individuals who have made my first trip to Notre Dame a memorable one.

As a youngster growing up in the metropolitan New York Area, I was a member in good standing of the subway alumni of this University. The subway alumni are those whose support of the Fighting Irish has always equaled that of the smaller group of alumni who actually attended classes here. Thus, I hope my very vocal support of the University serves to offset the fact that a part of my education was obtained at a place called Fordham, under the jurisdiction of the Society of Jesus.

I always dreamed of coming to Notre Dame, but frankly, I never dreamed of coming as guest speaker on the subject of pornography. My dreams in those days were more along the lines of listening to lectures by Knute Rockne, rather than that of academic discussions on obscenity and its effects on contemporary society.

But I do want you to know that being invited to come here to speak before this distinguished group is one of the high points of my life and one which I shall never forget.

Ever since I began to seriously study the problems occasioned by the dissemination of obscene material and what Congress should do about this problem, I have tried to relate the recent enormous increase in this material to what is happening to our culture generally. It never ceases to amaze me how drastic the changes have been, even in the brief span of years of my own lifetime, in what are apparently the generally acceptable standards for dress and deportment and in what is offered to the general public for reading and viewing.

There are those who are opposed to all censorship of obscenity, regardless of whether it reaches adults or children, and who ridicule those who see some dangers in its dissemination by characterizing them in such terms as persons who indulge in scare talk about the depravity of civilization.

The eminent historian, Professor Arnold Toynbee, in a recent interview referred to the fact that Man's environment has changed so drastically in the past half century or so, and shows every indication of such continued accelerated change, that he questions whether Man will prove adaptable enough, in the long run, to survive these changes. He thought it particularly ironic and rather pathetic that these changes which may eventually result in Man's annihilation have been brought about by Man, himself, and were not imposed upon him involuntarily.

Professor Toynbee was speaking chiefly of Man's physical environment. The effects of obscenity, good or bad, relate to Man's moral and cultural environment, but I feel that in this latter environment there has been a similar revolution. The stresses imposed by such rapid and drastic changes may be so difficult for Man to adjust to, that this second revolution may also pose a threat to Man's continued existence as a civilized creature.

It seems to me that in the recent past, the average man, woman, and child appear to have accepted for themselves a more disciplined standard of personal conduct by which they have attempted to live. Even though the standard may not always have been achieved, there seemed to have been more unanimity of opinion as to what these standards should be, and a more genuine conviction of what is "right" and what is "wrong."

I would not, myself, necessarily recommend that we re-embrace all the standards of the past, particularly all those of our Puritan and Victorian ancestors, nevertheless, we might, to our advantage, seek to preserve the best of past societies, those standards of honesty and integrity and patriotism which have stood the test of time and modify or reject other customs which are no longer suited to our way of life. This, it seems to me, would benefit our society, making both for more stability in family life and for less crime and violence in community life. Those who reject self-discipline and favor complete permissiveness in almost everything, including the dissemination of obscene material, may actually be taking one step forward and two steps backward in what I assume is the ultimate goal of all of us; namely, to achieve self-satisfaction and happiness.

In these times of changing mores, there have come to Congress many suggestions for changing the laws with respect to the dissemination of obscene material. One cannot but be impressed by the distress expressed by so many citizens at the nature of so much of the material presently available to the average person and by the pleas of such persons for new legislation which will afford them some relief.

LIMITS ON POWER OF CONGRESS TO ENACT OBSCENITY LAWS

Many Congressmen have given much thought as to what can and should be done in response to these pleas. Congress, of course, has only the powers which are given to it by the United States Constitution, either expressed or implied. It is for that reason Federal laws have traditionally taken the form of regulation of the mails, of interstate commerce and of importation from abroad.

In addition, Congress is bound in the exercise of its authority to legislate, by the United States Supreme Court's interpretations of the United States Constitution. These interpretations of the meaning of the various provisions found in the Constitution must be taken into consideration by Congress in evaluating the type of material it may proscribe in its law, what procedural safeguards must be incorporated into such laws to insure that individual rights are respected, and what guidelines must be set for administrative officers to follow in administering the laws. Thus, although there can be no controversy as to the power of Congress to enact legislation under the postal clause, or under the interstate and foreign commerce clause, in the actual exercise of this power Congress must draft its laws taking into consideration the many constitutional questions which may be presented.

COMMISSION ON PORNOGRAPHY AND OBSCENITY

The 90th Congress took a significant step in the right direction in the enactment of Public Law 90-100, which was signed by the President on October 3, 1967. This law authorizes the President to appoint a Commission whose duties will include, not only an examination of existing laws, but will also seek to ascertain the methods employed in the distribution of obscene material and explore the actual nature and volume of this traffic. The Commission will also attempt to ascertain the effect of such material on the public and particularly upon young people and what relationship it bears, if any, to crime and other anti-social behavior. After making these studies, the Commission will make recommendations as to methods, legislative, administrative, and others, as it may deem wise to regulate the flow of material of this type without interfering with Constitutional rights. One of the stumbling blocks in the past in evaluating the potential danger of obscene material has been the absence of reliable, responsible, factual data on the harmful effects of such material. One of the great contributions which I hope the Commission will make, will be to provide legislators, judicial officers, and others who deal with the problem, with this type of reliable data.

Traditionally, when applied in situations other than those involving questions of obscenity, the right to restrict speech has been justified by the fact that, if not restrained, it presents a clear and present danger of harm. On the presently available evidence, it has not been demonstrated to some that obscenity presents clear and present danger to society. I am confident that the new Commission will make an honest examination of cause and effect and will contribute needed information on this point. Therefore, I believe we should await the findings of the Commission with respect to the possible harmful effects of obscene material on the various groups in society before we push for any sort of comprehensive revision of existing law.

If, after study, the Commission does find that there are some dangers in the dissemination of obscene material, whether these dangers are relevant to people generally or to particularly susceptible groups of people, it seems to me that, despite the many difficulties, Federal and State laws could be drafted which would meet Constitutional requirements and could be, at least to some degree, effective in checking the distribution to such persons as it might harm.

Others, here, have gone into considerable depth in discussing the various legal problems which exist, and I do not propose to go over the same ground in any great detail, but only to refer to such problems in the context of discussing the various avenues of approach which I feel Congress, and perhaps the State legislatures, as well, might profitably explore in assessing what form these new laws might take.

I do not share the view that all obscenity laws are *ipso facto* unconstitutional. There are those of this persuasion, who number in their ranks Supreme Court Justices Black and Douglas, who believe that any statute which limits the communication of ideas is automatically unconstitutional.[1] However, the Supreme Court has officially rejected this position. In the *Roth* and subsequent cases, the majority of the Court has refused to rule that obscenity is entitled to the protection of the First Amendment, and has instead accepted the proposition that obscenity, being beyond the protection of the First Amendment, may be proscribed by properly drawn Federal and State laws.

DIFFICULT TO DEFINE WHAT IS OBSCENE

One of the great difficulties in drafting such statutes has been in defining what is legally "obscene" and, therefore, what may be legally banned. The test of what is legally "obscene" as expressed in the *Roth* case, is whether to the average person applying contemporary community standards the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest.

Understandably enough it has proven difficult to articulate a completely satisfactory, workable definition. The Court itself appears to have recognized this problem and, in several cases decided subsequent to the *Roth* decision, has been refining the definition and attempting to make it more precise.

For example, in a later decision, *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, the Court indicated that what is meant by "contemporary community standards" in the foregoing test means contemporary national standards and not local standards. Because there is frequently a difference in standards in various parts of the country, what may be tolerated, for example, in a large urban center such as New York or Los Angeles, may be rejected as offensive in a smaller or more rural community. Nevertheless, as the law is presently interpreted, it is the national, and not the local standards, which control.

An attempt at precision was also evident in the 1966 *Fanny Hill* decision. In that case, the only question before the Massachusetts Court was whether or not this book was legally obscene. The State Court attempted to determine this question by applying what it thought was the *Roth* test. As it turned out, the Supreme Court held that the State Court did not understand the *Roth* test, at least that portion of the *Roth* test relating to social value criterion. The Massachusetts Court held that a book need not be "unqualifiedly worthless before it can be deemed obscene." This, said the United States Supreme Court, was error. "A book," said Justice Brennan, "cannot be proscribed unless it is said to be utterly without redeeming social value."[2] So long as a book possesses "a modicum of social value," it cannot be proscribed. Further, all three elements of the *Roth* test must coalesce, that is: (1) the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole must appeal to prurient interest in sex, (2) the material must be patently offensive because it affronts contemporary community standards, and (3) the material must be utterly without social value.

In the fall of 1967, the Supreme Court again ruled on several obscenity appeals. In disposing of these appeals, the Court gave no explanation other than to cite *Redrup* v. *York*.[3]

The *Redrup* case involved the combined appeals from three State Court decisions, two of which involved violations of Kentucky and New York laws, respectively, for selling allegedly obscene publications, and the third, an Arkansas civil proceeding in which was a brief, per curiam decision.

The Supreme Court reversed the State Court convictions and held that the distribution of the publications in question was protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Court referred to the fact that in none of these cases was there a claim that the statute in question reflected a specific and limited State concern for juveniles. In none was there any suggestion of an assault upon individual privacy by publication in a manner so obtrusive as to make it impossible for an unwilling individual to avoid exposure to it. And in none was there any evidence of the sort of pandering which the Court found significant in the *Ginzburg* case.[4]

Of the cases considered in the fall of 1967, the latest to have been decided by the Court, one case involved the obscenity conviction of a Louisiana news vendor for selling "girlie" magazines and nudist publications,[5] and two other cases were related decisions which involved customs bans of Danish nudist magazines, most of which were intended for the male homosexual market.[6] The fourth case, and the only one in which the Supreme Court let the conviction stand, involved the obscenity conviction of a Miami sculptor who displayed in his yard, life-size statues of males and females in erotic embrace.[7] The Court let the latter conviction stand. It appears that it did so because there was an assault upon individual privacy by publication of the work in a manner so obtrusive as to make it impossible for an unwilling individual to avoid exposure to it. In drafting new legislation we must keep all of these various holdings in mind.

We must also bear in mind the *Roth* definition of obscenity, as amended by the Supreme Court, and consider whether it is more desirable to attempt to incorporate this definition into the law, or whether in the alternative it would be better to list explicitly the acts which will be outlawed, somewhat along the lines of the New York statute.

Another relatively recent development in the attitude of the Court, of interest to those attempting to draft legislation in this area, is an apparent shift in the Court's position away from the original three factor *Roth* test to the same three factor test, plus another element, the additional element being evidence of "pandering" in disseminating the material. This new approach is set forth in the *Ginzburg* case. In *Ginzburg*, in determining the obscenity issue, the Court considered the circumstances surrounding the advertising of the works involved. The Court appeared to assume that the works themselves might not be considered legally obscene in other circumstances but were considered obscene in these particular circumstances because they were distributed "against a background of commercial exploitation of erotics solely for the sake of their prurient appeal."[8]

The *Ginzburg* decision seems to be more than a mere elaboration of the *Roth* test. It seems to be an indication of a shift away from a concept of *constant obscenity* to one of variable obscenity. *Constant obscenity* is the concept that material which is obscene by reason of its nature will always be obscene regardless of the circumstances surrounding its presentation. *Variable obscenity*, on the other hand, contemplates that whether or not the material is obscene will depend to some extent on the circumstances surrounding its presentation.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Another aspect of the problem which I would like to see explored more fully, is the possibility of enacting a law which would be designed, not for situations where material is made available for mature adults who have the option of buying it, but for those instances where obscene material is more or less forced on people who do not wish it for themselves or their families.

In drafting such a law, I would look to some of the recent pronouncements of Justice Douglas. Interestingly enough, Justice Douglas, who has steadfastly taken the position that statutes which have the effect of censoring any material, including obscene material, are unconstitutional, has strongly stated the view that there is a constitutionally protected right of privacy". Such a right, according to his thesis, is not to be found in specific sections of the Constitution, but is rather suggested by certain Constitutional provisions.

The scope and content of this right of privacy are not restricted to, or by, the enumerated rights. This theory was expressed by Justice Douglas in 1961, in a dissenting opinion.[9] The, a few years later, the majority of the Court recognized the right of privacy doctrine in *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*.[10]

Justice Douglas, writing for the Court in the *Griswold* case, said, "specific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance."[11]

---

[1] 383 U.S. at p. 424—Douglas at 476 Black.

[2] 383 U.S. at p. 419.

[3] 386 U.S. 767.

[4] 383 U.S. at p. 769.

[5] *Connor* v. *City of Hammond* Docket No. 259.

[6] *Potomac News Co.* v. *U.S. and Central Magazine Sales, Ltd.* U.S. Docket No. 378.

[7] *Fort* v. *City of Miami* Docket No. 91.

[8] *Ginzburg* at p. 466.

[9] *Poe* v. *Ullman* 367 U.S. 497 (1961).

[10] 381 U.S. 479 (1965).

He referred to a zone of privacy created by several constitutional guarantees. Although the *Griswold* holding is limited to a recognition of a marital right of privacy which cannot be Constitutionally invaded by a State, it seems to me that it might be extended to afford protection of privacy of the home and the recent adoption by the Congress of the so-called Cunningham Amendment which permits a householder to order the Postmaster General to issue a decree to persons sending material which in the considered judgment of the homeowner to be obscene to cease sending such material, may be a step in that direction.

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN

Another area of investigation which I hope will be most thoroughly explored by the new Commission. is the effect of obscene material upon children. The Supreme Court has told us that the law may not trample on the First Amendment rights of adults in its eagerness to protect the youth of the community,[12] and that a law which forbids the sale or distribution of materials to the general public because it is deemed harmful to, or obscene for, children, is unconstitutional on its face.[13]

We are also told by a Federal Circuit Court that the Constitution does not secure to children the same absolute right assured to adults to judge and determine for themselves what they may read and what they should reject.[14] These holdings appear to me to represent a common sense construction of the Constitution, and I think it should be possible to draft a statute which will prohibit the sale, or delivery in the mails, to children under a certain specified age, of material which is described in sufficient detail to avoid the criticism of vagueness.

Such laws may well be more within the province of the States than of Congress. The States, under their police powers, have enacted many laws especially protective of children. New York State has recently taken this general approach and its statutes do not define obscenity, but rather describe in detail what is illegal for sale to minors.[15]

CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF PUBLICITY

Earlier, I said that Congress is limited by the Constitution in the type of legislation it can enact. However, I should also mention that Congress has available other resources which sometimes prove to be very effective aids in correcting situations. One of these resources is the power of publicity which is given to hearings and other Congressional activities. For example, the widespread publicity given the hearings held by the Select Committee on Current Pornography Materials of the House of Representatives, in 1952, brought to the Country's attention the nature and extent of the problem of obscenity in the United States.

During the first few months of 1953, fourteen States enacted legislation to control, penalize, or change their penalties for the distribution of obscene material. Commencing last year, due to the establishment by Congress of the new Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, interest in the solution of problems caused by the dissemination of obscenity has heightened considerably.

One of the expected contributions of the new Commission will be the publicizing of the problem. The resulting give and take of ideas should prove valuable to jurists and to the public, as well as to those legislators, public officials and others who are concentrating on the problem and attempting to develop solutions.

In our discussions today, many ideas have been exchanged which are stimulating and enlightening. The talks have introduced some new ideas to me, and I imagine to others, as well, and they have also served to focus and clarify my thinking on some of the difficulties which are presented by the dissemination of obscene material.[16]

In discussing this very subject—obscenity—the late, great Justice Felix Frankfurter declared: "We should not burn the house down to roast the pig." I would like to add the following as a postscript: "Nor should we let that pig run wild."

By careful and objective analysis, and by well-drafted, Constitutional and clear thinking, legislation, we will be putting that "pig" right in the oven where it properly belongs.

Adding Insult to Injury

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, some 300 members of the Florida Maritime Union recently were impelled to picket the Greek steamship *Australis* while it was in Port Everglades, Fla. I say impelled because, in the view of these American merchant seamen, the presence of the *Australis* in Port Everglades was the addition of insult to the injury which has been done to the passenger ship service of this country.

The SS *Australis* is the former SS *America*. The *America*, as the second largest liner under the American flag, served the United States in peace and war for more than 25 years. In 1964, in violation of an understanding that it would be kept in reserve until a replacement could be built, the *America* was sold to a Greek shipping company. It is now registered under the Panamanian flag and is manned, of course, by the grossly underpaid men of these foreign registered ships.

It was not enough that the *America* was sold rather than being kept in reserve as the merchant seamen of our country expected. They are now faced with the reappearance of that ship under its foreign name and flag in the ports of the United States. Here again an understanding that the former *America* would not be put into service to U.S. ports has been violated. The insult was added to the injury only 6 months after the transfer of the *America* to foreign registry and ownership, and it most recently has been brought dramatically home to us in the protests at Port Everglades.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how long we must wait for an effective start on the rebuilding of our merchant marine and especially of our passenger liner service. It is an insult, not only to our seamen, but to our entire people, that the greatest and richest Nation on earth should content itself with a pitiable merchant marine. The least we could do is to avoid helping those who are expanding the low-wage, low-standards, foreign-flag service which has been allowed to drive our flag from the seas.

SENATE—*Thursday, February 22, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We are aware that we are in the presence of the most high, O God, when we bow for this moment of prayer. We need the strength of prayer to stand against wicked forces. Therefore, we pray for the whole armor of God. Give us a belt of truth to tighten around our waists, a breastplate of righteousness to protect our hearts, shoes of peace for our feet to carry a message of good tidings, and a shield of faith against the burning arrows that frustrate, humiliate, and exhaust our strength. Give to us the helmet of Thy salvation in the forgiveness of our sins and evil ways. Arm us with a sword of truth to cut through and defeat the hypocrisies and untruths of the day.

Our thanks are expressed for great men like our first President, George Washington. We remember him in word, in leadership as he also prayed and received strength through the armor of God. Be with our worthy leaders in giving like strength for this time of our Nation's history. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 21, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, TO 11 A.M., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on Monday next, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m., Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

[11] 381 U.S. at p. 484.

[12] *Bantam Books* v. *Sullivan* 372 U.S. 58 (1963).

[13] *Butler* v. *Michigan* 352 U.S. 380 (1957).

[14] *People* v. *Kahan* 15 N.Y. 2d 311, 312 (1965) per curiam (concurring opinion).

[15] N.Y. Penal Law § 484:

[16] These States were Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas and Wisconsin. See 18 Mercer Law Review at p. 328.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOSS ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the convening of the Senate and after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be recognized, to have the floor for up to 1 hour, and that following the conclusion of that hour, there be a period for the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will be read by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], heretofore designated for that purpose by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the Secretary's desk). Mr. President, it is a distinct honor to read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BREWSTER read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north,* in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south,* protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south,* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north,* sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north,* it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east,* in a like intercourse with the *west,* already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation.* Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tender to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constituution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied to any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a further mark of our respect, appreciation, and admiration for the Father of our Country, and under the order of yesterday, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 22, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1968.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D. offered the following prayer:

Preserve me, O God, for in Thee do I put my trust.—Psalm 16: 1.

God of our fathers whose almighty hand has led us in the past and whose creative spirit is seeking to lead us in the present, be Thou our guardian and our guide in this hour of our national need.

Give to these leaders of our Nation and to the citizens of our land the faith, the hope, and the love which seeks to give rather than to get and standing up persists in doing something for our country rather than sitting down insists upon our country doing something for them.

We remember with humble pride the devotion of our first President whose name shines like a star in the firmament of freedom. May his courage in times of crises, his fidelity in periods of adversity, and his faith which sent him to his knees in prayer be ours as we face the hard facts of this hectic day. May the memory of his life and the consciousness of Thy presence strengthen our people and enable them to live in the spirit of good will and to labor for the good of these United States of America. In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 5, 1968, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. SIKES read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home: your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however, powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possibly, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, without its being considered a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission today to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE NEXT WEEK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 26

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to respond to the request made by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona and to inform the gentleman and our colleagues as to the program for the week of February 26.

Monday is District Day. There is one bill scheduled for consideration—H.R. 15131, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958.

Also on Monday we will consider S. 989, Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Tuesday we will have for consideration H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will consider H.R. 15414, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1968. This is an extension of excise taxes. This, of course, is subject to a rule being granted.

Also, S. 2419, development of cargo container vessels, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VA EMPLOYEES IN OKLAHOMA SUPPORT OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma fully supports our fighting men in Vietnam. The employees of the VA in my home State are making every effort to give the best possible service to the men returning as veterans, but they also believe in taking the extra step—in going the extra mile. They have, therefore, established a program to show the men still serving in Vietnam that they, and their fellow Oklahomans, appreciate what they are doing for us.

The Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma has two liaison men in Vietnam. They are Millard J. Ryker, who volunteered from the Muskogee regional office for 6 months duty in Vietnam as contact representative, and 1st Lt. James R. Wolfe. The Muskogee VA office solicited their suggestions as to the wants and needs of the servicemen they contact. They are reviewing those requests and are filling them to the greatest possible extent.

For example, several men returning from Vietnam have commented on the fact that the water has an extremely bad taste because of the chemicals used for purification. The returnees stated most units put Kool-Aid in the water to counteract the taste. The VA Employees' Association purchased 1,152 packages of presweetened Kool-Aid and sent it to the liaison men for distribution.

The employees have remembered that the worst burdens of war are always borne by children and have tried to at least partially offset by sending dolls and toys to Mr. Ryker for distribution to Vietnamese children.

The VA employees in Oklahoma saw to it that Christmas for our servicemen in Vietnam was not forgotten. Those employees voluntarily made candy and fruitcake for servicemen. Over 175 boxes of candy weighing in excess of 200 pounds were sent. Postage alone for the gifts was almost $150 and was paid for by the VA Employees' Association.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the VA employees in Oklahoma are vitally interested in showing our servicemen that they support their efforts and appreciate the sacrifices being made for us. I salute them in their endeavor.

THE DRAFT AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, late last week Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, in telegrams to all State selective service directors, announced the decision of the National Security Council that it is "not essential for the maintenance of the national health, safety, and interest" to extend student deferments for graduate study other than medicine, dentistry, and allied medical specialties. General Hershey pointed out that this action does not affect existing regulations governing deferment for graduate students who entered their second or subsequent year of graduate study in the fall of 1967. However, he informed the State directors: it "does affect students graduating from college this year, as well as those who entered the first year of graduate school last fall."

I disagree with this approach for several reasons which I will discuss herewith. Moreover, I feel the military obligations and needs can be met by effective use of our Reserve program to incorporate these students.

The view of our national military manpower needs, as determined by the National Security Council, should be reevaluated and Congress should amend the law if administrative adjustment is not forthcoming. Otherwise, if this decision stands, the short-term effect of it upon the thousands of our universities will be the loss of those teaching assistants to undergraduates at the very time when our college and university enrollments are expanding at a substantial rate. This presents a disruptive crisis to college and university administrators struggling with plans, and efforts to find financial resources, to cope with this expansion of college enrollment.

The longer term effect, although it will be reached within 3 years, will be to remove from the national economy the graduating corps of students trained in engineering, the social sciences, technical subjects and the other vital areas of graduate study. The requirements of our increasingly complex society dictate that every reasonable effort be made to increase our trained leadership in all areas of educational attainment. Let us continue to move forward and not be deterred from this national objective.

Another important factor is that the announcement of this decision now means that the 4,000 local draft boards will make decisions on deferment without the benefit of the national lists of critical occupations originally developed by the Departments of Labor and Commerce and will rely on "essential community need." The "essentiality" of math teachers, physicists, engineers, and other skills may be recognized in one part of the country and not in another. This is awkward planning for the Nation's needs to say the least. What is more, it leads to blatant inequities. For example, one board would defer a teaching student, while another board next door, in a specific instance that has come to my attention, would draft another student under the exact circumstances.

By no means do I feel the military obligations of these students should be unfulfilled. All male graduate students of eligible age should be required to enter a Reserve unit and develop their particular skills, with others, to eventually serve their country, either in military service or in their professional area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that these reforms be reviewed immediately.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 15530. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the purpose of entitlement to disability pension that veterans with less than 90 days service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15531. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15532. A bill to provide for the establishment in the District of Columbia of the University of the United States to function primarily as a national institute for advanced studies at which individuals of outstanding ability will pursue studies anticipating, identifying, and isolating future problems of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15533. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 15534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15535. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15536. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by providing for a program of State-administered postsecondary vocational education scholarships; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD (by request):

H.R. 15537. A bill to enable baby chick, started pullet, laying hen, and table-egg producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain, and develop orderly marking conditions at prices reasonable to the consumers and producers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 1117. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. KARTH, and Mr. ST. ONGE):

H.J. Res. 1118. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 653. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to reexamine the objectives and nature of the foreign assistance programs and the relationship of such programs to vital U.S. interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 654. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President has implied powers to take appropriate measures for the safe recovery of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and the vessel itself; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15538. A bill for the relief of Kalliroi Kapetanakis Gazulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15539. A bill for the relief of Angero and Theophilos Kamperides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15540. A bill for the relief of Luigi Papa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15541. A bill for the relief of Corazona G. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kind Words for the President

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Fort Worth, Tex., Congressman Jim Wright, addressed the "Victory, 1968" Regional Conference of the Democratic National Committee in Dallas, Tex., on February 10.

His address was warmly received by those in attendance, as he had some kind words to say about the President of the United States. His reasoned approach is something all Americans should consider as they hear the criticism of our President from all sides. I want to thank my colleague for his attempt to put the present criticism in proper perspective.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT TO THE REGIONAL DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 10, 1968

Many of the Republicans who two months ago were already dividing the spoils and at least some faint-hearted Democrats who were moaning in anguish over the 1968 national election prospects appear to have forgotten entirely what took place just 20 years ago.

For almost every unfavorable portent of 1968, we can find a very nearly identical counterpart in the outlook of 1948.

The President's popularity, as measured by polls, had recently been hitting its lowest ebb. The wiseacres said he couldn't be reelected.

The preceding elections had dealt unkindly with the Democratic party, and the President had a recalcitrant Congress.

East Coast sophisticates were mouthing in cultured tones about the President's rather plain talk and his lack of "style."

A group of Dixiecrat dissidents on the right and a self-styled "peace movement" on the left were fielding third parties in an attempt to siphon voters away from the Democratic President.

There was even a candidate named "Wallace" and a fellow in the wings named "McCarthy." How history does repeat!

In 1948, hardly anybody believed that Harry Truman had a ghost of a chance, but he came through with a smashing landslide!

It seems to me that there were three basic reasons for this resounding victory which upset all the political dopecarts and so thoroughly surprised the backroom boys.

First, the people identified with the President's plain talk and appreciated his stubborn sense of responsibility. In face of all the carping, the President did not yield to his self-appointed critics of either the right or the left—and the people liked that.

Second, even though people were not completely satisfied with the way everything was going at home and abroad, it became very apparent to the American public when the choice came right down to the wire that the Republicans were long on criticism but short on solutions.

The third reason is what we see demonstrated here today. When it looks like we're in second place, we Democrats try harder!

Today, I'd like to say a few kind words for the President of the United States—both for the awesome office which has been so aptly described as the world's most "splendid misery," and for the extraordinarily hard-working human being who occupies that office.

Alexander Hamilton once warned of the paramount importance in a republic to guard not only against the government's oppression of its people, but also against the people's abuse of their leaders.

History shows that, as a people, we have often taken Hamilton's advice rather badly. It seems, in fact, that our strongest and best Presidents are precisely those for whom we have reserved our bitterest hostility and our rankest abuse.

George Washington upon retiring from the office wrote to a friend that he would rather be in his grave than back in the White House suffering the monumental accusations and nasty personal innuendoes to which he had been subjected.

Jefferson's detractors called him a "Jacobin" which, in the political lexicon of the time, was roughly tantamount to being branded a "socialist" or even a "communist sympathizer" today. And one newsman prophesied in passionate, purple prose that:

"The Republic is in the last stages . . . because that atheist from Virginia is in the White House."

Filthy stories were circulated about Andrew Jackson. He was falsely and blatantly accused of profiteering on government contracts, and a large segment of the eastern press adopted the practice of snidely referring to him as "King Andrew."

No President was more unmercifully reviled—in the press, in the pulpit, on the street corners, and in the Halls of Congress—than Abraham Lincoln. He was scorned by his own generals and held in contempt by some in his own Cabinet. A review of the political cartoons of Lincoln's day would make even outspoken modern presidential critics blush over their surpassing bad taste.

Both Roosevelts were targets of the most vicious attacks. In 1908, a magazine called the American Businessman featured a cover picture of Theodore Roosevelt on which had been painted a crown, and editorially accused him of betraying his oath of office and of taking us down "the dead end path to socialism." Theodore, mind you.

How well we recall, though we try to forget, the dirty, unfair things that were said about John F. Kennedy, including bitter attacks upon his personal motives. In the wake of the national trauma which followed his untimely assassination, we were shocked into a sort of temporary national shame. We seemed to realize how shabbily we had treated our finest and most dedicated President. And we repented—for a few months.

Now the hounds of the hunt are baying again. The pack is in full cry. Our quadrennial silly season or orgiastic overstatement is approaching, and like some weird masochistic cult we find among us those who would turn upon our leader and devour him.

Let me make it clear that I am not speaking of those people who criticize American policy responsibly and constructively. I am not talking of those who honestly and honorably disagree with the President on matters of opinion.

I am speaking of those who are forever assailing the President's motives, those who trade on fear and traffic in hatred. I am speaking of those who wallow in the gutter of personal abuse. I am speaking of those who superciliously set themselves above the President and sneer at his works, mistrust his words, belittle his deeds, and question his honor.

I am speaking of some urbane sophisticates who think they have discovered a safe and clever way to abuse the President's personal integrity by inventing a term they call a "credibility gap" and chattering about it incessantly in the hope that they thus can create a climate of disbelief between the American public and its elected leadership.

I am speaking of those who gleefully try to embarrass our President internationally by thwarting fulfillment of his international commitments, in the making of which he acted under the Constitution for all of us.

Once I spoke in Congress in defense of an international commitment of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I said at that time that we have but one President at a time, and whether or not he belongs to my party, he is my President. When he is embarrassed, I am embarrassed because my country is embarrassed.

At that time I made this analogy: If we were flying over the ocean in an aircraft—and we may not have picked the pilot—we still would not pour water in the gasoline tank just to embarrass the pilot.

I felt that way when Mr. Eisenhower was President. I felt that way when Mr. Kennedy was President. And I feel that way when Lyndon B. Johnson is our President.

President Johnson's most partisan critics should remember that it was he, as Majority Leader of the Senate, who authored and effectively carried out the responsible bipartisan policy of supporting and upholding President Eisenhower in his international dealings. Because of Lyndon Johnson's inherent sense of responsibility, there was no doubt anywhere on earth that, whatever our differences at home, this Nation faced the world united.

Never has a man come to the Presidency better grounded by experience in the intricacies of our government than Lyndon B. Johnson. Never has a man devoted himself more dutifully to the office or at greater sacrifice of his personal repose. Never has a President worked longer hours or been more deeply dedicated to the fulfillment of his promises. And never has a President kept more of his promises to the people.

For more than a generation, every American President has spoken hopefully of medical care for the aged, of equalizing educational opportunity, of fairer treatment for the minorities, and of preserving our natural heritage. It remained for Lyndon Johnson to transform those dreams into realities.

And for these efforts, he is rewarded with abuse.

The white supremacists abuse him for doing more for civil rights than any President in history; and the black power militants castigate him for not having done the impossible, immediately.

The reactionaries flay him for producing the greatest volume of social legislation in history; and the so-called "New Left" ridicules him for preserving and honoring the very institutions and processes of our constitutional system which he is sworn to defend.

The bloodthirsty hawks scorn him for not having completely devastated North Vietnam and risked the outbreak of World War III; while the timid doves abuse him for not having cravenly abandoned an ally in its mortal struggle for freedom.

One extreme flails at the President for spending too much on Vietnam and too little on domestic programs; and another attacks him for devoting too much to domestic spending and too little to Vietnam. Surely they cannot both be right. Each is too eager to criticize and too reluctant to analyze.

Any President—and certainly this President—deserves better than this. The very least we owe to any President is a modicum of understanding and an assumption of his good faith. At the very least, our propensities for partisanship and personal abuse should stop at the water's edge. In the councils of the world, he is our spokesman. If we cannot uphold him, surely we should not undermine him.

There are, in all of this, two saving graces: while Americans historically have mercilessly abused our strongest and greatest Presidents throughout their terms in office, we seldom fail to reelect them.

And those whom partisan contemporaries most bitterly vilify, history most firmly vindicates.

And so it will be, my friends, with Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The Time Has Come

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past month, as Congress began its new work, notice came to me of the death in Vietnam of Sgt. Thomas B. O'Connor, son of Mr. and Mrs. Tom O'Connor, of Allendale, S.C.

Sergeant O'Connor believed in the necessity to stand with his country in this time of international crisis. He recognized the true enemy in Vietnam, and he believed so strongly in our presence there that when his regular tour with the U.S. Marines ended last year, he extended in order to remain with the men under his command and continue the fight. His death came in the spirit in which he had always lived, for the fatal wound was delivered after he had volunteered to accompany a reaction patrol, called out to aid a friendly unit under attack.

Sergeant O'Connor, as have others who died in this faraway land, brought honor to himself, his family, and his friends by the brave and distinguished service he rendered his country. Martha and Tom O'Connor have the consolation of knowing their son gave his life in the service of his country, for the cause of freedom, and to protect the people of this Nation and the free world.

The reason I address the Senate today is to invite the attention of my fellow Senators to an editorial written by the father of this son, a son we all miss, a son who symbolized all that is good and brave about our America today. Expression of the father and a picture of the son have been beautifully recorded in an editorial entitled "The Time Has Come," written by Tom O'Connor. The time has indeed come. Sometimes I fear that the time will pass before we truly rise to the occasion and meet the situation on the terms that our forefathers would have met it: Firm, resolute, and with unswerving dedication, as did this young man and all others of his breed.

This editorial by a grieving father symbolizes the hurt and pain that is felt across the broad expanse of America. I believe it contains a message which we all should hear, which we all should think about, and which we all should reflect upon. I salute Tom O'Connor and his son, and I pray earnestly that they and their kind will prevail.

Those of us who continue to enjoy the freedoms that this young man and other service men and women have preserved for a few more years should rededicate ourselves to insure what this father and all parents ask: that they will not have died in vain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published in the Allendale County Citizen of January 25, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME HAS COME

My son came home from Vietnam early this year. When he was last here, in October, standing big, poised, confident, I guessed I would have the record cabinet all built before he came home again in February, and, secretly, I planned to refurbish the darkroom for his new interest in photography.

When I followed the honor guard up the aisle of our little church in January, I remembered that it was here he assumed one time a military stance and with measured tread marched toward the altar bearing the cross before.

There was somewhere in me, on that bitter day, a block of ice that contained and constrained all of me that could be called me. I was not cold in the sleet and rain and the wind that blew across a dark day, when the skies wept and I could not.

Just as the rifles barked sharply in a last salute and from a distance the bugle began its mournful declaration of farewell, the rain brushed coldly, softly, against my cheek.

For a moment I raised my eyes and remembered that he liked, on days such as this, to go, booted and wrapped, off across the fields into our woods.

It was then that there came to me in sharp recall, almost startling in their clarity, some words I put down on an occasion like this in another war, fifty years away, in a boy's attempt to try somehow to relieve a suffering akin to that which now held my heart in icy bond.

"When I am deaf at last to cannonades
 That drum along some reach of ruined earth;
My soul withdrawn beyond the barricades
 And stopped upon my lips this present mirth;
Become, too soon, a fading, failing part
 Of yesterdays, that break upon a morrow
As a remindful weeping in the heart,
 Or pulse of pain, or anvil beat of sorrow;

Will you remember suddenly on streets
 In throngs about the city where you walk,
Or in the country garden, where the sweets
 Of summer keep the bee world full of talk,

These were the things I loved, yourself beside,
And while they are I have not wholly died?"

If I could remember this . . . if I could see again what he had seen . . . love again what he had loved . . . Then it was time to move again, to come again to the strange unrealities, of people in motion, of a world still there, and the steady beat of time going on forever.

I cannot accept my son's death as a matter of God's will. I must reject a God who would create so well and then purposely destroy. The God I reverence is a God of creation. My son was destroyed, I am afraid, by me and by you and by man's will, denying the will of God.

His own son died because of the willfulness of man, unheeding the plea for peace on earth. For too long we have let ourselves be instruments of willful men, feeding their ambitions, their greeds, their lusts for power with the lives of our sons.

I see no sense in the present demand that we lay down our arms and thus quit the present war. For to do so would leave us defenseless, at the mercy of rapacious men who have boasted they seek our enslavement and the end of individual liberty.

With all his vaunted advancement man is still led by savage chiefs. My son's death was decreed in councils of the mighty dominated by vanities against which my God has spoken.

Only when kings and rulers and leaders of men dedicate every bit of their strengths, physical, spiritual, moral, to the end that there shall be peace on earth and among mankind an intellectual rejection of war as a solution to any problem, can it ever be said my son, and the sons of the sorrowful millions, did not die in vain.

Leonard Carriere Looks at History and Our Involvement in Vietnam

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Blue Island Sun Standard is a publication which for generations has served the community of Blue Island, Ill. One of the features of its editorial page is a column by a prominent civic leader, Mr. Leonard Carriere, who thoughtfully expresses his views on issues of the day. The February 15 issue of the Sun Standard contained the following studious commentary by Mr. Carriere on the involvement in Vietnam, which I believe reflects the type of judgment which is prevalent at the grassroots level of the country:

IN PASSING

(By Leonard Carriere)

One of the "doves" has taken issue with some things I said last week about our being in Viet Nam. I repeat, that as I see it, I do not know as we have any other honorable choice. I, too, wish it were not necessary, either there or anywhere else. Such is not the case. The reasons are self evident, if we just look at the indisputable record of recent history.

At the outbreak of World War II, the Far Eastern picture had England occupying India, Ceylon, Burma and the Malay States; the French entrenched in French-Indo China (what is now North and South Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos); the Dutch in residence in Indonesia; the U.S. still in the Philippines; an independent Korea; and an Allied Nationalistic China.

Further, between them the Western European powers were in pretty solid control of the island groups in the South Pacific.

Under those circumstances there was no reason for us being in the Far East. If those circumstances were prevalent today, we would not be there. As we all know, such is not the case.

Gone are the English. Gone are the French. Gone are the Dutch, Korea, Nationalist China and just about every friend we had in the area. We are faced with a neutral India, Communist China, and the so-called independent nations, all of whom have either gone or are undergoing a process of communistic erosion. Additionally, at the outbreak of World War II, Russia was not the power she has since become, and neither for that matter was the United States.

If we were not there holding the line, what would happen would be quick and drastic, none of it conducive to our future welfare. So we are there. We are paying a stiff price but not so dear as it would ultimately be if we were not there. This makes sense to me, much as I dislike it and wish it were otherwise. I, for one, do not want to risk the alternative.

None of this has to do with partisan politics. Under any administration the results would have been the same. You can always quibble about the day-to-day conduct of our foreign affairs, but long range-wise I believe we are on the right track. Someday, in the rather distant future, there will be an answer. I do not believe many of us will be around to see what it is, but for the sake of all of those who may follow, I trust that it comes up heads.

The role of advocate of first principles is difficult. As I said, we have just begun. It will not be easy. I do not see how we can abandon the posture that was thrust upon us by the inexorable course of world events. We did not choose it in any planned manner. Yet, there is no disputing that we stand there.

Because we stand there I believe that the course of the future will not only be different, but it will be for our good and the good of the whole world. That's an easy thing to say; not all have faith in that general premise.

We could do nothing. There are some lulled into a sense of false security by this idea. That is our only other choice. For those of us who are running downhill that has an awful lot of immediate appeal. We could live our lives out without disaster overtaking us personally. That is as far as it will stretch. Somehow, and I do not know why, it is incredible that we pay some price for having been here. I do not find the price too high. It is not too difficult a task to pay not that I do not complain from time to time, we all do, yet if we do not believe in ourselves and are not willing to carry the load, a darkness will fall over us which will take a millenium to remove.

The 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Estonian Republic

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on February 24 we shall commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Estonian Republic. The day must be remembered, for it represents a day of independence and freedom which is meaningful to all of us who live in liberty.

It grieves me and all freemen that the national sovereignty of the Estonian people was violated 28 years ago. That their national spirit has survived is evidence of the perseverance and courage of Estonians everywhere.

Let us pray that Estonian independence may once again be declared, that Estonian freedom may once again be established, that Estonian dreams of liberty may once again be fulfilled.

Amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 15506, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

During the 89th Congress, President Johnson signed into law the Immigration Act of 1965. This act repealed the discriminatory national origins quota system as a basis for selecting immigrants

The Immigration Act of 1965 established a new policy governing those who seek admission to this country. The act provided an extension of the basic theme of U.S. policy—equal opportunity. The legislation stands with legislation in other critical areas such as civil rights, poverty, education, and health, reaffirming this Nation's continuing pursuit of justice, equality, and freedom.

However, when President Johnson signed the law it was only the beginning of a very important task. Serious inequities still exist in our immigration system and further amendments are needed to attain the objectives initiated in 1965.

The bill which I introduce today will effectively eliminate many of the remaining inequities in our immigration and nationalization policy and provide equal opportunity to all who desire to come to the United States.

My bill accomplishes the following objectives:

First. It refines the application of our belief in human dignity and equal opportunity under law by reestablishing a Board of Visa Appeals and a statute of limitations on deportation.

Second. It strengthens our immigration objectives to reunite families.

Third. It establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees and victims of natural calamity, and

Fourth. It provides necessary adjustments in our naturalization laws by establishing a Select Commission on Nationality and Naturalization to evaluate the fairness of our general policy in this extremely important, but long overlooked area of the public concern.

I would like to elaborate on these objectives by referring to specific sections of the bill.

Section 2 reestablishes a Board of Visa Appeals to review cases involving an immigrant visa to relatives of a U.S. citizen or of a permanent resident alien. There are numerous cases on record in which the denial of a visa by an American consul abroad raised justifiable criticism many of which cases were finally resolved by enactment of private immigration bills. To alleviate the necessity of introducing thousands of private bills each year, and eliminate the cost and expense involved, I believe that an independent Board of Visa Appeals, under law, will help assure a more equitable treatment of denial cases.

Section 5 of the bill redefines the seventh preference, currently allotted to "refugees." In place of "refugees," the seventh preference visa will be made available to desirable groups of aliens, not requiring labor certification who currently are admitted on a nonpreference basis. The availability of nonpreference visas is extremely limited, and all but precludes the admission of these aliens. Included in the new seventh preference are retired persons, private investors, fiancees of U.S. citizens, and members of religious denominations who seek admission to perform religious duties.

Section 6 of the bill establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees. In practice, our country has always been generous in providing resettlement opportunities to refugees, but our permanent immigration law has never included a comprehensive asylum policy. Our country which is so devoted to meeting the needs of all people throughout the world should at this time fully recognize the refugee resettlement needs throughout the world. My bill is intended to accomplish this objective, first, by providing for the issuance of 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees throughout the world; and second, by authorizing the Attorney General to parole into the country alien refugees when he determines that such action is in the public interest. This merely confirms what we have done over the last decade in admitting those who have fled from Hungary and Cuba.

Section 8 reestablishes a statute of limitations on deportation. It is an established principle of law that in the administration of justice, there must be a time limit, within which authorities must commence proceedings to punish for an alleged crime or violation of law. However, in matters involving the deportation of a lawfully admitted resident alien, this elementary principle of law does not apply. The alien may have resided in this country since childhood, or for 20 or 30 years or more. He may have been a product of our society, but he is denied its justice, and its equity under the law. The absence of a statute of limitations is a tragic-shortcoming, a glaring injustice which has caused undue personal hardship and anxiety in the lives of many.

Finally section 18 of the bill provides for the issuance of special immigrant visas to clean up the backlog of petitions accumulated under the discriminatory national origins quota system. This would apply only to the fifth preference for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. In Italy, for example, petitions dating as far back as March of 1955 are now being processed. To provide relief for qualified fifth preference visa applicants who still wish to join their family in this country, is just and humane.

I believe that the removal of all the remaining vestiges of the national origins quota system will permit a more effective and efficient administration of our immigration laws as amended in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I had the opportunity to address the Nassau-Suffolk Ancient Order of Hibernians, meeting on Long Island. I chose as the subject of my speech the "Immigration Law and Its Effect," particularly with regard to Ireland.

Under the terms of the Immigration Act of 1965, it was the hope of the Congress to achieve a fair and equitable immigration policy. Unfortunately, the new law in attempting to cure discrimination, saddled persons of Irish birth with an inequitable and unfair application of U.S. immigration policy. While total immigration to the United States has increased temporarily the number of persons of Irish birth permitted to enter continues to decline not because they do not wish to come here but because they are barred from entry by inequities in the law.

The statistics of Irish immigration into the United States in the last 4 fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 1964	6,307
Fiscal year 1965	5,463
Fiscal year 1966	3,241
Fiscal year 1967	2,624

The American Irish community is shocked by the drastic effects of the 1965 act on Irish immigration into the United States and will receive a further shock after June 1968, when the law goes into full effect.

I join the American Irish community in expressing disappointment that a new form of discrimination has developed in the implementation of our U.S. immigration policy. How can we affirm our basic commitment toward equal opportunity to immigrate, when immigration from one country is increased by 200 percent in 1 year while immigration from another country is reduced by a similar percentage or is severely curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, England, Ireland, and Germany enjoyed a privileged position in U.S. immigration prior to 1965, partially because of the number of immigrants contributed by them in earlier years. Now residents of all nations compete on an equal basis for U.S. immigration numbers. While we eliminated the discrimination caused by national origins quotas, we should also insure that admission to the United States from all nations be available to qualified persons on a fair and reasonable basis. The standards and terms for competition must be as fair for one nation as they are for another.

It is now evident that when the Immigration Act of 1965 was passed, the House did not anticipate the effect that the new law would have on the formerly so-called "privileged countries," and in particular Ireland. Overlooked was the sociological pattern of immigration from these countries.

Ireland's sons and daughters have for decades contributed to the building and growth of this Nation in every conceivable area of endeavor. The quota which was assigned to Ireland under the old law was in small part a recognition of these contributions. The Irish do not claim a monopoly on these contributions, the sons and daughters of other nations have similarly contributed, nevertheless, the present law in its effect on Ireland is discriminatory and should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, there is a definite need for legislative and executive action to eliminate these inequities in our immigration laws. The American community cannot be satisfied until the discrimination is remedied.

Col. Daniel "Chappie" James, U.S. Air Force

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a big man who stands tall for his country privileged my city of Fort Worth recently with a visit where he spoke to our local Air Force Association chapter. So impressed were all who heard him with this great patriot's appearance that the Fort Worth Star-Telegram caused an editorial to be published in honor of his visit. And the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge on February 22 will present Col. Daniel "Chappie" James with their coveted George Washington Medal for a letter he has written on his "Heritage of Freedom." It is my pleasure to include this editorial and the essay by Colonel James, along with a news account of his speech for the information of the Members of the House and readers of the RECORD:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1968]

PATRIOT IS PILOT WHO LOVES COUNTRY

Last week was a pretty good week for people who are getting tired of the doomsayers, the prophets of gloom who are forever making headlines with their portents of anarchy and despair.

We're awfully glad Air Force Col. Daniel (Chappie) James Jr. came to town. He showed us that unabashed patriotism is still in style.

In case you missed the news stories, Colonel James is a big man who stands mighty tall for his country. He is a 48-year-old Negro pilot who has flown fighter planes in three wars and who two years ago led the "Bolo" mission in which seven Communist planes were destroyed—the biggest bag for a single unit on any day of the Vietnamese war.

"I couldn't live long enough to pay this country back what I owe it," the colonel told an interviewer. "I've fought in three wars, and three more wouldn't be too many more to defend this country. I love America and if she has weaknesses and ills, I'll hold her hand."

How good to hear the joyous emotion of a man who knows what he's fighting for!

Colonel James called for unity of purpose in his address to the Air Force Association here. It was announced at the same time that he had won a top award from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for his essay on "Heritage of Freedom."

His essay asks us to turn a deaf ear to strident and divisive harangues and, instead, to become in our daily lives unfailing links in the chain of unity and freedom that has been the strength of our country. "We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other," the colonel says.

He is declaring that patriotism is more than bombs. He is saying that it means holding fast to what is good, and defending it. "If anyone wants to challenge America, they've got me to run over first," he said. We have a feeling no one is going to run over Chappie James.

Some other cheerful things happened last week.

There was the student poll at University of Texas at Arlington that indicated pretty strongly that college kids aren't thronging the road to perdition via drugs and sex, and that they are not fainthearted about protecting the nation and its freedoms.

The opinion sampling revealed that students at UTA pretty much hold that same views on sexual freedom that their parents did a generation ago—that is to say, a solid majority holds license to be dangerous. Also, the poll showed that eight out of 10 students belong to a formal religious group.

The hippies may not be taking over so fast as some people thought.

Also last week, there was the news that U.S. unemployment dipped last month to 3.5 per cent of the labor force, the lowest figure since November 1953. Unemployment of 3.5 per cent is getting close to what the experts call the "irreducible minimum."

Polls and statistics don't tell the whole story, of course, but good statistics are better than bad statistics.

This country has problems, and it would be foolish to deny them. But things happened last week that show we must be doing some things right.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Feb. 9, 1968]

COLONEL JAMES' ESSAY ON AMERICA

(NOTE.—Col. Daniel (Chappie) James Jr. who called for unity in purpose Thursday night in an address to the Air Force Association at Carswell Air Force Base, also received one of the top awards Thursday from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

(The Air Force colonel received the George Washington Honor Medal and a $100 prize for a letter he wrote on his "Heritage of Freedom."

(The essay is reprinted here in full.)

(By Col. Daniel James, Jr.)

The strength of the United States of America lies in its unity. It lies in free men blessed and ordained with the rights of freedom working to provide, build, enjoy and grow.

Those who would subvert us, or any free people, try to disrupt this unity by breaking the small parts from the whole, driving in wedges of fear and discontent.

I am a Negro and, therefore, I am subject to their constant harangue.

They say, "You, James, are a member of a minority; you are a black man."

They say, "You should be disgusted with this American society, this so-called democracy."

They say, "You can only progress so far in any field that you choose before somebody puts his foot on your neck for no other reason than you are black."

They say, "You are a second-class citizen."

My heritage of freedom provides my reply.

To them I say, I am a citizen of the United States of America.

I am not a second-class citizen, and no man here is unless he thinks like one, reasons like one, or performs like one.

This is my country and I believe in her—and I believe in her flag—and I'll defend her—and I'll fight for her and serve her. If she has any ills I'll stand by her and hold her hand, until in God's given time, through her wisdom and her consideration for the welfare for the entire nation, things are made right again.

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted, no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed, our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other because of race, creed, religion, political party or social strata.

We must stop using personal grievances as an excuse to break the laws of the land.

We must not join with any lawless mobs, no matter what the provocation, in disregard for law and order.

A thief is a thief, I don't care what he gives for his reason for stealing.

A mob is a mob. I don't care what the provocation is.

We can't afford it in this great country of ours. It is our responsibility to preserve our freedom and our unity. Great thinking men must help unite those with whom they come in contact through hard work and participation. Our contributions to the total effort can be a by-product of what we achieve through excellence in our chosen field. In our daily lives we must become a strong link in the chain of unity and freedom that has always been the strength of the United States of America.

I am an American. My heritage is bound by the tenets of freedom inherent in that simple statement.

My responsibility is to allow my children to join a community of free people everywhere who have the right to say, "I am what I am because I have the freedom to say it."

Freedom Day Rally

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a speech made by our distinguished colleague, JOHN R. RARICK, of Louisiana, at a Freedom Day Rally at Taipei, Formosa, on January 23. The rally was held under the auspices of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, an organization providing leadership throughout Southeast Asia in the struggle against the oppressive forces of communism:

FREEDOM DAY RALLY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow free citizens of the world.

I speak to you as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and as a voice for millions of my fellow Americans who believe in individual liberty under God.

You have won the moral support of the American public in your courageous struggle against the oppressive tyranny of the Communist dictators in Peking. We—the American people—stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you in a worldwide crusade for individual liberty, peace and self-determination.

Although I speak to you as an individual Member of the United States Congress rather than as an official representative of my Government, let me emphasize that there is a strong public feeling for the rightful cause of free China—which is revealed many times by American citizens across our country and is reflected in the political battles within our Government.

I can tell you that the vast majority of the people of the United States maintain their friendship for the legitimate government of the Chinese people here in Taipei, and recognize it as the only true voice for all the Chinese people.

The American public knows, as you do, that atheistic communism is the immoral enemy of free men; that communism threatens not only the nations bordering on her territory, but every free-world government, and every decent institution.

The much-publicized differences of opinion between Peking and Moscow must never be permitted to obscure the truth that every Communist government is a threat to peace and liberty, and that each is primarily dedicated to expanding Communist aggression by armed forces or subversion—not in disagreeing with each other. The people of the free world must recognize this fact.

When Captive Nations Week was first observed in the United States in 1959, Khrushchev displayed public anger, as have his successors, since this focused world attention to a basic weakness of the Red empire—the unconquerable spirit of the captive peoples.

The propaganda voices in Peking have been equally vigorous in denouncing rallies and programs such as the one in which we are participating here today, since they are aware of the tremendous unrest of the people of the mainland for restoration of fundamental liberties which the Communist regime cannot and dare not provide.

Since communism is fundamentally evil in its political, social, and economic principles, it has within itself the seeds of self-destruction which must be carefully nourished by we people working together with anti-Communist allies throughout the world.

You, the free Chinese people are among the leaders in the gallant struggle against communism on the Asian front—and rightfully so. Determination and true faith such as yours is a must on every continent and in every nation as free people battle the Red cancer.

The endless struggle of heroic people long held in painful bondage behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains can best be seen in the agricultural failures under Communist governments, since farmers, traditionally independent, do not produce to the best of their ability under any form of collective or communal farm system.

I want you to know that the American people do not support those few leaders of the free world who naively parrot the Communist co-existence line. We remind any free world leader who is tricked by the diabolical propaganda for co-existence, that the expansion of world communism is directly related to the blackmail concessions obtained by the Soviets at the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences.

For example, General de Gaulle has demonstrated a shocking misconception of foreign affairs, first in recognizing Peking, and recently taking sides with Moscow during the Arab-Israeli crisis. Fortunately, few leaders of the free world are as blundering or misled as De Gaulle.

I have just returned from Africa where I visited Rhodesia, Portuguese Angola, and the Republic of South Africa. I met with their leaders and saw firsthand the Communist weapons and material being used against the people of these free nations by the Marxist-trained and armed terrorists—many of whom are the exploited graduates of murder schools in Peking, Moscow and Cuba.

They are indiscriminate as to their victims—black, white or yellow—their methods are fear and revolution by internal collapse, and loss of confidence in the governing leaders. The people in those countries I visited actually consider themselves in an economic war with international communism, which is giving every indication of an attempt to establish colonial outposts in many so-called emerging nations in Africa. Strange indeed that those who scream colonialism, imperialism and exploitation the loudest are the ones hardest bent on bringing about that condition.

In Guatemala, last week, two of our U.S. military officers assigned to the consul's office were machine-gunned to death in broad daylight by Communist terrorists merely because they disliked U.S. intermeddling in their country as military advisers to protect the citizens of that republic. In Guatemala, over the past 18 months there have been an estimated 1,000 assassinations and murders attributed to Red-trained murderers. A most unbelievable and unconscionable method to bring about any progress or liberty. And as the attacked government in power tightens its security and law enforcement, we hear the Communist Party line "police state"—the police state, if such exists have been caused by, and is a result of, the Communist-provoked terrorism.

We know that the Communist world suffers from tremendous internal complications, both ideologically and economically. We must, therefore, apply every effective external and internal pressure to exploit their problems and bring about the collapse of their system.

As the Communist world struggles to avoid collapse it is sheer folly for the free world to rescue them by diplomatic or economic concessions, be they called humanitarian or for the relief of poverty. The way we can truly end the suffering of the colonialized victims of communism is not to subsidize their governments, but to hasten their leaders' collapse through shortages in food, money and popular support.

We must understand that any success for communism anywhere on the globe is damaging to freedom throughout the world; likewise a defeat for communism in any part of the globe advances the cause of liberty throughout the world. Therefore, we must continue to refuse to recognize the illegal government of Mao Tse Tung and think only of the restoration of free governments in every country where communism today exists. The diplomatic boycott of the illegal Peking rulers must continue.

As a result of the efforts by the brave citizens of South Viet Nam and her anti-Communist friends, the aggression sponsored by Mao Tse Tung and his co-conspirator—the Soviet Union—the military and people of Indonesia were inspired to overthrow the Peking-infiltrated dictatorship of Sukarno, and International Communism suffered a great loss of face as Indonesia rejoined the Free World.

The success of the struggle for individual liberty in Viet Nam, the firm defense of Korea, and the continuing activities of Eastern European leaders in exile, are all helpful to your hopes to free your mainland homes, just as your determined advances are helpful to the long suffering opponents of Communism in all other areas.

When our last great military leader, General Douglas MacArthur returned home from the Korean War, he pointed out—and I quote—"the very purpose of war is victory." The logic of that statement is evident.

The constant struggle against Communism in which we are engaged must and will end in victory for freedom. Every economic, diplomatic, and psychological weapon at the disposal of the Free World must be employed in the struggle for true world peace, through victory over Communism.

The turmoil on the mainland is evidence of the inevitable collapse of the Communist dictatorship. It is only a matter of time. We know that the deep-seated moral traditions of the Chinese people can never be crushed by the imposition of the false ideology of communism with its broken promises and disproved theories. The massive propaganda of Mao's puppets and hirelings together with his fear and intimidation hasn't been able to convince the people of mainland China that the philosophy of the Communists is right or workable. Any form of government which brutally oppresses and exploits hundreds of millions of people is doomed to dismal failure. Our task is to work together in a united effort to hasten that collapse.

The near future will restore the legitimate government for all China. Your perseverance and courage will have its reward of sweet victory. I am confident that the free peoples of the world will awaken and totally reject communism, and that in continued cooperation and mutual understanding between the free Chinese and the people of the United States together with others joining our efforts, legitimate world freedom and a lasting peace can be achieved within our lifetime.

Our voices, our wants, our goals are being heard! Truth and freedom crushed to the earth can but rise again.

The Government of Nationalist China is a stanch ally and brings strength and stability to our posture in Southeast Asia. It was most fitting that the American people were so prominently represented at the rally. Other speakers were C. K. Yen, Vice President of the Republic of China and Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League. A message from President Chiang Kai-shek was read to those gathered at the rally.

Carmine "Pop" Coppola

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor for me to attend a dinner at the Claridge Restaurant, in Brooklyn, N.Y., on Saturday, February 10, 1968, sponsored by the Honorable Charles P. De Martino, executive member of the Democratic Party of the 51st Assembly District in Brooklyn, N.Y. The dinner was in honor of Mr. Carmine Coppola, called by his many, many friends "Pop Coppola," who had been a leader in his community and a "captain" in the 51st Assembly District for 50 years. Mr. Coppola who is 79 years old is still working for the principles in which he believes, those of the Democratic Party. He endeavors, as he says, to "do what he can for his country."

There were many friends of Mr. Coppola at the dinner, many of whom he had helped to achieve public office, many who came to the dinner simply to honor a great man. Those on the dais were Hon. James V. Mangano, Hon. Beatrice Judge, Hon. Ceil Holton, Hon. Charles P. De Martino, Hon. Hugh Carey, Hon. Joseph S. Levine, Hon. William J. Ferrall, Hon. John F. Furey, Hon. Thomas J. Cuite, Hon. Ross J. DeLorenzo, and many clergy.

A tribute should be given to Hon. Charles P. De Martino and Hon. Ceil Holton for their excellent organization of the dinner and to Hon. Harold Rosenbaum for chairing the dinner.

It is therefore with pride that I place in the Congressional Record and bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by the guest of honor, Mr. Carmine Coppola:

Honorable guests, ladies and gentlemen, fellow party members, friends:

I would like to thank each and every one here for the honor that you pay me.

It is with a happy heart that I speak to you tonight.

It is difficult for me to express what 50 years membership in the party has meant to me. I have seen many of the sides of life.

I have seen victory, and I have seen defeat;

I have seen courage and I have seen cowardice;

I have seen happiness and I have seen sorrow;

I have seen pride and I have seen humility;

I have seen gratitude and I have seen ingratitude;

I have seen love and I have seen hate;

But probably the best way to sum up what the years have given me is the evidence before me right now—it is one of the greatest gifts that one man can give another, and that is the gift of "friendship."

Job Corps Offers Youth a New Chance in Life

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently devoted part of its women's news section to a very interesting account of how the Job Corps has helped three young ladies begin life anew. It makes encouraging reading, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

Job Corps Guides Three Trainees to a New Way of Life

(By Donna Scheibe)

Pasadena.—Women in Community Service (WICS) started off the new year with a success.

It was a triumphant success, one which WICS recruiters at 136 Madison Ave. have waited a year for. It has been that long since they put their first frightened young applicants on the bus to be trained for a new life.

Three of them on home leave visited Alma Williams and Mrs. Charles Chase, who screened them, to show how the Job Corps reshaped their lives.

MOVING EXPERIENCES

The girls leave little doubt that they have been through some moving personal confrontations to arrive at this point.

Roseanne Begay, 20, is a Navajo who had only an eighth grade education, no close relatives and a job as a live-in baby sitter. She faced life as a domestic and nothing more.

At no time had anyone discovered she had a fine singing voice, an exceptional sense of good taste in design and ability to sew.

"I found it out by myself, the best way," she says in reviewing her first year at the Albuquerque, N.M., Job Corps center.

She is a member of a church choir in Albuquerque, can tailor a suit and hopes to earn her way through a school of design—"One I'll pick out myself." She is an experienced data computer operator. She is also working toward a high school diploma.

All three girls are filled with terms such as GED and OJT. They halt conversation in answer to explain that GED relates to general education study and that OJT is on-the-job training and that each of them is receiving it. And proudly, that RA (residential aide) is an honor.

Collette Webb, 17, and Hortensia Navar, 19, have both been RAs. Each has served as not only an aide to the Job Corps director at her residence hall but as a judge for council of RAs at the center.

The halls are former U.S. Army barracks in Tongue Point, the Astoria, Ore., center to which Collette and Hortensia have been assigned.

LONELINESS RECALLED

Each of them recalls her loneliness and her disappointment at the barren surroundings when the Job Corps bus first reached the base.

"It rains in Oregon. Boy, does it rain," said Collette. "All the time—day and night. It gets to you—especially when you're new there."

But coming from a household with 12 children, Collette had to share her room with only one other girl. That, at least, was something.

Also, she had an allowance, half of which she could send home if she chose. With only a working mother supporting the brothers and sisters at home it was a brighter prospect.

And life at Tongue Point gave her the ultimate one can find at 17. Combining an almost harsh candor, bred of being black and poor at the same time, and a high intelligence no one had ever pointed out before, Collette discovered she is a leader.

LOOKS LIFE IN EYE

She not only looks life in the eye honestly for herself but expects the girls in her residence and study halls to do the same.

"If they fight, if they don't get along, they're severed," she says bluntly. "They volunteered. They wanted a chance. They better take it."

Smartly dressed in a wool knit suit she bought with her allowance she is unlike many in her old Blair High School who have had twice her chances at life. She knows exactly where she is going—into the Marine Corps—taking training and experience as a secretary with her.

Hortensia, 20, has made the biggest jump of all. Also from a family of 12 children, she spoke no English when she came to Lincoln High School, Los Angeles, from her home in Mexico.

Domestic service would have been her lot, except for a driving ambition and a determination to speak English and speak it well.

She does. And early in her first weeks at Tongue Point she showed an exceptional ability at manual skills. She can run the mimeograph machine, type 90 words a minute, operate the switchboard and has a vocabulary superior to that of many average Americans.

Roseanne went back to Albuquerque early. Without a family in California she had no reason to stay. "After you get over the first loneliness at the center, then it's sort of like the Army," she said. "Home is where you are and what you make it."

Hortensia yearns for home life. "I love the home and family parts of our study," she said.

CHANCE SEEN

Collette sees in home and family study hours a chance for Collene, her twin, who cannot joint the corps because she has a small baby.

Collette has already broached the subject in Oregon of having girls in home and family studies care for job corps children while the young mothers study.

Somebody must have been listening—a pilot center has started for that purpose in Pennsylvania.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 31st day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

A Joint Congressional Committee To Study Foreign Aid

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Representative Edward J. Gurney, of Florida, introduced this week a resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to evaluate and recommend changes in the foreign aid program. I commend the gentleman for his action and urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given the proposal. I am today introducing a similar measure. It is certainly time that a thorough reevaluation of our foreign aid purposes and programs be carried out. Recent disclosures of waste, inefficiency, and some corruption in connection with foreign aid activities only accentuate the need for a long overdue study of this area. The concern over foreign aid mismanagement is typified, I believe, by the following editorials, one of which appeared in the February 18 edition of the Salt Lake Tribune, and the other in the February 20 edition of the Washington Star:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 18, 1968]

MUSTY AID CORNERS NEED VENTILATING

Charges of waste in the U.S. foreign aid program gain substance with recent findings of wide-ranging implications. The latest disclosure that $250,000 in Agency for International Development funds were used to buy luxury "cocktail party" items in Santo Domingo is not the worst.

Reports from Washington tell of questionable AID spending totaling well over one million dollars. Investigations by AID's own inspector-general, U.S. Senate committees and some capital newsmen implicate AID officials and foreign contractors in either careless or corrupt transactions.

Allegations so far made public accuse Japanese and Dutch contractors of collecting $300,000 in overcharges against AID accounts and cite European firms, one identified as Belgian, for charging some $600,000 on fictional repairs to equipment heading for other AID recipient countries.

Investigators are also reported to have found that some AID officials enjoyed favors and expensive entertainment provided by those eventually awarded AID contracts. And at least one such contract was allegedly assigned to an American company whose most valuable assets were friends in high places. Indeed, many of the American principals being mentioned have personal connections as high as the vice president's office.

One sleuth hard on AID's trail, Senator John J. Williams (R-Del.), accuses the Justice Department of deliberately hiding information of what he considers would be a first class scandal if made public.

Herbert J. Waters, a former assistant to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, previously headed AID's Office of Material Resources and resigned as the organization's "war on hunger" chief just before a Senate committee issued statements like, ". . . it is evident that for many years the agency's top management has been uniquely resistant to . . . acting on . . . evaluations which contain critical comments of program operations." However, Waters says he helped instigate the present probe and that he is prepared to assist investigators in every way.

The amount of foreign aid money characterized so far as misspent is small compared to AID's two billion dollar annual budget and there is a possibility much of it mistakenly dispensed can be recovered. However, even one dollar going to the wrong pocket is theft, and just how badly the American taxpayers have been plundered will be known only when this matter is thoroughly aired.

As part of the nation's defense program, financial and material assistance to foreign countries is vital. The amount of money involved is bound to attract predatory types. It now seems time to weed them out, whoever and wherever they are. The current investigation should proceed with ample cooperation from every government agency involved.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 20, 1968]

TIME FOR AN OVERHAUL

Examples of waste, inefficiency and irregularities in the nation's foreign aid program have long since become a twice-told tale, with nothing ever seeming to be done to put things straight. One must hope, however, that the latest cases in point—some ludicrous, some shocking—will stir up enough indignation in Congress to lead to corrective action.

The cases, numbering over 50, have been reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the State Department's Office of Inspector General. They include—apart from questionable official conduct in the Agency for International Development—such happenings, or non-happenings, as the following: A costly administrative slip-up resulting in the shipment by air, instead of by ocean freighter, of 150 tons of bridge components from Tokyo to Bangkok; the expenditure of $100,000 for water service in Saigon to vessels that never received a drop; and the sudden discovery that 18 large crates of tools, marked for delivery to Paraguay, had gathered dust for nine years on a Buenos Aires dock.

Pennsylvania's Senator Hugh Scott is pressing for legislation to tighten up AID's operations to lessen the likelihood of future absurdities of this kind. "The program," he says, "is very much in need of an overhauling to protect the taxpayer." A hearty amen to that.

Higher Education in Law Enforcement

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a modern professional police force is desired by everyone in this country. Crime cannot be combated effectively unless our police are encouraged to achieve a higher degree of professionalism in crime prevention.

I do not believe that anyone would contest these statements. However, in the District of Columbia policemen and firemen's pay raise bill that is to be considered in the House, provisions for educational and recruitment incentives for the policemen have been eliminated. Is there any valid argument for eliminating these provisions? How can any city deny incentives for their officers to acquire higher education in law enforcement? And how can we, knowing how undermanned the District police force is today, not provide some minimal recruitment incentives to encourage men to come to this city to work.

To quote Herbert J. Miller, Jr., Chairman of the District of Columbia Crime Commission:

> It is an understatement that an upgrading of the educational background of law enforcement officers is urgently needed.

I should like to submit for all my colleagues the full text of Mr. Miller's letter. He concisely states the case.

The letter follows:

LAW OFFICES, MILLER, MCCARTHY,
EVANS & CASSIDY,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.

Congressman Gil Gude,
Congressman Brock Adams,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Having reviewed your proposal to increase the annual salary of Police Officers of the Metropolitan Police Department who have achieved certain educational levels in the law enforcement field, I am happy to heartily endorse this proposal. It is an affirmative, positive step toward a professionalization of the law enforcement officer. It is an understatement that an upgrading of the educational background of law enforcement officers is urgently needed.

I also endorse the balance of the proposal enabling the government to pay travel expenses and per diem in conjunction with recruiting activities—at least so long as the Metropolitan Police Department is unable to attract a sufficient number of recruits to fill its authorized strength.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT J. MILLER, JR.

Can Federalism Survive?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, spoke at the National Canners Association Convention in Atlantic City recently.

Members of the association who were deeply impressed with the excellent presentation he made of the issues facing our Nation at this time, have made a copy of his speech available to me.

As I, too, am impressed with this excellent analysis of the facts all of us must face in 1968, I welcome this opportunity to extend my remarks in order that I might include the text of his speech in the Record:

CAN FEDERALISM SURVIVE?

(By the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, U.S. Representative from Wisconsin)

I'm glad to have this opportunity to visit with the Board of Directors to discuss some of the major problems which are facing the Second Session of the 90th Congress, problems that face every American in this great country of ours.

In my district in Wisconsin everything grows. About a third of the cranberries produced in this country come from that particular district. We are developing a tremendous canning industry in that area. It's one of the fastest growing canning areas in America today. I think the canning industry has to do a better job in 1968 and in 1969 as we face the decades of the 70's in telling people that in the United States of America today, food is our best buy.

Many people do not realize the advancements that have been made in marketing demanded by consumers all over the United States. We hear a lot of talk about consumer protection. Consumers have made the decision as far as the market place is concerned from one end of this country to the other. We had some poultry here today. Do you realize that poultry is selling today at about half the price of 10 years ago? Any person going in any market place in America today can buy that product more cheaply than it sold just 10 years ago today.

When you look at the canned products that we have on our shelves all over the United States, it makes me wonder whether we should continue going on the defensive in the food and marketing business.

Although there is not going to be very much major legislation passed in this session of the Congress, as I look at my crystal ball, this area of food legislation will be one of the most important areas of concern in the Congress during the next four to five years. Within the next 30 days, there will be a new reorganization announced about the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service. There will be a new move to merge these activities under one head in an area which will bring together the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service for the first time in a very close working relationship.

The power and the authority of the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service will be greatly enlarged in this reorganization program which will be submitted by the President. It has been my privilege to have a briefing on this reorganization, by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, and this will be a massive reorganization of this important department which has so much to do with the future development of the canning industry and food marketing in the United States.

We're going to have legislation, and my good friend, Hyde Murray, I understand, gave you a very detailed report on the legislation this morning at your breakfast. I understand he traced through some of the major bills that will be considered by the House and Senate Agricultural Committees as well as the Senate and the House itself.

You all heard the President's State of the Union Message this last Wednesday night in which he outlined his recommendations for new bargaining power in the hands of individual farm and farm groups and I am sure that none of you were misled to think that he was talking about S. 109, the bill that has passed the Senate of the United States. You know and I know that he was not talking about that legislation. He was talking about a new farm bargaining bill which will be submitted to the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee completely revised, within the first few weeks of February.

No, we have major challenges in this session of Congress which probably will put much of this legislation on the back burner for six to nine months. Your concern and your opportunity during this six to nine months, perhaps even 18 months, is to understand fully how important this legislation is—whether it be in the area of taking over all inspection requirements or making you provide full and complete detailed reports on every recipe you have in terms of ingredients and all the way down the line. This is in the offing unless you use this nine to 18 month period to do a better job in getting your point of view across to members of Congress, members of the Senate and to the consumer.

You have this time, you've been given this time through a very unfortunate occurrence, and of course that unfortunate occurrence is the war in Vietnam. This has delayed many major pieces of legislation. It has delayed the expansion of the Food and Drug operation and the Public Health operation. In the United States Department of Agriculture plans have come to somewhat of a standstill as far as the over-all planners are concerned because the United States of America in this year 1968, faces the most crucial economic crisis in the history of our country. We simply can't do everything for everybody and still fight a war. Whether consumer or canner or farmer, whether it's the housewife in the kitchen or the farmer in the field or the worker in the factory—all of these people are going to have to be willing to make some hard, tough economic decisions. They are all going to have to be able and willing to make some sacrifices if we want a bright economic future in the period of the 1970's.

Today's situation reminds me of an airline pilot who was flying across the United States. It was foggy out and the passengers were very concerned because as they looked out their portholes, they could neither see the wingtips to the port side or the starboard side of the airplane. Finally, the pilot came over with a rather reassuring voice and he said, "I have two things to report. One is good news and the other is bad news. I would like to give you the bad news first. The bad news is that we are lost. The good news is that we are making record time."

This is the problem that faces the United States economically in this year, 1968. The bad news is that we are lost, we're not finding the right answers for the problems of our cities and depressed rural areas, for the problems of health, education, and welfare, for the balance of payments, inflation, high interest rates, crime and so on. But we're making record time as far as spending ourselves silly and cheapening the value of the dollar and creating more and more programs that don't seem to work are concerned.

That's why I suggested that you in the canning industry and all of us must be willing to tighten our belts, must be willing to make the sacrifices in this year 1968, although they are awfully tough sometimes to make. This is why the major issue facing this Congress is the economic issue, because the prosperity of the United States and every citizen in it is threatened in this year 1968 as it has never been threatened before. This Congress must be willing to make the hard, tough decisions that have to be made as far as matching revenue with expenditures and exposing the kind of gimmickry that is being used in this budget document which has been submitted on an informal basis to the Congress this last week.

We saw the deficit sort of melt from $33 billion for this fiscal year, 1969 by a kind of manipulation which every international banker and every economist recognizes on its face as deliberate misleading assumptions in order to cover up where this country is actually going. Five billion of that deficit disappeared because the social security trust fund which is now counted in the regular budget for the first time shows that much of a surplus. In addition to that, the President shows us $12.5 billion worth of taxes in the revenue column on the assumption that Congress will pass his tax bill.

He also takes for the first time $6 billion out of defense procurement funds through a transfer process to cover the current obligations of the war in Vietnam—money that will have to be put back either through a supplemental appropriation or in later budgets. This is the way that the deficit is cut down to $8 billion in this document that will be submitted to us on the 29th of January. Social Security receipts for the first time and Social Security taxes as you all know, are all going up this year; the payroll tax, the tax rate all is increased and the trust fund expenditures will be $46 billion, but trust fund receipts, unemployment compensation, Social Security, trust fund and highway trust fund amount to $52.5 billion in the fiscal year 1969.

Where does that balance because of the increased tax rates go? It goes over to help pay and finance the old administrative budget in fiscal year 1969. The war in Vietnam is costing $30 billion a year, yet in the 1968 budget only $21.7 billion was provided. The war costs in Vietnam have been underestimated in each of the last two years; in fiscal year 1966 by $10.8 billion; in fiscal 1967 by over $13 billion and all of these costs are coming home to haunt the United States of America. Regardless of the kind of manipulation that is used in this budget document, the time has come when we're going to have to be willing to stand up and pay for some of these costs on a current basis.

Although a majority of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States have not been convinced that a case has been made for a tax increase, I for one am willing to support that tax increase because we cannot have deficit financing to the extent that we have it in the United States of America today and expect to have any bright future as far as economic growth and development in the United States is concerned.

We can't be unwilling to pay the cost, we can't just ask a few people in our society to make sacrifices like our servicemen are making for us in Vietnam today. This has to be a cross to bear, that everyone has to share to some extent in bringing revenues and expenditures more nearly in line. Because the gimmicks will run out in the year 1970. These gimmicks may be good for 1969 in the budget document that is submitted in just three weeks, but my friends in the canning industry, every one of those gimmicks that is used in this budget presentation, can never be used again.

It seems to me that the Congress in making and working and living up to its responsibility must be willing to make the hard, tough decisions in the area of expenditure reductions first and that has to be the high priority item in this second session of the 90th Congress. But we will also have to be willing to face up to the revenue side of this budget so that we're not in a position of passing these bills on to some future group.

The future of federalism is involved in this whole debate. There are really four overriding issues that face America in this year 1968 and as we look to the next few years. They are Peace, Prosperity, Credibility in Government and the Future Course of Federalism.

Peace is an issue because we are once again at war. It is also an issue here at home because of the turbulence on our city streets. Americans would do anything honorable to bring about a lasting peace both at home and abroad. But on both fronts, Americans are frustrated and confused. Where we are going, what we are doing, what we hope to accomplish is unclear and uncertain both concerning Vietnam and the breakdown in our society.

Americans long, for firm leadership on both fronts. We want to be told where we are going and what we are doing to get there. In Vietnam, we are told the object is negotiations. But negotiations do not necessarily mean peace or an end to the war. We must not forget the Korean experience. More than two-thirds of the Americans who were killed in Korea died after negotiations began. Until our true purpose is brought into sharp focus by our national leaders, the raging debate on the issue of peace will continue to grow.

Prosperity is an issue because it is threatened. The cost of living, which has eaten up most of the wage increases Americans have won, threatens to climb another 5.5 percent in the next 15 months. Interest rates are the highest in this century. Social Security taxes have been increased and the Johnson Administration has asked Congress to raise taxes another 10 percent in this Session of Congress. The Balance of Payments crisis has led the President to restrict American business investments overseas and to request controls on tourist travel.

The spending issue dominated the last Session of Congress and it will dominate this Session. The root of our economic problems lies in a failure to set priorities among the hundreds of demands for federal dollars. We have been operating on a theory of "fight now and finance later" the war in Vietnam. At home the theory has been "finance now and perfect later" domestic programs in areas of poverty, education, health and welfare.

Credibility is an issue because it is difficult to place faith in some of the statements issued by the Executive Branch of government. Whether we are talking about the cost of the war in Vietnam, assessments of how we are doing over there, whether we are talking about the nation's budget and the true size of the deficit, or half a hundred other critical problems, Americans find it difficult any longer to believe what they are told.

Our people have always demonstrated a willingness to pull together in times of crisis and to make whatever sacrifices are called for to see us through the crisis. But to do that, they must know the facts. If Americans cannot have faith in the accuracy of their Government's statements, the whole structure and operation of our system is undermined. This affects every problem we face both at home and abroad. Without credibility in our nation's leadership, no meaningful or lasting action can be effectively undertaken.

My friends in the canning industry, the future course of Federalism is perhaps the overriding concern of Americans. All problems in America must be treated within the framework of our governmental institutions. The debate focuses on whether Washington should do it all or whether the various levels of our society should pull together in a true partnership. The tendency in recent years has been to make Washington the chief problem-solver by piling program upon program, directed, regulated and administered from Washington, D.C.

A better way, which would insure the preservation and strengthening of true federalism would be to enact a broad system of revenue-sharing including tax credits both for state and local taxes paid and for such special purposes as education and job training. We should also consolidate the hundreds of existing programs into bloc grants to provide more flexibility and effectiveness in getting the job done. This would be a far better way for Americans to do things.

If federalism is going to survive, it's up to the Congress to look over the 458 grant-in-aid programs that are currently on our statute books each with its own bureau chief, each with its own army, battalion or company of federal employees administering these grant-in-aid programs on the basis of priorities which are established in our central government in this federal system of ours. They hand out $17 billion this year to state and local communities, to school boards, to county governments all over America on the basis of projects that are submitted by the school boards, the county governments and state governments to a bureau in Washington, D.C.

I believe that if the Congress looks into these programs they will find that there are better ways to do things for America and there is a better insurance policy for America than the categorical grant-in-aid approach currently being used in Washington, D.C. That insurance policy is important if this federal system of ours is going to survive and it goes back to one basic psychological difference that exists in America today and that is: do we have problem solvers on our local school boards, on our city councils and are the governors capable and the legislators capable in each of our 50 states to solve problems?

As I have gone around and looked at the mayors and governors and the various individuals from one end of this country to the other I find that we have problem solvers in state legislatures, in county governments and city governments on our school boards and we have capable people as school administrators; but the reason that many of the problems in health, education and welfare in this federal system of ours are not being solved in the years 1967 and 1968 have not been because of the lack of individual creativity in these offices—it has been because of the lack of resources at the local level that have been restricted by the central government in this federal system of ours.

What we must do during this period of time, if federalism is going to survive, is look at a better way. I believe that this better way is resource or revenue-sharing with our states and local communities. I urge the national canning industry to look at revenue-sharing as a better way for Americans to do things as we face the decades of the 70's. This includes giving tax credits on federal income taxes for state and local taxes paid, whether they be real estate taxes or income taxes, whether they be sales taxes or excise taxes—tax credits against the federal income tax payments for local and state taxes paid, so that when a local unit of government or school board has to go in to solve a particular problem, they don't always run into some project that has to be approved or disapproved on the basis of priorities established in Washington.

You know, I have over 658 projects pending in my congressional district in the educational field alone. You can see how that's multiplied in each of 458 programs with the decisions being made in Washington, D.C. I think that you will join with me and the others in saying that there is truly a better way to protect our federal system than transferring all the decision making to Washington, D.C. and that better way is to keep the decision making where it should be with the problem solvers at the state and local level.

This is my challenge to you. I believe the federal system can survive, but we in this year 1968 have to be willing to make the tough, hard decisions that are necessary to bring it about.

LSD Legislation

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the great chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, and the chairman of the committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, JOHN JARMAN, for their work on legislation providing penalties for possession and use of LSD.

The subcommittee has already had 1 day of hearings and on Monday will hear from Members of Congress.

As the author of one of these bills I intend to testify. I know the terrible effects of these drugs, having served as chairman some years ago, of a special committee to investigate narcotics.

One of the major health and social problems with which this country is confronted is the growing misuse of drugs. Use of amphetamines, barbiturates, and LSD by our youth for the sole purpose of thrill seeking has spawned crime and violence in our streets and significantly contributes to the unfortunate and rapid rise in juvenile delinquency. The extent to which our population is resorting to false psychological states of euphoria is indeed alarming. We are faced today with the challenge of directing our youth to more meaningful endeavors and stemming the advocacy of drug indulgence.

Perhaps the most effective weapon against the indiscriminate use of stimulant, depressant, and hallucinogenic drugs is education; and I will wholeheartedly support increases in the educational efforts of the various Federal and State enforcement agencies involved in drug surveillance. However, we must buttress education and information with a comprehensive regulatory scheme.

The lucrative profits available in the mushrooming market for stimulant, depressant, and hallucinogenic agents has seen the entry of the hardened criminals and syndicates in the illicit drug traffic. Illegal traffickers have managed to divert massive quantities of dangerous drugs. The Food and Drug Administration has on several occasions made single seizures of these products involving over half a million tablets. Operators in this racket have even begun to peddle their products along established routes covering many States. Our prime objective in the enforcement of drug laws should be directed to the suppliers of this type of human bondage. The sale of LSD and other dangerous drugs must be halted.

Hallucinogenic compounds such as LSD and STP best exemplify the manifold tragic consequences incidental to clandestine drug use. We are now almost accustomed to hearing reports of violent and bizarre crime associated with LSD "trips." Malformations at birth are now being linked with LSD and chromosome changes have been observed. The problem thus affects not only this generation but possibly future generations. Every day a new compound captivates the warped minds of this Nation's subcultures. "Speed," methamphetamine, is the newest product to reach the streets.

Yet today the illegal manufacture and sale of LSD, amphetamines, and barbiturates is only punishable as a misdemeanor; hardly enough to deter persons from seeking the lucrative profits available. President Johnson stated in his state of the Union message that "the time has come to stop the sale of slavery for the young." Accordingly, in his crime message the President recommended increased penalties and pointed out that the sale of marihuana is a felony, even though the detrimental effects of marihuana are no greater than those posed by the use of LSD. The discrepancy in penalties is not justified from the standpoint of their use or from the standpoint of the crimes, antisocial behavior or highway accidents which they cause. I, therefore, am the author of legislation to increase the penalties surrounding the manufacture, sale and use of LSD and other dangerous nonnarcotic drugs.

I am confident that more severe penalties in the drug abuse area will act as a significant deterrent for those that otherwise might profit from the sale of these drugs. Potential users will also be more wary of indulging and hopefully will forego such a hazardous experience.

Washington Loved Home

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington, I want to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in one of our Fairfax County newspapers. Certainly, I am pleased to represent the district in which our first President was born, reared, died, and is buried.

Washington is known to schoolchildren and to the world as being a truthful and honest man. In fact, legend has it that he admitted to his father that he chopped down the cherry tree with his little hatchet and could not lie when questioned about it.

Our country has progressed a long way since Washington's day, and we would not want to return in most aspects of our daily life. But would not it be a credit to our Nation if our Government in all of its activities could meet this simple truthfulness for which Washington is remembered, rather than to be known both at home and abroad as a Nation that may not always tell the truth?

No one of us can be proud of the credibility gap that appears to be the hallmark of the present administration.

The editorial of the Fairfax County Journal-Standard referring to Washington's home at Mount Vernon is set forth below and I commend it to you:

WASHINGTON LOVED HOME

George Washington—President, general and statesman—always thought of himself as a country squire. And he lavished his love for the soil on Mount Vernon.

"No estate in United America is more pleasantly situated than this," Washington wrote proudly. "It lyes in a high, dry, and healthy Country . . . on one of the finest Rivers in the world."

Mount Vernon has been preserved as a patriotic shrine in Virginia by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association since 1853. Now the view across the Potomac will also be protected, the National Geographic Society says.

The Government has acquired 1,000 water-front acres in Maryland to be called Piscataway Park. The tract will block any commercial development that could mar the view from Mount Vernon. A public outcry narrowly averted construction of a sewage treatment plant on the scenic shoreline a few years ago.

Piscataway will preserve a panorama that has delighted visitors ever since Washington acquired the property in 1754. Said a guest in 1787: "The View down the River is extensive and most charming—nearly opposite the House the River Piscataway empties itself into the majestic Patowmack and adds greatly to the beauty of the Scene. In a Word this is altogether the most charming Seat I have seen in America."

Washington kept an eye on Mount Vernon even during the dark days at Valley Forge. In a letter he asked his steward: "To go on in the improvement of my estate in the manner theretofore described to you, fulfilling my plans and keeping my property together are the principle objects I have in view during these troubles . . ."

Under Washington's solicitous care, Mount Vernon developed into one of the handsomest estates of the period. The modest nine-room house he inherited from his step-brother Lawrence more than doubled in size. Gardens and efficiently grouped outbuildings sprouted in a villagelike setting near the main building. Acreage tripled.

Mount Vernon's master took a personal hand in the daily chores. "He . . . often works with his Men himself, strips off his Coat and labours like a common man," observed an amazed guest.

Mount Vernon now attracts more than a million visitors a year. Washington's own words speak through the years to welcome them: "I have no objection to any sober or orderly person's gratifying their curiosity in viewing the buildings, Gardens, &ca (etc.) . . ."

Passing ships of the United States Navy still pay their respects to Washington from the Potomac. Colors are half-masted, taps sounded; crewmen salute. The tribute probably began in 1801 when a newly commissioned frigate fired a 13-gun salute opposite the late Commander-in-Chief's home.

Such homage is appropriate, for Mount Vernon is more than a shrine. In a National Geographic article, Lonnelle Aikman wrote: "Mount Vernon is not just a national symbol, a historic monument to commemorate the remote deeds of a successful general and President. Its appeal is to the human heart as the home of George and Martha Washington."

General Washington, Let's Be Reasonable

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the February 15, 1968, issue of the Stars and Stripes-the National Tribune there is printed a scathing bit of whimsy written by Mr. Ferd Bronzell, who is Illinois State adjutant of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. It is well worth reading by every American for Mr. Bronzell compares the Spirit of '76 with the lack of spirit of '68. The article follows:

GENERAL WASHINGTON, LET'S BE REASONABLE

(By Ferd Bronzell)

If George Washington could come to life on the 236th anniversary of his birth and meet Jack Apologist, their conversation might go like this:

Washington: I see hundreds of American servicemen in Viet Nam earning the Badge of Military Merit—a decoration which I instituted on Aug. 7, 1782, but which you now call the Purple Heart Medal. They are truly on the road to glory. They agree with me that the United States is a free country; and being patriots, they cannot do otherwise than answer the call of their country. Like my fellow patriots during the Revolutionary War, the farmers and laborers and clerks are making sacrifices that will insure the continuation of freedom in this country. But, I ask, what has given rise to the draftcard burners and—what is the term—peaceniks? Has the concept of merit been lost to many of the people?

Jack Apologist: General, you must understand that they are exercising their privilege of dissent—something that you should understand. Let me tell you like it is. If we prevent them from violating federal and state laws, we would be depriving them of their birthright of dissent—an idea that you fought for valiantly. Sure, they may destroy property, interfere with the free passage and rights of others, but that is part of the game. They are actively displaying that dissent which proves that the United States is still a viable democracy.

Washington: How do you explain the attitude of indifference among many of the ordinary citizens?

Jack Apologist: True, many are indifferent. Check at almost any bank and you will see people cashing United States Savings Bonds the day after receiving them. You have to understand, General, we are experiencing inflation. It takes a lot of money to buy new cars, television sets, and air conditioners. How could the people keep up with the news in Viet Nam if they could not sit in air-conditioned rooms, watching the progress in Viet Nam on their television sets. General, be reasonable.

Washington: What motivates those young Americans, a term I use advisedly, who make fraudulent and hypocritical appeals in order to gain deferment from the draft? Is this support for the troops in Viet Nam?

Jack Apologist: General, please. Don't you realize that the families of these men would suffer undue hardship if they were drafted. Don't you know that because of inflation, four and five salaries are needed to keep a family up to our normal standard of living.

Washington: I am confounded by all the grumbling over the taxes which are necessary to support the men in Viet Nam. How do you explain this?

Jack Apologist: This is an old American game, General. It's a custom, like Monday morning quarterbacking. Sure, we try to chisel a bit here and there on our income taxes, and complain about what we do pay; but we all do it. So it's OK.

Washington: Do you think it is fair for so many Americans to hurt, either deliberately or thru indifference, the morale of the troops in Viet Nam?

Jack Apologist: Remember, General, you had your Tories.

Washington: Yes, but we dealt with the Tories.

East Michigan Tourist Association Resolution on Travel

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a resolution of the board of directors of the East Michigan Tourist Association expressing concern over the balance-of-payments problem and advocating a policy of unrestricted nontaxed travel.

Travel is a two-way street and only if it is allowed to continue on that basis will we Americans be able to effectively influence our world neighbors and bring about an era of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas citizens of the United States have always held to the tradition of freedom for Americans to travel throughout this nation and in foreign lands, and

Whereas travel by Americans, a major export-import industry of this nation, constitutes one of the most important international activities that works toward world peace and understanding, and

Whereas the Government of the United States has introduced measures including direct taxation that would bar Americans their traditional freedom of travel throughout the world through the Executive and Legislative branches as the major effort to reduce our balance of international payments deficit,

Now therefore be it resolved that the East Michigan Tourist Association, by powers vested in its Board of Directors, does hereby express its deep concern of the problem of the foreign payments situation of this nation and announce its support of a positive program to combat the serious situation confronting the American dollar by supporting the concept of unrestricted non-taxed travel for all citizens of all countries to visit the United States Travel Service for tourist promotion in foreign countries. In supporting this positive approach the members of this association give full support to the policies and recommendations of the National Association of Travel Organizations for overcoming the payments problem.

Poll Finds Nixon Widens Lead With Backing of 51 Percent in GOP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 21, 1968:

POLL FINDS NIXON WIDENS LEAD WITH BACKING OF 51 PERCENT IN GOP

PRINCETON, N.J., February 20.—Richard M. Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over seven other leading G.O.P. contenders as the top choice of Republican voters for the 1968 Presidential nomination.

The former Vice President is the favorite of half (51 per cent) of rank-and-file Republicans in the latest (early February) Gallup Poll survey and now leads his closest rival, Governor Rockefeller of New York, by the wide margin of 26 percentage points.

Mr. Rockefeller's standing has shown little change since the previous survey, in early January, while Mr. Nixon has gained 9 percentage points.

Governor Rockefeller's surge in popularity with Republican voters came between the November and January surveys, when he nearly doubled his share of the vote from 15 per cent to 27 per cent.

Mr. Nixon has led the field in all but one of the 23 tests of G.O.P. candidate strength conducted since the 1964 Presidential election. The exception came in November 1966, when the newly re-elected Gov. George Romney of Michigan briefly moved into the lead.

Governor Romney, the only other announced candidate on the list, continues to lose favor with Republicans. Firmly in second place before his "brainwash" statement in early September (with 24 per cent of the vote to Nixon's 35 per cent), Mr. Romney now has only 7 per cent of the vote and is in fourth place behind Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Interviewing for the current survey was completed Feb. 7, immediately following Mr. Nixon's announcement of his candidacy and just prior to the clash between Mayor Lindsay of New York and Governor Rockefeller over the recent sanitation strike in that city.

Other potential candidates listed in the survey were Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon and retired Lieut. Gen. James H. Gavin.

Here is the question asked:

"Here is a list of men (card lists 8) who have been mentioned as possible Presidential candidates for the Republican party in 1968. Which ONE would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate for President in 1968?"

Here are the latest choices of Republicans, compared with those from surveys in January and September:

[In percent]

	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon	51	42	40	35
Rockefeller	25	27	17	14
Reagan	8	8	16	11
Romney	7	12	14	24
Percy	3	5	9	6
Hatfield	2	2	1	2
Lindsay	2	1	1	2
Gavin	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference	1	2	2	6

(1) Not included on earlier list.

The results in today's report are based on a national sample of Republicans and cannot be applied to any one region or state.

Mr. Nixon has also registered gains with independents, voters who do not align themselves with either major party. Governor Rockefeller in January had drawn even with Mr. Nixon, but the latter has now moved into a 34 to 26 per cent lead among these voters.

The choices of independents are important since numerically they represent a voting group as large as Republicans. In order to do well in a Presidential election, a Republican nominee must make a good showing with this group.

The choices of independents, and the comparison:

[In percent]

	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon	34	27	29	23
Rockefeller	26	27	20	16
Reagan	13	14	15	17
Romney	11	13	17	20
Percy	5	7	5	6
Lindsay	2	3	5	6
Hatfield	2	2	1	1
Gavin	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference	6	6	8	11

(1) Not included on earlier list.

District of Columbia Police Pay Raise, Education, and Recruitment Incentives

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 26, during the presentation of H.R. 15131 there will be presented an amendment which will add education and recruitment incentives to the District of Columbia police and fireman pay raise bill.

In order to make these available to all Members on Monday I am having this proposed amendment printed in full in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

I also include an article by Mr. James Stinchcomb entitled "Higher Pay for Higher Education" in the RECORD immediately following the proposed amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15131 PROPOSED TO BE OFFERED BY MR. ADAMS

(NOTE.—The following will be added as two new sections to the bill.)

Page 10, after line 21, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 6. (a) Any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force—

"(1) who is serving in a salary class (other than salary class 9 or 10) of the salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, and

"(2) who is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (c) to have satisfactorily completed at least 30 but less than 60 semester hours or the equivalent of law enforcement or police administration courses at an accredited institution of higher education,

shall, if he has completed his one-year's probation, be paid $600 per annum in addition to the basic rate of compensation prescribed for such officer or member in such salary schedule.

"(b) Any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force—

"(1) who is serving in a salary class (other than salary class 9 or 10) of the salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, and

"(2) who is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (c) to have satisfactorily completed at least 60 semester hours or the equivalent of law enforcement or police administration courses at an accredited institution of higher education,

shall, if he has completed his one-year's probation, be paid $1,200 per annum in addition to the basic rate of compensation prescribed for such officer or member in such salary schedule.

"(c) Such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) shall be issued by the District of Columbia Council in the case of the Metropolitan Police force, by the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, and by the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the White House Police force. The Council and such Secretaries shall standardize such regulations to the fullest extent possible. The additional amount of compensation authorized by those subsections shall be included in any basic computation for retirement purposes under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, title 4, chapter 5) and for the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized, under regulations prescribed by the District of Columbia Council, to pay or reimburse an individual for the travel expenses which he incurred in traveling between his home or place of business and the District of Columbia for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is qualified for appointment to the position of private in the Metropolitan Police force. The regulations of the District of Columbia Council may (1) authorize the payment of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, and (2) prescribe maximum amounts of allowable travel expenses which may not exceed the maximum amounts authorized for employees of the government of the District of Columbia under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized, under regulations prescribed by the District of Columbia Council, to pay to a person who is newly appointed as a private in the Metropolitan Police force and who is required to relocate his place of residence in order to come within the required area of residence for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force (prescribed in the first section of the Act of July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, 4–132a))—

"(1) a cash resettlement allowance not to exceed $250, and

"(2) a per diem allowance not to exceed $7.50 per day for a period not to exceed ninety days beginning with the date of his appointment.

The allowances authorized by this subsection shall not be allowed unless the person appointed shall agree in writing to remain a member of the Metropolitan Police force for twenty-four months following his appointment unless separated for a reason beyond his control and acceptable to the Commissioner. In case of violation of such agreement, any moneys expended by the District of Columbia on the allowances authorized by this subsection shall be recoverable from the individual concerned as a debt due the District of Columbia. The Commissioner may waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this subsection, if it is shown that the recovery would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest."

(NOTE.—The above sections will take effect on the date of enactment. The necessary technical and conforming amendments required by the insertion of the two new sections are not shown.)

Higher Pay for Higher Education—A Review of Educational Incentive Pay Programs for Police Officers Now in Effect in the United States

(By James D. Stinchcomb)

Only several years ago, there were increasingly frequent references being made to the desirability of college attendance for certain police specialties. Then more recently the discussion has shifted from whether or not education was a luxury that policing could afford to how best it could become an integral part of the system. The momentum has carried some 140 institutions of higher learning into this field of study with a formalized degree program and at this writing only 15 states are not able to identify a police degree program within their boundaries. Now another discussion is emerging relative to higher education; once again it is one that has been heard before in other career fields and once again it can be predicted that in a few more years it will no longer even be a matter requiring debate. The reference is to "incentive pay scales" or the policy of establishing higher salary levels for persons who successfully complete academic work in pursuit of a college degree.

In mid-March of this year, the United States Civil Service Commission issued a directive permitting certain college graduates to be paid higher starting salaries than usual for their particular entrance grade. In doing this the Civil Service Commission was responding to pressures from federal agencies which are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with industry for promising young persons. Specifically the difference amounts to some $1,100 for those students who qualify for entrance above the general entry level for college graduates. For a graduate degree, this financial gain can amount to $2,300 on the basis of only one year's graduate study. The concept, rather than the amount, should be important to police administrators. Those who must face the recruitment task in the coming years, remembering the changing society and the general educational attainments nationally, would do well to sow such seeds immediately, modest though they may be.

To postpone any discussion of the concept that greater qualifications demand differential reimbursements could well hamper recruitment of quality personnel in the near future because young careerists are naturally going to be favorably predisposed to seek out those departments which have demonstrated their leadership in this emerging profession. The Chief who feels he needs precedent in terms of public funded agencies in his community that have a similar plan should obtain the local school board salary scale. That scale doubtless will reflect significant differences for those who enter teaching on an emergency certification basis without a bachelor's degree, for those who possess an undergraduate degree, for those who possess credits toward a master's, for those who have been awarded the master's and for those who have received considerable credits beyond the master's. There will also probably be a top salary bracket for those who possess the doctorate. Law enforcement agencies could immediately adopt an overall plan that calls for differential salary levels for those possessing 30 credits above the high school diploma. This would certainly be a modest beginning but each 30 credits could increase the income potential significantly and, of course, performance would have to continue to be satisfactory. Thus it is not merely an automatic raise. Hopefully such a program would assist the police department in retaining its better educated personnel and gradually enable that department to employ only officers with educational backgrounds.

Probably the best known efforts to achieve incentive pay for educational achievement have been accomplished by California's Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. Several examples from that state will perhaps prove helpful to police administrators interested in obtaining details on some departments that have achieved this and what amounts of money are involved.

Ventura, California, offers 5 and 10 per cent salary additions for two and four years of college, respectively. In Arcadia, California, a 5 per cent pay step is available to officers who possess 60 college units or an associate degree. Likewise in Fairfax and Fairfield, California, a 5 per cent pay increase is available. Other communities, obviously interested in encouraging continuing college attendance, have offered pay programs amounting to $1.00 per month for each semester credit completed successfully. Cities in this category include Lynwood and Maywood, California. Somewhere between on such scales lies Irwindale, California, which rewards each three credits completed with $5.00 per month increase. Most of these departments do have maximum amounts that can be obtained. In Holtville, California, 30 credits is worth an additional $25.00 per month and the associate degree earns an additional $50.00 per month.

One of the obvious advantages of such efforts appears to be that with a differential pay plan, many department's entrance salary will rise above that figure which college students consider essential. This will be especially true of young men possessing associate degrees from local community colleges and also those more inclined toward municipal police careers rather than federal service.

If the pay plan does not achieve this goal, it is short-sighted and not as likely to affect recruitment. It will, for years to come, however, have an impact on police officers who complete their education while employed. Initially, either aspect of the plan is vital but both ultimately must be achieved. Lest this discussion appear to suggest that only California has achieved this significant step forward, we can identify similar progress in the vicinity of the nation's capital.

The Arlington County (Virginia) Police Department provides an incentive arrangement for its personnel possessing degrees. That department has a top salary level of $8,361 annually for a private. A degree would raise that police private's salary to $8,756 annually. While an annual differential of $395 might not be sufficient to attract recent college graduates in search of career employment, it certainly offers a modest motivating influence for present personnel who desire to increase their understanding and insight into the complexities of the enforcement task. This salary differential is reflected regardless of the rank which may be obtained.

The Montgomery County (Rockville, Maryland) Police Department has offered a 5 per cent educational salary differential for the past two years. Each Montgomery County police officer who earns 15 or more credits receives this pay differential as long as he participates in the Police Professional Advancement Program. Upon completion of a college degree that 5 per cent differential becomes permanent. This incentive program, therefore, becomes both a reward for achievement as well as an incentive to complete a degree. Currently some 115 police officers from that department receive the educational salary differential.

The City of Tulsa (Oklahoma) earlier this year increased its award of $20.00 per month for each two years of work in police science education. The plan now provides for a one-step pay raise for completing two years of police science, and another step increase for completing two more years and earning a degree. Thus, an officer may receive from $25.00 to $40.00 extra for each two years completed, and an officer with a degree will earn $50.00 to $80.00 extra per month. The increases, of course, are contingent upon satisfactory work performance, and length of service is reflected in the step increases. The Tulsa Police Department indicates that some 30 officers have already earned the two-year educational increase.

Effective January 1, 1967, the police department in the City of Wauwatosa (Wisconsin) adopted an educational incentive pay plan for police officers. More recently this plan was expanded to include all other city employees. Under this plan an officer in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, receives an increment of ½ of 1 per cent of his base pay for each three credit college courses completed on his own time while a member of the department. At present the maximum increment is 5 per cent.

One of the very important features of the above mentioned programs is that not only are law enforcement courses encouraged, but there is equal incentive for the pursuit of such courses as sociology, English, psychology, political science, and others which will broaden the officer's understanding of his complex responsibilities.

One of the more recent plans of this type has received approval in the Village of Park Forest (Illinois). Under this plan an additional salary step has been added for those officers with five years of service in the department and who complete a specified number of training units. These training units may be obtained through the University of Illinois Police Training Institute in addition to four required liberal arts courses. The additional salary step, according to a recent departmental directive, should amount to an increase of 8 to 10 per cent more.

For approximately one and one-half years now, the city of Saginaw (Michigan) has offered a two-step incentive pay plan for those officers who receive a degree in law enforcement. The first pay step of approximately

$200 per year is available upon receipt of the associate degree. The second pay step of approximately $400 per year is available to those officers who complete requirements for the bachelor's degree in law enforcement. Prior to the establishment of this program, as was the case in several of the others previously mentioned, members of the department were surveyed to determine their interest in college attendance. In the Saginaw experience, two-thirds of the department's personnel indicated interest in pursuing such a program, and it was determined that the costs involved would be more than offset by the dividends which would accrue to both the community and the individual officers.

On the East Coast we can find one of the most ambitious efforts in this direction.

The Fair Lawn (New Jersey) Police Department very recently worked out a plan whereby patrolmen will receive a salary increase from $7,750 to $10,000 upon completion of a police science degree. Officers in all ranks may obtain an additional $17.00 for each college credit earned while in pursuit of a college degree. Certainly this plan is clearly in line with the recent recommendation from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. That report states that the median educational level for all policemen in the United States is 12.4 years and that this trend should be sharply accelerated. There is little doubt that this trend is advancing even more rapidly than once anticipated, and competitive salaries can be expected to assume their proper roles as educational qualifications advance.

Strong arguments in support of such pay plans can be offered to the local officials responsible for total community expenditures. Although there is no desire to discourage the limited mobility that we just now are beginning to experience, it should be noted that every effort also must be made to encourage the retention of police officers in the department that cooperates in personnel educational programs. A small department will have equal access to qualified personnel if its salary structure can compete realistically, and the larger departments likewise can provide higher salaries without concern for the narrowing pyramid which restricts the number of qualified officers who may be promoted in rank. Hopefully such an arrangement would reduce the obvious advantage that other career fields now offer to police officers who find themselves in a system that does not provide for additional pay steps beyond the initial 3–5 years experience and, furthermore, cannot offer impending vacancies at the next higher rank. And again as in the public school system, it is not our desire to reward only the leadership. Salaries must be competitive and attractive to the patrol officer who performs the daily tasks. In fact, the classroom teacher rarely seeks an administrative position because he finds the challenges of his field of knowledge and his clientele more rewarding personally. This should not discourage ambition but does suggest strongly that all levels of assignments and operations deserve incentive rewards and these should not come about solely because of promotions to staff positions in administration.

A number of communities have recently expressed interest in adopting plans such as these described. While we are aware of some that have even submitted requests, we have described only those known to be currently in operation. Comments from police administrators in departments possessing incentive pay plans were consistently favorable toward them insofar as employed personnel were concerned. The reservations expressed suggest that as a recruitment device they do not represent sufficient differential to attract applicants who already possess the bachelor's degree. Experience so far in recruiting those with the Associate degree is limited and therefore still inconclusive. Presently many young men pursuing the associate degree enter military service rather than embark on careers; others enter the police departments as cadets and thereby become part-time students thus delaying their degrees. W ecan, however, note with encouragement the comments from these progressive communities regarding their intention to expand the pay differential to become more competitive with other career fields requiring higher education.

U.S. Ambassador to OAS Shuns Arm-Twisting Diplomacy—Wins Friends and Results for a Strengthened Hemisphere Organization

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our forces are engaged in a fierce struggle in Vietnam, too little public attention is given to our efforts to secure and strengthen efforts toward progress and friendship in the Western Hemisphere.

Previously, the United States has been accused of conducting its Western Hemisphere diplomacy by using strong-arm, or "dominant nation" tactics. The results of these tactics, both with individual Latin American countries, and within the Organization of American States, have frequently been less than desirable.

I am happy to report that one of the most significant steps of progress in Pan-American relations in this decade has taken place this month. The Organization of American States has elected a strong and dynamic Secretary-General, Ecuador's Galo Plaza Lasso. Lasso, a former President of Ecuador, favors an OAS with an active and expanded role. He was elected with the support of the United States, but without the behind-the-scenes arm twisting that once characterized our Latin American diplomacy.

The man most responsible for this success, and for this change in the U.S. approach is U.S. Ambassador to the OAS Sol M. Linowitz. His unconventional brand of man-to-man, persuasive diplomacy has done much to enhance our partnership with, and to deemphasize our dominance over our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

I am proud to claim Sol Linowitz as both a good friend and a constituent. Before he entered public life, he contributed much to my home community of Rochester, N.Y., as chairman of the board of Xerox Corp. I know that my colleagues join me in praising the successful application of his many talents to the crucial area of Western Hemisphere relations.

With so many eyes turned to the battlefronts of Southeast Asia, it is good to know that we also have some very skillful eyes trained on our own hemisphere. I am pleaded to share with my colleagues two editorials which appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Times concerning the election of the new OAS Secretary-General, which take note of this important turn in United States-Latin American relations:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

OPPORTUNITY AT THE OAS

The election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is as important for the way it was done as for what it does. With enough effort of the right sort by all the members of inter-American system, it may well turn out to be the best thing that's happened to the OAS and to political life in this hemisphere since the principle of multilateralism was first introduced.

What it does is place at the head of the OAS a man of stature and energy who has been President of his own country, Ambassador to this country and an effective United Nations trouble-shooter in Cyprus, the Congo and Lebanon. It is not too much to say that he is very probably the best man for the job—and therefore, by past practice, the last man likely to get it. He got it the hard way, on the sixth ballot, after three months of political and diplomatic tugging and hauling in as honest a demonstration of the democratic processes at work as the hemispheric system has ever seen.

What was different about the way it was done this time was the way the United States played its hand. The traditional approach (still very much accepted by some State Department professionals) has been for the United States Government to pretend publicly to have no preferences, while twisting arms unmercifully behind the scenes on behalf of a captive candidate. This time, thanks largely to the refreshing influence of an able amateur, Ambassador to the OAS Sol Linowitz, who is anything but a traditionalist, the United States made no big secret of its admiration for Galo Plaza, but employed persuasion rather than the familiar power play. The Latin American members of the OAS were given time and opportunity to exercise their own influence, individually and collectively, on the result. That it was a sensible result is no mark against the other leading candidates, Eduardo Ritter-Aislan of Panama, and former Foreign Minister Falcon Briceno of Argentina. Rather it is a mark of increased maturity for the system as a whole.

A strong Secretary General means a stronger inter-American system, and a brighter opportunity for all of the members to grapple together, to greater effect, with the momentous political and economic problems of the hemisphere. Above all, a stronger OAS opens opportunities for the Latin Americans, if they have the wit and the will, to work in their own interests and in the interests of the hemisphere as a whole on a more equal footing with the United States.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE OAS COMES OF AGE

The Organization of American States has worked itself out of a leadership crisis in a way that opens exciting possibilities for a more active, more significant future. In breaking a three-month stalemate over the election of a new Secretary-General, the O.A.S. Council opted simultaneously for several objectives.

It clearly reflected the long-held desire of a majority of the twenty-two active member governments for an expanded O.A.S. role in promoting hemispheric cooperation and solidarity. It did so by electing Ecuador's talented Galo Plaza Lasso, a man uniquely qualified to administer those greater O.A.S. responsibilities and to make the most of them.

In the process, the Council also served notice on recalcitrant Governments—the United States included—to get on with ratification of the amendments adopted a year ago by the American foreign ministers. These spell out an important part of that enlarged O.A.S. activity and responsibility.

Mr. Plaza, the ablest President in Ecuador's history and a seasoned United Nations mediator, survived handicaps and humiliations to win the O.A.S. post. He had been tagged—unfairly—as the United States candidate, and he also had to contend with the hopes of small Central-American and Caribbean countries that they would elect one of their own.

None of this should handicap or inhibit Mr. Plaza when he takes office in May. At 62, he is a ruggedly independent but sensitive statesman who sought the job only when convinced that most member nations wanted a "strong, dynamic, creative" organization with an executive to match. He understands the United States well but a more unlikely errand boy for the Johnson Administration would be hard to conceive.

The Central-American group has been satisfied by the designation of Salvador's able Miguel Rafael Urquia as Assistant Secretary-General. For giving up that number two post, the United States will be asked to name a new Assistant Secretary-General for Administration with a view to tightening up the whole O.A.S. operation and thus guarding against the financial irregularities that added to the Organization's crisis last November.

As things have turned out, Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was off base last week in accusing the United States of "inept diplomacy" in its support of Mr. Plaza. Instead, the quiet pressure-free diplomacy of Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz paid off in a way that seemed impossible two months ago.

The result was that the O.A.S. ambassadors themselves worked out the compromise solution that now seems to please most of them and that opens new vistas for the Organization. For once, as one observer put it, the United States played throughout the role of "partner of the enterprise rather than boss of the enterprise."

Economic Consultant Sheds Light on Unearned Interest Enjoyed by Commercial Banks

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, no topic is more on the public mind, domestically speaking, than the financial condition of our great Nation. One of the most mystifying questions for most of our citizens is the process by which our money supply is increased and diminished.

Another little-known fact is that the money creation powers of the Federal Reserve System are utilized by the commercial banks to acquire interest-bearing Government bonds at no cost to the banks.

Every sovereign nation should have the power to borrow money when needed, but I have long advocated such borrowing needs should be satisfied by tapping the real savings of our citizens. Fifteen billion dollars a year is simply an outrageous sum for the American people to pay in interest on bonds purchased with bank-created money.

No Government official or monetary economist will deny that the great bulk of this Nation's outstanding public debt was acquired by private holders on the basis of free bank reserves created by the Federal Reserve System. In this manner the Government issues an interest-bearing obligation—the bonds—in return for a non-interest-bearing obligation—Federal Reserve notes—created as a result of the Federal Reserve System-commercial bank alliance.

Mr. Speaker, time and space do not permit complete and detailed explanation of this outrageous situation, nor of the precise mechanism of the fractional reserve against demand deposits which permits the commercial banks to literally create money—checking accounts—out of thin air. However, I insert at this point in the RECORD a short, but very carefully reasoned statement by Mr. J. H. Leopold, of Atlanta, Ga., on why our money supply must increase if we are to enjoy economic progress:

THE REAL ECONOMICS

(By Joseph H. Leopold)

Free enterprise in the United States is being undermined as much by misunderstandings of its proponents, as by its opponents. A case in point is a recent published statement on Inflation by the American Economic Foundation, an organization devoted to preserving free enterprise and the dissemination of "economic truths".

The **AEF** states that the story of our inflation starts in 1933 when the government began "deficit spending" by creating "new unearned money through the banking system, adding it to the money already in circulation, and thus raising prices". The statement continues:

"The people can also contribute to inflation . . . the commercial banks could easily create some new money for you or me (i.e., grant us a loan) . . . The bank would then give us what is called a deposit against which we can write checks. When the bank does this, the money supply of the nation is increased by the amount of our deposit . . .

"(However,) this new extra inflationary money created for us . . . disappears from the nation's money supply as soon as we pay our debt to the bank. But the extra money created for the government stays and stays and stays . . .

"The reason this extra money increases prices is that it does not represent the production of any extra goods or services for which the money can be exchanged; the people simply use more dollars to produce and exchange the same quantity of things".

Although hundreds of textbooks have been published in support of the foregoing, the writer will attempt to refute it in the few paragraphs available in this space.

While it is true that the "deficits" of the thirties, in terms of current GNP, were generally larger than post World War II "deficits" thus far, it is also true that inflation was *not* experienced during the thirties. In fact, the value of a 1940 dollar was about 20 cents more than a 1930 dollar. (Consumer prices in 1930 were about 20 percent higher than in 1940.)

With reference to the **AEF** belief that bank issued dollars raise prices because the people use more dollars to produce and exchange the same quantity of things, this is refuted by examining what actually happens with borrowed dollars; for example, when a loan is taken out for a plant expansion. The new deposit dollars attract available human effort and technological knowhow to construct the new plant. Without the loan, the new plant would not be built.

Instead of being inflationary, the new dollars, by making possible the construction of more efficient new plants, also make possible the production of more customer goods at lower prices—the opposite of inflation.

In a pecuniary society, expenditure of new money is the only way that the economic machine can be driven to produce more wealth, because citizens will exert more productive effort only in exchange for more dollars for that additional effort.

A dollar is simply a claim against a dollar's worth of wealth for sale at current prices; or what amounts to the same thing, a claim against a dollar's worth of human effort capable of producing a dollar's worth of wealth for sale at current prices.

A seller fixes his dollar price by adding his desired profit to all his dollar costs. He is not at all interested in whether his customers borrowed or earned the dollars used for the purchase; nor does he raise his price when he receives an order from the government, especially if he must compete for the order.

Prices are determined entirely by relative scarcity of goods and services—nothing else. Relative scarcity of goods and services is determined by relative scarcity of skills available to produce the goods and render the services.

If the supply of credit money in an economy is scarce with respect to the availability of skills at current wage and profit rates, the skills go unused and we have unemployment. (The collapse of the housing industry last year is an illustration of this phenomenon.)

If there is an abundance of credit dollars in the economy with respect to availability of skills, lenders will compete with each other for borrowers, and interest rates will fall; the bottleneck to economic growth will then not be unavailability of credit. Throughout the decade of the Great Depression the banking industry maintained billions of dollars of "excess reserves" reflecting many more billions of dollars worth of unused lending authority. As a consequence, interest rates were very low; but there was no inflation.

It is a false belief to think that prices of goods are directly related to the scarcity of credit dollars. As noted, prices of goods are related to scarcity of goods. However, when credit dollars are scarce and interest rates are high, prices of goods financed with borrowed capital must be raised to include the higher interest charges; therefore, "tight money" is an engine of inflation.

With reference to the credit money supply process performed by the commercial banking industry, the **AEF** apparently is not aware of the vital contribution to real economic growth that this operation makes. Since 1929, the banks have created and issued to the public through loans of all kinds over 350 billion new deposit dollars not in existence in 1929. It is meaningless to say, as **AEF** does, that bank created money "disappears" when the loan is repaid because, as noted, outstanding loans are always increasing.

Last year alone (1967) over 40 billion new deposit dollars not in existence January 1 were created and issued to the economy. Without this credit money supply process the economy would promptly collapse in a "money panic," such as almost occurred late in 1966 when the Federal Reserve restricted the lending authority of the commercial banking industry by refusing to issue sufficient "bank reserves" through the "open market."

In summary, the widespread belief that newly created dollars—for civilian or government use—are, per se, inflationary, is false. Expenditures are inflationary only if there is a shortage of goods desired to be purchased and a shortage of capability of producing these goods at current prices in response to demand. Since the U.S. economy is presently operating at only about four-fifths of its capacity to produce at current prices, it follows that about 25 percent more dollars are needed to be spent just to generate utilization of present idle plant capacity. Reduction in federal taxes is the only practicable source of these needed dollars. This fact will have to be recognized before any of our economic problems can be solved.

Statement of Representative Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia, in Support of His Bill Which Would Establish a University of the United States in Washington, D.C., Thursday, February 22, 1968

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to create a national institution—the University of the United States.

The University of the United States will take its place in Washington, D.C., to look toward the future of this country and fulfill a growing need which is being more clearly defined with every passing day. The problems of the United States of the future are being created today at a pace certainly undreamed of by General Washington and the other Founding Fathers, and even at a faster rate than could have been anticipated even as recently as World War II.

As we look ahead to a third century of the United States as a nation, we see rapidly advancing technology which will give us astounding advances in space, in medicine, biology and biochemistry. All of these great technical advances are bound up with social impact that affects an exploding population and, consequently, the orderly growth of a free society. What we cannot afford is to be confronted with scientific facts and methods which have a tremendous impact on all existing laws and mores without having been prepared. Certainly no responsible person wants to stand in the way of technological progress, which promises so much to our future and our children's future.

Our Government has many programs to encourage the scientific advances. What it does not have in abundance is organized thinking about how to provide the early warning of the problems the country will have to face and the identification of alternative solutions. We need to set up an institution in the broad public interest which looks ahead to identify, anticipate and isolate the major and even the minor problems that accompany the tide of the future. Of course, there is notable work being done in this area by private groups, but it is isolated and is too often tucked away as secondary to the limitless number of current problems we all face.

I think it is time for the country to formalize its approach to these social decisions of the future and commission some of its best minds to consider them not on an ad hoc basis, but over an extended period of time; as a primary activity.

It is with this as a partial background that I propose to you on George Washington's Birthday that we establish a national institute of advanced studies in Washington, D.C., with the unprecedented title of "The University of the United States." This would not be a university in the ordinary sense and should not be thought to detract in any way from the work of existing colleges and universities of Washington, D.C., and the rest of the country. Rather it will be a distinguished colleague to all of them.

I propose to you that this institution honor the memory of George Washington and be considered Congress' answer to a historical oversight dating back 169 years which kept Washington's wish for a national university in Washington, D.C., from being carried out.

General Washington bequeathed the Nation stock shares in the amount of approximately $25,000. The stock was never received by Congress. As a loyal alumnus of George Washington University, I must mention my awareness that this institution, which changed its name from Columbian College in 1823 when Congress deeded it land in the District of Columbia, is in the tradition of the George Washington will bequest.

My proposal, however, calls for the direct establishment of a national university which shall be limited to advanced studies.

The University of the United States would tap its rotating faculty to serve for a 2- or 3-year period as "Fellows of the University of the United States," from the universities, the professions, business and industry and other appropriate areas of American life. These men and women, brought to Washington at the height of their careers for a period of public service, would be selected on the basis of their particular capacity in special fields of endeavor to study specific areas in the public interest. The published results of their work would be reported to Congress for establishment of priorities and guidelines in complex legislative problems which can arise as the result of change.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the country needs and is ready for the University of the United States and I invite the interest and support of all my colthe leagues for the bill I introduce to you today.

How Dow Chemical Co. Saves Lives

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Midland, in my district, is the home of the Dow Chemical Co., one of the leading chemical companies in the world. Recently, this fine firm has been the subject of savage attacks, largely located on college campuses, simply because it is presently the sole manufacturer of napalm for our Armed Forces. The mob agitation and villification directed to this company is totally unwarranted. The young radicals and draft resistors who are spearheading these attacks completely ignore this company's tremendous involvement in research and manufacturing for the health and welfare of humanity. Its manufacturing of napalm, which amounts to less than one-fourth of 1 percent of its sales, does not alter the fact that our Government is committed in a serious conflict in Vietnam and that this product is only one of many items of war being supplied by American industry in support of our fighting men. I take pleasure in presenting for the RECORD the following article from the February issue of Nation's Business which is particularly pertinent to this situation:

HOW DOW SAVES LIVES

When an emergency arose involving the Dow Chemical Co., state police and the National Guard early one morning last year, there wasn't a peacenik or a picket in sight.

A 3:00 a.m. call to the traffic manager of Dow's Pitman-Moore division in Indianapolis dispatched a vitally needed drug to a hospital on Virginia's Eastern Shore via Indiana Air Guard and Virginia state police.

This incident, in which Dow's drug was credited with helping save the life of a critically ill patient, is far more typical of the company's function than the national headlines it has been getting lately.

Militant pacifists, draft resisters and New Left radicals have subjected Dow to mob harassment to disrupt its college recruiting and to smear the company as a war profiteer or for complicity in an allegedly immoral government policy—resisting aggression in Viet Nam.

Their reason, of course, is that Dow is the sole producer of napalm used by U.S. forces in Viet Nam. They ignore the fact that this weapon has saved the lives of thousands of American fighting men.

Dow President Herbert D. Doan explains: "We intend to continue making napalm because we feel that so long as the United States is sending men to war, it is unthinkable that we should not supply the materials they need."

ONE CONTRIBUTION—SAVING LIVES

Critics also totally ignore Dow's other contributions to this country's health, safety, education and to the public weal—by the exercise of corporate citizenship and production of things that are just plain useful.

Napalm represents a miniscule proportion of Dow's sales—about one half of one per cent of $1.3 billion in 1966. Little has been said about the company's contributions to mankind. One of them, as is true of many corporate giants, is saving lives.

Take health research: The company has been working since 1957 on development of an artificial kidney. It has been under contract with the National Institutes of Health since June, 1966, to accelerate the program.

The unit, using hollow fibers for the filtration function, has passed successfully its first clinical test on a single human being and by next June will be in full testing with 30 patients.

A Dow spokesman notes that many patients depend on artificial kidneys of various types, all of which are "horrendously expensive," and that people have died becaues they couldn't afford the cost. "This is intolerable."

Purpose of the Dow program is to reduce the cost drastically.

Growing out of the company's own experience is a virus-cancer research contract with the National Institutes of Health to develop rigid procedures to protect medical researchers handling viruses believed to cause leukemia.

The project, drawing on Dow's experience in safeguarding its own employees handling dangerous substances, includes a state-of-the-art survey and development of a prototype control unit and a system of monitoring personnel during and after involvement in virus research.

Also in progress is research on diagnostic testing and related equipment, including blood chemistry processes now in development, premarket or early marketing stages, in efforts to make diagnoses faster, simpler and more accurate. Much of the work is done by Dow researchers at Zionsville, Ind., or at Bio-Science Laboratories, Van Nuys, Calif., mostly owned by the company.

Other research involves immunization against mumps and German measles, which can cause mental retardation among unborn children whose mothers are stricken during pregnancy. "We feel we're quite close to something useful in both of these areas," says a company official.

Already developed is a measles vaccine, which company people say is the only single-shot vaccine on the market. Dow estimates that since 1965, nine million persons have received the vaccine in the United States.

Measles, besides causing death, create complications resulting in extensive hospitalization, mental retardation and sleeping sickness.

Also in the human health field, Dow makes drugs for high blood pressure (including the one rushed to Virginia that early morning last year) and others still being researched. It makes gamma globulin (to prevent or reduce the severity of measles and infectious hepatitis), prenatal diet supplements, a widely used anesthetic and others undergoing tests, flu vaccine, decongestants, a gastrointestinal preparation, painkillers, blood serum and a wide range of ingredients used in the manufacture of other pharmaceutical products.

The company also is big in agricultural chemicals, including a low toxicity killer of mosquitoes—bearers of encephalitis. It minimizes the problem of residue encountered with DDT that was publicized in the late Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring." This product, now awaiting government registration for domestic use, has been used against cattle ticks abroad, one of the major problems limiting beef production in economically underdeveloped countries.

Dow produces rabies immunizations for dogs, as well as an extensive line of other animal immunizers, including one that attacks a disease otherwise prevalent in poultry.

And the company makes a line of weed and brush killers, soil fumigants and grain fumigants.

MANY PUBLIC SERVICES

Dow has long been cited by independent authorities in another area of public service—clean water. It makes chemicals for treatment of water supplies and waste water.

The company currently is involved in research aimed at treating storm water runoff, a growing problem in urban areas, and removal of phosphates from streams. These phosphates foster growth of plant life that consumes the natural oxygen content of water by which streams purify themselves.

Then, too, it has developed instrumentation to help engineers monitor pollution levels in streams.

It has taken elaborate precautions to reduce contamination of the air by its own manufacturing processes. One research program now under way—which the company won't discuss in detail—involves treatment of pollutants from automobile exhausts.

In a technological society, the end use of products manufactured by a basic company like Dow are seemingly endless.

As one company spokesman puts it, "We are a supplier to all industries."

Uses include everything from aircraft deicing fluids to deodorants.

Dow solvents are a major item, including special products for "white room" or dirt-free environments, essential in activities like missile production. Dow has also developed a monitoring process to enable users of solvents to assure that they don't contribute to air pollution.

In fact, the company maintains extensive laboratory facilities to assure that no harm comes from the manufacturing, processing, transportation or end use of its products.

Some products have direct safety implications, such as a brake fluid whose high boiling point guards against one cause of brake failure, a spray-can tire coating to provide traction for cars stuck in snow and a commercial chemical to remove ice from roads.

In the field of corporate contributions, Dow has furnished some $60,000 to the famous hospital ship S.S. Hope in cash and donated products.

And in education, the company contributes well over a million dollars a year in cash to a large number of schools, even those where peaceniks disrupt company recruiting.

In addition, the company has developed a college summer employment program for students in its research, product development, customer service, finance and marketing areas tailored to student and corporate needs.

The company's public affairs activity ranges from executives' service on the school board and city council in Midland, Mich., the corporate headquarters, to Board Chairman Carl A. Gerstacker's chairmanship of the Commerce Department's National Export Expansion Council.

Thus, like other giant chemical companies—Dow is the nation's fourth largest—the company is deeply involved in innumerable pursuits in the public interest; some will say to a unique degree.

This, of course, cuts no ice with hard-core radicals whose hostility to business is becoming clearer. (See "Why Young Radicals Zero in on Business," July, 1967.)

The company feels that the demonstrations may damage it over the years ahead but has reviewed and reaffirmed its decision to continue supplying the government with napalm.

Which leads one long-time Washington hand and former government official with broad knowledge of the chemical industry to observe that here, too, by not caving in under pressure, Dow is performing another distinct public service.

Let Us Today Also Honor Two 1968 National Heroes

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that I rise on this day which was set aside to honor a national hero, George Washington, to bring to the attention of this distinguished body two 1968 heroes—Lance Cpl. Jimmie Prideaux, of Brighton, Colo., and Pfc. Johnnie L. Evans, of Germantown, Ohio.

I knew Jimmie Prideaux personally. In 1964 I had the privilege of nominating him to the Military Academy, but he had to decline the nomination because of a badly broken leg. Subsequently he joined the Marine Corps.

I do not know Johnnie Evans, but I hope to someday.

Their story is one which should instill in all of us a sense of pride in the caliber of young men who are fighting and dying in Southeast Asia today—regardless of how we may feel individually about the Nation's involvement.

It should also shore up our faith in the Nation's ability to survive the grave crisis which faces us during these "long, hot summers."

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD two outstanding newspaper accounts of the story of Jimmie Prideaux and Johnnie Evans.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 14, 1968]

JOHNNIE'S TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN FRIEND

One of the most prized possessions a bereaved Brighton family has of their dead Marine son is a crumpled, stained letter of sympathy and grief from their son's comrade in arms in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Earl Prideaux, Jr. Monday received word from the War Department that their son, Marine Lance Corp. James E. Prideaux, 23, had been killed in action.

The message was terse, stating only that their son was killed Feb. 5 by a fragmentation device while in combat at Phau Tiem in a northern Vietnamese province near the DMZ.

The family was advised their son's body will be shipped home for burial in a week or 10 days at Ft. Logan National Cemetery.

THICK OF COMBAT

The father, a retired lieutenant colonel who commanded a combat engineer battalion in World War II with the Third Army, knew his son had been in the thick of combat. On a previous patrol, the young Marine and his buddies were pinned down five days in the jungle before being evacuated by helicopters.

Born June 30, 1944, in Scottsbluff, Corp. Prideaux attended Haxtun, Colo., High School, where he played football and basketball. He also was an outdoorsman and skier.

In 1964, he was nominated by U.S. Rep. Don Brotzman (R-Colo.) to West Point. But the young athlete had previously broken his leg in football and had been in a cast five months so was unable to enroll.

PRE-MED SCHOOL

Young Prideaux attended pre-med school at the University of Colorado for one year, and the Colorado School of Mines 18 months prior to enlisting in the Marines in June, 1966.

He went to Vietnam last July, and had but 24 more days to serve there before attending jump school in Okinawa on the first of March.

Surviving besides his parents are a sister, Mrs. Mario Meakins, a Brighton school teacher; a younger brother, Robert a junior in Brighton High School, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Ole Thornby, of Belle Fourche, S. Dak.

Outside of the brief War Department notice, the family had skimpy knowledge as to the young Marine's death—until they received the letter from the Marine comrade.

POIGNANT LETTER

The letter was headed simply "First Platoon, Air Force Recon, First Marine Division." Starting with the salutation, "Dear Family," the letter said in simple, but poignant terms:

"I am very sorry about your great loss the family has to suffer. This is a letter to show how the company liked him. He was a brave man. When he got killed, him and a few more Marines were trying to recover a dead Marine's body on a bridge.

"I would have been there, but I got wounded. I was in the hospital when I heard the news. So don't think he died for nothing. I am tired of war, but I must keep fighting.

"Even though I am a Negro, I liked him because the color of people's skins don't matter to me. He was a good man. I mean it, too. With grief."

The letter was signed, "Johnnie."

[From the Longmont Daily Times-Call, Feb. 17, 1968]

WE THANK GOD FOR JOHNNIE EVANS

(By Ed Lehman)

As we all live with concern about the threatened long, hot summer with its overtones of racial violence, a deeply human touch of understanding has been added this week to a tragedy in Colorado.

Mr. and Mrs. Earl Prideaux of Brighton were very proud of their son, Marine Lance Corp. James E. Prideaux who was killed Feb. 5 near the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam. The usual combat casualty notices arrived, but they were followed soon afterward by a most touching letter.

Mr. and Mrs. Raleigh Messerchmitt of Longmont, longtime friends of the Prideaux family, brought me a copy of this letter from another Marine.

The author was Marine Pfc. Johnnie L. Evans, a Negro. He also had been wounded in the combat and reported he would have been with the Prideaux' son had he not been hospitalized.

"He was a brave man," wrote Johnnie Evans. He then went on to relate that the Marine had been killed trying to recover the body of a dead Marine from a bridge. He pointed out how much the other members of the Marine Company had liked Corporal Prideaux. But then he added:

"Even though I am a Negro, I liked him because the color of people's skins don't matter to me. He was a good man and I mean it too."

That message from the battlefield of Vietnam should be told to many because the brotherhood of man should not have to be found only in the holocaust of war.

Americans side by side today must stand together regardless of color or creed. We must not be fighting each other in pointless destruction to prove very little. Such instances of violence only set back the very causes for which all thinking people strive—regardless of their racial origins.

The message of Pfc. Johnnie Evans signed "in grief" certainly should be far stronger than the fiery words of hate mongers who would destroy our cities and set American against American.

As a mighty nation, we must realize that the total strength only is the sum of the people who form its ranks. Is it not possible that these veterans of shoulder to shoulder comradeship and loyalty upon the field of battle can speak up as most effective leaders in these trouble spots?

Certainly we do not have to look for our leadership to those who seek only trouble. Basically, these people care very little for the fate of this nation. And they care even less for the free world in these trying times.

My faith goes out to Johnnie Evans. To him and many others, regardless of the color of their skin, rests a solemn responsibility to make American freedom a reality for each and all. Only then can we fulfill our responsibility and be certain that Marine Corp. James Prideaux did not sacrifice his life in vain.

Blunting the Wallace Threat

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing awareness that this year's George Wallace presidential candidacy could very well precipitate a constitutional crisis if neither major political party candidate receives the necessary 270 electoral college votes.

Two of the major metropolitan newspapers in Minnesota, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and the Minneapolis Star, yesterday published editorials supporting my efforts this week to generate prompt congressional action on one of the various constitutional amendments already proposed which would insure orderly continuity of governmental leadership without fear of the Wallace threat of political blackmail.

As I have said each day this week, Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but not too late, to amend the Constitution so as to insure that minority candidate George Wallace cannot dictate the policies of the next President and Vice President of the United States.

The articles follow:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Feb. 21, 1968]

ANSWER TO WALLACE THREAT

Congressman Clark MacGregor is leading a valiant effort to move Congress toward prompt approval of a Constitutional Amendment abolishing the electoral college method of choosing the President. He hopes there still is a possibility of effecting such a change before next November's election.

While this would be extremely difficult to accomplish at this late date, the danger of the 1968 election being thrown into the House of Representatives is so real that a crash program to switch to direct popular voting on the Presidency is fully justified. If MacGregor manages to arouse the Congressional interest the situation calls for, he will be doing an important national service.

If House and Senate members would genuinely arouse themselves, MacGregor believes an amendment might be approved and submitted to the state legislatures by the middle of April. Then it would be up to the governors to call their legislatures into special session. Ratification by 38 states would make the amendment effective.

Despite the practical difficulties of completing this procedure with the necessary speed, the effort would be worthwhile. Even if it is found that the amendment process moves too slowly to effect November's election, it would be wise for Congress to move ahead with its portion of procedures as rapidly as possible. At least this would lay the foundation for effecting the reform before the 1972 Presidential campaign.

The 3rd party candidacy of George Wallace should be sufficient incentive to Congress to get moving. It poses a clear and present danger of denying both the Republican and Democratic Presidential nominees a majority of the electoral college vote. That would throw the election into the House where each state delegation would have a single vote. In a tight division Wallace could hold the balance of power. He declares it is his intention to seek just such a situation, and then to bargain (blackmail is a better word) with the two major parties. The one willing to accept his dictates on policy would get the White House prize.

If neither Republican or Democratic nominees would sell out to Wallace, there would be a stalemate in the House, and no President could be chosen until it was broken. The situation would be one of political chaos and national danger.

There is no justification for Congress holding back on approving and submitting an amendment at once. Not to take affirmative action will be an abdication of duty.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Feb. 21, 1968]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Many of the utterings of presidential candidate George Wallace can be dismissed as bombast, the kind of racist nonsense that will appeal only to tag-end segregationists. But the threat that Wallace poses to the orderly election of a President this year cannot be dismissed so lightly.

It is entirely possible that the Alabaman could win enough electoral votes to deprive the Democratic or Republican candidate of a majority. This would put the election into the House of Representatives, where each state would have one vote to cast. Wallace would then be in a position to wheel and deal—or, as he put it, to enter into "covenants"—to get what he really wants: a pledge from the winner that there will be no federal "interference" in Alabama's voter registration system, in its schools, and in its welfare programs. This would be the ugliest form of blackmail, but it would be legal, nonetheless.

The fault is not Wallace's. It is in the Electoral College system, which can permit a demagogue with a few votes in his pockets to negate the democratic process. Periodic attempts are made to abolish the Electoral College, but each has bumped against the hard fact that such a change requires a constitutional amendment that must be ratified by at least 38 states. Rep. Clark MacGregor, R-Minn., is now making such an attempt on the basis of the threat posed by Wallace's candidacy.

MacGregor's call for reform deserves support, but we feel he has set an impossible goal in trying to get a constitutional amendment ratified before the November election. It is hoped he will not abandon the task if his first effort fails. The attempt is worth making, even if the goal must be put off until the 1972 election.

Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen Receives Congressional Medal of Honor

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I was privileged to attend an impressive ceremony at the White House, upon which occasion the President of the United States conferred the Congressional Medal of Honor on a brilliant young flyer who was born and raised in my northwest Iowa district, and whose family still lives there.

I refer to Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen, of Clay County, Iowa, an F–105 pilot who last year completed 100 missions over North Vietnam. The mission score alone is spectacular, but the episode that brought him the Nation's highest honor occurred during one of those raids near Hanoi last March.

A man whose gift for words has earned him columnar space all over the country probably has described the action more dramatically than any communique or press release. So, Mr. Speaker, I incorporate in my remarks at this point an article by the famed commentator, Bob Considine, devoted to the award of the Medal of Honor to Major Dethlefsen, of whom Iowa and the Nation is understandably proud.

Mr. Considine's column, entitled "One Rough Day Last March," follows:

ONE ROUGH DAY LAST MARCH

(By Bob Considine)

The President said, "This is an afternoon when it is good to stand beside a man in uniform."

He was presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen, a 100-mission F–105 pilot—the first winner of the nation's highest award to have won it over North Vietnam.

"He is a brave man, come to claim the honor his courage has earned," the President said of the quiet man in blue and his wife and young boy and girl.

"He is also a spokesman for the courage of thousands like him in Vietnam. This is also a special afternoon for many of them.

"They are not thinking of medals in face of a desperate enemy offensive. They are thinking of us. And they will not fail us, even if it means dying before another morning comes."

LBJ went on to speak of the men of the Pueblo, of those who gave their lives in defense of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, and "Men who will throw back the enemy in the hills of Khesanh."

"He had a lot on his mind that day at the White House," the solemn young major reflected the other day as he drank a gingerale at the Dutch Treat Club luncheon.

It was probably the understatement of this winter of discontent. Like a lot of heroes, understatement is instinctive with Dethlefsen. Read what happened to him, one rough day last March:

He batted third in a three-plane attack on one of the strongest anti-aircraft complexes in North Vietnam.

The position bristled with Russian-built SAM missiles, capable of flying better than a thousand miles an hour faster than the F–105 must fly during a subsonic bomb run, as well as heavy anti-aircraft artillery and all known varieties of automatic weapons.

This 600 gun arsenal had been assembled and put in operation to protect the Thai Nguyen steel works northeast of Hanoi, the enemy's most important source of steel.

On that day in March it was to be "taken out," if possible, by fighter-bombers. But first its defenses had to be "taken out."

It took some taking.

Dethlefsen's flight leader, first to go against the hot bed of resistance, was shot down on his first pass. When the second pilot went after it his F–105 was shot up so badly he was forced to stagger away in the direction of home.

That left Dethlefsen.

As he dived toward the smoking but still highly active position, a MIG–21, much faster than the heavily-loaded F–105, dived from a high position and took dead aim on his tail.

Dethlefsen calmly flew into the heaviest flak now streaking up at him from below, knowing that if the MIG kept after him the MIG faced an equal chance of being blasted out of the sky.

Bits of his F–105 were being shot away as he let go with bombs and 20mm cannon fire. He pulled out of the dive, shook off the MIG, threw in his afterburner and climbed for heaven.

He had made a hard decision. Because the smoke from his own bombs and secondary explosions in the defense complex obscured the ominous SAM launching positions, he would have to make a direct diving attack from above the site for better visibility.

Instantly, another MIG–21 was on his tail. In his efforts to escape death from above and below, the major lost sight of the SAM area.

He tried it a third time, then a fourth, each time losing more of his screaming jet. The flight of the fighter-bombers was approaching the steelworks, and the SAM site was still largely intact.

So, menaced by the MIG's and forced to fly through a blazing hailstorm of fire, he went back three more times and emptied everything he had on the enemy's position.

It was a shambles of exploding SAM's and ammunition when he pulled up, kicked in his afterburner, and streaked away in search of his tanker, somewhere over Northern Thailand.

Almost single-handedly, Dethlefsen had paved the way for the strikingly successful raid on the steel works by the wave of fighter bombers.

He landed his battered F–105 at Udorn, to the north of his home base at Takhli, took a look at it and decided it would hold together long enough to fly on home.

"I was kind of tired that night," he told me. "So I had dinner and turned in."

Now his shooting war is over. The rangy Iowan who is a product of the University of Omaha teaches pilots at Vance AFB, Okla. As a holder of The Medal, a grateful nation gives him an extra hundred bucks a month.

Big of us.

Now Let's See

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a retired general, Rothwell H. Brown, writes a regular article in the Rappahannock Record, a weekly newspaper published in Kilmarnock, Va.

This past week he referred to international events and expressed his opinion on the conduct of the war and our decreasing prestige abroad. This is a thoughtful article by a well-informed man and I submit it to the Members for their consideration:

NOW LET'S SEE

(By Rothwell H. Brown)

Only a fool can fail to see that the United States has now reached a point of crisis in its history which is probably of far greater importance than was the smashing victory of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Today the United States faces a far greater peril than the confrontation with the military ambitions of Hitler and Tojo. Winston Churchill understood the terrible threat which the Soviet Union posed to world peace at the close of World War II. But he was summarily kicked out of office when he might have restrained the precipitate capitulation of the United States to Russian demands.

Secretary of State Dulles came the closest to awakening the American people and to forging an international defense against communist aggressive plans. Unfortunately, his early retirement and death led to communist-inspired repudiation of his tough policies directed towards collective world security.

The Russians have harnessed every man woman and child in Russia to their state program—the destruction of the United States and the conquest of the world. No internal suffering, no internal intellectual ferment, no internal dissent have been permitted to interfere with the long range plans of the Kremlin.

Science, technology and sheer manpower have all been directed towards the attainment of superiority in every aspect of military power which will permit them to overcome the United States without being destroyed in turn.

In addition to their unceasing efforts at home they have conducted a clandestine subversive campaign in the heartland of America. Over a period of 50 years trained and, unfortunately dedicated communist agents and supporters have been infiltrated into every stratum of American society and into every influential governmental, business, labor, cultural, educational, legal, racial and religious group in this country.

The American people are restless. The American people are afraid of the communist danger which they sense but cannot quite see or understand. The American people realize that something is definitely rotten in Denmark but are confused by propaganda and distortion and concealment of the truth.

Only our leadership seems unaware of the deadly nature of the Russian communist threat right here at home and throughout the world.

President Johnson seems totally incapable of breaking away from the pattern of appeasement, the pattern of "detente," the pattern of blind refusal to admit that we are under active Russian communist attack all over the world and in our own cities and hamlets.

We are now engaged in a war which we must not lose, for a defeat in Vietnam will bring the whole house of cards in the Pacific Ocean, the Indian Ocean and in the Mediterranean tumbling down like a haystack in a hurricane. Yet Washington, presumably under direct orders of the President suspended the bombing around Hanoi, Haiphong and the vast North Vietnamese military complex north of the DMZ during the entire period that South Vietnam was being torn asunder in concentrated attacks against its city centers of political and economic power. Such colossal stupidity is unbelievable—yet no one seems to be unduly concerned.

The President and his Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, have so misjudged Russian communist intent and Russian Communist ambitions that they have permitted our military strength to deteriorate. General Westmoreland has been supported at an inadequate level, and now we dare not avenge the seizure of our naval ship, the Pueblo.

The stage is now being set to drive the United States out of Korea, out of Vietnam, out of the Middle East, out of the Mediterranean and back into Fortress America. In America the communist fifth column will egg on the racial extremists, the labor extremists, the religious-peacenik extremists and the soft-headed intellectuals and clerics, all of whom have been enlisted in the cause of communism to tear the country apart internally until we fall like Lenin predicted, a ripe plum plopping into communism's waiting hands.

It is much later than most people realize. Many people are beginning to doubt that there is sufficient time left in which to select a new leader and rally our forces into a unified confrontation with the evil power that seeks our destruction.

There is the gravest possibility that this country will cease to exist as a free and independent Republic without having celebrated its 200th birthday.

If General Westmoreland has miscalculated; if massive Russian arms support flowing through Haiphong has given the North Vietnamese a not improbable weapons superiority; if Khe Sanh turns out to be our Dien Bien Phu, then Washington will probably collapse just as did Paris. Our Dunkirk could follow quickly, and Armageddon would be just around the corner.

But assuming that the courage and skill of our fighting men save us at Khe Sanh, then the American people must, somehow or other, force President Johnson to move forward resolutely to victory over Ho Chi Minh, in North Vietnam. Military victory is not only possible; it can be lost only in Washington. The Senators Kennedy notwithstanding, we can win in North Vietnam, and we must win.

Resolution by Republican Club of Arlington, Va.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, which speaks for itself, was adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., at its meeting on February 14. Since the Postmaster General is now considering the possibility of issuing a commemorative postage stamp in proper recognition of the 50th anniversary of the independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—I hope that the spirited public interest this resolution exhibits will not be lost on the hierarchy at the Post Office Department.

The resolution follows:

Resolution by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va.

Whereas the year 1968 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exist historical, cultural, and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the occupation and subsequent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is violative of both fundamental human rights and international law and has never been officially recognized by the United States and other nations of the free world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has overwhelmingly expressed its deep concern for the plight of the Baltic States, therefore

The Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia, requests the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp to call the attention of the free world to the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia, February 14, 1968.

Claude H. Smith, Jr.,
President.
Carolin Persinger,
Recording Secretary.

Attest:

Vermont May Prohibit All Billboards in State

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during a time when there is such a great need for governments on all levels to face up to their responsibilities it is truly refreshing to learn that the State of Vermont is moving forward on its own beautification program.

The Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1968, has written about these efforts. It shows what can be done when people want to do something about beautifying their countryside.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 19, 1968]

Going by the Boards: Vermont May Prohibit All Billboards in State—Measure, Likely To Pass Soon, Aimed at Pleasing Tourists—Foe Sees Trend Spreading

(By Jeremiah J. Mahoney)

Montpelier, Vt.—Vermont is a beautiful state. The drive up Route 5 along the Connecticut River is one of the prettiest drives in America. People journey from afar to view the fall foliage here. The sunsets are breathtaking.

But in recent years the view from Route 5 has been cluttered increasingly with signs advertising maple syrup and motels. The fall colors now come in flashing neon. And the setting sun now often slips slowly behind a billboard.

Soon, however, the signs may be gone. Vermont's 150-member House of Representatives is expected to vote this week on a bill that would eliminate all billboards except those on the premises of a place of business, and even those would be regulated as to size and shape. The state senate will consider the bill later. Passage seems likely.

"We won't permit the state to become a honky-tonk," says Democratic Gov. Philip Hoff. "We want to preserve Vermont's natural beauty."

The bill is the most far-reaching effort in the U.S. to hurt billboards, and the billboard industry is naturally upset. "We will just have to close up shop," says Elmer Nadeau, president of Vermont Advertising Co. The company, which maintains 213 billboards, is the biggest outdoor advertising company in the state. W. Edson McKee, lobbyist for the industry in Vermont, complains that the bill is so sweeping that it would prohibit billboards even in commercial and industrial areas. He also fears that if the bill passes here, the movement might spread "to Maine, then New Hampshire and elsewhere."

"A GAME OF ONE-UPMANSHIP"

But nearly every group that has taken a stand is in favor of the bill. Even ski resort operations and hotel and motel operations, some of the biggest sign-putter-uppers in Vermont, favor the bill.

"Putting up billboards has become a game of one-upmanship," says Rep. Ted Riehle, who introduced the bill in the legislature. "One motel puts up two billboards, then another down the road puts up four. The first motel, not to be outdone, puts up three more. The first thing you know, each has about eight signs, neither has gained an advantage and the roadside has been cluttered up."

Such "cluttering," says Mr. Riehle, endangers the state's livelihood. Polls show that 65% of the travelers to Vermont come here because of the state's beauty. Revenue from tourism, about $165 million a year, is the chief source of income for Vermonters. But tourists may quit coming here if they have to look for scenery behind billboards, Mr. Riehle contends.

To help tourists find motels, ski slopes and antique shops, the bill provides a variety of measures. Plazas would be built at busy gateways to the state and at other key locations, where information, maps and guidebooks would be available.

The state would also go into the billboard business itself, but in a sharply limited fashion. The highway department would erect and maintain "official business directional signs" that would carry information about businesses, including those serving travelers. The signs also would include information on scenic areas and cultural and educational facilities.

PRESENT SIGNS WOULD COME DOWN

The state would regulate the location, size, shape, color, lighting and manner of display and lettering of its signs. Businesses that wanted to be listed would pay a license fee of $50 per sign the first year, with annual maintenance fees of $10 to $25 thereafter.

The billboards that already are up would eventually be torn down. Compensation would be paid in some cases. Also, the bill provides a grace period that would allow some signs to stay up for as long as five years after passage of the measure. Billboards that are more than five years old, however, would have to be taken down immediately.

The new law would also make life a little more difficult for those who continue to put up signs on their own premises. Placement, size and shape of the signs would be regulated by the Vermont measure. Even those series of signs—"Peas," "Beans," "Tomatoes," "Carrots," and "Corn"—that lead up to summer vegetable stands would be controlled.

The law would limit farmers' signs to four square feet, and the signs wouldn't be legal unless they were at least 100 feet apart. Originally, the bill would have limited farmers to just four roadside signs, but that provision was deleted after a hearing last week.

There aren't likely to be many violators of the law if it is passed in its present form. Current provisions provide for fines of up to $100 and jail sentence of up to 30 days for each violation. Each day the illegal signs stayed up would be considered a separate offense.

Stone Mountain, Ga.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Stone Mountain, Ga., has been a point of great historical, recreational, and a phenomenon of great geological interest. Georgians have had a dream for many years to commemorate the leaders of the Confederacy by carving a bas relief of them on the face of the world's largest granite monolith, Stone Mountain.

It all began when the idea was inspired by the United Daughters of the Confederacy over 50 years ago.

In 1915, Gutzon Borglum was employed to plan a carving of colossal proportions depicting an army. Borglum began carving in June 1923. In January 1924, enough of the carving of General Lee was completed for Borglum, at an unveiling ceremony, to serve breakfast to a group of guests on Lee's massive shoulder. Shortly thereafter work was discontinued.

Augustus Lukeman, a sculptor, was then chosen to complete the carving.

Most of Borglum's unfinished work was blasted off the mountain to make way for a new design which was presented in April 1928. By midsummer 1928, due to financial difficulties, work was stopped.

In 1958, the State of Georgia adopted the project as an official State function. To improve the setting, 3,000 acres of surrounding land was acquired as a park in addition to the mountain itself.

Walter Hancock, of Gloucester, Mass., one of the Nation's leading sculptors, was retained for the completion of the work. Fortunately, the Lukeman models were still intact and available to assist Mr. Hancock.

Work on the carving is progressing rapidly and is set for unveiling by May 1969.

The Georgia State Legislature has passed a resolution requesting the Postmaster General to issue a stamp commemorating the completion of the carving. I am hereby inserting a copy of the resolution into the Record. I respectfully urge, as an American and Georgian, that the Stone Mountain memorial deserves to have a stamp issued in commemoration of completion.

The resolution follows:

H.R. 442

(By Messrs. Stalnaker of the 59th, Dollar of the 89th, Peterson of the 59th, Anderson of the 71st, Doster of the 73d, Bowen of the 69th, Collins of the 62d, and Ragland of the 109th)

Resolution requesting the United States Postmaster General to issue a postage stamp commemorating the historic carving on the face of Stone Mountain; and for other purposes

Whereas, the historic carving on the face of Stone Mountain depicting Confederate President Jefferson Davis, General Robert E. Lee and General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson will be unveiled during 1968; and

Whereas, Stone Mountain is the largest granite monolith in the world; and

Whereas, when the carving is completed and thus combined with the natural phenomena of the mountain, Stone Mountain will truly rank as the eighth wonder of the world; and

Whereas, the historic carving is a fitting memorial to those who served and those who died in behalf of a cause that shaped the destiny of America; and

Whereas, the Stone Mountain Memorial Association has developed Stone Mountain into one of the most unique historical, educational and recreational facilities in the world.

Now, therefore be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that this body does hereby request the United States Postmaster General to issue a postage stamp commemorating the historic carving on the face of Stone Mountain.

Be it further resolved that this body does further request that the United States Postmaster General issue such commemorative stamp at the Stone Mountain Post Office on the same day that the carving is unveiled.

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to forward an appropriate copy of this Resolution to Honorable Lawrence O'Brien, United States Postmaster General; Honorable Lester G. Maddox, Governor, State of Georgia; Honorable Richard B. Russell, United States Senator, State of Georgia; Honorable Herman E. Talmadge, United States Senator, State of Georgia; Honorable G. Elliott Hagan, Representative, 1st Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Maston O'Neal, Representative 2nd Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Jack Brinkley, Representative, 3rd Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Ben B. Blackburn, Representative, 4th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Fletcher Thompson, Representative, 5th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable John J. Flynt, Jr., Representative, 6th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable John W. Davis, Representative, 7th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable W. S. Stuckey, Jr., Representative, 8th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Phil M. Landrum, Representative, 9th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Representative, 10th Congressional District, State of Georgia; and Honorable Phil Campbell, Chairman, Stone Mountain Memorial Association.

In House: Read and adopted January 15, 1968.

Glenn W. Ellard,
Clerk.

In Senate: Read and adopted January 19, 1968.

Hamilton McWhorter, Jr.,
Secretary.

Postsecondary Vocational Education Scholarship Amendments of 1968

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Postsecondary Vocational Education Scholarship Amendments of 1968 which will further strengthen the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by permitting States more flexibility in administering the vocational postsecondary education programs by adding a system of scholarships administered by State boards of vocational education.

This amendment will translate into legislative action one of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education. In their report of last January, titled the "Bridge Between Man and His Work," the council proposed that—

> The opportunity grant program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 should be extended to post-secondary technical and vocational programs by setting aside 25 percent of the funds appropriated for title IV of the act.

Rather than subtracting from the successful and desirable opportunity grant program, this amendment proposes instead the addition, or extension, of the opportunity grant concept for vocational students.

In President Johnson's state of the Union message of January 17, 1968, he justifiably pointed with pride to the fact that:

> Today more than half of the high school graduates go on to college.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am equally concerned with the plight of the nearly one-half of our high school graduates who do not go on to college. Of course, I am not alone, in my concern, and some constructive steps on behalf of these non-college-bound students have already been taken.

Dr. Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education of the U.S. Office of Education, in his 1964 book, "Man, Education, and Work," noted this imbalance in our system of student financial aid. Dr. Venn said:

> Tragically, the nation's educational system is, when viewed as a whole, in what Edward Chase describes as a gross imbalance, its attention concentrated on the 20 percent of students who go through college.

In 1965, through the inspiration of my esteemed colleague, the Honorable John Dent, this House passed without a dissenting vote a bill which has since become the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act. That was a first giant step. Today I propose a second constructive step: Adding an innovative system of State-administered scholarships to the present system of insured bank loans.

In President Johnson's education message of February 5, 1968, he again noted that—

> More than 50 percent of our high school graduates went on to college.

But the President also called for "new approaches to job training" in his recommendations for new strength for vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, I support and urge passage of those proposals which are designed to support and improve our educational institutions, our high schools, vocational schools, technical institutes, and community colleges. But I feel we can also provide direct aid to the vocational student himself, just as we have done for students in higher education. This can be done economically, expeditiously, and efficiently through a system of State-administered vocational student scholarships.

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I find myself in accord with a most articulate gentleman whose philosophy generally places him at a point in the political spectrum far removed from my own.

Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., in his column of January 15, 1968, in the Washington Evening Star, wrote:

> Let us admit that if the state were to give each child a voucher, on the order of what is given to veterans under the GI Bill of Rights, cashable for sum X at any accredited school, that there would be massive redeployments of children in all the major centers of the United States.

Though I have never done a head count, I feel sure that, like myself, many of the Members of this House—and of the other body—have personally benefited from the GI bill of World War II and of Korea. I would propose for postsecondary vocational students what might be called a civilian bill of scholarships to be administered in the States, at the State level under a State plan for students in that State. Need would be the criteria.

Proud as we are of the increasing numbers and percentages of students who enter college, we must also be concerned for those who enter—but drop out.

In his book Dr. Venn asked:

> And what happens to them when they leave? Turned out of an educational system oriented toward someone else's college degree rather than their own work needs, and entering a labor market whose jobs require constantly higher levels of education and skill development, their prospects are bleak.

An excellent article on this subject, "College Dropouts: Successes or Failures," by Donald H. Ford and Hugh B. Urban appeared in the spring, 1965, issue of the Educational Record published by the prestigious American Council on Education.

Two excerpts from that article are relevant to the intent of my measure.

> We will also argue that attendance at a university or college is an appropriate way for some, but not all, people to develop themselves and their careers. Across the land we have hundreds of young men and women who are coaxed and wheedled into going away to college—youngsters who are not academically oriented; who do not learn well under the circumstances provided by the typical university with its highly formalized system of abstract instruction, course requirements, credit structures, and the like; or whose career aspirations actually call for an entirely different kind of background from that provided by our colleges and universities. For students such as these, the decision to leave college may represent a constructive act, a step toward a more productive, meaningful life. The error will have occurred in the decision to undertake a college education in the first place.
>
> Our college dropouts are trying to tell us something. Our total educational system is inadequate—there are some gaps in it. We, as educators, have oversold the concept of a college education representing it as the single preferred method of becoming educated. We have encouraged our fellow citizens to believe this, and we have failed to foster alternative avenues of career and educational development throughout our society. It is not true that any youngster with a high IQ who doesn't go to college represents a loss of talent to our society. Universities aren't the only place where people can learn things. A college education isn't the only avenue to a personally meaningful and socially productive life.

During the 1965 hearings on the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act I learned that approximately 20 percent of the students in accredited business schools have enrolled after having one or more semesters of study in 4-year colleges or universities. This, of course, is only one possible constructive alternative for those who find college not to be the answer. There should be access, free of financial pressures, to the trade and technical schools of this country and to the terminal occupational programs conducted by our community and junior colleges.

The past president of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, noted the important role of the guidance counselor in helping students. In the February 1967 issue of the Delta Pi Epsilon Journal he said:

> A counselor's proper function is to supply students with an understanding of opportunities and then to help the student arrive at his own decision. A good high school counselor should not feel a special commitment to a business school, a junior college, a public vocational school, or any other type of post high school educational opportunity.

Like Dr. Hoyt, I have no special commitment to any particular type of institution that is providing educational opportunity. But I feel strongly that this bill can open up new opportunities for the nearly 50 percent of our high school graduates who do not go to college and the 40 percent of college entrants who do not graduate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to study this measure carefully and join me in expanding the student opportunities for postsecondary vocational education.

The material referred to above follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP AMENDMENTS OF 1968

1. Provides for a program of 2-year scholarships for postsecondary vocational education students, administered by State boards of vocational education under approved State plans, but with selection of recipients for scholarship awards to be made by a State selection committee. Selectees could attend any eligible institution (defined as in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act) of their choice that admits them.

2. Appropriations authorized would be $100 million for each of 5 years, beginning with FY 1970, to pay initial-year stipends to scholarship holders, plus necessary appropriations for their second academic year. Financing would be 100% Federal, including cost of State plan administration. (For FY 1969, appropriations to finance State plans would be authorized.) Of the sums appropriated, up to 2% would be allotted to Puerto Rico and the territories; the remainder would be allotted among the States on the basis of relative numbers of students graduating from public or other nonprofit high schools.

3. The amount of the stipend would be determined annually for each student on the basis of his financial need (without regard to tuition and fees of any particular institution). Maximum stipend per year: $800, plus $200 in the second year for students who were in the upper half of their class in the preceding year. No stipend payable if the need is below $200.

4. Candidates would, generally, enter competition for awards while still in high school, and the State scholarship selection committee would make selections solely on the basis of superior ability to pursue successfully a course of study at an eligible institution determined in accordance with objective measurement of ability and achievement. Selectees would be ranked according to relative standing in the competition, and first-year stipends would be determined for those who need them, going down the list until available funds are exhausted. Those on the list not receiving an initial-year stipend would receive a certificate of scholarship.

5. In order to make for an equitable geographical distribution of scholarships and scholarship funds within a State, a State plan could provide for allocation of scholarship funds among school districts or other attendance areas on the basis of public and private high school enrollment or some other equitable basis.

Vice President H. H. Humphrey Speaks to Dallas National Conference

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the National Democratic Conference in Dallas, Tex., on February 9 and listening to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY address the conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. HUMPHREY's speech, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONFERENCE, DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 9, 1968

Most of you will recall the late Bob Thornton, four times Mayor of Dallas.

In his later years, he chose carefully between those meetings he would attend and those he would pass up.

He used to say: "If it's a do meetin', I'm goin'. If it's a don't meetin', I'm staying home."

This is going to be a "do" meeting, and it is going to be a "do" year for Democrats.

We have some important assets in 1968—not least, our opposition, the grumbling old party itself.

They have already renewed their familiar refrain: "Me too." "Enough for now." "Time for a pause."

They are for all the right things.

They are for health—but they voted 93 percent against Medicare in the House of Representatives.

Education? Oh, yes. But three quarters of their representatives voted against the elementary and secondary education act in 1965.

Cities? They want to improve them—but

88 per cent voted against model cities in the House of Representatives.

They have some window-dressing progressives. But you know—and the people know—what's for sale inside. Remnants, and a few bottles of Geritol for the faithful.

But we have more important assets than our opposition. We have a record we can take to the people.

We have the Medicare program—something we've been working for since Harry Truman's day. Today decent medical care is the right of almost 20 million older Americans. Seven and a half million senior Americans received care under it in the last fiscal year alone.

How long did we fight for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education? We passed it in 1965, and 9 million needy American children got substantial help last year because of it.

Social Security: We passed it in the first place over desperate opposition. And we brought another million needy Americans out of poverty a few weeks ago by expanding its benefits.

There is aid to higher education—and a million and a quarter needy students in college on public grants and loans because of it.

The minimum wage was ours too—twenty-five cents at first, and now a dollar sixty.

A Peace Corps—a Teacher Corps—Head Start for disadvantaged pre-schoolers—a nationwide youth opportunity program:

What does it all mean? A grandmother living out her days in dignity and security. Not pauperized by medical costs; a Mexican-American child who gets special help in language instructions; a chance for a Negro mother to keep her family together; a poor teenager who can look ahead to college rather than the street corner.

It all means dignity and opportunity—the right of free choice—for more and more individual Americans.

And how is it all done? Not for people, but with people . . . . not by the Federal Government alone, but by helping revitalize State and local Government.

It is done through and by the free enterprise system that has made this country what it is today.

It is done through private organizations.

Did you know, for example, that over 90 percent of the community action agencies using Federal War on Poverty funds are Churches, civic groups, inner-city community groups, and not Government agencies at all?

This new spirit of partnership and cooperation is part of our record.

And so is prosperity.

Everybody knows about our 83 months of unbroken economic expansion . . . and that unemployment is now at its lowest point in 15 years.

But do they know that real personal incomes have grown more in every single year since 1961 than they grew in the five years from 1956 to 1961 together?

I'm proud of that record.

And I don't mind reminding you that it is prosperity we are trying to protect today with the President's program to fight inflation. (A major part of that program, by the way, is the President's request for a temporary tax surcharge. It needs your help.)

Yes, we have a record to stand on and to put before the people:

This Administration has invested twice as much in help for education since 1963 as was invested in the previous century.

This nation is now investing over twice what it was in 1961 to help poor Americans lift themselves out of poverty. And ten million Americans have crossed that threshold since 1961 as a result.

Our investment in health is now three times what it was in 1964.

Not enough? Maybe not. There are of course limitations to what can be undertaken at any one time.

But we are doing so much more today than anybody did during the stagnant 1950's . . . so much more than any of us thought possible a few short years ago, that I find it hard to feel discouraged.

You don't get that kind of progress by accident. You get it with leadership that is ready to invest in a better, stronger, healthier America.

You don't get that kind of progress from timid guardians of the status quo and economies of stagnation. And Americans know it. * * *

So much for the record. There's a lot more, and I urge you to learn it and use it.

But you know and I know that the American people don't vote for yesterday . . . especially at a time when this nation faces serious challenges both at home and abroad.

1968 is going to be a year for serious debate about the future—not the past—of America.

Do we mean to pursue policy of security and development at home and abroad? Or are we going to draw back from our commitment to a better life in a safer world?

Do we as the richest, strongest nation in the world mean to lead in mankind's struggle for freedom from want, freedom from ignorance, freedom from fear?

Or are we ready to turn selfishly inward . . . to forget others . . . and leave this country and the world divided between rich and poor . . . healthy and sick . . . hopeful and despairing . . . peaceful and seething . . . threatening and threatened?

These are the challenges of 1968.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration does not seek to evade those challenges.

We shall meet them.

For, as Harry Truman said in another time of trial: "If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world, and we shall surely endanger the welfare of the nation."

President Lyndon Johnson has a program to meet those challenges here in America and in the world. You have seen some of it in his messages to Congress, and there is more to come.

There is a Manpower Program designed to wipe out most of the hard-core unemployment in this country by 1971.

That is no costly stop-gap, make-work, public-sponsored palliative. It is based on a partnership between Government and industry—industry to do the training and provide the jobs, Government to pay the extra costs of training.

It is not too much to say that this new Manpower Program will test the vitality of our free enterprise system.

Can it make room for half a million workers who have never before had the dignity and opportunity that goes with a productive, steady job? I think so.

In education: An educational opportunity act to assure "that in America there will be no economic or racial barrier to higher education; that every qualified young person will have all the education he wants and can absorb." More funds for Head Start . . . full funding for bi-lingual education programs . . . support to states for vocational training . . . a stay-in-school program . . . and much more.

Civil Rights: There are a lot of people in this country today who are mad at President Johnson and the rest of us Democrats because they think we've moved too far, too fast on Civil Rights.

One of the Republican Presidential candidates, reincarnated and true to his party's historic position, says: "Enough for now, time to consolidate our past gains."

And there is a third party candidate who says Republicans and Democrats alike have wrecked a comfortable and genteel way of life, and that he's going to restore it.

Well, I want to be perfectly frank with you.

When you declare that all Americans are equal before the law and at the polls . . . when you make your commitment to the emancipation proclamation not as a promise but as a reality, you do raise expectations and you do encourage change.

Change is coming. It is good for the health of this free country of ours. And we are for it.

When you ask Negro-Americans and Spanish-Americans, among others, to risk and give their lives for their buddies and their country, they will not—and should not—be expected to move to the back of the opportunity bus when they come home.

The challenge—and the responsibility of every American—is to make that change peaceful and constructive, to the benefit of all.

So this year's Civil Rights message asks Congress to help "complete the task it has begun," . . . to prohibit violent interference with Civil Rights . . . a strong equal employment opportunity commission . . . non-discrimination in jury selection . . . equal opportunity in housing.

Crime: The President declared just two days ago that 1968 is the year when "the forces of law and order must capture the initiative in the battle against crime."

He called on the 90th Congress to give the American people "the security that they demand and the justice that they deserve."

The President's message on crime will contain a 22-point program for action now—gun control . . . the safe streets and crime control bill . . . and much else drastically to improve the law enforcement capabilities of the State and local authorities responsible for public safety in this Country.

Meanwhile, all Federal law enforcement agencies have been unified under the Attorney General. The President has asked Congress for a powerful bureau of narcotics and dangerous drugs to prevent, in his words, "The sale of slavery to the young."

Were you waiting for dramatic new programs? Those are dramatic programs, and there are more messages yet to come.

They are dramatic.

They are Democratic.

They are the building blocks of a better, stronger, freer, safer America.

I for one mean to fight for them from this day until next November and beyond, and I hope you will be with me. * * *

What about the challenges we face abroad?

Those are the ones that concern Americans most today.

The masterplans for world peace—and even for local peace—are plentiful. But they don't always fit the realities that confront us.

What is the answer?

To withdraw and let the fate of a nuclear-armed world be decided without us?

Or to take the more difficult road of active engagement in pursuit of the fundamental human aspirations we have always stood for. Freedom from want. Freedom from fear. Self-determination. Social justice. Security. Stable and lasting peace.

America has chosen the latter path, as indeed it must, knowing full-well that, in the words of John F. Kennedy, "Peace and freedom do not come cheap, and we are destined—all of us here today—to live out most if not all of our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril."

We have believed that challenge accepted is safer than challenge ignored . . . that perils recognized are safer than perils denied . . . that peace and freedom are worth the sacrifice we may sometimes be called on to make.

Such a commitment requires a leader. This Country has it in President Lyndon Johnson.

He has the courage to meet our National responsibilities when others may waver.

He is unafraid to make a lonely decision when others afford the luxury of the second-guess.

And I believe that when the American people, this November, measure President Lyndon Johnson against any of the alternative choices, they will decide that his leadership is needed—both at home and in the world—for another four years.

The Presidency of the United States is no place for any image-maker's make-believe creation. Nor is it a place for men whose basic philosophy is out of tune with the times and with the needs of the next century.

It is a big job. It calls for a big man with a mind and heart big enough to do that job when the going gets tough.

We have our candidate. He is President Lyndon Johnson. With your support, he will lead our party to victory this November. And we will get on with the unfinished business of building a stronger, freer, safer Country—and a more peaceful world—for the Americans of the years to come.

Arkansas Careers, Inc.

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the January 12, 1968, issue of the Christian Science Monitor had the following article about a unique organization that has been in operation in Arkansas for the past several years:

HOW AND WHY

Arkansas Careers, Inc., is living up to its name.

It has been operating with a paid staff for only 18 months. But already it's found positions in Arkansas for 300 college graduates who normally would have left the State. And it has enticed back home to positions in Arkansas 200 grads who already had found jobs elsewhere.

What makes the organization unique is that it is financed entirely by private funds contributed by 600 Arkansas firms. And it charges no fees for job placement.

W. F. Rector, its president, and some other Arkansas businessmen grew weary of educating executives for other states. So they put the organization together informally three years ago. It quickly proved itself.

Today its executive secretary roams the state, talking to civic clubs and college groups.

Bimonthly news letters go out to college grads now in military service informing them of job openings back home. And businesses get a monthly report giving thumbnail sketches of Arkansans who are leaving the service, finishing college, or working out of state but wanting to come home.

It started back in 1960 when a group of civic and student leaders decided it was time somebody got busy to help young Arkansans find careers at home and, at the same time, assist businesses to fill available positions with Arkansas college graduates. Today that organization has a paid staff, has the financial support of over 600 Arkansas business firms, and has successfully aided young graduates find jobs they want and helped Arkansas business firms to employ capable and talented young people they need.

It is a pleasure to salute the fine Arkansans who comprise the officers and board of directors of Arkansas Careers: Mr. W. F. Rector, president; Mr. Dave Grunfest, vice president; Mr. Dabbs Sullivan, vice president; Mr. San Anderson, secretary-treasurer, and Mr. Porter Briggs, executive secretary.

Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller is chairman of the board and the members are Mr. S. J. Beauchamp, Jr., of Little Rock; Mr. John Carruthers of Pine Bluff; Mr. R. N. Dills of Fort Smith; Mr. Alexander Harris of Little Rock; Mr. Howard Holthoff of Gould; Mr. Larry Kelley of Little Rock; Mr. Ed Ligon, Jr., of Little Rock; Mr. Frank Lyon of Little Rock; Mrs. Mary McLeod of Morrilton; Mr. Russell Marks of El Dorado; Mr. Joe Martin of Pocahontas; Dr. Joseph A. Norton of Little Rock; Mrs. Dorothy Stuck of Marked Tree; and, Mr. Everett Tucker, Jr., of Little Rock.

The purposes of Arkansas Careers, Inc., may be stated briefly as, first, exposing college and university students to career opportunities within the State; second, assisting young men, serving their military obligation, in finding careers in Arkansas after discharge from active duty; third, assisting graduates, working out of Arkansas, to return home to work; fourth, helping businessmen find employees for specific positions; and fifth, sponsoring the annual Arkansas career days interviewing sessions.

The annual Arkansas career days are designed to give students exposure to career opportunities in Arkansas and to give businessmen an opportunity to interview students and graduates interested in working in Arkansas. Thus far the organization has worked with over 2,000 college graduates and has been directly responsible for the placement of more than 500 college graduates in virtually all fields of endeavor.

The military newsletter goes to Arkansans in the military service and keeps them abreast of economic happenings in the State. It keeps the young military serviceman aware of the employment opportunities available to him when he has completed his military obligation.

In addition to the military newsletter, Arkansas Careers publishes a monthly newsletter which goes to over 1,100 businesses throughout the State. This newsletter lists the qualifications of individuals who are interested in working in Arkansas. Over 1,500 résumés of prospective employees have been sent to Arkansas businessmen in the past 15 months as a result of the feedback from this newsletter.

Arkansas Careers, Inc., through its officers and board members, its paid staff and its participating business firms, is making a real contribution to the future of Arkansas. This effort by Arkansas business is in the highest tradition of individual enterprise.

Questionnaire

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week I placed in the mail my annual questionnaire to approximately 225,000 residents of the 10th Congressional District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

This is a time of crisis for our country. Taxes are increasing; anarchy and crime is rising; and America's prestige in the world is at its lowest ebb.

These are times when all Americans should inform their elected Representatives of their desires in legislative matters. The right to vote provides only occasional opportunity to express one's self in government, whereas the continous response of the public on issues facing our Nation greatly strengthens our system.

This is a critical year for the American people, and I thought my colleagues would be interested in the subjects questioned:

	Yes	No
1. Do you support the administration's proposed 10 percent increase in income tax?	☐	☐
2. Which of the following fiscal policies should the United States follow—		
(a) Impose a surtax on income?	☐	☐
(b) Reduce appropriations for existing programs?	☐	☐
(c) Postpone new domestic programs?	☐	☐
(d) Encourage foreigners to visit the United States?	☐	☐
3. Do you favor the proposal for a federally guaranteed annual income regardless of whether the recipient works or is capable of working?	☐	☐
4. Do you favor the recent bill I introduced which encourages the employment and training of the unskilled by a partnership between Federal Government and private industry where employers would be refunded part of the minimum wages paid the worker during the training period?	☐	☐
5. To reduce crime, anarchy, and disorder in our country do you favor—		
(a) Wiretapping in the investigation of organized crime?	☐	☐
(b) Larger appropriations to slum areas?	☐	☐
(c) Better enforcement of existing laws?	☐	☐
(d) Additional criminal laws?	☐	☐
(e) Government jobs for the unemployed?	☐	☐
6. If you believe Federal spending and domestic programs should be reduced by the administration and if the administration fails to make such reductions, do you believe Congress should vote these reductions in spending?	☐	☐
7. Would you favor curbing the power of the President to commit U.S. troops to war without specific prior approval of Congress?	☐	☐
8. Do you support President Johnson's proposal to restrict foreign travel and the suggested 15 and 30 percent tax on all moneys above $7 per day spent overseas as a method of reducing our balance-of-payment deficit?	☐	☐

Note.—Optional:

Sex: M .. F ..; party preference: Republican .. Democrat .. Independent ..; age 20 to 24 ..; 25 to 44 ..; 45 to 64 ..; 65 and up ...

District of Columbia Police Need Educational Pay Incentives

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident all of us would gladly testify to the importance of education in encouraging and preserving the values of our free and democratic society.

This is true because we recognize the importance of giving the best possible education to our children so that they can cope with the enormous challenges which will confront them tomorrow.

It is equally true because we have come to appreciate the value of continual growth and learning on the part of our present leaders and the general public as we attempt to meet the responsibilities of today.

Doctors, lawyers, educators, leaders of business and industry, and every private citizen with a stake in his community and country at large realize that education must be a continuing process.

And, events in recent months and years have taught us that nowhere is the need for increased understanding and knowledge more urgent than in the administration of this country's urban areas, where over 70 percent of our people live.

In particular, we have come to appreciate the highly complex nature of urban law enforcement and the great demands it makes upon those charged with the maintenance of law and order—our policemen.

Today's problems in crime control and law enforcement cannot be solved with yesterday's answers. Modern policework demands the highest order of talent and education.

Yet, strangely, we find that on Monday this House will be asked to approve a pay raise bill for District of Columbia policemen from which have been stricken educational pay incentives.

Such action, in my opinion, cannot be justified in the light of this Nation's clearly defined and recognized priorities. I think we should all support efforts to amend the bill on the floor and restore these incentives.

Simply stated, the amendments would provide $600 more yearly for officers who have completed 30 to 60 hours of college work in law enforcement and an additional $1,200 after 60 hours have been completed. Some modest recruiting incentives, such as payment of preemployment interview expenses, also would be provided.

I believe I am in good company in endorsing these incentives. They were in the original bill offered by the chairman of the House District Committee, of which I am a member, and then removed in executive committee session.

No testimony against the educational pay incentives appears in the record of the committee hearings on this measure.

Furthermore, when it became apparent that the educational pay incentives for District policemen were in danger, I solicited the opinions of two highly informed and responsible agencies.

One, the International Association of Chiefs of Police Inc., noted:

> The policy of this Association has long been one of full and active support for the concept of college education for police officers.

The other response, from the Justice Department, cited President Johnson's emphasis on a "specific program of fellowships, student loans and tuition aid for State and local law enforcement officers."

Because of the valuable contribution to the discussion of educational pay incentives for police made by the Police Chiefs Association and the Department of Justice, I would like to share their two letters with my colleagues in the House:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1968.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: It is with mixed emotion that I take this opportunity to comment on the recent action of the House District Subcommittee with respect to H.R. 10761 in the matter of police-fire pay. While increased compensation for police officers is well deserved and long overdue, I cannot avoid expressing considerable alarm at the Subcommittee's rejection of incentive pay programs.

The policy of this Association has long been one of the full and active support for the concept of college education for police officers. We recognize the need not only for more police officers, but for better police officers and in the long run we can only hope to improve the quality of the nation's police through educational programs designed to meet the needs of modern law enforcement. Our position was most effectively stated by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice when it reported:

"It is nonsense to state or to assume that the enforcement of the law is so simple that it can be done best by those unencumbered by a study of the liberal arts. The man who goes into our streets in hopes of regulating, directing or controlling human behavior must be armed with more than a gun and the ability to perform mechanical movements in response to a situation. Such men as these engage in the difficult, complex and important business of human behavior. Their intellectual armament—so long restricted to the minimum—must be no less than their physical prowess and protection."

Needless to say, we can hardly hope to attract college students into police careers or to encourage present officers to improve themselves professionally through college work unless we are willing to reward additional capabilities with additional pay. The concept of incentive pay for education is not a new one. In mid-March of last year, the United States Civil Service Commission issued a directive permitting certain college graduates to be paid higher starting salaries than usual for their particular entrance grade. In doing this the Civil Service Commission was responding to the needs of federal agencies which are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with industry for promising young persons.

Educational incentive pay plans are currently in effect in over twenty of the nation's police agencies and under study in dozens more. I strongly urge your careful consideration of and support for incentive pay for District police personnel. Since our Nation's Capital is so far below its authorized manpower, I would suggest that virtually any recruitment methods are necessary and would urge that the recruit incentive provisions also be restored to the bill.

With a view to the ultimate objective of better law enforcement, let us design a pay program that will provide over the months and years ahead for better police personnel capable of dealing with complex social problems and providing the citizens and visitors of the District of Columbia with the finest police service available.

Sincerely yours,

QUINN TAMM,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1968.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: I am pleased to respond to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on whether salary incentives should be provided for District of Columbia policemen to attend law enforcement or police administration courses at colleges or universities.

As you know, yesterday the President outlined for the Congress his program of action to meet the challenge of crime in our society. High on the President's list of things to be done was enactment of the Safe Streets bill amended to establish a specific program of fellowships, student loans and tuition aid for state and local law enforcement officers. This proposal reflects the President's interest in assuring that law enforcement officers who wish to do so may further their education. As the President said, law enforcement "means more than putting on a uniform".

It would seem to us that the program contemplated by the President would increase the effectiveness of law enforcement people throughout the country, and incentive pay for those who further their professional education would stimulate interest in the program.

You also asked whether a higher rate of pay for a law enforcement officer having college credits in law enforcement would impair the morale of his brother officers who do not receive a similar rate of pay because they do not have college credits. With regard to the particular situation in the District of Columbia, we would expect that District officials could better answer that question. We would hope there would be no adverse effect upon morale. Certainly, if incentive pay were provided not only for those who enter the police force with college credits but also for those who further their education in law enforcement or police administration while on the force, we would expect that morale would be improved. In such an event, every man would know that he has an opportunity to increase his salary by undertaking available self-improvement.

Your attention is invited to the February 1968 issue of "Law and Order", which contains a survey of trends in police education. Reporting on 287 police departments serving communities with populations varying from under 2500 to over 100,000, the magazine states that from a low of 12% to a high of 22% provide pay incentives.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Congressman Whitener, since he is the Chairman of the Subcommittee that has jurisdiction of the legislation involved.

Sincerely,

WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Deputy Attorney General.

Historic Church, Patriotic Padre

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a magnificent column by Dr. Paul H. Hallett, an associate editor of the National Register, a religious publication fair to people of all religious faiths and respectful of those who have none.

This column by Dr. Hallett was featured in the National Register, a weekly newspaper that circulates on six continents on Sunday, February 18, 1968. The piece in the National Register has been noted with warm commendation by leaders in church and state, including prelates, pastors, the clergy generally, youthful, middle aged, and those in the ranks of veterans in their golden years.

It is a special joy for me to bring this column to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in both Chambers, the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, because "the padre of the Americas," on numerous occasions, has invoked the blessing of God in both Houses of the Congress. As Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in his great-hearted, noble fashion declared in this body on Monday, February 19, 1968:

> The Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is one of the best known and most beloved servants of God and of The People of God in The Western Hemisphere.

It is good to note that a column in a newspaper that is nationally and internationally recognized for truth and fairness should describe a "country pastor, whose parish is the world," in terms that we know to be true.

This is my joyful privilege in connection with the official celebration of George Washington's birthday.

The article reads as follows:

HISTORIC CHURCH, PATRIOTIC PASTOR

(By Dr. Paul H. Hallett)

What might be called the mother church of the U.S. is in danger of being engulfed by a French metals empire, the Howmet Corporation, which plans to erect an aluminum factory near St. Josephs-on-Carrollton Manor Church in historic Frederick, Md. The pastor, who is as American as his church, is fighting an uphill battle to delay the rezoning of the 1,400 acres once owned by Charles Carroll for industrial use. He is the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who is known to everybody in official Washington and was called by Senator Mike Mansfield, for richly deserved reasons, "the Padre of the Americas."

The parish of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor was erected in 1811 by Archbishop John Carroll, the founder of the American Hierarchy. The land on which it rests was donated by his cousin, Charles.

Besides Charles Carroll, St. Josephs-on-Carrollton included among its original members two signers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, Daniel Carroll, brother of the Archbishop, and Thomas Fitzsimons. What other church in the Americas could claim so illustrious a patronage?

Two things distinguish Father Thorning: A sturdy faith and an ardent patriotism. He warned of Communist penetration in Guatemala in 1954, long before the experts were aware of it, and he saw through the Communist Castro while other Catholics were seeing in him a protagonist of the Social Encyclicals. For 22 years he has been pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton-Manor. At a time when the once glorious link between Catholicism and patriotism is being weakened, I can wish the valiant pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton few better auguries than that he may save his storied church against the encroachments of foreign industrialism.

Prosecutions in the Napco Case—Continued

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I wrote to the Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, expressing satisfaction over action begun several days ago by the Justice Department to recover funds from Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis, the firm that got paid by the Agency for International Development for delivering almost $4 million worth of automobile parts to India—most of which turned out to be worthless junk. In my letter I expressed the hope that Justice would not be content with taking civil action alone, but that criminal prosecutions against the parties to this obviously fraudulent transaction would also ensue. I asked the Attorney General for a report on this subject. I am pleased to note that the Washington Post in an editorial in today's edition also calls for consideration of criminal prosecutions in connection with the Napco scandal.

The editorial follows:

THE NAPCO CASE

The Department of Justice has rightly decided to move against Napco Industries, Inc., in an effort to recover money involved in the company's operations in connection with a Development Loan Fund financing of an Indian gear plant.

The Department, in its complaint, alleges that Napco machinery involved was given an excessive appraisal and that services to be performed and materials to be delivered were not forthcoming. It is contended that the tools involved were given a fair market value of $909,000 in 1960, but the figure used in the application was an estimated replacement figure of $3,724,000.

"From the time of the submission of the application," the Department complains, "through the execution of the loan agreement . . . the officers and agents of the defendant knowingly and deliberately engaged in a scheme and conspiracy to deceive the plaintiff's agents as to the existence of the aforementioned fair market value appraisal." It condemns "deceitful and wrongful acts by defendant's officers and agents."

These allegations, if confirmed in the forthcoming legal action the Department of Justice has now instituted, constitute a shocking perversion of the purposes of the aid program and an apalling deceit upon that program's administrators.

The Department of Justice in proceeding with this case is demonstrating a commendable indifference as to the prestige of those it suspects of wrongdoing. And if its civil actions are successful it ought to consider the advisability of proceeding to criminal prosecutions where warranted.

Tolerating Crime

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, according to the Washington Post of January 31, crime in the District of Columbia was up 32 percent in December 1967, over the rate for the same month in the preceding year.

If this figure is even a glim reflection of the national rate, perhaps at long last Congress will take the action needed to unshackle police and to prevent convicted criminals from escaping punishment.

There is little use dwelling on the District's miseries, for any respectable citizen who resides here knows the danger of going out at night or of leaving doors or windows unlocked. Pedestrians would be safer after dark on busy highways than they are on the streets of Washington.

For the Nation as a whole, the crime rate increased 29 percent in the years 1963–66. Unless the 1967 tabulation shows a trend distinctly more favorable to law and order, the new concept of treating criminals with exaggerated solicitude must be terminated. The Nation's biggest crime is tolerating crime.

The first duty of Congress is remove the unrealistic and unjust restrictions on officers of the law that have come about through a Supreme Court which has demonstrated greater sympathy for lawbreakers than for the general public. At the same time we must close wherever possible the ridiculous legal loopholes woven by court decisions.

House Joint Resolution 418, to authorize Congress, by a two-thirds vote in each House, to override decisions of the Supreme Court, will give the legislative branch an opportunity to return this Government to the laws and traditions that provided this country with security against lawlessness until recent years. The resolution needs to be acted upon with dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I should like to insert four editorials in the RECORD. The first, "Unpunished Murder," is from the Evening Star of February 6. The second, "Character of Society," appeared in the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., February 7.

The third, "Crime in Our Streets," was published in Nation's Agriculture. The fourth, "Making It Easy for the Criminal," is from a recent editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The latter publication cites a Philadelphia police report attributing 40 percent of all violent crimes in the city during 1965 to persons who had been convicted at least twice for previous lawless acts. The figure is another indication that current court leniency is an invitation to repeat robbery, rape, and murder.

Courts are also too quick to excuse first offenders. To correct a child, the wise parent does not give him a loving tap on the head for doing something wrong. Rather, he applies a poignant rap elsewhere. This method of chastisement should not be overlooked in dealing with communities of young punks who have come to believe that crime is a convenient way of life in this indulgent society.

The editorials follow:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 6, 1968]

UNPUNISHED MURDER

With obvious reluctance, a District judge last week freed the self-confessed killer of the widow of James F. Mitchell, a prominent Washington physician.

What this miscarriage of justice puts before us is a shocking example of the Mallory Rule at work—the rule which, to the dismay of this community's "liberal" element, has been modified to some extent by Title III of the new District crime law.

Mrs. Mitchell was suffocated in her Dupont Circle home two years ago by Harry Gross in a dispute over money. Gross, a handyman, confessed after lie detector tests had pointed to him as the guilty party. Now, there was no claim that any third degree tactics had been used by the police, no contention that the confession was not voluntary. And, of course, there was nothing at all to indicate that the jury had found an innocent man guilty of this murder.

The police, however, had waited four hours after the lie detector tests before taking Gross to a magistrate for arraignment. And this delay, under the blindly mechanical operation of the Mallory Rule, was held by the Court of Appeals to necessitate reversal of the conviction and, eventually, the release of the killer. The appellate judges probably were right, yet nothing could more clearly illustrate the wrong-headedness of the Mallory Rule—a rule concerned with a matter of procedure and not with the question of whether justice has been done.

Judge John J. Sirica said that he ordered the release of Gross "with reluctance," and that "if the new crime bill had been in effect when this man confessed he would not be set free today."

We hope that the moaners and the groaners will give a little thought to this—especially those who say, although they must know better, that Title III revives "arrests for investigation." It does nothing of the sort. Since Mallory had nothing whatever to do with any constitutional issue, we would also like to think that we have heard the last of the contention that Title III will be held unconsitutional "in the light of the Mallory Rule." This probably is a vain hope, however, since any such claim must spring not from deliberate misrepresentation but from total ignorance.

Title III may have its imperfections and if so Congress can correct them as experience demonstrates the fact. Meanwhile, we would rather take our chances with this new law than with a judicial rule which frees a confessed killer or a confessed rapist (Mallory) to walk the streets of this city.

From Oil City-Franklin Clarion (Pa.) Derrick, Feb. 7, 1968]

CHARACTER OF SOCIETY

Poverty is often given as the reason for much of the violence in our cities, and government leaders recommend spending billions of tax dollars to provide jobs. This supposed connection between poverty and riots is seldom questioned, but Evangelist Billy Graham flatly rejects the claim that poverty is the cause of present civil disturbances. He points out, "there was no such rioting, looting or killing of police officers in depression days when people were much poorer."

To many, there is far more involved in the present breakdown of law and order than just the restlessness born of poverty. Respect for law lies in the character of our people rather than in their affluence. A law-abiding society is built on character, and character cannot be created or bought at will with tax dollars.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

MAKING IT EASY FOR THE CRIMINAL

Recalling his experiences as head of Philadelphia's Police Department, New York's Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary remarked the other day that a survey taken in 1965 showed that 35 percent of all violent crimes in this city were committed by persons who were on parole, probation or bail, and 40 percent were committed by persons who had been convicted at least twice for previous lawless acts.

The repeaters and the individuals released prematurely on probation or parole fill the police records with crimes that could have been prevented by less lenient treatment when they were in custody.

"Why should we have to arrest the same man over and over again for rape?" asks Commissioner Leary. "The same man over and over again for robbery? Perhaps what you need is a law to remove him permanently from society."

Certainly there is need of greater preventive action to keep the habitual offenders from the streets. Stiffer sentences for all kinds of felonies is one answer. Another is less liberal resort to parole and probation to set free persons convicted of crime. Still another is speeded-up court process to bring defendants in criminal cases to trial. Time after time we hear of individuals who are free on bail getting arrested for another, and perhaps similar, crime.

Life is being made too easy for the criminal element; violation of the law is running hand in hand with contempt for all law.

[From Nation's Agriculture, February 1968]

CRIME IN THE STREETS

"At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. I hope I am over-wary. But if I am not, there is even now, something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law that pervades the country, the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of sober judgment of courts and, the worse, savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice."

These words, which could be applied to recent disorder and riots in the streets, are from a speech by Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois, on January 27, 1838. In like manner, the noted historian, Arnold Toynbee, has observed that the fall of every civilization has been preceded by declining morality, increasing contempt for the law and growing barbarism and anarchy within the nation before being conquered by outside powers. America is today being infiltrated and threatened by barbarism and anarchy from within.

Riots, sit-ins, looting, lawlessness of every kind are increasing at an alarming rate. Recent Supreme Court decisions seem to provide greater protection for criminals than law-abiding citizens. Disrespect and disregard for certain laws is being advocated from a few pulpits and the National Council of Churches has encouraged, as well as provided financial support for, protest marches and other civil disorders. The rationale is that riots, protests and even crime are the result of the "failure of society," that individuals should not be forced to obey laws which "offend one's conscience."

This philosophy encourages immorality and lawlessness by providing easy excuses for all kinds of indolence, degradation and crime. It is argued that the individual should not be held fully responsible for his acts when he has been handicapped by a slum environment, poverty, racial discrimination or inadequate education. Abraham Lincoln would not have become a statesman if he had been influenced by such perverted reasoning.

Finding the cause for the alarming increase in the incidence of crime in America is not easy because there are so many contributing factors. Many point to the breakdown of family life—working mothers, excessive drinking, easy divorce, little or no parental discipline. Others point to government programs which ignore or premiumize immorality, such as rewarding mothers of illegitimate children with welfare payments in proportion to the number of offspring and soliciting school drop-outs for make-work jobs at handsome salaries. Some place the blame on inadequate education in the public schools or the failure of the churches to challenge and inspire the people.

Few have related civil disorders, immorality and crime to government fiscal irresponsibility and the inflation which has gripped our nation for so many years.

Inflation is caused by the federal government spending more than it takes in—fiscal irresponsibility. Inflation destroys the value of savings—thus penalizing thrift and encouraging speculation and big spending. Inflation gets its impetus from human selfishness and greed—from efforts to get something for nothing.

Socialism, materialism, inflation and immorality seem to travel together down the same road. "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher." It is easy to place responsibility for inflation and the evils it breeds on the Great Society or politicians generally, but all citizens must share the blame. 1968 provides a great opportunity for legitimate and constitutional protest—at the polls.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Kilmer Job Corps Center

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, periodically I have commented on the successful rec-

ord of the Kilmer Job Corps Center. On February 9, 1967, I noted that the Kilmer Center was soon to celebrate its second anniversary. At that time, almost 1,300 youngsters had been trained and placed in employment by the Kilmer Center. Today I am proud to bring to our attention Kilmer's third anniversary. An article in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 12 recognized the achievement of the center in having graduated 3,217 corpsmen and placed 2,696 in jobs. I continue to be gratified by Kilmer's fine record, and I take this occasion to express my pride in the fine work accomplished by the staff and corpsmen as witnessed by this achievement.

Under unanimous consent I submit the article from the Philadelphia Inquirer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS GRADUATED 3,217

EDISON, N.J., February 11.—The Kilmer Job Corps Center here has graduated 3,217 corpsmen and placed 2,696 in jobs, officials said Sunday on the occasion of the center's third anniversary.

The first corpsmen arrived here Feb. 1, 1965. Current enrollment is about 1,700 youths between the ages of 16 and 22.

A spokesman said the center will delay its official celebration until April to coincide with the nation-wide Job Corps third anniversary planned by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Future Farmers of America

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Future Farmers of America is celebrating its 37th anniversary this year and represents a very important influence in the rural life of Minnesota. The current national membership is 445,000 affiliated with 8,900 local chapters. The Minnesota FFA membership is 13,826 representing 276 local high school Future Farmer chapters. It gives me great pleasure to salute Future Farmers of America in Minnesota and elsewhere across the Nation during this FFA Week.

Agriculture is this Nation's largest single industry. It is basic to our continued economic and social stability. The production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products employs more than a third of America's working force; and farmers are a $14 billion a year customer of industry and labor, not counting the billions farmers spend for consumer goods.

Our great cities, our mighty industries, our business and professional accomplishments, our educational institutions, and our high living standards are possible because of the efficiency and productivity of the American farm.

Likewise, the agricultural interests and income of farmers are inseparably tied to the health and prosperity of working men and women and the industries in our towns and cities. No one element of our Nation can scarcely exist, and certainly not prosper, independently of the others.

This Nation must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who leave the farm. These must be men with experience and training, for the successful farmer today is both a scientist and a businessman, mechanic and a laborer—at the same time capable of leadership in the affairs of the community. Generally, they must be men who have begun farming at an early age, so that by the time they are ready to marry and start a family they will be firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future.

The number of young men on farms is more than adequate to meet the needs for replacements, but not enough of those who enter farming have the educational background that is necessary for success under modern conditions. Vocational Agriculture and the Future Farmers of America constitute the most effective program developed for training boys to be good farmers and good citizens, and helping them to become established in the agricultural occupation of their choice.

In Minnesota, our FFA chapters are not only engaged in the active training of future farmers, but also are focussing attention on occupations related to farming such as marketing, processing and other agri-business activities. Those who are unable to actively farm will find many agriculturally related opportunities.

Our Minnesota FFA boys have an enviable record of community accomplishment as well as training in agriculture. Many chapters have sponsored fairs or livestock shows, conducted community-wide safety campaigns, and home fire drills. Almost all of the chapters have conducted organized conservation programs such as reforestation, habitat improvement, raising and releasing of waterfowl and/or upland game birds. They have raised and released over 10,000 wild mallard ducks and over 30,000 pheasants, and have planted a total of 1,729,247 tree seedlings.

Garden and carpenter tools have been collected, repaired, and shipped to developing overseas countries in cooperation with the Christian rural overseas program, which is evidence of the awareness of our young Future Farmers of their responsibilities on the global scene.

In Minnesota, our boys have contributed over $150,000 toward Camp Courage for crippled children and adults, further evidence of their desire to be good citizens as well as good farmers.

In closing, I would like my salute to the Future Farmers of America to include the words of the FFA creed, which in reality is a code for living that could be well adopted by all Americans. I hereby submit it at this point in the RECORD:

THE FFA CREED

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words, but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging, for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

Mississippi Legislature Asks Release of "Pueblo" and Crew

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a concurrent resolution which has been adopted by the Mississippi Legislature which is in session in Jackson, Miss., in regard to the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew.

I firmly believe that this resolution represents the attitude of the people of Mississippi and a large segment of the people of our country. It is especially timely and important in light of the recent threats by the North Koreans to punish the crew of the *Pueblo*.

The United States must renew its efforts to secure the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its entire crew, or we will lose faith with its valiant crew and subject the free world to further intimidation by the Communists.

I would like to especially concur with that part of the resolution which extends its sympathy to the families of two Mississipians who are crewmembers on the ill-fated ship.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 20

Concurrent resolution urging the President and the Congress of the United States to act promptly and with necessary appropriate action to provide for the release of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and to extend sympathy to the families of two Mississippians who are crew members on the ill-fated ship

Whereas, the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, an honorably commissioned ship of the United States Navy, while proudly flying from its mast the cherished and revered Stars and Stripes of the United States of America, was illegally boarded and seized by a numerically superior naval force of the North Korean Government; and

Whereas, the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was sailing on the open seas and in no manner breached any of the rules of the sea nor committed any overt or threatening act to provide said seizure; and

Whereas, the honor and dignity of the United States of America has been offended, her glorious banner sullied, and the national pride and personal spirit of the valiant crew wounded and bruised; and

Whereas, two young Mississippians were among the crew of the ill-fated ship; Communications Technician Second Class Rodney H. Duke of Ranking County and Gunner's Mate First Class Dennis R. Wadley of Leake County, are illegally held by the North Korean Government:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to act without delay in providing for the immediate release of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its entire complement to the United States, and we further urge that such action that is necessary and warranted for impletion be applied without quiver or qualm.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to each member of the Mississippi delegation in the United States Congress, and a copy sent to Mr. and Mrs. M. H. Wadley, Carthage, Mississippi, and to the Reverend and Mrs. Fred Duke, Pelahatchie, Mississippi.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 25, 1968.

JOHN R. JUNKIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1968.

CHARLES L. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.

Educational Opportunities for District of Columbia Police

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the matter of educational incentives for our police force, you may also wish to consider the availability of educational facilities in the area. Many of the educational institutions in this area have had degree programs in police science for many years. American University, here in the District, offers several courses of study: A certificate in police administration, 30 semester hours; an associate degree in police administration, 60 semester hours; or a bachelor of science degree in police administration, 120 hours. The University of Maryland has developed an associate in arts degree certificate program in law enforcement, and is planning to establish a 4-year degree program. Montgomery County Junior College offers an A.A. degree in police science, and Northern Virginia Community College also has a police science department offering an associate in arts degree.

The facilities are available; we cannot refuse to encourage the members of our Police Department to make use of them. By not doing so, we only deprive the District of Columbia of a modern, professional, and fully trained police force.

National Negro History Week in California

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD a proclamation by Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, designating this past week, February 10–18, as "Negro History Week" in California. It is appropriate, at this time, that all of us, not only those of us from California, be reminded of the significant contributions which the Negro has made to American history and to the development of American culture.

To contributions which the Negro race has made to every aspect of our national achievement are as varied as they are impressive. The arts have been immeasurably enriched by artists like Leontyne Price, Louis Armstrong, and Andre Watts, to name but three.

The sciences have profited from the services of men like Dr. Percy L. Julian, one of America's most distinguished research chemists. His discoveries in connection with the synthetic manufacture of certain important drugs have won him international fame.

The reputation of the American sports community depends greatly upon American athletes—men like Willie Mays, Archie Moore, and Charlie Taylor. Negroes have, in the last two decades, contributed, with increasing influence, to the political life of America. Thurgood Marshall, Robert C. Weaver, Ralph Bunche—these are names familiar to every household, and they belong to men who have significantly shaped the society we live in today.

Negroes have played a most important part in the formation of the State of California. The first Jesuit missionaries endeavoring to settle in California, in the middle 18th century, were assisted in their efforts by Negro soldiers who preserved their lives against Indian attacks. The first burial in a Christian cemetery at Monterey, in 1771, was that of a Negro, who had served the cause of the Jesuits. The historian, H. H. Bancroft, in speaking of the founding of Los Angeles, declares that the original settlement was founded September 4, 1781, by a body of 12 settlers and their families—46 persons in all, several of whom were Negroes.

Just as the Negro defended the early settlers of California, he has fought valiantly for the cause of freedom in every major conflict from the Civil War to the Vietnam war. I, personally, would like to pay special tribute to the many Negroes who are defending our national honor in Vietnam and elsewhere around the world; and to the many here at home who are working to promote racial harmony and national unity. They are truly the unsung heroes of our time—and I hope historians will not overlook them in recording the turbulent events of the 20th century.

At this point, I take pride in presenting Governor Reagan's proclamation, and commend it to the attention of everyone who sincerely desires the progress of both the Negro race and the American Republic.

Text of the proclamation follows:

Whereas Citizens throughout California will be observing the period of February 10th to 18th as the 53rd annual National Negro History Week, sponsored by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History; and

Whereas This period will be a fitting time for all Californians to contemplate the significant contributions which Negro citizens have made in science, industry, government, and the professions to the enrichment and advancement of our multi-racial culture; and

Whereas The Authors' Study Club, the Los Angeles branch of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, is sponsoring appropriate observances in California;

Now therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the period of February 10th to 18th "Negro History Week" in California and urge that all Californians take advantage of this opportunity to learn of the roles and contributions of the American Negro in the development of the United States and the State of California.

National Future Farmers Week

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as many of us here are aware, this is National Future Farmers Week. And it is a rather special week this year—marking as it does the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Future Farmers of America.

"Challenging Youth In Agriculture" is the theme for this year's observance. How fitting a theme it is. Upon the shoulders of these young men rests our future agriconomy. They deserve our commendation, for I am sure their belief in the future of farming is sorely tried these days. Agriculture is a difficult and demanding and complex field—and this Nation is dependent upon it. But prices paid for their products are low, the cost of every facet of farming operations is up, and draft calls hit rural areas particularly hard since a great many of these young men are already the mainstay of their families' farms. Nevertheless, they continue to learn the agribusiness, and are accepting the responsibilities given them by our Nation.

The FFA has played and continues to play a vital part in the development of this Nation's agriculture and in imbuing the youthful membership with that wonderful spirit of dedication and determination which will be the backbone of our Nation in years to come. Disregarding all else that our agriconomy embraces, the most basic fact still stands: a nation must be fed. Without agricultural soundness and stability, we could never achieve any sort of national soundness or stability.

And so we are privileged to pay tribute to the Future Farmers of America for accepting this tremendous challenge—to all these young men to the thanks of this Nation, for they are, indeed, America's future.

George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today Americans from coast to coast join in celebrating the 236th anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

I am indebted to Mrs. Russell Lowe, the mother of Mrs. Jane Peigler of my congressional staff, for having uncovered in her family archives a verbatim transcript of "The Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation," by George Washington.

I share this document with my colleagues, by inserting it in the RECORD, as a warm tribute to our first President:

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S RULES OF CIVILITY AND DECENT BEHAVIOUR IN COMPANY AND CONVERSATION

From a paper found among the early writings of George Washington copied from the original with literal exactness and edited with notes by J. M. Toner, M.D., in 1888.

The text following is an exact copy from the original manuscript, having been carefully compared with the corrected therefrom, even when errors or omissions are obvious.

This book has been gnawed by mice. Rule 12 and all at bottom of any of the pages had been nearly destroyed. Every word and letter remaining has been copied and are here given:

"1. Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are present.

"2. When in Company, put not your Hands to any Part of the Body, not usually Discovered.

"3. Shew Nothing to your Friend that may affright him.

"4. In the Presence of Others sing not to yourself with a humming Noise, nor Drum, with your Fingers or Feet.

"5. If you Cough, Sneeze, Sigh, or Yawn, do it not Loud, but Privately; and Speak not in your Yawning, but put Your handkerchief or Hand before your face and turn aside.

"6. Sleep not when others Speak, Sit not when others stand, Speak not when you Should hold your Peace, walk not on when others Stop.

"7. Put not off your Cloths in the presence of Others, nor go out your Chamber half Drest.

"8. At play and at Fire its Good manners to give Place to the last comer, and affect not to Speak Louder than ordenary.

"9. Spit not in the Fire, nor Stoop low before it neither Put your Hands into the Flames to warm them, nor Set your Feet upon the Fire especially if there be meat before it.

"10. When you Sit down, Keep your Feet firm and Even, without putting one on the other or Crossing them.

"11. Shift not your self in the Sight of others nor Gnaw on your nails.

"12. Shake not the head, Feet, or Legs, rowl not the Eys, lift not one eyebrow higher than the other, wry not the mouth, and bedew no mans face with your Spittle, by appr * * * r him * * * you Speak.

"13. Kill no Vermin as Fleas, lice ticks &c in the Sight of Others, if you See any filth or thick Spittle put your foot Dexteriously upon it, if it be upon the Cloths of your Companions, Put it off privately, and if it be upon your own Cloths return Thanks to him who puts it off.

"14. Turn not your Back to others especially in Speaking, Jog not the Table or Desk on which Another reads or writes, lean not upon any one.

"15. Keep your Nails clean and Short, also your Hands and Teeth Clean, yet without Shewing any great Concern for them.

"16. Do not Puff up the Cheeks, Loll not out the tongue rub the Hands, or beard, thrust out the lips, or bite them or keep the Lips too open or too Close.

"17. Be no Flatterer, neither Play with any that delights not to be Play'd Withal.

"18. Read no Letters, Books, or Papers in Company but when there is a Necessity for the doing of it you must ask leave: come not near the Books or Writings of Another so as to read them unless desired or give your opinion of them unask'd also look not nigh when another is writing a Letter.

"19. Let your Countenance be pleasant but in Serious Matters Somewhat grave

"20. The Gestures of the Body must be Suited to the discourse you are upon

"21. Reproach none for the Infirmities of Nature, nor Delight to Put them that have in mind thereof.

"22. Shew not yourself glad at the Misfortune of another though he were your enemy.

"23. When you see a Crime punished, you may be inwardly Pleased; but always shew Pity to the Suffering Offender.

" * * * too much at any publick * * *

"25. Superfluous Complements and all Affectation of Ceremonie are to be avoided yet where due they are not to be Neglected.

"26. In pulling off your Hat to Persons of Distinction, as Noblemen, Justices, Churchmen &c make a Reverence, bowing more or less according to the Custom of the Better Bred, and Quality of the Persons Amongst your equals expect not always that they Should begin with you first, but to Pull off the Hat when there is no need is Affectation, in the Manner of Saluting and resaluting in words keep the most usual Custom.

"27. Tis ill manners to bid one more eminent than yourself be covered as well as not to do it to whom it's due Likewise he that makes to much haste to Put on his hat does not well, yet he ought to Put it on at the first, or at most the Second time of being ask'd; now what is herein Spoken, of Qualification in behaviour in Saluting, ought also to be observed in taking of Place, and Sitting down for ceremonies without Bounds is troublesome.

"28. If any one comes to Speak to you while you are Sitting Stand up tho he be your Inferiour, and when you Present Seats let it be to every one according to his Degree.

"29. When you meet with one of Greater Quality than yourself, Stop, and retire especially if it be at a Door or any Straight place to give way for him to Pass.

"30. In walking the highest Place in most Countrys Seems to be on the right hand therefore Place yourself on the left of him whom you desire to Honour; but if three walk together the middle Place is the most Honourable the wall is usually given to the most worthy if two walk together.

"31. If any one far Surpasses others, either in age, Estate, or Merit, * * * would give Place to a meaner than himself * * * the one ought not to except it. So * * * it above once or twice.

"32. To one that is your equal, or not much inferior you are to give the chief Place in your Lodging and he to who 'tis offered ought at the first to refuse it but at the Second to accept though not without acknowledging his own unworthiness.

"33. They that are in Dignity or in office have in all places Preceedency but whilst they are Young they ought to respect those that are their equals in Birth or other Qualitys, though they have no Publick charge.

"34. It is good Manners to prefer them to whom we speak before ourselves especially if they be above us with whom in no Sort we ought to begin.

"35. Let your Discourse with Men of Business be Short and Comprehensive.

"36. Artificers & Persons of low Degree ought not to use many ceremonies to Lords, or Others of high Degree but Respect and highly Honour them, and those of high Degree ought to treat them with affibility & Courtesie, without Arrogancy.

"37. In Speaking to men of Quality do not lean nor Look them full in the Face, nor approach too near them at lest Keep a full Pace from them.

"38. In visiting the Sick, do not Presently play the Physician if you be not Knowing therein.

"39. In writing or Speaking, give to every Person his due Title According to his Degree & the Custom of the Place.

"40. Strive not with your Superiors in argument, but always Submit your Judgment to others with Modesty.

"41. Undertake not to Teach your equal in the art himself Professes; it flavours of arrogancy.

"42. * * * courtesie be proper to the * * * Dignity of his place * * * t yr. same with a * * * Clown and a Prince.

"43. Do not express Joy before one sick or in pain for that contrary Passion will aggravate his Misery.

"44. When a man does all he can though it Succeeds not well blame not him that did it.

"45. Being to advise or reprehend any one consider whether it ought to be in Publick or in Private; presently, or at Some other time in what terms to do it & in reproving Shew no Sign of Cholar but do it with all Sweetness and Mildness.

"46. Take all Admonitions thankfully in what Time or Place Soever given but afterwards not being culpable take a Time or Place Convenient to let him know it that gave them.

"47. Mock not nor Jest at anything of importance break no Jest that are Sharp Biting and if you Deliver anything witty and Pleasant abstain from Laughing there at yourself.

"48. Wherein Wherein you reprove Another be unblameable yourself; for example is more prevalent than Precepts.

"49. Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.

"50. Be not hasty to believe flying Reports to the Disparagement of any.

"51. Wear not your Cloths foul, unript or Dusty but See they be Brush'd once every day at least and take heed that you approach not to any Uncleaness.

"52. In your Apparel be Modest and endeavour to accommodate Nature, rather than to procure Admiration keep to the Fashion of your equals, Such as are Civil and orderly with respect to Times and Places.

"53. Run not in the Streets, neither go too slowly nor with Mouth open go not Shaking Yr. Arms * * * not upon the toes, nor in a Dancing * * *

"54. Play not the Peacock, looking everwhere about you, to See if you be well Deck't, if your Shoes fit well if your Stockings Sit neatly, and Cloths handsomely.

"55. Eat not in the Street, nor in ye House, out of Season.

"56. Associate yourself with Men of good Quality if you Esteem your own Reputation; for 'tis better to be alone than in bad Company.

"57. In walking up and Down in a House, only with One in Company, if he be Greater than yourself, at the first give him the Right hand and Stop not till he does and be not the first that turns, and when you do turn let it be with your face towards him if he be a Man of Great Quality, walk not with him Cheek by Jowl but Somewhat behind him; but yet in Such a Manner that he may easily Speak to you.

"58. Let your Conversation be without Malice or Envy, for 'tis a Sign of a Tractable and Commendable Nature, & in all Causes of Passion admit Reason to Govern.

"59. Never express anything unbecoming, nor Act Ag'tt ye Rules of Moral before your inferiours.

"60. Be not immodest in urging your Friends to Discover a Secret.

"61. Utter not base and frivilous things amongst grave and Learn'd Men nor very Difficult Questions or Subjects, amongst the Ignorant or things hard to be believed, Stuff not your Discourse with Sentences amongst your Betters nor Equals.

"62. Speak not of doleful Things in a Time of Mirth or at the Table; Speak not of Melancholy Things a Death and Wounds, and if others Mention them Change if you can the Discourse tell not your Dreams, but to your intimate Friend.

"63. A man ought not to value himself of his Atchievements or rare Qual * * * lost Virtue or Kindred * * *

"64. Break not a Jest where none take pleasure in mirth Laugh not aloud, nor at all without Occasion, deride no man's Misfortune, tho' there seem to be Some cause.

"65. Speak not injurious Words neither in Jest nor Earnest Scoff at none although they give Occasion.

"66. Be not forward but friendly and Courteous; the first to Salute hear and answer & be not Pensive when It's a time to converse.

"67. Detract not from others neither be excessive in Commanding.

"68. Go not thither, where you know not, whether you Shall be Welcome or not. Give not Advice whth being Ask'd & when desired do it briefly.

"69. If two contend together take not the part of either unconstrained and be not obstinate in your Opinion, in Things indiferent be of the Major side.

"70. Reprehend not the imperfections of others for that belongs to Parents Masters and Superiours.

"71. Gaze not on the marks or blemishes of Others and ask not how they came. What you may Speak in Secret to your Friend deliver not before others.

"72. Speak not in an unknown Tongue in Company but in your own Language and that as those of Quality do and not as ye Vulgar; Sublime matters treat Seriously.

"73. Think before your Speak pronounce not imperfectly nor bring out your Words too hastily but orderly and Distinctly.

"74. When Another Speaks be attentive your Self and disturb not the Audience if any hesitate in his Words help him not nor Prompt him without desired, Interrupt him not, nor Answer him till his Speech be ended.

"75. In the midst of Discourse ask * * * but if you Perceive any Stop because of * * * to Proceed: If a Person of Quality comes in while your Conversing its handsome to Repeat what was said before.

"76. While you are talking, Point not with your Finger at him of Whom you Discourse nor Approach too near him to whom you talk especially to his face.

"77. Treat with men at fit Times about Business & Whisper not in the Company of Others.

"78. Make no Comparisons and if any of the Company be Commended for any brave act of Virtue, commend not another for the Same.

"79. Be not apt to relate News, if you know not the truth thereof. In Discoursing of things you Have hear Name not your Author always A Secret Discover not.

"80. Be not Tedius in Discourse or in reading unless you find the Company pleased therewith.

"81. Be not Curious to Know the Affairs of Others neither approach to those that Speak in Private

"82. Undertake not what you cannot Perform but be Careful to keep your Promise

"83. When you deliver a matter do it without Passion & with Discretion, however mean ye Person be you do it too

"84. When your Superiors talk to any Body hearken not neither Speak nor Laugh

"85. In Company of these Higher Quality than yourself Speak not till you are ask'd a Question then Stand upright put of your Hat & Answer in few words.

"86. In Disputes, be not so Desirous to Overcome as not to give Liberty to each one to deliver his Opinion and Submit to ye Judgment of ye Major Part especially if they are Judges of the Dispute.

"87. * * * as becomes a Man Grave * * * Settled and attentive * * * dict not at every turn what others Say.

"88. Be not tedius in Discourse, make not many Digressions, nor repeat often the Same manner of Discourse.

"89. Speak not Evil of the absent for it is unjust.

"90. Being Set at meat Scratch not neither Spit Cough or blow your Nose except there's a Necessity for it.

"91. Make no Shew of taking great Delight in your Victuals, Feed not With Greediness; cut your Bread with a Knife, lean not on the Table neither find fault with what you Eat.

"92. Take no Salt or cut Bread with your Knife Greasy.

"93. Entertaining any one at table it is decent to present him wt meat. Undertake not to help others undesired by ye Master.

"94. If you Soak bread in the Sauce let it be no more than what you put in your Mouth at a time and blow not your broth at Table but Stay till Cools of it Self.

"95. Put not your meat to your Mouth with your Knife in your hand neither Spit forth the Stones of any fruit Pye upon a Dish nor cast anything under the table.

"96. It's unbecoming to Stoop much to ones Meat. Keep your Fingers clean & when foul wipe them on a Corner of your Table Napkin.

"97. Put not another bit into your Mouth til the former be Swallowed let not your Morsels be too big for the jowls.

"98. Drink not nor talk with your mouth full neither Gaze about you while you are a Drinking.

"99. Drink not too leisurely nor yet too hastily. Before and after Drinking wipe your Lips breath not then or Ever with too Great a Noise, for its uncivil.

"100. Cleanse not your teeth with the Table Cloth Napkin Fork or Knife but if Others do it let it be done wt a Pick Tooth

"101. Rince not your Mouth in the Presence of Others

"102. It is out of use to call upon the Company often to Eat nor need you Drink to others every Time you Drink.

"103. In Company of your Betters be not * * * than they are lay not your Arm but ar.

"104. It belongs to ye Chiefest in Company to unfold his Napkin and fall to Meat first, But he ought then to Begin in time and to Dispatch with Dexterity that ye Slowest may have time allowed him.

"105. Be not Angry at Table whatever happens & if you have reason to be so, Shew it not but on a Chearfull Countenance especially if there be Strangers for good Humour make one Dish of Meat a Feast.

"106. Set not yourself at ye upper * * * of ye Table but if it be your Due or that ye Master of ye house will have it so, Contend not lest you Should Trouble ye company.

"107. If others talk at Table be attentive but talk not with Meat in your Mouth

"108. When you Speak of God or his Attributes, let it be Seriously & * * * Reverence. Honor & obey your Natural Parents altho they be Poor

"109. Let your Recreation be Manfull not Sinfull.

"110. Labour to keep alive in your Breast the Little Spark of Celestial fire called Conscience."

Elect A. B. J.?

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the current emotionally trying times that force many emotionally determined choices, I was pleased to see the following realistic appraisal of the forthcoming presidential race. Last Sunday the editors of the New York Times focused their hard realistic eye on some of the factors that will contribute to the race.

I found it refreshing to find the Times "back on the track." The New York Times editorial follows:

ELECT A. B. J.?

As this election year begins, a button has made its appearance reading in large letters: "Elect ABJ." In much smaller print, ABJ turns out to be "Anyone But Johnson." There is no question that this set of initials expresses the attitude of a growing number of people. Mr. Johnson has lost the confidence and respect of many voters and even among the larger number of people who agree with some or all of his policies, he evokes comparatively little affection or admiration.

Those who feel most strongly against Mr. Johnson argue that only a new man in the White House could lead the nation out of the Vietnam impasse. Any Republican, it is contended, could make peace more easily than the incumbent who inescapably has an emotional commitment to present policies.

This is a powerful argument and, in our view, the most telling argument against President Johnson's re-election. But to make peace a man has to want to do so, be willing to pay the price for a settlement, and know how to negotiate it. These criteria apply as well to the Republican aspirants as they do to Mr. Johnson. Can it be said that Mr. Nixon, now the leading Republican candidate, is less bellicose, more willing to sacrifice a political advantage, and more calm and skillful in negotiation than Mr. Johnson? And if not Mr. Nixon, how about Governor Reagan?

Clearly, just any Republican cannot be counted upon to hasten the prospects for peace in Vietnam. Those who speak of "any" Republican are actually making one of two major qualifications. The first is to dismiss the Nixon-Reagan statements on the war as so much "campaign rhetoric." Governor Reagan has been in public life too short a time for one to form a judgment about the consistency of his views, but in Mr. Nixon's case, we see no reason to question the coherence and authenticity of his opinions on foreign policy. His tactical cleverness and verbal dexterity in domestic politics notwithstanding, he has for more than fifteen years taken a reasonably consistent "hard" line in foreign affairs. Those who think that Mr. Nixon does not believe what he says about a stronger military effort in Vietnam are standing on shaky ground.

The other tacit qualification made by those who favor "any" alternative to Mr. Johnson is that the alternative is going to be Governor Rockefeller or Governor Romney or Senator Percy. But Mr. Rockefeller's current views on Vietnam are unknown and Messrs. Romney and Percy are singularly lacking in experience in foreign affairs. Neither of them has the stature that General Eisenhower possessed in 1952 when ending the Korean War was the dominant election issue. The ambiguities and uncertainties of their possible candidacies point up the underlying truth that politics is a matter of choice, and rational choice requires that alternatives be clearly visible.

If President Johnson's record were hopelessly negative, it might still be possible to sport an ABJ button. But, in fact, his domestic record in education, health, and civil rights has many strengths. In foreign affairs, he has labored patiently for disarmament, for *detente* with Russia, and for freer trade. Even in Vietnam, where he made a grave miscalculation in committing American power on unfavorable terrain for an unattainable objective, Mr. Johnson has resisted the superhawks who want to blockade Haiphong and level Hanoi. And as his careful management of the Pueblo affair makes clear, the President seems at last to have been impressed by one of the most important and most painful lessons to be learned from Vietnam: America's reach should not exceed its grasp.

It is a democratic fallacy, encouraged by the fake intimacy of television, that heads of state have to be lovable or even likable. In the nuclear age, a President has to be rated on his competence, not his charm. It is up to the Republicans to produce a convincing alternative to LBJ, and a gross error for them to rely for victory on his present chief rival, ABJ.

Dr. Culbreth B. Cook: His Aim Is First-Class Jobs

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, with the great emphasis we place on professors in our modern universities, we often overlook the splendid work being performed by administrators and guidance personnel. Dr. Culbreth B. Cook. director of student placement and financial aid for Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, is a wonderful example of what an understanding and perceptive administrator can do to aid young students in adjusting to our rapidly changing society. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Cleveland Press on February 20:

HIS AIM IS FIRST-CLASS JOBS

(By Bob Seltzer)

Job placement is the first love of Dr. Culbreth B. Cook, and he finds the greatest demand of employers is for students in mechanical, electronic and building construction technology.

Dr. Cook, director of student placement and financial aid for the Metropolitan Campus of Cuyahoga Community College, said these students earn associates in science degrees. Starting salaries are from $500 to $600 a month.

"Big corporations put in bids several months in advance for our June graduates," said Dr. Cook. "Second in demand for men is accountants. For women, demand is highest for those completing the two-year courses for registered nurses, dental hygienist and secretarial science. Third is data processing.

"There are not enough Negro students in these fields. Their families and counselors are steeped in the old stereotype of preparing them for medicine, the law, teaching, social work, dentistry and the ministry. The sooner they aim for occupations in demand, the closer and quicker Negro students will get to first-class citizenship in all areas."

Dr. Cook, who graduated from Shaw High School, earned his M.A. and Ed. D. degrees from Western Reserve University and took post-doctoral work at Harvard and John Carroll University, is co-director of a workshop at Case WRU with Dr. Anne Pruitt, assistant professor of guidance and counseling.

The workshop, "Employment Problems of Negro High School Graduates," will hold its fourth annual three-week course in late June and early July. It is made up of teams of three from high schools and junior high schools—a teacher, a counselor and an administrator.

"We find that these graduates are ill-equipped in communication skills: reading, writing and arithmetic," Dr. Cook said. "I am a strong advocate of returning to the intensive teaching of the three R's at all levels."

Dr. Cook, a native of Cincinnati, coordinates campus and outside student employment for CCC and heads the college's aid program of scholarships, grants-in-aid and loans. This aid is based on need and scholarship achievement.

Before joining CCC in 1964 as vocational counselor, he was placement director for John Hay High School. For 25 years he taught in Cleveland junior and senior high schools. Dr. Cook, 56, zestful and dedicated, said his placement post and wide acquaintance in industry afford his best area for race relations.

"My concern is to put Negroes in places where they never have been before—'Pilot placement,' the Urban League calls it. I always stress the point of equal opportunity—not preferred treatment. All the Negro asks is the opportunity to achieve equality in employment, education and housing."

Dr. Cook enlisted in the Navy in 1943 and helped build and administer the Navy's first school for illiterates at the Great Lakes (Ill.) Naval Training Station. Later, he taught adult illiterates for the Cleveland School Board's adult education department.

The educator's wife, Katherine, holds an M.A. in group social work from WRU. She was the first Negro Girl Scout executive in the Cleveland area. The Cooks' daughter, Julie, is a junior at Western College for Women, Oxford, O. The Cooks live at 1568 E. 108th St.

With GOP It Is Nixon by 2 to 1

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Miami Herald of February 19, 1968:

WITH GOP IT IS NIXON BY 2 TO 1—ROCKY SECOND, ROMNEY BEHIND REAGAN

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Richard Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over seven other GOP contenders as the choice of Republican voters for the 1968 presidential nomination.

The former vice president is the favorite of 51 per cent of rank-and-file Republicans in the latest survey and now leads his closest rival, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, by 26 percentage points.

Rockefeller's standing has shown little change since the previous survey, in early January, while Nixon has gained 9 percentage points.

Rockefeller surged in popularity with Republican voters between November and January when he nearly doubled his share of the vote from 15 per cent to 27 per cent.

Nixon has led the field in all but one of the 23 tests of GOP candidate strength conducted since the 1964 presidential election.

The exception came in November 1966, when the newly reelected Gov. George Romney of Michigan briefly moved into the lead.

Romney, the only other announced candidate on the list, continues to lose favor with Republicans. Firmly in second place before his "brainwash" statement in early September (with 24 per cent of the vote to Nixon's 35 per cent), Romney now has only 7 per cent of the vote and is in fourth place behind Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Interviewing for the current survey was completed Feb. 7, immediately following Nixon's announcement of his candidacy and just prior to the clash between Mayor John Lindsay of New York City and Gov. Rockefeller over the recent sanitation strike in that city.

It should be carefully noted that the results in today's report are based on a national sample of Republicans and cannot be applied to any one region or state.

Nixon has also registered gains with Independents.

Rockefeller in January has drawn even with Nixon but the latter has now moved into a 34 to 26 per cent lead among Independents.

The choices of Independents are important since numerically they represent a voting group as large as Republicans. In order to do well in a presidential election, a Republican nominee must make a good showing with this group.

Bill Harrison Offers Wyoming Seniority, Experience, and Accomplishments

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, BILL HARRISON, offers Wyoming seniority, experience, and accomplishments in his announcement for a sixth term as the State's sole Representative in this body, and I am pleased to note that the newspapers of Wyoming have responded warmly to his announcement.

All of us who work with BILL HARRISON hope and expect that the voters of Wyoming will respond in the same fashion. Certainly there is no substitute for the ability, the energy, the devotion to duty and the experience that make him an outstanding Member of Congress.

I wish to include with these remarks editorial comments from the Cheyenne State Tribune, the Sheridan Press, the Casper Star-Tribune, and the Torrington Telegram, as well as a copy of Mr. HARRISON's announcement that he will seek a sixth term:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

HARRISON DECLARES

The most notable thing about William Henry Harrison's announcement for re-election to Congress is that it came as early as it did. Most politicians or aspiring office-seekers usually play it coy, waiting until a time closer to the filing deadline before formally making their intentions known even though only men, women and children are aware of their intentions.

By his early declaration, the durable Bill Harrison has served notice to one and all, both within and without his own party, there should be no doubt as to his plans and that all prospective primary and general election opponents must take notice thereof.

These latter might very well study past political history as well as the trend of the times, particularly the last two elections in this state.

When Harrison lost his only House race, in 1964, to Teno Roncalio, he went down by a mere 2,211 votes in an election that produced one of the biggest Democratic landslides in both state and nation, in the preceding eight years. Lyndon Johnson carried that election in Wyoming by 18,187 votes, the biggest popular majority accorded any Presidential candidate since Eisenhower (Nixon's margin over Kennedy in 1960 was 14,120).

Harrison, thus, was not overwhelmed in 1964 by any means; and he proved his ability to bounce back from that loss by immediately commencing his campaign for another term which he successfully carried out nearly two years later.

While age has been made a factor by his opponents in almost every race Bill Harrison has run in the past half dozen years, he has shot this theory to shreds by bouncing around like a 20-year-old.

Much was made of the fact in the 1966 election that while Harrison had been on the House Appropriations Committee before his 1964 defeat, and that Harrison suggested that if elected he would get his old seat back on that 50-member panel whose influence is so far-reaching.

Bill Harrison confounded these seers who said it couldn't be done by not only getting back on the appropriations committee but also by getting a ranking on it considerably above first-termers (17th out of 21 Republican members).

It might be well to point out at this juncture that Harrison suffered only one other political defeat in a general election contest since he first was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1950.

That loss came in 1954, when he chose the late Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney for the U.S. Senate. Despite O'Mahoney's enormous prestige and his strong political image, he won this contest—an off-year affair between the two monumental Eisenhower victories, only by 57,845 to 54,407, an edge of 3,438 votes.

It may well be that others will choose Harrison, if not within his own party, then certainly without. And it is probable that lacking anything else to contend against him with, they very well will harp on the age issue. Harrison will be 72 next August but if he recognizes this, he acts more like he thinks the figures were reversed.

He will be well-nigh unbeatable in the primary, and with all signs pointing to this as an obvious Republican year with no outside moral support from a Lyndon Johnson whose own record could well sink the most doughty Democratic candidates, Harrison very well could be unbeatable in the general election too. But apparently to make sure no one mistakes his intentions, he has made them clear, very early.

Anyone who chooses him can expect to have his work cut out for him. History supports that theory, and present conditions lend strength to history.

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, Feb. 13, 1968]

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Dick Redburn)

It was late at night, and the 1949 Wyoming legislature had or was near adjournment. In a room off the legislative chambers in the Capitol building in Cheyenne several people were talking and relaxing.

Among them were Lewis Bates, then editor and editorial writer for the Wyoming State Tribune; myself, then a reporter for the Tribune; and Bill Harrison, who was completing a third term in the Wyoming House of Representatives. There were others in the room but the faces and names are now hazy.

Bates, who by then had covered many Wyoming legislatures and had a shrewd sense of what many of these men thought, asked Harrison what his plans were.

"I think I'll try for Congress," Bill Harrison said.

Unofficial and informal, this was nevertheless the first time Harrison announced he would enter higher level politics.

Bill Harrison did what he said.

I remained on the reportorial staff of the Tribune for a time longer, and was to see Bill Harrison again. One noon coming out of the Tribune office, we nearly collided, but Harrison, then in the Republican primary seeking his first term in Congress, was undisturbed. He whipped out a campaign card and proceeded on his rounds meeting more people, handing out more cards.

Harrison was elected to Congress.

Off and on over the next few years paths would cross again. They became like paths when Ike Eisenhower ran for his first term as president. By that time, this reporter had become a member of the staff of Gov. Frank A. Barrett, and in that election Barrett was taking on the then Democratic political camp of the late Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney. Election of state officials was also up that year, and the Republicans consolidated travel, and campaign schedules.

Becoming involved in that campaign as a Barrett aid, meant becoming involved in the campaigns of the others. It should be recorded that in that campaign the main focus was on Barrett's race against O'Mahoney, while Harrison had the easier race.

But Bill Harrison considers no race easy. I think that at times Harrison felt his race was being underplayed, and at times I think he felt edgy about it.

It was also then, I discovered what a Bill Harrison campaign meant—it meant pounding the pavement in every town and hamlet in the state—it meant going into rural areas where the farmers and ranchers were at work—it meant long nights planning the next day or the next several days—it meant long nights planning speeches, and planning new advertising to meet the competition.

Harrison, Barrett and all the rest of the Republicans swept in with Eisenhower, and with feet sufficiently soaked in the political waters, I moved to Sheridan and returned to the newspaper business.

But shedding political experiences is not like shedding the measles. Politics may rub off, but never completely, so this acquaintance with Bill Harrison has continued, as have others.

Just as Bill Harrison put in exhaustive hours in the Wyoming legislature, so has he put in exhaustive hours in Washington. It has also been nice to have a personal friend in Washington. We certainly are not alone when we say that having a Sheridan country or a northeast Wyoming resident in Washington is a valuable state of affairs. When local problems need attention on a national level, there is someone there with a sense of understanding and a sense of empathy to the problem because it involves the place he calls home.

Bill Harrison has been this kind of a servant to the county and area, even as he represented the whole of Wyoming and the nation.

It would be flourishing the trumpets too loudly to say we've always agreed with him, or that we've always found him right. We lay no claim to political Godship for Harrison.

But claim can be laid to experience.

Experience in the ways of getting things done in Washington.

Experience in dealing with national problems.

Experience in dealing with the interests of Wyoming.

More experience in dealing with the interests of this area when attention on the national level was necessary.

It was last Friday that I saw Bill Harrison again. He was standing in the lobby of the Bank of Commerce, awaiting the elevator, and on the way to his upstairs office.

We talked, he about the important things going on in Washington, and I about politics.

He would run again for Congress, he said.

And I thought—we are back where we started in 1949. But we weren't. There are 19 years in between—19 years most of which had been given in the service of the public at home, in the state, and in the nation.

Carrying his brief case, Harrison caught the elevator and headed for his office. In Washington or at home, there is work to be done.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Star-Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

HARRISON ANNOUNCES

Rep. William Henry Harrison's decision to run for reelection was not particularly surprising. The timing, however, was considerably in advance of general expectations.

Since he had made up his mind this early, Rep. Harrison did the fair thing by the party in making it known, so that other prospective candidates could reach a decision based on the facts rather than on speculation.

Despite his age, Harrison is known as an extremely capable campaigner, and he can be expected to acquit himself well. His reputation in this field will not necessarily discourage others from entering the lists, and it should be a healthful circumstance if there is a clearly-drawn primary contest.

The Republican Party has ample room for divergent approaches to the problems facing the country, and competition does not imply repudiation. The voters are entitled to have the opportunity for choice in the primary as well as in the general election.

[From the Torrington (Wyo.) Telegram, Feb. 15, 1968]

State, Nation Need Harrison

News that Bill Harrison would be a candidate for re-election to Congress came as a surprise to few people in the State of Wyoming. It should be good news, however, that he made it official.

Bill Harrison has served his state and his nation well. His political philosophies are particularly vital at this stage of the nation's involvement in world affairs, as well as at home.

Harrison's detractors from the other side of the political aisle have, and will in the future, make his age a factor in the campaign. It should be pointed out the Johnson Administration made the most noise about job discrimination because of age. It seems to us that if ever maturity and the wisdom that comes with age were required it is now! Putting it another way, the Democratic party powers-that-be have given just one more reason why Bill Harrison should be re-elected!

Political Plans for 1968

(Statement of Congressman William Henry Harrison, at a press conference in Casper, Wyo., February 12, 1968)

I have come home to Wyoming to announce publicly to the party and people who have supported me in my ten years in Congress that I intend to wage a vigorous and successful campaign for a sixth term in the United States House of Representatives.

The anniversary of the birth of the President who created the Republican party seems a particularly appropriate moment for my announcement, for it is my party which must first pass upon my credentials for another term.

It is to my party that I submit my record without hesitation and assert that what I have accomplished for Wyoming, what I am in the process of accomplishing, and what I intend for the future qualify me for the nomination and for the seat that I have held during the 82nd, 83rd, 87th, 88th and 90th Congresses.

The only measure of personal pride that I claim is in my affection for the State of Wyoming and her people. I am proud to be a Wyomingite, to have served this State and her people in three consecutive terms in the State Legislature and in five terms in the United States Congress.

I have watched Wyoming mature from an essentially single industry state of the 1930's to the diversified home of 340-thousand Americans which is Wyoming in the 1960's. I believe I can say that to no small extent I have been a part of that growth.

During my ten years in the Congress, I have introduced and worked for more than 150 bills and resolutions that sought the direct betterment of Wyoming. In those years, 24 Harrison bills and resolutions have passed the House and most of these become public laws. The average for Congressmen is two bills in a full two-session Congress.

I have supported, and will continue to support, the varied interests of my State; from our ranching and manufacturing, to tourism and minerals extraction. I will continue working for a broader economic base for Wyoming and for those Federal laws and latitudes vital to the goals we seek for our State. Wyoming needs a greater realization of her industrial potential; more jobs, and paychecks, not only to keep our sons and daughters in Wyoming working to the mutual benefit of themselves and our State, but to bring into Wyoming the new blood and creative talent which will benefit us mightily.

The press said of me editorially when I ran with Milward Simpson and Cliff Hansen in 1962, that my "interests have ranged from agriculture, to reclamation, to oil royalties. They have cut across the economic spectrum that is Wyoming." I might add that seniority in the House of Representatives has broadened those interests and given me new insights relating to them. This service has brought with it age, which I have never sought to conceal.

The people of my party and State know my record and my energies and they know that the other side of the coin of age is the side marked "experience and seniority." This is the truly important factor to State and Nation.

In an eloquent statement issued last month, Senator Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey—a liberal Democrat, I might add—called the use of age as a test for responsibility and work, "a misconception that should have been thoroughly discredited." Senator Williams, himself a young man, added that "experience is a precious commodity."

In my ten years in Congress I have missed not a single day of work because of illness—not even from a common cold—and my doctors assure me that I am in excellent health and fully capable of waging the kind of vigorous campaign that Wyoming deserves and will get from me.

And that brings me to another point which I feel in all honesty must be brought into the open to settle once and for all an unfounded rumor.

I say publicly for the record, that at no time in my last campaign, before or since, did I ever state or imply that I would not seek re-election this year. I intend to run on my record and accomplishments, past, present and future, and I sincerely hope any who might oppose me would do the same.

I have chosen Lincoln Day to make my announcement and I think it is appropriate to close my statement, and to invite the questions of the press, by recalling Lincoln's words on duty and responsibility.

Quote: "I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end."

Thank you.

"The Vulnerable Russians"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent episode of Hanoi's attacks in South Vietnam bears all the hallmarks of carefully calculated psychopolitical warfare. In essence, the broad campaign against the cities of South Vietnam was far more psychological and political in objective than military. This is an important lesson for us to learn both in the present and for the future.

The new book of "The Vulnerable Russians" shows the background of this type of warfare in the case of the Soviet Russian totalitarians and, through them and their specialized schools in this warfare, the cases of all other Communist functionaries, including Ho Chi Minh. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the book is simply written, revealing in numerous ways, and consistently documented. With broad perspective, it shows the foolhardiness of viewing Vietnam, Korea, or any other part of the Red Empire in divorce from the power center; namely, Moscow itself.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work.

The excerpts follow:

Historical Outlines of Soviet Russian Aggression

"Human history," said H. G. Wells, "is in essence a history of ideas." The history of totalitarian Russian aggression is undoubtedly a major episode of human history and in basic essence sharpens the contrast between the ideas of national and personal freedom and those of imperialist domination and totalitarian control. History, one can say, is philosophy teaching by examples. And the examples we shall consider here are not, as the Kremlin would have it, evidence of any mythical contest between Communism and capitalism but are, instead, evidence of a real contest between Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism, on the one hand, and national self-determination and personal liberty, on the other. Truly, those who do not know or remember the history of Soviet Russian aggression are condemned to repeat it.

* * * * *

Second, the history of Soviet Russian aggression portrays a gentic development of conquest, predation, and exploitation, without which pure analysis remains sterile. In this respect, our short understanding of this history explains in largest measure our persistent misconceptions of the Soviet Union—as seen, for example, in the absurd use of the term "the Soviets"—as well as our gullibility for skillful Russian propaganda and our constant reactionism to the cold war ventures of the adversary.

* * * * *

Thus a complete and factually grounded history of Soviet Russian imperialism is indispensable to our thoughts and actions in the permanent Cold War staged by Moscow. It is equally necessary for our behavior and operations in any hot global war. This history is the very basis of justification and confirmation of the sound warning given by the renowned Russian philosopher, Nicholas Berdyaev: "It is particularly important for Western minds to understand the national roots of Russian Communism and the fact that it was Russian history which determined its limits and shaped its character. A knowledge of Marxism will not help in this."

* * * * *

THE TSARIST RUSSIAN EMPIRE BACKGROUND

It is an open secret that we Americans are not exactly conspicuous in the areas of historical research, interpretation, and analysis. In fact, until recently, in our schools and in our daily existence we had even shown a disdain for historical inquiry and understanding. With regard to the reality of Soviet Russian aggression, some of us were awakened only when colonist Moscow took to overt means of threat and bluff against the interests of the United States following World War II. It has been of little concern to most of us that by private or official agency we have helped substantially to build up this monster from 1917 to the present, either by commission or omission of various deeds and works.

* * * * *

Every conceivable "Communist" technique today has an able institutional precedent in the empire-building enterprise started by Ivan the Terrible in the sixteenth century. The repertorie includes divide-and-conquer, conspiratorial networks, genocide, Russification, two steps forward and one backward, broken treaties, a self-assuring mystical messianism, smoke screens of totalistic ideologies, political partitionism, the police state, inventions and distortions of history, incitement of class struggles, slave labor, anti-Semitic pogroms, Potemkin Village tactics, "peaceful coexistence"—in brief, the fashioned implements of cold war gaming aimed at eventual conquest.

* * * * *

It is also an experience masked by a succession of deceptive ideologies: the Third Rome doctrine of Orthodox supremacy, racist Pan-Slavism, and materialistic Communism. Where it serves Moscow's purposes, each of these is put into use today. For example, the Morros testimony which led to the Sobel spy case in New York brought out the fact that, as Morros put it, the "Russian plot . . . goes beyond communism. They are for Pan-Slavism on a scale more ambitious than Hitler's fanatical dreams of world conquest." And Morros operated with functionaries on the highest levels of the Kremlin conspiratorial setup.

* * * * *

The Tsarist Russian Empire suffered from the same rebellious upsurge of patriotic nationalism that the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires did. We know of the Polish resistance and fight for national freedom in the spirit of Mickiewicz, Kosciuszko, and Pulaski, but how many of us know of the freedom fighters and the resistance against Russian domination elsewhere within the empire? Frankly, few of us are acquainted with the White Ruthenians Kalinovsky and Hryniavetski who assassinated Alexander II in 1881; the Ukrainian Shevchenko and the pervasive spirit of Mazepa in subjugated Ukraine; the jealous independence of the Don and Kuban Cossacks in the spirit of Razin and Pugachov; the freedom star of the Caucasus, Chamyl, and the innumerable revolts of the North Caucasian peoples throughout the nineteenth century; The Muslim Congress of 1905–1906 through which the Turkestani and Azerbijani formed a religious common front against Russian colonialism.

* * * * *

In marked measure the Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese War was attributable to the rumblings and dissension of the subjugated non-Russian peoples, and the Revolution of 1905 was in part the explosion of this force of nationalism. A decade later, in World War I, mass desertion of these non-Russian nationals crippled the so-called military steamroller of the Russian Empire. Over two decades later—after a long period of ostensible Communist indoctrination—millions of these non-Russians deserted again, practically placing the platter of victory before the Germans.

* * * * *

Although we still have to uncover and make use of these facts, in the field of experience the Russian Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, knew them well and used them effectively for their own ends. Today, this account would be condemned by Moscow as "the provocations of bourgeois nationalism"; before the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire it was accepted by the forthcoming heirs of the empire in the name of national self-determination. "Russian Socialists who fail to demand freedom of secession for Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, etc., etc.—are behaving like chauvinists, like lackeys of the blood-and-mud stained imperialist monarchies and the imperialist bourgeoisie." So wrote Lenin.

* * * * *

In addition, most students know of the two Russian Revolutions in 1917, but how many of us are aware of the widespread non-Russian Revolutions for national freedom and independence at that time? Yet the significance of these non-Russian Wars of Independence cannot but have profound meaning for us today. Independent national republics were established in area after area: Idel-Ural, November 12, 1917; Finland, December 6, 1917; Ukraine, January 22, 1918; Kuban Cossackia, February 16, 1918; Lithuania, February 16, 1918, followed in that year by Estonia, White Ruthenia, Don Cossackia, North Caucasia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Poland, and Latvia. In Siberia, on April 4, 1920, the Democratic Republic of the Far East was founded, and in Central Asia a republic was proclaimed by Turkestan on April 15, 1922.

* * * * *

FIRST WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

As shown in part by the former Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression of the U.S. House of Representatives, the history of Red Russian aggression commenced with the onslaught by Trotsky's Red Russian army against most of these non-Russian republics. States like Ukraine and Georgia were subverted, conquered, and made to appear as independent Soviet Republics by the end of 1920. Familiar techniques of "intensive revolution," infiltration, propaganda distortion, espionage, conspiracy, and planted governments had been in full use before the military blow struck. One republic was picked off after another on the traditional basis of divide-and-conquer. By 1923 the first wars between the non-Russian nations and Soviet Russia were over. On January 31, 1924, the forcible incorporation of these many nations into the new prison house of nations was formally declared with the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A new Red Russian Empire was now in being.

* * * * *

As we noted earlier, it is little appreciated that the first smashing defeat of the imperialist forces of Soviet Russia was registered in 1920 by the Polish-Ukrainian alliance of Pilsudski and Petlura. *If* their combined forces had crossed the proper borders of Russia and completely wiped out the Red Russian Army, Europe and the rest of the world would certainly have benefitted from far more than a twenty-year breathing period. As reflections of historical reality many of these "ifs" have pointed meaning for us today.

* * * * *

It is also in this period that so-called Soviet history was punctuated with recurring uprisings, passive resistance, and the mortal danger of "bourgeois nationalism." Witness the uprisings of 1929–30 and the purges of 1935 and 1937 in Georgia, the revolt of the young Turkestani in the Basmachi underground during 1935–41, the armed revolts of the Azerbaijani in 1925, 1929–30, and 1933, and the persistent opposition of the Ukrainians, which caused a Russian satrap, Kossior, to blurt out in 1933 that "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger." Aside from revisionism, the greatest and most enduring of crimes in the Soviet Union today is "bourgeois nationalism." For us it is plain national patriotism.

* * * * *

It is also important to remember that without these conquered non-Russian areas Russia and its roughly 110 million people could only be a second or third-rate power. Ukraine by itself stands as the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain. It should be noted, too, that the major economic resources in the USSR are largely concentrated in the non-Russian nations. Turkestan, which Moscow deliberately partitioned into five artificial Central Asiatic republics, and has since exploited severely, literally abounds in diverse natural resources.

* * * * *

SECOND WAVE OF AGGRESSION

The second wave of Soviet Russian aggression was really triggered by Moscow signing a ten-year non-aggression treaty with Berlin on August 24, 1939. The treaty paved the way for the Nazi invasion of Poland. The outbreak of World War II followed, and the opportunity for Russian colonialist expansion presented itself in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States. The paramount feature of this massive aggression was, of course, the forced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Moscow's prison house of nations.

* * * * *

Several histories of World War II have been published, and many still are in process. But still to be written for the benefit of the Free World is the struggle for national freedom in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the very course of World War II—a saga of invincible will and heroism. While the war gave Soviet Russia the opportunity to extend its colonialism, it also gave the non-Russian captives an equal opportunity to strike for national freedom. Even many freedom-loving Russians saw their opportunity, too. As in World War I, mass desertions from the polyglot multi-national armed forces of the USSR were the order of the time. White Ruthenians, Cossacks, Bashkiri, Georgians, Tatars, Chechens, Ukrainians, and others, who were supposed to be hopelessly indoctrinated by Communism, deserted in the millions in the hope of fighting for the freedom of their lands.

* * * * *

Here, in a nutshell, is the explanation of the unsurpassed political blunder in this century. The German Nazis attempted to foist their type of imperialist totalitarianism upon these non-Russian nations and in reality—fortunately for us—it cost them the war and victory. Throughout this period and, as a matter of fact, up to 1950, the national underground systems of Lithuania, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Turkestan, and others, engaged in guerrilla warfare against both the Russian and German totalitarians, and later against the Russians and their colonial puppets. Our interest in guerrilla warfare today can well be satisfied by a study of the warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in that period.

* * * * *

The colossal naiveté of some of our leaders was displayed in the Yalta agreements and other unnecessary concessions made to the greatest imperialist power on earth. Up to that time hundreds of agreements, treaties, and promises had been callously broken by colonialist Moscow but, for a variety of reasons, our leaders felt it could not happen to us. The roots of the successive Berlin crises go back to this period, and so does the captivity of many additional non-Russian nations. The causal reasons of ignorance and even degrees of Russophilism still are at work today.

* * * * *

THE THIRD WAVE

Whether by military occupation or by indirect means of the traditional Russian borderlands policy or "intensive revolution," as seen more recently in Cuba, South Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the process of aggression and the end result of conquest and domination of a people are the same. Satraps in most of these areas are Moscow-bred, and although differences have arisen—as in the cases of captive Poland, satellite Yugoslavia, the junior partner Red China, or rascal Albania—who can logically deny that the permanence of the unrepresentative regimes in any of these areas is inseparably bound up with the strength and future of their originator, Soviet Russia? Aggression by indirection was shown in Korea in 1950; it is at work in different stages on all five continents.

* * * * *

The world's masters in empire-building continue to reap incremental successes of indirect aggression, despite our alliances, the United Nations, the horrendous presence of nuclear weapons, and the Maginot Wall of containment. By the use of Moscow's traditional argument of no interference in "internal affairs," by skillfull propaganda inducing fears of war, and by gaining sanctuary from us in the consolidation of their vast empire, they have a free field for subversion, infiltration, and indirect aggression in the non-totalitarian Free World. The words of Admiral William H. Standley, our former Ambassador to the USSR, are as pertinent today as they were over a decade ago: "Over the ancient skeleton of Russian imperialism, Lenin and Stalin threw a cloak of Communist ideology, but the bones show through. Even as in Czarist times, when the Russian Bear stands on its hind feet with its front paws held up as if in prayer, we must 'beware of the Bear that walks like a Man.'"

* * * * *

The policy of liberation, accurately construed, is inescapable for our country if we are determined to survive as an independent nation. In addition to the given quantity of armed protection, the greatest weapon we have is the captive nations of Europe and Asia. The case of Hungary proved our failure to implement this policy, not the inefficacy of the policy itself. With good reason, there is nothing more frightening to Moscow than a developing concentration by us on the numerous captive non-Russian nations within the USSR itself. The image of Russian power can be changed overnight with such concentration on Russian colonialism and imperialism within the USSR—and with enormous impact on Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many of us still have not pondered well the question, "Why was it that Khrushchev, sitting on a pile of missiles and nuclear bombs and boasting about economic progress and the victory of Communism, almost suffered apoplexy when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959?" The answer is found in the call for this kind of concentration.

Paradoxically enough, Marx recognized a century ago the same problem that faces us today: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. . . . There is only one way to deal with a Power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." The fearless way, however, presupposes no abysmal gaps in our knowledge of the enemy. Let us now consider some of these cultural gaps in our armor of understanding.

Imperialism, Russian Style

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of George Washington's Birthday I think it appropriate to remember the plight of the Baltic peoples in Lithuania. An excellent statement of the tragedy of this country and its loss of freedom is expressed in an editorial published in the Los Angeles Times on February 15, 1968. The editorial follows:

IMPERIALISM, RUSSIAN STYLE

As part of their unceasing campaign to win power and influence among the underdeveloped countries, Kremlin propagandists never tire of boasting that Russia is an implacable foe of imperialism and a dedicated champion of "self-determination."

Yet Moscow brusquely dismisses any suggestion that the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union are entitled to determine their own national destinies, too.

To call attention to this massive Soviet exercise in hypocrisy, organizations representing some 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent have proclaimed 1968 as "Lithuanian Fight for Freedom Year." Similar observances are being carried out by this country's Latvians and Estonians.

If they expect to generate any significant pressures on the Soviet Union, they are likely to be disappointed.

They won't get much sympathy at the United Nations, for example, because a majority of the members is unable to comprehend that white Europeans can be victims of imperialism, too.

The same disability unfortunately afflicts a lot of American and European liberals who wax indignant at colonial injustices in places like Angola, but wouldn't dream of demanding plebiscites within the Communist orbit.

Actually, the Russians are old hands at imperialism.

During the 400 years preceding World War I, Russia expanded at an average rate of 50 square miles a day. Thus, by the time the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917, the czar's empire consisted of a dominant core of Russians and a whole host of subject peoples—Ukrainians, Poles, Balts, Armenians, Georgians, Turks, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, etc.

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction.

Lenin's Bolshevik government formally recognized the independence and sovereignty of all three in 1920 peace treaties, thus ending 120 years of Russian rule.

As a conseqeunce of Stalin's deal with Hitler, however, the Red army invaded the Baltic countries in June, 1940.

In Lithuania all non-Communist political parties were outlawed and a puppet parliament "elected" which thereupon petitioned for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

The same kind of fate befell Latvia and Estonia.

After World War II, 30,000 Lithuanian partisans lost their lives in futile resistance to Soviet rule. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or moved to other parts of the Soviet Union. A deliberate policy of Russification was begun—and continues to this day.

No one can say for sure what would happen if the Kremlin allowed the Baltic peoples to choose freely now between independence and allegiance to Moscow—a right which is supposedly guaranteed by the Soviet constitution.

But one thing is clear. Russia's chest-thumping champions of "self-determination" have no intention of putting it to the test.

Henry S. Koster and Equal Economic Rights

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to inform my colleagues of the fact that public-spirited citizens can and do assist in the movement for equal rights for all of our citizens.

The attached letter from my constituent, Huntington M. Turner, details one such important movement, and the New York Times article of December 17, 1968, which follows gives further evidence of it.

Mr. Henry S. Koster is to be commended on his foresight and public service:

H. S. KOSTER & CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 19, 1968.

Hon. T. R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: When I retired as a Vice President of Chemical Bank New York Trust Company after thirty-seven years with that institution, under our pension plan, approximately four years ago, I joined my old friend, Henry S. Koster, whom I had first known in the banking business in Newark in 1925. We had also been associated together at Chemical Bank but he resigned to organize his own company and became a financial consultant.

A colored couple whom he employs, asked him to help a couple of their friends start in business. He thought about this, studied the situation and finally organized a group known as the Association to Assist Negro Business, which was publicized in the Times under date of December 17th. I am enclosing a copy of the article which I am sure you will be interested in reading.

Mr. Koster worked out all of the details, got thirteen guarantors and five or six others who put up money to run the office. They expect the Association to become self-supporting in the future when the business that they finance are successful, as they will pay a certain amount of their profits into a reserve fund for future failures. The Association has set up a Board of Directors composed entirely of Negroes who will screen all applications. These Directors are important individuals in the community. The Association has made an arrangement with the Freedom National Bank to make loans to approved applicants. Aubrey Edwards, who at one tme was Executive Director of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity is in charge of the Association's office which is located in Harlem at 271 West 125th Street.

After the reserve fund has been built up, there will be no need for guarantors and the Association will then stand on its own feet and be run entirely by Negroes.

I thought you would be interested in knowing about this as I am one of your constituents and the Association has its headquarters in Harlem. In my opinion, Mr. Koster should be commended for his leadership in organzing the Association and I feel that gestures such as this will go a long way in helping to minimize and perhaps eliminate riots.

Your opinions of the contents of this letter would be appreciated and while I am not asking you to do so, if you should, after investigating, enter this in the Congressional Record, I would appreciate your sending me a copy.

Sincerely yours,

HUNTINGTON M. TURNER.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1967]

GROUP IS HELPING NEGRO BUSINESSES

(By Leonard Sloane)

Robert Mickle is a 28-year-old former employe of the Transit Authority who wanted to buy a gas station. Connie Patterson is a 35-year-old saleswoman at a uniform shop who dreamed but never hoped of owning the store. And Joseph Muller, at age 59, had extensive experience in selling women's ready-to-wear and wanted to expand his horizons.

All three are Negroes and all three did not have the collateral required by a bank for a loan to start a small company. Nevertheless, all three are about to begin operating their own businesses thanks to an unusual organization that is less than a year old.

The name of this non-profit group describes its function: The Association to Assist Negro Business. Its 12-member board consists of Negroes and is headed by Rose Morgan, head of Rose Morgan Enterprises, which sells a line of cosmetics and operates a beauty shop. Its salaried president and also a board member is Aubrey H. Edwards, a young graduate of Morgan State College.

But an integral part of the concept is a group of white businessmen who, in effect, cosign the bank loans arranged by the association.

THIRTEEN GUARANTORS

At present there are 13 guarantors working with the organization. Each has signed a power of attorney authorizing a representative of the association to commit him as a backer of the loans that have been arranged individually. If the business fails or the owner cannot repay the money, then the guarantors are liable up to a maximum of $10,000 over a 10-year period.

"The whole idea came about from a pure need because there seemed to be no actual way that a Negro starting a business could get bank financing," Mr. Edwards said. "This project tries to deal with the experience and the collateral—the two things that influence commercial financing."

"This is a fundamental and ingenious answer to the key problem of developing economic opportunities for Negro businessmen," said Lawrence S. Phillips, president of the Phillips Van Heusen Corporation and one of the present guarantors. "It struck me as being a fascinating, yet simple, solution that I had never heard of before."

Working closely with the association in its program is the Freedom National Bank. The bank, like the association and many of the association and many of the individuals who have received the guaranteed loans, is in Harlem. And Freedom National's president, William R. Hudgins, sees the entire effort as a means of improving economic conditions in that area.

"I think this is one of the more meaningful ways those who have expressed an interest in the economic development of the Harlem community can be effective," he added. "It's putting your money where your mouth is."

The bank is participating in this project to an extent that goes beyond making normal business loans. "At such time that these individuals have exhibited substantial progress in their business, the bank will free up the guarantors," Mr. Hudgins said. "Then their guarantees can be used in connection with other loans."

What do the small businessmen who participate in the program think of it all?

"It's very good for the community," said James Ray Lewis, a 36-year-old businessman whose S. & J. Demolition, Inc., received one of the four loans that have been authorized under the program since it began in November. The demolition contracting organizations established by Mr. Lewis in September received a $21,000 loan at 7 per cent which enabled it to bid on a $30,700-wrecking job for a building owned by Columbia University on West 115th Street.

"I realize that if my father had a chance like this, he would have been able to get much further in life," declared Mr. Mickle, whose Shell service station will open in the Bronx on Wednesday. "It's a wonderful opportunity for a black man to get an economic chance in this country."

In contrast to Mr. Mickle, who is just beginning in his field, Mr. Muller has 34 years of experience in selling apparel. He started as a porter and worked up to assistant display manager, display manager, assistant manager and manager.

In two months, Mr. Muller will open a Lady Van Heusen shop on 125th Street, Harlem's main thoroughfare. He hopes to achieve a volume of $80,000 in his first year of operation and his opening inventory will be about $12,000 at cost.

"This whole concept is something that's been long overdue," he said. "It's unbelievable that people can be so altruistic."

EMPLOYES TRAINED

The beneficiaries of association-guaranteed loans also feel that they are helping to run the program because of the two commitments they undertake along with their participation. Everyone agrees to train some of his employes so that they eventually will have the experience to manage and possibly own similar businesses in the future. And those who achieve financial success will be asked to help support the association in its future endeavors.

The Association to Assist Negro Business has been financed temporarily since its incorporation last January by contributions from directors, guarantors and others. The group now hopes for financial assistance from a foundation and is looking forward to the time when the people it has helped can make contributions of their own.

Meanwhile, Mr. Edwards, former executive director of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity of New York, is keeping everything going with his enthusiasm and faith in the idea that more Negro-owned businesses are essential to the development of greater initiative and enterprise among a large segment of the population.

"We want to develop more participants in the marketplace," he said. "We find it most difficult. But it must be done. We want to help 15 new businesses get started next year. We'll work with them very closely as no government organization that assists small businesses can.

"You know, although this program is very heavily laden with social and emotional things, it's very business laden too. We don't ever want to have to draw on our guarantors. And we're all very much aware of the responsibilities we have to make this whole thing work."

Civil Disobedience or Due Process of Law?

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a very real social issue is presented by the question of civil disobedience.

We are a government of laws and of ordered change through elections and the political process. However, there have been times in our history, both past and recent, in which Americans have employed the techniques of civil disobedience to bring change in the social order. Whether this is right is a question we must all concern ourselves with.

A distinguished and accomplished judge, the Honorable Lyle E. Cook, has written a provocative and interesting article for the Stanford Alumni Almanac on this question. He asks, "Civil Disobedience or Due Process of Law?"

Judge Cook's exposition and his answer, like the question itself are worthy of a good deal of thought.

Under unanimous consent I submit Mr. Cook's article for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE OR DUE PROCESS OF LAW?

(By Lyle E. Cook, '29, judge of the Superior Court, County of Alameda, State of California)

"No man is above the law and no man is below it." —THEODORE ROOSEVELT, 1903

(NOTE.—Lyle E. Cook, '29, has been a judge of the Alameda County Superior Court since 1961 and earlier served on the Oakland-Piedmont Municipal Court bench. He received his law degree from the University of California and practiced in the East Bay prior to his judicial appointment. With the Judge Advocate General's Department during World War II, he remained in the Reserves until his retirement in 1962. Judge Cook has many civic and professional affiliations and has retained a deep interest in Stanford through participation in programs such as the Summer Alumni College. He and his wife Eleene are the parents of two grown sons.)

It has been said that one man alone on an island needs no law, but two do. And it is further said that if a woman joins them they need a whole system of jurisprudence.

Whether the latter is true or not we do have a whole system of jurisprudence embraced by our unique federal system of Constitutional law. By it our affairs are guided from the moment of conception to well beyond the day of final entombment. Our lives, our fortunes, and often our honor are in large measure determined by this legal structure.

This system is the product of no one man nor of a single generation of men. It has come down to us through the long processes of Western civilization, and we are continuing its evolution and refinement every day through our legislatures and our courts. Indeed, the whole history of the United States has involved the enlargement of human rights and human freedom through the social processes of our Constitutional form of government.

In accepting his second nomination to the presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke these prophetic words: "There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given; of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

The generation to which Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke over 30 years ago had shared the ravages of the Great Depression. Unrest, born of joblessness, mortgage foreclosures, and general economic stagnation throughout the country, had posed grave questions about the future of Constitutional government.

The present generation of Americans has more goods, more services, more provision for individual rights and freedoms than any other in the long history of mankind. Our affluent society has provided new goals for our hopes and new boundaries for our expectations.

Despite these obvious advances, a persistent unrest is being manifested at all levels of our body politic. Grave concerns about events at home and abroad are creating a complex of frustrated human behavior. Sharp conflicts have divided our people between the dove and the hawk, the liberal and the conservative, the advantaged and the disadvantaged. Complaints about the "Establishment" and the "Power Structure" come from many of the critics of present-day America.

In an era of such unrest it may be of benefit to examine the stresses and strains which these current phenomena are imposing upon our system of jurisprudence. It may also be well to sound a warning to those leaders of mass movements who seem so unconcerned about their potential for the destruction of that system.

Today, *ad hoc* committees formed by a wide assortment of persons for a wide assortment of purposes are posing serious questions involving the rights and duties of individuals under our Constitutional system.

The most recent and most disturbing incidents, at this writing, have been those organized by various groups which oppose the foreign policy of the United States in Vietnam. A generous assortment of "activists" has found common cause in a determination to force a withdrawal of our troops from that unhappy and disheveled country.

Mass movements involving thousands of people under the direction of one or more of these seemingly ephemeral *ad hoc* committees have descended on draft induction centers in several large cities with the announced intention of disrupting their function. These thousands have included leaders from the professions, a generous sprinkling of high school and college students, and a general miscellany which always seems to be available in moments of disorder.

Draft card burnings have been elevated to the apparent status of religious sacraments with the advice and consent of prominent clergymen.

These events have frequently involved a calculated intent to violate laws duly enacted pursuant to the Constitution of the United States.

The philosophy underlying these defiant acts and precepts is currently characterized by its partisans as the doctrine of "Civil Disobedience."

This euphemism apparently originated with Henry David Thoreau over a century ago. In his essay entitled *Civil Disobedience,* first published in 1849, he advanced his theory that men sell themselves into perpetual bondage by conforming to the traditional ways of the world.

Thoreau, who has been best known as a naturalist, did not limit his dislike of the ways of the world to the proclivities of mankind in the direction of war. He opposed "government" in general and all governments in particular. "That government is best which governs not at all," he wrote. He cheerfully went to jail rather than pay his taxes. He doubted the validity of the outcome of elections, stating that "there is but little virtue in the action of the masses of men." He felt no common cause with any political majority and preferred to think of himself as the only majority he wished to recognize.

In short, Thoreau preached a kind of solipsism. In his *Civil Disobedience* he summed up his philosophy in one significant sentence:

"In fact, I quietly declare war with the state, after my fashion, though I will still make what use and get what advantage of her I can, as is usual in such cases."

Thoreau was a member of a New England group of ministers and writers which was devoted to the ethical probings of the great German philosopher Immanuel Kant. Called Transcendentalists, the group also experimented with various kinds of Utopian living in communal societies.

It is hard to reconcile Thoreau's theories of Civil Disobedience with Kant's categorical imperative, central to his ethical concepts, which proclaimed, "Act as if the maxim from which you act were to become through your will a universal law of nature."

The present crop of "activists" is not the first group to espouse the philosophy of Thoreau. The Ku Klux Klan "demonstrated" in behalf of its "beliefs" from the years following the Civil War up to the present. It, too, has declared war on the state.

The philosophy that "the end justifies the means" has a superficial attractiveness. It appealed to the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and his adherents in the 1950s in much the same manner as it appeals to the leaders of marches on induction centers in the 1960s.

This theory also sanctions the sit-ins in college administration buildings seeking to prevent representatives of currently disfavored industries from interviewing student applicants for employment.

While the concept of disobedience to law was certainly not original with Thoreau, his use of the word *Civil* as a modifier has produced some semantic uncertainty. The same uncertainties would appear in the terms "civil wife-beater" and "civil rapist."

There is, of course, no legal or Constitutional basis for the concept of Civil Disobedience whether its handy solutions are employed by the political right, the political left, or the political middle. It does not give sanction to the violations of law by any group, ecclesiastical or profane.

The concept of "due process of law" in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence surely predates the Magna Carta, where King John was required to promise to observe "the law of the land." The term itself was used in the statutes of Edward III in 1355 in almost the precise language in which it is found in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

There is not room in this publication for any sufficient discussion of the meanings inherent in the term. No full and final definition of its wide embrace has ever been accomplished. "That kind of procedure is *due process of law* which is suitable and proper to the case and sanctioned by the established customs and usages of the Courts," the United States Supreme Court stated in an early opinion. Under its general concept of fundamental fairness it signifies a right to be present at proceedings, to be heard, to present evidence, to confront opponents and know their claims, and to have controversies decided by impartial tribunals. The term implies that laws shall not be arbitrary or capricious and that means selected to enforce them shall have real and substantial relation to that object. It has been described as "of the very essence of ordered liberty."

Due Process, thus, invites concepts such as the right to counsel and a speedy and public trial; prohibitions against double jeopardy, forced self-incriminatory testimony, and unlawful searches and seizures. On the other hand, Civil Disobedience can be realistically associated only with the vagaries and excesses of *ad hoc* committees spawned tonight and disbanded the day after tomorrow.

Due Process contemplates a permanent structure of orderly, predictable, and accountable government. Civil Disobedience contemplates ultimate anarchy.

It would be beneficial for those persons who wish America well to remember that the same Constitution which commands that no person shall be deprived "of life, liberty, or property without due process of law" also provides that the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies," and "to provide and maintain a navy," and that "the President shall be commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy."

This same Constitution which, in the First Amendment, proscribes any abridgement of the freedom of speech or of the press or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble also states, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme law of the land . . ."

The same courts which are charged with the recognition of all the rights under the Constitution are also charged with the enforcement of all of the duties. The option to comply only with selected portions of law and constitutions is not extended to president, governors, legislators, or judges. Should it be extended to anyone?

It is no little thing to act individually in defiance of the supreme law of the land. It is an act of monstrous proportions to advise and encourage others so to act.

But such defiance is being urged and practiced in these troubled times by persons of presumed maturity and in exalted positions from which they exert unusual influence.

Sometimes the proponents of Civil Disobedience cite historical examples such as the Boston Tea Party as justification for their extralegal efforts. It is submitted that this is a fallacious comparison. King George III, against whom the Boston patriots were rebelling, obviously provided a quite different form of government for Colonial America. Citizens of the United States now enjoy all of the facilities of the ballot box to effect changes in their government and in their governors. These facilities provide the machinery for orderly and effective change to reflect the will of the majority and to afford the views of minorities a hearing. None of these prevailed under George III.

The same can be said for historical protests against the rule of ancient Rome by early Christians, where government by the consent of the governed was an unknown principle.

The willful violation of any penal law is a crime. It is no defense that a law was violated in a cause or for a purpose the defendant asserts to be meritorious. Civil Disobedience thus becomes criminal disobedience.

This unhappy discovery was recently noted by a well-known folk-singer and disciple of Thoreau when she observed, "I was trying to disturb the war and I wound up in jail for disturbing the peace—does that make sense?"

An affirmative answer to this rhetorical question was given recently by the United States Supreme Court, which stated that an individual cannot escape from social constraint merely by asserting that he is engaged in political talk or action.

There are wide avenues of thought, speech, and action open to those who wish to express their dissent with any policy of their government. The principles of freedom of speech, of the press, of the rights of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances are not empty phrases. They are not optional indulgences by a whimsical government.

These principles and rights are backed by the full power of the three branches of the government and are equally binding on each branch. The Supreme Court has stated that a "function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger."

Thus, peaceful assemblies for the purpose of advocacy of points of view, peaceful picketing, peaceful parades, and any number of other peaceful events come under the Constitutional umbrella erected by the First Amendment.

Emphasis must be placed on the word *peaceful*. There are limits to these freedoms and rights as there must be to all individual actions if an orderly society is to be maintained. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes noted 50 years ago: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'fire' in a theater and causing panic. The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the evils that Congress has a right to prevent." Significantly, this language was used in the famous *Schenck* case involving the counseling of violation of the draft laws of World War I.

Freedom of speech and assembly do not extend to the blocking of entrances to public buildings by the bodies of large numbers of people assembled to deny access to persons having lawful business therein. They do not extend to the public utterances of obscenities, as a young man from Berkeley recently learned from a California Appellate Court. They do not extend to violence or physically oppressive behavior. They do not extend to the limits implied by the doctrine of Civil Disobedience and claimed by many of its current disciples.

It would seem, however, that ample latitude remains for all scholarly utterances and endeavors. Most people would even say that theological exhortations would not be unduly inhibited by any of these restrictions. To the great majority of our people these notions of violence and physical oppression seem strangely inappropriate in political, academic, or spiritual discourse.

It is also worthy of note that large numbers of arrests resulting from mob actions aroused by the advocates of Civil Disobedience have created a severe strain on the courts. Criminal trials, under the Constitution, must be held promptly and they take precedence over most other matters before the courts. Thus, claims for personal injuries and contractual obligations, along with other types of civil actions, have in some cases been delayed for many months because no judge was available to hear them. To the thousands of people involved this is a serious deprivation of a right to which they, too, are entitled.

There is an old maxim in the law of Equity that "he who seeks Equity must do Equity." This has come down to us from the old Ecclesiastical Courts of Chancery in England. It is still the law in most jurisdictions of this country. This maxim stems from the paramount principle that the law of Equity is the law of conscience. It means that a court will not grant equitable relief to a party to a lawsuit unless that party makes provision for the equitable demands of his adversary.

While this principle does not operate to deprive any person of his Constitutional rights, it seems reasonable to expect that men of good will and academic probity would agree that one who seeks due process of law from his government should, in all conscience, abide by due process of law in his own conduct. To do otherwise is to invite the disruption of our society.

"The Constitutional guarantee of liberty," wrote former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg, "implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy."

If in our zeal for easy solutions to hard problems we ignore the inseparability of our laws and our Constitution we shall, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "tear the charter of our own and our children's liberty."

This generation of Americans, indeed, has a rendezvous with destiny.

Special Bulk Mailing Rate for Neighborhood Groups

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15533, to amend title 39 of the United States Code in order to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, there has been a spectacular growth in neighborhood improvement groups in some parts of the country. Permit me to use my district, which coincides with the city of Minneapolis, as an example of such growth.

The last 5 years have seen a huge increase in neighborhood improvement associations in Minneapolis. More than 40 organizations are now actively involved in efforts to maintain and develop the family-residential character of the Minneapolis central city that has lost too many young, productive families to the suburbs.

Virtually every residential area in the city has its own neighborhood group that promotes local public improvements, encourages property upkeep and provides a "watchdog" service for zoning changes.

Three years ago, many of these groups banded together to organize a city-wide association of neighborhood groups. The Council of Community Councils, as the organization came to be known, has been a strong force for neighborhood development in Minneapolis. The council was instrumental in the passage of a statewide "dilapidated buildings" law which gave municipalities authority to demolish abandoned, dilapidated structures. More recently, the council successfully worked for an amendment to the Minneapolis housing code which made exterior maintenance of buildings a code item.

The new Federal urban legislation of the last few years has given neighborhood groups new opportunities as well as new responsibilities. Many groups are now deeply involved in Department of Housing and Urban Development and Office of Economic Opportunity projects. The Northside Federation of Community Groups, for example, organized the areawide election for directors of the new pilot center, a multiagency project which will coordinate more than $2 million worth of services for the residents of north Minneapolis. Recently, the Minneapolis City Council named representatives from 10 south Minneapolis groups to organize the policy and planning committee for Minneapolis' model neighborhood.

These new Federal programs have made it necessary for the neighborhood groups to make mailings more frequently and to larger numbers of people in the neighborhoods. The success of efforts such as model neighborhoods will depend in large part on the understanding that neighborhod residents have of these programs. Thus far, the Minneapolis groups have done an excellent job of informing their residents about the new programs. During the past year, community groups have sponsored hundreds of meetings, circulated thousands of newsletters and even rented a billboard in an effort to inform residents about proposals for new programs.

The communication function of the groups has been severely limited, however, by current postal regulations. Under existing law, neighborhood associations do not have special third-class bulk mailing privileges which would allow the groups to mail at the rate of 1.4 cents per piece. This means that all neighborhood group mail must be sent at the new regular third-class rate of 6 cents per 2 ounces. For private, nonprofit neighborhood associations, the 6-cent rate provides a real financial burden. The Jordan Area Action Committee, for example, would like to notify all the residents of a 65-square-block area about a proposed code enforcement project. But current postal rates make such a mailing prohibitively expensive.

There is real value in the independent nature of these organizations. Because of the informal, grassroots nature of these groups, they have an easier time gaining the trust of their neighborhood than does an official Government agency. Even with their new responsibilities, the neighborhood groups are not asking for direct Government subsidies. Many groups feel that they can operate most effectively by maintaining their independent source of financing.

Although Federal funds are not needed for neighborhood associations, the Government can provide a small but significant encouragement to the associations by extending to them the use of the special third-class mailing permit that is now available to a wide range of nonprofit educational and welfare organizations.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 15533

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4452(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "for fraternal organizations or associations" and inserting in lieu thereof "fraternal, or neighborhood improvement organizations or associations".

The Los Angeles Times Speaks Out on Congress and Welfare Reform

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times, which strongly urged the Members of the House and Senate to reconsider many of the severe restrictions and reductions in the welfare provisions of last year's Social Security Act amendments, adopted in the closing hours of the 1967 session of Congress.

The Times' editorial illustrates graphically the unfortunate human and financial results of these so-called welfare reforms, and presents persuasive arguments for early congressional reconsideration of these arbitrary and inequitable provisions of our Federal welfare programs.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND WELFARE REFORM

Tens of thousands of needy children and their families in California will be denied any federal assistance this year unless Congress reverses its ill-considered cutback in welfare funds.

In a year wracked by rioting in the slums, Congress responded to the crisis by reducing the amount of federal participation in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

Federal funding was limited to the percentage of AFDC children as of Jan. 1 this year. And since the birth rate is higher in low-income areas, the effect will be to disqualify the "excess" youngsters or to force state and local governments to assume the additional burden.

The congressional action will cause an estimated loss of $8 million of federal money in 1968–69 in Los Angeles County alone. L. S. Hollinger, county chief administrative officer, estimates that 30,000 dependent children will be affected when the new law goes into effect July 1 and 50,000 children by 1970.

It hardly seems possible that Congress would be so insensitive to the urgent problems of the urban poor as to shift part of the federal responsibility on to the hard-pressed local and state governments. Although the welfare load is growing at an alarming rate, cutting back on the aid to needy children is a harsh and unrealistic solution.

The Times supports new legislation requiring AFDC parents to accept job training where feasible and mandating the issuance of birth control information to welfare recipients.

But we join with the Board of Supervisors in urging the 1968 Congress to repeal the limitation on funds for needy children.

Another amendment, effective Jan. 1, will cost county taxpayers $3.5 million annually by imposing new restrictions upon the eligibility of unemployed parents for AFDC assistance. Those cut from the AFDC-Unemployed Parents program must be shifted to the General Relief rolls. The Times also urges the repeal of this amendment.

On the recommendation of Hollinger, the Board of Supervisors asked Congress to make three other badly-needed changes in federal welfare laws and regulations:

Increased federal participation in the placement of dependent children in foster care facilities. Federal help has been minimal in a program that has grown in cost 626% since 1958.

Greater flexibility in regulations and standards in welfare administration. Although federal rules follow federal funding, there is no reason why they cannot be realistic and flexible.

Inclusion of temporarily disabled persons in the Aid to Disabled Program, which now requires that recipients be permanently or totally disabled. Those suffering temporary disability must now be included in the General Relief program.

Welfare programs are only one of the means of easing the terrible plight of those in slums. But they are an essential means, and any political cutbacks now would be the most tragic kind of false economy.

ganizations or associations" and inserting in lieu thereof "fraternal, or neighborhood improvement organizations or associations".

The Los Angeles Times Speaks Out on Congress and Welfare Reform

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times, which strongly urged the Members of the House and Senate to reconsider many of the severe restrictions and reductions in the welfare provisions of last year's Social Security Act amendments, adopted in the closing hours of the 1967 session of Congress.

The Times' editorial illustrates graphically the unfortunate human and financial results of these so-called welfare reforms, and presents persuasive arguments for early congressional reconsideration of these arbitrary and inequitable provisions of our Federal welfare programs.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND WELFARE REFORM

Tens of thousands of needy children and their families in California will be denied any federal assistance this year unless Congress reverses its ill-considered cutback in welfare funds.

In a year wracked by rioting in the slums, Congress responded to the crisis by reducing the amount of federal participation in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

Federal funding was limited to the percentage of AFDC children as of Jan. 1 this year. And since the birth rate is higher in low-income areas, the effect will be to disqualify the "excess" youngsters or to force state and local governments to assume the additional burden.

The congressional action will cause an estimated loss of $8 million of federal money in 1968–69 in Los Angeles County alone. L. S. Hollinger, county chief administrative officer, estimates that 30,000 dependent children will be affected when the new law goes into effect July 1 and 50,000 children by 1970.

It hardly seems possible that Congress would be so insensitive to the urgent problems of the urban poor as to shift part of the federal responsibility on to the hard-pressed local and state governments. Although the welfare load is growing at an alarming rate, cutting back on the aid to needy children is a harsh and unrealistic solution.

The Times supports new legislation requiring AFDC parents to accept job training where feasible and mandating the issuance of birth control information to welfare recipients.

But we join with the Board of Supervisors in urging the 1968 Congress to repeal the limitation on funds for needy children.

Another amendment, effective Jan. 1, will cost county taxpayers $3.5 million annually by imposing new restrictions upon the eligibility of unemployed parents for AFDC assistance. Those cut from the AFDC-Unemployed Parents program must be shifted to the General Relief rolls. The Times also urges the repeal of this amendment.

On the recommendation of Hollinger, the Board of Supervisors asked Congress to make three other badly-needed changes in federal welfare laws and regulations:

Increased federal participation in the placement of dependent children in foster care facilities. Federal help has been minimal in a program that has grown in cost 626% since 1958.

Greater flexibility in regulations and standards in welfare administration. Although federal rules follow federal funding, there is no reason why they cannot be realistic and flexible.

Inclusion of temporarily disabled persons in the Aid to Disabled Program, which now requires that recipients be permanently or totally disabled. Those suffering temporary disability must now be included in the General Relief program.

Welfare programs are only one of the means of easing the terrible plight of those in slums. But they are an essential means, and any political cutbacks now would be the most tragic kind of false economy.